

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Various pagings.

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

FOURTH SESSION—FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

45 VICTORIÆ, 1882.

VOL. XII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE
SEVENTEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1882.

Edited and Indexed by JOHN CHAS. BOYCE, Assistant to Chief Reporter.



OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.
1882

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE SESSION OF 1882.

Minister of Interior (Premier).....	Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, K.C.B., P.C.
Minister of Finance.....	Sir S. L. TILLEY, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Railways and Canals.....	Sir CHARLES TUPPER, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Postmaster-General.....	HON. JOHN O'CONNOR.
Minister of Justice.....	Sir ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Public Works.....	Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.
President of the Council.....	HON. ARCHIBALD W. McLELAN.
Minister of Agriculture.....	HON. JOHN HENRY POPE.
Minister of Customs.....	HON. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Minister of Militia and Defence.....	HON. ADOLPHE P. R. CARON.
Secretary of State.....	HON. JOSEPH A. MOUSSEAU.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.....	HON. JAMES COLLEDGE POPE.
Minister of Inland Revenue.....	HON. J. C. AIKINS.
Speaker of the Senate.....	HON. D. L. MACPHERSON.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HON. JOSEPH GODÉRIC BLANCHET.....	Speaker.
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq.....	Clerk of the House.
DONALD W. MACDONELL, Esq.....	Sergeant-at-Arms.
JEAN P. LEPROHON.....	Clerk Assistant.
HENRY R. SMITH.....	Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

GEORGE B. BRADLEY.....	Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN A. ABBOTT.....	} Reporters.
JOSEPH C. DUGGAN.....	
GEORGE EYVEL.....	
ALBERT HORTON.....	
F. A. MARCEAU.....	
ISAAC WATSON.....	} Assistant to Chief Reporter.
JOHN CHAS. ROYCE.....	

LIST OF MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN THE

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

ADDINGTON —John McRory.	DIGBY —John C. Wade.
ALBERT —Alexander Rogers.	DORCHESTER —François Fortunat Rouleau.
ALGOMA —Simon J. Dawson.	DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA —Désiré Olivier Bourbeau.
ANNAPOLIS —Avaré Longley.	DUNDAS —John Sylvester Ross.
ANTIGONISH —Angus McIsaac.	DURHAM, E. RIDING —Arthur T. H. Williams.
ARGENTEUIL —Hon. J. J. C. Abbott.	DURHAM, W. RIDING —Hon. Edward Blake.
BAGOT —Hon. Joseph Alfred Mousseau.	ELGIN, E. RIDING —Thomas Arkell.
BEAUCE —Joseph Bolduc.	ELGIN, W. RIDING —George Elliott Casey.
BEAUHARNOIS —Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.	ESSEX —James Colebrooke Patterson.
BELLECHASSE —Guillaume Amyot.	FRONTENAC —George Airey Kirkpatrick.
BERTHIER —E. Octavian Cuthbert.	GASPÉ —Pierre Fortin.
BONAVENTURE —P. C. Beauchesne.	GLENGARRY —John McLennan.
BOTHWELL —Hon. David Mills.	GLOUCESTER —Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin.
BRANT, N. RIDING —Gavin Fleming.	GRENVILLE, S. RIDING —John Philip Wiser.
BRANT, S. RIDING —William Paterson.	GREY, E. RIDING —Thomas S. Sproule.
BROCKVILLE —William Fitzsimmons.	GREY, N. RIDING —Samuel J. Lane.
BROME —David Ames Manson.	GREY, S. RIDING —George Jackson.
BRUCE, N. RIDING —John Gillies.	GUYSBOROUGH —Alfred Ogden.
BRUCE, S. RIDING —Alexander Shaw.	
CAPE BRETON { William McDonald. William Mackenzie McLeod,	HALDIMAND —David Thompson.
CARDWELL —Thomas White.	HALIFAX — { Matthew H. Richey. Malachy Bowes Daly.
CARLETON (N.B.) —David Irvine.	HALTON —Hon. William McDougall, C.B.
CARLETON (O.) —John Rochester.	HAMILTON — { Francis Edwin Kilvert. Thomas Robertson.
CARIBOO —James Reid.	HANTS —W. Henry Allison.
CHAMBLY —Pierre Basile Benoit.	HASTINGS, E. RIDING —John White.
CHAMPLAIN —Hippolyte Montplaisir.	HASTINGS, N. RIDING —Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.
CHARLEVOIX —Simon Xavier Cimon.	HASTINGS, W. RIDING —James Brown.
CHARLOTTE —Arthur Hill Gillmor.	HOCHELAGA —Alphonse Desjardins.
CHATEAUGUAY —Edward Holton.	HUNTINGDON —Julius Scriver.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY —Ernest Cimon.	HURON, C. RIDING —Hon. Sir Richard J. Cartwright, K.C.M.G.
COLCHESTER —Hon. Archibald Woodbury McLelan.	HURON, N. RIDING —Thomas Fairrow.
COMPTON —Hon. John Henry Pope.	HURON, S. RIDING —Malcolm Colton Cameron.
CORNWALL —Darby Bergin.	
CUMBERLAND —Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, K.C.M.G.	

IBBEVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Samuel MacDonnell.

JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
JOLIETTE—Louis Arthur McConville.

KAMOURASKA—Joseph Dumont.
KENT (N.B.)—Gilbert Anselme Girouard.
KENT (O.)—Rufus Stephenson.
KING'S (N.B.)—James Domville.
KING'S (N.S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P.E.I.)— { Augustine Colin Macdonald.
 { Ephraim Bell Muttart.
KINGSTON—Alexander Gunn.

LAMBTON—Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.
LANARK, N. RIDING—Donald G. Macdonell.
LANARK, S. RIDING—John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE—Alfred Pisonneault.
L'ASSOMPTION—Hilaire Hurteau.
LAVAL—Joseph Aldéric Ouimet.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. RIDING—Charles Frederick Ferguson.
LEEDS, S. RIDING—David Ford Jones.
LENNOX—Edmund Hooper.
LÉVIS—Hon. Joseph Godéric Blanchet.
LINCOLN—John Charles Rykert.
LISGAR—John Christian Schultz.
L'ISLET—Philippe Baby Casgrain.
LONDON—Hon. John Carling.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MARQUETTE—Joseph Ryan.
MASKINONGÉ—Frédéric Houde.
MEGANTIC—Louis Ephrem Olivier.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Duncan Macmillan.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—Timothy Coughlin.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—George William Ross.
MISSISSQUI—George Barnard Baker.
MONCK—Lachlin McCallum.
MONTCALM—Firmin Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Auguste C. P. R. Landry.
MONTMORENCY—Pierre Vincent Valin.
MONTREAL, CENTRE—Michael Patrick Ryan.
MONTREAL, EAST—Charles Joseph Coursol.
MONTREAL, WEST—Matthew Hamilton Gault.
MUSKOKA—Alexander Peter Cockburn.

NAPIERVILLE—Sixte Coupal *dit* La Reine.
NEW WESTMINSTER—J. A. R. Homer.
NIAGARA—Josiah Burr Plumb.
NICOLET—François Xavier Ovide Méthot.
NORFOLK, N. RIDING—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. RIDING—William Wallace.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Jabez Bunting Snowball.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E. RIDING—Darius Crouter.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W. RIDING—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—George Wheler.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—Francis Wayland Glen.
OTTAWA (CITY)— { Joseph Merrill Currier.
 { Joseph Tassé.
OTTAWA COUNTY—Alonzo Wright.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—James A. Skinner.

PEEL—William Elliott.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Samuel Rollin Hesson.
PERTH, S. RIDING—James Trow.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Burnham.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—George Hilliard.
PICTOU— { Robert Doull.
 { John McDougald.
PONTIAC—John Poupore.
PORTNEUF—Roche Pamphile Vallée.
PRESCOTT—Félix Routhier.
PRINCE (P.E.I.)— { Edward Hackett.
 { James Yeo.
PRINCE EDWARD—James Simeon McCuaig.
PROVENCHER—Joseph Royal.

QUEBEC, CENTRE—Jacques Malouin.
QUEBEC, EAST—Hon. Wilfrid Laurier.
QUEBEC, WEST—Hon. Thos. McGreevy.
QUEBEC (COUNTY)—Hon. Adolphe Philippe René Jos. Caron.
QUEEN'S (N.B.)—George Gerald King.
QUEEN'S (N.S.)—Silas T. R. Bill.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)— { Hon. James Colledge Pope.
 { Frederick de Saint-Croix Brecken.

RENFREW, N. RIDING—Peter White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—William Bannerman.
RESTIGOUCHE—George Haddow.
RICHELIEU—Louis Huet Massue.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Edmund P. Flynn.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—William Bullock Ives.
RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.
ROUVILLE—George Auguste Gigault.
RUSSELL—Hon. John O'Connor.

ST. HYACINTHE—Louis Tellier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) CITY—Hon. Sir Leonard Tilley, K.C.M.G.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) CITY AND COUNTY— { Hon. Isaac Burpee.
 { Charles Wesley Weldon.
ST. JOHN (Q.)—François Bourassa.
ST. MAURICE—Louis Léon L. Desaulniers.
SELKIRK—Thomas Scott.
SHEFFORD—Hon. Lucius Seth Huntington.
SHELBURNE—Thomas Robertson.
SHERBROOKE—Edward Towle Brooks.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Dalton McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—R. Tyrwhitt.
SOULANGES—Jacques P. Lantier.
STANSTEAD—Charles C. Colby.
STORMONT—Oscar Fulton.
SUNBURY—Charles Burpee.

TÉMISCOUATA—Paul Etienne Grandbois.
TERREBONNE—Hon. Louis François Rodrigue Masson.
THREE RIVERS—Hon. Sir Hector Louis Langevin,
 K.C.M.G.

TORONTO, CENTRE—Robert Hay.
TORONTO, EAST—Samuel Platt.
TORONTO, WEST—James Beaty, jun.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Jean Baptiste Daoust.

VANCOUVER ISLAND—Arthur Bunster.
VAUDREUIL—Jean Baptiste Mongenais.
VERCHÈRES—Hon. Félix Geoffrion.

VICTORIA (B.C.) { Right Hon. Sir J. A. Macdonald, K.C.B.
 Amor DeCosmos.

VICTORIA (N.B.)—John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—Duncan McDonald.
VICTORIA (O.) N. RIDING—Hector Cameron.
VICTORIA (O.) S. RIDING—Arthur McQuade.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Hugo Kranz.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Samuel Merner.
WELLAND—Christopher William Bunting.
WELLINGTON, C. RIDING—George Turner Orton.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—George Alexander Drew.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Donald Guthrie.
WENTWORTH, N. RIDING—Thomas Bain.
WENTWORTH, S. RIDING—Joseph Rymal.
WESTMORELAND—Hon. Sir Albert James Smith, K.C.M.G.

YALE—Francis Jones Barnard.
YAMASKA—Fabien Vanasse.
YARMOUTH—Frank Killam.
YORK (N.B.)—John Pickard.
YORK (O.) E. RIDING—Alfred Boulton.
YORK (O.) N. RIDING—Frederick William Strange.
YORK (O.) W. RIDING—Nathaniel C. Wallace.

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION, FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 9th February, 1882.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 9th day of February, 1882, for the despatch of business.

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

PRAYERS.

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

“ Mr. SPEAKER, —

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber. And the House being returned,

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Bélanger, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to The Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a Judgment relating to the Election for the Electoral District of Argenteuil, declaring the election of the respondent, Hon J. J. C. Abbott, null and void.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that, in conformity with the Act 37 Victoria, Cap. 10, Sec. 36, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said Electoral District.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Angers, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to The Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a Certificate and Judgment in the matter of the Election for the Electoral District of Bellechasse, sustaining G. Amyot, Esq., in his seat.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had received the following notifications of vacancies which had occurred in the representation :—

Of THOMAS MCKAY, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Colchester, by resignation.

Of the Hon. JAMES McDONALD, Member for the Electoral District of Pictou, by acceptance of the Office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

Of the Hon. JAMES COCKBURN, Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Northumberland, by resignation.

Of THOMAS ROBERT MCINNES, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of New Westminster, by being summoned to the Senate; and

Of WILLIAM CARRUTHERS LITTLE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Simcoe, by decease.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had issued his several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out new writs of election for the said Electoral Districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of JAMES REID, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cariboo.

Of DARIUS CROUTER, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland.

Of DAVID IRVINE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Carleton, N.B.

Of SIMON XAVIER CIMON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Charlevoix.

Of GUILLAUME AMYOT, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Bellechasse.

Of the Hon. A. W. McLELAN, for the Electoral District of Colchester.

Of JOHN McDONALD, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Pictou.

Of the Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT, for the Electoral District of Argenteuil, and

Of GEORGE GUILLET, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Northumberland.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

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

HON. A. W. McLELAN, Member for the Electoral District of the County of Colchester, N.S., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper.

GEORGE GUILLET, Member for the Electoral District of the County of West Northumberland, introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley and Mr. White (Cardwell).

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

JAMES REID, Member for the Electoral District of Cariboo, B.C., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper.

G. AMYOT, Member for the Electoral District of Bellechasse, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hector Langevin.

JOHN McDONALD, Member for the Electoral District of Pictou, N.S., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper.

DARIUS CROUTER, Member for the Electoral District of East Northumberland, introduced by Mr. Blake and Mr. Paterson (Brant).

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE.

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

Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The hope I expressed at the close of the last Session, that on the re-assembling of Parliament we should be able to congratulate ourselves on a season of peace and prosperity has been fully realized.

Canada has been favored with a year of great prosperity.

Her farmers have enjoyed a plentiful harvest and remunerative prices.

Her manufacturing and other industries have been and continue to be developed under favorable auspices.

Her trade and commerce have been steadily increasing, and peace and order prevail within her borders.

For these various blessings we cannot be sufficiently thankful to the Giver of all good things.

The Chief Magistrate of the United States has been cut off by the hand of an assassin, and it is fitting that the sorrow of our people for a loss which was not that of our friends and neighbors alone, should be here adverted to as another instance of the sympathy which unites in brotherhood the British Empire and the American Republic.

During the recess I had the pleasure of visiting the Province of Manitoba, and of traversing the extensive prairies of the North-West, and from personal examination can sincerely congratulate Canada on the possession of so magnificent and fertile a region, to be inhabited, I trust, in the course of years, by millions of thriving and contented subjects of Her Majesty.

The immigrants have not confined themselves to Manitoba or its vicinity, but are scattered over the country westward to the base of the Rocky Mountains, and from the international boundary to the banks of the Northern Saskatchewan. It is, therefore, thought that the time has come for the division of the Territories into four or more Provisional Districts with an appropriate nomenclature. This subject will be submitted for your consideration.

During my journey I was met by numerous Indian tribes, all expressing confidence in the continuance of the traditional policy of kindness and justice which has hitherto governed the relations between the Government and the Aborigines.

I regret, however, to say that the necessity of supplementing the food supply to the Indians still exists, and is likely to continue for some years.

Every exertion has been made to settle the Indian Bands on Reserves, and to induce them to betake themselves to the raising of cattle and cultivating the soil.

These efforts have met with a fair measure of success, but we can only expect by a long continuance of patient firmness to induce these children of the Prairie and the Forest to abandon their nomadic habits, become self-supporting, and ultimately add to the industrial wealth of the country.

The influx of a white population has greatly increased the danger of a collision between the settler and Red man, and in my opinion renders an augmentation of the Mounted Police a matter of urgency. Your sanction to this increase will be sought.

The second report of the Commission appointed to investigate the existing system of the Civil Service will be laid before you, and a measure on the subject submitted for your consideration.

The decennial Census having been taken last year, the duty of reconsidering and readjusting the representation in the House of Commons is imposed upon you. A measure for the purpose will be laid before you.

Several other measures of importance will be submitted to you. Among them will be Bills for the winding up of Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies and Trading Corporations; for the consolidation and amendment of the Laws respecting the Dominion Lands; for the amendment of the Acts relating to the Supreme Court of Canada, and Bills relating to the tenure of office of the Judges of County Courts, and to Fugitive Offenders within the Empire; and your attention will be called to the present anomalous position of the Vice-Admiralty jurisdiction.

The work of construction on that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Prince Arthur's Landing and Winnipeg is being pressed to completion, and it is confidently expected that in July next, railway communication will be established between those places. The section between Rat Portage and Winnipeg, one hundred and thirty-

Mr. SPEAKER.

five miles in length, has been completed and transferred under the terms of the contract, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by whom it is now operated. Considerable progress has been made on the Eastern Section, commencing at Callander Station, and the vigorous prosecution of the work on that portion of the line during the present year provided for.

In British Columbia the work upon the section between Savona's Ferry and Emory's Bar is being carried on with every prospect of its completion within the time specified in the contract, and the line from the latter place to Port Moody, which has been carefully located during the past season, is now being placed under contract with a view to its completion at the same date as the section from Savona's Ferry to Emory's Bar.

Upon the sections to be constructed by the Railway Company, the work has been most energetically carried forward. During the past summer the road has been graded for the distance of two hundred and eighteen miles, and of this one hundred and sixty-one miles are open for traffic.

The Company have, in addition, graded eighty-nine miles of branch lines.

I am pleased to be able to state that the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway has largely increased, and that this line was during the last fiscal year, for the first time in its history, worked without loss to the country.

The works on the Welland Canal were so far advanced that the waters of Lake Erie were introduced for its supply in June last, and in September the new portion of the Canal between Allanburg and Port Dalhousie was opened for traffic.

You will be pleased to know that a monthly line of steamers, which has been subsidized under the authority of Parliament, is now plying between the Dominion and Brazil with good hopes of a mutually profitable trade.

The Report of a Royal Commission issued to inquire into the question of factory labor, and into the best means of promoting the comfort and well-being of the workingman and his family, without undue interference with the development of our manufacturing industries, will be laid before you, and I invite your earnest consideration of this report.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The Accounts of the last year will be laid before you. It will be satisfactory to you to find that the Expenditure has been less and the Revenue considerably more than the Estimates of last year, leaving a surplus of over four millions of dollars. A portion of this sum has been used in the reduction of the public debt by the redemption of matured debentures bearing six per cent. interest, and the remainder applied to the payment of public works chargeable to capital account. The necessity of issuing the Debenture Loan authorized by Parliament for those purposes has therefore been obviated.

The Estimates of the ensuing year will also be submitted, and will, I trust, be found to have been framed with due regard to economy and the efficiency of the public service.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I now invite your attention to the several subjects mentioned and to the general business which will come before you, with full confidence in your ability and patriotic desire to forward the best interests of the country.

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House the Report of the Librarian on the state of the Library of Parliament.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Motion agreed to ; and (at 3:45 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 10th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

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

DAVID IRVINE, Member for the Electoral District of Carleton, N.B., introduced by Mr. Blake and Mr. Burpee (Sunbury).

Hon. J. J. C. ABBOTT, Member for the Electoral District of Argenteuil, introduced by Sir John A Macdonald and Mr. Pope (Compton).

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that, in rising to move the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, I am not altogether in the same position as those members who have preceded me in former days in the fulfilment of this honorable duty. It is the custom to require that these speeches be made by recently elected members, who never fail to claim all possible indulgence from their colleagues who do not know them. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say that I am not in need of the same indulgence, for no one understands better than I do at the present time my unfitness to worthily accomplish the duty that has devolved upon me: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am glad to find myself once more in the midst of old friends, whom I have learnt to esteem from the time that I took my seat amidst them. I claim their friendship and trust that they will not be too exacting, should I fail in being as eloquent as one should be who is entrusted to move the Address. I would have feared, Mr. Speaker, to assume the responsibility which now weighs on me, had I not remembered the electors whom I have the honor of representing, and who have the right to expect from me all that may be expected of a representative who wishes to fulfil his duties conscientiously. The honor attached to the position which I occupy is fully

theirs, for I will never forget that it was they who elected me when I was still but a very young man, entrusting me with their most precious interests, and that, in spite of those who pretended that years enough had not passed over my head to allow of my serving my country in Parliament. When I was asked to move this Address, Mr. Speaker, a thought occurred to me, and a similar one must have arisen in your mind, as well as in the minds of hon. members who are listening to me, to wit: that the policy of the Government must be a good one when the Government can entrust it to such weak hands as mine, and that its measures must be excellent for it to ask lips possessing so little eloquence as mine to move its adoption by this honorable House. For assuredly, Mr. Speaker, if we look back for a few years, and if we draw a comparison between the present and the then condition of the country, we find that the Government which rules to-day has well deserved of the country. As stated in the Speech delivered by His Excellency, the country is enjoying peace and prosperity; our farmers have been blessed with abundant crops, which they have sold at good prices; and manufactories, which had been closed, have re-opened and are in full working order, whilst new ventures are being made every day. Thousands of workingmen, who were starving four years ago, are now earning a good living for themselves and their families. Capitalists no longer fear to put their money into all kinds of commercial operations, confident as they are in the policy of the day and in the future which encourages them. As His Excellency has so aptly said, we cannot sufficiently thank Providence for all its gifts, nor must we forget to thank it for having granted us so good a Government to preside over the destinies of our country; for, Mr. Speaker, whereas the Canadian nation seems to enjoy an era of unprecedented prosperity, and that happiness hovers over us, we have regretfully to note the fact that the neighboring Republic, albeit enjoying much prosperity, has witnessed during the past year an abominable crime against republican institutions. A man who presided over the destinies of the United States, and who had been elected to that position by the free vote of a nation, was foully murdered by another, who has just been deservedly convicted by a jury of his countrymen, and who will, in a few months, expiate his crime by hanging. Americans have not been the only ones to deplore Guitau's act, but protests have been heard from all parts of the world, and sympathy has been expressed from every quarter. His Excellency, who takes a great interest in the destinies of this country, has, during recess, visited our great North-West. His report thereon is most encouraging, and proves the wisdom of the policy of the men who have governed Canada since Confederation. The Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, are not ignorant of the sacrifices which have been made, for several years past, in order to open those immense northern regions, which, as said by His Excellency, are so splendid in their fertility. The distinguished men who said that the future of our country was there, are about to see their predictions realized far beyond what they had expected. Those immense tracts of land, which could drain all Europe's population, are now known to the whole world. Our North-West is making rapid progress, under the able and energetic direction of those who are now at the head of public affairs. Towns and villages are springing up where but a few years ago stood the bare prairie; and the territories are being filled up so rapidly that, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, it would become necessary to divide them and designate them by names which will better express their situation. This, Mr. Speaker, resulted naturally from the National Policy inaugurated by the Government; and I remember when the discussion on the Tariff took place, that eminent members of this House predicted that the North-West would be the necessary and natural outlet for the industrial products of the older

Provinces. Civilization has driven back the Indian tribes, and the whites are filling the places of their dusky brethren; but the Indians seem to understand the course of events, and expressed to His Excellency, during his trip, their confidence in the Canadian Government. We might, perhaps, enquire why we must still feed these savages in a country which enjoys the reputation of being so rich. We must not overlook the fact, Mr. Speaker, that these sons of the woods, who scarcely know of any other means of subsistence but the chase, will have some difficulty in adopting our mode of life, and we can trace their instincts through what has taken place during the few past years. When the buffalo had almost disappeared, they commenced to cultivate the soil on a small scale, like the white people; but last year, having learnt that the buffalo had made his appearance on our side of the line, they immediately gave up their crops and fields to return to their favorite pastime. This explains the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, wherein it is said that food will have to be provided for them for some years to come. The Indians, not having harvested their crops, and the yield of the chase having been insufficient, it is necessary now, and will be for some time in the future, to provide food for them. The Government has done everything in its power to teach these savages to cultivate the soil, so that they might support themselves; but there is not a member of this House, nor is there any one in the country, who is ignorant of the fact that it will take long years to civilize the 30,000 savages who still inhabit our northern possessions. It has also become necessary to propose an increase in the number of the Mounted Police. An explanation is necessary, Mr. Speaker, as to the reason which has prompted the Government to incur this increase of expenditure. The whites residing in the North-West, who have brought with them the horses and cattle required for agriculture, have, at times, seen the savages, when pressed by hunger, hunt their domestic animals for the sake of food, in lieu of the buffalo and other wild animals which they were in the habit of hunting. Under these circumstances, the whites have sometimes taken the law into their own hands, and the result might be a general uprising of the Indians. It is in order to avoid such conflicts that the Government has seen fit to propose an increase of the little army of the North-West. I notice with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that the whole country will be glad to learn, that a measure will be submitted to the consideration of this House for the reorganization of the Civil Service. I do not know what the measure will be, but I feel certain that the Government is actuated by the best intentions in presenting it. I will not say that patronage is a great advantage for Ministers or Members of Parliament, nor, on the other hand, would I ask that all patronage should be taken from the hands of those who were responsible to the people, to place it in entirely irresponsible hands; but I believe that a system compelling candidates for the Civil Service to pass an examination, which would prove them reliable employes, would be a great advantage and would meet with the approval of the public. The Census taken last year shows a considerable increase of the population during the past decade. It is unnecessary to say that this increase means wealth for the country, for that would be a truism. We are, moreover, in hopes of seeing our population increased still more in the next decade, owing to the fostering care of the National Policy. The need had begun to be felt of a measure concerning the liquidation of insolvent banking, insurance and commercial companies. The Government has met this demand in the Speech addressed to us yesterday, and I feel sure that, during the present Session, measures of a nature to satisfy the commercial community will be passed. There will be a codification and amendment of certain laws relating to the Dominion Lands, necessitated by the extensive operations which have taken place in lands in the North-West during

Mr. BERGERON.

the last two years. The Government has also been true to its promises to the members of the Province of Quebec anent the Supreme Court. We justly complain that to us the Supreme Court is not such as we were justified in expecting it would be. There are, as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, but two judges sitting in that court who are perfectly familiar with our civil laws, and when one unfortunate litigant from the Province of Quebec, after having gone through all the courts of the Province, comes before the Supreme Court, he sometimes loses his case when he has in his favor a greater number of judges thoroughly acquainted with our civil laws than are sitting in the Supreme Court. I feel certain that the Government, mindful of its promise, will amend the Acts having reference to that court, in such a manner as to redress existing grievances. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to notice the rapid progress made in the North-West without speaking of the great iron road, which more than any other cause has contributed to its development. Who is there who does not remember the anxious times through which the country has passed in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway? And when, last winter, a measure was brought before this House to place the construction of that road in the hands of a company, people understood then, and we have the proof thereof to-day, that we were right in stating it would be a gain to the country, and that it was taking a heavy load off the shoulders of the Government. The sincerity of the Syndicate has been demonstrated during the past year by the immense amount of work done on the line; and we can announce in this House, to-day, in presence of the representatives of the people, and to the country which gathers our words through the columns of the press, that by next July we shall have a direct line of railroad between Quebec and Sarnia or Collingwood on Lake Superior; travelling thence, by steamer, to Thunder Bay, and from there, by rail, to Winnipeg, with the usual rapidity of transit. The Syndicate has graded 161 miles west of Winnipeg during the year; and it is proposed to build 500 miles more next season. It should be remembered that work is also being done from Callander Station, on the east end of the line; not only has the Syndicate fulfilled its contract, but it is endeavoring to construct the road as rapidly as possible in advance of it; it is its interest, as well as that of the country, to accomplish this. In 1881, *i.e.*, for the year just run out, they have graded and built 218 miles of road on the main line, and 89 miles on the branches, which are now in a condition to receive rails. No one could suppose that so much could be accomplished in such a difficult country. In British Columbia, in spite of numerous difficulties, the Government feels certain that the work will be completed within the prescribed time of ten years. Moreover, to assist colonization and encourage immigration to these far-off lands, the Government has assumed the responsibility not only of proceeding with the construction of the 127 miles which it had entered into the obligations of constructing between Savona's Ferry and Emory Bar, but had decided to construct also the 89 miles of road from the latter place to Port Moody, on the shores of the Pacific, which work it is not compelled to carry out at present. Basing their opinion on past operations, the Syndicate state that the whole Pacific road will be constructed in five or six years instead of in the ten years which had been expected to elapse, and in this short space of time we will be able to start from the Atlantic Ocean and cross on British soil to the Pacific shore. If, Mr. Speaker, one wishes to have an idea of the immense amount of work carried out on that line, one has but to remember that 218 miles were constructed previous to 1878, and that since then 653 miles have been built, or an increase of 435 miles. It will not be a difficult thing for the people to believe in the ultimate success of the Pacific Railway, when they have before them that of the Intercolonial Railway. It is not so long ago that

speakers declared, both in this House and from the hustings, that this road would never pay the cost of the axle-grease it would use. During a certain time it cost the country a half a million of dollars to keep it in working order; but to day, Mr. Speaker, there has ceased to be a deficit, and the Intercolonial Railway is more than paying its running expenses. We could not wish anything better; as a matter of fact, the road does not cost the country anything to keep it in working order, whilst it renders a great service by the extent of its traffic through the fertile lands which it crosses. Its construction is certainly an honor to the Canadian Government. The following statement will show the increase of freight on the Intercolonial Railway:—

AMOUNT OF FREIGHT CARRIED.

In 1878-79.....	510,861 tons.
“ 1880-81.....	725,577 “
Surplus.....	214,716 “

This is an increase of 42 per cent., which is equivalent to a surplus of 21,472 car loads transported during 1880-81 over the number transported in 1878-79. The monthly service between Canada and Brazil is another consequence of our National Policy. This, Mr. Speaker, must be gratifying to those who have elected members supporting this policy in the House, and it is unnecessary to ask electors their opinion on this point, as they have plainly signified it in almost all the isolated elections which have taken place since that policy had been in vogue; and we may even foresee and predict that if that policy is continued, Canada will in time have commercial relations with every country in the world. The Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the treatment of operatives in manufactories, and to discover the best means to insure comfort to the workingman and his family, has made its report, and I see that the Government will submit to the House certain measures which, while not interfering with manufacturing interests, will in a special manner protect young girls and children working in factories. This subject is not a new one, Mr. Speaker. I remember that the hon. member for Cornwall has already proposed such a measure. I feel certain that this measure will meet with the approval of the House, for manufacturing interests are not to be encouraged at the expense of the public health, or at that of young people. One should not compel children to work in factories for such long hours as to preclude their acquiring the instruction they will need hereafter. In the United States there is a law preventing children under fourteen years of age from working in factories. I do not know if the same provision will be adopted here, but at any rate I have no doubt that the Government has mastered the subject and that the measure which it is to bring down will meet the necessities of the case. The country will be pleased to learn that the era of deficits has passed, and that last year's revenue has considerably surpassed the expenditure last year by over \$4,000,000. With a portion of this sum the Minister of Finance has paid debentures which were due and on which we were paying six per cent. interest; and with the other part he has paid the cost of certain public works which would have had to have been paid out of the capital fund, or which is almost the same thing, the Government has not been obliged to borrow, as authorized to do so by Parliament. His Excellency hopes that these various subjects will be discussed with that degree of patriotism which he has the right to expect from this House. I am too young, Mr. Speaker, to speak of the past with a personal knowledge of the facts, but members of this House, who remember what this country was previous to Confederation, and who have since that time seen it advance with giant strides towards prosperity, must be proud to see the immense progress we have made. A distinguished man has said that we were a people

chosen by Providence, and truly we are not quite 5,000,000 of people, but we inhabit a country capable of receiving hundreds of millions. Our public works are of such magnitude as to astonish foreigners. We live in peace, we speak nearly all the languages in the world, we adore the same God in many different modes, and we are going onwards, feeling both proud and secure in our future. The National Policy, which has had the approval of three-fourths of the Canadian people at the General Election of 1878, which has been endorsed by an overwhelming majority of this House, as well as in nearly all the isolated elections which have taken place, has not only given work and bread to our workingmen, enabled our farmers to sell their produce, given energy to our internal and external commerce, but it will also have the effect of bringing back in our midst our compatriots who have left for a foreign land during the times of depression and crisis, to earn that daily bread which their country could not give them; a large number are in exile, but they love their country and always speak of it with love. They will return; for one day, the Almighty moved by our fears and satisfied with seeing us taking steps to secure that result, will know how to bring back sons to their mothers, and citizens to their country. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving the following Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne:—

1. That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session, and further to assure His Excellency, —that we feel with His Excellency that the hope he expressed at the close of the last Session, that on the re-assembling of Parliament we should be able to congratulate ourselves on a season of peace and prosperity has been fully realized:

2. That Canada has been favored with a year of great prosperity:

3. That her farmers have enjoyed a plentiful harvest and remunerative prices:

4. That her manufacturing and other industries have been and continue to be developed under favorable auspices:

5. That her trade and commerce have been steadily increasing, and peace and order prevail within her borders:

6. And that for these various blessings we cannot be sufficiently thankful to the Giver of all good things.

7. That the Chief Magistrate of the United States having been cut off by the hand of an assassin, we feel that it is fitting that the sorrow of our people for a loss which was not that of our friends and neighbors alone, should be adverted to by His Excellency as another instance of the sympathy which unites in brotherhood the British Empire and the American Republic.

8. That we learn with great satisfaction that during the recess His Excellency had the pleasure of visiting the Province of Manitoba, and of traversing the extensive prairies of the North-West, and is able, from personal examination, sincerely to congratulate Canada on the possession of so magnificent and fertile a region, to be inhabited, we trust, in the course of years, by millions of thriving and contented subjects of Her Majesty.

9. That we recognize the fact that the immigrants have not confined themselves to Manitoba or its vicinity, but are scattered over the country westward to the base of the Rocky Mountains, and from the international boundary to the banks of the northern Saskatchewan; that we agree with His Excellency in thinking that the time has come for the division of the Territories into four or more Provisional Districts with an appropriate nomenclature, and that this subject, when submitted to us by His Excellency, will receive our attentive consideration.

10. That we are pleased to learn from His Excellency that during his journey he was met by numerous Indian tribes, all expressing confidence in the continuance of the traditional policy of kindness and justice which has hitherto governed the relations between the Government and the Aborigines, while we share His Excellency's regret that the necessity of supplementing the food supply of the Indians still exists and is likely to continue for some years.

11. That we are happy to know that every exertion has been made to settle the Indian Bands on Reserves, and to induce them to betake themselves to the raising of cattle and cultivating the soil, and that these efforts have met with a fair measure of success; but we are aware that we can only expect by a long continuance of patient firmness to induce these children of the Prairie and the Forest to abandon their nomadic habits, and become self-supporting, and ultimately add to the industrial wealth of the country, and that the influx of a white population has greatly increased the danger of collision between the settler and Red man; that we observe that His Excellency is of opinion that

an augmentation of the Mounted Police has been rendered a matter of urgency, and that our attention shall be given to the sanction of such increase as His Excellency may think it necessary to seek.

12. That we learn with satisfaction that the second Report of the Commission appointed to investigate the existing system of the Civil Service will be laid before us; and that any measure on the subject submitted to us shall receive our willing consideration.

13. That we are aware that the decennial Census having been taken last year, the duty of reconsidering and readjusting the representation in the House of Commons is imposed upon us, and we will carefully consider any measure for the purpose which may be laid before us.

14. That we learn with much interest that several other measures of importance will be submitted to us, and that among them will be Bills for the winding-up of Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies and Trading Corporations, for the consolidation and amendment of the Laws respecting the Dominion Lands, for the amendment of the Acts relating to the Supreme Court of Canada, and Bills relating to the tenure of office of the Judges of County Courts, and to Fugitive Offenders within the Empire; and that our attention will be called to the present anomalous position of the Vice-Admiralty jurisdiction; and that all these measures, when submitted, shall receive our best attention.

15. That we receive with much satisfaction the information which His Excellency has afforded us respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, and are glad to know,—

16. That the work of construction on that portion of the said railway between Prince Arthur's Landing and Winnipeg is being pressed to completion, and that it is confidently expected that in July next railway communication will be established between those places; that the section between Rat Portage and Winnipeg, one hundred and thirty-five miles in length, has been completed and transferred under the terms of the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by whom it is now operated; that considerable progress has been made on the Eastern Section, commencing at Callander Station, and that the vigorous prosecution of the work on that portion of the line during the present year has been provided for:

17. That in British Columbia the work upon the section between Savona's Ferry and Emory's Bar is being carried on, with every prospect of its completion within the time specified in the contract, and that the line from the latter place to Port Moody, which has been carefully located during the past season, is now being placed under contract with a view to its completion at the same date as the section from Savona's Ferry to Emory's Bar.

18. That upon the sections to be constructed by the Railway Company, the work has been most energetically carried forward. That during the past summer the road has been graded for the distance of two hundred and eighteen miles, and that of this, one hundred and sixty-one miles are completed and open for traffic.

19. And that the Company have, in addition, graded eighty-nine miles of branch lines.

20. That we share the pleasure expressed by His Excellency in being able to state that the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway has largely increased, and that this line was during the last fiscal year, for the first time in its history, worked without loss to the country.

21. That we are glad to learn that the works on the Welland Canal were so far advanced that the waters of Lake Erie were introduced for its supply in June last, and that in September the new portion of the Canal between Allanburg and Port Dalhousie was opened for traffic.

22. That we are pleased to know that a monthly line of steamers which has been subsidized under the authority of Parliament, is now plying between the Dominion and Brazil with good hopes of a mutually profitable trade.

23. That we shall read with great interest the Report of a Royal Commission issued to inquire into the question of factory labor, and into the best means of promoting the comfort and well being of the workman and his family, without undue interference with the development of our manufacturing industries, which His Excellency is pleased to say will be laid before us, and shall give it our most earnest consideration.

24. That we thank His Excellency for the assurance that the Accounts of the last year will be laid before us: That it will be satisfactory to us to find that the Expenditure has been less and the Revenue considerably more than the Estimates of last year, leaving a surplus of over four millions of dollars: and that we thank His Excellency for informing us that a portion of this sum has been used in the reduction of the public debt by the redemption of matured debentures bearing six per cent. interest, and the remainder applied to the payment for public works chargeable to capital account; and that the necessity of issuing the Debenture Loan authorized by Parliament for those purposes has therefore been obviated.

25. That we shall respectfully consider the Estimates for the ensuing year which will also be submitted, and which will, we trust, be found to have been framed with due regard to economy and the efficiency of the public service.

26. That His Excellency may rest assured that we shall give our best attention to the several subjects mentioned by him, and to the general business which will come before us, and that we thank His Excellency for the expression of his full confidence in our patriotic desire and our ability to forward the best interests of the country.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. GUILLET. Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence and sympathy of the House, as a young member quite inexperienced in parliamentary affairs, in discharging the important duty of seconding the Resolution in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. Before proceeding to the consideration of the Resolution so ably moved by the hon. member for Beauharnois, I desire to express my sense of the general pleasure and satisfaction that His Excellency has safely encountered the perils and discomfort of a winter voyage across the Atlantic, and resumed the most exalted functions of the government of the Dominion which he has heretofore discharged with such distinguished ability and success. It is a matter of deep regret to the House and country that the impaired health of Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise still detains her from the social circles of our governmental life which she has so brilliantly adorned. That she may soon recover her wonted health is the earnest aspiration of every patriotic heart. I am sure I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we unitedly rejoice with His Excellency that the hopes expressed at the close of last Session have been so fully realized, and join with him in acknowledging our obligations of gratitude to the Almighty for vouchsafing to this great Dominion the manifold mercies and blessings which have so abundantly crowned the past year. He has, indeed, "given us all things richly to enjoy." His kind Providence has smiled upon the labors of the husbandman. He has filled their barns with plenty and their hearts with gladness, and has blessed with prosperity and increase all the varied industries and interests of our country. We have peace in all our borders, and order, harmony and contentment among all classes of our citizens. We have been spared the visitation of pest and plague, "the pestilence that walketh in darkness and the destruction that wasteth at noon-day." We, indeed, cannot be sufficiently thankful to the bountiful Giver of all good. I am sure the House and country will sincerely reiterate the appropriate expressions of sympathy with the people of the United States in the assassination of President Garfield. His was a character conspicuous for its Christian virtues and exalted patriotism. The extended tour made by His Excellency through the North-West, attended by much privation, fatigue and danger, has added to the many obligations we are under to His Excellency, for the warm personal interest he exhibits in our Canadian institutions and enterprises, and for the constancy and devotion he manifests within and beyond his large and elevated sphere of duty in promoting the welfare of our country and advocating her interests and claims. His visit to the North-West has been the means of publishing far and wide its great resources and superior advantages for settlement. He has proved, if I may take the liberty of using the term, an immigration agent of inestimable value. There is one feature of this subject which, to many like myself, is of a more sympathetic and amiable nature: that is the effort put forth by His Excellency, when at home, to induce marriageable young women to emigrate to Canada. On behalf of those of our countrymen who are deprived of domestic comfort and happiness, owing to the scarcity of that element in our population, I return grateful thanks. Doubtless, in the near future, in many happy homes the children will rise up and call him blessed. Referring to the subject of immigration, it is worthy of notice that there is now no outcry from the people against immigration efforts and expenditure. For two or three years previous to the adoption of the National Policy many amongst the people felt aggrieved that the revenues of the country should be appropriated to add to the number of those who were seeking in vain for employment, and intensifying the difficulties and privations of those partially employed. The formation of the Territories into four provisional districts will greatly facilitate the arrangements for the settlement of the North-West, promote the good government

of the scattered settlements, afford precision and despatch to postal communication, and lay the foundation of four new provinces, a new constellation in our Dominion firmament. It is an assurance of the utmost importance, which His Excellency's intercourse with the Indian tribes of the North-West enables him to express, that they maintain an undiminished confidence in the kindness, justice and good faith which has always characterized British policy and British administration of Indian affairs. That they are suffering from an inadequate supply of food is a matter of deep regret, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House will cheerfully support the Government in any measures of relief, already undertaken or to be submitted for the consideration of Parliament. They cannot be allowed to starve, for the experience of the United States proves that it is far cheaper, apart from all humane considerations, to feed them, than adopt the only alternative and fight them, in consequence of depredations they would be driven in their extremity to commit on the settler. The House and country may well rejoice to learn that the present Administration have met with a fair measure of success in their policy of domesticating and civilizing the Indian by teaching him all the useful arts of social life. The effort being made to teach the Indians to cultivate the soil, and thus provide their own food and become self dependent—at the same time that they are taught all the mechanical arts which are connected with agriculture—will have the effect of not only relieving the exchequer, but will in the end, it is to be hoped, increase our productive classes and thus add to the wealth of the State. Moreover, the fact of occupation being given to these numerous tribes in the cultivation of the soil and in pastoral pursuits will check their migratory habits and warlike instincts, and tend to make them peaceful and useful citizens, and render them more susceptible to the christianizing influences of the missionary. The country will thus be relieved of possible enemies, and the settler afforded security and peace, and the great duty accomplished of improving the condition of these simple hearted and justice-loving red men of the forest and the great interests of settlement promoted. This policy is a new departure by the right hon. the Minister of the Interior from that pursued in the older Provinces, where the Indians have been allowed to pursue their own inclinations and to assume a position dependent upon the Government rather than on their own exertions. The following statistics show the progress made at the Farming Agencies among the Indians:—

No. of Acres under crop, 1880	1,815
“ “ “ “ 1881	3,491
“ “ fenced “	4,716
Hay cut “	2,873 Tons
Wheat produced “	4,471 Bush.
Oats “	4,377 “
Barley “	8,898 “
Potatoes “	18,631 “
Turnips “	19,775 “

There has been erected 600 dwellings of various kinds, besides barns, stables, root houses, &c., &c. The rapidly extending settlements have rendered necessary the strengthening of the force of Mounted Police. That it has been promptly done gives us additional proof of the prudence and vigilance of the Government. This force has rendered valuable service generally in promoting law and order in the out-posts of our advance into the new territories, and especially in the suppression of the liquor traffic. Prior to the establishment of this force there was no observance of the law prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the Territories. Had this continued, the result must have been the utter demoralization of many of the Indian tribes, and doubtless a costly Indian war. The several references in the Speech from the Throne to the rapid and extensive progress made in the construction of the Pacific Railway, will prove a most gratifying announcement to the country,

as it has been to the House. The rapid prosecution of the work on all sections, the astonishing vigor and enterprise displayed, and the undoubted liberality of the Syndicate in its land arrangements, have challenged the admiration of the country and also of observant minds among our neighbors. On this subject the *New York Times* says:

“The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have had the wisdom to see that their royal road to success lies in the cultivation of their land rather than in any attempt to dispose of their land grant at a high price, and they are consequently selling arable land, worth, according to experts, from \$5 to \$10 per acre, as wheat lands, at \$2.50 per acre, with a rebate of one-half the purchase money for all land brought into cultivation and settled upon within four years. This judicious policy is already bearing fruit by attracting from Ontario and from some of our Western States, as well as from Europe, a class of farmers, the produce of whose labor will afford an ample transit business for the great Canadian line.”

The important announcement which they have recently authorized, that they hope to complete the entire line in five years, is in a fair prospect of realization. How marvellous the change, Mr. Speaker, in the position and views of the country in relation to the Pacific Railway since it was first mooted as one of the terms upon which British Columbia was admitted to the Confederation. What a transformation has come over the prospects of the railway and the great North-West. I recall the effect of the discussion. It created grave apprehensions in my own mind. The Government was denounced by the Opposition in the strongest terms for undertaking to build the railway, and especially for substituting a railway for a stage coach road. To show how far short they were from grasping the great possibilities, the great latent resources of the North-West and the great future before this grand Pacific Railway, I have culled a few extracts from the speeches made against the railway when the British Columbia terms were under discussion:

“It would involve the country in ruin.”

“The scheme was an insane project, and sane men could not seriously think of it.”

“A commercial absurdity.”

“It would involve the country in a vast expenditure from which it could derive no possible benefit.”

“With mercury descending sometimes in winter to 50 degrees below zero it was impossible a railway could have a paying winter traffic.”

“There being no population far west, capitalists had no inducements to enter upon the work.”

In spite of these efforts to dismay the Government they had the courage of their convictions—they had the faith and prescience of statesmen in this great project, and the result is that today it is almost within our grasp. It is to be completed in five years. It is gratifying to observe that the great work of the enlargement of the Welland Canal is so far advanced towards completion as to be available for traffic. It is a matter of great advantage to our commercial interests and carrying trade to enjoy so largely improved facilities for transporting the increasing volume of the cereal and other products of the Western States and our own rapidly-developing North West, which may now be conveyed in vessels of several times greater capacity than could pass through the old canal. This will cheapen transport, and give much greater volume, it is confidently believed, to our export trade. It is a most gratifying and important announcement that the Government have succeeded in establishing, under authority of Parliament, a monthly line of steamers with Brazil, and it is to be hoped a like success will follow the negotiations now pending with France and Spain, thus opening large additional foreign markets for our produce and manufactures. The House will, I am sure, peruse with great interest the report of the Royal Commission issued to enquire into the best means of promoting the comfort and well-being of our working classes and their families. Doubtless important legislation will grow out of these investigations and good work accomplished in the direction of ameliorating and improving the conditions of

all, especially the more youthful workers. The important subjects of ventilation, of precautionary measures against the spread of infectious diseases, the establishment of fire escapes in large establishments, and the regulation of the hours of labor among minors, will, it is to be hoped, be considered in the proposed legislation. The second report of the Civil Service Commission will be looked for with interest. The proposed legislation will, I trust, promote the increased efficiency of the Civil Service of the country by adopting correct standards of qualification and providing for deserved promotion. By the expression correct standards of qualification I would not be misunderstood. A liberal education is not the only consideration, a due regard should be had to all moral qualities, to energy, activity, adaptability of temperament, and also to physical strength and vigor. I will not refer at length to the splendid evidence of the prosperity of the country in the magnificent surplus of over \$4,000,000 of the last financial year, now for the first time officially announced in His Excellency's Address, and the further announcement that this handsome sum has been applied to the extent of \$1,250,000, to the reduction of the public debt, and the balance to the prevention of the increase of the public debt, by being applied to payment for public works chargeable to capital account. The effect of this handsome exhibit must be to still further improve our financial credit, already so high in the money market of England that our securities stand second only to British consols. The Government have reason to take a just pride in the abundant evidences they are able to produce in proof of the success of their policy. The facts are innumerable and striking. I need only, for my purpose, refer to the development and flourishing condition of the industries in my own riding. There are parallel cases of progress and development in every section of the country, but in West Northumberland we find abundant testimony to the wisdom of the policy which the Government, with the approval of the people, has adopted. I find that since the introduction of the National Policy the proprietor of the Cobourg Car Works has increased his car shops, in buildings and machinery, to the extent of \$45,000; that he has increased the number of his employes by 224; that the wages he pays has run up from \$7,960 in 1878 to \$89,950 in 1881; and that the average advance in wages has been twenty per cent. I find also that to the business now branches have been added, including the building of mail, express and baggage cars, and that the manufacture of railway car-springs is to be commenced in about a month. The output of these works in 1878 was \$17,300, while in 1881 it ran up to \$620,000. Take, then, the Cobourg Woollen Mills. Large additions are being made to them with a view to doubling their productions. The hands have already been increased from eighty-eight in 1878 to 110 in 1881, and the wages paid have increased from \$1,250 in September, 1878 to \$2,092 in December, 1881, while the production has gone up from \$93,244 in the former year, to \$125,080 in the latter. Besides this there is a new mill, the Norval Mill, which has been started during the last twelvemonth. It employs thirty hands, and the wages average \$700 per month. The Cobourg Mat and Matting Works, which were closed during the depression, have been re-opened under the National Policy, and are doing a good business. At Grafton, the mill of Mr. Greenwood was nearly at a standstill during 1878, but in 1881 it received more orders than its proprietor could conveniently fill. Its output in 1878 was \$5,000, and, in 1881, \$12,000, and the men employed in it received higher wages than previously. The large increase in the industrial population of the country has greatly benefitted the home market for agricultural products of all kinds, and the consequent competition among buyers has contributed another element of improvement of demand and price. The employment of so large an amount of additional capital in producing goods formerly imported

Mr. GUILLET.

has increased the circulation of money, infused new life into every branch of trade, and increased the purchasing power of all classes. Thus the consumption of dutiable goods has increased and the revenues of the country largely augmented. If I may be allowed to indulge in a retrospective glance and look back to the Session of 1878, when the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Government—then the leader of the Opposition—proposed to Parliament those famous resolutions which heralded the National Policy, and consider the state of the country at that time, the wide-spread depression, the distressed industries, the increased and increasing number of bankruptcies, the scarcity of labor, the dearth of money, the timidity of capital, the alarming state of our finances, with large and yearly increasing deficits accruing, the prospect was indeed gloomy and discouraging. The Government of that day were appealed to upon every patriotic ground to change their fiscal policy. They were offered the aid and support of the Opposition in carrying out that policy. They refused. They were joined to their Free Trade idols, and the country was appealed to, and the people, by a vast majority, "let them alone." They rejected the policy, and the people rejected them. Mr. Speaker, the eventful day of the inauguration of the National Policy marked the commencement of a new epoch in our economic affairs. It gave a new inspiration of life and progress to our country. At once there was restored confidence, and soon the tide was turned. Our industries revived, our failing credit became re-established, the days of deficits were ended, and the days of surpluses restored on a grander scale than ever. All the good anticipated of the new policy has been realized; all the evils predicted of it have proved but phantoms in the minds of its opponents, and I can confidently assert that, from the time of its adoption until the present moment, there has not been manifested on the part of the propounders of this policy, or of the supporters of this policy, any weakening or holding back. They have been, and are, a unit for its maintenance in its integrity. Every assault upon it has been driven back, and it stands stronger to-day in the confidence and respect of the people of the Dominion than ever before. Is it not time, Mr. Speaker, that this conflict should cease? Defeated on so many fields where they have offered battle, why should its opponents persist in the useless slaughter? Why prolong the fruitless struggle? Why continue to oppose so obstinately the will of the people? The Opposition threw down the gauntlet of Free Trade in the campaign of 1878. For long months before and during the contest they appealed to the people against it, through the press and from the platform, with the prestige and patronage of power and position in the Dominion to help them. They appealed to the deliberate and enlightened judgment of a free people. The verdict was given in unmistakable terms, yet again and again have they appealed to the people as constituency after constituency has been opened, and in almost every case the people have reiterated their approval of, and confidence in, this wise and beneficent policy. Would it not, Mr. Speaker, well become those who boast so loudly of their respect for the voice of the people, those who profess to believe in and obey the authority and will of the people when expressed in a constitutional way, would it not well become our Reform friends who oppose this policy to cease to object to and obstruct the manifest will of the people. I appeal respectfully to these gentlemen in Opposition to abandon the hopeless strife. It will give them elevation of character and purpose in the estimation of the country, and will win them more friends than they can possibly win by the unpatriotic course they are now pursuing. In making this appeal I but re-echo the sentiments of many Independent Reformers, and of the more liberal and independent journals of the Reform party. I can well understand that hon.

gentlemen find themselves in a very embarrassing position in relation to a policy or a platform. Their political following is made up of such heterogeneous materials. The views and declarations of their policy have been so dissimilar and antagonistic. The hon. leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in his public utterances has evidently been feeling about for a policy. Like the young lady whom Bliffens declared played the piano with a great deal of feeling,—after the keys, he has played on the country with a great deal of feeling,—after a policy. What does the hon. gentleman propose—of what does the Opposition platform consist? They have no fixed policy for the Dominion. There is a policy of contradictions, a policy of sectionalism and provincialism. Their appeal is to sections and classes in strangely inconsistent language. The part and every part in turn is to the Opposition greater than the whole. They build little narrow platforms in each Province and among different classes. Among Free Traders they take up the parable of Adam Smith, and to Protectionists they talk of protection to vested interests. They tell the farmers his wool is insufficiently protected, and in the next breath ridicule agricultural protection and declare it cannot affect prices or improve the home market. They appeal to the mechanic and laborer, the carter and cab-driver, with the cry that they are taxed by this policy on their flour, bacon, corn and oats. In the Maritime Provinces they denounce the duty on breadstuffs. In Ontario they assail the duty on coal. These specimen planks are surely not the material out of which to build a platform calculated to sustain the cause of union, to broaden the views and sympathies of the people, and elevate their hopes and aspirations. Surely, if they are unequal to the work of constructing such a platform upon which the Nova Scotian, the New Brunswicker, the Prince Edward Islander, the chivalrous French Canadian, the citizens of Ontario, of Manitoba, and of British Columbia can unite and work together with a common impulse of patriotism, then they cannot hope to be entrusted with the weighty task of upbuilding this wide extended Dominion to the grand proportions of its vast capabilities—of its glorious promise. I need scarcely ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the manifest duty of the Government towards this policy, which is now the policy, the property in fact of the people, rather than the Government. And I am confident the people will not readily or easily yield or abandon this possession. The duty of the Government is clear, and they are faithfully and honestly performing it. What would be the effect in the country could the Government be so infatuated as to break faith with the people and abandon this policy? Would not such a whirlwind of indignation arise as would compel the representatives of the people, elected to support the Government, to abandon it to its fate? And the hon. the leader of the Opposition would not be slow to denounce the folly and perfidy of the Government, and to trim his sail to the popular breeze. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to second the Resolution before the House, and, in doing so, reiterate the sentiments in the closing paragraph, that His Excellency may rest assured that we shall give our best attention to the several subjects mentioned by him, and to the general business which will come before us, and that we thank His Excellency for the expression of his full confidence in our patriotic desire and our ability to forward the best interests of the country. Before resuming my seat, I desire, Mr. Speaker, to thank the House for its patient attention and kind indulgence shown to my remarks.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not my intention to interpose for more than a very brief space between the business of the House and the passage of this Address. It has become our practice, unless under very exceptional circumstances, to close the debate on the Address at the earliest possible moment, and, I think, a practice conducive to the public interest and the despatch of business; especially on an occasion

like the present, when many of the topics which are alluded to in the Speech, and many other topics—which have been attracting the attention of the public during recess, and must attract the attention of Parliament—require, for a profitable discussion, the production of the public documents and other returns which we hope shortly to find on the Table. To anticipate these discussions now would be worse than useless. I do not intend, therefore, to pursue the course which has, to some extent, been pursued by one of the hon. gentlemen who has just spoken. I may be allowed to express my congratulations to the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Address for the manner in which they have discharged that portion of their public duty. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said he was a young man. He has that advantage, but possesses with it the rare advantage of being an old politician, for he has been some years with us here, and we have reason to know his public services did not begin with his election to Parliament. I do not think, therefore, my hon. friend was fairly entitled to claim—and I am equally bound to say my hon. friend did not stand in any need of claiming—the indulgence of the House when he stood up to express his views and sentiments on the present occasion. With reference to the hon. member for West Northumberland, he will excuse me if I decline, on this occasion, to enter into a controversy with him, either as to the accuracy of his historical retrospect or the position of the Government on the questions of the day. The proper time will arise at a later period, and the hon. gentleman will, perhaps, find reasons—if he be, as I suppose he is, open to conviction—to change his opinions on some of those subjects before the Session closes. We rejoice as heartily as any person can, on that measure of improvement and prosperity which the condition of the country exhibits, and we rejoice also upon the improved view as to the sources of that prosperity which is apparent on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. On former days we have heard Ministers declare that that prosperity was, in some small measure, due to the condition of agricultural products, and for that they were good enough to allow some small measure of praise and thanks and blessing to Providence; but for the rest, which, they said, was a great deal more than that, they claimed the blessings for themselves. I remember that the hon. Minister of Finance disclaimed, a little while ago, the arrogation by the Government of the merit for all that had occurred, and said the proof of this was that they had not long since instituted a day of thanksgiving to Providence for its blessings. That, Sir, is about the proportion: one day to God and the other 364 to the Ministry. But this time I am glad to see that the improved prosperity in its various aspects is attributed to the Giver of all good, by which, I presume, we are not to understand the Finance Minister. Now I believe that the Trade and Navigation Returns will indicate very clearly the propriety of attributing these blessings to Providence, and will establish, as will also other circumstances, the fact that it is to those changed conditions to which we have repeatedly referred, that the substance and essence of the improved condition of this country, in common with several other communities, is to be traced. The Speech, as was natural, contains a somewhat extended reference to the North-West, and we learn that two things are essential with reference to the Indian population, which, under various synonyms, is referred to in the course of these paragraphs. We warned the Administration a couple of years ago, when they announced that, owing to the expected total failure of the food supply, it had become necessary to expend a very large sum to prevent the starvation of the Indians; although such expenditure might be necessary, the course being pursued was one which would almost inevitably lead to the reappearance of that item in our Estimates for many years to come. It did reappear the next year, but again it was stated to be an

exceptionable occurrence; but two years' experience on the part of these interesting children of the prairie and forest, of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken in such winning terms, having convinced them that if they do not hunt they will find beef and bread supplied to them by the Government, the Government have become convinced by these two years' experience that they must now lay down as part of their policy the supplying for many years to come, or until they teach them farming, of food to the Indians. The hon. gentleman has also announced that we shall have, besides feeding and keeping them comfortable, to control them more extensively than before. That we will require to watch them: we will require to watch them by nearly doubling the Mounted Police Force, as well as to keep them happy and contented by supplying them with food. These are no doubt considerations and policies which may well be questioned by circumstances and facts which hon. gentlemen may bring forward later. But it is certainly a grave circumstance in connection with the development of the North-West, that at the same instant we should be called upon to feed the aboriginal population of that country. I am told there is very great danger of collisions requiring severe repressive measures, and the establishment, to a large extent, of a force to guard the settlers in that country. Now the Speech, while it does contain extended reference, as I have said, to the North-West, is also conspicuous for certain omissions in that direction. Last Session there was brought to this House, in its dying hours, when it was impossible to discuss measures effectually—when there were but a very few members present—a measure altering the condition of Manitoba, increasing its boundaries and area. We contended it would have been fit and proper to bring down a complete scheme at that time; we held it was obvious that as the readjustment of the boundaries of Manitoba, to the extent proposed, meant financial changes as well, and that it would be proper to bring down proposals which, by mutual arrangement between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of the Dominion, had been deemed fit for submission to the Legislature, which should settle the question. It seems to me sufficiently obvious that in increasing the boundaries of Manitoba in the present manner, we are leaving open the other important question, which I hope it is now intended to submit to this Legislature. Can it be that an arrangement has not yet been made? Can it be that the question is still open? Can it be that the policy of the Government, as to the altered financial arrangements with Manitoba is not yet, even at this day, determined? Else, why should we find no mention of that in the Speech? We find the glowing picture presented two years ago, as to the expected immigration from older lands, not now referred to. I had hoped very earnestly that the condition of things, and the views of the Administration on this subject, would have justified a very strong expression of opinion in the Speech from the Throne. The subject has been under the consideration of the Government for some years. It has been brought before us, in this manner, more than once. As I have said, two years ago, a very distinct statement was made; but to-day, with the exception of an allusion to the subject of immigration, in that paragraph which speaks of the extent of country in which immigrants have settled, we find no reference to the past or future. Now, there has been a very considerable influx of people to the North-West; but so far as the information available to the public goes, it seems clear that the immigration, so far, has been due in its largest proportions to the older Provinces of the Dominion, and that, as yet, we have received but a very slight portion of those fruits which we hoped to reap from the extraordinary immigration from the older countries. I do not regret, for my part, to see the people of the older Provinces go

Mr. BLAKE.

West. I rejoice that our citizens, from any part of this Dominion, should find it possible to improve their condition, and probably to improve the condition of this whole country, by removing from one part to the other. But I do say it is a serious question for those older Provinces that this emigration should proceed in the measure in which it has been proceeding, without a supply from other countries coming in, to some extent to remedy the deficiency in population which must so result. The consequences in Ontario, if the present state of things continue—if there be not a very considerable immigration in that Province from the older countries—must be, in my opinion, very serious to the owners of land in its rural districts. There is a very large emigration from that Province, and there is not, so far as I can see, an adequate immigration from older lands to counterbalance that decrease. Therefore it is that we, as residents of the older Provinces, as well as people interested in the fortunes of the North-West, have experienced what seems a feeling of disappointment at the results thus far; and the fact that the circumstances do not seem to warrant any statement on that subject in the Speech from the Throne is sufficiently significant. The proposal to divide the North-West into four districts may be a very proper one. I trust that, taking the various circumstances with reference to the extreme difficulty of saying what the centres of population will be—where most rapidly the country will be settled—the arrangements will be of such a character as may not require very much disturbance, in the case of changes due to the creation of more railways in that country, and to circumstances of which we are not now cognizant. The present expectations as to the centres of population may be falsified. While it may be tolerably easy to point to certain places in that country, which from their position and relation to lines of travel, frontiers, territories and rivers, will necessarily be centres of population, I hold it to be very difficult to make arrangements of a permanent character at this time. I am a little surprised, however, at one paragraph in the Speech. The Speech tells us, first of all, of the great attention that is required to be paid to the Indian population. The question of the Indian population is a burning one. It then tells us that the white population requires more protection; but unless I was deceived, I thought I saw quite lately the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West in the vicinity of this building. So he seems a very long way from his white and red subjects, though he knows they require so much attention. There is another omission in the Speech, which I also greatly regretted to find—that is, that we are not promised a measure for the adoption of a simple, easy, less expensive mode of transferring real property, such as was brought forward in the time of the late Government, and to which I have once or twice directed the attention of the Minister of the Interior. I say that if our expectations as to the rapid settlement of that country are in any measure realized, as we hope they will be, we can do no greater practical benefit for the future of that country than now, while as yet the lands are ungranted—while there is no complication of titles—than to adopt a system which, so far as our present notions are concerned, may seem to us almost revolutionary, but which might make the title to lands and the security in reference to title, and the possibility of transferring interests, greater than they are in the older Provinces by the present system, and which will confer on those who will settle in the North-West, benefits which, if you summed them up, would be almost incalculable. This is the time to make such a change, the time at which it can be done without the disturbance of any existing system. I repeat my views on this subject to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, because I feel that at no time can this scheme be accomplished so easily and with such good results as at present. The Speech refers very

properly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it appears as if a policy had been adopted of concluding the construction of that railway, within a very much shorter period than that proposed to Parliament last Session. It is true the Speech itself does not contain a direct statement to that effect; but it does indicate as much, since it is declared that the section to Port Moody which, by the contract, was to be completed before 1891, will be completed at the same date as the section from Savona's Ferry to Emory's Bar—that is within four years of the present time. And the published statements and utterances which have taken place upon this subject lead to the other conclusion, to which indeed one or other of the hon. members who moved the paragraph now under consideration has also alluded. Well, Sir, that and other circumstances which have occurred are, so far from being, as hon. gentlemen would appear to argue, in contradiction of the views as stated last Session, the strongest verification of those views. Last Session we declared it to be our opinion that the proposed arrangement was one disadvantageous to the country, in this: that it imposed a burden infinitely greater than the necessities of the case demanded. The answer to that argument made was this: It is true that, as far as actual construction goes, if that were all, your position, although we do not agree with your figures, is correct; but there is another element to be taken into account, namely, the element of the expense of running the railway; that is an enormous expense for which we had to make payment, and it is included in this contract sum. Our argument was that the railway ought to be pushed from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg and through the prairie section, and that the time occupied, if a season or more, in doing that, will be time not lost with respect to the construction of the ends—time not lost, but gained with respect to the cost of the work, because more information will be obtained and more population will get in—and that the facilities will be infinitely greater, and that we will be better judges with respect to the scheme without any loss of time accruing. What was the fact? That the Canadian Pacific Railway Company propose, and have arranged with the Government, as I presume from the Government having made this contract in British Columbia, to hasten the completion of the ends of the line. And what does it prove? It proves this: that they cannot believe there will be a loss in the running expenses of the railway; that they believe that to anticipate the completion of the railway by five years will not be to involve a loss in running expenses, and if that be the conclusion which we are now to reach, is it not established that the investigations, the considerations, the fresh light thrown on this enterprise in the period of one short year, have shown us that the sum, whatever that indefinite sum may be, which was added to this contract price to pay the loss in running expenses, ought not to have been added. So with respect to the eastern link. The hon. gentleman has let out some of the secrets of the negotiations—secrets which were concealed from Parliament when Parliament was called upon to decide this question—for not long since he told us, at all events he told his friends and the public have heard it, that it is true that members of the Syndicate, during the negotiations and up to the completion of the contract, were greatly opposed to any plan for the construction of the railway north of Lake Superior as involving a heavy burden. Well, we all know that they did not succeed in carrying out their desire; that the Government insisted on that portion of the railway being included in the contract; that we paid because it was included, and that what the Syndicate thought was such an onerous proposal, a proposal which they would agree to only on being proportionately compensated for the task they were asked to undertake; and therefore a very large portion of the very many millions of money and millions of acres is attributable to the representations made that this was a very onerous part of the bargain—is

now proved, according to information obtained by hon. gentlemen, to be a most valuable portion of the road; that the Syndicate will not part with it, and that what appeared to be a bad bargain proved to be a good one. That is the consequence, once again, of not adopting the policy we suggested of proceeding with those portions which were necessary for the immediate development of the country, and completing the road from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, and looking around us a little more before we made what was believed to be a disadvantageous bargain, but which now turns out, on the statement of the hon. gentleman himself and of the Company and the Government, to be so much better even than his own followers supposed last Session. Of course, this change of policy is one which is of special interest, as it involves us in increased burdens. I quite agree that if it be true that the development of the country at each end is going to be promoted, it is another question, and it may be a fair reason for incurring that extra expenditure; but it is reasonable to point out that this is a serious change in policy whereby the expenditure which was to be spread over ten years, as far as the Government is concerned, is now to be concentrated in four or five years, involving an additional expenditure for the next four years of something over \$8,000,000. Of course, even the hon. gentleman will not assert that the interest on the money so rapidly expended, and to such an amount, will be met out of the lands—it is to be met out of the taxation of the country; and that which we said on various occasions last Session with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway is fulfilled by the declarations in the Speech, because not merely must that large sum, to meet the interest, be paid out of the public revenue, but it appears by the statement in the Speech that a very large portion of the great sum taken from the people of the country last year in taxes has been actually applied to the construction of the Pacific Railway, and it has been built to that extent out of the public taxes. We alleged that the power which was given to the Company is inordinate, and that also has been verified, although perhaps not to the extent which it will be eventually. I do not enter into an analysis of the freight rates, but they are very, very high. I do not know on what terms the Government have sanctioned those rates, but they are such as, although perhaps bearable where produce happens to have high values and there is a large quantity to the acre—and we must not forget that the imports of the country are, to a large extent, paid out of capital—still, although bearable under those circumstances and of a less serious character, when once the settler has become a settler, the question simply is, what are my annual charges, and what are the annual returns of my farm. We find the policy of the Administration has been in the direction of giving what was asked. We find local railway charters disallowed; we find in this part of the country the indefinite powers given in that bargain availed of; we find local railways absorbed; and it is possible that those who viewed with considerable equanimity the consequences of great power being extended to a company to use in a land many many miles away and to be exercised over other persons, will now feel a little more alive to the dangerous consequences and the burdens which result from such powers when they find them exercised at their own doors with results which press upon their own shoulders. We said that Sault Ste. Marie was the objective point to be reached at that time, but that was repudiated. It was said that the right thing to do was to push for the north shore at once, to keep at a distance from Sault Ste. Marie; nay, more, we were told that it was a treasonable and unpatriotic thing to discuss connection with Sault Ste. Marie, and that those who proposed that plan—though, indeed, there was numbered among those who advocated it one short year before the Minister of Railways himself—were men who were leagued in a hostile league to the interests of this country. But we find that the Syndicate propose to go

very near the Sault on the main line and all the way to the Sault by a branch, and it is now regarded as a very good thing, as an excellent thing, as a sort of betterment if possible of the Government policy, that a route should be adopted which enables them to go near to the Sault on the main line and altogether to the Sault at an early day. We said that the provisions as to the exemptions, the lack of restrictions in the conditions with reference to the lands, were likely to result in regulations not in the interests of the public, and I need not do more than point to the various series of land regulations issued by the railway for proof of that statement. It is true, and I rejoice to see it, that they have been modified lately in important respects; but in their objectionable form they are still quite within the competence of the Company. We cannot well find fault with the Company, for we gave them power to make them, and we knew that it would be to their interests to make them—the responsibility is on the Administration; nor do I believe that they would have been such as they are to-day, and still less, such as they were some time ago, if it had not been that power was given to the Company to hold their lands free from taxation, and had not absolute power been given them without restriction as to the mode of disposing of them. We said that the valuation of lands which the Government made for the purposes of the contract was a valuation contradicted by their own views of the year before, and a valuation not according to our reasonable anticipations of that time. This is proved from public documents and by the regulations issued by the Government itself as to its own lands, where lands at a greater distance from the railway than the railway lands and less advantageously situated are offered for sale at prices far in excess of those at which it was proposed to value the choice neighboring lands for the purposes of the contract last Session. I believe it is extraordinary the extent to which already events have gone in the direction of verifying those views which, as to some of the points, may require many years for their full development. I observe that we are offered for our consideration some subjects with which we are not wholly unfamiliar. Once again, there is a promise of a Bill for the reforming of the Civil Service, and my hon. friend, the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in effect, if not in terms, informs us that he wants it to be an efficacious Bill, that he wants to preserve the patronage, but that he wants to secure it only for capable persons, and so on. I think he will find it extremely difficult to combine these two objects, and, if he succeeds, I would recommend him at the earliest possible moment to send in a draft of his measure to the Administration, who, I am sure, will receive it with that consideration due to so devoted a follower, and may receive from it new light on this important subject. But, so far as I can judge of the laws of modern days on this subject, and from the statements of the first report of this Commission itself, they differ rather from the view of the hon. gentleman, and I believe that the exercise of that political patronage is at the root of many of the most serious evils which certainly beset our existing Civil Service system. I find also reference to a Bill for the winding up of incorporated insurance companies, banks and trading corporations. That also is an old dish. When the Insolvent Act was repealed the Government assented to the view that its repeal should be conditional on such a measure, and it was promised that such a measure should be introduced. It was found impossible, I suppose, to redeem that pledge during that Session; the next Session it was promised but not brought down; but, as the third time is the charm, we may now expect to have the Bill brought down. We are also promised a measure relating to fugitive offenders within the Empire. Such a measure may be necessary, but I do say that there is a cognate subject of much greater importance—I mean the present condition of the law with

Mr. BLAKE.

reference to the extradition of fugitive criminals from foreign countries. I say that the condition of our law is a disgrace, that the proceedings going on from time to time prove it, and that we should take very earnest and strenuous measures to secure the improvement of those arrangements between ourselves and other countries, and notably the United States, which are now existing, and to secure the substitution of some other and better convention for the antiquated Ashburton Treaty, or if that were found to be impossible, to make provision for legislative extradition. I think that we should largely increase the range of crimes which ought to be the subject of extradition, and that we should secure the provision of this House of a few years ago before the coming into force of a better, simpler, more harmonious and plain mode of administering the law. The question was carefully discussed in a case which arose the other day, but I do not know whether it will be possible to get over the difficulty in that case under the Ashburton Treaty. In that case a proposal was made to extradite a man who is acknowledged to be a criminal—and what is the difficulty in the way? It is very sure that the person in question is a criminal, for he is not only an accused person, but one who was sentenced, convicted, committed to prison, and who afterwards broke gaol. The difficulty is that under the Ashburton Treaty he ought to be sent across the lines for trial, but because he has been tried, sentenced, and was undergoing sentence when he escaped, you cannot get him back again. I see by the newspapers that a fresh charge is to be made against this individual for some other crime for which he has not had the good fortune to be tried, and I hope that the proceedings thus taken will result in his being extradited. But is it not disgraceful that it should be even a question of doubt whether such an individual should be free to remain on our shores? The Speech refers, although in terms perhaps less strong than some former references when steps were proposed to be taken on the subject, to fresh outlets for our trade and commerce, and to the starting of a line between this country and Brazil. I rejoice to learn from the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that they take a deep interest in the extension of our trade and commerce, and are desirous of forwarding them in every way. So are we all. We may believe that the methods pursued by the present Administration and supported by these hon. gentlemen may not be well calculated to enable this country to compete in the markets of the world, or that the projects which they bring forward are such as would enable us to exchange profitably, and we are all quite anxious that that should happen. And I say here, what I said years ago, that if we are going to make real progress in that direction, it must be that we ought to have our own agents, and that we ought to have further power to make those conventional arrangements with foreign countries; and until we—recognizing the fact that our situation is peculiar, that it is our own situation, that our own people understand our own business and our own situation better—undertake to discharge that duty ourselves and on our own account, but little progress will be made by the hon. gentlemen in the accomplishing of arrangements which, if the conditions of this country were different, would result in a profitable outlet for our manufactures, and a profitable exchange for our natural products. The executive administration, Mr. Speaker, is becoming a greater element in the public transactions of the year, and ought to receive more and more the careful attention of Parliament. More and more, year by year, are important matters, which formerly would have been supposed to be within the exclusive jurisdiction of Parliament, handed over to the control of the Executive, and our action is that of the criticism of the past, instead of the potential action of deciding what the course shall be. Take the land regulations, for example. Those who think most of the North-West must feel most warmly as to the magnitude of that topic. It is admitted that the prosperity and progress

of the North-West have for their base the fertile lands of that territory, and therefore the policy which is to be pursued with reference to the development of that country is largely a land policy. As to certain classes of these lands, it has been agreed that the regulations shall be subject to the disapproval of Parliament on being laid on the Table; but as to the bulk, the Government have taken absolute and uncontrolled power to make regulations, and we find series after series of regulations issuing, with almost the rapidity, though hardly with the symmetry, of the views presented by the kaleidoscope. The short motto we have adopted, year by year, for the North-West, has been "the land for the settler, the price for the public;" and after objecting as we did, though unsuccessfully, to the sale of land on other than conditions of settlement; after arguing again that if you should sell otherwise than on conditions of settlement, you should sell for cash only; after propounding resolutions in these directions for two Sessions in vain, we have found that the Government have conceded in part. We have found that what was proposed has been applied to the individual, and if he is to buy other than on conditions of settlement he is to pay cash. But what is good for the individual speculator is good for the party speculator, and the party speculator under one class of regulations, at any rate, is still to be permitted to purchase on credit. I very much dread that the effect of the last regulations in some important particulars will be to depart still more seriously from that motto, to introduce a system of large speculative holdings, and a system of middlemen, who will receive from the colonist a larger sum than the public gets, and thus to retard settlement for a long time and produce ultimate loss to the settler. We have to consider the regulations with regard to arable lands, to grazing lands, to wood lands, to coal and mineral lands and to town sites. All these are subjects of vastest importance, and subjects which one can do no more than make reference to at this time or until the regulations are before us, when they can be discussed profitably in detail. Amongst the subjects not alluded to in the Speech, is the exercise in the discretion of the Government, of the power of disallowance; and we see by the public papers that other instances are now pending before the Council or the Minister, in which it is seriously contemplated to pursue the same policy. I think it would be profitable for this Parliament, during the present Session, to engage in a discussion of that subject. It is of the last consequence that we should decide on the principles—applicable, of course, to all the Provinces—for they have all an identical and common interest in the matter—on which disallowance should be exercised—and decide, not in a limited sense, but in an enlarged sense, in a sense that, if it be necessary for the Government to take such action, will not make confederation a delusion and a snare, and result in bringing about that federal union which was once, and I presume is still, the dream of the hon. the First Minister. We have other subjects. We have had the Minister of Finance issuing a little circular—no, two—no, three little circulars, each of them corrective of the others, and circulars which I undertake to say Parliament considered it to be far beyond his power to issue, when he was authorized to issue any circulars at all—circulars, for instance, containing demands for statements regarding the private affairs of banks. He has done something else, too. We were told last year that it was utterly impossible, without lowering the dignity of Parliament, without insulting the representatives of the people, to inform them until the House should meet, until the Speech should be assented to, until the document itself should be laid on yonder Table, what the details were of a gigantic contract on which they were to be asked to pass within a few days of the time they were informed of it. But, how far is it in accordance with the respect due to the representatives of the people that public meetings of the electors should be informed months before

the meeting of Parliament, what the policy of the Administration was to be in an important particular—that they should be told distinctly and plainly that the taxes on tea and coffee should be removed, and that we should hear nothing at all about it now in the Speech? It is true, I have heard the hon. gentleman frequently, when he was asked, in advance, what he was going to do about taxes, say: "I cannot tell you that until my Budget is brought down. It would never do to let a word out." But he has changed his views, and the change is so radical, so revolutionary, that while he is quite decided that we are not to know anything about it before he makes his Budget Speech, he is decided that all the rest of the world shall know all about it long before. The most extraordinary thing is, that the hon. gentleman, in this particular, appears to have been animated by benevolent intentions toward the trade, and that the trade seems not to appreciate his benevolent intentions. I am glad to observe that he is quite disposed, in discussion with the trade, to change again somewhat if that will suit. I observe, although he has not told Parliament about it, by a letter addressed to a gentleman in Montreal and published in the newspapers, that he now states that if it will do them any good to prolong the disturbance he will postpone the removal of the duties for two months more. When they are complaining that trade is paralysed, that difficulties are increased by a long postponement, and when they desire to be out of their pain, the hon. gentleman asks them to wait two months longer and keep things in the pleasant condition they are for that space of time. I suppose it is because he has not finished that correspondence that we have no announcement on that subject in the Speech. We will have no doubt an announcement on that subject, and the hon. gentlemen who have been rejoicing, and who are rejoicing to-day, in the surplus, and who are glorifying the Administration for having produced it, will immediately afterwards glorify the Administration for having taken off the taxes. First of all they call upon us to bless them because they imposed the taxes, then they call upon us to bless them because the taxes produced fruits, and presently we are to be called upon to bless them because they take the taxes off again. I recollect the story of a person who was found one sultry summer day walking up a steep hill with a fence rail on his shoulder. He was met by a friend, who said: "What are you carrying that heavy rail up the hill for when there are plenty of rails on the top?" He answered: "It is rather burdensome to carry it up, but then how well I shall feel when I lay it down on the top of the hill." Such is the view of the Minister. He put on the taxes; it was all right and a great blessing. He takes them off; it is all right and a greater blessing still. That surplus is no doubt very large, and the change in the tariff, which has been communicated by the Minister in the sense of a reduction of taxation, is what we suggested to him last Session. We said that the surplus ought not to be so large and that the taxes should be light. We were told that it was premature, that two or three years would be time enough to talk of reducing the taxes; and we are glad to know that in this case it takes but a few months, and that one Session after he made the proposal it is to be realized. That surplus has produced, as I have said, an increase of taxes, it has not been produced by an abnormal consumption of imported goods. The consumption has not been in the gross, at any rate, much in excess, if at all in excess, of that which, judging from the past of this country, we might have expected; but it is produced from a moderate importation, because that moderate importation is taxed at a rate extremely oppressive in the gross, and still more oppressive if you consider the incidents of that taxation. The legislation of last Session included the power to appoint judges for the Province of Quebec. While in some other subjects hon. gentlemen opposite have been active; while we have

seen them everywhere except here; while they have been through the country from end to end, I suppose it was not to be expected that they should have found time to carry out that portion of legislation. I was told when I made the suggestion that other arrangements might be carried out which would give a more efficient judiciary to the Province of Quebec, without expense or an addition to the number of judges, that the matter was pressing, that it was urgent, that it ought to be passed that Session because the business of the litigants of the Province of Quebec demanded the appointment of an additional judge. The law passed, it came into force, and the judge is not named. How is that? What is the difficulty? Was it impossible? Was it found afterwards the judge was not needed? Was there an *embarras de richesse* as to the nominee? How does it happen that that which was so necessary, that no time was afforded for the consideration of some other plan, has turned out not to be at all necessary? So again with respect to another institution—the Penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul—where we had a report that it was necessary to supersede the warden, and that it was necessary to reorganize the establishment. We heard rumors that we were to suffer the loss of a respected member of this House—the hon. member for L'Assomption (Mr. Hurteau). We heard that he was about to prefer the presidency over a number of convicted criminals to association with the respectable individuals who compose this Chamber. But we are happy to know that he is still with us, and we would like to know the reason why.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He cannot part from you.

Mr. BLAKE. It is said that he found a little condition attached to his elevation to that exalted office, namely, that satisfactory arrangements should be made for the county. The county was not capable of being satisfactorily arranged for, owing to an *embarras de richesse* of Conservative candidates. My hon. friend, who smiles at me opposite, went down there, and when it was found impossible to reconcile these differences, my hon. friend from L'Assomption announced that he would retain that *mandat* which he had been prepared to abandon, and my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) congratulated him on the patriotic spirit which induced him, under such circumstances, and in view of these difficulties, to remain a member of this House and not become a warden of the penitentiary. And so it was that after many months of discussion the institution remained unprovided for, and it is but lately that an arrangement for the wardenship of that institution has been made; thus it being made palpable that political considerations, that the political view of patronage which my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is very anxious should be maintained, have interfered considerably with the efficient administration of the public service in an important particular. I, of course, agree, and very heartily, in the views which have been expressed in the Speech with reference to the calamity which befel the Republic of the United States of America. We must all do that, and agree not merely in the spirit, but also in the language in which that allusion is made. It is a painful commentary upon an advanced civilization that such an event should have been possible, and that in the history of that great country, within so brief a period, the lives of two of the freely elected governors of that country, should have terminated in such a tragic way. I will add no more than this, that we heartily rejoice to know that the illness which unfortunately afflicted my hon. friend opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald) has terminated so favorably, and that he meets us again restored to his usual health; and that although we may hope that he shall change his position in this House at an early period, we hope he will continue to grace this House for many years with that ability which he has heretofore displayed.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can cordially join my hon. friend in many things he has said during his interesting speech to-day. In the first place, I join with him in offering my sincere congratulations to the Mover and Seconder of the Resolutions, for the able manner in which they have pressed those Resolutions on the attention of this House. I can also congratulate my hon. friend opposite on the kindly and pleasant tone in which he has addressed himself so early in the Session to the discussion of matters of legislation and administration to which he has alluded. I thank him especially, and most sincerely, for his very kind allusion to myself. Probably we are to remain looking at each other; I cannot hope—although I would like it—to be ranged on the same side as the hon. gentleman, but we will look at each other as pleasantly as we can. My hon. friend is pleased with the Address on the whole, and with the improved tone as regards the extraordinary prosperity in Canada. He said that formerly we attributed everything to ourselves, but now we are so far improved in our manners, our morals, and our sentiments, that we give some thanks to the Greater Power. The hon. gentleman said we had given one day to God and 364 to ourselves. My hon. friend seems to grudge that one day, and I really do think, from the tone—the rather light tone—of my hon. friend that he was not very thankful on that same day. There is no doubt we have great reason to be thankful for several years of prosperity, and it is one of the happinesses of myself and my friends who surround me that we have had Providence smile upon us; and all that we can attribute to ourselves is this: that under a favoring Providence we have attempted to the best of our humble capacity to develop the interests of the country, and remove the stagnation under which it suffered; and we are proud to know, from the statement of my hon. friend himself, that our exertions have not been altogether unsuccessful. My hon. friend laid down the true principle, I think, of discussions of this kind on the opening of a Session in Parliament. Motions in amendment and long discussions are obsolete, except in very exceptional cases where the continuance of the confidence of Parliament in the Administration of the day is to be questioned. Then, of course, the sooner that is brought to a decision, the better; but, with that exception, it is a well understood rule now that the sooner we get to work the better, and that this preliminary discussion is merely a sort of undress rehearsal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am glad you have changed your mind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I sometimes do change my mind. I am not a Bourbon. I learn something, and I forget something; and apropos of that, the hon. gentleman congratulates us, on several occasions, on some improvements in land regulations and other matters,—that we have really taken a leaf out of his book, and the book of the Opposition. We are not too proud to learn even from my hon. friend. Not being Reformers, we find occasionally something to reform; and as with us who are not Reformers, the good of the country and not self gratulation or pride in our own opinion, is the chief guiding principle. We do occasionally, not very often, find that we can improve on even our own original ideas. Well, my hon. friend stated the principle correctly, but entered rather fully, and I think with some contradiction in spirit, into doctrines which he had laid down, and too fully, in the absence of papers and means of verifying statements, into the various subjects which the interests of the country demands should be discussed coolly. I do not, however, object to that or complain of it. The hon. gentleman speaks in a very proper and patriotic tone of his pleasure at the progress in the North-West. We are proud of that progress. We ought all, as Canadians, to be proud of it, and this Government has certainly some cause for congratulations through having been, in some degree, the means by which that country has

been, and is now being, developed. We also believed, notwithstanding my hon. friend was an unbeliever at one time, in the future of that country. We always believed in the value of the land, and I was ridiculed—and by none more than my hon. friend—at the valuations that I ventured to place on some of the lands.

Mr. BLAKE. The calculations, not the valuations. You were only four millions out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I did not then give full justice to the power of my hon. friends opposite to keep back the development of the country. I did not believe that their candid, conscientious statements as to the future of the country would have such an injurious effect on its progress as they proved to have had. Still, we have overcome even the influence of their opinion and their authority as to the worthlessness of the land for present purposes, and as to the prospect of an early immigration into that country. We have got over that now, and the country is rapidly being settled. It is quite true, the hon. gentleman says, that a large European immigration has not yet set in. There is a very wholesome transfer of the population from the older Provinces to the North-West. I coincide with my hon. friend that that is not to be regretted. The people of this country have a right to go to where they think their interests can be most promoted; and every man who, by going to the North-West either from Quebec, Ontario or the Maritime Provinces, increases his comfort, wealth and means, adds thereby to the wealth of the whole Dominion. Not only that, but I believe that in Ontario, especially in the most fertile portions, there was going to be too great a subdivision of the farming property. What is the consequence? The man who had his farm in Ontario or Quebec does not throw it away, nor does he abandon his home. No; he sells to his richer neighbor, who wishes to remain in the older Province, at a reasonable price. The farmer who buys is the capitalist, and in view of a change in the older Provinces of the products of farms, the larger those farms become in the hands of the capitalist, the better. So that I do not think it is to be regretted. On the contrary, I believe it is to the interest of the old and new portions of the Province that a portion of the population should be moved from one section to another, if, by that transfer, the parties so moved gain in comfort or in wealth. The hon. gentleman spoke of the increased Indian expenditure. He said he had warned the Government some two years ago against the commencement of the expenditure which is now going on. It is very easy to give a warning, but I will venture to say that if my hon. friend had been in the Administration at the time those votes were asked for, he would have felt himself bound to make the same demand, and would have expected to receive the same response from Parliament. It was by no fault, either of the Government or the Opposition, that the buffalo, the food supply of the Indian, are disappearing. They are being diminished by the progress of civilization and by the senseless slaughter that goes on in those regions; and further, the Indians in our country have been almost deprived of that source of food supply by the action of the American Government in keeping back, so far as a cordon of troops can do so, the herds of buffalo from crossing the line towards the north. It was an absolute necessity to any Government to take care that those people should not be allowed to starve, as they were literally deprived of their chief sources of food supply. In some districts the Indians could fish, and were no burden to the Dominion Treasury, but in the places where the animals and game are rapidly disappearing with the advance of settlers, and the buffalo are disappearing altogether, there was but one thing to do, either to feed the Indian or let him die. That being the alternative, of course Parlia-

ment, as one man, and without objection, except perhaps the warning my hon. friend mentions, voted the necessary supplies, the Government have tried their best to induce the Indians to settle on the lands, and betake themselves to the raising of cattle and the cultivation of the soil. I believe, on the whole, the experiment has been successful, and, strange to say, the greatest success has been attained with the wildest tribes. The Blackfoot Indians seemed irreclaimable, but they have betaken themselves with extraordinary readiness to their reserves, and we have good hopes that near the Rocky Mountains, extending to the North Saskatchewan and Peace River, the Blackfoot, the Bloods, and other tribes, will ere long be self-supporting. With the other Indians we have not, on the whole, succeeded so well. While the Indians have got this year an unexpected supply of food from the partial return of the buffalo, I believe, on the whole, it is to be regretted, because they have been told that the buffalo had disappeared, and that they must become farmers or cattle raisers, on which belief they had betaken themselves to those enterprises. But when they learned that the buffalo had returned, they remarked that all the white men's prophecies as to the final disappearance of the buffalo had been falsified, and in very many instances they had left their reserves and fallen back into their old habits. We must, in the language of the Speech, submit to that consequence of our acquisition of the country. Of course, the hon. gentleman is quite right in his remarks upon the supply of food to the aborigines. No one felt, more than myself, that the consequence of giving such food as was absolutely requisite to save them from starvation was an inducement, to a certain extent, to abstain from working. The Indian will not work if he can get enough to eat without working, and no doubt one of the consequences of our assisting them has been a supply of more food than was absolutely requisite to keep them from starving. But on the whole, as far as I can gather, the distribution has been as economical and judicious as possible under the circumstances of the case. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite will feel that one of the obligations thrown upon us all, as a civilized people, is to take care that these poor aborigines, who are deprived by the progress of civilization of their own country, of their hunting grounds and usual supply of food, are furnished with the necessaries of life for a certain period. It is true the Government have thought it necessary to increase the Mounted Police Force, but not to repress the Indians, as my hon. friend has suggested. The force, I believe, at this moment numbers but 300 men. It was thus established, in the first place, by the Government of 1873, their policy in this respect being followed by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite when in office. This force would have been quite sufficient to keep the Indians under proper restraint if no white men had gone into the country. The necessity for an increase is not the keeping of the Indians quiet, but the prevention of collisions between them and the white men. You can quite understand that if an Indian is starving, and sees a white man's cattle grazing, he will not starve—he will shoot the white man's ox for food, and it was not unlikely that the white man's ox will shoot down the Indian.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the process by which the white man's ox is to shoot the Indian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was going on to say, had I not been rather uncivilly interrupted, that our object is to prevent white men and Indians coming into collision. There are large herds of cattle coming into our North-West Territory from the Southern States—brought in by herdsmen and drivers from Texas, and the region between that State and the International boundary; and we know from

the history of the transactions between the white man and the Indian in the United States that in the western country the white man would be apt to shoot the Indian on sight, as he would a prairie dog. And such white men are coming into our Western Territory. They are accustomed to continual collisions with the Indians, and the great danger is that by any act of appropriation of a white man's property, the white man may be excited to protect it by taking an Indian's life, and the killing of one Indian might cause an Indian war, slaughter, and we do not know what other consequences. One thing is certain, that this would prevent or postpone for many years the immigration we hope shortly to draw into that country; and therefore it is that we ask the House to increase the Police Force to 500 men. Under the present Act, in case of immediate urgency or danger the Government have the power to do so; but as there is no such urgency, in my opinion, as to warrant that course, allusion is made to the subject in the Speech in the terms noticed. Although the force is to be increased if Parliament sanction it, I am happy to tell the House that the cost per man of the Police is very much diminished—in fact, to a very remarkable degree. To increase the number, therefore, does not involve a corresponding increase in the expense. My hon. friend from West Durham says that notwithstanding all the dangers that are apprehended in the North-West, he sees the Lieutenant-Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs at this Capital. He is here this winter as he was here last winter, and if I hold the position next winter which I do now, I shall certainly send for him to have the advantage of his assistance and advice, and explain to us of what goes on under his eyes in the Territory. I am happy to say that that gentleman has the confidence of myself as the head of the department with which he is most connected. I believe he is the right man in the right place—a very sensible, prudent man, cool, cautious and determined, while at the same time a man of kindly manners. He has got on very well, and has acquired the confidence and respect of the Indians with whom he has had to deal. My hon. friend has spoken of the measures mentioned in the Speech, observing there are some remarkable omissions. I do not suppose he has had the same experience in this respect. Report says he has had some very late experience in framing Speeches from the Throne, but I have no doubt that on no occasion would he make a Speech from the Throne, a mere catalogue or schedule of the measures of the Government which brings it down. We allude to subjects of general interest, as is always done on such occasions. We have, however, noticed at some length the position of the Indians in the North-West, and also the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I must say, I have never admired my hon. friend's astuteness more, than in his attempt to find fault with the Syndicate for finishing the road in five years instead of ten. The hon. gentleman was loud in his denunciations, at one time, of the folly of building the road to the north of Lake Superior, urging that it ought to have been indefinitely postponed, and postponed in fact till the Greek Kalends, so far as regards construction through British Columbia. His idea was that we should not have a Pacific or trans-continental railroad at all; but if we should have one it was to be run from the head of Lake Superior, leaving the Canadian system of railroads for ever and ever, amen. The remainder of the road was only to be finished in 1890. After seven years, we at last made an arrangement by which the road was to be finished in 1891, just one year more. I think it is much to the credit of the Government that, in choosing parties to build the road, they selected men who formed themselves into a company, and who, with some degree of doubt, with great hesitation, entered into a contract to finish the railway in ten years, and now found they would finish it in five years. Their energies are

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

wonderful, their resources are remarkable, and we shall have the road across the continent in half the time we anticipated. Some of my hon. friends opposite endeavored to raise a good-natured laugh at my having expected only to look down upon the completed railway. I think, Mr. Speaker, unless slain by the too vigorous assaults of the leader of the Opposition, I may hope, even at my age, to live long enough to travel across the Dominion, proceeding from Ottawa direct to the shores of the Pacific, without suffering any very great inconvenience or fatigue. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has spoken somewhat, and I think, without sufficient examination into the state of the case, about excessive freight rates. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the rates, so far as I can learn, are not excessive. They are considerably less than those charged by the Government, when the railway was a Government railway, without any objection being taken by the people interested; and the Government was so particular in guarding the interests through which this road was to pass, that they have taken care that both passenger and freight rates shall be subject from time to time to thorough revision by the Government. It is quite obvious that a shorter road, running fifty, sixty or 100 miles, is not so profitable as one extending 200, 300, 500 or 1,000 miles, and there must be a proper and due proportion between the service provided by such railway and the rate of remuneration; and the Syndicate have been warned, and know that the Government will not hesitate from time to time to deal with the reconstruction of rates as the road extends from east to west, and as the comparative profits and expenses of running the road alter with every mile of railway that is constructed and brought into operation. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has spoken about the land regulations, and said there have been several changes. There have been, and I really expect, and I am not ashamed to say so, that further experience may cause the Government from time to time to alter those regulations. If we find any regulation is an obstruction to settlement, we will alter it; if we find the price of land is too low, we will increase it; if it is too high, we will diminish it; all those things must be matters which can only be dealt with as in the progress of the country the necessity of change or amendment is shown to exist. There is one thing clear, however, that by no chance can the individual settler be prevented from getting his land if he chooses to go there, without the intervention of the middleman, whether a rich capitalist or colonization association. The homestead principle is going to be reserved and preserved most carefully, and when you remember that all those colonization societies can only, under the present regulations, secure lands to the north of the Pacific Railway, twenty-four miles from the railway belt, and twelve miles on each side of any subsidiary road that may run through the country in any direction, the House will see that those companies cannot in any way interfere with the early settlement of the country. Of course, the rush will be to get as near railways as possible, and we preserve to the settler the right to establish himself within one inch of the railway if he goes there first and makes his entry on the even-numbered lots, whatever its value may be. We have carefully guarded the right of the immigrant, and even under the most sanguine view as to the rush of population into that country during the next few years, there will not be any lack of good land in the vicinity of railways; and before colonization and other societies—which I am happy to say have been established in very large numbers and are offering large sums of money for tracts of land—can commence to bring in immigrants, each immigrant must have made up his mind that it is better he should pay those colonization companies for the land he requires rather than he should take the land for nothing in the vicinity of the railway. While we have thus protected the actual settler for years and years, if the present policy

be continued by the present or any succeeding Government, from the chance of being imposed upon, we have not forgotten the promise made by the Government that they would make the land in that country recoup to the Dominion the \$25,000,000 that we have promised the Syndicate, and what the Dominion has already spent, or is spending, on the Pacific Railway. There is no reason in the world, as I have urged again and again, why the people of the older Provinces should put their hands in their pockets and settle that country and improve it and build railways at their expense. That country, which is going to reap the advantage of those railways, should provide the cost of the improvements, and the North-West, I am happy to say, is so rich and will be so sought after, that what was a reasonable proposition at the beginning is now a certainty, namely, that it will be able to sell sufficient land that, while preserving the homesteading right, it would be able to repay to those who have contributed to the taxes necessary in connection with building the road, the money with interest added. My hon. friend speaks about the Civil Service Act, and he indulges in a little good-natured badinage about political patronage, and says he does not know whether the Government would pay sufficient attention to the representations of my hon. friend, the member for Beauharnois. All I can say is this: that we will pay at least as much attention to the representations of my hon. friend from Beauharnois as hon. gentlemen opposite did to those of the member for West Elgin. The hon. gentleman refers to the proposed legislation regarding fugitive offenders and the law under the Ashburton Treaty. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be well that that law should be extended—that the treaty should be extended, and that the number of offences under the treaty should be increased. I think now that there is such a similarity between the criminal law in the United States and Canada that every felony, and some of the crimes which are not technically called felonies, might well be subjects for surrender. If we can send back to Quebec a man who commits a crime in that Province, and escapes to Ontario because we have faith in their tribunals, we should have the same faith in the American tribunals and return their offenders across our borders, having every confidence that they will have as fair a trial as in our own country. I know that my hon. friend, and the Administration with which he was connected, attempted to deal with this subject. It is one which is not altogether, or in any considerable degree, within our power; it is only by action with the Mother Country and through the Mother Country that we can hope that a treaty may be made extending the terms of the Ashburton Treaty. The case which the hon. gentleman mentions, going on in Toronto, is certainly a strong instance of the imperfections of the treaty. Such a case arose when I was Minister of Justice, and, there being no *Habeas Corpus*, I tried the matter as on the original information, and the party was found guilty and returned to the gaol from which he feloniously escaped. The hon. gentleman, in referring to the trade which has been opened with Brazil, says that he would like to see all such commercial developments under the control of our own agents. If my memory serves me right, when we did appoint a quasi-diplomatic agent, one who was as nearly an ambassador as our colonial connection would permit, the hon. gentleman indulged in a good deal of the sarcasm, which he can use so powerfully and so successfully sometimes, upon the appointment of Sir Alexander Galt. I may say that in consequence of such arrangements made in England, Her Majesty's Government have agreed that in commercial treaties with any nations whatever, in which we may be interested, he shall be present as an assessor, and shall be put in immediate communication with those through whom the negotiations are going on. He has been so recognized both in Madrid and Paris, and though

political events have, as we all know, prevented the progress of the treaty with the Mother Country, so successful have been our attempts to have control of our own treaty-making, that Her Majesty's Government have agreed that if no commercial treaty shall be made between France and England, our representative may negotiate with France and make an arrangement on our behalf, so that Canada will be enabled to deal directly with other nations in matters affecting our trade and commerce. I shall not now allude to the question of disallowance. That is a serious question, involving questions of constitutional law, questions between the Dominion Government and Parliament and the Provincial Governments and Legislatures, and matters which, as the hon. gentleman knows, must be carefully handled and fully and dispassionately discussed. I hope that these questions will be approached by both sides of the House with an ardent desire to prevent constitutional difficulties or undue friction between the Provincial and Dominion Legislatures, or undue exercise of power by any of these bodies. My hon. friend is surprised at the breach of Parliamentary practice by the Minister of Finance in announcing to the public generally, in these democratic days, that there would be a reduction of the tea and coffee duties. My hon. friend, I think, has carried out the old parliamentary practice, and has observed that respect which a Minister of Finance ought to pay Parliament in making his announcements. If I remember aright, the hon. gentleman took occasion last Session to say that if there were no negotiations going on for a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, and if the state of the public chest would allow it, he would introduce a measure for the reduction or abolition of the duties on tea and coffee. There can be no mistake that he made such an announcement, and when he made the statement at the hustings or on the platform he was merely conveying to the public what he had previously, with due respect, conveyed to Parliament at his last Session. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is rather mixed in his recollection about the tea and coffee duties. I think he stated that we had increased those duties.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said that we imposed them. The hon. gentleman must know that they were an old source of revenue, that they were increased by the Finance Minister in the Government of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and that we reduced them.

Mr. BLAKE. There were no tea and coffee duties when my hon. friend was in office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And he imposed them, and now, under the favor of Providence and with the assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite, we propose to take them off. I have only one thing more to say, and that is, that I quite agree with the graceful and sympathetic terms in which my hon. friend spoke of the assassination of the President of the United States. It thrilled the heart of every man in Canada with horror to hear that, so causelessly, so sinfully, so wickedly, and so ferociously—from a mere desire for notoriety, or from some latent feeling of vindictiveness which we cannot fathom—so valuable and blameless and so worthy a life should have been shortened just as it promised to enter upon a new career of usefulness. I can only say, in conclusion, that I trust my hon. friend opposite and myself will conduct our discussions—the frailty of human kind intervening and interposing—in the same kindly spirit which I hope has actuated both of us in our remarks to-day.

On paragraph 26,

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say, in answer to the allusion of the hon. gentleman to another speech, that I knew no

more of the contents of that speech than the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I certainly knew nothing of it.

Resolutions agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

"That the said Resolutions be referred to a Select Committee, composed of Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Guillet and the mover, to prepare and report a draft of an Address in answer to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to the Houses of Parliament, in conformity with the said Resolutions"

Motion agreed to.

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

REPORTS.

The following Reports were laid on the Table:—

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year 1880-81.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Report of the State of the Militia of the Dominion for the fiscal year 1880-81.—(Mr. Caron.)

Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year 1880-81; also Report of the Auditor-General on Appropriation Accounts for the fiscal year 1880-81; also, Statement of payments charged to unforeseen expenses by Order in Council from 1st July, 1881, to date.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion for the fiscal year 1880-81; also, Report, Returns, and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion for the fiscal year 1880-81; also, Eighth Report on Weights and Measures; also, Report on Adulteration of Food.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to see that the hon. gentlemen have followed the excellent example set by the late Administration, and I trust that the excellent example of his colleagues will not be lost on the Minister of the Interior, and that he will bring down his report a little before the last days of the Session.

Mr. ANGLIN. Having first read it.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Having first read it.

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Mr. BLAKE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 13th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

Mr. SPEAKER presented a statement of the receipts and disbursements of the House of Commons.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER presented the Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals.

CONTRACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER also presented the contract entered into for the construction of the aqueduct on the Welland Canal, stating that the contract was subject to the disapproval of the House.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 2) for constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. BOWELL moved that a Select Committee, comprising Messrs. Bechard, Charlton, Colby, Desjardins, McDonald (Cape Breton), Ross (Middlesex), Scriver, Stephenson and White (Cardwell), be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates during the present Session.

Motion agreed to.

MURRAY CANAL.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings) enquired, Whether the survey of the Murray Canal has been completed, and if so, has the route been definitely defined, and whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with its construction and when?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in answer to the hon. member, that the final location is now being determined by the Chief Engineer, when contracts will be immediately asked for and the work vigorously prosecuted.

PROMISSORY NOTES AND BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce an Act during the present Session to repeal the "Act to impose duties on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange?"

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The intention of the Government with respect to this subject can only be properly stated when the Budget is brought down.

SALE AND MANUFACTURE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. VALLÉE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to alter the law respecting the sale and manufacture of Canadian tobacco, in such a manner as to allow farmers to sell their tobacco in the leaf, and so as to enable manufacturers of foreign tobacco to manufacture at the same time Canadian tobacco, both kinds in the same establishment? Whether it is the intention of the Government to reduce the duty of fourteen cents per pound on tobacco manufactured from Canada leaf?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I must answer the hon. member's question in the same terms as I answered the enquiry of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson).

ESTATES OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS.

Mr. HOUDE, for Mr. GAULT, enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session to provide for the equal division of the estates of insolvent debtors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce such a Bill.

IMPORTATIONS INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DECOSMOS enquired, What is the total value of merchandise imported into British Columbia from the other Provinces of the Dominion, during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881? 2. What is the total amount imported by sea from Montreal, or other eastern ports, into British Columbia, during the last fiscal year? 3. What amount was imported in the same period into that Province by overland route *via* San Francisco? 4. How much of the merchandise so imported was domestic, and how much foreign?

Mr. BOWELL. There are no returns in the Department affording such information, but I have telegraphed to the Collectors to ascertain whether they can supply it.

CONTRACTS ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. DECOSMOS enquired, What was the total value of the work performed up to December 31st last, by Onderdonk & Company, contractors, on the Emory-Savona contracts of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as estimated by Government engineers? 2. What is the total amount that had been paid thereon to the contractor up to that date? 3. How much of these railway contracts was then completed? 4. How many tons of rails were there then at Emory, including what may have been used in construction? 5. How many tons of rails are now on the way to Emory, and how many tons for Port Moody?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg leave to say, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that the total value of work done, as estimated by the engineers, on the contract referred to, is \$1,804,824; that the amount of money paid is \$1,624,300; that no part of the work is entirely completed, but that rails are laid for about twelve miles, and the work is in progress all along the line. The number of tons of rails at Emory, including those laid on the track, is 5,077. There are now on the way to Emory's Bar 1,490 tons; there are no rails on the way to Port Moody.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. HOUDE enquired, Whether the report of the Civil Service Commission is signed by all the members of that Commission; and if not, whether the report of the minority will be presented to the House with that of the majority?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report is not unanimous. The minority report will be brought down.

PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) moved for a return showing the amount paid for printing, by order of the Government, to any person or persons other than the contractor for parliamentary printing, the persons or firms to which such money was paid, and the nature of work done or the name of the document printed. He said: I wish to say, in connection with this resolution, that I made a motion somewhat similar

last Session, to which no answer has yet been made. I would like an answer to this motion at as early a date as possible. I find, on looking over the list of last Session, that to as many as seventy-seven motions for returns adopted by this House, no answers were given. I trust this will not be one of the unfortunate motions to be cast into the waste basket.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that a Special Committee of seven Members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday the 9th instant, and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Hector Langevin, Messrs. Blake, Mackenzie and Laurier do compose the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to say that I propose, to-morrow, to ask the hon. gentleman to make the usual explanations as to Ministerial changes. I think, if twenty-four hours were sufficient to make all the changes, twenty-four hours ought to be sufficient to make the explanations.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Papers and correspondence, not heretofore laid before this House, in connection with the Northern and Western Boundary of Ontario.—(Mr. Plumb.)

Return of all Provincial Acts passed by the Local Legislatures of the several Provinces of the Dominion and disallowed by the Government of the Dominion, since 1st July, 1867, with the reasons for such disallowance set forth in full; also, of all Provincial Acts which, though not disallowed, have been amended in conformity with the request of the Dominion Government, with the reasons for such amendments set forth in full; also, of all Provincial Acts which although not disallowed have been declared *ultra vires* by Her Majesty's Privy Council or by any court of competent jurisdiction.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Copy of all regulations and departmental orders respecting the arrears due to the Government on the sale of land in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territories, and the prompt payment of such arrears, according to the terms of sale, and of all instructions to, and correspondence with, the Crown Land Agents respecting the same.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Return of all correspondence with the Government by any party or parties or companies respecting the grazing or pasture lands in the North-West Territories, all applications made for such lands, all correspondence and applications respecting the claims of squatters or parties claiming rights of any kind in and to such lands; all grants, leases or other rights given to any one thereof, the terms and conditions thereof, showing to whom and when such grants, leases or other rights were so granted or given.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Return showing the number of licenses to cut timber on the Government lands in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territories granted by the Government, or applied for, from the acquisition of the country until the 1st day of February, 1882, the name of the licensee, the date of the license, the limit or quantity of land granted, the terms on which granted, including the annual rent, the stumpage reserved, time which license was to continue, the

number of licenses, if any, annulled, amount in arrear on such licenses, and all Orders in Council and regulations and rules or departmental orders respecting the same.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Return showing the quantity and location of coal, mineral and timber lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, sold, leased, licensed, or otherwise disposed of, since the acquisition of the country up to the 1st day of February, 1882, to whom, when, and the terms and conditions on which so sold, leased, licensed or otherwise disposed of, together with all Orders in Council and departmental orders and regulations in relation thereto.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Return of the receipts and expenditure in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the 1st day of July, to the 1st day of February in the fiscal years, terminating on the 30th day of June, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, and 1882, respectively.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Return in the form used in the statements, usually published in the *Gazette*, of the exports and imports from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of January, in each of the years, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882, respectively.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Return in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the Exports and Imports from the 1st July to 1st January, in each of the years 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882, respectively, showing the countries whence, and to which the same were respectively exported and imported.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Statement showing the amount of money on deposit on the 1st day of February, 1882, whether in Canada or elsewhere, together with the names of the banks wherein the said moneys are deposited, with the amount in each bank, respectively; also rates of interest, if any, allowed on the said deposits in each case, also the amount on deposit at interest.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Return of the cost of the Savings Bank branches of the Finance and Post Office Departments respectively; also the total cost of maintaining the several savings banks (under the control of the Government) throughout Canada, including all commissions or allowances of all kinds.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Messrs. *Glyn & Baring*, in reference to any alteration in the arrangements for the payment of interest on the public debt, or of any portion of the principal of the same, together with statement of the arrangement now in force for the payment of interest on the public debt.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Report on the condition and management of the Manitoba Indian Agency, under J. A. N. Provencher, the Indian Superintendent of the Manitoba District, made by the Government Commission of Enquiry, composed of the late W. H. Rose, Barrister, and Ebenezer McColl, Indian Agency Inspector, and the evidence upon which the same was made; also a voucher dated 25th June, 1875, for \$180, signed by one Tremblay; a voucher dated 25th June, 1875, for \$1,290, signed by one Tremblay, and a voucher dated 26th December, 1875, for \$600, signed by one Tremblay.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copy in full of the answer of Hon. Edmund Burk Wood, Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba, to the petition of Henry J. Clark, Q.C., of Winnipeg, and others, presented to the House of Commons, 4th March, 1881, said answer being reputed to contain fourteen chapters.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing (a) the amount of money paid for advertising in the various newspapers of Canada; (b) a list of the newspapers containing such advertisements; (c) the amount paid by each Department respectively, since last return.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

Mr. BLAKE.

Copies of all Orders in Council since the 1st of January, 1878, relating to squatters on lands in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

Return showing the number and location of Government land agencies opened in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the number of officers employed, and the amount paid for salaries in each year since the opening of the first office to date.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

House adjourned at 4.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

OTTAWA, 14th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COMMITTEES APPOINTED.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD reported lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare said lists.

Ordered, That the said Report be concurred in.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Senate requesting that their Honors will unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses, on the subject of the Printing of Parliament; and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing will act as members of the said Joint Committee on Printing.

THE DUTY ON CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. AMYOT in moving for a statement respecting the amount in detail, by counties, of the revenue produced by the duty on Canadian tobacco; also the detailed amount of the sum it has cost to collect this duty, and the amount derived from the fines imposed for the violation of the law on Canadian tobacco, the whole from 1st January to 31st December, 1881, said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to make an exhaustive speech on the question upon which I wish to throw some light. When the information which I require shall be before the House, it will, I think, be an easy task for me to prove that there is really no protection for Canadian tobacco, or in other words, that the cultivation of that plant does not participate in the advantages generally derived by the Tariff. It is admitted by those who know something about tobacco that there is between Canadian and American tobacco a difference between their intrinsic value of at least 7 cents a pound. Taking this as a standpoint, Mr. Speaker, and admitting that there is a difference in the intrinsic value, and then comparing the differential duty of 14 cents on Canadian tobacco with that of 20 cents on foreign manufactured tobacco, it will at once be found that there is a difference of 1 cent of protection in favor of foreign tobacco. If, in the next place, one calculates in detail the cost of foreign tobacco and of Canadian manufactured tobacco, it will be necessarily shown that this lack of protection represents much more than 1 cent. I have obtained from large manufacturers figures that prove that in order to give growers any kind of protection on Canadian tobacco as compared with American manufactured tobacco, it will be requisite to make a change in the actual duty and reduce from 14 to 6 cents the duty levied on it at present; thus, if one calculates the cost proper of tobacco, the cost of its carriage into town, the amount to be paid to the manufacturer, and if one adds thereto the profit of the manufacturer and of the retailer, one will find that one gets very good American tobacco at 37½ cents a pound. This,

based on the following estimated calculation: the present value of American tobacco reckoned at 6 cents a pound, carriage from the United States and Customs' dues, $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound; packing, 2 cents a pound; manufacturing and manipulating, 2 cents a pound; wholesale manufacturer's profit, 2 cents a pound; retailer's profit, 5 cents a pound, and Government duty, 20 cents a pound. Now, with regard to Canadian tobacco, if one adds together 14 cents Government duty, 2 cents for carriage, 2 cents for manufacturing, cutting and manipulating, 2 cents for packing, $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents for the manufacturer's profit, 5 cents for that of the retailer, one gets $34\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. What remains then as profit for the grower? About 3 cents a pound. Hence it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that there is actually no protection for Canadian tobacco. Now, if I am to believe the reports for 1880, all these duties which are levied on Canadian tobacco by means of stamps, licenses, &c., have brought the Government about \$7,600 for the past year. It is evident that the Government cannot, under such circumstances, derive any profit from the duty on Canadian tobacco, for \$7,600 do not represent an amount sufficient to cover the expenses incurred in collecting this duty. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, as well as I am myself, that it necessitates a whole host of officials to collect this duty, the establishing of offices, the engraving of stamps and other expenses as a natural sequence. Thus it is that the Government does not derive any revenue from this tax, but that it meets on the contrary with a deficit. Who, then, Mr. Speaker, is interested in such a system? Is it the grower? I have just shown, I think, that he does not get any protection, and whilst receiving no protection he finds himself constantly face to face with difficulties; he is, for instance, compelled to shape the tobacco, an operation for which there is no reason, and which causes considerable loss of time to the grower. Ere a pound of tobacco can leave his premises, he must have license, without which he cannot dispose of his tobacco. The law remains a dead letter, for no one takes out a license or submits to all the formalities. According to the present law the grower must roll his tobacco before it leaves his premises; then go to town, to reach which he has sometimes to travel a long distance, in order to procure the stamps; he then has to return, and if he has not a sufficiency of stamps the whole of his tobacco is immediately confiscated. The following case occurred lately:—A grower came to Quebec and purchased stamps for 350 pounds of tobacco; on returning to Lévis he stamped his tobacco, but it had so happened that his tobacco had dried, and that each pound did not represent what it did previously; thus he had a certain number of rolls of tobacco which were not stamped; he declined to sell these; nevertheless a revenue officer impelled by a motive which it might not be opportune to mention in this House, went to the grower's house, seized all his tobacco, as well as his horse and cart, and removed the whole; whilst the grower, who had honestly endeavored to fulfil the obligations of the law, was compelled to pay a considerable sum to recover his horse and cart, besides losing all his tobacco. On other occasions revenue officers and their subordinates, animated with a zeal hard to explain, have of a sudden entered respectable houses, where there might or not be people in bad health, broken open chests and cupboards, made confiscations or threatened to do so, and then left with that air of triumph which has the effect of causing the law to be laughed at, when enforced in such style. The present law is, therefore, not only unjust, but unreasonable, and imposes on growers formalities that have no cause to exist; a remedy is required, and I have no doubt that the Government will find one. I know that it is favorably inclined towards making all classes enjoy the advantages of that protection which has done the country so much good, and which has so powerfully contributed

towards recalling prosperity; and I feel certain that when all this is proved to the Government, it will be the first—if the statement which I ask confirms my statements—to bring to this House a measure that will do justice to the growers,—by granting them the protection that they ask for,—which will remove the obstacles which impede this culture, by which the revenue of the Government will be considerably increased. It will be objected that if Canadian tobacco is grown on so large a scale, that the importation of foreign tobacco will thereby be diminished. Not so, Mr. Speaker, for three-fourths of the population who actually buy foreign tobacco, will continue to smoke it, as they have acquired a taste for it. There was a time when Canadian tobacco was not taxed; just as large a quantity of foreign tobacco was consumed nevertheless, and it will be the same in the future. With regard to the revenue collected by means of a duty on Canadian tobacco, it will increase considerably, and for this reason: the duty of 14 cents levied, actually is so excessive, that no one pays it, and that every one defrauds the revenue. Now, were the duty fixed at 6 cents, or at a reasonable figure, every one would pay it, and the revenue would be considerably increased. Let us encourage and protect this culture and thus both increase the revenue and meet the unanimous wishes of the people. That is my reason, Mr. Speaker, for presenting the foregoing motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member cannot meet with any difficulty, and the statement which he asks for will be brought before the House. I seize the opportunity of congratulating the hon. member upon his maiden speech before this House. I feel convinced that he will be a valuable acquisition to members following and taking part in the debates; and I am certain, from the practical manner with which he has handled his subject, that he will be of assistance to us upon other questions than that of Canadian tobacco. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will excuse me, if I do not agree with him upon his argument concerning the duty on tobacco and the seizures that have occurred. The question will assuredly receive the attention of the Government, if it has not already done so; and if the Government is able to do anything in the matter, I am certain that the hon. member will have the pleasure of hearing the hon. Minister of Finance refer to the subject, when his Budget is brought down.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the House adjourns, I desire to make the customary explanations respecting the changes in the Government. The only change in the *personnel* has been by the elevation of the late Minister of Justice, Mr. McDonald, to the Chief Justiceship of Nova Scotia, and the appointment of Mr. McLelan as a Minister in his place. The Department of Justice becoming vacant by the elevation of Mr. McDonald, Sir Alexander Campbell was transferred from the Post Office Department and appointed in his stead. The Secretary of State, Mr. O'Connor, was transferred to the Post Office Department, and the President of the Council, Mr. Mousseau, was appointed Secretary of State. Mr. McLelan, the new Minister, taking the position of President of the Council.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's explanation partakes rather of the character of a statement. He has stated to us certain facts which the *Official Gazette*, and the other sources of public information, have rendered us familiar with some time since; but he has not given us any information which the House would have been glad to know. I had the good fortune last Session to be able to agree very cordially with the hon. gentleman in one of the transfers he then announced, and it is my misfortune

not to be able to agree with one portion of his present announcement. Last Session he announced that the Post Office Department had been transferred from the present incumbent to Sir Alexander Campbell, and I stated that I believed that change to be in the public interest. The hon. gentleman has re-transferred the former incumbent to the Post Office Department, and I am, of course, unable to say that I think the public interests have been served by that change, because it is the reverse of what I approved of last Session. With respect to the Minister of Justice, we are gradually being shorn of our prerogatives here. Last Session the First Minister announced that he had transferred one of the great revenue departments to the Upper House. The Department of Inland Revenue ceased to be an appanage of the Chamber of the people, and was transferred to the Senate. Up to this Session, at any rate, we have been accustomed to regard the Ministry of Justice as belonging to us. As Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, the gentleman filling that position has important duties to discharge of a quasi-judicial nature with reference to the legislation of this Chamber; and we know that judicial questions will be discussed which will require his presence here, and the people cannot be satisfied with any other result. I regret, therefore, that the disposition has still further been shown to transfer to the other Chamber, Departments which have hitherto been regarded as part of this Chamber. I regret it, moreover, because I do not think it can be said that we were altogether lacking here in gentlemen able to fill that office. The hon. gentleman opposite did, I believe, try his prentice hand at the discharge of those functions, during the absence of the Minister of Justice, and exercised those functions by disallowing the Streams Bill, in which I apprehend he sent himself up Salt River. But there are other gentlemen in this Chamber, who, I think, hold themselves competent to fill the position of Minister of Justice, and the regret that the office has been transferred to the Upper House, is intensified by the regret we feel that it is not filled by one of these gentlemen. With reference to the other change—that by which the President of the Council has been introduced into this Chamber—I am sure we must tender him our felicitations. He is, indeed, a fortunate man, a fortunate politician. I remember, about eleven years ago, when he left this Chamber in order to assume an office of responsibility and emolument, which it was deemed inconsistent with the weaker and frailer nature of the members of this House to fill, but which, when wrapt in senatorial robes, he might well hold without feeling that it interfered with his position or legislative functions. He now comes back to hold a still higher office with greater responsibilities. He returns to us in good company. Fortunate in the association as well as in all the other particulars of his career, he comes, introduced by, in the closest intimacy with, championed by, his friend and provincial chief, the Minister of Railways. Well do I recollect that it was from the fervent eloquence of my friend, the President of the Council, garnished with episodes from Holy Writ, that I learned my first estimate of the political character of the hon. Minister of Railways, and I am bound to say that all subsequent experience upon that score has convinced me with an ever-increasing and deepening conviction of the sagacity of comprehension, the accuracy of view, which my hon. friend the President of the Council had as to the public character of the hon. Minister of Railways when he gave to us all that estimate which still remains on record, and long will remain on record. It is but fitting that, after this length of time, the eulogist and the subject of the panegyric should appear, as they ought to appear, together. It is but fitting that these close and friendly associations, naturally resulting from the warm and zealous efforts of the hon. President of the Council, to place in his true light the hon. Minister of Railways, should be rewarded by his attaining

Mr. BLAKE.

under the auspices of the latter his present position, and we rejoice to know that they are now publicly, as well as privately, associated, no doubt, in the earnest effort, in their responsible positions, to verify by still further proofs, to give still further testimony to the truth of that estimate. I wish them no worse fortune than that they may succeed, than that they may, to adopt the phrase of the hon. gentleman, be loaded down with the share of the offerings that fall to the priest, and that they may be able early and once for all to convince the public that these eulogies are true and are applicable, not merely to their author, but also to their object. My hon. friend, in referring to the Ministerial changes, did not allude to another subject to which we must all refer with regret, but which is of sufficient public interest that I should ask an explanation regarding it. We are led to believe that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is unfortunately seriously ill. I wish to know if it is expected that he will resume his seat this Session, and whether it is intended his office should continue in its present condition for any considerable length of time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true my answer was rather in the form of a statement, because I really did not think it required much explanation. In the first place, the fact of the late Minister of Justice being appointed Chief Justice and withdrawing from the Government necessitated his place being filled, and it was filled accordingly by Sir Alexander Campbell. The hon. gentleman objects very much to the Minister of Justice being in the Upper House. I think if any one ought to be there it ought to be the Minister of Justice. In fact, the office of the Minister of Justice is analogous to that of the Chancellor of England in the House of Lords—where all matters of legislation are revised. The Department of Justice is not a spending department in any great degree, as the salaries of the different Justices are appointed by statute. By the re-appointment of the present Postmaster General, we bring back to this House, for the efficiency of which my hon. friend is so anxious, the office which is a large paying Department. My hon. friend alluded to the fact that the present Secretary of State acted for the Attorney-General in the matter of the Streams Bill. That was simply because the late Minister of Justice did not happen to be in his place at the time he had prepared his report and did not sign it, but he is responsible for it, and readily assumed the responsibility. As to the remarks respecting the hon. President of the Council, I am very glad to see that the hon. gentleman pays so much attention to his opinions, and is so much impressed with his judgment and ability. I can only say he will exhibit the same eloquence, power, efficiency and ability in his present office. With respect to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I regret to state that, since his health broke down very painfully last summer, he has not materially improved. His physical health has increased, but his nervous debility has not been removed. We hope it will; and we think it but fair an opportunity should be given for the recuperative powers of nature to exercise their effect. In the meantime the public service loses nothing, as the President of the Council performs the duties of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; duties which his acquaintance with our marine interests renders him well able to fulfil.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We all agree cordially with the last remarks of the Minister of the Interior. We trust that the rest he is about to obtain may restore the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to his duties. As to the point made by the hon. Minister of the Interior, that the Department of Justice is best administered in the Upper House, it has certainly the merit of novelty on this side of the Atlantic. I am not aware that we are about to make our Minister of

Justice a judge who is to sit in court and decide on matters generally, although I am informed that is being actually done to some extent in the present instance. I think this is a fitting opportunity to call the attention of the House, and notably that of my hon. friend the President of the Council, to certain extraordinary statements which have appeared in the public journals, purporting to be faithful copies or extracts of speeches and declarations made by him on a former occasion in another place. I should judge from the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior that he can hardly be aware of the extraordinary nature of those statements and of what they implied. According to the reports of journals of extremely wide circulation, language of very forcible character has been used by the President of the Council with regard to the hon. Minister of Railways. After a resume of the history of the Pictou Railway, with which most of us are more or less familiar, and after giving an account of the proceedings of the Minister of Railways in reference thereto, he goes on to say :

"But the picture, dark as it is, has something blacker still. I see there, standing in the background, the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia privately handing over to this same engineer a contract for the whole work. I see him shroud it in darkness and bury it for months in the grave of secrecy. And now the Provincial Secretary comes forward and tells us it was so hidden to serve the public interest; to enable Sandford Fleming, after he had taken the contract, to make better terms with the old contractors; to grind a few more dollars out of them. Public interest, indeed! Mr. Sandford Fleming's interests alone. Sir, I know not what term to apply to such conduct in a Government. I know not what to call it—I shall not venture an opinion; but in private life it is called extorting money under false pretences, and our laws make it indictable knavery."

He continued in the following language :—

"They have heard of men riding in public conveyances with a loose mantle about them and a pair of false hands folded in front to lull suspicion, while the real hands were finding their way into their fellow-travellers' pockets, and they now think that when the hon. gentleman put on the mantle of Herbert Huntington and the old Reformers, the hands he put to the plough were not real—that the real hands were hidden, that they might the better get deep to the arm-pits in the public chest, and they wait, they long for the opportunity to sweep him from his position. Therefore, Sir, there was no necessity to bring this case here to excite public opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, if having brought it here for investigation in the discharge of a public duty, what if the people should, on an examination of it, decide that the public interests have been bartered away and betrayed—that the man whom they once believed in as the apostle of retrenchment has become the great high priest of jobbery and corruption? Who then shall restrain limits to the just indignation as they take him, loaded down though he may be with the share of the offerings that fall to the priest, and impale him upon the horns of the altar at which he ministers."

I cordially join with my hon. friend beside me in congratulating ourselves on having restored to our seats a man so eloquent, with such a wealth of imagery, as that possessed by the hon. President of the Council. Those statements have been widely circulated; they are very grave. It is very important, in the interest of the public, that we should know the actual facts. A Minister of the Dominion of Canada ought to be like Cæsar's wife, beyond reproach and suspicion; and I am free to admit that, in my candid judgment, some of the present Ministers are beyond suspicion. Now, if this quotation I have made, and which purports to form part of the Official Report of the Debates of Nova Scotia, be false, then there is no more to be said, except that the newspapers which have published and circulated these things are, in my opinion, worthy of and liable to the most condign punishment. But if these statements be true, that is to say, if the President of the Council did really make assertions implying so much, involving so much, alleging so much against the Minister of Railways, as the statements which I have read, most clearly divers questions of interest would arise. Supposing the President of the Council was correct in describing the Minister of Railways at that time, and in that place, as he did, then I would like to know whether that Minister has since repented and become good, and fit to be the associate of the President of the Council? Or, take the other alternative: supposing that the Presi-

dent of the Council was wrong—that he improperly asserted those things of the hon. the Minister of Railways—then we would like to know, because those charges were publicly made and ought to be as publicly retracted, whether he has likewise repented and become good? It is very interesting to know how the matter stands at present: who is the penitent sinner. One of these hon. gentlemen must be. We know that in old times, in Nova Scotia, public men were sometimes involved in rather curious proceedings. Nova Scotia has produced very able men, but those able men have not been always quite so consistent as people could desire. Not quite, I repeat. I do not say that Nova Scotia is the only Province in which such things have occurred. I have known a notable case of a very prominent politician in Canada, who did, upon a time, denounce another prominent politician as a man steeped to the lips in corruption, and take him to his bosom later, after all. I well recollect that, and I am free to say I do not know that any particular harm resulted therefrom, at least in the direction apprehended. I have publicly stated before, and publicly repeat now, that I do not think that any moral injury accrued to the right hon. gentleman in respect to what he did then. I do not think it would be possible for any amount of corruption in another to do any harm to that hon. gentleman. But I have a special reason for alluding to that matter, which is this: very hard things have been often said of the Minister of Railways by eminent countrymen of his own. This is not the first time we have heard that men of high position in Nova Scotia have uttered and endorsed statements almost identical, though perhaps not so strongly worded, as those I have just read, made by the President of the Council. I think I have heard, and think there are on record in our *Hansard*, passages nearly as explicit, from the speeches of the present Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. Now, those things uttered by men of such reputation and of such high position, necessarily produce an unfavorable effect against the Minister of Railways in the public mind. That hon. gentleman occupies a prominent position in the House, and it is often said that when the right hon. gentleman proceeds to supervise the Canadian Pacific Railway, an event which we hope is a long time off, the hon. the Minister of Railways is the only man fit to fill his shoes and tread in his footsteps. Being a personage of such importance and so distinguished, it is most desirable that the earliest opportunity should be taken to enable the President of the Council, if he is wrong, to show us how he is mistaken; or, if the hon. the Minister of Railways was guilty of all these things attributed to him, to allow him to make a public profession of penitence thereon. I would be most loth to do that hon. Minister any injustice. I may say with perfect truth that my most earnest wish and most fervent desire for him is that he should get justice, and that right speedily. To borrow an expression from a speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior: "That is what I wish for, that is what I hope for, that is what I pray for." But on the present occasion I wish to give the President of the Council an opportunity of answering categorically two or three questions on this important point. I think that it is due to himself, due to the House, due to the position of the Minister of Railways. I desire to know whether these statements, purporting to be speeches of his, extracted from the Official Debates of Nova Scotia, are true and correctly reported, or substantially so, and if so, then I want to know if he still believes that he correctly described the Minister of Railway's conduct at the time and place I have referred to; and whether the President of the Council, if he correctly described him then, is quite satisfied that that hon. Minister has since abjured his evil ways and practices. But if, on the other hand, the President of the Council was mistaken and misinformed, then, Sir, I think it is due to the

hon. gentleman, whom he designated as a great high priest of corruption, and by various other hard names, that the President of the Council should come forward and declare to us that it was all a mistake, that this all happened in the unregenerate days when he violently opposed Confederation, and refused to recognize the hon. Minister of Railways as the incarnation of all that is great and good.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I am sure it must be gratifying to this House, and I am sure it will be gratifying to the people of Canada, to know that the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, especially the hon. gentleman from West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), take such a lively interest in the welfare of the country. They have not much to do, it is true, now with the conduct of its business, but they are able to criticize it as conducted by others. It is satisfactory to know that so much good feeling exists. The hon. member for West Durham is especially anxious that there should be no lack of harmony, no lack of a feeling of true community amongst the members of the Government—that they should all be in accord, and all agreeing well together. He seems to doubt whether that can be so, because he rakes up some old story of a quarter of a century ago, when strong men, fighting hard fights, said hard things, as men always do. But men are especially apt to say sometimes more than they exactly mean, and it is not a very good thing for society generally to bring up those things, because if we were to rake them up we would find that very awkward things might occur. Much later than a quarter of a century ago, even the hon. member for Centre Huron found it necessary to give a very different statement of what he thought to be true. He went to England to borrow money, and he conducted our affairs there in such a shape that he thought his credit was not very good, and he had to present, as he said, the silver side of the shield. When he came back here he presented the other side; but, of course he was only acting the part of a statesman, he was only trying to get money for Canada, he was only cajoling the unfortunate people of Egypt—or England—to some purpose, and it was not out of the way. I might also call that hon. gentleman's attention to something still later, and something that I do not think can be fairly urged against him except as an arm of party warfare. I only cite it as an example. Not long since we have heard his organ, the powerful newspaper we all respect and admire, the *Globe*, pointing at him as a sort of heaven-born financier, a man by whom the financial destinies of the country might safely be conducted, a man who would take care of our affairs. If he turns back to the files of that paper twenty-five years since, he will find himself designated as a mixer and muddler of figures—a man who was utterly unable to carry on any business whatever. Now, which of these things are true? Is the hon. member for Centre Huron a heaven-born financier, or is he a miserable mixer and muddler of figures, unable to carry on a Division Court clerkship? The *Globe* said he was the one thing, and it says he is the other. The people of Canada, carried away by the great influence of that paper, believed the *Globe*; they thought that he was simply a mixer and muddler of figures. Now, I cite things only to show that we should be careful not to attribute to men an evil disposition in the conduct of national affairs, because at one time or another they have been in antagonism, and there is no reason now to attribute to the President of the Council or to the Minister of Railways any ill-feeling at all. To the credit of the Minister of Railways I can say that all the men from his own Province who opposed him long years since are now here working in cordial harmony with him. Such is poor human nature. We have another example here before us. The air is full of rumors that even now there is strife and disunion, and that parties are being

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

rent asunder among hon. gentlemen on the other side. We hear that there is some little trouble, that their little domestic matters are not conducted with perfect satisfaction. Well, all we can do is, entering into this matter with the same peaceful spirit as manifested in the elegant language of the hon. member for West Durham, to hope that they may get these matters healed, that they may be able to frame a policy such as will satisfy themselves, if not the country, and that at least they may be able to agree decently and harmoniously together. It is an advantage to the country. We are so strong on this side of the House, the Government is supported by a party so massively strong in the country, that even if there were little dissensions among us, it would not make any difference. But those gentlemen cannot afford to have any dissensions; there is not enough of them; if they were to divide up they are so few that there would be two on one side and one on the other. The thing becomes unsafe. I submit that perhaps in these matters it is as well that we do not, in this debate, do anything more than deal with the business before us, and not try to rake up issues of five and twenty years ago, for the purpose of showing that one speaker used strong and abusive language towards another.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House, I think, will be a little surprised at the tone which the hon. leader of the Opposition and his former colleague, who sits beside him, have adopted on the present occasion. It is usual, I believe, on occasions of this kind not to exchange exactly the kind of courtesy that these hon. gentlemen have felt it their duty to use on the present occasion; but, Sir, I am not at all surprised that, placed in the very embarrassing position in which those hon. gentlemen are, smarting under the continued defeat which they have met with, they should now go out of their way to rake up the old quarrels of Nova Scotia, so long ago as 1866. I am glad those hon. gentlemen, goaded as they have been by the party lash of the paper that sustains them, have not ventured to assail my position in this House with anything more recent than the events of that period. Since I have occupied the high position of Minister of Railways and Canals, it has been my duty to make contracts involving an expenditure of something like \$130,000,000. The country has been told from year to year that when Parliament met I should be called to account. Those hon. gentlemen have been goaded by the party lash of the *Globe* newspaper to assail me in my position in this House, and yet, down to the present hour, there is not a man among them who has dared, in his place in Parliament, to do so. I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to challenge the integrity of my conduct, and I invoke a comparison of my conduct with that of my predecessor who now sits on that side of the House. When those hon. gentlemen are ready to bring forward anything that interests the Parliament of Canada, and which comes within the purview of this Parliament, they will find me *non nunquam paratus*. I am ready to meet them on every issue, and with evidence to confront any charges they may make, and I challenge the closest scrutiny of my public acts here or elsewhere. It is true, Sir, that in the old party struggles of Nova Scotia, where very intense and strong feelings existed between parties, strong and embittered language was sometimes used between political rivals. But these hon. gentlemen ought not to forget that when I came into public life in 1855, nearly twenty-seven years ago, it is a matter of history, that I stood confronted by the old Liberal party, the old Reform party of that Province, numbering at least a dozen able, prominent and influential leaders in its ranks; and it is my proud boast to-day that, fierce as had been the battles, contests and encounters between myself and them, every man of them who has since died—and many of them are gone—died my personal friend and my warm political supporter. And every man of those

old Liberal leaders of the great Reform party of Nova Scotia who lives to-day is my warm personal friend and my strong political supporter. And more, Sir, in the year 1855, one of the most intelligent and independent counties to be found in the wide domain of Canada—the county where I was born and where I am best known—elected me as its representative, and down to this hour, during nearly twenty-seven years, that county has given me its invariable and unqualified support, while these hon. gentlemen have been dismissed, contemptuously dismissed, from the seats which they held. They have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. They have gone about like Japhet in search of his father, looking for other constituencies to be bribed into electing them, while I have had the distinguished honor of having, in the county where I was born and best known, the unqualified, independent support of the electors for nearly twenty-seven years. These hon. gentlemen talked about the Pictou Railway, and they talked for six weeks about the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, in vain; but no, not in vain, for it had the effect of their being unable even to hold their own supporters together in this House or out of it. The reason they talk of the Pictou Railway is that they suppose they are best able to assail me on matters with which this House may not be very familiar. But they should not forget that on this floor one of their own colleagues, an able man, Mr. Jones, of Halifax, fought that question out to the bitter end with me—discussed it in all its bearings in their presence here—and with what result? With the result that when we went back to Nova Scotia, when the battle was ended, it was found that Mr. Jones was dismissed by his constituency, the large metropolitan constituency of Halifax, while I came back associated with fifteen supporters from Nova Scotia instead of five, which was all I had when the battle began. They should not forget that in the county of Pictou, where there was some feeling in relation to this matter at one time, I went down last summer at the solicitation of my friends there, and led our forces to the attack, and, after I had been confronted by all that could be said or done where the matter was best known, the independent electors of that great constituency of Pictou elected, as their representative in this House, a gentleman who had been unknown before in political life, in opposition to the popular and talented Mr. Carmichael who was long its representative. I give these facts as evidence that these gentlemen have failed in Nova Scotia, utterly and completely, to excite any antagonism to myself, or to prejudice the proud, the triumphant, the distinguished position I occupy as a representative of that Province: and they will be regarded as unworthy the position they occupy if they venture to go back to the events of 1866 in order to attack me. I defy them to challenge my conduct as a public Minister and a public man in relation to the events known in this House and in this country. Now, Sir, I may say, in reference to my friend Mr. McLelan, it was a source of just pride to me to find my old and bitter opponent for many years, Joseph Howe, on my side. It is a source of pride and satisfaction for me to know that having taken a straightforward course from the commencement, old opponents who had opposed me with great zeal on the Reform side in Nova Scotia could sit down in the Cabinet of the country with me when the time came for the public interests to require it. The course pursued by the pseudo-Reformers of Canada, the insincerity they exhibited, drove both Mr. McLelan and Mr. Howe from their ranks, and it is equally a source of great satisfaction to me to know that we have been able to meet on common ground, and discharge those duties imposed upon us in relation to the public interests of the country. Mr. Archibald has been referred to; but long after the circumstances to which allusion is made the hon. gentleman who referred to him knew that he (Mr. Archibald) had himself stated over his own signature, that he had never for a single

moment ventured to impute to me anything dishonorable as a man in any sense of the word. That hon. gentleman knows right well that the very fact of the association of these hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia with myself, gives to the world, in the clearest and most distinct terms, evidence that they believe me worthy of their confidence as well as the confidence of the public. But, Sir, from whom come these charges of inconsistency? Who are the men, who, in this period of the nineteenth century, venture on the floor of this House to talk of inconsistency because public men who have been in strong and bitter party antagonism are found combining together in the public interest? Do these charges come from gentlemen in a position to throw the first stone? Do they forget that the man held up to public execration by themselves and their press, who was denounced from one end of the country to the other, was received by them with open arms and all his offences forgotten the moment he was ready to become their associate? Do not they know that if ever any body of men took liberties with public consistency, they are the men who have done so whenever their interests required it? They are men who, having failed to obtain the confidence of the people of this country, never scrupled to combine with any person, no matter how violently they had traduced or assaulted him. They must take either one horn of the dilemma or the other; either they are ready to associate with any man however black his record, or they convict themselves of having, for personal or party purposes, denounced any gentleman who happened for the time to be opposed to them. But, Sir, I am not surprised that, smarting with defeat as they are, having tried their power in the House and found it *nil*, and having gone outside perambulating the country to the north, to the south, to the east and to the west, they come back, not to deal with the public interests of the country or to do the business before the House, but to vent the bitter spleen from which they suffer in consequence of their defeats. I congratulate the hon. gentleman who has opened this attack to-day on the courage which he shows at this late hour. I am glad that, having in vain, from the hour that the House took recess last year, when the hon. gentleman undertook to challenge the confidence of the country in the Government—having from that hour to this been unable to bring that hon. gentleman to bay, unable to get him to screw his courage up to the sticking point, so as to enable him to meet me in fair and open public discussion on a public platform, to deal with these questions—I say I congratulate him that he has managed to screw up his courage so as, out of the fyles of his party organ, to confront me with an event which occurred in Nova Scotia in 1866. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his great courage; but, Sir, I can tell him that no man so degraded himself in order to gain power as he did in Ontario. I tell him that he must stand convicted before the people of this country—and it is known everywhere that no man ever so degraded himself in order to obtain power as that hon. gentleman degraded himself in buying out one of the Ministers of a Government to which he was opposed. So long as that hon. gentleman lives he will have to meet the words: "Speak now." I say that he would give anything in his possession to wipe out the recollection of those words, which convicted him as a public man of forgetting, not merely what was due from one public man to another, but what was due from one gentleman to another, when he went to one of the members of the Ministry to which he was opposed, and made a corrupt arrangement which was afterwards rewarded by one of the highest judicial positions in this country—an arrangement, I say, for the most corrupt and dishonorable purpose by which one man could obtain the services of another. In conclusion I tell the hon. gentleman that here now, on this question, or any other connected with the public affairs

of this country, either in my own Province, where my conduct as a Minister and as a man has been endorsed as few public men in this House ever had their conduct endorsed, or elsewhere, I am ready to meet him; and I challenge him, whenever he is ready for the issue, to meet me in fair and open discussion, and he will find me prepared for the combat.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I think it will occur to the House, Sir, that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has travelled a little out of the record. He seemed at first to suppose that something unusual had been done in calling attention to the utterances of the distinguished gentleman who has lately been imported into this House as a Minister. Now, Sir, I do not think it is strange, but natural, that we should ask, when we heard that Mr. McLelan had been nominated President of the Council, who he was. I do not think that it is strange that hon. gentlemen with enquiring minds should say first of all, where does he come from? And they found he came from Nova Scotia. They remember that not many years ago he came to this House full of that bitterness which the hon. Minister had boasted that he had since extracted from him. They remember that the hon. gentleman, when he came here, protested, in the name of Nova Scotia, which sent him as one of its representatives, against the cause which the hon. Minister of Railways had pursued and to the view that in bartering and selling the rights of Nova Scotia he was promoting its interests; and it was natural that the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) should enquire, is this Minister the same Mr. McLelan? Then a little later on they saw him change his views. Why, they did not know; you cannot see motives, you cannot impute motives; but they saw him cross the floor not exactly cross the floor of this House, but assume a position which made it possible at the same time that he handed over his convictions to the Minister of Railways to accept an office from the Minister of Railways. Naturally my hon. friend, the member for Centre Huron, asks, is this the same Mr. McLelan who was appointed Commissioner of the Intercolonial Railway in such striking connection with his change of views on the great Nova Scotia question? It is a matter of history. Everybody would like to know who is this new Minister, and what he has done. Well, I do not think it is very strange that enquiry should be made respecting that hon. gentleman who distinguished himself in public life in Nova Scotia by bringing charges against the Minister of Railways, in connection with whom he came into the House, gross and base charges, which the Minister himself will admit, if true, to be widely calculated to destroy public confidence in him. The Minister of Railways boastfully told the House that he is a great man and occupies a high position; he taunted the Opposition on their minority in the House, he spoke indeed of everything except this particular matter. My hon. friends did not attack the hon. Minister of Railways, if the hon. Minister of Railways was an innocent man, they attack the circumstance that his colleague to-day had never purged himself from the accusation which, if an honorable man, and he still believed that accusation true, would have made it impossible for him to join the Administration. Sir, I think we must come back to the original position, notwithstanding the rhetoric and vehemence of the hon. gentleman. We do not want explanations respecting the "speak now" business. The duty of the Opposition is to enquire whether the new Minister is this Mr. McLelan, and whether he retains the same views, or whether he has changed his views. Before he asks the confidence of the House and uses his influence and eloquence, as he doubtless will do, to impress on hon. members his views, they had a right to ask whether he had changed his views as stated by himself, that the present Minister of Railways was a public plunderer and a disgrace to the Province he represented. If the President of the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Council has eaten humble pie and handed in his submission to that hon. gentleman, as the hon. gentleman has boasted here and often, and if he has given up the views which he at one time entertained, we have the right to ask what were the circumstances which led to the change. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that we were not in favor of reform, and it will be a great calamity if we find we have lost their confidence; but is it not enough that we are not up to the standard. What we want to know is this: is the hon. Minister of Railways the man the hon. President of the Council painted him, did he enter into a corrupt bargain, did he commit a great crime; and if not, he commits a great crime in not withdrawing those accusations, since he has found the virtue of the Minister of Railways whom he at one time denounced as a man utterly unworthy of confidence and trust.

Mr. McLELAN. I am somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the attention which hon. gentlemen opposite have bestowed on me this afternoon, as I did not expect so much of their attention, especially upon those old matters which occurred so many years ago in Nova Scotia. During the past summer I had the honor of appearing before the electors of Colchester and of meeting opposition there. I expected that in the heat of the contest everything connected with Nova Scotia and Nova Scotian politics might possibly be introduced; they were introduced, and this very question, this very speech which the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) has quoted here to-day was brought before the electors who understood the whole position of the case, and they passed upon that question and upon all other questions which were then raised, and sent me here as their representative in this House by an overwhelming majority. The hon. leader of the Opposition has told the House that I am a lucky politician. I regret that I cannot return the compliment, for if ever there was an unlucky politician it is surely the hon. gentleman who leads the present Opposition. It is true that he is at the head of a party which is growing small by degrees and beautifully less, if I do not mistake public feeling; but the foundations of every position which he has taken as leader of that party have been swept away, and he has shown himself to be an unlucky leader and politician right through. But, Mr. Speaker, he says I am lucky, because, after twenty-five years of public life in this country, I have been a few months a member of the Cabinet. Let me say this: that after spending a quarter of a century in public life, I entered the Cabinet, not by intrigue on my own part, not by intrigue on the part of any of my personal friends, but I entered it honorably. I was invited to enter it, and the people of my county sustained me. Mr. Speaker, if report be true, there are men occupying the positions of leaders of parties, who did not reach those positions without the intrigue of their friends. The hon. member for Centre Huron has read portions of that speech, and has put to me certain questions. As the hon. Minister of Railways has stated, party lines in Nova Scotia previous to Confederation were drawn very clearly. Party contests were very severe, and public men in that contest did use very extreme language in their references to each other. The question of the Pictou Railway came upon us suddenly in 1866, and it was surrounded by circumstances that excited the fiercest opposition, and aroused all the old party feeling that was so intense in that Province. Reference has been made to the language used by the present Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, but he has declared over his own signature that he did not impute any personal motives of wrong on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways. Whatever I may have said on that occasion I say now, namely, that when that contract was complete, and when the whole history of the railway was made known to the people of Nova Scotia, no

man will pretend to say that, whoever may have benefited, the hon. Minister of Railways never personally benefited by that contract. Therefore, all the insinuations that have been made against him by the hon. gentleman opposite are unworthy of repetition on the floor of this House. The hon. member for Centre Huroh has insinuated that I have changed my position in the parties, and he says that, not only in Nova Scotia, but in other Provinces, there have been changes in the party feelings of public men. I suppose the hon. gentleman is a very good authority on that matter. But the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) has referred more pointedly to me as having changed my party on the floor of this House and in the country. He has spoken of me as having sat on the opposite side of the House and holding certain views, and a short time afterwards coming to support the party who now rule this country. Let me say to the hon. gentleman and to this House, that when I was first elected to this House in 1867, I was not sent to support any particular party. I was elected on a certain pledge I gave to the electors of the county of Colchester. At that time the question of Confederation was before the people of Nova Scotia. The Confederation Act had been passed, and at the very first meeting held in my county, after I was nominated, I said to the people: "The Confederation Act is an accomplished fact, and we have to accept that Act; but I believe the terms of Confederation are unjust to the Province of Nova Scotia, and if I am elected as your representative, I will seek to modify and improve the terms with that Province." I was elected upon that pledge, the only pledge I have ever made upon the hustings, and with the help of others I succeeded in securing a modification of the financial terms of Confederation, and my pledge to the people of Colchester was redeemed. I then supported the party and the men who I believed were working in the best interests of the Province of Nova Scotia and the Dominion at large; and, Sir, I never had occasion to regret that. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that I am a lucky politician; but I do not see any great amount of luck in being called to the Cabinet after twenty-five years of public life. But I was surprised to find the hon. gentleman opposite bringing against me the charge that sixteen years ago I had delivered a certain speech in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and that I had ventured to come on the floor of this Parliament without making the declaration that I was then wrong. I have already stated that when the whole history of the railway was revealed, it showed that no personal benefit accrued to the hon. the Minister of Railways from the construction of that work; and now, believing that the course pursued by the hon. the Minister of Railways is that best suited to serve the interests of Nova Scotia and the Dominion at large, I am proud to give him my support. It is true that men differ in opinion and sentiments, and very often use strong expressions in debate; but it is no discredit to a man, after having used those strong expressions, if he can lay them aside, and join with another in promoting the general interests of the country. I would rather stand in that position of having forgiven even my enemy than in the position of having betrayed my friend.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I am a little surprised at the course of my hon. friends on this side of the House. They seem to be astonished that they should be attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, how can they be surprised at that? I do not want to go back sixteen or twenty years, but I want to call attention to the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last Parliament and during this Parliament. Can my hon. friends here be surprised at such ungenerous treatment, when the hon. the the leader of the Opposition, at the time he supported the hon. member for Lambton, would go out of the House instead of supporting and

standing by him? Need any one be surprised who saw the course the hon. gentleman then pursued, tripping up from day to day my hon. friend from Lambton, making every move to belittle him and oust him from the position he occupied until finally he succeeded. Can my hon. friends be surprised then that the hon. leader of the Opposition should go back for twenty years to rake up something that we know nothing about. I do not believe that this discussion, brought on by the two hon. gentlemen opposite, is likely to be of any great advantage to this country. I do not see what advantage is to be gained by bringing up old dead issues, and declaring that two hon. gentlemen who acted on different sides at one time have since come together. All those who formerly opposed the hon. Minister of Railways in Nova Scotia, have since then given him their support. What better proof could we have of the confidence of the people of that Province in that hon. gentleman, than the fact that every strong man there has rallied to his support. I can understand that this House should feel indignant, because the character of every member, the character of the House, is involved, and that the hon. gentlemen who have been attacked should rise indignantly to repudiate the aspersions cast upon them; but the course pursued is only on a par with that followed by hon. gentlemen opposite in the past.

Mr. ANGLIN. Some remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways renders it necessary that I should take part in this debate, although such was not my intention. Before coming to that matter, let me congratulate the hon. Minister of Railways upon the fact that the introduction of this topic by the leader of the Opposition has contributed in so great a degree to complete the triumph of which he boasts. He triumphed in the fact that he had brought Mr. Howe to his side by some means or other. He boasted of the fact that he had brought the hon. President of the Council by some means or other; but he was not able to boast that he had induced the hon. President of the Council to withdraw, in as public a manner as that in which he had uttered them, a single one of the charges made by him against the hon. Minister of Railways. Nor was it until the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had repeated the demand made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the Hon. President of the Council was forced to say the little he did. For sixteen long years, according to his own account, he has allowed that grave circumstantial charge of corruption of the grossest character to stand unretracted, unapologized for, and unqualified. To-day it remains unretracted, but it is somewhat qualified. The hon. Minister of Railways, perhaps, not expecting that his new found colleague would have been willing to go quite so far in the way of self-humiliation, tried to divert attention from the real nature of the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition by the skilful dodge of carrying the war into Africa, and making charges in return, incriminating the hon. leader of the Opposition. We are all accustomed to that; we found it previously tried by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton), who is always ready to come to the protection of the Government when he finds it in a very difficult position, by either distracting the attention of the House from the real question at issue or forcing the debate to a close. We are accustomed to hear the hon. Minister of Railways, when a charge is made against him, declare that since such charge was first made he had gone back to the people of Nova Scotia, and had been triumphantly sustained by them, and that, because he had been successful at an election, the charge, no matter how strong the evidence or respectable the person who made it, must be considered as thenceforth and for ever disproved. That is not logic or good sense. We know that elections do not always turn on those grave personal charges. We know they are very often determined by influences which blind a

large portion of the electorate to the real question at issue, and to the character of the man they are induced to support. When the hon. gentleman spoke of the election for the county of Pictou, he indulged in his usual course of making his case much stronger than the facts justified. I had the honor of taking some small part in the elections for the county of Pictou. Although the hon. Minister of Railways would like the House to believe that the leader of the Opposition was afraid to meet him on the public platform, I cannot recollect that I had any very serious apprehensions when I had the honor of meeting the hon. gentleman. My impression is that if I had a little more of the fair play he imagined he gave me, I would have made a more favorable impression. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that at that election this question of the Pictou Railway was brought forward as one of the elements of the contest. I had the honor of being present at the public meeting addressed by the hon. gentleman on nomination day, and subsequently at the meeting held in the Town Hall of New Glasgow. At the nomination a slight allusion was made by one gentleman, Mr. Carmichael, to this matter of the Pictou Railway—a slight passing allusion. He spoke only a few minutes, and he was the only speaker who even glanced at that question. That question was not brought into the issue in that election at all. We were there to discuss the great question of the National Policy, and also to ask the meeting to pronounce on the policy of the Government with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. Those were the questions we met to discuss, and to which the hon. Minister of Railways addressed himself. He said a few words in his indignant, or assumed indignant, style, in reply to Mr. Carmichael's remarks on the Canadian Pacific Railway question. But there was no discussion of that question on that occasion; and let me say that when the hon. President of the Council states that the whole history of that Pictou Railway transaction has been made known to the public, he asserts something I have never heard before, and which I am not in a position entirely to accept at his hands. Perhaps he knows all the secret history of that very remarkable transaction, and perhaps I know something of it. I am not sure I do; but I have heard a good deal with regard to that railroad which I believe, and I am almost compelled to believe very much more, though I do not know whether to believe it or not, in regard to what has transpired since that railway was first put under contract. The President of the Council now says that when the history of this railway becomes known, no man in the country can honestly believe that the Minister of Railways made any personal profit out of that transaction. I think the hon. President of the Council failed in his duty, because, having proceeded so far he did not lay before the House the facts that led him, and him alone, to that conclusion. It would be but just to that colleague so much assailed. In fact, the hon. gentleman never did do justice to the hon. Minister of Railways on this subject. If this is his conviction he should have taken the first opportunity to state to the public at large that he had changed his convictions; and also why he had changed them. I am sure the House would now indulge the hon. President of the Council and allow him to make any statement of facts that led to that extraordinary change of conviction. He must have been a sincere believer in that deplorable state of things described when he uttered the remarks quoted by the hon. gentleman opposite to him (Sir Richard J. Cartwright). It would not do to say now-a-days that these were mere political differences—that party lines were very tightly drawn in Nova Scotia in those days—that party excitement ran high, and men said very hard things of each other. That we all understand, and we can quite understand that men may say very hard things of each other which, afterwards, circumstances having changed, and the public interest requiring that they should come together would not render their uniting and

Mr. ANGLIN.

working in harmony without any loss of character or reputation impossible. But when grave circumstances arise, and charges such as are contained in those extracts are made by a public man in the Legislative Assembly of one of our Provinces—when those charges remain uncontradicted up to the present—it is no wonder that hon. gentlemen on this side, as well as the people throughout the country, should be astonished at the extraordinary spectacle now presented, a spectacle so humiliating to the hon. President of the Council—namely, his being introduced to this Chamber and walking arm in arm with a man whom he had denounced as the high priest of corruption. The hon. Minister of Railways would have the House believe—he repeats here what he said elsewhere—that during the last year the Liberal party has been losing ground in this country—or as the President of the Council says, that it has been growing beautifully less by degrees. We rather feel, on this side of the House, that it has been growing larger by degrees. If there has been any gain to any side, it has been to ours. The hon. gentlemen opposite have not, within the three years and a-half which they have held power, ventured to open a single constituency that at any time within the last dozen years has been regarded as absolutely Liberal. They have, however, opened constituencies which, even in the days of the Pacific scandal revelations and excitement, when a storm of popular indignation against the Conservatives swept over the country and hurled them from power, they were able to carry against us. Re-elections in such constituencies they are proud of to-day. What will they say of the election in the county of Carleton, in New Brunswick, where a gentleman almost unknown to a large number of the electors, came forward and boldly, manfully challenged the policy of the Government, and asked to be elected as one who would vote against it as unworthy of the confidence of the people? What will they say of the election in East Northumberland, an old Tory constituency not opened by them, but by the dispensation of Providence, to their terror and disgust —

Mr. PLUMB. Cite a few more.

Mr. ANGLIN. I wish we had a few dozen more constituencies open. We were never in such trim for the fight as at present. We are ready for the fray any day. Public opinion is now fully with us, an enlightened, liberal and indignant public opinion. The hon. Minister of Railways would have us understand that in Pictou the most extraordinary influences were all combined in favor of Mr. Carmichael, the popular and able gentleman who formerly represented that county. What are the facts? All the influences calculated to influence the public unduly were on the other side. The hon. Minister of Railways stumped the county. I was delighted to find when down there that he had been going round the county several days addressing public meetings—that, notwithstanding the severe illness from which he had previously been suffering, he was in full health and spirits, very anxious as to the result, and very much troubled, but as full of fight as usual, and for this I give him credit. In the county appeared the Premier of Nova Scotia himself, a representative of the county, contending on the same side with the Attorney-General of Nova Scotia, who represents the neighboring county, and is a man deservedly popular. Mr. J. Rigby, partner of the late representative, Mr. McDonald, who himself did business in the county a great many years, also held public meetings in many places, and the Minister had swarms of other assistants. And this is a county in which a Government railway runs, and in which a very large number of people expect the Dominion Government will build a branch railway for them if no one else will. All these influences were at work for the Conservatives. In this county there are several coal mines, as well as various other interests, which look for the support of the Dominion Administration. I say all these parties and interests were

enlisted in behalf of the success of the Government candidate. In point of fact, we not only sustained a desperate attack, but we fought gallantly, and came out of the fight under circumstances that gave us good hope of carrying the county at the next election. Let me add, that it is asserted, and I believe with truth, that some one or other used money largely in addition to all the other influences that were used on the Tory side in that canvass. The hon. President of the Council boasts of his majority in Colchester. He seems to think that he should be held excused—indeed, I may say justified—for anything he had ever done, whether it was essentially right and proper or not, because he succeeded, by some means, in obtaining a large majority in the county of Colchester. Report said he was doubtful at first about the result; it said that if the people had gone to the polls on nomination day he would have been defeated by a large majority. Report says that extraordinary means were used, between nomination and election day, to induce that county to declare in favor of the Tory candidate and the Tory Administration. This may be calumnious. I myself believe that if there were any good grounds for such stories as these the matter ought to have been taken into the courts, which should have been invited to pronounce on the conduct of that hon. gentleman or his friends, whoever they were, who were charged with these malpractices. The reports and rumors in that direction were strong, so strong and so generally believed, that the moral effect of the victory throughout the Maritime Provinces is very small indeed. That, in brief, was the way matters stood in the county of Pictou. The hon. Minister of Railways is a host in himself. My impression is that if he had not gone into the county, Mr. Carmichael would have been elected. However, the majority was not a very large one, and it will be found that when an opportunity comes, the people of Pictou will do themselves the honor and credit of reversing their decision upon that occasion. But, Sir, if these matters are to be discussed at all, let me add this much: that instead of meeting charges by mere recrimination, instead of taking the course adopted by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulbee), the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Railways, of fiercely making charges against hon. gentlemen on this side, it would look better before the country for them to meet the charges in that cool and calm manner with which such charges are met by men conscious of innocence. The course taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side all through this debate is, I think, calculated very much to create the impression throughout the country that the charges made some years ago by the hon. President of the Council, against the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, had some foundation in fact, and that they have not, at all events, been thoroughly disproved or satisfactorily explained away.

Mr. BOWELL. The House, and particularly that portion of the members who have had the honor of occupying seats here for a number of years, must have been not a little surprised at the tone of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, who, forsooth, has been selected by his party to hurl charges at members on this side of the House, and to read them a lecture on the necessity of retracting something they may have said, or articles they may have written, against those with whom they may have been in conflict at some former period. Certainly, that gentleman is not the one who should have risen in his place to read a lecture to any man, either in the House or out of it. I have a distinct recollection of the language used in a certain newspaper which he (Mr. Anglin) controlled, against gentlemen who were then opposed to him, whom he denounced as the vilest and most corrupt of men, and yet he was willing to accept from these same gentlemen and their colleagues, the seat that you, Mr. Speaker, now occupy. He has never to this day, either directly or indirectly, retracted one word of what he

then uttered against these gentlemen and the vast majority who sat in the House at the time. Not only that, but he denounced, in the same manner, the hon. gentleman now sitting on his left (Mr. Burpee), as being only fitted for a place in his own Province, where they teach people the trades. That is the language he used towards the hon. gentleman who is now his left hand supporter, yet he did not hesitate to accept the position which, as I will show presently, he used to his own personal benefit and the benefit of the party with which he is connected.

An hon. MEMBER. Feathered his bed.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; the Government gave him not only a feather bed to rest upon, but supplied him with the means to keep himself comfortable in future. Yet the same gentleman rises in the House and reads us a political lecture. Fancy a Speaker, the first Commoner in the land, occupying the most exalted position in the House, accepting it at the hands of those whom he had denounced as being fit only for the penitentiary, and then continue to occupy that seat in direct violation of the Independence of Parliament—in direct violation of every principle that should guide even a private member, sitting there and accepting contracts from day to day, from month to month, from year to year, in order to aggrandise himself. And this is the man who rises to administer a lecture to the members of this House, as if he had been selected by the leader of the Opposition to teach us parliamentary propriety. I think if ever we had a spectacle of cool political audacity we have had it exhibited to-day. The man who was only saved from being turned out of the House by the delay of the report of a Committee, which, if previously presented, would not only have expelled him from the Speaker's chair, but would have disqualified him from sitting in this House a single day, rises here to read us a lecture on propriety. This gentleman called attention to the language used by the hon. member for Colchester in 1856, at a time when they were fighting the great battles of their Province, and has endeavored to hold him up to execration because he then differed from the hon. the Minister of Railways, and now agrees with him upon political questions. Has he forgotten, has this House or the country forgotten, that the very man whom they denounced as being so corrupt that his very acts smelled to heaven, was, nevertheless, taken to their bosom and made a colleague a short time after? Did we ever hear one word of retraction from the hon. gentleman who then administered the affairs of this country? Did we ever hear of an apology by their then colleague, towards them, for his former acts? Nor did we ever have anything to show that they believed he was not as guilty and as corrupt as he was at the time that they denounced him. Not only did they take him to their bosom, not only did they take him to the Council Chamber and consult with him, but they made him the Governor of a great Province. Yet they are now horrified because the hon. member for Colchester differed from the hon. the Minister of Railways some fifteen years ago. It seems to be the policy of gentlemen opposite to hurl charges at the members, individually and collectively, of the Administration. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), says that because the Minister of Railways has not disproved these charges that have been made against him, *ergo* they must be accepted as true. Over and over again have those charges been repeated by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their newspapers since he sat in this House, and as often as the charges have been made, has the hon. gentleman retorted by challenging an investigation into any act of his life, parliamentary or otherwise, and not one of them to-day has dared to formulate a charge against his honor, personal or political. Does it follow, because these charges are constantly made, that they must be true? The logic of the

gentleman is lame and impotent upon this point. No man in the House knows better than he, that it does not follow, because a charge against another, whether it be directly or indirectly, that therefore it is true. He may talk of the "remarkable" circumstances connected with the Pictou Railway; he may say that all the circumstances connected with it were of a "remarkable character," but that proves nothing against the party against whom he hurls the insinuation. The hon. member is equally at fault when he refers to Ontario constituencies. He says that no constituency has been opened that has not been "from time immemorial" a Conservative constituency. It is quite evident that the hon. gentleman knows as little upon this subject as he does of other matters upon which he has addressed the House. East Northumberland was represented in this House—and he, as Speaker at the time, should know it—by a gentleman who has since been called away, for a large portion of the time since Confederation; but previous to that time, by the late Mr. Biggar, and formerly it was represented by Mr. Ross, brother to the Hon. John Ross. It is one of those constituencies which has been vibrating from one side to the other, and its elections have been governed and controlled more by personal likes and dislikes than probably any other consideration. If the hon. gentleman knew anything of the recent election in that riding, he would know that it was the prejudices of the party with which he has allied himself that defeated Mr. Kennedy; his defeat was more on account of his religion than his politics. Yet we find him who prides himself on belonging to and championing that particular party in this country, standing up in this House and glorifying the result of that election. With regard to West Northumberland, does not the hon. gentleman know that for five years since Confederation it was represented by Mr. Kerr, and does not he know that it was represented by a member of the Liberal party before Confederation, and that it is one of those close constituencies which one party or the other has an equal chance of carrying. It was opened on the recent occasion, not with any fear of the result, and the people expressed their confidence in the policy of the Government, that being the only question which was agitated during that contest; still the hon. gentleman tells us that no constituency has been opened which has not been from time immemorial, what he pleases to term a "Tory constituency." Surely he will not venture to say that Carleton, in his own Province, has been a Tory constituency. We all know that the former representatives of Carleton previous to 1878, were members of the Liberal Parliament of New Brunswick, and that it had been in the hands of the Liberal party for a long time. True the late representative was elected as an Independent, but having become, like many others in that Province as well as in Ontario, so thoroughly disgusted with the policy and the whole conduct of his party, and particularly with the Speaker of the late Parliament, that he could not justify his support of them either to his conscience or to his constituents. They have snatched it for a moment. They have gained their point in that respect, and they are welcome to all the comfort they can extract from that fact. Nor has Pictou always been represented by a Conservative. It was represented in this house by Mr. Carmichael, a friend of the late Government. True, it was opened, and a gentleman brought from the Senate to contest it, and that, too, at a time when we dared not open any constituency in the Maritime Provinces; and he carried it by a larger majority. I had supposed that the result of that election was achieved principally on account of the presence of the Minister of Railways in the constituency, who went there to assist his friends and to prove to the people that the policy of the Government was the true policy for Canada—the one which every patriot should advocate in the interest of his country; but I have now learned that the hon. member for Gloucester

Mr. BOWELL.

(Mr. Anglin) was there, and it is no longer a mystery to me that the majority against that hon. gentleman's candidate was between 200 and 300. It was the same in Colchester. They sent the best politician and the cleverest man they had in Nova Scotia to contest that county with my hon. friend the President of the Council—I refer to Mr. Jones. Those who know him and have heard him in this House are aware that he is a man of talent and of great research, and that he referred to all the old disputes that arose in 1874-75-76, during which time the President of the Council was an Anti; yet, after explanations given to the electors by the President of the Council, as to the cause of his taking the position he had taken, after a thorough investigation into the policy of this Government, that gentleman's presence, like the presence of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), in the adjoining constituency, resulted in the election of our candidate by between 400 and 500 majority. I shall not refer particularly to all those questions which have arisen in the present discussion, but I do not think that either the House or the country believes that it lies in the mouth of the leader of the Opposition, or more particularly of the hon. gentleman who sits by his side, to read us lectures upon either constituency or party fidelity. I remember the time when the hon. gentleman was as ardent an admirer of certain gentlemen on this side of the House as any one in the country. I have a distinct recollection, and, perhaps, a little more knowledge than some others, of the reasons which led that hon. gentleman to desert his former leader. I know, also, that when he saw an opportunity of getting place and position by deserting his friends, he did not hesitate to desert them. I know that the present leader of the Opposition was always a restive bird; he could scarcely ever be content, and certainly not content to follow any one; he must always be, to use a familiar expression, "cock of the roost." In the Local Legislature he never was content until he had dispossessed Mr. McKellar, who was the leader of the Reform party. True, Mr. McKellar, like another deposed leader, fell into the traces, and worked under him for a short time. Afterwards he was amply provided for for the remainder of his life, and I certainly am not disposed to find fault with his fortunes. Well, the same course was pursued in this House, and it has been well exposed by the Minister of Railways. Appointment to office, and the giving to a certain person a constituency after he had betrayed his leader, were acts which history will declare to have been the blackest in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blake) political history. He did very little better when he came to this House. On various occasions when his conscience would not permit his vote to sustain his leader, he found it convenient, with three or four other members, to exhibit his coat tails, one hon. member passing out of this door, another at that, and two others at a third door. The hon. gentleman has explained to the outside world, at Cobourg I think, that when he found his conscience would not permit him to record a vote in favor of his party and to sustain his leader, he thought it his duty to leave the House. That was a frequent occurrence during the last five or ten years. I have seen him doing it when a Minister on questions affecting myself. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. When the Government, of which he was a member, were attacked for giving a contract to "his friend Moore," he said that as he was personally concerned in the matter he could not record his vote on it, and he walked out of the Chamber. No doubt his conscientious judgment would not allow him by any possibility to record a vote respecting a matter on which he himself had been attacked, however untrue the charge might be. Well, Sir, he followed in this line. The Minister who then led the Government was not, I think, of his liking; and if outside report speaks truly—of course, I speak under correction—he kept that hon. gentleman in a

constant state of turmoil. There was scarcely a day when he was not throwing difficulties and obstacles in his way. He was in the Cabinet, and out of the Cabinet; but one thing is certain, he was always the power behind the Throne, and he was not content until he attained the position he now held as leader of the Opposition. The country will join me in the wish that he may long occupy that position. Mr. Speaker this debate has been sprung upon the House, I think, altogether unnecessarily. However, I can safely throw out this challenge: that whenever the time arrives for a comparison to be made either as to the administrative ability of the Ministers whom the Opposition have attacked, or as to their personal integrity, we will be quite prepared, individually and collectively, to meet any charge those hon. gentlemen may think proper to make; and I would advise them, when they have charges to make, to make them boldly on the floor of the House. Let charges be properly made and investigated, and we have no fear of the result. Let them act towards the hon. Minister of Railways precisely as I did to the late Speaker. When I had a charge to make I made it boldly, I placed it upon the Journals of the House, it was referred to a Committee, and the result is well known. Let hon. gentlemen opposite adopt the same course, and until they are prepared to do that, it will be more in accordance with parliamentary proprieties for, them at least, to hold their tongues upon questions affecting the personal honor and integrity of others. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) has particular delight in stirring up this kind of debate. The hon. gentleman did me the honor on one occasion to visit my constituency; he made an elaborate speech with the mercury 8° or 10° below zero, and it so completely froze the hearts of the people and so convinced them he was wrong, that I secured a large majority in the only Radical township then in my riding, a majority which is increasing every year; and if he with his friend from Gloucester, and Mr. Jones, of Halifax, would visit the riding at the next election, probably the majority would be a great deal larger than it has ever been in the past. In the meantime, I again advise hon. gentlemen opposite, if they have any charges to make, to make them in the proper manner, and we shall be quite prepared on any occasion to meet them. We only desire that when they fulminate charges they should be placed before the House in a manner so that they can be reached.

Mr. BLAKE. In view of the language used, and the compliments paid to me in the several speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps the House will indulge me a few words on questions personal to myself which have been raised. I do not presume to engage in the general debate, and reply to other statements and arguments which have been urged and which must be replied to, if they be replied to, by other speakers. The statement which I made I must confess did not appear to me to warrant such an exhibition of feeling as has animated hon. gentlemen opposite. The reference to the recorded views of one colleague as to another colleague, is a reference which has always appeared to me perfectly justifiable, perfectly reasonable and perfectly proper, as furnishing fit occasion for explanation or correction. That was all that was done. If there was an accusation it was not our accusation—it was the accusation of his colleague, the President of the Council. The gist and weight, perhaps the gravity, of that accusation was in the quarter from which it came; he was wounded in the side by his personal friend, and it was thought fit to call the attention of the House to those statements coming from that quarter, with a view to obtaining an explanation. I make these observations, because I think I am entitled to make them from the personal aspect which this debate, as relating to myself, has subsequently assumed. I have to say this: that were I as black as

I have been painted, it would not make the hon. Minister of Railways any whiter; it has nothing to do with the question raised by these quotations. That hon. gentleman stated, with respect to myself and my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), that we, having been defeated, looked, as Japhet in search of his father, for some constituencies which might be bribed to elect us. That statement, so far as I am concerned—I was not in the county at the time, but I believe I can speak for my hon. friend—is absolutely without foundation in fact. It is well known that prior to the General Election of 1878 I had the honor of receiving nominations in the county of South Bruce and in the county of West Durham; that, owing to ill-health, I declined both those nominations, and intended to retire altogether from public life. I was ordered to desist from any active exertion whatever. At a subsequent period my friends in the county of West Durham were very anxious that I should allow myself to be nominated, and it was represented to me that I would be elected, although I was obliged, as I was ordered to do, to leave the country. I thought of accepting that nomination. Communicating it to some of my friends in the South Riding of Bruce, they said it would be discouraging to the party there if I declined their nomination and accepted another. Upon that I finally and irrevocably declined the nomination for the West Riding of Durham, and presumed myself entirely out of the contest. At a subsequent period, many gentlemen of weight and influence in the South Riding of Bruce called upon me, and requested me so earnestly to allow my name to be used, although I could give them no assistance, that I yielded to their request so far, although I was obliged, according to my announcement, to leave; and I was defeated in South Bruce under circumstances and by means that I need not now allude to. I declined to receive a constituency. I did not open the West Riding of Durham; on the contrary, had I been consulted when the West Riding of Durham was opened, I would have declared to my friends that I would not accept the vacancy; but the vacancy having been made without my knowledge, and my being asked to accept it, I felt myself bound to accept it, which I did, and I was elected by acclamation. These are the circumstances on which the hon. gentleman based his accusation that being rejected by South Bruce, I went about seeking a constituency that I might bribe to elect me. The second statement he made was one which I was not surprised at. He declared that I was afraid of him. I have been sitting opposite the hon. gentleman in this House during fourteen years. During the larger part of that time he has had the sympathy of a majority of this audience. I do not know any audience equally critical in this country. I do not know any audience which one might be more afraid to face, in view of meeting superior powers. I am not going to contrast our powers. I will only state that I have not felt that impulse of fear which the hon. gentleman attributes to me; that whenever I have found it necessary, I have dealt with the hon. gentleman's policy and measures as I thought truth and the interests of the public demanded, and I intend to continue to do so until the end. The hon. gentleman shall not move me either by threats, accusations of fear, or in any other way, into feelings of indignation. Many long years have elapsed since the hon. gentleman lost the power of awakening in me the feelings either of surprise or of indignation. The hon. gentleman says that I was guilty of a corrupt bargain in connection with a change of administration that took place in a Local Legislature. We have heard a good deal to-day of the impropriety of dragging before this House occurrences that took place in Local Legislatures; it was a shocking thing, an unparliamentary and undignified thing, and a waste of time to discuss what happened in Nova Scotia. But I have found, from year to year and from Session to Session, no more appetizing morsel rolled under the tongues of those hon. gentlemen than what

occurred or what did not occur in the Legislature of Ontario. Well, Sir, time and again have these circumstances been discussed and the facts been stated, but time and again have they been repeated. The President of the Council has appealed to one election, when he says he was elected notwithstanding the accusations he made against the Minister of Railways. Well, I am not sure that it was not a point in his favor that he made them. However, the hon. gentleman appeals to that election as a proof that he did right—I do not know whether in making or in retracting the accusations. If I wished to use a similar argument, I might refer to half-a-dozen elections in which, whether as a member of a Government or a party, I have been successful; but I do not choose to appeal to them. I will simply say, as I did on a former occasion, when the hon. Minister of Railways made a similar accusation, that the statement he makes is utterly without foundation in fact; and I will add, as I did then, that if there be, if you can inform me of any more strong and cogent form of denial consistent with parliamentary usage, I wish to be understood as having used that form. As there are here, however, some hon. gentlemen who were not present the last time this subject was discussed, and who may not be aware of the circumstances under which the letter, or rather the note, the hon. gentleman has referred to was written, I will state briefly—though not at all with the hope that that slander will cease to be circulated because of my statement—how far, by a perversion of the facts and the dates, the hon. gentleman deceives himself by his reference to that note. The facts are briefly these: On a certain day—I cannot at this moment recollect the precise day of the week—the Treasurer of the Local Administration of Ontario had declared in the Local Legislature his resignation of his office. He had declared that he had resigned because he was convinced by repeated votes which had been given in the House, that the Government had lost the confidence of the country, and that it was not consistent with the principles of constitutional Government that they should longer protract the struggle, or attempt to retain office. The Government, however, did protract the struggle, and the debate continued. It was either on the following day or the day after, shortly after the House opened after dinner, that the Treasurer came to me—who was at that time the *de facto* leader of the House, having control of its deliberations by having a majority at my back—and said to me: “Mr. Blake, I have been attacked for my action in announcing my resignation, and I intend to speak before this debate closes. Do you think it will close to-night? If you do not, I would rather not speak until to-morrow.” I said to Mr. Wood: “My opinion is that the debate will not close to-night.” At a later period—an hour or two later—I perceived signs of the debate collapsing; and having made that statement to Mr. Wood, and he sitting in his seat, relying apparently on his belief that the debate would hold over till the next day, I scribbled on a sheet of paper the words: “You had better speak now,” and sent it across the floor of the House to Mr. Wood, who, having read these words, tore up the paper and cast it aside. Some adherent of hon. gentlemen opposite—and it has always been credited to a prominent adherent—picked it up and used it.

An hon. MEMBER. Out of a spittoon.

MR. BLAKE. Yes, I believe it was out of a spittoon. That is the state of the case. It is clear and simple, and effectually disposes of the accusation the hon. gentleman has made against me; and yet I have no doubt that it will continue to be repeated, with the false statements as to the dates and times, and the notion that I had arranged with Mr. Wood to make his resignation speech, when his resignation speech had been made either one or two days before that paper was written at all, and when it

MR. BLAKE.

was written under the circumstances to which I have referred. The hon. President of the Council has said that he has won his seat, and that having won his seat he is assoziated from all charges. I know of none that have been made against him except that he knows his colleague. But certainly those who, like me, have had cast so wantonly at them the aspersion that they were looking about for constituencies which they might bribe to elect them, may fairly, on this occasion, retort on the hon. gentlemen the enquiry what the Gloucester election cost. The hon. Minister of Agriculture also intervened, and declared that my conduct had been such as to cast discredit on myself and party. He and the hon. Minister of Customs alike made great complaint of my having, in some two or three cases, I forget the exact number, not voted, and in some two or three other cases voted with hon. gentlemen opposite. I suppose that in the different circumstances in which these abstentions or irregular votes took place, when I voted with the hon. gentlemen or did not vote against them they thought they were right in the propositions they advanced and which they then supported. If it was my misfortune either to disagree with them or to doubt, surely it is not a thing for either grave or serious commentary. Surely I could not be so very wrong in their view when I was so close to them. But I will say now what I have said, on former occasions, when I had the honor of occupying the position of leader of the party, long ago to my followers, what I have repeated to my followers since, that I have never asked or never will ask from any man who does me the honor to follow me, any closer or stricter allegiance than I am willing myself to give to another man. I am not willing, in any case whatever, to ask a follower to vote contrary to the conviction of his duty, and am not willing myself, on any occasion, to vote contrary to my convictions of my duty. The hon. Minister of Agriculture used various harsh words about me. He said I endeavored to trip up my hon. friend from Lambton, to belittle him, to undermine him, to intrigue against him—that I did dirty things. The hon. Minister of Customs said I was not content until I had obtained the position which I now occupy. I meet those statements with the same absolute and unqualified denial. I absolve any person, whoever he may be, or whatever station he may occupy, from any supposed or implied obligation of confidence or silence. I call upon any person, who can establish any such imputation, to come forward and say what he knows. Those who surround me here know that I did not crave or desire, that I do not to-day covet, the position which I am occupying. They know that I did not intrigue for it; that it has never been the object of my aspirations at all; and that if I now fill it, it is because they desire I should continue to do so. I am at their service willingly as one of themselves; but I have always said to them, as I say to you in this House, that I am very unwillingly, indeed, at their service in the place I now hold. The hon. Minister of Customs is not content with referring to the circumstances which have attended my occupying this place, but said that I undermined the position of my hon. friend Mr. McKellar also. Why I was responsible for his having held that position, having myself proposed the appointment of Mr. McKellar as leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature. I procured his appointment from my friends, and when the change was made it was Mr. McKellar himself who called his friends together in my absence, without my knowledge, and asked of them that substitution which he afterwards communicated to me and requested me as a favor to accept, and we have always been on the most cordial, intimate and friendly terms ever since. What I did, I did not merely with his consent, but at his request and instance. I have answered, as far as I could gather them, the personal charges made against me. I trust I have not intermingled with those answers much acrimony or acerbity. In truth, I have been injured to those charges. They have been so often repeated that the pain

which, I confess, I used to feel when they were formerly hurled at me, unjust as they were, has become somewhat dulled by the repetition of the operation. But as we are here in what is a new Parliament for many, and as for some years those charges have not been made here, I hope the House will not think it out of place that I should have so far trespassed on its indulgence, and I did so because I considered it due to myself and to the respectability of the Chamber of which I have the honor to be a member.

Mr. McCALLUM. I happened to have sat in the House at the time the occurrence of which the hon. member for West Durham has entered into so elaborate an explanation, took place, and last Session I referred to the course he took. The hon. member now admits that he did send the letter across the House, whereas, last year, he repudiated the charge as an exploded slander. I have no desire to slander anybody. I never did so. But I say that there are any number of hon. members in this House, to-day, who will corroborate my statement, when I say that the first intimation we had of Mr. Wood being made to resign his seat, was when the letter "speak now" was sent to him. If there was any arrangement with Mr. Wood through his being dissatisfied with his position in the Government, it must have been at a private interview between him and the hon. member for West Durham. That hon. gentleman tried, on a former occasion, to get clear by saying: "Was I not tried by a Committee?" Yes, he appointed his own judges, framed the charges against himself, and drew up his own resolutions. He wanted to deny this afterwards; and he now puts on an air of injured innocence when he is twitted about his coat tails vanishing through the corridors. I have seen him disappear myself. The House never knew in what position he actually stood. It was a case of now you see it, now you don't.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken are such as I could not allow to pass unchallenged, having been at the time closely associated with the hon. member for West Durham. It was perfectly well known to every one in Toronto at the time, from Mr. Wood's statements, and from the records of the meetings of the Committee appointed to investigate the charges made by the Hon. M. C. Cameron, that he declined to follow up those charges in the Committee unless he obtained his own manner of doing it. The communication of the circumstances made by the hon. member for West Durham are absolutely and indisputably correct. Now, a word with regard to the subject before the House. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. President of the Council announce that he came here in 1867, not to oppose the Minister of Railways, but to endeavor to get better Confederation terms for his Province. I had the honor, if it be an honor, of having been frequently consulted by the hon. gentleman during the first year of his membership in this place, and I formed a very erroneous opinion indeed, from the advice asked of me and the counsels that I was obliged to give him, if he came here with any such humane and proper intention. His intention, so far as I could gather it from his conduct here, and that of other members from the same Province, was that of intense, bitter hostility to the member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper), and to the policy which he successfully carried out in the scheme of Confederation. I never felt any hesitation in saying publicly, in the House and elsewhere, that at that time I had the strongest sympathy with the majority of the people in Nova Scotia, under the circumstances in which they were dragged into Confederation; and it is the weak spot in the conduct of those who effected that change that the vote had been carried in the Nova Scotia House, with the sanction and by means of the proceedings of the hon. member for Cumberland. But I found, after a very short time, that there was a limit to the public virtue of the President of the Council. I found he was amenable to reason, as the saying

is; that contemporaneous with his change in favor of Confederation, and getting Nova Scotia to accept it, was his appointment to a most lucrative office. I found he had not that strong sense of public propriety which should compel any member of this House to decline an appointment and refuse to go to the other House, when he could no longer sit in the House of Commons, which members acting properly have always done. The Minister of Railways declared to-night, with great pride, that he had successively humbled all the leaders of the Reform party in Nova Scotia; from being his strong and successful opponents, he had made them ultimately his followers and even his warm personal friends. Well, I assert that the friendship he acquired when he induced the late Mr. Howe, who was sent to England on a mission by the Nova Scotia Liberal or Anti-Confederate party, whither he was followed by the Minister of Railways—I imagine if it be true that he made proposals which induced Mr. Howe to desert his friends in Nova Scotia, to become an associate with the hon. gentlemen opposite, and ultimately reach the Lieutenant-Governorship by that means; if that be an exhibition of the friendship thus won by the Minister of Railways, long may I be spared friendships obtained and exhibited in such a manner. And so with the others: the friendship of the President of the Council was purchased by his appointment to an office in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Instead of the hon. gentleman boasting that he had acquired and secured the friendship of his opponents, he ought to have stated frankly, what, I am sure, he is quite prepared to do with his usual boldness, that he succeeded in the course of a few years in debauching the whole of the public men of his native Province. But the hon. gentleman did not succeed, when winning over the enemy, in holding all his own friends. If I recollect aright, Mr. A. Jones was one of his followers, and as he succeeded from time to time in gaining over some of his Liberal opponents by the means I have mentioned, he at the same time sometimes lost the support of his own friends. The hon. gentleman boasts of having succeeded in carrying a majority for Nova Scotia in the present House. We all remember the time when, as regards that Province, he stood here alone, one member against eighteen. Does he mention that or boast of it? Does he boast of obtaining fairly his last victory at the polls, which I hope he has so obtained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him? He knows that having come here, as he says, one member against eighteen, I went back to the General Election of 1872, and returned to Ottawa with a very large majority. But it was not the first time, and the majority lost in 1874 was regained in 1878.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I believe the hon. gentleman is right; he had a small majority in 1872.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A large majority of the members elected in 1872; all except one man, were sent here to support the Government of which I was a member.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was not the opinion of the electors. Those members the hon. gentleman claims may have supported him, for his bewitching manner and skill in winning such aid makes it difficult to know where such help comes from sometimes, though I admit he gained great success in his native Province at the last elections. But at the same time he cannot object to our calling up those reminiscences of the past when he boasts of having taken such associates into his bosom. All know the humiliating spectacle presented by the late Mr. Howe, who had declared at one time that sooner than touch the hand of the hon. gentleman—one of the most prominent men of Nova Scotia at the time—he would cheerfully grasp the hand of a dead Fenian; and yet the hon. gentleman was so cruel as to ask Mr. Howe to introduce that party to

this House. The whole circumstance was recalled to my mind the other day when I found the President of the Council also introduced by the Minister of Railways after the humiliation to which he had subjected him at a former time. I have no desire to say more, or to detain the House from other topics, but I will take occasion to refer to this subject hereafter. I have now simply to say this: in a parliamentary sense and as a Member of Parliament, that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman opposite (the President of the Council) should rise to his feet to support his present colleague, if he entertains the same opinion of his public conduct in a particular transaction, which it is shown by his speech he entertained some years ago. It would be a humiliating thing if such a question was not by the public asked and answered. It would be a reflection upon the public morality of the country, and it became a necessity with the leader of the Opposition to refer to that matter to-day. The President of the Council has said he has left that matter aside. He does not say that he retracts what he said some years ago, but that he puts the subject aside to forget it as the circumstances demands. If that be all he has to say in justification of himself for his attack upon his present colleague, then he is not justified in sitting where he sits now, nor was the hon. gentleman so attacked, nor are hon. gentlemen opposite justified in allowing him to occupy that position.

Mr. RYKERT. I simply desire to correct a statement of the member for Lambton. I happened to be a supporter of the Government of the late Sandfield Macdonald in the Parliament of Ontario, and to be sitting beside the present Chief Justice Wood, of Manitoba, when he made his celebrated speech, and I unhesitatingly assert that the member for West Durham has stated what is entirely contrary to the facts in asserting what we have heard about the speech made at a late hour of the night.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. RYKERT. The House was satisfied that the debate was to be prolonged.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman was afraid.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. RYKERT. Thinking that the debate was about to be adjourned he thought it important to send that missive across the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. RYKERT. I am certain, for I was a member of that House and sat alongside of Mr. Wood, then Treasurer of the Province, and the first information that I had, and the hon. members of the House had, was his having spoken immediately after he received that missive.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. RYKERT. And he never upon the floor of Parliament declared his opinion that they were acting unconstitutionally in holding their seats in Parliament. I unhesitatingly assert, as a strong supporter of that Government, that the first information we had of the disagreement in the Government was when he spoke after receiving that missive, and he never spoke but once on that occasion. The hon. gentleman knows right well that he spoke immediately after his sending the missive across the House, and the whole of his colleagues were astonished at his sitting in the Treasury Benches and making that speech. We all felt, as supporters of the Government, that if he desired to turn tail upon his colleagues he ought to have taken his seat on the other side of the House and then spoken. The facts were that from the intimate acquaintance of the hon. member for West Durham with the late Treasurer of the Province, and from the fact that he came with him a few days before in a stage coach, we all suspected that there was something wrong, and we

Mr. MACKENZIE.

were not at all surprised when we heard the hon. Treasurer stand in his place, and say that he thought the time had now arrived when they ought to resign their seats in Parliament because they did not enjoy the confidence of the House. No person gave the Government a stronger support than myself, and no person was more astonished than I was when the Treasurer arose and declared that he felt the time had now arrived when the Government should yield their places in the House, and the first information that we had was when this missive was sent across the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not impute any designed misinterpretation of facts to the hon. gentleman, but he is entirely in error. I did not say that Mr. Wood had spoken twice, because he did not speak twice. I said that one or two days after his resignation and after the final vote upon which the Ministry resigned, Mr. Wood came to me and asked me, "was the debate about to close?" I repeat—and it is impossible that I can be mistaken about it, because it was I who sent that note and not the hon. gentleman—I repeat it was either one or two days after, the very last day of that crisis, that Mr. Wood asked me how long the debate would last, and I gave him an answer; and seeing that my expectations were not verified, I sent a message to warn him that it was the last opportunity that he would have of making the statement he intended to make. Mr. Wood did not speak again, but he came to me afterwards and said: "I was obliged to you for sending me that word, but I had had a conversation with Mr. Sandfield Macdonald and he asked me not to speak again, and I agreed." "All right," I said, "all that I wished to do was to keep myself straight with you, because you had asked me when the debate would close." I had told him I thought it would not close that night.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said distinctly that the Hon. Mr. Wood had previously spoken.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, and I say so now.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman stated that the decision of the Treasurer was perfectly well known, that it was publicly known.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. And in pursuance of that he sent that message, and there is the gravamen of the whole charge.

WELLAND CANAL TENDERS.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish to ask my hon. friend, the hon. the Minister of Railways, if he will send down a copy of the advertisement asking for tenders on the Welland Canal, and copies of the tenders received. We have here a contract, and we are asked to sanction this contract without knowing any of the surrounding circumstances, and we cannot possibly give any deliberate judgment on that until we have obtained the other documents. If there are no Orders in Council concerning this contract, there must be an advertisement for tenders, and we must have copies of the tenders sent in. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman if he will bring these down without my making a motion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to make a motion. I am quite prepared to lay all the papers connected with the tenders on the Table of the House. The hon. gentleman is quite aware there were no advertisements; he is perfectly well aware of that, and that that is the reason this contract is made subject to the disallowance of Parliament. He knows we cannot bring down an advertisement that does not exist; but if he will put a motion on the paper for these papers—it might give me an opportunity of explaining the circumstances, I think, entirely to the satisfaction of the hon. member. At all events, every paper connected with the ten-

der will be brought down and the fullest information given to the House, and the House will be in a position to judge whether the contract should be ratified.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says I knew there was no advertisement; I did not know it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why did the hon. gentleman suppose this contract was made subject to the approval of the House if there was an advertisement?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I could not tell that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If there was an advertisement he is perfectly well aware it did not require to be made subject to the approval of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am quite aware of that, nor is there any law now requiring it to be subject to the approval of the House, even without an advertisement. The Privy Council has power to give a contract, but it is not in accordance with the Public Works Act. Although there was no advertisement I was not aware of the fact. I heard the rumor when I came into the House, but in order that I might verify my information I determined to make this request of the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite willing to lay every paper connected with the matter upon the Table without a motion, but if the hon. gentleman will make his motion it will give me an opportunity of explaining to the House all the circumstances.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Very well. I now give notice that to-morrow I will make the motion.

The House adjourned at 6.15 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 15th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 3) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Marine Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act incorporating the Sun Mutual Insurance Company of Montreal.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 7) for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK, in introducing Bill (No. 5) respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets, said: The object of this Bill is to enable railway companies to appoint agents in different towns or places where they have any agencies for the sale of railway passenger tickets, and authorizes the hon. the Minister of Railways to do the same thing. It also provides that no person, except those so authorized, shall sell railway passenger tickets. It provides, further, the penalties which shall be imposed on any person who shall sell those tickets without authority; also, that the railway companies shall be bound to redeem all the tickets issued by them which are unused in whole or part; that is to say, that if any person in a railway company issues a ticket, and the person who buys it only travels on it a part of the journey, the

company shall be bound to redeem it for the unused portion. I am satisfied that on the second reading of the Bill I shall be enabled to give the House reasons sufficient to induce them to pass it into law.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not die before he gets the Bill passed.

Bill read the first time.

STADACONA INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. CASGRAIN introduced a Bill (No. 6) to amend and extend the Act to empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.

Mr. VALLÉE. Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member give the House some explanation with regard to this bill?

Mr. CASGRAIN. The object of the bill is to wind up the affairs of this Company as soon as possible, which unfortunately cannot be done owing to certain claims pending in the courts, and especially owing to certain other claims which are not before the courts, which claims the Company is desirous of settling within a specified time, so as to be able to wind up its business and declare a final dividend.

Bill read the first time.

DUTIES COLLECTED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DeCOSMOS enquired, 1. What is the total amount of Customs, Excise and Stamps respectively, collected in British Columbia during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881? 2. What is the total amount of revenue collected from other sources, during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881? 3. What is the total amount of revenue collected from all sources in British Columbia during the last fiscal year?

Mr. BOWELL. The total collections on account of import duties in British Columbia for the past year, 1880-81, reached \$599,477.72. From other sources: entrance and clearance fees, \$320; bonded warehouse fees, \$400; examining fees, \$60.90; petroleum inspection, \$848; mariner's fund revenue, \$2,249.75; steamboat inspection revenue, \$606.49; seizure's revenue, \$620; copyright revenue, \$2.49; total, \$604,535.35. The following figures show the amount of Excise and Stamps, respectively, collected in British Columbia during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881: from Excise, \$46,355.78; Bill Stamps, \$1,187.50; total, \$47,543.28. The total amount of revenue collected from other sources, during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881, by the Department of Inland Revenue: inspection of weights and measures \$59.35; rent of camp reserve with buildings and wharf, New Westminster, \$395; total, \$454.35. Receipts from British Columbia, other than Customs and Excise: Post Office Department, \$15,464.85; telegraphs, \$8,931.24; steamboat inspection, \$606.49; casual, \$1,434.81; fines and forfeitures, \$51; miscellaneous, \$150.45; total, \$26,639.84.

POPULATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA BY LAST CENSUS.

Mr. DeCOSMOS enquired, 1. What is the approximate population of British Columbia, as determined by the Census of 1881? 2. What is the approximate number of the population, as far as ascertained, in each Commons electoral district. 3. What is the approximate number of Whites, Chinese and Indians respectively, distinguishing the number of adult males and females under each head.

Mr. POPE (Compton). The statement I will give is not an approximate but the real number. The total population by the last Census was 49,459. In New Westminster, 15,417; Cariboo, 7,550; Yale, 9,200; Victoria, 7,301; Vancouver,

9,991. Chinese, 4,350; Indians, 25,701; others, 19,408. Males, 29,503; females, 19,956. The relative numbers of adults cannot be now given, as the compilation of ages is not yet complete; but is unusually large.

RAILWAY FERRY AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government have, according to the promise made on the 14th March, 1881, invited tenders for a railway ferry between the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in South Quebec, and a point nearest the Occidental Railway on the Quebec side, so that the carriages may be transported from one side of the river to the other?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to say that correspondence is now going on between this Government and the Government of the Province of Quebec with a view to establishing a ferry for the transfer of railway carriages from one side of the river to the other, at Point Lévis, and that so soon as that correspondence is in a position to be laid before the House, Parliament will be asked to make an appropriation for that purpose.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. LANTIER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed, during next season, to the improvement of the River St. Lawrence from Prescott to the Lachine Canal, on the basis of the Welland and Lachine Canals; and in connection with that, whether the reports of explorations on the projected Cedars Canal have been examined by the Engineer-in-Chief, and a decision arrived at; and if not, for what reasons?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg leave to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that it is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to provide for the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canals during the present year; and that as there is no immediate urgency, and the Chief Engineer has been greatly pressed with other duties, he has not been able finally to report on the question as to the route the canal will take at that particular point.

THE MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. HOUDE enquired, Whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the recent complaints in a portion of the Montreal Press, regarding the manner in which the work was carried on in the Montreal Post Office by certain employes accused of negligence or incompetence? Whether it is the intention of the Government to enquire whether there is any foundation for these accusations?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The attention of the Government was called a short time ago to those irregularities and complaints, and to some other complaints besides, respecting the internal management of the Post Office at Montreal. A Commission was appointed to enquire into the grounds of those complaints, and also into the general management of the Post Office; and they are now at work, and have been since Monday last.

POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. TROW enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government during this Session to abolish the postage on newspapers in the counties of publication?

Sir L. TILLEY. The Government have that subject under consideration.

SETTLERS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, When the report of the Minister of the Interior will be brought down? When the available information as to the result of the Census will be brought

Mr. POPE (Compton).

down? What was the total number of persons settled in Manitoba and the North-West during 1881? How many from the other Provinces of Canada? How many from the United States? And how many from other countries?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. Minister of the Interior desired me to say, in his absence, if this question was asked, that his report would be brought down very shortly.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I think the information respecting the Census will be available to-morrow. With respect to the number of persons settled in Manitoba and the North-West, I cannot say positively that every person included in the figures I am about to give, is actually settled there, but the total number of emigrants who have gone there and who are supposed to be settled there, is 28,611. The proportion from Ontario and the other Provinces is 21,514; those from the United States, 2,758; from other countries, mostly from England and Scotland, 4,339.

THE TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) enquired, Whether the location survey of the Trent Valley Canal has been completed, and if not, what progress has been made with it, and when it will be completed, and whether any report has been made by the engineer in charge of the survey since the former report was made by Mr. Stark, C.E., confirming or differing from the last mentioned report as to the probable cost and practicability of the work, and whether it is the intention of the Government to recommend to Parliament the construction of the work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg leave to say that an appropriation having been made for the purpose, an engineer was detailed to make a careful location and survey of the Trent Valley navigation with a view to arrive at the cost and the feasibility of the construction of that work. Owing to the very extended nature of the country to be gone over, and the arduous duty connected with it, the engineer has verbally reported to me that he has not been able to complete the survey during the present season. He is expected, however, to make a progress report, and on the receipt of that report the question will be considered whether that work shall be proceeded with in part or in whole.

Mr. POPE (Compton). With reference to the question asked a moment ago by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I would like to add, what I am sure will be satisfactory to him and the House, that the places of those who have gone from the old Provinces to Manitoba and the North-West, have been more than filled by immigration to this country.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope so, I am sure.

Mr. ANGLIN. Will the hon. Minister add how many have left the country for the United States.

Mr. POPE. I cannot exactly say how many have gone to that country, but I know there has been a large immigration into this country from the United States, and I presume about the same number have gone out. I think something like from 15,000 to 17,000 have entered goods as coming into this country, who are not included in that list at all, and I presume others have gone out.

GEORGIAN BAY BRANCH, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. COCKBURN, in moving for copies of all correspondence since 22nd December, 1880, with Smith, Ripley & Co., and others, upon the subject of the Georgian Bay Branch of the Pacific Railway contract, said: I have made several similar motions to the present on former occasions, but I

have so far been unable to ascertain what the country has lost by the cancellation of the contract for the Georgian Bay Branch. It is worthy of remark that the wisdom of the policy of the late Government, adopted in 1874, of establishing a port on the Georgian Bay, preparatory to the construction of the main line north of Lake Superior, is now being demonstrated by the policy of the Syndicate and the present Government; for, if rumor be correct, they have adopted a similar policy by establishing a Georgian Bay port at Algoma Mills, west of French River. I think they might as well have continued the Georgian Bay Branch to French River, which would have served the same purpose that is now being contemplated, and at the same time have saved the loss which took place on the contract. Considerable money has been expended on actual work on the road, and a great many people have suffered disappointment and actual loss by moving into the territory south of Lake Nipissing after the road commenced only to find their hopes blasted by the cancellation of the contract after the change of Government. It seems to be a settled fact that the party now in power are determined not to have the railway built south of Lake Nipissing on any condition whatever.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL VISITS TO ENGLAND.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving for a return shewing the expenses in detail incurred by the several members of the Government, and any other person or persons in the service of the Government, or paid by the Government, sent to England or elsewhere, on behalf of the Government, or in the service of the Government, from the 10th February, 1880, to date, said: I draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the observations which I made the other day on this subject. On the 23rd of February, 1880, I moved a similar motion to this, and on the 7th of March, 1881, the hon. gentleman submitted the return. Surely the hon. gentleman has employes enough in his Department to enable him to prepare such a return in a shorter period than thirteen months, and it is simply a farce for Parliament to order such returns if so long a time is required to execute his orders. On the 16th of December, 1880, I made a similar motion, and I find that the return was only brought down to-day—some fourteen months after the motion was made. On the same principle I suppose I may indulge the hope that the return now asked for will be forthcoming some time in 1883 or 1884. Moreover, the return the hon. gentleman has brought down is not in accordance with the Order of the House, which was for the accounts in detail and not in a lump sum. For instance, on one occasion, Sir Leonard Tilley's expenses to England were some \$800, and on another occasion some \$2,400. One would like to have some information on this discrepancy.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that that return has been made in the same form as all such returns for the last ten years. I am not aware that any detailed statement has ever been made by any hon. member of a Government as to the number of meals he had, and as to his hotel and various other expenses. I know some delay took place last year, because part of the payments that had been made were for expenses incurred by agents in England, and they did not appear until the accounts for the year had come in. The discrepancy in the two sums mentioned by the hon. gentleman is chiefly owing to the fact that a portion of the \$2,400 was incurred on the first visit in 1878, but did not appear in the accounts until the next year, if my memory serves me. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has called attention to this matter, because the expenses of the two visits will compare very favorably with some others, I think. On the second visit, when I went to England to negotiate a loan, and in company with my colleagues to

discuss other questions, my secretary accompanied me, and his expenses are added. Information is now in the Department which will enable me to furnish, in a few days, what the hon. gentleman asks for in the Address.

Motion agreed to.

PASPÉBIAC HARBOUR.

Mr. BEAUCHESNE moved for copies of the report of the engineer who made the survey of the harbour of Paspébiac in 1874 and 1875.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any such report exists in any department; if a report has been made, it is one concerning the Intercolonial Railway. The motion may, however, pass. I shall make enquiries as to whether such a report exists, and if so, it shall be presented to the House.

Motion agreed to.

LAND GRANT BONDS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for all correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council in relation to the acceptance of the land grant bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the Government for any public purpose, and a statement of the action thereon, said: I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that it is stated in a prospectus of the Company that those land grant bonds had been ordered to be accepted in respect of certain other public purposes than security for the construction of the railway itself.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CONTRACT RIGHTS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence on the subject of any railway or projected railway claimed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be in derogation of their contract rights, said: If the ordinary sources of information are correct, there is more than one railway in respect to which there ought to be an answer to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

EXTRADITION.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence not already brought down, as to extradition, and as to the last Canadian Extradition Act, and as to the address of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament on the subject, said: I desire to call the attention of the Government and the House very briefly to the present position of this question with a view to obtain an early answer to this address. I think it is now two years ago since I proposed an address to the Imperial Government requesting their attention to the joint address unanimously passed by both Houses of this Parliament, so long ago as 1877, asking for certain executive action which was necessary in order that our Extradition Act of 1877, which also passed unanimously, might become efficacious within this country. To that joint address no response has been brought down to Parliament, and my motion lapsed at the request of the hon. the First Minister, who informed me that he was on the point, as he expected, of being able to make satisfactory arrangements; and it was not renewed last Session, owing to the circumstances which pre-occupied the attention of the House. It is extremely unfortunate—I do not blame the Government at all, because we have not any materials for judging of their action—that there should have been no action as yet taken in reference to the Act of Parliament which was so passed, as it would have removed very many of the evils and difficulties which now exist in the working

of the present extradition convention between this country and the United States. I know of grievous injustice and wrong having occurred owing to the complicated character of the existing provisions. I know of a case in which the interest of justice has been thwarted owing to the miscarriages due to the complicated character of the old provisions. After some thousands of dollars had been expended the proceedings were abortive, and though it was quite clear that the man ought to have been, in any sense but a technical sense, sent over the water, the demand for extradition was refused. The persons who made this demand were disgusted at their large expenditure, and gave the matter up. Other instances also occurred. It is a matter of very grave consequence that we should learn, at this late date, what prevented our Extradition Act from being put into operation. This is but one part of this motion. I hope this correspondence will be brought down early, in order that I may be put in a position, while yet private members have an opportunity of engaging the attention of the House, to make some further motion on this subject. The other point to which I refer is of equally, perhaps of greater, importance. I refer to the necessity of taking active measures for the enlargements of the range of extradition offences. That subject was discussed during my visit to England upon this topic—both the enlargement of the range and the more liberal application of the international law to this question. The difficulty that existed at that time, and which resulted in the temporary suspension of the Ashburton Treaty, was due to the controversy between Lord Derby and Mr. Fish as to the course that each country was entitled to take on the subject of extradition. That difficulty was ultimately resolved by the retirement of the Imperial Government from the position it had assumed; and the Royal Commission, composed of numerous eminent persons on both sides of politics, presented a report entirely abandoning the old exclusive and illiberal doctrines on this subject, and propounding doctrines more satisfactory to modern notions and the exigencies of the present state of the case. This report renders it impossible that the cases which were formerly suggested of the right of asylum, &c., and which had really no sound foundation, and the difficulties suggested as to the range of offences, which have equally, to the present day, no solid foundation, should form any obstacle. I maintain it is a special interest and duty not merely to procure an efficacious mode of working existing arrangements, but to press for further treaty arrangements extending the range of existing offences. If that fail, we should do what was suggested long ago to this House, on the occasion of the visit to which I have referred, and what has actually taken place in the early history of the old Province of Upper Canada and several other dependencies of the Crown, we should proceed legislatively, in order that, if we are unable to obtain from other countries the rascals that fly from us to them, we may be able to relieve ourselves of the rascals who fly from other countries to us.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With reference to the first remark of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the correspondence, of course, that has taken place—I do not know that any has taken place—will be laid on the Table. Judging from the remark made by the hon. leader of the Government, on Friday last, he is in accord with the hon. leader of the Opposition as to the propriety of extending our treaty arrangements, and there will be very little difference of opinion on both sides of the House when that subject is dealt with.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY DEFENCE OF CANADA.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for the correspondence between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, or any member or Mr. BLAKE.

officers therco^f, relating to the defence of Canada, said: It has been stated that, prior to the occurrence to which I am about to refer, a correspondence took place of considerable interest and importance with relation to the military defence of Canada, which has never been brought down, and that views of great interest to the people of Canada were communicated to its Government. I think it is about time we should be aware of what those views are. Later on, a memorandum in which the First Minister, and the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Railways joined, as expository of their view that the diplomatic office of a representative of Canada, should be opened at the Court of St. James, declared that at this moment certain subjects were under consideration, including the military defence of Canada generally, and of British Columbia more especially. That was some time in the year 1879. It is obvious, therefore, that the subject of the military defence of Canada, generally, and of British Columbia more especially, has been under consideration, at any rate, from the time I refer to, 1879; and, if my information is correct, it has been under consideration for a period considerably anterior. I think it would be of interest for us to know what the nature of the discussion has been, what the information is, and what are the statements to be made with regard to this very important subject.

Mr. CARON. This correspondence is of a most voluminous character, extending over a period of time previous to Confederation, and it will require some time to bring down all the papers. Of course, the whole of the correspondence, with the exception of what is private and confidential, will be submitted to the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman's statement means that no portions of that correspondence will be brought down, except such as will be of little or no interest.

Mr. CARON. When it comes down the hon. gentleman can judge for himself.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence and reports relating to the improvement of the commercial relations between Canada and any other country, including the correspondence on the subject of the communication of the French Consul at Quebec to a member of the Government, said: It will be recollected that we have already had a certain amount of correspondence from the High Commissioner, which was brought down, I think, last Session, stating the results of his negotiations so far. I presume there has been some continuance of the correspondence on that subject, and that we have at any rate some letters to show for that appointment. Besides that, I have already alluded particularly to the subject of a correspondence which is of some public interest, and which was noticed in the papers of the country, and also in English newspapers, and which has occasioned a little discussion in the British House of Commons. It seems a report got abroad that a gentleman who at that time was, or who a short time previously had been, French Consul at Quebec, addressed a communication to the Minister of Public Works, or in some way intimated to him that the French Government was cordially disposed to us in this connection, and that the Minister of Public Works was disloyal enough to receive that communication, and actually to impart it to somebody or other, I do not know whom. It seems this gave rise to some political excitement in the English House of Commons, and that the British Government was interrogated on the subject; that they communicated with the Canadian First Minister; that he

agreed that a glaring impropriety had occurred, and communicated his views to the Government in England to the effect that nothing of the kind should be repeated, and that a correspondence was addressed to the Government of France in order to ascertain how this dreadful thing had happened. I believe that ultimately the danger of a rupture of the cordial relations between France and England was averted by the assurance that the offending Consul had ceased to be an officer of the French Government, and that by means of that correspondence our Government has escaped from a responsibility it would, in the event of such a dire catastrophe, have had to assume. I desire all such information as the Government may possess on such an important subject, as well as that available on the perhaps more important question of what progress has been made in the improvement of our commercial relations with other countries.

Motion agreed to.

DEFAULTS IN THE LONDON POST OFFICE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for—

(1.) Copies of the evidence taken and the report made by Post Office Inspector Dewe, about 1880, on the defaults and irregularities in the London Post Office, and of any departmental action thereon, of the Reports and Order in Council as to the superannuation of the late postmaster, and the appointment of the present postmaster.

(2.) Copies of the evidence, correspondence, reports and Orders in Council or departmental action on which Scott Phipps, a clerk in the London office, was dismissed about 1875, and of all papers relating to subsequent re-appointment to office; copies of correspondence and statements as to the loss or disappearance of registered and other letters in the office within the last twelve months; and as to the action of the Divisional Inspector in suspending Phipps, and the evidence taken and the report made by him thereon; of all correspondence relating to that suspension; of the departmental direction to Inspector Dewe, the evidence taken and report made by him thereon; of the departmental direction to Post Office Inspector Sweetnam, the evidence taken and the report made by him thereon; of the departmental action and Order in Council dealing with Phipps, made after the reports; of all correspondence relating to that action, of the Order in Council thereafter made suspending Phipps; of the departmental or other action on which Inspector Dewe entered on a fresh investigation; of the evidence taken and report made by him thereon; of all correspondence relating thereto; and to the subsequent action of Inspector Sweetnam; and to the final action under which Phipps was reinstated and copy of such action.

(3.) Statement of the office held by the assistant postmaster at London prior to his promotion; of the date of his appointment as Assistant; of the time during which he has been a member of the City Council; and copies of any reports or correspondence relating to him.

(4.) Copies of any papers or reports relating to the late Deputy Inspector Cox shortly before his superannuation, and of the correspondence and departmental and executive action touching his superannuation.

(5.) Copies of any papers, correspondence or reports as to the condition of the London office.

He said: If it is understood, as I believe it is understood, from observations of the Minister of Public Works, that this motion will be granted and the papers brought down early, it will be convenient I should not give the House my reasons for the motion; and I will, on that understanding, propose the motion without any observations.

Mr. O'CONNOR. All of the papers that are not secret and confidential will be brought down. The papers are quite voluminous, and may be brought down in a week, or perhaps sooner.

Motion agreed to.

CIRCULARS TO DOMINION BANKS.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, in moving for copies of all circulars issued from the Department of Finance to any banks of the Dominion since 1st January, 1881, said: This is very like the request already made by my hon. friend in his motion; but, as the motion is not made in the same shape, I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance if any circulars other than those referred to by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) have been issued since the 1st of January, 1881?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. None.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then I will withdraw that motion by leave of the House.

INDIANS OF LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR.

Mr. DAWSON moved for a return of all correspondence which has taken place within the past two years between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario, in reference to the arrears due to the Indians of Lakes Huron and Superior, under the Robinson Treaty, together with any petitions recently presented by the Indians on the same subject.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask from the Government before this motion is carried—I am sorry the First Minister is not in his place—whether this correspondence is still proceeded with. I would like to know whether demands are still made upon the Province of Ontario for the amounts that the Indians were to receive under this treaty when the territory which was then negotiated for by the Government of Canada was lying within the limits of Manitoba. It would seem to be a very extraordinary proceeding if it should turn out to be correct, that the Government of the Dominion is making a demand on the Government of Ontario for the moneys which the Indians are entitled to under that treaty, at the same time denying any right on the part of the Government of Ontario to the lands that were then ceded.

Motion agreed to.

ACTS OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence, petitions, reports, and Orders in Council relating to Acts of Provincial Legislatures or reserved Bills of Provincial Legislatures not already asked for by address or order of this House, said: As my hon. friend from Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) has pointed out, the motion which was made and assented to by the House the other day was simply a motion for the return of Acts which have been disallowed. It does not give any of the correspondence or Orders in Council, and so on. This is the general motion which we have been in the habit of making every Session, and it is wide enough to deal with every case which has not been ordered or brought down.

Motion agreed to.

TRUST AND LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Mr. HESSON, in moving for copies of all correspondence between this Government and the Governments of Ontario and Quebec relating to the unsettled Trust and Land Improvement Fund account, said: I desire once again to draw the attention of the House and the Government to this matter, this being, I believe, the fourth Session in which I have been called upon on behalf of my constituents to refer to this unsettled account. After four years I have to say that my progress has not been very much, though I believe some progress has been made. The Finance Minister it appears, during the past few years, has made some efforts towards the settlement of this account, and these efforts have resulted in bringing down in the Estimates by the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario a sum of something like \$125,000 for distribution to the various municipalities interested in this account. That sum is not anything like equal to the amount credited to the fund, and I see no reason why the account should stand longer in its present position. I have had interviews with the Minister of Finance and his deputy on this question, and they state that they are willing and ready to settle this account at any time they can get the two Provinces, interested with the Dominion in the matter, to come to a settlement. I shall be glad if some means can be

devised by which to bring about the closing of this account once for all. It is a great injustice to the townships—and they are chiefly townships which are interested—that this account should be standing open so long, with the probability that when they come to close it the Governments may not see proper to allow them the interest which has accrued during these many years. I notice, from a discussion in the other House, that they have not included any sum for interest, and I wish it to be distinctly understood that wherever the blame for this state of things belongs, whether to the Dominion Government, or the Governments of Ontario or Quebec, the blame should be placed on the proper shoulders. If the fund is in the possession of this Government, I should think it is desirable that it should be placed to the credit of Ontario, to be distributed to the municipalities entitled to it. I trust something will be immediately done to have the account closed.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say that I heartily agree with the views expressed by the hon. gentleman, not merely as to this specific item, which is, of course, of itself a great grievance, but also as to the importance of closing these accounts which have remained unsettled for the fifteen years which have now elapsed since Confederation commenced. I suppose it has been the pressure of other business on the part of all the Governments interested which may have led to this result, but I do not think it is a creditable or reasonable thing that there should have been so long a delay in arriving at a settlement. I trust a very earnest effort will be made by the three Governments concerned to close the whole account, so that the accounts of the two principal Provinces of the Dominion may not remain in the unsettled, incomplete and confused condition they are now in, in consequence of the account not being closed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I entirely agree with the last speaker, that the time has arrived when these questions between the two Provinces and the Dominion Government should be disposed of. So far as the Dominion Government are concerned, it has been our anxious desire to have them closed. Immediately after the prorogation, in March last, communications were had with the two Governments, and I thought that in the summer we had reached a point where there was a probability of arriving at a conclusion; but the general elections, which shortly afterwards took place in Quebec, resulted in a further postponement of a settlement. The moment the House rises we will renew our efforts to bring about a settlement, because many of the accounts, such as those referred to by the hon. gentlemen, are in a condition most unsatisfactory to the parties interested.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of the Act passed by the Quebec Legislature in the Session of 1881, respecting mines; of all petitions praying for the disallowance of said Act; of the report of the Minister of Justice upon the said petitions, and of all Orders in Council, papers and documents relating to the said petitions for disallowance.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of the Act passed by the Quebec Legislature at its last Session, respecting Laval University; of all petitions asking for the disallowance of the said Act; of the reply of the University of Laval, and of all other papers relating to the request for disallowance.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any person connected therewith, and the Government, or any member thereof, respecting all claims made by said Company for stone, timber, gravel or other material used for the construction of said road, and all claims made on the Government therefor by said Company,

Mr. HESSON.

and all departmental or other orders respecting the same, specifying the extent and location of the land over or on which such claims have been made.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Returns showing the quantity of land sold by the Government of Canada in Manitoba and the North-West Territories in each year, from the acquisition of the North-West up to the first day of February, 1882; the price at which the lands were sold; to whom sold, and when; the amount received on account of said sales up to the date aforesaid; the amount in arrear for principal and interest.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, papers, reports, and Orders in Council relating to an Act of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, intitled: An Act for protecting the public interests in rivers, streams and creeks, disallowed by His Excellency in Council, and a copy of the said Act.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, papers, reports, and Orders in Council relating to an Act intitled: An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg South Eastern Railway Company, disallowed by His Excellency in Council, and a copy of the said Act.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Copies of the report of the engineer who made the survey of the harbor of Port Daniel in 1881.—(Mr. Beausiesne.)

Copies of the reports of H. F. Perley, Esq., and C. F. Roy, Esq., respecting the channel in the Traverse of the River Restigouche.—(Mr. Beausiesne.)

Copies of all maps of any part of Canada, issued by any Department of the Government since the first day of January, 1881; and for copy of a map of part of Manitoba or the North-West Territories, prepared, and of which some copies were issued and afterwards in part recalled.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all tariffs of rates for freight or passengers on the Intercolonial Railway, and the Prince Edward Island Railway, and a statement of all special rates granted on any part of either railway.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the subject of the route of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, including any branch thereof, and all reports and Orders in Council relating thereto; for a statement of the route so far as settled; for a statement of the expenditure by the Government on the line by them constructed to the westward of Winnipeg; and of the arrangements between the Government and the Company as to such expenditure, and a statement of the length of constructed line abandoned by the Company.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence relating to the rates for passengers and freight on any railway operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and of any tariffs of such rates proposed and approved, and of all reports and Orders in Council affecting the same; and of any special rates made on any such railway.—(Mr. Blake.)

Correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council in relation to any grants of land to, or to the selection or reservation of any lands for, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and a statement in detail of the lands granted, selected, or reserved therefor.—(Mr. Blake.)

Correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council in relation to any payments of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and a statement in detail of all such payments, with full particulars thereof.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council relating to the allowances proposed to be paid to Canadian manufacturers of certain goods required by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; of all applications for such allowances, and correspondence in connection therewith; for a statement of the calculations on which the proposed allowances were based; and an estimate in detail of the probable sums payable out of the Treasury in respect of each class of goods, assuming them to be made in Canada to the extent of the Company's requirements and of the *ad*

valorem percentage of allowance on each such class.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence relating to the construction of a railway on Vancouver Island.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of three circulars asking for information recently directed under instructions of the Minister of Finance to several of the banks, with the names of the banks to which they were directed.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the number of acres taken up in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territory under the Homestead Act, by homestead settlers, in the year 1881, and the total number of such homestead settlers and the number of townships in which they are located; also the number of acres taken up in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territories, in each year prior to 1881, together with the total number of such settlers in each year, and the number of townships in which they are located.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the number of acres entered as pre-emptions in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territory during the year 1881, and the total number of such pre-emptions, the number of townships in which such pre-emptions are located, and the amount of money paid, or yet to be paid, upon such pre-emptions; also the number of acres entered as pre-emptions in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territory in each year prior to 1881, the total number of such pre-emptions, the number of townships in which such pre-emptions are located, and the amount of money paid, or to be paid, on such pre-emptions.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all petitions, papers and correspondence having reference to the desirability of granting mail accommodation on the Grand Trunk Railway morning express train going West on Mondays for points between Belleville and Toronto.—(Mr. Stephenson.)

Copies of all correspondence on the subject of the remission of the duties on tea and coffee.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Statement showing the total amount of moneys received on account of Dominion Lands during the calendar year 1881.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Statement of the total amount on deposit with banks in Canada upon the last days of each month in the fiscal year 1880-81.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Return showing the total number of acres of public lands surveyed in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territory during the year 1881, and the cost per acre of such survey; also, showing the number of acres surveyed by contract, the number of acres surveyed by salaried employes of the Government, and the total cost, and cost per acre under each method.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the number of acres of public lands surveyed in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territories in each year prior to the year 1881, and the total cost, and cost per acre in each year of such survey.—(Mr. Charlton.)

All regulations issued from time to time by the Department of the Interior respecting the sale and management of public lands in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territory, and all regulations respecting the management and sale of mineral, coal and timber lands in Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territory, issued by the Department of the Interior up to date of return.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the number of acres of public lands sold in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territory during the year 1881, the amount realized in cash from such sales, the amount yet to be paid upon account of such sales, the number of purchasers of such lands and a list of the purchasers of 640 acres and upwards, giving names of purchasers and amount purchased by each; also showing the number of acres of public lands sold in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territory in each year prior to 1881, the

amount realized in cash from such sales at the time such sales were made, the amount since realized in cash from such sales, and the amount still remaining unpaid upon such sales; the number of purchasers of such lands in each year, and a list of the purchasers of 640 acres and upwards in each year, giving names of purchasers and amount purchased by each.—(Mr. Charlton.)

House adjourned at 5.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 16th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Mr. O'CONNOR presented the Annual Report of the Postmaster General.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in the absence of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, moved that a Select Standing Committee, composed of Messrs. Anglin, Blake, Brecken, Cameron (Huron), Sir Richard J. Cartwright, Colby, Daly, Fortin, Houde, Laurier, Macdonnell (Inverness), McCarthy, Mills, Mousseau, Tassé, and Wright, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library. He said: The only changes in the Committee of last year are the following: Mr. LaRue was replaced by Mr. McCarthy, and Mr. Masson, who will be unable to attend this Session, will be replaced by Mr. Mousseau.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry my hon. friend has made the exchange he proposes to the House, in substituting Mr. McCarthy for Mr. LaRue. That alters the composition of the Committee in two respects. I should have supposed the hon. gentleman would have left the Committee representing the Provinces respectively in the same proportion as last Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The composition of the Committee I think should meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. The changes affect the political and also the Provincial complexion of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. LaRue is replaced by Mr. Amyot, which I do not think changes the complexion of the Committee much, and the same remark will apply to the successor of Mr. Mousseau, who is unfortunately in ill-health. I think the hon. gentleman will see that the present Committee is fairly composed.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the changes are all right; but if the Committee is fairly composed now, it must have been unfairly constructed last Session, and unfair as against the hon. gentleman, who never was accused of being unfair to himself.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the Committee was unfair as regards us last Session, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman opposite will be happy to correct that unfairness on the present occasion.

Mr. LANDRY. I have not the same complaint to make to the hon. Minister with regard to the composition of the Committee, at least with regard to its political complexion,

but I must ask why Mr. LaRue's place is taken, representing as he did somewhat the French Canadian element, by a member of a different nationality?

Mr. BLAKE. The Committee is not altogether the same; there is another change; Mr. Masson is succeeded by Mr. Mousseau.

Mr. LANDRY. I thought the Committee was the same as last year and that the only change consisted in substituting Mr. McCarthy for Mr. LaRue.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Mousseau takes Mr. Masson's place.

Mr. LANDRY. There is nothing to affect us in that change, but in the other case we lose a member, and I think that in all that concerns French literature, we are not in such strength that we can afford not to at least hold our own.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will examine the composition of the Committee, he will perceive that if Mr. McCarthy takes Mr. LaRue's place, that nevertheless the Committee's composition is excellent as the names of Messrs. Fortin, Houde, Mousseau and Tassé are on it, and he may feel assured that the literary and historical interests of our Province will be in safe keeping in the hands of these gentlemen, even if we do not take it into consideration the French propensities of several other members of the Committee; it would have been impossible to do better under the circumstances, and if the hon. member will look at the composition of the Committee from an Upper Canadian point of view, he will find that under the circumstances it was but fair that Mr. LaRue should be succeeded by the hon. member.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Beatty.)

Bill (No. 10) to provide that persons charged with misdemeanors shall be competent as witnesses.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Bill (No. 11) to amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) introduced a Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell us whether this measure is the same as that which passed the Commons last Session?

Mr. GIROUARD. Not altogether the same. That portion of the Bill passed last Session which referred to the widow of the brother has been eliminated; that is about all the difference. The Bill reads in this way: "All laws prohibiting marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife are hereby repealed." The Bill will not affect in any manner existing vested rights.

Bill read the first time.

ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. IVES, in introducing Bill (No. 12) further to amend "The Dominion Elections Act, 1874," said: The object of the Bill is to amend a section of the Act, which provides that all candidates for election to the House of Commons shall deposit the sum of \$50,

Mr. LANDRY.

which becomes a contribution to the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the country. It seems to me that when we have a surplus of \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 the country can afford to pay the expenses of the general elections. In the place of that provision the amendment proposes to substitute the provision of the local Quebec Act, which, in my opinion, is much preferable. By the provision of the Quebec Act, each candidate makes a deposit of \$200. This is returned to him if he is elected, or if he succeeds in obtaining one-third of the votes polled. In fact, it is a provision which insures good faith in candidature, and in a measure will prevent candidates from being proposed from a mere desire for notoriety, or even from a more unworthy object. The provision of this amendment does away with the contribution to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and provides for the same deposit as provided by the Quebec Act.

Bill read the first time.

REGISTERED LETTERS.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Is it the intention of the Government this Session to provide greater security in sending moneys by registered letter by charging extra for registration purposes according to amounts sent, and the Government to be responsible in case the money is lost?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The question has not yet been considered by the Government.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. POPE (Compton) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General;

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LORNE,

The Governor General transmits, for the information of the House of Commons,—Copy of the Numerical Census of the Dominion of Canada, taken under the Act 42 Victoria, Chapter 21.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 16th February, 1882.

DRAWBACKS ON SHEET IRON.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence with the Customs Department on the subject of drawbacks on duty paid on sheet iron for nail making to the extent of the export of the nails made from such iron, said: I do not know what may be the extent of this correspondence, but there has been placed in my hands a copy of a letter written to the Customs Department, under date of July, 1881, enquiring, on behalf of a person engaged in this trade, whether the firm could get back the duty paid on sheet iron for nail making to the extent of the nails exported; and a copy of another letter, dated 8th September, 1881, referring to the former letter, and conveying the intimation that no answer had yet been received to that communication. I believe that no answer has yet been received to either of those two letters. There may have been some correspondence with other merchants on the subject, or, on the other hand, with those engaged in manufacturing sheet iron for nail making, such as the Londonderry Works for example. I wish to get all the correspondence whether with manufacturers or merchants; and I should have been glad to have had some explanation from the Minister of Customs of how it happened that a letter upon a subject so interesting to the trade of Canada should have remained unanswered from July last until to-day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am unable to give an answer to the hon. gentleman, because the hon. the Minister of Customs is not present; but I am sure, when he is in his place, he will be able to give a satisfactory reason for the letter in question remaining so long unanswered.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS REVENUES ON HUDSON'S BAY.

Mr. BANNERMAN moved for a return showing the amount received for duties at the ports of Moose, York and Churchill, during the years 1876 to 1881, inclusive; also the amount paid to Customs officers at the several ports. He said: I wish to call the attention of the Government thoroughly to this matter, as I have been informed that there is something going on in that country against the interests of Canada, and the sooner it is remedied the better. During the last eight or ten years a large and increasing trade has been done in Hudson's Bay. By a return to the American Government, we find that in 1880 between \$600,000 and \$700,000 worth of furs, whalebone and oil was exported from Hudson's Bay into the United States in foreign vessels. These vessels trade there with the native population without restraint, and without contributing to the revenues of this country, whereas the Hudson's Bay Company, which is now a Canadian company, has to make returns and pay Customs duties the same as any other mercantile firm in the country. Furthermore, these foreigners have taken possession of a most important point, in fact, the key to the northern portion of Hudson's Bay, and that is the Marble Island. They have built large storehouses there, and are doing a larger business on the shores of the bay than the Hudson's Bay Company. A further evidence of the grievance that the Hudson's Bay Company have against the Government of Canada for not protecting their interests there, is this: that when the United States Government bought the Territory of Alaska from the Russian Government, the Hudson's Bay Company had six or seven posts in that territory. They were given twenty-four hours notice to leave the country; they were allowed nothing for their improvements, and they had not time to take away their provisions or goods, and had to leave them there, and they became the property of the companies whom the American Government allowed to trade there. I, therefore, think it the duty of the Government to protect any parties of Canadians who are trading in that country, and not allow American traders to enjoy greater privileges than our own people. I would suggest to the right hon. leader of the Government the advisability of combining the geological surveys of that country with the collections of Customs duties, and of sending a revenue cutter to see that justice is done. If this suggestion is carried out, I have no doubt it will be found to work successfully. I find that \$1,800 is paid annually in commissions on the collection of revenue in the North-West, and I should like to know what percentage of commission is paid to those who are acting as Customs officers in that district. I think there are only two or three who are so paid, while something like \$15,000 or \$20,000 are collected annually there from the Hudson's Bay Company. I am satisfied that if the Government appointed a Customs officer, and used the proper appliances, the revenues of that country would be doubled, and the Government would be repaid for the extra expense incurred. But I maintain that the Government has a right to protect the interests of the traders in that country, whether at a loss or not, and the only way to do that is to send a revenue cutter there, which, I think, would put an end to the matter.

Motion agreed to.

MONEY ORDERS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. FARROW, in moving for a return showing the amount of moneys sent from Canada by post office money order to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the United States, and to all other countries during the past year 1881, also the cost of the same, said: Last year I moved for a similar return, and whether the return ever came down or not I cannot tell—all I

can say is, that I never saw it. I consider this a very important matter, as both those who send money and those to whom it is sent are interested in it. When this return comes down it will probably be seen that a vast amount of money is sent in this way from this country to the United Kingdom, and in moving for this order I know I am acting according to the wishes of the vast majority of the hard workingmen of Canada. I have not a word to say against the money order system as in operation between this country and the United States. Most of the arrangements are good, while, at the same time, they are practical, convenient and cheap. But what I have to complain of is this: that while we charge only a small percentage on money going to the United States, even to extreme points, such as San Francisco on the west and New Orleans on the south, it is entirely different when you come to send money by post office order to the United Kingdom. I am very glad to know that when the Government came into power and enacted the National Policy, if they discriminated in favor of one country over another, it was in favor of Great Britain. The Government had an eye to that, and all their prognostications as to the results have been fulfilled. Our trade with the United States has been, in a great measure, dropping off, while our trade with the Old Country has been increasing. We want the Government to consider this postal question in this light: that whatever may be the cost of sending money to the United States, it shall be sent as cheaply to the United Kingdom. I believe this is the wish of the House and of the country, and I do not see why it should not be carried out. I hope the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration, and that we will shortly see regulations adopted in that direction. There are two reasons why the charges should be made similar. The Old Country is not a foreign country. We all pride ourselves that we belong to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. We belong to the fatherland; the majority of us are either English, Irish or Scotch, and we are proud of our connection with Great Britain. The United States, on the other hand, is a foreign country, and the money we send there goes into their coffers. The money we send to the Old Country is generally the savings of those who have come out here, and it is sent for the assistance of fathers, mothers, sisters or dependent relatives, to whom a few pounds sent from Canada is of great benefit. But the greater part of the money sent is for emigration purposes. Many a father comes out to this country alone, because he is only able to pay for himself. He works with determination for a year or two, and when he has acquired a few hundred dollars he sends for his wife and children. Under these circumstances, I trust the Government will seriously consider the matter, and at once apply a remedy.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for North Huron. It will be the opinion of the House, and of the constituencies which we represent, that this question is one of very great importance, and that it is not sufficient that the papers be brought down as a matter of form, but that the opinions of the hon. members should be obtained on the subject. It is true, as has been represented by the hon. member for North Huron, that a discrimination is made against the United Kingdom. When we are endeavoring to induce immigration from foreign countries, particularly from Germany, whose delegates we have invited to visit the Dominion, it is desirable that every facility should be given to strangers visiting our country, with a view to settling here, to assist their relatives in joining them by sending small sums of money to the Old Country; and it is rather unfair that they should be charged a heavier rate for obtaining such an exchange than if they were dealing with the people of the United States. The complaint made by

my hon. friend is a just one, and it will be endorsed by the great majority of the House, and I trust there will be nothing to prevent the Postmaster General in devising some scheme whereby the rate may be reduced. It cannot be a matter of vital importance to the revenue, as we have a very large surplus; indeed, I fancy there is no strong reason to prevent an arrangement being entered into with the people of Great Britain and Germany, in order to place the scale of charges on a more reasonable basis than at present.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no objection to the motion passing, but I may as well remark that the matter was brought before the Postal Convention, and the result of that convention was, that negotiations have been pending for some time past between the Post Office Department here and Great Britain on the very subject which has been brought before the House.

Motion agreed to.

ADMISSION OF LIVE STOCK INTO CANADA.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government, relative to the admission of live stock into the Dominion for breeding or other purposes, said: The House is aware that for some years the Imperial Government have prohibited the importation of live stock from the United States into Great Britain, and has only permitted importation from Canada upon the understanding that the Dominion Government shall strictly enforce a similar prohibition of the importation of live stock from the United States into the Dominion. About two years ago the stringency of this restriction was moderated by the Imperial Government consenting to the transportation of live stock through Canada, on the Southern and Great Western Railways, from the Detroit to the Niagara River, connecting at each point with the American system of railways, the stock in question having been first subjected to a rigid examination by a duly qualified veterinary surgeon appointed by the Dominion Government. It has been found, upon official investigation on the part of the United States Government, that the cattle disease is confined to the southern and eastern States of the Union, and that the western States have been entirely free from disease. In view of these circumstances the Dominion Government would be more than justified in representing the facts to the Imperial Government, in urging still further concessions with a view to the importation of live stock from the West, subject, if necessary, to quarantine regulations and inspection. Much inconvenience has been felt by the owners of thoroughbred stock in particular, in consequence of the existing restrictions. According to newspaper report some negotiations, with a view to what we suggest, have been in progress. A story is told, though I do not vouch for its veracity, of a gentleman living in Petite Côte, on the Detroit River, who had a valuable herd of Jersey thoroughbreds, and who was anxious to import from the neighboring State of Michigan a Jersey bull recently imported into that State from England. Finding it impossible to induce the Minister of Agriculture to waive the regulations, even after careful inspection, and being determined to have his Jersey bull at all costs, he sent the animal round from Detroit, by the Lake Shore Railway, through the States of Michigan, Ohio, New York and Massachusetts, then shipped him from Boston to Halifax, from which city he sent him West by the Intercolonial and Grand Trunk Railroads. But, unfortunately, the man in charge, instead of transshipping at Toronto by the Great Western Railway to Windsor, continued on the Grand Trunk and crossed the river, during the night, from Sarnia to Port Huron, finding himself in the morning in Detroit, the place from which he started. The story is good enough to be true, and, at any rate, it illustrates the inconvenience

Mr. HESSON.

caused by the existing regulations. Now that it is an established fact that no cattle disease exists in the western States, the Government certainly should at least make efforts to have the restrictions withdrawn in favor of thoroughbred stock, with a view to subsequently extending the concession to all live stock under proper quarantine regulations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in his place, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Patterson) may rest assured that the Government has already taken measures, with the object of obtaining the improvement he wishes; and we hope the efforts we are making may be successful.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

Return showing the number of seizures made at each port of entry in the Dominion during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881; the amount of fines exacted at each port during said year; and the manner in which said fines were disposed of, giving the names of the officers receiving any portion thereof, and the amount received by each of such officers from said fines.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Report of the engineer appointed by the Government to ascertain the possibility and utility of the construction of a wharf at Point aux Trembles, in the county of Portneuf, together with the plans and all other papers and correspondence relating thereto.—(Mr. Vallée.)

Reports and papers in connection with the dismissal of A. S. McEdwards, the Postmaster at Neustadt.—(Mr. Jackson.)

Return showing: 1. The number of applications for land for colonization under plan number one of land regulations, issued by the Department of the Interior, 23rd December, 1881, up to date of return, and copies thereof; the number of applications granted or agreed to, the names and residences of the grantees, with the total number of acres granted or agreed to be granted, the location of each grant, and the number of acres in the same; the total amount of money received and to be paid on such grants, and the number of townships in which such grants are located; the number of applications refused, and the names of applicants and number of acres and location of grants applied for; the number of applications in suspense, with names of applicants, number of acres and location of grants applied for, and all correspondence relating to all such applications.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Also, a tabulated statement of the result of the foregoing return showing the name of each applicant, the date of his application, the number of acres applied for by him, the location of grant applied for, the disposition of the application, the moneys paid, and the moneys payable in respect thereof, with the dates of payment. 2. The number of applications for land for colonization under plan number two of land regulations, issued by the Department of the Interior, 23rd December, 1881, up to the date of return, and copies thereof; the number of applications granted or agreed to, the names and residences of the grantees, with the total number of acres granted or agreed to be granted; the location of each grant and the number of acres in the same; the total amount of money received and to be paid on such grants, and the number of townships in which such grants are located; the number of applications refused, and names of applicants, number of acres and location of grants applied for; the number of applications in suspense, with names of applicants, number of acres and location of grants applied for, and all correspondence relating to all such applications.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Also, a tabulated statement of the result of the foregoing return, showing the name of each applicant, date of the application, the number of acres applied for by him, the location thereof, the disposition of the application, the moneys paid, and the moneys payable in respect thereof, with the dates of payment.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing: 1. The number of applications for land made prior to the 25th May, 1881, and copies thereof; the names and residences of applicants to whom grants for colonization have been made up to 25th May, 1881, the number of acres and location of grants made to each; the total number of acres thus granted, the sums paid and the sums to be paid on such grants, and all correspondence on the subject of such applications. 2. The number of applications for land for colonization made under the land regulations issued by the Department of the Interior, 25th May, 1881, and copies thereof; the names and residences of applicants to whom grants for colonization have been made or whose applications have been agreed to; the number of acres and location of grant made to each, the total number of acres thus granted, the sums paid and the sums to be paid on such grants, and the number of townships in which such grants are located, together with all correspondence on the subject of such applications.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Also, a tabulated statement of the result of each of the foregoing returns, showing the name of each applicant, date of his application, the number of acres applied for by him, the location thereof, the disposition of the application, the moneys paid and the moneys payable in respect thereof, and the dates of payment.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the total number of applications for leases of pasturage lands, and the total number of acres thus applied for; the number of applications and of acres covered by such applications under each of the regulations issued from time to time respecting the public lands by the Department of the Interior; the total number of leases granted or agreed to, and the total number of acres covered by such leases; the number of leases granted or agreed to, and the total number of acres of land covered by such leases under each of the regulations issued from time to time respecting the public lands by the Department of the Interior; the name and residence of each and every applicant for a lease of pasturage land; the name and residence of each lessee of pasturage land under each of the regulations respecting the public lands issued from time to time by the Department of the Interior, together with the number of acres leased or agreed to be leased to each, and the amount of rental paid and payable by each.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Also, copies of all applications and all correspondence connected therewith up to date of return, and a tabulated statement setting forth the information asked for in the above return.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Correspondence between the Government and any of the County Court Judges of the Province of Ontario, or any other person, respecting the appointment of such Judges, or any other person as Surrogate Judges of the Maritime Court of the said Province with the salary, allowance or fees attached to such appointment; the number and name of the persons so appointed, and the date thereof, and all departmental orders or Orders in Council in relation to such appointments and salary, allowance or fees.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Returns showing the number of vessels (steam and sail) that entered and departed and reported and cleared from the harbor of refuge at Rond Eau, separately, as reported to the Government by the Harbor Master and Collector of Rond Eau Harbor, respectively.—(Mr. Stephenson.)

Copies of Reports of H. F. Perley, Esq., Chief Engineer, Department of Public Works, respecting Kingsville Harbor.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

House adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 17th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DREW moved that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to Wednesday, the 1st of March.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 13) to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Dominion Fire and Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Kilvert).

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Arkell).

THE ESTIMATES.

Sir LÉONARD TILLEY. I will state to the House that I hope, on Tuesday next, to lay the Estimates on the Table of the House, and to make the statement on Friday.

REVENUE CUTTER ON HUDSON'S BAY.

Mr. BANNERMAN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send a revenue cutter or other vessel to Hudson's Bay next summer, for the proper collection of the revenue?

Mr. BOWELL. The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONER AT PARIS.

Mr. VALLÉE enquired, Whether the Government have appointed, or intend to appoint, an agent or Commissioner to represent the commercial interests of Canada at Paris, France?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have understood that the Government of Quebec purpose appointing a representative or delegate to reside at Paris in the interests of that Government. Should such an appointment be made, it is just possible that the Government of the Dominion might make the services of that gentleman available in the encouragement of immigration and the promotion of the commercial interests of Canada.

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH SABLE ISLAND.

Mr. DALY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide for telegraphic communication with Cape Sable Island by means of a sub-marine cable, in accordance with the prayer of a petition of the Hon. N. W. White, and others, of the county of Shelburne, Nova Scotia.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is still under the consideration of the Government, but it is likely that we will be able to submit a vote to Parliament in the direction suggested.

EXTENSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Mr. COSTIGAN enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to so amend the general

election law, that the right to vote for members of the House of Commons may be extended to a larger proportion of the people than now enjoy it, and be uniform throughout the Dominion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That subject is under the consideration of the Government in connection with a measure we will be obliged to bring down, in accordance with the British North America Act, after the Census taken last year.

SALARIES OF RURAL POSTMASTERS.

Mr. WHEELER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present year, to increase the salaries of postmasters outside of towns and cities, in accordance with the increased revenue of the Department?

Mr. O'CONNOR. By far the greater number of postmasters outside the towns and cities are paid by a percentage on the amount which they collect, and, of course, as that amount increases from the increase of business, their salaries will be augmented in proportion.

CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. VANASSE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause to be prepared some elementary treatises on the growing and preparation of Tobacco, and to have them distributed gratuitously throughout the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department of the Interior will consider the matter.

REPORT OF THE FACTORY COMMISSION.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired, When the report of the Factory Commission, promised in the Speech from the Throne, will be brought down?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has been put in type for the use of hon. members, and I hope to submit it next Monday or Tuesday.

EMIGRANTS TO CANADA.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a statement of the number of emigrants booked and sent to Canada by the agents of each of the steamship lines, and of the number booked and sent by the agents of the Ontario Government, or any other Provincial Government, during the last fiscal year.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I may say to my hon. friend that it will be impossible for me to get the number booked by each of the steamship lines, though I can give him the number in the aggregate. As the hon. gentleman probably knows, that no agents of the Ontario Government, or any other Government, book these emigrants, they are only booked by the licensed agents of the steamship lines. The total number remaining in Canada of those so booked can be ascertained.

Mr. BLAKE. That will answer my purpose.

Motion agreed to.

GOODS IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John) moved for a summary statement, similar to No. 2 in the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the goods imported for consumption dutiable and free in the Dominion of Canada, the amount of duty collected, and the rates of duty levied thereon, during the six months ending the 31st of December, 1881. Also a similar statement to No. 5 in the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the goods, the produce and manufacture of Canada, exported from the Dominion of Canada, for the six months ending 31st December, 1881.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to the motion, except the time and labor involved in preparing it, as I have explained to the hon. gentleman. If these returns are to be asked for every Session, in addition to those which have already been asked for by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), they simply amount to a duplication of the Trade and Navigation Returns for every six months in the year, less those tables required for the registration of shipping. I shall see that as much as possible of the information sought for is brought down, and at as early a day as possible.

Mr. BURPEE. I think I should be able to reduce considerably the labor involved by keeping out some of the particulars asked for.

Motion agreed to.

THE PROPOSED MANITOBA AND HUDSON'S BAY RAILWAY.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and any other parties, in reference to the proposed railway from Manitoba to Hudson's Bay, said: I am aware that a number of gentlemen of some prominence in Canada, have had the construction of this railway under serious consideration. There are supposed to be very serious difficulties in the way of navigating Hudson's Bay. In the first place, the grain transported by that route would not be the grain of the current season, but of the season preceding; and, in the next place, vessels of different construction from those ordinarily employed would probably be required for a navigation which must be encumbered by a considerable quantity of ice. But my main reason for calling the attention of the Government to the matter, is this: I am inclined to think this subject has been brought to the notice of some shipowners in England, and I would suggest to the Government the expediency of urging the English Government to cause some of their squadron to be employed next year in ascertaining what length of time navigation remains open. If, as is asserted by some, that navigation is practicable for four months in the year, or thereabouts, this matter may be of considerable moment to the inhabitants of Manitoba; but if, on the other hand, it is practicable for only two months or six weeks, as some supposed-to-be-authorities assert, then it appears to me it would be an idle waste of money to construct this railway. As the matter is one of interest to English shipowners as well as to the people of Canada, I would suggest to the Government the desirability of having a thorough exploration in the way I suggest.

Motion agreed to.

SHIPPING DISASTERS ON INLAND WATERS.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and any other parties, in reference to loss of vessels on our inland waters, in consequence of over-loading or shifting of cargoes, said: There have been, as the House is aware, some serious disasters on our inland waters, resulting in the total loss of the crews in some cases, and under circumstances which have led the public to believe that very gross carelessness was exercised in the loading of those vessels. This is a matter to which attention has been directed in England and elsewhere by Mr. Plimsoll and other persons who take an interest in these matters, and I would call the attention of the acting Minister of Marine to the desirability of seeing whether some regulations cannot be adopted, to secure greater safety to life and property on our inland waters. Unfortunately, in cases in which vessels are heavily insured, there is too much reason to believe that the owners are very careless as

to the mode in which their vessels are laden, and, as we know, great loss of life not unfrequently results therefrom.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

Return of all Customs seizures made at Moose, York, Churchill, and all other ports in Hudson's Bay, during the last seven fiscal years.—(Mr. Bannerman.)

Statement showing the amount of duties collected on Canadian tobacco, whether manufactured, twist, or in the leaf; the amount of stamps issued for duties on Canadian tobacco from 1879 up to this date; the amount paid for the preparation and distribution of such stamps; the amounts paid by way of commission for the sale of such stamps, by districts; the number of persons employed in the distribution of licenses for the cultivation of Canadian tobacco, and in collecting the duties thereon; the salaries of such persons, or the commission received by them; all or any expenses of such persons defrayed out of the public chest.—(Mr. Vanasse.)

Copy of the complaints against Thomas Gordon, agent for the Indians on the Thames River, in the county of Middlesex, a copy of the Commission issued to investigate said complaints, and the report of the Commissioner, together with all the evidence received by said Commissioner, and all correspondence, Orders in Council, or other papers relating thereto; also a statement showing the expenses of said investigation to date.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

Return of all Canadian grown tobacco, manufactured or unmanufactured, seized by officers of the Department of Inland Revenue, within the Province of Quebec, during the years 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878, specifying 1st, the date of seizure; 2nd, the names of the parties from whom seized; 3rd, the Inland Revenue Division in which it was seized.—(Mr. Gigault.)

House adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 20th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Mr. McLELAN presented the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Company.—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Manitoba Bank.—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 17) to grant certain powers to the American Telegraph and Cable Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the St. John's Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Thunder Bay and Minnesota Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Lake Superior and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Exchange Bank of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Killam.)

Bill (No. 24) to amend the Act respecting pawnbrokers.—(Mr. Orton.)

PUNISHMENT OF ADULTERY AND SEDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON in introducing Bill (No. 25) to amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provision of the Act respecting offences against the person, by providing for the punishment of adultery, seduction, &c., said: This Bill provides for the punishment of adultery and seduction under promise of marriage. I propose, if the House assents to the second reading of this Bill, to ask its reference to a Select Committee. When the Bill is printed, its provisions will, I trust, bear a fuller discussion.

Bill read the first time.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 3) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 4) respecting the Sun Mutual Life Insurance Company of Montreal.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 13) to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Dominion Fire and Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

STADACONA INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend and extend the Act to empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.

Mr. VALLÉE. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the mover of this bill to the fact that this House has not the right to legalize a similar measure; it would be interfering with the civil law of Lower Canada to establish a limitation other than that determined by our Civil Code. The object of the measure is to compel the creditors of the Stadacona Insurance Company to file within a year the claims they have against the company, and to bring such claims before the courts within the same period, should they be contested, failing which they are to be barred by limitation. Now the civil law of Lower Canada gives every creditor, in the case of commercial transactions, the power of claiming his due, within a period of five years; in other words it fixes at five years the time of limitation. The measure now proposed requests this House to authorize the Stadacona Insurance Company to plead limitation at the expiration of a year. I maintain that this is an interference with our civil laws, and submit, Mr. Speaker, that the bill should be declared out of order from a constitutional point of view.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am of opinion that this House has undoubtedly the right of legislating on the matter now before it. Moreover, I believe that the Government has today foreshadowed a measure similar to the one I now bring before the House. At all events, the question just raised is liable to be dismissed, not only in the House, but also before the Special Committee, which is to consider the measure, and I think that it has always been the custom to refer these bills to the committee, as this one should be, in order that

the question be there discussed and explained. I have not had the advantage of seeing the measure which the Government intends submitting to the House, but I feel sure that the same difficulty which would arise from the passing of the measure now before the House to wind up the affairs of the Stadacona Insurance Company, will make itself felt, and that the House will see itself compelled to adopt a final mode of solution,—whatever local law there may be on the subject—towards winding up promptly and finally within a determined and reasonable delay the affairs of these various companies. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think that this bill should, like others, come before the usual committee, and there be discussed on its constitutional and intrinsic worth.

Mr. SPEAKER. If I understand the point of order raised, it is that the Bill is unconstitutional. That is a point of law which is never decided by the Chair, but is for the Committee to which the Bill is referred to consider and report upon.

STEAMERS ON BAY CHALEURS.

Mr. BEAUCHESNE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to subsidize a line of steamers to perform the service on the Bay Chaleurs, between Gaspé and Campbelltown, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Parliament will be asked to provide an appropriation for that service.

PACIFIC RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, When will the report and evidence taken by the Commission in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway be laid before the House? Is the evidence now complete in print in the possession of the Government ready for distribution?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report has not yet been received, but I understand it will be presented to the Government in a few days. The evidence is in the hands of the printer, and, together with the report, will be laid before the House in a few days.

FORM OF THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government has taken cognizance of a Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, at Quebec, on the 24th day of June, 1880, in which the noble speaker thus expresses himself:

"The very usages in the Parliament of Britain survive from the days when they were planted there by our Norman ancestors. I do not know that it has been observed before in Canada, but it has often occurred to me that in the British Parliament we still use the old words used by our fathers for the sanction of the Sovereign given to Bills of *La reine la veult*, or *la reine remercie ses bons sujets, accepte leur benvolence, et ainsi le veult*, forms which I should like to see used in Ottawa, as marking our common origin, instead of the practice that prevails of translating into modern French and English."

Whether it is, in consequence, the intention of the Government to yield to the wishes of the Governor General of Canada, and to adopt for this Parliament, whenever the occasion arises for sanctioning Bills, expressions which the Mother Country has retained, and which an ancient custom puts into the mouth of our Gracious Lady the Sovereign of the British Empire?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The form of giving the Royal Assent to Bills, as now adopted, has been used in Canada ever since it has possessed representative institutions. The language cannot be used exactly as it is used in England, for two reasons. In the first place, the Constitutional Act provides the mode in which the Royal Assent shall be given, and it also provides that it shall be given in

Mr. CASGRAIN.

both English and French. I think, if the old form as used in England were adopted here, it would shock the ear of my hon. friend, because the Clerk of Parliament says: "*La reine le veult.*"

WOODSTOCK, N.B., POST OFFICE.

Mr. IRVINE enquired, Whether the Government have procured a site for Woodstock, N. B., Post Office? If so, when, from whom, and at what cost, and whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with its construction, and when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. The site has been procured for the Woodstock Post Office from Mr. David Monroe, at a cost of \$2,000. We are now negotiating for an additional piece of land, and when that has been obtained, it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of the building.

THE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Is it the intention of the Government this Session to make provision to utilize the mail service in the interests of the public, so as to include the carrying of small parcels which are now sent by express at great expense?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The subject is under the consideration of the Government at the present time.

THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, when is it the intention of the Government to bring down the measure relation to the Supreme Court as promised in the speech from the Throne?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has the intention of introducing a bill relating to the Supreme Court shortly, at a date early enough to allow the House and the hon. member to consider it, and I hope the hon. member will be able to give our measure the support of his vote.

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. IVES, in moving for copies of all representations made during the last twelve months by either of the sections of the Bar of the Province of Quebec, or members thereof, with reference to judicial appointments in that Province, said: The members of the Quebec Bar who reside in Montreal, or rather, perhaps, I should say, some of the members of that Bar, have taken a good deal of pains during the last few months to convince the people of the Dominion that pretty much all the legal business in the Province of Quebec is transacted in that city, and that by far the greater part of the legal ability and legal acumen of the Province is concentrated, and that the Judges of the Superior Court resident in Montreal are by far the most overworked men in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I, as a member of the Bar in a rural district, do not desire, and will not attempt, to derogate an iota from the magnificence of those pretensions; but I think it is only right, as I was not present during the discussion last Session in this House, and only just to the learned Judge who presides in the district of St. Francis, where I practice, to say that the whole of the legal business in the Province of Quebec is not done in Montreal, and that the Judges in Montreal, about whom we have heard so much, are not the most hard-worked Judges in the Province of Quebec. If we were to take the very statistics which were published by Mr. Pagnuelo, and which were quoted in the House during the debate last Session, and were to refer to the year 1879, we would find that those statistics, instead of

proving that the Judges in the district of Montreal did more work than any other Judges in the Province of Quebec, show that the Judge of the district of St. Francis did more work, although he receives \$1,000 less pay, than any one of the Judges in Montreal. If hon. members will take the return for 1879 they will find that in Montreal 860 contested cases were decided in the Superior Court. There were during that year at least seven Judges to do the work in Montreal. There was always one Judge from the country districts assisting the Montreal Judges; there were generally two and very often three. In fact, a very large part of Circuit Court work was done by outside Judges. If hon. members will take as a safe estimate seven Judges and divide the number of cases decided in that year by that number, they will find there was an average of 123 cases to each Judge; while in the district of St. Francis, 169 contested cases in the Superior Court were decided by the single Judge, which gives forty-six cases over the average for each Judge in the district of Montreal. In that year 2,358 Circuit Court cases were decided in the district of Montreal, which was an average of 322 cases for each Judge, while in the district of St. Francis nearly as large a number, namely, 281 were decided by the single Judge. But this was only a return for the district circuit, not for the six county circuits which are attended by the resident Judge in that district. Besides this work done by the Judge in the district of St. Francis, it should not be forgotten that he does the criminal business in that district; that he holds two sessions of the Court of Queen's Bench; that he also attends to six circuits, three terms each, in every year, and those circuits are situated at a distance from sixteen to forty miles from his place of residence; that he has, besides doing all the work in his district, to preside at proof sittings the last six days in every month at the *chef lieu*. I think I am justified in saying that he does more work than any one of those Judges in Montreal, about whom we heard so much last Session. But this agitation in Montreal by the members of the Montreal Bar, naturally affected the Attorney-General of Quebec, who is a member of the Montreal Bar, which culminated in a Bill passed at the last Session of the Quebec Legislature, providing for the appointment of an additional Judge to reside in the district of Montreal; and at the last Session of this Parliament a salary was provided for that Judge. Now, this was done notwithstanding the fact that one of the Montreal Judges, Judge Torrance, during the discussion in the Quebec Legislature, published an open letter over his own name in the *Law Journal* of Montreal, to the effect that the Judges of Montreal did not consider it advisable or necessary that an additional Judge should be appointed; and we must conclude that the Local Administration have come to the same conclusion, since they allowed nearly a year to elapse before issuing the proclamation which brought the Act into force, and the Dominion Government have not yet made the appointment. But the motion refers more particularly to representations made during the last twelve months with reference to this and other appointments. I do not know that such representations we are reported to have been made, have actually been made, but I think it is desirable that some declaration should be made by the Government, some return should be brought down, so as to set at rest the question whether such representations have been made or not. It was reported in the public press, shortly after the adjournment of Parliament, that a delegation supposed to represent the Montreal Bar, or rather the English portion of the Montreal Bar, came to Ottawa and urged upon the Government the appointment of an English-speaking lawyer as the seventh Judge, on the ground that Montreal was the commercial metropolis, and that their French Canadian *confreres*, though very able lawyers in other respects, were inferior to the English section as commercial lawyers. It is also reported that the French Canadian members of the

Quebec Bar, represented very strongly to the Government that the appointment belonged to them, on account of the preponderance of the French Canadian population in Quebec. But the most extraordinary representation of all is not a matter of surmise, but a matter of record. It is to be found in the *Legal News* of December last, in the shape of a report by the Montreal Bar, and reads as follows:--

"The nomination of a seventh Judge to the Superior Court of Montreal, and the changes suggested with a view of shortening the *enquêtes*, and putting an end to long *delibérés*, would render scarcely necessary, in the future, any assistance being given by *les juges étrangers*. When it will be necessary to have recourse to these Judges, we hope that the hon. Chief Justice will consult the Judges of Montreal and our *batonnier*, with the view of avoiding an invitation being given to these Judges who have not the confidence of the Bar of this district, particularly those whose presence at Montreal has given rise to very general complaint. In case this representation should not be regarded, it will be the duty of our *batonnier* to convoke, without delay, a new meeting of this Bar."

Now, you will observe that the last paragraph contains a very formidable threat, one which allows the fullest play to the imagination of those who are terrified by it. If these gentlemen of the Montreal Bar had plainly set forth what they intended to do after another meeting of the Bar had been called—whether they intended to declare a rebellion, or whether they intended to attempt to capture the Custom House, or St. Helen's Island, or to proceed to Ottawa with a view of seizing the Capitol—some measures might have been taken to protect the public interests against them. But they simply say, that if the Chief Justice will not consult them with reference to each of the country Judges whom he asks to go to Montreal to assist in the performance of the duties of the Montreal Judges, they will call a meeting of the Bar. You can imagine the terror this threat struck into the hearts of the stranger Judges who had been in the habit of coming to Montreal to assist the Montreal Judges in the performance of their duties. You can fancy what embarrassment it must have caused Chief Justice Meredith and the Montreal Judges, lest by some accident they might not always be fortunate enough to select a Judge who would be agreeable to these gentlemen, and we must suppose it caused the Government some uneasiness, particularly when that threat was emphasized by the placing at that time of infernal machines in and around the Court House at Montreal. I do not suppose any proof was forthcoming that it was the committee of which Mr. Pagnuelo was secretary that placed these infernal machines around the Court House, but the fact of their being there at that time was very mysterious, and looked very suspicious. I desire to add that it is reported more recently that after the lamented death of Judge Laframboise a deputation from the city of Quebec waited on the Government, and urged that the appointment of a successor belonged to the Quebec division of the Bar, for the reason forsooth that Gaspé is nearer to Quebec than it is to Montreal. While the district of St. Francis is the third district in importance in the Province of Quebec, it has not a representative on the Bench at all; and we must conclude the reason to be that there are no members of the Bar in that district qualified for the position. We do not ask for a representative because we are nearer to the vacancy than some other district. We believe that the Government should not consider political exigencies, questions of nationality, questions of residence or proximity, in the appointment of Judges in the Province of Quebec. We believe that the sole and only consideration in the selection of men for the performance of the duties of that high and responsible office should be fitness. We trust the Government will not be terrified by the threat contained in this report, that unless the wishes of these gentlemen in Montreal are acceded to, another meeting of the Montreal Bar will be convoked.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) moved for a return showing the names of all persons appointed to office, either in inside or outside service, since the 23rd day of February, 1880, the offices to which such persons were appointed, and the salary attached thereto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to this if the words "and the reason of such appointments" are inserted.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE CHARGEABLE TO CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Mr. ANGLIN, in the absence of Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, moved for a return in detail of the receipts and expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund, from 30th July, 1881, up to 10th February, 1882.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This motion, and the next, seem to be the same thing, with the exception that this is from the 30th July and the next from the 1st July.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am sorry that I am not prepared to explain what the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) intended by putting these two motions in the way he has done. The objection made by the hon. leader of the Government seems to be well founded, so far as I can see.

Mr. BLAKE. It is possible the intention was to obtain, first, the statement for the longer period, as that would be almost immediately obtained; then the second one for the subsequent period, from the 10th to the 20th of February, for which there might be some greater difficulty in obtaining. If the whole could be rapidly obtained, perhaps it might be better to combine them, and take it from the first date down to the 20th February.

Mr. ANGLIN. Perhaps it would be better that the two motions be combined, and that afterwards the hon. member for Centre Huron should have the right to point out to the Minister of Finance why he put these motions separately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then perhaps it would be better to have the second motion passed first.

Mr. MILLS. I remember a discussion took place across the House between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Centre Huron in reference to the motion, and I think the hon. Minister stated that the second motion was already in his possession. It is the ordinary ten days motion.

The second motion, covering the time from the 1st July, 1881, to 20th February, 1882, was agreed to.

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION FROM CAPE SABLE ISLAND.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) in moving for copies of all correspondence with the department of Public Works, or petitions addressed to the Minister, asking the Government to provide for telegraphic communication between Cape Sable Island and the mainland in the county of Shelburne, said: This is a matter of considerable importance to the people of my county. The hon. Minister of Public Works the other day, in replying to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Daly) stated: "that it was possible that this service would be provided for in the Estimates for this year." I believe the expenditure made by the Department of Public Works in connection with this service in the Maritime Provinces is one of the greatest boons ever conferred upon our fishing industries. I only hope it will go on until every light station is connected with existing telegraphic

Mr. Ives.

lines, or by the semaphores patented by Mr. Gisborne. I have looked over the expenditure under this head, and I find it is carried on very cheaply indeed. I believe that service is under the control of one of the ablest of men in that department of science on this continent. I am glad to have the assistance of my hon. friend from Halifax. I trust that in the enquiry he made the other day he was actuated by a desire solely to advance the interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and I hope the Government will be careful to bring down all the petitions addressed to the Minister. I also trust that the hon. member for Halifax was not actuated by a desire to advance the political interests of his friends to whom he refers in the question he has asked. I think, however, he will find that the petitions addressed to the Department by that gentleman are very meagre indeed. When this plan was proposed by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), I directed his attention to this matter, and Cape Sable light station was one of the stations fixed upon some years ago to be at an early date connected with the telegraph system of the Maritime Provinces. I hope I will have some opportunity of reciprocating the assistance which the hon. member for Halifax desired to render me in this service.

Mr. DALY. I have great pleasure in supporting this motion, and I do so in view of the fact that the production of these papers will show that the subject has not been lost sight of either by the people of the county of Shelburne or by the citizens of Halifax, which city I have the honor to represent in this House. The matter is not one of merely local importance to the county of Shelburne, but it is one relating to the interests of the whole Province of Nova Scotia; and I may go further, and state that it relates to the navigation of the high seas, and a telegraph communication once established between the Island of Cape Sable and the main land, will be a very great service in the future. We trust that no more unfortunate shipwrecks, such as have taken place upon that coast, will ever occur again. But should they occur on that coast the establishment of a line of telegraphic communication, such as now asked for, will be of great service. It will be found, I think, on the production of the papers referred to, that this scheme has been taken up by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), and has been pressed by him upon the attention of the Government. Petitions have emanated also from the local representative of the county of Shelburne, and these petitions have been endorsed by such names as S. Cunard & Co., Lloyd's agents in Halifax, and by the representatives of almost all the marine insurance companies in the county of Halifax. It is, therefore, Sir, with no such view as has been so kindly attributed to me by the mover of the motion, but simply with a view of advancing the public interests, that I asked the question I proposed the other day, and it is also for the purpose of showing that due credit should be given to the hon. gentlemen who have moved in this matter, and to whom the credit will redound if the desired result be attained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I had the honor, when Minister of Public Works, to submit the policy which is now under consideration for the first time to the House, I may be permitted, perhaps, to say a single word in reference to this question. I would not have done so were it not that the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) seems so very unwilling that any person should join him, or cooperate with him, or propose without his cooperation, anything which may indirectly benefit the county he represents. After the allusion which has been made to the Hon. Mr. White, the representative of the county of Shelburne in the Local Legislature, and a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, it is right that I should say that when I was in Halifax that gentleman waited upon me, and urged, in the strongest possible manner, the great import-

ance of carrying out this extension of the telegraph system to the Island of Cape Sable. On my return I laid the views he expressed before my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, and subsequently transmitted a communication from that gentleman, urging, in the strongest possible manner, that the work should be carried out. I think that, under these circumstances, the hon. member for Shelburne should not go out of his way to belittle the services of a gentleman who has done so much to advance the interests of his county.

Mr. KILLAM. I would like to enquire if it is the intention of the Government to carry out this project. I might say that, apart from the use which this line will be in cases of shipwreck and for the purpose of transmitting weather reports, it will not likely be so great an expense to the Government as many of the cables will be, because the population on Sable Island should now be sufficient to support a telegraph company itself and I fancy that, apart from the expense of laying a cable and putting a telegraph line across the island, the other expenses—that is the annual expenses—will be very light.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to bringing down this correspondence. I might say, in answer to the last speaker that it is the intention of the Government to extend the line.

Motion agreed to.

CASES IN THE MARITIME COURT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for a return showing the number of cases disposed of by the Judge and several Surrogate Judges of the Maritime Court since the creation of the said court, until the first day of February, 1882; showing the place where each of said cases was disposed of, the name of the plaintiff and defendant in each case, and of the vessel or property seized, the amount of each claim, the amount awarded and the final disposition of each case, whether by appeal or otherwise, the amount of costs taxed to the successful party, the amount of Marshall's fees, the amount received by each officer of the court in each case, the appraised value of the vessel or property seized, the amount sold for. He said: I believe a return of a similar character to the one asked for was brought down on the 8th of May, 1879, including a statement of the cases disposed of by the Maritime Court up to the 1st of May, 1879, but that report was a very imperfect one. It did not embrace the information which I seek to obtain by this motion. I wish to obtain fuller information on several points, and more especially in reference to the costs incurred in the disposal of cases in the Maritime Court, and the delays that usually take place in the investigation and trial of cases before that court. I recollect when this subject was before Parliament some years ago, the propriety of a Bill of this kind was pressed upon Parliament in the interest of sailors. It was supposed that sailors coming before this court would have a speedy means of collecting their wages. It was said that without some such measure the sailor was, to a large extent, at the mercy of the vessel owner when he was discharged at a port from which he did not ship, or discharged before the period of his engagement expired. He had to pursue his remedy by suit, although subsequently, I believe, an Act was passed empowering him to go before two magistrates, but this measure was found very imperfect in its operation. It was supposed when the present Act was passed that the sailor would have a speedy and inexpensive remedy in cases of small claims against vessel owners; but I am afraid that that object has not been fully realized; and that our anticipations respecting the working of the Act have been disappointed. The present law does not give a safe and expeditious mode of disposing of these cases;

and I know, as a matter of fact, that it affords an exceedingly expensive mode of proceeding, and that it is a very complicated piece of machinery. We have, first, the Statute itself, which is not a very long one though one of a considerable number of clauses; and, in addition, we have the rules of the court, 278 in number, all of which have the force of statutory provisions. In addition to all that, we have to issue the writ in the ordinary way, which is, of course, quite correct; then we have a statement of claims, then a defence, and then come the pleadings and replications and the demurrers and all the other machinery which is necessary for the purpose of putting this law in successful operation. It does appear to me that in cases where small collections have to be made, there should be a more expeditious and cheaper way of settling these disputes. Then, Sir, as to the question of costs, I am quite satisfied that if the Minister of Justice will examine the return which will be brought down in reply to this motion, he will be startled at the amount of costs incurred in the prosecution of cases under this law. I know of one case in which the amount in dispute was some \$300 or \$400, while the costs amounted to over \$1,000. In another case, the amount in dispute was the small sum of \$150, and the costs taxed to the successful party were \$352, besides the costs the defendant would have to pay. I know of another case in which the amount involved was \$110, and the costs on both sides were in the neighborhood of \$1,000. These are facts which, I think, the return will establish beyond controversy, and, if so, I think it will be the duty of the Minister of Justice to remedy so great a wrong, and to provide a cheaper and more expeditious mode of dealing with cases of this kind. I observe that the Government promise some legislation with reference to Vice-Admiralty jurisdiction. I do not know how far they propose dealing with the question of the Maritime Court, but I earnestly press upon the hon. the First Minister the necessity of some legislation in the direction of making the machinery of the court less complicated, and the expenses less than they are now. I know of no reason why cases involving \$100, or thereabouts, should not be disposed of in the same summary way as are cases in the Division Courts of the Province of Ontario, and at an expense not exceeding \$10 or \$20, including disbursements. Under the law as it stands, the Surrogate Judge has absolute and unrestricted power of allowing just what costs and fees he sees fit. I know of a case in which the amount involved did not exceed \$110, and in which counsel fees were allowed by the Judge to the extent of \$110. I say that it is an outrage and a scandal on the administration of justice, which, I trust, the Government will remedy without delay. I move for this return with the view of getting some information on the subject, and I wish, with the consent of the hon. the First Minister, to amend the motion by adding to it the words: "when the case was first instituted, and when finally disposed of."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to this motion. The Act has not been long in existence, and there cannot be many cases, I fancy, such as the hon. gentleman mentions. I have not heard of any complaints, and no complaints that I am aware of have been laid before the Government of the working of the Act or the proceedings under the Act. But I am quite willing that the hon. gentleman should have the return.

Mr. BLAKE. I fear there is only too much foundation for what my hon. friend has stated. Some time ago similar complaints were made, and I believe some remedy was applied in some of the smaller cases. The Act was framed with the view of giving the greatest measure of flexibility in the proceedings, so that the lessons of experience might not be lost; and with that view it was thought proper to submit the mode of procedure and the rules made by the Judge to the Governor in Council. What has happened is, therefore, not

attributable to the Act, but to the mode in which the provisions of the Act have been worked. I am not now objecting to the original rules or the original tariff, neither of which I have seen; but I think it is very natural that they should have been framed in a manner which subsequent experience might prove was imperfect. But I think it is very much to be regretted that small claims, such as those of which my hon. friend has spoken, should continue to be tried, as I know they have been tried, by a procedure quite too cumbrous and expensive for the claim. I agree altogether in his view, that for those claims which do not exceed, at any rate, \$100, we ought to have the very cheapest and simplest form possible, something analogous to our Division Court form; and beyond that there ought to be a very low scale of costs, if not a fixed scale. These are cases which have always been deemed the subject of expeditious decision, in consequence of the needs and circumstances surrounding sailors, who cannot wait long at one port without danger of losing their season's voyage. It is, therefore, I think of the last consequence that an enquiry should be made, not into the Act, but into the rules and regulations and the tariff adopted under the Act, which may have gone very far to interfere with its operation, which but for them would be a great blessing, and which, in cases involving larger sums, has been found of great advantage.

Motion agreed to.

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving that it is expedient to discontinue the arrangements for keeping female convicts at Dorchester Penitentiary, and to provide for their transfer to Kingston, as is done in the case of the Quebec female convicts, said: When the estimates for Dorchester Penitentiary were before the House, on the occasion of the inauguration of that institution, I ventured to point out that it was an impolitic and expensive thing to provide for a female prison there. It was obvious, from the experience we had already had of the number of female relative to male convicts, that there would not be enough prisoners to render it fitting to have a separate staff. In the case of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary it was resolved not to have any female branch, but to send the female prisoners to Kingston; and unless extraordinary circumstances arose, there would still be a fewer number among the population of 800,000 people who inhabit the Maritime Provinces than there are among the population of Quebec, which is about half as large again. However, the Government decided that they were restricted by the plan which they had chalked out, and that they would organize the institution with the necessary apparatus for keeping female convicts there. I observe by the returns in the report of the Penitentiaries from the office of the Minister of Justice, that the matron and deputy-matron had nothing at all to do for some months after they got there; that then there were transferred two female convicts and one short-term prisoner—how they came to be transferred from Halifax to Dorchester I do not know—that two were discharged, and one convict was brought from St. John on the 14th January, leaving, on the 30th June, two convicts for the matron and deputy-matron to look after. In the larger institution of Kingston, receiving, as I have said, female convicts from the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, with a population by the Census of over three millions and a quarter, or about four times the population of the Maritime Provinces, the number of female convicts on the 1st July, 1880, was twenty-one; on the 30th June last it was but twenty-four, making an average of about twenty-two. For that branch of the institution there is a matron, deputy-matron, and assistant matron, who certainly would form a quite sufficient staff to take care also of the two convicts who now receive the sole benefit of the matron and deputy-matron at St. John. The extra expenditure occasioned by

Mr. BLAKE.

the transfer from St. John to Kingston would be merely the railway travel of the necessary guard attending the prisoner, and that expense, as far as Quebec, would be *nil*, as they would pass over a Government railway, and therefore we would have only to deal with the railway fare from Quebec to Kingston. Against that amount is to be set the fact that \$500, salary of matron, and \$300, salary of deputy-matron, are sums paid regularly at Dorchester, besides which, if I am rightly informed, those officials have free house, light, and fuel; and besides that, there is, of course, a certain portion of the penitentiary which, though now set apart for female convicts, is wanted for male convicts. I think, therefore, that all considerations of economy indicate that this change ought to be made; the salaries alone are \$800, and the extra payments, allowance and use of apartments may fairly be placed at \$700 or \$800 more, making an extra cost to the country of about \$1,500 for keeping two convicts in one place rather than in another. I believe, further, that there will be a better opportunity for the exercise of proper discipline and greater variety of employment, and of reformatory and penitentiary influences, where there are some twenty or twenty-five persons under a more organized system, than is possible to obtain in an institution where there are but two convicts. It is for these reasons I move the resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentlemen has said on this subject, but the Government is not prepared at this moment to accept this resolution. Parliament has provided a penitentiary system for the Maritime Provinces, and the subject was discussed before and oft, that there should be a female prison as well as a male prison there. The House is aware that before the Penitentiaries were united there was a matron for the New Brunswick institution and another for the Nova Scotia institution, and that, for purposes of economy, the two prisons were united, making the Penitentiary of Dorchester the convict prison for the two Provinces. The parties are now appointed and hold office, and proper notice must be given them before they could be dismissed. I take it that the hon. gentleman having brought the matter before the House and expressed his views on it, has no intention of pressing it. The Government will take the matter into consideration; they are not, however, prepared, under the circumstances, to accede to his motion at present, and I hope he will not press it.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid I could not carry it.

Motion negatived on a division.

GRINDING IN BOND.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council and regulations, on the subject of grinding in bond; a statement of all bonds given under the regulations with dates and names; a statement of the action thereon, and of the present condition of things in respect of each such bond; a statement in detail of the duties paid under or other satisfaction of each such bond, with the dates of payment or satisfaction; copies of all correspondence with, and demands made by Government on each person who has given such bonds; copies of instructions given to inspectors or other departmental officers, to investigate matters connected with grinding in bond, and of correspondence with, and reports from them; a list of the cases so far as ascertained in which wheat belonging to others has been improperly exported in the name of a grinder in bond to evade the duty, and in which wheat has been sold by a grinder in bond a trifle under market rates, on condition that it should be improperly credited in the export to the seller in order to evade the duty, and all correspondence and Governmental action thereon. He said: As far as I can understand the position of the question, it is this: it was disputed across the House

whether the regulations which were made by the Government for grinding in bond restricted, as I understand the Government alleged it was their intention they should restrict, the grinder in bond to export the identical wheat he had imported, after being manufactured into flour. I think I recollect a discussion in which the hon. the Minister of Customs alleged that in the view of the Government such was the meaning and intent of the former regulations; but not long after, if I rightly understand the question, there was a change made in the regulations to make more definitive, as I suppose, that portion, and make it clearer than it was under the old regulations, that it was the specific product of the imported wheat, the export of which was to satisfy the condition of the bond. My attention has been called to the practical operation, as far as the public can ascertain it, and as far as the course of trade has permitted it to be made known, of those regulations of late days. I have received letters from persons interested in the trade which indicate a state of things I think deserving some explanation. [The hon. gentleman here read extracts from a private letter intimating that Canadian wheat was shipped by some parties to cover wheat imported in bond, thus escaping payment of the duties.] The circumstances, I contend, amply warrant my making this motion.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down such information as we have in the Department, but I would suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition that he leave out those words "So far as ascertained," because they imply what is not a fact. The motion asks for a list of cases, "so far as ascertained," of the wheat belonging to others which has been improperly exported. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman and the House that nothing of the kind has been ascertained. If he will substitute the words "if any" for the words objected to, I have no objection to the passing of the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly. Substitute those words.

Mr. BOWELL. I may, for the hon. gentleman's information, say he is not quite correct in his view of the position taken by the Government last Session, when this question was under discussion. At that time the Order in Council which had been first passed regulating the grinding of wheat in bond and the shipment of flour contained the words: "or the equivalent of such wheat." The House will recollect that when the Tariff was under discussion and a duty imposed on wheat and flour, it was argued that the shipment of flour to an equivalent of wheat which might be imported, would answer the purposes then contemplated. But after experience, the Government decided, in order to make the duty what it was intended to be, a protective duty, the actual product of the imported wheat in flour should be shipped instead of an equivalent. That is the point to which the letter that the hon. gentleman has read, refers. In reference to bonds, we can understand, and any merchant will easily understand, that when goods are placed in bond, a certain time is allowed for the release of those bonds; and in the case of a bond for grinding purposes, a longer period is allowed than in the case of ordinary merchandise, because ordinary merchandise in bond pays the duty as soon as it is taken out for consumption. The mill or the warehouse into which the wheat is put, must, of necessity, be declared a bonding warehouse, in order that the grain may be ground and made up into flour, and sufficient time must be allowed the miller to do that. Then, at the expiration of the bond, the miller's duty is to account for the wheat which has been placed in his mill, by paying the duty, or producing certificates of exportation of the product of that wheat. If the flour has been put upon the market, as indicated in the letter which the hon. gentleman has just read, it must have been placed on the market between the time the wheat was put into the mill and the

expiration of the bond. The duty of Customs officers is, at certain periods, to investigate these bonds, and see whether the miller has the wheat in the mill at the time of their expiration. If he has not, he must account for it by producing certificates that an exportation of its product in flour has taken place, or pay the duty on it. It is true that the Department have had their officers looking into this matter. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, knows that there are Inspectors of bonds on all goods, and my attention having been drawn to this matter, I made it the special duty of the different officers to investigate it. I will be quite prepared to bring down the statements asked for by the hon. gentleman; but I question very much whether the statement made in that letter, and the inference drawn from it by the leader of the Opposition, will prove to be correct. I assure the House that the insinuations made in that letter, that certain privileges were given to millers supporting the Government, have no foundation in fact, I might use a stronger word, but will refrain from doing so. I might also add that in this particular, to which so much attention has been drawn by the Opposition press, I have been very careful that no concession should be made to any one class of people more than another. I challenge any hon. member to point out a single instance, either in the administration of this particular part of my duty, or of any other, in which advantage has been given to one importer over another. In the administration of the Customs Department, so far as regards either the grinding of wheat in bond, the imposition of fines or seizures, or any other matter affecting the collection of revenue, every man, whatever may be his political complexion, has been treated alike. The only irregularity that I have heard of in connection with the subject-matter of this motion, was one in the western section of the country. This slight irregularity—because I think it was nothing more—occurred on the Welland Canal; but from the high standing and reputation of the gentlemen I cannot believe, for a moment, that they had the slightest intention of defrauding the revenue. The moment the officer called their attention to it they at once paid over all that was remaining unpaid.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). While no one would be disposed, I suppose, to believe that there had been instances in which the Government had favored certain mills, the leader of the Opposition, is certainly warranted in bringing this matter to the attention of the Government. It must strike the hon. the Minister of Customs that, so long as we have such an anomaly in the Tariff as we have with reference to the wheat and flour duties, the question will arise, whether it is well grounded or not. It is certainly an anomalous state of the tariff to have a duty imposed on raw material of 15 cents a bushel, and a duty of only 50 cents a barrel on flour, when it requires only $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour, thus discriminating against the manufacturer and the miller to the extent of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on every barrel of flour he makes. When people find strong baker's flour put in the market at a lower figure than they are themselves able to put it in, I say they are justified in suspicions with reference to these two items.

Mr. BOWELL. They would be if the fact existed that no duty had been paid upon wheat or flour.

Motion agreed to.

COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all correspondence and Orders in Council with relation to the tenure of office of the County Court Judges in any of the Provinces; of all Local Statutory Provisions bearing on the subject; of any Commissions of Enquiry issued with regard to any County Court Judge, and the instructions accompanying the same,

and a statement of the action thereon; copy of any judgment of any Court upon any application for prohibition in connection therewith, he said: I observe, in the Speech from the Throne, that we are promised legislation on this subject, and think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is expedient we should be put in position of the facts related in this motion.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN MANITOBA.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for correspondence with reference to any Commission issued by the Local Government of Manitoba affecting the mode of administering justice in that Province, copy of such Commission and of the proceedings thereunder, said: This motion is based upon information which has reached me by the ordinary sources of information, the public prints, with reference to a Commission and proceedings that have recently taken place in Manitoba, and which, I think, at any rate, are of very serious import to this House and the country at large. No doubt the administration of justice and the constitution, maintenance, and organization of the courts are vested with the Local Legislatures, and no doubt, therefore, there are cases in which Local Governments and Local Legislatures may well inform themselves as to the way in which legislation on this subject is making, with a view to the amendment of the laws which may need to be made; but, if the public prints are correct, to proceed in the way they have been doing in this case, seems to me highly objectionable. I do not, of course, know the exact tenure of the Commission which issued lately, but the papers show that under it an enquiry was entered into as to the mode in which a particular Judge was exercising his functions apparently with the object of ascertaining whether he was discharging his duties rightly or wrongly, and whether he was guilty of improper behavior in the exercise of his functions. That was a Judge of the Supreme Court of Manitoba. Now, while I have never regarded as otherwise than anomalous the provision in the Constitutional Act upon the subject of judgeships, I think it is equally clear that so long as a Judge of the Superior Court is appointed under our Constitution, and holds his office on a tenure of good behavior, removable only upon an Address from the Senate and the Commons, I hold it to be of the highest consequence that, while we should keep this great inquisition open to all subjects of Her Majesty, for all well grounded complaints, and take care that they are duly enquired into, we should not permit Judges who hold their position by that tenure to be exposed to other inquisitions, which cannot possibly be effective in removing them from their office, and which must have a tendency to degrade, and to impair the dignity of the office itself. It seems to me that the Commissions which Local Governments issue under cover of their powers, as to the administration of justice, ought to be Commissions directed to the question of how their laws work, but not to the question of how Judges appointed by this central authority, and responsible to the Houses of Parliament, are discharging their functions. It is with a view to this subject being brought under the consideration of the House and the Government, that I make this motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope my hon. friend will not be attacked for that attack on state rights involved in his motion. However, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in the distinction that he has drawn. The Judges of the Superior Court, appointed by the Crown on the advice of the Ministry here, can only be removed by a Joint Address of the Senate and House of Commons, and any Commission issued in any Province—any colorable Commission, really for the sake of attacking a Judge and affecting his position—is altogether an improper proceeding and a direct violation

Mr. BLAKE.

of the terms of the Constitutional Act. The administration of justice rests with the Local Government; and if they, with a *bona fide* intention of ascertaining the working of the law, or any particular branch of it, either in the principle of the law, or in the practice of it, issue a Commission, it may be that the result of that Commission and the report may indirectly affect the position, character, and standing of a Judge. That cannot be helped—that frequently must occur; and any enquiries, to be effectual, may involve the necessity of impugning the conduct of a Judge in the particular subject referred to the Commission. But it is clear that a petition to issue with the object of attacking a Judge is altogether improper, unconstitutional and illegal, and the central authority here ought to take notice of it. I think, however, my hon. friend was quite right in making his motion. I am not able to say if there has been any correspondence in the matter, but I think it most probable that any report made by the Commission he speaks of, has been communicated to the Department of Justice. All the papers connected with the matter will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved, that it is desirable that a report should be presented to this House, within ten days from the opening of each Session, giving full information on all subjects affecting the Canadian Pacific Railway up to the latest date, and particularly all details as to: 1. The selection of the route. 2. The progress of the work. 3. The selection or reservation of land. 4. The payment of moneys. 5. The laying out of branches. 6. The progress thereon. 7. The rates of toll for passengers and freight. 8. The particulars required by the Consolidated Railway Act and amendments thereto, up to the end of the previous fiscal year. 9. Like particulars up to the latest practicable date before the presentation of the return. 10. Copies of all Orders in Council and of all correspondence between the Government and the Railway Company, or any member or officer of either, relating to the affairs of the Company. He said: It seems to me, Sir, it will commend itself to both sides of the House as reasonable that there should be presented to us in consecutive, distinct and intelligible narrative, from full particulars of the transactions with the Company and all the events which have occurred up to the time of the Session in each year. We have already passed, with the assent of the Administration, a large number of motions calling for information on this subject, and some more are yet to come. This information will come down at various intervals during the Session, and perhaps, in some instances, full information cannot be obtained owing to oversights which sometimes occur in Departments. Further information will be required, but it will be difficult from the conjuncture of them to obtain, even at a late period of the Session, an intelligible view of the whole situation, as it has been changed by events which have happened during the recess. Nor in the public documents which are subsequently printed, will it, according to our custom, be possible to get it, because these returns are printed in the order in which they pass the House, and we will have to search over various numbers of Sessional Papers in order to collect together in proper shape a history of the whole. Some of these transactions may also bear upon others, and it is in that view desirable that they should all appear. Beyond that it is not possible for those, not possessed of the confidential information which the Government as the negotiating party on one side have, to anticipate or even to elicit in all cases all that has taken place. There are one or two cases to which I might allude as indicating, perhaps, in the report which has just now been given to us, the necessity for this motion. Take, for example, the report of Mr. Schreiber, dated the 1st of November, 1881, in which

he tells us that "Engineers have been employed in locating a branch line from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Sault St. Marie, a distance of about 200 miles, sixty miles of which is now under construction." Now, if we are to believe the statement made under the signature of the Company's Secretary in the public prints, that is not at present an accurate statement of the situation. So far as the Company has been informed, that which was to have been a branch is now in large part a main line; and if the sixty miles under construction be the sixty miles close to the shore—being part of the main line—the branch is to be but sixty miles long. I might refer to other parts of the report in which the meagreness of the information—if I may be allowed the expression—and some other characteristics of it, seem to render it necessary that we should have a fuller statement. We are dealing in this respect with a gigantic contract—an enormous concern which, in its financial aspect, and in all the other aspects which belong to it, is of an entirely exceptional character, and, it seems to me that it deserves that exceptional treatment which I take the liberty of suggesting for it. I do not bring forward this motion with the view of reflecting, even by implication, on the Government for not having taken the course which I venture to indicate, but I submit to the House and to the Administration that it is a reasonable course to be taken; that it would conduce to the public advantage and to our intelligible discussion of all the matters connected with the Pacific Railway; that for the next five years, during which such rapid progress is to be made in that concern, during which such important points are to be settled, as, for example, those with reference to the selection of the lands, those with reference to the selection of the route, those with reference to tolls—which are constantly coming up during the recess—I say I submit, as the necessary corollary from the enormous administrative and executive power which we have granted to the Government of the day, that we should have exceptional facilities for a full report, and for that intelligible discussion which I am sure we all desire.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no objection to the passage of this motion. I would suggest, however, to the hon. gentleman to insert twenty days instead of ten days. This would give an opportunity of making the return more complete and probably more satisfactory to Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) suggests that we should split the difference, and make it fifteen days, as it is in other cases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well. I would say, while on my feet, that the hon. gentleman is quite mistaken when he speaks of the inaccuracy of Mr. Schreiber's report. Mr. Schreiber's report is strictly accurate.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. I did not state that Mr. Schreiber's report is inaccurate. It is dated the 1st of November, and quite possibly represents the condition of affairs to that date; but the information he gives may not represent the present condition of affairs exactly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. It does represent the present condition of affairs, because no such change has taken place as that to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Motion agreed to.

PIER AT ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. KILLAM, in moving for copies of all correspondence relating to the construction of the Acadia Steamship Company's pier, at Annapolis, and of any estimates or reports of the cost of that work, said: I make this motion with the object of assisting the company, and partly by request.

I understood that a promise was made last year to the hon. member for Annapolis that the sum of \$15,000 would be given for the construction of a wharf at that place. If so, the Government should be in possession of plans of the work, and I suppose the construction has to some extent been under the direction of their engineer. At all events, I have seen the work, and it is probably a justifiable expenditure, and will be of great use to that port and the trade of the country. The question, of course, arises which of such work are private and local matters, and which of public importance, and it is necessary for us, when discussing these matters in Committee of Supply, to have every information possible before us concerning them; and if the hon. Minister will be kind enough to furnish the information asked for in this motion, it will enable us to discuss the question more intelligently.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not understand exactly whether the hon. gentleman means to imply that this is a work of a local nature which should not be helped by this Government.

Mr. KILLAM. I said that when subjects of that kind came up in Committee of Supply, some information was necessary to enable us to find out whether a work for which money was voted was of local or Dominion character. This work, I think, may be properly entitled to receive aid from the Dominion, as many other cases of this kind, and I thought the Government, before promising the money, must have taken some steps to ascertain that fact.

Motion agreed to.

MARRIAGES IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copy of opinion or judgment of Mr. Justice Jette, in a recent case affecting the validity of a marriage in the Province of Quebec, in which certain questions were referred to an ecclesiastical authority, said: As we have a Bill before us in the name of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, on which this question came under discussion the last time that Bill was before the House, I think it is important that we should have this judicial decision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the Government or the House has the power to order the Judge to furnish a copy of his judgment.

Mr. BLAKE. We have constantly asked for public documents which are difficult to obtain. This document either has been, or will be, made public by publication in the newspapers, and all we want is an authenticated copy of it.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BRANCH LANDS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of any maps and plans of branch lines of railway, deposited by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the Department of Railways, with the date of each such deposit; copies of any prospectus, statement or advertisement issued by the Company in connection with the sale of their land grant bonds, and of the form of bond and of the mortgage securing the same; copies of any regulations or conditions from time to time made by the Company as to the sales of their lands, and of the forms of contract from time to time in use in respect of such sales; copies of any correspondence, and information as to the construction, maintenance and working, or acquisition, by purchase, lease or otherwise, of any lines of telegraph or telephone by the Company; copies of all papers affecting the amalgamation with the Company, or the purchase, lease, or other acquisition by the Company or any other railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The motion asks for two classes of documents, some of which are in the possession of the Government, others are not. All we can do is to bring

down the documents in our possession and endeavor to obtain such further information as we do not possess.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY WORK BETWEEN SAVONA'S FERRY AND PORT MOODY.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of advertisements, specifications, conditions, tenders, correspondence, Orders in Council, and all other papers relative to the letting of the railway work between Savona's Ferry and Port Moody, British Columbia, said: I am not aware whether a formal contract has yet been signed in connection with this work; I, therefore, have included it, though it may not be necessary, because I presume it will be laid on the Table of the House. I have asked for those things which it is proper to ask for, even in advance of the execution of the contract, and which I hope, therefore, will be brought down at an early day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he does not mean Emory's Bar and Port Moody, because all other correspondence relating to the contract has been brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. Emory's Bar, of course.

Motion agreed to.

VOLUNTEER DISCIPLINE.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for copies of all reports from General Luard, and from any other officer or court of enquiry, relative to matters connected with the command or discipline observed in the 27th Battalion of Volunteer Militia; and also of any departmental order made in relation to the same, and copies of all complaints or representation from any officer of the said battalion, or other correspondence.

Mr. CARON. I must state that it is quite unusual that any papers having reference to matters of discipline should be brought down and laid on the Table. However, under the circumstances, I have no objection that these be brought down, and they will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As the hon. gentleman has consented to bring down the papers, I shall not at present make the remarks I intended to offer. The matter is so serious as to require the attention of the House, and no mere usage of any sort will prevent us discussing intelligently the condition of the volunteer force.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. ANGLIN moved for a return showing what number of locomotives, passenger, freight, and coal cars, and other rolling stock were purchased or contracted for or built at the Government workshops during the year ending December 31st, 1881, distinguishing those that were purchased, those that were obtained under contract, and those that were built in the Government workshops, and showing how, in each case, the locomotives, cars and other stock purchased were purchased, whether by tender or by private arrangement with the Department of Railways and Canals, or through an agent; if by tender, whether tenders were invited by public advertisement or by circular; if by circular, to what parties or firms such circulars were addressed, and where the persons to whom they were addressed reside or do business; if through an agent or agents, the name or names of such agent or agents, and the amount of commission paid in each case; whether any locomotives or other rolling stock, purchased elsewhere than in Canada, paid Customs duties; the class, diameter, size and power of each locomotive purchased, and the price paid for each, the amount of Customs duties paid on each, and all the charges adding to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the cost; how tenders for any locomotives, cars, or other rolling stock contracted for were invited in each case, if by circular, the names and descriptions of the persons or firms to whom they were addressed, and a copy of the circular; the prices paid for any locomotives, cars, or other rolling stock obtained under such contract, or to be paid for such locomotives or other rolling stock as had not been delivered on December 31st, 1881; whether if, in any case, such locomotives or other rolling stock were built or are to be built out of Canada, the contractors paid or are to pay duties of customs on such rolling stock, and all other charges up to the time of delivery on any road in Canada belonging to the Government; the size, power and character of each locomotive delivered or to be delivered under any contract; the names, descriptions and place of business of all persons or firms from whom locomotives or other rolling stock were purchased, or with whom contracts for locomotives or other rolling stock were made, and the names of places or establishments in which the rolling stock purchased or contracted for were built or are to be built. He said: I do not know that we have any right to object that the works of the Province of Quebec have been used for a purpose of this kind; but we cannot forget that the Dominion Government has very large works at Moncton, which, I believe, are not fully occupied, and if an arrangement of that kind were made, an opportunity of that kind should be afforded to mechanics and contractors throughout the Dominion to build those cars at Moncton if they chose to do so, obtaining the same facilities in the Dominion Government workshops there that are said to have been afforded in the workshops of the Province of Quebec. With respect to all these matters the reports are entirely silent. Going through the Public Accounts carefully I could not find there anything that would afford the information to which I think this House and the country are fully entitled upon all these points. I do not at all insinuate that there is any intention to suppress any information, but there is certainly incorrect information in these reports which it would be well to have corrected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will say, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that no time shall be lost in bringing down all the information that is sought for in this paper; but as he has chosen to make a few remarks in introducing this resolution, I am glad to be able to relieve his mind at once upon two or three important points. In the first place, no rolling stock has been obtained by private arrangement with the Department; no rolling stock has been purchased except by Orders in Council, stating all the facts relating to it. Secondly, no agent has been employed, and, consequently, no commissions have been paid to any person. In the third place, I may say that no rolling stock has been obtained out of Canada that could be obtained in it. I think it is right that I should state that no time will be lost in giving the hon. gentleman the information. I am glad he concluded his remarks by saying that he did not wish to insinuate that there was any desire to suppress information, because I think he will find the report is quite as full in relation to all these matters as has been customary under previous Administrations. It is quite impossible, in a report of this kind, to answer every possible anticipation, and to deal with it in the voluminous manner we otherwise would in dealing with a subject presented to the consideration of this House.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

Return showing the number of claims referred to the Official Arbitrators from the 30th June, 1880, to the 1st day of February, 1882, the name of each claimant, the nature of

the claim, when referred, when decided, the amount claimed, the amount recommended to be paid or the amount awarded, the final disposition of each case, if appealed, the final result, showing which, if any, of the claims formed the subject of an action or petition of right, the amount of costs paid the claimant in each case, the amount of costs paid on account of professional services rendered on behalf of the Government in each case, and to whom and when such costs were paid.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Statement (1) of number of persons entering Manitoba and the North-West Territories, during the calendar year 1881. (2) Of the number entering Manitoba and the North-West Territories from each Province of the Dominion separately, and from each other country separately. (3) Of the number estimated as having settled in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, from each Province and country, during the year 1881. (4) Copies of the data and calculations on which the foregoing statements are based. (5) Copy of instructions issued, or requests made, by any Department of the Government, with a view to the ascertainment of information on the foregoing subjects. (6) Copy of correspondence thereon, including any returns made by railway companies or others. (7) Statement of all information in the possession of the Government throwing light upon the subject.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the number, nature and cause of the several seizures made at the different ports of entry of the Dominion, from the 30th day of June, 1881, to the 1st day of January, 1882, and the amount of fines exacted in each case disposed of.—(Mr. Killam.)

Return showing the Customs receipts for the last six months of 1879, 1880 and 1881, respectively.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

Copies of all reports made by Frank Shanly, on claims made by contractors or others on the Intercolonial, with a statement showing the nature of the claim and the amount claimed in each case; also a statement showing what action, if any, has been taken by the Department of Railways and Canals or by the Privy Council on any of such claims or reports.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Copies of all correspondence and Orders in Council between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any director or officer thereof, relating to the Company or its affairs.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return giving a summary statement for the six months, ending December 31st, 1881, of the quantity and value of the exports for each Province, as well as for the Dominion, of the produce of the mine, of the fisheries, of the forest, of animals and their produce, of agricultural products, and of manufactures, specifying in each case what is the produce of Canada, and what is not the produce of Canada, and a recapitulation of the same. Also, a summary statement of the quantity and value of the total imports of the same list of articles during the same period. A summary statement of the imports entered for consumption of the same list of articles and quantity, value, and duty, during the same period, and a recapitulation of the same.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Statement showing the number of registered letters which were lost during the year 1881, also stating the amount of money, the names of the postmasters where such letters were mailed, and the names of the postmasters where such letters were addressed to; also giving all the information obtained at the investigation held on the said subject.—(Mr. Coughlin.)

Statement in detail of the sums already expended in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, and an estimate in detail of the probable further expenditure; copy of all correspondence, contracts or arrangements as to the printing of evidence or report; statement of the name and residence of the person with whom the contract was made, and the price; statement of the name and residence of the person by whom the work was actually done.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all reports of engineers and correspondence respecting the lowering of the present level of the water in Lake Manitoba.—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports, correspondence and documents relating to the relieving of Messrs. Hunter, Murray & Co., from their contract in connection with the Welland Canal, with a detailed statement of accounts as between them and the Government in respect to the contract and the settlement thereof; and copies of valuation of the material on hand, and a statement of the price at which the same was taken over by the Government on the settlement with Messrs. Hunter, Murray & Co. Also, copies of advertisements for tenders for the works on Section 27 of the Welland Canal, or for copies of circulars issued to any parties asking for tenders for such work, with the names of all parties to whom such circulars or letters were sent; also, for copies of Orders in Council relating to the issuance of such circulars or letters, and the awarding of said contract; also, copies of all tenders and of all correspondence with the Department relating to the same.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 21st February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved:

That when this House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 27) further to amend the Act incorporating the Mutual Life Association of Canada, and to change the name thereof to "The Life Association of Canada."—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the charter of the Chartered Bank of London and North America, and to change the name thereof to "The Chartered Bank of London and Winnipeg."—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the North-Western Bank.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Bill (No. 30) to empower the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company to wind up their affairs, and to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the dissolution of the said Company.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Clements Steamship Company, limited.—(Mr. Wade.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Quebec Timber Company, limited.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Mutual Benefit Association of Sherbrooke.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 34) to amend and consolidate the Act of incorporation of the British North America Insurance Company, and all other Acts affecting the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 35) for amending the Acts relating to the "Trust and Loan Company of Canada," and for enlarging the powers of the said Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DREW moved that the time for presenting petitions for Private Bills, be extended to Wednesday, the 15th day of March next.

Motion agreed to.

MILLS AND FACTORIES COMMISSION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented to the House the Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the working of Mills and Factories of the Dominion, and the labor employed therein.

THE ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General;

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LORNE,

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1883; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 21st February, 1882.

Ordered that the said Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY stated that the Supplementary Estimates for the current year would be submitted on Thursday next.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. POPE (Compton) presented to the House the Report of the Minister of Agriculture, in relation to the Census Taking, also Manual, containing "The Census Act," and the instructions to officers employed in the taking of the Second Census of Canada, 1881.

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has been the custom, though not required by the rules of Parliament, to take a vote before we go into Committee of Ways and Means, and as we have followed this practice since 1874, I desire to move one vote, the second resolution.

The House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

2. Governor General's Secretary's office. \$11,200

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

DRAWBACKS ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT.

Mr. PATERSON (South Brant) moved for a return of all claims presented for drawbacks on goods manufactured for export since January 22nd, 1881, showing the names of all applicants, their place of business, the articles on which the drawback was claimed and the amount of each claim, distinguishing between the claims which have been allowed and those which have been disallowed and those under consideration and not yet decided, and giving the reason for such disallowance; also copies of all regulations made by the Department with reference to such claims. He said: In introducing this motion, I think it well to bring before the House certain facts which are to be learned from the Trade Returns which have been placed in our hands by the hon. the Minister of Customs. It will be in the recollection of the House, I dare say, that last

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

year I made a motion similar to this. I move this year in the same direction, because the evil I complained of at that time has not been remedied, and the evil results, in a measure, flowing from the want of that remedy being applied has gone on and has been increased and intensified. The Commissioner of Customs, in making his reports to the Minister, says:

"That he has the honor to lay before him returns which will be found, on examination, to present many features of a highly encouraging nature to all parties interested in the commercial prosperity of the Dominion.

"The first item worthy of special notice is the increase of the export trade. The highest figure reached in this department of commerce since 1868, was in 1873, when the total exports were valued at \$89,789,922, but in the last year, 1881, the amount of the same, as shown in these returns, is \$98,290,823, being an increase over 1873 of \$8,500,901; and over 1880 of \$10,379,365. This increase is wholly in the trade with Great Britain, and is principally composed of Canadian produce and manufactures."

I have looked, Mr. Speaker, into this statement in the light of the figures furnished by the Minister himself, and I have been totally unable to verify the statement there made, either in regard to the increase being wholly in the trade with Great Britain, or in regard to the other fact stated that the increase is principally composed of the produce and manufactures of this country. Now, Sir, with respect to the first item, which does not concern my question so much, but to which it is well to allude, because it shows hon. members that we may not receive with implicit confidence the deductions made by the Commissioner, that is if my figures are correct. I find, with respect to the total increase in the export trade having taken place wholly with Great Britain, these facts: I find we exported to the United States of the products of the fisheries this year, \$2,241,585; that last year, 1880, we only exported to the United States \$1,738,870, or in other words an increase of \$502,715. The products of the forest we exported to the United States, in 1881, to the value of \$8,349,844; in 1880, only \$6,352,418, or an increase of \$1,817,426. In agricultural products we exported to the United States, in 1881, \$10,631,374 worth; in 1880, \$8,086,795, or \$2,544,579 more in 1881 than in 1880. In manufactured goods we exported to the United States, in 1881, \$1,310,557, and in 1880, \$1,283,342, or \$27,215 more in 1881 than in 1880. Putting these four items together, we find that our export trade with the United States increased in 1881 over 1880, \$4,891,935. Yet the Commissioner tells us and the hon. Minister of Customs, by receiving that report and dedicating it to His Excellency, has told us and the country that the total increase of ten million dollars odd of our exports in 1881 over those of 1880 has taken place wholly in our trade with Great Britain. We contest the accuracy of that statement by another table which the hon. gentleman has given us. In 1881, the total exports of the products of Canada—and that is what really concerns us; we are not concerned in what is merely passing through—

Mr. McCALLUM. Yes, we are.

Mr. PATERSON. If you take it on that basis you will find that the statement of the hon. Minister is equally not borne out by the facts. But I did not work up that table, because it is not pertinent to the question. What we are interested in is what we produce. Taking that table, we find that, in 1881, the total exports of the products of Canada to Great Britain were \$42,637,219, and, in 1880, \$35,208,031; an increase in 1881 over 1880 of \$7,479,188. Yet the hon. Minister says the whole ten million dollars odd of increase in products exported is due to our trade with Great Britain. In 1881, the total exports of the products of Canada to the United States were \$31,015,109; in 1880, \$26,762,705, or an increase of \$4,252,404 in 1881 over 1880; still the hon. Minister tells us, through the Commissioners' report, that this increase, in 1881 over 1880, of \$10,739,365, lies wholly in our trade with Great Britain. Not that it is

a matter of much consequence whether the increase is due to our trade with one country more than with another. I would find no great pleasure in contemplating the fact, if it were a fact, that the increase of our export trade has been wholly with Great Britain. Canadians care very little where their money comes from, providing it comes; and instead of having to rejoice that the increase in our export trade is altogether with Great Britain, I rejoice more to find that it has not only increased with Great Britain, but with the United States and some other countries as well. I merely allude to the fact, because these statements furnished to His Excellency should not be received without being enquired into, and a true estimate formed of them. What concerns me more, and is more pertinent to my motion, is the fallacious statement found in the latter clause of this section, in which the hon. Minister of Customs tells us that this increase of ten million dollars odd is composed principally of Canadian produce and manufactures. Now, that is put in such a way as to be wholly misleading. I would, indeed, that that were the case. But the question arises, how is it that a statement of this kind should be made when the facts do not bear it out. I will generously suppose that the hon. Minister of Customs, in the multiplicity of his duties, had not time, personally, to examine the statement. That would be a charitable construction on my part. But I have to tell the House that while the gratifying fact remains, that the Exports of our agricultural products, products of the forest, our animals and other products largely exceeded in 1881 the exportation of 1880, though the latter also exceeded the exportation of the previous year, we are, when we look at the exports of our manufactures, gazing, instead of upon a bright picture, upon as gloomy a picture as it is possible for us to conceive. If the hon. gentlemen opposite find any consolation in the fact, shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, that our export trade of manufactured goods is dying out surely and quickly, then let them have all the consolation they can derive from it. In the year 1878, and years previous to that, a most gratifying state of things existed as far as our export trade was concerned, and qualifiedly, as far as our home trade in our own manufactures was concerned. Through the liberal measures taken by the late Government, in aiding and assisting the manufacturers of this country, and in exhibiting at the great gatherings in Philadelphia, Melbourne, and Paris, the products of our manufacturing industries, thus calling the attention of the world to the stage of progress we had reached in this respect, by this means a large export trade in manufactured goods was brought into existence in this country, and we have no reason to doubt that if the wise and prudent policy then adopted continued to prevail, the increase in the export of our manufactured goods might have gone on to the present time. What are the facts? I might point out to you the fact that, with reference to the products of the forest, there has been a very gratifying increase. Comparing, first, 1880 with 1879, we find that, through our products of the forest, we brought back into this country, in gold, \$3,593,048 more than in the year 1879. We find that, in exchange for animals and other products, we brought back \$3,486,973 in 1880 over 1879; of agricultural products, \$2,664,864. Thus, in these three items, the production of which the Tariff imposed by hon. gentlemen opposite was not able to change or lessen, because, fortunately, heaven's rain and heaven's light are given free to man, and are beyond their power to hinder or hamper. We had an increase of wealth in this country, in the year 1880 over the year 1879, of \$9,744,885. Now compare the past year, 1881, with the year 1879, and what do we find in these three items? We find in the products of the forest, \$11,698,553 more money brought into this country in the year 1881, from that item, than there was in 1879. Of animals and their products, we find brought into this country, in 1881, \$7,239,615 more than in 1879.

In agricultural products, we find brought back in gold to this country, \$1,638,863 more gold in 1881 than in 1879; or, in these three items, we find an increase of the wealth of this country of \$20,577,031 in the year 1881 over 1879; or, put these figures together, and we find that in the last two years there has been an increase in the wealth of this country, from these three items alone, of \$30,321,916. Sir, we can readily understand that Ministers, when they gazed upon the Trade Returns—when they took in the fact that during the past two years we have had \$30,000,000 of gold more brought into this country from sources with which they had no power to interfere in the slightest degree—we can understand how it is that the Minister of Finance, at one time disposed to share the credit with Providence, was good enough this year, in the light of these figures, to attribute the prosperity of the country to that source from which really comes the blessing of a merciful Providence. They have, however, interfered with the blessings of Providence in a measure, because if they had left our manufactured products alone, as they were forced to do from sheer inability, except in a slight degree in the articles before mentioned, we might have had the gratifying result declared to this House of an increase of gold brought back to this country as a result of increased shipments of exports of our manufactured goods. But, Sir, what tale do the books tell with reference to that matter? I have the figures here, and I find that in the year 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Government, we exported, after supplying our home wants, \$4,127,705 of manufactured goods. In that year, and in the year before that, owing to the encouragement received by those manufacturers, that legitimate encouragement which those manufacturers will always receive and must receive from the effects of a revenue Tariff, we were able to bring back of foreign gold into this country, as a result of the sale and manufacture of those articles, \$4,127,705. Thirty different countries of the globe had Canadian manufactured goods in their midst in the year 1878. But what is the tale now? What was the tale told last year? An increase of those sales? No, Sir, but a decrease in the year 1880 from 1878 of \$885,088. Come down to the year 1881 and compare that year with the year 1878. Is there any revival? Sir, the agricultural industry has revived, we have better crops. Our lumbering industry has revived, larger sales and better prices. Animals and their products have brought higher prices. There is increased wealth from that source. But how about manufactured goods exported in the year 1881? Why, Sir, while we exported in 1878, \$4,127,705, this year the exportation has decreased to \$3,075,095, or a decrease this year of \$1,052,610, an increase in exports, during the past two years, of over \$30,000,000 in agricultural products, &c., &c., but a decrease in the export of manufactured goods of nearly \$2,000,000, or 50 per cent. reduction on the total exports. I have taken the trouble to classify them somewhat. These figures are fraught with interest. I am one of those who believe in the manufacturing industries of this country; I like to see them developing. I am one of those who want to see our manufactures, not restricted to the home market alone; but, unhampered by these duties that are tying the hands of manufacturers, placed in such a position as a revenue Tariff will place them in, by enabling us to give cheaper goods at home, while they can compete with foreign nations abroad. I find we have some fifty-eight articles of manufactured goods that we export, and, as I said a moment ago, we have had a decrease in those fifty-eight articles, from the year 1878, of \$1,052,610. I have classified them in order to enable us to see which particular manufacturing industries are being injured by the Tariff now in force, for I hold, as I will endeavor to show at a later stage of my remarks, that the Tariff is greatly to blame for the deplorable fact that I have

just related to you. I find that in thirty-six out of the fifty-eight articles we export, there is a decrease of \$1,736,412. You will see in this list of thirty-six articles are composed some of the largest of our industries, in a manufacturing point of view. Take agricultural implements, a very large and expanding industry of this country, and one which you would naturally suppose would be able to supply our home market. But why is it unable to compete as successfully in 1881 as it was in 1878 with foreign countries, except it be that it has been handicapped in some way by the operations of the Tariff? In 1878, we exported of agricultural implements, \$86,001; in 1881, only \$31,269, or a decrease in that item of \$54,732—63 per cent. of a decrease of the export of agricultural implements.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for Niagara says hear, hear, but a cat could mew with just as much effect as that. We are now talking upon a subject that interests intelligent men, talking to those who profess to take care of the manufacturing industries of this country. Take the item of biscuits, a decrease of 45 per cent. in that; candles, a decrease of 95 per cent.; carriages, a very large industry, a decrease of 20 per cent.; clothing, a decrease of 60 per cent.; confectionery, a decrease of 40 per cent.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). Oh; you are a manufacturer of that.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I manufacture confectionery, and I wish I had some now to send you and the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) to put into your mouths. In the item of cordage, ropes and twine, there is a decrease of 43 per cent.; in the export of cottons we have a decrease of 35 per cent.; in drugs and medicines of 98 per cent.; in manufactures of fur, 48 per cent.; in grindstones, 17 per cent.; ground gypsum, 40 per cent.; hats and caps, 80 per cent.; manufactures of india rubber, 60 per cent.; pig iron, 98 per cent.; other iron and hardware, 18 per cent.; leather, sole and upper, 26 per cent.; boots and shoes, 57 per cent.; other leather, 73 per cent.; wine, 44 per cent.; ale, beer and cider, 35 per cent.; other spirits, perhaps owing to the increase of home consumption—the hon. Minister of Customs will tell us—the decrease is \$132,674, or 98 per cent.; in machinery, one of our most important manufactures, 48 per cent.; musical instruments, an increase in pianos and organs, but in other musical instruments, a decrease of 93 per cent.; oil cake, 43 per cent.; sails, 14 per cent.; sewing machines, one of our largest industries, one that was thriving before the present Tariff affected it injuriously, as shown by the Trade Returns, shows a decrease in exports of 39 per cent.; in ships sold to other countries, —a matter in which our Maritime Province friends will be interested—there was a decrease of 71 per cent. on the amount for the year 1878; in soap there was a decrease of 50 per cent. In tobacco stems and cuttings there was a decrease of 43 per cent.; in vinegar there was a decrease of 20 per cent.; in doors, sashes and blinds a decrease of 39 per cent.; in woollen goods—another great industry of this country—a decrease of 36 per cent.; or, in the exports of those thirty-six articles, there was a total decrease of \$1,736,412, or an average decrease of over 54 per cent. The picture is not a bright one, but I will endeavor to give hon. gentlemen opposite the comfort of what little brightness there is in it. In twenty-two articles of manufactured goods the export has increased. The export of books has increased \$8,908; the export of hemlock bark extract has increased \$2,228; glass and glass-ware, \$252; iron stoves and castings, \$5,572; scrap iron, \$153,374; jewellery and plated ware, \$83; junk and oakum, \$17,649; harness and saddlery, \$1,341; whiskey, \$1,557; wine in wood, \$599; organs, \$9,778; pianos, \$705; oil (not elsewhere specified), \$7,604; rags, \$34,433; starch, \$32,497;

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

steel manufactures, \$111,038; wrought stone, \$648; cigars and cigarettes, \$5,625; household furniture, \$20,497; other wood, \$99,131; other articles, \$168,792; or a total of \$63,802 as the increased export on those twenty-two articles in the year 1881 over the year 1878. But I think the House will allow me to deduct from that amount the increase in scrap iron, which is not a branch of manufacture, and does not give employment to a single man in this country, the product being simply the refuse of the machine shop. The export of rags should also be deducted, as I do not think hon. gentlemen will hold that the production of rags is an occupation which requires skilled labor, or that there are any manufacturers in this country who are specially engaged in producing rags. Therefore, I will deduct these two items which, together, amount to \$187,817, and the total increase would then be \$495,985. But, Sir, leave both the rags and the scrap iron in the list, swell the amount of increases all you can, give hon. gentlemen opposite all the brightness there is in the picture, and yet the decreases exceed the total increases by \$1,052,610 more than they did in 1878. I have another table which, I think, should teach the Ministry a lesson which they do not seem to have learned from their own Trade and Navigation Returns of last year. In this table I have compared the decreases in the exports of certain lines of manufactured goods in 1881 with those of 1880, for the purpose of showing that the decreases are going on; that it has not been arrested, but is daily becoming worse under the present system. Take the case of agricultural implements, and you have a decrease this year over last of \$27,859. In biscuits, the decrease was \$3,403; in candles, \$3,738; cordage, ropes, &c., \$2,053; in drugs and medicines there has been a decrease; in furs, hats and caps, grindstones and India rubber goods, while in pig iron we have a decreased export of \$71,844; in cotton there has been a decrease, in 1881, as compared with 1880, of \$2,630; in iron and hardware, \$7,875; in boots and shoes the decrease, which was enormous in 1880, has become much larger in 1881, being \$63,420 over what it was in that year; in other leather goods the decrease was \$3,371 more in 1881 than it was in 1880; in machinery the decrease was \$6,992; in musical instruments there was a decrease, while in sewing machines the decrease was \$36,093 more than it was in 1880, while the decrease in the latter year was an alarmingly large one compared with 1878. The decrease in ships sold to other countries was very large in 1880, but it has been swollen during the past year by the sum of \$116,309. There were decreases in soap; in tobacco stems and cuttings; in doors, sashes and blinds, while in woollens the decrease in 1881 as compared with 1880 was \$11,006, and the total decrease on these twenty-four articles in 1881 over 1880 amounted to \$328,957. And yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite cheer ironically as they hear the figures read which tell us that the proud boast we have made in the past with reference to our manufactures is a vain one under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that in a short time we will be obliged to confess that we are not able to meet the manufacturers of other countries, in other foreign markets. And this is not because our manufacturers are possessed of less energy or less brains than those of other countries; it is not because they are lacking in any of the essentials of a successful business career, but because they are handicapped and hindered under the operations of the Tariff which was brought in force by hon. gentlemen opposite, who, while pretending to be the special champions of that class, are yet ready to cheer when the figures are read from their own Trade and Navigation Returns showing that the business of these men is being destroyed. I wish to notice another point. Last year, in making a similar motion to this, I had occasion to give some figures, which, though not quite so startling in their nature as those I have given to-day, were

yet in the same direction. The hon. the Minister of Customs replied to me, and I now desire to call attention to his reply, because, if he deigns to answer me to-day, he will have to make a different answer. His answer on that occasion was as follows:—

"It is not my intention to enter upon a discussion of the subject with which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) has dealt during the last hour and a-half. I think that probably the best answer to all his arguments with reference to the exports of the country will be found in a short paragraph on page 6 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, in which the Commissioner points out the important fact that, for the first time in the history of this country since Confederation, the exports have exceeded the imports by \$1,421,711, and that they exceed also the value of the goods entered for consumption by \$16,129,109."

The hon. gentleman answered my argument, which was analagous to the one I use to-day, by quoting what was found in the preface to the Commissioner's report, stating that there was an increase of exports over imports. But what answer will the hon. Minister of Customs give me to-day, when this same Commissioner of Customs tells us that, instead of there being an increase of exports over imports, there is absolutely a decrease of over \$7,000,000? When I reminded him of the fact that I spoke of manufactured goods, he said that I made out a very good case for the Government, because I showed that the home market was now secured for the manufacturer. That statement was also made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who, at a later stage of the debate, replied to my arguments—and made as good a case for the Government, I am bound to say, as it was possible to make—but who failed, only because the facts and figures would not bear him out, and not from any want of ability. If he failed last year, what will his position be this year? Let us take some of the largest manufactures. There has been a great decrease in the export of pig iron, for instance. We have had a decreased export of 71,844 tons. No doubt the hon. member for Niagara will say that we have the home market; but what do the imports reveal? Why, that, in 1878, we only imported \$488,824 worth, while, in 1881, we imported of foreign pig-iron, displacing our own, according to the hon. member's argument, 715,997 tons. Certainly, then, it cannot be contended that the Tariff has shut out foreign iron, or that it has given us the home market, according to the extent the exports have decreased. Then, in cottons there has been a decrease in the exports and an increase in the imports. In 1878, \$7,104,517 worth of foreign cottons came into the country, while last year \$10,244,465 worth came in. In boots and shoes we find that there has been a decrease in the exports of \$134,618 worth. But have we the home market in consequence? In 1878, we imported \$243,578 worth of boots and shoes, while last year we imported \$105,592 worth. Therefore, I contend that the Tariff does not give our manufacturers a home market which they had not before; while it is so arranged that raw material is taxed, so that the manufacturer cannot produce goods as cheaply as he could formerly, he is, therefore, forced to charge us more for our goods, while at the same time he does not increase his home market. In machinery we exported \$37,281 less in 1881 than in 1878, while we imported, in the latter year, \$327,623 worth, against \$1,047,549 worth in the former. Therefore, the decrease of the machinery exports cannot be accounted for by the fact that we have the home market. In sewing machines there is a decrease in the exports of 1881, of \$107,806 worth, while the imports were \$193,337 worth, against \$101,404 worth in 1878. What could show the Ministers more clearly than these facts that the Tariff is so arranged that it is a positive injury to the manufacturing industries of this country? In woollens the decrease in the exports has been \$12,216, while the imports were \$8,742,024, in 1881, against \$8,535,453 in 1878. I might give other figures to show that the decrease in our exports cannot be accounted

for by our having the home market; but what I have quoted will, I think, prove indisputably that the reason our exports of manufactured goods are becoming daily and beautifully less is, that our manufacturers are unable, because of the burdens that have been heaped upon them by this Tariff, to produce goods as cheaply as they formerly produced them, or to compete as successfully in foreign markets. I have made these remarks in order to lead up to the point I bring before the hon. Minister of Finance, and that is, that—as was pointed out when this Tariff was introduced—it is a Tariff for which he is not entirely responsible, but with regard to which the manufacturers were consulted and the duties on different articles increased and increased until we have the Tariff that is the admiration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Tariff trying to suit these various conflicting interests, and not for the public good, it is no wonder that the effect has been so disastrous as I have pointed out. I am not making that statement without having cognizance of the facts. Last year the hon. Minister of Finance asked us to vote some \$400 to a gentleman interested in sugar refining, to pay his expenses to Ottawa and back. For what purpose did he come here? To help to frame the Tariff; and the hon. Minister of Finance, who had given him a Tariff to make him wealthy at the expense of the people of this country, was not ashamed to ask the House to vote his expenses, and a compliant majority did vote compliance. Therefore, we ought not to blame the finance Minister for this Tariff, because he was not altogether responsible. When I pointed out the inevitable result of imposing heavy duties on raw materials, that it would destroy the export trade, we were told: "No, we have a remedy in the system of drawbacks which we shall put into force;" that is, that they would, by a system of drawbacks, return to manufacturers the amount of duty that had been paid on the raw materials entering into manufactured goods that had been exported to foreign countries. When I moved for that return last year it came down, and what did I find? I found that twenty-one months had elapsed from the inauguration of the National Policy, so-called, to the period of my return, and that the total amount of drawback paid was \$15,397.10; but there were 213 claims, amounting to \$12,998.84, that were for lobster cans, which did not appear in the manufactured goods of the country, and therefore must come out of the total of \$15,379. Deducting that, I found that the total amount paid by way of drawback to manufacturers, on exported goods, was simply \$2,380.26 during that period of twenty-one months. Even of that sum \$634 was allowed as drawback on corn, used in making starch; \$275 on oats, used in making meal; \$550 on oil cake, made from linseed; \$49 in wire, used in making fences; \$34 on tin, used in canning meats, and \$836 on flour, manufactured into pilot bread. So the House will see there was not, during those twenty-one months, a single cent of drawback paid to any of the great leading manufacturing industries of this country. Whether the remarks I made last Session have led the Minister of Customs to be a little more liberal in this respect I cannot say; no doubt the hon. gentleman will inform the House with his usual candor. If my remarks had that effect, I am glad; but the hon. gentleman has not gone far enough, as is evidenced by the fact of the continued decrease in our exports of manufactured goods. Why, even admit that you give a drawback on the raw material entering into manufactured goods to the amount of the duty paid, that does not place the Canadian manufacturer in a position to compete with his rivals. Why, take the manufacturer of steam boilers and engines. He uses a large quantity of brass in his manufactures; there is a duty of 30 per cent. to protect the brass manufacturer in Canada. That manufacturer does exactly what every other manufacturer does: he takes advantage of the Tariff, and places 30 per cent. or 29 per cent. on his goods, just sufficient to keep out foreign goods.

So a manufacturer, making steam engines and boilers for export, if he brought in his brass goods from the United States, would have remitted to him the duty he paid on them in the shape of drawback, but having to pay an equal amount to the Canadian manufacturer, he is not allowed a cent of drawback in respect to that. So the House will see how the manufacturer reaps a disadvantage; and the result is, that this system of drawbacks has failed to relieve the difficulty that Ministers themselves saw must necessarily overtake the export trade of manufactured goods. I know no other way by which Ministers can learn a lesson of wisdom than by studying the facts presented to them, which should cause them to depart from their system of hampering the industries of this country. Return to a sounder and newer Tariff, let the industries stand on their own merits, giving no advantage other than such as will come to them in a legitimate way through the revenue Tariff, which, when in force, afforded to manufacturers in many cases better protection than they enjoy at the present time—at all events, affording them all the advantage they have any right to ask that the people of this country should concede to them. As illustrating the operation of the Tariff, let me give hon. gentlemen opposite an instance or two. I took the trouble to ascertain some facts from a large manufacturer in my own town, and I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there is not a manufacturer of any size or importance there who is not my warm personal and political friend. I have to tell them that, such being the case, as a matter of course they are the open and avowed opponents of the present occupants of the Treasury Benches, and therefore all the manufacturers cannot be their friends, at all events they are not found in my town. Why should they? With the exception of the sugar refining and one or two other industries, what have the manufacturers to thank the present Tariff for? Nothing certainly as regards the manufacturers in my own town. I have here the prepared statements of one of the largest firms, which shows that it paid last year by way of enhanced cost through the operation of this Tariff over and above what duty they would have had to pay under the Mackenzie Tariff on their raw material, the sum of \$6,096.04. That shows the extra cost they were compelled to pay on articles entering into their products for one year over and above the amount which they would have to pay had the old Tariff been in force, and that is a firm doing a large export trade. It is a firm which, before the present Government came into power, was doing an export trade with the uttermost ends of the earth—with Chili, Russia, and other countries; but their foreign trade is being slowly but surely crushed out under the operation of this Tariff—a result which is being brought about, whether through the inability of the Minister of Customs, I do not say, but I think it is. I have similar statements from other firms by word of mouth, though not prepared. One says the Tariff takes \$5,000 a year extra out of us; another says the amount reaches \$3,000. And what is the result of it? If the country were benefitted, if at home we were getting cheaper goods, we might view with some complacency the destruction of our export trade. But we have imports as great as ever, enhanced in price by the amount of duty, showing that we are paying enhanced prices on the same class of goods as are made at home, while, at the same time, there is a decreased export. I say these figures should challenge the attention of the hon. Ministers, and urge them, if possible, to devise some way by which this state of things may be remedied.

Mr. PLUMB. I am very glad to say that one of the earliest utterances from a prominent hon. member of the Opposition, who undoubtedly speaks with authority, shows that the undying hostility of his party to the fiscal policy adopted by this House continues as vigorous as ever. After the somewhat crude utterances of the late hon. leader of the

Mr. PATRICKSON (Brant).

Opposition, when he took a sad farewell of his constituents in Lambton, we were led to suppose that perhaps there might be some modification of the terms in which these hon. gentlemen have, from the beginning to the end, attacked, denounced and villified the policy of the Government. We can see, however, that the recess has stimulated my hon. friend, who has brought forward this resolution, to something more than his wonted energy, in the stentorian attacks which, from time to time, he is accustomed to make on the industries of this country. What is the scope of the hon. gentleman's argument? It is, so far as I am able to catch it, and I have endeavored to follow it very patiently, that because some items—and the hon. gentleman has very carefully made up his statements, since figures can be made to prove anything—of export have decreased within the last two years, that the National Policy is a failure, and is injuring our manufacturing interests. Well, I always supposed that we depended very much on our home trade, and that, though there might be a decrease in the exportation of some of our products, as the hon. gentleman says there is, the fact remains undisputed that the people are sufficiently prosperous not only to buy our own products, but also the imported products of other countries. We never pretended that we were going to build a Chinese wall about Canada, as hon. gentlemen opposite have so often asserted. We never pretended that we intended to take the course pursued by our neighbors on the other side of the border, of shutting out by our Tariff the manufactures of other nations, as hon. gentlemen opposite have so often said, and notably the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who is master of a certain kind of specious argument. I give him credit for it. He is so notably a master of it that he has been utilized largely by his leader in the campaigns of this summer, which have not been very fortunate. But I say we never intended to shut out by our Tariff the manufactures of other countries.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. We never intended to do so. We have said we intended to afford a reasonable protection to our own industries, which hon. gentlemen opposite refused to do. It is somewhat strange that in this argument we should be forced to meet the fact again, and the hon. gentleman is forced to meet it, that exports come to us from the country which has an almost prohibitory Tariff. Now, the hon. gentleman may take one horn of the dilemma or the other. Either the prohibitive Tariff of the United States does not prevent their exporting goods to us, or their Tariff does prevent their sending them. If it does not, if they do send us goods, it is an evidence that they are not handicapped by it. It is a fact, which every one knows, that one of the most sedulously protected countries in Europe sends to England large exports of iron manufactures, not small articles, but girders, and things of that kind, which they sell in the very heart of the iron district, underselling the traders in a Free Trade country. The hon. gentleman must take one side of the argument or the other. The hon. gentleman is, I believe, as the hon. gentlemen opposite generally are, greatly distressed that he has no longer the argument that the depression of trade in the country is so great as to force us to seek markets wherever we can find them, by sacrificing our manufactured goods. Within the last year or two they have been compelled to abandon the cry of famine and depression. Now, they are opening a discussion in this House upon an entirely different basis. The hon. gentleman says that in his town, the manufacturers have suffered. I have heard a very different story. My attention has been called to an article which appeared lately in the *London Free Press*, written from his place, and on which I might be able to lay my hands if necessary, stating that scarcely any town in Canada has more greatly benefitted by the Tariff than Brantford, that manufactories are

springing up rapidly there. I presume the hon. gentleman, with his usual candor, will acknowledge that such is the case.

Mr. PATERSON. I will; but I desire to explain.

Mr. PLUMB. I have the floor.

Mr. PATERSON. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman on one point. I did not say the manufacturers were suffering. What the hon. gentleman says is true. I said they were suffering as far as their export trade is concerned. That is what my latter argument is based on.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said they were handicapped.

Mr. PATERSON. I said they were handicapped in their export trade.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said they were handicapped and suffering, not only in their export trade, but that our ruinous Tariff had paralysed our industries.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not use those words at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He never said so.

Mr. PLUMB. Then the hon. gentlemen did not mean what he said.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, I did.

Mr. PLUMB. It is not my fault if the hon. gentleman did not mean what he said.

Mr. PATERSON. You were making too much noise to hear what I said.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said that he wanted to see our manufacturing interests developed.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. PLUMB. He said that under the favorable protection of the late Government, manufactures were flourishing and prosperous. The hon. gentleman contrasted the condition of things up to 1878 with their condition now, and the whole gist of his argument was, that we were more prosperous under that condition of things than we are now. The hon. gentleman cannot escape. That was the whole drift of his argument. I appeal to the House and the common sense of the country to say whether the hon. gentleman is correct. The hon. gentleman must be very badly driven into a corner when he opens a discussion with such a statement. The credulity of his party must be exceedingly great when they permit the hon. gentleman to make such statements without proof. I can only say I am perfectly astonished that, with the evidence before him everywhere, he should now seek to escape from the fact that the country is prosperous in all directions, and endeavor to prove that the present Tariff has paralyzed trade. I am astonished that, with the evidence before him, the evidence of his own senses everywhere, he now seeks to escape from the fact that the country is prosperous in all directions, and he endeavors to prove that the Tariff, as imposed by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, has paralyzed and injured trade. The hon. gentleman throughout his whole argument uses another specious plea which is very common to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. He speaks of the Tariff as if the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches had imposed the whole of it. He says that there is a Tariff of 30 per cent. or 35 per cent. upon brass manufacturers, in speaking of steam machinery; he says that the Tariff has increased the price just so much, but who is responsible for at least half of that, and perhaps more? I remember perfectly an hon. gentleman who did me the honor to visit my constituency to harangue the bucolic element who came there, and whom he thought would listen to his arguments—I had no opportunity to reply at the time he attempted to tell them that the Tariff on cotton had raised the price over 30 per cent. My hon. friend the late leader

of the Government, in the strongest charge he could bring against the existing Tariff, when he was using every possible argument against it, stated—and we may always make a little allowance for the exaggerations used in the heat of debate—he stated that our Tariff was an average increase of 5 per cent. over 17½ per cent. Cottons may be increased on the average by 7½ per cent.; if so, that cannot increase the price to 30 per cent., unless by some *locus pocus* the manufacturers have been enabled, through the misrepresentations of the hon. gentleman opposite, and through the misrepresentations of the press which echo their views, to receive a higher price and to be sustained in it. The hon. gentleman speaks of the decrease in the exports of pig iron. There was no pig iron manufactured in this country until within a very short time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; in Londonderry and Three Rivers.

Mr. PLUMB. That at Three Rivers is a new industry of about three years date, but even then that industry was paralyzed, and they were not able to do any large business until they were protected by the present Tariff. It is a good sign that these works are prosperous. We are using their iron. There is a prohibitory Tariff in the United States, and it is not at all likely, and the hon. gentlemen cannot expect, that we will export pig iron to England. I think the whole of his argument is based upon a succession of similar fallacies, which are intended, not so much for the ear of this House as for his supporters outside. The hon. gentleman knows that the instant propositions of that kind are made in this House they will be met, and he knows that the delusive manner in which he has put these figures will be very easily exposed. I have not the figures present, I did not intend to answer him on that point, but I observe that, in order to increase the list of articles which have fallen off in exportation, he has made use of some very paltry items where the whole trade is scarcely anything, or amounts to but a few thousand dollars. On the article of drugs I believe the whole export is but \$79. The exports of drugs and medicines, so far as I can see, that are not of our own manufacture, amounts to \$365. But a detailed answer to the hon. gentleman can only be made by reference to the books themselves. I say, again, that it is a little extraordinary that the hon. gentleman argues that the effect of this Tariff is to decrease our export trade, when the very articles which are coming into us are sent to us from a country which is so largely protective. A great many of those articles from the United States are largely protected. The hon. gentleman speaks of a great increase in our exports. He says that he does not care where that increase arises. Well, that is of a piece with everything that is said by hon. gentlemen on the other side. He does not care whether the produce that is raised in this country is taken into the United States, and a duty averaging 30, 40 or 50 per cent. paid upon it. He does not care whether that is owing to the exigencies of our trade and the balance of our trade, as it was during the Administration which that hon. gentleman supported for five years, and which he is endeavoring to get back into power. He does not care whether the farmer is compelled to go there, or whether he has the English market opened to him, or whether he buys under a tariff at all. The hon. gentleman's arguments are all of the same character; all he desires to do is to make a point against the present Government, and I believe in that he has signally failed. But I say again, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact, that we see, from the course pursued by the hon. gentlemen, that their policy is one of undying hostility to the manufacturing interests, one of undying hostility to the National Policy. We will hold the hon. gentleman to his utterances, because we believe that those utterances are made in consequence of an agreement among the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, and therefore, that he

stands in the position of *quasi*-leader of his party in this House.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MACKENZIE. It seems incredible that such a speech as that made by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) should pass unanswered by a single Minister. There has been no answer made by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). I think the hon. gentlemen behind them should make way for some of the Ministers.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). They are not ready yet.

Mr. BOWELL. We are certainly under a great compliment to the hon. gentleman. I dare say the members of the Cabinet will take their own opportunity to speak.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are afraid to do it to day.

Mr. ORTON. I can hardly agree with the hon. member for Lambton in looking upon the speech of the hon. member for South Brant as one of such great importance, and especially of such importance to his side of the House. I think no member ever rose in this House who so well succeeded in advocating the cause of his opponents instead of that of his own side of the House, and think his whole argument goes to prove the success of the hon. member to the people of Canada. In the first place, he attempted to show that our export trade in manufactures had decreased. Do we not well know that one of the main objects of the National Policy was to give to the Canadian manufacturer the Canada markets? Is it surprising to him to find that the effect of the National Policy has been to do exactly what it was intended to do, and the manufacturers find it utterly impossible for them to-day to supply the demand in the home market for the various manufactures of this country, and the consequence is that they are not obliged to seek foreign markets for their manufactures. Furthermore, the facts show that the people of this country have increased their consuming power. They are not in that deplorable state in which they were previous to the inauguration of this policy. They do not now suffer from the hardships and trials they then suffered from. Our laboring men find employment in every city, town and village in the country, and the consequence is, they are enabled to buy more largely of manufactured goods. Our manufacturers are employed beyond the capacity of their machinery or their buildings, supplying the home demand, and the consequence is that manufacturers buy from one another, as hon. gentlemen are well aware, one class helping thereby to increase the prosperity of the other, the result being that they have benefitted largely by the operations of the National Policy. It has been distinctly shown by my hon. friend that such is the case, for in attempting to show that the increased export of farm products was a point against the National Policy, he gave a proof positive that the effect of that policy had been to some extent to stimulate the production of farm products. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that the effect of the National Policy has been to give to the farmers of this country an increased market of no less than \$5,000,000 annually; and if they have also increased their exports, it only shows that a greater stimulus to production has been given to our farmers. It is true that Providence has done a great deal, but we find that not only the agricultural, but the lumbering industry and every other industry has been stimulated, and why? Because the people of this country are all prospering. Building operations are going on in all parts of the country; they are using lumber extensively, and the result is that the home market for lumber alone has increased enormously. If the hon. gentleman desired to give an honest and candid statement to this House with regard to the National Policy he would be prepared to show by statistics whether our manufacturers had increased their productions or not; and if he could have shown that the manufacturers had not increased their production of

Mr. PLUMB.

manufactured goods, or that the lumbermen had not increased their production of lumber, he might then have said, with justice, that the effect of the National Policy was injurious to those interests. But I think he will find, before this House dissolves, that overwhelming evidence will be forthcoming to show that in every class of manufactures the amount produced has been enormously increased, and that not only has there been an increased exportation of many of these articles, such as lumber and farm produce, but that there has also been a very large increase in the home consumption, owing to the increased prosperity of the people. The hon. gentleman referred to the manufacturers in his own town, and he admitted warmly that he did not intend to insinuate that they were not prospering; but when he attempted to show that the effect of the National Policy had been to destroy manufacturing industries, it would have been in order for him to show that the manufacturers of Brantford had suffered in consequence of its adoption. But the hon. gentleman says they have not suffered, and why? Because they cannot supply the demand for manufactured goods in their own country, and as soon as they can do so they will appeal to the Government for a drawback, so as to enable them to compete with foreign countries, and increase the export of manufactured goods. I wish to say one thing in reference to the agricultural interests, and I will put it in the shape of a challenge to hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is that this side of the House will be able to show, not only that they have given to the Canadian farmer an increased home market, but that they have increased his prices as compared with those in Liverpool. They will be able to show that the various articles used by the farmer in everyday life—the articles of common consumption, such as cottons and many other classes of manufactured goods—are to-day sold cheaper to the farming, mechanical, and laboring classes, than ever before. These facts will be forthcoming in due time, and then I think even the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) will—if he honestly confesses his opinion, as I believe he desires to do—acknowledge that the National Policy after all has been a blessing to the people of Canada.

Mr. HESSON. As the hon. member for South Brant has chosen to color the figures he has used, for the purpose of conveying the impression that the country is in a worse state now than before the introduction of the present Tariff, I have taken the trouble to compile a few figures which, I think, I may submit to the judgment of the House, to show that the hon. member is far astray when he imagines he can pull the wool over the eyes of hon. members, or of people outside, by applying his statistics in a way that will not stand the light. I will take the export of farm products for three years, during the previous Administration of the present head of the Government, viz: the years 1871-72-73, and show that they were very much less than they were in the three last years of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton; and as the times were adverse during those three years, the argument he has used with regard to the significance of the export trade will fall to the ground. In 1871, the exports of farm products were \$9,858,146; in 1872, they were \$13,378,562; and in 1873, \$14,395,340, a total export trade, during those three years, of \$37,632,048. I will now take the figures for the three last years of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, and show that the difference was largely in favor of that Government, though the bad times accompanied its administration of affairs. The exports of products of the farm, in 1876, were \$21,139,605; in 1877, \$14,689,876; in 1878, \$18,008,754; or a total, in the three years, of \$53,834,235. In other words, there was a difference of \$16,202,187 in favor of the late Administration, and yet I appeal to the House to say if its record was one to which even hon. gentlemen opposite

can look back with pride and satisfaction, and say that under it the country prospered. But we have to look further than that: we have to look to the present prosperity of Canada; to the home industries which have been established; to the home markets which have been created; to the home consumption of all our manufactured products, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to say, if they can, that the country is in a worse state now than it was under the Administration of their own party. Hon. gentlemen talk of the exports of the forest as helping to produce the mercantile prosperity which at present exists. I have figures to show that the exports of the forest, in 1877, amounted to \$23,010,349, and, in 1878, to \$19,511,574, making a total of exports of the forest, in the last two years of the Mackenzie Administration, of \$42,521,824. I presume that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will try to make the country believe that there has been an increase in the exports, and that therefore we have excellent times. In 1879, the exports amounted to \$13,261,459, and, in 1880, to \$16,854,507, a total of \$30,115,966; showing a difference in favor of the exports of the forest, during the Mackenzie Administration, of no less than \$12,405,858, or a total excess of the exports of the forest and farm, in favor of that Administration during the years I have mentioned, of \$28,608,045. Now, I ask hon. members of this House if the three last years of the late Administration were prosperous years, which can be remembered with anything like pleasure, or if those who had to live by the sweat of their brows had full recompense for their labor. The hon. member for Brant tried to lead this House to believe that the manufacturing industries of this country were suffering. What are the facts? I appeal to the hon. gentleman to candidly state whether they are not prospering in his own city beyond anything he ever anticipated. He must admit that there is scarcely an industry there that is not busily employed, almost to double the extent it was in former years, and that new industries have been created. He speaks of cottons having been brought into this country. I could not go to the cotton factory in his own town and give an order in the hope of having it filled in less than three months. And yet the hon. member would make it appear that the industries of this country are in distress. I say it shows a want of fair play to quote figures in the attempt to show that times are bad, that the policy of this Government is a mistake, and that we ought to go back to the policy of their predecessors. When we compare the records, I think hon. gentlemen opposite should hide their heads in shame that they were unable to legislate in the interest of the industries of the country, and that they now try to show that the country is suffering, because it is ruled by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to make only a few remarks in order to correct some words that have been put into my mouth. It is a matter of regret that when I endeavored to make my statement as fair as I could, the hon. member for Niagara should have made that a charge against me. The hon. member, instead of finding fault, should give me credit, because I made it a point to give every item of manufacture, no matter how it told, so that no man could say that I had made a garbled statement; and to make that a charge against me shows a lack of fairness on the part of the hon. gentleman. Another statement put in my mouth is, that the manufacturers of this country are not in a prosperous condition. I made no such statement. I was speaking wholly of our export trade, and I said that, so far as the ability of our manufacturers to do an export trade was concerned, they were handicapped by this Tariff. Hon. gentlemen call on me to testify as to whether the manufacturers of Canada are doing well or not. I believe that perhaps never were the manufacturers of Canada enjoying more prosperity than they are to-day. I believe that at no period have the manufacturers of Brantford done bet-

ter than they are doing to-day. But if that is true of them, it is true of all other classes in the community. If the National Policy was intended to do anything, it was intended to kill off the importer, and yet the testimony of importers is that they were never doing as well as they are doing now. The same may be said of the farmers, the lumbermen, and all other classes of the community. But the great point to consider is this: When we are all doing well, is that fact due to the Tariff? I say that it is not a result of the Tariff, but in spite of it; that so far as the Tariff is concerned, it is an injury and not a benefit; in other words, prosperous as our merchants and manufacturers are, they would be more prosperous if the Tariff was to-day as it was before. The \$30,000,000 of extra gold brought into this country during the last two years is the result of our exports of agricultural products, animals and their produce, and lumber. But did the National Policy cause heaven's rain to fall, or the sun to shine on our fields, giving us higher prices for our goods; or did the National Policy cause the rain to fall on the fields of England, Scotland or Ireland, blighting their harvests, and opening a market for what we had to sell? Did the National Policy raise the price of wheat in Liverpool, or the price of lumber in Albany, or in the markets of Great Britain? Clearly not. Therefore, that \$30,000,000 of extra gold that came into this country came in, in spite of the Tariff, and not as a result of it, and enabled the people of this country to buy more freely the goods they needed than before, and our manufacturers are thus sharing in the general prosperity. When hon. gentlemen opposite point to the manufacturers of my town as doing better than before, they must give them credit for common sense; and the manufacturers of my town resent the theory that they exist by the grace of the Finance Minister of this country. They contend that they are thriving because they are putting money and energy into their business, and not because of this Tariff, which every one of these gentlemen wish to have changed. The manufacturers in Brantford are doing well, the manufacturers in Canada are doing well, all classes in Canada are doing well, and they are doing well in spite of the Tariff, and as a result of the extra gold brought into the country from the causes I have mentioned, over which hon. gentlemen opposite have no control whatever. I trust I have now made myself, at all events, sufficiently plain that hon. gentlemen opposite can comprehend the position I take on this question.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman through the whole of his speech, nor the details of the figures which he has presented to the House; but I desire to call attention to one or two facts in connection with his speech which may possibly explain why the exports of the articles to which he referred have not been so great as in former years. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was very anxious that some member of the Cabinet should refer to the speech of the hon. member for South Brant, on account of the logic, I suppose, he thought contained in the remarks he had offered. If hon. gentlemen opposite would settle among themselves what their policy is, or is to be, it would be very much better not only for the country but for themselves. We have the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), who has declared that every manufacturer who has been protected is a highway robber, or language to that effect. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) has harked back since his speech made in Dundee, when he announced himself such an ardent Free Trader.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I made no change whatever.

Mr. BOWELL. He has told the people of this country, in a late speech, that he is going to lop off the protective branches by degrees. He has no idea of slaugh-

tering with one blow all the manufacturing interests, but he will take them piecemeal; and I hope, when the time comes, if it ever should come, they may die in peace. It may be that there has been a decrease in the export of the articles referred to by the hon. member for South Brant. It is quite true that there has been a decrease in the export trade of confectionery; but the hon. gentleman should remember that, during the time his friends were in power, the people and children had very little money with which to indulge in lollipops; and the hon. gentleman has good reason to know, as that is the particular industry in which he himself is engaged, that if that business is now much more prosperous than it was in past years, it is because he has found a market within the boundaries of our own Dominion for the consumption of the articles he manufactures, while in 1878 he was obliged to send them out of the country in order to find a market. The hon. gentleman is aware and no one knows better, because he has given much attention to the question of the export and import trade, that interprovincial trade, which has grown up within the last few years, and particularly within the last ten or twelve years, is double that which existed a few years ago. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few figures. I think they will show that whereas the exports, accepting the figures he has given, have fallen off on some thirty or forty articles, that interprovincial trade has increased and quadrupled the total sum. Take, for instance, the returns from Nova Scotia. In 1865-66 the imports into that Province, from foreign countries, were \$14,000,000. If the hon. gentleman will consult the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that the imports from foreign countries into that Province have decreased \$6,000,000 to \$7,000,000. Who have supplied those \$7,000,000 worth of goods, except the manufacturers of the Maritime Provinces, Ontario and Quebec, and the farms and dairies of this country? The same facts exist in regard to the trade of New Brunswick. If hon. members will refer to the imports from foreign countries, they will find that before Confederation, they reached \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 in that Province, and that during last year they amounted to little more than half that sum.

Mr. ANGLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that the people of New Brunswick consume as much to-day as they did before Confederation, that the Province is just as prosperous, and if that be the case, either the goods must be manufactured within the Province, or they were received from Ontario or other Provinces of the Dominion, which have entered largely into the production of articles formerly imported from foreign countries. Take the wide domain that lies to the west of us. In 1878, the interprovincial trade, covering articles sent by Canada to the North-West, amounted to about one million and a quarter. The exports, if I may so term them,—that is, the products of Canada—have increased from that sum to nearly six millions, for the year ending 30th June last, and during the last six months—I have not the figures by me, but I am speaking within bounds when I say that the trade of old Canada with Manitoba and the North-West Territories has increased to a very much larger extent than during the last year. Who have supplied the Maritime Provinces with goods? and who have supplied the great North-West with the agricultural implements, which the hon. member for South Brant complains have not been exported, and which do not appear in the trade returns, but the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec? The fact that there is not an agricultural industry in this country recently established, or that was formerly in operation, which is not working to its utmost capacity, and this afforded the best possible evidence that they found a market for their products. If these were not

Mr. BOWELL.

sent abroad they were consumed here; if they did not go to the Maritime Provinces they were sent to the North-West. What did a Free Trader and former supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite tell me the other day in Toronto, and he is a gentleman living in my own county? He said, after travelling through the North-West last summer, and spending six weeks or two months there, he came to the conclusion, whatever his theoretical opinions might be, that a protective policy was the correct policy for this country. I said to him: "What has led you to that conclusion?" He replied: "I have come to that conclusion because, while travelling one or two months in the North-West and going 300 or 400 miles west of Winnipeg, I found almost every article on the farm, such as agricultural implements, ploughs and wagons, bore the mark of some Ontario manufacturer," while before this Tariff was inaugurated and extra duties imposed, nearly all those articles, nineteenth-twentieths I am sure, were imported from Racine, Wisconsin, Ohio and Illinois. If the facts prove that the manufacturers are fully employed, that they can scarcely supply the markets in the old Provinces, and that they find the market within the bounds of the Dominion, such is not evidence of a decrease in the industries of this country. Neither is it an evidence that the industries of this country are hampered or handicapped by the Tariff. If that be established, my hon. friend's logic and argument falls to the ground, and until he can controvert the figures I have given him—I will have an opportunity, no doubt, before the House rises, to give the exact figures—he must admit the correctness of my statements with regard to the increase of trade. How is it possible that all the articles to which he has referred can possibly be manufactured to the extent to which they are in this country, and yet there be—I will not say a stagnation in trade, because the hon. gentleman repudiates that—but a handicapping of the manufacturing industries of the country. If they are handicapped by the Tariff to such an extent that it ruins them, I ask how it is that men of intelligence, men who do not exist by Act of Parliament, but who use their own brains, energy and enterprise to make their fortunes, should go on extending their workshops and manufacturing more to-day than at any previous period.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do they not ask for a change?

Mr. BOWELL. They do ask for a change, but in the direction of a higher Tariff. They want an increased duty, for instance, on iron. We find that none of them, not even the personal friends of my hon. friend opposite, ask to have the duties taken off. Referring to his own town, the hon. gentleman says the manufacturers there are his personal and political friends. I am not at all surprised that they should be his personal friends. I question whether any one who knows the hon. gentleman would not be his personal friend; but I am safe in saying that there is not an hon. gentleman on the other side who can compare with him in specious argumentation. No one can better tell just half what should be told, in dealing with facts, than my hon. friend. A paper has been handed to me containing reference to his town, in which it is stated that, in the year 1881 alone, the machinery purchased and the new buildings erected represented not less a sum than \$250,000. The promoters of these enterprises must be men lacking that quantity of brain and intellect to which the hon. gentleman referred, if they expend \$250,000 in the city of Brantford—a city containing 9,000 inhabitants—for the purpose of being handicapped and ruined. In addition to these expenditures, in Brantford, a company has established a new industry, the manufacture of farming and dairy utensils, with a capital of about \$50,000. The hon. gentleman knows that an English gentleman who had been carrying on business for a great number of years in

Yorkshire, has, owing to the operations of this Tariff, taken his whole plant and located himself in the hon. gentleman's city. From what I can learn, he is doing remarkably well. The fact that he has invested some hundreds of thousands of dollars in one enterprise there alone, and is now inducing others to invest their money in the manufacture of an article not yet produced in this country, is the best evidence that the handicapping of which the hon. gentleman speaks, has not had a very serious effect on our manufacturing industries.

Mr. PATERSON. Deal with the export trade.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's whole argument was based on the fact that in certain articles our export trade had decreased to the amount of \$1,300,000. I pointed out immediately afterwards that our inter-provincial trade had increased since Confederation, in the Maritime Provinces alone, by some \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000. I say that is dealing with the export trade.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be that I am not able to make my hon. friend comprehend.

Mr. PATERSON. That is explained by other causes. It is due to the \$30,000,000 import of gold arising from the export producing power of the people.

Mr. BOWELL. I quite admit that if they had no money they could not buy.

Mr. PATERSON. Where did they get their money?

Mr. BOWELL. Unless the people had the money to buy they would not buy. If they have got money, it is owing to the general prosperity of the country, induced to a very great extent by the establishment of large manufacturing industries. The hon. gentleman says that the money came into the country. I admit that, and contend that it is one of the results of the protective Tariff. If we did not manufacture to the extent we now do, all the products of the farm would be sent to foreign countries, and instead of the money being brought back to be expended here, we would bring back the products of foreign markets for our consumption. If we send to Europe 100,000 bushels of grain, and bring back in exchange gold, say, to the amount of \$200,000, you have that much to expend here and purchase our own manufactures: whereas, if we imported foreign manufactures instead, so much money would be taken out of circulation here. Just so long as we keep exporting to foreign countries and bring back gold, and manufacture here the goods we require to consume, just so long will the country be prosperous. I know that does not meet the views of the chief Free Trader, but I have more faith in one ounce of practice than in all the theory that Free Traders can produce.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And the results?

Mr. BOWELL. And in the results. The hon. gentleman particularly referred to the question of pig iron. He says that, under the late Tariff, the export of pig iron was greater than at present. Those who know anything of the manufacture of pig iron know that the Londonderry works are the only ones that have had any existence in this country for some time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Oh, no. There is Three Rivers.

Mr. BOWELL. For some time, I said, the Three Rivers works have been engaged in one particular manufacture. It is also known that at the time the hon. gentleman went out of power, these works, and the whole country, were, if I may say so, almost in bankruptcy. It may be true that the export of pig iron was greater then than now, and there may be two reasons for that. If there was none manufactured in this country for export, as there was not in 1878, then it follows that the export trade must have consisted of

English and Scotch pig iron which was brought into this country, warehoused, and then exported to a foreign country. That is where my hon. friend gets his export trade for 1878.

Mr. PATERSON. My figures are all for Canadian products.

Mr. BOWELL. That could not be, because there was none of any consequence manufactured in the country in 1877 and 1878. The present state of the Londonderry works is this: That instead of manufacturing pig iron for export they are manufacturing pig iron into billets and booms, and from that into bar iron. Though their whole establishment has been running night and day during the last year they are unable to supply the demands made upon them in this country, and if they have not exported the products of the two furnaces which are now in full blast, instead of the one they formerly had, it is because they are consuming the product of these mines and the product of these blast furnaces in the country rather than sending it out; that is the only answer that can be given, and to my mind it is a conclusive one. I intended to ask the hon. gentleman, before he made his last speech, what industries had been handicapped to such an extent that they had been crushed out of existence, under the operation of the present Tariff; but he has told us that he never knew manufactures so flourishing in the history of this country as they are to-day; and if they are flourishing, they must have a market of some description for that which they produce in their different branches of industry. If it be not in the export trade then it is, as I have pointed out, in the inter-provincial trade which has grown up to such a large extent and is constantly increasing. I know it has been the policy of the hon. leader of the Opposition—he is not present, but my argument is none the less pertinent—I know it has been the policy in the speeches which have been delivered by the hon. gentleman, particularly in the Maritime Provinces during the past year, that they should not trade with Ontario nor with Quebec, that the natural outlet for their products and the natural market for them is in the United States. The present leader of the Opposition stated, in a speech he made at Summerside, I think it was, that the United States was their legitimate market, and that they should not be compelled to trade with the other Provinces.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I could admire his countryman, Mr. Parnell, when he tried to enforce upon his own people the necessity of wearing only products they manufactured themselves. However much I disagree with him and his politics generally, I say I could admire Mr. Parnell when he said to the Irish people: "Wear that which you produce in your own country," because if they wore that which they manufactured themselves, it must be the product of their own labor, and the manufactures of their own country. But there is no comparison between a man who will advocate a policy of that kind and the man who will say to his own people: "Go to a foreign country and spend your money and ruin the manufactures of the other Provinces." I repeat that, while I could admire the policy of the one, because it would give labor to his own countrymen, I look, and I believe this country will look, with strong disapprobation, to use no stronger language, upon the leader of a party who advise a portion of the people of this great Dominion to go to the United States and purchase goods with their money rather than deal with the manufacturers of their own country.

Mr. ANGLIN. He never said anything of the kind; I was present.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that that is evidence of the fact, judging from the past, although, of course, in a parlia-

mentary sense, I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. I am only speaking from reports of speeches I read as having been delivered by the hon. gentleman. If he has been misreported, then, of course, I am wrong; but I cut the speech out at the time, and have it in my possession.

Mr. ANGLIN. Read it.

Mr. BOWELL. I thought it very extraordinary that a statement of this character should have been made in a country like this, where we are endeavoring to build up amongst ourselves a trade which will enrich the whole country.

Mr. PLUMB. He is reported in a half-a-dozen papers to have said it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says he was there, and that it was not said. What was the principal argument used by those gentlemen whom I may term the fathers of Confederation? It was that an interprovincial trade would grow up, and that articles which some Provinces could not produce would be produced by the other Provinces, being all members of the same family though living in different sections of the Dominion. Hence it struck me as very peculiar that the leader of a great party, and who is supposed to be at least in favor of the great principle of Confederation, should have given utterance to such language as this. I am not at all surprised that my hon. friend from Gloucester repudiates this sentiment, because we all know he was an uncompromising opponent of Confederation. I do not find fault with him for conscientiously believing that it would not be to the interest of that section of the Dominion in which he lived, and it was his duty, as a patriotic man to oppose it. But language of that kind, I say, is not that of a patriot. Any gentleman, any hon. member of this House, who has travelled through the Maritime Provinces and particularly in Prince Edward Island, must have found that the articles most largely in use there, particularly agricultural implements to which the hon. member for South Brant has referred, are nearly all bought from different sections of this Dominion, instead of being imported from the United States as formerly; but, what is still more gratifying, is the fact that, though being subjected to the heavy cost of transportation to the East, and to Manitoba and the North-West, these articles are sold, to-day, cheaper in these different sections of the Dominion than they were five or six years ago, when they were all purchased in the United States. The return for which my hon. friend has moved will be brought down. He tells us that the system of paying drawbacks—I think I may use the expression drawback to the drawback—has been intensified; that is, that the policy has been such as to prevent the possibility of these gentlemen obtaining their drawbacks. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is, that since our late discussion the principle has been extended to a certain extent, that in every single instance where manufacturers have presented their claims in such a manner that it was possible for the Accountant to arrive at a correct decision as to the amount of drawbacks they should receive, there has been no delay whatever in paying it to them. I think he will find that, when the return comes down, it will show that there was a much larger amount paid in the way of drawback than there was in previous years; and I have no doubt that, as the manufacturers continue to prosper, and when they shall have succeeded in more than supplying the home market, the export trade will continue to increase. And as it continues to increase, just so in pro-

Mr. BOWELL.

portion will the Government pay back as large an amount of drawback as the law will permit. But, unless manufacturers will place their claims in such a manner as will enable the Department, under the law, to deal with them, they have no right to complain of any delay which may take place. I make this explanation, because I know that in some cases manufacturers complain that their claims have not been attended to as rapidly as they should have been. Such claims, of course, come to the Department, and when complaints have come to me, and I have made enquiry, I have found in every instance that the claims have been made in such a way that it was impossible to deal with them until they were amended, and when this has been done no delay took place. I can only hope, as one of the best possible evidences of the prosperity of our country, that our manufactures will increase to such an extent that it will not be necessary for us to go out of the country for any of the articles we may require that can be manufactured here. As an illustration, I know that my hon. friend before me, the Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) finds that the demand for rolling stock to supply the Intercolonial Railway and other Government railways, has been so great that it has been utterly impossible for the engine manufacturers and car manufacturers of this country to contract for and deliver the articles required within anything like a reasonable time, or within such a time that he would have been justified in waiting to receive them. This has been the case in the car and engine shops, not only of Ontario, but in the Maritime Provinces; they have been driven to this extent, not to supply a foreign demand, but for the home market; so that the Minister of Railways, as well as many railway companies, have been obliged to import rolling stock in order to keep pace with the increased traffic in various sections of the country. Let us hope that this state of things may continue, and when the time comes for going into this matter more minutely, I think I will be able to show the hon. gentleman that, even in the articles to which he has referred, the manufacture has not decreased but has rather increased, and that the market has been in our own country instead of a foreign country. No article I know of furnishes a better illustration of that fact than that of furs. The demand for furs from Montreal, and other places in the older Provinces, in the North-West as well as the usual demand in other parts of Canada, has been so great that the manufacturers have scarcely been able to supply it, and hence they had none to export to foreign countries; but if those markets were not open to them for the sale of furs, as well as other articles, they would have to export them in order to find sale for that which they produce.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Company.—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Manitoba Bank.—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 17) to grant certain powers to "The American Telegraph and Cable Company."—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the St. Johns Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 21) to incorporate the Thunder Bay and Minnesota Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Lake Superior and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Exchange Bank of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Killam.)

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

The following motion was agreed to:—

Full description of the locality comprised in each Census sub-district from *a* to *f*, inclusive of Census district No. 192 "The Territories," with map delineating the boundaries of each sub-district.—(Mr. Blake.)

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 23rd February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General ;

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LORNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1882; and, in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons,

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 23rd February, 1882.

Ordered that the Message and Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN in introducing Bill (No. 36) respecting the Civil Service of Canada, said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill is intended to apply to the inside and outside services. The Civil Service, by this Bill, will be divided, as it is now, into two divisions: there will be the first or inside departmental division, and the second or outside departmental division. The inside division will comprise the officers at headquarters, the outside division will comprise the officers and servants outside the Capital. The Bill provides for the appointment of a Board of Examiners, who shall be authorized to examine all candidates for admission to the Service, and to give certificates of qualification to such persons as are found qualified, according to the regulations then in force. The meetings of the Board shall be held at such times, and the proceedings thereof shall be governed by such rules, as may be decided by the Governor in Council. It is intended to fix the salaries of the examiners, when so employed, at \$10 a day, and their travelling expenses; and if persons, as provided by the next clause, are employed as assistants for the examinations, they shall be paid \$5 per day. The Board of Examiners shall sit at certain periods in the cities of Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, London, Winnipeg, and Victoria, and such other places as may be determined by Order in Council. The Bill provides that all appointments shall be during pleasure, and no person except a Deputy-Head shall be appointed without a previous examination, in accordance with the provisions of the Bill. The Deputy-Head shall be appointed by the Governor in Council during pleasure, but may be removed for

cause, and if so removed the cause shall be communicated to both Houses of Parliament at the next Session, within the first fifteen days. The salaries of the Deputies, by this Bill, are intended to have a minimum of \$3,200, and a maximum of \$4,000. The duties of the Deputy-Heads of the Departments are provided for by the Bill. In the absence of a Deputy-Head the chief clerk may be named by the Head of the Department to fill his office. The Bill provides for four classes of clerks: chief clerks, first class, second class and third class clerks. Under the law as it stands now, there are five classes besides probationary clerks, namely: chief clerks, senior second class, junior second class, third class and probationary clerks or fourth class clerks. We thought it would be better to have, besides chief clerks, only three classes: first, second and third. Chief clerks shall only be appointed, according to this Bill, by Order in Council, passed on the report of the Deputy-Head of the Department, concurred in by the Head of the Department, and after the salaries have been voted by Parliament. More than that, the party so appointed must have a certificate from the Deputy-Head of the Department, that he possesses the necessary qualifications. Hon. gentlemen will see that a great deal more power is given in this Bill to the Deputy-Heads than is given by the law as it stands. The salary of a chief clerk will be the minimum, \$1,800, and maximum, \$2,400, as at present. A first-class clerkship shall only be created by an Order in Council, based on a report of the Deputy-Head, and concurred in by the Head of the Department, setting forth the reason for creating the office, and provided the salary has been already voted by Parliament. The salary will be \$1,200 minimum, per annum, \$1,800 maximum, which are the present rates. The second class clerkships will be appointed under a similar Order in Council, and with similar certificates. The salary will not be changed from what it is under the present law, \$1,100 minimum and \$1,400 maximum. The minimum salary of third class clerks will be \$400, and the annual increase of \$50 per year, up to a maximum of \$1,000. We have combined in the third class the two classes that existed before, namely, the third class and a junior second class. No increase of salary will be given to any officer unless on a report by the Deputy-Head, concurred in by the Head of the Department. There is the right of suspension of the increase, and when restored the arrears are not to be paid to the clerk. The manner of paying it would be from the beginning of next quarter. The number of officers and servants of a Department shall be determined by an Order in Council as well as the appointments; and all vacancies, however occurring, shall be filled in the manner provided hereafter in this Bill. No person shall be appointed to the Civil Service until he has passed an examination before a Board of Examiners. The examination will be according to the class to which the applicant aspires, and must be preceded by a preliminary examination to ascertain whether the candidate possesses such knowledge of orthography and elementary arithmetic, and whether his handwriting is such as to justify his admission to the qualifying examination. When that preliminary examination is passed he must be submitted to an examination for the class to which he aspires. No person will be admitted to be a candidate until he has satisfied the Board that at the time appointed for such examination he will have attained the full age of eighteen years, and that he is free from any physical defect or disease which would be likely to interfere with the proper discharge of his duties; also that his character is such as to qualify him for the Service. These examinations are open to all, but if the applicant wishes to be examined in English or in French, or in both languages, the examiners will have to grant his request. Then the Bill provides the machinery for giving notice in the papers, &c. When the examinations have taken place the examiners will send a list of the suc-

cessful candidates to the Secretary of State, provision being made for the publication of the list in the *Official Gazette*. The examination, of which I spoke just now, will apply to the messengers, packers and sorters in the first division, also to the third class clerkships and similar officers and employes in the inside and outside services. I need not go through the whole list. The mode of appointment will be this:

30. When it becomes necessary to make any new appointment to any of the classes to which is herein provided that first appointments shall only be after qualifying examination, such necessity shall be reported to the Head of the Department by his Deputy, and upon such report being approved by the Head of the Department, and after the salary to be paid shall have been voted by Parliament, the Head of the Department shall select and submit to the Governor in Council for probation from the list of qualified candidates, made by the Board as aforesaid, a person fitted for the vacant place.

That person will be appointed after he has passed this examination, and even then he is to be under probation for six months, and if during these six months the Head of the Department is not satisfied with him, he may be sent back and another appointment will take place in the manner in which the first was made. There is a provision also in the Bill by which an officer who has been so appointed, even after the six months but previous to the end of the year, should he be reported by the Deputy-Head of the Department as unfit for the service to which he was appointed, will be replaced by another in the manner provided by the Bill. If an officer is required in the Department for work requiring special qualifications, then the Bill provides for his appointment in the following way. For example, for an architect, or an assistant engineer, or an officer of that kind, the requisite qualifications for which are not possessed by any person then in the service of that Department, the Governor in Council may select and appoint such person as shall be deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy. Then about promotions in the Department:

33. Promotion in either division of the Civil Service shall be by examination, under regulations made by the Governor in Council.

(2) Such examination shall be open to any person employed in the Department in which the vacancy to be filled by promotion exists (unless the Governor in Council shall otherwise order) in either division of the Service who holds a position below that to which the promotion is to be made, and—

(3) Shall be in such subjects as, after consultation with the chief officers of the Department in which the promotion is to be made, may be decided upon by the Board as best adapted to test the fitness of the candidates for the vacant office.

The Bill provides that once in a year there shall be an estimate made by the different Deputy-Heads of the Departments of the probable requirements, or number of vacancies to take place in their respective Departments during the year. Of course that will be, to a certain extent, approximate; but the experience of the past few years will certainly show them what is likely to be the probable number to be provided for during the year.

34. (2) To the number so estimated shall be added such further number as the Deputy-Head may deem necessary to compensate for any failure of health, death, or other contingency; and a similar estimate shall be made, at the same time or times, of the number of vacancies likely to occur in the second division, to which promotions can be made. The numbers so estimated shall be those with reference to which the examinations for promotion shall be held.

Notice will be given in the *Official Gazette* of the vacancies likely to occur in the Departments, and the candidates may come forward and pass their examinations at the places fixed by the notice in the *Gazette*. The Board will be bound to make a list of those who are competing for promotion, and send it to the hon. the Secretary of State.

36. When any vacancy occurs in one of the higher classes, in either division, the Head of the Department shall select from the lists made, as herein directed, for promotion thereto the person whom, having due reference to any special duties incident to the office, to the qualification and fitness shown by the candidates respectively during their examination, and to the record of their previous conduct in the Service, he may consider best fitted for the office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Then there will be a probation for those as well as for the others, of six months, and if the probationer is rejected before the end of the six months, then another may be appointed in the same way and from the same list. During the time of probation, the office held by the probationer previously may be filled by another officer of the Department, under the same conditions.

40. So soon as conveniently may be after the passing of this Act, the Governor in Council shall determine the number of officers, chief clerks, messengers and other servants that are required for the working of the several Departments in each division of the Civil Service, but the amount of the salaries of the whole number shall in no case exceed that provided for by vote of Parliament for that purpose.

The object of this is, that if we wish to have this new law we must put in force as soon as possible, and for that purpose the Governor in Council will have to determine the number of officers that experience may have taught us is likely to be required for the proper performance of the duties of the Department, and will take the officers already there and use their services for that purpose; then if the number is larger, or if an officer holds a higher grade now in the Service than the grade to which he would be allotted were he to go into the Department for the first time, then he would be considered a supernumerary officer of his grade in that Department, thus he will be engaged in the Department with the functions, perhaps, of an officer of a lower grade till he is appointed permanently to the office, or has left the Service, or been removed. When a Deputy is required in a Department, he will have to be selected as ordinary clerks, from the list of those who will be declared, by the Board of Examiners, to have the qualifications of their class. The pay will be that which is now fixed third class clerks, not to exceed the minimum salary of a clerk of that class in proportion to the time he occupies the office, that is to say, the salary being, say, \$400 per annum as a minimum, if he is employed only two months it will be a sixth part of that.

42. (2) The temporary and supernumerary clerks so employed shall be paid only out of money voted by Parliament for payment of the contingencies of the Department and division of the Service in which such clerks are employed, or out of money voted by Parliament for the construction of the works upon which they are employed.

The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) having been a Cabinet Minister, will remember that, when persons were required for the examinations of harbors or rivers, or special works of that kind, these persons were chosen from among those experienced in the business, and were paid out of the allowance voted for the work. Then the 43rd clause provides for private secretaries. That makes no change. Private secretaries may receive \$500 per annum as such, and may be members of the Civil Service as now. But no private secretary shall be paid \$600 unless the amount has been previously voted by Parliament. The 44th clause provides for three weeks' absence of officers during the year. It is customary to give officers working during the year three weeks leave of absence when they have performed their duties well, and it is to be given by the Head of the Department, or Deputy-Head, as the case may be. In case of illness or any other cause, the Governor in Council may grant to any officer or servant of the Department leave of absence not to exceed one year.

Mr. MILLS. Is it intended that a private secretary shall be subject to an examination before he shall be appointed, or may the Minister appoint a private secretary, a member of the Civil Service, without examination?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill provides that any member of the Civil Service may be appointed private secretary; but a Minister may, by Order in Council, obtain the appointment of private secretary without his being subjected to an examination. Of course, as the hon. gentleman knows, a private secretary should have the entire confidence of the

Minister, and the latter selects him for that purpose, being first assured of his qualifications in other respects; and, therefore, that a private secretary, unless he may be a member of the Civil Service, is not subjected to the examination. The 45th clause provides that the Head of a Department, or, in his absence, the Deputy-Head of a Department, shall have power to suspend from the performance of his duties any officer or servant who shall be guilty of misconduct or negligence in the performance of his duties, and to recall such suspension and allow the suspended officer to return to his duties, but no officer shall receive pay for the time he may have been suspended. We think it better to put such a provision in the law, because, at present, if an officer is suspended for a time influences are brought to bear upon Ministers with a view of having the suspension revoked, as hon. gentlemen no doubt found when they occupied our places. We all know that pressure is brought to bear for the purpose of having his full salary paid to an officer who may have been suspended for three or four days or a week, as the case may be; and under the present law such requests are very difficult to refuse, whilst if such a provision is put in the Bill it will protect the Head of the Department as well as members of the House and others who may be kind enough to make such applications to Ministers. Another provision of this clause is, that in case of neglect of duty or misconduct by a civil servant, the Head of his Department may impose a fine not in any case to exceed one day's pay, and to deduct such fine from his salary. Hon. gentlemen may say that one day's pay is a small fine. In certain cases, in fact, I believe in any case, an officer, whether he be a chief clerk, or in the first, second or third class, will regard a fine of one dollar as almost as severe a punishment as if it were twenty or one hundred dollars, for, no matter how small the fine may be, it is equally a reflection on his conduct, and will give him as much pain as if it were a larger amount. All cases of suspension or fine by the Deputy-Head of the Department will, of course, be reported by him to the Head of the Department. The 46th clause provides that no extra salary or additional remuneration, of any kind whatsoever, shall be paid to any Deputy-Head, officer or servant in the Civil Service, unless such sum shall have been placed in the Estimates submitted to and voted by Parliament, and the name of the person stated. When the duties of any superior officer or clerk are continuously performed by an officer or clerk of an inferior grade during a period of more than three months, the latter may, on the recommendation of the Deputy-Head, concurred in by the Head of the Department, receive, in addition to his ordinary pay, the difference between such pay and the pay of the superior officer, whose duties he has performed. When the absence of the superior officer is not on account of illness, as, for example, if he were called away by important business to the United States, or England, the sum paid to the inferior officer who takes his place shall be deducted from his salary. The 47th clause provides for the retention of the attendance book. As hon. gentlemen probably know, this is not a particularly popular volume in the Civil Service; but, nevertheless, I am sure that the large majority of the officials who perform their duties punctually and well will not object to it, as it is a guarantee, to themselves and every one else, of their attendance in their offices, and the proper fulfilment of their duties. We, therefore, think that it should not be abolished. By the 49th clause it is provided:

That nothing contained in this Act shall prejudicially affect the salary or emoluments of any officer in the Service at the time of the coming into force of this Act, so long as he shall be continued in office, nor shall it affect any salary or emoluments granted by any Act now in force.

Of course we look to provide for the civil servants now enjoying office, and we do not wish to disturb the present

staff except to the extent involved in the re-organization of the Departments. By clause 50 it is provided:

That nothing in this Act shall diminish in this way the rights and powers of the Governor General in Council to dismiss any officer or servant.

The 51st clause is an amendment of the Superannuation Act. I shall read it, as I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen will prefer my doing so, in order that they may know exactly what its provisions are:

The superannuation of any civil servant shall be preceded by an enquiry by the Treasury Board.

(a) Whether the person it is proposed to superannuate is eligible within the meaning of the Superannuation Act;

(b) Whether his superannuation will result in benefit to the Service, and is therefore in the public interest; or,

(c) Whether it has become necessary in consequence of his mental or physical infirmity.

2. And no civil servant shall be superannuated unless the Treasury Board reports that he is eligible within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, and that such superannuation will be in the public interest.

3. No person hereafter appointed shall be deemed to have served in the Civil Service of Canada for the purposes of the Superannuation Act, unless such person has been appointed in conformity with the provisions of this Act.

We have here a guarantee that no mistake shall be made with regard to the superannuation of any officer, because previous to the report to Council, and previous to the action of Council, the Treasury Board will have to investigate the position of the officer, and see not only whether he should be superannuated, but whether he has attained the age, and is otherwise in a position to have the benefit of the Act.

Mr. MILLS. Is there any power to add to the time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the law in that respect remains as it is. The 52nd clause provides that the Secretary of State shall lay before Parliament, within fifteen days after the opening of the Session, a report of the proceedings of the Board of Examiners; also, within the same period, a return of the names and salaries of all persons appointed to, or promoted in, the Civil Service during the previous year. The Minister of Finance shall also lay before Parliament a return of the superannuations made in the Civil Service during the year, in accordance with the Act. The next two clauses are the repealing clauses, and by the last it is provided that the Act may be cited as the Canada Civil Service Act, 1882. The second schedule of the Bill gives the divisions in figures, but the salaries will have to be filled in afterwards, and I suppose I will have to introduce resolutions to that effect. Having made these explanations, I move for leave to introduce this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to find that this important matter has at last reached the stage of being embodied in a Government Bill. But I am sorry that, so far as I could gather from the expressions of the hon. Minister, this Bill does not embody the great radical principle in the method of appointing civil servants which we expected it would, namely, that of competitive examinations. Do I understand the hon. gentleman aright?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; it is a modified examination.

Mr. CASEY. So far as one can judge, it contains some admirable provisions for securing greater efficiency and better discipline in the Service. But there is one thing which I think should have been done, even before the introduction of this Bill. Certain information has been gathered, and I believe very effectively, by the Civil Service Commission, for the express purpose of enabling us to discuss this question thoroughly, which information, I believe, has been prepared for more than a year, but has not been distributed yet to the members. I hope the hon. Minister will see that the evidence taken at that Commission is laid before us before this Bill comes up for a second reading.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman will find that most of these documents have been laid before the House. The first report was laid before the House, at all events.

Mr. CASEY. But not the evidence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman may rest assured that the necessary time will be given to Parliament to examine the Bill, and to read the reports that have been made on the subject, before I move the second reading.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) introduced Bill (No. 37) to amend the Act to establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.

Bill read the first time.

BANK OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise for the purpose of asking leave to introduce a Bill (No. 38) for the relief of the Bank of Prince Edward Island, which I can only do by the unanimous consent of the House. It is a private Bill, for which there is no petition, and yet I am sure the House will, without opposition, allow me to introduce it. It is a Bill for the relief of the Bank of Prince Edward Island. It is known that that bank was obliged to suspend some little time ago. By its charter, which was granted by the Island Legislature, and is similar to our law, a suspension of ninety days operates for a suspension of the charter. The ninety days will expire on the 28th of this month. The bank has, I am happy to say, been able to make satisfactory arrangements with all its depositors, and I believe the directors are on the eve of making arrangements for the successful prosecution of their business, but not within the ninety days. A gentleman who is well known to a great many members of this House, Mr. Lewis Davies, formerly a member of this Parliament, is now in England, as the agent of this bank, for the purpose of making arrangements to enable them to go on with their business, and telegraphs that he is satisfied that he will be able to make those arrangements, but not within the statutory time. Of course, even if this Bill is passed by this House in one day, it will be too late, in consequence of the adjournment of the Senate, as the 28th will have arrived before the Bill can become law. There is, however, a clause in the Bill which provides that it shall have a retroactive effect; and if the Bill is not law at the expiration of the ninety days, it provides that there shall be an extension for ninety days longer. In that respect it is similar to the Act passed by the Canadian Parliament for the relief of the Royal Canadian Bank, in which a special clause was inserted granting an additional ninety days after the passing of the Act. I shall read the Bill, which contains only three clauses:

Whereas, the bank incorporated by the name of 'The President, Directors and Company of the Bank of Prince Edward Island,' by Statute of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, passed in the eighteenth year of Her Majesty's reign, was compelled by unforeseen losses and difficulties, to suspend payment on the 28th day of November, 1881, and under the provisions of said Act, if such suspension continues for ninety days from that last mentioned, the charter of the bank will be forfeited except only for the purpose of winding up its affairs and business, unless legislative provision be made for its relief; and whereas, it appears that since the said suspension, efforts have been made, and negotiations entered into in England and elsewhere, for the purpose of enabling the bank to resume payment, and it has been satisfactorily shown that there is every reason to believe that such efforts and negotiations will be successful, and that the bank will be able within the period hereinafter mentioned, to resume payment; and whereas, in the interest of the public and more especially of the people of the said Province, it is expedient that the relief prayed for by the said bank be granted: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

Mr. CASEY.

1. The period of ninety days, during which the said bank may resume payment without forfeiture of its charter, is hereby extended for ninety days after the passing of this Act, and if within that period the said bank resumes and continues payment in specie or Dominion notes, its charter shall continue in force as if no such suspension of payment as aforesaid by the bank had occurred.

2. If the said period of ninety days should have expired before the passing of this Act, the effect of the preceding section and provision shall be retroactive, and the charter of the bank shall, on the condition therein mentioned, be, and be held to have been, revived and continued, as if this Act had been passed before the expiration of the said ninety days."

I move, therefore, for leave to bring in this Bill, and that all rules and orders with respect to private Bills be dispensed with for that purpose.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I assume that the Ministry have satisfied themselves that the facts are all correctly stated, and that being the case—speaking for myself, and, I think I may venture to say, speaking for my friends on this side—no objection will be taken to what the hon. gentleman proposes. Of course he is aware—better, perhaps, than any other gentleman here—that this suspension is in danger of becoming a precedent which may be put into effect on occasions when there is not so much to recommend it as in the present instance. Still, I have no doubt that the course the hon. gentleman proposes is the best in the interest of the shareholders, the depositors and the creditors of the bank; and, so far as I am individually concerned, I will be glad to support the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. Minister of Finance is satisfied that the statements made in the preamble of the Bill are correct. There is, in fact, a Government deposit there, and the Government are ready to abide the result with the moral certainty of being paid in full.

Bill introduced and read the first, second and third times, and passed.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired, When is it intended to introduce the Bill for the distribution of seats announced in the Speech?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill will be introduced very shortly, and early enough to give hon. members a full opportunity of perusing all its clauses, considering and discussing them.

THE CENSUS.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired, Whether the information laid on the Table on the subject of the Census is all that is available, or that is to be submitted to the House this Session? If not, what further information is it intended to submit, and how soon?

Mr. POPE (Compton). Since the question was placed on the paper, other information has been brought down. Further information will be supplied, but when, it is impossible at present to say.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. COURSOL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause a clock to be placed in the central tower of the Post Office at Montreal; and if so, when the said clock is to be placed in position?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government to cause a clock to be placed in the central tower of the Post Office at Montreal; orders have been given to that effect, and the said clock is shortly to be placed in position.

AGED EMPLOYÉS IN THE MILITIA OFFICES.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place on half-pay, or grant a pension to

those employes in the militia offices discharged by reason of age or infirmity?

Mr. CARON. In reply to the hon. member, I have the honor to inform him that the existing law does not allow the Government to place on half-pay, or grant a pension to those employes in the militia offices discharged by reason of age or infirmity.

MILITARY COLLEGE AT KINGSTON.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to abolish the Military College at Kingston?

Mr. CARON. In reply to the hon. member, I have the honor to inform him that it is not the intention of the Government to abolish the Military College at Kingston.

MILITARY SCHOOLS FOR THE INFANTRY SERVICE.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to open, in the principal cities of the Dominion, Military Schools for the infantry service (similar to those in operation about 1863, the success of which was so complete), in order that the infantry battalions may complete their complement of officers and non-commissioned officers, who will first have been enabled to acquire suitable instruction in the military art, and so prevent the active militia from becoming rapidly ineffective?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to the question, because it contains statements which are controverted.

Mr. SPEAKER. The first part is not objectionable, but the last part must be withdrawn.

Mr. AMYOT. I have no objection to withdraw the latter part, as it does not meet with general approval, although I thought the fact stated was admitted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the question, as amended?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is: Whether it is the intention of the Government to open, in the principal cities of the Dominion, military schools for the infantry service?

Mr. CARON. I beg to state that it is not the intention of the Government at present to open schools, in the different cities of the Dominion, for the infantry service.

THE CORVETTE CHARYBDIS.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) enquired, (1) Whether it is the intention of the Government to utilize the steam corvette *Charybdis* as a training ship, as was originally proposed; and if so, when? If not, why not? (2) What has been the entire outlay by Canada in connection with the *Charybdis*?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg leave to say to the hon. member that the best mode of utilizing the steam corvette *Charybdis* engages the serious attention of the Government. As to the total outlay by Canada in connection with the *Charybdis*, if the hon. gentleman will move for a return, I will bring it down; or, on this question, I will bring down a return.

THE CLAIM OF JOSEPH CHARLES LISLOIS.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government have taken into consideration, in accordance with the promise by them made, on the 16th March, 1881, the question of paying to Mr. Joseph Charles Lislois, the amount of the losses sustained by him in the destruction by fire of one of his buildings, caused by one of the locomotives of the Government on the Intercolonial Railway? What decision have the Government come to; and if it be adverse, what legal and equitable reasons can prevent a Government from

repairing a wrong which the report of the official arbitrator shews to have been really done by them to a private individual?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to this question on the same grounds as in the previous case.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question must be, What decision have the Government arrived at in regard to the claimant in question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I desire to say that the Government have considered the question and have decided that they cannot entertain this claim.

THE TELEGRAPH SYSTEM OF THE DOMINION.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Whether the Government have taken into consideration the propriety of assuming the telegraph system of the Dominion and running it in connection with the Post Office Department, the telegraph system to-day being under the control of foreigners.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The question is open to the same objection. We do not know that the telegraph system is under the control of foreigners.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the Government has not taken this matter into consideration.

HAGGAS' WATER ELEVATORS.

Mr. WHEELER enquired, Whether the new system of supplying water to locomotives as adopted on the Government Railways in Prince Edward Island and the Canadian Pacific, known as the "Haggas' Water Elevators," is giving as good satisfaction as was claimed for it at the time it was adopted on the above railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I desire to say, in answer to the hon. gentleman that the adoption of the Haggas' Water Elevator system on the Prince Edward Island Railway has given the most entire satisfaction, and has proved to be quite equal to what it was represented. So far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned, the portion of the road on which that system has been adopted, is as yet in the hands of the contractors, and I have no knowledge further than that it is perfectly satisfactory.

MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL TAXES.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) enquired, Whether the Government intend, during the present Session of Parliament, to bring in a Bill making Dominion officials liable to pay municipal and local taxes upon their incomes, as is the case with other ratepayers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government do not intend to propose such a measure.

GOODS FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. KILLAM enquired, Whether any individuals or firms are permitted to import, free of duty, any goods for the use of the Intercolonial Railway; and if so, what are their names?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that no individuals or firms are permitted to import goods for the Intercolonial Railway free of duty.

MAILS FROM STRATFORD TO CHESLEY.

Mr. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have the mails carried from Stratford to

Chesley this season, by the Port Stanley and Lake Huron Railroad; and if so, when?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is not, at present, the intention of the Government to send the mails by that railway.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Mr. GIROUARD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister, said: After having seen, as we have to-day, a petition from about three hundred ladies of Montreal, for the repeal of the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, we cannot postpone the second reading of this Bill. It is perfectly clear that the passing of this Bill has become a necessity, not only in the interest of the female, but also in the interest of the male sex. This necessity is so manifest that I do not intend to repeat, to-day, the arguments which were made when this Bill was brought forward for the first time in 1880; the discussion then lasted four sittings. Every possible argument for and against the Bill was then advanced, and I would be abusing the indulgence of this House were I to deal with the subject-matter at any length. This House will recollect that on its second reading, this Bill was passed by 120 to 19, and on its third reading by a majority of 75. Finally, when the Bill was brought before the Senate, it occupied several sittings of that body, and there the Bill, after having been thoroughly considered, was not rejected, but its consideration postponed for another year. We have given the members of the Senate, not only one, but two years to consider it and arrive at a conclusion as to the tendency of public opinion regarding it, and what is the result? Do we find that public opinion is against the Bill? On the contrary, it is more in favor of the Bill than ever. So much so, that ladies have thought it necessary to adopt a very unusual proceeding on their part, and ask Parliament to adopt this measure. Since the Session of 1880 it has been constantly before the public. There is hardly a newspaper in the country which has not contained not only numerous correspondence, but also leading articles; and it is a most agreeable fact that not a single newspaper can be quoted against the provisions of this Bill. I do not intend to examine the question from any religious aspect. To-day, as two years ago, theologians are divided and will always be divided, but, I believe, that a large majority of the people of the Dominion are in favor of the measure, and that is the reason why I have the honor to ask the House to pass the second reading. I may add that this Bill has passed the British House of Commons ten or twelve times, and has been defeated in the House of Lords but by a majority of four—I believe in 1877. A similar Bill has become law in all the British Colonies except Canada. It has become law in South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia. Since last Session it has passed the Legislature of New Zealand, and has also become law at the Cape of Good Hope. Undoubtedly those colonies but follow the natural law. I have changed a little the wording of the Bill. The first section provides that all laws prohibiting marriage with a deceased wife's sister are hereby repealed. The first Bill provided that hereafter it shall be lawful for a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. I make this change to meet the views of the hon. member for Maskinongé and others of his friends who moved an amendment to that effect. I do not see, really, that it makes much difference whether the prohibition be repealed or the marriage be made lawful; but I make the change to meet the hon. member's views, and secure as many votes as I can. That position in the old Bill which related to the widow's brother has also been left out, to meet the views of another portion of this House, who, to the number of thirty, supported an amendment to that effect. As far as I am personally concerned, I would be glad to see that

Mr. GILLIES.

portion restored. It is only a sentiment, but sentiment must be respected. The second clause is inserted in order to protect vested rights with which we have no desire whatever to interfere.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Fitzsimmons,	Merner,
Amyot,	Fleming,	Méthot,
Anglin,	Fortin,	Mills,
Arkell,	Fulton,	Mousseau,
Bain,	Gault,	Muttart,
Baker,	Gigault,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Gillies,	Paterson (Brant),
Barnard,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Beaty,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Pinsonneault,
Beauchesne,	Girouard (Kent),	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Richey,
Bergeron,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Bergin,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bill,	Haddow,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bolduc,	Haggart,	Rochester,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Rogers,
Bowell,	Holton,	Ross (Dundas),
Brown,	Houde,	Ross (Middlesex),
Bunster,	Huntington,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Hurteau,	Routhier,
Burpee (St. John),	Irvine,	Royal,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cameron (Huron),	Killam,	Ryan (Montreal),
Carling,	Kilvert,	Rykert,
Cartwright,	King,	Rymal,
Casey,	Kranz,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Landry,	Shaw,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Lantier,	Skinner,
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Sproule,
Colby,	Longley,	Strange,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sutherland,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tasse,
Coursol,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Tellier,
Crouter,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Currier,	Macmillan,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Vallée,
Daoust,	McCarthy,	Wade,
DeCosmos,	McDougald,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Desjardins,	McDougall,	Wallace (York),
Doull,	McGreevy,	Wheler,
Drew,	McLennan,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McRory,	White (Hastings),
Dumont,	Malouin,	Wiser,
Elliott,	Manson,	Wright.—137.
Ferguson,	Massue,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bourbeau,	Jones,	Quimet,
Brooks,	Kirkpatrick,	Patterson (Essex),
Bunting,	Langevin,	Plumb,
Caron,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Pope (Compton),
Charlton,	McDonald (Vis., N.S.),	Scott,
Daly,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Stephenson,
Dawson,	McCuag,	Thompson,
Desaulniers,	McQuade,	Vanasse,
Farrow,	Mon tplaisir,	Weldon,
Fiset,	O'Connor,	White (Renfrew),
Geoffrion,	Olivier,	Williams.—34.
Hackett,		

Bill read the second time.

DRAWBACKS ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Paterson (South Brant) for a return of all claims presented for drawbacks on goods manufactured for export since January 22nd, 1881, &c.

Mr. CHARLTON. In view of the fact that the Budget Speech will be delivered shortly, and that matters pertaining to the trade policy of the Government will then be fully discussed, I shall not enter to-night into a lengthy discussion of the question under consideration. I shall confine myself to meeting a few of the views presented by the hon.

gentlemen who have spoken upon this question from the opposite side of the Chamber. My hon. friend from South Brant, in the course of his excellent speech, pointed out to the House, in a very forcible manner, the fact that, under the operation of the present Tariff, the export trade of the Dominion in manufactures is steadily decreasing. That, Sir, is a circumstance attending the operation of all protective Tariffs. The effect of high protective duties, when they are levied upon raw materials, is necessarily to diminish the ability of manufacturers to compete in neutral markets with the manufacturers in any country who are not subjected to the payment of duties upon their raw material. For that reason we find that in all protected countries the export trade in manufactures is insignificant. We might point out a good many instances to illustrate this view of the case. I shall confine myself on this occasion to one or two only, and I might cite, and will cite, the instance of the United States. The United States, after having been under the operation of a high protective system for twenty-one years have succeeded in developing, to a limited degree only, exports and manufactures, and I find that for the year 1880 the report of manufactures from the United States, including petroleum, a very large item, and an article in which, from the circumstances, they have a monopoly, and including also manufactured lumber, reached only the sum of \$104,000,000 in round numbers. That country, in 1860, after a long period of a revenue Tariff, reached, in the exports of manufactured cottons, \$10,930,000. In the year 1880, after twenty years of protection, the export of cotton manufactures from the United States, was \$9,880,000, considerably more than \$1,000,000 less than it had been twenty years previous; and at no time during the twenty years of the operation of protection in the United States, have the exports of cotton manufactures equalled those in 1860, at the close of the revenue Tariff period. I find that that country in 1880, after twenty years of protection, exported \$346,000 of woollen goods. Their exports of woollen goods amounted to two-thirds of 1 cent per head of the population, and their exports of cotton goods to less than 20 cents per head. Their total exports of all manufactures, including petroleum and lumber, amounted to a trifle over \$2 per head. Now, Sir, the country, whilst under the operation of this Tariff, taxed itself to an enormous extent. The best Economists in the United States tell us that the domestic productions of the country are enhanced in value to two-thirds the amount of the duty upon the imported article. The average range of duties in the United States is about 36 per cent. If this assumption is true, then the domestic productions of the United States, amounting to some 3,000,000,000 of dollars, are made \$720,000,000 dearer to the purchasers of that country than they would be under a different system. This, then, amounts to a tax upon every man, woman and child in the United States, in the enhanced cost of domestic goods, of \$18 per head; in other words, in order to secure a position by which they are enabled to export \$2 worth per head of manufactures, they pay taxes of \$18 per head upon the domestic productions of the country in addition to the tax they pay the Customs revenue. Well, Sir, the industries of that country that have been promoted and fostered for twenty years, are still reluctant to dispense with that protection which they claimed as infant industries twenty years ago, they are still infant industries, and they will ever remain infant industries under the operation of a protective system such as prevails in that country. Certain circumstances lead careful observers to the belief that one thing only prevents the United States from taking its position as the great manufacturing country of the world, and that thing is, its absurd fiscal policy. To-day, one of the great American manufacturing concerns, the Singer Sewing Machine Company, are erecting works, covering forty acres of ground, that are to employ

4,000 operatives and are to produce 3,000,000 sewing machines a year near Glasgow, they have transferred this business to Scotland, because, under the American tariff laws, they cannot prosecute it in the United States and supply the export demand. But for protection they could carry on the business in the United States, and make their three millions of machines annually, and at the same time supply the home market, as at present. This one fact illustrates the position I take—the position that is taken by Economists everywhere—that the Tariff system of the United States alone stands in the way of that great country assuming a position as the foremost manufacturing nation of the world, in place of the position it now holds of exporting, the beggarly amount of \$2 per head of manufactures. While the export of manufactures has fallen off in Canada, as it has fallen off in the United States as compared with a revenue Tariff for the period ending in 1880, the Trade and Navigation Returns indicate that our manufacturers have not secured the control even of our own market. It seems that in the year 1881 we imported something over \$10,000,000 worth of cotton goods. It seems that in that same year we imported \$3,750,000 worth of woollen goods. It seems that in that same year we imported \$12,800,000 worth of iron and steel, and their manufactures. It seems that in almost all lines imports are increasing, notwithstanding the adoption of a policy that was to exclude these products from our markets, and give to our manufacturers the control of the Canadian market. Now, Sir, in view of the fact that the imports of goods are increasing in Canada, in view of the fact that the exports of manufactures are diminishing in Canada, I would like to ask, at this stage of my remarks, what was the character of our last Tariff? Was that Tariff, which was supplanted by the present one, a Tariff that operated to the injury of the manufacturing interests of this country? Was it a Tariff under which our manufacturing industries could not be developed? I hold that, on the contrary, it was a Tariff under which the manufacturing industries of Canada had been developed, were developing, and would have gone on developing. I believe that, with the revival of times, with the increase of prosperity, that came from causes entirely beyond our control; that had that Tariff remained in operation up to the present time, our exhibit as a manufacturing people would have been more favorable indeed than it is under the Tariff now in operation. I laid before this House, in 1876, a statement, showing that, notwithstanding the depression that existed in Canada at that time, our manufacturers were in a better position, in a stronger position, were making larger sums on their investments, than were the manufacturers of New England or any other portion of the United States. That statement proved conclusively that, notwithstanding the depression, our manufacturers were in a fairly good position, in a comparatively better position, than the manufacturers of almost any other country. The depression was due, not to the Tariff, but to causes quite outside the Tariff. The depression would have passed away as readily, I believe more readily, without a change of Tariff than with the change of Tariff made by the present Administration. Then, Sir, with reference to the amount of our manufactures, the Census of 1871 shows that we produced in that year \$211,000,000 worth of manufactured goods in this country. This is an increase which grew up under a moderate revenue Tariff. I believe that when the Tariff changed, our production of goods was not less than \$250,000,000 per annum, and perhaps amounted to \$275,000,000. I find, on looking over the field and examining into the various branches of manufactures, that most of our successful manufacturers began with little capital. In the case of one firm—and I take the liberty of mentioning their name, because they appeared before the Depression Committee in 1876—in the case of the Messrs. Gurney it was acknowledged in 1876

that they were worth \$750,000. They commenced business, twenty years before, without a dollar and yet they managed to accumulate from their business an average of \$37,000 a year besides their living. The Tariff, which allows such an accumulation of wealth in twenty years, the establishment of a great business founded on nothing but the intelligence and energy of the men who founded it, was certainly one which might fairly be claimed as calculated to foster the industries of the country. I find, in looking over the country, and by correspondence with manufacturers, that the great majority of manufacturers in Ontario were men who commenced on very small means; that the great majority were highly successful, and that the majority of them were highly satisfied with the fiscal policy which prevailed before the change of the Tariff three years ago. I find that a great many of these manufacturers to-day are dissatisfied with the present Tariff, and pronounce it worse than the one which preceded it.

Hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. I will show, in the course of my remarks, that this is true, and that if the duty had been raised in 1876—as I am free to say it should have been—to 20 per cent., it would have been amply satisfactory to the manufacturers of this country, and, with free raw material, would have placed them in, and left them in, a better position than they have since occupied. I believe that if the duty had been raised 2½ per cent. my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper), was all ready and prepared to condemn that increased duty. I think it is a matter of public notoriety that the hon. gentleman made a very sudden and skilful change of base when the Finance Minister of that day disappointed the hon. gentleman's expectations by announcing that the duties would not be raised 2½ per cent. It is claimed that the Reform party are hostile to the manufacturers. Great pains are taken to impress the manufacturers with the belief that the policy of the party represented on this of the Chamber is one hostile to the manufacturing interests of the country. Sir, that is an allegation that I emphatically deny. The Reform party is not hostile to the manufacturing interests of the country; it is not hostile to any great interest of this country. It simply demands that there shall be equitable taxation, that due regard shall be paid to the interest of all classes; that no one interest shall be unjustly promoted to the detriment of other interests. The Reform party is willing to adopt a policy which has been conducive to the prosperity of the manufacturers in the past; which will be conducive to their prosperity in the future; which will be more conducive to their permanent and substantial prosperity than the one which is now in operation. I may say that I think we shall be able to quiet the troubled mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell), as to what our policy is. In the course of his remarks on this question he was very anxious that we should know what we meant—to define our position. We shall be able to define our position. We shall unquestionably define our position during the course of this Session, so that he will comprehend it. He will find it not hostile to any great interest in this country. He will find it calculated to promote all the great industries of this country, the manufacturers among the rest. And, Sir, we declaim most emphatically the allegation which has been made that we are the enemies of that or any other interests in this country. I hold that with a Tariff imposing duties for revenue purposes of 20 per cent., a Tariff permitting the admission of the raw material free of duty, would make the position of every manufacturer of this country, with possibly the exception of the manufacturers of sugar and cotton, better than it is to-day. I hold, Sir, that such a Tariff, while pressing less heavily upon the masses of the people, or extracting less money

Mr. CHARLTON.

from their pockets, while yielding all the revenue necessary, would be infinitely better for the manufacturing interests. And the very fact, Mr. Speaker, that a drawback is allowed in some cases upon the exported manufactured article is itself a proof that the present Tariff is burdensome to the manufacturer. If it was not so, why the drawback—why the rebate? It is an admission, Sir, that the articles necessary to the manufacturer in the progress of his business—his raw materials—are taxed by the Government; it means that the cost of the article he produces is enhanced to that extent, and when he attempts to export it and meets his competitors in a neutral market, who are not subject to the same duties, it is necessary, in order to place him on a footing of equality, for the Government to repay to him the sum extracted from him in the shape of duty on the raw material. It is true that our manufacturers are prosperous at the present time; it is true that their prosperity is almost as great as it would have been at the present time, under the old Tariff with the revival which has taken place, but I do not believe that the great mass of the manufacturers are as prosperous as they would have been under the Tariff which was supplanted by the present one. I have some letters from leading manufacturers which explain their views as to the operations of the present Tariff. I have one from a large establishment in my own county, engaged in the manufacture of reapers and mowers, in which they explain the enhanced cost of each machine in consequence of the increased duties imposed by the Tariff. It is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of yesterday received asking for details of extra duties over those of 1878 in our manufactures. Below we give them to you, and they are under rather than over the mark. In the construction of our reaper, we use 500 lbs. cast iron, 50 cents; 5 lbs. malleables, additional duties, 24 cents; 32 lbs. spring steel, 13 cents; 16 lbs. machinery steel, 10 cents; and say \$1 worth of bolts, 25 cents; 75 lbs. wrought iron, 19 cents; 1 lb. nuts, 1 cent; paints and oils, 4 cents; varnish, 5 cents; coal, 3 cents; wire, 1 cent; knives, 20 cents; total \$1.75."

This last sum represents the extra cost to that Company on one reaper as compared with the cost of material under the preceding Tariff. They say that this is within the mark, so that we may take the amount at \$2 on each machine, or an aggregate cost upon their business of about \$2,000, which they cannot get from their customers, because they have to sell their machines as low as formerly.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). How is it that the manufacturers are selling the machines from 10 to 15 per cent. cheaper than they were under the old Tariff?

Mr. CHARLTON. This manufacturer tells us that he is not making as much on his machines as he did before.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Then the manufacturers are not public robbers,

Mr. CHARLTON. He tells us that they are selling machines at as low a price as they did formerly, while under the Tariff they cost them more, and therefore the Tariff injures them. The question is not whether they are selling machines for more or less, but whether they are making as much under the Tariff as they were before it was adopted. Then we are told that they have control of the Canadian market. They had it before. This letter is from the firm of Green Brothers, of Waterford, Ontario. I have another from Noxon Brothers, of Ingersoll, one of the largest firms in Ontario, which I will take the liberty of reading:

"INGERSOLL, 2nd February, 1882.

"DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 27th ult. As nearly as we can estimate, the cost of our goods has been increased from eleven to twelve per cent. by the present Tariff. The cost of labor has not increased; we are not employing the same proportion of skilled mechanics as under the old Tariff; we have taken boys and ordinary laboring men and trained them to do our special kind of work only, and in this way displaced a large number of skilled tradesmen. The men and boys we train in this way never become mechanics in our works, and if put to

other employment than the one single thing they have been trained to do, they could perform only the most menial labor. In this way, they making use of a greater number of labor saving machines, we have to some extent counteracted the effect of the Tariff on the cost of producing our goods. Our annual product of goods could be manufactured under the old Tariff from \$12,000 to \$15,000 less than under the present Tariff."

I have a letter also from a firm in the town of my hon. friend the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—the firm of A. Harris, Son, & Co., in which the writer states that the Tariff is a damage to them of from \$5,000 to \$7,000 a year in the extra costs of materials. I have a letter to the same effect from the firm of Patterson Brothers, of Patterson, Ontario, which, like all the others, states that the Tariff has increased the price of their raw material and diminished their profits without reducing the price of their goods. If the position taken by these men is true, then the Tariff has not operated to their benefit as manufacturers; and I hold that it will be found that, with the exception of the sugar refiner, the cotton manufacturer and the woollen manufacturer, every manufacturing interest in the Dominion of Canada is placed in a worse position by this Tariff than it occupied under the revenue Tariff which preceded it. We were told by the hon. Minister of Customs that our manufacturers want higher duties. Well, it is certainly not the manufacturers I have alluded to who want higher duties on raw materials. He failed to tell us who wanted higher duties. Is it the Redpaths, who, under the operation of the present Tariff are making hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, and who are able to associate with the Rothschilds and the Vanderbilts? Is it the Valleyfield Cotton Company, who have declared a dividend of 50 per cent. on their capital? Is it those manufacturers who are running full time and are making enormous profits under the operations of this Tariff? I have heard of no others who want higher duties. We were also told by that hon. gentleman that our manufacturers are busy, because the purchasing power of the people is increased. I would like to ask him what would be the condition of affairs if we had a depression, if we had a failure of the harvest, if we had a year such as that of 1876, when we failed by over two millions of dollars in raising our own bread, if we had a period of depression all over the world, affecting the price of the products we sent to foreign countries, would he then be able to congratulate himself on the fact that the manufacturers were driven to fill orders, that the demand for goods was great, and that the people were able to buy freely? No, Sir. Then the condition of things would be as they were during the administration of my hon. friend from Lambton; then rigid economy would have to be practised by the people who were in trouble; and then the manufacturers would have to complain of diminished demand for their goods. The circumstances existing now are entirely different from those which existed during the three or four years previous to their advent to office. They flatter themselves that this is due to their policy. It is nothing of the kind. Have the good harvests been caused by the policy of the Government? Did the policy of the Government cause the depression here, or the depression that existed in the United States? Were the causes that produced that depression, that aggravated it, that continued it for five years, causes within the reach of this Parliament, or of any power in the Dominion of Canada? I hold that they were not. And to what is the revival due? Do hon. gentlemen opposite claim credit for the revival? Do they say that the National Policy has given us better harvests, that it has reached across the ocean and produced bad harvests in England, yielding us higher prices for our productions? Is it the National Policy which has reached across the border, and, in its potent influence, produced a revival of business there, which has re-acted on us. The assertion is absurd—the National Policy has produced none of these results. Well, Sir, there are certain facts on this

problem of what has produced the revival, which I may allude to shortly. I find that the net export of cereals and their productions—flour and meal—from Canada from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, amounted to \$48,767,000, and that the net export of the same articles in 1879, 1880 and 1881, amounted to \$44,978,000; the former being in five years, and the latter in three years. The annual average for the first period is \$9,753,000, and for the second period \$14,990,000; the average annual excess in the second period over the first being \$5,239,000. The excess for the three years since this Government came into power, amounts, therefore, to \$15,718,000. For the period extending from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, the export of butter and cheese, the produce of Canada, was \$31,860,960; for the three years, 1-79, 1880 and 1881, it was \$21,927,109; so that the annual average from 1874 to 1878 was \$6,372,193, and for the period between 1879 and 1881 was \$7,309,036, being an excess for the latter period over the former of \$936,843. I find, Sir, that in animals and their produce, the produce of Canada for the period from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, the exports were of the value of \$69,137,804; for the three years 1878, 1879 and 1881, they amounted to \$53,068,398, showing an annual average for the first period, of \$13,275,560, and for the second period, of \$17,698,466, being an annual excess for the latter period, of \$3,861,906. I find, Sir, that the exports of agricultural products, the produce of Canada for the period from 1874 to 1878 inclusive, were of the value of \$90,686,295, and for the period from 1879 to 1881 inclusive, they were \$63,911,119, being an annual average for the first period of \$18,137,259, and for the second period of \$21,083,706, being an annual excess for the latter period of \$2,946,447. I understood the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), in his remarks upon this question, the other day, to make a comparison between the last three years of the period covering the administration of the hon. member for Lambton and the three following years. I do not know whether I misunderstood him or not. He represented the exports of agricultural produce for 1876, 1877 and 1878 to amount to \$53,834,000, and that the exports for the following three years were some \$16,000,000 less. If I am incorrect I am open to correction.

Mr. HESSON. My remarks are before the House in the Debates. I said that, for 1871, 1872 and 1873, the last years of the administration of Sir John A. Macdonald, the exports of farms products, the produce of Canada, amounted to forty odd millions, as against \$53,000,000 during the last few years of the administration of the Mackenzie Government, the difference was some \$13,000,000. My object was to show that, although there was a larger export under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie, times were not better in consequence of that fact.

Mr. CHARLTON. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, as I thought a comparison had been made for a period subsequent to, and not before, the administration of Mr. Mackenzie. However, it will show this: that if the exports for 1871-72-73 fell \$16,000,000 short of those of 1876-77-78, that causes were operating at that time that produced the hard times that followed. Short harvests and diminished exports in due time produced their fruits. I find that for the three years 1876-77-78, as has been correctly stated by the hon. member for North Perth, the exports were \$53,834,000, or \$10,000,000 less than the exports for the years 1878-79-80. With regard to fisheries, the produce of Canada, I find the exports for the five years, from 1874 to 1878, were \$26,671,899, while for the three years 1879-80-81 they were \$20,876,242, giving an annual average for the first period of \$5,337,179, and for the second period \$6,792,080, being an annual excess of \$1,454,901. I further find on summing up those excesses of export that the average annual excess for the latter period was made up as follows: Net export of cereals, flour and meal, \$5,239,425;

animals and their products, the produce of Canada, \$3,861,906; fisheries, the product of Canada, \$1,454,901; being a total of \$10,556,232 per annum, or \$31,668,695 for the three years. Add to this the fact that in addition of that increase of thirty-one millions odd during the three years I have named our lumber trade with the United States greatly revived, revived to such an extent that our manufacturers last year were receiving for their lumber a higher price in gold than they received during the inflated period of the Civil War, in currency was worth only 40 cents on the dollar; when you add all these facts together you are able to account for the improvement in the times quite clearly and quite satisfactorily, without any reference whatever to the National Policy, or to any other fiscal policy of this or any other Government. My hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), in the course of his remarks, informed the House that the National Policy had stimulated the export of food. We were told, when the policy was introduced, that it would create a home market for our food; we heard nothing about the policy stimulating the export of food. We did hear that manufactures would spring up on all hands, that our consuming population would be largely increased, that a home market would be furnished for the agricultural products of the Dominion, that we would be no longer under the necessity of exporting food; yet hon. gentlemen to-day tell us that a diametrically opposite result has occurred, namely the stimulation of the export trade in the food products of Canada. How is it about this home market? Under what conditions can a home market be created in a country? Was it reasonable to suppose that when promises were made that the National Policy would result in the creation of a home market for the agricultural surplus of Canada. England has a home market; and why? Because of every \$100 worth of textile products manufactured 65 per cent. were exported. She is not prepared to hand over the control of her own market, but she supplies her own wants under the operation of Free Trade, and exports more than one-half of her manufactures. In consequence of being the workshop of the world, she has a home market, and, besides, a market for the surplus productions of other countries. But it is useless to suppose that Canada can secure a home market surplus by supplying its own wants. A country situated as Canada is, with great agricultural resources, can never afford a home market for its own products by simply attempting to manufacture for its own wants. The United States have been endeavoring to secure this home market for twenty years, and with what result. After endeavoring for twenty years to foster their manufacturing industries to such an extent as to create a consuming population that would consume all their food, they exported, in the year 1880, food enough for 25,000,000 people, and Canada exported enough for 1,000,000. The hon. member for Centre Wellington also informed us that the agricultural interests had been benefitted by this policy. In what way? By the creation of this home market which was to absorb all our productions? By the duty upon grain which was to raise the price of grain that much higher? Will any hon. gentleman in this House inform me that the operation of the National Policy, in so far as grain duties are concerned, has conferred any benefit on the farmer? I would like to hear some individual make that assertion. I say no, it has not. In 1878, and a number of years preceding, Canada was presumably a better market for grain than the United States, and a great outcry was raised here against the importation of American grain. In 1878, oats were worth 10 cents and wheat 14 cents more in Toronto than in Chicago. It was clear then that, under the operation of Free Trade, we had a better market for grain than the United States; and at the same time the United States had, for seventeen years, been living under a protective duty on grain. Although they had a protective Tariff they were shipping millions

Mr. CHARLTON.

of bushels to Canada, and, under the operation of Free Trade, the Canadian market was better than the American market. Is this the case to-day? Are oats to-day worth 11 cents more and wheat 14 cents more in Toronto than in Chicago? They are not. Since our present policy has been fairly in operation, there has not been a day when grain was not worth more in the American than in the Canadian market. I see a smile spreading over the countenance of my hon. friend for Niagara. If the hon. gentleman would follow—

Mr. PLUMB. Because we do not get protection.

Mr. CHARLTON. Wheat is worth more in Toledo, Detroit, Oswego and Buffalo than in Toronto. There is not a single grain on the list that is not higher in the American market than in the corresponding Canadian market. Such was not the case in 1878, yet we are told that the operation of the present duties is beneficial to the farmer. It is an insult to the farmer to try and palm off such nonsense upon him, which he does not believe.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 24th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Rainy River Improvement Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Dundee Land and Investment Company, limited.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Tecumseth Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Richelieu Bridge Company.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Sault Ste Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 44) to amend the Act incorporating the Napierville Junction Railway and Quarry Company.—(Mr. Courso.)

Bill (No. 45) to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value thereof, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, in moving that you leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire to make the usual financial statement. I may be permitted, Sir, to say that at no period in the history of Canada has a Government met Parliament with the financial condition of the country in the position it is to-day; at no period in the history of Canada has its credit stood so high as it stands to-day; at no period in the history of Canada, possibly, was the country, generally speaking, as prosperous as or more prosperous than it is to-day; and I propose, Sir, in the statements that I am about to submit to the House, to establish that that prosperity is in a great measure dependent upon the policy of

the Government adopted by Parliament. I know, Sir, that, in the estimation of some of my friends opposite, I have undertaken a herculean task.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hon. gentlemen opposite say hear, hear. In view of the predictions of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1879, with reference to this policy—when I am now able to submit, after an experience of less than three years, its results—I trust that I will be able to convince them even, that this policy has had much to do with bringing about the present state of affairs in this country. I regret, Sir, that I was not in the House either on Tuesday or yesterday afternoon (circumstances preventing my being present) to hear the speeches delivered by the hon. members for South Brant and Norfolk. I recollect, last year, that the hon. member for South Brant led up, as on the present occasion, a discussion of the policy of the Government, and the effect of the Tariff, in advance of the statement of the Budget Speech, and I called the hon. gentleman's attention, on that occasion, to the fact that it was not usual to pursue such a course, the hon. member told me we had been so long in bringing down the Budget, six weeks having elapsed, he could wait no longer; yet, on the present occasion, though not a fortnight had elapsed since the opening of Parliament, the hon. member was again to the front anticipating, as on a former occasion, the discussion that usually takes place after the financial statement. Sir, he was followed yesterday by the hon. member for Norfolk on the fiscal policy of the Government. I could not help thinking that the hon. member for Centre Huron may, by-and-bye—when the time arrives so much hoped for by hon. gentlemen opposite, when the present Opposition shall change places with us—find some rivals for the position he formerly occupied; but the hon. members for South Brant and Norfolk—provided they adopt our policy which, as I have stated on previous occasions, is the only course for them to pursue in order to get on this side of the House—will have the advantage of the hon. member for Centre Huron, because they can point to the emphatic, impressive and admirable speeches they delivered some three or four years ago in favor of a protective policy. Sir, the position of the Government, when they introduced what is called the National Policy, was a difficult one, because they had a difficult question to deal with. There was necessarily a great deal of speculation with respect to the effect of the adoption of that policy even in the minds of some of its friends and advocates. There was a question in their minds, as well as in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, whether, if it proved to be a protective policy, we would obtain sufficient revenue; if, on the contrary, it proved to be a revenue Tariff, whether it would give the protection to the industries of the country which was demanded by the people, as evidenced by the elections of 1878; and necessarily we, who had given careful consideration to this matter, had to speculate to a certain extent with respect to its effect. But, Sir, in 1880, the opinions that we had entertained in 1879 were being confirmed by the experience of the nine months. In 1881, they were still stronger, because evidence had accumulated to show that our position was the correct one; and, to-day, we stand in an impregnable position with respect to the results of the Tariff, both for protection and revenue purposes. I recollect very well last Session, when I made my financial statement, that it showed an apparent deficit of \$1,500,000, and when I explained that, under the operation of the Tariff, it would have provided just about sufficient to meet the necessary expenditure had we not in the year previous received a large revenue on articles consumed in the year following, hon. gentlemen opposite laughed at that idea, declaring that the plea would not avail, and that the Government had a deficit to

announce to the House. But what I stated was the fact. It shows that the producing power of the Tariff, as far as revenue is concerned, was such as to give us, if we had the \$700,000 collected in the year previous for goods consumed in the following year, and \$500,000 or \$600,000 of Excise calculated in the year previous in anticipation of the change of Tariff on goods consumed in the year following, there would not have been a deficit of more than \$200,000, showing how accurately and how fully the estimates of the Government were borne out. But, to-day, we stand here not with any doubt as to its revenue-producing power, but with evidence of the last year before us, with the Public Accounts and statements on the Table of the House, showing not only no deficit of even \$200,000, but, instead of an estimated surplus of \$2,000,000, there is a surplus of \$4,132,743 in the Treasury, as the result of its operations. Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition, in discussing the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne (I regret he is not present, and we all regret the circumstances which render his absence necessary), said, that he could not understand why it was that the Government had asked the people to bear the additional burden of the surplus, unless it was after the manner of the man who was found carrying a heavy rail up a hill, and, when asked why he was doing it, said it was for the pleasure he would enjoy in laying it down. Now, Sir, in this connection permit me to draw a contrast between the effect that was produced by the increase of \$3,000,000 taxation imposed by my predecessor, in 1874, and the proposition in 1879. In 1874, my hon. predecessor asked Parliament to give him, in addition to what he could collect from the then existing Tariff, \$3,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on the public works, completing the Pacific Railway, and other engagements which the Government was bound to carry out. What was the result upon the revenue? In the year following a response was given in the shape of an increase of something like \$2,000,000 paid into the Treasury; but, from 1875 down to 1879, the average amount received from the Tariff then existing was but \$12,500,000 per year. Had there been no change in the Tariff in 1879, the receipts from Customs would have been but a little over \$12,000,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I will not simply say yes, but will prove it as I proceed. Sir, what caused this? It was caused by the general depression in the country. You may impose a burden upon a man, but unless you give him food and sustenance he will be unable to carry that burden. The hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) imposed burdens on the people, but gave them no food to supply them with strength to carry them. What was the condition of our people at that time? With the prices of all the manufactures and products of the United States at that time exceedingly low, owing to the condition of that country then, the Tariff that he submitted was food and encouragement for the foreigner, but both were denied to our own people. When our people asked the hon. gentleman for bread, he gave them a stone; and the result was that, all over this country, factories were either closed or working at half time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; you must prove that too.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I can prove that also, because I saw some of them closed myself, and hon. gentlemen opposite asked me within a year after why we had not re-opened them. Men were without employment, knocking at the doors of Parliament, knocking at the doors of the Department of Public Works, asking for employment, and none could be got. It could not be expected, under these circumstances, that men could respond to the requirements of the hon. gentleman's Tariff; for if they had not the means they could not buy either the products of

Canada or the imports from other countries. The result was that, instead of obtaining an increase to the revenue, the revenue fell to what it was in 1874 before the increases were made, and the people refused to bear the burden that was imposed upon them. How was it in 1879? We asked parliament to give us such changes in the Tariff as would not only protect the industries of the country, but give us an increased revenue. Was there a response? I stated at the outset that the response was ample provided the money had been paid in for the year 1879 that belonged to that year. And in the year that followed, what was the response? They gave us a surplus of four million dollars and upwards, because we found employment for the people; because, by obtaining for them employment and higher wages, they were able to buy more than formerly. Men who owned bank stock had greater value in it than in 1878-79; men who had tenements unoccupied in 1878-79, had tenants for their houses, and the additional revenue thus received on all hands enabled them to buy more than in previous years. Men who were formerly working at half time and on low wages received higher wages and were working over-time. Farmers who had low prices and found sales difficult received high prices and prompt cash sales. The result was that, while we estimated the capacity of our people to contribute, during the year, \$17,000,000 for Customs to the Treasury, they paid in, voluntarily—because it was to a great extent voluntarily—\$18,500,000. I say voluntarily, because, of the increases of last year over the previous year, \$778,000 was paid in luxuries, such as wines, spirits, silks and satins, and articles of that kind. That indicates very clearly that the people had the means, and having the means they contributed more in that way than before. In the finer description of woollen goods, for instance, which are not manufactured in Canada, they contributed \$400,000 more to the Treasury than last year. In the article of cottons, which pay 20 per cent., they contributed \$300,000 more than in the year before. All this shows an increased purchasing power on the part of the people. We under-estimated their improved condition when we estimated that they would only contribute \$17,000,000; they contributed \$18,500,000. One important feature in this connection is, that though we expended for Public Works \$8,150,000 during that year, and redeemed about \$2,000,000 existing liabilities, bearing 6 per cent., the surplus of over \$4,000,000, with the amount of deposits in the savings banks of the Dominion, \$4,750,000, enabled us to meet these payments chargeable to capital, and still our interest account was less by \$90,000 than the year before. But I qualify that in this way: we paid \$90,000 less interest than the year previous; but, if we take the statement of the interest that was due for the year, and count it as all paid—though it was not all paid within the year—there would be still \$25,000 less interest than in the year previous, notwithstanding the increase of the expenditure on debt account. Now, it has been said that this surplus was an unnecessary burden on the people, that it ought not to have been imposed; but gentlemen who hold that view, and say that it is unwise to have a surplus of three or four million dollars, have, at the same time, stated that the United States are paying off their debt at the rate of \$100,000,000 per year and commend them for so doing; and assert that, unless we look carefully after our affairs, we will be subjected to burdens which, in view of the fact that their debt will speedily be wiped out, and they will have little or no taxation, will place us at a great disadvantage with them. Well, Sir, I cannot quite see, if it is desirable, in the opinion of those gentlemen, that there should be a surplus in the United States for the purpose of paying off their debt, that it is objectionable on the part of the Dominion of Canada to have a surplus, especially when it is collected under the

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

circumstances to which I refer. Sir, it is customary, I find, with our friends opposite, when addressing either their own constituents or other constituencies in different parts of the Dominion of Canada, to refer to the present state of things as alone the result of large exports during the last two or three years, and if I am rightly informed, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) stated that the present condition of affairs in Canada was not the result of the National Policy, but it was the result of large exports and a large receipt of gold coming into the country. Well, Sir, I find that that hon. gentleman and other hon. members, when they are speaking of the condition of the country, or when they are speaking of the position of the late Government and of the present Government with reference to their expenditure, are very apt to select one particular period against another period; one particular year, for instance, during the administration of the hon. gentleman opposite against a particular year of the present Administration. So, in the case to which I am now referring, the hon. member refers to the exports during the past year, 1881, and he says that the present condition of the country is to be attributed to that large export. Would it not be well, Mr. Speaker, for hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are making a comparison between the condition of the country under the two Governments, and embracing different periods, that they should select the whole period; for instance, that they should select the five years during which our hon. friends were in power and the two or three years during which the present Government have been in power, rather than select one particular year. It might not be convenient for the hon. member to do so; but I have had made up a statement to show that the present state of the country cannot be the result of largely-increased exports of the products of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will read them, and then I will challenge the hon. member to show that they are not correct. In 1874, the exports of Canadian products, including Canadian manufactures, were \$73,926,748; in 1875, they were \$67,490,893; in 1876, \$69,861,849; in 1877, \$65,864,880; in 1878, \$65,740,134; or an average for the five years of \$68,576,901. In 1879, they were \$60,089,578; in 1880, \$70,096,191; in 1881, \$80,921,379; making an average, for the three years, of \$70,369,049, an increase per annum of \$1,792,148. Now, Sir, the present state of affairs is not dependent upon the exports alone of the products of Canada—considering the average population during that period, and the average population during the past three years—he will find that the then state of the country as compared with the present, or the present condition of the country as compared with its condition then, is not due entirely, as he claims it is to that cause or to causes quite outside the National Policy. I call his attention to that, because it is of importance to show that during the five years that our friends opposite were in power, the value of the exports, being products of Canada, was but \$1,700,000 a year less, with a smaller population, than it was during the three years the present Administration have been in power. Moreover, hon. gentlemen very often take up the expenditure of 1877-78, by the late Government, and they compare it with the expenditure of last year, and then point to it as an evidence of the extravagance of this extravagant Government. Sir, I am prepared to show, from the data I have before me, that, if the hon. gentlemen opposite had collected from Customs, Excise and Stamp Duty, money enough to pay their expenditure, and if the present Administration had collected simply money enough to pay theirs, that upon the average population of the five years they were in power, and the three years we have been in office, the figures show that 23 cents per head less would have been collected from the people

of Canada, during the last three years, than during the five years that my friends opposite were in power. I have the figures here, and I will give you the data on which they are made up. There were collected from Customs, Excise and Stamps, in 1874-75, \$20,664,878.96; in 1875-76, \$18,614,415.02; in 1876-77, \$17,697,924.82; in 1877-78, \$17,841,938.19; in 1878-79, \$18,476,613.35; making a total of \$93,295,770.34. The deficits during the five years were \$5,491,269.51. If the deficits had been collected and added to the sums above, it would have amounted to \$98,787,039.85. The average for the five years was \$19,757,407.97. The average population for this period being 4,050,674, the per capita tax during that period was \$4.88 per head. These are the figures and these are the results. There were collected, from Customs, Excise and Stamps, in 1879-80, \$18,479,576.44; for 1880-81, \$23,942,138.95, making a total of \$42,421,715.39. Deducting the surplus for the two years, \$2,589,515.36, leaves \$39,832,200.03. The average for the two years of taxation was \$19,916,100.01, being, on a population of 4,282,360, \$4.65 per head during the last two years, as against \$4.88 during the other period. Now, Sir, it may be said but you collected more. We admit it; we collected \$2,900,000 in the two years more than was required for the expenditure. That was the surplus for the two years, and having been used in the reduction of the debt, diminished our taxation for all time to come. If any hon. gentleman on the opposite side should object to this it should not be the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), because, in a speech he made in the West not long since, he justified the collection from the people during the hard times of less than was required, and he said it was a proper thing to collect less because, when the times became better, they would collect more to make it up, and that is exactly what we have been doing. It is a very common thing to state—I have heard it stated in my own presence by a gentleman whom I am happy to see present, that the expenditure of the country has enormously increased within the last two or three years. I have shown that the taxation has not increased, because we require 23 cents per head less than before. But, of course, the expenditure has increased. How could it be otherwise? If we compare the average expenditure of 1874-79 and 1880-81, with the average expenditure for the five years previous—we find that our average annual expenditure—is \$1,229,372 in excess of the average annual expenditure of our predecessors. I admit that fact; there is no denying it. It is a matter of record, and I do not wish to deny it. But what becomes necessary to do now is, to show how this increased annual expenditure of \$1,229,372 was incurred, to compare the expenditure of the previous years with that of the last two years, and show that the present Government has been more economical than its predecessors by at least \$1,000,000 per year. Now, what do we find? We find that, from the 1st July, 1874, to the 1st July, 1879, the expenditure was \$119,679,284, or an average of \$23,935,856 per annum. From the 1st July, 1879, to the 1st July, 1881, the expenditure was \$50,356,866, or an average annual expenditure of \$25,178,443, the difference in their favor being, as I have already stated, \$1,229,372. And for what purposes were these expenditures made? In the first place, we find, that in 1879-80 and 1880-81, we worked an average of 401 miles of railway more than hon. gentlemen opposite worked when they were in office. These 401 miles of railway involved an expenditure of \$802,000 in excess of the expenditure for the like service performed by our predecessors.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where were these 401 miles of railway?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have the figures from a return furnished me by the Department of Railways showing that 401 miles were worked during 1881, over and above

the average worked by hon. gentlemen opposite. These figures are furnished in a return from the Department giving the different roads, and I am satisfied it is reliable. I will give the figures in detail if hon. gentlemen want them. The average amount of interest paid on the debt during 1879-80 and 1880-81, was \$7,648,006, against an average interest paid by our predecessors in 1874-75 of \$6,806,507, making an increase in the average payment of interest during the two years to which I refer, since the present Government came into power, of \$87,499. The increase in the sinking fund during the same period, over the average paid by hon. gentlemen opposite, was \$353,457. This was a practical reduction of debt by that amount. Then take the average increase of expenditure for Indians, and for the management of lands in the North-West, as compared with the expenditure for these services from 1874 to 1879, and we find that we have added, on account of these items, the sum of \$235,042. Take next the exceptional appropriations made by Parliament last year, averaging \$58,500, for the relief of the sufferers by fires in Hull and Quebec, and the relief of our Irish fellow-countrymen, and the increased expenditure for the Census over their average, amounting to \$56,079, and we have the following result—an increased expenditure altogether of \$2,382,617, which hon. gentlemen opposite were not called upon to make, against an average increase of \$1,229,372, or a difference of \$1,153,245 in favor of the present Administration. If I add to that the \$190,000 expended in the establishment of post offices in the North-West and British Columbia, and in the Post Office service generally, for which we have added nothing to the taxation of the people—because the difference between receipts and expenditure in the Post Office is less during the last two years—it would amount to \$1,343,000. We have, then, an answer to the question which has been asked by the leader of the Opposition, how it was that in a speech I made in August, 1878, I stated that I believed that \$22,500,000 would have been sufficient to pay the expenditures of the country during the five years the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power? If you deduct the amount I have mentioned from their average expenditure during the five years of their Administration—of \$23,900,000—we have just about \$22,500,000. In other words, deducting those expenditures, it will be seen that I was justified in making the statement to which the hon. gentleman alluded, because it is on that basis that we are carrying on the business of the country to-day. It is just as well that the whole truth should be known in reference to this matter, and while we, on both sides of the House, may be addressing public meetings, in different parts of the country, we may not often have the opportunity of meeting each other face to face as we do here in Parliament. It gave me great satisfaction to have my hon. friend opposite on the platform with me in West Northumberland, and I felt it an advantage—considering the position we occupy with reference to the financial position and the expenditure of the country—to have my opponent within reach, where he could make his statement, and I mine, and then leave the country, or those who were present, to decide who was right and who was wrong. It is desirable that we should meet our constituents and the people generally on all suitable occasions, but it is not always convenient for both parties to be present at the same time. Sometimes there is not sufficient time in an afternoon, and I admit that sometimes it is difficult to arrange that both sides should be heard on the same evening; and again, previous engagements may prevent; but, at the same time, it would be more satisfactory to the people who listen to those statements if they could hear, on the same occasion, the statements made by both parties—the one in opposition to the Government and the other in its defence. But here, we have

the satisfaction of knowing that the hon. gentlemen opposite—gentlemen who are thoroughly posted in every weak point in the armour of the Government, who are ready to insert a lance if the opportunity occurs—are present to hear our statements, and that we can each present our claims in the presence of the other. It will be for the public to decide, after these discussions are over, who are most worthy of their confidence. I know, Sir, that it has been said, and said truly, so far as the figures are concerned, that the expenditure of 1878 was something like \$23,500,000, while the expenditure of 1881 was \$25,500,000—public attention has been called to this fact—and therefore it is that I now point to statements taken from the Public Accounts, of the receipts from Customs and Excise during the periods I have named, to the facts as they appear upon record, to show that not only have the present Administration taxed the people for the necessary expenses of the country less than our predecessors did, but that we have absolutely spent, for the services performed by them, more than a million dollars per annum less than they did. It may be of some importance, as I have already referred to the expenditures for postal service, to call the attention of the House to the details. From 1875 to 1879, the expenditure for this service averaged \$1,709,375, and the receipts for the same period averaged \$1,149,423, leaving an annual deficit of \$559,952. From 1879 to 1881 the expenditure averaged \$1,847,505, and the receipts \$1,302,303, leaving an annual deficit of \$545,202. That shows an average increased expenditure of \$138,130 a year, with increased accommodation to the North-West, British Columbia, and various parts of the outlying portions of the Dominion, as well as increased postal facilities to the central and more populous portions, and an average increased revenue of \$152,880, or a reduction of the deficit to the extent of \$14,750 a year. Now, Sir, it may be well to call the attention of the House to one or two other facts, to show why it is that we have been able to keep the taxation of the people lower than it was during the time our friends opposite were in power. In connection with this, I desire to call the attention of the House to returns with reference to the working of the railways. From July, 1874, to July, 1879, the working expenses per mile of the Intercolonial Railway—and I have this return from Mr. Tims, the accountant—were, on the average, \$2,659, and from July, 1879, to July, 1881, \$1,987, or a difference of \$671 per mile. The average receipts per mile for the five years, from the 1st July, 1874, to the 1st July, 1879, were \$1,760, and for the two years, from the 1st July, 1879, to the 1st July, 1881, \$1,930, or an increase in the income of \$170 per mile, and a reduction in the expenditure of \$671 per mile. The average mileage expenditure of the Prince Edward Island Railway, from July, 1875, to July, 1879, was \$1,129, and from July, 1879, to July, 1881, \$926, being a decrease in the working expenses of \$203 per mile. The average receipts per mile for the four years, from July, 1875, to July, 1879, were \$649, and for the two years, from July, 1879, to July 1881, \$617, being a decrease in the mileage receipts of \$32, against a decrease in the expenditure of \$203 per mile. That I give, Sir, as one of the items of reduction in our expenditure which left us such a margin that it enabled us to incur increased expenditure, and at the same time to diminish the taxation. There has been another statement put forward calculated very much to discourage and dishearten the people of Canada, and at the same time to injure the Government; that is, that the debt of the Dominion of Canada is increasing in a greater ratio than its wealth and its population, and that, looking to the future, there is not a bright outlook for us financially when the Pacific Railway is completed, and all existing engagements fully carried out. Now, Sir, I think it is important, in the interests of the country, that the people should quite understand there is no foundation

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

for the alarm thus attempted to be created. I say, Mr. Speaker, that looking at the debt as it is to-day, looking at the position of the debt three years ago, looking at the liabilities of Canada when this Union was formed, and looking at the liabilities that are ahead of us in connection with the completion of the Pacific Railway, I have risen from the investigation of this matter with the conviction strongly fixed in my mind that there is no reason whatever for alarm. But that there is the greatest ground for hope and encouragement. It is a fact known to many members of this House that when the four Provinces which originally composed this Union came together in Confederation, the then existing debt of Canada averaged \$29 per head, based upon the Census returns of 1861. \$25 a head was at that time assumed by the Dominion of Canada, with the exception of New Brunswick, which, under special circumstances, received consideration to the extent of \$2.50 more. We know perfectly well that that did not pay all the debt of Ontario and Quebec. It left a debt equal to \$4 a head, which was subsequently, in 1873, assumed by the Dominion. Therefore, there existed at that time a debt, taking the population of 1861, of \$29 a head for every man, woman and child in the Provinces which in 1867 constituted Canada. Then there was the obligation, which became part and parcel of the Constitution—an obligation which has since been fulfilled—to construct the Intercolonial Railway; and the construction of that railway added \$6 a head to the debt, over and above the \$29 that existed at the time of the Union, making the debt practically \$35 a head. In 1878–79 the net debt of the Dominion of Canada was but \$31 per head of the population. At the present moment it is something like \$35 per head of the population. Let us see what it will be in 1879, the net debt, as shown by the Accounts, was \$147,481,070; in 1881 it was \$155,395,680. Then our engagements from the 1st July last, for the completion of the Pacific Railway, including the \$25,000,000 to be paid to the Syndicate, the \$13,500,000 to be expended by the Government in the completion of the sections now under contract, canal expenditure; say \$6,000,000, and other expenditure chargeable to capital, say \$3,500,000, will make the total \$203,397,680. But between this and 1890 the amount that is to be paid into the sinking fund, and which forms part of our annual charges upon the consolidated revenue, will average \$1,500,000 a year for the next nine years. That will give, for the reduction of the debt, \$13,500,000. Then the surplus for the nine years—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. An hon. member says Oh! but when we have \$4,500,000 assured for this year, when there is no doubt, after the reduction that we propose to make, that there will be a surplus of \$3,000,000 for the next year, it is not, I think, asking too much for the hon. gentleman to accept as reasonable a surplus of \$1,000,000 a year, for the remaining seven years of the nine, commencing on the 1st July last, that would make \$14,500,000 and would, with the sinking fund, reduce the net debt to \$175,897,680. But if we estimate the increase of population at but 18 per cent. only during the ten years the increase of the last decade, the result will be that, taking the population at that period and the debt as stated, the net debt then will be \$34.27 per head. If we have any extraordinary increase of our population (which I think it is but right to expect we will, but which I have not estimated for here) it will be ample to meet, at any rate, any extraordinary expenditure that may be made chargeable to the debt which we are not anticipating at the present moment. But, more than that, if the 150,000,000 acres of arable land that will be the property of the Government after handing over to the Syndicate 25,000,000 of acres, and which is now established as fit for settlement, yields

but \$1 an acre for half of it (the other half being offered as a free gift to settlers), it will meet the whole expenditure of the Government on the Pacific Railway, and in the North-West, down to 1890. If that be the case, then our debt, which certainly is not alarming, provided we realize from these lands the sum that I have stated, would only be about \$100,000,000, instead of \$175,000,000, or less than twenty dollars per head. Under these circumstances, Sir, I think there is no great cause for alarm as far as the taxation of the people is concerned, growing out of the increase of the debt. Then there is another mode of dealing with this question, and that is the interest we have to pay. We paid per head of the population :

In 1867-68.....	\$1 29
In 1874.....	1 31½
In 1878-79.....	1 56½
In 1881.....	1 57½

In 1890, estimating the net debt at \$175,897,680, and the population based on an increase of 18 per cent. for the ten years—taking into account the fact that the whole debt of the Dominion of Canada will then bear but 4 per cent., instead of the interest we are paying now—taking that into account, and placing the interest on the debt at \$7,000,000 per annum the interest per head of the population at that time would be at most \$1.37 against \$1.57½ at the present day, and this estimate does not take into account the probable reduction of debt by the sales of lands. This, Sir, I think, is an encouraging feature in connection with the future taxation of the people of Canada. We now come to the estimated expenditure for the current year. I submit for the consideration of the House, an amended estimate of the receipts of the current year :

Customs.....	\$20,500,000
Excise.....	5,600,000
Post Office.....	1,400,000
Public Works, Canals and Railways.....	2,460,000
Interest on Investments.....	750,000
Miscellaneous.....	900,000
Bill Stamps.....	100,000
Total.....	\$31,710,000

and an expenditure of \$27,250,000, showing a surplus of \$4,460,000 for the current year. I laid upon the Table of the House, yesterday, a supplementary estimate for the present year, involving an increased expenditure, chargeable to consolidated revenue, of something like \$1,000,000. That is composed of the following items: Indians, \$327,189, (I need scarcely enter upon any explanation with reference to the circumstances under which this additional expenditure was made necessary for the current year. It was referred to by the right hon. the leader of the Government in the remarks that he made on the Address in reply to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition.) The next item is working expenses of railways, \$312,000. That is not an increased tax upon the people. It is an increased expenditure rendered necessary, I am happy to say, by the increased business of the railways; and I am also happy to be able to state that they are yielding a revenue equivalent to the increased expenditure, and, therefore, though it adds to the nominal sum of the expenditure of the year, it adds nothing whatever to the taxation of the year. Then we come to the immigration expenses, \$28,000. This is an item that was formerly borne by the Government of Ontario, under an arrangement made with that Government, that they would bear two-thirds of the expenses of immigrants settling in that Province and coming by way of Quebec. They decline now to continue that arrangement, and we have to ask the House for \$28,000, to pay the expenses thus incurred. The increased expenditure for the Post Office, is something like \$75,000, but, as I explained before, it gives an increased revenue. Public Works, income and maintenance and repairs, show an increase of, in one, \$98,336, and the other,

\$29,000, owing to increased expenditure in the maintenance of canals, in keeping them up and having them in efficient order and condition.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Can the hon. gentleman give the canals separate from the railways ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. On Public Works for income is charged \$98,366; for maintenance and repairs, \$29,000; Mounted Police, \$90,000. This was also referred to by the hon. leader of the Government in the speech he made in answer to the hon. the leader of the Opposition. It is for the proposed increase of the force; \$90,000 is to be expended during the present year, because a portion of the force will be furnished with their outfit and sent there immediately. The expenditure this year is, therefore, larger in proportion for the time they will be on duty than that for next year. The engagements falling due for the year 1881-82, not chargeable to Consolidated Revenue, may be stated as follows: Redemption of the Debt, \$2,758,880; Railways and Canals, \$9,500,000, Surveys of Lands in the North-West, \$400,000, making altogether \$12,658,880. We purpose meeting this in the following way: Surplus for the year, \$4,460,000; deposits in Government Savings Banks, in excess of payments, \$4,500,000; in banks, to the credit of the Receiver General at call, \$5,300,000, out of which we can take the remaining \$4,000,000. This makes \$12,960,000, without borrowing one dollar on Bonds or Debentures. Before I take up the expenditure of the next year, it will be convenient for me to give some idea of the proposed changes in the Tariff during this Session. I think it best to do so before I enter upon the estimated receipts and expenditures of next year. The following are the proposed changes in the Tariff. The resolutions are differently worded, but I have placed them in this form so that hon. members may understand exactly the effect of the resolutions. It is proposed to place upon the free list, taking them alphabetically, anatomical preparations; they were free previously to 1879, now they are restored to the free list; bees, brass in sheets; Britannia metals in pigs and bars, celluloid in sheets. Celluloid, is an imitation ivory used by cabinet makers and organ builders. It now pays 20 per cent. China clay. Chloralum as a disinfectant is a most valuable article, and used extensively by rich and poor, it has been thought desirable to place it on the free list. Coffee, green (except by Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15), free; fowls for improving stock; iron, sand or globules and dry putty for polishing granite. Quinine. This has been done in deference to the wishes of our hon. friends opposite. Quicksilver; spelter in blocks and pigs; tea, (except as provided in Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15). (Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it would be as well, while I am on the tea question, to say a word or two with reference to some criticism that has been passed upon the course the Government took in announcing in advance that Parliament would be asked to remove this duty. It will be remembered by the House, that, when last Session the hon. leader of the Opposition presented resolutions for their consideration, proposing a reduction of taxation, I rose in my place and on behalf of the Government, stated the reasons why, at that time, we did not feel ourselves in a position to ask Parliament to reduce taxation. We stated that it was uncertain, what effect this policy would have, although it had shown that it was a revenue-producing Tariff up to that period. Still, there was some uncertainty as to the effects it would have when the new industries being established were in full operation. What was more important, I also stated that there had been petitions sent to Congress from Massachusetts, from Maine, and from New York, asking them to appoint a Commission to confer with a Commission to be appointed by the Imperial Government, to consider the question of reciprocity, that

under these circumstances, it was not desirable to remove any duties then collected, as by such an arrangement we would lose \$1,000,000 revenue, at least, on natural products. If no arrangements were made with the United States by which this revenue would be interfered with, I stated that on the re-assembling of Parliament I would ask the representatives of the people to remove two items of taxation, namely, the duties on tea and coffee. In 1872, without any notice to the public, with a duty on tea 50 per cent. higher than at present, and when tea dealers were found with large stocks on hand duty-paid applications were made to the Government to refund it, which, under the circumstances, the Government then consented to do. At the present time, it would be exceedingly difficult to adopt that principle, particularly as we have a differential duty on tea coming from the United States. It would have been exceedingly difficult to decide as to its value, and whether it was American importation or not. The Government, therefore, decided, unless there were stronger reasons than we could then see, we would not take the course we did in 1872. And to diminish the difficulty what did we do? When visiting the Maritime Provinces in July, with other members of the Government as well, I declared distinctly what we stated in Parliament, that we intended, among other things, to ask Parliament to take the duty off tea and coffee. And we made this statement so that every dealer in the country would be on the alert. We did not want the revenue; we did not wish any man to lose by a reduction in the Tariff on these articles; and we did not wish to be subjected to the embarrassment that occurred in 1872; so we repeated what we said in Parliament, thus putting every man on his guard. Proceeding with the changes in the Tariff, we also propose to place on the free list tin in blocks, pigs, bars and sheets. That means a reduction of \$100,000 of revenue at least. It is true, on the tins used for the fisheries and exported, the parties now obtain a drawback, but that is attended with considerable difficulty. There is a growing industry in this country—the canning industry—this covers canned fish, fruits and vegetables, the removal of this duty will be a relief to the agricultural and fishing industries. Woods—African teak, blackheart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar and satinwood—we propose, also, to place on the free list. This will meet the case of some industries in the country which use them and have to pay duty on them. The following duties are changed: Bookbinders' tools and implements, from 15 per cent. to 10 per cent. Common and colorless window glass, now 20 per cent., we propose to raise to 30 per cent. The late Finance Minister will be glad to hear this proposition, because one of the glass factories is located in a section of the country in which he is interested.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No; no.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Scrap iron, now paying \$2 per ton we propose to reduce to \$1. The question of the iron duties has been pressed upon the Government. The iron industry is an important one no doubt; but at this moment we are not prepared to submit any further proposition regarding it, and I can only say, in addition, with reference to it, that the subject is for the present under consideration. We, therefore, make no change except that I have named. The further proposals we make are:—Lead manufactures, from 25, to 30 per cent.; sand paper, from 20, to 25 per cent.; ships hulls, when containing machinery, to remain 10 per cent.; but the machinery in the hulls to be 25 per cent. This is because we found that under the old arrangement there was really an inducement to people to go to the United States and build a vessel and put in her machinery there, for they could be both brought in at 10 per cent., while machinery brought in separately was subject to a duty of 25 per cent. To spirits and strong waters mixed, now paying \$1.90, 20

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

per cent. is to be added. I think this was an omission in the past, because we find, from observation, that the fluid extracts imported into the country only pay 12½ per cent., while those who manufacture them in the country have to pay \$1.90 for alcohol used in their manufactory and have no protection whatever. On bags containing salt we propose a duty of 25 per cent. At present bags, in which fine salt is imported, pay no duty whatever; but the manufacturer of fine salt in the Dominion of Canada, if he purchases the cotton bag, has to pay the duty upon it, whatever it may be. Clock springs, now 35 per cent., are to be reduced to 10 per cent. Cotton seed, now 20 per cent. is to be 10 cents per bushel. Fireworks are to be at 25 per cent. Wrought iron tubing, one and three-quarter inch and upwards, is to be reduced from 25 per cent. to 15 per cent. Mustard cake is to be 20 per cent. Paraffin wax or stearine will be placed at 3 cents per pound instead of at an *ad valorem* duty. It has been difficult to arrive at a fair and just valuation, and it is because of that that this change is proposed. Rice, unhulled or paddy, is to be placed at 17½ per cent. This is for the purpose of fostering—and it is likely to do it, because there are a number of steamers now chartered—a direct trade between the Dominion of Canada and the East Indies. Besides, there is being erected in Montreal mills where we will obtain a better article at a lower price. The Customs officials have found great difficulty in fixing the value of different kinds of fruit trees imported. To overcome these difficulties we propose specific duties in lieu of *ad valorem* duties as follows: On apple trees, 2½ cents; pear, 4 cents; plum, 5 cents; cherry, 4 cents; quince, 2½ cents; grape vines, 4 cents. Silk plush or netting for gloves to be 15 per cent; harness and leather dressing will be placed under the head of blacking at 25 per cent; belts and trusses will come under the head of braces and suspenders. Kentucky jeans are to pay cotton duty. This is because efforts have been made to enter articles of cotton under the head of Kentucky jeans. Knitted cotton cloth we propose shall pay 30 per cent.; black and bleached cotton, three and six cords only, 12½ per cent. Tarpaulins coated with oil paint or tar, and cotton bags, made up by the use of the needle, to pay 30 per cent. A question has arisen in the Department as to what duty shall be imposed upon furs when in certain conditions of dressing. We now propose to add the words "wholly or partially dressed" after the word furs, to meet that difficulty. Bolsters and pillows have been entered at a lower rate of duty than mattresses. We propose now that the duty on bolsters and pillows shall be the same as upon mattresses. Glass (pressed or moulded) tableware is to be added to the 30 per cent. list. Under the head of paints, the duty on orange mineral, dry, which is much the same article as dry white lead, is to be reduced to 5 per cent. We also propose to add to the list of varnishes, lacquers, Japan and collodium. These changes involve a reduction in taxation, under head of Customs, of \$1,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say here a few words with reference to the proposed changes affecting the receipts from Excise. It will be remembered that a change was made with reference to the mode of dealing with home-grown tobacco. It required that all parties raising tobacco should have authority from a Government official to do so, but we now propose to remove that restriction, and that all parties shall have the opportunity, and as openly and as freely without license, to raise tobacco, as they have to raise potatoes as far as Government restrictions are concerned. It is proposed, however, to leave the amount which is collected for twist the same as it now is, and to license parties in different parts of the country, without the payment of any fee, to buy from the producers of tobacco anywhere and everywhere, whatever surplus they may have for sale, and such parties will sell to the individuals who have the licenses to

manufacture. We propose that for the next two years, instead of 14 cents, as now levied, per pound, 8 cents per pound shall be levied on all tobacco which is grown in the Dominion of Canada, and for the two years following, 10 cents per pound. This change will probably affect the revenue, although we cannot pronounce exactly on this point—\$50,000 the first year; after that the reduction will probably range from \$50,000 to \$75,000 a year. Then there is another question which has been brought under the consideration of the Government, by the commercial men and bankers of Canada. I refer to the legislation requiring stamps on notes and bills of exchange. In the preparation of this Tariff no special consideration was given to those who are engaged in business except in the way of increased business, and the prompt payment of accounts. We propose to relieve this class of the community of this duty, which has given a revenue of \$200,000 a year. And further, the Government have decided to ask Parliament, in the Supplementary Estimates, for \$150,000 to be distributed in the shape of a bounty to the fishermen of the Dominion of Canada in lieu of the interest on the Fishery Award. This subject, Sir, has been a difficult one, because pressure has been brought to bear by some of the local governments for the payment of the amount of the Fishery Award to them; but a vote—and a very large vote—of Parliament declared that this should not be done. In consideration, however, of the competition and interference of the Americans with our own fishermen, it has been considered desirable to give a tonnage bounty to every vessel engaged in the fisheries, and also a certain sum to every boat which is employed in the fisheries and which is licensed for that purpose. And while this will encourage the fishermen of the Dominion and extend our fishing operations—an important industry, the exports of which amount to over \$6,000,000 a year—it is expected that it will increase the building of a certain class of vessels in the Dominion of Canada, such as are to be found in Massachusetts, and constructed especially for this branch of business. Our people go there now, as they have gone every year since the passage of the Washington Treaty, as well as before that treaty was in existence, and to ports elsewhere in the United States to make arrangements with the owners of the vessels and clippers which are adapted for their purposes, to man and sail them on shares—as we have no vessels such as they require—consequently, the step which we propose to take will not only encourage and benefit our fishermen in the prosecution of their occupation, but it will also give a new impetus to the construction of the class of vessels which are required for this special work. Now, Sir, the result is that the propositions which I have just submitted, will entail a loss to the revenue from Customs and Excise to the amount of \$1,300,000 a year, while there will be an extra expenditure of \$150,000 for the purpose which I have named. This will, of course, reduce the available means at the disposal of the Government to the extent of \$1,500,000 per annum, and it may do more. Still that may be the limit, though other circumstances may reduce the revenue. We are now having erected three sugar refineries for the manufacture of beet root sugar. This is a business which, so far, has been limited, but still we must not shut our eyes to the fact that the day is not far distant—and, perhaps, it will occur in the next twelve months—when the revenue which is now received from imported cane sugar will be diminished, owing to the vigorous prosecution of this industry. That this will occasion a loss of revenue; but, at the same time an impetus will be given to a manufacturing industry, which will be of especial advantage to the agricultural interest, if it proves a success. When we bear in mind the fact that we have at present but 180,000 spindles engaged in the manufacture of cotton, and that, before the close of the

year 1882, we are likely to have 400,000 spindles in operation, the probabilities are that we will not obtain from cotton goods the same amount of revenue which we have received from this source during the past year. The experience of the last three years has shown that where vitality is given to any one of these manufacturing industries, we find that the employes, and those who are connected with them, and the parties who import machinery, pay large sums into the revenue—the revenue from machinery alone during the past year amounted to \$120,000—and these restore to the Treasury much of that which is lost in duties on articles manufactured; but still, as these industries increase and multiply, the imports of some of these articles must necessarily decrease. Still, we may fairly consider that, under the operation of these proposed changes, and under the operation of the increase in the manufacturing industries of the country, we may have available \$1,750,000 less during the next year than we will have during the present year. Now, Sir, I desire to come to the estimate with these changes in view of the expenditure and the estimated revenue of next year. It is estimated that the Customs will yield next year, instead of \$20,500,000, which was the estimate for this year, the sum of \$19,500,000; from Excise, \$5,500,000; from the Post Office, \$1,500,000; Railways and Canals, \$2,500,000; Interest on Investments, \$700,000; and Miscellaneous, \$900,000, making a total of \$30,600,000. The expenditure, according to the Estimates which are now laid on the Table of the House, will be \$27,300,000, or somewhere in that neighborhood. The vote that will be asked, in the Supplementary Estimates, as bounty to the fishermen, will be \$150,000, and there will probably be further Supplementary Estimates amounting also to \$150,000, making the gross Estimates, \$27,600,000 for next year. The items in which the expenditure is increased are those which are placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the present year, the Indians, the postal service, railways, and various other services, and this will leave a surplus of \$3,000,000. I have not taken into account the probable receipt of a very much larger sum from the proceeds of lands to be sold in the North-West, likely to be received during the present year. The estimate of receipts, from all sources, under the head of miscellaneous last year, was something like \$800,000. They are estimated this year at \$900,000, and I have continued that estimate for the next year, but there is every indication, and it is quite within the range, not of possibility, but of probability, that if the Government feel that they can reserve a sufficient amount of land in the districts of the country that will be required for actual settlement, the Government may be able to sell for cash, without interfering with the principle of actual settlement, a large quantity of land, and a very large revenue will be received from it. I have placed, however, in this estimate, nothing more than the ordinary sum expected to be received during the current year. It will be seen that we will have to provide a very large sum for expenditure under the head of Capital Account. For instance, the Minister of Railways has asked for \$8,200,000, as subsidy to the Pacific Railway Syndicate during the next year. That is based upon their own statement of the work they expect to perform. I rather think that an outside estimate, but, at all events, whatever money may be required to pay to the Syndicate under the terms of the agreement will be received by the Government from the sales of the land-grant bonds, and therefore we will not require to go outside for any loan for the purpose of meeting whatever that expenditure may be. What is more, the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Public Works claim that they will expend, on the Pacific Railway now under contract, in the completion of the sections between the head of Lake Superior and Manitoba, on the British Columbia section, on the Canals and on other Public Works chargeable to capital, \$9,000,000;

and, in addition, we will restore—have to redeem—\$7,340,000. I should not say have to redeem, we will redeem—we are not bound to redeem—\$5,900,000 of it bearing 5 per cent. interest, but we have given notice to the holders of those \$5,000,000 of 5 per cent. securities that we will redeem them in September next—and \$2,340,000 of 6 per cent. debentures fall due in England; making altogether \$16,340,000, that we will have to provide for outside of the sums to be paid to the Syndicate, and for which we have now on deposit on interest in the bank \$5,000,000. We have an estimated surplus for the next year of \$3,000,000; an estimated savings bank deposit of \$4,000,000; we have an estimate of \$1,000,000 increase in circulation of Dominion notes, leaving but \$3,500,000 to be raised either by the exchange of 4 per cent., bonds for the fives to that amount, or the issuing, in Canada, of a loan at 4 per cent. for the \$3,500,000. We were able to provide for \$3,150,000 last year, \$12,000,000 this year, and \$16,000,000 for next year without floating a loan outside of the Dominion of Canada, or any loan indeed, except the amount received from the earnings of the people of Canada. It is a striking fact, to which I wish just here to call the attention of the House, that the amount that is now being paid into the savings banks of the Dominion of Canada every month is nearly \$400,000 over and above the sums withdrawn, and has been so for the last three years. It is an important fact that I am able to state here, that in the three years and four months ending on the 1st February, there were deposited in the savings banks and in the Post Office savings banks of Canada, notwithstanding that the Government did not want all this money, and had indeed made regulations by which the amount to be received in the savings banks should be reduced from \$10,000 to \$3,000, that no interest should be paid for the month in which the money was deposited or withdrawn, so as really to discourage deposits—that notwithstanding that, the amount of deposits in the three years and four months in these institutions has increased over and above the sums withdrawn \$10,000,000 and upwards, and in the banks of the country they have increased during the same period \$26,000,000 and upwards, making an increase in deposits of the earnings of the people of this country in the banks of the Dominion and the savings banks in that time of \$36,000,000 and upwards. And this, while we are investing in manufactories and other industries of the country large sums of money, while we are sending our money to Manitoba and the North-West and investing it there, while the people of Canada have invested in the last three months \$3,000,000 in the bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway, still, notwithstanding this increased demand, we find that deposits have increased in that period to over \$36,000,000. No better evidence could be given of the prosperity of the country than this, and I say, and I hope to prove it before I get through, that this is largely due, as I stated at the outset, to the policy, the National Policy, which was adopted in 1874. Now, Sir, I know that, in dealing with figures, the subject is a rather dry one, and I have not, perhaps, made myself as clear as I would desire; but having stated briefly the expenditure for the last year, and income, the expenditure and estimated income for the current year, and the probable income and expenditure for the next year—I desire to say a few words with reference to the predictions that were made on the opposite side of the House when this policy was introduced. I think, if my memory serves me, that all of them have failed, and utterly failed. Now, Sir, I proceed to submit testimony in justification of my statement. I know it is a strong statement. It is going a great length to say that they have all failed. They certainly have failed to a very great extent, and I may say, and I repeat, that practically they have all failed. What were the statements that were made when this policy was introduced? One of them was,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

that it was calculated to interfere with the trade between the Dominion of Canada and Great Britain, that the policy was one that was in the interests of the United States rather than that of Great Britain, and therefore the feeling in the parent land would be one of great dissatisfaction with the Dominion of Canada, and the result would be damaging to our credit. Sir, time solves many questions, and it has solved this. I have in my hand a comparative statement—I have selected the year 1877, because the imports for consumption are nearer, in that year, to that of 1881, than that of any other year I could find under the old Tariff—from which I find that the gross imports for consumption in 1876-77 were \$96,300,483. Deduct from that the United States breadstuffs exported, to the value of \$4,562,000, included in the imports for consumption, that leaves a balance of \$91,737,740. The imports from Great Britain in that year were \$39,572,239, or 43 per cent. of the whole imports; from the United States, \$46,746,736, or 51 per cent.; and from other countries, \$5,418,765, or 6 per cent. In 1881, the imports from Great Britain were, \$43,583,808, or 48½ per cent. of the whole, against 43 per cent. in 1876-77; from the United States, \$36,704,112, or 40 per cent., against 51 per cent. in 1876-77; and from other countries, \$11,323,684, or 11½ per cent.; making a total of \$91,611,604, against \$91,737,740, in 1876-77. These figures show an increase of imports from Great Britain of \$4,011,569, a decrease of imports from the United States of \$10,042,624, and an increase of imports from other countries of \$5,904,916. Now, Sir, that establishes most clearly and agrees with the evidence submitted at the last Session of Parliament, that there has been a very large relative increase in the imports from Great Britain during the two years over those from the United States. It was stated by the Government in 1879 that such would be the case, because the manufactories that the Government expected to establish in Canada by means of the Tariff, were those the products of which we had previously largely imported from the United States. It was not with any ill-feeling toward our neighbors that this Tariff was established; but we were naturally gratified when we found that the policy we had introduced, to give additional employment to our own people, would interfere less with the industries and interests of Great Britain than with those of the United States. Such has been the result, and we thus have the answer to the fear that was expressed, that the Tariff in its operation would affect our trade with Great Britain more than that with the United States. Sir, there was another statement made; it was, that under the operation of a Tariff that imposed a duty upon breadstuffs, the forwarding trade between the United States and Europe *via* the St. Lawrence would be diminished. Well, I was able last Session to bring most conclusive evidence to show that it had not produced that effect.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What about last season?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am going to give you the figures for three years, and I will also speak of last season.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Give us last season.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I quote from the Trade and Navigation Returns for the last five years, and I will show that it was not the Tariff that caused the reduction last season. In 1876-77, converting flour into bushels of grain, the amount of foreign grain exported from Canada was 6,565,154 bushels; in 1877-78, the exports were 8,521,599 bushels; in 1878-79, they were 8,777,380 bushels; in 1879-80, 11,808,049 bushels; and in 1880-81, 12,143,720 bushels, or for the three years, from 1876 to 1879, an average of 7,954,711 bushels, before the difficulties said to be raised by the Tariff could have existed, while in the two years after the duty was imposed upon breadstuffs the average was 11,975,000 bushels. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie)

asks what about last season. After the opening of navigation—or after July—there was a falling off, but what was the cause of it? There was a decreased export from the United States ports during that period. At New York there was a falling off of 22 per cent., Baltimore about 24 per cent., Philadelphia 40 per cent., and Boston, which was the lowest, I think, something like 16 per cent. More than that there was what seldom occurs. There was a ring which had been in existence for two years by which the grain trade of Chicago was controlled, and which kept up prices, and this ring stipulated with the railway companies, such was the competition among the roads, for largely reduced rates, which had the effect of sending the trade by way of New York rather than by the St. Lawrence. It was to these exceptional circumstances, especially the reduction of the exports of United States grain, that the falling off of nearly 32 per cent., as compared with the previous year, was due. It was not due to the fact that the produce of the United States had to be passed through in bond and shipped in bond at the different ports of the Dominion. I give these figures to show that the fear, expressed by our friends opposite that the St. Lawrence trade would be diminished by the change in the fiscal policy, has not been realized. Now, Sir, the next objection raised by hon. gentlemen opposite was, in their own language, that the Tariff would dismember the Union. How was it to dismember the Union? Because, as they alleged, that the imposition of the new Tariff would increase the taxation of certain of the smaller Provinces, and that they would be knocking at the doors of the Dominion, demanding to be relieved of the burdens imposed upon them by the operations of that Tariff, or permission to withdraw from the Union. Let us place together for purposes of comparison the two Provinces of Quebec and Ontario—for a large portion of the goods consumed in Ontario are entered at the Port of Montreal—and place together the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, because New Brunswick receives from the western portion of Nova Scotia a large part of her natural products, while the merchants of St. John supply largely the merchants of the western part of Nova Scotia, the revenue being collected in New Brunswick, and paid by the consumer in Nova Scotia. If you take these two Provinces together and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec together, what do we find? That under the Tariff of the hon. gentlemen opposite, there was collected $14\frac{1}{2}$ cents per head for Customs in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, during those five years, more than were collected from the people of Ontario and Quebec. Now take up the last Trade Returns, and see what is the operation of the new Tariff, as far as the people of those Provinces are concerned, and you will find the difference in the last two years is that, instead of being $14\frac{1}{2}$ cents in excess, it is largely below the amount that has been paid by Ontario and Quebec. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Anglin) claps his hands, and I am very glad he is pleased with such results. We must take into consideration that in 1879-80 the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick paid into the Treasury a considerable sum of money in the shape of duty on the sugar they consumed and refined in Montreal, but, during the present year, that has been reversed, and the tables will show, from this time forward, that the refiners of Nova Scotia and those of New Brunswick, will pay to the Customs officials of those two Provinces a large sum of money for goods consumed in Ontario and Quebec, and, therefore, making every allowance for the duties that would have been paid by the people of the Lower Provinces upon the articles that are purchased from Ontario and Quebec, it will be found that this Tariff, instead of having an injurious effect upon Nova Scotia and New Brunswick it has had a beneficial effect in reducing the comparative taxation, and it has had a still more beneficial effect on the Province of Prince Edward Island. It will

be found that, if any section has to complain, it is not the smaller Provinces, and on behalf of whom the sympathies of this House were invoked; for the practical effect has been a comparative reduction rather than an increase of their taxation under the operation of this Tariff. Then, Sir, we were told that this Tariff would be oppressive to a certain section of the Dominion of Canada by the imposition of a duty on coal, while it would do no good whatever to Nova Scotia or other portions of the Dominion where there are large coal deposits. When I was asked by an hon. gentleman opposite in 1879 what increase of the consumption or what demand the Government expected to create for Nova Scotia coal by the operation of the Tariff, I stated that probably within a short time the consumption of Nova Scotia coal in the Dominion of Canada would increase to the extent of 400,000 tons.

Mr. ANGLIN. And displace American coal to that extent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I did; "to a very large extent" I said; or, if it will please the hon. gentleman more, I will say to that extent. I did not suppose, Mr. Speaker, sanguine as I was, with reference to the effect of this Tariff, that in three years, by the increased industries and by the increased demand for steam power, it would make a demand which would require over 400,000 tons to meet it; but we find that these industries have been growing up all over the country to such an extent that it has required more than 400,000 tons from the Nova Scotia miners, and has also caused a largely increased amount to be imported from the United States as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman state where that coal was distributed in the other Provinces?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot now say where, but I know some of it reached Cobourg.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How much?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know that, because I saw it going into a factory there. It was 800 tons I think they told me they had purchased from Nova Scotia, and I heard that some Nova Scotia coal was furnished to a factory in Kingston, and it was declared to be the cheapest coal for steam purposes; and at Guelph, also, I am told there was some consumed. But there is this on record: that in 1877, 757,000 tons of coal was raised in the mines of Nova Scotia; in 1878, 770,603 tons; in 1879, 788,271 tons; in 1880, 1,032,710 tons; and in 1881, 1,116,248 tons; and to be added to that, there was in British Columbia, 214,243 tons, against 145,542 tons in 1878, or a total of 916,145 tons in 1878, against a production in 1881 of 1,333,391 tons, being an increase of 417,246 tons per annum.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman now state the amount of export in each of those years?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. To the United States it was just about the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE. To all quarters?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is just about the same, leaving the consumption in the Dominion of Canada, increased by that proportion, 400,000 tons.

Mr. BUNSTER. Mr. Speaker, might I—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BUNSTER. I have a right to put the Finance Minister right. Were it not for the absence of the Island Railway we would have had over a million tons of an increase.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It only shows what is in store for us then. There was another very grave objection

brought to this policy, and that was, that when we imposed an additional duty upon sugar refined in any country that granted a bounty—that is when we provided that on the importation of sugar from any country that granted a bounty, the *ad valorem* duty should be levied on the duty-paid value of such sugar, and when we increased the duty on raw sugar 5 per cent., and the duty on refined sugar 10 per cent. hon. gentlemen opposite said this was an outrageous proceeding, that the loss to the Dominion of Canada might be counted at least by a million of dollars—\$900,000 to \$1,000,000—and it would be better, said our friends of the Opposition, to take all the men that would be employed in these refineries, proposed to be put into operation, and board them at a hotel and pay their bill, than to introduce this policy. Now, what are the facts that have developed during these last few years? Last year, I think, certainly the year before, the ex-Finance Minister intimated that we would lose \$900,000 of revenue; and the leader of the Opposition stated, here and at a public dinner in Toronto that, under the operation of this policy, we lost during the years 1879-80 \$600,000 of revenue, and that the people of Canada paid \$600,000 in increased price for the sugar which they consumed, so that the sugar monopoly, as he termed it, cost the people of the Dominion of Canada \$1,200,000 a year. I stated in my place in the House last Session in answer to that hon. gentleman, when he said a loss of \$500,000 revenue had taken place, that the returns laid on the Table perhaps justified the hon. gentleman in making the statement, because they showed that, in the year 1880, there had been \$600,000 less of revenue collected from sugar than in 1879; but I pointed out that the revenue collected in 1879 was \$300,000 more than it would have been, if they had not imported in January, February and March, before the Tariff was changed, \$1,000,000 worth of sugar more than they usually imported in these three months; so that there would not have been an apparent loss of \$600,000 if the \$300,000 had been credited to that year; and, further, that from the returns laid on the Table of the revenue collected for the first six months of that fiscal year, it was clear that the revenue to be received during that year would be equal to, if not above, that collected in any previous year. What has been the result? The figures that I am now quoting can be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and they show this: that during the last year we paid into the Treasury for duties on sugar, \$154,910 more than the average for the five years previous, and under the Tariff of the hon. gentlemen opposite, justifying the statement I made, and showing that, as far as the present Tariff is concerned, there is no loss, or comparatively no loss, of revenue, because if we add \$800,000 to the value of the sugar imported, and that \$800,000 is represented by freight from the West Indies, the labor in the refineries, coal consumed, interest on capital and other expenditures, and you add 43 per cent. duty collected in the year 1876-77 on the sugar imported, with the sums named added, then it would only give \$40,000 more than we collected last year. There is the fact that \$154,000 more were received during the last year than the average of the five years previous; so much with regard to the anticipated loss of revenue. A few words with respect to the cost of sugar to the consumer. When I made the financial statement last year I had obtained, from reliable sources, a return showing the comparative prices in New York and Montreal, when we had two refineries in operation. I stated that, as far as the prices of granulated sugar were concerned, it appeared that those paid by the consumers in the Dominion were 25 cents per 100 lbs. more than they would have been if the sugars had been imported under the Tariff of 1877-78; but I might have added, as I propose to add now, that that calculation did not take into account the profits of importers, the middlemen, between the New York refiners and the men who bought

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

and sold the sugar here. Still I admit that as regards granulated sugar, omitting the profits of the middlemen, there was the difference of 25 cents per 100 lbs. The yellow refined sugars being much less than it could have been imported for under the Tariff of 1877. I have now a carefully prepared return showing the values during two periods in each month in New York and Montreal, deducting the drawback and adding 30 cents per cwt. as the expense of importation; this calculation does not include 50 cents per cwt. profit on transactions between the New York refiner and the Canadian consumers; giving the consumers the benefit of that also, there was still 7 cents loss charged to the people of Canada on that line of sugars than if it had been imported from New York, under the old Tariff; adding the profits of the middlemen, the saving was 57 cents per 100 lbs.; and, with respect to other refined sugars the difference was much greater. As far as the revenue is concerned, there has been no loss, and \$800,000 were probably expended in Canada in refining sugars, in freights, and in cost of coal. What have we in return? I explained this very fully last year, and showed what the effect of establishing refineries had been. There are now employed 1,000 hands in the cane sugar refineries, or 1,100, including those directly connected with the beet-root sugar industry. Those men, most of whom have families, require food, clothing, tenements, and everything that the merchants, manufacturers, and farmers supply; those men are employed in this country at remunerative wages, whereas they would have removed to another country if it had not been for the policy that rebuilt those industries and placed them in motion. Then we have 400,000 tons of coal raised from the mines of Nova Scotia, giving employment to, perhaps, 1,000 men—60,000 tons of the 400,000 tons increase in the production of the Nova Scotia mines being used in the refining of sugar. Thus employment was given to the miners, a market was afforded to the coal owners, business was provided for vessels and railways, 60,000 tons of vessels being employed in conveying raw sugar from the West Indies to different ports of the Dominion, something like 90 per cent. of the whole coming direct to Canada, instead of 6 per cent. as in 1878. Employment was also given to coopers, and, in one section of the country I visited, the timber on the land had increased in value because of the demand for the particular wood used for sugar casks. Everywhere, in the extension of trade, increased machinery was required and in operation, and additional employment was given to the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite are aware that one of the refineries has not, so far, been a financial success; if it had not been for that the Moncton refinery would have been quoted as paying enormous profits. It will, however, give the ex-Finance Minister the opportunity of repeating that all those establishments will become failures when, by their increase, competition becomes keen, and loss would accrue to those engaged in them. If our policy stood alone on this question of sugar refining, which is announced as a huge monopoly, I hold that the facts I have given afford an answer to the statement and the fears expressed with respect to this matter. Now, Sir, it was alleged that this Tariff would fail either as a revenue-producing Tariff, or as a protective Tariff. What evidence have we that hon. gentlemen opposite were mistaken on that point? There are various ways of ascertaining the increase of industries as the effect of the Tariff. The one which I will now present is to show how the quantity of raw material consumed by manufacturers has increased since the adoption of this Tariff.

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

AFTER RECESS.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read a second time:—

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 27) further to amend the Act incorporating the Mutual Life Association of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the "Life Association of Canada."—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the charter of the Chartered Bank of London and North America, and to change the name thereof to "The Chartered Bank of London and Winnipeg."—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the North-Western Bank.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Bill (No. 30) to empower the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company to wind up their affairs, and to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the dissolution of the said Company.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Clements Steamship Company, limited.—(Mr. Wade.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Quebec Timber Company, limited.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate "The Mutual Benefit Association of Sherbrooke."—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 34) to amend and consolidate the Act of incorporation of the British America Assurance Company, and all other Acts affecting the same.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 35) for amending the Acts relating to "The Trust and Loan Company of Canada," and for enlarging the powers of the said Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

THE BUDGET.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, I would like to ask him whether the \$150,000, proposed to be taken as bounties for fishermen, is merely a grant for this year, or whether it is proposed to ask a similar grant every year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not proposed to provide for it by Act of Parliament, but to ask an appropriation year by year. When the House took recess, I was calling the attention of hon. members to some facts to prove that the fears entertained by some hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, that this policy would not increase the number of industries in the country or give additional employment to manufactures. I will take up, first, the increased imports of the following raw materials used in manufactures, namely: raw cotton, hides and wool. These three articles, especially cotton, because there is none produced in the country, give a very fair idea of the increased value of the manufactures. The raw cottons imported in 1877-78, amounted to 7,243,413 pounds; in 1880-81, 16,018,721 pounds, or an increase of more than double in the three years. Hides imported in 1877-78, amounted in value to \$1,207,300; in 1880-81, to \$2,184,884, or nearly double. Wool imported in 1877-78, was 6,230,084 pounds; in 1880-81, 8,040,287 pounds. Wool exported in 1877-78, amounted to 2,445,893 pounds; in 1880-81, 1,404,123 pounds, giving an increase of imports of 1,810,000 pounds, and a decrease of exports, which shows that there was a consumption, in 1880-81, of Canadian wool, over that of 1878, of 1,041,770 pounds, thus making an increase on the consumption of wool, between the two periods, of 2,851,973 pounds. The increased value of cotton, leather and woollen manufactures for the year 1881, as compared with 1878, therefore exceeds \$5,500,000 on these three articles alone. Now, let us see what facts we have been able to gather with reference to the new factories established, and the number of persons employed. I will deal with the

general statement first, and then with one or two different localities, showing the influence that has been produced there by the operation of this Tariff. I have statements with reference to wages, but I will take the number of persons employed first. Upon a very partial investigation, because it only extended over a portion of the Dominion, we ascertained that there have been ninety-five new factories established down to October last, since March, 1879, employing 7,025 hands. The cotton factories that are now in course of construction, and will probably be completed within twelve months, will employ 3,000 hands in addition to those I have already mentioned. 440 odd factories visited and that were in operation in 1878, less the ninety-five that I have named as being established since 1878, show an increase of employes varying from 5 to 30 per cent. and with an average of 17 per cent. in these 350 odd factories. That 17 per cent. on the number of employes, as far as we can gather from the Census of 1871, and making an allowance for reduction in the number employed between 1871 and 1878, would give 17,850, making 24,875 as the increase of employes since 1878. I will take, as an illustration of the effect of the Tariff, one of the cities of the Dominion to show what its operations have been—I refer to the city of Hamilton, that ambitious city, represented by my hon. friend on the right (Mr. Robertson). This is a statement made up by the immigration agent of that city, and, if my memory serves me, this is the gentleman who sent a return to a member of a Local Government with reference to the employment of men in the industries of that city, but it was not embodied in the statement made in the report of that official.

An hon. MEMBER. It was irrelevant.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It may be, but it strikes me it would be of some importance by way of making public the facts contained in this paper and to show there was employment for immigrants in that locality. Now we find that, in 1881, the value of buildings occupied in that city as factories, up to that date, was \$1,074,100. I have the answers from the different parties communicated with that have been furnished to the Minister of Agriculture by the emigration agent there. In 1878, the value of the buildings occupied as factories in the city of Hamilton, was \$705,200, an increase of \$368,900, or a rate of 51 per cent. The value of plant, in 1881, was \$1,174,750; in 1878, \$538,100, showing a difference of \$636,650, or an increase of 113 per cent. The value of goods manufactured in 1881—and I wish the House to give particular attention to this—the value of goods manufactured in that city alone, in 1881, was \$7,478,700; in 1878, it was \$3,857,000, making an increase of \$3,621,700, or 94 per cent. The number of hands employed in 1881, was 9,054, and in 1878, as it is given here, 3,703, showing an increase of 4,351, or 117 per cent. as between 1878 and 1881. The average rate of wages per head in 1881, was \$1.17½, in 1878, \$1.07½, or an increase of 9½ per cent., or 10½ cents per head. The number of workshops and factories, in 1881, was seventy-eight; in 1878, it was fifty-seven, an increase of 37 per cent. In 1878, thirty-three workshops were running full time, and twenty-four short time. In 1881, workshops running short time, one; full time, fifty-six; over time, twenty-one; making seventy-eight in all. This is my statement with reference to one particular town. An hon. member on the Opposition Benches, an hon. member from my own Province, speaking of the effect of the Tariff, the Session before last, said there was one thing it was expected this Tariff would do, and that was to increase the wages, but it had not increased them. I have a statement here, from 460 factories, to show the rate of wages as compared with 1878. The wages in 135 of the factories out of 460 visited remained the same as in 1878, but were

nearly all working on full time, while formerly many were on short time. Fifty of the new factories started at such wages and no change was deemed necessary. In 277 factories the wages have been increased from 5 to 35 per cent. The rate of wages generally throughout the Dominion, we all know, has been considerably increased; that settles, I think, the question of wages.

Mr. PATERSON (South Brant). How do they compare with wages in the United States?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know, Mr. Speaker, that we have been obliged to send to the United States to obtain men for our factories, and to pay more in some cases than they have to pay there.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you have a tax on the labor coming in?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; we have no tax on the labor coming in. We give them the encouragement that the hon. member complimented his leader upon giving some years ago when they increased the duty on cigars, when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and complimented the then Finance Minister with increasing the duty on cigars, he said it had brought thousands into the country and it was just the policy to pursue. That is the kind of protection we are extending, and we hope he will give us his support.

Mr. PATERSON. The quotation is not correct, that is all the trouble.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Then I stand corrected. I have read it somewhere, and I have not seen it contradicted.

Mr. PATERSON. It was a figure of speech.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The *Hansard* has just been put into my hand, and I have no doubt it passed through the hands of the hon. gentleman before it appeared in the *Hansard*.

Mr. PATERSON. This was a figure of speech, I said.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But let us see, Mr. Speaker, who made this speech. I find that it was made by Mr. Paterson, and I am quite sure it was not my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Patterson, Essex). He says:

"The other year the Finance Minister, in revising the Tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry which it never had before. The result was that a thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany were literally transported by the change in the Tariff to Canada, and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit. The middle men suffered a diminution of profits; but for them nobody seems to care much, the producer and consumer receiving all the sympathy."

Now, then, I tell my hon. friend—

Mr. PATERSON. I do not repudiate that yet. I said figuratively at that time that those men were not wrong.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I now come, Mr. Speaker, to another statement that has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite; but before I do so, in order to make my answer more complete than it would otherwise be, I desire to refer for a short time to the cost of the manufactures of the Dominion of Canada to the consumer compared with what they were in 1878. And I trust I may be able to use as strong language, or language very similar to that employed by my hon. friend from South Brant, that the result of the increase in the Tariff had not been to increase the cost of the article to the consumer. I take up, in the first place, cotton goods, because I know that in the Maritime Provinces as well as in the west, but especially the Maritime Provinces, great stress was laid on the increased cost of cotton goods as well as the increased cost of woollen goods, especially of the coarser classes. I stated last Session the prices of grey

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

and white cottons and brown sheetings, but I have here a statement showing that brown sheeting and bleached shirtings manufactured in the Dominion were sold at from 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. over the net cost price of the same articles in the United States, or 10 per cent. less than the price at which they would sell under the Tariff of 1877-78. That is to say, that with reference to this particular description of cotton goods manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, they are sold to-day at a lower price than they were sold under the old Tariff. I have here a statement from Mr. Parks, of the city of St. John, with reference to ball knitting cotton, manufactured and sold by him at $39\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound, delivered in Montreal, Toronto, London or Hamilton, while the net price of the same article in the United States, is 40 cents per pound. I have in my possession the letters written to, and the answers written by, men engaged in this manufacture in Massachusetts, and they state their lowest net prices. Therefore, the consumer of this description of cotton goods has them $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than they had them in 1878. With reference to cotton yarns, No. 7 to No. 10, in the United States, in 1878, they were $20\frac{7}{10}$ cents per pound, the raw cotton being 10 cents per pound. The same articles are manufactured by Parks, and they were sold, in 1882, for $22\frac{5}{10}$ cents, the raw cotton being 12 cents per pound. There was an increase of price in this case of $1\frac{8}{10}$ cents per pound on the manufactured article, against an increase of 2 cents per pound on the raw material. Carpet warps sold in the United States, in 1878, at $22\frac{5}{10}$ cents per pound, while the same article is sold by Parks, in 1882, at $24\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound, the increase being $1\frac{8}{10}$ cents per pound, against an increase in the price of the raw material of 2 cents, showing that the price was not really in excess of what it cost in 1878. Beam warps, No. 10, were $28\frac{5}{10}$ cents per pound in the United States, while in New Brunswick, in 1882, they were $31\frac{2}{10}$, an increase of $2\frac{7}{10}$ cents against an increase of 2 cents per pound on the raw cotton. Beam warps, in January, 1882, in the United States were $30\frac{6}{10}$ cents per pound net, while the price in New Brunswick was $31\frac{2}{10}$ cents per pound net, or less than 2 per cent. above the United States prices. These figures show that, so far as this particular class of cotton goods is concerned, they are sold to the consumer at a less price than in 1878, and many of the articles are sold at the American prices, or a fraction under or a fraction over them. I may add that it was not to be expected that the prices would be as low for the first year or two as they will be when competition is established. Take, for example, the year before last, when we had but two sugar refineries—those in Montreal—and look at the result which has followed upon the establishment of three others in the Maritime Provinces. A year ago I had to admit, on the face of the paper submitted to me, that 25 cents per hundred more was paid for sugar than under the Tariff of 1878. This did not include the charges by the middle men. Now we can state emphatically that the price is less to the consumer than if it had been imported under the Tariff of 1878. And I firmly believe that the competition in cost on cotton manufactures in twelve months, when we shall have 400,000 spindles instead of 180,000 which we have now, will produce such a result that there will be little difference in the prices here of any description of such goods and the prices in the United States. What our manufacturers say is: "that we can manufacture as cheaply here as in the United States, but we want the market. We are preparing for the sharpest competition, and we do not fear our friends on the other side of the line if we have the home market, and the competition among ourselves will keep the prices down to the consumer." This is an important subject. The leader of the Opposition referred to it, and in order to make the people in the Maritime Provinces see the effect of

this Tariff as he sees it, said: that if a farmer visited one of the dry goods stores, and bought a dress for his wife, he would have to send out of the nine or twelve yards he would buy three or four yards up to Ottawa. One farmer who was present said: "that is not true, because I take what I buy home to my wife; I send none to Ottawa." However, he was speaking figuratively, like my hon. friend from Brant. Many gentlemen and some ladies who were present at his meetings, said that the main point made by him against the Tariff was with reference to woollen goods. He said that the poor man would be compelled to pay 40 per cent. duty and upwards, and the rich man but 25 or 27 per cent. I have taken some pains to write to different parties who could furnish me with reliable information with reference to the price of woollen goods; and a gentleman sent to me, at the request of a friend, a letter, of which he authorized me to make any use I thought proper. I stated to the gentleman, to whom I wrote among others, that I wished reliable data—data that could not be shaken by any statements of fact that could be produced in the House—because we wanted nothing but the facts, and if the manufacturers were getting large profits, it was just as well that we should know it, and deal with the facts as we found them. This letter I received from Cantlie, Ewan & Co., of Montreal, who, I believe, have been for years engaged in selling woollen goods. It has reference to the price and value of certain descriptions of woollen goods made in Canada, compared with the prices of the same goods previous to the change in the Tariff. It is as follows:—

"1st. Etoffes, tweeds and fabrics made from Canada wools and used chiefly by farmers, laborers, shantymen and mechanics in country districts, are as low in price now as at any time during ten years previous to 1878. This refers to regular sales. No doubt during the very severe depression special lines may have been sold at a concession to force sales, but the average price of such goods, for 1880, 1881 and 1882, is lower than the average of ten years previous to 1878.

"2nd. Medium and fine wool fabrics made exclusively from imported wools and used by farmers, mechanics in cities and towns, and by the large mass of the population, were, in 1880 and 1881, and are now selling for 1882, at lower prices than at any previous time since these goods were made in Canada.

"The goods now made in Canada from fine and medium wools have improved very much in character as to fabric, color and finish, and ought on this account to bring more money instead of less.

"3rd. Flannels are now as low in price as at any time during the past fourteen years, except for a short time during 1877 and 1878, when, under the pressure of hard times, a break in price took place by the largest manufacturer of such goods attempting to run out the other smaller makers. This failed, and the price has since been steady. No advance has taken place, although wool supplies and wages all have advanced very considerably.

"4th. Blankets are as low in price now as they were any time during ten years previous to 1878. During 1880 they were lower in price than at any former time in Canada. Our Canadian wools were then very low in price, about 21 cents per lb.; since then wool suitable for blankets has averaged not less than 29 cents to 30 cents, and blankets have advanced in consequence. For last year and this present year prices are as low as any year since 1869. Being compelled by forcing competition to give up making blankets for 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, have no record of prices for these four years."

Mr. Speaker, that speaks strongly with reference to the price and value of the goods made in the Dominion of Canada largely from wool grown in Canada, and consumed by the masses of the people of Canada; and, as I stated in the early part of my speech, while the masses of the people have been buying their woollen goods at prices as low as they were before the change of the Tariff, it will be found by reference to the Trade Returns that we received \$411,000 more from the finer descriptions of woollen goods, worn by the wealthier people, than we did the year previous, and an average of from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 9 per cent. duty more than we did in 1878, from the consumers of the finer goods, showing clearly that, instead of the rich man getting his clothing cheaper and the poor man paying more as a rule, the poor man gets his clothing as cheap or cheaper than he did before, while the rich man has paid from 7 to 10 per cent. additional duty.

Mr. MILLS. Then Canada never was a sacrifice market.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes it was; that was the trouble. I asked one of the manufacturers: "How is it that, although wages are higher prices are lower?" He said to me: "The fact is we used to have to spend a large sum in employing runners to go throughout the country to make sales. We lost a large amount of interest on the stocks we had in hand and could not sell in spite of this increased expense; but now we have doubled our production, have orders ahead, our expenses of management have not increased, and we can sell at smaller profits than we could before, and yet in consequence of the increased production we have larger profits at the end of the year." Thus we see that, while we are building up these industries, the people are getting cheaper goods, and the manufacturers are making more money than they were before. Now, Sir, as I have dealt with the cotton and woollen goods worn by the masses of the people, I thought I would like to know how the case was with reference to the hats and caps made out of coarse woollen goods, felts, and other materials; and I addressed a letter to a gentleman in Montreal largely engaged in the manufacture of these articles—a gentleman who is, I believe, known to many hon. members of this House—Mr. E. K. Green. He, among others, sent me a reply, and which he said I might make whatever use I pleased; and as he speaks very strongly and decidedly with respect to the effect of this policy on prices, I give him as an authority on the subject. I know he is a somewhat prominent man in the city of Montreal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A prominent Protectionist.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; and he was, I believe, a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite at one time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He is yet.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Then, Sir, I present the testimony of a gentleman who sympathises with hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, and who, under these circumstances, would not, except for the National Policy, maintain this Government in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is not fair. I said he is a decided Protectionist.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Exactly so. Then he could not have any political object in writing a letter like this. I said: "I believe you are engaged in the manufacture of hats and caps, and that class of material," the relative cost of which, to the consumer, I had not, up to that time, received any information about. I was under the impression that some caps, made from the coarse woollen goods, cost a little more, and I was anxious to get information on the subject, so I wrote to him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the duty on hats and caps?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Twenty-five per cent. His reply was as follows:—

"HAMILTON, February 3rd, 1882.

"I have gone over and carefully compared the prices of the various lines of caps and felt hats manufactured by us in 1878 and 1881, and I find, as the result of my investigation, that the average selling price of our goods during the past year has been lower than in 1878, for the same class of goods. This is the case, not only in those lines of goods on which the advance of duty has been slight, but also applies to those coarse, heavy woollens, on which the duty has been considerably increased. These results have been attained by an increased protection of this class of goods, in consequence of the present Tariff, and by a natural law of manufactures, whereby a larger quantity of a given article can be produced and sold to the consumer at a less price than a smaller quantity of the same article. In other words, owing to the enlarged market afforded by protection, and the keenness of home competition, we are able to supply the country generally with coarse woollen caps and felt hats at lower prices under the present Tariff than in 1878, before it went into operation.

"As an importer, manufacturer, general merchant, of twenty-five years' experience, extending at present from Cape Breton to British

Columbia, I can safely say that the country as a whole, in its solid material prosperity and sound financial condition, has never been (during the period mentioned) as truly prosperous as at present. I believe this statement will be confirmed by every leading banker and merchant throughout the Dominion. You are at liberty to use this letter in any way you may think best."

We have taken the felt hats and woollen caps, the woollen clothing and the cotton underclothing, and, for the mass of the people, it does not appear to have cost them a great deal more for these articles—it cost them somewhat less; but, at any rate, we say they have cost them no more than under the Tariff of 1878. Let us see, what other articles have been affected by the Tariff. We increased the duty considerably on waggons and carriages. I have several statements all pretty much in the same direction—but I have one in particular in which is given the prices of waggons and carriages. Waggons which sold in 1871 for \$64, sold, in 1878, for \$62, and, in 1881, for \$60. Carriages which sold in 1871 for \$110 cash; in 1878, for \$105 cash; and in 1881, for \$100 cash. A carriage that sold in 1871 for \$120, sold in 1878 for \$100, and in 1881 for \$100. A covered buggy, first class (giving the description of it), which sold, in 1871 for \$170, sold in 1878 for \$160, and in 1881 for \$150; so that the increase of duty on carriages has not had the effect of increasing the price to the purchaser. Ploughs are selling at 15 per cent. less than in 1878. All agricultural implements are selling from 5 to 20 per cent. less than they sold in 1878. Organs are selling at 15 per cent. less than they were sold for in 1878, and the business has increased nearly four-fold. Sewing machines are reduced in price \$10 each, and the business has trebled or more. Boots and shoes, and leather manufactures, first-class custom work, has increased in price about 15 per cent., equivalent to the wages of the men employed in that particular work; but factory goods are sold at from 10 to 25 per cent. less than in 1878, although the price of labor has increased. Lamp glasses sell at less than in the United States in 1878. In hardware goods there has been an increase in price for a portion, but not greater than the increased cost of labor and of raw material, but a large portion are sold lower than in 1878. The best class of furniture is selling at a somewhat higher price than before—that is, the very best description of furniture—but the furniture that is used by the masses of the people, manufactured at the large establishments of the Dominion of Canada, is sold as low, and lower in most cases, than it was in 1878. The price of iron castings in 1882 is 9 per cent. higher than in 1878; in 1879 the prices were at the lowest, pig iron being cheaper than at any period since. The increase in the price of iron castings is about 15 per cent., or equivalent to the increased cost of the pig iron and the labor—principally of the labor. Cut nails are 5 per cent. lower, and finishing nails are 9 per cent. lower than in 1878; pressed spikes, are 12 per cent. lower than in 1878, and railway spikes, \$2 per ton lower than in 1878. Horse shoes are 8 per cent. higher than they were in 1878, because when the machine made horse-shoes were first introduced, in order to induce those who required them to abandon the manufacture of shoes, the prices were put down, and consequently they were lowered in 1878, and are now selling at 8 per cent. higher than in that year; but for nails there has not been an increase in price, though we have increased the duty upon them. Let me say that, as far as these particular manufactures are concerned, it does not appear that the consumer has been called upon to pay anything more, as a rule, but in some cases less than before, and consequently the Tariff, to the masses of the people, with reference to these manufactures, has not been oppressive. An hon. gentleman opposite, the member from the County of St John's, the late Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee) took a different view of this subject. His view was endorsed by the late Finance Minister. He evidently

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

entertained the opinion that this was a protective policy, and that it would increase largely the consumption of home manufactures at a higher price and yield less revenue. That hon. gentleman stated—and the late Finance Minister said that no answer had been given to it—that, under the operation of this Tariff, we would tax the people \$7,000,000 more than before, and they would pay but \$2,000,000 of that into the Treasury. Now, there has been \$6,000,000 paid into the Treasury over and above what was collected in 1877, and if we increased the manufactures last year by \$15,000,000, the average duty that would be imposed if imports would be 20 per cent., and if the increased cost to the consumer for that \$15,000,000 worth of goods, manufactured in the country, was equivalent to the duty, then the hon. gentleman might claim that the people paid \$3,000,000 for these goods that did not reach the Treasury; but I have shown, that, instead of paying the increased duty that was imposed, they have these goods as cheap as they were before the change and we have the \$6,000,000 in the Treasury, and the people have paid no more for the goods manufactured under the protective policy. There are a great many statements made about the taxation of the working man, and especially upon the farmer. Now let us look at that view of the case for a moment. There is a good deal of sympathy manifested for the farmer. I, on a former occasion, made the remarks in answer to some statements made by an hon. gentleman that the farmer was heavily taxed under this Tariff, that from the peculiar position of the farmer, he would not in proportion to his means contribute as much as certain other classes. It was afterwards stated that I had said they would not pay their share, or would not pay enough into the Treasury. I simply said that under the Tariff, owing to his peculiar position, he would not contribute as much as some other classes of persons who were not producers, and who consumed largely of imported goods. Now, let us for a few moments consider the condition of the farmer in the light of the facts I have just presented—and when I am referring to the farmer, I desire to include the mechanic and the laborer. I am referring to the masses of the people of Canada. Let us see now under the change in the Tariff that has been in operation since 1879, with the reductions proposed to-day, how the farmer, mechanic and laborer stands. His tea will cost him 5 to 6 cents a pound less than it did in 1878. The duty is removed off his coffee. The sugar, considering the middle man and his profits, is at least 50 cents per hundred pounds lower than before. His molasses is 10 per cent. less than he paid in 1878. With reference to rice he will be able to obtain it, under the new arrangement, a little less than before. Soap has increased about 12½ per cent. in price, the increase, however, is due to the raw material from which it is manufactured, and this raw material pays no duty. With reference to spices the duty remains unchanged. With reference to woollen goods used by the masses they are as cheap or cheaper than before. With reference to woollen yarns they are as cheap or cheaper than before. Hats and caps are also as cheap as they were before. Custom made boots and shoes are 15 per cent. more, the others less. Agricultural implements are from 5 to 20 per cent. less than in 1878. Sewing machines are \$10 less than before; carriages less than before; lamp shades and glass ware are less than before; organs are less than before; nuts and bolts, which I did not refer to previously, are less than before; furniture of common qualities is as low, if not less than before; nails and spikes less; horse shoes a little higher; stoves and castings a little higher; hardware, taking it all round, a little higher; tools and files less than in 1878. The reduction in cost will average from 5 to 10 per cent. as near as can be gathered on the articles named. Now, Sir, that being the case, let us consider the

position of the farmer especially. I quite admit if it could be shown that this Tariff had no advantages for the farmer, that it was oppressive, that he paid more taxes than formerly and received nothing in return, then he might be induced to accept the invitation of hon. gentlemen opposite to oppose this policy whenever it is put upon its trial. But the leading articles which he is consuming are no higher than before, and in many cases they are less. We will now enquire what other benefit he has in addition to the lower prices. In my judgment the farmer is as greatly interested in this Tariff as any other class of men in the Dominion. In the first place he has the home market. An hon. member opposite referred to the home market last Session, stating that it was of very little importance. Visit any section of the Dominion you please, put yourself in communication with the farmers, especially in the neighborhood of towns where manufacturing industries have been established and are increasing, and ask them if they are deriving no advantage. Why, Sir, under the operations of this Tariff, the vegetables, the fruit, the poultry, the lamb and veal, and other meats, the butter, the cheese, for almost everything they offer for sale, they obtain higher prices on account of the home market than is obtained in localities where they have to sell to the middle man and ship to another market. In conversations with the farmers, I found that, in 1878 they frequently came to market with their fruit and vegetables, and would stand there all day; and, not being able to get a price which would be an object to them, would drive home and wait for another opportunity, frequently being compelled to return and take what was offered. "How is it now?" I said. They replied: "There is no difficulty now. We sell everything we bring in for cash, and at good prices." Why? Because the country is in an active and flourishing state. Manufactories have increased, the number of the employed has increased, and their wages also have increased. They have plenty of money with which to buy country produce—I speak particularly of perishable goods which cannot be sent to a distant market. Some 25,000 more people are employed than in 1878 in these manufactories, and if they represent four for each family, you have 100,000 people to be fed, the heads of whose families were without employment, or were only partially employed, or not in the country in 1878. What the effect of this is to the farmer can be clearly understood. But it is said the duty on oats is no protection to the farmer, the duty on corn is very little benefit to the farmer. What is the fact? Do they not obtain better prices for their corn than they did before with a duty of 7½ cents per bushel? They certainly do. There is no question about that. Do they not obtain better prices for their rye? admit that that is regulated to a very large extent by the price in Germany and elsewhere, the markets to which it is generally shipped from the Dominion; but the distillers of Canada now buy their rye from the farmers of Canada, which they use as a substitute for corn. That gives an increased market, and to a certain extent affects the price. With reference to the price of oats, we have evidence beyond controversy, in my judgment, that it has been increased to the consumer 3 cents per bushel. But it is said the European market regulates the price here. It does not matter an iota what duty you put upon it. Does it not? The leader of the Opposition said in Nova Scotia—and I do him the justice to say he made the same statement in Toronto previous to the West Toronto election—that the duty on coal increased the price of coal to the consumer in Ontario, and that the duty on breadstuffs increased the price of breadstuffs to the consumer in the Maritime Provinces. The operation of this state of things, he said, would create a bad feeling between the people of Ontario and the people of the Maritime Provinces, because the latter had to pay additional for the breadstuffs of Ontario consumed

in the Maritime Provinces, and the former additional on the coal consumed in Ontario. On the subject of coal, I know there has been a great deal said; but my enquiries have led me to the conclusion that, while we receive a very considerable sum from coal imported from the United States and consumed in Ontario, one-half of that sum is paid by the coal producers in the United States. That is my conviction, and we have evidence of it. It is only very recently, in conversation with a gentleman who purchased in the United States 2000 tons of coal for consumption in Canada, that a portion of the coal duty was paid by the coal producers of the Western States. But, as I said on a former occasion, if the people of the United States were to say to us to-day, or any day, that they would go back to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, by which the natural products of the two countries would be exchanged free, we would be prepared to agree to that arrangement. But it would be the greatest mistake that any Government could make at this time, while negotiations may be opened at no distant day, while notice may be given by Canada of the abrogation of the Washington Treaty, within twelve months, and when there is a desire in the United States, on the part of a portion of her people, to open negotiations for the free exchange of natural products, it would not only be a mistake—it would be madness, to yield one iota of the vantage ground we now possess. If we were to yield it now we would do that which we would regret for all time to come. Therefore, we are not prepared to offer any proposition for the reduction of the duties now levied on these articles. Sir, the prices have been quoted in Chicago and compared with the prices of wheat in Toronto, and the conclusion has been drawn that the Tariff has no effect on the price of wheat in Toronto. But, Sir, an exceptional state of things has existed in the United States for two years. This year especially the holders of wheat have felt that the short crop in the United States and the short crop in Europe would necessarily bring up the price above what it was when the harvest was completed in America. They have been holding for a time wheat at 6 cents per bushel higher than the price brought for that description of article in the Liverpool market, adding the ordinary freight and ordinary expenses in taking it to the market. What have they been able to do from the fact of holding the grain? They have driven the railroad companies and the shipowners to the point that, in order to enable them to get the price they were asking for it in Chicago, they have reduced the freight by railways, and the charges of transportation and the freights on shipping by which it has been sent forward, and thus made just a fair return considering the price which was paid for it in Chicago. And what was the difference a week ago. I will give an illustration, simply to show that this Tariff, while it does not, of course, increase the price of grain 15 cents a bushel, it does, as I estimated last Session, increase the price on an average of 10 cents a barrel on flour consumed in the Dominion of Canada; and, if the leader of the Opposition was present, I would thank him for the compliment which he paid me at one of his meetings when he undertook to show to the people of the Maritime Provinces that they paid more for their flour, and, in order to clinch the matter, he quoted my statement in Parliament to prove that the price was increased to the consumer 10 cents a barrel. Ten days ago wheat was sold in the Toronto market 3 cents higher per bushel than it was sold for in the Chicago market, and it could not have brought these 3 cents per bushel in excess had it not been for the Tariff; and I will tell you why. The cost of transmission of that particular class of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool, *via* New York, was precisely to a cent what it cost to convey the same description of wheat from Toronto *via* the Grand Trunk Railway and the Allan steamers to Liverpool;

therefore, if it depended simply on the English market, that wheat would have had to go down 3 cents in price per bushel, in order to compete with the wheat sent from Chicago. But it brought 3 cents more, because, as we know—after the harvest is in, and a large portion of it has been shipped to England—the quantity of Canadian grain in the country being diminished, Canadian millers have to pay an increased price for the wheat which they require, and this increase naturally goes into the pockets of our farmers, who reap the benefit. The miller, therefore, has either to go to the United States market and pay the duty, or he has to pay the price which the farmer demands for his grain here; consequently our farmers, ten days ago received 3 cents more per bushel for their wheat than they would have obtained had our market been open and exposed to the danger of being broken down by shipments from the other side, which, without the duty, would have been thrown in here, and thus brought into competition with the produce of our own agriculturists. The returns on the Table of the House show that in the years 1879-80 and 1880-81, there were 10,000,000 bushels more of Canadian grain consumed in Canada, than was the case during the two years previous. We had, therefore, a market for the products of Canada to the extent of 5,000,000 bushels of grain per annum, which we did not before possess, and it is thus we derive the benefit. Our exports of the products of Canada have been somewhat increased, and a home market for 5,000,000 more bushels of grain has been provided for our farmers who have obtained better prices than they would have received, had their market been open to free competition with the farmers of the Western States; and in this manner, the Tariff has conferred a decided benefit upon our agriculturists. I have the evidence here which will show the exact extent of the reduction in imports of breadstuffs. In 1877, we consumed in Canada, 5,210,890 more bushels of United States wheat than we did in 1881, and in 1878 we consumed 2,161,867 bushels more than we did in 1881. In 1877, we consumed 599,737 more bushels of American oats than we did in the year 1881, and in 1878, we consumed 1,999,153 more bushels of United States oats than we did in the year 1881, showing that in 1881 we had a home market for 7,302,000 bushels more of home grown grain than the average for the years 1877 and 1878. That is sufficient, I think, to establish pretty clearly that the home market for the farmers of Canada, with an increased price in certain seasons, gives them what they would not possess if that home market was open to the Americans to send in their produce free as they have done down to 1878 or 1879. Considering the fact that the farmer, as well as the laborer, the artisan and the masses of the people, pay no more for the goods they consume than they did in 1878; considering that he has the home market free from competition to a very great extent, for such products as I have named as well as vegetables, fruit and other articles that may be considered perishable, and securing higher prices than he did before; I think it will be difficult to convince him that, under the present policy, he is not benefitted, and to induce him, under any circumstances, to oppose a policy that has so increased the value of his produce. Having dealt with these points I desire to deal with another objection, and that is that the ill-feeling that would be created in England from the adoption of this policy would affect our credit there. I answered that last Session, and in this way: that in 1878 the securities of New South Wales, which were the highest colonial securities in the English market, sold from 4 to 5 per cent. above Canadian; that while Canadian 4 per cent. securities had increased from about 89 or 90 to 104, that the other colonial securities had not increased in like proportion; that then Canadian securities were 1 per cent. above those of New South Wales, and therefore

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

their increased value was not solely attributable to the abundance of money and the lower rate of interest. I am in a position to state to-day, that our securities are 2 per cent. above those of New South Wales, showing a relative increase over last year, and standing, as they stood then, at the very top of every colonial security that is offered in the English market, and next to Consols. In this connection, I may remind honorable members that I laid on the Table of the House, a few days ago, the particulars of an arrangement made with our agents for the transaction of our business for ten years. Messrs. Baring and Glyn, Mills & Co. have acted as the agents of Canada for many years; and down to 1873 and 1874 the arrangements made by old Canada and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were, that they were to receive 1 per cent. for the negotiation of loans, 1 per cent. on their redemption, and 1 per cent. for the payment of interest on the coupons. Since then an arrangement was made by which the percentage on the coupons was reduced to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on bonds issued after 1873. It was in contemplation, when our High Commissioner was appointed to London, to make arrangements by which that agency should become a financial agency as well, and I stated to the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), who put some questions to me last Session and the Session before, that this matter was delayed, owing to a difficulty that had arisen with the agents, as they claimed that outstanding bonds having been issued, payable at the offices of Messrs. Baring and Glyn, Mills & Co. they had the right, as long as they were in a position to do so, to redeem them and receive the commission. As it was likely to lead to a controversy which neither party desired to bring about, the result was that a proposition was made to Sir Alexander Gait by our agents, that, for the future, commencing on the 1st of January last—and that proposal was accepted—the commission for paying all coupons would be uniform, namely, $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That saves \$15,000 yearly in commissions to agents. Then we have \$35,000,000 that may be redeemed in 1885. We have arranged in this contract, and instead of their receiving 1 per cent. on the redemption of these securities—they have agreed to exchange 4 per cent., or possibly securities bearing a lower rate of interest, with the holders of the 5 per cent. securities, who may desire to do so—that is, redeem them by an issue of new debentures for $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which, if we paid 1 per cent. for the redemption, and even $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the negotiation of the new loan, would save 1 per cent. on \$35,000,000, making a saving of \$350,000 on that transaction. Now, Sir, I think I have pretty thoroughly answered the objections made in 1878 to this policy, and answered them by facts gathered from the Public Accounts, facts gathered from the Trade Returns, facts gathered as I accept them from reliable men, but of course subject to correction, and if they are not correct we wish to have them corrected. We want to have the facts with reference to this matter and then we shall know precisely where we stand; but we present them here believing them to be correct, and consequently proving that our case is strong, and that the fears entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite were groundless. Let us look again for a few moments before I close, at the operations of this Tariff. How has it affected the different interests of this country? Take, for instance, the owners of bank stocks, it has not injured them. The stock owned in Ontario and Quebec to-day, at the quoted prices of sales made within a week, is \$20,000,000 above what the quoted sales in 1879 would produce. Has it hurt the manufacturers? It has not, because while they say they are selling goods less than they did before, business has largely increased. They are working full time, making prompt sales, and their increased productions, at even a lower price, have given them better profits than before. Have the men employed by the manufacturers suffered? They have not, because we

find that in the cases where they have not had an increase of wages they have had constant employment instead of short time as before. In many cases they have not only constant employment but they work overtime, and their position is better than it was before. How is it with the laborer to-day? He has plenty of employment in every part of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Plenty of employment. I say that, and I am surprised that any hon. gentleman would say no.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No? Well, Sir, his position is infinitely improved, at all events, as compared with what it was before the adoption of the present Tariff. We do not now find the Government compelled to ask Parliament to authorize the construction of Public Works, in order to give work to unemployed men. How is it, Sir, with reference to the merchant. The wholesale merchant tells us that his trade has been doubled last year compared with that of 1879, and 50 per cent. larger than that of 1880, that he has had prompt payments, that there have been fewer bankruptcies, fewer losses than he has known before. How is it, Sir, with the shipowner? The shipowners are at this moment probably feeling less the changes that have taken place in the industries and general interests of the country than any other people. There are circumstances affecting the shipping interests of Canada that cannot well be reached by legislation. One is the fact that the iron ships of the old world are rapidly taking the place of the wooden vessels of the new, built by our own ship-builders. We give a drawback that is more than sufficient to make up for the additional duty imposed on the materials used in the construction of ships, and I give as an evidence of this fact that but one builder out of the eighteen or twenty who sent in their claims for drawbacks asked more than the 75 cents allowed. The drawback gives the builder more than he pays in additional duty, and, in many cases, gives a return equal to the whole duty he pays.

Mr. KILLAM. But the Government fixed an arbitrary drawback.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Of course we did.

Mr. KILLAM: If the amount was arbitrarily fixed, what was the use of any man asking more?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am speaking of the applications made before the adoption of the specific rate. Applications that were made to the Minister of Customs when it was announced to the shipowners that the extra duties they paid upon materials entering into the construction of ships, would be returned to them. But one of them made a claim above the 75 cents per ton subsequently fixed upon, and many of them claimed not more than half that sum. And, Sir, we now come forward with a new proposition—bounties on a certain class of vessels. The construction will give employment to our people in building suitable vessels for the fishermen. We are doing everything we can do to protect that interest, though, I admit, it is not possible to grant the same aid as to some other industries. How is it with the lumber interest. It is said the Government have done nothing for that. To a certain extent I admit it. We may have increased the cost of the oats and of blankets, if the lumberman buys those shoddy articles upon which a duty of 45 per cent. is paid. If we except those two articles, it will be difficult for the lumberman to show that he pays any increased taxation that does not go into the Treasury as his share of the \$2,500,000 necessary to make up deficits of past years. It would, I admit, be difficult

for us to show any great direct benefit given to them, but I throw out this idea. It is now well understood that after three years operation of this Tariff, that houses that were unoccupied before have no longer "to let" on them; that there is an increased demand in all parts of the Dominion for lumber for home consumption, as compared with 1878, for new buildings, and every thousand or million feet sold for use in our home markets decreases by just so much the amount that would otherwise be exported, and it is well known by those who live in the Maritime Provinces how much the prices in American and English markets depend upon the stocks placed upon those markets. The lumber we manufactured in 1878 and could not consume here, was thrown, in addition to the ordinary shipments, upon the English and American markets, reducing its value there. Providing an increased demand at home is the measure of relief afforded to the lumber trade. How is it with the mining industry? Has there been nothing done for that? Has nothing been done for the coal industry, by increasing its output 400,000 tons last year, and it would have been increased still more but for the accident at the Albion mine? There are two smelting furnaces where there was one before—and there is a proposition now, and capital paid in, for smelting works in Montreal. There are before the Government now propositions that may result in the establishment of other iron industries; but take the facts as they are, they show that the policy is doing something for this industry. I have already explained the effect of the Tariff upon the farming interest; I have shown that the farmer has a home market and higher prices owing to American produce being largely shut out, while the articles he consumes are not higher than they were before. Look at the railway interest. It was thought the operation of the Tariff would tend to diminish the amount of their traffic. If we could make a careful account of the manufactured goods carried over the railways, we would find that the revenue from these sources have largely increased. Comparing what they carried from the sea-ports in 1877-78, and what they carry from the sea-ports to-day, and add the manufactures from the various factories that are sending their products all over the Dominion, it will be found that the railway proprietors have a large interest in this new policy. Every interest in the country has been, in my judgment, largely and materially benefitted. This policy, supplemented with our legislation securing the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has combined to place us in the enviable position we now occupy—the best position of any people on the face of the earth. Let us look at it for a moment. Here we are, with large expenditures ahead, it is true, but with a rich, fertile and illimitable domain which will pay off largely the indebtedness that will be incurred in its development—nay more, the portion of it which was required for the maintenance of our police and Indians, and for the preservation of peace in that country, will all be reimbursed out of the proceeds of these lands; and if it were not for the consideration, a high consideration, I admit, a consideration that can not be overlooked by this Parliament, without injury to the country—that it is desirable to give to the people of the old world and the inhabitants of our own Dominion, free homes in that great North-West, we could realize in a few years, if they were put up at public auction, the money that would pay back, not only the expenditure up to the present time, but down to the completion of the railway. But it will come in the future; our public debt will be decreased, our annual interest will be reduced, and we shall occupy the proud position of being able to offer to the industrious and honest men, who cannot find work in the old world, a home here, with free lands, a country girdled with railways, and a canal system the best in the world, with institutions that will protect their lives, their properties and their rights, and that will afford a refuge for the oppressed men if there be any in any

part of the old world. We will open our arms to them all, and bid them welcome, and make the Dominion of Canada, as I said in my closing remarks in a former speech, what Providence has designed it to be, one of the greatest, richest countries in the world, one we may be proud to belong to, especially by every man who has advocated and supported the policy that has in three years raised us to our present enviable position, a policy that will not be repealed, a policy that will be sustained either by gentlemen opposite, or by those on this side, for the will of the people will demand its permanency. Under these circumstances, we feel a pride and a satisfaction in meeting Parliament and presenting our case, and we are prepared to vindicate our position here and elsewhere, and we know that, at the close of this Session, when the arguments on both sides have been heard, and we have met our opponents face to face—as we are now stronger in the country than we were in 1878—we will be still stronger at the close of the Session than we are now, and that when the time comes to ask the people for the endorsement of our policy they will sustain us and send us back here to perfect and continue the policy we have inaugurated.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker: It is my pleasing duty, on the present occasion, to compliment the hon. the Minister of Finance on one important improvement on his previous practice. Until now, Sir, we have not, although he cannot say we have not urged and spurred him on, we have never been able to induce that hon. gentleman to bring down his Budget to Parliament in a reasonable time after the opening of the Legislature, and much valuable time has thereby been lost, wasted, I may say, to very little purpose. Now, Sir, although the hon. gentleman has been very slow, and very long in following the good example set under the Administration of my hon. friend, still even in this the eleventh, or it may be the twelfth, hour of this Parliament, we rejoice to hail ever so slight an improvement in this matter. I only wish I could push my congratulations further, and that the same improvement, which has been manifested in the expedition with which he has brought down his estimates, had been displayed in their preparation. I would that, besides copying us in the speed with which they were produced, he had also copied us in the economy with which they were framed; I would that he had produced a policy that might, in some small degree, justify the vaunts with which he has just concluded his exposition of that policy. It is not always particularly easy to follow that hon. gentleman. What between the subtlety of the hon. gentleman's logic and the complexity of the hon. gentleman's grammar, what between the curious convolutions of his arguments and the curious convolutions of his sentences now and then, if I should make a mistake and sometimes not clearly understand what he means, I must say I am not entirely to blame, and although he may not have any very great consideration for us on this side of the House—we do not expect it, and do not generally receive it—he ought, I think, to have some little consideration for those willing and faithful followers who are so ready to accept every statement that hon. gentleman may be pleased to make, either this year, or the year before, or the year before that. The hon. gentleman has given us, to-night, a new series of kaleidoscopic views of the beauties of the National Policy. If any of his followers happen to be afflicted with a sense of logic or good memories, they must be somewhat puzzled to reconcile the position occupied by that hon. gentleman to-night, with the position which that hon. gentleman has taken on many previous occasions. Sir, I think it would be well that the hon. gentleman should decide finally, what his followers are to believe on some of these important questions. Are we to understand, as we understood from that hon. gentleman not very long time ago, that it is a great misfortune for the

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

people of this country if the balance of trade be against them; or are we to understand that it is a good thing, if the balance of trade be in their favor under certain circumstances; or are we to understand, as I rather think he would have us understand, that it is a good thing to have the balance of trade in our favor if we happen to have a deficit, but a very bad thing indeed to have it in our favor, when having it in our favor would prevent us having a surplus. Now, on the present occasion, the hon. gentleman, although on other occasions he was very loud in discussing this matter of the balance of trade, has said nothing about the important fact that the balance of trade is very seriously against the Dominion of Canada for the past year. He was pleased to tell us that he had an excess of several millions of dollars over the sum he expected to raise, but he left it somewhat dubious whether an excess of several millions of dollars is to be held as a proof of the wonderful accuracy of his estimates, or as a proof that he succeeded in his leap in the dark. He has left it a mystery to us whether the real virtue, the real blessing the National Policy has bestowed upon us, is, as he told us three years ago, to reduce imports in every way, or whether the real end and purpose of his National Policy is to stimulate imports and thereby create a surplus? Are we to understand, after perusing these figures, after looking through our Public Accounts, that the hon. gentleman holds it to be the best proof possible of prudent statesmanship, that he has succeeded in doubling the taxes, and in doubling the expenditure of the people of Canada within some thirteen years? Are we to understand the hon. gentleman still continues of the mind that it is desirable for us to take it out of the Americans, as he put it a few years ago; and are we to look upon this remarkable increase which the last year's Trade Returns show of the imports from the United States, as a proof of the success of this policy of taking it out of the Americans? He tells us that everything, or almost everything, is cheaper now, that we have more taxes imposed upon almost everything. Is he prepared to follow that to the logical result and put on more taxes, so that we may ultimately get these things for nothing. The hon. gentleman was loud in explaining to the House that a certain number of thousands of hands, as to which I will say something presently, have been added to our population by his policy; but the hon. gentleman said nothing, for reasons which will presently appear, about the exodus which his friends at any rate choose to assert took place under the Administration of my hon. friend, or perhaps he has got new light upon that subject? Has he discovered that this prodigious exodus has resulted, according to the Census, in the remarkable circumstance that the great Province of Quebec, by the Census, grew twice as fast, while my hon. friend presided over the destinies of the country, as in the decade before? The hon. gentleman alluded most gingerly to the fact that a very short while ago, a very few years ago, he, an old Minister of Finance, had formally and solemnly stated his conviction that \$22,500,000 were ample to carry on the affairs of the Government of Canada. That was his statement before the last election. Now I find, in the year just closed, he spent \$25,500,000, or \$26,000,000 if we include the sum spent on Dominion lands. I find he asks for about \$27,000,000 for the service for the present year, and we all heard him tell us he expected to require \$27,750,000, without including Supplementary Estimates and without counting \$450,000 for Dominion Lands, for the year 1882-83. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman will do well, at another time, to take some opportunity to explain the trifling contradictions which appear to be involved in the several statements made by him; and when the hon. gentleman glories in the surplus he has got and calls upon us to admire him because, owing to circumstances over which he had no control, we have a surplus of \$4,000,000, or thereabouts, to-day, I, in turn, ask how that was got?

Of that \$1,100,000 are derived from those two most odious and oppressive taxes, which were never imposed in any civilized country before—under similar circumstances at least—the taxes on breadstuffs and on fuel. And if we added the expenditure on Dominion Lands, we would find that—deducting these two taxes which ought never to be imposed, and which could only be defended by the most extreme fiscal necessities, and adding a sum which for the purposes of comparison at least should be added—the hon. gentleman's surplus of \$4,000,000 would shrink to \$2,500,000. I can understand, and I am quite prepared to admit, that there are circumstances under which a surplus is just cause for congratulation. We have known in the past some such circumstances. I remember very well, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, when, without adding one penny to the burdens of the people of this country, from its natural growth and increase, a surplus relatively quite as large as this of which the hon. gentleman boasts, was obtained by Sir Francis Hincks. I admit that that was a fair and just ground for congratulation. Had this surplus been so obtained I would admit that it was a fair and just ground for congratulation; but what does the reality show? The reality shows the most oppressive system of taxation. The facts are these: The statements made by myself and my hon. friend, which the hon. gentleman has no doubt inadvertently misquoted, have been verified to the letter. Those statements were these: I told the hon. Minister that if he aimed to obtain revenue, he would find his Tariff was a total failure so long as the exports of the country continued low, and so long as there was no general improvement; but that the moment our exports increased, the moment that the general improvement, which I foresaw would shortly arrive, came, that moment the Tariff which he chose to abrogate would, without any further burdening the people, have produced fully as large a surplus as the hon. gentleman has boasted of to-day—at all events fully as large a surplus if you deduct those obnoxious duties on coal and breadstuffs. What did my hon. friend beside me state? The hon. member pointed out what has since proved to be correct, that whereas the hon. gentleman stated that all he needed was \$2,000,000, he had so grossly overloaded the taxation, and had gone so far beyond what was actually required, that this Tariff would produce \$7,000,000 instead of \$2,000,000 the moment our trade improved. The facts were that the \$7,000,000 which my hon. friend stated would be produced, and more, were taken out of the pockets of the people when only \$2,000,000 were required. Now, I will tell the hon. gentleman what were the conditions, in my judgment, at all events, under which the National Policy might fairly claim to be credited with this surplus and improvement. Let those hon. gentlemen show, if they can, that those increased exports, on which the whole increased imports depend, are due to the National Policy. Let them show that the increased imports are due to the National Policy, and then I, for my part, will freely and fully admit that the National Policy has had something to do with the increase of this surplus. But, Mr. Speaker, if we find that facts utterly and entirely contradict that absurd assertion, that the exports have increased from causes over which those hon. gentlemen could exercise no more control than over the procession of the equinoxes; if we find they are due absolutely and wholly to the increase in the lumber trade, exports of animals and their products, and of agricultural produce,—then I say those hon. gentlemen stand condemned as imposters who have laid claim to an improvement which their policy was not able to prevent, but which it certainly did nothing to create or stimulate. What are the broad facts of the case? They are these: that in 1879 we exported, exclusive of bullion and estimated short returns, \$60,000,000 worth of products; that in 1880 we exported \$70,000,000, and in 1881, very nearly

\$81,000,000. Now, Sir, how was that made up? Why, in two years, from 1879 to 1881, our exports of the forests rose from \$13,250,000 to \$25,000,000—\$12,000,000 of that \$20,000,000 were due to the increased exports of lumber—and in the case of animals and their products, the exports rose from \$14,000,000 to \$21,333,000. There, Sir, you have the whole increase. Does the hon. member expect we would believe, will he even venture to assert here that his policy has contributed to the increase of the exports of lumber or of animals and their products from the Dominion? If he does, I wish that he or some of his friends would condescend to show us how. I shall show him and this House, and I think the country, that what his policy has done in that direction has been to retard and injure the growth of those two great industries, that the hon. gentleman is not entitled to an iota of credit for the increase of exports which have taken place, and out of which the imports have been paid. How does the hon. gentleman propose to deal with these facts—facts contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and as well known to him as to hon. members on this side of the House. But probably, Sir, the hon. gentleman, as he has dealt with other difficulties, will not deal with them at all. The hon. gentleman is, however, blessed with colleagues a little more logical than himself, and I will give to the House an extract from a speech made by one of his colleagues, in which an explanation is offered tending to show that the National Policy, the policy of taxing everything that the producers of these articles use, did contribute to increase our exports of lumber and our exports of agricultural and animal products. On a certain occasion the hon. Minister of Public Works was banquetted in the good city of Hamilton, and after dinner the hon. gentleman was good enough to explain how it was that the National Policy had contributed to the increase of these exports. "The fact is," said he, "that as soon as that great policy was proclaimed, so great was the immediate revival of confidence in the people, that they at once set to work to plough more land, to grow more crops, and to raise more cattle." Well, the hon. gentleman, in order to establish his friends' case, found it necessary to assert this. But if the hon. gentlemen had been with me, a few weeks later, when I read that wonderful exposition of the effects of the National Policy to a couple of thousand of the best agriculturists in Western Canada, and heard the shouts of uncontrollable laughter which greeted it, he would have understood that, although logical, it was not likely to be effective, at any rate, with the hard-headed farmers of Western Canada. When I asked those 2,000 farmers, numbering among them as good agriculturists as can be found in the Dominion, and among whom were a great many supporters of the hon. Minister of the Interior, whether there was one among them who had been induced by the immediate revival of confidence to set to work and plough more land, grow more crops and raise more cattle, not one could be found to stand up and say he had grown a bushel more of grain or a pound more of beef. The actual fact is in direct contradiction to this ingenious theory. Immediately on the introduction of that policy, as every one acquainted with Western Canada knows, there was a large and lamentable exodus of many of the best farmers of the western region, not, I am sorry to say, to our own North-West, but to Dakota, Minnesota and other portions of the United States.

Mr. PLUMB. And to Texas and Kansas.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. If the policy had any effect at all it was not to increase the number of acres under plough or the amount of crops and cattle raised, but sensibly and materially to diminish them. I said, and I repeat, that the hon. gentleman's Tariff, as a revenue Tariff, was an utter failure, as low as our exports continued small. Take the Revenue Returns for 1879 and those for 1880, and you will

find deficits ranging from two to one and a-half million dollars; and not until these exports increased to the figure which I named was there the slightest sign of expansion or the slightest appearance of the surplus of which the hon. gentleman boasts. It is clear, I think, clear to demonstration, that had we had to-day the Tariff which existed in 1878, we would have had ample revenue without adding one iota to the burdens of the people. I invite the attention of the House to this simple fact. In 1875, our total exports amounted to \$67,500,000; in 1881, to \$81,000,000. Now, it is known to all practical men that the volume of our imports, and consequently our revenue, is necessarily regulated by the volume of our exports for the preceding year or two. Therefore, it is clear that if, in 1881, we exported, as we did export, \$14,000,000 worth more than in 1875, our revenue, under my Tariff, would have proportionately increased. What was the revenue in 1875? The revenue from Customs amounted to \$15,361,000. Now, if you make proportional allowance for the very large increase of exports which took place between 1881 and 1875, you will see that I am stating the literal fact when I say that, so far as it is possible to calculate in a matter of that kind, there is not the slightest or remotest doubt that, with such an export as we had in 1881, that Tariff would have produced at least \$18,000,000, and that without at all burdening the people. But the hon. gentleman was good enough to allude, although in a gingerley fashion, as I said, to the fact that our imports at present were slightly in excess of our exports. I dare say the House will recollect that in a public document, emanating from a brother colleague, great credit was taken and great stress laid upon the fact that, although there was a deficit, yet for the first time in the history of the Dominion, the exports—in 1880—had exceeded our imports. Well, I am not going to delay the House by entering into a disquisition on the merits of the balance of trade theory. I am, I confess, myself of the opinion, which does not appear to be shared by hon. gentlemen opposite, that if we are lucky enough to exchange £60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 worth of goods for \$80,000,000 or \$90,000,000 worth, we are largely the gainers by the transaction. That is a theory, however, which men like Smith and Mills, Peel and Gladstone, Cobden, Bright and Fawcett, are still deluded enough to entertain, but it is not the theory of the hon. Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman entertains quite a different idea. First of all, let me correct one error into which he has fallen. The hon. gentleman has chosen to include in the relative amount of exports and imports, what are called short returns in inland ports. Now, I do not think he is quite right in including those, for two reasons.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not include them.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Those short returns are but a mere matter of guess-work.

Mr. BOWELL. Has not that been practiced for the past ten years?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am quite aware of that, and in making my statements I have usually called attention to the fact that it is a mere matter of surmise, but there is special reason why this should not be counted in just now. As every man who lives on the frontier knows, there exists now what did not exist before, an enormous importation of smuggled goods into this country quite as much as any short returns from inland ports in the United States. Taking what are known and proved to have been exported, and what we know we imported, leaving out short returns on the one hand and smuggled goods on the other, you will find that the balance of trade is just \$10,000,000 against us. Let us read what the hon. Minister of

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Finance said on this subject three years ago. I quote from his own Budget Speech of 1879. He said:

"There are other difficulties. The volume of imports has not much diminished. Regarding the matter as I do, I think it is to be regretted that the volume of imports has not been materially reduced."

This was at a time when the volume of imports was \$80,000,000:—

"I look upon large imports ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large balance of trade against us, as one of the causes of the troubles with which we have to contend, one of the difficulties that it is our duty to remedy. Imports have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large, showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment, that they ought still to be further diminished. It appears to me that we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of our imports from all parts of the world."

That is his policy as expounded in 1879, when our imports amounted to nearly \$80,000,000; but we find that now, that our imports, exclusive of bullion, amount to \$90,488,000, the hon. gentleman has not a word to say about the duty of the Government to remedy this state of things if possible, about it being apparent to him that we ought to turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of our imports from all parts of the world. It may be news, or it may not be news, to the hon. gentleman to know that in the Mother Country, to which he was just inviting us to direct our attention in connection with some other matters, during the last twenty-five years, the balance of trade against England was something like two thousand millions of pounds sterling, or ten thousand millions of dollars. That he will find, if he chooses to look up the English Trade and Navigation Returns. It might interest him also to know that in spite of that, the English imports of bullion were about \$500,000,000 more during the same period than the English exports of bullion. Now, I am in no respect concerned about this same disastrous balance of trade, but I do submit, Sir, that unless there has been a total reversal of the laws which, according to the hon. gentleman, ought to govern our conduct in these matters, then I suppose that this \$10,000,000 against us is a most deplorable fact, and the hon. gentleman ought, as he said he would, to turn his best attention to remedy this terrible flow of imports from all parts of the world. Sir, the hon. gentleman has one ground—and only one—for contesting these statements. If the hon. gentleman be prepared to show that he and his colleagues were really the authors of the good crops which have increased our exports, and, which is also an important factor in the case, that they have contrived that there should be bad crops elsewhere, and so add to the prices which we receive for our goods, then I would say that the hon. gentleman had made out a case for his National Policy, but not till then, unless he is prepared to declare that the great expansion of business in the United States, to which an extremely large proportion of his surplus revenue is due, was caused by his having taxed considerably more every article which the Americans had to send us. When we speak of the injury inflicted by this over taxation, I would call the attention of the House and the hon. gentleman to this well-known fact; whenever you attempt to raise a revenue by heavy indirect taxation you must of necessity add very largely to the burden of the people, over and above the amount which goes into the Treasury. That, there is no possibility of avoiding, nor will all the calculations which the hon. gentleman has given in the slightest degree affect a fact so well proven as that. Now, Sir, it is not a point which necessarily militates against the National Policy *per se*. It is conceivable, it may be argued, that so great are the other advantages of that policy that it is worth our while to submit to a taxation of thirty or forty, or fifty millions in order to enjoy it; but there can be no excuse for concealing the self-evident fact that whenever you raise a revenue by indirect taxation, you so hamper

commerce in a thousand ways, you so interfere with profitable production, that you add most enormously to the cost to the taxpayer; and that when you put \$4,000,000 into the Treasury, even under an ordinary revenue Tariff, when the rate of taxation is not high, you certainly take at least \$5,000,000 out of the pocket of the taxpayer. When you do it under a Tariff like this, it is almost impossible to estimate the total amount, but it is certainly vastly in excess of twenty-five per cent. True, there is the converse to that. After you have raised your taxes to a certain point you may then without fear go on and add as much as you please. But, except in very few cases, that has not been done by us, and my position is briefly this: although it is true the hon. gentleman has secured \$4,000,000 of a surplus in the Treasury, it is none the less true that under his Tariff he has done that at an enormous cost to this country—a cost, I believe, of not less than eight or nine million dollars; and I will tell him, for one thing, and will show him presently, that in one article alone, that of sugar, he has taken \$4,000,000 out of the pockets of the people, and put \$2,500,000 into the Treasury. Now, I will take two special points touched upon by that hon. gentleman. First of all, I propose to refer to a question of great interest to the masses of this community, and that is the greatly increased cost of living. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman and his friends are apt to deal with this question by general assertions, not giving details, as, indeed, he dealt with it to-night. They do not appear to be able to see that these arguments are self-contradictory, self-condemnatory. If these men are able to produce these things as cheaply as they could elsewhere, what need have we, or what need have they, for a protective Tariff? Why, Sir, the case is clear. It is because, and only because, certain Canadian manufacturers, as a rule, cannot produce as cheaply as those of other countries—that they require to shut out, by a Tariff wall, the products of other countries. Probably the hon. gentleman does not hear the complaints of the poor. He does not hear the complaints of men with small fixed incomes. The hon. gentleman has been of late consorting with men who are making their thousands and tens of thousands in the operation of this Tariff, who have the greatest possible desire, and, I fear, the greatest possible inclination, to prevent that hon. gentleman from appreciating fully the mischief he has done, and in concealing from him the facts which he ought to know, and some of which, at least, I hope to bring to his attention to-night. The hon. gentleman cannot see how he has increased the cost of living; the hon. gentleman does not know, apparently, that on every yard of coarse tweed the poor man uses, his Tariff compels him to pay 25 or 30, or 40 per cent.—not more perhaps than in 1878, which has very little to do with the matter—but 25 or 30, or 40 per cent. more than that same article could be obtained for elsewhere, if it was not for his Tariff. The hon. gentleman cannot understand how he has added to the cost of living, when on every yard of coarse cotton, the man who consumes it is obliged to pay one-third more, at the fair market price, than if there were no tax and no Tariff to pay. He cannot understand how the man who purchases a pair of coarse blankets finds the cost of living increased when he is compelled to pay 60 per cent. more than the article would cost could he purchase it in bond without the duty paid. He cannot understand how the cost of living is increased, when, on every gallon of coal oil the poorest man consumes, he has to pay from 15 to 20 cents more than it could be obtained for, but for his Tariff, and but for the absurd and mischievous regulations which, in the interest of a monopoly, he has imposed on its inspection. He cannot understand how it comes to pass that the cost of living has increased, though he knows that on every barrel of sugar weighing 300 pounds the public have to pay \$9 more than they would pay, if there were no taxes at all,

and the hon. gentleman cannot see this, he cannot understand it, he merely denies the fact, and I venture to say that if in the course of his peregrinations through the country he will call on my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie), when he happens to be in Sarnia, and if he will go across the river to Port Huron, my hon. friend will be able to show him, in the course of half an hour's walk, a variety of shops in which he will be able to procure sundry of those articles at the prices I have named and much cheaper than he could purchase the same articles on this side of the border. Or if he will accompany my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Wiser), or my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Gunn), either of these gentlemen will be able to show him a precisely similar state of things. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman whether it ever occurred to him why it is that people smuggle goods across the line. What extreme and absurd folly it would be for a man to run the risk of the penalties provided against smuggling, if he could obtain goods as cheaply in Canada as he could in the United States. I tell him this, and I make my statement on the authority of one of the largest importers of dry goods in the Dominion, that there are merchants in the United States who are prepared to deliver goods in Canada to any of the hon. gentleman's supporters who want to earn an honest penny under the Tariff, at the rate of some 10 per cent. higher than the invoice prices in the United States, but they do not calculate to pay the 35 or 40 per cent. duty when the hon. gentlemen's Tariff levies upon them. As I said before all these things are mysteries to my hon. friend apparently, but when the hon. gentleman comes to deal with the duty on coal, then all the hon. gentleman's wanted astuteness returns. He is prepared to explain that; he is prepared to do more, to illustrate his explanation, and a most remarkable illustration it is. Not long ago I saw a quotation from an eloquent speech of his, in which dealing with this question of coal, he gave an explanation not differing very much from that with which he favored us a little time ago. What the hon. gentleman says in the matter of this duty of coal, is, I had my difficulties once, but now everything is plain. Sometimes the consumer pays the duty, and sometimes the producer. The hon. gentleman went on to illustrate his position by telling the story of the student, who was asked whether the sun went round the earth, or the earth went round the sun, and who compromised the matter by declaring that sometimes the earth went round the sun and sometimes the sun went round the earth. It is much to be regretted that we have not the advantage of securing the services of that student amongst us. I am convinced that, under the guidance of the hon. gentleman, he could be trained into a most admirable Protectionist Finance Minister. There is the right raw material, the accommodating nature, the reluctance to push things to extremes which so eminently characterize that hon. gentleman. I am prepared to endorse him myself to some extent. I am prepared to admit that the consumer pays the duty just as often as the earth goes round the sun, and that the producer pays the duty just as often as the sun goes round the earth. But, Sir, doctors, and even colleagues will differ on these questions now and then, and I have observed that the hon. gentleman's colleagues, in dealing with this question of the duty on coal, have not always taken the view that he takes. We are aware that, not long ago, an election took place in the Province of Nova Scotia in which the Minister of Railways took a very active part, and this was how he explained the duty on coal to a listening audience at Pictou: "The policy of the Liberals," said the hon. gentleman, "is to take the duty off coal and saddle on you, the people of Nova Scotia, your share of the \$500,000 now paid into the revenue of the one and a half millions of Ontarians. And he went on, the day after, to say that "The people of Ontario paid \$400,000 of taxes on coal, of

which taxes Nova Scotia is relieved, and Mr. Carmichael," said the hon. gentleman, "is anxious that Nova Scotia shall be saddled with it," and that is a statesman-like utterance calculated to remove entirely all those fears of disunion and sectionalism which the hon. Minister of Finance so justly deplored should be excited among our population; and I think, if I am not mistaken, the Minister of Railways went on to point out to his Nova Scotia audience that Ontario interests were greatly at a discount in this matter of coal. He said, and said truly, that you can get coal at the pit's mouth for 50 or 60 cents a ton, while they have to pay \$4.50 or \$5 a ton, and we have given you people of Nova Scotia an additional protection of 50 or 60 cents in addition to the natural production at \$4.50, to enable you to deal with these million and a half of cumberers of the earth of the Province of Ontario. Other gentlemen who are deserving of the notice of this House, have a still different story to tell with respect to this coal duty. Here is what the President of the largest railway at present existing in Canada, has to say:—"Materials of all kinds," says Sir Henry Tyler, "are dearer than they were ever before, and in particular the price of coal has increased to the extent of the duty imposed. He could hardly conceive of anything more injurious in a nation like Canada than to place a duty on coal." That was the opinion of the President of the Grand Trunk Railway,—slightly different from the opinion of the Minister of Finance; and as his company pays some \$50,000 or \$60,000 of that impost he may be supposed to know something, at all events, of what he was talking about. I would like to know whether those shivering wretches, who have to experience extremity of our cold winter weather when the thermometer is 20 degrees below zero, have anything to say with regard to the benevolence which adds 50 or 60 cents to the price of each ton of coal they purchase. I cannot better conclude my remarks on the subject than by giving to the House a resolution which was introduced by a very distinguished and notable colleague of the hon. gentleman, a man who looms large in the public eye, no less a person than the present Speaker of the Senate, on this question. Some few years ago, the Hon. Mr. Macpherson moved in the Senate:

"That in the opinion of this House, by subjecting the duty of Customs as proposed in the bill—breadstuffs of any kind, or rice, coal and coke, salt or any of the natural products enumerated in Schedule C of the present Tariff, and which at present are admitted into Canada free of duty—a principle would be introduced that would be partial in its operation between the Provinces constituting the Dominion, that would distribute the burden of taxation unequally and vexatiously amongst the people, that would injuriously disturb trade and tend to engender sentiments of sectionalism and disunion in the minds of the people of Canada."

Well, Sir, we on this side of the House may be pardoned if we entertain some doubts as to which of the three—the President of the Senate, the hon. Minister of Finance, or the hon. Minister of Railways—has exactly got at the true inwardness of the same duty on coal. The hon. Minister of Finance finds it impossible to see how this Tariff can be unfair to the mass of the population. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman, I observe, when he wants to ascertain how a duty is going to affect the consumer, how it is going to affect the great mass of the people, wisely goes to the manufacturer of the article which is to be protected. He finds out what the producer thinks; but what the consumer thinks or feels appears, and perhaps is, to him a matter of comparative indifference. Now, Sir, I have pursued, I am bound to say, a different plan. When I want to ascertain how a system of taxes affects the poorer portion of the community, I endeavor to ascertain from those of them who keep accurate accounts of their domestic expenditure, what sums they spend on the various articles which are taxed, and in that way, I think, we can find out with some degree of precision what is the true incidence of the hon. gentleman's Tariff.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Now, Sir, I have here two cases—one of a man earning about \$300 a year, equal to about \$1 per diem, and another of an artisan who receives about \$400 a year, equal to about \$1.50 per diem. Let us see how these men are taxed. I find that, in the latter instance, they are obliged to expend some \$40 or \$50 in the purchase of six tons of coal; I find that they are obliged to purchase about six barrels of flour, about 150 pounds of sugar, and to expend for clothing about \$62 for a family of six; and they will consume some fourteen gallons of coal oil in the course of a year. Now, let us see how, on an income of \$400 a year, these taxes will foot up. There is a specific tax on flour equal to \$3, and a specific tax on coal equal to \$3. On the coal oil they use, they are obliged to pay at least \$2.50 more than, save for the operation of the tax, they could obtain that article for elsewhere, while on their clothing, which is necessarily the largest taxable item, taking the average of the hon. gentleman's Tariff, it is impossible that they should pay less than \$21 a year. Their sugar costs them at least \$5 in taxes, and if we put on the average allowance for excisable articles, we find that—without taking into account the vast variety of articles of food, bedding, tools, books, and other minor articles which every workingman uses—on an income of \$400 a year, the absolute known Dominion taxes amount to not less than \$43.50, not taking into account municipal taxes, which must average at least \$10 a year more. In the same way, in the case of a family of five, living on an income of \$300 a year, I find, allowing for excise taxes, that the taxation is not less than \$37 a year, not counting municipal taxes. It may be, Sir, to the hon. Minister of Finance a matter of perfect insignificance that a man who receives an income of \$300 a year should be taxed by the Dominion to the extent of \$37, and that the man who has an income of \$400 a year should be taxed to the extent of \$43 for Dominion purposes; but I doubt extremely whether these men themselves are not beginning to wake up to the fact that they are taxed most oppressively and unjustly under the Tariff introduced by these hon. gentlemen. Sir, one of these men, a man of some education, wrote to a friend whom I employed to collect these facts—and I will give the hon. Minister of Finance a view of his tariff from the consumer's, and not the manufacturer's point of view. This is what this poor man has to write, and let the hon. gentleman ponder it well:

"I am certain of this—that under the revenue Tariff I was sickly. I had a good deal of broken days off work, but I was enabled to save from \$30 to \$40 a year. I have enjoyed good health during the last three or four years, and have been seldom a day off work."

Am I to think that the hon. gentleman imputes it to the National Policy, that this man enjoyed good health during the past three or four years.

"I have had to curtail my expenses considerably to meet the claims upon me every Saturday, and as to saving anything, it is impossible."

Sir, that is the exact fact. The hon. gentleman did not and does not intend it, I dare say; but the effect of such taxation as I have depicted on such incomes as those I have referred to has been most undoubtedly to interfere, first of all with the comfort of the working classes, and then with their power to better their condition. There can be no doubt that this heavy taxation deprives these classes to a great extent of the power of making a home for themselves, that it greatly impedes the education of their children, that it deprives them of the power of obtaining luxuries which they are entitled to as much as the hon. gentleman or anybody else, and that it distinctly lowers the standard of comfort. Although I do not mean to say that the Tariff is wholly responsible—because I believe the price of provisions, which forms the largest portion of a laboring man's expenditure, has gone up—yet there can be no doubt that there has been a marked and sensible degradation in the

standard of comfort enjoyed by these men. Now, Sir, there are important questions underlying this whole subject, to which the hon. gentleman would do well to attend. There is evidence in such statements as I have made—and that evidence comes to us from every quarter of the country—which goes to show that the hon. gentleman has done two things likely to be attended in the future with great mischief, for this country. He has sensibly lowered the standard of comfort among the working people, and he has to a very large extent, by artificial legislation, interfered with the due distribution of property, without adding one farthing to the national wealth collectively. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows, or the hon. gentleman ought to know, that all over the world at this moment thoughtful men, men of the highest station, of the highest intellectual attainments, are most desirous to see how, if it be possible by law, great fortunes may be prevented from being artificially created, and the proper distribution of great fortunes may be ensured, and he might, if he chose, learn from the straits to which our friends in the Mother Country are reduced, the risk of artificially creating great fortunes by operation of law. Now, Sir, I have no objection whatever to any man accumulating as large a fortune as he can by any honest and legitimate means. I do not mean to say that I regard it as the highest aim and object of life; and I may say this, that if that be regarded as the highest end and object of life we would not be engaged in politics, for my experience in politics is this, that although many men have entered office rich and left it poor, no honest and honorable man ever entered office poor and left it rich. But, Sir, be that as is may, my objection to his whole policy lies here, that what he has been doing is, as I said, to take many millions from the great mass of the people and to divide it among a very small and favored few. I do not mean to say that there is not something, in a political sense, to be said for the policy. The men among whom you are distributing the millions are likely to help you at election times. They may control votes, very likely, and very often they do, and no doubt, Sir, as in old times, the public may be debauched by the free use of part of the money which has been previously taken from them. But I do not regard that as statesmanship. I do not regard that as an honest policy. Nor do I believe, whatever the hon. Minister may say, that that is a policy which is likely to be attended with any great ultimate advantage to the country. Now, the hon. gentleman was extremely anxious to have us show what ground we had for our allegation that he was unjust to the farmers of Canada. Sir, I might remind him of the promises made, if not by him, at any rate by his followers and friends, that these farmers should most undoubtedly obtain better prices than those paid in the United States. The hon. gentleman himself must know that that is not the case, because he devoted a long and labored argument to show why it was that to-day prices are lower in Toronto than they are in Chicago. Well, Sir, I think the farmers of Canada will require some better explanation than the hon. gentleman has given to satisfy them that there can be any just cause for the condition of things which I find recorded at present as existing between these plans. Ordinarily speaking, Sir, in the days when my hon. friend was Premier, there was a very material difference in favor of Toronto against the Chicago markets. I take the dates of the 11th September, 1878, and I find there, Sir, that in Toronto wheat stood higher than in Chicago from 10 cents to 13 cents, that the market stood higher for oats about 8 cents, and for rye 11 cents. I turn to the date of January, 1882, and I find that the 13 cents advance have shrunk up to 4 cents. That oats are positively 3 cents lower in Toronto than in Chicago, and I find that rye is 10 cents lower and barley is 27 cents lower. Now, Sir, I would not say—I never have said, that the hon. gentleman's policy was solely responsible for that, but I do say that the onus lies on

these gentlemen who promised farmers better terms—who promised them better prices—that the onus lies on them to show how it is that the promises were so completely and totally reversed, and after three years' experience of the National Policy prices of cereals are absolutely lower in our own markets than in the markets of the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman has one advantage, when he talks of the way in which taxes affect farmers. Very few farmers—very few people in any class of life keep accurate accounts of their expenditure. I find it a matter of great difficulty to obtain any reliable statements from my farming friends as to the amount that they purchase of dutiable articles, and as to the way the Tariff affects them. Nevertheless I have succeeded in finding one or two, and with the permission of the House I will call their attention to the way in which the present taxation affects our farmers when carrying on operations on anything like a considerable scale. I have here a statement in detail from an extremely respectable farmer of my own acquaintance, having a family of nine, in which he states that he has expended in the last year for clothing, dry-goods, millinery of all kinds, about \$180; for hardware, \$58; for a variety of agricultural implements, \$180; harness, \$40; for tea and sugar, \$53; and for miscellaneous dutiable goods about \$60, making in all about \$571. I do not mean to say that this man is an ordinary example; he is a farmer of more than ordinary intelligence and of more than ordinary income; but I say this, that it is quite clear, applying the Tariff to the various classes of articles I have enumerated, that this man is contributing far more than his fair proportion of that duties to the revenue. I should estimate the taxes which man has to pay, at certainly not less than \$150 a year, and I am quite well aware that there are a great many farmers, at any rate, in that part of the world where he resides, who are obliged to pay quite as much, and some even a larger sum to our revenue. Sir, when I listen to the hon. gentleman's enumeration of his gifts by the Tariff to the farmer, and when I remember what the cost is, that these farmers had to pay, my mind reverts to a certain story of a famous American, which the hon. gentleman may perhaps have heard of. I will take the liberty Sir, of calling his attention to the anecdote in question. Once upon a time, so Mr. Barnum relates, he found himself in desperate straits—he had no money, no credit, his character even was under a cloud—some petty difficulty about a contract, I believe, I do not know what; at any rate, Mr. Barnum was morally and financially nearly dead beat. Well, Sir, he goes on to narrate how, in this hour of extremest need, a brilliant inspiration, a flash of genius struck across him, and he determined to start a lottery on an entirely new principle. His lottery was to have no blanks, all were to be prizes—all classes, farmers, mechanics, merchants, importers and manufacturers, all were to have prizes in Mr. Barnum's lottery; and he also goes on to relate with great gusto how a very long time elapsed before the men who obtained prizes in this lottery discovered that the prizes on the average were worth about one-tenth of the cost of the lottery ticket. Well, Sir, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman or his chief has ever heard the story; if they did not copy Mr. Barnum in this particular it would only be one of the numerous instances with which history is studded, which show us how great minds, when they find themselves in similar difficulties, are apt to resort to similar expedients in order to get out of them. The hon. gentleman, to-day, informed us that he was about to make a new departure in political economy in this country at least. He is going to give, so he tells us, a bounty of considerable amount to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Now, Sir, knowing how grievously oppressive his Tariff has been to that most deserving class of the community, knowing how much they have suffered under it, knowing how utterly impossible it is for him to help them, I do not know, Sir,

that I should feel disposed to criticise him so much for relieving them to some extent, although it is a very curious argument in favor of a policy to take money out of one pocket and put it into another and call that granting relief to the people. But, Sir, I submit that, if he be right in redressing the injustice which he has laid upon the fishermen by his Tariff, there are other classes in this community who have a right to the same justice at his hands. If the fishermen are to have bounties, other classes of the community have a right to bounties too. The lumberman has a right to be indemnified for the increased cost to which this Tariff has put him. Why should one man receive a privilege more than another? Why should the maker of cotton cloth, the maker of woollen cloth be allowed to receive from one-third to one-half more than the fair market value of his article when he comes into competition with other goods made in other markets; and why should my agricultural friend not be allowed to receive one-third to one-half, or whatever the proportion may be, more than the absolute market value of every bushel of grain and every pound of beef, cheese and butter, that he may bring to market. I should like to know what reason the hon. gentleman can advance why he should not give bounties to that and the other class I have enumerated. Does he dare to say that the farmers are less deserving? Does he not know that on our farmers, more than on any other class, the whole prosperity of this Dominion depends, that above all other classes, except possibly the one class of fishermen, farmers have to dread and have to contend with foreign competitors, and how does he propose to help them in their fight with foreign competitors? He has weighted them down in every possible manner. He has added to the price of every article that they require to use. He has increased the cost of production of the articles they sell, and has done nothing whatever to advantage them in any shape or way. Sir, I say that whatever the hon. gentleman may think, he will find that farmers know as well as I do—I was going to say as well as he does—that the price of all the great staples which they produce has been, is, and will be, for many years to come, ruled by the price in the English and European markets, and that their real competitor is the American producer in fighting against whom this Tariff puts them at the highest disadvantage. Then, Sir, I proceed to ask, following the line of the hon. gentleman's argument, what has he done for the lumberman? To whom does he owe the surplus of which he boasts? The lumber industry has increased its exports \$12,000,000. It has enabled us to buy \$12,000,000 more of imports. Upon these imports he has raised those four millions. To whom does he owe more than he does to the lumbermen? Here, again, I prefer to go to the fountain head. I have tried to find out for myself what the opinion of the lumbermen of Canada may happen to be as to the merits of the hon. gentleman's Tariff, and I received, but one week ago, a letter from the head of a leading lumbering firm which I shall take the liberty of reading to this House. This gentleman says:

"I know that our timber costs us from \$1 to \$1.50 per thousand more than it did four years ago. The larger portion of this may be attributable to increase of duties, yet some, unquestionably is due to the increased demand for labor, owing to the return of activity in the lumber business of the United States. During the past summer wages were about \$2 per month higher, owing partly to increased expenditure of the men upon themselves and their families, owing to the ext a price of clothing, &c. The expenditure in the woods has been considerably higher, partly owing to the same cause, partly owing to the advance in the price of standing timbers. That the present Tariff presses very heavily upon the lumber trade, is a fact beyond dispute, while the profits derived from it are, on an average of years, much below a fair return on the capital invested. Everything the lumberman uses in his business, iron, steel, saws, woollens, cotton, pork, flour, oats, corn and lots of other things, are subject to an almost prohibited tax, although in many cases, you cannot obtain in Canada, articles of the quality you want. For instance, I sent the other day, an order for a few hundred dollars' worth of saws, on which I shall have to pay 36 per cent. duty, in order to build up one or two factories in Canada who cannot make the quality of saws I require."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Sir, I deem it unnecessary to add one word to that statement. It is made by a man of many years' experience in the trade, thoroughly familiar with its working, and to my certain knowledge, eminently capable of calculating what the Tariff actually does cost the lumber trade; and I ask again what will the hon. gentleman do to protect and encourage the lumberman, to whom, more than to any other class, he owes the surplus of which he and his friends boast so loudly. Then, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman done for the workingman. His vaunts are loud enough; but, let me ask, has the hon. gentleman taken any steps to protect the workingman? Has he tried to secure them from foreign competition? Are they less worthy, the workingmen of Canada, of being secured against foreign competition? Are Canadian men less worthy of protection than Canadian cotton and woollen goods? Why, Sir, these gentlemen will not condescend to take the least ordinary precautions to secure the health and safety of the workingmen. Sir, that was a most suggestive paragraph in the Speech from the Throne:

"The Report of a Royal Commission issued to enquire into the question of factory labor, and the best means of promoting the comfort and well-being of the workingman and his family, without undue interference with the development of our manufacturing industries, will be laid before you."

The paternal Government are to take pains to secure the comfort and happiness of the workingman and his family, always provided that it is not to be done by interfering with the profits of their masters—the manufacturers. Sir, one good thing these hon. gentlemen have done—late in the day, and I do not hold it by any means an excuse for their previous neglect—but they did issue a commission to enquire into the condition of factory children in the factories he has alluded to, and I am bound to say, that so far as I am able to perceive, these gentlemen to whom the duty was entrusted, have done it honestly and well. But, what do these gentlemen report to us? They tell us, Sir, in the first place, that they have found much inconvenience and delay in obtaining information, that in some instances they were told by manufacturers that they knew their own business, and that the Government should not dictate whom they should employ, or interfere in matters of trade. The Commissioners report states:

"The employment of children and young persons in mills and factories is extensive and largely on the increase, the supply being unequal to the demand, particularly in some localities, which may partially explain why those of such tender years are engaged. As to obtaining, with accuracy, the ages of the children employed, we found some difficulty, inasmuch as the employer has no record thereof, having no interest or obligation in so doing, consequently in order to ascertain their ages they were interrogated either by one of the Commissioners or some one in the factory. We are sorry to report that in very many instances the children having no education whatever, could not tell their ages; this applies more particularly to those from 12 years downwards, some being found as young as eight and nine years."

The Commissioners go on to describe a state of things in which

"the children invariably work as many hours as adults, and if not compelled are requested to work over-time when circumstances so demand, which has not been unusual of late in most lines of manufactures. The appearance and condition of the children, in the after part of the day, such as may be witnessed in the months of July and August, was anything but inviting or desirable."

Now, I say this, the Government has committed a great and grave fault, that they have been guilty of very serious laches in allowing such a state of things to exist without, till now, having made the faintest or remotest attempt to remedy it. They knew right well, because some of them at least are not ignorant of what has transpired in other countries, that when factory labor has been stimulated; as they proposed themselves to stimulate it under this Tariff, the greed of parents and employers has always resulted in cases of the grossest tyranny and oppression to the unfortunate young children employed in those factories; and yet knowing that, they have allowed three years and a-half to

elapse since they undertook to inaugurate this policy before they have taken the smallest or slightest pains to protect the family of the workingman, guard his safety and protect him against dangers which the framers of this report say, and say justly, at present exist in a great many factories in the Dominion. And let me tell the hon. gentlemen this, that they are doubly bound to see that these children are well taken care of, that they are not oppressed and ill-treated in the case of specially protected manufacturers, because the specially protected manufacturers are neither more or less than subsidized pensioners of the State, and the State which pensions them ought to look to them and see that such grievous wrongs and oppressions as this report reveals are not permitted to be exercised on 2,000 or 3,000 children in Canada. I will take the case, as the hon. gentleman desires, of the great bulk of the manufacturers of Canada. Those of which I have just spoken were specially protected, but I come now to the great bulk of the manufacturers. I repudiate entirely the attacks which the hon. Minister and his friends have from time to time made on us. I say they have no right whatever, from any utterances of mine or any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, to say we entertained the faintest or slightest feeling of hostility towards the manufacturers of Canada. Sir, the causes of their prosperity, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has done for them, lie in the single fact that the profits of our great industries have increased to a very large extent, and when the great bulk of our people became better able to purchase their products they in turn received a considerable share of prosperity; but as far as this Tariff is concerned the fact of the matter is simply this, that with respect to most of the manufacturers the Tariff has either directly injured them, or it has left them exactly where they were. What interest have these manufacturers in seeing that wages are raised, and under this Tariff wages must be raised all over or else the condition of the workingmen must be sensibly deteriorated, because in spite of the Finance Minister's statement, it is a well-known fact that a dollar to-day will not purchase within 10 or 15 per cent. as much as a dollar would purchase two years ago. What interest have the manufacturers in there being dearer freights, or duties on raw material in the shape of iron, or motive power in the shape of coal. Sir, the hon. Minister spoke just now of the increase in the production of coal. That may be, or it may not be. It would be very natural and very reasonable that, when the general prosperity of the country increases, the consumption of any one of the leading articles should increase; but I find that a large portion of the increased production is due to causes with which the hon. gentleman cannot pretend to have had anything to do. I am informed by hon. gentlemen conversant with the trade, that a very large proportion of the increased production of which the hon. gentleman boasts, particularly in Cape Breton, arises from the fact that it has now become the custom for vessels from New Orleans and other Atlantic ports to take a very considerable quantity of coal on board at that point to enable them to prosecute their voyage. If that be the case, it is a very desirable trade, and one which should be fostered, if the Government could foster it; but I have yet to learn in what way the Government can cause ocean going steamers to visit Cape Breton. There is another case in which a valuable trade is springing up, which would spring up more rapidly if it were not hampered by the Tariff. It is an export trade in manufactured lumber, such as doors and window sashes. There is a trade which I conceive it to be exceedingly desirable to cultivate, as it is one which would give employment to many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of people here; and how did the Government help this trade? This is an export trade, one subject to severe foreign competition, and the Government helped it by imposing additional taxes, which

amounted to about \$1 per thousand on the production of the lumber, which is the raw material entering into this kind of manufactured goods. All the hon. Minister can say is, that he had not injured the trade to quite that extent, but only to the extent of about one-half of \$1 per thousand. Speaking for myself, and in no way for anybody else on this side of the House, I may say this with respect to manufactures that I have always, when I was Minister of Finance, recognized as I do now, the plain and self-evident fact, that there must be heavy indirect taxation to produce a revenue; that while we are burdened with the obligations we are now burdened with, we cannot pretend to obtain that revenue without indirect taxation, but our policy was this: We desire to distribute that taxation justly. We held that that was best for the great bulk of the manufacturers that they had nothing then, as they have nothing now to fear from us; that they are far more likely to be injured by the Tariff exactions of the hon. gentlemen, and the domestic competition which he says rightly is the result in a great many cases. Our policy is to tax the people as lightly as we can, and when we are compelled to add to the taxes, to add to them justly and equally, avoiding all taxes which may press unduly on the poorer classes of the community, whom every statesman ought to guard, and from whom, especially when their incomes are small, you ought to avoid taking away any portion of that small wage they possess. Now to follow the hon. gentleman in this account of his expenditure and administration, we find that, practically, he has doubled our taxes. We know that he has doubled our expenditure since Confederation was inaugurated. We begin with 13½ millions of dollars, and find ourselves to-day with 27¼ million dollars demanded for the service of the coming year. Allow me to recall his statement that 22½ million dollars were sufficient for all reasonable purposes. Allow me to recall to your mind the innumerable denunciations with which this country rang, of the intolerable extravagances of my hon. friend, when he asked for \$23,500,000 for the public services. I do not know whether it was from ignorance of the facts, which he ought to have known, or from a not unnatural desire to diminish the weight of the enormous expenditure which he confessed he incurred, that the hon. gentleman was so anxious to make it appear that this expenditure of \$27,750,000, was really very little more than the expenditure of \$23,500,000. But I will explain to that hon. gentleman that the only reason why my hon. friend beside me was compelled, in the first two years of the term of his office, to expend somewhat more than he did in 1878, was this, that when that hon. gentleman opposite left office he left behind him a legacy of three or four million dollars to be expended in the various public works which he had put under construction in 1873-74; and that of our total expenditure in 1875-76, chargeable to income, at least \$1,250,000 is due to the works which had been put under contract, and for which votes had been taken by that hon. gentleman in 1873. That, and that only, is the reason why the expenditure of those two years was increased beyond the expenditure in 1878. The hon. gentleman will have to display a great deal more ingenuity than he has yet displayed before he will convince the people of Canada that an expenditure that has increased from \$23,500,000 in 1878 to \$27,750,000 in 1882, is an expenditure which can be justified, or which can be made consistent with his own declarations in 1878 before he obtained office. But the hon. gentleman talks of the percentage of taxes. I would like to call his attention to a few simple facts on that subject. I find that, in 1877, with a population of 3,250,000, we had a total taxation of \$11,750,000, and the average per head about \$3.60; in 1878, when our population was about 4,000,000, \$17,841,000, consequently an average per head to \$4.46. And even if he adds the \$1,000,000 deficit which then

existed he cannot bring it beyond \$4.71 per head; and I find now, with a population of 4,250,000, we have a taxation of \$23,912,000, in other words \$5.61 per head; and if you take into consideration the enormous addition to the public burden caused by the oppressive character of his Tariff, we would pay \$7 per head instead of \$5.61. I doubt that this is even too favorable a view to take of the case, as there is too much reason to think that when we take the Census as our guide we are resting on a very uncertain basis. Canada, I think, of all civilized countries possesses alone a Census as to which only one certain part is known, and that is, that it is utterly unreliable, that it is not an enumeration of the people, that it does not give the number of Canadians in Canada, but the number that are in Canada, and a certain number of Canadians outside Canada, as to whom no one can say one-tenth or one-twentieth will return. I fear that the mode in which that Census was taken was with a deliberate fraudulent intent. I fear it was taken for the purpose of eluding the terms of the Confederation Act and depriving the Province of Ontario and the Province of Nova Scotia of a large part of the representation to which they are justly entitled. It is a very extraordinary fact that the Province of Quebec, a Province which was alleged to have been depopulated under my hon. friend, has increased under this Census twice as much as it had between 1861 and 1871, and the distribution of the population involves other circumstances which give the census a suspicious character. If that suspicion be unfounded, the hon. gentlemen have, at any rate, deliberately invited it by their barbarous manner of taking the Census—a system which I do not believe would have been tolerated by any other country calling itself civilized. Apart from the enormous amount to which the total expenditure has been swollen, we find on looking on the estimated returns a number of items enormously in excess of the sums expended by us in 1878; and what is very remarkable is this, that the items in which the largest figures appear are precisely those with respect to which these hon. gentlemen were wont to denounce my hon. friend and his colleagues for the display of the greatest extravagance. We find for Civil Government that in 1878 we expended \$823,000; in 1883 the expenditure is estimated to be \$973,000. We find that in the superannuation grants which were also most vehemently denounced, while we spent \$106,000 those gentlemen ask for \$155,000; and if the return lately laid on the table be an index, they are likely to spend \$170,000 in the year 1883. We find that in the Post Office while we spent \$1,724,000, they demand \$2,018,000. We find that in Immigration we spent \$180,000 and they demand \$378,000, and that the total result is, as I said, that against our annual expenditure of \$23,500,000, they demand \$27,750,000 in 1883. Sir, although these cases are bad enough there are worse cases yet behind. When I come to consider the expenditure in some of the other departments, notably when I come to consider the expenditure in the Department of the Interior, I am, to quote a phrase from a colleague of the hon. gentleman, appalled at the extravagance and mismanagement which it discloses. Sir, within a few years, the Department of the Interior has become a very great spending department, perhaps the very greatest spending department in the hands of any Minister of the Government. We find that for the service of the future year, \$909,000 are demanded for Indians; \$413,000 for Mounted Police; \$99,000 chargeable to income for Dominion lands; \$450,000 chargeable to capital for the same purpose; and for the office at Ottawa, \$86,000. Now, it will be interesting to compare these expenditures with those for the same purposes in 1878. Then the Indians cost us \$421,000; our Mounted Police, \$334,000; Dominion lands, \$87,000; and the expenditure for the department here amounted to \$44,000, without counting in either case the salary of the Minister. Our expenditure in 1878, under the administration

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

of my hon. friend from Bothwell, for all these purposes, amounted to \$888,000. The expenditure under the Minister of the Interior for the same purposes amounts to \$1,957,000, being an excess of just \$1,069,000. Now, Sir, this is virtually the largest spending department of the Government. It is true that nominally the Department of the Minister of Railways and perhaps the Department of the Post Office, spend larger sums; but, as is well known to the House, so much of the expenditure in these departments is absolutely fixed, that this has become to all intents and purposes the chief spending department. Here you have an enormous increase, and that is not the worst of it. To a very large extent, practically, these charges are fixed charges, are the increase of fixed charges; and when we find that from \$400,000 the expenditure for Indians alone has risen to something like \$1,000,000, and that when capitalized at 4 per cent. is equivalent to an addition of \$15,000,000 to the national debt, we may well ask whither are we drifting? I ask, Sir, is it going to stop? All I can say is, that I fear instead of stopping it will increase. Now this is the department which of all the departments under the control of the Government needs the very closest supervision, needs the very closest personal attention. The difficulties of administering this department are no doubt very great; the distance at which the several officers are from headquarters is great; the temptations to which they are exposed are enormous, and, as everybody who has ever sat in the Cabinet knows, there is, and always will be, under the best circumstances a very great difficulty indeed in efficiently supervising it. It is incomparably the most important department of the Government at this moment, and I do not hesitate to say that it is incomparably the worst managed. Now, I am perfectly well aware that the gentleman who is its present head, is, in some respects, an able man. He is an able lawyer, he is an able politician, but I am bound to say—and it is the opinion which I and many of the older members of the House have always entertained of him—that when we come to the practical working of a department, the hon. gentleman will be found a very indifferent administrator; and here we have a proof, Sir. It was a very great mistake for the hon. gentleman to assume this important Department in addition to the onerous functions devolving upon him as Premier. If the hon. gentleman had been all he is not and all he ought to be, had he possessed the untiring zeal for public service, had he possessed the rigid integrity, had he possessed the powers of industry which my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie) possessed, even still I would say that the task would have been too much for his strength or the strength of any man. As it is, Sir, there has been a most complete failure in the administration of this department. We have seen that most enormous increase in the expenditure to which I have called attention. Sir, the state of that department is a by-word on the streets of Ottawa; it is a by-word all through the North-West Territory, from one end of the North-West to the other you hear one chorus of discontent at the inefficiency, at the difficulty of obtaining information, at the lack of courtesy on the part of the officials of the Canadian Government in all matters respecting the settlement of that country. I speak of what I have known. There is not a day that I do not receive communications from many of my own constituents, either in Huron or who have gone to Manitoba, all saying the same thing, all repeating the same charges, the same complaints against the administration; all giving information as to how the officers have abused their position; all repeating that you cannot obtain, in Canada, the most ordinary items of information that are supposed to be given and which ought to be given to settlers seeking their fortunes in the North-West. I will give you, out of a score of letters, an extract from a letter I received but four days ago, and the letter is to this effect:

"I am unable to obtain maps here of any practical use, and I have already applied to the Dominion Lands office at Ottawa, but with very

poor results, as they appear there to have very little information to give to parties seeking it, or they are very careless about giving what they do possess. There are large numbers of others involved in the same difficulty. We can procure any number of maps of Dakota, but we are unable to obtain even a fairly good map of our own North-West."

What that man writes to me, I have heard from hundreds of other quarters within the past eighteen months. The contrast with the United States in that particular is most lamentable, is most distressing. Whatever other faults the United States officers may have, they are zealous and most active in giving all possible information with respect to the lands and the opportunity offered for settlement in their own territory. It is very much to be regretted that a similar state of things cannot be made to prevail in the Department which is nominally administered by the Minister of the Interior. Sir, these things are known to all. We know from day to day, from quarter to quarter, and from half-year to half-year, that there has been one continuous change in the regulations affecting the important interests over which that hon. gentleman presides. First of all we have squatters warned off with the result, as I found when I was in that region, that about 1,000 Canadians made homestead entries in the adjoining Land Office of Dakota. Then there came a ukase limiting the settler to 80 acres, but that was repealed owing to the universal discontent which it aroused. Then the terms under which the right of pre-emption might be obtained were altered, and next we had an arrangement that the land should be sold at one-tenth of the nominal value paid down, and then, but not till after the mischief had been done, no land is to be sold except for cash in full. Then we have a budget of so-called colonization schemes with all the clauses in the regulations compelling actual settlement carefully struck out. Then we had an arrangement that the settler should have each alternate section. Now, I see that whole counties will be sold *en bloc* without any forfeiture clauses allowing any person to purchase who may choose to do so. Had these things occurred under the administration of my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I can well understand how the House and the whole country would have rung with denunciations of his ignorance, his incompetence and his extravagance; and with the most unbridled accusations against him from one end of the Dominion to the other. I suppose, seeing that it is the hon. Minister of the Interior, who is responsible for the administration of the department, it is all right. But I tell him if he continues to be the head of the department that he cannot pretend to say from Ottawa what is best to be done for the settlers of the North-West, that neither he nor any other man, who has never visited the country nor has any personal knowledge of it can pretend to administer its important affairs in the interests of the people who are to settle it. There are departments and departments, Mr. Speaker, and I say that this is one of the departments which cannot be worked by shelving every troublesome question in pigeon-holes marked "masterly inactivity;" nor by telling good stories to people who come to interview the Minister on important matters of business. The proper administration requires more than that; and it is a misfortune of no ordinary character that its administration passed from the able and competent hands of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), into the hands of the right hon. Minister of the Interior. We see the result of the change in an expenditure double or nearly treble what it was; in the turning of the North-West into a gambling table; in the tens of thousands of honest settlers who have been driven away from the North-West to seek for homes on the American side of the border. If ever an impudent assertion was made on the floor of this House, if ever there was a case of effrontery in the world it was when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and dared to say that the Opposition were responsible for the fact that so many

Canadians had gone to Minnesota and Dakota in place of going to the Canadian North-West. This was due above all and beyond all to his own gross blunderings, and if the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall), who I am sorry to see is not in his place, was able to say ten or eleven years ago, when he was afflicted with one of those periodical fits of truth-telling which sometimes attack him, when like Balaam he speaks sorely against his will—though I am bound to say that like Balaam he always takes an opportunity of recanting what he says on these rare occasions—I say, if that hon. gentleman spoke truly when he said that treason and imbecility reigned in every department, he might to-day, with infinitely greater reason, make the same declaration so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned. The plain fact of the matter is this: that the hon. gentleman has shown himself utterly unable to grasp the magnitude of the great interests involved in the present administration of this department. There is no one thing upon which the future of the Dominion more depends than upon the right conduct of that department, and the right administration of the great territory we have acquired; but the course of affairs since the right hon. gentleman undertook the charge of that department shows that he is treating it as nothing but a vast engine of political influence, and, I fear, a vast engine of political corruption. Now, Sir, although this is a subject on which, if time permitted, I could find a great deal more to say, I must pass on to the details of the administration of the hon. Minister of Finance; and I am bound to say that his administration will compare well with that of the colleague beside him, though even so I find it far from satisfactory. He laid great stress on the fact that large sums of money were coming into our hands on savings bank accounts, but he forgot to tell the country what the savings bank deposits cost and how he turned them to account. I find from returns brought down the other day, that while we are borrowing from the public with one hand something like \$13,000,000 for which we pay interest at about four per cent. and for which we pay in expenses of management nearly one per cent. more—making in all about five per cent.—we are with the other expending it in this way: We have about \$12,000,000 or thereabouts lying in the various banks, of which \$5,000,000 or so bear interest at rates varying from 3 to 4 per cent. Consequently the advantage we get from these large deposits is this: That while we are paying something like \$600,000 on these loans from the people, we receive in interest from the banks about \$170,000 or \$180,000, and so cost something like \$400,000. Now I fail to see that this can be called a proof of very good management or very good banking. I approve, myself, of giving all possible facilities to depositors of small amounts; I would gladly see the hon. gentleman copy the example of Mr. Fawcett in England, and allow, as they do in England and in France, small amounts of Government securities to be taken by small depositors; but I do not think it is wise or prudent, or that it can be called good management, to pay 30 or 40 per cent. more than this money is worth in the open market. In ordinary banks at this moment, you will hardly get 3 per cent. on the deposits you make, and it is well known that the cost of managing these deposits is small indeed, while here we are paying 5 per cent. and receiving about 1½ per cent. The hon. gentleman is exposed to two dangers. In the first place while money is plenty, he receives a great deal he is not able to use profitably, and in the next place if there is a contraction he will run a great risk that a large amount of this money will be called in when it will be inconvenient to repay it. It is a source of no profit now, and of great risk hereafter, and there is considerable loss to the public in the meantime. And remembering, as I do, what censures the hon. gentleman's friends passed on the late

Government because they kept considerable sums on deposit while they had large public works going on, I think his friends, if they have any regard for their own reputation or consistency, should censure him as they used to censure us for the exhibit which his own figures show, and the amount which he is now unnecessarily holding on deposit. But, Sir, besides savings banks, the hon. gentleman must needs try his hand on the banks generally; and although he has not condescended to bring down the several circulars which he has issued, I have been able to obtain from the public prints a tolerably correct statement of the circular which he originally addressed to the several banks of Canada. Now, Sir, I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman's intentions were excellent. I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman wanted to obtain some information which he thought of value, and perhaps to check some practices which might have led to mischief. But the hon. gentleman resorted to a most extraordinary mode of obtaining it. One would have thought that he would have communicated in the first instance to one or more banking authorities before he issued a circular which threw the banks of the country into a state of confusion, well nigh of panic, as that circular did. The hon. gentleman makes it his boast that when he interferes with manufacturers, he is very particular to consult the manufacturers themselves. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman had any interest in promoting the operations of a few bears on the Montreal Stock Exchange; but the result of this act of his was to cause the stocks to fall in value in one day from 3 to 20 per cent. It was a mere accident that the hon. gentleman's action did not produce a serious panic, because if there had been at the same time any great disturbance in the markets of the world—and a serious disturbance did occur shortly afterwards—the hon. gentleman might have seen most unfortunate results from that step of his. I think hon. members ought to consider well whether they should entrust that hon. gentleman with powers which he has shown himself to be very little capable of using with discretion. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has adopted, I am told, a rather extraordinary course with respect to promotions in his department. Well, we have all heard in the good old days, about a hundred years ago, that according to the renowned Sheridan:

"It's a mighty fine thing to be a father-in-law,
To a mighty magnificent three-tailed bashaw."

But in Canada, at any rate, it is a much finer thing to be brother-in-law to a Minister of Finance. I would like to know how many pensioners this hon. gentleman is going to put on the country. My hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Ross) made a remarkable statement the other day as to the number of pensioners one of the ministers had put on the country, and I forget whether he followed it up with a statement as to those belonging to the Minister of Finance. Then, the hon. gentleman, not content with meddling with the banks, must address a rather remarkable letter; and here, too, he has not favored us with a full correspondence between himself and the importers of tea and coffee. My object is not to discuss the principle of the remission of those duties, but to call attention to the very remarkable statement he made in explanation of his proposed remission. I find, Sir, in a letter signed S. L. Tilley, and addressed to one James H. Read, of Montreal, in which the hon. gentleman states that if it is the wish of the trade, the change will be delayed for a couple of months to enable parties to dispose of stock out of bond. It seems to me that is a remarkable view of public duty for a Minister of Finance to propound. I had always supposed that when a tax was remitted, that it was done in the interest of the public and the consumer; but, apparently, in the eyes of the Minister of Finance, the interest of the consumer has very little to do with it—it is only the convenience of the importer that is to be consulted. I

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

remember only one similar instance of a Minister of Finance acting on the same plan, and that was when the hon. gentleman, in the plenitude of his good nature, enabled the importers of Canada to obtain money from the banks in order to enable them to import goods in advance of his own Tariff. I recommend him to peruse the remarks made by various newspapers of note at the time, on that remarkable feat of his. Now, Sir, it appears to me that the hon. gentleman is very likely to repeat in 1883 the very self-same errors, to indulge in the very self-same delusions, and to bring about the very self-same results which he did ten years ago. Then, as I warned him, he chose to mistake a temporary inflation for a permanent advance in prosperity, and although I agree with him that there is at present no such inflation as existed at that time; although I believe there are better chances of maintaining our present revenue, still I see him not availing much of his surplus to make any material reduction in the burdens of the people, but making it the excuse for plunging into additional expenditures. Let him remember that a double accident has happened to him. Not only have we had good harvests here, but there have been bad harvests on the other side of the Atlantic; and if these circumstances should be reversed, if we should have bad harvests here, and there should be plentiful harvests on the other side of the Atlantic, then I can tell the hon. gentleman that the pleasant delusions he has been indulging in this afternoon would be dissipated as ruthlessly as were those he indulged in in 1873. Sir, he has one point in his favor, I admit. The North-West is likely to become a very important factor in measuring the future commercial prospects of this country; and although it will continue to involve us in very heavy outlays, and although hon. gentlemen have done their very best to deprive Canada of the benefits which might be received from the development of that country, still, granting all that, I think there are sufficient chances of solid progress in the North-West to greatly neutralize the mischievous effects of their policy. But, Sir, I come to consider the hon. gentleman's proposed reductions of taxation. I am very glad to see any proposed reductions of taxation. I do not propose to quarrel with him for taking off taxes on tea and coffee and other articles. But I will point out that the taxes which he is taking off are precisely those which are most evenly distributed, which take least out of the pockets of the people in proportion to the sum they put into the Treasury. No taxes could be taken off which would do less to relieve the people than those particular taxes which he has selected. If he really wants to relieve the people, let him remove the taxes on breadstuffs and on coal, and those specific duties on various textile fabrics. These taxes are an abominable injustice, discriminating in favor of the wealthier consumer, and against the poorer.

Mr. KILLAM. And to nobody's benefit.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that cottons and woollens, and a variety of other articles, were selling as cheaply now as in 1878. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that if that were true it would prove nothing. The question is not, are these goods sold cheaper to-day than they were in 1878? but are these goods sold cheaper or as cheaply now as they can be obtained in other quarters? That is the true question, not as he put it. I have reason to believe the hon. gentleman is grievously misinformed as to the prices of goods in 1878. I have here, taken from invoices of a large dealer, the following statements, and I will give them in detail, not as he does, as mere vague general assertions, but I will give the actual facts and prices. Speaking of grey and unbleached cottons of a class largely used by the working classes, that gentleman tells me that in 1878 the prime cost was 6½ cents, while the selling price was 7¼ cents, that in 1881 the prime cost was 7½

cents, and the selling price $10\frac{1}{2}$ cents, or in other words, whereas under the old Tariff there was $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents difference between the cost and selling price, or 28 per cent., under the present Tariff the difference is $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, or as nearly as possible 39 per cent., making 11 per cent. difference in the prices of this article, caused directly by the hon. gentleman's Tariff. Take the case of flannels, which the hon. gentleman knows are largely consumed by the masses of the people. They cost about 19 cents in 1878, and were sold over the counter for 28 cents; they cost now 18 cents and sell for 30 cents, being a difference of 10 per cent. on that article as against the present Tariff. As regards the heavy cloth used for overcoats by the working classes, and for warm winter clothes for women, there was bought for 2s. 6d. sterling in 1878, while the selling price was 92 cents, it now costs the same, 2s. 6d., but the selling price is \$1.07, being an increase of 15 cents per yard, caused directly by the hon. gentleman's Tariff. And, Sir, I also have letters from men who are largely engaged in trade in this country, and this is what one of them writes under date no longer ago than 20th January, 1882. He is talking about the relative prices of American and Canadian cottons:

"One of the best known and most saleable American cottons is branded Atlantic A. Its width is 36 inches. It sold in New York formerly for 8 cents, now for $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Canadian cotton of similar width and weight, but not quite so good, is sold at wholesale for $10\frac{1}{2}$ cents."

Are we to understand from the hon. gentleman that that extra two cents will form no tax upon the purchaser or producer of that cotton. The writer goes on to say:

"Lower priced cottons are sold in New York for $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard, a similar quality of goods in Canada cost $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents; striped shirtings, largely used by workmen, the price in New York is $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents, but this class of goods being very heavily taxed under the hon. gentleman's Tariff it is sold over the counter here for 15 cents per yard, and even at that price is largely used and preferred by our own people."

It stands to reason, and I cannot see how the hon. gentleman can deem it worth his while to raise the question, where you have the same specific duties to pay on articles in cottons ranging from 4 cents or 5 cents a yard to 18 cents or 19 cents, that the cheap goods must pay an enormously heavy tax as compared with the more expensive ones, and in the case of woollens where you have the same specific duty on those costing 40 cents as on those costing \$2, the proportionate tax upon the poorer class of articles must of necessity be enormously heavy. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has certainly in the course of his four or five hour speech travelled over a great deal of ground, and I do not know that I would be justified in following him all through, but I would like, Sir, to say a few words on a question on which he laid a great deal of stress, that is, the question of the actual cost to the consumer under this Tariff of the sugar now consumed in Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman entered into a long and minute calculation to show that we were obtaining sugar under this Tariff as cheap, or cheaper—I think he said 7 cents a hundred cheaper—than we could obtain it under the preceding Tariff. Well, Sir, I say this: the measure of the tax on the people of Canada is the difference between the price at which they can obtain the sugar in Glasgow or New York and the price they have to pay to Mr. Redpath or anybody else in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, I offer here the statement given me by one of the largest and best known wholesale dealers in the article in Canada, and I find from it that in the last six months, between the end of July and the end of December, the average price of granulated sugar in Montreal, less the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. discount usually allowed to the trade, was \$9.50 per hundred. In New York, with the usual discount, the cost, exclusive of duty, was about \$6.35. Therefore, it follows that we have paid on an average \$3, and a trifle upwards, per hundred on all the sugar that was consumed in Canada in a refined state. Now, Sir, what was the amount of sugar imported

into Canada? The gross amount was 136,406,000 lbs. Of that all but about 16,000,000 lbs., or about 120,000,000 lbs., were imported exclusively for the use of the refiner. That would produce, at least, 110,000,000 lbs. of sugar, after making liberal allowance for the waste accruing in manufacture. What do we receive on that? From the hon. gentleman's own statement we receive \$2,459,000 duty; yet of that 110,000,000 lbs. we had to pay to Redpath & Co. \$3 and a fraction per hundred more than the price in New York and Glasgow. Had that money gone into the Treasury we would have received \$3,723,000 instead of \$2,459,000; and the result of this Tariff has been just what I told the hon. gentleman, that the people of Canada have paid \$3,750,000 more than they would have done if there had been no duty; and that \$2,500,000 have gone into the Treasury and \$1,250,000 have been paid to keep the thousand men he spoke of employed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That is the exact fact of the case, whatever the hon. gentleman may say to the contrary; and it was a most paltry quibble on the hon. gentleman's part to speak of receiving a revenue of \$2,459,000 with an import of 136,000,000 lbs., as if that was equivalent to a duty of \$2,600,000 on a total importation of about 108,000,000 or 110,000,000 lbs. When the people are better off they will undoubtedly buy more sugar and consume more than when they are not so well off. No thanks to the hon. gentleman or his policy for that. Had my Tariff been in existence we would have had \$3,250,000 in the Treasury instead of \$2,500,000, as the hon. gentleman or any of his clerks could easily have ascertained by a very simple computation. The amount of sugar consumed in Canada when refined is equivalent to about 126,000,000 lbs., and on that I say the old Tariff would have produced \$3,250,000. The people of Canada, I repeat, have paid \$3,750,000. Now, in the matter of ship-building, the hon. gentleman might have told us that the quantity of ship-building that is going on has been very considerably reduced under his Tariff. He might have told us that these direct imports of tea, these ships from China and Japan which were to come into the Dominion, have been conspicuous by their absence during the whole time of the hon. gentleman's administration. Now, Sir, as to diminishing our exports from Montreal, I think the Montreal Corn Exchange are likely to be quite as well informed as the hon. gentleman as to its causes, and I observe, in a recent report of theirs, they advocate strongly the abolition of duty on breadstuffs, and they do not hesitate to hint that there has been a great deal of fraud in connection with the alleged exportation of American flour ground in bond, to replace the American wheat brought into the country by certain millers. When we get down certain returns that have been moved for, we will be in a position to ascertain for ourselves more accurately how far the suspicions of that body are justified. Until then I do not propose to enlarge on that particular question. Now the hon. gentleman, in the course of his argument, advanced three claims on account of the National Policy, which appear to me to be specially deserving of attention. He has, first of all, claimed credit for the foreign demand which existed for our foreign exports as a result of that policy. Well, Sir, I fail to see how by any possibility the hon. gentleman can maintain that this policy could in the slightest degree ever contribute to the increase of exports of the articles I have referred to. Then I allege he is wrong when he claims that his policy has created an improved home market, that the men who produced these articles have obtained more money for all these manufactures through the operation of his policy and not through their own exertions or the prosperity

of the farmers, the fishermen and the lumbermen of the country. Those have not been benefitted in many cases, they have been seriously injured, though looking at the general increase of our exports, there is no wonder that the great improvement in the home market, of which he speaks, has taken place. But, Sir, last of all, in talking of the cheapness of articles, the hon. gentleman has chosen to compare—whether correctly or not I am not in a position to say in all cases—the prices in 1878 and 1882. Now, Sir, that is wholly and entirely a false contention. The tendency of all textile manufactures, and of manufactures of all kinds, is to grow cheaper year by year. New inventions are being brought forward with the object of cheapening manufacture, and they would cheapen it if the hon. gentleman did not interpose with his coal taxes and other things calculated to destroy and interfere with the natural tendency of trade. All the time raw material ought to be getting cheaper, because the production is usually widening and cheapening, and new raw materials are constantly being brought into use. But all these facts the hon. gentleman entirely discards. He will not face the real question, which is not whether in this or that particular year things were cheaper, but whether things can be produced as cheaply here as they can be produced elsewhere; he entirely omits to take into account the pressure which his policy has produced on many of the most deserving classes of the community. He proposes, it is true, to relieve the fishermen of his native Province and of the Maritime Provinces, but what is he going to do for all those numerous class of people, such as clergymen, schoolmasters, clerks and others, whose incomes are in a great measure fixed. When he talks of the general prosperity I think that the hon. gentleman would do well occasionally to go through the streets of this very city. Then he would see that this general prosperity has not extended all over Canada as far as he could desire or we could desire. I think he will see many shops empty, many advertisements of properties for sale; and I can tell him that very recently, to my knowledge, some thirty properties were put up in this city for which a bid could not be obtained. Sir, we find too from the Census returns that the picture is not in all respects as the hon. gentleman would wish us to believe, although the information has in some cases been rather limited. I find that in the case of North Leeds the population has absolutely retrograded. I find the same in the case of Frontenac, of Lennox, East Hastings, West Northumberland, East Durham, West Durham, also of the good town of Niagara, which is becoming small by degrees and beautifully less under the fostering care of its honorable representative. I also find South Wentworth and Halton in the same condition, and an equal number of counties which are marked as almost absolutely stationary. I cannot speak of the state of things in St. John, but the member for the city and county of St. John, and other gentlemen who are well acquainted with that locality, tell me the state of things there is pretty much the same. In the west, in such towns as Belleville, Goderich, Mitchell, Stratford and Welland, I find the population is stationary or decreasing. I cannot say, therefore, that I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman that the result of his policy has been an universal and uniform improvement all over this country, and it is not to be wondered at when we will remember the amount of indirect taxes which is taken out of us as in the case of sugar, cotton and woollens, levied in one way or another, for the benefit of the favored few I have alluded to. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking those burdens light. I think the people of Canada can bear them, but not without serious inconvenience. In looking over the whole position I am forcibly reminded of the times these hon. gentlemen profess to admire, the good times which existed 120 years ago—those good times, Mr. Speaker, when settlements were looked upon as the natural fields of plunder

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

for a few favorites, when Prince Edward Island was divided amongst some fourteen or fifteen families on certain conditions of settlement, which conditions of settlement, I believe, were never fairly fulfilled, and when Great Britain after a long struggle lost half this continent, and was nearly degraded to the position of a third-rate power. Now, Sir, when I look at these hon. gentlemen and remember their antecedents, when I recollect their past record and the consequences of their present acts, instead of feeling the glow of virtuous joy which that hon. gentleman the Minister of Finance experiences, I feel much more disposed to blush for the degradation of Canada now and to tremble for the consequences hereafter. I do not want to blame the hon. Minister too much, for after all he and his colleagues have only done what it is their nature to do, and we should not be too severe on their little weaknesses. My hon. friend was good enough to tell us our credit was high in England, that our securities ranked next to Consols. Have I quoted him aright?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Higher than any other colonial securities.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. He did not say that. He said next to Consols. I remember he used a similar statement before, which I took occasion to correct. No doubt Canadian securities rule high. That is a very satisfactory fact; but looking at the enormous sinking fund we employ purchasing our own securities, I am not so sure the prices are due to the causes the hon. gentleman assigns. I may remind him he would have done much better had he got rid of the sinking fund on the occasion of his last loan instead of adding to the very large amount we have occasion to employ in that way. Moreover, we have not been on the market of late, and when we come to employ \$1,250,000 in purchasing our own securities year after year, it is not a matter of great astonishment our bonds should run up one or two per cent. higher than those of other colonies which are every year putting securities on the market.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have sinking funds too.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes; but they are always raising loans, and their sinking funds are not as large as ours. The hon. gentleman took occasion to say that he was going to disprove most completely the charge that his Tariff had in any way interfered with the importation of dry goods into this country, and selected with some skill a year—I think 1876—in which the imports of Great Britain had sunk to about \$40,000,000. I object altogether to the fallacious argument the hon. gentleman uses. His policy has been to compare years of extreme depression with years of rather remarkable prosperity. Now, I am willing to compare years of prosperity with years of prosperity and years of depression with years of depression and have nothing to fear in the comparison. Why could not the hon. gentleman have given us the imports from Great Britain in 1873-74-75 when our exports, though not as large as at present, were very considerable. He says he has not interfered in the slightest degree with our trade in Great Britain. Well, when our Tariff had some pretence to be a revenue Tariff and our exports were several millions less than they are to-day, I find that in 1873, we imported \$68,000,000 worth of goods from Great Britain; in 1874, \$63,000,000; in 1875, \$60,000,000, against an import of about \$43,000,000 the present year. He is very fond of having averages; let him carry his average a little further back; he will find the result will confirm what we have said. He will find that he has reduced the natural importation from Great Britain to the amount of something like \$25,000,000, if we take the extreme points. The hon. gentleman stated that the old Customs Tariff would have failed to produce sufficient revenue, but failed to produce

the smallest ground of argument for that assertion other than this, that our Tariff imposed burdens on the people without providing food and encouragement for them. I would like to know how he found food and encouragement for the bulk of the people when he taxed food, fuel, light and every other necessity. And when he talks of the people paying voluntarily into his treasury, I would like to know what option he gives or ever gave anyone of us in the matter of contributing to the revenue. As to the number of factories which the hon. gentleman alleges came into operation, all that he has the slightest ground to claim credit for are the 95 which he states, although he gave no details, had come into existence since March 1879, while as to the increase in the hands employed elsewhere, the majority of these are due wholly to the increased prosperity of the country arising from causes I have enumerated, over which the National Policy had no control whatever. And there is the explanation of the whole increase that has taken place. I might, were it worth my while to go into a discussion of that kind, point out to the hon. gentleman that although it may be true that in two or three isolated cases there has been an increase in value of city property, yet, that over a large portion of Western Canada, at any rate, there has been a positive decrease in the value of farming lands, and a very material decrease in the number of farmers inhabiting those counties. Sir, unhappily the mischief which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have done is likely to remain. Those hon. gentlemen, in addition to inflicting other grievous burdens on the people seem to have busied themselves with all the industry that they possess to attempt to concentrate all the power of this country in their own hands. They are, from day to day, attempting to trample on our provincial rights. They are, from day to day, interfering with every liberty which we still continue to possess. They talk of Canada being a free country. Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or to sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or another. That is the position to which they have reduced us. As to our provincial liberties they seem only to be occupied in devising means to curtail them at every point they can. Now, Sir, I do not mean to threaten, but most assuredly I do say—not perhaps to them, not perhaps to the men who support them, but to the people of Canada who sent them here and to whom they may shortly, perhaps very soon, have to appeal—I do say to them that if they persevere in this course, if they persevere in trampling on our provincial rights, they may find that Confederation will fall to pieces almost as soon as it was created; and if they persevere in particular in trampling on the plainest rights of the people of the North-West, then I warn them that so soon as that country begins to be filled up, so soon as settlement is crystalized there, so soon as the people begin to feel the pressure of the bonds they are imposing upon them, Canada will run very great risk of losing the North-West just as Great Britain lost the United States a century ago, and no men will be more directly responsible for it than the two hon. gentlemen I see immediately before me. Sir, these men may boast of their great majority here to-day, they may boast of their full Treasury, they may boast of their devoted supporters; but I can recollect some ten years ago, when these gentlemen were just as insolent, just as arrogant as they are to-day, when they had just as strong a majority behind them, just as full a Treasury, when they were prepared to be just as unscrupulous in maintaining their places as they were to-day; yet in twelve months after that time I saw them scattered and driven into deserved ignominy. The fate that befell them in 1873 may well befall them in 1883, and I see signs and tokens, not a few, that if they do not take care, and if they do not mend their ways, that fate will assuredly befall them

again; and say that it will be a very fortunate day for this country when we will be able to put a stop to all the vexatious legislation with which they have burdened and harassed the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

STAMP DUTY.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD. I wish to make a statement which I think of such importance that I think it ought to go to the papers to-night. My hon. friend who sits near me has given notice for doing away with the stamp duty. That is a statutory enactment, and until the Act is itself repealed stamps must still be affixed on promissory notes and bills of exchange in order to make them legal. The fact that it is the intention of the Government to take off the duty does not prevent the legal necessity of still affixing stamps until the repeal of the Stamp Act.

House adjourned at 12:20 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 27th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 47) to extend and amend the Acts relating to the Canada Landed Credit Company. —(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 49) to amend the Act intituled: "An Act relating to interest on moneys secured by mortgage of real estate.—(Mr. Orton.)

Bill (No. 50) to enable any person charged with an indictable offence, to be admitted to give evidence on his behalf.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan; and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mills.)

FREE TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. McCUAIG moved for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the free transmission by mail of newspapers within the county in which the same are published.

Mr. KILLAM asked the Government to explain its policy on this question. He raised the point of order that this was a measure affecting public revenue, which a private member could not introduce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, from the title of the Bill, it was one which should commence by resolution.

Motion withdrawn.

EVIDENCE IN CASES OF INDICTABLE OFFENCES.

Mr. McCARTHY, in introducing Bill (No. 50), to enable any person charged with an indictable offence to be admitted to give evidence on his own behalf, said: This Bill contains three short clauses, and is taken from the criminal code recently prepared in England by a Commission which the present Justice Stephens is the chief. The Bill provides that any person charged with an indictable offence may give evidence on his own behalf, but the limits of cross-

examination are, to a certain extent, curtailed. He is not to be called as a witness for the prosecution, and if called on his own behalf, the cross-examination may, at the order of the Judge, be limited in matters of reputation or character as the Judge thinks proper. I do not propose, just now, to say anything more. Of course, this brings up the oft-discussed question as to the propriety of admitting criminals to give evidence, but that general question can, perhaps, be more properly discussed on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. ANGLIN. Why do you limit the right of cross-examination?

Mr. McCARTHY. Because in cross-examining the accused in the ordinary way, as to his credibility, it might be very unfair towards him to investigate his whole life, and it is left to the discretionary power of the Judge as to where the examination should stop.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

DIOCESE OF THE SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. MILLS, in moving for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 51) for the incorporation of the Synod of the Diocese of the Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith, said: It is not necessary that I should make any remarks on the introduction of a private Bill of this kind. Remarks in explanation in support of its provisions, can be more fitly made at a later stage. The provisions of the Bill are similar to those for the incorporation of the Synods of the churches at present existing in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. This Bill will enable certain parties in the region mentioned, to form themselves into a local corporation, to transact business, to appoint the members of the Synod, and hold real estate for certain purposes.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Rainy River Improvement Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the Dundee Land Investment Company (Limited).—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Tecumseh Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 44) to amend the Act incorporating the Napier-ville Junction Railway and Quarry Company.—(Mr. Coursol.)

Bill (No. 45) to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value thereof and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

THE RICHELIEU BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. BAKER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 42) to incorporate "The Richelieu Bridge Company."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is this a Railway Bill?

Mr. BAKER. No.

Mr. MILLS. I have not seen the Bill, but if it does not relate to the bridging of navigable streams it is not a measure within the jurisdiction of this Parliament—it belongs to the Local Legislature—I mean if it interferes with navigation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Richelieu is a navigable river.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. McCARTHY.

MARITIME JURISDICTION ACT.

Mr. WILLIAMS enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to so amend the Maritime Jurisdiction Act that a more speedy and less expensive method may be provided for the recovery of seamen's wages in Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say that the matter is one which can be dealt with without any change in the Act constituting the Court. The Government has asked the Court, whether the Court will consider, in conjunction with the Surrogates in the counties where the chief business of the Court is being done, the existing rules of the Court, with a view to ascertain whether the expenses of proceedings in the Court may be reduced.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Mr. DAWSON enquired, Whether, in the document relating to the boundaries of Ontario, bearing date 18th February, and addressed, as appears by the newspapers, to the Secretary of State by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, the lecture of Sir Francis Hincks therein referred to, accompanies the said document as a part of the case for Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The lecture of Sir Francis Hincks does not accompany the document as part of the case.

BRIDGE CROSSING RIVIÈRE DU LOUP.

Mr. GRANDBOIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to replace, during the coming season, the wooden bridge on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, crossing Rivière du Loup, by an iron bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government, during the coming season, to replace the wooden bridge on the line of the Intercolonial Railway crossing Rivière du Loup.

POST OFFICE AT BRAMPTON.

Mr. ELLIOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates for the purpose of building a post office and Custom house in the town of Brampton, county of Peel?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is not to place a sum in the Estimates for this purpose, but the matter will be investigated during the recess.

RESIDENT JUDGE AT GASPÉ.

Mr. FORTIN, in moving for copies of all letters, reports, and documents respecting the appointment of a Judge in the county of Gaspé, and the system of judicial decentralization in Canada, said: In making this motion, I think it is my duty to address a few remarks to this House on a question of importance which interests one of the first elements of society, that is to say, justice. I represent a county which forms, by itself, a judicial district. That district should have a resident Judge, as the law declared more than thirty years ago, but for more than ten years we have had no resident Judge. The Judge acting in that district has been itinerant; we see him a couple of times a year; he stays with us two or three days, and in consequence of this state of things, justice suffers. I may say that we have no administration of justice there, and, when I state that, I state the sentiment of the whole county. But, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the question will be better understood if I am allowed to read part of a letter which I addressed to the Minister of Justice on that question:

"OTTAWA, 3rd February, 1882.

"SIR,—I think I would fail in my duty as representative of the county of Gaspé, if I were not to address you this letter in reference to the appointment of a Judge to replace the Judge of the district of Gaspé, who died recently.

"And it seems to me that I could not begin this letter more pertinent-ly than by citing the following words, pronounced by the illustrious and much regretted Sir George Cartier, in the House of Representatives of United Canada, when he proposed the second reading of the Bill for judiciary decentralization in Lower Canada in 1857; these extracts are taken from *La Minerve* of the 17th April, 1857.

"The cry that has resounded from one extremity of the Province to the other against the present system, must not be considered as a clamor, but, on the contrary, as the public expression of the necessity of a more extended judiciary decentralization.

"Now, that it is acknowledged that decentralization is a necessity, we must find out by what means we can obtain this object without burthening the consolidated fund with an expenditure larger than the present one.

"That Bill became law. It was nothing less than a system of judiciary decentralization with districts numerous enough to answer the wants of the large regions situate on the extremities of the country (and it is there only that the population in the Province of Quebec increases to a considerable extent, as proved by the Census) and resident judges, for that measure necessarily involved the residence of the judges, and all the judiciary personnel, at the chief towns of their respective districts. I took active proceedings with the Government on the occasion of the appointment of Judge Winter, in order that he would take his residence at Percé.

"I brought the matter before the House of Commons, and the Government led me to believe that Judge Winter would go and reside at Percé.

"But what happened? Judge Winter always resided at New Carlisle, until he was superannuated. Judge Caron resided at Quebec, and Judge Laframboise at Montreal.

"I am obliged to declare it—this system is condemned by all the population of Gaspesia, who finds that the judiciary decentralization promised, voted by the Legislature, and which was to have secured for Gaspesia a prompt and an effective system of justice, has not been put in practice for the last ten or twelve years, as regards the residence of the Judge at the chief town of the district, and that is one of the essential parts of the system of judiciary decentralization. Without that, this system is, so to speak, decapitated. Judiciary decentralization has always formed a part of the programme of the Conservative party, and also of the Liberal party.

"As for me, who have observed closely what has taken place in the county of Gaspé—I should say in all Gaspesia—since 1852, I must declare that justice is not administered there as it ought to be, to the great detriment of the interests of all classes of that region.

"Itinerant Judges do not suit that distant part of Canada, which, on the contrary, ought to have in its midst all the elements which constitute an important centre—I should say, a kind of autonomy.

"One might be tempted to say that, far from going ahead in the patriotic work of judiciary decentralization, we have retrograded.

"It is, however, the most powerful and fruitful factor in the work of colonization, and without active and efficacious colonization in the regions which form the outskirts of the Province of Quebec, where will the superabundant population of the old countries go? They must exile themselves in foreign lands.

"I pronounce myself now, as I have always done, in favor of a resident Judge in the judiciary district of Gaspé, and I beg you to be pleased to use your influence in the Privy Council so that the system of judiciary decentralization may be put in operation in the county of Gaspé in all its plenitude.

I have, etc., etc.,
(Signed) "P. FORTIN.

"Hon. Sir ALEX. CAMPBELL, K.C.M.G., C.B., Minister of Justice.

"P.S.—Population of the county of Gaspé in 1871, 18,729; in 1881, 25,001. Increase of the county of Gaspé during the last ten years, 34 per cent. Increase in the Province of Quebec during the same period, 14 per cent.

(Signed) "P. F."

That is the letter I addressed to the Minister of Justice, demanding redress for the people of the county of Gaspé. I know it has frequently been said, and especially by gentlemen connected with the legal profession: "What is the use of a Judge in those places? There are no cases to be tried." But when we find that the Judge, so far from remaining until the last day of the term, leaves before it is half through, after, perhaps, postponing indefinitely a number of cases, how can the merchants, the agriculturists, who may have occasion to go to law, get that justice which they have a right to expect? I wish to read a summary of a speech delivered in 1878 in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, on the second reading of the Bill to remove one of the Judges of the district of Gaspé to Quebec. The Bill was conceived in that spirit of centralization, which we see, unfortunately for this country, so strongly manifested in our cities; but, fortunately for the administration of justice in Gaspé, the Government fell and the Bill fell with it. On the 30th March, 1868, I moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor Gen-

eral for a statement of the number of sittings of the Court held at Amherst, Magdalen Islands. I had made that motion on account of the complaints made by the people of these Islands, because the Judge had often failed to go and hold Court there, to the detriment of the people of that place and to the injury of its commerce and fisheries. I also then complained that the Judge did not reside at the capital town of the district, but at New Carlisle, a distance of 65 miles away. But nothing was done. My complaints made in the name of a large county and of a suffering people were in vain, and I need scarcely add that this was a great disappointment to the Gaspesians—this is a matter easily perceived. On the 4th April, 1860, I made another motion in this House, on the occasion of the absence of the Judge, during several terms of the Circuit Court of the Magdalen Islands. At the same time I complained that Judge Thompson had never resided at Percé, the capital of the county, and that neither did Judge Winter reside at the chief town of the district. The Government promised to compel him to take up his residence there, but nothing came of it. After a time the Administration changed, and we naturally expected the Reform party would grant us the measure we had asked, but nothing in the way of the reform asked was done by them, nevertheless. In short, all the Governments have shown, for the judiciary interests of that county, a heedlessness, a carelessness and disdain, which I am utterly at a loss to explain. No solicitude, no benevolence, and no pity, I may say, for the population who are colonizing these distant regions, amid all the kinds of difficulties and hardships which they undergo in making this country rich, by their being great consumers of the products of the manufacturers. This I can explain in only one of two ways: either we are thought by the Government to be an inferior people inhabiting an inferior country, and that anything is good enough for us; or else, the Government is returning to the old ideas of centralization—ideas which, if carried out, will be fatal to this country, which increases its population, only in the vast regions which lie at its extremities on the north, south, east and west. No pity for them! They must be worked and have nothing. No railways, no general improvements, not even a good administration of justice. But, Sir, the measure is full, and it overflows. The people are discontented. I will here read extracts from letters written to me in 1878, by leading gentlemen in the county, which demonstrate that our grounds of complaint are not exaggerated. The first is as follows:—

"The Judge came here to hold the January term, which has been appointed by proclamation to last from the 23rd to the 29th, inclusive; but, although there were several cases fixed for to-day—the 25th—and witnesses summoned in these cases from Cape Rosier, Grinn Cove, and Newport, the Judge closed the term on the 24th, in spite of the objections of the lawyers, and went away immediately. The reasons given were, that the cases were not important enough—being suits for from \$20 to \$30—and that there were more important cases to judge, viz: Kamouraska election case, and the Quebec term, which he had to attend at Quebec. Now, I do not know what you will think of these reasons, but the people of Gaspé did not find them very satisfactory."

The second is as follows:—

"The Judge receives a salary to act as a Judge; he either neglects to fulfil his duties or the Government gives him instruction to neglect his duties as Judge at Gaspé, to transfer them to Quebec, and this causes an additional expense to the country, while it is a refusal of justice to the people of Gaspé. As for me, I have important cases connected with the settlement of a succession which I cannot enter into Court, because I can never be sure of the presence of the Judge at any term, and I do not like the unnecessary expenses to commence pleading before a Judge who is in such great haste to return to Quebec or Montreal, and is liable to be replaced at the next term by another Judge before whom I would have to begin my pleadings anew."

The third is as follows:—

"The term was fixed for the 23rd. The Judge sat for the 29th days, and closed the proceedings on the 24th, without having done anything. Mr. St. Croix, from Jersey, Channel Islands, doing business at Fox River, had to remain in the county all winter to follow his case for this term, but his case has again been deferred. Witnesses had come from New-

port, Fox River and Griffin Cove, but all that for nothing, as the Judge had gone before he arrived, and all the expenses of these witnesses fell on the poor clients. The fact is, many persons are afraid to proceed in Court, on account of the shameful and uncertain manner in which the terms are held. The Judge said he had to go and hold the February term at Quebec, and attend to some election case at Kamouraska. The witnesses that had been summoned arrived yesterday and this morning—the 24th and 25th—and I do not believe that they will praise much the administration of justice when they will have returned home. They find that, since the Government will not give us a resident Judge, the least we can expect is that, when a Judge comes down, he ought to hold the term to the end, or at least hear the cases fixed for the term, and in which the witnesses who are summoned, and who live at great distances from the chief town, were on their way to the Court. The people do not go to law, because they are never sure to have a Judge when the term comes, and that is the reason why there are so few cases on the roll."

One can judge, from these extracts, of the unfortunate position in which the people of Gaspé are placed, as regards the administration of justice. But the position of the people of the Magdalen Islands is still worse. Suppose an inhabitant of the Magdalen Islands has a case before the Court at Percé, he consults the Court Calendar and sees that the terms are fixed to certain dates. He leaves his home and embarks on board the steamer for Pictou, distant 120 miles, and from Pictou to Percé 370 miles, making the distance travelled to reach Percé 490 miles. He has arrived at Percé, where he is liable, under the present system, to find the Judge absent or away; he returns home, another 490 miles, making in all 980 miles travelled, and at an expense of from \$50 to \$60; added to which is his disappointment at finding no Court and damage to his case and his business, a process liable to be repeated many times over. I have proved, by these extracts, that the administration of justice in the county of Gaspé has been faulty to say the least. Many people believe that the county of Gaspé and its population are small and insignificant, and that there is no progress in that part of the country. I will read a few statistics to show that the county of Gaspé, notwithstanding the bad administration of justice, and notwithstanding that the Government has never done much for it, has increased in population as much as any other part of the country. The county of Gaspé is 4,584 square miles in extent, or 2,933,760 acres, while Prince Edward Island is 2,133 square miles in extent, or 1,365,400 acres, showing that Gaspé is twice as large as Prince Edward Island. The county of Bonaventure is 3,465 square miles in extent, or 2,217,600 acres, one-half as large again as Prince Edward Island. We find that the population of Gaspé, by the Census of 1871 was 18,729, and by the Census of 1881, 25,001, an increase of 33 per cent. The population of Bonaventure, in 1871, was 15,923, and, in 1881, 18,908. Rimouski had a population of 27,418 in 1871 and has increased to 33,791 in 1881. The three counties of Gaspé, Bonaventure and Rimouski, in 1871, had a population of 62,070, while in 1881 they have a population of 77,700, so that the increase of population in these three counties in ten years has been 15,630. Now, let us compare this with the increase of population in Prince Edward Island, which has a Governor, a Legislature, a bench of six Judges, a railroad, and many other things which go to make up a country. According to the Census of 1871 the population of Prince Edward Island was 94,021, and according to the last Census, 108,891, showing an increase of only 14,870, against an increase of 15,630 in Gaspé. This shows that Gaspé must have resources which have not been credited to it; and remember, that no immigration from Scotland, England, Ireland, Germany or France has occurred during the last thirty years that I have been there, to that country. It has increased of its own blood. Let us also compare it with Cape Breton. In 1871, the population of Cape Breton was 75,483, while in 1881 it was 84,500, an increase of 9,017. These comparisons which I have made, without any idea of belittling Prince Edward Island or Cape Breton, show that Gaspé is of sufficient importance to deserve more attention and solicitude on the part of the Government. Let them give us one-tenth

Mr. FORTIN.

of the consideration they give the west, and we will be contented. While I am speaking of judicial decentralization, I must say a word on the principle of decentralization itself. The principle of decentralization is the principle of a free country, the principle of a free man, the principle which people want to have established when they emigrate from one country to another, while the opposite principle, that of centralization, which is doing so much harm in the Province of Quebec, seeks to control everything directly from a common centre. Such a system tends to make the resident in the country like an inhabitant of the town, and subservient to him and to crush out thereby the liberty and spirit of the people. I am in favor of decentralization. Although I was educated in a city—and possibly if I had continued to live there I would have held their ideas—I changed my views when I went to reside in Gaspé, for I found that the French idea of centralization was wrong and the English idea of decentralization was right. Why should we oblige the people of Gaspé to go to Quebec for everything? Gaspé possesses natural resources such as would make a country. It is larger than many of the kingdoms of Europe, and if increased judicial and other advantages had been afforded, the increase of the population would not be 15,000 only, but 50,000. Providence has done a great deal for that portion of the country, although there were some drawbacks, such as the climate and its remoteness from the great centres of commerce. Its resources are manifold and extensive, but alluding to the fisheries alone, I may say that, there were left last year, on the beach, millions of pounds of cod-fish refuse which, if skilled industry had been developed there, might have been converted into valuable, fertilizing substances which would have brought a great deal of money. What I ask on behalf of Gaspé is, that its people be afforded what was promised them by the Conservative and by the Liberal parties respectively. What we want is decentralization; we want the right to live as independent men, and not be compelled to go to Quebec in order to obtain what we should have at home.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD There can be no objection to grant all those reports and documents respecting the appointment of a Judge for the county of Gaspé and the system of judicial decentralization in Canada. Of course any confidential communication must be excluded of necessity. Mr. Speaker, there can be no objection to this resolution being passed. I must admit that the hon. member for Gaspé has a rightful claim to what he asks. Gaspé has the same right as any other portion of Quebec to have a resident Judge. From a series of circumstances, I do not know how it happened, either the Governments of 1872, of 1874, or 1880 have not been able to secure a resident Judge in the full sense of the term. I think, however, that the view enunciated by the hon. member must be carried out, that in any appointment made as Judge of Gaspé it shall be made a condition that he shall reside there, and that he should not consider he had satisfied his duty by visiting the county occasionally when his services were required. That part of the Province of Quebec has, as I have said, the same right as any other part to have a resident Judge, so that lawyers and other persons can apply for summary procedure and conduct general business without being compelled to go either to Montreal or Quebec or elsewhere for the purpose of receiving the Judge's decision. I can assure my hon. friend that we fully understand the difficulties of the case, and we will see that the evil shall be remedied as far as it can be remedied, and that it shall be an understanding, if a Judge is appointed, that he shall be a resident Judge, and if he does not carry that out it shall be a sufficient cause for a motion in both Houses of Parliament to remove him. Perhaps, as my hon. friend is the great telegraphic authority in this country, he may think that by establishing telephonic or telegraphic communication, we may make a compromise, but unless he holds that opinion

we will endeavor to insist on having a resident Judge for Gaspé.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My recollection is that when the late Judge was appointed, he was appointed on the distinct understanding that he would reside there. I also recollect that he at first declined the appointment on those terms, but afterwards accepted. I was not aware until very lately that he was not residing in the district. It is unfortunate that such is the case, but I am quite sure the late Government did everything in their power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure also.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am sorry that, after the hon. gentleman has shown what the products of Gaspé are, there should be any desire manifested to live out of a district where men grow so stout and strong as its representative in this House.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer of the First Minister to the hon. member is very satisfactory, as regards the wants of the district of Gaspé, but I propose to call the attention of the Premier to the fact that there are many other districts in the Province of Quebec which have suffered just as severely as Gaspé. There are districts which have had Judges appointed to serve in the locality, and yet who reside in Quebec and Montreal. I do not want to specially blame the Governments any more than the Judges, because I know the tendency of centralization, to which the hon. member for Gaspé has referred, exists very generally in those cities, and persistent efforts are made to retain the Judges, who should reside in outside districts, to remain in Quebec and Montreal, in order that the Bench there may avail themselves of their services. I understand, from the language of the Premier, that he agrees with the proposition laid down by the member for Gaspé, that Judges who are appointed to administer justice in particular districts, shall reside in those districts. I would particularly call the attention of the Government to the fact that the law is not enforced in this respect, and this with the tolerance of the Government. It cannot be questioned that the rural districts largely suffer from the absence of the Judges. The duties of Judges are not confined simply to the Court House, and it is a serious grievance on outside districts that, when a Judge is required to administer the law at any time, he should be absent. I have no intention to criticize the Government, because I know that pressure has been brought on it to allow this state of things to exist, but I simply call the attention of the Government to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have heard no complaints from any other portion except Gaspé.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not file any complaint with the Government, but simply call their attention to a state of things which exist.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. Not only does the state of things which exist stand in the way of that perfect decentralization that Sir George Cartier had in view, but there is a disposition among a certain section in Lower Canada to abolish the present system altogether, and bring about a system of centralization by having all the Judges reside in cities. Sir George Cartier was only induced to take the step he took in establishing the present system after a great deal of agitation in Lower Canada. The system of decentralization was one imposed on him almost unanimously by the people of Lower Canada, and there is danger now of our taking the retrograde step of centralizing judicial influences in the cities. The matter is in the hands of the people, and unless they make their opinion felt to-day they may find themselves deprived of this great boon, which was regarded as one of the most important reforms, and be again obliged to resort to agitation in order to secure its renewal. Whatever may be the

views of some of the eminent members of the Bar, the system is a credit to the Province of Quebec, and ought to be preserved; but the people will require to keep their eyes open, or it may ultimately be taken from them.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Last Session we had a very long debate on this same question, in which the hon. leader of the Opposition made a very long and effective speech against the system of administration of justice in our Province. One of his great points was, that the country Judges were becoming useless and ought to be transferred to the cities. I strongly protested against that at the time, and am glad that the hon. member for Quebec East, and the hon. member for Shefford, came to my support against the policy of their hon. leader.

Mr. LAURIER. I am aware that the hon. member for West Durham was opposed to having courts without Judges, and referred to the system of Ontario, where there are no courts without resident Judges, who are called County Court Judges.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I recollect well what took place. The hon. leader of the Opposition made a regular indictment against our Judges in Quebec, but to-day our cause is vindicated by the hon. members who have just spoken.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I remember quite well the sense of the hon. member for Durham's remarks, and felt that they had been misunderstood by the hon. Minister at the time he made his reply.

Motion agreed to.

FERRIES BETWEEN CANADA AND UNITED STATES.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for a return of all Orders in Council regulating ferries between points in Canada and the United States, together with all correspondence as to the regulations affecting such ferries, said: The legislation with regard to the ferries on the frontier, to which my attention has been called, seems to be very confused. By 20 Victoria, chapter 7, it is enacted: that in order to encourage international ferries and in the interest of commerce, it is essential to place the control and management of these ferries in the hands of the municipalities interested; and it was with this object, apparently, that by the same statute the license is directed to be, in all cases affecting the international ferries, granted to the municipality. But, both before and subsequent to the passing of this statute, the power to regulate was given to the Governor in Council; so we have one authority managing and another regulating. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to settle what each was intended to do. By the Confederation Act this power was retained exclusively for the Dominion Government, but no action appears to have been taken. We find Orders in Council affecting inter-provincial ferries published with the Dominion Statutes of 1877-78-79, but I can find no Order in Council affecting international ferries. By the Dominion Act 33 Victoria, chapter 35, all such international ferries are made exclusively subject to the Parliament of Canada, and the 5th section of that Act authorizes the Governor in Council to make such regulations as he may deem expedient for various purposes connected with such ferries, such as establishing their extent and limit, defining the conditions under which licenses may be granted, determining the size and description of the vessels to be used, fixing the tolls which should be charged, the times and hours of crossing, and imposing penalties for the breach of such regulations. It would appear from this that all such ferries, since Confederation, are subject to regulations to be approved by the Dominion Government, and that the municipalities shall stand in the position of lessees, whose leases have not expired and are only empowered to sublet, being deprived of all authority for enforcing regulations for

the conduct of such ferries. This is a matter seriously affecting my constituency as well as the western frontier, at such points as Sarnia, Windsor, Sandwich and Amherstberg, and also at Kingston, Brockville and Prescott on the St. Lawrence. It is very desirable that the Government should deal with this matter, and that such regulations should be put in force by the Governor in Council as would meet the necessities of the several municipalities interested. At Windsor we have a very superior line of iron ferry boats, running constantly between that port and Detroit, from six in the morning until midnight, and carrying a large number of passengers, and a great quantity of freight. It seems to me that it is the duty of the Government to deal with this matter without further delay. The municipal authorities should have full power given them to regulate and control these ferries, and also to enforce the penalties against them for any breach of the conditions of their licenses. It is now nearly twelve years since the passing of the Act referred to. So far, it seems to me to have been inoperative, and should any litigation arise it is doubtful whether a municipality could enforce its authority against the owners of the ferries. I hope the matter will receive the immediate attention of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. MUTTART moved for a statement showing lists of articles on which freight rates had been lowered, with amount of reduction, on the Prince Edward Island Railway, since the year 1878; also, copies of all correspondence relating to further lowering of rates, including passenger fares charged on said railway. He said: In making this motion, I may say that, on a former occasion, during the Session of 1880, I introduced a motion somewhat similar to the one now submitted. At that time I ventured to assert that I believed, if freight rates were lowered on the Prince Edward Island Railway, on certain articles, especially agricultural produce, it would not only prove a great advantage and convenience to the people, but would also be a source of constantly increased revenue to the Government. Since then a small reduction has been effected in the Tariff rates on some articles. And what has been the result? In the report of the Minister of Railways, laid before Parliament the other day, we are told, by the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, that "very considerable reductions were made in freight rates during the year, notably on potatoes and on goods ex steamer *Northern Light*, nevertheless, the earnings have shown an increase." This is just the result that was anticipated. But, apart from the subject of the lowering of rates leading, in certain cases, to increased business, and consequently increased receipts, the people of the Island have a right to special consideration in the management of their railway. The Island is essentially agricultural, and, therefore, the first consideration should be to afford the utmost facilities to the farmers in transporting their produce to market. The Island Railway, it will be remembered, is a local road not connecting directly with the railway system of the mainland. Being a surface road, it is by no means a straight one. Consequently, a great distance is travelled in getting from one point to another than if there were fewer curvatures. Farmers are, therefore, charged, in having their produce carried by rail, for greater mileage than they would otherwise be if the road were straighter. Then again, the road only cost about \$16,000 per mile. These, and various other reasons, might be urged in favor of still further reducing freight rates on this road. As regards passenger tariffs on the Island Railway, I certainly think the rates should be lowered. Instead of charging 3 cents per mile, as at present, for first class passenger fare, the charge should be only 2 cents a mile, and return second

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

class tickets should be given, as in the case of first class return tickets. I feel confident that, if the passenger rates were lowered as I have indicated, that the next year's report of the superintendent would be able to say, in regard to passengers, what he has this year stated regarding the result of lowering of freight rates. During the recess, the hon. Minister of Railways, in his official capacity, inspected our Island Railway, and I hope, from his personal knowledge of the road and of the exceptional requirements of the people of the Island, he will endeavor to carry out their wishes in this respect, by lowering both the freight and passenger rates on the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. HACKETT. In rising to second the motion of my hon. friend, I desire to say that this question of lowering the rates on the Island Railway is one of great importance to the whole Island. As is well known, and as my hon. friend has stated, the Island Railway cost but a small amount of money in its construction. The people of the Island had begun the construction of the railway before the Island entered the Confederation, and it was intended that the road should be a narrow gauge railway, a surface road, that many curves would be allowed, that the cost of construction would be small, and that consequently freight and passenger rates be over that road would also be small. Unfortunately, however, the Local Government had the fixing of the rates before the Island entered Confederation, after which the Dominion Government assumed the responsibility of running the whole of the road, and of fixing the rates the same as those charged on the Intercolonial Railway. This was considered by the people as very unjust, for the reason I have already stated, because the rates are very much greater on the Intercolonial Railway. There are many short curves on that road, and, fixing the rates on the Island road according to mileage, is very much in excess of what it would be on the Intercolonial Railway. This matter was brought to the notice of the Government in 1880, and I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman who now administers the Department of Railways has thought proper to make a reduction on the carriage of certain articles. The people of the Island are principally agriculturists, and the commodities which they require to send to market are of a bulky and weighty nature, having no very great value. The principal products of the Island are oats and potatoes. These cannot be conveyed over the road at present for more than fifty miles, because it is quite impossible for the farmers to sell their commodities at sufficient prices to enable them to pay the freight of their commodities over more than fifty miles of the railway. It is a well known fact that the fall season on the Island is very short, and that the harbors, with the exception of one or two, close very early, and it is of great importance that the people should move their produce during that short season. To do this they should be allowed to move them to the furthest point, 100 or 200 miles over the railway, but on account of the very high rates charged they are not able to send them more than fifty miles. The consequence is, that many of the products of the Island remain in the hands of the farmers and traders, and they send them by water in the spring. This is a matter that should be considered by the Government. The Island Railway has to compete with water, and carriage by water is much the cheaper, for no part of the Island is more than seventy miles from the water. The Government should lower the rates on these articles so that the farmers can send them over the whole length of the railway, particularly in the fall. With regard to the articles on which rates have been lowered, I have figures to show that an increase has taken place in the transportation of those articles as well as in the revenue. In 1880, when this matter was brought before Parliament, only 34,699 tons of potatoes and roots were sent over the railway. In 1881, after a reduction had been made by the

hon. Minister, the very large quantity of 105,223 tons were sent over the road, being an increase of about 70,000 tons. Although the lowering of the rates was an experiment, still the revenue to the Government was increased by about \$1,000 on that one item alone. Then, with regard to sawn lumber. Although lumber was not one of the commodities of the Island, still a very large quantity is sent over the railway. I was in conversation with a gentleman last summer who owns a large saw mill, and he told me that last year, for the first time in the history of the railway, he was able, in consequence of the lowering of the rates, to send his lumber 100 miles. I find that, in 1880, only 1,589,412 feet of sawn lumber were sent over the railway; while in 1881, in consequence of the reduction in rates made by the hon. Minister, there were sent over the railway 2,901,314 feet, or an increase of over 1,000,000 feet of lumber, giving an increased revenue to the Government of about \$1,000 upon that item. Then, with regard to cordage and tan-bark: in 1880, 1,498 cords were sent over the road, but in 1881 an increase of 500 cords had taken place, giving an increased revenue of \$400 or \$500, thus establishing clearly the success of the experiment of lowering the rates, which would justify the Minister in making a still further reduction in the rates for other articles. The principal commodity of the Island is oats. The farmers almost exclusively raise oats, and these have to be sent over the railway late in the fall; but from 1880 down to the present time I regret to say that no reduction has been made in the rate for the carriage of oats. Last fall an attempt was made to increase the rates over a short distance of the railway, and I find that, notwithstanding the great increase of prosperity which has taken place, the quantity of oats carried over the railway has largely fallen off. In 1880, 575,441 bushels of oats were sent over the railway; in 1881, 412,526 bushels were sent over the road, showing a falling off of over 100,000 bushels, while other articles, notably roots, potatoes, lumber and cordage, have largely increased. This shows clearly that the farmers of the country are not able to send their oats over the railway with profit to themselves in consequence of the high rate, and, therefore, they resort to navigation. In 1880, the revenue arising from the carriage of oats was \$12,422.64; in 1881, the revenue was \$8,89.02, showing a falling off of \$4,000 on that item alone. These facts show the necessity of a further reduction of the rates on oats. In fact, we cannot send oats over that railway with any profit for a distance of more than twelve miles. I think it is most important, not only to the people of the Island, but to the Government, to lower the rates. This will increase the revenue, undoubtedly, as has been clearly shown by the articles experimented upon. With regard to the carriage of passengers over the railway, I may say that the accommodation is of very poor description. The railway being a narrow gauge, the cars are quite contracted, and there is not sufficient room even for two passengers on each seat. Still we are charged on that piece of railway the same rates as are charged on the Intercolonial Railway. It is well known to all that, with steel rails and a solid road-bed, passengers are carried quite smoothly over the Intercolonial Railway; but on account of the sharp curves and steep grades on the Island Railway, passengers are very much shaken up and disturbed, and it is not very good for the health. I trust, therefore, that the Government will view this matter as I do, and will make such reductions in the passenger rates as will meet the views of the Island people. I think the result of the experiment already tried in lowering freight rates will justify the Minister in making further reductions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is, of course, no objection to this motion, and the papers moved for by the hon. gentleman will, as a matter of course, be brought down.

The subject of this motion will receive the careful consideration of the Government. I will be only too glad to find that, by reducing still further the rates on the Island Railway, the net results will be improved. If that can be shown, and if there is good reason to believe that by a reduction in the rates we can improve the net results, which I regret to say are still very unfavorable, it will be a matter of very great pleasure to me to recommend such a reduction. But it is a well known fact that the people of Prince Edward Island have perhaps a larger amount of railway accommodation in proportion to the population than any other people in the world. It is equally well known that it costs a large sum of money to give those railway facilities to the people of Prince Edward Island, and regardless altogether of the cost of the work, the operating expenses of the railway on the Island are still very largely in excess of the entire income. Still, of course, I believe the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that the reduction which has been made, has had the effect of decreasing the very large margin that previously existed between revenue and expenditure, and if it were found that by further reductions we could still more decrease the disparity between revenue and expenditure, I shall be only too glad to effect an improvement in the operations of the road by a measure of that kind.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. KILLAM moved for copies of all correspondence, telegrams and cablegrams between the Government and any person or persons, and of any correspondence, telegrams and cablegrams between any persons, the originals or copies of which may be in possession of the Government, and of all Orders in Council, and of any documents or papers in possession of the Government relating to the appointment, or proposed appointment of an Administrator of the Government, or of a Deputy Governor, to act during His Excellency's absence from the Dominion in November last. He said: In moving for this correspondence, I am not charging the Government, as I might have done, with any dereliction of duty, or with any assumption of prerogative that does not belong to them. But I think it would be interesting to the public, and to members of this House, to know what took place last autumn, when His Excellency was about leaving for Europe, and the manner in which the gentleman on the Treasury benches treated him, compelling his remaining in the country for a fortnight. The reports which appeared in the press of the country in relation to the matter, are interesting, and are such as to excite the curiosity of any one who cares to look into the matter. I am not bringing the question up out of an idle spirit of enquiry, but simply to state the principle, that I do not think it is a proper thing for the Government of this country to assume powers which, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite assumed in this matter. If, however, they are clear of blame, the correspondence will, of course, show that fact distinctly. About the 20th of October last it was announced that His Excellency was about leaving on a visit to the Mother Country, and that a meeting of Council was to be held for the purpose of appointing an Administrator. On the next day it was announced that His Excellency was unwell, which we all regretted to hear, and unable to leave, as he had intended. This was officially contradicted, and it was stated that the matter had been entirely arranged, and that he was going on the next Friday. We heard soon after that his departure was still further delayed, that he would not leave for two weeks, and that General MacDougall was to come to this country to act as Governor. Now the letters patent are perfectly plain, and it seems odd that such occurrences should have taken place as those to which I refer.

We have a system of government which may be imperfect in itself, but which, it is clear, cannot at all be misunderstood. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have misunderstood it entirely. I do not say they did; I do not charge them with having done so; but I think they did, and that they attempted themselves to appoint an Administrator of the Government, practically to appoint their master, and in circumstances in which he might be their servant. I believe, with some others, that we live under a very good constitution; that we are well off in this country; that our system is a good one, and that while we have a Governor General appointed by the home authorities we are as happily situated perhaps as some republican countries which have the privilege of electing their own Presidents or Governors. There are those who, like my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), think that we might grow our own Governors General, but while we are living under this constitution I think those who profess to enjoy the confidence of the people should observe the system under which they live, and should loyally carry out its provisions in letter as well as in spirit. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite did so on the occasion to which I refer, and I believe that if the correspondence is brought down it will show that they placed themselves in a wrong position. I believe, with the hon. member for Victoria, that it is a proper thing for the people of this country to consider whether or not we should have greater privileges in this way, and I think the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin), who I regret to see is not in his seat, would agree with me in any steps we might take in the direction of securing additional liberties of that kind. I do not think, however, that it is proper for the Government of this country to assume the right to appoint their Governor General as hon. gentlemen opposite did on the occasion to which the motion refers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no papers, and therefore we cannot bring any down.

Mr. KILLAM. Does the hon. gentleman deny that there was any correspondence on the subject with England, and that they were informed by the home Government that they could not take the course they proposed to take in relation to the appointment of an Administrator in His Excellency's absence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I do.

Motion negatived on division.

REPORT OF INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DECOSMOS, in moving for the report of the Inspector of Fisheries for British Columbia for the calendar year, 1881, said: I understand that such a report has been received at the Department here, and as it contains important recommendations bearing upon the fisheries of British Columbia, I think it very desirable that it should be laid before the House at an early day, and afterwards referred to the Printing Committee, so that it may be printed and distributed among the members. The hon. Finance Minister, the other day, alluded to the take of the fish of Canada as amounting to \$6,000,000. I have private information that the take of the fish and fur-bearing animals taken from the sea in British Columbia amounted last year to \$1,500,000. At the eastern side of the continent some \$80,000 or \$90,000, I believe, are spent for the protection of the fisheries and for fish-breeding purposes, while at the western end of the Dominion some \$2,000 or \$3,000 only were spent last year. Without going into the necessity for spending a larger sum of money, I will at this time simply move for the return.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. KILLAM.

SHIPPING DISASTERS IN INLAND WATERS.

Mr. SPROULE moved for a return showing the name and number of all boats or sailing vessels lost on Canadian inland waters, since 1870, with the value of property, the number of lives lost, and the known or supposed causes of the losses. He said: I move for this return in order to bring before the Government and the country the subject of the great annual loss of life and property in our inland waters, with the hope that something may be devised to prevent these disasters. Year after year some very extensive losses are chronicled. In 1879, the *Waubuno*, which ran from Collingwood to Parry Sound, was lost, with all the passengers and crew; and at the litigation which took place in connection with the loss of that steamer, the fact was brought out that she was allowed to go to sea in an entirely unseaworthy condition. If the Act regulating the appointment of inspectors requires the inspector to examine the hulls of boats as well as the engines, probably a large portion of the loss of life and property might be avoided. The Chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection, in his last report, says:

"The loss of the steamer *Waubuno* on the 22nd of November last year, with all on board, led to the recommendation by me of the appointment of an inspector of hulls of steam vessels, such person to have supervision over their seaworthiness as well as over their construction. The loss of two steamers this year under, as far as we can judge, like circumstances, and about the same time of the year, the one on the 6th and the other on the 24th of November, draws attention again to the importance of such an appointment."

The propellor *Zealand*, one of the vessels alluded to, was lost off Long Point, Lake Ontario, with all on board. The propellor *Simcoe* was lost on the 24th of November, off Manitoulin Island, Lake Huron, on her way from Chicago, and twelve of the crew were lost. On the 24th May, 1881, the steamer *Victoria* was lost on the Thames. Those persons who had the privilege of being at all acquainted with the nature of the circumstances and who examined the hull afterwards, came to the conclusion that the loss was very largely due to the imperfect way in which the boat was built; and if inspectors were appointed with instructions to examine the construction of boats, not only their boilers but also their hulls and every part of them, and have some superintendence over their loading, many calamities would be averted. It is a well-known fact that, although the boiler of the boat might be all that could be desired, the strength of the boat must be measured by its weakest plank. In many of the other cases we have this result, and that when an examination was made it was found that vessels had been allowed to go to sea without proper protection to life, in the shape of life-boats, and had the inspection gone far enough this fact would have been disclosed. In regard to the *Waubuno*, witnesses had declared that some of its planks were rotten. On the 24th November last, the steamer *Jane Millar* was lost while proceeding from Beaverton, on the Georgian Bay, towards Manitoulin. In that instance it appeared that the disaster occurred owing to the vessel being overloaded on the top deck, having a large amount of water in the hull, and no ballast in the bottom to steady the boat. If inspectors were instructed to see that vessels were properly loaded, a large saving of life and property would annually be secured. After obtaining the returns for which I ask in this motion—and I desire to obtain them at an early day—I propose to again bring the subject before the attention of the Government, and offer, if possible, some suggestions as to what remedies ought to be devised for the purpose of preventing these annual losses. When the Government's attention has been called two or three years successively to these disasters, it is high time some steps were taken to amend the Steamboat Act, so that inspectors should be appointed, not only to inspect the boilers of vessels, but their hulls likewise; that inspectors' visits should

be made more than once a year, as is the present practice; that a certificate should be given to vessels allowing them to run up to a certain time in the fall if they were properly equipped; that a fine be imposed on masters for allowing a larger number of persons on board than was consistent with safety; and that vessels, when leaving port, should be properly equipped with life-boats and life-saving apparatus.

Mr. LANE. In seconding this motion I desire to remind the House that last Session I moved that an investigation should be held into the loss of the steamer *Waubuno*. It was late in the Session when I proposed my resolution, and nothing was done. Of course an objection could be taken to my proposal, on the ground that it referred to a matter in litigation; at the same time I could not see any reason why an investigation should not be held, notwithstanding the fact that the matter was before the courts of law. This year we have had another disaster, occurring very near the port where I reside on Georgian Bay, in which about thirty lives were lost. Every year disasters, more or less numerous, take place on Georgian Bay, and I am fully satisfied that if the matter is properly looked into by the Government they may, to a large extent, be averted. It is the general impression that the *Jane Millar* was lost last fall simply because she was constructed on improper principles, added to which was the circumstance that she was overloaded. I think it is advisable that at all lake ports there should be a resident inspector, whose duty it should be to see that vessels are not allowed to leave port except in a proper condition, and not overloaded. I do not think there is any way of arriving at the true reason of these losses unless an investigation is held, under the auspices of the Government, by competent persons, who will take evidence and make a thorough enquiry. It certainly is a very serious matter that every year we should have reported unexpected losses—I say unexpected losses, because there is no reason why the *Jane Millar*, for example, should have been lost with twenty lives on board. The storm in which she went down was not one which would wreck a vessel which was in proper condition to withstand a moderate gale; she was not very far from land, not over a quarter of a mile, and we have it on the evidence that, unless there was something radically wrong, she would not have been lost. No doubt the Government will have observed the extent of the disasters that have occurred during the last two years; and to those particular instances to which attention has been called, will decide that it is necessary that the whole question shall be thoroughly examined, in order that life may be protected.

Mr. McCALLUM. Of course it is very desirable if the Steamboat Inspection Act can be improved, it should be improved; but I can tell the hon. mover of the resolution that we have a Steamboat Inspection Act, and I regret very much he has brought the subject before the House, particularly in regard to the *Waubuno*, because I believe that matter is yet before the court. I venture to assert, in contradiction to the hon. gentleman, that these very boats of which he speaks now were seaworthy. All the inspection possible—and it is desirable we should have all inspection possible—will not prevent such an occurrence taking place when a vessel goes out in a heavy sea, and gets caught in a gale or a heavy snow storm. Instead of the inspectors the master of the *Victoria* was to be blamed altogether, because the accident happened through his carelessness in allowing so many people to go on board. The boat had three times as many on board as she could safely carry. Had she the right number, she would have been safe enough. As to the accident to the *Jane Millar* at the time she was lost a very serious storm was raging. The hon. member suggested that the captain of a vessel should be fined when his vessel was not properly loaded. Was not the captain subject to a penalty right before his eyes? Was he

not the proper judge; and if he went out with an overloaded vessel, did he not risk his own life? Surely that was penalty enough. I hope the Government will appoint a proper shipbuilder to inspect hulls. These should be inspected as well as the machinery. It may be said the present inspectors have had the inspection of hulls under their control as well as the inspection of machinery, but the hon. gentleman may find fault and say the present inspectors are not qualified to inspect the hulls of vessels. I know that, on the contrary, they have succeeded very well so far. If the hon. gentleman will look at the other side of the water, he will find that many vessels have been lost there the past season—even new iron boats, through collisions and other accidents. It is very advisable we should have all the restrictions possible, and do all we can to save life, but the loss of life will take place as long as we have men engaged in that business.

Mr. KILLAM. I take this opportunity to ask the hon. Minister of Railways if any material change is proposed in the system of inspecting steamers in the Maritime Provinces engaged in ocean navigation as separate from the lakes, and whether the Bill for the inspection of inland steamers is in an advanced state of preparation, so that we may shortly expect it down?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend will wait until the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in his place, he will answer the question.

Mr. McCUAIG. I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Welland with reference to the inspection of vessels. The Government have to rely on the inspectors appointed by the insurance companies. I am aware the Government are considering the desirability of appointing some practical shipbuilder to inspect the hulls. I have no doubt the appointment of a man of skill will meet all the wants of the country in that direction.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION CANALS TENDERS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for copies, 1st, of all tenders for the enlargement of the Welland Canal, the amount of each tender moneyed out, the bill of approximate quantities on which tenders have been computed; the names of all persons to whom contracts have been awarded, specifying whether awarded under a call for tenders or not, and, if not, the bill of quantities and schedule of prices on which such contracts based; the date of each contract, the date when stipulated to be finished, and if finished, the date of its actual completion; the amount paid each contractor, and the bill of quantities on which such payments have been made; and bill of quantities of the work in each case remaining unfinished; the amount and nature of the securities deposited by each contractor; the names of contractors who have failed in carrying out their contracts; and amounts of securities and drawbacks forfeited by each contractor so failing. 2nd. Copies of all tenders for the enlargement of the Lachine Canal and the like information in every particular as is asked above for the enlargement of the Welland Canal. 3rd. Copies of all tenders for the enlargement of the Ottawa River canals, and improvement of its navigation, and the like information in every particular as is asked above for the enlargement of the Welland Canal. 4th. Copies of all tenders for the construction of the Culbute Canal, and the improvement of the navigation of the Upper Ottawa River, and the like information in every particular as is asked above for the enlargement of the Welland Canal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER suggested that, as the returns asked for would entail a vast amount of work, and therefore probably not be furnished until very late in the Session, the hon. gentleman should move instead for information in re-

gard to any specific point on which he desired to be enlightened.

Mr. COSTIGAN asked that the motion be allowed to stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

CLASSIFICATION OF IMPORTS.

Mr. BURPEE moved for a return of all circulars, memoranda and instructions issued by the Customs throughout the Dominion, relating to the interpretation of the several classes of goods imported and the duties to be levied thereon under the Tariff since March 14th, 1870, to 1st February, 1882.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite sure my hon. friend desires a volume of very interesting reading, therefore I suggest that the time for which we should have the returns and memoranda should cover from the 1st of January, 1874. I think the House will see, and those members who take the trouble to read those papers, that the course pursued in the endeavor to equalize the values at which goods should be imported, under the present Government, is much the same as that pursued by the late Government. There may be a slight difference, though I do not say it as a fact, the general impression being in favor of the present Government, as having taken measures to carry out its orders, which the late Government did not do.

Mr. MILLS. I believe that the regulations or policy of the present Government, in this matter, has proved extremely unsatisfactory. I know many cases in which gentlemen have crossed from this side of the line to the other, to purchase what they could not obtain in this country, and of their having entered those goods at the prices at which they were bought in the States. The Custom House officers detained them as under-valued. Affidavits have been produced to the effect that the parties from whom, and the parties by whom those goods were purchased, setting forth the price actually paid. But, notwithstanding the testimony of both parties, Ministers have sent an appraiser to fix a higher valuation and tax the importers for larger sums than the goods were actually worth, sometimes compelling them to pay a fine besides. I can give some cases in point: the owner of a nursery at Windsor, Mr. Dougall, was suffering from some blight or disease that had attacked his pear trees, and he purchased in the States the trees necessary to complete his assortment. He purchased them at the prices at which they are universally sold at such nurseries, but they were retained at the border until many were worthless, on the plea that many were entered at a lower price than their actual valuation. Another value was fixed on them, and when Mr. Dougall wrote to the Department of Customs, to inform them that the prices fixed on this side were not those at which they were sold in the United States, no regard was paid to him. He assured them that the new values attached were higher than those fixed by the nursery to purchasers on both sides of the lines; but no redress was obtained. Again, many of the farmers in the south-western peninsula have been making experiments in the production of sorghum and other varieties of sugar cane, and have imported pans and other utensils from the United States for the manufacture of sugar. But when these articles and machinery purchased were landed at the Custom House at Amherstberg, they also were detained, on the charge that the farmers had entered them at less than their actual value. I know several instances where the buyers have shown to the Department that the prices at which the articles were entered were those actually paid for them, and affidavits have been produced from the sellers in support of this statement. Yet the Minister of Customs sent an appraiser who fixed another value than that of the manufacturers, and not only charged the Customs tax on these im-

ports but fined the parties because they did not enter the machinery at other prices than those at which they were really purchased. I would like to know when a farmer goes from Canada to the United States to purchase machinery for the manufacture of sorghum, what other valuation can he attach than that which he has been called on to pay? How is he to know whether the prices given are too much or too little—how is he to fix a valuation except by the price which he actually paid. He comes forward and produces his invoice. He says: "This is the price I paid for this article." The hon. gentleman says you must pay more, and if he objects to that and the price is insisted upon he is subjected to a fine. This is the way the hon. gentleman seeks to encourage skilled agriculture in the western portion of the peninsula. I can tell him there is a great amount of dissatisfaction at the manner in which the law is being administered. I think I have with me the correspondence in some of these cases, and it is perfectly obvious that the spirit of the law, at all events, has been violated in the manner in which it is being administered, and serious vexations have been caused to a very considerable number of the agricultural population.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) prior to the House rising, made some complaints against the administration of the Customs Department, which are not justified, either in the law or in the practice of the administration of the affairs of that Department. The hon. gentleman said there was great dissatisfaction in the western section of the country as to the administration of the Customs Department with respect to the ruling of the value of articles for duty. He also informed the House that certain fruit trees, purchased at a nursery in the United States by a Mr. Dougall, in the county of Essex, had been refused entry at the prices he paid. I am not prepared to say that such is not the fact. On the contrary, I am aware that much difficulty has arisen in arriving at a fair and equitable valuation of that class of articles entered for duty. It arises from the fact that many of the nurseries in the United States sell to the Canadian purchasers at a much lower price than they sell to the purchasers in the United States. It may also be true that they produced affidavits to that effect, and these affidavits may have been quite correct as to the prices paid for the article. But the House will remember that the hon. member for Bothwell stated—and he was very particular in the manner in which he put the point before the House—that the trees were entered at the price at which the nurseries in the United States sell to all Canadian purchasers. That is a point we do not dispute. He also stated that, in the case of machinery, affidavits from the persons who purchased and who sold the machinery in the United States, were presented to the Customs Department, stating that the price at which the machinery was entered for duty was the price which they had paid for it in the United States. That I am not prepared to dispute either. In the administration of that part of the Department, and particularly in ruling the value of articles for duty, we find that these articles are sold in the United States to the Canadian purchaser, at a much lower rate than they are sold to the American purchaser; in other words, articles which are sold in the United States, and go into consumption in the United States, are sold at a higher rate than the same articles are sold to the Canadian purchaser when to be brought into this country. There are many reasons why that is done—particularly in the case of machinery and all the manufactures from iron and like material—in the United States. When they are sold by the

manufacturer for export they receive a drawback, which reduces the price at which the article is sold in the United States. In other cases they make special rates for the trade in Canada, in order to retain the market at the expense of manufacturers in this country. The argument of the hon. member for Bothwell is simply this: That all goods purchased in the United States, or any foreign market, should be entered for duty at the price at which they are purchased. The hon. gentleman ought to know, if he does not know, that such is not the law. He ought to know that in the consolidation of the Customs Act by his own colleague, the late hon. Minister of Customs, the case is particularly provided for, and I will read the two sections of the Act which provide the mode, and the manner, and the value at which all articles shall be entered for duty. I am sure if he had applied to his late hon. leader who sits beside him, and more particularly to his late colleague, who was Minister of Customs, for their opinion on that point, he never would have made the speech he did. If you turn to the 31st clause of the Customs Act, you will find it reads as follows:—

"In all cases where any duty is imposed on any goods imported into Canada, *ad valorem*, or according to the value of such goods, such value shall be understood to be the fair market value thereof in the principal markets of the country whence the same were exported directly to Canada; and every appraiser, and every collector, when acting as such, shall by all reasonable ways and means in his power, ascertain the fair market value, as aforesaid, of any goods to be appraised by him, and estimate and appraise the value for duty of such goods at the fair market value, as aforesaid."

The 32nd clause points out what shall be considered a fair market value, and reads thus:

"The fair market value for duty, of goods imported into Canada shall be the fair market value of such goods in the usual and ordinary acceptance of the term, at the usual and ordinary credit, and not the cash value of such goods, except in cases in which the article imported is by universal usage, considered and known to be a cash article, and so *bonâ fide* paid for in all transactions in relation to such article; and all invoices representing cash values, except in the special cases hereinabove referred to, shall be subject to such additions as to the Collector or appraiser of the port at which they are presented may appear just and reasonable, to bring up to the amount to the true and fair market value, as required by this section."

Now, the House will see that, by their own statute, for which he himself is responsible, as a member of the late Cabinet, the only course that could be pursued in honestly administering that law was to take every article which is imported into this country, and ascertain whether the price at which it is entered for duty is the fair market value in the country whence it was imported directly to Canada. Now, that is all that the appraiser, the collector, the Commissioner or myself—when it was referred to me—had ever ruled in matters of this kind. I know that difficulties have arisen in reference particularly to fruit trees, and in order to avoid that, the House will see, on referring to the proposed changes which are now before the House, that we have, after a good deal of consideration and after having compared the nurserymen's prices in the United States with the prices at which they have been entered for duty, we have concluded in future to charge a specific duty, and thereby do away with the difficulties that have arisen in the past in the entry of that class of goods at a very much lower rate than they are sold in the United States. The case with machinery is precisely the same. I will give you an illustration upon this point. I have had locomotive engines imported that have been entered at a price less the profit of manufacture, less the freight of bringing it to the frontier; and then declared to be the fair market value. Now, any one reading that statute would know that that is not the law, and that any Customs officer allowing an article to pass which was entered in that manner, would be doing a gross injustice to the honest man who was making a fair entry at a fair price. I thought it advisable that the House and the country, at least those who do not know what the law is, should have this matter placed fully and fairly before them. It is a

great difficulty—I frankly admit it is one of the greatest difficulties—in administering the Customs law, to regulate entries so that one importer shall not have an advantage over another importer; and had the law been strictly enforced from the time of its enactment, as it has been during the past three years, I do not think we should have had the difficulties that have arisen during the last two or three years in particular. Another difficulty that often presents itself is the fluctuation of the market: articles may rise in value to-day and fall again in the market in a month hence. Complaints often arise from the fact that an importer may have purchased at one time a particular article and given a certain price for it, while another importer may have purchased the same article two months afterwards and entered it, and may have paid 10, 20 or 25 per cent. higher. In other cases, the invoices are made out and the entry made at the prices which ruled in the market, perhaps two or three months previous to the time of the purchase. Then it becomes the duty of the appraiser at once to raise the face of the invoice, and if he can show that there has been an attempt at fraud, it becomes his duty not only to raise the value for duty, but to impose the penalty which is inflicted by the 46th section of the Act. I am surprised that a member of the late Government, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), should have risen in his place and taken exception to the administration of the law on points of this kind. If he had shown any case where the law had been administered in such a way to the injustice of the importer—that is, by reason of the value of the article being raised higher than that at which it is sold in the market in which it is purchased for home consumption—then he would have had a case against the Government; but in all the cases to which he referred—and I was particular to notice the language he used—he stated that the prices at which the goods were entered for duty were the prices at which they were sold to all Canadian purchasers. He did not say to all purchasers, or that they were sold at the same price to Canadian purchasers as to the purchasers in the United States for home consumption; but, on the contrary, that the prices at which they were entered were the prices at which they were sold by the American manufacturers or American nurserymen to the Canadian purchaser. I have shown that no other course could have been taken under the law than the one we have adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as well as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Barpee), is unfortunately absent.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not our fault.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I know it is not, nor is it the fault of the hon. gentlemen themselves, and the matter must come up again on some other motion when these hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity of replying to the remarks of the Minister of Customs. I may say, however, that I understood the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say distinctly that the price at which Mr. Dougall brought in his fruit trees was the ordinary price charged at the nursery in Michigan.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, to all Canadian purchasers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not so understand him.

Mr. BOWELL. I was careful to note his language, and those were the words he used.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not dispute the hon. gentleman's accuracy; but the hon. member for Bothwell said that he had papers showing the unjust working of the law in two or three cases, and particularly that in a certain case—after the goods were appraised at a higher price than that at which they were bought in the United States—the importer was obliged to pay not only the higher duties, but a fine besides.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the law.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think the law can be so interpreted.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will read the 46th section of his own Act, he will find that the appraisers had no option.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. gentleman will read the clause he will find it is not open to the construction he has placed upon it.

Mr. BOWELL. I will read it for the hon. gentleman, but before doing so I may tell him that, not only had the appraiser no option, but the Minister himself was equally restricted. This is the clause :

"If, in any case, the actual value for duty on any goods, as finally determined by the appraiser, or the Collector acting as such, or under the next preceding section—

Which, I may say, provides for the appointment of merchants as experts to value the goods if the importer should be dissatisfied with the ordinary appraisement. The clause proceeds :

"In the case therein mentioned by 20 per centum or more, the value for duty as it would appear by the invoice or bill of entry thereof, then, in addition to the duty otherwise payable on such goods when properly valued, there shall be levied and collected upon the same a further duty equal to one-half of the duty so payable on such goods when properly valued."

The last clause, I may say, was an amendment made by myself, but I shall read it as it was when the hon. gentleman passed it :

"And the value of any goods for duty shall never be appraised at less than the value for duty as it would appear by the invoice and bill of entry."

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not understand the clause as the hon. gentleman understands it. It seems to me that these proceedings have reference only to fraudulent entries.

Mr. BOWELL. No ; I do not think so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It would be impossible that an entry could be made at all, under the hon. gentleman's interpretation. The whole reading of the clause shows that the object is to prevent the making of fraudulent entries. In the cases referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell, the ordinary prices were paid and were objected to. The prices were appraised at a higher value, and not only was the duty paid at this higher value but a fine was imposed in addition. What possible protection would there be for the purchaser, however honest, against being fined, if the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the law was carried out? It is quite clear that any person could be fined at the discretion of the hon. gentleman or his appraisers.

Mr. BOWELL. The memoranda and orders from the Department, moved for by the late hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Burpee), will show that, not only did the hon. gentleman's Government so interpret the law, but that they carried out that interpretation precisely as I have carried it out. It is the interpretation placed upon it by the law officers of the Crown ; it is the interpretation which has prevailed since I have been in the Department, and it is the one which, as I am informed, was adopted by those who preceded me. The deductions which the hon. gentleman has drawn are not borne out by the facts. He says that no one can make an entry under my interpretation of the law ; all that any one has to do in order to avoid the penalties of the clause is to make the entry at the fair market value of the goods in the country where they were purchased. Supposing an importer goes to the State of New York and buys a bankrupt stock at 10 cents on the dollar, does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that these goods should be entered in the Customs of Canada at that rate?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Certainly not.

Mr. MACKENZIE.

Mr. BOWELL. The importer could say, and could swear that they were bought for that price, but no one in his senses will say that that should be their value for duty. What the Department would have to do would be to ascertain the fair market value of the goods in the country where they were purchased and have the entry made accordingly. If goods are purchased at a sacrifice sale, or if they are a free gift to the person who imports them, it would be absurd for him to expect in the one case that the duty would be collected on the price at which the goods were purchased, or that, in the other, they should be entered free of duty altogether.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Certainly.

Mr. BOWELL. Still that would be the case if the face of the invoice were taken to determine the value for duty. Supposing that a man is presented with a horse at Rochester and that his value in Rochester is \$100, that would be the price at which it would have to be entered for duty, if it appeared that its value exceeded by 20 per cent. or more the amount for which it was entered, the importer would be subject to the penalties of the law.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That would be a case proving exactly what I have said—that the clause applies to fraudulent entry. I am only speaking of cases in which the goods are bought in a legitimate way, and in a legitimate market, in which the purchaser goes into a wholesale house and buys at the regular trade price, and I do not think that in such cases he should be subject to the fine.

Mr. BOWELL. I do. The price should be the market value in the country where the goods are purchased.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman cited a number of cases in which the law was designed to prevent fraud ; but those referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell were those in which the purchases were made from the first parties at the regular market price and in the regular manner.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. ANGLIN, in moving for a return showing the number of locomotives and cars of all descriptions, and of snow ploughs and flangers, belonging to the Intercolonial Railroad, now undergoing repairs at the several workshops of the Intercolonial Railroad or elsewhere, and the number of locomotives, cars of all descriptions, flangers and snow ploughs belonging to the Intercolonial Railroad awaiting repairs in any workshops or at any station of Intercolonial Railroad, or elsewhere, said:—I thought of asking for a return to cover all rolling stock on the Intercolonial requiring repair, but I thought that would be rather unreasonable. My impression is that a very large portion of the cars and other rolling stock now actually in use on the Intercolonial requires considerable repairs. Last year we found no less than 21 locomotives lying idle waiting for repairs, in workshops and other places, at the time the hon. Minister stated he found it necessary to hire locomotives—of a very inferior description, I believe—of a company in order to do the additional work imposed on the rolling stock by taking over the Riviere du Loup Branch. This year the hon. Minister has been fortunate in not having had very many severe snow storms, and the rolling stock should be in a very much better condition. It has had, however, another year's wear and tear, and I am strongly of the impression, notwithstanding the very favorable report on this point given in general terms by the Superintendent and other officials of the road, that the rolling stock has suffered very much in the meantime, and very much of it is in a very bad condition. The return will give some insight into the actual condition of the rolling stock, and I am of

the opinion that some such information should appear in the annual report so that it might not be necessary for any hon. member to move for it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no objection to the adoption of this motion, but I take objection very strongly to the hon. gentleman giving impressions without having any data on which to found them. No hon. gentleman has a right to abuse his privilege as a member of this House, to call in question the accuracy of the statements of independent and impartial officers, who, in the discharge of their duty, holding high and responsible and important positions, place their signatures deliberately to statements laid on the Table of the House. Until some satisfactory ground is found for challenging the accuracy of the statements of officers who have enjoyed the confidence of the late, as well as the present Government, it is most improper, I think, for any hon. member to state that, in his opinion, the reports to which the officers have appended their names, are false, for it amounts to that. The hon. gentleman ought not to make such a statement without possessing some data to offer to the House. Does he suppose that a railway employing 100 locomotives and a corresponding number of cars for its operations, should not at all times have a very large number in shops for repairs? If the hon. gentleman is under this impression, he will find, by enquiry from any railway corporation or authorities, that it is utterly impossible to operate a great line of railway, with so large a number of engines and amount of rolling stock, without constantly having in the shops for repair a great number of locomotives and cars. The question is, whether the rolling stock of the Intercolonial locomotives and cars are kept in an efficient condition—as to whether they are good. You have charged to capital account a certain number of locomotives and a certain number of cars; and what the road is bound to do is to keep that number of locomotives and cars in a thoroughly efficient condition. If a locomotive is destroyed it must be replaced, and the cars must be kept good, and in a thoroughly efficient condition, in order to present a fair, honest, and just statement to the House. In connection with the operation of the Intercolonial, I have taken all pains and trouble that a Minister can take who must largely depend upon reports of the officers in his Department for correct information, and I have personally visited every shop, examined every locomotive, and personally gone over the road, and so thus verified by personal observation the accuracy of official statements. I do think, under these circumstances, hon. gentlemen ought not to venture to challenge the accuracy of the officers of the Government in the mode in which that hon. gentleman has done. The hon. gentleman says he is aware there have been very few snowstorms. Here that has been the case, but the hon. gentleman should know that in no year since 1872 have the snowstorms in the Maritime Provinces been so intense, and created so much difficulty in working the Intercolonial Railroad. Therefore, the hon. gentleman has a rather incorrect foundation for the return he asks for; but I shall have much pleasure in bringing it down, and challenge the closest scrutiny into the statement made regarding the rolling stock.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister says my hon. friend from Gloucester abuses his privileges as a member, in asking questions of this kind. Surely, the hon. Minister abuses his position when he makes such a charge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman should not put words into my mouth that I never uttered. I found no fault with the hon. gentleman for asking for the return. It is a perfectly proper return to move for. But, in moving for it, he ought not to say that, in his judgment, the rolling stock is not in the condition in which it is reported to be by the officers of the Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has a right to say he has reason to believe—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He ought to give grounds for his statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is because the hon. gentleman has information on that subject that he makes the motion. The hon. Minister forgets that, when on this side, he spent half his time doing the same thing year after year and day after day, even to the extent of abusing public servants by name. Now, it seems no one must open his mouth to assert the contrary of what any engineer or officer may state over his signature. I saw a return this afternoon signed by a departmental officer, which I have no doubt is wrong, and I will in due time challenge the correctness of his statement. If we were to adopt the hon. Minister's view of our public duty, we might as well go home, having no right to make any enquiries unless with positive evidence to back them up. I refuse to be bound by such a rule. I shall always endeavor to protect public officers but not to the length of requiring every hon. member to believe every statement made by a subordinate of the Government.

Mr. PLUMB. No doubt the House will feel gratified to find the hon. member for Lambton, in his position of deputy leader of the Opposition, assume again the same old tone with which we are all acquainted. No doubt the hon. gentleman's interposition was needed to protect his hon. friend from Gloucester. I noticed that hon. gentleman, in moving for his return, made statements calculated to damage the Intercolonial Railway with reference to its management. The hon. gentleman said that, according to his information, there were twenty locomotives disabled.

Mr. ANGLIN. I did not say that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that last year there twenty-one disabled.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman, from the manner in which he spoke, intended to throw discredit on the management as regarded the rolling stock. It is well known that, under the present management, the road has been made a success, and is no longer a burden on the country, which it was fated to be so long when under the management of hon. gentlemen opposite; and that they are galled by the contrast is evident by the wry faces they are compelled to make every time this question comes up.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am sure we are all obliged to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, for the exceeding kindness with which he came to the help of the hon. Minister of Railways, who, I thought, was quite able to take care of himself. I did not say I am aware there are now twenty-one locomotives waiting repairs. What I said was, that last year, when I moved for a return similar to this, that return showed that out of 100 locomotives, twenty-one were actually in the repair shops, and many of those actually at work ought also to have been in the shops, being entirely unfit for work. To that statement many hon. gentlemen here will bear testimony. The evidence brought out by that return last year is in itself sufficient justification for what I have said on this occasion; for then, as to-day, the rolling stock was reported in excellent condition. I do not accuse the officials of falsehood; that is a very strong expression. They may have their own ideas as to the efficient and proper condition of the rolling stock, but their ideas are not mine nor, I think, are they those of the majority of right thinking men. I am not satisfied with the very meagre report submitted this year, and believe, from the experience of last year, that there are strong grounds for questioning its accuracy. The hon. Minister seems to think that before I am prepared to make any such statement, I should bring evidence to support it. Let me just mention one or two facts in my county with

reference to the rolling stock of that road. Last winter, I had occasion to go to Halifax, and chose to go by night, feeling satisfied that I could get a Pullman. But no Pullman was to be had, and I had to take an ordinary first-class passenger car. During the night it was intensely cold, and towards morning, after we left Moncton, all of the passengers, some eighteen or twenty, woke up shuddering with the cold. We were all extremely cold, though the brakeman did put on more fire; indeed, I think it was creditable to this man that he did his very best to warm the car, though utterly in vain. By-and-bye, notwithstanding all the efforts made to maintain something like comfort, it was found impossible to keep us warm, any more than if the car were made of mere brown paper. In this wretched and most uncomfortable condition passengers continued all night, though unable to discover where the real cause of the difficulty lay. Towards morning, however, I found the whole secret of our trouble and our suffering. The floor had been patched, on the economical principle of the Minister of Railways, in such a manner that the old and new boards did not meet, leaving wide open spaces, through which the cold night air, then at the point of zero, was freely rushing. It was thus easily seen how absolutely impossible it was to warm the car. I could easily have found two parties able to corroborate the assertions made on this subject. There is abundant evidence that the rolling stock is running in the opposite of first-class condition. I am satisfied the return will show, on its very face, that this rolling stock is not what it should be. The hon. gentleman said, some time ago, that he told me I was very much mistaken as to the state of the road and rolling stock, that in a railroad of several hundred miles, with many hundred cars, there must be always a certain number of engines and cars, more or less worn down. He did not need to give me any such information, for every one knows that such a state of things is to be expected, but when 49 locomotives out of 110, and a large number of cars appear very much used up, there is great reason to question the style of the management of that railway. Then the hon. member tells me we have had most severe snowstorms this winter. Did he say how many, or in what places they occurred? The fact is that until little over three weeks ago, we have had no snow along that railroad, and latterly but a few snow storms, some of them subsequent to the date of this notice. Take it all in all as regards the railroad this winter the weather has been the most favorable known since the Government undertook the management of the road. I deny that the railroad is in an admirable condition; and, without accusing them of wilful mis-statements, I believe they have not correctly represented the condition of the rolling stock and road bed. I am quite satisfied that it will be admitted my statements have been justified, in moving for this return, immediately on its production.

Motion agreed to.

THE CORVETTE *CHARYBDIS*.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving for copies of all correspondence and reports relating to the *Charybdis*, and a detailed statement of all expenditure incurred in connection with said vessel; also a statement in detail of the number of men employed thereon since said vessel arrived in Canada, and the capacity in which each man was or is employed, the amount paid to each; also a detailed statement of any damages done by said vessel since the 1st May, 1881, and of any claims preferred for such damages, said: On turning to the Sessional Papers of 1881, there will be found a voluminous correspondence between the Canadian and Imperial Governments, between the Canadian Government and the Lords of the Admiralty, England, upon the subject of the acquisition of this vessel. I commend the perusal of this correspondence to those who take an interest in literature of this kind. They will find it exceedingly valuable and instruc-

Mr. ANGLIN.

tive. I do not know—the papers are not very clear on the subject—where the idea arose of the purchase or acquisition of the *Charybdis*. I am not quite sure—the papers throw very little light on the subject—where the flash of genius originated that suggested the propriety of the acquisition of this valuable piece of property now in the possession, I assume, of the Canadian Government—whether, with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is occasionally struck with “sudden flashes of genius” or with our Canadian High Lords of the Admiralty—I know not. The papers are somewhat silent on the subject; but I gather from a communication dated the 8th of October, 1880, addressed by a person in the service of Her Majesty to the Lords of the Admiralty, that the idea of the acquisition of this valuable piece of property must have originated on this side of the water, because I find in that communication that the Dominion Government desired to have the vessel handed over to them, all standing, and that a few days afterwards a communication was addressed by the Canadian Government to the Imperial Government, in which it is stated: “The Dominion Government, while expressing their gratitude (I suppose their well-founded gratitude) for the munificent gift they were about to receive from the Imperial Government, enquire “whether the guns on board will be transferred with the vessel itself.” That struck me, upon reading that correspondence, as exhibiting an extraordinary amount of ingratitude. They were to get a vessel, all standing, and furnished with ammunition and provisions, and yet they coolly suggest the propriety of the Imperial Government giving them something more. They wanted the armaments on board to be included in the valuable gift. The correspondence goes on, a number of letters pass between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian Government and the Lords of the Admiralty, with respect to the transference of this vessel to the Canadian Government; and on the 25th October, 1880, our Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James, telegraphs thus to the Canadian Government:

“The Admiralty say that the *Charybdis* has arrived at Davenport, and they are ready to transfer the ship, and ask you to send an agent to receive her.”

So far the negotiations appear to have progressed satisfactorily, and I find the Minister of War in Canada, in response to this telegram, under date 26th October, 1880, thus telegraphs back:

“Make arrangements with the Admiralty with regard to some agent being sent from Canada to receive the *Charybdis* and take charge of her, and say that Captain Scott of our service would be sent to bring her over.”

You see, Sir, that Capt. Scott of our service—of our naval service, I suppose—had been instructed by the Canadian Government to go over to England and take possession of this vessel of war, and a telegram was sent from our Minister of War here to the Imperial Government, notifying them of that fact. Well, subsequently, and before the property was transferred to us, there was a good deal of haggling—I think, very unworthy of hon. gentlemen opposite—who appear to have been so grateful for the great gift that the Imperial Government had conferred upon them. There was a good deal of haggling as to whether the guns of the vessel should pass with the vessel itself, and whether the provisions, the salt pork, and the meat, and the sea biscuit, and a large quantity of provisions that she had brought back from her seven and a-half years’ cruise in the Chinese seas, and which was just the thing to feed our sailors upon—as to whether those provisions should be handed over to the Canadian Government, and also as to whether the Canadian Government was to undertake the repairs of this vessel. However, the haggling ended peaceably, I am glad to say, and the Imperial authorities then decided that this vessel should be transferred to the Canadian Government; with her fittings and fixtures and

unconsumable stores. I do not know whether that means stores that could not be consumed or stores that had not been consumed; I apprehend it meant stores that could not be consumed, and we were to get all that. Our Government agreed to accept this valuable acquisition upon these liberal terms, and a communication was sent to the Government stating:

"The ship will be delivered to you all standing as she came from the sea, and you may probably find in her a quantity of coal, salt meat and other provisions."

This was addressed by our Minister of Marine to Capt. Scott of "our service." Now, Sir, that was very satisfactory so far; but, unfortunately, when Capt. Scott made the investigation, it was found there was no salt meat, no provision and no coal. So anxious were our friends on the other side to acquire this property and become possessed of a vessel of war, that they were willing to take the property without the usual preliminary investigation as to whether the vessel was fit for the service for which she was intended. I suppose, acting upon the principle that you should never look a gift horse in the mouth, our Minister of Marine at once jumped at the conclusion that this was an exceedingly favorable offer, and he, on the 22nd November, 1880, directs our Ambassador to thank the Imperial Government for this valuable gift. Why, Sir, a valuable gift; they knew nothing about it at the time, had never inspected her, had never seen her, and knew nothing about her fitness for the service for which she was intended; they had no idea whether she was properly equipped or not. Yet they appear to have been delighted, in ecstasies, intoxicated with joy at the very idea of the acquisition of this valuable man-of-war. Sir, it looked to me very much as if they were about as well pleased and tickled with the gift as the King of Siam is, as you know, Mr. Speaker, when he becomes the fortunate donee of a white elephant. You know he rejoices with exceeding great joy. The whole court becomes intoxicated with gladness. The moment the presentation is made, the dancing girls are brought in and the tom-toms are set to work to discourse music to the assembled multitude. So with our friends on the other side; they appear to have been so delighted, so full of ecstasy, so enchanted with this acquisition, that they thought it was not worth while, or proper, or prudent, to make any enquiries as to the condition of the vessel. But permit me to remind you that the King of Siam, when he acquires the valuable gift of a white elephant does one thing that I am going to recommend the gentlemen opposite to do in this case. You know, Sir, being thoroughly conversant with the history of that noted country, and its forms and ceremonies, that when the king becomes possessed of this white elephant he at once erects a pavillion for the animal, and then he sends out all over the country; and, if possible, secures a white monkey. The white monkey is put in the pavillion for the purpose of keeping off evil spirits. I say here to our Canadian High Admiral, get a white monkey and send him down to the harbor of St. John to prevent the *Charybdis* from dying of dry rot. Now, after having done all this, after having this property partially transferred to them, our hon. friends on the other side, especially the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, through his representative on the other side of the water, does what he ought to have done at the outset, he makes enquiries as to the character of the vessel; he goes on board and inspects her, and what is the result of that investigation? Now, I ask the hon. the Minister of War sitting opposite me, to take up this interesting correspondence that, perhaps, in the multiplicity of the business that engages his attention from morning till night, he has had no opportunity to examine. I ask him to take up the report of the correspondence in the Sessional Papers of 1881, and see exactly the character of this valuable acquisition with which the Cana-

dian Government and people are saddled—not, I hope, for all time to come. In going over that correspondence I find this state of facts existing with respect to that vessel. This vessel of war, recollect, that was going to be a terror to the Queen's enemies, and of dread, I fear to the Queen's subjects, this magnificent vessel of war that was going to astonish the Canadian natives, let us hear the description given of it in the correspondence to which I briefly alluded. First, she is described as an old type of corvette. Seamen will know what that means. She was said to have been seven and a-half years in the Chinese seas, not much improved, one would naturally imagine, by that service. She was twenty years old, far past the bloom of maidenhood, and was verging upon the sear and yellow leaf. She was of a type, say the Lords of the Admiralty, that was not worth the cost of repairing, so that it was necessary to dry dock her, as the boilers would not last two years. It turned out that the boilers would not last two days, that she was utterly unfit for any service when the inspection was made, that she had no provisions nor coal on board, and that it was necessary to buy a heavy anchor for safety in the harbor of St. John, where they were taking her to. I do not know whether they got the heavy anchor—I believe they did from the accounts submitted to the House. I am told that the heavy anchor did not save the people of St. John from this terrible monster; that her speed under steam at high pressure was seven knots per hour; that it required 180 men to work her. When testing the boilers it was discovered that they were in a very unsatisfactory condition, in fact that they were very old and useless. And on the 2nd of December, 1880, it was stated that the estimated cost of the repairs of the vessel amounted to £2,000 sterling. That was the kind of vessel we got, and that is the information I got here from the papers submitted last year. Having made this inspection, and having made some improvements, they spent nearly, if not altogether, £2,000 upon this vessel, when another difficulty arose. It became a question among the high authorities sent to England whether the vessel could cross the ocean at all or not. It was quite clear, from the report we have heard, that it would not be safe for her to undertake a sea voyage in the winter. Whether she should take the southerly or northerly route was not certain; a council of war was held, and the conclusion arrived at was that at one season of the year was the voyage safe, and the captain decided that he should leave for the other side of the Atlantic in April, and then take a northerly course; and then it was said that it might be possible to accomplish the voyage in forty days. Even after the inspection was made by himself, and after a council of war was held, Capt. Scott decided that the vessel was not quite satisfactory. His life was not insured, nor could he get seamen whose lives were insured, he did not feel safe in launching his precious body on board of this valuable corvette even in April, and with the wisdom which characterized him—and which, I suppose, generally characterizes seamen—he concluded that he would have a further inspection. He calls in an expert, Mr. Barber, who reports to him on the 5th January, 1881. The substance of his report appears in the following letter:—"Mr. Barber, as you will see, has made a report condemning the boiler. He says that in bad weather we might be caught in a lee shore, and then to have poor boilers would cost us our lives. "Such arguments," says Capt. Scott, "are unanswerable;" and I should say they were. With bad boilers, with only a pressure of ten pounds on the safety valve, with a tub of a vessel that was twenty years old, seven years of which were spent in the Chinese seas, a vessel that was not well equipped, I agree with Capt. Scott that the "arguments were unanswerable"—and the captain acted on the belief that the arguments were unanswerable. What does he do further? He goes again with Mr. Barber on the vessel,

Another examination is made of the boilers. Scott says further the ship is a handsome corvette, but the boilers are fearful. She is a thing of beauty, but not a joy for ever. She is a thing of beauty, but not a thing of safety, so far as Capt. Scott was concerned. The boilers were fearful, he says, and, of course, he would not risk his valuable life on board such a vessel. However, after spending this large sum of money on this beautiful corvette, he finally sailed across the stormy ocean and landed in the port of St. John. But the trouble did not end there. In fact, it was merely beginning. There was trouble on the other side of the water, there was trouble on the water, and there was a great deal more trouble when the boat arrived in St. John. The vessel was moored in that beautiful harbor, amid the shipping of St. John, but the old thing would not stay moored. True to her instincts, she was bound to engage in the strife, and, like the war-horse, she smelt the battle from afar. She would not stay moored; she would not obey her commander, she would not obey the commands of the Lord High Admiral. She broke loose, had a serious commission round the harbor of St. John, to the terror and consternation of the peaceful citizens of that place and of the shipping within the harbor. How much damage this terror of the ocean committed upon the Queen's enemies I know not; how much damage this terrible monster did upon Her Majesty's subjects, I know not; how many lives were lost by the freaks of this wonderful vessel, which would not stay moored, I know not; but I am told that at least two peaceful citizens of St. John lost their lives in attempting to get aboard her, for the gang plank, like the rest of the old tub, was rotten, and they broke through and were drowned. What damage she committed in the harbor of St. John I cannot say, but suppose when the returns are brought down, we will have ample information on that interesting and important subject. But there is a grim side to this question. It is ridiculous and absurd to find our Government getting, even as a gift, a vessel which could serve no useful purpose, and was good for nothing; but the matter, as I said before, has a serious as well as an absurd side. The Prime Minister, in discussing an item in the Estimates last year, said that she might be used for a training ship, or to defend the approaches to the St. John's harbor. She has not been used as a training ship; and if you read the papers of St. John, Mr. Speaker, as I have no doubt you do, you will have noticed that she has not been a source of safety to the people of that city or the shipping of that harbor. On the 16th of March, 1881, the Prime Minister stated that this vessel cost about £400 stg., Why, Sir, four months before that utterance was made, viz., on the 2nd of November previous, we find that £1,000 sterling had been placed to the credit of Capt. Scott, at the Bank of Montreal in London, for the purpose of repairing her, that Capt. Scott wanted another thousand, and that this would not be enough to put her in sufficient repair to cross the ocean. On reference to the Public Accounts of last year I find an item of \$9,040.37, expended on this beautiful corvette, whose boilers were dangerous to the lives of those on board her; and find in the Supplementary Estimates of this year that hon. gentlemen opposite ask a vote of \$12,000 more. How much more has been expended on her, and how it has been expended, no man in the House knows, nor will we know, until the detailed accounts come down. But the fact remains that upon this beautiful but utterly useless vessel we have so far spent over \$20,000. How much more we have to pay no mortal man can tell. It is absurd that we should have acquired a vessel of that kind at all, and that such an enormous sum of money should be expended in connection with her. I am told that there is no knowing the day or the hour when she may break away from her moorings and seriously endanger the property and lives of the people of St. John. I advise the Government to send

Mr. CAMERON (HURON).

her back to England, as she is of no use to the people of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

MALT AND MALT LIQUORS.

Mr. ORTON, in moving for a return of the various modes which have been hitherto adopted by Canada for collecting duties from malt and malt liquors, and also for any information which may be in possession of the Government in reference to the mode in vogue for collecting such Excise duties in the United States and Great Britain, said: The question which this motion involves has two aspects—one, the agricultural, and the other in connection with the interest of those engaged in brewing malt liquors. I had the honor the other day of presenting a petition signed by the whole County Council of Wellington—one of the largest agricultural counties in Ontario—and by a very large number of influential agriculturists, praying that the duty be removed from malt and placed on malt liquors, as is done in the United States. Experience in Great Britain and other countries has shown that animals can be fattened much more rapidly and successfully with grain when malted than when in an unmalted condition. It is well known to medical men that extract of malt is highly nutritious, in fact, it is used for debilitated constitutions when other foods cannot be assimilated. The same principle has been applied to the feeding of cattle, and as this House is aware, an agitation for many years in England in favor of the abolition of the duty on malt and the placing of the duty on malt liquors, has at last resulted in the adoption of that principle, to the great benefit of the agriculturists of that country. Grain when malted is in fact partially digested, so that less grain in that condition is required for feeding cattle than when it is in the ordinary state; and the agriculturists in my county, who are largely engaged in fattening cattle for the foreign market, desire to be placed on an equal footing with the agriculturists of the United States and Great Britain. This is the agricultural view of the question. The other view has reference to those engaged in the manufacture of malt liquors. The present mode of collecting the duties is both very expensive and very annoying. If the duty was collected by a stamp duty on malt liquors, a very large expenditure would be saved. I believe the mode adopted in the United States is to issue stamps of different values according to the size of the package; the stamp is placed on the hole of the barrel, so that when the malt liquor is used, the stamp is erased. That plan is very simple, and under it the duty would be much more easily and cheaply collected than under the present mode. The obstruction to business which results from the present mode is very serious. The maltsters of Canada are a large body, and they have a large amount of capital invested in malting for exportation to the United States, and it is important that this industry should be encouraged in this country, as there are many lands which will grow barley in Canada, but which are not fitted for other classes of grain. Barley of a superior quality than is grown in the United States is produced in Canada, and it is important we should have the manufacturing of that barley into malt, conducted in our own country, as far as possible. By encouraging that business a large amount of employment is given to the people, and money expended is now retained in our own country. I will give the House one instance coming within my own knowledge, to show the annoyance and expense involved to the manufacturer of malt by the present arrangement. Last autumn a maltster, in my section of the country, who was engaged in producing malt for export as well as for his own use, had sold a large quantity for exportation, when he found he had arrived nearly at the end of the quantity in the bonded warehouse, there were 400

or 500 bushels unfit either for exportation or manufacturing into malt liquors. He had newly-spread malt ready to place on the kiln, and he desired to obtain information to re-dry those 400 bushels so that he would be able to sell them, as they had only been partially damaged with having become damp. A permit was telegraphed for to the Collector of Customs, but he did not happen to be at home. In the meantime the malt was ready to be placed in the kiln, and the brewer and maltster went to the Excise officer and asked him to make a bonded warehouse of the kiln—they adjoined each other—and he, after great persuasion, agreed to do so, locked up the kiln, allowed the malt to be re-dried and placed in the bonded warehouse. By this means 400 bushels of malt were saved and duties were afterwards paid on them to the Government. Had that not been done this quantity of malt would have been destroyed, great loss would have occurred to the maltster, and a loss of revenue would have accrued to the Government. But that was not the end of the matter. The Excise officer was not allowed any discretion, and in consequence of the irregularity in not receiving a permit owing to the Collector being absent from home—it was never attempted to be shown there was the slightest possibility of any fraud being committed—he was suspended. This is only one of a number of instances daily occurring to those engaged in this business in Canada day after day; they have fifteen or twenty men remaining idle until the Excise officer chooses to come to his post. By a change in the regulations much labor, expense and annoyance will be saved to those engaged in the business, and I believe the Government will derive a very much larger revenue from that source than at present. There is not a brewer in Canada who will not be willing to have as large a penalty, as possible, imposed rather than be subject to the delay, loss and annoyance occurring under the present regulations. If it were thought proper by Parliament to make a change it would be found that we would derive a larger revenue and effect a great saving, not only to the large class of brewers, but also to those engaged in agriculture especially in exporting barley to foreign markets.

Mr. KRANTZ. I hardly endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Centre Wellington in respect to the duties on malt. I believe it would be a great advantage to the agriculturists of this country if they could malt barley, and such other grains as are not fitted to be malted for brewing purposes. In the Old World, in Germany, from which I come, I know that on large farms the malting of grain is carried on to a large extent for the purpose not only of fattening cattle, but also for producing milk wholesome, and there is no better food for producing a plentiful supply of milk than barley malt. Not only from the farmers' point of view is it advantageous that the duty should be removed from malt and placed on malt liquor, but it is in the interests of the manufacturers of malt liquors—in the interests of the brewers. The present mode of collecting the revenue from beer is most inconvenient and annoying to the manufacturer, and I believe a larger amount of revenue at less cost will be obtained by taking the duty off malt and placing it on malt liquor in the shape of stamp duty, as is done in the United States. The production of beer is very large in the United States, and the revenue derived therefrom is enormous, and the mode of collecting the revenue is quite applicable to Canada. I hope the Government will take the matter into consideration at their earliest convenience and seek to apply a better system of collecting duty than that which now prevails.

Motion agreed to.

POSTAL COMMUNICATION WITH THE COUNTY OF SAGUENAY.

Mr. CIMON, in moving for copies of all petitions and correspondence addressed to the Government concerning postal

communication on that part of the north shore of the St. Lawrence comprised in the county of Saguenay, said: In presenting this motion I wish, in a few words, to call the attention of the Government to the importance of the county of Saguenay, which is one of the two counties I represent. This county comprises the whole of the north shore of the St. Lawrence from the Saguenay to the eastern extremity of the Province of Quebec, at Blanc Sablon, or a length of 600 miles, including, moreover, the Island of Anticosti. The resident population of this coast and of the Island of Anticosti numbers 8,879 souls; to this must be added 3,000 to 4,000 souls more, who spend their time there in fishing when navigation is open, thus giving a population, a total population, of about 12,000 souls, or a larger population than the respective population of the counties of Chambly, Laprairie, Napierville, Soulanges, Vaudreuil, Three Rivers, and Laval. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to give you an idea of the wealth of the fisheries of the county of Saguenay, I beg leave to refer you to a Blue-book entitled "A Statement of the Fisheries for the year 1880," which is an official Report of the Government, and which shows that they represent an annual value of \$1,467,435.50 for the year 1880, as per following details:—

77½ brls. pickled salmon at \$12.00.....	\$	9,270 00
148,155 lbs. fresh salmon, packed in ice, at 10c		14,815 50
275,125 cwt. codfish (summer fishing) at \$4 00		1,100,580 00
14,589 cwt. codfish (autumn fishing) at \$4 00		58,356 00
193 brs. flounders at \$6 00		1,158 00
146 brs. haddock at \$6.00		876 00
5,493 brs. herring at \$5.00		27,465 00
516 brs. mackerel at \$5.00		2,730 00
58 brs. trout at \$3 00		464 00
10 brs. sardines at \$3.00		30 00
10½ brs. cod tongues and sounds at \$9.00		94 50
13 brs. eels at \$7.00		91 00
26,198 sealskins at \$1.00		26,198 00
111,216 galls. seal oil at 50c		55,608 00
5,460 galls. whale oil at 40c		2,160 00
166 galls. porpoise oil at 50c		83 00
237,269 cod liver oil.....		118,634 50
11,000 lbs. of lobster		1,650 00
4,401 lbs. fish for local consumption at \$4		17,604 00
29,568 brs. fish used for manure and bait		29,568 00
Total for 1880	\$1,467,435 50	

The total annual value of the fisheries of that division of the Gulf comprising the counties of Saguenay, Gaspé and Bonaventure, is \$2,357,220.20; and since the county of Saguenay is represented in that amount by \$1,467,435.50, it must be conceded that its fisheries are more extensive and more important than those of the whole of Gaspesia, including the Magdalen Islands. But more remains to be told. The county has engaged in the fisheries: 67 vessels, representing a tonnage of 2,235 tons, a value of \$64,220, and employing 315 hands; 1,067 fishing vessels, valued at \$41,457; 694 flat-bottomed boats, valued at \$9,068; 2,174 fishermen and 1,098 shoremen; 381 salmon nets, representing 33,393 yards of netting, and valued at \$14,365; 29 cod seines, representing 4,980 yards of netting, and valued at \$5,798; 24 herring seines, representing 13,385 yards of netting, and valued at \$6,988. I must add that the Government derives annually, from the letting of various rivers in the county of Saguenay, the sum of \$5,561, and from salmon-fishing licenses a further sum of \$636. So much for the fisheries. A large lumber business is also done on that part of the north shore, which is estimated annually at at least \$1,000,000. Well, notwithstanding the importance of the county of Saguenay, what has the various Governments done for it in the matter of public improvements? I dare not say, so little has it been. I must, nevertheless, congratulate the hon. Minister of Public Works for causing a telegraph line to be constructed on that

part of the North Shore, for it will be of great service to that part of the country. But with that one exception, nothing has been done; there is neither railway, nor quay, nor any kind of public work. But, it will be said, the Government have surely established a rapid and easy postal service? Nothing of the kind. The hon. Postmaster General has taken good care not to think of the north shore and of that industrious and important population. Postal communication is in a most primitive state in these localities. It is by the merest accident that a mail is sent thither overland once a month, very often only every two or three months. I claim that a little more attention should be shown to the north shore, which contributes every year several hundreds of thousands of dollars to the public Treasury. We ask for a subsidy of \$4,000 a year—but a paltry sum you will perceive—which will enable the Government to have the mails transported fortnightly by a steamer which will stop at all points on the North Shore where there is a post office. By means of this subsidy the Government will, moreover, contribute towards establishing a regular line of steamers plying fortnightly between Quebec and Esquimaux Point, stopping where required, thus affording rapid and easy transit to the population of the county of Saguenay, and contributing to the rapid development of those localities. The owners of these steamers have sent in offers concerning this to the hon. Postmaster General. All the residents of the North Shore have signed and sent to the Government petitions to that effect, and these petitions are endorsed by the merchants and Board of Trade of Quebec. Why should not the Government of Canada do for the North Shore that which the Government of Newfoundland has done for the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador? I hold in my hand a public notice of the Postmaster General of Newfoundland, showing that he despatches a special steamer to carry and distribute the mails on the whole of the Newfoundland and Labrador coasts, wherever there are fishermen, thus giving fishermen an easy method of transport. Here is this notice:

“ROUTE OF THE LABRADOR MAIL STEAMER, 1880.”

“The Northern Coastal Steamer will connect with this Service at Battle Harbor.

“Labrador Steamer to leave St. John's on the 10th July, call at Harbor Grace—thence to Salmon River, thence to Blanc Sablon, Forteau, L'Anse-au-Loup, Red Bay, Chateau, Henley, Chimney Tickle, Cape Charles, and Battle Harbor.

“Proceeding North—From Battle Harbor to Spear Harbor, Francis Harbor Bight, Square Islands, Dead Island, Venison Island, Punch Bowl, Bateaux, Indian Tickle, Grady, and then go direct to Indian Harbor, Brig Harbor, Mannoek's Island, Hack, and Cape Harrigan.

“Returning South—Calling at Hopedale, Turnavik, Adnavick, Long Tickle, Rogers Harbor, Ragged Islands, Jigger Tickle, Cape Harrison, Sleigh Tickle, Holton, Emely Harbor, White Bears, Smokey Tickle, Indian Harbor, Rigoulette, Pack's Harbor and independent, two last places alternately.

Black and Long Islands and South-East Cove, alternately.

Grady,

Indian Tickle.

Bateaux and Domino, alternately.

Punch Bowl:

Seal Islands and Comfort Bight, alternately,

Bolster's Rock,

Venison Island.

Tub Harbor and Snug Harbor, alternately.

Dead Island.

Scrammy Bay,

Ship Harbor and Fishing Ship's Harbor, alternately,

Francis Harbor Bight.

Little Harbor.

“Murray and Spear Harbors alternately, and thence to Battle Harbor.

The following trips will be the same as the above, except after the first round trip in September, the Steamer will not be required to go North of Holton, but after that trip must call at all Harbors between Bateau and Henly Harbor, for Herring Fishery news.

“JOHN DELANEY,

“Postmaster General.

“St. John's, 2nd July, 1880.”

I trust, therefore, that the Government will accede to my legitimate request, especially when it is taken into consideration that it is the North Shore which provides, to a great extent, food for the city of Quebec. I hope that the Government will take prompt steps in the matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to granting the documents asked for by the hon. member, but I would merely ask him to remember that, although it may be possible that the improvements that he asks for the county of Saguenay are absolutely required, yet the Government cannot do everything at once. We have already begun making considerable improvements in the county of Chicoutimi, whilst on the North Shore, as he has himself observed, the Government has, on a vote of the House, granted a telegraph line which is extending from year to year, until it shall have reached the extreme limits of the Province of Quebec and of the Dominion of Canada in that direction. I feel sure that the hon. member will, through the energy that characterizes his demands to the Government, obtain in years to come the other improvements which are necessary to the county of Saguenay.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

Mr. ORTON, in moving for a Select Committee to enquire into and report upon the effects of the present Tariff upon the agricultural interests of the Dominion, said: It will be within the recollection of many that a similar committee was asked for, and granted, in 1876, and proceeded to perform its duties under circumstances that do not exist to-day. The result was, it brought down, not in the ordinary manner, but in a round-about way—the only one in which it could then be brought down—a report on the question of agriculture in relation to our Tariff. The report, in consequence of the opposition of the Government supporters on the committee, had to be made by moving the adjournment of the House. To-day a different state of affairs exists. Any member, whether on the Government or Opposition side, could move for a committee in the interests of agriculture without meeting opposition. The result of the elections of 1878 fully endorsed the report of the committee of 1876. Many hon. gentlemen, who did not agree with the then Opposition, still gave their evidence in favor of protecting the agricultural industry, and prominent among those was the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. He candidly and honorably stated his views in a letter which became celebrated at the General Elections of 1878. The evidence given by leading agriculturists, the answers given to questions sent to reeves, deputy reeves and presidents of agricultural societies, showed that they were four to one in favor of the policy brought into operation by this Government. Notwithstanding this overwhelming evidence, the Opposition to-day contend with as much energy as they did in the past, that this policy is not in the interests of agriculture, and I know it is highly important we should have every fact and feature of this question brought fairly and clearly before the country. The Opposition contend that no protection can be given to the agriculturist. Their hon. leader, in various speeches last summer, more especially that one at Cobourg, foreshadowed, rather faintly, what would be the possible policy—for no policy has yet been clearly defined by them—of the Opposition, should it come into power. He said it was utterly impossible to protect the agriculturists of Canada. Still, he said, no Government would take off at once all the protection on manufactures. The hon. member for Lambton, in a speech to his constituents, gave expression to similar sentiments, both agreeing that, as far as agriculture was concerned, the protection must be removed. It was stated by them that not only was our agriculture not benefitted by that, but that the traffic by our railways and canals was seriously injured. I need not refer to that point

at length, because, I think, the other day the Finance Minister very ably and conclusively showed, that so far as that contention was concerned, there was really no truth in the allegation. But the Government side of the House refutes that idea, and contends that it is as essential to agriculture that this interest should be protected as it is that protection should be extended to our manufacturing industries. It was shown by the Finance Minister, also, that the market of the Canadian farmers had been increased to an enormous extent, that in consequence of the adoption of the National Policy the home market had been greatly extended last year, there being no less than seven million bushels of additional Canadian grain sold in our own market, which large amount was formerly taken by the farmers of the United States. A large market in this country formerly lay open to the farmers of the United States, who had by competition taken from them a large portion of their own market. It is very strange when hon. gentlemen in Opposition state that it is an evil to our farmers to have a large market at their hearths, and that notwithstanding this market, they derived no good from it. Is there a single business man in the House who would say it would be an injury to him to have a large additional number of customers? But what will hold good as regards those engaged in other industries will hold good as respects our farmers. I think we shall be able to show conclusively by the committee that not only have they obtained a large market for their produce, but large additional prices. With regard to the classes of grain grown in this country, and other produce and cattle, I shall not go into that subject particularly to-night. The Government has already referred, by the Finance Minister, to that subject on the Tariff discussion; but I may call attention to a few important points as regards which our farmers have experienced most striking benefits. In the North-West market our Ontario farmers now enjoy a valuable trade in horses and cattle and the higher classes of stock. The result has been highly beneficial to the agricultural interests of this country. Horses which were formerly a drag in the markets of the older Provinces are now rapidly bought up for the North-West at large prices; the same applies to other kinds of stock. As our Ontario farmers have become large cattle graziers and are going extensively into the higher kinds of stock, it must be plain to every man who looks candidly at the question, that they will enjoy hereafter a large and profitable market in the North-West—and one not open to foreign countries. I might refer to other articles of farm produce, such as wool, but shall defer any reflections on that subject for the present. There is another point I wish to refer to, and that is the fact of the National Policy, in making money cheap, has resulted in great benefit to agriculture in this country. In consequence of the introduction of the National Policy to Canada, money has been kept in this country which used to be sent to foreign countries. The money which our farmers obtained for their grain which they sold in foreign markets was left there to buy the manufactures of those foreign markets, and the result was a stringency in the money market of Canada; but in consequence of the benefit which has accrued through the operation of this policy, we find money plentiful and cheap in Canada. Confidence is established in the British money markets, in Canadian securities, from the effect of the National Policy and the judicious management of the present Government in bringing about a system of surpluses, instead of the former system of deficits. The result has been to give confidence to British capitalists, and money is cheap in the Canadian market. Even the other day we saw in the Bank of England the rate of money was much increased; it went up one day, I think, to 7 per cent. Is it not strange that this did not effect the money market in Canada? The simple explanation is this: that British capitalists feel more confidence in

Canadian securities, than they do in British securities, because of the troubles that exist in the British Empire. The result of the cheap money in Canada has been to give greater stimulus to the production of agricultural products; and this year we find a very much larger amount has been supplied to our own people, and also a larger amount to Great Britain. Our exports have largely increased, in consequence of which many of our farmers have made improvements in their farms, and consequently have been enabled to raise more; in other words they have been enabled to produce two blades of grass where only one grew before. I need not refer to the benefit which has been derived by the large market for the perishable products of the farmer; but I will just refer to one point which I think conclusively shows that the price of grain has risen in Canada. Never before was spring wheat higher than fall wheat. Fall wheat does not continue to be affected so much by the National Policy as spring wheat. Why? Simply because spring wheat is used by our own millers, and our own people to make strong bakers flour; and the result is that spring wheat has risen in price and is now higher than fall wheat, through the inauguration of the National Policy. I think this conclusively proves that the effect of the National Policy, on that kind of wheat at any rate, has been highly beneficial to the Canadian farmer. Now, Sir, it is strange that hon. gentlemen opposite will continue to maintain that it is better for us to buy our manufactured goods in Great Britain and in the United States than in Canada. I would like to know why it is that Great Britain and other manufacturing nations in Europe have so high a market for agricultural products? Is it not because they have a large accumulation of artisans and laborers employed in manufacturing goods? Why, then, should we not endeavor, if possible, to transfer the artisans of Europe and Great Britain to this country in order to manufacture for our own people and thus provide for the increased population that will come into this country through the development of our great North-West. We have regions yet to be developed whose importance we can hardly realize. We see that the iron industry of the United States has increased to an enormous extent within the last twenty years. In 1860 the iron industries of the United States produced \$24,000,000 worth. In 1880 those industries in that country had increased their products to the value of \$450,000,000. Now, Sir, with our resources of iron and coal and our other facilities for entering into the manufacture of various classes of ironware, it is evident to all who will look to their country's interest, that there is a great future before us in the development of that industry, and that the development of that industry will be beneficial to the farmers, none can deny. If such high prices for farm products in Great Britain is caused by the large manufacturing centres there, the development of those manufacturing centres in this country will have a similar result. There is no reason why we should not have a higher and continually increasing market for the farm produce in our own country. The object of the committee will be to gather all the information they can and place it in as clear a light as possible before this House and before the farmers of this country, so as to enable them to express their views in a manner similar to that in which they did so before the former committee. Hon. gentlemen may, perhaps, then be able to put into some sort of comprehensible shape the policy which they have been seeking to lay before the country. I think it will be thought a great benefit to hon. gentlemen opposite, and also satisfactory to those on this side, when the report of that committee is brought before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to replace the name of Mr. Allison by that of Mr. Plumb.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is important that such a committee should be appointed, if it is within the province

of this House to do so, and I understand it is. Of the nearly four and a-half millions of people of the Dominion of Canada, nearly two-thirds are to-day engaged in agricultural pursuits. We have two classes of political theorists in the country who hold different views with respect to this question; and a great many people are inclined honestly to support what they believe to be in the interest of the agricultural class, if they were able to ascertain that it really would be to their interest that the National Policy should be continued. Representing, as I do, an agricultural district where a large majority of the people are engaged in these pursuits; and finding, as I have done, that one class strongly contend that no benefit is derived by the farming community from the National Policy, while another class just as strongly maintain that great benefit is resulting from it, I say it is most important that we should have some report from an authoritative source on this subject when we go back to the country again. Any information that may be laid before the committee, and any report that may come from it, will be accepted with greater confidence by the people, and will appeal to their honest, unbiassed judgment, with greater force than it would if coming from representatives of either of the political parties. Again, this committee would be enabled to send for persons and papers and get information that could not be obtained through other channels. They will be able to put it in such a shape as that the agriculturists can easily judge for themselves as to whether it would be for their interest to continue the National Policy. If it does nothing else than to establish the fact as to whether it is or is not advantageous, and if it is, how far; and if not, what different plan could be adopted that would be in their interest—if it does nothing else, it will be of great interest to the farming community and the country in general. I believe that a very large majority of the farmers believe that the National Policy is benefitting them; still there are a great many others who do not think so, some of whom are not opposed to the Government. Many others are unsettled in their opinion, reading as they do journals supporting opposite views on the subject. If you can enable those parties to decide either one way or the other, I think it will be in the interest of this country. I deem it therefore to be my duty to support the appointment of that committee. The sooner it is appointed the better. The sooner the information is obtained and the report is made in such a shape that it can be laid before the agriculturists, the better for them, and the better for the establishment of the principle as to whether the National Policy is or is not in the interest of that large and extensive class.

Mr. TROW. I was approached to-day by the hon. mover of this resolution, asking me whether I would serve as a member of that committee. I think it quite important that a committee should be selected for that purpose. It is a matter of vital interest to this great country of ours. But I think it is essential that a much more practical committee should be selected. For instance, I have not heard all the names, but it seems to me that there should be some practical agriculturists placed on that committee. I understood from the mover to-day that he intended to put on Mr. Bain and Mr. Charlton. But I object, in the first place, that notice ought to be given of the names of the committee, which has not been done. I object to the formation of the committee, in consequence of the proper notice not having been given.

Mr. ORTON. In reference to Mr. Bain, I spoke to him to-day and he told me he was afraid he could not act, that he was going home.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I think the names should have been put in the motion. We do not know who they are. It has been observed by my hon. friend on this side of the House that gentlemen holding different opinions with regard

Mr. SPROULE.

to protection should be placed on that committee. I have one objection to make: it is that there are only two members from the Maritime Provinces on that committee, and they are both on the same side of politics. I think that both shades of politics from the Lower Provinces should be represented on that committee. I believe Mr. Girouard (Kent) is on the committee for New Brunswick, and I think there is no one on the Liberal side of politics from Nova Scotia. I think the complexion of the committee is not fair to the House or to the country. Moreover, I believe the objection has been made that the names have not been placed on the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is usual that the names of a committee should be given in the notice, and that has not been done in this case.

Mr. GAULT. I think the prices obtained for farm produce throughout the Dominion show sufficiently that the farmers are satisfied with the National Policy. If this committee desires to know the price obtained by farmers for their produce, it will be easy to do so by consulting the market reports. I am sure the prices are thoroughly satisfactory to the farmers. They are saving money rapidly. When I have entered the Savings Bank at Montreal, I have observed that out of thirty or forty people in the bank, twenty of them were farmers who were making deposits in the banks. And throughout this whole country, east and west, wherever I have been I have found the farmers depositing their money in the banks at three per cent. and paying off their debts to the loan societies. They have been doing so very largely during the past year. I cannot see the object of this committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest to my hon. friend that it would be very desirable to instruct the committee to enquire what benefits there have been to owners of cotton mills.

Mr. GAULT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am a stockholder in the Hudon Cotton Mills—probably the largest in Canada—and that my stock has not paid me three per cent. The time may come when it will be more profitable, but the time has not come yet.

Mr. SPEAKER. I rule the motion out of order on the ground that notice was not given of the composition of the proposed committee.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all reports in relation to improvements, &c., to be made on the wharf at St. Michel, County of Bellechasse.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Report of the Commission consisting of Judges Miller and Dubuc to report on certain staked claims under the Manitoba Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Return showing the amounts paid to Mr. E. Dewdney, as Indian Commissioner, amount paid to Mr. Galt as his Private Secretary, and all amounts paid to or on behalf of both for travelling expenses, travelling outfit and all other expenses, from the date of their appointment to 1st July, 1881.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

Return showing all sums paid to Sir A. T. Galt as High Commissioner; also amount paid for rent and outfit of his residence in London; also amount paid for travelling expenses of himself and his associates in the service of the Government since the 1st of July, 1878.—(Mr. Ross, Middlesex.)

Return by Ports showing the quantity and value of all kinds of coal entered in warehouse or otherwise, either under the heads of free, or for exportation, or for the use of vessels trading on the great lakes and rivers of the Dominion, since March 14th, 1879, up to February 1st, 1882.—(Mr. Burpee, St. John.)

Return showing the number of tons or car loads of through freight carried over the Intercolonial Railway from the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the rate charged per ton or car load, whether ordinary or special rates, the gross amount received for said freight, the proportion of the same paid to any other line of railways or steamers; also, a similar return for all through freight from Ontario and Quebec to the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick carried over the Intercolonial Railway, the rate charged per ton or car load, whether ordinary or special rates, the gross amount received for said freight, the proportion of the same paid to any other railways or steamers.—(Mr. Burpee, St. John.)

Return by Provinces, showing the number of immigrants settled in the Dominion of Canada, each year from 1878 up to 1881, inclusive.—(Mr. Burpee, St. John.)

Return showing the number of vessels, with their tonnage, nationality and port of entry in which sugar, syrup and molasses were imported into this country during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1881; the quantity of sugar above 14 D S, and the quantity of a lower grade, by each vessel or steamship; also, for a like return, from 1st July, 1881, to 1st January, 1882.—(Mr. Rogers.)

Return of all petitions, correspondence, &c., forwarded to the Government or any Department thereof, relating to the change of name of the "Hopewell Corner" Post Office to that of "Albert," in the County of Albert, N.B.—(Mr. Rogers.)

Copies of all advertisements or circulars asking for tenders for the supply of iron and iron manufactures, hardware, oils, coal, wood, ties, timber and all goods and materials required for the use of the Intercolonial Railway, during the period from June 30th, 1877, to December 31st, 1878, and from June 30th, 1880, to December 31st, 1881, with a statement of the names of the persons tendering and the prices asked in each tender for each description of goods, the names of the persons, if any, whose tenders were accepted, and the point at which the goods were to be delivered.—(Mr. Killam.)

Statement showing the prices paid for wrought and cast iron, steel, copper, zinc, tin and brass, car wheels, springs, axles, oil, paint, waste, bolts, nuts, spikes, coal, wood, and other materials and stores purchased for the use of the Intercolonial Railway, during the year ended June 30th, 1881, with the names of the parties from whom the goods were purchased, and the points at which they were delivered; also, for the year ending 30th June, 1878.—(Mr. Killam.)

Statement showing the prices paid for wrought and cast iron, steel, copper, zinc, tin and brass, car wheels, springs, axles, oil, paint, waste, bolts, nuts, spikes, coal, wood, and other materials and stores purchased for the use of the Intercolonial Railway, during the six months ended December, 31st, 1881, with the names of the parties from whom the goods were purchased, and the points at which they were to be delivered; also for the six months ending December 31st, 1878.—(Mr. Killam.)

Copy of the judgment of the Court of Chancery and the Court of Appeal, of Ontario, in the case of McLaren vs. Caldwell *et al*; and all correspondence between the Dominion Government and Government of Ontario, since the last motion was made on this subject.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Copies of all correspondence and Orders in Council not already brought down affecting any railway companies chartered either by the Legislature of Manitoba, or by the Parliament of Canada, in Manitoba or the North-West, and relating either to grants or reservations of land, questions of route or terminal points, or relating in any other way to the affairs of any such companies.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 28th February, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SALE OF PROPERTY ON SUSSEX STREET.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the hon. the First Minister if he is prepared to answer the question he was to answer to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. The first question was, whether the Government sold recently any land on the corner of Rideau and Sussex streets, in the city of Ottawa. The sale is authorized, but not completed. The sale is authorized to be made under Act 19 Victoria, chapter 45.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A private arrangement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A private arrangement. The land was valued by Mr. H. V. Noel. It consists of 155 feet on Rideau street, and 50 feet on Sussex street. The Order in Council authorizes the sale of it to the assignee of the Church of England, for the sum of \$1,550.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DREW moved that the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be extended ten days from to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Planters' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 53) to amend the Act incorporating the North American Mutual Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Ontario Investment Association.—(Mr. Carling.)

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in continuing the important discussion which was opened here on Friday last, and which dealt with the great question at issue between the two parties in this country, I desire to say, as I have always said, that I have no intention of discussing the question of Free Trade and Protection as an abstract question. I would be quite prepared to admit that, even if in England, the policy adopted long since, and now in force, of Free Trade, was the best policy that could be adopted for the country, it would in no way affect the issue between the parties here. I hold that, notwithstanding the very striking evidence that we have that many of the ablest and most intelligent minds in that great country are seriously considering this important question, and are entertaining very grave doubts as to the wisdom of the policy of Free Trade for the Empire.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear; but I would like to ask him if there is no significance in such a result as was recently witnessed in the great constituency of the North Riding of Yorkshire—

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; there is not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where this question was made a battle ground of party, and where one of the most important and influential constituencies in the Empire reversed its verdict and pronounced unequivocally in favor of a policy of Protection, even to the extent of a duty on corn? Well, Sir, as I said before, if I were quite prepared to admit that the policy of Free Trade was the best to be adopted in the British Empire and by Great Britain, I should, at the same time, maintain that, situated as Canada is, we have no alternative but to adopt the policy now in force in this country. It is impossible, Sir, and any one must admit it who takes the trouble to look at the position Canada occupies, with a comparatively small population of between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 of people, and lying alongside the great country to the south of us, now numbering 50,000,000; it is impossible, Sir, I say, for any public man to examine this question and arrive at any other conclusion than that the policy of Canada must be greatly influenced by the fiscal policy of the great country to the south of us. And, Sir, I think it would be wise to adopt the sentiment of Carlyle, that history is philosophy, teaching by experience, and, looking at the question in the light of that important axiom, ask ourselves what the result of fourteen years experience in relation to this question has been for Canada, what inference has been drawn from the policy of the two great parties in this country by the experience gained in relation to these questions for the last fifteen years? It is well known, Sir, that the party who now have the confidence of the people of this country adopted, from the first, a policy of protecting Canadian industries.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An hon. member on the other side of the House questions that statement; but, Sir, I think I shall be able to show that hon. gentleman that the low Tariff of 1867, adopted by the party now in power, was as protective a policy as was required in the interests of Canada in that day. Hon. gentlemen may say that the Tariff of Canada had been reduced in 1866. Why reduced? Because the reduced Tariff of 1866, adopted before Confederation, was a Tariff found to be all that was necessary in order to give the protection required for Canadian industries. It is well known, Sir, that the great war, which existed from 1861 to 1865, in the United States, so completely disorganized the labor markets of that country as to afford for many subsequent years quite as full and as abundant a protection to Canadian industries as under the present Tariff. The hon. gentleman knows right well that, although a low Tariff was adopted at the first Session of the first Parliament of this Dominion, the policy was then adopted of fostering and protecting Canadian industries. Hon. gentlemen know right well that, although a low Tariff was adopted, it was accompanied by measures calculated to foster these industries. Look at the free list, and you will find that the policy was to provide for the introduction of articles required to be consumed and to be used in manufacturing industries to a much larger extent than was subsequently the case. Then taking the great interest, especially the shipbuilding, and the policy was adopted of fostering that great and important industry by making articles that entered into the construction of shipping and that had to be imported into this country free of duty. Then the industry of sailing these ships that were built was also fostered by adopting a policy of making the light dues

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

which rested on the vessel a Government charge. So with regard to all other industries, every effort was made to give such protection as industries of the country at that period required. Take the question of machinery. At that time it is well known that within Canada you could obtain but a very small amount of machinery, owing to the absence of any manufactory of machinery. The policy of the first Parliament, and of the first Tariff that was enacted in this Dominion, was a policy of allowing all machinery that could not be manufactured in the country to be admitted free of duty for the purpose of fostering the establishment of new industries within the borders of Canada. Then, Sir, we had the question of the fisheries, one of the largest and most important industries in this country. What was done for this industry? In the first instance, every person knows that, with the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, the market which had been open to our fishermen had been closed. What did we do? The Government of Canada decided to foster and protect our own fishermen, and to prevent encroachment upon our fishing grounds by fishermen from the United States, and this gave all the advantage to our fishermen that they could receive. Every person remembers the taunts and ridicule that were thrown from the other side of the House at our efforts in that respect. Every person remembers the taunts with reference to Mr. Mitchell's fleet used for the purpose of protecting that industry. Not only did we do that, but we imposed a tonnage license upon American fishermen coming into our waters, and when a license of 50 cents a ton was found not to be adequate protection we raised it to \$2. Having thus shown a firm resolve to protect the undoubted rights of our fishermen in our waters the United States were brought to the conclusion that it was desirable to have that question arranged by a treaty; and it is well known, Sir, that the result of the Washington Treaty was not only to re-open the American markets to the fishermen of this country—under the policy of Protection we had adopted—but it was agreed, under that Treaty, that means should be taken to ascertain what amount of money should be paid by the United States Government to Canada for the enjoyment of our fisheries. Every person who was present in this House at the time remembers the taunts and sneers flung across the floor of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to that matter, and we were told that nothing would be obtained. But, Sir, as an outcome of that Washington Treaty, and of the efforts of hon. gentlemen then and now on this side of the House to protect the interests of our fishermen, no less a sum than \$4,500,000 was awarded to be paid to this country; and, to-day, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, true to the policy of protecting that great and important Canadian industry, is in a position to come down and ask justly from this House that no less than \$150,000 per annum shall be contributed by this Parliament from the public funds as a bounty to the fishermen, whose fishing grounds have been, to a certain extent surrendered, under the Washington Treaty, to the fishermen of another country. I mention this in order to show that the policy which animates gentlemen on this side of the House is a policy that was adopted in 1867, on the first formation of the Canadian Government, and has continued until the present time. Well, Sir, it will also be remembered by gentlemen opposite that we made a very strong endeavor to secure protection for the great coal mining interests of this country and for the great agricultural industry. It will be remembered that the Government of that day—the first of this Confederation—brought down a policy imposing a duty upon coal coming from the United States into this country, and accompanied it by a proposition to impose a duty upon grain and breadstuffs brought from the adjoining Republic into Canada. It will be remembered that, notwithstanding that that policy was maintained for a year, we were obliged ultimately to succumb to the

united hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of our own friends who were less advanced on this important question at that time than I am happy to say, they are to-day. Now, Sir, it is very well known to the House that I have always been—from the first hour I entered this House—an advocate for a duty on coal. I never could see, and I cannot now, why coal should be exempt from duty, even as a pure question of revenue, any more than any other article found in the Tariff. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House join issue with us in that respect, and the ex-Minister of Finance calls a duty on coal an odious tax, while the hon. leader of the Opposition maintains here, as elsewhere, that it is a sectional tax. Well Sir, I can only say that I fail to see any foundation for the statement that it is an odious tax, or for the view that it is a sectional tax. What makes it an odious tax? Why, these hon. gentlemen say coal is a necessary of life! Yet the Tariff they propounded and maintained, provided for the imposition of duties upon other articles which are just as much necessities of life as coal. In this cold country, hats, boots and shoes, and clothing of all kinds, are necessities of life. It is not a matter of choice as to whether any individual in this country will wear these articles or not; they are articles of prime necessity, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite never discovered that, because these articles are absolutely necessary to maintain life in this country, they should be struck from the list of dutiable goods and put on the free list. Hon. gentlemen know right well that coal oil is as much a necessity of life in Canada as coal, and yet what was their policy with regard to it? Why, my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby)—I beg to be excused for mentioning him by name—aided by all the Conservative strength that at that time was to be found in this House, was two years fighting the battle to bring down the duty on coal oil to a figure below 150 per cent. The hon. the ex-Finance Minister, although now so anxious about articles which are necessities of life, was prepared to maintain then an odious tax of 150 per cent. on the article of coal oil, and was only compelled to surrender at discretion when he found he was being pushed to the wall and that outside opinion overwhelmingly supported his opponents. Was the duty on coal oil a sectional tax? I would like to ask the hon. and learned leader of the Opposition if a tax on coal oil is not as much a sectional tax as a tax on coal. There is no coal oil to be found outside of Ontario. Whatever advantage was enjoyed by the industry, in consequence of the duty, inured to Ontario where the oil was to be found. Yet the duty was not called an odious or a sectional tax because oil was an Ontario product, and these gentlemen feel that it is quite right to denounce the tax on coal found in Nova Scotia as odious and sectional, while, at the same time, they resisted a fair and legitimate reduction on coal oil, the duty on which was, as I said before, not only equally odious but equally sectional, being four times as great as the duty on coal, as the hon. gentleman knows. I say, too, that these gentlemen have never been able to show, here or elsewhere, any reason why a duty should not be imposed on coal, the same as upon any other necessary of life. I may mention, as another evidence of our desire to foster and protect the industries of this country, that between 1867 and 1873, when we found we had more revenue than we required to maintain the public service in efficiency, we abolished the duties upon tea and coffee; and we did that essentially in the interests of the industries of this country, and with a view to fostering those industries, because it cheapened the cost of living, and in that way permitted the carrying on of the industries in a better and easier mode than otherwise was the case. Well, Sir, in an unhappy hour for the interests of Canada, gentlemen opposite came into power—not in virtue of the express sentiment of the country, not in virtue of a decision of the people at a time when the issues

between the two parties were laid before them—because in the General Election of 1872, the policy that had animated the Conservative party, the policy that had been so eminently successful in the promotion of the prosperity of Canada, was heartily endorsed by the people at the polls. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen failed to meet the people at the polls on a policy of their own, and they adopted a system which is a favorite mode of operating with them—intrigue; and thus they succeeded in obtaining power. I say, Sir, that this was an unhappy hour in the interests of Canada, for I need not remind the House, Sir, that from that hour down to the time when they were dismissed from the positions for which they proved so thoroughly unequal, the fortunes of Canada were surrendered to hands utterly unworthy of the charge. They succeeded to power with an overflowing revenue; they succeeded to power with the trade, the business and the revenue of the country in the highest possible state of efficiency, and I need not tell the House, Sir, what the lamentable record of that five years of misrule was, during which they supplanted the protectionist policy which had been the policy of Canada down to that time, and introduced a policy of what they called out-and-out Free Trade—at least, to as large an extent as they could adopt it. Well, Sir, they have said on more than one occasion—I do not know, however, that the matter is very important—that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and myself, as well as other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, were formerly Free Traders. They have said, Sir—and they have endeavored to establish on various platforms and occasionally in this House the fact—that formerly my hon. friend and myself held different sentiments in reference to this great issue from those which we now entertain. I say, Sir, that the history of the past will fail to establish any such proposition. I do not, for a moment, hesitate to avow that when I was in the Government of Nova Scotia, and when I had the honor of occupying a position in the Legislature of that Province, I was a Free Trader. My policy was that of Free Trade, and why? Because it was utterly impossible for a small community of less than 400,000 people, situated as we were, without the means of obtaining a market outside of our own borders, even among Canadians, for any but a Free Trade policy to be adopted; but, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite know little of the discussions of the past if they do not know that my hon. friend and myself took our ground in our respective Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick strongly and clearly on the advantage of having all these Provinces united together in one great Confederation, and that one of the leading grounds on which we urged this change was, that it would enable a policy that would protect the industries of the country, to be adopted, and which otherwise was impossible. I say, Sir, that when the Reciprocity Treaty was abolished by the United States, as leader of the Government at that time. I went down to the Legislature of Nova Scotia and asked the Legislature to re-impose all the duties that were in operation previous to the treaty, and which had been suspended during the continuance of the treaty, and to adopt the same system in this relation, which had before existed; and, Sir, as I have said before, I, on all occasions pointed out to my countrymen, that while nature had given to Nova Scotia great natural resources, and such as had made other countries great manufacturing centres, and had built up flourishing and immense industries, it was utterly impossible for any such result to follow, unless we became part of a great Confederation, opening up an extensive market within ourselves, by which such industries could be fostered. I am told, Sir, that some remark which I made on the occasion of the introduction of the Tariff of the ex-Finance Minister, gave evidence that I was an out-and-out Free-Trader. Well, Sir, all I can say to this is, that if hon. gentlemen opposite will refer to the files of the

Globe newspaper, they will find that I attacked the hon. gentleman's Tariff on that occasion on the ground that it took away the protection—the fostering protection—which was given by the Tariff that had previously existed, to Canadian industries. Hon. gentlemen will discover that on that occasion I joined issue with the ex-Minister of Finance on the question of the proposed imports on shipbuilding, and I said: "Here is a great Canadian industry. It is in a position that will not bear tampering with, and yet I find that one of your first moves is to take away the protection which this industry has enjoyed, owing to the freedom from duty upon articles which go into the construction of ships, and are imported into this country." And I was able to fight the battle so sharply on that occasion, with the aid of my friends on this side of the House, that we compelled the hon. gentleman to take back his Tariff, readjust it, and make it much less obnoxious than it was before. I told the hon. gentleman in that debate—as will be found in the report to which I refer—that he was attacking the industries of Canada by imposing a duty on machinery which was brought into this country, and this, too, when there was no corresponding aid given to the manufacturers, who were to bring such machinery into this country, so that, from the beginning to the end, Sir, I took the ground that that hon. gentleman was striking a fatal blow at Canadian industries in his Tariff, and defended the policy of fostering the industries of Canada as far as it was in my power to do so on that occasion. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman was successful, and what was his first move? The leader of the Opposition at Cobourg said that what they proposed to do was to foster industries by taking the duties off all articles which went into manufacturing, and by increasing the free list. But what did the Government of which the hon. gentleman and the ex-Minister of Finance were members do when they had the power? Did they promote the industries of Canada by taking the duties off articles such as I have mentioned, and by enlarging the free list? No, Sir, but they struck a heavy blow at the industries of Canada by imposing duties on a large number of articles which entered into the consumption of manufactures in this country, taking them out of the free list and imposing duties on them. Then, Sir, I need not say that another step of these hon. gentlemen in the same direction was the reimposition of the duties on tea and coffee. These hon. gentlemen now profess—as hon. gentlemen on that side of the House are very apt to profess when they have not any power to deal with the subject—a deep anxiety for the poor man; but who does not remember, when they brought down a measure to levy duties on tea and coffee, that they banded themselves together to a man and voted down the resolution which was proposed by my hon. friend, who then and now represents Montreal, with the view of having these duties so adjusted as to lighten the tax on the poor man. Under their Tariff the rich man, who is able to drink tea that costs 90 cents or \$1 a pound, had to pay no larger tax into the revenue, and had to contribute no more to the revenue, than did the poor man, who was only able to drink tea worth 25 cents a pound. These gentlemen were then deaf to the claims and difficulties of the poor man, and without compunction voted down the resolution that would have modified the unfairness of the Tariff, which was putting a heavy duty on tea and coffee. Well, Sir, they then imposed taxes on articles which were in the free list, and they burthened the industries of the country with exactions; and at the very time when all was changed, and when all was changing, these hon. gentlemen imposed duties on the shipbuilding industry, and they imposed duties on the great bulk of our industrial community by the levying of a tax on tea and coffee, and struck off the protection which had existed with reference to Canadian trade in tea, by removing the differential duty which had hitherto

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

enabled this trade to be carried on in Canada. Everything that these hon. gentlemen could do to make Boston and New York the commercial capitals of Canada they did do, and with what result? With the result, as I have said before, that during the five years that these hon. gentlemen were in power, and that this policy of taking away the protection which had been given by their predecessors to Canadian industries prevailed, of making the poor man poorer, and of bringing this country into a condition such as every Canadian, of whatever stripe of politics he might be, earnestly deplored, and such as every patriotic Canadian can never wish again to see in this country. I defended the duty upon coal when we were in power in the first instance. We maintained that principle as long as we could; and when we returned to power we reverted to our original policy—the same policy of fostering Canadian industries that had animated us from the first. We returned to it, and publicly proclaimed, as we did years before, that it was a proper principle, when we urged upon them the vital importance, in the interest of the country, of changing that policy in this respect. We did all that men could who were in a minority to induce them to adopt a policy which we believed would be successful in changing the financial condition of the country. I had pointed out repeatedly the experience of that great nation to the south of us, which had adopted the policy of protection to foster the industries of the country, with the result of relieving it from the disastrous consequences of its great Civil War. I talked, however, to deaf ears. But, having received the mandate of the people to deal with the great question of the financial policy of the country—having declared, with no uncertain sound, what the policy was which animated us, and would inspire us if again entrusted with power, the result of our appeal to the country was to sustain the policy we had adopted here, and which we had pledged ourselves to carry out if once more entrusted with power. Well, we reimposed the duty on coal—that odious tax which hon. gentlemen opposite had succeeded in striking down, but which I have shown here is a pure question of revenue, and which can be defended on that ground as successfully as any question that can be discussed. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, dealt with this subject, and that is perhaps the only part of his speech with which I was inclined to differ—he stated that one-half the duty on coal was paid in the United States. On the other hand, the ex-Finance Minister, the other day, quoted from a speech of my colleague, the Speaker of the Senate, in reference to the imposition of the duty on coal; and I am quite aware that, years ago, that hon. gentleman and a number of other hon. gentlemen associated with the Conservative party were not so advanced as they are to-day in regard to this subject. I am glad, however, that the hon. gentleman opposite has quoted a part of the argument which he deemed conclusive in reference to this public question. By-and-bye, however, I shall invite him to pay the same respect to the views of the Speaker of the Senate on another point which will come under consideration, which he has shown in relation to this question. Now, when I was down in Picton, I made a speech to which the hon. gentleman opposite did me the honor of alluding. He said I stated I had placed a duty on coal which fell mainly upon 1,500,000 people of Ontario. My opponent questioned the right to have a sectional tax, but I pointed to the fact that the ex-Finance Minister had set an example of supporting and sustaining a sectional tax. I pointed to the fact that that hon. gentleman had placed a duty on petroleum of 150 per cent. on an article that was solely the product of Ontario, and which was largely paid by the other Provinces. Then again, duties were placed on the 100,000 tons of shipping in the Maritime Provinces, that would have produced \$100,000 under the Tariff which the hon. gentleman brought down.

While 600,000 people in the Maritime Provinces would have to contribute \$100,000 of revenue under the hon. gentleman's Tariff, 1,500,000 people in Ontario were asked to contribute a little over \$7,000 under his adjustment of that duty. But that did not prevent the hon. gentleman from proceeding further in the same direction. He showed no objection to the adoption of a sectional tax, provided it fell on the shoulders of the Maritime Provinces, saying, in effect, that supposing such duties were not paid in Ontario, the arrangement was all right. But under our policy we provided for legitimate protection to all the industries of all the Provinces; and while hon. gentlemen ask for the imposition of some burdens in matters in which Ontario is more interested, there is another instance in which, according to their own showing, the tax is not paid by them but by the people of the Lower Provinces—is certainly not paid by the people of Ontario. Now, we maintain a principle—I have advocated it from the moment I had a seat in Parliament, I have never ceased to uphold it. I defy any man who has read the discussion of this question, in the *Mail* newspaper, which has been going on for the last three or four months, who has candidly and dispassionately weighed the arguments published in that journal, I defy any man who will approach this subject in a fair and candid spirit, to arrive at any other conclusion than that the coal tax is not paid by the people of Ontario, although paid in Ontario. I venture to state, and have sufficient grounds for the statement, that the imposition of the coal duty has not cost the people of Canada one farthing, either in Ontario or out of it. I take this position, and shall give the House my grounds for it, that, instead of the duty on coal having increased the price to the people of Ontario, it has reduced it. I hold that, from the hour of the imposition of that duty down to this hour, Canadians have paid less duty on this article than formerly. It is on this point I differ slightly from my hon. friend the Finance Minister, who seemed to think that, perhaps, half the duty might be paid in the United States and half in Ontario. I am satisfied my hon. friend had not given that branch of the subject the close and exhaustive examination which I have felt it my duty to give it, or he would have arrived at the opinion I now unhesitatingly state, that the imposition of the duty has not cost the people of this country anything, but the reverse. Now, Sir, my first position is that the price of coal from the United States is fixed and governed by the competition that coal has to meet with. There is not an hon. gentleman in this House who does not know, from the practical experience of every day, that the tariff in a railway changes with different seasons of the year, being governed and largely caused by the amount of competition that the tariff meets with. If you are carrying freight to a competitive point, if you are carrying freight to an open port where you have to compete with water carriage, you put your freight down in order to get the business that you would otherwise lose. If the railway is carrying freight to an inland portion of the country, where there is no such competition, you impose such a charge as you think the work performed is fairly entitled to. Now, I maintain that a close examination of this question will prove beyond controversy that, looking at it in the light of experience, which is, as I have said before, the test to which I propose to subject this matter, the House will be driven—I say, with reference to this side of the House, willingly driven, because we are open to conviction in a clear and strong case, but unwillingly driven on the other side of the House—to come to the conclusion at which I have arrived. The moment that the duty was imposed upon coal going into Ontario, it became a competitive point, because they were threatened with the fact of their coal being displaced by the introduction of Nova Scotia coal. The hon. member for Lambton, the other night, seemed to think that the whole question was as to whether we had succeeded in displacing the coal. It is

not necessary to the success of our policy to displace the coal at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing is necessary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will examine this question a little further, he will find that—provided you stimulate the production, provided you succeed in giving work to the miners and employment to the twelve or fifteen million dollars of capital that have been invested in the mining operations of this country, and employment to the miner in raising the coal—it matters little where it is consumed, provided that policy has led to this increased consumption. But, Sir, I may say that, after the most careful examination of this question, it has been found that no coal is superior to that produced in the Province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend from London (Mr. Carling) was at one time Minister of Public Works for Ontario, and his Department caused a careful and exhaustive analysis to be made of the comparative values of the different kinds of bituminous coal. It was then found, as a result of that analysis, that the cheapest coal that could be purchased for the use of the public buildings in the city of Toronto, was Nova Scotia coal. It is well known, although I do not consider it necessary to the argument, that some 284,000 tons of additional coal has been sent into the Upper Provinces under the influence of this Tariff. Before that a very large amount of coal was displaced, but the result, as I said before, could be obtained without displacing necessarily the coal in Ontario. Now, I quote from the Trade Returns of home consumption, showing the imports of anthracite into the several Provinces from the United States, and the average cost per ton. What do these tables show? Why, Sir, they show that, in Ontario, in 1877, there were 261,895 tons imported, costing \$1,163,944, or \$4.45 per ton—that was before the imposition of any duty; in 1878, there were 266,434 tons imported, at a cost of \$1,022,816, or \$3.85 per ton; in 1880, there were 335,794 tons imported, costing \$1,022,055, or \$3.04 per ton; in 1881, there were 357,524 tons imported, costing \$1,522,375, or \$4.25 per ton. So that we have never reached, down to the present time, the cost per ton of anthracite coal coming into the city of Toronto; it has never reached the price that was placed upon that article before there was the imposition of one cent of duty. In Quebec, in 1877, there were imported 117,124 tons, costing \$468,759, or \$4 per ton,—mark, Sir, that Quebec, though much further from the point of production, was a point of sharp competition, and the result was that, instead of having to pay in Quebec \$4.45 a ton, as they paid in Toronto, they only paid \$4 a ton; in 1878, \$3.15; in 1880, \$2.65, when the 50 cents duty was imposed; and in 1881, \$3.77. In Nova Scotia competition was still greater, and the distance was much greater also. The anthracite coal mines of Pennsylvania as you will observe, are at the furthest point, and yet the cost of the anthracite coal of Nova Scotia was far lower than either in Ontario or Quebec, both of which were much nearer to the point of production. In 1877, the importation was 11,887 tons, costing \$44,560, or \$3.74 per ton; in 1878, the average cost was \$2.93 per ton; in 1880, \$2.58; in 1881, \$3.70. In New Brunswick it cost \$4 per ton, the same as in Quebec in 1877; \$3.46 in 1878; \$2.81 in 1880, when the duty was imposed; and \$3.70 in 1881. So that here you have the fact clearly established that the very moment the duty was imposed the parties who shipped their coals to Toronto and Quebec, put these places into a different category from what they were before, they made them competitive points and reduced the cost of coal to a larger extent than the amount of duty paid. It is impossible for any impartial mind to arrive at any other conclusion than that the imposition of a duty of 50 cents a ton has not only not increased the cost to the consumer, but it has lowered the cost to the consumer

in Ontario. The following is the table from which I have been quoting :

Province.	Year.	Tons.	Total Cost.		Cost per Ton.
			\$	\$ cts.	
Ontario.....	1877	261,895	1,163,944	4 45	
	1878	266,434	1,022,816	3 85	
	1880	335,794	1,022,055	3 04	
	1881	357,524	1,522,375	4 25	
Quebec.....	1877	117,124	468,759	4 00	
	1878	105,384	333,836	3 15	
	1880	142,239	378,150	2 65	
	1881	161,449	608,813	3 77	
Nova Scotia.....	1877	11,877	44,560	3 74	
	1878	10,592	31,169	2 93	
	1880	12,513	32,467	2 58	
	1881	15,909	54,661	3 70	
New Brunswick.....	1877	23,223	92,823	4 00	
	1878	21,240	73,555	3 46	
	1880	24,232	63,095	2 81	
	1881	28,243	104,807	3 70	

It will be at once apparent that the price of coal in 1880 was less than in 1878, the first named year being the year after the imposition of the duty, and the second named year being the year immediately preceding it. So you here have that additional fact; in other words, there was a drop in the price as invoiced to Canadian dealers immediately after the National Policy was adopted, just as the Grand Trunk Railway puts its fare up when the St. Lawrence is closed, and puts its fare down when the St. Lawrence is open, simply because in one case they have to meet competition, and, in the other case, they have no competition. Bituminous coal followed the same rule, and the United States practically ceased sending any into the Dominion, with the exception of Ontario, where the invoiced prices, as per Customs returns, show an average of \$3. 3 per ton for 1881, as against \$3.67 for 1877. That shows the United States coal owners feared less the competition with Nova Scotia, because they found that it had not been sent forward to the extent they feared it would be, and they increased the price to a certain extent. Now, Sir, I think I have shown that the price of coal varies in the United States according to the degree of competition experienced by it from the coal from Nova Scotia and Great Britain; otherwise you would not have coal sent to Quebec at a lower price, you would not have coal sent a longer distance than it is to Toronto from the Pennsylvania coal fields. In Boston, a sea-board city of the United States, the price of coal is \$6.50. In the inland city of Chicago the price is \$8.50. How do hon. gentlemen account for that? The cost of carrying to the city of Boston, and the cost of carrying to Chicago is the same. I have under my hand a periodical published in New York, called *Coal*, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to verify the statement, he will find that the cost of carriage to Chicago and to Boston is the same—\$2 in each case—yet the price of coal in Boston is \$6.50, while in Chicago it is \$8.50, showing that the price of coal is fixed by the coal dealers and by the amount of competition. In Chicago there is no competition with British or Nova Scotia coal, and the consequence is that the price is put up to just the highest point the coal dealers can place it; showing again, Sir, as I have stated, that this question of its being placed on the competitive, or the non-competitive position, affects the price of coal. My authority for the statement I have made as to the freight rate to Boston is the *Boston Herald's* commercial report, and a periodical published in New York called *Coal*, and dated the 25th of January. The receipts of Nova Scotia and English coal into Boston, in 1880, were 54,781 tons. In 1881, somewhat

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

more; and a large proportion of the coal import in 1881 was from Nova Scotia, as Cape Breton coal owners endeavored to force it into that market at \$3.50 per ton. No coal was supplied to Chicago from others than the Pennsylvania coal fields. I think, under these circumstances, the House will have no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the several ports of Canada (and of Ontario especially) were, by reason of the duty imposed upon foreign coal, removed by the Pennsylvania coal owners from the list of non-competitive points to the list of competitive points. The proof of this is the fact that the Boston wholesale price, to dealers of anthracite, in 1881, was \$4.20, while the wholesale price in Toronto, of the same kind of coal, was, in 1881, \$4.20. The authority in this case is the *Boston Herald's* commercial article for the Boston price, and, for the Toronto price, the Customs returns and the following table, which gives the total import of coal into Ontario, and the price of anthracite, compared with Philadelphia—a non-competitive point:—

Year.	Quantity.	Cost of market of purchase.	Price per ton.	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	Philadelphia
				wholesale price.	more than Ontario.	less than Ontario.
	Tons.	\$	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1877.....	420,010	1,793,407	4.27	2 59	1.68
1878.....	406,971	1,476,022	3.62	3.22	1.00
1879 to March 15.....	322,528	1,252,703	3.88	2.89	1.00
1879 after March 15.....	93,895	245,255	2.71	2.37
1880.....	516,729	1,509,960	2.92	4 53	1 61
1881.....	344,833	1,499,143	4.34	4 90	1 00

This table shows, first, that prior to the 15th of March, 1879, the Philadelphia dealer purchased his coal at a cheaper rate than the Ontario coal dealer; second, that after the imposition of the duty, the average price of the Ontario coal dealers was less than that of Philadelphia in 1880, by \$1.61, and in the fiscal year of 1881, by 56 cents. If we compare Toronto with Philadelphia, we find that Toronto coal dealers obtained their supply during the calendar year 1881, at \$4.20 per ton against Philadelphia at \$4.90, or 70 cents less than Philadelphia; and if the duty were added to the price of the coal, there would still be a large margin in favor of Toronto against Philadelphia. Further evidence is to be found in the fact that coal sold at Ogdensburg, in the winter of 1880-81, for \$5.90, while at Prescott the retail price was \$6 per ton; the cost of freight to Prescott, harbor dues and unloading is 68 cents. If the duty were added to the cost of the coal, it ought to have sold at \$5.90 plus 68 cents plus 50 cents, or in all \$7.08. At Oswego, coal sold during the present year, at \$5.75; freight, from Oswego to Belleville, 40 cents; harbor dues and unloading, 28 cents; if duty were added to cost, 50 cents, the coal ought to sell at \$6.93, while the price at Belleville was \$6.50, showing that the result of the duty has been to decrease and not to increase the price of coal. At Buffalo, coal sells the present winter for \$5.70; the freight to Toronto is \$1; cartage 30 cents, or equal to \$7. The freight in this case is given on the authority of railway companies, that being the rate from the Bridge to Toronto for all quantities of coal under 10,000 tons. In summer rates are lower, Mr. Nairn, a coal dealer of Toronto, placing the freight at 70 cents during the summer. The price of coal then was \$6.50, in Toronto. During the present month the price of coal, in Toronto, was advertised at \$6.50, by P. Burns, a leading coal dealer. At that price, with winter rates of freight, coal is obtained by consumers at 50 cents less than the consumers of Buffalo pay for it. At Chicago, coal retails at from \$8 to \$8.50, or an average of \$8.25. The rail freight from Buffalo is \$2

the difference in freight is 70 cents in favor of Toronto. If Toronto paid as much as Chicago it ought to pay \$8.25 minus 70 cents, or \$7.55; if the duty is added to the cost to the consumer, Toronto, to have its coal at the same proportionate rate as Chicago, would have to pay \$7.55 and duty 50 cents, or \$8.05. It actually pays \$6.50 to \$7. At Detroit coal sells at retail for \$6.25; freight from Buffalo 50 cents. The price at Toronto is \$6.50, with freight \$1, ought to be \$6.70, to be proportionately as dear as Detroit. In further proof that the duty is not paid by the people of Ontario see following table of the retail prices in Toronto at the several dates mentioned:—

	Hard Coal.	Soft Coal.
Oct 24, 1872	\$7.00.....	\$8.00
" 23, 1873	7.50.....	7.00
" 22, 1874	7.75.....	7.00
" 30, 1875	7.00.....	5.75
" 25, 1881.....	6.50.....	5.50

In 1881, with the duty of 50 cents in operation, the cost at Toronto of hard coal was \$6.50, and soft coal \$5.50, the lowest price at which this table shows it to have been purchased since 1872.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was it in 1884?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This table does not give it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it is a very convenient table.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am taking the figures in this table from the prices furnished by the *Toronto Globe*—a table which shows that in no year between 1872 and 1875 inclusive, when there was no duty on coal, was coal as cheap in Toronto as it has been in 1881, with the duty fully established; so that the hon. gentleman will have to work at that table a good deal before he will be able to invalidate the conclusive argument which I have adduced therefrom—that the imposition of the duty on coal has been in favor of the Ontario consumer, so far as the price of coal is concerned. The *Philadelphia Ledger*, in December, said:

“Coal demand has been in excess of the ability of the companies to furnish it. It is really just cause for apprehension for the future, should the trouble of want of water or other causes continue to limit production.”

This was said because of the drought of last season; nevertheless, Toronto coal supply was cheaper to it than in full production years. Now, Sir, I have another table to which I wish to invite the attention of hon. gentlemen, as showing what the effect of the National Policy has been on this great and important industry. It is a comparative statement of the coal sales, labor, &c., in Nova Scotia, for 1873, the last year of the Macdonald Government; 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie rule; and, 1879 to 1881, three years under the National Policy. It shows the decrease under the Mackenzie Administration and the increase under the National Policy:

	1873.	1878.	Decrease in 1878.	1881.	Increase in 1881 over 1878.
Coal sales from Nova Scotia mines.....	881,106	693,511	187,595	1,034,800	341,289
The number of men employed	4,362	3,135	1,227	3,600	465
Number of days worked at coal.....	995,153	663,850	331,303	847,595	183,705
Tons of coal shipped from Nova Scotia to Montreal and Quebec	187,059	83,710	103,349	263,628	184,918
Total imports of coal at Montreal and Quebec....	415,380	328,074	87,306	529,091	201,017
Coal shipments from Cape Breton to Montreal and Quebec	80,213	28,108	52,105	146,122	118,014
Total tons of coal shipped from Sydney Harbor.....	253,396	128,061	125,335	258,961	130,900
Tonnage of ships arrived in Port Sydney.....	222,999	215,061	7,938	406,082	191,021

I give to hon. gentlemen opposite these facts and figures, which establish beyond question the fact that, so far from the people of Ontario having suffered from the imposition of a coal duty, the very reverse has been the case.

Mr. ANGLIN. By the Upper Provinces, I presume the hon. gentleman means Quebec and Ontario.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I mean Quebec and Ontario. At Cobourg, where I had the pleasure, at no very remote period, of discussing before the people—if not in the presence of the hon. leader of the Opposition—this very important question, I was able to deal with a very remarkable argument which he gave in favor of reducing the duty on coal. And what do hon. gentlemen suppose it was? And, Sir, I may say, while referring to that, that the ex-Finance Minister, the other night, gave us the same reason. He said, what a frightful injustice to railways. It was not the poor man then on whose behalf he complained—because I may say that these “shivering wretches” with whom the hon. ex-Finance Minister is so familiar, are not known to us. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the day is not remote when there were shivering wretches suffering from want of employment, and without the comforts of life. But I am happy to know that, under the policy now in operation in this country, all that is changed. Where there was misery and cold there is now comfort and happiness. But I say that coal is not the fuel of the poor man in Canada. I say that to nineteen-twentieths of the poor people of Canada wood is their fuel, and the price of coal does not touch the question at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman say that of Toronto, where the great consumption of coal is?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it of Canada. There are other places in this country besides Toronto, although the hon. gentleman does make it his home.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows that in the country districts the people have not the necessity nor the means of getting coal; but where coal is consumed, is it consumed by the rich or the poor?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought I made it plain to the hon. gentleman that it is a matter of no moment to them, because I have shown that the poor man of Toronto gets his coal cheaper under the National Policy than he did before. But I say that, taking this whole Dominion, wood is the fuel of the poor man, and therefore it is a delusion for these hon. gentlemen to dwell on the price of coal as a hardship to the poor. I have shown that it is not a hardship but a benefit to the poor. The hon. gentlemen were greatly alarmed for two classes, and who were they? Why, Sir, they were the railways and the manufacturers. I thought these manufacturers were bloated aristocrats, that you could not take too much out of. But, Sir, it appears that these hon. gentlemen as the day approaches when they have to be put in the balance and weighed, are becoming very sensitive in regard to the manufacturers, and they want coal put on the free list in order to increase the enormous profits to these manufacturers. Suppose the manufacturer had to pay an addition of 50 cents a ton on coal, he was able to pay it, because we had given him an increased production. We had provided for fostering and protecting his industry against the slaughtering from the neighboring country that formerly crushed it out, and thus enabled him to pay this additional 50 cents a ton without feeling it. But, Sir, what about the railways? Have the railways any ground for complaint? How was the hon. the ex-Finance Minister able to make a case in respect to the railway? By quoting the speech of Sir Henry Tyler? No; but by misquoting the speech of Sir Henry Tyler. The hon. gentleman put words in the mouth of Sir Henry Tyler which he never uttered. I challenge him on this point. I say more. I say the hon. gentleman,

who entertains such a very low estimate of human nature as his speech the other night led us to believe he holds, ought to be careful how he places words in the mouth of any man that the man never uttered, because it is open to the imputation that the hon. gentleman's knowledge was not at fault. Now, Sir, I tell him, if he did not know it, he ought to have known it; and I tell you why. This subject had been a matter of public discussion. The *Globe* newspaper had falsified the report of Sir Henry Tyler's speech. Either the *Globe's* correspondent in London, or the persons at the *Globe* office in Toronto, falsified Sir Henry Tyler's language and made him say that which he never had said. That became a subject of discussion, and the *Globe* was challenged with the production of Sir Henry Tyler's speech, which proved the statement I have made, namely, that either the correspondent in London or the parties in the office at Toronto were so driven to the wall to sustain their untenable position on this question, that they had to do what the hon. ex-Finance Minister, after this has been a matter of public discussion, ought not to have done,—put words in the mouth of Sir Henry Tyler which he never uttered.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Produce the speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have got it here, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that not only does it not say what he has stated that it said, but the very reverse. Sir Henry Tyler, of course, like all gentlemen in his position, was anxious to show why he had not a larger net balance in favor of the railway, and he would have been only too glad if he could have shown that the imposition of the duty of 50 cents per ton on coal had compelled him to take that 50 cents out of the earnings of the railway in order to adjust his balance, but he did not venture to say so; he could not say so, because I happen to know that the Grand Trunk had purchased coal cheaper than the company had purchased it before, and therefore Sir Henry Tyler was not in a position to make such a statement. He said:

"He gives us all the reasons for the excess in the expenditure of the present half year, which you will see on page 12—increased consumption of fuel caused by much severer weather during the past winter. 2nd. Advance in prices of fuel, wages, and materials. 3rd. Outlay in working the extra traffic, which, of course, requires extra fuel; and so on. As regards fuel, I should like to tell you what we are doing in that respect. We are gradually economizing, and using more coal and less wood."

Sir Henry Tyler was made to say that his company was suffering, that the Grand Trunk and all the railways were suffering to the extent of the duty on coal. He tells the people that, although he had not got as large a balance as he desired, he was increasing it, because the company was using more coal and less wood. He said:

"In the half-year ending June, 1880, we used 60,000 cords of wood and in the half-year ending June, 1881, only 48,000 cords. *Per contra*, we used in the half-year ending June, 1880, 109,000 tons of coal; so that we had a decrease of 12,000 cords of wood and an increase of 34,000 tons of coal. As wood becomes more scarce, and there are extra facilities for getting coal, we shall hope, in working our traffic, to effect further economy in this respect."

The hon. the ex-Finance Minister put language in Sir Henry Tyler's mouth which he never uttered.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is that all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that not enough to show that Sir Henry Tyler did not say what has been reported? Is it not quite enough to show that there is no foundation for that which *Hansard* shows the ex-Finance Minister stated, and the words he put in Sir Henry Tyler's mouth? Is it not enough that Sir Henry Tyler, instead of saying they are suffering from the increased cost of coal, owing to the duty, and that it was increased by the amount of the duty, which the ex-Finance Minister made him say, the company are economizing by using more coal and abandoning the use of wood? If the hon. member for Lambton does not think

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that enough, I am afraid it will be very hard for any one to satisfy him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows it is not enough as well as I do.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it will not be necessary to occupy the attention of the House much longer in respect to the question of coal. I think I have disposed once and for ever of any foundation whatever for the imputation that the duty upon coal has increased the cost to the consumer in any part of the whole Dominion. I have shown that whereas poverty and suffering existed before, now all is comfort and prosperity. I have shown hon. gentlemen that the great coal-mining industry, which was languishing and dying, and would have been crushed out, has revived; we would, under the late policy, have been in the position that Ontario would have had no protection, for there would have been no Canadian coal-mines that would have been brought into requisition. But all that had been changed, and now we found not only industries springing up in every direction, but, at the same time, it can be clearly established that this has been accomplished without either manufacturers or railways or any persons being called upon to pay a single additional farthing. But suppose it had cost the railways something? What have we done for the railways under our policy? Does the hon. gentleman know how those railways have progressed under the National Policy that he and the leader of the Opposition are so exceedingly anxious about—those great corporations which cannot be said to be so very poor? The hon. gentleman has only to look at the returns, and he will find they are of a very striking and interesting character, like all other statistics relating to the National Policy. Those prove beyond controversy the interesting growth, prosperity, advancement and progress of this country. There is no barometer you can apply that will give you a clearer test as to the public weal than the railway receipts of the country. The railways stretch through the country in every direction, and just in proportion as the country flourishes the receipts advance, and as the country suffers they decline. Let me invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to what the railway returns show, and then they will see whether there was any cause for expressing sympathy for the railway companies, even if they paid a coal duty. The following is a comparative statement of the tons of freight carried and of receipts:—

—	1876-77.	1877-78.	1878-79.	1879-80.	1880-81.
Number of tons of freight carried.....	6,859,796	7,863,472	8,348,810	9,938,858	12,102,245
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Receipts from passengers.....	6,458,493	6,386,325	6,459,598	7,076,340	8,198,274
Receipts from freight	11,321,264	13,129,191	12,509,094	15,506,935	18,616,517
Receipts from mails and express.....	744,741	795,797	789,926	851,288	942,671
Receipts from other sources.....	217,554	208,764	166,448	102,076	150,257
	18,742,052	20,520,077	19,925,066	23,536,639	27,907,719

Thus we have a total of \$18,742,052 in 1876-77, against \$19,925,066 in 1878-79; and when the hon. gentleman's policy was changed, we have \$27,907,719 received from railways in this country, or an increase in 1880-81, from the year the hon. gentleman received permission to retire from the management of public affairs, of no less than \$8,082,453. So that, if the railways had to pay a few cents duty a ton on

coal, they could very well afford to pay it, considering the position in which they are placed to-day under the National Policy, compared with that in which they were placed before. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to carry his attention back to the occasion on which he introduced his first Budget Speech. What was the prospect he held out then with reference to the Intercolonial Railway? He led the House to believe that they might be prepared for a deficit of \$1,250,000 in the working of that railway. Well, the year that they retired from the management of public affairs, the deficit went up to nearly \$750,000, and, had the hon. gentleman remained long enough in power, I think he would have been able to prove himself a correct prophet by running the deficit up to the amount he estimated, \$1,250,000. To-day, however, we are able to say that we have increased the carriage of freight 42 per cent., and instead of having to face a deficit of \$750,000, as the account stood in 1878-79, when the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite was changed, we had a small balance it is true, but a balance on the right side of the books. The hon. gentleman may say that we increased freight 42 per cent. So we did, but what effect would that have had if they remained in power? If it had cost as much to carry a ton of freight as when they were in power, the deficits would have enormously increased, and the hon. gentleman would have been able to show triumphantly how accurate he made his estimate when he estimated that it would reach \$1,250,000. Turn which way you like, and what do you find? You find, just as the railroad barometer shows, an enormous increase of traffic, progress, prosperity and comfort, taking the place of poverty and retrogression. That is what you find all over this country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister had the proud satisfaction of standing here, the other night, and presenting a picture of the condition of this country, such as might well fill with just pride the breast of every patriotic Canadian. It did not seem to have quite that effect upon some hon. gentlemen who are not a hundred miles away. One would have supposed he was unfolding a record of the most disastrous woe that could befall a country, if one were to judge from the lengthened visage of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance. Perhaps no man ever suffered more than he, while it was his painful duty to see the hon. Finance Minister place in bold relief, though without any allusion to it, the successful results of his policy in contradistinction to the failure of the policy of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance. I need not remind you of the fact that when we adopted our policy, when the issue was joined, when the question was practically for this country whether we should have direct taxation or adopt the National Policy of protecting Canadian industries on Canadian soil. The hon. gentleman smiles when I refer to direct taxation. Does he forget that he himself stood here and admitted that he was at the end of his tether, that all his resources were exhausted, that he knew of no means of wringing any more taxation out of the impoverished people of this country except by direct taxation?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No; I did not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman forgets that when a number of the members from Lower Canada were urging a policy that would favor the growth of Canadian tobacco, he met that proposition, not by saying that it was a bad one, but by saying that it would take \$500,000 out of the revenue, and that he knew no mode of replacing it except by direct taxation. The hon. gentleman referred the other night to memories. There is no one thing that he has so much reason to dread as the memory of the members of this House. His Budget Speeches have been fyled away, and have become musty, because no person wishes to turn up such unprofitable and unwholesome reading. If he could only wipe out the recollection of those speeches, and the positions

that he assumed when he was feebly attempting to grapple with what he was unable to deal with—the financial interests of this country—it would be, indeed, a fortunate thing for him. We can well recollect when the hon. gentleman brought down his Tariff in 1874 and imposed \$3,000,000 additional taxes, and came back two years later with another deficit, and asked for an additional \$500,000 taxes, he told us we had reached the limit of indirect taxation, and that if he had any convenient mode of collecting an income tax he would be disposed to propound it. I say that, when the right hon. the leader of the Government came to the rescue, when the people themselves came to the rescue and saved the country from the incompetent hands of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, we stood on the threshold of direct taxation; and if we have it not now it is because these hon. gentlemen were deprived of the position for which they had shown their utter unfitness. But what did they say when our policy was adopted, when we compelled them to admit that we had fairly and faithfully redeemed the pledges on which we had been elected, that we had carried out manfully the assurances we had given the people? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the memories of hon. members of this House have enabled them to forget that the ground he took was that it would fail as a revenue Tariff?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman forget that he took the ground, on the floor of this Parliament, that the depression would be intensified instead of decreased? Does he forget that for six long months, he and all his followers, in and out of this House, and the *Globe* newspaper, endeavored to show that the depression was deepening, and that the country was irretrievably ruined; and it was only when right and left, before and behind, everywhere in fact, evidence presented itself so overwhelming of the progress and prosperity of the country that it could be no longer concealed, that the hon. gentlemen harked back on their prophecies and tried to discover something besides the National Policy to which our great progress might be attributed? But, Sir, that door is not open to them. It was closed by themselves. Here, on the floor of Parliament, when discussing this great issue of the fiscal policy of Canada, they declared the adoption of the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would fail as a source of revenue, because it would so tax the imports coming into this country that no one could import anything. We tried, in our feeble way, to convince them that they were wrong. We tried to show them that, if we fostered and protected the interests of Canada as they should be, the purchasing power of the people would be increased, and that the imports would increase in a corresponding ratio. Hon. gentlemen had other objections. What were they? They said: "The credit of the country is gone; your policy is such an attack upon Imperial interests that it will close the money market of the world, and your loss of revenue will deprive you still further of the means of paying the indebtedness of the country." That was the hon. gentleman's ground. Where do we stand to-day? When my hon. friend was able to stand up and tell us the revenue had shown such buoyancy, and reached the position it had never shown before, did my hon. friend attempt to show that the credit of the country had suffered? Why, Sir, let me invite the hon. ex-Minister's attention for a few moments to the figures that I have here. If he has any doubt about the credit of the country, they will set his doubts at rest at once and for ever. What did he do when he was entrusted with the power of negotiating the bonds of Canada in the money markets of the world—before he required any money—the hon. gentleman rushed with hot haste into the money market, and by a process to which we shall perhaps refer more at length by-and-by, put the securities of Canada

on the market—as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance did upon an open market, with free competition, in order that Canada might get what they were worth? No; he fixed the price, he fixed the interest, he fixed the period of the bonds, and fixed the price away below what the bonds were selling for in England at the time on the open market, and what was the result? The result is one that will for ever close that hon. gentleman's mouth on the question of the credit of the country. Who are the happy possessors of the four millions sterling worth of bonds that the hon. gentleman took across the Atlantic, in 1874 and disposed of among his friends—

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Who were my friends.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That, Sir, is more than I can tell. The hon. gentleman has refused us that information. If the hon. gentleman is impervious to every kind of evidence, he cannot be impervious to the fact that the men to whom he gave those bonds are, to-day, £600,000 sterling richer than they were before they saw him; that the men to whom he gave the £4,000,000 worth of debentures are, at this moment, the happy possessors of \$2,920,000 more than they paid him for the bonds. I do not wonder the hon. gentleman is getting very uneasy, but there is more to come. What does the hon. gentleman say of 1876? He went back again there when he did not require money, and sold his bonds at a ruinous discount—4 or 5 per cent. below what they were bringing in the market. The happy possessors of those bonds, amounting to £2,500,000 sterling are \$1,825,000 richer than when they purchased those bonds at the price fixed by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance. That, I think, will settle at once and for ever, any question as to the credit of Canada. I do not say that our present position is all due to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I doubt it very much. I do not say it is all due to the National Policy, because had our bonds on that occasion got fair play in the money markets of the world, they would not have been sold at these ruinous figures, however satisfactory the arrangements may be for the happy parties with whom the Finance Minister made them. Well, Sir, what was my hon. friend the Finance Minister able to show? He was able to show, instead of being in the unhappy position of the ex-Finance Minister, who accumulated a deficit of \$7,500,000 in three years—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I repeat it, Sir. I say, but for the fact that these hon. gentlemen were dismissed from power by the overwhelming fiat of the great majority of independent electors of this country; but for the fact that the hon. gentleman was deprived of the opportunity of continuing his mad and senseless policy, on July 1st, 1879, he would have had a deficit to face, in the three years, of \$7,500,000. What is the position of the hon. Minister of Finance? He stands in the proud position of being able to show, not only remarkable progress, prosperity, happiness, comfort, and everything that a country can desire to see within its borders, but, under this Tariff, in 1881, a surplus of \$4,139,000; in 1882, a surplus of \$4,450,000, and, in 1883, he has the best reason for estimating an additional \$3,000,000 of surplus. Notwithstanding that he gives back \$1,500,000 taxes to the people, he is able to meet the country with the best evidence that any Finance Minister can desire: that, instead of a deficit of \$7,500,000 in three years, he will have a surplus of \$11,500,000. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen do not like surpluses. When did they discover that a surplus was such a deplorable thing? Why, Sir, we have never ceased to hear them praising the position of the great Republic to the south of us. Do they say a surplus is a bad thing, that it is very bad statesmanship to wipe off the debts of the country by hundreds of millions—\$250,000,000 the year before last was wiped off of the debt of the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

And yet these hon. gentlemen think a surplus is very bad. Well, Sir, they took the best means to convince the country of their sincerity, for they abhorred a surplus as the greatest pestilence that could invade a country, and they were successful in showing the reverse of a surplus to an extent that would satisfy the most exacting mind. But what more does my hon. friend show? He shows that we have a decreased interest—notwithstanding the great expenditure on the public service of the country—in the year of \$90,000, or an absolute decrease, in the charge on interest, of \$25,000. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has exhibited great anxiety about the indebtedness of Canada. Well, he may thank God and take courage while the management of the financial affairs of the country is in the hands of the present Minister of Finance, because the Minister has shown that we can carry on the public works without increasing the public indebtedness or the charge for interest. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite have been greatly exercised, and have perambulated the country with doleful statements about the enormously increasing expenditure; but we have been able to carry on the public business at an expenditure of actually 23 cents less per capita of the estimated population than the amount expended by hon. gentlemen opposite. But, Sir, I say that the ex-Finance Minister failed, utterly failed, to grapple with this question. It is true he talked here for three hours, and he talked—I was going to say to very unwilling ears; but I will not, as there were not many ears here to listen to him. Most of them were conspicuous by their absence, and at that I was not at all surprised. After listening to the hon. gentleman for a weary half-hour, and finding him going over and over the same old story that he seems to have got by rote, and is evidently unable to get out of his mind, I was reminded of a witty expression of Lawrence O'Connor Doyle in the Nova Scotia Legislature. There was an exciting discussion there on the subject of pickled fish, and a great deal of acerbity had been thrown into the debate. Presently the debate toned down and it was being carried on in a subdued way, when Larry Doyle rose in his place and said: "We had better take to the question for the pickle has run out and there is nothing but tongues and sounds left." Now, for the first hour of the hon. gentleman's speech we had the pickle, but after the pickle ran out we had nothing but tongues and sounds left; and I am sure it was a relief to the House when the hon. gentleman resumed his seat. Well, the hon. Finance Minister has not only done what I have already described, but he is able to show \$1,000,000 of reduction in the controllable expenditure of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to know where the surplus comes from, and they say: "Did not it come out of the people's pockets?" I say in reply, no; \$750,000 come out of the savings in the management of the Intercolonial Railway—the saving of money you wasted before, of money you would waste again if you had the opportunity. The ex-Finance Minister made a point of the Post Office expenditure. But what do the Post Office expenditures show? They show that we spent more money on the Post Office service, and yet that it cost Canada less than it did during the term of office of our predecessors, because, notwithstanding the enormous extension of the service in the North-West and the improvement of facilities generally, the deficiency between our revenue and expenditure is greatly less than when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in charge. The hon. the Finance Minister was also able to show that we could carry our economies into effect when we came into power, an illustration of which was found in the saving of \$671 per mile in the running of the Intercolonial, meaning, in all, a half or three-quarters of a million dollars. He was also in the proud position to show that, notwithstanding the large capital expenditure that has been made, notwithstanding the fact that from the time of the Union until 1878-79 the per capita debt increased from \$29 to \$34—the per

capita debt has only been increased \$1 over and above the amount at which it stood when hon. gentlemen opposite left power. The hon. gentleman was also able to show that, when the great Canadian Pacific Railway is completed, and every dollar of expenditure is provided for, the debt of this country—including the canal expenditure and everything else—would only be \$203,000,000; and that the surpluses—the money the country can afford to pay, as they do in the United States, to the reduction or diminution of the debt—would, up to that period, bring the amount down to \$175,000,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With the sinking fund?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the surpluses, with the sinking fund, would bring it down to \$175,000,000. So I think the anxiety of the leader of the Opposition, on the score of the debt, will be very much relieved. The hon. the Finance Minister also drew attention to the fact—a fact which hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute—that if we sell one-half of the rich, fertile lands we have for sale in the great North-West, at \$1 per acre—and hon. gentlemen opposite are hardly likely to question that calculation—the debt of Canada will be reduced down to \$100,000,000, or to a figure, after the great national work has been provided for, far below what it is at this moment. The hon. gentleman has shown that such was the improved condition of the people that, while these hon. gentlemen are talking about the pressure upon the poor man, and while the hon. gentleman says that the fiscal policy of the country has degraded the poor man, while the hon. gentleman has endeavored to show that his comfort has been less, my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Finance meets him with conclusive testimony as to the fact that, in three years and four months, these poor suffering operatives have deposited no less than \$13,000,000 in the savings banks of this country; and this, too, notwithstanding the regulation which shut out and closed these savings banks against the wealthier class of the community, and the class of deposits which used to be received. And not only was there an increase of \$13,000,000 in the savings, but also increased deposits in the other banks of no less than \$23,000,000, or an increase of \$36,000,000 in all in money deposited in the banks of Canada in three years and four months; and this is indisputable evidence of the position which this country to-day occupies, notwithstanding the fact which is patent to every hon. gentleman, that, during these three years and four months, more money and more capital has been invested by the capitalists of Canada in fostering, promoting, and building up our industries than ever occurred before in Canada during the same period. The hon. gentleman is, moreover, able to extend the free list; the hon. gentleman is able to take the duties off tea and coffee; the hon. gentleman is able to meet the desire of our friends in Lower Canada with reference to home-grown tobacco; the hon. gentleman is able to strike off the Stamp duties to the amount of \$200,000 a year; the hon. gentleman is able to give the fishermen of this country a bounty of \$150,000 a year, and well we may do so. What do they do? Why, Sir, these hardy sons of toil, these men who have to take their lives in their hands in building up the industries of the country, have created exports for Canada of no less than \$6,000,000 per annum. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the estimates have been increased. So they have. Naturally they have been increased; and my hon. friend pointed out the reasons why they have not been increased with regard to the controllable expenditure, for that we have decreased—but merely in order that the hon. the Finance Minister might properly discharge his duty to the country. Now, Sir, I think we have given pretty conclusive evidence as to the position which the country occupies. I think that the statements made by my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Finance will carry the conviction to the mind of every intelligent man in this country,

that no country on which the sun shines, was ever in a position to claim greater advance in the progress that has been made in the same time, or was in a happier and more prosperous state than Canada is in to-day. I have had myself the opportunity of seeing more of Canada during the last six months than probably any Canadian ever saw of the country during the same time. I have travelled away up the Pacific coast, and I have gone 300 or 400 miles into the interior of British Columbia, returning through the North-West, Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. I passed through Prince Edward Island from end to end, and with regard to every section of the country which I visited, I am here to add my testimony to that which the hon. Finance Minister gave in such a conclusive manner, and to declare that a more united, a more happy, a more prosperous, and more progressive people are not to be found in any part of the world than are to be found in Canada to-day. This, Sir, is the proud position which my hon. friend occupies; and he was enabled to show that all this enormous increase has been given, and all this change in the trade policy of our country has been accomplished, without exposing ourselves to one jot or tittle of the danger which the ex-Minister of Finance predicted when this policy was introduced. It was said it was going to be inimical to Great Britain. But, Sir, the fact is now ascertained from the Trade Returns that, so far from this being the case, the very reverse has been the result. Instead of a policy, such as was in operation before, and which was eminently in the interest of our friends across the border, when no Canadian could look forward to any future, except the hope that he might continue to occupy the position to which we were reduced by hon. gentlemen opposite, of being the hewers of wood and drawers of water to our neighbors across the line, and instead of the trade of Canada being steadily withdrawn from Great Britain to whom we owe so much, and transferred to the foreign country to the south of us, building up that great and populous Republic, the result has been what my hon. friend said it would be, and the Trade Returns establish the fact that the average imports from the Mother Country are increased, while the average imports from the Republic to the south of us have been largely decreased. My hon. friend, moreover, has been able to show that not only is this the case, but also with increasing the price of all those products and articles which, owing to the high prices, were going to cause so much suffering and destitution throughout the country provided this policy was adopted. Competition between our home industries has been such that we occupy the vantage ground of being able to demonstrate that never were necessaries of life and the things which are incidental to the comfort and happiness of the poor man to be obtained in Canada at a cheaper rate than is now the case. And the hon. gentleman did not venture to question this.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I did.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I did so, very strongly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman merely said that: "Assuming it to be true, the question was not whether all these articles were to-day cheaper than they were in 1878 in Canada under my Tariff, but whether we can buy them cheaper to-day in Canada than in New York," and if so, he says: "You are injuring the poor man." Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he must be hard-pressed, when he is endeavoring to controvert the fiscal policy which is calculated to foster and protect the industries of Canada, and can only say, that the way in which the poor man is injured, is not because we have not reduced the cost of goods below what they were in 1878, under his Tariff, but because prices are not as low as they are in a country where the Tariff is

twice as high as ours. But let the hon. gentleman take courage and take heart. If, in a country where the duties imposed are doubly as heavy as they are in this country, you can buy cheaper, and if, under our policy, you can buy goods cheaper than was the case under his Tariff in 1878, how long will it be before you can get goods in Canada at prices greatly below those now paid for them? And the hon. gentleman will find that, while the Treasury is six millions better off, there is no industry in this country which is also not better off. He said—and I was not surprised to hear it—that he labored under very great difficulties in getting up a case against this policy. He says: "I cannot get the farmers to give me any information." The farmers are so rich and happy, and contented, and comfortable, that they would not talk to, or look at, the hon. the ex-Finance Minister at all, and I am not surprised at it. He says that the farmers were deceived. Sir, there is not a class of our people more difficult to deceive than our farmers. It is because he could not deceive the farmers of this country that the hon. gentleman is sitting where he is now. They felt that, under the hon. gentleman's policy, they did not get fair play in Canada, and they exercised their independent influence at the polls to place the hon. gentleman where he is, and to bring back into power the party who said they were determined to foster and protect and maintain Canadian interests on Canadian soil. Well, Sir, what else was my hon. friend able to show? These hon. gentlemen were very anxious about the amount paid to Sir Alexander Galt a little while ago. They said it was a terrible thing to have a High Commissioner, and consequently I was glad to learn, from the remarks made on the opening day of the Session, that the hon. leader of the Opposition had changed his mind on this point, and suggested that Canada had attained to so dignified a position that she ought to have a Minister at every civilized court in the world. But, Sir, Sir Alexander Galt, in conjunction with the Minister of Finance and the leader of the Government, have effected a financial arrangement, and what does it save? Why, Sir, we save \$15,000 a year in the payments which we are now required to make to Messrs. Glyn and Baring, under the system which was under operation when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of office; and not only that, but when \$35,000,000 are to be redeemed in 1885, the country will save in this one transaction, under this new arrangement, no less than \$350,000. I, therefore, say that if ever there was a Finance Minister who had reason to be satisfied, and who was able to point to every industry in the country, and show that new life and vitality were given to it, and to the position of every artisan and operative in this country, and demonstrate that his position was immensely improved over what it was before, it is my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The ex-Minister of Finance wants to know what we have done for the workmen. I have shown what we have done for the shipbuilders; I have shown what we have done for the miner, and I have shown what we have done for the farmer. It has been shown that the prices of the farmer's products have been better than ever before, and the hon. gentleman opposite (the ex-Finance Minister) impaled himself on the horns of this dilemma the other night. He said you cannot improve the price of wheat because that is regulated in Mark Lane; and yet the hon. gentleman denounced the tax in breadstuffs, including wheat, as an odious tax. I want him to establish the assertion that it is an odious tax, and that under the National Policy there is no improvement in the price of the products of the farm. Let me ask him this question: he says we have increased the farmers' burdens, and he has gone before the farmer with tears in his eyes to condemn our policy with this result: that the farmers have simply laughed at him. They have laughed at him because they knew that he had said here before, and would say here again if in power as he said the other night, that the laborer's burdens had been increased

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

by the price of living—that everything he used he had to pay more for it. How can you increase the cost of everything consumed by the laborer, mainly consisting of farm products, without benefitting the farmer? It is just such questions we had put to him. We told him we would benefit all classes of industries in the country. We told him we would improve the condition of the farmer by a better home market. But the hon. gentleman could not understand. But now when the farmer laughs at him on account of his theories, he will know that the people hold that his former statements were baseless; that the farmer to-day gets more for every product, that is more for every product of the soil than he could have got if the policy of the late Government, of making Canadians hewers of wood and drawers of water for any other country, had been carried out as he would still have carried it out.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will become my duty to make a few further observations in relation to the remarks made by the ex-Finance Minister in reply to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on Friday evening last. But before I do so I have a still more painful task to perform, of referring to the mode in which the hon. gentleman replied to my hon. friend the Finance Minister. I am in the judgment of the House when I say that the gratuitous and unprovoked insult offered to my hon. friend who propounded the policy of the Government in the Budget Speech, excited the common disgust of both sides of the House. I say it to the credit of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who I believe felt as keenly the insult offered to my hon. friend, and the still greater insult offered to the dignity of Parliament, as the hon. gentlemen of this side of the House. My hon. friend the Finance Minister at a very early age engaged in commercial pursuits, and having, by industry, by integrity, by everything that men value, attained the confidence of all classes of the community in which he lived, he had the honor at a very early age to be elected the representative of the chief city of the Province of New Brunswick. That hon. gentleman so discharged his duty as to be elevated to the high and honorable position of Prime Minister of that Province, and he came to this Parliament in 1867 enjoying the respect of all classes of the Province in which he was born. In this great arena he was able to take such a high position as warranted his being advanced to the elevated position he now occupies, and, at a later period, he entered upon the highest social position in New Brunswick, amid the hearty applause of both sides in that Province, who vied with each other in terms of friendly reception upon its being announced that he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick. The colleagues of the hon. gentleman opposite in public declared that had they had the selection of a gentleman to fill that high office, there was no man they would have rather asked to occupy that position than my hon. friend. Well, at the close of his period of action as Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, he was invited by hon. gentlemen opposite to accept a second term.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No, he was not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would require better authority of contradiction than the ex-Finance Minister enjoys in this House or out of it, to cast doubt on my statement. I say again that the colleagues of the ex-Finance Minister, when he was Finance Minister, approached my hon. friend to induce him to accept the second term of the Governorship of that Province at their hands. What did he do? Why it was a position of ease; it was a position worthy of any gentleman in this House, or out of it, to

occupy. But he looked at his country, and saw the condition of public affairs; he saw the prostration of this country; he saw the lamentable position to which his successor had brought the financial affairs of the country; and, regardless of his own ease and comfort, he threw himself back into the political field and was again sent to this Parliament by the chief city of New Brunswick. Well, having been clothed with the important duties he now discharges, he returned to that constituency, and, by acclamation, was again sent back here to deal with the public affairs of this country. How has he dealt with them? Handling the most important questions that could be confided to any member of any administration, at a time the most critical in the history in Canada, he has been so enabled to deal with those great questions as to empower him to stand in the proud and triumphant position he now occupies, and to show the House that no Government in the country, or out of it, ever occupied a position more triumphant in relation to the questions of public policy which he has propounded. And, Sir, that speech, one which I need not say to the hon. gentlemen who heard it, was of transcendent ability—a speech that would have done honor to any representative assembly in the world—that speech, I say, the courtesy of which only equalled the ability with which it was delivered, was received by the ex-Finance Minister—how? Why, Sir, in a manner that, I have no hesitation in saying, caused his supporters and the hon. gentlemen who sit around him, to blush with shame.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, Sir, suppose that, instead of the record that my hon. friend possesses; suppose that he had stood in this House in the position of a man who, unable to make his own way, born in the lap of luxury, had had all the advantage that wealth can bestow, and had been sent to a great University on the other side of the water; and suppose that he had come back without high honors and distinction that such a man, if there was anything in him, ought to have come back with, had come back without either honor or distinction; supposing that having returned he had undertaken to qualify himself to practice in a learned profession, and after years of struggling was obliged to abandon it because he was not able to reach the Bar, and suppose, making use of his wealth, he had been able to obtain a constituency, and finding that the party with which he was associated knew him too well to entrust him with high and responsible duties, he had abandoned his party, turned his back upon his friends and went over to the enemy and made common cause with them, and by his political tergiversation obtained a position amongst his opponents of a life time that he had never been able to acquire among his friends; suppose that had been the position of my hon. friend, and suppose that having obtained the lofty position of Minister of Finance, instead of discharging the high duties that devolved upon him in the way my hon. friend has done, his first act was to put into the mouth of the Governor General a statement that was devoid of truth—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose that for political and party purposes he had asked the representative of Her Majesty in Parliament assembled to declare that the financial condition of this country was such from the inability of the revenue to meet the expenditure, that a serious deficit was inevitable—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That a serious deficit would follow unless increased taxation was laid upon the shoulders of the people—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So it was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose that after that hon. gentleman had ventured to make that statement, he had supported it, by attempting to force a balance in the Public Accounts, to the extent of half a million of money; suppose that my hon. friend stood convicted—and I use the term deliberately—stood convicted before this Parliament, of having put chargeable to revenue \$545,000 that was voted by Parliament for capital account, spent by Parliament for capital account, was transferred by the late Finance Minister to force a balance on the other side; suppose that after all that was done my hon. friend had been unable to accomplish his object, and that it had remained clear as noon day that after this half million had been carried over, he still stood in the position of having a proved and established surplus at the time he had declared there would be a deficit; suppose that would be the position—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I deny every word of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does he deny having declared that the ordinary expenditure of the country demanded a large increase in the volume of taxation to be put upon the people of this country? I have, under my hand here, the hon. gentleman's own testimony, and there was not a word of truth in it. The same hon. gentleman that declared that there had been \$1,500,000 deficit on the 1st July, 1874, the same hon. gentleman that declared that, in 1875, the ordinary expenditure of the country would have involved a deficit of \$2,000,000, committed himself to this statement which I will read, and then I will leave the House to judge how far that hon. gentleman's statement will be regarded as a contradiction to any statement that any hon. gentleman may make in this House. I read from an Order in Council. What does it say? That that \$3,000,000 of taxes was imposed to meet a deficit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. You should say, were imposed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am much obliged to my hon. friend. I am afraid I shall be charged with being ungrammatical. Does it say these \$3,000,000 of taxes were imposed for the purpose of meeting a prospective deficit in the ordinary expenditure? No, Sir, but the hon. gentleman here stands committed, with every colleague that he had in the Government, to the statement that every dollar of that was imposed for another and a different purpose, and that was to meet the expenditure that would be involved by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will read from an Order in Council, to the truth of which every one of those gentlemen is pledged, of the 8th July, 1874, after the close of this very year in which the hon. gentleman declared that it was necessary to impose high additional taxation in order to enable the revenue to cover the expenditure. On that day, this Minute of Council is signed and sent to the same Governor General that had been asked to declare, in his place in Parliament, that a large taxation was required to meet the ordinary expenditure of the country. It says:

"In order to enable the Government to carry out the proposals which it was hoped British Columbia would have accepted, the average rate of taxation was raised, at the late Session, about 15 per cent.; Customs duties being raised from 15 to 17½ per cent., and the Excise duties on spirits and tobacco, a corresponding rate, both involving additional taxation exceeding \$3,000,000 in the transactions of the year."

Now, the hon. gentleman ventured the statement that this taxation was required to meet an impending deficit, and yet he declares that more than \$3,000,000—\$3,000,000 was all he asked the House to vote for the purpose he then stated—and more than \$3,000,000 was voted by this Parliament for the express purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No; it is no such thing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, suppose that my hon. friend, after placing himself in that position, had gone a

step further, and suppose he had been entrusted with the public debentures of the country for the purpose of floating a loan in the Imperial market, and suppose my hon. friend, instead of placing the debentures of Canada in the most favorable position he could, and by public competition obtaining the very highest price they would command, and bringing back to this country \$500,000 more than the hon. gentleman obtained for a like amount of debentures—I say, suppose, instead of doing that, he had gone there and quietly sat down and fixed a price, set a fixed term of years, and had sold these debentures to parties who, as I have stated before on the two occasions on which the hon. gentleman made this secret loan he had sold them to his friends, and had enabled them to stand in the position to-day of being richer to the extent of \$4,745,000, than they would have been before making the hon. gentleman's acquaintance—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now, I say if my hon. friend, instead of occupying the position he occupies in this House and country, had his reputation tarnished with transactions such as this—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that then there might have been some excuse for the arrogant and insolent tone which the hon. gentleman ventured to use toward my hon. friend. Now, he holds that the Speaker of the Senate, my hon. friend's colleague, is a very high authority, and he quoted him the other night as a great authority, as if the opinion of the Speaker of the Senate was to be accepted as conclusive, and he puts him in the *Hansard* as having settled that question by his *ipse dixit*. Now, Sir, I will quote the authority to which he pays such deference, and I will see what that hon. gentleman, known to the members of this House and the country at large as a man of the highest standing and character—known to be a man thoroughly versed in all these banking, mercantile and monetary transactions—has to say of the ex-Minister of Finance, and we will see whether that hon. gentleman is as ready to accept the authority of the hon. Speaker of the Senate as he was when he quoted him against me the other night:

"In the increase of the debt stated above, \$42,811,202.32, of course is included the sum of \$1,520,833, that being substantially the portion of the loan of 1876 (\$12,166,666) which Sir Richard Cartwright allowed as discount to the lenders, and paid for brokerage, &c."

I may say that my hon. friend, the Speaker of the Senate, in using this language, is only dealing with the smaller loan of £2,500,000 sterling, and not with the larger loan of £4,000,000, which was still worse. He goes on:

"While the Dominion did not receive this sum of \$1,520,833, or any part of it, yet interest, sinking fund, &c., have to be paid thereon, amounting to about \$70,000 a year, till the maturity of the loan in 1906. (The interest alone at 4 per cent. exceeds \$60,000 a year). To have to pay \$70,000 a year for 30 years for that which the Dominion did not receive, seems a grievous hardship, but Sir Richard maintains that it was a model loan."

An hon. MEMBER. A muddled loan.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, perhaps it is a misprint for that. He goes on to say:

"But, in the opinion of men who do not belong to their model school of finance, it was an improvident and mysterious loan."

Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us what a mysterious loan is?

"I say mysterious, because it was sold without competition, on terms which reduced the net proceeds which Canada received to about 87½ cents on the dollar, and, further, because Mr. Mackenzie's Administration refused to make public the names of the allottees or beneficiaries."

And now we find that the allottees or beneficiaries are only a trifle under one million pounds sterling better off for these two loans, which they negotiated with the hon. the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

ex-Finance Minister of the Dominion. Now, suppose my hon. friend stood in that position, there might be some slight ground, some show of reason, why any hon. gentleman in this House might feel that he need not be too choice in the language he was throwing across the floor when dealing with such a man and under such circumstances. But, I say, Sir, and I say it advisedly, that there is not a man in Canada who has the bad eminence that the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance has, as one who has lowered the tone of debate in this House and out of it, without the slightest cause; there is not a man in Canada, and I say it advisedly, who has placed himself in a position of more unenviable notoriety than has that hon. gentleman by the coarse, insulting and ungentlemanly language which he uses in this House and out of it, and I will prove the truth of what I say. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman is not particular to a shade as to the occasion on which he uses such language. What would he have thought of my hon. friend if he had gone to London and over his own signature committed himself solemnly to the statement that all the expenditure which the Government of this country had undertaken was wise and legitimate expenditure—an expenditure in the public interest; that it had all been admirably calculated to promote the best interests of Canada, and had then come back with the ink barely dry on his record, on the solemn record to which he had committed himself, had gone on a public platform and denounced the men who had incurred that expenditure, which he solemnly declared was a wise and judicious expenditure, and one which was in the interests of the country?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Not a bit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not a bit? Then I shall read the hon. gentleman's own language, for I have it here:

"This entire debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. But not wisely or judiciously.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not done with the hon. gentleman yet:

"The indirect advantage from these public works has been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed. The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since Confederation."

Now, what will be said of a gentleman, who having signed with his own hand as the hon. Finance Minister of Canada, stating to the people of England that they could rely on that as being an honest and a true statement of the affairs of this country—what shall be said of him when he comes back to Canada, and on a public platform uses the foul language that the men who incurred that expenditure had exhibited brutal ignorance, or that their conduct was that of a drunken crew scuttling the ship they were about to leave? And what was his excuse when he was charged with such conduct? As I have described, he says that the exigencies of a public man are very great.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I said nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He said that sometimes we have to exhibit a silver shield and sometimes a brazen one. I think most of the hon. members of this House, who have heard the hon. gentleman, will have come to the conclusion that he mostly relies on the brazen shield, for a more brazen transaction or a transaction which, to use the words which he is so ready to use himself, stamps the man who was guilty of it with undying ignominy in the eyes of every honorable and high-minded man, was never perpetrated in this country. And what does the hon. gentleman venture to say in the very speech which he delivered the other evening? He says that the statements of

my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture—his published official statements—are utterly unreliable. And what more does he venture to say of a man who, he knows, stands as high as a man of honor and character in this House as any man that can be found in the wide domain of Canada? He uses the term in reference to the conduct of that gentleman—“deliberate and fraudulent intent.” What shall be said of a man who ventures to use such language as that, of any hon. gentleman of this House, and especially by a man who has such a record as the hon. gentleman himself? What shall be said of a man who applies to a Minister of the Crown, my right hon. friend who sits beside me (Sir John A. Macdonald), such language as that he was “insolent and unscrupulous,” or applies to him the term “deserved ignominy?” He said that the right hon. gentleman was driven from power in deserved ignominy.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no man in this House who should blush more to make such a statement than the hon. gentleman. What did he do? He spent five long years standing in the position of a Minister of the Crown, denouncing my right hon. friend in the foulest and most unworthy terms that our language supplies. He went from platform to platform outside of this House, and fairly out-Heroded Herod in relation to the language he used inside the House; and with what result? With the result that when the great electorate—the great, independent, intelligent electorate of Canada—were called upon to decide between my right hon. friend and the man who traduced him, they consigned one to the ignominy which he deserved, and gave to the other the highest and proudest position that a Prime Minister of Canada ever occupied. If the hon. gentleman was capable of learning anything—which I regret to say, I find he is too obtuse to do—he would have learned that his declarations of opinion are utterly discredited by the people of Canada. He would have learned, Sir, that he had it thrown back in his teeth that all the foul language he had used had recoiled upon his own head, and that he had sunk, while my hon. friend had become elevated to the proud position he now occupies. If only for its uselessness, one would suppose that he would have learned by this time the folly of giving vent to such utterances. The hon. gentleman says—and it is a very striking illustration of the bent of his mind—that it may be all very well for the Minister of Finance to place under obligation these millionaires, that the money may be found very convenient at times of a general election. That shows the bent of the hon. gentleman's mind. Suppose, Sir, that my hon. friend had stood convicted, as that hon. gentleman stands convicted—and I use the term again advisedly—of having in the teeth of the statute abused his position in the absence of the hon. Minister of Customs, by taking surreptitiously from the public Treasury \$59,000 before a general election, and giving it to a great corporation. Is it any wonder, Sir, that men should come to the conclusion that Ministers of the Crown may forget the high position they occupy to such an extent as to become the beneficiaries—not to the tune of \$5,000,000 to friends abroad, but here in Canada, to lay a great corporation under the obligation of having received, in the teeth of the statute, \$59,000 of public money. Now, Sir, I am glad that the painful task of showing that hon. gentleman what my hon. friend has not done—what his record is not—is ended, and that the insult, the gross, unpardonable insult flung across the House by the hon. gentleman, was as undeserved as it was gratuitous; and, Sir, I will now pass on to notice a few more of the very remarkable observations made by the hon. gentleman in reply to my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman, with his very stilted phraseology, and his wheeling around and throwing himself into a great variety of attitudes, brought to my recollection a circumstance that occurred on the

occasion of his first Budget Speech. I confess that the hon. gentleman has improved a little in his style of public address since then. There were some comments in the lobby on that occasion; and, as you will remember, the hon. gentleman was not only very stilted, but very mechanical; and one gentleman said to another in the lobby: “He seemed to bounce around and jerk around like one of Mitchell's revolving lighthouses.” “Yes,” said the other, “but without the light.” When I saw the hon. gentleman wheeling around to his supporters, it reminded me of that occasion; and when I tried to follow him, I saw that the hon. gentleman had no argument to address to the House, and I found that it was the revolving lighthouse without the light. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the outset, took my hon. friend to task for want of economy in preparing his estimates. Want of economy in preparing his estimates! What did the hon. gentleman mean? Does he forget that the estimated expenditures of the first year that he was Finance Minister are now recorded on the public records of this country, and that he asked this Parliament to vote no less than \$26,600,000? And yet, in the year 1882, he wants to know why his economy was not followed. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman asked for no less than \$1,300,000 more than the largest expenditure that Canada had ever had. I know that the Public Accounts state that the expenditure of 1873-74 was \$23,316,316; but it is not true. That is the statement in which the hon. gentleman forced the balance. That is the statement which contains half a million of money, transferred by the hon. gentleman's right hand from capital account to the charges on revenue, contrary to the manner in which it was voted by Parliament, for the purpose of swelling the balance and making the excuse for his statement that there would be a deficit on the first of the following July. And that matter, Sir, stands on record, under the pen of one of the officers in the hon. gentleman's own Department, the accountant. And what else? There are \$59,000 of Customs refunds of the former year, and, if that had been an honest charge, it could not have gone in there as an expenditure of that year, which the hon. gentleman knows right well. It was a statement of an amount of money drawn in the teeth of the statute out of the Treasury of Canada, and handed over to a wealthy corporation on the eve of an election, and the hon. gentleman seems to understand all the weight and importance of such a transaction as that. Well, Sir, the next fault he has to find with my hon. friend, is this—he wants to know if being two or three million dollars astray in the estimated revenue he is to receive is not evidence of the want of ability in the hon. the Finance Minister. What does the hon. gentleman say? He says my hon. friend took a leap in the dark. Well, he came out the right side up. The hon. gentleman took a leap in the dark, but he came out in the ditch—that is the difference. My hon. friend knows that it would be impossible—not in the case of an ordinary change, but in a revolution in the Tariff, such as was the change my hon. friend made—to estimate exactly what he would receive. But he came out with the balance on the right side—he came out with a surplus. The hon. gentleman took his leap in the dark, and he came out, at the end of three years, with a deficit of \$7,500,000. That is the difference. The hon. gentleman talks about leaps in the dark. Why, the hon. gentleman, with the Tariff, and with the Trade Returns in his hands, and with the experience of the past, brought down his Estimates here—and what were they? His estimated expenditure was \$26,600,000, and he was only \$2,987,000 astray. The hon. gentleman declared that he would receive from that Tariff of his own concoction \$25,250,000, and he received \$22,507,000, or \$2,642,000 less. And yet he stands up here, with the brazen shield as usual, and taunts my hon. friend with errors in his estimate, and with having got more money by his leap in the dark than he expected. The hon. gentleman's next charge is that the

expenditure had swollen double—from \$13,500,000 to \$26,600,000. Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to say to that? The expenditure had swollen from \$13,500,000 to \$23,500,000 at the time the hon. gentleman came into power, according to his own statement on Friday night. Yet, what was his first step? Did he say that was enough for him? Big as it was swollen it was too small for him. Big as it was swollen his first step was to come down and ask the House for \$3,000,000 more in order to carry on the ordinary government of the country. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman would act wisely if he said little about it. He declared in England that the increased expenditure was of such a character that it had greatly advanced the best interests of the Dominion, yet the hon. gentleman now declared that such increase was unnecessary; because if it does not mean that it means nothing, for if the increase was necessary for public purposes, then the Minister of Finance would not be warranted, if he failed to bring down such estimates to Parliament; if, on the other hand, they were beyond what they should have been, then the Finance Minister should defend himself for coming to Parliament in 1874 and asking for \$26,600,000. The hon. gentleman's first estimate was only \$400,000 less than the statement now on the Table of the House; yet he charges us with extravagance. I now desire to direct the attention of the House to a very important statement made by the hon. member on Friday night. He said:

"Immediately on the introduction of that policy, as every one acquainted with western Canada knows, there was a large and lamentable exodus of many of the best farmers of the western region, not, I am sorry to say, to our own North-West, but to Dakota, Minnesota, and other portions of the United States."

Who is to blame for that? The hon. gentleman bows his head: he is. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is quite conscious who is to blame.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. You are to blame.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will show the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it. I will direct attention, while on this point, to another remark made by the hon. gentleman, as it relates to the same subject. He said:

"If ever an impudent assertion was made on the floor of this House, if ever there was a case of effrontery in this world, it was when that hon. gentleman rose in his place and dared to say that the Opposition were responsible for the fact that so many Canadians had gone to Minnesota and Dakota, in place of going to the Canadian North-West."

I am in the judgment of the House as to whether hon. gentlemen opposite for years have not been decrying and denouncing everything Canadian.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am in the judgment of the House, of both sides of it, as to whether those hon. gentlemen have not, both in their places in Parliament and on the public platform, done all that men could do to cause men to turn their backs on Canada and take up their residence in the United States. I will read a statement made by the ex-Finance Minister, and if he can find any advertisement published in the United States more calculated to draw people from Canada to that country, where the hon. gentleman is not known but only has the reputation of having been a Finance Minister, then I should like to see it. What did the hon. gentleman say here in his place in Parliament on Friday night? He ventured to use such language as this with respect to his country:

"Why, Sir, I tell them to-day that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or to sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or other."

Is that calculated to draw immigrants to Canada. That is the language that he and his friends have used in expressing their opinions of this country. I say there is no intelligent man who places confidence in, or believes in the statements of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hon. gentlemen opposite, who would not turn his back at the first opportunity on this country and remove to any other country in the world. That is the position which the hon. gentleman occupies, and that is the kind of work that he and those around him have been engaged in doing for years in the interest of Canada. Despite all their efforts, they have worked in vain. Under the financial policy of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, enacted into law by Parliament, all the efforts of the hon. gentlemen opposite have proved to be futile, and to have only recoiled on themselves, and they will only have the result of teaching an intelligent people, keenly alive to their own interests, who are the men in this country upon whose statements they may place reliance, and who are the men upon whose management of public affairs they may wisely depend. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman entertained us with his novel theory respecting the balance of trade. We have been accustomed to hear a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about the United States and the statesmen of that great country, who have proved themselves to be about as successful in the management of financial affairs as those of any country in the world. I know of no instance in which the financial management of the Government has been crowned with such remarkable results as in the United States. What did President Grant say on the question of balance of trade? Did he say that the more the balance of trade was against the United States the better? President Grant, in his Message of the 6th of December, 1876, said:

"Taxes have been reduced, within the last seven years, nearly three hundred millions of dollars, and the National Debt has been reduced, in the same time, over four hundred and thirty-five millions of dollars. By refunding the six per cent. bonded debt for bonds bearing 5 and 4½ per cent. interest, respectively, the annual interest has been reduced from over one hundred and thirty millions of dollars, in 1869, to but little over one hundred millions of dollars in 1876."

President Grant then adds the boast that the balance of trade has been changed from \$130,000,000 against the United States in 1869, to \$120,000,000 in their favor in 1876. The hon. gentleman says that it is perfectly obvious, if you send \$60,000 or \$70,000 away and receive back \$90,000, you make money by the exchange. He forgets that the balance has to be paid in certain cases. I need not say, with respect to England, that no comparison can be drawn, because it is the great money centre of the world, and occupies an entirely different position from countries generally. The hon. gentleman says we have increased the cost of living, and gives the reason "that on every yard of coarse tweed the poor man uses, the Tariff compels him to pay 25 or 30 or 40 per cent. and perhaps more, than in 1878." Well, did the hon. gentleman not notice the statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister with respect to the wool trade of this country; did he fail to perceive that the amount of wool imported was reduced and a less quantity exported, while, at the same time, a greater quantity was used in this country, and the consumption of wool was increased by nearly \$3,000,000 during the year? What does that mean? Why, it means that the wise policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance gives such encouragement to the manufacture of these coarser cloths which the poor men require, that the amount of wool consumed in their manufacture is 3,000,000 lbs. over and above that of any previous year. That ought to be an explanation to the hon. gentleman, that it is quite possible for a tariff to be so constructed, in relation to the industries of a country, as to foster the manufacture of these articles within the country, so as, by competition, to furnish the people with them, as my hon. friend showed they had been furnished, at a lower cost, while giving profitable employment to our operators and consuming the wool grown in the country. The hon. gentleman is very anxious about the lumberman; he wants to know why we do not give the lumberman a bounty. I have passed over a great deal of what the hon. gentleman

said, because it seems to require no remark. There may be a point in it, but his sentences are so involved that it is difficult to discover any point. He wants to know if the fisherman has bounties why not the lumberman as well. Yet the lumber trade, according to his own showing, was never in a more flourishing condition than it is to-day, and the hon. gentleman will find it as difficult to get information from the lumbermen as from the farmers. The reason is, they have no such information to give as he is looking for. There is a lumberman behind me of high standing and character who is as well acquainted with the lumber trade as any man in the country. Let the hon. gentleman look at his books and he will find no cause of complaint. He will find that the lumbermen are suffering from no reverse. On the contrary, so flourishing has been the lumber trade in the past year that \$12,000,000 worth were actually exported over the previous year. As for the farmers, he has admitted that they are so prosperous, owing to the prices of everything they raise that it is quite unnecessary to refer to them. That hon. gentleman must have another personal fling at my hon. friend. He is very anxious there should be no nepotism in this country, that Ministers of the Crown should show an utter disregard of their own relatives, that when they make friends they should make them abroad. That when they wanted support of the great companies that was all right, but no Minister of the Crown should pay any attention to his own connections. I think, if the hon. gentleman would look into the Public Accounts, he will find a few pensioners of his own name and connections entered in them. It is, therefore, not very safe for him to fling a stone in that direction. He complains also of the mode in which the Civil Service has been dealt with in making improper promotions. I ask the hon. gentleman to take up the record of this Government and find one case analogous to the mode in which promotion was abused and the introduction of parties into the public service abused under his Government. Let him refer to the Post Office Department, and he will find the case of a stranger, not belonging to the country at all, who was brought in and appointed over the heads of civil servants, men of character, standing and intelligence, and able to teach that gentleman his duty. Yet this stranger was forced in over their heads at a salary which they could not acquire after twenty years service. Let the hon. gentleman then go to the Customs Department, and he will find that for a supporter of one of his hon. colleagues the same operation was performed; and gentlemen who had served long years in the public service were taught the melancholy lesson that no matter how well they performed their duties they were to remain in the back ground whenever a Minister had a friend or favorite to push over their heads. In the Public Works Department a still more flagrant and notorious instance of political favoritism occurred. A man brought in from the outside was pushed from pillar to post until he was landed, after three or four years service, in the position of Deputy Minister, when these hon. gentlemen went out of power. When the hon. gentleman finds three cases under this Administration to compare with those I have mentioned, he may fairly venture to throw his taunts across the floor of this House at the mode in which promotions are made under this Government. The hon. gentleman taunted my hon. friend with having framed a Tariff most disastrous to the shipbuilding industry. Where did the hon. gentleman get his authority? Does he not know that there has been a keen competition going on between iron and wooden ships, in which the latter have been worsted? Does he not know that all he could do himself to strike down the shipbuilding industry he did; and that although we did succeed in staying his arm to some extent, it was not until we came back to power, that, by our giving a drawback to the extent of the duty imposed on the materials used in shipbuilding, that industry had any fair play.

Let me read the hon. gentleman a statement from the *Wind sor Mail*, County of Hants, Province of Nova Scotia. That statement reads:

"During the year just closed Hants County built twenty-six vessels measuring 19,044 tons. Never but once in the history of the county was there such a large amount of shipping built as during the past year. The total number of vessels on our list is 252, measuring 163,144 tons. More than half of these are barques and ships, nearly all of which are engaged in the foreign trade. The amount of capital invested in this country during the past year alone is not far short of \$600,000, and the total value of the shipping of the county amounts to considerably over \$4,000,000. There was built last year in this county nearly one ton of shipping for every inhabitant, and the total amount of shipping on the list would average seven tons for every man, woman and child in the county."

Yet the hon. gentleman says the shipbuilding industry is suffering. He wants to know why we are going to relieve the fishermen. He cannot get this bounty for the fishermen out of his mind. It seems to disturb the hon. gentleman. But I can tell him there will be no such difficulty with the poor and hardy fishermen. They will not whine over this bounty as the hon. gentleman is inclined to do. He says the Minister of Finance proposes to relieve the fishermen of his native Province and of the Maritime Provinces. But what is he going to do with all these numerous classes of people such as clergymen, schoolmasters, clerks and others, whose income is to a certain extent fixed? Let him go to any clergyman, and he will find the same difficulty as to the information he wants as he finds with the farmers. But, Sir, the clergyman will tell him that, under this fiscal policy, the congregation that was struggling, unable to do as they wished to do, to sustain the church to which they belonged, they have now ample means to give their clergyman the comforts he and his family requires. When he goes to the schoolmaster, the schoolmaster will tell him: "Why, Sir, you have mistaken me if you think I am an object of sympathy. The number of children who can be sent to school now—whose parents formerly were struggling with poverty, unable to clothe them—is such as to give me ample reward." The demand for teachers, like the demand for knowledge, like the demand for luxuries, has grown just as the revenue of the country has grown, grown just as the industries have grown, and just as everything that is in the interest of Canada has grown from the time the hon. gentleman was deprived of the power of longer throwing his blight over all the industries of this country from end to end. In the matter of clerks, before, while the hon. gentleman was in power every third man you met wanted to know if you could not give him some little office that would give him \$200 or \$300 a year. He would say, I am an accomplished accountant, a good writer, and have a thorough knowledge of grammar, which the hon. ex-Finance Minister honors so highly, but I can get no employment. If you want a man possessing these attainments to-day you have to search for him, because the demand for that kind of labor, created by the industries that have grown up, has made it almost impossible to get such men who previously searched in vain for employment. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman made a very remarkable admission the other day. He said: "I feel much more disposed to blush for the degradation of Canada"—that is the language with which the hon. gentleman invites people to come to this country—"and to tremble for the consequences hereafter." Sir, I do not wonder the hon. gentleman trembles. I should be greatly surprised to see him blush. He is much more in the brazen shield line than in the blushing line. What is the dread hereafter he trembles to meet? It is the next election, Sir. I am told already, that not only is there a revolt among the hon. gentleman's supporters in this House—and I am not surprised that they should be anxious for him to relinquish the position of financial spokesman of the party—but that his constituents are equally willing to let him make his bow and give them an opportunity of being better represented. I am not surprised

that the outlook in his old constituency, where he is best known and from which he was dismissed by the verdict of the people at the last election—notwithstanding his boasted wealth he was compelled to abandon that constituency, and he trembles now lest he may not find it easy to get back into the House at all. The hon. gentleman may find the electors of this country share the sentiment he uttered the other night, that a Minister—and, of course, he who aims at being a Minister—should be like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. The hon. gentleman told us that he prays sometimes. Let me recommend him when he does so to use that model and best of prayers in which he will find: "Lead us not into temptation;" a prayer that he may never again be Finance Minister, and never have the chance of repeating his operation on the money markets of the world. That is a prayer in which the intelligent electors of this country will most devoutly join. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman concluded his somewhat vague and stilted address with the following statement:—

"For those men may boast of their great majority here to-day, they may boast of their full Treasury, they may boast of their devoted supporters, but I can recollect some ten years ago when these gentlemen were just as insolent, just as arrogant as they are to-day, when they had just as strong a majority behind them, just as full a Treasury, when they were prepared to be just as unscrupulous in maintaining their places as they are to-day, yet in twelve months after that time I saw them scattered and driven into deserved ignominy. The fate that befel them in 1873 may well befall them in 1883, and I see signs and tokens, not a few, that if they do not take care, and if they do not mend their ways, that fate will assuredly befall them again."

Now, Sir, does the hon. gentleman not see that, just in proportion as he can sustain the charge of our being dismissed from power with deserved ignominy, he is heaping a greater amount of it upon himself. Does the hon. gentleman not see that it is bad enough for a party, strong in power, with a great majority in this House behind them, as they had in 1878, to go to the people against a high-minded honorable set of gentlemen on the other side, and sustain an overwhelming defeat? But, Sir, what shall be said of men who, after the people of this country have had an opportunity of weighing them in the balance, say of them: "For heaven's sake give us back anything rather than let them again have control of the Government." If we are open to those charges, what was the hon. gentleman's conduct to induce the people of this country, by an overwhelming majority, to say: "Get you gone, and let better men take your places." If we are bad, what must you be, who, by the verdict of the intelligent electors of this country on September 18th, 1878, were consigned to the humiliating position you occupy now, and placed in your position my right hon. friend and his colleagues whose services to the country were known. I would, therefore, recommend the hon. gentleman not to venture upon that line of argument again. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me what signs of the times he sees. I am afraid they are visions; and I think the hon. gentleman must be asleep when these visions come over him. I do not see how any waking man can see any such signs or tokens. As I said before, history is philosophy, teaching by experience; and what does the history of that day and of this teach the people. Why, Sir, when a change of Government is imminent, when the public mind is on the waver, when a Ministry are shaken in the public confidence, there are signs of the times. There are tokens, and they are unmistakable. Do you see them now? Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to portentous signs of the times that point with unerring fidelity, in free countries such as ours, to the direction the public mind is taking. What was the position of the hon. gentlemen opposite when they had been in power for three years and four months? It is true they went to the country with a great majority; but we told them it would be swept from their feet, and I gave them the reasons

why. They were plain and distinctive reasons which, under parliamentary forms of Government, have been found to be conclusive upon such a question as this. I said: "Look abroad over the face of the country; remember the great majority you had and tell me where it is now." I showed them that, out of sixty-one Government seats that had become vacant, they had only been enabled, including the Ministerial elections—a dozen of them or something like it—to elect forty-seven supporters. I showed them with reference to the twenty-six seats of the Opposition that had become vacant, that we had been able to elect out of them, and out of the seats which had become vacant on the Government side, no less than forty. So that at the end of four years we stood in this House twenty-eight votes on a division better than when the Government was formed. These were the signs of the times—the unmistakable signs of the times; and, Sir, when the then Government went to the country we realized them to the fullest extent, the overwhelming verdict of the people confirming the verdict of the by-elections as it almost invariably does. But what is the position of gentlemen opposite to-day? Thirty-four seats have been vacant on the Government side, and out of those thirty-four how many have we won? Thirty-two, Sir, and hon. gentlemen opposite, out of thirty-four seats and in three years and four months have taken exactly two seats from us. What more? Twelve seats on the Opposition side have been vacant. Of course a great many could not become vacant because the Opposition is so small numerically. But twelve seats on that side have been vacant, and out of those twelve we have taken six. So that we stand, to-day, giving them the benefit of the two seats they carried out of the thirty-four that became vacant on our side, eight votes stronger on a division, in consequence of the by-elections, than we were on the day that the General Election was over. I ask the hon. gentleman what, under these circumstances, he thinks the signs of the times point to? I tell the hon. gentleman this—and I have said it elsewhere as well as here—that so long as the people of Canada are compelled to look forward to the administration of its financial affairs by the ex-Minister of Finance of this country, we are safe. I tell the hon. gentleman that the worst sign of the times for us would be his retirement into private life, because it would give his party an opportunity it does not at present possess. I trust he will not do anything so much at variance with our interests. But, as I remarked, at the end of three years and four months we have a majority of ninety members in this House, at our back—a majority strengthened, as I have said, by the free will of the sovereign, independent people of this country; and we are sustained, to an extent that no Government can expect to be sustained, because there are a variety of things—for instance, disappointed parties looking for a great deal from a Government, who naturally cannot have their expectations realized—which cause Governments to suffer occasional defeats. We, however, stand in this position: that we have the assurance, not only that the sovereign electors endorse, from end to end of Canada, the policy of this Administration, but that they recognise that, under that wise and judicious policy, the blight that fell upon the country under the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite has been removed, and that the true interests of every class of the population is involved in maintaining that great policy to which this Government has committed itself, and which has proved so eminently beneficial to the people of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron), moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is pressed—and I beg pardon of the hon. gentlemen for speaking to the motion of adjournment, though it is my

right to do so—I wish to say something with respect to some remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Now, I do not hold it worth my while though the rules of the House would permit it, to follow that hon. gentleman. I am not going to contradict him, but I am going to expose him. In the hearing of the House a very short time ago, that hon. gentleman took upon himself to say that I had misquoted Sir Henry Tyler with regard to the coal duty. Now, I have here the veritable words used by that gentleman at the meeting of the Grand Trunk Railway shareholders on the 6th of October, in the city of London. We will see what Sir Henry Tyler did say with respect to this same coal duty :

“ There was also a considerable rise in the cost of materials, of labor and of fuel ; and I am sorry to say that this was very much in consequence of the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government. That policy makes everything which a poor man requires dearer for him to purchase, and in consequence of that policy he requires higher wages in order to be enabled to exist. I have repeatedly spoken in this room as to the duty which is placed upon fuel. I cannot conceive anything more unwise in a nation like Canada, that has to import a great part of its fuel, and wishes to encourage its manufactures and to encourage its railways, than to place a duty upon the article of coal.”

Does the House, the press, and the country, want any better evidence than the statement I have just read, that in no possible circumstance in which the Minister of Railways can be placed is he able to adhere to the facts of the case. There is a sample ; there is proof that he is not. Every gentleman heard him say I had misquoted Sir Henry Tyler. There are Sir Henry Tyler's own words in reply. I do not expect to see the hon. gentleman blush, but I think that his friends, followers and leaders will blush—not for the discredit in which he is involved, but for the inconceivable stupidity which has enabled me to make such an exposure of his error. I forgot to say that in that same document I found a quotation from the report of superintendent on fuel ; and the hon. gentleman used the passage showing he had seen the speech, had examined it in detail, and deliberately suppressed the portion to which I alluded. I quote from *Herepath's Railway News*, the best authority on all railway subjects. Now, I come to the question which the hon. gentleman alluded to, in regard to which he made some surprising assertions, which he dare not put in plainer language, as to the mode in which I administered these several loans I was charged with negotiating in England. With respect to the mode in which the loans were placed on the market, the course followed was this : in the first place, I adopted the mode pursued by Sir Alexander Galt, Sir Francis Hincks and Sir John Rose, one and all infinitely better authorities as to the wisdom of the course I adopted than the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Finance, and all their colleagues and supporters put together. As to the result it is perfectly well known, to the House and hon. gentlemen, that Sir Francis Hincks, at any rate, may be depended upon as an impartial judge in my case. It is known that I took grievous objection to his entering into the Ministry of the Department of the Interior, therefore I may appeal to the publicly expressed testimony of Sir Francis Hincks—a very good judge on those subjects—as to the manner in which I placed those loans on the market. I obtained as high a price as possible, and any gentleman who wishes to see Sir Francis Hincks statements can find them in detail in the *Journal of Commerce* for the last several years. I may remark that when I first went into the London market I found our Canadian securities at 5 per cent. I was the first man who succeeded in floating a loan at 4 per cent., and I rendered a considerable service to the public of Canada by so doing. But I say more : the hon. gentleman insinuates there was something mysterious about these loans—that there was some illicit advantage to some or other persons in regard to them. I tell him this—that every farthing of the money paid in or about those

loans passed, not through my hands, but through the hands of the financial agents of this country, Messrs. Glyn, Baring and Rose ; that if there was any unfair or illicit advantage to any one it was given by those gentlemen. And if the Minister of Railways, or any of his colleagues, asserts that I betrayed the interests of Canada in these matters, they will have to make the same humble apology to those gentlemen which they had to make to my friend the Hon. Donald A. Smith. The House has not forgotten the charges those hon. gentlemen hurled at the head of Mr. Smith, nor have they forgotten the look of the Minister of Railways when thirteen months ago I gave him the opportunity of retracting those slanders.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not retract anything.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking of the Finance Minister ; I spoke of two other hon. gentlemen.

An hon. MEMBER. You said the Minister of Finance.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It was not the Minister, but other hon. gentlemen beside and around him. Now, as to the loans. The hon. gentleman attacks the prices at which my loans were sold in 1874 and 1876, and contrasts them with the prices obtained to-day, and he has the audacity to tell the people of the country and the members of this House that by some mysterious practices amounts of £600,000 sterling in one case and £300,000 or £400,000 in the other were put in the hands of some mysterious parties on the other side of the Atlantic. Let us contrast the loans made by the Finance Minister in 1879 and 1880. In 1879 he floated a loan of £3,500,000 which enjoyed the Imperial guarantee at 4 per cent. ; they were floated at an average of 96. For that loan he got something like £2,860,000 sterling. That loan to-day would be worth, at the current market quotations, not less than £3,250,000. Has the hon. Minister of Finance taken £400,000, by some mysterious means, out of the pockets of the people of this country, and put them into the pockets of the parties who negotiated the loan of 1879 ? I see the hon. Minister laugh, and well he may, at the profound ignorance displayed by his hon. colleague beside him. Now, Sir, when in 1880, I think it was, the hon. Minister floated another loan of £3,000,000 sterling, at 95 or thereabouts, are we to understand that because those securities now range at 105, the Minister of Finance, by some mysterious means, took £300,000 sterling, or say \$1,500,000 out of the pockets of the people, and put it into some private friend's pocket ? Sir, I have been in the habit during many years of listening to the hon. Minister of Railways, and I think he knows by this time how much value I attach to the tornado of words he occasionally lets loose in this chamber. It comes, and blows, and goes ; it has about as much effect on me as a hail storm is likely to have on a hill-top. Sir, before I dread the censure of that hon. gentleman and his colleagues, I must learn to respect them, and it is because of their past record that I neither dread their censure nor the utmost they can do.

Motion withdrawn by leave of the House.

Mr. ANGLIN. The long personal attack made by the hon. Minister of Railways upon the member for Centre Huron has, perhaps, served to distract the attention of the House from the question we have now under consideration. It is not my purpose to take any part in the contest between these two gentlemen. I feel that the hon. member for Centre Huron is abundantly able to take care of himself in matters of that kind, and I am quite willing to leave it to him to defend his reputation against the charges made by the hon. Minister of Railways. I think, on the whole, it would be better that we should address ourselves to the subject-matter before the House. If we were to accept the

statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Finance as unquestionable—and I remember that only a short time ago it was said to be something quite improper for any member on this side of the House to question statements made by these hon. gentlemen or their subordinates—if we were to allow them to state our case as they pleased, and as they have chosen to do in more than one instance; if we were to accept as unquestionable, promises that we regard as absolutely false, we would then be compelled to accept also the deductions at which they have chosen to arrive. But we, on our side of the House, question almost every statement they have made, either as utterly inaccurate, or as a very skilful perversion of what we regard as true. The hon. Minister of Railways chose to commence his speech this afternoon by declaring that neither he nor the Minister of Finance was ever truly regarded as Free Traders, that nothing could be found to prove that they had ever taken, in the Governments of the Provinces to which they both belong, a course as Free Traders, or advocated a policy that could be fairly called a Free Trade policy. Yet, a few minutes afterwards, with an inaccuracy, an inconsistency, a reckless disregard of self-contradiction, which distinguished that hon. gentleman this afternoon more than in any speech I ever heard him deliver, he told us distinctly that he had always advocated Free Trade in Nova Scotia as far as it could be carried out there, because in the peculiar circumstances of that Province Free Trade was a necessity. He told us, furthermore, that for many years before Confederation he was an advocate of a Union of the Provinces, and in that he told us what is correct; but when he proceeded to tell us that, in adopting a 15 per cent. Tariff after Confederation the hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House did not mean to adopt a policy of Free Trade, but rather a protectionist policy, and that in framing that Tariff they had acted strictly upon the principle of Protection, he asked this House to believe what is impossible for us to accept. A 15 per cent. policy was adopted, I believe by the Parliament of old Canada, and that 15 per cent. became the Tariff after Confederation, avowedly for the reason that the people of the Maritime Provinces were known to be Free Traders; that it would not do to offend their Free Trade principle by asking them to accept even the old Tariff, but that the old Tariff must be modified in the direction of Free Trade in order to reconcile the people to Confederation, to which it was known a great majority was strongly opposed. That was the true reason why the rate of taxation on the great part of our imports was reduced to 15 per cent. But they placed upon the free list a large number of articles, and he claims that as a measure of protection. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if it was a measure of Protection, in 1868-69, to place a large number of articles upon the free list, how has it come to pass to-day that it is a measure of Protection to take off that free list so large a number of articles and reduce it to such insignificant proportions? How is it that the hon. the Minister of Finance has found it necessary, even this Session, to come down and add some of the articles to the free list, which, a short time ago, according to his principle of Protection, he took off that list? No, Sir, it was not acting upon any principle of Protection; it was acting upon a principle which has always guided the advocates of a revenue Tariff policy, that that large free list was adopted in 1868-69, and was maintained from that time till the unhappy year of 1879. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman, after having contradicted himself in that extraordinary way, after having made those extraordinary statements, and placed himself in that strange position, proceeded to speak on the question of the coal duties. He told us truly that for many years he has been an advocate of a duty upon coal, and he told us, as we have heard from him often before, that for his part he could see no good reason why, for

Mr. ANGLIN.

revenue purposes alone, a duty should not be imposed on coal. He added that one of the strongest objections against the duty on coal was the fact that it was a partial and a sectional impost and this he seemed to admit. But, he strove to contend that, although in some senses the duty is a sectional impost, nevertheless, it does not bear largely on the poorer classes in any part of the country, because, forsooth, the poorer people used wood for domestic purposes rather than coal; and, when asked by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) what he thought of the duty as it affected Toronto, he scouted the very idea of having any regard for the working classes of even so large a city as Toronto, and overlooked the fact, that if the working classes of Toronto alone were affected by this duty on coal, there would be a sufficiently strong reason why it should not be imposed. But, we all know that coal has been taking the place of wood in all our large cities and towns for many years past; that every day it is becoming more and more the fuel of the working classes—I will not particularly say of the poorer classes, because the hon. gentleman repudiates the idea that we have now any poor class in Canada. He speaks of those who were in want, several years ago, as shivering wretches. That is the language employed by these patrons of the poor—not the brothers or the protectors—but the patrons of the working classes, and he speaks of those who, owing to circumstances over which they had no control, owing to the will of Providence, who so directed the affairs of this country and of the whole world, that a few years ago we had generally wide-spread distress, so that many shivered for want of fuel—speaks of them not as men having the same feelings as himself—men as respectable as he would be if every charge made against him were proved as calumny; he speaks of them as an inferior order, as shivering wretches.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will, probably, allow me to correct him. I suppose he does not intend, personally or unintentionally, to do me an injustice, but when he says that I used the expression "shivering wretches," he is mistaken, for I used that expression as a quotation from a speech of the ex-Finance Minister. I did not use the expression myself, so that the reproof falls upon his friend and not upon me.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then it is only to be regretted that the hon. gentleman, to whom I listened with great attention, did not use this expression so that we could understand it. Well, Sir, the coal duty is a sectional duty. It is true that a very large portion of the coal imported into the country, as well as produced in our own mines, is used for manufacturing and railway purposes; but it is also true that a very large portion of it is used for domestic purposes, and that a large number of the people of this country feel very severely and sensibly the burden which is imposed upon them by the tax on coal, unless, indeed, they can be persuaded, and they never have been persuaded yet, that the Americans pay the duty instead of their having to pay it themselves. I believe that the statement made to that effect by the hon. gentleman is one which will startle the country as much as any he ever made. He has never shown himself deficient in that quality which Danton has said is so necessary to those who would carry their purposes by means of strong assertions; but I do not think he has ever ventured to go much further in the way of assertion than he did when he said that the Americans pay the whole duty on coal. The Finance Minister went so far as to say that the Americans pay at least one half the duty on coal; and I think we were a little startled in this House, and I think the business people throughout Canada were startled by that statement of the hon. gentleman, but the hon. gentleman is not advanced enough with regard to this coal duty to suit the views of his hon. colleague. The hon. gentleman told us, in the early

part of his speech, that some time ago one of his colleagues, a gentleman who took a prominent position in discussing these trade questions, entertained the opinion that the tax on coal, and, I think, the tax on flour, as being sectional and oppressive in their nature, would lead to much trouble if imposed; but he says that that gentleman, like many others in his party, was not sufficiently advanced to know that the tax on coal, instead of being an injury to the poorer classes or to those who use coal for any purpose, would be a benefit and would enable us to take money out of the pockets of the Americans for our own service and purposes. But, Sir, he has himself undergone a very material change of opinion upon that point, and within a very short time. I heard him make that remarkable statement in regard to coal in the campaign in Pictou. He had not then reached that advanced state in which the wonderful fact dawned upon his mind that the Americans pay the tax on coal, for he used something like this language in addressing the people of Pictou, as one good reason why they should oppose the repeal of the tax on coal, and as a reason why they should not vote for Mr. Carmichael. He said: "See how this thing works. The people of Ontario pay \$400,000 a year into the Treasury of the Dominion, and you Nova Scotians get your full share of the benefit of the expenditure of that money for public purposes, without contributing a single dollar towards it." He went on to speak on the advantages which that county affords for manufacturers, and the benefit which was conferred on an establishment for the manufacture of railway wheels and axles; and in pointing to the success of that concern he attributed it not merely to the energy and skill and industry of the gentlemen connected with it—though he gave them credit for these business qualities—but he went on to say that the cheap coal which they had at their doors, which they got without any additional cost for production, would be an important factor in the success of their business. More than that, he said that the tax of 50 cents per ton on coal has this effect: that it handicaps—that was not the word he used, for I do not pretend to quote his words, but it was to that effect—the effect of the duty on coal is to handicap the manufacturers of Ontario to such an extent as to give an additional protection to the manufacturers of New Glasgow when they come in competition with the manufacturers of Ontario, when they come into competition with their products in the far West. It struck me, when he made his statement to-day, that he does not intend to face Pictou on the eve of next election, for if he did he would have to unsay what he said at the last election, and tell them that the duty on coal affords them no advantage, because the people of Ontario do not pay this duty, because they get coal as cheaply, and even more cheaply, than they did before, and instead of its being a benefit to the manufacturers of the town of New Glasgow, as giving them an advantage in the competition with the manufacturers of Ontario, it is in fact a loss and an injury. More than that—if what the hon. Minister has stated is true—what is to be done in the case of one of the Government's prominent supporters who, it is said, receives a return of duty paid on the coal which he brings from the United States for use in his tug boats and steamers? That hon. gentleman listened to his leader this afternoon, and of course could not question the accuracy of his statements or the potency of his reasoning or the soundness of his conclusions; therefore he must know that he has been wrongfully receiving that money from the Americans, and as an honest man he will, no doubt, make it a matter of conscience, and make retribution as soon as possible.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that such a rebate has been made, or is he speaking from rumor?

Mr. ANGLIN. I say that it is reported that he got coal from the United States for the use of his steamers without paying the duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Any person can do that if he likes.

Mr. ANGLIN. And bring it into Canadian waters, and use it in Canadian waters?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that nothing is liable to duty until it is landed.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is well to get an explanation on this point, and it is well for the tug owners in other parts of the country to know this fact, of which some of them have been woefully ignorant.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose they have been seeking information from you.

Mr. ANGLIN. They have been getting their information in a very telling way—through their own pockets—they have been paying the duty. Why, I notice that the tug owners of Quebec have been in the strange belief that the duties paid have been coming out of their pockets and not out of those of the Americans, and have sent a memorial to this House stating that this tax is a burden and interferes with their business, and that altogether it has been an injury and a serious detriment and loss to them.

Mr. BOWELL. Do these gentlemen go to the United States for their coal?

Mr. ANGLIN. They can get it without landing it, I suppose.

Mr. BOWELL. If they do, it would not be dutiable until landed or sold in the country.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then I suppose these gentlemen will be very much obliged to me for obtaining this information for them. The hon. Minister of Customs has come to the relief of the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), who wants to get his coal in free for the use of his tugs; and after the explanation of the hon. Minister, that hon. gentleman, I suppose, will not find it necessary to pay that money over to the Treasury, to which, according to the teachings of the hon. Minister of Railways, it most unquestionably belongs. The hon. Minister of Railways says that in a few months he has learned a great deal on this subject—new light has dawned on that wonderful understanding of his. I remember how, five or six years ago, when he was talking on this question of coal duty, it seemed impossible for him to know any more of it than he knew then. But he has received new light since, and this afternoon he read to us some most elaborate calculations and statements, which he says prove most conclusively—though I could not see the proof—that the Americans pay this duty on coal. I understood the hon. Minister to make this statement—that some years before the imposition of this duty on coal, the price in Toronto was very much higher than the price in Philadelphia, but that immediately after the imposition of the duty the price in Toronto not only fell to the price in Philadelphia, but the price in Toronto actually fell to \$1.64 a ton lower than the price in Philadelphia; and he asks the people of this country to believe that the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal has led to that extraordinary change. Well, Sir, if the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal has that extraordinary effect, why does not the hon. gentleman prove himself logically consistent for once, and ask this House to vote the imposition of another 50 cents on coal? If the Americans pay the duty, why should we spare them? Why should we be satisfied with taking a paltry 50 cents out of them if we can get a dollar or two? Besides, according to the hon. gentleman's reasoning, it will reduce the price to a lower point than it has ever touched before. In reply to what he knew would be the answer to that, he used most extraordinary arguments in the hope of bringing the people of this country to believe that they do not suffer anything from the National Policy, because many staple articles can be purchased to-day at lower prices than they brought four or five years ago.

He thought that very conclusive and very convincing. It may be to those who are superficial enough to be led by the old *post hoc propter hoc* style of argument; but to the thinking business people of this country, arguments of that kind will not carry the weight which the hon. gentleman seems to imagine. The real question with respect to coal, as with respect to every other article, is this: is it or is it not to-day dearer because of the imposition of these additional taxes? If, by reason of the additional taxation, prices have been increased 5, 10 or 20 per cent. to that extent, is the National Policy a burden and grievance to the people? The hon. the Minister of Railways spoke about the price of coal in Chicago, and told us that railway competition reduces the cost of freight and sometimes even prices at the place of purchase, at the same time pointing out that there are competing points to which freight comes at lower rates than are charged for shorter distances. That is, no doubt, the fact, but competition between water and rail routes existed before the National Policy came into force. Probably there have been some developments in American railways, which have tended to cheapen coal at particular points; but competition has not been increased in the slightest degree by reason of the adoption of the National Policy by the people of Canada. The hon. the Minister of Railways has mentioned that the people of Chicago have to pay very much higher for their coal than those of Boston, because, he says, there is some competition in Boston and none in Chicago. The only competition at Boston is the little that comes from Nova Scotia, and perhaps a few cargoes come from England, but I do not understand that coal is received there in sufficiently large quantities to compete with the coal from American mines. The competition to-day is less than it was a few years ago when coal was admitted duty free. No doubt, in the present state of things in the United States, if a higher protective duty on coal were asked, Congress would be willing to grant it; they got all the protection they chose to ask in the past. The hon. Minister has compared the prices at Chicago with those on this side of the line, and has declared that prices have changed since the National Policy was introduced, not merely to an extent equal to the 50 cents duty, but to a very much larger extent. The operation of the National Policy, if we are to accept the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, are of the most extraordinary character, not merely mysterious and miraculous, but actually taking the place of Providence itself. Providence, according to those hon. gentlemen, is now but a minor influence in the affairs of the world. Indeed, since the great National Policy has come into force, there is no longer, if we may believe them, a Providential controlling power over nations, producing abundant harvests in some countries when the harvests in others are deficient, and making peoples feel they are dependent on each other. Providence is now a minor power, and the National Policy of Canada is that which regulates the state of the crops in the Dominion, the United States and Europe, and regulates the commerce of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone so far as to claim that every commercial change which happens to prove advantageous to the Canadian people is the result, not of the action and control of an over-ruling Providence, but of the National Policy of which they boast so much. The hon. Minister of Railways spoke afterwards of the prices of coal at Prescott and Ogdensburg. If I apprehend correctly his remarks, they are to this effect: To bring coal from Ogdensburg to Prescott costs 67½ cents per ton for freight, and more for port and other charges; but the price at Prescott is much less than the price at Ogdensburg, with the duty, the freight and other charges added. It is well known, however, that it costs less to bring coal to Prescott and land it there in the first instance than to take it to Ogdensburg.

Mr. ANGLIN.

In that way the hon. gentleman and those who have labored for him have endeavored to make a case in his behalf. Those assertions are so wide of the mark that they must have seemed absurd to hon. gentlemen opposite, although they were ready to cheer the hon. gentleman. They watched every opportunity to encourage their leader; no strong assertion was allowed to pass without its cheer, nothing that could be called a *bon mot* passed without a redoubled cheer. There was some little joke passed which we on this side of the House could scarcely understand, over which hon. gentlemen opposite went into ecstasies; but while the hon. Minister was reading his long, elaborate calculations to prove that the Americans paid the duty on coal imported into Canada, his followers were silent. The calculations did not go down. They knew too well that these statements were not only incredible, but that the people would not be misled by them, that the Minister in making that statement was damaging their case before the intelligent constituencies of the Dominion, and they were silent because they were apprehensive. Glances were exchanged which indicated to us that they would very much prefer that the hon. Minister had not dwelt so long on that subject, and had not gone so far as he did. While the hon. Minister was talking an hon. member was prompted to send a telegram to ascertain the prices of coal at Detroit and Windsor, which are a mile apart. I did not think that it was necessary to send such a telegram. When I saw statements similar to those read by the Minister appear in some of the newspapers of the Tory party, I confess I was perfectly astounded to find that any person could write any such articles and hope they would be received with favor by any portion of the people. They were so palpably absurd, so utterly unwarrantable, and so intensely ridiculous, that I never could imagine that the man who wrote them really believed they would be accepted by any large number of people. Perhaps they thought they could calculate largely on the credulity of the people, and indeed they showed this, day after day, by the manner in which they dealt with this question. Therefore, I was not surprised to find hon. gentlemen opposite stunned by the course taken by the hon. Minister of Railways, nor was I much surprised to find the hon. Minister of Railways himself, who often owed his success to the audacity of his assertions, take such a course. It seemed infatuation, it is true. It seemed to be one of those cases which prompted an ancient writer to say that, "whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad." Some demon must have taken away from the hon. gentleman that acuteness of intellect, that power of vision, that capacity for understanding how far he can traffic on the credulity of his audience, not in this House alone, but throughout the country, when he ventured on such statements as those. They will be published broadcast throughout the country, and I hope every business man will get a copy, so that he may be able to judge of the character of the statements, on which hon. gentlemen opposite rely as a means to carry the elections, about which they have begun to talk so much lately. Here is a statement of prices in Detroit and Windsor, telegraphed while the Minister was speaking, by a gentleman whose authority is undoubted. The difference in price between Windsor and Detroit is 75 cents. At Windsor coal sells at \$7.50, which, in Detroit, can be bought at from \$6.50 to \$6.75. Twenty-five cents, I presume, will bring it across the river and the duty is fifty cents. But I am told that a vessel could as easily turn into the harbor of Windsor as Detroit, so that in that case the carriage would add nothing to the cost.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman name his authority.

Mr. ANGLIN. He is Mr. A. A. Bartlett.

Mr. MILLS. Perfectly reliable.

Mr. BOWELL. Is he Police Magistrate at Windsor?

Mr. ANGLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. All right, he is a very respectable Grit.

Mr. ANGLIN. All Grits are respectable. When they cease to be respectable they cease to be Grits. But the hon. gentleman said that after the imposition of the 50 cent duty, Toronto, Montreal and Quebec became competing points; and the dealers on the other side determined to sell to parties at those points so low as to enable them to pay the duty and compete with the home produced article. He did not tell us much about the prices of bituminous coal, but dealt with the anthracite rather than the bituminous, part of which comes from Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. At all events, Quebec and Montreal and places between were points at which our coal competed with coal brought from the United States long before the National Policy was imposed. On former occasions when this question was discussed in this House, it was stated that coal could be brought up the Gulf of St. Lawrence at a considerable profit to Quebec and at a fair profit to Montreal, where it could fairly compete with the bituminous coal from the United States. I remember well that Mr. Mitchell, who then, I think, was interested in a line of steamers running to and from the Gulf, made that statement, which was also made by many other business men, so that Quebec and Montreal and intermediate places were as much competing points as they are to-day. In the Lower Provinces, it is said, we are still further from the coal-fields of the United States, than Quebec or Montreal. I do not know whether it costs much or anything more to bring coal to St. John or Halifax than to Montreal or Quebec, but judging from prices I think coal can be imported as cheaply to the former as to the latter points. According to the theory advanced by the hon. Minister of Railways there must be an understanding among the coal dealers of the United States to sell for export to Canada, for the sake of the small quantity they do sell here, at lower prices than they accept for coal to be used in the United States. Business people will not credit that. For my part, I have to burn a considerable quantity of anthracite coal every year, and I find that the duty adds 50 cents to the price of the coal besides the 5 or 10 cents more additional profit charged by the dealer. The hon. gentleman compared the output of coal from 1873-4 to 1878 with the output from 1878 to 1881, and showed that the output is much larger at present than it was during the late Administration, attributing the increase, of course, entirely to the National Policy. Now, it is always well, when we are discussing matters of this kind, to ascertain what causes are in operation to bring about the results we are all agreed on. We know that of late years there has been a wonderful change in the carrying trade in the various countries of the world. We know that a very large number of steamers now go to harbors in Nova Scotia to procure an additional supply of coal, finding it profitable to go a little out of the way to get this new supply of coal rather than set out with a full supply, since, by taking the former course, they are enabled to start with a larger quantity of cargo. During the last year we had in the harbor of St. John, for the first time in my recollection, as many as fifteen or sixteen English steamers coming to take cargoes or deals, which had to procure additional coal. This is a portion of the additional output which is attributed to the National Policy. We might as well attribute to the National Policy the fact that they came to St. John to take deals and thereby did serious injury to the trade of wooden ships. We do not resort to any means of that kind in order to establish our case. We do not choose to be inconsistent, to be inaccurate, or to deal in incongruities, false deductions or false premises. What we seek to establish is the truth. We leave the public themselves, in most cases, to infer from what is known to be true what the natural and proper deduction ought to be. Other causes brought those steamers

to our ports, not the National Policy. But there were in our ports sixteen large steamers to be supplied with coal for the transatlantic voyage. And the output again was increased in another way. The hon. the Minister of Railways himself, talking of the Grand Trunk management, showed us that they are abandoning the use of wood to a large extent and substituting for it coal. He read what he thought was a contradiction of the statement of the hon. member for Huron but, of course, it was nothing of the kind; it did not throw the slightest doubt on that statement. But it did show that for that and other causes there is a large demand for coal, either foreign or domestic. We know that on the Intercolonial also there has been a very large quantity of coal used of late years, and less wood than formerly; and then the revival of business and the opening of new establishments, including two sugar refineries in the Lower Provinces, has increased the demand for coal. But, except the sugar refineries, I do not know any case in which this increased demand should be credited directly or indirectly by the public to the National Policy. My impression is that the quantity of coal taken out of the mines was not very much, if at all, in excess of the quantity taken out a few years ago. The hon. gentleman would prefer, of course, to take in his arguments the average of the periods of greatest depression; or, as the Ministerialists sometimes do, one year of great depression compared with a year of prosperity. But I believe that the output of coal is not very much larger now than it was six or seven years ago. The Minister of Railways made another extraordinary statement—perhaps it was a *lapsus lingue*—that from the year 1878 to 1881, while the output was diminishing year by year, the number of people employed diminished to the extent of 1,200, and that since the increase commenced the number employed had increased, not by 1,200, but 400. My impression is, that there must be some mistake—that there must be as many men employed to-day taking out coal as there was some years ago. That, at all events, was the statement of the Minister of Railways. He did not show that any considerable quantity of coal ever reached the Ontario market. The great object of the imposition of the duty on coal was to give the miners of Nova Scotia control of the principal markets of Ontario. Ministers are now compelled to admit that it has not done that and will not do it. The Minister of Railways told us of some analysis of Nova Scotia coal made some years ago by the member for London, when a member of the Ontario Government, and of the admirable results of that analysis, as showing that this coal was very much better than any other. But we do not find that it is imported by Ontario, and the people of Toronto are so stupid, so regardless of their own interests, as to import an inferior coal at a higher price instead of a superior coal at a lower. There is a contradiction of facts here to be explained by the hon. Minister. It is amusing to hear of experiments made in the good city of Ottawa by persons who desired to introduce the Nova Scotia coal and encourage its use by the people generally, but who themselves chose afterwards for some reason to use American coal. But it is a remarkable fact that not very long ago, in advertisements, I presume coming from the Department of Public Works, calling for tenders for coal, I think for the use of these buildings and Rideau Hall, it was expressly stipulated that the coal must be American.

An hon. MEMBER. Patriotism.

Mr. ANGLIN. Patriotism of the purest water. While it is a fact that Nova Scotia coal does not find its way to Ontario, it is also a fact that it is coming more largely into use elsewhere—for instance, the railway from St. John to Shediac, which formerly used wood, is now using coal. But we do deny that the increase is attributable to the National Policy. The hon. gentleman made some broad assertions as usual. He asserted very lately,

as the Finance Minister did before him, that this country is to-day enjoying a degree of unprecedented prosperity. I have heard him say that it enjoys an amount of prosperity such as no other country in the world ever enjoyed; he declared this from a balcony in front of an hotel, standing on which he looked into a block of buildings on the best business street in St. John, and if it were not dark at the time, he must have observed that two-thirds of the whole block was actually unoccupied, and that the ugly words "to let," which the Finance Minister says have disappeared, might have been seen on much of that big block of buildings. Late as is the hour, I do not wish to allow all of the Finance Minister's statements to go unanswered. Of him personally, I do not wish to say anything; his colleague, the Minister of Railways, has lauded him this evening in a manner which, to say the least, was very extravagant, but not so much to please his colleague, as to hit the member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) over his shoulder. I am willing to let that matter pass on the grounds that all said of his public career and conduct, need not or ought not to be contradicted. But in reference to his statements in this speech, I must say that while they are less bold than the statements regarding coal, made by the Minister of Railways, they are nevertheless statements which, I believe, no Finance Minister who had a proper regard for his position, as a public man, or a due regard for his reputation as a Finance Minister, ought to have made. He taunted us on this side of the House with having indulged in predictions which he said have all failed. Well, Sir, we claim that all we anticipated has been more than fulfilled. All our anticipations have been fully realized in every instance. Why, he said, you asserted on the other side of the House that this Tariff would not be a revenue Tariff because it would discourage importation. Now, see what it has proved to be. It has proved to be not only a good protective Tariff, but a great revenue Tariff; it has not only brought us in the \$2,000,000 we anticipated, but put \$6,000,000 into our coffers over and above what our predecessors collected; therefore he would have us conclude that what we said upon that point was erroneous. What we said was this: that in so far as that Tariff proved to be a protective Tariff, in so far and to fully the same extent would it diminish the revenue; and that if the protection were as successful as the hon. gentlemen opposite anticipated, then the revenue must necessarily be reduced below the amount required for the public service of the country. We doubted much whether even this high Tariff would be the success as a measure of Protection they asserted. We always contended that it would not; but we did say that if we were to admit what they said, the conclusion was inevitable that the revenue must be reduced below the point at which the interests of the country required it should be maintained. What does the hon. gentleman himself say in this very speech? He says, the reduction of revenue which will be caused by the operation of his policy, that is one of the reasons for not reducing the surplus further, for not removing taxation. He tells us we have 180,000 spindles in operation, and next year we may have 400,000, and as that number will produce more cotton cloth, our revenue will suffer proportionately—the very thing we said last year; the very thing we repeat now, that so far as this Tariff is protectionist, so far does it tend to diminish the revenue. It is because it has failed as a protectionist Tariff, to a great extent, that it has been successful as a revenue Tariff. It has been successful in extorting from the working-people of this country, an amount of money greater than was ever expended in this country in any year before, and \$1,000,000 in addition to the amount expended. It has been successful in wrong-doing, successful in injustice, successful in grinding the faces of the working-people of this country. The hon. ex-Minister of Customs made a statement last year, and having asserted that that statement has proved

Mr. ANGLIN.

fallacious, the Finance Minister proceeded to tell the House what that statement was, but his memory was certainly at fault. Some how or other, by accident or design—I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of wilfully misinterpreting another, the habit is so strong with him that it is almost excusable—but in this case he certainly grossly mis-stated the position taken by the late Minister of Customs. He told this House that the late Minister of Customs said that the National Policy Tariff would increase the taxation by \$7,000,000, and that only \$2,000,000 of that would go into the Treasury, while the other \$5,000,000 would go into the pockets of the manufacturers; and the hon. gentleman says to-night, "See what the result is, instead of \$2,000,000 we have \$6,000,000 in the Treasury," and the ex-Minister of Customs is proved to have made a statement utterly incorrect. Why, he just managed to turn the statement so as to make it suit his purpose, and so as to enable him to say it was incorrect. If the ex-Minister had made that statement he would have been subject to the charge of having made a great mistake in his calculation. His calculation was simply an arithmetical application of the new Tariff to the imports for the year 1878, as they appear in the official returns. Item by item was taken as far as the new Tariff could be applied to them, and the result was that the new Tariff would increase the taxation over the amount actually collected in 1878 by nearly \$7,000,000. It was the hon. Finance Minister himself who said that by the operation of this Tariff he would get \$2,000,000 more, and then the late Minister of Customs said: "Well, if you do put into the Treasury only \$2,000,000 more, then the other \$5,000,000 must go into the pockets of the manufacturers, for it will certainly be taken out of the pockets of the people." Well, Sir, the imports, I believe, are somewhat in excess of the imports of 1878, and consequently he has \$6,000,000 in his Treasury, and the manufacturers, or some of them, have a very considerable addition to their profits. One of them declared in this House, two or three evenings ago, that on his cotton stocks he has never yet earned more than three per cent. A singularly unfortunate gentleman that must be. If you go into the city of Montreal you will not find a business man in it who will not tell you a different story with regard to that gentleman's position and his income from his stocks.

Mr. MACKENZIE. One gentleman told me he got 18 per cent.

Mr. ANGLIN. Others got that in cash and a great deal more in another shape. People in Montreal say about the Hudon factory that the original stock was \$100 a share. Some time after the National Policy went into operation, the \$100 was converted into \$200 without any money having been paid up, very considerable cash dividends having been paid out. From that time it has gone on, increasing, the factory has put in new machinery, making it more valuable than it was, and still they are paying large dividends on the stock so watered, so that to-day you cannot buy that stock in the market for less than \$250 on the \$100, and without paying a single additional dollar, by the simple process of accretion, that stock is worth five times as much as it was in the beginning. The hon. gentleman is a most respectable man, a man whose word I would take as soon as his bond in any commercial transaction, and his bond is known to be a very valuable security. But here is an extraordinary contradiction between the statements of two gentlemen. But, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister would have us believe that our taxation has not increased by reason of this National Policy, that we pay less *per capita* than we paid a year ago. Those who have been acquainted with the hon. gentleman for some years, who have heard him speak on the subject from time to time, are aware that the use of averages and the working out a *per capita* is a favorite mode indeed

of meeting objections to any particular project or theory of his. If you add so much here and take off so much there, you get a certain divisor, and if you add to that divisor a certain amount, your quotient will be so much less. That is the process by which he gets the results which he wishes to obtain. Let me refer for a moment to one or two of his statements. In order to prove that the tax on imports now is less actually than it was some years ago, he takes up an average of years. He will not compare his present income with the income of any one of those years of depression of which we hear so much, but he chooses to make an average of all the years under the Mackenzie Administration, and in making that average he is careful to take those years which would diminish the side of the account which he wishes diminished. He chooses to date the beginning of the Mackenzie Government from the first of July, 1874, whereas they came into power early in November, 1873, and had control of public affairs during the spending portion of that time, and succeeded, notwithstanding all the Minister of Railways has said on that point, and notwithstanding that they did add to the annual expenditure a sum which he wished to charge to capital account. That hon. gentlemen are very fond of capital account. We had any number of charges to capital account last year, and they appear this year in the Estimates for the Intercolonial Railway and other places. As I said, the hon. Minister of Railways wished a certain amount charged to capital, but when the new Administration came in they thought, and thought properly, that it should be charged to revenue. They so charged it, and Parliament, notwithstanding all the hon. gentleman could say, approved of their course. Oh, but the hon. gentleman will say: "It was a hostile Parliament." When a vote in Parliament or in a constituency goes in his favor, the fact is sufficient, in the hon. gentleman's eyes, to clear a character, no matter how badly it is stained, or to brighten a reputation, no matter how dark it may be, but when a election happens to go against him, or a vote in the House, its decision is of no value at all. But though that amount was added to the annual expenditure—so careful were the Ministers of that day in their control over their expenditures, that they kept them largely under the income, and then came the addition derived from the increase in the Tariff. I will not stop to argue whether that increase was a necessity or not; it was alleged to be a necessity at the time, and the Parliament of that day, by a majority of some eighty votes, declared it to be a necessity in order to save the country from the deficit with which it was then threatened, thanks to the extravagance and the improvidence of hon. gentlemen opposite. But the hon gentleman does not choose to take that first year and give gentlemen on this side credit for the surplus they succeeded in securing by economy on the one hand and by the imposition of this additional taxation on the other. He wants, if possible, to make up a deficit by-and-bye, and he has also another object in view, and so he takes the years 1874-75, 1875-76 and 1876-77. He strikes an average of the whole and says the population was so-and-so—a purely fanciful figure—and then makes this division and says: "the quotient is \$4.88 *per capita*." Then he goes to the other side of the account and takes 1878-79 as a year of his own. This is the first time I heard them claim that year as one of theirs, for they have always repudiated it. I find that 1879-80 and 1880-81 are the two years on which he calculated as their own. It was upon these two years that I wanted to contrast two calculations of the hon. gentleman, in one of which he claimed 1879, and in the other he changed the late Administration with that year. I find, however, in taking up the paper, I have substituted the one year for the other, but the contrast between the two will remain the same. In calculating the amount *per capita*, he takes it in this way. He takes 1874-75, 1875-76, 1876-77,

1877-78 and 1878-79. He takes the population at 4,050,000, a fanciful figure, but probably nearly correct. On the one side he adds what he calls the deficit and from the other he subtracts a surplus, and the deficits he wants to make out as \$5,491,000. His colleague the Minister of Railways has told us over and over again that that deficit was \$7,500,000; and I think these two hon. gentlemen should contrive to agree on so important a matter instead of contradicting themselves so materially. If we take the actual time during which the Mackenzie Government had control of public affairs—only the time which can be legitimately calculated—the deficit would not be quite \$2,000,000, but by working the calculation out as I have described one of these hon. gentlemen makes it \$7,500,000, and the other \$5,500,000. The Minister of Railways makes the amount *per capita* \$4.88, while he says that in the present condition of things it is only \$4.65. Let me contrast this with the calculation of exports, by which the hon. gentleman endeavors to show that the prosperity of Canada is due to a very small extent to the increase of the exports. Instead of taking the figures for the last year or two of the season of depression and contrasting them with the present two years, he goes back to a period when, in point of fact, there was little or no commercial depression or suffering in this country, when there were no people out of employment, although depression prevailed in the United States, which was then in possession of the panacea which these gentlemen prescribe for all such evils—namely, a high Tariff. During these years Canada was enjoying a fair degree of prosperity, but the hon. gentleman does not compare the returns for the last two years with those for the two previous years. He calculates on the five years previous to 1879, and charges hon. gentlemen on this side—or rather he does not really charge them, because it is really an admission—that there was not a depression at the time, but only for a short period in the latter portion of their Administration. But on the other side he adds in the year 1879, claiming that as their year, because in that year the whole exports were a little over \$60,000,000—\$8,500,000 less than in 1878, and very much less than they were in our previous years. He then takes the years 1879, 1880 and 1881, and strikes an average from these, and by means so improper he succeeds in reducing his own average exportation, saying: "My exports only exceed yours on the average by about \$1,700,000 a year, and therefore the increased prosperity cannot be due to the increased value of the exports;" whereas, if he had compared 1881 with 1878 and 1879, he would have found an enormous difference in the exports. In 1878 they were but \$68,000,000, in 1879 \$60,000,000, in 1880 over \$70,000,000, in 1881 they were \$80,923,379—\$150,000,000 in round numbers in the two latter years, against \$128,000,000, or an increase of over \$22,000,000 in the exports of those two years as compared with the exports of the two years which were the real years of depression. Sir, I state that is not a fair mode for a Finance Minister to adopt, as it does not represent the true state of things in this country. That \$20,000,000 has come into the country and created that purchasing power which the hon. gentleman attributed to the National Policy, and, increasing the purchasing power, has stimulated all industries in this country, manufacturing as well as importing. The hon. gentleman took another way of proving that the people of the Dominion pay less than they did years ago. He says the Maritime Provinces imported more and paid more per head some years ago than they do now. Sixteen years ago the Province of New Brunswick imported \$10,000,000 worth of goods. After Confederation the imports declined for some years, because the times which these gentlemen say were times of prosperity, were really times of depression and suffering. After Confederation the item of flour coming into Canada disappeared from our accounts,

and for that item about a million dollars ought to be allowed. Deducting that million, \$9,000,000 would be left as our imports in 1866. They rose again in 1872 to over \$10,000,000; but in 1879-80 the imports of New Brunswick, as they appeared in the Public Accounts, were less than \$4,000,000, and last year our whole imports are put at only about \$6,000,000. If we were to take our average population, we would find, if our imports were to go on progressively, that we ought to have credit for \$12,000,000 or \$12,500,000, instead of about half that amount. This is not caused by the substitution in our markets of the manufactures of Canada for imported goods. A great inter-provincial trade has grown up; but I must say that it is a very one-sided trade. We import into the Lower Provinces to-day a vast amount of goods from the Upper Provinces—some of them Canadian manufactures, and some of them importations from the old country—part of these clothing made up in these Provinces. The articles imported into our Province from the Upper Provinces have displaced, not the articles which we imported from other countries, but the articles manufactured in our own Province; and to-day the manufacturers of New Brunswick are less prosperous than they were ten or twelve years ago. In the city of St. John there are fewer hands employed in skilled labor than there were ten or twelve years ago, as a result of this competition with the manufacturers of the Upper Provinces. The few articles they send down which take the place of those we formerly imported are coarse woollen goods, and lately some of the coarser cottons. The value of those I cannot fix exactly, but if you put it at \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000, that will be the outside figure. Beyond that, a very large quantity of the goods we consume must be imported goods; and the change produced by the Tariff is this, that the merchants of Quebec, Montreal and other parts of the Upper Provinces, supply the people of the Lower Provinces with imported goods as well as manufactured goods; and on these imported goods we pay the duties, not into our own Custom houses, but into the Custom houses of the Upper Provinces. On the face of the accounts we do not get credit for this, but the person who ought to be most familiar with this condition of things is the gentleman, who himself, as Provincial Secretary in 1866, collected the duty on \$10,000,000 of imported goods. It is the nature of things in all these new countries of ours that the purchasing power of the people should increase faster than the population; and the purchasing power has on the whole increased in the Lower Provinces, so that we must be purchasing more of those imported goods than we did eight or nine years ago. Therefore I say that when the Finance Minister asserts on the basis of these accounts that the people of the Maritime Provinces are paying considerably less taxes than they paid some years ago, he makes a statement which no Finance Minister, knowing of what he spoke, should have made. I must protest as strongly as I can in courteous, civil and parliamentary language, against such a perversion of the facts, such an attempt to mislead by stating the facts as they appear merely on the face of the Public Accounts, without adding other facts, which qualify those statements and which would enable Parliament and the country to form an accurate opinion on the subject. We in the Lower Provinces are paying more taxation than ever before. There is another way of estimating it and it is this: In 1866 our imports were \$10,000,000, and we paid but an average duty of 10 per cent., although the duties were raised just before we entered the Confederation. The Minister of Railways claims credit for being a protectionist and for having raised the duties in his Province. The duties were increased in the Maritime Provinces and reduced in Lower Canada. On these \$10,000,000 we collected about \$1,000,000. The Dominion Tariff adopted in 1868-69 made the average duty on imports 12 per cent., and to-day it is 21 per

Mr. ANGLIN.

cent. Yet the Finance Minister, by his *per capita* shuffling, averaging and estimating, managed to cut down the *per capita* so as to make it smaller, when we are paying 21 per cent. on all goods dutiable and free, than it actually was under the 10 or 12 per cent Tariff. But the hon. gentleman will say, the imports are less than formerly, because to-day a large portion of the goods required and which were formerly imported is now manufactured in the country. That is a very broad assertion. We in the Lower Provinces believe that we pay more into the revenue, and that when, by reason of the Tariff, we are compelled to buy goods manufactured in Canada, we are paying additional duties, perhaps not into the Treasury, but into the pockets of the manufacturer, and are, therefore, worse off, because if they were paid directly into the Treasury we would expect to obtain a return of a portion in some form or other. I do not think the Minister of Finance has succeeded in establishing the truth of his assertion that the rate of taxation has been reduced. Another mode which he has taken to arrive at this conclusion is by assuming that the present Census figures are correct and reliable. I suppose there is no man in Canada knowing anything of the circumstances under which the Census was taken, and the mode in which it was taken, who entertains any such opinion. We know even in our part of the country that very, very many persons are made to appear in that Census as residents of Canada who left years ago and have no intention to return. The system in which this Census was taken is called the *de jure* system, because it has nothing in it of just and right as *lucus a non lucendo*. This system has been so worked that hundreds of thousands have been added to the Census of Canada, and my impression is, from all I can learn, that instead of our population being 4,300,000, we have scarcely more than 4,000,000. The Minister of Railways will doubtless say that I am making an attack on Canada, injuring the country and destroying its reputation, but in Parliament it is our duty to speak what we believe to be the truth; and if the country cannot progress when the truth is known it cannot progress at all. Truth may be concealed for a time, but it will make itself known in spite of all opposition. On this side of the House we act on the principle that, in discussing these questions we should ascertain as far as possible what the truth is, and base our arguments not on what we wish the population and trade to be, but on the facts themselves. I feel bound to say that I do not believe we have as many people as the Census represents this country to have, because the Census has not been taken in the proper sense of the word *de jure*, but for some reason or other on an utterly fallacious system, one calculated under all the circumstances to create the impression that we have a great many more people than we have. I have heard, within a few hours that, one of the counties of my Province, not a large county, which was considered some years ago under the Mackenzie régime to be one of the most flourishing and prosperous, and which increased from 6,000 or 7,000 to 14,000 or 15,000 has declined in population within the last eighteen months at least 12 per cent. I know that the population of St. John is to-day less than it was ten years ago. I know from an examination of even those false Census reports, that the population driven out of St. John by the fire did not establish themselves anywhere in the neighboring districts, and that as the rate of increase in those districts had not been equal to the old rate of increase in the country, and that therefore the decline in St. John cannot be ascribed, as it will be attempted to be ascribed, to the effects of the great fire. From St. John we have lost not merely the 2,800 people which the Census shows to be the decline of population as compared with ten years ago, but we have lost also the large natural increase which took place there during some seven or eight of those years. I believe that within two years we have lost from St. John and the

immediate neighborhood 5,000 or 6,000 or perhaps 7,000 or 8,000. The city of Halifax, which has complained of a large loss of population, has, nevertheless, according to the Census, increased as compared with 1871, while St. John has decreased, the meaning being not that Halifax has done well but that St. John has done much worse. Let us take the city of Ottawa. The Finance Minister, in that triumphant tone which he knows well how to assume, and which some time borders almost on insolence, declared that to-day there are no laborers in Canada out of employment, and that no workmen gather round the Parliament or Departmental buildings clamoring for employment. The Minister of Railways made the similar assertion, that to-day there was ample employment, because the National Policy had stimulated all industries, and had not merely stimulated industries but had created wealth and resources that had never before existed. The hon. Minister of Finance said that to-day you could not find any of those placards "to let" in any of the windows of the towns of Canada, that the houses were everywhere occupied, that new establishments were everywhere going up, and signs of prosperity and abundance were everywhere visible. A bright picture, but is it a correct one? Would that it were correct, but how could any man walk through the streets of this town and have that opinion? Let him go through Sussex street and he will find "to let" staring him from almost every window, shops closed, and others doing a business that can hardly be a paying one. I am told that in Ottawa to-day there are 600 or 700 houses of one kind or another absolutely unoccupied, and that a few years ago there was not a single unoccupied house to be had. Where are the people that clamored around this building some years ago demanding employment from the Government, and who were led to believe that the Government could find them employment, and that it was the special province of the Government to see that the seasons were what they ought to be, the harvests abundant, and business prosperous? That was the teaching of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They had the Workingmen's Association in this city, and gathered a number of those people together, telling them that if the Tories returned to power a brighter day would dawn, that all would find employment at high wages and be happy and contented. Where are those people to-day? Do they and their families present the cheerful and happy appearance predicted? They have all disappeared. They remained in the country until the National Policy came into operation, when finding it did not give them the employment expected they left the country.

Mr. PLUMB. Where have they gone?

Mr. ANGLIN. To the United States.

Mr. PLUMB. They have a high Tariff there.

Mr. ANGLIN. But they left here after we got the high Tariff. They left because, notwithstanding the Tariff, there was more depression felt in Ottawa than ever.

Mr. PLUMB. How could they live in the United States?

Mr. ANGLIN. The change of times for the better in the United States, as times have changed in Free Trade England, brought about additional employment.

Mr. PLUMB. But the United States had a high Tariff.

Mr. ANGLIN. Prosperity had commenced in the United States and it has continued to the present day. That prosperity is reflected in this country, and it is to it that Ottawa especially owes what prosperity she now enjoys, because of the higher value of lumber. But this prosperity was not due to any change of Tariff. There was a change of Tariff in the United States and England as well as in Canada, and if the change of Tariff in Canada has done such wonders here, the change in the United States and England should have had a similar effect in those countries. We know that under the

Tory Administration of Disraeli, depression was felt throughout England. We know that in the iron districts of Cleveland one furnace after another went out of blast, and the people were in great misery. If it were not a too contemptuous term to use they might have been called shivering wretches, so much did they suffer. Other districts in England were in as bad a condition although those wonderful Tories were in power, and notwithstanding the glorious foreign policy of the Tory jingoes. Mr. Gladstone returned to power and proposed a change of Tariff—an important change, as the hon. member for Centre Wellington would say. He took the duty off malt and substituted for it a duty on beer by the barrel. Immediately after things began to improve, and where formerly there was distress there is now abundance of employment and prosperity. According to the reasoning of hon. gentlemen opposite, the change was due entirely to the change of Tariff taking the duty off malt and placing it on beer. There was also a change of Tariff in the United States about that time. Just as the years of adversity were fading away, the duty was taken off quinine, and the country immediately became prosperous. For no other reason, as far as the Tariff or fiscal policy was concerned, did the depression disappear and a change for the better take place, except that the duty was taken off quinine. This may be the *reductio ad absurdum* of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is just as justifiable to attribute the change for the better in England and the United States to the changes in their Tariff as it is to attribute the improved condition of Canada to our National Policy. But to return to the workingmen of this city—to such a depth of poverty were many of them reduced, that when they were driven in despair to leave the country, some had not the means to do so, and they had to apply to the Corporation for assistance. In 1879, when the Tory Government were in power, when the Tory sun was high in the heavens, and hope beat strongly in every breast, and a new stimulus was given to trade, the city of Ottawa paid \$2,050 to assist these citizens to go to some other place where they could get employment. It was necessary to give \$1,150 in the year 1880 to help the very poor of Ottawa to go elsewhere to seek employment, and in the year after another sum. In 1881, that blessed year in which the country was so prosperous, if we believe the hon. gentlemen opposite, in which there were no shivering, suffering, ill-clad people—in that year Ottawa was forced to pay \$760 more to enable the poverty stricken to go away to earn a living elsewhere. In all, since the accession of the Tories to office, \$3,960 has been paid to those who were so poor that they could no longer get bread enough and had they not been so aided would have had to crawl out of the country. It has been said that there are no poor at Montreal—that it is a great, prosperous city, and that the National Policy has done wonders for it—that thousands additional of men are employed,—and we are told that Montreal ought to be prosperous above all other places. It was my misfortune to be compelled, some time ago, to spend six or seven weeks in Montreal, and being what the Minister of Railways would call of an enquiring turn of mind, passing up and down the streets I looked for evidences of the wonderful prosperity of which all the Tory papers and Tory orators had been telling us. There is always in that city a busy multitude to be seen on the main streets; but walking through the back streets, I observed in many a house the placard "to let," although the Finance Minister stated all such had disappeared. In the districts where the workingmen dwell, I saw many empty houses, and in the more fashionable quarters, including Prince of Wales Terrace, St. Catherine Street, I also saw "house to let" in more than one place. Elsewhere, everywhere I turned, appeared similar evidences of the same kind. On enquiry I found that houses recently let were bringing astonishingly low rents, and the owners reducing them to get tenants.

Coming to the business streets I found even there the same evidence that prosperity was not so very extraordinary, and the hum not so loud as had been asserted. I found on going through Notre Dame street, the old Recollet House, which was a very few years ago a fashionable dry-goods establishment, built and fitted up in a most expensive style, now occupied by an auctioneer, with a few dusty old traps in the window. Elsewhere I found properties occupied in such a way, that it was evidently impossible they could pay interest on the money invested on them, and I have seen statements in the papers which I believe true, that property, to-day, at Montreal is very, very far short in value of what it was in 1875, 1876 and 1877. And not merely has the market value of the property decreased, but the Assessors have had to reduce the value as assessed, and it remains down to this day, they not feeling justified in making any considerable increase this last year or two, notwithstanding the National Policy, and although the Tories are in power and they assert that everything is prospering and booming. A somewhat similar story might be told of Quebec.

Mr. PLUMB. Is property in Montreal lower than in 1875?

Mr. ANGLIN. I believe that the population of Montreal, besides, is not as large as four years ago. In 1878, 1879 and 1880, a very much larger number of people left Montreal to seek employment and remain elsewhere in employment, than the new arrivals and the natural increase would amount to. The Finance Minister says that there are no laborers to-day in Montreal wanting employment. Only a few weeks ago in answer to an advertisement, in the Montreal paper, calling for 50 or 60 laborers at a dollar a day, the doors of the building, where application was to be made, were broken in by the pressure of the hundreds who sought for work. I ask what would be a fair day's wages for a fair day's work? Hon. gentlemen opposite, who have professed themselves great patrons of the workingmen, but who desire to see them employed for the benefit of the employer, should tell us what is a fair day's wages for a fair day's work at any season. It has been said that the purchasing power of money has been gradually diminished of late years, and we have seen pastorals issued on high authority, of no less than two Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, asserting that the purchasing power of money has been so greatly diminished that ministers can no longer be expected to live on their old stipends, and that their congregations should increase those stipends to enable those ministers to live as they did a few years ago. The same remark applies, in a very much stronger degree, to the workingmen. The Tariff presses with greater weight and severity on the workingmen who paid the higher duties on their coarse heavy clothing. It is they especially who most largely contribute to swell the revenue so as to enable the Government to spend all they do and boast of a large surplus. Would one dollar a day be a fair day's wages for a fair day's work?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to see any hon. gentleman engage Canadian laborers for a dollar a day in Ontario.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. gentleman will understand that only a very short time ago the wages of the laborers on the North Shore Railroad, in the Province of Quebec, were reduced to 80 cents.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The wages of men on the Canada Central Railroad have been \$1.20.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am not guessing or speculating, but speak of an actual occurrence and reduction on a road almost in sight of our Parliament windows.

Mr. PLUMB. They went away to get \$1.10.

Mr. ANGLIN.

Mr. ANGLIN. Where?

Mr. MACKENZIE. To Niagara, perhaps.

Mr. PLUMB. You cannot hire a man there for less than \$1.10.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Niagara is interrupting the hon. gentleman who has the floor, in a contumacious manner, which is highly discreditable to him.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. member for West Durham is interrupting and making statements in regard to me which, in a parliamentary sense, are not founded on fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Niagara will have the courtesy to listen to the hon. member.

Mr. ANGLIN. Whenever the hon. member for Niagara becomes restless, I know I am making a good point, and I do not want him stopped. Now, Sir, in my own town I caused enquiries to be made as to the rate of wages there, in the various kinds of employment, because I knew we would have to deal with this question. I know myself that in the town and city supposed to be represented by the Finance Minister there are to-day many hundreds of laborers without employment. I employed a young man to go through the city and investigate the matter. His report was this: Of late years it has become the custom in St. John to lay the keels of vessels in the early part of the winter, and to prosecute work on them during the winter, for the reason that employers can dictate terms to the men they employ. The highest wages paid to skilled workmen in the shipyards was one dollar a day for the time they could work; and in the winter season they do not average more than four days a week. Wages range from a dollar down to 80 cents a day. The majority of the men receive 80 or 90 cents; only a few earn a dollar. Whoever else has been benefited by this National Policy I think it cannot be shown that the laboring man, the artisan or mechanic has had his condition materially improved. The Finance Minister himself admitted that in 200 factories of the Dominion there has been no increase of wages, and the only benefit that he claims for the workmen is that employment is more steady; well, that is not to be attributed to the National Policy, but arises from other causes. He admits, at all events, that the rate of wages is not increased in a number of these factories. In others he says it is increased by the munificent sum of ten cents a day. Now, I think when he makes a statement such as this he ought to pay this House the compliment of laying full details on the Table, showing us where these factories are, the number of men employed in them and the rate of wages paid at present, and for the last three or four years. I think we were all surprised to hear there are as many as ninety new factories in the whole Dominion. I would be astonished at it were I not aware that since the National Policy came into operation there can hardly be a shingle mill or a cheese factory put up that is not announced as a new industry, the result of the National Policy. I hope that the Finance Minister will do the people the justice of making a full and complete statement, so that we can all judge of its exact value. He says that there was some increase in the rate of wages. I heard of one case of some stove makers up in Hamilton or Toronto, who were very earnest advocates of the National Policy, and who were amongst those who clamored most loudly for increased protection in order that their men may have increased employment and increased wages—I heard that their employers resisted the demands of their men for increased wages until a large number of them had gone to the United States and the others were threatening to go, and then there was an increase of 10 per cent. which was proclaimed all over the country as a result of the National Policy, but it turned out afterwards that it was merely a return to the wages paid by the same firm under the Mackenzie Administration. I heard of another interesting case where I was almost per-

sonally acquainted with the facts. In looking for the boom the Finance Minister visited Almonte, where there are a great many woollen mills, and where the owners have displayed much energy, which would deserve the admiration of all their fellow-citizens, were it not that they joined in the effort to impose upon their fellow-subjects those increased burdens. The hon. gentleman was shown through the largest of the mills, and by-and-bye, after he had made his hurried survey in which, with an eagle glance he took in at once the process of manufacture, the employes were all gathered in some large room to be addressed by the Finance Minister and to cheer him and present him with an address. On the walls was written in large letters: "On and after the 1st of December next, wages in this mill will be increased 10 per cent." Here, at least, was a case where the National Policy had brought great advantage to the workingmen, a case in which the Ministry might triumph ever more. After the National Policy had gone into operation, I learned from Mr. Galbraith, the late representative for that district, whose loss we all deplore, that some weeks after the National Policy went into operation, the men demanded an increase of wages, but instead of receiving it they were told they must either work one hour every day additional or consent to a reduction of ten per cent., and they consented to the reduction of ten per cent. That continued for some time until they found it necessary to increase the rate of wages, but they only went back to the rate in force during the Mackenzie Administration. Such has been the effect on the rate of wages and on the laboring men, and I have never yet heard of an instance of any increase, and I doubt if any hon. member in this House has heard of an instance where any one of these manufacturers, after the National Policy had gone into operation, or even after he had begun to experience its benefits, of his own will and motion and out of a sense of justice, called his men together and said: "I am making more profit to-day by reason of the National Policy, the cost of your living has increased, and as a matter of justice I think I will admit you to a share of these profits and increase your wages. If any such instance as that has occurred in any part of this Dominion, I think it would be well for the sake of humanity, and especially for the sake of such humanity as exists amongst manufacturers of the class we find described by the Commissioners appointed by the Government, that it should be widely known, that it should be known that there is something to redeem the dark and gloomy features of this hideous policy, something to show that the working people of the country are deriving some benefit from the National Policy. The hon. Finance Minister says that all trades and manufactures have been improved. He declares that the manufacturers did not want to increase the prices, that they never meant to increase the prices, that all they wanted was the market secured to them—and they, high minded, honorable and patriotic men that they are—they would take care that the people had not to pay more for their productions than they would have to pay for the imported article. We are told that everything is now cheaper than it was before, and we are asked to infer that this is due to the magnanimous manner in which the manufacturers are dealing with the people whom they might fleece, but would not because they are so honest and just. The hon. gentleman speaks of the manufactures of boots and shoes, and he states that to-day hand-made boots and shoes are about 15 per cent. dearer than they were. On what basis he made that calculation I do not know, I never heard that they were 15 per cent. dearer. My impression was that the price was about the same, but I suppose he had some data for his conclusion. He said that factory made boots and shoes are cheaper, and he would have us infer that they are cheaper because the National Policy gives the manufacturers the market all

to themselves. But they had the market all to themselves before the National Policy. Look at the returns of two or three years ago and you will find that the whole importation of boots and shoes into the Dominion, including British Columbia—to which in those days you could not get boots and shoes from Canada without much trouble—and including baby shoes and so on, which are manufactured at but a few places in the United States—the large factories not troubling about them—were something like \$240,000. And to-day we are importing notwithstanding the National Policy, and the importations this year are larger than last year, showing that the National Policy has had no effect because it was in operation last year and it is in operation to-day. Why, then, attempt to mislead the people of the country? The Finance Minister must have known—he cannot help knowing—that the boot and shoe makers had the market to themselves years ago, and that if there was any depression in that trade it was not because of any slaughtering of foreign boots and shoes in the country, but because the purchasing power of the people was diminished at the time, and they could not buy as many boots and shoes as they could a few years before, or as they can at the present time. Some may say that a man must wear boots and shoes, at any rate; but it will happen that a man who is in distress will wear a pair of boots with rents in them which, under better circumstances, he would throw aside. Another article to which the hon. gentleman referred was agricultural implements; but the manufacturers of these implements had the market to themselves before the National Policy, and exported, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) conclusively showed, a great deal more than they are exporting now. Some of these makers, I believe, were rather annoyed because the Americans for a time sent these implements to Manitoba, when it was almost impossible for our men to send them there at a reasonable cost; but when communication with that country was opened up our manufacturers found themselves able to send agricultural implements there, and as they were able to keep the Americans out of the markets of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, they would have been able to keep them out of Manitoba and the North-West without any change in the policy of the country, other than opening up the territory and rendering it accessible to them as it previously was to the American manufacturers. The Finance Minister said that they are manufacturing more than they were before, though he was forced to admit that the duty on the raw materials presses heavily on those manufacturers, taking out of some of them, as was shown by an hon. gentleman on this side, something like \$12,000 a year; and yet, Sir, because they manufacture so many more and send out so many more they are, he said, making greater profits and enjoying a larger income. For the increase, which is a natural increase under the circumstances of the country—an increase which comes from the increase of the arable land brought into cultivation in this country—he would claim credit for his National Policy. The hon. gentleman has spoken of carriages, but I can assure him that carriage makers to whom I have spoken regard the National Policy as purely oppressive in their case, and the hon. gentleman has shown by his own statement that it is so. He says that carriages a few years ago were worth \$10, \$20, \$30 or \$40 more than they sell for now, and he says, see what the National Policy is doing for the country. Why, Sir, the carriage makers had the country to themselves before the National Policy. Look at the old returns and you will find that something like \$70,000 worth were imported each year, and these mostly consisted of fancy carriages. Ninety-nine per cent. of the work was done in the country and by the people of this country, and they were able to charge higher prices in those days, although now

many articles of the raw material are heavily taxed. Some of them, indeed, did clamor for Protection. They thought that the few carriages that were coming into the country should be excluded and that they would get higher prices, but instead of that they are getting lower prices, the cost of the raw material is increased, the production is smaller in our part of the country at least, and the carriage makers complain bitterly of the National Policy. I can assure hon. gentlemen that if they expect the support of many carriage makers at the next election, they will find themselves as woefully mistaken as I hope they will be in other predictions they make. Then the hon. gentleman referred to hats and caps, and to felt hats, and he read a letter from Mr. Green, of Montreal, to show that felt hats are sold more cheaply than they could be imported. It seems to me that that gentleman learned his lesson from the Minister of Finance or from the Minister of Railways. Perhaps he did not know that he was learning a lesson, for some people take in knowledge and imbibe ideas without knowing exactly how they get them, and then imagine they are their own. But his ideas are the ideas of hon. gentlemen opposite, who argue, not that any article is sold as cheaply in Canada to-day as it could be imported under the old Tariff, but that it is cheaper to-day than it was seven or eight years ago. When the hon. gentleman came to cottons he admitted that some particular cottons are a little dearer, but you must remember, he says, that the cost of the raw material has increased while the price of the manufactured article is no more in any case than the increase of the price of the raw material, and in some cases it is less. He very conveniently forgot to say anything about the raw material when he came to talk of woollens. When he tells us that the woollen cloth is cheaper than it was ever before in Canada, and puts that forward as a proof that the National Policy does not increase the cost of such articles, he does not tell us that the price of wool has fallen some 20 cents a pound or thereabouts, or that the price of those goods has fallen so low in other countries that the manufacturers, though so highly protected, cannot charge any more than they are doing. I would like to know how many cases there are in which the manufacturers charge less than the cost of importation plus the duty. I believe that where the articles are at all of equal quality there are scarcely any such cases. The only case which the hon. Minister of Finance put in such a light is the case of the knitting yarn of Mr. Parks, of the city of St. John. We had that case talked about all through the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman told us that horse shoe nails were at first sold very cheaply, because the persons manufacturing them wished to introduce them, and as soon as the market was created they could raise their price. He did not tell the House that the manufacture of this knitting yarn is a very new manufacture in New Brunswick, introduced only within a year or two, and that it is quite possible Mr. Park is trying to follow the example of those horse shoe nails manufacturers, introducing it into the country, and that then, if the National Policy continues to exist, he will advance his price. There is, however, a question as to the possibility of importing these articles, which was very fully discussed in the Lower Provinces; but no rational man, no impartial, intelligent man, who will examine all the evidence on this subject, can have the slightest doubt that the price of warps has advanced in this country to just the point at which the imported article, plus the duty would be sold. That was the only argument by which the hon. gentleman attempted to show that the manufactured article was sold any cheaper than the imported article could be sold. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the evidences we have of the prosperity of this country. We would like to hear where the ninety new factories are. It would be gratifying for us to know that these new factories have gone up, and that there is a prospect of their securing sufficient support under a revenue

Mr. ANGLIN.

Tariff—because I think it will hardly be contended by any gentleman on the opposite side of the House that for all time to come these industries should be treated as infant industries, and treated as though a Tariff of 17 or 20 per cent., or whatever the necessities of this country may require, would not be sufficient protection for them. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it a very fine thing that a large number of our people should be converted into servants of that great class which they are building up, who, they boast, spend their money in silks and satins, fine paintings, and all kinds of luxuries—wealth not created by their own skill or industry, but extracted from the hard earnings of the masses of the people. Just see, the hon. gentleman says, what these wealthy men have spent during the past year; and he actually attempted to lead to the inference that because a larger amount is paid in duty to-day than was paid two or three years ago on the finer cloths and silks, therefore the rate of taxation on these articles is more than it was before. He scarcely had the hardihood to put the conclusion in so many words. Now, Sir, where is all the benefit of the National Policy? Who are so wonderfully prosperous in this country? Hon. gentlemen opposite cry continually: oh, the great prosperity of the country—the great contentment of the people of this country—the wonderful progress of the country—the happiness and the surprising growth in wealth of the people of this country. Sir, we are, I suppose, as a whole, better off than we were some years ago; although, unfortunately for the city I come from, we have not felt very much prosperity there. We did a little more business last year than we did the year before, but we were foolish enough to attribute that to the fact that there was in England and in the United States an increased demand for lumber, which gave our ships and our men more employment. We cannot see how the National Policy has anything to do with it, or how it has increased the business of the city. Many a house in the town has the placard “to let” on its windows. The prosperity is not to be found there. It is scarcely to be found in the city of Quebec. I assert as the result of my own observations, that though there may be more employment and greater prosperity in Montreal, and probably a better state of things than in 1879—about which hon. gentlemen opposite talk—yet the condition of affairs to-day is not so good as it was six or seven years ago. There are not so many men employed in that city, nor are there so many living there, the wages are not so good and property is not of equal value. But the hon. gentleman says: “Look at the bank stocks.” Why, the bank stocks, he says, have at present such market prices that to-day they are worth \$20,000,000 more than they were worth—when? When Mr. Mackenzie and his associates left office? Not at all. At any time when the hon. member for South Huron administered the affairs of the country? Not at all. But the \$20,000,000 was the increase over 1879. Hon. gentlemen opposite promised that the National Policy would increase the value of stocks; but when they got into power, stocks within a few days declined in value \$6,000,000. It is with the prices at that point reached after hon. gentlemen opposite assumed office that the Minister of Finance compares the price of to-day, and he claims as a result of the National Policy, an improvement in the prices of stocks. That improvement is caused by the fact that there is to-day, throughout the civilized world, for some reason or other, a superabundance of capital seeking employment. If you look at the stock markets in another way you will form the conclusion that instead of stocks being in a better position now than four, five or six years ago, they are in a very much worse position. Take the favorite stocks in Canada, and you will find that in no instance is the investor receiving more than 5 or 5½ per cent. for his money. The Finance Minister does not care, perhaps, to look at that aspect of the case, but it is an important aspect. Bank stocks are a risky investment. There

is no bank in this Dominion or in any other country, no matter how highly esteemed or how well managed, in which the money invested is not, to a certain extent, risked. We every day see banks supposed to be strong and solvent coming to the ground, and men placing their money in bank stocks ought to receive even in the present state of the money market, a return of 7 or 8 per cent.; but these investments in Canada scarcely pay 5 or 5½ per cent. Therefore the estimated improvement in prices is not the only way to test the question as to whether there has been a real improvement in that particular. While on this point let me say that the statement with respect to investments in Government savings banks, as proof of the prosperity of the working classes, is the most fallacious and contradictory of the whole fallacious and contradictory statements made by the Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman speaks of these deposits as if they were all made by the working classes, but he admits that the limit of deposits is placed at \$3,000. I suppose there are very few workmen in this country who have \$3,000 to spare, but I know there are many large depositors who could not be classed as workmen at all. Only a short time ago I was asked by a friend of mine to advise him about taking \$3,000 or \$4,000 out of one of the banks that is paying 3 per cent. and transferring it to the savings bank which pays 4 per cent., and I advised him as to the means by which he could effect this exchange. For some time past the banks have had more money than they could profitably lend out, and some time ago they informed their customers that interest on their deposits must be reduced to 3 per cent., and in many cases they refuse to take deposits at all on interest. That is the case with some banks in the city where I reside, and I think it is the case with many banks in the Dominion. The consequence is that people who do not want to invest money in any of those wonderful factories that nobody sees, deposit their money in the savings banks. It may be said that the bank deposits have not diminished but increased. The cause for that it would be exceedingly difficult to determine. Why capital just now is so abundant all over the world, it is not easy to explain; but one reason why it is so abundant, or rather why a great deal of it is idle, is that as yet we have not so far recovered from depression as to have entered into enterprises which would absorb the capital saved during the years of depression, when the people found it necessary to economize, and were taught habits of economy which they have not yet quite forgotten. At all events, as far as the savings banks are concerned, it is absurd to say that deposits are those of working people exclusively. The farmers, we are told, are particularly benefitted by the National Policy, and the reason, according to the Finance Minister, is that they have a much larger home market for their products. The general improvement in business causes an improvement in prices of produce, and enables the people to buy more articles and at somewhat higher prices. I do not think there has been a very material advance in prices. In my own town I know that the prices of lamb, poultry and game have been kept up, or advanced on account of the demand in those same United States which are absorbing a great part of our labor also. Under my own eyes my townsmen are sending away car loads of lamb and turkeys by the ten thousand to the United States market, and, therefore, by reducing the supply here the prices are raised. Probably a similar result appears in other articles and places also. I think it will be found that the increase must be attributed particularly to this cause. I will not deny that the larger amount of money afloat also enables our own people to buy more freely; but I have never heard that our markets have improved very materially in this respect. The hon. gentleman treated us the other day to a calculation, made up of guess-work estimates, as to the increased number of hands employed by reason of the National Policy.

He visited some factories, and in some found additional hands, and calculated somehow that the average increase was 17 per cent.; then he calculated there would be 17 per cent. increase in all the large factories, and coolly assumed the increase would be about 17,000 persons. Then there are 7,000 more employed in the new factories of which we know so little. We do not know half-a-dozen of them in fact; he told us also that in the factories to be established, there would be some 3,000 more employed, making altogether 27,000. And though he has under his own eyes the report of the Commissioners appointed by the Government to enquire into the condition of the same factories, and might have learned from it, if not from personal observation, that a very large number of the employes in the larger factories are girls and boys of very tender age, and that in manufacturing towns, when the father is employed in one kind of factory work the children are employed in another, thus two-thirds or three-fourths of the members of some families being employed. So when it was calculated that each employe represented four persons at least, giving an aggregate of over 100,000, that peculiar process of calculation was such as only the present Finance Minister could employ.

An hon. MEMBER. Captain Bobadil's.

Mr. ANGLIN. Perhaps so. It is so long since I have read of Captain Bobadil's exploits I am not very clear as to their character, but I think he disposed of whole brigades by challenging one after another. Now, Sir, will any living man really come to the conclusion that 100,000 additional people have been brought into our cities and towns because of the National Policy. We have not got them in any city or town in New Brunswick. Even Moncton, of which they have been bragging so much as illustrating the benefits of the National Policy, I believe has not so many inhabitants to-day as it had the year those hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. St. John has not as many by thousands. Quebec, I believe, has not as many by thousands, though it shows an increase in the last Census. Montreal has not as many by thousands. We were told wonderful things about the growth of Hamilton. I hope they are true, but my impression in the first place was that the authority was of a very questionable character, and that the whole thing was got up for a partizan purpose. Then this report makes the condition of Hamilton, the character of its factories, the amount of money invested in them and the number of men employed before the National Policy, very much worse or less than they actually were; and I believe it makes the number of men employed to-day and the amount of money invested to-day much larger than they actually are. It would require a great deal of proof to convince me that the products of the factories of Hamilton had increased from \$3,000,000 to \$7,000,000 in the time stated—though I hope it is true. We know that Toronto is a growing town, but I think the hon. member for Centre Huron read from papers to show that in many districts in the Province of Ontario the population has actually diminished within ten years, the diminution having taken place within the last two or three years at the outside. Then people began to go out. To-day they are going out in numbers, not as large perhaps as a year or two ago: they continue to go from all parts of the Eastern Provinces, and in many cases they go, not to the Canadian North-West, but to the United States. So much for the increased population and the increased home market for the farmer, for which the hon. gentleman takes credit in his speech. My impression is that to-day the population of all the towns of the Dominion is no larger than it was before the National Policy, while in many towns it is much smaller. Has the National Policy increased the price of wheat, barley or rye to the farmer? These are all taxed. We have protective duties on articles of which we have a large sur-

plus to export, the prices of which must necessarily be regulated by the prices in the markets to which we send our surplus of these articles. Where do we get the increased price? The Minister of Finance told us that circumstances may arise which would lead to an enhancement of the price of Canadian wheat and flour in the Canadian market. Either we may have a short crop, or what is more likely to be the case, we may have shipped at a particular season of the year so much that what is left will be insufficient for the needs of the people; and when we reach that point he admits that the price will go up, perhaps as much as the equivalent to the duty. He admits that, although the increase will be confined to a particular season in the whole year it will amount to ten cents a barrel on all the flour used in Canada during the year. Now, that is a considerable tax, it means a large sum of money in the year on all the flour used in Canada. But he says this increased price goes into the pockets of the farmers. Does that hon. gentleman know so little of the course of trade in this country and all other countries as not to be aware that by the time that state of things comes to pass in any year nearly all the grain is out of the hands of the farmers? Do the farmers of Ontario hold their wheat on speculation until the next spring? I think not. So far as my enquiries have gone the farmers sell nearly all their wheat within a few months, as fast indeed as they can thresh it. There is another point the force of which will be perceived by any man acquainted with the course of trade. If any considerable quantity of grain remains in the hands of the farmers, the price will not advance. But it is not the farmers who receive the benefit of any such advance as that. In the Maritime Provinces the people have to pay an enhanced price for their food, but that enhanced price does not accrue to the profit of the farmer but to the profit of the trader and the speculator, who are of the class of men particularly favored by the present Tory Administration. Now, what else? He says there is more demand for rye, as distillers now use it more largely. He does not say they pay a higher price for the rye. He does not pretend to say that they absorb all the rye of the country, which would be the case if the Tariff had added to its value; but can any man in his senses imagine that it is of the slightest moment to a farmer whether he sells his rye to a man who distills whiskey in Toronto or elsewhere, or to a man who intends to export it if the price be the same. Where is the benefit of the home market in that case? Did not the Minister in making such a statement attempt to cajole and deceive the people, whom to-day the Minister of Railways described as the intelligent and independent farmers of Canada? Does he suppose that the intelligent and independent farmers of Canada are to be misled by such sophistries and fallacies as have been propounded to them by hon. gentlemen opposite? It is true that some of them were deceived once and misled by men whom they had never trusted before, by men in whom they had no confidence when they voted for them. They said, we will try what will be the results of a change; we cannot be much worse. They made the trial very much in the same way that a sick person, who has been told by his physician that he will recover, but that his recovery will be slow, tries a quack, in whom he has no confidence even when he tries him. Some of the people in the country tried hon. gentlemen opposite whom I have no idea of insulting when I call them quacks—I mean that they are political quacks—charlatans of the worst description—but they will never trust them again as they never trusted them before. Farmers as a class are intelligent and sensible men. They never trusted in the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the man who has been fooled once and knows it is not likely to be fooled again. The Minister of Railways, as well as the Minister of Finance, says: "We

Mr. ANGLIN.

have not only imported a larger quantity of foreign wool, but the exportation of Canadian wool has been reduced by over 1,000,000 lbs.—just see what a large home market we are creating." But the farmers suffer if they are only getting half the price for wool that they got before, while the prices of sugar, woollen and cotton cloth, and many other articles are higher than they were before. If the National Policy regulates the price of these articles and makes them higher, why does it not give the farmers a higher price for their wool? Men do not go on producing any article which they find it unprofitable to produce; and although wool may be profitable at 40 cents a pound, it may be a losing business to grow it at 20 cents a pound. If these hon. gentlemen had the interest of the farmers so deeply at heart, why did they not put a duty on wool? Why did they leave it on the free list the first year, and last year, when they found it necessary to please or to delude the farmers a little, impose a duty on the wool we do not use in the country, and put no duty on the wool we import? The wool used by the manufacturers comes in free. They are not bound by any provision of this National Policy—they are not forced to use the wool produced by the people of Canada. We were told, when that objection was first taken to the Tariff, that the farmers would have their home market, and the price would be kept up, so that they would have no need of any protection. Duties are imposed on wheat, barley, rye, and other things which are not imported at all. Hides come in in large quantities, and why are hides not taxed? Forty or fifty per cent. on hides would add very materially to the value of every hoof on a farm in this country. But that would not do; the farmers are to be humbugged and cajoled, but the farmers are not to be protected. Cheese sells very well now, but since the National Policy went into operation the best cheese could be bought at five or six cents per pound; for a whole season it was a drug in the market.

Mr. BOWELL. This year?

Mr. ANGLIN. No, I did not say this year, I said since the National Policy came into operation.

Mr. BOWELL. What year?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In 1879.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). In 1850.

Mr. ANGLIN. I say that since the National Policy came into operation it was a drug in the market. The National Policy did nothing for cheese, it left the duty where it was before. I do not know that it could do anything for cheese, but hon. gentlemen might have tried to do something. The omnipotent National Policy they say can do anything. Talk of asking for bread and getting a stone; it can convert the stone into bread. The limits of the power of the National Policy are inconceivable and incalculable. It extends beyond space, it controls the heavens. The dew that falls from heaven falls as the National Policy directs; the rain drops as the National Policy directs; the sun shines as the National Policy directs, and what the fields yield the National Policy controls and directs. Why, then, should it not control the cheese market and give farmers a good price for their cheese? Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell us seriously that in regard to a single article the farmers of this country get a cent more than they would have received if the National Policy had never been heard of: got more even for their cabbages, their turnips, their poultry, their lambs and their veal as the Finance Minister asserts? Now, Sir, we say that the National Policy, instead of being a benefit to the people of this country as a whole, or to any large class of the people, is the greatest curse that could befall them. Look through the whole country, and find if you can, what industry is benefitted by it. They say our anticipations have been falsified; that our calculations all failed. We

said the very day that this policy was introduced that it would have this effect: it would encourage the production of cottons, it would stimulate the making of woollens of a certain class; it would probably lead to the establishment of refineries sufficient to refine all the sugar we want in the country, and would enable the proprietors of establishments of that kind—unless they are greater fools than people generally take them to be—to take out of the pockets of the people, not legitimate prices for their productions, not a fair profit on their capital, on their enterprise, on their labor, but to realize profits beyond all conception. Forty, fifty, and sixty per cent. is freely talked of as dividends actually earned by some of those establishments to-day. The fact that such enormous amounts of money have been taken out of the pockets of the poor people, for it is mainly they who pay the heavy taxes, is heralded as a matter for triumph. They say, look at our surplus and our great factories? Did they say, look how the surplus is obtained? They talk eloquently of the great buildings, such as the Hudon Factory, where children of eight or ten years of age, are kept working eleven long hours a day for four days in the week, and if I remember rightly thirteen hours a day for the other two days in the week. Those magnanimous men, those great patriotic men, those men who desire to increase the welfare of the working classes and think nothing of dividends, were yet willing to grind the sweat and blood of the poor children into hard cash, to rob the people and pay children \$1 or \$1.50 a week for eleven long hours of toil every day. We have to day a reduced population, a people forced to be content with wages lower than they received seven or eight years ago. And in proof of that let me say, in regard to those very coal mines in question, that strikes are in existence, the miners demanding additional wages. A newspaper published in their interest in Halifax states, and I believe truly, that the wages paid to-day are lower than those paid 20 years ago, while the purchasing power of \$1 is scarcely equal to that of 50 cts. at that time. If we take the statement of the hon. member for Montreal West, it appears that even the proprietors of factories are not making money, 3 per cent. being about the average rate. Nevertheless the profits are enormous. They pay most miserable wages and some of them grind down the poor people in a shameful way, as is described in the Government report. The manufacturers of agricultural implements, harness, boots and shoes and furniture are suffering from the operation of the Tariff. There may be one or two exceptions, cases in which the duties have been regulated so as to afford the manufacturers protection, and enable them to charge higher prices; but, except these, all the manufacturers are suffering and the farmers are gaining nothing, though, of course, they are doing well in Ontario and the western country, because they have enjoyed abundant crops and obtained large prices by exporting to Europe. For these reasons are they able to go into the cities and towns and buy largely in the shops and elsewhere, the products of home and foreign manufactures, and thus enable the people in these towns, that are prosperous in the west, to live better than in the years just past. Thus the revenue is swelled, and, in addition, we have an enormous taxation to bear, notwithstanding the abolition of duties on tea and coffee and tin, which, according to the hon. Minister of Finance, amount to \$1,250,000. We will still have an enormous burden to bear, a burden rendered intolerable from the fact that it is the pride and glory of the Government to boast of a surplus and invest the money in improvements for the benefit of people who are going into the North-West—improvements the cost of which the hon. gentlemen tell us will come back again to our children or our children's children—when they know that neither ourselves, nor our children, nor our children's children will ever see it back. By that expenditure we have an immense monopoly created in the North-

West, and we see that and other monopolies—monopolies small and large—controlling the Government of this country, directing what the Government must do in their interest, changing the line of railway as they choose, and directing what duties shall be imposed, for their benefit, on the people. This is the condition which they describe as glorious, but from which the intelligence and patriotism of the people will relieve this country when they get the opportunity.

Mr. McCALLUM. I have been informed by some of my friends that the hon. gentleman said I had received favors from the Government in the shape of getting my coal free from duty. Did the hon. gentleman make such a statement?

Mr. ANGLIN. I stated that I heard it said repeatedly that the hon. gentleman was allowed to bring coal from the United States free of duty for use on the steamers he employs in the western waters, or something to that effect.

Mr. McCALLUM. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have neither received nor asked any favors from the Government. As for my conscience, I do not want anybody to be responsible for my conscience. I do not wish to make any remarks before the House at this time of night, but it is a wonder to me that hon. gentlemen opposite do not learn from experience. Here they are the same as they were four years ago. They say that we promised everything. We have said—we must pay the interest of our national debt as honest men, that we wanted money to make improvements in the interest of the country and to pay for legislation, and also that the money should be collected in such a way as to assist the industries of the country as far as possible. I ask every member within the hearing of my voice, is not this Tariff accomplishing these results? Is it not collecting a revenue, paying expenses of the Government, meeting the interest of our debt and assisting the industries of our country at the same time. But hon. gentlemen opposite will not learn; they are still going on with the same old story. The hon. gentleman who just sat down said the country is in a worse state than in 1879. Why, there was one industry that prospered during the time that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power—the soup kitchen—yes, and another, the sheriff's office. I say distinctly if any man can show that I received any favor in any shape from the Government, I will resign my seat in this House—anything in the shape of a coal duty or printing either. It ill becomes that hon. gentleman who, when sitting in your chair, Mr. Speaker, received favors from the Government. I say he should be the last man in the House to accuse me of getting favors, for he must know the statement is not correct. If he did not know he ought to have known it. If he had asked me I would have told him as an honest man that I received no favors from the Government. Do hon. gentlemen opposite want to go back to where we were in 1874 and 1879? Do they want one-sided Free Trade, with no corresponding benefits to Canadians; to give the American farmers the Canadian market, with Canadians shut out from the United States market by their Tariff—a stone wall of 30 per cent. If so, let them speak out plainly. Those hon. gentlemen are very strong in assertions, and while they stick to such as they make, they may expect to come back to the House after the next election with a smaller number than ever, which is now small enough. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down talked of the effect of the Tariff on agricultural implements. I know by experience they are now cheaper than they used to be, and are becoming cheaper and better year by year. There is the same good change in many other articles, including waggons and carriages. We have now got a market in the North-West, a better home for artisans and farmers, and if you keep out competition, you can keep our own people fully employed. What we promised the poor men was to give them full employment if the Tariff was raised to a certain figure, so as to prevent slaughtering goods. It has that effect; and

when gentlemen speak in this House about a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, I feel happy in saying that in this country wages are much better than they used to be. I do not say for a moment that the workman is getting too well paid yet, because I would like to see him having all the comforts that it is possible for any man to have; and there is no doubt the day is coming. But I will say this, that they are much more comfortable and prosperous now than they were under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they are now fully employed. Even if we admit that the articles they have to purchase cost them a little more, we must remember they are fully employed, and have more money to purchase with, whereas under the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite they had neither work nor money, but were starving. But, say they, Providence has done all that; we have had good crops. Well, it is a strange thing that these gentlemen are so unlucky when they come into office. I remember in a former case, when they were in power, we had the weevil in the wheat; and whenever they come into power we have poor crops. We never have any evils in legislation. Now those gentlemen have got to change their tactics; they have got to adopt this policy if they ever expect to succeed in this country and come over to the Ministerial side of the house. I do not say they will do it, though whether any man living to-day will see it or not I do not know. But they must change their tactics; they must work in the interests of Canada; must stop running down their own country; they must stop praising up the adjoining nation, before the good, loyal people of Canada will trust them with the management of their affairs.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to know if you obtained the coal for your steamers from the United States free of duty?

Mr. McCALLUM. I tell the hon. gentleman that I did not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman should be obliged to me for getting the matter straightened.

Mr. McCALLUM. The matter was straightened before, as the hon. gentleman would have known if he understood plain English, and I always endeavor to speak plainly.

Mr. BOULTBEE moved the adjournment of the debate. Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Mr. MOUSSEAU presented the report of the Secretary of State, for the fiscal year ending 31st December, 1881.

House adjourned at 12:55 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 1st March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Canada Mutual Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Act 43 Victoria, chapter 69, respecting the Anchor Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beatty.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Mr. McCALLUM.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Brant Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Currier.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. THOMPSON, in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) to provide that railway passenger tickets shall be available to the holder thereof until used, said: This is a short Bill and explains itself. It provides that all railway tickets issued by all railways over which this Bill has control shall be good until used; in other words, that a person shall receive value for his money. The Bill will be printed in a few days, and then hon. gentlemen will be able to make themselves fully acquainted with it.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

STAMP ACTS REPEAL BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I call the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, to a Bill (No. 63) to repeal the duty on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange. I was so successful in carrying a Bill the other day without much interruption, that I am emboldened to try it on again, with the assistance of my hon. friend. It is to carry the Act for the repeal of the Stamp Acts. They must be repealed, otherwise the legal obligation of affixing stamps still exists. On consulting with the Law Clerk, and his opinion is endorsed by Mr. Todd, the Bill can be introduced without resolution; and if you agree with those authorities, I shall move, with the unanimous consent of the House, to have the Bill carried. The special reason for which I ask the House to do so, is this: His Excellency the Governor General will be asked to come down and give assent to the Prince Edward Island Bank Bill, and I would like that he be asked to give assent to the two Bills at the same time. I, therefore, move, seconded by Mr. Blake, for leave to introduce a Bill to repeal the stamps on promissory notes. The Bill reads as follows:—

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. No duty shall be payable on any promissory note, draft or bill of exchange, made, drawn or accepted in Canada, after the fourth day of March, in the present year, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two; and from and after the said day the Act passed in the forty-second year of Her Majesty's Reign, and intitled: "*An Act to amend and consolidate the laws respecting duties imposed on promissory notes and bills of exchange,*" shall be repealed: Provided always that all Acts or enactments repealed by the said Act shall remain repealed, and that all things lawfully done, and all rights acquired under the said Act or any Act repealed by it, shall remain valid, and all penalties incurred under them or any of them, may be enforced and recovered, and all proceedings commenced under them or any of them may be continued and completed, as if this had not been passed: And provided also, that all unused stamps lawfully issued under the said Acts or any of them for the payments of any duty hereby repealed, shall after the said day and until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, be received at their face value in payment of any money payable to Her Majesty for the public uses of Canada, or in exchange for postage stamps of like face value.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask my hon. friend kindly to relieve me from the position of seconder of this motion. I do not at all object to the proposal that we should dispense with all notices and proceed at once to legislate in the direction which the House now intends to legislate; but unless it would embarrass him very much indeed, to find a seconder, I would prefer not to act in that capacity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would then suggest Sir Charles Tupper, if that will relieve my hon. friend's embarrassment.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree that it will be the inevitable result of the proposal of the Minister that this measure should become law at the earliest moment. The announcement of the fact that such a change is in contemplation, and the suggestion in some leading organs of public opinion that it had already taken place, is likely to produce considerable confusion and difficulty unless we legislate according to the intention which has been announced; and, therefore, I quite concur in the view that, whatever is to be the decision of the House, it should be proceeded with immediately, so far as I am individually concerned. I do not know, however, whether the Finance Minister has consulted persons who hold stamps, with a view of ascertaining whether they would not like to retain them for two months or so longer, or whether it would be any advantage to the trade that they should do so.

Mr. MILLS. I do not rise for the purpose of making any objection to the measure. It is one which has, perhaps, been on the whole more inconvenient than unjust; but the First Minister, over and over again, told Parliament, ever since the tax was imposed, that he knew no tax more fair or more justly imposed than this. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to repeal it, and I think we should have a statement from him why he has changed his views on this particular subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not changed my opinion at all. I think that, for the purposes of revenue, there can be no better means than the Stamp Act. I think that commercial transactions should contribute, and commercial men should contribute, to the revenue as well as the farmers, the mechanics, the manufacturers, and my hon. friend and myself, who are working men; but such is the happy state of Canada, and such is the flourishing state of the revenue, that we have been able to assist various industries and take off various burthens. And we might have gone still further, perhaps, but we could not well have gone much further in the direction of the reduction of taxation without affecting the principle of the protection of the industries of Canada and the encouragement of their development. We have laid that down as a fixed principle, and no attempt will be made to affect or alter the Tariff of Canada if it can be supposed in any way whatever to affect the great principle which was established by the adoption of the National Policy. As we have relieved various classes of men, and as, happily for us, we are in a position to relieve every class of some burthen or other, I think the commercial world has the same right to have a share of the benefits so generally distributed amongst the people of Canada.

Bill introduced and read the first, second and third times and passed.

COLONIZATION SOCIETIES.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to rescind that clause of the land regulations which provides for the disposal of tracts of lands to colonization societies?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to arrange, at an early date, the rates to be chargeable for freight and passengers, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Emerson and Rat Portage, Winnipeg and Brandon, and intermediate points?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That matter is now being arranged.

WINNIPEG DRILL SHED.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place, in the further Supplementary Esti-

mates, a sum to assist in the erection of a drill shed in the city of Winnipeg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter is now engaging the attention of the Government.

IMPROVEMENT OF RED RIVER.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the further Supplementary Estimates to improve that portion of Red River called "The Rapids," between Winnipeg and Selkirk, so that lake vessels can reach the former place at any time during the season of navigation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have no information in the Department relative to the obstructions which exist in the locality mentioned in the question. Their nature and extent can only be ascertained by an examination which I hope will be made during next season.

WATER HEN RIVER NAVIGATION.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the further Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of improving the navigation of Water Hen River, so that barges and tugs can run between Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To answer this question I would have to enter into more details than I can do now; but when the Estimates come down I shall, perhaps, be able to enter into the question. The intention is, at all events, to have an examination made of that river, which is connected with Lake Winnipegosis as well as Lake Manitoba, and when the Estimates come down I hope the hon. gentleman may find something which may give him an opportunity to enlarge on this subject.

WORKS IN LITTLE RIVER ST. LOUIS.

Mr. BERGERON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have work done in Little River St. Louis, in the County of Beauharnois, in order to furnish water to manufactories of the city of that name; and if so, when do the Government propose to have the said work done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am enabled to state, in reply to the hon. member, that the River St. Louis has been surveyed, but that the Engineer-in-Chief of the Department does not consider that he has sufficient information to enable him to make any report or recommendation to the Department. He has the intention of visiting the locality in person during the coming season, and perhaps the Department will be obliged to employ yet another engineer to see how far the proposed works would affect those on the canal.

BRIGADE CAMPS.

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have brigade camps formed this year; and if so, what proportion of the force do they intend having drill?

Mr. CARON. It is the intention of the Government to have brigade camps this year. We hope to drill about 20,000 men. The camps will be similar to those held last summer.

BREAKWATER AT RED POINT, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MUTTART enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates, this Session, for the construction of a breakwater at

Red Point, in King's County, Prince Edward Island, in compliance with a petition presented to the Department of Public Works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department is not in possession of the necessary information to be able to say whether they would recommend the construction of a break-water there; but, most likely, we shall be able, next season, to cause an examination to be made, and to have a report made to the Department.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SOREL.

Mr. MASSUE enquired, Whether the Government proposes to construct, this year, in the town of Sorel, a public building for the purpose of bringing together therein all the public offices?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not yet taken into consideration the question of erecting a public building in the town of Sorel, but it has the intention of having the matter looked into during recess, and will send some one to Sorel to report in what state are the buildings occupied by public departments in that town.

SUPREME COURT APPEALS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving that it is expedient that in appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada, the printed records in the Courts below should be accepted for the purpose of the appeal without requiring the reprint of the same matter, said: In this matter it is to be observed that the appeals from the two larger Provinces—the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec—to the Supreme Court are from Provincial Courts of Appeal, which Provincial Courts of Appeal, according to their regulations, require the printing of the matter necessary to the determination of the appeal, and the effect of the system at present adopted by the Supreme Court is to impose upon the suitor a wholly unnecessary and very heavy expense. I regret to be obliged to bring this matter under the consideration of the House, but it will be remembered that this is not done hastily, because some years ago the subject was brought to the attention of the Court itself, and subsequently it was discussed in Parliament, and still after that, upon the occasion of the debate with reference to the abolition of the Supreme Court, two years ago, I referred to the same subject in these words:

"There are some points in regard to which discussion has been had formally in this House by which expenses have been reduced. I believe, for example, it would be a proper thing to provide in regard to all cases in which the Court below required that the proceedings shall be printed, that the Supreme Court should accept the printed books and papers. That would involve a very considerable saving."

Notwithstanding these various suggestions, to which I believe there was no dissent, and to which I believe the concurrence and support of the profession in the two Provinces was given, there has not been any action, and the result as I have said, have been cases involving very considerable expense. The system of printing is one which, as those conversant with it well know, involves an enormous expense for a few extra copies of the printed documents. If you order, as in the Court below they usually order thirty or forty copies in excess of the required number, and the printer will supply fifty or sixty copies for the same price, as I am informed by professional persons, whose duty it is to obtain these prints, and under any circumstances, the extra price is but the cost of the white paper and press work, a mere nominal cost. The cost is \$1.50 a page according to the usual tariff charges, and, therefore, if you assume that the printed matter in the Court below in an ordinary appeal case is about thirty pages, which I fancy will not be an unreasonable assumption, though I do not speak with authority on that

Mr. MUTTART.

point, there is involved an expense of \$45 for reprinting, which is utterly unnecessary. But that is not all, nor is it the larger part of the expense, because the tariff of fees which is prescribed by the Court includes a charge of 30 cents for every 100 words to the lawyer, for the consideration of and settlement and work of his in connection with the printing of the case. If his work were, as it ought to be, to shorten the case, it is not a very good way to pay by the page, because it is no work at all to leave the case as it was, and for every page he shortens it you take about \$2 from his remuneration. Human nature will tell you that, under those circumstances, the cases are not shortened, and that what happens—if not invariably, almost invariably, I believe invariably—is, that we have a reprint of the appeal case below, with a certain small addition, a title page, the judgment of the Court below, and a few little et ceteras of that kind added, which of course are necessary and must be paid for. The extra expense to the suitor, in addition to the cost per page, amounts to something close upon \$2 more per page, or for an appeal case of thirty pages in the Court below, to \$100, which is literally thrown away. There is no useful purpose whatever secured by the expenditure of that \$100. My attention was particularly called to the injustice worked by this system, by a large example of it which recently occurred. There was a very heavy case tried in the Court of Appeals of Ontario, which came to the Supreme Court. The book in that case numbers no less than 912 pages, the printing of which cost \$1,368, in the Ontario Court of Appeals. It would have cost no more to have brought that case to the Supreme Court if the books had been accepted, than the price of twenty-six extra pages, which, with fees and charges, would amount to \$50 or \$60. What did it cost? A contract, at a reduced rate, was made for the printing, owing to exceptional circumstances, so that the modest sum, not of \$1,368, but of \$912 was thrown away in printing. But that is a thing, I am informed, that cannot be repeated, and for the future, if this system continues, we must expect to pay \$1.50 per page, or a total sum of \$1,378. But the tariff allows, as I have said, \$1.93 per page for those 912 pages, the average number of words on a page being 645; and that would add about \$1,730 more for the printing of that case, or an aggregate expense of \$2,645, to hand into the Supreme Court a fresh print of the matter which had been already printed. Now, it seems to me a disgrace that such a transaction should occur, and most outrageous that suitors should be called upon to pay those large sums for no useful purpose whatever. We ought to agree, I think, that every expenditure, for which there is a reason, should be wholly cut away, and that for those expenditures and services which are useful, reasonable remuneration should be paid; but to continue a system under which there is to be a reprint, the cost of reprinting and of lawyer's expenses in connection with it, amount to \$3.50 for every page, seems to me, as I have observed, nothing less than monstrous. It is for these reasons I move this resolution.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not think there is any difference of opinion regarding the adoption of the motion of my hon. friend; but, perhaps, there may be a difference of opinion as to whether it is within our functions, and worthy of the dignity of this House, to go into matters of detail such as this is, the subject-matter of which is within the control of the Supreme Court, which can itself order and accomplish the whole object that the hon. member seeks to obtain. All the Supreme Court has to do is to pass an order to the effect that the books printed for the Court below will be received by them, as far as they are good, and that it is unnecessary to reprint them. I hope it is hardly necessary for this House, I venture to doubt whether it is quite consistent with its dignity, to enter into a discussion

of this subject and dictate to the learned Judges of the Supreme Court what they should do on what is really an insignificant matter of practice. There is another way I wish the difficulty could be obviated, and it is adopted by the leading practitioners having business in that Court, namely, when printing books for the Court of Appeal of Ontario they strike off a double number; instead of fifty they print 100 in all important cases in which there is a reasonable probability that they will go to the Supreme Court, the simple result being that they have to pay for the paper and press work for the extra fifty copies, and when the cases go to the Supreme Court a title page, the reasons of appeal and the requisite additional matter is added. While no hon. member will object to this resolution being adopted, I venture to doubt whether it is either expedient, or our duty, to waste the time of the House in discussing it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When this motion was up the other day, I mentioned that the hon. the Minister of Justice had called the attention of the Judges of the Supreme Court to the subject. I hold in my hand a memorandum from the Chief Justice and the Judges on the matter, in which they state that the Court has had frequently to call attention to the unnecessary amount of printing matter not required by the rules, and has been compelled in several cases to direct the Registrar to refuse to allow such printing to be taxed as costs, I will not detain the House by reading this memorandum, but will hand it to my hon. friend for perusal.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad that the hon. leader of this House and the hon. Minister of Justice in the other House, consider that the matter is not so unworthy the attention of Parliament as to be set aside. I always have been of opinion that it is unfortunate we should have to notice these questions, and agree with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), that it is quite within the competence of the Supreme Court to remedy this grievance; but I stated that several years ago the attention of the Court was called to it, and it was brought up in Parliament two years ago, as well as three or four years ago. If, therefore, nothing has been done after a lapse of four years, and in the meantime money is being expended uselessly, I do not think it is too early now to bring this subject again before the House and spend ten minutes of time in saving an expenditure of several thousand dollars to the suitors of this country.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Halton). I agree very much in the opinion of my hon. friend behind me, that it is not the business of this House to concern itself about the internal management of any particular high court in the procedure which may take place before it. If any abuses occur there is a means of applying the remedy without the necessity of discussing them in this House, where very few of us can have any considerable amount of knowledge respecting the details involved. I have made enquiries, as well as my hon. friend opposite, regarding the printing of material for the Supreme Court, because I had also observed the very ponderous volumes printed in that Court in connection with the case shortly to be argued and decided there; but I ascertained that the rules of the Court were not in fault at all. If any fault existed, it belonged to the solicitors in the case, because it was for them to say what matter they wished to be printed and used there. There is no rule of that Court requiring that anything but the case should be printed at all. Exhibits may be brought in manuscript, and there is no rule, at all events, against the use of printed cases from the Courts below. It is necessary that the judgments of those Courts should be before the Supreme Court, which has to reverse or confirm those judgments, as it is necessary it should be in possession of the reasons for and against the appeal; but it is not the fault of the rules of the Court if it results from our

own statute that the Supreme Court must have before it the cases from which appeal is taken. The whole matter is in the hands of the counsel engaged, and the question is whether it is any particular grievance with which Parliament should interfere that the parties in litigation should make more expense than is necessary. There is another view from our standpoint that may be well considered. It is not desirable that all the cases which arise in the inferior courts should be appealed, and I think it is no great disadvantage that there should be some obstacles in the way of such appeals; and if parties will carry these cases to the court of last resort, I do not think the general public will be much concerned should they have to incur considerable costs in securing their object.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a statement of the number of persons in each electoral district counted in the Census, &c., though absent from the place at which they were counted, said: On a former occasion, during last Session, I indicated my opinion that it was extremely important that the arrangements for taking the Census should be such that there would be some statement of the persons who were counted, although absent from the place where they were counted. It was known that very considerable difficulty existed in ensuring any measurable degree of accuracy in the application of the *de jure* system to such a statement. So much difficulty exists in informing the minds, guiding the judgment, and ensuring accuracy of understanding when matters of discretion and opinion are involved, that that was granted. I believe from what I have been able to learn from information communicated to me in various parts of the country, that all sorts of opinions have prevailed in the minds of enumerators as to the mode in which they should count the population. In some cases they have counted every person who belonged to a house, even although that person had been a very long time resident in foreign parts, unless the head of the household would say he was quite sure the person was not coming back. In other instances, men who have been absent eight, ten, or twenty years, have, as I have been informed by persons in the locality who were familiar with the circumstances, been counted. It is not unnatural that such results should occur, because it is impossible, with such a vast army of enumerators to be instructed, that mistakes and misinterpretations of directions should not take place. But a corrective element would have been, and I hope has been, introduced, if the Census has been taken on the principle that each enumerator noted in a separate column every person who was counted although absent; because with that protection we could understand in any particular locality when there was an abnormal counting of the persons not present; and well understood laws of average, as applied to the ordinary circumstances of the country, would point to the cases in which it was likely there was a misinterpretation of instructions, thus affording ground for further enquiry and the correction of errors of this description. I hope, therefore, that steps have been taken of this kind, and that the hon. gentleman will be able to bring down that for which I ask—a statement of the number of persons in each electoral district counted in the Census, though absent from the place at which they are counted.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I do not remember the circumstance the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has spoken of in alluding to this matter last year. When the schedules were laid on the Table, all were produced, and the hon. gentleman did not propose any amendment. It is true, it was most unpopular, and that no unnecessary questions were given—no more were put than were thought necessary for the country. With that principle in view, I cut down the

question as much as possible—enough to do away with one whole schedule, almost all dispensed with, failed to elicit answers that amounted to anything. For that reason, I must say, it is quite impossible to bring down the information asked for. There was no column for the purpose in question; I may say, and without answering all the remarks of the hon. gentleman at present, that the Census of Canada was taken from 1841 to 1861, by taking all the people found. All strangers were admitted as well as those absent. Consequently, you found, in 1871, the public disappointed at the number of people reported in Canada. Necessarily there could not have been so much of an increase in 1871, since we adopted the principle of leaving strangers out. From 1871 to 1881, there was as large an increase as any one could have expected.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says he has not got the information. You cannot at all tell how many persons were counted absent?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very sorry for this; I understood that the Censuses prior to 1871 were on the *de facto* principle.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Were on the *de jure* principle?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It is entirely uncertain then, under the circumstances, what our population numbers. Nobody can tell by this mode of taking the Census the actual number of our Canadian population. I know an instance of a near relative of my own, whose case will throw some light on this point. He was the son of a family, who, at the age of three, was adopted by another person, and was removed 120 miles; and from the age of three to the age of twenty-one he lived 120 miles away in the family of his adopted parents. But the Census taker who went to his parents' family, insisted on counting him there. Of course, he was also counted in the other place.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes. He was an inmate of the house of his adopted parent, and had been a resident for eighteen years; he was a grown up man at the time, and my friend objected to the young man being counted there, and said: "Why, you will be counting in your Census so-and-so at that rate, including many who have gone to the States ten or fifteen years and settled in the west." "Why, of course," replied the Census taker, "I have counted them."

Mr. POPE. If the hon. gentleman will give me the name of this worthy individual, I will find out whether he was counted in both places. The system of Census taking we adopted is the only true one. What do you want to arrive at? What is the object of a Census at all? It is to give the true population of the country; the people who would befriend its strength if invaded; who really belong to it. If we were to take the *de facto* principle, injustice would be done. My hon. friend said, the other day, there was no Federal country in the world where the *de jure* system prevails. It prevails in most countries, including the United States and Germany, which take the Census as we do. Supposing an exhibition was going on in Toronto or Montreal, and 5,000 people from either city happened to be visiting the other, would you follow the *de facto* system? If so, an injustice might be done either city. Where you have such a revenue and provincial system as ours, you can properly follow no other than the *de jure* system. As a general rule it is the best. My hon. friend said, the other night, I intended to do injustice to Ontario as regards Nova Scotia. If you took the Census on the other principle you would do a very great injustice to Nova Scotia. Ontario

Mr. POPE (Compton).

had, in 1871, out of a population of 1,600,000, but 3,865 fishermen and mariners, while Nova Scotia, with a population of less than 400,000, had 18,636 fishermen, who are a good deal of the time away from home. If you took the *de facto* system, you would lose those people altogether, and deprive the Province of one constituency.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a detailed statement of all deposits of money made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with the date of such deposit and the terms wherein the same was made, and the rate of interest payable thereon. Also for a detailed statement of any purchases made by the Company from the Government, with prices and terms. He said: I wish to state that this motion includes very specially purchases of lands, stores and supplies which were agreed to under the original contract.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This return, or a part of it, applies to a matter in the Finance Department, and another belongs to the Railway Department. There is no objection in bringing down the information asked for.

Motion agreed to.

LONDON POST OFFICE CLERKS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for all correspondence, reports, and Orders in Council, relating to J. J. Ross and J. Gordon, late clerks in the London post office, and to their superannuation, said: I may observe that the hon. Postmaster General promised me, the other day, that the return I moved for would be brought down, but a considerable time has elapsed without that being done. The papers I now move for have connection with the same transaction. They involve the superannuation of the officers, accomplished about the same time as the superannuation of the late postmaster, and I should like them brought down as rapidly as possible; also the other papers to which I alluded.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These papers are being prepared with all despatch.

Motion agreed to.

WINTER TERMINUS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for copies of petitions, memorials, letters and telegrams in respect to measures being taken to ensure to the Maritime Provinces the winter terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said: I intended to move this resolution the other day, but I let it stand over on account of the absence of the hon. Minister of Finance, who had had some communications with regard to the subject. I am sorry he is not here to-day either, but this is too important a matter for us to allow it to remain without getting some information. In the Lower Provinces we have always looked forward to becoming, at some day, the winter terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but we suddenly found ourselves, the other day, in a position to expect that such would not be the case. The members of the Syndicate, or some parties connected with them, have held some preliminary meeting in Portland in regard to the matter, and, of course, this naturally puts everybody on the *qui vive* to know what was the intention of those interested. Finally, our people in New Brunswick, having been endorsed by the press of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, took the matter up, and memorialized the Dominion authorities with respect to this matter. This subject is taken up by myself in the most unselfish manner, because it is a matter of indifference to us where the winter terminus is, whether in Nova Scotia or in New Brunswick, so long as it is a

port of the Maritime Provinces. If it is in Nova Scotia, naturally New Brunswick gets her share of the business and *vice versa*. But for us to be left in a state of suspense is damaging to trade in the Lower Provinces. I cannot for a moment believe, that the result we fear will actually take place, namely, that the trade of the North-West will be diverted from the Lower Provinces after we have spent so much money to build up that great country under the National Policy. I, therefore, feel it my duty, in the meanwhile, to move for these papers, in order that we may have before us all the information in the possession of the Government and elicit from the proper quarter some details as to what is likely to be the final determination in the matter. As I stated before, I do not believe for one moment that it is the intention of the Government to allow the Lower Provinces to be cut off from all benefit from the trade of the North-West; because we were led to believe, when we entered Confederation, that our towns in the Lower Provinces should become the Liverpool's of the Dominion, and that our seaports would receive the trade coming over the great inter-provincial line from British Columbia. Therefore, without saying anything else, and without knowing exactly what may have passed between the petitioners and the Government, I beg to move for these papers.

Motion agreed to.

PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTIONS.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for charters or constitutions granted by the Crown or the Imperial Parliament to the Provinces of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Vancouver Island; also, copies of all Acts, charters, royal instructions, commissions, Orders in Council or despatches, altering or amending the same, as originally granted, or conferring or withdrawing any political rights or privileges before or after the granting of such charters. He said: My object in moving for these documents is to endeavor to obtain, in some comprehensive form, copies of all such documents relating to the early history of the country as are mentioned in the motion. It is, at present, I believe, impossible to obtain in the Library here, copies of many of those original documents, which should be accessible to every one. I have consulted the Librarian in regard to the matter since putting the notice on the paper, and he informs me that some of the documents may be amongst the archives in one of the other Departments; and, if so, I think they should be lodged with the Librarian or put in his charge. Some of the privileges conferred on these colonies were conferred simply by a despatch. In several cases the original Local Assemblies were only convened on the authority of a despatch. That despatch, of course, conferred certain political rights, which will not be found in the particular charter respecting that Province. It appears to me that it would be exceedingly desirable to have all such documents bound in one volume together, and if the hon. gentleman opposite would give his attention to the matter, as I think he will, such a volume would be a welcome addition to the historical documents in the possession of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was under the impression that all such documents were in some part or other of the numerous publications we have in the Library; but I find that the hon. gentleman has ascertained that that is not the case. Of course the object of the motion is one which I think of very great importance indeed, and the only thing to be considered is the best way of collecting these documents. Might not the best means of getting them be through the Library Committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE. It might be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Those who make collations of these documents will know how many there are and what ones are wanting, and I have no doubt they can be procured from the different colonies, from England, or perhaps from the Departments here, or in Toronto. I quite agree that the object is one of sufficient importance to warrant the hon. gentleman in making the motion, and I shall be glad to give him every assistance in carrying it out.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved for copies of all statements, showing approximate quantities of the several classes of work, which were submitted to any parties tendering for the construction of the railway between Port Moody and Yale; also copies of any conditions imposed upon tenderers other than those asserted in any public advertisement asking for tenders. He said: I have observed, in some of the public newspapers, statements to the effect that the hon. the Minister of Railways had procured an approximate estimate of the work on the Port Moody and Emory's Bar section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, subsequent to the publishing to intending tenderers, of the one upon which the tenders were supposed to have been made. I make no charge of the kind myself, but I have seen the statement published broadly in the newspapers, and I have moved for copies of all such approximate estimates in order to ascertain whether any such documents exist, and whether, if such calculations were made, any of the contractors received information from them which others did not receive. The tenders were accepted in a lump sum, and therefore, information of this kind would be of the utmost value to all intending contractors, and if any one obtained possession of information which was not in the possession of every one of the parties tendering, the only thing that can be done, and ought to be done, is to cancel the whole contract and ask for tenders afresh. I will not touch on other points connected with the letting of this contract, because I intend to do that at a subsequent period and in another way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reference to this matter, that the hon. gentleman will require to change his motion in order to obtain any of the papers, because there are no such papers as the motion refers to. There are no "statements showing approximate quantities submitted to any parties tendering." The Department distinctly avoided submitting quantities of work to any parties, and all parties were alike authorized to obtain any information that was in the possession of the Department by looking at the statement of estimates and quantity of work made by the engineers. If the hon. gentleman will strike out the words "submitted to any parties, &c.," I will have great pleasure in bringing down all the papers to which the motion refers. But as no papers were submitted to any parties tendering it would be impossible to bring them down. The papers containing all the information in the possession of the engineer in charge of this work were at the service and disposal of any intending contractor, and he could have access to them, and could see them in the Department. All the tenderers were informed to that effect, and all were treated, as I need not tell the hon. gentleman, in precisely the same manner.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am willing that the motion should be changed as the Minister suggests.

Mr. BLAKE. Were the papers seen by the parties?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; by all intending tenderers. They were all informed of the plans, estimates and profiles; everything showing the quantities of the work as ascertained by the surveyors was at the dis-

posal of every one of them, but no quantities were submitted to them, because they were informed that they must make the tender on their own information. We would not, of course, be responsible for a statement of quantities; otherwise a great number of questions would arise when the work came to be performed as to whether the work were greater or less, &c.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that all the contractors were told that they might see whatever was there, and if that were so they were placed upon an equal footing. I am anxious to know whether, as a matter of fact, all the tenderers did look at the papers in the Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume so.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is not aware?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Some tenders were signed by parties in British Columbia who were not here, and perhaps were not represented here; but all parties had an equal opportunity, as the papers were equally accessible to all.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for a detailed statement showing the amounts paid for the Meteorological Service of Canada during the years 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881, said: I do not make this motion with any desire to find fault with the very moderate amount which has been expended for this important service during these years, but rather with the view of suggesting that certain improvements might be made which would render the service more effective. These improvements would involve a certain amount of expenditure, which, however, would be more than compensated for by the advantages which would result. The first and most important of these improvements would be to have the forecasts issued at midnight. At present these forecasts only reach the Maritime Provinces after half the day is over, at about one o'clock in the afternoon. The bulletins are only posted in Ontario between ten and eleven o'clock, long after the parties interested, especially shipping men, have started on their day's work. If the forecasts were printed at midnight there would be a little more expenditure for telegraphing, but they could be sent throughout the whole Dominion and published in every morning paper, while the bulletins could be posted at every telegraph office and railway station as soon as they were opened in the morning. This would be a great benefit, not only to our shipping interests, but to our agricultural, forwarding, and commission interests. I have a letter here from a friend who tells me that, in conversation with a large commission merchant in Toronto, largely interested in shipping, he was assured by that gentleman that the public had no idea of the large amount of property annually saved to the country by this system of storm warnings, and he mentioned several instances in which he considered his vessels had been saved by paying proper attention to the storm signals. I think also that the system of coast telegraphy might be extended to our lake regions. If cables were extended to Manitoulin Island, the storm signals would be available for our shipping at the head of Lake Huron, and if telegraph lines were run to the lighthouses at Point Pelée and Long Point, on Lake Erie, and to those at South Bay and Presqu'Isle, on Lake Ontario, so that the storm signals might be displayed to passing vessels, it would be a great benefit to the shipping interests. Not only would disasters be averted by the warnings of approaching storms, but if loss did occur, more prompt means would be used for securing assistance, and thereby the actual loss sustained would be greatly lessened. A great deal of money has been spent on our gulf telegraph system; and if the small amount I

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

suggest were expended—only a small amount would be required—it would be of great practical benefit to the shipping interests on our inland waters. I would draw the attention of the Government to the remarks made by the late Superintendent of the Meteorological Service in the last report that gentleman laid before the Department of Marine. He says:

“Although, owing to the limited funds placed at my disposal, it is impossible to do all that is desirable in the way of placing information and conclusions regarding the weather immediately before the public, I trust that the efforts already made in this direction will be appreciated.

“The great interests which the country has at stake in its shipping has led me in the past to pay as much attention as possible to the prompt issue and publication of storm warnings. There is still, however, much to be accomplished in this branch of the service. The accuracy of the warnings has, as already stated, gradually increased, and the time has now come when it would be advisable to make this information available at all points of the coast at which there is any shipping. Dr. Fortin's scheme will do much in this direction, but there are still many points which are not reached. Were only two or three vessels saved it would more than pay for the cost of the whole service.

“To increase our knowledge of meteorology, and especially of the laws of the formation and progress of storms, it is necessary that we should obtain observations taken at sea. Other countries have paid special attention to the subject of maritime meteorology; but in Canada nothing has been done, the time and energies of the office being taken up in other directions. Considering, however, that the shipping interest occupies such a prominent position among the interests of the country, and now that our storm warnings and probabilities are an assured success, an effort might be made to obtain information from parts of the ocean which few except Canadian vessels traverse—particularly between Nova Scotia and the West Indies. In England there is a special department of the meteorological office presided over by a superintendent who devotes his sole attention to this work, and which, in addition to discussing general questions of ocean meteorology, publishes from time to time instructions for aiding mariners in their navigation, and also for avoiding severe storms. Charts are also issued showing the prevalent winds in different parts of the ocean during each month in the year. Similar information is collected by the ships of European and other countries, and also by those of the United States.

“Before it was thought possible to predict the weather with any certainty, the agricultural interests received most attention; but in Canada agricultural meteorology has unfortunately fallen somewhat into the background, much reliable information, which would have been of very great value for disseminating among intended immigrants, might have been collected, and would have aided greatly in the settlement of the North-West.

“To collect information available for agricultural purposes we require a very large increase in the number of stations at which observations are taken of the rainfall and general weather, and a smaller number at which temperature observations are also taken. The study of the influence of the weather on crops should prove of great interest to the farming population of Canada.”

In the part of the country where I reside, the weather bulletins have proved very satisfactory. American vessel owners and master mariners are in the habit, in the Detroit and St. Clair rivers, of crossing over to Sarnia and Windsor to ascertain what the reports from the Toronto Observatory are, apparently placing more reliance on our reports than on those found at Port Huron or Detroit, which come from Washington. At an interview with leading mariners, interested in our inland shipping, I was requested to bring this matter under the notice of the hon. the Minister of Marine and the Government, and to urge upon them the necessity of establishing telegraph lines and storm signals at the points I have mentioned on Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. The expense of running wires to the lighthouses on Long Point and Point Pelée would be very small, and the establishment of storm signals would do very much to protect vessels traversing our inland waters.

Mr. PLUMB. Living as I do on the border of Lake Ontario, and knowing as I do something of the great importance of this work, I wish to add my voice to what has been said by my hon. friend in favor of extending this service so far as the Government think it possible to do so. I have an intimate acquaintance with the gentleman who now so ably presides over that Department. I believe him to be thoroughly conversant with the work, and I trust that the Government will see their way to deal liberally with him, and to extend the service of which he has charge, with advantage both to the agricultural and the commercial

interests of the country. The great difficulty under which that gentleman labors has been referred to by my hon. friend—that of the want of the means necessary to establish an efficient night service by getting information from all parts of the country. This is a point which has been strongly urged by Mr. Carpmael himself, and it is obvious to every one that, if it is worth while to do the work at all, it is worth while to do it thoroughly, even if it is somewhat more expensive to the country. Of the predictions which had been made by this service more than 80 per cent. had been verified. The modern improvements by telegraph, their acquaintance with the law of storms, and knowledge of the course pursued, of the storm movements, which are heralded by the difference in the atmospheric pressure, enable these gentlemen to predict with great certainty, for at least twenty-four hours in advance, any great atmospheric change. We are so accustomed to see these predictions, that we make our calculations accordingly, and seldom find they are wrong. The gentleman who is in charge of the Observatory put into my hands last year a memorandum showing the exact course of the great storm in which the steamer *Waubano* was wrecked in Georgian Bay. The course of that storm was predicted, and the prediction proved accurate in almost every essential particular. If the information could have been transmitted at an earlier hour to the point from which that steamer started, the lamentable loss of life and destruction of property that resulted would have been avoided, as well as other destruction of property which occurred in the vicinity during the storm. That loss would have compensated for any additional expense to which the Government would have been subjected in making the service as efficient as it could be made. I cannot dwell too strongly on the fact that this is a matter which has not yet claimed the amount of public attention and favor to which it is entitled. It is not only a matter of great importance to the commercial interests, but to every farmer, especially during the harvest time. If these reports were posted at the village post office, or other special points to which the farmer is daily accustomed to go, thousands of dollars would be saved to our agricultural community, during the time of gathering in the harvest, through the mere fact of knowing, six, ten or twenty hours in advance, that any change of weather was going to take place. The information given by this service should be disseminated everywhere. Up to last year the sum at the control of the Superintendent of the Observatory was insufficient to enable him to use the information in his power in the most effective manner. It seems to me that a small addition in the yearly Estimates would probably effect so advantageous a change in the system, by enabling the Superintendent to get out his reports in time, that it would be one of the most effective and essential services that the Government could do; not only to the commercial but to the farming interests of the country. I trust the few feeble words with which I have endeavored to back up my hon. friend's application, and enforce the arguments he has used, will be of some avail in calling the attention of the Government and this House, and through this House the public, to the great use of that work and the great necessity which devolves upon us, now that we have the means in our hands, to make the most effective use of that means.

Mr. McLELLAN. The information asked for, will be found in the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The object the hon. gentleman had in view was to call the attention of the House to the value of this service. I am satisfied this service is of great value to the country, and as the public learn to be guided by the warnings issued by that branch of the Department, the Government will be called on to pay more attention to the service and render it more efficient. A very large expenditure is incurred by telegraphic messages, but I am satis-

fied that something in addition in the direction indicated might be of value.

Mr. PLUMB. Simply to get the night service, that is all we want.

Mr. McLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. BUNSTER. It affords me much pleasure to hear the hon. Minister say the Government will give more attention in the future, to the motion before the House, and I hope in so doing he will not neglect British Columbia.

Motion agreed to.

COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving for all correspondence between the Government and the County Court Judges of the Dominion and others respecting the resolution submitted to the House during the last Session of Parliament, by the late Minister of Justice, on the subject of the proposed increase of the salary of such Judges, said: Last Session the hon. Minister of Justice submitted to the House, a resolution in the following words:—

"To the Judge of the County Court of each County, Union of Counties or District in Ontario, of which the population exceeds fifty thousand, \$2,000 per year, for the first three years; \$2,400 per year for the second three years, and \$3,000 per year thereafter. The period of service of a Judge now in office to be counted, but the increase of salary not to take effect retrospectively."

That resolution remained on the Notice Paper of the House for a period of nearly two months, and just at the close of the Session the then Minister of Justice withdrew the resolution without assigning any reason, except that at that period of the Session it was too late to deal with the matter exhaustively and intelligently. Now, there is no doubt in the world that the Government did propose making some additional arrangements with respect to the salaries of the Judges of the County Courts by way of increasing them. The Government withdrew that resolution without any reason that I am aware of for that course. I assume that, when the Government submitted that resolution to the House, they must have concluded there was a necessity for it—must have had some reason for it. It was not acted upon, however, I assume, after due and careful consideration; and if the Government gave it such consideration, then I would like to know why it was the resolution was withdrawn, and that, so far, this Session it has not been re-introduced. I am aware these Judges naturally take a deep interest in this question. I believe that, at a meeting of the Judges, a deputation was appointed to wait on the Government, and that it did so within the last few days, with a view of ascertaining whether or not the Government now intends to make the increase proposed by the resolution I have just read. Of course I know not what answer the Government gave or course it proposes to take; but I trust that, having submitted the resolution I read to the House last Session, the Government will not allow the matter to drop now. Now, why did the Government abandon those resolutions? Was it because the additional sum it was proposed to give the Judges would necessarily add to the people's burden? If so, there is a very simple way by which this difficulty can be overcome, and the Judges of the Court get the increased salary without, in my judgment, adding to these burdens. I observe the Government have introduced, through the Minister of Justice in another branch, a Bill with respect to the County Court Judges, and it provides that no junior County Court Judges shall be appointed in any county with a population less than 70,000. I think that a step in the right direction. It does appear absurd that junior Judges should be appointed in some counties with under 40,000 inhabitants, while others, with a population of over 60,000, are without them, and where, of course, business is larger than in the less densely peopled

counties. As the matter now stands there are some six or seven junior Judges in counties where the population is under 70,000. If the hon. gentleman in his Bill will drop the junior County Court Judges as the offices fall in, and not make appointments hereafter, he will save about \$15,000. That sum distributed among the present thirty-five or forty Judges would give them a salary of nearly \$3,000 each, which, in my judgment, would be a fair one. It appeared to me always unreasonable that the Minister of Justice should expect to get men qualified for the position of a Judge in a large county, where there is much litigation and no little of it complicated—to get them from the first or second ranks of the profession, at \$2,000 a year for the first three years, and \$2,400 subsequently. I trust the hon. gentleman will revise the whole scheme of paying the County Court Judges, and not put them on probation or make them do penance for three years. If fit at all, a Judge is entitled to \$2,400 or \$3,000, or whatever the amount may be at the outset. Another point I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to is this—and it is only repeating the statement the First Minister himself made to the House eight or ten years ago when this subject was under consideration—that is, that the junior Judges should be placed on a better footing; that there should be no distinction in point of salary between junior and senior. Both have precisely the same functions, the same responsibilities, the same work; and, therefore, I cannot understand the reason why the salary of the junior should be less than that of the senior. Besides, I have been always of the opinion, and think the hon. the First Minister was of the same opinion, that there should be a sliding scale in the salaries of those Judges. There is no reason why the Judge of the County Court in Peel, for instance, with a population of some 16,000, should get precisely the same salary as the Judge in Perth who has to administer justice to a population of 54,000; nor why the Judge at Halton, with a population of under 20,000 should receive precisely the same amount as the Judge in Wentworth, who deals out justice to a population of over 66,000. In my judgment a sliding scale should be adopted to meet these inequalities. But, in any event, I have been always of opinion, which I believe the Government held last year when the resolutions I submitted were tabled by the late Minister of Justice, that the salary of the County Court Judges, taking them all round, is not sufficient, and that the Prime Minister should not expect to get leading men in the first or second ranks of the profession to accept a position at a salary of only \$2,000 a year for the first three years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to the motion. I was unfortunately out of the House when the hon. gentleman commenced his remarks, of which I only heard the conclusion. I do not think it would answer any good purpose to discuss now the question of the salaries of the County Court Judges, as there is a prospect of the measure on this subject before the other House passing and coming here, when we shall have an opportunity of discussing it fully. No doubt both sides will approach the subject with a desire to meet the interests of the public in the efficient administration of justice in the Province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

RETIREMENT OF LIEUT.-COL. FLETCHER.

Mr. HOUDE, in moving for copies of all correspondence with the Department of Militia and Defence in relation to the retirement of Lieut.-Col. John Fletcher, late Assistant Adjutant-General of Military District No. 5, and to the bonus granted to him on his retirement, said: In making this motion I wish to call the attention of the Government to what seems to me both an anomaly and an injustice. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that there has been in existence for many years a system of pensions for

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

superannuated employes of the Civil Service. I cannot say that I am a great admirer of that system, but I am not going to discuss it at the present moment. What I wish to point out is the fact that those public servants who have the strongest claim on the gratitude of the country are precisely those who receive no pension when old age or ill-health compel them to withdraw from the service—I am alluding to salaried commanding officers in our active militia. Those men have greater responsibilities than most civil servants. They expose their lives for the country and yet they receive less pay than ordinary civil servants, and have no compensation at all. Take, for instance, the case of Col. Fletcher. He has been in the service of the country, as a faithful and competent officer, for over thirty years. He has exposed his life twice in meeting foreign invasions of our territory, and on two other occasions in upholding law and order in the presence of domestic riots. He has also done much for the organization of the militia in his Province, being all the time poorly remunerated, while civil servants, having far less responsible duties, were receiving fat salaries. Now, having left the service in his old age, he is offered a small bonus which, at best, cannot secure him a yearly revenue of more than \$200 for the support of himself and family. I cannot call that an equitable treatment of public servants according to their respective merits. It is to be remarked that Deputy Adjutants-General and Brigade Majors, though receiving the meagre salaries of second and third class civil servants, have to obey orders which take them from one place to another, and sometimes from one Province to another, to the great inconvenience of their families and to the great detriment of their private interests. I know that the present Government is acting under a law that has long been on our Statute books; but I think it is time to change it, and I think it is desirable that the Government, either this Session or early at another Session, should introduce a system of more equitable remuneration to those who serve the country in a military capacity, and give them salaries more in accordance with the importance of the duties with which they are entrusted, and more in harmony with the scale of salaries paid to other public servants. As long as civil servants receive pensions, I see no reason why retired Deputy Adjutants-General and Brigade Majors should not, *a fortiori*, enjoy the same privilege. Such a policy, I have no doubt, would be approved by this Parliament and the people generally, for it would be only too logical and just; at least, that is my humble opinion.

Mr. CARON. I shall have very much pleasure in bringing down all the papers and all the correspondence which my hon. friend has asked for in his motion. I must say that I believe that no class of public servants are more deserving of pensions or of retiring allowances than those who act upon the military force of Canada. I believe that men like Col. Fletcher, who have given their time and energies for a number of years, to the service of their country in that branch, should be treated on a footing of equality with others who serve their country in the civil branch. I think it is but just that militia officers, when forced to retire from infirmity or old age, should receive a retiring pension. However, in the present case when the papers are brought down, my hon. friend will see that Col. Fletcher has been treated as well under the law as it now stands, as the most favored who receive retiring allowances from the Government. It was previous to the time that I became head of the Department of Militia and Defence that Lieut.-Col. Fletcher was retired. He received on his retirement two years' salary amounting to \$3,400. That allowance, which was accorded to very few, was granted in consideration of the long services which he had rendered, and the manner in which he had always behaved in the different positions that he occupied in the Department of Militia and Defence.

When the papers come down I think my hon. friend will find that Col. Fletcher has been treated as well as it was possible to treat him under the existing law. I have no doubt, if it were possible later to make a change in the law which would allow the different Brigade Majors and Deputy Adjutants-General, upon retiring after a certain number of years' service to receive a pension than when it was submitted to Parliament, knowing how Parliament always shows its liberality on votes required for militia purposes, the measure would meet with the approval of this House.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am very glad that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) has called the attention of the House and the Government to this case of what I consider peculiar hardship. I have not a word to say in criticism of the action of the Government with regard to it. I do not doubt, as the hon. Minister has said, that the Government has dealt with the case under the law, as it now stands, perhaps as liberally as it was possible for them to do; but as the law stands the case is certainly one of great hardship. Col. Fletcher has been for many years, first as Brigade Major and then as Deputy Adjutant-General, in charge of the district where I reside. I have had an opportunity of observing the manner in which that officer discharged his duty, and without having any desire to institute a comparison between him and other officers holding similar positions, I must express the opinion that there has not been an officer attached to the militia service of this country who has more thoroughly and more actively discharged the duties entrusted to his care than has Col. Fletcher. He has never been satisfied with the mere perfunctory discharge of those duties, but he has shown an energy and ability quite unusual in men holding such a position which he filled. To Col. Fletcher, more than to any other officer, is due the success which has attended rifle associations, especially in the frontier counties of the Province of Quebec. He was very active in organizing those rifle associations; he was always present at the meetings, and gave those in charge of the association the benefit of his great experience; and even since Colonel Fletcher has been retired from active service he has continued to manifest the interest which he formerly displayed in those associations, and he also attended, last summer, as I have reason to know, all the meetings which took place on the frontier. As the hon. member for Maskinongé has stated, the retiring allowance, which though it seems somewhat large, would furnish, if funded, only the beggarly income of \$200 a year. He is now a comparatively old man, having a pretty large family dependent on him, and is too old to engage in any other occupation. I trust it will be possible in some way to take measures for his relief.

Mr. STRANGE. I know nothing whatever of the circumstances of Deputy Adjutant-General Fletcher's retirement; but, as the hon. the Minister of Militia has called him a civil servant, I think superannuation should be made available to Deputy Adjutants-General and officers in similar positions. Whatever may be said respecting Col. Fletcher, I think, if he is to be called a civil servant, the proper course would be to qualify himself in order to avail himself of the superannuation fund of this Dominion.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I do not want to occupy the attention of the House, or prolong the discussion, but I desire to add, to what has been said by hon. members in regard to Col. Fletcher, my testimony as to his efficiency as a public officer. I know the difficulties which the hon. the Minister of Militia will find in meeting the views of those who would like to superannuate Col. Fletcher handsomely; but perhaps this extraordinary case may call the attention of the Government to the embarrassing position which officers occupy, and, at all events, if they could see their way to deal with this case in a more liberal spirit than the hon. the Minister has been able to do, I am sure, from personal knowledge,

though I am not a military man, that no men would be more pleased that something has been done than would be the volunteers with whom he has served, and who have come to regard him, not only as a good officer, but look upon him with the affection of a friend.

Motion agreed to.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

Mr. KILLAM, in moving for a statement showing separately the gross earnings on local and on through traffic on the lines of railway worked by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, between Annapolis and Windsor and Halifax respectively, and the mode of division of receipts from through traffic between the said railways by which the sum of \$21,216, stated in the report of the hon. Minister of Railways, as the one-third earnings of the Windsor Branch Railway payable to the Government, is arrived at, said: It appears in the Public Accounts that, last year, the receipts from the road did not exceed \$60,000; my remembrance of the matter is that, under a previous management, they were about \$90,000 per annum. I desire to obtain information on this point, and I am prepared to change the wording of the resolution if it is not acceptable.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the motion will cover the case, and I see no objection to bringing down the information.

Motion agreed to.

REGULATION OF FISHERIES.

Mr. WELDON moved for a copy of all Orders in Council issued, relating to the regulation of fisheries since first of January, A.D., 1879, and of all circulars and instructions issued since that date to the Fishery Inspectors and Wardens in the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick; also, of all licenses to fish for salmon in the rivers or portions of rivers in New Brunswick, granted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Inspector of Fisheries, and the Fishery Wardens, under the Order in Council, dated the eleventh day of June, A. D., 1879; also all applications for such licenses which were not complied with, and the names of the several applicants. He said: In making a few remarks upon the motion, I do not wish to refer to the streams, as the question of whether the exclusive right of fishing existed is now before the Courts, but as to streams which are private and non-navigable, upon which there is no doubt the riparian proprietors make the exclusive right to fish. By an Order in Council, dated June 14th, 1879, fly-fishing for salmon was prohibited without the lease or license of the Department, and then the Department practically claimed the right of property in the fisheries. Parties who had the exclusive right in those waters have been refused a license, though they expressed their willingness to conform to the rules and regulations of the Department, while other parties were granted licenses. Owners of land, fishing thereon, have had their rods and fishing gear seized, and they have been treated in an arbitrary manner, brought up before justices and treated as ordinary criminals. While I do not deny the right of the Department to prohibit fishing in a river to enable the fisheries to be recuperated, I protest against this exercise of refusing or granting licenses, either for the purposes of revenue, or, at the pleasure of the Department, permitting one owner to fish and prohibiting the other. Such authority is not either within the British North America Act nor the Act relating to fisheries, and certainly was never intended to be granted to the Dominion Government by the power given to regulate sea coast and inland fisheries.

Mr. McLELLAN. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that the main portion of this question is now before

the Courts, and that pending the decision of the Courts any discussion of it is out of place. He seems to think the regulations made by the Department are unjust in some respects. I can only say that since I have been in the Department, any arrangements made have been only temporary, pending the decision of the question by the Courts, which decision we hope to have in a short time. I do not know of any objection to bring down such papers in the meantime as are not dependent upon that decision.

Mr. WELDON. I was speaking entirely of rivers above navigation, which are not touched by the question before the Courts.

Motion agreed to.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that he had received from the Returning Officer of the Electoral District of South Simcoe a certificate that Richard Tyrwhitt, Esq., had been duly elected to represent that District in this House.

The hon. member was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Strange, and took his seat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That in admitting Richard Tyrwhitt, Esq., elected to represent the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Simcoe, to take his seat, upon the certificate of the Returning Officer, this House still recommends a strict adherence to the practice of requiring the production of the usual certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, of the return of the writ of election.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 47) to extend and amend the Acts relating to the Canada Landed Credit Company.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mills.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Planters' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 53) to amend the Act incorporating the North American Mutual Life Insurance Company, and to change the name thereof to the "Dominion of Canada Life Insurance Company."—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (54) to incorporate the Ontario Investment Association.—(Mr. Carling.)

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Detailed statement of receipts and expenses in connection with the maintenance and operation of the telegraph line from Selkirk to Fort Edmonton; and the telegraph line from Selkirk to Winnipeg, separately.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copy of the complaints against E. Watson, Indian Superintendent for the reserves at Sarnia, Walpole Island, Kettle Point and Stony Point in the county of Lambton, a copy of the Commission or Commissions issued to investigate the condition of affairs on the said reserves, and the reports of the Commissioner, together with all correspondence, Orders in Council, and other papers relating to and resulting from the said investigation; also, a statement showing the expenses of said investigation. The above to be furnished in connection with the return of the investigation into the affairs of the Indians on the Thames.—(Mr. Coughlin.)

Return of all papers concerning the granting of a charter to the Hudson's Bay Company to construct a tramway around the north shore of the Grand Rapids of the
Mr. McLELLAN.

Saskatchewan, and any information to show if the tramway can be used by the public on paying certain tolls.—(Mr. Bannerman.)

Copies of all timber licenses and mining licenses issued for cutting timber or mining within the disputed territory west of the meridian of the east end of Hunter's Island; also copies of all leases or grants of mill sites or other water privileges; also statement of the number of acres granted in each year in the same territories to date.—(Mr. Mills.)

Copy of the petition of the citizens of Hamilton for the purchase of a site, and erection thereon, of a new Custom House and other Government offices, and all papers and correspondence connected therewith.—(Mr. Bain.)

Return showing quantities of Springhill coal delivered at St. John and intermediate stations by the Intercolonial Railway, during the year ending December 31st, 1881; also rates of freight per ton to each of said stations; also all special rates and the parties to whom given, the quantities delivered to each of such parties at such special rates.—(Mr. King.)

Copies of the land regulations in force on the 16th October, 1878, and those which have since, from time to time, been made.—(Mr. Mills.)

Return of the leases and licenses now in force, issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, under the provisions of the Fisheries Act, 1868, of rivers or portions of rivers in the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, with the date of their issue, and the term granted, and the amount of rent reserved in each lease.—(Mr. Weldon.)

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 2nd March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 64) respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the New York and Ontario Furnace Company.—(Mr. White, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 66) to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intitled: An Act to incorporate The Board for the Management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Acts amending the same.—(Mr. Shaw.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

DEPOSITS OF BENEFIT SOCIETIES.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to legislate, this Session, towards compelling benefit or co-operative societies, doing a life business, to make deposits with the Government for the benefit of Canadian policy holders.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is under the consideration of the Government.

WORKS ON THE RIVER PETITE NATION.

Mr. ROUTHIER enquired, Whether the Government proposes to assist in the completion of the works commenced in the River Petite Nation, Prescott County, in

order to facilitate the descent of timber down that river;— and if not, whether it is the intention of the Government to fix a manner of paying a toll upon the timber which passes through it, in order to indemnify the proper person for completing these works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to inform the hon. member that the Government has not yet come to any decision on this subject which it still has under consideration.

COURT OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McCARTHY, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 3) for constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I do not propose to add very much to what I had the honor to address to the House last Session, the Bill now presented being substantially the same as that which was introduced, not only then but the Session before. The most material alteration is that it does away with that which in the opinion of a great number was an objectionable feature, namely, the right of appeal to the Supreme Court from the decision of the Railway Commissioners. As the Bill now stands there is no absolute right of appeal, the decision of the Commissioners being final and conclusive; but the Commissioners may, if they think proper, upon the application of any of the parties to the litigation, or may without any such application, state a case in a matter of law for the opinion of the Supreme Court. That a measure of this kind is necessary is probably the opinion of the great majority of the members of this House, and I think that conclusion is arrived at from a knowledge of the fact that under the law as it at present stands there is practically no means of compelling railways to obey the law or carry out the objects for which they were incorporated. There are, to-day, in this Dominion, over 8,000 miles of railway already constructed. That railway system has cost the country, over and above the amount that may have been contributed by those interested in it and by those who own the roads, about \$100,000,000, and the earnings of the road amount to almost as much as the total amount that is raised from the people of this country annually for the purpose of carrying on the Government of the country. When I state these facts, I think I show that it is a matter of very great importance that there should be some means of forcing the railways to do justice to all their customers, and to carry out the intention of the law, which is that one railway should not be independent of another in the sense of being a carrier, but that they should be aids and adjuncts one to another. This subject has engaged the consideration of the Parliament of Great Britain on very many occasions. Although railways were known only as early as 1832, I find that, in 1840, the House of Commons referred the subject to a Committee; that, in 1844, the matter was again referred to a Committee, and again in 1865; and the result of the report made by these various Committees was that, in 1872, a Railway Commission was constituted for Great Britain, which has existed from that day to this. It has been said by those opposed to legislation in this direction that the Commission in England has not been a success. Well, Sir, I suppose nothing can be more decisive on that point than the interim report which was made by the Select Committee in England to which this matter was referred during the last Session of Parliament. The Committee met early in the year, and sat until the Session was at an end; and the result arrived at was, in the first place, that they thought the matter was so important that the Committee should be reappointed at the Session now going on in England. The Committee further stated that there were a few points connected with the matter submitted to them upon which they found themselves enabled to arrive at

definite conclusions, one of which was that it was necessary to maintain some special tribunal to which should be referred questions arising as to the rights and duties of railway companies in relation to the trade and traffic of the country; that the operations of such tribunal should be simple, cheap and expeditious; that this tribunal should have jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of the special acts of railway companies in any cases of illegal charges; and that a *locus standi* should be given to it in branches of the Chamber of Commerce and other similar associations of trade and agriculture. I think that is a conclusive answer to the statements made that the Railway Commission in England has not been a success. It is true that a great number of cases has not been dealt with by that Commission; but why? Because the decision in one case determines the point not only for the parties then litigating, but for all parties interested in the question involved, and also because there are not many litigants, a railway company being necessarily one party to any case. The result has been that, after eight or ten years experience, a large Committee of the House of Commons universally resolved that the tribunal should be continued, and, if possible, made more efficient, speedy, and cheap in its operation. Now I do not pretend that this Bill ensures all the requirements of this subject; all I hope is that, if the principle of this measure commends itself to the House, some sort of an Act will be passed which will rectify to some extent the grievances the people of this country labor under in connection with railway companies. I would say to my friends who are in favor of what is called the National Policy, that the railways can in a great measure defeat the objects which the National Policy was intended to serve. By a reduction of their rates, they can so enable parties to import into Canada goods, and sell them cheaper than goods can be manufactured in Canada and transmitted from one part of Canada to another, or even from one part of a Province to another part. I have a statement here with regard to a quantity of oil cake which was to be taken from Chicago to the western part of Ontario; and the freight from Chicago to Belleville, where the intending purchaser resided, was absolutely less than from a point in the Province of Ontario itself. The result is that the outside manufacturer may be enabled to defeat the Tariff arrangements which have been made to protect the home manufacturers. In other respects we labor under very great disadvantages. The railway companies, by raising their rates, if there is no competition, and by lowering their rates if there is competition, have power to work great hardships to people living along the line of the road. They may charge more for carrying goods fifty miles than for carrying the same class of goods a hundred miles. In any view, I think I am warranted in introducing this measure. I gather from a speech of Mr. Charles Francis Adams, which was sent to me by a friend, that a Committee of Congress has been appointed to prepare a Bill on this subject; and there is also a Bill on the same subject before the Legislature of the State of New York, where the railway companies have almost absolute control, and where it is difficult to carry any such measures; and for several years past there has been a Railway Commission in existence in the State of Massachusetts. The plan followed in Massachusetts seems to answer there, according to Mr. Adams' statements. I do not know whether it might not act here as well. There the tribunal is not a court. There is a Commission, clothed with executive power—it is true, but a Commission of Enquiry—with power to investigate and report, and it is their duty to report annually to the Legislative body; and, by the public opinion which is thus brought to bear upon offending railway companies, it has been found that much good has been done. Mr. Adams has prepared a short Bill, which he asks Congress to pass, and it is pretty much in the same direction,

Whether the railway managers of this Dominion are sufficiently open to public opinion to be acted upon in that way, or not, I am not prepared to say. It has not been found efficient in other places, though it does appear to act in Massachusetts, and to meet with the approval of Mr. Adams, who has been for many years one of the Commissioners. I do not know that I need say anything more; a good deal might be said on the subject. The difficulty is, to what particular point to direct one's attention; but I venture to think that to most hon. members the necessity of compelling railway companies to obey the law, and carry out the purposes and objects for which they were incorporated, is sufficiently obvious. If that be so, the next question is, what is the means to obtain that desired end? I venture to think there is no other means except a tribunal such as this, because, as it is stated, the railway problem itself is an anomaly, and can only be dealt with in a manner different from all other subjects. It has to be dealt with in a different sense because of its peculiarities. Then the objection is made that we have already sufficient courts in existence, and the expense of these courts is as much as the people are able to endure. Well, as to that, all I can say is, that this Bill would certainly not make litigation more expensive than it is. It would not promote litigation, but it would have a tendency in the opposite direction, and the expense, of course, is a matter which I cannot deal with as a private member, and which must ultimately, if the House pass this Bill, be dealt with by the Government. In most of the States of the Union, I believe, though I am not positive on that point, the expense is borne by the railway companies, and there is no reason why, to a certain extent at all events, the expense should not be borne by the railway companies here. I, therefore, move that the Bill be read the second time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not propose, at this stage of the Bill, to detain the House with any very lengthened remarks; but it will be naturally expected that, in relation to a matter of such great importance as this, some notice will be taken of the speech which has just been addressed to the House by my hon. friend, who has again brought forward this measure. There can be no doubt whatever as to the great importance of the subject which he has brought before us. There cannot possibly be any question as to the great importance of the railway interests of this country, and of those interests receiving such attention at the hands of this Parliament as will lead it to do all that it is possible Parliament can do to promote the interests of the people, and, at the same time, to avoid such interference with railway interests as might be prejudicial to those interests themselves. The hon. gentleman has not, I think, dealt with two of the very important difficulties to which I drew his attention when he submitted his Bill to the House on a former occasion. One of those was the want of power on the part of this Parliament to deal with the railway questions of this country in the manner which he proposes. It is known to the House that, under our Constitution, the powers of Parliament are confined to a certain class of railways, and that over a great many of the railways we have no jurisdiction whatever. They obtained their charters, they operate them under laws passed by the various Local Legislatures of the Dominion; and I think the hon. gentleman should provide some means by which that difficulty would be obviated, and by which it would become practicable to deal with this question as a whole, as otherwise it is perfectly apparent that, to a very large extent, the very important objects he has in view—and no one questions their importance—will entirely fail to be attained. The hon. gentleman has stated there are over 8,000 miles of railways in Canada, and the bare statement of that fact is quite sufficient to show the enormous interest that is at stake; and I think he might have gone further, and have stated that never was there an amount of capital

Mr. McCARTHY.

—the enormous amount of capital that has been required to be invested in the construction of these 8,000 miles of railway—that has proved more productive for the benefit of the whole of this country from end to end. Every one who knows anything of the value of railway accommodation, and what it has accomplished for the people, must recognize the fact that to these railway companies and capitalists who invested their money in the construction of those 8,000 miles of railway which we have in Canada to-day, we are more deeply indebted for our progress and prosperity than to any other cause.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend, at this moment, to be diverted from the very important question under consideration in order to enter into a discussion of the National Policy with the hon. gentleman who favored us, on a recent occasion, with his views at very great length. The proper time will, no doubt, arrive to deal with the opinions of that hon. gentleman; but I have no hesitation in saying, in relation to the National Policy, that these 8,000 miles of railway have proved one of the great factors of the progress and prosperity of this country. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) knows I drew his attention to another important point in connection with this matter, that is, not only the difficulty which exists owing to part of the railways being under local jurisdiction and the remainder under Federal jurisdiction, but the fact that we occupy a very different position in this country from that of the country from which the hon. gentleman has taken his Bill, that is, Great Britain. Great Britain is isolated, and the country being insular it has no connection with any other country. What is our position? I may, however, say, before leaving the point of the enormous amount of capital that has been invested in Canadian railways, that not only has it been productive of incalculable benefit to the development of this country, but there has never been a corresponding amount of capital invested that has been, at the same time, so advantageous to this country in which it was invested and so little profitable to the parties who furnished the money and invested it. There is no country which has benefitted more than Canada by the construction of railways, and there are no capitalists who have benefitted less than those who have invested their money in Canadian railways. Therefore, it is of great importance, while recognizing fully the value of the measure proposed, to bear in mind the magnitude of the railway interest, and the claim that it has on our most favorable consideration. Unlike the railways in England, Scotland, and Ireland, the railways of Canada are, many of them, lying in close proximity to the railways of another country—the United States—over whose legislation and the management of whose railways we have no control. It, therefore, becomes very evident that we should deal with this matter in such a way as not, by hampering and interfering with the free action and operation of our railways, direct the traffic and trade which they now control out of our country into the neighboring Republic. It is very well known that the Grand Trunk Railway, through almost its entire extent, is in close, keen competition with the railways of the United States, and that a very slight thing will transfer the traffic from one side of the St. Lawrence to the other, and thus deprive Canada of the expenditure of millions of dollars per annum now expended here. While every one must admit the importance of the views expressed by the hon. gentleman, we must not forget that—in our anxiety to meet every emergency, protect every interest, and establish what we believe to be a just and legitimate control over the management of these railways—we may so hamper and embarrass these railways as to prevent them competing in the race between our own roads and those of the adjoining country, and thus inflict an irparable and

great evil on our country instead of doing it a benefit. I do not intend to discuss this question at any very great length; but I must say that I do not myself favor the organization of any more courts in Canada than are found to be absolutely necessary. It is only the other day that our hon. friends opposite, when in power, organized the Supreme Court, with the result of taxing the people \$50,000 a year for its maintenance, and it is now proposed, as I understand by this Bill, to have another Supreme Court in Canada. My hon. friend asks for the appointment of three Judges. They will have to be very highly paid. If this court is to be of any value at all, it must, under this Act, be composed of three Commissioners who deserve and obtain the confidence of the people. The hon. gentleman says one of them must be a lawyer. I want to know what salary we would be obliged to give the hon. gentleman himself, who undoubtedly is eminently qualified for the position, in order to obtain his services. I say that we could not obtain that hon. gentleman's services for the position of Commissioner—to give up his emoluments at the Bar and become a railway Judge—at less than between \$10,000 or \$20,000 per year. I suppose it would be possible to find a lawyer in this country who would accept a smaller amount; but you do not simply want a lawyer who will accept an insignificant emolument. You want a man whose legal standing, character and position in this country would command that respect and confidence which alone would make such a court valuable. Then the hon. gentleman says the next Commissioner must be a railway man. I know something about railway men, and what is the fact? The fact is, the late Government were obliged to pay \$8,000 per year to obtain the services of Mr. Bydges, formerly manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and when the Government no longer required his services, the Hudson's Bay Company were very glad to secure them at \$10,000 per year. It is also well known that the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway is getting a much larger salary than that. The third Commissioner will have to be in a position to compare favorably with his two colleagues. Under this Bill, we are therefore to have another Supreme Court established to accomplish the objects in view. I draw attention to the fact as one not unworthy the consideration of the House at the outset. The hon. gentleman has said that the Committee in England arrived at the conclusion that there must be some simple, cheap and expedient mode of dealing with this subject. If the hon. gentleman can devise such a mode, by which the admitted evils—for there are a great many things susceptible of improvement in relation to railway management—can be dealt with, and dealt with in such a way as not to unduly hamper the great railway interests of this country, I would be extremely glad. No doubt it is the hon. gentleman's intention to refer this Bill to the Railway Committee, in order that it may receive all the consideration and examination to which a matter of such great moment is entitled; and I would be very glad should the Committee arrive at any conclusion by which it will be found this Parliament can legislate on this important question, in such a way as to attain the object the hon. gentleman has in view, without involving injustice in some of the cases to which I have drawn attention.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of legislation in reference to railways is one which is exciting considerable attention in every country in which there are railways; and, for the consideration of the subject, it may be as well to glance at the position the Governments of different countries have taken towards railways in the past. When the first railways were run in England, the Government insisted upon fixing the rates, both passenger and freight. That was found not to work very well, and then the system grew up in England of what was called "free trade in railways;" that is, competition by different railways for the traffic in different parts of the country. That system worked just as

it is found to work in Canada at present. One railway purchased the stock of a rival and competition ended. There is another system in vogue in some continental countries—a portion of the railways being Government railways, and the balance being owned by private individuals. The Government fixed the rates, amenable, of course, to the legislature, and influenced by public opinion through the press, and this system proved very acceptable in those countries. In fact, I think the best system of railway organization in the world is the system in Belgium, which is being adopted in some other countries where a portion of the main line of railway is owned by the Government and a rate of freight is so fixed, which is acceptable to the great majority of the people. A system of Railway Commission is exciting also considerable interest in the United States. Several different States have appointed Railway Commissions, after a desperate struggle, the measure having been forced upon them by the united action of the rural population through the Granges. There is no very great agitation in this country in favor of a Federal Commission. The Minister of Railways says that the objection here is that a portion of the legislation in reference to this question should belong properly to the Provincial Governments. But as to all railways which interchange trade between different countries and different Provinces, the legislation properly belongs to the general Government, it should be held that legislation properly belongs to the Federal Government, and that the legislation in reference to these railroads, so far as this country is concerned, should initiate in this House; and the different Provincial Legislatures may follow afterwards, passing legislation for purely local railways. This is a question which cannot be shirked any longer. There is a feeling in certain sections of the country that if a person happens to be placed in a particular locality he is handicapped by being obliged to pay heavier rates to the sea-board than a farmer, merchant or other person somewhere else. The feeling is now well grown that there should be some legislation in reference to this matter. The Bill, to be effective, and to meet the wishes of the community should, besides, have a clause giving the Commissioners the means, by publishing the manner in which the different rates are collected, or some other suitable machinery, with the power of preventing extortionate rates in particular localities. Another thing I should like provided for—that is, some way of forcing railway companies to keep a certain form of account open to the supervision of those Railway Commissioners, and by publicity, by bringing an enlightened public opinion to bear upon them, keep them from entering transactions, perhaps very questionable. I hope that in another Session there will be some legislation added to the Bill which, in a manner, will regulate the freights of the different companies. The Bill at present is only an instalment of the needed legislation. This is a question which must be settled, and the opinion is gaining ground—it is a fixed opinion in all countries now—that the Legislature should control the freights of railway companies. We grant them charters in the different Provinces, giving their roads the character of public highways, and have the right of regulating the charges thereon. There is no Commission which would fix the charges at rates to be injurious to the companies; or compel them to abide by rates that would prevent them declaring dividends. But they should exercise such a control over railways as to prevent exceptional rates. In my section of the country we have the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, of which my hon. friend is a director, running into a mining district north of Kingston. But some of the parties connected with it receive exceptionally favorable rates in the sending of their iron to market, while others competing with them are obliged to sell out their properties to the railway company, because unable to pay

the freights charged. In other cases parties on long routes get exceptional freights. Why has one person a right to get exceptional advantageous rates over his neighbor? The Commissioners should enquire into matters of that kind and prevent such evils as exceptional freights. No man has a right to get his stuff carried to market more cheaply than his neighbor's. No man should be handicapped in the operations of business. A railway company should charge equal rates to all parties. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill as an instalment of the legislation that should be on our Statute books.

Mr. PLUMB. The question which has been suggested by the Bill has agitated the public mind for a great many years, in fact ever since railways were constructed. My hon. friend who brought in the Bill (Mr. McCarthy) stated in his argument in favor of its passage, that in England the question, very soon after railways were chartered, arose in Parliament. A Committee was appointed in 1840, and another in 1841, and another in 1865, and the results of those Committees were not found satisfactory, even as late as 1872; that twenty-two years results of the examinations of those Committees and of their reports were not found satisfactory, and that in a country where the railway system is entirely isolated, and where difficulties such as disturb the railway business of this country do not exist, and where the roads yield a fairer return. Under all these circumstances the hon. gentleman says that, in 1872, it was reported the Railway Commission was not a success.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say the Railway Commission was not a success, but that the reports of the different Committees had not suggested an improvement up to this time. It was only in 1872 the Railway Commission was appointed.

Mr. PLUMB. That was what I was trying to say, but my remarks were not so clear, perhaps, as my hon. friend's. I meant to say that after eighteen years' experiments this Railway Commission had been successful, and that railway matters were now comparatively within its control, resembling the conclusion which the hon. gentleman proposes to reach by his Bill, presented to this House for almost the first time. He then stated that there had been Commissions appointed in the United States. The only one working in the United States is, as he stated himself, in Massachusetts—an Advisory Commission which has not power to do anything—no power to decide, no power to take the law into its hands, but merely to make recommendations, and those recommendations to be accepted by the Legislature or not, as the Legislature chooses. It must be remembered that, in the United States, the whole railway system is a continuous one, that there can be no such thing as legislating for separate railway systems. The great question of railway traffic from the west to the sea-board is not one, I venture to say, which can be dealt with by a measure such as the hon. gentleman proposes, and the railway companies, in order to retain their traffic, it is well known, with the constant competition, the constant change, the constant fluctuation, if they were hampered by being compelled to refer to a Commission for powers to alter or to change their rates, would be handicapped in such a way that the traffic which passes through Canada would be driven out of it altogether; for the railway managers of other countries would very soon find out that it was impossible for our railways to compete with them if there was any such disturbing causes the hon. gentleman proposes. The question as to whether there should be a discrimination in rates, is one that has been discussed on more than one occasion in this House and elsewhere. That it is an evil, that it often inflicts injustice, cannot be denied. The only question is how it can be practically dealt with; and, in view of the railway legislation, I wish it to be put on record on every occasion in which I have an opportunity of

Mr. HAGGART.

publicly announcing my views on the subject, as of the opinion that it becomes us always to deal with these great corporations, in view of the great benefits that have resulted to this country—greater benefits in the aggregate than any of those minor matters to which the hon. gentleman has referred—and that those who have opened up the country by means of their enterprise and capital have, almost in every case, failed to reap any return for the moneys invested. It is a well known fact that there is no railway in Canada, at this moment, that pays any dividend whatever, except the very small dividend that may have been declared by the Great Western, which, I believe, has been at the rate of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. The shareholders of that company, mostly English capitalists, have put their money into it, and I believe it will be a serious injury to this country if it is found that we are tampering with the business by means of such a Commission as has been proposed by my hon. friend—that we are tampering with the railway business, which so far, in many instances, has scarcely paid more than its running expenses. It is perfectly well known that in the Grand Trunk Railway millions of capital have been lost. No matter what the original management might be, no matter whether there were mistakes made in its construction, it has wrought for the people of Canada a benefit which has been perfectly immeasurable, and, for one, I am always ready to consider this benefit in any legislation proposed to this House that is of a hostile nature to that company. I have no railway interests whatever; I stand in this House entirely free; and I believe we shall be true to our interests when we admit that invested capital here has its rights, and that it behooves us not to imperil those rights, or interfere by legislation with them in such a way as seriously to hamper or injure them. My hon. friend proposes that the complicated questions which concern particularly railway companies themselves, and the large competition which has already been created by legislation—I think most unfairly to the railway companies that have already invested their money here—my hon. friend suggests that those rights, and the absolute control and management of those companies shall by this means be taken out of their hands and be virtually vested—how? Vested in a Commission of gentlemen who may or may not be practical men. They are very likely not to be, because such men would demand salaries which would preclude the Government of Canada from being able to employ them. The manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I believe, has a salary of \$50,000 a year. This Commission would require a man of great skill and of ability to take these vast and complicated interests into his hands and so regulate them as to do perfect justice to all parties. It is not for the purpose of favoring any class that a Bill of this kind should be drawn; it is for the purpose of protecting railway interests just as much as protecting the interests of the people; and I think it requires skill, ability, judgment, experience and impartiality, such as in the very outset it would be almost impossible to obtain. The hon. gentleman says railways are not amenable to the law. I do not know why. It appears to be certain, however, that those existing by virtue of Provincial charters can hardly be reached by any legislation such as this, unless we provoke further that conflict of jurisdiction that we desire to avoid. The hon. gentleman says it is possible for combinations of railways to defeat the policy which has been inaugurated by the present Government. Well, I am not aware of any case where any such injury has been inflicted. There may be, there always will be in the management of railways, special cases where discriminations will be made. It is absolutely necessary in some cases, in order to retain the through traffic, that special rates should be made. Without such an arrangement even the Grand Trunk Railway, and the railways competing with it for through traffic, would be third-class railways; they

would not be able to keep up their rolling stock. The receipts which those railways are able to make by going out of the country and receiving through traffic which otherwise would not go over their lines, would be altogether lost to them. It is well known that within the last two or three years the Grand Trunk Railway has laid a new track, it has secured an excellent combination for passenger traffic, and has put on Pullman carriages which greatly promote the comfort of the travelling public. The whole community are to be considered, and not the interests of any special class. Railways are institutions for the benefit of the public, and everything should be done which, within reasonable limits, will give them the means of keeping up their business, and of securing to the public the best accommodation for passengers and freight. The lives of passengers, and the speedy transit of passengers, are of quite as much importance as the carriage of freight. I regret exceedingly that there has been nothing suggested in the speech of my hon. friend in introducing his Bill, which has changed my mind in any way upon the impracticability of reaching even the desirable parts of the policy which he desires to enforce by means of this Bill. So far as I can see, it has not been shown that this Bill will meet any of the great and grave objections which have been urged against the abuses of the railway system. The system here is in its infancy, and we are endeavoring, as far as we can, to encourage capital to come here. I am not afraid that any very large profits will be made by these companies; I am not afraid that the bloated capitalist will be puffed out larger because he holds shares of railway stock that do not pay dividends; and, while companies are in that position, we are bound to deal with them with all possible fairness, and give them, so far as we can, at least our forbearance. There have been no successful railway Commissions created in the United States. Considering that the railways exist by separate State charters, it is impossible for any comprehensive Commission to be created by the United States Government without interfering with State rights, and no such Commission has been attempted. There are, of course, general railway Statutes in the United States, but a year or two ago a Commission was appointed to investigate the working of railways in the State of New York. It is pretty well known why that Commission was created and what its objects were, and I am apprehensive that it would be a dangerous power to put in the hands of any two or three men to regulate the traffic of this Dominion. I fear it would be scarcely possible to find men who would not represent too strongly either one or the other of the two sides, which might be antagonistic to each other, and when a competition of interests occurred it is easy to see which would be likely to get the advantage. On the whole, I do not think the time has come—I do not think our experience has been great enough in such matters to deal intelligently and fairly with the questions which come up in this Bill. For myself, I confess I do not think there is any pressing necessity for such a measure, and while I regret to differ from my esteemed and hon. friend, who has introduced the Bill, I have done so frankly and fairly, and shall continue to do so until I see a better reason for sustaining his measure than is apparent at present.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). I am not prepared to say that the measure before the House is the best that could be adopted for the regulation of railways; but I am clear that, after Government ownership of railways has been done away with, we must have Government supervision of some kind over these roads. I cannot agree with the proposition of the Minister of Railways, who says that Canada has been much indebted to railway companies. I know that Canada has been deeply indebted to railways, but that she has been indebted to railway companies, I very much doubt. Take for instance the Grand Trunk. The people of this country, some twenty-five years ago, gave \$15,000,000 to aid

in the construction of that road, and yet I believe it is a fact that that railway is carrying the produce of the farmers in the neighborhood of Chicago more cheaply to the seaboard than the produce of the Canadian farmers. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Plumb), says that the railway companies are bound by the law; but I would like to know what individual can go into court and fight with a railway, for the company can carry the case from court to court until, if their opponent is a man of fortune, his fortune would be exhausted. He says that interest has not been paid on the capital which has been invested in railways. I admit it, and this is one of the reasons why I think railways should be the property of the Canadian people and not of English stockholders. It is not to the people of Canada that our progress in connection with railways is due, but to the widows and orphans and the capitalists of England, and I think that if there is a benefit from railway investments Canadians should receive it, and if there is a loss they should sustain it. The hon. the Minister of Railways said that he was doubtful if a lawyer could be got for less than \$15,000 or \$20,000, in whom the people of this country would have confidence as a Railway Commissioner. I mention the name of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cameron, who sits on the Bench, and does not get anything like \$20,000, and there is no man in this country but would have the most implicit confidence in any judgment which he might render. Some hon. members have spoken of competition, but competition cannot be obtained, for the simple reason that the railway companies pool their earnings and sell out to each other. We have had illustrations of that fact—perhaps not very numerous—but we have had some. The people living along the line of the Credit Valley Railway, aided it for the purpose of getting competition with the Great Western and Grand Trunk, and they taxed themselves heavily for its construction. The Credit Valley was built, and now we find that that road is said to have been leased to the Great Western, one of the roads against which, to secure competition, the people subscribed their money and built the railway. Then again, we have the positive injustice with which these roads deal with the people. I do not blame the railway companies—I blame this Parliament and this Government for giving them power to do injustice. I hold that it would be the best thing that could be done in the interests of the country, if the people would authorize Parliament or the Government to buy up the whole of the railways and run them in the interests of the people, instead of their being run as they are now in the interests of the shareholders. I do not blame the shareholders, because if I was one I would very likely do as they do. Every man looks to his own interests, and when the interests of a body of men are against the interests of a community, the interests of the community are likely to go to the wall. At present railroads have the power—and they exercise it—of giving discriminating rates of freight, and this discrimination results in the injury and ruin of some men and some places. For instance, suppose I am doing business in a town, and another man beside me gets preferential rates, what is the effect but to destroy my business? In places which are competing points special rates are given against those where there is no competition, and the result is an injustice to the property of those in the non-competing points. I am pleased that my hon. friend has brought in this measure, and, although it may not be adopted in its entirety—although some other measure may be substituted for it—I trust the House will see that a measure will be passed putting railways in the country under the control of the Government, and under strict governmental supervision. I think that this country was not made for the railways, or the people of this country made for the railways, but that the railways were made for the convenience and accommodation of the people and for the benefit of Canada. I doubt

exceedingly whether Canada has ever derived any benefit from railway companies.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill adheres to his determination to secure some legislation on this subject. I agree with the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that some legislation is necessary. There is no doubt that railway companies, which have received special powers from Parliament for the purposes of the convenience of the people, should, to a great extent, come under the control of the people, or of some body appointed by them. The case is even stronger where railways, as is now so generally the case, have received aid from the Government or the municipalities interested in their construction. In this case, there is no doubt that the public interest should take precedence to the interests of the shareholders in any arrangements connected with the running of those lines. These roads have received their charters and large assistance for the very purpose of affording accommodation to the people, and if the shareholders attempt to set the interests of the people at defiance, or manage the lines purely for their own profit, I think it would be proper that Parliament should step in, and protect the rights of those who invested in them. I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Railways seems to take the opposite view—that he seems to consider that the interests of the railways should be set above the interest of the public. In the objections he has raised against the Bill, he has referred almost entirely to the injury that might possibly be done to the railways by interfering in any way with their traffic. He says that our railways are not isolated—that they have to compete with American railways, and that they should not be handicapped by our putting any restrictions on their traffic arrangements. It is true, they have to compete to a certain extent with American railways, but there is no necessity for these railways competing beyond a point at which it is profitable for them to do so. They have done so, however, and I believe if a Railway Commission were in existence which would sometimes restrict our Canadian lines from engaging in that cut-throat competition, the shareholders of these railways, as well as the public in general, would be benefitted. The hon. member for Niagara tells us that it would be a great injury, not only to the railways, but to our people, if we prevented the railways from getting all the freight they can from across the line. I do not say that it might not be an injury if they did not get some of it; but I say that the carrying of through freight from the west to the sea-board is injurious to the public as well as to themselves—injurious to themselves because they do it at rates that do not pay; and injurious to the people of Canada because, in order to keep down the rates for through freight, they have to charge higher local rates, often to people who have aided in the construction of these same roads. I say that, in such cases, the restriction laid on with the firm hand with which the hon. Minister of Railways would, no doubt, lay it on, would be very beneficial. Discrimination of a very objectionable form also arises sometimes between neighborhoods in Canada, sometimes because certain railways have favored points, and sometimes because they have to compete at certain points with rival lines. We have monopolies in Canada itself—monopolies created by law, as in the case of the great monopoly which controls the entire trade of the North-West, and will probably yet control the entire trade of Canada. We have monopolies created by circumstances, as when one railway only exists in a neighborhood, and will not allow another to go through it. We have monopolies created by amalgamations, where lines created to compete with each other afterwards amalgamate—and this is not one of the least objectionable cases that arise. In fact, in my own county, as well as in neighboring counties, we are feeling, at the present moment, some of the effects of an amalgama-

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk).

tion of this sort. The people of St. Thomas, a little more than a year ago, gave a very large bonus to the Credit Valley Railway Company to enable them to complete their line to that city, hoping thus to get competition eastward with the Great Western Railway, which formerly controlled all traffic to the eastward; but, Sir, the bonus was scarcely given and the railway scarcely completed when it appeared that negotiations were in progress for the consolidation of the Credit Valley Railway with the Great Western, with which it was intended to compete, so that the people of St. Thomas found, after giving a bonus of \$50,000 to secure a competing line, that they had only secured another branch of the railway which controlled the traffic of the town. Of course it might be impossible to prevent arrangements which might amount to an amalgamation; but if a Commission existed as provided by this Bill, they could very easily provide that the city which had subscribed so largely for the purpose of securing competition should not be defeated in that object. I have no doubt other sections of the country are suffering in the same way, and that the evil will, in a few years, become greater than it is now. There is no doubt that the two greatest railway corporations in the country are competing with each other to buy up existing lines. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is acquiring all the lines it can get. It has acquired the provincial railway extending from this city to Montreal; and it is said it has acquired, or is trying to acquire, this very Great Western Railway, together with the link between Ottawa and Toronto which is to form part of its through line. We know that the Grand Trunk Railway is also trying to obtain all the side lines it can get; and it is not improbable that, before long, we shall find the entire railway trade of Canada in the hands of those two great companies, which, by their competition, may reduce through rates, but will make up their losses in that respect by the exorbitant rates which they will charge for local traffic. I think the creation of this vast company last year, and the fact of such competition going on between it and the Grand Trunk, are weighty reasons for the passage of some such measure as that introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe. I do not pretend to have gone through the provisions of that Bill in detail. There are provisions in it, the operation of which I do not quite understand, and provisions which may be objectionable; but I think the House would only be doing an act of simple justice to the people of this country, who have subscribed largely to different lines of railways, in passing the Bill through its second reading, and giving the hon. gentleman an opportunity in Committee of perfecting it, and making it something thoroughly practical and useful. The objection has been made that we cannot do anything to regulate provincial lines. I see the hon. gentleman provides a possible solution of that difficulty by allowing our Commissioners to sit with provincial Commissioners; but that difficulty is disappearing gradually by the absorption of the provincial lines by the two great railway lines of the Dominion. I am glad to see the support which this Bill has received from both sides of the House, although the hon. Minister of Railways appears to be against it. The arguments advanced in its favor are such as occurred to many of us a year ago, when we were discussing the great railway scheme of the Government. We then urged the great danger to the country arising from the creation of a railway monopoly, and I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House feel the force of those arguments more keenly this year than they did last year, and I trust that, by the passage of this measure, we shall be able to do away with some of the evils which this monopoly may bring upon us.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). This Bill has attracted a good deal of attention during the past two or three years in the Province of Ontario. There have been numerous discussions upon it in the press and at public meetings,

and it has been looked forward to as a panacea for some of the evils under which the public are laboring, especially discriminating rates between competitive and non-competitive points, the amalgamations of companies, and the creation of monopolies. I have glanced through the Bill now before the House, and I fail to find anything in it likely to work a cure for these various grievances. The Bill seems to me to be confined to two classes of provisions: one for settling disputes between railway companies and municipalities as to right of way, crossings, and so on, and the other for settling disputes between railway companies as to their traffic arrangements and their crossings, and the few other points of that kind; but I only find one clause containing the slightest reference to those various questions of a public character to which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and some others on this side of the House, have referred. There is only one clause which touches the grievances under which the public may be supposed to be laboring at the hands of railway companies, and that is the 27th clause of the Bill, which recites that doubts have arisen as to the validity of what is known as a joint purse arrangement, or the working of different lines by a joint committee, and declares that arrangements of this kind shall not be allowed, and makes some other provisions which, as I understand them, amount to nothing, and would not in any way remedy the grievances, or prevent, if the Bill went into practical effect, the accomplishment of the joint purse arrangement, if two companies sought to enter into it. There is not one word to prevent the amalgamation of companies for the best of all reasons, for the hon. gentleman is too experienced not to know that all our legislation in this direction cannot possibly prevent amalgamation in fact. We may prevent amalgamation in name, but to prevent amalgamation in fact, or one company acquiring control of the stock or bonds of another, none of our legislation can possibly reach so long as companies are controlled by the holders of the stock and bonds, which is the case, as is well known, of every railway company in existence unless they are Government railways. I think, therefore, this so-called Railway Commission Bill, about which much has been said, would turn out to be empty thunder, as far as the railway companies are concerned, and would give no relief to the public, but would utterly fail to attain the object for which the public sought for and hope to obtain at the hands of Parliament. But there are a great many difficulties which environ the way to legislation on this subject, as the Minister of Railways pointed out, and no doubt the hon. member when drafting this Bill—and when expunging, if I recollect rightly, some of the clauses in the Bill of last Session,—met with these difficulties. He doubtless felt the subject was one very difficult to deal with, and that it was utterly impossible to draw a Bill that this Parliament would pass, which would effectually reach the objects which, no doubt, he had in view. I doubt if he carries any other cure for those evils under which the public or some portion of the public in some places suffer than that proposed by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), that the Government buy out the railways of the country and run them themselves. I confess I am not prepared to adopt that policy; I think the country is not prepared to adopt it, but that the people would far rather labor under the comparatively trifling grievances that now exist, than enter into the wholesale business of buying up and running railways from one end of the country to the other. There is another difficulty to which the Minister of Railways did not refer, and it is especially applicable to Canada. What I refer to is this: the Government still own the Intercolonial. Are the Government prepared to submit the Intercolonial, a Government work, to the operation of the Bill and bring it under the control of the proposed Railway Commission;

and if not, is that road to be excluded and excepted from the control of the Commission, while every other road is to be subject to it? That railway carries on competition with other railways in different parts of the Dominion, and is it proposed to exclude it from the jurisdiction of the Commissioners while all other railways are to be placed under them? Of course the hon. member has endeavored to touch this point of provincial railways. He has only touched it. He proposed when any disputes arise between a Dominion and provincial railway, that, with the consent, of course, of the provincial railway or the Legislature governing it, two of the Dominion Railway Commissioners should be allowed to sit with one representing the provincial railway. I do not think any provincial railway will ever be willing to go into an arbitration of that kind with two of the Judges representing in fact, and appointed by the other interested, and the provincial road nominating only one. That mode of dealing with the difficulty will be found to be utterly impracticable, as in fact the whole of the Bill will be found to be. The Bill proposed to settle difficulties between railways—a matter in which the public took no interest—and difficulties between companies and municipalities, which have really no existence. None of the latter have ever been worthy of discussion, or in regard to which the slightest difficulty has been experienced in settling them, with the exception of that respecting the frontage in Toronto and the right of way down to the city. That was a matter of dispute between railway companies, and the city of Toronto took a very secondary interest in the matter; but the dispute was settled in as satisfactory a manner by the tribunal now established, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, as it could have possibly been decided by the Railway Commission to be named under this Bill. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) talked a good deal about the Credit Valley road, as did other hon. gentlemen, but instead of declaring that this House should legislate in regard to that road, and prevent it being amalgamated with the Great Western, I think it would have been better if he had given his suggestions to another parliamentary tribunal, over which, perhaps, he has more influence and control, and in which he certainly has more political allies than in this House. The Credit Valley is entirely under the control of the Ontario Legislature; it has no power to amalgamate with the Great Western, and it is not likely to obtain such power from the Ontario Legislature at present; so any amalgamation between it and the Great Western is utterly impossible as the law stands, and, at all events, it is a matter over which we have no control whatever. If the shareholders in another company thought fit to acquire bonds or stocks of the Credit Valley, I suppose they could do so, and we could not legislate to prevent them. We cannot prevent capitalists buying stock or bonds of any company, and, so far as our legislative power goes, we are without any power whatever with regard to the Credit Valley Railway, and, as a matter of fact, there has been no amalgamation, and the Great Western does not possess any control over that road. While speaking of the Ontario Legislature, I would suggest that that tribunal does not always deal with these questions in the same spirit. If the Credit Valley wanted amalgamation they could not secure it, but when, strange to say, an application is made by the Grand Trunk for amalgamation or anything else, they get it at once by a sweeping majority. There is no opposition to anything the Grand Trunk wants. When a few days ago the Great Western and capitalists applied unitedly for the incorporation of the company to build a central station, which every one knows is an absolute necessity in Toronto, the Grand Trunk came forward and said: "You must not have a charter as it will interfere with our Union station." The Railway Committee declared the preamble not proved by a majority of thirty.

After a day or two had elapsed they passed a Bill amalgamating the whole of the railroads now composing the Midland system, and when called upon, in the interests of some of my constituents who had given bonuses, and by those of the hon. member for West Elgin, who had also given bonuses, to some of these roads being amalgamated, that Legislature refused to order these companies to give back the bonuses or make some provision that would give the municipalities some of the benefits, for which they had subscribed their money. The Legislature refused, on the ground that this amalgamation should be sanctioned whether the local companies were bonused or not; and the amalgamation was completed, the Grand Trunk Company having, notoriously, the control of the Legislature. That just shows that we cannot always look to the Legislature to prevent amalgamation. At the same time, I confess, that I do not see that any beneficial result to the public at large, can follow from going further with this Bill, or letting it go to the Railway Committee. If my hon. friend thinks further discussion would enable him to elaborate something that would attain the objects the public have in view, which are not attained by this Bill, or if he thinks that the Bill could be so amended or re-drafted in Committee, as to meet the objects sought to be attained, I have no objection to acquiesce in its being referred to the Railway Committee; but I am convinced it will be found these objects are very difficult, if not impossible of attainment, by the Bill before the House. That Bill does not in the slightest degree reach the object sought for.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is very clear that the hon. member for North Simcoe, in endeavoring to make his Bill law, need not expect any sympathy or support from any person connected with the railway companies. The object of the Bill is to put the railway companies under the control, if not of Parliament, at all events of a Commission; and he need not expect to get assistance in the slightest degree from any person connected with railway companies. The companies want no controlling check by the Legislature. They want to have everything in their own hands, as they have now practically. I think this is the third time the hon. member for North Simcoe has introduced this Bill. I may say when it was first introduced in Parliament I felt disposed to oppose it. I was inclined to entertain the opinion that perhaps the less we interfered with corporations of this kind the better in the public interests; but a careful examination of the subject has convinced me that it is the imperative duty of Parliament to interfere in this matter. The experience in the Mother Country, the difficult problems that have been solved there through the instrumentality of a Railway Commission, the experience of the great public, the United States, extending over a number of years, the report of the Committee appointed, I think, by the State of New York, in 1850, which had under review and consideration the whole railway traffic in that State and the adjoining States, the mass of valuable evidence obtained on the subject, and the valuable report that was submitted by, I think, what was called the Hepburn Committee,—all this convinced me thoroughly that it was the absolute imperative duty of the Legislature to interfere in some way. Now, my hon. friend has introduced his Bill three times, in 1880, 1881 and now in 1882. In 1881, the Bill only reached its first reading, and, for some reason best known to the hon. member for North Simcoe, the Bill was not pressed. I advised my hon. friend to press the Bill and take the sense of the House on the question, because I felt satisfied that, with our experience in the last few years and notably the last year or two, the majority of the House would pronounce in favor of the principle set forth on the Bill. I am perfectly satisfied that the vast mass of the people is in favor of some legislation in the direction indicated in the Bill of my hon. friend. I am

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria),

not going to make a speech on the question just now, because, as I understood from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways, he is not opposed to the principle of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand he has not, at all events, used any argument in opposition to the principle of the Bill, but is willing to let it be referred to the Railway Committee. I advise my hon. friend from North Simcoe not to refer this Bill to the Railway Committee, but rather to have it referred to a Select Committee, who will take the trouble to put into shape what I believe my hon. friend is attempting to arrive at, but which, perhaps, is not exactly comprised in the Bill submitted. The hon. Minister of Railways though not opposed to the principle of the Bill, suggested one or two difficulties. I think these difficulties, especially one of them, were greatly exaggerated. The hon. Minister stated we have now too many Courts in the Dominion; that we created a Supreme Court; that there are some serious objections to the existence and continuance of that Court, and that it costs the country \$50,000 a year. It appears to me that has nothing to do with the question. The real point is, whether the people desire it. If they do, there should be some tribunal created for the purpose of carrying into effect these provisions. The hon. Minister of Railways exaggerated, in my humble judgment, the difficulties.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not unusual.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Perhaps it is not unusual. On this occasion, however, the hon. Minister has exaggerated the difficulties very considerably. No man has a higher respect for the eminent abilities of the hon. member who has introduced this Bill than I have, and it is quite possible he would not withdraw from the practice of his profession for the small sum of \$20,000 a year. But the hon. Minister must recollect that there are in Canada men just as eminent in the legal profession as the hon. member for North Simcoe. We must recollect that the Judges of our Courts of Appeal in Ontario and Quebec, are men selected from the best ranks of the profession on account of their eminent abilities, and these men are willing to take these positions at a salary of \$5,000 per year; yet the hon. Minister thinks we cannot get men able to deal with the questions likely to come up under this Bill at a salary under \$10,000 or \$20,000 a year. The hon. Minister knows well that we can get first-class lawyers, both in Ontario and Quebec, to occupy positions in the Supreme Court or Court of Appeal, at \$5,000 per year. The Judges in the Supreme Court here are only paid \$7,000, and surely better men than they are could not be desired to sit on the Commission provided for by this Bill. The hon. gentleman knows well that the three Judges or Commissioners could be obtained at a salary of not exceeding \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year altogether. But my hon. friend, in his Bill, does not propose there shall be a fixed salary, but provides for payment by fees. To that I am opposed. If the Judges are to be independent and above suspicion they should be paid a fixed salary, as in England, and should not be open to the suspicion even that they might be influenced by the railway companies, as they would be if paid by fees from the railway companies. It may be quite true that the Bill does not provide for some of the difficulties to which objection is taken—the difficult problems that are constantly cropping up with respect to the carrying trade and traffic over our Dominion Railways—but it is a very simple matter, if the Bill is not perfect in that respect, to make it perfect; it is an easy matter, if the Bill gets a second reading, and is referred to a Special Committee, to give that Committee full authority to deal with every possible class of cases that can arise between railway companies and individuals, or between railway companies themselves. The hon. member

for Niagara has said that the experience in the Mother Country, where they have had eighteen years experience, of a law like this, has not been satisfactory. The hon. gentleman ought to know quite well that the law in England has only been in existence eight or nine years; that, up to 1854, the Board of Trade dealt with this subject, and so difficult was it to obtain anything like justice from the Board of Trade, or so difficult was it to set the Board of Trade in motion, when any question arose that should come before it, that Parliament interfered in the matter, and took it out of the hands of the Board of Trade, and handed it over to one of the Superior Courts there, the Court of Common Pleas. From 1854 to 1873, dealing with questions of this kind was entirely in the hands of the Court of Common Pleas in England. Anybody who has taken the trouble to examine this question, to read the reports of the various Commissions appointed with the view of enquiring into questions of this kind, knows perfectly well that transferring such questions to the Court of Common Pleas was wholly useless. During the whole period, from 1854 to 1873, I do not think there was a single case that ever came before the Court of Common Pleas, where the difficult problems continually cropping up with respect to traffic, freights, rebates, unequal rates, monopolies and all such embarrassing questions, was ever submitted to the Court of Common Pleas. So satisfied were the representatives of the people in Parliament, that as my hon. friend has stated, a Committee was appointed by Parliament to make enquiries on the whole question. They took evidence and the measure underwent a thorough investigation, and the result was that the Committee reported that the Board of Trade was not a sufficiently judicial body to deal with questions of this kind; that the Court of Common Pleas was not sufficiently informed on such questions, and that a Committee of Parliament was not sufficiently permanent to regulate such matters. Two of these tribunals had been in existence and failed to grapple with the questions, now a third was proposed. That Committee made their report, and as a result a Bill was introduced in 1873, the 36 and 37 Victoria, chapter 48, after which the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe, (Mr. McCarthy) is modelled. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) says the law would be a failure here as it is a failure in England. I deny that statement; it has been eminently successful in England. True, for a few years, it was a failure, as all new experiments, especially in the establishment of a new procedure, and the creation of new courts, usually are. Parties generally are reluctant to commit their cases to a newly constituted tribunal. In addition to that, it is well known that such a tribunal would have the whole power of the railway corporations enlisted against them, and for a considerable number of years for these reasons it was practically a failure in England. For a whole year no case came before the Commission, but, as people became acquainted with its beneficial working, cases of difficulty were committed to it, and as time went on the Court became eminently popular. If the hon. member for Niagara referred to the report of the Board of Commissioners issued in 1881, he would have seen ample proof of its satisfactory working in England. If it worked satisfactorily there, I see nothing to prevent its working satisfactorily here. The hon. the Minister of Railways says it does not follow that it will work well in Canada—that we are differently situated. In England railways are isolated from the continental system; we are beside the great Republic with whose railways we have great competition. Apart from the general question as to how we should clothe the Committee with the power of dealing with freights and other matters necessarily arising on our through lines of railway, there are many questions constantly arising on our local roads that should be committed to the proposed Board. Does the hon. gentleman know,

during the last eight or ten years, of a question relating to any of these matters having been brought before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or of its dealing with or disposing of it—such as unequal rates, rebates, monopolies, giving a preference to one individual or to one locality over another? I venture to say no such question has ever come before that Committee. And yet these are leading questions, constantly cropping up in the carrying trade of this country. The hon. gentleman says it has been a failure in the United States; that, with their gigantic system of railways only one State has established a Commission. But he ought to know perfectly well that, although they have adopted it in but few States, in almost every State laws have been passed so stringent that it is almost impossible for a railway company to evade them. In Massachusetts and one or two other States, they have laws prohibiting rebates, drawbacks or special rates for any party; and if they are violated in the interest of any individual or locality it is followed with exceedingly heavy penalties. In some cases the offending company would be liable to imprisonment for three years and to a fine of \$20,000. Although in no State have they a Railway Commission, as I have stated, yet their laws are much more stringent in regard to such acts than ours. In addition, the hon. gentleman ought to know that this very question has occupied a very prominent position for the last year or two—in public discussions in the carrying trade of the United States—that in almost every State a Special Commission to make enquiries into the best mode of checking undue preferences and monopolies has been appointed; and that last year a Bill was submitted by an eminent member of Congress to that body to create a Board of Railway Commissioners that might have power and authority over the United States. Now, Sir, it is said, by the hon. member for Victoria, that this Bill does not contain provisions that will meet the difficulties which have been suggested by the hon. gentlemen who are in favor of this Bill. That may be quite true to some extent, but not altogether. I believe that the Bill is an eminently proper one, and I believe that additional provisions can be grafted on it that will make it still more satisfactory to those who are engaged in the trade of the country. The hon. member for Victoria argued that there was no occasion for legislation of this kind. Sir, that strikes me as being an extraordinary argument for any member of Parliament to use who has taken the trouble to enquire into this question. It seems extraordinary that he should argue that there is no necessity for legislation of this kind, that there is no necessity for the creation of a Board of Railway Commissioners, or for some authority having an independent existence, that will be above the control of these huge and gigantic corporations that we have created, are now creating, and will go on creating, I suppose, till the whole Dominion is interlaced with railways. It does appear to me that, if there ever was a time in the history of this country when we ought to deal with that question in a practical manner, now is the time. This Parliament created a gigantic corporation not long ago. We see, by the applications that have been made to the Legislature of Ontario and to this Parliament, that there is now an attempt to extend the power, the influence, and the greatness of these corporations. Why, Sir, one or two railway companies are, practically, gobbling up the whole of the minor railways, and, I venture to say, that, within two or three years, the entire railway system of this Dominion will, practically, be in the hands of two gigantic railway corporations, they will be above Parliament, above the power of the Government; and to say that the farmers of the country, the traders of the country, can get justice from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, with the power and the influence those railway companies possess over members of Parliament and over the Government—I care not which party is in power—is, in my

variable judgment, so much arrant nonsense. The same thing was stated in the United States. What did Vanderbilt and Gould say? Why, that even with respect to the Commission which they proposed to establish, either the railways would own the Commissioners, or the Commissioners would own the railways. The same thing might be said with respect to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The only way by which we can secure justice to all parties, I think, is by the establishment of a Board of Railway Commissioners. It is said there is no necessity for it. Why the experience of everyday life shows the necessity for it. Let me give you one or two instances. The same thing was said in England. Now, if any one will take the trouble of turning to a valuable little work upon Railway Corporations, published by Mr. Parsloe, in England, he will find just the very argument that has been adduced now against this Bill fully answered. The author points out the absolute injustice to localities and to individuals, of the preferences that were allowed there before the establishment of this Court of Railway Commissioners. My hon. friend has referred to an instance that also came under my notice last year, when the Grand Trunk Railway carried a car of oil cake from Baden to Belleville, a distance of 185 miles, and charged \$52. They carried the same cargo from Chicago to Belleville, a distance of 628 miles, and charged \$50; in other words, they charged \$2 less for carrying it 443 miles further. Now, Sir, I ask you, is that a state of things that ought to continue? It is all very well for us to say that men who have invested their capital in these companies ought to be protected. So they should, fairly and honestly; but there is somebody else that ought to be protected as well as they. We invested in the Grand Trunk Railway, if I remember aright, something like \$16,000,000 of the people's money, and think that while we are protecting the interests of the English capitalists, who have invested their money in this and other railways, we ought not to forget the people of this country who contributed largely to the construction and equipment of that road. It was stated in a Toronto paper, on the 20th February, 1881, and has not been denied, that the Grand Trunk Railway charged \$75 a car for coal oil from the city of London to the city of Ottawa, to all the manufacturers and refiners there, except to one man to whom they gave a drawback of \$38 per car. Now, it is quite manifest that if they charge \$75 a car to every refiner and manufacturer of coal oil, who had his oil shipped from London to Ottawa, and gave one man a drawback of \$38 a car, that one man had the advantage in the market to the extent of \$38 per car. Why, Sir, some manufacturers send their coal oil from London to Ottawa *via* the Suspension Bridge, and over the New York Central and the Rome, Watertown, and Ogdensburg Railways, and they get their oil carried by that roundabout way from London to Ottawa for \$56 per car. Still the man who got the rebate, or the preference, or the drawback, had an advantage of \$19 per car even over those who sent their oil *via* the United States. Is that a state of things that ought to continue? It is quite clear the Railway Committee of the Privy Council cannot deal with it; they would not deal with it; and it is quite clear that it ought to be dealt with by some tribunal. Now, here is a case that happened not long ago—a gross case, an outrageous case, if it be correct. It was stated openly in the press of Toronto, and has not been contradicted. The correspondent of a Stratford paper stated not long ago that a car load of flour is carried from London to Montreal for \$15 less than from Stratford to Montreal. Is that so? Because, if it is, it is a gross outrage, and one that ought not to be tolerated by a free Parliament for a single day. Although we may have every sympathy with the unfortunates—if they have been unfortunate—who invested their money in this undertaking, still, as I said before, we ought to protect the interests of our people. It is further stated that the Grand

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Trunk Railway carried a car load of flour from Brantford to Montreal *via* the Grand Trunk, 39 miles further than from Stratford to Montreal, at a much less rate than from Stratford. Now, Sir, if that be true, I say that it is an outrage that ought not to be tolerated. It is further stated that freight on a barrel of pork from Chicago to Brockville is 80 cents, and from Brockville to McKay's Station, a distance of 100 miles, is 95 cents. They carried a barrel of flour 100 miles and charged 8 cents more for carrying it that distance than they charged for carrying it 723 miles. I know an instance that occurred in my own neighborhood a few days before I came here. A gentleman wanted to ship some stuff to Winnipeg. He found that the freight upon mutton from Goderich to Winnipeg, distance of 1,333 miles, was \$3 per 100 pounds; while from Clinton to Winnipeg, though 12 miles nearer Winnipeg than Goderich, the freight was only \$1.61 per 100 pounds, so that the man was paying, \$1.39 from Goderich to Clinton, a distance of 12 miles. Now is that a thing Parliament ought to tolerate a single moment, if a free Parliament can check it? So, with respect to passengers, you can get a ticket from Boston to Chicago much cheaper than you can from Montreal or Ottawa to Chicago. It may be difficult to check these things, but I think that Parliament ought, at all events, to make an attempt to check them. Let me—in answer to my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb), and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who appear to think that the proposition submitted by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has proved a practical failure when submitted elsewhere—read the opinion of the New York Chamber of Commerce, as expressed by their spokesman, Mr. Simon Stern, on the propriety of legislative interference. That gentleman says:

"Gross inequalities arise from this condition of affairs. Individuals and communities are put at the mercy of these great corporations, who have it in their power to make one man rich and keep others poor, and they actually exercise that power in an arbitrary manner, without rule, without consistency, and seemingly without reason.

It may be said that this is all true enough, but the Board of Commissioners which the hon. gentleman proposes to create by this Bill will not cure the evil we complain of. I say, Sir, that we have already tried the experiment of having these matters disposed of by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and that it has been a failure. In England they tried to solve the problem through the Board of Trade, but that experiment proved a failure; they tried it through the intervention of the common law courts, but that plan, too, was found unsuccessful. Let us at all events make the experiment proposed in the Bill, and see whether or not we can check what I cannot look upon otherwise than as a most iniquitous state of affairs, viz., that these railway companies should have unlimited and unrestricted powers to discriminate against individuals or localities, and make one man rich, as Mr. Stern says, and another poor—to destroy one locality and build up another. The experiment is worth trying at all events, and if the hon. Minister of Railways has no other objection to the Bill, except that it will necessitate the creation of a new court, and the appointment and payment of new Judges, I humbly submit that that is not a sufficient argument against the Bill. The hon. gentleman did advance another argument, viz., as to our right to attempt to interfere with railways that obtained their corporate existence through the Local Legislatures. But, Sir, it is not necessary to discuss that subject at any length, or, indeed, to discuss, it at all just now, because, as I understand the hon. Minister of Railways, he is willing that the Bill should be referred either to the Railway Committee or to a Select Committee. I wish to remind the hon. gentleman, however, that that question has practically passed beyond the region of discussion in the United States at least. The State of Pennsylvania undertook to deal—not exactly in the

same way as the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill, but in an analogous way—with the traffic of railways by the imposition of a tax for State purposes of \$2 per ton on all freight passing over railways, both local and inter-state, which passed through the State of Pennsylvania. It was contended that the State tax was illegal. The Supreme Court of the State held that it was not illegal. The appeal was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, which held that it was an illegal imposition, because the State had no power or control over traffic of this kind—that traffic meant commerce, and that commerce was a matter within the purview and jurisdiction of the Federal authority. And I believe the same rule will apply here. If freight or traffic be commerce—and according to this authority it is—then I say the Parliament of Canada, and the Parliament of Canada alone, will have power to deal with this subject. I shall give this Bill my most cordial support. I hope it will be referred to a Special Committee, who will have power to deal with it intelligently and carefully, and take sufficient time to submit to Parliament a measure which will commend itself to the public and to those engaged in the trade with which my hon. friend proposes to deal.

Mr. ORTON. I would not be doing my duty to those who sent me to this House if I did not rise to express my warm approval of the object which this Bill has in view. I think, Sir, the feeling is very general in the community—I know in my own constituency it is very intense—in reference to the grasping power of railways, and the disregard they show to the public feelings, the public convenience, and the public welfare. I happen to represent a constituency which, like the county of Elgin, contributed very largely to the Credit Valley Railway for the purpose of obtaining competition with the Great Western, and after a great deal of effort on the part of the people of that county, and the expenditure of a very liberal amount of money by the various municipalities, the road was constructed, and the people have, so far, derived a great deal of benefit by the construction of a competing line. But, like many others in my neighborhood, we find ourselves face to face with the fact that the Great Western have made a proposition for amalgamation which appears to have been favorably received, and, in fact, so far as the public are aware, the amalgamation has occurred. At any rate it is quite evident to those who send traffic over these railways, that there is an understanding between the companies that they shall not look to the convenience of the public, or the general advantage of trade. As the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) has stated, the Government and the people of this country have contributed largely to all our Dominion railways, to the Great Western and Grand Trunk Railways more especially; but we find these railways constantly pursuing a policy which is dangerous to the best interests of the people. We find them setting aside local traffic in favor of through traffic. When our people wish to send their grain to a foreign market, not only do they not get as favorable rates of freight as the people of a foreign country, but they do not receive the same consideration in the way of car accommodation, and it is this grievance which they feel the most severely. I hope this Bill will go before the proper Committee and receive the careful attention it deserves.

THE STAMP DUTY.

Mr. SPEAKER reported that the Senate had passed Bill (No. 63) to repeal the duty on Promissory Notes, Drafts and Bills of Exchange, with one amendment.

Amendment read the first and second time.

ATTEMPT ON THE QUEEN'S LIFE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said an announcement had just been made in the other House, which it was well he

should make here, and which would afford cause for rejoicing to hon. members at the ill-success of the dastardly attempt to take the life of Her Majesty. He then read the following Message:—

“Her Majesty the Queen has been shot at at Windsor this afternoon but has not been injured.”

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

After Recess.

COURT OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Halton). Mr. Speaker, I desire, in the first place, to compliment the hon. member for South Huron for the very able and informing speech which he has delivered on this subject. When the subject was before Parliament last Session I had very grave doubts, and expressed them, as to whether the circumstances and necessities of the case required the remedy which my hon. friend from North Simcoe proposed. It seemed to me, Sir, that with the Supreme Court, with the Committee of the Privy Council, and with the other means which were at the disposal of parties who might feel themselves aggrieved, sufficient opportunity was afforded for the redress of any injuries that might be sustained. But further reflection and further observation, and the change which has taken place since then in our railway system, convince me that it is absolutely necessary in the public interest, and in the interest of individuals composing the public, in their dealings with railway companies, that some better remedy should be provided for the redress of evils than those which now exist. The Bill submitted for our consideration seems to me to be open to some very serious objections. At the same time I think it is expedient, and I think we will be discharging our duty to the public—for I believe there is a strong public opinion on this question to-day—by taking such steps as the case requires for considering, and, if need be, amending the Bill. I would very much prefer if my hon. friend would consent that his Bill should be referred to a Select Committee of the House, composed of gentlemen distinguished by their knowledge of the law and of the railway business to consider its various details. I would call my hon. friend's attention to one point which has occurred to me as a constitutional objection to his measure. I question very much whether it is in the power of this Parliament to adopt a measure giving such powers as are proposed to be given to this Railway Commission. This Parliament is a Parliament of limited powers, as much as the Local Legislatures of this Dominion. It has very much larger powers, of course; its range of jurisdiction is very much larger; but, at the same time, it is restrained within constitutional limits, and I do not find in our Constitution any authority given to us to establish a tribunal of this kind, and to give it compulsory powers which it may exercise affecting the rights and privileges and property of the subjects of this Dominion. It must be in the character of a Court if it exercises these powers at all. It is a judicial body if it is anything. It may recommend to Parliament, it may inquire, it may investigate, it may report; but if its judgments or decisions are to have any legal or binding force or effect, they must emanate from a judicial tribunal. It must be a Court—a court of law; and we know what a court of law is, and how it is regulated. Appeals may be made from it to the Privy Council of England. The railway corporations have their ramifications extending very widely; the larger portion of the railways, as has been stated, are owned, or have been contributed to by parties living under a foreign jurisdiction, and it does seem to me that beside the question of the expenses, the investigations, and the decisions of such a tribunal, we must see that we have the power, the constitutional

right, to arm this tribunal with authority to enforce its decrees. I see by the 14th section of this Bill that my learned friend proposes to transfer the judgments of this Commission to the Exchequer Court, and to make them decrees or orders, or equivalent to decrees or orders, of the Court of Exchequer. I question very much whether we can thus draw, as it were, on the constitutional power of an existing Court—which undoubtedly we had the power to establish—to support the judgments and decisions of this tribunal. I think that would be straining very much the power we possess. Section 101 of the Act under which, I suppose, any authority of this kind may be inferred, is very short and explicit:

“The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, provide from time to time for the constitution and maintenance of a general Court of Appeal for Canada.”

It was under that authority that the Supreme Court was established:

“And for the establishment of any additional Courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.”

Now, is this tribunal, which my hon. friend proposes to constitute, a Court in the sense of this Act? Is it a Court for the better administration of the laws of Canada, or a Court for the administration of a particular department or a particular class of the laws of Canada? Because it is clear to me that we must provide, by positive enactments, for the subjects upon which it shall adjudicate. To give a case by way of illustration: one of the objects for which it will be appointed will be to deal with questions arising from unfair discrimination between places and individuals in the charges made for freight by railway companies. That is an abuse. That, I should say, speaking off-hand, is against the common law of the land. I do not see on what principle a quasi-public company, performing the duties of a public carrier, can undertake to discriminate between different freighters, and to charge one person a large sum and another person a lesser sum for the same work. It seems to me that, under the principles of the common law that must be objectionable. But if any difficulty occurs in applying the common law in such a case, we should make it—if it is not already made—positive law. We should do as has been done in many cases in the United States, declare what can be and what cannot be done by these railway companies; and if the existing courts cannot deal with the case we can constitute courts for that purpose. But I have very great doubts that the Board of Railway Commissioners proposed by this Bill will come within the spirit and meaning of the authority which is given to us in the 101st section of the B.N.A. Act. I merely point that out as an impression produced on my mind on reading this Bill. But if the Bill is referred, as I have said, to a Select Committee of this House, and if that Committee will make use of the information which has been obtained by members of this House on this matter, and apply that information, first to finding out whether a remedy cannot be provided by enforcing the principles of the common law, and then provide some easy, simple, prompt, cheap machinery by which offenders may be brought under the tribunals of the country, I think that is as far as we can go, and will be found to be a sufficient remedy. If not, we shall come here again, and continue to come, for the purpose of amending defective laws, and applying effective remedies. I trust that my hon. friend will make the selection of a good Committee and let this matter be considered by it. I confess my opinion has greatly changed as to the necessity of some adequate remedy for those abuses which are beginning to show themselves in all parts of the Dominion.

Mr. CURRIER. I agree with those who have spoken in favor of this Bill. I think the time has come when legislation should take place in the direction which the Bill proposes. I think the Commissioners ought to be clothed with power and authority to settle all matters of complaint between individuals and railroads—to regulate passenger fares and freight charges, and all matters concerning railway traffic generally. I hope the Bill will become law this Session. I believe that gentlemen well qualified to fill the position of these Commissioners can be found for a very much less sum than has been indicated by the hon. Minister of Railways. I think, for \$4,000 a year, gentlemen could be found who could administer these matters to the satisfaction of the country. I hope this Bill will become law this Session.

Mr. McCUAIG. Whatever necessities may have arisen in other countries for the establishment of a court of this nature, I have arrived at the conclusion that the conduct of the railway companies of this country do not justify such a law. I have had some forty years experience of railway matters in this country, and I am somewhat familiar with its trade, and I have yet to learn from an authoritative source, that the Grand Trunk Railway, which has given us many advantages, has, in any instance, extorted from the people. I feel, as a Canadian, that we invited years ago foreign capitalists—English capitalists particularly,—to embark their money in this enterprise, and that the Government of the country were, to a certain extent, committed by a prospectus issued when the public were invited to take stock with reasonable probability of a profit arising from their investments; and from that day to this those people who embarked their money in good faith have not received one shilling of dividend. Under such circumstances, I am prepared to admit that they have a right to make a reasonable and sufficient charge to cover all necessary expenses, and to secure them in addition a fair and equitable dividend on the money they have invested. I am not prepared to place the entire railway interests of this country in the hands of any three men, however able they may be. Those interests are too great, and those organizations too powerful, to be submitted to the authority of any three men. I believe we have on the Bench in this country men of undoubted integrity, who are familiar with the laws of the country, and if you wish to give them more power to deal with these questions, I am willing that you should give it to them; but let us avoid establishing any additional courts, especially such a court as this, in which you propose to hand over interests so large to three men. Now, Sir, it has been argued, and properly argued, by the hon. the Minister of Railways that, to secure men of eminent ability, great financial skill, and skill in the management of railways, you would have to pay enormous salaries. It is well known that the banks are paying \$25,000 a year to the managers of these institutions, and it is also well known that the employment of these men of ability and financial skill has proved a large source of profit to the banks; and if you can only secure such men by the payment of large salaries, then I say, by the establishment of this court, you will be adding \$200,000 a year to the expenses of this country, and I am opposed to any additional expense of that kind. My hon. friend opposite spoke about the influence of these large companies upon Parliament. If, Sir, the Parliament of this country, composed of the House of Commons containing 208 members, and the Senate, composed of some eighty members, could be influenced in its action by these large institutions, how much more unsafe would such interests be in the hands of three men. But I do not believe it possible for the railway companies to influence this Parliament. I believe the patriotism for which the hon. members of this House are distinguished, will rise above anything of that kind, and I regard it as an insult to the hon. members of this House, to say that they can be influenced by any influences of that

Mr. McCUAIG. Whatever necessities may have arisen in other countries for the establishment of a court of this nature, I have arrived at the conclusion that the conduct of the railway companies of this country do not justify such a law. I have had some forty years experience of railway matters in this country, and I am somewhat familiar with its trade, and I have yet to learn from an authoritative source, that the Grand Trunk Railway, which has given us many advantages, has, in any instance, extorted from the people. I feel, as a Canadian, that we invited years ago foreign capitalists—English capitalists particularly,—to embark their money in this enterprise, and that the Government of the country were, to a certain extent, committed by a prospectus issued when the public were invited to take stock with reasonable probability of a profit arising from their investments; and from that day to this those people who embarked their money in good faith have not received one shilling of dividend. Under such circumstances, I am prepared to admit that they have a right to make a reasonable and sufficient charge to cover all necessary expenses, and to secure them in addition a fair and equitable dividend on the money they have invested. I am not prepared to place the entire railway interests of this country in the hands of any three men, however able they may be. Those interests are too great, and those organizations too powerful, to be submitted to the authority of any three men. I believe we have on the Bench in this country men of undoubted integrity, who are familiar with the laws of the country, and if you wish to give them more power to deal with these questions, I am willing that you should give it to them; but let us avoid establishing any additional courts, especially such a court as this, in which you propose to hand over interests so large to three men. Now, Sir, it has been argued, and properly argued, by the hon. the Minister of Railways that, to secure men of eminent ability, great financial skill, and skill in the management of railways, you would have to pay enormous salaries. It is well known that the banks are paying \$25,000 a year to the managers of these institutions, and it is also well known that the employment of these men of ability and financial skill has proved a large source of profit to the banks; and if you can only secure such men by the payment of large salaries, then I say, by the establishment of this court, you will be adding \$200,000 a year to the expenses of this country, and I am opposed to any additional expense of that kind. My hon. friend opposite spoke about the influence of these large companies upon Parliament. If, Sir, the Parliament of this country, composed of the House of Commons containing 208 members, and the Senate, composed of some eighty members, could be influenced in its action by these large institutions, how much more unsafe would such interests be in the hands of three men. But I do not believe it possible for the railway companies to influence this Parliament. I believe the patriotism for which the hon. members of this House are distinguished, will rise above anything of that kind, and I regard it as an insult to the hon. members of this House, to say that they can be influenced by any influences of that

kind, however powerful. In accordance with these views, I move, seconded by Mr. Hackett:

That this Bill be not read now the second time, but be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not prepared to say whether the Bill is a remedy for all the evils that now exist in relation to the management of railway companies; but I confess I am not a little surprised to hear an hon. gentleman of the large business experience of the hon. member for Prince Edward take the ground that there are no causes of objection to the way in which railways are managed in this country. My experience is that these railway companies are made the means of discriminating between individuals and localities, and some remedy is required in this respect. My own opinion is, this Bill does not go far enough; but I am quite satisfied that some remedy should be applied in the way of restricting railway companies from conducting their business in a manner that is beneficial to some and prejudicial to others. I am satisfied that the discussion which has arisen on this subject, whatever may be its fate, will be of much benefit in the way of directing attention to the question as it stands at present. It may be said that the common law of this country provides a remedy for discriminating rates by railway companies between individuals and localities. But we must remember that, up to the present time, at all events, the law has been inoperative in that respect. If the law can be put into operation by our courts and tribunals as they stand at present, and if it is a sufficient remedy some method should be devised of applying the law so as to make it reach the railway companies. Any person who knows anything about the power of railway corporations, must know that no individual desires to enter a suit against a great railway corporation for the purpose of obtaining justice with regard to the exactions made by such company. We all know that the power of these great companies is such that it is almost impossible for any individual to cope with them single-handed in the courts of this country. It seems to me that if some tribunal, some court of immediate resort was organized to which cases of discrimination on the part of railway companies might be referred without going through the process of law as it now stands, it would be very desirable to have such a court. It may be that a court of this kind might be unconstitutional, as the hon. member for Halton has suggested; but it seems to me that a body of men might be appointed to enquire summarily into cases referred to them, and if it was not deemed advisable to clothe them with the power of deciding the questions at issue, they might be charged with deciding whether the cases referred to them were such that they ought to be brought into the courts. For instance, if it be a fraud on the public that discriminating rates exist by which one individual may be able to obtain rates over a certain portion of the line on more favorable terms than those given to other individuals, as mentioned by the hon. member for Centre Huron, this tribunal proposed to be organized under this Bill might be charged with the duty of dealing with cases of that kind. I am strongly in favor of the adoption of some means by which those cases can be reached by some swift remedy, and for that reason I shall support the Bill and vote against the amendment.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I am very glad, indeed, that the hon. member for North Simcoe has introduced this Bill. It is decidedly in the interest of the smaller towns of Ontario, and perhaps all over the Dominion. I am quite aware that railway companies have done a great deal to promote the trade of this country and develop its resources, but they have done all this on commercial principles, and as they are now managed, it is clear to everybody that, unless competition exists at certain points, the trade of smaller places may be sacrificed for the building up of larger places. Now, although a Bill like this may tend to increase rates at

competing points, the effect no doubt would be to reduce rates at other points, so that the railway corporations on the whole might not suffer much. Everybody can see how places like Toronto, London, &c., where there are competing lines of railways, people doing business at these points have material advantage over those doing business at smaller points. It is not the interest of the country to centralize wealth too largely at two or three particular places. Smaller towns all over the Dominion have burdened themselves for railway competition; and sometimes, when they got what they expected, they are deprived of this by combinations formed between rival companies. If there was a Court of Commissioners such as the hon. member for North Simcoe has referred to, we would get a better distribution of justice from railway corporations than is conferred by those preferential rates. I fancy that smaller towns and men of smaller means would have a better chance to maintain their position, and I feel satisfied that smaller towns, which are now being deprived of natural facilities for development, would grow more rapidly. I could state instances where smaller towns have been kept in the background by rates imposed against them. If the hon. member for North Simcoe could break down these differential rates and give advantages to people who are deprived of these advantages in their ordinary business, it would be a great boon to this country. I hope the House, therefore, will reject the amendment and adopt the motion, so that we may be enabled to follow in the course in which the more advanced States of the American Union have gone, as well as England, and thus relieve ourselves to a certain extent of the bondage imposed on us by the railway corporations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope my hon. friend will not persist in his motion to delay the Bill for three months. This Bill is now before the House. It has been amended by my hon. friend since last year, and now he brings it in in a shape which he thinks entitles it to receive the sanction of Parliament. It is only fair we should refer the Bill to a Committee. I should prefer the Railway Committee, because it is much larger, but if the House is of opinion that a separate Committee would give better attention to the matter, I would not oppose the selection of a Committee. I think the Committee will have a very important duty to perform, which will be to examine the matter thoroughly, to hear witnesses, and obtain all the data required to enable them to report a good Bill. When the Bill comes before the House it will be reprinted and we shall be in a position to judge whether the Bill so reported is one that should receive the sanction of the House; but up to this moment we can hardly say we should not consider this matter at all. There may be exaggerations on one side or the other, but all this will be examined by the Committee, and it would report how the matter stood. I really believe the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig), would do well to reserve this motion for another stage of the Bill, should the Bill, after it had been considered by the Committee, meet with his disapproval.

Mr. McCUAIG. My experience is, that most of the railways through Ontario have not been constructed in the interests of the people, but to oblige political partisans in the Ontario House. I believe there has been no regular system laid down on which those railways were to be built, and no doubt railways have been built which have brought ruin on those building them, owing to the action of political parties. We cannot expect that every man should have a railway at his own door, and it is time that the House took into its own keeping the large sum of money granted in aid of railways. My resolution was not submitted with a view to its being offensive to the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, of whose ability I am perfectly sensible; but from the temper of the House and of

the people, I believe the Bill was not one which would meet general concurrence. However, at the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Cameron (Huron), Colby, Daly, Girouard (Jacques Cartier), Houde, Jones, McDougall, McLennan, White (Cardwell), White (Renfrew), Trow, Weldon and the mover. He said: In making this motion, I beg to refer, and I do so very briefly, to some of the criticisms that have been made in the debate which has just taken place on the second reading. Most of the adverse criticisms have been very fully and completely answered and there is very little left for me to say. I regret very much that the hon. the Minister of Railways is not in his place, because, from him a very large portion of the opposition to the measure has proceeded, and it would have afforded me much pleasure to have replied in his own hearing and presence. I understood the hon. the Minister of Railways to object on one ground, which I thought I had explained last Session, and which I can explain in a very few words this Session. One point the hon. Minister made was, that it was impossible for us, in this House, to deal with local railways, and that the measure, therefore, must be, to a certain extent, incomplete. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that is so, and remembering that, out of 8,000 miles of railway in this Dominion, probably two-thirds, or 6,000 miles, are under the control of this Parliament, I fail to see any very great force in the argument that, because we cannot deal with 8,000 miles, we should not deal with 6,000 miles. But I entirely deny that this Parliament is not competent to deal with this matter of railways, notwithstanding that the companies may be chartered by the Local House. I believe the Constitution under which this House sits—as the hon. member for Huron has told us, and he cited American authorities—gives this House the power to deal with all matters affecting trade and commerce—and the matter of traffic is a matter of commerce—and is therefore within the purview of the Parliament of Canada. I think these reasons are sufficient to answer that objection. Then the promoters say—and it has been urged more than once, not merely here, but elsewhere, and not merely on this occasion, but whenever the Bill has been mentioned—that the appointment of a Railway Commission would have the effect of hampering Canadian railways, and give the advantage of through trade to American systems. If the Bill were laying down any cast-iron rule, and saying that Canadian railways should charge so much per mile, or so much per ton for freight carried by them, I could understand the force of that objection; but the very fact that the Commission is to be composed—and the appointments will rest very largely with the hon. the Minister of Railways—of competent men who will understand the interests of the country as well as of the railways, I think, answers the question, as they would not unnecessarily interfere with through traffic so long as it did not interfere with local traffic. But we must remember that the people have, practically, built the railways of this country. In that respect, perhaps, the railway system of Canada differs from that of any other country, at all events nominally one-third, but I believe actually one-half, of the cost has come directly out the pockets of the people; and if the people are going to have their own railways used against them, so that the foreigner may be able to use them against our people, it is an injustice which the representatives of the people should endeavor in some way to prevent. I disclaim all hostility to railways. Believing that honesty is the true policy, not merely for people generally but also for railways, I see no possible objection to railways conduct-

Mr. McCUAIG.

ing business honestly and fairly, and charging fair rates, but not attempting to control the business and rights of our people in the interests of railway managers. I think that it will be found that this frequent conduct of railway managers in discriminating in favor of capitalists and against towns, and endeavoring to crush rival routes, is really of more injury to the railways themselves than of benefit to the particular corporations. The result, at all events, is that they destroy their rivals in business, crush them down effectually, and by-and-bye gain, by amalgamations, that which this system of injustice has first brought about. My hon. friend the member for Halton (Mr. McDougall), seems to doubt whether the law is constitutional or not. I must confess, though I say it with great deference, before a parliamentarian of my hon. friend's experience, that I entertain no such doubt. It seems to me the section of the Act, to which he refers, confers on this Parliament power to constitute a court for this purpose, for the whole country. The words of the law say so, and I see nothing in the language of the Act to lead me to suppose it expresses any other than its apparent meaning. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who has criticised the measure on another ground, objects to it because he thinks it practically amounts to nothing. Well, I will not say—perhaps I might say—that if it did not amount to anything, perhaps it would not receive the opposition of my hon. friend. But I think he cannot have read it with very great care when he forms the opinion that there is no provision in the Bill calculated to meet the wants of the country. Clause 24 reads:

The Commissioners, in addition to the powers conferred on the Governor in Council by the Railway Act, respecting the approval and revision of tolls, and which powers and authority are hereby vested in them, shall have power to fix the maximum rates of charges for the conveyance of passengers with a due amount of baggage, and of animals and goods, on the railway; and such rates of charges shall include the tolls and the cost of locomotive power and every other expense connected with the conveyance of passengers and with a due amount of baggage, and of animals and goods, upon the railway.

I want to know whether my hon. friend and the House thinks that it is not important to invest in a judicial body, such as the Railway Commissioners would be, the power to fix a fair toll for the carriage of passengers and freight. Practically there is no such law on the Statute book now, or if there is any such law, it cannot be enforced. I was amazed the other day though not surprised, to find—on a motion made in the Local House of Ontario for a return of the different by-laws of the railway companies that had been submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor, or approved of by Order in Council, by the member for North Huron, I think (Mr. Creighton)—that Mr. Pardee announced to the House that, from 1867 down to the present day, not one of the local railways had ever submitted their by-laws for the imposition of tolls to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Consequently, there was not one by-law for the collection of tolls practically legal at the time. The railways had presumed on the ignorance of the people—had assumed that nobody would question their right, and never put them in the position of having their tolls legalized by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I venture to assert that if an Order of this House were carried for a return of the tolls imposed by the railways of the country, the same result would be found. I do not believe that any of those railways has submitted its by-laws for the fixing of the tolls and rates for the sanction of the Governor General in Council, which the law of the land requires. There might be a practical injustice done under the Bill sometimes, but there would be the means of a remedy within the hands of everybody. But the Bill does not stop there. If my hon. friend would read the 26th section of the Act, and also the 31st, he would find that, although perhaps it does not go far enough, there is very great power conferred on the Commissioners, and in a direction which, if

I do not misinterpret the opinion of the great majority of the members of the House, it is desired by the House it should be, namely, the enforcement of the law by some legal tribunal. I am exceedingly obliged to my hon. friends on both sides, who have addressed the House, for the courteous manner in which the Bill has been received; for the very great attention they have given to its discussion, and for the light many of them have thrown upon its provisions. I trust now that the motion has been placed in your hands it will receive the assent of the House. If the Bill were referred to the Railway Committee it would be at least doubtful whether it could become law, owing to the amount of business which must take precedence of it with that body. I am not wedded to any particular word or phrase of the measure; but I do not desire that a Railway Commission should be constituted, which should be qualified to enforce against the railway companies the laws placed on the Statute book. It would be wrong to send the Bill to the Railway Committee, as they have a great number of Bills on their orders already, and, as I have said before, its fate might be doubtful. This being a public Bill, it should be dealt with by the House or a Select Committee, and when that Committee's report is presented, it could receive the consideration of the House and the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

PREVENTION OF FRAUD IN RELATION TO CONTRACTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 7) for the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of public moneys, said: The Bill, is the same that I brought forward last year. It was then referred to a Select Committee of the House, one of the members of which was the late Minister of Justice, now Chief Justice of Nova Scotia. It received the careful attention of that Committee, and was reported to this House in consequence. I, last year, suggested that the Government should take this measure in hand, because it is one in which the Government is very much interested. The suggestion not having been accepted, I intend, myself, urging the measure upon the House to the best of my ability: I leave those aside for the present, and merely state that I do not believe there is a member in this House who does not feel that a measure of some kind in this direction is needed at present. Certain events that occurred immediately prior to last Session became so notorious that I could not help taking notice of them at the time, and introduced a measure to prevent their recurrence. It was then made evident that in some of the Public Departments the influence and favor of public officials was used in order to further the interests of private individuals in obtaining contracts. In the present Bill I propose to make a misdemeanor of such offences and to punish them. Not only does it propose to punish the guilty party with a penalty but to inflict such a punishment as will deter such persons from committing the same offence again. Hon. gentlemen must have observed that the mere payment of a small sum of money as a fine will not deter individuals from making large profits out of contracts if they can do so by spending a few hundreds or a few thousands of dollars. On the contrary, if you begin by trying to bribe some officials, they will willingly pay a small fine in order to secure a large advantage. Therefore, I make this offence a misdemeanor, and leave to the tribunal the imposition of a fine or a sentence of imprisonment for a certain number of months at the discretion of the court. Now, Sir, there is another class what we call middlemen, who come between the Government and contractors. These men have become, what I may

term contract brokers, whose influence must have a very baneful effect upon the public interest in the letting of contracts. The Bill provides that such persons shall also be punished by a fine and imprisonment. I need not remark that abuses which this measure seeks to prevent have already occurred. I know by long experience myself that they occurred in the old Province of Quebec. I know they have happened since, and last year we had still other instances. If this Bill becomes law it will provide in future for the punishment of persons guilty of fraud against the Government. It has been said that this measure is too severe, and that in consequence of being impracticable it will be useless. I do not think those objections are sound, because there is no doubt that parties guilty of fraud, will take every means to conceal it, and that is no reason why a strong attempt should not be made to detect and punish it by law. To this effect I would invite the attention of hon. members to the consideration of this Bill, in order to make it as perfect as possible. I am well aware that a measure of this kind cannot cover all cases; I am well aware it is not perfect as it now stands, though it has passed the test of a Select Committee when it was in the hands of an able lawyer, who now honors the bench of Nova Scotia. If any hon. gentleman can suggest any useful amendment it will gladly be accepted on my part. Now, there is another class of offences for which this Bill provides, that is, those in which officials receive a bonus or a reward from contractors in order to facilitate their operations with the Departments. This is an abuse that ought to be rigorously suppressed, and not only the person who receives a bribe ought to be punished but the person who offers it ought to be punished as well, and the former, at least, should be dismissed from the employ of the Government. In connection with this part of the subject is the use which contractors make of the money which they unjustly get from the Government by the means I have just mentioned, in paying heavy subscriptions for electioneering expenses. It is unnecessary for me to refer to any well known instances in the past where successful contractors have used their ill-gotten gains for electioneering purposes; but if these things have occurred once they may occur again, and I think we ought to provide by legislation against their repetition. I may add that when I proposed this measure last year the hon. leader of the Government said he was contemplating such a measure himself. On that occasion he said:

"There is now a measure of a very drastic and severe character before the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of preventing fraud. The Government propose to see that measure before dealing with the whole subject, and extend the provisions of the present Election Law, which in some respects are so severe as to be inoperative and in other respects are too lax."

I am sorry to see that such a measure has not been brought down this year. I think the one I now propose ought to receive the support of the Government, and I therefore move its second reading.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is the Bill which the hon. gentleman brought before the House last year, and he says the leader of the Government last year spoke of a Bill which was before the House of Commons in England on a similar subject, and wished to see the measure which was passed in England before dealing with an analogous measure in this House. The English Parliament, however, did not pass the Bill, owing, as the hon. gentleman knows, to the fact that other great measures were then engaging their attention. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) knows that a similar measure is now being brought before the House of Commons in England, and I think it would only be fair that we should await the result of whatever legislation may take place there, in order that we might have the benefit of their experience on this subject,

and the discussions which take place in the English House of Commons. I would, therefore, suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should delay the consideration of this Bill for a few weeks, so that we may be able to pass a Bill which will be a credit to our Parliament, by having the advantage of the discussions which take place in the English Parliament.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think that we wish the Parliament of England absolutely to make our laws. I do not doubt we might receive a great deal of information from them, but we waited last year and nothing was done, and the same thing may occur this year. If I understand the current of events, if we are to have any legislation upon this Election Law this year, this is the proper time to proceed with it. Under the circumstances, I regret to say that I am unable to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: The hon. gentleman is sorry not to be able to agree to my suggestion, and I am sorry to be obliged to move

That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time thirty days hence.

Mr. BLAKE. When the Bill, which the member for L'Islet introduced last year on this subject, was brought to the second reading, the leader of the House, instead of receiving it in the way in which the Minister of Public Works receives it now, said that it contained many commendable provisions, although of its precise details he would not commit himself; but he agreed that the measure should go to a Select Committee to have it properly considered and a measure matured. It went to a Select Committee, and was brought down to the House at so late a period that it could not be proceeded with. The Select Committee comprised, amongst others, a member of the Government not now in the House, and, I believe, the report of the Committee was unanimous on the measure. Of course the House was not then, and is not now, committed by that result, but it is fit that the fact should be stated. The hon. gentleman has introduced this Session the measure as the Committee reported it, so it is in effect that which received their endorsement. Now we know perfectly well what is the English of the hon. gentleman's proposition. It is this: first, that at the expiration of a month it is impossible that the measure introduced into the English Parliament shall have been considered, or that we shall have the matured, definite, and decided opinion of the English Parliament upon the subject within that time. Secondly, that if we had it, such will be the state of the order paper that a Bill in the hands of a private member, the second reading of which is not to take place for a month from this time, cannot go through this Session. The proposition then, in plain English is, as the House understands, that the Bill shall not become law this Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much that the hon. the Minister of Public Works should have taken this course. There is no earthly reason for it. As the hon. member for West Durham has said, there were no objections taken to the Bill of the hon. member for L'Islet by the First Minister last Session. On the contrary, if I am not mistaken, it was suggested by him that it should be referred to a Select Committee, and among the members of that Committee were no less than four or five supporters of the Government, among them being the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Brooks), the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and the Minister of Justice of that time. The Committee had at least seven or eight meetings, and the Bill was gone over very carefully. The Minister of Justice was present at every meeting at which the Committee did anything, and the provisions of the Bill, as it is now introduced, met with the approval and sanction of the late Minister of Jus-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

tee. Many of the amendments made in it were made at his suggestion, so that the Bill now before the House is virtually the Bill of the late Minister of Justice. Why, then, Sir, should the hon. gentleman seek, by a sort of side wind like this, to defeat the measure altogether? Surely he does not object to the principle of the Bill? There is not a single provision of the Bill that is not an eminently proper one, and the hon. gentleman does not say that there is. He simply says that we should wait to hear the discussions in the English Parliament, but surely we are not going to tie ourselves to what the English Parliament does. It may reject the Bill. The circumstances there may be such as not to justify its passage, and therefore I do not see any reason the Minister could have for the motion he now makes, except to defeat the Bill, and surely he is not prepared to take that course. If the hon. gentleman asked for a delay of a week or two I would advise the hon. member for L'Islet to accede to his request, but a delay of a month is practically to defeat the Bill, and for that defeat the hon. gentleman must take the responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Public Works by his motion, I think, proceeds on the assumption that the members of this House consist of a number of flies on the wheel; that we are wholly unable to originate or carry any legislation that may be required to meet the wants of the people. The hon. gentleman has for many years looked to Washington as an example for his legislation on financial questions; and on minor questions of this sort we are now asked to look to the Parliament of England. Now, I had supposed that 200 gentlemen, elected to this House by the various constituencies of this Dominion, ought to be capable of originating and carrying through such legislation as might be required for the good of the country. I do not object to profiting by the experience of the people of England or of any other country, but on questions of this sort, in which we know, from our own experience, what the evils and defects are which we are anxious to meet, it does seem to me an insult to the capacity of this House to say that we should not legislate on such a question, but wait to see what the people may do in England under, perhaps, a wholly different state of circumstances, and that we are here servilely to copy the legislation of the English Parliament. We should not be here as representatives of the people at all if we have only to do what the hon. gentleman proposes. All we need to do is to elect a Committee to watch what is done elsewhere and declare that what originates in some other Parliament 3,000 miles away shall be copied and made the law of the people of this country. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is the proper course to pursue he should abolish representative government here altogether and return to the condition of a Crown Colony, where we would have a Governor General sent from England with authority from England to legislate for the people of this country.

Amendment (Sir Hector Langevin) carried on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bannerman,	Hay,	Mousseau,
Benoit,	Hesson,	Muttart,
Boulbee,	Hooper,	Ogden,
Bourbeau,	Houde,	Orton,
Bowell,	Hurteau,	Patterson (Essex),
Bunting,	Jones,	Pinsonneault,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Platt,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Plumb,
Caron,	Kranz,	Reid,
Colby,	Landry,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Costigan,	Lane,	Rouleau,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cuthbert,	Lantier,	Ryan (Montreal),
Desaulniers,	Macdonald (Kings),	Scott,
Doull,	Macmillan,	Shaw,
Drew,	McCallum,	Stephenson,
Elliott,	McQuaig,	Tassé,

Farrow,
Ferguson,
Fitzsimmons,
Fulton,
Gault,
Gigault,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,

McLelan,
McLennan,
McQuade,
McRory,
Maason,
Massue,
Merner,
Mongenaix,
Montplaisir,

Tellier,
Tyrwhitt,
Vain,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings).—78.

NAVS:

Messieurs

Anglin,
Bécharé,
Bergeron,
Blake,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cameron (Huron),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Coupal,
Crouter,
Currier,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Geffrion,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haddow,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
King,
McDonald (Vic., N. S.),
Macdonell (Lanark),
McDougall,
McIsaac,
Malouin,
Mills,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Shelburne),
Rogers,
Ross (Middlesex),
Rymal,
Scriver,
Skinner,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Weldon,
Wheler,
White (Renfrew).—51.

PAWNBROKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. ORTON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 24) to amend the Act respecting pawnbrokers.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I imagine this is a Bill outside our jurisdiction.

Mr. ORTON. I will explain the object of the Bill. The Pawnbrokers Act now in force is an old Act which existed, I believe, previous to Confederation, and there is an Act in force in every Province. But the regulations with respect to pawnbrokers cannot be enforced, simply because it is *ultra vires* for a Local Legislature to pass any penal clause. It is simply to supply a penal clause so as to enforce the Acts in operation in the various Provinces that the Bill is drawn, and it was prepared at the suggestion of the County Crown Attorney at York. In towns and cities very great cruelties are perpetrated by pawnbrokers charging 120, and even higher, per cent. for loans of money on chattels and goods of the poorest class of the community, and the object of the Bill is simply to enforce the regulations in regard to pawnbrokers.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust the hon. gentlemen who are responsible for the legislation of the House will look at this Bill. It seems to be, in principle, wholly objectionable. It may be, it is quite possible, that the law with respect to pawnbroking may require amendment, and stricter provisions may be necessary with respect to that particular kind of trade; but what the hon. gentleman proposes by the Bill is this: that any pawnbroker who takes more than by the local law he is authorized to take, shall, in respect to which violation no other punishment is provided, be held to be guilty of a misdemeanor. The hon. gentleman no doubt aware that it is competent for each Province pass a law which will prescribe the punishment of imprisonment for a breach of this law, if it thinks fit. If a provincial law is thought by the Provincial Legislature to be of such a character that its provisions should be enforced by imprisonment for their breach, it has full authority to so enforce them; but this proposal, which, so far as my recollection goes, is entirely novel, is to create a breach of a provincial law, which breach the Provincial Legislature has not said shall not be punished by imprisonment, to be a misdemeanor. Surely it is rather wholesale legislation to ask this Parliament to declare that whatever laws about pawnbroking Local Legislatures may from time to time make, shall be, if no other penalty is prescribed, punishable by imprisonment. I think if the local law is not ob-

served and if its non-observance should be punished by imprisonment, the Local Legislature, having full authority, might make an application to this Parliament, and it will be a mistake to take up civil rights and civil questions which are wholly within the competency of Local Legislatures and make breaches of provincial laws on those subjects criminal offences under some very extraordinary state of facts which does not appear to exist here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken on this point, that in matters which are within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature we should not interfere, even should we have power to do so, except in very rare cases. I do not think the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) has stated that Local Legislatures had not a right to interfere in matters of this kind. On the contrary, I think the contents of the Bill show that the mover admits that Local Legislatures have a right to interfere in this matter, so much so that the object of the Bill is to declare that the violation of Provincial Acts on this subject shall be punishable in the manner prescribed by the Bill. I think the hon. gentleman would do well not to press the Bill, but withdraw it, and give us time to report the matter to the Minister of Justice, in order that we may, the next time the Bill comes up, tell him exactly whether the hon. the Minister of Justice agrees with the views I have expressed. I am not here to give advice legally to the House, but I express the opinion that this is a matter in which this Parliament should not interfere, but leave it to the Local Legislatures. The fact is, if there is a cry in the country about anything, it is about interference on the part of the Central Legislature with the jurisdiction of Local Legislatures. Of course we avoid these interferences, but they will happen sometimes, and we should try to avoid them as much as possible.

Mr. McCALLUM moved the adjournment of the Debate.
Motion agreed to.

DRAWBACKS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Paterson (South Brant) for a return of all claims presented for drawbacks on goods manufactured for export since January 22nd, 1881, &c.

Mr. CHARLTON said he would reserve the remarks he intended to make on this motion until the Budget came up again for discussion, as the same questions were treated in both.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYES.

Mr. ANGLIN, in moving for a return of the names of all persons employed on the Intercolonial Railway whose salaries have been reduced or increased in the year ending December 31st, 1879, the year ending December 31st, 1880, and the year ending December 31st, 1881; the amount of such reduction or increase, and the salaries or wages now paid; giving also, the names and salaries of all persons displaced or removed, or who have resigned, and of all persons who have been employed during the same three years, said: I observe that in the railway report of this year the amount charged for station expenses is very much larger than in former years. I presume that the hon. Minister of Railways has found it necessary in many cases to increase the salaries of the persons employed in the various railway stations, and I presume he has found it necessary to appoint additional employes. The hon. Minister will have no objection to the motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to this motion passing if the mover will introduce the words

"increased charges and the year ending 31st December, 1878," to the motion as it stands. But I would say to the hon. gentlemen it will be in his recollection that when I drew the attention of the House to the necessity for reducing the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway to the lowest possible point, that he expressed the greatest sympathy with a number of the parties whose salaries were thus reduced, and that I stated very frankly that it was with a great deal of pain that the position of the service made it indispensable to perform the work at the smallest possible cost. But I stated, at the same time, the great pleasure it would give me when the time arrived, when the revenue would balance the expenditure, to take into the most favorable consideration the claims of the officers whose salaries had thus been reduced. The hon. gentleman will be very glad to learn that the time has arrived when it is in our power to fulfil the pledge that was then given to Parliament, and the hon. gentleman will not be surprised to learn one thing, that on a railway where the traffic has increased 42 per cent., there should be some further expenditure in performing that work. He will hardly expect the traffic of the road to be increased to the extent of nearly 50 per cent., and the service to be maintained at the same cost. Every person who knows anything of railways is aware that the expenditure on a railway bears an immediate and direct relation to the traffic. The return will be brought down as early as possible. I shall be only too glad to lay all the information asked for before the House.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have no objection to the amendment suggested by the hon. member, whose purpose is obviously to institute a comparison with the management of his predecessor. I should expect the increase of traffic to lead to some increase of expenditure. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that when those reductions were made I did express sympathy with the number of persons whose salaries were reduced, and, as I thought, very unreasonably. I pointed out that there might have been some cases where a reduction might have been legitimate and necessary. Very many salaries of men were reduced who could barely live upon them, reduction in such cases involving a great deal of suffering; and I do not think that a country like this, under even the pressure of temporary difficulties, should have treated some of their employes in the way witnessed. I have heard also, and will try to ascertain whether it is correct, that, during the last year or two, very many of the most competent employes on the road, of themselves, quitted the service, because the compensation they received was inadequate to the services rendered, and insufficient for the supply of their absolute necessities, and that they are among the number that sought employment in a foreign country. It should be seen how many of the valuable employes in the stations resigned within the last year or two—on this point we should certainly have information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope I may be permitted as the hon. gentleman has introduced an entirely new subject, to say a word in reply. He said that a large number within the last year or two, of valuable servants of the road, had sought employment in a foreign country, in consequence of a reduction in their salaries. I am glad to be able to say that I am not aware of a single valuable officer having left the road for such a cause. There have been some instances—and it is only right I should take this opportunity, the first offered, of acknowledging—notwithstanding the suggestions of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which suggestions are characteristic of the remarks made by them on all occasions—the wonderful readiness with which the employes of the Intercolonial Railway met the exigencies of the case, and the zeal that they still exhibit in the public service, notwithstanding the reduction in their

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

salaries. It is due to them to say that I was scarcely prepared for the manner in which that measure—a very painful one to me—was met by the great mass of the employes. I stated at the time that, in most of the instances in which persons left the service of the road and sought employment in foreign countries, they, after a time, applied to be taken back, showing that they had not benefitted their position by quitting the service, notwithstanding the reduction of their salaries. I am also very glad to be able to say that, notwithstanding the great efficiency of the road and its successful management, I have not lost, to this moment, a single officer holding an important position on the road when I became Minister of Public Works and Railways.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS OF FLANNELS.

Mr. BUNTING moved for a return showing the number of yards of canton flannel, bleached and unbleached, with the price per yard, and the amount of duties collected on the same, which have been entered for consumption in the Dominion from the 30th June, 1880, to 1st February, 1882.

Mr. BOWELL. The adoption of the motion would be useless. There is no such classification as the motion asks for, and, consequently, it would be impossible to comply with it if passed.

Motion withdrawn.

MAJOR RIDOUT'S REMOVAL FROM MILITARY COLLEGE STAFF.

Mr. BUNTING moved for correspondence between the Commandant of the Royal Military College at Kingston, the Major General commanding the Militia, and the Minister of Militia, relating to the removal of Major Ridout from the Royal Military College Staff.

Mr. CARON. I shall be very happy to bring down the fullest possible information that the Department possesses. Still, I must say that I would not like it to be looked upon as a matter of precedent, because it is a matter of discipline; but, as it is a question of considerable importance, the Department will produce the fullest information.

Motion agreed to.

THE CASE OF MAJOR RIDOUT.

Mr. BUNTING, in moving for a return of a copy of the charges preferred against Major Ridout, for a copy of the instructions to the Court of Enquiry, and the evidence taken before the Court, said: My object in moving for this information is simply to get it with a view to discuss the subject at a later period of the Session. Much has been said in the papers during the last twelve months, on the subject of the removal of Major Ridout from the College. A good deal has been also said with regard to the utility of this institution, and it is with a view of discussing the whole question that I move for the papers.

Motion agreed to.

CADETS IN THE MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. STRANGE moved for a return showing the number of cadets who have been admitted to the Royal Military College since its opening, on the 1st of June, 1876; the number who have graduated, the number who have left the institution without graduating, the number now on the strength of the College, and the greatest number attending the College at any one time, and the date; also, so far as can be ascertained, the place of residence and occupation of the cadets who have graduated, with the detailed arrangements, if any, by which graduates may be called upon to serve in

Canada if required. He said: I make this motion in order to lay the information before the people in Western Ontario, who are somewhat disappointed, both in the College and in the results. When it was organized by the late Administration in 1875, it was considered then by a great many members of the militia force of Canada to be an establishment far in advance of the times or of the necessities of the country. It was felt that the Canadian militia force was a force of citizen soldiery, who might be called upon to serve in case any attempted foreign invasion was made into the Dominion. It was felt, also, that the militia of Canada had to rely for their effective strength upon the number of efficient rifles they could count in the force, and the highly scientific branch of military knowledge provided by the College of Kings' on was looked upon as rather extraneous and rather in advance of the military spirit of Canada. It has also been conceded, I think, that the militia of Canada are merely an adjunct of the militia force of Great Britain, of which country, I need not remind the House, Canada forms at present so important an appanage. In case a war of any importance took place in Canada we should necessarily have to look to the Mother Country for scientifically educated officers, which we cannot at present supply. That being the case, a great many of the friends of the military force in Ontario, for whom I speak at the present moment, have felt that the presence of a Military College was scarcely necessary, and that the money expended in founding it would have been better expended in maintaining the force as it at present exists. So far as the staff of the Royal Military College at Kingston is concerned, I have not one word to say. I know that every gentleman there is a man illustrious both in arms and in that scientific education which is necessary for gentlemen who hold such positions. Nor shall I refer to the recent quarrel which took place between them, because I believe it is purely a question of military discipline upon which this House should have nothing to say. At the same time, I have always felt that the College is receiving funds to which the active militia of Canada is entitled. I trust, when the details are brought down, it will be seen that the continuance of this College is not necessary for Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad that these returns have been asked for, because I believe the feeling is pretty general throughout Canada that this College is a useless luxury. We find that, after the money is voted for its maintenance, that it turns out a class of men on the community for whom our next duty is to find a place where they may earn a living. We provide a useless education for these young men, an education which takes many of them away from the pursuits of industry and afterwards they become a burden on the country; and if we do not find them situations, we are told that they leave the country, and therefore they do not add to the strength of our militia. I think it would be much better if the money voted for the support of this College was applied to keeping up the efficiency of our volunteers. Another difficulty is, that the recruits who come here from the Old Country appear to be on terms of antagonism with those of our own people; feuds arise between them over which, perhaps, we have no control, and the result is, that the institution is brought into discredit. Altogether, I think the money spent upon the institution might be devoted to much more useful purposes.

Mr. CARON. I can assure my hon. friends that I am most desirous that every possible information may be placed before the country relative to the Military School. It may be a debatable question—and it certainly is one into which I shall not venture to enquire at this moment—whether the establishment of the Military School was premature or not; but it is now an institution of the country,

and I think that when the information is brought down possibly some of the objections which my hon. friend has spoken of will disappear—at least, I hope so. My hon. friends should remember that it should be possible to find positions for these cadets, from the fact that they are receiving a very high education in the College. Owing to that fact I may say that we have already availed ourselves of the services of some of the cadets by giving them positions in the institution itself. Others have been given positions in the Mounted Police. I hope that the very high education they are receiving—and which I hope can hardly be considered an obstacle to obtaining a position in any country—will be the means of obtaining them positions, which I have no doubt they will fill to the honor and credit of the institution from which they come. I shall lay every information before the House, and I think when it is brought down the House will be in a better position to discuss the matter than it is at the present moment.

Mr. McCUAIG. I would like to remind my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that when an officer of the British Service accepts a position such as he has referred to, he does so at a very great sacrifice. I am of opinion, however, that the material for the highest positions in our service can be found here as well as in the Old Country. I believe that the Military College has been a success; and I hope that it will be liberally sustained by Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

List of the names of Foreign Life Insurance Companies who have made deposits with the Governments for the sole benefit of Canadian policy holders. (Mr. Gault.)

Return showing the total cost to date of the portion of the Intercolonial Railway between Rivière du Loup and the terminus at Hadlow or Chaudière Junction; giving under distinct headings the price paid to the Grand Trunk Company, the amount expended in improvement of the road bed, the amounts paid for rails and for sleepers, the amount expended in ballasting, in erecting or repairing station buildings, in making sidings, in improving the water supply, the cost of rolling stock supplied and charged to Capital Account, and the number of locomotives and cars of all descriptions so supplied and charged; and also, the estimated amount, if any, required to complete the repairs, improvement and equipment of that portion of the road and to be charged to Capital Account.—(Mr. Anglin.)

Return showing in detail the several sums which make up the sum of \$24,372.54, described in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, Appendix No. 3, as an amount expended "for the completion of the Intercolonial."—(Mr. Anglin.)

Correspondence between the Commandant of the Royal Military College and the Militia Department, in reference to the appointment of a Captain of Cadets for the College in lieu of Major Ridout.—(Mr. Bunting.)

Return showing the various changes in the organization of the Royal Military College, since its establishment to 1st February, 1882.—(Mr. Bunting.)

Return showing the salary paid to Professor Ferguson, the number of Cadets attending his Classes, and the number of Lectures given by him from the 1st day of November, 1881, to the 1st day of February, 1882.—(Mr. Bunting.)

Return of the names of the staff and of the employes of every description in connection with the Royal Military College, with the salaries and allowance received by each and their duties.—(Mr. Bunting.)

Return of graduates holding commissions in the Militia, who have attended the trainings of battalions to which they are attached, since July, 1880.—(Mr. Bunting.)

Detailed list of cadets of the Royal Military College, past and present, who were born in the United States.—(Mr. Strange.)

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 3rd March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LORNE,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I acknowledge with thanks the Address you have legally adopted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the Session, and I rely with confidence on the assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your careful and full consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 3rd March, 1882.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

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

Mr. SPEAKER,—

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

(In the Senate Chamber.)

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act for the relief of the Bank of Prince Edward Island.

An Act to repeal the duty on Promissory Notes, Drafts, and Bills of Exchange.

And the House being returned,

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 68) to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and Act amending the same.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 69) to grant certain powers to the C. W. Williams Manufacturing Company, and to change the name thereof to the Williams Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 71) to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Managers of the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the amendments thereto.—(Mr. Brooks.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McCuaig.

Mr. BOULTBEE. Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment of the debate, because I felt unwilling that such a speech, involving such propositions, as that made by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), should go without being answered or contradicted. But before dealing with him, I should like to make a few remarks with regard to some statements made by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) on the motion to adjourn, which was made for the purpose of allowing him to make those statements. It will be recollected that the hon. the Minister of Railways had charged that the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) had misquoted Sir Henry Tyler's speech in London, with respect to Grand Trunk Railway fares, and the hon. gentleman had a motion to adjourn moved so that he could make some statement. In that statement he charged the hon. Minister of Railways with having said that which was, in fact, untrue, and he added a good many remarks in his usual sarcastic manner. I will read the remarks that were made in his original speech by the hon. member for Centre Huron, and which the hon. Minister of Railways said was a misquotation:

"Here is what the president of the largest railway at present existing in Canada has to say: 'Materials of all kinds,' says Sir Henry Tyler, 'are dearer than they were ever before, and in particular the price of coal has increased to the extent of the duty imposed.'"

This was what the hon. Minister of Railways stated was a misquotation, that it was incorrect and untrue, and that Sir Henry Tyler never said anything of the sort; and it will be remembered by those hon. members who were present, that the hon. member for Centre Huron rose and stated that his original position was correct, and he read from this very speech, from the speech of Sir Henry Tyler on the occasion referred to, some remarks to show he was correct. I will read those to the House, and then hon. members will see how correct he was. Here is what was read by the hon. member for Centre Huron in showing that the hon. Minister of Railways was incorrect:

"There was also a considerable rise in the cost of materials, of labor and of fuel; and I am sorry to say that this was very much in consequence of the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government. That policy makes everything which a poor man requires dearer for him to purchase, and in consequence of that policy he requires higher wages in order to be enabled to exist. I have repeatedly spoken in this room as to the duty which is placed upon fuel. I cannot conceive anything more unwise in a nation like Canada, that has to import a great part of its fuel, and wishes to encourage its manufactures and to encourage its railways, than to place a duty upon the article of coal."

That is the extract which the hon. member for Centre Huron read to show that the hon. Minister of Railways had misquoted Sir Henry Tyler, and yet it will be seen that he adds to the remarks made by Sir Henry Tyler as reported in the very speech which he quotes himself:

"And in particular the price of coal has increased to the extent of the duty imposed."

Now, I will ask this House to consider whether that is a fair and proper way of treating this House, whether that is the way the intelligence of hon. members and the people should be treated, in attempting to get a snap verdict, by reading two quotations apparently from the same report and adding a sentence to one which never was spoken. This was not done in ignorance, because, when the question first arose, it was thoroughly discussed in the newspapers; and it was declared by the *Mail* and other papers supporting the Government, that Sir Henry Tyler never made use of that remark, that it was a forgery, and that it was added in a certain newspaper, and when the full report was received it was found to be incorrect. I must confess, I think, I never saw human effrontery go much further than in taking this very speech in which the refutation appeared, and quoting it to show he was correct. It is not often we see such a thing done. Before dealing as best I may with the hon. member

for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), I wish to pay a little attention to some other remarks made by the hon. member for Centre Huron when he had the motion to adjourn made. It had been asserted by the hon. Minister of Railways, when addressing this House, that the hon. member for Centre Huron when Minister of Finance, in 1876, in making a loan and selling the debentures of the Dominion of Canada in England in November, 1876, fixed an arbitrary price at which to sell those debentures, and at a price below their market value; that he had not sold them after throwing them open to public competition, and that he had always refused to disclose to whom he sold them. I understood, when the motion to adjourn was made, that the hon. member for Centre Huron was to explain this, but he made no explanation of it whatever, and it remained apparent that the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Railways were correct. I have in my hand the return showing what the terms of that loan were and how it was made, and I think when once that is shown in this House, and when the manner in which that loan was made is fully understood by the country, the universal verdict of the people, given after due consideration, will ask that an hon. gentleman who can conduct the financial affairs of the country so unfortunately, shall not be again entrusted with their management. I find this loan was issued, as it was said, under the authority of an Act of Parliament; it is a loan at 4 per cent. payable in thirty years, and the arbitrary price fixed was 91 per cent.; and besides that 9 per cent. discount, there are charges and commissions, and rebates of interest allowed to purchasers. The only result of that loan was this: that out of £2,500,000 sterling, amounting, at \$4.87 to the pound, to \$12,166,000, we lost something like \$1,500,000; that is, the hon. gentleman brought back to this country less than the amount of the debentures he sold by \$1,500,000, and he left us to pay, for thirty years, the interest upon that \$1,500,000 which the people of this country did not get. I assert that that is a bad and ruinous principle on which to do business. In making a loan, the great object to be sought is this: that we get as much of the money to be used in this country as we can. It is sufficient for us that we should pay the interest on that money, in the London market, without leaving both principle and interest there, as was done in this case. That is, perhaps, only a matter of taste or judgment; but when a Finance Minister who, unlike the treasurer of any ordinary financial corporation or municipality, is entrusted with the power of dealing with the finances of the country, without giving any security therefor, beyond the honor of a statesman, and the confidence reposed in him by the people, takes our securities into the English market and does not submit them to public competition, but fixes an arbitrary rate, 3 or 4 per cent. lower than our debentures in that market at the time, then, I say, he abuses the trust that was reposed in him. The debentures were to be sold at 91 per cent., 9 per cent. discount, and were not even submitted to public competition, because there was in his terms that which enabled the hon. gentleman to allot that loan to anybody he pleased. I do not know that this was dishonesty, but it permitted dishonesty. The following is the clause:—

"The allotment will be made as early as possible, and in cases where it has not been practicable to make any allotment, the deposit will be returned."

So desirable an investment did the loan seem to be that many millions were asked for; and the effect of this clause was to put it in the power of the hon. member for Centre Huron, in his capacity as Finance Minister, to choose to whom he should allot that loan. Up to this day, the Canadian people do not know who got that loan, who made this \$1,500,000, with accrued interest for twenty-nine years. The hon. gentleman refused to tell, and I challenge him now on behalf of the people of Canada,

whose trust he betrayed and whose money he squandered, to give to the House the names of those who got that money. I do not say that the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance did what was dishonest and wrong; but I say that, had he desired to make money out of his position, it was in his power to go to his friend, Mr. King, or any other man and say: "This loan is going to be put on the market; there are, under the terms, hundreds of thousands in it; make application and I will see that it is allotted to you." We do not know whether that was done or not, because we do not know to whom the loan was allotted. Supposing the treasurer of a municipality in Ontario was deputed by the town or village council to go to Montreal or some other financial centre, as is often done, and sell the municipal debentures for the purpose of obtaining money to build a bridge or town hall or something of that sort, and then come back with \$15,000 instead of the \$20,000 expected, and supposing he refused to tell to whom he sold these debentures below the market rate, what would be the fate of such treasurer if he were sued the next day to make good the deficiency? It is rather unfortunate that hon. gentlemen opposite are addicted to making transactions of this kind. We had at one time a treasurer in our Ontario Legislature, who went to England to dispose of about \$1,500,000 worth of local debentures. The price he obtained was not satisfactory to our people, and they looked into it. The treasurer had not been careful enough to cover his tracks, so that it was ascertained he had sold them to a company of which he was director and solicitor. The *Mail* published these facts, and the hon. treasurer brought an action against it for libel. As usual, in Courts of law, when the case reached a certain point, the Treasurer, Mr. Brooks, was examined, and it was found that he had sold the debentures to this company. When that fact was elicited, Mr. Brooks simply dropped the action, and it has never been renewed until this day. Our late Finance Minister, who is a wise man in some respects, saw the trouble the poor Treasurer of Ontario got into by admitting to whom he sold his debentures, and refused to tell with whom he did business. Therefore, we cannot tell whether he sold our debentures to his own friends or not. Perhaps I have dwelt longer on this than I intended, but I feel the enormity of the issue involved, because when this House will be dissolved and we go to the country within the next twelve or eighteen months, the people will be called on to decide whether they will trust the management of their affairs to hon. gentlemen opposite, who approve of the system carried out by the hon. member for Centre Huron in floating our debentures, or whether they will support an administration which has sounder views of finance and do not countenance any such system. If there is anything that marks the line of distinction between the statesman and the ordinary politician, it is the ability to discriminate and choose the best men as associates in the management of public affairs, and it is notorious that, though pressed to do so, the right hon. the leader of the Government refused to retain the services of the hon. member for Centre Huron, by making him his Finance Minister. I think when the country considers the way this hon. gentleman has conducted our affairs, they will join with me in coming to the conclusion that he is by no means a fit man to be entrusted with their administration; that must be their universal determination, and I believe it is the decision the people will come to. I make this application against the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), on the grounds I have given, because of the way in which he disposed of that loan. But I know he is not a fit man to be entrusted with the affairs of this country; I have shown that his judgment is erroneous, and is not to be depended upon; that he is not a man able to forecast the future, able to gather together the ordinary probabilities occurring to the minds of all men, and to form from

them a policy of judicious arrangements to carry on the people's affairs. I find a reference to his Budget Speech of 1874, that he estimated the revenue at \$25,000,000, and estimated the same amount for each of the two following years—that is, for the three, \$75,000,000. I find, on looking into our Blue-Books, that the revenue for those years reached but \$69,000,000; so he made a mistake to the extent of \$6,000,000 in estimating his means for carrying on the people's affairs. But, in his Budget Speech immediately following, he went still further wrong; he did not know, apparently, how far wrong he was going, because he estimated, not that he would be wrong to the extent of \$6,000,000, but would have a surplus of \$1,000,000 a year for the same three years. But, instead, he had a deficit of \$2,680,000. If you add that to the \$6,000,000, he makes a mistake to the extent of \$10,000,000 in three years. I submit then, that if this gentleman were, as his associates claim him to be, not only the most honest man among the whole people of Canada—if he were as honest as he and his colleagues represent him to be—yet these facts prove he is not a man of business, a man of good sense, a safe man to entrust with the affairs of the people. As a means of showing how erroneous that judgment was, I looked again at the same Budget Speech of February, 1875, where I found he estimated the increase in the deposits in the Government savings bank at \$1,000,000 a year for each of the three years, 1875, 1876, and 1877. In a young country like this, thriving and progressive, with our male population active and intelligent, that was a very moderate estimate to make, and there would have been a result far beyond that amount if the affairs of the country had been conducted with efficiency and wisdom. But what was found to be the result of his judgment in that instance, instead of \$1,000,000 a year, that he had expected, or \$3,000,000 altogether, there was a decrease each year, amounting, in the whole, to \$1,460,000. The country was going to the bad. I think I have answered the remarks that he somewhat unadvisedly made on the motion to adjourn, to obtain an opportunity of making them. I think he would have done better to have left them unspoken. As I said before, I moved the adjournment of the debate because I was unwilling that here, on the floor of the House, hearing it and knowing it would be transmitted by the press to every avenue of the land, there should go through the minds of men statements so damaging to the country, and so discreditable, I think, as those of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin). I went through his speech this morning, taking an hour to see whether any principle was involved in it, any line of argument laid down, any strong position set forth, which I could try to controvert. I could find nothing of the kind. Through the melancholy meandering of thirty or forty columns of *Hansard*, dreary iterations and anecdotes, appeared no general principle, nor discussion of any useful question. There was nothing you could get hold of on which to ground an argument. In the first three or four columns there is absolutely nothing at all but quotations in English, in our own vernacular tongue, and other matter of little interest. He repeats the quotation of the old Latin author: "Whom the Gods wished to destroy they first make mad." My own opinion is, if that principle be true, as regards representative and legislative bodies like this House, it would seem, from the utterances of this hon. gentleman, that destruction has threatened—not our party, but the Opposition. For, certainly, if we treat their own utterances as illustrating any position they wish to bring themselves into, we may well say: "That they whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad." The very first point the hon. member for Gloucester tried to make, and it was received with additional enthusiasm by his friends behind him, affected the coal duty. He said:

"Well, if the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal produced the extraordinary effect of making it cheaper and procuring more revenue, why does not the hon. the Finance Minister ask for the imposition of

Mr. BOULTBEE.

another 50 cents? If the Americans pay the duty now, why should we spare them? Why should we be satisfied with taking from them a paltry 50 cents? According to the hon. gentleman's theory, that duty reduces the price."

Any practical business man in the country knows the utter absurdity of the argument of the hon. member for Gloucester. It is a well recognized principle of commerce and business, as I understand it, that active competition invariably lowers prices, but it would be absurd to suppose it would lower them beyond a living limit. At the end of the first seven or eight columns of his speech, after dealing with the coal question, the hon. member for Gloucester says that he hopes that the line of argument adopted by the hon. the Minister of Railways would be scattered broadcast through the country; and that treatment of the coal question, thus adopted, would be understood by the whole country. The hon. member for Gloucester must know very little of what is going on in the country and quite misunderstands the avenues for news that we have in Ontario, in uttering a remark of that kind. I suppose that, when talking in this House, he fancies the sound of his voice and that of his friends would not reach a long distance or influence a larger circle than the newspaper of which he is himself the editor, possessing a circulation of only some ten or eleven hundred. There is the rock on which he splits. He does not know that one of the newspapers we have in Ontario enjoys a circulation of 200,000, by which means every town and hamlet is made acquainted with the nonsense he utters, as well as the remarks made by his unpatriotic friends also. His desire is to destroy the country, to ruin her credit, to show that we are a miserable people. That is published in the *Mail* newspaper and in other papers having an enormous circulation throughout the length and breadth of the land. Do not let the hon. gentleman think that his utterances are united to the little paper which he edits himself. The people of Ontario, if they have had the patience to wade through his melancholy speech, will see, from the principles he enunciates, whether he is a safe man to have their interests in his charge. There are three positions with regard to this coal duty. Now, Sir, I treat this coal duty, perhaps, at greater length than I should, because it has been a sore question in Ontario. We have been worried by every witty demagogue throughout the land ever since this duty was imposed, trying to inflame the minds of the people, trying to raise in their minds a hostility against the people of the Maritime Provinces, trying to anger them and make a sore feeling, trying to create a feeling that in the end the destruction of this Confederation will take place, of which all loyal and true men are so proud. Sir, it has been fully established, beyond contradiction in the *Mail* newspaper, that this duty of 50 cents a ton on coal has not increased the price, that is one position, and I think it has never been controverted. Then there is another position: supposing it does increase the price by 50 cents per ton, then I say—and it is a belief and a conviction indulged in by every patriotic son of Ontario—that if the imposition of that 50 cents a ton in coal enables us to bind together more closely the Provinces of this Dominion, and knit to us more closely the men of the Maritime Provinces by affording them this scanty measure of justice and sympathy, they are willing that it should be done. That is the feeling. As the avenues and the means for the transmission of this commodity become more adapted to trade than we shall see Nova Scotia coal creeping up mile after mile in the Province of Ontario, and the return ship laden with freight going to increase the volume of inter-provincial trade between us, and thus consolidating the nation. Now, even in the inception of the trade, what do we find? We heard the other day, from a gentleman on the floor of this House, that they are using 150 tons a month of Nova Scotia coal at Kingston. I know that large quantities are being used at Cobourg, and as we go on to double this trade and to send

our commodities down to the Maritime Provinces, we shall knit more closely together these Provinces in these strong bonds of union which alone can make us a strong nation, and we are only deterred from doing so now—we are only kept back by men like the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), who, in the narrow circle of his miserable party prejudice, would sacrifice all the future of this country, and who has endeavored, on the floor of this House, to create dissension between the Maritime Provinces and Ontario. Disposing of both those points, suppose now we created no inter-provincial trade, suppose the 50 cents does become added to the price of coal, then I take the position that it is a fair and proper tax to impose. It is a good revenue producing tax. Who does it bear upon? It does not bear upon the poor man; it bears upon the rich. The poor man buys his three tons of coal in the year; the rich man buys his fifteen, twenty, thirty, or more, and he pays a per capita of \$4 or \$5, while the poor man pays \$1.50. But I can give to this House—and I am sure they will receive it with pleasure—the utterances of one of these men on this very point. In the East Riding of York—which I have the honor to represent—and I may say it is one of the metropolitan counties, being contiguous to the city of Toronto, and its people are not less intelligent than any other people of Canada—I think a very large proportion of the electors are laboring men and mechanics who work in the city and live just outside its limits. We had a meeting the other day in the East Riding of York, where political questions were discussed at some length; and there, in that meeting, held some eight or ten days ago, a mechanic was called upon to speak—a big, broad shouldered, hard headed and hard handed man, too—and he spoke in a way that was highly interesting to the men around him, and he spoke, I may say—and I say it for the satisfaction of the sensitive feelings of the elegant scholar from Centre Huron—he spoke with grammatical accuracy; he pronounced his language, I think, about as well as the hon. member for Centre Huron; I only wish I could have done as well, but then he, like myself, unlike the member for Centre Huron, had never any opportunity of going to school, because there were no schools where we were living when we were boys. What did this man say? He said, honestly and fairly, I cannot discuss these questions exhaustively; I do not understand them sufficiently to go into all the details; but this I know, he said, that when the late Government were in power I only got four days' work in the week on the average, and that at low wages, and the little family suffered rather; but now I get six days' work in the week, at high wages, and the wife and children are all comfortable. Then he went on and took up this question of coal, and he said: I do not know whether the 50 cents duty becomes added to the price or not, but I am getting it just as cheap, or even cheaper, than before. I do not care whether it is added or not; it is a mere trifle to me to pay \$1.50 a year extra on the three tons of coal I use, when I get more than one hundred extra days of work in the year, at high wages, compared with what I did when those gentlemen were in power. And he also said—he was a pretty intelligent man, and very naturally so, because he supports me; he is chairman of one of my Committees—he said also about cotton: They say cotton has raised a half cent a yard; well, I don't know, even if cotton is half a cent dearer a yard it won't make much difference; I can wear my shirt as long as I like and have as many of them as I wish, and I was not even able to do that before. Now, I may say that there was also on that same platform one of our foremost farmers, known out of his own county as a scientific agriculturist—I refer to John Gibson, of Markham, a farmer known all through this country as one of the most upright men who ever lived. He was quite unlike some gentlemen I know, the names of

whose constituencies I will not mention, because I do not believe he could tell a lie. Well, he got up and said that, some objection was taken to this protection policy on the ground that it militated against the farmer. Well, now, he said: I do not think there is any class of men, so far as I know, who are so much benefitted by the creation and extension of manufacturers, as farmers, because it gives them the market not only for their grains which we can always sell, and which go to Europe or elsewhere, but we have a chicken, or a dozen eggs, or a sucking pig, or any other luxury of life—because sucking pigs are luxuries—we can sell them at once and get the cash for them and take it home. So the farmer was satisfied. Not only were the farmer and the mechanic satisfied, but there were three or four Reformers present who never gave a Conservative vote in their life, and they said they were satisfied—they were going to support the National Policy; they said they could not do otherwise, because the country was flourishing. In taking his position as to the action of the Reform party with regard to the National Policy, the hon. member for Gloucester said that what his friends contended for was that to the extent the Tariff proved protective it would prove a fallacy in working up a revenue, and a little further down he seems to roll the morsel round his mouth again, and revert to the same thing after having touched on something else in the middle. The hon. gentleman says that the National Policy has failed as a protective Tariff, and that it has also failed as a revenue Tariff. I would like to ask him, if it has failed as a protective Tariff, why it is that, throughout the length and breadth of this land, from one end to the other, we have the hum of industry, and the utterances of a happy, contented and prosperous people? If that state of things is not due to the Tariff, I would like to ask him and his friends to what they impute the prosperity we are enjoying. Taking up his other position, that it has not succeeded as a revenue Tariff, I would just ask him if any one can look at the happy, smiling and contented countenance of the hon. Finance Minister, who is rejoicing at present in the possession of a very large pouch well filled, and say that his Tariff has failed as a revenue Tariff. The people are being paid good wages, they are prospering, they are getting rich, and we have a surplus revenue, so, I think, that for the present, we may dismiss that point. The member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) argued at very great length to show that the cotton and woollen manufacturers and others are making enormous profits. It was demonstrated by the hon. Finance Minister, and his arguments have not been controverted—I do not think they will be controverted, although I dare say they will be denied, because we have gentlemen on the other side who are always ready to deny what they cannot disprove—I say it was proved by the hon. Finance Minister that the cost of cottons and those other goods has not increased. If that be the case, and even if it can be shown that these manufacturers have made enormous profits and large fortunes, it only shows that we are creating wealth within our own borders instead of sending it abroad. Money is abundant, the rate of interest is low; money can be had for 5 per cent. interest instead of 10 as it was before, and I say that better marks of the prosperity of the country cannot be found than the ability to obtain money at a fair rate of interest. We do not find men going around shaving notes or lending their money at exorbitant rates; but instead of that, they are investing it in business and manufactories, and the result is that our wealth is increasing, our population is growing, and we are improving in every respect. I may say that I waded through the long, dreary, melancholy speech of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), and tried to find some legitimate position taken by him—some position on which he could stand. He took one position which would have been a good one if it had been borne out by the facts, but it seems to have no foundation. He takes the position that

the reason of the great prosperity of the country is that we have been having a large export trade; that we have been sending large quantities of timber, cattle and other goods out of the country, and that this prosperity is not due to the management of this Government—the skill of the hon. Finance Minister or the effects of the National Policy. I wish to call the attention of the late hon. Finance Minister (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) and the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) to the fact—and I may say that I have looked into the matter and believe I am correct—that the exports in 1871-72-73 were less than those for 1876-77-78 by \$16,000,000. Yet, all the time that these exports were increasing we were getting poorer and more miserable, so that I do not think there is much in that argument. Going a little further into the hon. gentleman's speech, we get into a long diatribe, in which there is little except this: that he inveighs bitterly against the fate of the Maritime Provinces for having to pay duty on the goods which they buy from Ontario. He thinks they might buy somewhere else; that it is a hardship that, through the imposition of duties, they should be obliged to buy in Ontario, when, as he says, Ontario makes money out of them. He then takes up the case of Ontario, and inveighs, with equal earnestness on behalf of the determination of the people of that Province, because they have to pay duty on coal. I do not think any member of Parliament could possibly take a much more incendiary position than this. When we consider the struggles we have gone through, and the enormous efforts which have been made to bind together a lot of small scattered Provinces into one great Confederation, in connection with our old motherland, I think he is no true patriot, no true friend of his country, no true son of Canada, who comes here, where his utterances have the weight that attach to an old and respected hon. member of Parliament, and endeavors to create a dissension between the various Provinces which, if continued, can end in nothing but the disruption and destruction of the Confederation. He then goes into a lot of statistics for something like half an hour—as near as I can measure its length from the columns of *Hansard*—and then coming back, he launches into some old topic, his troubles about inter-provincial trade, his troubles about the Maritime Provinces buying their goods in Ontario, etc. As I said before, in doing this I think the hon. gentleman has taken a wrong course, and one which he should not have filled. He goes further, and seems determined, if he cannot find facts upon which to base his arguments, he will make the facts for himself, and how does he do it? The Census has just been taken, at great expense, with great care, and under the most skilful superintendence, the whole business being done as well as any Census taken on the face of the earth, and everybody seems satisfied with it except the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), and he says it is all untrue. He says that, instead of our population increasing it is decreasing, that our people are fleeing out of the country—literally starved out of it. In fact, as was most pathetically expressed in some beautiful lines by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Bunting) which recently appeared in his paper:

“They've fled for bread to other lands.”

The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), says that he thinks he may possibly be condemned for saying this. He feels, himself, that he has taken a course so unstatesmanlike, so unpatriotic, so unfair, that he will be condemned in the eyes of every right-thinking man, but he says the truth must be told. Truth is great, and must prevail. I would like to ask the hon. members of this House, and the people of this country, whether we are to say that all those sworn Commissioners of the Census are wrong, and none but the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) right. The evidence is against him. We cannot believe that these gentlemen

Mr. BOULTBEE.

are wrong, that they have wilfully foresworn and misconducted themselves, and that the only man in Canada who dared to speak the truth is the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin). The people of this country will believe no such thing, and I think that he who thus inveighs against his country, not only against its status and its credit, but also against the honesty of its officials, is no true friend of Canada. He goes on further to speak of Montreal. Upon that point I do not pretend to have the facts myself, but I have asked a number of gentlemen here from Montreal, who aver that it is utterly false that that city is in a very bad state, that its population is leaving, that its property is of less value than before, and that everything is in a very bad condition. They say that the hon. gentleman dare not stop in Montreal on his way through it. Now, I warn him to go there at night, and not to expose his person to those irritated people of Montreal, who, he says, have not money enough to buy eggs of an impure character; but they say they have, and they will very likely be after him in that sort of shape. Then the hon. Minister of Finance, in his speech, said that he had new factories all through the country. Well, I thought we had myself. I thought I had seen them, knew of them, and seen them mentioned in the newspapers. The hon. member for Gloucester tells us that they have got no such things as new factories. Well, I got two or three people to make a list of the new factories for me, and it fills the whole side of a sheet of foolscap. In Toronto, there are thirteen or fourteen new factories, employing 1,473 hands. But then there are a number of factories in which the labor employed has been increased. In the city of Toronto, previous to this National Policy, there were 841 hands employed where there are now more than double that number of new hands, and the total amount of wages paid in one year for additional hands is \$729,000. I also find that in the small town of Dundas seven or eight new factories have been established, employing 903 hands; in Galt, about a dozen, employing 734 hands; in Hespeler, where, previous to the National Policy, there were two or three miserable factories, employing 105 hands, there are now 627 hands employed. Here is a statement regarding cotton factories, showing that previous to the National Policy they were employing 2,150 hands, they are now employing 8,600; and a man told me in the lobby just now that in the Acton Glove Factory, a factory that was languishing under the late Tariff, the wages paid have increased 15 per cent., and they are employing 140 hands instead of 40. I hope that answers the question of the hon. member for Gloucester as to whether there are any new factories or not. Well, the hon. member for Gloucester is a very sympathetic man too. He thinks that if this National Policy has done any good to the laboring man, whose face, he says, it has ground, and whose means of living it has taken away, he should like to see it. Here are his own words:

“I doubt if any hon. member of this House has heard of an instance where any one of these manufacturers, after the National Policy had gone into operation, or even after he had begun to experience its benefits, had, of his own will and motion and out of a sense of justice, called his men together and said: ‘I am making more profit to-day by reason of the National Policy, the cost of your living has increased, and, as a matter of justice, I think I will admit you to a share of these profits and increase your wages.’ If any such instance as that has occurred in any part of this Dominion, I think it would be well for the sake of humanity, and especially for the sake of such humanity as exists amongst manufacturers of the class we find mentioned by the Commissioners appointed by the Government, that it should be widely known.”

Well, Sir, I just looked around and I found in a newspaper in the reading room this small local paragraph, relating to an iron founder in Guelph, belonging to Mr. John Crowe:

“Advance in Wages.—Mr. John Crowe called the moulders of his establishment in a body into his office the other day, and informed them that he had decided to make an increase of 25 cents a day in their wages. Several of the employes expressed their satisfaction to Mr. Crowe for the liberal increase paid. The wages now range from \$2.00 to \$2.25 per day.”

I hope that will satisfy the hon. gentleman. The next position he takes is, that without the National Policy the market could be kept for agricultural implements, waggons, carriages, etc., in the Provinces, and also in Manitoba and the North-West, by opening up the territory and rendering it accessible to them as it was previously to the American manufacturers. What does the hon. member for Gloucester mean by that? Does he mean that, without this protective policy, we would have kept the market of the North-West for our own people? If he does, I can answer him also on that point. The real policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side was to let the wealth of the old Provinces be poured out to create that magnificent new country, and then to furnish it as a market to the American people. The policy of the Government is that, while we are spending our wealth to open up this magnificent territory, it should be retained for those who created it, and not be given away to add to the wealth of the neighboring Republic; and it is a good and sound policy, and one that will commend itself to the good sense of the people of this country. In his tour in the east, at two or three places, the hon. member for West Durham stated openly that the natural market of the people of the Maritime Provinces was not with Ontario, but with the United States. The hon. member for Gloucester, I think, denied this the other day, but it is true nevertheless, because I have the papers here, supporting hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, which reported it. The hon. member for Gloucester will not deny it now, I fancy. That was stated in a speech at New Glasgow, and in another at Prince Edward Island; and that shows conclusively that the policy of the other side of the House is, that we should create that magnificent territory in the west, and then hand it over, lock, stock and barrel, to the United States. But the hon. member for Gloucester goes a little further than that. He says:

"I can assure hon. gentlemen that if they expect the support of many carriage makers they will find themselves as woefully mistaken as I hope they will be in other predictions they make."

well, I had a conversation the other day with Mr. Speight, the great carriage maker of Markham, who has the highest reputation for that kind of work in the Dominion of Canada. In fact, I think I am right in saying that the Government, in asking for tenders for carriages, require them to be made up to the standard of the Speight waggons. He has also the contract for making Herdic coaches for Canada. He has been a Reformer all his life. He had been telling me how he was able to sell his waggons and carriages cheaper than before, and he said: "The country under this National Policy is so much more prosperous that I get better pay and do not make so many bad debts, and I get large orders from the North-West mostly, and I know exactly what I am making; and I would sooner do business in that way than peddle my waggons around the country." I asked him: "Could you have retained that trade in the North-West if you had not this protective policy?" "No," he said, "the Yankees would have run us out of the land." He did not tell me himself, but a number of gentlemen told me, that after I had been talking to Mr. Speight on this subject, he announced before a large number of people that so important did he consider the National Policy to this country that, as a duty to himself, to his country and to those invested in manufactures and to the number of workmen he employed, he was determined to support the National Policy at the next election; and, therefore, I am able to tell the hon. member for Gloucester that one carriage-maker, and one of the most important in the Dominion, is going to support me and the Government at the next election, because he considers it to be his duty to support the National Policy. The hon. member for Gloucester goes on for a certain time longer and again returns, and says over again substantially the same thing he said about the factories, and wants to know where the new factories and new industries are. I

have answered the hon. member once before when he made that portion of his speech before. There was no necessity to duplicate the speech, and I do not see any necessity for duplicating the answer and again reading the list of factories. The hon. gentleman, as he, running out of topics, again returns to his attack on Montreal, and declares that the value of property is depressed, the people are poor and miserable and unhappy, and are leaving the country, and in fact they are in a very bad condition altogether, I have asked substantial citizens of Montreal whether the hon. gentleman is correct in this aspersion on the character of the city, and they reply that it is utterly false and untrue, that the people are more prosperous, more money is being made, more houses are rented, and business generally is more active and prosperous than it has been for a decade; and they further say that the citizens are more thankful and more prayerful than before; they are thankful that hon. gentlemen opposite were turned out of office, and they pray every day and night it may be long before they return again. Then, the hon. gentleman's speech covers a couple of columns on the low rate of interest. I referred to that before, but it is a subject so important that I may be excused for referring to it for a moment. I will be borne out by every business man that there is nothing which marks so much the prosperity of Canada as when money is plentiful and rates of interest low. If that be not correct, I know nothing of these things whatever; that is the way I have been taught. So I say we now find that, instead of money being used in buying mortgages and in shaving and discounting notes, it is used in manufactures which are intensifying and creating the wealth of the country. He says:

"The general improvement in business has caused an improvement in prices of produce, which enables the people to buy more articles and more dearly."

In this utterance, made in a loose sort of way, the hon. gentleman gives away the whole position, when he concedes that the farmers are receiving good prices, that the people have more money and can buy food at higher prices. That is what we want, that is what the people were hungering for—for the time when they would be able to buy, without feeling injured, the comforts and even some of the ordinary luxuries of life. The hon. gentleman goes on a little further, and again returns to the attack on Montreal. When I see this triple attack on Montreal, I cannot help thinking that at some time or other the citizens must have refused to hear some such a speech as the hon. gentleman made the other night, and if they did refuse they ought to be forgiven. Then he says that the National Policy, this creation of more money which has enabled the people to buy more goods at better prices and make themselves more comfortable, has only operated in favor of the farmer and speculation. I do not know what he means by that. If he means the ordinary trader, I conceive it has improved the position of farmers and manufacturers. If he means by speculators, men who are ready to go into legitimate avenues of business, I admit it has favored the speculator; but if he means by that term one who tries to live without working, but by shaving notes, then, on the contrary, the reduced rates of interest and the increased amount of money in the country have injured his position. The hon. gentleman, towards the close of his long harangue, became very feeling for the farmers. I think, here, at the end, I have got the key to the whole speech, the key to the action of his lifetime, and to the action of his political friends. They have been misled, I think, by his powerful brain, because he says that, at the last election, we cajoled and deceived the farmers of Canada; they have often cajoled me, but I cannot say I ever cajoled them, and if the hon. gentleman builds up his political future on his ability to cajole the people, he will find the farmers cannot be deceived, either by him or by his friends. The saying, "that whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad," I have

shown applies to himself. Here is another point which the hon. gentleman turned to himself. He says:

"They never trusted in the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the man who has been fooled once and knows it is not likely to be fooled again."

After long days and years of active agitation, the hon. gentlemen opposite got into power; the hon. member for Gloucester occupied the Speaker's chair, and, if report speaks truly, he did not lose by it. They succeeded in obtaining a large majority on account of the large and wide professions they made. They had stated, from every stump in Ontario and even from the shores of the Pacific down to the boundaries of the Maritime Provinces, that they were the most honest men on the face of the earth; that they were true Reformers, and if they got into power they would, like Jack Cade, put a towel in every man's pot. Well, the people of this country trusted in the promises of these gentlemen and will never put trust in them again; but will again confide the administration of public affairs to the present Government, which has fulfilled its pledge and brought the country into its present prosperous and happy condition. The last remarks of the hon. member for Gloucester, who was careful not to point out any particular places as an illustration of his statements, were that our Census were all wrong, that the people are leaving the country, that manufacturers are suffering and everything going to the bad, and that nothing would save the country from destruction but the restoration to power of himself and his hon. friends. I will, in a very few words, try to show the converse of these statements. At the last election, the people looked forward to those who were seeking their suffrages to devise some remedial legislation which would put the country in a better condition than it was in then, and the right hon. leader of the Government and his supporters promised that, if placed in power, they would endeavor to change the aspect of affairs. I ask you again whether this promise has not been fulfilled, whether, in the history of any nation, at any rate under institutions like ours, you have ever seen in so few years so great a change in the condition of the country, so marvelous a bringing about of a state of prosperity, happiness and contentment. It might be said of the hon. Finance Minister, as it was said of a statesman in a neighboring country: "He struck the rock of the national credit, and an abundant stream flowed forth." Under the management of the hon. member for Centre Huron, the public credit became a corpse, which he could not galvanize, much less get it on its feet, that it might walk. Yet, after all the success which has attended the efforts of this Government, these hon. gentlemen opposite ask to be again placed in office, in order that they may do away with the National Policy. I have that confidence in the common sense of the people, that I believe when the next elections come, come when they may, the Government will be returned to power with as large a majority as they have at present.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). We have been very much interested on this side of the House in the remarks made by the hon. member for East York. In fact, it is hard for me to say whether we are most impressed by the forcible argument which he presented to us, or the chaste and moderate language in which he couched his arguments, or the melodious tones of his voice. In fact, it is always a pleasure to listen to the hon. member for East York. He excels all other members of this House in his anxiety to take care of the Opposition. He sometimes singles out one member, sometimes another. This afternoon he has taken charge of two or three. The hon. gentleman first devoted his attention to the hon. member for Centre Huron, and was very much annoyed because that hon. member chose, acting on his own judgment, to change his political associates some years ago. The hon. member for East York,

Mr. BOULTBEE.

himself changed his political associates. I think the hon. gentleman was a Liberal at one time, though now working with Conservative party, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to have a little charity towards those who change their political opinions. I think if he claimed the liberty of deserting his friends and going over to the Conservative party, he should concede the same liberty to the hon. member for Centre Huron, and allow him to join the Liberal party. I am, however, quite satisfied with the exchange. I think we have benefited by it. I would be quite willing to exchange—should there be any more of the hon. member's stripe in our party, and I do not think there is another left—but admitting for the moment that there are any, I would be willing to exchange them by the dozen for gentlemen of the stamp of the hon. member for Centre Huron. The hon. member has found great fault with the hon. member for Centre Huron on account of The hon. gentleman seems to be a great authority on loans. He insinuated that the hon. member for Centre Huron put himself in a position to be personally benefited by the loan which he made in 1873-74. I cannot say that he directly insinuated that the hon. member for Centre Huron did benefit by that loan, personally, but he implied as much as he would dare to imply on that point, on the floor of the House. Such an insinuation is unworthy of the hon. member for East York.

An hon. MEMBER. Not unworthy.

Mr. ROSS. My hon. friend behind me says it is not unworthy. I will leave it so. Does he not know that the loan floated by the hon. member for Centre Huron, was floated in the same way as those floated by previous Finance Ministers? Does he not know that every insinuation and inuendo which he made in connection with that loan would apply equally as well to those made by Sir A. T. Galt, Sir John Rose and Sir Francis Hincks? Does he not know that these gentlemen, in floating loans, placed them on the English market at a fixed minimum rate, and no hon. members on this side of this House, to my knowledge, ever insinuated that these gentlemen were personally benefited by any loan they had made. Does he not know further that Sir Francis Hincks approved most cordially and in the strongest terms, of the loan made by the hon. member for Centre Huron, a few years ago. If the hon. member will allow me, I will read from the *Journal of Commerce* a quotation from an article written by Sir Francis Hincks, on that loan, it is dated the 25th July, 1879. Sir Francis Hincks said:

"It is about as unreasonable to attribute the success of the loan to the favorable influence of the National Policy, as it would have been to have attributed the failure to that cause. We confess that we are unable to discover the ground on which the *Gazette* infers that "the credit of Canada stands higher to-day in the London market than ever before." The test of the correctness of this opinion would be the comparative value of Canadian 4 per cents. and Imperial guaranteed 4 per cents., on the 4 per cent. debentures of New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Victoria, and Tasmania at the present, and at some previous fixed time. All the Colonies mentioned have 4 per cent. bonds in the market, and it will be found that, while they are generally higher than those of Canada, they have all shared the improvement in price caused, not by the National Policy, but by the abundance of money in the English market, consequent on depressed trade and want of confidence."

Here is the opinion of a gentleman who occupied the position held by the present hon. Finance Minister, who floated a loan in the English market on precisely the same conditions as the loans floated by the hon. member for Centre Huron, and who holds that that was the best way in which that Canadian loan could have been floated. He ought to know that the allotment of the shares when a loan is floated at a fixed price, is made entirely by the financial agents of the Government, in London, and that the hon. the Finance Minister has nothing to do with the shares allotted to those who may take the loan; and he might know, further, that the present Government has for ten years appointed the

Baring Brothers financial agents of Canada, in England, without power of revocation. So that, if any charge is made against the financial agents, in London, in connection with the loans floated by the late hon. Finance Minister, we have a complete answer in the fact that these men stand so high in the good opinion of the present Government, that they have been appointed our financial agents for ten years. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) has indulged in some very chaste and polished phrases, in the speech just concluded. I jotted down just a few of them, to which I will call his attention, though, perhaps, they were uttered in haste. In referring to the member for Centre Huron, he spoke of his conduct as almost exceeding that of "human effrontery." In alluding to the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), he spoke of the "incendiary position" which that hon. gentleman occupied. I think we have had enough of such language from the member for East York, and I will therefore dismiss the hon. gentleman from further consideration; I know any reference made to him is unnecessary. The position in which he stands, in the estimation of members on both sides of the House, does not even call for the reference I have made; but I thought it necessary thus to allude to him in brief. We have entered upon a very important discussion. The question before the House at present is, practically, shall the policy of the present Administration, in regard to the financial affairs of this country and its fiscal policy be sustained. The hon. Finance Minister explained, the other night, his Budget at great length. He spoke of our revenues and expenditures, and was followed later by the hon. Minister of Railways, who also discussed at considerable length a number of questions, to a few of which I will refer. First, he charged the member for Centre Huron with bringing down estimates in 1874 for \$4,000,000 more than the largest expenditure of the late Government. The hon. Minister of Finance will remember that by the obligations which he had incurred in 1873, instead of bringing down an estimate for \$20,900,000 he should have brought down an estimate for \$23,368,000. He will also remember that the ex-Minister of Finance, in the expenditure for 1873-74, kept within the estimate of his predecessor, and that the present Minister of Finance, exceeded the estimate of his predecessor. He will remember that, in that estimate of 1873-74, we had to provide for the very heavy obligations which were undertaken by our predecessors; we had the Intercolonial Railway in course of construction; we had the enlargement of the canals on hand; we had the obligations incurred in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, heavy obligations which it was necessary to meet in order to maintain the credit of the country. The hon. Minister of Railways, in dealing with the expenditure of this country, touched the question very gingerly. It will be within the recollection of many members of this House, how vigorously the hon. Minister of Railways denounced the expenditure of the previous Administration in 1878, how he took up item after item of our Estimates and charged us with extravagance, because, in some instances, there were increases. I will make a short quotation from his speech delivered on the 22nd February, 1878, when he said:

"Inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power, all we ask is, not that the taxation shall be increased, because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future."

This was the platform upon which the hon. Minister of Railways went to the country in 1878, and I was not surprised that, when he came to discuss the Estimates of his colleague, a few evenings ago, he touched the items of expenditure so gingerly. We had before us his promise,

made in 1878, and we had the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance in the city of St. John, when he declared that he believed \$22,500,000 were all that would be necessary with which to carry on the affairs of this country. I am not surprised, then, that when the hon. gentleman came to deal with the expenditure, he touched the matter so very carefully; and, if we just revert to the facts of this increased expenditure, this position will be made very clear. Let us look, first, at the entire expenditure, as contained in the Public Accounts during the last few years, and compare them with the expenditure of the last Administration, and with the Estimates proposed for 1882-83. The hon. Minister of Finance delights this Session in averages, not only averages in the matter of expenditure, but in the matter of trade. I will give him a few averages in the matter of expenditure. If the hon. gentleman will notice the expenditure for the Dominion of Canada, he will find that the average during the last two years of the last Administration, was \$23,511,229, and that the average expenditure of his own Administration during the last two years, was \$25,176,594, or an excess in the last two years over our average expenditure of \$1,665,365, or an excess over our last year of nearly \$2,000,000. Now, we can understand, from that simple fact, why the hon. Minister of Railways was so careful, in discussing the public finances, not to touch on the expenditure of this country. No doubt when he looked at the Estimates he was completely appalled, for these Estimates proposed, when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, as indicated by the Minister of Finance, an expenditure of \$27,600,000, or an expenditure of \$4,000,000 over the highest expenditure of the late Reform Administration. We pointed out in 1878 that during the first seven years of Confederation the Conservative party increased the expenditure \$10,000,000. They were upon the stool of repentance during the five years they sat in the cold shades of Opposition, and nobody suffered more during that time than my distinguished friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb). While in that position they promised reform, they cried *peccavi*. Place us in power again and we will reform the finances of this country, we will reduce the expenditure. From every platform, as well as from their places in this House, they declared loud and strong their allegiance to economy and to a careful financial management. Circumstances placed them in power, and we see now how much their promises were worth. From an expenditure of about \$23,500,000, such as we required in 1878, the expenditure of this country has leaped up to \$27,600,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for this increase. Let us go into detail. The hon. Minister of Finance boasts that he was able to reduce the interest account, I think, something like \$50,000 or \$59,000. He boasts of that as an astounding feat of financial ability. The interests of this country now are in very safe keeping, because we have paid this year \$59,000 less for interest than we paid the previous year. How did he accomplish this feat of financial ability? Was it by negotiating a favorable loan in the English market? Was it by raising the credit of this country until it exceeds the credit of the other British colonies? No; not at all, but because he was able to buy up a few 6 per cents. and substitute 5 per cents. in their places. He had not to go to the English markets to negotiate a loan; he had the money in the Post Office Savings Bank, and he used that money, and all there is to boast of in this financial feat is that he saves \$59,000. But let us look at the averages, for that is a favorite doctrine of my hon. friend, and it is a new doctrine, a new plank in the Conservative platform. This doctrine of averages simply proves that the hon. gentlemen opposite required on an average, during the last two years, \$760,981 more for interest than was required during the late Reform Administration. They required \$750,000 to be drawn annually from the pockets of the people to meet public expenditure more than the

late Reform Administration required, as a result of the hon. gentleman's management of public affairs. When we come down to the controllable expenditure—the expenditure which is particularly under the control of the Ministers—you will see how apparent the extravagance of the present Administration becomes. In speaking of controllable expenditure, the Hon. Senator Macpherson, in his pamphlet, says:

"This expenditure is as much under the control of the Ministers as the expenditure of your respective households is under your control."

Now, if this proposition is sound—and coming from a colleague of the hon. gentleman opposite, we must take it as of high authority—what follows? It follows that, these hon. gentlemen are particularly to blame for any increase in the controllable expenditure. It may be possible that, in the matter of interest and the matter of the collection of revenues, they might find some extenuating circumstances, but here their own colleague says that the controllable expenditure of this country is as much under their control—I use his own words—as the expenditures of their own households. Well, we find that these hon. gentlemen, during the last three years, have increased the controllable expenditure of this country by \$750,000. There is an expenditure that they might have prevented—so their colleague says—and is yet in their power, and yet it goes on in precisely the same line as the other expenditures of the country go on. Let us apply the doctrine of averages and what do we find? We find that the average controllable expenditure for the last two years is greater by \$439,913 than it was under the late Administration. And you will find this remarkable fact in connection with this point, that, whereas, under the late Administration, we were able to reduce controllable expenditure by \$1,750,000 in five years, and brought it down to the lowest point it had reached since 1875, the hon. gentlemen have gone on increasing it year by year, increasing it at a very rapid ratio, until now, as I have already said, the controllable expenditure is greater by \$750,000 than it was in 1878. Let us look at a few items of that controllable expenditure. Let me take the first item in the list, that of Civil Government, and what do you find under that head? In 1878, we required \$23,369 for Civil Government; the hon. gentleman required, in 1881, \$915,958, or an increase of \$92,589 in that single item. Perhaps they will say that the requirements of this country are such as to necessitate an increase under that head. Every hon. member of this House knows what are the expenses under that head. They are principally expenses of the Civil Service. When we read the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite in which they denounce the extravagant salaries paid the Civil Service during our Administration, and the increase in the number of officers in all the Departments, and when, in the face of these statements, we notice that in three years they have increased the salaries of the Civil Service—under the head of Civil Government—\$92,589, what are we to say of the pledges these hon. gentlemen made in the matter of economy? Take the averages, and you will find that averaging our last two years and averaging their last two years, the expenditure is \$89,000 greater during the present Administration than it was during the late Administration. And if we look a little further and ascertain the cause of this increase, we find that the expenditure for the service of several of the Departments has gone on increasing at a rapid rate. I wish to call the attention of the House to the increased appointments made by the present Administration in detail. Let us take, in the first place, the Department of Justice. In the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Railways in 1878, I notice that he denounces in very strong terms the expenditure under this head. In 1878, under the late Administration, there were thirteen persons in the Depart-

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

ment of Justice, and in 1881, there were seventeen persons. In 1878, we paid \$14,860 for salaries, while, in 1881, they paid \$19,451, an increase of about \$5,000 in that single Department. Take next the Department of the Interior, including the management of Indian Lands. In that Department forty men were employed in 1878, and, in 1881, the number was fifty-nine. In 1878, \$44,380 were paid in salaries, while last year there were paid \$63,515, an increase of nearly \$19,000 in that Department alone. Then take the Department of Inland Revenue. In 1878, there were on the civil list of that Department twenty-seven persons; in 1881 the number was thirty. In 1878, \$28,571 were paid in salaries; in 1881 the salaries were \$32,025. Then, in the Department of Public Works and Railways, over which presides the economical Minister of Railways, who said, in 1878, that they did not want as much money as hon. gentlemen opposite, because they did not require as much to carry on the affairs of this country. In that Department, with a single head, in 1878 there were thirty-one officers. In 1881, there were forty-nine persons. In 1878, their salaries were \$44,325, while, in 1881, they were \$65,722. Take, next, the Post Office Department, a Department which has had as many heads during the past year as some of the fabled characters of old of which we read.

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Senate had passed an Address to Her Majesty the Queen.

The Address was read as follows:—

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly, in our own name and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government. We were profoundly shocked, may it please Your Majesty, by the intelligence which was received by telegraph yesterday that an attempt had been made on Your Majesty's most honored and valuable life. We take the earliest opportunity of adding our congratulations to those which we are persuaded will come from our fellow-subjects in all parts of Your Empire, at Your Providential escape from so grave a peril.

We are deeply grateful to the Author of all Good for averting a dire calamity from Your Majesty's people, and thankful to Him that Your Majesty's life may still be counted among the precious possessions of Your devoted subjects. We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's reign may long be continued.

D. L. MACPHERSON,
Speaker.

THE SENATE,
Friday, 3rd March, 1882.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Address which has just been read from the other branch of the Legislature, will, I have no doubt, be unanimously concurred in by this House. It is not requisite, I think, for us in this House to expatiate on this subject. The feelings that pervades every portion of this House are the same that exists in every part of the Dominion of Canada—the most devoted loyalty to Her Majesty, the greatest respect for her virtues, domestic and public, the horror with which we have heard the news, and the great pleasure and delight with which we have learned that she has suffered no injury from the atrocious attack. It has been her fate, like other illustrious public persons, to have been the object of attack—some from a desire of notoriety, some from insanity; but I am glad to say, and we are all glad to know, that no political reason, no political cause of discontent, has been the moving cause for these outrages. Sir, without further remarks, and seconded by my hon. friend the member for Lambton, who, I have no doubt, will have the greatest pleasure in joining me in this matter, I move that this Address be now taken into consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I regret that the hon. gentleman has not asked the hon. leader of the Opposition to second this motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the hon. leader of the Opposition is absent from a cause which we all regret.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I thought he was in the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am informed that he is absent in consequence of a family affliction, or I would have asked him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, I could not refuse, under any circumstances, to second a motion of this kind. Our loyalty here is not merely in relation to our political connection, but it is to a great extent a sentiment. With every one who has had the pleasure of knowing anything of the virtues, high character and political wisdom, generally speaking, of Her Majesty the Queen, I could conceive of no greater disaster that could happen than a fatal issue of such an attempt as the one referred to in the Address, and which now has been made for the fourth or fifth time in her life. I am sure nothing would give Her Majesty greater pleasure than to know that every attempt of that kind has excited the horror and indignation of the people on this side of the Atlantic quite as much as amongst those who immediately surround her throne. Her Majesty's character has been such as greatly to elevate the whole tone of society in Great Britain; and apart altogether from the virtues which she possesses as a Sovereign, her personal virtues are such as to commend her as the first woman in the world to all who love an exhibition of the highest phase of domestic virtues. I have great pleasure in seconding the motion which the hon. Premier has made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that the whole House will second the address to be presented to Her Majesty the Queen. In the name of all French Canadians, I may say, that although our religious faith differs from that of our gracious Sovereign, yet we are second to none in our loyalty towards her. We have always looked upon our gracious Sovereign as an example to be held up for admiration, whether as woman, mother or Queen; and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province of Quebec and in the Dominion of Canada, wherever the French language is spoken, there is in unity with men of other nationalities, but one common feeling of horror on hearing of the attempt on the life of our Sovereign. I will not add a single word, but content myself with saying that I fully concur in the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the hon. Premier, and from those of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), whilst addressing this House.

Mr. Fiset. Mr. Speaker, I regret that our leader is not present to unite with the hon. Minister of Public Works, (Sir Hector Langevin), but he will permit me to say, in his absence, that we fully endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. Minister and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie).

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that this House do concur in the Address of the Senate to Her Most Gracious Majesty, and that the blank therein be filled up by the words "House of Commons."

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency be pleased to transmit, in the first place by telegraphic message, the joint Address of both Houses to Her Most Gracious Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Canada Mutual Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 56) to amend the Act forty-third Victoria, chapter sixty-nine, respecting the Anchor Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate "The Brant Loan and Savings Company."—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. Currier.)

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the New York and Ontario Furnace Company.—(Mr. White, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 66) to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intitled: "An Act to incorporate the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland," and the Acts amending the same.—(Mr. Shaw)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Bridge Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

THE BUDGET.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). When I was interrupted before six o'clock to enable the House to express its thankfulness for the happy deliverance of Her Majesty from bodily harm, I was discussing the expenditures under the head of Civil Government, and I was attempting to show that the tendency of the present Administration was to increase the expenditure of our Civil Service—not only to increase the number of officers, but the salaries as well. I was about to show that in the Post Office Department, the number of officers had increased from 109 in 1878, to 140 in 1881, and that the salaries had increased from \$90,704 in 1878 to \$110,990 in 1881. I might further show that this increase is not confined to the Departments already named. For instance, I find that in the Department of Marine and Fisheries the number of officers had increased from twenty to twenty-five, and the salaries from \$27,897 to \$30,597; being a total of 469 in all the Departments in 1878, against 537 in 1881, or an increase of sixty-eight officers, and a total of salaries, in 1878, of \$510,925, and, in 1881, of \$574,240, or an increase of \$63,685.

Mr. FARROW. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he takes into consideration the extra clerks?

Mr. ROSS. I assure the hon. gentleman that I have taken into consideration the extra clerks and all the extra services, and if the hon. gentleman knows better, he will have an opportunity to show what he knows on the subject. I was going to say that one of the charges brought against us in 1878—in fact during the whole continuance of our Administration—was, that in the Civil Service there was an enormous increase, both in the number of officers and the salaries paid to them. A distinguished Senator in speaking of the salaries of officers under the late administration said:

"We have evidence in the statement I have read, of waste—corrupt waste—because I fear the increased expenditure is owing to the unnecessary employment of favorites—the sons, nephews, and cousins of political supporters at the public expense."

Sir, if I chose to retaliate, if I chose to examine the Public Accounts, and select from the host of names that are to be found over the various pages of those accounts, I think I could show that that charge, so far as we were concerned, was entirely unfounded, but that, in the present instance, any hon. member who desired to make a charge of that character could make it with perfect safety, for there is scarcely a Minister on the Treasury Benches but has various friends of various degrees of relationship occupying important, influential and lucrative positions in the public service. I could give instances if it were necessary—instances where Ministers have three or eight, or even as high as twelve of their nearest and dearest in the public service, enjoying the advantages of those positions; and while those things are well known to every enquirer in to matters of this kind, still we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we filled the public offices with friends and relatives. I need not pursue this matter further. I have answered the challenge that we were not responsible for the increase in the Civil Service; I have answered that challenge and have made another—that hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible. I have furnished them with the facts and we will wait in patience for their denial. I take up the next Department of Government, Administration of Justice. Now, Sir, this was a Department that was very closely criticised by our opponents. They charged us with extravagance here as elsewhere. What do we find? The annual expenditure during the last two years of the late Government averaged \$565,285; the average for the two last years of the present Administration was \$579,134, an increase of about \$14,000 over our average, and the Estimates call this year for \$613,519. The same applies to the Immigration Department. We have an enormous increase, an increase of \$70,000 over our last year, and we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that when the Pacific Railway was under way, and when the vast territory of the North-West was handed over to the Syndicate, the Government of the Dominion would be relieved from the expense previously involved in the encouragement of immigration. The Syndicate has control of the North-West, full, free and ample control of our vast domain on this side of the Rocky Mountains; yet we find, in the face of these declarations, with these words fresh on the pages of the Official Debates, that the expense under the head of immigration is largely increased, and the Government is going to promote immigration, not for the settlement of their own lands, but for the lands of the Syndicate. Then pensions come under our view; we find a large increase in them also, over \$8,000 beyond our average for our two last years. Under the head of superannuations we find another increase; and let me call the attention of the Government to a fact or two in connection with superannuation. It is quite clear the system of superannuation needs consideration. I am not going to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with abusing the privileges of the Superannuation Act. I am not prepared to prove they have abused their privileges, I do not know whether they have or not; but this is an established fact on the face of the record, that the late Administration were able to manage the affairs of the country, and were able to maintain the efficiency of the Civil Service by superannuating only thirty-eight officers in 1878, and now we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite, in the last report, that they could not maintain the efficiency of the Civil Service in 1881 without superannuating seventy officials. The allowances which were made because of superannuation in 1878 amounted to \$16,857. Those hon. gentlemen opposite have charged the country with an allowance in connection with the superannuation to the extent of \$29,927. Sir, there must be something wrong in this enormous increase. I see by the Estimates that \$155,000 is asked for superannuation next year, an increase of nearly \$40,000 over the amount asked for in the last year of the late Administration. Why this anxiety to get rid of officers

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

in the Civil Service? Do you remember, Sir, how the hon. Minister of Railways denounced the late Administration for superannuating some officers who had attained sixty years of age? Look over the superannuation tables of the present Administration, and you will find men superannuated at a much earlier age than sixty. I have great fear that the privileges and powers conferred on the Government by the Superannuation Act are abused, and the attention of the House should be seriously directed towards providing a remedy in this particular. What is true of superannuation is also true of the militia service. I am not prepared to say that we are able, in this young country, to maintain ourselves in perfect safety without incurring a large expenditure under the head of militia. I have great doubts, however, as to the propriety of this House and country expending annually from \$600,000 to \$700,000 on this service. If it could be shown that this large expenditure was made for the special purpose of making our young men efficient in the militia service of the country, then there would be some justification for that expense; but we find that, out of a total expenditure of something like \$690,000, only \$157,125 were expended on the drill of our Canadian volunteers, the remaining sum of almost \$500,000 being expended in various other departments of the service. It is true this expenditure may be necessary as the service is now conducted, but it is to be deplored that, while the House votes \$700,000 in order to maintain the efficiency of the volunteer force, only about one-fifth goes directly into the pockets of those who give their time and energy in order that the force may be maintained efficient. I notice the hon. the Minister asks this year for a still larger estimate, I believe for \$750,500. This is an enormous amount, in the face of the expenditure made in that service by the late Administration. As with the militia, so with the Military College. An agitation has sprung up in the country recently for the abolition of that College. If the College was properly managed it should not be abolished, for I believe it serves a very important purpose in the Militia Department. I believe it can be said that it is exceedingly useful, and I know of no way of maintaining the militia force efficiently than by training thoroughly a number of our young men early to the militia service. But what do we notice in connection with the expenditure of the Military College. In 1878, it amounted to \$30,113, and, in 1881, to \$58,690; so that the cost of this institution—I do not speak slightly of it when I call it a little institution—has nearly doubled in the last three years.

Mr. BOWELL. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Bill establishing that College provided for an increase?

Mr. ROSS. Then, why do you ask the House to vote that increase?

Mr. BOWELL. The Bill provides for an increase in the number of the staff and other additional expenses which it is necessary to vote every year.

Mr. ROSS. Even admitting that, and I am not prepared to admit what the hon. gentleman says, because I do not know whether he is correct or not, that does not justify the increased expenditure.

Mr. BOWELL. Who established the College?

Mr. ROSS. We admit the establishment of the College, and that it was a wise act. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to repeal the law establishing it? If not, he is responsible for its existence and maintenance equally with us.

Mr. BOWELL. The Government is bound to maintain that College provided by the Bill introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ROSS. I defy the hon. gentleman to show by the Bill any reason for doubling the expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You have not read the Bill.

Mr. ROSS. I have not seen it since it passed the House, but I will stand corrected if the hon. gentleman can show me any clause justifying the increase. Does the Bill require that in three years we should increase the expenditure to \$30,000. In 1873, the staff of the Military College were paid \$13,946. I suppose the hon. gentleman will tell me that the Bill provides for the payment of \$30,751 to the officers and staff in 1881. Does the Bill provide for that? I wait for an answer and cannot get any. I find that, in 1878, we paid for non-commissioned officers, \$2,591. I suppose the Bill provides that, in 1881, we should pay \$5,579. We will see when this estimate is voted whether the Bill so provides or not. I say that expense requires to be justified. If we have established this institution in order to foster a military spirit among our young men so that they may, when required, be able to do efficient service for their country, we want it to be so managed that it will secure the moral support of the people. But, if the people find it is made an excuse for largely increasing expenditure or supplying places for officers that may not be required, the people will not look so kindly on a Military College as they do. In the inspection of insurance companies there is also an increase. In 1878, the late Administration were able to conduct this service with two clerks at an expenditure of \$3,412. Now it requires three clerks at an expenditure of \$4,424. I suppose this expenditure was also provided for in the Bill creating that inspection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who pays for that?

Mr. ROSS. The Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the insurance companies.

Mr. ROSS. The money is voted by this House, yet I suppose the hon. gentleman will justify it from his place. Let us take up the Department of Public Works. I find an enormous increase proposed in this Department. I see by the Estimates, that for this year the large sum of \$1,684,865 is asked, or an increase over last year of \$610,000. Now, I am free to admit that, when we can afford it, it is desirable for us to provide for the service in the various parts of the Dominion such buildings and conveniences as may be necessary, but there is something slightly suspicious in this item. I remember the hon. Minister of Railways the other night denounced the late Finance Minister very strongly for his anxiety to vote the sum of \$59,000 to a large corporation on the eve of the general elections. True, if voted for any political purpose it certainly was an outrage; but why this anxiety just now—on the eve of general elections, when the air is full of rumors that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to the country—to provide post offices, public buildings, Customs houses and such conveniences in small cities and towns all over the country. Look at the statements made in some of the towns visited by the hon. Minister of Public Works during his peregrinations through Ontario last autumn. But to return to the Military College, the Act for the establishment of which I have now in my hand. What is the clause in the Act to which the hon. Minister of Customs refers. The clause reads as follows:—

"The College shall be conducted under the superintendence of a military officer having special qualifications with regard to the instructions to be given, and discipline, whose title and designation shall be that of Commandant. There shall also be two other professors and instructors and such assistants as may be found necessary, and as may be authorized by Parliament. The salary of the Commandant to be not more than \$3,000 and of the other professors not more than \$2,000 each, all the staff of the College to be appointed by the Governor in Council and to hold office during pleasure."

I suppose the hon. gentleman will argue from that, that the Bill provides for the increased expenditure, when it dis-

tingently states these officers are to be appointed by the Governor in Council. I was going on to show how the hon. Minister of Public Works was regarded in some of the towns of Ontario, which he visited during his peregrinations. I noticed he paid a visit to the town of St. Thomas, that he was banquetted there, and that they had a very high personal regard for him. In fact, I think the hon. gentleman was banquetted in almost all our little towns and cities in Ontario, and in each he took occasion to speak very frequently of the compliment paid him by Her Majesty in making him a Knight of St. Michael and St. George. Here is what Mr. Charles Rowe said at the banquet.

"He said he wanted Sir Hector Langevin to understand that St. Thomas was the exact spot for a \$75,000 post office. He said that the people of St. Thomas supported the Conservative Government, but they wanted a *quid pro quo*, and suggested that a fine post office and Custom's office would fill the Bill."

Personally, the city had a high opinion of Sir Hector, but they wanted a post office and Customs' office out of him. The high personal opinion they had of the hon. Minister of Public Works was evidently a small matter compared with the *quid pro quo*, a \$75,000 post office and a Customs' office. Now, I think that is a *quid pro quo* which the hon. gentleman understood very well, and I think it will be seen that he understood how to make the best of his opportunities. One thing I understand quite well, and that is that the Estimates are exceedingly large. There is scarcely a little town or city at which he was banquetted but which receives an appropriation of from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for public works of various kinds. I am not prepared to charge the hon. the Minister of Public Works with having made use of his position in order to strengthen his friends politically; but these peregrinations and appropriations have a very significant look at the present juncture. The hon. gentleman's estimates seem to be got up upon the principle, that wherever he thought it necessary that appropriations should be made, for what reason I am not prepared to say, the appropriation is made accordingly, and the Estimates tell the tale. Let me take up another Department—expenditure on behalf of the Indians of the North-West. I cannot understand how that expenditure has increased so enormously. The average during the two years of the last Administration, was \$361,549, and the average during the two years of the present Administration, is \$799,800, an increase of nearly \$500,000 in three years; and now the hon. the Minister of the Interior asks \$909,309, an increase of 300 per cent. over the expenditure of the late Administration. Then we come to canals, under the Department of the Minister, who takes a very great interest in public works. The late Minister of Public Works was charged with mismanaging our canals, and what do we find in looking into the Public Accounts? Just this: that under his management they yielded a profit of \$31,252 over and above all expenses. But under the magnificent management of the Minister of Railways they are now conducted at a loss of \$5,180, or a margin of \$30,000 odd on the wrong side in three years. You will notice still further that this increase of expense is largely in the matter of salaries. I find there is an increase in salaries on all the Canals—on the Welland, St. Lawrence, Chambly, and Ottawa and Rideau. The total paid for salaries in 1878 reached but \$29,880, and, in 1881, \$31,092; and this was the outcome—not with an increased trade, but with a reduced traffic on the Canals. There would be some justification for this increased expenditure had there been increased labor; but there was a reduced amount of labor, so that the enlarged expenditure cannot be justified on any ground. In the Excise Department the same increase, the same extravagance, appears. In 1878, the late Administration were able to manage this Department with but 191 employees, while, in 1881, the present Government required 199. In 1878, the salaries paid were \$174,272, while, in

1881, the amount reached \$189,529, or an increase of \$15,257. And this increase, which extends to the service as a whole, extends to it in detail. I will give but one other instance: Take the Inspection of Gas—not an expensive Department of the Inland Revenue Department, but one that has been peculiarly managed. In 1878, the salaries came to \$7,000; in 1881, \$8,797, or an increase of \$1,700 in that Department alone. In 1871, it required seven officers to conduct the inspection; in 1881, fourteen were wanted. In 1878, something like 4,454 meters were inspected; in 1881, but 2,895, so that you see there again a large increase of expenditure with a reduction of the amount of work to be done. I must also investigate in the same line the Post Office expenditure, the outside service; and I am free to say that any reasonable expenditure in that line would be readily supported by members on this side. We are anxious that all parts of the Dominion should be favored with the greatest facilities for communication in that way. Let us see where the increase took place. Here is a fact which cannot be gainsayed: The increase in the cost of the conveyance of the mails last year amounted to \$43,792; increase in salaries and allowance, \$110,788; and the Estimates this year is for over \$2,018,900. If this increase had taken place in affording better facilities for the people, nobody would object. The people of the country must have their mails, and must pay for them. But the increase for affording postal facilities was very small, indeed, compared with the enormous increase in salaries and allowances. Nor can it be argued that it took place for the extension of mail facilities in the North-West. For the extension of mail facilities only \$24,693 more were absorbed than in 1878; and we are willing to allow every additional increase for mail facilities, as I have already remarked. Yet here we have an enormous increase in the Post Office Department which cannot be justified. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite will claim that the revenue has increased. If it has, who deserves the credit? Have they done anything to increase it? Is this not a natural increase arising from the increased number of newspapers published in the country—arising from increased facilities for the dissemination of information and so forth. We have here the plainest evidence of extravagance in the Post Office Department, under the head of salaries and allowances—of an expenditure increasing far more rapidly than that affording increased mail facilities for the people. I have now gone over, not only the gross expenditure for the Dominion since 1878, but have looked over its details in some departments, and I am bound to say no party ever attained power, having made such strong pledges of economy, that violated their pledges more persistently than the hon. gentlemen opposite. Where the late Administration were able to manage the affairs of the country for \$23,500,000, the present Government asked \$27,600,000; and where the controllable expenditure was reduced by the last Government \$2,000,000 in five years, the present Ministers have increased it already \$750,000. Where the late Administration were able to conduct the Civil Service with a certain number of officers, these hon. gentlemen have increased that number; as also the amount of salaries. So that, on the whole or in detail, the service shows extravagance prevails in every department. The country will hold the hon. gentleman opposite responsible when the day of reckoning comes, and the sooner the better, and the verdict ought to be one of condemnation against them. I come now to another subject, the coal question, and, respecting it, permit me to say that I never heard the hon. Minister of Railways address his own followers with so many evidences, on their faces, of the feeling that they discredited every word he said. His remarks had little or no effect on this side of the House, but I think that they had even less effect, if possible, on his supporters on his own side. Why? Because the hon. gentleman was inconsistent with

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

himself and his colleagues in every stage of his argument. Does not the hon. gentleman know that one of the distinguished colleagues with whom he is associated was opposed entirely to the duty on coal? Why was that gentleman opposed to the coal duty? Because he knew that the people of Ontario had to pay this duty on coal. Then there was another hon. gentleman, a colleague of the hon. Minister of Railways, who was a little more modest than the acting Minister of the Interior, who was not prepared to say that the people of Ontario paid the whole duty on coal, but he believed, in his modesty, that the people of the United States paid about half of it, and that the people of Ontario paid the other half. It remained for the hon. Minister of Railways, who is prepared to rush in on every emergency, to make the bold assertion that the people of the United States pay the whole duty on coal. The hon. gentleman was inconsistent with his colleagues, and he was inconsistent with himself. A few months ago, in Pictou, he said that 1,500,000 of Ontarians paid \$400,000 of a duty on coal. And that, by the payment of that duty the people of the Maritime Provinces were relieved, to that extent, of the burden of taxation. He said, as his colleague stated the other night, that by reason of the duty the manufacturers of Ontario were placed at a disadvantage as compared with the manufacturers of the Maritime Provinces. So the hon. gentleman is inconsistent with himself in this matter of the coal duty. He stated in a meeting in San Francisco that the duty upon coal was imposed contrary to the laws of nature, contrary to the free interchange of products between the two countries, and it was a duty that ought to be abolished. The argument of the hon. gentleman amounted to this, that we paid no duty upon coal, because at competing points the Americans, in order to get the Canadian trade, reduced the price of American coal, and consequently, we got coal the extent of the duty lower. Now, if this argument be true, what advantage is the coal duty to the people of the Maritime Provinces? The duty was placed upon coal in order that the coal of the Maritime Provinces might reach the Province of Ontario. But if the people of Ontario get the coal less the duty, then the people of the Maritime Provinces have no advantage because of the coal duty, and consequently it is a fraud on the face of it, and the hon. gentleman was himself the first man in this House to point out distinctly to the people the character of the fraud he had perpetrated upon them when he proposed that duty. Let me take another line of argument. If that line of argument applies to the duty on coal, it will also apply to the duty on breadstuffs. Now, the producers of Ontario send breadstuffs to the competing markets of the Maritime Provinces, markets that compete with the breadstuffs imported by dealers at Halifax and St. John; yet the hon. gentleman tells the people of Ontario that, because of the duty on breadstuffs, the Canadian farmer gets a higher price for his breadstuffs in the markets of the Maritime Provinces. But here again the argument based upon the principle of competition comes in. When we send our breadstuffs to competing points such as St. John and Halifax, the Americans, on the same principle as they deal with us in the matter of coal, will deal with us in the matter of flour, and they will send their flour to these competing points in the Maritime Provinces and sell it there, less the price of duty, and then the advantage which we derive from the duty on breadstuffs is thrown to the winds. That is the line of argument the hon. gentleman pursues. So, not only is the coal tax valueless as a protection to the coal producers of Nova Scotia, but the bread tax is equally valueless, in the line of reasoning taken by the hon. gentleman himself, as a protection to the producers of breadstuffs in Ontario. But the hon. gentleman says that the Americans, in sending their coal to the Canadian market, sell their coal to the

Canadian consumers cheaper than to their own consumers. I have here a letter from the agent of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railway Company, in which he says :

"When prices are fixed for Canada, no reference whatever is made to your duty, nor is it talked about or thought about."

So the American coal dealers, in sending their coal into Canada, neither think nor talk about this wonderful coal duty of which the hon. gentleman has made so much—or, I should say, so little. Then the hon. gentleman said that the duty does not increase the price of coal. Hear what the Treasurer of Ontario said upon this question a few days ago in his Budget Speech :

"It is well known to this House that the Province of Ontario requires a large quantity of coal for her public buildings such as the Parliament buildings and the various charitable institutions of the Province. The average price paid for soft coal by the Government of Ontario in 1874 to 1879 was \$4.25 per ton; in 1880 and 1881 the average paid was \$5.09 per ton, or an increase on soft coal of 84 cents per ton.

Now, I do not say that the duty on coal has increased the price 84 cents a ton; but there is the fact that the Province of Ontario, who purchases large quantities of coal, and generally by contract and getting it at bottom prices, is paying from 84 cents per ton more for their soft coal than in 1874 or subsequent years. For hard coal the price paid from 1874 to 1879 was \$5.12 per ton; in 1880 and 1881, the price paid was \$5.81 per ton, or an increase of 69 cents per ton. There we have again the fact that both for hard and soft coal Ontario is paying to-day a higher price than before the duty was imposed; and the taxpayers of that Province, as distinct from the taxpayers of the Dominion of Canada, are burdened with that additional expense. So much for the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways. I wish now to call attention to two or three remarkable statements made by the hon. the Minister of Finance. The first statement to which I wish to call your attention, is the pride with which the hon. gentleman introduced his Budget, the gush in which he indulged over the prosperity of the country. How it warmed his patriotic heart. He looked all over Canada from the Pacific slopes to Prince Edward Island, and he saw prosperity throughout all our borders. All our homes were happy. Happy, why? Because Providence had smiled upon us? No; but because the Minister of Finance had smiled upon us, because of the National Policy which he, with the assistance of five or six others, had incubated a few years ago, was introduced. All this happiness arose from the National Policy. Sir, I had the honor to sit in this House in 1873; we had the same gentleman for Minister of Finance but we had no National Policy then—it was not heard of then—and yet the same Minister of Finance indulged in precisely the same sort of gush, only, if anything, a little more gushing. Let me read what he said then :

"Looking at the history of the country during the last five years with reference to its trade and commerce, its navigation, its banking institutions, its tonnage and exports and imports, I find that every aspect from which I view it I rise from the enquiry feeling the greatest possible encouragement, not only with reference to the past but with reference to the future."

Then we had no National Policy, the duties were 15 per cent. "But we had the same Minister of Finance," I imagine I hear him say. He goes on :

"First, let me draw your attention to the marvelous and wonderful increase in the capital invested in the banking institutions of the country during that period; and next, to the extraordinary increase in the deposits in the banks of the Dominion."

Are not those the same sentiments that rang so eloquently through this House a few hours ago?

"Nothing could show more satisfactorily the increase in the wealth of our people than the facts to which I am about to direct attention. Let me first refer to the paid-up capital of the banks for 1867, and, as I do not desire to weary the House, I will not give the figures for the intermediate period. The paid-up capital of the bank in February, 1867, was \$28,692,980; and at the same period in 1873, it was \$49,189,969;

the deposits in 1867 were \$26,103,004; and, in 1873, \$59,560,003, thus showing a net increase in the ordinary banks of the country, including savings banks, of nearly \$37,000,000 within the space of five years; and an increase of paid up capital of the Banks of Ontario and Quebec alone (the banks in the other Provinces not being included as they have not sent in their returns) of \$20,497,000."

The same gush, the same basis for gush, the same prosperity without the National Policy, with a Tariff of 15 per cent., brought about by natural causes. Why was not the hon. gentleman candid enough to tell the House that the causes of the country's prosperity and the abundance within our borders was the same in 1881 and 1882 as it was in 1873, viz., the productiveness of our farms and the products of our forests and our fields which we were able to send to foreign markets? There is another remarkable statement which the hon. gentleman did not make, and that is, he made no allusion to the balance of trade. Last year this was the principle stock in trade of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman boasted that by means of the National Policy he had brought about the balance of trade. Who killed Cock Robin? was about the language of the hon. gentleman last year, in the matter of the balance of trade; but we are not asked this year, who killed Cock Robin. This year he is not dead. We have a different state of affairs altogether. Not only did the hon. gentleman boast, in this House, of bringing about an equilibrium between the exports and imports last year, but he boasted of it in the country. When surrounded by his friends and enthusiastic admirers—and I don't wonder that they admire him, because he is exceedingly ingenious—at the great Conservative Convention in Toronto, in November, he stated, amid the cheers and applause of his associates :

"For the last few years we had imports averaging \$20,000,000 a year, over and above exports. During the last two years we have nearly equalized our exports with our imports. Whatever people may say our people cannot understand the theory that the larger the excess of our imports over our exports, the more prosperous is the country. We say that as with the individual so with the nation, that if he expends more than he receives, poverty stares him in the face."

Now, "our people" cannot understand it, and I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance understands it. I do not know that I understand it myself, I frankly confess. The hon. gentleman, however, seems to agree with both sides, because he sometimes speaks on both sides. "With the individual so with the nation, that if he expends more than he receives, poverty stares him in the face." This is the outlook. We spent eight millions more than we received last year, and therefore, to use the hon. gentleman's words, "poverty stares us in the face." "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." But that is not the only time when the hon. gentleman expressed views on this question of the balance of trade different from those he holds now. His views change according to circumstances. He had views on this question in 1873. I have his Budget Speech here, and this is an exceedingly valuable and interesting deliverance, from which I will read a word or two :

"Let us for a moment look back to the history of the past five or six years and it will be found that during the first five years of Confederation there appears to have been an excess of imports over and above exports of \$60,000,000, or \$12,000,000 a year. I know it is very natural for persons looking at this subject cursorily to suppose that this cannot but lead to financial embarrassment, but let us examine into the matter. Here we have something like \$12,000,000 a year excess of imports over exports. Add to that the debt of the Dominion, payable in London, \$4,000,000 more, and we have \$16,000,000 a year to be provided for, which our exports do not appear to cover. But if we look into the matter more carefully we will arrive at the conclusion, and the just conclusion, that there are no good grounds for apprehension."

That was the condition of the hon. gentleman's mind in 1873 when, as he says himself, he examined into the thing very carefully, when he examined it not cursorily; and he found there was no ground for apprehension, although he found a balance of \$12,000,000 against us. So we have here a distinct contradiction between the hon.

gentleman's views in 1873 and his views at the present moment. We heard nothing about the balance of trade this year, probably because the hon. gentleman examined the matter more carefully, and no doubt by this time he has come to the conclusion that the balance of trade is not of such serious consequence after all. But not only was the hon. gentleman alarmed about the balance of trade in 1878, but a colleague of his, a Senator, was also alarmed, and he told the people of Ontario, in the course of his perambulations through the country—for these hon. gentlemen moved about a good deal—that the balance of trade was a very serious thing. He said, in speaking of this matter in the county of Bruce:

"Under present circumstances, our importations are so large that all we produce and export is insufficient to pay for them, and for the interest on the Public Debt of the Dominion, and on other indebtedness—loans, provincial, municipal, and individual. The amount of obligations for which the country has to provide is greater than its value in products are sufficient in value to meet. The consequence is, we are going heavier into debt every year. The balance of trade against us—that is, the value of our imports over the value of our exports—for the ten years between 1868 and 1877 amounted to the enormous aggregate sum of \$236,000,000. Now, gentlemen, it is surprising that the country is not more depressed than it is to day under these circumstances. * * * * * The day of settlement has to come; it is inevitable. The individual indebtedness is largely extinguished through the Insolvency Courts, and a deplorable way it is of extinguishing debts. We know to what an extent it has been the case in the country of late years, and that a system of honeycombing is still going on."

These were the views of the present Acting Minister of the Interior, who was alarmed that the balance of trade was against us. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if there is anything serious in this balance of trade after all. I will not discuss this question, but it is well known that the balance of trade, in favor of the United States, last year, was large—greater than for many years back—that it exceeded, by \$90,000,000, the average for the last six years; consequently, I see no cause of apprehension on this score. We know, further, that the balance of trade has been largely against Great Britain for many years, and yet, notwithstanding this fact, Great Britain has been exceedingly prosperous. There was another statement made by the hon. gentleman which I must not overlook, and that is, that all the predictions which we made in regard to the National Policy had failed. That statement is frequently made; I have heard it before in this House; and I intend to examine it somewhat minutely, and see how much truth it contains. Now, what was our position in connection with the trade question in 1878? We admitted, in the first place, that there was a great depression; it was present to the minds of every one of us. But we knew that that depression prevailed not only in Canada under the 15 per cent. Tariff, but in the United States under a 45 per cent. Tariff; and that it also prevailed in England, in Germany, and in France; and our contention was that that depression would pass away as a matter of course. We held that it could not be on account of the low Tariff, because it prevailed under both high and low Tariffs; and we pointed out that the failures which we so much deplored in 1876, 1877, 1878, and 1879 were not among manufacturers mainly, but among traders. We pointed out, for instance, that in 1878 there were 112 failures among manufacturers, and 745 among traders; that the aggregate liabilities of the manufacturers who failed amounted to \$1,428,000; and the aggregate liabilities of the traders who failed amounted to \$14,737,000; so that the depression which prevailed in the country at the time did not press so heavily on the manufacturers as it did on the traders and other classes in the community. We pointed out further that under a 15 per cent. Tariff the manufacturers had been exceedingly prosperous. We had been able to quote the Minister of Finance that the country was prosperous in 1873, when a 15 per cent. Tariff prevailed, and we contended that in the natural order of things, when depression departed from other countries, it would pass away from Canada likewise.

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

Sir, were we deceived in that prediction? Has not the depression passed away in the United States, and yet the Tariff has not been changed one farthing? Has it not passed away in England and France, and yet no changes were made in the Tariffs of those countries? Depression or prosperity, as hon. gentlemen would admit if they had the candor, does not depend on Tariffs, but on causes entirely beyond the control of Ministers or Parliaments. We predicted further in 1878, that protection would damage the manufacturers themselves in the long run; and I am prepared to show that the Tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite introduced in 1879 is damaging the manufacturers. Our contention was first, that that Tariff would produce over-competition; and we will see if it does not in a short time. The indications are pretty clear that in the matter of cottons there will be over-competition. We contended that the home market would be over-crowded, because industries would be unduly stimulated as they were in the United States, and would overload the home market, and naturally bring about depression. We contended also that the protective Tariff would create monopolies. We shall soon see whether that is the case or not. It has been and is the case in the United States in very many instances, and the effect of this Tariff in Canada will also be in some instances to create monopolies, as well as to centralize wealth. But our great contention was that by a protective Tariff you would make production dear, and thus disable the manufacturers from competing in the markets of the world. Now, Sir, we have the most striking proof of the fulfilment of this prediction in the Trade and Navigation Returns which have been brought down by the Minister of Customs. What are the facts? In 1878 the exports of manufactured goods amounted to \$4,127,000, and in 1881 to \$3,075,000 a reduction of 25 per cent. in the exports of our manufactured goods in three years. To what is that owing? Hon. gentlemen will say that it is owing to the fact that the demand at home is so great that manufacturers have no time to export. But we find that this is a law of a protective Tariff—that in every instance in which the protective Tariff is introduced, its tendency is to diminish the amount of exports in the line of manufactured goods; and this is particularly striking in our case when we notice the form which this reduction has taken. For instance, in 1878 we exported to the markets of the world—that is, other markets than those of Great Britain or the United States—\$990,000, while last year we exported to the markets of the world, \$552,000, a reduction of 60 per cent.; and it is to be noticed that during the same time the value of the manufactured goods exported to Great Britain was reduced by \$1,000,000. Why was it that in 1881 we could not export as much manufactured goods to Great Britain as we could in 1878? Why, simply because the manufacturer of Great Britain was not handicapped by excessive duties on his raw material, while the manufacturer of Canada was. And this is true, as I have said, in every instance where a protective Tariff has been introduced. Take the United States, for example. In 1871, 77 per cent. only of the exports of the United States were agricultural produce, while, in 1881, 82½ per cent. were agricultural produce; that is to say, in 1871, before the manufacturers of the United States began to feel the full effect of a protective Tariff, they were able to export 23 per cent. of their total exports to the markets of the world, while, in 1881, under this fostering protection which was introduced in 1860, they were able to export only 18½ per cent. of their entire exports in the shape of manufactured goods.

Mr. PLUMB. I suppose they used them at home.

Mr. ROSS. And if you compare the effect of a protective Tariff in the United States with the effect of a revenue Tariff in England on the production of manufactured goods, what will you find? Let me state a fact or two, for the amusement, if not for the instruction of the hon. member for Niagara. In

1880, the United States exported \$9,418,000 worth of manufactured cotton goods, although they produced the raw cotton within their own domain, and within a few hundred miles of the factories of Massachusetts; while England, although it had to import the raw cotton from India and the United States, was able to export \$337,000,000 worth. In the face of that fact I ask, which is the more advantageous, a revenue or a protective Tariff?

Mr. PLUMB. I refer you to the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. member for North Norfolk can take care of himself as well as the hon. member for Niagara, and I will have great pleasure in handing the hon. member for Niagara over to the tender mercies of the hon. member for North Norfolk. Now, take the matter of woollen goods. Surely the facilities for the manufacture of woollen goods in the United States are equal to those in Great Britain. The entire export of woollen goods from the United States in 1880 amounted to \$216,573, while from England, under a revenue Tariff, which hon. gentlemen opposite denounce as unfair and unreasonable, there were exported \$86,300,000 worth of manufactured woollen goods. I might go over the whole list of manufactured goods and find the same result. Take copper goods: there were \$180,000 exported from the United States, \$6,200,000 from England; earthenware, \$82,000, from the United States, \$9,900,000, from England; glass, \$730,000, from the United States, with a very large protection, and from England, \$4,600,000. Pig-iron, with all facilities for mining, and the advantage of coal being near iron mines, the Americans were able to export only \$65,000, whereas England exported \$26,000,000. Take bar-iron, \$25,000 from the United States; \$11,500,000, from England. Railroad iron, with a protection of 128 per cent. was exported by the Americans, to the value of \$643,000, and by England to \$25,900,000. Of refined sugar, the United States exported \$1,700,000 worth, and England, \$5,600,000 worth. And the force of this argument will be still more apparent when it is remembered that a large supply of the imports of the United States, came from Great Britain. It was said that Canada, under a protective Tariff, would be able to manufacture goods more cheaply than similar goods can be manufactured under a revenue Tariff. But what is the evidence of the United States on that point? Last year the Americans imported, notwithstanding their protective Tariff of 38 per cent., \$25,723,000 worth of cotton goods, and of that quantity \$16,552,000 was from Great Britain. There we have the fact again that, notwithstanding the advantage which this so-called protection is capable of providing—notwithstanding, it is said, it will reduce the cost of production and cheaper goods to the consumer, England, under a revenue Tariff, was able to send over \$16,000,000 worth of manufactured cottons, into the markets of the United States, being \$6,000,000 more than the United States were able to export to all the markets of the world. The same is true of woollen goods. The United States last year imported \$37,250,000, of which \$19,338,000 were from English manufacturers. In the same way, out of the total imports of \$47,000,000 last year of manufactured iron and steel, \$40,000,000 were the product of English manufacture. If protection could do anything for an industry surely it could do something for the iron industry, when the protective Tariff ranges as high as 41 per cent. In the matter of leather manufactures, earthenware, glass, carpet and silk, the same holds good, although those various industries are protected, some of them as high as 59 per cent. Let me take the imports from Great Britain of two or three particular articles. From England the United States imported \$5,906,000 worth of cloths and cassimeres, and the Americans exported to England not a single dollar's worth, although this industry is protected by about 58 per cent. In shawls, protected by 53 per

cent., the imports from Great Britain last year amount to \$704,000, and not one dollar's worth was exported to England. Take dress goods: these were imported from England to the amount of \$8,719,000 worth, and yet the Americans were not able, with a protection of 58 per cent., to send a single yard of American dress goods into the English markets. Take carpets, with a very large protection, I suppose equal to that on other woollen manufactures, equal to 58 per cent.: they imported \$1,414,000 worth and yet the Americans were not able to send one dollar's worth of carpet into the English market. The same is true of iron goods. Take steel rails, with a protection, as I have said, of 128 per cent. The United States imported last year \$1,576,000 worth and \$2,223,000 of iron rails, and yet with that protection they were unable to send a dollar's worth of steel or iron rails into the markets of England. The quantity that was exported by the United States was sent to Brazil and other markets. Of cutlery, on which the protection is equal to 45 or 50 per cent., they imported from England \$1,076,000 worth, and were able to send to England the paltry quantity equal in value to \$1,286. These facts prove conclusively that the policy of the Opposition, a revenue Tariff policy for this country, is the true one. The evidence is strong, taking Great Britain as an illustration, that under that Tariff alone can manufacturers compete in the markets of the world. Why, the Americans boast of the rapid development of their country—boast especially of the vast development of their various industries; but in spite of the protection imposed on these industries in order to protect them, they are unable to compete in their own markets, or in the markets of the world, with what they call the pauper-labor of England, under a revenue Tariff. We also predicted that under a system of protection it would be impossible to distribute the burden of taxation fairly. The hon. Finance Minister, with the assistance of five or six others, incubated a Tariff which was submitted to the House, and announced it as a measure which would distribute the burden of taxation fairly. It was on the Statute-book one year, and was hailed by his friends as the most wonderful Tariff ever framed. It was in many respects wonderfully and fearfully made. But it did not remain in that form. Next year eighty-four alterations were made in the Tariff, and then it was a thing of rare beauty. Next year fifty or sixty alterations were made, and, I think, when this year's Budget was brought down there were something like 109 more alterations more; it being still more wonderfully and fearfully made. But does it yet distribute the burden of taxation fairly? I hold that it does not. I hold it is impossible for the wisdom of man to design a protective Tariff that will distribute the burden of taxation fairly. It cannot be done in the very nature of things; it is impossible. Why? Who were the men who assisted to frame that Tariff. Was it the consumers? No; but the producers. And while I do not charge one of them with selfishness, but yet being producers, they laid their claim before the hon. Minister of Finance, who, with his usual suavity, considered them. But were the consumers called into court? Not one; their case was never placed before the Finance Minister. We find in the Public Accounts an item of \$400 or \$500 to one Mr. Dunstan for advising the Minister of Finance as to the duties to be placed on sugar. But out of the 4,000,000 people in Canada who consume sugar, was there a single instance in which one of them was consulted as to how he should like the imposition of such a Tariff as would suit Mr. Dunstan. We know, from the history of the protective Tariff in the United States, that the burdens of taxation under their Tariff do not fall equally on the consumer. In the matter of wages alone, we find that since the protective Tariff in the United States, they have only increased 60 per cent., though the cost of living has increased 92 per cent., being a difference of 32 per cent. against the laboring man on that item alone. If the burdens of taxation under our Tariff fell evenly and fair-

ly on all the consumers, why this clamor from all parts of the country for increased salaries? Why is there such a vigorous appeal made to this House by our Civil Service for a bonus? Why did the Civil Service of Toronto memorialize the Government for increased salaries? Why did the Bishop of Niagara issue a pastoral letter to his Diocese advising an additional remuneration to his clergymen? If the hon. member for Niagara, were the Bishop of that Diocese, I have no doubt that he, in the kindness and generosity of his heart, would issue a similar pastoral letter. The ground on which the Bishop's letter is based is that the cost of living has materially increased. Thus we have an illustration from the very district in which the hon. member for Niagara resides, of the uneven distribution of the burdens under this Tariff. We predicted, as one of the incidents of this Tariff, that the burden of taxation would fall unequally on the farmers, who are one of the great consuming classes of this country. We said that it was impossible to protect the farmer, that any Tariff framed for his protection would fail in that object. Let us see if that proposition is not fully borne out. The answer made to it is that the National Policy will give the farmer a home market. Even if it did, I doubt if that would be a *quid pro quo*—to use the language of a friend of the hon. Minister of Public Works—for the burdens which it imposes. To give the farmer a home market, would necessitate a large increase in our population. If you look into the Trade and Navigation Returns, you will observe that the farmer had a home market in 1878, or, shall I say, a certain portion of it as he has in 1881. But for a surplus, the farmer in 1878 had to look to the foreign market for the consumption of his products. Well, the exports of agricultural produce, animals and their products have increased between 1878 and 1881, 52 per cent; that is to say, we had to find a foreign market in 1878 for \$14,019,857 worth of animals and the products, and, in 1881, for \$21,340,290. In 1878, we had to find a market for \$18,605,754 of agricultural products, and in 1881, for \$21,268,327. In that time, making all allowances for the increase of population, one would suppose that the National Policy, if it was going to produce its promised effects, would have given the farmer a home market in 1881. But what are the facts. Our population increased 5 per cent. during that time, yet the surplus we had to send to the foreign market increased 68½ per cent.; so that now we are sending 6½ per cent. more of our produce to the foreign market than we sent in 1878. Where, then, is the home market that was promised by hon. gentlemen in 1878. The hon. Finance Minister boasted the other night that he had added 24,000 operatives to our population. Did he say that he added them as immigrants or accessions from foreign countries? Had he done so he would have added something to the consuming capacity of our people. But they were not so added. I do not know that 10 per cent. of them were so added, so that, practically, we have had very little more added to the consuming population of this country in 1881, than the natural increase of the population would give, and the home market, therefore, supplied us, is practically valueless as a means for consuming our surplus produce. And supposing these 24,000 operatives had been imported—I do not use the term offensively—for the working of our manufactures, would they consume the surplus products of our farmers? Just fancy 24,000 individuals in addition to our population of 4,000,000 consuming the products of all the agricultural industries of this country. Here we have a magnificent illustration of what the farmer has received by the home market which was promised him. He has received the additional consumption of 24,000 individuals. But if you look into this matter in detail you will find this argument yet stronger. In 1878, we had to find a foreign market for 14,000 horses, in 1881, for 21,000 horses. In 1878, we had to find a foreign market for 29,000 horned

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

cattle; in 1881, for 62,000. Where are the operatives that were to swarm through this land and consume the farmer's productions? In 1878, we had to find a foreign market for 242,000 sheep; in 1881, 354,000. Where are the mutton-eating consumers that were to be introduced into the country to consume the farmer's mutton, beef, and other produce? We were told that the farmer would certainly get a market for his smaller produce. I think the hon. member for East York referred to the farmer going to market with a chicken and getting ready money for it now—something he could not do in 1878? Where was my hon. friend in 1878? Were there no chickens where he resided at that time? We have given him a new revelation which he thought worthy of recording on the floor of this House, namely, that through the National Policy a farmer, in 1882, can go to a Canadian market and find a ready sale for a Canadian chicken. Such is the full fruition of this National Policy of which the hon. member boasted so largely this afternoon. In 1878 we had to find a market for \$67,000 worth of poultry, and, in 1881, for \$133,000 worth of poultry—twice as much sold abroad, notwithstanding these operatives were coming to eat up all the chickens, not of the hon. member for East York, for he no doubt can do that himself—but the chickens of the Canadian farmers.

Mr. PLUMB. Is that "cackillation" right?

Mr. ROSS. I leave the hon. member to do the "cackillation," as I pursue this enquiry a little further. In 1878, where the people had to find a foreign market for \$13,000,000 of Canadian butter; in 1881, they had to find one for \$17,000,000. In 1878, a foreign market had to be found for 5,262,000 dozen of Canadian eggs; in 1881, for 9,000,000 dozen. I invite attention to these facts in order to show that the home market, that was to be supplied the Canadian farmers by the National Policy is a failure. Let us consider the question as to agricultural products. In 1878, we had to find a foreign market for 7,000,000 bushels of barley; in 1881, for 8,800,000 bushels. In 1878, a foreign market for 2,340,000 bushels of oats; in 1881, for 2,900,000. The same difference may be noticed in the item of peas, and almost the same with flour and in nearly all the other agricultural products of the farm. So that, in the matter of animals and agricultural products, and these, too, cover the produce of our Canadian farms, we find the National Policy has been so far a failure; that it has not supplied the Canadian farmer with a home market, but that now, as before, the Canadian farmer has to go into the markets of the world to sell his produce. We were also told that the National Policy would give the farmer a better price for his produce—that he would be able to sell it at an advance. The Minister of Finance, in 1881, I think, said that after investigating that matter very closely he could not see that the Canadian farmer got much of an advance for his wheat at certain periods of the year; but he believed, however, that in June and July it was very probable he would receive a small advance, but that when he had a surplus he did not believe the Canadian farmer got any advance. Last year we had a surplus to export of nearly 3,000,000 bushels, so that then he got no advance. In 1881, we had a surplus also, and exported 2,500,000 bushels. So that, in 1881, inasmuch as we had a surplus, on the reasoning and showing of the hon. Minister of Finance, the farmer could not have received any advance. Perhaps, however, there is something in the idea that the farmer would receive an advance in June and July, and for the reason that the Canadian farmers are nearly sold out during those months; and that if the millers of Canada had easy access to the American market, they could import grain without any difficulty, and pay such prices as the pleased in the home market. But if, as was done by hon. gentlemen opposite—if obstacles were

placed in the way of the Canadian millers importing grain, this would account for the advance during June and July. Let us take the average price of wheat during June and July for a number of years—the middle period, the 30th of June, the point between the two extremes for 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, during the five years of the late Administration—and strike an average and compare that with the average price during the three years of the present Administration. I take figures from the *Monetary Times*. Take No. 1 fall wheat: f.o.b.c., average price paid during the five years of the late Administration, was \$1.25 per bushel; during the last three years, \$1.13. No. 1 spring wheat, during the previous period, \$1.15; last three years, \$1.13, showing a decline. Barley, 72½ cents during the late Administration, 70 cents last three years; oats, 41 cents the five years, 37½ cents for three years; peas, 76 cents the five years, 71 cents for three years; wool, 30 cents the five years, 24 cents for three years. And this was an industry under the particular care of hon. gentlemen opposite. Butter, five years, 16½ cents; three years, 14 cents. Cheese, five years, 11½ cents; three years, 9½ cents. Now, as I have said before, these were the months of the hon. Finance Minister's own choosing. I have appealed to the record, and the evidence is against him. I do not know that it makes any difference whether it is against or in his favor. I do not believe it is sound reasoning to assume that the Tariff affects the price of Canadian wheat, because its price is regulated by the prices in Liverpool; but it shows the utter absurdity of his line of reasoning. Let me take the 1st of October during the same period, and show you the results. During October everybody knows that no American grain comes into Canadian markets. It would be absurd to suppose such a thing, as our granaries are full of Canadian grain, and our millers can get all they want at their doors. Yet, strange to say, the average price paid in October, when foreign grain cannot come here, was greater during the last three than during the previous five years. That establishes the point, if anything were necessary for that purpose, that the Tariff does not affect the price of grain, for at the very time it could affect it we found it was higher on an average during the five years when we were without a protective Tariff; and at the time it should affect the price grain was not higher, but was higher in autumn. Let me next refer to the price of grain in the American market, my few quotations being taken from the report of the Secretary of the Bureau of Statistics, Washington. In 1856, wheat sold in the American market, on an average during the whole year, at \$1.85 per bushel—that was at a time when there was no duty on imported wheat; and let it be said that that was the highest price paid for wheat from that year down to the present time, except in two instances, 1865 and 1868. Corn was sold in 1855 for 89 cents a bushel, and only five times since that year was it sold higher. In 1879, corn sold, notwithstanding the high duty on imported corn, at 47 cents. Beef sold in 1856 for 8½ cents per pound, and this price was only exceeded six times since; in 1880, it was sold as low as 6¼ cents, the same with butter and the same with pork. In 1856 pork was sold for \$9.70 per hundred, in 1874 it was as low as \$5.70, thus showing that tariffs do not regulate the price of produce, which is alone regulated by the price in the markets of the world. I think I have shown that the home market promised the farmer has been a failure, that the farmer has to send his products to the English market now as before. I think I have also proved that the price promised the Canadian farmer for his produce has not been realized, and that in every particular the farmer has to content himself with the results of competition in the markets of the world, or, rather, with the results which follow from the lowness of supply and demand, and that the Tariff will give him an increased price or improve the extent of his productiveness. We said again, in 1878, that even if the farmer got the protection promised him it would be no

equivalent for the burdens which it would impose upon him. Let me put this in a nutshell, if I can. You will see that, last year, we collected in Customs duties altogether \$18,500,000, and that \$123,000 were collected on farm produce. Now, it is the law of trade—shall I say, a law of political economy, that, as a rule, duties imposed on any article add that much to the cost of the article to the consumer. Assuming that proposition to be correct, the manufacturers of Canada have profited to the extent of \$18,000,000; for duties to that extent were levied on manufactured goods, while the farmers of Canada have only profited to the extent of the duties on bread-stuffs \$123,000. That is the reward they have received for supporting the National Policy, and, on the other hand, they have paid for manufactured goods some \$18,000,000 on the enhanced price, because the duty must be added, notwithstanding the logic of the hon. Minister of Railways, in the matter of coal, to the price of the imported article. The manufacturers, then, are protected to the extent of \$18,000,000 in the goods which they sell, and the farmers are protected by less than \$500,000; that is, for every dollar which the farmer receives in the form of protection he gives \$37 protection to others.

Mr. ROCHESTER. Would the hon. gentleman give us the average price of rye during the late Administration?

Mr. ROSS. I have not taken the quotations of rye.

Mr. PLUMB. He makes a wry face at that.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentlemen can discuss that question with rye himself. Our next prediction was—for I am following the predictions to which the hon. Minister of Finance refers—that any special advantage given to the producer would be a tax upon the consumer. Now, it is quite clear that the consumers, in every instance, have to maintain the burden of taxation. While that can be done under a revenue Tariff, and still justice be done to all, the proposition we put forth is that any special advantage—and that is the basis of a protective Tariff—given to the producer, is an undue burden to the consumer. I will give a fact or two in confirmation of that: in 1878, we imported \$7,000,000 worth of cotton, and paid \$1,250,000 in duties on those cottons; in 1881, we imported \$10,000,000 of cotton, and paid in duties, \$2,225,000 on these importations; that is to say, the consumers of cotton goods in Canada last year paid \$500,000 more for their cottons, than they paid under the Tariff of 1878. In the matter of books, we imported the same quantity in 1881, that we imported in 1878, and we paid \$67,000 additional duty. Is that no burden upon the consumer? In the matter of woollens we paid \$832,324 more of duties upon woollens we consumed in 1881, than we would have paid on the same woollens imported under the Tariff of 1878. This becomes still more conspicuous when you observe the rate of this duty. In the matter of blankets, the duty last year was 45 per cent., or an average of \$1.34 on every blanket imported into the Dominion of Canada. In the matter of flannels, the duty averaged 29 per cent.; hosiery, 27 per cent.; clothing, 35 per cent.; Brussels carpets, the average duty was 11 cents per yard; on carpets all wool, of a different grade altogether, the average duty was 22 cents per yard; in carpets partly wool, the average duty was 14 cents per yard; on unbleached cotton sheetings the average duty was 2½ cents per yard; ginghams and plaids, 3½ cents; denhams, drillings and ducks, 4 cents per yard. Now, who pays these increased duties? Evidently, the consumer. The whole tendency of this taxation, unfairly distributed as it is, is to impose unfair burdens on the consumer, and give special advantages to the producer. Now, we are willing to see, as we always have been, a large production of manufactured goods in this country, but we know that under a 15 per cent. Tariff, manufacturers pros-

pered, and many of them made their fortunes. Not a word need be said to disparage the manufacturing industries of this country. They are exceedingly important, as hon. gentlemen know right well. But we have two classes to consider, and while we consider what is fair to the manufacturer—we urge that we do consider what is fair to the manufacturer—we want at the same time to distribute the burdens of taxation fairly and honestly among the great consuming class. Another prediction we made in regard to this Tariff was, that it would discriminate unfairly against Great Britain; and I hold that prediction is fulfilled. Let us see. The average duties last year paid upon goods imported from Great Britain, was $24\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; the average duties imposed on goods imported from the United States, was $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Does not that discriminate against Great Britain? Is there not an increased duty of 2 per cent., on the average, on the goods imported from Great Britain as compared with goods from the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. Tell the House the excessive imports from Great Britain over those from the United States.

Mr. ROSS. I will leave the hon. gentleman to tell that. The average duty on dutiable or free goods from Great Britain was $20\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I have got here the fact the hon. gentleman wants. I call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Customs to this fact, that the average duty paid on all the goods, dutiable and free, imported from Great Britain last year, was $20\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and the average duty on dutiable and free goods imported from the United States, was $15\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; so that we have the same discrimination on goods imported from Great Britain, whether dutiable or whether dutiable and free.

Mr. BOWELL. If you import double the quantity from Great Britain that you do from the United States, of course the duty would increase, would it not?

Mr. ROSS. I made a statement; the hon. gentleman may correct it if it is wrong. The hon. gentleman can understand the difference between 20 per cent. upon dutiable and upon free goods from England and 15 per cent. upon dutiable and free goods from the United States, and if he cannot understand that it is a discrimination, then I cannot help it. I am simply making a statement, believing it to be correct. It remains for the hon. gentleman to disprove it when the proper time comes. We contend further, that the manufacturers under this protective Tariff are not as well off as under the Tariff of 1878. We proved that in the matter of their ability to export manufactured goods, and we can prove it more clearly in another form. Take this statement, and let the Minister of Customs notice its bearing. In 1878 we gave the manufacturers of Canada, \$31,000,000 worth of imported goods—principally raw materials; and we took from the manufacturers of Canada, the home market for \$53,000,000 worth of manufactured goods.

Mr. PLUMB. What were the said materials?

Mr. ROSS. I do not know whether they came from Niagara or not; but I state the fact, and I will repeat it for the benefit of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). I say that we gave the manufacturers the benefit of \$31,000,000 worth of raw materials free of duty; and we took from the manufacturers of Canada, the home market for \$53,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. Now, what do these hon. gentlemen do? They gave to the manufacturers of Canada, in 1881, \$19,000,000 worth of said material, duty free—or, \$12,000,000 less than we gave them in 1878. And so, under their protective Tariff, they have taken from the Canadian farmers, the home market to the extent of \$63,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. So that both in the question of raw material furnished the manufacturer, and in the relief of his home market, they would be better under the Tariff of 1878 than the Tariff of 1881. Besides, under this Tariff you bur-

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

den the manufacturer with \$641,000 in the shape of duties on his coal, which is a raw material to him. You burdened him with \$420,000 on breadstuffs last year; with \$87,000 on pig iron; with \$12,000 on the copper which he uses as a raw material; with \$14,000 on lead as a raw material, and you tax his unmanufactured marble, his paints, oils and varnishes—all his raw materials—while, at the same time, you have taken the home market to a greater extent. Why, Sir, the quantity of manufactured goods sold on the Canadian market to-day is greater by about \$12,000,000 than it was in 1878, so that the manufacturer has to pay more duty on his raw material, he is furnished with a less quantity, and he has more importations of manufactured goods to compete against. If that is not a disadvantage to the manufacturer, let the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) rise and explain. True, we can put a duty on the manufactured articles; true, we can impose difficulties in the way of their introduction into the country, but we have shown that, in the matter of promoting the introduction of raw material in order to facilitate the operations of the manufacturer, we have been much more liberal than hon. gentlemen opposite. Again, we predicted that the National Policy would damage our foreign trade, and our predictions in that regard have been realized. It is a fact, which hon. gentlemen cannot deny, that Canadian shipping is vanishing from our seas. Take the returns for 1878, and compare them with those for 1881. In 1878, we sold to other countries, ninety-three ships; in 1881, we sold only sixty-one. In 1878, we sold \$1,218,000 worth of ships built by Canadians; but in 1881, we sold only \$348,000 worth of Canadian-built ships; so that this industry is languishing. We were told, before the National Policy was introduced, that all the industries of Canada were languishing, but we have here an instance of hon. gentlemen trying to protect an industry, and the result has been to throw it into a decline. I think that under such a condition of things we must displace our Finance Minister, and that the hon. and able member for Niagara must put his hands to the helm and see if he cannot resuscitate this drooping industry. From 1873 down to 1878 the tonnage of Canadian vessels represented an increase every year—an increase in six years of 11 per cent., or 636 vessels and 259,297 tons. How has it been since? Every year a decline—a decline in three years of $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or 22,193 tons. This is an industry to which the hon. gentleman should devote his attention—an industry which requires his fostering care. In the United States protection has had the same results. We find that last year 82 per cent. of the whole foreign trade of the United States was carried on by foreign shipping, and only 18 per cent. in American ships. If protection could foster the commerce of that country, it has certainly had an opportunity, and as certainly has it failed. We warned hon. gentlemen opposite that by the introduction of this policy they would damage the commercial interests of the country. We warned them that if they interfered with our shipping they would interfere with our commercial and industrial prosperity. What can this country become unless we develop our commerce? We occupy a strong position on this continent, and it is only by fostering our foreign trade and improving the condition of our commercial marine that we can hope to take our true position amongst the nations of the world. We predicted also that the National Policy would not tend to the increase of our wealth, and I wish here to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a fact which is worthy of their careful consideration. It is contained in the last report of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington. Between 1850 and 1860—that is, before the protective Tariff was adopted in the United States—the wealth of the United States increased 126 per cent., while between 1860 and 1880 the aggregate wealth of the United States increased only 31 per cent. From 1850 to 1860 the

American people added \$226 to the wealth of each person, while from 1870 down to 1880 they lost 30 cents per head taking into consideration the increase of population. The United States furnish us with the best example of what a protective Tariff can or cannot do. Their example was a warning to us in the matter of shipping. It showed us that the shipping of the United States declined very rapidly under a protective Tariff, that every year it was reduced until now they do but a small portion of their own trading and carry on but a small portion of their own commerce. In Great Britain, on the other hand, under a revenue Tariff the commerce has been constantly increasing, year by year, until, as Gladstone said the other day at Leeds, England to day does 55 per cent. of the whole trade of the world, civilized and uncivilized. Surely, Sir, we have in this fact itself conclusive evidence of the comparative merits of the two policies. Now, Sir, what are the comparative positions of the two parties in this issue? We are charged with being enemies to the manufacturers of this country. Sir, we repudiate such a charge. We have evidence in the prosperity of the manufacturers under a revenue Tariff, that under a revenue Tariff prosperity is possible to our Canadian manufacturers. We have evidence under a revenue Tariff in England, that prosperity is possible without a protective Tariff. We have evidence in the rapid development of this country, and in the rapid rise of manufactories previous to 1879 that it is quite possible for this country to prosper under a very low Tariff. On the other hand, we have evidence that this Tariff is already doing its mischievous work, decreasing the capacity of our manufacturers to compete in the markets of the world, increasing the cost of production, and adding to the burdens of consumers. The Liberal party are prepared to do justice to all classes of the community. They do not pretend, like their opponents, to dispense peculiar nostrums, but on broad principles of fairness and equality they are prepared to dispense to every class of the community the justice they should receive under a fair fiscal policy, and prepared to extend to every class of the community such protection as a fair fiscal policy will enable them to extend. Hon. gentlemen opposite intend to go to the people of this country representing, as I have said, that we are hostile to the manufacturers. They will go to the country probably representing that the great prosperity which this country enjoys at the present moment is due to the National Policy. I have no fear, Sir, that these representations will be believed. I have no fears that the intelligent yeomanry of this country will be carried away by representations in regard to increased prices and increased advantages which they know they have not received through the National Policy. I believe the people of this country can look beyond the present, and can take a broad view of all the interests of the Dominion, and that they will support that party which is supposed to deal as fairly with one Province of the Dominion as another, disposed to support that party which will develop the commercial prosperity of this country, and not be carried with these partizan representations which lead men sometimes to tamper with industrial difficulties for which they are not capable of providing an efficient remedy. I am satisfied, Sir, that when this debate has closed, the country will be thoroughly informed of this matter, and that the Liberal party, true to their desire to develop the interests of Canada, as a whole, will see that the affairs of this country are entrusted to the hands of those men who never shrink from dealing fairly with all classes of the community, and standing by the interests of every Province of this great Confederation.

Mr. McLENNAN. The saying is attributed to Mr. Canning that nothing is more delusive than facts, except figures. I think we can improve upon the maxim. Prophecies, I think, we may say, are still more delusive; and I

am rather surprised at the temerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet it is not new. They remind one of a story that is told of a witness who was severely tested by counsel upon entering the witness-box—a female witness. She was asked if she were not afraid to hear false witness. "Never a fear," said the old lady. The picture that has been delineated before us to-night, the utter misery of this country, is very touching, that is to say, it would be if it were true. Among the unhappy victims it is hard to tell who are most miserable, the producers or the consumers. But there is a gleam of hope for them. There is another class, a small class, fortunately for the people of Canada—the shipowners are greater sufferers than all others put together. Well, this is a gleam of hope. I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman who has just sat down in all his massive figures, for the reason I have stated. But I would like to know, whilst all this evidence is to the fore, whether, in this difference in favor of the United States between an average of 15 per cent. duty and the duty of 20 per cent. upon goods from the United Kingdom—whether free goods and goods entered in bond that pay no duty are included; because, if they are, there is really no test, and it is one of the instances that go to prove how utterly delusive figures may be in a statement of this kind. You will remember, Sir, that the course which this debate has taken has been rather unusual. Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition were so determined that the Budget of my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, should be killed dead as a door nail, that it was attacked before its birth. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) made a motion the other day, for fear that this Budget should not be brought down in the course of the Session; but I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance has survived and has brought down his document—and a very good one it proves to be. Among the items which were discussed then was one upon which the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) has dwelt with a good deal of unctious, to-night, and that is the item of pig iron; and we were reminded of the difference of the exports of pig iron between one year and another. Well, it turns out that the export of Canadian pig iron amounts to the magnificent sum of \$179. But there is a feature in this question of pig iron that illustrates the difficulty of dealing with figures, and that proves that now, as in former times, two and two do not always make four—for the purposes of argument, I mean. The imports of pig iron in 1881 were \$716,000, and the consumption was \$715,000, leaving a difference of \$1,000; and yet we exported to the United States foreign pig iron to the value of \$321,000, so that, if figures were always accurate, for the purposes of argument, \$716,000 of imports have produced \$715,000 for consumption and \$321,000 for export. If anybody takes the trouble to look into the matter it is very easily explained, but these are the figures on the face of them. The value of the imports is the cost of the pig iron on which it pays duty; the value in its export is the value at the place at which it is shipped, and the whole question in regard to pig iron is merely one of carriage, a very important one to this country and to those unfortunate ships about which I may have something to say. There is really no pig iron manufactured in Canada for export. The manufacture at Londonderry has taken another form—it all goes into rolled iron—and no quantity has ever yet been manufactured for export. The small quantity of pig iron, amounting to \$179, was from Three Rivers, where charcoal iron has been manufactured for a good number of years, but it is a quality of iron that cannot be exported because the duty is too high, and the competition in the United States prevents it flowing in there. As to the question of ships, the sale of Canadian ships and the use of Canadian ships have declined for a very good reason. The commerce of

the sea has come to be done in iron ships chiefly, and in steamers. I find, by returns of the Harbor Commission of Montreal, giving a comparison from 1878 to 1881, that the proportion of tonnage in steamers had risen in those four years from 67 to 83 per cent., while in sailing vessels it declined from 32 to 16 per cent. And this does not represent all the difference. There is no full statement here of the number of wooden vessels, but everybody who has anything to do with shipping knows very well that wooden ships on the ocean are everywhere giving place to iron ships, and it is just as well known that we have not yet in this country reached the ability to manufacture iron ships, which is the simple reason for this decline in Canadian vessels. It is true our friends in the Eastern Provinces were told by some of the prophets who went about the country that there was yet hope of their wooden ships being again brought into use under certain circumstances. The fact is, that in this case the hopeful had to do with a matter as circumstantial as the waves of the Atlantic that, unfortunately for them, do not change. They had to deal with the change going on in the shipping trade of the world, and I am afraid it will be a very long time before our friends in the Eastern Provinces will see a change in the circumstances that will enable them to return to the building of wooden ships. I think there is more hope for them in the proposal which the hon. Finance Minister has made, of occupying their small vessels in the fishing trade. That is a field in which there is some room for them to extend, and it is one of the differences between a theory that has no base and that does not yield to circumstances, the system of hon. gentlemen opposite and the practical system of the hon. Minister of Finance. We have had a great deal of argument, and, I think, of unnecessary argument, as to what was said by Sir Henry Tyler on the subject of coal. I think this is very easily explained, and all Sir Henry Tyler said may be very fairly admitted without prejudice to any party concerned, because Sir Henry Tyler made a statement of fact connected with the consumption of his company, and the fact was this—I believe nobody disputes it—that in the half year ending June, 1880, the company had used 60,000 cords of wood, and during the half year ending June, 1881, only 48,000 cords; that the company used in the half year ending June, 1880, 109,000 tons of coal, so they had a decrease of 12,000 cords of wood and an increase of 34,000 tons of coal. And Sir Henry Tyler goes on to say:

"As wood becomes more scarce, and there are extra facilities for getting coal, we shall hope, in working our traffic, to effect further economy in this respect."

This is a question quite with the competency of Sir Henry Tyler, his argument is specific and clear that the company had economized by the use of coal. Sir Henry Tyler has not, however, contented himself with stating this fact. He has gone on to express an opinion as to the fiscal policy of Canada, and here he gets upon very different ground and debatable ground. The other statement is that the policy of Canada makes everything a poor man requires dearer for him to purchase, and in consequence of that policy he requires higher wages in order to be able to exist. And he adds:

"I cannot conceive anything more unwise in a nation like Canada, that has to import a great part of its fuel, and wishes to encourage its manufactures and to encourage its railways, than to place a duty upon the article of coal."

If we admit that Sir Henry Tyler is an authority upon finance, perhaps there is something in this statement; but I really do not know that Sir Henry Tyler proves before us an authority on finance. I think, if I were looking at the situation, I might find something else to explain the position in which Sir Henry Tyler found himself. He was endeavoring to explain to the shareholders the reason why there was so little money as the result of so much work, and he enters into an explanation involving this reference

Mr. McLENNAN.

to the financial policy of Canada. I do not know what Sir Henry Tyler's information is with respect to Canada. I do not know whether his opinion is worth more than that of the hon. gentleman who repeated it in this House with so much emphasis and determination. I do not know that Sir Henry Tyler's authority is greater than that of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), in a statement made on his own authority. It is quite possible that hon. members going out of the field of the financial policy of Canada into the position in which Sir Henry Tyler found himself, might say that the reason the shareholders of the Grand Trunk had not more money for their work was because they did too much work for too little money. I think that to be a simple explanation of it, and I have heard people say that the Grand Trunk Railway is very much in the habit of carrying too much freight, and carrying it too far for too little money, to the prejudice of this country. Sir Henry Tyler had entered into, perhaps, a very foolish contest with a man named Vanderbilt, who happened to have more money and a larger *clientèle* than the Grand Trunk Railway, and I think the authority of members of this House on the question of railway carriage, might be just as good, perhaps a little better, as we are in the country, than that of Sir Henry Tyler on the fiscal policy of Canada. I am sorry the hon. member for South Brant is not in his place. We all think a good deal of him. He is very full of figures, and is like that "Uncle Jack" in the story of the "Caxtons," who was a very complete character. Anything in him that was not arithmetic was philanthropy, and what was not philanthropy was arithmetic. My hon. friend went with a great deal of good humor into the subject, reminding one very much of a very big boy with an apple dumpling, but he got his mouth rather too full. He set about blowing up the hon. Finance Minister, and what did he bring to the work? It is difficult to blow anything up without fire. My hon. friend had certainly one element for his work, but the spark happened to be wanting and there was no fuel to burn. The old tinder-box had got wet, the flint had been worn to pieces, and the old jack-knife, I suppose, had been rubbed until there was no more steel upon it. But he brought to the work an immense pair of bellows. Well, I believe that the Government of Canada cannot be blown up by a pair of bellows alone without the vital element. My hon. friend for Middlesex dwelt upon some questions connected with our trade in what he conceived to be the fulfilment of his role of prophet. I notice that the prophets from Vennor downwards—or, need I say, down to Vennor—usually adopt the same method of maintaining that everything that is, is as they predicted. I am very glad, for the future of this country, that we are able to see a little daylight on the situation and that things are not what they seem to him; under the circumstances it is very satisfactory to know that the hon. gentleman stuck to his predictions. My hon. friend was very eloquent on the subject of chickens. I thought he was going to tell us something about that little hen we heard of last summer. What has become of that hen? Are its eggs hatched, or are they addled? Is there no hope that they will ever bring forth a reform pullet. We have listened, so far in vain, for the flutter of its wings in the House. Is it a fact that no pullet of mortal incubation will ever bring relief? Must we wait until a Phoenix arises from the ashes of the Reform party? A great deal of argument has been used to show that there is really no relation between this country, under its present Government, and the protection of Providence. I do not know whether gentlemen opposite have ever heard of the old maxim that "Providence helps those who help themselves." We have always maintained on this side of the House, that that was the hope of the Conservative party, and when we advocated a change of policy a few years ago, we did so for the reason that we proposed to use our own judgment and experience in adapting our-

selves to the circumstances in which we found ourselves. We have been accused, to-night, of changing with circumstances. That is the very thing we boast of doing. One of the first principles we have maintained is, that no law of political economy has ever been established to show how this necessary evil of taxation must be imposed, and to show that it must be imposed absolutely in one way and no other. We have always maintained that it is a question of circumstances, and we adapt ourselves to circumstances. That is just the difference between our theory and that of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are perpetually endeavoring to force an idea of law in connection with this operation of taxation. We maintain that there is no law on the subject, or, if there is, no one has ever discovered it. The hon. gentleman was very strong on the subject of our having had to export some things last year. That is just what we proposed to do, and we were very glad to find a market for our commodities in foreign countries. We never said we were going to control the markets of the world, as to the prices of our products. What we wanted was to keep our own market for our own people to the extent to which they could supply it, and I think that has been accomplished. Among the many authorities that have been thrown across the House at us, is that of the Treasurer of Ontario. Now, that is rather a good joke. We all value Ontario. The representatives of Ontario are a very important body in this House, but we believe the Government and Province of Ontario have nothing particular to do with the fiscal policy of this country. We believe that the Government of Ontario went very much out of its way in the initial business of the Legislature, when that Legislature met, in taking up for the first time the discussion of the fiscal policy of the Dominion. Our opinion on this side of the House is, that it was pure impertinence on the part of the Treasurer of Ontario to meet the Legislature with the idea of discussing the fiscal policy of the Dominion. Now, Sir, coming from this little discussion across the House to the actual Budget of my hon. friend, I think there is a little more hope for us, and we do not see that disastrous condition of things to which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) drew our attention. I think the statement of the Minister was a very good one, and that he dealt very wisely with the position as it fell into his hands. With an accumulated surplus of something over \$4,000,000, and a prospect for the coming year of \$3,000,000 more, I think he is acting very wisely in doing what any farmer in the country would do under the same circumstances—that is, when he finds himself with a pocketful of money, he does not withdraw his energy in creation, but pays off a part of the debt; and if my hon. friend can follow the example of the United States in this matter as he has done in so many others, I think he will find the same reward on this as on other occasions. That I believe he proposes to do—that is, to keep down the debt rather than keep down the taxes, of which nobody complains, if I exclude our friends opposite. My hon. friend has made some reductions, and, I think, for very good reasons: the removal of the tax on bills and promissory notes, for the best of all reasons, because the tax in its operation appeared to be unequal and vexatious and led to a great deal of litigation. All taxes are liable to difficulty in collection; but when a tax is marked in that respect beyond all others it is very wise to abolish it. He knows very well that the true policy is to collect the taxes with the smallest possible amount of friction, and he has reduced that friction very much by this change. My hon. friend has taken another step that has been from time to time open to controversy—the removal of the duty on tea and coffee. I do not propose to complain because they are free. I believe, and think it is the opinion of a good many members, that whilst the tax existed all the old women of both sexes in the country could fill themselves with tea, without knowing that they paid duty upon it. I think, very likely, the grocers and

importers of tea will get a very great part of the difference in this reduction. We must not be misled by the paradox of a free breakfast table. If the removal of the duty on tea and coffee would give every man, woman and child a free breakfast, we should all go for it most heartily, and say it was a thing to be desired more than any fiscal policy we ever heard of. But I hope my hon. friend has not been misled by any idea of this kind. The indulgence in paradox ought to be left to the other side of the House. We have heard of 4,000,000 of freemen that were not free, and we know the great paradox of free trade has been utterly burst and broken—the greatest paradox of all, which reminds us of the saying of old Sam Johnson, in his introduction to Shakespeare—"that some old men (a good many men) who are determined to be notorious, when they find they can add nothing to truth, indulge in paradox." I do not know that there are any men in bondage in this country, unless the trifling bondage to which they subject themselves, in listening to my hon. friend opposite occasionally. If they do that they may get very much off the track; they may make a great mistake as to suppose they are suffering poverty, "disaster" and "fraud" I think was one of the mildest terms used by the member for Middlesex, (Mr. Ross,) this evening, in relation to the duty on coal. It is a very bad habit to indulge in terms of this kind, when they have no meaning. If there was anything in the idea of a free breakfast table, I should favor it. I am sorry my hon. friend did not go a little further with his reductions, because, I think, among the large number of medical men in this House, it will be universally conceded that a very useful thing, according to their present practice is the lighter wines, and particularly the sparkling wines, commonly administered to patients, in a state of convalescence. These, unfortunately, are subjected to the highest duty in the whole Tariff. The value of the sparkling wines imported last year was \$100,000, and the duty amounted to \$55,000. I know that my hon. friend imposed a portion of it 30 per cent., under the impression that we could take it off under certain circumstances. Well, the world is drawing so strongly in favor of protection, that I see very little chance for the French admitting our ships free. I think the next time my hon. friend deals with the Tariff, he will let the convalescent have a free pint of champagne, as well as allow the old ladies a free breakfast table, which is not free. The matter with our friends opposite is that they have not got a policy, and are rather disappointed that anyone else should have one. The effect in the country is that the farmers have their barns full and favorable markets for anything they choose to sell, including the chickens and eggs, not added, that we have heard of. The manufacturer has his warehouses full, and his shops are fully employed, and the laborer has his pockets full and that chicken in the pot we have so often heard about. The country is not given over to occult science. The people do not go abroad like the prophets to look for reasons, being quite content to take the reasons that appear on the surface. They know that, in 1878, they were groaning under every form of poverty and depletion which, they were convinced, the Government could do something to remedy, and that the incidence of taxation under any circumstances had something to do with the prosperity of a country. They were willing to accept these reasons and results; and whilst we may regret very much that our friends opposite cannot find a policy, I believe, and will not venture to make a prediction. I will not enter into competition with the member for Middlesex in this work, but will say that whilst the country sympathizes very much with the melancholy condition of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, under the circumstances, it is willing to accept things as they are. Whilst all classes find themselves in those comfortable circumstances they are certainly not disposed to wear sackcloth.

Mr. RINFRET. Mr. Speaker, hon. members on the Ministerial side have repeatedly told us, in their speeches, that various industries were springing into new life, that commerce was flourishing with renewed strength; in a word, that the country was prosperous. The word prosperity is the apology tendered us by hon. gentlemen when we venture to attack the errors which swarm throughout the Tariff. When we point out the injustice of the so-called National Policy, we are ever met with the same answer; they flaunt in our faces that the Treasury is full, and that the country is prosperous. I am not at all surprised to see to-day hon. members on the Ministerial side make political capital of the return of commercial activity in Canada, which return is in reality but the natural sequence of the return of commercial activity throughout the entire world. Hon. gentlemen opposite have accustomed us to this system of making political capital for some years past, when endeavoring to hold the Liberal party responsible for the commercial depression which reigned in our time, and which was merely the natural result of a universal crisis. There is not a single member in this honorable House who will seriously pretend that we could by any legislation, whatever have counteracted that mysterious influence which was upsetting in all parts of the world the most solidly established financial institutions. There is not a single member who is really convinced to-day that if this crisis has disappeared from the face of the globe, it is due to the National Policy of a country like Canada, which numbers but a few millions of a population. I do not hesitate in saying, Mr. Speaker, that it was an improbability that Canada alone should escape that crisis, and I will add that it is equally impossible for it not to enjoy its share of the now universal renewal of business. The hon. Minister of Finance has really developed but a single idea, from which he has deduced all the facts and arguments of his speech, and this idea is that his Tariff must be good as the country is prosperous. I shall take the liberty to present to the House a few facts and arguments, with a view of establishing the fact that the Tariff has nothing to do with the prosperity which we are enjoying to-day; that the National Policy embodies several unjust laws which should be swept away, and that it has in reality retarded the natural development of the resources of the country. There are a certain number of important points which must not be lost sight of in passing judgment on the policy of the Government, viz.: the resources of the country, the nature of its products, its geographical position, and its population. We must also remember that the true way of fostering the people, the real means of protecting them, is to develop the industries of the country for the good of the greater number. It seems to me that Free Trade is the right principle which should preside over the establishment of a Tariff in England, for that country, by its inexhaustible iron and coal mines, as well as by its geographical situation, is destined to be *par excellence* the greatest commercial and manufacturing centre of the world. The free entry of grain and of agricultural products from foreign sources, the free entry of all the necessaries of life, fosters the exportation of the products of the manufactures of that great country by enabling them to turn them out at the lowest possible figures. Now, if we institute a comparison with the United States, we see that our neighbors, who are able up to certain points to meet their demands themselves, owing to the great variety of what they produce, and their mines of all kinds, have, perhaps, suffered less from their protective Tariff than any other country would have done. For, if their protective Tariff has given the death-blow to their general trade with the other nations of the globe, they have an important local market in their population of 50,000,000. And everyone knows that there exists, as an antidote to the protection enforced against foreign countries, the most absolute free trade between the various States. It would, however, be erroneous to expect for Canada England's high commercial

Mr. McLENNAN.

prosperity, under an absolute system of Free Trade; no one is in doubt on that point. On the other hand, we have not, like the neighboring Republic, a population large enough to have a local market so as to save us from the disaster brought about by the protective Tariff imposed on us by hon. gentlemen of the Treasury benches. Moreover, we have not a different variety of productions to supply our wants. We are without the raw material; we do not produce any cotton; our climate is not favorable to producing the quality of wool used in our manufactures; our coal and iron mines are but few, and are hard and expensive to work, in comparison with those in England. From these facts I conclude that, notwithstanding our high protective Tariff, it will be a difficult task for us to convert Canada into a manufacturing country, and that many years will elapse ere we send our manufactures to foreign markets. But if Canada is lacking in this raw material, and in the productions of a manufacturing country, it has, on the other hand, inexhaustible forests, magnificent water stretches, the finest in the world, and besides a rich and fertile soil. It would be to my mind a wise policy, a truly national policy, that which would develop the resources of our forests, encourage navigation, and foster by all possible means the agricultural resources of the country. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches have not taken into account the facts I have mentioned; they have reckoned too much on purely artificial means, favored the creating of certain artificial products unsuited to the geographical situation of the country or to the nature of its resources. I am speaking of certain manufactured articles. I do not pretend that we should withhold all encouragement from manufactures; but I maintain that a policy which, under the pretence of protecting manufacturing industries, would injure the important industries I have just spoken of, would be a false and irrational one. I am one of those who think that the high duties imposed by the hon. Minister of Finance, with the object of giving protection, are of a kind to be injurious to navigation, to the lumber trade and to agriculture. That is what I am about to prove. It is an undeniable fact that wherever protection granted to manufactures has been in vogue, that the decay of the mercantile navy has followed, as a matter of course. This wall of China built between a protected country and adjoining ones, can but have one result sooner or later, and that is to diminish the general trade of that particular country with the neighboring ones, and to injure its navigation considerably. The United States and France are there to prove what I state. No comparison can be drawn between the mercantile marine of these two countries and that of England, the country of Free Trade *par excellence*. In Canada, notwithstanding the return of trade, we notice that there has been, for some time past, a considerable decrease in the grain carrying trade which used to pass through our canals. A large quantity of the grain which formerly took that route, has gone to Boston and New York. It is true that the National Policy has not prevented trade from finding a transit as formerly between England and the United States; it is true that there is not any duty on grain consigned from one of these countries to the other; but there was a trade carried on formerly between Canada and the United States on the one hand, and Canada and Great Britain on the other. By means of this trade we used to consume here the grain and flour coming from the United States, and we used to export our own products. We had everything to gain by this transaction, inasmuch as the consumers in this country could buy from the nearest seller and take advantage of all circumstances of time and place. Our shipowners and merchants in large cities used to derive considerable profits therefrom. The National Policy has brought about a decrease in this trade, to the detriment of our canal revenue and the general interests of navigation. The National Policy

is also, in a certain measure, injurious to our lumber merchants, in forcing them to pay a higher price for what they import from foreign ports as furnishings for the shanties and for all tools used in cutting and preparing wood for the purposes of trade, without giving them any counterbalancing benefits. But the important industry which suffers in a more direct fashion from the effects of the Tariff is agriculture. Those who are really affected and unjustly treated by it are the farmers and workingmen, who constitute the great mass of consumers, or, in other words, nearly the whole of the population. The result of the Tariff, as far as they are concerned, has simply been to make them pay a higher price for what they purchase, without giving them any advantage whatever in the matter of what they sell. They are the real victims of the favoritism shown to a certain number of individuals, at the expense of the rest of society. In order to prove what I state, we have but to look over the list of the various articles for which the people pay a high price in order to give manufacturers an unjust protection. Our cotton factories are a striking example of this favoritism. In 1879, when the National Policy was inaugurated in this country, we had six or seven cotton factories. One of them, the Hudon Cotton Manufacturing Company, could be said to be flourishing, even in those days of commercial depression; four or five went through the crisis without suspending; one only failed, according to the information I have been able to procure. And this happened at a time when, in the United States, that paradise of protection, a number of manufactures of the same kind failed in succession. It is evident that since they have been able to face the crisis, that there was but one thing lacking to enable these manufactures to make money, and that was an increase in the general consumption; in other words, the means of acquiring consumers, and this could not but happen when the crisis came to an end, and trade once more looked up. No one can reasonably doubt to-day, that in ordinary times the Tariff of the ex-Minister of Finance was entirely sufficient to guarantee the existence of these factories, and even to enable them to earn large profits. But there is not a single man of business who, on seeing the enormous profits realized to-day by our cotton factories, will not say that they are illegitimate, and that they constitute a real extortion from the Canadian people. If we consult the Montreal market reports for the last few months, it will be seen that the Canada Cotton Manufacturing Company had its shares quoted in November or December last, at from 165 to 170, and the Montreal Cotton Manufacturing Company at from 185 to 200 per cent. It would be a difficult thing to-day to obtain Hudon Cotton Company's shares. This company paid last year a dividend of 10 per cent., and a further bonus of 33½ per cent. These enormous profits were merely realized because the present Tariff forces the people of Canada to pay for each square yard of cotton goods, a cent or two more than they ought to pay, or than they would pay if the former Tariff was in force. The Conservative press and hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to establish that the National Policy has not had the effect of increasing the price of cotton. It is an easy task to prove the contrary. These hon. gentlemen cannot but admit that on imported cotton the consumer has to pay, besides the whole of the duties imposed, the actual value of the cotton, which may vary considerably, and the manufacturer's profit. Under the former Tariff, those duties were on an average 17½ per cent.; to-day they represent from 30 to 50 per cent. No one can deny that the people paid those enormous duties on cotton goods imported since the new Tariff was established. Those imports amounted to about \$8,000,000 in 1879-80 (\$7,825,164), and to over \$10,000,000 in 1880-81. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we enquire of any important firm, the answer will be that imported cotton goods have been sold at precisely the same price as those manufactured in the country. Thus the people have paid, in excess of the value of

the article, a tax of 30 to 50 per cent. on all cotton goods purchased either from abroad or from our manufacturers. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in his speech at Charlotte-town, gave a striking example of what I have just stated. The price of cotton yarn spun in the celebrated Park's factory was at the time \$1.25 a bundle, or \$1.15½ under discount. On the same day the price of a similar article was 92½ cents in Boston, New York and Philadelphia, or 85 cents under discount. The duties on that article amount to 15 per cent. and 2 cents per pound—altogether over 30 per cent.—and represent the exact difference between the Canadian and the United States prices. Part of that duty is legitimate, and no one in this honorable House can be opposed to reasonable duties on cotton goods; but what renders the tax an unjust one is that it is too high, and that it favors excessively certain individuals at the expense of the mass of the people. I say certain individuals advisedly; for, Mr. Speaker, no one else but the manufacturers has derived any advantage therefrom. At the elections in 1878, the hon. leader of the present Government said, I think in his speech at Toronto: "Manufacturers will be enriched and you (the workingmen) will have your share of their prosperity; you will earn better wages, &c., &c." Well, Mr. Speaker, is there a single one of these companies which realize large profits so much above the usual profits of trade, which shares these profits with its hands by increasing their wages? Enquire of the hands and you will find that they do not get a half-penny more than the current price of labor. The hon. leader of the present Government added that were the National Policy established, "capital and labor would walk hand in hand together, and that there would exist between them a community of action and interests." We perceive, to-day, that the favoritism is extended to capital alone and not to labor. The high duties levied on woollen manufactured goods constitute another glaring injustice towards Canadian consumers. The duties on woollens are 7½ cents, 10 cents per pound and 22½ per cent. *ad valorem* on an average, or adding together these two duties, an average of from 35 to 40 per cent. on the value of the article. But, through a peculiar scale of the duties, certain woollen articles pay from 20 to 25 cents per dollar, whilst on others the duty reaches as high as 60 per cent. The protection on woollen goods was, according to the framers of the National Policy, to have had the effect of creating a large number of manufactures and to diminish the amount of foreign importations; and the farmers of Canada, by way of compensation for the surplus to be paid on cloth, tweeds, flannels and alpacas, in a word, on all woollens they purchased, were to receive higher prices for their wool through the establishing of a national market for that article, and by the placing of certain duties on wool coming from abroad. Let us examine up to what point these promises have been fulfilled. The Liberal party has ever been opposed to protective duties on manufactured woollens; it has never had any faith in the possibility of success for such a policy; but really, notwithstanding our little faith in it, we could never have anticipated the complete fiasco which was in store for the Government. We see, to-day, that not only have the imports of woollens not decreased from year to year, but that they have, on the contrary, increased in the enormous ratio of 35 per cent. during the past fiscal year. The imports amounted to \$6,292,699 in 1879-80 and to \$8,554,397 in 1880-81. The crude wool, for which farmers were to receive a higher price, has decreased in value about 30 per cent. It is sold at about 10 cents less than in 1878, according to market reports, since the inauguration of the National Policy. During the last General Elections, it was promised from all the hustings that duties should be placed on crude wool, so as to specially protect the farmers. And we did, during the Session of 1880, impose a duty of 3 cents on a certain grade of wool; but this duty is farcical and a mockery, as

there is not a single pound of wool of that grade imported from abroad. If we glance at the Trade and Navigation Returns, it will be seen that not a single cent of duty has been paid on that article during the past fiscal year. The hon. Minister of Finance had reckoned on the rapid increase in the manufacture of woollens. Up to the present time this kind of industry seems to meet with but scant success, and the result of the National Policy has been but to increase the price of woollens without increasing in any tangible manner the number of woollen manufactures. I do not fear to say that, do what we will, impose whatever duties we may, we shall never manufacture woollens in Canada with any degree of profit. The United States are there to prove what I advance; it will be seen that there, in spite of the highest Tariff it is possible to possess, the neighboring Republic exported, in 1880, woollens to the value of \$216,576 only, whereas its imports of that article still reach the enormous figure of \$33,911,093. Last year, England alone sent into the United States for \$13,000,000 worth of woollens. Our exports of woollens amounted to \$55,000 in 1878, and \$48,000 in 1880, or a decrease of \$7,000; they amounted to but \$30,000 in 1881. As to the national market for crude wool, it exists less than ever; imports continue, and as I have already said, the price of wool is still exceedingly low. Thus it will be seen, Mr Speaker, that the National Policy has merely had the effect of raising the price of woollens, whilst reducing considerably the price of wool. It has done much harm to the consumer; it has been doubly injurious to the farmers in order to favor a few privileged individuals, and has in no way contributed to the general prosperity of the country. The protection granted to refined sugar has brought about the same result as that on cotton and woollens, to wit: to increase the price of that article and to make refiners earn large fortunes at the expense of other classes of society. The duty levied on sugar, according to the Tariff of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance, brought us a large revenue to the Treasury, whilst imposing a less heavy load on the people's shoulders than the present one. Since the coming into force of this Tariff, the consumer has paid, on an average, on every pound of sugar 1 cent more than he would have paid had the hon. ex-Minister of Finance's Tariff been in existence. To convince one's self of this fact, one has but to compare the prices of refined sugar at New York with that on the Montreal market for the last three years. One will perceive therefrom that, even adding the duties levied under the old Tariff as well as freight and commission, the wholesale price of sugar in Montreal exceeds that of New York by from 75 cents to \$1 per 100 lbs. We consume every year from 100,000,000 to 120,000,000 lbs. of sugar. According to the two market reports which I have just mentioned, I do not think it to be an exaggeration to estimate at \$1,000,000 the surplus paid by the consumer for the purchase of his sugar, taking the average of the three last years. If to this be added the loss incurred by the public Treasury to benefit the refiners, we must conclude that the people of Canada, through the unjust Tariff they possess to-day, lose every year from \$1,250,000 to \$1,500,000, in order to enrich and favor a few refiners. Now, what is the advantage derived therefrom by the country? The great advantage, we are told by our political adversaries, is that sugar is refined in this country, and that thereby work is given to our workingmen. Very well; we employ a few more men than we did under the preceding Tariff; no one can deny this fact. But the number is of little importance, when compared with the immense sacrifice imposed on the mass of consumers. Some time ago I saw in a newspaper a suggestion on this very point to which the hon. Minister of Finance has alluded, which suggestion seemed a fair one to me; it was, that the country would gain several thousands of dollars a year, were it to board these few workingmen in the best hotels in the country, and keep them there doing

Mr. RINFRET.

nothing, provided that we should re-establish the old Tariff on sugar, which enabled the people of Canada to buy it at a lower figure, whilst increasing the receipts of the public Treasury. No favoritism is shown to the workingmen who are merely paid the current wages of labor. The only ones favored, the only ones reaping unjust profits through the monopoly ensured to them by the Tariff, are the refiners. But sugar is not the only article of grocery protected by the Tariff. The so-called National Policy has increased the price of all articles in that line, with the exception of tea and coffee, on which the duties have just been cancelled; there is a duty on raisins, on starch, on spices of all kinds and on corn starch, which is generally the food of invalids and children. The duties on vinegar are now 60 per cent. instead of 17½ per cent. as formerly. It would be no exaggeration to say that the price of all these groceries has increased on an average from 10 to 15 cents on the dollar. I shall content myself with a passing mention of the duties which weigh heavily on manufactured articles from leather, the duty on coal and on hardware, and all articles manufactured from china or glass, these points having been fully handled by hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me. I will merely say that the duties levied on agricultural implements and carpenters' tools are too high, and that these articles should have found a place in the free list. You will excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if I have enumerated a few of the articles on which the duties have been increased in an unjust fashion. It would take too long to review all the errors and iniquities with which the Tariff abounds; it will suffice that I should add that the so-called National Policy has increased the duties on imported goods in such a ratio, as to represent an increase of \$10 to \$15 per family of ten persons. If we add thereto the surplus paid on articles manufactured in the country, the price of which has risen, owing to the monopolies established by the present protective Tariff of the Government, we can but conclude that it is no exaggeration to reckon on an average at \$25 per family, as the increase of expenses brought about through the policy of the Government, which amount represents the surplus of taxes which the present Tariff compels us to pay. A part of these imports goes into the public Treasury, and a considerable part goes to enrich those whom the National Policy takes under its special protection. Let us now examine, Mr. Speaker, what the farmers receive in return for the enormous load which the policy of the Government imposes on them. I say, without hesitation, that they are in no way compensated, and I am going to prove it with certain facts. The National Policy has not raised, and cannot raise, by a solitary cent the price of the articles which the farmers have for sale. I regret to say that the promises of protection made to agriculturists in 1878 have not been kept. Protection had been promised to crude wool, as a compensation for the duties on woollens. I established just now that this promise was a mockery and a farce performed to the detriment of the farmers of this country. We had been promised duties on our hides by way of compensation for those levied on manufactured leather. As a matter of fact, these duties have not yet been imposed. I am not going to decide as to the intrinsic merits of these two imports; but I blame the Government for having made promises to the farmers when they could not keep them. Last Session the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) asked, as a special protection to agriculture, the placing on the free list of all articles employed in the manufacture of beet root sugar. He showed that beet root sugar will never be manufactured in Canada unless Government granted it some practical advantages. If the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches admit a general system of protection, we have a right to ask if it is through antipathy to the agricultural classes that the Government will not do for beet root sugar that which it has so willingly done for sugar refining, cotton goods,

woollens, and a number of other industries? I voted for that special protection on beet root sugar, but as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the request of the member for Stanstead was not granted. Last year we also asked, in order to secure the farmers their share of protection, that the duties on Canadian tobacco should be abolished. These duties on Canadian tobacco have been in existence for a number of years; they were established by the Conservative party and kept in force by the Liberal party for the purposes of revenue. The people suffered less from these duties at that time, as compared with what they have suffered during the last two or three years; at any rate, the increase was a necessary one as there was not a sufficient revenue. But now that the Treasury is overflowing, owing to the enormous taxes on manufactured articles, the Government would be doing a politic act in abolishing this duty completely. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made a good step in this direction, but have not, I think, gone far enough to satisfy the people of the Province of Quebec, who are entirely opposed to this duty. In 1878, in order to cause the farmers of Canada to agree to the National Policy, they were promised an increase in the price of grain through the levying of special duties on grain coming from abroad. We said then, and we repeat it to-day, that the price of all kinds of grain, excepting Indian corn, is regulated by the price on the English market, for we have a surplus of all kinds of grain, and the only channel we possess to divert it through is the English market. The price of grain varies greatly according to the demand. It was very high in 1873, 1874 and 1875, and everyone knows that we did not have any protection during those years. It decreased in the years following, during the crisis which swept the whole world, diminishing everywhere the capacity to purchase, and as a sequence the general consumption. In the United States, that elysium of protection, the price of grain was lower than in this country; but the price of grain never fell as low as it did during the year that immediately followed the adoption of the Tariff; it was during that year that oats sold at a cent per pound on the Quebec market. To-day the price of grain in Canada is a good one, because grain is selling well throughout the world, but the Tariff has absolutely nothing to do with this rise in the price. If we follow the quotations of the grain trade in Liverpool and in Canada during the past years, before and after the inauguration of the National Policy, it will be seen that the price of grain in Liverpool is the same as here, plus freight and cost of transport, or a difference varying between 25 and 30 cents. This fact alone proves clearly that our market quotations are entirely ruled by the English market. But the important point to look into is a comparison drawn between the Canadian and American markets. It was pretended in 1878 that by the levying of certain duties we should have a difference of a few cents in our favor over the price of grains in the neighboring Republic. Let us see what happened during the last few years. In 1878, during the last months of the Mackenzie Administration, oats were from eight to ten cents dearer in Montreal and Toronto than in Chicago. This fact was admitted by our political adversaries who were complaining at the time that oats from the United States were being sold on our markets; these oats would have been sold on their own market had it not been that our prices were higher. In 1881, from the beginning of September to the end of December, the price of oats was always from 1 to 3 cents higher on the Chicago markets than on those of Montreal and Toronto. Notwithstanding the greater distance of the English market, the same thing took place with rye; its price was higher here than in the United States in 1878, and lower in 1881. The price of graded wheat has varied much; on the whole, it was about as high here as in the United States. It would be difficult for me to give the cause of this decrease in the

price of oats and rye on our markets as compared with that in the United States. If I have placed these facts before this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, it is only with the view of establishing that they constitute the most complete contradiction of what was said by our political adversaries, when they promised that the result of the Tariff would be to create a national market through which grains would command a higher price than in the neighboring Republic. I have, therefore, established: 1st. That the price of grain on our markets is determined by the English market, because we have a surplus of agricultural products which we are compelled to sell—this fact cannot be denied, and I think I have proved it absolutely; 2nd. The price of grain, compared with that of the United States, instead of increasing, has diminished by a few cents; 3rd. That the National Policy has no influence over the price of breadstuffs. If it has actually done anything, if it has had any result in the present case, as some of our political adversaries pretend, it has been in direct opposition to the interests of the farmers, as is clearly shown by the facts I have brought forward. Thus, under whichever aspect we look at the Tariff, we arrive at the conclusion that it enriches a few favored ones at the expense of the mass of the people, and that it increases by a sum of \$25 the expense of every farmer's family, without giving him anything as compensation. I sincerely regret that the Government should have shown itself so unjust towards the agricultural class as to refuse everything that has been asked for it as its legitimate share of the general system of protection. There exists still another kind of favoritism which the National Policy has established, and which is still more particularly odious. The Tariff favors the well-to-do classes of society, and falls heavier on the working classes. I will now establish this by facts. Let us first take manufactured woollens: A cheap tweed, valued in England at 20 cents, and which the poor man buys to clothe himself, has to pay besides the 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, the same price of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound as the cloth of good quality bought by the rich man and which costs \$4 in England. Thus does the poor man pay 41 to 42 cents per dollar of duty on the value of the article, whereas the rich man is paying only from 20 to 21 cents per dollar. All manufactured woollens used in clothing both sexes exhibit the same unjust distinction. Whilst farmers and the working classes generally pay from 40 to 50 cents per dollar of a tax, the well-to-do class of society which buys dear and fine goods pays on an average but 20 to 30 cents per dollar. The same injustice is repeated with regard to cotton goods. Low-priced cotton goods pay the same duty per square yard as high-priced goods and the poor man pays nearly double the amount paid by the rich man on these articles. There are a number of other articles of minor importance which it would be too long to enumerate here. Let us take tobacco, for instance: the duties are about 75 cents per dollar on tobacco priced at 50 cents which the poor man buys, whereas they amount but to from 25 to 35 cents on tobacco costing \$1 to \$1.50 which is bought by the rich man. The tax on Canadian tobacco really falls on the farmers and the working classes alone. But the tax that falls heavily on the working classes in our cities and on the farmers, and on those classes only, is that on coal oil. The well-to-do classes in towns consume gas, on which the tax is almost *nil*, amounting to about one cent in the dollar through the tax on coal; but coal oil, which is used by the working classes in our cities, and by the farmers, has to bear the load of several taxes; it is charged with the cost of inspection as to its safety, and must be refined to a high degree of specific gravity; besides that, there are protective duties on crude and refined oil coming from foreign parts; all these imposts, when added to the special legislation of the National Policy, which favors monopoly in the refining of coal oil, have had the result of increasing from 40 to 50 per cent. the price of that article.

If to that be added the duties on lamps, on lamp globes, one can but conclude that, whereas the rich man does not pay any tax on light, workingmen and farmers pay the enormous tax of from 30 to 35 cents per dollar. And the most unpopular tax, and which falls heavily on the poorer classes, is the tax on flour.

Mr. BOLDUC. No; the price of wheat is determined by the English market.

Mr. RINFRET. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc) states that the price of wheat is regulated by the English market; but the hon. member can but admit the following facts, viz.: that the duty of 50 cents on flour has not had the result of increasing the price of that article during the winter and spring seasons, but that it certainly has had that effect during a few of the summer and autumn months since the Tariff is in force. In my opinion, the people of the Province of Quebec have paid entirely this duty of 50 cents, because at that time of the year we always import for home consumption a large quantity of flour from the United States, whilst awaiting the harvesting of the fall crop in the Province of Ontario. The tax is an odious one, because it falls on an article which is one of the primary necessities of life, because it was imposed notwithstanding all the solemn promises made by Conservative candidates at the last elections in all the counties of the Province of Quebec and of the Maritime Provinces. I will not go into further details, for I think I have satisfactorily proved that the present Tariff distributes taxes in the most unjust fashion, and that the weight of these taxes falls more heavily on the working classes and on the farmers than on the well-to-do classes of society. I have to add that it is a serious mistake, considering the large revenue we enjoy to-day, the maintaining of taxes on articles of primary necessity such as bread, light and fuel. It was with some surprise that I heard the hon. Minister of Finance, when announcing his surplus for the past year and the still more considerable surplus for the year ending next June, attributes the merit of it to himself and congratulates the Government thereon. I fail to see any wonder worked in this instance by the hon. Minister. Mr. Gladstone has been highly lauded because he had found the means of increasing the revenue whilst diminishing the taxation; but the hon. Minister has discovered quite a different recipe, for, in his case, if the revenue has increased, so have the taxes, and in a far more considerable ratio. His surpluses have been obtained by imposing on the people of Canada the heaviest taxes they have ever had to bear. This extraordinary revenue has, moreover, completely upset the provisions of the hon. Minister himself, and constitutes a complete contradiction of what he stated in 1880. It will be remembered that at that time the hon. Minister of Finance told the electors of his county that the taxes would not be increased, and that to govern the country, \$18,000,000 of Excise and Customs' duties were enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, the revenue from those two sources has attained over \$22,000,000 for the year which has just ended, and consumers have paid \$4,000,000 in excess of the amount the hon. Minister of Finance said he would impose on the people of Canada. For the year which is to end in June next, the taxes will again be \$4,000,000 more than for the year which has just ended. It is most unjust to levy such a taxation on the people of Canada, and to make them pay several millions more taxes than are necessary to govern the country. I will now take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, of reminding the House that one of the effects of the National Policy was to be, according to our political adversaries, a decrease in our imports. Now, the enormous increase in the public revenue simply exists through the considerable increase in our imports. Thus, to attribute to himself the merit of his surpluses, and to be able to congratulate his Government, the hon. Minister is compelled to contradict the opinions he expressed during

Mr. RINFRET.

the Session of 1880. It will be remembered that he then triumphantly announced that the general trade of the country was at last fairly balanced, and in truth, in 1879-80 our exports exceeded our imports by about \$100,000. He almost rejoiced at that time over our deficit of \$1,700,000, "for," said he, "the famous problem of the balance of trade had been solved for the first time in our favor." He attributed, somewhat naively, to the National Policy what was simply due to the crisis. But what is strange is that the hon. Minister of Finance rejoices to-day over our surpluses, in the face of an increase of \$20,000,000 of imports, and when the balance of trade is against us by a sum exceeding \$7,000,000. In 1880, the hon. Minister extolled his policy because it had turned the balance of trade in our favor, whilst saddling us with an enormous deficit; this Session he again praises his policy because it has brought about the contrary, because it gives us surpluses, whilst turning the balance of trade against us. These contradictions go to show the complete absence of principles in those occupying, to-day, the Treasury benches, and the facts I have enumerated are the strict proof of what we told the electors in 1878, viz., that the balance of trade is against us in years of prosperity, and that the contrary takes place during the years when a crisis and commercial depression govern. The hon. Minister of Finance, ever modest, attributes to his policy a great part of the credit due for the considerable exports of 1880 and 1881, which are the true causes of the return of trade. There is a fact, however, which no one can call into doubt, and that is that the present Tariff merely influences, from the point of view of general trade, the manufactured articles which have received special protection. Now, the exports of these articles have diminished from year to year, since the inauguration of the National Policy. There is no real increase, except in the exports of lumber and agricultural products. Our political adversaries have, I hope, too great a confidence in the good sense of the people to try to make them believe that the return of the lumber trade is due to the National Policy. For if you question any lumber merchant, he will tell you that the only effect of the Tariff on his trade has been to increase the price of the articles employed by him in preparing the wood for the market; consequently the National Policy, instead of assisting him, has done him injury. The sole cause of commercial activity in that line of trade to-day, is the revival of trade in England and the United States, which revival has increased the consumption in those countries, and the purchasing capacity of those who are our natural customers and whose purchases had fallen off during the crisis. The revival of trade in Europe has had the same effect on our grain and live cattle trade, by increasing the consumption and the purchasing capacity of larger quantities in those countries. But that is not the only reason, inasmuch as our agricultural products are concerned; another important factor was the failing of the crops in Europe, whereas we had a plentiful harvest in Canada. This failing of the crops could but have the effect of increasing the price of our agricultural products. The whole of these causes, the revival of business in Europe, the failing of the crops in that country, and the three good harvests which we have had in succession in Canada, are sufficient to explain the considerable exports and the rise in price of our agricultural products. But I am not afraid of saying that the National Policy has nothing to do with it, unless our political adversaries are prepared to prove that protection, that our Tariff, has caused the crisis to cease throughout the whole world, and has given us good crops whilst causing the crops in Europe to fail at the same time. I have established, therefore, that the National Policy has not brought about the promised result of decreasing our imports and of turning in our favor the balance of trade; that it has not done, and cannot do, anything for our export trade. I have also, I think, established that the extraordinary revenue from which the hon.

Minister of Finance derives so much pride, exists only because the people of Canada are paying exorbitant taxes. The Government has been wise in reducing these taxes somewhat, having evidently understood that its system of taxation was becoming exceedingly unpopular. I hope I have said enough on this subject, Mr. Speaker, to show that the National Policy is a farce throughout, and a mockery of the people of Canada. I will say a few words only about the Estimates which are presented to us for the carrying out of the general administration of public affairs. I merely wish to oppose to these Estimates the pompous promises made to the people during the last General Elections. During the elections of 1878, the Mackenzie Government was accused of extravagance, because its whole annual expenditure was in all \$23,500,000. The present hon. Minister of Finance asserted, in his speech to the electors of his county, that the country could be governed with an expenditure of \$22,500,000. The future Minister's utterings on this point became the programme of every Conservative candidate. The accusation of extravagance brought against the Mackenzie Administration was a bit of effrontery coming from those who had increased the public expenditure from \$13,000,000 that it was in 1867, to \$23,316,000 in 1873, or an average increase of $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions a year. During its five years in power, the Liberal party brought this expenditure up to \$23,500,000 only, and we may say that there was a practical decrease in the expenditure, if we take into account the surplus of population and the considerable engagements willed to us by preceding Administrations. These engagements added enormous amounts to the debt of the country, as I am about to prove presently. I will show for the moment up to what degree the present Administration has endeavored to redeem the solemn pledges made in 1878, to the effect that it would do its best to reduce public expenditure. During the very first year that they were in power, the Ministers increased our expenditure to \$24,850,000, and it has reached \$25,500,000 for the year ending June 30th, 1881. The Estimates for the year ending June, 1882, are ahead in excess of the sum of \$26,000,000; those for the present year, to which it will probably be necessary to add supplements, amounting to one or two millions, amount to \$27,600,000. Thus does the present Government spend, after a three years' administration, about \$4,000,000 more than the Mackenzie Government and about \$5,000,000 more than the amount which, according to the Minister of Finance himself, would have been sufficient to govern the country. I will not enter into details, so as not to engage for too long a time the attention of this honorable House. These figures are quite sufficient to show that there is in the administration of the public funds an unwarrantable extravagance. Let us now pass on to the public debt. During the elections of 1878, we were accused of having increased the public debt to a too considerable extent. We proved then beyond doubt that the Liberal party was not responsible for these additions to our indebtedness, and that we had merely contracted loans to meet the engagements willed to us by preceding Administrations. I will resume these engagements in a few words, and for that purpose I will quote the speech of the present hon. Minister of Finance. The following is a passage of his speech on the Budget in 1873:—

"We are entering upon new engagements involving a very large sum of money, and which will require a very large increase of our debt. We have \$10,000,000 to expend on the Intercolonial Railway. We have \$30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific, and the canal system will involve an expenditure of at least \$20,000,000. These are serious matters, inasmuch as they add \$60,000,000 to our national debt. Let us now see what is the annual charge involved in this matter. For the sinking fund we require \$600,000, for commission and interest \$2,764,000, making a total annual charge, when these works are completed, of \$3,367,400."

Thus, according to the hon. Minister, these works were to bring our debt up to about \$170,000,000. Let us examine now what were the burdens imposed on the

country by the Mackenzie Administration. On the 1st of July, 1874, our public debt amounted to \$109,000,000 in round figures; in 1878, it had reached \$141,000,000, or an increase of \$32,000,000 for the period during which the Liberal party was in power. This is \$28,000,000 less than the Estimates of the hon. Minister for 1873; it is \$28,000,000 less than he would have spent had he been in power during these few years. Now, Mr. Speaker, the public charges for interest and the sinking fund, instead of being increased for a sum of \$3,367,400, were merely increased from \$1,500,000 to \$1,700,000, being a saving of 50 per cent. on those same charges as compared with the Estimates of 1873, which I have just mentioned. The Liberal party saved on the ordinary expenditure an amount almost sufficient to compensate for this increase of charges relating to our debt. Each and every loan contracted by the Mackenzie Government was debited to works and public undertakings determined upon by law, and to the carrying out of which the country was formally bound. Several millions were spent on the Intercolonial, the canal system and the finishing of the Parliament Buildings. I do not speak here of the enormous amounts expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway, as every one knows who is responsible for this gigantic undertaking. I have established that the Liberal party could not but increase the public debt, as it could not withdraw from the engagements willed to it by preceding Administrations. I have likewise shown that this increase would have been far more considerable, had the Conservative party been in power during these past few years. Let us now see if the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have kept their promises in this important matter of the public debt. According to the latest Public Accounts submitted to us, our debt amounts at present to \$155,000,000, and will probably attain \$200,000,000 in a few years, when all the undertakings of the Government will have been carried out. I call the special attention of this honorable House to this rapid increase of our public debt and of our general expenditure. In years of commercial prosperity, with a high Tariff like the one we have to-day, our revenue is more than sufficient to meet public expenditure and the interest on our debt; but it was proved beyond doubt in 1879-80, by that year's deficit, that in years of commercial crisis our expenditure may be equal to our revenue, even with our actual Tariff. In 1880, our expenditure reached, nevertheless, \$24,850,000 only; and were we to experience, in 1883, a commercial depression, together with an increase of about \$3,000,000 in our public expenditure, taking 1880 for the sake of comparison, our deficit would, instead of reaching \$2,000,000, reach about \$5,000,000. It is a fact that our public charges have since a few years increased far more rapidly than the resources of the country; and if we have a surplus to-day, it is because the hon. Minister of Finance has not yet reached the utmost limits of taxation. Let us bear in mind that there occur crises from time to time, and that prudence teaches us not to depend too much on years of plenty. I will not any longer occupy the attention of the House. I think, Mr. Speaker, that all the hon. members of this House should do their utmost to prevent the increase of our public debt, and to strike off from our public expenditure all that is not necessary to the good administration of the country. It is by means of a wise and economical policy and a just and equitable distribution of taxes that we shall render ourselves worthy of the trust placed in us by the electors of Canada.

Mr. PLUMB moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:35 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 6th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

AGREEMENTS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER laid on the Table of the House the following agreements :—

Agreement entered into between John Paterson and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, to erect section houses and combined freight and passenger houses on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Yale and Kamloops Lake, British Columbia.

Also,—Between Andrew Onderdonk and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, &c., &c., for the construction of the section of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Emory's Bar to Port Moody, in British Columbia.

Also,—Between Andrew Onderdonk and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, &c., &c., for a steel or iron bridge over Fraser River, at Lytton, British Columbia.

Also,—Between Walter Oliver and Her Majesty Queen Victoria, &c., &c., to construct a passenger and freight station, at Rat Portage, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, for \$1,925, and the out-house for \$125—total, \$2,050,—before the 15th August, 1881 ;—

And also,—Contract for freighting engineer's supplies from end of section 15 to section 42, Canadian Pacific Railway, with Robert Ferris, Peter Paul, and George Millwar, contractors.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 72) to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Strange.)

PROMISSORY NOTES.

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark), in introducing Bill (No. 73) relating to promissory notes and other negotiable instruments, said: The object of the Bill is that where a promissory note or other negotiable instrument is given in consideration for a patent right, or for an invention which may hereafter be patented, it shall be written or printed, that it is given "for a patent right." Each instrument in the hands of any purchaser or holder shall be subject to the same defences, as it would be in the hands of the original holder or owner; and any person who purchases or becomes the holder of a promissory note, knowing it to have been given for the consideration aforesaid, shall hold the same subject to such defences, although the words "for a patent right" are not written or printed on its face. And in case any one induces another person to make a note for such purpose, and does not have the words "for patent right" entered on the note, it shall be held to be a criminal offence and misdemeanor, and the offender shall be liable to imprisonment for two years.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

ELECTION BY ELECTRICITY.

Mr. FORTIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) respecting the voting at elections of members of the House of Commons of Canada, in the Magdalen Islands in the Electoral District of Gaspé, and the Island of Anticosti in the Electoral District of Saguenay, under certain circumstances. He said: This is a new kind of law and I ask the indulgence of the House while I explain its operation. It is well known that the Magdalen Islands are during the winter season completely isolated from the rest of the world. It is no use to talk about the winter navigation of the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. I have never pronounced myself publicly on that question, because I have never had a suitable opportunity of doing so; but, after thirty years of study, and after consulting residents on the shores of the Gulf, and the fishermen of the Magdalen

Mr. PLUMB.

Islands and of the North Shore, who go sealing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence during the months of March and April, I have come to believe that winter navigation of the Gulf is an impossibility. Yes! I am fully convinced that winter navigation is an impossibility in a commercial sense; you cannot get through the ice when packed, but may when the ice is broken or disintegrated by winds or currents. You have an illustration of the fact: Look at the vessel of whom some people so much boast, and that cost so much—the *Northern Light*—a great name for a small thing; look at her caught in the ice about a month ago, and remaining fast in it, though the ice does not pack at that point so closely as in some other parts of the Gulf. I am very glad the passengers did not suffer much, and were rescued. Look again at a vessel built for Arctic navigation, provided with everything desirable for the purpose, owned by that spirited and liberal man, Mr. Bennett, of New York; she had not been a month in the ice till she was caught and bound in it for a year and a-half. And was finally broken to pieces, three-fourths of the crew dying of starvation. Let us confine ourselves to the possible, and not attempt impossible or visionary undertakings. One of the greatest proofs that winter navigation is impossible is that the people of the Magdalen Islands never asked me to try to get them a vessel to run to them in winter. You know that electors are very much in the habit of asking all they can possibly hope to get; yet these people, though separated from the rest of the world, including Canada, during winter, have never asked for winter navigation. At present these people cannot vote during the winter, and the law provides that even if they do not vote then the election is legal. Now, thanks to the good will of the Government, this House and the country, the Magdalen Islands are provided with a system of telegraph, capable of competing with any in the world, in perfect operation, and possessing nine working stations. You can now telegraph to any station, and receive an answer within a couple of hours. When you have this sure means of communication—especially when the telegraph belongs to the Government and is under its management—why should those people be disfranchised any longer, by not getting the chance to vote in winter as well as in summer? When we know that the most difficult diplomatic negotiations and treaties and the greatest financial schemes are carried on and accomplished through the telegraph, why can we not use it for an election? I believe we can, and therefore I wish to introduce this Bill, which can effect the object without violating any essential in the general election law. The following is the text of the Bill :—

Whereas means of certain and uninterrupted communication between the Magdalen Islands, in the electoral district of Gaspé, and the Island of Anticosti, in the electoral district of Saguenay, and the mainland, by means of the electric telegraph now in operation between the points above mentioned, exist and are available for use during seasons of the year when navigation is closed; Whereas, by means of such electric telegraph, the telegraphic system upon the Mainland is placed in connection with the telegraphic system of the Islands aforesaid, which latter system is under the direct control of the Government of Canada; and whereas it is expedient to employ the said telegraphic communication for the purpose of allowing the votes of the electors of the electoral districts aforesaid, residents respectively in said Islands to be counted in elections for the House of Commons of Canada taking place when communication other than telegraphic is interrupted by the closing of the navigation; Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. Whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor General of Canada at the time when an election of a member to represent either in the electoral districts aforesaid in the House of Commons of Canada is about to be held, that communication by water between the Islands hereinbefore mentioned and the mainland is, or is about to be, interrupted by the severity of the season, all necessary instructions may be transmitted to the proper officer, and all returns may be transmitted by him by means of the electric telegraph; and the Governor in Council may make such order as to the details of such election, so far as respects the said Islands, as he may deem expedient.

The clause respecting writs means that on the eve of an election the order or commission will be sent by telegraph in-

stead of writing. The returning officers and all other officers will to be appointed by telegraph. The ballot boxes and voting bulletins will be prepared on the Islands. Every proceeding will be carried on as in other parts of the country, and when the election is finished, the result will be reported by telegraph. The Bill is very simple, and, I think, can be carried out without violating the secrecy of election or any other portion of the law. By accident there were added to the title of the Bill the words, "voting by telegraph." It is not voting by telegraph, it is "carrying on the election by means of the telegraph."

Mr. BRECKEN. It is not my intention to offer any opposition to my hon. friend's Bill, but knowing, as I do, that the hon. gentleman from Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) is looked upon as a very high authority upon all questions affecting the navigation of the Gulf of St. Lawrence in winter or summer, I was disappointed at the reference he made to that celebrated vessel known as the *Northern Light*. I am sure that if my hon. friend thinks it necessary to introduce a Bill to enable the free and independent electors of the Magdalen Islands to vote upon the mainland by means of electricity, it is quite as important and as essential that the inhabitants of Prince Edward Island should have the means of voting in the same manner from the Island to the mainland. I was a little uneasy, I might say alarmed, when I heard the hon. member for Gaspé speaking in a slighting manner of the *Northern Light*. I think the *Northern Light* has proved the possibility of navigating the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and I hope to have the assistance of my hon. friend from Gaspé when I bring this matter before the notice of the House at a future time. With regard to the *Northern Light*, the people of Prince Edward Island, while they are not altogether satisfied, highly appreciate the advantages which she has conferred on the country. It is true that she has been icebound in the Straits of Northumberland for four or five weeks, but if that proves anything at all it only proves that more ought to be done than has been done yet. It is an experiment, and as such it merits legislative action as much as the insular position of the free and independent electors of the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. KILLAM. I think it is an extraordinary confession for the hon. member for Gaspé to make when he says that he never formed an opinion on the question of the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence. I regret that, because, if he had given his attention to it with the same success he gives to other questions of a kindred nature, probably he would have rendered the Government great assistance in solving the problem of the communication between Prince Edward and the mainland.

Mr. FORTIN. In my opinion the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence as a commercial enterprise, is an impossibility, and that is also the opinion of everybody practically acquainted with the Gulf of St. Lawrence whom I have consulted. I do not say that if you had an Arctic vessel you could not go through the Gulf by winding your way in every direction; but I would like to know who would insure the cargoes in those vessels, and who would be so foolish as to take passage in them when they might be caught in the ice and remain locked up for weeks and even months? This is an important question, and if the House will allow me I will cite an instance showing the difficulty of winter navigation. I speak on the authority of Sir Hugh Allan, who related me the fact. Many years ago a sailing vessel was coming up the Gulf in the beginning of May, she took a tack northward and got into a pack of ice. The wind came from the south-west and she became packed in ice off the Straits of Belle Isle, and there remained fast until about the middle of June. What happened then may happen again to any vessel trying to go through the St.

Lawrence in winter. When I spoke before I did not mention the ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, that is quite a different thing. With regard to the *Northern Light*, I did not want to belittle the vessel too much; but almost every person who has seen the vessel says she is not constructed for that kind of work. Now, let me tell you what has taken place during the voyages of that vessel. She can pass through the ice when it is loosened up by the winds and tides, but when the ice is closely packed against the shores by the wind or the current, she cannot pass through, nor can any other vessel. In order for a vessel to go through thickly packed ice, she must be able to displace the ice, and where is the ice to go to? Is the ice to go up, or down, or sideways? Can a vessel remove packed ice a number of feet each side of her during a distance of many miles? I have been myself through the ice, and I have seen the Straits of Belle Isle completely packed on the 28th of June, 1861, when not even an Arctic vessel could have made her way through, but on the next day the wind and the current had made a passage through the ice about ten miles long? With regard to the inland ferry between Prince Edward Island and Pictou, they will be able to cross most of the time, but when the ice is closely packed along the shore, it is quite impossible for them to pass through.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Railway Company (Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 17) to grant certain powers to "The American Telegraph and Cable Company."—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 68) to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company and Act amending the same.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 69) to grant certain powers to the "C. W. Williams Manufacturing Company," and to change the name thereof to the "Williams Manufacturing Company."—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 71) to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intitled: "An Act to incorporate the Managers of the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland," and amendments thereto.—(Mr. Brooks.)

CHAMBLY CANAL TELEPHONE.

Mr. BENOIT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to employ the telephone on the Chamby Canal, in order to render the working of this canal more efficient?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The subject is now being considered by the Government.

GRANTS OF LAND FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. CROUTER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make grants of land to such as survive,

or to their families, if dead, of the persons who did military service in the defence of their country A. D. 1837, and the subsequent years thereto, during the period known as the Canadian Rebellion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

SHELBURNE HARBOR, N.S.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a fog whistle at the entrance to Shelburne Harbor, N.S., during the present year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of my colleague, I have the honor to answer the hon. gentleman that the Hon. Mr. White has communicated with the Department about this matter, which has been taken into consideration, and the intention of the Department is to erect a fog whistle at the entrance to Shelburne Harbor.

BARRINGTON HARBOR, N.S.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide, in the Supplementary Estimates for the erection of a lighthouse upon West Head Cape, Sable Island, at the western entrance to Barrington Harbor, N.S.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is under consideration.

INSPECTION OF FACTORIES.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH, for Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to provide for the inspection of factories; if so, when?

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

LIGHT ON THE RIVIERE DU LOUP WHARF.

Mr. GRANDBOIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a light upon the wharf at Rivière du Loup, in the County of Temiscouata?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the Government.

MAIL SERVICE AT ST. FLAVIEN.

Mr. RINFRET enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a daily mail to the Parish of St. Flavien, in the County of Lotbinière, in accordance with the request addressed last Session to the Post Office Department?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The subject is now being considered by the Government.

FOUR DOLLAR BILLS.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to put into circulation bills of the denomination of four (4) dollars; and if so, when?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Such is the intention. The plate is now being prepared, and will be issued probably in a month or two.

CAPE TORMENTINE RAILWAY.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision, during the present Session, for the construction of the Cape Tormentine Railway?

Mr. CROUTER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject is now under the consideration of the Government.

SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. HOUDE enquired, Whether the Government proposes to introduce any measure to the effect of abolishing the system of superannuation allowances granted to the employes in the Civil Service? If not, whether it intends to apply this system, or an analogous one to the salaried officers in the Militia Service?

Mr. CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to abolish the system of superannuation allowances granted to the employes in the Civil Service, or to apply this system to the salaried officers in the Militia Service.

SALARIES OF DEPUTY ADJUTANTS-GENERAL AND BRIGADE MAJORS.

Mr. HOUDE enquired, Whether the Government considers the salaries now paid to the Deputy Adjutants-General and to the Brigade Majors in the Militia, as proportionally fair as those ordinarily paid to the employes in the Civil Service? If not, whether it proposes to increase the salaries of the above named militia officers?

Mr. CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of militia officers.

LIGHTHOUSE ON ISLE PERROT.

Mr. MONGENAIS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to rebuild the lighthouse at Isle Perrot, opposite Ste. Anne's, destroyed by fire during the summer of 1880?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government to ask for an appropriation for that purpose.

THE REPORT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Before you pass to the next Order I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to an article in the *Mail* of Saturday, in which it is stated that a bulky Blue book was laid on the Table of the House, containing over 400 pages, being the report of the Department of Indian Affairs. I have not had the pleasure of seeing that Blue book. I wonder if it is possible that it has reached the organ of the party before it reached the members of this House, or has it been laid on the Table of the House, as reported in this paper? I just call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the matter; may be he will explain it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I saw that article. The hon. gentleman says he has not seen the report, if it has been laid on the Table. Neither have I, Mr. Speaker. But I hope to be able to lay it on the Table tomorrow or the next day. How the advance sheets got to the organ at Toronto I am not at present in a position to tell my hon. friend, because I do not know.

Mr. ANGLIN. The dignity of Parliament in this case seems to be very seriously hurt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad my hon. friend from Middlesex has taken to reading the *Mail*. I have no doubt that if he continues to do so he will be a much better member of society, and of this House.

HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AT BELLE CREEK, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. BRECKEN, in moving for copies of correspondence, reports of engineers, and all other papers relating to harbor improvements at Belle Creek, in Queen's county, Prince Edward Island, said: It is not my intention to occupy the

time of the House, but to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to this very necessary work. Belle Creek empties itself into the Straits of Northumberland, and is situated from the capital of the Island about twenty-five miles. It is a thickly settled part of the country and is well cultivated, but I suppose there is no part of the Dominion where the people suffer so severely from the want of railway and steam communication. They have to travel in autumn, when they ship agricultural produce, a distance of from twelve to twenty miles to avail themselves of markets. The harbor is shallow and requires dredging, and if a few thousand dollars were spent on it a great benefit would be conferred upon the inhabitants of the locality. I doubt very much if there is an equally intelligent or industrious body of settlers who have made an equal advance and are still suffering from want of the commonest means of transportation, than the people at the bay in question. I know the Minister of Public Works has a great many claims upon him, but I hope he and his colleagues will take this matter into earnest consideration, and do something to enable these people to participate in the benefits now so liberally extended to inhabitants in the other parts of the Dominion. When these people living in Prince Edward Island, hear of the millions that are spent for the purpose of opening up communication, and when they know the advanced policy of this and all Governments is to give means of access to and transport from all parts of the country, they feel they are laboring under a very serious disadvantage. I hope the Minister of Public Works and his colleagues will see their way to mete out common justice to those people, and remedy the evils I have attempted to describe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The correspondence will be brought down. I may say to my hon. friend that I would be most happy to be able to recommend grants for this work as well as for many others, but we cannot do everything in one year. We do what we can this year, and I hope we shall see the hon. gentleman here next year, and in the next Parliament, and indeed, until he has become very old, and, no doubt, during that time, we shall be in a position to recommend to Parliament all the improvements he desires in his county.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND JURIES.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, in the absence of Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark), moved for correspondence between the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government, relating to an Act, intitled: "An Act respecting Grand Juries," being Chapter 13, 42nd Victoria (Ontario Statutes), which Act was not to come in force until a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor by his Proclamation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would inform the hon. gentleman that there is no necessity for this motion. The papers included in it are now in course of preparation on a previous motion for a return, and they will be brought down in a day or two.

Motion withdrawn.

EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. SCOTT, in moving for a copy of the Proclamation bringing into force the Act extending the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba, said: The Province had experienced great enlargement. According to the Manitoba Act, passed in 1870, the Province was assigned four representatives in the House of Commons, and two in the Senate; and it was provided that when the next Census of 1881 should be taken, the Province would receive an additional member in the Senate, and as to representatives in the Commons the number was to be entirely guided by the 51st

section of the British North America Act. By its provisions we cannot obtain a larger representation than four members, although at the time it was passed the Province possessed a very insignificant population. When the Act for enlarging the Province was passed, it enjoyed an area of only 14,000 square miles. To-day, its extent is 150,000 square miles, or more than ten times as large; and yet, according to the British North America Act, we are denied a larger representation than the smaller area possessed. This amounts to a very great injustice to a fast growing young Province like Manitoba. I believe, however, it is not the desire of Government or this House to deal unfairly with the Province. The clause in the British North America Act referring to this subject reads thus:

There shall be assigned to each of the other Provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such Census) as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained).

By the Manitoba Act, section 4, it is provided that:

The said Province shall be represented, in the first instance, in the House of Commons of Canada, by four members, and for that purpose shall be divided, by Proclamation of the Governor General, into four electoral districts, each of which shall be represented by one member: Provided, that on the completion of the Census, in the year 1881, and of each decennial Census afterwards, the representation of the said Province shall be re-adjusted according to the provisions of the 51st section of the British North America Act, 1867.

By the Boundaries Act, 44 Victoria, section 2, it is provided that:

All the enactments and provisions of all the Acts of Parliament of Canada, which have, since the creation of the Province of Manitoba, been extended into and made to apply to the said Province, shall extend and apply to the territory, by this Act added thereto, as fully and effectually as if the same had originally formed part of the Province, and the boundaries thereof had, in the first instance, been fixed and defined, as is done by this Act—subject, however, to the provisions of section 3 of this Act."

It appears, then, by this clause, we have no legal claim on the Government for increased representation, and, therefore, I bring this motion before their attention to secure that improvement. We hold that the Province is now so much enlarged, being the second largest in the Dominion, that we have a strong claim to increased representation. The area of Quebec is 193,000 miles; Manitoba, 150,000, and Ontario, 109,000, and I believe that within the ten years, what with the rapid construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and branch connecting lines from the south and north; with the great attention now directed towards that country, not only by the people of Canada and by the people of the northern tier of States adjoining, but by the people of Europe; with the fair and judicious arrangements and satisfactory policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway in reference to land settlement; with the wise and judicious management of the affairs of the Dominion by the present Government; with everything secured of a tendency to build up the country, we may reasonably hope that within the next ten years our population will be little less than half a million. If our anticipations are realized, it must be considered by all as most unjust that Manitoba should be deprived of a fair representation. True, we have lost some settlers, who, owing to a clause in the Land Regulations preventing second homesteading, left us and settled in Dakota. But we have more than counterbalanced that loss—a few dozen settlers—by the accession of a number of settlers from the south-western States. We have received upwards of 100 families from Missouri, who are now contented and comfortable, and we have had last season a large immigration from Dakota and Minnesota, which there is no doubt will continue. Only last week I received a letter from a Methodist clergyman, settled in the town of Brainard, Minnesota, desirous of obtaining six townships in the North West, who states he is confident he can settle them within a year by Canadians from Minnesota. Doubtless, emigrants will pour into the country as lively as we expect, therefore I think

the House should endeavor to take good care of her Big Infant in the North-West, and give her a fair representation. All that we ask is British fair play and no favor.

Motion agreed to.

CONGRATULATIONS UPON HER MAJESTY'S ESCAPE.

Mr. SPEAKER read the following Message from the Senate, acquainting the House, that they have agreed to the Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to transmit the Joint Address of both Houses to Her Most Gracious Majesty's Providential escape, without injury, from the attempt made on her life on Thursday last,—by filling up the blank with the words "Senate and" and that such Joint Address of both Houses be transmitted to Her Majesty, in the first place with the utmost dispatch by cable message, and in such other manner as His Excellency may see fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This resolution, I believe, has been sent down in the order in which it appears in the Journals. But I believe the Address should be presented to Her Majesty at once, and the earlier the better.

WINTER COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE PROVINCE OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. BRECKEN moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and any other parties having reference to the improvement of the winter communication between the Province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland, with a view to keeping up daily steam communication for the conveyance of mails and passengers, as stipulated in the terms of Union. He said: In making this motion I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the very important bearing of this question to the inhabitants of Prince Edward Island, from which Province I have the honor to come. When we entered Confederation in 1873, one of the terms agreed upon was continuous communication, winter and summer, with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion. Now, it may, perhaps, be urged with some reason that it is impossible to literally fulfil that condition. Such has been our experience with the *Northern Light*, which has been locked up a mile or two from Pictou during four weeks, and since last Friday she has been knocking about the Straits, and has not yet succeeded in reaching Prince Edward Island. But while we admit that during certain portions of the year, in January and February, it is almost impossible to construct a boat that will keep up continuous communication with anything like regularity, still there are other matters that ought to be considered, and there is a mode of communication still open to us that might be very vastly improved. Now, Sir, after we went into the Union, and during the years 1874, 1875 and 1876, they gave us a wooden boat called the *Albert*. She was placed on the route between Pictou, Nova Scotia, and Georgetown, Prince Edward Island. But she was utterly incompetent to do the work, so much so that she was never entrusted even with the carriage of the mails. After that we were given the steamer *Northern Light*, but the communication she gives us is so uncertain that we do not even send the mails by her. The most reliable mode of communication we still have is the old fashioned mode we have had for more than half a century, that between Cape Traverse in Prince Edward Island and Cape Tormentine on the mainland. Now this route, under the efficient and able management of the men who have charge of it, is tolerably secure, though the exposure and risk are very great. I venture to say there is not, in the most obscure corner of

Mr. SCOTT.

the Dominion, a more primitive mode of travelling than that we are compelled to adopt in Prince Edward Island. The nearest point in the Island Railway to Cape Traverse is eleven or twelve miles away. At the Cape you get into one of these canoes or boats, and then, going in a direct line of nine miles exposed in the open Gulf, you land at Cape Tormentine, and then you have to travel some thirty-six or forty miles before you reach the Intercolonial Railway. Now, Sir, I submit, with all respect to the hon. Ministers who comprise the Government, that that is not a fulfilment of one of the terms upon which we entered into Confederation. Doubtless the first consideration with us at that time was an anxiety to see these separate Provinces form one great Confederation, thereby strengthening the bonds that unite us with the Mother Country; but after that, one of the strongest inducements offered us to come into the Union was the promise of an efficient and continuous winter communication. Now, Sir, when you look at the mode of travelling in most countries in these civilized times, you must be struck with the contrast which it offers to the mode of communication to which we are confined—a mode so uncertain and offering so much exposure and hardship, that people only leave that Island now from an imperious sense of duty, such as impel hon. gentlemen who represent that Island to come up to Ottawa to attend their parliamentary duties, or pressing business interests; but under no other circumstances will people consent to leave the Island. The hardships and exposure to which travellers are subjected are so great that none but those of the most robust constitutions will undertake the journey. I am not drawing upon my imagination; I have had three or four years experience of it, and I do not hesitate to say that, compared with the facilities and comforts afforded in more fortunate parts of the Dominion, the mode of travelling to which the people of Prince Edward Island are confined is not fit for an Indian; but I mean to say that that term of the Union has not been carried out so far as we are concerned. I think we should have, at least, railway communication between Cape Traverse and the Island Railway on Cape Tormentine and the Intercolonial Railway. The service of the *Northern Light* we do not consider sufficient. There is not a man on the Island, from the most obscure to the most intelligent, who believes that the terms of the contract have been carried out. It is most desirable that any feeling of dissatisfaction should be allayed as far as possible, and I do hope that some improvement will be made on the present tedious and unsafe mode of travelling. The matter is one of far greater importance to us than possibly can be realized by hon. gentlemen living on the mainland. We were told when we entered the Confederation that our insular position would not operate prejudicially to us, and more—that whatever natural disadvantages we might labor under would, as far as possible, be removed. I think we have a strong claim founded on the terms of the contract on going into the Union, and founded on the principles of justice, for some such improvement as I have suggested; and I hope the position we occupy will engage the serious attention, not only of the Government, but of the members of this House. We are spending millions of money in other parts of the country in opening up means of communication, and we all recognize the fact that, if we wish to open up the country, we must have these means of communication. Some great historian—I think Macaulay—has said that, if you wish to learn of a country's advancement, you need not look at its paintings, its sculpture, or its poetry, but look at its roads, look at the facilities which it affords for men meeting together and exchanging thought and opinion with one another. His opinion is very true in this day, and in this country, for you can judge very safely of a country's advancement by the extent to which it enjoys these facilities. If you apply the rule to the mainland you must apply it to Prince Edward Island, and I would say that I think it

will be a cloud, I would not say a blot, on the escutcheon of the hon. Minister of Railways, who has done so much in the way of opening up communication and affording facilities for travel on the mainland, if he makes the case of Prince Edward Island an exception to his general policy. He, himself, is from the Lower Provinces, his home is by the sea, and I hope he will see the necessity of doing something to help us in that matter. When the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) spoke this afternoon about voting by electricity, I thought he rather depreciated our means of communication, but I was happy to find out that I had misunderstood him, because I know that he is a gentleman of great experience in these matters. I think there is no part of the Dominion which, at this moment, suffers greater natural disadvantages than our little Island, and I hope the hon. Minister of Railways and his colleagues will see the propriety of fulfilling the terms of the contract made with us at Confederation. In 1878, the Government, which was then led by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), sent down an experienced engineer, Mr. McLeod, who made surveys, and in the Sessional Papers of the House will be found valuable information collected by him. He strongly recommends something in the same direction as I am now suggesting, and his recommendations have the greater weight because he is an engineer and a scientific man, and cannot be open to the suspicion of political bias.

Mr. MUTTART. To the large majority of the members of this House this subject, I have no doubt, is of very trifling importance; but to Prince Edward Island representatives, and the people whom they represent, no question can be of greater importance than the question of continuous and efficient steam service between the Island and mainland both summer and winter. It is unnecessary for me to add anything to what has been already said as to the attempts which have been made towards navigating the Straits in the winter season. The old steamer *Albert* and the *Northern Light* have paid so many visits to Parliament, that there is no need of my introducing them on this occasion. It is not my intention to refer so much to what has been done as to what has not been done in the way of carrying out the terms on which we entered the Union. Fearing that the Government, as well as hon. members of this House, may have forgotten the exact wording of the bond, let me refresh their memories by reciting the exact words:

"Efficient steam service between this Island and the mainland, winter and summer, thus placing the Island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion."

Has this agreement been fulfilled, I would ask? I answer it has not. Now, one of the chief inducements held out to Prince Edward Islanders at the time of entering the Union was the promise that they were to have efficient steam service, winter as well as summer, between the Island and the railway system of the Dominion. I believe, if it were even suspected at that time that the Dominion Government would neglect or refuse to carry out every part of the agreement, especially that in reference to winter steam service, the people of the Island would never have consented to join the Union. They did join, however, and now I ask, is it right, is it just, to treat them with indifference because the Island happens to be the smallest Province of the Dominion. I appeal to the Government and to hon. members of this House for justice in this matter. This is not a party question; it is simply a question of fulfilment of contract between the Island and the Dominion Government. Whichever party may be in power the obligations remain the same. The late Government gave us the *Northern Light* as a sort of experiment, it is now said; and although, with no less a personage on board than our worthy Superintendent of Penitentiaries, she has been stuck in the ice for the last few weeks, she has nevertheless already proved the feasibility of navigating the Straits in

winter, or for a portion of the winter at least. But, as I said, it is not my purpose to discuss at present the *Northern Light*, or the eastern route with an additional steamer, nor the branch railways in connection with the capes route. I merely wish to point out that the winter service between the Island and the mainland is neither continuous nor efficient. This state of affairs has continued already too long, and the people of the Island consider that they have waited about long enough to have this matter attended to. British Columbia entered the Union with the understanding that the Pacific Railway should be built within a given time; millions of dollars have been expended in keeping faith with British Columbia. Of this I do not complain, as the Government is bound to carry out their engagement with British Columbia, but not any more bound than they are to fulfil their agreement with Prince Edward Island. I only wish the members of the Government could be induced to take a trip to the Island at the present time. By the time they would travel from Amherst to Cape Tormentine and from Cape Tormentine across the Straits of Northumberland, by means of an ice boat, to Cape Traverse, and from there to the nearest point on the Island Railway, they would exclaim: "Our experience is more than sufficient. We will give the Islanders safer and easier communication with the railway system of the Dominion, regardless of cost."

Mr. HACKETT. This question is one of very great importance, not only to the people of Prince Edward Island but to the whole Dominion of Canada, that I consider I would not be fulfilling my duty if I remained silent at this time. It is my opinion that Prince Edward Island cannot be considered an integral part of the Dominion until the natural difficulties we labor under there are overcome. Although we may be a part of the Dominion on paper, I care not what Government may be in power, unless we have direct and continuous communication with the mainland, we cannot participate in the prosperity of the country. So important was this question considered at the time of Confederation, that the Government of the Island insisted on having a clause inserted in the Terms of Union, stating that direct and continuous steam communication between the Island and the mainland should be kept up at the expense of the Dominion Government. I say these terms have not been carried out. We have now been about eight years in Confederation, and yet we have still to resort to the old mode of crossing from the Island to the mainland in the winter. First, we had the old wooden boat *Albert*, which, in 1875, kept up communication for fifteen or twenty days after the close of navigation. Then we had the *Northern Light*, which, in the first year, proved a complete failure. In 1877, she did better, and latterly she has been crossing during the winter season with more or less regularity. But from January to April she is unable to keep up her trips regularly, and the old mode of carrying the mails has to be adopted; and but for the brave men who cross the ice, we would be cut off entirely. These men are very poorly paid; while large sums of money are spent in other parts of the country to keep up communication, these men who are engaged in crossing the Northumberland Straits in winter are the most poorly paid of any in the Dominion. They have to cross nine miles on the roughest description of ice, and were it not for their skill in this work, it would be quite impossible for us to keep up communication in the winter time. What we complain of is that nothing at all has been done to improve this route. I myself, about a month ago, crossed by that route. On leaving Prince Edward Island, we were about nine hours in the ice, dragging the boat with us, and on reaching the other side we had to put up with the hospitality of the people on the shore. There is nothing at all on that route for the accommodation of the public. I think this is very unfair. A very small amount of money, one or two thousand dollars, expended for building boat houses, in which the boats could

be sheltered, and for affording accommodation to the public, would be a very great boon. Apart from the question of steam communication, I think the Government should improve the crossing at the Straits. When you reach the Straits, from the Intercolonial Railway to the Island Railway, you have to travel some forty miles. This could be overcome by building a branch line of railway, which would not cost more than from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 and the interest on that would not be large. I hope the Government will not allow any time to elapse before they take action on this matter. The people of the Island have waited patiently while other claims were presented. While the members from British Columbia pressed their claims we kept silent, hoping that after they were settled the Terms of Union with the Province of Prince Edward Island would be carried out; and now that the question of a railway extending from the old Provinces of Canada to British Columbia is settled, we hope the Government will turn their attention to the improvement of winter communication with Prince Edward Island. The Terms of Union are not altogether confined, moreover, to the question of winter communication. Part of the agreement was that communication should be kept in summer time also. At the time we entered into Confederation, an Island company had the carrying of the mails from the Island to the mainland. From that time they received a subsidy from the Dominion Government. But as the wants of the country are increasing, so the accommodation should increase. The boats which run in the summer time are not now found sufficient, and as their contract will expire within a short time, it is very desirable that something should be done towards putting better boats on the route. It is well known, from the peculiar position of Prince Edward Island, that the whole of the Dominion, with the exception of a small portion of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, lies west and north of Summerside. Summerside is the point from which direct communication in the summer time should be kept up with the mainland. If good and strongly made screw steam vessels, having ample carrying capacity and accommodation for passengers, were placed on that route, they would prove a paying speculation not only to the owners but also as tending to develop the resources of the country. I hope before a long time elapses we shall find boats of that character doing that service. While I do not want to throw any blame on the Prince Edward Island Steam Navigation Company, as I believe they do the best they can, and that their captains are prudent and careful seamen, yet it does appear that the wants of the country have overdrawn the accommodation, while, in the meantime the boats have grown older and inadequate to meet the wants of the service. In October last year, while sailing vessels were putting out to sea from Summerside, the boats of the company were tied up, and for several days while there was open water the people were detained from receiving their mails. Looking at the fact that the Dominion Government undertook, at the time Prince Edward Island entered the Confederation, to provide efficient steam communication between the Island and the mainland, we, as representatives of the Island, are only doing our duty in urging this matter on the earnest attention of the Government. The people of the Island have waited long and patiently, and they believe the time has now arrived when this part of the compact shall be carried out; they insist on it, they look at it as part of their rights, and there should be no beating about the bush. This is a grievance under which the people are laboring, and they urge upon us, as their representatives, to urge upon the Government in Parliament to see that this portion of the Confederation Terms are carried out. I trust before any lengthened period has elapsed, and this year, during the present Session, some proposition will be made for the carrying out of this

Mr. HACKETT.

important part of the terms of the Confederation, and thus, to a very large extent, benefit the people of the Island, and also increase its trade with the older Provinces of the Dominion, because we are large consumers of the commodities of the older Provinces. We are an agricultural population; manufacturing has not developed to any great extent, and if it is desired that we shall be consumers of the manufactures of the older Provinces, and receive those goods as cheaply as possible and promote trade, the Government should, this Session, see that this important stipulation of Confederation shall be carried out.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS IN THE COUNTY OF ST. JOHN.

Mr. BOURASSA moved for a statement showing: 1st. The names of all officers and enumerators employed in taking the Census in 1881, in the County of St. John; 2nd. The amounts paid to each of them for fees, emoluments and travelling expenses; 3rd. The number of miles certified as having been travelled by each of them. He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I must call the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to the fact that there have been some deplorable omissions on the part of the Census takers in certain parishes of the County of St. John. They have omitted taking notice of some of the finest, and I may add, most valuable properties in the county, on which somewhat numerous families have resided for a period of fifty years. I do not understand how such omissions have taken place, but, at any rate, such is the case. I would not like to say much of all the other parishes of the county, for I am aware that the Census was correctly taken in some parishes, as I personally know the enumerator employed in so doing, but in the parish of St. John inconceivable omissions have taken place.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the motion just made by the hon. member. With regard to the omission of certain names or properties, I feel sure that such is the case, since the hon. member says so, but the fact has not come to the knowledge of the Department; and I hope the hon. member will be good enough to give to the Department the names of persons whose properties have not been taken in the Census, so that the Department may make enquiries of the enumerators employed in that county, in order to ascertain how it is that these omissions occurred. I am, nevertheless, certain that on the whole the Census was well taken; there may have been a few omissions on the part of the Census taker, and it is to be hoped that the hon. member will communicate the names that he knows to have been omitted to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I called at the Department of Agriculture, and on enquiry I found that the names of whole families were omitted from the Census sheet, so I gave those names to the Deputy Minister of the Department. But again, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the property omitted is one of the finest in the parish of St. John.

Motion agreed to.

EXPORT OF COAL FROM NOVA SCOTIA.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH, in the absence of Mr. MACKENZIE, moved for a statement showing the quantity of coal exported from the ports of Nova Scotia, during the years 1877-78 and 1880-81, and the countries to which such coal was exported; also, the quantity of coal carried upwards through the St. Lawrence Canals and through Ste. Ann's Lock on the Ottawa River.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Suppose you amend the motion, so as to include 1879 also?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I have no objection.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS—QUEEN AND DUFFERIN STREETS, TORONTO.

Mr. WALLACE (York), in moving for a return of all correspondence, petitions and reports of Government Engineers relative to the different railway crossings at Queen street and Dufferin street, on the western limit of the city of Toronto, said: There are four different railroads crossing those streets; and, owing to the want of repairs to the tracks, as well as neglect of proper precautions, a number of lives have been lost, and many persons maimed for life. I believe a report by a Dominion and an Ontario engineer have been made on this subject, and I hope we shall soon see that proper measures have been taken to protect at those points the lives and limbs of the public. I understand the report recommends gates, which are thought likely by the people of the neighborhood to prove a useful protection. In accordance with the opinion of the Common Council, it is considered that gateways would not be a sufficient protection; but that a sub-way or a bridge should be constructed. I hope the Government will take this important subject into consideration, so that by this time next year there will exist a suitable protection, either in the form of a sub-way or bridge, at this particular point.

Motion agreed to.

MAPS OF MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. HESSON moved for copies of all maps of Manitoba, the North-West, and British Columbia, published by authority of the Department of the Interior, for the year ending December 31st, 1881, and up to the present date. He said: My object in bringing this motion before the House is to explain the impossibility of members here supplying constituents with all the maps of this region asked for in consequence of the limited number furnished. This matter was brought before the Committee of Immigration and Colonization last year, and, I believe, then the member for North Huron pressed strongly the necessity of having a large supply of good reliable maps for the information of the people who take an interest in that great country. It was pointed out there is a desire to ascertain all that can be known about the North-West, and that the success of settling the United States north-western region was largely attributable to the extensive distribution of maps by land and railway companies. We have a railway corporation now, which is also desirous of settling our North-West, and, in conjunction with the Government, it might well issue a sufficient number of maps to meet the demands of the members of this House. Within the past week I have received at least fifty or sixty letters asking for maps, and on one day three telegrams. True, a very large supply was issued by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, which contained the land regulations. Still I consider the map is too small, and when you send such an article to one constituent, and a very superior map to comparatively few, much dissatisfaction is created. The small map is so small as to be almost valueless, and only seems to give offence where a member, too, intends to confer a compliment by it. If it is not in the power of the Government to furnish members with a sufficient supply of good maps, or at least a good one for the Post Office in each county, where it might be consulted by all interested in the country, I would suggest, as it is not a very expensive production, that a map be issued, having the imprint of the Department of the Interior, which would be likely to be considered correct, and give satisfaction to enterprising individuals thinking of the North-West. Those maps might be distributed on the authority as well as with the imprint of the Department, and placed in the bookstores, where they might be sold for actual cost to the Government. The large maps should be printed and placed where the people could have easy access to them. I know it is announced

that a few more will be distributed to the members, but an hon. gentleman says the supply is run out, and even the paper is not to be had. I hope the Government will remedy this, and afford the people all the information possible. I believe good maps would be more valuable than a great number of these pamphlets now circulated at the expense of the Government, and at great expense to the Post Office Department in particular. Many of those pamphlets are thrown away, while a valuable map would be preserved. I think 12½ cents would cover the cost of the colored maps, while giving the most gratifying information with regard to the North-West.

Mr. ARKELL. I second the resolution, and fully agree with the remarks just made. I believe the North-West is now becoming a very important part of the Dominion, and that all the information obtainable by the Government should be furnished to the people. I believe that there is no better medium of communicating information to the people than through a large number of good reliable maps of that territory. My hon. friend only asked for four maps for each member of the House. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) suggests that the Government should furnish each member of this House with forty maps. I am not here to advocate a large expenditure, but I believe it would meet with general favor for the Government to issue a reasonable lot of maps, and supply, first the members, and then the people at large, in so far as the Government might think advisable.

Mr. McCUAIG. This system will involve a large expense to the country. I think it would be better for the Government to supply each clerk of the various township councils with a map, and it would be the duty of the clerk to keep it exposed in his office so that every one could go there and inspect it. My county is sixty miles square, and in the general intelligence of its people, I think, it will bear favorable comparison with any other county. I have been asked for maps by thirty or forty individuals living in different lots, and because I could not supply all of them with maps some of them were annoyed. It seems to me that if the Government would furnish three or four maps to each clerk of a township who should keep them exposed for the use of the farmers, that is all the Government should be called upon to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This matter, of course, has occupied the attention of the Government. Hon. gentlemen must know that these maps are not made for nothing, and if all the demands were granted I think it would cost a good many townships to pay for the maps at the selling price of the land. About twenty-five thousand of the maps of a late issue, have been published, and a great many have been sent home to the Old Country and to Europe. Of course, it is more important to the Dominion as a whole, that the maps should go across to the Old Country than merely be the means of transferring a portion of the population from one part of the Dominion to another. There has been a large issue of these maps, and, as hon. members know, they are very complete; and I believe they are exceedingly accurate, but they are not inexpensive. At first, not thinking the demand was so great, maps were issued to people as they were asked for, but the demand for them was so great, the rush was so great—people were getting them, and I dare say some people were selling them for all we know—that the whole supply was exhausted. There has been a new edition issued, and it is proposed by the Government to issue a considerable number to each member of each House for distribution among his constituents; and then arrangements are to be made with the publisher of the maps to sell them at cost price and to place them in every booksellers' shop in every place in the Dominion. That is the plan of the Government, which, I hope, meets with the general assent of the House.

Mr. BUNSTER. I would ask the hon. leader of the Government what is being done for British Columbia. Not one map has been issued for British Columbia, while the hon. leader of the Government admits that 25,000 are being issued for Manitoba. I think British Columbia is not included in the North-West. I think great injustice is being done to British Columbia, and it is to be hoped the Government will not continue to do such injustice as not to have maps published of that Province. Even the maps of British Columbia that have been issued by the Government have not done that Province justice, and I hope the Government will remedy that injustice in any future map they may publish. The map ought to show the resources of that country, and I am satisfied our resources are such that every Canadian will be proud of them when they are represented on the map. A great injustice has been done to British Columbia through not having maps, through not having proper representations made of her resources. Through the neglect of the Government in locking up the land of British Columbia, and asking our Provincial Government to keep them in reserve, immigration has been prevented from coming in there, and hence we are not able to show that we have made as much progress as the North-West in consequence of the Government locking up the public domain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am obliged to my hon. friend for his suggestion, as we both come from the same Province and represent the people. I will, however, point out a little difference between our Province and the North-West. The lands in the North-West all belong to the Dominion Government, and as they want to sell those lands they must prepare maps for that purpose of all the lands, except the railway belts which belong to the Provincial Government, and it is for the Provincial Government to prepare maps of all those portions of the great Province of British Columbia, except such as are not included in the lands to be conveyed as a subsidy for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The limits of those lands have not been settled yet; I hope they will be shortly, and then as the railway works up to Kamloops and opens up that very fine country, maps will be prepared by the Dominion Government and the lands will be put into the market, and I have no doubt my hon. friend will go to speculating there and make as much money as some of our hon. friends have made at Winnipeg.

Motion agreed to.

TELEGRAPH EXTENSION IN VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. BUNSTER, in moving for all papers asking that the telegraph line on the east coast of Vancouver Island from Nanaimo be extended to Comox, so as to accommodate the communication of the farmers, merchants and traders of Comox with the outer world, said: This is a question of greater importance than the Government are aware of. There are at least 300 or 400 at Comox, and there would be a great many more only for the reserve to which the hon. leader of the Government has referred. There is no reason why the Government should not extend the telegraph line, inasmuch as they have not built the railway which they should have built years ago, particularly according to the Carnarvon Award. I hope the Minister of Public Works will take the matter into consideration and have the line extended, as I believe it will be a paying institution from the time it is built. In fact it should have been built years ago.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take leave to read a communication I have just received from the Governor
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

General's Office, conveying a telegraphic Message dated 6th March, 1882. The Message is as follows:—

LONDON, 6th March, 1882.

Message 3rd March, laid before Queen. Her Majesty much gratified by congratulations of Legislature and people of Canada for escape and by assurances of loyalty and devotion.

KIMBERLY.

READJUSTMENT OF THE REPRESENTATION.

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

Mr. MILLS. Before the motion is put, I wish to ask the leader of the Government when he intends to bring down the Bill relating to the distribution of seats on the Census, which was recently taken. The measure is a most important one, and as four weeks have elapsed since the Session opened, members of the House are, naturally, anxious to know what the hon. gentleman proposes; and this, of course, we cannot know until the Bill is before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true; but it is early in the Session yet. This is only the fourth week of the Session, but I may say that the measure is now being considered. It is a matter of great importance constitutionally, and we have, necessarily, to legislate in the matter. We will bring down the Bill in due season, so as to give the hon. gentleman, and every member of the House, an opportunity of expressing his views and considering the measure when it comes before the House. I may say, at once, that this measure excites a great deal of interest. I find that much correspondence has taken place, as every one wishes to have a constituency or two in his immediate vicinity. The Government will consider the matter with a desire to prepare a measure satisfactory to the House, and will bring the Bill down in due season, so that it may have the full consideration of hon. members.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Detailed statement of flour, meal and corn entered for consumption at the different ports of entry in the counties of the Province of Nova Scotia, from the 15th of March, 1879, to the 30th September, 1881.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Statement of services performed for the Government by the tug-boat *Annie Stewart*, during the past three years, places at which employed, and copies of all contracts and agreements entered into with the owners of said boat for her services.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Statement showing the properties sold by the Government in the town of Sorel, and the neighboring parishes, since September, 1872, up to this present date, mentioning the price paid and the names of the purchasers.—(Mr. Massue.)

Return of all circulars, memoranda and instructions issued by the Customs throughout the Dominion, relating to the interpretation of the several classes of goods imported and the duties to be levied thereon under the Tariff, from the 1st of January, 1874, to the 14th March, 1879.—(Mr. Wallace, York.)

Copies of all letters of instruction from Lindsay Russell, Esq., Deputy Minister of the Interior, to James Anderson, Crown Timber Agent at Winnipeg, relating to disposal of timber for lumber, railway ties, or cordwood, since March 1st, 1881, and all correspondence relating to the same.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing the report and survey of Mr. McLatchie, D.L.S., on the water powers on the Rainy River, at or near Rat Portage.—(Mr. Wallace, York.)

Copies of all correspondence with the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario relating to the Boundary Award, since the 27th of January last; also, for all correspondence and Orders in Council relating to the appointment of arbitrators to make an award as to the disputed boundaries.—(Mr. Mills.)

Copies of all reports, plans, letters, petitions and all documents whatsoever, respecting the fisheries and fishing licenses granted to François Ruelland, of St. Valier; Jean Baptiste Langlois, of St. Valier; Alexis Leclerc, of St. Michel, and Henri Blais, of St. Michel.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Copies of the report of the engineer ordered to examine the mouth of the Rivière du Loup (*en haut*) in order to ascertain what the cost would be of the dredging necessary to admit of vessels entering it during the low water season.—(Mr. Houde.)

Statement showing the names of the persons who made the Census of 1881, in the county of Rimouski; the number of miles paid for and allowed to each of the said persons, and the amount received by each of them for his fees.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Copy of the cheque deposited by Andrew Onderdonk, with his tender, which was accepted, for the construction of the railway from Port Moody to Emory's Bar.—(Mr. Guthrie.)

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 7th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the International Construction Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 77) relating to the Canadian Electric Light Company, and to confer certain powers upon the said Company.—(Mr. McDougall.)

Bill (No. 78) to amend the Acts incorporating and relating to "The Sovereign Fire Insurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the American Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 81) relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. PLUMB. I think it is proper, in commencing a discussion which affects, in every way, the great interests of the Dominion, that I may, as a member of this House, as a loyal subject of the Queen, refer to the terrible occurrence with which we were shocked a few days ago. I may say, and I think I express the feelings not only of

this House, but of the whole Dominion, without exception—for I believe no more loyal people exist, owing allegiance to the British Crown, than the people of Canada—that we heard, with the greatest grief and indignation, of the wicked attempt on the life of Her Majesty the Queen, and rejoice that the assassin has been powerless to inflict the slightest injury; and that in this, as in previous instances, a merciful Providence has interposed to protect and shield our beloved Sovereign, and to spare her to the faithful and loyal millions over whom she exercises, under the Divine blessing, a just and beneficent rule. Mr. Speaker, when the debate closed on Friday evening, we had been listening for long time to a speech of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). The skill with which that hon. gentleman presents his side of the argument is well known to the House, and it is also well known to those audiences whom he has addressed in various parts of the country during the recess of Parliament. He is, Sir, I believe, one of the prominent leaders of the Opposition party, and we are to accept his statements as being authorized by the leader of the Opposition, and generally sanctioned and endorsed by those hon. gentlemen who sit beside him. That hon. gentleman, after a rambling discussion of the Tariff and its effects, came down to facts, as he is pleased to call them, and treated us, for a long time, to certain figures taken from the Public Accounts in which he claims to be an expert. Now, Sir, after a long experience in the tactics of that hon. gentleman, I may say—I think I may say it without offence to him—that whenever he makes a statement with particular precision and a good deal of vehemence, without ever presuming to doubt, in a parliamentary sense, that the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in everything he says, I always go back to the record for the purpose, of course, of ascertaining, as I expect to ascertain, and as I hope always to ascertain, that the hon. gentleman is quite within the limits of what may be called parliamentary truth. When the hon. gentleman's speech was put into my hands, I ventured to take up the Public Accounts, the Tables of Trade and Navigation, and other material from which the hon. gentleman drew a large portion of his speech; as I wished by this means to ascertain the general accuracy of the hon. gentleman's statements; and, as I always like to dispose of figures as soon as possible, I will venture to go over some of the main parts of his speech and compare part of his figures with others which I have ascertained to be official, which every hon. gentleman in this House may verify for himself. It may fairly be claimed that if, in a great number of instances, he has given figures which can be shown, whether through accident or design, manifestly wrong, great credit should not be attached to the laborious effort of the hon. gentleman. I will now take up the hon. gentleman's speech and go over portions of it point by point; it will be a little tedious to do so, but I hope I shall not be quite as tedious as he was. In speaking of the hon. Finance Minister's address new under discussion, he says: "The hon. Minister of Finance will remember that by the obligations he incurred in 1873, instead of bringing down an estimate of \$20,900,000, he should have brought one down of \$23,368,000. This must be specially noted." He says, also, that the average expenditure for the last two years of the late Government was \$23,511,229. This is the beginning of his statement of figures. Now, I wish to show that, in regard to the \$23,368,000 which he asserts was the expenditure for which the Government of 1873 is wholly responsible, we have made statements which have been uncontradicted in this House year after year, showing that the expenditure of 1873-74, after all the Supplementary Estimates were brought in, for which my hon. friend who now occupies the place of Finance Minister can possibly be held responsible, amounted to \$22,300,000. That hon. gentleman has stated, on the floor of this House, that in order to swell the expenditure of that year, and to cast obloquy on his predecessor, the late hon. Minister of

Finance took \$567,000, which should have been charged to the capital account and put to the operating account of the Intercolonial Railway; that there was another item of about \$200,000 for election expenses which is chargeable to the hon. gentlemen opposite; there were refunds and other items swelling the amount to \$922,000, which were added to the expenditure for 1873-74, some of which ought not to have gone into expenditure chargeable against revenue at all, while for other items of the \$922,000 the Government succeeding the Government of 1873 were clearly responsible. My hon. friend, when he makes statements of this kind, is very apt to look only on one side of the account. He asserts that the average expenditure on Consolidated Fund account of the late Government was \$23,511,229, for its last two years. Now, mark how plain a tale shall put him down. Its expenditure the last year but one was \$23,503,158; its expenditure the next year was \$24,455,381, making altogether \$47,958,539, the average of which is \$23,979,269, instead of \$23,511,000. There is a little difference of \$468,000, to begin with.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman—

Mr. PLUMB. I do not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman is talking about 1878-79, when I spoke of the last four years of the Government.

Mr. PLUMB. I call the hon. gentleman to order. The expenditure for our two years, 1879-80, and 1880-81 were respectively \$24,850,624 and \$23,502,550, in all, \$50,365,188, or an average of \$25,176,594. The average increase is \$1,197,325, instead of \$1,625,365, as the hon. gentleman asserts, and the increase of our average expenditure for those two years is \$718,000 and not \$2,000,000 as the hon. gentleman asserted. I knew the hon. gentleman would wince when caught in that misstatement. How long has the hon. gentleman assured the country that we were responsible for the expenditure of 1873-74; but his party came in power in October, 1873, precisely as our friends did, in October, 1878, but his friends were not long in power before they began to increase the expenditure. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the expenditure of 1878-79 was made on the estimates of the late Finance Minister, and he knows perfectly well that he is attempting to steal a verdict by falsely stating—in a parliamentary sense I mean, and I say so with apologies—by knowingly stating that the expenditure of 1877-78 was the expenditure for the last year of their period. We know better than that, and we will prove it before we get through. He said that the highest expenditure of the late Administration was \$3,600,000. I suppose he says so now.

Mr. ROSS. I did not say so then.

Mr. PLUMB. The statement is in the *Hansard*, and I will read it.

Mr. ROSS. Read it.

Mr. PLUMB. He says the average expenditure during the last two years was \$23,511,229, and, in another place, which I shall come to directly, he says that from an expenditure of \$23,500,000, such as they required in 1877-78, the expenditure has leaped up to \$27,600,000, and that we are responsible for the increase. He also says that the Estimates proposed now with the Supplementary Estimates brought down amount to \$27,600,000 or \$4,000,000 more than the highest expenditure of the Reform Administration. This means an assertion that the Reform Administration did not spend more than \$23,600,000 in any year, but in fact they spent \$24,448,372 in 1875-76, and \$22,345,381 in 1878-79; and the expenditure was only kept down in the two intermediate years, by cutting down the militia expenditure \$400,000 and odd, and taking from Public Works chargeable to income nearly \$500,000 more. There was an increase in

Mr. PLUMB.

every item of what is called controllable expenditures and that by a Government which claimed to be specially a Reform and an economical Government. It is quite easy to see how the expenditure was brought down below \$24,000,000; and it is equally easy to see how the hon. gentlemen opposite dodged those items altogether. He says that this extravagant Government increased the expenditure \$10,000,000 between 1867 and 1873-74. Well, I have heard that before. In fact, none of the hon. gentleman opposite ever get up to make a financial speech without repeating that old charge. I have often asked what they mean. Do they intend to say that that increased expenditure of \$10,000,000 was improper in any way; that the interests of the country did not require it? Do they intend to say that when they were sitting in Opposition, year after year, the late Finance Minister or any of his new friends ever seriously challenged that expenditure till 1873, when, for the first time, he criticised adversely the Budget brought down by my hon. friend, the present Finance Minister? I never yet have heard any hon. gentleman on the other side say here, where he could be met face to face and answered, that a single item of this expenditure was unnecessary. It necessarily grew out of the cementing together of the Provinces into the Union; it was indispensable for the purpose of creating Courts of Justice, for the opening up of the North-West, and the bringing in of other Provinces to the Confederation, the establishment of lighthouses, the improvement of harbors, and other expenditures of that kind. All these items have been defended over and over again on this side of the House, and yet every time an hon. gentleman on the other side begins a financial speech, he goes back to the same old cry; but, to use a very vulgar expression, it is a cry that is "played out." I shall now begin in further answering the member for South Brants figures at the very head of the items of controllable expenditure, but before doing so, I wish to say one word with respect to controllable expenditure itself. The hon. gentleman is very careful on this point. With that ingeniousness which is his peculiar forte, and which is so well understood by those who have heard him, he indicates but very vaguely what he regards a controllable expenditure. He does not say precisely what it is, but he says that the items of controllable expenditure there have been large increases. Now, I will undertake to define, as nearly as I can, what controllable expenditure is. First, I say that when we take up the Public Accounts or the balance sheet of the year, there are certain items which, in the present condition of things, must be regarded as not controllable. These items are among others Charges upon debt—Interest and Sinking Fund—which are voted by Parliament. Subsidies to Provinces may also be numbered among them. Then, I say that the expenditure for the North-West Territories are largely a charge which must be made—a charge which we must expect to increase every year if we intend to gain anything by our possession of these Territories, and it is a charge which will necessarily increase year by year so long as prosperity increases, and so long as immigrants are going into that vast country. Whenever that expenditure is diminishing, it is a sign that we have failed in our attempt to colonize that great domain, and that our predictions in regard to it have not been fulfilled. Now, Sir, the charges for interest on Debt and Sinking Fund, charges of management and subsidies to Provinces, for the past eight years have been as follows: In 1873-74, \$10,255,000; in 1874-75, \$11,124,000; in 1875-76, \$11,122,000; in 1876-77, \$11,480,000; in 1877-78, \$11,659,000; 1878-79, \$11,952,000, in 1879-80, owing to the necessity of negotiating loans for the purpose of constructing the Pacific Railway, it was increased to \$12,659,000; and, in 1880-81, it was reduced again to \$12,525,000, instead of being increased as the hon. gentleman has asserted. The ordinary expenditure of 1873-74—and I wish to

have particular note taken of this—owing to the improper items to which I have referred having been included in that expenditure of that year, amounted to \$8,324,000; in 1874-75, it amounted to \$7,868,000; in 1875-76—under that economical Government that promised us reform in every direction, that came into power face to face with the greatest financial crisis of this century, that promised reductions on all hands, under the authority of a gentleman who was one year a mixer and muddler and the next year a heaven-born financier—the expenditure was \$8,569,774; in 1876-77, by starving the militia and public works, they reduced it to \$6,835,000; in 1877-78, it was \$6,542,000; in 1878-79, it was \$6,941,000; in 1879-80, it was \$6,963,000; and, in 1880-81, it was \$7,293,000. Now, the charges on revenue, in 1873-74, amounted to \$4,736,000; in 1874-75, \$4,719,654; in 1875-76, \$4,796,238; in 1876-77, in which year began the period of deficits, and of a falling off in the revenue and an increase in the cost of collecting of it, which signalized the Administration of the party of my hon. friend from Middlesex, the charges on revenue amounted to \$5,194,896; in 1877-78 they amounted to \$5,301,124, with a still declining revenue; in 1878-79, they amounted to \$5,561,162—and that was the culminating crisis, and in that year an indignant people requested the hon. gentleman and his friends to take the opposite side of the House. In 1879-80, under a conservative Government, they amounted to but \$5,227,113, with an advancing revenue; and, in 1880-81, the last year of which we have the Public Accounts, they amounted to \$5,683,153, on a revenue of over \$18,400,000 from Customs' duties \$5,343,000 from excise, an increase of revenue of \$5,500,000 over the last year of the late Administration with an increase of charge for collecting this additional amount of only \$120,000, producing a surplus over expenditure of more than \$4,000,000. The total expenditure in 1873-74, for which hon. gentlemen opposite declare we were responsible, less the items which I have just stated, amounting to \$959,000, was \$22,316,000. In 1874-75 it was \$24,713,071, to which is fairly chargeable the \$959,000 also; if as hon. gentlemen opposite contend the whole of it is chargeable to revenue at all, this would make the expenditure of 1873-74, \$22,762,701; it stands \$23,713,071; the expenditure for 1875-76, \$24,488,327; in 1876-77, \$23,519,301; in 1877-78, \$23,503,158; in 1878-79, \$22,455,381; in 1879-80, \$24,850,634; and, in 1880-81, \$25,502,554. Now, if we deduct from this the charges for interest on debt and sinking fund, the subsidies to the Provinces, and the expenditure of the North-West Territories, on the principle I have stated—which I am sure the majority of the members of this House will agree with me is the only correct principle—the controllable expenditure of the Dominion will be, for 1873-74, \$12,128,534; for 1874-75, \$11,593,969; for 1875-76, \$12,207,902; for 1876-77, \$11,235,139; for 1877-78, \$10,944,640; for 1878-79, \$11,567,816; and for 1879-80, \$11,015,797. Thus the controllable expenditure for 1879-80, was \$1,112,737 less than the controllable expenditure of 1873-74, notwithstanding the improper addition to the expenditure of that year which I have noted; it was \$577,000 less than the controllable expenditure of 1874-75; it was \$1,192,105 less than the controllable expenditure of 1875-76; it was \$239,342 less than the controllable expenditure of 1876-77; it was \$71,000 more than the controllable expenditure of 1877-78; and it was \$561,019 less than the controllable expenditure of 1878-79, for which hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible in every possible way, far more so than we were for the controllable expenditure of 1873-74. Now, Sir, that is a specimen of the reasoning of the hon. gentleman who has sought to prove that his party decreased the controllable expenditure between 1874 and 1879 to the extent of \$2,000,000. The hon. gentleman is very fond of averaging. The total controllable expenditure from 1874 to 1879, inclusive, amounted to

\$69,706,449, or an average of \$11,617,740 for each year. Our expenditure for 1877-80 and for 1880-81, to which the hon. gentleman called attention, make altogether, \$22,702,826; the average of that is \$11,351,413. The comparison between their average from 1874 to 1879 and our average from 1879 to 1881 shows that they spent in controllable expenditure an average each year of \$11,716,749, while we spent \$11,351,403 in 1879-80 and 1880-81, those extravagant years to which the hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly referring, and, therefore, that our average yearly expenditure in those years was less than theirs by \$365,337.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to call his attention to a point.

Mr. PLUMB. I will allow the hon. gentleman to speak when the proper time comes.

Mr. ROSS. The average cannot come higher than the greatest expenditure during any one year.

Mr. PLUMB. There will be time enough for the hon. gentleman to speak. In the course of his speech he stated that we required on an average \$760,951 more for interest than was required during the late Reform Administration. This does not prove anything in this particular connection, and can only have reference to an improper increase of the debt, but I only want to show the general incorrectness of the hon. gentleman's figures, and I take that point. The whole interest paid in 1875-76-77-78-79 amounted to \$31,470,000, being an average of \$6,294,000. In 1879-80 and 1880-81, it was \$13,786,000, or \$6,893,000 annually. The hon. gentleman has made a statement under this head which is incorrect, and not borne out by the figures. They increased the expenditure \$952,000 between 1877-78 and 1878-79, the next year we increased it \$394,000, and the increase for the last year over 1878-79 is \$1,047,000. Taking the controllable expenditure for our two years, he says the increase is \$750,000. I have, however, shown that the average decrease in the controllable expenditure is \$365,337. The hon. gentleman is about \$385,000 wrong there. The hon. gentleman said:

"I take up the next Department of Government, Administration of Justice. Now, Sir, this was a Department that was very closely criticized by our opponents. They charged us with extravagance here as elsewhere. What do we find? The average expenditure during the last two years of the late Government averaged \$563,260; the average for the two last years of the Administration was \$579,314, an increase of about \$14,000 over our average, and the Estimates call for this year, \$613,519."

The hon. gentleman is wrong there, his average should be \$571,608, while ours is \$579,034, an increase of \$7,400 instead of \$14,000. The hon. gentleman further said:

"The same applies to the Immigration Department. We have an enormous increase, an increase of \$70,000 over our last year."

Now, let us look at the Immigration Department. The expenditure for the six years that I charge against hon. gentlemen opposite, was \$1,704,033; the average expenditure those years was \$292,342 or \$41,530 more, by averages, than our expenditures for the last two years, 79-80 and 80-81, which amounted to \$250,812. The hon. gentleman is wrong here as usual. The hon. gentleman next stated that there had been a great increase under the head of Pensions. He used these words:

"Then pensions came under our view; we find a large increase in them also, over \$8,000 beyond our average for our two last years."

We will take up Pensions. The amount expended during the six years of the late Administration reached \$556,478, the average being \$92,746. Our Pensions for 1880-81 were \$96,388, but for the two years 1877-78-78-79 their average was \$106,819, while for the two succeeding years ours was but \$99,618, so the hon. gentleman got on the wrong track again. The Superannuations to which the hon. gentleman refers

must necessarily increase. It is impossible that, in a service like ours, men will not be growing older and must be placed on the superannuation fund. The increase is a small one, but it is one that will grow, and I will not take exception to it in regard to the hon. gentleman, if the country is ever so unfortunate as to have him on this side of the House, so long as hon. gentlemen do not make superannuations for the purpose of making places for favorites who are older than the officers they superannuate. We now come to the item of Militia and Defence. The hon. gentleman said :

"I have great doubts, however, as to the propriety of this House and country expending annually from \$600,000 to \$700,000 on this service. I notice the hon. the Minister asks this year for a still larger estimate, I believe for \$750,500. This is an enormous amount, and in the face of the expenditure made in that service by the late Administration."

Let us look at the Militia Service. That service, for the years which I have taken up, and during which hon. gentlemen opposite managed the affairs of the country, cost \$4,916,134; that is an average of \$819,355. Yet, the hon. gentleman deplors the fact that \$750,000 are asked for by the hon. Minister this year, in view of our growing population, and the increased need of military drill and volunteer organization. This is a criticism of the estimates. It is not money spent, but asked for. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about estimates as if they were expenditures; they mix up the two, and whenever they find it most convenient to their purposes to quote one or the other they do so indiscriminately. They never adhere strictly to the Public Accounts, for they find them fraught with danger to their arguments. The expenditure under the Militia head for the last two years amounted to \$690,019, and \$667,000, making an average of \$678,509, against an average yearly expenditure by hon. gentlemen opposite of \$819,355, a reduction of \$140,000 in our favor. I do not state this because I consider it true economy to cut down the Militia expenditure; on the contrary, I am very willing to support a liberal expenditure; and I am well pleased my hon. friend who holds the position of Minister of Militia has entered earnestly into his work, and does not, as a loyal Canadian, stand exactly in the position that some gentlemen occupied who held the office when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Then comes an attack, a gross attack, on our Minister of Public Works—an attack which the hon. gentleman went out of his way to make, in scarcely parliamentary terms. But we are so accustomed to that kind of tactics with hon. gentlemen on the other side, that it is scarcely noticed by us except when some gross breach of propriety compels hon. gentlemen on this side to rise up and denounce it. Let us look at the Department of Public Works, said the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), and contemplate the monstrous and extravagant increase in its expenditure! Of course, we perfectly well understand that public works are matters which, unless we have all the details of the various building and other operations, cannot be fairly criticized by looking at any lump sum. But as the hon. gentleman is fond of averages, we will give him an average in this case. The entire expenditure on Public Works and Buildings chargeable to income, during the year for which the hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible, was \$8,807,091, giving an average of \$1,467,849 a year, and we know how suddenly and suspiciously it was reduced in 1876-77 and 1877-78. The entire expenditure of the present Government under that head during the last two years was \$2,190,091, or an average of \$1,045,345 per annum, showing that the late Government spent on a yearly average just \$572,525 more than the present Government. He also spoke of Indian grants, saying that the average for the last two years reached \$361,549; but it really rose to \$455,415. The hon. gentleman knows that those grants are not properly subject to the kind of criticism he practised in this House. He knows the

Mr. PLUMB.

exigencies of this country—the necessity for preserving the peace between the Whites and the Indians and keeping open the North-West—a necessity upon which the future fortunes of Canada largely depend, and that our treatment of the Indians must be in a liberal and kindly spirit—the poor men who were the original owners of the soil. The hon. gentleman will do well to contrast—when he is so fond of making contrasts between the Government on this and the southern side of the frontier—our policy with the spirit in which those unhappy aborigines have been treated by our neighbors to the south, and there is no more commendable item in the Public Accounts than that which shows we have endeavored to deal justly—aye, and more than justly—honestly, liberally, fairly, and in a kindly spirit, with those helpless beings to whom the Dominion Parliament is both guardian and trustee. This is not an item for the kind of criticism which the hon. gentleman has indulged in. Now, he says, the late Administration were able to manage the affairs of the country for \$23,500,000 a year—I told him, I would come to that statement which he has just now denied, and that the present Administration asks \$26,600,000—Estimates again, instead of ascertained expenditure—and that where the late Government reduced the controllable expenditure \$2,000,000 in four years, the present Government have increased it already \$750,000. I would like the hon. gentleman to show me the items of expenditure reduced in the four years of their term mentioned. They are not in the Public Accounts. The hon. gentleman must have some secret plan of making up his sums, and I would like to see his method of putting statements together. I say those statements are utterly garbled, or utterly without foundation. The average annual expenditure of the late Government was \$23,875,876—upon a declining revenue and yearly increasing deficits—with a condition of the country previously unknown, with failure and disasters staring the late hon. Ministers in the face, and with a Finance Minister who constantly refused to look at the public necessities—who spurned the people who came to him asking, imploring him that he would try to do something for their aid—a man who refused to hear a delegation of the business men of the country who came to seek relief, when he was mixing, muddling and meddling with the Tariff—who produced a Tariff on the 14th of April, 1874, withdrew it and brought one down entirely different on the 29th of the same month, having harassed, unsettled and disturbed every interest in the country. Dealing with that period of depression, he expected to get \$3,000,000 by increasing the taxation, and he increased the expenditure to put the people's money into the pockets of those of his followers who had helped to get himself and colleagues into power. We had yearly deficits, amounting in all to nearly \$7,000,000, with the public credit so paralysed, that our 4 per cents. sold at 87½, I believe, or less. Our factories were closed, our business was prostrated, bankrupt stocks of merchandise destroyed the business of the honest trader, and yet the stream of expenditure swelled and grew larger and wholly exhausted the public Treasury. The late Finance Minister, in his first speech, after he took the responsibility of office, when the commercial disasters of that period were impending, stated that he could not be expected to attempt to cut down the expenditure on public works, then under the control of the leader of the so-called Reform Government. Oh! no! He could inflict \$3,000,000 of taxation upon the people which did not produce any adequate revenue for the Treasury, and he was compelled to do so, because those who had helped these hon. gentlemen into power demanded their pound of flesh from the people, and they got it. Remembering these facts, and holding the hon. gentleman from West Middlesex responsible as an accessory, it seems very strange to me

that he should have ventured to make to the House the statement we heard last Friday. I knew that it was impossible they could have been made from the Public Accounts. After charging us with the whole expenditure for 1873 and 1874, he was cunning enough to attempt to hold us responsible for what could not be laid to our door, thinking he could get a small advantage in making up his statement on that basis. I believe I can appeal to any fair-minded man to sustain me in the endeavor to put the position taken by him fairly before this House, and through the House before the country. The truth is, that when one hears statements made by the hon. gentleman with his pleasant flow of language, and his captivating eloquence—an eloquence learned in a different school from the Parliament of Canada, but which still gives him an advantage over many of us, who do not hold the quasi-official position that he does—we are almost led for a moment to pay grave attention to it; just as we are led very often, when we find in the newspapers a taking heading, with the relation of some attractive incident in a great society, something that catches our eye, following it till we find we have been entrapped into reading an advertisement of a patent medicine. It is exactly so with the hon. gentleman; his speech may take us in for the moment but we know it is a puff of the men who led the country into trouble—a quack nostrum, after all, like St. Joshua's Ointment, or some other take in of that kind. We never hear one of his speeches without feeling, when we get to the end, we had been sold or disappointed by it. It is not very easy to find out the trick, but when we once know it we are not likely to be caught again. The hon. gentleman manifests the same rabid antipathy to the manufacturing interests which characterizes all the gentlemen of his school. He forgets nothing, and he learns nothing from the condition of the times at present. The first utterance I made in this House this Session was made in order to fix the attention of the House upon the fact that, after witnessing the unexampled prosperity of the country, after seeing that we were rising out of the great depression for which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side were in some degree responsible, when there were cheering signs of prosperity everywhere, when there was no doubt that success had largely attended the efforts of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to do something for the struggling industries of the country—that hon. gentleman came back to this House with the same bitterness that characterizes him and his party in their attacks upon these industries. I have noticed, to be sure, that there are gentlemen on the other side who are trying to hedge just now when they find the tide turning so swiftly against them. But those who are prominent in that are too well known; it is too thin; nobody will believe in the sincerity of any man in regard to Protection who can argue as well on one side as the other, and whose arguments in favor of a protective policy have been equally convincing with his arguments against it. The hon. member for West Middlesex has a great deal to say about the unfortunate position of the consumer in this country. He also has a good deal to say about the unfortunate position of the producer. He says we are handicapping the manufacturers, and he says, at the same time, that the consumers are suffering from our policy. We have been told that the manufacturing interest was to be destroyed by the protective policy; that the burdens we were throwing upon the manufacturers would break them up, or else that those who were prosperous would engage in such reckless competition that prices would decline so far as to ruin them. Well, if prices are kept down by competition—and I believe they will be—the home market will be secured and the consumers will get the benefit; and I am sure that it is on

record that almost every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House has asserted that such will be the inevitable effect of the Tariff. We say that we are not here for the purpose of preventing that kind of competition. We are very glad to see it. If, by the competition of five or six refiners, the price of sugar goes down—and if the price of sugar has gone down so far that the Halifax refinery is unable to sustain itself, it is not favorable to the hon. gentleman's argument. The hon. leader of the Opposition asserted in Toronto, with his usual humor, that "Redpath had a sweet thing." It looks as if some hon. gentlemen had rather a sour thing in their attempt at such a line of argument as that brought forward by the hon. member for Middlesex, because, in respect to sugar refining, upon which they always attack us, if the business is done on so small a margin and requires such close management and so much capital that there is no profit in it except for men who have large means and large business experience, and understand exactly the workings of the market, I think that is as strong an argument against the hon. gentleman's outcry in respect to the sugar monopoly, of which we have heard in every speech that has been made by them, either inside or outside the House, since the sugar duties were modified, as can possibly be adduced. The hon. gentleman is very much concerned about our export trade. He is very anxious that our manufacturers should be compelled to go to some slaughter market or other to get rid of their productions. He expresses the greatest sympathy with them because the trade returns do not show that they are exporting largely. Well, I always thought that the first object of a manufacturer was to secure a home market for his goods. I always thought it was not desirable that goods should be exported if they could be consumed at home. I always thought it was a note of a decline of prosperity when there were large amounts of goods forced upon foreign markets. We are living and learning every day, and even the member for West Middlesex may learn something perhaps from an authority endorsed by the Cobden Club (Mr. Medley). That club has published a pamphlet lately written by Mr. Medley, in which he says that he does not think it desirable for England to increase her exports; he does not think it would be desirable for the ports of other countries to be opened to receive English goods free of duty. It was the necessity of the case that forced that argument upon him. Those gentlemen will turn like weather-cocks. While was supposed that the example of England would compel other countries to open their ports and to receive her exports free, that was the great cry which was used by all the earlier Free Trade advocates. Now, those gentlemen, finding that the nations of the world are resolved to take care of themselves, and that the spirit of Free Trade is not to be enthroned on a bale of cotton and rule the world in favor of Manchester manufacturing interests, find that they must take a new tack. They now say, through Mr. Medley: "We do not want other nations to follow our example; it would create an excitement among our manufacturers, which would excessively stimulate production; there would be a drop in prices owing to excess in competition, and the manufacturing interests would all go to ruin altogether." Mr. Medley says it is a matter for grave question whether it is desirable for England to have the export trade of the world freely open to her or not. I commend that pamphlet and its ingenious reasoning to those hon. gentlemen who have opened a parallel discussion running cheek by jowl with the Budget debate, and who could not wait for the usual financial explanations before they attacked the Tariff. Those hon. gentlemen, and particularly the late Minister of Finance, are never weary of showing into what a terrible condition a protective Tariff has brought the United States. I used to listen to their arguments, and I was always strengthened in my belief that the United States were not rushing to ruin, by the eloquent pictures of the benefit of a protective system which were drawn by the hon.

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He prevented me from wholly despairing of the Republic. And now we are told by the hon. gentleman from West Middlesex—who, I hope, submitted his arguments to his friend sitting behind him (Mr. Charlton) before he gave them to the House—that one of the most terrible consequences of the American protective system is the decline in their shipping trade. I remember when the Tariff discussion arose in the House in 1876, my hon. friend from North Norfolk, with that eloquence with which he is so largely gifted, told us what effect a protective Tariff had had on the United States. At that time the hon. gentleman was expecting there would be an increase of 2½ per cent. in the Tariff, and he has acknowledged since, that he was in favor of such an increase upon the 17½ per cent. list, and his argument was so well urged that he took the House almost by storm. But he failed in his conclusions. After having delivered one of the most effective protectionist speeches which had been made in the House up to that time, while his arguments were still fresh in our minds, the hon. gentleman reached the last three or four sentences and then he suddenly went back on himself, and tried to take the other side of the argument. But he had done too well; he had convinced us by those admirable statements he had enunciated with such confidence, and at times—not always—with such accuracy. The hon. gentleman argued in 1876 that decline in the foreign shipping and commerce of the United States was nothing serious when compared with her internal trade, which had prospered to an incredible extent, and her domestic commerce had reached two hundred million tons a year valued at ten thousand million dollars. He enquired: "What is foreign commerce to a people who have a home trade of such enormous proportions, the result of their protective policy?" Why, he argued, they can afford to let their foreign commerce decline, they can afford to be isolated from other nations when they are so enormously prosperous, under a protective system, a system that gives the farmers a home market. The hon. gentleman was particularly eloquent in urging that every farmer should have a market at his own door, although now it suits him to decry what he is pleased contemptuously to call the 'garden-sass' theory, which is that every farmer shall have a market at home, not only for cereals but for perishable products. Then the hon. gentleman at once and for all disposed of all such flimsy arguments as are made by his hon. friend from West Middlesex, and it is unfortunate that those hon. gentlemen are not at one with themselves. The hon. gentleman from Lambton says so far as the Tariff is concerned, there are vested interests. He says, if you are kind enough to let us come back to power we beg to remind you that vested interests have been created, that we shall deal with the industries quietly and gently, that we shall not crush them all at once, but kill them inch by inch, so that they will have time to prepare for their fate—time to make their last will and testament, and settle their family affairs. On the other hand the hon. gentleman from Centre Huron, with noble rage, says we will have nothing to do with them; the manufacturers are bloated monopolists, and he denounces them with all that fury which seizes him when cannot by any other means answer the arguments with which he is met by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), endeavors to persuade the manufacturing fly that if he will but come into the Free Trade spider's web which he has prepared for him, nothing shall hurt him. But the fly knows the voice too well; he has "been there before," and is not to be persuaded to venture himself in the meshes again. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), is also one of those who give no quarter. In season and out of season, he rises to his feet, and, almost inarticulate with anger, denounces the manufacturers, who, he says, are fattening upon an unfortunate public. The hon. leader of the Opposition has probably learned something, from his tour in the Maritime Provinces, and is therefore not quite as rabid in his utterances in

Mr. PLUMB.

respect to protected industries as he was when he began to gain experience among the coal miners. Later on we may take occasion to deal with these various views, but, in the meantime, I propose to read a few words, spoken by my hon. friend for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he was posing as a Protectionist, in order to give the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who sits beside him, an opportunity of weighing well what he says before he places himself in opposition to the hon. member for Norfolk. That hon. gentleman said:

"It may be safely assumed that no country has attained to greatness in manufactures without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself; and I think the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of self-defensive power of a nation is incontrovertible."

That is a beautiful sentence—the case is remarkably well put; indeed, it could not have been much better expressed had the hon. gentleman been a leading member of the Cobden Club. He goes on to say:

"We have an illustration of this in the United States. * * * I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by Protection, and that the manufactures being brought to the door of the farmer would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufactures, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops * * * We have at our own doors all the illustrations and experience of Protection and its benefits required for our government and guidance. The United States have adopted a protective policy under which their industries have been fostered and promoted, until, in 1870, their products reached \$4,253,000,000, giving employment to 2,000,000 operatives, and disbursing over \$775,000,000 in wages."

Three years later he delivered himself on the same subject, and here is what he said:

"This celebrated National Policy is what? Where shall we look for its source? It is a servile imitation of the American system."

Sir, I believe that the system of Protection is one which develops the industries of the country. I believe that we have an abundance of talent and genius, which should not be restricted in their development to a single kind of industry. I believe that we have no right to say to the Canadian people: "If you want to exercise your ingenuity, your inventive faculties, your commercial intelligence, and your gifts other than those necessary to the pursuits of agriculture, you shall go away from your own country, for we intend, so far as we can, to make you hewers of wood and drawers of water to other countries." The late hon. Finance Minister has been eloquent in season and out of season in denouncing the gathering together of people in towns. 'Stay at home,' he screams, 'like your fathers before you; let the children subdivide the farm, until by-and-by we shall get into some such condition as the Irish population are in at the present moment. Your young men shall have no other than farm work; no varied opportunities of developing their powers; and if there is a skillful mechanic or an inventive genius among you he must seek an appreciation and employment in some other country.' How was it with us before the National Policy was introduced? We were dealing with the United States—buying from them from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 worth of goods; buying from them, in fact, everything from a jews-harp to a melodeon that required skilled and highly paid labor. We gave employment to such labor and paid for it with the products of our soil and labor, representing 80 cents or \$1 a day. One half of our annual balance was paid in that way and the remainder in hard gold, and that was the system which hon. gentlemen opposite insisted on continuing. They denounced us when we proposed to change it, and said we would incur the displeasure of the great nation alongside of us if we attempted what they called a retaliatory policy. I know many gentlemen of standing and influence in that country, and when I said to them that we were thinking of adopting

a policy such as theirs, although not so high a Tariff, they replied that that was the sincerest form of compliment to their system to imitate it, and wondered that we had been so blind as not to have done so before, that they were not surprised to learn that we were tired of a one-sided and juggled system of Free Trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite predicted dire results which were to come from our Tariff against the manufactures of our friends across the border. Among them would be, they asserted, the abrogation of the railway bonding system. When I mentioned that to leading men in the United States they said we need not fear. They wanted our carrying trade and did not intend to cut off their noses to spite their faces. It was absolutely necessary for us, Mr. Speaker, to raise the Tariff on account of the extravagance of our predecessors—who had failed to adjust their revenues to suit their expenditure—who had incurred a succession of deficits—who had incurred the public debt, without providing additional revenue to meet the charges it imposed. We unreservedly pledged ourselves to the country while in Opposition nearly two years before the fatal 17th of September, which was the Ides of March for our hon. friends opposite, that if we came into power we would deal with the fiscal policy of the country exactly as my hon. friend, then as now, Minister of Finance, pledged himself to deal with it in 1873. What did that hon. gentleman say then? He said:

“Our 15 per cent. Tariff gives us an abundant revenue, and it gives us protection, inasmuch as the Americans, owing to their high prices at the close of the war, buy everything from us and can sell us nothing. We do not want any more protection yet, and we do not want any additional revenue. But when the time comes—as it will come, for assuming the provincial debts, for giving a new subsidy to Nova Scotia, for taking in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, and for opening up the North-West—when that time comes, we shall deal with the fiscal questions, with reference to the protection and fostering of our industries.”

My hon. friend from South Brant, (Mr. Paterson) then, as now, in Opposition, could not wait. He rose and begged the hon. Minister to bring in a protective Tariff without delay, he was loud—as he always is—in expressing his disappointment that the Conservative Government of 1873 did not introduce a protective Tariff. The hon. gentleman was posing then—honestly, I think—as a Protectionist; and as he is posing now as an anti-Protectionist, I leave the inference to be drawn from my statement that he was honest in both attitudes. We have been charged with having stolen a verdict in 1878. We have been charged with having deluded the people. We have been charged with having obtained their suffrages under false pretences. If there ever was a straight issue, it was made in the first instance by Sir John A. Macdonald's resolution in this House, in favor of a protective Policy for all our industries, which was discussed at great length and was finally voted down by a majority of forty or fifty. The hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, and who then administered the Government and seemed so secure in their places, sealed their doom and ensured our our triumph. Upon that issue, fully accepted by our opponents, we went to the country. Hon. gentlemen who say that a verdict was stolen from the people in 1878, show very little confidence in the intelligence of the electors of Canada. It is the habit of hon. gentlemen on the other side, when the popular will is not in accord with them, to abuse the people, whom they so loudly extol at other times. Such is the habit also of the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite; and I tell them that the greatest misfortune which I think can befall any party is to have the support of such an organ, except the misfortune of having its finances administered by the gentleman who administered them for five years. In a so called reply to a speech of the hon. Minister of Railways, we had a Budget speech from the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin). Well Sir, I have endeavored, in preparing to address the House—and I do not like to do so without examining the arguments which have been made on the other side—to follow

that hon. gentleman's speech. I know the hon. gentleman has a most remarkable verbal memory. I know it was formerly possible for him to listen to a speech, and report it almost word for word. But this sometimes leads him into error. The hon. gentleman's speech was a melange without beginning or end. It was a jumble of words which I could hardly follow; yet there was running through it all a misconception and consequent misrepresentation of fact—if one may so speak—which is one of the peculiarities of that hon. gentleman, and makes it very difficult to follow his argument. It is very much like trying to watch the motion of a water-spider jumping about on the surface of a stagnant pool. But there is one prevailing idea through it all, and the hon. gentleman has uttered that idea so long and so persistently that I will give him the credit of now being perfectly sincere in believing it. The hon. gentleman reminds me very much of a story I heard many years ago—a very pertinent one, I think, not only to his own mental attitude, but to that of several other gentlemen on the opposite side. Many years ago an officer of the American navy, hailing from Baltimore, a very venerable gentleman, high in command, had been in the constant habit of telling a favorite story at his mess table. He said he was out on the Chesapeake Bay in his boat, shooting canvas-back ducks, when he saw two beautiful swans flying towards him. He fired one barrel, brought them both down from an enormous height, and they both fell into his boat. The story was a very big one, but no one ventured to question it, and he continued to tell it, year after year, until an old friend with whom he was to dine one evening, said to him: “Commodore, excuse me, but I know you will let me take the liberty of speaking about that swan story. It pains me to see some of the younger officers wink at each other when you tell it. Couldn't you tone it down somewhat?” The Commodore took the hint, and that night he modified the story so far as to say that he killed but one swan and picked it up in the water where it fell. His friend congratulated him after dinner and the old Commodore replied, “My good friend, I am greatly indebted to you, for do you know, sometimes on my lonely couch at night, and in moments of gloom and deep dependency, I fancy I missed both those birds.” I do not know whether my hon. friend from Gloucester has a similar feeling, or whether on his lonely couch at night he ever thinks he has missed both of his birds and feels an impulse to modify some of his wild statements, which are like the Commodore's swan story. The hon. gentleman is very fierce in his denunciations of gentlemen on this side of the House, and he has been particularly severe on my hon. friend the Minister of Finance; and I now wish to say that there never has been an occasion, since I have been in public life, when I have had more pleasure in listening to a financial statement than I had in listening to that of my hon. friend on Friday last. When he came into power we were undoubtedly face to face with great difficulties. We were face to face, in the first place, with an implacably hostile opposition which threatened, as it did, as it does, as it will, to interfere with the policy which we might adopt, no matter what it might be—pre-judge it, distort it, misrepresent it in every possible way—denouncing those who might act under it—putting themselves in such a position that they were a constant menace to capital, which is always sensitive—always slow to move. It is a great gratification to know that, in spite of all these obstacles, my hon. friend has been able, from the public records, from his own personal observation, from that painstaking, intelligent examination which he has made into the results of the policy we have adopted, to bring down to the House such assuring evidence that what he promised has largely come to pass, and that if there is any want of success anywhere, it has arisen from the fact that those who are hesitating whether they shall embark their capital or not, owe that hesitation to the remote possibility that their interests may

be interfered with. I do not think there is the slightest danger. I do not think hon. gentlemen who sit on the Opposition Benches are likely to come out of that position; I do not think that if they did they would be quite as sanguinary as they promise to be; and I know perfectly well that the business men are not going to trust the horo of deficits and his confreres. They will not again trust those who falsified, during the five years they were in power, every promise and every pledge they made before they came into office, but we shall have to wait for the full fruition of the present hon. Finance Minister's policy until another election has assured by another triumph the position of the leader of the Conservative party, and of those gentlemen who have so ably seconded and supported him, and I cannot doubt that the vote of the people will again return those faithful servants to this House with an undiminished majority to complete the good work they have so successfully begun. When we were labouring to convince the people that we would not be false to our promises, and that if we came into power we would endeavor to do something, feeble though it might be, for the development of the overborne and perishing interests of the country, the people were warned a day or two before the elections to remember that the vote of those who should support our party at the polls would be in direct approval of the following:

"The Pacific scandal, the Intercolonial Railway villainy, the North-West blundering the Northern Railway scandal, the Nova Scotia bribe, the British Columbia terms, fraught with evil consequences to Canada, the payment of \$4,000 to get Riel out of the country, the Moylan scandal, the Secret Service robbery, the lavish policy which increased the public expenditure from \$13,000,000 in 1867 to \$23,658,000 in 1872-73, and increased the public debt \$96,000,000 for public works, and altogether by \$131,000,000; and of an unprincipled party which has pledged itself to carry out the 'National Policy,' which is to impose taxes on raw material, food, and clothing as follows: \$2 per ton on all coal, \$7 per ton on pig iron, a tax on wheat, a tax on flour, a tax on meal, a tax on salt, a tax on beef and pork, a tax of 46 to 60 per cent. on cotton yarn, a tax of 41 to 81 per cent. on thread, a tax of 50 to 60 per cent. on silks, etc., a tax of 35 per cent. on machinery, a tax of 30 per cent. on stoves, a tax of 70 per cent. on wool and woollen goods, a tax of 85 per cent. on flannels and blankets, a tax of 40 per cent. on ready-made clothing, a tax of 50 to 84 per cent. on carpets, a tax of 85 per cent. on alpaca goods, a tax of 40 per cent. on heavy cottons, a tax of 70 per cent. on lighter cottons, a tax of 40 per cent. on linens, a tax of 35 per cent. on boots and shoes, a tax of 35 per cent. on rubber and leather goods, glass bottles, lamp chimneys, clocks, furniture, carriages, envelopes, writing paper, felt hats, guns, rifles, pistols, umbrellas, parasols, and a whole host of articles used in every family. In a word, those who vote for the Tory party vote to grind the consumer and the poor man beneath a millstone of taxation."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). From what paper are you quoting?

Mr. PLUMB. From the *Toronto Globe*. The *Globe* is the friend of the poor man. Like the hon. leader of the Opposition, that journal is so fond of the poor man that it is striving to keep him always poor, it cannot afford to lose him, and if hon. gentlemen opposite came into power to-day they would adopt a policy to make the poor man poorer, as past events have shown. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross), to whose speech I have been largely addressing myself, and who is so fond of the law of averages, told us at various places during the summer campaign that there had been a large mortgage placed upon the farms of the unfortunate people of this country by the Conservative Government. The public debt, he asserted, was wholly created by our party and formed an incumbrance or mortgage of \$7 an acre upon every acre of improved land in the Dominion. The hon. member for North Norfolk made the same assertion in a speech in Niagara a few months ago, and the only person who seemed alarmed was a sympathetic Grit who did not own an acre.

Mr. ROSS. By \$9.

Mr. PLUMB. No; I find it was \$7 an acre. I cannot admit that there is such a mortgage on the lands of our agricultural population. They need not lie awake at nights for fear of it, for so long as the surplus is rolling up

Mr. PLUMB.

to four or five millions a year there can be no danger of foreclosure, which was not the case when deficits were increasing and the credit of the Dominion declining. If the farmers, who have listened to such silly stuff, desire to be safe, they had better beware of the party of deficits, and of a policy which did so much between 1873 and 1878 to lower the credit of Canada. So long as Dominion 4 per cents. are worth 104 in the market and our securities keep up in value, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the hon. the ex-Finance Minister, our agricultural friends need not be at all alarmed. The time they have to fear will be when those who mismanaged public affairs from 1873 to 1878, come back into power, and then it may be possible that the imaginary mortgage may become a real one in danger of foreclosure. Now, however, they are tolerably safe, notwithstanding the disasters pictured by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) and the groans heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, in my own district, repeated the same terrible story; I do not, however, believe there was a farmer, who heard him, who would have sold his farm for 25 cents per acre less, although my hon. friend endeavored to persuade him that he was in the condition of an involuntary mortgagee. But it is one of the tricks of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is cognate to the means they use for the purpose of persuading the people that the country is in a suffering and feeble condition. Unfortunately for them, within the last two years the remorseless logic of events has compelled them in great measure to give up the argument adverse to the future of the manufacturing interests and that based upon the theory of a general decline of business. We heard nothing else for nearly two years. There was no hon. member opposite who did not endeavor to say something worse than his friend who preceded him about the condition of the country, and the more extravagant the statements the more they were applauded. I remember when a gentleman rose and said that St. Catharines that was in great business trouble and distress; it was the hon. member for Elgin, (Mr. Casey.) His friends loudly cheered him as he drew the dismal picture, it was a good story until another was told. The more extravagant, the more terrible the tale of distress that came from that town, the more it seemed to delight our hon. friends in Opposition. But two or three days afterwards the opposite side of the story was presented. My friend, the hon. member for Lincoln, (Mr. Rykert,) received a statement contradicting the mournful stories of the hon. gentlemen from West Elgin, (Mr. Casey,) and the lugubrious faces of these hon. gentlemen showed how terribly they were disappointed on finding St. Catharines, after all, was not ruined, but still possessed life and encouraging hopes and prospects. I saw in the *Globe* the other day, an account of the utter destruction, in a business way, of the Village of Welland, which seemed to give the Editor much satisfaction. It was the most doleful narrative possible; the town was utterly ruined and destroyed; yet the very next day, in another paper, there was a statement that the town of Wellandport, a neighboring place, had increased its population in three or four years by 400 per cent. One town had gone down, the other had gone up. What the cause was I do not know, but the paper that copied stories of the destruction of Welland took very good care not to put the companion picture alongside. That reminds me that sometimes even the great *Globe* itself is caught napping, and is compelled to acknowledge that there has been a great increase in the prosperity of the country. Here, in this copy, I find four pages devoted entirely to a description of Toronto, with many startling head-lines, describing the various subjects—of its growth and prosperity; the great increase of wealth and population. The story is told almost as attractively as if the gentleman who made up the paper had lots to sell in that thriving

city. It is headed Trade Review of 1881, which we are told was the most active and prosperous year in the history of the city. Then we have the striking head-lines, such as "Toronto as a Business City;" "Large Increase in the Wholesale Trade;" "Lively Condition of the Retail Business;" "Great Crops of Wheat and Barley;" "Small Export of Flour and Wheat;" "Provision Trade Somewhat Restricted, but Healthy;" "Prosperity of the Lumber Trade;" "Larger Receipts and High Prices;" "The Retail Trade Producing \$36,000,000, and the Produce Trade \$33,000,000;" "The Gain on this Twelve per cent.;" "Total Trade of the City for 1881, \$85,257,000." It really looks as if the statement had been issued from the *Mail* office, and I am surprised that the *Globe* should have published an article so damaging to its party views. The review of the whole trade of the city is extensive and interesting. We used to hear a great deal about the bankruptcies that were said not to diminish when we came to this side of the House; the hon. gentlemen opposite were fond of bringing out statistics to show that even in 1879 the number and volume of commercial disasters had not lessened. But such disasters do not usually occur from sudden causes. They result from years of declining trade, depression and adversity; men do not fail on account of their losses in the previous six months, but because their business has suffered from a long dry rot, which compels them at last to break up when revival of trade seems hopeless, and that was the state of things that existed in this country. But let us look at the results of the six years in this respect: in 1873 the amount involved in failures was \$12,354,000; 1874, \$7,000,000; 1875, —, who was in power then? Methinks I see a peculiar expression on the face of the hon. gentleman who was the leader of the opposite party then; and the total for this year was \$28,843,000. In 1876, \$25,517,000; and for 1877, a year when hon. gentlemen opposite were still in power, \$25,510,000; in 1878, \$23,132,000; in 1879, after struggling through years of gloom and hoping against hope, many could not sustain themselves longer, and sunk in sight of land, and \$29,000,000 were involved in those business failures of that year; and we heard it charged by hon. gentlemen opposite that this disastrous sum furnished an evidence that the present Administration had not brought about the prosperity they promised. An hon. member beside me mentions the prospective repeal of the Insolvency Law as a principal cause of the failures of 1879; we knew that when it was threatened, everybody, that year, rushed in to take advantage of it as far as possible. What happened the next year? If I remember aright, my hon. friend the present Finance Minister then presided over the Treasury. It began to recover from its depletion, business revived, the people became more hopeful. There arose a general belief that business men might venture upon further investments. The rate of discount, instead of remaining at 1 or 2 per cent., began to appreciate, and people everywhere became more hopeful. And why? Because they saw men in power who were inclined to look to the interests of the country and protect them if they could—at any rate men willing to make some effort in that direction, and not to acknowledge that they were entirely helpless as regards the promotion of the general welfare. Well, in 1880, the failures reached only \$7,000,000, against \$29,000,000 the year previous, and, in 1881, the total was but \$6,000,000, against \$28,000,000 in 1875. If there is anything in this argument, we have a right to use it, because similar arguments were employed by hon. gentlemen opposite, who have endeavored to fasten upon us the responsibility for the disasters of 1879, with which we had no sort of connection. Every business man knows that those disasters were due to complications which originated long before my hon. friends took their seats on the Treasury benches. I have not had, until now, an opportunity of thanking my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) for coming to enlighten the little constituency that I represent. He gave me a short time for reply to the open-

ing part of his speech, and no opportunity to reply to several statements which he made in the second part of his address on that occasion. I shall take the opportunity, before sitting down, to refer to a few of the hon. gentleman's points. As he, like the hon. member for West Middlesex, is an aspirant to the financial office in a future Liberal Cabinet, his utterances are considered, by his own side, of much importance. On this point, I may say, there is a sort of financial duel going on between the hon. member for North Norfolk, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for West Middlesex, to show which can make the biggest bid on the floor of the House and elsewhere, to win the favor of the present leader of the Opposition, though how long he may continue to lead I do not know. Therefore, the utterances of the hon. member for North Norfolk, viewed in this light, possesses very considerable significance. He has, within a short time, I believe, constructed a platform for his party, which I have seen in the press, but as it has not been accepted generally by his party I will not now refer to it. The hon. gentleman made a very calm and temperate statement during the time that preceded the time he had given me to speak. He made no remarks then which called for special answer, but spoke in the courteous tone and manner which often characterizes him. I had reason to suppose that he would continue in the same way after I had availed myself of the brief opportunity he gave me to address my constituents. But no sooner had I sat down than the hon. gentleman seemed to lose his temper. I had said nothing to provoke him, but he proceeded in a manner so entirely different from anything I had ever heard from him that I was grieved and surprised. He began with a tirade against the Tariff, eating his own words at every sentence, contradicting himself flatly in every possible manner, denouncing what he himself had advocated on the floor of this House with as great eloquence as any man that ever defended a protective policy. Some of his statements at Niagara were of a most extraordinary character. He stated that the Tariff had increased the price of cotton 35 per cent. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the average increase in the Tariff was from 5 to 5½ per cent. He knows that there was a Tariff of 17½ per cent. then existing, and he himself was in favor of raising it to 20 per cent. Now, suppose there was an addition of 10 per cent.—though nobody pretended that the average Tariff upon cottons is over 25 per cent, altogether it could only raise the price 10 per cent.—and it has not raised the price at all, because it is well understood that these goods are sold as cheaply now as they were before the Tariff was put upon them, so that no argument can be based upon that. But the hon. gentleman must know, though he studiously concealed it in his argument, that an addition of 2½ per cent., which he favored, would have raised the Tariff to 20 per cent., and only what was added to that was an addition to the Tariff of 20 per cent. that he himself desired and advocated. Hon. gentlemen opposite habitually deal with the Tariff in the same way; they always assume in their arguments that the whole of the present Tariff was put in by the present Government. The hon. gentleman attempted to mislead those whom he was addressing. He said, also, that it was impossible for the farmers to receive any benefit whatever from the Tariff. But he was so unfortunate as to have for his chairman a gentleman who had been benefited to the extent of \$700 or \$800 that year by protection in peaches, as he was one of the largest peach growers in Canada. When I asked that gentleman if he would like to have the Tariff taken off farm products, fruit, etc., he was silent and never made response, although he is an ardent member of the hon. gentleman's party. My hon. friend also stated that our Government had increased the public debt to an enormous figure, and that the late administration were only responsible for \$80,000 of the whole, which was spent on one of the canals. Of course he was trifling with the intelligence of his auditors, every one of whom

knew better. He said the increase of the public debt was from \$75,728,000 in 1876, to \$157,000,000 in 1881, and was wholly chargeable to the Conservative Government. He generously acknowledged afterwards, however, that the aforesaid \$80,000 of the \$81,000,000 of increase had been incurred by Mr. Mackenzie. I made up the account afterwards and tell my hon. friend that the nett public debt had been increased mainly by the assumption of the Provincial debts, by the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and the purchase of the North-West, from \$76,000,000, in 1867, to \$99,848,482 in July, 1873. Under the rule of our hon. friends opposite it swelled up to \$139,362,069, on June 30, 1878, with liabilities incurred by the Mackenzie Administration for \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 more, and the loan of December, 1878, which increased the debt to \$146,481,071, June 30, 1879, should have been made by the late Finance Minister before the elections. In round numbers, the increase made by hon. gentlemen opposite might be fairly stated at \$50,000,000. When the late hon. Minister of Finance came into power he said that liabilities amounting to \$130,000,000 to be provided for were left upon him by his predecessors. Somehow or other he managed to get through with them by expending about \$22,000,000, and the remainder was spent for works inaugurated by the hon. gentlemen themselves. They were not bound to build the Canadian Pacific Railway as a public work; there was no obligation resting upon them to rush into the scheme, which they took up before they had the survey of a responsible engineer. There was no obligation on them to make the addition to the public debt which that wild adventure cost them—an adventure which was, as they left it, practically useless, which, so far as the North-West is concerned gave that country a railway into a wilderness which never was explored, and when there was scarcely a line blazed by the pioneer's axe—a line which ran from Fort William to English River on one side and from Red River to Rat Portage on the other and left a gap of one hundred and seventy-eight miles. And my hon. friend the leader of the late Government, said he did not intend to hurry the construction of the intermediate line! He attempted to utilize what he was pleased to call the "water stretches," over which there could only be transported two ship loads of grain during the whole navigable season, after harvest, and he put under contract 112 miles on one side of those water stretches and 113 on the other, costing, at least, \$8,000,000, and all this for a perfectly useless service, which never would have paid for the greasing of the wheels of the railway carriages, employed upon it, until the gap between the two sections had been built.

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

After Recess.

Mr. PLUMB. When the House rose for Recess, I had followed the hon. member for Lambton to the heart of the wilderness, which will be celebrated in the history of the achievement of the late Minister of Public Works as the Lake Mille Lacs route with its seven impracticable portages, the Fort Francis Lock that never was opened, and the utter waste of money connected with the most frantic scheme that has ever been attempted by a public officer of Canada. I shall not be uncharitable enough to leave him there with no outlet for escape except a circuitous route which has never been used for any practical purpose. In concluding my reference to that portion of the hon. gentleman's career, I would simply say that his whole policy is fairly illustrated by what was done in connection with railway construction, and the attempt to make a thoroughfare in that direction. I do not wish, and I do not intend, to press this matter as I might upon the hon. gentleman, although, if I felt so disposed, I might almost be excused for doing so, when I remember the long years, during which he tyrannized over me and over other members of the opposite side of the House

Mr. PLUMB.

from himself, and especially over those who, like me, happened to have less parliamentary experience than he had. Although during his whole parliamentary career I cannot remember an instance in which he ever showed me the slightest courtesy, or extended a helping hand to me, though he knew I was unused to Parliamentary and parliamentary procedure—although, on the contrary, I believe that from the time I entered Parliament until I was called to come back here, after a contest which was brought about by the hon. gentleman and a gentleman who was then his adviser, but is now no more, I do not think I ever received a kind or encouraging word from him—still I am not disposed to recall to-night, in anything like an unforgiving spirit, his conduct towards me, however much reason I may have had to complain of him. I am not of the spirit of those who, in the hour of a man's depression or humiliation, would add one word to increase them. I have only to say, however, that those who occupy public positions, such as I occupy, should hold it a duty to call public attention again and again to the mismanagement, to the reckless waste, to the stupid blundering, which characterized the hon. gentleman's administration of the Public Works, in connection with the railway system from Fort William to Red River. I may say, too, that it is in evidence that Mr. Fleming commenced the construction of that work by running the railway line towards Shebandowan from Fort William, until it was practically found that no road could be made, that it was abandoned after proceeding westward with the work thirty-six miles, and after he had settled with the contractors, by giving them the option of going by another line. There were no surveys, no quantities, no estimates, no proper regard for the money of the country; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) and his colleagues, for some reason or other, either in the interests of the contractors, or in some interests which I will not attempt to characterize, it thought desirable to proceed with the work without the slightest preparation. It was thought proper, also, to begin at the Red River as well as at Fort William, when there were no means of carrying supplies there except by a most circuitous and expensive route. There was no survey there and no line laid out. The engineers went on fumbling for a line on both sides, and on one side a demurrage of three or four thousand dollars was paid to the contractor, while his men were idle and while the engineers were looking for a line on which his work should begin. And yet it was made the ground of an appeal to the country in the interests of economy, forsooth and careful management; that these hon. gentlemen should be permitted to retain the confidence of the country, because as they boasted they were building those lines of railway for \$24,000 a mile, but the estimated cost was made on imaginary quantities; on an imaginary line; in an imaginary direction, to an imaginary termination; through an imaginary survey. When the real facts came to be found out—and they were, or ought to have been, in the possession of the gentleman who had control of the Public Works when he made that appeal—it was discovered that the quantities which had been estimated were far exceeded; in some cases 30, 40, 70 and even 100 per cent.; and that the cost of the road was to be enhanced to nearly \$40,000 a mile. Notwithstanding all this, the hon. gentleman persisted in his mis-statements to the electors; persisted in boasting of his economy and good management. But for our investigations and our close enquiry into the whole matter, the public would have been deceived into the idea that their claim to economy was well founded that it was not founded on a pretence which it would be parliamentary, I presume, to call mistaken, but which, I think, it would be honest to say was false. If we can show, as we can show, that that was one of the principal claims put forward for the support of the public, in Ontario

mainly, but elsewhere as well; we have a right to say that those who brought it forward have no right again to claim the confidence of the people. But that is not all. We were persistently told at the time that we were said to be snatching a verdict from the people by false pretences, that we had loaded the country with responsibilities so enormous that its resources could not meet them. We were told that we had left upon the predecessor of my hon. friend the Finance Minister responsibilities variously estimated at from \$96,000,000 to \$130,000,000; and a list of these responsibilities was paraded before the public. We were taunted with our recklessness, our extravagance, as if we had no interest in our own country—as if we were not Canadians—as if we did not seek to benefit the country and do the best we could for it—as if we were a set of reckless political adventurers; or, in the language of the hon. gentleman who made the statement (Sir Richard Cartwright), as if, after wrecking the ship on the rocks, we scuttled her, and broke into the spirit-room and, in drunken desperation, destroyed the cargo. That was the way in which we were characterized by the hon. gentleman from Centrs Huron, who has had his lesson, and will have his lesson again. What is the fact, Sir? The fact is that the claim to economy in respect to the building of the Pacific Railway was as unfounded and baseless as the claim that we had loaded the country down with liabilities which it was impossible to meet. There are no evidences that any particular change was made in the general policy of the country, except one of extravagance, and except the assumption of the construction of the Pacific Railway as a Government work, a work which certainly gave rise to a good many scandals which I will refer to by-and-bye. I find the true statement of the case, as tested by the Public Accounts, is simply this: The public debt of the country at the time of the consolidation of the Union of the Provinces was net \$75,629,641. The next year it was reported, net, \$75,757,131; in 1869, \$75,859,269; 1870, \$78,204,744; 1871, \$77,706,517; 1872, \$82,189,072; 1873, \$99,848,462. There we will pause. At the time of bringing into the Union the Provinces that had not joined it at the time Confederation was established, there was, upon a fair statement of accounts, a debt of about \$100,000,000. Then, by arrangements which I presume the last people to question will be gentlemen of the Maritime Provinces, who are usually appealed to for support of my hon. friends on the opposite side and as having been particularly burdened by the taxation which it is claimed has been put upon them, certain obligations were incurred. These were Assumption of Provincial debts, Subsidy to New Brunswick in lieu of certain timber dues, Admission of Prince Edward Island, Opening of the North-West, and other measures for the general welfare, benefit and harmony—additions by which the net debt was increased to \$108,224,465 on 30th June, 1874. Up to, and including 1873, the debt was \$99,848,462, showing an increase from 1867 to 1873 for legitimate purposes—for purposes that have not been questioned—for purposes that cannot be questioned—for purposes which were absolutely indispensable to the prosperity and union and harmony of the country and the consolidation of Confederation—of \$22,595,000. Now, in that year, and with these additions—with a debt of \$99,848,462—the gentlemen upon the opposite benches assumed power. They assumed power, as I have often stated, under pledges which confined them to very narrow limits. They had taken on themselves while in opposition, obligations that we had never considered our party bound by; they had undertaken to reduce the public expenditure; they had undertaken to limit the public debt; and they had undertaken to curtail the progress of the country—the last two things cannot be done the one without the other, because the true indication of the progress of a country like this is the gradual and judicious increase of the public debt and public expenditure, without which the country cannot be

developed. They had undertaken to do all this. Now let us see what was the fulfilment of that undertaking, in the matter of the public debt my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk said generously he would acknowledge that they had increased it \$80,000, but that was for some canal or other to which his hon. friend and former leader had been committed; in fact, he threw the whole responsibility of the increase of the public debt during the five years of the late Administration upon the gentlemen now on the Treasury benches. The debt, up to 1873, increased \$22,595,000, and, in 1873, our hon. friends opposite succeeded to the Treasury benches, came into power by tactics which I will not attempt to characterize, by a false issue on which they obtained a judgment from the people, a judgment which the people were very glad to reverse when they had had an opportunity of testing the hon. gentlemen's performances. They came into power with \$99,848,462 of debt, increased to \$108,224,965 on 30th June, 1874, and they left it, in 1878, with that debt increased to \$139,362,000, and with obligations, by contracts and otherwise, which compelled their successors to borrow, at least, \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000, with deficits of \$6,500,000, which had to be provided for, making an absolute increase of \$46,500,000, with whatever further sum would be required to meet their contracts for railway construction, in an undertaking to which they were not bound on taking office, an undertaking which they had commenced by a law passed in the Parliament of 1874, abrogating all the old contracts, abrogating the policy of the former Government, and taking upon themselves, as a Government, the construction of the Pacific Railway as a public work, involving, as everybody knows who has had any experience in public works, conditions and considerations which those hon. gentlemen ought to have shrunk from, for it placed them constantly in such a position, with regard to public contractors, that we will be glad, on our side, when we have relieved the country from such an onerous responsibility. The amount of the increase of the public debt, between 1873 and 1877, has been \$46,532,508. Now, Sir, there is no question but that some part of that is due to previous engagements. Every incoming Government must be bound to a certain extent by the engagements of its predecessors, and there is nothing so foolish, there is nothing so unpatriotic, there is nothing so improper, as for an incoming Administration to attempt in any way to shirk a fair or proper responsibility that has been thrown upon them by their predecessors; but we have had every possible reason for returning to the hon. gentlemen opposite the measure that was meted out to us in 1874. Why, Sir, on my first appearance in public life when I took my seat here in that year I heard and never shall forget the Budget Seech which was delivered to this House by the hon. Finance Minister then in power. I shall never forget the shriek and the howl, and the aggravated, piled up, heaped up vituperation which that hon. gentleman poured out on his predecessors. Why, Sir, a financial statement is supposed to be a calm, deliberate effort. It involves considerations which ought to forbid expressions of passion; it involves the public credit, which should constrain a Finance Minister, I think, to take the same line that would be taken by a judicial officer, otherwise damage must be done to it. Violent harangues by hon. gentlemen entrusted with the public funds should not be tolerated, and yet there has not passed a Session since I came into Parliament, in which the hon. gentleman who held the position of Finance Minister in the late Government, the gentleman who was afterwards dismissed from the control of the public treasury, has not indulged in harangues that would disgrace a political stump speaker. This state of things almost compels us to resort to meeting argument of that kind with similar argument. I regret very much that the debates in this House, particularly those which have reference to the credit of the Dominion, have been brought, by the example set by

the hon. gentleman who held the public purse strings during five disastrous years, down to the position to which they have been brought, and, Sir, the responsibility rests only in one place, and we will enforce the responsibility there. Since we came into power in 1878, the net debt has been increased from \$140,362,069 to \$155,395,780, exclusive of deficits. The loan of December, 1878, should be added to the \$140,362,069—by so much as it increased the gross debt—say nearly \$5,000,000. It ought to have been made in the summer of 1878. The net interest, in 1878, was \$6,533,000; in 1881, it was \$6,918,000, when, although there was an increase of \$15,000,000 of net debt, there was only an increase of \$386,000 of net interest. Our friends on the opposite side increased the gross debt up to 1878, \$35,213,834, and the gross interest charges, \$1,850,659. The increase of the gross debt since 1878 has been \$25,904,379; increase of gross interest charges only \$558,752. The comparative saving between the two financial managements is, as may be readily seen, \$593,248 a year in our favor, for at the same rate of charge as is shown on that \$35,213,834, our \$25,904,379 would have involved an interest charge of \$1,152,000. In accounting for the increase of the public debt, which is often thrown in our faces, it may be very well occasionally to look back and see what are the items that compose that increase. The debt of 1867, was \$75,629,641 net, was represented the assumption by the Dominion Government of the main portion of the debt of the Confederated Provinces. Part of the remainder was afterwards assumed, and properly assumed, in 1873, by my hon. friend the Finance Minister under authority of Parliament. Now, Sir, we assumed debts of the Provinces to the amount, after 1868, and prior to 1874, of \$15,525,274. We spent during that period upon Public Works chargeable to capital, \$2,145,843; upon surveys and expenses connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$1,081,394; upon the Intercolonial Railway, \$14,520,000; on the North-West, \$2,919,000—making altogether, \$36,192,000. But, Sir, we did not increase the public debt to that amount. All these were expenditures properly chargeable to capital, we had a right to borrow \$13,000,000. But, Sir, we took out of the surplus revenues of the country a large portion of that sum, because during those periods, while my hon. friends who are now in office held power, we had, as we have now, a period not of deficits but of surpluses, and we had money to spare from income account. Instead of squandering it by increasing the public expenditure we put it into public works chargeable to capital, and that we have done well and wisely, we have an authority which the hon. gentlemen on the other side can never question. We have a circular issued by the late Finance Minister in 1876, in which he states that a large sum—I believe he said somewhere between \$11,000,000 and \$12,000,000—accurately speaking it is \$11,973,579—had been expended in public works chargeable to capital, and that the whole public debt had been invested—judiciously invested—in public works for the benefit of the Dominion of Canada, and for the benefit of the Empire as well. With that statement in his hand he went to England to make that famous negotiation in which he sold our public securities at 87½ or less, and we never found out to whom he sold them; or who has made the normous profit of nearly 17 per cent. or nearly \$2,125,000 on that cloudy transaction, and when he was charged with having made a statement so favorable to his predecessors, he said he presented the silver side of the shield to the capitalists of England, and intended to present the brazen side (I thank him for teaching me that word) to the electors of Ontario whom he was then addressing. I now come to the increase of the public debt under the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I admit that with a good deal of that increase we are chargeable, though I do not come down to \$80,000 as the extent of the responsibility of the late Government therefor, as my hon. friend from

Mr. PLUMB.

North Norfolk has done. I will relieve him from the idea that I intended to charge against those gentlemen as reckless expenditure the increase under their Administration. I do not intend to deal with hon. gentlemen opposite in that spirit, but will treat the subject fairly, because it is only a temporary advantage for gentlemen to get up unfair statistics and make misstatements and garble accounts and twist them, as has been done, I am sorry to say, by some members of the Opposition, whose names I could mention. The increase was as follows:—From \$108,224,965, June 30, 1874, to \$146,481,070, June 30, 1879, amounting to \$38,256,115. The principal items causing the increase are, Debts of the Provinces, \$4,947,000; Public Works, \$16,091,000; Pacific Railway, including the Foster contract, Fort William purchase, and Fort Francis Lock, \$9,122,564—and the greater part of that is absolutely due to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; the Intercolonial Railway \$8,534,985—charging upon the country during the Administration of those gentlemen annually large deficits. Now, I am happy to say, under the Administration of the present Minister of Railways which cannot be too highly commended and complimented, and which cannot be too generally understood, that great work, instead of being a heavy charge on the country, for the first time in the history of its existence, shows a balance of receipts over expenses, and promises to yield a revenue which will do something towards relieving the burden of its construction. To-day, our financial position may be stated thus: we owe a general debt of \$199,000,000, but we have of assets that are of good character—a sinking fund in the first place of nearly \$11,000,000, and bank deposits and other available securities amounting to nearly \$33,000,000, leaving the public debt, less cash assets, \$155,395,780, of which \$19,900,000 is for deposits in the savings banks, for Dominion notes. My hon. friend the Finance Minister has shown that Canada has ample means to meet all her obligations if she pursues the policy which has been so successfully inaugurated by him. He can also show that Canada has a treasure far beyond anything which grows out of the taxation of her people, a treasure far beyond anything which any other country that I know of in the world possesses, in proportion to her population and necessities, in the Great North-West, an acquisition which was made by the far-seeing statesmanship of my right hon. friend who leads this Government, an acquisition which has been held and developed in opposition to the fiercest contention on the part of the Opposition, an acquisition as to which it is now evident that even the most sanguine estimate formed in respect to it will be far more than realized. Sir, it was painful to see, three years ago, on the eve of a general election, the efforts that were made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to deprive the country of whatever advantage might have accrued to it from the possession of that great and splendid possessions. Sir, I remember on one occasion during the Session of 1880, an hon. gentleman who now confronts me spent an hour reading from Blue Books extracts which were calculated to damage and to depreciate the value of our North-West Territory. These extracts are not now to be found in the *Hansard*, they have been suppressed in the Official Reports. I remember also that another hon. gentleman, who then aspired to the leadership of his shattered party, and has since obtained the doubtful prize, took pains to tell us that there was no value there, that we should abandon the policy of progress, and that we should go back to the policy of 1872, that we were not able to complete the undertakings which we were assuming, that we should withdraw from them, and, as to our neighbors upon the other side, that we should not disturb the policy by which we were made their hewers of wood and drawers of water, that we should recede from our Tariff and deal with

them on their own terms that we give up the idea of connecting the great west and the Pacific coast with the Atlantic sea-board, drop everything like political ambition, and crawl humbly into our shell. Yet that hon. gentleman, on more than one occasion, posed as the champion of young Canada, posed as one who was leading young Canada to have something like a national existence. I think young Canada is now convinced that they made their idol, but have found him clay. Sir, we believe that we have a right to say to the country that we on this side of the House have endeavored in every way fairly and honestly to protect its interests, and I do not desire to attribute to hon. gentlemen opposite any intention to do otherwise, but I do say that the logical consequence of the position they have been compelled as our opponents to assume, places them in an attitude of hostility to interests important to the growth and progress of the Dominion. They are about to go before the country again, to ask that they shall have a renewal of that confidence which they betrayed between 1873 and 1878; they are about to go to the country with the record which I have given—and, unless they falsify it, there is no other record for them—to ask that the people of Canada shall again entrust them with the reins of power. I think I see those hon. gentlemen taking the platform, and endeavoring to make a case for themselves. I followed through the press the career of the leader of those hon. gentlemen in the Maritime Provinces when he was struggling against adverse fate, and attempting to urge the claims of his party upon his unwilling and unsympathizing hearers. It was a melancholy spectacle, it was one which we shall never forget; we shall always recall the halfhearted support which he received from the party organ in Ontario; we shall always remember the meagre audiences that collected to meet him, the feeble excuses for the marked absence of the mass of the people, and we shall remember more than all what we believe to be the great disappointment of the hon. gentleman, and the greater disappointment of his friends, when he had finished that tour and came back to his constituents in Ontario. Sir, I believe, nothing has happened which could be of more advantage to the Conservative party than the visit of the hon. the leader of the Opposition to the Maritime Provinces, in respect to our political interests there. With that eloquence of which he is master, and that ability for special pleading, which is his own, he put before the people of those Provinces the strongest side of his case, and if he did not win their favorable judgment, it is certain nobody else of his party can do so. We shall see, as we did in 1877 in Ontario, and as we did in the Maritime Provinces last summer, the hon. gentleman for Shefford pleading for himself and his colleagues, he who, I find,—on looking at an extract from one of the newspapers there, amused the people by giving them a facetious account of the scandals that attached to the Conservative party. Well, my hon. friend was a proper person to address an audience of the Maritime Provinces upon the scandals that attached to the Conservative party. I do not envy him his role, and I cannot suppose that the people of that country took much interest in his bankrupt stock of exploded scandals. But, Sir, we heard that the hon. the leader of the Reform party, when he was in the Maritime Provinces, talked a good deal about the legitimate channels of trade for those Provinces; he gently patted on the back those gentlemen who were in the first place opposed to the union of the Provinces—those gentlemen who were over-ruled and over-borne and who had not the instinct to see that they were wrong. Many of them still clung to that exploded idea, and refused to be comforted when they saw those who led the Provinces into Confederation holding power and controlling the political destinies of their several Provinces. He suggested that the proper ally

for those Provinces, the natural place for their trade, was the great Republic alongside of them. The hon. member for Gloucester indignantly denied that any such statement had ever been made. Why, all the newspapers which have given his leading speeches, notably the one delivered at Summerside, show that that was the tenor of his argument. The hon. leader of the Opposition was absent from his seat at the time, but I do not think he will thank his super-serviceable friend from Gloucester for taking up the cudgels in his defence and endeavoring to put him in a false position. Where, I may add, in view of the financial position of this country, in view of its prosperity, in view of the opening up of the great North-West, in view of the contract which has been made for carrying immigrants into that country, in view of that Pacific Railway Syndicate, which it has been attempted to use as a weapon against us, but which will be a boomerang to hon. gentlemen when they throw it out—where, I say, after the statement made by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, to attempt to criticize which would be entirely supererogatory on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite—where have they any expectation that they can appeal with hope of success to the people whom they once defrauded? Why, I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman who leads the party proved himself to be neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, when he said in Quebec on the eve of the last local election that he expected that there would be large Liberal gains in that Province. I am afraid that in a short time he found the truth of that adage of Sam Slick or Hosea Biglow: "Don't never prophecy unless you know." I do not see much hope for the hon. gentlemen in the Maritime Provinces, and in the other Provinces I see nothing to encourage them. But the chief battle-ground will be Ontario; and, judging from the circular which has been issued by the hon. gentleman who now leads the opposite party, we may fancy he hopes he may do something with the voters' lists and the assessment rolls that will aid him there—and I hope every friend of mine who hears my voice to-night will remember that in making up those lists and rolls the battle will begin, and there for the most part the battle will be won. I know something of this, because on one occasion I purged my constituency of forty-two fraudulent votes belonging to what is called the Reform party, and by that means I got a majority four times as large after I was unseated and went back again for re-election as I had before. We know that an agitation has been commenced in Ontario which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would almost lead to a disunion of these Provinces. We have heard the wild harangues; we have seen the audacious statements; we have seen the attempt to bulldoze this Parliament for the purpose of gaining a temporary triumph for unscrupulous and desperate partisans in the Province of Ontario. But I can tell hon. gentlemen that I know that public opinion is not so easily thrown off its balance; and I trust that in any discussions which may arise in the Dominion House of Commons upon the Boundary Question or the Streams Bill, the very opposite course will be pursued by the hon. gentlemen here who have been so foully attacked and misrepresented from that pursued in a place where a mischievous attempt at agitation has failed to gain even a temporary triumph. Sir, last year when I had the honor of addressing this House on the Budget, while speaking of the Dominion and its resources, and of the development which is so rapidly going on—the greater portion of which, I honestly believe, is due, not to the statesmanship and forecast of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, but to the patriotic policy adopted by those with whom I have the honor to act—I took occasion to compare the trade position of the great country alongside of us, with that of the Dominion. That country has often been referred to as taking enormous strides in material prosperity, and its progress in wealth enterprise

and population can scarcely be over-stated. It must not be forgotten that it has advanced most rapidly since it adopted a very high protective Tariff, and we have been informed by one of those gentlemen who seem impelled to write about things they do not understand very clearly, that Canada is a sort of slack water between two systems—England on the one side illustrating the extreme Free Trade principle, and the United States on the other side illustrating Protection. We will assume the population of the United States to be 50,000,000 people, that of Canada 4,350,000. According to the latest authentic trade returns, we find that the imports of the United States, in 1880, amounted to \$38 a head, or \$761,000,000, while Canada's imports at the same time were \$39,000,000, or \$40 a head, showing that we had a larger import trade in proportion to our population than the great nation beside us, and that we had not built up a Chinese wall to exclude foreign manufactures. The exports of the United States, in 1880, when they had an enormously redundant crop, including their cotton, which is a specialty, were \$851,000,000, or \$42 50 a head; while the exports by Canada, in spite of the arguments of my hon. friend who tries to prove that we are ruined because we cannot export anything, were \$39,600,000, or \$38 a head.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What were they before the National Policy was introduced?

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman can look up the trade returns, and he has a very ingenious way of falsifying them when he likes.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to order. The hon. gentleman says my hon. friend has a very ingenious way of falsifying the returns.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not say he falsified them.

Mr. BLAKE. I submit to you that is not parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not. I hope the hon. gentleman will keep himself to the proper ground of the discussion.

Mr. PLUMB. If I have unguardedly transgressed the rules, I beg to apologize to this House and to the hon. gentleman. I wished to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to a peculiar state of things in the United States which I think will go very far towards strengthening our case in a certain argument which is now proceeding, and it struck me it was desirable to see whether, as is alleged, the exports of the United States have been absolutely throttled by their fiscal policy. It was desirable to see whether the United States could continue, under a policy which has doubled their Tariff, to export manufactured produce. Therefore, it was desirable to know the relative proportions between the exports of the agricultural produce of the United States and their exports of the manufactured products in a certain period, when that Tariff was not established and between the exports of their agricultural and manufactured products, during the periods when the Tariff laid its greatest stress upon the country. I have taken pains to tabulate a statement on this subject, and will commend it to the hon. member for West Middlesex to test it, if he likes. During a period of low Tariffs, before the imposition of the Morrill Tariff—which was enacted in 1861, after the secession of the Confederate States made it possible for a policy of that kind to be adopted—from 1850 to 1860, of the total exports, 79½ per cent. was agricultural products, and but 20½ per cent. manufactures. From 1861 to 1871, during a period of war and inflation—a period when the United States were absorbing everything—when the Tariff was at its highest point, agricultural exports were only 72·36 per cent. of the total, and exports of manufactures were 27·64 per cent. From 1871 to 1880, after the civil war, the agricultural products reached 78·44 in proportion to 21·66 of manufactured goods.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB. Now, those figures show conclusively that during two periods when a protective Tariff prevailed—

Mr. PLUMB.

a Tariff so high that the hon. member for North Norfolk, while he praised it as highly as he could praise any fiscal policy, and recommended it generally to our adoption, by an argument which, I say, he never has equalled since, in this House—the proportion of exports of manufactures to agricultural products average 1 from 1861 till 1871, 27·64 per cent.; for the next ten years, 21·66 per cent, and for the ten years of low Tariff—from 1850 till 1860—but 20·50 per cent. I believe these figures will show the hon. gentleman that there has been no decrease of manufactured exports under a high Tariff of the United States; on the contrary, they have largely increased. I have taken an average for ten years in each case, as the hon. gentleman is very fond of averages, which he thinks prove everything, though I do not always agree with him. We are told that our policy is working very badly in the Maritime Provinces, of whose sufferings we are constantly hearing; but I think we have sometimes a little evidence to the contrary. I do not know whether the extract I am about to read will be considered authoritative on the subject, but I will give it for what it is worth. I quote the following article from the St. John, (N.B.) Sun :

"It is said that Messrs. Blake, Burpee and Huntington (accompanied, of course, by Mr. Elder, M.P.P.,) will visit the St. John factories to-day and see for themselves what is being done by our manufacturers—those people whom the *Telegraph* referred to as 'a few struggling manufacturers,' the protection of whose business against foreign competition Sir Richard Cartwright described 'as legalized robbery.' We hope they will take a good look at our workshops, in many of which the number of operatives has been doubled and trebled since 1878, notwithstanding the National Policy and in the face of Mr. Weldon's allegations of universal mercantile bankruptcy. As an aid to those gentlemen in estimating the difficulties which surrounded manufacturing in St. John while Messrs. Blake, Huntington and Burpee were in power, and when the *Telegraph* was their oracle and most obedient servant, we offer a few figures for them to ponder at their leisure.

"In 1874, when the Mackenzie-Blake Government took control of public affairs, the condition of manufactures in St. John was as follows:—

1874.

Capital invested in manufactures	\$7,968,000
Annual wages paid	3,605,640
Males employed in manufactures	8,428 }
Females employed in do	1,769 }
	10,197

"When the Mackenzie Government left office in 1878, the condition of things had so changed, that the following was the result:—

1878.

Capital invested	\$5,235,000
Annual wages paid	1,709,875
Males employed	5,003 }
Females do	1,281 }
	6,284

"The change produced, therefore, is represented by the following:—

FALLING OFF.

Reduction of capital invested	\$2,731,300
Reduction of annual wages	1,806,955
Reduction of males employed	3,425 }
Reduction of females do	488 }
	3,913

"It is, therefore, true that during four years rule of the Mackenzie Government, St. John and Portland manufactures suffered to the extent, in round numbers, of a loss of nearly three millions of dollars of invested capital; about two millions of dollars of annual wages paid; about four thousand people driven out of employment.

"And this, notwithstanding the enormous expenditure and the employment afforded during the rebuilding of the burnt district.

In that connection it was very distressing to hear that, on one occasion, when my hon. friend the Finance Minister was travelling in that country, there were nineteen unfortunate persons who were supposed to be kicking their heels in a cold baggage car, and who, owing to the terrible effects of the policy which he had inaugurated, were about to leave the country. Well that statement was published all over western Ontario and the country generally; those unfortunate men were pictured as being in great distress, while my hon. friend was lolling at his ease on the sofa of a special carriage of the Intercolonial Railway. They all had their little carpet-bags with them, they were all

going out of the country, by so much reducing its stock of bone and sinew, and adding to what my hon. friend on the other side once called the ex-odus. But one story was good until another was told. The following letter was soon after addressed to the *Sun* :

"GENTS,—I have had my attention drawn to a statement in the *St. John Globe*, that on the train that took Sir Leonard and party to St. John on the 23rd, there were a number of laboring men who were fleeing the country. The object of the *Globe* in drawing attention to this matter was, no doubt, to try and injure Sir Leonard, and, at the same time, have a hit at the N.P.

Now, I think I can throw some light on this 'exodus' question, for it so happened that J. Winslow Jones & Co. (limited) of Portland, Maine, U.S., for whom I have packed lobsters for many years, required a number of men skilled in making and sealing cans, and they requested me, as soon as our packing season closed, to arrange for a number of my men, who understood the business, to go and work for them during the corn packing; and on the 23rd inst., which I believe is the day in question, I took twelve men from here to Shediac, and saw them off in the train, after giving them a letter to Messrs. Jones & Co., and I have no doubt but these are the men spoken of.

"They are all to return in October or November.

Then the paper goes on to say :

"The nineteen tearful men with nineteen small valises have been heard from. They did not go out of Canada at all. They found work in the St. Croix cotton factory, which has been built solely under the stimulus of the N.P. The N.P., therefore, stopped them on the border, as it has already stopped hundreds, and will, when in full operation, stop thousands from going out of Canada, by providing them with varied and remunerative work in the Dominion."

Well, Sir, we were told by a witty writer not long ago that you might as well try to get a mule by the hind leg as to reconcile a Grit to a national enterprise. I do not know whether that is true or not, but it looks to me very much as if the whole course of the leaders of that party is hostile to the industrial movement of the country, and, considering the tone which from first to last has characterized the utterances of hon. gentlemen on the other side in respect to our fiscal policy, which is characterizing their policy in respect to settling and developing the North-West, it looks as if it were quite true that you might as well try to get a mule by the hind leg as to get one of those hon. gentlemen to join with us fairly, heartily, honestly, to strike hands with us in an endeavor to go forward for the purpose of promoting the interests of our common country. It is a different thing in the United States. I never heard a man there attempt to decry his country. However widely they may differ in opinion, however bitter may be their party strifes, when the question comes up as to the interests of their common country, you will see that they are as one. They believe they have—and they have—a great destiny to carry out. They started in an entirely different way from us. Their inauguration was one which was commenced in blood. Their Constitution insured to the several States all the rights which were not surrendered in terms strictly defined to the general Government. They started with a jealousy of Federal power; they started with the intention that the States should hold their autonomies and their reserved rights. Out of that grew those unfortunate discussions which at last led to a vast outlay of treasure and of blood, and to consequences which no man yet living can foresee. But notwithstanding all that, they think, and they have reason to think, that they have solved some of the most difficult problems of political liberty. Knowing it as I do, and wishing, from my former allegiance to it, always to speak with the tenderest respect of the land which gave me birth—and never did I in any way join in any hostile criticisms upon it—I do not agree with the opinion that in the Constitution of the States is to be found the true essence of political perfection, but I believe that the most perfect freedom that exists in any Government in the world is to be found in the palladium which is furnished to us by the British Constitution. I believe that it is to be found in British liberty as obtained by concession after concession from the Crown by the Parliament of England, which is the

true Government of England. I believe that our policy with regard to that great country south of us is to proceed in lines parallel to its course, and the true definition of parallel lines is that they never shall meet; but, Sir, I do not care how closely they may come together. We are to work out on this side of the continent our great destiny; they are to work out, also on theirs, a commensurate destiny; and I trust that, while we may be enabled, without entangling alliances, to keep always in sympathy with them, we may never, by any machinations on this side or any seductions on the other, be tempted for one moment to swerve from the position that we have held, of undying loyalty to the British Throne. Sir, I believe that Canada has a great destiny; and I believe that we shall be indebted largely for the fulfilment of that destiny, under God, to those now at the Helm of State, and notably to the leader of the great Liberal Conservative party. I believe that in the great North-West we are to find the principal elements of Canada's future greatness. I believe that, if we are true to ourselves, if we do not waste ourselves in low party bickering and small party differences, if we are willing, as patriotic men, to strike hands together and to go forward, each endeavoring to do his best for the good of the country, that we shall be doing a noble work, and shall be rewarded by seeing our pathless wilderness blossom as the rose. I believe the North-West has possibilities which no man has yet imagined; I believe also that those possibilities are to be worked out by the policy which we have adopted; and I believe no greater misfortune could happen to Canada to-day than that that policy should be reversed, than that it should be possible for the work which we have commenced to be interrupted in its great progress, than that it should be possible for men to come into power who would embarrass this country in its forward movement. Our friends opposite, I believe, would take such a course if the destinies of this Dominion were again committed to their hands, because they feel bound to do so for consistency's sake, and by the inexorable law which governs men who have made rash promises when in Opposition which they try to fulfil when they succeed to power. No greater misfortune could happen to Canada than that there should be any desire on the part of her people to take away the authority they have given to those who now rule their destiny and relegate them back to opposition to make room for those who now sit on the other side of this House—those who have done what? Who ruled Canada for five years to the yearly detriment of her people; who saw Canada sinking and would not stretch a hand to save her; those of whom it may be said, as it was said of a party on the other side of the border: "When the country sinks their party rises; when the country rises their party sinks." I pray—as one having no party prejudice in the matter—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB. Hon. gentlemen may take that position if they choose. They know that their course towards me has been as unfair, perhaps, as was ever pursued towards any public man in Canada; but I lay that aside. I desire to meet my opponents on common ground where each may do what he can for the good of the country; and I pray, for the sake of Canada, that the era of misrule and blundering, and maladministration may never again return to blight and blast the hopes of the people of this Dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Before a vote is taken upon the proposition before you, I propose, as briefly as I can, to address some remarks to the House upon the object which we have in view in going into committee. Usually, Sir, in a deliberative assembly in countries where parliamentary government prevails, the presenting of the Budget is an occasion which Ministers take advantage of in order to lay an exposition of the affairs of the state before the country, and to give the assembled representatives of the people

some idea of the exact position of their commercial and financial affairs. No one could have listened to this debate from the beginning without feeling painfully conscious that the chief object of hon. gentlemen opposite was not to give this exposition in the calm and deliberate manner which it requires, but simply to make it the occasion for attack upon their adversaries upon this side of the House. There was an acrimony and a violence in the tone of the hon. Minister of Finance—who usually looks as mild as a lamb—that was quite extraordinary. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Railways is not in his seat, as I mean to say something regarding his attitude also. He set up as the second of the Minister of Finance, and actually spent two whole hours in abusing the members on this side of the House. The only alleged fault that brought such heavy punishment being the charge that the hon. Minister of Finance was occasionally in the habit of using indifferent grammar. And because of that charge we have these two hours of what I shall not dignify by calling invective, for it was not worthy of the name, but what I can only designate as one long, bitter, coarse, scold, which may best be described by a couplet from Bret Harte:

"He quoted no hymn and he uttered no psalm,
He opened his mouth and he roughly said damn."

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was good enough to go out of his way, in rather an undignified fashion I must say, in order to attack myself and some other hon. members of the late Administration. Now, Sir, I am disposed, to-night, to defend my Administration, and show that the policy I adopted was one which I believe to be for the interests of the country. We have been told, to-night, with fearful iteration by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down—he repeated it at least twenty times—that our very existence was inimical to the progress of the country; that we never made a speech or uttered a word but what was in condemnation of something of a great national character, and that, instead of being patriotic like hon. gentlemen opposite, we were earnestly devoting ourselves to the destruction of the country. And yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman ventured to say that we were driven from office ignominiously in 1878. This phrase was also used by the hon. the Minister of Railways, and we were reminded of our great defeat in 1878 by the hon. the Minister of Finance, on two or three occasions, in the course of his speech. Sir, I deny that there was any ignominy attending my defeat and that of my colleagues. We took our stand on a certain principle on that occasion, and if we risked our political reputation, if we risked our places as Ministers and our positions as representatives of the people, in order to carry out a principle practically into action, is there any ignominy in that? Is there not more ignominy in the case of hon. gentlemen who sold their country for a sum of money?—who were not able even to attend the House long enough to have a direct vote taken on the subject, but walked out of the House one evening resolved never to come back. The hon. gentlemen who thus accuses us were both in the Ministry when they had the celebrated negotiations with Sir Hugh Allan, and yet they venture to speak to us of ignominy because we took our stand on a well-known political principle. Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down talked of striking hands as parties, of striking hands with the Mother Country and the neighboring Republic and marching on parallel lines, but never to meet. What was our policy in 1878, one that was in harmony with the professions and practices of the Mother Country? Was not it our desire as Liberals—following the example of the great English Liberal party, who have made England great and glorious—to follow those principles of trade which England and all her colonies, with no solitary exceptions, have given effect to in our own day; and if the people of this country, misled in a time of deep depression,

Mr. MACKENZIE.

gave their votes against our continuing to keep our position, I feel rather proud of having sacrificed myself and my position to the vindication of a principle which I believe to be the root of all political prosperity. Sir, when we assumed office in 1873 we did so with a firm determination to use the possession of office only to give effect to the principles we professed in Opposition, and I am prepared to maintain, on every occasion, that we did so give effect to our principles, that we endeavored to restore peace and harmony to the disturbed districts of the country; that we endeavored to bring the entire population of the Confederated Provinces, some of which had been confederated rather against their will, into a harmonious union on all political issues. It was our duty, also, Sir, and our desire particularly, to extend the domain of civilization in the North-West. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) said, in the course of his closing remarks, that we had invariably shown a malicious desire to prevent the acquisition of the North-West and throw every possible obstacle in the way of its settlement. Sir, it is almost laughable to find this hon. gentleman, who has not been very long in Canada, venturing to lecture to Canadians who have been here all their lives, about the North-West. Every one who knows Canadian history knows that for the last twenty-five years there has been a steady fight on the part of the Liberal party of Ontario and Quebec to obtain possession of that territory. Who does not remember the discussions that took place at the various conventions in the west, and particularly the one in 1859? Who does not remember the advocacy by the chief political organ of the Liberal party and the chief organ of public opinion in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, yes. The hon. gentleman thinks so himself for he reads the *Globe* the first thing every morning to see what it has to say, and he is in mortal terror of what may appear in that organ. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always ready to denounce the *Globe*, but when they find anything in it tending to support, in the slightest degree their own opinions, it is quoted as an authority not to be despised. Now, Sir, it was, as I said, a determined effort on the part of the Liberal party that brought that country first into public notice; it was that party that promoted its settlement, that promoted its purchase, and all who are acquainted with the internal history of the last twenty years knows that Sir George Cartier and some of his friends were the only opponents that policy had, their action being taken on the miserable plea that that policy might extend too rapidly and too far the political power possessed by the larger Province. I am glad his successors in this House now in power do not appear to act upon that narrow ground, but are willing to join with the Liberals in settling that magnificent country. But they say we decry the merits of that territory. When did we do so? We have invariably on this and every other occasion in respect to this and every other subject, sought to make plain the exact truth respecting the position of that country, and, no matter what hon. gentlemen opposite may say, I prefer being in Opposition, and being able to say, that no person has been misled through any utterance of mine in respect to the state of matters in that country. I have observed, also, in the course of the debate, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not at all ashamed of the proceeding of last Session; that they are still prepared to defend, as the best possible thing that could be done, or that ever was done, the rejection of the lower offer of one company and the acceptance of the higher offer of another for the building of the Pacific Railway. We are actually charged by the hon. member for Niagara with having needlessly and recklessly, when not called upon to do so, commenced the

construction of the Pacific Railway. We are charged with having made ourselves responsible for a considerable portion of the debt, on the ground that we commenced the railway when we should not have commenced it. We were charged a few evenings ago, on the other hand, by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), if the report in a newspaper be true, with having done nothing at all to build the railway up to the time of our leaving office. The fact is, both hon. gentlemen are wrong. The policy of the late Administration was this: we believed the bargain entered into with British Columbia was a most improvident and unwise one; that it was one impossible of execution; that, even if it were possible to execute it, it would not be fair to the other Provinces to do so at that time and in that manner; and we endeavored honestly and faithfully to get the terms reduced, and we succeeded in getting them reduced. But, in the meantime, we held and believed that it was exceedingly desirable, though not absolutely necessary, to obtain as early an entrance into the country as possible by rail, and we lost no time, after acceding to office, in getting work commenced at two points between Fort William and Red River. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), with that accuracy which distinguishes all his utterances respecting his political opponents, was good enough, on several occasions lately, to say that when we left office, after having been five years in power, there was not one mile located, according to one speech, and not one mile built, according to another speech.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I made no such statement anywhere as that the late Government left office without having a mile of the Pacific Railway located. What I said was this: that they left office without having one mile located west of Red River. That is the statement I made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have seen the report, and it is stated as I have said. I have a letter here from a gentleman who was at the meeting in Almonte. He says:

"Mr. White also stated that, when the late Government went out of office, after five years incumbency, not one mile of railway was built on which an engine could run."

Is that correct?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not only was there one mile built, but 200 miles were built; and if the hon. gentleman will consult the report of the Minister of Public Works in the year following my leave of office, he will find it there stated that the track was laid for some thirty or forty miles west of Fort William, and that engines were running over 102 miles, the balance of the track to English River being ready for the rails. It is there also stated that, on the Selkirk Branch, extending over twenty-three miles, there were trains running and the track laid from Winnipeg to Emerson, and had been so for months before that time. Yet the hon. gentleman ventured to make such a statement. But it is difficult to believe hon. gentlemen opposite. Their only policy appears to be abuse of their opponents. They do not discuss measures; they do not discuss the state of the country; but they say, if you can, throw mud at your opponents until some of it sticks. I say in regard to the Pacific Railway that we located the line entirely to Red River from Fort William, and we located the line entirely from Selkirk westward to the mouth of the Fraser at Port Moody, and except what the Syndicate has set aside, our location has been entirely followed. All through British Columbia the exact line surveyed by us has been accepted by the present Administration. The other part we had ready for them to begin upon is accepted and finished, that is, between Rat Portage and English River; so instead of our policy being barren, it was most productive, and was carried out with much regard to economy, that no one can at this moment charge us with wantonly and uselessly spending a single dollar of the public money. Speaking of

the acquisition of the North-West country, as early as 1852 the late Mr. Brown, during the first session of Parliament, and when he was giving his leadership of the Reform party, proposed the resolution in the House for the acquisition of that Territory, thus showing most conclusively with whom rested the glory—if it be a glory, and I think it is—of having banished an odious monopoly from the face of the continent, and made the country fit to be occupied by a civilized people. My hon. friend beside me says the country has now got into the hands of another monopoly. That is very true, and it is a matter deeply to be regretted. But I do not intend to discuss that subject to-night, but will confine myself to the discussion of the policy of the two Governments in regard to financial and trade affairs, and limit myself to such references as are absolutely necessary to statements made from time to time during this debate. With respect to our policy, as contrasted with the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, let me say this: During the elections of September, 1878—I am sure there was no lack of abundant declarations of policy on our part to indicate precisely what is the line we intended to follow—we declined to accept anything looking in the direction of Protection. We said we had a revenue Tariff of 17½ per cent. which afforded a very large protection to manufacturers, and I knew then, and I know now, that that did afford a sufficient protection to nearly every legitimate interest. I was very much astonished, a few nights ago, when the hon. member for West Montreal assured me and the House that he had not obtained 3 per cent. upon his investments in cotton manufactories since the present Government came into office. As my information on this point is very different from the hon. gentleman's experience, I shall propose, in the course of a few days, to ask the House to allow me to get a Committee of Enquiry into the distressed condition of the cotton manufacturers, and in that Committee I hope we will obtain the evidence that the hon. gentleman is prepared to give, to show the wretched condition in which the trade is, even now, and the fatality of those people who are going on building cotton factories all over the country as fast as it is possible to invest money in brick and lime. But the hon. Minister of Finance, who is so censorious upon us, was not a Protectionist in September, 1878. At that time he denied, explicitly and categorically, questions addressed to him in that sense at St. John, when his dear friend, Senator Boyd, who is a sort of wet nurse to the hon. gentleman—I beg his pardon, a dry nurse I should say—telegraphed to the leader of the hon. gentleman to ask if it were true that a Protectionist Policy was proposed; if it were true that 35 per cent. of duties were proposed to be added; and he replied that there was no such thing intended, but only a readjustment of duties. Now, Sir, none of us would object, for one moment, to a readjustment of duties. There must be a readjustment of duties every two or three years with every Administration, and the hon. gentleman himself has come down, and I think he is right, with a proposition to readjust his own Tariff this Session. In fact, there will be a readjustment every Session, and it will be readjusted out of existence before the hon. gentleman is very much older.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, several hon. members say no, but we will see how that will be. But, supposing that the hon. gentleman did adopt Protection as a principle—he did not certainly on that occasion—but now if he does adopt it, let us see what that principle is. The hon. gentleman claims that the vast amount of money which he possesses as Finance Minister, has been the result of his Protectionist Policy. Now, I am delighted that we are able to congratulate the Finance Minister and each other on the prosperous state of the country. I am glad to be able to say that I have seen abundant evidence of the prosperity myself in all

parts of the country. I am proud to say that throughout the country districts where there was a good deal of suffering in previous years, that that is almost entirely removed. I am glad to say a considerable portion of the indebtedness of farmers has been paid. But, Sir, I am also bound to say, and every hon. gentleman opposite will be bound in his heart to acknowledge, that we owe all that prosperity, not to the machination or the tricks of a politician, but to the abundant resources provided by an all-powerful Providence. We all know what a revival of the industry of farming means. We know that during the last three or four years, at least, there was a succession of bad harvests in England, the great consuming country of the world. We know that during these same years, three of them at least, there was a more than usually abundant harvest reaped in Canada. We know that during the previous year, while my Administration was in power, there was an almost total cessation of enterprise in the lumbering interests of the country. The two great staples of this country for exportation sale are the cereals and animal products of the farm, and the products of the forest, and when there was a revival in the sale of the products of the forest equal at least to the abundance of the harvest that was reaped, how could we escape prosperity, no matter how bad the Government was that held the reins of power? If the hon. gentleman claimed that he is entitled to any merit for this, he is claiming that he is in the position of Providence, the arbiter of national prosperity. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman must know that no money is to be made by taxing a class of the community. Protection means protection to some particular industry, to some particular class of the community, and if one class is protected it must at the expense of all the other classes and if all classes of the country are protected alike, then all are made poorer by the cost of enforcing that protection on the country. That is the theory of Protection, and I defy any person to give it any other color. The theory of Free Trade, on the contrary, is that all restrictions should be removed from the purchase or sale of products or commodities, so far as that can possibly be done consistent with the local circumstances which have always to be considered. One hon. gentleman opposite—I think it was the Minister of Customs—said the other day, that he observed from a speech of mine, that I was prepared to kill the manufacturers off by inches. Sir, I said in my speech delivered at Lambton, a few weeks ago, that we were accused of a determination, if we should succeed at the coming elections, of returning at once to the Tariff which we ourselves had in operation. What I said was that no politician, no statesman, no Minister could honestly disregard the interests that may have been created, and that while there must of necessity be a return at some time to sound principles of fiscal legislation, that that return would have to be considered in connection with the interests so created. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman will look back, he will find declarations of mine of a similar character years before. In my address to the electors of Hamilton in January, 1874, I took precisely the same ground. In my speech which is published—delivered, I think, at Brampton in 1877—the same ground is again taken. There is nothing inconsistent in that position. It is perfectly just in itself, and it is, in my opinion, wise statesmanship to take that ground. We have a firm belief that the Tariff that is in existence now, or any protective Tariff, must necessarily be ultimately a serious mischief to the country. Protection can legislate money out of one set of pockets into another set of pockets, but how is capital created except by industry? Were there no labor in the world there would be no capital, and were there no labor in Canada there would be no money to distribute. Protection proposes to take the money from those who earn it and put it into the pockets of a few individuals. I think I recollect a speech of the

Mr. MACKENZIE.

Minister of Finance—I may not be correct in attributing it to him, but it was a speech of some hon. gentleman opposite—where he claimed it to be a great benefit to the country to create a few millionaires in Montreal and elsewhere who would have large sums of money to expend for benevolent purposes—I am not able to give the authority, but my impression is that it was my hon. friend opposite (Sir Leonard Tilley). The principle upon which the late Administration desired to conduct the affairs of the country, was to remove restrictions of all kinds from trade; to enable every one to buy and sell in the cheapest market without restriction, so far as it was possible for us to do this with the necessity resting upon us of raising a revenue from the Customs duties. This was the course, Sir, which the Government pursued, and in defence of that principle the Government went to the country. We were badly beaten. I regret that extremely for the sake of the principle involved; but I have no reason to regret it on personal grounds, I have no reason, Sir, to regret the reverse which relieved me from an immense responsibility, enough to weigh down the energies of any man, if continued for years; and while I do not at all desire to say, or pretend to think that an honorable politician shall not desire to get office, I desire at the same time to say, and I hope, Sir, that gentlemen opposite know that I have given proof of that in my political career—that rather than accept office when I could not carry my principles with me, I have declined it. I admit, Sir, for all that, my entire responsibility, as well as that of my colleagues, for the policy of the late Administration, and I am prepared to defend it at all times and under all circumstances. We endeavored to do the best we could for the country, and I believe we did the best that could be done; and we endeavored to carry out a policy which I believed would be not only the source of prosperity to the country, but would place us in the proud position of marching in line with the Mother Country, and the great Australian colony pushing forward those principles of freedom, for they are intimately connected with the doctrine of Free Trade. Protection as a system is a relic of barbarism. There should be free trade in goods as well as in land. How would hon. gentlemen like restrictions on the sale of their lands or on any other thing they have? Everyone knows perfectly well that the principle of free trade is one that cannot be abandoned without causing suffering in some quarter; but, Sir, gentlemen opposite say that our policy caused heavy deficits to occur in the revenue of the country, and they claim great credit for having remedied those deficits. Now, Sir, have they created wealth? Had they put their hands in their pockets and filled the public Treasury with money, I could understand that they should get credit for removing the deficit, but they simply imposed more taxes—one of the most vulgar of all remedies for removing a deficit; and if it were criminal in us to have a deficit, I would like to know if it is less criminal for other parties to have a deficit? We will see what the deficits were during the period the hon. gentlemen were in office, before Confederation, in the old Province of Canada. In 1858, they had a deficit of \$3,375,377; in 1859, they had a deficit of \$1,494,744; in 1860, a deficit of \$1,973,999; in 1862, a deficit of \$1,999,000; and, in 1862-3, under the Sandfield Macdonald Government, a deficit of \$2,064,331. The deficit in the first year was 39 per cent. of the revenue; in the second year, 18 per cent.; in the next year, 20 per cent., and in the fourth year, 20 per cent. Now, Sir, with this record of deficit, we never, on our side of the House at that time, charged the Government with being responsible for that deficit because they did not impose fresh taxation. If the deficit could have been removed without taxation, no doubt the late Administration would have done it, but they did not believe that the method of giving relief during a period of deep depression and deficiency of crop was to tax the people. The hon. gentlemen opposite were not able to remove this deep depres-

sion immediately on coming into office, as they promised. Sir John A. Macdonald, while in Middlesex, declared that if he and his friends triumphed, not a day would be lost without bringing relief to the country.

Mr. STEPHENSON. That was figuratively speaking.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman will find a good deal around him that is figurative. The promise was that stocks would immediately raise, manufacturers would employ more hands, and life would be given to the country all over. Well, Sir, as one hon. gentleman proved, there were more failures during the year in which they succeeded to office than many previous years in Canada. Bank stocks fell until there was a loss in a few months of over \$12,000,000. Every part of the country showed the deepest depression, but, Sir, an immediate good crop relieved the difficulty to a great extent, and there was a gradual revival in the state of the country as a whole. For periods of depression come and pass away almost without being sufficiently capable of explanation by political economists. That, Sir, added to the revival of the lumber trade, alone enabled hon. gentlemen opposite to show a better record in the second year of their Administration; and had the depression not passed away in England and in the United States as well as here, and had they obtained only the same kind of crops that prevailed during our period, and were subject to the same losses in the lumbering business we were subject to, their record would have been worse than ours, very much worse, because the depression was growing deeper and deeper. Now, Sir, the circumstances of the country after the accession of the hon. gentlemen opposite, were favorable to any Government, and no Government can possibly provide a remedy for bad crops, and no Government can destroy the beneficial influences of good crops. Besides that, Sir, there was this additional circumstance: we all knew that throughout the Province of Ontario—I am not so intimately acquainted with other Provinces, but I believe it is more or less the same there—that there was a very considerable amount of money borrowed by farmers. I know that many farmers were indebted to country storekeepers; I know that during two or three years every family throughout the country were compelled—whether in affluent circumstances or poor circumstances—to economize their means largely in order to make their revenue meet their expenditure; but, immediately after obtaining a good crop and the revival of the lumber business, money circulated more freely, the storekeepers were able to sell an abnormal quantity of goods and an unusual amount of money came through their hands into those of the wholesale dealers, and thence to the coffers of the Government, from the importation of new goods. This, Sir, is the real source of the prosperity the hon. gentlemen boast of as being the result of their policy. It is true, Sir, that some branches of trade were not beneficially affected by the tide of prosperity that has come, for from the time of their accession to office to this hour the shipping interests of the country have suffered, and are suffering, a greater depression than they ever did before, and the export of vessels which formerly was a very considerable item has decreased now very seriously, and this is quite natural, Sir, as a result of Protection. We can never purchase goods unless we sell goods—we must exchange one kind of goods for another—our purchases are not made in gold. A very small portion indeed of the purchases of the world are made in gold. They are made in commercial exchanges of one commodity for another, and if our people take the ground which hon. gentlemen opposite have done, and done successfully, that it is a mistake to import anything for sale, they cannot expect that the imports will continue long. And if they take the ground that we ought to make everything we consume ourselves, they will simply destroy the foreign trade and get into the position the

United States is in at the present moment, of having almost their entire carrying trade in the hands of foreign competitors. This is the inevitable result of a false policy, and it is a result which hon. gentlemen opposite are rapidly bringing about in this country. It will not take many years, Sir, until it is fully developed in all branches of industry. Inordinately protected industries will multiply over the land as they are multiplying now; notwithstanding the wretched pittance which cotton manufacturers are getting as profits, they are multiplying fast now, and when these reach the producing capacity of the country for consumption—when they reach the amount of goods that we are able to consume, then they will at once come into active competition with each other, and the result will be as it was at one time in the iron industry in the United States, that the trade was almost destroyed; that then a combination of ironmasters and founders took place, by which an effort was made to keep up prices by combination. Then resulted a general demoralization in the Legislature. Log-rolling committees were formed to endeavor to get industries benefitted at the expense of the nation. This will be the result that will be reached by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite within a very few years. The hon. Finance Minister, however, says that his policy has given bread to the workingman—that his policy has given abundant work to the workingman. It is true, Sir, that we see in one quarter that the workingmen are striking to get the same wages they got in 1877-78. It is true, the hon. gentleman, in his list of new factories mentioned a few days ago and finally laid on the Table of the House, includes manufacturing factories that are not new at all. The moment I looked at the list I saw one put down as a new manufactory in Toronto with 200 hands employed, although it was only one moved from the village of Newcastle, because they believed they could carry on their business more profitably in that city. I notice three others in the same position, and I am satisfied that if that list is closely examined, as I presume the newspapers will do, it will be found that not one-half of the ninety-five are new factories. I enquired yesterday in Montreal, and no person could tell me, amongst the number of merchants I met, where that factory was with 550 hands employed.

Mr. PLUMB. You are in rather bad company.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, I am with the majority in the House, but I must endeavor to put up with it for a time.

Mr. PLUMB. You will have to put up with it for a long time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A good deal of time was taken up in discussing the relative expenditures of the two Governments, and the hon. member for Niagara—I hope he will not go off singing at present—was good enough to adopt a new method of balancing books. He is evidently a most dangerous book-keeper for any establishment to have, for he managed to balance his account by simply subtracting \$900,000 from one side in order to make it equal to the other side. There was no attempt to make the items agree, but there was a most simple method of obtaining a balance by deducting as he did \$900,000 from the expenditures of the North-West. Now, I have taken another method of obtaining an exact comparison of the expenditure of certain years. I give the items from the Public Accounts, and the hon. gentlemen can take them down if they like. In 1873-74, the interest payable upon the public debt was \$5,724,436; in 1877-78, it was \$7,048,883, or an increase of \$1,324,447. Payments into the sinking fund, in 1873-74, amounted to \$573,920; in 1877-78, to \$945,716, an increase of \$431,826. In the Administration of Justice, in 1873-74, there was a payment made of \$459,037; in 1877-78, of \$564,920, or an increase of \$105,883. Indians, \$146,068, in 1873-74; in 1877-78,

\$421,503, an increase of \$275,435. North-West Mounted Police, in 1873-74, \$199,599; in 1877-78, \$334,748, an increase of \$135,149. Weights and Measures, no payment in 1873-74; in 1877-78, \$96,484, or a total increase upon the items I have given, which were items beyond the control of the Administration, of \$2,369,224. The total expenditure for 1877-78, was \$23,503,158, and deducting the increases in these seven articles, it left a net expenditure for the same purposes that \$23,316,000 were spent for in 1873-74, of \$21,133,124, from which a further amount of increase in pensions of \$49,399 has to be deducted, leaving the actual net expenditure \$21,083,535 in room of \$-3,316,316, the last year of hon. gentlemen opposite, or an actual decrease of, as nearly as possible, \$2,500,000 from the time we took office to that period. But we will take another year to show that this was continuous. We will take the previous year of 1876-77. I will not weary the House with more than the one statement, but I think it is important that the statement should go upon record. In 1873-74, as before, the interest was \$5,724,436; in 1876-77, \$6,797,226, or an increase of \$1,072,791. Sinking fund, an increase of \$314,453, the figures being: 1873-74, \$513,920, against \$283,373 in 1876-77. Administration of Justice, 1873-74, \$459,037; 1876-77, \$565,597, or an increase of \$106,560. Pensions, \$56,453 in 1873-74; in 1876-77, \$112,531, an increase of \$56,000. Indians, \$146,000 in 1873-74; in 1876-77, \$301,596, or an increase of \$155,528. Mounted Police, \$199,599 in 1873-74, against \$352,749 in 1876-77, or an increase of \$153,150. Weights and Measures, none in 1873-74; in 1876-77, \$111,085, an increase of \$96,484; or a total increased expenditure, in these several items, of \$1,955,044, the expenditure for the year being \$23,510,307, leaving a net expenditure, after deducting items similar to those spent in 1873, of \$21,555,257. Now, Sir, I will take a year altogether of the period of administration of the hon. gentleman opposite. I will contrast his own last year, 1873-74 with the year 1880-81. The interest in 1873-74 is \$5,734,436; in 1880-81, it was \$7,594,144, or an increase of \$1,869,708; the Sinking Fund, \$513,920, in 1873-74, and \$1,250,731 in 1880-81, or an increase of \$636,811; Administration of Justice, \$459,037, against \$583,597, an increase of \$124,920; Pensions, \$56,463, against \$96,388, an increase of \$39,935; Indians, \$146,000, against \$305,097, or an increase of \$168,988; Mounted Police, \$199,599, against \$289,845, or an increase of \$90,246; Weights and Measures, \$74,170 in 1880-81. Now, the total increase for 1880-81 over 1873-74 was \$3,494,779, while the hon. gentleman's total expenditures in the Public Accounts was \$25,502,554, leaving as a net expenditure, \$2,007,775, or a difference of \$1,000,000 higher than ours in the years 1877-78. There is no controverting these figures.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman laughs, but I defy him to do it unless he declares his own statement to be wrong.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, no; we do not own ourselves responsible for \$73,500,000 in 1873-74.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But besides that, hon. gentlemen opposite have been in the habit for two or three years back, of charging to capital account what we always charged to revenue account. Last year the hon. gentleman took \$300,000 and charged it to capital account. The hon. gentlemen—both of them who spoke during this debate—boasted of their success in reducing the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway and of having revenue to meet expenditure. When we come to discuss that, Sir, we know what sort of revenue this is—a good deal of it; we know how much of it is Government freight; we will know, also, how much has been spent on capital account after the late Government had closed the capital account.

Mr. MACKENZIE.

We find that there is at present before the House—they are asking votes or accounting for votes, a sum of about \$100,000, that is charged to capital account, that the late Administration would have charged to revenue account. It is a very easy matter, almost as easy as the method of the hon. gentleman from Niagara, of striking a balance when the sum gets too large for capital account. The increase in the Indian subsidies seems to me to be most alarming. There are large sums asked in the Supplementary Estimates of this year—I forget how much, but something nearly half a million altogether—without any statement as to what it was spent for, except one item, and it is impossible that we can accept that as a normal expenditure in that country. There must have been some extraordinary expenditure that the House is not yet aware of, and while I am not at all unwilling to vote for the Government to do what is necessary and right, for the Indians, I am not in favor of voting money to keep a horde of servants attending the Indians in that quarter with doubtful results, indeed, and I believe there is an excessive expenditure in connection with this service which the Public Accounts Committee ought to look into. With regard to the Post Office income, all I have to say is that a colleague of the hon. Ministers opposite, Mr. Macpherson, devoted himself in two pamphlets which are crammed with falsehoods from the first page to the last, to attacking the late Administration upon every possible item of expenditure, and one of the items of expenditure was the Post Office expenditure, for which we were severely attacked as being most improvident; but gentlemen who have spoken during this debate have stated that the expenditure has been heavy; no doubt, but it has been incurred in opening up routes in the North-West, part of it, as part of our expenditure, has been devoted to the same purpose. I do not attack the hon. gentlemen opposite about the expenditure, because I have not looked into it, but I think I can say this: that while the expenditure of the late Government increased at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, the increase in expenditure before we took office reached \$115,000 per annum, and it has reverted to the same figure now, and it has increased about \$300,000 since we left office, showing that hon. gentlemen opposite have not at all—some of the number, at all events—succeeded in keeping down the expenditure for what they attacked us, although it was very much less than theirs. The hon. Minister of Railways is not in his place, and I will defer some remarks which I propose to make about another branch of the public service until he is in his place. I should say, in reference to these comparative expenditures, that there is one word of explanation I forgot to make. There were two or three items that hon. gentlemen opposite would have been entitled to take credit for, as abnormal, in 1873-74. They will remember it when I mention it: the expenditure on the boundary line between the United States and ourselves, for which they paid somewhere about \$61,000 in their last year, and \$146,000 being a balance paid in military stores that was due to the Imperial Government. I have not counted the cost in our own expenditures for the years I have mentioned. But we had to incur an expenditure of something about \$200,000 for exhibitions at Philadelphia, Paris, and Sydney, which I have not counted on the other side. The hon. the First Minister and one or two other gentlemen made some reference to the coming policy of the country guided by them, and as to our relations with foreign countries. They have taken larger votes of money for the purpose of keeping up a quasi-ambassadorial establishment in London, and they have sent an Ambassador to Paris. No results came from his visits and those enormous expenditures, yet I argue in the policy announced to this extent, that we ought, in all matters concerning our own trade, to do our own business; that honor is not a new thing with us as some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think. He took that ground in this House many years ago, and in 1870 we had a long debate upon that sub-

ject. With that as with other matters when we assumed office we assumed the responsibility of carrying this practically into effect, and at the time that the Fishery Arbitration was about to be proceeded with, and when the Imperial Government desired us to take an Imperial Commissioner to manage the affair, we took the ground that the Commissioner must be a Canadian appointed by ourselves, and that the arbitration should be under the control and management of the Canadian Government. This was ultimately conceded, and my hon. friend beside me (Sir Albert J. Smith) as Minister, and Sir Alexander Galt as Commissioner, are entitled to the entire credit which the hon. Minister of Railways took to the Government on the Treasury benches of securing that amount of money. Had that negotiation been left, as former negotiations concerning the United States were left, in the hands of some gentlemen from England who did not know the manner of conducting business in the United States, or the blustering character of the proposals made sometimes, I believe we would not have received one dollar for our fishery compensation. Again, Sir, when, in 1874, it was proposed by some gentlemen at Washington to have an attempt made to revive the Reciprocity Treaty, we made representations to the Imperial Government that it was desirable that such negotiations should be opened; but we took the ground also that they must be opened and carried on by the Government here; though nominally, in the concluding parts, by the Government at home. The result of that negotiation was that the late Mr. Brown was appointed and commissioned by the Imperial Government as a joint Plenipotentiary with Sir Edward Thornton to conduct these negotiations. They were not successful, as the United States did not carry it out, although their Congress agreed to the arrangement made; but such were the facts of the case, and I mention it to show that the policy for which credit is claimed now, is simply our policy which the hon. gentlemen opposite have tardily agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My hon. friend for Niagara cries hear, hear. Let me read to him what his leader said in the debate in 1870. Sir John Macdonald said:

"Why should they pass resolutions asking for power to negotiate treaties by their own Ambassadors? Why should they throw away the great advantages they now have of the assistance of England in negotiating treaties? How much better to have the powerful influence of Great Britain than to go with bated breath and humble tone pleading in *forma pauperis* with foreign countries to make a treaty with them. Their answer would be we don't know you, who are you? A Province of England. 'Then send England to us, we will treat with her.' That would be the deserved answer we would get."

This was the language of the hon. gentleman a few years ago, and now he takes credit to himself for introducing a new system, which in fact has been in operation for years. In 1871, he was himself sent, not as a joint Plenipotentiary but as a High Commissioner to Washington; but his success on that occasion in upholding Canadian interests in the payment of the Fenian claims and other matters, was not such as would induce any people or any Government to place him on a similar commission a second time.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hon. gentlemen say hear, hear, but let them look at the records and see what that success was. If ever there was a humiliating position presented by a people it was that of the British Commissioners and the Canadian Commissioners among them, agreeing to pay all the claims of United States citizens that were raised in connection with the ravages of cruisers at sea, and refusing even to consider the claims of our own people in Canada for the expenses connected with the Fenian raid. Yet that, Sir, was the result of his first negotiation as an Ambassador, and say it was not such as would induce any Government to trust him with the same thing again.

An hon. MEMBER. Well, we got what we wanted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, we did, but you did not.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). We laid the foundation to stand on.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, and the superstructure would never have been built by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman whether he does not know that, at the beginning of these negotiations at Washington, it was understood that they should not be held unless it was understood there should be no allusion to the Fenian raid?

Mr. MACKENZIE. No such thing. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will apply the plummet rule to him and see if he is plumb on this matter or not. I recollect very well, Sir, all that passed in this House when the then member for Sherbrooke (Sir Alexander Galt), who knew more of the coming Commissioner than any other person in this House, was unwilling to trust him without specific instructions. He moved a resolution in this House giving those specific instructions; and I might here tell my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb) that I had more confidence in his leader than Sir Alexander Galt had, and I thought it was a mistake to give those specific instructions from this House. I, therefore, opposed the resolution, but I found out my great mistake, and I should have acknowledged that the then member for Sherbrooke knew better what he was doing in that matter than I possibly could. I am quite willing though for all that, and notwithstanding these strictures that I am compelled to make upon what took place, I am prepared to support the principle of giving to Canada every power of that kind consistent with our allegiance to the Mother Country and our political connection with it. It is quite evident, Sir, that this country cannot go on and submit to negotiations—on this continent, at all events—being conducted by people who know nothing whatever of the country. I regret that owing to an affection which I have in the throat, I am unable to speak much longer to-night, or to refer to some matters which I shall have to postpone to a future occasion; but before sitting down I have to say this: that while hon. gentlemen opposite will obtain from me every fair play in every matter connected with the Estimates, I shall criticise closely and carefully the various expenditures which I deem to be inconsistent with the ground they have taken or the promises they have made to the country. The hon. member for Niagara referred to the expenditure on capital account, and to the question as to who were responsible for the increase in the debt. Now, my hon. friend behind me was as nearly as possible absolutely correct. The expenditure on capital account made by us was entirely, with the exception of the St. Peter's Canal, on account of obligations entered into by the previous Administration. The hon. member for Niagara said that we rushed into the construction of the Pacific Railway when we were not called on to do it. I take no such views of the obligations we were forced into in connection with the Columbia bargain. That bargain was made by the Government, and although imprudently made, I felt, as a Minister sworn to do what was right for the country, that I was bound—and my colleagues felt the same—to give effect to that treaty as far as it was possible for us to do so consistent with the burden of taxation that was to be imposed on the people. The contracts on the whole of the canals were let when we entered office—that is, on the Welland Canal, the Lachine Canal, and the canals on the Ottawa River. These embraced an immense expenditure of money—no less than \$43,800,000 for canals, between \$10,000,000 and \$12,000,000 for the Intercolonial Railway, no less than \$30,000,000 for the Pacific Railway, \$2,000,000 for finishing the railways in the Lower Provinces,

\$2,500,000 for the Prince Edward Island Railway, \$4,500,000 for minor works, \$2,500,000 for improvements on the St. Lawrence where there were no locks, and \$1,000,000 for advances. All these obligations had to be met. We might be called to account for proceeding with any of them too fast, but we did not proceed with any of them—that is, the canals—faster than we believed the public interests required. I am not at all certain now that the policy was a wise one of entering on a great enlargement of the Welland Canal. It was not our policy, but we followed it up. The plan was the plan of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I take my full share of responsibility for that as a simple member of the Legislature, although not supporting the Government at the time. We find, Sir, that although the Welland Canal is constructed with locks 270 feet long and 45 feet wide, there is not at this moment one single vessel building for traffic through that canal, though it is about finished. So much is freight being carried on railways that it becomes exceedingly doubtful whether any of the canals of the country will ever pay any revenue again.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What does the Fort Frances Lock do?

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Fort Frances Lock was never finished, and, therefore, there is no traffic there.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It ought never to have been commenced.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My hon. friend is too wise altogether. He looks wiser than any man ought to be. His remark was an original one, but I think I heard it before. I am seriously discussing the commercial effect on the country of these works.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Well, this is a commercial work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, I am afraid not now; hon. gentlemen opposite have placed it out of that category.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You should not have begun it, that is the reason.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, Sir, I am not here to bandy words with the hon. members for Hastings, either west or north; if I were, I would have only to go up to Shaw's Canal, where I will show them twice as much money was spent in a hole they can see to-day,

Mr. PLUMB. It was done by your party.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; it was done long before I was in power.

Mr. PLUMB. The Reformers were in office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; it was done by hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire now, Sir, to refer to one charge made by hon. gentlemen opposite—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is only right, considering the condition of the hon. gentleman's health, that if he feels that it is inconvenient for him to continue the discussion to-night—

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am exceedingly obliged to my hon. friend, but I will not avail myself of his offer to-night. I shall only refer to-night to the charge made that we are inimical—hostile—to manufacturers. The charge is one not merely without foundation, but it is an absurd charge. Why should we be inimical to manufacturers? Are not many of us interested in manufactures? Have not many of us friends who are manufacturers? Are not the majority of manufacturers political friends of ours?

An hon. MEMBER. They were; they are not now.

Another hon. MEMBER. They have always been.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have stated that I believe the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has worked injuriously to
Mr. MACKENZIE.

manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that agriculture is not a manufacture. I hold it to be a manufacture of the largest kind, without which our country could not exist. It is one which involves a large amount of capital and manual labor, and produces more than any other manufacture in the country. And what we are not willing to do is this: we are not willing that farming interests should be subordinated to manufacturing interests; but we contend that one should be placed on as good a footing as another, and that to assert that the farmers have benefited anything from the National Policy, is to go against the plain indication which the market prices and the history of the last two or three years discloses. Let us endeavor by our policy to adopt such a course as will do justice to the farmers as well as to the manufacturers. While I am not disposed at all to continue an excessive protection to any class, whether farmers or manufacturers, I am only desirous of obtaining sufficient revenue from the Customs and Inland Revenue sources as will meet the wants of the Government, and we must remember that we have no other source of revenue to look to, and that if we create classes by our legislation we will have difficulties in after years in separating those classes into their usual normal condition. We will set one class at war against another, and we will produce that feeling of disaster which has prevailed in Germany and in France for the last two years in consequence of their protective policy. I intended to refer to the condition of these two countries, two of the most highly protected countries in the world, except the United States. The state of Germany is such at present in consequence of Protection—as authorities show—that the people are flocking in hundreds of thousands from her shores and seeking homes across the Atlantic. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say, I have no doubt, that these parties are seeking shelter in the United States, where protection also prevails.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is the paradox.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No. There is no paradox in it. If the hon. gentleman has candidly made an enquiry he will find this: That the United States is a small world in itself. It has every variety of climate, it produces every variety of fruit, cereals, and productions of every kind; they have mines of almost every kind available in the country, and they have an immense population of their own, but with all that they are not able to export any considerable quantity of manufactured goods.

An hon. MEMBER. They have their home market.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are simply able to keep their own markets—not quite that, as an hon. friend behind me remarks; but that is the utmost they pretend to do. It is perfectly well known that their export trade is destroyed by the protection they have, and it is equally well known that our export trade is gradually being destroyed too. Short as the time is, it has already had a very serious effect upon our exports of manufactured articles. I desire simply to say this, that so far as I am concerned—and I believe hon. gentlemen on this side of the House share the opinion—we are friends alike of farmers and manufacturers, but we hold that no class of persons or occupations should have anything more than a fair opportunity to develop their energies and their productions to the utmost extent that can be done consistent with the welfare and interests of others.

Mr. COURSOL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think my hon. friend is under a misapprehension. I understand he thinks that the hon. member for Lambton intends to continue his remarks on the next occasion when this matter comes up again. I am under the impression, however, that he said he would take another opportunity of adding the few remarks he

would have made this evening had his health allowed him to do so. In that case, perhaps, my hon. friend had better not move the adjournment of the debate, but to make now the remarks he intended to make.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. COURSOL. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that the predictions of politicians and financiers are realized; they are in the habit of predicting wonders which are not justified in the course of events. Twenty years ago, the promoters of the Grand Trunk Railway predicted that that enterprise would yield 12 per cent. to its shareholders, yet those who trusted in these promises are still awaiting a first dividend. The Government which preceded the present one, had promised Canada a return of the golden age, and instead of that we had an era of deficits and failures. But there has been a remarkable exception to the almost general rule laid down by me. In 1878 and 1879, we predicted—we, the men of the Conservative party—that if the Government changed the basis of its fiscal policy, the country would once more see the first days of its prosperity; our predictions have come literally true, and even those who are opposed to our policy must fairly admit that a most desirable change has taken place throughout the country, and that prosperity and the public fortune have made immense strides in progress. The hon. leader of the late Government (Mr. Mackenzie) has said this evening—and I am glad to record his words—that everywhere had prosperity increased, that it was rapidly progressing, and that the whole country was feeling its effects. Last year, Mr. Speaker, on a similar occasion, I gave to this House a summary of the progress that had taken place in Montreal, since the bringing into play of the National Policy. I had the intention of doing the same this year, but after having heard the remarkable speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, after having read attentively this interesting *exposé* of the resources, the progress and the hopes of the country, I immediately abandoned the idea, for, as has been so aptly said by one of the newspapers: "The speech tells all, explains all, comprises all." Moreover, Mr. Speaker, why should I have taken so much trouble? No one seriously disputes the progress made; even the opponents of protection are compelled to admit it; issue is joined on but one point: the free traders differ with us as to the causes of this return of prosperity. They go as far as to pretend that this return has taken place in spite of the National Policy, and that without that policy our prosperity would be still more considerable. In the face of such an assertion, it is evident that the question is one we might discuss without ever coming to an understanding. One must despair of convincing such opponents. I even think that we have obtained a good deal in making them admit that times are better. But at the time of the electoral contest, these gentlemen did not go so far; they did not say then that protection was hurtful; on the contrary the majority of those who, to-day, hoist the Free Trade flag, then said that protection was a good thing. I had a proof of this in the elections of 1878. My opponent in the electoral division of Montreal East, Mr. Archambault, who was supported by members of the Quebec Government and several Federal members, was, himself, compelled to proclaim protectionist principles, although he was a free trader, as he was convinced that such was the only way to obtain any votes. Since that time, these gentlemen have not changed; they have remained such as they were; they take care to be protectionists at public meetings, and become free traders in the House only. They have two sets of weights and measures: one for the people, and one for the House. These gentlemen content themselves with the idea that the House sees the *Hansard* only, and they forget that their speeches are published in the press and that the people remember them in due time. It is true that all of them have

not yet reached that point of good faith which is forced from them; there are still a few obstinate ones who deny the progress made with as much audacity as they would deny the sun's light, so true is the adage that those are the most blind who will not see. But there is a simple method, and within reach of all, of settling the question. Let them consult our manufacturers, our merchants, and ask them if they would have opened new factories without the National Policy, if they would have risked their capital in Canadian undertakings without the protection that we asked for, and that we obtained from the Government which is in power to-day, from the wise, prudent and far-seeing men who lead the country. All these manufacturers, all these merchants will give the same answer; all will proclaim the benefits derived from the fiscal policy inaugurated by us in 1878, and we find this testimony even on the lips of those whose political ideas differ from ours. It is true that there is a small number of people unacquainted with the truth, who will cry out against what I say, but whose actions belie their utterances. In 1879, we saw in Montreal some of our political opponents, who were engaged in trade, await the inauguration of the Tariff to establish new manufactures on the day following its introduction, or to increase in size those that were in existence; they would never have ventured to do this a day earlier, for our industries were at death's door and could not compete with the Americans, who were, for the time being, selling their goods at starvation prices on our markets, reserving to themselves the right of selling them at a higher figure later on. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that never did any Canadian Minister of Finance rise under more favorable circumstances, if one bears in mind the position of his predecessor, the gallant knight who sits opposite (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), who, formerly, in his speech on the Budget, had nothing to announce but deficits and an increase of taxation. He had promised us the golden age, and instead he gave us an era of deficits. What a difference there is this year! The present Finance Minister announces a surplus of \$4,000,000 and a decrease of \$1,000,000 in the taxation; a judicious policy has evidently resulted in our excellent state of the finances. "Give me a good policy," said an eminent French financier, "and I will manage money matters the better for it." During the *regime* of Free Trade, the country held nearly the same language. When capitalists were blamed for not engaging in trade, they replied: "Give us a good policy, and we will engage in large enterprises." Well, Sir, under the management of the Conservative Government we have inaugurated a good policy, and who is there to deny that since then the country has done a good business? Who is there of good faith who will deny that this policy has been productive of good results both for the Government and the country? The same policy has resulted in increasing from 10 to 20 millions the deposits in the Government savings banks. This represents the savings of the country and the accumulation of national wealth. It is one more result of that policy which has increased the value of all public stock, and has raised the banks' capital from 60 to 74 millions in a few years. But why should I recall all the astounding changes wrought in the country? Amongst our most bitter opponents are men from Ontario who, four years ago, loudly cried for a protective Tariff. The hon. gentlemen of the Province of Ontario, of whom I have just spoken, were in good company when, with the Liberals of our own Province—for we also have much pleasure in counting in our ranks former protectionists who became converted to Free Trade—it is not known why, or, rather, it is too well known; but, at any rate, converted to Free Trade at a time when the National Policy, that very policy which they asked for formerly, was going to revolutionize the fiscal state of Canada. It is interesting to read to-day the speeches of these converts to Free Trade, and the reading of those speeches is a dangerous thing for

them, as their speeches and conversion are of so recent a date. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few statements, made the other day by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), which I wish to refute. The hon. member ran amuck through the National Policy, and I must congratulate him upon the style of his speech, which was most carefully prepared. But what would his colleague, who represents the county of Lotbinière in Quebec, and his political leader in our Province, have said, had he heard him? Assuredly, either one of two things would have happened; either Mr. Joly would have blamed his friend, or the hon. member would have had to deny his chief. The hon. member is, no doubt, aware that Mr. Joly called for protection more loudly than we have, if that could be.

Mr. RINFRET. Will the hon. member allow me to make a remark? The hon. Mr. Joly, who represents the county of Lotbinière in the Local House, did really declare himself in favor of a protective Tariff in 1872, but the Tariff proposed at that time was not the Tariff of the present Minister of Finance.

Mr. COURSOL. The hon. member and colleague of the member in this House never could explain what kind of a Tariff he desired.

Mr. RINFRET. At any rate, I defy the hon. member for Montreal East to prove that Mr. Joly at any time declared himself in favor of the present Tariff.

Mr. COURSOL. It is evident that the hon. leader of the Opposition in Quebec could never have declared himself in favor of the present Tariff in the Quebec House, as that question never came before it that I am aware of.

Mr. RINFRET. Or on the hustings.

Mr. COURSOL. But I know that the colleague of the hon. member for Lotbinière in this House, has declared himself in favor of Protection. I know that he came, accompanied by his friends, and even by the Attorney-General, to make a speech in the division of Montreal East, and that in those days he was in favor of Protection. It is time now that those two hon. gentlemen should come to an understanding, for they must either agree or differ; one of them must submit to the opinion of the other, or the other must abandon his opinion. But this is, however, a difference which they may possibly be able to settle when in the presence of their constituents. I am glad to see that matters can so easily be arranged in a county like Lotbinière, to wit: that it is possible to elect a protectionist member for the Local House and a free trade member for the Federal House. Well, I just said that the leader of the Quebec Government had spoken in favor of Protection. This is what I find in a document and in a letter published in 1872:

"It has been proposed to give to the party that is to undertake that task the name of 'National Party.' (Applause.) I will tell you why that name has been chosen. You will have seen from the discussion in the House as well as in the papers, that to attract a large emigration that is to be advantageous to the country, it is necessary to encourage manufactures by all possible means. Every one understands that our young men would not leave the country if they could find in it sufficient, not to live in luxury, but to earn enough to feed and clothe themselves. In order, therefore, to stop this exodus of the population, a party is required that will encourage industries of all kinds, a party that shall be national before all, and which is from the beginning to obtain favors, not political but commercial independence. To that effect we require a National Policy, if we wish to bring back our fellow countrymen to their homes, to encourage foreign emigration and establish a market with other countries. (Applause.) Instead of building up theories and utopian systems, I think it is better to adopt a platform, as the English say, a national, commercial and manufacturing platform."

The hon. leader of the Opposition said, later on in 1876, he had not yet changed his opinions at the time, as is shown by the following letter addressed to our colleague, Dr. Orton:—

"MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I have received to-day only a series of printed questions coming from your Commission, in whose work I am deeply interested, and I hasten to forward you my answers. I fear that they will be found somewhat long; but I must say that I feel a certain

Mr. COURSOL.

satisfaction of being enabled to put my ideas on the subject into shape, whatever may be their worth. It is for me a kind of a protest against the accusation brought against me during the present Session, both in the House of Commons and in the press of having abandoned the principal article of the programme of our national party. We claim everywhere a national, commercial policy. My friends have been accused of forsaking this policy, and as chief of the national party, my name has been dragged in among those of the parties accused; but I never did abandon that policy.

Here we have the leader of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec who, in 1876, declared himself to be a protectionist, and his friend sitting to-day in this House a free trader. But the hon. member for Lotbinière is not the only one; he has some boon companions in Ontario. We know the hon. members from Ontario, eloquent men whose burning words have rivetted the attention of the House, who, a few years ago sang the praises of Protection; who said that if we did not get Protection, the Americans would invade our markets; that if we did not get Protection, we should cease to exist as a nation; that the only means of saving us was to encourage manufactures which would give a livelihood to our workmen and bread to those that now lacked it. That was what our hon. friends from Ontario told us. And hon. gentlemen of the Province of Quebec spoke in the same strain. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has said the same, and, as ever, his eloquent utterances reached the hearts of his electors and his hearers when he spoke of Protection, when he pointed out to them the destitution of the country, when he showed them how prosperous they would become if they but encouraged Protection. But these hon. gentlemen have forsaken such ideas; their opinions have altered. It is for them to explain why they have done so. They have not done so yet, and as long as they do not, all the praises they make to-day and all their utterances will be of no value. The hon. member also touched upon the question of cotton. It is a subject which he treated at some length, and it appears that he obtained his information from good sources, but, in my opinion, his opinions are wrong both logically and as to facts. I am not going to take up all the errors and exaggerations of the hon. member, but I will content myself with pointing out that he complains that the Tariff does not sufficiently protect the manufacturers.

Mr. RINFRET. What I said was quite the reverse. I claim that the present Tariff favors cotton manufacturers to too great an extent.

Mr. COURSOL. I request the hon. member to allow me to close my sentence. These are his words: "The Tariff favors the manufacturers, at the expense of the consumer." He instances the Hudon Cotton Company, which paid 10 per cent. to its shareholders with a bonus of 33 per cent. Moreover, he maintains that the Cartwright Tariff gave all the encouragement that manufacturers needed. His judgment is erroneous on at least two points in that part of his speech. It is true, that like many others the Hudon factory has done an excellent business, but the hon. member forgets to tell us that with many others this factory devotes its profits to enlarging its buildings, and to employing a larger number of hands; this factory, which employed but 400 to 500 hands under the Liberal regime, gave work to 1,000 hands at the present time, and would in about two months employ some 1,600. When manufacturers get rich in such a manner, every one benefits by it. The Tariff of the ex-Minister of Finance was not sufficient, as the stock of most manufacturers was quoted at ten cents on the dollar; those are the times which the hon. member regrets. Again, the hon. member spoke of the Parks manufactory, and he has told us that it has not increased salaries. The contrary is true, for it had increased the salaries of its employes 25 per cent., and a good many young girls who formerly did not earn anything as they could not find employment, now earn \$7 to \$8 a week. The

hon. member has blamed the National Policy because imports have increased. It is true, but it proves merely that consumption has increased owing to a better state of affairs, the consumption of products of local manufactures having increased. How is it that the hon. member did not see that his argument would recoil upon him? For if the Tariff could not prevent foreign imports from coming in, it must at least prevent manufacturers from raising prices above the nominal value of their products. "Competition," says the hon. member, "still flourishes." Now, according to Free Trade, competition is necessary to check monopoly and abnormally high prices. According to his own words, we enjoy such a competition. What is he complaining of, or what reason has he to complain? With regard to woollens, the hon. member says the prices of woollens have increased. Woollen manufactures have multiplied throughout the country and cannot meet the demand. A better quality of woollens are manufactured than are imported. I think this fact is universally admitted. I will quote the following article which I notice in the *Toronto World* concerning the duties on wool:—

"The wool hat manufacturers of Eastern Pennsylvania held a meeting in Reading yesterday. Among those present were Messrs. Hendel Brothers & Sons, John R. Miller & Co., J. G. Mohn & Brothers, William H. Reinhoel & Co., J. N. Levan & Sons., Hendel, Robst & Co., George Hendel & Co., and many others. They passed resolutions protesting against the Government's proposed admission of foreign made wool and fur hats without the customary duty of 50 cents per pound and 35 per cent. Heretofore Canada was supplied with American made wool hats, but manufactories are established along the border, and the American market is being flooded. Canada gets her wool free of duty, and if the 50 cents per pound is taken off the foreign hats the difference will be at least \$2 per dozen, which will close the forty-one manufactories in the East entirely. Australia is also desirous of sending a large quantity of wool here. A very strong letter, fully setting forth all the facts, was prepared and sent to Washington, and it is likely that the Pennsylvania and New England manufacturers will send a full delegation to the national capital."

This proves that woollens are manufactured in this country greatly to our advantage. No doubt the imports of wool, and especially those of raw wool used as primary matter, had also increased. The hon. member complains that the price of Canadian wool has decreased 30 per cent. It is a mistake; wool is sold here as high as in England. Were it otherwise it would, according to the laws of trade, be exported to Great Britain; but what is true is that our exports of woollens have diminished by one-half because it is used up in our own factories. The hon. member also complained that the Government had not placed a high enough duty on wool imported as a primary matter, and that the duty of 3 per cent. is insufficient. He called it farcical; but is it not a farce to see him on the one hand ask for an increase of taxation on primary matter, and, on the other hand, complain of the high prices of native manufactures. The hon. member did not take into account our peculiar position opposite the United States. There is no Free Trade theory that will hold against the hard fact that our neighbors in the United States close their markets to us and try to dispose of their products on ours. We have had, therefore, to protect ourselves, and we did so to the advantage of the country. If in the future Americans wish for another system—if they wish to return to reciprocity, arrangements may possibly be entered into between the two Governments, Canadian and American, to promote the interests of both countries; but until that time comes, I maintain that the National Policy is the only one that can do any good to Canada. The hon. member handled the coal oil question. He told us—I presume it is in his county—that people complained of the high price of coal oil, that it was their only means of getting light, and that the duties levied were such as to cause suffering; and he told us that owing to the duties on this article and on woollens, every family was burdened with the amount of \$25. As to coal oil, he said the effects of the duty were less felt in cities, because gas was used there. That argument

will not hold good, for were the hon. member to reside in Montreal or in any other Canadian city, and were he to see the rapidity with which that instrument called a gasometer marks the quantity consumed, and find out to his cost what the use of gas costs every six months, he would soon be of a different opinion. But the hon. member forgets that it was the Government he supported which imposed a tax on coal oil, and which refused to reduce it. It is only owing to the influence and experience of the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) that this tax was reduced from 15 to 4 cents. The tax amounted to 15 cents including the Excise, which had been remitted by the Conservative Government. Now, if the hon. member is so desirous of giving good and cheap light to his electors, he has but to give them the electric light, and I feel sure that those gentlemen will do so by-and-bye. The hon. member has also spoken of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He told us he would not speak of the enormous sums asked for that road, and that every one knows who is responsible for that gigantic enterprise. And, truly, Mr. Speaker, we are all acquainted with the discussion that took place on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I, as a member of the Conservative party, wish to have my share of credit in this matter. I see with pleasure that the whole country learnt with joy that the Government had settled the question in England once for all. The Conservative party ratified by a large majority the treaty concluded between Sir John A. Macdonald and the Syndicate; every one was interested in that affair and was glad to see it settled, as it was as embarrassing for the Liberal as for the Conservative party. It was a political as well as a commercial necessity. A political necessity, because all Governments were bound to England in the carrying out of that enterprise. It was a commercial necessity, as we were desirous of creating a new nation; we wished to create a new nation in the North-West, a nation that would soon number millions of children. The only way of attaining this object was to have a railway which could unite the extremities to the centre, and which could give easy communication from one end of the country to the other, failing which it was impossible to enjoy a communion of ideas, of interests, of sentiments and of ambition, such as it was necessary to have between the people of the North-West and those of the East. Touching the commercial question, we knew that the United States being closer to that part of Canada than we were ourselves, had we not laid a railway to transport our merchandize, trade would have taken the road of the United States. The reports that we receive from the Canadian Pacific Railway show that the road is progressing rapidly, and that in a few years we shall see travellers, freight and baggage leave the shores of the Pacific to reach East Montreal, which I represent. It was the plan of Sir George E. Cartier in 1872; it is now nearly carried out, and this Pacific Railway, after leaving part of its freight in Montreal, will go to Quebec, and joining the St. Charles Branch of the Intercolonial, will enable the men of the far West to see the beautiful city of Champlain so pregnant with reminiscences. I know, Mr. Speaker, that opinions are divided in the House on this question. The number of our opponents is not considerable, but their opinions ever ensure respect. The Liberals approved our policy at the outset; they condemn it now; that is their concern, but none of them have explained their change of opinion; the task would be too difficult a one, but it is a necessary one, without which their condemnation of to-day is *sans significance*. Such is not the only homage rendered to the National Policy by interested parties. During the last year's Session of the United States' Congress, an American representative said to his colleagues: "You must hasten to grant reciprocity to Canadians or the protection they have given their manufacturers will teach them to do without us." The prophecy of that American has been realized, for we can do without them. We purchase from our manufacturers a portion of

the goods sold to us by Americans, ere the introduction of the National Policy, without the price of these goods having increased. The enormous sum which we had to pay them has remained in the country; it is paid to our thousands of workmen who were formerly unemployed, and as I said just now, that money finds its way into the savings' banks. It is similar facts which explode the sophistries of Free Trade, and which confound those who pretend that the National Policy ruins the country. Yes; the country is prosperous, the breeze of progress blows in all directions; on all sides does one hear of new commercial ventures, of projected railways; in a few months has been built a road from Montreal to Sorel; another is to be built from Ottawa to Montreal, besides new roads from the west running towards Montreal and the east. A good policy has borne good fruit. The country has willingly seconded the efforts of the Government, which differing in this from its predecessor, thought that it could do some good for the country and that its *role* was not merely that of a fly on the wheel. But the most advantageous situations have always their dangers; ours is no exception. The abundance of money, the desire of making a rapid fortune often prompts to hazardous enterprises and speculations. It is not so long ago that several cities and thousands of individuals were ruined in that respect, and they have seriously suffered. These lessons are liable to be too easily forgotten and it is good to recall them from time to time, for it is seldom that fortunes acquired at one stroke do not disappear as quickly as they come. Let us rather take advantage of the good policy which the Government has given us, and slowly but surely engage in profitable affairs.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:35 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 8th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill (No. 82) to amend the Act 43 Victoria, respecting the navigation of Canadian waters.—(Mr. McCallum).

THE SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURT ACT.

Mr. LANDRY moved for leave to introduce a Bill to repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act and the Acts amending it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask my hon. friend to be kind enough to delay the introduction of his Bill until he has seen the Bill promised by the Government, and which will be laid before the House soon. I think it will be the proper thing for him to wait till then.

Mr. LANDRY. In answer to the hon. Minister of Public Works, I have to say that this Bill is on the Orders of the Day since the 24th February. Previous to that date I asked the Government if it was its intention to amend, within a short delay, the Supreme Court Act. As I fear that my Bill will not pass if it does not at once take its place among the Orders of the Day, I think it is in the interests of the public that it should be presented at this date so that each one may study it; at any rate, if the Government is going to hasten the introduction of its measures, I have no objection to postponing for a few days the introduction of my Bill.

Mr. COURSOL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN; Mr. Speaker, the thing rests entirely with the hon. member; if he insists on introducing his Bill, let him do so, but I thought the hon. member would consider it an act of courtesy towards the Government to wait for the Bill which it intends bringing before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend will observe that if, after the introduction of the Bill of the Government, he is disposed to think that that Bill will be amended by the insertion of a clause abolishing the Supreme Court, he can introduce that as an amendment to the Government Bill, so that he will have every opportunity of pressing his opinions if the Government Bill goes on at all. If my hon. friend has sufficient confidence in the Government to believe in their pledges that they will give us a Supreme Court Bill, this Session, he will be quite sure to have an opportunity of having a vote on his own measure.

Motion withdrawn.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Mr. CHARLTON enquired, What was the net public debt on the 31st December, 1881.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I stated to my hon. friend that the return he asked for could only be an approximate statement, but I have had placed in my hands, by the Deputy Minister of Finance, the following: The net debt on the 1st of July, 1881, was \$155,375,780. The net debt on the 1st of July, 1882, will be \$154,085,910, or a reduction of \$1,309,870. The expenditure during the six months, charged to capital, is stated here at \$3,531,139.

REPORT OF GERMAN DELEGATES.

Mr. MERNER enquired, Whether a report has been received from the four delegates from Germany invited by the Government to visit the North-West Territories, during the month of September last, with a view to induce emigration to those Territories, and whether the report submitted to the Government has been written in the German language, and whether it will be printed in that language for distribution?

Mr. POPE (Compton). A report has been received, but no report has been published in this country; it has been published in Germany, and is being distributed there. Two German pamphlets have been published in this country, one written by a German, and the other the Governor General's speech. These, of course, will be distributed in a few days in Germany.

CROSS POINT AND CAMPBELLTON, N.B., FERRY SERVICE.

Mr. HADDOW enquired, Whether the Government intend taking any steps to improve the inter-provincial ferry service between Cross Point and Campbellton, on the Restigouche River; and whether the survey made last season revealed any difficulty in the way of such improvement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

DREDGING THE RESTIGOUCHE RIVER.

Mr. HADDOW enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send a dredge, during the coming summer, to operate on that part of the channel of the Restigouche River below Campbellton, of which a survey was made during last year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is perfectly true that a survey was made last year. The estimate is a very large one, and, therefore, I am not in a position, now, to state to the hon. gentleman what the Government may propose to do then.

DREDGING GRAND LAKE, N.B.

Mr. KING enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a survey of McManus' Cove, Grand Lake, N.B., during the coming summer, with a view to dredging the same?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is not yet decided.

DUTY ON LAND PLASTER.

Mr. WHEELER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to remove the duty on manufactured land plaster, imported for use as a fertilizer?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention of the Government.

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH enquired, Whether the bounty of \$150,000 a year to the fishermen is intended to be permanent, or only to continue as long as the Treaty of Washington is in force, and whether fishermen engaged in the salmon, shad and river fisheries are to participate in the benefit of such bounty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The full particulars with reference to the intentions of the Government on this subject will be stated when the vote is brought down for the consideration of the House.

STATISTICAL BUREAU AT WINNIPEG.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a Statistical Bureau at Winnipeg, as a branch of the Department of Agriculture, for the purpose of collecting the agricultural and industrial statistics of Manitoba and the North-West, to be published annually as a report.

Mr. POPE (Compton). It is the intention of the Government to collect the chief statistics of the North-West, and we are now considering the subject.

IMMIGRANTS ACCOMMODATION AT WINNIPEG.

Mr. SCOTT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make immediate arrangements at the city of Winnipeg for the temporary shelter of the large number of emigrants who are now arriving, and will continue to arrive during the present year, at that place?

Mr. POPE (Compton). We are now making arrangements for the accommodation of these immigrants. It is our intention not only to repair the old sheds but to build new ones.

DREDGE AT THE MOUTH OF RIVIÈRE DU LOUP.

Mr. MASSUE, in the absence of Mr. HOUDE, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send a dredge next spring to the mouth of Rivière du Loup (*en haut*)?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Such is the intention of the Government.

DOMINION FRANCHISE.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk) moved that the members of this Parliament should be elected under a franchise, the creation of the law of the Dominion, and having no reference to the franchise of any of the Provinces comprised within said Dominion. He said: The proposition embodied in the resolution I am about to submit to the House is one with regard to which, it seems to me, there can scarcely be any

difference of opinion. This Parliament is supposed to be the embodiment and the exponent of the popular will, and at least ought to have the right to say by whom and by what franchise its members shall be elected. It may be said that, at the present time, this Parliament controls the franchise, because the elections to this House are conducted on the franchise of the several Provinces of the Dominion. But, Sir, any Province can, if it has a mind, change the franchise, so that it never is in reality determined by this Parliament what the franchise in the elections of its members shall be. I think, in this way, the Parliament of the Dominion, which is the highest authority, is, in some measure, subordinate to, and made dependent upon, the authority of the Provinces. It seems to me that it is not a correct principle that the highest authority should be dependent upon the inferior, and, therefore, I think that this resolution is one which will commend itself to the principles of this House. At present, members sit here who are elected by different franchises. No two Provinces have franchises which are alike. In the Province of Ontario, we have a real estate qualification and an income qualification. In cities, the franchise is real estate to the value of \$400; in towns, to the extent of \$300; and in municipalities and villages, to the extent of \$200; besides which there is an income franchise of \$400. In addition to this, we have the farmers' sons, who enjoy the franchise without having any property qualification. In Quebec, the franchise is \$300 in cities, or a rental of \$30; in other municipalities it is \$200, or a rental of \$20. In Nova Scotia, the franchise is \$150 of real estate, and \$300 of personal or real property, or \$300 of personal property alone. In New Brunswick, the franchise is \$100 real estate; \$400 personal property or income, while, in Prince Edward Island, the franchise is, practically, universal, for it almost amounts to manhood suffrage. In the Island, any man between twenty-one and sixty enjoys the franchise, while over the age of sixty a voter must be assessed for property to the value of \$6.40 a year. In Manitoba, a residence of a short time is required, with ownership of property to the value of \$100. In British Columbia, the franchise amounts to manhood suffrage. Now, Sir, I think that every hon. member of this House must admit that this anomalous condition of things—that hon. members who have an equal right in the legislation of this House, should be affected by different franchises—and it is to remedy this wrong that I propose the resolution. Look how this thing works. A man in one Province is denied the right which is given to his fellow subject in another Province. It has a tendency to create discontent. It is destructive of patriotism, because no man can do otherwise than feel discontent if he is refused rights which are enjoyed by his fellow subjects. He cannot be animated by a feeling of strong patriotism, when he feels that injustice is being done him, and this feeling of discontent makes the government of the country more difficult to carry out, and renders the stability of the country less secure than it otherwise would be. The more intelligent the people are, the more keenly will they feel the wrong thus done them, and the more discontent will such a wrong arouse, because ignorance can be enslaved without feeling that it is being wronged; but the more intelligent a community or a people is, the more will they be alive to their rights and privileges. It is not quite pertinent to the subject upon which I am now speaking to say what the qualifications of a voter should be; but still, I think it is so relevant to it that it may not be out of place for me, at least, to give my own views on that subject. I believe myself that manhood suffrage would, take it altogether, be the best suffrage for this country. The Canadian people as a mass, are intelligent and able to exercise the franchise, and, therefore, I think it is in the interests of the country that they should be entrusted with it; because you cannot withhold a right from a man that he feels he is

entitled to without him feeling the wrong, but if you give a man his rights they make him feel more deeply his duties as a subject; they make him a better subject than he otherwise would be. It may be argued, and I dare say it was argued truly, when the franchise was given to the people of older nations where the masses of the people are comparatively ignorant to what they are here, that it is not safe to entrust them with the franchise; but every Canadian possesses or hopes to possess property, and he is intelligent enough to know that the security of his property is in the proper administration of the law, and this makes him a good law-abiding subject. Again, property is widely distributed in this country. Property does not belong to the few, and the many are not homeless, as in many other countries, and, therefore, there is no such danger in giving the franchise to a man who has not property in this country as there is in other countries, where the few, comparatively speaking, are the owners of property, and where the many are, in a measure, homeless. Again, every man requires to submit to the law. What is the law? It is a compact between the various members of society to regulate the conduct of one towards another. Well, it cannot be said that it is just that a man shall be bound by an agreement to which he is no party. If a man is bound to obey the law, he ought to have a voice in the making of the law. Again, it is said that taxation without representation is an injustice. I agree with this proposition, and I think it is also injurious to patriotism, because how can you expect a man to have any patriotic emotions who does not own a foot of the land of the country in which he lives, or who has no voice in the government of his country. I ask, how from such a man can you expect patriotism? If taxation ought to have representation, every man is taxed in this country—that is, he is a consumer—and as this House only deals with taxes which are the result of Excise or Customs, every man who is a consumer pays taxes, and, therefore, ought to be represented. The man who has no property pays the heaviest taxes you can levy on any man. He is the first man, perhaps, who would be called on to perform military duties—to risk his life in the defence of the country—and yet you give him no voice in the government of his country, while you tax him more heavily than it is possible to tax any man with property. Again, if you adopted manhood suffrage, you would be going very little further than the existing state of things, and you would be doing away with many of the evils which arise from the present system. For instance, if we had manhood suffrage we would not have the difficulties we have now in determining who shall vote. A great saving would be effected for the people in doing away, in a great measure, with Courts of Revision, and the Judges Court to decide who shall be electors. And I hold it would tend to good morality, because, now, many men are put on the voters' lists who should not be there, and many are kept off who ought to be on. It is a sort of struggle between the two political parties as to which can get the largest number of voters put off or put on. Another good effect which manhood suffrage would have, in my opinion, would be this: that it would, to a large extent, eliminate politics from the management of our municipal affairs. Then we would have no anxiety for political reasons to strive who should rule the municipalities or corporations in which we live. We could only then have one desire, and that is, to elect men best calculated to do what is right in the interest of the public. Our leading men would not require to tell the electors to look after the voters' lists, or to say to their friends: "See by all means that you get the voters' list right."

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). And if the assessor is a Grit, watch him.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. McCallum, the resolution on the Paper.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk).

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS AT THE PORT OF ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. TELLIER, in moving for a statement of imports and exports at the port of St. Hyacinthe from 1st July, 1881, to 1st February, 1882, a statement of the receipts and expenses at the same port during the same period, said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I wish to call the attention of the Government and of the House to the importance of the port of St. Hyacinthe. This port was opened in 1875, and since that date its importance has gone on increasing. The first year of its opening the exports amounted to only \$21,930, the imports to \$27,401, and the duties to \$1,157.06, whilst, according to last year's returns, I see that the exports from this port amounted to \$73,233 and imports to \$113,569. I noticed also that during the same period the receipts reached \$7,549.94. If we refer to the comparative statement of exports and imports, from and in the various ports in the Province of Quebec, for the year ending 30th June, 1881, we find that the port of St. Hyacinthe ranks seventh in the Province of Quebec as to its imports, and tenth as to its receipts. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this port ranks last, not only in the Province of Quebec, but also in the whole Dominion, as to its expenditure, which was, during the last year, \$313.12. I have prepared a statement showing the number of ports in the Dominion. They number 138. Of these 138 ports 55 contributed for the fiscal year 1880-81, less revenue to the Dominion than the port of St. Hyacinthe. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the salaries paid in each of those 55 ports are considerably higher than those paid in the port of St. Hyacinthe. Thus, in Ontario, we find 17 ports yielding less revenue than the port of St. Hyacinthe; however, in these ports salaries are paid amounting to \$17,235.33, giving an average of \$1,013.72 for each port. In the Province of Quebec there are 14 ports yielding a less revenue than that of St. Hyacinthe, and in those 14 ports the salaries amount to \$14,250, or an average of \$1,018 for each port. In New Brunswick we have 9 ports yielding less revenue than that of St. Hyacinthe, and the salaries in those ports amount to \$11,961, or an average of \$1,329.04 for each port. In Nova Scotia we have 15 ports yielding less revenue than that of St. Hyacinthe, and salaries amounting to \$17,660.55, or an average of \$1,177.37 for each port. So, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen that the average annual salary in all these ports is over \$1,000. Notwithstanding this, for the last few years the salary has been \$300 only at St. Hyacinthe, which amount has been increased to \$400 for the current year. It is with a feeling of satisfaction that I submit these facts to the Government, in order to show the unfair position in which stands the Collector at St. Hyacinthe. I have already raised the question of increasing the salary of that officer, who has ever faithfully and diligently discharged his duties, and I hope that the Government will hear my prayer. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not only the port of St. Hyacinthe that is unfairly treated by the Customs Department. It would seem that there are two sets of weights and measures in that Department. I see the Province of Quebec is one of those which collects the most revenue for the Dominion. It yielded \$8,133,664 during the past year, whereas Ontario contributed but \$6,401,522 during the same period. There is here shown, Mr. Speaker, in favor of Quebec, a difference of \$1,732,141 in the revenue of the two greatest Provinces in the Dominion. Notwithstanding this, the Province of Quebec, which contributed the greater amount of revenue is not the one where the salaries are the highest, for if we look into the year's reports, we see that in Ontario there has been spent in collecting Customs duties the sum

of \$223,577, whereas Quebec spent but \$195,229 for the same purpose, being a difference of \$23,338 which the Province of Ontario spent over and above the Province of Quebec. If we compare the salaries paid in the two Provinces we will see that not only are the expenses incurred in collecting duties less in one Province than in the other, but that the present Government has despoiled Quebec to favor Ontario. In 1878, under the Liberal *regime*, the salaries in Ontario amounted to \$188,793, and, in 1881, under the Conservative *regime* to \$193,067, or an increase of \$4,274 over 1878. A different system has been followed in the Province of Quebec, for the salaries, instead of being increased in the same ratio as in Ontario, have been reduced. Thus, in 1878, the salaries in Quebec amounted to \$148,417, whereas in 1881 they were reduced to \$139,694, or a decrease of \$8,723. On the other hand, the Province of Ontario, which contributes less revenue than the Province of Quebec, sees its salaries increased, whilst the Province of Quebec, which contributes a larger revenue than the Province of Ontario, has its salaries reduced. It is a fact that they have been reduced to the extent of \$8,723, whilst those of Ontario were raised by a sum of \$4,274. The salaries of Customs officials in the Province of Quebec are either sufficient or they are not; if they are sufficient, then there is a useless expenditure in Ontario, and if they are not, an injustice is being done to Quebec. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it will be sufficient for me to place these facts before the House in order to have this injustice remedied, useless expenditure curtailed, and to see the Collector at the port of St. Hyacinthe receive a salary more commensurate with the responsible position with which he is entrusted and with the services he is called to render to the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, (in French). Mr. Speaker, I regret that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Customs, is not present to hear what the hon. member has just said.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Speak in English.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I ask to be excused, if I speak my own language. If the hon. member wishes to speak in English, he may do so. I will not fail to call the attention of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Customs, to the figures given to us by the hon. member. It may be, that the officer employed at the port of St. Hyacinthe has been overlooked or unfairly treated, but I am sure that it is not the intention of the hon. Minister of Customs to allow him to suffer, or to do him an injustice, and I will certainly call his attention to-morrow to the remarks just made in the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, if the mere question of the salary of this official was under discussion, I would consider, notwithstanding the absence of the hon. Minister of Customs, that the question is not one of great importance, but the facts brought forward by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Tellier) certainly call for the attention of the Government, and for a more satisfactory answer on its part. If it is true, as I doubt not, that the receipts of the Province of Quebec have amounted to \$8,000,000, and those of Ontario to \$6,000,000 only, and that so great a difference exists in the expenditure for salaries of employés in the two Provinces, I think that the Government should take into consideration the totality of the remarks made by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, and remedy matters.

Motion agreed to.

THE TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

Mr. ORTON moved that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report to this House upon the operation of the Tariff upon the agricultural interests of the Dominion; with power to send for persons, papers and records;—and

that the said Committee be composed of Messrs. Wallace (Norfolk), Bain, Trow, Coughlin, White (Hastings), Landry, Benoit, Béchard, and the mover. He said: I shall not make any further remarks on the objects of the Committee, beyond those I made on a former occasion. I think there can be very little doubt on the part of hon. members of this House that it is a very important Committee; and, although hon. members on this side may be very positive that the operation of the Tariff is beneficial to the agricultural interests, that is no reason why we should not enquire whether it can be made still more advantageous to those interests. This Committee will also afford an opportunity to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to obtain the facts relating to the effect of the Tariff on this large and important industry, and I have no doubt that the result of the Committee will be highly satisfactory to the country.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hon. members on this side of the House can have no objection to a most careful and thorough enquiry, provided the enquiry be a really honest one, into the operation of the Tariff upon the position of the farmers of this country, and as to their condition; but it strikes me that the hon. gentleman who moved this motion can scarcely be aware of its effect, and the important fact that it is an expression of non-confidence in the Ministry. The hon. the Minister of Finance declared very distinctly and clearly the other day that he had made a thorough enquiry into the operation of the Tariff as affecting the interests of the farmers, that he had ascertained what the effects are, and he stated what those effects are. The hon. Minister stated that the Tariff operated so as to place more money in their pockets, and he told the House, moreover, that the farmers themselves are thoroughly aware of the good effects of the Tariff on their interests. The hon. Minister of Railways subsequently repeated something very much to the same effect. Perhaps I am out of order in referring to a past debate, but I can hardly refrain from directing the attention of the House to the statements made by those two hon. gentlemen in their official capacity. The mover of the resolution declares thereby there is some room for doubt as to the operation of the Tariff on the interests of the farmers. I believe there is more than room for doubt, if the statements made are correct. I have no doubt, if an honest and thorough enquiry should be made, it will prove beyond all question that those statements made by hon. Ministers were made, if not in ignorance, at least in misconception of the facts, and in ignorance of the actual operation of the Tariff in that particular.

Mr. ARKELL. No doubt the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) has brought forward his motion for a very good purpose; but I am inclined to think that hon. members on this side of the House will not agree with a motion of that nature. It tends to throw distrust on the working of the National Policy, and, so far as I am individually concerned, and I can only express my own feelings, I must say that in my part of the Dominion farmers are well satisfied—the Conservative farmers and the moderate Reform farmers are well satisfied with the working of the National Policy. I believe no Committee appointed by this House can obtain information that will throw any more light on the question than is shed upon it at the present time. The time will come, probably in 1883, when the question will be settled at the polls, and I believe it will be settled in a manner satisfactory to the Ministry of the day; and I do not think it is necessary at the present time to appoint a Select Committee to look into the working of the National Policy as far as our agricultural interests are concerned. I shall, therefore, feel it my duty to vote against the motion.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION REGULATION.

Mr. BLAKE moved for copies of all Orders in Council, departmental orders and correspondence relating to the arrangements for the promotion of immigration, including the regulation under which a commission has been lately granted to the agents of steamship companies, with a statement of the number of persons booked under the operation of the said arrangement, and of the total number of immigrants booked (1st) from the United Kingdom, and (2nd) from the continent of Europe for the season of 1881. He said: Some time ago I moved for an address for certain information on the subject of immigration, but that was for the last fiscal year. This address is for a statement of the number of persons booked for the immigration season of 1881, and it embraces also a proposal that we should address His Excellency for copies of Orders in Council, departmental orders and correspondence, including a regulation under which a commission was granted to agents of steamship companies. I am informed a regulation was made under which, I think, \$2 per head has been granted to the agents of steamship companies in connection with immigration.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I have no objection to the motion, and the returns will be brought down as far as I am able to do so. I would, however, say to the hon. gentleman, that there is not now any arrangements for such commissions being paid. For two months, August and September of last year, if my memory serves me, we did pay commissions; but there is no such arrangement now in force.

Mr. BLAKE. There was one.

Mr. POPE. Yes, during those two months.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF CATTLE.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex), in moving for a list of quarantine stations authorized under the regulations for the importation of cattle for breeding purposes, said: I see, by the public prints and the *Canada Gazette*, that a portion of land has been set apart near the town of Sarnia to be used as a quarantine station. Now, I have nothing whatever to say against this selection of Sarnia; but I think, if the Minister of Agriculture had paid any attention to the question as to what was the most eligible position for a quarantine station of that character, he would have placed one in the county of Essex. Of course, they have the Grand Trunk Railway at Sarnia offering facilities for the importation of cattle at that point, and I see no reason why Sarnia should not be on the list; but there are five or six railways opposite to Windsor, running to southern, western and northern points, and if the concession as to the importation of cattle for breeding purposes is to have any practical value, I do not think any hindrance should be placed in the way by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, so as to compel people to take cattle 100 miles out of their way before they can reach the desired destination. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture ought to make a still further concession, and give us a quarantine station at some other point, either Windsor or Amherstburg, in the county of Essex.

Mr. JONES (South Leeds). I have no doubt that the place selected by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, near Sarnia, is a very good point, and that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) would like a station opposite his county. Perhaps we all should like to have quarantine stations in our respective counties if the Government could afford it. But I think there should be more than one quarantine station for Canada. For the far West, I should say the place chosen is a very good one if we are only to have one such station; but, I believe, there is a great neces-

Mr. ARKELL.

sity for more, and that the principal importations of cattle to Canada, for breeding purposes, are from the eastern States and New York. Therefore, I think, we should have, besides a station on the St. Clair River, a quarantine station on the border between New York and Canada, and that no better place for it could be found than some of the islands in the St. Lawrence, where cattle could be kept totally isolated, with no danger of the spread of disease from any infected animals.

Mr. POPE (Compton). The objection of the hon. member for Essex could not have arisen if we could reasonably have obtained a site for a quarantine station at Windsor—not that I think there are not other places quite as good. But we sent an officer to see if we could get any land at Windsor for the purpose of a quarantine station, or at Sarnia either, and his report is entirely in favor of Sarnia, at which we are offered a piece of land at a nominal rent. Everybody knows that it takes a considerable quantity of land, twenty-five or thirty acres, for such a station. I am not so anxious, as the hon. member for South Leeds, that cattle should be brought into Canada from New York and the adjoining States. While the Government is quite ready to allow the introduction of healthy animals from the east, we do not believe there is any disease in the western States, from which we should generally prefer importations. The hon. gentleman says there should be more than one quarantine station for Canada. We have already several, though, I am sorry to say, they cost a good deal. We must maintain such stations at the principal ports, large as the expense is. We shall have one at Sarnia, if the money be voted for it; we have one at Quebec already, and are going to have one at St. Johns. We have a station at Charlottetown, and one at Halifax, or shall have, if the House votes the necessary money. I think we have gone as far at present as it is safe in expenditure for this purpose.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I do not feel satisfied with the explanation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture on this subject. I can tell him that if any official of his Department came to Windsor, or Essex, to enquire about land for a station, neither I nor any of my friends, political or social, ever heard of it. I could easily get him all the land he wants for the purpose. And when he is informed that there is a veterinary surgeon at Windsor and another at Amherstburg, for the inspection of all the cattle brought in, and that these veterinary surgeons, though appointed by the Government, are paid by the railway companies, I think it will appear to the House very remarkable that no stations should be established in that county. With regard to the importations at the point I recommend, there are twenty applications received in that part of the country for permission to bring in cattle for breeding purposes for one made at Sarnia. I do not care five cents whether the station be placed at Windsor or Sarnia, so far as political objects are concerned, so the hon. gentleman for South Leeds is quite mistaken in attributing any such motive to me on this occasion. I think the Minister has made a blunder in this business. If he knew anything of the West, its business and railways, he would understand that the great railway centre in the West is Detroit, and not Port Huron; and if he wishes to consult the convenience of the public, he will have a station at the points I suggest, either Windsor or Amherstburg. I am quite satisfied he can get suitable land for it for nothing, and I believe that if he sent an officer to enquire into the subject, that officer performed his duty in a very inefficient manner.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOR WORKS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. McISAAC moved for copies of all reports of engineers, and petitions respecting Arisaig Pier, Cape George

Pier and Bayfield Breakwater, Nova Scotia, and all other papers relating thereto, since 30th September, 1878. He said: For the last three Sessions I have brought the matter referred to in this resolution under the notice of the Minister of Public Works. Petitions have also been sent in from time to time setting forth the condition of those public works. I am sorry to say little has been done either to preserve, or to improve those structures. I am happy, however, to see that the sum of \$1,500 is put in the Estimates this year for one of those works, that at Arisaig. I have only to say, as a proof of the importance of this work, that it is one of the oldest, if not the oldest of the kind in Nova Scotia. From the remote date of its completion, till Confederation the Local Legislature had charge of it and improved it, from time to time, and always maintained it properly. Since that time this Parliament has had charge of it, but did not give it sufficient attention. But now, on account of the rapid growth of the fishing business, especially last year, it is not \$1,500 but \$15,000 that should be expended on this work. There is another work, the pier at Cape George, commenced in 1870 by the Dominion Government. Between the date of its commencement and 1877, from \$30,000 to \$40,000 had been expended in completing and repairing this structure. Unfortunately in the fall of 1877 the storms or gales of that season injured it to some extent, and swept portions of it away. I brought it to the notice of this Government at the time, and an engineer was sent down, but no provision was made for its proper repair. A small trifle, not exceeding \$1,000, if expended then would have prevented the necessity of spending the large sum required now. This Government commenced it in 1870, before the advent of the late Government to power. Something over \$20,000 had been expended, and it had been completed by the present Government when in power before. The late Government expended something over \$10,000 upon it in repairs. The Government cannot say that the matter was not brought to their notice. I have brought it to the notice of the hon. Minister of Public Works again and again. I will say this for him, that during the first year of the present Administration I wrote to him and spoke to him, and he regretted then that he was not able to do anything for the work, but said the next Session something certainly would be done. But the next Session came and passed, and not one dollar has been appropriated since. The consequence is, that over \$30,000 is lost and wasted by this Government, simply because they did not grant a very trifling sum in 1879 to prevent the entire destruction of this work. Besides, a great injury has been done to the fishing trade in that place. These works are altogether in the interests of the fishermen, and to show their importance to the fishing interests, I may say that fishermen resort to these places, not only from different parts of Nova Scotia but also from the neighboring provinces, especially from the Prince Edward Island. As a result, business has increased so rapidly and so extensively that last summer an immense canning establishment was put in operation, in each of these places in spite of the lack of shelter which the present Government failed to afford. Another work in which waste of money has been permitted is that at Bayfield. I may say that Bayfield Harbor is one of the best harbors between the Strait of Canso and Pictou. There is no other harbor on the southern coast of the Straits of Northumberland calculated to give as much shelter as the harbor of Bayfield. To make it as nearly perfect as possible a breakwater connecting the Island with the mainland was started. It had been under the consideration of successive Governments, and at last it was undertaken by the Mackenzie Administration in 1877, and the first instalment of it was completed in 1878. The intention of the Government then was to build it by instalments, and to complete it in three years. That time has elapsed and

not a dollar has been expended since. I may say the same of Tracadie. The present Government expended money there and allowed the works constructed by themselves, which cost money, to disappear altogether. Hardly a trace of thousands of dollars which they expended in that part of the country can be seen to-day, simply because they thought far more of the Great West than they did of those who were contributing the money they were so prodigal in expending in the West. I may say that no money can be so profitably expended in Nova Scotia, especially for the fishermen, as money appropriated for the improvements of harbors and piers. It adds to the safety of their lives, and enables them to prosecute their calling at times and in places when and where it would otherwise be impossible. Besides the direct benefit to the fishermen in this respect, expenditure of money in making these improvements is beneficial to other classes of the people. We complain, particularly for the last four years, of the treatment of our fishermen; in fact, we complain of the treatment that the whole Province of Nova Scotia has received at the hands of this Government so far as appropriations for harbor improvements are concerned. The complaints are not confined to the portion of the Province from which I come; they are general. I will present to the House a comparison of the treatment which Nova Scotia has received during the first four years of the late Administration, with the treatment she has received from the present Government since they came into power. While they have increased the expenditure generally, and whilst they have taxed the people enormously, yet they have allowed the fishermen of Nova Scotia to disappear almost altogether from the Estimates. I find that, in 1879, the first year of the present Government, they voted \$17,500 for the harbors and breakwaters of Nova Scotia. In 1874, during the first Session of the Mackenzie Administration, \$205,200 were appropriated for the same service, or \$187,700 more granted by the Mackenzie Administration for the fishermen of Nova Scotia and the improvement of the harbors and piers, than had been granted by the present Government. Can they say they were not able to be so generous to the poor fishermen of Nova Scotia as the Mackenzie Administration? No. What were the receipts then? The revenue of the present Government, in 1879, amounted to \$23,307,406, while the revenue at the disposal of the Mackenzie Government in their first year, amounted to \$24,648,715, or \$1,341,309 more than the present Government received. But what was the expenditure of that year? We find that the present Government, during their first year in office, expended, as ordinary expenditure, \$24,850,634, while the Mackenzie Administration expended only \$23,713,071, or \$1,137,563 less than the present Government expended the first year. Let me compare the second year of the two Administrations in their treatment of Nova Scotia in this respect. I find that the appropriation by the present Government in the second Session, was \$40,194; that by the Mackenzie Administration in their second year of office was \$242,500, or \$202,306 more than the present Government. Is it because the present Government had no revenue, or because they spent their money elsewhere, that they did not treat Nova Scotia as liberally as the late Administration? But I do not say that the late Administration gave us what we were entitled to and, as a proof of that opinion in Nova Scotia, I would cite the fact that the people changed their representatives here in the majority of cases, and sent others in their place. They were led to believe that in this matter, as well as in every other, the Conservative party would deal more generously with the interests of Nova Scotia, but they have found out their mistake. The receipts during the second year of the present Administration amounted to \$29,635,297. The revenue of the late Administration during the second

year amounted to only \$22,587,587, or \$7,047,710 in excess, and yet they only gave the fishermen of Nova Scotia \$40,194, while the late Government gave them \$242,500. What was the expenditure during the second year? The expenditures made by the present Government reached \$25,502,524, while the expenditures by the late Government amounted to only \$24,488,371, or \$1,014,124 less. The third year may be a little better, so far as the appropriations are concerned. In 1881, the appropriations for harbors and piers, by this Government, amounted to \$55,900, while in the corresponding year, 1876, the late Government expended only \$36,500, or \$19,400 less. But let us compare the revenue. From the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, I find that the revenue, for 1881, is \$31,710,000, while the revenue at the disposal of the late Government was only \$22,059,274. This was on account of the low Tariff, and the Government, out of sympathy for the fishermen of Nova Scotia who suffered much during the depression which extended over the whole world, decided that was not the time to add to their burdens by imposing more taxation. The excess of taxation in that year was \$9,650,726, to which amount I have no doubt the fishermen contributed more than their share. I find that the expenditure, in 1881, was \$26,419,670, whilst the expenditure of the late Government in the corresponding year was only \$23,519,301, or over \$2,000,000 less. From the Estimates brought down for 1882—including the Supplementary Estimates to date—I find that the appropriations to be made for harbors and piers this year will be \$58,426, while, in 1877, the corresponding year of the Mackenzie Administration, the appropriations amounted to only \$31,500, or \$26,926 less than the amount now asked for that purpose. But let us look at the receipts and the general expenditures. It is impossible to say what the revenue for 1882, or the fourth year of the comparison, will be. We have been told by the hon. the Finance Minister that the revenue for 1881 will be \$31,710,000, and, allowing \$1,710,000 to be cut off, and calling it \$30,000,000, we may take that amount as the revenue for the fourth year, while the revenue at the disposal of the Mackenzie Administration for the corresponding year was only \$22,037,000. The expenditure in 1882 chargeable to Consolidated Revenue Fund, according to the last Estimates, amounts to \$28,797,732, while that at the disposal of the Mackenzie Government, in 1877, was only \$23,503,158, or a difference of \$5,294,574. Aggregating the amounts for these four years, I find that the present Administration appropriated only \$172,020 for the harbors and piers of Nova Scotia since their advent to power, while the Mackenzie Government, during the corresponding period, gave the fishermen of that Province \$515,700, or an excess in favor of the late Administration of \$343,680, or 300 per cent. as much as the present Administration gave for that purpose, while, at the same time, the present Government have increased the expenditure to the alarming figure of \$10,346,689. If we compare the receipts or revenue the two Governments had at their disposal we find that the present Government received \$22,982,116 more during their first four years than the late Administration. Yet we find that the late Government gave to the fishermen of Nova Scotia three times as much as the present Government; and these men, as I remarked, in proportion contribute more and suffer more under the operation of the National Policy than perhaps any other class. Hon. gentlemen will say that the present Government, in their beneficence, have granted \$150,000 this year to the fishermen of the Dominion. Let us suppose the fishermen of Nova Scotia alone get this \$150,000. What do we find? We find that the present Government only granted \$172,000 for piers and breakwaters in Nova Scotia, which may be considered as done for the benefit of the fishermen; and

Mr. McISAAC.

adding that to the whole \$150,000, we have only \$322,020, or \$190,680 less than was granted by the previous Government in the interest of the fishermen. But we do not get the whole of that \$150,000. The fishermen of the Dominion get it. If we get only the half, the difference would be still more largely in favor of the justice, if not the generosity, of the late Administration—because from comparison we can call it not only justice but generosity. There are many claims on behalf of the fishermen which this \$150,000 is supposed to satisfy. But it cannot be made to meet them. The \$4,500,000 of the Fishery Award, which has been in the hands of the present Government for the last three years, is the money of the fishermen of Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces generally. Some say that this insulting \$150,000 is ample liquidation of their claim; but I say it is not. If the fishermen have any rights at all, they are entitled to the interest on the whole amount. The present Government have enjoyed the use of that money for the last three years. If I remember rightly, the hon. the Finance Minister, in his first Budget Speech, said the first money he received after his advent to power was the Fishery Award. It was paid in November, 1878, I believe, and the interest on it at 5 per cent., from that time to the end of next June, would amount to about \$805,000. That is what the fishermen of the Dominion are entitled to; and after that they will be entitled annually to \$225,000—and this annuity should not be left dependent on the whim or vote of Parliament, it should be secured by Statute. If the present Government recognize and sympathize with the claims of the fishermen, when they ask for nothing but their own, the recognition ought to be payment in full. The fishermen of Nova Scotia have another claim. In October last the hon. Minister of Railways went to Cobourg, in Ontario, to tell the fishermen of Nova Scotia that the people of the Maritime Provinces paid \$369,000 of duty on breadstuffs. We in the Maritime Provinces know that the fishermen, more than any other class, pay the duty on breadstuffs. They are almost the only importers of flour and meal; and the reason, which has often been stated in this House, is that the fishermen carry their fish in their own vessels to the United States, and bring back flour as a return cargo. In that way although they pay the duty of 50 cents, they save the difference between it and the freight from Ontario to Nova Scotia. Besides the United States is the market for their fish, and not Ontario or Quebec. I find from the returns of 1880, that the fishermen of the Dominion number 60,617, the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces 41,873, and the fishermen of Nova Scotia 29,276. If we take these figures as the basis for distributing the bounty among the fishermen of the Dominion, we find that each will receive \$2.47. On the same basis of distribution we find the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces pay about \$8.80 per head of the \$369,000 taxation on their breadstuffs according to the recent announcement of the hon. Minister of Railways. I will give an instance of the oppressive effect of the policy of the Government on Nova Scotia, apart from their curtailment of subsidies for navigation improvements. Let me refer to the county of Antigonish, whose population is mainly composed of farmers, fishermen, mechanics and merchants. What do they gain by the so-called protection? According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find entered for home consumption in the county of Antigonish during 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Free Trade Tariff, goods to the value of \$66,115, on which were collected duties amounting to \$12,032. In 1831, the last year of the National Policy or Protective Tariff, goods valued at \$59,239 were entered for home consumption, while the duties collected on the same reached the astonishing sum of \$25,543, more than double the amount of duty paid by the same people in 1878, and that on \$6,876 less of goods. In other words, the duty they paid in 1878 was about 18 per cent., while in 1831 it exceeded 44 per cent., or an increase in the rate of

percentage of 146 per cent. Where does this enormous taxation go? It certainly does not go to the poor fishermen, as I have shown by the figures quoted a moment ago. The hon. Minister of Railways can answer this question. The far West down to the Pacific which has been, and is the arena of his prodigal expenditures, can tell where the taxation of the people of his native Province goes. Every one knows the great influence the hon. gentleman has with the Government. Every one knows how well that influence is deserved. I would ask him to exercise it in the interest of his own Province. We all remember the support he received in that Province at the last election, in the belief, that if he were returned to office, fuller justice and greater generosity would be shown to Nova Scotia. I hope when the next Supplementary Estimates will be brought down, they will show that he and his colleagues are disposed to make a departure in their continuously unjust treatment of Nova Scotia. I hope these Estimates will show that the present occupants of the Treasury benches are not content merely to do as much for the fishermen and people of Nova Scotia, by way of appropriations, as their predecessors have done. They are expected to increase these appropriations in the *ratio* in which they have increased the taxation. Nothing less can be just, nothing less should be satisfactory to the people of Nova Scotia.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, there is no objection to the motion. We will bring down the papers, and the hon. gentleman will then see whether his long speech was exactly the speech to make on this motion. It should have been made last night. At all events, the hon. gentleman must say that, if the late Government had, during the first two Sessions of office, asked Parliament to make larger votes for the Province of Nova Scotia than we have made during our first two years of office, he has not to thank the hon. members of the late Administration, but the previous Government of Sir John A. Macdonald; because, if the hon. gentleman will only remember the speeches of the hon. gentlemen opposite, while they occupied these benches, he will find that the hon. the Minister of Finance of that period, apologized to the House for the large amounts he was obliged to ask Parliament for the purposes of piers and breakwaters, seeing that they had been commenced before the Government took office, and they were obliged to ask Parliament for amounts to complete them. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do? The hon. gentleman told us just now that, in their third year, they did not ask as much money as we are now asking Parliament to expend in that county—that they asked \$19,000 less than this Government asks. We propose to expend in that part of Nova Scotia \$55,000, while the late Government that year expended but \$36,000. And in this, the fourth year, we are proposing \$58,400, their demand being \$26,000 less, which shows that, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, they did not treat Nova Scotia as well as we did when in office before and are doing now.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. You do not take the receipts into account.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says we might have given more money to Nova Scotia, though we are giving her 33 per cent. more than did the late Government one year, and 50 per cent. more than it gave another year. He also states that we are receiving more money than the late Government, and should be more liberal towards that Province. But the late Government accumulated deficits to the amount of \$7,000,000, which we must pay off before we can enter upon all those new works. Consequently, he must not be surprised if we cannot double or treble our proposed outlay. He must excuse me if I do not follow him in all his remarks upon the Budget, which can be noticed when it comes up at the proper time.

Mr. McISAAC. I wish to observe, in reply to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that the comparison I made between the expenditure of the late and of the present Government on the harbors and piers of Nova Scotia, is not the result of any partizan spirit. I merely dealt with undeniable facts in the interest of my constituency and Province. If, as the hon. gentleman says, the expenditures of the late Government were rendered necessary by unfinished works, commenced by their predecessors, which is not the case, I would ask how is it that the obligations of their predecessors were binding on the late Administration, and that such obligations cannot be binding on the present Administration. How is it that he is not bound to finish the Bayfield breakwater commenced by the late Government? How is it that he is not bound to preserve from total destruction structures that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, by the expenditure of trifling sums on timely repairs? He talks of the deficits of the late Government. I assure him, if these deficits did exist, they were much more agreeable to the fishermen and people of Nova Scotia, than the boasted surpluses of the present, when they received three times as much for their needed works out of the Treasury as they did since. They were a sweet yoke, when they arose from larger grants and lower taxation.

Mr. MacDONNELL (Inverness). I cannot allow this discussion to end without some share in it, though I am at a loss to know what course to pursue. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) has gone over considerable ground, not confining himself to the works specified in his motion. He has spoken of the interests of Nova Scotia generally, and in doing so must have had reference to the county I represent. Last year I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works, in rather an emphatic and direct manner, to certain works in my county, and we had a slight passage of arms on the subject. I was answered very curtly, and in a manner which I think did not become the chair which that hon. gentleman occupies; and I was told on my return home on many occasions I had damaged the cause I advocated by exciting the ire of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Therefore, on this occasion, I am at a loss what course to pursue. I am afraid to repeat the course which I pursued last year, when I drew on my devoted head the indignation of the hon. gentleman, lest the county so humbly and inadequately represented by myself might thereby suffer, and be deprived of its just share of the public moneys. I have considered this thing rather deliberately, and have sometimes come to the conclusion that I would approach the hon. gentleman in the most supplicating and obsequious terms. At other times I thought I should ruffle his feathers again—but really I am at a loss to know what course to pursue. Perhaps I should apologize to the hon. gentleman for charging him, last year, with negligence and want of capacity in the discharge of his duties. Well, I believe I was a little out of the way in charging him with this offence, because I know he is a most efficient, industrious and excellent Minister. It is true, I am coming a little soft soap over him; but anything at all to get justice from him for my poor constituents. To be in earnest, perhaps the Government are ignorant of the facts, for I can scarcely believe they would be guilty of the outrageous neglect of public property in the county so far witnessed. If they had visited the locality and possessed any respect for themselves, they would acknowledge and repair that neglect. The Island of Cape Breton, which the hon. Minister of Railways visited a few years ago, is peculiarly situated. The people of the Island have contributed to the construction of railroads and other public property in all parts of the Dominion, and yet have no railroad themselves, but are entirely dependent for their exports and imports on the facilities of navigation. At the time of Confederation we had a wharf at Port Hood, built in connection with the Pictou Railway from Hali-

fax to Pictou, in order to make it the connecting point between the Island of Cape Breton and the railway system of the mainland. Sir, I represented the county of Inverness when the measure for building that road was before the Nova Scotia Legislature, and I would not then support the Government of my hon. friend who is now Minister of Railways for the Dominion, unless I had a pledge that the wharf should be built in order that the people of Cape Breton might more conveniently and more advantageously enjoy the benefits of that railway. The hon. gentleman passed his word that that should be done, and he redeemed his word and built that wharf. That wharf forms part of the public property of this Dominion, and the Government of this Dominion, since Confederation, contributed from year to year to the maintenance of that property till the last few years, until the county of Inverness became so unhappy as to choose a representative who did not support, and who does not support, the Ministry of the day. Now, Sir, that wharf has gone to destruction. We can sail a ship between the outer end of the wharf and the land. I have asked to be allowed to expend private means upon that wharf, but leave was not given, and last year the structure was almost completely carried away. I wrote and applied to friends of the Government in the county, knowing that any interposition on my part would do more harm than good. I besought the friends of the Government in the county to act in the matter—for the Government have a good many friends in that county who suffer as well as my own friends—and finally the Government granted several pittances of \$500 at one time and \$500 at another time. But the amounts were not sufficient to secure the wharf from danger, and, therefore, it was eventually almost entirely destroyed. Portions of the money were expended in the stormy season of November. Now, Sir, I think it beneath the dignity of statesmen, governing a country so wide as this boasted Dominion, for the sake of gratifying a petty pique, to neglect a public work in any part of the country simply because the member of that part of the country is opposed to them, and that at a time when they can boast of a majority of one hundred at their back. When the learned Minister of Railways advocated Confederation in that earnest and eloquent manner in which he alone is able to advocate anything, one of his pleas was that the statesmen of the Dominion would become enlarged as well as the country, that parish politics would be cast aside, would be lost sight of, and that our hearts and our souls would become commensurate with the extent of our country. But, Sir, we find that that result has not been realized. We find that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works—because they put their heads together to consult about the matter of patronage to Nova Scotia—have concluded, simply because my humble self represents the county of Inverness, to deprive that county of necessary public works. We find that the souls of those men do not expand as the hon. Minister of Railways prophesied they would. We know that the powers of legislation are immense; we may legislate a National Policy, we may legislate for the prosperity of the country—it is said the Legislature can do anything but make a man a woman or a woman a man—but I never believed that legislation could make the country prosperous in the manner hon. gentlemen pretended it could. We find that legislation cannot convert small-minded men into wise, just and whole-souled men. Now, Sir, that is only one public work. There is the harbor of Cheticamp, in the county of Inverness. This section of the county is peopled by the French Acadians, who were formerly so ill-treated. They still retain the simplicity of their manners, and are an industrious, intelligent and hard-working people, pursuing an honest livelihood by agriculture and fishing. This is one of the finest fishing districts in the Dominion of Canada, and has one of the

Mr. MacDONNELL (Inverness).

most extensive and prosperous branches of the great firm of Messrs. Robin & Co. When my hon. friend from Lambton so ably led this House and the Government of the country, he expended a large sum of money in dredging that harbor—the first money these poor men had ever received at the hands of any Government. The harbor was considerably improved. But the works were discontinued, the dredge was taken away, after it had remained there a part of two summers, and was removed elsewhere to perform some other pressing service. I am sorry to find that never since has one cent been expended upon that harbor, and that the work then done, has been, owing to its incompleteness, deteriorating and going to ruin. I wish to draw the attention, particularly of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, to that harbor and to the necessity of getting a dredge there to clear out its entrance. Never, within the memory of man, was that harbor entered by a vessel before this work was done, but now, or after the dredging, vessels of sixty or seventy tons, laden with goods and fish, could enter and depart from that harbor. This is one of the best fishing stations of the Province of Nova Scotia. Then there is the closing of Port Hood Harbor. During the last Session of the Mackenzie Administration, the present hon. Minister of Railways, in speaking of that harbor, said:

"He would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if the Government had arrived at any conclusion with reference to a work of considerable importance in Nova Scotia, which had been under the consideration of the late Government, and which had been brought to the notice of this Government from time to time—he referred to the closing of Port Hood Harbor, Cape Breton."

Now, Sir, it will be observed—and I would like particularly to impress upon the House, and upon the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways himself, the fact, the very interesting and significant fact, that when this question was put to the then leader of the Government, the present hon. Minister of Railways was not in power. He was most solicitous, however, about this work; he was exceedingly anxious; and he was struck with the importance of it. It was a "work that had been under the consideration of the Government for many years." He did not at first name the work, but he referred to it in the most ominous terms, in order to rivet the attention of the House upon its importance, and he hoped that the Government would, then and there, without further delay, make an appropriation of about a quarter of a million for the purpose of commencing the work. The Government of that day, acting largely, I know, at the instance and suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Railways, granted \$10,000 in order to commence the work. Tenders were invited for a certain portion of the work, specified by the engineer, and were received for amounts less than the grant at the disposal of the Government; yet, Sir, notwithstanding the anxiety and solicitude of the hon. the Minister of Railways, who, within a few months thereafter became Minister of Public Works, that sum of \$10,000 was erased from the Estimates, and, to this day, not a cent has been expended on the work. I would ask if the hon. gentleman was serious at that time. I would ask himself if he was serious, and I await his reply. If he was not serious, what was he? I will not say, but I think the House can judge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman wishes I will give him my reply. He stated that I asked a question from the then Minister of Public Works, across the floor of the House, as to whether it was his intention to make an appropriation for a breakwater at Port Hood, and, I think, the hon. gentleman will remember that the answer I received—I am speaking entirely from memory—from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, was that this breakwater would cost a certain sum, which the hon. gentleman has just stated was a quarter of a million, but which, according to my recollection, was estimated, by the hon. the late Minister of Public Works, at a very

much larger sum. I believe it has been estimated at half a million.

Mr. MacDONNELL. \$360,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER \$360,000; and I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works stated that it would be quite useless to make any appropriation for that work unless the Government were prepared to go on and furnish this \$360,000, in order to carry it to completion. Certainly, Sir, the hon. gentleman could hardly have been serious in making an appropriation of \$10,000 upon a work which would cost \$360,000. If the hon. gentleman raises the question of seriousness in dealing with this question, I think the House will come to the conclusion that the interests of my hon. friend, who is just now in so animated a manner addressing the House, induced the appropriation of \$10,000 to do a work which, it was stated by the Minister of Public Works of that time could not be entered upon unless the House were prepared to vote an expenditure of \$360,000. I presume that the appropriation of that \$10,000, however, accomplished the object for which it was intended, that is, to serve the interests of my hon. friend who is presently addressing the House; and, having served the only useful purpose it could serve, in enabling the hon. gentleman to obtain his return again to this House, in order to promote the interests of the important constituency which he represents, I think the hon. gentleman should not complain that an appropriation so ridiculously inadequate for its supposed purpose should have been wasted, seeing that the only object it could possibly subserve had already been accomplished.

Mr. MacDONNELL. My hon. friend has now made the best case he possibly could. I want to tell him, regarding this grant serving the purpose of getting my return, that it had the very reverse effect. I want to tell him that, in many sections of the county, the work is not looked upon with favor, and that I never received so small a vote, even in that locality, as I received at the last election. As regards my object in getting any money granted, or making the address which I now make, I wish to tell these hon. gentlemen that they could not do anything more calculated to the end he mentions than to pursue to the close of the chapter the conduct they are now pursuing. I feel that by giving the rights to my county which it is entitled to, these hon. gentlemen will be jeopardizing my return to this House, but I shall never desire to occupy a seat in Parliament at the cost of the interests and rights of my constituents; and if, to-morrow, I could prevail upon the hon. gentlemen to give such a grant as would make them so popular in the county of Inverness that their candidate would be returned in opposition to myself, there is no person that would be more happy than I. Some reference has been made to the question of bounties to fishermen. I may speak of that on another occasion, but, in the meantime, I have only to say that our fishermen are much more directly interested in getting what is due to them expended on wharves, harbors, &c. than they are in receiving bounties. The hon. Finance Minister says the bounty will be given in order to encourage fishermen to build vessels, but what would be the good of the class of vessels he speaks of at Cheticamp. They cannot bring them into the harbor and along the western coast of Cape Breton where there is good fishing—where there are as good fishing grounds as anywhere in the world—there are no harbors into which such vessels could enter. These hon. gentlemen have no accurate knowledge of the requirements of the fishermen, or they would not propose to have this bounty expended as they propose to expend it. I now wish to raise a flag of truce between myself and these hon. gentlemen, but I want the money. I want to get justice, and I want to have this public wharf reconstructed. I assure the hon.

gentlemen who rule this country with such power and with such determination that they are not punishing my supporters alone in the county by refusing the grant. They are punishing the county of Pictou, and I would ask the attention of the hon. members for that county. The trade between Cape Breton and Pictou is growing rapidly, but it has suffered a disaster in the loss of this harbor. Inverness county is dealing largely with Pictou. The steamer *Druid* runs weekly or bi-weekly between Pictou and Port Hood, and the amount of freight it carries is something surprising. One day last year there were 400 passengers coming to Port Hood on board that steamer. The amount of freight imported from the wholesale merchants and the manufacturers of Pictou, and from Halifax and other places *via* Pictou, is very great. This is not a local matter. It is a matter of wide, of universal importance, and I ask hon. gentlemen, who are now luxuriating and basking in a surplus of \$4,500,000, to do an instalment of justice, and show that there was some ground for the prediction of the hon. Minister of Railways that the souls of men were capable of expanding with the confines of their country.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. SCOTT, in moving for copies of all correspondence between the Government and squatters on school lands in the Province of Manitoba, said: It will be recollected that, during the month of September last, the Government authorized the sale of certain portions of the school lands in Manitoba, which had been occupied by settlers for a number of years. At the earnest solicitation of those specially interested, as well as the Board of Education of Manitoba, and others, the sale was postponed. But the question will probably come up again, and therefore, I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that, according to sub-section 1 of section 23 of the Dominion Lands Act, the Government can only dispose of those school lands by public competition. At the time that the settlers on the school lands located in the Province, the number of immigrants was very limited, and those who did come preferred to settle in townships already partly settled by Canadians. The result was that a number settled on the school lands, believing that when the time came for the disposal of the lands, the Government would deal somewhat generously with them. It certainly would seem very hard that their improvements should be disposed of by public competition, and I would therefore urge on the Government to take some means this Session to remedy this evil. There are upwards of 8,000 school sections in the Province of Manitoba, and only twenty have been located on by actual settlers. It must also be remembered that the people who settled on the school lands did not take up homesteads or pre-emption claims. They have simply taken up a quarter-section of 160 acres, for which they are willing to pay a reasonable price, but they do not wish to be turned off after having made improvements on their land.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 18) to incorporate the Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Donville.)

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Lake Superior and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 72) to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Strange.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the International Construction Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 77) relating to the Canadian Electric Light Company, and to confer certain powers upon the said Company.—(Mr. McDougall.)

Bill (No. 78) to amend the Acts incorporating and relating to "The Sovereign Fire Insurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the American Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. Colby.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 81) relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. IVES moved the second reading of Bill (No. 12) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain the nature of his Bill?

Mr. IVES. The scope of this Bill is to amend that provision of the Dominion Elections Act which provides for candidates making a deposit with their nomination paper. Under the law as it now stands each candidate is required to make a deposit of \$50, which becomes the property of the Dominion, no matter what may be the result of the election. This Bill proposes to amend the law in the sense of making the deposit \$200 instead of \$50, and of returning it to the candidate in all cases, except where he polls less than half the number of votes polled for the successful candidate. This Bill would make the Dominion law precisely the same as the law of the Province of Quebec with reference to elections therein. It has been found in that Province that this provision operated in the direction in which it was intended to work—namely, in many cases to prevent bad faith candidates presenting themselves—merely for notoriety or purposes not even so creditable; indeed the Bill works admirably in that respect. I cannot understand upon what principle the present Dominion law rests; nor can I find in any other country, possessing institutions like our own, that candidates are made to contribute to the general election expenses.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are in England, and to a larger extent than here.

Mr. IVES. In England, as well as in the Province of Quebec, candidates are sometimes made to contribute in the way of a penalty.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They have to from the hustings in England.

Mr. IVES. I do not find that principle exists anywhere else than in Canada—the candidate purely and simply being made to contribute to the expenses of the general elections.

Mr. SCOTT.

Of course, it is not a large matter; but, for a House of 210 members, we must suppose there will be quite as many unsuccessful candidates, and over \$20,000 will be contributed towards the fund for the expenses of the next general elections, and over \$10,000 will be contributed by the elected candidates. I do not find any principle upon which that provision of the law can be defended, or why it should be retained. If the indemnity received by members is larger than it should be, I could understand its reduction; but if it is regarded as an indemnity simply, I do not see why members should be made to contribute towards the expenses of the general elections. But there is a very great advantage in the provision which I propose to make, which may be defended on sound principles, and that is, making the deposit large enough to deter persons from presenting themselves who have no idea or hope of being elected at all. This evil may not be so much felt in Ontario as in Quebec. In Ontario the field is generally occupied by two candidates, one representing the views of one political party, and the other of its rival; but in Quebec we very often have, owing to the diversity of nationalities, a third candidate, who presents himself merely for the purpose of mischief and notoriety.

An hon. MEMBER. To be bought off.

Mr. IVES. And we have found the provisions of the Quebec Act, so far, advantageous to the political parties, to the Province, and the people generally, so I think we should have it enacted for the Dominion. It may be defended on the principle of punishing a candidate who presents himself without any idea or hope or expectation of being elected. We may fine him, as it were, \$200; but I do not see on what principle we can make him pay towards the expenses of the election, unless the indemnity is too large, in which case it would be more manly and candid to reduce the indemnity.

In reply to Sir ALBERT J. SMITH,

Mr. IVES. I do not propose to make a defeated candidate pay if he gets half as many votes as the elected candidate, and any sort of a white man—a candidate—should get that number.

Mr. COURSOL. Will the Bill have a retroactive effect?

Mr. IVES. It has been objected in some quarters that the Bill is a step in the wrong direction, a retrogression or going back on the liberality with which the law treats candidates. I think, instead of that, the Bill goes quite the other way: that it, in fact, throws the field open to honest candidates. We have already done away with the property qualification, and now propose to abolish the \$50 charge to all candidates who present themselves; and instead of that being a step backward, it is a step forward in the direction of making the field more equal and open to all candidates who present themselves in good faith.

Mr. BLAKE. This is not the first time a measure of this kind has been introduced. There is no doubt there is a good deal to be said in favor of the view that candidates should not be inconvenienced by the detention of the deposit; but much may, on the other hand, be said against the proposition to increase that deposit to \$200. I have never favored, much, any deposit at all. I have always thought that we were trenching upon very dangerous ground when we proposed to create impediments in the way of a fair expression of opinion by the people at the polls by bringing forward candidates. I believe the small deposit which is now exacted was proposed as a part of a new system by which the nominations, instead of being publicly made at a hustings, were to be made by written papers. It was suggested, if my memory serves me right, at that time that as a consequence of the absence of that general expression of public

opinion, a pressure which might prevent a nomination in the sense of the Bill when a community was opposed to it. I said the absence of that wholesome pressure of public opinion might induce nominations which were wholly and utterly vexatious, done in a corner by a written nomination paper, and it was suggested that a small deposit or payment of \$50 might check that. As I said, I never favored it very much; but I should be glad to concur, speaking for myself, in legislation which should provide that at any rate the successful candidate, or both candidates, on conditions something like those which the hon. gentleman mentioned, should receive back whatever deposit he had made. But, I must say that I feel personally hostile to the increase of the deposit. I think that we ought not to increase the difficulties in the way of a presentation of as many candidates as five and twenty electors choose to nominate for the consideration of the people at any election. The hon. gentleman says that this measure is, in the whole, a measure in case of intending candidates. I do not think so. I think that the provision of so substantial a deposit as \$200 is a provision which will very often prevent contests, when it would be highly desirable that there should be contests. I may be misinformed, but my information is that the provision in the Province of Quebec is precisely similar to this. I think it is one-third of the votes there, if I have been rightly informed.

Mr. IVES. One-third of the votes would be one-half as many as the successful candidate received—one-third of the total votes, unless there should be three candidates.

Mr. BLAKE. As to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that in Ontario this Bill is not much wanted, but that in Quebec it is wanted, because in that Province, besides the two legitimate candidates, there is a third person who frequently comes forward and causes a difficulty and trouble, that suggestion is entitled to great weight, because, in the case supposed, there will be a contest anyway. There are two legitimate candidates who are going to the polls, and, in the case supposed, the annoyance and trouble result from the uncertainty which is introduced into the contest by the circumstance that there is a third party who, perhaps, may take away enough votes from one or the other to alter the result of the contest. If this proposal is intended to accomplish anything practical, it is to prevent contests, not to prevent an extra number of candidates. I do not myself oppose the second reading of the Bill, because I should like to see provisions in which the deposit will be returned; and I hope that, if the Bill passes this House, the amount of the deposit will be reduced to the old figure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt there is a good deal to be said on both sides for and against the law as it now stands, so far as a deposit of \$50 is concerned, and also in favor of the position taken by my hon. friend in presenting this Bill. There is no doubt that very often a candidate is brought forward only for the purpose of annoying the real candidate of the people, the man who is known to have the very large majority of the constituency in his favor. Therefore, if a deposit of \$200 was exacted, as suggested by the hon. mover of this Bill, it might, in many cases, put a stop to that practice. On the other hand, there is no doubt that this Bill interferes with the freedom of choice of the people. As the hon. member has just said, if we see no other inconvenience it would be better to have perfect freedom in the choice of candidates by the electors. However, Parliament, in its wisdom, has thought proper to put a check on the number of candidates that might be brought forward, and that, instead of having sometimes eight or ten or more candidates, having no deposit to make, being desirous of gaining a little notoriety in their county or in the country—in order to avoid that, Parliament has thought proper to put a check on the indiscriminate nomi-

ination of candidates by exacting a certain deposit of money. I know that it may be considered a hardship for the candidate who has a large majority of votes, to lose the \$50 deposit he is obliged by law to make when he is nominated. Nevertheless we have had that law for a number of years. As has been said by my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, we have found, in the Province of Quebec—I was not a member of the Legislature there when the law was made—they have found that a deposit of \$200 was not too large an amount to prevent contests, to prevent candidates from coming forward. The fact is, during the late elections in the Province of Quebec, I think in several counties, we saw three candidates coming forward, though they had deposited \$200 each, and I think several of them lost their \$200. Under these circumstances, I think it would be better to delay the consideration of the measure to another day and give the Government time to consider whether they would favor a change in the law, or whether they would leave the law as it is. Perhaps my hon. friend would not take it as a want of respect to himself if I move that the consideration of this Bill be postponed to another day.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks ere this motion passes. I am in favor of the principle of the Bill of my hon. friend the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives); but he has seen fit to apply a remark to the Province of Quebec, which I feel bound to take up. The Bill, as it stands, is of equal service to all the Provinces. We have constantly opposed—for my part I have done so on every occasion—the Bill which is in force concerning Federal elections, because I considered it an anomaly to impose a tax on candidatures,—for the payment of a sum of \$50 demanded of each candidate as a contribution to the electoral fund is really a tax. Now, this tax is not to be countenanced, cannot be reconciled with the coming forth of a candidate for a position such as representative of a county. It would seem to me that one should consider that incumbency as one of public interest and that he who accepts it does so not for his private ends but for the general good of the country. The principle of the Quebec electoral law is totally different. A deposit of \$200 is asked for, not as a tax on candidatures, but to avoid candidatures which are brought about in order to cause a useless contest. If it is found that the deposit of \$200 is too high—although no one in the Province of Quebec has raised any complaint to that effect—let it be reduced; but, at least, let us wipe out the clause compelling a member to pay a tax in order to be able to come forward, which I consider an anomaly in our legislation. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe has seen fit to say that this system had been adopted in the Province of Quebec owing to the difference of nationality. Now, my experience of elections has not brought under my notice a single case where the question of nationality had any connection with those worthless candidatures which might force themselves on an election; and even in a case where there would be two or three candidates, the objection does not hold good, because the moment there is a contest, the expenses are the same, and there is always the trouble of holding an election. What is sought for by this legislation is to prevent a contest where there is no necessity for one. This is, I believe, the object of the law, and in this sense am I disposed to ask for the adoption of the Bill. For the present, I have no objection to vote in favor of the adjournment of the consideration of this question.

Mr. BECHARD. I would like to make one remark on this subject. As I understand the Bill of my hon. friend, it is based on the Election Law of the Province of Quebec, and I would suggest that that law is somewhat severe in one particular. I refer to the provision which enacts that the candidate shall lose his deposit if he does not poll one-third of the whole of the votes required.

Mr. IVES. Only half the number of the candidates elected. There may be three or four candidates.

Mr. BECHARD. Only half of the votes polled in favor of the victorious candidate. There are some cases in which men have good reasons to believe that they run a good chance of election, and still may be defeated, and I think such a provision is rather too severe upon them. I have witnessed myself cases in which distinguished lawyers have been requested to be candidates, and have lost their money because they did not come up to the number of votes required by law. They were men who, by their position and talents, might have good reason to carry the constituency, and I think it too bad if this severe provision of the law should be put in force against them.

PAWNBROKERS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Orton's proposed motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 24) respecting Pawnbrokers.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to give some further evidence that the Act which is in operation in the Province of Ontario, and I believe in the Province of Quebec, requires to be supplemented by some such legislation as that which the hon. gentlemen now proposed in order to make it effective. The Act which is now in force is a law which forms part of the consolidated statute of the old Province of Canada and was passed at a time when usury laws were in operation. Of course the usury law provided means for preventing pawnbrokers from extorting undue amounts of interest from their customers, but since the repeal of that law it is almost impossible to obtain a conviction under the Act as it now stands. I wish to read some remarks made by Mr. Justice Cameron in a case of that kind brought before his court. It is the case of *Regina vs. Adams* and is reported in "Practice" reports, volume 8, (unbound) page 462. At page 467 of same report, Mr. Justice Cameron says:

"Though it is not the province of a Judge to suggest what laws should be enacted or abrogated, it may not be out of place, as the Usury Laws were modified in favor of the poorer or needier classes in the enactment of the law relating to pawnbrokers, to call attention to the fact that those classes would seem to require some protection from the exorbitant demands of those who carry on that trade or business by the imposing of restrictions upon pawnbrokers, so as to confine their exactions upon necessity within something like reasonable bounds."

This is the language of Mr. Justice Cameron in a case in which he decided that the prosecution was unable to recover. This matter has also been brought before the public in the columns of one of the leading organs in the city of Toronto. I refer to the *Toronto Mail*, from which I shall read a portion of an article which appeared on November 3rd, 1880:

"It is time that the pawnbrokers of the city were looked after. They are charging and getting 120 per cent. interest upon loans, notwithstanding that they obtain the best security in the world, and they have been allowed to do this so long without being interfered with that they go so far as to bully people who remonstrate. Hearing complaints of this nature, a *Mail* reporter started out on a tour of investigation a short time ago, and during his researches took in the majority of the city uncles.

"On the 23rd of October he dropped into the Singer loan office, 115 Queen street west, and raised \$10 on a gold watch. Circumstances interfered with his further proceedings for a couple of weeks, but on the 15th of November the watch was released at an expense of \$11. A dollar was thus received by the Singer family for their trouble in keeping goods twelve days. As they were liable for the month, however, their charge was only at the rate of 120 per cent. per annum.

"The same afternoon, November 5th, 'Mr. Black' pawned a chain for \$2 with D. Lorsch & Son, 6 Queen street east. On the 9th Mr. Black went after his property, and paid \$2.20 for it.

"Is 10 per cent. per month your legal charge, my friend?" queried Mr. Black.

"I don't care whether it's legal or not, it's what I charge. I ain't a-going to starve," said Davie. He also had got 120 per cent. *pro rata*; actually his return was about 700 per cent.

"The same evening Mr. Black dropped into the office of Fleming & Ward, 108 Adelaide street east, and left a watch for which he received \$5. Next day he got it out for \$5.50; 120 per cent. again, nominally, and really 3,652 per cent.

Mr. BECHARD.

"On November 10th the loan office of G. Adams, 327 Queen street west, came in for attention. Adams was very cheeky. He looked disparagingly at a watch and chain, and remarked that 'They wasn't worth much.' The visitor listened very submissively. 'Mine uncle' trotted out a phial of acid and proceeded to test the articles, keeping up a running commentary on their demerits. They proved to be genuine, and he asked what was wanted.

"'Three dollars,' returned the occupant of the stall, meekly.

"'No, sir—can't do it.'

"'Well, I'll take two; but what are you going to charge me?'

"'Charge you ten per cent. a month.'

"'Is that legal?'

"'Don't care a cent whether it's legal or not, it's what I charge, and if you won't give it you can go without. It's a bad lot anyway,' concluded the man of money, as he looked contemptuously at the goods.

"The reporter donned his time-keeper, and sidled timidly out of the stall.

"Other places were visited, invariably with similar results. Then a trip down to the Provincial Secretary's office was made to get the legal rates allowed, which were believed to be in the neighborhood of 5 per cent. per month, or 60 per cent. per annum. To his surprise the charge allowed turned out to be considerably less than 2 per cent. per month. The following clause, embodied in the Act respecting Pawnbrokers and Pawnbroking in the Revised Statutes of Ontario for 1877, is the legislation covering the matter:—'Every pawnbroker may take the following rates above the principal sum advanced, before he is obliged to re-deliver the goods pawned; that is to say:—For every pledge upon which there has been lent a sum not exceeding fifty cents, the sum of one half-penny (or five-sixths of a cent) for any time not exceeding one month; and the same for every month afterwards * * * and soon progressively and in the same proportion for every sum of fifty cents up to twenty dollars.' That is to say, for any sum beneath twenty dollars, the pawnbroker to charge interest not exceeding one and two-thirds cents per month, or twenty per cent. per annum."

I might go on reading the whole article, but the above will suffice. Now, Sir, it is very evident that some action is required. As I understand, it is very doubtful as to what power this Legislature has to deal with the matter, and at the request of the hon. the Minister of Justice, having drawn the attention of the House to this matter, I will ask leave to withdraw the Bill.

Bill withdrawn.

RATE OF INTEREST ON MORTGAGES.

Mr. ORTON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 49) to amend the Act intituled: An Act relating to interest on moneys secured by mortgage on real estate, said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I have introduced proposes to enlarge the effect of the Bill which was passed by this House a couple of years ago. Though that Bill was received very gratefully by the masses of the people of Canada, it was only accepted as a half-loaf; and, although I consented to the passage of the Bill as it was, it was my intention, at some future day, to bring the matter again before the House, with the view of having the scope of that Bill very much enlarged. This Bill provides that the Act shall not only give relief to those who may in the future borrow money, but to those who have been obliged to borrow money in the past, and have been misled by loan societies to borrow money at what they supposed was 6 or 7 per cent., when it was in reality 12 or 15 per cent. Now, the evil which loan societies have done in this country, and the hardship which they have caused to the farming community, cannot be calculated. We all remember the sufferings which our farmers passed through, when owing to the policy by which they were compelled, during seasons of bad harvests, to mortgage their farms and borrow money at high rates of interest. We had a policy in vogue which did not give the farmers their legitimate price for their grain in the markets of Canada, while the farmers of the neighboring Republic, when they had a short crop and there was a large crop in Canada got their home market and got higher prices, so that their short crop amounted to almost as much as their crops in more prosperous years. That was not the case with our farmers. They were obliged, when Providence did not smile upon them and when their harvests were short, to take low prices, because the American farmers had frequently an abundant harvest at the time the Canadian farmers had a short one, and they rushed their produce into

our markets, and in that way reduced the profits of our farmers, and obliged them to borrow largely from the loan societies. The result of that was very disastrous to this country. I venture to say that nine-tenths of those who left Canada during the time the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite prevailed, were forced to go through the operations of these loan societies. Many of them borrowed money on their farms, in consequence of the representations of the loan societies published throughout the country that they were willing to lend money at 6 or 7 per cent. on long terms, and people did not suppose they were paying from 10 to 15 per cent. But that is not all. These people could not get relief. The loans were made on long terms of fifteen or twenty years, and when the farmer wished to sell, or to change his interest, high to a low one, these loan societies refused to allow him to give up his mortgage—refused to give up their hold unless they received something like a pawnbroker's rate of interest. The interest imposed on these unfortunate borrowers was in some instances as high as 20 or 30, or even 40, per cent. Many of them found themselves unable to meet the instalments of principal and interest, and they were often obliged to give up the struggle and lose their farms. When they asked relief from the loan societies, they extorted from them the whole interest, calculated to the end of the term, which frequently amounted to as much as the sum originally borrowed, after the borrower had supposed he had been paying both principal and interest for five or six years. This Bill is intended to enable those, who are obliged to borrow under these false representations, to pay off their mortgages at a reasonable rate of interest—at the rate of interest which the loan society would obtain did the loan run on to the end of the term. I think that is very fair towards the loan societies, and it will afford very great relief to a large class of people in this country. Notwithstanding the good times we have had, which have enabled many of our farmers to pay off the heavy mortgages on their farms, there are still a large number in the country struggling under the burdens imposed upon them by the loan societies. There is another clause in the Bill which strikes at another existing evil—that is, where store-keepers and private bankers, in running accounts, charge 10 per cent. every six months, and compound it every six months. Among merchants and store-keepers, as long as a farmer is known to be well off, he is sometimes allowed to go on from year to year buying in goods until his bill, perhaps, becomes so great that he cannot pay it, and then the merchant or business man goes to him and asks him for a mortgage. It may be said that all the real estate owner has to do is to state that he will not pay this illegal rate of interest. It is true he has that choice. The business man tells the farmer that if he did not give him the mortgage he would put him to such costs that it would be much cheaper for him to pay the illegal interest demanded, and the farmer was compelled, not by choice but by necessity, to give a mortgage, and the principal of that mortgage very often consisted of interest compounded for four, five or six years, calculated every six months. The same is the case with private banks, which loan money to farmers. When the note became due, and the rate was very often 12 per cent., and they often allowed it to go on—they are perfectly well aware that they are safe, so long as the security is good—and they compound it in the same way. One clause of the Bill is to remedy that injustice. There is another clause which is for the purpose of those who loan money on real estate, after a mortgage is due, to accept payment, and, although it may be overdue, they are compelled to accept principal and interest when tendered them. We all know that in many cases, when the mortgage is allowed to become past due, perhaps with the consent of the lender and with the belief on the part of the borrower that all he will have to pay will be principal and interest up to the time when he tenders the

money, the lender refuses to take principal and interest up to that day and demands six months notice or much larger interest before he will surrender the mortgage. I believe it has been held by the courts that the lender of money need not give up his mortgage, unless he pleases, without receiving notice. There is a clause in the Bill intended to check that evil. No doubt there are other hon. members who have taken an interest in the subject, who will be more able than myself to debate on the evils which this Bill is intended to prevent.

Mr. BLAKE. The House would like to know the views of the Administration on this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The idea is to allow it to pass the second reading, and to refer it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. BLAKE. The Bill of last Session, which it is proposed to repeal, was carefully considered by the Government, and was concurred in by the Finance Minister.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The Bill carried by my hon. friend last Session made no provision for important points dealt with in the present measure. The hon. gentleman from Centre Wellington has given a good deal of attention to this question, and it has done very much good in the country. But why should a farmer, though his mortgage is overdue, not have the right to go and pay the mortgagee except with additional interests. The Chancellor of Ontario held the other day that there was nothing on the Statute book to compel the lender to accept payment of such mortgage except with additional interest. A gentleman in Niagara, borrowing money at 10 per cent. upon his farm, which he subsequently sold subject to such mortgage, but when the man who purchased went to the lender and tendered payment of the balance of the mortgage and interest to date, the lender refused to accept the money except on payment of six months' interest additional, on the ground that the mortgage was past due. The case went to court, and it was held that the mortgagor was entitled to six months' additional interest. If a mortgage overruns eight or ten months, why should the borrower be compelled to pay this additional interest? Was it the duty of Parliament to make laws for the rich against the poor? The existing Act applies to loan societies which loan money to private individuals on good security. And let me here say that there are no corporations which have better security than the loan societies, which always lend at about half margin, and some received at the rate of \$154 per year for ten years upon a loan of \$1,000. Their rate is certainly 16 or 20 per cent.; while farmers believe they are paying 6½ per cent., they are really paying 15. Is it not, then, the duty of Parliament to pass a law, giving persons, who have been deceived by others better educated and controlling capital, the right to pay off a mortgage, after it becomes past due, without extorting from him over six months' additional interest? A few years ago our farmers suffered, and they were compelled to borrow money, and to-day many of them are paying 15 or 20 per cent., when other men now borrow money at from 5 to 6 per cent. Those men should be relieved by Parliament. I am not going to say that the National Policy has made money plentiful, or that the acts of the late Administration were the cause of the farms being mortgaged. That has nothing to do with the present question. The question resolves itself into this: Are we going to give these men the relief they desire? Let loan companies have the power to charge 6 or 8 per cent., but give borrowers the right to pay off mortgages after they have been running three or five years at 8, 9 or 10 per cent. interest. There are a large number of persons in the country quite willing to give a bonus to get rid of the burdens imposed

upon them by long date mortgages drawing heavy interest, but are now prevented by a law which compels them to pay additional and unjust interest. Where will they look for relief if not to this hon. House? On the last Bill the hon. member for West Durham spoke very fairly indeed. He voted against the second reading, for which I was sorry; but when it came before the Committee he gave to it a good deal of attention and assistance. The leader of the House then asked my hon. friend to withdraw his motion, not to press the Bill; but it was pressed, and independent of that hon. members passed the measure. It went through Committee and was passed, and for the past year has given more general satisfaction and done more good to the unfortunate borrower than any other law passed. Nothing injures or breaks up a family more rapidly than a high rate of interest. Interest and taxes have to be paid, and the merchant and the mechanic and others must often do without their money. Then ensues great dissatisfaction among the children; the boys and girls have to leave home and the old man is left alone to paddle his own canoe, a very difficult task for him. Very often the farm is sold and the old people thrown on the road through these high rates of interest. There is no farmer in the country can afford to pay all his bills requisite to the carrying on of his business and over 6 per cent. for money. I hope the hon. leader of the House will allow this Bill to go to Committee, before which the recent decision of the Chancellor, in a certain place where there was no relief, with other things bearing on this subject, can be considered. There is not a man in the House representing an agricultural constituency who will not be held responsible if he fails to give the farmer relief from the unreasonable and unjust law which compels him to pay additional interest. It is their duty to assist the hon. member, who brought this Bill honestly and fairly before the House, to pass it into law. The people of the country, particularly the unfortunate borrowers, ask for it earnestly, and those who now refuse to give them that relief, I hope will be held responsible for such neglect of duty.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I answered the hon. member for West Durham just now as to the course the Government would take, saying they would allow the Bill a second reading, and to be referred, as last year, to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. I think the hon. gentleman will see that the proposed amendments to this Bill run in exactly the same direction as the extension of the law passed last Session. By the first clause of the Bill it is intended to substitute for the figure 5 the figure 3; the only other change is to state what the rate of interest shall be. Of course the attention of the Committee will be called to the fact that this refers to the mortgages made before the passing of this Act. Afterwards the Committee will have to examine how far the change should go. The Bill remains as it stands, with the exception of the last short section, provided that the Act will apply to all moneys secured by mortgages on real estate subsequently to the 1st July, 1880. This is to be replaced by sections 6, 7 and 8—a change exactly in the sense of that of last year. The same principle is to be extended by those three clauses for the purpose of protecting the man who has been obliged to consent to a large rate of interest. If he is able to pay before the end of the period of the mortgage he may do so, by paying the average interest, and, if I am not mistaken, three months beyond, as the notice implies. So I do not think we should object to the second reading, leaving it to the Committee to perfect the measure as was done last year.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the hon. gentleman spoke I thought I understood the Bill, but I confess I do not understand it now.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe that it would be in the interest of a great many persons in the country burdened
 Mr. WHITE (Hastings).

with debt, to pass such a measure. It is questioned by some whether we have a right to pass a retroactive law to interfere with contracts already made. But, if we remember that many of those contracts were made by the delusion of the borrower, who was thus led into trouble, it would not be considered very unjust to pass a retroactive measure for the relief of the victims. In many cases, at present, the borrower, who has been deceived and entrapped, can be hauled up and harassed before the courts. In many cases in the country it is represented to the man compelled to borrow, that he is getting his money at 6 per cent., payable on the principle of equal instalments. But, after borrowing and commencing to pay it back, he often finds that the interest is more than twice as much. I remember an instance, that of a man in my neighborhood, who bought a property and agreed to pay 6 per cent. interest, calculated according to a plan fixed by a company. After some time he sold the place, stipulating also for 6 per cent. interest to himself; but, when the second party, who had bought the place, paid him the 6 per cent., according to agreement, and he went to pay the original owner, he found out that the 6 per cent. received from the one man, did not at all meet the 6 per cent. charged by the other, and finally came a lot of litigation; and it was ascertained that, instead of paying 6 per cent. as he understood to his creditor, he was actually paying over 13. If, through the nature of the agreement entered into with those societies and their representatives, it is impossible for an ordinary intelligent borrower to correctly understand how much interest he is paying, it is right a remedy for injustice should be afforded, and we are doing a great injustice to such sufferers; in other words, we are really permitting the companies to extort money under false pretences, by allowing the present system to continue. It would be no great injustice, either to those societies or to the country, if a retroactive measure was passed to relieve those parties who inadvertently, and from want of proper information, have been seduced into such agreements. Some years ago the rate of interest was very high; contracts were entered into extending over many years; now, however, when money is cheaper, and farmers and others are able to relieve themselves of their burdens, are they to be deprived of the opportunity of doing so? The farmers especially find these high rates of interest burdensome. The idea of a farmer paying a higher rate of interest than he can make by the rent of his farm is absurd. A farmer will seldom rent his farm at a rate affording him more than 5 per cent. on its price; and if he has to pay more for his money it ruins him, rendering it, under the average circumstances, with average crops, impossible to support himself and family. If the Bill is retroactive, and we have power to pass it, we have a moral right to do so, because we will thus relieve a very large class of people from the tasks they have undertaken, that in the natural order of events they will never be able to fulfil. We will relieve them also from a great deal of misery, and, in a measure, do some justice to them, or give them that justice which they seek for to-day, considering, as we do, that they are entitled to it, from the fact that many of them have entered into these contracts under the misunderstanding that in reality they are not paying anything like the large amount these mortgages compel them to pay to-day.

Bill read the second time; and (at 9:20 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 9th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Saskatchewan, Qu'Appelle and Assiniboine Navigation Company.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 85) to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874.—(Mr. Vallee.)

MILL STREAMS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 84) to make lawful the erection and maintaining of certain mills, mill dams, wharves, ways, sluices, fishways and works, between high and low water mark, upon and near to certain streams that flow into the Bay of Fundy, in the Province of New Brunswick. He said: This is a very important Bill. It was placed in my hands for me to bring before the House in order to protect certain private rights of mill owners and others on the shores of the Bay of Fundy. It appears that they have mills which somewhat encroach on the low water mark, and that they have been obliged to build dams and booms there to protect their lumber. At certain times people go there and endeavor to force their way maliciously, and threaten the mill owners that if they do not pull down their mill-dams and booms they will bring an action. One gentleman, I believe, had to pay some \$1,900 to get rid of these blackmailers. This Bill is intended to correct that state of things, and to prevent mill owners, who have dams and booms on these small streams which are not navigable, from being imposed on by blackmailers.

Mr. KILLAM. Is the Bill introduced with the consent of the Government for the sake of supporting their fishery regulations or of attacking them?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have not considered that yet.

Mr. BLAKE. What streams is it intended that this Bill shall apply to?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Goose Creek is one of them, and another is called Salmon River, and various little streams running into the Bay of Fundy. I do not know the names of the others.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is evidently protecting his own class—loose fish.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is *tu quoque*.

Mr. BLAKE. From the lucid explanations given of this measure, I have not been able to apprehend whether it is not a local or private Bill; but I suppose it will be best to get the Bill in print, when we can get those explanations which it seems impossible for us to get now.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I try to make the matter clear to the hon. gentleman. There is nobody he can understand on this side of the House, and I am sorry I cannot make him understand.

Mr. KILLAM. I think a measure of this kind, affecting as it does many important interests, is one requiring notice in Committee of the Whole before it is introduced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, if it proves to be a private Bill, the possibility of which the hon. gentleman opposite suggests, then it must fail for the want of notice and all the other requirements. But, if it be a pub-

lic Bill, we can judge of it when we have it in print. I have no doubt the Bill is for the purpose of removing some difficulty, but what the difficulty is we cannot tell until we see the Bill.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

UNOCCUPIED SECTIONS OF THE MENNONITE RESERVES.

Mr. MERNER enquired, Whether there are still unoccupied sections of the Mennonite Reserves, which were set apart for them to settle on in Manitoba; has the period for such purpose expired; and, if so, has application been made by them for an extension of time, and to what period has it been extended; and in the event of there being sections to be disposed of, when will they be offered to the public for sale?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are unoccupied sections in the Mennonite Reservation. The period for which the reservation was made expired on the 1st of January, 1882. Application has been made for an extension of time by the Mennonites, and the subject is under consideration. In the event of any unoccupied sections being offered for sale, the public will get full notice.

THE RIVER MASKINONGÉ.

Mr. HOUDE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send, in the spring, an engineer to examine the mouth of the River Maskinongé, in order to ascertain what would be the cost of the dredging necessary to allow of vessels entering it during the season of low water?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention.

ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS enquired, Whether it is true the Government has leased, or is about to lease, any of the islands in the River St. Lawrence, at or above Brockville?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The islands referred to in the question were surrendered many years ago to be disposed of for the benefit of the Indians who surrendered them. They are, therefore, held in trust for that purpose by the Department. Some of these islands were leased last year.

SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 5) respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets, said: I must give the House some explanation regarding the trade which the Bill is intended to prevent and destroy. The traffic in railway passenger tickets, which has grown up within the last few years, is extending and increasing in a remarkable degree. This is owing to the great growth of our railway system and the great increase of railway travel. We have incorporated railway companies for the purpose of opening up and developing this country, and we took the duty of allowing the railway companies to carry passengers for charges not exceeding a certain fixed rate per mile. Within that restriction the Legislature in its wisdom saw fit to give the railway companies the right to make contracts for carrying passengers on such terms and conditions as they might see fit; and one of those conditions was that such tickets were not transferable. And yet, by the law of the land as it now exists, people are allowed or assume to deal in these railway tickets—to purchase and sell them again. We do not allow people to buy and sell the goods of other people without some authority; and it seems to me that the same rule should be enforced with regard to the sale of railway tickets, which are the property,

and which are under the sole control of the railway corporations over whose lines the people are to travel. The fact that these railway tickets are not transferable is a convenience to the travelling public; because, in acts of this kind, the railway companies compete with one another and carry through passengers at greatly reduced rates. It seems very hard to us that we should have to pay, say \$10, for being carried from Toronto to Montreal, while other passengers can be carried from Boston to Chicago for \$5. But the railway companies would not get any of that through traffic at all, if they were not allowed to compete, and carry persons at very low rates indeed. If prevented from doing so, they would lose their traffic, either from less accommodation for the through traffic or less railway facilities than are now used in carrying those passengers; and in this way the public would not gain anything by preventing the carriage of those through passengers. Moreover, by preventing this, by allowing those ticket brokers to purchase and re-sell tickets, there would be a tendency thus manifested to prevent all excursion rates. I have been informed, on very good authority, that excursion rates would be much more general and more freely offered to the public, if the railway tickets issued on those occasions could be prevented from being used, and sold by ticket brokers, because a great number of passengers are carried and preparations have to be made for that service; and it is intended that only those who intend to avail themselves of those tickets, as excursionists, should partake of the advantages, so that the whole travel on those tickets should be over in one, two, or three days. But if those tickets are produced, alterations and erasures are made by the ticket broker, and the tickets again are sold to ordinary travellers; the companies being defrauded of a large amount of money in consequence. Since this Bill was introduced I have had put into my hands a very important statement, made by one of these ticket brokers, who is now in New York and has offered to come to Ottawa and give evidence before any Committee of the House as to the practices in vogue at brokers offices in Toronto and Montreal, where they have dies and printing presses and other means for altering the tickets issued by the railway companies. At such places forgery and allied crimes are committed, which we cannot reach, because those people have a right, as they say, to carry on this traffic. If it can be proved they have carried on that nefarious trade, I think it is the duty of the House to endeavor to put a stop to it. If hon. members think that the railway companies should not issue limited tickets, or any issue which they make should be good until travelled upon, that is a different matter, which may be treated by itself; but we should put a stop to people buying and selling tickets which are illegal, worthless and useless, because the people imposed upon by such tickets are those who are least able to defend themselves—the poor, the ignorant, and the unwary. The rich man, the educated man, or the sharp business man never buys a ticket of this kind, unless after taking precautions to find out its value. It is the poor emigrant who buys such tickets, and in using them finds he has been sold. He often finds that he has bought a ticket, either out of date, or one which expires short of his destination, the result being that he is put off the train. Such occurrences happen every day. It is only the other day I read a paragraph in the *Montreal Witness*, of February 15th, which shows the extensive prevalence of this nefarious practice:

"No less than four passengers, *via* the Central Vermont Railway, were disappointed last evening owing to their having purchased their tickets from scalpers. Three of them were put off the train at St. Lambert by the conductor, and the fourth paid his fare in hard cash again, as he could not spare the time to return to confront the man who supplied him with a ticket which was not transferable. The tickets, it appears, were purchased in Manitoba, and are punched for a portion of the journey between Winnipeg and Boston. One of the three young men, who returned to the city last evening, made complaint to the Police Magistrate this morning. Detective Richardson was despatched

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

with the stranger to find out the name of the scalper, who sold the ticket for \$6, in order that a warrant might be issued.

"The passengers who were so summarily dealt with on the train are naturally very indignant. One of them, very eager to proceed on his way, persisted on boarding his car, but was pushed off.

"The seller of the ticket claims that the company were bound to accept it, as the original purchaser had not signed the form of agreement to the conditions, one of which was that the ticket was non-transferable.

"There is a difference of opinion on the laws regarding tickets, but such a scandal should be terminated, by putting an end to the uncertainty on the subject. Some contend that the railway company receive value for carrying one person a certain distance, and that that person is immaterial to the contract. Others argue that the contract is between the company and the original purchaser, who cannot assign his right under the contract, without the consent of the other party, *viz.*, the company. It is to be hoped that this matter will be decided at once, for there have been a large number of similar cases recently, the parties being unable to stop over to secure their rights by a suit at law."

It most frequently happens that the people imposed upon are the ignorant and unwary men, who have no means of prosecuting an issue, and who are anxious to get to their journey's end with the least delay. To stop at Montreal, Toronto, or elsewhere, to prosecute the offenders, would mean increased expense to them, and they would often rather proceed on their journey and buy a fresh ticket than incur that loss. Again, it happens when a man has bought a bad ticket, and finds himself sold, that he prefers to pass on by the purchase of a good ticket, without wishing to have it thought that he had gone to a ticket scalper's office, because no man of intelligence would like it to be known he did a mean and contemptible thing, and an act contrary to law, because the law declares that the tickets are not assignable or transferable, though "a seller saves a few dollars in disposing of them. It was decided in Ontario that, if a man buys a ticket, subject to certain conditions, they had to be carried out, any failing in that respect making him the loser. We know, as a matter of fact, that there are two classes of tickets issued by those companies, one at a certain rate that is unlimited. They may be issued at any time for one or two years, and are good until used; but the other class is limited to a certain number of days, and is issued at a cheaper rate. It seems to me that the railway companies have some reason, when they say we will issue a certain number for a limited period, and will provide additional accommodation for the people to travel on them. But it is difficult, or impossible, for us to be prepared at all times to meet a great rush of travel which may occur on those cheap tickets, though they are unlimited. Those ticket scalpers, as they are commonly called, are carrying on an illegal trade, or dealing in an illegal commodity; the trade being immoral and corrupting in its tendency. They are practically offices open for the receipt of stolen goods; and instances have come out in the law courts very recently, last summer, where it was shown that these ticket scalpers were in the habit of bribing ticket agents and railway conductors to rob and defraud their employers. A notorious case came to my notice last summer where a ticket agent of the Great Western Railway had been in the habit of transferring a large number of tickets to these ticket scalpers, thereby defrauding his employers. I am informed further, that on an important railway running out of Toronto, one of the oldest and most trusted conductors on that road has told his employers that these men are continually importuning him and others of his class to bring back to them unpunched tickets which had been travelled upon, thus bribing him and others not to punch the tickets so that they might be used over again. Sir, if this is the case it is the duty of this House, as speedily as possible, to put an end to the rascality of a trade such as this. I hold in my hand another document with reference to this matter which has been sent to me since this Bill was brought in, and which I think it is my duty to read to the House. It is a letter from a Judge presiding over a Criminal Court in the city of Montreal, I refer to the Police Magistrate of the

city of Montreal. It is dated 16th February, and is as follows:—

"BUREAU DES MAGISTRATS DE POLICE,
"MONTREAL, 16th February, 1882.

"SIR,—I see by this morning's papers that you are presenting a Bill to regulate the sale of railway tickets. Our experience here shows that the present state of things is of a great inconvenience to a large number of poor fellows who, ignorant of the laws or regulations of railway companies, and attracted at the low prices at which scalpers advertise old tickets, are too often put into extreme circumstances on account of the companies refusing, on the trip, to recognize those tickets as valid. Many of them have been turned out of the cars and left in very painful conditions, in places where they were unknown, without means of paying their fare, either to continue their voyage or to return home. As the victims are generally poor, those cases often pass without notice from the public, more particularly as the scalpers prefer generally to come to some understanding with the victimized, who are always too glad to accept any offer of settlement made to them. But those cases are altogether too numerous not to deserve the attention of those in authority, and of our legislators. I am glad, Sir, that you have taken the matter in hand, and as I have felt painful that there was no remedy to prevent those poor people from being made victims, I have thought it advisable to communicate to you our experience here, with the hope that you will succeed in your undertaking.

"Praying to be excused for the liberty I take,

"I remain, Sir, yours truly,

"C. AIME DUGAS,
"Judge of Sessions.

"G. A. KIRKPATRICK, Esq., M. P."

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Does not the Criminal Law provide for the crime?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It does provide for the crime when a party is detected in selling a ticket which is out of date, or useless. There was a case last year, in Montreal, where these ticket scalpers sold, to two young men who had just come out from England, passes from Montreal to Chicago, which they had obtained in an illegal manner; they sold them as valid tickets. The young men were put off the cars. When they went to get their luggage checked, they were told the passes were out of date, and they went and complained to the police, and Mr. Abraham—I think that was the name of the man—was arrested, tried, and found guilty of obtaining money under false pretences. However, owing to a defect in the indictment, it not having been signed by the Attorney-General himself, the indictment was quashed, but the jury found a verdict that the man was guilty of obtaining money under false pretences. That is one case, but how many others are victimized in the same way who will not take the trouble to prosecute these men? Very often they prefer to pay an additional fare, or to pay the fare over again, in order to reach their destination. We ought to devise some means of regulating the sale of these tickets. I am asking this House to pass a law which is in force in many of the States of the Union, in Pennsylvania, Illinois and New York. A very important case was tried lately in Pennsylvania to test the legality of the law, and the Judge there said the law ought to come within the power of the Legislature on the ground that it affected good order, morals, and the peace and safety of society. He held that the Legislature, by this measure, intended to destroy a business detrimental to good morals, and as bad in its effect as gambling itself. That is the opinion of Judge Ludlow in a very important case that was tried before him in Pennsylvania. The only way that this evil can be dealt with, it seems to me, and I have considered it in all its aspects, is to pass a law that only agents authorized by the railway companies shall be allowed to deal in railway tickets, the property of the railway companies themselves; then any one who sells a ticket will be the agent of the company, and bound to carry out the conditions upon which that ticket is sold. Now these scalpers are unauthorized, and are not bound to any party when they sell a ticket to a passenger; but, if only authorized agents are allowed to sell them, the companies will be required to carry out the conditions upon which that agent sells the ticket. It will remove from our large cities those shops and places which are now the receptacles for stolen

property, where are to be found printing presses and dies for altering these tickets and committing a crime against the laws of society and against the laws of the country, but which cannot be detected till it is too late to punish the evil doer. It will remove the temptations which these men hold out to the officials of railway companies to commit a fraud and to rob their employers. I believe its effect will be most beneficial, and that it will be for the advantage of the travelling public, because the railway companies will then be able to afford greater facilities for the travelling public, knowing that the tickets will not come back upon their hands through these illegal and unauthorized agents. It will enable them to issue excursion tickets more frequently and at cheaper rates. But if a traveller is prevented by sickness or any other unavoidable cause from using a ticket for which he has paid, he should have some means of reimbursing himself for the money he has paid by disposing of the ticket. I have attempted to provide for that, and copying from the laws of New York and Illinois, I have introduced a clause at the end of this Bill which provides that the railway companies shall redeem all unused tickets for the portions of the journey for which they have not been used. It may be a little difficult to carry this out, but if the House allows this Bill to pass a second reading I shall ask the House to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, where it may undergo a strict scrutiny and be made as practicable as possible. I have no sympathy, and I hope this House will have no sympathy, with the persons who are engaged in this nefarious traffic, which, as Judge Ludlow says, is detrimental to good morals. These people came here last year and petitioned this House not to interfere with them in their endeavors to earn an honest living. But they are not earning an honest living; they are earning their living by trafficking in illegal commodities. They are preying upon the poor by selling worthless tickets to them; they are obtaining money under false pretences. More than that, they have the audacity to come here and petition this House for protection. I hold in my hand a most extraordinary revelation of the amount of money which these people say they spent in this city last year for the purpose of defeating a Bill which never reached its second reading, upon which no vote of this House was ever taken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read, read

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not intend to read it, but I will read it to the Committee if the Bill is read the second time. But I would like to read the latest effusion from these people, who petition the House that they may be protected in their honest calling. This is a circular which has been issued since this Bill was introduced, and it reads as follows:—

"DEAR SIR.—The Grand Trunk Railway Company, with the assistance of the New York Central and the Pennsylvania Central, have again, at this Session of Parliament, last week brought in a Bill to prohibit scalping, adding a redemption clause at this Session, which will take a great deal of labor and money if it can be defeated. Last year a similar Bill was introduced, and defeated by the Canadian brokers at their own expense, because they asked for assistance, but received none—we had then six brokers in Canada, while we only have two now—and I would therefore appeal to you earnestly to send what you can to assist me. Whatever you contribute, send at once. Mr. E. Lichtenhein has the promise of assistance from the American Ticket Brokers' Association, through G. G. Lansing, and, if you will act promptly, we may be able to again defeat the Bill this Session. No matter how small the amount may be, it helps, and I trust you will not overlook it, as you may be placed in the same position at any time, and require our assistance. So remit at once, and oblige,

"Yours truly,

"S. ABRAHAM,
"245 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada."

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It is not addressed to you, is it?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No, Sir, it is not addressed to me, which the hon. gentleman knows very well. It is addressed by this man to some of his conferees on the other side of the

line. I say that any person who had the impudence to address such a circular as that, and state such things as he has stated in that circular, deserves no consideration for his "honest and legitimate calling," which he petitioned this House not to interfere with. I hope, Mr. Speaker, this House will take into consideration the acts which I have briefly and inadequately presented to them, and pass this Bill through its second reading, and allow it to go to a Committee, where, if necessary, further information can be given by witnesses of cases in which poor, ignorant people have been defrauded of their money, to the great injury of society and good morals, and as to the necessity which exists of putting an end in some way to this trade. If this Bill does not meet the case, we can improve it; but, for goodness sake, I hope the House will assist me to put a stop to this trade.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If my hon. friend is going to withdraw the Bill, I will not take time in discussing it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am not going to withdraw it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). My hon. friend bases his application to Parliament to pass this Bill on two or three grounds. His first ground is that if this Bill does not become law, we will not have excursions as we have had in years past. There must be a great objection to the issue of excursion tickets by the railway companies. This trade of buying and selling tickets has been in existence for a long time, and I do not think that so far the existence of that occupation has in the slightest degree interfered with the excursions on railways. It appears to me that the railway companies give excursions just as often as they find it convenient, and as they think they can make money out of them. On that ground I do not think my hon. friend has made any case. The hon. gentleman also took the ground that the tickets sold by the scalpers were, as a general rule, sold to the poor and ignorant, who were made the victims of this trade. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the evidence given in the Lamm case, in which a gentleman engaged in this industry, I think of the name of Lamm, who had been arrested under the laws of the country, he will find he made a confession and detailed all the intricacies of his trade. He said they were not in the habit of selling to the poor and ignorant at all, but as a general rule they sold the tickets to keen, sharp, calculating fellows, who would pass over a railway on any ticket at all, and sometimes on no ticket. They found that in selling to the poor and ignorant that in ninety-nine cases out of hundred they were caught; but when they sold to the keen, sharp fellows they were not caught. Therefore, I say the poor are not affected by this business. Another ground taken by the hon. gentleman was that the ticket scalper carried on an illegal trade. I am not sure that the mere buying and selling of tickets is illegal, but some things which the hon. gentleman says these men do are illegal, and can be punished by law. He says they are in the habit of getting tickets illegally from the railway companies, and making money by selling them. That may be so, but the hon. gentleman's Bill will not stop that. He may pass a dozen Bills, but if there are dishonest employes on a railway, these dishonest employes can still steal tickets from the company and dispose of them to the public through the agents. The hon. gentleman admits that if the scalpers do anything wrong in selling the tickets, such as erasing or changing the date, the Criminal Law at present will reach them; and there is no doubt the hon. gentleman is correct there. If they sell a ticket now, representing that it is a valuable ticket which will carry the purchaser from a given point to a given point, and it turns out to be a wholly valueless instrument, they can be reached under the law as it now stands. The hon. gentleman admits that they can be reached now when they

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

are caught; how can he make the law reach them without catching them and proving his case? He will do it under the ordinary Criminal Law, just as well as under the Bill he has introduced. Now, I do not know what these men have been doing in attempting, by improper means, to influence gentlemen on the other side of the House. I am quite sure no man on this side has been approached in any such manner. I am quite sure that no attempt, so far as I know, was made on this side of the House to do what has been charged. Hon. gentlemen will know how far that is correct, so far as any person in this House is concerned. We are not concerned about what those men do. We are not legislating for Mr. Lamb, Mr. Lichtenhein, Mr. Abraham, or anybody else in particular; we are asked to legislate in the interest of the railway companies; and, if we defeat the Bill, it will be because we understand that the Bill is not in the interest of the travelling public, but in the interest of those companies. In my judgment, after having read this Bill, both last year and this year, I think it is a bad one, and should not receive the sanction of Parliament. I do not see in it a single redeeming feature. Why should we pass the Bill? Is it in the interest of the travelling public? Is it in the interest of the great mass of the people? No; it is introduced in the interest of the railway companies, and was introduced last year on their instructions; and it is now pressed in their interest, and would result, if it became law, to their advantage. I ask my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), who is a lawyer of standing in Ontario, and who, no doubt, pleads many cases against railway companies, whether he does not think they are sufficiently protected by the law as it stands, both as to freights and passengers? They are so well protected at present that it is almost impossible, either for a man who sends goods, or travels over their lines, if wronged or injured, to reach them by law; there are so many conditions, provisos and stipulations in the bills of lading that it is almost impossible to obtain redress for any violation of the law, or breach of contract on the part of those corporations. It is the same with regard to passengers' tickets; those companies hem and guard themselves round so efficiently that, in ninety-nine cases in one hundred, although the grossest wrong may have been inflicted on the traveller, he finds himself wholly without redress. Let us see what the Bill proposes—let us analyse it a little. If Parliament sanctions one of those extraordinary Bills, it will invest the hon. Minister of Railways with power to appoint ticket agents all over the country for every railway belonging to the Dominion, and to every private company.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes; he will have that power.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No; he will have it only for his own railways.

Mr. CAMERON. The second clause supports my view. It reads thus:

2. The Minister of Railways and Canals, or company hereinbefore described, employing any such agent, shall give him a certificate of his appointment, which shall be under the hand of the said Minister or the corporate seal of the company appointing him, and such agent shall keep the same framed or exhibited in some conspicuous part of his office or place of business, where it can be seen or read by those resorting to the office.

This authorizes the hon. the Minister of Railways to act for the one, and the agents of the railways for the other class of roads; those company agents can sell tickets for their railways, and the hon. the Minister of Railways tickets for the roads belonging to the Dominion. Why should the hon. Minister be appointed for that purpose? What right has Parliament to ask him to appoint agents for the sale of those tickets any more than for the sale of any other commodity in the market, such as railway shares, stocks, or anything belonging to a private individual? Section 5

prohibits the sale of tickets except by such agents, under a penalty of \$50. It reads as follows:—

5. No person whosoever, except those authorized as above mentioned, shall sell or offer for sale, any railway passenger ticket, or pass, ticket, certificate or other instrument, enabling any person or persons, or purporting to entitle any person or persons, to travel on any one railway, or more than one railway, or any part of one railway, or parts of several railways to which this Act applies; and any person or persons offending against this Act shall, upon summary conviction thereof before any Justice of the Peace, be subject to a fine of not less than twenty dollars nor more than fifty dollars.

Nobody, under this Bill, is at liberty to sell a railway ticket, unless appointed for that purpose, under a penalty of \$50. Now, why should that be so? Why should I be prohibited from selling my railway ticket? I buy and pay for my ticket and the company sells it for a given purpose. I buy it to travel from one to some other given point, and if I do not see fit to travel the whole distance, why should I be prohibited from disposing of it for the unused portion? The hon. gentleman might as well undertake to prevent me from using or selling any other of my commodities. I bought the ticket in the open market, and it becomes my property as much as the clothes I wear or anything else I own—as much as a bank share, bank bill, or voucher. Why then, I repeat, should I be debarred from selling this piece of property? It does appear to me unworthy, unreasonable—outrageous, I was going to say—to so interfere with private rights. Besides, I doubt very much if Parliament has got the power to pass any such law. The hon. gentleman has referred to a case in Pennsylvania where a similar law has been boldly enforced for a year or two—certainly not more—in which the court held it was within the competence of the Legislature. Possibly it may be; but if it is within the competence of that Legislature, it would not be within the competence of the Federal Parliament in the United States, nor within the competence of the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman will find, I think, that the case has been overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask him if that is not so? I understand it has been overruled, and I recommend my hon. friend to examine the matter. We have, as the hon. gentleman has said, created these vast corporations and given them large powers; quite right, possibly. But we know perfectly well that, in many respects, the corporations abuse their powers. We should not allow them to do that to any greater extent than is practicable at present. We also know well that the travelling public have but few rights they can enforce; and yet my hon. friend proposes to take away one of them. Is it not true that these companies will issue tickets from Chicago to Boston at less than from Chicago to Toronto or Ottawa, and that they will sell tickets from Chicago to Boston for less than from Chicago to Montreal? If that is so, such a policy is inimical to the interests of our local trade. Local passengers now pay from 50 to 75 per cent. more for accommodation over those railways than the through passengers. If I buy a ticket at Boston for Chicago, why should I not, if I see fit, change my mind, and have the right to get off at Toronto, and sell my ticket for the rest of the way? If my business interests require me not to extend my journey to Chicago, if any one of the accidents occurs out of the thousands which beset men during life's journey, I say, why, under such circumstances as these, should I be deprived of the balance of what I paid for that ticket from Boston to Chicago? If I see fit to defer my journey at Toronto, why should I not be at liberty to sell that ticket to some man who is travelling from Toronto to Chicago? The railway company undertake by their contract simply to carry one passenger from Boston to Chicago. They are only bound to carry one, and what difference does it make, as a matter of fact, to the railway company whether that man travels the whole journey, or whether a part of the journey is travelled by one man and part by another? I can see no reason in

it and no hardship to the railway company. They undertake to carry one passenger, and the law ought to compel them to carry one passenger through the whole distance. My hon. friend's Bill prevents them from doing that. If I buy a ticket from Boston to Chicago and get off at Toronto, under the hon. gentleman's Bill I cannot dispose of the unused ticket unless I sell it to the company that sold me the ticket. My hon. friend says that in section 9 he has guarded against any loss to the travelling public. If a person is unable to complete a journey from point to point over the route they have to travel, the hon. gentleman says his Bill will compel the company to redeem that ticket for the unused portion of it. Now there might be something in the argument of the hon. member if his Bill did so provide; but the Bill does not provide that remedy at all. According to the 9th clause the only company who is bound to redeem this ticket is the company who sells it, and no other company. Now, Sir, I buy a ticket at the city of Boston for Chicago; I travel up to Port Sarnia, and I am prevented, by circumstances over which I have no control, from pursuing my journey to Chicago. I want to dispose of my ticket, but I cannot do so unless I go down to the city of Boston where I bought it and sell that ticket to the railway company from whom I bought it. The Bill of my hon. friend contains a delusion and a snare. It is a delusion to say that the Bill provides for the redemption of that ticket when there is no provision to that effect, except by the company who sold that ticket. If I buy a ticket in Florida or California for the city of Boston, and get off at the city of Montreal as I expected to go down to Jacksonville or to San Francisco to dispose of the unused portion of my ticket? Because that is exactly what the Bill provides for. I buy a ticket from one of the many lines of railway that are feeders to the Grand Trunk Railway. I travel over the Grand Trunk, down, perhaps, to the town of Brockville, where I stop, not seeing fit, for good and sufficient reasons, to pursue my journey any further. Have I got to go up to Owen Sound and ask the company there to redeem my ticket. Now, I think that provision of the Bill is wholly ineffectual and useless. The hon. gentleman says the company that sold the ticket is bound to redeem the unused portion of it, and to pay for it at a rate which shall be equal to the difference paid for the whole ticket, and a cost of a ticket between the points for which the ticket is unused. Now, as I understand that provision of the Bill—and it is the only one of which the travelling public can avail themselves—it is this: If a ticket is bought at Chicago for Boston, we will say, at \$10—I believe \$13 was the price last year—the purchaser gets off at Toronto, and he loses the unused portion of that ticket, which has cost him \$10; but the fare from Chicago to Toronto is say \$10. In that case the holder of the ticket gets nothing for the unused portion of it, and so receives no benefit from this section of the Bill. That is the plain reading of the Bill, and if that is so, it affords no protection and no compensation whatever to the travelling public for that portion of the ticket not used. The main features of this Bill have been before some of the States of the Union for some time. I am not aware it has been adopted by any State except Pennsylvania. I know that scores of States have rejected that Bill. I am not aware that New York has adopted it; if it has adopted it it must have been last year, because I do not think it was in the Statute book of New York before last year. It was said that Pennsylvania passed it solely through the influence of the railway kings of that State. Now, let us see what the leading newspaper organs of the United States have had to say upon the principle of this Bill. Most every clause of my hon. friend's Bill are to be found in a Bill that was introduced into the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, and the 9th clause, I think, is about identical with a similar clause in a Bill introduced into the

Kentucky Legislature. The *St. Louis Globe*, a paper with a very large circulation, and supposed to represent correctly the sentiments of the people on this subject, says:

"Instead of legislating to break up the 'scalping,' it would be much better if legislators would devote their attention to the punishment of railway companies which offer low rates as an inducement to purchase tickets, and then forbid the using of the tickets except at their royal pleasure."

The *Louisville Commercial* says:

"The Bill (introduced in Kentucky Senate) is simply scandalous: the travelling public have few enough rights as it is; and the Kentucky Legislature should consign this villainous Bill at once and for ever to the limbo of all vicious legislation."

Now, I do not propose to consign my hon. friend's Bill to the "limbo of all vicious legislation," I only propose to put it under the Table. The *Chicago Tribune* says upon the subject:

"We regard the Railroad Ticket Scalper's Bill as a blunder, and have an idea that it will be declared unconstitutional."

The *Courier-Journal*, published in Kentucky, says:

"The Bill (pending in the Kentucky Legislature) should be called 'An Act for the Perpetration of Frauds on Travellers.'"

My hon. friend is quite willing to prevent frauds upon the railway companies; but I think they are sufficiently protected on this subject already. It is perfectly well known that frauds upon travellers are constantly being perpetrated. The *Cincinnati Gazette* says:

"Railroad tickets are sold to bearer, as bank notes are issued to bearer, and, of course, are transferable. It is clear enough that this traffic is legal."

Well, where is the saving to the travelling public in the United States? It does appear to me that this Bill, instead of saving money to the great mass of the people, will be a very serious injury to them. I shall oppose the hon. member's Bill at every stage. I think it is a step in the wrong direction, and I regret to see that it is seconded by the hon. gentleman who sits beside him, and who, instead of legislating in the interests of the great railroad companies, ought to direct his attention to protecting the interests of the travelling public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The argument addressed to me by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, appears to me to be founded upon a misapprehension of facts. His whole argument rests upon the basis that the railway company contracts to carry one person between two given points, and that that contract involves the obligation to carry any person, or any number of persons, who may purchase that ticket between those two points. Now, that is not the contract the railway companies make when selling a ticket. The railway company sells a ticket to an individual for the purpose of carrying that same individual from one point to another, and the party who uses that ticket for any other purpose than that for which he bought it, commits a fraud upon the railway company from whom the ticket was purchased. The hon. gentleman himself has stated that the railway company in Boston, in times of sharp competition, sells a ticket to a party, to carry him to Chicago, for a much less sum than he would have to pay to carry him to Toronto. Then, I ask the hon. gentleman, if in the face of it, that contract is not a contract to carry one and the same person, and not two different persons, between those two points? The hon. gentleman's own sense of justice, his own sense of a commercial transaction, will at once show him that the contract is not to carry two different persons over the distance between two extreme points, but to carry one and the same person, because, otherwise, it would be quite impossible to carry out the intention of the company in giving a ticket from Boston to Chicago. The hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend, who introduced the Bill, has

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

given no sufficient grounds for it. I think he has offered the very strongest grounds for the favorable reception of this measure by the House, that it is possible for any hon. gentleman to offer in favor of any Bill. What does the hon. gentleman show? Why, he has shown that this process of ticket scalping is a cause of fraud and dishonesty in the country, and that, moreover, it causes railway conductors to become dishonest, because it puts before them the temptation not to punch the tickets, and in not punching the tickets when they take them up, they can sell them for money. The Bill of my hon. friend makes it impossible to sell it, because the party receiving it cannot sell it again. The result is that the present system affords great temptation to dishonesty, and causes honest men to become thieves by exposing them to temptation. It is well known to any person that has anything to do with railway management, that this system is a fruitful cause of fraud and dishonesty in conductors, because by not discharging their duty in punching the ticket they are able to dispose of it to their own advantage. The party who purchases from the conductor also becomes a party to the fraud, and becomes an avowed assistant in the act, because he knows when he buys that ticket from the conductor that it has not been punched, and he therefore occupies the position of a receiver of stolen property. The hon. gentleman says that it is not the poor, but that it is the sharp practitioner who becomes the purchaser of these tickets and who makes the profit. But with what result? Why, with the result that the party who in the first place failed in punching the ticket, and the party who purchases it from the conductor, all become parties to a fraud, and have become so owing to the present condition of the law. Now, Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman if the House should not adopt a measure that is calculated to check any possible means of fraud, and means of fraud so palpable that they are known to be widely adopted all over the country, and to be, not only calculated to demoralize, but to be absolutely demoralizing. There are hundreds of people throughout the country connected with these transactions, and I ask if that is not a sufficient reason for the House adopting such legislation as will meet the difficulty. The hon. gentleman said that this Bill is entirely in the interests of the railway companies, and not in the interests of the travelling public. Suppose it were, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that it is not proper to pass any legislation in the interests of railway companies, if it can be shown to be honest and fair and just legislation? All this Bill asks from this House is to give such protection to the great railway interests of this country as they are entitled to receive at its hands, for the purpose of preventing their being made subjects of dishonesty and fraud, for the benefit of any person. I ask the hon. gentleman if he is so anxious to promote the interests of the travelling public, is he prepared to promote them by means dishonest and fraudulent. I ask him if that is the position he is disposed to take. I do not believe that the great travelling public of this country will thank the hon. gentleman for adopting such a position as this: that for the purpose of protecting them he is obliged to resist and throw out a measure which strikes at an open, known, notorious, fraudulent practice, existing in the country. I believe that the hon. members of this House have but a small idea, a very inadequate idea, of the prevalence of this custom, and the demoralizing tendency that the law, as it now stands, has exercised, and the measure, therefore, is one which, I think, on that ground alone, is worthy the careful consideration of the House. I believe the House will think very seriously of the responsibility that would be assumed by it, in refusing to send this Bill to a Committee where it could be carefully examined in the light of any testimony that could be brought for or against the measure, so that it would finally be a measure well calculated to promote the end in view. When the hon.

gentleman says that this Bill is entirely in the interests of railway corporations, I say no. I say that the passage of this Bill is in the interests of the travelling public. All the travelling public have a right to receive is that for which they pay. All the accommodation any member of the travelling public has a right to receive from a railway corporation is a proper consideration for the amount of money he pays. He pays money for a certain given and specific purpose, and he is entitled to receive all that he pays for, but nothing more. The hon. gentleman says the Bill will not benefit the travelling public; but I answer that a means of preventing ticket scalping is eminently in the interests of the travelling public, as, thereby, these corporations and their managers can give greater facilities with reference to the use of railway tickets when they are protected against the unjust, unfair, and dishonest use of these tickets after they are sold. Take the subject of the return tickets. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say, that because a man buys a ticket from a railway agent, and pays for it a certain sum of money, which will enable him to travel 1,000 miles and return, that it is doing a just act or one that is fair to the company, or honest as regards himself, if he travels to the extent of his journey and sells the return ticket to another person to enable him to travel over a road at a rate which he could not otherwise travel over it?

An hon. MEMBER. Why not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let the hon. gentleman go to the Allan Company, asking for a return ticket to England, and what will they do? They will sell him a ticket for, say, \$100, and if he asks for a return ticket they give him one for \$140. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that that return ticket, which they have sold him at a greatly reduced rate because he is coming back by their line, can be honestly used by selling it for \$90 or \$100 to another man, who otherwise would have to pay the full single fare, and who, by this means, cheats the Allan Company out of the just passage money? I say that a man who uses his ticket in that way defrauds the company, and makes himself a dishonest man; and I say that the effect of this Bill is to strike at that dishonesty, and the very fact that any hon. gentleman can question such a proposition is to me a proof how widespread and demoralizing the tendency is, and how necessary it is to have some efficient means taken to check this practice. Apply the same rule to any other transaction in the world, and its dishonesty will at once be admitted; but because the contract is in the form of a railway ticket, parties seem to suppose that they may obtain the services of a railway corporation, which the latter have never engaged to undertake, and which the party has not fairly or honestly obtained. The same principle that applies to return tickets applies also to excursion tickets. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me—is there one hon. gentleman here who will stand up and say, that it would be an honest act for a man to go to a railway company and pay for an excursion ticket, on account of which he is carried 500 miles at one-fourth the ordinary rate, and then use this ticket for ordinary travelling purposes? Everybody knows that on such occasions the company provides means of carrying say a thousand people, and if a thousand people are carried at one time they are carried at a much smaller cost to the company than they could be carried by ordinary trains, and therefore the company gives the public the benefit of the reduced cost. I say a man that uses an excursion ticket in that way uses it for a purpose contrary to the contract which he has made with the company, and uses it in a dishonest way. That is my view of what is fair and honest, and I think it is a view which will commend itself to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. The present law leads not only to fraud but to forgery. It not only has a tendency to demoralize the conductor,

the ticket scalper, and the private individual who purchases from the scalper, knowing at the same time that he is defrauding the company, but it leads to wholesale forgery. The very fact that these tickets can be sold is a strong incentive to widespread forgery in relation to these tickets, and that such forgery can be successfully practiced is one strong reason for asking the protection to the companies which this Bill will afford. The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill has placed it on a foundation so broad and strong, and given such cogent reasons why it should be accepted, at least, in its general principles, with such modifications as may be required, that I do not feel it necessary to detain the House much longer, and I do not believe this House can be led to treat a Bill of this kind in the mode suggested by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that there was something wrong in the Bill because it provided that the Minister of Railways could appoint agents for the sale of railway tickets. I do not think that will be a great injury to the country. I am not inclined to think it would be; but the very fact that hon. gentlemen have been obliged to discover that in the Bill which is not to be found there, is the best evidence of the difficulty they experience in constructing an argument against it. There is no such proposal in the Bill. It provides that the Minister of Railways shall appoint agents for the sale of tickets on the Intercolonial Railway, and that all companies shall appoint agents for the sale of tickets over their own lines, and, therefore, the Bill is not open to the objection which has been raised. I believe the more this measure is examined, the more it will be found to be in the interests of justice and of honesty, and I trust it will receive the favorable consideration of the House; and there will be no objection to sending it to a Committee, where testimony may be received, and where the hon. gentlemen will, I have no doubt, have evidence tendered that will astonish them very much as to the frauds that are perpetrated in regard to the sale of railway tickets as the law at present exists. I can only say that, so far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, I have known that a great deal of fraud takes place, and I have appointed detectives and used every possible means for the purpose of ferreting it out; but while it remains a perfectly honest transaction for a ticket scalper to sell a ticket to any point; it is next to impossible to remedy the difficulty and prevent its recurrence. I trust the Bill will receive the favorable consideration of the House, and will go to a Committee which will be able to examine it and deal with it on its merits.

Mr. SPROULE. I think any merits which the Bill possesses are counteracted by the last clause. It provides for the redemption of unused tickets. A contract is entered into between the railway company on one hand and a passenger on the other, that the latter shall be carried between two points, and if, from accident or circumstances over which he has no control, he be compelled after travelling part of the distance to leave the train, he has no remedy. By the clause of the Bill it is distinctly stated that he shall be able to redeem any unused portion "at a rate which shall be equal to the difference between the price paid for the whole ticket and the cost of a ticket between the points for which a portion of the said ticket was actually used." If it had read: "rate paid for the ticket that the party holds," then the passenger would have got back something. Take the case of a passenger purchasing a ticket from Boston to Chicago for \$12, the cost from Toronto to Chicago being \$6. He arrives at the latter point, and, on getting out of the train, wants to sell his ticket. No sum will be due, as the cost from Toronto to Chicago will consume the balance. Besides, there might not be an official to return any balance, and it could not make any difference to a railway company to carry two passengers, if, between them, they covered the

same distance, as to carry one the whole distance. Another reason why the Bill should not become law was because the present custom was for railway companies to appoint agents to sell tickets under the circumstances complained of. When companies issued excursion tickets they were not responsible for damages under special circumstances, and if a second party travelled on the ticket it would be on like conditions. I admit that there is some force in the contention that railway companies make special provision for carrying a large number of passengers at a certain time and special rate, and that, under those circumstances, the companies should not be compelled to carry parties at different times at the same rate, but the effect of the Bill is nullified by the last clause. If the last clause were adjusted it would still be open to the companies to appoint agents to redeem tickets or not. In order to make the Bill effective in the public interest, it will be necessary to insert a clause compelling the companies at every station to appoint agents to redeem tickets only partially used. Until such clauses are inserted the Bill is not in the interest of the travelling public. The tendency of the decisions of our courts is against the public; it is not so in the States. In this country an individual has practically no redress against companies. When this is the case there should be some machinery to compel them to protect the public.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I do not know much about the subject practically, but if I understand it aright a great wrong is done to railway companies. If a passenger takes a ticket from Boston to Chicago for say \$10, and if he stops at Toronto, the cost from that point to Chicago being more than from Boston to Chicago, and at Toronto sells his ticket, a fraud is committed on the railway company. This is not done by persons who are compelled to leave the train but by those who purchase tickets at Boston and do not intend to go to Chicago, but purpose getting off at Toronto, selling their tickets, and making money out of the transaction. Whether this Bill will meet the difficulty and will prevent what I consider to be frauds on railway companies, I do not know. Under the circumstances, if it is possible by legislation to protect the companies in this regard, it is our duty to do so. I think, however, that the companies should have the power to protect themselves by regulations printed on the tickets, stating for example that they are not transferable. A remedy should at all events be found for the difficulty.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk): While I have no sympathy with ticket scalpers, I think the trouble originates with the railway companies themselves, when they undertake to carry passengers, in some cases two or three times a greater distance, for the same amount in some cases than in others. There is no trouble in carrying passengers such as there is in taking freight which requires handling; let the companies, therefore, regulate their rates on principles adjusted. I am not prepared to say that I will not vote for the second reading, because I think something should be done.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think either the mover of the Bill or the hon. the Minister of Railways has succeeded in making out a case in favor of the principle of the Bill. In my opinion, legislation has gone altogether too far in that direction already, and it is because the public are placed in an unfair and unequal position as compared with the railway companies that the transactions have arisen of which the hon. gentlemen has complained and undertaken to remedy by this extraordinary Bill now before the House. If, Sir, you look at the facts as they are, you will find that these corporations are not simply private companies. They are quasi-public corporations. We have given them powers which do not usually belong to private corporations. We have given them power to acquire and hold property taken from private individuals, to appropriate that property to their own uses, and, in many cases, almost on their own terms; and it is

Mr. SPROULE.

because we believe they can be made to serve the public as public carriers that we have permitted them to do this. But when the public, individually, come to deal with these corporations, we find that they do not stand on a footing of equality with them; and the well known rule in Courts of Equity is, that when two parties enter into a contract in which they do not stand on a footing of equality, the court will not allow the contract to override the strict principles of equity in the case. They do not, for example, allow a contract between a guardian and a ward, because the parties do not stand on a footing of equality; and to allow a railway company to print on its ticket, or on its bill of lading, the terms and conditions on which they will carry passengers and freight, seems to me a monstrous proposition, though it is constantly acted upon. It is simply because they are permitted to do so that the evils have arisen of which the hon. Minister of Railways and the mover of the Bill complain. With regard to the condition "not transferable," when I purchase a railway ticket from an agent I do not bind myself that I shall travel on that ticket. Supposing a person, who desires to travel on a road with the members of his family, buys, say half-a-dozen tickets, does he bind himself to the condition that one particular member of his family shall travel upon a particular ticket? There is no such contract as the hon. Minister of Railways refers to, for he may travel on the ticket himself, or he may give it to any member of his family, or to a stranger. Yet the railway companies print on their tickets "not transferable," and I suppose if they could identify the particular party who uses a ticket, they could, under the law, enforce what is a very unjust obligation; and if the hon. gentleman undertook to repeal that law, he would be moving in the right direction. The obligation is one which is forced on the party buying the ticket. Say that the person who buys the ticket wishes to travel from Ottawa to Toronto; he is handed a ticket on which is printed "not transferable." He says: "I do not want a ticket on these terms." He finds that he cannot make terms with the company; he must accept the particular terms which they impose upon him, or he cannot go at all. It is nonsense to talk of an obligation of that kind being a binding contract between the parties in any just or equitable sense, and it is because such obligations are attempted to be imposed that the difficulties have arisen of which the hon. gentleman complains. If railway companies had uniform rates of travel they would not have the slightest interest in saying that A should travel on a ticket instead of B; it would be a matter of no consequence to them; but having taken advantage of their power to charge different rates for travel and traffic from different points at the very time that the public are seeking to mitigate the mischievous effects of that power, they come here and ask us to come to their aid against the public by the Bill which is now before the House. A man who buys a ticket from a railway company buys the power to travel from one point to another, and, so far as the question of right is concerned, so far as those principles are concerned which justify Parliament in granting the power to expropriate property from private individuals to a corporation—so far as every consideration of public interest is concerned, which justifies us in creating railway corporations—that is all that they have a right to require. They have no right to say that A shall not travel a portion of the way because B has purchased a ticket between two particular points. It can be a matter of no consequence to them, except that they wish to charge different rates between different points on the line, and we have no right, in my opinion, to interfere in their behalf, and assist them against the public, who are seeking to protect themselves against this power on the part of the corporation. I think the Bill should not be read the second time.

Mr. PLUMB. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has made use of very ingenious arguments, and has

uttered a great many of what might be called half truths. There is no doubt that the purchaser of a railway ticket acquires the right to travel on that ticket, and if there are any regulations printed upon railway tickets which are against the common law of the country, they do not bind the purchaser thereto. This has been held in a great many cases in which actions have arisen between railway companies and the holders of tickets. It has been held that if a person has a gratuitous ticket or pass upon which the company state that they will not hold themselves responsible for any damage, such a condition cannot be enforced on the part of the company, or that they are thereby exonerated from any damage that may ensue. If a person makes a bargain with a company to travel on their line he is entitled to travel on it in the way in which the ticket gives him permission. If he starts on an excursion train he is bound to go through on that train, because he is carried at a lower price by a special arrangement which does not apply to ordinary trains. If a man buys a ticket at Chicago, he buys it at a competing point, at a point at which, in consequence of the competition between roads, the railway company is obliged, perhaps for a time, to lose money in order to maintain its traffic, and he has no right to speculate on that ticket. He has a right to go through, and if he does not go through the company should be bound to redeem that ticket in proportion to the number of miles for which he has travelled and no more. I believe it often happens that our Canadian companies are subject to unfair cut-throat competition by the railways of the United States, and if they do not meet that competition by lowering their prices at competing points they lose money; they lose their business to the ultimate loss of the public, as they are thereby prevented from giving them proper accommodation. The Grand Trunk, for example, would soon become a fourth class railway, running a few passenger trains, with their cars not put in repair and at great risk to life, if they could not compete fairly with other roads for other traffic, and when there is no competition they get fair rates and some remuneration for the business. The evil is not that they carry passengers at too high a rate where there is no competition, but that they are obliged to carry them at too low a price at competing points, in order to maintain the traffic which is necessary for their success. It is no injustice to us if a man who travels from Boston to Chicago should travel for a lower rate proportionately than we have to pay, provided we are carried in proper time, with proper accommodation, and at a reasonable charge. That is the manner in which to consider it, stripped of all excitement and prejudice. That is the fair way to look at it and no other. I believe there are great evils growing out of this system of scalping. I believe there are difficulties affecting the whole railway system, and, while I do not propose to defend any injustice on the part of the railways, I say that, as great corporations which have done infinite service to this Dominion, they have been largely instrumental in developing the prosperity of this country, and as the shareholders of these corporations have furnished the money by which we have great public accommodation, they should receive adequate remuneration for their services, and they are entitled to our consideration whenever a question comes up in regard to them. They are entitled to justice, but they are entitled to nothing more. Under these circumstances, I believe it is desirable that Parliament should calmly investigate the question which is involved in this Bill; not that I intend to commit myself to the advocacy of the passage of the Bill if it be found, on hearing evidence and upon examining the facts, that we ought not to allow it to pass; but I say that any proposition of this kind, fairly brought forward and embracing questions on which there is a wide difference of opinion in this House, should not be strangled on the proposition

for the second reading. It is a courtesy seldom refused to any hon. member who brings forward a measure of this kind, and, unless there is very grave objection, that courtesy ought to be extended. I would like to hear evidence on this subject, for I confess that, in this respect, I am in the same position as many other hon. members, that I am not fully conversant with all the difficulties which are sought to be remedied by this Bill. I would like to hear evidence on both sides. I would like to see what case is made out by those gentlemen who propose to spend money for the purpose of obtaining legislation upon this subject; and I would like to see what case is made out on the other side. I think this Bill should pass the second reading, and be referred to a Committee, so that after evidence is taken, and the Committee has reported, the House will be able, without prejudging the case, to decide whether the Bill should become law or not. I do not believe in condemning it in advance, and the hon. member introducing it is entitled to have a fair chance, and for that reason the Bill should be read the second time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The House should not leave the matter as it now stands. We must either pass some such Bill as this, or we must legalize the business of ticket scalping. I do not agree myself with all the arguments that are based upon the assertion that a ticket is a contract. A ticket may be a contract in form but it is not one in reality, because the purchaser is not asked to agree to any terms; he simply asks what the fare will be to a certain place, and he supposes he gets something that will carry him to that place. There may be a lot of conditions printed on the ticket, it is notorious that it is so, but the passenger is not asked to assent to them. I think it is quite open to discussion whether we should not render railway tickets transferable; but I do urge that we should not leave the law in its present state. If, as the mover of the Bill has asserted, a great many poor people are being wronged by being lead to purchase tickets from scalpers, then Parliament should either suppress the business or legalize it. Hon. members who have advocated the Bill have not attempted to answer the objection urged by the hon. member for South Huron against the redemption clause. That clause is of no value as it now stands; it is practically worthless; because there may be places where a passenger wished to redeem his ticket, and no person there to pay him; and the Bill ought to provide that the amount to be paid as redemption money shall be a fair proportion, having regard to the distance travelled, as compared with the whole price of the ticket. If those amendments were made, I think the House would feel justified in giving a favorable consideration. The Bill should go to a Committee, but I do not wish to commit myself very strongly to the principle of the Bill, because the House will have to consider whether it should not make railway tickets negotiable or transferable.

Mr. IVES. It seems to me that the scope of this Bill is to create a new offence in Criminal Law. It makes it an offence, punishable by fine, for any person except the persons appointed to deal in railway tickets, to buy or sell such tickets. If we are creating a new offence under the Criminal Law, it should be perfectly clear and apparent that there is necessarily illegality or immorality in the transaction. It does not at all follow that because there are illegal tickets, forged tickets, or tickets the dates of which have been altered, all tickets which are bought and sold by persons not authorized by railway companies are out of date, forged or illegal. When a Bill goes so far as to say that the dealing in this commodity shall be an offence whether the tickets bought or sold are good or bad, is, I think, going very far indeed. If the hon. member had limited the scope of the Bill, to making it an offence punishable by fine to sell a ticket that was out of date or a non-transfer-

nable ticket, I could have understood the principle upon which the Bill rests. The whole question of immorality or otherwise of dealing in railway tickets rests upon whether the ticket is transferable or not—whether the ticket is a contract between the company and he who takes it, that he, and he only, should be carried, and that no one else should be carried in his place. Now, I am quite aware that in Canada our courts, as a rule, have held that tickets on which the words “not transferable” are printed are not transferable, and that a railway company may put off the cars any one, other than the original purchaser, who seeks to ride on it. But I am equally aware that the courts in all the New England States—and I am speaking from knowledge—have refused to give that interpretation to such words; and that, upon the Grand Trunk Railway, the conductors on one side of the line receive one set of instructions, and the very opposite on the other side, on this subject. On one side they are authorized to kick a person from the cars riding on a ticket of a past date, or which he did not originally purchase, while on the other side they are cautioned against that course under the same circumstances, so long as the ticket has not been used before, no matter who is using it then. Many tickets dealt in by those scalpers are bought in Boston or other American cities, the words “not transferable” not being on them at all. And it is a well-known principle in law that a contract is to be interpreted, whenever it is sought to be enforced, by the law of the place wherein it was made. Now, this contract was entered into in Boston, and, by the law of that place, it is perfectly good for anybody to ride on between the points covered. If my interpretation be correct, when that ticket comes to Montreal, and any other person there purchases it and seeks to ride upon it, he has a right to do so, under the law of the place where it was purchased, and parties have a right to purchase these tickets and sell them. Therefore, it does not, as a rule, follow that all tickets dealt in by those scalpers are illegal, and that their trade is nefarious and immoral. It may be said, that to deal in tickets out of date is illegal. Well, it seems to me that is no reason why we should make it an offence to deal in legal tickets. The dates of promissory notes are occasionally altered to take them out of the statute of limitations. But will my hon. friend, who proposes this Bill, make it illegal to buy and sell those notes, because sometimes their dates are changed for this purpose? When the House undertakes to say that such and such a person shall deal in those tickets, and that any one else who deals in them, whether legal or illegal, shall be guilty of a new offence, it is going very far indeed. If an offence is committed by those scalpers—if they alter the date of a ticket and commit forgery, we have a law to punish them; and it will be no more difficult to catch them under that law, than under the proposed law. I do not see what is to be gained by the Bill; but I am sure, so far as I know, that the feeling in the country is very much opposed to making a new criminal offence of dealing in railway tickets. I think it would be much wiser for the House to remove all grounds for saying it is immoral, by amending the law in the sense recommended by my hon. friend who spoke last—namely, making all tickets good until used. It is intimated that those railway excursions are got up in the interest of the public. I was always under the impression that the railway companies got them up for their own benefit, to induce a very large number of people to make trips who at the ordinary rate would not think of them. As to the matter of return tickets, I cannot agree with the hon. the Minister of Railways that it is necessary for the same person to go and return. The intention of companies is to secure the return of the passenger by their line rather than by some other road, and not to secure the return of any particular person. I have no objection to the Bill being read a second time; because if it

Mr. Ives.

comes into Committee, I should like to move an amendment to all the clauses, providing that hereafter railway tickets shall be considered good until used, no matter in whose hands they may be.

Mr. McCUAIG. There are certain well-defined principles in commercial transactions which should be applied in this case. For instance, when a man proposes to leave Boston for Montreal, and gets a ticket at a low rate, in consequence of the competition between those points, he is guilty of bad faith at the beginning if he buys, not intending to go to the place named; he really wishes to buy a ticket for the purpose of making a profit out of it. If it were shown that the railways of Canada had charged an exorbitant rate, enabling them to pay enormous dividends to their stockholders, I could well understand that Parliament should interfere with their course. But, unfortunately for Canada, and more unfortunate for those who hold stock in its railway companies, I am not aware they have ever received dividends, and until you can show that reasonable dividends have been paid, I think we have no real fault to find with the arrangements of those companies. We know that the competition on the American railway lines has been so serious, that we have to depart occasionally from those strict rules that, under other circumstances, might be enforced. I contend that a man who buys a ticket in Boston for some other place, by way of Montreal, when he really wishes to go to Montreal only, is guilty of a certain amount of deception towards the company. The agents at Chicago, say, impressed with the idea that a ticket purchaser is going to Boston, in good faith sells him a ticket by a Canadian line, and so far as that is concerned the railway companies have in every instance acted in perfect good faith—the ticket to be good from Chicago to Boston—but they naturally are not willing, because it is not agreed, to carry one man to Montreal and another man to Boston on the same ticket. In cases of expediency it might, perhaps, be justifiable, but you cannot evoke any principle of right and justice in support of a proposal to force companies to act in the manner proposed. No one who votes against a Bill intended to correct this wrong can plead justice in its defence. I am sorry to say that many in Canada seem to run away with the idea that railways are built for the express purpose of carrying persons and traffic at rates which may suit their convenience, whether remunerative or not to those corporations. In the first place, the Canadian people have contributed largely towards the construction of those roads and the reduction of their capital stock, thus enabling many companies to proceed. But notwithstanding that, the capital has been so reduced, they have not been able to pay 1 per cent. dividend to the stockholders. That knowledge being before the country, it is wrong to charge these companies with practicing extortion or fraud against the public. As this law is intended to give fair protection to the railway companies, I shall give it my support.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I think we should allow this Bill to go to a second reading, because the subject involved is a very important one. I fear that if we should refuse to let it go to a Committee, so that these clauses could be put into a practical shape, the impression would go abroad that this House is inclined rather to protect these scalping gentlemen rather than to look into the matter to see if the evil cannot be remedied. These ticket scalpers are not honest men trying to make an honest livelihood, but they are dishonest men, trying to make money by fraud. I think the matter should be investigated. We should not allow it to be said that this House refused to consider a Bill so important.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). I think from the description I have heard there is certainly a wrong somewhere.

There is an axiom in law that no man should be tried by a single Judge but rather by a jury. The hon. member asks that this Bill be submitted to a Committee, and if there is anything wrong to set it right. I do not think the railway companies should control this House, and I do not think the ticket scalpers should rule this House. Let a Committee investigate it as they investigate any other Bill, unless it emanates from the Government. If the railway companies are doing an injustice to the travelling community let us remedy that injustice. If the ticket scalpers have to go out of the business let them take up some other means of earning an honest livelihood. I believe we should submit this Bill to a Committee to investigate and report upon, and, if the Bill is not what it ought to be, we can throw it out and let the matter go on as at present.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee composed of Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Albert J. Smith, and Messrs. Weldon, Brecken, Desjardins, Guthrie and the mover.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better to refer the Bill to the Railway Committee. It can then be considered by a sub-Committee and afterwards the Bill will come back to us with the authority that a Committee can impress upon it. It seems to me to be a peculiar Bill and that we ought to refer it to a Standing Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend. I was under the impression it would go to the Committee on Railways. As a matter of course they would appoint a sub-Committee, and when the sub-Committee reported, with the evidence which had been laid before the Railway Committee, their report, whatever it may be, will have very great weight with the House and the country.

Motion withdrawn, and Bill read the second time.

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

After Recess.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 11) to amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person, said: I introduced this Bill in the hope that the Minister of Justice would deal with the question. I do not propose discussing it at length, but will make one or two observations on the subject, and give one or two reasons why I think this Bill should become law. It is known that the offence which I propose to make criminal by this Bill is not an indictable offence under the common law, and that no statute has been passed, either in this country or in England that I am aware of, making it a criminal offence. Of course they have in England a mode of dealing with it that we have not in Canada. In England notice is taken of it in the Spiritual Courts. In Canada we have no Spiritual Courts, and therefore there is no way in which we can deal with this offence. I never could understand the reason why this offence—perhaps one of the worst that possibly could be committed—has never been brought within the pale of the Criminal Law. My attention was particularly drawn to the question during the last fall circuit, when one of the grossest cases which I think I ever heard or read of came before my notice—a case in which a father was charged with having committed this offence with his daughter. The evidence was clear that the offence had been committed. The father was charged with having committed the crime of a rape; in my judgment the evidence fell short of establishing that charge; but so prejudiced, if I may use the expression, were the jury against the committer of such a flagrant outrage that the man was convicted of rape, and, I am glad to say, was sent for ten years to the penitentiary.

Now, I do not see why this offence—one against decency and every moral sentiment—should not be brought within the pale of the Criminal Law. As the law stands now, one who commits this offence may escape unwhipped of justice. Our Criminal Law, which provides for the protection of females in every direction but this one, inflicts very serious punishment on persons who commit offences of that kind. They are liable to go to the penitentiary for a series of years, and are subject, in some instances, to corporal punishment. My own opinion is that this is the kind of punishment that ought to be inflicted, and that very severely, for such offences. We have already provided that an offence against a female under a certain age shall be a felony, and that the same kind of offence against a female between the ages of ten and twelve shall be a misdemeanor. We have provided that assault with intent shall be a misdemeanor, and that the offender shall be liable to be imprisoned and flogged at the discretion of the court. But while we have done all that, we have left this most beastly and disgraceful of crimes without any punishment whatever. I see no reason why that should be so. There is another reason—which may, perhaps, not weigh so strongly, but is still a reason—why this should be made a criminal offence. The hon. gentleman who leads the House knows that a man who may be charged innocently with this offence, has no redress whatever. He cannot bring a civil action, and has no redress unless he can prove that he has sustained some pecuniary loss. I know of a case in which a Methodist minister was charged with having committed this offence with his own daughter, and it was held by our courts that there was no redress for him. He could not recover, because he was not charged with a criminal offence. It is singular that while in this country no punishment has been provided for this offence, almost every State in the American Union has made this a criminal offence, and attached severe punishment to it. In the State of Vermont, for instance, I find that it is an offence against their Statute Law for a man to have criminal intercourse with the mother, the grandmother, the step-mother, the daughter, the grand-daughter, the grandfather's wife, the son's wife, the wife's mother, the wife's grandmother, the wife's daughter, the wife's grand-daughter, the sister, the brother's daughter, the sister's daughter, the father's sister, and the mother's sister, and the punishment is five years in the State prison, with a fine of \$1,000. In the State of Maine the prohibition extends to exactly the same class of cases, and the punishment is ten years in the State prison. In the State of Michigan the prohibition is the same, and the punishment fifteen years in the State prison; in Iowa the prohibition is the same and the punishment ten years imprisonment; in Ohio, the law provides that this offence committed with any person within the relationship of first cousins is a criminal offence, and the offender is liable to imprisonment for ten years; in Minnesota, the prohibition extends to the same class of persons as in Ohio, and the punishment is two years in the State prison; in New Hampshire, the prohibition is the same as in Ohio, and the punishment one year in the State prison and a fine of \$100; in Massachusetts, the prohibition is the same, and the punishment twenty years in the State prison; in New York, the prohibition is practically the same, and the punishment ten years imprisonment; in the State of Pennsylvania, the prohibition is the same as in Ohio, and the punishment is imprisonment in the State prison and the forfeit by the offender of one-third of his estate; in Wisconsin, the punishment is two years imprisonment; and so on throughout nearly all the States in America. In my Bill, I fix a medium punishment—I say that a person guilty of that offence shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary for ten years, and shall be liable to be flogged. I think, if flogging is justifiable in any case, it is in cases of this kind. I find that even in

India this offence is made penal by their criminal code. While we are sending almost every day missionaries to christianize the people of India, and spending hundreds of thousands to make them better than we suppose they are, in this respect they are far ahead of us. They make it a criminal offence there, and it is a criminal offence according to their penal code, and offenders are liable to be imprisoned. With regard to the first class of cases provided for in the Bill, I am not sure it will be wise at present to include them. The Bill was taken from the law in the State of Indiana, where prohibition extends to a step-daughter. I am not particular whether it extends that far or not; but in regard to the other classes of cases provided for by the Bill, I think it is the duty of Parliament to make this serious offence criminal by Statute. I propose adding, in line eleven, after the words, "or such," the following—"or if any grandparent shall have intercourse with his grandchild." With these observations, and trusting the Government will see the propriety of making this an offence by law, so that the strong arm of the law will reach any person who so far forgets what is due to our common humanity to commit an offence of this kind, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can quite understand the motives that induce the hon. gentleman to introduce this Bill. The case which came under his own special notice, I suppose, while acting as Crown Prosecutor, called his attention to its enormity, and very properly induced him to bring this subject before the House; but I think my hon. friend has not, and will not, under this Bill, attain what he would desire. In the first place the hon. gentleman already sees there perhaps may be an objection to one portion of the Bill, the first clause. I think that this sin, for it is not yet a crime, is connected more with the closeness of blood than with any other social relation, and if we are going to deal with this as a portion of the Criminal Law, we should keep the physiological distinction before us. Then the Bill is limited in too great a degree. The hon. gentleman has cited, for instance, a Bill passed by one of the States of the Union, in which the sin is made an offence, and is extended to blood relationships. I think this Bill should be carefully considered, and all blood relationships should be included as a whole, and not to the very limited extent that this clause provides. And then, I think, the hon. gentleman has forgotten to declare that the offence is a crime. He says the party shall be deemed guilty of incest. He might as well have declared that the party was guilty of hypocrisy or want of charity. The first clause must set out that incestual relations constitute either a felony or a misdemeanor. We have only the right to deal with sins when they are declared to be crimes, and we must legislate that they are crimes. I heartily concur in the motives which have induced the hon. member to introduce the Bill. I think, however, that it is not in such a perfect state as to warrant us in reading it a second time now, because there is no offence declared in the Bill and no principle in the measure. It simply says that any person who has this intercourse shall be held to be guilty of a sin, and, being guilty of a sin, shall be liable to certain punishment. We must, however, declare at the outset that the offence is a crime. I hope the hon. gentleman will move the adjournment of the debate, so that he can amend the Bill in this particular.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I quite agree that the Bill ought to have stated that the offence is a crime. If the hon. the First Minister approves of the principle of the Bill he can scarcely object to its reference to a Committee to consider whether the provisions of the Bill should extend to a larger class than that to which I have extended it. To declare the offence a crime can be done by adding one or two words.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the whole Bill.
Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Mr. BLAKE. The objection of the hon. the First Minister can be remedied very easily by saying not that the offender has been guilty of incest, but that he has been guilty of the crime of incest, because that will be declaring that incest is a crime.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would not do.

Mr. BLAKE. The fact is that the difference of opinion on this subject is so finely drawn that it involves purely grammatical considerations. I quite agree in the general view that we have no right to deal with a subject unless it is one that can be properly brought within the domain of the Criminal Law, and if not so, we should declare that the particular Act we are about to bring within the domain of the Criminal Law, shall be a crime. It will be quite palpable what the House intends to do if it passes the second reading. I cannot approve of the course which the hon. the First Minister proposes, as it would amount to the order being discharged. As it appears to be the opinion of both sides of the House that incest ought to be declared a crime and punished, it will be a more sensible and more business-like course to allow the Bill to be read the second time and referred to a Select Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very difficult to treat an unbusiness-like Bill in a business-like way. I quite differ with my hon. friend opposite, with all due deference to him, that the insertion of the word "crime" would have the effect contended for, without altering the whole construction of the passage defining what our Criminal Law is. The list runs—treason, felony and misdemeanor, and it must come under one of those heads; it will not do to put it as the hon. gentleman has proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. When I spoke of the crime, I, of course, omitted to rank it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It must be ranked as one or other crime, but the Bill does not say which. I do not see how this Bill can go to a Committee as it is drawn. But really there is no sense in the Bill from my point of view.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why can you not add the word "misdemeanor?" That would be sufficient I think.

Mr. GUTHRIE. There is a decision as to what constitutes a crime that should lead us to regard this as sufficient. In a very celebrated case in England, the Court of Queen's Bench decided that the nature of the punishment is to be determined whether the offence came within the Criminal Law or not. There the punishment is of a criminal character and would be quite sufficient to show that we regarded the Act as an offence.

Mr. MILLS. It is also recognized that a crime should be considered misdemeanor if its class is not mentioned, and if this Bill declares certain offences a crime, they would be so regarded unless a further classification be given.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. According to the argument of one hon. friend opposite, the nature of the punishment defines the crime, and the nature of the punishment makes the offence a felony. If a man be sent to the penitentiary for ten years for an offence, it must be a felony. Another hon. gentleman opposite says this offence is a misdemeanor. There is the difficulty—settle it between you. The Bill was copied rather hastily from the Indiana Statute without due consideration. I do not think it can go to a Committee, or that it is fit to be adopted by the House. I think my hon. friend has made a great mistake in his law.

Mr. CAMERON. I understand the objection to the Bill is on this technical ground, but it is easy to insert the word felony or misdemeanor, as the case may be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no desire to prevent the introduction of such a measure, or its becoming

law—I quite agree with my hon. friend in some respects. If he would take my suggestion, and meet my difficulty—if he would adjourn the debate and propose a new clause, covering those difficulties, and widening the offence to the extent of the law enacted in another country, I should not oppose the reference of the Bill to a Committee.

Mr. CAMERON. I have no objection; but it would be better to refer it to a Special Committee with a view to consider that question carefully. Surely there could be no objection to that course. If it is a proper Bill to pass, it is for lawyers to settle the terms and formalities to make the Bill perfect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to a reference to a Special Committee on that understanding.

Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. THOMPSON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 58) to provide that railway passenger tickets shall be available to the holders thereof until used, said: The Bill is but short, and it requires but little explanation at my hands. There are but two clauses: one provides that all railway tickets purchased shall be available to the purchaser or holder thereof until used, and the second provides that no conditions shall be attached why it should not be used until the passenger receives the value for his money. I had intended to say a good deal more on the Bill; after the discussion this afternoon, I am pretty well convinced it is the better Bill of the two that has been introduced with reference to the railway tickets, and that it will receive a strong support. Therefore I move the second reading, and that it be referred to the Railway Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is rather a strong step to take, a motion to read the Bill a second time and refer it to the Railway Committee. I should have liked to have heard some argument or reason from the hon. gentleman why railways like any other corporations should not make conditional contracts—why they should be prevented from making contracts—why, notwithstanding any contract entered into willingly or unwillingly between parties, those arrangements might be set aside? The hon. gentleman is not arguing at all and has given no reason for it. It is not exactly in accord with the principle involved and sanctioned by the House in the disposal of the Bill before six o'clock. However, I would like very much to hear my hon. friend.

Mr. THOMPSON. I may just say that I am aware of many instances in which tickets have been sold to people who were not aware that they were entering into a contract with the railway company. They paid the company so much money a certain distance, and they expect that portion of the agreement to be carried out. If anything should occur to a passenger on the way, that requires him to delay his journey beyond the day which the ticket says it is good for, then he loses the ticket and his money too. To-day I have been informed of a gentleman who came from Winnipeg with a through ticket to this city. Upon his arrival at Brockville he was late by a day or two, the detention being caused by a storm, over which he had no control, and he had to pay again in order to complete his journey here. I believe there are many instances of this kind on record, and this Bill is to make the railway companies do what they ought to do—give value for the money they receive.

Mr. MILLS. I think this is a very necessary Bill, and it ought to receive the sanction of Parliament. I do not agree with the suggestion hinted at by the hon. the First Minister, that a railway company ought to be free to enter into a contract with individuals who have business with the road the same as two parties who are standing upon

a footing of equality. As I said this afternoon I say again: that a railway corporation and a private individual having business with it, do not stand on a footing of equality. A railway corporation is, to a large extent, a public corporation, and its public character cannot be overlooked by Parliament. It comes here and asks for certain special powers. You do with railway corporations what you scarcely ever do in any other case—you compel private parties, who have property along the line of railway, to part with that property, whether they are willing or not. You exercise towards the public at large, on behalf of the railway corporation, so far as their interests require, the right of eminent domain; you treat the railway corporation in that respect as a public body and not as a private proprietor. I think you are bound to see that the corporation exercises its powers in the public interest. You have a right to exercise over that corporation a restraining influence. You have a right to interfere with the freedom of contract in a way which you would not have any right to do in the case of two individuals who stand on a footing of equality. Now, if any person comes to a railway station for the purpose of having goods shipped by that railway, from that point to some other, or if they wish to go as passengers, they are not free to negotiate with the railways, they are not free to enter into a contract. The railway corporation can insist on their own terms. They prescribe whatever conditions they please; and because they have printed those conditions upon what is after all simply a receipt for the money which they acknowledge having received from a party, to carry some one from one point to another. I say this is regarded as a contract binding upon the party receiving it, and we are told that we are interfering with the freedom of the contract if we interfere with the railway corporation in this particular. I would refer the hon. the First Minister to an instance that recently occurred in Great Britain. Take the relation between landlord and tenant in Ireland. Upon what principle has the recent Bill regulating rents been based? Upon the principle that the tenant does not stand on a footing of equality with the landlord: that it is all nonsense to talk about applying the principles of freedom of contract between the parties. We have recognized the same principle over and over again in our jurisprudence. We do not permit a person to sell his property to his trustee; we do not permit a guardian to purchase a property from his ward. Every contract of that sort is closely scrutinized. Now railway corporations have certain corporate rights. They have certain special privileges and advantages that have been conferred upon them in the public interest. The rights of private parties have been interfered with by the State in consequence of the public duties these corporations have to discharge. My hon. friend proposes by this Bill to say that a railway corporation, when it receives money and gives a ticket, which is simply a receipt for that money, authorizing a party to be transferred from one point to another, shall fulfil that contract whether that party goes the whole journey or whether he goes part of it and transfers his right or receipt to another party. Take the case of postage stamps. The hon. gentleman's colleague sells postage stamps, and what are they? They are receipts for money; when that receipt is put upon a letter, it entitles the party who has dropped that letter into the Post Office to have it carried to any part of the Dominion. It is a receipt for the money and a promise to do a certain thing on the other. It is none of the postmaster's business whether that receipt has been stamped on the letter by the party who purchased it or some one else. So a railway corporation has no right, looking at its public character, to say we will give you a ticket and that ticket shall be good only for a certain time, and when that time expires you shall not force upon us a

contract for which you have received pay. In my opinion this is the very principle of the measure. All the difficulty that has been complained of, and which I shall not mention as having been complained of in another debate, because that would be irregular; but I say that all the difficulties that have grown up, relating to frauds committed by ticket scalpers and others, are simply attempts of the public to protect themselves against the special powers railway corporations possess. If the hon. gentleman would support this Bill, or permit some other similar measure to be carried, all those arguments, and all those acts which are designated as frauds would at once disappear. Why should a railway corporation interfere between two parties and say, although we have got the money we will not permit you to transfer your receipt and your interest in that receipt to another party. Why do they do so? Because we grant special privileges to railway corporations which are not enjoyed by individuals. But if Parliament does not give them that power it may be well to say, that having received the money for carrying a party from one point to another, the obligation shall be fulfilled, and that the party himself shall choose his own time when he will insist upon the completion of the obligation. It can make no difference to the company. What difference can it be to the railway company whether A or B travels on the ticket after the money has been received? They have entered into a contract to carry some one from one point to another, and if that party does not see fit to go himself, the contract ought not to be regarded as binding upon him to go. I say that it can make no difference to the railway company whether A or B travels on that ticket, or whether both of them use it, one travelling a certain distance and the other travelling the remainder of the distance, if the company have received their pay. What we have to consider in this matter is the public interest, and I say the public interest will be served and promoted, and the grievances that have been felt by the public will, to a certain extent, be remedied by the Bill now before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not suppose it required this elaborate argument from my hon. friend to convince me that Parliament has the power to interfere with contracts. We do so continually. The hon. gentleman has no right to believe that I was opposed to the principle of this Bill. I merely said it was rather a strong measure to introduce without a word of explanation. I merely asked an explanation from my hon. friend who has introduced the Bill, to see whether I could accept the principle. After his very lucid and clear explanation of the principle of the Bill, and the great wrongs the public suffer from the want of such a Bill, I am convinced, with my hon. friend, that this Bill ought to go to the Railway Committee, and I am also convinced, with my hon. friend from Bothwell, that this Parliament has the right to legislate.

Bill read the second time.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT SACKVILLE.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH, in moving for copies of all correspondence relating to the superannuation of James D. Dixon, Collector of Customs, Sackville, and the appointment of his successor, William C. Milner, said: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Dixon is a highly respectable man living in my county. He has been connected with the Customs for many years, and I think the records of the Department will show that he has been a most able and efficient officer. The community in which he lives are very anxious to know the reasons why he was superannuated. His successor, Mr. Milner, I have nothing to say against, except that he is the publisher and editor of a very violent political paper in my county. Mr. Dixon, without any good reason, so far

Mr. MILLS.

as the public knows, was dismissed, and if there are any reasons for that dismissal they are anxious to have them known.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down all the papers in the hands of the Department. I am not aware that anything has been said against the respectability of Mr. Dixon, nor is there any record in the Department of that kind. He is admitted to be a very respectable man; but with Mr. Dixon, as with all of us if we live long enough, there is a period in his life when he became unfit to perform his duties, and from that fact, and a knowledge of the mode in which the business of that port was conducted, led to his superannuation. My hon. friend has not moved for any papers in reference to an assistant of Mr. Dixon, who was under the purview of that port. He also is a man highly respectable, but he had arrived at a time of life—his age was something like eighty, I believe—when it became necessary, in the interests of the revenue, and particularly for the protection of the revenue, that both gentlemen should be superannuated, and more active and live men, if I may use the expression, should be appointed to perform the duties. The very fact that since the change took place a number of seizures had been made from parties who were in the habit of defrauding the revenue, is the best evidence that the duties of the office are now being efficiently performed. I do not say that Mr. Dixon was unfit to sit in his office and perform the indoor work, but such was his age and state of health that we knew he was not fit for out-door work, hence, as I said before, a more active man was appointed. I am not prepared to admit the theory that because a gentleman is an editor of a newspaper opposed to my hon. friend, he was, therefore, unfit for such a position. Neither am I prepared to admit the theory that because a man was what might be called a violent politician he should not be eligible for such an office. If that theory were adopted in practice I am afraid there are few of my hon. friend's supporters, either in the Maritime Provinces or anywhere else, who would be fit for office. Mr. Milner is an active, energetic and educated man, who has shown the same attention and energy in the discharge of his duties as Collector of Customs that he displayed in conducting his newspaper, and if he proves as successful a Collector of Customs as he was an editor, I am sure the country will have cause to be thankful that such a change has been made.

Motion agreed to.

FUEL SUPPLIES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE moved:

That this House do forthwith resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the following Resolution:—

That the future of the vast Territories of the North-West is largely dependent on the supply of fuel at a moderate rate;

That the present information as to the country and the coal areas is not sufficient to warrant Parliament in creating long enduring interests in large quantities of the coal areas;

That the Regulations as to coal lands laid on the Table make no provision for the application, as a general rule, of the just principle of public competition to the acquisition of those valuable lands, and thus leave open the door to disadvantageous cessions of the public domain for the benefit of individuals;

That the said Regulations make no adequate provision to check the consolidation of large blocks of the coal lands in few hands, and the consequent restriction of competition and enhancement of the price of coal;

That the said Regulations make no provision to secure any working of the coal mines by the lessee;

That the said Regulations provide, by the arrangement for twenty-one year leases, renewable, for the creation of interests of longer duration than prudence at this time would, as a general rule, lay down;

That they make no proper provision for the settlement of the terms of renewal;

That the said Regulations do not become operative, if disapproved of by this House; and the House is responsible for their coming into operation;

That this House disapproves of the said Regulations.

He said: In asking the House to go into Committee of the Whole on the resolution of which I have given notice, I desire to say that there is perhaps no subject which, so far as we can forecast the future of the North-West Territories, is of greater consequence than—setting aside the question of railway construction and the question of the settlement and sale of agricultural lands—that of the fuel supply. When the hon. gentleman a year or two ago brought forward his proposal for the alteration of the law with reference to the disposal of the coal lands, I suggested the propriety, in view of the importance of this subject, of providing that the regulations to be from time to time made, should be operative only after being laid on the Table for a certain number of days without being disapproved of by either House of Parliament. These regulations that I think were made in December last, have, in pursuance of that provision of the Act, been laid on the Table and are now within our purview. We are not in a position, so far as my information enables me to judge, to speak with any degree of accuracy at this time as to the nature, extent and location of the coal and lignite beds of the North-West. Such information as we have is to be found in detached portions of the various reports which have been made largely upon other subjects, and which contain here and there allusions to the existence of beds of coal and lignite in various points of the territory. But there does not seem to me to have been, as yet, placed before Parliament—if there is accessible to the hands of the Government—any information which is of a satisfactory character as to the extent and nature of the fuel supply in this record of the North-West. I have moved this resolution in the form of a proposal that we should go into Committee, because, while I think it proper to suggest various points which seem to me to be worthy of the attention of the House, I was extremely anxious that we should have upon the question, whether we decided it at this moment or not, the utmost latitude of action and that it should not be said as an objection to my proposal that some one or other term in the resolution which I submit was a reason why the House should not assent to it. I am only asking the House to go into Committee at this moment to consider these resolutions, and if there be any parts of the resolutions which are fit to be accepted, those parts can be retained, and if there be any parts which, upon the explanations which may be made from the other side of the House do not appear to be consistent with sound policy, of course those parts can be eliminated, and we are not bound by the entry into Committee to adopt the whole or, indeed, any part of the resolution. Now, the first position which I take is—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment? The opening remarks which the hon. gentleman has made have convinced me that it would be better if this debate were postponed, and I will tell him the reason why. In consequence of delay by the printers, the report of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and the Geological Superintendent, has not yet been laid before the House, but I think it will be before the House on Monday next—at least it has been promised by the printer, and I think the hon. gentleman will find in it some additional information respecting the coal fields which I would like the House to have.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it stands at the request of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

BOAT LICENSING ON GEORGIAN BAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for all correspondence concerning the boat licensing system, and its operation, as it affects the Georgian Bay, Ontario, any applications or correspondence on the subject of the formation of a company to become sole

licensees of all or a large area of these fishing grounds, and copies of any departmental or other action thereon. He said: I make this motion because I have received a communication from persons resident on the shores of Georgian Bay in which they state that the boat licensing system, which has been in force for some time, has given general satisfaction, has worked well, and has conduced to the interests of a very large body of fishermen, who ply their vocation in that part of the country, adding that it is bruited abroad that arrangements have been made for the formation of an extensive corporation to do the fishing and to obtain a sole license for the whole or a very large portion of this area. It seemed to me important at the earliest moment after receiving this communication to move for these papers in order that no transaction of that kind should be completed without the House being in possession of the facts and having an opportunity to pronounce on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

THE FACTORY COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE moved:

For copies of all instructions to, and correspondence with, the Commissioners on Factories, including instructions and correspondence as to information and enquiries on other points than those on which their report, laid on the Table, touches; and copies of all further reports made by them.

For the detailed statements in possession of the Government, showing as to 460 factories, from which information was obtained last fall.

(a) 1. The locality and nature of business of each of the ninety-five new factories, said to have been established since March, 1879.

2. The number of hands employed in each, distinguishing between adults and children, and males and females; the number in each employed at piece work, and their remuneration; and the number employed at wages, and the rate of wages; and the hours of labor.

(b) 1. The locality and nature of business of each of the 365 factories said to have been established previously to March, 1879, and to be still in existence.

2. The number of hands employed in each of these factories, in 1878, with the information before mentioned, as to sex and age, piece work, wages and hours of labor.

3. The number of hands employed in each of these factories in 1881, with the information before mentioned, as to sex and age, piece work, wages, remuneration and hours of labor.

He said: In moving for this return, I would beg to point out that the report of these Commissioners, which has been laid on our desks, says that the report is handed in in accordance with the instructions they received, but no such instructions have been communicated to the House. It is, therefore, proper that we should have the instructions under which this Commission acted—issued departmentally, I presume, by the hon. Minister of Finance, because I observe that the letter is addressed to him, and speaks of his instructions—and also all correspondence with these Commissioners. I make this proposal to the House, because I think it is clear, from the statement made in the paper on the Table of the House, that further instructions were given to these Commissioners, to report on other points, and to accumulate other information than what appears in this report. This report states that the Commissioners have obtained statistics from some 465 factories, which they have visited, and gives a good deal of information with reference to the quantity and classification of and remuneration for the labor in these factories. Of these factories some ninety-five were stated to have been established since March, 1879, and the remainder to have been in existence prior to that date. It is very obvious that these figures either present a very extraordinary accidental coincidence, or the source of information which the Government had as to the 460 odd factories, is the source of information from which they obtained these statistics, and, therefore, it is that I presume that the same Commissioners enquired into the condition of these 465 factories, of which ninety-five are new. Then I ask for detailed information regarding each of these ninety-

five new factories. It will be observed that the report indicates that this information has been obtained by the Commissioners, because it mentions the number of hands in the various establishments and gives a more minute classification of them than I ask for in this motion. The total number of hands in all the factories is stated to be 43,511, of whom 19,131 were engaged at piece work, and 19,365 at day work; from which it appears that there is about an equal division of piece work and day work. My proposal is that we should have detailed information with reference to each factory. The statement, if I recollect aright, is that the rate of wages has increased from 5 to 35 per cent., averaging 17. Of course, if we take the figures 5 and 35 the average will be 17 or 17½, but that may not be at all the true average increase in the rate of wages, because there may be a very much larger number of persons who may have received a lower rate of increase, or a very much larger number who may have received a higher rate within those figures of 5 or 35; and in order intelligently to arrive at an accurate approximation of the state of the case in that regard it is necessary to ascertain the details of the information from which the hon. Minister has deduced this general conclusion upon so unsubstantial a basis as the minimum and maximum amounts. Then I ask for similar information as regards the 360 factories said to be established previous to March, 1879, and to be still in existence, and the number of hands employed in 1878 and 1881. The number of hands employed in 1878 is given by the hon. Minister in some shape, after some calculation, on some information. I do not agree with his figures. I think they are almost demonstrably inaccurate; but it is convenient that we should have information on which we can reach a conclusion, and, therefore, I ask that the information be communicated in detail, inasmuch as we have a large part in gross, in order that we may deal with the subject more intelligently than we can do on the present information. I am sorry I was unable, from the statement of the hon. Minister and from the report, to add another proposal which I would have been very glad to add, and I would be very glad to add it now if the Administration would say to me that they had obtained information on this subject. There is a statement that there were ninety-five new factories or businesses established; also, that there were 200 and odd factories which were in existence in March, 1879, and are still so; but there is no return, either in the statement of the Minister or the report, of those establishments which, since that date, has ceased to exist, and without some information of that kind, the tables, for some purposes, are wholly valueless. That is the case of the Massey works, which are entered as a new industry established since March, 1879. The fact is, that the Massey Agricultural Works have been in existence for not less than twenty-five years. They existed in the riding which I represent until they were removed to Toronto comparatively recently, and there existed also large agricultural works adjoining Massey's new location, known as the Toronto Mower and Reaper Company, but the two concerns have been amalgamated. It is, therefore, obvious, if we could get from the hon. the Minister any information on this point, it would be desirable, but not finding in the speech of the hon. the Minister, or in the report of the Factory Committee, that they had entered upon that fruitful sphere of enquiry, I did not think fit to propose that we should ask such information.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC MANUFACTURES EXPORTED TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. VALIN moved for a statement of the goods which were manufactured in the Province of Quebec, and

Mr. BLAKE.

exported to British Columbia, between the 1st January, 1880, and the 1st January, 1882; and also a statement showing the value of these goods and the names of the vessels in which they were carried. He said: It might seem strange to the House that I should move for an order of that kind, representing as I do one of the counties in the Province of Quebec. I believe, however, that I am not only representing Quebec, but other Provinces which export goods to British Columbia. I am aware that last year a vessel, which was built in the Province of Quebec, took a large cargo of goods manufactured principally in Montreal to the Pacific Province; I say from Montreal, but I might have added also from Ontario, as I know a large quantity of goods are manufactured at Hamilton and elsewhere and shipped to British Columbia. One of the great principles and objects of the National Policy was the supply by one Province or part of the Dominion, of the wants of another, thus assisting the home trade. We know that much goods are wanted in British Columbia, for example, not manufactured in that Province, so that they can be supplied by the Province of Quebec. The far western Provinces need goods of various kinds, including agricultural implements, and boots and shoes, which they can procure in Quebec to their mutual benefit, thus excluding the products of the United States. Some have styled the National Policy a bad policy, but I call it a good one, as it encourages the transmission of manufactures of Quebec and other Provinces to British Columbia, thus extending and assisting our home industries.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be impossible to bring down the return desired, because there is no distinction made, nor is there any entry in the Customs Department, Quebec, as to where such goods were manufactured. The value of the goods sent to British Columbia from Quebec would be given, and also the quantity; but there would be no entry as to whether they were the product of Canadian or foreign manufactories. I dare say we could name the total amount of goods shipped from the Province of Quebec. I have been enabled to obtain the amount of goods shipped from a few of the Ontario ports and also from Montreal, during February last, for the far western Provinces, and it is only such a return I should be able to bring down. From Hamilton, during February, goods to the value of no less than \$103,250 were shipped to Manitoba and \$25,804 worth to British Columbia. From Toronto the amount was \$301,000, and from London \$60,000; or from those three ports alone to the two Western Provinces, a total of \$490,269 worth. For the information of the House, I may state that as regards the exports from Hamilton most of the goods were the product of the different manufactories of that city.

Mr. VALIN. That is satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN VESSELS IN FRANCE.

Mr. VALIN, in moving for the correspondence between the Government of Canada and that of France, respecting the entry of vessels built in Canada, said: I have sought for such information for a long time. I remember that the shipbuilders of Quebec have sought for free trade in vessels with France since 1875, year by year. We cannot exchange our materials used in shipbuilding on a free basis with France; for many years we have sought the privilege of selling in France vessels built in this country, knowing that such a trade would benefit the city and all points of Quebec. We should like some information on the subject.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know if there has been any correspondence between the Government of Canada and that of France on this subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no correspondence between the Governments of France and Canada at all. Any negotiations, or anything in that nature respecting international trade between Canada and France have proceeded, of course, through Her Majesty's Minister in France. Sir Alexander Galt, our Ambassador in England; is attending to that subject at present, and is, I believe, at this moment in Paris, accompanied by an officer of the Foreign Office, for the purpose of making arrangements specially applicable to the trade of Canada with France, inasmuch as I believe all hopes of a treaty between France and England have vanished. Sir Alexander Galt was yesterday in France for that purpose, with good hopes of making some special arrangement with the consent of Her Majesty's Government, but there is no direct correspondence on the subject.

Mr. ANGLIN. In 1877 and 1878 the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and their friends and press throughout the country, especially in the Province of Quebec, made a great noise respecting a trade that might possibly be done between France and Quebec. They complained very loudly that the late Government did not take special energetic action, or raise means to bring about an arrangement that would increase that trade. I think that complaint was one of the factors in the election of 1878, in Quebec especially, and the difficulty to the late Government was created by the statement so made. It was asserted that a trade could be created between Quebec and France, and that if the Mackenzie Government had done their duty that trade might have been in existence and a very large number of vessels might have, and would have, been built in Canada for the French market. That the Mackenzie Government had grossly neglected their duty was loudly asserted and widely believed, I have no doubt. But since the present Government was formed it does not appear that they have taken very much more energetic means to bring about that desirable end than their predecessors. It does not appear that there is any greater trade between France and any portion of the Dominion than in the years of the late Government; and especially in regard to the shipbuilding interest it clearly appears that it has not made any progress under the present Government, but has seriously declined. In fact, there is very much less shipbuilding to-day than in those years when the deplorable condition of the shipbuilding industry of Quebec was so much commented on—when it was often made the subject of probable lamentations of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Motion withdrawn.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Mr. VALIN moved for all documents relating to accidents which have occurred on railways, to accidents in which there was loss of life, to the number of lives lost upon the railways under the control of the Government, between the 1st January, 1880, and the 1st January, 1882; and to the names of the persons who have thus lost their lives.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that these documents are now before the House, except for the last six months of 1881; so I would suggest that he limits his motion to the period of the first of July last and the first of January last.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think the Minister of Public Works is mistaken. I think the only accidents reported to the House are accidents to the person. Many other accidents occurred during that period, in which there was no injury to persons but where there was a very serious injury to property.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I made the statement on the authority of my colleague, the Minister of Railways. As he

could not be here this evening, he told me these documents were all prepared in anticipation of this motion.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the documents before the House must be the documents which are the statutory returns made by the railways themselves. I do not at this moment recollect whether the statutory return includes accidents which are not attended with injury to persons.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It does. I remember some years ago when I presided over that department, the Government returns included not only accidents that were followed by death, but, also, other accidents. In the present case, if we find that the return is not complete we will make it so.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

BRANCHES OF THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. ANGLIN moved for a return showing what branch or branches and sidings of the Intercolonial Railroad were built or commenced during the year ending 31st December, 1881; the length and the cost of each, and the amount expended and estimated total cost of any branch or siding commenced and not completed before 31st December, 1881. He said: Although the Minister of Railways is not in his place, I will state my particular reason for moving for this return. I heard it stated, and I believe correctly stated, that during the last year a branch railway was built from the Intercolonial Railway, at or near the village of Lexford, in the county of Cumberland, a length of four or five miles. There was no order of this House obtained, no authority of Parliament, that I am aware of, for the construction of that branch. I can hardly suppose that the Minister would wish the House to regard so important a work as a mere siding on the railway which he would be authorized to construct under the existing laws of the country. It is, I believe, intended that this piece of railway should form a portion of a line running from the Intercolonial Railway, through the city of Cumberland, to the harbour of Pugwash on the Straits of Northumberland. It runs at present chiefly to supply the wants of a thriving woollen factory at the village of Oxford, and, of course, the immediate neighborhood. There are, I presume, other sidings and other branches which will be included in this return. I make the motion for the purpose of enabling the Minister of Railways to explain what has been actually done in this respect, and whether he has or has not caused this railway to be constructed, and if he has, under what authority he acted in the matter.

Motion agreed to.

INSTRUCTIONS TO HEALTH OFFICERS.

Mr. WELDON, in moving for copies of circulars and instructions issued to the Health Officers at the ports of Halifax and St. John, N.B., in regard to vessels arriving at those ports having contagious diseases on board, said: I wish to call the attention of the Government to a matter of considerable importance to the whole country. I understand that a vessel arrived at Halifax with a contagious disease on board, and that owing to the health regulations having been violated, the disease was spread over a large portion of the Dominion, including the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, and Ontario, and some lives were lost in consequence. I understand that only a fine of \$400 was imposed—a fine entirely inadequate to the gravity of the offence.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will give some explanation of what seems to me to be a most serious transaction. The matter attracted a great deal of public attention owing to the widespread outbreak of the disease, in consequence of the infraction of the regulations.

If it be the fact that only a fine of \$400 was imposed, it seems to me to be an altogether inadequate penalty for so grave an offence.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I had not heard of the outbreak in Ontario, though I know of the case in New Brunswick which has been alluded to. I immediately took steps to have the matter looked into; those who were not infected were separated from the others; and those who were exposed were properly looked after. With respect to the fine, it is the maximum fine which the law allows; and as soon as I heard that the regulations had been infringed, I gave instructions to have the offenders dealt with. We could do no more than we did, though I quite apprehend the serious difficulties which may arise in such cases.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that all the Government could possibly do to mark their displeasure has been done. I am not conversant with the regulations; but I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as to the maximum fine which can be imposed. There may be other things, however, which might be done by the Government. I think the law is imperfect which permits a vessel to come in with perhaps an enormous number of persons on board. It may be occasionally that there are a thousand immigrants on board, who, if the quarantine regulations are broken, may disseminate a terrible disease all over the country. As the hon. gentleman says he has not heard of the disease being in Ontario, I can say that I saw the statement in a newspaper that a person in Toronto had this disease, who was a passenger on that vessel.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I can assure my hon. friend that the Government, as far as possible, has enforced the Quarantine Act. But the hon. gentleman and the House must understand that at present there is very little disease brought into the country—so little that we have reduced our quarantine staff considerably. We cannot prevent a case occasionally occurring, but when it does occur, as in the present instance, we put the law into force as early as possible. The first I heard of this case was from the Local Government at Fredericton, and I immediately telegraphed to our agent in St. John to place the other passengers in such a position that the disease would not be disseminated throughout the country. I do not know that we could do anything more, or that the law should be more stringent than it is. It may be that the officers of the ship were to blame.

Mr. WELDON. A fine of \$400 is a very trifling matter compared with the landing of persons afflicted with contagious diseases. I am very glad to learn of the promptness of the hon. Minister of Agriculture in sending directions to the health officer at St. John, and I believe no more danger has been heard of from that quarter.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). I wish to call the attention of the Government to the necessity of strictness in this matter of quarantine. I may say that the port of Sydney, in Cape Breton, is unrivalled as a harbor, either by Halifax or St. John. 400,000 tons of tonnage called at the harbor of Sydney last year, exclusive of the other ports of the county. Several cases of small-pox arrived at that port; and yet, unlike either St. John or Halifax, we had no quarantine officer there at all. I wish to urge on the hon. Minister of Agriculture the necessity of appointing a quarantine officer, and building a quarantine hospital at that port. Vessels have come there, which have been obliged to build quarantine hospitals at their own expense; and when such ports as Charlottetown, Pictou, and other places have quarantine officers, I think it is important that the Government should place one at Sydney.

Mr. DALY. With regard to the question brought up by the hon. member for St. John, I may say that the feeling at the time this unfortunate occurrence

Mr. BLAKE.

took place was one of great indignation at the captain of the *Peruvian*, who deliberately broke the regulations of the port and came up to the dock, in violation of the directions he had received by the health officer. The feeling was that the Government could not impose too heavy a fine, and the heaviest fine that could be imposed was inflicted. But subsequently a certain amount of sympathy was felt for the company to which the steamer belonged, and we were told, forsooth, that the health of the country was to be injured that the mails might not be delayed. Now, I consider that the health of the people of Halifax, and the whole Dominion, is of far more importance than that the English mails should not be delayed for ten or twelve hours at the port of distribution. I may also state that there is some excuse for the peculiar circumstances under which the passengers were landed on that occasion. A violent storm was raging, and it would have been hardly safe for the vessel to anchor on quarantine ground; and it was partly on that account that the captain made so bold as to come to the wharf; but on being warned that by so doing he was infringing the rules, he should have removed. The health officer did his duty by removing the patient to the quarantine hospital. After that, I believe every precaution was taken to secure the port against danger. Unfortunately, the evil arose through the gross negligence of the captain in breaking the rules of the port.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Has the fine of \$400 been paid or remitted?

Mr. POPE (Compton). I believe the fine has been paid. I know it has not been remitted. It was ordered to be collected. With respect to my hon. friend's observations about Sydney, I admit that Sydney is a very important port; but we have a great many important ports in the country, and where there is no quarantine, the Collector of Customs is made the quarantine officer, and in case of infected ships he is empowered to employ a doctor to board the ship, and if he thinks proper, to prevent the passengers from landing. This is done because the country cannot afford to keep a quarantine at every port.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think the prevailing feeling must be that a fine of \$400 or £100 is quite insufficient to deter any steamboat captain from entering Halifax or any other port. We all know the importance which steam vessel owners attach to getting their vessels out of port with the least possible delay, and a delay of half a day is very much more important than the imposition of a fine of \$400; and therefore the Minister should have authority to impose a much higher fine if he found the circumstances demanded it. In the particular case under consideration, if the statements made respecting it are true, no penalty could be too severe for the offence committed. Despite the remonstrances and protests of the officers at Halifax, the captain chose to run his vessel up to the wharf and land his passengers; and the penalty should be so severe as to deter all steamboat captains from following such a bad example. If the Minister does not possess power to impose heavier penalties, he should ask Parliament to clothe him with power to impose such penalties as will prove deterrant in future. I rose chiefly to direct the attention of the Minister to a report in the Halifax papers to-day that one of the steerage passengers went to Digby, Nova Scotia, and there became sick of the disease—probably he was sick before he left the ship—and two persons had since contracted the disease, and there is great danger of it spreading. I am sure, from what I know of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, he will adopt prompt measures to stay the disease.

Mr. GAULT. I think, under all the circumstances, the captain was quite justified in going into port as the vessel was in danger of being wrecked. There was only one case

on board. Everything was done on the vessel to prevent the spread of the disease, and the ship was fumigated. It went to Boston and returned to Halifax, where the second mate or steward died. I might as well leave the city of Ottawa because there is a case of small-pox on Gloucester street.

Motion agreed to.

THE STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

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

Mr. BLAKE. Before the House adjourns I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the state of public business, in some particulars of great importance to us. At all events, I am glad to observe that he has laid the Indian Report on the Table to-day. I had intended to recall his attention to it; and we are to expect the report of the other branch of his Department on Monday. But there are, with respect to Dominion Lands, a very large number of questions which I suppose will not be answered in detail by the report, and upon which returns, unopposed, have been granted. Some time ago it was said by the hon. member that those returns had been formulated in such detail, a very long time would be required to bring them down, and the suggestion was made that the work would be facilitated by adopting motions such as were framed. The returns that have been brought down are but a drop in the bucket compared with what we deserve. We are exceedingly anxious to obtain information upon many leading points connected with the administration of the Dominion Lands—connected with the mode in which the regulations have been carried out, with respect to applications made for land under the colonization scheme, and so forth; and we are anxious, if we can obtain full particulars, to get some abstract of the particulars in order to deal intelligently with the subject. The House has been in session a month, but we have had no information on the subject up to this time. With respect to the Pacific Railway, hon. gentlemen opposite conceded, by agreeing to the motion which I made on the subject, the expediency of our being placed permanently at an early period of each Session in possession of very much fuller information than has been given in the Minister's report. The report this year gives us really no information of any value whatever. We had learned, perhaps not very accurately, still with comparative accuracy, no doubt, very much more from the ordinary sources of information than from the ordinary report of the Minister. Numerous returns have been moved for. I know a great many will require a very small amount of clerical labor to answer. Then, with respect to the Railway Commission, which was instituted before last Session and which has wandered from Dan to Beersheba taking evidence, we have seen statements of the evidence taken, and if my information be correct, the evidence is in print and has been ready for distribution almost since the opening of the Session. Whatever measure of importance we may attach to the report, we will attach more to the evidence, and if the formal report and finding of the Commission be not yet prepared and they have been unable to reach a unanimous and deliverable verdict, a short report might be laid before the House accompanied by the two volumes of evidence. It seems to me we ought to get what information we can on that point. There are various subjects which were before us in some sense before that Commission was instituted, and various others have come before us in some sense since; but it has been thought fit not to challenge discussion or enquiry in regard to them until the machinery the Government set in motion should have insured its policy and views, and until their evidence had been brought down. It is not unreasonable, now that the Government have used this Commission so long, that we should use what has been obtained, and that if we cannot get the verdict of the Com-

mission, we should get their evidence without delay. Several returns of great consequence have been asked for, and I would like the hon. gentleman himself to look at the volume brought down, and see that greater expedition be used in producing those wanted. The papers with regard to the disallowance of the Streams Bill are still awaited, though returns respecting Laval University and other subjects have been brought down. It does seem those papers ought to be brought down promptly, and that in several departments greater energy should be used in the production of this and other valuable information. We have a considerable staff of supernumerary clerks who enjoy a considerable amount of leisure, which ought to be utilized as well as other resources to expedite the bringing down of those papers, without which it is impossible to consider and properly dispose of the business of the country generally. I ask for the exercise of a greater amount of diligence, so that we may find next week the bulk of those documents brought down for early action upon them. We are pretty much in the same position with reference to legislation. We have been one month in session, and have got yet but one Government Bill on the paper, the Civil Service Bill. My hon. friend the first Minister has had the Census Returns of the population before him, with the various constituencies and sub-districts, and has had the opportunity of deciding the fortunes and fates of the Opposition and Ministerial party, by leaving to one or other that portion of the population they may aspire for support, for he informed us the other day that he was engaged in considering the Representation Bill. Now, at this period of the Session, I am still anticipating and uncertain what sort of a measure he will submit. He might have decided that question some time ago; but it is to be hoped we may soon see it, however late. And so with reference to the Supreme Court Bill. Two years ago we were promised it; and also one year ago, at the earliest period of the Session, we were again promised it; but even yet I do not see it, whether the delay be due in part to the lack of system on the part of hon. gentlemen or to that removal of which I complained of, the Minister of Justice from this Chamber, I do not know. It is a fact, however, at least, that there never was in the history of Canada, since we first assembled, one Session in which it could be said, that after the expiration of one month, there was but one Government Bill seen on the paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With reference to the returns the hon. gentleman asks for, I will venture to say, that during the twenty-eight days, the four weeks or lunar month during which we have been sitting, as many or more returns were brought down as during any month when the hon. gentleman opposite was employed looking after such papers. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have tried, of course, to make up for their want of numbers by their vigor in asking for such papers, nearly every one of them moving for a string of returns. They are of an enquiring mind, to satisfy which they have put all sorts of questions and asked for all sorts of returns. It is not for the officers of the different Departments to judge of the comparative value of those returns, or to know which of the hon. gentlemen opposite wishes to have his first and which wishes to postpone his return. The papers are prepared and put in hand the moment they are communicated to the different Departments—are prepared according to their advice. Every attempt is made to carry out the wishes of hon. members in this respect. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk suggested that some special returns should be brought down, they are being expedited, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that a considerable staff has been put on to produce them with all possible speed. I hope the hon. gentlemen opposite will not accuse the Government of extravagance in putting on so many clerks to satisfy the demands of their inquisitive intellectual minds. The hon. gentleman says there is only

one Government Bill before the House. True, but this is not the only branch of the Legislature as yet. The other branch is considering several measures which, if the hon. Minister of Justice had a seat in this House, would have been introduced here. But I think they can be as well discussed in the other House and sent down here, as discussed here and sent to that Chamber. I have no doubt the measures will not be protracted, nor will the business be slighted by its being introduced in the other House. The hon. gentleman's memory is not very good. Not many years ago, the sturdy legislative efforts of the Ministry of that day amounted to the merest trifle, if you leave out the private legislation. I dare say before the Session gets through it will be found that the legislation is of as important a kind as has been passed for the last seven or eight years. With reference to the report of the Pacific Railway Commission—the Commissioners in the first place will see the business-like remarks of my hon. friend opposite, and will also see that he is not going to pay any regard to their report. I shall convey to them in as earnest terms as I know how, the extreme desire of my hon. friend to have the report and the evidence, or the report without the evidence, and I dare say he will get them. He says there is only one Government Bill on the paper. You know the old fable of the rabbit and the lion—how the rabbit said to the lion, I have twenty children to your one; ah! but says the lion, mine is a lion. Our Bill has been asked for, and was embodied and discussed when the hon. gentlemen were on the other side of the House, and at considerable length; and my hon. friend, not now in his place, made praiseworthy efforts to introduce a Civil Service Reform Bill—not supported or encouraged by the hon. gentlemen opposite. That Reform Government did not want Civil Service Reform. But my hon. friend sowed the good seed and his efforts received the attention of this effete Tory Government that now exists, and they have attempted to bring down a measure which has given satisfaction to my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey).

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; we discussed that subject during last Parliament, and my hon. friend said he approved of the measure in his place. He said that it was a good Bill, but that he was disappointed that the principle of competition was not involved—that with that exception it was a move in the right direction. I do not think, if the hon. gentleman from Gloucester was a Minister, he would go for the principle of competition.

Mr. ANGLIN. I would not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman wishes to leave himself out. Badinage apart, we shall endeavor to please the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, who knows that we have already brought many returns down. They are now in active progress, and to-morrow I shall see and exercise, with his permission, my own idea of the comparative value of these returns. I shall try to bring down what I think most important, and postpone the others, to bring down as quickly as possible those affecting the Land Department.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say, with reference to the hon. gentleman's observation as to the activity displayed in bringing down returns as evinced by the results, that a great many returns brought down this Session were moved for more than a year ago, and which he took about a fortnight or three weeks of this Session to bring down. And as the clerks the hon. gentleman speaks of have been so diligently occupied in getting up the returns that have been brought down, why were they not getting up returns that ought to have been prepared long before the Session commenced at all and ought to have been ready the first day of the Session? I may just

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

add that the Bill the hon. gentleman compares to a lion in some of its respects, reminds me more of another animal who was once said to wear the lion's skin.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement showing the number of vessels registered in the Province of Quebec, and also a statement showing the number of vessels sold and lost, between the 1st January, 1873, and the 1st January, 1882.—(Mr. Valin.)

Copies of the annual returns made by the licensed druggists or vendors of liquor under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, in the several counties and cities where the law has been adopted.—(Mr. Haddow.)

Statement showing: 1st. The working expenses and revenue of the Intercolonial Railway in each of the years 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881. 2nd. The number of the employes of the railway and the salaries paid in each of these years. 3rd. The number of miles run in each year.—(Mr. Gigault.)

Copies of the Engineer's Report respecting the repairs made to the wharf at Matane, and the improvements that would have to be made to the harbor in that locality.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Return showing the number of pounds of wool imported into the Dominion, since 30th June, 1881, and amount of duties collected thereon.—(Mr. Macdonell, Lanark.)

Return of casualties to trains on the Intercolonial Railway arising from collision, broken rails, or otherwise, from the first day of January, A.D. 1881, to March 1st, A.D. 1882, with the respective causes and dates, and the amount of damage (if any) in each case, to property, and compensation paid to owners of property damaged, and amount of claims (if any) unsettled.—(Mr. Weldon.)

House adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 10th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DREW moved that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to Wednesday, the 15th instant.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 86) to amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to authorize the said Company to erect a bridge over the Ottawa River.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 87) respecting a certain agreement between the Canadian Securities Company and the liquidators of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 88) to explain the Act to grant relief to the Canada Agricultural Insurance Company, and to define the powers of the assignees therein mentioned.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Massue.)

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Pacific Railway Ferry Company.—(Mr. Massue.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Tassé.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Grand Central Station Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 95) to amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Canada Provident Association.—(Mr. Currier.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before entering upon a discussion of the main question before the House, I shall ask its indulgence, while I allude to a matter that I think may properly be considered one of a personal nature. I refer to the allegations made, and repeated upon the floor of this House, and in the country, with reference to my alleged inconsistency upon the trade question. The hon. and genial member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), the other day, in the course of his speech, took occasion, I think, for about the hundredth time, upon the floor of the House, to allude to a speech made by me in 1876, and he reminded me of the fact, Sir, that we are all growing old. It is a characteristic of old men to dwell upon the scenes of youth, and the hon. member seems to go back to that speech with peculiar unction on every and upon all occasions, and to quote garbled portions, which give us an incorrect impression as to the nature and character of my remarks upon that occasion. That speech has been quoted by various hon. members of this House, and it has been alluded to by the press of the country. Now, before making any quotations from the speech, with reference to the question of inconsistency itself, I presume that no hon. member of this House will claim that he has absolutely lived without inconsistency in his whole life. I believe my hon. friend the member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), can hardly make that claim. In his speech the other day, he gave utterance to some very glowing sentiments with reference to the loyalty of the people of this country and of himself, to Her Majesty, and I was carried back in imagination to the time when he was a resident of the city of Albany, and when, as a prominent member of the Democratic party there, he was loud in his denunciations of everything British in order to catch the vote of the Irish population. I was carried back to the time when the hon. gentleman advocated a revenue Tariff as the principle of the Democratic party of the United States, and I have no doubt advocated it ably and well. And I think I can refer to other instances in this House where an hon. gentleman has changed his position and sentiments. I see before me the hon. Minister of Finance, and I have been informed that he was once a very eloquent advocate of free trade principles in the

Legislature of New Brunswick. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, I am informed, was also once a very eloquent advocate of free trade, and I believe that the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) has not always entertained the views that he now propounds with reference to this trade question. I do not find fault with these gentlemen. They have a perfect right to change their sentiments in this matter. The only being in the world who can maintain a consistent course is an animal. The donkey, for instance, can keep a consistent course. But the intelligent and studious man must necessarily be advancing and modifying his opinions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed to say with reference to myself, that I was brought up and instructed as a protectionist from my youth, and I accepted as axioms with regard to trade, certain things that I now doubt the correctness of. I am perfectly willing to say that I have modified my opinions upon the trade policy. I claim that I have a right to modify them, that there is nothing discreditable in a modification of views, and the only question that can be properly be raised is, am I honest on the matter. If this is denied by hon. gentlemen opposite, it simply becomes a question of varacity. Let us see what my public utterances have been on this matter. Let us take that very speech quoted by the hon. member for Niagara, and read the first clause and the conclusion. Upon that occasion I opened my remarks by saying that, like many hon. members of this House, I believed in protection to a certain extent as beneficial to the country. Now the question was what was the extent to which I advocated protection, what were the limits within which I would confine a protective duty. Those limits are defined in the concluding clauses of that speech. I said:

"In conclusion I may state that I am desirous of doing everything calculated to promote the manufacturing interests of the country. But, looking from my standpoint, I believe that the present Tariff is adequate, that at all events to demonstrate the adequacy will require more time. I heartily endorse the policy of the hon. Finance Minister in declining to advance the rate beyond 17½ per cent."

Did you ever hear hon. gentlemen opposite making an honest quotation from that speech.

Mr. RYMAL. Never.

Mr. CHARLTON. There was a portion of the Reform party in this country advocating an advance of these duties from 17½ to 20 per cent. I am free to say that I was in favor of that advance, and, in my opinion, had that advance been made, every gentleman who sits upon the Treasury benches would have taken the ground at once of free traders, and would have denounced the protectionist policy of the Reform party. When I made that speech I did it from the standpoint that the duty of 17½ per cent is protective. It is a measure of protection though, perhaps, not quite enough to suit all parties. Having now dealt with this personal matter, I shall address myself to the question before the House. In the discussion of the trade question, and the policy and politics of the day, there is one thing apparent to the close observer, and that is the desire and aim of the Government, upon all occasions and at all times, to divert attention from all other issues before the people of this country, except the National Policy alone. The National Policy floated them into power, through the delusion practiced upon the people, and through false promises that were never realized. To-day, they intend to make use of the same delusion and the same policy, in their efforts to delude the people into the belief that the revival which has reached this country as well as older countries, in consequence of causes entirely outside of this Tariff, is due to the National Policy. They carefully abstain from a discussion of such questions in Ontario, as, for instance, the Boundary Award, a question of infinitely greater importance to the people of Ontario than the

National Policy or anything growing out of it. They also abstain from discussing the disallowance question, the great constitutional question, involving the rights of the Provinces of this Dominion, and of infinitely more importance than the National Policy. They refrain from discussing the pernicious land regulations with reference to our domain in the North-West, nor will they discuss, unless compelled to do so, that stupid and disastrous contract for the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway made a little more than a year ago. In the policy they pursue in the discussion of the public questions of the day, certain salient points are presented. The first is their tactics in endeavoring to ascribe to the policy of the hon. member for Lambton and his colleagues, the depression that existed in this country from 1874 to 1878. Now, I intend, Mr. Speaker, briefly to enquire into this question, as to whether the policy of the late Government had anything whatever to do with the condition of things during their term of office, and I think it will be an easy thing to prove that there is no good authority for the assertion of hon. gentlemen opposite that the change in the commercial condition of this country is due to the policy of the present Government. The panic or depression that afflicted Canada afflicted as well every portion of the commercial world. It had its inception in the United States in 1873. It was caused in that country by large unproductive investments in railways, by a series of years of extravagant speculations, and by the operation of an unsound currency upon the business of the country. For many years the currency of the United States had been a depreciated, an irredeemable currency, and in consequence the transactions in all branches of business partook largely of the nature of gambling. In the gold gambler's rooms in Wall street the fluctuations in gold were closely watched, and according as gold was "bullied" or "beared," according as it was forced up or forced down, the prices of commodities in all branches of business rose or fell. This uncertainty of prices gave to every legitimate business a character of gambling, and the losses of the business classes in the country culminated in the panic or depression, which, though it was hurried on by other causes, would have ultimately resulted from the operation of their unsound currency alone. This prostration which, in the years 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877, left one-half their blast furnaces idle, which left a large proportion of their great manufacturing industries idle, which, in 1877, left 2,000,000 men in that country without employment, and, for the first time in the history of the United States, set loose an army of tramps to roam up and down the country, which left idle \$100,000,000 of capital in blast furnaces alone, which led to the production of only 2,069,000 gross tons per annum from 1874 to 1878, when the capacity of the furnaces was 4,876,000 gross tons. I say that this state of things, brought on in the United States by the causes to which I have alluded, produced that commercial depression that afflicted Canada during most of the years during which my hon. friend for Lambton was at the head of affairs. That American panic also affected England, and that reacted upon us. How did it affect us directly? It affected us in the price of certain commodities we sell to the United States. It affected the price of barley and of peas, two articles for which we find a market almost exclusively in that country. But the chief effect was upon the price of lumber. This is one of our great industries, and ranks next in importance to that of agriculture. The effect of the panic in the United States was to stop almost entirely the progress of building operations there, and thus put an end to the demand for our lumber. There was scarcely a lumberman in the Ottawa Valley but lost money steadily and rapidly during all these years. Most of these men, had the banks closed down upon them, would have been bankrupt, and the only reason why the banks did not close down upon them was that so much

Mr. CHARLTON.

was at stake that it was thought better to carry them along. I think I see my hon. friend for Ottawa City (Mr. Currier) smile. No doubt he could confirm the truth of what I say. To-day the price of lumber is advanced 50 or 60 per cent., and we are able to get more for it now than we could during the Rebellion, when everything sold at war prices, and when United States currency was worth only 40 cents on the dollar. The effect of this panic upon our industries was, of itself, sufficient to produce the state of things we found existing in Canada from 1874 to 1878. But it was aggravated by other causes. Singularly enough, in conjunction with this panic in the United States, and with the depression, which, as a consequence, settling down upon our industries, Providence seemed to have withdrawn its favors, and we had a succession of bad harvests, so that, in 1877, our net export of course grains and meal was only \$2,597,000; and the country did not raise its own bread, and, as I showed in some remarks I made the other day, our exports of the products of the soil, during the five years my hon. friend for Lambton held office, were less than the three succeeding years since the right hon. gentlemen on the other side became the First Minister of the Crown. Will any one accuse my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) of being responsible for the seeds of disaster which were sown for years in the United States, and for the crop that was ultimately garnered? Was his influence so great and far reaching that it controlled the interests of that great country? Will any man accuse my hon. friend of controlling the interests of England—her vast interests by sea and land? Will any man accuse my hon. friend of being responsible for the bad harvests during the years of his Administration? If it can be shown that the Reform Government were responsible for all these things, it follows, as a matter of course that they were responsible for the depression that afflicted this country during that period. But if this cannot be shown to be true—and it would be an insult to the intelligence of the Canadian people to say that it was true—it follows, as a matter of course, that the Reform Government of that day were in no way, direct or indirect, responsible for the hard times that paralysed the industries of Canada during that period. Well, Sir, having shown that the panic was not confined to Canada, having shown, I think satisfactorily, that the Government was not responsible for that depression, let us next enquire whether that depression was more grievous in Canada than in other countries. If we examine into this question carefully we will find that Canada, though she passed through a period of great trial, had cause for thankfulness in the fact that the depression existing here was less grievous than in other countries. I might spend much time in elucidating this point, but it is not necessary to do so and I have not time. I will simply allude to one or two facts bearing on the matter. The facts I give relate to our manufacturing interests which are brought more immediately under consideration in this discussion. By the statistics of forty-eight New England manufactories, in 1877, employing a capital of \$52,320,000, it was shown that sixteen declared no dividend; nine declared dividends less than 6 per cent.; eight, dividends of 6 per cent.; seven, dividends of 10 per cent. and upwards. In 1877, I was at some trouble to get returns for a number of manufacturing industries in Canada. I addressed circulars to a great number of manufacturers and received answers from twenty of the principle ones, and upon tabulating that information I find that six of the twenty in that year earned a dividend of 20 per cent. and upwards; that two of them, although not giving their dividends stated they were satisfactory; that two of them declared dividends of 10 per cent.; that six declared dividends of from 6 to 8 per cent.; that one declared a dividend satisfactory as compared with former years, and two only declared no dividend. Two establishments in Canada as

against sixteen in New England declared no dividend. It is evident, if this is a fair criterion on which to form an opinion, the condition of the manufacturing industries in this country was greatly better than that of New England at that time; and I venture the assertion that during the entire period of the depression the manufacturing industries of Canada were more prosperous, and felt the effects of the depression less severely, than the manufacturing interests of the United States or any other country. I found, on looking over the returns of those manufacturers, that they all considered their condition a ruinous one if they had only made ordinary interest as their dividend; if they had not declared more than 6 per cent. they affirmed they were on the verge of ruin. I found one large cotton mill that gave a return of no dividend had actually earned 10 per cent., and expended the money on plant, being unable to meet its orders and obliged to enlarge its capacity. I found one large woollen mill with a capital of \$180,000, declared a dividend of 10 per cent.; that many manufacturers reported strong competition among themselves; that the sewing machine manufacturers wanted reciprocity with the United States, and would be glad to be able to meet the Americans on equal terms in their own markets if they had the same privilege in the markets of the United States. I found agricultural implement manufacturers reported, without exception, business good, that during the depression they were fully occupied, and one large foundry reported business improving and the profits 20 per cent. It would seem then that our manufacturing industries were not on the verge of ruin. It would seem that the depression that affected our industries affected them in a less degree than it did their customers, the farmers. I believe their business was in a better condition than that of their customers the lumbermen; in short, that there was no interest in the Dominion that less required the fostering care of the Government, or felt less severely the depression, than the manufacturing industries at that time. Why, in the Census returns of 1871, it was shown that the production of our manufactures was \$221,000,000, that they had grown to such an extent that they had employed at that time 187,000 men. The depression was not due to the policy of the Government, and, on comparing the condition of our manufactures, with those of other countries, we had every reason to be thankful that our condition was not worse. The second salient point to which I will refer is, the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the Government, in the discussion of this question. After having claimed that the hon. member for Lambton and his colleagues were responsible for the depression that existed, they proceed to claim that to the National Policy is to be attributed the revival. They remind me of an African asking a missionary for good medicine, in order that he might shoot straight, and asking for a charm to keep away wizards. It was like the North American Indian asking for a charm to defend himself against evil spirits. They claim they dispensed good medicine—the hon. member for Lambton's bad medicine—that his policy had nearly ruined the country, and brought about the disaster, which was due to other causes, and that they had brought about the revival, with which they had as little to do as the natives of Africa or the Blackfeet at the base of the Rocky Mountains. Let us enquire as to what is the true cause of the revival. All periods of commercial depression are brought about by over-trading and extravagance. During every period of commercial depression one feature of the depression is that the people uniformly economize; they seek to get out of debt; and the practice of that economy will in itself bring about a return of good times, usually within a year or two. In Canada, during the entire period of this depression, the people were practising economy; during the entire period of the depression the people of the United States were doing the same; and, but for the evil

effects of the vicious currency system of the United States, the depression which extended over five years would probably have passed away in two. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who claim to be the parties who brought about this revival, take credit to themselves for the effects that were produced in this country by the economy practised by the people, from 1874 to 1878. Then another great cause of the revival in business was the return to specie payment in the United States, on 1st January, 1878. On that date, when the Government returned to specie payment, there was a marked improvement in public affairs, and that improvement has continued to the present day. The country was waiting in expectation for the time when they would have a solid basis for their currency, and the moment that occurred the affairs of the United States improved, and steadily continued to improve. It is needless to say that it reacted upon us, and that improvement in trade was largely due to the return to specie payment in the United States. Another reason for the revival is the fact that there have been two bad harvests in England since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, and the consequence of this was that the prices of the products of the soil were largely increased in this country. Another feature of the case was, that in conjunction with the fact that two bad harvests came in England, two good harvests were reaped here. Here are the causes of the revival in a nut-shell: economizing during five years of bad times, the return to specie payment in the United States, and the great boom in business that occurred there, affecting in a most remarkable degree our lumber market, the failure of harvests in England, which gave higher prices to the productions of our fields, and two good harvests which occurred in this country, enabling our farmers to reap an enormous advantage from the advance in prices. These are the causes of the revival, causes entirely beyond the control of the Government of the day and beyond the control of any Government, and yet causes so palpably natural that no man can for a moment doubt that these were the real causes that produced the revival. Let us see what story our exports tell bearing on this question. The other day I drew a comparison between the exports for the period of the incumbency of the hon. member for Lambton and of hon. gentlemen opposite. I will take the two last years of the Administration of my hon. friend from Lambton, and compare them with the two last fiscal years, and we shall find that our exports in butter and cheese, for 1877 and 1878, were \$13,201,000, while the exports for 1880 and 1881 reached \$16,035,000. Exports of animals and their produce, including butter and cheese, for 1877 and 1878, \$28,240,000; for 1880 and 1881, \$38,967,000. The agricultural products of the country exported in 1877 and 1878 came to \$32,698,000, rising, in 1880 and 1881, to \$43,562,000. Exports of the products of the fisheries, 1877 and 1878, \$10,498,000; 1880 and 1881, \$13,447,000; showing an excess in the export of those articles for the two years, 1880 and 1881, of \$24,550,000, as compared with the years 1877 and 1878, the average annual excess being \$12,275,000. My hon. friends will see what effect that state of things would naturally produce on the business of the country. The causes of the revival in trade are not far to seek. I alluded, a few moments ago, to the fact that the manufacturing industries of this country had attained to considerable development in 1870, when we were manufacturing \$221,000,000 worth of goods, and were employing 170,000 men. Let us enquire into the circumstances of this development, this very great development of our manufacturing industries. Under what circumstances did they develop to this extent—was it through the operation of a protective policy? No; it was not—not protection as we generally use the term. Every business was then developed under a revenue Tariff policy, during the greater part of the time, of 15 per cent. duties. Under this policy

we had developed great manufacturing industries in this country, and, as we have seen, they rested on a firmer basis, they paid better dividends during the period of depression than the manufacturing industries of the United States, which had been fostered by very high protective duties. True, there was a class of manufacturers who, at the time, were without adequate capital; but can we point out any instances where, under this revenue Tariff, manufacturers had accumulated wealth? I think we can. I find in the commercial reports of that year, that J. and R. Molson are credited with being worth \$1,000,000; J. G. Worts, \$1,000,000; E. & C. Gurney, \$750,000; E. K. Green, \$500,000; Mr. Gault, \$500,000; William Darling, \$500,000; Mr. Hay, \$500,000. And most of these men had accumulated that amount of property commencing with nothing, or a very small capital. I know of numerous cases in which large manufacturing interests were built by men commencing with nothing but their naked hands, honorable instances of business success and energy. I believe that the manufacturers of this country have had nothing to complain of in the progress made up to the present date. I would now ask do they need special favor—favors that the lumbering interest, the farming interest, and the fishing interest of the country does not need? Was there justice in singling out this interest, which at that very moment was a more prosperous one than the others named, and making it the recipient of special favors? I believe there was not, and all that was proper for us to do was to continue our policy of incidental protection that had been in force, with such modifications as experience might dictate—with modifications which, in my opinion, would have pointed in the direction of a slight increase in the duties levied. Here let me say, that in the discussion of this question, from the beginning to the end, there has been a determination, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, to place the Liberal party in a false position—to induce the manufacturers to believe that this party are their natural and sworn enemies. Certain expressions, no doubt, have been used in the heat of debate, which, taken isolated and by themselves—like those extracts from my oft quoted speech—might be tortured into a meaning of this kind. But I hold that the Reformers of this country are as solicitous as to the prosperity of this interest as any other party in the country, and that they are willing to do for the manufacturing interest all that it can legitimately claim or ask. But they are not prepared to give it special favors—unjust favors at the expense of others. The Liberals are prepared to arrange a schedule of duties of such a character, and to such an extent, that every industry that can be created in the country to advantage can flourish under that Tariff. They are prepared to give the manufacturers a better Tariff than they have to-day, by sweeping away the duties on raw materials, and placing duties on imports to a degree sufficiently high to afford to those industries all the protection necessary to enable them to build up a business and realize profits that ought to be satisfactory—not, perhaps, profits of 50 per cent.—but such as they enjoyed in 1877, 20, 15 or 10 per cent. profits, which ought to be satisfactory to them. It was asserted when the Tariff, now in force, was put in operation that we were to have a Canadian market for Canadian manufacturers; that the object of the Tariff was to give the manufacturers control in the Canadian market? Has that occurred? Has that object been realized by this Tariff? Will any hon. member say yes?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. We shall see. I find that, in 1874, we imported \$11,341,000 worth of cottons; woollens, \$11,160,000; iron, steel and manufactures of the same, \$12,934,000. In 1879, under the operation of a revenue Tariff of 17½ per cent., the importation of goods in those lines was largely reduced; cottons had fallen to \$6,535,000; woollens to \$6,992,000; importations of iron and steel, \$6,457,000; the total importation of

Mr. CHARLTON.

these articles for 1879 was \$19,980,000, against \$35,449,000 for 1874. I hear an hon. gentleman say we had no money to pay for them in 1879. It seems, then, we were buying some goods and manufacturing largely. It seems that our manufacturing industries were in a prosperous condition and were actually declaring dividends of 20, 15 and 10 per cent., and I presume we had a little money to buy goods during that time. Well, Sir, what do we find in 1881, after some three years of this protective policy? Do we find the importations are smaller than they were when this policy went into operation, in goods of this character? They ought to be, but they are not. I find the importation of cottons last year was \$10,267,000, against \$6,500,000 in 1879. I find that the importation of woollens was \$8,739,000 in 1881, again \$6,992,000 in 1879. I find the importation of iron and steel and the manufactures thereof were \$12,460,000 in 1881, against \$6,457,000 in 1879, or \$31,407,000 in the aggregate, against \$19,985,000 when this protective policy went into operation. Why have you not the market for the Canadian manufacturer? Why have you not shut out this entire importation, instead of having an increase from \$20,000,000 to \$31,500,000. Now, I propose to examine the total importation of goods that are susceptible of manufacture in this country. I made an estimate in 1877, and by that estimate I found that we imported that year of goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada on the specific duty list, \$398,000; on the 17½ per cent. list, \$35,209,000; on the 10 per cent. list, \$508,000; on the 5 per cent. list \$3,383,000; and of free goods, \$3,322,000, making a total of \$42,830,000 imported in 1877 of goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada. Now, are the imports of last year of goods susceptible of production in this country less? They ought to be if this Tariff was to shut out foreign importation. Let us see what they are. I find that, in the year 1881, we imported \$10,267,000 worth of cottons, \$8,739,000 worth of woollens, \$12,461,000 worth of iron manufactures and steel, and of all other goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada, not including refined sugar, \$27,227,000, or a total, in 1881, of \$58,695,000, against a total, in 1877, of \$42,830,000, an increase of \$15,865,000, or 26.8 per cent. This does not indicate a very remarkable degree of success for this policy, which was to exclude foreign goods and give the Canadian market to the Canadian manufacturer. It shows, on the contrary, that we are importing more, three years after this policy went into operation, than we were before, and this in the face of the fact that the importations to this country are very much in excess of what the returns indicate, because smuggling has greatly increased during that time. I see by Secretary Blaine's report that the United States exported to Canada 24,000,000 yards of cotton cloth in 1881; that, of that quantity, 19,000,000 yards were smuggled and 5,000,000 appear in the Customs returns. I venture to say that, if we take into account the extra amount of goods smuggled into Canada, the importations would amount to more than \$60,000,000, as against \$42,000,000 in 1877. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has made a failure. His policy has not secured to the manufacturers of this country the control of their own market. Now, I wish to call attention to a statement in detail as to the operation of a number of our manufacturing industries in Canada. I shall not read the whole statement, but I will give you a summary of it. I have here a list of forty-one industries. These industries produced, in 1871, \$165,000,000 worth of goods. I find that in respect to nineteen of these industries the importation in their line from the United States was greater this year than it was in 1877. The industries in which the importations were greater are brick and tiles, brooms, brushes, carriage-making articles, cooperage edge tools, hatters' goods, paper-making, tubs, oil refiners, India rubber goods, soap, candles, rope, twine, sewing machines, trunks and valises, railway goods. In all these lines the importation

is greater now than it was when this Tariff went into operation. I find that in these forty-one industries, the total importations from the United States in 1877 were \$3,797,000, or $2\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. of the whole amount manufactured in the country in 1870; that the total imports from all countries, in 1877, were \$6,753,000, or 4 per cent. of the total amount manufactured. I find that, in 1880-81, the imports from the United States had increased to \$4,618,000, or $2\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. of the whole amount, an increase of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the importation from the United States, in this entire list, of \$165,000,000. I find the total imports had increased from \$6,753,000 to \$8,047,000, being $4\frac{8}{10}$ per cent. of the whole production. I find that, while nineteen of these forty-one industries had increased their importation from the United States, last year, as compared with 1876-77, that in seven more of them the reduction was very slight indeed. Now, these returns indicate very clearly that the operation of the Tariff has not been what its friends claim it has. These statistics prove very plainly that the importation of goods, susceptible of manufacture in Canada, are increasing, and I infer from this and various other facts, that a revenue Tariff of, say 20 per cent., with material admitted free of duty for the use of manufacturers, would be a better Tariff for the manufacturing industries of this country than the Tariff now in force. I think it might be profitable in this connection to point to the experience of another country in that matter, which has a direct bearing upon the question, as to whether a revenue Tariff is as well calculated to foster the manufacturing industries of this country, and give them a permanent and prosperous growth, as the hot-bed forcing process of high protective duties. I shall take the condition of the manufacturing industries in the United States for a term of years, and quote a few statistics with reference to the importation and exportation of goods, and the growth of manufacturing industries in that country during a revenue Tariff period and a protective period. I find that, in 1850, four years after the commencement of a revenue Tariff policy, the gross production of manufactures in the United States was \$1,019,106,616, and the net production was \$463,982,734. I find that, in 1860, after ten years more of a revenue Tariff policy—which went into force in 1846, and ended in 1860—the gross production was \$1,855,861,676, and the net production was \$854,251,584. I find that ten years later—in 1870—after ten years of protection, the gross production was \$4,232,325,442, and the net production \$1,743,898,000. From the best information obtainable, it is supposed the gross production of manufactures in 1880, as shown by the Census tables when completed, will be, \$5,000,000,000, in round numbers. What does this show? It shows that the increase in the net production from 1850 to 1860, under a revenue Tariff policy, was 84 per cent. It shows the increase from 1860 to 1870, under an extreme protection policy, was 104 per cent., if we value the goods in the depreciated currency of that time; but if we make a due allowance of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. discount for the average 20 per cent. premium at which gold stood during that year, we find that the actual net increase was, $86\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or an increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., in the decade under the forcing process of high protecting duties, over a decade under the operation of a revenue Tariff, or 84 per cent., from 1850 to 1860, against $86\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., from 1860 to 1870. I find the increase in the second decade, under protection, from 1870 to 1880, amounts, on gross production, to 18 per cent. only, against 84 per cent. on net production from 1850 to 1860; but if we deduct from the price of goods in 1870, $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., to make it equal to gold, the increase was 43 per cent., and this is as favorable a shewing as can be made for protection—43 per cent. increase for 1870 to 1880, against an increase of 84 per cent. in the revenue Tariff period, from 1850 to 1860. The wealth of the country, in 1840,

was, in round numbers, \$4,000,000,000,000. The wealth of the country in 1850, embracing four years of a revenue Tariff, was \$7,135,000,000. In 1860, after ten years of a revenue Tariff, it was \$16,150,000,000. In 1870, after ten years of protection, it amounted to \$30,068,000; and, in 1880, to \$39,400,000, including payments on the public debt. Let us analyse this statement, Mr. Speaker, and see what are the average increases in the wealth of the country during these various periods. From 1820 to 1830, the increase was 41 per cent.; from 1830 to 1840, the increase was 53 per cent. From 1840 to 1850, it showed a rapid rise to 80 per cent., and four of those years they had a revenue Tariff. From 1850 to 1860, there was a marvellous rise from 80 per cent. to 126 per cent. during a period of revenue Tariff. From 1860 to 1870, the increase dropped down from 126 per cent. to 85 per cent., and from 1870 to 1880, when the full force and effect of this policy had been brought into play, there was an increase of 31 per cent. against an increase of 126 per cent. from 1850 to 1860. From 1850 to 1860, during this revenue Tariff period, the woollen manufactures of the United States increased 62 per cent. mainly in the last three years of the period. In 1860, under a revenue Tariff, the production of pig iron was 100,000 gross tons greater than in the previous year, reaching the amount of 900,000 tons. In 1860, the export of domestic manufactures was \$48,000,000, an increase of 200 per cent. in ten years under the operation of a revenue Tariff, while, under the operation of a protective Tariff, the exports of domestic manufactures has steadily decreased in proportion to increased population and, to-day, it is smaller *per capita* than at the end of this revenue Tariff period. The exports of domestic manufactures from the United States in the year 1880, leaving out of account petroleum, of which they have a monopoly, were \$70,000,000, an increase of exports of those goods of $2\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. per annum under a protective Tariff period, as against an increase of 20 per cent. per annum under a revenue Tariff period, from 1850 to 1860. Had the rate of increase that obtained from 1850 to 1860 been continued, the export of domestic manufactures from the United States this year would have reached \$240,000,000, in place of being \$70,000,000, excluding petroleum. As it is, the export per head, in 1860, was \$1.55, as against \$1.40 in 1860. Now, if we place this showing against that made by England, we shall find a very remarkable contrast. While the United States are exporting \$1.40 per head of domestic manufactures, England exported \$32, and her foreign commerce is greater than that of the United States and Germany combined, with a population of 91,000,000, and greater than France, Russia and Holland combined, with a population of 124,000,000 inhabitants. During the period from 1850 to 1860, the increased value of agricultural products in the United States was 100 per cent., and during the same period, with ten years of a revenue Tariff, the increase of the value of farm property was 103 per cent. The export of cotton goods afford a fair indication of the operation of these two systems. In 1846, at the commencement of a revenue Tariff, the export of cotton goods was \$3,500,000. In 1850, after four years operation of the revenue Tariff, the export of cotton goods was \$4,240,000. In 1860, after fourteen years of the revenue Tariff, the export of these goods was \$10,934,000. Then the policy was changed, and after an experience of six years of a protective Tariff, we find that the export of cotton goods fell from \$11,000,000, in round numbers, to \$1,780,000. In 1870, the export of domestic cottons was \$3,787,000. In 1880, after twenty years of protection, the export of domestic cottons from the United States was less than 1860 at the end of the revenue Tariff period, the amount being \$9,981,000. In that same year England exported \$367,000,000 worth of cottons. Now, Sir, while the United States were importing largely of all classes of manufactured goods, I will call the attention of

the House to their imports in various lines. While they imported, in 1881, \$40,860,000 worth of woollens they exported \$346,000 worth, or two-thirds of a cent per head; while they imported \$31,219,000 worth of cottons, they exported the \$9,981,000 worth which I have spoken of. They also imported of iron and steel, \$46,491,000 worth; linen and flax, \$16,150,000 worth; silks, \$32,000,000 worth; and these five lines of imports amounted to \$166,668,000 in the year. These were goods, every dollar's worth of which were susceptible of production in that country, and should have been produced there if the promises made by the protectionists had been fulfilled; and to secure their own control of the markets in that country there was an average rate of 60.4 $\frac{1}{100}$ per cent. levied on woollens; 38.5 $\frac{4}{100}$ per cent. on cottons; 36.7 $\frac{2}{100}$ per cent. on iron; 50.5 $\frac{2}{100}$ per cent. on steel; 58.8 $\frac{2}{100}$ per cent. on silk; 33.3 $\frac{2}{100}$ per cent. on linen; in the year 1881, and yet with these enormous duties—duties which were absolutely to exclude these goods from the markets of the United States; duties which were to give to the manufacturers of the United States the entire control of their own markets—with these enormous duties the United States imported, of these five articles, \$166,668,000. Clearly, Sir, the operation of the high protective duties, as shown by the experience of the United States as well as by our own experience, has not been to give to the manufacturers of the country the absolute control of their own markets. It will be found, Mr. Speaker, on careful examination of the Treasury reports of the United States as to the price of various commodities—the averages have been kept monthly since 1825—that the highest prices for wool, grain, butter and cheese, and other farm products, have been realized in the United States during revenue Tariff periods. Well, Sir, if that be the case, as it is, it is clear that there is some humbug about this talk about agricultural protection in the United States. If the farmers of the United States, after subjecting themselves to the operation of these duties, averaging over 36 per cent. on all the imports of that country—these duties which have wrung from them hundreds of millions of dollars annually—have not realized a better market for their productions, and if it can be shown that the prices of agricultural productions were better under a revenue Tariff, then protection, clearly enough has failed in that respect. They have been deluded with false promises, and they have been paying millions, hundreds of millions and billions of dollars for a shadow of something they have never realized. Now, let us see what kind of a home market these farmers have. They have been submitting to this taxation for twenty years for the purpose of creating a home market; that is the inducement that was held out to them, that was the promise they believed. In 1860, the agricultural exports of the United States were \$295,000,000, or 78.6 $\frac{1}{100}$ per cent. of the whole amount; in 1870, they were \$391,000,000, or 79 per cent. of the entire amount of exports; in 1880, they were \$685,867,000, or 83 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the entire amount; and, in 1881, they were \$730,000,000, or 83 per cent. of the entire exports. That is not a brilliant example of the fulfilment of prophecy, or of securing to the farmers of the country a home market by the policy of protection. Let us look more closely at what has it cost the farmers of the United States to secure this home market? Senator Beck, of Kentucky, estimates that last year the farmers of the United States paid for domestic goods produced in that country, 25 per cent. more than they would have paid without a protective policy; in other words, that they paid upon the \$5,000,000,000 worth of goods which were manufactured in that country, in round numbers \$1,125,000,000, more than they could have been imported for free of duty, in order to secure a home market that only left them a small surplus of \$730,000,000 worth of productions to export to foreign countries. It is a swindle, a fraud, and we, in Canada, are developing a home market in the

Mr. CHARLTON.

same direction. Under the operation of the National Policy the agricultural exports of this country have increased. Last year they were greater than they were in the last year of the Administration of my hon. friend from Lambton. We exported food enough to feed 1,000,000 people; and yet this policy was to give the farmers of this country a market at their own doors for all the productions of the soil. But the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that all we have to do is to have a little patience—that he has made a start, and that if we have a little patience, we shall soon have a home market for the balance of our production. Let us see what increase in the home market the hon. gentleman claims to have created already. On reference to his speech, I find that he claims that ninety-five new industries have been started in this country, employing 7,242 persons. He goes on to say:

"Some 400 odd factories visited and that were in existence, less the ninety-five that I have named as being established since 1878, show an increase of employés varying from 5 to 30 per cent., and with an average of 17 per cent. in these 350 odd factories that were in operation before. That 17 per cent. on the number of employés, as far as we can gather from the Census of 1871, and making an allowance for reduction in the number employed between 1871 and 1878, would give 17,850."

Now, I want to ask my hon. friend the Finance Minister if he has the hardihood to assert, with regard to industries created in this country under a revenue Tariff, industries which had grown to such proportions that they produced \$221,000,000 worth of goods a year, that any increase in their operative force, in consequence of a revival of business throughout the world, is due to the National Policy? I utterly repudiate such an idea; it is preposterous. These manufactories would naturally increase their business in consequence of that universal revival of trade. They were in existence before the National Policy was adopted, not one of them was created by that policy, and the assertion that any one of them was created by the National Policy is, as I have said, preposterous and absurd. The hon. gentleman asserts that ninety-five factories were established.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is only a part of them.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will take into consideration the part he has given, and we shall see what kind of a list it is; and we shall ask him afterwards to give us an amended list, and then a supplemental list of the rest. On classifying the list of ninety-five new industries which he claims as due to the National Policy, I find that there are four cotton manufactories, sixteen woollen and knitting mills, twelve iron and steel establishments of various kinds, three boot and shoe factories, three furniture factories, two tobacco factories, seven musical instrument factories, five sugar refineries, three bone button factories, three glass factories, three pulp factories, three picture frame factories, and thirty-one miscellaneous concerns; employing in all 7,242 hands. In the miscellaneous list there are paper box factories, children's carriage factories, glove and slipper factories, cigar box factories, emory wheel factory, paint works, plated works, salt drying works, clothing company, corset factory, beef cannery, canned fruit factory, hat factory, pottery, brush factory, planing mills, etc. Of course a planing mill would be created by this National Policy in a country which exports its lumber. I find the hon. gentleman, in his list, claims that the new establishments in Montreal employ 1,839 hands. I have information which leads me to believe that the number in the horse-blanket factory is overstated by nine; in the shirt factory, by thirty-five, and in the glass factory, by 175; that he takes credit for the old Redpath sugar refinery, which was built before the National Policy was adopted; that the shirt factory is an old concern resuscitated and the old business continued under a new name; that the St. Lawrence Sugar Refinery is the DeCastro Syrup Company enlarged; and that the employés in the really new concerns are really 760 instead of 1,839. I hope

the hon. gentleman's statistics in other cases are more reliable than they are in this case. I find that he takes credit for a new establishment in London, which the local papers know nothing about. I find, with reference to Toronto, that he claims the Massey Company, which was removed from Newcastle; the Heintzman piano factory, which is an old concern; Childs & Company's boot and shoe factory, which is an old firm resuscitated; Gray's & Company's clothing establishment, which is an old firm; the Nut and Bolt Works, ten years old, which was closed up and removed; the Canning Works, which employ about 300 girls for a few weeks in the year; and the mill furnishing factory of Barter & Company, which is in no wise due to the National Policy, being an old establishment for the manufacture of a patent machine. The total number of hands—1,635—which he claims to be employed in new factories in Toronto is, by this means, reduced by 578, leaving a balance of 1,058, of whom 300 are girls employed a few weeks in the year in canning fruit. We have seen how much the case is overstated in Montreal. We have seen how much it is overstated in Toronto, and it leads us to have suspicion as to his statements in other respects. I find that in the hon. gentleman's own city he puts down a bolt manufactory, employing twenty-five hands, that is an old concern, and he fails to inform us that the Safe Company and the Colebrook Iron Works, employing five times as many hands as this establishment, have been killed off by the National Policy. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he heard that statement. He no doubt is familiar with the affairs of that country. Does he know that the Colebrook Iron Works have been killed off by his policy?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Oh, I know all about it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question does not interest the hon. gentleman. I have gone carefully through this list and I have arrived at the following estimate as to how much of this industry is due to the National Policy. I estimate that in the cotton trade 450 hands are employed in ways that may perhaps be considered due to the National Policy. In woollen goods I estimate 400 hands, in furniture 40, in sugar refining 298, unless we also take the number employed in the Redpath refinery which was created before the Tariff. In glass establishments I estimate 360 hands, in miscellaneous establishments 232, making a total of 1,680, or adding the Redpath concern, 2,030 hands employed in establishments given in this list whose existence may fairly be attributed to the National Policy. What have we on the other hand? Are there any establishments killed off by this policy? How many would be required to manufacture the goods we do not export, that we did export under the Administration of my hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie)? I think we may fairly claim that there have been driven out of the country at least 2,500 operatives owing to this policy. The net result is a loss to this country of 500 operatives. But, even if we assume that the hon. gentleman's estimate is correct, and that his policy has given employment to 7,242 more operatives than were employed before the National Policy, I would ask if that is a benefit commensurate with the cost of this policy to the country. What does this policy cost us? How much excessive taxation is levied in consequence of this policy? In 1878, the revenue from Customs amounted to \$12,782,000, and there was a deficit during that year of \$1,128,000. I estimate that it would have been necessary under a Reform Administration to increase the expenditure \$1,500,000, which is a liberal estimate, had my hon. friend continued to manage the affairs of the country, because in five years he only incurred a gross increase of expenditure of \$200,000. This estimated increase of expenditure would have required a

revenue the present year of \$15,400,000, and the hon. Finance Minister tells us we are to have \$20,500,000, or \$5,100,000 more than would have been necessary to manage the affairs of the country. From this it is plain that we are taxed \$5,000,000 more than would be necessary under prudent management. We have an excessive tax of \$5,000,000. But that is not all. It is estimated that under the protective policy, for every \$4 that is collected and placed in the coffers of the Government, at least \$9 are collected in the form of enhanced cost of domestic goods by the manufacturers. I will modify my estimate. I will suppose that consumers are paying \$8,000,000 more in increased cost of domestic goods manufactured in this country, and upon that estimate we have an increase of \$13,000,000 a year on the burdens of the people in direct and indirect taxation. \$13,000,000 is the cost to the country of a policy that, upon a liberal estimate, has increased the number of operatives in this country by 7,242 souls. If the actual increase is 2,500, which is a liberal estimate, the cost per head to the country is \$6,600. If each of these represents three in a family, the cost per head to the country is \$1,733. If there are 7,000 of them, the cost is \$1,850 per head. If there are 7,000 of them, and three in a family, the cost is \$617 per head. But the hon. gentleman tells us that, in compensation for this great cost, we have an extensive market for our "garden sass," and he revives what is known as the "garden sass theory" of political economy. I find, in the report of his Budget Speech, the following:—

"Why, Sir, under the operations of this Tariff, for the vegetables, the fruit, the poultry, the lamb, the veal and other meats, the butter the cheese, for almost everything they offer for sale, they obtain higher prices on account of the home market."

Well, Sir, I suppose we can manage to dispose of all the butter we have to spare. We do now find a profitable foreign market for a large amount of butter and cheese. We can let our calves grow up to oxen and let our lambs grow in the same way if we can find no market for them. I will admit, for the sake of argument, that there is an increased market for garden sass, and let us estimate the cost to the people of the country. By the Census returns of 1870 I find that there were 275,000 acres of garden and orchard. That was an average of one acre for every fourteen and a half inhabitants. If the population had been increased by 7,000, and each person represented three in a family, there would be 21,000 of an additional population requiring an increased area of orchard and garden of 1,500 acres, at a total cost—if this were the only benefit—of \$13,000,000. The cost per acre at this calculation would be \$8,666. The cost to the country, if the National Policy has increased the number of operations, 7,000, and each represents three in a family, would be \$617 per head. I propose now to refer to some of the statements made by my hon. friend regarding the market for farm produce. I find in the report of his speech that he refers to the exceptional state of things that has existed in the American grain market for the last two years. Well, certainly, Sir, there has been an exceptional state of things. Under the operation of the National Policy for the last two years grain has been higher in the American than in the Canadian markets, higher in Chicago than in Toronto, and that exceptional state of things will continue so long as the hon. gentleman's fiscal policy remains in operation. In this he refers to the effect of "corners"—of speculators forcing up the price of wheat. Undoubtedly, an exceptional state of things has existed in the West. No. 2 spring wheat has at times been 10 to 15 cents higher in Chicago than in Toronto. Whatever that state of things may be due to, it is at all events apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the duties upon American wheat are rendered useless by the fact that wheat is higher there than here. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"Well, now, Sir, ten days ago wheat was sold in the Toronto market 3 cents higher per bushel than it was sold for in the Chicago

market, and it could not have brought these 3 cents per bushel in excess had it not been for the Tariff."

You see, Sir, the hon. gentleman had one crumb of comfort. He was able to pick out one day when wheat happened to be 3 cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago. Well, Sir, wheat of the same grade was higher even on that day in Chicago than in Toronto, for the grade of spring wheat sold in Toronto is superior to that of the same name sold in Chicago, and when Chicago No. 2 spring is lower by 3 cents than No. 2 spring in Toronto, the fact is that grade of wheat, such as is raised in Canada, would be worth, even in Chicago, several cents per bushel more than the ordinary Chicago No. 2. Hard No. 2 is usually quoted in Chicago at from 4 cents to 7 cents higher than ordinary No. 2 spring, and that would be the class usually sold in Toronto. But, Sir, whatever may be true as regards the hon. gentleman's assertion that wheat could be sent from Chicago to Liverpool as cheaply as from Toronto to Liverpool, on account of the ring controlling freights, that is not the question affecting the people of this country, but the question is whether the duties upon grain are doing them good or not. The question is, would wheat, quoted 3 cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago, be brought from Chicago to Toronto and sold there at prices to depress the market. Will the hon. the Finance Minister tell us the 3 cents per bushel in favor of Toronto market on the day of which he speaks, would pay the freight from Chicago to Toronto. Will he tell us there was any possibility of going to Chicago, buying wheat at 3 cents per bushel margin, bringing it to Toronto or any other Canadian port, and selling it there so as to depress the price of wheat in the Canadian market? If it is not the case, then, so far as the farmers are concerned, it has no bearing on their interest and nothing to do with the question of practical protection. Then the hon. gentleman tells us, Sir:

"As we know, after a heavy shipment of produce, after the harvest is in and a large portion of it has been shipped to England, the quantity of Canadian grain in the country being diminished, Canadian millers have to pay an increased price for the wheat which they require, and this increase goes into the pockets of our farmers, who reap the benefit."

In other words, Sir, after the crop in Canada is gathered, after it is sold, after it has gone out of the farmers' hands, after it has been exported from the country, when it becomes necessary for the miller to import wheat for home consumption the price of wheat rises. Of course it does. Can the hon. gentleman contend that the rise goes into the farmer's pocket? It does not; because the farmer is not selling the wheat. The fact is the country has sold short, and the supply must be imported. Except when wheat is imported, prices here are invariably lower than in corresponding markets in the United States. I would like to give some quotations of prices. I may say that in the course of the past summer, addressing audiences at various times, I have made a practice of compiling the latest market quotations on each occasion. This course I have followed during a period of several months, and in no case have they failed to tell the same tale that these grains were higher in American markets than in corresponding Canadian markets. I have market reports for March 2nd. On that day No. 2 spring wheat was worth \$1.26½ in Toronto, it was worth \$1.26½ in Chicago, but hard No. 2 was quoted there at \$1.30. No. 2 Duluth, the same day at Buffalo was \$1.45, and No. 1 Duluth was \$1.60. I find that on that day barley sold for 70 cents in Montreal, 87 cents in Toronto, \$1.14 in New York, and \$1.04 in Chicago, \$1.05 in Buffalo, \$1.08 in Oswego, in any case almost 20 cents higher than in Toronto. Oats, Toronto, 41 cents per 34 lbs.; Chicago, 42 cents per 32 lbs.; Buffalo, a corresponding market to Toronto, 47 cents; Toledo, at the head of Lake Erie, 44 cents, or 3 cents more than in Toronto. Peas, Montreal, 76 cents; Toronto, 80 cents; Buffalo \$1. Rye, New York, 90 cents; Chicago, 88 cents;

Mr. CHARLTON.

Toronto, 83 cents. Best grade of butter, Montreal, 34 cents; New York, 47 cents; Toronto, 26 cents; Chicago, 30 cents; Buffalo, 36 cents. Best grade cheese, Montreal, 12½ cents; New York, 12½ cents; Chicago 13½ cents; Buffalo 14. It can readily be understood how necessary it is for the protection of Canadian industries to impose duties so as to prevent any lunatic from going to Buffalo buying No. 2 spring wheat for \$1.45, bringing it over to Toronto to sell at \$1.26½, to hinder evil disposed persons from buying oats in Chicago at 42 cents per 32 lbs. and slaughtering them in Toronto at 41 cents per 34 lbs. How great the benefit that no person is allowed to buy barley for \$1.08 in Oswego, bring it across the lake and ruin our markets by selling it at 87 cents. The whole system of duties is an absurdity in every article that can be named. Of what value is protection to us when the prices of all these articles are higher in the American markets than in ours.

Mr. PLUMB. If that argument means anything it means that we have not protection enough.

Mr. CHARLTON. In every article which can be enumerated, grain, butter, cheese, and other produce the prices are higher in the American markets than in the corresponding markets in Canada; they have been so for months and even years previous.

Mr. PLUMB. If the argument means anything, it is that we have not now enough protection.

Mr. CHARLTON. It means that there is no danger of American grain being brought into this market to depress prices here. That argument means that the idea of preventing produce being sent from a high-priced market to a low-priced market is an absurdity and a fraud. It means that hon. gentlemen opposite have been palming off on the country one of the greatest humbugs ever palmed off on the public. I repeat that the American farmers and the Canadian farmers have been made the victims of a fraud, through the promise that the imposition of duties on grain would raise the prices in either of those countries, when both of those countries have vast surpluses to export. How absurd it is to suppose that in the United States, of whose wheat crop 36 per cent. was exported last year, a duty on wheat would raise the price in that country. The Canadian farmers now clearly see that such a duty does them no good.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Lake Superior and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Quebec Timber Company (Limited).—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 3) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Marine Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 4) respecting the Sun Mutual Life Insurance Company of Montreal.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Manitoba Bank.—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 27) to further amend the Act incorporating the Mutual Life Association of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the "Life Association of Canada."—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the charter of the Chartered Bank of London and North America, and to change the name thereof to "The Chartered Bank of London and Winnipeg."—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the North-Western Bank.—(Mr. Rochester.)

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read a second time:—

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Saskatchewan, Qu'Appelle and Assiniboine Navigation Company.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at 6 o'clock I was just upon the point of entering briefly into the consideration of the coal question, and I shall only touch upon that matter. It is said that the Oracles of ancient Greece, when giving utterance to their announcements, felt that they were imposing upon the public credibility. This feeling made them laugh in their sleeves, and in fact two augers could not meet each other without indulging in a hearty laugh at the remembrance of the sells they had palmed off on a confiding public. I thought of that circumstance when the hon. Minister of Finance gradually broke the ground for the good news we were to receive, by telling us he thought the consumer in Ontario did not pay all the duty on coal, but that, at least, one half of that duty was paid by the American coal merchant. Having thus broken the ground for the reception of the good news, the hon. Minister of Railways proceeded to inform us that not only was that true but in point of fact the news was better than that, and that the American coal dealer paid all the duty. It reminded me of a story of an old African in the palmy days of American slavery. In driving his master's oxen he met with a misfortune one day. The team ran down a hill over a precipice, and the waggon was smashed and both oxen were killed. Cæsar, in revolving in his mind how it would be best to break the news to his master, concluded he would break it gradually. So he came in and he says: "Massa, the waggon am broke." Well, the master thought that was bad. Then, the darkey says again: "Massa, the nigh ox am killed." Well, that somewhat excited the master. After a pause, he says again: "Massa, the off ox am killed, too." "Well," said the master, "you rascal, why did you not tell me this all at once?" "I was afraid, Massa," said Cæsar, "that if I told you all at once you could not bore it." So the hon. Minister of Finance prepared us gradually for the reception of the full measure of blessing we receive under this duty. I shall not enter at length into a discussion of this question, but I propose to read a letter from a gentleman, a very high authority, a gentleman who, some years ago, was employed by the Treasury Department of the United States, to write a report for that year on the trade relations between Canada and that country, a gentleman who has been at the head of the editorial staff of a prominent daily newspaper for several years, and who is an authority of some repute. Knowing this gentleman's familiarity with trade affairs, I wrote him the day following that on which the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways was made. His reply is dated Buffalo, 5th March. I may say that Buffalo is a great *entrepot* for anthracite coal. Buffalo is the point from which immense shipments are made by the lake vessels, and the great coal companies have enormous quantities in Buffalo, and a very large amount of coal is kept constantly in stock there. The letter is as follows:—

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have seen Mr. Underhill, one of the representatives here of the great coal companies here, and he assures me that there is no kind of a rebate, in any form or under any name, given on coal going to Canada. He says the duty is one element of the Canadian price, which is just as distinctly calculated by the dealers there as the freight is. He expects, in a few days, to meet the general Canadian agent of their

association, and promises that he will get from him a memorandum of facts, to be put in your hands. Meantime I enclose circulars Buffalo prices (wholesale) for the past year. The prices given in the October circular are still prevailing. The difference between price free on board vessel 'and to dealers on board cars, at Buffalo and the bridges,' going into or through Canada—is simply the cost of transfer from car to vessel, and includes no rebate. I will send you what further information I can gather as soon as possible.

"Sincerely yours,

"J. N. LARNED."

"Mr. JOHN CHARLTON, M.P.,
"Ottawa."

This, then, is the declaration of the agent of coal companies in Buffalo, and it is fairly contradictory to the declaration made by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. I now propose to deal with one or two points raised by the hon. the Minister of Railways in the course of his speech; and I must say I have a sincere admiration for the hardihood, the unbounded hardihood, of that hon. gentleman. I really think that in the course of debate he warms up, and he is something in the condition of a rider in a steeple chase, who gets so excited in that ride that he has only a hazy recollection of the way he scaled the hedges and leaped the ditches in the course of his ride. I am inclined to believe that the hon. Minister of Railways, warming up to the subject and launching out so freely and making assertions so palpably absurd, must have lost his head and lost sight of what he intended to say. On this occasion he said that there really was no choice in 1878 between adopting the National Policy and resorting to direct taxation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do candidly say that I never heard a more absurd assertion made on the floor of this House than that is. Let us examine into it for a moment. I showed before recess that to provide for the expenditures on the scale on which they stood in 1878; to provide for the deficit that existed in that year, and to provide for the additional annual expenditure of \$1,500,000—which would be an ample increase—we would require an increase of \$2,620,000 upon the revenue of that year which amounted to \$12,975,000. Now, Sir, are we to believe that it would have been impossible to secure that additional revenue after the revival came, or that there could not have been a revival and an increase of revenue on the scale of duties levied under the old Tariff to meet that increased expenditure. If it was impossible to realize that amount then some change would require to be made—perhaps some slight addition in the revenue duties, but even then it was not necessary to resort to a policy such as was inaugurated by hon. gentlemen. But I think I can show, to the satisfaction of this House and of the country, that it is within the limits of reasonable expectation to suppose that the revival in trade would have produced, under the scale of duties imposed by the old Tariff, an additional revenue sufficiently great to meet this necessary addition to our expenses. That addition would have been, in round numbers, 20½ per cent. on the Customs duties of 1878. If we look to the United States, a country similarly situated to ourselves, and examine the increase in the Customs duties in that country consequent on the revival of trade, I think we shall be satisfied that the revival here would produce an ample amount. I find from the returns of that country that, in 1878, the American revenue was \$130,000,000 in Customs. I find that, in 1881, that revenue had increased—without a solitary change in the Tariff, without a change in the minutest particular, but solely in consequence of the revival of trade in that country—from \$138,000,000 to \$198,000,000; that in four years the revenue of the United States, without any change in the Tariff, had increased 52 per cent. That being the case, I would ask is it unreasonable to suppose that the revival in trade here would not have produced an increase in revenue at least two-fifths as great as in the United States. I hold that the supposition is not unreasonable. I hold that it is morally certain that if the Cartwright Tariff had continued

in force until last year it would have produced more than \$2,600,000 more than in 1878, and if that can be shown then the assertion of the hon. Minister of Railways that there was no choice between the National Policy and direct taxation in 1878 is an utter and unmitigated absurdity as it undoubtedly and positively is. The hon. gentleman then went on to speculate a little and theorize on the increase of our public debt, and he told us that if we sold our lands at \$1 per acre we would reduce the debt \$100,000,000. The hon. gentleman has no doubt heard of the old lady's calculations as to how many chickens a certain number of eggs would produce, and how many more chickens would be produced when the eggs which these laid were hatched, and the arithmetical proportion of increase; but a great many slips occur between the cup and the lip. The old lady did not realize her expectations, and I am afraid the hon. Minister of Railways will never realize his expectations in reference to the revenue to be derived from the prospective sale of public lands. I wish to direct his attention very briefly to certain statistics in regard to the American public lands. They had a great public domain like ourselves. They have sold large quantities of land; millions and tens of millions have settled upon them. They are now a nation of 50,000,000 of people, and if we can expect to reduce our debt \$100,000,000 by the sale of lands, what might we reasonably suppose that country has derived in nearly a century from the sale of its public domain. I see by the returns of the sales of lands in the United States, from 1796 to 1881, that they realized \$207,000,000—certainly a very large sum. But I see that the expenses of the land department for that period—and the statement does not include the expenses of the general Land Office up to 1852, which would be many millions—were \$74,366,000, and that the net proceeds of the sales of the public lands of the United States, from 1796 to 1881—almost one round century—amounted to \$133,000,000, an average amount of \$1,550,000 a year. That sum represents interest at 4 per cent. on \$38,777,000. That sum stands the United States only in an amount of \$38,770,000 capitalized; and in the face of these figures how absurd is the assertion of the hon. gentleman with regard to the revenue likely to be derived from the sale of lands in the Canadian North-West. Then the hon. gentleman makes another assertion, and, of course, he does it on the theory I propounded a few minutes ago, viz., that if the hon. gentleman was to assert that a great flood swept over the earth, and that thousands of people were destroyed, we would be told, when we came to eliminate the portion springing from his own exuberant fancy, and got down to the bottom facts, that it meant only a heavy shower. He says that the farmers are now receiving higher prices than ever before. Evidently the hon. gentleman's memory is defective. He probably forgets the prices we received during the Crimean War, when we had prices nearly twice as high as to-day. His memory does not even extend back as far as 1877, when the average price of wheat for a whole year was \$1.47. In January of that year it was \$1.34; March, \$1.47; April, \$1.74; May, \$1.97; July, \$1.65; August, \$1.40. In January of that year oats were 46 cents; March, 47½ cents; April, 46 cents; May, 52 cents; July, 46 cents; August, 41 cents. Peas were 92½ cents in May; and all grains that year were higher than they have been this year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Why did you not have good times with such splendid prices?

Mr. CHARLTON. We were laying the foundation for the good times which the hon. gentleman is now enjoying, and which we would have enjoyed had we remained in power. We did not reap as we sowed, but we sowed and another reaped. That is all the trouble there was about it. The hon. gentleman, after this absurd statement, proceeds

Mr. CHARLTON.

to make an enquiry. He enquires of this House: "If we were had in 1873, what must you have been in 1878, when the people drove you from power?" Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. gentleman has not reached that sublime height of hardihood to assert that the Reform party were driven from power in 1878 for reasons similar to those that operated in producing the downfall of his own friends in 1873. I think that the hon. gentleman will see that there is a marked difference between the circumstances of the two cases. In fact, his party can scarcely be said to have been driven from power; they left power as a debtor leaves his country, between two days; they left power as a soldier leaves the ranks and skulks in the bushes during the hours of battle. They were here one day, and when we came here the next day, we had, in the meantime, received notice that the contest would not take place, in consequence of one of the combatants being unavoidably absent. So they were not driven from power, but skulked away, not daring to meet the vote of the representatives of the people. Whatever lead to the downfall of the late Government in 1878, they could not be accused of dishonorable conduct. They were not driven from power because they betrayed a great public trust; they were not driven from power because they received money for a public charter. They were, it is true, defeated, but they were honorably defeated; they stood by their principles, and they fell on the field of battle, honorably if disastrously, and no stain rests on them such as rests on hon. gentlemen opposite, in connection with the event of 1873.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What about stolen letters?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that must be our hon. friend from Hastings; I failed to catch what he said, and therefore it must be lost. The hon. Minister of Railways next referred to the question of the balance of trade, and he told us in relation to this matter that England occupied a different position from that of any other country, and that what was a good thing for England was a very bad thing for any other country; he also quoted from President Grant's message of 1876, congratulating the United States on the possession at that time of a favorable balance of trade. Now Sir, it is well known to political economists that in countries situated like Canada and the United States, what is known as a favorable balance of trade is in most cases an indication of distress. Favorable balances of trade almost invariably accompany periods of commercial depression, and it is generally found that when good times follow depression, what is known as an unfavorable balance of trade occurs. And that happens to be our case. It happens, notwithstanding the position hon. gentlemen take on the subject, that Canada in the last fiscal year has an unfavorable balance of trade of \$8,000,000, exclusive of our specie reports. We find that in the United States, from 1856 to 1881, inclusive, that in seventeen of these years the country had an unfavorable balance of trade, and in nine of these years it had a favorable balance of trade. From 1856 to 1874, there were but two years when a favorable balance of trade occurred, and those two years were immediately following the commercial revulsion of 1867. England has had the balance of trade against her time out of mind. From 1861 to 1880 the balances of trade against England amounted to £2,496,000,000 sterling, or \$11,481,000,000, an average of \$574,000,000 a year of a balance of trade against that nation for every year since 1856; and yet that condition of things has not ruined her—why? Because it represents the profits of England. Mr. J. G. Mulhall, in a recent article, gives the component parts of the balance of trade for one year. He tells us that the profits on the ocean-carrying trade of that year amounted to £45,000,000, and this reminds us of the fact that the American foreign carrying trade has fallen from 89½ per cent. in 1830, to 16 ⅔ per cent. in 1881. If that state of things continues, hon. gentlemen can figure for

themselves how long it will take the protective policy of the United States to obliterate this trade altogether. Mr. Mulhall also gives, as making up the balance of trade against England, the following items: Insurance, £3,500,000; interest on capital in foreign trade, £5,000,000; merchants' profit, £17,500,000; interest on foreign investments, £55,000,000; making a total of £126,000,000 of an unfavorable balance of trade, every pound of which represents England's profits. We may count on a considerable sum from our own ocean-carrying trade until the present policy obliterates it, and we may count on a profit from our merchant's trade; and with these two items, we need not be alarmed if we have a balance of trade against us. So much for the criticisms I wished to make on the points raised by the hon. Minister of Railways. Now, I wish to refer to one or two points made by the hon. member for Glengarry. That hon. gentleman asserted that the Legislature of Ontario was not warranted in discussing the National Policy. Well, Sir, I am at a loss to understand why even a country debating school should not be permitted to discuss the National Policy. A matter which may be discussed in private circles, which is discussed everywhere, is surely a legitimate subject of discussion in the Legislature of Ontario. I presume that my hon. friend, taking the position that his party does, that the Provincial Legislatures should be trampled upon, that their acts should be revised by the Governor in Council and set aside for ever, thinks it is beyond the prerogatives of the Ontario Legislature to discuss anything pertaining to Dominion politics. The hon. gentleman says, speaking of us, that our friends have not got a policy, and are disappointed if anyone else has. Well, I think before this Session closes the Reform party will be able to demonstrate that they have a very well defined policy. I think the lines of its policy will be set pretty clearly before the country, and will be such as will challenge the approval of all right thinking men. In treating of the question of the rates of duties, I wish to lay before you one feature of the question which is generally overlooked. When we speak of a 20 or 25 per cent. duty, it is thought that the price of the article is increased by 20 or 25 per cent., or whatever the duty may be. Such is not a fair statement of the case; we should add to the duty the wholesale dealers' profit. If a wholesale dealer imports \$100 worth of goods, and pays \$20 duty on them he charges a profit of say 10 per cent., not only on the cost of the goods but on the duty as well; then the retail dealer charges 25 per cent., if that is his profit, not on the \$100 or on the \$120, but on the first cost, the duty, and the wholesale dealer's profit together, amounting to \$132. He charges 25 per cent. upon \$132, the cost to him of the article, and I have made up a table here, Sir, which shows what the ultimate cost to the consumer is, assuming that the wholesale profit is 10 per cent. and the retail profit 25 per cent. I find, Sir, by working it out, that a duty of 20 per cent. means an increased cost of $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to the consumer, that a duty of 30 per cent. means an increased cost of $41\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., that a duty of 40 per cent. means an increased cost of 55 per cent., that a duty of 50 per cent. means an increased cost of $68\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., that a duty of 60 per cent. means an increased cost of $82\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., that a duty of 70 per cent. means an increased cost of $96\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while a duty of 75 per cent. means the doubling of the cost to the consumer, increasing its cost, as it does, $103\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. So that, Sir, the injury inflicted upon the consumer by the policy of unnecessarily large duties is not to be measured by the amount of duty, but is largely in excess of the amount of duty imposed by the Government. Now, one word or two, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question of what constitutes the character of the principle under discussion. Sir, I contend that the money levied upon the people in proportion to their ability to pay for the support of the Government is just taxation.

But the National Policy does not do that, it does not levy its taxes upon its people in proportion to their ability to pay; on the contrary, it requires the poor man to pay more taxes in proportion to his ability than the rich man. It places a heavier duty upon the low grades of cotton and woollen fabrics, such as poor men use, than it does upon the finer and more expensive grades. It places a duty upon breadstuffs in the Maritime Provinces, and that duty bears unequally and with unjust rigor upon the poorer classes of those Provinces, as compared with the rich; it places a duty upon coal, of which the poor use more in proportion to their means than do the rich. Consequently the National Policy does not equally distribute taxes among the various classes, so that each should pay in proportion to its ability. The next principle that applies to taxation is that it should be levied in such a way as to put money into the Treasury with the least loss, direct or indirect; that is not only just, but wise taxation. Now, Sir, does the National Policy fulfil this requirement? I maintain that it does not; it fails in the first requirement by levying its duties unequally. It has levied the taxes in such a way that, while it brings some \$5,000,000 extra into the Treasury, yet in its operation it adds at least \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 more to the burdens of the people by their being compelled to pay enhanced prices for the domestic fabrics of the country, so that the policy fails in this requirement, and actually causes unnecessary waste. Then, Sir, these taxes are levied not for the support of the Government, but for the benefit and aggrandisement of particular classes; and therefore the taxation is neither wise nor just, but may properly be characterized as unjust, if, indeed, a stronger term should not be used. But it may be asked, does the National Policy do this? I answer, yes; for while it does not come up to the requirements I have first named, it is liable to the objection, to a great extent, of aggrandizing particular classes. We hear, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Redpath is reported to have purchased the late residence of the Empress Eugenie (Chislehurst), and, I ask, how did he make the money to buy this palatial residence? How is it that he is able to vie with the Vanderbilts, the Rothschilds, and other millionaires of Europe and America to-day? How has it been accumulated? Simply out of the taxes imposed for the benefit of himself and a few others. I claim that the National Policy is open to the objection of having produced this result in this case, and in numerous others. Now, Sir, revenue taxation is right, but if the Government must get a revenue, let that revenue be derived in such a way as will bear equitably and give such incidental protection to the industries of the country as may fairly be given. And we have seen, Mr. Speaker, that under the revenue Tariff in Canada we have had a large development of our manufacturing industries. We have seen, Sir, that under a revenue Tariff prevailing in the United States from 1846 to 1860 during that time the manufacturing industries of that country increased. I repeat that a revenue Tariff is consistent with the national wealth, progress and growth. Now, a revenue Tariff of, say 20 per cent, with raw material for manufactures admitted free would unquestionably greatly lessen the burden of the people of this country, and it would, with equal certainty, greatly stimulate the growth and manufacturing industries of this country. We should then have just such a measure of protection as this country requires and one in the interests of the manufacturers themselves, but it is unwise to force the development of manufactures, and to overcrowd the markets, it is only wise to do what is necessary to aid the operation of business, and to tend to a safe and healthy growth. There is something comical, Mr. Speaker, in the efforts made by our hon. friends opposite to attribute everything that is cheering in the present condition of the country, to the effects of the National Policy. Why, Sir, if

we believe these hon. gentlemen, we will consider that the increased prices of butter and cheese are owing to it; that it has increased our population, in the face of the well known exodus; that it has increased the price of wheat, oats, barley and rye, even in the United States; that it makes the Yankee coal dealers put down the price of coal, and while it makes coal cheaper than it was before, it at the same time makes it enough dearer to enable the Nova Scotia dealer to bring his coal as far west as Coburg, when he could not formerly send it further west than Montreal. In fact, it makes coal, at the same moment, dearer and cheaper. It increases the cost of manufactures, the cost of importation, and yet the people are said to get goods cheaper than before; in fact, it produces the most opposite results, does this National Policy. Why, Sir, for the results of the five years of economical administration and economy of the people that we have had, under my hon. friend from Lambton, we are called upon to credit this wonderful National Policy. As to the short harvest of 1876; why, the recurrence of such a melancholy event as that is rendered impossible by the operation of the National Policy. For the three good harvests that succeeded that short harvest, we must again give credit to the National Policy, and for the two bad harvests in England that policy must also be thanked, as the result was a greater demand for our productions. Our National Policy has also brought about the resumption of specie payment in the United States, and the revival of business there—so far reaching are its effects. For the effect of the revival of trade in the United States by which our lumber trade has obtained such increased profits, credit to the National Policy; for a bountiful Providence and for all the merciful dealings of a just and gracious God, credit to the National Policy. If you wish to find the grand first cause upon which all human events depend, for the great pivotal point upon which all interests of nations, all interests of individuals, all interests of commerce and trade rest, all the world over, put your finger on the Canadian National Policy and you have it. Mr. Speaker, the Reform party will not assume the responsibility for certain things, either in the past or in the future. They do not propose to assume the responsibility for drought, plague, potatoe rot, the potatoe bug, short crops and matters of that kind. They distinctly and emphatically disclaim all responsibility for these things now, in the past as in the future. There are certain things which the Reform party will not claim to be able to do; it will not claim to be able to avert events which are overruling Providence has fore-ordained shall come to pass. Whatever God decrees in human affairs the Reform party professes to believe will come to pass, and it does not and will not profess to have the ability or power to avert any of these events. But there are many things which it will be able to do; it promises to have sympathy now and in the future for every move made in the direction of human progress. It promises further to give to this country a policy which will give just and equal taxation, and at the same time lead to a rapid and healthy development of all the interests especially the manufacturing interests of this country. It promises to call a halt in this sweeping tide of public expenditure, which threatens to engulf the country in financial ruin. It promises to adopt, as a matter of parliamentary policy, the assumption that the public debt is large enough, and should not be permitted to exceed reasonable limits. It promises to pay due regard to provincial rights, and prevent the Federal power trespassing on the rights of the Provinces in this Dominion. It promises to adopt a land policy for this country with regard to the disposal of that vast public domain in the North-West, which is to be the home of future millions—a policy conceived in the interests of the masses, in the interests of the men who will till that soil, and not in the interests of that horde of speculators who throng to that

Mr. CHARLTON.

country, and desire to win millions out of the sweat and toil of those who will be called upon to pay the vast profits they expect to make from lands the settler will be compelled to buy from them. And, Sir, the Reform party promises this country honest administration. It promises an end to those contract scandals at the head of which stands the Pacific Railway Syndicate bargain, a disgrace to this country; and not far distant from which stands the Onderdonk contract. It promises to remedy these things, and it promises to place the affairs of this country in the hands of a leader who is temperate, honest and capable; a man of the highest personal character; a man who, without rank or the flummery of titles, is recognized as a prince among his fellow-men.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was very witty at the expense of the hon. member for Niagara. He said he could look back and remember when the hon. gentleman was not so loyal as he was when speaking of our Sovereign the other night. He might look back a very few years when he himself was not so super-loyal as he is now, when he ridiculed the volunteers of this country for going out to defend it. He said the hon. member for Niagara could look back to the time when he was a democrat and a free trader, and now he is a protectionist. The hon. member for Norfolk might look back to a period not so far remote as that—only the other day—when he was a republican and a protectionist. Why, let him look back at his own history. He speaks of inconsistency. Trace his own inconsistencies, and they are numerous. He was like a chameleon in the rapidity with which he changed his political opinion, indeed he might be called a chameleon politician. The hon. gentleman was great upon statistics; he is marvellous as a compiler of statistics; he is great as a manipulator of figures. Give him figures and he will prove anything, even that white is black, and black no color at all. The hon. gentleman was fond of dealing in hard words, and spoke of the audacity of the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways. If you were to take away his own audacity and his figures, there would be very little left. The hon. gentleman has said that he was a protectionist and always was a protectionist. That is true. He declared that 17½ per cent. was enough, yet he advocated 20 per cent. But if 17½ per cent. was sufficient, why did he deliver that great speech in favor of protection? It was not a necessity. No one calculated to do away with the 17½ per cent. Tariff, which had been in existence two years before he made the speech. Then, again, the hon. gentleman was kind enough to say—I suppose he judges other men by himself—that if the late Government had proposed an increase, their opponents were prepared to denounce them and come out as free traders. As regards the boundary question, I remember that, in 1872, the hon. gentleman travelled through his own constituency and mine, and what did he say with respect to the land which is now of such immense value? He declared that the whole of the lands on the north shore of Lake Superior were worthless and would not pay to occupy; but now, because he seeks, if possible, to embroil the Ontario and Dominion Governments, he places a high value on them, saying that the people of Ontario are being robbed of their rights and of valuable land. The hon. gentleman proceeded to account for the depression in the United States by ascribing it to inflation. Evidently, he has inflation on the brain, and he can never have given the subject a moment's thought. When did the depression begin, was it at the time of inflation? No, it was long afterwards. I heard an anecdote the other day, and, although I am not good at telling anecdotes, I will relate it for his benefit. This is the anecdote I wish to tell in illustration of my point: two boys were attending school, and one of them had an india-rubber band, which he showed to his neighbor. The little fellow said: "Come, tell me what is that?" The other replied: "It is an india-rubber band and I

will show you the use of it; you catch hold of it in your teeth," when the other took it as bidden. The other boy then pulled it out and let it go when at its full length. Now that is an illustration of expansion and contraction? The expansion in the United States did no harm, but it was the contraction that produced the bad effect.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). It hit them in the mouth.

Mr. WALLACE. Another of the hon. gentleman's propositions I am glad to be able to agree with. I am glad to be able to agree with him sometimes; it was this: that Canada had good reason for thankfulness. While I agree with that proposition, I differ with him as to the cause. I believe that Canada has great reason for thankfulness in having got rid of the imbeciles on that side of the House, who brought ruin and distress on the country—who were the flies on the wheel. Then, again, he said that the manufacturers would prosper under a 15 per cent. Tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite lacked one thing when in office; they could not take a wise and comprehensive view of the situation. When that Tariff was in existence we had a much better protection than any Tariff could give—namely, higher wages for labor in the United States than existed in Canada. But when the depression overtook the Republic—when labor fell to a lower point than in this country—they sailed into Canada with their goods at slaughter prices, and destroyed our manufactures that had been established, and that were prospering before that state of things commenced. The hon. gentleman also told us in one breath that the manufacturers of Canada are not prospering, and in the other that they are making too much money by robbing and ruining the people. The two things cannot be true; one or the other must be false. Then, again, when speaking of the imports of cotton, they were much larger in 1881 than in 1878. But he forgot to tell us that in the first year we only imported the raw cotton to the extent of \$7,250,000, and in the latter over \$16,000,000 in the same material. Furthermore, he said that the manufacturing industries of this country have decreased, as shown by the exports—Why? Because we are not exporting as much as in former times, and the reason is obvious, because there is nothing to export. The manufacturers sell all they make in this country; and they are better employed, working longer time, and turning out more goods than when they exported largely. But there was one industry referred to as not flourishing now as when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and that was the export of rags. Well, I admit that the late Government was an instance of a signal success in the manufacture of rags; their do-nothing policy brought a great many people to beggary and rags, and the reason why the people had none to export was that they had to wear them themselves. I am happy to say that the people of this country now have rags to export, because they can wear good clothes. Then, again, when I heard the hon. gentleman talking about the farmers of the United States paying hundreds of millions, for the encouragement of manufactures, as he said for a home market, that did no good, I bethought me what a set of fools the people of the United States must be, and what a loss they sustained when they did not keep that prince of political economists in that country, that Solon, to tell them how to manage their own affairs. They ought to send for him, because he knows more than those 50,000,000 of people how their country ought to be governed. The hon. gentleman also asked what is the result of the National Policy? First of all, he replied, it extorted \$5,000,000 of taxation; and it took \$8,000,000 from the people for the pockets of the manufacturers. Does it stay there? Is it not sent out again to employ labor and make the people prosperous, by furnishing more abundant and remunerative employment. He also asserts that the manufacturers are not making

money, and that he wishes to make them more prosperous by a Tariff of 20 per cent. and removing the duty on raw materials, in order to give them a better opportunity of enriching themselves at the expense of the consumers of this country, for whom at other times he professes so much sympathy. The hon. gentleman also dealt with the coal question, which I wish the hon. gentlemen opposite to think for a little. I lay it down as a principle that I think cannot be gainsaid, that the duty on an imported article that meets with home competition is paid by a foreign producer or exporter. For instance, a Canadian importer is nothing more or less than a salesman for a foreign manufacturer, and it is as the importer of the foreign goods that he pays the duty. I lay it down as a rule then that, where home competition obtains, the duty on the imported article has to be paid by the owner or producer. Now, as regards United States coal as an article of fuel that comes in competition with the coal of Nova Scotia, and with the wood of Ontario, or old Canada generally. What is the effect of the quantity? The quantity regulates the selling price or marketable value of a commodity. I find that by looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns that we imported to this country over 1,000,000 tons of coal. I ask hon. gentlemen what effect the introduction of that 1,000,000 tons has had upon the fuel market of Canada? Is the tendency of the importation of that article not to reduce its price? If that be true, the introduction of that 1,000,000 tons gives the Canadian consumer fuel at a cheaper rate; if it has any effect at all. Then to get into the market the coal has to pay a duty of 50 cents a ton, which duty has to be paid by the coal miner, or by his agent, before it can be used in Canada. Therefore he has to pay \$500,000 of duty, and the result of his bringing his coal into this country is, I repeat, to give the Canadian consumer fuel at a cheaper rate than otherwise. I believe this view cannot be gainsaid. I think there can be no doubt that an American coal miner pays the duty on coal.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Then put \$1 a ton on it.

Mr. WALLACE. An article may be sold, for a short time, below the cost of production, but it will not be for long. It may be said that, if the American coal miner had not to pay the duty, he could sell that coal so much cheaper. It is true, but would he? The principle you hon. gentlemen recognize is this: that to sell in the dearest market, the American coal miner sells coal at the highest possible profit, and he would not reduce it in price if he met with no competition in this market. As far as competition is concerned, the 1,000,000 tons is the quantity that makes the competition, and, if he has a duty to pay to get that in, he can sell it for no more than he would have to sell it if he had no duty to pay. That is all I will say of the coal question. Then, I say, the hon. gentlemen on the other side are guilty of a fallacy in reference to the grain trade. It is an almost universally recognized maxim that the Liverpool market regulates the price of grain. I say it does not. I say that the people of this continent, being 50,000,000, as against the smaller number in Great Britain, and being, consequently, larger consumers of breadstuffs, they have more influence in regulating the price of breadstuffs than the people of Great Britain. The quantity again comes in, or the law of supply and demand, and the markets of the world regulate the price. But I will ask the hon. gentleman how the Canadian farmer could avail himself of the English market if he had no competition. I would ask him how he could avail himself of the markets of the United States. He could not take his grain there to sell it because in taking it there he would have a duty to pay. He could not send it there to sell it himself, he would have to employ an agent; and no Canadian farmer is interested in a market further away from him than he can carry his produce to

market himself, or than he can send it and go to look after the selling of it. Unless he can do one or the other of these things he is bound to sell in the nearest market to himself. It would not matter to him what the market price was in Montreal, or New York, or Liverpool, it is the market in which he is to sell that regulates the price he will get for his grain; and it is the home competition that the Canadian farmer has to consider to get the highest price. We say that the National Policy has established a greater home market than we had before; and this cannot be otherwise than true, because we are manufacturing more goods than we did before, and unless we have towns and cities and villages, we cannot have a home market for the produce of the farm. Every hon. gentleman knows that it is impossible to have towns and cities if you have nothing but farmers in the country; unless you have manufacturing going on there is no possibility of having an urban population in this country. The hon. gentleman, in referring to some of the industries that were said to have been started under the auspices of the National Policy, referred to the Redpath Sugar Refinery. He said that was an old industry that was not started under the National Policy. It is true it was an old industry, but gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, by their bad legislation, had destroyed that industry, and the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, by their better legislation, called it into existence again. Is that not equivalent to establishing a new industry. He also said that some of the industries that were characterized as not new ones, are new ones, and are due to the National Policy entirely. Among these is the Heintzman Piano Factory. He said that was not a new one, but I am informed that it was started in 1830. Then he referred to the Toronto Bolt and Nut Factory. That is another industry that was killed under the government of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and was revived under the present Government. Childs & Charlsworth's Shoe Factory was established in 1881. The Barter Manufacturing Co., the hon. gentleman admitted was started since, but he said it was not due to the National Policy. The St. John Nut and Bolt Factory is another one. But I was informed that the manager of the institution stated that it was due solely to the National Policy. These are some of the industries he referred to as not having been benefited by the National Policy; but, from the information I have, there is no doubt they were all new industries, or were revived under the National Policy. Now I come to the revenue Tariff that these hon. gentlemen speak so much about. I would like some hon. gentlemen to define what they mean when they talk of a revenue Tariff. Is it a Tariff that will raise revenue? If it is, then I apprehend they will have to admit that the Tariff of the hon. Minister of Finance is an immense success, because it has raised revenue sufficient, not only to meet the expenditure of the country, but he has a surplus of over \$4,000,000. But, oh! says the gentlemen, you have unjustly taxed the people, you have raised more money than was needed. Well, Sir, I think it is a good fault to have too much money. It is a far better position than these hon. gentlemen were in when they occupied the Treasury benches. I think the hon. the Minister of Finance levied, at one time, duties that he said would raise \$3,000,000, at another time, that would raise \$500,000, yet they had not enough revenue, although they had a revenue Tariff, and they had to come down to this House, year after year, announce a deficit, proving clearly that their Tariff was not a revenue Tariff. But my hon. friend the hon. the Minister of Finance has a revenue of over \$4,000,000 too much. They say this is a bad thing, but I think it is rather a good thing to have too much money. Is it not in the interests of the people, is it not a prouder position for the hon. the Finance Minister to be in, to be able to say: "I am not disappointed; the country has been so much more prosperous than I anticipated, it

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk).

rose from its depression so much sooner than I expected, that instead of having, as I estimated, a surplus of \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000, we have a surplus of \$4,000,000," and then having that surplus he is able to say: "I will take off the duties on teas, on coffee, on some other things; I will reduce the taxation, and keep up the revenue still, and also reduce the debt." I think the people of this country, at the present moment, are not suffering from taxation. You hear no man complain: they are all willing to pay the taxes. And why? Because they have more employment and better wages, and have more means to pay with. I am inclined to think it would have been as wise to retain the duties and still further to have reduced the debt of this country, but my hon. friends do not always agree with me, and I have got to submit to what they do. Again, these hon. gentlemen say that the old Tariff would, under the improved trade of the country, have raised sufficient revenue. Well, I cannot understand upon what ground they say so. I take up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and what do I find? I find that the imports of goods entered for consumption, in 1877, were \$96,000,000 and upwards, yet that did not raise revenue enough. I find the goods entered for consumption, in 1881, were only \$91,000,000. Well, if the \$96,000,000 of imports, in 1877, could not raise revenue enough, I would like to know how, under the same Tariff, \$91,000,000 of imports could have raised sufficient revenue? Then, again, we hear much of imports and exports. Well, in my opinion, neither give unerring evidence of the prosperity of a country. A people may be importing goods they cannot pay for. They may be enjoying a present pleasure at great future pain. They may be getting themselves into trouble by importing too largely. And, again, a people may be importing goods and keeping their own workmen standing idle, and the idle people would be a tax upon the industrious to support them, and it would not be in the interest of the country, perhaps, to have too much importation. And, again, I do not think that exports are evidence altogether of prosperity. I have read that the people of India exported rice and wheat when numbers of their own people were dying of hunger. Every man knows, who knows anything, that the people of Ireland have to export the pigs or the butter that their families should consume to pay the rent, but will any man say that the export, under such a condition of things as this, would be evidence of the prosperity of the country? The true test of the prosperity of a country is the comfort enjoyed by the masses of its people, and will the hon. gentleman, or any one of his friends, dare to say that the people of this country are not at this moment infinitely more prosperous, that they have not more comforts than they had when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power? But these hon. gentlemen say this state of things is not due to the National Policy, but to the increased exports and the better crops. Is this true? If, as they say, the increased exports are the sole cause of the prosperity of this country to-day, then, by a parity of reasoning, the increased exports at other periods should have produced prosperity also. Let us see if that is true. I look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I find that for the three years ending 30th June, 1873, the total exports of the products of this country were \$200,053,380; while for the three years ending the 30th of June, 1876, they were \$218,943,037. Will any man say that the country was as prosperous in the three last-named years as in the three first? If it be true that increased exports are the cause, and the sole cause, of prosperity, why does not the same cause provide the same result in every case? Then take the three years ending the 30th of June, 1878. The exports in these three years were \$208,511,779, or \$8,000,000 more than the three years ending June 30th, 1873? Why did not the larger exports

of these years produce greater prosperity than for the three years ending on the 30th June, 1873? Then, again, they say that our prosperity is due to the products of the farm, but what do I find on looking at these returns? I find that we exported of animals and their produce, and agricultural products, for the three years ending on the 30th June, 1873, they were \$77,469,233, as against \$98,885,496 for the three years ending on the 30th June, 1876. Why, I ask, did not the better crops, the larger crops as evidenced by the larger exports, make the country more prosperous and give us better times than for the three years' ending in 1873. But, Sir, these hon. gentlemen are impious. They dare to charge Providence with their own imbecility. They say the depression was due to the failure of the crops, when it was due to their own bad management, as I shall endeavor to show further on.

An hon. MEMBER. Go for them.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not go for anybody, I go for principles. Now, Sir, I shall endeavor in my own way to account for the depression which we had in this country. It is true, Sir, that if men cease to toil, if Providence fails to reward and bless their labors, there can be no prosperity, no happiness; there can only be misery, for it is only by nature and labor, which are the only two producers, that men can live and men can enjoy life. But it is equally true that men, by their own acts, can mar prosperity, destroy happiness, and create misery. Now, Sir, what it may be asked was the cause of our misery. First of all, I attribute it to the folly of a Government, which, when asked, when entreated by the people to change the policy under which they were ruining the country, lent a deaf ear to their entreaties, and paid no heed to their miseries. They said: "Wait, and things will come all right;" they said, almost as unconcernedly as Nero as he looked upon the ruins of Rome, and fiddled as it burnt: "Wait, wait and it will come all right." When they saw the industries of the country sacrificed by the introduction of goods from the United States, why did they not take hold of the question, impose a duty, and prevent that injustice being done to the Canadian people? But they did not do it; they sat and looked on, and saw ruin settling upon the country—they did nothing to avoid it. Another reason, and one of the chief reasons, in my opinion, was the action of the money-lenders of this country. What had the bankers of Canada been doing? They began gathering in the savings of the people, paying them a higher rate of interest, and lending the money to the importers, to bring in more imported goods than the country wanted, more than the people could consume. They gave money to the importers when they would not give it to other people, because they could sell them exchange, and make more money out of it, and the result was to destroy the trade of the country by bringing in imported goods, and having them sacrificed in the country, as they were. They did it in another way: they paid 6 per cent. to the people for money at deposit in the savings banks; they came in competition with the private borrower, and because they were better off they could get it on better terms, and the result was that the people had to pay exorbitant rates—sometimes 10 to 12 per cent., a rate which no man could pay—the effect being that capital was thrown out of employment, and labor being stopped, production was also stopped. I hold that the causes of the depression were two. First, the incompetency of the Government, amounting almost to imbecility; and, second, the greed of usurers. There was no necessity for this depression. There was no time in which the country had not good crops, although they say so. But the hon. gentleman went further along, and said that, in 1877, we had better crops and better prices than we have had since; but when it suited his purpose to say the other thing, he said that the depression was due to the deficiency of the crops and decreased

prices. These hon. gentlemen are not consequential. They are illogical in every step. They are reasonable in nothing. Why did the country improve under this Government? First of all because of the restoration of confidence; the change of policy set capital and credit to work. On the 1st of July, 1878, as any hon. gentleman can find on looking at the bank returns, we had only a bank circulation of \$16,000,000, or a little less to do the business of this country. Cannot any man see that with such a limited circulation and with a broken credit, why there was a depression? And why have we better times to-day? Because of increased confidence; because when this Government came into power they said they would try to adopt the policy to benefit the trade of this country; and the very fact they promised to try to improve matters increased confidence—just as you would help a drowning man to make an effort to save himself by promising to throw him a rope, or would make him despair by not offering to help him. The hon. gentleman also spoke of expenditure, referring specially to the controllable expenditure. It is true, I find, that last year the expenditure amounted to \$7,293,361, or \$751,000 more than it was in the last year of the late Government. But what was it in the second or third year of their existence? I find that, in 1876, when they had no fear of the elections before their eyes, the controllable expenditure amounted to \$8,559,774, or \$1,276,210 more than it was in our last year. I would like to know where the economy of these hon. gentlemen comes in. It is true, they made a saving; but what is economy? I hold that economy is a wise and judicious expenditure of money; and if we can afford it and have the money, it would be niggardly and foolish not to carry on public works for the benefit of the people; and I ask hon. gentlemen to look and see wherein the expenditure has been increased. I find that the present Government expended \$125,979 on the Census more than their predecessors did in their last year; for public works, the utility of which hon. gentlemen will not pretend to deny, if we are to develop the resources of this country, \$140,797 more; for Indian agents, \$383,984 more—this expenditure may have prevented an Indian war which would have cost infinitely more in treasure, it may possibly have saved a large sacrifice of life; for immigration and quarantine, \$70,000 more to make provision for the large immigration that was expected last year; for ocean and river service, \$27,067 more; for militia service, \$46,863 more; being a total increase of \$795,798, or \$44,000 more than the increase of the entire expenditure of last year over the entire expenditure of their last year, showing that in all other branches of the service the present Government must have economized. Hon. gentlemen speak also of the decrease in shipbuilding and the shipping trade, which they attribute to the National Policy. Now, the material used in ship building is wood, iron and rope. There is certainly no duty to be paid on timber required for this purpose; and on imported articles used in shipbuilding I believe there is a drawback which does away with all the duties upon them; so that it cannot be said that the decline in shipbuilding is due to the National Policy. Every man knows that steamers are largely superseding sailing vessels, and that wooden ships are going out of use, and, therefore, there is not so many ships built or used as in former years. Hon. gentlemen also say that this policy will destroy the foreign trade of this country. Is that true? I find, on reference to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the tonnage of vessels entered inwards and outwards in this country, in 1878, was 12,054,890 tons, and, in 1881, 13,804,402 tons, or an increase of 1,750,000. I also find that the two smallest years of shipping in Canada were 1875 and 1876. In the first of these years the shipping amounted to only 9,900,000 tons, and in the second, 9,100,000 tons. Another evidence that the foreign trade of the country is not injured, is found in the fact that the total imports and exports, in 1878, were \$173,405,484.

against \$203,621,668, in 1881, showing an increase of over \$30,000,000. The hon. member for Lambton, speaking the other night, said that free trade was the great principle. Well, Sir, admit that it is the great principle, and follow it out to its logical conclusion; and what is the result of universal free trade? The inevitable result of it must be that it will reduce all labor to the level of the lowest. Because it is known that the people that can live cheapest will work cheapest, and those who work cheapest will be able to sell cheapest; and what will be the result of that? It will put the people of Canada into competition with the Chinese labor, and will force them to live upon rice and nuts, as the Chinese are said to do. It will put them into competition with the serfs of Russia, who live on train oil and black bread, and can scarcely be said to have any civilization. And it would have the people of this country placed into such competitions as this. This must be the inevitable result of universal free trade. Although it may be good for the whole world, still it might not be good for each individual, and, so far as Canada is concerned, I maintain it would be of injury. I ask the hon. gentlemen if this is what they desire in this country—that the labor of this country shall be ill-paid? Why do men come to this country and expatriate themselves? It is that they may be able to do better than at home: they would never have come to be put on a worse footing than before. I want to see the laborer of Canada and every man in Canada enjoy as much of the comforts of life as the people of any other country in the world. But the hon. gentlemen opposite are aiming at reducing Canadian labor to the level of the lowest classes in Europe and the older countries of the world. Then, Sir, with regard to the cheap bread cry. Why was it raised in England? Was it for any good purpose? Was it that the laborer might have more to eat? No, Sir; it was for this reason—that they wanted people to work cheap, so as to get manufactures cheap, and by manufacturing cheaply that their employers could make themselves suppliers of the world. It was not to benefit the workingmen, or to give them more comfort; it was that they might be able to get the work done cheaper, so that they might sell more largely of their manufactures to foreign countries. We hear much about the poor man and much about workingmen. Why, Sir, sometimes it makes my blood boil to hear these remarks about workingmen; of all men the workingman is the most independent, and the one who requires least sympathy. Many of these hon. gentlemen who speak of the workingmen in this sympathizing manner, it was generally before election time and when they are trying to make political capital out of it. When elections are over they have little or no affection for the workingman. I like to see hon. gentlemen always consistent. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition in this House, who is a Free Trader on principle, I would ask why it is that he does not apply that principle to the profession of which he is a member? Why does he not come down and say we will have no protection for the law. We will do away with the table of fees which has been made by those who sympathize with learned gentlemen of the long robe. Let us have Free Trade; but these hon. gentlemen, when that principle affects their interests, they practice Protection. These hon. gentlemen are very desirous of getting to the Treasury benches. What reasons do they put forward as a justification for putting themselves in power again? The hon. leader of the Opposition at one time announced certain ideas that he intended to follow and by which his party ought to be governed; he made a speech at Aurora, and he threw out the idea of Federation of the Empire, minority representation, and abolition of the Senate. But that hon. gentleman has been a member of the Government since that time, and now he is leader of the Opposition, yet he has not carried one or other of these schemes—reforms as he called them—into

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk).

force. He said he would not belong to a party that had nothing to reform. I was not a little amused to hear my hon. friend from North Norfolk talk about the Pacific Scandal. That gentleman said that this Government was turned out for being guilty of the infamy of selling a charter and of getting money for the purpose of corrupting and bribing electors in this country. How bad these gentlemen must have been; and yet, after sending the gentlemen on the other side of the House to power, and after four or five years' experience, what did the people do? They turned them out, and brought back those men who were so guilty. What does this prove, Sir? Either that the people thought they were more corrupt, or, if they were honest, they were imbecile. They said, let us have corruption, if you will, but let us get rid of imbecility; and they turned them out. Now, Sir, I think it is about time that I was bringing my remarks to a conclusion—

Hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh! save me; I cannot undertake to speak four hours; it would kill me if I did. But I believe that we, the advocates of the National Policy are supporting an enlightened system of commerce; we are advocating a policy that will give to the poor man a just reward for his labor—at all events, that is what we aim at, and we endeavor through the Government to conduct the affairs and commerce of the country upon the maxim of live and let live. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side are the advocates of a policy of buying in the cheapest markets and selling in the dearest. Why, Sir, what would be the result of that policy? It would be this, that it is destructive of all patriotism; those who advocate that policy have no humanity, they do not recognize the brotherhood of man, they look upon their kind as machines to be taxed, as a man out of whom you can make money by selling to him dear and buying from him cheap. It is antagonistic to right, Sir, and calculated, if it is carried out, to make every man an enemy of his fellow, to make of this earth a hell. That is practically the result of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest—the whole idea is antagonistic to that most perfect of precepts: "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you."

Mr. IRVINE. Although I do not consider I possess less courage than other men, I confess I am entirely unaccustomed to guerilla warfare. I admit that my grammar is not very good and that my arithmetic is not such that I can apply it to some of the calculations presented to this House. I have listened with a great deal of pain and some pleasure to the speeches delivered during the debate. I have listened with pain to hon. gentlemen trying to prove the most absurd propositions on record. I confess that I like a man from the Lower Provinces better than a man from Ontario; but I would like, when Maritime Province members rise to the intellectual standard of the House that they should neither deceive the people or pursue a course of absurd reasoning. It was with pain that I listened to the statement of an hon. gentleman occupying two hours in delivering, that the people of Ontario were paying less for coal because they were paying half a dollar per ton duty. My arithmetic does not answer in that particular. I shall address myself to the discussion of the National Policy. I am quite an humble man; I belong to a very small party in this House, but, if I am informed correctly, to a large party in the country; I am a practical farmer, not a gentleman farmer, who has servants near him to whom he can say "come and go," but I issue orders and I assist in executing them. I am one of those who, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, have been enriched by having taxes heaped upon them. I can speak from practical experience, and one ounce of such is worth a pound of theory such as is addressed to the House. I am pleased to say I belong to

the party to which I have always belonged, the great Liberal party of Canada, which has given to this country all she possesses in the shape of liberty—religious and civil. I am glad also to think that I have a love and respect for the Old Country, and when the Liberal party of Canada and the Old Country are compared, they will be found to be very closely allied. The Liberal party in the old land is always the friend of the poor man; the Tory party, prior to Sir Robert Peel and the repeal of the corn laws, was the friend of the land monopolists. The Peelites and Liberals were friends of the poor, and in this country the Liberal party has always been a friend to the poor, while the Tories, like the Tory party in England, are supported by the monopolists. I am glad to say that I have the honor of following a leader in this House against whom, after sitting in this House a month, the worst thing that can be charged is comprised in the two words: "Speak now." I am gratified also that the man, whom I love above any other man in Canada, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), has been followed by his opponents from Dan to Beersheeba, and the only charge ever preferred against him—and that charge never stuck to him—was that he had purchased rails, and the price had afterwards fallen. I remember very well in 1848, when I landed in New Brunswick, a boy, that the times were hard. I bound myself at £16 a year to do labor as a servant, and I have never been ashamed of it. I have heard that Andrew Johnson, when he was in the height of his glory, was asked whether he had not been a tailor, and he replied: "Yes, and I was a good tailor too; I made clothes and was a good workman." If I was a servant, I was a good servant, and the man who hired me for £16 a year was the first man to vote to send me here. Nor am I ashamed of my ancestors, for I am descended from a stock which wherever placed in the world makes its mark. Whether at Alma or the Heights of Inkerman it is always to the front. Whenever I go in Canada and come across a full-fledged Tory manufacturer, when he is defeated in argument, he turns round, whether in the social circle or market-place, and says: "You are not patriotic, where is your patriotism and loyalty?" That is the incessant cry. That was the old story and cry when our fathers were fighting for responsible Government. They too were told they were disloyal when they were abolishing Clergy Reserves and other grievances. I am glad to say, however, that reproach and cry had died out entirely in this country till lately. After the Union, we were for a short time troubled with it, owing to the want of patriotism and the tyrannical treatment of Nova Scotia by one man. If they had been properly treated there is no people more loyal. They were accused of base disloyalty, because they did not follow the beck and nod of the tyrant. Happily, till this National Policy was started, we never heard this disloyalty cry of late years. We entered the Union in good faith, expecting to be treated constitutionally; but we find to our sorrow we were not so treated. I am bound to say we have never been troubled with this foolish howl about want of loyalty and patriotism until lately—till hon. gentlemen opposite returned to power. Why do they fling this disloyalty cry across the floor? Simply for the reason, that those gentlemen who formed the coalition, including some of the men of New Brunswick that we honored—though we never liked coalitions, we were willing our representatives should assist in consolidating this country into a grand Dominion—find it to their benefit. In order to keep themselves in power they committed acts, which in the eye of the people of Canada, and according to the universal verdict of England, disgraced this country; and in order to get back into power they propounded a theory or policy which we were promised would make everybody rich—farmer, manufacturer, and all. This reminds me very much

of what Barnum said when getting up a great show. He was asked what he was about, and answered: "The people of this country like to be humbugged, and I might just as well humbug them as anybody else." The Ministerial party tried this plan, and returned to power. They think they can capture the county I represent, but they are much mistaken, if we take, as a criterion of the moral sentiment of my county, its action in electing a representative. I find it stands higher than the average constituencies of Ontario which sent Ministerial supporters to Parliament to support men who were not penitent for their past political conduct.

An hon. MEMBER. The National Policy.

Mr. IRVINE. I will come to that subject soon enough, if you will keep quiet. I remember very well, from 1848. It was a very poor time when I settled in my county. We had no stimulus to trade. I remember about 1854, when the Russian War broke out, prices reached their highest figure. Hay sold at \$40 a ton; oats at 80 cents a bushel, and spruce logs \$13 a thousand, in St. John, a point never touched since. We had no National Policy then, however. From that time until the American Civil War broke out, we had a very poor period. But during that war the farmer received excellent prices for his products, though we had no National Policy then. Afterwards we had a poor spell again, a time of depression. What I hold is, that we have generally seasons of prosperity followed by seasons of depression the one following the other quickly. I am sorry that we had to pass through a season of depression after 1878, and I am bound to say without reference to the National Policy, that I sold farm produce lower in 1879 than since 1848, and 1879 was the first year of the present Government. Oats in Carleton then sold at 22 cents a bushel. We had the National Policy then, but of course it is said, it had not had time to bring forth fruit. But I sold hay lower in 1880—fifty tons at \$5 a ton—lower than ever before. At present, notwithstanding the National Policy, we are not receiving exactly as high prices as some years ago. But I admit that my county is now very prosperous. We have lumbering, and, if a man cannot get employment on the New Brunswick side, he can cross to Maine, where there is any amount of work for man and beast. There are no idle men in the county, whatever be their occupation. If that be due to the National Policy, let its friends prove it; I do not think so. With regard to manufacturing interests in New Brunswick, they have always done well. I never knew a manufacturer to fail. We have in Woodstock two iron foundries, whose owners commenced with a little capital and are now reported wealthy. I have it from both proprietors that they were better under the old than under the present Tariff. As far as that is concerned I think it is very plain that the new arrangement has been no benefit to them. Then there is one thing in reference to the manufacturers that we always laid down in New Brunswick, and that our Government appears to have laid down—that was, that it was unwise for a new country to encourage every class of manufactures, but that only those should be encouraged which could be carried on successfully. Another principle laid down was that raw material should be allowed to come in free, so that our manufacturers could compete with others. Another point I wish to dwell upon is this: Before the Union, certain propositions were made to us that I am bound to say the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have not fulfilled. When these propositions were made to us to enter the Union, New Brunswick was under a 12½ per cent. Tariff, and Old Canada was under a 20 per cent. Tariff, and, in order to induce us to enter the Union, they reduced it to 15 per cent. If it was for our interest to reduce the Tariff to 15 per cent. in order to induce us to enter the Union, how can it now be for our advantage to have a Tariff rising to 30 or 40 per cent.? Then I must

say this—and I am sorry to say it, I blush to say it—that Canadian statesmen are not exactly the material we thought they were. It is said of English statesmen that they consider their country's honor as their own, but I am sorry to say Canadian statesmen are not so sensitive as that. If they can compass their own ends they are not so very careful of their personal honor. Another point I wish to direct attention to is, that when the statesmen of this country decided to make such a great change in the Tariff, all parties should have been consulted. I am glad to say that I have the honor to belong to a great party in this country—the farmers. It is said that four-fifths of the people of Canada are farmers, but I am sorry to say there are less than a dozen farmers in this House. You cannot walk about here without running against manufacturers. This country will soon be ruled by manufacturers and doctors and lawyers. I say, with all due deference to the occupants of the Treasury benches, that a party as influential as we are, who contribute so much to the material prosperity of Canada, who export more than half the products of Canada to the European markets and bring the money back in gold—I say we are entitled to some consideration at the hands of the Government. When they proposed this great change in our fiscal policy, did they call upon the farmers to know what changes they required? No, Sir; they promised that they would make everyone rich, and, if I am informed correctly they sent over to Uncle Sam's territory and brought over two Tariff tinkers to fix this up, and then the hon. Minister of Finance issues his circulars to all the manufacturers to come up and meet the Tariff tinkers, and arrange the Tariff so to have just what they wanted. The farmers of Canada have to purchase goods from the manufacturers; but did he ask the farmers to come up here to see whether he was giving the manufacturers' produce preference or not? No, he insulted them, openly and knowingly insulted them, and they are of poorer stuff than I think they are, if they do not resent it, they are not the material I think they are, if they do not drag the Tariff down upon the wretches' heads. No wonder hon. gentlemen laugh when I say wretches' heads; but you must always remember that I am an Irishman, and have the privilege of "speaking twice."

An hon. MEMBER. Their righteous heads.

Mr. IRVINE. Righteous heads? I do not mean such a thing as that. No, for you might as well look to Sodom for righteousness. If there were two righteous men among them they might be saved. Righteous! The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. Righteous! The men who would—perhaps I had better stop. I am very glad I have a chance to meet these silk-stocking chaps that have been running the farmers. I am about the first farmer that has had an opportunity of stating his case here, and want to state it fairly, and I am bound to say that I think you are good-natured gentlemen. I am wonderfully pleased to think that I am just in the place where I am, for I tell you that down in my own county I had to oppose these giants; these ravenous wolves were around, and I had a serious time of it. I am bound to say that here British liberty is the ruling principle in this House. If we take the returns of Canada we will find that manufacturers succeeded much better under the Mackenzie Administration than they do now. As far as exports of manufactured goods are concerned they exported nearly, if not quite, three-quarters of a million more in 1878 than in 1881. The exportation of manufactured goods in 1878 amounted to \$4,715,776, and, in 1881, to \$4,042,123, so that the manufacturers made a better showing in 1878 than in 1881. But what I object to in this arrangement is, that the manufacturer has an undue advantage over the farmer. I will explain the farmer's position. He has no home market except for a limited amount of his products. In 1831, the entire exportation was \$93,000,000, of which farm produce amounted to \$44,000,000. The farmer is obliged to go into the broad world to dispose of his produce; he cannot do it at home. Now, I ask you if every weight should not be thrown off the farmer? I ask you, if he is to run the race successfully, should not every weight be thrown off him? But the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have weighed him down still more instead of taking the weights off of him. We have to go to the markets of Europe to sell our produce. There is not an implement the farmer uses on his farm, that is not heavily taxed—not one solitary implement. I will take the liberty to read the letter that was read the other day by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It will answer my purpose as well as it did his. It is in reference to the extra duty under the present Tariff on agricultural machines over the duty under the Mackenzie Administration. The letter is as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—Yours of yesterday received asking for details of extra duties over those of 1878 in our manufactures. Below we give them to you, and they are under rather than over the mark. In the construction of our reaper we use 500 lbs. of cast iron, 50 cents; 5 lbs. malleables, additional duties 24 cents; 32 lbs. spring steel, 13 cents; 16 lbs. machinery steel, 10 cents; and say \$1 worth of bolts, 25 cents; 75 lbs. wrought iron, 19 cents; 1 lb. nuts, 1 cent; paints and oils, 4 cents; varnish, 5 cents; coal, 3 cents; wire, 1 cent; knives, 20 cents; total, \$1.75."

I wish to ask hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches if they think that by taxing the raw material of every implement used on the farm they can enable the farmer to work to greater advantage? Previous to this there was a tax upon the tin which the farmer used, but if it was for sealing fish or any purpose like that a rebate was allowed. I ask if the Canadian farmer can compete fairly in the race with other nations in the markets of Europe, if he has to pay more than his share of the revenue of his country? The materials of which implements are made were never taxed before, or, at all events, only to the extent of something like 5 per cent. It is said that we are opposed to the manufacturers, but we never heard that until these hon. gentlemen came into power in 1878. There is no reason why we should oppose the manufacturers. We have mutual interests with them, we sell them our products and they sell us their goods. But the farmer asks no favors from the Government, he has the common sense to know that the Government cannot give him a market, and that it is only taunting and humbugging him to tell him so. What we object to is that the Government should take the manufacturers under their particular protection, that they should put them in hot-houses so that they are afraid to come out for fear the cold blasts of winter may strike them. The farmer, they say, is able to compete in the markets of the world, but the manufacturer is not. As a farmer, I am willing to protect the manufacturer to a reasonable extent, but not to such an extent that the purchaser of his goods may not have the right to use his own judgment in purchasing goods. I do not think it necessary to give the implement manufacturers of Canada a protection of 30 per cent. I do not mean to say that the manufacturer is made of any such material that he will fold his arms and say: "I am unable to compete with the American manufacturer unless you give me the benefit of a 30 per cent. duty." At all events, if the manufacturer does say so, he is not of the stuff that Britons are made of, because, wherever you find a Briton, he says: "I am able to meet the world." We all know that it was the farmer who had much to do with making this country what it is; who went in and cleared the forest and made the wilderness blossom as the rose and drove the aborigines back, and brought our vast domain into cultivation. We know who should receive a fair kind of protection at the hands of the Government, but who have received insult upon insult and who, instead of being invited to give their opinion when the great change was made in our fiscal system, were treated with silence. I

Mr. IRVINE.

think 30 per cent. is too large a duty on agricultural implements. I think 15 per cent. should be enough and let them have the raw materials free of duty.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What would you do with the raw materials we produced? Would you leave them unprotected?

Mr. IRVINE. We will come to that by-and-bye. But I would like to know how the farmers are used. It takes the lawyers and doctors of the House to explain anything like that. One of the cries of the Government in 1878 was that Canada should be kept for the Canadians. Well, I believe they are bound to keep Canada for the manufacturers; but what is to be done to secure Canada for the Canadian farmers? Supposing that when the change was made in our fiscal system, a committee of Canadian farmers had been invited to discuss that point and say what protection should be given them. Do you think the first step they would have taken would have been to ask the Government to place a duty of 20 per cent. on horses? We exported 29,000 horses last year; would a duty of 20 per cent. upon them have put money in our pockets? Last year we exported 62,179 head of cattle, and 354,155 head of sheep. If a practical farmer had been asked to assist us, would he have placed a duty of 20 per cent. on cattle and sheep? Certainly he would not. He would have seen that we imported last year 75,000 barrels of pork; and would not a practical man have said to the Finance Minister, "We do not want you to put a duty on those things which we export, but we would like you to put a duty on the article we import, namely, pork." But he did not put a duty on that article. The 10 per cent. duty was on before Confederation. No; he insulted us first and humbugged us afterwards. Then, again, he placed 15 cents on barley and 7½ cents on corn. We export barley largely; we exported last year 8,800,519 bushels of barley and imported about 7,000,000 bushels of corn, about 3,000,000 bushels being for home consumption. The excuse he gave for putting the light duty on corn was that it was used by the brewers, and he is a great friend of the brewers. Everyone knows that a bushel of corn is worth two bushels of oats; and there has not been a year since 1879 in which oats have not ranged 4 or 5 cents a bushel higher in Maine than in New Brunswick. It is taunting and insulting the farmers, pretending that this kind of thing is any protection for them. The Finance Minister talks of retaliating against the United States. It is humiliating to hear him talk such nonsense as to say that this is any retaliation. It is all very well to talk of imbecility, but who is the imbecile? Then I come to the article of wool. The Finance Minister says we export 1,000,500 pounds of Canadian wool, and the inference naturally is that we are raising more Canadian wool than we can manufacture. But what is the fact? We import eight million pounds of foreign wool. After this Tariff was in operation a great cry was raised that foreign wool was imported by our manufacturers, to the great injury of the Canadian farmers, and he placed 3 cents a pound on wool. Yet we bring in 8,000,000 pounds of wool duty free, and we are obliged to ship 1,000,500 pounds of our native wool. Now, Sir, the farmers of Canada ask that Canada should be for the Canadians, and that you should place the farmers on an equality with the manufacturers. On the wool for a suit of woollen clothes worn by the poor man a duty has to be paid, while the wool for the clothing of the silk-stockinged fellow is allowed to come in duty free. What can we expect better from the Tories than that? They never were the friends of the poor man; they always pressed him and made him subservient to the rich; and I am sorry that a gentleman whom we took from the apothecary shop should be the enemy of the poor man.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He was a good apothecary.

Mr. IRVINE. Now, Sir, I come to his friend Parks, of the cotton warps. There are two men in the cotton business; one man manufactures and the other purchases, and I am the purchaser of cotton. Is it not very strange that the manufacturer, who gets his raw material free of duty and his labor cheaper than it is in the United States, should want a duty of 2 cents a yard on cotton when its first cost is only 5 cents a yard? We are told that it requires 2 cents per square yard to give him protection against the United States. Well, what is the inference? It is this—I may be unparliamentary (if I am I will take it back after I say it), but it looks to me like another Hugh Allan job; as if they were hard up and wanted to raise the wind. I do not believe a Canadian manufacturer would come here and say that he required that protection to hold his own. Why, then, are we compelled to pay so much into the treasury? Well, the hon. Finance Minister explains it away; he says: cotton is as cheap now as it was in 1878, that it is sold as cheap to-day in Canada as it is, I think, in New Hampshire. But how is this? Why, I live within four miles of the American boundary, and I have as good a right to know what the retail prices of goods are as any other man in Canada. We are told that our cottons are as cheap as those of the United States markets, but I say, Sir, there is more Yankee cotton used, a large part of it smuggled into Carleton county, than there is of Canadian, and I am willing to let the statement go back to my constituents. Now, in reference to Parks' cotton warps, I will stake my reputation against that of the Finance Minister in this matter; he says, I think, that these warps are sold as cheap to-day as they can be purchased in New Hampshire, freight added. Well, what is the fact? From my own observation I know that, in 1880, the price of Parks' warp—white warp I have reference to—five pounds in weight, was, at retail in the stores there, \$1.50; and the retail price of the same article, in 1881, was \$1.35. Now, both in 1880 and at the present time, you can go across the line five miles and buy a better warp for \$1. I pledge my honor to this fact, and the hon. Minister can ascertain it from his own party in the county. Now, Mr. Speaker, can you blame a poor man in that county if, instead of paying \$1.35 out of his day's wages, he goes across the line five miles and buys American cotton for \$1.00. And the difference in value in favor of the American cotton is 2 to 2½ cents per yard. Now, Sir, we come to the matter of hides. It appears, as though in 1880 and 1881, we imported \$2,184,884 worth of hides—duty free. Well, I have never objected to that. I believe that we should import duty free the raw materials which we manufacture; still I am forced to fight for myself. If, as the hon. Finance Minister says, \$1.75 duty upon the material that goes into a reaper makes that reaper cheaper, how, I ask, will 20 per cent. added to those hides make them dearer? I cannot reason it out and must leave it for my hon. friend opposite. The hon. Minister says that 50 cents added to coal makes it cheaper for the people of Ontario, and I would have 50 cents added to the hides that they also might be cheaper. I wish to illustrate one point with reference to machines. If my memory serves me right, I think the first mowing machine imported into the county of Carleton—it was about twenty-five years ago, and a very crude one—cost \$145, and you can buy the same machine now for \$65, that is \$80 cheaper than the original price. This is equal to a falling off of \$3 per year previous to the National Policy. But the hon. Minister of Finance—I must give him credit for it—did not say that the machine is cheaper by putting a duty upon it, but he says it is cheaper than in 1878. He also says that hats and caps are cheaper than in 1878; he says to the manufacturers—he does not say it to the men who purchase the hats—send me a letter, and the manufacturer, who, of course, is making money out of it, is quite willing to write a letter to suit him. He says hats and caps

are cheaper than they were in 1878, but I venture to say they are cheaper by 15 per cent. in England than in 1878. There is so much dodging and squirming, and so much chicanery in all the arguments used by hon. gentleman opposite that I am thoroughly disgusted. I have observed with pain and a good deal of indignation that the hon. Finance Minister has tried within the last two years to make it appear that New Brunswick is paying less per capita than Ontario or Quebec or any other Province in the Dominion, a course of action which I think unworthy of the man, for he should have been the last man to have done so. But I must thank the hon. Minister of Customs, who came to the rescue. I do not think he came voluntarily. The speech of the hon. member for Brant, (Mr. Patterson) in which he pointed out that the Tariff had not fostered the export of manufactures, and that the exports last year were less than four years ago, forced him to do so. The hon. Minister was driven into a corner, and he did us involuntary justice. I will read, for the edification of the people of New Brunswick, the words used by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. The hon. Minister said:

"The hon. gentleman knows, and no one knows better, because he has given much attention to the question of export and import, that inter-provincial trade, which has grown up within the last few years, and particularly within the last five or six years, is double that which existed a few years ago. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few figures. I think they will show that whereas the exports, accepting the figures he has given, have fallen off on some thirty or forty articles, that inter-provincial trade has increased and quadrupled the total sum. Take, for instance, the returns from Nova Scotia. In 1875-76 the imports into that Province, from foreign countries, were \$14,000,000. If the hon. gentleman will consult the Trade and Navigation Returns, he will find that the imports from foreign countries into that Province have decreased \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000. Who have supplied those \$8,000,000 worth of goods, except the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, and the farms and dairies of this country? The same facts exist in regard to the trade of New Brunswick. If hon. members will refer to the imports from foreign countries, they will find that, seven or eight years ago, they reached \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000. During last year they amounted to little more than half that sum. The hon. gentleman knows that the people of New Brunswick consume as much to-day as they did five or six years ago, that the Province is just as prosperous, and if that be the case, either the goods must be manufactured within the Province, or they were received from Ontario or other Provinces of the Dominion, which have entered largely into the production of articles formerly imported from foreign countries."

I thank the hon. Minister of Customs most heartily, and I feel uncommonly grateful to him for having done what the Finance Minister failed to do. When New Brunswick imports \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 worth of goods she pays more duty than when she imported \$10,000,000. In 1873, the value of the goods entered for consumption was \$10,849,763, on which a duty was paid of \$1,246,138. In 1881, the value of the imports for home consumption amounted to a little over \$6,000,000, while the duty reached \$1,266,000. And that was done in the face of the fact that it was publicly stated there was to be no increase of the Tariff, but merely a readjustment. I will read for the edification of the House what the hon. Minister of Finance said in St. John in the campaign of 1878. Here are his words; I have taken the report from a paper, but if it is not true he can deny it—it is taken from a Tory paper and is therefore all the worse. The Finance Minister said:

"If I had been in Parliament last Session I would not have voted for increasing the duty on unenumerated articles from 15 per cent. to 17½ per cent. I am now coming to the delicate question of flour and coal, the great question on which this election is to be run. I have no hesitation in saying that if I had been in the House last Session when supporters of the Government proposed a tax on these articles, I would have voted against the motion. It is not true that Sir John A. Macdonald advocates a 35 per cent. Tariff, or any increase in the volume of taxation. The alteration of the Tariff does not mean the imposition of more duty, but merely a readjustment of the burden."

Those are the hon. gentlemen's words, and it will be remembered that he got the *Accoucheur-General* of New Brunswick to send a telegram on the question, and the answer he received was that there would be no increase, but a readjustment. What opinions can I entertain of such men?

Mr. IRVINE.

Take this, in connection with the fact, that when the proposition was made to increase the Tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent., the hon. Minister of Railways was reported in the *Mail* to have said that it was entering the thin end of the wedge of taxation. If the present Tariff did not increase the burdens, how came it that we are paying as much duty on \$6,000,000 of imports, as we formerly did on \$11,000,000? Truly these are model statesmen. I sincerely regret that the honor of our Canadian statesman who rule half a continent is not of more value. I want to touch on the National Policy again, which I find hard to quit. It is doubtless very productive of good, as one of the most fruitful sources of blessing to some people in this country; if they had not its help they would have nothing. This reminds me of a man in our Province who was not exactly round, or as they say in Ireland, was half-witted, who, when he saw the hon. Finance Minister spreading his hands and belauding what the National Policy had done, said: "Sir Leonard, what have you done to increase the price of spruce logs from \$4 to \$8?" He replied: "The prosperity is due to the National Policy;" the National Policy which made spruce logs \$8 in St. John, instead of \$3 or \$4, in a year. We do not know half the virtues or powers of the National Policy.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Did the crowd believe him?

Mr. IRVINE. Believe him! Why, the man was half-witted who asked the question.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). And how much wit had the man who answered it?

Mr. IRVINE. You can guess by the answer. Now, coming to the question of the interests of the farmer, I remember last fall, when the Prime Minister came over from England, the Tory press loudly proclaimed that England was going back to her position before the repeal of the Corn Laws, or to adopt the Fair Trade principle. This press said that the hon. gentleman had set the heather on fire in England too, and that we should have fair trade in England as well as in Canada. But there was no great prospect of that event in England. Let us see whether the present Ministers are friends of the farmers. The fair traders in England say, they are going to pay all their taxes by putting a 20 per cent. duty on foreign wheat and a duty on lumber, too, all of which, according to this theory, must be paid by Canadians. This is the policy which the Tory press claim that our First Minister originated when in England. He not only binds down the farmer with clogs and taxes and other obstacles in Canada, but incites the English fair trade party to impose duties on our products when they arrive in England. This policy would not injure the manufacturer, for he is not obliged to go to the outside or English market, because they have the slaves in Canada to impose their goods upon whether good or bad. The English manufacturer does not pretend to sell goods cheaper than any one else, but he fears not to sell them on their merits; but the Canadian manufacturer says to the people, "You must take my goods and pay for my shoddy whether good or bad," and to the lumberman, "You must take your lumber to the English market and bring back the money to spend in such goods as Canadian shoddy." That is the freedom and liberty we are treated to. One class is to be favored, and all the others are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for it. The cry of disloyalty in Nova Scotia and elsewhere has only lately been raised by the present Government, who have set one class against the other—the manufacturer against the farmer and the laborer. I do not think we are going to cement the bonds of union in a country stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific by any such means. We now come to another point: The National Policy was to make a home

market for our produce. Speaking from memory, the Finance Minister said he had found a market for about \$6,000,000 of farm produce in this market. I will not dispute that, but I think we exported \$3,000,000 worth of farm produce more in 1881 than in 1880; this would show that he has not made much of a market. I must give him credit for this, however, that he has made a market in the Maritime Provinces, for six or seven millions worth more of Canada manufactures than formerly. He also made a market for the market gardeners of Ontario, and especially for the men of a place called Gananoque. I wish to read his own words on this subject, for I am afraid that the people of New Brunswick would not see them except through me. This is one of the nicest productions I have seen, and it will add much to the literature of the Lower Provinces. The hon. gentleman spoke thus, as I see by the official report:

"Let us see now if these leading articles which he is consuming are no higher than before, and in many cases they are less than before, what benefit he has in addition to the lower prices. In my judgment the farmer is as greatly interested in this Tariff as any other class of men in the Dominion. In the first place, he has the home market. An hon. member opposite referred to the home market last Session, I think, stating that it was of very little importance. Visit any section of the Dominion, put yourself in communication with a farmer, especially in the different towns where manufacturing industries have been established and are increasing, and ask them if they are deriving no advantage. Why, Sir, under the operations of this Tariff, for the vegetables, the fruit, the poultry, the lamb and veal, and other meats, the butter, the cheese, for almost everything they offer for sale, they obtain higher prices on account of the home market, than is obtained in localities where they have to sell to the middleman and ship to another market. Now, Sir, in conversation with some of those gentlemen, I found that, in 1878—I speak more especially of a conversation I had with some farmers not a hundred miles distant, in the active and energetic manufacturing town of Gananoque—I ascertained that they frequently came to market with their vegetables, would stand there all day, and, not being able to get a price which would be an object to them, would drive home and wait for another opportunity, frequently being compelled to return and take what was offered. "How is it now?" I said. They returned: "There is no difficulty now. We sell everything we bring in for cash, at better prices." Why? Because in that locality everything is in an active and flourishing state. Manufactories have increased, the number of the employed has increased, and their wages have increased. They have plenty of money with which to buy perishable produce—I speak particularly of perishable goods which cannot be sent to a distant market."

That is the market we receive for the \$6,000,000 worth of goods manufactured in old Canada, and an excellent market it is. It is a great compensation. But there is another thing that I would like to say in behalf of New Brunswick, and that is in reference to the flour business. If the people of Ontario believe the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways that 50 cts. a ton duty on coal makes the coal cheaper, we are willing to let the duty remain. Seeing we are purchasing \$6,000,000 worth of manufactured goods from Ontario, it might be well for you, seeing that the duty on coal does not affect you, that you should abolish the duty on flour. We are willing to let it remain on coal, owing to the convincing argument of the Minister of Railways, and you would do well to leave it there. But I think that seeing the hon. Minister of Finance himself made the statement, it would be just as well in the interest of the coasting trade of the Maritime Provinces, to abolish the duty on flour. Well, I am about to finish, and I dare say the House is very glad of it. When I get home to my own people they will ask me: What is doing up there now? What is the news? In reply I shall have to commence something after this fashion: "You did a great deal for a man in New Brunswick. You took him up and made a man of him, and he is now, I believe, like some of the rest of his colleagues, a belted knight. When we entered into the Union he stated that \$2.68 per head from the Dominion Government annually would be sufficient for 25 years, and that sum has already been doubled. After promising a market to the farmers of Canada, according to his own words, he has simply made a market for the gardeners of Gananoque." In addition to that I would tell the people: You know that on every platform in Central New Brunswick he went round telling you that the Intercolonial Railway was

coming right down the valley of the St. John. The hon. gentleman had been from one place to another making these promises. A gentleman put him a poetical question. He says, mentioning him by name, though I believe it is unparliamentary to mention names here—but he said:

"Come, Tilley, stop your puffing and blowing,
And tell us where the railroad is going."

That hon. gentleman told the people who made a man of him that that railway would be built by the Valley of St. John, and if it was not that he would resign. He wrote his resignation, and put it in his pocket, and he kept it in his pocket, he kept it in his pocket, and he kept it in his pocket, and at last, Mr. Speaker, he took it out of his pocket, and they say that when he took it out of his pocket he put it into the spittoon like the man he was. I believe there is an hon. gentleman here—they say he is the hon. member for Halton, I am speaking from memory now—who told the people in St. John shortly afterwards that these Tories built the road and throw \$8,000,000 into the sea, and what was that for? It was to keep the Province of Quebec in the traces. But the hon. member that they made a man of, put his resignation just where he intended it, and he kept it there. When I go home again I will tell them in addition to that, that he said "if I had been in Parliament in 1878, I should not have voted for the duty on flour or coal." And I will tell them that the hon. Finance Minister, and the Prime Minister too, declared that in changing the fiscal system of the country, there would be no increase but a readjustment; but that, nevertheless, under that readjustment we are paying as much duty on \$6,000,000 that we import now as on \$11,000,000 under the old Tariff, besides paying tribute on \$6,000,000 western of manufactures. By-and-bye, they will be so proud of the giant, that they will not know how to contain themselves, and they will wonder what sort of a man this is that can adapt himself to every circumstance. Why, these men, if they were out of power to-morrow, there is not a pledge they would not make to get back to power. There is nothing they would not do to get into power. Just think of it! If I am correctly informed, there is a smooth-faced gentleman over there, whose garments smell with a bribe of \$32,000. If that is unparliamentary, I will take it back. Some hon. gentlemen surrounding me seem to think it is. The last observation I made had better perhaps not have been made; I do not know but my hon. friends are right, because they do not wish to throw mud, and I object to that myself. But perhaps it is just as well I had not said it. However, Mr. Speaker, it is said. But I suppose it is quite enough for me to tell the good this Minister of Finance has done to the Province of New Brunswick when I go back. I desire to say what the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have done for the farmers. They have not placed them on an equal footing with the manufacturers. We do not object to protection, provided we are not taxed too much to pay for our manufactured goods. We are willing our manufacturers should have a reasonable protection—not 35 or 40 per cent. We are willing to buy their goods and to unite with them in the work of building up a great country. I have said that under the present Tariff arrangements we have not received justice at the hands of the Government. I have only to conclude by thanking the House for the kindness with which they have received my remarks. This is the first occasion on which I have attempted to address the House, and, if it is the last, I am thankful for the opportunity thus afforded me.

Mr. GIGAULT. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has spoken in glowing terms of the Liberal party and their policy. He claims to be an honest farmer. I think he should not content himself with being an honest man; he should study a little of the political history of

Canada. I would like to ask the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Irvine) what has the Liberal party done for Canada? I would ask our opponents what measures they have adopted to improve the material welfare of the country? None. The members of the Liberal party who sit in this House have always opposed measures which have been advanced to promote the best interests of Canada. They opposed the building of the Grand Trunk Railway; the erection of the Victoria Bridge; they opposed Confederation—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. GIGAULT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Liberals of the Province of Quebec opposed Confederation. They opposed, also, the building of the Intercolonial Railway, and they are opposing the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is very ridiculous on the part of the Liberal members of this House to pretend to be the successors of Baldwin and Lafontaine, as they often say they are at public meetings and even in this Parliament. Do they forget that Baldwin was defeated by one Hartmann, a clear Grit? Do they forget that Lafontaine was denounced as bitterly by the Liberal party as they now denounce the leaders of the Conservative party in this House? Do they forget that in the Province of Quebec the Liberals said that all the acts of the Baldwin-Lafontaine Administration were acts of treason?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Not at all. The Tories said so.

Mr. GIGAULT. If the hon. member will turn to *Le Pays*, the organ of the Liberal party of that time, and read the number published on the 20th January, 1852, he will find the following:—

"That Mr Lafontaine, who, in 1834, denounced the traitors, has become himself a traitor."

The editor further said that all the acts of the Lafontaine-Baldwin Administration were acts of treason, and that Lafontaine himself trampled on the rights of the people. That is what was said by the organ of the Liberal party of that day, and I do not know how the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) can so far forget the past history of his party as to say that the Liberals of Quebec are successors to Lafontaine and Baldwin. They are ashamed to-day of having opposed these men, just as they will some years hence be ashamed of having opposed the present policy of the Conservative party. When our National Policy and our railway policy have fully developed the resources of Canada, as they will certainly do, and have made of it a country of which we will have reason to be proud, they will then perhaps say that they never opposed the policy of the Conservative party; but it will be too late for them to say so then as it is now too late for them to proclaim themselves the successors of the illustrious statesmen whom they branded as traitors. I understand that our opponents are going to publish a manifesto to the people of Canada. If it contains the arguments employed by Liberal speakers inside the House and out of it, it will certainly be very amusing to the electors. The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) said that the farmers received no advantage at all from the present Tariff, and the member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) affirms that in Nova Scotia they are obliged to buy corn and oats from Ontario and Quebec and pay higher prices than they would otherwise have to pay but for the Tariff. The member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) says we are drawing millions from the masses of the people to favor a few manufacturers, and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in a speech delivered on the 23rd February last, declared that this Tariff was ruinous to the manufacturers. The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) asserts that the farmers pay higher prices for manufactured goods, and he alluded chiefly to the

Mr. GIGAULT.

agricultural implements sold in Canada. What did the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) say on the 23rd February? Alluding to the manufacturers, and chiefly to the manufacturers of agricultural implements, he said they were selling mowers and reapers and agricultural implements at as low prices as formerly. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has put himself to a good deal of trouble to show that the farmers pay higher prices for agricultural implements, and how can he answer what was said by one of his friends a few days ago? The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), speaking of the duty on wheat and flour, said that on certain days in the year in the Province of Quebec we paid 50 cents more for each barrel of flour. If that hon. gentleman reads the speech made in 1879 by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Bechard), he will see that his friend affirmed that the duty on wheat and flour would never have the effect of increasing the price of wheat and flour by one cent; as for the member for Iberville himself, he said last Session that agricultural protection was a humbug and was useless; and what motion did the same member make a few years ago? He contended then that we imported too large a quantity of oats and corn from the United States, and he moved in this House then in order to promote the interests of the farmers we should impose a duty on these cereals. The hon. member for Lambton says that the duties are always paid by the consumer; yet that same gentleman, in 1874, sent the Hon. George Brown to Washington to endeavor to get the duties removed which were imposed by the American Government on Canadian oats, corn and barley which were imported to the United States. Did the hon. gentleman then believe that the duties were paid only by the consumer? No; he worked so hard to have these duties removed because he was convinced that they were detrimental to the interests of the Canadian producers. The hon. member for Centre Huron pretends that the farmers receive no advantage at all from the present Tariff; but that hon. gentleman does not require his neighbor to contradict him, because he can do that himself. In that same speech he weeps over the fate of the workingman, who pays \$3 a year more on account of the tax on flour. Does that statement agree very well with the statement made in the same speech that the farmer receives no advantage from the Tariff? The member for West Durham affirms that we are going to make millions of the manufacturers, and the member for West Middlesex asserts that the Tariff is ruinous to the manufacturers, that it will build up so many manufacturing establishments that there will be over-competition, and that at last they will sell at very low prices to those much-to-be-pitied consumers. The member for Centre Huron, in a speech in 1879, asserted that this Tariff would certainly injure our credit in England. Now, it is proved by the facts that our rate of interest is lower, although our public debt has increased. The same gentleman, at the conclusion of his speech in 1879, said that by this Tariff the Conservatives were wrecking their fortunes and the fortunes of Canada. If he wishes to know whether his prediction has been fulfilled, let him listen to the sweet voice of his friend, the hon. member for South Brant, who said a few days ago:

"I believe that perhaps never were the manufacturers of Canada enjoying more prosperity than they are to-day. The same may be said of the farmers, the lumbermen, and the other classes of the community."

I will ask the hon. member for Centre Huron if these words sound like the wrecking of the fortunes of Canada. Instead of the desolation which that hon. gentleman expected from the present Tariff, we have had prosperity. But that same gentleman attributes our prosperity to the abundant harvests which we have had during the last two or three years. During the late Administration we had also abundant harvests; which were it was alluded to in the Speeches from the Throne in 1875 and 1878; but those abundant

harvests could not counteract the bad effects of the policy of the late Government. The member for Lotbinière contended that the Tariff was of no benefit to the farmer. I would ask that hon. gentleman if the Finance Minister would have been able to reduce taxation—to remove the duties on tea and coffee, to diminish the tax on tobacco, to abolish the stamp duty—if he had not received large duties since 1879 from breadstuffs; but for that revenue the Finance Minister would not have been in the fortunate position of being able to reduce the duties by \$1,500,000 this year. If we reverted to the revenue Tariff spoken of by the hon. member for South Brant, the farmers would be obliged again to pay duties on tea and coffee, higher duties on molasses, tobacco and malt—duties which would only give revenue, but which would not foster our industries, and we should always prefer taxes which bring revenue and at the same time foster our industries. If we adopted a revenue Tariff the American farmers would again flood our market with their grain and produce without paying a cent of duty, while the Canadian farmer would have to pay 15 cents on each bushel of barley, 10 cents on each bushel of oats, and other duties on grains which he might export to the United States. Our farmers understand their interests too well to submit again to such an injustice. They know that the present Tariff is fair to them; it says that as soon as the American Government will remove the duty on Canadian grain, then our Government will remove the duty on breadstuffs coming from the United States. If they wish to admit our breadstuffs free, we are willing to admit theirs free; that is the right and equitable policy to adopt. Many Conservative members were led to believe that, seeing the results and the popularity of the National Policy, our opponents would give up all opposition to it. But they were mistaken. For the sake of the Conservative party we may certainly be glad to see the Liberals continuing to support a revenue Tariff, as it will be a great help to us in the coming election. Even some Reform newspapers predict for our opponents a crushing defeat if they continue to support their Free Trade theory. We see the *World of Toronto*, and the *Tribune of Montreal*, warning the leaders of the Liberal party that if they persist in their opposition to the National Policy they will certainly receive a crushing defeat in the coming elections as they did in 1878. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) alluded to the increase of the public debt, and of the annual expenditure. He acknowledged, at the same time, that under the late Administration there was a large increase under those heads, but he declared they were not responsible for it. Can the hon. member hold the Conservatives responsible for the establishment of the Supreme Court? for the establishment of the Military College? Are we responsible for the public money squandered on the Fort Frances Locks, for the Georgian Bay Branch, for the purchase of steel rails and other enterprises of that character? We must expect that, in proportion as our population and wealth increase, our annual expenditure will increase. The President of the United States, in his last Message, said that \$400,000,000 would be, this year, the revenue of his Government. When the population of the Union was less, the expenses were much less, but as the population augmented they had to increase their debt and annual expenditure. The hon. member for Lotbinière alluded to England as being a very prosperous country, because it had Free Trade; but my hon. friend should know that in England under a revenue Tariff the annual expenditure per head is \$12.35, in France \$14.07, while in Canada it is only a few cents more than \$6, and there are a great many countries in the world where the annual expenditure per head is much higher than in the Dominion. When we see the results we have obtained from the National Policy, we should not fear to go again before the electors. I was sorry to hear the language used by the hon. member

for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) toward our present Finance Minister. If there is a man who is highly esteemed in Canada to-day it is the Finance Minister, who is the author of our protective Tariff. In the United States the American people, grateful to Henry Clay for having introduced a protective Tariff in their country, have erected statues in his honor; and during coming years it will be recorded in the history of Canada that the present Minister, by introducing a protective Tariff, contributed to the prosperity of Canada as much as any man could do.

Mr. McLELAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock, midnight) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 13th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock:

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the Annual Report of the Department of the Interior.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 99) to amend an Act to enlarge and extend the powers of the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Carling.)

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Quebec Timber Company (Limited).—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 3) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Manitoba Bank.—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 27) to further amend the Act incorporating the Mutual Life Association of Canada, and to change the name thereof to the "Life Association of Canada."—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 28) to amend the charter of the Chartered Bank of London and North America, and to change the name thereof to "The Chartered Bank of London and Winnipeg."—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 29) to incorporate the North-Western Bank.—(Mr. Rochester.)

SUN MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. GAULT moved the third reading of Bill (No. 4) respecting the Sun Mutual Life Assurance Company, Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) said: In reference to this Bill I desire to move that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with a view to the adding of a clause which was struck out by the Committee on Banking and Commerce. When the matter came up in that Committee, by clause 2 in the Bill as originally printed, which provides for the reduction of the quorum of directors, some objection was made to it; and the hon. member for Montreal West, who has charge of the Bill, stated that he did not attach any importance to the clause and was willing to have it struck

out. But I find that, by some of the directors of the company, a good deal of importance is attached to the clause, the object of which is to reduce the qualification of directors from \$5,000 to \$2,500. The object is to enable directors to be obtained in some of the towns away from Montreal. In the Canada Life Assurance Company the qualification for director is only a single share, and it is desired, in this instance, to make the qualification but twenty-five shares. People find that at points like London, St. John's and Halifax, it is sometimes difficult to obtain directors willing to take as large a number of shares as fifty, and, with the view of securing the assistance and co-operation of gentlemen at such points, the Board of Directors have unanimously expressed the desire that the qualification should be reduced. I, therefore, move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole, with instructions to add the following clause thereto:—

Section 9 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting the word "twenty-five" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not personally observe that there is any objection to the statement of the hon. member of the reasons for voting for that amendment. But the hon. gentlemen has stated that there was in the Committee a discussion on this subject and some objection made to the clause. It seems to me, then, that the case comes within the spirit, if not the letter, of our rule, which, I think, provides that no amendment shall be proposed without a certain notice. We are yet in the early part of the Session and there can be no difficulty in complying with this rule. I suggest, then, whether the Bill should not be allowed to stand, so as to allow of notice being given of this amendment in order to its consideration by the Committee.

Mr. WHITE. There was no discussion on the subject in the Committee. Some one objected to this as an unusual clause to reduce the qualification, when the member for Montreal West simply stated that he attached no importance to it, and was willing to accept of a change. But if objection is taken to the amendment being proposed without the notice required, of course I shall have to give it.

Mr. BLAKE. The point is this, if I rightly remember the rule of the Committee: It says that no important amendment shall be made without due notice before hand. I should attach some importance to an amendment that had been the subject of discussion, and should observe sufficient respect for the decision of the Committee, which forbids the acceptance of such amendments without the opportunity of sufficient consideration.

Mr. WHITE. I am content, then, to allow the item to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let the order stand.

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the New York and Ontario Furnace Company.—(Mr. White, Hastings.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 86) to amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to authorize the said Company to erect a bridge across the Ottawa River.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Bill (No. 87) respecting a certain agreement between the Canadian Securities Company, and the Liquidators of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 88) to explain the Act to grant relief to the Canada Agricultural Insurance Company, and to define the powers of the Assignees therein mentioned.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Massue.)

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Pacific Railway Ferry Company.—(Mr. Massue.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Tassé.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the "Grand Central Station Company."—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 95) to amend the Act incorporating "The Bell Telephone Company of Canada."—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Calais and St. Stephens Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Canada Provident Association.—(Mr. Currier.)

GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know whether the line is shorter than the main.

Mr. CAMERON. Much shorter. It is only three or four hundred miles long, I believe.

Bill read the second time.

MONTREAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to ask my hon. friend if this Bill affects the recent arrangement made with the Great North-Western Telegraph Company.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). No, it is simply a consolidation of the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company with the introduction of the same clause that was put in the charter of the Dominion Telegraph Company some year ago.

Mr. BLAKE. But that would affect it.

Mr. CAMERON. It does not affect the existing arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE. But it would give the power.

Mr. CAMERON. It would give power to make a lease. Bill read the second time.

IMPROVEMENTS OF THE HARBOR OF MATANE.

Mr. Fiset enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates, a certain sum in order to continue the improvements in the Harbor of Matane?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No decision has yet been come to in this matter, which is at the present time under consideration.

LINE OF STEAMERS BETWEEN CANADA AND BRAZIL.

Mr. LAURIER enquired, Is the service by the subsidized line between Canada and Brazil to be a monthly one? If

so, what is the reason that no steamer of that line has arrived at Halifax since December last?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The service in question is monthly, indeed. As to the second part of the question, I am not in a position to-day to answer the hon. member.

IMPROVEMENT OF WHITBY HARBOR.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), in the absence of Mr. WHEELER, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to place a sum in the Estimates for the improvement of Whitby Harbor, on Lake Ontario?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter is still under consideration.

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during this Session, a Bill to amend the law of evidence in criminal cases, similar to the Imperial Act of 32nd and 33rd Victoria, chapter 68?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter is now before the hon. the Minister of Justice, who has it under consideration.

RIGHTS OF THE HUDSON BAY COMPANY.

Mr. MACDOUGALL enquired, Whether the Government has recognized the right of the Hudson Bay Company, under its charter, as modified by the 9th article of the agreement for transfer, of March 22nd, 1869, to trade in the public lands of Manitoba and the North-West Territory?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has never been requested to recognize such a right, and has not recognized it.

Mr. MACDOUGALL enquired, Whether the Government has recognized the right of the Hudson Bay Company to claim, under the 17th, 18th and 19th sections of the Public Lands Act of 1872, or any other, and what authority, lands of great value in the Red River Settlement belt, in lieu of lots assigned to the Company in the adjacent "townships" and "bona fide" settled on, under the authority of any Order in Council, or of the said Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been an Order in Council on this subject, and, if my hon. friend will move for it, it will be sent down.

THE DRAWBACK REGULATIONS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of correspondence and information in possession of the Government as to the use of barrels, or parts of barrels, in which American flour had been imported, for the purpose of exporting Canadian flour in evasion of the regulations as to drawback, said: I may say that since I made a former motion, in which I asked for such information as was in the possession of the Government as to some other modes of evading the regulations as to drawback, I have received one or two communications intimating that the heads of barrels in which American flour was imported have been used in barrels in which Canadian flour has been exported, with the view of evading the regulations as to drawback. I would like to know what information the Government have on that subject.

Mr. BOWELL. The attention of the Government has not been called to any wrong of this kind, but I saw a communication on the subject in a Montreal newspaper. Upon reading it, I cut it out and sent it to Montreal for information; and the answer I received I shall be very glad to bring down for the hon. gentleman's information.

Motion agreed to.

COST OF CANADIAN AND FOREIGN COTTONS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a copy of all statements in the possession of the Government showing, in detail, the cost of specified brands of like qualities of Canadian and foreign brown and white cottons, with dates and other particulars, said: This motion is made in consequence of a statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister the other day, that he had in his possession papers showing that the cost of white and brown Canadian cottons was from 5 to 7½ per cent. over the cost of the foreign goods. Information that I have received from a number of very extensive dealers in cotton is that, as to foreign brands capable of being compared with Canadian brands, that statement is not in accordance with their experience. It is important that we should have the precise facts on this subject, and as the hon. Minister announced that he had in his possession the paper which contained the facts, I suppose there will be no objection to bringing that paper down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman's last statement. I did not state, with reference to cotton sheeting, that I had the papers. I had reference to correspondence in connection with information furnished me by Mr. Parkes with regard to warps and other things.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, on reference to the record of the debate, the hon. gentleman will be found to be reported as saying that he had a statement as to white and brown cottons. I was not present at the time.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if the hon. gentleman says he did not say so, I accept his statement.

Mr. BOWELL. No such records as these are in the keeping of the Customs' Department. But if such a statement is brought down, there should be added the price of the raw material.

Mr. BLAKE. My motion is founded simply on the reported statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, that like qualities of brown and whitesheetings made in Canada, cost in Canada, from 5 to 7½ per cent. more than the same quality of American cottons, and if the hon. the Finance Minister has in his possession the evidence on which that statement is based, I want that evidence brought down. I do not expect that that evidence would be in the Department of Customs, I expect that it would have reference to the same dates, which alone would be the proper basis of comparison, without any reference to the raw material, which, being bought in the same market, would be of the same cost.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The statement I made, so far as my memory serves me, was that I had correspondence, which passed with manufacturers in the United States, in reference to cotton warps and yarns. I have in my possession the letter from the person who furnished me with that information, which I have no objection to bring down.

Motion agreed to.

STATION AT ST. ANACLET.

Mr. FISET moved for copies of the correspondence between the Government and interested persons of St. Anaclet, and of Pointe aux Pères, and all other persons whatsoever, respecting the erection of a railway station in the parish of St. Anaclet. He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I wish to say a few words. The parish of St. Anaclet, through which the Intercolonial Railway passes, does not possess a station, although the population of that parish exceeds 1,400 souls; there is besides another parish in the rear of St. Anaclet which will shortly become very populous. Farmers have to travel two leagues and more to reach the nearest station, when the train passes before their doors. Another reason for which the Government should

construct a station at St. Anaclet, is the neighborhood of Point-aux-Pères. As it is more than probable that a road is to be made between St. Anaclet and Point-aux-Pères, that road will enable the people of the whole locality to enjoy the advantage of a station at St. Anaclet, and will add to its importance. Again, pilgrims going to Ste. Anne in summer, would get out at that station as being the nearest to their objective point. I think, Mr. Speaker, that for these various reasons, the Government should try to grant a station to the parish of St. Anaclet at as early a date as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member having addressed the House in French, I am requested by my colleague sitting on my right to reply to him in the same language. A station has been asked for at St. Anaclet, as stated by the hon. member; petitions have been presented, and recently the curé of Point-aux-Pères, or the priest who serves the mission there, made the same request by letter or otherwise; he pointed out the advantages that would accrue from a station at St. Anaclet, for on a road being opened from Point-aux-Pères to St. Anaclet, Ste. Anne would become easier of access and the railway would reap the benefit of their travel. The railway company has not yet decided the question, which remains open. The principal object is that we have been asked to give money to build the road, which is a thing we cannot do. The hon. member understands this. If the station is granted, the two parishes must necessarily come to an agreement to build a road to give access to their station, from the river shore to St. Anaclet.

Motion agreed to.

PICTOU DRY DOCK.

Mr. DOULL, in moving for copies of petitions and all correspondence in connection with the dry dock at Pictou, said: The other day, two hon. members on the other side of the House, the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), and the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), declaimed very loudly because no appropriation was made for certain breakwaters and repairs to piers in their counties. Reference was made to myself by one of them. I have no doubt their complaints were well founded. I am aware that the pier at Arisaig requires to be repaired; I am also aware that the wharf at Port Hood requires repairs, and that a considerable trade is growing up between Pictou and that port. Those hon. gentlemen are pleased to complain that provision has not been made in the Estimates for those works, but whilst they have ground for complaint, I think I have much stronger ground, because no provision has been made for the dry dock which has been petitioned for not only by the people of the port of Pictou but also by the shipowners and masters of different ports of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and, if I mistake not, of New Brunswick. I have better reasons than the hon. gentlemen opposite for feeling dissatisfied that no provision has been made for the work to which I refer. In the first place, I support the Government, while those hon. gentlemen do not. Another reason is that a dry dock at Pictou would prove of general benefit, whereas the works to which those hon. gentlemen referred would possess only local and comparatively small benefit. Still another reason is that the work for which I desire an appropriation will, in reality, take nothing out of the Treasury that will not be returned. I will endeavor to show this House why I think the aid asked for should be given by the Government. Every person who is acquainted with the trade of the Dominion knows that the larger portion of the shipping passes through the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which is one of the most dangerous waters of the world. Since the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) secured the adoption of his telegraphic system the dangers have been reduced, still the navigation is suffi-

Mr. FISER.

ciently dangerous as to cause every year many disasters and shipwrecks, and insurance underwriters ask a higher rate for vessels navigating the waters of the Gulf in spring and fall, than for vessels navigating the larger waters of the ocean. But it may be said that a dry dock is being built at Point Levis, which will answer all purposes. I contend that the Point Levis dock, when built at a considerable expense, will only prove serviceable to vessels entering and leaving the River St. Lawrence. I will give a reason why I think so. Most of the disasters in the Gulf occur under north and north-west winds, when vessels could not possibly make the river, whereas if a dock were built at Pictou those winds would enable a vessel with temporary rig to make that port and receive the necessary repairs. That the carrying trade of the Dominion through the Gulf requires a dock of that kind, I think will appear evident, when I inform this House that the rates of freight charged from the Gulf ports are as a rule much higher than from the Atlantic ports of the United States, and they will continue to be higher until such time as we afford to our seaports the same facilities and advantages to sea-going vessels as are furnished at American ports. While we have spent millions of money in improving the inland navigation of the St. Lawrence and our highway from the Lakes to the sea-board, in order to bring the produce of the West at lower rates to the sea-board by that route than it is carried by other routes to the sea-board of the United States; we must afford such advantages to sea-going vessels as will enable them to carry freight as low from our ports as from those of the United States, otherwise the rates from the United States ports will continue to be lower than from our ports. I, therefore, contend that the money spent in improving our inland navigation will be, to a large extent, useless, unless we give these advantages to our sea-board, and for this reason I maintain that this dry dock is a necessity in the interests not merely of the port of Pictou, but of the whole Dominion, and not merely for our sea-going vessels but also for the whole of our shipping interests. You may carry freight from the West through our inland water-way at a low rate to the sea-board, but if the rate from the sea-board to Europe is, in proportion, higher than the inland freight is lower than that charged by rival routes, the trade will continue to go pretty much to the seaports of the United States. It is not, therefore, local, but one affecting the interests of the whole Dominion; and I, therefore, consider I have some reason to complain that there is no appropriation for it in the Estimates. But, apart from that, I said this work was not going ultimately to take any money out of the Dominion Treasury. The dock proposed to be built at Pictou is of the description known as Simpson's dry dock. It is not very expensive, and they are found in the United States to answer the purpose equally well with the more expensive docks. The estimated cost of this dock will be \$150,000—the outside estimate. The proposition for the building of this dock is, that the Government should lend the money to the Commissioners of the port of Pictou at 4 per cent.; that the port of Pictou should pay the residue of the harbor dues, after paying the Harbor Master's fees, towards the payment of interest on this amount. If the harbor dues are insufficient, they might be increased to a small extent to enable the Harbor Commissioners to pay off this interest out of the harbor dues—at least \$3,500. The estimated revenue to be derived from this dock is set down at \$7,500, which, together with the \$3,500 from the harbor dues, will make \$11,000. The interest on the \$150,000 would be \$6,000, and the estimated cost of working and maintenance, \$2,500, making \$8,500 of an annual payment for interest, working and maintenance. That amount taken from the \$11,000 will leave a balance of \$2,500 towards a sinking fund that would be over and above what is necessary to pay the interest of that money, and would ultimately wipe

out the whole amount. But that is the estimate at the present time, under the existing state of matters. But we look forward to the trade, not only of the port of Pictou but of the Dominion, especially the carrying trade increasing; and, as a matter of course, the number of ships required will also largely increase. If so, it is only fair to calculate that that sum of \$11,000 will be largely augmented, and the earnings of the dock will also be swelled. I, therefore, contend that it is only fair that the Government should not only give the port of Pictou, but the shipping interest of the Dominion, what is asked for in this petition. I hope that, after what I have stated, the Government will re-consider the matter and give the money that is required.

Mr. KILLAM. I have no doubt that the subject brought before the House is one of very great importance, and the more so because we have had evidence before the House—I think a year or two ago, affecting the action of the Government with regard even to their own steamer in the port of Pictou—and which evidence was brought before certain Committees of the House to show that it is possible to haul the Government steamer on a slip which is under the control of a member of the Liberal party. I have myself in my possession a piece of the sheathing of the steamer *Mayflower*, which I shall be happy to show the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works, to let them see what an industrious insect our *teredo nautalis* is, and to show them that even so strong a Government as theirs can have their steamers destroyed, partly for want of a dry dock, and partly for want of a feeling for a gentleman who might not be grudged a fair price to haul up their boats.

Motion agreed to.

IMPROVEMENT OF CASCUMPEC HARBOR.

Mr. HACKETT moved for all correspondence with the Department of Public Works since the 1st July last, having reference to the improvement of Cascumpec Harbor, Prince County, Prince Edward Island. He said: My object in making this motion is to ascertain what has been done during the last year for the purpose of improving this harbor. I regret I have to trouble the House again with relating the facts in connection with this very important harbor. Last year and the previous year I had this motion before the House, and almost succeeded on one occasion in obtaining a grant of money for the purpose of improving it. But through some mysterious cause I failed. I need not say that this harbor, being on the north side of Prince Edward Island, and the only deep water terminus of the railway west of Summerside, is of very great importance to the Government, and should be improved, thereby facilitating the trade in that part of the country. But apart altogether from the trade consideration, or its being an outlet for the produce of the western and northern part of Prince Edward Island, as a harbor of refuge it is most important that it should be improved. Last year the works of the Island required a very large amount of money, but a very small amount would make the improvement now asked for. The trouble is there are two bars at this place, an inner bar of rock, and an outer bar of sand; and engineers have stated that if the inner bar were blasted, and a channel of sufficient depth made, say 14 or 15 feet—there is only 12 feet now—a corresponding increase of the depth would take place at the outer bar, probably making the harbor accessible. This harbor is not merely a local matter. It is necessary as a harbor of refuge for vessels engaged in the carrying trade, going through the Gulf—being quite in the bight of the Island on account of the strong current which the north-easterly wind makes, and which obliges the vessels to go in-shore. There is no opportunity other than strong crafts working out against these obstacles; therefore it is necessary the harbor should be improved. A large number of fishing vessels from Nova Scotia, New

Brunswick and Quebec, frequent our fishing grounds in the vicinity of this harbor; but I regret to say that on very many occasions a number have been cast away, and not only property, but the lives of the crews lost sometimes. I have here a statement of wrecks that took place in the vicinity of this harbor since we entered into Confederation, eight years ago. Fourteen vessels, of the value of \$146,000, have been lost on that coast, owing to the want of a harbor of refuge. Not only were the vessels lost, but a very great destruction of property ensued. There were thirty-eight or forty unfortunate seamen lost as well. I think, in the interest of humanity, as well as in the interest of trade, this harbor should be improved. Last year, when I brought the matter before the hon. the Minister of Public Works, I felt almost certain he would make an appropriation for this improvement. To remind the hon. gentleman of the promise made, I will read his exact words:

"We have to see what are the works called for in the different parts of the Dominion, and then decide which of these works should be undertaken now, and which delayed. Under the circumstances, this harbor—though I understand the importance of the work—may have to stand over, though I am not in a position to say to-day it will have to stand over until next year. We may be in a position to ask Parliament, in the Supplementary Estimates, for a vote for this; nevertheless, I cannot promise that, first, because it would not be my duty, and secondly, because I have no right to anticipate the vote of the House, though the matter will be looked into again."

Now, it will be seen by this that the hon. gentleman stated last year he was in hopes to be able to put an amount of money in the Supplementary Estimates for the improvement of this harbor, but that as it was necessary to delay some work, this might also have to stand over. Although I was not at all satisfied to have it stand over last year I hoped it would be put in the Estimates this year, but my hopes were blasted. When the Estimates came down I was disappointed to see that no appropriation was made for this harbor. If the hon. gentleman has not already placed a sum in the Supplementary Estimates, I hope my calling his attention to it now will induce him to do it. It has been said that the Province of Prince Edward Island is taking considerable money out of the Dominion Treasury. That statement has been made not only by the Opposition, but it has been repeated on the Government side of the House. I remember that, in 1880, the hon. leader of the Opposition stated that Prince Edward Island had extracted up to that time something like \$1,200,000 more out of the Dominion Exchequer than she had paid into it. In the last Session I think the hon. Minister of Finance also stated that we had largely overdrawn. I think that is very unfair. If that is the only reason why our public works are not attended to it is a very poor one indeed. It is a fact that the imports of dutiable goods into Prince Edward Island have fallen off considerably within the last few years. In 1876, the total imports of dutiable goods into Prince Edward Island amounted to \$1,590,981; for the year ending 30th June, 1881, they amounted to \$907,825, or a falling off of \$683,156. Now, although the Trade and Navigation Returns show a falling off of imports direct to the Province, still it is a well-known fact that the people use as many dutiable goods as heretofore, although the goods have not been imported direct from foreign countries. They are purchased at other ports in the Dominion. The goods that are imported into the ports of Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Toronto, are bought by the Prince Edward Island traders; the duty is paid at the port of entry and credited to the Province in which they are entered, and, as a matter of course, the people of Prince Edward Island thus get no credit for the amount of revenue these goods pay. There are a few lines of goods manufactured in Canada that are bought by the people of Prince Edward Island, and there are many other lines of goods sold by the wholesale merchants, and also used by the people, that are imported. I may say

that with regard to these, that print cottons, certain line of woollen goods, fancy goods and hardware, are largely imported at the ports mentioned by me, and are bought by the traders of Prince Edward Island, but as the duty is paid where the goods are entered, that Province gets no credit for it. On three or four lines of goods alone, cottons, woollens and hardware, there is a falling off of \$400,000 or \$500,000, showing conclusively that, although the Province is not credited with so large an amount of duty paid per head as some other Provinces, still they pay the duties nevertheless. I hope that this apparent deficiency in the duties paid by Prince Edward Island will not stand in the way of the Government prosecuting the public works. I trust that this very important harbor of Cascumpec, which I have brought so many times to the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, will be attended to this year, and if the hon. gentleman cannot see his way to grant an amount sufficient for the whole works, a reasonable amount will be quite satisfactory.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sure the House, as well as the county the hon. gentleman represents, cannot complain that the hon. gentleman has been remiss in bringing this subject to the attention of the Government. As far as I am concerned, I must say that I am well acquainted with the whole subject. The hon. gentleman has done all he could for the last three years to induce the Government to ask Parliament for a vote of money for this work. I, for one, am aware of the importance of that harbor, and of the works the hon. gentleman wishes the Government to undertake. But the Government have so many works, so many calls from various portions of the Dominion, that we have to postpone some of them from year to year, in order that we may do those which are most immediately necessary. This harbor, as the hon. gentleman knows, has been much damaged on account of the natural breakwater of the harbor having been broken through by the sea, and consequently it does not afford the shelter it would if that natural breakwater had not been partially destroyed by the sea. In any improvements the Government may make in that harbor, they must keep in view the fact that the natural barrier will have to be restored, which will necessitate the expenditure of a large sum of money. The most pressing work, as the hon. gentleman says, would be the removal of the bar of rock, and he thinks if that were done, the water might then destroy the outside bar. That is quite possible, but the removal of the bar of rock is a work of considerable magnitude. However, the hon. gentleman having once more brought the matter to the attention of the Government, I shall again bring it before my colleagues. But if I am not able to bring down an estimate for this work, let not the hon. gentleman say next year that I promised it for the Supplementary Estimates. I will lay the matter before my colleagues, and if, after reconsidering it, they think we shall be justified in asking for a vote, I shall be very happy to put in an estimate for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOM HOUSE BOATMEN AT QUEBEC.

Mr. AMYOT, in moving copies of all petitions from the Customs boatmen of the city of Quebec, applying to be supplied with official uniforms, and of the replies to such applications, said: Mr. Speaker, I hope the Government will give that petition its earnest consideration. It is very important to the Customs service of Quebec, that the boatmen be distinguished by a special uniform, which would give them a greater authority when they board foreign vessels. It would be a very small expense for the Government, and would considerably increase the efficiency of the service.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HACKETT.

THE APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS RYAN.

Mr. COURSOL, in moving for copies of all correspondence, certificates, &c., addressed to the Government in relation to the appointment of Mr. Thomas Ryan as engineer of the Custom House at Montreal, with the date of such appointment, said: Mr. Speaker, before asking of this honorable House, an order to obtain this correspondence, I trust I may make a few remarks on a subject which interests me particularly, as the representative of the division of Montreal East. Towards the middle of last February a deplorable accident occurred in the Montreal Custom House through the bursting of a steam boiler. The engineer in charge of this boiler was fatally wounded by that explosion, and died therefrom in the afternoon of the 1st March instant. Shortly after that accident I had occasion to talk with the hon. Minister of Public Works, and he said to me at the time, as indeed it was but just that he should, that he hoped and that he wished that the appointment of an engineer should be made with the concurrence of the three representatives of the city of Montreal. Now, Mr. Speaker, no one knows better than yourself and my hon. colleagues in the House, how difficult it is for a member to dispense patronage, even when he represents alone an electoral division. It is ever a source of trouble to him, and, at the same time, it is sometimes a source of unpleasantness between the Departments and the members of the House. This difference of opinion may go a long way, when the question is one of exercising one's right of patronage in a city like Montreal, where there are three members, each one representing a division. Under such circumstances patronage should be dispensed with discernment, and especially with justice. I have a complaint to make with regard to the manner in which the appointment in question was made. It is not the first time that I have reason to complain. On the several occasions when I have had complaints to make, I have always done so to the face of the Government. I am one of the supporters of that Government. I support with my vote the policy we have inaugurated and which we think to be to the greater advantage of the country; but although I uphold the policy of the Government, as a general rule, I desire it to be well understood, that I do not intend to support individuals, or any member of the Government, if justice is not done to the division which I represent. Now, in the present instance, I presented on the 2nd March instant, to the hon. Minister of Public Works, a petition signed by one Gunn of the city of Montreal. This petition had been brought to me by one of the electors of my division, and it was accompanied by a large number of testimonials as to the applicant's ability, signed by men competent to know, certifying that Mr. Gunn was able to fulfil the duties of engineer. At the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I sent him that petition, together with the testimonials and a letter from myself. Four or five days later, I received a letter from the Department stating that Gunn's petition had reached too late, and that the appointment had already been made when the Department received it. Well, Mr. Speaker, this appointment must have been made hurriedly, and that is the cause of my complaint. The individual died on the first day of March at 4 o'clock p.m.; the same day the petition was presented, and the day following I was informed that the appointment had been made. But since that time, I have reason to believe, that another petition was sent to the hon. Minister of Public Works by other persons, by my two colleagues and by the Senator for the division of Alma. I complain of the fact, that Senators, who are not elected by the people, and who in certain electoral divisions could not get themselves returned, should be the first to come and recommend certain appointments to be made without the concurrence and participation of the member, who is left by them in complete ignorance

of what is going on. I have, therefore, to complain that this appointment was made without my participating in it, and the reasons since given to me by the hon. Minister of Public Works are rather an aggravation of the injustice, I will even say the insult done to my division. I hope there will be another opportunity to enable me to show to this House how patronage is dispensed, and the difficulties which we have to encounter each time an appointment has to be made. I complain especially of the fact that the Government and Ministers lend a too willing ear to persons who do not represent electoral divisions, which has the effect of weakening the candidate's strength in the division, and he has already trouble enough to secure justice for his constituents. If I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is not in a hostile spirit; I do so from motives of duty and fully understanding the position I take in this matter. I am entrusted with the defence of the interests of my constituents, and I will not, as long as I am the representative of Montreal East, allow the members of the other parts of the city to obtain any advantage over me. Let things be done openly and publicly, so that the responsible member be cognizant thereof, and then he will have no cause to complain if he does not obtain what he asks for; but what I do object to is the manner in which these things are done; sooner or later, it will end badly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the documents asked for in the hon. member's motion shall be brought down as soon as they can be copied. The hon. member has certainly the right to complain if he thinks that an injustice has been done to his division, and I would be the last member of the Government to blame him for so doing, the more so, that he has done it in most proper terms, which show that he is to-day as ever the friend of the Government. But, Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case seem to have been presented to the hon. member in a different light from what they really are. The accident which took place resulted in the death of the engineer and the stoker, and the official whom I sent to repair the disaster reported to me that it was necessary to have a competent employe, and one upon whom the Department could place dependence. In consequence I sent an engineer from my Department to replace temporarily the victim of the accident, pending the time when I should have a competent man to assume the post. Meanwhile, the engineer who had been seriously wounded, succumbed; the stoker had died sometime previously. Whereupon I received at different times a recommendation from Messrs. Gault and Ryan, two of the members representing the city of Montreal, who both favored the appointment of Mr. Thomas Ryan as engineer.

Mr. COURSOL. And one from the Senator.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I received those two recommendations from Mr. Gault, one of the members for Montreal, and from Mr. Ryan, another member for the same city. I also received another recommendation to the same effect from Mr. Ogilvie, Senator for that division, and another from Mr. White, also a member of this House, and from other persons of Montreal. The hon. member came to me once and spoke to me of the appointment which was to be made, and mentioned to me that there was some one he wished to recommend. I told him to send me his petition, together with what testimonials he might have. Those documents reached me on the morning of the 2nd instant, as stated by the hon. member. I considered the question during the course of the day, and after having perused the recommendations and the testimonials sent in from divers sources, I found that the hon. member for Montreal East recommended one Gunn, whilst the Senator and the other members for Montreal supported the appointment of Thomas Ryan, and I came to the conclusion that Thomas Ryan should be appointed, and such appointment was consequently made. The hon. member says that the appointment was

secretly made. It was made like all other appointments. When an official has to be appointed, he is appointed and receives the vacant position. The only thing about which the hon. member might seemingly have reason to complain about, is, that having called upon me, I should have made the appointment before receiving his letter, and the letter from the Secretary of the Department would certainly lead one to believe that such was the case; in fact, the letter actually says as much. This morning, upon seeing the hon. member's notice of motion on the Orders of the Day, I asked to see the letter written to the hon. member on the subject, and upon seeing that that letter stated that the appointment had been made before the receiving of the petition presented by the hon. member. I sent for the Secretary of the Department and asked him for the order by virtue of which the appointment had been made. The Secretary referred to the documents and found that he had made a mistake; thereupon he wrote me the following letter, which I will read to the House:—

“ OTTAWA, 13th March, 1882.

“ SIR,—Referring to the letter which Mr. Coursol, M.P., wrote to you on the 2nd inst, enclosing testimonials in favor of Mr. F. Gunn, applicant for the situation of Engineer to the Custom House of Montreal, I find that you endorsed on that letter instructions to return those testimonials to Mr. Coursol and to inform him that Mr. Ryan had been appointed to the situation applied for by Mr. Gunn. Your instructions were dated the third. I regret, that through an error which I cannot explain, that the letter written to Mr. Coursol according to those instructions, and which I signed, contains the unauthorized statement that ‘the appointment of another person (Mr. Thomas Ryan) had already been made to the vacant situation, previous to your (Mr. Coursol's) recommendation in favor of Mr. Gunn having reached the Minister.’”

Thus it is that the hon. member was perfectly justified in speaking as he did awhile ago, as the Secretary's letter put matters in that light; but the Secretary declares that he made a mistake in the close of his letter, and that the appointment had not been made when the hon. member's letter reached me. As a matter of fact, the question was only settled in the afternoon after I had examined the testimonials in favor of Gunn, submitted to me by the hon. member, as well as those in favor of Ryan. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. member will see that there was no intention of doing him a wrong in the present instance, any more than I have done in the past. I have always shown myself to be the friend of the hon. member, as he has always been that to the Government, and I hope that after these explanations, he will understand that the right appointment was made. It may be that he would have preferred that Gunn should have been appointed instead of Ryan, but I had to weigh matters and see who, in my opinion, should be preferred. I thought Ryan should be appointed, and therefore I did so.

Mr. COURSOL. There is another individual who was appointed the same day, the assistant engineer, and that on the recommendation of my two colleagues, whilst the man I had recommended was not appointed.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal). I regret very much that my colleague from Montreal East has thought proper to bring this matter before the House. I may say that the unfortunate accident which led to the death of the late engineer, Mr. Maghar—who, I may say, was a Protestant—occurred on the 15th or 16th of February last, and the appointment was made on the 2nd of March. I had the pleasure of knowing the gentleman whom the hon. the Minister of Public Works appointed to the vacant position. Although his name is Thomas Ryan, he is not a connection of mine; he does not happen to be even a co-religionist of mine. In Montreal, the rule is to appoint to any vacant position a man of the same religious persuasion as his predecessor. Knowing Mr. Ryan's qualifications for the position, I felt pleasure in signing a recommendation in his favor, and I think it is due to those of us who recommended him, and

also to the hon. Minister who appointed him, that I should read some of the certificates he has received from high authorities in other quarters :

" DOMINION OF CANADA,
" Certificate of Competency.

" FIRST CLASS ENGINEER.

" To THOMAS RYAN,—Whereas it has been found that you are duly qualified to fulfil the duties of a First Class Engineer, the Board of Steamboat Inspection does hereby, in pursuance of the Canadian Act respecting Certificates to Engineers (31st Vic., Cap. 65), grant you this Certificate of Competency for a period of one year from the date thereof.

" Given under the Seal of the Chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection at Montreal this first day of January, 1880.

" SAMUEL RISLEY,
" Chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection."

" CANAL OFFICE,
" MONTREAL, 29th March, 1880.

" ANDREW ROBERTSON, Esq.,
" Chairman, Montreal Harbor Board.

" SIR,—I beg to state that I have known Mr. Thomas Ryan for upwards of twenty-two years. He is a first class mechanical engineer, of very sober and industrious habits.

" Mr. Ryan has had seven years practical experience in dredging, as engineer in charge of Dredge No. 1, belonging to the Department of Public Works, during which time he gave entire satisfaction to the late Mr. Sippell, who expressed regret when Mr. Ryan left the employ. Mr. Ryan is conversant with both languages, and, from his energetic disposition and mechanical as well as practical knowledge, I am fully of the opinion that he would make an efficient Mechanical Superintendent of the Montreal Harbor Improvements.

" I have the honor to be, Sir,

" Your obedient servant,

" M. CONWAY,
" Superintendent Lachine Canal."

" THE OTTAWA RIVER NAVIGATION COMPANY,
" 13 BONAVENTURE STREET,
" MONTREAL, 2nd March, 1880.

" MR. THOMAS RYAN, Engineer,
" Hochelaga, Que.

" DEAR SIR,—I have much pleasure in stating that, during the many years you were employed by this Company as engineer, you gave very general satisfaction. I can recommend you as a steady, sober and attentive man. I regret that the business of this Company would not enable us to pay you such wages as would secure your services for the future. However, I have no doubt but you will succeed well in the railway business, where there is far greater scope for a man of your ability. Wishing every success,

" I am, dear Sir,

" Yours very truly,

" R. W. SHEPHERD,
" President."

" Q., M., O. & O. RAILWAY, W.D.
" Master Mechanic's Office,
" HOCHELAGA, March 27th, 1880.

" To the Chief Engineer and Harbor
" Commission of the Montreal Harbor Trust.

" I understand that the bearer, Thos. Ryan, is making application for the position of Mechanical Engineer for the Montreal Harbor Trust. I take pleasure in recommending him as a fit and proper person for that position. I have known Mr. Ryan over twenty-two (22) years. I know him to be a first-class steamboat engineer and a good mechanic; he has been in charge of first-class steamers as engineer, and dredges, for a number of years, and his character bears the highest reputation as to sobriety and integrity. I consider that he is one of the few men in Canada fit to fill such a position, and I take pleasure in recommending him for that position.

" A. DAVIS."

After these certificates, I think nothing need be said regarding Mr. Ryan's competency to fill the position to which he has been appointed. The moment I read these certificates, I had great pleasure in recommending Mr. Ryan, in whom I believe the Government have a first-class officer.

Mr. COURSOL. The hon. gentleman labors under a misapprehension. I never said a word against Mr. Ryan's ability. It was my right to bring this matter before the House, and to have my position respected. It was my right not to be made a subject of derision by being asked by the

Mr. RYAN (Montreal):

hon. Minister to send in a recommendation, and finding that before I had done so the appointment had been made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman might have added that I have just read a letter in which the Secretary of the Department stated positively that the appointment had not been made before the hon. gentleman sent me the letter.

Mr. COURSOL. The letter was read before the House, and I thought the hon. Minister might have translated that himself. I know that the requisition of Mr. Ryan was sent on the 1st of March, and the man died at 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the same day, and, not only was the chief officer appointed, but the assistant also.

Motion agreed to.

FOG-WHISTLE AT SHELBURNE HARBOR.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for copies of all petitions and correspondence received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, since 1st January, 1881, in reference to the erection of a fog-whistle at the entrance of Shelburne Harbor, Nova Scotia. He said: I was glad to learn from the Minister of Public Works, the other day, that it was his intention to provide for the erection of a fog-whistle at the entrance of Shelburne Harbor. I must, however, take objection to the manner in which he answered my question on the subject; and as he and his colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, seem anxious to make a little political capital out of the erection of this work, for the benefit of a gentleman who is likely to be an opponent of the Liberal candidate for the county of Shelburne. I desire to refer to some papers which have been in the possession of the Government for some time past. The answer of the hon. Minister of Public Works was that the Hon. Mr. White had communicated with the Department about a fog-whistle, that it had been taken into consideration, and that the work had been decided on. My motion calls for this communication, which seems to have had considerable effect on the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. But I wish to remind those hon. gentlemen that many important petitions, asking for the erection of this fog-whistle, were presented in 1878, signed, not only by people in Shelburne, but by many influential shipowners in Halifax. A petition had been presented signed by Cunard & Co. and the Presidents of the various insurance companies in the city of Halifax. On the 18th February, 1879, I directed the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to these important petitions and urged on him the consideration of this work. I received a polite reply, such a one as is very often addressed to members of the Opposition, namely, that the matter was under the consideration of the Government. I again brought it to the attention of the Government on December 24th, 1879, and I again received the same answer. I next called attention to it in 1880, and again received the same answer. I still again called attention to this matter last Session. Another promise was made by the hon. the Minister of Railways in 1878. When addressing a meeting of the electors of the county of Shelburne, and advocating the return of the Conservative party to power, one of the first utterances of the hon. gentleman was in respect to this subject; he referred to the neglect of the important interests of the port by Mr. Mackenzie, and assured the electors of Shelburne that one of the first acts which would engage the attention of a Conservative Government would be the erection of a fog-whistle at the entrance of this harbor. This matter has been before Parliament about three years, and now on the eve of a General Election, according to popular rumor, a promise is made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to have the fog-whistle erected there. I am very glad it is to be erected, as it is an important work, not local in its character, but

affecting the shipping and Maritime Provinces; but I will use my influence to prevent the Conservative party from reaping any local advantage from this question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, the papers will be brought down; but the hon. gentleman should not find fault with the Government, and with myself in particular, if, at the fourth Session of this Parliament, we grant what he says he has been asking for for three years. Surely he should be glad that the Government has acceded to his request, and whether it was advocated by the hon. gentleman or by others, at all events our attention has been called to it in such a manner that we decided to ask Parliament to provide the necessary money to carry out the work. At all events, whether it has been secured by the good influence of one set of men or by another, the fog-whistle will be erected; of course, the hon. gentleman, who wants to use it as much as he can against us, is welcome to do so, though the fog-whistle will speak for itself.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend did not object to the Government having got light on the subject, but he rather complained that they had been befogged for three years, and although the applications of the great house of Cunard & Co., municipal bodies and other parties interested, had altogether failed to remove the fog during three years, the white light of the fourth year had effectually accomplished it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The facts showed that evidence was accumulated to such a degree that finally the Government acceded to the request. Whether it would be a white or red light, at all events, we shall have a light there.

Motion agreed to.

FRAUDS BY TRUSTEES.

Mr. McCUAIG, moving for a return showing the number of persons who have been convicted within the last ten years of fraudulently disposing of property held by them as trustees, said: The object I have in view is that some means shall be taken by Parliament to make it imperative on trustees or executors to make a half yearly return of the assets of the estates in their charge, and file the same in the Superior Court, or with the registrar in the different counties. There are many instances in this Dominion where large estates have been wholly lost by the negligence of the executors or trustees, and if a proper return were made every six months, and filed, as I have indicated, it would prove a very excellent effect on their action. We know that a man on his death-bed very often calls in a friend and appoints him his executor or trustee to administer his estate. The future of the family depends on the honest discharge of the trust undertaken. Very often it occurs that a brother is appointed, and friends of the family have every delicacy in asking him respecting the position of the estate. This would be obviated by having a law by which executors or trustees would be compelled, under the solemnity of an oath, to file, every six months, with the legal authorities I have mentioned, details of all the security and everything connected with the administration of the estate. I am not sure whether I am in order in bringing this question before Parliament. What I wish to do is to bring it forward so that it may be placed before the country, in order that it may receive early attention from whatever parliamentary body it might be found to belong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have no direct means of obtaining the information asked for by the hon. gentleman; but he has a very praiseworthy object in view, and the return will be very useful if it can be obtained. The Government will take such steps as they can to collect the information, but it will be some time before we can give any satisfactory statement.

Motion agreed to.

THE DOMINION LANDS ACT IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. MILLS, in moving for reports made by Crown Land agents relating to working of the Dominion Lands Act or land regulations in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, since 1st January, 1880, said: I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman continues to receive, from time to time, as was the custom formerly, suggestions as to the manner in which the land regulations that have been adopted, work in the various districts of Manitoba and the North West. Some years ago the hon. gentleman introduced, and got a Bill passed, consolidating the Lands Acts, and making certain changes, and, from that time to this, various modifications of the land regulations have been made. It would be interesting to Parliament, and highly useful, if the reports made by the land agents in reference to the matter were laid before the House, so that we may have an opportunity of seeing how far the regulations have been adopted, and the provisions of the Act are seen to be beneficial—also, what difficulties are found in the way of the efficient operation of the law. I trust the hon. gentleman will bring any reports of this kind down to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no objection to the giving of this information. I shall instruct the Deputy Minister to look up any such reports, and, if there are any such reports or suggestions of improvements or modifications—or any opinions to the effect that any part of the law works badly—it will be well to make use of them at an early day.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF CAPTAIN ALLAN.

Mr. MILLS. In moving for all papers, correspondence and Orders in Council, relating to the dismissal of Captain Allan from the public service, said: I am not sure whether Captain Allan was dismissed or resigned, but I would like any information in regard to the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Amend the motion so as to make it read papers relating to the dismissal or resignation and it may pass.

Mr. MILLS. I have no objection to that amendment.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

VOLUNTEER COMPANIES IN ALGOMA.

Mr. DAWSON moved for a return of all correspondence and documents relating to applications made on the part of the young men of the district of Algoma, to the Department of Militia and Defence, for the privilege of being allowed to form volunteer companies within that district. He said: In making this motion, I may call attention to the fact that for a number of years the young men of Algoma have desired to form volunteer companies throughout the district, and that they have always met with very courteous replies from the Department of Militia and Defence, but nothing so far has been done to enable them to form such corps. Now, in the whole district of Algoma, with its 21,000 inhabitants, there is just one half company of volunteers. I think if there is an expenditure on account of the Militia Department, it ought to be distributed equally over the Dominion; every district ought to have its full share of the volunteer force. I may mention in regard to Algoma, that very great numbers of railway laborers are likely to be drawn into it—large bodies having gone there within the past few years; and it is very desirable that there should be volunteer companies in the different parts of the district. We have the best material for the formation of such companies. I may add, that the young men of Prince Arthur's Landing and of the north shore of Lake Huron are anxious to form companies also, as are some on Manitoulin Island. I do not see therefore why the district

of Algoma should not be treated with the same respect in that regard, as the others throughout the Dominion.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GUILLET moved for a return showing the average number of miles of the Intercolonial Railway worked each year since any portion of that road was opened to public use; the cost per mile of running the road each year, and the average quantity of freight carried per mile, and the average earning per mile in each year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my hon. friend to allow this motion to be amended by striking out the words "any portion of" after the words "opened to public use," or since the year 1876. That will give all the returns he asks for from the date of the opening of the Intercolonial Railway in 1876. To go back to the time the first portion of the road was opened would take us to 1853, when the section was opened from Halifax to Bedford.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think we ought to have that information too.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection then.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Let us have it. There is some very interesting information back of 1876.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not the information at hand. The procuring of it will occupy a long period. It will not be possible to give it to the House as soon as some hon. gentlemen may desire.

Motion agreed to.

WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I should like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that in the papers brought down in reference to this contract (27) on the Welland Canal, there is no statement of the quantity and value of whatever materials were taken from the late contractors, in making up the amount of the award by Mr. Page, at \$61,313. There is a book of writings stating that there was a quantity of goods at one place and a quantity of timber at another—a derrick at one place and a derrick at another; but we have no value attached to this property, and know neither the prices nor the quantities. I hope the hon. gentleman will bring down this information as speedily as possible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentlemen will put on a slip of paper the subjects on which he wishes information, I will draw the attention of the head engineer to it, and get the facts required as quickly as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. I ask for copies of the valuation of the materials on hand, and a statement of the price at which they were taken over by the Government. There is no statement of any valuation of those materials on hand, nor the prices of the property taken over by the Government.

BROWN SHEETING AND BLEACHED SHIRTINGS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I would just call the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to this passage from his speech, and ask if he intends to bring down the statement referred to:

"I have here a statement showing that brown sheeting and bleached shirtings manufactured in the Dominion were sold at from 5 to 7½ per cent. over the net cost price of the same articles in the United States."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I have that statement and shall bring it down; but the correspondence with the United States merchants and manufacturers has reference to the cottons.

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

Mr. Dawson.

After Recess.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). Before adopting the first clause, I wish to make an amendment to the same effect as that which I gave notice on the second reading of the Bill, declaring first marriages valid. I wish, also, to make another amendment, in order to meet some objections that have been raised by some hon. members, especially from Nova Scotia. It is stated that in that Province the law prohibiting marriage with a deceased wife's sister contains also several other provisions, and it has been objected that the first clause, as worded, would repeal the whole of that Statute. I am not sure that such would be the effect of the clause, but, in order to meet the objection, I would ask that to the first clause the following be substituted:—

"All prohibitions of marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife are hereby repealed."

And then to add the following words, in order to meet the case of past marriages:—

"To the same effect, both as to past and to future marriages, as if such prohibitions never had been enacted."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should attach to the Bill a schedule of the laws prohibiting marriages.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not think it is necessary, but, at the same time, I have no objection to give them verbally. We have, so far as I recollect, Statute 34 Victoria, Statute of Henry VIII., Lord Harvey's Act of 1835. So far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, we have Article 125 of the Civil Code.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that my hon. friends from Jacques Cartier and Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) are agreed this Session. They were not quite agreed in 1880, when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier introduced his Bill upon that subject. That was a Bill which rendered legal all marriages between a man and his deceased wife's sister, and my hon. friend from Maskinongé was dissatisfied with that, and upon the occasion of the third reading he moved an amendment in the sense of this Bill, providing that the prohibitions should be removed, and that amendment was defeated by a vote of 133 to 10, which singular success of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier upon that occasion has induced him to propose the clause of the hon. member from Maskinongé on this occasion. For my own part, I have great objection to the clause as it is now proposed, for reasons which I gave, and which other hon. members gave, when my hon. friend's Bill came before the House in the first instance in 1880. As it first came before the House it was a Bill which rendered legal the marriage between a man and his deceased wife's sister, and then proceeded that legality with exceptions of all prohibitions, or dispensations, or rules of various churches, somewhat in the language of the 127th article of the Code. During the progress of the Bill that eliminated all these exceptions, when it reached the third reading it was simply a Bill to render legal the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister, and also the other marriage which is now dropped from the Bill. Now what was the reasoning upon which the House was induced to eliminate these conditions and reject by a vote so decisive as 133 to 10, the alternative proposal of the hon. member for Maskinongé, which is now in this Bill. In the first place, the law of marriage was assumed to be placed within the province

of this House upon the theory that there ought to be one uniform law of marriage for the whole Dominion. The distinction which is made in the Confederation Act between the law of marriage and the law effecting the solemnization of marriage, must be referable to that consideration, that is, as to the validity of time, as to the classes of persons between whom it should be lawful and between whom it should not be lawful that marriage should be contracted. It was expedient that there should be one uniform law, and that uniform law was to be obtained only by the legislation being in the Central Parliament. That was the first consideration. The second consideration was presented to the House, firstly, I think, by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) and afterwards by others, and it was that this was a relation in which it was essential that the law should be plain, clear, certain and precise, exposed upon the Statute-book, and that we should know exactly what our law was. Now, of course, we have not got one marriage law for the whole Dominion, because this Legislature has not hitherto acted upon that law, and the laws of the various Provinces, therefore, are at this moment as they were. It is one thing to legislate on a subject untouched; it is an entirely different thing when we are called upon to legislate in a sense which shall not produce uniformity or certainty, but which will perpetuate a difference and an uncertainty in our law. Now, the purpose for which this change was proposed by my hon. friend from Maskinongé in 1880 was the purpose, presumably, for which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has adopted, in 1882, that clause, notwithstanding the strong vote against it in 1880. By these means a very different result will be accomplished from what was accomplished by the Bill as it passed to its third reading in 1880. By that Bill, as it passed this House, the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister would be civilly legal wherever it took place within the Dominion. The effect of the present plan is, that by the 125th section of the Code, such marriages are made absolutely void, and in the Province of Quebec those marriages are absolutely void to-day. To make them legal is one thing, but simply to repeal the prohibitions against them is to bring into force the 127th clause; and that is the purpose, I presume, of my hon. friend, to apply to these marriages, the prohibition in the 125th clause being removed, the provisions of the 127th. As the Bill stood in 1880, the marriage being made legal, the 127th clause would not have applied, but as it now stands it is intended to apply that clause. That clause will apply in Quebec, and what will be the consequence? That clause reads:

"The other impediments recognized, according to the different religious persuasions, as resulting from relationship or affinity, or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities. The right, likewise, of granting dispensations from such impediments as heretofore to those who have hitherto enjoyed it."

The consequence of that will be that, instead of a marriage with a deceased wife's sister being a legal marriage in the point of view in which the law makes it legal or illegal, it will be subject to this 127th clause. It will, therefore, be a void marriage in the Province of Quebec as between persons of the Roman Catholic faith—not merely void according to the doctrines of their own Church, but now in the eye of the civil law—unless a papal dispensation be obtained. Nor am I quite certain whether the effect would not be the same with reference to the particular church to which I belong—whether there would not be an impossibility of contracting marriage, even civil, between such persons belonging to the Church of England. Thus it will happen that, by the Bill as now proposed, we shall have no uniformity; but, instead of that, we shall have a different law in one Province from the law in the other Provinces, and a different law, perhaps, affecting more than one of the religious com-

munities into which the population is divided. It will happen thus, that we will not have certainty, because this question is to be disposed of according to the rules of the different churches which are not within our cognizance; but, as I observed in the Session of 1880, with reference to certain of these contentions, they are to be brought, according to the views of many jurists and Judges, before the Ordinary in the Province of Quebec, and—as happened in former cases—it happened not long ago in a case, for the judgment in which I moved the other day, that the decision as to the validity of such a marriage is to be determined first by the Ordinary, before a Civil Court can decide whether it is valid or not. I submit, therefore, that the House is taking a retrograde step if it chooses to assent to the view which was rejected by a majority of 133 to 10 in 1880, if it chooses now to adopt this provision of the Bill of my hon. friend instead of the provision which he warmly advocated in that year. The hon. gentleman's own name was recorded with the majority of 133, who voted against the proposition of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), and which he has now accepted and made the foundation of the present Bill. The hon. gentleman certainly owes us some explanation why he has adopted the proposition which we defeated by so large a majority on that occasion; but for us who, perhaps, are not so deeply interested in the understanding between the parity of two, as my hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard); it is important, also, to know why, when the principle in view in having the marriage laws to be disposed of by this Parliament was to secure uniformity, we should be asked to legislate, not in that direction, but in the direction of perpetuating diversity.

Mr. GIROUARD. I expected that the point, which the hon. gentleman has raised, as to the uniformity which would exist all over the Dominion, except the Province of Quebec, would be raised, but I expected that it would come from another hon. gentleman, a representative from that Province. The hon. gentleman says that the tendency of this Parliament is to have uniformity of law all over the Dominion on matters of marriage, that the clause was inserted in the British North America Act with that view; but it must be admitted that no action has been taken on the sub-section of clause 91, assigning different powers to different Parliaments; and it must also be admitted that there is another clause which defines the powers of the Local Legislatures, and a clause which will always prevent uniformity in the laws on the subject of marriage. I refer to the sub-section which entrusts the Local Legislatures with all matters pertaining to the celebration of marriage. The Dominion Parliament have nothing to do with the celebration of marriage, and consequently we never will succeed in having uniformity of legislation on that subject. To day, all over the Dominion, the marriage laws are quite different in one sense. We have no one civil officer by whom marriage has to be celebrated, and some years ago the Church of England in Upper Canada insisted that Non-conformists should be married by their ministers; and it was only when a special law was passed that marriages could be celebrated even between the Dissenters themselves by Dissenting ministers. As I stated, the laws of marriage all over the Dominion are quite different, and we have put that construction on the Bill as it is now framed to-day, and I do not see why it should not be adopted if the Government is willing to accept it as it is. The hon. gentleman asks why I have accepted certain provisions of the Bill which I opposed on a former occasion. The present Bill, I admit, differs from the other in many respects, but the other was defeated in the Senate by the narrow majority of one, and I regard it as of great importance that we should secure the present one from defeat in the other branch of Parliament. I know, as a matter of fact, that the Bill worded as it now is

will meet the views of more than half-a-dozen Senators who would have opposed it in the shape in which it appeared two Sessions ago, and this is one reason and the main one which induced me to adopt these changes. There is another part of the Bill to which the hon. gentleman has made allusion; that is to the marriage of a widow with a deceased husband's brother. That change which the hon. gentleman asked for was defeated by a large majority, and the reason I accepted it to-day was not to get a majority here, because we know the feeling to be in favor of it in this House, but for the same reason that I mentioned with regard to the other part of the Bill, viz., to secure a majority in the Senate. I know, as a matter of fact, that if that provision had been included in the other Bill it would have passed the Senate, and, although I believe that that provision should not have been included, I have made the alteration in order to ensure the success of the measure. I, therefore, submit that the wording of the Bill as framed to-day is sufficiently warranted by the circumstances of the case.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that the reasons given by the hon. gentleman are sufficient to justify the important changes which have been made in the character of the Bill. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to provide by this Bill that all these disabilities shall be removed; but he does not provide for the absolute removal of these disabilities, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned. The hon. gentleman knows that parties standing in the relationships which are now declared improper for marriage, cannot marry in Quebec without a dispensation, and they will not stand on a footing of equality with persons similarly situated in the other Provinces. The hon. gentleman, in this Bill, does not recognize the right of the individual at all. In the Province of Quebec, he says, the disability shall continue unless a dispensation is obtained. The Bill, as it stood before, did not attack the religious opinions of anybody; it did not say that any person should be in good standing in a church, who did not marry according to the canons of the church; it left that to be decided by the religious society to which the person belonged. But it said that if he wished to contract such a marriage, no impediment should stand in his way. I do not think we ought to subject parties to disabilities in one Province which would not exist in any other Province in the Dominion. This, the hon. gentleman does by his Bill. The hon. gentleman says, he is making these changes, not because he thinks them right or proper; on the contrary, he prefers the Bill as it was before; but he makes them in consideration of the hostility of certain gentlemen in the Senate. Now, the passage of this Bill in this House last Session by a very large majority, and its sanction by the popular branch of Parliament for the second time, would be very good reasons why the Senate should not persist in their rejection of the Bill. We know that the rule that prevails in the Parliament of the United Kingdom is, that if a measure is carried through the House of Commons one year after another by very large majorities, the House of Lords abandon their objections out of deference to the thus well-expressed will of the representatives of the people. There is no doubt that rule would prevail here if the hon. gentleman persevered in the Bill as it passed this House the Session before last. I regret very much the changes made in the Bill, because I do not think they will secure uniformity in the individual rights of the people in the different sections of the Dominion, and we ought not to legislate for the purpose of making such distinctions as the hon. gentleman proposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree with my hon. friends on the other side in preferring the Bill as it passed this House the Session of 1880, when it was a simple declaration that such marriages were legal. However, I have not charge of the Bill of my hon. friend, who desires to carry
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).

out, as far as he can, the principles of the Bill which he introduced and pressed in this House with such force in 1880, for the reason that in its present shape it is more likely to become law. And that is a very good reason—at all events to myself—why I should vote for this Bill, although I would have preferred that it had another form. I do not quite go with my hon. friend from West Durham in the view that the division of the jurisdiction between the Local and Federal Parliaments was for the purpose of producing uniformity in the law with regard to what marriage consists of. We can well understand the reason of that division of jurisdiction; from the fact of the Catholic religion prevailing in Lower Canada, it was thought better that the Provinces should each provide for their own mode by which marriage could be effected. To say what marriage is, who a person may marry, belongs to the Federal Parliament; the mode of making them man and wife belongs to the Local Legislature. But it does not follow that we cannot recognize and provide for the different divisions of the Dominion, just as is done in England with regard to England and Scotland. I presume, however, that this clause will, in effect, amount to what the Bill of 1880 proposed to effect—that, as a general principle every man will be free to marry any woman who will marry him exclusive of the prohibition which the law of the country establishes. The 125th section of the Code which the hon. gentleman cited, prohibits marriage “between a brother and sister, legitimate or natural.” This clause removes that prohibition, and if it stood alone it would have the same effect as if it positively declared the marriage to be legal. But my hon. friend says the 127th clause would prevent this Bill going into operation in the Province of Quebec as it would elsewhere. This clause speaks of “the other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions resulting from relationship or affinity.” What other affinities are referred to? I would like to hear my hon. friend on that point for whose legal acumen I have the highest respect.

Mr. BLAKE. If my hon. friend is right, I am sure his faithful followers, the hon. members for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), will be very much disappointed, because the object they have in view would not be attained. I will tell the hon. gentleman the reason why I think the change has been made. As long as the 125th section and the 127th section remain, “the other impediments” do not mean the impediments that exist under the 125th section. But the instant you wipe out by this law the particular impediment, it proposes to wipe out, viz., the prohibition as to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, it ceases to be one of the impediments mentioned in section 125, and therefore it becomes one of “the other impediments” mentioned in section 127. Such is the process of reasoning which has convinced the hon. members for Jacques Cartier and Maskinongé that this clause will secure the particular result they hope to obtain. Of course, they may be mistaken; but is it well that the marriage law should exist in such uncertainty? Had we not better make the matter plain before we get through with the Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 125th clause prohibits these marriages; that is repealed. But my hon. friend says that if that is repealed then the 127th clause must prohibit such marriages. I think subsequent legislation must override both clauses.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. McCUAIG. As a layman, I am entirely opposed to this Bill. I believe that the educated opinion of Great Britain is against it, and all the possessions of Great Britain should follow the example of the Empire. Believing that I will record my vote against the Bill, I beg to move, seconded

by Mr. Daly, that the following proviso be added to the Bill:

"Provided that no clergyman or minister of the Gospel, authorized to perform the ceremony in marriage, shall be obliged to perform such ceremony if the woman is the sister of the former wife of the man to whom she desires to be married."

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I beg to ask the mover of the Bill if the Roman Catholics in my Province will be under a different law to their co-religionists living in the Province of Quebec, where such marriages would not be good without a papal dispensation.

Mr. GIROUARD. I never said they would not be good without a papal dispensation. The application of article 127 is open to some doubt, but most assuredly that article can have no effect in New Brunswick, to which the Civil Code does not apply.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman doubt whether clause 127 does apply? I do not think we shall pass a law when such a doubt exists.

Mr. GIROUARD. It will not be the first instance where the laws of marriage will not be the same within all the Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite different whether the laws will be diverse or whether the laws will be but uncertain.

Mr. GIROUARD. It is not uncertain.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member said it was uncertain whether clause 127 would apply.

Mr. GIROUARD. What if it does?

Mr. BLAKE. We want to know whether it does apply or not.

Mr. GIROUARD. Suppose it does?

Mr. BLAKE. The House should pause before it passes a law with respect to the marriage contract, which is the foundation of all society, when the author of the Bill confesses the doubt as to its meaning. I think the course should be that adopted with respect to all important legal Bills, namely, a reference to a Select Committee.

Mr. GIROUARD. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy there is no doubt about the question.

Mr. GIROUARD. In regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig), I doubt very much whether this House has jurisdiction, but if it has I have no objection to its insertion in the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The Bill should provide that marriage between a man and the sister of a deceased wife shall be legal, instead of putting it in the form it is here. That being what the House is anxious to declare, why should we not say so?

Mr. HOUDE. When I proposed, two years ago, an amendment similar to the present terms of the Bill, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier opposed it, because he did not see any material difference in the form proposed by me and the form proposed by himself then. I understood it was the general opinion of the House at that time that there was no material difference in the two forms, although I and some others thought the form proposed by me was the better one.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Mr. HOUDE. I stated at the time why. The hon. members for West Durham and Bothwell now show much solicitude for my co-religionists of the Province of Quebec. I am very glad of that fact, and, no doubt, when an occasion presents itself my co-religionists will show themselves thankful for that solicitude; but, under these peculiar circumstances, I think there is no need of their kind protection. I think we can interpret and represent their sentiments on this

occasion as well as the hon. members for West Durham and Bothwell. I do not think they can speak better than others for the Catholics of Quebec, and the Bill does not affect brethren of a different faith. It is only Catholics who might be affected by this particular form, if affected at all particularly. As my co-religionists have not complained—they have seen the form, as now presented, for several weeks, and I believe not a single voice of complaint has been heard—I do not believe those two hon. gentlemen are justified in appearing here in the *role* of protectors of my co-religionists of the Province of Quebec. As regards the amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) I must say that the Civil Code of Quebec contains sufficient provisions to protect ministers of every denomination against being forced to celebrate marriages to which they have religious objections. If the other Provinces have not the same stipulations they might imitate that part of the Civil Code; but I do not believe we have the constitutional right to accept the amendment of the hon. member as it refers to solemnization of marriage; to say that ministers shall not be obliged to celebrate marriages, is to trespass on the ground of the solemnization of marriage, a power which belongs to the Local Legislatures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has moved an amendment to the first clause, and then my hon. friend from Bothwell moved an amendment to the amendment, to strike it out.

Mr. MILLS. I did not move anything. I asked the hon. gentleman if he would accept such an amendment. I said, in reply to the hon. gentleman from Maskinongé that he appeared to take greater care for the Province of Quebec than for the people of the other Provinces. Now, Sir, before the hon. gentleman can indulge in argument of that sort, he must confine his Bill to the Province of Quebec; but he has not done so, he has taken the whole Dominion under his patronizing care. So has the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill; he has undertaken to deal with this question on behalf of the whole Dominion, and I think he is quite right and proper in doing so. I believe, Sir, we sit here as the representatives of Canada, not as representatives of the Province of Quebec or the Province of Ontario; we are here as representatives of the whole Dominion, and we should so discuss this question which affects the common well-being of the country at large. The hon. gentleman has introduced his Bill and it relates to the whole Dominion, yet he undertakes to deal with one Province in a way a little different from that in which he treats the other Provinces; then he says, this is my special Province you have no right to interfere here, this is sacred ground and you have no right to enter here and discuss what we have to do in this particular Province, you must confine yourself to the other Provinces of the Dominion. That is the position which the hon. gentleman has taken towards the hon. leader of the Opposition and towards gentlemen on the other side who have discussed this particular measure. Now, Sir, I think in discussing a question of this sort we should try to put the people of the whole Dominion upon a footing of perfect equality; the hon. gentleman refuses to do that, and he places a certain portion of the population—the people of Quebec—in an entirely different position from that occupied by the people of the same faith in every other Province of the Dominion. I object to that, and the hon. gentleman who now has charge of the Bill objected to it when it was proposed two years ago, and when a very large majority of this House refused to concur in an amendment of exactly the same character as the Bill that is now before the House.

Mr. HOUDE. In answer to the remarks of my hon. friend from Bothwell, I must say that I believe the ideas which I hold on this and other subjects are not more nar-

rowly bounded than his own. I was not the first to drag the name of the Province of Quebec into this debate, but that was done by the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Mills), and the member for West Durham. I am discussing this Bill from the point of view of my conscience, as the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, also does, and it was because the Bill, as at first presented, according to my views, was contradictory to the doctrine I hold and opposed to my religious views, that I did not accept it. I contend that I am entitled to the same latitude as the hon. gentleman himself in this direction, when dealing with so important a subject. I do not know what are the peculiar views of my hon. friend on this subject, but my view is that marriage is a religious contract before being a civil contract, and, because I entertain these views, I prefer the later form of this legislation to that which was at first proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. But my hon. friend attacked both my hon. friend for Bothwell and myself, because he said we were interfering with Quebec, and that this Bill was going to interfere with Quebec. The hon. gentleman will not deny that it is going to alter the laws as they affect Quebec, Ontario and all the other Provinces of this Dominion, but he seems to think it was wrong to mention the circumstance that he would produce a different state of law in the Province of Quebec than in the other Provinces. Is there anything wrong in that? Is it proper that the hon. gentleman and his friends should confine their remarks to the effects of the law upon the one Province, of Quebec; and if they do not speak of the other Provinces, are all to be dumb? The hon. gentleman really agrees with me as to what the effect will be, and it certainly will not be good, yet he says in substance—I do not choose to say so, and you have no right to say so—I deny that I hold any such restricted tenure as that. I have a duty to perform and must point out what the effect of the proposed change will be upon all the Provinces. I deem it of the last consequence that in dealing with this contract of marriage our legislation should be perfectly clear and that there should be no uncertainty about it: that some classes of persons are entitled to marry and others are dis-entitled to marry all through the bounds of this wide Dominion, and I cannot think that I have done anything wrong in stating and endeavoring to enforce that proposition.

Mr. McCUAIG. I can very well understand that the laymen of this House should not be familiar with this subject, and they cannot perhaps understand the proposed effect of this law introduced by my hon. friend. I think, however, when we see, as we do this evening, the ablest lawyers of this House disagreeing as to its effects, then by far the safer plan will be to throw it out altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that the effect of the proposition as it stands would be in the case of a person in the Province of Quebec having married his deceased wife's sister, and which marriage was long void; if such a person afterwards married somebody else, which marriage was good, he would find himself suddenly married again to this sister of his deceased wife.

Mr. GIROUARD. There is a second clause to meet that.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that would be the effect.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boulton). The first clause reads:

"All laws prohibiting marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife."

Mr. Girouard moves to substitute for that the following:—

"All laws prohibiting a marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife are hereby repealed, both as to past and future marriages, and, as regards past marriages, are as if such laws had never existed."

Mr. WELDON. This proposed amendment, as regards New Brunswick, is going to have some effect; for instance,

Mr. HOUDE.

it will legalize marriages which have been declared by our Provincial laws as void.

Mr. GIROUARD. There is a clause to protect you from that result.

Mr. WELDON. When a decree has been pronounced there may be a call to reverse it. I feel doubtful as to the effect of this clause. Indeed, so far as my feeling goes I am opposed to the Bill altogether; and after what has been stated as to the diverse effects it will have in the different Provinces, I believe it requires further consideration. I should certainly like a clause inserted to the same effect as the amendment of my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig), in regard to the protection of clergymen of conscientious scruples. There is a great difficulty about the solemnization of marriage, with regard to the constitutional position, and something like a declaration should be made. In fact, I receive letters from persons of high position in my church, the Church of England, asking for something of that kind. Indeed, many of the bishops and clergy are strongly opposed to the Bill, and will experience strong scruples in carrying it out. There is a difficulty about the solemnization of marriage. This subject long confused the Local Legislatures; but something should be done to show it is not the intention of the Dominion Parliament to place fetters on a clergyman who may have conscientious scruples in regard to this measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it was the object of the Legislature in 1880 to take care that the law, if the principle of the Bill was adopted, should affect past as well as future marriages. It would be rather absurd to sanction any other result, or to provide that one marriage with a deceased wife's sister was lawful and proper after the Act, and that another, before the Act, must be considered incestuous. It would be wrong and absurd that our legislation should have that effect. But my hon. friend opposite says there may be cases of an absolute declaration of the illegality of a marriage, and that in consequence the parties might consider themselves as severed, standing towards each other as if no marriage had taken place. Well, I understand that a subsequent clause in this Bill removes that objection. If the clause as it stands in the Bill does not remove that objection, it should be so strengthened as to produce that effect; if there has been any judicial binding severance of a marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, that should be held to be binding till a new alliance took place subsequent to such decision. I think that view is quite right as to the other point raised by my hon. friend opposite and the hon. member for Prince Edward. I am not aware, as regards Ontario, that there is any law obligatory on clergymen to compel them to marry people whom they do not choose to marry. In England, where there is an Established Church, and where formerly, marriages could only be celebrated by clergymen of that Church, they were obliged to marry parties in cases where there was no legal disability. I do not remember, at this moment, if there is any obligation upon the clergyman of any denomination to marry people whom they do not choose to marry.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me the hon. gentleman's observation does not completely answer the point. I think it will not be right that the Bill should simply deal with the cases in which a judicial severance had been followed by a second marriage, or in which, without judicial severance, if the marriage was simply null there had been a second marriage; but also cases in which there may have been a judicial severance and the parties may have been remaining together.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They may be married again.

Mr. BLAKE. I know they can, but if you provide that all the provisions are removed, as if the laws had never existed, then in what position are those parties with reference to whom there has been a judicial declaration under the old laws that their marriage was a void one? How do they stand after that? Are they married?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it would be for us to marry them. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier would quite object to this part of it.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think it is very clear that this clause, as it stands now, would legalize a marriage which had been declared void by the judicial tribunal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is another clause to meet that. First, we legalize the marriage, and then comes the clause containing the exception.

Mr. GIROUARD. We have to provide for vested rights.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What do you call vested rights? If a marriage by law is absolutely void there is no vested rights.

Mr. GIROUARD. The hon member forgets that, by the first section, that marriage void to-day will be valid.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. No; you make exceptions; even though they are separated by judicial decision. I think we had better report progress.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend if he ever heard of a judicial separation by either husband or wife unless they wanted to marry somebody else.

Mr. WELDON. Under our divorce laws they would have to have a permission from the Divorce Courts to marry again. I know a case where a marriage was declared void on this ground, and neither of the parties are married again.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be better for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, knowing that every one is desirous of aiding him in this matter, to refer the Bill to a small Select Committee.

Mr. GIROUARD. The Bill has been so much discussed already there is no need of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is quite evident there is a wide divergence of opinion as to the terms. My hon. friend had a consultation with the hon. the First Minister, but the result was only the changing of one word. Now, if he gets his hon. friend on a Select Committee, and two or three other legal gentlemen with him, the Bill may be produced in such a shape that we can all accept it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill of 1880 provided in the positive that all such marriages were legal. This merely provides in the negative, but containing a proposition that all such marriages are repealed—just exactly the same thing, according to my view. My hon. friend says that by having it in one form rather than the other the Bill will pass both Houses, and, if we adopt the phraseology of 1880, the likelihood is the Bill will be lost.

On clause 2,

Mr. GIROUARD. The clause is put in with a view of meeting open estates, where estates have devolved to the children of the first marriage. I, therefore, propose the following:—

“Nothing herein shall affect the rights acquired by the issue of the first marriage previous to the passing of this Act.”

Mr. BLAKE. The practical result would be, in the case I have stated, that if there has been a judicial declaration that the first marriage is void, the effect of this clause will be to re-marry them.

Mr. McCUAIG. I think this had better be referred to a Select Committee. The mover of the Bill does not seem to understand what it will accomplish.

Mr. GIROUARD. Of course, it is very difficult to provide for all cases which may come up hereafter; that is the reason I make the clause general, as it is in the Bill. It will be for the court to decide, in any case coming before it, what shall be the effect of this clause. We might put in this clause:

“Nor shall this section render legal any such marriage where either of the parties has afterwards, during the life of the other and before the passing of this Act, lawfully entered into marriage with another party.”

I have taken this from the debate in 1880, as given in the *Hansard*.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend will observe that he has not yet met the case stated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not intend to meet every case. Let him propose an amendment to meet it.

Mr. BLAKE. We have got to meet every reasonable case that may occur. That would meet the case I had suggested of a subsequent marriage. But the hon. gentleman for St. John says he knows a case of a judicial declaration that the marriage was null, upon which the parties had separated and had lived apart for twenty years. Do you propose, by Act of Parliament, to join them together again as husband and wife? Why do it? They were not married. The law has declared they are not married. They are separated for twenty years, and they have not married again. You surely are not going to marry them again at 9 o'clock in the evening.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think they ought to be married by Act of Parliament. They had no right to sever.

Mr. HOUDÉ. Retroactive laws are always pregnant with difficulty and danger, and I think it would not be desirable to regulate retroactively in a matter of such importance as the present.

Mr. GIROUARD. I agree with the hon. gentleman, but it is difficult to frame a clause on such terms as to meet so many different views.

Mr. MACDOUGALL. It is obvious that, in a question of this kind on which so much depends on phraseology, and in view of the fact that the marriage laws of Nova Scotia—and perhaps of some of the other provinces—exist by virtue of an Imperial Act (which Acts we are by the Constitutional Act prohibited from repealing)—in view of these facts I think it would be well if my hon. friend would accept the suggestion from the other side and refer the Bill to a Select Committee where legal gentlemen from the various provinces could meet together and agree on the language to be used in the Bill—language which must carefully discriminate between the powers of the Federal Parliament and the powers of the Local Legislatures. In the Constitutional Act there is to be observed a distinction—upon the exact limits of which, however, no two lawyers in the House, perhaps, could be found to agree—between the powers of the Local Legislatures, as to the solemnization of marriage, and the powers of this Parliament with respect to the general question of marriage and divorce and the consequences that flow from them. As the question is one of very serious import to private parties, if the Bill is to be workable, I think it would be well to have it carefully considered by all the light possible to be obtained from the legal minds of the House so as to render it creditable to Parliament, and to the hon gentleman who has it in charge, and satisfactory to the public.

Mr. WELDON. Do I understand the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) to say that we cannot repeal an

Imperial Act? If that is the case that principle will apply to the Province of New Brunswick, as our marriage law is based on a statute of Henry VIII.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am rather surprised to hear a constitutional lawyer, like the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) say that we have not power to repeal an Imperial Act. When this same question came before the House, two years ago, we intended to repeal an Imperial Act in a very direct manner, by saying that such marriages shall be declared legal, and if we could say so then, why not now? The question then, to-day, is whether we shall repeal an Imperial Statute, and I do not see why this House should not pass the present Bill without referring it to a Select Committee. There is, of course, the difficulty about making the provisions of the Bill retroactive in their effect—every hon. member is anxious to meet his own particular case—but I think the Bill is much more likely to be dealt with intelligently and effectively by a large Committee like the present than by referring it to a Committee composed of five or six members.

Mr. RICHEY. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) appreciates the difficulty which some of us feel very strongly. We are assuming to do what really we are not doing by the Act. We hold out to the country that we are about to legalize throughout the Dominion of Canada, marriage with a deceased wife's sister, whereas the Act seems to be framed solely with regard to one Province, the Province of Quebec. It seems to me that the Bill will be productive of mischief greater than the mischief which it proposes to remedy. Suppose the Act is passed, it is assumed all over the Dominion that a man is to be allowed to marry the sister of his deceased wife, and that such marriages may be carried into effect. A great deal is left in this Bill to the construction of the courts. Some of the courts may decide that, under this Bill, marriage with a deceased wife's sister was not rendered legal. What would be the position of the married parties then? Infinitely worse than if such an Act had not been passed. The hon. gentleman does not seem to make a distinction between an Act such as this, declaring in general terms that all laws opposed to marriage with the sister of a deceased wife are repealed, and a law which declares such marriages to be valid. In this Province we are assumed to have brought with us the Common Law of England, and such portions of the Statute Laws, as are applicable to our several circumstances. Assuming the Acts of Henry VIII to be applicable in the different Provinces, the courts of these Provinces may have declared such marriages to be voidable under the Statutes of Henry VIII. Now, the point to be put to the House is, whether if, under such a generally expressed statute as that, the Statute of Henry VIII is to be repealed. It would be competent for us to legislate on all these subjects and declare that notwithstanding that Act such marriages shall be legal, but to assume to repeal an English Statute is a different thing. For these reasons we should feel disposed and desirous to sustain the Bill which was originally brought into this House, because it is simple and complete in its terms. It declares that these marriages shall be valid, and that is the very thing which the House assumes before the country to do.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill will consent to refer it to a Committee. Its phraseology instead of being such as to make it likely to pass this Parliament will, I am inclined to fear, have the opposite effect. The difficulties which have been suggested in regard to it are of such a character that as a layman I feel that I should have grave doubts about voting for it as it stands to-day, strongly as I am in favor of allowing marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife. I am satisfied, looking at the measure simply from the discussions which have taken place to-day, that the

Mr. WELDON.

effect of the Bill is to make it apply specially or particularly—in terms at any rate—to the Province of Quebec alone. Of course, it applies in general terms outside of that Province, but at the same time there are distinct provisions which are introduced expressly and simply because of the Code of Lower Canada. My hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) seemed to feel that any reference to that fact was taken in the point of view of the hon. gentleman who made reference to-day to the Roman Catholics of the Province of Quebec, but who should remember that there are a few Protestants in the Province of Quebec, and that the clauses of the Code apply to them as well as to the Roman Catholics. I think, therefore, we should have either a declaratory law, as we had two years ago, declaring such marriages to be legal, or else put this Bill in the hands of a Select Committee of lawyers from the different Provinces, who will be able to settle the phraseology as will make the Bill one likely to pass this House, and make it effective in the country for the end we have in view.

Mr. GIROUARD. I think the objection of the hon. gentleman applies to the first clause of the Bill, which has been adopted, and the same difficulty will be repeated with regard to its retroactive effects.

Mr. WHITE. But the hon. gentleman must remember that his Bill has not yet passed this House, and the discussion will probably be reviewed when it comes before the House, and, therefore, those of us who are really in favor of the measure can discuss it, with the view of having it adopted, as it passed this Chamber before.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Several hon. gentlemen have spoken in favor of referring this Bill to a Special Committee. They say simply that they prefer the Bill of 1880 to that of 1882, and if you had a Committee it would have to decide in favor of one or the other. There is no use of having a Special Committee to decide that point. My suggestion is that the Committee should rise and report the Bill; and in concurrence, on the third reading, any hon. gentleman who desires the Bill of 1880 to be substituted for this Bill may move it, and we shall have this question settled at once.

Bill reported with amendments.

PUNISHMENT OF ADULTERY, SEDUCTION, &c.

Mr. CHARLTON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 25) to amend the Criminal Law and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person by providing for punishment of adultery, seduction, &c., &c., said: I have long felt, Sir, that the state of our Criminal Law is very incomplete in regard to the class of offences which the Bill I now desire to be read the second time, deals with. The preamble of the Bill states very clearly the reasons which have led me to propose that these offences should be made criminal:

“Whereas it is expedient to provide for the punishment of offences against chastity, morality and decency, and to afford some measure of redress to the victims of the debauching wiles of offenders against virtue and domestic peace.”

In moving the second reading of this Bill, I shall simply ask the House to affirm one or more of the principles embodied in it, and if the House sees fit to do that, I shall then move for its reference to a Special Committee. The principles of this Bill are already embodied in the Criminal Statutes of Canada. We have on our Statute-book a law providing for the punishment of seduction under certain circumstances. We have a law providing that seduction on board a vessel is criminal, and I am unable to see why the principle should not also prevail on land. The first section of this Bill provides that adultery shall be a misdemeanor; that no prosecution shall take place except upon the com-

plaint of the husband or wife of one of the offending parties, and that no prosecution shall take place two years after the commission of the offence. The third clause provides for the punishment of lewd cohabitation or behavior. The fourth clause provides for the punishment of inveigling or concealing a previous chaste female into or in a house of ill-fame. The fifth clause gives power to search for a female so inveigled, and to bring her before a magistrate for delivery to parents or guardians. The sixth clause provides punishment of teachers seducing their female pupils. The seventh clause provides punishment for seduction under promise of marriage. The eighth clause provides for punishment of seduction, by a married man, under promise of marriage and pretence of being unmarried. The ninth clause gives right of action for seduction, by females seduced. The tenth clause provides that the father or mother or guardian may maintain such action. The eleventh clause provides that in those actions, action for loss of service shall not be prevented. The twelfth clause provides that the testimony of the female, in certain cases, shall require corroboration. The thirteenth clause makes provision with respect to the finding of indictments. I find that a law similar to the Bill I have introduced exists in twenty-seven States of the Union; in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, California, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Arkansas, South Carolina, Oregon, and others. Every one of the Northern States has a law of this nature on the Statute-book. I find the English Commissioners who were charged with the duty of making enquiries with respect to the abduction or inveigling of females to the Continent, for the purposes of prostitution, have recommended a law similar to this punishing seduction. Believing these are offences which the Criminal Law of Canada should take cognizance of, and believing this Bill is a step in the right direction, whether the details are right or not, I beg to move the second reading, with the understanding that if the Bill is read a second time, it shall be referred to a Special Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal of difficulty, under the present circumstances, in introducing a Bill of this kind. A certain portion of the Bill meets with my most hearty approval and will receive my most hearty support. I think, however, some portions of it would not serve as a protection to female virtue, but have a contrary effect; but as the hon. gentleman says he is going to send it to a Special Committee, and as I go with the hon. gentleman fully in all that portion of the Bill which affects attacks on the sacredness of the marriage tie, I shall be glad to see the Bill have a second reading and go to a Special Committee.

House divided: Yeas, 107; Nays, 16.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Anglin,	Gillies,	Patterson (Essex),
Arkell,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Bain,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Platt,
Baker,	Girouard (Kené),	Pouppore,
Beauchesne,	Gillett,	Richey,
Benoit,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blake,	Hackett,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Borden,	Haddow,	Rochester,
Boutbee,	Hay,	Rogers,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Ross (Dundas),
Bowell,	Hooper,	Ross (Middlesex),
Breckeu,	Huntington,	Routhier,
Brown,	Kaulbach,	Ryan (Marquette),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Kilvert,	Rymal,
Cameron (Huron),	Lane,	Schultz,
Carling,		Sriver,

Casey,	Macdonald (Kings),	Shaw,
Casgrain,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Smith,
Charlton,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Sawball,
Cockburn,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Strange,
Colby,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Tellier,
Coughlin,	Mackenzie,	Thompson,
Coupal,	McCallum,	Trow,
Coursol,	McDougald,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	McDougall,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McQuade,	Vanasse,
Doull,	McRory,	Wade,
Farrow,	Malouin,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Fiset,	Manson,	Wallace (York),
Fitzsimmons,	Merner,	Weldon,
Fleming,	Méthot,	White (Caldwell),
Flynn,	Mills,	Williams,
Fulton,	Montplaisir,	Wright.—107.
Geoffrion,	Ogden,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bergin,	Drew,	Massue,
Bunster,	Grandbois,	Mutarr,
Burnham,	Laundry,	Royal,
Cameron (Victoria),	Langevin,	Rykert,
Caron,	Macmillan,	Vallée.—16.
Cimon (Chicoutimi),		

Bill read the second time and referred to a Special Committee composed of Messrs. Charlton, Guthrie, Shaw, Paterson (Essex), Cameron (Huron), Ross (Dundas), Ives, Sriver, Macdougall, Girouard (Jacques Cartier), and Malouin.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of all charges made against Lieut.-Col. Walter Ross, of the 16th Battalion Volunteer Militia, while in command of the camp at Pictou; also copy of order appointing a Court of Enquiry, and the statement of charges furnished to Col. Ross, by the Department of Militia, which he was to be tried upon; also copies of all letters and telegrams from the Minister or Department of Militia, relating to the erection of a canteen; also copies of all letters to the Department from any persons recommending the grant of authority to build a canteen on the camp ground; also copy of the evidence taken before the Court of Enquiry, in support of the charges and in rebuttal thereof; also copies of all general orders issued in connection with such charges; also copies of all other correspondence, Orders in Council, departmental orders, or other documents relating to such charges and enquiry.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Statement of the expenditure on account of the Militia in Canada, from the 1st of July, 1874, up to the 1st of July, 1879, and since the 1st of July, 1879, up to the present date.—(Mr. Vanasse.)

Statement of expenditure on Metaghan River Breakwater during the calendar year 1881, showing the days' labor of men and teams and quantity of material furnished, with the amount paid in each case.—(Mr. Killam.)

Return giving name of Agent employed to select land on Detroit and St. Clair Rivers for Quarantine Stations, the quantity of land selected for such purposes and the cost thereof, together with all reports made by the said Agent.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Return showing the quantity, value and the duty paid on the imports entered for consumption of: 1st. Grain and products of grain, viz: Barley, beans, buckwheat, Indian corn, oats, peas, rye, wheat, mill feed, &c., buckwheat meal or flour, Indian or corn meal, oatmeal, rye flour, wheat flour; also of animals, viz: Horned cattle, horses, sheep, swine, to be slaughtered in bond for exportation; also of fruits, provisions, viz: Butter, cheese, lard tried, or entered lard untried, and meats, for the years 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881. 2nd. Also in a separate

schedule the value and quantity of the same goods not entered for consumption during the same years. 3rd. Also showing the quantity and value of the exports in animals and their products and agricultural products (both included, as in the Trade and Navigation Returns) for the same years.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Return showing the names of the officers who took part in the Red River expedition of 1870-71,—embracing, as well, those of the "Ontario Rifles," as those of the "Quebec Rifles"—and the rank which they then held, and that which they now hold in the Militia.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Return of the last Census of 1881, showing the number of manufactories in the county of Beauharnois; and the number of people employed therein.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all petitions, letters, judges' reports, correspondence and other documents whatsoever connected with the petition, to be set at liberty, made by Thomas Fletcher, sentenced on the 8th of June, 1881, by the Court of General Sessions of the Peace for the District of Montreal, presided over by His Honor C. M. Desnoyers, P.M.—(Mr. Tellier.)

Copies of all correspondence between parties who occupy school lands in the Province of Manitoba and the Department of the Interior, with copies of all reports made to the Department upon the subject.—(Mr. Schultz.)

Copies of all claims made under the Manitoba Act by half-breed minors and others, who were temporarily absent on the 15th day of July, 1880.—(Mr. Schultz.)

Copy of all tenders received by the Department of Railways and Canals, for the lighting of the Welland Locks by electric light, together with the Order in Council on which the contract has been awarded.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copy of correspondence between the Postmaster-General and all parties offering to establish steam communication between Canada and Brazil; also, between Canada and France; the Orders in Council referring thereto, contracts signed and statement of services rendered to date, with amount paid for same.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return of all correspondence and documents relating to applications made on the part of the young men of the District of Algoma, to the Department of Militia and Defence, for the privilege of being allowed to form volunteer companies within that district.—(Mr. Dawson.)

House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 14th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE DOMINION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) to amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion of Canada. As it is known to the House, there are three Acts in existence at present in regard to these lands—the Dominion Act of 1879, and two amendments; and it is found exceedingly inconvenient, by those persons who are going to the North-West, to be obliged to scan them in order to find out exactly what the provisions of the Land Act are. Consequently they are being consolidated for the convenience of the country. There are some amendments with which I will not trouble the House at present, but which will appear fully marked in the Bill, so as to be seen by every hon. member.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD

DOMINION MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) further to amend and consolidate the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force. The main object of the Bill is to enact the resolution which I have placed on the paper, for the increase of that force, which I think is necessary. I may, on Friday, move that resolution. There are sundry clauses affecting the discipline and training of the force, which may be found to be necessary.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to ask if the right hon. gentleman has made any provision in the Bill for the taking of old volunteers into the North-West Mounted Police Force. Many of them look forward to that as a kind of promotion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Men cannot be taken into the force under eighteen, nor over forty years of age. Subject to this rule, if they pass military inspection and can read and write, they are admissible, if their characters are good, and their characters are supposed to be good. Recruits will be taken as they offer themselves. They must, however, be able to read and write; being peace officers they must be intelligent, be able to serve processes, and must have the physical qualifications of a soldier. With those qualifications the rule will be, first come first served.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I desire to call the attention of the House to a paragraph in the *Montreal Gazette* of to-day, which reflects seriously and most unjustly on my conduct as a member of this House. The paragraph is as follows:—

"Among the Bills which passed a second reading was that to amend the Act relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company. When the Bill, which is in the charge of Mr. Hector Cameron, was reached, Mr. Blake enquired whether the Bill asked for powers which would legalize the lease to the Great North-Western Telegraph Company. Mr. Cameron endeavored to evade the question and mislead the House by answering 'no,' that it merely asked for the powers granted to the Dominion Telegraph Company some years ago. 'But,' said Mr. Blake, 'the power which it seeks is the power to lease, or, in other words, to confirm the arrangement with the Great North-Western Telegraph Company.' The brief altercation, this afternoon, indicates that the leader of the Opposition will oppose the Bill of the Montreal Telegraph Company."

I find the report in the *Hansard* of what did occur is as follows, and is substantially correct, I think, with the exception of a couple of verbal errors:—

"Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company.

"Mr. BLAKE. I should like to ask my hon. friend if this Bill affects the recent arrangement made with the Great North-Western Telegraph Company.

"Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). No, it is simply a consolidation of the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company with the introduction of the same clause that was put in the charter of the Dominion Telegraph Company last year."

What I really did say was "some years ago."

"Mr. BLAKE. But that would affect it.

"Mr. CAMERON. It does not affect the existing arrangement.

"Mr. BLAKE. But it would give the power.

"Mr. CAMERON. It would give power to make 'release.'

The word should be to make "a lease." I do not intend to submit, without remonstrance at least, to an imputation of improper motives on my conduct and language as a member of the House; either coming from an irresponsible newspaper correspondent in the gallery, or from any hon. member on the floor of the House, who may be responsible, either directly for his utterances in this House, or indirectly for what may appear in the newspaper under his control. The statement that I endeavored either to evade the question or mislead the House is false. The statement

which I made was literally true—that the Bill in question in no way affects the existing arrangements with the Great North-Western Railway Company, nor is it intended to do so. I stated exactly what is the case in saying that its object is, simply, the consolidation of the Acts in relation to the Montreal Telegraph Company, with the addition of a clause copied, *verbatim*, from the Act passed in relation to the Dominion Telegraph Company several years ago. When the hon. member for West Durham asked the question, if it would not affect the lease; I replied, it does not affect the existing arrangement between the companies, nor does it. The existing arrangement stands on its own validity. It may be now either valid or invalid; but that existing arrangement stands entirely unaffected by the Bill introduced. Then, when the question was asked, would it give the power to make any new arrangement in the form of a lease or otherwise; I expressly stated, that it would give the Montreal Telegraph Company shareholders, if they thought fit, power to make new arrangements in the former lease if they thought it was in their interest to do so. I stated candidly to the House exactly what the Bill was intended for, what it contained, and what its effects would be. I neither evaded the question of my hon. friend, nor did I mislead, or endeavor to mislead, the House. I regret that I do not see in his place in the House at present an hon. member who is supposed to have some control over the utterances of this newspaper, but I would venture to say that if he is not prepared to make a statement on the floor of the House of the kind that is in this newspaper, neither let it appear in the form of a communication from the irresponsible gallery correspondent under his control.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. the Minister of Finance delivered his Budget Speech some time ago, it was not expected then, I think, that this discussion should be so prolonged. That speech so clearly established the soundness and the wisdom of the policy adopted by the country in 1878, so triumphantly vindicated the course which the Government has since pursued, and so completely refuted all the objections which hon. gentlemen have brought against that policy, that we might have expected that they would remain almost silent upon the question. It was not unreasonable to suppose, I think, that in view of the position of the country, as shown by that speech, they would have abandoned all opposition to that policy, and would have said across the House to my hon. friend: "Whatever may be our opinions on the abstract theory of free trade, the experience of the past year or two has shown us clearly that, with the great natural resources our country possesses, and situated as Canada is, it is our duty to protect our own sons in the development of those resources, and in the building up here of a great country." But the hon. gentlemen have chosen to take another course; they have chosen to show themselves as active in opposition to this policy as they were in 1878. We should be thankful that they have so clearly and so distinctly defined the hostile attitude they assume towards this policy. We should be thankful that they have, with all the ability and ingenuity they possess, with all the zeal for which they are so remarkable, attacked the position of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance with so little effect. We have reason to be thankful, especially to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), for having directed our attention to that celebrated speech of his delivered in 1876,

prepared and delivered at a time before this question had assumed so strong a party aspect as it has now, and which, when read, completely refutes and answers all the speeches the hon. gentleman has made upon this great question since that time. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that he was born and bred a protectionist, that through the ardor of his youth, and far into the experience of the intellectual vigor of mature manhood, he lived a protectionist, that nine-tenths of his life he was a protectionist. Mr. Speaker, what is bred in the bone is hard to get out. I am sure that after that long experience and that long life spent in the advocacy of protectionist principles, if we could get behind party obligations, we would find the hon. gentleman the best protectionist that sits in the House. When the hon. gentleman was listening to the Budget Speech of my hon. friend, I was amusing myself in fancying the conflict that was going on in his mind. As a protectionist he must have been delighted, he must have rejoiced in the position of the country, as shown under that protective policy; he must have been delighted with the exhibit made when subsequently my hon. friend, in answer to him, gave the statement that, during the last six months, although there has been expended on public works \$3,500,000, the public debt has been reduced \$1,300,000. I am sure the hon. gentleman, as a protectionist, was jubilant and joyful; but, as a member of the Opposition, as a member of the Grit party, discomfited and discouraged; he would be ready at the same time, Sir, to give us a repetition of that quotation which he gave from the "Bigelow Papers":

"Things look thunderin' dark, there's no denyin';
We are clean out of hope, and almost out of lyin'."

If the hon. member for Lambton will permit me to use that choice and select couplet of his, I would say that the hon. member for North Norfolk, as a protectionist, "quoted a hymn and uttered a psalm;" but, as a disheartened Grit, he savagely said damn. The hon. gentleman has, however, defined his position. He has told the House that there is no change in him since last year, no change since the year before, there is no political change but one since 1876. He supports Free Trade and a revenue Tariff, and all the gentlemen who have spoken on that side of the House have defined that to be their position. The hon. member for Lambton has told us in his speech that he is ready to defend the principles he held in 1878, the principles upon which he went to the country and upon which he fell. He says that those are the principles by which he stands, on which he fell, and which he is ready to defend. In 1879, and in 1881, he stated in this House that he was ready to go out of the House but not ready to desert the principle of Free Trade. He now says:

"During the election of September, 1878, I am sure there was no lack of abundant declaration of policy on our part, to indicate precisely what was the line we intended to follow. We declined to accept anything looking in the direction of protection."

Again:

"The principle upon which the late Administration desired to conduct the affairs of the country, was to remove restrictions of all kinds from trade; to enable every one to buy and sell in the cheapest market without restriction, so far as it was possible for us to do this with the necessity resting upon us of raising a revenue from the Customs duties."

Further, he says:

"Protection, as a system, is a relic of barbarism. There should be free trade in goods as well as in land."

It is true the hon. gentleman referred to the opinions which had been advanced by him previous to 1878, and down through the controversy; that is, incidental protection, and his position now is the same position which he held previous to the elections, and all through the contest, viz., that there shall only be a revenue Tariff, and such incidental protection as may flow from it. But the House will see that the manufacturers can count nothing from such protection

as the hon. gentleman advocates, because, if his object is solely to collect a revenue, the moment it prevents importation then he would lower the Tariff in order to induce a larger flow of imports into the country. The hon. the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) in defining his position, was more out-spoken and more violent than any of his hon. friends. On several occasions, in this House, he asserted that the cause of the failure of the manufacturers of this country, before the adoption of the National Policy, was simply that they had not brains enough or money enough to carry on their industries. He stated, further, that those who failed were shiftless and wanting in vigilance; and that the National Policy only provided for the shiftless and idle men who could not maintain a profitable business under fair competition. I ask the attention of the House for a few moments, while I read extracts, showing the views entertained by the hon. gentleman of the manufacturers of this country:

"Socially, I do not conceive it possible to imagine a policy which is likely to do more to corrupt the people of Canada than that brought down to-night. We have two dangerous classes to deal with; there is, at the base of society, always a class of shiftless and idle men, not having sufficient self-reliance to maintain themselves, and only too glad of any excuse to thrust the burden of maintenance on other persons, and you absolutely tell them that it is the duty of the Government to make the country prosperous, and provide employment for them all. Every one who knows anything of European affairs is aware that one of the greatest dangers with which European statesmen have to contend, is the spirit of socialism and socialistic ideas among a large class of the population, and, Sir, you are here deliberately introducing a system which recognizes the leading ideas of socialism, which, indeed, practically justifies the leading tenet of socialism, that property is theft, for, assuredly, property acquired in this way, under a Tariff such as this, is very little better than downright, legalized robbery."

He then says that:

"The manufacturers of Canada who had supported this National Policy are men who deliberately and shamelessly sold themselves to the present Government."

He goes on to say:

"But I know, also, there were many manufacturers who offered themselves for sale as shamelessly as it was possible for men to do. They were as frankly cynical about the matter as the Norman chief, who told the French Archbishop who proposed to convert him to the true faith:

'As for thy faith, a sea-king's gods
Are those which give him most.'

So these gentlemen's politics were as they openly declared: 'The politics which would give most,' and no doubt they did exercise a most powerful influence in displacing my hon. friend and of enabling hon. gentlemen opposite to return to power."

Again he says:

"Nor can they, with any degree of justice, raise the plea of vested interests which has been often used to prevent alterations of the Tariff as it stood. Where men have created a business under the operation of the Tariff framed for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the whole people, I admit a great deal may be said against any violent alterations or interference with what has been the settled policy of the country. But when men deliberately sell themselves to this or that political party for the avowed purpose of taxing the rest of the community, for their private benefit, there are no vested rights in such a case, though they may be vested wrongs enough for the people, when they come to their senses, to redress."

From these extracts will be seen the position which the ex-Finance Minister has taken all through this discussion; and at the present time all those who have spoken on the other side of the House have taken the ground that there can be no vested rights in the manufacturers, and the issue they put squarely before the people of this country is the same as it was in 1878; viz.: free trade or protection—our own markets for our own people, or our markets for the American manufacturers. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that we, on this side of the House, are anxious to avoid the discussion of other questions of infinitely greater importance, such, as the Boundary Award, the enlargement of the debt, and the public expenditure of the country, by bringing forward the question of the National Policy. I

Mr. McLELAN.

think the hon. gentleman will find that when the proper time comes there will be no shrinking, on the part of the hon. gentlemen on this side, from the discussion on any other question which he, or those who sit around him, may choose to raise. The hon. gentleman amused the House, I may say, with the large number of promises in which, speaking on behalf of the Reform party, he indulged. He says the Reform party:

"Promises to call a halt in this sweeping tide of public expenditure, which threatens to engulf the country in financial ruin. It promises to adopt, as a matter of parliamentary policy, the assumption that the public debt is large enough, and should not be permitted to exceed reasonable limits."

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman and those associated with him had, during the five years they sat on the Treasury benches, striven to stop that tide of public expenditure; if they had striven to keep down the public debt, the promise which the hon. gentleman now holds out to the House and to the country, would have been worthy of more consideration than it is. I did not expect that the hon. gentleman, who seems to be so familiar with the public records of the country, would have referred at all to the public expenditure and the creation of the public debt. Let me, for a moment, turn his attention, first to the condition of that debt, and show him who is responsible for the creation of the larger portion of it. Now, in all the comparisons hon. gentlemen opposite have made, they insist upon giving to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the year 1873-74, and in their own expenditure stopping at 1878. Let me make a comparison as to the public debt. On the 1st of July, 1874, the net debt was \$108,324,964; on the 1st of July, 1867, it was \$75,728,641; showing an increase of \$32,596,323. Hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that this increase of debt, large as it was, was not nearly all for public works; \$29,452,334 formed the debts of the Provinces which were added to the Confederation between 1867 and 1874, as well as the debts assumed from Ontario and Quebec which existed previous to 1867; leaving as the net increase during the seven years of the Administration of the hon. gentleman now occupying the Treasury benches the sum of \$12,143,989, or an average increase for expenditure on public works of \$1,734,555 a year. Hon. gentlemen should further bear in mind that during those seven years the Government also expended on public works, chargeable to capital, but paid for out of revenue, \$14,778,034, or an average of \$2,111,147 a year; and during that time they reduced the taxation by over \$1,000,000, by remitting the duties on tea and coffee, and other articles of necessary consumption. Now, let hon. gentlemen opposite contrast and compare this with the five years that they held office. On the 1st of July, 1874, the net debt was \$108,324,964, and on the 1st of July, 1879, it was \$142,990,187, an increase in five years of \$34,665,223. In addition to that there was spent \$4,490,000 of the Fishery Award—and hon. gentlemen will see that but for the payment of the Fishery Award that amount of money would have been borrowed in the English market and have been added to the indebtedness—making in all \$39,156,105, or an average of \$7,831,221 a year, against an average increase by their predecessors of \$1,734,855. Now, I have shown that hon. gentlemen opposite borrowed money upon the public credit of this country to be expended for the public works of this country, but which they expended in the ordinary expenses of their Government to the extent of \$1,034,708. The hon. member for Lambton the other night took a good deal of credit to himself and his Government for having secured the Fishery Award to which I have referred.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the hon. member for Lambton sent an ambassador—a quasi ambassador, as he called him the other night—down to

Washington to negotiate a treaty to give up all claims to that Fishery Award, whatever it might be, and to give to the Americans permission to introduce a great portion of their manufactures into this country; in which, however he failed. And let me say this, Sir,—that there is on record the proof, which cannot be controverted, that all the arrangements for conducting that arbitration were made previous to the change of Administration.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, there is not.

Mr. McLELAN. It is on record that the arrangement was made and sanctioned by the British Government that the arbitration should be held in a Dominion city, and that one of the arbitrators should be a Canadian subject. All these arrangements were made before the change of Administration, and the only thing the hon. gentleman's Government can take credit for is their negligence in bringing that arbitration to an earlier termination and getting the use of that money. The hon. member for North Norfolk will see from the figures I have given him, taken from the Public Accounts, that his own associates are directly chargeable with having increased largely the public debt of this country during their Administration.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us on what public works this borrowed money was expended.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for Lambton stated every dollar of it was expended honestly. We are not disposed to question his honesty or that of the hon. member for Middlesex, or to go all through the Public Accounts to find out whether this or that dollar was honestly expended. The question is: were not a great many thousands and millions of dollars improperly expended?

Mr. ROSS. No.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not to be drawn aside to go over the history of the public expenditure of these hon. gentlemen during five years. I am not going to refer to all the mistakes and blunders of their Administration from the St. Francis Locks down to the last dollar they improperly expended. I am willing at the present moment to say that the hon. gentleman acted honestly; I admit that the hon. gentleman who was then Premier of the Government did his incompetent best in controlling the expenditure, but I do say that a great many thousands and millions of dollars were expended uselessly for all time to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I know, have said, time and again, that they were in difficulty on account of legacies left them by their predecessors. Why, the hon. member for Middlesex knows that, for seven years, the men who went out of office had been expending over \$2,000,000 a year on an average, out of public revenue, on public works of capital account; and if the succeeding Government wanted to borrow money to prosecute these undertakings left them, the completion of the Intercolonial and the Pacific Railways, they had a surplus of over \$2,000,000 a year, left by my hon. friend on my right, which would have paid the interest, at 5 per cent., on \$40,000,000. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, the first thing they did was to increase the taxation of the country, by \$3,000,000, which would have paid the interest, at 5 per cent., on \$60,000,000; so that, with the surplus left by my hon. friend, and the additional taxation put upon the country, they had the means to pay interest on \$100,000,000 with which to carry on the public works left to them. But the hon. member for West Middlesex asks me how that money was expended. I come back to the statement of the hon. member for Lambton, that every dollar was honestly expended, and that, when his Administration came out of office, they had 200 miles of railway running. They had expended nearly \$11,000,000 on the Pacific Railway, and had not quite, as the hon. gentleman said, 200 miles of rails laid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman read what I said?

Mr. McLELAN. I will give the hon. gentleman the figures exactly as to the position of the road at the time he went out of office. They had expended about \$11,000,000 on the Pacific Railway in detached pieces, without any connection or even possible means of connection, not even were the St. Francis Locks finished. Here are the figures:

	Miles.
From Fort William to English River.....	97
" Selkirk to Telford.....	70
" Winnipeg to Selkirk.....	22
Total.....	189

or an average of $37\frac{1}{2}$ miles per year. The rails were laid on these detached pieces of the road to the length of 189 miles, but, though the rails were laid, the road was far from being completed, and not a single passenger had been carried over a single mile of the 189 miles after an expenditure of \$11,000,000. With this expenditure they had only succeeded in laying rails, without carrying passengers, at the rate of thirty-seven miles a year. What has been accomplished by the present Administration?

	Miles.
From Prince Arthur's Landing to Vermillion Lake ...	242
" Selkirk to Trout Lake.....	139
" Winnipeg to near Brandon.....	134
" Emerson to Selkirk.....	85
" Winnipeg to Stonewall.....	20
Total.....	641

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not correct, the hon. gentleman embraces all that was done by the previous Government in what was done by the present one.

Mr. McLELAN. Will the hon. gentleman have a little patience? He will find patience in this life is a great virtue. Deduct from the 641 miles the 189 miles which the hon. gentleman had laid down but not finished.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is more than that.

Mr. McLELAN. You will find with rails laid and in use, carrying passengers, 452 miles, constructed by the present Administration in three and a quarter years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. McLELAN. The contrast stands this way: The late Government expended \$11,000,000, and laid at the rate of thirty-seven and a half miles of rails per year. The present Government have not expended so much money, and have built 139 miles per year. The hon. member for Middlesex can draw what comfort he likes from those figures, which are taken from the public records of the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk has referred to the sweeping tide of public expenditure, and promised, on behalf of the Reform party, to stop it. One would suppose that the hon. gentleman would have made some reference to the past, and been guided in his conclusions by the record of the five years during which his party were in power. A good deal has been said as to the manner in which the Public Accounts for 1873-4 have been prepared. It has been charged, and not denied, that the hon. gentlemen opposite who made up the accounts of 1874, held hon. gentlemen on this side responsible for the expenditure up to that year. Included in these Accounts are sums that were voted by the previous Parliament to be charged to capital account, sums amounting to over \$900,000. And, Sir, it is upon the preparation of that account that they attempt at all to go into comparison of the expenditures of two Administrations. An American paper asked: "Can a democrat get to heaven?" And the Boston *Transcript* replied: "Certainly, if he has the handling of the returns." The hon. gentlemen opposite can go into a comparison when they have the handling of the returns, when

they have the making up of the accounts, as they had in 1874. Now, Sir, they have been placing the gross expenditure of 1873-74 at \$23,316,316, but with the deductions which have been shown as not properly belonging to that account, the true expenditure is \$22,224,316. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) claimed the other night that he should receive credit for the increase of interest, for the amount paid to sinking fund, and the management of the debt. Take the whole amount for interest, sinking fund, management of debt and subsidies to Provinces at \$11,952,641 in 1878-79, and deduct the amount paid in 1873-74 for the same services, and the increase of interest, sinking fund, and management, \$10,255,793, and add the difference to the expenditure of 1873-74, and you have a total expenditure, assuming there have been increases in other departments, of \$24,091,159; but we find, in 1878-79, the expenditure was \$24,455,381, or an increase of \$364,222. You will find also, in looking at the Accounts, that in addition to this hon. gentlemen opposite cut down the important and vital services of the country. They reduced Immigration and Quarantine, \$106,318; Militia and Defence, \$344,584; Public Works and Buildings, \$812,408; Lighthouses and Coast Service, \$89,491; so that, taking these into consideration it would be seen that in the other departments there was an increase of \$1,717,053. The hon. member for Lambton told us the other night that there had been charged to capital account a large sum for Dominion lands, and I gathered from his manner that he thought it was an improper charge, and that it should have been charged against the revenue. But the House will bear in mind that in 1874-80 Parliament set apart 100,000,000 acres of land for the construction of the Pacific Railway, the proceeds thereof to be a capital account, and the cost of the survey of those lands is a proper charge against the sale of them, and should be so placed. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in making a comparison between 1873-74 and 1878, claim credit for having reduced the public expenditure, but, making a true calculation and deducting those charges which properly belong to capital, and those expenditures which were exceptional at the time, I have shown there was, during that period, an increase of really \$1,717,053. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that in the present Estimates there is an appearance of a large increase, that whatever had been the expenditure up to 1878-79 on their part, hon. gentlemen who came into power in 1878 have largely increased the public expense of the country. I wish to turn the attention of the House for a moment to the remarks of the ex-Finance Minister upon this point, and I wish to show, from the speeches of the hon. gentleman, that his complaint in 1877-78 was, that the condition of the revenue was not such as to enable him to make that expenditure which the public service called for. The hon. gentleman said:

"No doubt, Sir, there is this misfortune in our present position—we are debarred, so long as our revenue continues in its present state, from attempting many things which I shall be glad to see attempted. There are valuable improvements which the hon. gentlemen are not able at present to consider. There are valuable suggestions made from time to time, which we would desire, if our circumstances permitted, to carry into effect. We are obliged, no doubt, to abstain from doing those things, but when we are told, after having to contend with the difficulties we have met with, that we are wrong for not attempting to do more, I must venture to enter a protest against such censure. Sir, to condemn us, in the present state of our finances, because we are unable to undertake new enterprises, is as unreasonable as if the passengers were to rise in mutiny against the captain and crew, because they were unable to make progress to port while obliged to lie in a storm."

This proves that hon. gentlemen opposite were unable to expend as large an amount as they desired, and thought the wants of the country demanded; but now, when we have, under the fiscal policy which has been adopted by the present Government, an overflowing Treasury, and when called upon by the wants of the country to make a larger expenditure to meet the needs of the public

Mr. McLELAN.

service, hon. gentlemen opposite condemn us for pursuing that wise course. They refer especially to the expenditure on Civil Government. I find, on turning to the Public Accounts of almost every country in the world, that there is a continuous and continued increase of public expenditure. I find that, in the United States, a country to which hon. gentlemen opposite so frequently point, there was expended for Civil Government—that is, exclusive of the war charges, navy, Indians and pensions—in 1830, \$3,250,000; in 1840, \$5,600,000; in 1850 it rose to \$16,000,000; in 1860, to \$2,000,000; in 1870, to \$53,000,000; and, in 1880, it was \$57,500,000. I find that in Great Britain, which may be called a finished country, the public expenditure year by year steadily increases. In 1870, it was £68,864,000; in 1875, £74,328,000; and, in 1880, it had risen to £84,105,705, thus showing a steady increase. So in this young, unfinished country—as I may call it—in this active, enterprising and growing country, under the policy which has been adopted by the present Government, there must be necessarily an increase of the annual expenditure to meet the public wants and services of the country. But some hon. gentlemen opposite have referred especially to the Civil Service increase of expenditure. If you take the average for the five years of the late Government, you will find their expenditure under this head was \$349,598. The average for 1879-80 and 1881 was, under the present Government, \$907,281.97, or an average increase of \$57,683—that is the average for the last three and a-half years. The House will understand that, under the Statute governing the Civil Service, its members receive an annual increase of from \$50 to \$100 a year, and that without any action on the part of the Administration. This annual increment amounts to \$14,000 a year, which, for the three and a-half years, would amount to \$49,000. There was also an additional charge upon the Civil Service of \$14,000 for our High Commissioner, Sir A. T. Galt—a charge which I do not gather an approval of from the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton. But I am sure after the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, that by his assistance in the negotiations in Europe, the Government have been able to make a saving in the payments of public interest, and on our indebtedness, very largely exceeding Sir A. T. Galt's salary, no valid objection can be raised to that charge. Now, those two charges amount to more than the admitted increase for the Civil Service, of \$57,683, by \$6,000 a year. The House will bear in mind, having been so informed by members on this side, as well as by hon. gentlemen opposite, that there has been a considerable increase in the expenditure of the Post Office Department. I find that postal expenditure all over the world, increases largely year by year; and it is not strange to find an increase in this new country, where many new settlements have yearly to be provided with postal service. Let us notice the increase in the work in the Post Office Department in 1881, and compare it with the services rendered in 1878. The number of post offices increased, from 1878 to 1881, 15 per cent.; miles of postal routes, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or from 38,730 to 41,600 miles. There has been a large increase also in the labor connected with the Post Office Savings Banks, between even 1880 and 1881; deposits in 1880, \$56,031; 1881, \$71,747, an increase of \$15,716, or 28 per cent. The amount on deposit in 1880, was \$2,720,000, and, in 1881, \$4,175,000, or an increase of nearly \$1,500,000, or 53 per cent. Withdrawals in 1880, 9 per cent.; 1881, 14 per cent. With regard to the number of open accounts—and here is where a great amount of labor is incurred and expense involved—they numbered, in 1880, 31,865, and, in 1881, 59,605, or an increase of 8,240, or 25 per cent.; and there was an increase remaining, of the balance due to depositors of 57 per cent.; so that the work performed by the Post Office Department has largely increased the expenditure, and mainly in providing for the

North-West Provinces and the territories. The hon. member for West Middlesex, I think, (Mr. Ross) went over some of the departmental expenses in detail, and referred especially to the Department with which I have had some connection, the Marine and Fisheries, stating there had been a large increase in its cost from 1873 to 1881.

Mr. ROSS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had looked at the figures and taken them correctly, he would have found there has been no increase beyond the statutory increase of \$50 to \$100 a year, already mentioned. In 1878 the expenditure on Civil Government in that Department was \$32,632; contingencies \$8,270—making \$40,902. For 1881, the same Department, the expenditure was \$36,447; contingencies \$6,270; increase by Statute, \$1,897, leaving a balance of \$40,820. A comparison of the expenditure with 1878 shows there has been an actual decrease in the Department of \$132, a diminution effected not by transferring any of the charges under that Department to other services, as hon. gentlemen opposite did in 1875, in order to enable them to come to the House and boast of a saving in the civil expenditure. I am quoting from the ex-Finance Minister's speech. He says:

"Coming now to the other side of the account, the House will perceive that, for Civil Government, we have effected a decrease of \$27,352."

I have not had an opportunity of going through all the Departments; but in that Department of which I have been speaking, I find that, in order to enable the hon. gentleman to make that boast, he took between \$15,000 and \$16,000 from departmental salaries and transferred it to the account of the lighthouse and buoy service; that is, Agents of the Department whose salaries had always been included, up to to that year, in the charges for Civil Government; that hon. gentleman took them out of this account and transferred them to the lighthouse and buoy service, to enable him to boast of his economy. I remember seeing, somewhere among the Public Accounts, in some out-of-the-way place, under the head of immigration, I think, that a member of that Cabinet made a trip up to Winnipeg, and \$1,000 for expenses was there charged instead of being under its proper head—Contingencies. I remember also in the correspondence which took place between the Government and Mr. Jenkins, after the latter's dismissal, that the hon. Premier invited him to visit Paris, and the \$500 or \$600 of expenses on that occasion were charged to Immigration. If you take the records of the five years and go through them carefully, you will find that the little hen had a habit of hiding her nest eggs where she hoped no one could find them. But the hon. member for Lambton seemed to complain that the Dominion Lands account had not been charged to capital account, and that the expenditure for Indians had so largely increased. In view of the critical position we occupy towards the Indians, I think the House and the country will admit that a large expenditure, if it be successful in keeping the peace, is wisely made; the House can understand how very slight an outbreak would check the tide of immigration that is setting into that great North-West, and how the expenditure of a few thousand dollars or a few hundred thousand dollars in keeping peace with the Indians and preventing disturbances between them and the immigrants is the wisest possible expenditure the Government can make. I say that it is a critical time because the tide of immigration has been largely increased. We have been told by the Minister of Agriculture that during the last year something like 28,000 people have settled in Manitoba. In the United States, it is customary for the authorities to estimate at \$1,000 per head the value to the country of every immigrant coming into it; and, at that rate, these 28,000 people who have settled in Manitoba, during the past year, are worth to the Dominion of Canada

\$28,000,000. If you look at it merely in this light, a large expenditure to keep peace with the Indians in order not to check that tide of immigration, is the wisest possible expenditure the Government can make. Let me say another word on that point as to the value of immigration to the country. I think we may safely put it down that since the change of Government, and since the adoption of the policy by the present Government to open up communication with the North-West by means of the great Pacific Railway through that country, that there has been given an unwonted impetus to the tide of immigration into that country, and to that impetus at least 100,000 of a population may fairly be credited. If you take the same valuation that the Americans give to their immigration of a \$1,000 a piece, there is \$100,000,000 added to the wealth of this country.

Mr. MILLS. By transference from one Province to another?

Mr. McLELAN. Let the hon. gentleman consider for a moment. How many of these people would have gone out of the Dominion into the United States?

Mr. ANGLIN. A penny saved is a penny gained.

Mr. McLELAN. I thank the hon. member for Gloucester for the remark. A penny saved is as good as two earned. If we have saved one-half that number of people from going into the United States we have saved 50,000, and a penny saved being as good as two earned, for every person being worth \$2,000, we still have \$100,000,000 added to the wealth of the Dominion. Does the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) know how many people went out of Canada into the United States previous to the opening up of the North-West? In 1850, there were in the State of Connecticut 3,145 people born in the Dominion of Canada; and, in 1870, this number had risen to 10,840. In Illinois, in 1860, there were 20,932; in 1870, 32,388. In Maine, in 1860, there were 17,540; in 1870, 26,661. Massachusetts, 1860, 27,060; in 1870, 69,491. Michigan, 1860, 36,582; in 1870, 89,335: or a total, in 1870, of about 500,000 people born in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. How many are there now?

Mr. McLELAN. Not so many by at least 50,000 or 100,000 as there would have been but for the opening up of the North-West. And I may say more, there are more Canadian born people in the United States to-day than there would have been if the hon. gentleman had never delivered that speech of his in praise of the Western States. I will not undertake to say how many people left this country in consequence of the speeches delivered by himself and the hon. member for Lambton, but I beg him to bear in mind, when next he desires to make a speech decrying his own Province and bemoaning the United States, to bear in mind the remark of the hon. member for Gloucester, that a penny saved is as good as two earned, and every one that goes out of this country in consequence of his speeches involves a loss of \$2,000 to the Dominion of Canada, and a gain of \$2,000 to the United States. Now by this large exodus of people to the United States there went out of Canada, from 1860 to 1870, 22,000 or 23,000 people each year on an average, all of whom went to swell the population of the United States and to increase the wealth of that country. I say there never was a wiser step taken by any Government than the hastening of connection with the prairie lands of the Great North-West, in order to turn aside the tide of immigration to our own country. As the hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to that question, I may say that that tide is not quite so strong and fall as it would have been, had the hon. gentleman taken a different course and spoken differently of his own country and of the United States. Whatever hon. gentlemen on the other side may say, I think the country understands that, owing to the

great impetus given to the construction of the railway by the bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that tide of immigration has been increased, and we have a greater number of actual settlers who have gone into the North-West country. And placing the money value on each of these settlers, which is placed by the United States on their settlers, more than the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the country will be returned to the country by these additions to its population and its wealth. And that tide will go on so long as the present Government remains in power, and so long as the National Policy continues in existence. Complaint has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the National Policy has largely increased the taxation of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Let me refer the hon. gentleman who says "hear, hear." to the Finance Minister of his own party. I fear that that hon. gentleman will not accept the position—correct though it be—that taxation should be the measure of expenditure. Let me point him, first, to the fact that the expenditure under the present Government is less to-day by 22 cents per head than it was when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power. The mere fact of their expending without collecting does not alter the force of the charge against them. Suppose the hon. gentlemen had left a deficit of \$10,000,000 a year, and had only collected \$10,000,000 from the country, would any man stand up and say that this latter sum was all the taxation they put upon the country? But I wish hon. gentlemen to mark, learn and consider well the position taken by their own Finance Minister. His position was, that but for this "Tariff of abominations," as he called the Tariff of the hon. Finance Minister, there would have been as much money collected from the people of this country under his Tariff as there has been under the present Tariff. He says that he would have collected \$18,000,000, and how does he attempt to show that? He says that the importations of the country have always borne a certain proportionate excess over the exports—that the exports of 1881 exceeded the exports of 1877-78, and that, in 1881, there would have been the same proportionate increase of imports under his Tariff that there was in 1877-78. If hon. members will take the imports and exports of 1878, and those of 1881, they will find that, according to the ex-Finance Minister, we should have imported over \$21,000,000 more in 1881 than we did. The hon. gentleman claimed that he would have collected a revenue on that amount; and would thus have received in all \$18,000,000. Will hon. gentleman opposite tell me wherein lies the difference? If my hon. friend the Finance Minister has collected \$18,000,000 under his Tariff—and his predecessor claims that under his Tariff there would have been larger imports, and that he also would have collected \$18,000,000—why do they charge us with having so largely increased the taxation of this country. When he claims that the amount he would have collected from the country would be the same as has been collected by the Finance Minister.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. He says he would have collected enough money. You have collected too much.

Mr. McLELAN. He estimated that he would have collected under his Tariff last year, about \$17,000,000, and this year, \$18,000,000. But he would not have collected that much. The hon. the ex-Finance Minister has not got so far away from the raw material for a Finance Minister as to understand that there is something more necessary than the mere imposition of taxation on a country, in order to raise a revenue—that you must, with that taxation, correspondingly increase the purchasing power of the people. The

Mr. McLELAN.

hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross), the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), have taken the ground that we are destroying the manufactures, because there has not been a large exportation from the country during the past year. If hon. gentlemen will look at the position taken by their own ex-Finance Minister, they will see why there were not other exports. The little boy asked his mother: "Ma, what is a junction?" "A junction," said she, "is where two roads separate." In the party opposite there seems to be a junction; in the Grit mind there is a separation of ideas, in all directions. The ex-Finance Minister takes the position that, under his Tariff, we would have imported \$21,000,000 worth more of goods, and the hon. members for Middlesex, Brant, and Norfolk say that we are killing out the manufactures of this country. According to the ex-Finance Minister there is a void of \$21,000,000 to be filled up; and I ask the hon. member for Bothwell what is the difference between importing \$21,000,000 worth of goods and collecting taxation on them and shutting them out and collecting the same amount of money on the imports that really come in? There is this difference: that you get back the \$21,000,000 in gold, while you employ your own people in supplying the void created. Why, Sir, it is as plain as a sunbeam, that if, according to the hon. member for Centre Huron, \$21,000,000 worth of goods have been shut out from this country, the manufacturers of this country have been employed in filling up that void, and that \$21,000,000 coming in in gold and circulating through this Dominion has given employment to the people, and enabled them to purchase, not only that \$21,000,000 worth of goods, but many millions more. Upon this question of exports hon. gentlemen refer us to England and the United States; they say we have just the same fate as all protective countries, and that we should take a lesson from the experience of all free trade countries—that we should allow the Americans to send in as many goods as they please for the benefit of our manufacturers—to add to their prosperity and to enable them to export largely of their products. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the record, they will not find what they claim, that England is going on largely increasing her exports. They will find that of the products of England exported there has been for a number of years a steady decline.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. I hope the hon. gentleman is not saying "hear, hear," because he rejoices that this is the case; he is saying it, perhaps, because he thinks this statement incorrect. I take it from the parliamentary returns in the Library, and I will refer to a few articles. The export of cotton manufactures in 1873, was £69,228,000, in 1878, £65,000,000 and, in 1879, the last year given, £63,000,000; in woollens and worsteds, the export, in 1870, was £20,952,000; and, in 1879, £19,575,000; in iron and steel manufactures, the export, in 1877, was £20,000,000, and, in 1879, £19,000,000; in coals, it was £8,000,000 in 1877, and £7,200,000 in 1879; in linen goods, it was £7,000,000 in 1877, and £6,793,000 in 1879. The only article in which there seems to have been an increase in the export is machinery, which shows a large increase, I suppose in consequence of other countries providing for the manufacture of the goods themselves. But one would suppose that in that free trade country there were no importations of manufactured goods, according to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I find that, instead of there being no importations, there is a very large increase in the importations into England of very many manufactured articles. The importations of manufactured cottons, in 1876, amounted to £1,750,261, and they have since gone up to £2,500,000; in the simple article of buttons the

importations have increased in four years by over £1,000,000; in iron and steel manufactures there has been an increase, since 1876, of more than £1,000,000, or 70 per cent.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Where from?

Mr. McLELAN. Partly from the United States, part from Germany, part from France, and all other parts of the world—from highly protected countries, as some hon. gentleman behind me suggests. The importations of silk have gone up from £11,815,740 in 1876, to £13,324,935. Hon. gentlemen will therefore see that, in that free trade country, which they take so much delight in pointing to, there is a steady decline in exports, and a steady increase in the imports of manufactured goods. In the simple article of woollen manufactures, the importations have increased from £6,676,000 in 1876, to £9,700,000. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen seem to take great delight in making comparisons between that country and the United States. In the increase of business in the world there may have been larger exports than in 1879, but the fact remains on record that there has been for a long series of years a steady decline. And why? Look at Great Britain on the map, and you will find her manufacturing region very little larger than the Province of Nova Scotia—I think about 21,000 square miles—

Mr. MACKENZIE. The area is 67,000 square miles.

Mr. McLELAN. Supposing it is, all the manufactures of Great Britain are produced in the 21,000 miles. Supposing the area to be 67,000 square miles, or double that—if it will satisfy the hon. gentleman any better—Great Britain, even then, is not much larger than the two or three little Provinces down by the sea. What is the rule in Great Britain? Everything that passes outside the border is classed as export, even if only sent to the Channel Islands. Go to the United States and take the manufacturing portion, say the eastern States, draw a line round them and call everything that goes over that line into the far West, or the cotton and Pacific States, an export, and you will find that the manufacturing exports of the United States compare favorably with those of Great Britain. The manufacturing portions of the States have got to supply 50,000,000 people, you go to Great Britain and only find 35,000,000; thus they have 15,000,000 to supply in addition to the population of Great Britain. So that, when you come to look at the position of the two countries, you find the difference in the exports and manufactures is not so very great as the hon. gentleman would have us believe. I am just now reminded of the arguments used by the hon. member for Centre Huron the other night—it seems the poor but respectable farmer will write if he will not speak to him, as the hon. Minister of Railways said the other night. From that letter the ex-Finance Minister stated to the House that the poor farmer paid \$150 per year to the Treasury of the Dominion. Taking the average, rich and poor together, and supposing that that poor farmer pays up the average, this would make, according to the position taken by the hon. member for Centre Huron, a revenue of \$72,000,000 in Customs. The absurdity of the position is manifest. Hon. gentlemen opposite try to persuade the people that they are enormously taxed, but when the figures are worked up the results show a revenue four times the actual amount. I would ask the hon. gentleman how it fares with the poor man in England? Is he free from taxation under a free trade Tariff?

Mr. ANGLIN. He has got free bread.

Mr. McLELAN. And so do people in this country get free bread; they get it cheaper now than if they imported it.

Mr. MILLS. The English workingmen get free sugar.

Mr. McLELAN. Everything that the poor man looks upon as a necessity is taxed, except bread, in England—tea, tobacco, beer, spirits, and all these things that are largely used by the poor man—very much more than they are taxed in this Dominion. Nearly \$40,000,000 are raised on tobacco alone, of which the poor man is the largest consumer, the tax being about \$1 per lb.; tea is taxed 12 cents per lb., and rum and spirits, the poor man's drinks, are heavily taxed, while wines, the beverage of the rich man, come in comparatively free; silks are imported to the extent of \$65,000,000, and come in free, while the poor man's spirits, tobacco, tea and beer are all taxed; so that if you look into the condition of the poor man in that country you will find he pays more taxes by far than the poor man in the Dominion or the United States. There is one thing which stands out painfully in the records of Great Britain, and that is that there are 1,000,000 paupers supported by charity in that country. One would suppose that in that free-trade country the people ought to be so prosperous that there would be no poor men, yet one in every thirty-five of the population is a pauper. But the hon. gentleman has claimed that we tax them \$150 a year each: not only do they assert that we have drawn from the poor people at the rate of \$72,000,000 into the Treasury—and the Minister of Finance says he can find no such sum there—but the hon. gentlemen state that we have taxed the people in the increased price of products that the people of this country cannot manufacture, and do not manufacture, and sell as cheaply the goods they produce as goods from the United States. The hon. ex-Finance Minister states that the larger the market the cheaper you can produce goods; that if you have a market of 50,000,000 people you can manufacture cheaper than with a market of 4,000,000. Suppose it be so, does it follow that we are to give the Americans our market of 4,000,000; that we are to permit them to send in everything to Canada, while we are not permitted to send anything across the boundary line; that they are to manufacture for three-fourths of our people, and our manufactures are to be confined to perhaps one-fourth of the population of the Dominion? Taking the hon. gentleman's own argument, the larger the market the cheaper the goods; if you shut out American goods and allow our manufacturers the whole Dominion, goods would be cheaper for the 4,000,000 than if the market were limited to 500,000 or 1,000,000. But hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground, also, that the National Policy is about to induce a large competition among domestic manufacturers, and that they themselves are to suffer by it. We hope—and we take the ground that if we secure to our manufacturers the market of the whole Dominion, and we have declared to them that it is our policy that they shall have market—they will be induced to enter more largely into manufacturing interests, that keener competition will arise between them, and through that competition there will be a reduction of prices, and that, eventually, although it may be possible in some cases for a year or two that the prices of certain articles may be increased with this policy in operation, yet still, when you have encouraged and induced manufacturers to establish different industries, you will eventually have goods cheaper in the Dominion than you would have them under any system of importation under the old policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they never could have a revenue Tariff which would be under 17½ per cent. A few manufacturers might be induced to go into the business, but they would always count upon their competition as being outside, and they would add 17½ per cent. to the prices. There would not be a sufficient number of them to make competition among themselves, and they would look to the competition outside, being themselves protected by

the 17½ per cent. duty; so that we would never get from the manufacturers of this country under a Tariff that permitted half the goods to be imported goods at prices below those of the imported articles plus the duty and cost of transportation. So I think it is plain, from the position taken by the hon. gentlemen themselves, that the National Policy induces domestic competition, that it will create such a number of industries in this country as will result in such competition as will reduce prices for home-made goods. The ex-Finance Minister takes the ground that you can manufacture cheaper for 50,000,000 than for 4,000,000. The market depends on the number of manufacturers who go into a certain line of business to supply the demand. Take the article of cotton. There are between 800 and 900 factories in existence in the United States, while here, with 4,000,000 of people, we shall require seventy or eighty factories before we shall be any better supplied with such factories than they are in the United States, and under this policy I hope, and indeed I am sure, that, one after another, industries will spring up and the competition will bring prices down as low, if they be not so already, as are paid either by the people of the United States or the people of England. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) told the House that the late Government did more for the manufacturers than we are doing, because they admitted, duty free, more of the raw materials for manufactures than we are doing under the present Tariff; and the hon. gentleman went into a calculation and gave figures to show that under that Tariff they admitted \$31,000,000 worth, while we have only admitted \$19,000,000 worth, and that, therefore, the advantages to manufactures were greater under the Cartwright Tariff than under the Tariff of the present Administration. I have turned to the figures and find them not exactly what the hon. gentleman has stated. It is, I suppose, fair to assume that it is an error in figures, but it is somehow curious that the figures given by him favor his own side. The true figures are: Free goods, in 1878, \$30,619,262; in 1881, \$19,990,879, being a difference in favor of 1878, of \$10,628,383. Upon the face of this statement, without any explanation, it would appear that hon. gentlemen opposite had, in 1878, admitted more goods duty free than we did in 1881; and the hon. gentleman would convey to the House and the country the impression that the goods comprised raw material, to be used in manufactures, and that, therefore, they were the friends of the manufacturers, and not we. Looking at the imports of that year, 1878, I see the aggregate includes barley, \$137,243; oats, \$651,441; peas, \$18,729; rye, \$77,398; Indian corn, \$3,535,619; wheat, \$6,510,148; flour, \$1,866,101; rye, \$8,655; Indian meal, \$619,380; oatmeal, \$22,226; in all, \$13,451,849 worth of bread stuff, admitted and computed in that \$30,000,000, which he claims as raw material. Why, when you eliminate this large sum from the imports of 1878, and take out, also, coal, \$3,054,852, you find that, under the present Tariff, \$5,878,318 worth more raw materials for manufacture are admitted under this Tariff, than came in under the Tariff of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which, they think, did so much for the manufacturers in 1878.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Does the hon. gentleman eliminate the raw materials from the imports of 1878, as well as from the imports of 1881, and place them on precisely the same basis? That is the position I took, and that is the calculation I made.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman, in his calculation, took the gross figures of the free goods in 1878 and added \$400,000 more than the books warranted on the one side, and deducted on the other side, thus making a difference of \$12,000,000 instead of \$10,600,000. That is the calculation of the hon. gentleman. I have taken out the articles that, in 1878, came in free of duty; the breadstuffs to the amount

Mr. McLELAN.

of \$13,500,000, and I have shown that the Tariff of the present Dominion admits a larger quantity of goods free, for manufactures, than did the Tariff of 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. And a larger value.

Mr. McLELAN. And of larger value—goods that enter directly into manufactures. I think it will not be denied that there has been a large increase in the manufactures of the country, and that I have shown, at least from the position taken by the hon. the ex-Finance Minister, that the manufacturers of this country have had at least \$21,000,000 in supplying the people of Canada. I have shown that we have admitted more raw materials to encourage those manufacturers, and that although the exports of manufactured goods may have fallen off, the House can easily see the reason why—that it was to supply that void created by the shutting out of \$21,000,000 worth of goods that the hon. the ex-Finance Minister stated would have been brought in under his Tariff. The supply of that void, as my hon. friend the Finance Minister stated, has given employment to a large additional number of workmen. There has been from new industries and the increase of old, an increase of about 24,000 workmen. Now, take the usual number of persons dependant on every workman, and if you believe with the hon. the ex-Finance Minister that without this Tariff there would have been \$21,000,000 worth of goods more imported—if you take the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that every workman produces about \$1,000 worth of goods a year, these \$21,000,000 would give employment to 21,000 workmen, or a little less than the number which the hon. the Finance Minister stated as the number of new hands employed by the various industries created or stimulated under this policy. If you take the employment of this large number, and the maintenance of the people dependent upon them—the returns of the United States manufacturers, show that every man and woman employed has upon an average three or four persons dependent upon him or her for support—you will find that the supply of that void, the manufacturing of that amount of goods, has given employment, or support, to something like a total population of between 80,000 or 100,000 persons. The position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is that we should do away with this policy and go back to the Tariff of 1878, and should admit all these goods—the \$21,000,000 worth which the ex-Finance Minister stated would have come in under the late tariff; then, as a consequence, you would throw out of employment 21,000 persons now engaged in manufactures under the present policy, and all the people dependent upon them—say between 80,000 and 100,000. If you thus deprive them of a living, you would have to maintain them at the public expense, or they would have to leave the country. A return to the tariff of the late Government means this: That you will thereby shut down so many of the industries of this country, as would throw out of employment all these persons, depriving of support the 80,000 or 100,000 dependent upon them; and you make it imperative upon that large number to go to the United States. As I have shown previously, taking the amount set down as the value of each emigrant to the United States, you would send them persons to the value of \$80,000,000, which would represent the loss to the Dominion. I want now to refer to the general prosperity of the country.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McLELAN. Before recess I was referring to the exports of this country, and to the reasons why there should have been, in the past year, a decrease in the outgo of manufactured goods. I was referring to the position taken by the

ex-Minister of Finance, that \$21,000,000 had been prevented from being imported by the Tariff of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I was referring to the great impetus that the expenditure of \$21,000,000 in gold among the manufacturing industries of this country had given to them. I need not have elaborated that position, because the hon. gentleman themselves stated this year that an income of \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 would greatly improve the condition of the people, and would greatly stimulate and encourage manufacturing industries of all kinds. He said:

"I need not tell any one who has paid attention to the actual operation of commerce, how enormous by an income to the people of \$10,000,000 in the space of six months would tend to encourage and stimulate every kind of industry at home, and increase our powers of purchasing, and our consumption of dutiable articles."

I think, then, that from the words of the hon. gentleman himself, it is proven that the manufacturers of this country have had a yearly expenditure among them of at least \$20,000,000 in gold more than they had under the operation of the Cartwright Tariff. The hon. gentlemen opposite seemed pained and dissatisfied because we did not purchase those goods abroad, because, as they claimed, we hinder the prosperity of this country by not having a larger trade balance against us. The true index of the prosperity of a country, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, is that there shall be a large balance of trade against a country.

Mr. ANGLIN. No.

Mr. McLELAN. I think an hon. gentleman who was his leader entered into a very elaborate argument to show that the larger the balance of trade against a country was, the greater its profits.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. McLELAN. It was stated that the balance of trade represents the profits which a country had made upon its exports, and hence the larger the balance the greater the profit.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It very often does.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman will enquire into the operation of trade, he will find that, perhaps, even supposing there are large profits upon the goods exported from this country or from the United States, it is not the exporter who receives the profits. I ask the hon. gentleman to state to us what profit the English manufacturer has upon the sale of cottons which he sends to this country, after they come here. His profits stop at the price that is fixed, and in the bills for the exportation; and when they come to this side, and are sold here, the man who handles them, and not the exporter, receives and pockets the profits. So is it with almost everything that is sent from this country. Upon goods that come from the other side the price is fixed before shipment, and the profits, whatever they may be, belong to the merchants on the other side of the water. But, even suppose it were otherwise, suppose that upon the \$100,000,000 worth of goods we had exported there was a profit of \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000, did it never enter the minds of hon. gentlemen that it would be better for the country to have the profits come back to this country in gold to be expended among the people themselves? Why, surely, if there are profits, is it not better to use them in employing our own people than to expend them in employing the workmen and manufacturers of other countries. But it is because there has not been the large balance of trade against us, because we have reduced that largely from former years, that there has been, as I contend, an increase of prosperity among the workmen and among all the manufacturing industries of the country. The hon. gentlemen opposite have made a charge against us that we have discriminated in this Tariff against England and in favor of the United States.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear; that is so.

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman who indulges so much in averages will take the average of importations from Great Britain for the five years of their Administration, he will find that, from 1874 to 1879, the total amount was \$209,077,876, or an average of \$41,815,575. The average for the years 1880 and 1881 has been \$43,583,800, or an increase of \$1,768,235. So that if you take the average of the time which they administered the Government under the Cartwright Tariff, and if you take the average of the years under the Tariff of my hon. friend, you will find that from Great Britain there has been an increase of \$1,768,235. Now, how has it fared with the United States? During the five years of their Administration, the average amount of importations was \$48,111,896; the average during the two years this Tariff has been in full operation, has been \$36,704,012, or a decrease of \$11,407,884. So that the figures demonstrate that, however strongly or often the hon. gentlemen may assert it to the contrary, the Tariff has operated to increase the trade with Great Britain, and to decrease trade with the United States. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), in referring to this matter, stated that we have a larger percentage of duty upon the importations from Great Britain than upon those from the United States. If the hon. gentleman had looked at the articles imported he would have found that there are a large amount of free goods, consisting of raw cotton, raw tobacco and hides, that come from the United States, which swelled up the list of free goods from the United States in excess over the goods from Great Britain. This change in the current of trade, and the employment which it has given to our own people here, as I maintain, tended largely to increase the prosperity of this country. I know, Sir, that hon. gentlemen on the other side were very slow last year in admitting that there had been any change in the condition of the country, and it is only now when the evidence has grown so strong as to be incontrovertible that they admit that the country is exceedingly prosperous. But they say that this is all due to Providence, and that it is impious on the part of the Government to claim any share in the change. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that the members of the Government, when they claimed any hand in effecting this change in the condition of the country, reminded him of the Africans who went to the missionaries to purchase gun medicine to make their guns shoot straight. The hon. gentleman told a number of other stories in which colored gentlemen figured. In fact all through his speech there was very strong coloring, but the hon. gentleman laid such unction on the story of the gun medicine that I feel like obliging him by telling him a little African story. I remember very many years ago that a gentleman in Halifax invited me to go and spend a day shooting with him in the neighborhood. We procured a gun each and went to one of the colored settlements. One of the young Africans attached himself to our party and went into the woods with us. The young colored man rather preferred the city gentleman at first and followed him, but after a number of shots had been fired by my friend with no effect, he left him and came back to me and said: "Massa, don't you think there's a spell on that man's gun?" I said: "A spell, what do you mean?" He said: "There are some people who can put a spell on your gun, and it makes the gun so that it will never shoot straight afterwards. The shot comes right back, or else it goes around a corner. Daddy lent a gun to a man once and it came back with the spell on it, and it never shot straight afterwards, but would shoot round corners." The hon. member for North Norfolk, in 1876, had a protection gun, which shot true to the mark every time and made a bulls-eye. But the hon. gentleman lent himself to party interests, and the spell of party spirit was put on his gun and he has been shooting around corners ever since.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. His spell was not the go-spel.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), in his list of promises, gives some insight into the theological opinions of the party to which he belongs. The hon. gentleman tells us what the party to which he belongs believe, or rather what they profess to believe. He tells us that his party profess to be strong on foreordination and election. Ex-Governor Vance once had a negro servant who was also very strong on foreordination and election. He said to his servant one day: "Peter, do you think I am elected to be saved." "I do not know, Massa; I never knew of anybody being elected without being a candidate and working for it." These hon. gentlemen hold to the opinion that Providence foreordained everything, but the fact is that they never were candidates for the good times; they never worked in co-operation with Providence to bring them about, and hence they were not elected. We find, in 1876 and 1878, that in the Governor General's speech they return thanks to Providence for the abundant harvest, so that it seems that during their Administration the sun shone, the dew fell, and the rain descended, and there was an abundant harvest. The hon. gentleman makes another promise. He promises to have sympathy now and in future, with every move made in the direction of human progress." They may have had that sympathy for the struggling manufacturers of the country, up to 1878, but instead of doing anything for them they folded their arms and said they were flies on the wheel, and that the manufacturers might struggle on and contend against the inflow of slaughter invoices, which were coming in from the United States. They had sympathy, but nothing more; but the men who now administer the affairs in this Government, claim that they will not only sympathize with those struggling in the direction of human progress, but will lend a helping and a protecting hand to help them forward in their efforts for progress. They tell us that the farmer has not been benefitted under this policy, but I would ask how can it be possible that with all the circulation of money that is going through the various industries of the country, there should be such an increase of expenditure within the country, with 24,000 workmen—as my hon. friend pointed out—to be fed, and 80,000 to 100,000 dependents upon them, how it is possible that there can be this expenditure taking place without affecting the condition of the farming population. Now hon. gentlemen take the ground that it is impossible to do this, because they say that the prices of the Canadian farmers' grain is fixed in Mark Lane. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, why it is that these prices are fixed in Mark Lane. I tell the hon. gentleman that it is because England protected her manufacturing and mining industries for many years and increased the population engaged in those industries over and above the agricultural interests. I was referring, before recess, to the manufacturing extent of that country and mentioned what was in my mind, as the extent of the whole territory of the country instead of the manufacturing districts; but taking the whole country you will find that agriculture has reached a higher perfection in England than in any other county in the world almost, and that the average yield of wheat per acre in England is in excess of that in America or any country of Europe. Now, why is it that in England there is such a demand for grain? Why is it, as the hon. gentleman says, that she fixes the price of the grain from this country and the United States? It is because by protection she has fostered a great mining industry, because by protection many years ago she created a great manufacturing industry, and a great commercial industry depending on it; and, in conse-

Mr. McLELAN.

quence of the existence of these three great industries, she is obliged to send to America for the food required by the population thus created. The hon. member for North Norfolk will tell the hon. member for Gloucester that there is great advantage in having these people brought near to the farmer, instead of 2,000 miles away. Now, if the price of Canadian grain is fixed in Mark Lane, so is that of American grain, and both stand on an equal footing in that respect. Why then do the people of this country desire reciprocity with the United States? It is because we live alongside of the manufacturing population of the United States, who consume everything that the farmer has to produce, and who would afford a better market than we now possess for our agricultural produce. But we are not able to secure reciprocity, and we must do the next best thing: we must create these manufacturing industries within our own borders, and within reach of our own farmers, in order that they may enjoy increased prices. But, Mr. Speaker, let me strengthen my position, because not only cereals, but all the other various products of the farm, are affected by close proximity to large manufacturing centres of population. I take half-a-dozen of the great grain-growing States and compare them with the same number of manufacturing States. The State of Illinois had, in 1870, a population of 1,809,606 over ten years of age, of whom 365,754, or 20 per cent, were engaged otherwise than in agriculture; that State, in 1879, yielded 312,000,000 bushels of corn and 44,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the average value per acre of her produce was \$12.47. In the State of Indiana 16 per cent. of the population are engaged otherwise than in agriculture, and the average value of the produce is about the same; in the State of Iowa the average value per acre of produce is \$8.88; in the State of Kansas—a favorite State with some hon. gentlemen opposite—19 per cent. of the population are engaged otherwise than in agriculture, and the value per acre of the produce is \$9.11; in Minnesota—another of the hon. gentlemen's favorite States—the average value of the produce is \$10.29; and in Nebraska, the average value of the produce is \$8.60 per acre. In all these States the average of the population engaged in pursuits other than agriculture is 19.13, and the average value per acre of the produce is \$10.67. These are the great grain-growing States of the Union: let us compare with them the great manufacturing States. In Connecticut 35 per cent. of the population, over ten years of age, are engaged in manufacturing industries, and the average value per acre of the farm produce is \$16.82; in Delaware 26 per cent. of the population are engaged in manufacturing, and the average value of the farm produce is \$15; in Maine, which is often counted as one of the poorest States, 25 per cent. are engaged in manufacturing, and the value of the farm produce is \$13.51, which is higher than that of any of the grain-growing States; in Massachusetts, 43 per cent. of the population are engaged in manufacturing, and the average value of the farm produce is \$26.71; in New Jersey, 34 per cent. of the population are engaged in manufacturing, and the average value of the farm produce is \$18; in Pennsylvania, a great mining district, nearly 30 per cent. of the population are engaged in manufacturing, and mining, and the average value per acre of the farm products is \$17.68; in Rhode Island, 44 per cent. of the people are engaged in manufacturing, and the average value of the farm produce is \$29.32 per acre. In the whole of these great manufacturing States, where the farmers have their market at their own doors, the average value of the farm produce is \$19.69 per acre, against \$10.67 per acre in the great grain-growing States, or nearly two to one. If we, by the encouragement of our manufacturing industries, increase the population who do not follow the pursuit of agriculture, we create a large consuming population in the midst of our farmers, and thus furnish a ready market for our produce.

The position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that we should content ourselves with the production of raw material for the rest of the world to use in manufactures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You touch them on the raw there.

Mr. McLELAN. The position of the hon. member for Lambton is that we should have free trade in American goods just the same as we have in lands, and the hon. member for North Norfolk on this position said that the people who have got the start in manufacturing are the people who will hold that position unless you intervene with a protective policy. The hon. gentleman said, the other night, there had never been an honest quotation made from his speech in 1876.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The speech was not honest.

Mr. McLELAN. My right hon. friend was not here when I took the position that it was an honestly prepared and delivered speech, before a spell was cast on the hon. member's mind; before this question of the National Policy had assumed that strong party aspect it has now. But that hon. gentleman said no person will assert it is proper to protect industries that are not natural and adapted to the country, but when they are suited to the country it is the duty of the Government to foster them. Manufactures do not spring up readily on a virgin soil, their tendency is to remain in a beaten track; now if we adopt the policy of the hon. gentleman and let in a flood of American manufactures, trade would follow the beaten track and we would have to content ourselves with the production of raw material to supply the American manufacturers. What benefit can it be to the farmers of this country to have even a large number of men employed in producing the raw material? There is no great amount of skill required to cut down a tree, or take out the ore, and the rates of wages paid to those engaged in those operations are always low—so low that the men have just enough to obtain the bare necessities of life—and have no money to expend in the purchase of those articles which make the profit of the farmer. Encourage manufactures and the people acquire a higher degree of skill, and obtain higher rates of wages, so that they have a surplus, after purchasing the necessities of life, to expend in articles that bring profit to the farmer. Manufacturers are paying from \$2 to \$5 per day to the men they employ, and one man at \$5 a day is of greater benefit to the farmer than a dozen who would earn 80 cents per day, because he has more money to spend outside the bare necessities of life. You must consider, not alone, the number of men you employ, but also the rate of wages paid. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take the Maritime Provinces under their care, and lament that there is such a falling off in the shipping. True, there has been a decrease in the construction of vessels, but the reason has been explained, time and again, namely, the change from wood to iron. The hon. gentlemen seem to be very much grieved that there is not a much larger fleet in the United States. Why, the United States commercial fleet ranks second in the world. If the language of hon. gentlemen opposite were taken to indicate their feelings it would seem they desired the United States should rank higher than Great Britain. I have turned my attention to this, and it is not because of any increased burdens that have been placed on the construction of ships,—not at all. There is no man acquainted with the construction of ships that will pretend to say there is any greater burden now than there was before the adoption of this policy; but one of the main arguments used up to 1878 was, that we would destroy the commerce of the country, internal and external.

If hon. gentlemen would just turn to the records, they would find that not only has there been an increase of sea-going vessels visiting the Dominion during the past year over 1878, but a marvellous increase of coasting and inland navigation as well. Take the entries inwards and outwards, of sea-going vessels: In 1878, there were 17,000 vessels, 6,684,000 tons; and, in 1881, 20,762 vessels, 8,104,331 tons, or an increase in the latter year of 3,246 vessels, 1,420,334 tons. In the coasting inwards and outwards the year 1881 shows an increase over 1878 of 2,189,300 tons, or, taking the coasting inland and the sea-going together, you have an increase of 3,609,083 over 1878, so that the assertion of the hon. gentleman that this policy is destroying our commerce with the world and our trade among ourselves falls to the ground when you come to figures and hard facts. The hon. Minister of Railways also showed the House the enormous increase there was in railway carriage; in 1881, the tons carried were 12,102,245; in 1878, the quantity was 7,000,000 odd tons, the increase being 4,218,000 tons, and in receipts \$7,787,000. So that both by sea and land, by ship and rail, the position of hon. gentlemen opposite has been taken away and it has been demonstrated that our policy has not had the effect of decreasing our trade. We had a visit from a number of distinguished gentlemen belonging to the Opposition down to the Lower Provinces, with the purpose, if we can judge by their arguments, of destroying that trade, and of crushing out that inland trade. The leader of the Opposition accompanied by a number of gentlemen, a band of missionaries, visited us last summer to prove to us, as one of the gentlemen put it, that we who voluntarily accepted the National Policy are as much deserving the commiseration and attention of political missionaries as are the heathen. I remember that a gentleman, having heard the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), one of the devoted band, in his little speech in which he endeavored to show that it was their duty as missionaries to come down and break the bonds under which the people of the Maritime Province were held—having heard the speeches by the missionaries, said:

"I feel like quoting the words of the old Master of the Rolls of Nova Scotia, when he was running an election against a deacon. I feel like saying, how pleasant are the footsteps of these devoted missionaries, through the hills and valleys of Nova Scotia; how beautiful on the mountain tops are the footsteps of these devoted missionaries, shod with a preparation of the gospel—the gospel according to Edward Blake—and heel-tapped with all the misrepresentations of the party."

This band of missionaries came down and endeavored to persuade the people of Nova Scotia that they were in the dark; that while we were creating a great internal trade and were, by our policy, protecting our people from undue competition from abroad, but giving the freest trade within our own territory, it was the duty of the people of the Maritime Provinces to cease trading with Canada, and trade with the United States. At meeting after meeting, the hon. the leader of the Opposition labored with that argument, to show that the people of the Maritime Provinces should trade with the United States.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not so.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand the hon. gentleman says it is not so. The speeches of the hon. gentleman were reported on so many occasions by his own friends, and the arguments by which he endeavored to persuade the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, that the true course was to trade with the United States, were so often published and repeated that I did not think it was worth while to gather them and bring them here; but I happen to have by me a little speech which he made at Newcastle, when he was taking his departure from the Province, in which he made an incidental reference to this point; and I may say that in that speech he repeats the idea that they entered as

missionaries and departed in the same character. He said:

"The scheme of this world is an harmonious, not a contradictory one. Therefore, when we use our best endeavors to spread the blessed doctrine of free trade, we act in the spirit of the gospel."

But the hon. gentleman said:

"We should leave each Province and man free to make the best of their own, and labor for greater freedom of trade with the United States as well. The Government's policy hinders such a result. Quebec interests, like those of the Maritime Provinces, lie in the direction of as free a trade as possible with the United States, and Ontario was equally desirous of having closer commercial relationship with the people over the border. He hoped that instead of maintaining a retaliatory policy against each other—a policy by which we both lose—both countries would abandon it. If they did not, it was no reason why we should continue it for 'half a loaf is better than no bread.'

Mr. MILLS. Is that not so?

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says: "Is that not so?" It depends a great deal on who has the half-loaf. You want to give the whole loaf to the United States. You believe in the spirit of the gospel according to Mr. Blake, revised and approved by Brother Jonathan, that it is more blessed to give than to receive; that we ought to give Americans the privilege of sending their goods here whether they accord to us a like privilege or not. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in a speech at New Glasgow, as reported in the *Eastern Chronicle*, a Grit paper, said:

"If you had not been at liberty to exchange your property you would find it useless to continue to produce more than you required for your personal wants, for you could not get rid of it. To restrict or prevent you from exchanging what you desire to exchange would be a restriction against which you would rebel. Restrictions which have a tendency to divert trade from its natural channels are injurious to the country: *Your natural channel of trade is with the neighboring Republic. Your exports will find the best market there, and your imports should come from there*; but that natural channel of trade has been to a considerable extent restricted by the revenue necessities of that country. This country also requires a revenue, which must be derived from indirect taxes; but the very moment you put a tax upon an article capable of exportation, that moment you apply the restrictive principle."

The hon. gentleman is reported in a Charlottetown paper as having spoken thus: "Your natural channel of trade is with the neighboring Republic. Your exports will find the best market there." And again he says: "Your natural market is the United States; that country will be your market for potatoes and a large number of other articles," and so forth. But the whole tendency of the argument of the hon. gentleman is that we in the Maritime Provinces should cease to trade with Old Canada and go to the United States.

Mr. ANGLIN. No.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. Minister of Customs made some reference to this subject in the earlier part of the Session. Now let us see what will be the effect of adopting the policy which the leader of the Opposition proclaimed from almost every platform in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward's Island last summer. What does the hon. gentleman suppose the trade of the Lower Provinces is worth to Quebec and Ontario? In 1864, the last year before Confederation we imported \$12,604,642 worth of goods into Nova Scotia, and, in 1865, there was an increase to \$13,087,000. The hon. gentleman will not pretend to say that, previous to Confederation when everything that came from all the other Provinces was counted in the imports, and when of those \$13,000,000 worth of goods only \$500,000 came from Ontario and Quebec, the trade between those Provinces could have been anything like so large as at present? What were the imports of Nova Scotia in 1881? The total imports, outside of what came from Ontario and Quebec, reached \$7,052,000. Do you suppose the people of Nova Scotia have grown so poor that in 1865 when there were only 350,000 or 360,000 people, that they imported more goods than in 1881, when they had increased their population by

Mr. McLELAN,

100,000, and participated in all the increased wealth of this great country, that they imported goods worth only \$7,000,000 odd, in 1881, as against \$13,000,000 in 1865? No; the consumption in 1881 was greatly increased, but the supply was from home produce or from Quebec and Ontario. The amount of goods we purchased from Ontario and Quebec will be judged by the great diminution in the foreign imports from 1867 down to 1881. Our imports from the States, in 1864, were \$4,303,000, in 1881, only \$2,216,000.

Mr. ANGLIN. What about the effect of the Reciprocity Treaty?

An hon. MEMBER. The National Policy has done it.

Mr. ANGLIN. No.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman wants to know what effect the Reciprocity Treaty had. I tell him the import of dutiable goods into Nova Scotia from the United States, in the five years previous to 1865, had increased 21½ per cent. under the Reciprocity Treaty; the importation of goods, subject to duty outside the Treaty, had decreased 20 to 21 per cent. But now with internal trade between the Provinces, the imports into Nova Scotia from the United States, have fallen off from the amount in 1864, \$2,000,000. The arguments of the leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia were that we should cease purchasing goods from Quebec and Ontario; that we should increase our purchases from the United States instead; that our trade should flow in its "natural channels," and that we should deal with our natural customers, the people of the United States. If you followed out the hon. gentleman's argument, you might go into this great North-West which we are spending such large amounts, and into which the tide of immigration is setting so strongly and say: "Stop the trade with Ontario and Quebec, and deal with the United States." If the hon. gentleman does not want to break up the political union by his advice, he did his utmost to break up the commercial union between the Provinces. If the hon. gentleman came to power, and should say to the western and other Provinces: "You must not trade with Quebec and Ontario, we shall arrange to have our trade flow in its natural channels;" if he should say to the North-West people: "Your natural channel is the road to St. Paul—get all your goods from that place and stop importing \$5,000,000 worth of goods from Ontario," these Provinces would suffer beyond calculation. The hon. member for Lambton said the other night, in speaking of the deficits under his Government, that, in 1856 or 1857, under a previous Government, there were deficits very much larger. As a matter of course there were deficits, because there were not customers enough for the goods of Ontario and Quebec; there was no internal trade—no sufficient circulation among the people to enable them to purchase goods, and the want of that circulation from 1874 to 1878, from the same cause, produced the deficits in 1877 and 1878. If you cut off the trade of the Upper Provinces, you will return to the days of poverty and deficits, and the loss to Ontario and Quebec will be incalculable. Artemus Ward said of Jefferson Davis, when he was attempting to break up the Union, that it would have been better than \$10 in his pocket if he had never been born. And if the leader of the Opposition succeeded in carrying out that policy, it might be said of him also that it would have been better than \$10 had he never been politically born—better than that he should go into Ontario suffering from the effects of that policy. We do not feel disposed to accept the policy and arguments of the hon. gentleman; nor do I think that any very large proportion of the people of Nova Scotia accepted the policy he laid down. I do not think his own friends were willing to accept the doctrines which he propounded. We were pleased

to have them come down and visit us and see our country. We were pleased with the eloquent speeches the hon. gentleman delivered on most occasions, although they contained sentiments and propositions which the people were not disposed to accept. So we had nothing to complain of in the hon. gentleman's going down, but all we complained of was as to the manner of his going. What we had to complain of in that visit was that he announced it so many months before he went, and kept us so long in the suspense of waiting for the policy that would carry the whole Province, as we feared. It was the long long suspense that was painful to us. Carlyle, when travelling in the north of Scotland, was very much annoyed at the crowing of a cock in one of the neighbor's yards at the house where he slept. In the morning he was in great wrath, and at breakfast, stating what had been the disturbance of the night, he went out and found the old lady who owned the rooster in the adjoining garden, and fell to berating her. She said: "Oh! Mr. Carlyle, he did not crow so very loud, nor so very often." Said Carlyle: "Woman, I dinna mind the crowing of your old rooster, but you dinna ken how I suffered a'tween whiles waiting for the crowing." So, Mr. Speaker, it was the long, long months of suspense that was painful to us, and now you dinna ken what we poor blue-noses suffered waiting for the cock of the pairty to crow. You know that hope deferred maketh the heart sick, and so even his friends were sick with suspense, waiting for him so many months, but they were a very much sicker crew when he went away. The Grit countenance, after the elections in Colchester and Pictou, was a study; they were solemn as a tombstone. But when the hon. gentleman had come and gone, they had stretched out as long as a grave yard fence. The hon. gentleman came down with no policy that reached the political heart and aroused the enthusiasm of his followers, or gave them any hopes of a change of Government for this Dominion. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not complain of that visit nor the result of it; but I am sure that if the policy he propounded there were adopted, the whole country would soon have reason to complain, both of the policy and of the hon. gentleman who would impose it upon this country. The whole tendency of the Opposition has been, not only to diminish the internal trade of the country, but to belittle the country in every possible manner, and by all possible means. The position of the two parties was this: that the party now governing the country claim to be able to improve it and to render it prosperous, and their position is dependent upon their success; the party in Opposition deny this and are aiming and determining that this country shall be a poor one, and that the promises and the hopes of the Administration shall not be realized. On every possible occasion when a statement is made that this country is prospering, that our industries are increasing, that new manufactures are springing up, we have hon. gentlemen opposite denying it and trying to create the impression that there is no industrial prosperity and that the country is not advancing. We have hon. gentlemen opposite even going so far—going beyond what has ever been done in any civilized country—I believe, declaring that the Census taken is a fraud, declaring that we have not increased in population and creating the impression abroad that we are not advancing at the rate the Census shows. If we have good lands in the North-West, if we have a valuable country there, the hon. gentlemen opposite again tell us, and tell the world, that there are better lands and a better country for agriculturists across the borders in the United States. So often have they done this and derided and belittled their own country, that their speeches now form part of the land advertisements of land agents in the United States. But, Sir, the opposition the hon. gentlemen have brought to this policy

has not been successful. All their efforts to belittle this country have not stopped its growth. We know not how much it has hindered this country, but it has not altogether stopped the growth of this Canada of ours.

"Ours is no sapling, chance sown by the fountain;
Blooming in summer, in winter to fade."

Ours is a strong, a vigorous plant, hardy as the oak that strikes its root to the soil and spreads its branches to the sunshine. This Canada of ours stretches far outward to the Atlantic to catch the first beams of the morning sun, and goes with that sun westward to the far off Pacific. Growing in the sunshine, hardening in the storm, it shall strengthen through all the coming years. It shall grow and harden and strengthen so long as the seasons come and go, so long as agriculture yields her food to man and beast. This Canada of ours will increase so long as commerce interchanges and distributes the varied productions of the earth. It will prosper so long as manufactures exist. It will increase and prosper, so long as there are human hands to throw the shuttle in the loom, to drive the locomotive on the rail, to guide the ship on the sea, to draw the fish from the depths. It will abide in strength so long as there are hands to draw the furrow, and plant the seed, and gather the harvest, and be uplifted in gratitude to Him who hath given so largely, so liberally, so bountifully of everything that is necessary to make a great country. How liberally, how bountifully, have we been dealt with? We have countless acres of soil, rich as the hand of man ever strewed with seed for grain, or planted with flower for beauty. We have great storehouses, inexhaustible mines of every mineral substance that can minister to man's comfort, and make for his adornment. We have in the North almost measureless forests, that give, when the wind, that grand old harper, strikes the pines, the music of work and wealth. We have lake joined to lake, great inland seas and rolling down from them magnificent rivers, affording facilities for a vast internal trade, which the hon. gentlemen opposite would seek to destroy. Whilst the great oceans whose billows beat on opposite shores connect us with the commerce of the world and bring to us in their fisheries a perpetual harvest of food and wealth. When I think of all these things I am thankful that there is a great party—the great Liberal Conservative Party—in this country who have realized the full value of these resources, and that they are ready to discharge the responsibility which rests on us to develop them. And I am proud to stand here to-night an humble member of a Government commissioned by the people in 1878, and consecrated to the work of guarding the interest and protecting the industrial rights of the 4,000,000 of men and women who inhabit this country—men worthy of the great races from which they sprang—women who, with their beauty, their grace and their intelligence, will transmit to the coming generations all those high qualities which have made the name of France and Britain so glorious in all history—4,000,000 of men and women who, guarded in their interests and protected in their rights, will go forward to develop the resources committed to their care and make of this country a nation of which all the nationalities of civilization shall be proud.

Mr. FLYNN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is the last man that I should have expected to see stand up in this House to defend a high protective Tariff. It will be remembered, Sir, that at the time that a Union of the British North American Colonies was proposed, among the many arguments that were urged in Nova Scotia against Confederation, there was none more prominently brought forward, none more often used, than that the taxation of the people of Nova Scotia would be largely increased by Confederation. Among the men who opposed the Union of the Colonies on that occasion, the member for Colchester (Mr. McLellan) was a prominent man, and there was no man

among that party who, from the platform, and from his place in the old Parliament of Nova Scotia, advocated that particular view more strongly than did the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McLelan), so I cannot but express my surprise to find the hon. gentleman to-night defending a high protective Tariff, and one that bears so unequally and unfairly in his native Province. It is not my intention to follow that hon. gentleman through his long speech. It would be impossible for me to follow him if I desired, because it appears to me that a great many of his remarks had little bearing on the question before the House. He employs to-night the same brilliant oratorical powers and the same splendid peroration in which he magnified the extent of this vast Dominion—the same brilliant language which he now uses to laud up the Dominion to the skies he used in the old Parliament of Nova Scotia in belittling Confederation, and teaching the people of that Province that they would commit the grossest error, and make the grandest mistake of their lives, if they linked their destinies with that of the Confederation. The hon. gentleman has referred to the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the Tariff in 1876. The charge of inconsistency has often been made against that hon. member with regard to that speech. The changes have been wrong upon it in this House, and the charge has gone to the country that he had shown himself to be inconsistent on the subject of Protection. But it is to be noticed that those who make these charges quote only the opening portion of the speech. Is it fair to take an isolated extract from a speech of two or three hours duration, and say that some particular position was the one which he assumed. The hon. member for North Norfolk at the conclusion of that very speech stated very distinctly what he meant by a protective Tariff. The Tariff then was a Tariff of 17½ per cent. *ad valorem*, and the hon. gentleman went that far in the direction of Protection and no further.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FLYNN. I will read what the hon. gentleman said :

"In conclusion, I may state that I am desirous of doing everything calculated to promote the manufacturing interests of this country. But, looking from my standpoint, I believe that the present Tariff is adequate ; that at all events to demonstrate its inadequacy will require more time. I heartily endorse the policy of the Finance Minister in declining to advance the rate beyond 17½ per cent."

Mr. BOWELL. How does that affect the argument ?

Mr. FLYNN. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there is no protection in 17½ per cent.; that that is Free Trade, but surely that Tariff gives protection to a very considerable extent. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), was more consistent than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The latter has alluded to the Fishery Award as due to the present Government. All I shall say on this subject is, that it was during the time of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) that the matter was brought to a conclusion. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who preceded him in his Department was an excellent and a vigilant officer. I wish to take no credit from him to which he is fairly and honorably entitled, for I believe he discharged the duties of his office well ; but, at the same time, the whole matter was negotiated and brought to a termination during the period when the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McLelan) spoke of the decline of manufactures and imports in England. I think he stated that the manufacturing industries had declined in that country. I wish to read from a speech, delivered before

Mr. FLYNN.

the Chamber of Commerce at Leeds, by Mr. Gladstone, on that subject :

"His country, whose life-blood the vampire of Free Trade is insidiously sucking—(cheers and laughter)—let us see what share in this little island we have got of the trade of the world. In 1880, our trade with the world amounted to £693,000,000 in value—the largest, I believe, imports and exports taken together, and, of course, re-export—the largest ever known. In 1873, or the year of our greatest exports, I believe the total trade represented £682,000,000 ; but I will take our worst year, 1879, which was the year of that darkness which called forth all the owls and bats in the country, and sent them creaking about (laughter) in order to disturb us, and, if possible, to teach us to walk in the ways of another policy. In 1879, it is quite true, the trifling sum of £612,000,000 was all that passed through our hands in this business of exchange in a population of 35,000,000 people. Let us compare the trade and population of some other countries. The German Empire, with 40,000,000 of people, had £371,000,000 of trade. The United States, with 50,000,000 of people had £239,000,000 of external trade, most of which, an enormous share in which, as you know, was owing to our demand for the food and provisions which, thank God, she produces ; and these two countries together—two of the most civilized countries of the world, and both of them highly productive—with a population of 90,000,000 had a trade of £610,000,000, while we, with 35,000,000 of people, had a trade of £612,000,000. (Loud cheers.) So that, comparing ourselves with these great and intelligent countries, man for a man, you have nearly three times the amount of trade that is in their hands. Take again three other countries, which I take on account of the large figures which represent their high place in the trade of the world. France has £313,000,000 of trade with 36,000,000 of population. Russia has £183,000,000 of trade, with 80,000,000 people. Holland has £116,000,000 of trade, a great deal of which, as you know, is transit trade for the supply of the interior parts of the Continent ; she has 5,000,000 people. There, again, we have a population of 121,000,000 with a trade of \$612,000,000, exactly that which in the disastrous year of 1879 fell to our share with a population of 35,000,000.

That clearly proves that England, under a Free Trade policy, has not certainly declined in her industries. I said, in opening my remarks, that I was surprised at the position taken by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McLelan) with regard to the high protective Tariff, and on that subject I wish to quote from a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman in 1865, in the Nova Scotia Assembly, in reference to the question of Confederation and the increased taxation which it would inflict on the country. In the extract he is reported to have said :

"Confederation, instead of extending the commerce and developing the natural products of this country, will rather cripple trade. I have already shown that Confederation must necessarily impose upon us a very heavy Tariff and exceedingly large burthens. The consequence of that is to increase the cost of living and producing the articles of export, and when you increase the cost of living and of wages, you are unable to compete with other countries in the sale of your coal and fish and other articles which Nova Scotia is especially calculated to produce."

That speech was delivered in 1865. Again, during the first meeting of this Parliament after Confederation, in 1867, when the Minister of Customs of that day introduced his Tariff, in which he proposed to impose a duty of 25 cents a barrel on flour, the hon. President of the Council made a speech, in which he said :

"The Minister of Customs assumes that there being no duty between the Provinces, that we shall purchase largely in Canada, and so escape duty. It may be that while goods from other markets are shut out by a 15 per cent. Tariff, that we may get some articles from Canada, but they will, in all probability, cost the consumer more than if we could get them from England and elsewhere by paying 10 per cent. The fact that while we had in Nova Scotia the same rate on manufactured goods from all countries, we did not import from Canada, proves that manufactured goods there are not sold so cheap as in other countries. And if we do, hereafter, import from Canada, the consumer will pay as high or higher for the goods than when admitted from England at 10 per cent., the difference being that the money goes to the Canadian manufacturer, and not the Treasury for the public benefit."

The hon. gentleman went on to show that the increase on certain staple goods then proposed in the Tariff—which was to be only a 15 per cent. Tariff, much below the present one, and in which many articles now taxed were on the free list—would increase the taxation in the Province of Nova Scotia to the extent of \$35,000. He also said :

"The Minister of Customs in commencing his speech stated that the object was to present to the House such a statement of figures and facts that no Unionist should return to his people in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, hanging his head in shame on account of increased taxation."

But what has he shown? That, on the bread and articles necessary for the sustenance and comfort of the poor man, there is a large increase of taxation, while in the rich man's wines and brandy there is a reduction. Sir, I scarcely think that any Unionist will venture to hold up his head and attempt to justify Confederation with the argument furnished by the hon. gentleman's explanation of the result of this Tariff. But it matters little to the poor man what saving there may be on luxuries. His complaint will be, as ours is, that you tax the bread and necessaries of life."

That was what the hon. gentleman said in 1867. It was taxing the bread of the poor man then to impose a duty of 25 cents a barrel on flour, but to-day it is not taxing the poor man's bread to impose 50 cents a barrel, 100 per cent. more. To further show the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman, I may quote some questions which are put to him by a correspondent belonging to his own county, in to-day's *Globe*:

"Why did you, at a meeting in your own village, when answering A. G. Archibald, draw a map on the wall to show that the proposed Confederation would comprise a 'narrow strip of land,' and that Nova Scotia was at the extreme end, and had no natural relationship with the Upper Provinces? Why did you tell us that, if we were confederated, that we would have to buy largely of Ontario, and sell her people nothing in return? Why did you tell us that Ontario would send us her beef, butter, cheese and all kinds of manufactured goods, and take little or nothing from us except the 'hard cash,' and get that as we could? Why did you repeat to us a thousand times that the raising of our Tariff from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent. would entail upon us a taxation grievous to be borne? But more, in 1867 you told us that a Tariff of 15 per cent. was the most outrageous taxation that ever was imposed, and if we were only strong enough it should never be collected. You told us too, what has since come true, that the Tariff could not long remain at 15 per cent., for the Tariff of old Canada had been brought down from 20 per cent. to 15 for the express purpose of catching Nova Scotia. In 1881, you have a new tune. A Tariff that averages nearly 30 per cent., about double your ruinous 15—is the most glorious piece of legislation ever enacted by any Parliament. What made the change?"

Now, Sir, I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman any further in the speech he has made. I think the extracts which I have given from his own speeches prove that if ever a man was inconsistent in his public utterances that man is the hon. President of the Council. We have been told by that hon. gentleman, as well as by the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. Minister of Finance, that this country is in a flourishing condition. The hon. the Finance Minister drew a glowing picture of the prosperity of this country, which he attributed entirely to the National Policy. Now Sir, there are portions of this country which have not yet participated in that prosperity; there are portions which have felt, and are still feeling, the evil effects of the National Policy. It is true that Providence has blessed this country with good harvests; the farmer has received good prices for the products of his farm; the lumber industry, which for many years was in a depressed condition, has revived; and there is a general revival of trade. But this revival is certainly not due to the National Policy, but in spite of it, as it has certainly added to the cost of the production of lumber and other goods. But the hon. Minister of Finance has told us that a protective policy was necessary to the material advancement of this country. Now, let me refer that hon. gentleman to a period in 1873 when he occupied the same position in the Government that he occupies to-day, when he came down with his Budget he then drew a vivid picture of the prosperity of this country and the wonderful increase in trade and in large banking institutions. Yet all this was under the 15 per cent. Tariff. Now, if the general trade of the country advanced under this 15 per cent. *ad valorem* duty, if under it the manufacturing institutions of the country flourished and were prosperous, it proves this fact, that it is not necessary to the material advancement of the country to have a high protective Tariff. Let me refer him back to a period some years before that, under the old Province of Canada. Then for a period of nearly ten years, under a high protective Tariff, they had hard times and a general depression in trade, and in every branch of industry, and the Government which then ruled were forced

to meet Parliament with annual deficits. We have had good times under a revenue Tariff and we have had bad times and general depression under a high protective Tariff. But this only proves that either under a revenue or protective Tariff you may have periods of depression, with this difference: that with a protective Tariff you approach depression by imposing burdens on the people when they are least able to bear them. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech of this and last Session, tried to convince the country and the House, that, under this Tariff, the people are getting goods cheaper than they were under the Tariff of 1873, and, in order to establish this point, he read letters from several manufacturers which he calls reliable *data*. I consider this is not a fair way to put the question. If the hon. Minister of Finance wishes to put this question fairly he had better give us the opinion of somebody else as well as the manufacturers. He had better write down to the lumbermen, fishermen, merchants and other people in the Maritime Provinces and get their opinion; or, better still, let him visit those Provinces and interview the people there. Let him ask their opinion of this Tariff, and whether they consider they are getting goods cheaper. I will engage, they will show him it is not a fact; he will find that the people pay more for woollen and cotton goods, and have more difficulty in making both ends meet, than they had before. Now, Sir, much has been said about the prosperity of this country. I admit that some parts of the country have prospered in a very great degree, owing to the revival of trade, but other parts have not. Now, I contend, in several parts of Nova Scotia, and I think it is the same in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, that real estate which, perhaps, is the best test of the prosperity of a country, has fallen as much as 100 per cent. in some places. I am aware that in Halifax, so it has been stated in the press, more laboring men are out of employment, and there is more suffering in that city this winter than for many years previous. Property that sold some time ago, perhaps eight or nine years ago, in the very centre of the business part of Halifax, for \$40,000 was sold only the other day for \$21,000—a reduction of 100 per cent. in the value of that property, which, one would think, should now be more valuable, consisting as it does of stores and wharf property. Now, Sir, the hon. the Minister of Finance told us that woollen and cotton goods were cheaper under this Tariff than under the former. If this is the case, I ask why do the manufacturers of those articles come here and ask for a higher protection to prevent their being slaughtered, as they term it, by American goods. If they can now sell their goods cheaper than before, it seems to me highly absurd to clamor for more protection. We say that the Tariff operates against the poor man and in favor of the rich; that is the contention of those who have spoke on this side of the House, and there can be no doubt that the specific duties are the same on the cheaper cottons, shirtings, flannels, cloth, and other things used by the poor man, as they are on the better quality of goods used by the rich. The poor man pays 10 cents per lb. specific duty for his clothing, and the rich man, who is more luxuriously clad, pays the same. The specific duties are the same for poor and rich on the cheaper kinds of cotton. Why, the Tariff of 1879 nearly doubled the duty on cottons and more than doubled it on woollens which are chiefly used by the poorer classes. Again, Sir, does not your bread tax discriminate against the poor? Why, you have 50 cents per barrel on flour, the same on the poorest grades and cheaper quality used by the poorest people as on the highest quality and dearest kind used by the rich man. Then, Sir, have you not a tax of 40 cents a barrel on corn meal, an article which costs even less than one-half the price of flour, and has a duty upon it nearly the same as flour, and this is used by only the very poor classes. Now, Sir, in the

course of his speech, the Minister of Finance said, in alluding to the people of the Maritime Provinces, that there were some of these things which they did not seem to understand. I must say I thought when he made that statement he was paying a very poor compliment to his countrymen down by the sea. I do not hesitate to say that the people of the Maritime Provinces understand these things and are as well able to judge of them as the people of the other Provinces of this Dominion. In order to show the hon. Minister of Finance that this Tariff discriminates against the poor and in favor of the rich, I will read an extract from a journal published in Charlottetown last summer, it said :

" A leading merchant of this town directed our attention to five items in one entry he was making out. These goods were used chiefly by the poorer classes, fisherman's blankets, cotton tweeds, woollen clothes, &c. Here is the cost and duty paid on them :

Fishermen's Blankets.....	\$ 49.00—Duty is \$ 32.80.
Bale White Cotton.....	383.00— " 126.44.
Flannels ..	74.00— " 19.15.
Woollen Cloths.....	308.00— " 98.00.
Cotton Tweeds.....	132.00— " 34.00.

A total cost, as per invoice, of \$946, with a duty of \$310.39, or an average of 33 cents on the dollar, upon the poor man's coarse blankets 67 cents, and it is within a small fraction of 40 cents on the dollar upon the coarse tweeds worn only by the poorer classes. I will now read from a speech delivered by a merchant of the city of Halifax before the Halifax Chamber of Commerce. This speech was made after the introduction of the present Tariff by Mr. Adam Burns, a large importer of dry goods, a prominent man, and a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us hear what is the opinion of this gentleman on the Tariff, and I presume to testimony like this the hon. Finance Minister will have no objection, coming, as it does, from his own side. On that occasion Mr. Burns said :

" He thought the Tariff was objectionable in many respects, but he did not criticise it in any spirit of hostility to the present Government whom he looked upon as the persons best suited to administer the affairs of this Dominion. One objection he had to the Tariff was the specific duties which were excessive and very unjust to the poor man, cheaper kinds of cloth used by him and the fine broad cloth of the rich man were alike taxed 10 cents per \$1 which all could at once see was unjust to the user of the cheaper material. The speaker instanced cotton batting, wadding, cotton warp, knitting, grey and white cotton, colored cottons for shirtings, flannels and blankets, clothing, tweeds, &c., carpets two ply (such as the majority of the working class use) and many other articles as commending themselves to the favorable consideration of a considerate Finance Minister as needing very little protection and being under the specific duty system enhanced in price greatly to the injury of the class of people least able to bear increased burdens. The specific duties he looked upon as the most obnoxious feature in the Tariff. Our worthy Doctor represented he said in discussing the Tariff, that he thought it unfair that the poor man's serge should be taxed to the same extent as the rich man's broad cloth—what would that gentleman's feelings be when he found the poor man's clothing taxed at the rate of 45 per cent., while the rich man only paid 30 per cent. under this iniquitous, he might almost say diabolical specific duty system. It might be said that the inequality was only apparent, and as manufactures extended things would differ. As a rule, however, our prices would be ruled by those in other countries and manufacturers would pocket larger bonuses. No doubt in time so many would become manufacturers, that they would kill each other and prices would go down so low that the whole basis of business in the Dominion would become unsettled. He denounced the Tariff generally as unnecessarily high, tending to stop healthy competition with outsiders, encourage smuggling, and offer a premium generally to dishonesty."

This was the language used by Mr. Burns on that occasion, and any one who knows him will admit he is a gentleman quite as capable of intelligently discussing the Tariff question, or any other question, as any of the manufacturers of this Dominion. The Halifax Chamber of Commerce is a body which contains very many Conservatives, yet, on that occasion, not one was to be found to defend the Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. In looking over the Trade Returns I find that, in 1881, the imports of foreign cottons reached \$10,244,465, and, of woollen goods, \$8,744,000, making a total of about \$19,000,000. The consumer of these goods pays the duty, but it presses more heavily on the poorer classes

Mr. FLYNN.

under what Mr. Burns terms the diabolical specific duty system. Notwithstanding the statement I have read the Finance Minister has told the House that the people are getting their cotton and woollen goods as cheap as at any time previous to the pre-ent Tariff; but I hold the testimony of Mr. Burns to be worth more than that of interested manufacturers, who have an interest in keeping up the delusion of low prices. We contend that, under this high Tariff, many of the manufacturing establishments are making large profits, and that if that be so the people are paying a great deal of money besides what goes direct into the Treasury. It has been contended by the hon. the Finance Minister that goods are being sold cheaper now than they were before the Tariff. Let me quote the opinion of a Montreal paper supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, the *Canadian Spectator*. Speaking of the cotton factories, it says :

" Nothing can more strikingly illustrate the marvellous prosperity of Canada under its protective Tariff than the condition of the cotton factories in and near Montreal. The annual meeting of the proprietors of several of these establishments have been held during the last few weeks, and the statements presented are said to have been of the most glowing description. In one instance the profits are said to have been \$200,000, equal to 100 per cent. upon the original paid up capital of the company, on a turn over for the year of some \$900,000. We congratulate the fortunate shareholders on their enterprises."

I might say I commiserate the unfortunate tax-payer. We have it announced on good authority that the stock is paying 100 per cent. on the original capital. We have it on good authority that the wages dispensed by one of the companies for this year was some \$90,000, giving employment to 600 souls. It is true that the average rate of wages paid was not very high, being somewhat under 48 cents per day for every man, woman and child employed. Here is the other side of the picture, the dark side. While the fortunate stockholders were securing 100 per cent. on the original stock the wages of the poor laborers averaged only 48 cents a day. One would suppose that when the stockholders were making immense fortunes they would afford something more than such a miserable pittance for their laborers, who had to toil during long hours to earn large dividends for their employers. But no; it does not matter what the wages may be so long as the cotton lords make their money and the National Policy flourishes. Having said so much in regard to the Tariff, I congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance on having at last had the courage to come down and propose something in the shape of a bounty to the fishermen. The hon. gentleman says that the \$150,000 is proposed to be given in lieu of the Fishery Award. It will be remembered that, in 1879, the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo) made a motion here, claiming the Fishery Award for the Maritime Provinces. The Government, on that occasion, took the position that those Provinces were not entitled to it, and they decided against the views entertained by that hon. gentleman and others, who supported him on that occasion. It will be further remembered that at an early period of the Session of 1880, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), introduced a resolution, declaring that the proceeds of the Fishery Arbitration, in right and justice, belonged to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. He supported the view then enunciated in an able and eloquent speech, and was ably sustained by most of the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, who set forth the claims of those Provinces to the Award. How was the gentleman met by hon. gentlemen opposite? The hon. leader of the Government came forward, denying the right of the Maritime Provinces to the Fishery Award, stating that they had neither a legal nor an equitable claim to the money, which belonged to the Dominion Treasury. In short, it has been absorbed into it. Notwithstanding this denial of the hon. gentleman opposite, and this amendment moved and carried by a large majority in that House,

the hon. the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech, stated that we are giving to the fishermen of the Dominion, \$150,000—not as a bounty on fish, but in lieu of their interest in the Fishery Award—thus admitting our claim to that award. Now, if his position is correct, we are entitled to the whole interest on that amount, the \$4,500,000, accumulating from the time it was paid by the United States to the end of the current year, 1882, which, according to the calculation given to the House the other night by the hon. member for Antigonish, exceeds \$800,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. FLYNN. I am glad to hear the hon. leader of the Government say hear, hear.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. He will put it in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman's speech is neither here nor there.

Mr. FLYNN. It is evident that this \$150,000 is but a small instalment of what is due to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. I am afraid it will go but a very short way in making up to them the exactions of the Tariff. It would put but a very small sum into their pockets, as against the very large amount taken out of them by the Tariff. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) asked the hon. the Finance Minister lately if this grant was to be secured by Act of Parliament, or during the existence of the Washington Treaty. The hon. gentleman replied that he would say nothing until the item was submitted to the House. I would much prefer, small as this sum is, to see it secured by Act of Parliament, so as to be sure that the fishermen should possess a guarantee of getting it. No class of people in the Dominion are more entitled to the consideration of the House than the fishermen, whether we look at the extent and value of our fishery exports and trade, or at the risks and dangers to life and property involved in this interest. No class pays more into the revenue than the fishermen, or suffer in a greater degree from the effects of a protective policy. This was one of the arguments to induce the people of that Province to accept Confederation. It was stated by the Minister of Railways and his friends, before Confederation, that a bounty would be given to fishermen. I believe that on the hustings in Halifax, in 1867, a telegram was sent to one of the Union candidates (Mr. Hill), in which it was stated: "You can assure the fishermen of Nova Scotia that they shall have a bounty if we confederate." This despatch was scattered all through the Province, and it was generally believed that a bounty would follow Confederation. But during the seven years that the hon. gentleman held office no bounty was given, and we never heard a word of it till this year, when rumors were current of a general election. What did the President of the Council say on the occasion of the Tariff discussion in reference to the fish bounty in 1867? He said:

"We are told that we may have bounties to fishermen. We have no assurance of this. But if by any possibility we do, I think, from the statement I gave to the House, last night, showing that, even under the old Tariff in force in Nova Scotia, the result of the last five months has given the Dominion Treasury a profit of over \$150,000 out of us in that short period, and from the increase I have shown this Tariff imposes, it follows that if our fishermen get bounties, it will only be a portion of our own taxation."

This statement was made by the President of the Council in 1867, when there was a rumor of the fishermen getting bounties, namely, that they would be receiving only a portion of their taxation. I now come to the subject of coal duties. Both the hon. the Finance Minister and the hon. the Minister of Railways have stated that the increase of the output, from the mines, is due to the National Policy entirely, and that the consumer in Ontario does not pay the

duty on the foreign coal. The hon. the Minister of Finance did not go quite so far as the Minister of Railways. He stated the people of Ontario paid half the duty. I believe that unless the Government can show that they have given, to a large extent, Ontario as a market for the coal of Nova Scotia, the coal duty is a failure. The hon. the Finance Minister stated in the House, in 1879, that the duty would give a market in Ontario for this coal, by displacing 400,000 tons of foreign coal, and that if his policy was successful, the demand for Nova Scotia coal would increase still further. Now, he states his policy is successful beyond his most sanguine expectations. Yet, we find that 400,000 tons of coal have not been sent into Ontario. We have nothing to show that more than 800 tons were sent there, having gone as stated, to Cobourg; but we hear of none having gone anywhere else in that Province. In the Report of the Mines of Nova Scotia, we find that wherever coal is sold the name of the Province or country is given with the quantity sold; but no mention is made of Ontario; therefore, I conclude that no coal has been exported to that Province; and if the Finance Minister's policy has failed to give the markets of Ontario to the coal of Nova Scotia, there is no longer a reason for inflicting on nearly a million of people of the three Maritime Provinces your bread tax, and on the people of Ontario your fuel tax—both sectional—both unjust. As to the 400,000 tons of an increase in sales that he speaks of, the Mines Reports give but 341,503 tons in excess of 1879. I contend that this increase is due to entirely different causes than the National Policy. In the first place it is due to the revival of trade, from which the coal trade as well as other industries has benefitted. It is, in the second place, due to the increased demand for coal in the Lower Provinces, coal taking the place of wood for domestic purposes; in the third place, to the great quantity of Bunker, sold to foreign-going steamers; and, in the fourth place, to the increased sale of coal in foreign markets. I have made a comparative statement of the coal sold in 1879 and in 1881, which I will read. In 1879 the sales of Nova Scotia coal reached 278,120 tons; in 1881, 382,413 tons, or an increase of 104,293 tons. In 1879 the sales in New Brunswick were 84,731 tons, and, in 1881, 123,526 tons, showing an increase over 1879, of 38,796 tons. In 1879, the sales to Newfoundland were 57,651, and, in 1881, 62,174 tons, showing an increase of 5,153 tons. In 1879, the sales to Prince Edward Island were 43,412 tons; in 1881, they were 49,313 tons, showing an increase of 5,901 tons. In 1879, the sales to the United States were 51,641 tons; in 1881, 113,728, showing an increase of 62,087 tons. In 1879, the sales to the West Indies were 10,124 tons; in 1881, 21,600, showing an increase of 11,476. In 1879, the sales to Europe were 10,124 tons; in 1881, 13,612 tons, showing an increase of 3,488 tons, or a total increase over 1879 of 231,163 tons. Here we have an increase in the sales of Nova Scotia coal of 231,163 tons accounted for. Surely the hon. Minister of Finance cannot claim an increased sale of 62,000 tons to the United States, as due to his policy. Surely he cannot claim the increase to Europe and other countries as due to the National Policy. Therefore, he cannot claim an increased consumption of over 100 per cent. These 231,000 tons he cannot lay any shadow of claim to as due to the National Policy. Now, if we take the balance of the increase, and if we can find out the quantities of coal carried in those vessels that are now traversing the Atlantic so frequently, and touch at the mines of Cape Breton and Pictou, and if we include the quantity sold to Quebec, we will account for the increase in the sales of coal in 1881 over 1879. Now, Sir, I am free to admit that the National Policy may have displaced a few tons of English coal in the Province of Quebec, but beyond those few tons it has had no other effect whatever. It has a tendency in

doing that to raise the rates of freight across the Atlantic. It prevents our own shipping, which is in a depressed condition now, from taking coal as ballast, as they were in the habit of doing, and therefore it inflicts a serious injury on the shipping interests, proving that the National Policy, where it benefits one, injures a dozen. But we had the market of Quebec to a large extent before the imposition of a duty. Now, let me refer to our export of coal in 1874 to the Province of Quebec. In one year of depression I find we exported to that Province, 189,574 tons. Now, I may fairly assume that if the revival of trade increased the quantity sent from Nova Scotia to Quebec, that quantity would have been sent without a duty at all on coal. The hon. gentleman stated that his policy of imposing a duty on foreign coal was going to displace 400,000 tons the first year in the Province of Ontario. Has it done so? Not at all. So far from displacing foreign coal from Ontario, the importation of foreign coal has increased. We find the imports of foreign coal, in 1879, amounted to 863,061 tons; in 1880, to 973,610 tons; in 1881, to 1,159,106 tons; or an increase of nearly 300,000 tons, in 1881, over the imports of 1879. Now, so far from shutting out our coal from the Province of Ontario, we have an increased importation into the Dominion of over 300,000 tons. The hon. Minister of Finance claims that this increase in the output on Nova Scotia coal was due to the National Policy. Let me direct him back to the period of 1873, the period that he himself referred to as the golden period of Canada. What was the product of her mines then? I find by the report of 1873, that the coal production of her mines for that year was 1,051,469 tons. I mention this fact to show that when trade was brisk, when there was a demand for coal in foreign markets, the products of our mines in 1873, under a revenue Tariff, when there was no duty on foreign coal, were not as great as in this boasted year of 1881. The coal trade had to share the general depression, like all other trades; but when times changed for the better, then, like other industries, it became more prosperous. Now I propose to read from the official report of the Inspector of Mines for Nova Scotia, in 1878. I propose to show by this document that if the coal industry was suffering under the late Government, it was due to the general depression of trade, that other industries were suffering at the time as well as the coal industry, and that the coal industry was suffering in other countries as well as in Canada. The report says:

"Great Britain and the United States were alike affected by the wave of financial depression, and though coal dealers of these countries also sought relief in exportation, Nova Scotia struggled for a part of the trade with the West Indies, but was overpowered by her powerful competitors controlling return freights."

Now, it was stated by the hon. Minister of Finance that this great increase in the product of coal in 1881 was due to the National Policy. I propose to show that since the opening up of our mines in 1785 the increase has been gradual every decade. It was greatly stimulated after the settlement of the Duke of York's lease, in 1858, by the Nova Scotia Government. He says:

"Comparing the Trade Returns for a number of years, a permanent, though fluctuating progression is noticeable, each decade, roughly speaking, doubling the output of coal. The annual sales of the present time are more than double what they were in 1858, when the trade was opened to competition. This year's output has exceeded that of the often styled prosperous year of 1865, and though it has so, and also that of the preceding year, it is regarded as most unsatisfactory, and naturally so, for it has not been remunerative. But then, nowise has coal-mining generally of late been prosperous in England and the United States. Every one is familiar with the accounts of the extreme destitution and desolation of districts of South Wales, but lately prosperous and thriving; and, in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania, of the collapse of many companies, of the large sacrifices of members to keep their works in operation, and of the hardships endured by workmen forced to accept short time and starvation rate of wages. It is sufficient to call such circumstances to mind, and to remember the conditions of those engaged in the trade abroad, to cause some feelings of resignation that, trying as the times may be for us, they are no worse than with our neighbors. * * * But the conditions involved in the direct and

Mr. FLYNN.

indirect advantages to the trade and in the gain and loss to the country at large by such a tax, are so many, and the whole question is so involved, that I shall not attempt to classify and consider them. It might, however, fairly be asked whether a tax which checked importations from Great Britain would not so raise the rate of freight up the St. Lawrence as to practically defeat the end in view, and increase the homeward freights on grain and lumber. It is also questionable whether a tax would stop the importation of hard coal which we cannot supply. It is certain that by it the exports would not directly be increased, and it is also certain that with it the western consumer of coal must pay it or go back to the use of wood. * * * If the business of coal mining is to be fostered, a bounty is said to have this advantage over a tax: it would not bear unequally on different parts of Canada, nor interfere with the export trade of the St. Lawrence, while it would increase the exportations, and benefit the failing West India trade, while contemplating the several means open for winning the trade of the Upper Provinces."

That was the opinion, in 1878, of Mr. Poole, given in his official report to the Government of that day, and no man was more competent to give an opinion. He was thoroughly conversant with the management of our mines, and he is now discharging the duties of an important position as manager of one of our large collieries. The more I consider the question the more strongly am I convinced that it is impossible to give the market of Ontario to the coal producers of Nova Scotia with a less duty than \$2 per ton. In 1877, a Select Committee was appointed in this House to enquire into the condition of the coal trade. The hon. Minister of Railways was a member of that Committee, and I also was a member. Witnesses were examined, who urged this duty, and based their calculations on the probability of establishing inter-provincial trade with the Upper Provinces. But that inter-provincial trade has never been created, it has been found impossible to compete with the United States, simply because the Pennsylvania mines lie so much closer to Ontario, that the cost of transportation is much less, and the cost of mining is much lower than with us. We have no statistics giving the extent of the trade between the upper and lower Provinces since Confederation. If we had I believe it would show that while our imports from the Upper Provinces have largely increased since Confederation we export very little to them. In 1865-66, the value of Canada exports to the Maritime Provinces was \$1,571,516. In 1866-67, the year of Confederation, they were \$3,418,589—an increase of \$1,847,473, while our exports to the Upper Provinces remained about the same; and I believe if we had the means of finding out the extent of that trade, there is no doubt that the exports from the Lower to the Upper Provinces would be found to be about the same that they were before Confederation. One of the witnesses examined before the Committee to which I have referred, stated that from statistics he had obtained, and from his knowledge of the commerce of Canada, the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland imported, in 1876, from \$10,000,000 to \$11,000,000 worth from the Lower Provinces, while our exports to them were only, \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000. Judging by these facts, the inter-provincial trade has been altogether one-sided. The goods which we could send to the Upper Provinces are not the goods that they will take from us. Much stress has been laid on a statement made by the leader of the Opposition, that Ontario was not the natural market of the Lower Provinces. But who will say that the United States are not the natural market of the Maritime Provinces? Have not they been our natural market for years before Confederation, and has anything which hon. gentlemen have done altered that fact? Will they take our products if we send them to Ontario? They do not take them; and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show by any statistics they can produce that since Confederation they have increased the purchase of goods from the Lower Provinces; so that the hon. leader of the Opposition was not wrong in stating what was an absolute fact and truism, that the natural market of the people of the Maritime Provinces was the United States. It has been

their market in the past; it is their market now, and it will be their market in future. There are physical difficulties in the way of putting our products on the Ontario market. The cost of transportation is too great, while we have our natural market along the sea board of the United States for everything we produce. These hon. gentlemen talk about protection to the farmers, but where are the benefits which the farmers of the Maritime Provinces have received from it? Were their products bought by the manufacturers of Nova Scotia? No, Sir, they find a market for their surplus products in the United States, Newfoundland, and other countries, particularly the United States. They are the people we must trade with, so that no man can reasonably charge the leader of the Opposition with stating what was not absolutely correct in saying that the United States was our natural market. Am I, or is any other inhabitant of the Maritime Provinces, so patriotic, so deeply in favor of inter-provincial trade, that we must send our goods to the Upper Provinces at a lower price than we can obtain in the United States? With regard to the question of sending our coal to Upper Canada, let me read an extract from the report of the Committee on Coal:

"A recent contract made by the Grand Trunk for a supply of steam coal for its locomotives may afford some criterion whereby to judge of the cost at which, without regard to any special arrangements for downward freights, it may be laid down in bulk at Montreal and Toronto respectively. The tenders accepted for Montreal by the Grand Trunk were, for Nova Scotia coal, at \$3.96 per long ton on the wharf, or adding 27 cents for cartage, \$4.23 in the yard. At Toronto, the tender for American coal was accepted at \$3.40 per short ton in the yard, or equal to \$3.78 on the long ton, a difference in price between the two tenders of 45 cents in favor of the United States coal at Toronto. If to this be added \$1 per ton, the lowest rate at which it has been suggested coal can be borne from Montreal to Toronto, and the difference may be stated in round figures, at \$1.50 per ton against Nova Scotia."

Now, Sir, according to these facts and figures, we find that American coal has an advantage of \$1.50 over Nova Scotia coal in Toronto; and if times revive we might fairly allow for a margin of 50 cents a ton freight, which would make a difference of \$2 a ton in favor of American coal at Toronto. What did the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) himself say in 1879, when this coal duty was discussed? He then said that a duty of 50 cents a ton was not sufficient to give the coal owners of Nova Scotia the market of Ontario, and would only be a tax on the people of Ontario and Quebec. Anybody who gives the slightest attention to this subject must see that the coal duty has entirely failed to give the people of Nova Scotia what was promised to them, namely, the market of Ontario. But, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways stated in his speech that the people of Ontario do not pay the duty—in fact, that coal is cheaper to-day than it was before the duty was imposed. If this contention is correct—if the people of Ontario are actually getting their coal cheaper than they did before the imposition of the duty, the natural inference is that the duty of 50 cents is of no good, but a positive injury, to the people of Nova Scotia. But, Sir, if, on the other hand, the coal producers themselves think that the coal duty is a benefit—and many do seriously think that it is—why not give them the 75 cents a ton which they asked, and which was promised to them; and if, as the hon. Minister of Railways says, the Americans pay this duty, why not put on the 75 cents and please the coal producers in Nova Scotia. The hon. Minister of Railways, in order to establish his theory, contrasts the prices of coal since the duty was imposed with those which prevailed when there was no duty. But, Sir, these prices do not prove his theory. The price of coal, like that of other articles of commerce, varies from time to time; whatever may be the price, you must add to it the cost of transportation and the duty, and then the consumer pays the duty beyond any doubt, whether in Ontario or elsewhere. I have said that the coal duty does not benefit the coal producers. Let me read a statement made by Mr.

Brown, the manager of the old Sydney mine in Cape Breton, one of the oldest mines in Nova Scotia. He says:

"He stated most emphatically that the duty on coal had not done them one cent of good; in fact, this mine had to pay annually \$1,500 more duty on articles needed in operating it than under the old Tariff: the duties on colliery plant, supplies, &c., had, in fact, been doubled without the slightest corresponding benefit. He instanced the great increase of duty on rope wire from 5 to 20 per cent. The duty was imposed on coal to secure the Ontario market. This it had utterly failed to do. Several of the Cape Breton mines shortly after the establishment of the National Policy, sent cargoes to Ontario, and they had invariably lost by the operation and would not again repeat the experiment. Some may say the large output of coal in Nova Scotia is an evidence of the stimulating effects of the National Policy. This does not at all follow; it arises from other and totally different causes. In 1878, Ontario imported from the United States, 588,000 tons of coal; in 1880, her imports from the same markets were 740,000 tons, an increase of 161,000 tons. With just as much propriety might it be said this increase was due to the National Policy, which was avowedly adopted to secure this market for the miners of Nova Scotia."

This is the opinion, not of a person interested in arguing against this duty, but of the manager of one of the oldest collieries in Nova Scotia, and therefore entitled to respect. Now, let me give the opinion of another gentleman, a friend and supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite—a gentleman belonging to Halifax, who had written a great deal in favor of the National Policy, and who supported hon. gentlemen in the last election. He says:

"Any one acquainted with the wants of a colliery in Nova Scotia will tell you that the new Tariff about doubles the duties payable under the old Tariff, and that the duties now imposed on colliery plant and supplies average more than the duty levied on imported coal and coke. When I think of how the National Policy proposed to foster our mining interests, as Mr. Tilley's proposing to impose such a duty as would give the home industry the home market, and then think of what it would have done for the coal mines—well, I better not write my feelings lest the Philistines rejoice. My conviction is the Cape Breton collieries are much worse off under the new than under the old Tariff—they cannot now get any more for their coal, they cannot now put their coal into Ontario, they have now to pay about twice as much duty as before."

These two gentlemen, who are thoroughly acquainted with the coal interests of Nova Scotia, tell you that your National Policy has doubled the cost of operating the mines, and that the duty has totally failed in sending the coal of Nova Scotia to the Province of Ontario; and what these gentlemen say is endorsed by the statement of the hon. member for Pictou, in 1879. When the hon. the Finance Minister made the coal duty a part of his policy, he claimed that it would benefit not only the coal owners of Nova Scotia, but the men engaged in the mines, as well as the coasters engaged in carrying the coal to market. He said that the wages of all these people would be increased by the National Policy. Let me enquire how far have the wages of these men been increased? To show you that this is not the fact, I will read from the *Trade Journal*, and would call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the quotations here, which I have given them from papers and from gentlemen who are friendly to the policy of the Government. The journal from which I will now read is friendly to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to the policy of protecting home manufactures. In April last, I find the following extract—I might here say there was to be no exodus of our people, they were to be kept at home and were to have constant employment, every man was to get work within the Dominion, and we were told we should not find them going to the United States, as under the *regime* of Mr. Mackenzie—but what does this say? I read, *Trades Journal*, April, 1881, quoting from a Cape Breton paper, a report of the departure of a number of men for the United States, rejoicing over the exodus, because it may give employment to those who remain. The *Journal* says:

"Men are as thick as mushrooms in Cape Breton, and the abundance of labor there has been the principal reason for the low rate of wages prevailing. If there are at any given place twice as many laborers as are required to meet the demand, the consequence must be a severe competition to secure employment. Take away the surplus labor, and a better chance presents itself to those remaining to receive a sufficient remuneration for their labor. If economists are correct in their state-

ments that the value of labor can only advance as the supply is restricted, it must be a source of gladness instead of sorrow to every well-wisher of the working classes to know that the supply is becoming every day more limited. Of course, we could wish that all could receive remunerative employment at home, but so long as that is impossible, it is a patriotic thing for those who can to find employment out of the country, so that those who remain will have the opportunity to make themselves more comfortable."

I again quote from that journal of February 15th, 1882:

"A quarter of a century ago laborers' wages in Nova Scotia were as high as they are at the present time. Laborers then got \$1 per day, and to-day the orthodox pay for a laborer is no more than that though in some cases—the Acadia Colliery, for instance, it is even less—as low as 90 cents. It is asserted also that the purchasing power of 50 cents twenty-five years ago was as great as \$1 at the present time. While inclined to think the statement somewhat exaggerated, we know that a \$1 now does not go so far as it did a number of years ago. Somehow or other \$1 a day seems to be generally accepted as the proper pay of laborers, and it is a most difficult thing to induce employers to believe that the matter needs readjustment. When labor is abundant and provisions cheap, employers hasten to bring the wages, if possible under the standard price; but let the labor market be ever so tight and provisions high, nothing it seems will induce them of their own accord to raise the wages above the accepted standard. That a laborer is inadequately paid for a day's work at \$1 must be admitted by all who study the question. At the present prices for the necessaries of life it is impossible for him to keep himself and his family without running into debt."

Here we have a statement that the wages the men are now getting are the same as they were twenty-five years ago, with the producing power of \$1 double what it is to-day. But even under a policy of Protection, strikes have been occurring. There was a strike at one of the collieries not a long time ago, and there is a strike now in Nova Scotia, at one of these coal mines, for higher wages. These men, in 1875 and 1876, during a period of depression, were willing to have a decrease in their wages; they allowed their employers, knowing that times were hard, to deduct some 10 or 12 per cent., from their daily pay, and that remained, not only during the period of depression, but it continued after the time of the inauguration of the National Policy, and up to this winter. They were, from 1879 until the other day, working at less wages than they were getting from 1874 to 1877, when their wages were reduced; they are now on strike, not to have their wages increased, but to be put in the position they held in 1877. I may now ask, has this National Policy made freights higher? I will show, so far from that being the case, that they were never lower. I find that during the years 1870, 1871, 1872, and 1873, a period of a revenue Tariff, when there was no duty imposed on coal to foster and stimulate that industry and other industries—I find that then the rate of freight on coal per ton averaged from \$3 to \$5, to Boston, New York, and other places in the United States. I ask what has it been during this protected period, during these years of prosperity and abundance when everything was flourishing? I find that in 1879, 1880, and 1881, it ranged from \$1.40 to \$2.50, or 100 per cent. less than the coasters were getting in 1871 and 1872, when there was no duty on coal. From these facts and figures we must inevitably conclude: First, that the coal owners have not been benefitted by the National Policy or the imposition of a duty, inasmuch as it has failed to give them the market of Ontario. In the second place, we find the working men have not been benefitted, because they are getting less wages than they were twenty-five years ago, when \$1 would purchase very much more of the necessaries and comforts of life than it can at present. We find, in the third place, that the coasters are not getting within 100 per cent. of the freights they received previous to the imposition of the duty; and besides when they returned from their trips with small quantities of flour or meal for their family, they are met by the Customs officers and forced to pay a duty, in effect a bread tax. Might I not ask every candid and impartial man, if this coal tax has not completely failed in the purpose for which it was intended. This is an important matter for the people of the Maritime Provinces and I speak to-night on their behalf. It

Mr. FLYNN.

is a serious matter to tax their flour 50 cents, and their meal 40 cents; to say that you give us as a compensation 50 cents per ton on coal, is not satisfactory to our people. I am aware that the coal industry of Nova Scotia is an important one, and I am willing to do all I can to foster it, but there are other industries of greater importance, such as the lumbering and fishing interests of our Lower Provinces. Why should this special coal industry be singled out, and the attempt made to foster it, and a duty imposed in its interest, when the other two industries which I have named, lumbering and fishing, are neglected? Let me compare them. I find that the number of men engaged in lumbering is 80,000, as stated here by a table prepared by a lumberman; the capital employed is about \$100,000,000, and the export trade is \$25,000,000. The fisheries, according to the statistics, employ 60,000 men. I have not been able to arrive at the capital invested in this industry, but the export trade is nearly \$7,000,000. Now, I ask, what is the coal industry? According to the figures we find that it employs 3,567 men, taking the Report of the Mines of Nova Scotia for the year to December, 1881. It is stated that the capital invested in that industry is \$12,000,000, while the exports are of the value of \$1,169,058. Here we have an industry that employs only 3,567 men, whose exports are only \$1,169,000, and is the pet of the Government, and fostered by the National Policy at a duty of 60 cents per ton, while we have lumbering and fishing interests giving employment to 140,000 men, with exports amounting to \$32,000,000 and over \$100,000,000 of capital invested, not protected, or is any attempt made to protect them. Can anything be more absurd than to foster and protect an industry such as coal at the expense of other industries. I am opposed to the imposition of the duty because it is part of a policy that involves taxation on nearly a million of people in the Maritime Provinces. I am opposed to it because it is part of a policy that makes the lumbering and fishing interests contribute, by paying this bread tax, to foster this industry. I am opposed to it because it makes the great bulk of our people—the farmers, mechanics, laborers and the men who have limited incomes—pay higher for many of the articles required in their families. I do not intend to weary the House with many further remarks; but when I heard the Minister of Finance boast of a surplus of over \$4,000,000, I did hope that he would reduce the taxation of the people to a greater extent than he proposes. I hoped the hon. Minister would reduce the Tariff on cheap cotton and woollen goods, and abolish the bread and fuel taxation. But in this I have been disappointed, and the people of this country, the toiling masses, will yet have to bear the burdens his Tariff imposes on them. The hon. gentleman, in his Budget Speech, drew a vivid and graphic picture of the vast resources of this country; he spoke of the ability of the people to pay taxation. When I heard him speak in that strain, he reminded me of a speech delivered in the English House of Commons by Edward Burke, on economic reform. It would appear that the hon. gentleman had to deal with a taxing Finance Minister in England just as we have to do in Canada, I think the extract is not inappropriate and I will read it:

"He had no wish to deny that our resources are as brilliant as any one chooses to make them. Our resources, too, may be as unfathomable as they are represented—indeed, they are just whatever the people possess and will submit to pay. Taxing is an easy business, any projector can combine new impositions, any one can add to the old. But is it altogether wise to have no other bounds to your impositions than the patience of those who have to bear them?"

I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance if it is altogether wise to have no other bounds to his impositions than the patience of those who bear them? If this young Dominion, this Canada of ours, as it is sometimes called and was termed to-night by the President of the Council, is to flourish in the future, if Confederation is to be a success, if we are to have

a real and solid Union, not depending on an Act of Parliament, but upon the mutual interests and mutual affection of the people—and it is only on this basis it can ever be permanently established—if we are to have within our borders a happy and contented population, then we can only accomplish these desirable results by pursuing a policy that will tend to harmonize every section of the Dominion, that will make every contributor to the National Treasury feel that he is only paying his just and fair proportion. While the Tariff as a whole is oppressive and burthensome, there is, to my mind, no portion of it more objectionable and less defensible than the bread and fuel taxes. In a climate such as this is, with long and severe winters, this tax is a cruel one, and, as was justly stated by the hon. member for Lambton, is a relic of barbarism. There is no doubt, with our public works, with the construction of the Pacific Railway, and with our increasing debt, we shall require a large revenue in future; but if we do, let us at least in one respect imitate the example of the Mother Country—let us have in Canada no corn laws, no taxes on bread and fuel, readjust the Tariff so that it may bear more lightly on the poor man. Do this and you still can have the Tariff sufficiently high to protect and give a fair return for capital invested by prudent and careful manufacturers. That is all they can reasonably expect—it is all to which they are entitled.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). I have listened to the long speech of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) with some surprise, for he devoted three-fourths of his time to belittling the coal interests of his Province. That industry is peculiarly a Nova Scotia industry, and it is very surprising that a representative of that Province should devote such a long time, as the hon. member for Richmond has done, to deprecating the coal duty. In order to prove his case, he has quoted statements of agents of some coal mining companies of that Province, among them a gentleman who resides at Halifax, and who is known, to-day, as one of the strongest supporters of the National Policy—I refer to Mr. Lithgo, of Halifax. No doubt, that gentleman wrote the letter, but he did not oppose the duty on coal; he regretted that the duty was not larger, and what he objected to was an increase of the duty on articles required in mining coal. The hon. member for Richmond referred also to a gentleman, agent of the General Mining Association at Sydney, and quoted an extract from the *St. John Telegraph*. I have reason to believe that Mr. Brown was misrepresented in the correspondence of that paper, and I have reason to believe that Mr. Brown is not aware that he ever made to the representative of the *Telegraph* the statement attributed to him. It is true that gentleman may have crossed Mr. Brown and had conversation with him.

Mr. FLYNN. That statement was published in the Provincial papers and never contradicted.

Mr. McDONALD. That gentleman is not aware of ever having had an interview with a reporter of the *Telegraph*; that he does not know a reporter of that paper; that he may have had a conversation with a stranger, but Mr. Brown is not opposed to the coal duty. What he complains of is the increase in duty on articles required in working a mine. No man with any intelligence, or the owner of a coal mine, or anyone interested in a coal mine, is opposed to the duty on coal. The hon. member for Richmond has also quoted extracts from the *Trades Journal* to the effect that the wages of coal miners was as low in 1881 as some years ago. But he must remember that its editor is the secretary of a number of unions among the miners of that Province, and that it is his interest, and the interest of those miners, that he should advocate an increase of their wages. The hon. gentleman must also remember that there is quite a difference between the wages for 1881 and 1880 and the wages from 1873 to

1878, when the miners were unable to earn anything like a living, the men not working more than half time; and he must also know that the Government of Nova Scotia was compelled, a few years ago, to come to the relief of those miners, to prevent their starving, and to supply them with the necessaries of life, and that the municipal council of the county I represent also had to come to the relief of those men. The whole thing is changed at present. Those miners, for the past two years, have been perfectly able to earn a living, and pay off some of the debts contracted during the years from 1873 to 1878. They have been able to buy better clothing, and have had constant employment, though their wages is small. No man in the House, or anywhere else, would better like to see their wages increased than I, and I have every reason to believe that the coming year will see it increased. The hon. member for Richmond quoted some statistics to prove that the National Policy did not benefit the coal industry. I have a few statistics here which I will read to the House, to controvert that opinion. It must be remembered, however, that the National Policy produced no effect early in 1879. It was put into operation in the spring of that year, and, consequently, the coal owners had no opportunity of making contracts for that year; so that the increase for that year is naturally very small. In 1879, the total coal sales of Nova Scotia were 688,624 tons, being less than those of 1878 by 4,883 tons, the falling off being chiefly to the West Indies and the United States. But the sale of round coal, which bring the higher prices, exceeded that of 1873 by 12,923 tons, more than making up the deficiency in quantity by the increased value of the kind sold. This year, the very first year of the National Policy, the most notable point in these sales was the increase of sales to Quebec and Ontario, which, in 1879, reached 154,118 tons, against 83,710 tons in 1878, being an increase of 70,408 tons, or 84 per cent. In 1880, the total coal sales were 94,659 tons, being an increase over the sales of 1879 equal to 266,035 tons, and an increase over those of 1878 to the extent of the handsome difference of 261,152 tons. In the year 1880, there was a large increase of the sales to New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, the West Indies, Europe and the United States; but the most satisfactory to the growth of inter-provincial trade is the fact that the sales to Quebec and Ontario went up, in 1880, from 154,118 tons in 1879 to the handsome volume of 239,091 tons, being a clear increase in the consumption of Nova Scotia coal by the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, to the extent of 84,793 tons more than in the previous year, and amounting to an increase of no less than 155,351 tons over the last year of the defunct sectional Tariff of 1878. In addition to the large increase of inter-provincial coal sales in 1880, there is the gratifying fact that our coal sales to the United States were 123,423 tons, being the largest sales by us in that direction since 1874. I may here say that the hon. member for Richmond was mistaken in stating that the coal sales of 1874 were the largest of any year during the history of the coal trade. I find by the Report of the Superintendent of Mines of Nova Scotia, that the total sales in that year amounted only to 881,106 tons, instead of the 1,000,000 tons which he mentioned. This increase, I consider attributable to the stimulated power of production given to our coal mines by the large demand arising directly from a better control of our home market, whereby our coal owners were placed in a better condition for competing with the mines of the United States in their own ports and in the face of a heavier Tariff than we charge upon their coal coming into Canada. I think, Sir, this amply demonstrates to the entire satisfaction of every unbiassed mind, inside or outside of this House, that our Nova Scotia coal producers fully sustain what they claimed in their fruitless petition to this House in 1875, when they asserted that all they asked was an even start in the competition, fair play, but for no favors, and

that with these they were prepared to compete with all comers in the open marts of the world. We now arrive at the coal sales for 1881. The total sales for this year has entered, for the first time in the history of this country, the loftier spheres of the millions, being 1,035,014 tons, an increase over the previous year of 80,355 tons, and an increase over that of 1878, the last year of the reign of sectional discrimination, of no less than the handsome balance of 451,304 tons. The sales this year, 1881, to the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, have also gone a stride higher, having been 268,628 tons, equal to an increase of 29,537 tons over that of the previous year, and no less an increase over 1878 than 184,918 tons, equal to a gain of 321 per cent. It is also important to note that in this last year, 1881, there is the important item of increase of sales to the West India Islands of 9,455 tons, which, although not large in the abstract, has the important significance of our being likely to secure restoration of our larger coal sales to these Islands, previous to the extinction in this country of the sugar refineries by the policy of our Liberal friends; and more important still is the fact that as our coal sales to these Islands increase, so will our direct importation of sugar and molasses, and as our ships will in this way be able to secure direct outward and inward cargoes, the freight in each direction can be carried at a cheaper rate, the direct effect of which must be to cheapen the cost of sugar and molasses to the people of this country. Let me now, Sir, call the attention of the House to the following memoranda of summary increase of coal sales from Nova Scotia to Ontario and Quebec each year since 1878, inclusive,

Total coal sales to Quebec and Ontario in 1878.....	82,710 tons.
do do do 1879.....	154,118 do
do do do 1880.....	239,091 do
do do do 1881.....	268,628 do

To Quebec and Ontario :

1879 over 1878.....	70,408 tons.
1880 do 1878.....	155,381 do
1881 do 1878 ..	184,918 do

The figures show an increase in the percentage of the sale of coal to Quebec and Ontario for the undermentioned years, as follows :—

1879 over 1878.....	184 per cent.
1880 do 1878.....	285½ do
1881 do 1878.....	320 do

while the total coal sales of 1881, for the Province of Nova Scotia, have attained the unprecedented volume of 1,035,014 tons, or 341,503 tons over that of 1878, it should not be forgotten that, owing to the terrible accident which befel the Foord pit, in the Albion mines, in November, 1880, which so destroyed that mine that its production, last year, was lessened to the extent of 90,000 tons, every pound of which would have found a ready sale, and which, but for this calamity, would have brought the total coal sales of Nova Scotia up to about 432,000 tons, as the direct result of the National Policy in this single branch of industry, over and above the sales of the last year of the pro-American legislation of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It may be said, although erroneously so, that these benefits are merely of a local character, and that direct benefits are not common to the whole country. Now, the reply is simple and answerable, which is, that whatever production of a useful kind involves the investment of a large amount of capital, gives employment, disburses large sums in the payment of employes, and consumes largely the produce of the other staple industries of the country and fills an important place in the prosperity of the country. Let us see how the coal mines of Nova Scotia stand these tests. The capital invested in these mines is not less at the present time than \$20,000,000. During the year 1881, they employed 3,567 persons who performed 894,961 days' labor, besides employing continuously 324 horses. Hence it

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton).

follows that not less than 21,400 persons derived, directly, their maintenance and support from their connection with these mines, and the disbursements for labor, including men and teams, amounted to \$1,418,499, and there was paid out on construction account which includes colliery buildings, dwellings, &c., \$125,374; and in addition to these there was paid as royalty into the Provincial exchequer, the amount of \$82,600, in addition to taxation for municipal purposes on the value of the properties. Nor should it be forgotten that the 21,400 persons deriving their sustenance from the disbursements of these mines, consume Ontario flour, wear Ontario tweeds, and other fabrics of her production for clothing; wear boots and hats manufactured in Quebec, and sleep under Ontario made blankets. Neither should it be lost sight of by our friends of the Upper Provinces, that every ton of Nova Scotia coal, sent into these Provinces, adds power to the lever which keeps down the crushing force of American coal monopolists; and this competition is rendered the more necessary from the fact that the quantity of English and Scotch coals hitherto brought to Canada is becoming less year by year, and at no distant day will about entirely disappear. The reason of this is, that steamships are rapidly driving sailing ships out of the transatlantic trade, and it is the latter kind of ships which, alone, carry out coal for ballast, because steamships find it more convenient and cheaper to ballast by the use of water tanks. It is, moreover, a matter of vital importance to these border Provinces lying side by side with the United States, that in the event of an interruption to the present peaceful relations of the two countries, the Provinces should be in a position to furnish within themselves the essentials of existence and motive power. Our neighbors of the United States felt the force of their inability to supply this important article to the extent of their own needs, at the time of their late civil war, as was seen by Nova Scotia coal being sold in Boston for \$14 per ton in 1864, and in 1865 for the enormous price of \$18 per ton. Neither is it unimportant to remember, that a large proportion of the material used in coal mining pays import duties ranging from 25 to 10 per cent., and taking the average of articles extensively used in mining, we have an average of nearly 18 per cent., viz. : powder, 20 per cent. ; locomotives, 25 per cent. ; cordage, 20 per cent. ; iron wire, 15 per cent. ; boiler tubing, 10 per cent. ; leather belting, 15 per cent. ; making an average of 17½ per cent. The American people have long regarded coal as a production entitled to protection, and in order to protect and build up this industry, have, since the date of 1824, imposed a duty on imported coal, varying at different dates from that year forward, of \$1.68 per ton, \$1.75 per ton, and \$1.10 per ton; and at another period, when their coal mines had developed to enormous proportions, and they had less fear of competition, but fearing retaliation on the part of Canada, they reduced it to the present rate of 75 cents per ton. At one period, from 1846 to 1862, their coal duty was an *ad valorem* one of 30 per cent. ; from 1862 to 1865, they substituted an *ad valorem* duty of 24 per cent., and then returned to a specific duty. Now, the result of this long continued fostering care has been that the coal production of that country had, in 1870, attained the large proportion of 32,863,690 tons, and in 1879 it attained to the enormous volume of 59,808,398 tons—an increase of annual production, in nine years, of 27,000,000 tons. Just in proportion as the volume of the coal production of the United States increased, so did their iron and other manufacturing industries expand, and the stimulus of demand kept their agricultural productions all the while in the van of progress. Comparing our Canadian duties on foreign coal with our duties on ordinary lines of manufacture, it is seen for instance that on woollen goods there is a duty of about 35 per cent., on cotton clothing about 30 per cent., and on cottons about 20 per cent., making on these four lines of production

an average duty of $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. On coal we have a duty of about 25 per cent. Thus, on three articles now supplied, mainly to Nova Scotia consumers from Quebec and Ontario, we find an average duty of $27\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., so that it is difficult to see wherein there is anything worthy of the name of a grievance existing by an undue sectional protection. I was of the opinion, when this Tariff was introduced to this House in 1879, that a duty should be placed on American coal equal to what they imposed upon ours, and that this would not increase the price to the Ontario consumer, and I believe that many of the representatives and mercantile men of that Province were of the same opinion. I hold to this opinion still. The hon. Minister of Finance, when introducing his Tariff of 1879, told the House that he calculated this duty of 50 cents would increase the production of the Nova Scotia coal mines by 400,000 tons, by the expiration of two years; and I beg here to congratulate the hon. Minister on the correctness of this calculation, for wherein it differs from the realized results, that difference is on the right side. Surpluses result from all the hon. Minister's calculations; deficits are ghosts of darkness that appear to flee from his presence. But I may also say that on no other grounds could I support the general scale of the present Tariff, except the present one, of extending a share of this general protection to the great coal producing industries of this country. It is a matter of congratulation to the people of Nova Scotia that their great and growing coal industry has been so rapidly increased under the present fiscal arrangements; it is a matter of very great congratulation to the people of these Upper Provinces that their manufactures have so rapidly developed as to require this increase of supply, and that their furnaces have been supplied with a superior coal at a reduced cost. It is a matter of vast congratulation to the Government of this country, that they have succeeded in so harmonizing the interests of the different Provinces, in such a manner and so successfully, as to make this interchange of trade mutually profitable to all, binding more firmly their bonds of a common loyalty to each other. Nova Scotia discovered by experience, previous to 1878, which of the two great parties of the Upper Provinces were her true friends, and most ready to extend fair play and even-handed justice to her people; but if anything further was necessary to confirm Nova Scotians in the knowledge of who were their true friends in this House and in the councils of the country, the doubt, if it existed, has been thoroughly removed by what has been said and done since September, 1878. They now perfectly understand that, from the accession of the Opposition to power—should such ever happen again and of which the appearances are growing beautifully less—they have nothing in expectation to gain, but, on the contrary, they have everything to lose. In every constituency opened in that Province since 1878, the electors have given such unmistakable proof of their fully realizing the facts of the case, that there remains not the shadow of a doubt, but they will add to the numbers of the general and generous support they have already extended to the Government of the day, which has proved itself so able an administrator of justice and fair play to all, and the Opposition pledged to take the duty off foreign coal can expect but little support, if any from the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. KRANZ. At this late hour I shall ask the indulgence of the House only for a few minutes. After three years of trial of the fiscal policy of the Government, I think we are now in a position to judge of its merits by the results it has achieved, and these results I feel warranted in saying will be proclaimed by a majority of the people of this country as being most beneficial to the interests of the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant and the miner. The fiscal policy of the present Government fulfils what has been promised to the people. It has given to them the home market to as full an extent as it is possible under the cir-

cumstances. We have good times, it is acknowledged by all hands, and we rejoice in acknowledging that the good harvest and the good prices at which we have sold the products of the farm and the forest during the last two years, have furnished material for our prosperity, but at the same time I claim that the protective policy of the Government has furnished the means and the machinery by which we have turned the blessings of Providence to good account. It is the machinery by which we husband the products of the soil and the mine, and the means by which we increase them. What would have been the effect of our good crops, had the one-sided trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite been in operation? The millions which we have received for the products of the farm and the forest would have been spent for goods manufactured in the United States or Europe. These millions would have, in a short time, gone back to foreign countries to enrich their manufacturers and workmen; but how do matters stand at present? Our farmers are freely spending their money for goods which are manufactured in Canada. They buy Canadian blankets; they do not pay \$1.43 duty on their blankets. They buy Canadian cottons, Canadian buttons, Canadian gloves, they spend their money for Canadian manufactured goods, and by doing so they keep a great amount of money in this country, thereby increasing our wealth, and giving employment to our people, and the farmer is at the same time at no disadvantage. The fiscal policy of the Government has given him the home market, so far as the home market goes. According to the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister we see that over 5,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain have been consumed more than in previous years. These 5,000,000 bushels have kept out American grain to the same extent, and the Canadian farmer has had the home market thus far. But besides the grain the farmer reaps a great benefit from the sale of many other articles which are consumed at home. As an example of how the National Policy works I may state how it works in my own riding. In the town of Berlin there were employed in the old factories, in 1878, 360 hands; now the same factories are employing 686 hands, not including new establishments in which 212 hands are employed, making a total of 898 hands, or an increase over those employed in 1878 of 538 hands. In the adjoining town of Waterloo there has been started one new button factory, which employs 70 hands. In a furniture factory are employed 40 hands more than in 1878. A woollen factory employs 75 hands more than it used to employ; it employed 45 hands in 1878; it employs 120 in 1882. In an agricultural implement factory, the increase is 13. The total number of hands more employed in Waterloo is 197, not including the increase in a large foundry and a carriage factory, for which I did not obtain the correct figures, and excluding, also, the increased number of hands employed by the distillers and brewers, who have doubled their capacity by erecting new buildings and machinery. The village of Bridgeport, adjoining Berlin, employed in a woollen factory, in 1878, 8 hands; it now employs 30, or an increase of 22. So that, within a radius of two miles, there are 758 more hands employed now than in 1878. I might go further and state the facts with regard to several other villages in the county. In Conestoga there is an increase in the number of hands employed in the flax mills. The Messrs. Perrine, who have a flax factory there and at Doon, employed, in 1878, 70 hands, in 1882, 150 hands; and they assure me that they sell their goods, such as rope and twine, now from 15 to 20 per cent. lower than in 1878. I may also mention that their raw material is all produced in the country. In the village of Wellesley, the working population has increased about 50 per cent., and the knitting factory of Reiner and Steins turns out as fine goods as were ever imported from Germany or England. In the villages of Bloomingdale, St. Jacobs and Elmira,

woollen factories and cabinet factories, which were carried on on a small scale, have also increased. I think I may fairly say that the number of hands employed in North Waterloo at present exceeds the number employed in 1878 by fully 800, and in the South Riding by 600, which gives a total increase of 1,400 hands in the whole county. The hon. member for Lambton, in his speech the other night, said :

"How is capital created except by industry? Were there no labor in the world there would be no capital, and were there no labor in Canada there would be no money to distribute."

Now, if these 1,400 hands which are employed in the county of Waterloo more than were employed in 1878, earned only 50 cents a day each, that would be \$700 a day, or creating \$210,000 of capital in one year; and this is done without damaging the farmers in the least, because the farmers are going on creating wealth by tilling their farms, and at the same time they find an improved home market for the produce which they have to sell. I hope the fiscal policy of the present Government will not be changed for many years to come, and I am not in the least afraid that the prediction of the hon. member for Lambton with regard to it will be fulfilled. The hon. gentleman cites France and Germany as instances of the bad results of protection. He says :

"We will set one class at war against another, and we will produce that feeling of disaster which has prevailed in Germany and in France for the last two years in consequence of their protective Policy. I intended to refer to the condition of these two countries, two of the most highly protected countries in the world, except the United States. The state of Germany is such at present in consequence of protection—as those authorities show, that the people are flocking in hundreds of thousands from her shores and seeking homes across the Atlantic."

I think the hon. gentleman must be misinformed in this respect. The people of Germany are leaving because the country is very populous, having over 40,000,000 people, and it can very well afford to send to America a few thousands or even hundreds of thousands every year; that process has been going on for years, and yet the population of Germany is not decreasing. The hon. member for Lambton also said :

"They are simply able to keep their own markets. It is perfectly well known that their export trade is destroyed by the protection they have."

Now, the hardest blow the German export trade ever received was from the high protective Tariff of the United States, which kept German manufactures out until the Germans had to emigrate and transport their manufactures to the United States in order to compete there. On the other hand, the Americans lately exported a great many manufactured goods to Germany; so did England, and the German Government found it necessary to protect their own manufacturers against these foreigners. Any one who believes that the emigration from Germany is due to the protective policy of the empire, is quite mistaken.

Mr. RYMAL. On looking at the Census returns, I find that between 1871 and 1881 there has only been an increase of 800 people in the entire population of the South Riding of Waterloo, and in the North Riding there has only been an increase of 1,600. It appears to me that the figures the hon. gentleman has given will not be borne out by the facts.

Mr. KRANZ. The hon. gentleman is not correct. You will find that the farming population has decreased, and yet we produce more grain and more fat cattle.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then the farming population have left, and the home market does not keep them at home.

Mr. GILLMOR moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Really, I think this debate must come to an end. We are now getting towards the end of the Session, and this discussion on the Budget is really blocking the way. We must try to come to a vote

Mr. KRANZ.

very soon. We can sit until two or three o'clock this morning, and to-morrow I am going to ask the House to give us Thursday so that we can get through, unless we want to sit until July next.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. GILLMOR. The debate would, no doubt, be unnecessarily prolonged if I propose to speak for four or five hours, but there will be an end of all these things as there will be an end of the Government, I hope. I do not intend to comment upon the speeches of hon. gentlemen at all; whatever speeches may have been made by them will go for what they are worth. I will, however, reply to the last speaker, who dwelt upon the home market. That is a favorite phrase with hon. gentlemen opposite, but I do not exactly understand what they mean by this term. There is no increase in the population since the National Policy went into operation, and what greater home market have we now than before? Did not the people eat bread and meat; did they not use the Finance Minister's "garden sass" before the National Policy? I cannot understand how the home market has been increased without a very material increase of population. Our people had to be fed and clothed before that policy was introduced, and there is no greater market for the products of the farmer now than there was before; there is no force in that argument. The discussion to-night has been chiefly upon the coal question. I have never studied it, but I was surprised at the arguments of the hon. Minister of Railways in reference to it. He undertook to prove that the Americans paid the duty on the coal; I do not know. I am sure, whether that is the case elsewhere or not—I do know it is not the case with us in New Brunswick; our importers go and enter their coal and pay 50 cents per ton upon it, that is added to the price of the coal, and the purchaser buys it, paying the first cost, freight and duty. It is, therefore, absurd and a waste of time, in fact it is counting upon the credulity of this assembly, to begin to talk and to urge any such argument as that; it is perfect nonsense. The hon. Minister of Railways tried to prove that at some certain competitive points the duty was not paid by the consumer, but that the American producers paid it. Now, these competitive points existed before there was any tax, and I ask: Cannot competitive points exist without a tax and yet have the same effect? There is no argument, to my mind, in that. Having said so much about the speeches of other hon. gentlemen, I will now begin my own. No one that has listened to the arguments and speeches of gentlemen on the other side of the House, particularly the members of the Administration, can fail to have discovered that they think their government is quite perfect. I always supposed that all human institutions were more or less imperfect, but their government is the *ne plus ultra* of perfection, there is nothing more that can be done in that direction. Yet I thought I discovered in the Estimates brought down that they are not altogether satisfied with their National Policy, and it occurs to me that in these Estimates there are several items that look like supplementing the National Policy. They think it necessary, notwithstanding all the National Policy has done, to supplement it and to bid for the people's support at the next General Election. Now the hon. gentlemen can boast of a good many things; they can boast of having the largest majority at their back that any Government in Canada ever had, and without wishing to depreciate their supporters. I think they can boast of the most accommodating majority—that is my impression; they have perfect confidence in their leader, and a great admiration for everything he does. They can boast, too, of having incurred the largest debt that Canada ever knew. They can boast of having incurred the largest debt of any like population anywhere, where there has been no extraordinary occasion to incur that debt; they have got the debt up to \$200,000,000. I do not mean to say that much of this money may not have been appro-

riated or expended upon public works that will eventually be of benefit to the country. I do, however, pretend to say that it is a debt far beyond our resources and far beyond the interest of the country. There is a limit, no matter how much public works may be required, to the obligations and to the debt which we shall fix upon a people numbering a little over 4,000,000. There is another matter they can boast of—they have inflicted upon this country the most obnoxious and most oppressive Tariff that it has ever experienced. There is another thing, they have imposed a gigantic railway and land monopoly, the greatest that any country ever had forced upon it. Monopolies grow upon countries by degrees, it takes years to establish a monopoly, but these gentlemen can boast of having placed on this country a complete monopoly at the start, perfect in all its parts, a monopoly that this country will not get rid of and which will hold it by the throat in years to come. These things are, perhaps, to be boasted of by the gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and if they are matters of congratulation they truly can laud one another to their heart's content. There is another marked characteristic of the gentlemen opposite, that is the disposition to magnify everything, to exaggerate everything of a general character. They do not seem to be able to take a fair view of anything that is presented to them. During the late Administration when we all knew and admitted the depression that existed in this country, was there anything like fair treatment of that question? In all their speeches they dealt in the grossest exaggeration, they depicted the state of the country then in a very much worse light than the facts justified, there was no moderation, no sticking to facts in reference to that depression, which was very great it is true; but there was no distress in Canada at that time, there was no starvation, no hunger, no real want. The depression at that time was felt by all the industries of Canada, and no one industry suffered more than any other; the agricultural interest suffered from short crops for a certain number of years, the lumber interest suffered from low prices in the markets to which we had to send our production, manufacturers suffered, of course, to some extent, and all these interests alike were depressed. We admitted that, but there was the greatest exaggeration resorted to by hon. gentlemen opposite to magnify the depression which then existed. All who remember the discussions of that date know how they endeavored by all their eloquence, by all their powers to exaggerate, to make people believe they were in a great deal worse position than really was the case. They were bad enough, no doubt, but not at all in such a condition as they were depicted. There has been a change in the circumstances of the country, but they cannot treat them now in a fair, rational, reasonable manner; they refer to them now as though the millenium had arrived, as though nobody knew what want was. They exaggerated the improvement in the state of things and could not treat any question of this kind without magnifying and distorting it. I admit that there is an improvement in the times. I am glad to say it, but I know that the improvement is not at all commensurate with the statement they put forward. I speak now for my own Province; I know that we have been benefitted in the locality where I live, because we export lumber largely there. That is the principal industry, or one of the principal industries in that locality. We get better prices for our lumber, and, consequently, times are somewhat improved. With regard to other parts of the Province they are improved in that respect also; but, generally, times have not very much improved in New Brunswick. With regard to the crops last year, we have not for many years had so poor a crop as we had there. Our potato crop, which is a very important one and one from which the agriculturist derives a great deal of money, was almost a failure, our wheat crop was a failure, and our "garden sass" was not as good as

usual. The hay crop was, no doubt, a large one, but it was very much injured in being got in, and, taking all in all, not for twenty years have agriculturists had poorer returns than last year. Notwithstanding that, we have very much in New Brunswick to be thankful for, but not to the National Policy. What I say for New Brunswick, I can safely say for Prince Edward Island. I read in the papers that in Charlottetown not for many years has there been so much depression as at present. I am satisfied it must be so. The National Policy is doing nothing for them, and in order to off-set its effects they are asking for breakwaters here and appropriations there, trying to satisfy their people to stand the grinding taxation placed on them as well as on the people of the Lower Provinces. In times of depression such as prevailed when the late Government were in power, a good many people left the country. Whenever members of the Opposition rose to speak in the House they referred to the exodus; but we hear nothing about that now. I know, in the locality where I reside, the exodus was greater during the last three years than ever before, and never in New Brunswick were there so many vacant farms and houses as to-day; yet the Finance Minister and his associates talk about general and universal prosperity, that there was never anything like the wonderful change three years of the National Policy has produced. They cannot speak on any subject without giving it a false coloring and magnifying it,—that is the most moderate word I can apply. During the years of the late Administration there was another cry—the slaughtering process. It took me some time to find out what hon. gentlemen meant, but it turned out that it was this: that the Yankees, in order to break down our manufacturers, brought in vast quantities of goods and gave them to the people for little or nothing. How truly liberal our American neighbors are! I never received anything from them without giving a *quid pro quo*. I do not think much harm would be done if they brought over all the goods we require and gave them to us; it might injure the manufacturers, but it would help the masses, and the Government should help the majority. Of course, there is no slaughtering now; there is no difficulty which the National Policy has not relieved! It has found a market at home for all farmers' products and has made everybody rich and happy! I have not heard it has made a Christian of anyone; no doubt, it prepares them nicely for this world, and, no doubt, it will prepare them for the ascent and perfect them for the future life. I do not think the National Policy or Confederation either, the way it has been managed, has done anything for New Brunswick. It is no use to open old wounds, or to go back too much to those past issues that we cannot remedy, but I will make a slight reference to New Brunswick before Confederation. In 1866, the imports of the Province amounted in round numbers to \$10,000,000. There can be no doubt that the people use as much dutiable goods as they did in 1866—indeed, they must use a good deal more as the population has somewhat increased, though it has not increased so much as it ought to have done and a great many have gone away. This importation has very much decreased; I cannot exactly tell the reason, but the hon. Finance Minister who has made this subject a study, and who knows almost everything, can, I suppose, tell the reason. We only entered for consumption last year, \$4,698,632 worth of dutiable goods, and \$1,318,480 worth of free goods, making a total of \$6,016,972. In Customs duties we paid \$1,256,638. Excise \$29,445, stamp duties \$9,174, making a total of \$1,560,398. This is not probably quite two-thirds of what we do pay, because we pay a large amount on goods imported into other Provinces, and brought down there, and in addition we pay a good deal into the pockets of the manufacturers of the Upper Provinces. I am not over-estimating or exaggerating when I say that New Brunswick is, to-day, pay-

ing \$2,000,000 a year into the public Treasury. When you make a fair estimate of the amount of goods we consume in that Province, when you take what we pay on imports and add that, and what we pay to manufacturers whose prices are increased by the amount of the import duty it is not surprising that New Brunswick pays \$2,000,000 of taxes. The average rate of duty for 1868 was 13½ per cent, it is now 21½. If these figures are correct, has New Brunswick anything to thank the present Government for—to thank the National Policy for? In my opinion, she has not. We, in New Brunswick, export of the products of the forest, in round numbers, about \$5,000,000, constituting about three-fourths of all our exports. The exports of our fisheries do not appear large, some \$700,000 or \$800,000. I have often desired the adoption of some better mode of showing the extent of that industry, and of obtaining correct statements on the subject. The county I represent has a large fishery business, a population of nearly 5,000 persons being engaged in it. I know that the Dominion does not give us credit for the amount of fish exported from our Province. I think the reason is that we are located on the border, and a good deal of the fish we catch and cure is taken in small boats over to Eastport, and sold there for export from that part of Maine. The amount mentioned looks small for all New Brunswick; I am satisfied it should be given at three or four times \$700,000 or \$800,000. Besides, Nova Scotia gets credit for a larger export of fish; but that Province exports much caught by the people of New Brunswick, who cross to Yarmouth and sell their fish. With regard to the large lumbering industry, I do not want to favor it more than any other; I have no preference for any, they are all alike to me, and we engaged in them are all one family. No one industry should be burdened at the expense of another. But the hon. Finance Minister admits honestly and candidly that he can do nothing for our great lumbering industry. But he can assist and bolster up other industries at the expense of this one. He stated, a Session or two ago, that lumbering was a waning industry, which would eventually die out, leaving its place to others. Now, it is a strange argument, because an industry is weak and languishing, it should be left to its own resources, or to die a natural death; that it should be taxed for the purpose of building up other industries, including the manufacturing, which are not more important. What is the argument with regard to the manufacturing industry? That it furnishes a home market. Is there any industry that furnishes a home market to the agriculturist equal to the lumbering, or buys so much oats and hay? Is there any industry that wants as much of the farmer's flour, pork, butter and everything else produced on the farm? Our lumbermen consume as much of the agricultural products, man for man, as those engaged in any other industry; and do they not help the farmer as much as the cotton or wool spinner? Why not, then, give them credit for affording a home market for our agricultural products, and give them the same fair show as persons in other industries? Does lumbering not furnish labor also for the strong right arms of our young men, as well as employment to our ships, stevedores and other toilers? Why, then, should this interest be ignored? Why does the hon. Finance Minister sanction a policy that obliges him to admit that he cannot help this important lumbering industry? If he would let it alone and let alone every industry that is not self-sustaining, he would follow the right policy. No country is enriched by fostering an industry that is not self-sustaining any more than a man is enriched by embarking in an unprofitable business. If an industry is not self-sustaining, the country does not want the burden of supporting it. It has been a favorite theme with Ministers and their supporters that England is declining, that she has reached the zenith of her power, is becoming old and feeble in a commercial sense, and is tottering to decay. That has been the burden of the hon. gentle-

Mr. GILLMOR.

man's song, and that she adopted protection during her earlier years till she became strong and rich and able to stand alone, and after she became rich enough she threw off this beautiful policy and adopted free trade. Well, now, how illogical that is, how contrary to common sense, how contrary to all the instincts of human nature, that a country adopts a policy that makes her great in commerce, and rich, and when she gets rich enough she throws it off, but she never does throw it off until she gets rich enough, and nations, like individuals, never throw off a system that enriches them. England, all down the ages till very recently, had the same obnoxious policy, loaded with monopolies and restrictions that crushed and prevented the growth of commerce, and she never took any strides in progress till about forty years ago. Some of her restrictions were so absurd that one would hardly think a civilized people could adopt them. I find, on reference to some works, that in Queen Elizabeth's time she said the finest flowers of her garden were these monopolists, and those patent rights she granted to her favorites. There were certain individuals who had monopoly of the sale of certain articles. Some favorite had the right to sell salt, some others had the right to sell iron, and others to sell vinegar, and many other articles I need not mention, the sale of which was confined to a few favorites. Nobody else could sell salt, vinegar, and so forth but some favorite, and so trade was crippled, and the people were robbed; down even to 1834 the East India Company had the exclusive right to sell tea in England. I dare say many here remember the circumstances. Now, was not that a very singular thing, that a country so enlightened as England should give the right to sell tea to the East India Company, and prevent competition? In that very year the people of England paid \$7,500,000 more for tea than they would had the right system existed, and there had been free competition in the sale of tea. It was in consequence of England's absurd colonial policy that she lost the best half of the North American continent, a country that those hon. gentlemen admire so much. I do not wonder that they admire that country, it is one of the greatest countries in the world. That territory was lost to Great Britain by the determination to control the trade of her people in the colonies. In 1651, England prohibited all nations from importing into England any commodity that was not the growth of that country, and it extended this absurd law to the American colonies, and compelled them to have nothing carried to and from the colonies, except in English ships. The colonists could not export to any place but to Great Britain any of their products, neither sugar, tobacco, wool, indigo, ginger, dye wood, molasses, rice, pitch, tar, turpentine, coffee, hides and numerous other articles. That was the policy under which she was becoming strong, and making those colonists do all their trade with her, not allowing them to go into the best markets and get the most they could for their exports, nor would she allow them to purchase in any other market. In 1700, no man could be a hatter in the colonies unless he had served seven years at the trade, and no hat, after he had made it, could be taken from one colony to another to be sold. They must only make hats enough for their own people, just about like the present policy. All manufactures of iron were prohibited in America; no wool nor manufactures of wool could be carried from one portion to another.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I rise to a point of order to ask the hon. member what he is quoting from. The rule of the House is that copious notes are allowed, but when an hon. member reads from a document we are entitled to know what document he is quoting from.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am quoting from a pamphlet written by the hon. member for Charlotte, and you can have the perusal of it to-morrow in the *Hansard*.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I ask for a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see that the hon. member is reading his speech, he is only quoting his notes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Even Lord Chatham, who was the greatest friend the colonies ever had, stated on one occasion that under certain circumstances he would not allow the colonists to make a hob nail or a horse shoe. These were the years in which England was becoming great, in which she was increasing her wealth and her conquests. Mr. Speaker, the decline of England's greatness has been predicted by honorable gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and it has been predicted by some Tories in England too. I hold some statistics in my hand which, I think, will convince those hon. gentlemen that she is not in her dotage. England is still strong and vigorous. I do not usually read much statistics; I do not intend to read any thing from the Trade and Navigation Returns. That volume has nearly a thousand pages, and it has been gone over several times since this debate commenced. There is nothing in it that has not been repeated over and over again. I shall read some statistics that bear directly on this question, and which go to prove that the free trade policy of England is an enlightened policy, a policy which has benefitted England and, I think every nation that has adopted it, a trade policy not formed upon the principle that if you trade with me I will trade with you. After England had become enlightened on this subject by her statesmen and her philosophers, she stepped out entirely independent, when all the nations of Europe were protected and to a great extent they remain so still. Her progress has astonished the world. I do not admire everything in England, I was never accused of being extra loyal, but wherever I can see anything that is right, whether in England or in America, no matter where it is, I always acknowledge that which appears to me to be good and true. And with regard to England receding from free trade principles, it cost her too much trouble, too much money, too many hard-fought battles, to get rid of the odious monopolies which ground down and fettered her commerce, ever again to return to such a hateful and injurious system. The population of the United Kingdom, in 1841, was 26,500,000; in 1881, it was 35,000,000, an increase in these years of 33 per cent. The taxable property, not including Ireland, increased during these forty years—and they formed the period during which we may fairly say free trade principles prevailed—from £51,000,000 sterling to £542,000,000 sterling, and I might add to this increase £40,000,000 more of property which was excluded from taxation, or an increase of ten fold. Could such a result ever have been obtained under a system of protection and odious monopolies? In 1840, the exports of England was £51,000,000 sterling; in 1880, it was £223,000,000, or an increase of 450 per cent. In 1841, the deposits in the Savings Banks were £24,500,000; in 1880, they were £75,500,000. In 1849, there were in England and Wales, 201,000 able-bodied paupers; in 1880, when free trade had begun to do its work, with a large increased population, there were only 111,000 paupers. With regard to the doctrine of the balance of trade to which the hon. Finance Minister referred, I do not pretend to know much about it, and judging by his speeches on the subject, with all due deference I must say that he does not appear to have studied it very much. The balance of trade has all the time been going against England, and during the last thirty years it has gone against her to the extent of £1,600,000,000 sterling. How on earth has England ever been able to pay up this balance? Has England any debts with foreign nations for her imports? What nonsense to talk about the balance of trade being against England! Has she exported gold to make up this difference. On the contrary, we find that during those years she imported four or five millions more gold than she exported. The trouble is that during the existence of her free trade policy England has been drawing money from all these pro-

tected countries, and enlarging her riches, at the same time, that she opened her ports and made her trade as free as the air that surrounds the Island. The solution of the whole question is, that the exports brought back more imports than the goods sent out. They made money in the transaction. Talk of England being in debt or having a balance of trade against her! Where does Canada go when she wants money, and Australia and almost all the nations of the earth? To England, of course. And what goes back to England for that money? £60,000,000 sterling for interest—for interest on investments in foreign countries. This balance of trade against her gives her £60,000,000 sterling, some of it—and a precious sight too much—from Canada. And yet, these hon. gentlemen say that England is going back from light to darkness, and that she does not understand her business. There are no such financiers there as in the Dominion of Canada! No, they do not know how to get the balance of trade, but they know how to get the money, and make money out of it; and the way they get it is by freedom of trade and freedom of exchange. Between 1875 and 1880 the imports were £622,000,000 sterling more than the exports, but according to the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite, who dwell so much on the balance of trade, England had to pay that in gold. It must have drained her coffers, or else she owes the money still. But the truth is she is making money out of the system just as an individual does in the same way. If I send out a cargo of lumber valued at \$500, and get back \$1,000, this is against me, but the truth is I made \$500. That is the explanation of it. During those five years England imported £147,000,000 sterling in gold, and exported £144,000,000 so that, besides the £622,000,000 which she owes on the balance of trade, she has £223,000,000 more by bringing in more gold than she sent out. I am giving these statistics to show these gentlemen the condition of that country for which they profess so much loyalty, but are always striving to depreciate in comparison with France and Germany and the United States. Nobody ever heard them predict anything else for her than failure, decline and decay so long as she continues to adopt this system.

Mr. HESSON. What brought England to her proud position—free trade or protection?

Mr. GILLMOR. Do you think that any man would get rich under a system and then abandon it? What hon. gentleman, if he found himself becoming wealthy, would say, "I am going to stop getting rich so fast and become generous—I do not want to get rich so fast?" Why, the thing is absurd. The investments of England abroad have been tending rapidly upwards until they are now supposed to have reached the enormous sum of £1,300,000,000 sterling, on which she is receiving an interest of £60,000,000 sterling; and this has been achieved since the introduction of free trade. Now, let us make some comparisons between the foreign trade of England and that of France, Germany and the United States, the countries which are continually referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1849, France exported £49,000,000 worth of manufactured goods; in 1879, thirty years afterwards, with all the protection she wanted, she exported of the same goods £34,000,000 worth, and her population did not increase much during that time. Hon. gentlemen say that the United States is pursuing the course that will enable her to distance England in the race—that in a few years England will have to occupy a second place in matters of trade and commerce. I know that the United States is a great country, but I have no more doubt that its greatness is not due to the protective system, than I have that it is not due to slavery or to Mormonism, because these exist there. I say their greatness just proves that the evil policy that they have adopted cannot crush out the ener-

gies of the Anglo-Saxon race, but that it has retarded them in the race I am satisfied; the best minds in the United States believe so too, and the majority of the electors of the United States will so vote, and did so vote when Hayes was elected President. You would think, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, that protection was the universal sentiment of that country. Not at all. A great battle was going on there, and I believe some men here will live to see the time when they will abandon their pernicious policy. England has been a protected country nearly all through her history until recently, and one would have thought that the struggling industries of the United States would have been a little strengthened in their limbs by this time and would have been able to compete with Great Britain to some extent. They have more raw material, they have the climate, they have the food, they have everything to make a great manufacturing country, and they ought long ago to have gone forth and possessed the world in spite of Great Britain. But have they done so? They have not, as the record which I am about to read will prove. How do the United States compete with England in Asia, Africa, and Australia, three countries which are open to both alike? The whole of the exports of manufactured goods sent to these countries from the United States in one year amounted to £4,751,000 sterling, while England sent £78,140,000 sterling. That shows what a free trade country can do, as compared with a highly protected country. But how is it in regard to trade with the whole civilized world? In 1880, the trade of Great Britain with the world amounted to £698,000,000 sterling. That is what a population of 35,000,000 can do under a free trade system, while the German Empire, with 40,000,000 people, had a trade of £371,000,000 sterling, and the United States, with 50,000,000 people, had a trade of £229,000,000 sterling, and that was in wheat and agricultural products and manufactures that she sent to all the world. Why, it is insignificant compared with what many other countries send. These, the two most civilized nations, Germany and the United States, both of them under a system of protection, with a population of 90,000,000, do a trade of £610,000,000 sterling. England, with 35,000,000 of people, does a trade of £612,000,000 sterling, three times as much, man for man, as those two countries. France has a trade of £313,000,000 sterling with 36,000,000 of people; Russia has a trade of £183,000,000 sterling, with 80,000,000 people; and Holland has a trade of £116,000,000, with 5,000,000 of people. These countries combined have a population of 121,000,000, or £612,000,000 sterling, exactly the amount of England's trade with 35,000,000 of people, and that not in one of her best years, but in a year of depression. I will now speak of the terrible disasters which have happened British shipping under her Free Trade policy. The tonnage of England in 1840 was 6,490,000 tons; in 1880 it was 41,348,000 tons, an increase of more than six-fold in forty years under her free trade system. I myself remember that the United States liners used to come occasionally to the place where I live and take cargoes of lumber to England. I remember they were the admiration of the world, they were the finest ships that had ever been seen on the ocean. They are entirely removed under their system of protection, you hear nothing about American liners now. Thirty years ago Americans had four-fifths of the carrying trade between America and England, but free trade has enabled England to change the picture and to do most of that trade. In 1850, American ships were represented in the trade of the world by say fifteen as against forty for England; in 1840, the forty of England had grown to fifty-seven and the American fifteen had diminished down to six. That was the effect of protection upon the United States, that the 35,000,000 of the British Isles have 52 per cent. or more than half of the trade carried on by the entire human race. In all this growth, this wonderful increase is an

Mr. GILLMOR.

argument that ought to convince any man that was not willfully blind to the best advantages of free trade as compared with protection. Can you find such an example elsewhere? The world has never shown such an example. England sits to-day the mistress of the world as far as trade and commerce are concerned, and it is due not to her natural resources but to her enlightened free trade policy. While others may be looking at her she is extending her trade and increasing her wealth, setting an example that all the world, if they wish to be great, will eventually have to follow. The principle of protection, I say, is no evidence of the greatness of the United States. That country is great in spite of protection as she was great in spite of slavery, as she is great in spite of Mormonism and all the other "isms" that ought to be removed; she is great on account of her own wonderful resources because she is the finest country under the sun, and England lost that country by her miserable colonial policy and by protection. That country is great because she has a climate for every nation in Europe. Anybody who wants to come from the north of Europe and look for a cold, bracing climate can find it in the United States; if one comes from the sunny climate of Italy, he can find a genial atmosphere in the Central States; or if one comes from Africa and wants a scorching sun, he can find it there. Her fields, forests and gardens will make her great, notwithstanding rings and the operation of monopolies which have ground down her people. In this connection I am satisfied the time is not far distant when they will rise in their might and sweep these men from power who have so long imposed upon their credulity. That time will come sooner or later. God grant that it may be very soon, and that the Dominion will follow their example. Statistics have been compiled from which it appears that during the year 1881 there was shipped from New York 72,276,312 bushels of grain, and not one solitary bushel of that went in American vessels, either propelled by steam or by sail. How is that; what is the reason of that; are they not enterprising, do they not know how to build, maintain and sail ships as well to-day as before? Yet the fact is that of the carrying trade from the great city of New York, the commercial metropolis of America, not one bushel of that grain in that year was shipped in American bottoms; and it is absurd to talk about protection when such are the results that flow from it. The Suez Canal reports tell a wonderful story of England's trade. During 1881, 2,250 English ships passed through the canal. This was four times greater than the total of the other nations of the world during that year; and how many American ships do you think passed through that canal during that year? You could not tell me one, for there was not one. France came next to England with a magnificent total of 109 as against England's 2,256. That shows why England has money to lend, that tells the story of the balance of trade. Her ships are on every sea gathering, like the bees, honey from every flower over the wide world. That is what makes the balance of trade, makes it the glory and admiration of every Englishman. The hon. Minister of Railways said we must necessarily, as we are alongside the United States, shape our fiscal policy to meet theirs, and that is a sentiment which has been expressed by nearly all hon. members. In fact, it is a known principle of the Tory party—they must of necessity do it. We are the colony of a limited monarchy, and is there any necessity for changing our constitution because we lie alongside a Republic? Is there any necessity, moreover, to adopt their institutions because we lie alongside? There is no more necessity for imitating their trade policies than there is for imitating their constitution. It is quite a separate and independent matter. But that idea involves another idea, that we must declare a war of tariffs with the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not

now talk much about this war, they are constantly making comparisons unfavorable to every country except the United States. With respect to this retaliatory policy there is no part of the National Policy which has had a greater effect in giving hon. gentlemen opposite a majority than this idea of retaliation, a war of Tariffs declared with our neighbors across the line. There is not a more silly portion in the whole policy than that. I will give an illustration, and illustrations can be obtained every day. I live on the border, and our trade is very considerable with the United States. A farmer comes in to market at St. Stephens with a load of potatoes, but as there is no demand he passes over to Calais. On arriving at the end of the bridge on the American side, he is compelled by the Custom House officer to pay a duty of 15 cents a bushel. He gets one black eye there, according to the hon. gentlemen's theory. He is in a country where meal, cotton, sugar and oil are cheap, and he buys one dollar's worth of cotton, like amount of sugar, a bag of meal and a can of oil. The punishment of the Yankee, it will be remembered, is the gist of the whole Tariff system. On arriving at the Canadian side the Custom House officer seizes him by the throat and compels him to pay 40 cents on the cotton, 40 cents on the sugar, 20 cents on the meal, and as the kerosine oil will not stand the Canadian test it is confiscated. That is another black eye. I have heard the Minister of Finance talk about a victim, but I shall be glad if he can find a greater victim than this farmer who goes home to his family with two black eyes and little else from the proceeds of his potatoes. It is a disgraceful system to exist between two civilized nations. The man who went from Jerusalem to Jericho only fell among one batch of thieves and they robbed him of his raiment, but this farmer fell among two batches one on each side of the boundary. That is retaliation! Why, if the policy is so good, increase the army of detectives? The truth is that the people do not believe entirely in that policy and will trade along the lines. The Government are even appointing female detectives. Hon. gentlemen opposite all admire the system, but I am ashamed of my country and of the fact that a Canadian is made to suffer with a view to punishing the Yankees. I have no prejudice against the manufacturing or any other industry; but there is no reason for taxing the whole Dominion to be able to make such a statement as the Finance Minister does about some new factory in some locality. I do not deny that the erection and establishment of a manufactory, will help the locality in which it is placed, give employment to the laborer and do good to the people of the place. But why should every other locality that derives no advantage from that factory suffer in consequence? Why should the manufacturers have this advantage? Are they the class that ought to have the sympathy of the Government. As a class, they are rich, educated, and able to command the services of eloquent advocates. They can control the press, and, as a class, are the last men that ought to be singled out for any special privileges. I regret that with all those qualifications they do go about like mendicants and pass round the hat to force contributions, under the present system, to make the poor pour riches into their lap. That is the plain interpretation of your policy; and where is the reason for it? No; you do not reason logically about it; you deal in generalities and fallacies, as well as with the prejudices of the people, making them think that because some manufactory is being erected in some place in Ontario, the whole people are going to be enriched by it. You talk as if all the manufactories had been brought into existence by the National Policy, and exaggerate from first to last all through the chapter. The manufacturers are not the men that this paternal Government ought to look after. How is it with the great mass of the people who are poor? Without exaggeration, I should say that the poor you have always with you, and always will have, for the major-

ity of the laboring classes are comparatively poor. Though not suffering hunger, the present Government party made them believe they were suffering during the late Administration. While it was in power, I saw in Ottawa how you arranged the working-men's meeting, inflamed their minds and brought them up to ask the Prime Minister what he would do with them. You brought them up to ask for bread; and before the demonstration ended they would hurrah! for Sir John.

Mr. HESSON. I protest against the hon. gentleman libelling the working men.

Mr. GILLMOR. The hon. Finance Minister said in his great Budget Speech—in fact everything hon. gentlemen opposite say or do is great, the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways was so described. In reference to something about the leader of the Opposition—that he fed the people. I have known the hon. Minister of Finance, and leader of the Government, and most of the leading men opposite for thirty years, but never was aware of their feeding the people. But I have known the contrary and the poor have fed and clothed those hon. gentlemen well; with their hard-earned wages they have clothed them in purple and fine linen, and let them fare sumptuously every day; and I see that the eyes of some of them stick out with fatness. They ought to be grateful for the good feed that they get out of the laboring classes. Those hon. gentlemen say the people want work. Of course they do, but they want the proceeds of their work; they want money. But the laboring men want work, and to get their money not unfairly. I will say a little about the National Policy, with which I do not profess to be acquainted very minutely. I have not made a study of political economy, like some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, though I do not think they have studied it to very much advantage. Notwithstanding that I differ very much from them with regard to the National Policy, I admit their great ability and information. Some of them are orators, and in all ordinary walks of life, they occupy a good position. I have no doubt they are good husbands, neighbors and citizens, and right in all respects save the National Policy. When they parade it they do not act like rational men. As a medical man, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you have, as well as men's bodies, studied their mental construction; and if so I will recall some lesson I read many years ago in a treatise on mental philosophy, to show that men may be sound on every question but one. One instance was that of a certain nobleman in England who to all appearances was perfectly sane, going about his ordinary business in a way to cause no suspicion of unsoundness of mind. But there was a certain hallucination which drove him into his garden about 12 o'clock every day, under the impression that he had become a plant, when he would insist on being watered, and the servant would have to go through that process for him. After that he was just as sane as anybody else till the same hour next day. Another man, to all appearance also sane, when he had occasion to sit down, would do so with the greatest care thinking that a certain part of his person was glass and that if be dropped down hard, there would be a regular smash up. There was another case of a nobleman who died, leaving a very large estate with his son as executor. This case will come nearer my point. A brother of the executor discovered, as he thought, that he was not sane on some points; and so he thought that the executor was not capable of managing the estate, when he applied to the courts for an investigation into his brother's condition. So, accordingly, a court was summoned and the examination commenced. The counsel examined a witness, and in all possible subjects they found the man sane. The audience all concluded that the man was sane and that he should remain executor as he was appointed. But just before the case was concluded, his brother said to his counsel: "Just ask him who created

the heavens and the earth." So the lawyer asked him; his eyes flashed as he said: "Why, I created the heavens and the earth." "Ask him who makes the rain to descend, and the sun to shine and the earth to bring forth her fruits." "I do, of course." "Ask him who controls the nations of the earth and the trade of empires." "Why, I do." Well, Sir, the jury at once decided that the man was insane and that a new executor would have to be appointed. The story is suggested to me by the conduct of these hon. gentlemen who pretend that it is they who make the rain to descend and the sun to shine and the earth to bring forth her fruits. They regulate the trade of foreign countries, they improve the price of grain, and produce it here—or their National Policy does—they improve the price of lumber, and they are making all the people happy. Now, I do not think they talk sanely on that subject; in that respect they act like crazy men, and there is a jury that will try them and decide they are crazy. I am a free-trader, but I know that certain revenues must be raised in order to maintain the institutions of the country. I would raise these, as near as I could, upon the free-trade principles of England if I had the power. I know that we have got to have revenue, and therefore every man ought to contribute a certain portion of his gains to maintain the institutions of the country which afford protection to life and property and in which we all participate. But I maintain the principle is wrong to take by law any part of one man's earnings and give it to another man. It is unjust. A system of taxation that would be just is one that will not increase the price of any commodity, if that could be arrived at. The next best system is that which will tax goods the least possible amount that will meet the requirements of the revenue—that is, a revenue Tariff. The worst system that has been ever devised is the system which raises a revenue by making goods dear, and that is your protective policy. Whatever system takes a portion of one man's industry and gives it to another man is an injustice, and you are doing that by your protective system. Whenever a man earns a dollar by the sweat of his brow he has a right to that dollar himself, and has a right to purchase with it as much as he can get in any market in the world. There is no danger in their trading where it is not best for themselves. Why does the Government know more than the business men of this country, and does this Government understand how to do business better than they? Can they tell the people where they ought to trade and where they must trade? I see my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is in his seat. If there be one man in the Government that my heart warms towards it is the hon. Minister of Customs. He has always treated me well and given me the honor to come down to my county last summer. I was delighted to see him, and when he got there he was received with great *éclat*. He made a speech. I do not know exactly whether the rostrum was a barrel or a bag, but he stepped off the rostrum into a coach, into a chariot with white horses, and the National Policy men around him, one on his right and one on his left. They drove through our commercial metropolis, and the people were so excited you would have thought it was Barnum's museum. Nothing was ever seen like it there before. But the greatest amusement was to see the gentlemen that were on his right and on his left, exhibiting the champion of the National Policy. That was Canada for the Canadians, no trade with the Yankees. That community gives about two-thirds of its vote to the Tories. I get about one vote out of three in that community, but I hope to get more next election. My hon. friend went down there, and he was treated as I was glad to see him treated. After he was there a little while—I do not think he exactly liked the looks of things—he thought the National Policy was not commending itself to that community. After he came away, and without consulting his friends at all,

Mr. GILLMOR.

he appointed two more preventive officers, although there were already five or six. He did it without anybody's knowledge. After they had been driving him around in a waggon he did not believe these gentlemen were just the men to carry out the National Policy. He did not believe he could trust them in that respect, and so he had to add to the staff two more men to watch these good friends of his—these good friends that were loud in their praises of the National Policy from daylight till dark, at the corners of the streets, on the hustings, everywhere they were remarkable National Policy men; but from dark to daylight they were great Free Traders. His friends were great National Policy men all through the week. They go to church on Sunday, but Monday night they look out for Free Trade. He took the patronage out of their hands. I would like to see the correspondence. Will the hon. gentleman give it if I ask for it; but there will be no correspondence. They put it to him, and he had to come down with \$15,000 to build a Custom House to reconcile these gentlemen. He never had such a time in his life to carry out the National Policy. Why? You might as well try to stop the St. Lawrence as to stop people from buying and selling where it is best for them. They know better how to do it than you do. They are a law-abiding people—I mean to say where these laws are equitable; but you drive them to desperation. You are aiming to disturb every branch of industry. You are driving the commercial men whom it effects more almost than other class, over to the other side. Many of the important traders there have got their warehouses on the other side. I know several who are strong National Policy men, extreme party men, that were this fall looking out for stores in Calais to rent in order to keep a part of their trade that you are driving across the border. I do not believe that it is right to break the laws in this respect, but I mean to say that when you force an obnoxious policy on the country, when you try to force men to buy from Canadians at a higher price than they can buy from Americans, a sense of justice and of fair play will go further than the law, and you cannot control it. All along the frontier there is the same objectionable system. In Ontario if one man wants to exchange an article he has with another man for an article which he requires, he is allowed to do so, but if the parties happen to be situated on opposite side of an imaginary line in New Brunswick, they are prohibited from trading in that way. I do not care whether a man is black or white, if he has something which I want to buy, and I have something which I want to sell, I believe that we should be allowed to trade; and if I am compelled to buy from the people of Ontario, when I can purchase at a cheaper price from the American people, there is a failure on the part of justice and fair play. The Government have got one part of the policy of free trade running correctly. If you have a cargo of lumber to export they will allow you to export it, but if Canada is to be kept for the Canadians, why not keep it at home? But, on the contrary, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McLelan) said it was better that it should be exported, because you bring back the money. I want to bring back that on which I can increase my wealth most, and if I bring back an article on which I can enrich myself, does not the increase of the individual increase the wealth of the whole country? I produce, say, a cargo of fish or lumber. I send it to the United States, and it is convenient for me to bring back the money or such goods as I find cheaper to purchase there; and why should I be compelled to correspond with some man in Ontario, and make a bargain to send us down flour or any other goods or produce at a higher rate? Why should I be compelled to contribute to the proceeds of any particular institution in Ontario? I am attached as much to the Dominion as any other man, but matters of trade and matters of benevolence are on an entirely different arena. Men trade and exchange

to make money honestly, and that is the object of trade; but by the National Policy, you say to a country: "We know where you ought to trade; we know who you should trade with, to make yourselves richer, and we will make you trade there else we will tax you for the benefit of some one else." That is unjust and wrong from the beginning to the end. Anything which I can buy from the Canadians as cheaply as I can buy from the Americans, I would buy for my own interest and that is the only motive. How absurd it is to compel a man living on an imaginary line between New Brunswick and the United States to go up to Ontario and buy from Canadians at a higher price, goods which he can obtain much cheaper a few miles from his own home. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that that is keeping wealth within ourselves, and that we will become rich by that method of trading. We cannot get rich in that way. Robinson Crusoe, on the Island of Juan Fernandez, was on that principle the most independent community that could be imagined. He had no import trade; he had no export trade; he traded with his own community and he had it all to himself, and I never heard that Robinson Crusoe amassed very much wealth or enjoyed very much comfort. The whole thing is illogical; all the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite are mere expedients and fallacies. They cannot argue the question logically and convincingly with anybody, and unable as I am—and I certainly do not pride myself on my knowledge of these matters—I am not afraid to meet the cleverest man among them on the trade policy here or anywhere else, and discuss the question with them half an hour about. They dare not take me up. They will admit that free trade is all right in theory, but in practice it is all wrong. I say, Sir, that this is a contradiction in terms. I say that what is right in theory can never be wrong in practice. If the proposition is right theoretically it must be right practically. In conclusion, I may say that this is a most serious question, because these hon. gentlemen who have been Revenue Tariff men all through their history until now, when they are blossoming for the grave, have very recently become converts to this policy of protection. I have known the hon. Finance Minister for a long time. I was associated with him for many years, and I never knew him, in Parliament or out of it, to defend a protective policy until he came here. He was always in favor of free interchange of commodities and unrestricted trade. Those were his theories. I know also that by reputation the Minister of Public Works entertained the same opinion; but a time occurred when trade was depressed, and these hon. gentlemen, instead of acting the part of statesmen, acting as men on their side of politics in England would have acted, have played on the prejudice of the people, got them to elect them to seats in the House, and they are now—having nailed their colors to the mast—endeavoring to fix this system on the country. The longer it is fastened on the country the harder will it be, as in the case of the United States, to throw off the fetters which they have placed on the country; the more difficult will it be to remove the corrupt influences which have sprung out of rings and monopolists and designing and anxious politicians and syndicates. They are, too, becoming fixed on the country and a power is being created which it will be hard to break. We have to fight this battle out to the end. I may not see the end, but I hope my friends around me will accept no compromise; that they will have nothing to do with the protective system, but that though a small band they may like the army of Gideon gird on their swords and put the Midianites to flight. I have an abiding faith in the independence and intelligence of the people of this country. I have an abiding faith in the correctness of the principles of free and unrestricted trade, but I want no compromise in our own ranks. I would rather have an army of 300 men good and true, prepared to fight the battle to the end on the

square issue of right and wrong than all Gideons host. Now, Mr. Speaker, the great battle all down the ages of mankind has been around three central points: one is the freedom of the person, another the freedom of opinion, and the other freedom of exchange, or the liberty to buy where we please and to sell where we please. The first great point has been gained after many hard-fought battles, and the time has arrived, thank God, when in most of the civilized countries of the earth no man is held a slave, whether black or white. Freedom of opinion has been another hard-fought battle; men still have their prejudices in social life, in politics and religion, but such immense strides have been made in gaining freedom of opinion that men can hold their opinions and express them, so long as they do so within the bounds of prudence and not in violation of the law. The next great battle to be fought out is freedom of exchange, the right of which has been implanted in man by the Creator as much as the right to breathe the vital air, and no argument can prove the contrary. You may say we must pay our legitimate taxes; I admit it; but when you come to matters of trade between man and man, I say that the Government who taxes one industry to support another industry does an injustice and robs the man of that which rightfully belongs to him. Am I afraid that these principles will not triumph? No, Sir; I have an abiding faith in the people of this Dominion. They may do wrong for a time; you may humbug them a little longer; you may deal in your sophisms and your exaggerations; you may get the manufacturers and the monopolists of this country to aid you; but there will be an end to it. The time will come sooner or later, when the liberty to buy and sell, when and where we please, will become international and universal. And now, I cannot better conclude a speech of greater length than I intended, than by this quotation:

"God speed the ship, but let her bear
No merchandize of sin,
No groaning cargo of despair
Her roomy hold within,
No lethean drug for eastern lands,
No poison draught for ours,
But honest fruits of toiling hands
And nature's sun and showers."

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this debate has already been carried over a period of nearly three weeks, during which time a number of very lengthy and very excellent speeches have been delivered, covering almost every point embraced in the very broad and comprehensive speech of the Finance Minister; and I would not presume to offer any additional remarks were it not that some matters of a somewhat local character have been incorporated into the debate, to which it would be a gratification to myself to make some reply. Since the union of the British North American Provinces, I presume that it has not fallen to the lot of a Finance Minister to present to Parliament a Budget speech under circumstances so satisfactory and so gratifying as those under which the hon. Finance Minister spoke to us on the 24th of last month. It did seem at that time as though that speech might well be allowed to stand against all that could be said in opposition to it; and my impression is that it would have withstood everything that has been said against it to the present moment. But our friends opposite are not of that opinion and they have been indulged to their hearts' content in attempting to pick that speech to pieces. Now, I would like to know in what one particular that speech has been successfully assailed. Has any gentleman in the Opposition ranks pretended to controvert the fact that there was on the 30th of June last a surplus of \$4,130,000 in the Treasury? Has any member of the Opposition controverted the fact that there have been a large number of new industries established, and that there have been more employment and better

wages for the working people of the country? Has any man attempted to deny that the two great objects of the National Policy have been most successfully achieved? They know that it is useless for them to attempt to do so, for they themselves have repeatedly admitted that the condition of the country has been greatly improved; and I want to know why the condition of the country has improved except largely through the instrumentality of the National Policy, and through the wiser counsels that have prevailed since 1873. Now, the question has frequently been raised in the discussions between the two great parties in this country as to whether it is or is not a good thing to have a large balance of trade against us, or whether it was, speaking generally, a good thing for any country that there should be year by year a large balance of trade against it; in other words, that the imports should so largely exceed the exports of a country. That being the fact, as in the case of a private individual, when his expenditures largely exceed his income he must come to grief; and countries, with the rarest possible exceptions, when their expenditures are more than their receipts, or when they import more goods than they export, it must necessarily be with them as with an individual, and we have had a very striking illustration of that in the history of the last fourteen years. At the risk of being a little tedious I want to go into some calculations which I have made, and I would say for the gratification of those who are listening to me, with a view of affording some measure of relief to their minds, that if I shall find that more time than I anticipated in the beginning will be required in order to finish my speech, why, we may just say it off in the middle and I shall pursue it on some other occasion. The exports in 1880-81 amounted to \$98,290,823 as I have it, and I am inclined to think it is the largest export we have ever had; of that, however, I am not certain. The exports in 1874-75 were \$77,886,979, or a difference between the two periods of over \$20,000,000. Now let us turn to the imports; in 1874, they amounted to \$123,070,283; in 1880-81, the total was \$105,330,840 or a difference between the imports of 1881 and 1874-75, of \$17,739,443. The difference between the exports of 1880-81 and the imports of the same year, and the exports and imports of the former period, namely, 1874-75, amounted to \$38,143,287. Now, according to my arithmetic the balance of trade in 1881 was better by \$38,143,287 than it was in 1874-75. Now, I think that proves pretty conclusively that it is very much better to have a large export and a comparatively small import, provided we can supply ourselves in the mean time in a large degree, than it is to have it the reverse. The average annual balance of trade against us from 1867 to 1873-74 was \$20,356,438 and that was during what we would call the rule of the Liberal Conservative party. The average annual balance of trade from 1873-74 to 1878-79 was \$24,807,346, or between four and five millions worse during the latter than during the former period. The average annual balance of trade from 1879-80 to 1880-81 was \$4,725,107 instead of more than \$20,000,000 from 1873-74 to 1878-79. From 1867 to 1873, as our enemies are constrained to admit, it was an exceedingly prosperous period in the history of Canada, and progress was greater than during any previous period. This I will illustrate better by-and-by; whereas, on the other hand, from 1873-74 up to 1878-79, I need not describe the condition of the country. Gentlemen opposite seem to forget that by their mismanagement in various ways, by their blind adherence to a free trade policy they were successful in one department at least, viz., in rolling up deficits. It is noticeable that the years during which the imports and exports most nearly balanced have been our most successful years, viz.: 1869-70 to 1879-80, while the years in which the imports have been most largely in excess of the exports have been most disastrous years. I am talking

Mr. LONGLEY.

now about the latter period from 1867 up to 1873. We are not here to speak of these years, but I have already said they were eminently prosperous and successful. Our revenue increased very largely to the extent of \$7,000,000 during that period and our trade extended to the amount of \$86,000,000. What was the condition of our savings banks, what was the increase of the bank capital of the country? In every respect there was every indication of prosperity, but during the other period there was every indication of approaching ruin and bankruptcy if we had continued on in the same ratio as we had been going for two or three years previous. In 1869-70, the balance of trade was more in our favor than during last year, 1880-81, but the aggregate trade was \$55,000,000 smaller than in 1880-81 and the aggregate trade smaller by \$29,000,000 in 1879-80 than in 1880-81. The total yearly increase of tonnage, inwards and outwards, from 1867 to the end of 1873-74 was 709,000 tons. The yearly increase from 1873-74 to 1878-79 was 7,438 tons; in 1879-80 and 1880-81, 1,007,893 tons. From 1874-75 to 1878-79, shipbuilding decreased annually 19,254 tons, or 77,015 tons in five years. In 1879-80 and 1880-81 the annual decrease was only 12,093 tons, or 24,187 for two years. It will be noticed that whereas from 1875 until 1880 there was a decrease each year in shipbuilding, yet, in 1880-81, there was an increase. The tonnage added to our shipping fleet during the year 1880-81 was 10,500 tons. From 1875-76 until the end of 1878-79 the total tonnage of steamers in the coasting trade increased 2,884,584 tons; the sailing vessels tonnage decreased 1,118,833 tons; or a total increase in coasting trade in three years of 1,765,751 tons. In 1879-80 and 1880-81 the steamer tonnage increased—2 years nearly as much as in five years—2,132,482; in 1879-80 and 1880-81 the sailing tonnage increased 917,601; or a total increase in coasting trade, in two years, of 3,050,083 tons. There was a decrease of sailing vessels employed in coasting each year of the Mackenzie Administration. Under this Government they have largely increased. It is a noticeable fact that while the steamers increased only 104,713 per year more under the present Government, the sailing vessels were 831,744 tons per year better off under them than under the Mackenzie regime. From 1867 to 1880-81 the average annual excess of imports over exports was \$18,971,114; the excess for 1880-81 was only \$7,040,017, or better by \$11,931,097 than the average since Union. From 1867 to 1874 the exports increased \$32,000,000, or \$5,333,333 per annum. From 1874 to 1879 the exports decreased \$18,000,000, or \$3,600,000 per annum. Adding the increase of exports from 1867 to 1874 to the decreased exports from 1874 to 1879 make an average against the latter period of \$8,933,333. The exports have increased \$27,000,000 since 1879, two years. The exports decreased \$18,000,000 from 1874 to 1879, making a difference of \$17,500,000 per year. That is to say, that the increase of exports during the last two years has been \$13,500,000 per annum, while the decrease in exports during five years—1872-74 to 1878-79—was \$3,600,000; total, \$17,100,000. Now, what becomes of the argument of the hon. member for Brant. He, indeed, admitted that the export of manufactured goods had fallen off. Well, what then? Why, first, it proves that under the present policy we command our own markets; secondly, that we save immensely by thus supplying ourselves, keeping the money and our men in the country instead of both going out of it, and reaping all the benefit of the labor bestowed upon the goods manufactured and consumed. At any rate, it would be something new were any hon. gentleman to succeed in such an enterprise; because, although we have been discussing the National Policy for three or four years up to the present hour, I am not aware that any hon. member has successfully controverted this position. None deny but that the times are better than they were

three, four, and five years ago. To what other causes can the improvement be ascribed than those claimed for the National Policy? That is the question we ask, and more, we say that you gentlemen of the Opposition cannot controvert the statement, else we are persuaded you would do it, which you have never done yet. Let us examine this question. First, the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) admits a larger employment in connection with the manufacturers; secondly, he states that the exports of goods made in connection with those same manufacturers has fallen off in 1880-81. Now, granting these two propositions, are they not the plainest possible evidence that the home manufactures are in good demand for home consumption? If this is correct, then is not the great object of the National Policy attained—namely: Home-made goods for the home market. Now, we will take the hon. member for Brant, who doubtless is a protectionist at heart. So strongly are his protectionist proclivities that he has to be carefully on his guard whenever he gets up to speak on the other side of the question. Out of the hon. gentleman's own mouth, taking his own argument, we prove conclusively that the chief ends of the National Policy have been accomplished. The member for Lambton said the other day that labor is the foundation of all work, saying that no country can be rich without labor. These are two propositions to which people will readily assent. Let us see at what conclusions we shall arrive by logically pursuing the argument, that a policy such as that of the late Government which allowed goods to be manufactured in other counties and sold here is calculated to ruin this country; while a policy which increases labor, as even the hon. member for Brant admits ours does, is the one to make a country rich. Now, then not only have we the testimony of this hon. gentleman in favor of our policy, but we have even a greater name, the hon. member for Lambton, who was at one time looked upon as a great authority. It is true he has lost a little of his prestige since that time, but we still look to him as an authority in most matters that relate to the interests and concerns of this country. Therefore, by the hon. member for Lambton's doctrine and the hon. member for Brant's admission, it follows as the night follows the day, that the National Policy is the policy for Canada. But the hon. member for Brant proved an increased import for 1880-81, of the class of goods manufactured at home. If, therefore, the imports have increased, and new manufactures have also been established, while all the manufactories are doing a larger business than before, have we not the plainest possible proof of the greatly increased purchasing power of the masses of the people, and is not another doctrine of the National Policy advocates established, namely, that increased labor will give the laborers more money to spend? In other words, when all have full employment the purchasing power of the country is vastly increased. Those are our cardinal doctrines, and it would seem as though these are doctrines now held by even such free traders as the members for Lambton and Brant, one of whom declared not many years ago that he nailed his free trade colors to the mast and was determined to go down with the ship rather than haul them down. Unfortunately for him, but very fortunately for the country, his ship did go down, although he had his colors nailed to the mast, and if that ship were afloat, being buffeted by the tide now as it was then, it would go down a second time, and for this reason. I was surprised to hear the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who entertained us with such a peculiar speech, say that the country was only waiting to expel the present Government. I thought to myself: have we had no test of the popularity of the Government, of the position they hold in the confidence of the people? Even so recently as the day on which the electors for South Simcoe deposited their ballots; and pray what was the result of that election? Was it not simply to double the majority of the former member? Then

look at the Government as it was supported when we first assembled here in 1879, and how are they supported to-day? They then had a majority of about eighty, which was thought quite large enough by the Ministers themselves; but that majority of eighty has since been increased to ninety odd; some say ninety, some say ninety-six. Every constituency opened, save two, has been gained by the Government; a proposition hostile to the Government would be voted down by a majority of over ninety any hour. I rather think the majority is all the time growing, and that we do not want any better signification of what the sentiment of the country is in regard to the distinctive policy of the Government. So much has been said about England, that it were a pity, perhaps, to make any further allusion to that noble country, which we all love so well; and all I shall do will be to say this, that for one, I think much of England and have too ardent a desire for her prosperity to rejoice in any way at seeing indications of her decay. Now, I am not prepared to say that England is less powerful to-day than she was a quarter of a century ago. In some respects she has increased her importance among the nations of the earth. Her relative power to-day, may be as great as it was years ago; but we cannot deny the fact that, in regard to England's agricultural interests there has been a very signal decay during the last six years. In respect to the number of horned cattle, they have decreased about 2,000,000, and in respect to sheep, swine, horses and all sorts of stock there has been a corresponding decrease. We know, also, that some 600,000 acres once sown to wheat have recently been turned out to pasture, and that year by year the English agriculturist is less able to compete with his brother agriculturist on this side of the water.

Mr. BORDEN. They are sending potatoes over this side this year.

Mr. LONGLEY. I know they are, and I am glad they are able to send them. It has been many years since they have had many potatoes to send from England. It is to be regretted that they have had little, except manufactured goods, to send, because it is notorious that England, with all her greatness, has been largely dependent upon America for much of her food for years past, and the problem is to know where that sort of thing is to end. One word more with regard to England's wealth. I am an utter disbeliever in the statement made by hon. gentlemen that the wealth of England is materially, if at all, increasing. I cannot suppose for a moment that England's manufacturing industries are in nearly as good a position as they were ten or twenty years ago. It must be obvious to every man who will look into the subject that though England commanded the markets of the world in a former period she has been from year to year in the position of being driven out from one market after another until she now reciprocates to a small extent with many leading nations of Europe. She is almost shut out of the markets of France. And, by the way, it would not be inappropriate to remark that England has very recently sued for a treaty with France, a treaty which, years ago, France willingly enough accorded, but which for reasons which France best understands, is now refused. At one time an alliance with England was coveted, almost every nation was ambitious to cultivate trade relations with her, but it does not seem to be so now. If I am correctly informed as to the condition of France, she is much more prosperous to-day than even Old England, and that too in face of the fact that twelve years ago France was at the feet of an exacting and despotic power, but in six years after the adopting of a highly protective Tariff, her industries became flourishing and to-day she is acknowledged to stand among the foremost nations in the world. Germany, also, has been referred to as a signal instance of the

unwisdom of adopting a protective Tariff. While I am not conversant with the exact position of Germany, and am satisfied that in regard to manufacturing skill and in regard to the increase of her power, there is scarcely a nation in the world whose power and influence are so great as those of Germany, and that, too, in spite of the fact that she maintains a million men in arms, which of itself is enough, almost, to break any country down—but to speak of Germany having suffered in consequence of the adoption of a protective policy, is to talk in utter disregard of the facts which are acknowledged by the whole world. You do not usually find all the nations of Europe trembling at a power that is going to decay. Then, if you were to speak of the comparatively small country of Belgium, with a population of 5,000,000, look at the progress of that little country in manufacturing industries. She has come into sharp competition even with England herself; and it is noteworthy that the nations which have been the sharpest competitors should obtain that excellence, with power to compete with England, through the adoption of the protective policy. You will find that whenever a nation has adopted a protective policy for a number of years, that nation has increased in material wealth, and in every respect has improved her condition; and, on the other hand, you will find that in almost every instance where there has been a blind adherence to the principles of free trade, especially where the surrounding nations have adopted a protective policy, that nation has gradually gone to decay, or at any rate has decreased in power in comparison with other nations. France maintains an enormous army which must be a drawback to her, but I look upon the history of France during the last twelve years as little short of marvellous. She was supposed to have incurred a debt that she could never discharge; she had been mutilated by her enemy; and yet we find that in a very brief interval she springs up to her former position, and bids fair to rival any nation in Europe; but she has had a protective policy to some extent for seventy-five years, and notably since the disaster of 1870. There was an attempt made the other night by the hon. member for Lambton to show that the present Government was extravagant, and that the Government which he conducted for five years was a very economical one. The increase of expenditure in 1875 over that for 1873-4 was \$2,960,336 and the increase in 1876 over 1875 was \$717,062. In 1876, the amount disbursed over 1873 was \$3,677,398; I believe that in fairness we might deduct from that the sum of \$1,500,000 which was paid to Prince Edward Island and \$370,000 which we might by a very liberal allowance to the Government regard as being paid in unusual expenditures. This would reduce the excess in 1876 over 1873 to \$1,800,000. Now then, the increase of expenditures during the interval under review only amounted to \$5,760,764, and yet the hon. member for Lambton, the other night, without a change of countenance seemingly, in the most modest way imaginable, coolly told us that his was a most economical Government and this a most extravagant one. I admit at once that the Government which ruled the country from 1867 to 1873 was a most liberal Government—in the matter of expenditure—but the marked difference between that Government and the one which succeeded it was this: that while the one had surpluses amounting to over fifteen millions of dollars, the other had deficits amounting to about one-third of that sum.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). How?

Mr. LONGLEY. Has the hon. member for Middlesex the cheek to say that there were not over \$15,000,000 of a surplus during that period?

Mr. ROSS. How much?

Mr. LONGLEY. Some hundreds of thousands; and if the hon. gentleman does not take my word I will give him the word of the ex-Finance Minister, and ask him if he

Mr. LONGLEY.

desires to controvert my position. Whenever they were charged with having made large expenditures they laid the blame on their predecessors. Will they name the objections of which they complain so much? The total expenditures on public works paid out of Consolidated Revenue in 1873 was \$1,977,613; in 1875, \$1,757,075; and in 1876, \$1,948,941; the increased expenditure upon piers, harbors and breakwaters in 1876, over 1875, was \$130,248. The expenditure charged to Consolidated Fund in 1875-6 for works not begun in 1874, but voluntarily assumed by the then existing Administration, viz., on piers, harbors, river works, custom houses, penitentiaries and marine hospitals, amounted to \$621,669. Now, it seems to me, that however desirable it may have been to have that money appropriated for the purposes to which it was applied, I say it was not expedient or wise for them to expend that amount of money when there were constantly increasing deficits, and when it was obvious that they really had not the money to expend. The total amount expended in 1874 upon works not commenced in 1873 was \$327,552.

Mr. ROSS. You are reading Senator Macpherson's figures?

Mr. LONGLEY. I do not care whose figures they are. If they are Senator Macpherson's figures no man has yet had the courage to undertake to refute them, although frequently challenged to do so. I do not say whether or not they are Senator Macpherson's figures, but I will say that there is scarcely a man in this wide Dominion who understood better what he was about than Senator Macpherson when he was compiling those figures, nor a gentleman who would be a safer guide in matters of finance than that hon. gentleman. Our trouble with our opponents is that they do not meet us face to face. When, for instance, certain statements are made by the Minister of Finance, which those gentlemen in general terms, are fond of disparaging and disputing, why do they not rise to their feet, or take the first opportunity that offers afterwards, to grapple with those facts? Why, the hon. Minister of Finance gave us more facts and figures and sound arguments the other day than those gentlemen could digest in a lifetime; they would not be so foolhardy, they know better than to undertake to wage a direct war with that hon. gentleman, or to bring things to a direct issue, because, so far as we can judge at any rate, when the Minister of Finance undertakes to talk upon matters of finance, or in relation to the National Policy, and matters in relation to the Tariff and various classes of goods, he knows exactly what he is talking about and no man in this House has yet been able to controvert his statements. Well, possibly the hon. member for Bothwell may undertake to combat that, he is able to talk on questions of constitutional law and is very wise and learned upon a variety of topics which he does not infrequently drag into this debate, when in the estimation of others they do not seem very much to belong to it. A man may be learned upon a variety of topics, but then after all it depends very much upon the use a man makes of what he knows, and his judgment about displaying it. The total amount expended in 1874 on works not commenced in 1873, was \$327,552, and the total amount expended in 1875, upon works not commenced in 1873, was \$203,546. The amount expended in 1876 on works not commenced in 1873 was \$556,596. That is pretty fair for a Government that was going behind at the rate of \$2,000,000 a year, and at the same time increasing the aggregate expenditure. Now let us try civil government. I may say I have only one objection to the use of these figures; it is a somewhat serious one, viz.: that they have been used before in this House, but then after all those hon. gentlemen have to be reminded very frequently of certain unpleasant facts, and the only apology I have for using them at the present time I have already referred to, that the hon. gentleman for

Lambton for the twenty-fifth time undertook to tell the House the other night that his was an economical Government, and that ours was an extravagant one. Now, civil government was in 1873, \$750,874, but in 1875, the cost was \$909,265, a jump up of \$175,000 in a single year. In regard to expenditure for Civil Government, contingencies account in 1873, reached \$287,000 odd; in 1875, \$302,327; in 1876, \$301,602. There is no excuse for that increase.

Mr. ROSS. What was it in 1878?

Mr. LONGLEY. I am glad the hon. member reminded me of that. The then Government took alarm in 1878, and no wonder. The people had come to find out that their statements in regard to economizing were delusive; they had commenced to examine for themselves, and besides they were approaching a general election, and on the score of saving their credit and commending themselves to the country, they effected economy in certain directions, but it was too late to begin to reform. I do not think the country gave any credit to them for doing so, otherwise the people would not have sent them about their business and given their opponents a majority of 80 in a House of 200 odd members. The Administration of Justice increased as follows: 1873, \$393,966; 1875, 497,465; and 1876, \$544,091.

Mr. ROSS. Why does the hon. gentleman stop with 1876?

Mr. LONGLEY. It will be bad enough to go to that length. In regard to that particular case, and on many other occasions I have had my sympathies considerably aroused as matters went against them from 1873 to 1878, and also against the country. I do not see how hon. gentlemen opposite can obtain any encouragement. They can find no encouragement in the by-elections, but they comfort themselves with the idea that a good time is coming, and I hope the youngest will live to see it. In Customs the cost was, in 1875, \$682,673; in 1876, \$721,008. I think it would have been bad enough to have kept the expenditure up to the level of the previous years. The deficits were piling up in an alarming manner. The Excise Department cost, in 1873, \$103,704; in 1874, \$119,000, and, in 1879, \$203,759. This is a comparatively small branch of the public service, yet here there was a proportionate increase as in all the other departments. Let us turn to the Emigration Department. In 1873 the expenditure was \$277,368; in 1875, \$302,770; in 1876, \$385,845.

Mr. ROSS. Give us the figures for 1877-78.

Mr. LONGLEY. I have already explained why I do not speak of it. I will ask one of my friends to pursue the enquiry in regard to that year about which the hon. gentleman is so solicitous. Let us see what the sequel of this extraordinary expenditure was. The number of emigrants obtained by us in 1873 was 36,901; in 1875, with a very considerable increase of expenditure it was 16,038, or less than half; and in 1876, 10,901 for an expenditure of \$385,000. The cost per head, of these immigrants in 1873 was \$7.76, quite a moderate sum, because each immigrant might reasonably be expected to be worth what he cost. But in 1875, the cost per head was \$18.09, and in 1876, \$26.55. I could by no very unfair comparison say it was \$30.10. But I have deducted from this computation the cost of the Mennonites, which might be fairly included. Thus we have a cost of \$7.76 for 1877-78, and for 1879, \$26. It seemed that the larger the expenditure was, the fewer became the immigrants. I will not pretend to go all round Departments and institute comparisons; but if you will go into the various public services during that time and carefully note the management which distinguished each Department, you will find that the management in other places was about on a par with the management of the Emigration Department. From the 30th June, 1873, to 1876, the total increase of interest chargeable to the Consolidated Fund was \$1,203,797. That only involved an annual increase of expenditure in

connection with Public Works of about \$400,000 a year. Now, there could not have been any great progress made in connection with the public works during that interval. I say here—although it may be an individual opinion that I express—that the Macdonald Government never imposed an onerous obligation upon the Mackenzie Government. I say, and I am in the presence of gentlemen who understand the question much better than I do, that the Mackenzie Government, in view of all the circumstances, was not obliged to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. But he voluntarily took upon himself obligations which the former Government had assumed, and far transcending the obligations of the former Government. The former Government never contemplated, when they formed the union with British Columbia, to give more than \$30,000,000 as a subsidy to the construction of that work. What was that in comparison with the onerous obligations imposed upon the country under the Act of 1874? One can have but a feeling of amusement that men who conducted the affairs of the Government at that time have now the face to speak about the country again entrusting them with power. Now, if the ex-Minister were in his seat, I would just give the House, a chapter on the steel rail transaction. I shall make a remark or two, and I will make them with every reasonable consideration to the gentleman who is absent, because I entertain for him a very high respect. There is no denying now, in view of the revelations that have taken place since the purchase of these rails, that over \$2,000,000 were lost to this country, which will entail upon us and our children through ages to come a very large annual burden in the shape of interest. The act was all the more inexcusable, inasmuch as the article purchased was not wanted at the time, nor would they have been wanted for years afterwards. Such a thing as the purchase of 50,000 tons of steel rails, when there was not a mile of road graded, is an unheard of thing in the history of Canada, or, I think, in the history of any other country. There was one thing that was very significant about that transaction, independent that the article was purchased long before it was needed, purchased in a falling market and at a time when everybody must have known that the price was likely to fall. And here is what I refer to—and it is the most awkward feature of the whole transaction. The Minister of Railways, although he proposed to purchase 50,000 tons of steel rails, did not issue his advertisement until the 29th of September, though the tenders were to be opened on the 8th of October.

Mr. ROSS. Did he not extend the time?

Mr. LONGLEY. Yes; but it would require one day for the advertisement to reach anybody, and another day to send the tender, and thus—allowing for the sabbath which intervened—only six or seven days were allowed for the consideration of tenders to be put in. At least three months should have been allowed. Yet because some of the late Premier's friends remonstrated vigorously the time was extended to a month. I think the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), spoke of the accumulations in the savings banks previous to the inauguration of the National Policy. Did he think that made the difference? Did he happen to think that at that particular time we could do without a National Policy? The fact is, the Grits were not in power at that time, and hence the accumulations in the savings banks; but as soon as they came in, the savings banks were depleted, like everything else. We should not overlook the relative positions of Canada and the United States at that particular time. We could then do very well without a National Policy; we were scarcely interfered with at all by the United States. But subsequently it became a very difficult thing; it did not matter how many goods were slaughtered

in our markets, or to what extent we were being sacrificed to the United States, these gentlemen adhered to their policy. With regard to savings banks, I have a statement with reference to the savings in the shire town of Annapolis County, my own county. It shows the amounts on deposit in each year from 1875 to 1882: On the 30th June, 1875, there were \$22,059.06; in 1876, \$19,291.48; in 1877, \$22,587.08; in 1878, \$36,013.33; in 1879, \$65,875.60; in 1880, \$52,145.21; in 1881, \$92,782.44; and on the 1st January, 1882, \$125,951.77. And that is only one of the many signs of the times, of returning prosperity and comfort on the part of the people; of the little surpluses which they have accumulated under improved times, and which they are careful to place in the savings banks. Now there was on the 31st January, 1882, five times the average amount that was in that bank at any time from 1875 to 1878; I think that is very significant. My statement in reference to the surpluses from 1867, down to 1873 has been confirmed by the ex-Minister of Finance, who gave the moneyed men of England a vivid description of the prosperity of Canada at that time. He said that although there had been very large expenditures in connection with improving the public works of this country, yet the revenue had steadily increased, so that there were between fifteen and sixteen millions of a surplus, and that the money which had been thus expended would in years to come greatly contribute to the progress and prosperity of the country. He also said that no man who had money to lend need be under the slightest apprehension in regard to the credit and resources of Canada—and remember, Sir, that was two years after the advent of the Mackenzie Government to power. I know that at Aylmer the ex-Finance Minister, two years afterwards, undertook to tell the people that the outgoing Government were little better than a drunken crew and that the last act of their lives was an attempt to scuttle the ship of State. I know he said that, but unfortunately he had said a very different thing before, and that was two years after he himself had taken charge of the finances. But the Opposition say it is all owing to depression of times. Was the depression of times in Canada any greater than it was in the United States during the same interval, with this simple distinction, that the return to better times began a little sooner in the United States than here? I assume that the depression affected the United States just as much as Canada.

Mr. ROSS. With a protective Tariff?

Mr. LONGLEY. I will point out the distinction between the position of the United States during that time of depression and the condition of Canada. In the one case we were not able to meet our annual disbursements and at the end of five years we had deficits amounting to something like \$6,000,000; and the present Finance Minister has assured us that, but for the National Policy which saved us from a very serious disaster, the debt would have amounted to seven or seven and a-half millions. In the United States, however, they were able not only to prevent deficits but had larger surpluses and for a considerable length of time and instead of increasing the natural debt, they year by year reduced it. There is no escaping from the conclusion that the condition of things for 1873-4 led to this conclusion—that the depression was due first to extravagance on the part of the Government in regard to the expenditures, and second in regard to general mismanagement; and probably if the hon. member for Middlesex had had a seat in the Cabinet he might have avoided the breakers into which they ran the ship of State because it is notorious that a portion of the late Cabinet rendered but little aid in the way of managing public affairs. I will not undertake to describe the heterogenous masses that were got together. But if I had a file of the *Globe* or some

Mr. LONGLEY.

of the other organs of my hon. friend from Middlesex, I would be relieved from the necessity of saying a word myself in regard to the personnel of a part of the late Government. And these were the men who swore all their lives that about the greatest crime men could commit was to form a coalition government.

Mr. ROSS. Grits do not swear.

Mr. LONGLEY. I hope the hon. gentleman does not, but I would not trust many of that party. Had the conditions of things been unpropitious from 1867 to 1873 and prosperous from 1873-4 down to 1878-9, we could have attributed the success during the one period and the disasters attending the other to accidental causes, or, in the former case, to unpropitious circumstances. But it is significant that no sooner were the late Government displaced from power and the Liberal Conservatives restored to office, then the old prosperity that marked the experience of the country from 1867 to 1873 was won back, so that there is no escape from the conviction that it was simply from mismanagement that while there was success in the first period, there was want of success in the second, success following again in the third period.

Mr. ROSS. You had deficits in 1879-80.

Mr. LONGLEY. And why? Our friends opposite almost ruined the country and we were not able to restore its prosperity in a single year, but what was the state of things from 1867 to 1873? From the first year of the present Government, beginning with a small surplus of about \$200,000, we ran it up in one year to \$3,617,000, I think. But that was not equal to \$4,130,000 lately announced. I do not wonder that the hon. the Finance Minister was strong and eloquent when he went into the minutæ of his subject the other day. There was inspiration in a surplus of \$4,130,000 obtained through his own wise policy, matured by his colleagues. He had occasion to be proud of its results, and he was able to speak in such a way as to captivate all of us, not only in the House, but the public equally outside. Scarcely a newspaper, with any pretension to fairness, but was almost as unqualified in its praise of that speech and of the success of the National Policy as were the papers of the Government; and this applies to all the independent newspapers also. Let anybody read the *Evening Telegram*, the *Toronto World*, and other papers that claim to be independent, and see what they say with regard to the Tariff and the results achieved under the National Policy and the wise administration of the present Government. The leader of the Opposition is away at present, or I would make remarks at some length in regard to him. I will only make one or two observations at this time, however. Lured by the brilliant prospects held out to him last winter by the members from New Brunswick, that hon. gentleman was tempted to make a visit to the Maritime Provinces. I will not undertake to describe the many ovations he received, nor the large and enthusiastic meetings he was enabled to gather. His principal argument had reference to Mr. Parks' cotton factory and the cost of the various kinds of clothing, which he told the people they were obliged to purchase at extravagant prices. One meeting was held in my own county, at which there were assembled 300 persons all told. He told us a good deal about the impositions of the Tariff and about the extravagance of the Government, but he laid the chief stress upon the fact that the Tariff was oppressive, that poor people were obliged, when they went to purchase their garment, to be satisfied with six or eight yards instead of ten, and he intimated to them that they must cut the garment according to their cloth, and he was disposed to dock them in regard to the various articles of clothing they were to wear. With reference to flannels, with reference to cottons and all those fabrics, he was going to dock off considerable from the liberal allowance the ladies had indulged in previously. We

did not have time to ask two or three members of the Cabinet to enlighten us on that occasion, though we thought it especially needful after the visit of the great luminary of the west. The truth is, however, that we came to the conclusion after the visit of the hon. gentleman, that we could dispense with a call from any of the leaders of the Government. In fact, we came to the conclusion that if we could not get these leaders of the Government to come down, the best thing would be to get the leader of the Opposition to come down again—the one plan would be as effective as the other. The fact is the hon. gentleman came down on a fool's errand. He found he had no cause to advocate as he and his friends found in this Chamber. Almost within sight of the spot where the hon. gentleman addressed a small number of the electors of Annapolis, there stood a furniture factory, and its history, since the inauguration of the National Policy, would be the strongest argument that could be offered against anything the hon. gentleman could say against that policy. The proprietor of that factory informs me that he has doubled his business in two years. He has, since last summer, erected a two-story building, 60 feet in length by some 30 in breadth, in which has been started a manufactory of organs and other musical instruments. So as one thing leads to another, we have here a manufactory of our own, where, but for this Tariff, American goods would have been offered at slaughter prices. The first statement is that he has doubled his business in two years. He says: "I have doubled the number of my workmen. Parties in St. John first gave me an order for twelve suits of furniture of a certain make. That was to cover an interval of six months. The same parties gave me an order in December last for 80 suits, to be delivered in four months." Then he goes on to state that parlor furniture has increased in same ratio. This gentleman states further that he pays out about \$60,000 a year for labor and stock, and about \$2,000 a month for wages. The best of all is that since the inauguration of the National Policy he has sold his furniture, not higher, but ten per cent. lower. This is in full confirmation of the arguments we have adduced from the time that policy was introduced until now. What does this little industry which I have referred to, mean? It means the retention in the country of 30 or 40 workmen, to begin with—most of them, skilled workmen, and all good citizens. There can be no manner of doubt but what these 30 or 40 men, or the larger proportion of them, would have been in the United States at work in some of the factories in that country to-day, but for the inauguration of the National Policy. It means a better home market for the producer, and a large amount of money unspent for foreign articles, which might be furnished as cheaply, yea, cheaper, and as well made, at home. It also means greater self-respect, and a constantly increasing advance in every way, and no one can controvert that reasoning. I have not mentioned this as being a very important matter in itself, but simply as it is indicative of the tendency of the policy to which we ascribe the present prosperity of the country. Foundries, shoe factories, canning establishments and various other manufactures have been started and to-day we bid fair to make more money in consequence of the convenient home market than we would have made before this beneficent policy was introduced. I shall speak now from a Nova Scotian standpoint, and the outlook for that Province, at a moderate computation, is 25 per cent. better than it was in 1877-78. Let us look outside of this little county of Annapolis and extend our thoughts and observations to the two Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Two sugar refineries have been established in those Provinces, one at Halifax and another at Moncton; two cotton factories, one at Halifax and one at Windsor. Now, a cotton factory is being started in Halifax, and one at Windsor, and both of them it is expected will be opened in the spring and in operation

An agricultural implement factory is about being started at Amherst, so we are informed through the newspapers; a woollen factory at Hopewell has been started, and a glass factory at New Glasgow, both places being in Pictou county. And other enterprises are in prospect. Now, this is just a fair beginning of a new order of things, the starting of manufactures to supply all our own wants. Very soon, Mr. Speaker, we shall be relieved from the necessity, I hope, of looking to Ontario and Quebec for the bulk of our manufactured articles. There is no reason why we should not manufacture as well and as cheaply, yea, in every respect to manufacture more cheaply than in any other part of the Dominion of Canada, and that is more particularly the case in the vicinity of the coal mines, where the coal is right alongside the factory. Taking, for instance, the glass factory at New Glasgow, any coal that is used in connection with that factory is right at the door, and may be hauled by a team and put into the factory at \$2.00 per ton, perhaps less. Well, now, will any one pretend to say we shall not, if we get started, be able to hold our own with the older and more populous, if not the more enterprising Provinces; I think it cannot be disputed. Not that we begrudge to Montreal or Quebec any advantage they have reaped from our patronage. With the most friendly feelings towards the United States, believing in their institutions, and admiring them as I do, nevertheless I very much prefer trading with the Upper Provinces or any other portion of the Dominion, if we cannot supply our own wants. But remember that the United States is what she is in consequence of a protective policy, much more highly protected than our country. What but this policy could have carried the States through one of the most disastrous and expensive wars in which any country was ever engaged, and enabled them shortly after its close to more than regain the position they had occupied in the scale of nations previously; and to-day to such a degree have the Americans carried forward their manufacturing industries that it may well be doubted whether any country on the face of the earth manufactures better articles or sells them at cheaper prices.

Mr. ROSS. England does.

Mr. LONGLEY. No; England does not. She may exceed the United States in certain articles, but in regard to others she is far behind the United States, as is seen by the fact that England has been driven out of the Australian market by the Americans in respect to the sale of certain manufactured articles; and not only out of Australia, but out of other countries. This has in a measure been done by France, which is quite as highly protected as the United States. Wherever you find a nation in the first rank at the present time you will find it has attained that particular excellence and success chiefly through the initiation of a policy similar to that which we entered upon as it were the other day. I want to know why it is we, with a territory equal to that of the United States, and richer in regard to mining interest than almost any other country, as broad and rich and diverse, except, possibly, our climate—why may we not achieve what the United States have achieved during a century. If we progress for fifty years as we have done during the last two years, we shall ultimately rival the United States, because we have this advantage in regard to our land especially, that while our land is almost untouched, their land is mostly or very largely occupied. Their time may be said to be in a large measure past, but our time has just come. I do not believe there is a country on the face of the earth, with a population so small, that has as fair a prospect before it as this Canada of ours. I hope we shall see the time when none of the statesmen or politicians in Canada will think it either becoming or necessary to disparage and belittle their country. We have had enough of that. We have one of the

best, richest and most diversified countries, in regard to natural resources, on the globe I will now say a word or two about the coal industry. Years ago we had—I presume now have, \$15,000,000 invested in the Nova Scotia coal mines, an industry which gives the Province a revenue of \$100,000 a year, or one-fifth of its entire revenue. Is it any wonder, then, that we should attach some importance to the coal industry, and to the fact of 60cts. a ton duty having been imposed upon it? I think not. It would be odd if we thought less of it. I think I shall be able to demonstrate that this duty has had an immense influence on this industry—that it has wonderfully increased the output of coal, and that nobody has been injured by it, but Nova Scotia has been very largely blessed. I approve of reciprocity between the different parts of the Dominion and the cultivation of interprovincial trade. What were we united for, if not to interchange commodities and do one another good? If we glory in the name of Canadians—if we have any pride of country—what can we more earnestly desire than to see every part of the Dominion grow, thrive and expand into a nation, until we shall even rival the great nation alongside of us. I speak thus not because I represent a county that has any direct interest in the coal mining business; I speak first as a Nova Scotian and second as a Canadian. The people of Ontario ask us very kindly to put up with the inconvenience of paying 40 cents a barrel on corn meal, and 77 cents a bushel on corn. We cannot exactly see the necessity of that provision in the Tariff, but so far as I know the friends of the Government, at least, cheerfully acquiesce in it, and it is only the grumblers from Yarmouth and certain other places that are constantly driving into the ears of the people that there is any special hardship in this matter. We believed that the Tariff would promote the cultivation of corn in the valley of Annapolis, where we can grow corn as well as in any part of Ontario. Now, for the coal. I propose to read a statement which has been carefully compiled by a gentleman who thoroughly understands the business, and I think I can vouch for the accuracy of his figures. Here is a comparative statement of coal sales, labor, etc., of Nova Scotia and shipping for 1873, the last year of the Macdonald Government, to 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie rule, down to 1881, the third year of the present Government. The total consumption of coal in the Dominion in 1878 was 1,415,576 tons; in 1881, 2,150,528 tons, or an increase of 735,112 tons, or 51 per cent. Now, I think that is pretty fair in three years, an increase in the consumption of coal to the extent of 51 per cent. We now come to the coal sales in Nova Scotia. The sales of coal in Nova Scotia in 1873 amounted to 881,106 tons. In 1878, 693,511 or a falling off in that year compared with 1873, of 187,559 tons, or 21 per cent. The total consumption of coal, in 1881, was 1,034,800 tons, an increase of 341,289 tons, or 49 per cent. I wish to call attention to one significant fact. Several hon. members have undertaken to prove that there has been a falling off in the output or consumption of coal since 1873. In dealing with that point I wish to give the total imports of coal into Montreal and Quebec. In 1873, there were 415,380 tons. In 1878, 328,074, or a falling off of 87,306 tons or 21 per cent. The increased consumption in 1881 over 1878 was 201,017, or 61 per cent. Now, the coal shipped from Nova Scotia to Montreal and Quebec in 1873 was 187,059, and in 1878, 83,710, or a decrease of 103,349 tons. In 1881 there were 263,629 tons shipped or an increase of 22 per cent. Will anybody say in the face of that fact that the National Policy has had no effect on the coal industry. But let us try this matter by another test. The number of men employed in 1873 was 4,362. In 1878 it was 3,135, or a falling off of 28 per cent. There was an increase of 15 per cent. in the number of men employed in 1881. The number of days' work in 1873 was 995,153, in 1878, 663,800, a falling off of nearly 50 per

Mr. LONGLEY.

cent., and in 1881, 847,595, an increase over 1878, of 183,795, or 28 per cent. Now, let us look at the imports at the harbor of Sidney. In 1873, they were \$350,760, in 1878, \$260,760, a falling off of \$90,000 or 26 per cent., and in 1881, \$396,750, an increase of \$135,990 or 52 per cent. The exports from the harbor of Sidney in 1873, were \$526,792, in 1878, \$276,122, a falling off of \$250,670 or 48 per cent., and in 1881, \$542,922, an increase of 97 per cent. The Custom receipts at the harbor of Sidney in 1878, were \$23,481, and in 1881, \$27,226, an increase of \$3,745, or 16 per cent. The Sick Mariners' Fund in 1878 amounted to \$931, and in 1881 to \$1,963, or more than double. The number of steamers which arrived at the port of Sidney in 1878, was 24, in 1881, 255, an increase of 231 per cent. That wonderful increase in the number of vessels calling at the port of Sidney is largely owing to Sidney being on the way to Montreal, where they go for freights. The tonnage of the ships arriving at the port of Sidney in 1873 was 222,999, in 1878, 215,061, and in 1881, 401,082, an increase of 186,021 tons, or 86 per cent. Now, I will give you one fact. From 1873 to 1878 the days labor at our coal mines decreased 33 per cent., and from 1878 to 1881 increased 28 per cent.; that is only a difference of 61 per cent. The Nova Scotia coal trade gave 847,594 days' work to the people. Then here is a statement of the iron industry and gold mining, &c., which I won't refer to any further. Nova Scotia and British Columbia give Canada 2,235,770 days' labor, or a circulation of over \$4,100,000 for mineral labor. I am coming now to the part that I promised a while ago. I hold in my hand a statement of the cost of coal in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for the years 1877, 1878, 1879 and 1881, and if this be a correct statement I think that it settles conclusively the fact, and establishes our contention that a duty of 60 cents per ton on coal has not increased the cost to the consumer. If I am wrong in this respect, or if these figures are incorrect, I shall be glad to be set right and to have the figures controverted; they will be accessible to anybody. In 1877 the cost of coal in Ontario was \$4.45; in 1878, \$3.85; in 1879, \$3.04; in 1881, \$4.25—that is just 20 cents lower for coal per ton in 1881, in Ontario, than was paid in 1877. This is in one sense a dark subject, but it is capable of illumination and it is possible that the hon. gentlemen opposite may get their dark understanding—politically—illuminated through its instrumentality. In Quebec the price of coal in 1877 was \$4.00 per ton, in 1878, \$3.15 per ton, in 1880, \$2.65; in 1881, \$3.75, or 25c. a ton lower than in 1877. But it is pretty clear it could not be the National Policy, else coal would have been higher in 1881 or at least as high as it was in 1877 when we had the National Policy. In Nova Scotia the cost of coal was, in 1877, \$3.74; in 1878, \$2.93; in 1880, \$2.58; in 1881, \$3.70, or a difference this year of 4 cts. in favor of 1881. In New Brunswick, the prices for the same years were \$4.00, \$3.46, \$2.81 and \$3.70. I think the hon. Minister of Railways will not be found to be so extravagant or so far out of the way in the declaration he made the other day in regard to the cost of coal, saying that Ontario had obtained coal quite as cheaply under the National Policy as it would have without it.

An hon. MEMBER. How about the hon. Minister of Finance?

Mr. LONGLEY. I do not think the statements of the hon. Minister of Finance, either as to the effect of the National Policy or the coal industry are often questioned in this House.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. Minister of Railways questioned them.

Mr. LONGLEY. The difference between those hon. gentlemen is narrowed down to about this: that it is not conceded to be so much for the interest of the Opposition to

disparage statements made by the hon. Finance Minister as statements made by the hon. Minister of Railways. But it comes to just the same thing, because the Opposition have been so little able to fasten any misstatement or untruth on one hon. member as well as on the other, although I have heard from day to day intimations made in regard to one of those hon. gentlemen that he was extravagant and exceeded the bounds of fact and so on; but I am not aware that either in this chamber or out of it anyone has ever been able to establish any misstatement against him, notwithstanding that he has offered in many instances, at all events more than once, to place a sum of money in the hands of any disinterested person as a forfeit if able to convict him of the slightest departure from truth and accuracy; yet hon. gentlemen talk about those various transactions as if the charges had been proved. Well you may say, in reference to this, and as the big Scotchman said about the beating his wife used to give him: "It pleases her and does not hurt me"; and if those hon. gentlemen opposite derive amusement and gratification from the iteration and reiteration of statements which they never have had the ability to prove, let them continue the operation. I do not know but what the Minister of Railways will profit more by the operation than if those gentlemen ceased to practise it. I repeat that from 1867 to 1873 the banking capital of the Dominion doubled, as did the Savings Banks deposits, and the trade of the country expanded to \$86,000,000. The shipping increased, and every industry and interest seemed to thrive during that period, notwithstanding that the Treasury was subjected to extraordinary exactions. During that period several of the Provinces were incorporated into the Union, including British Columbia; expenses of the Fenian invasion, and various unexpected and unusual expenditures were incurred. Notwithstanding all that, the revenue showed a buoyancy and productiveness never witnessed before, but probably rivalled by its buoyancy during the last year.

Mr. ROSS. The balance of trade was against us.

Mr. LONGLEY. It was from 1873 to 1878, but not half so much during the time of the Conservative Government as under the *regime* of the friends of the hon. member for Middlesex. I wish now to refer to a subject a little outside the range of my argument for which I claim the indulgence of the House a few minutes longer. I now refer to a discussion which took place not long ago, and to the invidious comparison and criticisms instituted in regard to the President of the Council, and the relations he sustains to the hon. Minister of Railways. Reference was made to a period long past when the President of the Council used severe language in regard to the hon. Minister of Railways. I think after what was said by the *Globe* in reference to several members of the Mackenzie Administration, that a little discrepancy, or difference in severe language that may have passed the lips of the President of the Council in regard to the hon. Minister of Railways, would scarcely be worth mentioning. But I think I can give a pretty good explanation in a very few words in regard to the matter. The difficulty all grew out of the fact that the Minister of Railways was able to take the wind out of the sails of the Local Government of the day, in a way they did not dream of. The Pictou Railway was let in nine or ten contracts, being 52 miles in extent. One after another the contractors broke down because the prices they received were insufficient to enable them to go on. Finally the engineer resigned his position. Another engineer of considerable eminence was appointed to take his place, and an estimate was made of the cost of completing the road, and Mr. Fleming became the contractor at a sum below the estimate made by the new engineer. When the new contractor took that work several thousand dollars below

what the second engineer estimated it at, the Opposition thought they had reasonable grounds of attacking the Government. However, not a single successful assault was made, and out of a House of 55, when a vote came to be taken, there was a majority of 25 to sustain the Government. Although there were intimations of improper action on the part of the Government made by the leader of the Opposition, when he had time to cool down he volunteered to say that he never suspected the Minister of Railways of having derived one dollar's advantage from that transaction. Although it has been repeatedly asserted that he did, nobody has ever been able to furnish a tittle of proof that such was the case. One word with regard to the future; it is full of promise. The condition of the country ought to make us the envy of our neighbours. The industries of the country are in a flourishing condition, but that is not the best of it. The Government, in view of the splendid financial condition in which they found themselves, came down to the House with a proposition to remodel the Tariff in such a direction that there will be a remission of taxation to the people of this Dominion of \$1,500,000, or \$1,750,000. In addition to this they have voted \$150,000 to the fishermen. I have been assured that the good things which are sure to follow, are too numerous to mention. I have this to say, that whether in regard to the fiscal policy of the Government or whether in regard to the finances or the industries of the country or the public works of Canada, which practically embrace all matters of large import,—you find matters in an equally satisfactory condition. I am satisfied that if the Government had occasion to appeal to the electors of this broad Dominion to-morrow they would not be guided by a majority of 80 such as they had in 1878, but of 95 or 100 such, as I think, they will have when they next come to appeal to the electors of the Dominion.

Mr. RYKERT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 4.25 o'clock, a.m., Wednesday) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 15th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Qu'Appelle Land Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 104) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents, certain powers for the relief of John Dickenson Brunton.—(Mr. Ryan, Montreal.)

Bill (No. 105) to amend the charter of the Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Gault.)

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. DREW moved that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills, and presenting Private Bills, be extended to Saturday the 1st day of April next.

Motion agreed to.

PATENT ACT (1872) AMENDMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria), in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to further amend the Patent Act of 1872, said: The amendment is simply to give to the Commis-

sioner of Patents the same discretion, in reference to extending the time for importing articles covered by patent, that he now has in reference to extending the time for manufacturing. It has been discussed, I believe, by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, as well as by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, and when the time comes for the second reading, of course it will be a more proper opportunity for further investigation in the matter.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I crave the indulgence of the House for the purpose of making a personal explanation. Yesterday, before I came into the House, having been detained some little time, I find an hon. member complained of something that appeared in one of the public newspapers. In looking at the Official Report, I find these words:

"I do not intend to submit, without remonstrance at least, to an imputation of improper motives on my conduct and language as a member of the House; either coming from an irresponsible newspaper correspondent in the gallery, or from any hon. member on the floor of the House, who may be responsible, either directly for his utterances in this House, or indirectly for what may appear in the newspaper under his control."

Then I find the hon. gentleman went on to say:

"I regret that I do not see in his place in the House at present an hon. member who is supposed to have some control over the utterances of this newspaper, but I would venture to say that, if he is not prepared to make a statement on the floor of the House of that kind that is in this newspaper, neither let [should] it appear in the form of a communication from the irresponsible gallery correspondent under his control."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the hon. gentleman did not do what parliamentary practice would indicate he should have done—that when he intended to make a personal reference to a member of the House, to have given him notice that he intended to do so, in order that he might be in his place. Had he done so it would have avoided the necessity of my making an explanation the second day. What I desire to say is this: that I have no control or connection in any form or shape with the parliamentary correspondence of that paper or any other paper in this country during a Session of Parliament. Since I have been a member of this House, I have studiously avoided all responsibility for what appears in the newspaper. I do not direct what appears in these communications, I do not dictate them, I do not suggest them, I do not see them before the matter leaves the House, and my only knowledge of what appears in the parliamentary correspondence of the *Montreal Gazette* is derived from a perusal of that paper when it reaches me by mail the following day. I desire to make this statement, simply for the purpose of putting myself right in relation to that matter. As to the matter itself, all I wish to say is, that I have no doubt that newspaper and that correspondent are both abundantly able to take care of themselves. I go further, and say that in view of the fact that this Bill would not be before the House, to-day, had it not been for the decision of the courts voiding the arrangement made between the North-Western Telegraph Company and the Montreal Telegraph Company; in view of the fact that it is here only because of the decision of a meeting held after that decision of the courts, I think we may fairly come to the conclusion that the paragraph which appeared in the paper did not warrant the strong language which was applied to it by the hon. gentleman who spoke yesterday.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). As my hon. friend has referred to me, I am quite willing to accept his disclaimer of any responsibility for anything that appears in the columns of the newspaper in question, or any other newspaper in Canada, so far as its parliamentary correspondence goes. I presume, however, that he has that responsibility that attaches to the position, I believe, he occupies of

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

managing director of the company which publishes the newspaper.

Mr. WHITE. I may say that I am not the managing director.

Mr. CAMERON. Then I am misinformed as to the position my hon. friend occupies. But he will not go so far as to say that he has no connection with the newspaper. As to my not having given him notice of my intention of referring to the matter, all I have to say is, that I desired to take the earliest opportunity of referring to the matter; that I did refer to it yesterday as soon as it came to my knowledge, and I expected that, with the usual punctuality of attendance which distinguishes my hon. friend in being in his place in the House, from moment to moment, he would be here. If I had had an opportunity of giving him notice I should have done so. Of course he has availed himself now of the permission which has been given him to disclaim any responsibility for that paragraph, and I am quite content to accept his disclaimer. As to whether the individual in question who wrote it, though he may be quite prepared to take the responsibility, I do not think it is my business to go and seek him out, whoever he may be, or do more than call the attention of the House to the matter as I did yesterday. What I thought then I think still, that it was a most improper reference to the conduct of a member of the House, and a most unwarranted one so far as it imputes to me any intention or desire to mislead the House in the remarks I made. As to the statement that this Bill would not have been before the House but for the decision of the courts, I am not well advised whether that is the case or not. So far as the consolidation of other companies goes, I should think it was a very reasonable thing for them to do. Their Act at present, comprises at least a dozen Acts, extending over a period of from thirty to forty years, many of them contradictory and manifestly requiring consolidation. As to the clause that has been added that will be discussed when the proper time comes, and an opportunity will then be afforded my hon. friend, or anybody else who objects to the granting to this company the powers the Bill has granted to other companies, to state the reasons why they should not be so granted.

WHARF AT ST. MICHEL.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government this year, to grant aid to the municipality of St. Michel, in the county of Bellechasse, in respect of the repair and maintenance of the wharf on the River St. Lawrence in that municipality?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The matter has not yet been looked into by the Government. I have caused the papers relating to it to be put before me, and I will probably come to a decision next week.

RAILWAY INSPECTION FUND.

Mr. McCARTHY enquired, (1) Whether an annual rate has been fixed on by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, of the sum per mile payable by railway companies towards the fund called "The Railway Inspection Fund," pursuant to the Railway Act, Section 97. (2) How much has been paid into that fund; and the amount now to the credit thereof?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that no rate, I believe, has been fixed, and that, consequently, no amount has been received to the credit of the fund. I may be allowed to explain, at the same time, that the Railway Act contemplated the appointment of an officer for the discharge of the duty of inspection, but such an appointment has not been made. When a railway

requires to be inspected, an engineer or some other officer is detailed from the Department. Consequently the expense has been very trifling.

THE BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. GILLIES enquired, Is it the intention of the Government that licensed fresh water fishermen, operating on the lakes, shall participate equally with the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces in the sum of \$150,000 to be voted as a bounty for the encouragement of those who follow that calling?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say to the hon. member, as I said to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), that, when the vote is asked, the fullest particulars will be given as to the mode in which it is proposed to appropriate it.

MAIL SERVICE IN BRUCE COUNTY.

Mr. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates this Session, for the purpose of bearing the expenses of an evening mail service, by Great Western Railway, from Walkerton to Paisley, Port Elgin and Southampton, the same as at present enjoyed by Walkerton?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The matter referred to in the question is now engaging the attention of the Post Office Department.

Mr. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the current year, to give a daily mail service between Warton and Lion's Head, in the Saugeen Peninsula?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have to answer this question in the same terms as the previous one asked by the hon. gentleman.

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Government business shall have precedence on Thursdays during the remainder of the Session.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF PICKLED HERRING.

Mr. FORTIN moved for copy of letters, reports or other papers relating to the importation into Canada of pickled herring, in barrels or half barrels, or of other kinds of fish from Newfoundland or the Labrador Coast, and the inspection of such fish in Newfoundland or elsewhere, and the stamping of the barrels or half barrels containing the same, by the Inspector of fish and fish oils in Canada, with their inspection brands. He said: Before the year 1873 the inspection of fish and fish oils was not compulsory; but there was a fish and fish oil Inspection Law for Lower Canada and a similar one for Upper Canada. The Maritime Provinces had also a fish and fish oil Inspection Act. In 1873, a general Act was passed for the whole Dominion, making the inspection of fish and fish oil compulsory, and in the year 1874 an Act was passed to make better provision for such inspection, most of the Act being the same as the first one. But there was added a clause with reference to Newfoundland herring, which seems very strange to any one acquainted with the fish trade of this country. I was not in Parliament at the time or I would have opposed it. This clause allows the herring taken in Newfoundland by Newfoundland fishermen to be inspected by their own inspectors and to be entered into Canada free of inspection. Our inspectors, instead of inspecting these in the same way as Canadian fish are inspected by law, are simply obliged to put a brand on the barrels on the payment of only 2 cents per barrel.

Now, I have papers in my possession which prove what I say. I will first read extracts from letters I have received from an overseer of fisheries, who lives on the Labrador Coast, at Bonne Esperance, in Canada, and who has seen both Canadian and Newfoundland fishermen at work:

"BONNE ESPERANCE,
"LABRADOR, 9th February, 1880.

"DEAR SIR,—I see in the *Chronicle*, received yesterday, a notice of a letter written by you to the Government, on the subject of fish inspection.

"Fishermen will be very thankful, if you would bring this to light.

"We labor under great disadvantages, and cannot compete with Newfoundlanders, who send their fish to Montreal and Quebec, while we, who have to pay duties, etc., have to pay heavy fees to incompetent fish inspectors to enable us to sell fish in our own markets.

"My neighbor, Capt. Joy, is an inspector, (every Newfoundland captain, who chooses, can be appointed).

"We take herring, it may be from the same seine. He simply brands his name on his barrels; they pass into Canada free (2 cents inspection fee), while we poor Canadians have to submit to see our fish turned out on the wharf, and have to pay 50 cents per barrel on an average.

"If some relief cannot be had, by placing the fishermen of both countries on the same footing in some way, we shall have to sell our fish to Newfoundlanders, who, by simply placing their names on the barrels, can pass them through Canada to the west or other markets.

"I do not object to fish inspection, but, in my opinion, it should be made to apply to all fish from Newfoundland as well as Canada, or else be made optional.

"WM. H. WHITELEY."

"BONNE ESPERANCE, 14th October, 1880.

"DEAR SIR,—I received your letter of 20th August, and was glad to hear from you. As regards your enquiries about Capt. Joy:

"He comes every season, in June, to Salmon Bay, and carries on the cod and herring fisheries. He is appointed an inspector by the Newfoundland Government, and when he gets herring, inspects them, and ships them to Quebec or Montreal.

"In the event of any other fisherman having herring to ship, either to Canada or Newfoundland, all he has to do is to borrow Capt. Joy's stencil plates, and use them on his barrels. Salmon, of course, Capt. Joy has to leave to the tender mercies of the Canadian inspector, also oils.

"I think it very unjust to the Canadian fisherman, to be forced to pay an average charge of 50 cents, while herring are landed, it may be from the same vessel and sold to same parties, which only pay the nominal fee of 2 cents, because they belong to some Newfoundland concern. * * *

WM. H. WHITELEY.

"ST. JOHN'S, NEWFOUNDLAND, January 22nd, 1882.

"DEAR SIR,—

"Newfoundlanders possess an advantage over Canadian fishermen in being able, by branding their name on their barrels, to get their herring into Canada without any inspection fee, a tax which all Canadian fishermen have to pay. Wherever they catch their fish they may, and they do sometimes, take them from the same seine, bring them in the same vessel to Quebec or Montreal, then the Newfoundland brand is rolled away with a nominal charge of two or three cents per barrel, while the Canadian must pay, on an average, 50 cents per barrel for the same herring. Any Newfoundland, on application to his supplying merchant, can be appointed inspector, and every man who carries on fishery on any large scale can do so, and is an inspector. It is a curious state of things, but it is so.

"WM. H. WHITELEY."

Now, let me tell this House how this imposition is carried on. I have a list of all the fishery inspectors of Newfoundland for the year 1880, from which it appears that there are no less than 127. This confirms what Mr. Whiteley says—that every fisherman from that colony who wants to be a fishery inspector has only to apply to the merchant who supplies him, and he becomes inspector of his own fish. Not only is this so in their own country, but many hundreds of Newfoundlanders come and fish on the coasts of Canada, cure and pack their fish there, brand them, and then take them to Quebec or Montreal to sell, which he can do by paying only two cents of inspection fee; while the Canadian fisherman, if he does not get his fish inspected according to law, and for which he pays from 20 to 25 cents a barrel, is liable to have his fish seized. I say it is not fair play. In this a list of the charges paid by Canadian fishermen for the

inspection of herring is given, and I will read it to the House. It is as follows:—

1876, Caprain F. Lachance, 350 bbls.....	\$ 70
1876, Lachance & Dugal, 460 bbls.....	92
1876, Michaud Coulombe, 200 bbls.....	40
1877, Leblanc, 300 bbls.....	60
1877, Michaud Coulombe, 250 bbls.....	50
1877, P. Landry, 300.....	60

I need not read the whole list, but I may say that, in 1878, 1879, and 1880, parties from Quebec who had gone along the shores of the Gulf to fish for herring, and brought herring to Quebec, had to pay from 20 to 25 cents per barrel for inspection fees. Here is the record of Captain Kennedy, who paid \$100 for the inspection of fish on board his vessel. I will show the House what a bounty, so to speak, is given to the Newfoundland fishermen to bring into Canada their fish and destroy the trade of our fishermen. I have been investigating the subject for two years, because I knew when I came to bring the subject before the House I would have to give the true figures. You might believe that the Government of Newfoundland is very liberal in its dealings with this country. Well, let us see, many hon. members and many fishermen will remember the time when the Newfoundland Government, not only charged light dues to Canadian vessels on the coast where the Government of Canada had built lighthouses and maintained them, but they charged them double the price paid by Newfoundland vessels. Not only so, but here is what a fisherman that went into a Newfoundland port for the purpose of legitimate trading was called upon to pay. This is an account signed by J. P. Kearney, a sub-collector of Labrador on the Newfoundland coast. For 300 empty barrels he was charged \$35, being 20 per cent. duty on empty barrels. Remember that the vessel never landed any of those articles, but went into the port to get a load of fish, by changing those articles with the fishermen on shore. Other items are: Salt, \$2; flour, \$4; tea, \$2.50; soap, 26 cents; tobacco, \$8.40; and other items, bringing the amount up to \$74.52; adding 15 per cent., there is a total of \$85.70. Here is a Canadian trader going to the Newfoundland coast, and he is made to pay on a small cargo \$85, while Newfoundland fishermen bring their fish—sometimes taken on our coast, and branded by our officers—into Quebec and Montreal, and are charged only 2 cents; while our fishermen have to pay from 20 to 25 cents. I will now give a statement of the herring inspected in Quebec and Montreal, first Newfoundland herring, and second Canadian herring; I will also show what each paid, and what a bonus is given, in a certain way, to Newfoundland fishermen to keep the trade from Canadians. Of Newfoundland herring there were inspected in Quebec, in 1875, 5,648 barrels; 1876, 4,227 barrels; 1877, 5,262 barrels; 1878, 1,119; 1879, 1,803. In Montreal there were inspected in 1875, 37,687; 1876, 19,526; 1877, 24,831; 1878, 14,791; 1879, 11,380; making, with the half-barrels of Newfoundland herring, in 1875, 44,700; 1876, 24,892; 1877, 32,625; 1878, 16,728; 1879, 13,818; total, 132,764. Formerly the herring fishery and trade were very productive in Lower Canada, but when the Newfoundlanders were allowed to bring in their fish for 2 cents inspection fee, while Canadians have to pay 20 or 25 cents, the table is turned, and many of our capitalists had to abandon the business, and the trade went into the hands of other fishermen. For that reason less herring is now brought into Canada by Canadian fishermen than by Newfoundland fishermen. The herring brought by Canadian fishermen into Quebec, from the Maritime Provinces as well as from the Gulf, but principally from the Province of Quebec, amounted as follows: 1875, 18,087; 1876, 5,579; 1877, 12,537; 1878, 2,465; 1879, 1,649 barrels. Only a small quantity went to Montreal. If Newfoundland herring had paid the same inspection fee as our fishermen are

Mr. FORTIN.

compelled to pay, the amount would have reached the sum of \$26,552.80. But as they were charged only 2 cents, they only paid \$2,665.28. The herring taken by Canadian fishermen, which was only 40,317 barrels, compared to the 132,764 barrels from Newfoundland, paid \$8,023, which shows that 40,317 barrels of Canadian fish paid, as inspection fees, over \$8,000, while those 132,000 barrels from Newfoundland paid only \$2,655, giving a bounty of \$23,000 to the fishermen of Newfoundland to bring their fish into the country and destroy the trade of Canada. I have given the figures and a statement for five years, made up by myself, and which I believe correct. Now, I think I have made out a case for the attention of the Government, who, I hope, will look into the matter, and give our fishermen redress for the injustice committed against them the last few years. Our fishermen are not so rich, or do not make enough money to enable them to stand that treatment. On the contrary, they ought to be treated as favorably as possible by the Government and the country. Those Newfoundland inspectors inspect fish even in Quebec. Sometimes they come to that port with fish taken off the coasts of Canada—perhaps by Canadian seines and with the help of Canadian fishermen—they come to Quebec boldly on their muscle, and sometimes find some of their barrels not branded, when they brand them there, and the fish receives the inspection brand from our own fish inspectors for a 2 cents fee only without having been inspected; it then enters and passes as if inspected by Canadian inspectors, and sells as high as our own fish. I do hope the Government will put an end to this injustice.

Mr. KILLAM. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Gaspé is fully informed on the subject on which he has addressed the House; and I regret that during his able speech, it has been difficult where I sit, opposite, to catch the facts and figures he has presented, and that he, perhaps, has not received the attention from the Government that the subject deserves. I do not intend to make any lengthened remarks on the subject; but I should like, for a few moments, to receive the attention of the hon. member of the Government, under whose Department this matter comes, because the subject is one of great importance, and worthy, at least, of some attention. I had myself grave doubts, when the Inspection Act passed, whether the system of compulsory inspection could be properly applied; and whether it was likely to be a success, and I consented to it only under reservation. My experience of it, up to this time, is that it has not been a success. In the first place, it has not been generally applied in the country; in the second place, where it has been applied, it has been applied in such a way as not to secure the object expected. The character of our fish in the foreign market and its price depends, not upon the character given to the fish by the brand of the Canadian inspector, but upon the quality of the fish as shown by foreign inspection. Without touching particularly upon the points advanced by the hon. member for Gaspé, I wish to refer to something which comes more particularly under the head of the fisheries of our own coast, with which I am more conversant. The hon. member himself will remember that, in the consideration of the Inspection Act, the question of the inspection fee upon imports from Newfoundland was taken up principally with regard to the Halifax market, which receives fish from Newfoundland, and re-exporting it to the West Indies. I suppose a branch of this subject which does not come so much within the Quebec and Montreal trade as within the Halifax line. But beside that, we are placed in this position: fish caught in one county are inspected; in the next county, no inspector has been appointed. I have not been enabled to learn that the inspected fish ever received any higher award in the markets than those uninspected in such counties. Beyond that, we have a large spring mackerel

fishery on our Nova Scotia shore. It is a catch of what we may call spring mackerel, fish not commonly used in this country, but which are exported to warmer countries and sold at a fair price, and in which a very large business is done. This fishery along our shores employs a large number of fishermen, particularly in the counties of the west end of Nova Scotia. I am not myself prepared to point out or trace the course the mackerel take on the maritime coast towards the Bay of Chaleurs. We know that immense shoals of mackerel pass the shores of Nova Scotia in the spring. They become gradually larger and fatter fish, and perhaps more valuable as they reach the Gulf. But at the same time the quality of fish caught along the western end of Nova Scotia, and along the eastern shores of the United States, are valuable for a certain market, and a large amount of money is invested in the catch. The Inspection Law towards the fishermen who are employed in this business works in this way—at least I know it works in this way in my own locality. The fish are caught in traps, sometimes 200 or 300 barrels in a catch. They are taken up, split, dressed and put into barrels, green, perhaps the next day, with just a slight proportion of salt, enough to preserve them for a few days, and sent to the American market, the proper market for fish. It is impossible, as my hon. friend probably knows very well, to cure these fish in that time, so that in an ordinary mackerel barrel 200 pounds could be put. They have to be thrown in, as it were, and headed up, sometimes in a slipshod way, but just cured sufficiently to enable them to reach the Boston market in good condition. There the fish are weighed, sorted and repacked, and perhaps, in five or six days after the fish are taken from the water, they are sold in the south western States. What does the fish inspector do? Of course the result of the matter is—I am not laying any blame upon the inspector—but the result of the system is that the inspector takes from the fishermen 10 cents a barrel for letting his fish go out of the country, contrary to law. It simply annoys the fisherman without doing him any good. I am instancing this one case out of a number I might give, to show the bearing of the compulsory Inspection Law. I wish particularly to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to this matter. I hope he will take the matter into his consideration, and if he does so, I am sure we will have the practical help of the hon. member for Gaspé—in order to remedy the evils complained of, and which exist in the inspection system all round the coast of the Dominion.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I am sure the facts brought to the attention of the House by the hon. gentleman, will receive the careful consideration of the Government. There exists indeed an apparent monopoly on fish coming from Newfoundland, and passing without inspection. There may be many reasons for that. My hon. friend knows very well that some business houses or companies have so good a reputation that their produce is always received without inspection. For instance, I know of some firms on the Gaspé sea coast, whose dry fish are so good and command such a price that, when exported into Great Britain, they are received without inspection, although inspection is compulsory and very severe on other fish. In two particular cases the attention of the Government has already been drawn to that monopoly, though it is really trifling. There may be sufficient reason for bringing this subject to the attention of the Government, and especially to the Minister immediately concerned.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). This is a matter of considerable importance to my own county particularly. Last year, on a motion, I brought this to the attention of the acting Minister of Marine, and he promised to give it some consideration, but no notice has been taken of it. As has been stated by the hon. member for Yarmouth, the

mackerel fishery was seriously affected by the Inspection Law. It is carried on in the early part of the season, usually lasting from five to six weeks. In my own county thousands of barrels of mackerel are annually caught and sent into the American market. It is only within the last year that any attempt has been made to carry out the Inspection Law in that county. I know that in one case a charge was made against the Deputy Inspector, and I was requested to bring it to the attention of the Government to the effect that he had, in a wholesale manner, inspected a large quantity of mackerel. The fact is that the inspection, as now enforced in that county, is of no value whatever to the packers. They are called upon to pay 10 cents a barrel for an inspection that is of no value in the Boston market. The local brand, of some packers, has more weight with the Boston purchasers. Almost all the mackerel sent out of the county of Shelburne, are taken into the Boston market, where they have to be reinspected by the Boston inspectors before sale in that market. I trust the Government will enquire into this matter, and remedy a great injustice to that branch of our fisheries.

Motion agreed to.

PROVINCIAL RAILWAYS.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe by the public press that a resolution has been passed by the Order in Council on the subject referred to in the motion I am about to move, accompanied with a request that it should be transmitted to His Excellency the Governor General, for the purpose of submission to this Parliament. I therefore move for a copy of any resolution of any Provincial Legislative body transmitted to His Excellency on the subject of the exercise by the Parliament of Canada of the power to declare provincial railways to be for the general advantage of Canada, and of any correspondence in connection with any such resolution.

Motion agreed to.

LAND SOLD TO THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a statement of the total quantity of land agreed to be sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the total price agreed to be paid therefor during each month up to the 1st day of March, 1882, distinguishing between the sales of farming lands and those of town, village or station lots, wood land, mineral, quarry lands, and other special sales, and including the quantities and prices realized for lands in which the company became interested by agreements in connection with the location of stations. He said: I observe that large sales are said to be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the lands which they have received and are to receive under their contract, and that very considerable sales have been made of special lots as well as agricultural lots. It is, of course, important to know from time to time the progress of these operations. We are interested in the transactions as to the sales of land in view of the regulations and arrangements as to tolls and traffic, as well as to the other questions which arise under the contract, and may observe that it is important to learn the prices realized for lands in which the Company becomes interested by agreements in connection with the location of stations. If I am rightly informed, a sum not far from \$1,000,000 has been paid either by actual receipts or by agreements for sale in connection with station lands, and it is expected, under the operation of the contract and of the administration of Dominion lands, that very large sums will be made on the lands through the prairie country generally, not merely with respect to lands which the Company itself owns, but also with respect to

Dominion lands on the alternate sections which adjoin station grounds. This is a subject of no insignificant importance. My own belief is—I have a notice on the paper on the subject, but I mention this as relevant to the motion—that unless the system be changed the whole advantage due to the enhanced value of the Dominion lands around the stations to be fixed on the Canadian Pacific Railway, will go to the Company instead of the public, and that a very large sum indeed, will be realized from station lands—a sum which by itself will go very far to construct the railway over the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the absence of the hon. Minister of the Interior, I may say that there will be no objection to the motion, and that all the information which has been asked for, so far as it is in the possession of the Government, will be brought down, and any information which is not in the possession of the Government we will endeavor to obtain.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT ON COURTNEY RIVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BUNSTER moved for Dominion Agent's report on Courtney River, in Comox District; also, to state which was the lowest tender for the clearing of said river. He said: I ask for these papers in the interest of a very thriving settlement, who consider that they have been greatly abused by not having this river attended to. It would shorten the distance they would have to come to market, by about seven miles, and allow the farmers of the district to make three or four trips a day instead of making one trip, as at present, and that over a very bad road. As I understand it, the Dominion Government are obliged to keep all navigable rivers open. A few years ago this river was navigable for vessels drawing as much as twelve feet, but from the falling in of trees and the carelessness of lumbermen it has been allowed to become obstructed. A sum has been placed in the Estimates year after year for the purpose of clearing it out, but it has not been expended. I believe a Dominion Agent was sent by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to report on the matter, but I consider that he did not do his duty, as if he had advertised for tenders the sum which was placed in the Estimates, and the contributions of settlers, together, would have made the river navigable. The matter is also of importance because the river is one which will contribute to the wealth of the Dominion by its salmon fisheries.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers will be brought down, and when they are brought down the hon. gentleman will see that, if a discussion is to take place, it had better take place when the vote for the estimate is considered.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENDITURE ON COWICHAN RIVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BUNSTER moved for a copy of all statements showing, in detail, the money expended on Cowichan River, and surveyor's report as to whether the said river was completed as per contract, and how much money was paid out of the sum voted for its improvement. He said: This is a motion which I should probably have made last year or the year before. The late Government granted a sum of money for the purpose of clearing out this river—a sum something like \$1,500. I never could get full details on the subject so as to satisfy my constituents as to how the money was expended, but, one thing is certain, the river never was properly cleared out. The river leads to a large lake, twenty miles long by ten or fifteen wide, and opens up a large tract for settlement. When this river is cleared out, it will open up a section of country which will contribute a

Mr. BLAKE.

great deal more to the revenue of the country than the Government will have to spend in performing the work. It is declared a navigable river, and, therefore, it is the duty of the Dominion Government to have it cleared out.

Motion agreed to.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF MANITOBA.

Mr. SCHULTZ moved the reading of the journals of this House on Monday, March 7th, 1881, so far as the same relate to the petition of Henry J. Clark, Q.C., and others, of Winnipeg, Province of Manitoba, setting forth certain charges against the Honorable Edmund Burk Wood, Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not observe that the hon. gentleman who has made this motion has followed it up with a notice of any motion proposing to take any further step upon the reading of the petition, nor do I conceive—subject to your decision, Mr. Speaker—that it would be competent for him to take any further step without giving notice. We are dealing with a very grave question, a question involving the mode in which a Judge shall be dealt with. We have had two instances in the history of this Parliament—one during the former reign of hon. gentlemen opposite, and one when the hon. member for Lambton was in power—in which this question came up, and a certain course of procedure was established in regard to it. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether they have considered the propriety of allowing the reading of this petition to take place, unless it be accompanied with some further step.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not had my attention called especially to the practice, and I cannot say whether this is an improper motion or not. Of course, we have to proceed with great circumspection in any charge brought before the House in respect to the position of a Judge; we must not allow any technical objection to prevent substantial justice being exercised towards him. I am not aware whether my hon. friend who makes this motion is prepared to make a further motion just now, or whether, if he is prepared to make that motion, he could do so without having given notice.

Mr. BLAKE. I submitted that point to Mr. Speaker, and I understood Mr. Speaker to assert that no such motion could be made without motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be unfortunate in the interests of justice that there should be any error in proceeding against a Judge, and therefore I would ask my hon. friend to allow his motion to stand over, in order that he may give notice of any motion which he may intend to make after the reading of the journals.

Mr. SCHULTZ. It was my intention to follow the adoption of this motion with a motion for a Committee; but in view of the suggestion of the right hon. leader of the Government, I am willing that the present motion should stand.

Mr. MILLS. Before the order is disposed of, I would ask whether the Government have not received a reply to this petition, and whether that ought not to be laid before Parliament, before any further action is taken.

Mr. BLAKE. That is one of the addresses which have been passed, but to which as yet no answer has been received.

Motion allowed to stand.

DAMAGES ALONG THE GRAND RIVER.

Mr. McCALLUM, in moving for copies of all reports made by James Cowan, Esq., Dominion Arbitrator, on the claims of the inhabitants for damages sustained along the

Grand River, on the upper level of the Welland, by the rising of the water for canal purposes, said: I make this motion in order to draw the attention of the Government to the great injustice which has been done to the people I have the honor to represent. The late Government, in 1874, considered it expedient to raise the dam across the Grand River, in order to supply the Welland Canal with water for navigation, as well as for manufacturing purposes. In consequence of that action, lands along the Welland Canal and the Grand River were submerged, the barns and houses of the inhabitants in some instances being washed away. I called the attention of the Mackenzie Government to the matter, and they appointed arbitrators to look into these claims. I moved for the instructions given to the valutors, but they were not in the Department, and I believe no instructions were given to them. Only one class of damage is covered; that is the land submerged. They did not take any account of the lands washed away by the action of the water, and if they had any instructions as to that matter, they must have been verbal instructions. They undertook to do justice to the people by taking receipts in full as well for the damage created by the washing away of the banks as well as by the lands being submerged. I cannot do better than read one of the receipts presented to a gentleman who suffered damage. He was offered a small sum of money as damages for his land having been submerged, and for having had part of his farm washed away by the action of the water, and they wanted to take his receipt in full, including damages sustained from the washing away of the banks. The receipt reads as follows:—

Know all men by these presents, that I, David Reid, of the township of North Cayuga, in the county of Haldimand, in the Province of Ontario, farmer, in consideration of the sum of \$115, to me in hand paid by Her Majesty the Queen, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have released and forever discharged, and hereby for myself, my heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, do release and forever discharge Her Majesty the Queen, her heirs and successors, of and from all claim or claims which I now have or may hereafter have against Her Majesty, her heirs and successors for all damages which I have or may hereafter sustain or suffer, by reason of my land, situate on the Grand River, being overflowed or submerged by the waters of the said Grand River, said overflowing or submerging being caused by the addition made to the height of the dam at Dunnville, which said land so overflowed or submerged, may be described as follows, that is to say the south part of lot six in the third concession of the township of North Cayuga, also the south part of seven in the third concession of the township of North Cayuga. This discharge to cover all damage arising from wash of banks or in any other way by reason of said addition.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this day of October, A.D., 1877.

Signed, sealed and delivered in }
duplicate, in presence of }

It appears it was the intention to pay the property holders only for the land submerged, but the valutors added these words in writing:

"This discharge to cover all damage arising from wash of banks, or in any other way by reason of said addition."

This receipt I find is dated October, 1877. The gentleman referred to refused to take the amount of money offered. The valuator of that day threatened him with law, or, in other words, gave him notice that if he did not accept this small sum for the damages done him, the matter would be referred to the Arbitrators of the Dominion. When the late Government was in power, I called their attention to this matter, but, from that day to this, the gentleman has not obtained redress. I now call upon the Government to remedy this grievance; of course, the damages took place when the Government of the hon. member for Lambton was in power, but it is about time it should be settled. I will read the notice which the valutors gave to the inhabitants, setting forth that if they did not agree to accept the small sum mentioned, the matter would be referred to arbitration. The notice reads as follows:—

We, Archibald Livingston and James F. Lister, valutors duly appointed on behalf of the Dominion Government, do hereby, on behalf of the Minister of Public Works for the Dominion of Canada, give you

notice that we do hereby, on behalf of the said Minister of Public Works, tender you the sum of \$20 in full satisfaction of all damages which you have or may hereafter sustain by reason of the washing, overflowing or submerging of your land, being the south part of lot six, in the third concession of the township of North Cayuga, by the waters of the Grand River; also the sum of \$95 in full satisfaction of all damages which you have or may hereafter sustain by reason of the washing, overflowing or submerging of your land, being south part of lot number seven in the third concession of the township of North Cayuga, by the waters of the Grand River, and that we consider the said sums of \$20 and \$95 respectively to be reasonable compensation in the premises, and further, that the question as to the amount of the said damages will be referred to the arbitrators duly appointed under the Act in that behalf unless you accept the said sum of money within ten days after the service of this notice upon you.

Dated this 26th day of September, A.D., 1877.

A. LIVINGSTON,
J. F. LISTER,
Valutors.

DAVID REID, township of South Cayuga.

This gentleman has not obtained redress yet, and I call upon the hon. the Minister of Railways to look into this matter. I suggest that he should send a valuator at once and remedy the grievances, which could be done without the expenditure of much money. I understand there is a report by Mr. Cowan, one of the Dominion Arbitrators, in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals on this subject, and I therefore move that it be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES OR SUPERANNUATIONS

Mr. KAULBACH, in moving for a return showing the sum total paid each year by the Government for all allowances or compensations granted as retiring allowances or superannuations, in all services, from the 30th June, 1873, to the 30th June, 1881; also, for a similar return of all moneys paid by the Government as pensions, said: The system of superannuations is looked upon by many with much disfavor, and is a theme worthy of being carefully considered and discussed, in order that this House and the country may be better satisfied than at present, that the system should be still continued. With a reckless, unscrupulous and extravagant Government—which, I am happy to say, we are not having at the present, but under the wise and careful management of our right hon. and respected leader, a prudent and economical one—the door is opened widely for much favoritism and corruption, which, without it, could not exist. This House is aware that the impression prevails abroad that in numberless instances under other Governments, officials have been dismissed from office, rather superannuated or pensioned—more properly speaking, "shelved"—well qualified to discharge the duties required of them, and others are planted virtually less capable of filling the position than their predecessors. Yet, in order to give the party position and influence, resort is very frequently had to this unfortunate privilege for unfair practice. Now, can any one tell me what benefit is derived from this system other than a personal interest of the staff of employes? Does the widow of the pensioned, after his decease, receive any benefit from this system? I will answer—No, not in any way. The poor widow and fatherless children have to battle their way through this hard, cold world, the best they can, without a dollar of aid from this service. Then I ask why cherish the system any longer? I have a great respect for old age, and would be the last to discard an official, or recommend his dismissal from office were he capable and willing to discharge the duties satisfactorily and well. But I think we can improve the present condition of things very considerably, and which I consider to be a step in the right direction, were we to discard the system entirely, except as respects those already on the lists as officials, who have been and still are contributors to the fund; and letting it be understood in future, that all parties taking office take it to perform the work simply for the salary it offers, as a doctor or a clergyman would accept his posi-

tion, and if, through physical infirmity or advanced age, he becomes unequal to the work required of him, then to vacate the position and make room for others. Thus, by this open, fair, square system, officials would better understand their positions, and would feel satisfied to lay by, of their earnings each year, for a rainy day, by investment in the Government Savings' Bank, or any other security they may think proper, which would be a sort of sinking fund from which to derive a revenue when disabled through illness, or when the evening of their day arrives and their sun is well nigh set. Now, as the present system is unpopular, and by many considered often improperly made use of by Governments to serve private and party ends, a "behind the curtain scene," I would certainly recommend that some measure be adopted at an early day to block out an improvement.

Motion agreed to.

THOMAS POTTS OF ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. ANGLIN moved for copies of all correspondence between Thomas Potts, of St. John, N.B., and the hon. the Finance Minister, the hon. the Postmaster General, and the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, or any officers in their Departments, regarding the destruction or abstraction of letters addressed to him from the Department of Agriculture. He said: Some years ago, Thomas Potts, of St. John, N.B., who had been for some time in the employ of the Government as an Immigration Agent in England, returned home, having been relieved from his position. He continued for some time expecting an appointment from the Government, and on December 3rd, 1880, he received a letter from the hon. the Finance Minister, informing him that the Minister of Agriculture had agreed to appoint him an Immigration Agent to the eastern States, but did not wish the fact made known until the appointment was made, as he would be deluged with applications. This intimation caused Potts to await quietly for some time a notification of his appointment. He, however, made preparations to accept the office and discharge his duties. He left his house, and, I suppose, disposed of some of his furniture, continuing to await the notification until the following March. On March the 3rd a letter was written to him, which he received some days after, informing him that an official letter was sent to him some time before appointing him Immigration Agent, but that nothing had been heard from him in reply. He received the letter in Fredericton, but telegraphed immediately to the Department that no official document had reached him, and that he would write. He did write, after calling on the Postmaster at St. John, who told him that no such letter had reached that office, or it would have been delivered to him. Mr. Potts then, on March 14th, received a letter written by Mr. Currier, in which he was informed that not only was a letter, dated 8th of January, written to him and mailed to his address, but two official letters were subsequently sent him.

Mr. POPE (Compton). That is wrong; there was only one official letter.

Mr. ANGLIN. Mr. Currier's letter reads:

"I am to inform you that an official letter was mailed to you on the 8th January last, and addressed St. John, N.B., and also to state that two official letters were subsequently sent you."

Mr. POPE. That is wrong.

Mr. ANGLIN. That is the statement of Mr. Currier, the Private Secretary of the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Potts was, of course, surprised at this, and he immediately telegraphed to the Minister of Finance, informing him, at least, so he says, that he had not received those letters. He added that he was still awaiting instructions, and sincerely trusted that circumstances, over which he had no control, would not be allowed to inflict such an injury upon him as his deprivation of the office expected, to which letter

Mr. KAULBACH.

there was no reply. However, he continued to make further application on the subject. Mr. Currier again wrote to him on the 14th of March, 1881, as follows:—

"Mr. Pope desires to acknowledge your telegram of the 9th and letter of the same day, and, in reply, I am to inform you that an official letter was mailed you on the 8th of January last, addressed St. John, and also to state that two official letters were subsequently sent to you."

Again, Sir, Mr. Lowe writes in reply to another application:

"As respects our several communications, I may tell you that I wrote that official letter of 8th January, by the direction of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture."

And there is another thing. He says:

"The second letter referred to by you, dated March 3rd, was also intended to be signed by me. It was written by the shorthand writer, and I can very easily understand the accident of its having slipped in the mail without any signature."

He says that the three letters were written to Mr. Pope, and Mr. Pope then says that no reply was ever received to any of these letters. But Mr. Lowe writes:

"I could not tell you its precise date, the date of the last letter, but I did feel surprised at not getting an answer from you; and Mr. Pope spoke to me three or four times on the subject. It was in the early part of March that Mr. Pope sent Mr. Daley, the agent at Montreal, to do the duties which he had designed that you should do."

Mr. Potts, in one of the letters he did receive, was told that in consequence of the delay, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture found it necessary to appoint another person to the office that Mr. Potts was expected to have received, and that nothing could be done just then in his behalf. It does seem to be a very extraordinary thing that these three letters, all having the departmental and official marks upon them, should have been lost in transmission through the post office. He believes great injury was done to himself by the fact of those letters being somehow prevented from reaching him. He demanded an investigation in the matter, not only on his own behalf, but also on behalf of the public, for he naturally assumed that great injury was done to the public, if the Post Office Department was so administered that letters of that character could be abstracted or destroyed in transit. It was a remarkable presumption of a reasonable cause of complaint, and he applied to the Postmaster General of that time (Sir A. Campbell), making strong representations on the subject. Before he wrote to the Commissioner, he wrote again to the hon. the Minister of Finance, under date of the 15th of April. In that he takes strong ground. He says:

"I think that it will be universally conceded that no department of the public service can afford to condone crime, or pass lightly over offences in its subordinates which would consign private individuals to penal servitude."

He was strongly under the impression that there was a wilful or deliberate withholding or destruction of those three letters. Mr. Lowe's explanation in regard to that is that the letters were entrusted to Mr. Small, the accountant of the Department, and that Mr. Small stated, in the presence of the hon. the Minister of Finance, that he actually did mail those letters.

Mr. POPE. No; one of them.

Mr. ANGLIN. But that one, Mr. Potts asserts, never reached him. He made application again to Sir A. Campbell, demanding further investigation, and declaring that there must be one or other of the Departments utterly unworthy of public confidence. He was led to the conclusion that the letters were destroyed by some persons in the Department. He demanded a full and thorough enquiry. Some enquiry, it appears, was made, but Mr. White of the Department writes to him as follows:—

"I have the honor to inform you that full enquiry has been made for the missing letters, mailed at Ottawa, from the Department of Agriculture to your address at St. John, N.B., to which you refer in your communication of the 27th of March, but I regret to state that no intelligence of them has been received."

Mr. Potts thinks it very extraordinary that it is so utterly impossible to trace letters, and especially letters of this character, letters which naturally catch the eye of any person handling them, inasmuch as they had usually the official endorsement and departmental marks. He thinks that it is in the public interest that some further steps should be taken in this matter, to obtain a more thorough and searching investigation. He cannot believe it possible that, in any of the Departments of the Government of Canada, letters of this kind could be destroyed, and all trace of them lost. He uses strong language, and says that some parties render themselves liable to penal servitude. The hon. the Finance Minister then writes to him as follows:—

"Since my return to Ottawa, I have had personal communication with the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, and the officials of the Post Office Department, touching the investigation that has taken place referring to the non-delivery to you of letters written you by the officials of the Department of Agriculture. I regret that they have completely failed to trace the abstraction or destruction of the letters referred to, to any party in or out of the same. The case is a mysterious one I admit, and the operation has been so cleanly performed that I feel the guilty party will not be discovered. I do not know what further steps can be taken."

Well, Sir, it may be difficult to know what further steps can be taken; but I would like, by making this motion and asking for these papers, to stimulate the energies and perceptive powers of the hon. gentlemen, who as heads of those Departments, are responsible, not only to Mr. Potts, who has lost his situation, but also, I think they will admit, responsible to the public at large for the proper administration of affairs in their Departments. I therefore beg leave to move for copies of all correspondence between Thomas Potts, of St. John, N.B., and the hon. the Finance Minister, the hon. the Postmaster General, and the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, or any officers in their Departments, regarding the destruction or abstraction of letters addressed to him from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POPE. In the first place I would like to know what my hon. friend intends to do? What action is he going to take in this matter? So far as these letters are concerned, there was but one letter that was an official letter, the letter, I think, of the 8th of January. In the clearest manner possible he accused the office of my Department of making away with these letters. If men are going to do anything like a crime they usually have some motive for it. Why should these men make away with a letter that I had directed to be sent to this Mr. Potts? Mr. Potts had been agent in England for some time, he had applied for the agency again. At that time we were not sending travelling agents away, but we had decided to circulate in the New England States certain handbills and certain information regarding the North-West in order to induce people to go to the North-West from the New England States. This position I offered to Mr. Potts for four months. I leave it to the House whether it is at all likely that the gentlemen in my office had any interest that would induce them to make away with a letter of that kind. I ask if it is not unreasonable for the hon. gentleman to stand up there and talk about men who never thought of any crime, as if they had committed a crime. This is a crime which, if proved against him, would send him five years to penitentiary, and the hon. gentleman insinuates—though he does not say positively—that the crime was committed by a man who never had the slightest stain on his character. As to Mr. Potts, the best proof that he had no ground of complaint, was the fact that he was offered a better position and refused it, and it is not likely that he would have accepted an inferior one. It is my strong opinion that the letters were taken out of the post office at St. John, by some one else bearing Mr. Potts' name. I have the declaration of Mr. Lowe and Mr. Small,

that they remembered mailing the letter; I believe the letter was mailed and that it was taken out of the post office, perhaps, by some one else bearing Mr. Potts' name.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture misunderstands me if he assumes that I make any charge against any officer in his Department. Nor does Mr. Pott himself make any charge with regard to these letters. He says that they miscarried; that they must have been abstracted or destroyed, and that therefore there must have been wrong doing, and that if so, the wrong-doer should be discovered and punished. He thinks it a most extraordinary thing that three letters, all relating to the same subject, and bearing the official stamp, and one that would be remarked should have been mislaid, and that no trace can be found of who is responsible in the matter. Whether Mr. Potts would or would not have accepted the situation I am not very able to say, but judging by the correspondence it seems to me that he was very anxious to obtain it. It was stated to him in the letter of the hon. the Finance Minister, of December 3rd what the position would be, and he says he made preparations to enter on the discharge of his duties whenever his notification should arrive. He waited for that notification, the hon. the Finance Minister telling him that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture did not wish him to make his appointment known, as, if known, it would rush on other applications. Now, if the whole case has not been fabricated for the purpose of making trouble, he was evidently willing to accept that position, though the hon. Minister thinks he was not. He has applied repeatedly to have a thorough investigation made. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture wants to know what I intend to do further. I may say as I said before, that one of my objects in making the motion was that, perhaps, I might stimulate the hon. gentleman himself a little, and the present hon. Postmaster General, as the persons most interested in maintaining the character of their Departments, to make some further and more thorough enquiry, in order, if possible, to discover how and by whom the letters were lost, or mislaid or destroyed. I confess that I cannot see very clearly what more I can do in the matter than I am now doing. Mr. Potts is a gentleman with whom the hon. the Minister of Agriculture was well acquainted. He served under him with entire acceptance, as the phrase goes, and has always, I believe, been regarded as a gentleman of very considerable intelligence and a great deal of energy, and a very useful public officer. Mr. Potts is well known in St. John, and it is not at all probable that any other gentleman of his name could have received all these letters. If he had received the other letters they would be an intimation to him that the third letter, which was official, had been sent, and would enable him at once to communicate with the Department, but that three letters, all bearing on this subject and all forwarded at various times, should be mislaid, is certainly, as the hon. the Finance Minister himself admits, a very mysterious affair. I hope a thorough investigation will be made. I may say that I have no personal interest in the matter. Mr. Potts simply requested me to bring it before the House as he thinks that the public have a right to know the way in which matters are done in the Departments of the Government. He thinks a great wrong has been done, and that it is a pitiable thing, an intolerable thing, that the Government of this country should have to confess that they are unable to provide a remedy for such a wrong.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 107) respecting harbor and river police of Canada.—(Mr. McLelan.)

Bill (No. 108) respecting Fugitive Offenders in Canada from other parts of Her Majesty's Dominions.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 109) to amend and further to continue in force, for a limited time, the Act respecting the Administration of Criminal Justice in the Territory in dispute between the Governments of the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 110) to further amend "The Seamen's Act, 1873."—(Mr. McLellan.)

Bill (No. 111) to amend the Act 40 Victoria, Chapter 30, intituled: "An Act to make provision against the improper use of fire-arms."—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 112) respecting County Court Judges.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Act incorporating "The Canadian Steam Users Insurance Association," and to change the name of the Company to "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Beaty.)

NAVIGATION ACT.

Mr. McCALLUM, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 82) to amend the Act 43 Victoria Chapter 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian waters, said: The object of this Bill relates to the responsibility of vessel owners for damages in cases of collision, and is to assimilate our law, to that of the United States. As the law now stands, it is unjust to Canadian owners, as it makes them responsible to the extent of \$32.92 a ton, on the registered tonnage of the vessel, while American vessel owners are responsible only to the value of the vessel. The object of the Bill is to make our law similar to that of the United States.

Mr. McLELAN. As my attention has only now been called to this Bill, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow it to stand over.

Order allowed to stand.

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

The following motion for a return was agreed to:—

Copies of all despatches between the Governments of Canada and of Manitoba, and of all correspondence between members of such Governments, and of all Orders in Council in reference to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba; and, also, in reference to further grants of money, or other aids, to that Province.—(Mr. Blake.)

House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 16th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa Railway.—(Mr. Abbott.)

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton), moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) to amend the law of evidence in criminal cases. He said: I may say that my object in introducing the Bill is to conform with the law of civil cases in Ontario. The Legislature of that Province, at its last
Mr. ANGLIN.

Session, amended the law of evidence in civil cases so as to permit certain persons to make them compellable to give evidence, who were not competent before the passing of that Act. It is now the law of Ontario:—

"If in any court of justice, any person called to give evidence in a proceeding in respect of which this Legislature has jurisdiction to enact as is in this section enacted, shall object to take an oath, or shall be objected to as incompetent to take an oath, such person shall, if the presiding Judge is satisfied that the taking of an oath would have no binding effect on his conscience, make the following promise, affirmation and declaration: 'I solemnly promise, affirm and declare that the evidence given by me to the Court shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth'"

That being the law in civil cases, I submit that it is desirable that the law should be amended so as to apply the same provision in criminal cases, and, if the Bill becomes law, I shall ask that it apply only to the Province of Ontario, as I understand that there is not a similar law to the one from which I have quoted in any of the other Provinces of the Dominion.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. FISET. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the French version of the *Hansard*. I would like to know why that translation is so much behind hand this year. The same complaint was made last year, yet the translation was more advanced at the same date than it is this year. To date, we have not yet one hundred pages of the French version of the *Hansard*.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Chairman of the Committee, I have to state that these delays have been repeatedly pointed out. I have taken information with regard to the reasons which prevent the due distribution of these debates, and I find that to-day there are 130 pages of them translated, but yet to be printed; so that if any blame is to be attached to any one, it is to the printers. I have informed the Clerk of the House of the complaint made, and I trust that steps will be taken to remedy this delay, which is much to be regretted.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. RYKERT. Mr. Speaker, so many able speeches have been made during the present debate, and so much ground has been covered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have discussed the policy of the present Government, that I find some difficulty in knowing what course to take on the present occasion. I desire not to trespass on the ground already so well occupied by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in the debate. I shall probably take a different line of argument in defence of the policy of the Government from what I had otherwise taken had I spoken at an earlier stage of the debate. I shall endeavor to show what are the antecedents of those men who are now attempting to form public opinion in this country, and who so kindly offer their advice on this important question. I shall endeavor to show, out of their own mouths, that the policy of the Government is acceptable to the people, and that the National Policy has been a success, so far as the action of the Government is concerned; and I think I can satisfactorily prove to the House and the country that the gentlemen now occupying the Treasury benches are fairly entitled to ask for a renewal of the confidence reposed in them on the 17th of September, 1878. The discussion so far has, no doubt, taken a very wide range. The Budget debate was anticipated by my hon. friend from

South Brant (Mr. Paterson), for what cause I cannot possibly understand, unless to show to the House and to the country, probably, that he is best qualified to occupy the position of Finance Minister when the time may come for hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House to be called to this side; that, however, I think, lies in the remote future. These hon. gentlemen, in the discussion of the Budget brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister, have entirely lost sight of the fact that the question of the National Policy was fairly and squarely tried by the electors in 1878, and that the people then rendered a verdict not only upon the question of Protection and Free Trade, but also upon the merits and demerits of the late Administration. They have endeavored in this debate to draw aside public attention from the great issues before the country; they have endeavored to draw a red herring across the trail, hoping thereby to escape the responsibility cast on them by the electors. But what has been the most extraordinary circumstance, to my mind, throughout this whole debate, is that the leader of the Opposition has so far remained silent. It may be, Sir, that he is framing a policy to launch upon this House and the country before the close of the debate; but so far he has allowed the lieutenants and subordinates of his party to discuss the question, without offering one single word to show what are his views on the fiscal policy of the Government. The hon. member for Lambton, a few nights ago, uttered a mournful dirge over the downfall of his Government, and with his usual boldness—if I may use that expression, and I do not do so in an offensive way—asserted that his Government fell without sacrificing any principle. That remark must have struck every gentleman in this House with astonishment. Hon. gentlemen who know the record of the country during the five years these gentlemen were in power, must recollect that they violently cast aside every political principle which they held dear while on the Opposition side of the House; every principle these gentlemen laid down for the guidance of Constitutional Government one after another was shamefully cast aside. I could point probably to a dozen or more planks of the Reform platform as laid down by them on different occasions, which were broken as soon as they entered office. I need only refer to one or two of those planks in order to satisfy the House and the country that when these gentlemen proclaim that they did not sacrifice any of their principles, they are not speaking by the book, but are endeavoring, for some reason, to deceive the electors. It will be fresh in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that one of the great principles of the Reform party, was that no public money should be expended without a vote of Parliament—that no contract should be undertaken for public works without the consent and approbation of Parliament. Yet when the question of the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway was before this Legislature, and when the hon. member for Lambton was asked by the present leader of the House to explain why he had undertaken that work, the hon. gentleman said: "I have nothing to tell this House, I have nothing to tell the country, I have decided that it is in the interest of the country that the work should be done, and I have determined not to give this House any satisfaction." It was one of the planks in the platform of the Reform party, that all contracts should be given to the lowest tenderers, provided that they had the ability to perform the work; but we know how they violated that principle. We know that the hon. member for Lambton, in his celebrated address when going before the electors, said that he was going to elevate the standard of public morality which his opponents had done so much to debase and to conduct public affairs upon principles which honest men can approve of and by practices which will bear the light of day. Well, Sir, how did he do it? I will call my first witness into the box, the Lilliputian Premier of Ontario—what does he say, with regard to the

elevation of the standard? There was a celebrated trial in the city of London, familiarly known as the "Come-along-John" trial, in which a large amount of corruption is shown. On that occasion Mr. Mowat attempted to justify the course his friends had pursued in violating one of the important principles of the Reform party; and this is what he said:

"Well, it got over the country that our opponents would spend money. Well, full of this idea, a good many Reformers spent money; some \$5, some \$10 to purchase votes. I am afraid in London we spent more money (cheers and laughter); but I consider that the expenditure of money under such circumstances was quite justified, considering the antecedents of the opposing party."

That is the testimony of the Premier of the Province of Ontario. The hon. member for Lambton also laid down the proposition that the policy of the Liberal party was to make Parliamentary Government supreme, and to take from the Government all power to use the people's money without a direct vote of Parliament. I need not refer the hon. gentleman to that celebrated instance when he expended \$300,000 without asking Parliament for its consent. I refer to the Fort Frances Locks. I might go on and point to the ground taken by the hon. gentleman in building the Pacific Telegraph Line, and also in regard to the Georgian Bay Branch, to show how the hon. gentleman failed to carry out that doctrine. I simply point to those facts to show the country that, when hon. gentlemen opposite, on every public platform, declare that the Reform party fell sacrificing no principles, those hon. gentlemen had no principles whatever, which they did not violate at one time or another. There can be no doubt that those hon. gentlemen feel somewhat chagrined and mortified at the defeat they sustained, and hope by some means or other to return to the Treasury benches. Some hon. gentlemen say that this Government ascended to power on false pretences. I should like to know what those false pretences were. Will some hon. gentleman kindly tell us what they are? If they are not prepared to do so, then it must be held that the assumption made by them is for party purposes. They know right well that the issues before the country were, viz.: the fiscal policy of the Opposition, as laid down by the proposition of the right hon. leader of the Government in its resolutions of 1878, and also the extravagant administration of public affairs by the Administration of the day. It seems, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to discuss those questions in the manner in which they should be debated. It is true we have certain hon. gentlemen making speeches of two, three, or four hours' duration, among these being the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and no doubt, by-and-bye, we will have the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). They pursue different tactics, however, and seem to think it important to pile up figures and thrust them before the House and the country in order that the people may be mystified, and in order that their attention may be drawn from what are the questions directly in issue. Those hon. gentlemen are not satisfied with discussing the subject as I think it should be discussed, but they go behind the Mackenzie Government and say: "Look at your administration during the preceding five or six years." Those hon. gentlemen say that the annual expenditure of the Government was increased by some \$10,000,000. What that has to do with the present discussion I cannot conceive, but they must fill up their speeches with something, and they accordingly fill up their time with old issues, long since settled by the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, in justification of their extraordinary extravagance, that it was caused by the legacies left by the previous Government. I should like to know what those legacies are. Have they ever told us what they are? Not to this hour have they told us what they are, but they make repeated statements, in order to lead to the conclusion that they were compelled to

run into this extravagance and corruption. Hon. gentlemen will not say that the Intercolonial Railway was a work not recognized by all parties; and that was an expenditure which necessarily increased during those years. There could be no doubt that the enlargement of the several canals was a work approved of at the time of Confederation, and recognized as a work of public necessity, and of which they have no reason to complain. Let them point to the public records, if they dare, and show one instance where their votes are recorded, either against the building of the Intercolonial Railway or the enlargement of the Welland Canal. It is true there were differences of opinion in regard to the route of the Intercolonial, but in regard to building the railway itself there was no question whatever. I should like to know if the Pacific Railway is one of those legacies left by their predecessors. If so, why did they not, when the opportunity arose, at once decline to go on and finish the road. They had a convenient majority at their back, numbering fifty or sixty, and they could have entirely reversed the policy of their predecessors. They could have done so if they liked, but they felt it was in the interests of the country that the railway should be built, that the road was an enterprise which the country was bound to undertake, an enterprise which must, sooner or later, be carried out for the purpose of developing the great resources of the far West, and they themselves have placed on record that the Pacific Railway was a public necessity. The leader of the Opposition, in his famous Aurora speech, of which we heard so much, declared that the building of the Pacific Railway was a great public necessity. If that were one of the causes of the increase in the public debt, hon. gentlemen opposite cannot now say it was a legacy left them by their predecessors. Now, if they cannot, by any possibility, tell the House and the country what those legacies were which have caused so much increase of expenditure, they ought forever to hold their tongues on that important question. While hon. gentlemen say that we have increased the public debt, and added largely to the public expenditure, they, at the same time, declare that the increase has been caused by constructing works of public utility. But we have the evidence of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance, so often referred to in this House, when he appealed to the capitalists of England in 1875 for a loan, and at a time when he wished to present the bright side of the picture, and it cannot be too often referred to, because it will show the country that those hon. gentlemen now airing their theories are not sincere in what they say, that hon. gentlemen opposite are wrong when they declare that the public debt has been increased for works of no public utility. When that hon. gentleman explained how the debt and expenditure were increased, he glided in the fact that all the works carried out were of public utility, and when they have that evidence, it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to go behind that statement, and say that the expenditure was unnecessarily increased. If the expenditure was unnecessarily increased, that offence was condoned. But there was another issue before the people. In 1878, that question was thoroughly discussed. From public platforms and different parts of the country, he declared that, although there was an increase of \$10,000,000 annually, he could not find fault with that increase. In his celebrated picnic speeches, he did not condemn that expenditure; nor did he say it was not incurred under various pleas more or less valid. We do know, however, how that debt was increased, one being the assumption of the debts of Ontario and Quebec. But of this increase it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to complain. I would like to know in what financial position Ontario would be to-day had the Dominion not assumed that debt at the time. Instead of a surplus to-day that Province would probably owe \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000, or be

Mr. BYRNE.

in a state of insolvency. Did any of the hon. gentlemen opposite oppose the increase of this Dominion debt in this way? If so, why do they not say so, telling us when and where? They do not, however, nor do they say what were the questions before the House at the time. But I will remind hon. gentlemen opposite that they did something when in office that they will probably never accomplish again—because I do not expect to see them in office again during my lifetime—they turned our surpluses into deficits. They raised the public debt by \$34,665,233, that is to say from \$108,324,965 to \$142,405,892, while up to July, 1881, the present Government had only increased the debt by \$12,405,792. The present Government, however, have this year realized a surplus of over \$1,000,000 and decreased our debt since July, 1881, by \$1,319,510. If that is not a record of which any Government should not feel proud, I cannot conceive of any. The member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), the other night, criticized the ordinary expenses of the present Government. That is a fair subject of discussion—one of those issues which should be put fairly and squarely before the people. If hon. gentlemen opposite will only select issues of that kind, instead of running away in every direction for other subjects, I shall have no objection to meet them. But if you strip that hon. gentleman's speech of the big mass of figures carelessly thrown together, and its heavy draft on the imagination, you will find little left—only the old saw-saw story of taxation and the poor man's sufferings. Another hon. gentleman has taken a very active part in this debate. He seemed to find fault that the member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) had criticized his position in this House and country—I refer to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Until he shows sufficient repentance on his part, and has got absolution for past political errors, I do not feel disposed to accept him as a proper person to give advice in this House. His speech of a few nights ago was nothing but a rehash of the speeches made in 1870 and in 1879-80. Comparing the last with the former speeches, I find he simply repeated the same story, and threw together the same figures, but in a more confused way. He told us the old "garden sass" story over again, with which the House is very familiar; and, although it was taken up with great gusto by that celebrated hon. gentleman from Carleton, N.B., it produced very little effect on the House. But, says the hon. gentleman, what right have you to criticize my speech—why did you not read it fairly? He says it is read by his opponents in a manner to misrepresent his views on Free Trade and Protection. If I recollect that speech of 1876—and my memory is good in following the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite—my reading is different from that of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who feels a little annoyed that his speech of 1876 has not been read and commented upon. I intend to show the House that he is a stronger protectionist than even his hon. friend behind him; but the difference is, that the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk had for its head, protection, and for its tail, free trade, while the speech of the hon. member for South Brant had for its head, free trade, and for its tail, protection. As suggested by an hon. friend behind him, if the two were put together they might make a fair protection speech. I like to see a man, who, having learned his principles as a child, develops and adheres to them at mature age. After having lived some thirty-five or forty years as a protectionist, and having received those principles, as he said the other night, at his mother's knee, I cannot conceive how he could have failed to enunciate them, lately, and could have turned a political somersault in a few days. If he be a protectionist, let him act as one manfully. If, upon a public platform, he talks protection principles as the only remedy for the country, I do not like to see him say afterwards, on finding the audience are of a different opinion, confess that he talked nonsense the day before, and say that he ought

not to have spoken as he did, and wants now Free Trade. Such men are not proper guides for us on the eve of a General Election. They would deceive the electors. He says that he has changed his mind, but I cannot find a proof of it. No doubt, whatever this House will allow him to recant if he likes, he must confess he was wrong, and go through a certain amount of penitence before we can receive his opinion on the other side of the question. The hon. member for North Norfolk spoke, the other day, with a view to bidding for the manufacturers votes. I must confess he is rather cunning, as well as the hon. member for South Brant, in this respect, and that they are most useful men when they get on the stump. Because if the audience faces one way, against their views, they will promptly turn round and say, I have been talking a little nonsense; but here is my protectionist speech made elsewhere. They will meet another audience of the Free Trade sort, and they will say when they find themselves perplexed by a difference of views, here is my Free Trade speech, reported in the *Hansard*. These are most convenient men to go before the country and address the electors. The hon. member for North Norfolk, in order to condone the errors of his past career, now tries to make friends with the manufacturers. A few nights ago, he said:

"Certain expressions, no doubt, have been used in the heat of debate, which, taken isolated from the context, like the extract from my celebrated speech, might appear a meaning of that kind."

That is one of the speeches that the hon. member for North Norfolk generally makes on the eve of an election. I am satisfied the hon. gentleman, if he found his party were going to adopt a Protection platform, or a Free Trade platform, could change his tactics to suit either case. The hon. gentleman said, the other night, that he was in favor of a 17½ per cent Tariff, but he candidly admitted he wanted 2½ more! The hon. member for South Brant very quietly tells us that, although a free trader, he would still like a 20 per cent Tariff. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk, in criticizing the course pursued by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), thought he made a point against him when he said he was brought up a democrat on the other side of the line, and, therefore, assumed that he must have made some speeches in favor of Free Trade views, though the hon. gentleman failed to point to one single address made by him. However, there is no doubt the hon. member for North Norfolk is a Simon Pure Yankee. He seems to be a Yankee of the first water in all his views, as expressed in this House. But the hon. member for Niagara is a gentleman who, in all his utterances, has never plagiarized. He does not copy wholesale the speeches of Wilson and of Cox, in the Congressional *Globe*. In looking over his speech the other day, and the speech of 1876, I was reminded of the speeches I had read in the Congressional reports, and I turned them up in the Library, and there I found that the hon. gentleman has taken, almost wholesale, the speech of Samuel Wilson, in the year 1862, on the Morrill Tariff; and later on he followed the doctrine of Mr. Cox. If you take out of his speech the Yankee notions and plagiarisms, there is neither head nor tail left. There is another hon. gentleman in this House who attempted to lecture us rather severely, and that was the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Irvine). Now, I do not propose to refer to that speech of his, but I would just remind him that he was not in a circus. While his acting was very fair, as a political effort I think he was a great failure. I think he did well to announce to the House that it was his last speech. It is just as well, when hon. members come here for the first time, to let their seats get warm before they burst out into such floods of eloquence and abuse of their opponents. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen having failed to agree upon a policy or upon a mode of attack, they set to work and join hand and hand in one thing. There is one thing a Grit—call

him a Reformer if you please—will always do out of office. The moment he finds he cannot get possession of the Treasury benches, he sets to work to belittle his own country and cry down its credit, hoping by that means in some way to induce the electors to believe that he is the right man to hold the reins of power. Now, these gentlemen seem to forget what the issues were in 1878. These issues were the National Policy and the expenditure of the Government, and both were fairly placed before the people. The right hon. leader of the Government moved a resolution in favor of a higher Tariff, and issue was taken upon it by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) in a celebrated speech, in which he denounced that as legalized robbery. He stated the country was not prepared to accept the proposition of the right hon. gentleman, and publicly declared that taxation in any form, such as suggested, was legalized robbery. Not only that, but these hon. gentlemen, upon every public platform, endeavored to show the electors that by adopting the fiscal policy proposed by the right hon. gentleman, they were going to make the consumer pay the duty, and to enrich the rich man at the expense of the poor man. According to the hon. member for Centre Huron, they were going to impose \$2 a ton on coal, and \$1 a barrel on flour. By all such devices they sought to induce the electors to believe that the proposed fiscal policy would be destructive to their interests. However, the people believed that the reins of power ought to be entrusted to the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches, and the result was the verdict of the 17th of September, 1878. Now, mark what these gentlemen did when they went out of power. They set to work immediately to cry down the credit of the country. The country was going to the dogs; the land in the North-West would never build the Canadian Pacific Railway; it was only a barren waste, the home of the buffalo and the wild cat, I think the hon. member for Gloucester said. One of those gentlemen denounced it as one of the roughest countries in the world. There was also going to be a great exodus from the country—they were all going to Kansas. Now they are adopting a different course, and, as I said a few minutes ago, I can conceive why it is that the hon. members for North Norfolk, West Middlesex, and South Brant are put forward to discuss the question of drawbacks, and all those matters, in anticipation of the Budget. There is no doubt there is a little rivalry among them as to who shall be Minister of Finance, but I think the hon. member for West Middlesex will carry off the palm, because, as a mixer and muddler, he has no parallel, and according to the *Globe*, that is the very highest qualification. After hearing the hon. gentleman's figures, I was more mystified than when he began his speech.

Mr. ROSS. Do you comprehend them now?

Mr. RYKERT. No, I cannot. The hon. gentleman has a habit of drawing conclusions from a mass of figures before him, without considering whether they will justify him in coming to that conclusion. However, I have no doubt that before very long he will find himself qualified to take one of the front seats, as Minister of Finance, in the distant future.

Mr. ROSS. Will you be kind enough to say wherein they are astray.

Mr. RYKERT. I will do so. The hon. gentleman knows I never yet made a speech without proving my statements as I went along, as hon. gentlemen have found to their cost before. Let the hon. gentleman bide his time; I will satisfy him before I sit down. I shall show that these gentlemen are not the professed educationalists they seem to think they are. What surprised me most was the entire silence of their leader. He is perfectly indifferent to everything around him. I do not think he sleeps all the time,

but is waiting to see how the course of events will turn. He is true to that Aurora speech, perhaps he may recollect it. He thinks it is not the duty of hon. members in Opposition to form a policy. He then laid down the broad proposition that it was not necessary for hon. members in Opposition to have a policy for the country. Let me quote from that celebrated speech of his, because I think the more that speech is kept before the public, the more they will be satisfied that the hon. gentleman should remain in Opposition for the next half century. He said:

"I know that I have made a rather disturbing speech, but I am not afraid of that. As far as I can judge, not much can be done without disturbing something or somebody, and if that is the only objection to be made to the sentiments I have uttered, I am quite ready to meet it. I may be said, also, to have made an imprudent speech, at least it might be said, if I were one of those who aspire to lead their fellow-countrymen. This is the function of Ministers, we know it, and we do not quarrel with it—to say nothing that can be caught hold of—nothing in advance of the popular opinion of the day, to watch the current of that opinion, and when it has gathered strength to crystallize it into Acts of Parliament."

Well, Sir, it may be we are going to have those acts crystallized, but if we have to wait till he comes upon this side of the House, we shall have to wait for some time. I was rather amused the other night, on going out of the House, after the hon. member for North Norfolk had spoken. I met a chap in the ante-room who said to me: "I guess that Yankee has made a pretty long speech, but if he cannot make any more than he made out of the 'garden sass,' I think the old fellow will remain in power for a long time yet;" meaning Sir John A. Macdonald. Now, I thought that chap's head was level. Now, Sir, I propose to give a few instances of the somersaults which those hon. gentlemen have made in jumping from a Free Trade, to a Protectionist platform. The hon. member for North Norfolk, who has now disappeared from the House, was, at one time, in favor of a revenue Tariff policy. In 1876, he said:

"With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted which would bring the United States to terms, and would at least protect us against slaughter invoices."

Now, the same gentleman in 1879, made the following remarks, as will be seen by reference to page 536 of the *Hansard* :—

"One or two words in regard to retaliation. I always listen to talk about retaliation with a certain degree of nervousness. I always have a feeling of fear when that matter is referred to just as I do when I see children handling dangerous edge tools. Retaliation. Forcing the United States to come to our terms. Why, that is sheer madness."

He also was one of those who lately joined in the hue and cry raised by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) when he stigmatized this policy as legalized robbery. But, in order to place the two statements made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) side by side, I will quote from one of his speeches in 1876. He said:

"It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by judicious protection; I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufactures, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away."

But the hon. gentleman turned a somersault on that question in 1880, as will be found by referring to *Hansard* page 849:

"Protection is, under every state of circumstances, a loss to the many for the gain of the few. It can be nothing else, it never has been anything else, and it never will be anything else, to the end of time, but legalized, organized robbery, under the forms of law."

Another of these hon. gentlemen who is fond of lecturing to the country on this subject, is the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and I have no doubt he will rise, in the course of this debate, and give us his experience

Mr. RYKERT.

in discussing this important question. I believe that, generally speaking, that hon. gentleman is pretty honest in expressing his opinion; but when he comes to the question of politics, he inclines to lean strongly on the side of his "party," but, perhaps, he is excusable for that. I think, however, I owe him an apology for having to introduce his speech before the public, because I intend to show that of all the protectionists in this House, he was the greatest—that he was a protectionist in 1876, pure and unadulterated. That hon. gentleman helped to form public opinion in 1878, and, if I am not mistaken, he said that he could not be elected unless he promised protection to the farmers. Is not that so? The hon. gentleman does not answer.

Mr. PATERSON. My time will come.

Mr. RYKERT. Well, I will answer for the hon. gentleman. On page 186 of *Hansard*, for 1876, the hon. gentleman is reported to have used some words which I will quote, as showing how he managed to get elected. I will not be so unparliamentary as to say that he got into Parliament on false pretences, but I will let the House draw the inferences when I quote his language. He said:

"At my last election when my opponents told them that they need not expect any protection from the Reform Government, I had to assure them that whenever this subject came up in the House I would raise my voice in their behalf, and I think it is hardly possible that the duty on wheat will give increased prices."

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. Wait—you are not out of the woods yet. I hope the hon. gentleman will possess his soul in patience, and I will endeavor to be as brief and as pointed as possible. I think it would be rather unkind, when the hon. gentleman is no doubt going to make a speech to the country, that I have to put him on the defensive by obliging him to reply to his own remarks of previous years. As I said, he is one of those who go about the country delivering lectures, but I have noticed that these hon. gentlemen never care to enter my constituency. I can never catch them there. I have begged and beseeched them to come, but without effect, and the only chance I have, is to read their speeches in the *Globe* and comment on them as I think proper. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"I think it is hardly possible that the duty on wheat will give increased prices, because we raise a surplus and export it. Nevertheless, it will be a protection to our millers, and if any can be given to our agriculturists by a revision of the Tariff they should get it. The party to which I belong, and which is led by the Premier, will make a mistake if they refuse to grant this Committee."

The hon. gentleman goes on to tell the hon. the Finance Minister that the farmers have a strong case which the Government cannot refuse, and if they did refuse he could bring down a petition signed by 100,000 grangers to make them do what they wanted. In speaking about the case made out for the farmers, he said:

"It is true some hon. gentlemen here think the United States pursue a commercial policy that is utterly nonsensical in some respects; but until the duties on agricultural products are removed, it is *prima facie* evidence that the farmers believe protection to be in their own interests."

These appeals to the hon. Finance Minister were not received with much favor; but the hon. gentleman says: "You must give us a lever to fight Brother Jonathan." He claimed that if we had protection for our home industries, if we protected the produce of the fields and the produce of the mines, we could bring Brother Jonathan to his knees and compel him to give us reciprocity. Let us see what the hon. gentleman said on that subject:

"The question is whether in the event of future negotiation, the imposition of a tax on grain would operate in our favor. Fancy a Commissioner, delegated by this Government and sanctioned by the British Government, sent to Washington to negotiate such a treaty. The question might be asked what he desired. He replies: 'I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our forests, fields, and mines.' Then the United States Commissioner might ask: 'And what will you give us in return?' Our representative replies: 'The free

use of our markets for similar products of our country.' The astute American would naturally say 'We have that already. I do not see that you offer us anything.' We must remember we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up anew the reciprocity question. I need not remind this House that the great lever we had before in negotiating a reciprocity treaty is ours no longer."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was that lever?

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman knows, and if he does not, he can refer to the speech and find out. I do not intend to spend much time in repeating the speech of the hon. gentleman, except to show the House and the country that he has been as great a chameleon on the protection question as the hon. gentleman behind him (Mr. Charlton). The hon. gentleman appealed to the Ministry for a defensive policy. On that subject he said:

"The hon. the Finance Minister should ascertain, if possible, what articles are being slaughtered in our market, what industries are thus being crushed out in our midst, what enterprises could be successfully fostered in this country, and then frame a Tariff that would be defensive in its nature. He, being the champion of our interests, should use, not offensively, but defensively, the weapon that has been placed in his hands, in order to prevent the life-blood of this country being drawn from it."

What does the hon. gentleman mean by that, if not protection? The hon. gentleman, a little farther on, speaking of the hon. member for South Waterloo, says:

"The hon. member for South Waterloo predicted the result of protection would be to stimulate our industries so much that more factories would arise than the country could sustain. That would bring down prices, and ruin the manufacturers. If that be the case—and I believe the hon. gentleman is right—it would be the concern of those gentlemen who are asking for protection at the present time. Prices would be brought down, and consumers would get the benefit of cheaper goods than they now have. It would simply remove the competition from the American manufacturers to our own, the consumers receiving the benefit all the same, but the country being enriched by the industries."

Now, Sir, what would you call that if not protection? Upon that occasion the hon. gentleman was desirous of showing that political favors had been conferred upon himself. He talked about the great industry in which he was interested, and spoke about a thousand people from Germany having been brought into the country in consequence of it being protected. The hon. gentleman was a little afraid that the hon. the Finance Minister was a little too strong for Free Trade, and he wanted him to go a little further, and make all the manufacturers prosperous in the same way. Let us see what he says:

"If the Finance Minister finds such is the case, I trust that the wisdom which led him to yield that point will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism will tie his hands. I hope that other hon. gentlemen will speak on this subject, and whether the Committee is appointed or not, the interchange of views will lead the Finance Minister to bring in a Tariff which will redound to the prosperity of the whole Dominion."

Now, Sir, I have shown you the free trader and the protectionist. The hon. gentleman says, in opening his speech:

"I am not a protectionist. I am not one of those who believe in erecting a wall so high that you cannot trade with any other country, but I must admit I am in favor of a defensive policy."

The hon. gentleman was a free trader when he began his speech, but a protectionist before he ended; on the other hand, the hon. member for North Norfolk was a protectionist first and a free trader in the end. In order to convince the hon. Finance Minister, who sat there with his arms folded, allowing the country to go to the dogs, perfectly helpless to improve the country's condition, and caring not what happened, so long as he remained on the Treasury benches, the hon. gentleman made another pathetic appeal to him. He spoke soundly when he said:

"It is well known that we pay a cash bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. It is a fact that some of those who have been thus induced to emigrate to Canada have been compelled, from want of employment to which they have been accustomed, to go to the United States. I believe by a defensive Tariff you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find the steam-whistle of our factories will be the call for them to come."

What other inference can we draw from this language than that the hon. gentleman is a protectionist at heart, but for party purposes a free trader. It struck me on reading that speech that the hon. gentleman was trying to lead up to his own industry. He was a little afraid that the hon. the Finance Minister would destroy that industry by taking away the little protection it had, and in order to lead up to it, he pointed out that if one industry flagged another flagged, and therefore he hoped the Minister would do what he wanted. He said:

"I have confidence that he will arrive at a conclusion on this point. I know the difficulty he will have in satisfying all parties, but we should keep in mind the fact that we are one people, and when one of our industries prospers all must benefit, while if one languishes, all must suffer more or less."

They seem to admit that manufacturers are a little pushed and are not getting the prices they ought to have, but that consumers obtain the goods as cheaply as before. There is no increase of price to consumers, and the only persons who might be dissatisfied are manufacturers who have been investing large amounts of capital. The hon. member for South Brant is selling candy and sugar as cheaply as ever to consumers, but he does not make as large profits as formerly, and he therefore speaks feelingly on the subject. But what is a most extraordinary circumstance is that while all the speeches were being made in the House in 1876 upon the resolution of the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the leader of the then Government was perfectly silent; not one word escaped his lips in condemnation of what was said by his supporters; indeed, he tacitly acquiesced in what they said. He as leader of the Government, was bound to declare then and there, whether those views were acceptable to him, but instead of doing that the hon. gentleman remained perfectly quiet and allowed those hon. gentlemen to run riot in speaking of the beauties of protection, and did not say one word against their statements. But there was an issue in 1878. Times were changed. They knew if they followed the present leader of the Government in his protectionist views, they would be berated by the organ of their party. They knew they had to come within the traces, that they had to submit to the lash, and they at once declared they were free traders. They pronounced protection legalized robbery, but the people said: "How are you able to say so, when a short time ago you declared that the establishment of one industry would foster another, that thereby employment would be given to the people, and that we would have thousands of immigrants." The result was that hon. gentlemen opposite received notice to quit on that memorable occasion which they will not soon forget. But after 17th September, 1878, those hon. gentlemen adopted different tactics. They thought their policy was to belittle the country as much as possible; they felt it was not in the interests of the country that capitalists should invest money here, and they bent their energies to turning out the Government. They adopted a new role. There is one thing which hon. gentlemen will have remarked in their experience as public men, namely, that the moment their party gets into Opposition its members become prophets; they prophesy for good and evil; and I want to show how the prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite have been verified by events. The hon. member for West Middlesex adopted the role of a prophet. He was strong in the idea that an increase in the Tariff would be productive of a decrease in the revenue. He said that by no possibility could there be an increase in the revenue, that when a large expenditure was incurred in the collection of revenue the revenue must naturally decrease. I want to show he was wrong, that the cost of collection was not what he anticipated, and therefore his prediction has not been realized. The hon. gentleman said, in 1879: "It (the Tariff) had been conceived in iniquity and brought

forth in sin." The hon. gentleman uses pretty strong language sometimes, and yet he lectured the hon. the Minister of Railways the other night on the use of strong language; but there never was an hon. member who used stronger language than himself, and from his position as an educator of youth, or rather as a late supervisor of the instruction of pupils in different places, one would suppose he would be a little more careful in the choice of his words, because I think there should be some limit to language used in this House, and such terms as jobbery and corruption, although used in a parliamentary sense, are not exactly what should be used on the floor. The hon. member for West Middlesex further said:

"It was a Tariff that discriminated between the rich and the poor, and it was a Tariff which would bring destruction on those who had introduced it. He objected to the Tariff, because he believed it was going to be very expensive, not only in the sense that it would increase the cost of goods to the consumer—"

Mr. ROSS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. What does the hon. member for North Norfolk say in answer to that?

Mr. ROSS. Let him answer.

Mr. RYKERT. He says the consumer does not pay high prices, and I will show by evidence that such is the fact. The hon. member for West Middlesex continued:

"But because it increased the expense in the mode of collecting the revenue."

Has that been realized? Let me make a comparison as the hon. gentleman is fond of comparisons. In 1877, there was collected \$12,546,987. at a cost of \$721,601; in 1878, \$12,784,824, at a cost of \$711,527; in 1881, \$18,406,012, at a cost of \$717,704, or, in other words, while it cost \$714,000 to collect \$12,000,000, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches paid only \$13,000 more for collecting \$6,000,000 additional, in round numbers. I think this establishes that the hon. member for Middlesex was a false prophet. The hon. member for North Norfolk also adopted the role of a prophet. A prophet sometimes is not best known in his own country, and I think the hon. gentleman, when he is reminded of what he predicted during his speech in the Budget debate of 1880, will come to the conclusion that he is not a very safe prophet. With regard to Conservative expenditure we hear enough from hon. gentlemen opposite; but not a word about our surpluses. Said the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk, speaking of the present Tariff and its author:

"Has the hon. Minister of Finance found that this policy at the end of the year, has added materially to the revenue of the country? He has not and he has still further lessons to learn; as the evil of protection develops itself, he will be enabled more thoroughly to appreciate the fact that, in adding to the burdens of the people he is destroying the revenue."

The member for North Norfolk will bear that in mind, and will see that he was a false prophet. Again, it was said:

"If the manufacturers are to have that monopoly, by excluding foreign goods, what revenue are we to get from the Tariff on those goods? The sources of revenue are dried up by the same Act which compels the people to pay large prices to favor the home monopolists."

Now the hon. Finance Minister pledged his word the other night that prices are not increased, and announced a large increase of revenue instead of a deficit, a surplus of \$4,000,000. So the hon. gentleman is not very capable of acting as a reliable prophet. Now a word or two to the member for West Middlesex.

Mr. ROSS. Only?

Mr. RYKERT. I will make my remarks as short as I can. I do not wish to be prolix. That hon. gentleman will, pro-

Mr. RYKERT.

bably, be glad to know that he has been a false prophet also. He said, in 1879, this Tariff was going to operate seriously against Great Britain; and he read a large mass of figures, though I do not say he was responsible for the result. He said:

"The great cry of the protectionist used to be protection against importation from the United States. Judging from the manner in which the Tariff was framed, he would suppose it was distinctly prepared with the view of protecting us against Great Britain. He would give one or two instances in which this was done. In the article of cotton goods we imported \$4,500,000 from England and \$2,500,000 from the United States. The Tariff has been increased from 35 to 42½ per cent. in the matter of tweeds of which we imported 100 times as much from England as the United States, viz., \$936,000 from Great Britain, and only \$9,507 from the United States. The Tariff has been increased 22½ per cent."

Now mark the result of the Tariff. In 1881, cottons imported from Great Britain, \$7,911,743; from the United States, \$2,166,140; or a decrease from the United States of \$400,000, and an increase from Great Britain of \$3,400,000. Was the hon. gentleman in this instance not a false prophet?

Mr. ROSS. The duties are higher.

Mr. RYKERT. Of tweeds we imported from Great Britain, in 1881, \$3,363,469, and from the United States, \$15,877, or an increase of \$2,400,000 from Great Britain, and of only \$6,000 from the United States. I think he was a false prophet in this instance too. The hon. gentleman stated that in flannels we imported seven times as much from Great Britain as from the United States, and that the Tariff had been increased 32½ per cent. See the result in 1881, \$255,060 from Great Britain, and only \$12,216 from the United States. Other woollen goods imported from Great Britain, \$1,099,595, and from the United States \$55,483, or nearly a hundred times as much more from Great Britain, instead of less as predicted. Now, as the hon. gentleman said, let us turn to the other side of the picture. He likes to compare our trade with each country, and to say our Tariff is going to be disastrous to Great Britain. The hon. member for West Middlesex, said: In the matter of carriages, we imported from the United States \$83,299, and from England only \$2,130, but the duty on this article was only increased 7½ per cent.; or, in other words, he wants us to believe that the importation from England largely decreased. Now, in 1881, we imported from England \$5,865 worth, or double the amount in 1879, and from the United States, \$70,973. At page 634 of the Official Reports, Mr. Ross said:

"If this was not discriminating against Great Britain, he did not know what was. If this was not framing a Tariff distinctly to exclude British goods, what did it mean? He noticed in the resolutions brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister, that it was proposed that, when the Americans reduced their duties on certain articles going into the United States from Canada, the Governor in Council might reduce the duties on those articles coming from the United States into Canada. But was there any such provision in regard to goods coming from Great Britain? He could not find it in the Tariff from one end to the other. He would almost suppose, reading that Tariff in the light of British interests, British trade, and British manufactures, that it had been framed by some designing Americans, with the view of crushing and destroying the commerce which was happily established between England and this country."

In 1879, we imported from the United States, \$188,540 worth of rubber goods; from Great Britain, only \$55,924 worth; in 1881, from Great Britain we took \$199,220 worth; and from the United States, \$291,994. Of leather manufactures we imported, in 1879, from the United States, \$207,960 worth; and from Great Britain, only \$29,360 worth; yet the duty increased only 2½ per cent.; in 1881 the imports from Great Britain were \$576,264 worth; from the United States, \$614,523 worth; increase from Great Britain, over \$370,000. But the hon. gentleman in his concluding remarks said that the Tariff was 24 per cent. against England and only 22 per cent. against the United States, but he forgot to tell the House this was caused by the more expensive goods and luxuries used by the rich

coming from England as, for instance, I find in 1881 we imported:

Woolleens.	From Great Britain.	From United States.
Cashmere	\$3,358,616	\$ 4,174
Dress Goods	1,480,756	79,083
Carpets	907,045	46,181
Shawls	150,587	2,141
Hose, Clothing and Flannels.	2,289,447	114,280
Oottons	5,746,807	632,206

I have shown that the predictions of the hon. gentleman on this point have not been realized; that he is one of those false prophets, whose opinion we ought not to consider in discussing this important question.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. I find that I have aroused the hon. gentleman from his slumbers. I will pay him a little attention before I sit down. Then in addition there were feathers, \$4,888, as against \$1,206; manufacturers of flax, \$1,361,880, as against \$49,750; silks, \$2,589,000, as against \$760,000, or, in other words, a total of \$18,370,018, as against \$1,619,016 from the United States. In other words, there were nine times as much imported goods from Great Britain, of an expensive quality, as there were from the United States; goods which were bought and used by those who were able to pay a high price for them. Mark you, that in those articles I have mentioned, over one-half of the \$35,000,000 worth imported came from Great Britain, and from the United States only about one-twelfth. So you will see when you come to look at this question from a national point of view, the only conclusion we can come to is that the Tariff imposes more restrictions on the rich man than upon the poor man. But on another class of goods coming from the United States in large quantities, such as wheat, flour, coal, books, and things of that sort, these pay a duty of 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while others pay a duty of double that amount. I merely allude to these things in order to satisfy the hon. gentleman that he was wrong in his prophecy. He was wrong in his statement and wrong in his conclusion, and that being the case I think I may justly ask the House not to place any confidence in statements made by that hon. gentleman in that reckless manner. I do not use the word reckless in an unparliamentary sense. Now, the hon. gentleman from South Brant also went to the country and lectured the people on what they should do in the coming campaign. He performed, it is said, a missionary tour in the county of Haldimand to introduce politics into municipal elections with the result that a Tory was elected for warden by a majority of ten to six. It seems to me that before these hon. gentlemen discuss questions of fiscal policy they ought to reconcile their differences, they ought to show they have formed their principles; they ought not to come into this House, one expressing an opinion directly in favor of Free Trade, and another in favor of Protection. They ought to endeavor, at any rate in caucus, to harmonize their views, and lay them before the House and the country, in order that the people may see what their views are. The hon. member for South Brant was read entirely out of the list of free traders by that celebrated speech of his on the drawbacks. It still rings in our ears, and we cannot help thinking of it, although it is against the rules of the House to refer to former debates. In eloquent language my hon. friend pictured the miseries of the manufacturers, because they have to sell so cheap to the consumer, and he urges the House to give, at least, 20 per cent. to manufacturers. But then we find the ex-leader coming out fairly and squarely a free trader. He pronounced Protection a relic of barbarism of the worst kind. He says, however, very kindly, that in case he comes to the Treasury benches, he will let the manufacturers die by inches. I think he is very accommodating, but I do not think he

will have a chance of accomplishing his policy very soon. The leader of the Opposition, who seems to be deaf to all that is said around him, has a sort of wandering policy, a policy for the Maritime Provinces, a policy for the Upper Provinces, in other words, speaking in the Province of Ontario, he has a milk and water policy, and speaking in the Lower Provinces he is a strong free trader. I will not add to the misery of the hon. gentleman in quoting his speech, but we have on record in the Library speeches of the hon. gentleman, no doubt revised by himself, at any rate published in his own organ. The hon. member for Gloucester, with that modesty for which he is so famous, and with that kindness and consideration for hon. gentlemen for which he is so well known, says that the hon. gentleman did not express those views. Well, I cannot say what he said down in Gloucester, I have not been able to find the speech he made there, but I find eight or ten in which his policy seems to be that Canada must be sacrificed at the feet of the United States. He says, in the Lower Provinces, that he is a free trader, but when he comes to the Province of Ontario he has no objection to turn a somersault upon a protectionist plank, provided it lands him into power. I fancy, however, the country will say that it wants his policy defined. But, in point of fact, we have got his policy on record, and I do not think he will recant so readily as the hon. members for North Norfolk and South Brant. I do not think he is so active as they are in turning somersaults. However, no matter what he now says we have him fast. The hon. gentleman went down by the sea. For months and months it was predicted that the great champion of Canadian Independence, the hero of the Aurora speech, was going down to teach the Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers what they were to do. The hon. gentleman was a little reckless, he must confess, in his remarks there. He laid down his platform, we have got it and intend to hold him to it. I must refer to it, however unpleasant it may be to the hon. member for Westmoreland. I direct my attention to him because the hon. leader seems to be asleep.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Talk louder and wake him up.

Mr. RYKERT. The *St. John Telegraph* is a real Simon Pure Grit organ, judging by its editorials. I find a report of the hon. gentleman's speech in that paper of 16th July, 1881, and in that speech, which is elaborated at great length, and apparently revised by the hon. gentleman, I find language which admits of no doubt, and I think we can safely say that, at last, we have got him nailed, although his friends have been trying to squirm out of it in this House. But the little bird has told us what were the utterances of the hon. gentleman who, in the exuberance of his loyalty, said he was capable of leading the great Reform party in Canada. He gave utterance to certain expressions which unmistakably fasten him down as a free trader pure and simple. The Reform party, in 1878, froze fast to the poor man, and they want to freeze to him again, but we are determined with good prices and plenty of labor—men getting \$1.25 per day—we are determined to keep him on our side. I think hon. gentlemen will find, when the time comes round next year, a very large majority of the poor men will vote in favor of the friends of the poor man.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Perhaps that will be this year.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not know that the hon. gentleman would like to have it this year. A short time ago they were frantic in their demands to this House that there should be an appeal to the country, but they have discovered in the course of events that the affairs of the Government have been so fairly, honorably and honestly administered that the people have faith in the honesty and integrity of the Government, and they are not quite so anxious now to have an election. Why, Sir, a short time ago they made frantic

appeals to go to the people, but a few nights ago we found the organ in large black letters stating that it was unfair to foist an election upon the country now. They do not want it now, but it seems—I do not like that last picture in *Grip* of Sir John whispering in Mr. Brown's ear, and I think that he is keeping rather too close company. I hope our leader will not be found whispering.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I won't be done brown.

Mr. RYKERT. I hope we will have the pleasure of hearing of it first. That is merely an interjection. However, I was proceeding to state what the leader of the late Government and the ex-leader of the Opposition said: "I am a free trader in principle, I believe in free-thought, free men, free property," I expected to see free love next. "The last mentioned is the latest to be acquired." Now here we have a free trader; that is something very satisfactory and I have been wanting to find out, for some time, where the hon. gentlemen stood. Again, in another speech which he made at the place called St. John River, I find recorded in the *St. John Telegraph*:

"He showed that the same principles which governed inter-provincial trade applied to international commercial transactions, and anything which unnecessarily interfered with it, any restriction not the fruit of necessity, was a wrong and an injury."

Then, in pointing out the great affliction to the poor man necessitated by the policy of the present Government, he went on, speaking of the present fiscal policy, to say:

"He dwelt at some length on the evils of restriction and especially the embargo on trade with the United States."

Then, again, at New Glasgow he used this language:

"Nova Scotia was not the natural market for Ontario flour. Geography was against the exchange. Why then not leave the people of Nova Scotia to buy American flour if they wanted it, and the people of Ontario to buy American coal if they wanted it."

This is the platform upon which the hon. gentleman stands. While these political missionaries, who give the people the benefit of their eloquence, do not try to reconcile their policy with the policy of their leaders, why do they not say they are in favor of Free Trade, and adopt it fairly and squarely, instead of beating about the bush? As to the hon. member for North Norfolk, we know what his affinities are, and where his ideas spring from, but I say let them go in for a united platform, let them support their leader and discuss unitedly any policy they like. I think we can safely say we have got a platform upon which we can fasten these hon. gentlemen; moreover, the first lieutenant of that party says the same thing. The hon. member for Centre Huron uses the term "legalized robbery" with reference to enriching our manufacturers at the expense of the poor man; he comes out fairly and squarely as a free trader, and there is the secret of the Opposition in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite, and accounts for the resolution which was sprung upon the House before the Budget Speech. The members for North Norfolk and South Brant were afraid lest the hon. ex-Finance Minister should anticipate what they were going to say, and they feared he might mould public opinion, that he might promulgate certain views distasteful to themselves. They anticipated his views by moving a resolution in this House, declaring that their ideas were in favor of a sort of milk and water protection. I say we ought to have these statements before they go to the country, in order that the people may pronounce upon their views. The hon. member for Gloucester made a great speech of from four to five hours long—more or less—the other night; and with his usual eloquence, and that earnestness of manner characteristic of his countrymen, bewailed the misfortunes of the Lower Provinces. Poor Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were going to the dogs, everything was sacrificed to the interest of this Province; Nova Scotia being sacrificed to the Province of Ontario.

Mr. BRYANT.

That hon. gentleman, however, in the face of the declaration of the hon. member for Lambton, had to admit there was some degree of prosperity cropping up here and there; but the hon. gentleman said: "Look at the exodus from our country; people are leaving every hour." The hon. gentleman in drawing this picture, says the Minister of Agriculture, has sent a false report down to this House, and he does not believe that it is a correct report. He does not believe there are as many as 4,000,000 of people in this Dominion, and bewails the misfortunes of his countrymen, attributing the whole of them to this abominable National Policy. Now, these gentlemen, I might say these apostles of Protection, the members for South Brant and North Norfolk, have been going about the country gathering up a little information about public affairs, and they are forced to add their testimony to the prosperity of the country. Sir, the Government wanted no better defenders than those hon. gentlemen. Take their speeches from beginning to end and they are manifestos declaring that the fiscal policy of the present Government is a success. In whatever direction you go you find an increase in manufactures, and they are forced to admit that our manufacturers are making a home-market—not over 3,000 miles away—but at the door of the farmer. Their whole argument is in favor of Protection and of the fiscal policy of the Government; but, Sir, these hon. gentlemen, while admitting that the policy of the Government has brought prosperity—for the hon. member for Lambton says that as a matter of fact the country is prosperous—attribute it to various reasons. They admit, in the first place, that the country is prosperous, but they say that a revenue Tariff is a success. They beat about the bush to find an excuse for it. They say the hon. Finance Minister has no right to say that his policy has made the country prosperous. Providence did it all, they say. We all look forward, with a great deal of pleasure and respect to Providence smiling benignly upon us on all occasions, but it is a most extraordinary thing that, when a Grit Government is in power, Providence does not smile upon us and help us. They had good crops from 1874 to 1879, with few exceptions; indeed, they had better crops in that period than we have had since, and yet Providence did not smile upon them. And why? Because Providence helps those who help themselves. They sat with arms folded and let the country go to the dogs, and how could they expect Providence to help them. These hon. gentlemen now adopt a new role. They say you are putting heavy burdens on the people by the imposition of these fiscal duties; you have taken \$4,000,000 out of the pockets of the people and what was done with it? Well, at all events that sum represents a surplus; it represents something in actual existence at any rate. A good and frugal farmer finding himself in embarrassed circumstances will do his utmost to make the soil produce as much as possible. He applies to it all the well known rules of husbandry by which to increase its productiveness, and when he gets a surplus—more than he requires for his living—he puts it in the bank either to pay off the mortgage or to add to his capital. Surely he is not any poorer by doing so. It is the same way with the Government. By the imposition of these duties—though the matter was at the time prospective and doubtful—the Finance Minister who proved himself a good prophet, obtained the surplus which we now enjoy. We have that much money to put to capital account, but this is an experience which hon. gentlemen opposite never enjoyed. It seems to me that the fact that we are able to raise a large revenue is an evidence that we are not in a very unfortunate position, and a strong proof of the prosperity of the country. But, say these hon. gentlemen, people are leaving the country in every direc-

tion. It seems to me that if the leader of the Opposition still maintains the idea which he promulgated a few years ago, and if the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) still adheres to the opinions expressed in his celebrated Dundee speech, and says that the National Policy is a system of legalized robbery, we have a right to ask these hon. gentlemen that they shall, now, once and forever, promulgate their policy, and let the country know what they intend to do. I am satisfied that the country does not want a policy which will place us at a disadvantage with the people of the United States. These hon. gentlemen do not say what kind of a policy they want. If they want a defensive policy let us know it. If they want a defensive policy, or a revenue Tariff policy, or a retaliatory policy, let us know it. They say that such a policy as we now enjoy might have been useful some time ago, but that now it is a thing of the past. But if, as some of these hon. gentlemen say, a defensive policy was good in 1876, why is it not good now, and why should we return to a revenue policy. I was rather severely criticized because I gave the definition of their policy once before, but I shall now give the definition adopted by the Chicago Tariff Convention some time ago. At that convention it was

Resolved, That a Tariff for revenue only, is a system of duties on imports based on the false and ruinous idea that the Government will look out for itself and the people must look out for themselves, that home industry will thrive most when it is least cared for in the laws, and that it is expedient to hire foreigners to produce manufactures for our use, while tens of thousands of our workmen are deprived of employment and our own good raw materials be neglected to make room for importations—a system which has always ended in prostrating our industries and in reducing multitudes to idleness.

It seems to me that this is rather a good definition of a revenue policy, and one which we have had illustrated and proved by what we have heard in this house. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) endeavored to prove the failure of the National Policy, by showing that the exports had fallen off largely on some sixty articles. He says we have fallen off in our exports of manufactured goods, \$1,652,610, but if the hon. gentleman desired to place the case fairly before the public, he would have placed a list of the imports alongside the list he gave us. I find that between 1878 and 1881 there has been a falling off in imports of twenty-nine different articles, of no less a sum than \$3,296,468, which conclusively shows that our manufacturers have got the home market. Among the articles to which I refer, are musical instruments, axes, stoves, furniture and another article which is so dear to the heart of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—candy. It seems, therefore, that even the hon. member for South Brant makes more money than he did, now that he has got a home market, and I would like the hon. gentleman, when he gets up, to tell us how much more he manufactured this year than last, and whether he has not found his market in Manitoba, the North-West and the eastern Provinces? There is another industry which has thriven under the influence of the National Policy, and that is fruit. In the one article of green fruit alone, the importation has fallen off \$70,000 in the course of one year. If the hon. gentleman had been disposed to be fair, he would have stated these facts, and would have shown, also, that the inter-provincial trade is proved by the fact that the importations into Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have fallen from \$17,947,689 in 1878, to \$14,016,366 in 1881. I cannot imagine that the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick eat less or work less than they did before, and yet they have imported \$3,000,000 less than they did in 1878, and have exported \$1,000,000 more. The Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, in 1878, exported \$15,469,562, and in 1881, \$16,349,868. This shows an actual difference, in their entire trade, between

the two years of \$4,000,000. The natural conclusion which we draw from these facts is, that they have the whole market. As a further proof of inter-provincial trade, let me point out that Nova Scotia imported from the United States, in 1878, of flour from wheat \$605,633 worth, and, in 1881, only \$98,699 worth; and of oatmeal, in 1878, \$4,286 worth; and, in 1881, \$255 worth. I do not think this reduction is accounted for by Scotchmen giving up their oatmeal porridge, because they do not generally do that. In New Brunswick we find that the imports of flour from the United States, in 1878, were \$336,722 worth, and, in 1881, \$83,299; and of oatmeal, in 1878, \$1,514 worth; and, in 1881, only \$440 worth. In Prince Edward Island the importations of flour, in 1878, were \$50,536 worth; and, in 1881, \$9,169 worth; and of oatmeal, in 1878, \$456; and none in 1881. Another fact which, to my mind, conclusively shows that we have secured the home market is, that in bleached and unbleached cottons, gingham, jeans, &c., the importations have fallen in these three Provinces from \$768,912 worth in 1878, to \$286,881 worth in 1881, or a difference of \$482,931. This must show that these goods were manufactured in the country, unless we say that the people used less cottons. Now, let us see how this inter-provincial trade has benefitted the farmers. These gentlemen coolly and deliberately talk of this Tariff injuring the farmers in the presence of men who know as much about it as they do themselves. I apprehend that a farmer knows what benefits him as well as a manufacturer or anyone else, and when we find that there has been such a change in the course of two or three years, we have a right to attribute it largely to the National Policy. We find that the importations of grain for home consumption have fallen from \$13,438,758 in 1878, to \$2,397,250 in 1881, or a difference of no less than \$11,041,508. That is one benefit that the farmers of this Dominion have derived. We also find that the exports of horses, in 1878, were \$1,273,728, and, in 1881, \$2,094,037; and of cattle, \$1,152,334 in 1878, and \$3,464,871 in 1881. I might go on and show the same increase in our exports of sheep, barley, Indian corn, oats, wheat, rye, peas, and a whole catalogue of articles which form the produce of the farmer; and I think that the hon. gentleman will admit, if he concedes that the hon. the Minister of Finance has not cooked the Public Accounts, that the farmers have now a home market, and have an opportunity of selling their produce at almost any price they ask. They have the market brought from 3,000 miles distant to their own doors, they have all their wants supplied within their own reach, and in the eloquent language of the hon. member for North Norfolk:

"A farmer raises a bushel of corn which he sells for 50 cents in a foreign market, and with the proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but supposing the manufacturers brought to his door and the better market which it creates increases the price to 60 or 70 cents per bushel, and although import duties are levied on cottons from Manchester so as to add largely to its price, still he may be enabled to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn instead of the three yards it was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labor is increased."

That is another portion of the brains of the hon. gentleman's speech. The hon. members for North Norfolk and South Brant might find evidence of the extraordinary success of the fiscal policy of the Government also in our exports. We find that in the last three years of the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the exports were \$236,165,405, and the imports for home consumption \$282,233,268, or an excess of exports over imports of \$46,067,773. Now, look at the other side of the picture: during the last three years of the present wise and economical Administration the exports were \$257,603,536, and the imports for home consumption \$243,734,561, or an excess of exports over imports of \$13,968,975. How can hon. gentlemen explain these figures? They may perhaps attempt to explain them away, but to my mind these figures are unanswerable.

We can draw but one conclusion, namely, that there has been a great change in the producing power of the country, that a great benefit has been derived, that a great change has taken place in placing our finances in a healthy condition, and the fact that the excess of exports and imports in the three years show a difference of \$13,000,000 is strong evidence in favor of the Conservative Government. As another evidence of the benefit of the National Policy we can point to some of the industries of this country, and I shall be able to show that the reckless statements made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, in regard to the schedule of the hon. Minister of Finance, are not justified by the facts.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

Mr. RYKERT. I have shown, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen opposite had no settled or defined policy. Upon the question of fiscal policy they were entirely at loggerheads, that while the leader was a pronounced free trader and his first lieutenant was a free trader, we had, on the other hand, the hon. members for North Norfolk and South Brant who were pronounced protectionists in the past, and were now endeavoring to shift their sails in order, if possible, to catch the popular vote. I think I have also shown that the only policy of these hon. gentlemen was a desire and greed for office. No man will attempt to controvert this after hearing the record of these hon. gentlemen and remembering their action during the present Parliament, and the extraordinary efforts made by them in 1872-73 to seize the reins of office from the hon. gentlemen who now control the Treasury benches. I think I have shown that those public lecturers have been at times free traders and protectionists. Whenever it suited the view of their audiences they were free traders and delivered free trade speeches, but when it suited them to play the part of protectionists they at once appealed to their past record as contained in the parliamentary *Hansard* and said: "there are my speeches," so they have the happy faculty on all occasions of adapting themselves to the audiences which they are addressing. I think I have shown satisfactorily to this House that those hon. gentlemen who now profess to lead public opinion attempted to frame a policy for this House and country which was not deserving of public confidence. I have also shown, I think, out of their own mouths, that the country is prospering, and that under the benign influence of the National Policy it is bound to advance and bound to prosper. I think I have also shown, out of their own mouths, although it is like drawing their eye-teeth from them, that the revenue vastly exceeds the expenditure. Having accomplished that much, I think I can fairly claim to have performed the task which I assigned to myself on opening my remarks, and have satisfactorily redeemed the pledge I made when I commenced my speech. I have some few more observations to make in respect to the National Policy. I desire to correct the representations of hon. gentlemen opposite, and show that those who made these representations, in my judgment have not the interests of this country at heart, but made them from a desire to remove the effect of the magnificent speech delivered by the hon. leader of the Financial Department of this Dominion. These hon. gentlemen felt the effect of that speech like a bomb-shell in the camp, and when the hon. the Finance Minister made the public declaration that, after a year's experience of the National Policy, he could point to an overflowing Treasury of \$4,000,000, the statement fell like sour vinegar upon those hon. gentleman, and they made all sorts of contortions. There remains the plain, naked fact, that there are upwards of \$4,000,000 in the Treasury, and they, to break the effect of it, are obliged to

Mr. RYKERT.

declare that this sum has been extracted from the pockets of the poor people. The hon. member for North Norfolk might possibly have pointed with the greatest pride and satisfaction, if he had chosen to do so, to the very extraordinary and rapid advance made in another industry, that is, the cotton industry. I have before me a record, showing the vast increase in that enterprise. The mills of 1878, had an aggregate of 75,000 spindles, which, with 173,000 now being erected, would bring the total to 248,000. It has been asked what was the use of all this importation of raw cotton. We have the answer there. In every direction these cotton manufactories are springing up, and the vast increase in the importation of raw cotton, from 5,800,000 lbs. in 1877, to 16,018,000 lbs. in 1881, shows clearly and conclusively where it has gone. I am happy to state I have received to-day, an application to the Government for water power on the Welland Canal, for a factory that will employ 400 hands. In every direction we have people applying for permission to utilize the water power along that canal; and I look hopefully to its supplying many manufactories along its line. Those hon. gentlemen opposite, on a former occasion, after I had addressed the House on the Budget Speech, took the opportunity to set one of themselves up to cry down the credit of the town I have the honor to represent. I do not know that it was greatly to their credit, because they dislike its representative to run down the town. I know that they have no partiality for myself.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). Oh, we have.

Mr. RYKERT. They have no great reason for any partiality, but still that does not justify their discrediting the town, or my constituents, whose confidence I have enjoyed for nearly a quarter of a century. As an instance of what is being done by the manufacturers at present, I shall quote an article which I cut from one of the Hamilton papers, showing the immense trade springing up between the Dominion and the North-West. It is dated 6th March:

"Among the goods sent from this city to Manitoba and British Columbia during last month were: Clothing, \$70,292.87; boots and shoes, \$7,526.20; stationery, \$5,490.29; stoves and castings, \$7,634.54; tobacco, \$6,041.52; groceries, \$3,131.49, and other articles, making in all \$129,056 67."

These goods were all sold in one month, \$129,056 worth, giving evidence of the great benefit of the National Policy now in securing to ourselves this inter-provincial trade. I am addressing myself more particularly to the hon. member for South Brant, because he is going to follow me, because he is a protectionist one day and a free trader the next. The head of one portion of his speech is free trade, and the tail protection; and I would like him to explain what the body is. If the body is generally protection, as it is, we should know the reason. The hon. gentleman never told us that manufacturing industries had been developed by the Tariff in his own city. I hold in my hand a Brantford paper, which may be the organ of the hon. gentleman for all I know, setting forth the benefits of the National Policy. I have been surprised and disappointed that he did not take an early opportunity of telling the House what this paper reports. Under the date of February 10th, and the heading—"Good-bye Mr. Paterson," I read as follows:—

"Mr. William Paterson has taken his departure for Ottawa. What a pleasant story he will pour into the ear of his chief! He will tell Mr. Blake that the commercial aspect of Brantford never looked brighter than it does to-day. He will say that our new cotton mill now employs in the neighborhood of 200 hands, and that the proprietor has a sufficient number of orders on hand to keep his mill going for twelve months. He will report that many of our manufacturers have at least doubled their works during the past fifteen months, and in proof of this he will declare that in the year 1881 alone the new machinery purchased, and the new buildings erected, by the heads of our industries, represented a sum not less than \$250,000. Mr. Paterson will also tell Mr. Blake that the North-West trade, given to Ontario by the present Tariff, has brought thousands of dollars to Brantford, and then to back up this statement he will say that the Harris Agricultural Implement firm,

who have eight large warehouses in Manitoba, have determined to build immense premises to enable them to supply the orders that come from the Prairie Province. Mr. Paterson will also take delight in detailing the numerous small industries, such as canning and fruit evaporating works, that have sprung up in Brantford since the early part of 1879. In this connection he will probably say that a company with a subscribed capital of \$50,000, has recently been organized in this city to manufacture farm and dairy utensils, and that premises and lands have already been purchased for the purpose. But the acme of Mr. Paterson's satisfaction will be reached when he informs his leader that another English manufacturer, attracted by the field that Canada, through the beneficent agency of the National Policy, offers for the industry, is, in conjunction with Mr. Slater, of the cotton mill, entering into negotiations with the city to erect a large wincey factory in Brantford. How we envy our member! What a lucky man he is to be the bearer of such good news! What a glowing picture William the Distorter will, on the floor of Parliament, draw of the good fortune that has, in these National Policy days, fallen upon the chief municipality of his constituency!

"Good-bye William! Don't forget to mention the new cotton factory, the new farm and dairy works, the new wincey mill, the new canning factories, the proposed extensions under consideration by Buck, of stove fame, and Harris, Son & Co., the large increase in the workmen at the G. T. R. shops, and last, but not least, the boom in your own establishment. Ta! ta! William. Ah! but you are a lucky man."

I expect the hon. gentleman, in his speech, will tell us all about that subject. The hon. the Finance Minister did not know of these new industries, and, consequently, did not include them in the schedule he laid before the House lately. The hon. gentleman opposite might have enlightened us on the matter, but chose to refrain. I fully expected that some hon. gentleman would have given us a quotation from the speech of my colleague in the Local Legislature. They say that no man of any experience or practical knowledge would stand up before a public audience and declare that the National Policy had benefitted our commercial and agricultural interests. I reply that no man will stand up and say that Mr. Neelon, the member for the Local Legislature, is not one of the most practical and experienced business men in the whole Dominion, and when hon. gentlemen opposite saw how this hon. gentleman put an end, in the Local Legislature, to the discussion of the National Policy by the Government, I would like to know how they felt. Up to the time he spoke, every little penny-a-liner and penny whistler of hon. gentlemen opposite aspiring to be leaders in politics, had something to say about the effects of the National Policy, with which the Local Legislature had nothing to do. But when the member for Lincoln arose in the Local House, it was like a bomb-shell in their camp. Speaking of St. Catharines, that miserable little place, so belabored by my opponent, he said he knew one establishment which, in 1878, employed only some sixty hands, that now employed 125, the production of the establishment during the Mackenzie regime reached between \$50,000 and \$60,000 a year; but now they amounted to \$125,000. Another establishment, in 1879, turned out but \$30,000 worth of goods, although they had three travelling agents endeavoring to sell them. During the last year the out-put was \$100,000 and all the goods met with a ready sale. Let me give the testimony of Mr. Neelon as to the benefits of the National Policy. He said:

"In fact, the agriculturist secured at his very door, owing to the protective policy, from 15 to 30 per cent. more for these products than if he were compelled to sell them for export. Without a protective policy our artisans would be compelled to seek employment over the line, and our farmers must consequently seek their market for these products of the farm over the border. A ready and profitable market was now furnished for these articles at the farmer's own door, and if he did pay a little more for the goods he purchased he could, and should be quite willing to afford it. He thought that the National Policy, instead of being a detriment was of decided advantage to the farmer."

And he further said if he were in Ottawa he would support Sir John A. Macdonald. Now, let me give further testimony. I would like to give some information respecting my own town. Smith's saw factory employed thirty men in 1878, and sixty are employed there now, the sales are more than double. I cannot give the exact amount, but wages are increased to all the men; while everybody was then working only three-quarters time, now they are working

full time. Collinson's factory employed fifty-five to fifty-seven men in 1878, and at present they number 107; they produced \$58,000 worth of goods in 1878, and \$107,000 in 1881. The Welland Vale works employed forty-five men in 1878, and now have 120; they manufactured \$50,000 worth of goods in 1878, and now the amount is \$140,000. I will just read now from a circular issued by another manufacturing company, which certainly corroborates what the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk said to this House, namely, that while the manufacturers' expenses have increased, yet the prices to the consumers are not greater. I hold in my hand a circular of Whitman & Barnes Manufacturing Company, one of the largest in our city (St. Catharines), employing 175 men, in which they say:

"We find that the orders for 1882 are at present far in excess of the total orders for 1881, and although some lines of stock used by us have advanced step by step for the last three or four years, still the prices of knives are not as high as four years ago; and it is our determination to keep prices as low as possible, giving first-class goods at a price that will make us a living profit, and give satisfaction to our numerous customers."

The hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for Lambton have spoken of the incorrectness of the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance with regard to the prosperity of the country. Now, I find they have omitted to mention a great many instances of prosperity. In sight of my own door a manufactory established in 1878, employs now about 100 men. Why even the *Thorold Post*, a good substantial Grit paper, finds fault with the hon. the Minister of Finance for giving them the go-by. It says:

"How was it that Sir Leonard Tilley, in the list which he submitted to the House of Commons, of the factories which have sprung up under the benign influence of the National Policy, made no reference to our Thorold industries, which can come under that head, namely, the two knitting factories, pulp mill, and basket factory, which altogether employ about 150 hands. Poor Thorold has been sadly left out in the cold by the Government, in more ways than one."

They never write an article without having a sting in the tail end, there is some little grievance against the Government, which, no doubt, they will rectify before long. Now, let me draw the attention of the House to another statement—I will not say it was made designedly—but the hon. gentleman from Lambton stated that in Montreal he had not been able to discover the Glass Company as one of these wonderful evidences of prosperity. I have here a letter from a manufacturing establishment, showing how many men they employed. It is called the Excelsior Glass Company, and was erected in the summer of 1881, working since then, the production is \$1,000 per day, and up to Saturday, 2nd March, they employed 496 hands and had discharged some because they could not get coal from Nova Scotia fast enough. In September, 1881, they employed 525 hands. Now this is an industry which the hon. gentleman could not discover even with a search warrant. Then we find the hon. member for North Norfolk, who is so huge in the matter of figures, urging that most of these new establishments have long existed. Now it grieves him terribly to see these factories resuscitated. Nothing grieves hon. members of the Opposition so much as to see evident signs of prosperity in the country; they do not like it, and for that reason they would rather sacrifice everything—their country, their wives and relations—than themselves, and they will not see facts which are within their reach and knowledge. I have a letter from the Hyndman Company dated 13th March, 1882, in which they say: "We started in 1881,"—that is a pretty old concern is it not—"we are now employing twenty-five to twenty-seven men directly and about double as many indirectly." This establishment the member for Norfolk said was an old concern. Here is another company, R. H. Gray & Co., which he says is an old firm also. I do not wonder that the member for North Norfolk will not like that company being resuscitated. Well, it started in January

1878, a weakly miserable concern, employing ten to twenty hands; it now employs sixty hands steadily, and the proprietor states: "We are pleased to bear testimony to the good effects of the National Policy." Then another statement from the Bolt and Nut Works of Toronto, see what the proprietor says. They failed in 1874, under the benign influence and *regime* of hon. gentleman opposite, and remained closed until August, 1879; they are now getting steady work, they are running from 7 a. m. till 10 at night; they employ 193 men in their factory, and a large number besides making boxes. Under the old Tariff it had no existence whatever. The salaries range from \$1.25 to \$3.25 per day, and this is, no doubt, bad news to the hon. gentleman opposite. I can almost fancy I can see the wrinkles on the face of the hon. member for South Brant and his annoyance, because new industries are flourishing in the country. I will now address myself to a subject with which I am somewhat familiar, and which I am sure our friends will be glad to hear discussed, and on this question there is one thing in which we have an advantage over them; it is this: We have surpluses where they had deficits, and that is the great difference between them and our party. We have also the fact staring us in the face, that the public debt has largely increased, though at the same time we know that that debt had been increased for works of public utility. I referred, this afternoon, to the speech of the hon. member for Centre Huron, in which he said publicly—when showing that bright shield to the capitalists of England—that the whole expenditure had been incurred for works of public utility. I cannot do better than repeat it, because it is a matter that I like to hear read, and because the hon. members for North Norfolk and West Middlesex are accustomed to proclaim to the general public that the debt had been increased by the extravagant course of Sir John A. Macdonald, during the time he was in power previous to their getting office, and pointing to the fact in order to justify their own extravagance during the preceding five years; in other words, while condemning what is wrong in the other party, they justify themselves in doing the same thing. The hon. member for Centre Huron says:

"The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since Confederation, although it has in the interval been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind, such as the outlay connected with the several Fenian attacks on the country, the acquisition and organization of new territory, and providing an adequate defensive force for the Dominion."

Now, Sir, that is the testimony of the hon. member for Centre Huron. Let us call into the witness box the master of the hon. gentleman, and see what he says. I find in the *Globe*—they have heard of that paper, no doubt—of November 16th, 1881, in speaking of Goldwin Smith, the following:—

"Who does not see that Mr. Smith wants the same thing for Canada, and is ready to decry this country if so he may injure its credit, and thus prevent development of its incalculable resources and induce the people to look to Washington or despair; it is true that the debt of the Dominion is large, but nineteen-twentieths of it have been incurred for productive purposes, and the interest has always been promptly paid. With no debt and without works, in which the money has been expended, the country would be infinitely poorer than it would be were the debt doubled without adding to the works."

Now there is the testimony, not only of the hon. member for Centre Huron, but of the organ of the party, that the public debt, large as it was, was justified under all the circumstances. When the hon. leader of the Opposition went down to the sea, he discussed the financial policy of the Government. He had never been much of a success at figures, but when he was not in the hearing of gentlemen who knew better he undertook the financial aspect of affairs in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman made a speech containing what I would call reckless statements. What struck me as being most remarkable was one in reference to the deficits of the late Govern-

MR. RYKERT.

ment. Now, I have been on almost every platform in the Province of Ontario and heard these spouters talk about the deficits of the Dominion, but I never yet heard one of them say the deficits were caused by expenditures in the North-West Territory. But the hon. leader of the Opposition wanted to let himself down lightly by catching on to the coat tails of the Mackenzie Government. He stated the whole of these deficits were caused by expenditures in the North-West Territory. Let me read an extract from that speech, revised by himself, which I find in the *St. John Daily Telegraph* of February 16th—I believe the hon. member looks upon that as a good clear Grit paper:

"But for the North-West there would have been no deficits in the last Administration. It was the North-West that created them. If you remember what has been done they must go on. I believe they must go on."

Well, Sir, that is something satisfactory. We have a statement here under the hand of the Deputy Minister of Finance where I find what were the deficits and what were the expenditures. During the years 1875-76, this economical Government, of which the hon. gentleman was so distinguished a member, ran behind \$1,900,085; in 1876-77, \$1,460,027; in 1877-78, \$985,776, making a total of \$4,346,588. The great trouble is this: that the hon. gentleman knows so little about figures, he cannot tell whether it is capital account or otherwise. If he will turn to the 24th schedule he will find that the Pacific Railway expenditure is carried to capital account. And how did they get the money for that? Why, they borrowed it. The whole expenditure of the North-West, in 1875-76, was \$1,136,194; in 1876-77, \$918,742; 1877-78, \$864,890, or a total of \$2,919,026, showing a difference between that and the deficits of \$1,427,762. Now, Sir, why did not the hon. gentleman state the fact? It seems to me it would have been far better and more to his credit in aspiring to lead the government had he stated the facts just as they were, and allowed the country to judge whether his position was better than that of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the government. Now I propose briefly to refer to some financial statements in connection with this matter. The hon. member for West Middlesex, who lately has assumed the position of Minister of Finance for the Opposition, undertook to criticize the expenditure of the Government, and in that criticism he did not deal fairly with those figures at all. Nevertheless, I do not blame the hon. gentleman because he knows as little about figures probably, as the leader of the Opposition, and for that reason it is natural for him to mix and muddle figures. Now, let us take a few figures: for 1877-78 they collected \$22,375,013 at a cost of \$5,301,124, or at the rate of 23 per cent. For 1881, they collected \$29,635,297, at a cost of \$5,683,123, or at the rate of 19 per cent., a difference of 4 per cent. in favor of the Conservative Government. The collection of Customs cost, under the Grit *regime* in 1877, 5.82 per cent.; in 1878, 5.59 per cent., and, in 1881, 3.89 per cent., or a difference of nearly 2 per cent. in favor of the present Government. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) took the average expenditure of the last two years of the Grit Government, and he took those years because he thought he could make a point with them, although he knows right well that the last year was no fair test. In that year they starved everybody and everything in order that they might be ready to meet the electors, as was evidenced by their bungling on the great public works. They so starved the Welland Canal that it has taken thousands and thousands of dollars to cover up their neglect. The average expenditure during their last two years, according to that hon. gentleman, was \$23,511,229; the average expenditure under two years of Conservative rule was \$25,177,574, or a difference of about \$1,665,355. Now, if the hon. gentleman had been desirable of telling us

facts—and I do not accuse him of being so desirous—he would have informed the House that the increase was caused by their own recklessness, by adding to the public debt \$34,000,000, making an increase in interest of \$1,521,902, and \$542,497 sinking fund, making a total of about \$2,064,381, which, if taken into account, would leave a balance in favor of Conservative rule of \$399,016. We will now take the ordinary controllable expenditure, to which he also referred. In the two years of Grit rule the amount was \$13,377,588; during the two years of Conservative rule, \$14,257,415; making a balance of \$879,827 in favor of the Grits. But from this you must deduct the item of Census, which was not an expenditure in their year, and also the excess in the expenditure of Indian Affairs. These items in their two years amounted to \$731,698, and in the two years of Conservative rule to \$1,626,944, making a difference in favor of Conservative rule on those items of about \$894,944. Deducting that from the excess of expenditure mentioned by the hon. gentleman, we have \$15,177 in favor of the Conservative Government. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen say your ordinary controllable expenditure has increased very rapidly, and no doubt it has; but I am going to prove, out of their own mouths, that that expenditure has not increased as rapidly as they anticipated, or as rapidly as they stated the country would require. I will not go back to last year's expenditure, but I will give them the benefit of quoting the Estimates for this year which are the largest. I do that for this reason: that when the hon. the leader of the Opposition went down by the seaside, to discuss the financial affairs of the nation, he would not take last year's expenditure at all, so I will follow his example, so as to put the worst possible phase on our side of the question. Now, the Estimates of 1882, are \$8,381,673, and, comparing this with the expenditure of 1875-76, we find a difference of \$188,101 in favor of that year. If you deduct from this the excess in 1882, on account of Indians and Census, you have a sum in our favor of \$682,793, which added to the other balance makes a total, in favor of 1882, of \$870,894 as compared with 1875-76. Now, take another view of the matter. The expenditures of 1874-75 were \$7,868,690, which, deducted from the Estimates of this year, leaves an excess for 1882 of \$512,983. Deduct from this the excess on account of Indians, \$813,829, and Census, \$41,628, in all \$855,457, leaving a balance in favor of 1882 of \$342,454. Let us now compare the Estimates of 1877-78 with those of 1882, and let us deduct from the Estimates of 1882, those items which did not occur in their time, or the amount of excess in 1882. These are: Indians, excess, \$487,805; Census, \$58,947; Public Works, 706,281; Immigration, \$197,616; Ocean Service, \$78,256; Militia, \$140,364; or a total of \$1,669,269, which deducted from the Estimates of this year, leaves \$6,712,404; and if from this you take the expenditures of 1877-78, you find that the difference is only \$169,894, and this in face of the fact of the great development of the country. Let us now make a comparison of the ordinary expenditure of the two Governments. This ordinary expenditure for the last three years of the Grit Government amounted to \$21,947,362, and for the last three years of this Government to \$21,134,992, leaving a balance in favor of Tory rule of \$812,374. I will now make a comparison between the expenditure of 1881 and the Estimates made by the late Finance Minister in his Budget Speech. His estimates were as follows: Legislation, \$600,000; Civil Government, \$900,000; Administration of Justice, \$900,000; Marine, \$900,000; Militia, \$1,050,000; Public Works, \$1,500,000; Immigration, \$500,000; Miscellaneous, \$150,000, or a total of \$6,500,000; while the expenditures for 1881 for the same services were \$5,534,593. I think, Sir, that when we find that this country has, during the past year, been able to carry on its affairs without visibly increasing the national debt, when we find that within the

last eight months we have been able to reduce the national debt by \$1,300,000, and that we have to our credit \$4,000,000, it is a very satisfactory exhibit. This is not money wasted; it has been paid by the people, and no person has complained of it. Can hon. gentlemen opposite give a single instance in which the people have complained of these taxes during the last year? They cannot name one. Now, Sir, some of the speakers in this debate have stated that we are indebted to the Liberal party for everything that has been a benefit to this country. That is a statement I have heard made on public platforms during the last quarter of a century, and I have failed, with all the research I could bring to bear on it, to discover what great work of public utility is entitled to be placed to the credit of the Reform party. What are they? Will some hon. gentleman name one great act of public utility which that party has placed on the Statute-book? Now, I am not going to review their past legislation, because if I attempted to do so, I would have to look at a blank. Their record is before the country—a record of extravagance and corruption, a record which shows that they were totally incapable of administering our public affairs, a record of deficits substituted for surpluses. I am not going to go over that ground, which was so well covered by the hon. member for Rouville, (Mr. Gigault), who, I think, must have satisfied every hon. member of this House in the very eloquent and logical speech which he delivered, that the Reform party can lay nothing to their credit in respect of legislation. We, on the other hand, can say that we have a happy and prosperous country, we can say that we have a happy and a contented people, we can say that our expenditure has been kept within the revenue, we can point to an overflowing Treasury, we can point to a home market for our people, we can point to our laborers and mechanics enjoying peace and prosperity, and we can point to the rapid development of the North-West, a country which will become the financial safety-valve of this Dominion. With regard to that country, I cannot do better than quote from a recent speech of the Hon. Senator Beck:

“I went to Winnipeg last summer and there saw a thriving city of 15,000 people, with a railroad about finished to Lake Superior. It was being pushed with great energy and abundant means westward to the Pacific Ocean to reach the trade of Australia, China, Japan and the Indies on English soil, with cheap ships ready to furnish free goods for transportation over this continent to Europe. I went west of Winnipeg nearly 200 miles on that road, and saw thousands and thousands of acres of wheat clearing forty bushels to the acre, weighing sixty-three and sixty-five pounds to the bushel, and was assured by undoubted authority that on Peace River, 1,200 miles north-west of where I was, wheat was being produced in immense quantity equal to the best I saw in Winnipeg, while great herds of cattle were being fed without cost on as fine grassy land as the world affords.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, one hon. gentleman has stated that we were the subservient followers of the right hon. leader of the Government. Well, Sir, I admit the charge if he pleases to term an honest following subservient. I am proud to be an humble follower of that hon. gentleman. But, Sir, we can say what they cannot say—we never turned traitor to our hon. leader. In the hour of our hon. leader's greatest difficulties, the Conservative party stood shoulder to shoulder at the back of the hon. gentleman as the leader of the party; they recognized that he, of all others, was Canada's greatest statesman; and it is no reflection upon us to say, that we have followed that hon. gentleman faithfully. I take it as a compliment, and I thank the hon. gentleman for it. Sir, what are the issues before the country? The right hon. leader of the Opposition down by the sea has stated them. He says: “There are three issues before the country, and they are plain and definite—revenue and expenditure, the Tariff, and the development of our young country.” Sir, on these three questions we take issue, and we have the advantage in taking issue upon them, because we can point to the rapid development of our country, to a wise and economical arrangement of our financial

affairs which has produced a revenue far in excess of our expenditure, and to a Tariff which has promoted and built up new industries, a Tariff which is day by day developing the material resources of our country. We have to choose between these two parties: on the one hand, we have a disorganized party, having a divided fealty, recognizing no particular leader either within or without Parliament; a party desiring to obtain power for their personal aggrandizement and not for the interest of the country; a party bound together for the defeat of the Government, but for no other special purpose; a party which, when in power, turned surpluses into deficits and did their utmost to destroy the prosperity of the country. On the other hand, we can point with pride and satisfaction to the fact that we have a Government with a policy well defined and well matured, a policy which extricated our finances from confusion and filled our Treasury to repletion; we have a Government able to deal with the question of the development of the North-West Territory; we have a Government which has done its utmost to encourage and foster the industries of the country, and I do not hesitate to express my belief that when the electors of this country shall have an opportunity of pronouncing upon its policy they will render an overwhelming verdict for the Government which has sought to encourage the struggling industries of the Dominion and protect the rights and liberties of the people.

Mr. PATERSON (South Brant). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words before this debate closes, and in doing so I will try to remember the desire of the Government that the debate may soon be brought to a close, and also to remember that there are other gentlemen who desire to speak on this question as well as myself. I will, therefore, endeavor to limit my remarks to a few points that seem to me necessary to be touched upon. It would be a difficult matter for a member on this side of the House to say anything very new, very fresh or very interesting on this subject after the long, able and exhaustive speeches of many members of the party to which I belong. Still, we all have our own way of presenting our case, and I desire to present the question at issue between the two political parties as they strike my mind, as I see them, as I feel them to be. And I would say that, while I fully recognize the fact that the speaker who has just sat down has reminded us of, and which we are constantly reminded of by every speaker who addresses the House from the Government benches, that we are but a miserable minority in the House, and but a miserable minority in the country, as they affirm; yet, though we may be but a minority, hon. gentlemen recognize the fact that there is some little life to be found on this side of the House yet. I do not deny that the party to which I belong was defeated in the election of 1878. Hon. gentleman opposite are very fond of reminding us of that fact; that fact was borne home on our minds, that we could not fail to note. The hon. the leader of the Government, in a congratulatory speech he made shortly after the elections of 1878, was reported to have said that on the day after the election it was impossible to find a Grit in Ontario, or a Rouge in Quebec, even if you offered a reward. Their faces were so long that our good friend Mr. Geo. Brown, who has gone to his rest, and whom the Conservative party did honor to in common with ourselves, after he had gone, was charged 15 cents for shaving on the day following the contest, instead of 10 cents, on account of his face being so long. The Reform party believes in the eternal fitness of things. There is a time to laugh and a time to refrain from laughing, and, it strikes me, there was nothing particular for the Reform party to laugh at on the 18th September, 1878. I will not say it was a time to weep, but it was not the most appropriate time to laugh. We had been defeated in the country, we were passing through a long period of depression; but if it were true we

Mr. RYKERT.

had been so beaten, if it might be said we should have hidden our diminished heads, hon. gentlemen opposite, at all events, know that the heads have since come to light; that though beaten at the polls, there is a party which stands by the principles contended for at that time, a party that is represented in this House, a party not represented in this House in proportion to its numbers in the country, but a party that we believe, when an appeal is made to the people again, will come back to this House numerically stronger than they are at the present time. It is not always a proof that men are right because they secure the verdict of the people. If the people had the questions fairly presented and if they were properly understood, then I would bow, and I bow now to their decision, but I would bow more complacently to the public will as expressed at the polls. But the contention of the party to which I belong is this: that the people of the country did not pronounce in favor of the policy that hon. gentlemen opposite have given us, and which they term the National Policy. The question that was asked the public was to place in power men who would give the manufacturers better markets, larger markets, bring more of them into existence than before, that would give the artisans higher wages, and give the farmer higher prices for the products they had to sell. It was an appeal to the pockets of every class in the community, and though hon. gentlemen would not redeem the promises they had given, because to fulfil one would have been in conflict with another, they were careful in the different Provinces and on different platforms to make such promises as, for the time being, they thought would catch the popular ear. And thus it was they attained to power, while the hon. the Finance Minister himself is an evidence of the fact I am pointing out. The hon. the Finance Minister—if newspaper reports of meetings are correct, I have no reason to doubt they are not—stood on a platform in his own Province, a few days previous to the election of 1878, and though he did not use the words himself, his colleague running with him—he, the hon. the Finance Minister, being on the platform with him, and by his silence endorsing what his colleague said—stated that no statesman would ever propose to place a duty on flour. The hon. the Finance Minister did not deny that on the platform, and the audience no doubt interpreted, from the promises and statements made by the colleague of the present hon. Finance Minister, not challenged or contradicted by him, but endorsed by his silence, that the policy of the Conservative party, if restored to power, would not be a policy that would tax the food of the people of his Province. The hon. Finance Minister himself, knowing that the people of his Province were opposed to the burthens of taxation being increased, assured them that it was not contemplated to increase the Tariff, but simply to readjust it. When the leader of the Government was giving utterance to sentiments different to that from platforms in Ontario, word was passed over the wires to New Brunswick, and a telegram was sent from there to him, to ask if he meditated and had stated there would be an increase in the Tariff, and he replied that it was nonsense, that there was no increase of the Tariff meditated, but simply a readjustment of it. Then I ask whether the people of the Maritime Provinces gave their verdict in favor of the policy which hon. gentlemen said they had pronounced on. Hon. gentlemen said that if restored to power they would not increase the taxation and not tax breadstuffs; and as they were restored to power on these distinct pledges, it is for the people of those Provinces to settle the question with hon. gentlemen opposite who certainly misled them at that time. Another cause that led to the disaster was the continued misrepresentation of the Reform party with regard to the position they occupied towards the manufacturing interests. From every platform we were denounced as the enemy of the manufacturers, we were told that

our policy was a policy for the destruction of manufacturers. The Finance Minister himself stated that unless there was a change in the Tariff within two years, almost every manufacturing interest in this country would be closed up. Such extravagant statements being made, and a time of depression existing in the country, ears receive the words they utter and hearts believe them to be true. Had they contemplated and more clearly looked at the position of parties in the history of this country, they would not have entertained the views that some of them appeared to have entertained at that time. What has been the history of political parties with respect to the manufacturers of this country. Their position was not one of antagonism to the manufacturers. I have challenged on the platform, as I challenge the hon. gentleman now, to point out an act of the Mackenzie Administration designed to do an injury to the manufacturing industries of the country; and I defy them to produce a proof of Mr. Mackenzie ever having levelled a blow at those interests. Let them take up that challenge. This is beyond their power, so far as I remember, to prove any act of the kind. But, on the other hand, I can adduce to the House and country, proofs that cannot be refuted, that while the Mackenzie Administration were careful to conserve the rights and interests of all classes of the community, they took care that the manufacturing industries should also have that share of encouragement that I believe they ought to have. Hon. gentlemen opposite say hear, hear. They seem to think it a strange thing for a member to stand on this side of the House and pronounce himself in favor of our manufacturing industries. The member for Lincoln spent three or four hours this afternoon speaking, during which he referred to speeches I have made, and quoted garbled extracts therefrom, as well as from the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and several other members. His object was perhaps a double one. It may have been, primarily, to misrepresent the sentiments of myself and other hon. gentlemen in the House; but he may have had, in the second place, another object in view. He may be cognizant of the fact that nothing he can say would be received on its own merits; and in the speech in which he attempted to argue the question on its merits, he pursued this year precisely the same plan he has pursued on the occasion of every Budget Speech. He made the old argument, searched *Hansard* for proofs, he quoted from eminent speakers portions of their speeches in order that they might appear in the *Hansard* as his own, and lend grace and dignity to that performance. In his speech of last year you will find the same remarks and garbled quotations, and you will see that my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk then referred to his garbled quotations, that he would like to see a retaliatory policy. But, when the hon. member for North Norfolk said that it would be unwise, impolitic and injudicious to attempt a retaliatory policy, did the hon. gentleman opposite quote that utterance of my hon. friend? No, he did not quote it, and he quoted it not designedly, because he had received the explanation, and it was in the *Hansard*, as made by my hon. friend last year. He has quoted from my speech, and said a great deal with reference to it. He pretended to have found a mine there, and the sentiments uttered by me in that speech, he said that I do not hold at present. He is mistaken: I stand here to-night prepared to utter the same sentiments—to say that on no occasion, either in the House or on the platform, do I remember having uttered sentiments contrary to the true tenor of my argument contained in that speech. And I am willing to be held to the tenor of that speech, because, at that time, I uttered the sentiments I believed; and while I hold the right, if my views become enlarged, if my stores of information become any greater, if to-day I see things in a different light, to change my

views and the expressions of my views, I would not disguise my real sentiments. It would, indeed, be strange if, in this Parliament, when the able men on both sides have debated this question with the vigor and power we have seen for many years past, if a man might not learn something new with reference to these matters. But while I am willing to admit that my views may have been, perhaps, a little modified, and that my expressions may have been, in some points, a little toned down by experience, I yet stand here, abiding by the tenor of that speech, when that speech is fairly quoted and taken in its connection. And just permit me here to make an allusion to one instance the hon. gentleman related, in which he was thoroughly unfair to myself in making—that is, in reference to a word or two that passed between me and the hon. the Finance Minister in the course of that hon. gentleman's speech, with reference to an interjection I made, in which the hon. member for Lincoln said to-night that I had denied the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister. I did not deny that statement, and I believe my hon. friend did not so understand me. I have not heard any hon. gentleman during this argument express himself in that way. The hon. the Finance Minister was speaking about the employment of labor and the bringing in of men from the United States. I asked him was there a tax on labor coming in. He replied: "No; but we propose giving laborers the same encouragement that the hon. member complimented his leader for giving to the cigar industry, when he put a duty on cigars, saying it had brought thousands into the country." What I said to the hon. the Finance Minister, which he will admit, was—that it was very nice, but his quotation was not correct. I knew in the speech I made there was a sentiment like that, but at that time I did not think the phraseology ran exactly as it did; and I said the quotation was not exactly correct, and I thought I had said that the effect of the imposition of that duty by the Finance Minister of that day had been the same, as if a thousand men had been brought from other countries and set to work in this country. But I am bound to say that the phraseology of my speech in the *Hansard* did not bear me out, and so far the hon. Finance Minister was right. That is very different to saying that I denied his statement. Now hon. gentlemen opposite understood that, while saying that I was not attempting to repudiate the fact that I had uttered the sentiment that this change of policy had given additional employment to men in this country. That I did say and stand by, because it is the truth, and I desire to speak the truth at all times. But who effected the change in the Tariff that produced that result? We are told the late hon. Finance Minister is a gentleman whose whole aim and policy was to destroy the manufacturing industries of this country. How then will they reconcile that with the fact that through the revision of his Tariff, he was enabled to bring about this result? The hon. gentleman insinuated to-night—and it was an insinuation unworthy of him—that the late hon. Finance Minister yielded to pressure from me, and that the tax was imposed to benefit myself. I think I can stand here in presence of men who know me and say, with a clear conscience, that I have never made anything out of parliamentary life; and if every other hon. gentleman can say the same, with as clear a conscience, I shall be glad. I stand here to-night to defend the changes in the Tariff effected by the late Finance Minister. I propose to take that very change as an illustration of the principle that would guide me in a revision of the Tariff. I take that very instance as a proof of the ability and wisdom of that hon. gentleman so much denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite as an enemy of the manufacturers and unable to grapple with the commercial questions of this country. I take that instance as a refutation of such assertions. I am told this change affected the cigar industry. While he remembers this, it is not so men-

tioned in the speech. But I do not deny it. What were the facts with reference to that industry? The protection enjoyed by those manufacturers, ranged from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3, 5, 10, 15 and 20 per cent. An average of 11 per cent. was all the protection the cigar manufacturers enjoyed on their products in this country. And, on revising his Tariff the late hon. Finance Minister gave that industry an average protection of how much? Fifteen per cent.; and it was in consequence of this increase that all the beneficial results that have been noticed appeared; and when hon. gentlemen opposite increased that protection from 15 to 31 per cent., no such large beneficial results followed. Then I said that other industries might be benefited in the same way. The late hon. the Minister of Finance, in revising his Tariff, respected the other industries, and increased their protection from 15 to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which was a wise and prudent step in my judgment. And when, in 1876, I made the speech referred to, which is on record now, and of which I am not ashamed, I was then in favor of an advance in the Tariff in that direction, provided any change was made, and the necessities of the revenue demanded it. I admitted then, as I admit now, that my policy would be a defensive one, and that in raising the revenue of this country, if foreign goods were being slaughtered in our markets, or sold under ordinary prices—if our manufacturers were thereby being crushed out—that I would use the Tariff as a means for securing the revenue, and at the same time affording encouragement to those industries natural to the country. Sir, that has been the policy of the Reform party, and was the policy of the Mackenzie Administration. Their Act is on the Statute-book, and judged by their action they stand there as the friends of the manufacturers, and of all classes of industries that are to be found in this country. With reference to that particular industry, it may have been; and, indeed, I was myself inclined to think that perhaps I had over-estimated it somewhat in referring to the good that had been done with reference to it, when I put it down at 1,000 men, which the hon. the Finance Minister magnified undesignedly, I believe, into thousands. But, Sir, what was the fact with reference to that change in the Tariff, when 15 per cent. and no more of an average protection was given to this industry? I will show the hon. gentleman what was produced by it. In 1874, there was 437,281 lbs. of foreign cigars imported in the country; in 1876 that had fallen to 195,387 lbs. That industry had given employment to a very great number of people in this country, and it was a wise and prudent change to make in the Tariff, and good was effected by the imposition of a duty that gave the manufacturer not more than 15 per cent. protection. Then I told my hon. friend at the time, what my views were with reference to that change in the Tariff. I said that the article would cost no more to the consumer, that the profits of the middle man would be somewhat diminished, but the consumer would not suffer one iota. Let me remind the hon. gentleman of this fact, that the profits of the middle man on that article are from 60 to 120 per cent. But it is known that cottons, woollens and other goods are sold at close prices and the middle men cannot afford to cut upon their margin. The increase upon these goods must fall upon the consumer, and he must pay it. Another point with reference to the cigar manufacture, there is an Excise duty on cigars as well as an import duty. If the hon. Minister of Finance had placed his import duty on these cigars, and excluded them from the country, and had no Excise duty on them his revenue would have been diminished, and he would have had to tax the people upon some other article. But there being an Excise duty upon cigars he raised the Excise duty at the same time as Customs duty, and secured the same revenue that he had before. That is what I call an arrangement of the Tariff,

MR. PATERSON (Brant).

an adjustment of the Tariff, that is wise and politic. What he did in reference to that industry in giving it a fair and legitimate protection, under the operation of his Tariff, enabled him to secure a revenue to carry on this country, and so with other manufacturers. And bear in mind another fact, that in 1876 gold in New York was quoted at 113 $\frac{1}{2}$, and the protection of manufactures was very much reduced by the price of gold. But the hon. gentlemen have not been content to leave the protection of manufactures at from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 20 per cent., they have given some favored lines 25, 30, 35, 40 and even 50 per cent. of protection. There, Sir, is where my contention is with the hon. gentlemen opposite, that is my quarrel and the quarrel of the Reform party with them. The Reform party has never said that it objected to duties on manufactured goods in this country. We never gave effect to such a policy, and we do not now wish to give effect to any such policy; but we say this: that an industry if it cannot live on from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 20 per cent. protection, with its raw material free, is an industry that is not needed here. That we can afford to wait until it shall be found to be called into existence by that amount of protection. Let me call to the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, who talk as though we had no manufactories in this country prior to the advent of this glorious National Policy, how the manufactories of this country stood. Why, in 1871, when the last Census was taken, when we ascertained what the industries of this country amounted to, we had 140 different lines of manufacturing industries employing some 187,942 hands, and they produced \$221,617,778. Yet we hear these hon. gentlemen speak as though we had no manufacturing industries in this country before the National Policy was introduced. What was the condition of manufactures in 1876? Depressed, no doubt; they must have been depressed, when the whole country was so. We had a year in this country when we did not grow as much wheat as we wanted to feed our own people, and there must have been a depression felt by our manufacturers, by our artizans, and by every class in the community, as they may feel it again if Providence should withhold his blessings, and we should have an equally small crop in the future. But, Sir, in 1876 even, and from that down to 1878, the manufacturers of this country, as a class, were in as prosperous a condition as any class in the community—I believe more prosperous. And I defy the hon. gentleman opposite to show, from the Trade Returns, or statistics, or mercantile agencies, anything to the contrary. And what was the record of the hon. gentleman with reference to our manufacturing industries? In 1876, there was to be an exhibition, to be held at Philadelphia, of our manufactured goods, and the hon. gentleman from Lambton, who was then leader of the Government, came down to this House and asked for a grant of \$100,000, to enable the manufacturers and farmers of this country to make an exhibit at Philadelphia. He was supported in that application by members on this side of the House, and the money was granted. But what was the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite? Why, Sir, the right hon. leader of the Government rose in his place and opposed that grant; he spoke in disparaging terms of it, and sneered at the manufacturing industries of this country. He said the country was too young to make a creditable exhibit of her manufactures at the world's exhibition, and he considered the money thus granted would be entirely thrown away. But the hon. gentleman from Lambton carried his resolution, and this country made a most creditable exhibit at Philadelphia; the eyes of the world were directed to the manufactures displayed by this country there. In connection with that exhibition, and at a subsequent meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade, Mr. Thomas White, jun., asked permission to introduce a resolution respecting the

question brought before that meeting, by Dr. May, on the previous day :

"That this Board, recognizing the creditable display of Canadian manufactures and products, made at the recent Centennial Exhibition, at Philadelphia, is pleased to learn that the event of the distribution of awards to successful exhibitors, by His Excellency the Governor General, is to be marked by a public banquet; and that the President be requested to appoint two gentlemen each from Ontario and Quebec and one each from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, to act as members of the Central Banquet Committee."

That, Sir, is the testimony of Thomas White, the present hon. member for Cardwell, as expressed by a resolution moved in the Board of Trade, in 1876, with reference to our manufactures. Then, if there was a period of calm for some of the manufacturers of this country, in 1875 and 1876, in 1878 when these hon. gentlemen went to the polls, in 1879 when these hon. gentlemen were passing their National Policy, that period of calm was passing away, gold had become par in the United States, and there was greater enterprise and greater prosperity than there was at that time. Yet we have the testimony of Mr. Thomas White, with reference to the creditable display we made at the Centennial Exhibition. We have more than that, we have the foreign trade which sprang up, largely fostered and influenced by that display, the result of it standing in our Trade and Navigation Returns, a proof of the wisdom of the Mackenzie Administration in aiding those manufacturers to show what they could do in the markets of the world. Let me give you another idea of what was being done by the manufacturing institutions of this country in 1876, to show how far wrong the Minister of Finance was when he said that if two years longer had rolled round under the existing laws almost every manufacturing industry would be wiped out. I find, in the correspondence of the *Montreal Gazette* in 1876, an account of a visit to the manufacturers of the town of St. John's in the Province of Quebec. A correspondent writes as follows:—

"The town of St. John's (Quebec Province) so often spoken of by Montrealers during the summer months 'as a pretty little place but terribly dull,' remarks which the quiet appearance of the town several years ago gave little ground to doubt, has, during the past few years, made such rapid progress that only the first of the above clause applies."

After describing the city he adds :

"In every direction the stranger turns he is confronted with fresh evidences of improvement in the number of new dwellings, he sees nearly all of them occupied and some still in various stages of completion. When he hears of the great increase of population and in the value of real estate he is still further surprised and wonders what can have caused the change. He does not take long to discover the cause, for several tall chimneys that led from large buildings, erected within a very few years, belch forth a thick heavy smoke, that tells the tale without further remark, of the industrial work going on in the factories. The most important of these is the St. John's Stone China Ware Manufactory, erected some three years ago. A short sketch of what this factory was intended to do was published in our columns some years ago, and then the most encouraging prospects of success were held out to the newcomer among our manufacturing interests. The most complete realization of all that was then hoped has taken place, and it is with the greatest pleasure we find the St. John's Stone Chinaware Company's manufacturing in successful and complete operation. Quietly and without advertising, save the short sketch alluded to above, the company has progressed step by step, meeting one difficulty after another and successfully conquering all opposition until now, with a producing capacity, equal to forty-five or fifty packages weekly, it finds a ready market and good prices in all parts of the Dominion."

There, Sir, is the testimony with reference to the manufacturing institutions of St. John's in 1876. He goes on to speak of the boot and shoe manufacturing there and the woollen manufacturing.

Mr. GAULT. That company failed and shut up, and had to be reorganized after 1878—St. John's Stone and China Ware Company. It is now a completely new industry.

Mr. PATERSON. Is the hon. gentleman sure of it?

Mr. GAULT. I am quite certain.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, it is very strange then, and I think it will not do, or should not be recognized as a wise thing on the part of the hon. the Minister of Finance, to prop up and keep from falling an institution that finds a ready market and good prices in all parts of the Dominion. That is what the testimony was with reference to that. That information was furnished to this correspondent, it is to be supposed, by the managers of that work—a ready market and good prices in all parts of the Dominion, and yet he says they have failed. And this was done, mind you, in the year when gold was 13½ premium, yet the hon. gentleman tells us they failed. So the Prince Edward Island Bank failed the other day. Is that the National Policy? Had that anything to do with it? There was a large sugar refinery failed in Halifax, was that due to the National Policy? There was a large sewing machine factory failed in Guelph, was that due to the National Policy? No; hon. gentlemen will tell us—the Finance Minister did tell us—that there was not proper management in the Halifax refinery and that therefore it failed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has not failed.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, suspended. I do not wish to injure any manufacturing industry, and I thank the Finance Minister for suggesting the better word. But the Finance Minister will agree with me that a large amount of capital has been lost in it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. So it has been said.

Mr. PATERSON. And I think the Finance Minister admitted in his speech that it was not as well managed as other concerns, and so it may have been true with regard to this chinaware factory. The same correspondent spoke about a glass factory that failed, and about another being started in its place, and perhaps that is the one to which the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Gault) alludes. But, at all events, here we have the testimony of a correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette*, on information furnished, I suppose, by the proprietor of the concern, for it could not well be obtained from anyone else, showing that they found a ready market and good prices in all parts of the Dominion. But we have testimony from other sources. Take my own town, to which the last speaker referred me. In Brantford we have a new cotton factory; but, outside of that, I do not remember any manufactory of any importance which has been brought into existence under the National Policy; and we had manufactories there years and years ago, before the National Policy was ever dreamed of; and these manufactories were doing business and prospering, and were in a better position under the Tariff of the Mackenzie Administration than they are under the National Policy at the present time. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen opposite represent the Mackenzie Tariff as a Tariff designed to destroy the manufacturing industries of the country, they are stating what is not borne out by the facts; they are making mis-statements which they ought to know are mis-statements from their own personal knowledge of flourishing manufacturing institutions before 1879. I stand here and attack their Tariff and denounce their Tariff and fight against them and their Tariff, because, while it has given exceptional advantages to a certain few industries, it has in addition to injuring other industries, actually placed some manufacturers in a worse position than they were before. I can prove it. It is susceptible of proof—that is, if the Minister of Railways will be accepted as proof. I can prove it, if the statements of the Finance Minister will be accepted as proof in this matter. In 1875, I remember that the Minister of Railways denounced the Mackenzie Administration because he said that the 2½ per cent. additional protection which they gave the manufacturers had been wiped out by taking the raw material out of the free list

and taxing it. What did the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite do? Why, Sir, it took the raw material of a large proportion of the manufacturers of this country out of the free list and imposed duties upon it, and by the imposition of these duties reduced the advantage that the manufacturers had in this market as well as in the foreign market; and the very fact, Sir, that the Minister of Finance said, with reference to the foreign trade, that a drawback would be given equal to the amount of duty paid by the manufacturers on the raw material entering into the manufacture of goods, shows that he knows that the imposition of duties on the raw material wipes out the protection that is enjoyed by the manufacturers to that extent. Take the manufacturing institutions in my own city, as well as in other cities in the Dominion, and their coal is taxed that used to be free, their iron is taxed that used to be free, their bar iron is taxed at a greatly increased rate, boiler tubes have increased to 25 per cent., their boiler plate has been taxed, and every department of brass goods—to them the raw material—has been taxed, so that they are actually to-day in a worse position than they were before. What is true with regard to them is true with reference to the manufacturers of agricultural implements and many others of this country, and with the exception of a few industries to which the Government have given special favors the manufacturers of this country would be in a better position, I believe, under a 17½ per cent. Tariff with their raw material free, than they are at the present time. Let us look, for instance, to this same question of crockery. In 1876, under a 17½ per cent. Tariff, with gold at 113½ in the United States, the manufacturers of these goods could find a ready sale and good prices for all they could make. But let us see what the hon. gentlemen did with reference to crockery. In 1876 there was imported of crockery into this Dominion \$430,888 worth. In 1881 there was imported into this country \$139,029 worth, or \$9,000 worth more of crockery from foreign markets in 1881 than in 1876. Now, Sir, what are the facts? The hon. the Finance Minister has raised the Tariff on crockery to 30 per cent., and yet there have been imported \$400,000 of these goods. What is the result? The purchaser of crockery not only pays that 30 per cent. on the crockery imported from other countries—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Do you mean on all crockery?

Mr. PATERSON. No, on white ware. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that the Trade and Navigation Returns, not being exactly classified in each year, it is difficult to understand what they mean. I think, however, I said white crockery, and that I will have been found to have said it.

Mr. PLUMB. Say it slow, over again.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether it could be said slow enough to enter the cranium of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). I find iron, stoneware, &c.,—that is, cream color—classified in 1881, \$250,435, as being imported. Now, the serious fact with reference to that is that under the National Policy, that amount of crockery was imported on which we paid 30 per cent. more, and the people had to pay the manufacturers of crockery 30 per cent. on all the goods they turned out, or 30 per cent. more than if it had been on the free list. I am willing, and the Mackenzie Administration were willing to give, and did give, the manufacturers 17½ per cent. protection, and under that they prospered and improved for several years; and while we might help to give protection to that extent, I may say, that to go beyond that and impose higher duties is to make the people of this country pay a higher rate for protection than they should pay. I am one of those that believe in building

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

up the manufacturing industries of this country, and with a view of having that they must have some advantage, and that they cannot exist when they are young without such advantage. I have supported always and am now advocating such a view, and when the Reform party come back, effect will be given to that view. If a revenue could be raised on that, and if, at the same time, we could, by its operation, afford such protection to the manufacturers as they are fairly entitled to in the interests of the country, I should support them. But I say that when you give the manufacturing industries of this country a protection of 30 per cent., you are making the people pay more for that interest than it is worth. I am glad to see our sugar refineries opened. Our friends opposite speak as if it was a source of satisfaction to gentlemen on this side of the House to see our sugar refineries closed. Not so; it was no action of the Mackenzie Government that closed the sugar refineries. The Mackenzie Government did not open them, and the reason assigned by the Finance Minister of the Mackenzie Government for not doing so was that the manufacturers of sugar, the washers of sugar, or one at least—for that was about all there was—stated that it was necessary in order to bring that result about, that he should have an amount of protection that would bear unduly on the 4,000,000 of consumers; and the position the Finance Minister took, on looking at this question, was that he was bound, as the man entrusted with the financial interests of the people of this country, to consider the interests of the 4,000,000 consumers as equal to the wishes of one sugar refiner, and he said he could not see his way to do what that sugar refiner wanted and at the same time do justice to this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite did it, however; and what does the country pay for it? Last year the hon. Finance Minister said they paid 25 cents a hundred; but this year he says the country has paid nothing for the benefit. Let us see how that sugar calculation bears out, and the people of this country will be able to form some idea of what they are paying for opening the sugar refineries. In 1878, we imported 105,240,173 lbs. of sugar, on which there was paid into the Treasury \$2,515,823, a duty equal to \$2.39 per hundred; in 1881, we imported 135,126,176 lbs. of sugar, on which a duty was paid of \$2,438,857. Now, Sir, if the same average duty that was levied under the Mackenzie Administration had been levied on that 135,126,176 lbs. imported in 1881, there would have been paid into the Treasury \$3,229,515, instead of \$2,438,857, or \$790,658 more than was paid under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I am willing to admit that that figure is subject to a slight decrease, because many of the sugars brought in, in 1881, were for refining purposes, &c.—it might be alleged, did not possess the full weight of sugar; but the loss would be very slight, and there stands the fact of the loss of revenue. If the people got their sugar cheaper, it might be made up to them; but, calculations made in this House show that, while you lose that amount of revenue, the people are paying more for the sugar they consume. Now, let us see the effect of this? The people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of Ontario pay between them, on the articles of breadstuffs and coal, prime necessaries of life, about \$800,000 per annum; under the arrangement of the sugar duties by the Mackenzie Government, we should have received from the 135,000,000 lbs of sugar imported, as much revenue as we have at the present time in the public coffers, and the people of this country would have free coal and free breadstuffs of all kinds. That shows what the country is paying for these sugar refineries. Then, Sir, with reference to the article of wood-screws, there was a duty of 17½ per cent. on them under the late Administration and a factory was in existence. Hon. gentlemen opposite raised that protection to 35 per cent., and yet there are more screws coming in now than there were

then, which proves that the people of this country are paying not only the enhanced price on what is imported, but also on what is produced in the country. So with reference to woollens and cottons—there are excessive duties placed on them, there are more cottons and woollens being imported, and the inevitable result is that the people are paying more for their cotton and woollen goods—not only for what are imported, but for what are made in the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to deny this; but if a little common sense is brought to bear on this matter, it ought to make it patent to every business man in this House that where you do not produce as much goods as the country wants, you not only increase the price of the goods coming into the country, but enhance the price of those made in the country. To argue differently is to say that human nature does not avail itself of any advantages within its reach. The manufacturers of any class of goods will, as an effect of their human nature, take the advantage that the Tariff gives them, and if it enables them to demand 10 or 15 per cent. more for their goods than they could get without that Tariff, they will take that advantage and use it. When manufactures increase in the country, and when in any line of manufactured goods you produce more in the country than the country requires, then the imposition of the duties on foreign goods of a like nature does not necessarily raise the price of the goods made at home; because you have a home competition, and the home competition will bear down the price, and then you have reached the second stage of protection when you get cheaper goods—this fact being always borne in mind, that that is the result unless these manufacturers combine to restrict production and force up prices, which they can do under a high Tariff, and there a high Tariff is dangerous; or this other fact, that the raw material these manufacturers use being taxed, they must of necessity ask more for their manufactured products, or be content with a less margin; or the other result, which sometimes follows over-protection, and will not wholly be remedied by home competition, that the manufacturer does not keep up to the mark by sharp, keen competition from without as well as from within, is contented to work along with his old-fashioned machinery in his old-fashioned way, and does not bend his energies to forward his enterprises as best he might. With these exceptions, I admit that the proposition is correct; that when we produce more manufactured goods in the country than the country wants, the imposition of the duty does not necessarily enhance the price.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The Finance Minister agrees with me and every business man in this House will agree with me. If a little common sense is brought to bear on the discussion of these matters, we will all know that such results must follow, but it is certain that there are not enough goods produced to supply the public wants; then the imposition of duties not only increases the price of the foreign goods imported, but it enhances the price of similar articles made in the country. I have endeavored to show that under the Mackenzie Administration, and their Tariff, the manufacturers were in existence in this country, that they were doing as well as many of them are doing now in comparison with how all other classes were doing; they had come into existence, and prospered equally in years gone by, as they have since the introduction of the National Policy. I come now to speak with respect to the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite, to another class, and another great industry, the agricultural industry. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Rykert), did me the honor to quote from another of my speeches in regard to agricultural protection, and in that matter he, as he has done

in other matters, misquoted, took out of their connection my words, so as to present them in a different manner from what my sentiments and expressions really were. In 1876 the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) moved for a Committee to enquire into our agricultural interests; there had been previously a Committee moved for and granted to enquire into our commercial and manufacturing interests. The hon. member for Centre Wellington had made that motion the previous year, I think, if not during the two previous years. He had previously obtained a Committee, but it failed to make a report. When he moved his motion in 1876, the hon. member for Lambton, then leading the Government, rose and objected to it on the ground that the hon. member had previously had a Committee granted, but nothing resulted from it, and he objected to granting the Committee, as he viewed the motion as a buncombe one. It was on that occasion I spoke, and advocated the appointment of that Committee. I said there might possibly be two sides to that question of agricultural protection. I said that my own opinion was, that a duty on wheat would not raise the price of wheat, because we grow a surplus and export it; but, nevertheless, there might be two sides to it. I thought it was desirable, when a Committee was asked for, to ascertain whether that was the case or not that a Committee should be granted. Mark what the hon. gentleman opposite said. The hon. gentleman, in quoting me, stated that I rose and said my party will make a mistake if they refuse to grant this concession, leaving the House to understand that I advocated duties on breadstuffs, and that I said my party would make a mistake if they did not grant that concession. That is the word you used, is it not?

Mr. RYKERT. Probably you heard what I said.

Mr. PATERSON. You do not deny it. I say it was with deliberate intent to misconstrue my language and deceive this House.

Mr. RYKERT. Will the hon. gentleman say I did not read his exact words?

Mr. PATERSON. I have asked you whether you used that word or not. I gave the opportunity of saying whether the word you used was concession.

Mr. RYKERT. I read your words exactly as they were.

Mr. PATERSON. Did you read from *Hansard*?

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not find fault when I ask the hon. gentleman what word he used. I understood him to use the word concession.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I called the hon. gentleman to order because he was addressing himself directly to my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman must address the Chair, and speak in the third person.

Mr. PATERSON. I quite understand, and will accept that hint from the leader of the Government. His is an example we sometimes find it difficult to follow, and if I have been a little unparliamentary, I know you, Mr. Speaker, will pardon me because the leader of the Government sometimes sets me that example. As I understood the hon. member for Lincoln, he read that I stated my party would make a mistake if it refused to grant concessions, while the word I used was Committee. The impression left is different in that case. I was advocating the appointment of a Committee to ascertain whether the duty on breadstuffs would benefit agriculturists. I said it would be a mistake if my party refused to grant the Committee, and, without egotism, I may say that at my request the leader of the Government withdrew his request and a Committee was appointed. I went on in that speech to say that possi-

bly the Committee might find in their report that the imposition of duties on articles that the farmer produced would be an injury to him instead of a benefit, in which case no person would advocate the imposition of those duties or the carrying of them into effect. It was my wish, however, to ascertain what influence the imposition of such duties would have on the farmers; it was not an argument, as the hon. member for Lincoln tried to make out, for placing duties upon breadstuffs, but it was the expression of a desire to ascertain what effect such duties would have.

Mr. RYKERT. I read your exact words.

Mr. PATERSON. No; my exact words were, Committee, not concession. Do you say that that is not correct?

Mr. RYKERT. I do not.

Mr. PATERSON. Then I accept the statement. The hon. gentleman will also admit that he did not read what I subsequently said, which explains the whole matter, and that I wish the appointment of the Committee in order to ascertain the effect of the imposition of duties. A Committee was granted. Did the Committee ever report in favor of the imposition of the duties on grain? The Committee never so reported, but it submitted the evidence to the House, and left every man at liberty to determine the question for himself. To-day it is a problematical question whether the imposition of those duties has been productive of good. A Committee was appointed the other day on the subject, showing that there is a dim suspicion that those duties, after all, have failed in doing what they were expected to do in benefitting the agriculturists of this country. If there might be anything said in favor of the imposition of those duties, it is what I said in that same speech, that with the imposition of those duties, we might be able to say, in the event of the Americans desiring a renewal of reciprocity, that we have duties on grain. I say now, that if there is any value in having those duties, that is the value; but it will be a very little value, because the Americans would say it would be no advantage to them to get this market for their grain. If there was any argument in it, it was that; but what did hon. gentlemen opposite tell the farmers? They told them they would get better prices as the result of the imposition of this duty on grain, and whether designedly or not, in that, the Government of this country have deceived the farmers and they are attempting to deceive them to-day. But farmers have been undeceived with reference to it, and many of them who cast their votes in favor of hon. gentlemen opposite, under the delusive promises broken by them since they have been in power, will withhold their votes from them at the next election. Let us bring a little common sense to bear upon this question. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to follow me for a few moments. He admitted my proposition, made a little while ago, with reference to manufactured goods, viz.: that when you produce more manufactured goods in a country than it wants, that then the imposition of a duty could not benefit the manufacturers, except they wanted to enter into a combination.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say anything of the kind. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to put a construction upon a remark I made across the House, that it did not bear. The hon. gentleman said that when in a community, or any section of a country, the people produced more than the country required, and they had to seek a market abroad, then it was not necessarily the consequence that it should increase the price to the consumer, and, under those circumstances, I said hear, hear, to it.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps in words a little more plain, my hon. friend that sits beside me says that he used

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

the same words that I did, and now the Minister of Finance has endorsed that hon. gentleman's position. I knew he would, because it is common sense, and the view which a business man would take of a business question. But, Sir, the farmer had reached the second stage of protection before the National Policy was put in force at all, and therefore the imposition of duties on grain is a force, a delusion and a snare, and they know it. If they do not they show no more intelligence on this question than the gentleman who addressed us this afternoon. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that when you have a surplus of any article in this country, and are obliged to send to foreign markets to find their prices, the imposition of duties upon that article is harmless to increase its price. Now, as admitted by the Minister of Finance, you cannot protect the agricultural products of this country except in the one article of Indian corn. I say here, as I have said on every platform, on this article you can enhance the price. And why? Because we do not grow as much of it as the country wants, and therefore the imposition of a duty on corn raises its price to the Canadian farmer some 7½ cents per bushel. The Minister of Finance agrees with that in his speech, but the hon. the Minister of Railways said that the imposition of 50 cents a ton on coal did not raise the price of that article, because Yankee coal came into the country and met coal produced here, and consequently the Yankee paid the duty. Corn comes into the country and meets corn grown here; how is it that the Yankee does not pay the duty? The hon. the Minister of Finance says that the duties on corn did not raise the price to our farmer, and I say so too. He is logical and I am with him, but as a consequence the hon. the Minister of Railways is illogical and inconsequential with reference to his coal duties. With reference to duties on corn the farmer has had his prices enhanced, and that cannot be prevented; but is that in the interest of the farmer? It is in the interest of the farmer who has corn to sell, but while one farmer has one hundred have not. An hon. gentleman says that it gives the farmer a better price for his oats. It is a very strange thing, if that be the case, that oats should be higher in the Chicago market than they are in Toronto, as I think the hon. member for North Norfolk pointed out the other day. If the farmers are content with it I have no reason to complain of the duty, but I argue simply on business principles, and the hon. gentlemen know for a fact that the farmers, having reached the second stage of protection, before the new policy was introduced, it is impossible to protect them; that being the case a Tariff that makes them pay enhanced prices for what they have to buy is an imposition upon them, and they have a right to resent it. Trace the hon. gentlemen opposite in their action in this matter; they put a duty of 15 cents per bushel on wheat and 50 cents per barrel on flour. The duty on wheat is greater in proportion than the duty on flour, and that shows that the hon. gentlemen knew that the impost of a duty on wheat would not raise its price at all. What did they do further? They went through the farce of putting a duty on wheat, and then they passed an Order in Council permitting the millers of this country to go to the United States, where they could buy 2,000 to 10,000,000 bushels of American wheat, and bring it into Canada, and not pay one cent of duty on it, but simply give their bond, grind that wheat into flour, sell that flour in Canadian markets, within a period specified, and if the millers had sold and realized their prices within one year after, they could export a like quantity of flour and wheat, and the exportation cancelled the bond they gave for the duty, and thus they never had paid one cent of duty upon it. That was the treatment the hon. gentlemen opposite gave the farmers, and that would have been the fact still, if the attention of the country had not been called

to it by a gentleman on the Opposition side of the House, denied, at that time, by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, who subsequently had to admit it, however.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he changed.

Mr. BOWELL. I never made any denial. I said, when the Tariff was first under discussion, that the principle of allowing an equivalent to be used instead of the actual product was not only discussed, but was affirmed in that debate, and the hon. gentleman knows that.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman said that I had not interpreted it right. I say, I proved I was right on that occasion, and that the hon. the Minister of Customs, though thinking I was not right at that time, very soon found out that I must have been right, judging from the fact that he passed another Order in Council in which the phraseology was changed, requiring them to export the product of the same wheat that was imported.

Mr. BOWELL. That is quite true, but I did not make any such denial as you attribute to me.

Mr. PATERSON. I accept what the hon. gentleman says. But I think the hon. gentleman said I did not give a proper interpretation; I accept his statement. Now, let me call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to the agricultural protection, and to his reasoning in reference to it. There is something very strange, when he touches upon this agricultural protection. I find that he says in his speech, made this year, that through the imposition of this 15 cents a bushel on wheat the Canada farmer gets 3 cents a bushel more than otherwise practicable; that at a certain season of the year when the farmers are sold short it would be possible to get a higher price by a duty on wheat, and he goes on to say that the cost of the transmission of that particular kind of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool was precisely the cost from Toronto to Liverpool by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Allan line of steamers. Therefore, if the price depended on the English market, that wheat would have had to go down 3 cents more; because as we know, after a large portion has been shipped to England, the quantity of Canadian grain in the country being diminished, the Canadian millers have to pay an increased price for their wheat, which goes into the pockets of our farmers, who reap the benefit, and, therefore, the millers have either to go to the United States market and pay the duty, or pay the price demanded by the Canadian farmers. Consequently, ten days ago they received 3 cents a bushel more for their wheat than had our markets been open to the Americans, and exposed to the danger of being broken down by the shipments from the other side. What does the hon. the Finance Minister mean by this? Why does the Canadian farmer, by this duty of 15 cents on wheat, get 3 cents a bushel more? Because he says he would not sell his wheat unless the Canadian miller gave him his price, and, if the miller went to the United States, he would have to pay 15 cents more. If that be so, why, I ask the hon. the Finance Minister, does he not ask more than 3 cents a bushel extra? Why, if the miller must pay what the farmer asks, does he stop at 3 cents—why not ask 10 cents or 12 cents? The matter must be explained on some other ground than the 15 cent duty. Take the article of wool, and see how the farmer was treated by the Government. They told him they would put a duty on wool that would enhance its price. What are the facts? The first year they imposed no duty on wool. The next year the farce is gone through of imposing a duty on sorts we were not importing. The Trade and Navigation Returns for 1880 showed that some 6,000,000 lbs. of wool were imported without paying duty; in 1881, 8,000,000

lbs. entered without paying one cent of duty. The farce was again gone through of placing duty on other things, which hon. gentlemen opposite knew would not have the slightest effect in enhancing their price. Now, with reference to another class in the community, the mechanics and artizans, I take this ground—and I have thought a good deal upon this subject—that it is the bounden duty of the men entrusted with the affairs of this great country to recognize the fact that there are other men besides the manufacturers whose interests ought to be conserved at their hands. While I am willing and anxious, and while the Government I supported and the party I am connected with were and are willing to arrange the Tariff as to give fair protection to manufacturers, they felt and feel bound, at the same time, to do fairly with them; to not place these men in a position to extort heavy prices from the consuming classes. When you remember that the National Policy does this, that while it gives to certain manufacturers 35, 40, and 50 per cent. protection, it leaves the mechanics and artizans who work in those factories without it—while we, the manufacturers, are protected against the competition of foreign countries, the men by whose energies we are enriched are not protected in the slightest degree, our labor market being open to the whole world, foreign artizans may come in, under-bid them, and take away their living. I do not intend, of course, to put a duty on labor; but I say this, while the labor is left untaxed, the articles purchased by the laborer should not be heavily burdened. That is the principle we war against, and not against the manufacturers, but against a Tariff that would give them an illegitimate amount of protection. We are told that hon. Ministers have made the times better. All the credit for the prosperity of the country is arrogated by them, by virtue of their legislature. It was pointed out by the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate, and by myself in a few remarks I offered on a motion made the other day, and for the making of which I was found fault with by the hon. the Finance Minister, who said I desired to anticipate him—it was stated also by the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon, that I wished to anticipate that hon. gentleman by requiring a reply to my motion, although my remarks had an entirely different object, being intended to elicit information that would enable us to determine on the question in which some of my constituents were interested—I say that on that occasion I pointed out that the prosperity of the country had been brought about by the fact that within the last two years there had been \$30,000,000 extra gold brought into the country, as a result of extra sales of lumber, animals and other agricultural products. I also stated that unless the hon. gentlemen opposite could claim the power of raising the price of lumber in the United States market, compelling Heaven's rain to fall on our fields, and of raising the price of grain in the British market, that those \$30,000,000 could not be credited to them, and I argue that through the operation of this \$30,000,000, circulated through this country, manufacturers have experienced an impetus that would bring about the result we have witnessed—peace, plenty and prosperity in our country. But the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Finance Minister, said: we will show the hon. gentlemen in Opposition, that our prosperity could not have come from the large increase of exports. A more rash statement was never uttered. That \$30,000,000 should be brought in and not produce an effect in the shape of greater prosperity is a statement so rash that the Finance Minister should not have ventured upon it. Why, any one can understand what the effect of such a benefit would be in this country. He claims that the whole prosperity the country is enjoying, is due to the beneficial effects of his National Policy; but as a proof he furnishes us with a list of industries that it has brought into

existence. Let us look at them and examine this statement, with a view of ascertaining the course of the greater prosperity and wealth of our country. I find in the list of manufactures that he has given us as having been established in this country, that that statement leads us to certain results. He tells us that there has been some manufactories started in Hamilton in which 255 extra hands have been employed. By the Census of 1871, there were 4,456 hands employed in that city, and in the three years the National Policy has been in force he tells us it has put 255 extra hands there. In the city of Kingston, in 1871, there were 1,298 hands employed in the manufacturing institutions, and he says the National Policy has given us 40 more hands during the last three years. In London, 2,261 hands were employed in 1871, and he claims that 130 extra hands have been put there as the result of the National Policy during the last three years, but a newspaper in that city says that he cannot find even that manufactory. In Quebec, there were 7,250 hands employed in 1871, and the National Policy is credited in three years with having put 300 more hands in that city. In St. John, N.B., there was employed in 1871, 4,103 hands; the National Policy is credited in the return furnished by the Minister himself with having given an addition of 25 hands to that city. No wonder there is a boom in St. John. Any one can readily understand why there should be an immense boom there as the effect of the National Policy, if 25 additional hands, according to the showing of the Minister of Finance, have been placed in that city. Eight extra people a year to consume the products of the country surrounding that city.

Mr. HESSON. Is the hon. gentleman comparing his statements with 1878?

Mr. PATERSON. 1871, seven years before that; in 1878 the population would be much larger than in 1871, and therefore the comparison is altogether in the hon. gentleman's favor. The hon. gentleman knows very well that until we get our Census returns we are not in a position to tell what the manufacturing industries were in 1878. The hon. gentleman opposite knows, or he ought to know, that it is only when the Census returns are completed and tabulated, that we are able to ascertain the aggregate of the industries of this country, therefore the hon. gentleman knows I am quoting from the only figures it is possible for me to quote from. But I fancy this statement of the hands that were employed in this country, in 1871, was vastly increased in the seven years that intervened before 1878. That I can tell from my own personal observation, as can every other hon. gentleman. In the city of Halifax, 1871, there were 2,167 hands employed, and the National Policy is credited with putting 183 more there, 60 hands a year in that city—all idle now, I am told. In Montreal, there were 21,187 hands, in 1871. The National Policy is credited with adding 1,924, including Redpath. In Toronto, in 1871, 9,400 were employed, and Toronto is credited with 1,638 more. In Paris—I could only get the returns from the cities; in the towns we could not get them in the Census separately; but I take the town of Paris, and I find there has been five extra hands set to work, as the result of the National Policy—that is hardly two hands extra per year in the town of Paris. Every merchant in Paris is doing a better business than he did; manufacturers are busier than ever before. The reason of it is plain. The hon. Minister of Finance has told us, it is because he set five extra hands at work, and they are consuming the goods of the country, that is the five extra hands, that, during the last three years that have been put in the town of Paris, have made the farmers of North Brant rich. In Woodstock it has given them twenty-one hands, seven hands a year. The county of Oxford is prosperous, the towns of Oxford are going on, and that is only one town in Oxford, and the whole county of

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Oxford with 50,000 inhabitants, has an increase through the operation of the National Policy of 21 hands. Yet all the towns in that thriving county are busy and flourishing, the farmers are prosperous and doing well, better off than ever before. Why? the hon. Minister of Finance has given us the secret—the home market that was produced by these twenty-one hands in the town of Woodstock; and any man must be blind that cannot see it. Then we go into St. Catharines. We heard something about St. Catharines. The hon. gentleman opposite has told us a great deal about St. Catharines. We find the hon. Minister of Finance only claims to have put ten extra hands in St. Catharines as the result of the National Policy during the last three years—three hands and one-third per annum in the city of St. Catharines.

Mr. RYKERT. How many additional men did I claim?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman claims so much that we cannot accept his claims. Will the hon. gentleman not take the official document that has been submitted to us by the hon. Minister of Finance, as having weight and authority? I find that comparing the list of the Minister of Finance, St. Johns, Quebec, that thriving town whose chimneys were belching forth their smoke in 1876, has gained thirty-eight hands. Why? There were hundreds during the Mackenzie Administration. That one stoneware factory, erected during the Mackenzie Administration, employed 120 hands; the hon. gentleman's National Policy has added thirty-eight more. The town of Sherbrooke, 48 extra hands added, 16 per annum according to the statement furnished by the Finance Minister; the town of Cobourg, 32 hands extra; Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 25 extra hands; and I call the attention of my hon. friends from that Island, one of whom a year or two ago, in this House rose and demanded that a sum of money should be given to that Island for improvements because the National Policy had not benefitted them, and they demanded that they should have an extra sum given to her to be applied to some public works in order to compensate them. I tell my hon. friend that his difficulties, in that direction, from this time cease. The Island of Prince Edward has been benefitted by the introduction of the National Policy. The hon. the Minister of Finance has given us a statement in which it is conclusively proved that in Charlottetown twenty-five extra hands have been employed as a result of this policy during the last three years—eight hands per annum—eight extra consumers a year for Charlottetown. That is all I say the Minister of Finance claims having done for the capital of that island, and that is all that is given to the island anywhere. But there are unreasonable people there who, having had an extra market provided for them by eight hands per annum to consume their agricultural products, are not content with the effect of the benign National Policy. The list is valueless. Let me do the hon. Minister of Finance this justice, that he told us, when he submitted this list, it was only a partial one. I agree with him, it was only a partial list. That list does not represent and cannot represent the number of extra hands employed in this country at the present time. As a result of the National Policy, it exhibits more; but the hon. gentleman knows that while manufacturers are working and more hands are employed, they are employed not as the result of the National Policy, but as a result of an increased demand for all classes of goods which the people are enabled to buy by virtue of the \$30,000,000 of extra gold, wealth brought into this country from sources over which the Government have not the slightest control or the slightest power. The hon. gentleman opposite asked me how it was with reference to the branches in which I am engaged myself; he asked me to tell him, and said I would be afraid to say what the effect would be upon that industry. I am not afraid to tell the hon. gentleman opposite that the industry in which I am

engaged, so far as I am myself personally concerned—and I believe that is true with reference to several others in the same line—we had last year perhaps the most successful year we have had in our business career.

Mr. PLUMB. It all ends in smoke, though.

Mr. PATERSON. No, there is some taffy in it. The hon. gentleman would like to know, perhaps, what the reason of it was. I will tell him one of the great reasons why we are doing a better business. After the introduction of the National Policy by my hon. friends opposite many of the largest manufacturing concerns in that line failed, closed up, the machinery was torn out, the hands were discharged and had to find their way to the United States, and the places have not been reopened. That took place subsequent to the introduction of the National Policy. My good friend who sits in front of me knows one of the large establishments. The hon. member for London (Mr. Carling) knows another of the largest establishments, and the hon. member for Lincoln knows another. Every one of them were in the position I pointed out after the introduction of the National Policy, and some of them months after it came in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under that protective policy given by the late Government, with 10 cents more added?

Mr. PATERSON. No. Under the protective policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. That is one of the industries the hon. gentleman did not protect additionally.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We gave 10 per cent. to it over and above that splendid Tariff you are boasting of.

Mr. PATERSON. Ten per cent., and the hon. gentleman will understand when I tell him, that he did not give any more protection for the same reason, the hon. Minister of Railways said the ex-Minister of Finance added his 2½ per cent. protection by taxing raw material.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON. He doubled raw material in these lines.

Mr. PLUMB. What was it?

Mr. PATERSON. He raised it on lard from one to two cents per pound.

Mr. PLUMB. Oh, lard!

Mr. PATERSON. When I tell the hon. gentleman this, he laughs; he does not seem to understand; but the hon. Finance Minister will understand that some of those institutions use tons of lard every week; and when they raised the duty on that one cent a pound they took away a large share of this extra 10 per cent. protection.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is 10 cents a pound, and if you put a pound of lard in, you only pay one cent on that as increased duty.

Mr. PATERSON. Increased duty on what?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. On cigars. I was aware they put glucose in them, but I did not know that they put lard.

Mr. PATERSON. I think when the hon. Finance Minister was in Brantford, he did me the honor to visit my establishment, and I showed him my bakery where biscuits are made.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I had forgotten. The other branch of his business is so frequently mentioned here that I had it in mind.

Mr. PATERSON. I know very well, of course, that the hon. Finance Minister cannot be expected to remember all the details of the many establishments he visits, but I may tell him that the cigar branch of my manufactory is but a small one, and that my principal industry is confectionery and biscuits, to the latter of which I referred

when I spoke of lard. The duty on confectionery was raised to one cent per pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, but the duty on the raw materials, such as sugar and lard was such as to largely reduce the benefits on the product. The same is true of the duty on agricultural implements and the bulk of the other manufactures of this country. The result of the increased employment of men by the men remaining in this business at the present time is largely explained by the fact, that under his policy many of the large institutions of this kind of manufacture, the machinery was torn out. Fewer men were employed in manufacturing the same line of goods, the demand became enhanced because of the good times, and the men in those trades are doing better than before. Now, I think I have made that sufficiently plain to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PLUMB. That is a "candied" statement.

Mr. HESSON. Would a little more duty have saved those industries which the hon. gentleman says were crushed out?

Mr. PATERSON. No, certainly not.

Mr. HESSON. Then what is the hon. gentleman complaining of?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not complaining. I am supremely happy. I am merely stating that I am willing and anxious to give the Finance Minister all the credit that I can, but so far as that trade is concerned, any step he took was more to their injury than their benefit. The hon. Finance Minister knows, though the hon. member for North Perth does not, that, so far as that article is concerned, it had arrived at the second stage of protection before his policy came in; that we could produce more goods than the country required; that we have an excess of competition, so that the weaker went to the wall, the result being that fewer remained in the business, so that the imposition of the duty neither caused these men to go down nor prevented them from going down. So with regard to the great bulk of the manufacturers of this country. I shall give the House a few figures to show conclusively that the prosperity we are now enjoying is not attributable to the National Policy at all. On the 17th of September, 1878, the Government of the hon. member for Lambton was defeated. Hon. gentlemen opposite came in power, and I propose to give a list showing the comparative prices of bank stocks and various articles of merchandize on the 12th of September, 1878, and the 11th of September, 1879.

Mr. PLUMB. Why do you not take 1880?

Mr. PATERSON. I take a date immediately before the downfall of the Mackenzie Administration and another date a year after that under the new Tariff, which I think is a fair comparison.

Mr. PLUMB. No.

Mr. PATERSON. Why?

Mr. PLUMB. You know as well as I do.

Mr. PATERSON. If the National Policy was the cause of the rise in the value of bank stocks and of various products, then I think it is fair to take September 11th, 1879, one year after the Mackenzie Administration had fallen, and after the National Policy was fairly established.

Mr. PLUMB. Why?

Mr. PATERSON. You claim that the enhanced value of bank stocks and agricultural products was due to the National Policy. The Prime Minister even said before the Government came in power, that a change would be produced before the policy came into operation, but I do not hold the Government to that statement; but after the National Policy was put in operation then we might rightly look for its effects and expect them. The prices of bank

and other stocks in September, 1878, and in September, 1879, were as follows:

	Sept. 12, 1878.	Sept. 11, 1879.
Commerce Bank.....	113½	112½
Federal Bank.....	104½	98
Hamilton Bank.....	99	97½
Imperial Bank.....	103	95
Montreal Bank.....	170½	130
Dominion Bank.....	117	110½
Toronto Bank.....	138	111
Merchants Bank.....	95
Canada Permanent Loan.....	181	172
Canadian Government Debentures, 6 per cent. sterling.....	101½	100
Dominion 6 per cent Stock.....	101½	100
County Debentures.....	102	101½

There was a fall in all these stocks, although one year had elapsed after the Mackenzie Administration had left office, and hon. gentlemen opposite had taken their places and months after the National Policy had been put into vogue. If it was the producing cause of the prosperity we enjoy, why do we find such a decline in these stocks, and no enhancement in the price of other articles? Because it was a year of depression and there was a fall in our exports of that year.

Mr. BOWELL. I will send the hon. gentleman the price list of this year if he likes.

Mr. PATERSON. The following show the extent to which prices of farm produce fell from September, 1878, to September, 1879:

	12th Sept., 1878.	11th Sept., 1879.
Fall Wheat, No. 1.....	\$1 06 to \$1 77	\$1 02 to \$1 04
do No. 2.....	1 02 to 1 03	0 99 to 1 02
Spring Wheat, No. 1.....	1 02 to 0 00	0 98 to 1 00
do No. 2.....	0 97 to 0 98	0 96 to 0 97
Oats.....	0 28 to 0 30	0 31 to 0 32
Barley, No. 1.....	1 00 to 1 05	0 60 to 0 00
do No. 2.....	0 83 to 0 85	0 50 to 0 00
do No. 3.....	0 70 to 0 75	0 40 to 0 00
Pease.....	0 68 to 0 70	0 63 to 0 65
Butter, choice.....	0 09 to 0 12½	0 10 to 0 12
Cheese.....	0 08½ to 0 09½	0 05 to 0 07½
Dried apples.....	0 06 to 0 07	0 04½ to 0 05
Mess pork.....	13 00 to 14 00	12 50 to 13 25
Hams.....	0 12½ to 0 13	0 11 to 0 12½
Lard.....	0 08½ to 0 10	0 08 to 0 09½
Eggs.....	0 09 to 0 10	0 09 to 0 10
Hops.....	0 05 to 0 09	0 05 to 0 07
Wool, fleece.....	0 23 to 0 24	0 20 to 0 00

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone through a list of bank stocks and of produce; I have shown hon. gentlemen that in all these items of produce that the farmer had to sell, there was a fall in prices months after the National Policy was the law of the land from what they were during the last days of the previous Administration; and these figures point out this significant fact, that prices were lower because the depression had not passed away in the markets of the world, and that when good times came and we had the produce of the field, farm and forest to export, bringing wealth into this country and increasing the purchasing power of the people, prices advanced until to-day we are in the enjoyment of the blessings we have, and which hon. gentlemen opposite verily seek to claim as the effect of the Tariff they have introduced. Now, Sir, I have not indulged in personalities, and do not intend to indulge in personalities; I have not read up other men's records; I have not attempted to point out inconsistencies in other men. I might, indeed, point out that there has been a remarkable change of opinion in sentiment and action on the part of many hon. gentlemen opposite, which is perfectly within their right, and I do not think it is a part of my duty to take up the time of the House regarding the opinions of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I might point to the President of the Council. I might read extracts from his speeches in which he admitted himself to be, what I never admitted myself to be, as out-and-out

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

free-trader. I might read extracts from speeches of other hon. gentlemen much more able on trade questions than the hon. gentleman who addressed the House this afternoon and quoted extracts so largely. I might quote extracts from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken, if not in this House, in other places where this subject has been as intelligently discussed, who took precisely the line I now take and have always taken; I could do that, but I think it is not necessary I should do so. That hon. gentleman (the President of the Council) could give reasons why he supported a Tariff at a higher point than he was willing at a former period to support; no doubt he could give good reasons, and I will not take up the time of the House to point out changes of sentiment and action on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. It must be borne in mind that if I were to do so there is scarcely an hon. gentleman opposite whose votes could not be pointed to as having voted down a protective policy; but I do not desire to do that, it is not necessary. A question may be debated on its merits, and in that way some good may be obtained and we may ascertain what views hon. gentlemen on both sides hold in regard to it. We have been charged with a want of patriotism because we do not submit to the National Policy in quietness and peace. Hon. gentlemen opposite often make the charge. I do not, however, think that charge is fairly to be levied against us. I do not think it exhibits want of patriotism on the part of a man to object to excessive and undue taxation being levied upon him. Let me call the attention of the House to an article I found in the organ of the Government in this city, yesterday, an article that afforded me some little amusement, an article that places the party to which I belong in the light in which hon. gentlemen opposite are continually endeavoring to place us as being the enemy of manufacturing industries. What did I find? I found there an article reciting that the Princess of Wales and a great many of the first ladies in England attended one of the late drawing-rooms of Her Majesty dressed in silks and satins made in England, and the reason why these ladies appeared in this wise was because the English silk and satin industries were in a depressed condition, owing to French silks and satins having taken possession of the market. The ladies seeing that such was the effect determined that they would support English manufacturers, they adopted the plan of wearing English silks and appeared in them at Her Majesty's drawing-room. And we are told that those ladies, if they had been here, would have been ridiculed by the Reform party, for its policy was to crush out manufacturers. But it would not be so. The most ardent free-trader on this side, and the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) will go as far in that direction as any man, never objected to anyone wearing Canadian-made goods, but simply to a law that compels him to do so or pay 30 per cent. by way of fine into the Treasury. If hon. gentlemen opposite are the patriots they claim to be, I will give them clearly a solution of the whole troubles in regard to the National Policy. We are told that we are a remnant of the people of the country, and that the overwhelming mass are in their favor. Let them carry their principles into effect and let them see to it that they obtain nothing for the household or for their personal wear, except such as is produced in Canada; then will they benefit and foster our manufacturing industries. Is that the position hon. gentlemen opposite take? Look at the Finance Minister; my eyes may deceive me, and I am not a good judge of dry goods, but if I see correctly the hon. gentleman's portly form is enclosed in a coat made from cloth bought from the hated foreigner. The hon. Finance Minister knows that there is cloth made in this country which is good, substantial and sound. The hon. gentleman knows that this industry, or he tells us that he knows this industry was in a depressed condition. Would it not be more patriotic to follow the example of the Eng-

lish ladies and, instead of using imported goods, wear a coat made of good Canadian material. His waistcoat I believe is formed out of the same material. I cannot say, at this distance, what kind of goods it is with which his limbs are enshrouded, but I am very much inclined to believe that they are not Canadian tweed; and when the hon. gentleman attacked the Liberal party for its want of patriotism, he did so in pants made of foreign cloth. If not, let him speak.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not ask my tailors.

Mr. PATERSON. There sits the hon. Finance Minister, who denounces us for want of patriotism because we object to undue taxation on Irish linen instead of Canadian cotton. He might reply that cotton is hardly a proper article of which to make a shirt for a Finance Minister of Canada. I agree with him that linen, perhaps, looks better; but for the patriot he is, and for the men who denounce us for want of patriotism, he should come forward and be prepared to wear good Canadian cotton. What is true of him is true of the hon. member for Niagara, who poses here as a patriot; but we will not spend the time with him. On all occasions he takes care to tell us how thoroughly loyal he is. It cannot be expected of him, that he should be found refusing to wear English-made goods, but let the gentlemen opposite give evidence of their patriotism, and besides raising their voices in favor of our manufacturers, let them set an example and were these Canadian goods themselves. Then we may expect to have our manufacturers prosper without even the imposition of those duties which are repugnant to the great part of our people. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he burns in his grates any Nova Scotia coal.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do sometimes, not always.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know if I am correctly informed, but I ask the hon. gentleman if it is true that in asking for tenders for the supplies of coal for the Parliament Buildings, it was expressly stated that the coal should be American coal, and that the same thing was done with regard to Rideau Hall?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Only a small quantity of it and for a specific purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. Why should you put in any of it; when you took the duty out of the Yankee, why did you not take it all? The hon. gentlemen divided their patriotism, they wanted a certain amount of money out of the Yankee, and yet they wanted to encourage the Nova Scotia miners; and while I am on that point I might just as well ask another question, and I ask it in all fairness. If the coal duty is paid by the American producers, I ask the hon. Finance Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Railways, why he remitted the duty on material that the Syndicate used in constructing the bridges on their road? The hon. Minister of Finance was a party to making a clause in that Syndicate bargain by which they gave them all the iron for their bridges and all their bridge material, their fish-plates, spikes, and all their telegraphic apparatus, I believe, used in the original construction of the road, duty free; and why, according to the showing of the hon. gentlemen opposite, did they do it to leave an amount of money in the pockets of foreigners which ought to have been taken from them and put into the Treasury of this country. In doing that they gave up the whole question; they admitted by that action that the statements which they make on the floor of this House are without foundation; that the producer pays the duty on goods that come into this country. The hon. gentleman can take, as they say sometimes, either horn of the dilemma—either the foreigner does not pay the duty or they have made a present to the Yankees of the

amount of revenue we should have derived. The hon. gentlemen know how it was; it was a present to the Syndicate; and then they passed an Order in Council by which the manufacturers of iron producing a like material in Canada for supplying any of that article to the Syndicate, is to have an actual bounty given to him out of the taxes of this country. We are quite willing to appeal to the country and make the issue between the Tariff that we advocate and that of the hon. gentlemen opposite; we will be able to show the manufacturers that under the Tariff which we would impose the people will derive as much advantage as they do now, they will get all the legitimate protection they can demand. We will show the artizan and the laboring classes and the agriculturists that they will be placed in no worse position than they have been, but rather in a much better one. We are ready for the fight which the Minister of Finance says will come soon, but there will be other issues than the National Policy before the people then, of which they must take cognizance. There will be the bargain made with the Pacific Railway by hon. gentlemen, and on that the people's judgment must be asked. When that bargain is placed before the country in all its iniquity, hon. gentlemen will find that they cannot force its acceptance upon the people as they did upon this House. The First Minister said in this House that he could sell all our public lands in ten years for \$69,000,000 which he would have in the Treasury, either in cash or in securities as good as cash; and the Minister of Railways gave this House an estimate of the cost of that portion of the work that the Syndicate were to construct; on it he pledged his word, and the statement of his Chief Engineer, that this portion should not cost more than \$48,500,000. They will have to explain to the people of this country how they abandoned that plan without the sanction of Parliament, and gave to that Syndicate, according to their own showing, for \$48,500,000 worth of work, 25,000,000 acres of land (worth at their own calculation \$3 per acre), and \$25,000,000 in cash, making in all \$100,000,000. They will have to tell the people of this country why it was they did not sell those lands and realize the \$69,000,000, and out of that take \$48,500,000 and complete that road and own it themselves, and have \$20,500,000 of cash left in the Treasury; these are points on which the people will have to be answered. They will also have to show why they have locked up that great North-West for the next twenty years in a gigantic monopoly, and they will have to justify the bargain they have made with the Syndicate. They have locked up deliberately that great North West, that empire that is to be, and in addition to \$50,000,000 over and above all they have to expend, they have a monopoly to the right of all freights and of all passengers who may come in and out of that country for 20 years to come. The hon. Minister of Finance knows, and it is a matter of record, that amendment after amendment was moved when there could be no reply made to them, they were so reasonable in themselves, but by their brute force they bore us down in this House, and the people of the country knew it and hon. gentlemen opposite will feel that at the next election. We know the result with reference to that matter—that hon. gentlemen opposite have exercised the power of disallowance of a charter passed by the Manitoba Legislature, and have evinced a determination to keep the lands locked up in that country. They will have to answer, with reference to the Pacific Railway Company, the increased charges imposed. One of their planks before the people was a diminution in the public expenditure. But what are the facts? Why it has gone up, as their Estimates ask \$3,000,000 more than was required by the late Administration. On those points they will have to answer to the country, as well as for all their acts of maladministration since they assumed office.

Mr. PLUMB. What is the "diminution?"

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what it is.

Mr. PLUMB. It does appear there is bad grammar on the other side sometimes.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think there was an error in my grammar, but I think I transposed some syllables. But I thank the hon. gentleman for correcting me. Hon. gentlemen quote so largely from my speeches—extracting their elegant portions—that they may be anxious to quote from this one too. It should be free from all errors. I hope they will quote from it its very proper language. I may say, however, that I am not, generally, in the habit of complaining of interruptions; but the hon. member for Niagara, when speaking the other day, was asked a question by an hon. gentleman on my side, when he resented it, saying he did not want to be interrupted.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not say so.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg your pardon—you did say so.

Mr. PLUMB. I beg your pardon—I said the hon. gentleman who interrupted me will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. ROSS. No; you said more than you are charged with.

Mr. PATERSON. At any rate, the hon. gentleman manifested an indisposition to be interrupted, and there is no hon. gentleman who interrupts members on this side more. I care not if a gentleman asks me a question properly; but when a member professing to be a gentleman, thinks an opponent is making a point—when he feels the iron is entering—and embarks upon a deliberate system of interruption, he places himself beyond the pale of politeness and has no right to be treated in the way he wants. Let me tell the hon. gentleman if he would prate less about British loyalty and study more British courtesy and politeness, he would stand a little higher in the estimation of every true lover of British institutions in this House. Let him speak if he has anything to say; but I do not like the continual chatter and gabble. I would bear with it on account of his years; but he has placed himself beyond the pale of forbearance. He systematically interrupts without sense or reason. He should be prepared to defend his course and give reasons for it.

Mr. PLUMB. Will the hon. gentleman, with his usual courtesy, allow me to call attention to the fact that, for three years, in this House, when he was one of the tyrannical majority, I never rose but I was hounded down by himself and his supporters. I never was able to make my voice heard, for the howls on the other side. I do not claim anything exceptional. I rise like any other man who has a right to speak here, and the hon. gentleman knows how systematic were the attempts to hound me down. There has been no disposition on this side ever to trifle with hon. gentlemen on the other side. They may cry "Order," as they like. But we, as a minority on the Opposition side, were never treated with the forbearance and courtesy with which we have treated our opponents, to whom we always listen. We have never formed a *claque* to prevent them from speaking. We have listened to them and their tirades, hour after hour, with a forbearance which I say now has almost ceased to be a virtue.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman's defence is not a denial of my statement. He could not deny it. A man with less vanity than the hon. gentleman, or less anxious to have *Hansard* record his wise sayings, would have been appalled by the noise often made whilst he spoke, but it was not I who made it.

Mr. PLUMB. Very likely not.

Mr. PATERSON. No; it was his own political friends who hounded him down by their noise.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman knows better.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. PATERSON. No, not only in this House, but in the country, if report speaks true; particularly at North Ontario, the cry was: "take this man out of the constituency; he is doing more harm than good." You must not try to fasten upon the Opposition the blame of the interruptions here received.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is openly stated and reiterated frequently that at North Ontario the hon. member for Niagara was treated discourteously, that his speech was not acceptable to the people he addressed. I was present, and there is no foundation for that statement whatever.

Mr. PATERSON. The statement has been reported in the press; the hon. Minister knows that.

Mr. PLUMB. Who reported it?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I admit the report has been published.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. member for North Ontario.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. the Finance Minister has not attempted to deny that it was his own political friends in the House, on more than one occasion, who interrupted him with their noise.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I was not here at the time.

Mr. PATERSON. On reflection, I admit you were not here, but the hon. member for Niagara knows it himself. I do not wish to be discourteous, however, nor to say a word offensive to any member. I never use personalities, but in discussing public questions I have a right to be listened to without continual interruptions, made for the purpose of making me lose the thread of my argument. I do not know that I need continue speaking longer, as other hon. gentlemen wish to address the House. I have only a few words to say in conclusion on one other matter, and that is, that the party to which I belong have been not only misrepresented on this trade question and many other subjects, but the hon. gentlemen have made a practice, not only in the House, but through the country, of pointing to us as a party not thoroughly loyal to the British Crown. They charge us with annexation proclivities, with a leaning towards the United States, and scheming for political annexation. I remember the leader of the Government, in a talk on one occasion, at a Canadian gathering, described the Grits as hybrids, and said that they were a cross between a Democrat and an Annexationist.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. members opposite say, hear, hear, as if they endorsed the sentiment. I think, Sir, those gentlemen will have to look in vain through the history of that political party to find evidence of disloyalty. They are a party, it is true, that do not prate about their loyalty upon all occasions. They take it for granted that being loyal men every one will know that they are loyal, and that it is not necessary to proclaim it on the house-tops. With reference to annexation sentiments being held by them, I deny it. I have to rejoice that I do not belong to a party, the leader of which expressed in plain terms that his choice as between independence and annexation would be annexation to the United States. I am happy to say that utterance coming from the leader of one of the great political parties, came not from the leader of the political party with which I am associated. I have to rejoice that it was not the leader of the Reform party that pointed the young men of Canada to look to Holland and to Belgium to see the position their country occupied with reference to the United States. I am happy to say that it was not the leader of the Reform party that belittled his country by pointing the people of Canada to those countries in Europe surrounded by powerful nations without the power of extending and developing themselves, to show that we

are in a position like them. Sir, I am glad the leader of the political party that found it necessary to express such a sentiment in favor of annexation to the United States before the independence of this country, if choice had to be made, was found leading the party opposed to the one I am associated with.

Mr. BOWELL. Why not accompany that statement with the reason the right hon. gentleman gave at the time.

Mr. PATERSON. I can give you the reason. He said Canada was not able to hold her own, that she was too small, that the condition in which she was placed was one that rendered her unable to develop herself.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That annexation would follow.

Mr. PATERSON. I have it here:

"Independence is a farce—Canada must belong either to the British system or to the American system. Here we are with 4,500,000 people lying alongside of 55,000,000, the most unhappy position in which a nation can be placed, the most crushing to its energies and its intellect, the most destructive to its prosperity is that of living next door to and at the sufferance of a powerful neighbor. Look at Europe and you see the position which small nations occupy. Look at Belgium and Holland, Belgium trembling for fear France will take her, and Holland in fear of Germany. There is no spirit, there is almost hopelessness in those countries; and I say, looking at the question of independence that if we had to make a choice between independence and annexation, I would rather that we should have annexation and join with the United States at once than be here a small nation, a dependent nation obliged to raise the phantom of an army and navy, obliged to have foreign Ambassadors at an enormous expense, and after a brief existence to be absorbed as Texas and California were absorbed, and as Mexico will be absorbed."

There is a statement endorsed by the party by ringing cheers at Toronto and by the ringing cheers of the hon. gentlemen opposite in this House. Annexation for these men before independence, holding out Holland and Belgium as an instance of what Canada is. Holland and Belgium, surrounded with powerful nations, no room to develop themselves, no more territory to conquer, no land to which to invite the emigrants of other countries. That is the likeness this Canada of ours is compared to by the great leader of the party opposite. I see representatives who from 1,200 miles to the east have come here, and I see representatives in this House who have come here 3,000 miles from the west, and I will see, if I live a few years, men coming from thousands of miles from the North-West standing in this House. Yet these hon. gentlemen opposite talk about Holland and Belgium as being fit comparisons of this great country. They talk about raising the phantom of an army, the phantom of a navy—words from the leader of the party opposite—when we have 50,000 trained men now and are paying for them. They talk of the phantom of a navy when we now rank fourth in mercantile marine among the nations of the earth. They talk to us of being like Holland and Belgium, when we have not only all the old provinces, but have the North-West as a home for millions and millions of people from all climes and from all zones, whom we ask to cast in their lot with us. "Holland and Belgium, young men of Canada," says the leader of the Conservative party, "look to those countries, with their energies crushed, almost paralyzed; your Canada is like theirs." A fine picture for the young men of this country; a fine picture to induce the young men of Canada to develop their energies and lead on. Sir, I give the monopoly of these sentiments to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. We maintain and firmly adhere to the British Crown; but, Sir, if the time comes which the leader of the Government refers to, when a choice would have to be made, if the Government of England should submit the question to this country, if choice had to be made, and the question was put to me whether I would go for annexation with the States, or for an independent country, I would say, and many others would say it with me, I am a Canadian freeman; I see from the east to the west, a fertile region; I see that our

shores are washed by three oceans; I see that we have the largest fresh water seas on the globe; I feel the life-blood of a Canadian pulsing through my veins; and if choice is to be made, the choice I shall make will be this: That Canada, maintaining her own separate existence, should go forward, hew her way, nobly go forward, triumphantly—not defiantly—till she reached the fulfilment of the great destiny that I believe is hers, of being a nation of people among whom shall exist liberty and order and freedom, and the highest state of civilization, and whose right arm shall ever be extended in the hour of Britain's need—if Britain should ever have an hour of need—to help her as devotedly as she has done in the past. These are my sentiments, and let hon. gentlemen opposite wipe out the expression of their leader, let hon. gentlemen blot out the cheers with which they endorsed it a short time ago, before they venture to charge hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House with being in favor of annexation to the United States. No, Sir; and it is because I see the grand future that is in store for our country, that we have here a country with immense possibilities which are calculated to stimulate our young men to develop the noblest sentiments that are in them. And, Mr. Speaker, it is because we believe in this great possibility, and desire rightly to develop the immense resources of this country, that we want them not to be belittled, and we want the ambition of our young men not to be crushed out by sentiments so derogatory to their country. What we want to do in this House is so to legislate that, in this country, which I believe has such a magnificent future before it, we shall prevent all monopolies, all preying of one class upon another; that all unjust laws shall be taken from our Statute-books, and that we shall be able in all our deliberations in this Assembly ever to remember that we stand here two political parties, opposed to one another on many points, but one party having as much right as the other, the right to express its sentiments; ever remembering that in the heat of strong debate gentlemen opposed to us are gentlemen, that we are not to indulge in personalities; ever remembering that we should guard our tongues against uttering charges against public men that are not true and only maintain such charges as may be fairly urged against them in their administrative capacity, that, laying aside all such methods, we shall rise to the discussion of subjects on their own merits, and thus set an example to the young men of Canada, outside these walls, worthy of their imitation; ever remembering that others should enjoy freedom of thought and freedom of speech with ourselves, and that we should be able to bear quietly the arguments that may be advanced by our opponents. I believe that we have before us the possibilities of a great heritage, that a grand future is before us; and I would desire, recognising my own failings as I might the failings of others, that we may be enabled, as legislators in this House, to have this for our aim and object at any rate, though we may have different ways of accomplishing them, that our hearts shall be united together as one man, that Canada shall be made to increase and prosper, and that we shall set such an example to those outside this House as to argue on their merits all questions that may be discussed with reference to the future welfare of this country; that all unseemly strife and bickering, and harsh personalities are not necessary between the public men of Canada; but that when the people have rightly understood and determined upon these questions, effect shall be given to their wishes. I have been led to make my remarks at greater length than I intended as the interruptions with which I have met have led me a little out of the path I intended to pursue. I have endeavored to argue the question on its merits, to show what my course has been in the past on this question; and while I do not pretend to say that I would not modify my views and learn lessons

from the experience of the past, that with reference to the trade question they have very slightly changed; that they are much in the same direction as they were, and that I am persuaded that the best interests of the country are not to be served by the policy in force at the present time, which gives an undue amount of protection to certain manufacturers and does not give a proper amount to others. The Tariff I advocate is a Tariff designed to give a revenue without unduly pressing upon the people, and to show that that has been my view, I will read not my own sentiments but an expression of opinion of a Board that could speak with a great deal of authority with reference to questions of trade and finance; I refer to the Board of Trade resolution passed in 1878 when the Mackenzie Administration was in power. That resolution was seconded by Mr. E. K. Green, who, if I remember rightly, was mentioned by the Finance Minister the other night. In quoting that resolution I give what were my sentiments on the trade question in 1876, what have been my sentiments as expressed in every speech I believe I have made down to the present time both in this House and on the different platforms of the country, even when my audiences were largely composed of agriculturists:

"That while in the estimation of this Board, the present Tariff of 17½ per cent. is fair and reasonable, yet in the event of its being found necessary to increase the duties for revenue purposes, that this Board would respectfully request the Government to consider the industrial development of the country in any readjustment of the Tariff."

That motion was carried. If the revenue demanded an increase of Tariff I would have that increase made in such a way that it would develop the industries of the country; but if not demanded by that, then, Sir, that the people should not be made to pay for sheer protection on any other ground. I may also say in conclusion that while I recognize the fact that the Government have a majority of supporters of this House, while I would not venture in any predictions of what may take place in the future, yet that this side of the House will not be unprepared for the coming conflict whenever it comes, or shrink from it. I should suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite will naturally be anxious that the same constituencies that pronounced on them in 1878 shall pronounce upon them when the next election comes. I suppose that hon. gentlemen will not endeavor to change the bounds of any of the counties. I am quite willing that the four additional constituencies that we are entitled to in Ontario, as the result of the Census, shall be so arranged as to ensure the election of supporters of the Administration. That satisfaction I would not attempt to take from them, and I suppose they will see that they enjoy it. But, having done that, I suppose that they being so strong in the affections of the people—so sure that the people will endorse their policy—they will never consent to any cutting and carving and dividing, and re-arranging of townships, to give undue advantage, for if they desire to give the country an evidence of their faith in what they say, they will take the verdict from the same constituencies that gave it in 1878. If they do that we are prepared, first to meet them and discuss these questions, and then to abide by whatever verdict may be given, as we did on the last occasion when we met them at the polls. If that verdict should be against us we will still maintain what we think is right; we shall battle for our principles until we shall find a majority of the people agreeing with us, and when that time comes, I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite, in transferring themselves from that side of the House to this, will conduct themselves with courtesy, with proper humility, and with the decency and quietness which we have always shown.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not purpose, Mr. Speaker, to follow the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House in all the subjects to which he has referred. It will be within the observation of hon. members, that during this

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

debate the Opposition have taken a somewhat new position. The hon. member who has just taken his seat anticipated the debate, to some extent, on a motion he introduced into this House, evidently proposing to place himself before the country in a position less inimical to its great industrial interests, than that which during the last three years he and his party have occupied in Parliament. Since that time almost every speech which has been delivered on that side, if we except the speech of the late Minister of Finance, who, I am bound to say, was honest and candid enough to maintain here the same views that he has always maintained—has indicated that they propose to go to the country with the assurance to the manufacturing interests, that those interests will receive a certain amount of protection at their hands. Well, Sir, we can remember what took place during the last Parliament; we can remember that there were in Parliament, supporting the then Administration, a certain number of very pronounced protectionists; we can remember that the hon. member for South Brant, the hon. member for North Norfolk, the then hon. member for Lincoln, the late hon. member for West Montreal, the two hon. members for Hamilton and other hon. gentlemen in this House, made speeches in favor of protection, which undoubtedly for force, vigor and strength of argument, have not been excelled by any speeches delivered on the same subject since. But, Sir, we remember also that, with all the influence they possessed in Parliament, and with all the undoubted influence of the conviction that reigned in the minds of many people that they more accurately represented the popular sentiment than many of their friends, they were yet utterly powerless to induce their leaders to modify their trade policy; and I am sure that, under these circumstances, the great manufacturing and industrial interests of Canada of every kind will be slow to entrust the Government of the country to gentlemen, who, as a party, were quite regardless of the warnings of a few of their friends, and still adhered to the principles of Free Trade, so far as those principles could be applied in this country. There is one satisfaction to be derived from the statement the hon. member for South Brant has made to-night. We have listened with some anxiety to learn what is precisely the policy they are to give us, and to-night we find that the hon. member for South Brant has spoken of the Tariff which he proposes to give us, as the Tariff that was formerly in force. Well, Sir, that is, at least, a candid, a frank, a straightforward statement. The change we are to have is a change to the condition of things that existed under the late Administration; the Tariff of the future is to be the same Tariff that existed before, if the change of Government takes place, and with that frank and intelligible statement, I think we may fairly leave the issue to the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite, beginning with the hon. member for North Norfolk, seem to be alarmed lest the issues before the country shall be confined to the National Policy; they tell us that long before the elections take place, that question will be so overwhelmed by the other issues which have since arisen and are arising that it will have but little influence with the people of Canada. The hon. member for South Brant, in a speech delivered in another place a few evenings ago, made the statement that the National Policy was no longer an issue in this country, that it was not worth while discussing it at all, that the questions which would be decided by the people of Canada in the elections, were the question of the financial administration of their affairs, the question of the Pacific Railway, the questions connected with the development of the North-West, and other questions apart altogether from the National Policy; and we were told that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were most anxious to avoid the discussion of those other questions. Sir, for one, I have no desire to avoid the discussion of the other ques-

tions; I should be sorry indeed if this party had to go to the country in 1883, if the elections shall then take place, depending simply upon its record in connection with the question of Free Trade and Protection. On the contrary, I am convinced that there will be no shirking of other issues; that we shall be able to appeal to the country on all the issues the hon. gentlemen opposite have named; that we shall be able to show that the financial administration of the affairs of this country by the hon. gentlemen now in office has been a wise, economical and patriotic administration; that we shall be able to show that in relation to the development of our great North-West, they have adopted a policy which was not only wise and patriotic in its inception, but which has already vindicated itself by the results which have since taken place; that we shall be able to show that in consequence of the land regulations of the Government, settlers and capital have been flowing into that country, giving to it a development such as we could never have hoped for two or three years ago. Upon all these questions the party now in power will be able to appeal to the country, quite as certain of a favorable verdict as they are upon the great question of the National Policy, upon which I venture to say, if you were talking with hon. gentlemen opposite in their private chambers, simply as their private friends, nine-tenths of them would declare that the people of this country are against them. Sir, much has been said in relation to the financial administration of this Government, and though I do not propose to take up much time in discussing it, I have grouped together a few figures which I think will show that we have nothing to fear in presenting the record of this Government on that subject. It is important that this subject should be referred to for two reasons: the question of whether the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches or hon. gentlemen opposite, happen to hold office is in itself, apart from the interests of the country and the policies they respectively represent, a matter of no great consequence; men reign and pass away, but the influence upon the country of the discussions which take place are lasting and abiding, and it is because of a settled determination apparently on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, for what reason it is difficult to appreciate, to show that this country is going headlong to financial ruin, that it is important to present the facts as they exist as tersely and as briefly as possible. Scarcely a speech is made by hon. gentlemen opposite, especially outside of Parliament, in which we are not told of the enormous increase of expenditure which took place under the Conservative Government of this country, from \$13,500,000 in 1867, to nearly \$23,500,000 in 1873-74; and we are asked to believe, from that bald statement of figures, that the financial administration of the Conservative party was disastrous to the interests of the country. Let me, in the first place, protest against the method of calculation which hon. gentlemen opposite adopt. The year 1873-74, which they always assumed to be a year of Conservative administration, does not in any sense belong to that party; they are not responsible for the expenditures of that year, as I shall be able presently to show. But even assuming for the purpose of this argument, that they were responsible, what are the facts? Surely hon. gentlemen, in the interests of the country, might be honest enough to state that the Dominion in 1867 comprised only four Provinces. We were for the first year only laying the foundations for the future government of the country; the expenditures were small in all the Departments; Parliament simply met together for the purpose of paving the way to that greater policy of development which was followed afterwards, and therefore to speak of the expenditure for 1867 as an expenditure which ought to be considered in any matter of comparison or calculation, is to do a great injustice not to the party then in power but to the country itself. At the end of the period what was the position of the country?

Instead of having four small Provinces we had seven Provinces and the great North-West. The country as it exists to-day had been completed as regards its geographical boundaries. At the end of that period, and as a consequence of that enlargement, the expenditures which were made during those six years were all expenditures, as was stated by the late Finance Minister in his celebrated circular when he went to England to float his first loan, made on works of great public utility, on works of improvement, on objects of development, and on the necessary expenditure connected with the enlargement of the Dominion, and the acquisition of the great North-West Territory. I have the accounts here, but I will not detain the House by dealing with particular items of increase. All of them are of the character to which I refer. But if it was wrong during those six or seven years to have increased the public expenditure, if it was a crime on the part of the Conservative party to have done so, what shall we say of hon. gentlemen opposite, who came into power full of promises of economy and retrenchment, with a backing such as no Government before that time had, and who yet went on adding to the expenditures all the time they were in office? But I have said the comparison was not a fair one. The Conservative party were not responsible for the expenditures of 1873-74. I am not going to refer to the fact that the accounts were made up by hon. gentlemen opposite so as to include certain items of capital expenditure, such as the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, on the Dawson Route, and certain Customs refunds; but there is an easy way of testing this matter. The Government of that day were responsible for the Estimates they submitted to Parliament. The Estimates were the measure of what they believed would be the proper expenditure during that year. Well, Sir, what did we find? That the total amount included in the first Estimates brought down were for \$31,008,423; that the expenditure on capital account included in that, amounted to \$9,974,240, leaving the expenditure, on account of Consolidated Fund, according to the Estimates as first brought down, a little over \$21,000,000, exactly \$21,034,183. Then there were certain Supplementary Estimates brought down, three sets, aggregating \$604,483, making the total Estimate, for 1873-74, as brought down by the then Administration, \$21,639,666. The expenditure for that year—and hon. gentlemen opposite were in office for eight months of the time—was \$23,316,316, or \$1,676,650 more than the Conservative Government obtained power from Parliament to expend in the Estimates which they brought down at that time. It may be said that Governments very often spend more money than is estimated; but I think we may fairly assume that had the Administration which was in office before 1873 continued in power, they would not have spent more, judging by their record of the preceding year. The warrant for assuming this is to be found in the fact that the Estimates brought down for 1872-73 amounted to \$29,675,460, including an estimate for capital expenditure of \$9,949,500, leaving \$19,725,960. The Supplementary Estimates amounted to \$575,774, making the Estimates brought down by the Government for the expenditures required for 1872-73, \$20,301,734. And yet, although they obtained the power from Parliament to expend that amount, the actual expenditure made by the Government in that year was \$19,174,647, or \$1,127,087 less than they had obtained power from Parliament to expend. If we find a Government bringing down Estimates on the eve of a general election, as those Estimates of 1872-73 were brought down, with every desire to make the probable expenditure appear as low as possible, and if we find that the Administration remaining in office is able to get through the year's business and expend \$1,000,000 less than they had obtained authority from Parliament to expend, we may fairly hold that the same Government remaining in office will make ends meet and

be able to carry on public affairs without increasing the expenditure beyond the next year's Estimates. Yet we find that hon. gentlemen opposite, having control of the expenditures, exceeded the Estimates by \$1,676,650. How was that excess made up? In Civil Government, for instance, hon. gentlemen opposite spent \$150,226 more than had been voted by Parliament; and when I tell the House that in the one item of contingencies they spent \$75,000 more in that year than the Government had estimated would be necessary, and had taken the authority of Parliament to expend, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me in the statement that that was a reckless expenditure on their part. Then in the Administration of Justice they spent \$78,776 more than Parliament had voted. For Legislation they spent \$354,970 more than Parliament had voted. It is quite true there was a general election which was not anticipated when the Estimates were brought down, and they are perhaps entitled to say that they could not have anticipated that expenditure. But we were told when that Government came into power, and especially as a reason for the entrance of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) into the Government, in violation of the principle which he himself had laid down, that the number of the Executive Council should not be increased beyond that which the law specified, even in cases where an hon. gentleman entered without salary, that 119 members of the House, which is a good working majority, had requested the hon. gentleman to enter the Cabinet, and had given him assurances of support if he did so. With 119 members supporting the Government in a House of 206, I may fairly say that they were not bound to have a general election. Having regard to what occurred at that time, they had no intention of having a general election until they began to see, looking at what they might be requested to do during the five years they would be in office, that it would be better to secure, if possible, a larger majority while the influence of that great slander, usually called the Pacific Scandal, was upon the country. Then I find that for the collection of Customs they expended \$56,062 more than Parliament voted; and in the collection of Public Works revenue they spent \$319,034 more than was voted. For Post Office revenue collection they expended \$71,270 more than voted; so that in these items alone, and which it must be admitted were controllable expenditures and within the competency of the Government, within certain limits of course, to regulate, they expended \$730,338 more than had been voted by the preceding Administration. I am aware that it may be said, in relation to the years 1878-79, that the Government which is now in office expended also more money than had been voted by their predecessors; but we may fairly account for that from the fact that during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in office their financial administration was very severely criticised by the press and public men of this country; and on the eve of going to the country and as a preparation for the elections, their Estimates were so framed as to give the appearance, at any rate, of the greatest possible economy. Although that was the fact, what was the real result? The Conservative Government spent \$758,508 more than their predecessors had obtained the authority of Parliament to spend; and of that for the collection of public works alone, largely connected with the work of the Intercolonial Railway, there was \$414,714; while, Sir, the Liberal Government had expended \$1,676,650 more than the Conservative Parliament had voted. Now, let us take some contrasts. Under Civil Government hon. gentlemen opposite spent \$150,226 more than their predecessors had voted; the Conservatives when they came in spent \$27,804 less than their predecessors had voted. Under the head of Administration of Justice the Liberal Government spent \$78,776 more than their predecessors had estimated; the Conservatives when they came into office expended

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

\$36,734 less than their predecessors had provided. On Weights and Measures, the Conservatives spent \$25,296 less than had been voted by Parliament for that service. In the collection of Customs duties the Liberals expended \$56,062 more than their predecessors had voted, while the Conservatives only expended \$13,875 more. In the collection of Post Office revenues the Liberals had expended \$71,270 more than their predecessors had voted, the Conservatives only exceeded the amount by \$17,423. In Legislation the Liberals expended \$354,970 more, while the Conservatives only spent \$58,071 more. I have said enough to show that the only true course in making a comparison of the two Administrations is to take the last complete year of each Administration of the results of which there can be no doubt as to where the responsibility rests. Doing so, what do we find? We have been told, if I mistake not, by the hon. gentleman from West Durham, in a speech which he made out of session, that the increased expenditure during the five years of Mr. Mackenzie's Government was only \$200,000; and referring to a remark made by the First Minister in a speech at Toronto, that the Liberals when in office were like soldiers marking time, moving but making no progress, he said that was true with reference to the expenditures of the country, because they had succeeded in carrying on the Government during these five years, and at the end of that period found themselves spending only \$200,000 more than their predecessors had spent. Now the ordinary expenditure—what in Public Accounts is put down as ordinary expenditure—in 1872-73 was \$7,062,095, and in 1877-78, \$6,542,510, an apparent decrease of \$519,585. But in dealing with questions of controllable expenditure it seems to me that we must always include the charges upon revenue. There is not after all any part of the expenditure, except perhaps Public Works, Militia and large items of that kind, which is more within the control of the Government of the day than are those expenditures connected with the collection of revenue. If we add these items we find the controllable expenditure of 1872-73 was \$10,457,570, while, in 1877-78, it was \$11,843,634, or an increase in the aggregate of these two classes of expenditure of \$1,386,064. But, Sir, let us look at this decrease in "ordinary expenditure" and see how it is made up. Well, we find in the item of Militia and Defence a decrease of \$630,527. We all know how that was effected. The country corps were cut off from their drill; and if hon. gentlemen opposite had simply wiped out the Militia altogether, as I believe some of them would desire to do, they could have made a much larger reduction than that. They could have presented a much more taking aggregate to the people. Then we find in the matter of Public Works expenditure, such as improvements in harbors, putting up public buildings, and other works of that kind, there was a decrease of \$599,017. In that case, also, all they had to do was simply not to spend a dollar on harbors or public buildings, and stop all public works; they could thus have saved very much, and they could have made a much better show in the aggregate figures. Then I find in connection with the expenditures on Dominion lands, there was a decrease of \$150,048; they had only to stop sending out surveyors, to stop everything in connection with the development of the North-West, in order to make the decrease very much larger and thus present a better picture. But in these three items alone, which I will not admit were economies, which were simply a starving of the public service—in these three items alone—the decrease was \$1,379,592, or \$800,000 more than the entire aggregate decrease of which they are in the habit of boasting so much. Now, while this is the case as to these items, what do we find as to others in connection with which economies might have been practiced? In the matter of Civil Government, which they tell us we have been much too extravagant in administering, during their five years of office, they increased

the cost by \$160,180. Under their rule, the cost of the Administration of Justice increased \$163,954; the cost of the Post Office Department—of the collection of the Postal Revenue—increased no less than \$657,206, making a total increased expenditure in those items—all controllable expenditures—of very nearly \$1,000,000, viz.: \$981,206. Under those circumstances can hon. gentlemen opposite, with any regard for accuracy, at any rate, say to the people of this country that, during the time they were in office and had control of the expenditures, they did anything to entitle them to claim credit for economy or retrenchment? What has been the expenditure under the present Government? I take simply the Public Accounts as my authority, because it is most inconvenient to deal with the Estimates. Last year the present Government spent half a million dollars less than they obtained the authority of Parliament to spend. Therefore, having regard to fairness and accuracy we can only deal with the actual expenditure as brought down in the Public Accounts; but from them what do we find? That the total expenditure in 1877-78, the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, was \$23,503,158, and, in 1880-81, under the present Government, \$25,502,554; or an increase under the present Government, in three years, of very nearly \$2,000,000. How has that increase been brought about? In one matter, the charges, interest, sinking fund and on the public debt, there is an increase of \$883,604. Surely the late Government were responsible for that. I think I may say that the present Government have made no expenditures on capital account, if you except the payments that may have been made on the Yale and Kamloops Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and on the contract for the missing link between Thunder Bay and Selkirk—excepting on works begun by hon. gentlemen opposite, and for which the contracts were actually let before the present Government was formed. Then they have had to expend on an exceptional item—that appears every ten years in our accounts, and which fell in since the present Government took office—viz.: the Census, \$127,033; and they have also been obliged to spend in Public Works, \$140,171; and on Indian grants, \$383,594; Post Office, increase in the Collection of Revenue, \$151,719; and on Public Works, for the collection of revenue, in consequence of the greater mileage of the Intercolonial Railway, an increased outlay of \$231,727, or on all these items a total of \$1,918,848. This leaves only about \$80,000 of an increase on the other items of the public expenditure. Not one of those items, I venture to say, can hon. gentlemen opposite fairly challenge. They cannot challenge the increase in the interest on the public debt, and the sinking fund and charges connected with it; nor can they complain of the item for the Census, for that is a statutory obligation, and an outlay we have to incur every ten years. They will hardly complain of the increased expenditure on public works in presence of our large revenue, our overflowing Treasury, or that the wants of the country in connection with the public works are being generously and fairly dealt with. They will not object either to the increased expenditure on account of the Indians. If they do I would refer them to the admirable correspondence from the North-West, which appeared in the *Toronto Globe*, the leading organ of their party, in which the policy of the Government in making larger expenditures in the North-West, in connection with the Indians, was fully sustained and vindicated, and in which the prediction was made, which has been realized since, that very large expenditures for this purpose would be required. They can hardly complain of those expenditures to which I have referred, and, therefore, the only expenditure, taking the whole service of the country, to which any exception can be taken is this item of \$80,000. If I were disposed to take up the time of the House, I could show that every single item making up that sum may be vindicated and defended on its merits. Then, I say, if we look to the great increase of the public outlay

during the time the late Government were in power, and compare it with the expenditures of the present Government, we will find these remarkable facts: The expenditure on the public debt showed an average annual increase during the administration of the late Government of \$478,207, while the average annual increase since the present Government was formed is but \$294,535. The Post Office expenditure during the late Government showed an annual increase of \$131,441; during the three years of the present Government the increase has been but \$50,573, and that in spite of the fact that within the last three years that service has been extended over our great North-West, and an enormous expenditure to the country has been required by the necessity of furnishing settlers with adequate postal accommodation. Again, I find that the annual increase in the cost of collecting Customs revenue under the late Administration was \$29,352; under the present Government it has been but \$1,059, or about one twenty-ninth part as large as the increase of the late Administration, and that, despite the fact that there was an aggregate decrease in the Customs revenue during their term of five years of \$171,341, while there has been an aggregate increase under the present Administration of \$5,621,268. I find also that while the collection of the revenue increased annually during those five years, by \$381,130, the annual increase during the last three years has been but \$127,343. Then, Sir, while the revenue itself increased during the period of the Mackenzie Government \$312,308 per annum, it has increased during the last three years, \$2,420,095. The hon. gentlemen opposite, when in office, actually increased the cost of collecting the revenue by \$68,822 a year more than the increase in the revenue itself. I think that may fairly be said to be pretty strong evidence that there was no great economy or carefulness in the administration of public affairs by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, I think you will agree with me, under these circumstances, that in relation to the financial administration of this Government, the hon. members of the Government themselves, and their supporters in this House, have no reason to fear any public criticism to which they may be subjected, and have no reason to fear the ordeal to which, within a short time, sooner or later, we must all submit at the hands of the people of this country. The hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of referring to the increase in the public debt. While as between the two parties it may be a matter of no great consequence whether the debt increased more during the five years one party were in power, or the six years another party were in power, or the three years that the same party have since been in power, the use which hon. gentlemen make of this increase in the public debt, is to create the impression through this country, and in other countries where it is our interest to stand well, and to which we are appealing for a share of the emigration that is going from them, that the Dominion is going headlong to ruin, that it is incurring debts beyond what its resources will fairly justify. In pursuance of this policy we are told the debt has doubled since Confederation. What are the facts? In 1867, the net debt was \$75,728,641; in 1873, the debt was \$99,848,461, or an increase of \$24,119,820, or an average annual increase for the six years of \$4,019,970. The net debt in 1878 had increased to \$140,362,069, an increase in five years of \$40,513,608, or an average annual increase of \$8,102,721. The net debt in 1881, on the 30th July last, was \$155,395,780, an increase in three years of \$15,033,711, or an average annual increase of \$5,011,237. Let me give hon. gentlemen those averages. Six years of Conservative rule, an average annual increase of the public debt of \$4,019,970; during the five years of Liberal rule, an average annual increase of \$8,102,721; three years of Conservative rule, an average annual increase of \$5,011,000.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman include in that second statement the loan effected by the hon. Minister of Finance in the autumn of 1873?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, and I include also the loan effected by the present hon. Minister of Finance in the autumn of 1878. Now, Sir, what are the facts with regard to this debt, looking to the increase of our obligations? I find that about \$20,000,000 of that increased debt since Confederation is represented either by the transference of the debts of the Provinces, or simply taking from one pocket and putting into the other, relieving the Provinces and putting it upon the Dominion; or it was incurred in bringing in new Provinces with their debts, and was, therefore, represented by an increased population, an increased area of country, and must not be considered an increase upon the debt of 1867 in which the four Provinces alone were involved. Before 1873, during the time the Conservative party were in power, I find no less than \$15,525,279 was of this character; so that the actual increase of the debt during those six years represented by the increased burden upon the people, was \$8,594,541, or an average annual increase of \$1,432,423. Then, of the increase between 1873 and 1878, I find that \$4,927,060 was of the character I have just described, represented by the introduction of new Provinces and their debts, or by the re-arrangements of debts, and was not an increased burden upon the people in relation to their debt. I find, therefore, that the average increase, deducting that amount of the five years of Liberal rule, was \$7,117,109. Then, Sir, as illustrating the difference between Conservative and Liberal rule, let me point out one fact of very great importance, and that is, the expenditure upon capital account as compared with the increased debt during the periods the two parties respectively were in power. I find that during the six complete years of Conservative rule no less than \$12,072,780 were spent on capital account in excess of the addition of the debt. During the five complete years of Liberal rule \$1,997,613 were added to the debt more than was expended on capital account. Then I find that during the last three years of Conservative rule \$991,683 were expended on capital account in excess of the addition to the public debt; or, if we take the expenditure up to the 1st January last, according to the statement by the Minister of Finance, we find that \$4,522,822 was expended upon capital account in excess of the debt. That statement is more than fair to hon. gentlemen opposite, for it gives them the benefit of 1873-74, and it places on the hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches the responsibility of the expenditure of 878-79. But if we take their method of using figures what do we find? We find that during the time the Conservatives were in office, during the seven years which are usually credited to the Conservatives in connection with the public expenditure of this country, there were \$12,833,009 spent on capital account in excess of the addition to the public debt. We find that the late Government added to the debt, in excess of capital expenditure, \$4,257,512; and we find the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, since they have returned to office, have expended upon capital account, in excess of the addition to the public debt, no less than \$7,543,033. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask this honorable House, whether in relation to the public debt of this country, that is a record of which the Conservative party have any reason to be ashamed? But I know that hon. gentlemen opposite say: "We are not responsible for this enormous increase of debt during the time we were in office." The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) puts their responsibility for their increased debt at somewhere—I forget the exact figures—but certainly under a million dollars.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. \$200,000, I think.
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. WHITE. Considerably under a million, at all events. It is undoubtedly difficult to apportion between the two parties the responsibility for the increased public debt, or for the expenditures in connection with it. But my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in the speech which he delivered this afternoon, pointed out what, I think, everybody must admit that they are quite as responsible for all the increases to the public debt which have taken place since Confederation as the party who are now in office. The Intercolonial Railway was an obligation at the time of Confederation; it was part of the Treaty. The then leader of the party, the late lamented Mr. Brown—and would to God he were with us to-night to see what are the principles his friends and former followers are venturing in his absence to proclaim—stated that Confederation was worth six Intercolonial Railways. I heard him make the speech myself in the old Music Hall, Toronto. That was an obligation resting on the country as a whole; for it both parties were responsible. It is true, as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has pointed out, that there was a difference of opinion as to the route; but I would like to ask the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) what he thinks of the route of the Intercolonial Railway. I would like to ask the members for Lower Canada—those who were in Parliament at that time and those who are in Parliament to-day—what they think of the route of the Intercolonial Railway. It is a notorious fact that except the Ontario Opposition and a few of the New Brunswick members, the whole of the Opposition—the Nova Scotia Opposition and the Quebec Opposition voted with the Government of the day in determining the north shore line as the route of the Intercolonial. What are the facts with regard to the canals, which is the next large item entering into the expenditures making up the increase of debt? Every one knows who has read the Confederation Act that the question of expenditure upon the canals, although provided for by that Act, was contingent on the condition of the finances. It was for the Government of the time, whatever the Government might be, to determine when they would enter on the work of enlarging the canals. Now, what is the history of the case? When the Conservative Government left office in 1873, I think I speak accurately in saying that there was not a single contract let for the enlargement of the canals west of Lachine, that all the work in connection with the canals west of Lachine was undertaken after the Conservative Government went out of office. Nay, more than that. Although the Conservative Government had advertised for tenders, and, I believe, had received tenders for certain contracts in connection with the Welland Canal, the Minister of Public Works of the late Ministry, when he came into power, stopped those tenders—rejected them—and advertised anew for tenders. It was competent for him, under the terms of the Confederation Act, under the obligation the country had assumed, connected with the construction and enlargement of the canals, to say that the condition of our finances would not permit us to go on, and, therefore, under the contract we are not bound to go on; and when we remember that the first act of the Government was to increase the annual taxation of the country by \$3,000,000 because the ordinary requirements of the country necessitated it, including, of course, the expenditures on the Pacific Railway—every one will admit that the hon. member for Lambton might have taken that course, and have said our finances will not permit us to enter upon the work, and, therefore, we will not enter on it. But he did not take that course; he entered on the work, on his own responsibility as a Minister; his party supported him on their own responsibility; and their organs in the country, the *Montreal Herald*, the *Toronto Globe* and

others, actually called on the people of this country to sing pæans of praise to them, because they entered on the work of enlarging these canals promptly which their predecessors had so long neglected to the injury of the country. In relation, therefore, to the canals they were undoubtedly responsible, and solely responsible, for the expenditures. Then, Sir, as to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Parliament of Canada had committed itself to the declaration that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be built by a company, aided by subsidies of land and money. That was the resolution that accompanied the contract with British Columbia. It was, in fact, part of the contract to all intents and purposes, and was accepted by the gentlemen who were here representing British Columbia; one leading gentleman from that Province, Mr. Trutch, declaring in a speech he delivered in the Russell House that it was part of the contract and that they were prepared to accept it as such. When those hon. gentlemen came into power it was for them to determine what they should do about the Pacific Railway. They arranged the policy. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) said in a speech to his own constituents that he proposed to go on with the work as a public work, because the country would then have the profits, instead of the contractors, in constructing the railway. And yet, after he had gone into the work, more as a matter of profit to the Government than of profit to the contractors, his friends now come down and say that they must not be held responsible for the expenditure, because, forsooth, the agreement that the Pacific Railway should be built was entered into before they came into office. More than that, we have had during the last three years, in every Session of this Parliament, declarations of the most formal kind—declarations recorded in the Journals of the House, which, if they mean anything, meant that that bargain was not binding on the people of this country; that it was a bargain to be executed or neglected just in proportion as the Parliament of Canada might consider it to be in the interests of the country to do consistently with the condition of its finances at the time. Surely, Sir, it was these same gentlemen who have thus formally interpreted the bargain for the construction of the Pacific Railway, who are responsible for the increase of debt involved in connection with it. That is the position in relation to this matter of the public debt; and I think, therefore, we might fairly say that on that question as in relation to the ordinary public expenditure, we can fairly claim that the policy of this Government, not as compared alone with the policy of their predecessors, but viewed simply by itself as a policy to be judged of in the interests of the country, is one that we can fully defend and one which the people of this country will amply sustain. Now, Sir, I come for a moment to deal with the National Policy. There is one fact, on which I think we may all congratulate ourselves, and that is, that with the exception of the particular surroundings of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), the condition of this country is everything we can desire. We find that every hon. member who has spoken on that side, from the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and through all the others that have addressed the House—and I do not say through all the others in any tone of disrespect—I say we find an admission that the condition of this country is eminently prosperous; that every branch of industry, every branch of commerce is in a condition in the highest degree satisfactory. We heard to-day from the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and I do not wonder that he was so good-natured, so pleasant-looking when he made the announcement, I do not wonder that it prompted his eloquence to such an extent, that, in his own particular business, this last year had been one of the best years in his experience. I think the

same thing may be said of almost every man, for whatever may be the condition of the country there will always be exceptional cases from exceptional circumstances of people who do not do as well as their neighbors. But I think we may fairly conclude that that is the opinion and that is the estimate of every man in this country in relation to the present commercial condition of the country. But, Sir, we are told—although the country is prosperous, although every industry is flourishing, although commerce is yielding a larger return to those engaged in it than it has yielded at any time in the past history of Canada, that this is not in any sense due to the National Policy—that this improvement is entirely due to Providence. Sir, I bow with awful reverence, with the profoundest faith, in the presence of that great mystery. I consider that now, as in all ages past, national blessings will follow national well-doing, and national curses will follow national wrong-doing. I am a profound believer in the over-ruling guidance of Providence; but I say the manner in which the hon. gentlemen have been dealing with this subject is little less than impious. It is a fatalist doctrine which they have proclaimed. They tell us, the sun shining and the rain falling will give everything that is required, and that nothing is left to wise fiscal laws or to the industry of the people. According to their doctrine men may fold their arms and drop on their knees and leave the rest to Providence; but if there is a doctrine of undoubted truth it is that Providence helps those who help themselves. In the very same breath in which they tell us that you cannot make men rich by Act of Parliament, these hon. gentlemen propose to make them rich by Act of Parliament, by changing this policy for another; their whole argument is that this policy is a bad one, an injury instead of a benefit to the industries of the country, and that if they were in office they would introduce an Act of Parliament by which they would promote the industries of the country and make men rich. Sir, we have great reason in this country to be thankful to Providence, but I think that in Parliament, dealing with questions of legislation, we may fairly confine our discussions to that legislation and consider its effects on the condition of the country, all of us recognizing how much we owe to Providence, without this perpetual invocation of that power as the one source of the increased prosperity of the country. I am sorry, Sir, and I say it in no irreverent mood, that this over-ruling power did not reach to the region of the hon. member for Charlotte, which seems to be the only place in the whole of Canada on which Providence frowns. I hope it is not a judgment on the people for sending the hon. gentleman to Parliament. Now, Sir, we are told that the whole of the increased prosperity is due to the fact that we have had better crops during the last year than we had before. What are the facts? The year 1877, for instance, was not a prosperous one in this country, but the very reverse. It was one of those years which hon. gentlemen opposite told us, happening to be a dull year in all departments of trade and commerce, paved the way for that great change which took place on the 17th of September, 1878. Now, what do we find with regard to the crops of that year? I hope that some day or other we shall have a Bureau of Statistics in Canada which will give us information on subjects of this kind. But in the absence of such information the annual crop reports, furnished by the Grand Trunk Railway, may be taken as official. According to them we find the state of the crops in 1877 and 1881 to be as follows: Fall wheat, there were 65 returns above the average in 1877, and only 45 in 1881, while below the average there were none in 1877, and 12 in 1881. Spring wheat, above the average, 53 in 1877, and 41 in 1881; below the average, 5 in 1877, and 9 in 1881. Oats, above the average, 56 in 1877, and 42 in 1881; below the average, 6 in 1877, and 3 in 1881. Barley, above the average, 47 in 1877, and 42 in 1881; below the average, 3 in 1877, and

5 in 1881. Peas, above the average, 43 in 1877, and 28 in 1881; below the average, 13 in 1877, and 23 in 1881. Thus we find from the only evidence of an official kind that we can get at, that the crop in 1877 was actually a better and larger crop than that of 1881. But what do we find further? We find that the value of the crop, as entered at the Customs for export in 1877-78, which was the crop of 1877, of wheat, flour, peas, oats and barley altogether amounted to \$15,375,486, against \$15,697,987 in 1880-81, or an increase in the latter over the former year of \$322,501, or only two per cent. Will hon. gentlemen tell me that this difference of about two per cent. accounts for the difference between the depression of 1877 and the prosperity of 1881? But, Sir, we have been told that the National Policy has lessened the price of cereals to the Canadian farmer. One cannot very well understand the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. When we are dealing with manufactures we are told that the imposing of a duty on the foreign article coming into Canada increases the price to the Canadian consumer by the amount of that duty; but when we are dealing with the cereals of the farmer, we are told that it has the very opposite effect and decreases the price of the article coming into the country. What do we find? I know that the hon. member for North Norfolk, the other evening, referred to the prices in Chicago as compared with those in Toronto. If they were disposed to deal with this question in that spirit of fairness which the hon. member for South Brant commended in his closing remarks, they would not make that comparison. They know the reason that at times prices in Chicago were higher than in Toronto. They know that for the same reason wheat in Chicago, during the last year, has been 6 cents. higher than in New York, and therefore they were perfectly well aware that it was not because of any question of fiscal policy either on this side or the other that this particular fact exists. On the contrary, it is due to that miserable gambling spirit which is eating like a canker-worm into the whole commercial transactions of the United States and this country. It is the result of the wheat corners in Chicago, where men seek, not by legitimate trading, but by *finesse*, by holding a hand which they think to be a strong one and going one better if they think it to be necessary; this wretched gambling which, as I have said, is eating as a canker-worm into the commercial honesty and honor of this country and the United States, is the cause of the fact that at times the prices of wheat have been higher in Chicago than in Toronto. But what is the general fact? I take the average value of American wheat exported from Canada as entered at the Customs as the easiest way of arriving at the facts in connection with this matter. In 1877, the average value of American wheat was \$1.50 per bushel, while the average value of Canadian wheat exported was \$1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$, or a difference in price in favor of the American wheat of 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per bushel. In 1881, the average price of American wheat for export as entered at the Customs was \$1.07 $\frac{1}{2}$, while that of Canadian wheat was \$1.03, or a difference in favor of the American of 27 cents in 1878, and of 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents last year. That is the fact as derived from the Customs returns in regard to the export of those cereals in the two years, 1878 and 1881. I do not say, I have too much respect for myself to say, that this is due to the National Policy. During the discussions that took place when those hon. gentlemen were in office, I never charged them with the whole of the depression that existed; what I did charge them with is this; that in the presence of the depression and in spite of suggestions made by wise merchants who understood trade and saw means by which the depression might at least be relieved and mitigated in severity, they failed to do anything. And although now I do not think that the change I have mentioned is due entirely to the National Policy, yet I do think it is an all-sufficient answer to the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the effect of the National Policy

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

has been to reduce the price of wheat to the Canadian farmer. If it has, then I ask upon what ground, hon. gentlemen opposite go down to the Maritime Provinces, as they did last year, and speak to the fishermen about the enormous tax on breadstuffs. How can a tax on breadstuffs be detrimental if the effect of that policy is to reduce instead of increasing the price to the producer? Let them take one course or the other. Let them at least have this amount of candor, that they will have the same story for all parts of the country. If they will only do that I venture to say we can meet them fairly on every platform. But when they go to Ontario and tell the farmers that wheat was higher in Chicago on a particular day than it was in Toronto, and that therefore the National Policy has reduced the price of their wheat, and when they go down to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces and tell them they are paying 50 cents per barrel more for flour than before the duty was imposed—when they undertake to adopt a policy of that kind, then I say they are not adopting a policy worthy of a great party, as they are, or consistent with that fair, proper and reasonable method of discussion which the hon. member for Brant commended to us at the close of his remarks, although I am afraid he did not act quite up to it during the progress of his speech. What has been the effect on imports of agricultural products into this country for home consumption? I take the Trade Returns for 1878 and for 1881. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) last year made a comparison with the Trade Returns one year earlier than I am now able to submit. Taking the years 1878 and 1881, I find there is a decrease in the receipts of barley equal to 285,214 bushels, the aggregate in 1878 being 302,147 bushels, and, in 1881, 16,933 bushels. I find that the importation of Indian corn has decreased 5,344,198 bushels, and I venture to think that the coarser grains of the Canadian farmers supplied that large decrease. Oats declined 2,089,933 bushels between those two periods. Peas, which are not a large importation, decreased 6,306 bushels; wheat decreased 5,558,759 bushels; rye, 145,598 bushels; wheat flour, 126,939 barrels; and I venture to think that the void was filled up by the productions of the mills of this country which had to that extent a greater home market for their output. Then I find this fact, which is of interest to the fishermen of the Lower Provinces and the people of Lower Canada, who do not grow much wheat and have to get their flour from abroad, that, instead of increasing the price by reason of the tax, the average price of flour in 1878, as entered for export at the Customs, which ought certainly to have given us prosperity in that year, if the mere condition of our crops is the one test either of prosperity or the reverse, was \$5.93 per barrel, while in 1881 it was \$4.65. The people of the Maritime Provinces had certainly nothing to complain of in connection with the price of flour under this policy as compared with what it was before. But how far has the improvement that has taken place in the country been the direct result of the National Policy? I quite admit that a change of policy with good times following, and with good times following in other countries at the same time, renders it extremely difficult to apportion precisely where the influence of the policy comes in in those improved conditions; but there are some facts which I think go to show very clearly that the National Policy has done its fair share in improving the condition of the people of this country. It has not been the only factor in bringing about that improved condition, but it is a most important one, and without it that improved condition would not have taken place to the same extent. It is admitted that Canadian manufactures are improving—that they are in a prosperous condition. It is admitted, moreover, that new manufactures have been started. I am not going into details to show whether the gentlemen who made the report to the hon. Minister of Finance made

a strictly correct one; they do not pretend to have done so; they have given an approximate report of the condition of things as they found them in the different cities and towns they visited. I do not propose to go into those particular details, but simply to state what everyone knows to be the truth, that there has been a large increase in the manufacturing capacity of the people of this country, as illustrated by the new industries that have sprung up in all parts. In spite of that and of the fact that the existing factories have been employed full time, it is only with the greatest difficulty that orders can be filled at this moment. Let me give you an illustration. Last year we had a provincial exhibition in the city of Montreal, and we had occasion to get an engine and boiler for the machinery hall; we sent round notices to a number of the people in Montreal who were in the habit of making those articles, and in addition we sent similar notices to other parties outside, for we required to have them within a particular time; and what was the fact? That only one man in Montreal even offered to do the work and when we went round and asked them why they did not make an offer, they said they were so busy it was impossible for them to get the order through within the time specified in the notice they had received. One firm from Stratford, who were anxious to introduce an admirable engine into the factories of Montreal and the Province of Quebec made a stretch to give it to us. We got the engine from Stratford simply because our own factories in the city of Montreal were so crowded with business that they could not possibly undertake to perform that small piece of work within the time required for our exhibition purposes. There is no merchant in the country who will not tell you to-day that he has the greatest possible difficulty in getting orders filled in almost any industry. Some of our factories in course of construction have been actually stopped that would otherwise have been going on; they have been retarded in their progress towards completion because of the difficulty of getting machinery from manufacturing establishments of that kind in different parts of the country. In view of these facts I think I may fairly say that the industries of the country are all most prosperous and busily employed now, and it is certainly admitted on all hands that they were not in that condition in 1877-78. Now is that due to the National Policy? Let me take only two examples. I take first the cotton industry, which is the special antipathy of hon. gentlemen opposite. In that industry there has undoubtedly been an enormous development during the last three years. The Hudon factory of Montreal is not referred to, I think, in the returns submitted to the hon. Minister of Finance, because it is not a new factory. It was in existence before that time, but it had two additions made to it since then, and if I am rightly informed another building very nearly as large as one of those additions, if not larger, is about going up immediately alongside of it. The Hudon factory has been trebled in capacity, and new cotton mills have sprung up in all parts of the country. We have the Stormont mill, the Hamilton mill, the Coaticook and Stratford mills, all of them in operation before the 30th of June last—new mills started as a direct result of the National Policy. Then we have in addition to that, a large number of new mills which were in progress at that time, which are approaching completion, and some of which, I believe, will be very soon in operation. I was glad to see, only the day before yesterday, that a new establishment near Montreal—the Merchants Manufacturing Co.—for the purpose of turning out white cottons, had been put in motion, and operations have commenced, and they are now turning out cotton for the Canadian market. And yet we find that in spite of the old factories and their enlargement and the building of new factories, we cannot meet the demand; that the imports of all classes of cotton goods actually increased from

1878 to 1881 by 66½ per cent. The hon. member for South Brant would say, by that process of reasoning which he adopts in this House, and which reminds one very much of the process by which a gentleman undertook to prove that fish-pie was better than heaven—he said fish-pie was better than nothing, nothing is better than heaven, therefore fish-pie was better than heaven. But, Sir, this large importation of cotton is simply an evidence of the increasing purchasing power, and of the increasing wealth of the people of this country. It shows that our people are to-day so very much wealthier and more comfortable, in so much better circumstances, that they are able, in spite of this enlarged out-put of goods in their own factories, to increase their importations from abroad by this 66½ per cent. But when we analyse the importations, we find that of the two classes of bleached and unbleached cotton goods that are going out of our own factories, there has been a decrease in the importations of 27½ per cent. What is the fair inference from that? It is that the National Policy has, by the establishment of these factories, been able to supply that larger want of our people, and has thus added to the prosperity and wealth of the country. Look at the further fact that, in 1878, we imported of raw cotton 7,243,413 lbs, and, in 1881, 16,018,721 lbs., very nearly 9,000,000 lbs. of cotton manufactured in this country more than was manufactured in 1878, and I believe more than we would have been manufacturing to-day of the National Policy had not gone into effect. We are told, however, that the cotton manufacturers are all growing rich, and therefore this improvement in the condition of the cotton trade, instead of being a result for which we ought to be thankful, is a ground for dissatisfaction on the part of this country. What has been the experience of people who have invested their money in cotton in Canada? Why, in 1877 and 1878 everybody knows cotton stocks for which people paid 100 cents on the dollar in order to establish industries and to improve the country, could be had for from 10 up to 60 or 70 per cent. of their value. You could have got the stock of the Cornwall Cotton mills at 10 per cent., and people would have thanked you for taking it even at that price. We find to-day that cotton stocks have gone up, and those who bought at such low prices are now reaping their reward. Is it any harm that they should make a good thing out of their purchase? Has anybody been hurt?

Mr. ANGLIN. Yes, a great many.

Mr. WHITE. Will the hon. gentleman explain who?

Mr. ANGLIN. Everybody who has had to pay the additional price for the cotton manufactured.

Mr. WHITE. Well, Sir, I shall go on with the argument; I propose to come to that point in a minute or two. I say that these people have not increased the price of their cottons, as compared with the foreign article, by the imposition of the duty. What do hon. gentlemen opposite propose? A 17½ per cent. duty, even if the effect were to wipe out the cotton industry altogether. In fact they regard that industry as something that, if weeded out, would be a national blot effaced. Then what would they have instead? Foreign manufacturers, cotton lords, cotton princes in New England and in Old England, instead of in Canada, sending their goods in here; and the consumer, because of the non-production of the article in Canada, actually paying the 17½ per cent., and the Canadian merchant's profit into the bargain. That is the way in which they propose to benefit the Canadian consumer. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not deny that there must be duty on those articles. They had a duty of 17½ per cent. themselves, when in power; and they tell us that that is the Tariff they are going back to; but they must admit that 17½ per cent. according to their principles, would be added to the price to the consumer, with the merchant's profits besides. I make the statement that, with manufactories in our midst, the price of the goods is

reduced not increased. The difference is, that when the merchant imports from abroad he is away from the area of competition, but when he buys from the factories in Canada, he is within the area of competition. An Ontario store-keeper may go to Montreal—take that as an illustration—and enter the establishment of Gault Bros. to purchase cottons, manufactured in the Hudon factory on the one side, or in the Cornwall factory on the other. At any of those establishments he may himself buy goods. Thus, competing with the manufacturers, we have the importing merchants, who are thus compelled to sell at a smaller margin of profit. But, by importing the cottons from New or Old England, with no manufacturing in Canada, the merchant would be removed altogether from that area of competition and would secure a higher profit—as we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite—a higher profit not only upon the price of the goods, but upon the duty as well. Those cotton lords of Canada, as they are called, have succeeded in making some money, at least those of them who were fortunate enough to hold their stock, or to buy when low. They are receiving a fair return to-day. But the price to the consumer of the ordinary cotton goods manufactured in Canada—and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to go into an investigation of the facts—is not, on the average, 10 per cent. in excess of the price in the New England factories, from which the larger portions of those cottons were coming to us before the National Policy was adopted. But there are cotton lords everywhere. One would imagine, from the speeches of those hon. gentlemen, that it is a sin for a Canadian to make money by investing in industries of this kind. He may lend his money on mortgage, and take what interest he pleases, add commissions and adopt any other tactics he likes in order to get a large sum out of the unfortunate who is compelled to borrow, and is respected by hon. gentlemen opposite, as a man to be admired. But let him put his money into an industry which employs hundreds of people, and furnishes bread to them and their families, and if he makes money, and is encouraged to continue in his business by making money, he becomes an object of dislike to hon. gentlemen opposite. In England, with Free Trade, cotton lords are well known; they are the rich men of the country; many of them have made enormous colossal fortunes, and how—by the protection which cheap labor gives them. Hon. gentlemen opposite will argue that that is a policy in the interest of the people of the country where it prevails; that it is a cheaper country to live in, where the toiling masses eke out a miserable existence on small wages—that that is a system that we should emulate in order that the cotton lords in foreign countries may make money by sending the products of that cheap labor to this country. Then, Sir, I take the case of woollen goods. I find that the effect of the National Policy in relation to them, or at any rate the fact as it exists with the National Policy—if hon. gentlemen opposite will prefer that way of putting it—is that the imports from the United States have declined 48 per cent., and the imports from Great Britain have declined only 4 per cent., or while the imports of cotton goods from the United States in 1878 were 36 per cent. of the whole, in 1881 they were only 20 per cent., so that this policy cannot be said to have greatly injured our friends in the Mother Country. The decrease in the importation of woollen goods in 1881, as compared with 1878, is \$476,907. To that extent and to the extent of the increased purchasing power of the people, we have had a home market secured to our woollen manufacturers, to an extent not witnessed before the National Policy was adopted. What do we find? The importations of raw wool have increased from 6,230,084 lbs. in 1878, to over 8,000,000 lbs. in 1881, or an actual increase of 1,810,203 lbs.; and that increase has been almost entirely in the finer grades of African or Australian wool, which we do not produce. The imports from the United States, of the class of wool which might to some extent compete with

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

our own wools, decreased last year by 157,000 lbs. I find that the exports of wool from Canada have largely decreased. In 1878, we exported 2,445,893 lbs. of wool; and, in 1881, 1,482,928 lbs., or about 1,000,000 lbs. of a decrease. The farmers did not raise less wool in 1881, than in 1878; the decrease was simply the result of a larger consumption of Canadian wool in the factories of this country.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you not think less wool was grown in 1881?

Mr. WHITE. If less was grown, all I can say is that the fact is exceptional, because there has been a larger production of everything else in the country. I know that in my own district there has not been a decreased production. But the hon. member for South Brant, who, I know desires to deal with this question candidly and fairly, will not say that the woollen factories of Canada have not been enlarged and better employed in 1881 than in 1878; and they must therefore, in the nature of things, have consumed a larger quantity of Canada wool, as illustrated by the decrease in the export of that article. What more do we find now? There is an enormous improvement. The woollen trade of Canada, I admit, is an old trade—in existence for many years. It has had an existence of such a struggling kind that, I venture to believe, that but for the change of policy in 1878, the number who would have abandoned the manufacture of woollen goods would have been very large. What do we find lately? In consequence of the present fiscal policy and the introduction of new machinery, a very great improvement. Let any one go up to Almonte, as my hon. friend and I did, the other day, and take a walk through the mills; let him look at the improvements in the machinery there visible, and at the enlargement of the establishments, as well as at the cloth turned out, and he will certainly experience no little surprise. Indeed to-day, no man need wear foreign cloth unless he likes. My hon. friend is pleased to refer to the Minister of Finance and to the clothes he wears. Well, that is a kind of *argumentum ad hominum* that perhaps has some little influence. I happen to have a Canadian tweed suit on; I like Canadian tweeds—not particularly because they are Canadian, but because they are cheap. I am bound to say that if people do not like Canadian tweeds and wish to wear foreign tweeds, I can see no reason why they should not have the privilege of doing so if they are willing to pay the duty. But what I mean to say is this—and I know it from my own experience, that experience that comes to a man who is not rich, and who is compelled to calculate what everything is going to cost him—that I can get a suit of Canadian tweeds as good in appearance, and, I believe, better in wear than a Scotch tweed of the same pattern, that I can get it at least, in Montreal, for from 25 to 40 per cent. less than the imported article. But if people will use Scotch tweed—and there are many who will do it as the country gets richer—if the people will do it, then I say let them do it, but let them pay the duty upon it. Now, I claim that both as to the Canadian woollen and cotton trades the improvements in them are the direct result of the National Policy; and I claim further, that in neither one industry nor the other has the price to the consumer been in any way increased by the change of policy. There are people who prefer to wear foreign goods. They are found all over the world. You find, as a consequence of this, in the United States to-day, in spite of the enormous increase in the production of manufactured goods in the country, an enormous increase of nearly 50 per cent. in their importations.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. Does the hon. gentleman think that is any illustration against a protective policy? It means that the people are using expensive foreign goods. There are persons, for instance, who will not wear Canadian tweeds, because

they say that when they go on the street to hail a carter they may find him with a suit from exactly the same piece, and, therefore, they prefer to pay the extra price for the foreign article. The effect of the Tariff in relation to the article of woollens has been this, that it has imposed the tax upon the shoulders of the people, who are the best able to bear it. There is no man in Canada to-day that cannot clothe himself from head to foot without paying one cent of duty or of tax, who cannot, on the contrary, get those articles just as good and at just as cheap a rate, having regard to the price of the raw material, as they are to be had either in England or in any other country where the articles are manufactured. But if he wants imported goods he has to pay at least a portion of the duty for them, and nobody will blame the policy which places that tax upon him. The effect of the other policy would be to drive these woollen factories out of the country, and that is the only way in which this matter can be argued. Drive them out of the country altogether, import the articles from abroad, and you put upon the poor man as well as upon the rich, the obligation of paying the full duty with the merchant's profit added. Now, I take another article, and perhaps hon. gentlemen will say it is my hobby, but I cannot help it. I take the tea trade as an illustration of the effects of this policy. In consequence of the differential duty put on by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and accepted by this Parliament in 1879, a very important result has followed to the trade of the country. What do I find? That the import of tea—and perhaps no better illustration can be given of the generally improved condition of this country than is to be found in the increased consumption of tea in Canada—we find that the importations in 1881 amounted to 16,647,015 lbs.; in 1878, they were 11,019,231 lbs.; so that the people of Canada have been able to use half as much more tea in 1881 in consequence of the generally improved condition of the country, the greater purchasing power and comfort of the people, than they were in 1878. Now, how has this trade been effected? I find the importations from Great Britain have increased 27 per cent.; that is a foreign trade. I find the importations from the United States, which is not a foreign trade in the ordinary acceptation of the term, decreased 11 per cent. I find that the importations from China increased 358 per cent., from Japan 265 per cent. The importations from other countries were not large, so I give the figures because the percentage might appear to indicate a disposition to mislead the House. The figures are 6,385 lbs. for 1878, to 59,657 lbs. in 1881, or an increase of 900 per cent., so that from every country except the United States there has been an enormous increase in the importations, while from the United States the importations have decreased 11 per cent. notwithstanding that the aggregate increase from all countries has been somewhere about 50 per cent. We have had importations direct from the Dutch East Indies to Quebec, of 47,475 lbs. Now, Sir, I know hon. gentlemen opposite will say these were not direct importations. They will ask where was the ship that brought these teas into Montreal or Quebec?

Mr. ANGLIN. The Flying Dutchman.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman can sneer at a question of trade affecting the interests and well-being of this country; he has no better argument to offer. But, Sir, these are questions which affect the well-being of the people of this country, and they will recognize and realize the conduct of hon. gentlemen who, in this discussion, have nothing but sneers to offer. They ask, where is the ship? What is the fact with regard to it? What was the condition with regard to this trade at the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in office in 1878? New York was coming to be the great centre or distributing point in relation to the

tea trade for the whole Dominion, and as merchants went there for tea, they went there for other articles as well. What was the general tendency and course of our trade? Every year there was an increased importation of goods from the United States, and a decreased importation from the Mother Country, and from other countries as well, largely in consequence of just such a policy as was involved in this question of a differential duty upon imports of tea from the United States. But as a result of these direct importations, whether they come from China and Japan to Montreal, or to Toronto or Hamilton merchants, over the American railways, or whether they come directly up the St. Lawrence, as a large quantity of tea did come—but however they came, they came as direct importations, as the result of business relations between the Canadian merchant and the producer in the foreign country, or the commission merchant or broker in the foreign country, thus leading to those relations of trade between the two countries which, in the future, I am quite satisfied will produce important results for the commercial prosperity of this country. The policy of the Government has restored the distributing tea business to the merchants of Canada instead of to the merchants of the United States. Now, I will take another article which may be considered a hobby of mine, and that is the business of sugar refining. I am not going to refer to sugar refining as it has been already dealt with so ably on the floor of this House. But I desire to refer for one moment to a sneering reference made by an hon. gentleman to Mr. Peter Redpath, who, it is said, has recently purchased Chisselhurst in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman who first made a sneering reference to that gentleman was the hon. member for West Durham, who, although himself a Chancellor of a University largely endowed with the public funds, and therefore not dependent upon the contributions of the benevolent and patriotic people of the country, ventured, at a public meeting in the city of Toronto, during an election, when he hoped to excite the popular mind against the sugar refining business, to taunt Mr. Peter Redpath with having contributed \$50,000 to a museum in connection with McGill College, Montreal. I am glad to know that it was not \$50,000, but \$125,000 that Mr. Redpath contributed for that object. I do not think it comes well from a gentleman who occupies, in relation to the higher education of this country, the position which the hon. gentleman from West Durham occupies, I do not think it comes well from him to make every man in Canada who is engaged in the industries of the country feel, if he contributed to the support of these great institutions, he would render himself liable in consequence of it to be traduced, villified and sneered at by public men. I say it was not what was to be expected from a gentleman occupying his position. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) does not appear to be aware that the Redpaths were an old family in Montreal long before sugar refineries were heard of in Canada. They made money in the ordinary course of trade; they were not only a family of wealth, but a family of respectability, and they realized what, unfortunately few rich men realize, the responsibilities which belong to great wealth, and they were always ready to contribute of the means they had accumulated to the promotion of objects of usefulness in the city in which they lived. If the Redpaths have made money by sugar refining they have made it by a close attention to business, by watchfulness to even the one-hundredth part of one per cent, in connection with their transactions. In fact I may say that they have made their money more as merchants than as refiners. They were taunted with making money in the old times, and the Molson family—a family of great business capacity—started a sugar refinery alongside of them. But it went down. It had not the skill which was brought to bear for the success

of the Redpaths' refinery, and it passed out of existence—an evidence of the fact that sugar refining requires great skill, great attention, great command of capital to make it a success. What occurred only the other day at the city of Halifax, and one cannot refer to it without a feeling of deep regret? A refinery was started there, and one would have thought that with the enormous profits which hon. gentlemen are always talking of, it would have been able to maintain itself. But it did not maintain itself. It has in the meantime, at any rate, suspended operations, and let us hope it will be able to renew these operations. But surely what has occurred proves that all these stories of the enormous profits that are realized as a result of the Tariff on sugar refining are simply fables to catch if possible the ear of the people of this country and of enlisting their sympathies against the National Policy. Mr. Redpath has gone to England, and it is said that he has bought the magnificent residence that has been referred to. With all respect to the unfortunate and distinguished lady who recently occupied—if she does not now occupy it—it never has had and never will have a worthier occupant than the gentleman who is now going into it. His going from here is a loss to the country. Men like him are few and far between in any country, and in this new country, where there are so many opportunities for the useful employment of wealth, such men are all too few. I am sorry—all his fellow-citizens in Montreal, all who know him are sorry—that he has felt it incumbent for personal reasons to leave the country. To find a man with his record sneered at and insulted in this House, because he has been able to do that which many merchants who have imported goods and made money could have done, as the result of employing his wealth in promoting the commerce of the country and building up a trade with the sugar producing portions of the world, is certainly what no one could have expected from hon. gentlemen having seats in this House. The point to which I wish to refer in regard to the sugar duties, is the change that they have effected in the foreign trade of the country. In 1877-78 we imported from Great Britain, 53,237,698 lbs. of sugar. We imported from the United States, 45,195,335 lbs.—or altogether, 98,433,033 lbs. From the countries of production we imported only 11,993,439 lbs.; while, in 1880-81, we imported from Great Britain and the United States, 21,263,390 lbs., and from the countries of production, 108,526,175 lbs.—a complete change in the current of trade in this country. Then, in 1877-78, when hon. gentlemen opposite had succeeded in utterly destroying the import trade from Brazil, we did not import a single pound from Brazil, while last year we imported no less than 23,603,875 lbs. Now, Sir, this change in the current of our trade shows us that as our other industries become more thoroughly developed we shall be enabled to send our surplus to other countries. This has been accomplished, and in addition to that an industry has been fostered in our midst which is so important in all its ramifications that even the leading apostle of hon. gentlemen opposite—Mr. David A. Wells—the great Free Trader of the United States, wrote a pamphlet to show that sugar refining must be taken out of the ordinary category of industries, and deserved the fostering and protecting care of the Government. The aggregate trade with South America has increased from \$669,804 in 1878 to \$1,369,731 in 1881; the aggregate trade with the West Indies from \$1,035,531 to \$6,742,933. These are direct results of the National Policy, so far as the imports from those countries are concerned, and, as I have said, the time will come in the nature of things when the multiplication of the industries and manufactures of Canada will give us a surplus for exportation, and when that time comes the business relations we have with these foreign countries will prove, to be valuable factors in the building up of foreign markets for the manufactures of Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

This brings up the question which was started by hon. gentleman opposite, relating to the decrease in our exports of manufactured goods. Well, all I have to say about that is this: that assuming that all the manufactories in the country are fully employed, assuming that new factories are being built, assuming that in addition we are importing relatively to the articles manufactured in the country as much as we were before, all these things being taken for granted, and they cannot be denied, they simply prove that we are finding a home market for these productions, which everybody knows is the best market. Now, Sir, I take as a further proof of the fact, that our factories are all busy, the increase in the imports of raw products, such as furs and skins, grease for soap, raw hides and skins, raw silk, wool, broom corn, undressed hemp, unmanufactured tobacco, raw cotton, gums, crude gutta-percha, machinery for mills and unmanufactured steel; and I find that in all these articles we imported in 1881, 80 per cent. more than we did in 1878; that is to say, that to the extent of that 80 per cent. we had the manufacturing going on in Canada, not only giving employment to the people in our mills, but improving the condition of the people in the neighborhood of the mills. The hon. gentleman for South Brant, in one of his speeches, referred to sewing machines as having been injured by this policy. He stated that the exportation of sewing machines had largely decreased. As a matter of fact it has decreased. 7,946 machines, worth \$107,806, have been exported less than were exported in 1878. Well, while the hon. gentleman was making his speech I thought I would write down to the manager of the Williams' Sewing Machine Co. in Montreal, and ascertain the cause of that circumstance, and here is the reply:

"In reply to your enquiries, I am happy to be able to state that our business has been very much improved by the operation of the National Policy. We are now employing three times as many hands, and making three times as many machines as we made before the National Policy came into operation, and we find our home market very much improved, that is to say, we find that more machines can be sold though we do not get any higher prices. In fact, prices are rather lower than they were, but we do not complain of this as we much prefer doing a large business on small profits than a small business on large profits; it is much more profitable and satisfactory.

"There is one point on which I wish to make a bold assertion, and make it with a strong emphasis, and that is on the question: 'who pays the duty on imported machines?' I say that the foreign manufacturers pay it. Let a Canadian dealer go to any of the American manufacturers for machines, and he can always get them cheaper than an American dealer by the amount of the duty. In other words, a Canadian dealer can buy machines from \$3 to \$5 cheaper than an American dealer can buy the same goods. Thus, the American manufacturer pays the duty which goes into our Dominion Treasury on machines imported into Canada."

Mr. MILLS. Then the duty can be no impediment to the importations?

Mr. WHITE. There is one of the wise sayings of hon. gentlemen opposite. I will tell you what the duty does: it ensures, to a certain extent, the Canadian market to the Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

Mr. WHITE. They can sell more machines, and they would sell still more machines if that duty was higher. The object of the duty is not to increase the price to the Canadian consumer, but simply to give to the Canadian manufacturer that confidence which will enable him to enlarge his manufactories, to produce a larger output, and ultimately to sell to the consumer much more cheaply than before. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who last spoke told us we were going to have new issues presented to the people of this country; he told us we were going to have as an issue that terrible bargain regarding the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have heard the hon. gentleman on that subject before; I had the pleasure, the inestimable pleasure, of hearing him in the town of Cobourg, when he appealed to the people in relation to this terrible, this iniquitous bargain

to which he has referred to-night. I remember his graphic description of that long night's sitting we had here; hon. gentlemen moved an amendment, affirming the principle that ought to be adopted; they made their speech upon it; no answer was vouchsafed; the members were called in and the large majority voted them down by brute force, and so the hon. gentleman went on with his description. Well, the hon. gentleman might, when he goes into the country next, at least tell the people that we had been discussing that question for six weeks on the floor of Parliament, that every single point in this series of amendments had been fully discussed, and that it was simply a question of whether there ever would be an end to the discussion in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the hon. gentleman made his statement, and what was the result? In that town where he made the statement 125 of a majority was recorded for the Government, and in the entire constituency, in other parts of which the hon. gentleman spoke, there was, with the exception of three polling sub-divisions, actually a larger Conservative vote polled than was polled in the election of 1878; and I think I may fairly say that what occurred in that constituency, in spite of the eloquence of the hon. gentleman, will occur in other places when the day of trial comes. Why, Mr. Speaker, the last subject which they care to discuss to-day before the people is the National Policy; my hon. friend knows, in his heart of hearts he knows, that he would give the best dollar he ever was worth—yea, more than that—he would give half his last year's business, if he could wipe the National Policy question out of existence altogether, if he could only close the mouths of the gentlemen who sit on the front benches before him from presenting this perpetual Free Trade view to the House and the country. He would give his best half-year's business if he only could by some method prevent them from ever proposing the Free Trade view of the Tariff. If stories be true—I am not given to repeating matters of that kind in Parliament—an effort was actually made to induce a constituency in this country to drop the ex-Finance Minister at the next elections. I know the hon. gentleman found it necessary to leave this House and go all the way to Centre Huron in order to be present at the convention, and with his gracious smile and pleasant face mesmerize it into negating the suggestion made in other quarters that he should be left at home that they might rid themselves of his influence on the subject of a National Policy.

Mr. PATERSON. I hope the hon. gentleman does not mean that I made an attempt of that kind; I have not heard of such an attempt being made.

Mr. WHITE. I have too much respect for the hon. member for South Brant to think he would do that secretly that he would not do openly. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, would be glad to get rid of this question. In their heart of hearts, if we leave out doctrinaires like the hon. members for Bothwell and Centre Huron and the hon. member for Charlotte, there is not a member who would not give his best half-year's income to get rid of the National Policy as an issue. But I tell them this now, that when the trial comes they will be just as anxious to get rid of the Pacific Railway contract. There is no subject I know of that has been a subject of controversy between political parties in this country, where the argument is so overwhelmingly on one side, and where, what is very much better, the facts are so much on one side as that in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We shall probably have an opportunity of discussing it before the Session closes, because, if what I hear be true, hon. gentlemen opposite are going to move amendments to almost every motion to go into Committee of Supply. I shall not object; it is a fair and legitimate course for the Opposition if they think fit to adopt, but when the time to discuss it comes there will be no difficulty whatever in dealing

with it. Then as to this question of locking up lands in the North-West, what do we find? If we wanted any evidence that those hon. gentlemen do not believe—I use the word in a parliamentary sense—the arguments which they are using in respect to the influence of the Pacific Railway, we would have it in the fact that a number of them are now risking their whole fortunes almost in land investments in that country, which if all that was said last Session be true is going to be utterly paralyzed by the influence of the enormous monopoly imposed on it. What is the position of the country to-day compared with what it was in 1878? When hon. gentlemen went out of office what was its condition? Its industries were paralyzed, its commerce was almost at a standstill. There was scarcely a merchant or a man who had a dollar to invest in any enterprise in Canadian industries, but looked with anxiety to see whether the same insane policy—and insane it was, in view of what was taking place on the other side of the line—was to be continued or not. The hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side, before the last election, and referred to a statement made by the hon. First Minister, that the very moment the elections took place and the Conservative party were returned there would be a revival of hope in the country. I say, there was a revival of hope in the country. That the mere passing of an Act was to operate as if by magic, without the influence of the operation of that Act on the country, nobody for a moment could believe; but what they would and do believe is this, because it is true and they had a right to believe it, that the fact of placing that Act on the Statute-book had this effect: more men at once looked forward to see where to invest their money in the industries of the country with a fair opportunity of receiving a profitable return. The attempt of the hon. gentleman opposite to contrast that the prices of bank stock in September, 1878, and September, 1879, when the hon. gentlemen know that matters were unsettled in the latter year in consequence of bank disasters that occurred at that time, the result not of what had occurred in the year immediately preceding, but of continued mismanagement which at last became developed and known to the outside world—the idea of stopping a moment to contrast the two periods, was simply to insult the intelligence of the country, and an injustice to his candor in dealing with questions of this kind. At that time business was paralyzed, the industries of the country were struggling almost hopelessly, our great North-West was looked upon by our best minds as an incubus, and people talked of abandoning it, and the people were looking forward with but a slight gleam of hope to the future of Canada. What is our position to-day? In every town and village we find reviving trade, in every homestead we find reviving happiness. The hon. gentlemen opposite tell us this Government does not make the sun to shine; but I heard a gentleman the other night say that this policy did make the sun to shine in many a household where formerly there was only sorrow, gloom and hopelessness. In regard to the North-West to-day, instead of its being looked upon as an incubus, we find our best men are going there. In every township of the country the hon. gentlemen opposite, like the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, know from letters they have received for maps of that country, that you cannot go into a bar-room or into a friend's house but the subject of the North-West is the general theme. In relation to the obligation undertaken by the Dominion for the construction of the Pacific Railway, we find that by the surplus of three years which the policy of this Government has brought about, and by the advantage which will result to Canada in saving of interest by the redemption of our bonds, which in the three years we shall have to redeem, we shall be able, without spending a copper as represented by the annual obligation by way of interest, to pay every

dollar we have undertaken. If hon. gentlemen opposite will only give this country fair play, if they will remember that though they are in Opposition they yet owe some obligation to the country itself, if they will remember that they may attack the Government in regard to financial administration, and the conduct of the Departments, but keep their hands off the country itself—I venture to say that the future will be brighter, will be one of which none of us need be ashamed. The hon. gentleman opposite has also been pleased to refer to the speech made by the hon. leader of the Government in Toronto, in which he said he would prefer annexation to independence. But, Sir, what was the occasion of that speech? There was a demand in certain quarters in the country for an immediate severance of the tie that binds us to the Mother Country, and the establishment of a national independence. That demand came from the newspapers representing the wing of the Liberal party, which is popularly supposed to be identified in sentiment with the hon. leader of the Opposition. It was urged upon the ground that political independence would put us in a position to secure more favorable trade relations with the United States, something in the nature of a continental Zollverein. But if influenced by that hope, we secured an independence to-morrow, do hon. gentlemen imagine that the people of the United States—who naturally would prefer that this whole continent should be politically theirs—in order to preserve our independence, in order to give us that separate national existence on this continent which we had sacrificed so much to obtain, would give us those trade relations? Not a bit of it; on the contrary, they would draw the cords in trade matters more strongly than they are to-day, until men, sickened of the poor results of their past efforts at independence, would say “let us have annexation, it is the only thing now for us to get in order that we have the trade relations that we have desired.” It was no wonder that the right hon. leader of the Government said better have annexation at once than such a miserable interregnum between the two countries as the result of this deliberate policy, which they would adopt to prevent our getting those trade relations as an independent community which we have not now, knowing all the time that the effect would be to cause us to look for them in another direction. Sir, the right hon. gentleman requires no certificate of loyalty at my hands; his whole career in Canada has been one of fidelity to the Mother Country. Why, the very charge which hon. gentlemen have urged against him was that so true has he been in his allegiance to the Mother Country, that he has even sacrificed this country in the interest of the Empire; that was the charge made from one end of this country to the other a few years ago. And now they wilfully misunderstand and mis-state a speech delivered by him, and they undertake to pose themselves as the special loyalists of Canada, and ask us to believe that the right hon. gentleman was untrue to the Empire. He requires no certificate of loyalty from either inside or outside of this House; his record is his best certificate. And wherever he is known, whether on the other side of the water or on this, he is known to be a true servant of the Queen; a true, loyal subject, an earnest, devoted statesman, who has with self-sacrifice, such as no man in Canada has ever made before, given a valuable life to the service of his country which he might have used to the enrichment of himself; and when he passes from us he will occupy in the hearts and memories of the people of Canada, as no public man has ever done before, the proud position of its best and ablest statesman.

Mr. LANDRY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2.25 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 17th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 116) to prevent the amalgamation of railways directly or indirectly under the control of the Parliament of Canada, unless under express provisions in the Acts respecting each of the companies amalgamated; and to provide that in no case shall such amalgamation be lawful, unless and until bonuses or privileges of any kind paid or granted to either company by any municipality, be previously repaid or restored, or the grant or promise thereof cancelled.—(Mr. McCuaig.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to cast on the present debate that valuable light which other speakers, more eloquent and better informed than I, have caused to shine upon it, I will not say since a few days, but from the time that this question of the Tariff was submitted, now three years ago, to the deliberations of this House and the approval of the country. Such is not my intention. Moreover, the question has been thoroughly elucidated; theoretically by learned dissertations developed by both protectionists and free traders, with all the knowledge they were capable of, in presence of this deliberative assembly; practically, by the working of the new Tariff. What more could be desired? I would certainly not speak to-day if I had nothing better to do than to tread well-beaten paths, and following in the steps of my leaders, to send up to heaven an eternal hosanna of admiring approval. Representatives of the people, we have other duties to fulfil, and we must leave to the past and to the men whose popular confidence has deserted, the care of recovering these lost vestiges, this embodiment of the servitude of the will and of the intellect. Totally different is the spectacle which meets our gaze to-day, a new evil shows its face even in the midst of the assembly where are deliberating the representatives of the nation, and the nation which is after all the sufferer, calls upon us to arrest this flood which threatens to overthrow everything. I am referring to that deliberate manner of acting of certain people, which has become systematic, of falsifying public documents when quoting them, of altering facts and figures, in brief of deceiving one's audience and the people who read us. This system is much more in vogue than one would imagine, and if for some time back it has invaded the columns of a certain press, it has found in this very House devoted proselytes who have endorsed it by their adoption of it. Some there are who have acted with malice prepense and with good-will, but the majority, I doubt not, have unawares, and in perfect good faith, lent the aid of an honest tongue to this unceasing propagation of error. What do the motives matter, after all? The error remains and we have to fight it, under whatever shape it comes before us. And it is because it has made its appearance in this House, and that a servile sheet has published it *con amore* in our Province, that I wish to raise my voice in protest, Mr. Speaker, and re-establish the truth if possible. In other words, I intend combatting the

errors given utterance to during the present debate by our political opponents in general and more especially by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret). I have listened attentively, and I am tempted to say with pleasure, to the speech of that hon. member, and if he has not succeeded in convincing me, I am bound to admit that he almost captivated me by the charm of his language, the flow of his speech and the ease of his delivery. The speech of the hon. member for Lotbinière, evidently intended in the mind of its author to become an important factor in the next electoral contest, may be divided into three parts, for it contains three distinct accusations brought against the Conservative party: 1st, that of having burdened the country with an iniquitous protection; 2nd, that of having increased the annual expenditure for Administration; 3rd, that of having increased the public debt. My friend the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) has already triumphantly replied to the first of these charges. His convincing arguments, strengthened by undesirable facts, and a reasoning not to be resisted, have destroyed the slender scaffolding erected by ingenious sophistry, and over which drooped in timid fashion the banner of Free Trade. Of this charge, nothing remains but the feeble echo which reaches us at a distance of 300 miles from the weak organ of a party destroyed by its own unpopularity. Let us stifle this last cry—after having pointed it out. The House will remember the interesting spectacle given us when the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), answering the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), called his attention, in the teeth of his own assertions, to what the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec had said, not only in this House, but also before the Special Committee organized by it. To the blow struck by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), the organ of the Liberal Party in the Province of Quebec has answered, and what does it say? This is what we read in the *Electeur* of the 10th March, 1882:

" * * * Mr. Coursol recalled to the memory of the House that Mr. Rinfret did not profess the same principles as Mr. Joly with regard to the Tariff. He represented Mr. Joly as a full-fledged protectionist. Now, it is true that in 1872, Mr. Joly came forward in favor of reconstructing the Tariff as a protective basis. But there is a wide difference between what was proposed in 1872 and the present Tariff. What was asked for then, was the free entry of raw material used in manufactures. And again, we asked for the conclusion of commercial treaties with all countries to enable us to dispose of our manufactured articles. If Mr. Tilley had proposed to the House a Tariff such as the one sought for by Mr. Joly, I have not the slightest doubt that the Liberal party would have adopted it with a few restrictions. The Hon. Mr. Joly never pronounced for a Tariff of favoritism and of monopolies like the one we have to-day. Besides, those who are acquainted with the rectitude of mind and the spirit of justice of that distinguished man, know that he is totally opposed to the flagrant injustice of the National Policy, and to the heavy taxation with which are burdened the working and agricultural classes of the country."

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the answer of the Liberal organ of the Province of Quebec. And yet we have more to show than what the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) pointed out to this House. We have authentic declarations; we possess a letter, signed by the Hon. Mr. Joly himself, and to which I desire to call the attention of hon. members. Ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, on the 27th January, 1872, a few citizens of Quebec met in the Salle du Patronage. Their number was small, but their ambition was great. There were there, elbowing one another in a room, the noisy celebrities of an ancient and dying party, young recruits, future commanders of the party that was to arise, and there was also, one need not be surprised at the fact, a corporal's guard of those discontented souls whose hopes had never been realized; they are the malcontents who are known everywhere and in every age. The meeting was opened with Mr. Joly in the chair, Mr. F. Langelier acting as secretary. The papers of the time have preserved for us the report of what took place at that memorable sitting. The first thing done was the forming of a committee of some

twenty members for the Quebec District; resolutions were then passed, speeches were made, and the policy of the new party clearly defined and notified to the country. Mr. C. A. Pelletier, who is to-day a Senator, proposed that as a panacea to the then existing state of affairs, the following reforms should be adopted: hence sprung into life there and then the programme of the national party. I do not intend to give it to you in detail, but there are two clauses of it to which I wish to call the special attention of this honorable House. The programme embodied in its clauses the line of conduct to be followed by the new party not only with regard to the Province of Quebec, but with regard to the whole Dominion. The programme was divided into two parts. There were clauses affecting principally the Province of Quebec, whilst others were to govern the Dominion. With regard to those affecting the interests of the Province of Quebec, I will call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the thirteenth clause of the programme, for I shall have to invoke it in support of certain arguments of which I am about to make use in favor of the increase of the national debt. This thirteenth clause reads as follows: "The Dominion to pay that portion of Canada's debt charged to Quebec and Ontario." With regard to what specially concerns the interests of the Dominion, there is clause 7, which states that "the national party will devote all its forces to obtain for us the absolute right of negotiating ourselves our treaties of commerce with other countries;" but, Mr. Speaker, that programme did not satisfy the ardent spirits of the members of our national party of that period. Speeches were made, and on that occasion, the leaders of the so-called national party thought the opportunity a favorable one to let the country know their views on the position of the affairs in the country. I have taken the trouble of collecting the opinions of the principal leaders of the party. There is, for instance, the opinion of Senator Pelletier. What did he say on the 7th March, 1872, at a second meeting called to approve of and confirm the proceedings of the first one? He said:

"Let us rather take into consideration the influence which keeps us at such a distance from the promised prosperity. As is shown by the resolution which I hold in my hand, we have not sufficient markets for disposing of our products. The manufactures, the different branches of industry which we could develop to such advantage, do not enjoy the necessary protection. Our country has immense advantages and yet it is the most backward country in America, owing to the want of encouragement given to manufactures, and the scarcity of markets for the sale of our products."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of Senator Pelletier, there were two causes to which we might attribute the languishing state of affairs throughout the country: in the first place, the dearth of markets; and secondly, the lack of protection for our manufacturing industries. In those days all the speakers who followed Mr. Pelletier confirmed the opinion of the hon. Senator; and this is the resolution presented at the time by the Hon. Luc Letellier de St. Just, which resolution was seconded by half-a-dozen of his most devoted partisans:

"5th. In order to ensure the development of agriculture, commerce, and industry in our country, to bring home our fellow-countrymen, to attract immigration, it is necessary that we should have every facility to help our manufactures to contend with foreign competition and to open new markets for our products; and this is only to be attained by our being allowed to determine ourselves our commercial relations with other countries."

That motion was unanimously carried. But not only is this the opinion expressed by these hon. gentlemen on the 27th January and the 7th March, 1872, but a short time before the leader of the Liberal party in this House, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), had the opportunity of making public his views on the question; and on the 9th November, 1871, at the time when the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska had chosen him as its representative, he said on the debate upon the Address:

"The principal cause of the evil from which we are suffering is, that up to the present time the production of the country has not equalled

the consumption. The Ministry might as well admit this fact, as it is not alone to bear the responsibility of it; the whole nation is responsible. It is a humiliating thing to be obliged to state that after an existence of three centuries this country cannot supply itself, and that, whilst nature has prodigally endowed it with all that is necessary to make it an industrial country, it is obliged to seek its supplies in foreign markets. Sir, many years ago, a great patriot, Mr. L. J. Papineau, when seeking a remedy for evils existing in his day, summed up his policy on that subject in the following simple precept: "Nothing must be bought from the Mother Country." I am of opinion that the policy expressed in this sentiment comes home to us with as great a force to-day as it did when it was given expression to."

Such was the opinion, Mr. Speaker, of the leader of the French section of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. His wish was then that the English markets should be closed to us, or, in other words, he justly wished to impose those high duties, and even higher ones, than those which he condemns to-day. He wished for a prohibitive Tariff, for a system which might prevent the Canadian consumer from going in quest of goods in the English market. Such were the views publicly professed by the hon. member for Quebec East. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you wish to know—it will answer more specially a few of the objections raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret)—what was the more particular opinion of the hon. member who represents in the Local House the same county as does my hon. friend in this House? On the 24th March, 1876, Mr. Joly wrote a letter in answer to questions that had been put to him by the Committee appointed by this House to enquire into the causes of the then existing commercial depression. Here are some of the questions put to him, together with his answers:

"2. Is it Canada's interest that we should continue to admit American products duty free, whilst Canadian products taken across the frontier are heavily taxed?"

"Answer.—No; it is against Canada's interest. My humble opinion is that we should admit free of duty only the raw material required for our manufactures."

Further on, Mr. Joly adds:

"4. * * * It is not by depreciating the price of everything that we shall attain national wealth. The higher we pay, the better for us, provided our means increase in par with the increase of price. Ask the workman which he prefers—flour at \$5.50 a barrel and no work, and flour at \$6 with plenty of work?"

And Mr. Joly goes on to say:

"9. As a matter of course our market is too circumscribed to allow us to employ all the hands which go and seek work in the manufactures of the United States, but we might yet employ a greater number than we do, were we to keep our market for ourselves, which we ought to do since the United States refuse to open theirs to us."

"10. Does the importation of American flour, free of duty and without reciprocity, place you in a disadvantageous position opposite American competitors? If so, state your reasons."

I call the special attention of the hon. member for Lotbinière to the answer of Mr. Joly:

"A.—Those who have grain to sell, must suffer seriously."

"12. As the *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. levied by the United States on flour, against the fixed specific duty of 20 per cent. per bushel of wheat, works generally as a differential tariff against the Canadian miller, is it, in your opinion, desirable that the Canadian Parliament should establish differential duties?"

"A.—Yes."

And that is, Mr. Speaker, just what Parliament has done.

"13. Do you think that the admission into the Canadian markets of horned cattle, horses and American sheep, subject to a duty of 10 per cent, whereas the United States impose a duty of 20 per cent. on the same animals coming from Canada, is damaging to the Canadian raiser of stock, and would you recommend a duty similar to that imposed by the United States?"

"A.—Yes."

That is what the present Parliament has done. And the declarations of the hon. leader of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec, of that hon. member who represented in the Local House the county which the hon. member for the county of Lotbinière represents in the Federal House,

MR. LANDRY.

these declarations, I say, constitute the best answer that can be made to the objections raised against the Tariff developed a few days ago by the hon. member for Lotbinière himself. I have given you, Mr. Speaker, the opinions of the principal leaders of the Liberal party. But it will be objected that these opinions were liable to have been changed. Yes, these opinions may have changed; and I have here to explain the cause of such changes, the declaration of another leader of that party. Thus spoke, on the 27th of January, 1872, a man who began his speech by the following words: "I am a child of the Liberal party, and I intend to die one." 'Tis he who is to-day a judge in the District of Arthabaska, Mr. Marc. Aurele Plamondon, and he adds:

"The scene has changed, and so have circumstances; political parties must, therefore, slightly modify their ideas and bring themselves to the level of the state of things, without concerning themselves who is the standard-bearer, as long as that standard reaches the position where it should be."

Such was and such may be the power that influences the actions of hon. members who constitute the Opposition to-day. Willingly will they sacrifice their ideas, willingly will they submit to the current forced upon them by existing circumstances, provided, as has been said by one of their leaders, their standard reaches the place where it should be. But why should I seek in the past the necessary arguments to controvert the assertions of the hon. member for Lotbinière when I find in his very utterances the most complete repetition of what he has said in this House. Now, what does the hon. member really say. He first lays down his thesis, and says: "The resources of a country, the nature of its products, its geographical position, its population, those are the four elements to be considered in adopting a Tariff. In other words, true protection is that which fosters the development, the resources, of a country in the interest of the majority." Such is his starting point, his first principle. From this point of view the hon. member thinks that England is necessarily a free trader, because it is *par excellence* the greatest commercial country, the great manufacturing centre of the world. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not tell us that England, before becoming a free trader, built up her industry by the adoption of an essentially protectionist Tariff; and for us, in the condition in which the country is, and especially our industries, it is necessary firmly to establish them ere reaching this free trade which the hon. member praises so in England; we must create our manufactures to attain this result; we must of necessity have protection; we must, as has said the hon. member, adopt measures to foster in a direct manner the resources of the country in the interests of the greater number. The hon. member finds that our population in Canada is insufficient, that our products are in small variety, that there is an absence of raw material, that there is no cotton, that the climate lends itself with difficulty to the production of wool, that the working of coal and iron mines is attended with difficulty. On the other hand, he finds in it inexhaustible forests, magnificent water-stretches and a rich and fertile soil. According to the hon. member, protection should tend specially towards the development of our sylvan resources, towards the encouraging of navigation and towards agricultural production. Such should be, according to him, a true National Policy; but further on, the hon. member takes to contradict by fresh assertions the propositions he has advanced before. He asserts, for instance, that the protection of manufactures ruins mercantile shipping, and to prove his assertion he says that in 1879-80 imports amounted to \$6,292,699, whereas in 1881 they reached \$8,554,397, i.e., an increase—I am speaking of woollens only—in the enormous ratio of 35 per cent. for the last fiscal year; in other words, the hon. member establishes that the protection of manufactures is not at all the ruin of mercantile shipping, since imports have, in 1881, increased

35 per cent. over what they were previous to the putting in force of the present Tariff. He goes on to say that protection has the result of imposing excessively high duties on products required in manufactures, and notwithstanding that, he tells us that instead of increasing, raw wool has decreased 30 per cent., which is at once a contradiction of his first assertion. In speaking of sugar, the hon. member asserts that the price of that article has increased, and he adds that the Tariff of the ex-Minister of Finance brought in more revenue than does the present Tariff. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Tariff of the ex-Minister brought in more revenue to the Treasury, it is probably because the duties at that time were higher than those levied now; it was necessary to levy higher duties, because it is duties that contribute to the increase of the funds of the Treasury. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the best answer to be made to the hon. member for Lotbinière, and to all others who pretend that the present Tariff is injurious to the people, is to make an appointment with them in presence of the people at the next elections. It was they who heralded that doctrine in 1878. At that time the country was suffering from commercial depression; at that time the Government in power could in no way remedy the state of things existing throughout the country. It was then that we came before the people in 1878. These hon. gentlemen pretended that they could save the country with Free Trade. We, on the other hand, maintained that we could not deliver the country from the evils from which it was suffering without adopting the more rational policy of protection. The contest took place and the people pronounced themselves in a decided manner for the adoption of protection. Isolated elections have taken place since then; from year to year, members have come before the people, either through a vacancy occurring in a constituency, or for other reasons, and on those occasions, when the people have been afforded a new opportunity for expressing an opinion, they have invariably—the facts are there to bear out what I state—by a large majority returned to Parliament members who supported the present policy of the Government. I will now come to the second charge preferred by the hon. member for Lotbinière, for I do not wish to abuse the patient hearing granted to me by this honorable House. This is what the hon. member says, when speaking of the expenses of the Administration:

"The accusation of extravagance brought against the Mackenzie Government was a bit of effrontery on the part of those who had increased public expenditure to \$13,000,000, in 1867, and \$23,316,000, in 1873."

Mr. Speaker, in order to be able to discuss it in all freedom, I think we should determine the basis of the discussion; it becomes necessary to make a comparative study of the two Administrations—between the first Conservative Administration, from 1867 to 1873, and that which succeeded it in 1873. I think it is important to know on what ground we are manoeuvring. According to the figures given to us by the hon. member, I understand that in his study of the question, he gives to us the year 1873-74, whilst he gives the year 1878-79 to the Liberals. If I am mistaken, I beg he will correct me.

Mr. RINFRET. If the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) requires explanations, I can give him some. I did not take into calculation the year 1878-79, because the Estimates that we made in 1878 were considerably exceeded by the Conservative party when it came into power; whereas we, in 1878, remained within the Estimates prepared by the hon. Minister of Finance; thus it is completely impossible for us to take upon ourselves the responsibility of the increase that took place in the Estimates of 1878.

Mr. LANDRY. I think that the hon. member is muddling the question instead of throwing any light upon it. If the hon. member gives us the fiscal year of 1873-74, I think that in all justice he is bound to take 1878-79.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. I think it was on the 7th November, 1873, that we lost the reins of Government, and those hon. gentlemen left office in October, 1878. Well, if they give us the whole of the fiscal year 1873-74, although they were in power nine months of that year, I think that they should take in exchange the fiscal year 1878-79; and I ask the hon. member if he will take that basis to establish any discussion whatsoever on.

Mr. RINFRET. I have given my explanations. I have said that we remained within the Estimates of 1873, and that our Estimates of 1878 had been considerably exceeded, and that we could not be held responsible for the surplus spent by the Conservative party.

Mr. LANDRY. This signifies that the hon. member holds us responsible for the whole of the increase which they created in the public service during the year 1873-74, but that he has not the courage to undertake the responsibility of the expenses for the year 1878-79. I expected more justice and more generosity on the part of the hon. member; and I thought that as he wished to shoulder us with the responsibility of the expenses of the nine months of administration during which they were in power, he would also have the courage to take the responsibility of the nine months of our administration in 1878-79. The hon. member tells us that we brought the expenses up to \$13,000,000 to which they amounted in 1867, to \$23,316,000 for the year ending 30th June, 1874, thus giving us the fiscal year of 1873-74. When, further on, he speaks of the public debt, he willingly forgets 1873, to be able to say that on the 1st July, 1874, our national debt amounted to so much, leaving to us the whole responsibility of its increase to that date. I ask the special attention of the hon. member, for I am about to show him the contradiction that exists between the assertions he has just made with that he made in his speech the other day. This is what the hon. member said: "The Liberal Government, during its five years of power, brought its expenses to \$23,500,000 only." But what does the hon. member leave us? Why, the year 1873-74. Starting from the 1st July, 1874, he says that the Liberal Government, during its five years of power, brought the expenses up to \$23,500,000; consequently, if the hon. member wishes to reckon five years from the 1st July, 1874, he is forcibly compelled to go to the 1st July, 1879, or calculation is a mere word. Thus, the fiscal year 1878-79, according to the hon. member for Lotbinière himself, must be imputed to the Liberals, otherwise we find that the Liberals were but four years in power, which is incorrect. Well, let us take the assertions made by the hon. member before this House, and let us prove to him that the figures he has given have not been given correctly, and that to the detriment of the Conservatives and the advantage of the Liberals. I will, in the first place, accept the gift of the hon. member, and I will take the year 1873-74 as one of our years, because the Budget that had been brought down by the present Minister of Finance, and who was Finance Minister at that date, determined, one may say, the expenses to be incurred during that year 1873-74. If for the expenditure of administration we take the figures given us by public documents, we find that from year to year the Conservative party, from 1867 to 1874, placed considerable amounts aside. We have to notice a period of surpluses. The first year, it is \$201,835.53; the second, \$341,090.52; the third, \$1,166,716.07; the fourth, \$3,712,479.09; the fifth, \$3,125,344.86, and so on from year to year, so that during the first Conservative Administration

we put aside \$11,075,063.39. The following table is a resumé of my idea:—

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Surplus.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1867-68.....	13,687,928 49	13,486,092 96	201,835 53
1868-69.....	14,379,174 52	14,038,084 00	341,090 52
1869-70.....	15,512,225 65	14,345,509 58	1,166,716 07
1870-71.....	19,335,560 81	15,623,081 72	3,712,479 09
1871-72.....	20,714,813 68	17,689,468 82	3,125,344 86
1872-73.....	20,813,469 45	19,174,647 92	1,638,821 53
1873-74.....	24,205,092 54	23,316,316 75	888,775 79
			11,075,063 39

What is now the balance sheet of hon. gentlemen opposite? They came to power with the programme of the national party according to which they were to reduce expenditure; yet, what do we see after five years of their Administration? In 1874-75 they have a surplus, the only one, alas, during the time they were in power, a surplus of \$935,644. But, Mr. Speaker, they regretted that surplus and did not repeat the offence, for the following year brought a deficit of \$1,460,027.60; the year after, another deficit of \$1,460,017.66, and thus from year to year, reaching at last a total deficit during their Administration, of \$6,426,958.51. I defy the hon. member for Lotbinière and the hon. members of the Opposition to contradict a single one of the figures that I have given to the House. But in order to be just, let us deduct the amount of their surplus from the total amount of their deficits, and we find an absolute deficit during their Administration of \$5,491,314.51, as shown by the following table:—

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Surplus.	Deficit.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1874-75	24,648,715 04	23,713,071 04	935,644 00	
1875-76	22,587,587 05	24,488,372 11		1,900,785 06
1876-77	22,059,274 11	23,519,301 77		1,460,027 66
1877-78	22,375,011 88	23,503,158 25		1,128,146 37
1878-79	22,517,382 14	24,455,381 56		1,937,999 42
				6,426,958 51
				935,644 00
				5,491,314 51

But, Mr. Speaker, I have not given you here the cost of the new Conservative Administration since the Liberals left power. Thus, if we compare the receipts and expenditure, we find that in 1879-80, the first year which can be charged to the Conservative party, the receipts amounted to \$23,307,406.69; and that in 1880-81 the receipts were \$29,635,297.51. If we compare now the expenditure together with the receipts, we find that in 1879-80, the first year of our coming into power, we had a deficit of \$1,543,227.76, not \$1,700,000 as stated by the hon. member for Lotbinière, and the following year we had a surplus of \$4,132,743.09. Now, if we consult the last number of the *Official Gazette of Canada*, we see that up to the 28th February, 1882, the receipts amounted to \$21,624,819.65, and the expenditure to \$16,956,817.25, leaving a surplus of \$4,668,002.40; if we add these two surpluses, we obtain a total surplus of \$8,800,745.49. Let us now deduct from that sum the deficit of the first year, and we get a final

Mr. LANDRY.

surplus of \$7,257,517.73, as is shown by the following table:—

Year.	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Deficit.	Surplus.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1879-80	23,307,406 69	24,850,634 45	1,543,227 76	
1880-81	29,635,297 51	25,502,554 42		4,132,743 09
1881-82	21,624,819 65	16,956,817 25		4,668,002 40
				8,800,745 49
				1,543,227 76
				7,257,517 73

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, if we compare the receipts and the expenditures of the Conservatives, with those of the Liberal Administration, we get the following results which I submit to the House: from 1867 to 1874, the first Conservative Administration, a surplus of \$11,075,063.39. From 1874 to 1879, during the reign of the Liberals, we have a surplus of \$935,644, but, on the other hand, a deficit of \$6,426,958.61. From 1877 to the 28th February, 1882, during the second Conservative Administration, we have a deficit for the first year of \$1,543,227.76, but, on the other hand, we have a surplus amounting to \$8,800,745.49, i.e., that for the whole number of years of Conservative Administration, we get a total of \$19,875,808.88, against a deficit of the Liberals of \$6,426,958.51. If, on the one hand, we deduct from the Conservative Administration the deficit of its first year, and, on the other hand, add to the Liberal Administration the surplus of its first year, we obtain the following grand total: Conservative Administration, a surplus of \$18,332,581.12; Liberal Administration, a deficit of \$5,491,314.51, as shown by the following table:—

Year.	Conservative Administration.		Liberal Administration.	
	Deficit.	Surplus.	Surplus.	Deficit.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1867 to 1874.		11,075,063 39		
1874 to 1879.			935,644 00	6,426,958 51
1879 to 28 Febu'y, 1882.	1,543,227 76	8,800,745 49		6,426,958 51
		19,875,808 88		935,644 00
		1,543,227 76		
		18,332,581 12		5,491,314 51

But it has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditure had increased, and that we had increased it by about ten millions during the time we were in power. Yes, the expenditure has increased. But it is easier, and the hon. member for Lotbinière knows it better than anyone else, that it is easier to cultivate at a lesser expense a property of one or two acres than one of fifty. In the same way, the more a country grows, the greater are the expenses. It is less expensive to govern four Provinces than it is to govern seven. But the hon. member, when stating that our expenditure had increased, did not add that the country had increased likewise; that instead of the four Provinces we had in 1867, we have now a considerable territory which comprises, besides those four Provinces, those which have been since added and which to-day form part of the Canadian Confederation. That is what the hon. member should have

added. Nevertheless, let us take what he says. In 1867 our expenditure reached \$13,486,092.96; in 1874, even if we take the year which hon. gentlemen are willing to grant us, our expenditure reached \$23,316,316.75, or a difference of \$9,830,223.70. Such is the increase of our expenditure; but, on the other hand, our receipts have increased likewise, but the hon. member for Lotbinière failed to say so. He failed to state that at the same time our expenditure was increased by the addition of the several Provinces forming Confederation, our receipts had so increased as to allow us to remove certain duties which were pressing on the people. As a proof, the duties on tea and coffee were removed in 1872 by the Conservatives and again removed by them this year, because the Liberals had re-imposed them in 1874. Well, what has been the increase in the receipts? In 1867, at the time of Confederation, our receipts amounted to \$13,687,928.49, and in 1870-74 they had reached \$24,205,092.54, or an increase of \$10,517,164.05. Now, if we wish to deduct from the increase of our receipts the increase of our expenditure, we still find a balance in favor of the Conservative party of \$686,940.26. Such are the figures supplied by the public documents. Let us now compare the Conservative with the Liberal Administration. Let us examine what the Liberal Administration has done during the five years that the hon. member says they were in power. In 1874-75, the expenditure was \$3,713,071.04, and in 1878-79, the last year of their Administration, the expenditure reached \$24,455,381.56, or an increase of \$742,310.52. Is that the policy of economy promised to us by the Liberal party when it blossomed forth in the Salle du Patronage in Quebec, which was paraded later on in mid-Lent, in the Quebec Music Hall, and then from Province to Province, from county to county, but no further than the county of Montmagny, for the county of l'Islet was then closed to the national party, although it was still represented by an old Liberal. Now, Mr. Speaker, whilst the expenditure was increased by a sum of \$742,310, what was the increase of receipts in 1874? The receipts amounted to \$24,648,715.04, and in 1878 they had fallen down to \$22,577,382.14; and yet hon. members had burdened the country with an additional tax of \$3,000,000 at one sitting, and \$500,000 at another, making \$3,500,000. Thus, if we compared the increase of the revenue with the expenditure, we find against the Liberal party a balance of \$2,873,643.42. The two following tables, the figures composing which are taken from the Public Accounts, show the difference existing in the increase of the expenditure and receipts between the two Administrations:—

CONSERVATIVE ADMINISTRATION.

Year.	Expenditure.	Increase.	Receipts.	Increase.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1867-68....	13,486,092 96	13,687,928 49
1873-74....	23,316,316 75	9,830,223 79	24,205,092 54	10,517,164 05
				9,830,223 79
				686,940 26

LIBERAL ADMINISTRATION.

Year.	Expenditure.	Increase.	Receipts.	Decrease.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
1874-75....	3,713,071 04	24,648,715 04
1878-79....	24,455,381 56	742,310 52	22,577,382 14	2,131,332 90
				742,310 52
				2,873,643 42

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the expenditure had been increased. It has been said that we had increased the expenditure by a sum of \$9,000,000, but good care has been taken not to go into details. Thus, for instance, we have acquired more property; we have aggrandized the country that belongs to us. We have, in consequence, increased the national debt, and yet the hon. member has not stated that our debt which in 1867 obliged us to pay only \$4,501,568.33 for interest, had reached in 1881 an amount that necessitated the payment of an interest of \$7,594,144.88, i.e. an increase of \$3,092,576.55. The same applies to the appropriations granted to the Provinces. In 1867, the population was not what it is to-day, and the Census of 1871 established a new basis for the granting of appropriations to the Provinces, so that the amount which was in 1867, \$2,758,966.46, reached \$3,455,517.73 in 1881, or an increase of \$701,552.27. The Public Works have also increased. In 1867, when our country was, so to say, emerging from childhood, we spent on Public Works a sum of \$126,269.78, and in 1881, owing to the increase of receipts, we spent a sum of \$1,138,765.93, or an increase of \$1,012,496.15. And then, we have had the Census. In 1867 there was no Census, and in 1881 there was an amount of \$127,033.56 expended on that object; and thus, from expense to expense, we reach a total for the interest to be paid on the national debt, the appropriations to Provinces, the Public Works, the Census, the Customs, the Excise, the Railway and Canals, the Post Office, Immigration, Lighthouses and the Coast Service, the North-West and Manitoba, of \$10,301,578.94, as shown by the following table taken from the Public Accounts:—

—	1867.	1881.	Increase.
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Interest on the debt.....	4,501,568 33	7,594,144 88	3,092,576 55
Appropriations to Provinces	2,758,966 46	3,455,517 73	701,552 27
Public Works.....	126,269 78	1,138,765 93	1,012,496 15
Census.....	127,033 56	127,033 56
Customs.....	477,503 82	717,704 31	240,200 49
Excise.....	78,939 00	247,577 05	168,638 05
Railways and Canals....	626,286 33	2,703,665 74	2,077,379 41
Post Office.....	616,802 21	1,876,657 96	1,259,855 75
Emigration.....	60,396 23	250,812 99	190,416 76
Lighthouses and Coast Service.....	174,982 78	443,724 36	268,741 58
North-West & Manitoba	1,162,688 37	1,162,688 37
			10,301,578 94

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an examination to be made which is not to the advantage of the Liberal party, but which it is most interesting to make, if we wish to compare the expenses with those of the Liberal Administration. I will merely take a few items. Let us take the cost of Legislation as an instance: In 1876, the Liberals spent for that purpose, \$627,230.67; and in 1881, the last year of the Administration of the Conservative party, for which we have details in the Public Accounts, we find that this expense was \$611,375.73, or a decrease of \$15,854.94. The Fisheries cost, in 1876, \$108,183.73; and in 1880, we asked for but \$80,560.35, or a decrease of \$27,623.38. Then there are the Penitentiaries; perhaps in the days of the Liberals there were more criminals than now. We must believe such to be the case, for in 1875 they cost \$337,593.55, and to-day they cost but \$301,366.29, or a decrease of \$36,227.26. Then weights and measures. It was in the good old time when those men had fine weights, but not many measures. In those days they spent on Weights and Measures, \$111,085.70; and the Administration which governs the country to-day spent, in 1881, but \$74,170.43 for that purpose, or a decrease of \$36,915.17. Police. Evidently this is the complement of the penitentiaries, for naturally, when the penitentiaries

cost higher the police must also. In 1875, the Police cost \$54,563.06; to-day it costs but \$13,525.77. Since the Conservative Administration has come into power tranquility has returned, and the police has no longer its *raison d'être*. Thus there is in that item a decrease of \$41,037.29. In those days Statistics cost \$67,552.16. We have reduced their cost to \$22,408.13, or a decrease of \$45,144.03. The Lighthouses and Dominion Coast Service, which cost, in 1876, the sum of \$545,848.62, now costs but \$443,724.36, a decrease which saves the people \$102,124.26. Now, let us come to Immigration. Mr. Speaker, the stream of immigration is greater to-day than it was then; more immigrants are coming into the country to-day than then; less Mennonites have come, perhaps, but still we have a greater number of immigrants to people our lands; yet in 1876, immigration cost the country \$385,845.36. We have reduced this amount to \$250,812.99, or a saving to the people of \$135,032.37. On the Militia, the amount has been reduced from \$1,013,943.84, that it was in 1875, to \$667,000.51 for last year, or a decrease of \$346,943.33. If, Mr. Speaker, you sum up the few items I have mentioned, you will find, on comparing the expenditure of the Liberal with that of the Conservative Administration, that there is, in favor of the latter a decrease of \$480,902.03, as shown by the following table of comparative statement of expenditure:—

	Liberals.		Conservatives 1861.		Decrease.	
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
Legislation (1876).....	627,230	67	611,375	73	15,854	94
Fisheries (1876).....	108,183	73	80,560	35	27,623	38
Penitentiaries (1875).....	337,593	55	307,366	29	30,227	26
Weights & Measures (1877)	111,085	70	74,170	5	36,915	17
Police (1875).....	54,563	06	13,525	77	41,037	29
Statistics (1876).....	67,552	16	22,403	13	45,144	03
Lighthouses and Coast Service (1876).....	545,848	62	443,724	36	102,124	26
Immigration (1876).....	385,845	36	250,812	99	135,032	37
Militia (1875).....	1,013,943	84	667,000	51	346,943	33
					480,902	03

But, Mr. Speaker, not only are there the expenses of administration, there is also the public debt to be considered. I will quote what the hon. member said in his speech on the 1st July, 1874. Said he: "The public debt was, in round figures, \$108,000,000."

Mr. RINFRET. It amounted to \$109,000,000.

Mr. LANDRY. I think I hear the hon. member say it was \$109,000,000. A million more or less is not of much consequence to the Liberals. At any rate, I will take what he said from the *Hansard*, and I find the following:—

"On the 1st July, 1874, the public debt was, in round figures, \$108,000,000; in 1878, it was \$141,000,000, or an increase of \$33,000,000 during the time the Liberals were in power."

Thus, according to the hon. member himself, the increase of the debt under the Liberal Administration amounted to \$32,000,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, such is not the case. But, before discussing this question, I wish to make a simple comparison. A country is governed, from my point of view, at least, in the same way as a farmer cultivates his lands; there are what is called ordinary expenses as well extraordinary ones. Thus, the Administration of Justice, the working of the Civil Service, the salaries of its employees, the expenses necessary for Legislation, are ordinary expenses for any Government; thus, for a farmer, ordinary expenses consist in the cost of cultivating his land, seeding it, har-

Mr. LANDRY.

rowing it, and so forth. But besides these expenses, there are others which increase the territorial value of the country in the same manner as a certain expenditure will increase the value of a farmer's lands; they are extraordinary expenses, for ordinary expenses do not increase the value of a property, they can only contribute towards the yielding of profits more or less considerable. But if a farmer buys the land of his neighbor, or if he carries out on his property works which double its value, naturally enough his earnings will not suffice to pay that increase; but then the farmer is justified in raising a loan. It is the same in the case of a Government of a country. When the question arises of increasing its territory, constructing railways, digging canals, then the Government is justified in raising loans to meet its extraordinary expenditure; and that is what both Liberals and Conservatives have done. Well, from that point of view, are we going to institute a comparison between the public debt under the Liberal and Conservative Administrations respectively. In 1867, the public debt was \$75,728,641.37; in 1874, when we fell from power, it amounted to \$108,324,964.42, or an increase of \$32,596,323.05. Such was, in 1874, when the Liberals came into power, the real increase of the public debt; but, Mr. Speaker, I read to you just now clause 13th of the national programme, wherein it is said that the Federal Government should assume the debt of the different Provinces, and in the British North America Act, I find at clause 112, the following:

"The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec shall be jointly responsible towards Canada, for the surplus (if surplus there be) of the debt of the Province of Canada, if, at the time of the Union, it should exceed \$62,500,000, and shall be obliged to pay the interest of that surplus at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum."

Thus, at the time of Confederation, in 1867, it was decreed that by that Act, that the debts of the two Provinces should amount to \$62,000,000, and that any sum exceeding that should be paid as indicated by that clause. Now, in 1873, the amount of the debt was thus exceeded, and the various Provinces were to pay this increase. Hence the clause in the programme of the national party, which sought to make Confederation take this increase to its account. Our opponents cannot, therefore, complain; it is one of the fundamental articles of their programme. In 1873, we consequently assumed the responsibility for a considerable sum by virtue of a resolution passed by this House and embodied in 36 Vic., chap. 30. This is what the statute says:

"In the accounts between the several Provinces of Canada and the Dominion, the amounts payable to and chargeable against the said Provinces respectively, in so far as they depend on the amount of debt with which each Province entered the Union, shall be calculated and allowed as if the sum fixed by the 112th section of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' were increased from \$62,500,000 to the sum of \$73,006,088.84, and as if the amounts fixed as aforesaid, as respects the Provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba by the terms and conditions on which they were admitted into the Dominion, were increased in the same proportion."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the debt of the two united Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada was about \$10,700,000. The Confederation having assumed that debt, it became necessary to grant to the other Provinces forming part of the Confederation a suitable proportion so as to put them on the same footing as the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The Public Accounts show that the Provincial debts thus assumed by the Confederation amounted in all to \$20,452,340.58. I showed just now that the total increase of the public debt was \$32,596,323.05 and if we deduct from that amount the amount of the Provincial debts, say \$20,452,340.58, which is not an increase of the public debt, but merely the transfer of a debt owed by the Provinces of Confederation which has assumed the payment thereof, we find that the actual increase of the debt in 1873-74 was but \$12,143,982.47.

But to this increase of the public debt, there is a corresponding and considerable increase in the territorial value, and on looking into the Public Accounts we find that during that period the Conservative party spent \$3,672,663.91 for public works. We see, moreover, that the Intercolonial Railway cost during the same period the sum of \$17,937,735.76; the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$1,391,619 80, and that the acquiring of the North-West, together with the necessary expenses of establishing an Administration there, cost \$2,920,000, or a total of \$25,922,019.47. If we deduct from this amount the real increase of the debt, which is \$12,143,982.47, we have a balance of \$13,778,037 to the credit of the Conservative Administration. To sum up, Mr. Speaker, from Confederation to the day when the Liberals came into power, the Conservative party governed the country, increasing the debt by \$12,143,982.47; but at the same time it increased the territorial value by \$25,933,019.47, leaving a balance to its credit of \$13,778,037. Let us now examine what was done by the Liberal Administration. When it came to power, the debt, as stated by the hon. member for Lotbinière, amounted to \$108,324,964.42. In 1878-79, when it was driven from power by the people, the debt had reached \$142,990,187.36, or an increase of \$34,665,222.04, and not \$32,000,000 as the hon. member for Lotbinière pretends. We must be fair towards our opponents and doing for them what we do for ourselves, allow them a corresponding increase of territorial value against that increase of the debt; they engaged in public works amounting to \$17,645,985.12; they spent for the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$11,052,617.30, and \$5,283,965.47 for the Intercolonial Railway, which expense increased the territorial value by \$33,982,567.89. But during the same period the public debt was increased by a sum of \$34,665,222.94, i.e., there is a balance against them of \$682,655.05. Such has been the consequence of the Liberal Administration. We returned to power in 1878. At that period, as I have just shown, the debt amounted to \$142,990,187 36. In 1880-81, according to the Public Accounts, it was \$155,395,780.40, or an increase of \$12,405,593.04. But to that increase of the debt there corresponds an increase of territorial value, brought about by the following expenditure: Public Works, \$4,413,035.02; Canadian Pacific Railway, \$9,013,026.35; Intercolonial Railway, \$2,656,747.40; Public Lands, \$334,681.41, or a total of \$16,417,490.48. In other words, whilst we increased the debt by a sum of \$12,405,593.04, we were increasing the territorial value by a sum of \$16,417,490.48, leaving consequently a balance to the credit of the Conservative party of \$41,011,897.44. There but remains, Mr. Speaker, to collect these materials, to place them together in one table, and to prove to the House and to the country the cost of the Liberal Administration on the one hand, and that of the Conservative Administration on the other. From 1867 to 1874 the increase of the debt under the Conservative Administration was \$12,143,982.47; at the same time, the increase of the territorial value, through public works, was \$25,922,019.47. From 1874 to 1879, during the Liberal Administration, the increase of the territorial value amounted to \$33,982,567.89, but, at the same time, the increase of the debt was \$34,665,222.94. From 1879 to 1881 the increase of the debt on our side was \$12,405,593.04, but, at the same time, the increase of the territorial value of the country through public works amounted to \$16,417,593.04. To sum up, the Conservative Administration, during the two periods of 1867 to 1874 and of 1879 to 1881, increased the public debt by \$24,549,575.51, whilst it increased the territorial value by a sum of \$42,339,509.95, or, if we deduct the increase of the debt from the increase of the territorial value, a surplus in favor of the Conservative Administration of \$17,789,934.44. Let us now take the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. They increased the public debt by \$44,655,

222.94, and the territorial value, \$33,982,567.89, which shows a balance of \$682,655.05 against them, as will be seen from the following table:—

Year.	Conservative Administration.		Liberal Administration.	
	Increase of the Debt.	Public Works Chargeable to Capital Account.	Public Works Chargeable to Capital Account.	Increase of the Debt.
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
From 1867 to 1874..	12,143,982	47	25,922,019	47
From 1874 to 1879..	33,982,567	89
From 1879 to 1881..	12,405,593	04	16,417,490	48
	24,549,575	51	42,339,509	95
			24,549,575	51
			17,789,934	44
				34,665,222
				33,982,567
				89
				682,655
				05

But I am mistaken, Mr. Speaker, for we have received more recent figures, and on Friday, the 8th March, the hon. Minister of Finance made the following statement in answer to a question by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton): The debt, on the 1st July, 1881, was \$155,395,780.40; on the 1st July, 1882, it will be \$154,085,910, or a decrease of \$1,309,870.40; the sum expended for public works and chargeable to capital account during the first six months of the present fiscal year is \$3,531,139. With these new data we get the following fiscal table, which briefly presents the actual situation of the country with regard to this question of the national debt. We have, under the two Conservative Administrations, from 1867 to 1874 and from 1879 to 1882, an increase of the public debt of \$23,239,705.11, and whilst we were thus increasing the debt by that amount, we were at the same time increasing the territorial value of the country by a sum of \$45,870,648.95, or a balance of \$22,630,943.84 in favor of the Conservative Administration. And during the Liberal Administration, we still found ourselves face to face with the same result, the balance to its debit being \$682,655.05, as shown by the following table:—

Years.	Conservative Administration.		Liberal Administration.	
	Increase of Debt.	Public Works chargeable to Capital.	Public Works chargeable to Capital.	Increase of Debt.
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.
From 1867 to 1874..	12,143,982	47	25,922,019	47
From 1874 to 1879..	33,982,567	89
From 1879 to 1882..	11,095,722	64	19,948,629	48
	23,239,705	11	45,870,648	95
			23,239,705	11
			22,630,943	84
				34,665,222
				33,982,567
				89
				682,655
				05

Mr. Speaker, those figures, better than any speech, better than ancient theories on Free Trade and Protection, show us that the Conservative Administration is a benefit to the country; for when, in 1870, the people cast off the hon. gentlemen who were then in power, it was sufficiently enlightened and the line of action then followed by it is a pledge of its action at the next elections. It is not the speech made by the hon. member for Lotbinière which will

serve as a programme during the next struggle. The figures which he gave in perfect good faith, I believe, but which in the face of public documents are shown to be incorrect, may perhaps deceive a few people in his own county; but in all the other counties of the Province of Quebec, we shall see at the next election a repetition of the judgment rendered by the people in 1878, viz.: Down with those who can only govern by imposing taxes, and power to those who work with their whole heart to foster the interests of the country. After a few years of power, we are face to face with a surplus exceeding \$4,000,000, and we are enabled to diminish the duties on tobacco and on many other articles. The word tobacco reminds me of what the hon. member said in his speech; it deserves to be taken up. He said:

"The duties on Canadian tobacco have existed since a number of years; they were imposed by the Conservative party and kept in force by the Liberal party for revenue purposes."

This assertion is perfectly harmless, Mr. Speaker, but, in order to be perfectly true, the hon. member should have added that not only were they kept in force but increased by the Liberal party. Those duties were increased by it to 10 cents, and when the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc) presented a motion for the reduction of the duties on tobacco, we saw the hon. member who preceded the hon. member for Lotbinière in this Parliament, Mr. Bernier, vote in favor of that amendment; but we have seen the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and other leaders of the party, vote against that motion.

Mr. RINFRET. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) should speak to us about his own vote in 1880 on a motion similar to that of the hon. member for Beauce, and about the vote of the hon. member for Beauce himself.

Mr. LANDRY. I am glad that the hon. member for Lotbinière should have raised that objection, and I will answer him in the very words of his leader, as he delivered them on the 23rd April, 1878:

"There is no one in a civilized country who would pretend that tobacco should be exempt from taxation; it is, of all others, an article on which every Government levies duties. At the present time there is not a civilized country that would venture to abolish this Excise duty and exempt tobacco from duty."

It is probably for that reason that last year the hon. member was one of that phalanx of eleven members who, during the past Session, tried to overthrow the Ministry on that question. Here is the further opinion of the hon. member for Quebec East, who adds:

"In the second place, it is impossible to levy a duty on foreign tobacco without levying the same duty on Canadian tobacco. If the duty is taken off native tobacco, the result would be to destroy entirely the revenue coming from that source. I am of opinion that tobacco is one of those articles that should be taxed, and that consequently it would be an erroneous and ruinous policy, so far as the revenue is concerned, the removing of the tax."

The hon. member for Quebec East goes further than any other Liberal member has gone up to this date, or than any other friend of the people, in the sense of the hon. member for Lotbinière. Another thing that deserves consideration is the following one; the hon. member, whilst explaining the increase of expenditure and of the public debt under the Liberal Administration, said:

"I do not intend to speak here of the enormous amount spent for the Canadian Pacific Railway, as every one knows who is responsible for this gigantic undertaking."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that sentence is not intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people of the Province of Quebec, and of the whole of Confederation, provided always that the speech of the hon. member be read throughout the country, if that sentence was not spoken with an electoral purpose,

Mr. LANDRY.

I think the hon. member should withdraw it. Better than any one else does he know how that matter stands. Let us now make the acquaintance of the friends of the hon. member. On the 12th September, 1882, I think it was under the Maedonald Administration, the following memorandum was presented—

Mr. RINFRET. That is a thing of the past.

Mr. LANDRY. The hon. member thinks it is a thing of the past, yet it is a memorandum drawn up by his party in 1882, and we are going at any rate to see what was the opinion of the Liberal party with regard to the Pacific Railway. A convention was held under the auspices of the three Governments of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that convention drew up the following memorandum:—

"The undersigned, representing the three Governments of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, assembled to consider the despatch of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated 12th April, 1882, concerning the Intercolonial Railway, having given the most careful attention to the important points raised in that despatch, have come to an understanding on the following points, to wit:—"

The question then at issue was the obtaining of a guarantee for a loan for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and one of the reasons given for making that request was the following. And among those points is the subjoined one:

"5. That the undersigned, in arriving at this conclusion, were principally guided by the firm opinion that a railway between Halifax and Quebec would form an essential link of a long and uninterrupted line of communication, crossing British possessions from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a road, in the construction of which all the Imperial interests in British North America are closely involved. And the undersigned, with the object of submitting in a proper manner that part of the question to the Imperial authorities, have decided that the three Provinces will shortly act in unison to demonstrate the high political and commercial importance of the western extension of the projected line."

(Signed),	J. S. MACDONALD,	L. V. SCOTT,
"	J. MORRIS,	WILLIAM MCDUGALL,
"	W. P. HOWLAND,	U. J. TESSIER,
"	F. EVANTUREL,	T. D'ARCY MCGEE, etc."

Such was the opinion of the Liberal party in those days; and if we refer to the speech made by Mr. Mackenzie, at Sarnia, we find the following declaration:—

"It will be necessary for us to complete our great national road across the continent, and I think it will be the duty of the Government, as it is its wish, to put into execution every plan that might tend to bring about such a result."

The *Globe* of that date is less explicit; it speaks as follows:—

"Nothing is further from truth. The speech of Mr. Mackenzie at Sarnia, distinctly gave to understand what was the line of action he intended following, and subsequent declarations have explained and developed all the ideas that had been then suggested. There is no doubt as to whether the Pacific Railway should be constructed or not. This question has been irrevocably settled in the affirmative, and there is not a single statesman in Canada who would undertake to defend the negative position on that point, on which every one is agreed."

But, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes to know the opinion of his own leader in the Province of Quebec, in the Federal House, this is what he said:

"Mr. LAURIER. We are all agreed upon this that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be built on Canadian soil; there is no difference of opinion on that point.

"Mr. LANGEVIN. Really!

"Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there are two opinions held on the subject.

"Mr. LANGEVIN. Your opinion differs from that of your leader.

"Mr. LAURIER. No; he said that we should proceed with the construction of the road gradually, as the country needed it. I have never heard any opinion expressed here against the construction of the Pacific Railway."

Well, after such testimony, I think that the little sentence ejaculated by the hon. member for Lotbinière should return into obscurity. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude the few remarks I have made on the question submitted to this House by

recalling the words of the French poet, one of the ornaments of French literature, written some centuries ago :

" On conte qu'un serpent, voisin d'un horloger,
(C'était pour l'horloger un mauvais voisinage)
Entra dans sa boutique, et, cherchant à manger,
N'y rencontra pour tout potage,
Qu'une lime d'acier qu'il se mit à ronger.
Cette lime lui dit, sans se mettre en colère :
' Pauvre ignorant! eh! que prétends-tu faire ?
Tu te prends à plus dur que toi,
Petit serpent à tête folle :
Plutôt que d'emporter de moi
Seulement le quart d'une obole,
Tu te romprais toutes les dents ;
Je ne crains que celles du temps."

That fable, gentlemen, contains a precious teaching ; the clockmaker is evidently the Conservative party which has given the policy of protection to the country, and the steel file on which the serpent breaks its teeth is protection. I need not say who is the serpent, but turning towards the members of the Opposition and taking them as a whole, I will read to them the following moral to the tale left to us by the great fabulist :

" Ceci s'adresse à vous, esprits du dernier ordre,
Qui n'étant bons à rien cherchez sur tout à mordre.
Vous vous tourmentez vainement ;
Croyez-vous que vos dents impriment leurs outrages
Sur tant de beaux ouvrages ?
Ils sont pour vous d'airain, d'acier, de diamant."

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak, it is not my intention to make a long speech at this advanced stage of the debate ; but for the little that I have to say, I wish to do so in that beautiful French language in which you yourself made from time to time such eloquent speeches ere taking your seat in the chair which you now occupy. I have listened with interest to the majority of the speeches of the supporters of the Government, and I must say that if I had but to take into consideration the general tone of those speeches and the most striking feature of them, I would feel somewhat disposed to join those hon. gentlemen in proclaiming that the country is prosperous, that our commerce is flourishing, that our manufacturers are making fortunes, and that our farmers have seen their labors rewarded by the splendid results of the last two years. But, Mr. Speaker, those speeches contain certain expressions of opinion that I am far from agreeing with, and certain appreciations of fact to which I cannot give my adhesion. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), whom we have just heard, has pretended to say in his speech that some of the leaders of the Liberal party had in 1872 made speeches, and others had published writings, in favor of a protective Tariff, and he concludes therefrom that they have contradicted themselves and that the Liberal party has shown a want of consistency on that question. I trust I may be permitted to say here that the individual opinions of a few people, even of the leaders, cannot bind a party as a party, and the only instance where one can say that it has a binding effect on the party, is when it has been given utterance to before the electors as a doctrine of the party. Then has one the right, should it abandon that doctrine after having promulgated it, to reproach it with inconsistency. The hon. member has spoken of the deficits which occurred under the Administration of my hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie). Let me state that these deficits were brought about less by an increase in the expenditure of the Administration of my hon. friend than by the considerable decrease of receipts. There was an increase in the expenditure, which it is well known was due to obligations which the hon. member for Lambton found imposed on the country when he came into power ; and again, no one has forgotten that the principal source of revenue of the Government are the Customs receipts, and these, which amounted to \$15,000,000 in 1875, fell to \$12,000,000 or \$12,500,000 in 1876. Therein lies the

true reason of the deficits which took place under the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton. At the beginning of this debate, we saw the hon. Minister of Finance present to the House and to the country a brilliant picture of our financial position, and at the same time attempt to paint in glowing colors the general prosperity which he attributed to what one is pleased to call the National Policy. His speech was received with oft-repeated plaudits from his friends in this House ; but those plaudits became the expression of a genuine feeling of enthusiasm, when the hon. Minister announced that for the last fiscal year there was a surplus of \$4,500,000. Really, looking at the enthusiastic manifestations of my hon. friends opposite, at the mere statement of that fact by the hon. Minister, one would have been inclined to believe that that excessive surplus did not come into the public coffers from the pockets of the worker, of the consumer, in a word from the people of Canada, but that it had simply fallen to them as did formerly the manna which fed the Hebrews in the desert. If, on the one hand, it is admitted by every one that a surplus of receipts arising from a strict economy in public expenditure, as well as from the working of a moderate Tariff, gives a subject of general and legitimate satisfaction, I ask whether there is any particular reason to rejoice and to allow oneself to be carried away by enthusiasm, because after ascertaining an increase in the ordinary expenditure of \$2,000,000 in the space of two or three years, one still finds oneself face to face with a surplus of \$4,500,000, as if that enormous surplus had been derived from some marvellous source revealed recently to the hon. Minister of Finance. Let me say to my hon. friends on the other side of the House that what they appear to consider as an extraordinary financial success, others have the right to consider it as simply the legitimate result of an odious and oppressive system of taxation. Now if my hon. friend, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), at the door of whose Administration one lays the bitter accusation of having allowed two or three deficits to accumulate—if the hon. member for Lambton—who, during the time he was in power, had the misfortune of seeing his country a prey to a commercial and financial depression, the most terrible, perhaps, which the world has had to endure for the last half century, noways taking into account the suffering caused by that crisis—had only had recourse to an increase of taxation, to this simple and easy method of covering up a deficit by increasing the taxes, he might easily, at the end of each fiscal year, have had a surplus instead of a deficit. But my hon. friend, true to his principles of frankness and honesty, rather than heighten the sufferings of a people already in distress by increasing the taxes, preferred to let two or three deficits accumulate, knowing full well that these deficits would disappear and become surpluses as soon as the crisis was over, without it being necessary to have recourse to an increase of taxation. It is thus that the hon. member for Lambton did not fear to risk his popularity, to risk the high position that he held at the head of the country, resolved if he had to fall to fall like a man ; and he fell, Mr. Speaker, but he fell like a man of honor, true to the principles that he had advocated during his whole life ; he fell, and I can venture to say that he fell carrying with him the heartfelt sympathies of his fellow-citizens, who, on the day after his fall, were proud to do homage to the integrity of his character and to his remarkable talents. Mr. Speaker, the statement that the hon. Minister of Finance should have been able to make to the House should have been one announcing a decrease instead of an increase of expenditure. The people had the right to expect such a statement from the hon. Minister after the blame cast upon the Liberal party during the last elections for slightly increasing the expenditure. The people had the right to expect that the Conservative party, on returning to power, would not increase the ordinary expenditure after what had fallen from the lips of the hon.

Minister of Finance during the last electoral campaign on that subject. Who does not remember that occasion when the hon. Minister, addressing his electors, severely censured the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton on account of a slight increase necessitated by obligations contracted before his Government came into existence? Who does not remember that memorable occasion when the present hon. Minister of Finance, speaking to the people, told them that a sum of \$22,500,000 was sufficient to defray the ordinary expenses of Administration? These words, under such circumstances, constituted a promise, a rallying cry, which was repeated from county to county, from husting to husting, by the friends of the hon. Minister. How is it that, after taking so solemn an engagement, the hon. Minister should be compelled to-day to come and ask the representatives of the people the authority to expend for the next fiscal year a sum of \$27,500,000—or \$5,000,000 in excess of that famous sum of \$22,500,000 which he himself declared to be sufficient for the purposes of ordinary expenditure. The people are not ignorant of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is they who will have to pay this additional sum of \$5,000,000. The people are also aware that it is from its purse that this has been ruthlessly taken, to be tossed into the public coffers, the \$4,500,000, constituting the excessive surplus of the past fiscal year. In the presence of these facts, it is to be hoped that the people will not be the dupes of the joyous manifestations of hon. members sitting on the right side of the House. In this debate, Mr. Speaker, hon. members on the right side of the House are making strenuous efforts to convince the country that the present prosperity is due to the operation of what is called the National Policy, and care has been taken to hold up to our admiration the prosperity which manufactures are now enjoying. I do not intend discussing whether this prosperity is real or exaggerated; but if that prosperity is as great as it is said to be, to what fortunate concurrence of circumstances, do I ask, is due that fortune which our manufacturers are acquiring so rapidly, and which has made some of them millionaires in a very short space of time. It is the work of the National Policy, I am answered from the other side of the House. So be it; but then it would be more explicit, it would especially be more precise, to say at once that it is the result of the present Tariff; that it is the work of the protective Tariff which creates this unjust privilege in favor of the manufacturers by an excessive protection; that it is the work of the protective Tariff, which, adding an artificial value to the real value of manufactured products, compels the consuming people of Canada, farmers, members of the liberal professions, workmen and laborers, to pay each day of their lives higher prices for the manufactured articles which they require than those which they would have had to pay if those articles were not so highly taxed. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that it has been said that there are certain goods which are sold cheaper in Canada to-day than in 1878; without stopping to discuss the exactness of this assertion, I say that the price of goods is ever determined by the unchangeable law of supply and demand, and that if it is true that certain goods are to-day cheaper in Canada than they were in 1878, it is because the price of goods has likewise fallen in those countries from whence we import them; it is because the production of those goods, as compared with the consumption, is greater to-day throughout the world than it was in 1878; or, in other words, that the supply of those goods, as compared with the demand, is more considerable to-day than it was then. But whatever be the price of goods, be it comparatively high or low, the consumer has ever to pay over and above the real value, the artificial value represented by the amount of duties levied on those goods. If I am told that the reduction in the price of goods is caused by a greater production of the same goods in our own country, then I will ask why do you maintain the high duties levied on

Mr. BROWNE,

these goods? As long as these duties are maintained the consumer has a right to say: "You are making me pay so much per cent. over and above the real value of the goods." Far from me, Mr. Speaker, be the thought of even hinting that the Customs should be abolished. I am not ignorant of the fact that in a country like this the Customs will, for a long time to come, constitute the principal source of revenue for the Government; but I share the opinion of those who think with modern economists that the Customs should be especially a fiscal instrument, and that in our country, whilst retaining its fiscal character, they can give sufficient protection to those of our manufacturers who are entitled to it. But the Customs must always avoid tending towards monopoly, because monopoly is naturally always unjust and odious, as its practical result can but be the enriching of one class at the expense of the greater number. It will, perhaps, not be out of the way, in the course of this discussion, to compare certain results with certain promises made to the people during the last General Elections. It is known that the opponents of the Government of the hon. member for Lambton, taking advantage of a crisis that was making itself felt, not only in Canada, but in the United States, in England, and in the whole civilized world, tried at first to convince the people that this crisis and the disasters which followed in its wake were attributable to the maladministration of the hon. member for Lambton. A remedy was suggested—we know now what that remedy is—but what was odious in it was disguised under a magic name, a name pleasing to the ear, especially to the ear of a suffering public; it was called "protection," and then one said to the people: "With protection will the golden age come back, your ills will disappear with protection; protection will cause the cessation of the greatest of the evils which afflict your country, the emigration of your fellow-countrymen to the United States; and not only will emigration cease, but those of your fellow-countrymen who have already gone to the States will be brought back into this country through protection." And yet the protective Tariff was hardly in operation, but one saw emigration increase to an alarming extent, hundreds of people, starting from the furthest parishes of the Province of Quebec, were daily crowding the trains going to the United States. One had never witnessed such an exodus as the one which took place in the fall of 1879, and the spring of 1880. It is but fair to add, Mr. Speaker, that the proportion of this emigration has considerably decreased recently during these times of plenty for the country, but no one would venture to state that it has completely ceased. As to those of our fellow-countrymen, whom protection has brought back into their country, I will not deprive the hon. Minister of Agriculture of the pleasure of informing us of their number, but he may feel certain that the country would be curious to get some statistics on that point. I will leave aside certain points that I might have made passing mention of, in order to arrive more promptly at an important part of the question. A great deal has been said during the course of this debate of the prosperity of agriculture. We agree on the fact of this prosperity, but we differ as to the principal cause to which it should be attributed. There are those who attribute it to the operation of the Tariff, or, at any rate, in a great measure to the operation of the Tariff, whilst others attribute it entirely to the action of Providence. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am one of those whose faith is greater in the interposition of Providence than in the action of the Tariff. During the past two years our country has been blessed with abundant harvests, and I am fully convinced that we do not owe any part of that abundance to the Tariff; but that we owe it wholly to Providence, to its sun, to its rain. To the advantage of a good harvest has accrued yet another: that of being able to sell our agricultural products at highly remunerative prices. But here I recognize again the hand of Providence, which has shown

itself most beneficent towards us, for whilst Canada was blessed with an abundance, which spread wealth and joy in the midst of our population, the European world saw its crops perish, owing to unfavorable weather. Hence a scarcity and a consequent dearness of agricultural products on the European markets; and in consequence of this falling off of the crops in Europe, we have been able to sell Europeans our abundance of agricultural products at more remunerative prices than usual. Such, Mr. Speaker, is the true cause of the increase in the prices of our agricultural products since a year and a half. The hon. members who sit on the other side of the House have persisted in trying to make us believe that that increase was to be attributed to the action of the Tariff, "for," said they, "the action of the Tariff has given our farmers the control of our home market." Well, I maintain—it is my humble opinion, although it may not be that of any other member of the House, yet it is my opinion—I maintain, I say, that in a country like ours, where we have an immense surplus of agricultural productions, the mere fact of this surplus gives to farmers the control of the home market, without the intervention of the Tariff. I should understand the force of the argument that a protective Tariff can give the control of the home market to the farmer, if we were like certain European countries, like England for instance, which is every year compelled to import large quantities of agricultural products for its consumption; I can understand that, in that case, a protective Tariff would give a great advantage to farmers and a greater control over the home market; but, in a country like ours, which every year has an immense surplus of agricultural products which we are obliged to dispose of on foreign markets to get something for them, I maintain that the mere fact of that surplus is sufficient to give the farmers the control of the home market. Under such conditions our market cannot offer any advantages for the sale of agricultural products brought from abroad. The American farmers of the Western States, against whom, practically speaking, our protective system has been instituted, understand their affairs full well; it is not in their interest to export their agricultural products to a market which, like ours, is supplied in abundance with agricultural products, but to a market where those products are in demand and where they can, consequently, sell them on better terms and at more remunerative prices. Now, let me give additional strength to my reasoning by an example: one knows that since a certain number of years, since we have had easy communication with the United States, the southern portion of the Province of Quebec—and I think that that branch of trade extends to the district of Three Rivers—sends a large quantity of hay to the American market. During the summer of 1879, after the coming into force of the protective Tariff, hay was selling, at least in my part of the country, at \$8 per ton. In the fall of 1880, hay began to be sold at \$10 per ton, and in the spring of the same year it was worth as much as \$15. Last fall, hay sold at from \$10 to \$12, whilst to-day it fetches scarcely \$10; it even sells for \$9. Why these changes in the price of the hay which we export to the United States? It is because corresponding variations have been felt on the American market; as fast as prices rose on the Boston market, as fast did they rise in Canada, and as soon as they fell on the Boston market, they fell in the same proportion on the Canadian market; this shows that the price of hay in Canada is determined by the value of that article on the American market, whither we transport it. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I say of hay applies to all other agricultural products of which we have an enormous surplus; to barley, of which we export a large quantity, but which we do not import; to oats, to peas, to horses, to horned cattle, to sheep, and to cheese and butter, of which we yearly export millions upon millions of pounds. With regard to these products, I say that our

market prices are not determined by the local requirements, but by the value of the products on foreign markets. One has given farmers to understand that under a protective tariff it would be easier to sell these products, because the Tariff gave them the control of the home market, and with that control, that market would be sufficient to absorb all their products. I ask what would have been the value of our products had we not been able to export some on foreign markets? During 1880, we exported, under the denomination of animals and their products and agricultural products, \$42,628,546 worth. Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the immense quantity of products which it has been necessary to export to realize that enormous sum, had remained in the country—that we had not had a foreign market wherein to sell them and to derive some profit therefrom—what would have been their value if we had had but our own markets to absorb them? Their value would have been *nil*, not even sufficient to reward the farmer for the twentieth, nay, the fiftieth part of the labor which this production cost him. Thus, as soon as we establish that to give a greater value to our agricultural products, of which we have an immense surplus, we are obliged to dispose of them in foreign markets, it necessarily and logically follows that the prices at which they are sold on our own markets is determined by their value on foreign markets, and not by the demand of our own markets. Now, if the rise or fall in the value of our products depend on the prices which these products are worth in foreign markets, what advantage can the present Tariff give farmers? Are we going to pretend that the present Tariff has the power of bringing about a rise in the price of agricultural products on foreign markets? Assuredly not. And if the present Tariff is powerless to bring about that rise, I say that it is equally powerless, whatever kind of a Tariff it may be, to give our Canadian farmer any advantage on the home market. But if the present Tariff does not secure any advantage to the Canadian farmers, it has at least the merit of working in a sense hostile to their interests, and the farmer has the right to say to Protectionists: "What do I care for your protection, which has not done anything for me? What do I care for your protection, which can have no effect in raising the price of my products? What do I care for your protection, which makes me pay on the woollens and cottons which I and my family require, a duty of 35 per cent. in excess of their real value? What do I care for your protection, which makes me pay on boots and shoes a duty of 25 per cent. in excess of the real value of those goods? What do I care for your protection, which makes me pay on the agricultural implements that I require for cultivating my land, a duty of 25 to 30 per cent. on each reaper, on each thresher?—which makes me pay a duty of 25 to 30 per cent. on every fork, on every shovel, on every rake, over and above the actual value of these articles, whilst under the Tariff of 1878 I paid only 17½ per cent. on the same articles? I am willing, adds the farmer, to pay certain duties as my share of contribution towards the revenue necessary for the purpose of Administration, but I object to pay exorbitant taxes which are not necessitated by the exigencies of the public service, and which can but tend to one result: the rapid enriching of certain men at my expense." My hon. friend the member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), in his answer to the excellent speech made by my hon. friend the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), in the course of this debate, addressed to the leaders of the Liberal party the same reproach which has been cast at them to-day by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry). He accused them with inconsistency concerning the question of Protection. I have but one word in answer to the hon. member for Montreal East, and I will content myself with repeating to him the English proverb with which he is so well acquainted: "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at their neighbors." Indeed

whom do I see sitting before me on the Ministerial benches? Most distinguished men, for whom I individually entertain the greatest respect, but who have thought they should considerably modify their opinions on that question of the Tariff. For more than forty years that we have enjoyed in Canada the advantages of responsible Government, all parties have been agreed on that question of the Tariff, and we have maintained a revenue tariff based on the principle of the English school. Never has this question of the Tariff been made the subject of a struggle between the two great parties who have divided popular favors. It is only four or five years since that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have seen fit to change their opinions and adopt the protective system which they offered to the people as a panacea for the evils they were suffering from. I could quote on that subject to the hon. member for Montreal East an authority which he no doubt will not reject—I refer to that of Sir George E. Cartier, expressed at a banquet which his friends gave him in 1870 or in 1871, and at which he said:—

“There are those who speak of introducing a protective Tariff. It would be a mistake; for a protective Tariff, by having the effect of diminishing our importations, would have a tendency to diminish our foreign trade.”

Such was the opinion of a man on that question whose memory is revered by hon. gentlemen opposite. Assuredly they have good reasons to respect the memory of that man; but while remaining faithful to his memory it is to be regretted that they have not also found it right to adhere to the economical principles of that statesman.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 20th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FLOATING CORD-WOOD ON RIVER ST. FRANCIS.

Mr. VANASSE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to regulate the floating of cord-wood on the navigable portion of the River St. Francis.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to ask whether this is the same Bill that was introduced last year, the year before last, and the year before that.

Mr. VANASSE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I should have thought all the cord-wood would have been floated down by this time.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

THE STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire again to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the absence of some important returns. The Canadian Pacific Railway returns, as to their lands, their money and their route, &c., which are very urgently required, have not been brought down. Returns as to railway supplies; as to grinding in bond; the abstract of the land returns; papers connected with the awards of Mr. Shanly, on the Intercolonial Railway; papers connected with the disallowance of the Streams Bill; supplementary papers moved for in connection with the Boundary Award, and returns in reference to the Welland contract and the taking over of Messrs. Murray & Co.'s contract, are all still required.

Mr. BECHARD.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as returns relating to matters in my Department are concerned, I have given instructions that no time should be lost in preparing them. I wish to say a few words in reference to the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton a few days ago, that the returns in reference to the Welland Canal are not as full as they should be. I communicated with Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, who did not, in reporting the amount that should be paid to the late contractors, act in the capacity of Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, but as independent arbitrator, appointed under Order in Council, with the concurrence of both parties. Mr. Page said that, in his opinion, to give more specific and detailed information would be to establish a dangerous and inconvenient precedent which would not certainly be in the public interest. When the arbitration took place in this building, the amount claimed by the contractors was very large, and the arbitration was a very important one, as hon. gentlemen will remember. Mr. Page was then appointed sole arbitrator as in the present case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Not sole arbitrator.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am giving Mr. Page's statement. There were two arbitrators, one for each block, the eastern and the western. It having been found a troublesome and expensive process to arrive at an award in that way, Mr. Page, as I understand, was made sole arbitrator in reference to this building. At all events, that was the statement made to me. At that time, the late Hon. George Brown was a member of the Government; and he advised Mr. Page in the strongest terms to make this important award a bulk sum, and not enter into details, as these, if given, would only furnish so many various points to which exception could be taken. The then hon. Minister of Justice, whom he consulted in that matter, gave him the same advice; and from that day to this Mr. Page has always, in the various cases in which he has been appointed sole arbitrator, given the award in a bulk sum, after entering into the most careful calculation of details to arrive at a just award. Under these circumstances, Mr. Page said he did not furnish the details; but, after the most careful consideration, had arrived at the amount that ought to be paid. If the hon. gentlemen will look at the papers that accompany this return, which is the specification on which the new contractors took over the works, they will find that it embraces a very close detailed statement of all the materials and everything taken over from the previous contractor, Hunter, Murray & Co., and a statement in detail of the property they were obliged to pay—some \$119,000—for or be charged with as received on account of their contract. Before bringing down further details in the matter, I, therefore, thought better to inform hon. gentlemen opposite of the opinion which Mr. Page had expressed, an opinion in which I entirely concur, and to suggest that Mr. Page would be glad to place at the disposal of the hon. leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for Lambton, the fullest information they can possibly desire, and will wait on them at any time convenient for that purpose. If, however, these hon. gentlemen consider the other course should be adopted, I am willing to leave the responsibility on them of pressing for more detailed information, and will not hesitate to adopt what course may, in their judgment, be thought necessary.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no doubt Mr. Page has acted in this, as he has in everything else, in a perfectly conscientious desire to serve the public interest; still, I am not always able to concur in the conclusions at which he may arrive, and I feel some delicacy in accepting the offer to look at papers which may not be open to be examined by other hon. members. I will think the matter over, and look at some of the previous cases, and, in the

meantime, put no notice on the paper until I arrive at some conclusion as to what should be done.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—
Bill (No. 48) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

The following Bills were considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Saskatchewan and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Clements Steamship Company (Limited).—(Mr. Wade.)

Bill (No. 34) to amend and consolidate, as amended, the several Acts relating to the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. McLennan.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Planters' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH AND CABLE COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria), in moving the third reading of Bill (No. 17) to grant certain powers to the American Telegraph and Cable Company, said: The Minister of Public Works, after having considered the measure, had suggested an amendment, in accordance with which he proposed to refer the Bill to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of striking out certain words.

Mr. BLAKE. What words?

Mr. CAMERON. The words relating to the laying of the cable across the Pacific. At present this Company has power to lay a cable across the Atlantic or Pacific. Inasmuch as the House, last Session, passed a resolution in relation to the incorporation of a company for the laying of a cable across the Atlantic and Pacific, I understand the Minister of Public Works thinks that this Bill should limit the powers of the Company to the Atlantic. I therefore move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend it by striking out the words "Pacific Ocean."

Motion agreed to.

Bill amended in Committee and reported.

Mr. CAMERON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this Bill on the same lines as the Bill we passed, I think, last Session, giving the promoters, I believe a British corporation, certain powers?

Mr. CAMERON. It was a French Company. The powers are, verbatim, the same.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. GAULT moved the third reading of Bill (No. 4) respecting the Sun Mutual Life Insurance Company of Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I move an amendment that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to add the following clause:—

"Section 9 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting the word "twenty-five."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the precise effect of this?

Mr. WHITE. On moving this amendment last Monday, I explained its object. It is intended simply to enable the Company to have directors in different places on a smaller qualification than provided for in the present Bill. The Bill requires a qualification of \$5,000, or the possession of

fifty shares, and my amendment is designed to make the qualification twenty-five shares instead, in order to give the company the benefit of the services of gentlemen who would prefer to qualify on twenty-five shares. The qualification for the Canada Life is but one share, and I think there are prominent members who are directors of it on no larger qualification.

Bill amended in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

NEW YORK AND ONTARIO FURNACE COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 65) respecting the New York and Ontario Furnace Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this Bill, which seems to me to be rather of an objectionable character. I presume it has not been amended in Committee, but if it has, we have had no information of it. The Bill recites that the New York and Ontario Furnace Company has been "duly incorporated under the General Laws of the State of New Jersey and of the United States of America," and it expresses a desire "to mine for and ship iron ore and manufacture iron in its various forms, at various places within the Dominion of Canada, and for such purposes is desirous of having its organization and corporate powers recognized by the Parliament of Canada and extended to the Dominion." There is no information as to the character of this Company, the nature of its organization, what its corporate powers are, or who the incorporators are. As a foreign corporation, I admit it is within our competency to give it the corporate powers which are within our jurisdiction, whether they are created by a foreign State or by one of the Provinces, though I think that is an objectionable course unless there is a sufficient reason for it. The foreign corporation is granted power, and this is its main power—to acquire real and personal property in any Province. Now, it seems to me, first of all, that unless there is some overruling clause to the contrary, our legislation ought to be in the direction of creating ourselves the corporation to which we give power. We have just had an instance of the contrary. The Bill which has just been read, without exception, promoted by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), the Cable Company's Bill, was a Bill granting to a foreign corporation certain powers here. Why was that unobjectionable? Because that corporation created by the foreign Government had obtained powers from that Government essentially to the carrying on of its enterprise, which we could not give, and therefore it is impossible, save by joint action of that description to invest a single corporation with the whole powers. That is a good reason, from my point of view, for our incorporating the entity which we have just recognized with the power of landing its cable on the shores, with certain other powers which it was necessary for them to have, and which they could only get by the joint legislative authority of two Legislatures of independent jurisdiction. But that reasoning does not apply to this case at all. All that is wanting to be done by the New York and Ontario Furnace Company can be done by a corporation composed, if you will, of the same proprietors as the company in this country. They can buy as they can acquire personal property, they can mine and carry on business, and there is no difficulty in their completing the whole of their operations by virtue of a Provincial or Canadian incorporation, as the case may be. That is the first difficulty I have in acceding to the third reading of this Bill, that, without a clause which would justify a course obviously inconvenient, we are simply recognizing a foreign entity and giving it powers. The next objection is this: that we are practically, as I am afraid, transcending our jurisdiction and acting upon the jurisdictions

of the local bodies. It seems to me that the practical operation of this Bill is, that this Company or these corporators desire to own and work some mines in the Province of Ontario, and they ask us to give them power to acquire real and personal estate. Now, I say that our only power to do so is limited to the cases in which that is a necessary incident of some other power, as, for example, when we create a railway company, in accordance with our indisputable right to create certain classes of railway corporations, inasmuch as we know that it is a necessary incident to that power that a railway company shall have power to expropriate and hold lands, and we assume to ourselves the right to give them that power. But it does seem to me that in this case the primary object of this Company is to obtain the right to hold real and personal estate within the Province of Ontario or some other Provinces, I care not how many, and to work them. It seems to me we ought not so to interfere, it might be contrary to the policy of a particular Province to allow any corporate body to hold any land in that Province. The question of property and civil rights is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province, save in so far as we are empowered incidentally to meddle with those subjects. The mere circumstance that we have something to do in the regulation of trade and commerce does not give us the power, as a general rule, simply to incorporate private companies, who are going to carry on trades. That is a different thing altogether from the general regulation of trade and commerce, as has been demonstrated in some recent decisions. Therefore, it seems to me the Bill is one deserving the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My hon. friend has just said he understands that no amendment was made in Committee, which is not the case. In the Committee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, some material amendments were made and, if I am not mistaken, an amendment was made declaring the incorporation of this body was for the general advantage of the country. If that be so, that amendment would clearly bring it within the functions and powers of the Legislature.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. Certainly that would bring it within the functions of this Parliament, if that declaration were made in this Act. Is not the erection of furnaces and the carrying on of smelting a business of a public character in that sense within the Act?

Mr. BLAKE. I think my hon. friend will find that that applies to public works and undertakings declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON. Granted that it does. It has been applied to railways and other works purely local in their character, repeatedly in this Parliament, whether rightly or wrongly, I am not going to argue now. I have my own opinion as to the proper construction of that clause, but it has undoubtedly so been applied in our past legislation. A discussion upon the point that my hon. friend from West Durham has just raised occurred in the Private Bills Committee, and the question as to its involving property and civil rights was also discussed there at considerable length in reference to this Bill. It was found, however, that this House had in former Sessions passed more than one Bill of just this character, giving to a foreign company and corporation corporate powers in Canada, without insisting upon their being organized upon the laws of Canada, or their stockholders being residents here, and without any of those securities that the Legislature used to throw around incorporations of a public body; that we, at any rate, as a Committee only followed the established course of legislation in allowing the Bill to pass. I mentioned that to show that the matter was discussed and

Mr. BLAKE.

considered by the Private Bills Committee, and that we have only followed the precedent of allowing the Bill to pass in the shape in which it ultimately passed the Committee. The question, however, is a large one, and one which is well deserving the attention of the House, and I am glad the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has referred to it. Personally, I may say, that I am not at this moment prepared to accede to the position that we should give to companies incorporated abroad, for any purpose whatever, a corporate existence here, without knowing their strength and power of carrying on a business which, in regard to companies whose corporate powers originate in Canada, are so carefully looked after in the general Act. The principle, however, is one which, as I have already remarked, deserves the careful attention of the House. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), who had charge of the Bill before the Committee, argued that to throw restrictions in the way of giving corporate powers to foreign companies would be unnecessarily to keep out of the country a large amount of foreign capital which it would be desirable to have embarked in Canada. Under the Joint Stock Companies Act, it is necessary, I believe, that a certain number of the directors if not of the subscribers are required to be British subjects, and he argued that to compel them to go through the form and incur the delay, trouble and expense necessary to incorporation under the Act, would be to deter the influx of very desirable capital. He said that in this particular case the Company desired to put up smelting works, and also to carry on the business of mining and shipping iron ore largely to the United States, which would involve transportation in vessels, and in interchange of trade between the countries, and that, therefore, their incorporation would not be within the powers of any of the Provinces. He also pointed out that to refuse them corporate powers would be to retard the development of our iron industry, and exclude a large amount of foreign capital which it was very desirable to get into the country. I believe he stated that the capital of the Company was \$1,225,000, and he instanced the fact that a company was incorporated the Session before last called the Consolidated Gold Mining Company to carry on gold mining in his own county, and that they had received their powers by an Act exactly like this. That Company has since brought into Canada a large amount of American capital, and is now carrying on an extensive business by virtue of the incorporation which it procured the Session before last. The same powers were granted last Session, I believe, to an English Company—the Winslow-Jones Canning Company—which carried on its operations in the Lower Province. If, however, the House should now take a retrograde step and declare that it is not in the interests of Canada to give this kind of incorporation well and good, but we shall be reversing the course of our legislation for some time back.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say that I have looked into the Bill, and I find that it has not been amended in Committee as supposed by the hon. gentleman.

Bill read the third time and passed.

EDISON ELECTRIC LIGHT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. There was a strong feeling among many members of the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills that this Bill was one that more properly fell within local jurisdiction than perhaps any other Bill before the Committee this Session. The powers which it asks, the nature

of the operations which it is proposed to carry on, prove that the Company should have sought an Act of incorporation from the Local Legislatures and not from this Parliament. There is nothing like trade or commerce connected with the operations of a company organized for this purpose. It is practically local in its character; it is for the purpose of carrying on a certain class of business within a certain locality, and, as this Company must be subject to municipal regulations, it should therefore receive its powers from Local Legislatures, but if this Bill were passed the Company might claim to be entirely free and exempt from municipal control. It is proposed to give the Company certain powers of expropriation and certain easements with respect to lands belonging to private parties. We cannot impart to a company any powers this Parliament does not possess, and we do not possess any such power as is proposed to be given by this Bill. The British North America Act defines that the control of property and civil rights is with the Local Legislatures of the different Provinces; in so far as this Parliament has any power at all it is expressly vested in it for special purposes, and it had no right to go outside those special purposes as it seems to me it will do if it undertakes to incorporate this Company. I say nothing about the merits of the enterprise; it may be greatly in the public interest that an organization of this kind should receive an Act of incorporation, but the point I desire to impress upon the Committee is, that this Parliament has no jurisdiction over the subject proposed to be dealt with by the Bill, and that the parties should have sought incorporation elsewhere and not from the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. COLBY. The object to be attained by the incorporation of this Company and other companies of a like character, is one with which the House and the country at large will undoubtedly have great sympathy, and one in which they will feel a very great interest. We all know the great expenditure of capital and the consecration of lives of many eminent men that have taken place for the purpose of solving this problem of an economical and improved light. We know the very satisfactory results which have been attained in France, England and the United States, that very rapid progress has been made, and that the problem may be now looked upon as practically solved. Those gentlemen who have devoted themselves so entirely to the solving of this problem, are prepared to introduce their system into Canada. Capitalists in this country are prepared to join them in the enterprise, and they simply ask from this Parliament the power which it has granted to telephone and similar companies which desired to do business through the Dominion broadly, and not in any special Province, city or locality. It stands precisely on the same footing in that respect as the telephone companies, which have been already incorporated by this Parliament. With respect to the power of expropriation there is no such power properly so called contained in the Bill. There was in the Bill, as I introduced it, certain powers of expropriation, and the question was carefully considered in Committee. Those powers were withdrawn. The only power left was a clause by which, under certain conditions, the wires may be placed under ground so as not to interfere with any houses or property, after full compensation had been given to the proprietors. The object of that was explained by the gentleman before the Committee who was an expert. He pointed out the dissimilarity between the conducting methods of electricity for electric purposes and for ordinary purposes, that there was an immense loss of power resulting from any increase in the length of the wire. It was explained in the Committee that Mr. Edison himself was only now able to cover by his system a radius of five-eighths of a mile from its centre, conse-

quently distance is an object. In all ordinary cases, provision is made for the laying of mains in the streets, from which mains the houses adjacent will be lighted; but there may be a case where, in order to reach a water power, it may be of immense advantage to the Company, instead of traversing some street or square at a considerable distance, to take a direct line from the water power to a point which is to be the centre of illumination. There might also be a case in which the electric light, being used on the one side of a building in the centre of a block, it might become necessary to reach a corresponding building on another street, it would be of great advantage to have a direct line, instead of passing round a considerable distance. After thorough discussion in Committee, it was thought proper to give the Company such powers as were fairly incidental to their incorporation, or as would enable them to carry out their system successfully. The Committee, after mature consideration of this point, during two or three sittings, arrived at the conclusion to leave this one power. It is not the right of appropriating the land of another or owning acquired lands, but of simply passing their lines and affecting this important saving of distance. Ordinarily, it was explained to the Committee, the wires would be laid under ground, and would be laid, with the consent of the municipal authorities, along the streets, and the illumination would be imparted to buildings by circuits from these mains. I think the House will have no difficulty in coming to a conclusion similar to that arrived at by the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has confused the two topics, the reasonableness of the provisions contained in this Bill, and the question whether it is fit we should incorporate this Company at all. We are dealing, at this moment, not with the question of the reasonableness of the Light Company having certain powers of expropriation, but with the question whether it is fit this Company should be incorporated here. My hon. friend has referred as an instance to the case of the telephone companies. Well, there was a great deal of doubt as to the telephone companies, but they stand on a wholly different basis from this. At the time we incorporated telephone companies, the telephone system was also in its infancy; and we know it is susceptible, even in its present condition, of development in the way of very long circuits. This capability of development is quite inapplicable to the Electric Light Company. My hon. friend admits this since he says it is of great importance to the Company to save a few yards distance. Five-eighths of a mile is their extreme length of circuit. The Company is essentially local in character. They could not even light the whole of Ottawa from the same centre. It is, therefore, proposed to incorporate a company here which is to do a separate business in each town of the Dominion in which it chooses to do business.

Mr. COLBY. Absolutely the same as the telephone company.

Mr. BLAKE. No, because there was great possibility of the extension of the telephone. A telephone system might possibly be established, for instance, between Montreal and Kingston, and so forth.

Mr. COLBY. The possibility of extension exists here. The fact did not exist when the telephone company was incorporated.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman's statement of the case be correct, I think the possibility of extension would be a very slight pretext on which to assert our jurisdiction. The light can only be sent five-eighths of a mile now, and it cannot be presumed it may be sent so many miles as to make it a Dominion affair. I think we had better wait awhile to find whether such

things exist, and when they do exist we can deal with them. My hon. friend puts the matter upon those public grounds which I think are entirely beside the question. He speaks of the consecration of their lives, by some eminent individuals, to such improvements as the production of this light. No doubt those men will be great benefactors to their kind; but, so far as I can observe, they are always particularly watchful to take care, and very properly so, that among the persons benefitted shall be the inventors themselves. I do not think it is free light that we are about to get. I believe that all those enterprises are covered up by patents, and that we shall be called upon to pay just as much as is thought, on the whole, to be the most remunerative price to the inventor. But that is not the question here just now, the question is not the incorporation of an Electric Light Company, but whether it should be incorporated; whether a light company for Ontario and Quebec, should be incorporated under the authority of the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec, or under the authority of the Canadian Parliament, especially in view of the fact that it is admitted to be absolutely essential that the Company should expropriate real estate and interfere with the municipal regulations, and deal with those matters rather jealously kept hitherto within the control of the local bodies, and within the control of the local municipalities. We are treading upon a dangerous path when we propose giving a company like the present those large powers in this Parliament, and interfering in the manner proposed with what is properly a subject of local legislation.

Mr. COLBY. I think the analogy between the Telephone Company, which was incorporated and which now practically exists in Canada, and this Electric Light Company, is complete. Those who asked for the incorporation of the telephone company did not ask it on the ground that it would be a rival of the telegraph. The claim was put on the ground that it would be a local institution, as one convenient for use in the cities; and, at present, I am not aware of any points at considerable distances apart in Canada connected by telephonic communication.

Mr. BLAKE. There is an efficient telephone between Toronto and Hamilton.

Mr. COLBY. I was not aware of the fact. But I will suggest what I think will be obvious to every person who has any knowledge of the methods of electric lighting. The machinery connected with electric lighting is difficult and expensive to construct. It has to be manufactured under the superintendence of experts; and I believe I am correct in stating that, although there are several companies incorporated in the United States, that they have one central manufactory for their machinery, available to all the States. I believe that the machinery for a Canadian Company could not well be manufactured in the different Provinces, and that if we would ask for the effective construction of this machinery in the different Provinces, it would be necessary for the Company to manufacture its own apparatus and machinery in order to carry on its operations within each Province; the Company, I say, would be obliged to have a separate manufactory in each Province, whereas I think its work can be done much more effectively and economically by one central institution. The hon. member for West Durham seems to think, from the tone of his observations, that it is our duty to watch and embarrass this Company.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. COLBY. This Bill is proposed in the interest of cheap lighting—in the public interest, and I think we should give every facility to those different rival companies to compete among themselves, as well as with gas companies, in order that the result of that general and firm competition may give cheap light to the people. I think this is an object which should be encouraged, instead of

Mr. BLAKE.

striving to embarrass and trouble such companies, and of promoting the formation of small companies in the different Provinces, which should operate in small local areas. We should give those companies the privileges they ask—of extending their operations through the whole Dominion, and doing so in the most economical manner. We should give them a helping hand, so far as we can profitably do it. I think they are only asking at our hands powers that we have already granted the telephone company, and which are perfectly proper for us to grant.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). When I stated that the preamble had been amended in the other Bill before the House, by inserting the statement that it would work to the general advantage of Canada, I was mistaken; I find it was in this Bill the amendment was made. The two were before the Committee on the same day, which may have led to my mistake. That Bill was fully discussed in the Committee on Private Bills, and the amendment to the effect I have indicated was introduced deliberately. It was considered at the time of its discussion in the Committee, that the introduction of the electric light system was a work to the general advantage of Canada; that, inasmuch as the Company have to carry on their operations in every Province, the best system would be the construction of one central establishment from which operations could be carried on between two or more of the Provinces. Supposing, as has been suggested, that the water power of the Chaudière was used to manufacture the electric light in Quebec and Ontario—a result which, I believe, is within the circle of probability; when it is considered that the Act of incorporation gives the Company power to manufacture the requisite machinery and carry on the business of selling all over the Province; when it is also considered that it dealt with the patents that were to be vested in the Company—that patent extending over the whole Dominion—the Company thought in their wisdom that this was a case in which that declaration was properly put in the preamble—that the incorporation of this Company was for the general advantage of Canada. If these words were properly inserted in the preamble this discussion is now out of place. If they were properly inserted they would give this Parliament jurisdiction to deal with this question. I entirely endorse the argument of the hon. member for Stanstead, that this Bill is within our functions, and I am aware that if the House does not accede to the proposition now before it—that when a company comes to this Parliament possessing functions so large, and asks for permission to carry on operations in every Province of the Dominion, we are to try them and say you cannot obtain your request; you must go to the eight or nine Provinces of the Dominion and get an Act passed by the Legislature enabling you to carry on your business. When a company asks such large powers—when its objects are good—to carry its work of connecting two or more Provinces—when it deals with patents and proposes to sell the articles it manufactures in every part of the Dominion, for the advantage of the whole people, I confess it is a company whose incorporation comes within the proper functions of the general Parliament. For these reasons, I think that the declaration is properly inserted, and that the decision of the Private Bills Committee, arrived at deliberately after full discussion, should be adopted.

Mr. MILLS. I am not surprised at the argument of the hon. member for Victoria, that we here can give the authority asked for by simply declaring that the subject may be dealt with by us, and is for the general advantage of the people of Canada. If the hon. gentleman is right, we can exercise jurisdiction in regard to any matter, however local its character may be. If it will simply require for any Act of Parliament that it be pleaded it is for the general advantage of Canada, no Court would be at

liberty to go behind that declaration and enquire into the merits of the case.

Mr. CAMERON. Nor could any Court do so.

Mr. MILLS. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. It was not intended that we should abuse the powers we possess by a declaration of that sort. We have to look at the facts and the nature of the case on all occasions. If the subject-matter is local in its character, we cannot divest it of that character and give it a Dominion character simply by a declaration such as the hon. gentleman proposes to impart into the preamble of this Bill. We must exercise the powers we possess of exclusive jurisdiction, and legislate in such a way as not to interfere with the powers given to the Local Legislatures. Local Legislatures have certain powers conferred upon them. They have powers to create municipalities, to confer upon a municipal corporation certain legislative and executive functions—to discharge certain municipal powers; and the hon. gentleman proposes here to exercise a power which might seriously interfere, which might, in fact, take away the power that a Local Legislature is authorized to confer upon a municipality. The hon. gentleman might, by this Bill—because we have the power to legislate upon this Bill, have given this Company much more extensive powers than they possess, he could give them power to take property absolutely. We have the power to say that a company may take the property of private individuals, or to take the property of a municipal corporation; we might authorize them even to take the property of a Provincial Government lying within a particular town or city where they propose to erect their establishment. Now, here is one of the powers possessed by municipal corporations: for instance, the power to see to the lighting of the city. It is one of their necessary functions, in order that they may discharge their municipal duties, to preserve peace and order, and properly enforce the law. But the hon. gentleman proposes here to deal with the subject in such a way as, it may be, seriously to cripple the municipal council of a town or city from the proper and efficient discharge of their municipal functions. It is perfectly clear that if we can incorporate this Company we can incorporate a gas company. All that it is necessary for a gas company to do is to come here and say that they wish for power to provide the various towns and cities with gas, and that they propose to carry on their operations in every Province of the Dominion. It is true this corporation would be necessarily of a local character. Their business in one place would be wholly independent of their business in another place, and yet, by the rules laid down by the hon. member for Victoria, we could incorporate a gas company for the entire Dominion, we could confer upon them extraordinary powers, and we could, in this way, obtain absolute control over the municipalities, throughout the various Provinces of the Dominion. It is clear, to my mind, that the Constitution never contemplated the exercise of any such powers as I have just referred to. I decline to enter into a discussion of the merits of a corporation of this sort. They may be, as I stated before, highly meritorious, much more advantageous than gas companies, but that is a question with which we have nothing to do. We have to do with the question of jurisdiction, and if the jurisdiction is vested elsewhere, then the merits or demerits of this Company may be properly considered in the Legislatures and not in this Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend who has just spoken has always taken this ground since 1867, but the hon. leader of the Opposition has never taken the position he now does, and I do not know that he has before expressed his opinion. I think it would be exceedingly unfortunate for the country if we altered the principle that has obtained in this House ever since 1867, and the constructive powers

of Parliament that have been given by Acts again and again. Of course I have not them now all in my recollection; but if you go over the list of Statutes of Private Acts passed since 1867, you will find that my hon. friend, as a general rule, opposed them all in this House, but Parliament has always overruled his opinion, strongly and ably though it has been expressed. Acts have again and again been passed in the same position, and with the same rights, powers and privileges, as are claimed under this Act. I say it would be exceedingly unfortunate for any great undertaking or any great invention that any party desired to introduce, if the inventors of this new undertaking were obliged to go to every Legislature, to the seven or eight or twenty—as we may have by-and-bye—Legislatures to get power to have several separate corporations with separate powers, with separate privileges, or distinct various privileges under varying conditions and restrictions. It would be equivalent to the banishment from this country, practically, of any great improvement of the nature of this Bill. I do not think there is the slightest ground for the point my hon. friend has contended for. He is, however, not speaking to the question of whether this Parliament has power to incorporate this “Edison Electric Light Company,” but he is reducing his argument and objection to some of the clauses. He objects to the appropriation clause. Well, it may be that when we come to these clauses—if there are such clauses in the Bill, I have not read it—that my hon. friend can raise objections to them; but the question now is, has this Parliament the jurisdiction to grant an Act of incorporation to a company seeking to introduce the “Edison Electric Light” into every town and city of the Dominion? That is the simple question. Now, in the first place, the power of incorporating these companies cannot come within the general phrase of property and civil rights, and the hon. gentleman, if he will look at the 92nd clause of the British North America Act, will see clearly that it does not. Because, although the same clause that gives Provincial Legislatures the exclusive right to legislate as to property and civil rights, gives them especially the power to grant Acts for the incorporation of companies with provincial objects, and if that clause was not there it shows that the Imperial Legislature, by inserting that clause, say that they could not incorporate companies even for provincial objects under the general powers of legislating as to property and civil rights. They have only the power to incorporate companies with provincial objects. That being inserted there expressly, it shows that if it had not been so expressed they could not incorporate a company even for provincial objects. Then the British North America Act provides that we can pass all laws for the good government of the country, except when they are exclusively reserved for the separate action of the Provincial Legislatures, and that it must be shown, as an objection to any Act introduced here, that it comes within some of the special exceptions which deprive the general Parliament of this general power of legislation on all subjects for the good government of the country, that is, for the material advancement or improvement of the country, unless it interferes distinctly with that general power, when it is cut off, severed from this Parliament, and handed over, exclusively and beyond doubt, to the different Provinces. Now, if you look to the 92nd clause of the British North America Act, giving exclusive powers to the Provincial Legislatures, it provides that they shall have exclusive power of legislation as to “local works and undertakings.” Now, I call the attention of the Committee to these two points—“local works and undertakings.” Works and undertakings are not the same thing. The work is the thing to be done; the undertaking is the incorporation of the Company and the organization of the means to carry out the work, and the hon. gentleman will see that those two

phrases, "local works" and "local undertakings" have separate meanings, because, looking at the 10th sub-section of the 92nd clause of the Act, we find that whereas the general language is local works and undertakings, in sub-section C the word "undertaking" is not used, but the word "works" only, and the sub-section only applies to works, the general purview, however, of sub-section 10 applying to both. I will read the first paragraph of sub-section 10 of this clause :

"Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the Province with any other or others of the Provinces,—"

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will please wait until I conclude the sentence, so that its continuity may not be interrupted :

"Or extending beyond the limits of the Province."

Now, the undertaking of the Edison Company is not for one Province, or for two, but for all. The undertaking which we are authorizing them to commence, and organize, and carry out, is to establish works generally for every Province in the Union.

"Lines of steamships between the Province and any British or foreign country."

My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) argued that, if you stretch this clause, you can do anything you like, you can pass any law, but we must read the language just as it is expressed :

"Such works as, although wholly situate within the Province, are, before or after their execution, declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more of the Provinces."

This applies to the works, and it is this clause which supports the argument of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron). We will suppose that Mr. Edison, as an individual, established electric lights in every town or city in every Province of the Dominion; that, after he had done so, he chose to make an incorporated company, and come to this Legislature, that company could get an Act for the construction of these works, declaring them to be for the general advantage of Canada. If we declared as a legislative body, if the Legislature of the Dominion declares that any work, no matter how local, or small, or insignificant, be for "the general advantage of Canada," it must be held that the Parliament of Canada will act with conscience, and will not declare any work to be for "the general advantage of Canada or two or more of the Provinces" if they do not think so. That declaration once made—any work, however local its character, so being declared legislatively by the Parliament of Canada to be "for the general advantage of Canada," it becomes a general Dominion work, just as the shortest railway connecting Ottawa with Prescott if declared to be for the general benefit of Canada at once becomes a Dominion work. The general legislation rests here; of necessity it rests here, whether for the purpose of forming before incorporation and commencing work if the work is created; the work so built, so organized, is for the general advantage of Canada. The language cannot be clearer, and the object of this clause, the object of the Imperial Parliament in passing the Act was to prevent absurdity and expense and obstruction to material progress by compelling every person introducing a great undertaking—offering to carry out a great undertaking in each other Province for the general advantage—to go to the several Provincial Legislatures. They might get power in one, they might be refused it in another; they might get restricted powers in one and large powers in another; they might be compelled to submit to conditions varying and inconsistent in their nature. All these obstructions were present to the legislative mind at the time this clause was adopted, and it would

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

really introduce some of the worst and most inconvenient features of the Federal system if we were driven to this necessity. It was for the very purpose of avoiding such obstructions that this law was so framed. I say again that we have acted upon that principle. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has always objected to it from the beginning, but the Legislature has overlooked his objections, and it would be rather an interesting thing to go over and collate the various private Acts which have been passed in this Parliament since 1867, and see how universally on almost every possible subject of material progress, the principle contended for by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has been set aside, and Parliament has, for the general good of the country, adopted the principle which is asked for in the incorporation of this Company.

Mr. BLAKE. There are some things which the hon. gentleman has said to which I assent, and a good many others from which I dissent very strongly. I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman regards the Federal system as a very inconvenient system.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, the hon. gentleman does, and he pointed out, in the remarks which he has just made, that by assenting to the principle contended for by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), we would be introducing one of the most inconvenient features of the Federal system, and we know that the hon. gentleman regards the system as an inconvenient one—one whose inconveniences are sometimes perfectly appalling. Fortunately, however, as some of us think, and unfortunately as some others believe, we have a Federal system, and we have to take the inconveniences as well as the conveniences. We have to take the good along with the bad. There is undoubtedly a great advantage in centralized power; the despot can do many things which cannot be done by the exercise of free government in a free country, but while there may be some slight inconveniences in the division of power to which the hon. gentleman refers, we believe that it is better to put up with these inconveniences for the sake of the greater gain which subsists between these divisions of power. I do not think the phrase which the hon. gentleman has quoted has so wide a meaning as he ascribes to it. It is a phrase that has almost a technical signification in connection with railway companies, and if you look at the context of this phrase, you will find that it is dealing with arrangements for transportation or communication of some kind or other :

"Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings connecting the Province, with any other or others of the Provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the Province."

That is the class of work spoken of; the incorporation of companies with provincial objects, as the hon. gentleman himself observed, is dealt with in another clause, the 11th clause. Now, I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be found difficult for any court, when the work or object was of a character which fairly comes within the description of local works and undertakings, to enter into the question whether the Parliament of Canada was right or wrong in declaring that the particular Act was for the general advantage of Canada; but I dissent from the view that the word "undertaking" applies to any company. A work to sell ginger pop in the street, for instance, would not come within clause 10; it must be a work or undertaking of the class specified in the exceptions given in this clause, such works as are wholly situated within a Province, but which are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada and not mere trading companies. If the words "for the general advantage of Canada" can be applied to a trading company under any circumstances, we are bound—and all the more absolutely bound because

of the argument of the hon. gentleman, and because our action is not susceptible of review—to consider whether we can honestly, and with propriety, apply these words to any particular case. The hon. gentleman has said that it would be of great advantage to Canada to have the Edison light introduced. I doubt it not; but suppose the Edison light had not been invented, would it not be of great advantage to Canada to have gas introduced into every city or town, or to have waterworks? Could we not honestly declare these to be of great advantage to Canada in the sense that the hon. gentleman proposes? Certainly we could, and that proves that that is not the sense in which these words are used in this clause. We have to consider whether the character of the operations of the Company is local. The question is: whether the particular Company before us is a company which, within the true meaning of this clause, can be declared for the general advantage of Canada. It is not enough to say that it would be very useful for a great many towns or for every town in the Dominion to have the Edison light introduced, if the Edison light is to be introduced by separate arrangements in each town, else whatever was to be for the advantage of the towns or cities of Canada would be for the general advantage of Canada, and so you would practically absorb almost all the local powers with reference to incorporation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not wish to follow up the discussion, for I think the Committee will understand it; but the Statutes of Canada for 1877 have just been placed in my hands. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was then Minister of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I think not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that chapter 83 in this book is an Act to incorporate the Dominion Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Canada. If there is anything more local than another, it is the land in the Provinces; and yet here is an Act to incorporate an association having for its object "the improvement of agriculture and horticulture, the sale and disposal of their productions, and the procuring of their supplies to the best advantage, the systematizing of their work, the discountenancing of a system of credit, the encouragement of frugality, and the intellectual, social and financial improvement and welfare of its members in the various Provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But what are their powers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will send the hon. gentleman the book, and he will see that they are local in all respects, and that they apply to every Province. I take it, if there is a local work, it is the printing of the *Ottawa Free Press* or the *Ottawa Citizen*.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; or the *Belleville Intelligencer*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Or the *Toronto Mail* or the *Toronto Globe*; yet I find in the same book an Act to amend the Act to incorporate the *Globe* Printing Company, the preamble of which states: "Whereas, the *Globe* Printing Company has, by its petition, represented that it is desirous of establishing offices in various places outside of the Province of Ontario." It had a Local Act of incorporation.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But that is clearly a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As an hon. friend says, there is a great absence of electric light about it. The Act goes on to say: "The said *Globe* Printing Company may establish branch offices in the capitals of the several Provinces of Canada, and in any other cities, towns or places in the Dominion or elsewhere." There is one fault in this, perhaps in consequence of the modesty of the promoter. It does not say that the distribution of this paper is for the general advantage of the Dominion, and that may be a

ground for some of the friends of the *Globe* saying that this is unconstitutional. I do not know whether the hon. member for Bothwell opposed this Act in 1877 on that ground. Another Act of the same year is to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Engine and Machinery Company, which was a Local company before, and wished to extend its business of making machines to other Provinces. Except for the crotchets of the hon. member for Bothwell, we never raise the point; we always held the common sense view that any undertaking that was to be carried on in more than one Province should be authorized by a general Act of incorporation; and now this point is brought up at the very last moment.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If I understand the hon. member for West Durham, he contends that works of this kind do not come within the 10th sub-section; that it is not a work or undertaking, and that those works must be limited as applying only to works of the class specified in such sub-section, namely, "lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings." The hon. gentleman argued that this Company could not be termed an undertaking. In sub-section C of section 10 the works and undertakings are declared to be:

"Such works as, although wholly situated within the Province, are before or after their execution, declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada, or for the advantage of two or more of the Provinces."

The question is, then, simply whether this is a work or not. If, however, the hon. gentleman is right in arguing that sub-section 10 does not cover works of this kind, what clause is there giving jurisdiction over matters of this kind to Local Legislatures? It can only be either the 11th clause for the incorporation of companies with provincial objects, or the 10th clause. What we contend is, that the incorporation of a company to do business all over the Dominion and carry on business of this particular kind is not the incorporation of a company with a municipal, local or provincial object. If it is not one or the other then the Local Legislatures can have no jurisdiction. If that were so, then the reserve power vested in this Parliament was the one to be exercised for the incorporation of this Company.

Mr. MILLS. I objected to the incorporation at the time, but the majority of the Committee having previously sanctioned the incorporation of companies with like power, a charter should not be refused in similar cases. In this case the Company cannot be incorporated and exercise its functions without seriously interfering with the powers which are conferred upon Local Legislatures, or by them conferred on municipalities.

Preamble agreed to.

On an amendment moved by Mr. COLBY,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It was objected that the exercise of this power by putting up electric light wires might be accompanied with inconvenience to individuals and the public, and also to telegraph and telephone companies. The attention of the Government was directed to it, and I believe the Minister of Public Works consulted the scientific officer connected with telegraphs and such matters in his Department, and the telegraph and telephone companies also took an interest in the subject. Finally the amendment as now proposed met with the approval of Government, and also of the telegraph and telephone companies. The amendment provides that electric light wires when carried above ground shall be wholly insulated so as to be free from any possibility of danger or inconvenience to any one, and in all cases the wires were to be worked on a metal circuit. That was insisted on by the telephone companies more particularly. They are in the habit of establishing earth-currents, and they contended that as the force of the electric circuit is

much greater from the electric light wires than from the telegraph or telephone wires, if the electric light wires were placed so as to connect with gas or water pipes, the earth-current would be destroyed by the electric light wires. Those companies also objected to electric light wires being placed on the same side of the street, on the ground that they would have a similar effect.

Mr. BLAKE. We have noticed accounts in the public journals, of serious accidents that have occurred in connection with these wires. I was, therefore, glad to learn that danger was to be specially guarded against, but when I hear that, notwithstanding the insulation of the wires, telegraph companies objected to electric light wires being placed on the same side of the street, I doubt whether the insulation will be an effective remedy.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The officers of the Edison Company affirm that no danger could arise from the electric light wires. As a matter of precaution, and owing to the doubt which the telephone company more particularly put forth, this clause was modified. I am told also that in the case of the Edison light such an extension as that to which my hon. friend refers could not possibly occur. I am told that in some modes of using the electric light, danger does undoubtedly exist. In the case to which my hon. friend refers, no doubt it was the Brush light that was used, and in the case where, on the Marquis of Salisbury's property, a man was killed by unwisely taking hold of the wire, as the battery was turned, the wire ran along the garden wall close to the ground. The Edison Company say that under their system nothing of the kind could possibly occur, as the power is produced in a different way.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite evident we are dealing with a thing of which we know very little, but if there is no danger from the wire carried overhead, with the precautions that are taken, it is still of very practical consequence that there should not be an extra set of poles on the other side of the street in order to carry those wires. We know that in the principal streets of our towns there are poles on one side of our streets, and, if this amendment be introduced, our streets will be further disfigured with poles on the opposite side.

Mr. COLBY. That can only be done with the concurrence of the municipal authorities.

Mr. BLAKE. The municipalities will be forced to the option of either allowing the Company to erect a second set of poles or —

Mr. COLBY. They may exclude the Company altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. Does not the hon. gentleman see I am speaking in the interest of the Company and the towns themselves? The price the latter will have to pay for the electric light will be the permission to erect a second set of poles on their streets. I think it is unfortunate we should put in a prohibitory clause of that kind. If the electric wire can be affixed to the telephone poles, without in the slightest degree interfering with them, why insert this clause? Why should our streets be disfigured by a second set of poles? I consider the enormous number of telegraph poles in our towns their greatest disfigurement. If my observations on this point meet with no better answer than they have met with, I shall take another opportunity of moving against that proposed amendment. I do not exactly understand what is the meaning of the clause: "Provided the Company shall not interfere with the public right of travelling on or using such streets, highways, bridges, public places, or navigable waters; and as to such streets—" I do not understand to what those words: "and as to such streets," apply; whether it was the intention of the draughtsman to provide there should be no interference with the streets at all, except with the consent of the

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

municipality. If so, I think words could be devised which would make the meaning clear, for it is not clear now.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Halton). That remark of the hon. gentleman raises an objection which I did not think it proper to interpose when we were on the preamble of the Bill, though I do not agree with the views expressed on this side of the floor with respect to the constitutional right of the House to deal with this question in the way in which this Bill proposes to deal with it. But I agree so far, that it is in the power of this Parliament to incorporate this Company. We may give it the bare power of incorporation in the whole Dominion, on the decision of the Privy Council, in the insurance cases, that this Parliament may incorporate companies for a great many purposes, but these companies will only have the mere Act of incorporation, because the Provinces may make laws that will interfere with their various forms of business, since these may involve questions of civil rights and property in the Provinces. While we may incorporate this Company, it does seem to me necessary that we should oppose any attempt to deprive the municipal authorities, or the Local Legislature of any Province, of the power of making regulations for the protection of the lives and properties of their citizens. This is done by giving this Company power to force their way into cities and towns, despite the municipal authorities, and establish a dangerous enterprise in their midst, for though we may know little of the electric light we know that it plays occasionally singular pranks. I believe this is not a matter that was contemplated to come under the powers of this House, but is a matter of important local interest. I followed the argument of the hon. gentleman who leads this House, and whose opinion on matters of this kind I always hear with very great respect; but I do not see that, under the distribution of power in the Constitution, the Local Legislatures can be deprived of the power given them expressly in the 92nd section, because that is an exclusive power. Whatever power or right they have is exclusive, and we have no right to interfere with it. To pass this measure would be to strain very much the right given to this Parliament to deal with works that are for the general advantage of Canada. The lighting by gas and the furnishing of water to cities and towns, all these things by a similar declaration, can be seized—the jurisdiction ousted—if the direction of these matters can be seized by this Parliament under that declaration. I do not think that that was the intention of the Constitutional Act. I do not think it is within its spirit, meaning, or policy. I believe that a very uneasy feeling would be created in the minds of the Local Legislatures, and in the minds of the people of the several Provinces, in respect to the exercise of their provincial rights, if we undertook to deal with questions of this kind on such a ground. I make these observations with reference to the 5th clause, which appears to be open to the objection urged. It is the power of expropriation—of taking property by force, leaving it to arbitrators to decide as to the amount that should be paid for it. That power is given to the Company by this clause. The power of going into public streets is also given to the Company by this clause, and, as the learned and hon. gentleman opposite pointed out, the words of the restriction are insensible, and have not a grammatical connection. It seems to me to be an evasion—that some clever draughtsman has framed this clause for the purpose of appearing to give to the municipalities some power or right to control this matter. But I think he has succeeded in depriving them of this power. The language must be amended so as to show clearly what the restriction means.

House resumed.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. McDougall), who was speaking at six o'clock is not yet present. I will, however, call the attention of the hon. member for West Durham to the fact of some previous legislation of this Parliament, in reply to the contention that we cannot incorporate any gas or water companies. I find this Parliament has habitually incorporated such companies, and on the ground that the common sense meaning of our Constitutional Act was this: that when any company desired powers to enter upon any undertaking in more than one Province, or in all the Provinces, it must come to the Central Government; if the undertaking was to be confined within only one Province, the company has to go to the Local Government. In 1876, there was an Act passed to incorporate the Canadian Gas Lighting Company, the 39th Victoria, providing as follows:—

"1. The said petitioners and all such other persons as shall be shareholders in the Corporation hereby created, shall be, and they are hereby made a body corporate and politic, by the name of the 'Canadian Gas Lighting Company,' and shall have the power to work the said inventions and processes, and also the patent known as Rigby's Excelsior Patent for the manufacture and sale of illuminating gas, and the apparatus to produce the same in any part of the Dominion of Canada, and may hold, use or dispose of the same for the benefit of the business of the said Company. Moreover, the said Company may acquire and hold by purchase or otherwise immoveable property, for the efficient and convenient carrying on and development of the business of the said Company, and may sell or otherwise dispose of the same, and in place thereof acquire other immoveable property for the same purpose."

That Company came to this Legislature in 1876, asking power to form a gas company in this city, Ottawa, and in this Province of Ontario. That is exactly the case with which, according to my hon. friend from West Durham, this Parliament could not deal. And the very next Bill passed is an Act to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Gas Company, and which was brought to this Parliament, not for the purpose of setting up a gas company, to do business in all the Provinces, but in only two of them, Ottawa and places across the river, including Hull, which are in Quebec. With this object the Company came to this Parliament and got an Act, giving them full powers to expropriate property, and do all other acts performed by such companies, although they were operating in only two Provinces.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is it declared in that Act that the work is for the benefit of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; no such intention is declared in either Bill. But in the first Bill it was declared by the promoters that they desired to have power to manufacture and sell illuminating gas, and introduce any apparatus required in their business in any Province of the Dominion; and the next Bill provides for the conveyance of the gas made in Ottawa to the city of Hull, and the villages of New Edinburgh and Rochesterville. In both cases this was legislation which comes under the special disapprobation of the hon. member for Bothwell. I do not know whether my hon. friend was Minister of Justice then, but I think he had neglected a part of his duty as a member of Parliament in not pulling up the Legislature.

Mr. BLAKE. I was Minister of Justice then and the following year, to which the hon. gentleman alluded before dinner, but I never thought it was the duty of the Minister of Justice to be personally responsible for all the Private Bill legislation. While I occupied that office, my attention was too much engrossed with the public legislation to be able to attend very closely to the private legislation. I

think the right hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying there has been such a large number of Acts of this character passed since 1867, though, I admit, that there have been several. As to the Bill of the Ottawa Gas Company, I have some recollection of it, but I have no recollection of the other. There was some discussion on that subject, and I think that the view in which that Act was passed was, as the hon. gentleman said, that the corporation supplying the gas was to extend its work across the river into the other Province. I argued that gas works, in the ordinary sense of the term, were local works, and that they were not properly called to the general advantage of Canada, because they were to the advantage of every town. I still think so, though I am not aware that that Company did any business. Of the time from 1876 to 1882, except in the case of a railway Act or two, I do not recollect a declaration having been inserted that the Act was for the general advantage of Canada. We have always assumed till now that they were so, because when Parliament chose to exercise this power in respect to the incorporation of companies, not for the construction of works, as I called them, such as railways, canals and telegraphs, but trading companies of this kind, they did it under what is called the reserved power, they did it in the view that it was for the incorporation of a company with more than provincial objects, and therefore, a company which we had the power to incorporate. I still think this Parliament has power to incorporate companies for purposes beyond provincial objects, and the question in this case is, whether it is fairly to be said that the objects of this Company are provincial and local objects, to be accomplished, therefore, by the Provincial Legislatures, or for the general advantage of Canada. However, I supposed we had passed that stage of the discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend brought it up in his remarks.

Mr. BLAKE. I think we are now engaged on the meaning of the clause. Both the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall,) and myself felt a little concerned to know what the able draughtsman meant by these words: "And as to such streets."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend will admit that the Edison Electric Light is as much a general light as the Ottawa Gas Company light, and may be as much for the general advantage.

Mr. CAMERON. I confess on reading that clause I do not see the grammatical or other difficulty in the way of understanding what is meant. I think it defines the power of the Company as to using the public streets for such purposes only as may be approved by the municipality. And "as to such streets," it means any of those streets mentioned in the previous part of the clause, that the Company shall only use them by the previous consent of the municipality.

Mr. COLBY. I think if my hon. friend would read that clause as a parenthetical clause, it would meet the difficulty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grammatical construction is plain enough. There is a proviso: "provided the Company shall not interfere with the public right of travelling on or using such streets, highways, bridges, public places or navigable waters," that is plain enough; "and as to such streets only," that is, shall interfere "only and upon, and subject to such agreements in respect thereof as shall be made between the Company and such municipalities respectively;" so that the Company cannot interfere at all with the use of the streets by the public, and can only interfere under agreement made between the Company and the municipality.

Mr. BLAKE. The proviso is doubled up; "provided the Company shall not interfere with," &c., is repeated.

Mr. CAMERON. I have no objection to my hon. friend suggesting any amendment that there shall be no use of the streets, except by the consent of the municipality.

Mr. BLAKE. I would propose to insert: "and shall only interfere" instead of "and as to such streets, highways and public places, with the consent of the municipality, and upon and subject to such agreement." I observe, in to-day's *Montreal Herald*, a statement on the subject of companies of this description which is interesting with reference to this clause. It says:

"There are thirty bills now before the British Parliament for the conferring of franchises on electric light companies. It is held that this is a very suitable occasion for overhauling the whole question, and a move is made for a Special Commission charged with that business. The bills, almost without exception, provide for over-head lines, and the attachment of lines to buildings. To both of these experts most strongly object on the score of safety to property and life."

I make that observation, because I notice that both here and in the proposed amendment at the close of the clause there is an obvious intention to carry the electricity not merely under ground but over head at the option of the company.

Mr. COLBY. Only on the streets.

Mr. BLAKE. Well I don't know that the streets are the least frequented part of a town, and if there is any danger in carrying the wires over head it will be on the streets.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would bother the birds only, though.

Mr. BLAKE. We had a discussion on this subject when the Telephone Bill was before Parliament, and considerable objection was made to carrying these wires above ground. It was alleged, at that time that it was impossible to carry the wires below ground because it was really impracticable, so to insulate them, that the work could be carried on owing to the earth-currents. In that view the Committee rather reluctantly agreed to permit them to be carried above ground at that time, but they inserted an express provision which should come in force, in case an invention should be made by which the wires could be carried under ground without interfering with the efficiency of the service. There seems to be added reasons why such a provision should be made in the present case, unless there are reasons with which we are at present unacquainted, for carrying the electricity over-head. If such reasons exist, we must face the difficulty, but if it is possible to carry the wires under ground, I think that, perhaps, on the ground of security, and certainly for other reasons, it would be desirable that they should be so carried. There is no doubt that the existence of telephone wires at a high level over head, on the poles and over the roofs of the houses, has been a subject of difficulty in cases of fire. There has been more than one instance of firemen stumbling on these wires, and falling down, and there are also difficulties in using the ladders when these wires are present. There is also the question of unsightliness, to which I have referred, and if there is no incumbent reason why the wires should be carried under ground, I think it would be better that they should be so carried.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Of course there is this difficulty, that the carrying of the wires under ground is necessarily infinitely more expensive than above ground, and it is very possible that, to enforce carrying the wires under ground in every case, would result in making the introduction of the electric light system so expensive that it would defeat the object which I suppose we have in view, viz., to encourage a cheaper and better system of lighting than at present. I understand that, as a matter of practice, the Edison Company prefer carrying the wires under ground wherever it is possible to do so; that is, in cases where the distance is not so great or the circumstances such that the cost would be prohibitory if not ruinous if they were put under ground.

Mr. BLAKE.

They are, however, unwilling to be tied down by an absolute provision compelling them to carry the wires over-ground. There is this point, however, to be remembered, that they can only carry them over-head with the permission of the municipality, and I think we may safely trust municipal councils of the different cities and towns to compel the company to carry the wires under ground when it is not unreasonable to ask them to do so. I think, therefore, the Bill should remain as it is.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Would it not be well to have an amendment referring the telephone and telegraph wires to the civic authorities as well.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That clause was put in at the instigation of the Bell Telephone Company. I thought it unnecessary, and pointed out that the municipalities would afford them sufficient protection in this respect, but they asked for the clause, and we had no objection to it.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is very important that we should not, unnecessarily, multiply the number of poles we have at present, a number of poles on one side of every principal street, and we are absolutely making it necessary that there should be another set on the other side of the street. I do not see why we should make such a provision.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Suppose it turns out that there is no danger, why should we restrict the powers of the Company because there is a difference of opinion now? It seems to me that it is tying the hands of the Company unnecessarily, and that it is an unjustifiable interference with the powers of the civic authorities unless there is an absolute necessity for it.

Mr. COLBY. On the subject of danger I have in my hand the report, in a recent Boston newspaper, of a meeting, in which this whole matter of the electric light was brought before the municipal authorities of Boston. The electric light companies were proposing to illuminate the city at the same price as the gas companies were charging and to give three times the volume of light. In that discussion this question of danger came up, and Professor Burnstein stated that the only cases of accident were where the ground circuit was made use of, but if the metallic circuit was used there was no danger whatever. The metallic circuit is provided for in this Bill, and it is not intended to use the ground circuit.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the provisions of this section. It says that the municipalities shall have jurisdiction, subject to the by-laws passed by the Council in pursuance thereof. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, intends to give municipalities power to legislate on this subject, and indicates the way in which they shall exercise it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). We give powers every day, conditional upon the municipalities giving consent; we have perfect authority to do that.

Mr. MILLS. This section does more than that. It provides how the municipalities shall exercise their powers, in order that such exercise of their powers may be valid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we have sufficient power to compel parties appointed under Provincial Acts to perform duties given to them by the Dominion Statutes; I think we have power under an Act passed by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, in clause 35.

Mr. BLAKE. I appeal to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, to know whether, with his new view as to legislation, he proposes to allow this clause to stand, which provides that meters and fittings shall not be liable to be seized for rent.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That clause is copied verbatim from the Gas Company Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite allow that all old Acts are gospel; that there is no necessity for remodelling them.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman is responsible for so many of them that he should believe in them. I have no objection, however, to the clause being struck out, without this course being taken as a precedent.

Bill amended and ordered to be reported.

CREDIT FONCIER FRANCO-CANADIEN.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 99) to enlarge and extend the powers of the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think that this Bill ought to be read the second time. It seems to me to be a very extraordinary measure of legislation. The Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien was a Quebec corporation, incorporated by the Legislature of that Province, and given a certain exceptional and peculiar powers and privileges, a monopoly in a certain limited sense, and certain other powers. Those privileges and powers were given to it because it was going to lend money to the good people of that Province at 6 per cent. or less, indeed 5 per cent. was the general promise and expectation; and the operations of a company so beneficent it was natural to expect would be eagerly looked for there and elsewhere throughout Canada. And as a consequence a Bill to extend the powers of the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien to all the Provinces of this Dominion, and to give the good people all over Canada money at 5 per cent., or at least less than 6 per cent., was introduced into the House, and pleaded for eagerly and with great pleasure by those who held that it would be a success. The measure came to the Banking and Commerce Committee, along with another measure to create a Dominion Corporation, with the same beneficent object, and subject to the same restrictions. Some of us thought that some of the powers which that Corporation was obtaining were peculiar and exceptional, and that it was an objectionable procedure to extend the powers of a provincial corporation in the manner proposed by the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien. Some of us held the opinion—which, I believe, the hon. leader of the House has himself expressed this very Session—that if a provincial corporation desires to have powers over the Dominion, and comes here with that object, it should come for the purpose of being re-incorporated here, within our own jurisdiction, and in order to obtain all its powers from us. We objected to that mode of extending the powers of a provincial corporation. We objected to some of the exceptional and peculiar privileges asked for, but our objection was overborne. It was no use talking—no use saying a word against the Bill—because this Corporation was going to lend money by this Bill at less than 6 per cent.; and my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White) and many other hon. members, desiring there should be legislation to reduce the rate of interest sustained the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), who protested that it was his patriotic desire and determination that the Company should not take more than 6 per cent. for their money. In fact, they were so generous that they would scorn to take more—they would insist more certainly on receiving less than 6 per cent.—but at any rate not more, including commission charges, fees, taxes and other claims from the borrower—would be received by this patriotic, self-sacrificing, and self-denying corporation; and so, with a sweep and a rush both Bills were carried through Committee and the House. Having obtained from the Local Legislature exceptional privileges, a monopoly as regards France, and from this Dominion Legislature, exceptional privileges—having obtained those advantages in the Local Legislature two years ago, and the rights and privileges I have spoken of in this Central Legislature one year ago, upon the

assurance and understanding that it was going to lend money at not more than 6 per cent., this Corporation comes here now, just one little year after, and says: "We have got the privileges we wanted. Will you now be good enough to remove the restrictions?" I do not think we ought to remove the restrictions without removing the privileges too.

Mr. GIROUARD. Perfectly right.

Mr. BLAKE. It does seem to be an extraordinary thing that a corporation should come here and ask to be incorporated on specific grounds. They put in a claim to the favorable consideration of the Legislature that they were going to do what no other company would do, lend money at 6 per cent. and be bound not to collect more. The next Session of Parliament they come here and say they want the restriction removed. That is the first object of the Bill. The second is likened to it. They ask certain powers to borrow money. These powers were extravagant in the view of the Committee, and in the view of the hon. the Minister of Finance. He himself, after several days consideration, brought down a claim which he was prepared to assent to, a claim which went beyond the provisions which had been heretofore accorded to other corporations. But it was necessary to give exceptionally favorable considerations to a company that was benevolent enough to lend money at 6 per cent. Therefore this Company now come and say: "You will be pleased, first of all, in the first clause, to remove that restriction which obliges us to take 6 per cent. or less; secondly, you will be pleased to grant us larger borrowing power than last Session." It does seem to me that this Company either came to us under false pretences last year, or is coming to us under pretences that cannot be maintained this year.

Mr. BOURASSA (in French). Mr. Speaker, ever since the time I had the honor of sitting in the old Legislative Assembly, my opinions and actions have ever been the same in tending to repress usury and to determine the rate of interest. It is at least twenty-five or twenty-six years since I introduced the first measure to that effect, and I succeeded in getting it twice passed in our old Canadian Parliament, but the Upper House of that time rejected it. Every one knows the disasters brought about by this unrestricted money trade; a part of our farmers have been ruined by the system of usury; another part has gone to the United States, and the others merely exist and remain poor. Already has a large number of our finest farms passed into the hands of capitalists under this system of usury; and if we encourage usury, we shall, in the next twenty years, see all the lands of our farmers pass into the hands of capitalists. They will find themselves compelled, as one sees in Europe, to hold their farms under lease, which they will transmit to their children at their death, and at ruinous conditions, as it is done to-day in Ireland. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, do I hope that the members of rural districts, who are, like myself, witnesses of the disasters caused by usury, will do their utmost to repress them. I propose that this Bill be not now read the second time, but this day six months.

Mr. GIROUARD. The statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition does not cover the whole case. It is true that in 1880 the Credit Foncier was incorporated by the Quebec Legislature, with certain extraordinary privileges, but the hon. gentleman has not referred to those privileges in particular. The only privileges which the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien enjoys exclusively is that of having representation in Paris. That is the only privilege. No other company, either foreign or domestic, is prevented from carrying on business and lending money on real estate in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman has said that, if we ask to-day to have the limitation removed, we should have no exclusive privileges. We have no objection, in the least, to abandon that privilege of having representation in

France, to the exclusion of all other corporations. In my own estimation, I never attached much value to that concession, and I am authorized by the directors of the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien to abandon that privilege, if necessary. What has the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien done for the country? I was greatly surprised by the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Bourassa), who is so strongly against usury, and yet has moved the six months' hoist to this Bill. As a matter of course, this Company has reduced the rate of interest to 6 per cent. There is hardly a money lender in the country who has been able to lend money on real estate within the past year except at 6 per cent. The original subscribers of the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien have subscribed and paid in the sum of \$1,250,000. That sum of money has been lent in the country for terms varying from ten to fifty years at 6 per cent. interest, and not less. We never intended, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, to lend money at less than 6 per cent. When the Credit Foncier was established, money was worth $4\frac{1}{2}$ and 5 per cent. on the Paris market, and consequently its promoters intended to loan money at 6 per cent., getting 5 per cent. for the shareholders and 1 per cent. for the cost of administration. Has the Credit Foncier kept good faith with the country? The hon. gentleman who moved the six months' hoist ought to know. Many of his own electors have borrowed money from this institution, for terms varying from ten to forty years, at 6 per cent. per annum. He now repays that service by trying to kill this institution. The Company wants to get power to follow the fluctuations of the European market. Money which has been lent in this country is not money raised in this country, but is raised in the Paris market. and how can you expect, under the fluctuations of the Paris bourse during the past two or three months, to loan money here at 6 per cent., when it is worth, at least, 6 per cent. in Europe? When we ask for the removal of that restriction obliging us to lend money for not more than 6 per cent., we do not ask it with a view of extracting a rate of interest of 8, 9 or 10 per cent.; we want only to be in a position to follow the fluctuations of the Paris market. When money is worth, in Paris, 6 or 7 per cent., we have only 1 per cent. margin for cost of administration. We will lend money at 6 per cent. as long as we can get it in Europe at 5 per cent., but if we cannot get it at 5 per cent., permit us to lend, at least, at 7 per cent. I am surprised that, an institution which has already done so much good to the country, having loaned \$1,250,000, which sum was not raised by means of bonds, or by the subscribers or shareholders putting money into this Company and getting for it 6 per cent. for ten or fifteen years, but for thirty, forty or fifty years. I do not believe the hon. member for St. John's has really considered the whole question, because, if he had, he would see that the usury of which he complains so loudly, and with reason, will be practiced more than ever if this Credit Foncier is to disappear. But he need not be afraid. The present amendment is asked in good faith, and I believe it will be granted. As I said before, that privilege which has been granted by the Quebec Legislature to the Credit Foncier of having representation in France, we are willing to abandon, and we stand here on an equality with all loan companies. They have unlimited power to loan upon any rate which may be agreed upon. I had occasion to-day to examine the Act of incorporation of the Montreal Building and Investment Association, or the Company incorporated in 1874 by this Bill, and not only were more powers granted to it than were granted to the Credit Foncier, but the power of lending at any rate agreed upon between the borrower and the lender; and during the present Session a well known loan company of Canada have asked the very powers which we ask by this Bill, but we did not hear the hon. member for Iberville

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).

(Mr. Béchard), and the hon. member for St. John, Que., (Mr. Bourassa), propose the six months hoist. Is it because the Credit Foncier has had the effect of calling in usury in this country that these hon. gentlemen did not speak out on that occasion? I hope the amendment will be negatived.

Mr. McCUAIG. After the discussions which have taken place on this subject, I think Parliament and the country have come to the conclusion that the farming lands of this country are unable to pay more than 6 per cent., and that this Parliament would be doing wrong if we allowed any modification of the charter of this Company which would enable them to charge more than 6 per cent. I notice that the first clause of the Bill reads as follows:—

Section 8 of the Act, cited in the preamble, is hereby amended by striking out the words, "not exceeding 6 per centum per annum" in the second and third lines thereof, and substituting therefor the words "that may be lawfully taken by individuals," and by striking out at the end of the said section the words "but in such case such percentage or commission and the interest together must not exceed 6 per centum per annum on the principal loaned."

By passing such a provision we would simply be giving powers similar to those which have enabled the loan societies of Upper Canada to charge the farmers rates varying from 6 to 16 and even 18 per cent. interest. I believe that the sooner the farmer who is obliged to pay even 8 per cent. interest sells out the better, and I think every farmer in the House and out of it will agree with me. I quite agree that this institution is one which has conferred great benefits on the farmers of Lower Canada by relieving many of them who were paying on mortgages 8 to 10 per cent. and even higher rates of interest, and enabling them to get their money at a reasonable rate; but at the same time my acknowledgement of this benefit will not justify me in legalizing a rate of interest higher than I believe should be charged on any real estate security by any corporation.

Mr. Fiset (in French). Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of the amendment which is before the House, I will add a few words to what has already been said. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) blame the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Bourassa) because several of his electors had been very glad to borrow money from the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien. As a matter of fact, they did borrow from the Credit Foncier, but at 6 per cent., and it is to protect those same electors and those who should find themselves under the necessity of borrowing, that my hon. friend is desirous that that Company should not have the right to lend money at a higher rate than 6 per cent. Another remark made by the hon. promoter of the Bill surprised me. He pretends that this Bill will prevent usury. I must confess that I cannot on that point grasp the hon. member's idea. He wishes to diminish usury and at the same time he is endeavoring to obtain that the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien, which, according to its charter, may only lend at 6 per cent., the privilege of lending money at any rate whatsoever. This is, in my opinion, a singular fashion of stopping the evils of usury. As my hon. friend has observed, he has been for more than twenty-five years the promoter of a Bill tending to repress usury, and he was formerly supported by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who, I doubt not, will support the amendment of the hon. member for St. John. The Hon. Sandfield Macdonald, in 1864, during the debate on Confederation, made a memorable speech against usury, and he pointed out at the time, to the House and to the country, the interest which my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Bourassa) had shown since 1858, in diminishing the rate of interest. Can we, to-day, give to so important a company the right of lending money at any rate whatsoever? Assuredly not. You know, as well I do, that when the Credit Foncier was established in the Province of Quebec political capital was made out of it, and this question was the all important one at the last elections. We were

told to look at the advantages we were to derive from the Chapleau Government establishing the Credit Foncier, and when we replied that we were granting it a fifty years' privilege, what was the answer we got? We were told that it was true that the Company had a fifty years' privilege, but that, on the other hand, the rate of interest had been limited to 6 per cent. Well, what are we seeking to do to-day? We are seeking to give the company an unlimited privilege; and if steps are taken to obtain it in the Federal House, it is because we know that a Bill is shortly to be introduced in the Local House allowing the Company to raise the rate of interest, which is not to remain at 6 per cent., but the right is to be given to raise it to 8 and perhaps 10 per cent. We know this, and we wish that the first step should be taken in the Federal House, because we know very well that in the Local House, besides obtaining the privilege of lending at 8 or 10 per cent., the Company will preserve the privilege of fifty years, and that if the present step succeeded, it would greatly strengthen the vote to be given in the Local House, and no other Company would, during that period, have the right to establish itself in the Province of Quebec. I think, therefore, that in the interest of the agricultural class we should support the amendment of my hon. friend the member for St. John.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I believe that every man who has had to borrow money, not merely in Quebec, but in other parts of the Dominion, will acknowledge the benefit that has been conferred on the whole of Canada by these gentlemen from France, who brought money to this country and loaned it at 6 per cent. They have been benefactors, not only to the Province of Quebec, but of Ontario and of the whole of the Dominion, and they have done more good to money borrowers than any other institution of the kind; but, at the same time, if we should now give them the further power which they ask, we would simply be jeopardizing every man who has borrowed money from the Company. They will simply endeavor to compel every man who may have fallen behind in his payments to pay the higher rate by threatening legal charges—and everybody knows who has to employ the lawyers of this country that they are rather an expensive luxury—they will get him to agree to give them a new mortgage sooner than be sold out by the sheriff. I think, therefore, that we are bound to keep faith with the men who have borrowed money from them for 10, 20, 30 or 40 years, and that we should let the original Bill remain as it is. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) has introduced a very short and a very sweet Bill for the Company, but a very sour one for the borrower, and I think that we should not permit the Company, because they are a powerful and wealthy Corporation to have their interests advanced at the expense of the borrower, who borrowed his money at a lower rate than they would now charge should the proposed amendments be allowed. The effect of the operations of this Company has been to reduce the rate of interest all over Canada; as before they were incorporated it was not uncommon for 7 and 8 and 10 and 12 and even as high as 15 per cent. to be charged. There is no trouble in borrowing money in any part of the Province of Ontario to-day at 7 or even 6 per cent., thanks to the Credit Foncier, and I hope that Company will continue to succeed and to benefit the people of this country. The hon. gentleman says that they only want to get 1 per cent. above what they can borrow money for in France; but this Bill does not say so. This House has given its bond to the borrower, and I am satisfied that the present measure will not be allowed to pass the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This Bill purports to amend the law passed by this Legislature, but the true effect of the Bill is to alter the law establishing the Credit Foncier in the Province of Quebec, where it has had the right to lend money on condition that the total amount of interest should not

exceed 6 per cent. I maintain that even if the Bill passes this House, it will not be worth the paper it is written upon, because notice is given that the same application is to be made to the Legislature of Quebec.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). No; it is not the same thing.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We have no right in this Parliament to transgress the condition imposed on the Credit Foncier Company by the Legislature of Quebec, and to say that that Company shall be allowed to lend money in the Province of Quebec at more than 6 per cent. The courts would not recognize such an act of ours. Clause seven of the Bill passed last Session provides that in all cases the commission and interest shall not together exceed 6 per cent. But apart from the constitutional question, what is the reason alleged by the hon. gentleman for the Company's desire to raise the rate of interest? He says that because it is raised in France, therefore it must be raised here. When the Credit Foncier Company and other companies were created on the Paris market, there was an amount of corruption that was not perceived at the time; but the crash came, and then the money rose, and the Credit Foncier was affected like all others. Nobody forgets that the promoters of this Company did not undertake it for nothing, or that during the elections in the Province of Quebec we were told it was to be one of the greatest blessings which had ever happened to the Province. Suppose the rate of interest increases again in Paris 1 or 2 per cent., the Company will want to increase the rate here still more. The Bill does not limit the rate to 1 per cent. over the rate at which it borrows. For the two reasons I have given I will not support this Bill, and I think the hon. Minister of Public Works should help in this matter, because he has in the past labored to reduce the rate of interest.

Mr. HESSON. I had great pleasure last year in supporting the Bill for the incorporation of the Credit Foncier Company, and I regret that it finds it necessary to ask the House for further legislation to enable it to increase the rate of interest. I am not certain that the country is altogether dependent on the Credit Foncier Company for lowering the rate of interest. I find, on looking at the *Gazette*, that there are \$47,500,000 lying in the banks without receiving interest, and \$45,000,000 lying there to be drawn out on notice. We know that the banks do not allow, as a rule, more than 3 per cent. interest on deposits, therefore I do not feel justified in agreeing to allow this Company to charge a rate of interest which is not justified by the circumstances of the country, and, therefore, I shall oppose my hon. friend's motion to allow it to fix whatever rate of interest it chooses. Reference has been made to a Bill brought before a Committee of this House asking for similar powers. I am not aware that that Bill has been reported to the House, but my impression is that the same objection will be made to that Bill, because I apprehend that the feeling of this House is entirely opposed to increasing the rate of interest. Six per cent. is the highest rate that can fairly be paid by any business man, and especially by the farmers of the country, who are more particularly interested in this question, and more largely involved with those companies.

Mr. DESJARDINS (in French). The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) is mistaken. The Quebec Legislature has not any right to fix the rate of interest, that power being vested in the Federal Parliament. All that the Quebec Legislature can do is to grant a charter to a loan institution, leaving to the Federal Parliament, or to law, to determine the rate of interest. I think that, under those circumstances, the promoters of this Bill have done right in coming before the House, not with the purpose of destroying what was done in Quebec, but to

suspend the operation of the Bill, in so far as the Federal Parliament can do so. I have not any interest in this Bill nor in the Company that asks for it; on the contrary, I belong to a loan institution whom it has not at all suited to see the Credit Foncier spring into existence. I regret, for the sake of the general interests of the country, the position in which this institution finds itself, which, after all was merely an experiment made in this country by strangers who were desirous of coming here to invest capital, in the belief that they could find profit in so doing, even with the rate of interest at 6 per cent., through the difference existing between the value of interest on the Paris and Canadian markets. We are perfectly well acquainted with the extraordinary circumstances which have influenced the Paris market during the last few months; the wide margin existing twelve or fifteen months ago has ceased to be, and it is impossible to-day to find money on the Paris market at a higher rate than 3, 4 or 5 per cent. at the highest. Now, unless we absolutely wish to drive these capitalists from the country, under the pretence that having caught them with a Bill, the tenor of which they may not change, we hold them now, and whether they lose or earn money, we must compel them to remain *in statu quo*. Now I do not think that it is in our interests thus to discourage the importation of foreign capital into this country. One may well be disappointed, I am for my part; and I sincerely regret that the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien should be compelled to come and ask the Government to change its charter. I think that the privilege embodied in its incorporation was perfectly reasonable considering that it came here with an organization, such as to permit its lending money at the maximum rate of 6 per cent. Now, that this Company asks for a change in the principle which made a distinct institution of it, the whole question can be summed up thus: must we ask for the total stoppage of that institution because it is no longer able to lend at 6 per cent., or is it not better to put it on the same footing as other societies, and thus attract hither capital to compete with that of other societies, in such a way as to prevent those exaggerated rates of interest which companies might be inclined to adopt if there was not any competition in the market. Such is the notice that would determine my supporting the Bill proposed by my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). I say to myself: we cannot at present have an institution that will fix the rate of interest at 6 per cent., but if we adopt the proposed amendment, we enable that institution to continue the importation of its capital, which will come into competition with that of other lenders, and in a certain measure prevent the undue rate of interest of which we had to complain before the establishing of that institution. It is admitted that during the last year it has rendered great services, and perhaps will be allowed to render similar ones if the French market becomes stable again; should it enjoy once more its normal state, there is no doubt that it will become possible for it to obtain a rate of interest that will enable it to lend at the same rate as heretofore. It is its advantage to do so, for it is perfectly known that the greater the sum it will be able to invest there the more considerable the profits, even with a most restricted margin between the margin of interest paid in France and that charged here. I do not see why one should wish to treat with so much vigor capitalists whose intention was after all to endow the country with an institution from which we have derived great advantages. The position in which they find themselves to-day is one beyond their will; they are bowing to a case of *force majeure*, and they have the alternative of suspending their operations or of denying the conditions thereof. It seems to me that, under those circumstances, we should be a little more favorably disposed and not discourage men who are willing to continue under new circumstances, but who admit that they have no longer a right to the privileges which they

Mr. DESJARDINS.

enjoyed, when they themselves cease to grant to us the advantages which had obtained them those said privileges. As for me, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to support the second reading of the Bill, with the proviso of amending it, before the Committee of Banking and Commerce, in such a fashion as to meet the objections which might destroy the privilege which the institution obtained under its first charter.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). Last year this Company was specially incorporated for the purpose of lending money at 6 per cent. If the Bill proposed to secure any change that would benefit the incorporation without doing injustice to borrowers, I might support the second reading; but this change, in regard to the rate of interest, is the only one proposed. Instead of continuing to lend money at 6 per cent. the Company propose to lend it on similar terms to individuals. Moreover, it is proposed to change the principle on which the company are allowed to borrow money. By the Act of last year they were allowed to borrow five times the amount of their paid-up capital, now they ask power to borrow on security of mortgages that may represent borrowed money; and that was a wrong principle. I can see no object in allowing the Bill to go to the second reading.

Mr. BECHARD. I must recognize that the institution is a useful one, provided that it fulfils the conditions on which it was organized. It is well known that this Company has received from the Province of Quebec a monopoly or privilege for many years, and it was said at the time, by the advocates of the Company, that the privilege was granted in compensation for the low rate of interest at which it proposed to lend money, namely, 6 per cent. Now the Company propose to have one of those conditions removed, and be authorized to lend money at high rates. I think the monopoly should also disappear if the Company claim to be placed on the same footing with other institutions of a similar kind. I understand this Parliament is not competent to remove this monopoly. That can only be removed by the authority which granted it. The Company should therefore have commenced by having this privilege removed before coming here for better terms. The hon. gentleman says that young as it is, the institution has contributed in a large measure to reduce the rate of interest. I remember well that the rate had already become considerably reduced before this Company came into operation. A year ago last spring the rate of interest had become reduced to 7 and 6 per cent., and then the Company had not commenced operations. At that time, you could hardly get more than 3 per cent. for deposits in the banks. The reduction was due in a large measure to the beneficial harvest we have had and the high prices at which we have sold our products.

Mr. COURSOL. The country, I believe, hailed the establishment of the Credit Foncier with pleasure, and every one supposed that the interest would continue at the rate that law gave that institution power to charge. Since that time, events in France have made money so tight that it is under the necessity of asking power to charge a higher rate. For my part, I would have no objections to our doing all in our power to relieve this Company, and I hope it will shortly be in a condition to lend at its former rate of interest; but I object to this Parliament legalizing usury by removing all limit on its power to charge interest. It may be said that people need not go to the Credit Foncier, but we are bound to protect the public at large, and see that those who go to the Credit Foncier are not imposed on. A maximum rate might be fixed in this instance, and the Bill might be referred back to the Committee to have this maximum rate settled.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not see that any object will be gained by referring this Bill to the Committee on Banking

and Commerce. There are no details in it. It is a simple provision to remove the restriction with regard to the rate of interest. I remember well the circumstances under which some of the extraordinary powers granted this Company were asked for before the Committee last Session. The promoters came before the Committee with beating of drums and blowing of trumpets, proposing to inaugurate a new era in this country in the lending of money. There was no intimation then that this extraordinary state of things would last only a year. We were given to understand that the result of our granting the legislation asked for, would be the power on the part of borrowers, especially among the farming community, to obtain money at lower rates than those ruling, and this was to continue for the fifty years of monopoly given by the Quebec Legislature. It is idle for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to talk of the willingness of the Company to consent to the removal of this monopoly. We have no power to deal with it here, and until it is removed by the Province of Quebec I do not see what reason this Company can give for asking us to remove the restrictions to the imposition of which it agreed voluntarily a year ago. The circumstances under which this Company finds it difficult to continue lending money at a fixed rate, are exceptional. The state of things in France, brought about by the commercial crisis, is likely to disappear within six months, and it is quite possible the Credit Foncier may be able to obtain money in France, even at 4 per cent. Or, if they continue to lend money at 6 per cent., they would be making 1 per cent. more than he thinks they would be likely to ask. I am entirely opposed to the passage of the Bill and to its reference to a Committee, and shall vote heartily for the six months' hoist.

Mr. GAULT. I am aware of the favor with which this Bill was received, not only by this House but by the whole country; and I say from my own knowledge, that was the means of reducing the rate of interest from 8 and 7 to 6 per cent. Very large amounts have been lent at 6 per cent. On that account I should think that if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would limit the rate to 7 per cent., his Bill should be allowed to go before the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. GIROUARD. One or two hon. members have said that we should apply to the Legislature of Quebec for redress. We ask the interference of this Parliament in this question, because I consider it belongs exclusively to the Federal Parliament. The Local Legislature has no jurisdiction whatever as regards the rate of interest, which belongs to this Parliament alone.

Mr. SCRIVER. I only referred to the point over which the Quebec Legislature has exclusive jurisdiction, and said that they should go to that Legislature to ask for the renewal of the monopoly.

Mr. GIROUARD. Some hon. gentleman exclaimed: "You have obtained a monopoly;" but they take good care not to define what that monopoly is. Monopoly is a very big word, and we know its effect; but I hope it will not have the effect of defeating this Bill. What does the monopoly amount to? Having a representative in France?

Mr. SCRIVER. Exclusively.

Mr. GIROUARD. This is not simply a Quebec corporation. It has been incorporated by Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; and it has lost about \$200,000 in Ontario and \$50,000 in Prince Edward Island. It is a Dominion corporation, enjoying no monopoly whatever. But it is said—you have obtained that monopoly, whatever it is worth, under the condition that you shall lend at 6 per cent. I defy hon. gentlemen to show a single word in the charter to support an understanding of that kind.

Mr. CASGRAIN. According to the language of the Act, 6 per cent. interest is sufficient, and the Company cannot pass that figure.

Mr. GIROUARD. That is not correct. The charter says the Company shall not exceed the rate of interest fixed by law, for the simple reason that the Local Legislature has no jurisdiction in matters of interest.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes 6 per cent. is the rate.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. In the absence of any agreement with regard to interest, the interest is fixed at 6 per cent.

Mr. GIROUARD. Yes; but we are told that the monopoly has been granted this Corporation to lend money at 6 per cent. Nothing of the kind. The contract with the Quebec Company was, that they should lend money only at the rate fixed by law. I ask is it fair to reject this Bill? Is it not better to refer it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce? Let the Committee pronounce as to whether there should be no liberty of the kind asked for. This is the first time that I have seen a Bill of this importance treated in this manner, and especially when the parties interested have done so much good to the country. If a limitation of the rate of interest must be imposed, let the Committee say so. If it fixes 7 per cent. we shall accept it. But why refuse to this institution, which has not abused its powers and privileges, a privilege which has been granted to every company of this kind that has come before Parliament? I am not speaking of this institution alone, but of hundreds of the same kind incorporated by this Parliament with no restrictions as to the rate of interest. Why should you be so severe, the moment the question is presented by the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien. I ask that this Bill should be treated fairly and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. If it finds a limitation should be imposed, say 7 or 8 per cent., I have no objection. The Trust and Loan Company had 8 per cent. allowed for many years, and it was looked upon as very favorable in its operations to the country at large. The second clause of the Bill is very important. When the question of issuing debentures comes up we find a discrepancy between the Quebec and Dominion Charters. The Quebec charter gives power to issue bonds, on the basis of the money lent in the country by this Company; but the Dominion charter takes the basis of capital paid in. And consequently when we came to issue bonds we did not know exactly under which charter we issued them. It is important, therefore, there should be an agreement as to the basis. Is it astonishing that we should ask power to issue bonds based on the large amount of money we have invested in the country? Here is an institution which has commenced with \$1,250,000. Money not borrowed, but subscribed and paid in, in good faith. Is not that a good basis for the issue of another \$1,250,000 worth of bonds? It is not the general custom to examine such bills on the second reading, as I could not propose any amendment. Did we treat the Bill of the Trust and Loan Company in this way a fortnight ago? Did we not allow it to go to the Committee, and is not this Bill exactly similar except as to the matter of the issue of bonds?

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). It is very well known I have always been an advocate of a fixed rate of interest, though I regret I failed to obtain it. I cannot see fairness and justice in the course proposed towards those asking for the consideration of this measure, or of holding this Company to a fixed rate of interest and permitting other companies to charge what they please. I think this measure should be submitted to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I cannot see why they should refuse the promoters of this Bill the opportunity of having it discussed, as all other Bills of the kind are. I go

further, and say that I do not see, if this Company has committed a foolish act and bound itself to contracts it cannot carry out, that we should compel it to adhere to them; because no law compels any one to abstain from increasing the rate of interest if he can augment it. I cannot see any reason why this Bill should not be allowed its second reading and referred in the usual way.

Mr. GIROUARD. I wish to say, in reply to the hon. member for L'Islet, who said that we have no power to remove a monopoly, the hon. gentleman has forgotten that this Act is to amend another Act. We have a Dominion charter. But even if we have no power to remove that monopoly, has not the Credit Foncier power to renounce it? I hereby, on behalf of this Company, publicly renounce it before this House.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Put a clause in the Bill.

Mr. GIROUARD. I cannot do that now, it is against the rule.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Act does not touch this Federal Act. It merely extends and enlarges the powers of the Quebec corporation.

Mr. GIROUARD. Does it not make it a Federal Act?

Mr. BLAKE. No; it does not.

Amendment, six months' hoist (Mr. Bourassa), agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Flynn,	Mills,
Anglia,	Fulton,	Montplaisir,
Bain,	Geoffrion,	Muttart,
Bannerman,	Gillies,	Olivier,
Béchar,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bill,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Blake,	Gunn,	Poupore,
Bolduc,	Guthrie,	Richey,
Bourassa,	Haddow,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Haggart,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bowell,	Hesson,	Rogers,
Brecken,	Holtou,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brown,	Huntington,	Routhier,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hurteau,	Rymal,
Caron,	Irvine,	Scott,
Cartwright,	Kaulbach,	Scrifer,
Casgrain,	Killam,	Smith,
Charlton,	King,	Snowball,
Chimon (Charlevoix),	Landry,	Sproule,
Chimon (Chicoutimi),	Langevin,	Stephenson,
Cockburn,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Sutherland,
Colby,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Tasse,
Coughlin,	Mackenzie,	Tellier,
Coupal,	Macmillan,	Tupper,
Crouter,	McCallum,	Tyrwhitt,
Currier,	McQuaig,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	McDongald,	Wade,
Doull,	McLelan,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Drew,	McQuade,	Weldon,
Dumont,	McRory,	Wheler,
Farrow,	Malouin,	White (Cardwell),
Fiset,	Massue,	White (Hastings),
Fitzsimmons,	Merner,	White (Renfrew),
Fleming,	Méthot,	Williams.—105.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Elliott,	McLennan,
Allison,	Gault,	Manson,
Arkell,	Gigault,	Ogden,
Beaty,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Platt,
Beauchesne,	Hay,	Reid,
Boulbee,	Hooper,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunting,	Houde,	Ross (Dundas),
Cameron (Victoria),	Jones,	Ryan (Marquette),
Carling,	Krans,	Ryan (Montreal),
Coursol,	Lane,	Ryker,
Daly,	Longley,	Wallace (York).—35.
Desjardins,	Macdonald (Kings),	

Mr. Ross (Dundas).

BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mills.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the American Electric Light Company of Canada.—(Mr. Colby.)

House adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 21st March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with the intention of making a second speech, or of repeating, in English, what I said the other day in French on this question; but when, on Friday last, this House adjourned, I had not quite completed my remarks, and it was agreed, on the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, that I should conclude them on the resumption of this debate. I think I could hardly let this occasion pass without noticing, at least briefly, the speech which was made a few days ago by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), who alluded to my course on one or two past occasions. The hon. member referred to something I said in the speech which I made in this House on the Tariff question during the Session of 1879, with regard to wheat and flour, and the effect of the duties imposed on those articles. What I said then I freely repeat now, for I still hold the same opinion—namely, that while there is in Canada a surplus of wheat and flour which we must export to foreign countries, the prices of those articles at home are determined by the prices abroad; and so long as we have that surplus, we are not in need of importing wheat and flour for home consumption, therefore, we have no duty to pay, and under those circumstances the duties imposed on such articles cannot be available to wheat producers in this country. To this opinion I may add, to-day, that, in consequence of a bad wheat crop in Canada, or of too large an exportation of our wheat and flour to the British markets where the demand for those articles may suddenly become great, were we are compelled to import those articles for home consumption, it is my opinion that we would have to pay the duties on them, and so long as that importation took place those duties would prove some advantage to our wheat producers in our market. As hon. gentlemen opposite are making great efforts, in eloquent speeches, to convince this House and the country that the increase which took place within the last eighteen months, in the prices of our farm products, must be attributed to the fact that the control of our home market has been secured to our farmers by the Tariff. I must say that I have very grave doubt as to the correctness of that proposition; for it will be remembered that, during 1879 and the first portion of 1880, farm produce

in this country was sold at lower prices than before, notwithstanding the operation of the Tariff. If we were situated as the people of England are—if we were compelled to import every year large quantities of farm produce for home consumption—I could understand that the duties imposed upon those imports would be of advantage some to our farmers, in our national markets. But in this country we are not so circumstanced. Instead of being obliged to import farm produce for home consumption, we are, on the contrary, compelled to export it, if we wish to make it of any value to us. Last year we exported of home products \$42,620,546. Suppose this immense quantity of farm produce which brought us this considerable amount had remained in Canada, and that we had only our national market to absorb it, what would have been its value to us? Everybody will see that it would have been wasted, or would have remained perfectly worthless to the farmer, notwithstanding the operation of the Tariff. Having every year a large surplus of farm produce to export, we are dependent for its sale upon the foreign demand, and the greater the demand the higher the price—the less the demand the lower the price. This being the case, it logically follows that the prices of our farm produce at home are determined entirely by the prices it produces in the foreign market, and not at all by the operation of our protective Tariff. Now, I believe that the surplus we have every year does more to secure to our farmers the control of our market than the Tariff; for to that extent itself that surplus excludes the foreign article from our market which, being already overflowing with our national products, cannot prove an advantageous market for the sale of foreign produce of similar kinds. The farmers of the western States understand their business very well when they will not sell their surplus in certain markets. They take good care not to send it to the markets already overflowing with similar products, and from which a surplus must be exported to some other country; but they take good care to export their produce to markets where it is needed, and where they can consequently sell at remunerative prices. I say then that the control of our market is secured to our farmers by the very fact of our having a surplus; and that the price of our produce at home is entirely determined by its price abroad, and not at all by the Tariff. Having disposed of this portion of my subject, I must return to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault). He referred to a motion which I made in 1878, asking for the imposition of a duty upon corn. I will not take the trouble to enter into any explanation of my reasons for making that motion, but I will content myself with telling the hon. member that I had as good reason for making it as his leaders had for imposing precisely the same duties in the Tariff of 1867, and for repealing them in the following Session of 1868. I had as good reasons for making that motion as his friends had for dividing upon it, one party voting for and the other against it. The hon. gentleman still upholds the doctrine that the producer pays the duty instead of the consumer, and he asserts that the hon. member for Lambton also upholds the same doctrine—that if he does not now uphold it he did so a few years ago; for he endeavored to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States Government, through the agency of the late Hon. George Brown, because he knew that the duties imposed upon our exports to the United States were paid by the producer. I will not attempt to give the reasons which impelled the hon. member for Lambton to attempt that negotiation, for he knows them better than I do, and is more able to explain them, if he thinks it worth his while. It is admitted on both sides of this House that a reciprocity treaty with the Americans on the basis of Free Trade would be beneficial to both countries. We know that the duties imposed on our exports to the United States hurt our sales, for in increasing the price of our products in the American

market, they have a tendency to diminish their consumption and the demand for them; that is an evil. But on the other hand, it must be admitted that the duties imposed on our imports from that country hurt our purchasers, and that is another evil. These restrictions, it is admitted on all sides, are injurious to our international trade with the Americans, and it is for that reason we are disposed, on this side of the line, at least, to negotiate, if possible, a reciprocity treaty on the basis of Free Trade. But, Sir, if the doctrine of the hon. member, that the producer pays the duty, is sound, I say that protection to manufacturers, by the imposition of Customs duties, is an impossibility indeed, Sir. If the duties imposed on our imports are paid by the foreign producers, certainly they cannot have the effect of increasing the prices of foreign goods when they come into our own market, and where the protection is the advantage, then you give it to our manufacturers? But, that is not all. If that doctrine is sound, the present rates of the tariff are not high enough; they should be 50 or 75, and why not 100 per cent. With such a Tariff we would have a very large revenue. The hon. the Finance Minister would see flowing into his coffers, next year, not only the \$20,000,000 which he expects from the Customs, but perhaps \$75,000,000 or \$100,000,000. With such a revenue what could not be accomplished? We could construct all our great public works without being obliged to borrow a single dollar. We could pay our national debt within the short space of a few years, and we could defray the expenses of this Government without imposing a cent of taxation upon our people, for all this money would be paid by foreigners with whom we have commercial intercourse. Now, everybody will agree with me, that a stringent application of that doctrine would be productive of the most beneficial results, and that surely the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) should soon take the place of the hon. the Finance Minister. But that hon. gentleman did not only allude to myself in the course of his remarks, but he also referred to several of my hon. friends sitting around me, and notably to the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret), and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). Each of these hon. gentlemen received his little share of the compliments so modestly distributed by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault.) But, among those hon. gentlemen, the hon. member for South Brant seems to have been a pet and a favorite with the hon. member for Rouville, for not only was he congratulated upon his utterances on different public occasions, but he was also congratulated upon his sweet voice. Surely, Sir, the hon. member for Rouville did not mean to be ironical when he spoke of the *sweet voice* of the hon. member for South Brant, for no man who has heard that full, sonorous tribune's voice, whose thundering tones have so many times, either from his seat in Parliament or from the hustings in Ontario, cast terror into the Conservative ranks, would dream for a moment to exchange it for the voice of the hon. member for Rouville, however agreeable, amiable and musical the hon. gentleman may think it is. Now, Sir, if that hon. gentleman chooses to indulge in pointing out what he, doubtless, considers to be contradictions between the utterances of public men at one time and the utterances of the same men at other times and on other occasions, he need not, in order to fulfil that mission, travel outside his own political atmosphere; let him, *that star* of the Conservative party, revolve in the orbit of that party; let him study the utterances and deeds of his friends on different occasions, and he may be sure to find enough there to gratify his inclination and to edify himself. The hon. gentleman, in another portion of his speech, seemed to feel that he would not be discharging his whole duty unless he directed a little attack against the Liberal party. I noticed, Sir, that since that hon. gentleman

held a seat on the floor of this House, he never misses at every Session the opportunity of throwing bitter aspersions upon the Liberal party of this country. True it is that, perhaps, he has very good reasons for displaying that animosity, because the Liberals are numerous and strong in his own constituency, and they only need stand united, to make this hon. gentleman repent in sackcloth and ashes, the bitterness he has never failed to display against them. The hon. gentleman said that the Liberal party were always opposed to the great measures passed for the good of the country, and he mentioned the Intercolonial Railway and the Pacific Railway as among those measures. If I wanted to imitate the conduct of the hon. member, it would be proper for me, in answer to that charge, to direct his attention to the reading made by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) in his speech, of a memorandum of the proceedings of a convention composed of delegates from the then Liberal Government of Canada, and from the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in which it was shown that the respective Governments of those Provinces had decided that the Intercolonial Railway, and later the Pacific Railway, should be built. I might also refer him on that question to another extract made by the hon. member for Montmagny—namely, an extract from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Lambton at Sarnia, in which he declared himself in favor of the construction of the Pacific Railway. These extracts from the speech of his own political friend will, I think, be a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman's groundless charge. The hon. gentleman in another part of his speech said that it was ridiculous for the Liberals to call themselves the successors of Baldwin and Lafontaine, whom they denounced as traitors; and on this charge being denied by my hon. friend from Verchères, the hon. gentleman quoted an extract from a paper published thirty years ago, which seemed to reflect upon these great political leaders. I well remember that some thirty-four or thirty-five years ago, a dozen of young men—all students—started a paper, which lasted about two years, and was succeeded by the journal from which the hon. gentleman quoted the other day. But I hold, Sir, that the Liberal party, such as organized later, cannot be held responsible for the writings or utterances of those young men, whatever they may have been, and it would be as unjust to bind them by what may have been written in those papers, as to attribute annexationist principles either to the Conservative or the Liberal party, because some of their members shared in the annexationist movement which took place in 1849. It is well-known that a distinguished member of the Conservative party now holding a place of high trust in the name of this Government, in England—signed an annexationist manifesto in 1849. Do we conclude from that fact that the great Conservative party are in favor of annexation?—it would be an injustice to do so. Sir, Lafontaine and Baldwin, were two great Liberal leaders, who fought for the institution of responsible Government in this country, by whom were they opposed?—by men who, in those times, were called the leaders of the Tory party, by men with whom a large portion of those who had previously followed Lafontaine and Baldwin, made an alliance, accepting the leader of the Tory party for their own leader, some time after these two eminent men had withdrawn from public life. Those who branded Baldwin and Lafontaine as traitors, were not the Liberal party, as was asserted by the hon. member for Rouville, but they were those men who had opposed them all their life, and who were so bitter against them that on a memorable occasion never to be forgotten, when what was called the Indemnity Bill passed Parliament, they succeeded by inflammatory speeches in infuriating a mob of their followers, who, doubtless, in order to show their loyalty to their Queen, did not hesitate to assail the representative of Her Majesty in Canada with

Mr. BÉCHARD.

a shower of rotten eggs, and who, after having accomplished that chivalrous exploit, a few days afterwards, in order to show their loyalty to their country, burned down the Parliament buildings of Canada. These are the men by whom Lafontaine and Baldwin were branded as traitors. Sir, I dislike to indulge in those regrettable reminiscences of the past, a past which is far behind us, but I am compelled to do so in defence of the Liberal party against the bitter attacks made by the hon. member for Rouville. Lafontaine and Baldwin were never called Conservative leaders, they were never known as Conservative leaders, they were Liberal leaders; and the Liberals of to-day, like those men, are imbued with Liberal principles, which they intend to uphold and defend against all assaults, from whatever quarter they may come, even when they come from the terrible member for Rouville. The hon. gentleman says, in another portion of his speech, the Liberals never accomplished anything for the good of the country. Sir, this charge is pretty vague, and no one is expected to recite here what the Liberals have done, in answer to that inoffensive charge which is absolutely gratuitous. It is true they have not been long in power. During the last thirty years, they have been in power but twice; first, under the Administration of the late John Sandfield Macdonald, which lasted about twenty months, and next during the Administration of my hon. friend from Lambton, which lasted only five years, and during which this country was distressed by a terrible crisis which paralyzed all kinds of industries, and which could be controlled by no power on earth except that of time. But, if the Liberals have not had sufficient opportunity to accomplish all they could wish for their country, they have, at least, one great advantage—they have often been promoters of great measures which, after having been resisted by their opponents, have finally been adopted by them. They have, besides that, a clear and noble record. There is no dark page in the history of the Liberal party, and after several defeats on the battle-field, they can look with pride to their escutcheon which remains spotless and unstained.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). I feel reluctant to prolong this discussion, of which I am sure both sides of the House must be tired, as it has been continued now for some time. Yet I must say that this side of the House has hardly had their share of the speaking. On the other side of the House we have heard several speeches four or five hours in length, and I, therefore, have no need to apologize when I say that, if we continue this debate any longer, it will not be our fault, but that of the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, we need not fear the discussion that has taken place with regard to this matter. Our principles are the same to-day as they were in 1879; our position has not changed in any way. Hon. members on the other side of the House have especially attacked the hon. members for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and South Brant (Mr. Paterson). They have attacked these hon. gentlemen for speeches they made in the past in regard to this question, not by quoting the whole of their speeches, or giving a fair interpretation to them, but by quoting only a portion of them, which was very unfair to those hon. gentlemen. But when we come to review the speeches made by several hon. members on the other side in the past, and the course they have pursued with regard to this question, we have little to fear from comparison. Take the President of the Council himself, and his action in the past on this trade question has been entirely contrary to his action to-day. Prior to Confederation he was strongly in favor, not only of a revenue Tariff, but of out-and-out Free Trade. His strongest objection against Confederation was that it would raise the duty from 10 per cent., as it was then in Nova Scotia, to 15 per cent. The hon. the Minister of Railways, when in the Government of Nova Scotia, was a pronounced upholder of a Tariff for revenue. In the discussion that took place in 1874, in the resolutions of the hon. member for Centre Huron for raising the Tariff from 15 to

17½ per cent., the present hon. Minister of Railways then spoke in the strongest possible manner in condemnation, saying it was the entering of the thin edge of Protection. Here are his words:

"I fear the hon. Minister is seeking to enter the thin edge of Protection, which will eventually work ruin and desolation to the Maritime Provinces. Let the hon. Minister look at the neighboring Republic, and he will find that the policy of that country has swept their flag off the seas, and given to others the carrying trade of the world."

I find that the right hon. leader of the Government, in 1873, spoke thus:

"The flour tax has been imposed as an assertion of the independence of the country against American exclusive legislation. It has been maintained in this view until it had been found to work oppressively on certain sections of the community, and so it was repealed as a step in the right direction."

We find the *Montreal Gazette* of that time had the following:

"Let our wise men run the Dominion ship as nearly as possible on the Free Trade plan, and we shall have no fears for her safety."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have also the resolution moved by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) in 1874:

"That, without forming any opinion upon some of the details of the present Customs Tariff, and the anomalies which are inevitable in all Tariffs, this Board is of the opinion that no change should be made in it unless the exigencies of the public service demand larger revenues, and that in such case any increase to be made should be in accordance with the principle of the present Customs Tariff, which, while not interfering with the commerce of the Dominion, affords incidental Protection to its manufactures. That this Board is of the opinion that permanence in the fiscal policy of the country is most important alike to its commerce and to its manufactures, and that no changes should be made in the Tariff not demanded by the absolute necessities of the revenue."

We might go on giving speeches and resolutions of other members on the other side of the House to show that only a very short period has elapsed since they took stronger ground than even we take now against Protection. I think hon. gentlemen opposite had better settle this question among themselves before they begin to lecture us on this side of the House as regards our policy. They have challenged us with being disloyal, with being hostile to manufacturers and hostile to the best interests of this country and to everything that tends to promote its progress; but I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show any unpatriotic motive as actuating hon. members on this side. If they will travel through the country they will find that the largest number of people interested in manufactures and in enterprises of various kinds belong to the Liberal party; they will find them more liberal than conservative in fostering enterprises required to promote our industries and cause them to progress satisfactorily. The Liberal party believe that enterprise and energy are the only true motive powers to secure success in any enterprise; they do not believe in the assistance of legislation or protection to spur enterprises into existence and leave them afterwards to depend more on State support than on the energy and enterprise of the promoters. I therefore hurl back the charge that the Liberals are hostile to manufacturers, or to the progress of the country. The policy propounded by hon. members of the Opposition in 1879, has been maintained by them ever since, and the results have proved that they were right. When the hon. Minister of Finance introduced his Tariff in that year, he came down with the proposition to raise \$2,000,000 of revenue by a readjustment of the Tariff. We, on this side of the House, took the ground that, if that sum was required, the hon. Minister had imposed an enormous burden to secure that result, a far greater tax than was necessary to raise that sum. We maintained that the Tariff introduced, if applied to the importations of 1878, would produce a taxation of nearly \$7,000,000, either in revenue or in the pockets of manufacturers. If the Tariff of 1879 be applied to the importations of 1878, it will produce that amount almost precisely, and whatever does not go into the revenue will go to the manufactures. We showed that

taxation would be increased, and the result has proved the accuracy of our prediction. With regard to the different industries, we maintained also that a vastly larger number of manufactures would be injured by the Tariff then proposed than would be benefitted by it; that they were not protected but injured by the increased taxation imposed on raw materials used. We maintained that over 500,000 farmers representing a population of over 2,500,000, could not possibly be benefitted by the Tariff but would be called upon to bear increased taxation. We maintained also that while we were a large exporting people and depended almost entirely on the exports of farm produce, lumber and fish for the imports of the country, and for our paying capacity to balance the trade, these industries being taxed very largely could not possibly receive any benefit from the Tariff and did not. We maintained that the lumbermen of the Dominion, who represent a capital of over \$100,000,000 and who altogether support between 400,000 and 500,000 persons, and who have exported since Confederation nearly \$300,000,000 worth of lumber, were called upon to bear increased taxation, and could not possibly derive benefit from the Tariff. We maintained that the shipping interest, which is a very large interest in this Dominion, representing about \$50,000,000 capital, could not derive any advantage from the Tariff by being called upon to pay additional taxation, but would decline, as statistics have shown; also that the fishermen were additionally taxed and could receive no benefit from the Tariff. We maintained also that a large number of manufacturers were not only not benefitted but were injured by the taxation imposed on raw material. They have not got, as said they would, the home market, and their exports of manufactured goods steadily decreasing, as trade returns show. We took those strong grounds in 1879. The results have proved that we were correct in all our representations at that time. They were not only proved by the parties themselves, by farmers, lumbermen, shipbuilders, fishermen, and by several of the manufacturers, but also by the Government. The Government are aware that they could do nothing, and that they have not improved the position of the farmers. They know they have taxed the lumbermen, and have admitted it. They know that the millers have been taxed; and therefore, to satisfy them, they gave them the privilege of grinding grain in bond for exportation. They admitted that the shipbuilders have been heavily taxed, and they have given them a bonus of 75 cents per ton, but not the labouring men. They know that the fishermen have been taxed, for they come down this year and declare that: "We know you are taxed very largely, and we therefore give you \$150,000 a year to help to make up for the taxation." The fishermen are a very important part of the community, the shore boat and schooner fishermen, represent 80,000 good, able-bodied men and support a population of 350,000 or 400,000 people. The lowest possible calculations made in Nova Scotia is that the taxation under the Tariff amounts to \$12 per head for these men. But we will place the additional taxes at \$6 per head, and we then find they are taxed nearly \$500,000 a year by this Tariff, and the Government now come down and offer \$150,000 in lieu of that sum. We find also that the Government admit they tax manufacturers, for they come down year after year with alterations of the Tariff, and they have extended the free list from time to time, as pressure was brought to bear on them by the manufacturers. So I say that as regards most of the industries I have mentioned, the Government themselves have shown that they know they have taxed them by coming down and making concessions in lieu of taxation. I might mention also that the blacksmiths, boiler-makers, coopers, engine builders, sail-makers, car manufacturers, sheet-iron workers, stone and marble workers, printing offices, paper manufacturers, sash and door manufacturers, wood turners, carvers, gilders, broom and brush makers, tailors, clothiers, furriers and hatters, trunk makers, and others, all more or less heavily

taxed on the raw materials they use, and are worse off under this Tariff than under the previous one as manufacturers. Further, there was great and unjust discrimination in the Tariff introduced by the hon. the Minister of Finance. Certain classes of the population were taxed more than others, especially the laboring classes, who are large consumers of the cheaper classes of dry goods chiefly in woollens and cottons. These were taxed 20 to 30 per cent. more than those who can afford to buy the more expensive goods. With regard to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways, I do not think any speech delivered in the House this Session has done the Opposition more good than this. The extreme position he took on coal itself is an evidence of this. The hon. the Finance Minister talked of the Americans paying half the duty, but the hon. the Minister of Railways went further and said they paid the whole of the duty, and that coal could be bought cheaper here than in the United States. With regard to coal oil, the hon. Minister of Railways might have known, and probably did know, that the Opposition when in power reduced the taxes on coal oil from 15 cents to 6 cents per gallon. With regard to tea, he spoke of the enormous discrimination of the duty levied by the late Administration; but any one who will look at the importation for ten years back will see that none was imported at the prices mentioned by the hon. Minister, and that the duty was no greater on one kind than on another. As far as the loans floated by the hon. member for Centre Huron are concerned, the hon. Minister of Railways, in speaking as he did, cast a reflection not only on his own colleague but also on our general agents in London, for the charge that the late hon. Minister of Finance distributed his loans among his own friends in London would apply equally well to the present hon. Minister of Finance, since he adopted the same course and sold at rates no better in 1878-79, did he give to his friends thereby over \$3,500. I am sure no hon. member on this side would charge the hon. the Minister of Finance with giving his friends any advantage over the public at large, who were the purchasers. The hon. the Minister also spoke of the London agents. Well, if they acted, as he asserted, they were certainly not worthy of being retained, yet the Government made no change of agents. We believe the transactions were, in all cases, perfectly honorable and fair, and that the agents are good, substantial, careful men, and that the hon. the Minister of Railways, in making the statement, not only showed his unfairness and reckless insinuation, but implicated in his charge not only his own colleague but the Government agents as well. As to the differences in the price of the last loan, 1880, the difference in the dates of negotiation will account for that. In 1873-74, there occurred in Vienna and New York, a panic of which many commercial and financial failures were the outcome. The crisis was something unheard of, so much so that the interest on money in London rose to 9 per cent. The following year, 1875, that panic continued. In 1876, the tightness in money still continued, and, in 1877, the Russo-Turkish war had a depressing effect on business. In 1878, the Glasgow Bank failure and other commercial disasters had made the negotiating of loans almost an impossibility on favorable terms; but, in 1879-80, the change took place and money went down to 2 and 2½ per cent. and remained so, thus making it much easier for the hon. Finance Minister to float his last loan. The hon. Finance Minister, in his speech, compared 1874 and 1878, 1875 and 1879, 1877 and 1879, 1877 and 1881—changing his base of calculation and comparison no less than thirteen times to suit his purpose in comparing the management of the late and present Government. It must be very amusing to the commercial community to be informed, as they were by the hon. Finance Minister, that they paid into the Treasury \$18,500,000 as a voluntary contribution to the revenue. In comparing exports and imports, the hon. Finance Minister, in

Mr. BURPEE (St. John).

answer to the hon. member for Brant, took the years 1874 and 1878 and compared them with 1879 and 1881, showing very little exports on an average in the last three years over 1874 and 1878. But, to make out a case against the late Government—that the taxes levied by the present Government were less than those imposed by their predecessors to the extent of 23 cents per head—he takes the five years from 1875 to 1879, and compares them with the two years from 1880 to 1881, making use of the deficits and surpluses. He showed that the taxes under the late Government were \$4.88 per head, and under the present, \$4.65 per head. He takes in some cases where it suits 1874 to 1878, and has several times said that we are responsible for 1874. The hon. member for Cardwell, said, the other night, that we were responsible for that year, and we will, for comparison sake, take the years from 1874 to 1878, and the years 1879 and 1881 for all our comparison. For the period from 1874 to 1878, adding the deficits of \$2,363,000, it leaves a tax of \$4.80 per head. Now, take the three years from 1879 to 1881, and deduct surplus of \$750,512, and we have a rate of \$4.80 per head; or take the account as it stands in the Public Accounts, in which I think the people of the country will look for their information, and compare the years of each Government, as there recorded, and you will find, from 1874 to 1878, the taxation was \$4.68 per head, while that from 1879 to 1881 reached \$4.86, or was 18 cents less per head in the first period of the late Government than in the second, or present Government.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BURPEE. Now, with regard to the average expenditure of, the two Governments, the Minister of Finance takes for comparison the outlay from 1874 to 1878 with that from 1879 to 1881, to show that the increased expenditure by the present Government over that of the late Government was only some \$1,242,000. But there must be added to that amount \$334,000 for Dominion lands, which the late Government always charged to revenue, but which the present Government takes out of revenue and charges to capital account. But while we are enquiring into the expenditure of the two Governments, it is best to take the Public Accounts, from which it will be seen that the expenditure of the late Government has reached only \$23,500,000 in 1878, and that its expenditure had increased, from 1874 to 1878, but some \$200,000; and that, notwithstanding that the present hon. Finance Minister said, during the elections of 1878, that all his party wanted was \$18,000,000 from Customs, Excise, and Bill Stamps, or altogether but \$22,500,000 to carry on the business of the country. Notwithstanding that the hon. the Minister of Railways said that they could do with less than \$22,500,000 if they were in power, we find that in three years, their expenditure has reached \$25,500,000, or with \$334,000 more, which they charged to capital account, which we charged to revenue, (Dominion lands,) making an aggregate of \$25,834,600, or \$2,334,000 above that of the year 1877-78. But that is not all, they have not only increased the expenditure of the Dominion in three years, over \$2,734,600: but they came down this year and asked, in the Estimates for 1882-83, the enormous sum of \$27,600,000, and also \$400,000 for Dominion lands, charged to capital which, I repeat, we charged to income, making a total of \$28,000,000, an addition to the expenditure of \$4,498,000 in five years of their reign. They may add and subtract from the figures as much as they like, but that is the result from the Public Accounts and their own estimates. Then we had the hon. member for Cardwell, whom I do not see in his place, dealing with this subject; he, the other night, also charged the late Government with the responsibility of the expenditure for the year 1873-74. He said that we exceeded the estimates for that year, the estimates of the present hon. Finance Minister, by \$1,676,660. Now, I can show from the Estimates of that hon. gentle-

man for 1873-74 that the late Government did not only not exceed them, but did not expend the amount set down for that year. The original Estimates for 1873-74 were \$20,941,182; first, Supplementary Estimates, \$368,340; second Supplementary, \$57,300; third, Supplementary, \$100,000. Then, again, under the 36th Victoria, the provincial subsidy and assumption of the provincial debts produced another item of \$918,000; increased salaries, \$300,000; admission of Prince Edward Island, \$418,000; organization of Mounted Police, \$200,000; a further balance of \$432,000, making a total of \$23,685,000 of estimated expenditure for 1873-74. The expenditure of the Government of the hon. member for Lambton during that year was \$23,316,317, or less than the estimate by \$368,692, showing the member for Cardwell's great error. I may just give one of the many instances of the necessity of the Government of 1873 estimating very large amounts on account obligations incurred by them a few days before they left office, 7th November, 1873. We find that a number of appointments to office and increases to salaries were made between January, 1873, and 7th November, 1873, in the Civil Service as follows: Governor General's Office, three were increases in salaries amounting to \$350; in the Privy Council one new appointment, \$700, and six increases, \$820, total \$1,520; Secretary of State, nine new appointments, \$4,690, and nine salaries increased \$1,650, total \$6,340; Militia, six new appointments, \$5,600, eighteen increases, \$2,677, total \$38,277; in Receiver General's, two appointments, \$1,600, and seven increases, \$1,200, total \$2,800. In the Public Works Department there were twenty-eight appointments, costing \$21,546, and one hundred and seventy-one salaries increased, \$19,074, making a total in the number of increases and appointments of 199, at a cost of \$40,620. In the Department of the Minister of Justice there were seventy-five new appointments, \$77,800, with eleven increases, \$1,760, making an addition of \$79,560. In the Department of the Interior there were nineteen new appointments, \$14,070, and twenty-five increases, \$5,000, total \$19,080. Customs, new appointments, 111, \$58,076, increase, 636, making an additional outlay of \$125,461. Inland Revenue, eighty-four appointments, \$30,575, and ninety six increases, \$16,550, total 180, addition \$47,065; Department of Finance, seventeen appointments, \$15,400, increase twenty-four, \$2,650, addition \$18,050; Agriculture, forty-one appointments, \$35,025, increase fifteen, \$1,178, addition \$37,203; Marine and Fisheries, 159 new appointments, \$21,900, and forty-nine increases, \$9,025; additional expenditure, \$30,925; Post Office, seventy-seven new appointments, \$36,020, and 311 increases, \$22,220, additional expenditure, \$58,220; altogether an addition made by the late Government of 1873 for the Civil Service alone, just previous to their going out of power, of \$475,293 annually. What do we find under the Government of the hon. member for Lambton, the total reductions for ordinary controllable expenditure, between the years of 1874 and 1878, was \$1,781,566, divided thus: Civil Service, reduction, \$60,300; Penitentiaries, \$37,500; Legislation, \$166,000; Immigration, \$137,822; Geological Surveys, \$1,764; Marine Hospital, \$8,972; Public Works, \$827,404; Ocean Service, \$5,328; Light-houses, \$75,100; Miscellaneous, \$21,000; Dominion Lands, \$195,535; Culling Timber, \$32,946; Militia, \$359,239; Contingencies, \$64,625. We find these several reductions, between the years 1874 and 1878, amounted in all to \$1,781,566. The hon. the Finance Minister next in taking up the comparison of the two Governments for Post Office service he goes back again to the years 1875 to 1879 showing the average annual expenditure to be \$1,709,000 and the average annual receipts \$1,149,000, average deficits annually \$560,000 for late Government; while for the years 1880-81 the average annual expenditure was \$1,847,000 and the average annual receipts \$1,302,000, average deficit \$545,000, or a deficit of \$15,000 a year less than the

late Government. Mr. Speaker what are the facts of the case, taking the years for which the late Government are responsible and comparing with the years the present Government are responsible—1874 to 1878 inclusive, and 1879 to 1881:

Late Government, 1874-78, average annual expenditure...	\$1,592,241
do do deficits	1,144,116
Average deficits.....	\$448,125

Present Government, 1879-81, average annual expenditure..	\$1,826,451
do do deficits	1,259,008

Average deficits..... \$567,443

Or a greater annual increased deficit by the present Government of \$119,318, instead of a decreased deficit of \$15,000. The increase of expenditure for this service in three years by present Government has been \$151,719, and the increase the present Government asked for up to 1873, \$294,961. This statement shows the enormous increased expenditure of the Post Office service. Now, I think this will show the unfairness of the present Finance Minister in making comparisons in their favor, as against the late Government. The years from 1874 to 1878 are taken as those for which the late Government are responsible, although I say they are not responsible for the whole of it. The hon. the Minister of Finance next took up the Intercolonial Railway. I venture to say there is no part of the public service for which the late Government have been more abused than in connection with that railway. While the hon. member for Lambton was at the head of the Department of Public Works, he was abused from one end of the country to the other, for his alleged mismanagement of that road. When the present hon. Minister of Railways came into power, his first duty, of course, was to set things right, as he said, in dismissing officers, reducing the salaries of others, already small, shutting up the workshops at Moncton, and buying a good deal of the rolling-stock in the United States. During the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, the cost of the construction work done at the workshops at Moncton was charged to revenue account, while after the dismissal of these men from the workshops, and when the rolling stock was imported, the cost was charged to capital account by the present Government. Some of the men dismissed from the Moncton workshops were found employment in the United States in the places where these locomotives and rolling-stock purchased by the Government were manufactured. The hon. the Minister of Finance makes the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway, from 1874 to 1879, under late Government average, \$2,659 per mile. He makes the working expenses for the two years of the present Government average \$1,987 per mile, showing a decreased expenditure by the present Government of \$672 per mile. He shows an average receipt per mile, from 1874 to 1879, of \$1,760, late Government. The average receipts for the two years, 1880 and 1881, were \$1,980 per mile, or \$220 of an increase in favor of present Government. What do we find by taking the five years from 1874 to 1878 and comparing them with the years from 1879 to 1881, the correct years for comparison. As this is a subject out of which a good deal of political capital has been made against the late Government, I shall be more minute in this statement than I would be otherwise. In 1874, there were 371 miles of railway in operation, yielding a revenue of \$893,430, and involving an expenditure of \$1,025,831. In 1875, 422 miles; revenue, \$861,593; expenditure, \$850,775. 1876, 512 miles; revenue, \$846,861; expenditure, \$877,485. 1877, 720 miles; revenue, \$1,154,447; expenditure, and \$1,461,273. 1878, 720 miles; revenue, \$1,378,946; expenditure, \$1,611,273. Those were the years during which my hon. friend for Lambton administered that Department. In 1879, 720 miles; revenue, \$1,294,009;

expenditure, \$1,875,000. 1880, 840 miles; revenue, \$1,506,298; expenditure, \$1,603,439. In 1881, 846 miles; with a revenue of \$1,760,393, and an expenditure of \$1,759,822. Now, Sir, for the purpose of making comparison we will take the five years of the late Government from 1874 to 1878, in which the receipts averaged \$1,027,455 annually, and the three years from 1879 to 1881, in which the receipts averaged \$1,520,283 annually, showing a balance in favor of 1879-81 on receipts of \$492,778. In five years the expenditure, under the late Government, averaged \$1,165,327; in three years, under the present Government, viz., 1879 to 1881, \$1,746,417, or an expenditure by the present Government over the years 1874-78 of \$581,090, or a net balance in favor of the late Government of \$88,312.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say, in speaking of the railway expenditures, that he took six years. Allow me to read what I stated on that subject. What I said was this:

"Now, Sir, it may be well to call the attention of the House to one or two other facts, to show why it is that we have been able to keep the taxation of the people lower than it was during the time our friends opposite were in power. In connection with this, I desire to call the attention of the House to some facts with reference to the working of the railways, from July, 1874, to July, 1879."

All the calculations are based on five years.

Mr. BURPEE. That is just what I have taken—1874 to 1879.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Including both years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. From July, 1874, to July, 1879.

Mr. BURPEE. For the purposes of comparison it will make little or no difference in the calculations, but in favor of the late Government, if you take it that way. I have taken the total receipts and the total expenditures of the railway, and I shall now take the receipts and expenditure per mile as the hon. the Minister of Finance has done. From 1874 to 1878, the receipts per mile were \$1,886; from 1879 to 1881, \$1,890, or four dollars per mile in favor of the present Government. For the five years, from 1874 to 1878, the expenditure per mile was \$2,151; from 1879 to 1881, the present Government have expended \$2,234, or a balance against the present Government of \$83 per mile, or on the whole a net balance in favor of the late Government of \$79 per mile. If any hon. member of the House chooses to go into these calculations, he will find, by the Public Works Reports, that they are accurate. I might say, before going further, that in the comparisons I have made I have put the late Government on the same footing as the present Government. I have taken the amount for steel rails, \$700,000, paid by the late Government in 1876-77-78 out of revenue as the present Government are charged all such expenditure to capital account, and there are quite a number of smaller items in the Accounts which are now charged to capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, that were charged by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) to revenue. My hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was in power, sought to close up the capital account of the Intercolonial from the year 1876 and charge everything, to revenue account, instead of doing, as the present Government are doing, charging a large number of items to capital. In 1879, there is charged to capital account, \$226,639; in 1880, \$548,000; in 1881, \$608,732, and in the Estimates for 1882, they took \$446,469 for capital account—the supplementary estimates they ask for \$383,639 more this year, making, for 1882, \$730,308. They ask for 1883, \$609,086, making altogether nearly \$3,000,000 in the five years that they have charged and estimated for capital account. Then, Mr. Speaker, last year they asked

Mr. BURPEE (St. John).

\$1,600,000 for running expenses, and they have asked, in the Supplementary Estimates this year, \$300,000 more, making, in all, \$1,900,000 for running expenses. Now, I think, when we consider the increased trade of the country, the increased freight, which has grown, between 1878 and 1881, something like from 7,833,420 tons in 1878, to 12,102,000 tons in 1881, or an increase of nearly 60 per cent.—passenger nearly same increase,—and when we consider that the receipts have been nearly 30 per cent. over those of 1878, and when we consider that during part of the time of the late Government the road was unfinished and incomplete, that it was laid with iron rails, and equipped with insufficient rolling stock, that it had to compete for two seasons with the Gulf line of steamers from Shediac to Gaspé, Quebec—I say that, when we consider these facts, it speaks volumes for the management of the late Government, and shows how unfair the criticisms are in which members of the Government indulge throughout the country regarding the management of the Intercolonial Railway by the hon. member for Lambton. We also find that in the three years under the late Government, from 1876 to 1878, there was a surplus in managing the canals of \$4,629; while in the three years under the present Government, from 1879 to 1881, there was a deficit of \$40,319, with a larger trade. Then we come to the reduction of taxation spoken of by the Minister of Finance. While we on this side of the House are willing to accept any reduction of taxes which the Government are disposed to give us, we say, or I for one say, that there is no tax which the people of this country feel less than the duties on tea and coffee. Last year's consumption was 16,000,000 lbs., which was certainly very large. In 1873, the consumption was 15,000,000 lbs., and, in 1875, it was 14,000,000 lbs; but in the highest year the average taxes on tea and coffee amount to only about 20 cents per head of the population of the Dominion—one-half of the taxes on one barrel of meal, a little over one-third of the tax on a barrel of flour, and one-third of the tax on a ton of coal. The boast is made from one end of the country to the other that the hon. Minister of Finance is giving the people a free breakfast-table by reducing the duties on tea and coffee; but before you talk about a free breakfast table, you should go back to the old duties on tables and chairs by reducing 17½ per cent. take off the 12½ per cent. additional on crockery-ware, 12½ per cent. on silver and plated ware, 50 or 60 cents a ton on coal, and 10 or 50 cents a barrel on meal and flour, all of which reductions are necessary to make a breakfast table as free as it was in 1878. When you consider the taxation on all these articles, you will see how false is the idea that is being spread abroad of the people getting a free breakfast table. The hon. Minister of Finance also referred to a prediction made by us on this side of the House, that the Tariff would interfere with the trade of Canada with Great Britain. No doubt it was said that the Tariff would change the current of trade, but it is almost impossible to make a comparison between the two regimes with respect to the trade with Great Britain and the United States. From 1874 to 1878, as the hon. Minister of Customs well knows, a large amount of the imports into this country from the United States, entered for consumption, were afterwards exported, and were not the products of Canada. From 1874 to 1878, the total imports for consumption were \$529,256,000; the total value of goods entered for consumption and afterwards exported, not the products of Canada, in the same five years, were \$38,976,000; leaving the net imports for consumption for the five years \$490,279,000. Of these imports, there came from Great Britain \$48,232,000, or 49 per cent.; and from the United States \$42,425,000, or 43 per cent.; and from other countries \$7,398,000, or 7 per cent. For the three years, from 1879 to 1881, the total imports for consumption were \$243,735,000, less the amount for 1879, which was

imported and afterwards exported, of \$7,677,000, making the net consumption for the three years \$236,057,000; of which there was imported from Great Britain, \$36,346,000, or 46 per cent.; from the United States, \$24,037,000, or 43 per cent.; and from other countries, \$8,302,000, or 10 per cent., showing a decrease of 3 per cent. from Great Britain, while United States, remained the same. The average duty on English goods from Great Britain was 18 per cent. in 1879, 19 per cent. in 1880, and 20 per cent. in 1881, while the average duty on goods from the United States was 15 per cent. in 1879, 15 per cent. in 1880, and 15 per cent. in 1881. For my part, I do not place any value on this argument, only the matter is used throughout the country in order to make capital against the late Government for trading with our neighbors. I believe that merchants will buy their goods where they can buy them the cheapest, no matter whether in the United States or Great Britain. I believe that a great portion of the people of the Dominion are satisfied that when they trade with the United States it is for their interest to do so, and nothing can stop it; and if it is a profitable trade to our people, they should be allowed to do business wherever they can trade the best, and make the most money. Another statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance was that, during the five years under the late Government, from 1875 to 1879,—change in years again—the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia paid 14½ cents per head more taxation than the Province of Ontario, &c., while in the two years under the present Government, they paid less per head. This argument is an unfair one, and ought not to be used by any Minister of Finance in a comparison of one Province with another. The hon. the Minister of Customs, at an earlier stage of the debate, showed very fairly and plainly that the trade of the Lower Provinces had fallen off very rapidly, and he believed the causes were the increase of the inter-provincial trade with Ontario and Quebec. The imports of New Brunswick have dropped from \$10,223,000 in 1873, to \$3,996,000 in 1880, and they rose last year to \$6,016,000. Nova Scotia imported, in 1874, \$19,907,000; in 1880, \$6,133,000; and, in 1881, \$7,052,000. The argument of the hon. the Minister of Finance means anything, only serves to expose the poverty of the Lower Provinces, in buying less than they were able to buy three years ago. The average duty paid by the different Provinces will show better how the Tariff affects the current of trade. In the five years from 1874 to 1878, Ontario and Quebec paid an average duty of 12·15 per cent., while in the three years from 1879 to 1881, they paid an average duty of 18·03 per cent. Nova Scotia, in the five years from 1874 to 1878, paid an average duty of 14·10 per cent.; and in the three years from 1879 to 1881, 19·49 per cent. New Brunswick, in the five years from 1874 to 1878, paid 15·50 per cent.; and in the three years from 1879 to 1881, 20·79 per cent. That shows very clearly the unequal taxation of the different Provinces. I have been very careful to go into this matter thoroughly, because the hon. the Minister of Finance has so repeatedly sought to show the people of the Maritime Provinces how little taxes they pay into the Dominion Treasury, and that they pay nothing towards the expense of the North-West Territory, or the expenditure on canals, railways, and other works, which are charged against the Consolidated Account. A careful examination of the provincial trade and taxation of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will show that they pay heavier taxes than Ontario and Quebec, and have contributed per population every dollar of their shares to the expenditure of the Dominion. I think it will be a fair calculation if we take the imports into the Maritime Provinces during the five years previous to Confederation, as an average to work upon. If we do that, we find that, with the regular increase of population, according to the last Census, New Brunswick has imported for consumption, from 1863 to 1881, \$123,468,000 worth of

merchandise. The Trade and Navigation Returns, however, show that, from 1868 to 1881, the imports were \$104,424,075, and the amount of duty collected thereon was \$16,071,878. But on the consumption of \$123,468,000, as I have stated, the duty would, under Dominion rates of taxation collected, \$20,658,563, or \$24,044,552 worth more goods consumed and \$4,586,688 more duty collected. That is for New Brunswick alone. There can be no doubt that as the country advances the people consume more goods, and their consumption will yearly increase; but I have taken the amounts just as the population increased. For Nova Scotia, the Trade and Navigation Returns show in those years goods entered for consumption to the amount of \$123,053,114, on which there was duty paid amounting to \$17,834,855.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Do I understand the hon. member to say that during the five years previous to Confederation \$104,000,000 worth of goods were entered for consumption.

Mr. BURPEE. No. I took the average of five years previous to Confederation as a basis to work upon. I take \$7,978,183 as the average imports for the five years previous to Confederation for New Brunswick; I did so because during the year immediately preceding Confederation the imports were \$10,000,000, and I thought the Minister of Finance would take exception to that year as the imports were so large, in making the calculation, I have taken the average amount which I have stated, and have taken into account the increased population year by year. The imports of Nova Scotia, during that period, amounted to \$123,053,114, on which duty was paid to the sum of \$17,834,855. The consumption on that basis, of the average of the five years before Confederation and on the increased population, from 1863 to 1881, would be \$179,529,748, and the duty collected, directly or indirectly, was \$23,894,055, or an increase of consumption from Ontario, or Quebec, of \$56,471,634, in those years, and an increase of duty of \$9,060,100. Those figures, I think, answer the question as to the consumption of the Maritime Provinces, and what these provinces do not import from Great Britain and United States comes from Quebec and Ontario. The hon. the Minister of Finance referred to the sugar question. There is a singular circumstance in connection with it, that it is impossible to find out, either from statistics or from the refiners, as to the loss of weight to the refinery in the quantity of sugar between the time when it is taken into the refinery and when it passes out as between the grades of sugar. In 1874, there were imported 111,934,604 lbs; in 1879, 118,366,467 lbs; in 1880, 116,847,000 lbs; in 1881, 136,416,000 lbs. The average price, in 1877, was 5½ cents per lb., and, in 1881, 3½ cents per lb. We find that the loss of revenue, comparing the two Tariffs, was, for the year 1880, \$754,249, taking the same quantity and quality as 1878 for comparison, and \$755,718 for 1881, making a total loss of revenue of a little over \$1,500,000 on what would have been collected under 1878 Tariff if quality and quantity imported be the same. The average price, as taken from the *New York Price Circular and Journal of Commerce*, which is an authority on all wholesale prices, was, for sugar in bond in New York, \$613, and duty paid into Canada under the Tariff of 1878 would be, in Canada, \$3.66; 100 lbs. the average price for Canada refined, as taken from the *Montreal Journal of Commerce*, was \$9.70. In drawing this comparison I have taken every week and month of the year, and striking an average it appears that the sugar of the United States taken out of bond and paying duty under the Tariff of 1878, would have cost here \$1.04 per 100 lbs. less than it cost us Canada refined. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say that the cost of transportation should be added to the New York prices. To us in the Maritime Provinces and in most parts of Ontario, the cost of carrying sugar from New York to its destination is a good deal less than from Montreal. It is some 15 or 20 cents 100 lbs. less from

New York to St. John than from Montreal to St. John, and for the year 1881 the average price in New York, in bond, was \$6.50, under the Tariff of 1878, would be on sugar laid down here, \$9.12½ per 100 lbs, while the average of the Montreal was \$10.09, showing an increase over that if imported under the Tariff 1878 from New York of 96½ cents per 100 lbs. The cost to the consumers (duty paid) on granulated sugars for the average of the year 1881 was, in New York, \$9.61 per 100 lbs., and in Canada it was \$10.09, showing 48 cents per 100 lbs. less to the people of United States than Canada. The hon. the Minister of Finance has spoken pretty freely of the increased cost of manufactured cotton goods and decreased cost of the article to the consumer as compared with 1878. I am not going into the question minutely, but I wish to refer to one point. The hon. gentleman, in his speech, said that raw cotton in 1881 was 2 cents a lb. higher in price than in 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. More.

Mr. BURPEE. If the House will look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, hon. members will find that the price of raw cotton in 1878 was 10.70 cents per lb., and, in 1881, 10.44 cents per lb., showing what would be the cost to Canadian manufacturers, that is the value which manufacturers have entered at the Custom House in 1878 and 1881, and no doubt is correct. I do not propose to go through the different items to which the hon. the Minister of Finance referred, saying manufactured articles are less cost in 1881 than in 1878. I know from the information I have received, not only from merchants and consumers but from manufacturers, that the facts are quite different. There is an increase in the prices of a great many articles, but there may be some kinds of goods that are a little less in price owing to the cheapness of those goods in the European markets. Woollen goods are now and have been for the last few months nearly 20 per cent. cheaper in England than in 1878. Of course, our manufacturers are obliged to meet the competition and reduce their prices accordingly, but I venture to say the consumers and merchants can better decide what goods cost now as compared with 1878 than the hon. the Minister of Finance. The manufacturers control their prices according to foreign markets, and keep prices up so as to keep foreign goods out, which the consumers have to pay. With regard to the manufactures of the country, I believe that a revenue Tariff would but suit the business of the Dominion, and afford ample protection. I believe that a revenue Tariff such as we are now obliged to impose for the expenditure of the Dominion, properly adjusted, would suit all the manufacturers, and that they would prosper better under it than under the present Tariff. I admit that four or five manufacturers have been materially helped by the discrimination made in their favor by the Tariff, and that under it the cotton and woollen manufacturers, and sugar refiners, and perhaps the furniture manufacturers, have experienced a temporary help to their enterprises. But the question is, will they be able to stand in times of adversity as well as if they were of a slower growth and established on a better foundation. I have been more or less engaged in manufacturing, for many years, and I believe that it is more to the advantage of the manufacturers to be let alone as much as possible by the State and depend on the energy and enterprise of the promoters. Legislation in their favor does not prosper them on the whole; because they cannot and do not, as we know by the example of the United States, stand adversity as well as those manufactures which grow up, under less protection, by enterprise and industry. The Liberal policy has been very well defined—namely, to pursue such a course towards the country, in and out of this House, as will be to the interests of all classes in the Dominion, and not to discriminate between one class and another, but to legislate so that one class shall be as well protected and cared for as another. That policy has been pursued by us as well in as out of office, and I think the country will

Mr. BURPEE (St. John).

so appreciate and understand our policy. The laborers, the farmers, the lumbermen, fishermen, shipbuilders, as well as the majority of the manufacturers, have shown most conclusively, by letters and representations, that they are not benefitted by the present Tariff, but are taxed very heavily and unequally. Our policy stands in contrast with that of the Conservative party. Their policy is to take from him who hath not even the little that he has, and give it to him who has abundance.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Even at this late stage of the debate, I desire to make some remarks in reply to statements of previous speakers—

Mr. PLUMB. Will the hon. member allow me to say one word in explanation? I was violently interrupted by hon. members on the other side when I attempted to make an explanation—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has already spoken on this question.

Mr. PLUMB. I merely rise to explain and will not occupy much time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. You can only speak with leave of the House.

Mr. PLUMB. I have no doubt the House will allow me to make an explanation.

Mr. BOWELL. I take it for granted that in other cases the rule will be most rigidly carried out too. The hon. member for Niagara was asking leave simply to make an explanation when he was interrupted by the hon. gentleman from St. John.

Mr. BLAKE. He was not interrupted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think I am out of order, but if I am I will submit.

Mr. PLUMB. I ask the permission of the hon. gentleman who has the floor to make my explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not the permission of the hon. member that is wanted, but the permission of the House.

Mr. PLUMB. I ask the permission of the House, and if it is refused I will be glad to know it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman making an explanation if he chooses. When he rose I was proceeding to refer for a few moments to some remarks made by the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) during the course of his speech the other day. He said, on that occasion, that he quoted from the leading journal of Charlottetown, a statement that there had been less depression in that town for many years, and went on to trace it to the effect of the National Policy. Now this is far from being the case, and I cannot let that remark go uncontradicted. Any depression existing in Charlottetown is owing to different causes. We know very well we have had a very serious bank failure in that town, which has tested the business portion of the community very seriously. We know, also, that it has led to a temporary depression in business; but I strongly contend that the people of Prince Edward Island generally are in as flourishing condition, or as well off to-day, and as prosperous as they have been at any time in the past. I may add that the condition of the farmers and of the population generally was never better, and that money was never more plentiful, never circulated more freely, than during the past year and the present season. If we want to judge the real state of the country and the extent of its prosperity, we cannot go to a better source than the savings banks' accounts. Now, looking at the amount of the deposits in the savings banks in Prince

Edward Island, what do we find? I just accidentally, this very day, saw a return of the deposits in the savings banks in Charlottetown for January, and I find that deposits for January, 1882, show an increase over the deposits for January, 1881, of 120 per cent. I find also that the withdrawals for January, 1882, over the withdrawals for January, 1881, only amounted to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and that the average deposits in January, 1881, reached \$97.74, while the average amount of each deposit for January, 1882, was \$127.33. Now, I contend that this is but an indication of the prosperity of the country. From my general knowledge of Prince Edward Island, there never was a time, in the history of that Province, when there was a larger circulation of money among the farming class than there is at present. The hon. member for Charlottetown, in the course of his speech, said he could not see how we could have a home market without an increase of population. He also said, I think, that, having the same number of people to clothe and feed as before, the National Policy could not furnish us with a home market. There is no doubt of this fact, that if a large number of our population turn their attention to manufacturing, and are taken from our farming population, there will be an increased market and consumption of the products of the farm; and there is no doubt that, if our people get increased labor and increased price for their labor, they will be larger consumers. Under the present policy, there is very little doubt the people eat better food and wear better clothes than they did under the policy of our predecessors. The hon. member for Richmond said that the people of the Lower Provinces pay more for their cotton goods, woollen goods and other articles than formerly. I deny that such is the fact. Having a good deal to do with that sort of business, I may say that never in my experience has the price of either cotton or the ordinary wear of woollen goods been sold at lower rates than at present. If people imported these goods under the present Tariff, it is probable they would have to pay higher prices for them, but we know very well that the wool of our own country is manufactured into the cloth that enters into general wear, and those articles are now sold at a cheaper rate than heretofore. The same thing may be said of cottons. Cottons are now manufactured in Canada and sold cheaper than if imported. The hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Flynn) also said that the Tariff operates in favor of the rich man against the poor man. I deny that. The hon. member seems to think that the present Government are carrying out the policy of the late Government, when the latter taxed the tea of the poor man, as against the tea used by the rich. The hon. gentleman went on to say that the present Government taxed everything that was used by the poor fisherman. He seemed to have a great deal of compassion for the poor fisherman; but the poor fisherman is intelligent enough to know that the clothes he wears are manufactured in this country, and it is entirely useless for the hon. member for Richmond to try and make him believe he is paying dearer for them than he did under the late Government. The poor fisherman also knows that, under the policy of the present Government, the nets, lines, twines, hooks, &c., and other articles used by him, come in free of duty.

Mr. KILLAM. They always did.

Mr. MACDONALD. If these hon. gentlemen abuse the protective policy, they must, should they in the dim future return to office, put on a duty on those articles of the poor fishermen, if they carry out their theory. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat said the policy of the Opposition was not to tax one party at the expense of another. If they should carry out that policy they would have to tax every portion of the people alike, and to do

that they would have to put a tax on the necessaries used by the poor fishermen, as well as those used by other classes. The hon. member for Richmond also said he would like to see the fishermen's bounty secured by Act of Parliament. On that score I agree with the hon. gentleman. I would like to see the bounty to the fishermen secured by Act of Parliament, because it is just possible some day or other the hon. member and his friends may come back to power, and, if they do, they will at once, should they follow out their Free Trade policy, remove the bounty that this Government, I am happy to say, has placed at the disposal of the fisherman. The hon. gentleman is opposed to Protection because, he says, it makes the fisherman, the mechanic, and the farmer pay more for the necessaries of life. Let us look for a moment at this statement. Everything that enters into consumption by the fisherman is manufactured in our country. His flour is ground out of wheat grown in Canada, his articles of clothing are manufactured here. There is, therefore, no foundation whatever for the assertion that the present policy taxes the poor fisherman. It has been said that the people of the Lower Provinces are prevented from taking flour from the United States with which they very often trade. The fact is quite the reverse. If our vessels go to Boston or New York they can always buy the quality that is used by our people, superior extra flour of Canada, in those markets, and lay it down at their own doors as cheaply as by the St. Lawrence or the Intercolonial Railway. Therefore the charge that the 50 cents duty per barrel is a tax on the poor fisherman falls to the ground. Now, Sir, with respect to the mechanic, we find he is situated, in some respects, like the fisherman. The material he wears is all manufactured in this country, and the increased employment furnished him by the increased prosperity, under the National Policy, puts him in a position to buy more goods from the farmer in a way that he could not do before. The farmer, in his turn, comes in for a share of the prosperity by finding a better home market for his productions. Not only has he a better home market, but he has reason to look forward to the time when we shall be in a position to treat with the Americans for reciprocity. We have now inducements to offer the Americans reciprocity. We can show them that they are losing the trade of this country to the tune of millions of dollars annually; we can show them that their coal is taxed when coming into Canada, and, in all these respects, that we have something to offer in exchange for reciprocity which we had not under the policy of our predecessors. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), in the course of his remarks the other day, took a fling at the coal duties. He said the coal duty was a fallacy; that it does not benefit the coal producers; and that it interferes with our shipping coal across the Atlantic. Now I am astonished at such an objection, because if a vessel has to take ballast across the Atlantic to the St. Lawrence ports she can come to the port of Sydney, get her cargo of coal there, and freight that will pay her for bringing it up to Quebec or Montreal, whatever port on the St. Lawrence she may go to for a return cargo. It is true, possibly, that the duty on coal has not given us a better hold in the United States markets, but it has placed us in a better position for a remission of the duty on their coal. The hon. gentleman also said that the coal production of the mines was greater in 1873 than in 1881. But he did not give us the returns after 1873, during the time his party was in power, for, during that period the production of the mines declined until they were at the point of closing. When the present Government came into power they began to revive, and the coal of the Lower Provinces is reaching the Upper Provinces to a greater extent each year. Not only that, but the manufacturers in the Lower Provinces are yearly increasing their demand for coal. Sir, I am not astonished at the hon.

gentleman for decrying the coal interests. I remember, not long since, when there was a fleet of vessels belonging to a company represented by the hon. gentleman, that was a credit to any country, and some of which were to be found on the seas in all parts of the world. That fleet flourished when the coal trade flourished, but when that trade went down the fleet of vessels that came into the harbor of Arichat went down also, and, so far as I know, they are not likely to come up again until the coal trade takes a turn for the better. The hon. gentleman also seemed to think it was a great hardship that the people of the Lower Provinces had to buy their goods from the people of the Upper Provinces, who, as he said, took nothing from them in exchange. Now, Sir, there is no doubt that we buy largely from the people of the Upper Provinces, and it is possible that they do not take as much from us in exchange. But it matters little to the people of the Lower Provinces so long as they have a good market for their productions elsewhere, so long as they can find an outlet in other countries for their products, of their fisheries, their farms and their mines. Not only that, but the policy of the present Government is building up a vast and extended country in the west which will in the future be one of our best markets for fish. Now, Sir, looking at this matter in a disinterested way, I may say that I believe it is in the best interests of the country that this policy was inaugurated. I believe it is doing good to the country generally, building up our manufactures, assisting our farmers and our mechanics, and I am happy to see that the Government have fulfilled their promises by taking the fishermen under their protection and affording them a small share of the prosperity that is coming to the people generally.

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

After Recess.

Mr. KILLAM. It is far from my intention to offer any lengthened remarks on the subject now engaging the attention of the House. I do not propose to go into any long discussion of the Tariff for reasons which must be obvious to every one. The subject has been very ably discussed on both sides of the House, and although, Sir, I had hoped that some of the arguments adduced on this side might have had the effect of converting some hon. gentleman opposite, I have practically abandoned that hope. I thought, Sir, that the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) might have had some effect on the hon. the Finance Minister, that he might have induced that hon. gentleman to see the error of his ways, and before parting from us this year might have made such a change in his policy as would have been more acceptable to the country and more creditable to himself. I thought probably that my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would have had some effect on the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and that the tone of that hon. gentleman's speeches and his other public statements might have been so modified as at least to have led the public to suppose that he had returned to the well known views that he once held on this subject. However, Sir, as I said before, I have about given up that hope. Hon. gentlemen need not ask if we are resigned to the situation, for we are not by any means. We are just as much opposed to the iniquitous National Policy, so-called—the policy of taxing the many for the benefit of the few—as we were when that policy was introduced. We are just as much opposed to the principle of taxing unnecessarily for the sake of accumulating a surplus to be expended in ways, proper or improper, as we were when the Tariff was introduced; but we find that it is no use to discuss the question with hon. gentlemen opposite. They are wedded to their idols and we will let them alone. But, Sir, we consider it our duty

Mr. MACDONALD (King's).

briefly, but in the most forcible manner, to state our views here in such a way that the country may be still aware that the representatives of the great Liberal party of this country in this House still hold sound political views—views in accordance with the spirit of the age, and the spirit of progress in the nineteenth century—views which we are proud to believe are wiser than those of our great grandfathers, which hon. gentlemen opposite pride themselves in entertaining. However, Sir, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the general principle of the Tariff. When this debate was begun by the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister I happened to interpolate a suggestion that he had fixed an arbitrary drawback for the duties paid on ship materials. The hon. gentleman liking, as no doubt he is justified in liking, the praise of those seated around him, made an answer which I did not consider a proper one, which I thought was rather disingenuous, and, of course, looking around to his followers for their applause he received it, and was very happy in having received it. I think it my duty—because it was no use for me to continue interrupting at that time—to address the House just now and vindicate the views which I hold and which led me to make the remark on that occasion. I do this in no captious spirit, but simply for the purpose of putting before the House plainly the views which are held by myself in common with hundreds of other people in this country. The hon. gentleman stated that, in 1879, he proposed to return all duties paid on all materials entering into the construction of ships, and he stated again and again that he was going to adopt the policy of returning on all goods exported a drawback equal to the amount of the duty paid on the materials entering into the manufacture of those goods. I know very well that in few cases has that been done. I understand that in the majority of cases, and in some important cases, he has refused to do it. The hon. gentleman afterwards professed to have carried out the policy which he promised in the first place, but he carried it out in this way: On the 12th of November, 1879, an Order in Council was passed, providing that a drawback not to exceed 40 cents per ton on ships without iron knees, or 50 cents per ton on ships with iron knees, should be paid on every ship built in the Dominion. The drawback was only to be allowed on canvas, paints, oils, chains, spikes, iron and iron knees actually used in the construction of the vessels, but, in 1880, the hon. the Finance Minister came to the House, and, in answer to an application from some hon. gentleman on this side, he brought down a return showing the amount of drawback claimed, and the amount granted; and he told us that he was giving an ample amount, because the most of those who had applied had asked for less than 40 or 50 cents a ton, as the case might be. He told us also, the other evening, that not one or only one had applied for any drawback in excess of the 75 cents which was to be allowed under the existing Order in Council. Well, the one statement had nothing at all to do with the other, and the hon. gentleman, in 1880, claimed that he was giving a sufficient drawback, but his return showed that out of fourteen applications four had applied for more than the amount given. The hon. gentleman, the other night, did not tell the House that most of the ships launched before the 1st of January, 1880, were built principally under the previous Tariff and were therefore not subject to the Tariff introduced by the hon. gentleman. More than that, the drawback was only paid on a few articles which I have just specified; and, besides, if the drawback was sufficient why did the hon. gentleman go on to increase it, and place himself in the position of paying out public money without the authority of Parliament? On the 15th of May, 1880, after Parliament had risen, an Order in Council was passed fixing the drawback at from 55 to 75 cents per ton, according to the classes of ships, payable, not upon proof of the duties

having been paid, but simply payable upon every ship. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intended to say that, but that is what I understood him to say. But if the hon. gentleman will bring down to the House one duplicate of the applications made with each case, and lay them on the Table, I think it will show that, in almost every case where application has been made by the builder of the ship, there is no reference whatever to the amount of duty paid, except that the blank is filled up with 55 to 75 cents, and that, in consequence, that amount is paid. It was not necessary to show that the duty was paid, because the Order in Council distinctly states that such a drawback shall be paid on ships, more in the nature of a bonus or a bounty than in the nature of a duty, because, as he explained, it was difficult to show which of these articles might have been imported and which were manufactured in the country, and very properly an arbitrary drawback was fixed. Having said so much on that point, I will review the question. The hon. gentleman proposed, in the first place, a drawback of 40 and 50 cents, claiming that that was the duty paid. By an Order in Council, he increased it from 50 cents to 75 cents per ton. In 1879, he repeatedly told us that he intended to return all the duty paid on all materials used in the construction of ships. In 1880, he said that 50 cents was generally sufficient. Well, we had various opinions about that. I think the case practically stands thus: In 1873, certain duties existed. I am unable to say what they were, but it is not necessary for the purpose of my argument that I should. It is not possible for any person to make an estimate of the actual duties paid on these articles going into the construction of a ship, but certain duties existed under the previous Tariff. In 1874 my hon. friend from Centre Huron brought down his Tariff, and we were then met with a howl of opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite, who said that \$1 a ton extra was being imposed. We did not admit that at the time, and many calculations were made to show that the additional duty imposed would not amount to over 60 cents a ton. Last summer when the hon. Minister of Railways was down on missionary business to Nova Scotia, he made a speech at West Branch, in the county of Pictou, in which he is reported—I take the report from the *Halifax Herald* of the following day, as having said that Messrs. Jones and Carmichael had voted to put an additional tax of \$1 a ton annually on ships. He repeated this statement again and again in the meeting, and stated, further, that Mr. Carmichael had voted that 380,000 Nova Scotians should pay \$400,000 per annum of taxes on shipping. The hon. Minister of Railways is sometimes carried away by his enthusiasm, but I do not think he intended to make such a gross blunder as that. We will suppose, for the sake of argument, that before the hon. member for Centre Huron brought down his Tariff, the duty on shipping amounted to 60 cents a ton; according to the hon. Minister of Railways the hon. member for Centre Huron put on an additional \$1 a ton; then the hon. Finance Minister came in with his Tariff of 1879, and proposed an additional tax we will say of 50 cents a ton; that will make a total of \$2 a ton. Well, if \$2 a ton exists on shipping, how does the hon. Minister of Finance suppose that he is going to counterbalance this by paying a drawback from 55 to 75 cents a ton? I am only making these statements for the purpose of showing the House and the country what reliance is to be placed on the statements of the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways. If these hon. gentlemen are no nearer the truth in the rest of their statements than they are in this matter, how can they be safely trusted with the government of the affairs of this country? The hon. Minister of Railways stated repeatedly during that canvass in Nova Scotia, that Mr. Carmichael had voted to make 380,000 Nova Scotians pay \$400,000 annually on shipping. The real facts were these. In that year I think

a larger number of tons were built than in any year in the history of Nova Scotia ship building—I think there were 84,000 tons building, on which, if the statement of hon. gentleman opposite had been correct, a duty of something like \$400,000 additional would have been paid—though I deny that the hon. member for Centre Huron imposed more than 60 cents a ton additional; but the result was that the friends of the hon. Minister of Railways in Nova Scotia claimed that in consequence of his abuse, the hon. member for Centre Huron had been compelled to withdraw his resolutions. The contrary was in fact the case. Nobody supposes that the bluster of the hon. Minister of Railways would have the slightest effect in that direction; it was the moderate and reasonable representations made by supporters of the hon. member for Centre Huron, that induced him to take the matter into his consideration and reduce these duties to a figure, which probably left the increase at something like 30 cents a ton. The \$100,000 of the hon. Minister of Railways are reduced on inspection to certainly not more than \$25,000. Then it was considered necessary to increase the taxation of all classes, unlike the Tariff introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite, which increase the taxes of a few, and which was class legislation. I ask again, if all the statements of those hon. gentlemen are no more truthful than those I have cited, how can they be trusted to administer the affairs of this country? I listened with some attention, the other day, to the speech of the hon. President of the Council. I regret that he is not here, but I presume that, having been converted so often, it is idle to expect that any argument of mine will produce any material change in him. He has come into the House of Commons recently, after his long absence in another place, to treat us with doctrines the opposite to those advanced by him when he was here before. When I first had the honor to be a candidate for a seat in this House, I made liberal use of the arguments of the hon. President of the Council. He told us that when the Maritime Provinces were brought into Confederation, there would not be reciprocal trade between them and Canada—that our imports would increase, but that instead of paying duties into the public Treasury, we would be paying them into the pockets of Canadian manufacturers. That hon. gentleman cited, the other day, the fact that the imports of Nova Scotia had decreased by \$7,000,000, and boasted that we were building up an immense trade between the Provinces. Formerly he said that we would be paying money into the pockets of Canadian manufacturers. I believed then that his views were sound, and I believe that the same views are sound to-day; I believe that if the Province of Nova Scotia had been left out of the Confederation, and we had been importing from wherever we chose, and buying where we could buy cheapest, the revenue that we would collect under such a Tariff as the hon. the Minister of Finance has levied would be, to-day, at least \$3,500,000. I believe that we are really paying that amount now, but, under the Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is paid in such a way that it does not appear, because instead of being paid into the public Treasury it is put into the pockets of Canadian manufacturers, and by the classes which form the majority of our population, and which, from the nature of their occupations, must consume a large amount of dutiable goods. I do not wish to refer at length to the remarkable speech of the hon. the President of the Council. I looked at him with sorrow; I thought what a useful man he might have been in the House of Commons, if he had not yielded to the blandishments of the right hon. gentleman opposite, and accepted office with a comfortable seat in the Senate; but he chose his own course, and, I suppose, he is responsible, not to us on this side, but to his constituents. Well, Sir, he gave us some remarkable ideas of trade; he quoted a lot of diminished imports in England, but was not sufficiently fair to the House to state that nearly all of those reductions were based on reduced values of the articles exported. He did

not do that; he wished to convey the idea that effete England was dying out, because she had adopted the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that the New Zealander would soon be seated on London Bridge contemplating the ruins. There were now, he said, in Great Britain, no less than 1,000,000 paupers under Free Trade, while by adopting the principles of Protection, which we have carried out in Canada, what a prosperous country it might be. The President of the Council left out part of it. I am not going to refer at any length to the Trade Returns of Great Britain, I will just quote this with respect to the poverty question which may throw additional light upon the speech of the President of the Council. In England and Wales, in 1849, the first year for which there are complete returns, there were 931,000 persons of all classes receiving relief. On the corresponding day of 1881 there were 803,000, a reduction of 131,000. The population of England and Wales was estimated, in 1849, to be 17,564,000; the population in 1881 was estimated to be 25,798,000. The President of the Council came to tell the House that although there were 1,000,000 persons receiving aid in Great Britain—I suppose he meant in the United Kingdom—the proportion had fallen immensely; that while the number of persons receiving aid had fallen off 11 or 12 per cent, the population had increased 45 per cent. in the same time; that not only was there an actual decrease but there was an immense comparative decrease in poverty. Then, Sir, here is an indication of the progress of the country, and these are all the figures I am going to state on the subject because I think they convey a sufficiently correct idea as to the material progress of the Mother Country. The average annual value of property and profits assessed to income tax for the twelve years, from 1843 to 1854 (I commence at 1843 for the simple reason that that is the first year for which there are complete returns for the United Kingdom; it is rather before that, but I take an estimate for Ireland) was £277,000,000; for the twelve years, from 1855 to 1866 inclusive, £345,000,000; for the thirteen years, from 1867 to 1879 inclusive, £510,000,000; for the last five years of the thirteen £575,000,000. Is not that a complete answer to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, that poor, unfortunate England is going to ruin and decay, because she does not adopt the far sighted policy of Protection which hon. gentlemen opposite advocate. I still decline to agree with hon. gentlemen opposite in their trade views. I regret to say that I will have to remain incorrigible. I think those views were only adopted as a policy of expediency during the time of depression in this country in 1876-77-78; that even now those hon. gentlemen are repenting that they were so short-sighted as to adopt this policy; and, if they are not repenting, at least that they see day by day that the country is repenting they ever placed them in power. We thought a short time ago that those hon. gentlemen were very much satisfied with themselves and their policy; we thought when we came here we heard rumors that in a short time they would seek an appeal to the people at the poll. Our hopes were excited; we thought, now is the opportunity of seeing how we stand, and what the people think on this question. Day by day those rumors have faded away—I hardly know the reason, there may be other difficulties in the way—but I think, as reports came in from different parts of the country hon. gentlemen opposite became more and more convinced that this policy was not one which is likely to be sustained by the people. However, we shall be very glad when they give us an opportunity. I suppose, however, the policy to be adopted would be very much like that pursued by the celebrated cook, of the Widow Bedott, in regard to potato puddings—that if the oven is very hot you will have to take them out some, and if it is not very hot you will have

Mr. KILLAM.

to leave them in a little longer. I apologize to the House for using such a humble illustration in such a dignified House, but my precedent is the President of the Council who interspersed his speech the other day as liberally with anecdotes of the kind. In conclusion, I beg to say that on this side of the House we have wider ideas than hon. gentlemen opposite. They talk about the poverty of England; they claim at the same time that the Tariff is calculated to foster trade with England, and to discourage trade with the United States. They wish us to trade, and they say they are doing all they can to assist trade with poor, falling England with England, that is hardly able to sustain herself, and to discourage trade with the prosperous and happy United States along our borders which are growing rich under the policy of exclusion, which hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to adopt. They tell us one moment that it is better to trade with England than the United States; at the next moment they tell us it is better to trade longitudinally than across a few degrees of latitude; and in almost the same breath they say it is better not to trade with any country at all, but that it is better to trade at our own doors and in our own home market. We on this side of the House have wider and larger ideas. I have heard the hon. Minister of Finance discoursing eloquently on the white sails and symmetrical hulls of the ships sailing on every ocean and carrying our flag into every port. What has the hon. gentleman done to assist in fostering that trade? He has given his attention to the sugar business. I think I will be perfectly correct in saying that only about \$1,500,000 of fixed capital is invested in sugar refineries. To that subject the hon. gentleman devoted months of attention. I suppose I would be equally correct in saying that in the shipping and fishery interests there are \$40,000,000 invested. What has the hon. gentleman done for these industries? To the ship-owner does he not say I return you 75 cents a ton, and to the fishermen I am going to give you a bounty this year of \$150,000? The hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Flynn) touched on this subject, and he was perfectly correct in saying that the hon. Minister of Finance has been bleeding the fishermen to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars during the last three years, and he now comes down and admits that the interest on the Fishery Award is due to those fishermen. If we add together the amount unjustly and unnecessarily taken away from them during the last three years, and the amount which the hon. Minister admits is due them, the interest on the Fishery Award, and gives them in return a bonus of \$150,000 for this year, it cannot be expected that the fishermen of this country will approve the action of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The fishermen of this country are not to be led astray by any such sop as that. They know how they have been ill-used; they know how they have been unnecessarily taxed. They will take it of course, because men who are struggling for existence will not refuse a bonus of that kind when it is offered to them, but they will remember, when the day comes, that those who are entitled to their support are not those who place unnecessary taxation on them, who kept back from them their just share of the Fishery Award, but gentlemen on this side of the House, who resisted the policy of taxation, who fought well to secure their proper share of the Fishery Award for the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. VALIN. Will the hon. gentleman say what was the drawback given by the late Government?

Mr. KILLAM. Those will be the men who will receive the support of the fishermen of this country. I will not dwell longer on this question. I will content myself with saying that we are prepared to bide our time, to go to the country with those ideas, ideas broader than those of hon. gentlemen opposite. We believe, instead of imposing

restrictions on trade, instead of doing all we can to obstruct commerce with the rest of the world, in removing trade restrictions, and that the greater the commercial intercourse nations have with each other the better it is for the interests of civilization and humanity in general, and for that country which was wise enough to adopt this policy first.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew). I do not intend to enter into any elaborate defence of the Government policy, or to discuss to any extent the question now before the House. I simply rise to offer a few observations in reference to the alleged disastrous effects of this policy on the lumber interest. I have been struck with the persistence with which hon. gentlemen opposite have devoted themselves to the discussion of the disastrous effects of this policy on that particular interest, and it has occurred to me that these hon. gentlemen would not be so solicitous for the welfare of the lumber interest were it not that my hon. friend the Finance Minister represents in the Government a Province specially interested in the success of that industry. In discussing the effect of the National Policy on the lumber trade we must take into consideration the fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite led by the hon. member for Centre Huron, followed by the hon. members for North Norfolk, Middlesex and Brant, have declared that the imposition of duties upon agricultural products had had no effect in enhancing the value of those products or of benefitting the farmers of Ontario. Again, the hon. member for Gloucester declared in the most positive terms that the introduction of the National Policy has had no effect in increasing wages. We must, therefore, come to the conclusion that the disastrous effect produced by the Tariff on the lumber industry has been produced by the increase of the price of manufactured articles. The hon. member for Centre Huron read, during the course of his speech, a letter from a leading lumber merchant whose name he did not give, but who had declared that the policy of the Government had increased the cost of lumber by from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per 1,000 feet. I propose, as I pretend to know something of the effect of this policy on the lumber trade and the comparative cost of the manufactured articles now and under the Administration of the hon. gentleman opposite, to read to this House a comparison of the cost in 1878 and 1882 of the manufactured articles that enter into the production of lumber, and as, like the hon. member for Centre Huron, I prefer to go to the fountain head to obtain my facts, I have extracted this statement from the books of the firm of which I am a member. I find these comparisons are as follows:—

	1878.	1882.
Chains.....	6½ cents.	6½ cents.
Ropes.....	10 "	12 "

As the price in 1881 for ropes was 10 cents, you will observe the increase is due to the increase in the cost of the raw material, and not to the effect of the Tariff on that particular article:

	1878.	1882.
Iron.....	\$ 2 60 to \$ 2 75	\$ 2 75 to \$ 3 00
Steel, sleigh shoe....	04	03½
Cast Steel.....	18	16
Axes, scoring.....	13 00 to 15 00	13 00 to 15 00
" broad.....	4 50 to 5 00	4 50 to 5 00
" chopping.....	11 00 to 12 00	9 00 to 10 50
Grindstones.....	02½ per lb.	02½ per lb.
Tea.....	27	19 or 23½ with duty.

Now, a good deal has been said about the effect of this Tariff on woollen goods, especially on blankets in the price, an increase of which I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite dilate upon very feelingly. I am not in a position to make a comparison of the cost between 1878 and 1882, from my own knowledge, but I have a statement from a woollen manufacturer near this city, who is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who held a seat in this House during last Parliament. His statement shows that those articles are now sold cheaper than they ever were in his experience.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then raise the tax.

Mr. WHITE. If to raise the tax would have the effect as it has had of increasing competition and thereby cheapening the articles, we would be very glad to have the tax raised. These are the comparative prices of manufactured articles that enter into the production of lumber. But whilst I make the statement to the House, I frankly admit, that this statement of the hon. member for Centre Huron, that the cost of producing lumber has very materially increased during the last two or three years is correct. But, Sir, how has it been enhanced? I will glance now at the comparative prices of the agricultural products which entered into the production of lumber in 1878 and in 1882. I find that for pork we paid, in 1878, \$16 per barrel, and, in 1882, \$21.25; flour, \$5.50 in 1878, and \$6.25 to \$6.50 in 1882; oats, 35 cents in 1878, and 40 to 43 cents in 1882—showing an average increase in the cost of those agricultural products of over 20 per cent. in 1882 over 1878. Then we come to the question of labor, which is one of the largest items of expenditure in the production of lumber, and we find that there has been of late a very material increase. Men to whom we paid \$8 or \$12, in 1878, we now pay \$16 to \$20; others whom we paid \$18 to \$22 in 1878, we now pay \$36 to \$36; and again, those to whom we paid \$32 to \$40 in 1878, are at present paid \$40 to \$55; another class paid \$20 to \$22 in 1878, are now paid \$30 to \$35, while men who got \$12 to \$15 in 1878, now receive \$20 to \$35, showing an average increase of over 50 per cent. in the value of labor in 1882 over its cost in 1878. Now, I contend that those figures show that the policy of the present Administration has succeeded; that the prophesies of hon. gentlemen who in 1878 sat upon the other side of the House and who then propounded a policy to the country, which they said they would carry out should they be invested with office again have been verified, and that the policy of the present Government has been completely vindicated. We then said that our policy was one in the interest of the farming community, and in the interest of the lumbermen, and it has had the effect of increasing the prices both of agricultural products and of labor throughout the country. Now, it is as I said, quite true that an increase has taken place in the cost of producing lumber, but I would like to ask the hon. member for Centre Huron, assuming that he pursued his enquires far enough to ascertain, whether his informant would rather have the result of business to-day, or the results in 1878—whether the increase in the value of the material of the lumber, as produced and manufactured, is not very much greater than the increase in the cost? I dare say that hon. gentlemen opposite will say that the increase in the value of that article has been brought about wholly by the foreign demand. But if these hon. gentlemen will take a little pains to ascertain what the consumption of lumber is in the country—which has been the direct result of the National Policy, the direct effect of the increase in the erection of factories, and in the furnishing of habitations for operatives throughout the country—I think they will admit that at least some effect has been created by the National Policy in producing a home demand for that particular article. I think I hear the hon. member for Gloucester dissenting from that proposition; but the hon. gentleman perhaps does not know that, in Montreal alone, during the past year upwards of 100,000,000 feet of sawn lumber and timber were consumed, and in Toronto upwards of 80,000,000 feet, while throughout the whole of Canada the same effect has been produced. Now, I repeat that if the member for Centre Huron had pursued his enquiries a little further he would have found that his lumber friend would have told him, that, notwithstanding the increase in the price of lumber, the increase in its value was so much greater that his net profits were very much greater in 1881 than in 1878 or 1876, years during which hon. gentlemen opposite held office. Surely it was not the disastrous effects of the National

Policy on lumber interests that enabled the Ontario Government to make so successful a sale as that reported on the 6th December last, of which the *Globe* speaks in the following terms:—

"The sale of limited berths by the Ontario Government yesterday was more successful than any that has yet taken place.

"It was the first Government auction since 1872, and from various circumstances, including the present and prospective profitableness of the timber trade, prices were unprecedentedly high, averaging very nearly \$600 per square mile, as against only \$200 in 1872, at the last sale, and aggregating \$717,176.

"The limits sold cover 1,281 square miles, an area equal to that of the county of Wellington."

And you will remember that, in 1872, the country was in a very prosperous condition, and we had not this disastrous National Policy that appears to sit like a nightmare on hon. gentlemen opposite. So much for the effects of the National Policy upon that industry. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will find, when they come to make an appeal to the country—and I heard the last speaker say that they were anxious it should take place as soon as possible—but I can only tell him that he does not reflect the opinions of the leading organ of the Reform party in Ontario—because it seems to view the possibility of an early dissolution and election during next summer with some degree of alarm—I think they will find themselves very much mistaken if they calculate upon success. I can tell that hon. gentleman and his friends that appeal as they may to the different interests and industries throughout the country, taking them separately, and endeavoring to create prejudice in the minds of those connected with certain industries, that when that appeal is made to the country, the result will be more overwhelmingly disastrous to those hon. gentlemen than the elections of 17th September, 1878. I do not quite agree with the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance that it is impossible for this Government to protect or enhance the lumber interest. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Huron when he says that some encouragement should be given to the manufacturer of small wooden wares, of doors, sashes, blinds and goods of that description. I do not, however, agree with him when he says that the hon. the Finance Minister should give, for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture of those articles, a bounty to the lumber trade. I think that the better mode would be to adopt a policy favoring the conversion of a very considerable amount of material that now goes to waste into articles affording considerable employment to operatives and giving to the manufacturers a small profit. We must remember that in the United States there is a large home consumption, and the manufacturers of those articles in the country have a home market of upwards of 50,000,000, whereas the manufacturers of Canada would have a home market of only 4,500,000, so that the manufacturers in this country are to a great extent handicapped by the fact of a small home market as compared with the American market. I find that as the result of that advantage there is a large export of those articles from the United States to the British Colonies other than Canada. For instance, in 1880, there was exported from the United States goods of that description to Newfoundland and Labrador to the value of \$16,864; to the British West Indies, \$92,073; to British Guiana \$13,134; British Honduras, \$8,983; British East Indies, \$4,174; British possessions in Africa, \$303,345; Australasia, \$367,677, making, in all, \$806,240 of that class of goods exported from the United States to the British Colonies, whilst we in Canada exported to the British Colonies \$18,566 worth. It seems to me that if the Government would, by the appointment of Commissioners to visit those colonies and endeavor to create an intercolonial trade, as inter-provincial trade has already been such a success, if they would take some means to build up intercolonial trade between Canada and the other British Possessions, they would confer upon the

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

lumber interests the greatest benefit that could be conferred upon it. I throw out this suggestion with the hope that the Government may, in their wisdom, deem fit to offer some degree of assistance to that particular interest. I do not think, however, as I said before, that those engaged in the lumber trade and especially the operators, will be found to support the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think that when the time comes it will be found that that interest will unite in returning the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches to the position they at present occupy.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) claims, as a result of the National Policy, the increased price of agricultural productions and the higher rate of wages which is now paid. But it so happens that a higher rate of wages is now current in the neighboring country than was current in 1878, yet there has been no alteration in its fiscal policy. It also happens that a higher price is paid for agricultural products in the United States now than there was in 1878, and yet there has been no change in their Tariff. By referring to the *Journal of Commerce* of February 3rd of the present year, I find quotations of the price of wheat in the United States in the years 1878 and 1881, as follows: Winter wheat, in 1878, \$1.01; in 1881, \$1.44½. Spring wheat, 1878, 90 cents; 1881, \$1.32. Oats, 1878, 28½ cents; 1881, 47 cents. Corn, 1878, 46½ cents; 1881, 69 cents. Butter, 1878, 16 cents; 1881, 25 cents. Tea, with regard to wages, day laborers were paid, in 1878, from \$1 to \$1.50 per day; in 1880, from \$1.50 to \$2.50. Carpenters, in 1878, from \$1.50 to \$2; in 1880, to \$2.50 to \$3. Bricklayers, 1878, \$2 to \$2.50; 1880, \$3 to \$4. Now, unless hon. gentlemen claim that the National Policy in Canada has raised the price of agricultural products in the United States, and also raised the rate of wages, I think they cannot contend that the National Policy here is the only cause of the increased price of agricultural products and the higher rate of wages. Hon. gentlemen are very fond of comparing 1878 with 1881, and the prices of articles in those two periods, forgetting altogether the change in the outside world with regard to those articles; and it is well known, for example, that goods can be produced in Great Britain at a much lower rate now than in 1878. If the duty was lower by 17½ per cent., would hon. gentlemen say that the working man would not receive a greater amount of the products which he desires in exchange for his labor? When we listened to the hon. member for Cardwell the other night—and we always listen to his remarks with pleasure—my attention was recalled to a statement made by him last year, wherein I was proud to find that he had made an important admission. During the campaign of 1878, the matter was much discussed as to who was responsible for the expenditure for the year 1873-74. I was proud last year to find that that hon. gentleman admitted the year 1874-75 was the first year in which the late Administration had full control of the affairs of the country. I was somewhat surprised to find this year, however, that he maintained positively that the present Government were not at all responsible for the year 1873-74. Last year he stated, as recorded in the Debates, page 1081, "in the first year in which hon. gentlemen opposite had complete control of the affairs of the country that of 1874-75." Now this year the hon. gentleman declares that the year 1873-74 did not, in any sense, belong to the Mackenzie Administration, that they were not responsible for the expenditure of that year. Now he gave us no reason why he changed his opinion in the matter, though we would have been very much pleased indeed to have learned the reason. I think, moreover, he scarcely gave the hon. gentlemen on this side due credit for the opinions they hold. I find him stating the opinions expressed by them with regard to the

control of Providence over our affairs seemed to him very shocking. He said:

"The manner in which hon. gentlemen have dealt with this name is little less than impious."

Now, I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when they speak of Heaven's rain and Heaven's sunshine, have in view, not these benign blessings coming down on the bare rock or the barren field, but upon the seed that has been put into the soil which had been cultivated by the hand of man, where time and labor had been expended in preparing the ground for receiving that seed. I think that was the idea in the minds of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House when they so spoke. Will any hon. gentleman on the other side say that; after a man had done all he could in preparing the soil and putting it into a proper condition to receive the seed, and after having scattered the seed thereon, that any policy that could be devised would cause one grain of that seed to germinate, that a 30, 40 or 50 per cent Tariff would cause that little germ to spring upward or the root grow downward? Would any National Policy that has ever been contrived cause that grain to grow? If there is any one impious, surely it is he who says that man, independent of the sun and of the seasons, can bring about prosperity, as was said on one occasion by an hon. gentleman who in speaking about the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) said the prosperity which he has given the country. The hon. gentleman also made a comparison of the value of the exports of agricultural products in 1877-78, with those in 1880-1881, and he made out the difference to be only \$322,501 or only 2 per cent. Or, in other words, he claimed that only 2 per cent of the prosperity of the country was due to the good crops, I would not say that the hon. gentleman did so designedly, but it is singular that he omitted to mention a great many important articles of produce which were exported in 1881. Looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that, in 1877-78, we exported of green fruits, \$149,330, and in 1880-81, \$645,658; hay, in 1877-78, \$1,163,628, and in 1880-81, \$1,813,208; potatoes, in 1877-78, \$361,134, and in 1880-81, \$830,218; malt, in 1877-78, \$439,792, and in 1880-81, \$649,857; beans, in 1877-78, \$76,013, and in 1880-81, \$117,708; rye, in 1877-78, \$251,669, and in 1880-81, \$783,840; vegetables, in 1877-78, \$26,026, and in 1880-81, \$67,745, or an aggregate of \$1,467,585 in 1877-78, as against \$4,908,234 for these articles in 1880-81. The total amount of exports of agricultural products in 1877-78 was \$18,808,754, as against \$21,668,327, or a difference of \$3,159,573, or 17½ per cent. instead of 2 per cent. as stated by the hon. gentleman. Let us look at the matter in another way, namely, by taking the average exports of agricultural products during the four years, 1874 to 1878—the years of depression—and the average under the National Policy, namely, from 1879 to 1881. The average during the former period was \$17,774,038, and during the latter \$21,063,706, an increase of 18½ per cent. Of animals and their products the increase has been still greater. I will not trouble the House with the figures, but I may say that the difference between the former period and the latter amounts to 30 per cent. Let us look at the matter in another way. The total amount of agricultural products during the four years 1874--78 was \$71,091,153; while for the three years, 1879--81 it was \$63,191,119, or a difference of only 3 per cent. The difference with regard to animals and their products is only 2½ per cent. Now, I think these figures show conclusively that the harvest was a material and important factor in the prosperity of the country, though I do not claim that it was the only factor. I believe that the three years of depression forced on the people of this country the necessity of economy and thrift, and the good times we are now enjoying are in a large measure the fruit of the

savings of the people. We have had a great deal of wrangling on the subject of deficits, but let us look at that matter in a common sense point of view. The deficit showed that the people were not buying goods—that they would rather do without many of them until better times came, and in consequence the imports fell off, therefore the revenue. Hon. gentlemen opposite, sometimes, but very rarely, speak of Protection as one of the causes of prosperity, but usually speak of it as the sole cause, and if it be the sole cause of the good times surely the fact is susceptible of proof. It is not sufficient proof to say that before the National Policy we had depression, and under the National Policy we have prosperity. We require further proof than that. One thing preceding another does not prove that the former is the cause of the latter, and besides we are reasoning from one period of time to another, and we should be careful that no other cause slips in during the intervening period. We say that such a cause stepped in. To test the matter let us take a familiar illustration. Suppose that A is a known fact, and we find that A is sometimes along with B, if we can find by looking through a number of cases that A sometimes exists and B does not, we may take it for granted that one is not the cause of the other. Now, I want to show the House that prosperity can exist without Protection, and if I am able to show that, that goes far to establish the proposition that Protection cannot be the cause of prosperity. I will take the best illustration which I think can be found, that is the illustration of two countries lying side by side, Victoria and New South Wales, one having a system of Free Trade, and the other a system of Protection. I alluded to this on a former occasion, in the year 1879, when I compared the year 1870 with the year 1876. On the present occasion I will draw the attention of the House to the condition of these two countries in 1871 and in 1878, the last years of which I can obtain accounts. In order that we may have a fair understanding of the case, I will also compare our condition with the conditions of those two colonies, and if the comparison is unfavorable to us, it is with no disrespect to our own country that I make it known. I am quite willing to admit that these two colonies have natural advantages which we have not, and if they have increased in wealth faster than we have, I think it is due to that fact rather than to their own energy. If nature has done less for us, we ought to do more for ourselves; if nature has not furnished us with so genial a climate, then we ought to make this country as comfortable and inviting for the immigrant as we can—and this is one of the strongest objections I have to the National Policy, that it enhances the price of those articles that contribute to the comfort of the people in our climate. Fuel, food, and clothing, these three articles ought to be obtainable at the lowest possible price, and if we make these articles cheap in this country, we can offer inducements to emigrants to come here. Last year at a meeting of the Colonial Institute in London, Sir Alexander Galt asked why so few emigrants went to Canada, compared with those that went to the United States; and I think it was Mr. Anderson, the member for Glasgow, who replied that the United States had, on the whole, a better climate—a greater variety of climate—"and in order to make up for these advantages," he added, "you ought to offer them inducements to come; the protective Tariff which you have is making your country more objectionable than it should be; reduce your Tariff, make your country more attractive, and you will get emigrants." Now, let us make a comparison between Canada, Victoria, and New South Wales: and I may remark that the duties imposed in Victoria are not very heavy, ranging from about 10 to 20 per cent. New South Wales is as near Free Trade as it can be; there are no duties on manufactured goods whatever, the revenue being derived from the duties on teas and certain descriptions of sugar chiefly.

The increase of population in Canada during the last decade was 24 per cent., in Victoria 20½ per cent. in seven years, and in New South Wales 37½ per cent. in seven years. The exports of Canada have increased 32½ per cent. in ten years; the exports of Victoria have increased 2½ per cent. in seven years, while the exports of New South Wales have increased 66½ per cent. in seven years. The exports per head are \$20.41 in Canada, \$85.08 in Victoria, and \$93.44 in New South Wales. The imports and exports per head in Canada are \$41.60, in New South Wales \$199.88, and in Victoria \$176.96. We are not able to form an estimate of the value of the farm stock in Canada, but in Victoria it amounts to \$75 a head, and in New South Wales to \$205 a head. The bank deposits per head in Canada on the 28th of Feb., 1882, were \$23.50; Victoria, in 1878, \$100.72, and in New South Wales, \$120.55. In regard to immigration, one of the statements made time and again against the policy of the late Administration, was that it was driving the people out of the country. Now, it was not a Free Trade policy that we had; there is no use of hon. gentleman opposite saying that we hold Free Trade views; whatever our views may be, they are only a difference in degree. But if we were driving the people out of the country under a 17½ per cent. Tariff, we should suppose that Free Trade would drive more out of the country; and yet we find that, from 1874 to 1878, the immigration into Victoria was 182,730, and the emigration 160,119, an excess of immigration of 22,611, while, in the same period in New South Wales the excess of immigration over emigration was 50,500. The imports from Great Britain to Victoria per head were \$37.19, and to New South Wales \$45. And while I make these comparisons to show the relative success of the two countries, you must remember that Victoria produced in twenty-nine years \$9,615,000,000 in gold dust, while New South Wales produced in the same period only \$1,620,000,000. I think that shows conclusively that it is possible to have prosperity with protection. I will now refer to some remarks made by the President of the Council which I can hardly allow to go unchallenged. That hon. gentleman, although he recently became a member of this House, is an old parliamentarian, I suppose of nearly a quarter of a century's experience, and of course he will not expect to have the same treatment meted out to him as would be given to a new member, and his position as the President of the Council gives authority to his utterances. Allusion has been made already to the hon. gentleman's manner of treating the Mother-Country. It is somewhat remarkable than hon. gentlemen opposite taunt us on this side of the House with playing into the hands of the Americans. They are continually thrusting into our teeth that our policy is one for the advantage of the American people. At the very time when those hon. gentlemen are doing this, they are trying in every way to belittle the Mother-Country, and speak slightly and disrespectfully of it. With respect to the comparison made by the hon. President of the Council as regards the exports from Great Britain, I think he was very unfair in his selection of years. He took certain years to make one comparison, and other years to make another comparison, selecting such years as would enable him to make a point in his own favor. Such is, however, a rather unfair way of making a comparison. For example, with respect to the exports of cottons, the hon. gentleman took 1873, 1878 and 1879; for wollens, he took 1870, and compared it with 1879; for iron and steel, he took 1877, and compared it with 1879; for wool, he took 1877, and compared it with 1879, and so on. And when he wanted to make a comparison the other way, he said there was a decrease in all those articles, except in machinery, which showed a large increase, which I suppose went to other countries to enable them to manufacture goods. If the hon. gentleman had desired to make a fair comparison of

Mr. FLEMING.

the exports, he would have taken the two last years, 1880 and 1881, and compared them with 1878 and 1879, and he would then have given a fairer comparison in regard to the progress of the country. With respect to linen goods, which the hon. gentleman quoted, we find that in 1880-81, as compared with 1878-79, there was an increased exportation of 6 per cent., woollens increased 8½ per cent., cottons 36 per cent., iron and steel 43 per cent., showing that the Mother-Country was not retrograding but progressing; that the reason why there had been a reduction in the exports in 1878 was largely owing to the shrinkage of value and to the inability of the people in other countries to purchase their products. Looking at the exports of Great Britain to the United States, we find that, in 1880, as compared with 1878, manufactured cottons increased 58 per cent., iron, wrought and unwrought, 699 per cent., woollen 32 per cent., again showing that Great Britain was not falling behind, but was holding its position, and that the depression was only a temporary one. The President of the Council made a statement at which I felt pained; he declared that the people of Great Britain were heavily taxed, and that the workingman was taxed on his sugar. The hon. member for Bothwell at the time endeavored to set the hon. gentleman right, and said that the English workingman had free sugar. "Then," said the President of the Council, "the records are wrong." This is most astonishing—that the President of the Council did not know that the duties on sugar were repealed in 1874. Where was the hon. gentleman all that time? He reminds me of Washington Irving's story of Rip Van Winkle. I imagine the hon. gentleman fell asleep in 1873 and awoke the other day to find that the world had progressed, and that Great Britain had advanced in its fiscal policy and removed the duties on sugar. With respect to taxes imposed on the people of Great Britain, there is no country in the world where the workingman can enjoy the fruits of his labor while paying so small taxes in the way of Customs dues. If he avoids drinking tea, coffee and wine and does not use snuff or tobacco he really has no Customs dues whatever to pay. The President of the Council drew a comparison between the shipping of this country during the past year as compared with 1877-78. He said the shipping of this country, in 1877-78, was 6,684,000 tons, while, in 1880-81, it was 8,104,333; but the hon. gentleman took the registered tonnage, and that is a very different thing from the freight tonnage. If he will examine the facts he will find that the whole freight tonnage, in 1877-78, was 5,187,892 tons, while, in 1880-81, it was 5,092,509 tons, or less by 95,383 tons. Here is a point which certainly possesses interest to the people in the western portion of the Dominion. It may be asked, what have we to do with tonnage? I answer that we have a great deal to do with tonnage. It stands to reason if vessels come to this country, the cost of carriage of freight will be lessened if vessels obtain return freight. I think it is very important there should be a trade both ways. If there is not, the farmer who sells his grain, or the lumberman who sells his lumber, has to pay the expense of the vessel coming out in ballast. This matter is a very serious one. The following is a statement of the register tonnage and freight tonnage of sea-going vessels leaving and arriving, 1880-81: Sea-going vessels leaving:

	Register tonnage.	Freight tonnage.	Percentage less than register.
British	1,673,117	1,529,162	8½ per cent less
Total	4,071,391	4,122,619	1 per cent more equal 51,228 tons over

The difference, therefore, between freight tonnage and register tonnage on English vessels leaving this country, is 8½ per cent., and the difference on the total tonnage is 1 per

cent. more on the freight over the register tonnage. Sea-going vessels arrived :

	Register tonnage.	Freight tonnage.	
British	1,752,888	534,413	75 per cent. less.
Total	4,032,946	969,890	75 per cent. less.
Total outwards and inwards	8,104,337	5,092,509	62½ per cent. less.

Total shipping trade outwards and inwards and including the inland trade :

Register.	Freight tonnage.	
13,802,432	7,987,422	42 per cent. less, or 5,815,010 tons.

If we are to be a commercial people, we must consider how we are going to buy from other countries as well as how we are going to sell to them ; and when we are boasting of our trade with Brazil, with regard to sugar, our trade with Glasgow and Greenock is falling off to such an extent that our vessels are coming out in ballast. I think it would not be prudent at this late stage of the debate to enter into other matters relating to the effect of the Tariff. That has been discussed already ; but I would draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to this point. Speaking on the Budget last year of the benefits the farmer derived from the Tariff, he mentioned the article of rye and said :

"I find from investigation that there has been in part of the Dominion and along the banks of the St. Lawrence a new enquiry, enquiring for that article and that the distillers of Ontario and Quebec instead of using corn are asking for and buying rye, giving growers an increased price as the result of the duty on corn and rye."

The hon. gentleman, speaking on the same subject, this year, said :

"The distillers of Canada now come to the farmers of Canada for rye which they use as a substitute for corn. That gives an increased market, and, to a certain extent, affects the price."

These are plain statements. This is now a question of speculation, but one which we are in a position to prove beyond the shadow of doubt. The Inland Revenue Returns give us the total quantity of grain used in the manufacture of spirits.

	Total used.	Corn.	Percentage of corn.	Rye.	Percentage of rye.
	lbs.	lbs.		lbs.	
1878	67,594,902	51,917,220	76½	10,529,912	15½
1880	53,394,258	41,409,142	77½	7,989,340	15
1881	53,667,108	42,264,041	78½	7,612,366	14½

If therefore the proportion of rye used in 1878, had been used in 1880 and 1881, there would have been an additional consumption of 17,225 bushels in those years. Thus does that coincide with the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, that the distillers of Canada are using rye as a substitute for corn, which gives an increased market and affects the price. With regard to the duty on corn, that is a matter in which I feel a very deep interest. If it was not that it would take too much of the time of the House, I would read an extract from the speech of Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, when he abolished the duties on grains of all kinds. As a result of taking off that duty and the importation of fertilizing substances we find that the farmers in Great Britain are able to produce on an average twenty-eight bushels of wheat per acre. I believe that for one farmer benefited by this policy, a duty on corn, a thousand are injured. I will give another instance of injustice to the farmer. Take the manufacturer of starch for example : he gets a drawback in the corn used by the manufacturer of that article ; but the farmer who purchases corn to feed the cattle, which is sold in the Old

Country, in competition with the cattle of other countries, gets no drawback. Again, the miller may grind flour in bond, and oats in bond, and the pork packers may pack pork in bond, under this Tariff ; but the farmer cannot buy his corn without paying a high duty ; there was no help for him. He is made by the National Policy to be the ass which gets the least hay and bears most of the burden. I will notice another item in the Tariff, the duty on window glass. If there is one thing that ought not to be taxed it is the light of the sun. There is a protection in this article of 20 per cent, and, as I understand from hon. gentlemen well informed, the glass works at New Glasgow can be carried on profitably with this protection. Its owners have the coal convenient and can manufacture the glass required in the country and find a good market and make good profits at 20 per cent. But there is a new glass factory starting at Napanee for which this protection is not sufficient. How far will you carry that principle ? Suppose a man takes it into his head to work a sterile farm, all rocks and sand, and because he cannot raise the same amount of produce from it that he could from a fertile farm, he asks the Government to reimburse him for his outlay on the unprofitable place. Help given to such parties would but encourage men to go into business where they had no chance, and for which they were not suited. Under this policy, every settler who goes to the North-West has to pay more for a pane of glass, to foster that factory in Napanee. What is the benefit of this protection to the people of Canada as a whole ? The city of Montreal has, for example, derived its full share of benefits. I like to hear of its prosperity. I have no doubt there are many men in that city, of the highest culture, energy and enterprise, but it must be remembered that Montreal is not the whole of the Dominion. This country has a population of 4,302,000 odd, and the population of Montreal only about 140,000. Now, suppose a law were passed by which one man could take from every other inhabitant of the Dominion, 5 cents, he would gain by that operation \$216,440 ; well, suppose this fortunate person were to pay out \$140,000, or \$1 a-piece to each inhabitant of Montreal, no doubt that would be considered a fine policy for the inhabitants of that city. This imaginary case gives a good idea of the operations performed by this Tariff. Would the country be any the richer from such an arrangement ? No, there would be just the same amount of money in it as before the operation ; but, instead of the money being in the pockets of the whole people, most of it would belong to one individual. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in pointing out the beneficial effects of the National Policy, forget that there are many others in the Dominion besides the manufacturers, that there are at least 6,000 towns and villages in the Dominion ; and if a map were employed, resembling the colored political map which, in not very good taste, was hung up at the entrance to the Library to remind the Liberal party of its defeat—if such a map were colored red so as to show the places where the National Policy produced any good effect, the blue, to show the places where it produced none—what kind of a map would you have ? You would have a map with just a few red spots here and there, but the greater portion blue. In dealing with protection to certain industries, you have to consider the whole country. The hon. Ministers forget that they are dealing with but a few individuals. One hon. gentleman, pointing out the benefits of the National Policy, reminded us how much more wealthy and prosperous the people of the eastern States were than those of the western States, and he pointed out a number of individuals immensely wealthy. He also showed that in the western States there were a considerable number of persons engaged in manufactures. It occurred to me, however, to ask—was it possible for any manufacturer to exist in the western States without protection ? The western States had no protection

against the eastern States. How, then, can manufacturers exist in the western States? If it is possible for manufacturers to exist in the western States without protection, surely they might exist in Canada under a protection of 17½ per cent. If, again, it is possible for manufacturers to exist in New South Wales, where there is no protection afforded, surely they might exist in Canada under 17½. I wish to call attention to the condition of the manufacturers of New South Wales. One would suppose they could not exist without Protection. With regard to the woollen manufacture from 1860 to 1864, representing \$32,632,000, the average importation from 1870 to 1874 was \$29,571,950. Now, taking the increased population, the average for those last years should have been \$47,684,620, the difference between these two sums showing the amount of home manufacture \$18,112,670. In boots and shoes the average imports, 1860—64, were \$8,626,380. In 1870-74 the average imports were \$1,179,715. If the imports in the last series of years had been in proportion to the population, as they were in the first series of years, the imports would be \$9,674,515, showing that there had been manufactured in the country \$3,494,000. There are eighty-one large establishments in New South Wales engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes, some employing 500 hands and some 350. I will read you an extract from a Melbourne newspaper :

“Our travellers report to us that they find great difficulty in placing our goods upon the neighboring markets, principally through the competition of Sydney with their own manufacture and European imported, sold sufficiently low to secure the custom. It must be remembered that Sydney has always had a steady export of her own manufactures, and that her manufacturers are giving inducements to our best workpeople to remove there. It also must be remembered that all leathers—the boot manufacturers' raw material—are admitted free into the port of Sydney, while an import duty of 7½, 10 and 20 per cent. is enforced in Victoria, thereby placing the Sydney manufacturer at an advantage.”

and if we look to the interests of the whole community, if we want to do what is just between man and man we must frame a Tariff by which no particular industry will be built up at the expense of the people, and if a man raise a crop that crop belongs to him and no one has anything to do with it. All he has got to do is to pay his share of the expense necessary to carry on the Government of the country, and if any law steps in and says to that man: “You shall not have the privilege of exchanging your article for another that you desire unless you pay tribute to some particular industry,” that interferes with the liberty of the subject. I have endeavored, Mr. Speaker, to show that many of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite are incorrect, that the arguments based upon these statements are consequently worthless. Believing that I have succeeded in exposing the fallacies of the hon. gentleman's reasoning, I am forced to the conclusion that men of ability and intelligence, such as these hon. gentlemen to whom I have alluded, must have been very hard driven, indeed, when they had recourse to such flimsy arguments, because I hold a skillful man will never use a bad argument for a good one. I will pronounce no panegyric upon Canada or its future. But I will say this: let us do the duty that lies nearest to us, and that is, readjust our Tariff so as to impose no burden on the people more than is necessary to carry on the Government of the country. Let our fiscal policy be such as will tend not to centralize, but to diffuse wealth throughout the country.

Mr. BEATY. It may be a comfort to the House to know that I do not propose to make any lengthy observations. Any that I shall make will be very general, and will bear in a general way upon the questions which have been presented to the House during this debate. I have watched the debate with some interest for the purpose of discovering the issues involved in this controversy. I have observed that the debate has been characterized with much ability and a good deal of industry, but it has also been, to a certain

Mr. FLEMING.

extent, strongly partizan and sharply hostile. Occasionally, I may say, happily not very often, it has been unseemly personal. I regret that these personalities have been imported into the debate; it does not add to the dignity of the House nor to the importance of the subject. When I come to consider the lines in which the controversy has run, I find two leading items. The first that is presented is the idea of a revenue Tariff. Now, I do not understand this idea to mean more than looking at it as a financial question. Revenue as a finance question solely. Now, is it possible for any Government to frame a Tariff for this country that shall have merely a financial aspect? It seems to me that there lies the fallacy of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite. Can a Tariff be framed that will simply have financial features in it? Must it not affect trade? Does not every Tariff affect trade? All the contention on the part of the Opposition with reference to the Tariff is that it affects trade; is it not that it affects it injuriously and that therefore it ought to be reduced? Now, as I view the case it is impossible to consider this question simply from a commercial point of view. It must always be considered in reference to the financial result as well as the effect it has upon the trade of the country. Now, their line of argument presented in this controversy is whether a trade policy—because I look upon the trade policy not altogether as the National Policy, although it has acquired that name—whether the trade policy of the country is a factor in the present prosperity of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is not; hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have mostly contended that it has produced some result in the general prosperity which now prevails throughout the country. The contention, therefore, amounts substantially to this: Has the National Policy, the trade policy of the Government, an effect upon the national prosperity as it now exists? It is not denied that there is great prosperity all over the country—it is simply denied, as I understand the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the prosperity is attributable to the trade policy of the country, and nearly all the debate we have had on the Budget, has tended to that point. Now I submit the points of objection I have heard stated by the Opposition are not of a character to convince gentlemen in this House or in the country. They will fail to convince any one that the trade policy of the Government has not had a beneficial result in the Dominion from one end to the other. The objections which are chiefly urged against it are, first, that it is unsound in theory, that the laying on of a Protective Tariff is an unsound feature; that it is not a healthful feature or a helpful influence upon the country, and we are told, in reference to this matter, that it involves a question of Free Trade and Protection. Now, no person looking at the abstract questions of Free Trade and Protection can say that Free Trade should be applied to this country, more than that, so long as we have a revenue derived from indirect taxation the theory of Free Trade is impracticable or impossible in its application to this country. Under these circumstances, therefore, the doctrine of Free Trade cannot and should not be introduced into the controversy. The question is simply to what extent is any Government authorized for the benefit of the country to extend the rate of taxation and increase the Tariff. The contention of the hon. gentlemen opposite is that the rate of taxation is too high on some articles, and that it should be reduced to a moderate rate. In other words, that the Tariff should be re-adjusted. The theory, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite have been concerned, is that Free Trade should be applied, but only to the extent of producing a revenue by the Tariff, and they entertained that theory so far, that it ultimately ran away with them and ran them out of power. It was like the hunter and the bear. While the hunter pursued the bear it was good sport, but when the bear turned on the hunter

the fun departed. Another objection which is presented, in reference to this matter, is that the increased taxation is oppressive, and this is their strong point. In the general aspect in which I shall look at the question, I judge that if the people were oppressed, if, as the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) expressed it, they are suffering from taxation, they would have expressed their sufferings so that we could hear from them in some form or other. I know that an agitation has been kept up on this question not only in the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite but at the public meetings which have been held throughout the country for the purpose of agitating the public mind. We know that the members of their party have wandered away down to the sea-side for the purpose of promoting health and politics, for the purpose of gaining fresh air and fresh conquests, and we know also that not a single objection has been presented to this House showing that any class of Her Majesty's subjects are suffering in consequence of this taxation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They rather like it.

Mr. BEATY. Yes, as my right hon. friend says, they rather like it, judging by the fact that they make no pretence of complaint in reference to the matter. And when you examine carefully the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, what do you find? I do not recollect, at the moment, of hearing one hon. gentleman in this House, except the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) and the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) declare that his constituency suffered in consequence of this taxation. I find a general suggestion—and I would not have hon. gentlemen mistake me; I find cloudy insinuations from hon. gentlemen opposite that this taxation is oppressive, but when they come to the specific articles with regard to which complaint is made, we find they are very few indeed; and when we come to the different classes of people in the country what do we find? The manufacturers certainly do not complain. If we go to the traders who deal between the manufacturers and consumers, we hear no complaints from them; and when I speak of complaints being made, I mean complaints made in public meetings, and by those other means by which people are accustomed to make known their grievances. If we go to the farmers we find no complaint from them, and as to the mechanics, we simply hear that they want an increase of wages, because they know that the increased demand upon the manufacturers of the country is such that they can expect increased wages. The laborers stand in the same position, so that when you come to specific articles and particular classes of the community, we do not find that complaints are made in any substantial form which this House can take cognizance of in reference to the grievances which hon. gentlemen mention in connection with the Tariff. We find, on the contrary, that it has created great activity in the whole country; that it has increased the invention of the people, that it has resulted in improved machinery and the production of superior articles in consequence of the great competition and the skill and capital which is employed in production. Again, it is suggested that this is class legislation and therefore objectionable. Well, there is class legislation on a great many subjects. We have legislation for lawyers, for doctors, druggists, and others, but the question is, is it legislation for them or for the public. I think it is very objectionable to have legislation either for a class, or against a class, but Parliament has frequently passed Acts both for classes and against them, in a certain sense, but such legislation is always based on the principle that it is for the public good, and therefore a proper kind of legislation. That, I contend, is the kind of legislation that is presented in this matter. We are told that the consumer is affected disadvantageously by the Tariff, but where is the outcry coming from? From what class? What county

has been heard from by petitioning or otherwise? We have innumerable petitions on questions of every description, but we have not had one petition representing the ideas put forth by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. This is a substantial and undeniable fact which is clear in spite of all the figures which have been used so much in the course of this debate. We have not had from any part of the country, from Halifax to Victoria, a single petition on the trade policy of the country. Another statement put forward against this policy is, that it is detrimental to the country at large. In what respect is it so? What facts have been presented by hon. gentlemen opposite to convince any ordinary mind, any mind not given to figures, that this tariff is detrimental to the country at large? It can bear only two aspects—it must be either good or bad, beneficial or baneful. Now, we find on looking abroad, that the country, instead of going to the dogs, is prosperous; and while we are willing to give all the credit due to an abundant harvest, to an increase in the lumber trade, and to all the other factors in the development of this country, in any comparison we make with former years, we cannot exclude from our consideration the fact that the trade policy of the Government has been very beneficial, especially in the cities and towns for which I more especially speak. We are told by the hon. member for Yarmouth that hon. gentlemen opposite are in harmony with the spirit of the age. Wherein are they in harmony with the spirit of the age? Is it the spirit of the age in the United States, or in Germany, or in France? Is there not a tendency in England, to-day, to go back, to some extent—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BEATY. Is there not a controversy going on in England, showing that there is a strong under-current in the English mind against the system of Free Trade as it exists there. It may not be at present very strong, because the traditions of generations cannot be done away with in a year or two. Is it with the spirit of the age in these countries that hon. gentlemen opposite are in harmony? And can it be said that they are in harmony with the spirit of the age in Canada, where they are in opposition to the policy supported by the people at the polls? Then the hon. member refers to the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Railways in regard to these matters, and he wishes the attention of the country to be called to them. But has not the attention of the country been called to them? Has it not been called to them by all the organs of the Opposition, by all the speeches made in this country during the last three or four years, and by the thirty-six bye elections which have taken place? And what has been the effect of these calls? Has it not been to increase the number of the supporters of the Government, so that, out of these thirty-six seats, two were lost to the Government and six gained, leaving them four better than they were before? Then the hon. gentleman spoke of the trade of the country. Is not the trade of the country extending everywhere? Is it not extending within the country itself, to the West Indies, to England, and to the United States? All these things show that this policy has not been so disadvantageous to the country as hon. gentlemen opposite claim. But what is the positive evidence of the success of this policy? Why, we find new factories established, be they few or many, inducing capital to go into active works, instead of being invested in mortgages and land. In my own riding of West Toronto, for instance, representing about 39,000 people, during the last two years there have been nine new factories established, employing at least 1,600 hands; and the city of Toronto itself has increased in population 30,000, while, taking the suburbs with the city, there has been an increase of from 40,000 to 45,000 in the population; and this population, to my personal knowledge, is better off, has more

employment, has more wages, and is in all respects more prosperous than it was three, six or eight years ago. And why is that? Not only because of good crops or increased prosperity in the lumber trade, but also because of the introduction of new factories and the enlargement of old ones. There has been an increase in the same direction all over the country. The other evening, while the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Kranz) was speaking of the increase of population in his riding, the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal) interrupted him, and compared the Census of 1871 with the Census of 1881. At the time a memorandum was put into my hands, which states that the hon. member for South Waterloo was comparing 1871 with 1881, and not 1878 with 1881; that between 1875 and 1878 workman after workman and family after family moved away to the United States, because of the fiscal policy of the Government; that from the village of Hesper the establishment there for the manufacture of worsted goods was moved away to Holyoke, Mass., entirely because, as they said, of the trade policy prevailing in the country. That a different state of things exists to-day is what convinces people that the trade policy of the Government is a beneficial policy. Every man acquainted with city affairs knows that previous to about three years ago the manufactories were not fully employed; some of them had to give up, and some of them worked only half time; whereas now the manufacturers are busy all over the Dominion. That fact is undeniable; and thus not only mechanics and laborers are employed, but they in turn provide business for merchants and traders, and the result is found, as stated by the Minister of Finance, in an increase in the deposits of the savings banks during the last three years of over \$13,000,000. Now that is a showing by itself indicating that in the cities and towns, for I am persuaded it is there that saving banks receive the largest amounts, mechanics and laborers are able to make deposits. That indicates as far as they are concerned that this policy is not detrimental but advantageous, that it is a policy which we at least are able to support, and which we think we can go to the country upon with full confidence whenever the time may come. I may add an observation in connection with what the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) said in connection with the lumber trade. Now, the fact that farmers obtain for their oats, pork and other produce larger prices where the lumber trade is carried on, is to my mind a conclusive proof of the truth of the contention of this side of the House that a home market is better for a country than a more distant market. Is it not a fact that wherever capital is brought and the lumber trade is carried on, farmers in those neighborhoods in most instances secure better prices for their oats, pork, hay and other produce than do farmers not in immediate proximity to lumbering camps? And that illustrates the idea which has been strongly and properly pressed here, that manufacturing industries in towns and cities furnish a home market which is a benefit to the farmers, and that the farmers therefore are not heard complaining or uttering any grievance in connection with that policy. I do not propose to dwell on that matter, because it has been so fully and with such detail presented to the House; but there is another item to which I wish to refer, namely, the railway policy which has been inaugurated and carried on so far with remarkable success under the present Administration. Now, what has been the effect of that policy on the country? Has it not relieved the Government of immense responsibilities in giving into the hands of a responsible and capable company the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Has not the giving of that work into their hands justified the method; have not the consequences which have resulted from it justified its adoption—the rapid construction of the road, the rapid

Mr. BEATY.

development of the North-West Territory, the speedy settlement of the country, and the immense immigration which we shall have not only from Europe and all parts of the Eastern Provinces, but also from the United States, whereby a large number of Canadians who were driven across the lines by reason of the depression in former days will return to the Dominion? What do these facts prove? They prove that this policy in its national aspect is immensely beneficial to the whole community, that it gives vent to the energies which otherwise would be driven into foreign countries, that it opens out opportunities for the enterprise and capital of Eastern Provinces, and as we have seen by the statement made by the Minister of Customs the other day, it opens up new avenues of trade which otherwise would not be available to the Eastern Provinces. All this is in itself of the greatest importance to Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. But there is another feature in connection with the railway policy which is not often taken into account. While the Government is giving a large sum of money annually for the purpose of promoting this national railway enterprise, could any Administration have obtained for the same sum, better skill in railway matters, in financial enterprises, in opening up territory, in inducing immigration, than that possessed by the company which is at present carrying on the work? Not at all. They have found in the company superior skill, large capital, equal to the emergency and a faculty for opening up the country in a manner which has astonished everybody who considered the matter before the enterprise was entered upon. And there is in connection with this railway policy and general policy, a feature which I should not like to overlook, and it is this: I do not recollect any time since Confederation (of course there are hon. gentlemen who have been more largely engaged in politics who can speak more positively, as I have for many years only given a single eye to political matters) when there was such general tranquility as prevails to-day. There are no remonstrances from British Columbia or from Nova Scotia complaining of their condition in any particular way; they are quiescent, taking the circumstances as they come, and are enjoying the benefits of this policy. I am quite satisfied that at no time during those fifteen years were so few complaints, uttered in a tangible form, from any part of the Dominion. This railway policy produces an immense benefit to this country by opening up an avenue for the trade of the world. There can be no doubt whatever that it will open up an avenue between Europe and Asia across this continent. It is the shortest route, and, it may be said, it will be the best route, when established, for conducting trade between Europe and Asia. Our geographical position enables us to take this lead in the matter of inter-oceanic railways, and hence we stand in this position that, without this railway, Canada could never have attained to that condition of national aspiration which it has now reached, when the great North-West Territory is opened by running a railway from east to west. Then the land policy, which is a very important item, probably next in importance to the trade policy, and if there is any difference between them the land policy possesses a greater importance, is enabling the North-West to be settled up in a manner almost unparalleled in the history of this continent. While the United States have had to some extent the same run of events, yet now we are and will bring to a larger extent year by year the population of the Old World to new fields of enterprise in the North-West, in a manner that has never been paralleled in the history of the world. I notice that the *Globe*, in an article on Monday week, spoke in most enthusiastic terms of its effect on emigration from England as well as from Europe. The North-West not only gives room for emigrants from the Old World, but for the young and enterprising people of our own Dominion who want to enter into new fields and place themselves on that

fertile land. Although not much has been said about the Colonization Companies, and we sometimes hear that the Policy is being abused, it seems to me that the Government would not be employing a more potent agency or a cheaper and better one for the interests of this country, than this scheme for introducing immigration, at no cost to the Government, but to the great advantage of the Dominion. The Government are relieved of the cost of bringing in immigrants, the land is sold for some money, which goes into the public Treasury, and reduces the public debt, and that being the case, this immigration policy, represented by Colonization Companies, is one of the best that has ever been devised. We sometimes hear of the national aspirations of the young men of this country. They have now a wide extent of country in the North-West, where they can employ every energy, invest every dollar of capital, and enjoy all the benefits which labor in that fertile country can give. The general results of our financial policy are the best that can possibly be conceived. When we look at the large revenue and surplus produced, without the country suffering or complaining, we must come to the conclusion that our financial policy was so well adjusted that no better result could possibly be arrived at. We cannot ignore that great fact of the immense surplus and revenue produced, without affecting the people injuriously, or even causing them the least loss of enjoyment, while promoting at the same time our national industries and national wealth. A policy such as this will, I am persuaded, be endorsed by the people at every opportunity. Then there is the general distribution of wealth evidenced by the large deposits in the savings banks, and by the opening of new channels in trade and manufacture to capital that formerly was locked up in land and other ways. These are the striking features of the National Policy which has been promoted by the present Administration, which has been supported by the great majority in this House and the country, and which has in every by-election almost that has taken place in the last three years, been endorsed by the people. Under the circumstances, should the House go back on the policy that has produced such beneficial results and being endorsed in so striking a manner? The lesson we have to learn is to let well enough alone. In reference to this matter it has been suggested that there will be a general election this spring. Whether there should be a general election or not, it is plain to me that it would be a great mistake to throw the country into the turmoil of elections during our present business prosperity. The party can well wait and the country can well wait. Let us then wait and see what the result will be; and then when we are all obliged to go to the people we will see what they have to say on this matter. I am persuaded, unless a very extraordinary revolution, which it is unreasonable to expect, will take place within the next 18 months, the country will support the policy which it endorsed in 1878. What is the policy proposed by the Opposition? It is, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the re-adjustment of the Tariff with the view of withdrawing its protective effect. Now, is that reasonable? Moreover, although that is the general proposition, what are the specified items presented to the people to induce them to endorse a re-adjustment of the Tariff? There are none whatever. We have presented the idea of a free breakfast. I would be glad if there was a free breakfast in every respect, and a free fire to cook it. But has it been proved that the duty has produced such results on coal and food, that they are dearer than they were three years ago? On the contrary, I bought coal cheaper than I could two years ago. The contention may be made that it would be still 50 cents cheaper without the duty, but even that is a question of doubtful controversy. Another item of the Opposition policy, as presented last year, more strikingly than this year, was in reference to the Pacific

Railway. It was represented that only the prairie section should be built, and that the construction of the eastern and western sections should be postponed. This would not be a national nor a safe policy, and we can therefore the more readily support the policy of completing the whole railway from one end of the country to the other, thus opening up that internal trade which will bind all the provinces together and give to each its share in the advantages the whole Dominion possesses. There is one policy which undoubtedly the Opposition have, and that is the policy of opposing the Government. They remind me of the story of the emigrant who came to New York while the elections were going on, and was asked by both parties to give his vote. He refused, because he said he did not understand the issues, but on being pressed he said: "Have you a Government?" The reply was "yes." "Well," said he, "I'll vote against the Government anyhow." The Opposition vote against the Government everytime regardless of the results to the country and the merits of the policy presented. It is true some hon. gentlemen have said that the country has been the victim of fraud, been humbugged, and that the leaders of our party have shown imbecility.

Mr. MILLS. And of this side of the House.

Mr. BEATY. And possibly of that side also; but I do not like to see offensive statements and charges made against hon. members in this manner. I think it would be more respectful and proper that hon. gentlemen who have been twenty, thirty, or forty years in the Government and Parliament of the country, and who have manifested an honorable character in all their dealings in public affairs, and have shown, at all events, no imbecility, should never be exposed to such charges or insinuations. It would be much better to withdraw them or leave them to be made, if at all, outside of this House, and to let hon. members work in a dignified and harmonious manner in promoting the welfare of the whole country. I have listened carefully to the speeches made throughout this debate. I have listened attentively to the strong points which I think have been made by the Opposition against this policy and in antagonism to the present condition of affairs produced in this country by that policy. I have listened with earnestness and have sought with some degree of candor to reach the true conclusions that ought to be arrived at on this important question, possibly biased to some extent by my party predilections and associations, but I still think the true policy is to stand by the Government in its Tariff, on its commercial policy, its railway policy, its land policy, and endeavor, shoulder to shoulder, to carry on the work it has undertaken, and extend it, as opportunity presents itself, and for six years longer the country will reap the great benefits of a policy which for the three years of its existence has produced such marked results, and it will go on prospering and to prosper.

Mr. KING. I do not desire to trespass at very great length on the time of the House. I quite understand that hon. members on both sides are growing weary of this debate. I have listened with attention to the speeches made on both sides, and have been forced to conclude that on one point, at least, both parties, almost without exception, are agreed—that is, that to-day the Dominion is enjoying a prosperity beyond the measure attained two or three years ago. But while this is the case, I find a marked difference in the views of hon. gentlemen as to the causes. Members of the Government side are not willing to admit that the better times and increased prosperity are in any way due to the increased exports of lumber, to the improvement in the crops, or to any other cause save the National Policy. Though my remarks may be considered somewhat sectional, I intend to confine them to the Tariff as applied to my own Province, New Brunswick. I offer no apology in so doing, believing as I do that the Tariff has worked more

injuriously to that than any other Province of the Dominion. I propose to confine my remarks mainly to the leading industries, viz.: farming and lumbering. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, told us that we had reached a period more prosperous than ever known before; that our farmers had an increased home market, and were getting better prices for their produce than ever they were before. I will quote his own words:

"Manufactories have increased, the number of the employed has increased, and their wages have increased. They have plenty of money with which to buy perishable produce—I speak particularly of perishable goods which cannot be sent to a distant market."

And then he goes on to say:

"I think it will be difficult to convince the farmer that, under the present policy, he is not benefitted, and that he can be induced, under any circumstances, to oppose a policy that is calculated to increase, as it has done, the value of his produce, and give him higher prices and a better home market than he had before it was introduced."

I admit at once that if the Finance Minister can satisfy the farmers that his policy has produced the change he will have good claims on them for support. It will be difficult to show that such is the case. In the report laid on the Table of the House showing the number of new industries promoted by the Tariff, I find that three are claimed for New Brunswick; one of these is located at Moncton, a sugar refinery employing sixty-five hands; another at Moncton, a lock factory, giving employment to fifty hands; while a third factory at St. John employs twenty-five hands. If I were disposed to criticise sharply that report, I could tell the House that one of those industries was in existence some years previous to the National Policy, and that so far as the lock factory is concerned, the building was in course of erection, and the business was intended to be carried on, prior to the National Policy. But in the calculation I am about to make I can afford to treat the matter generously. It will be seen from that return, that all told, the only claim for the National Policy, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, is that it employs 140 additional hands. I do not know the average wages paid, but I assume that \$1.20 a day will be up to the mark. If so, we find that gives an annual expenditure of \$50,000 paid as wages to the employees in those factories. Now, by the Census of 1871, it will be seen that New Brunswick had considerably over 40,000 farmers. Allowing for the natural increase, it is fair to conclude that we have to-day somewhere near 50,000. If that \$50,000 went directly into the pockets of those farmers it would be providing for each an increased home market to the extent of but \$1 per head. I claim that such is not the case—that by no means can it be shown that they receive anything like that amount. For instance, the farmers in New Brunswick do not supply the people with the wheat flour used, which is largely supplied by Ontario. It is known that the farmers only furnish to the operatives in these factories the meat, vegetables and dairy products consumed, which I might put down at one-fourth of that amount, or \$12,500, which may be said to go directly into the pockets of the farmers of New Brunswick. This would give them an increased home market to the extent of 25 cents each. To make the matter somewhat plainer it will be found that the average products of a New Brunswick farm is about \$300. That gives an increased home market to the extent of one-twelve hundredth part of the products of the New Brunswick farm; or it simply gives an increased home market to the extent of a peck of potatoes to each farmer. But I want to treat the matter fairly and I am disposed to investigate it still further. It seems that the National Policy, by the efforts made on the part of the Government, and the gentlemen supporting them, has induced capitalists to invest their moneys in New Brunswick, and it ought certainly to have produced some results greater than we have seen so far.

Mr. KING.

I assume that, in the next year or two, we are to have some increase in the manufacturing industries of New Brunswick. I am prepared to admit that at the present time they are building a cotton factory at St. Croix which will give employment to 300 hands. In St. John, after a great effort they have managed to make a beginning in the erection of a cotton factory which will probably give employment to 200 more. At Moncton there is another in course of erection of equal capacity. In the city of St. John there is a cotton factory which has been a long time in existence, and which flourished long before the introduction of the National Policy. There are probably about 150 additional hands employed in that factory. All these together will give about 850 additional hands not shown in the returns laid before this House. I assume, that in the next year or two, some other small industries may be created, giving employment to perhaps 150 hands—for instance, the canning industry. I am at a loss to know the rate of wages likely to be paid to the operatives in the cotton factories. It is a little curious that the manufacturers of New Brunswick all seem to run in the cotton line. That is conclusive to my mind that this industry must be receiving protection over and above the other industries of that Province, or else the capitalists would find some other industries that would pay them as well. In looking over the report of the Factory Commission I find that about 75 per cent. of the labor employed in cotton factories is what is called adult female labor, but that includes girls of 14 years and upwards. Moreover, in this 75 per cent. is included the labor of children under 14 years, and many of them under 10 years. I assume that that class of people, at all events, are not in the habit of receiving extraordinary wages. Reports show that the wages paid in Montreal cotton factories average 48 cents per head. I know we have not got as cheap labor in New Brunswick as in Montreal, and I assume that 65 cents would be a fair rate of wages to be put down to the thousand of operatives to be employed in the Province of New Brunswick. This would give \$650 per day or in round numbers, \$200,000 per year. This is as much as can safely be claimed for the National Policy next year. Next year the farmers according to a former calculation, will have an increased home market to the extent of \$1 per head. That, I think, at all events, the farmers will not appreciate as a very great boon on the part of the hon. the Minister of Finance. I fancy that will hardly satisfy them for the increased taxes imposed upon them by the Tariff. There is another point. This does not represent the profits of the farmers under the National Policy; it simply represents the increase in the home market. If I were to divide it by six it would come nearer the mark, and that would give less than 25 cents profit. In order to show that the farmers are not benefitted by that, I have but to show that the increased duty on a cotton warp would balance the account. But we are told that the farmers not only have an increased home market, but are getting better prices than before the introduction of the National Policy. On that point I have referred to the St. John newspapers published in the month of March, in 1874. The hon. Minister of Finance himself knows that the lumber business was then flourishing, and that that business is the great support of the farmers of New Brunswick. I find that instead of increasing the prices for the farmers the opposite is the case. In a list of eight articles, namely, beef, geese, lamb, mutton, pork, socks, turkey and wool rate to-day exactly as they did then; on butter, buckwheat meal, cabbage, chickens, ducks, eggs, cheese, hams, shoulders, tallow, yarn and oats, the price is 10 per cent. lower. Two articles, hay and potatoes, are higher than they were in 1874. I do not believe any hon. gentleman will claim that the National Policy has raised the price of hay in New Brunswick. Everybody knows that the increased cost of hay in New

Brunswick is caused by the injury to the last year; and as for potatoes, the potato bug has had as much to do with raising the price as the National Policy. Every farmer knows that the price of this article is regulated entirely by the price in the Boston market, and they quote prices in Boston instead of the prices in St. John. I think I have shown conclusively that the National Policy has not done very much either in the way of increasing the prices or in increasing the home market to the farmers of New Brunswick. I propose to show now what has been, to my mind, the real cause of the increased prosperity of that Province. Some three years ago spruce logs were sold in the markets of St. John as low as \$4.50 per thousand. The price on the average was \$5.00 for the best kind of spruce logs. To-day logs of the same description bring \$8.00. Deals were sold then at \$6.00 to \$7.00 per thousand; to-day they are quoted at \$10.50 to \$11.00. I think that will satisfy anyone who knows anything about the condition of affairs in New Brunswick that the higher price of lumber has had much to do with the increased prosperity of the farmer. But, in order to point out the difference between the home market provided by the National Policy and the market provided by the lumbering industry, I propose to submit a further calculation. The average exports of lumber from New Brunswick is about \$5,000,000 per annum. The amount required for home consumption, of course, cannot be correctly stated, but I am safe in putting it down at \$1,250,000. This includes the different products of the forest. The farmers not only supply to the lumbermen such articles as are made use of by operatives in the factories, but they supply in many cases, the standing timber. Then they supply the horses that are required in hauling out the lumber, the hay and oats required to feed them, and a large proportion of the team work required in that industry. I am safe in stating that so far as my Province is concerned, the farmers supply 50 per cent. of the labor required to cut and handle the lumber. In addition to that the families of the lumbermen afford a home market for farm produce. As I before stated, one-fourth of the amount expended in wages in factories went into the pockets of the farmers. I now state that one-half of the whole proceeds of the lumber produced in New Brunswick goes directly into the pockets of the farmers, after deducting Government stampage. So we have \$3,000,000 to be expended among 50,000 farmers, which affords a home market to the extent of \$60 a head, as against \$1.25 per head which is credited to the National Policy. There is another point to which I desire to call the attention of the House—a statement made by the hon. Finance Minister last Session and repeated this Session :

“With reference to the price of oats, we have evidence beyond controversy, in my judgment, and which I stated last Session, after a careful calculation, that it has been increased to the lumberman 3 cents per bushel.”

Now, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I have had an experience in the lumber business extending over twenty or twenty-five years, and I have never known a time when the prices of deals were so high and the price of oats so low in comparison as at the present time; while oats were, in 1874 and 1875, 55 cents a bushel; to-day they are a drug in the market at 50 cents, and I do not think it would be difficult to show that the decreased price is largely due to the National Policy. The hon. member for Renfrew is generally spoken of as an authority on lumber, but I think it would have been better, if to-night he had pointed out how it would be possible to sell articles to lumbermen cheaper to-day than in 1878, when the duties upon them have increased, unless the prices have declined in the country in which they are manufactured. With regard to rubber belting, my experience is that I am compelled to purchase the imported article at an advance of 25 to 30 per cent. The hon. Minister of Finance asserted that there had been an increase in the price of hand-made boots. Now, while the

employees of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) may use slop-made boots, the lumbermen of New Brunswick use hand-made boots, and as each man wears about two pairs a year, the result of the hon. Minister's statement, if true, would be to take out of their pockets about one dollar a year on that article alone, at the same time, I deny that the maker of hand-made boots has benefitted by the National Policy to the extent of a single dollar. With reference to the price of lumber the hon. Finance Minister has admitted on two or three occasions that he could do nothing for the lumbermen; but last summer, in the county of Carleton, N. B., it was reported that he stated that his Government had increased the price of spruce logs in St. John. He claimed that by their legislation they had increased the prosperity of the country, and thereby the price of logs, but I think he would have been nearer the mark if he had attributed the increased prosperity of the country to the increased price of these logs. He threw out the idea that the increased price of lumber was due to the increase of home consumption, but it strikes me that the Trade and Navigation Returns show that there has been an increased export of lumber in the last year or two, and that in the face of that fact the export price has been steadily advancing; and I think the retail lumber dealers of St. John will bear me out when I say that there has not been a period for many years in which there has been so little demand for lumber for building purposes at home as now. While dealing with matters of detail I might be allowed to point out some old industries which have revived during the last few years and some new ones which have been introduced into the Province of New Brunswick, which have proved beneficial to the country, and especially to the farmers. Since the revival of business in the United States there has been a very large demand for hemlock bark, bark extract, spiling, ship timber and sleepers, and an entirely new industry has been created by the demand for soft wood in the lime-burning districts of Maine. This wood has become an article of commerce, and brings a large amount of money into the country, and gives employment to a large number of hands. Furthermore, I might go on and show that the National Policy has proved injurious by compelling the vessels that carry our products away to return in ballast. It might be supposed that no manufacturing was done in New Brunswick prior to the National Policy, but the hon. Minister of Finance has quoted on two occasions in this House, from a report published by the manufacturers of St. John, which shows that in 1874 there were 9,000 persons engaged in manufacturing in and around the city of St. John. As to the causes of prosperity or depression among manufacturers I will not give my own testimony, but I will read an extract from a speech delivered by a gentleman who differs from me in his political opinions—a gentleman who was a delegate from St. John Board of Trade to the Dominion Board of Trade, which met in Montreal in March, 1874—Mr. T. R. Jones, who said :

“There are many manufactories in St. John, including three cotton factories. But assuredly they did not owe their establishment or their prosperity to the protective Tariff which they now enjoyed under the Dominion. They had been before, and were flourishing under the low duties which had prevailed in the Province of New Brunswick previous to Confederation. The great article of the St. John cotton manufacture was what is called warps. A few years ago these were imported. Now hardly any were imported, the whole quantity being made in the country. Nevertheless, manufacturers were like other people in business. They sometimes found the examination of the balance sheets present a blue look-out. But the Government was no more bound to protect them against bad seasons or against the consequences of their own bad management in the shape of over-production and bad debts, than it was bound to protect any other class of the community. In fact, it could not do it. The manufacturers were now suffering mainly from over-production and from the ambitious attempts to make a class of goods which natural circumstances placed beyond their power. Mr. Robertson was quite right in imputing the depression of the woollen trade, especially to over-production, and as there was at present no foreign trade, it was quite easy to see that the over-production when it took place must be peculiarly disastrous. As an illustration of the truth of this opinion, we might mention that there was at

Sherbrooke a single mill which, notwithstanding the small population of the Dominion, was larger than any similar mill in Great Britain, with one exception. The fact was that while this over-production prevailed no improvement would be made by increasing the Tariff, whether it was 20 per cent. or 50 per cent. the glut would remain."

That is the opinion of a gentleman who, I believe, is a warm supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, a manufacturer then and a manufacturer now in the city of St. John. But, Sir, what has taken place in St. John and elsewhere in the Dominion may, and is likely to occur again; and when the next wave of depression sweeps over this country, I fancy that many hon. gentlemen who are to-day so ready to invest their money in cotton factories, will have a similar experience to those who came before them. I hope it may not be so, but that they will get ample return for every dollar which they invest, and that we in New Brunswick may keep a portion of the trade within our own borders. I desire now to refer to a statement made by the hon. Finance Minister with reference to the position New Brunswick occupies in Confederation. I had the pleasure of listening to a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman last summer; the audience was very large and very attentive, and the hon. gentleman made one of his best speeches on that occasion. One remark of his, which I have not forgotten was this:

"If you charge New Brunswick with one-thirteenth of the cost of the Intercolonial Railroad, you have not paid a dollar which you have not got back, you have not paid a dollar for Indians, Mounted Police, or the development of the North-West."

Now, I have looked over the accounts for 1831, and I find that in that year New Brunswick paid into the Dominion revenue \$1,703,000. I think it would be impossible to show any way in which New Brunswick has directly or indirectly received anything like that amount out of the Dominion Treasury. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Finance that when he again makes that statement, either in this House or out of it, he should give us the details. It is possible that some items may be improperly charged against New Brunswick. For instance, \$130,000 expended in that Province last year for the Dorchester Penitentiary, which is for the benefit of the whole Maritime Provinces; then there are the lighthouses on our coasts, which are for the benefit of the shipping of the whole Dominion, and the cost of which is debited in the Public Accounts against New Brunswick. The item of quarantine is also the basis of a large charge in the Public Accounts, although, as has been recently shown in a remarkable case, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec are as much interested in an efficient quarantine as New Brunswick. Another item which is included in the subsidy to New Brunswick is \$150,000 which the Province receives in lieu of export duty. The hon. Minister of Finance knows very well that in an arrangement made prior to our going into Confederation, New Brunswick reserved the right to collect export duty on lumber, and it is not fair to charge that against New Brunswick. The hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech the other day, made the following statement:

"And, therefore, making every allowance for the duties that would have been paid by the people of the Lower Provinces upon the articles that are purchased from Ontario and Quebec, it will be found that this Tariff, instead of having an injurious effect upon the smaller Provinces, has had a beneficial effect, and it has a still more beneficial effect on the Province of Prince Edward Island,—it will be found that, if any person or locality or section has to complain, it is not the smaller Provinces that were arrayed here, and on behalf of whom the sympathies of this House were invoked, for the practical effect has been a reduction rather than an increase of their taxation under the operation of this Tariff."

Well, sir, prior to Confederation the hon. Minister of Finance told us that for twenty-five years to come our taxes would not exceed \$2.75 per head; and I believe that prediction is about to become true under the operation of his Tariff by our exports being so diminished that the amount of the Customs duties which we have to pay must be diminished

Mr. KING.

also; but I submit that the amount of import duties the people have to pay, as shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns, does not indicate correctly the amount of taxes imposed on us by this Tariff. In 1873, the imports of New Brunswick amounted to \$10,839,000. That was a prosperous year, but it is not more prosperous than hon. gentlemen claim last year was—that if no change had been made in the Tariff to restrict trade, the natural increase in population would have in this prosperous year increased that amount to over \$12,000,000. What are the facts? According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, in 1881, the imports were reduced to \$6,016,972, on which that Province paid duties amounting to \$1,256,638, or \$10,000 more than she paid on the larger amount of imports in 1873. The difference in these two amounts shows that New Brunswick is purchasing \$6,000,000 of goods in the Dominion; part in Montreal and Quebec in dutiable goods, the balance from the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec. Notwithstanding statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite that goods are supplied to us cheaper than they would be imported, the very fact that it is found necessary to impose a Tariff double what it was in 1873 in order to compel our people to buy these goods proves that we are paying the duties into the pockets of the manufacturers. It then follows that New Brunswick paid, in 1881, \$1,703,979; that we pay duties in Montreal and elsewhere on a part of the \$6,000,000; the remainder passing into the hands of the manufacturers is the amount paid indirectly on the \$6,000,000 worth of goods purchased in the Dominion, and the whole can be put down as equal to the amount paid on \$6,000,000 worth of goods imported, making the total amount of taxation under this Tariff nearly \$3,000,000. This shows the true measure of taxation imposed on New Brunswick. The position of New Brunswick is this: She is unable to find a market in the Dominion for her products; she is obliged to export them largely to the United States. There they are met by a protective tariff which materially reduces their value. The proceeds must be brought back in gold, and in order to supply the wants of her people she is compelled to apply to the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec. There again the purchasing power of her way is reduced by the operation of our own protective Tariff. Her position is between two fires. This it is that is drawing the life-blood out of our Province; that is lowering the value of real estate in almost every part, except a few favored localities benefitted by the introduction of railways built at the whole cost of the people; that has diverted trade from our chief commercial centres, and reduced rents, particularly in St. John, below a point ever dreamed of. Speaking for myself, if this is to continue—if New Brunswick is to be taunted as being a dependent member of this confederacy and a mendicant among her sister Provinces; if, in the future glory that awaits this country she is not to share, if the only purpose she has to serve is to afford a market for subsidized manufacturers—if I believed this, I would then say sever the bonds which bind her to the Union, restore her to the position she once occupied as an independent Province. But I am not without hope; we have faith in the future of the country, and we look forward to the day when the great Liberal party will be restored to power, when this country will be governed in the interest of the many, not of the few, when monopolies will no longer dare to raise their heads, and when even-handed justice will be dealt out to all the Provinces composing this great Dominion.

Mr. DOULL. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night and at this late period of the debate, I do not propose detaining the House for any lengthened time, and I am perfectly well aware that there is no occasion for me to go over the arguments which have been addressed from this side of the House so much abler than I could possibly submit them. I do not think I would have occupied the time of the House at all upon this question, were it not that the hon. member for

Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Flynn) made reference to a speech of mine in 1879, on the coal question, and had that hon. member not made some statements that I consider are not strictly in accordance with facts. In 1879, I contended that a duty of 50 cents per ton would not secure the markets of Ontario for Nova Scotia coal; I, at the same time, stated that I thought it would secure a portion of the Quebec market for that coal. I do not think I was mistaken in either prediction. We obtained a very much larger portion of the Quebec market than we had prior to the imposition of that duty. In 1880, we obtained from the Government an increased duty on our coal, a duty of 60 cents on bituminous coal. That secured for us, I am very glad to say, a very large portion of the Quebec market, and also, notwithstanding all that hon. gentlemen opposite have said, enabled us to place some coal on the Ontario market. I might state here that we could have put a much larger quantity of coal into Ontario, were it not that we found for all the coal we could produce in Nova Scotia a nearer market, so that, as a matter of fact, coal producers sent their coal to the nearest market first. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that because we have not been able under the National Policy to send Nova Scotia coal, or much of it, into Ontario, therefore the National Policy has been a failure. This appears to me altogether nonsense. It has given to our Nova Scotia coal producers a market for all the coal they can produce. Previous to the adoption of the National Policy and the putting on of this duty on coal, our coal owners could not obtain a market for their coal. This proves most conclusively that the duty has been an advantage to them. The object, more particularly, of my addressing the House to-night is to call attention to some remarks of the hon. member for Richmond, who I regret is not in his seat. That hon. gentleman said:

"Now Sir, I am free to admit that the National Policy may have displaced a few tons of English coal in the Province of Quebec; but beyond these few tons it has had no effect whatever."

I will show, before I sit down, the quantity of coal that it has enabled us to send to the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman also said:

"It has a tendency in doing that to raise the rates across the Atlantic."

I cannot comprehend the meaning that the hon. gentleman intended these words to convey. If the meaning I would take from them is correct, what follows cannot be correct, even according to his own ideas:

"It prevents our own shipping interests which are in a depressed condition now, from taking coal as ballast, as they were in the habit of doing, and therefore it inflicts a serious injury on the shipping interests, proving that the National Policy where it benefits one injures a dozen."

The more of the Quebec market that we obtain for our coal the greater the benefit to our shipping industry. You can understand, who live in Montreal, that the freights, as a rule, for some years back, from Montreal to Europe, have been unremunerative. They have been so low that ship-owners could not make anything of a profit out of them; but with the coal freight, which we get from our coal ports up to Montreal, we are enabled to make a profit out of the freights that we obtain from Montreal to Europe. That is one of the results of the increased market in Quebec for our coal, so that instead of the National Policy acting injuriously upon our shipping industry, it acts very beneficially. Another remark of the hon. member for Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Flynn) is this:

"We find the imports of foreign coal, in 1879, amounted to 63,061 tons; in 1880, to 973,610 tons; in 1881, to 1,159,103 tons, or an increase of nearly 300,000 tons, in 1881, over the imports of 1879. Now, so far from shutting our own coal from the Province of Ontario, we have an increased importation into the Dominion of over 300,000 tons."

This is quoted as an argument to show that, because we have not been able to shut out the imported coal from

Ontario, therefore the National Policy has injured our coal industry. The hon. gentleman forgets, that although we have not shut out foreign coal, the National Policy has had the effect of increasing the manufactures and increasing the consumption through the manufactories to such an extent that the consumption of coal has been very largely increased, as I will establish presently. Whilst 300,000 tons of foreign coal have been imported over and above what was imported in 1878, still we have sent from Nova Scotia, between 300,000 and 400,000 tons, more into our markets than we did in 1878. Another statement which the hon. gentleman made was this:

"Let me direct him (the Finance Minister) back to the period of 1873, that he himself referred to as the golden period of Canada."

Well, we are trying to return back and I think the National Policy is helping us to get back to that degree of prosperity which we had in 1873. The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

"What was the product of her mines then? I find by the report of 1873 that the coal productions of her mines for that year was 1,051,469 tons, or a production of 1,600 more than in 1881."

Now, this is a statement which the facts do not bear out. We have never produced in Nova Scotia more coal than we did during 1881. The quantity produced in 1881 was 1,124,270 tons. According to his own showing, the production in 1873 was 1,051,469 tons, leaving a difference in 1881 of 72,801 tons. Now, in order to show that in 1878 the same depression existed in Great Britain and other coal-producing countries as then existed in Nova Scotia, he quoted from the report of the then Inspector of Mines. I think it would have been well for him if he had only quoted one-half of the section. I will read the quotation from the report of the Inspector of Mines for Nova Scotia, for 1878. He says:

"Great Britain and the United States were affected by the wave of financial depression; and as the coal dealers of those countries also sought relief in exportation, Nova Scotia struggled for a period to trade with the West Indies, but was overpowered by her powerful competitors controlling the return freights."

Now, I confess that the National Policy of the Government has given us the very thing, without which we could not contend successfully with our competitors in 1878, which will enable us and has enabled us to contend successfully with them, because we have already increased our exports of coal to the West Indies. Why? because we have now a direct trade with the West Indies, which we had not in 1878; and that has enabled us to send coal thither, which we were not able to do in 1878. Then he goes on to try to prove that the increase of our coal sales has not been owing to the National Policy, but we have every decade increased gradually the out-put and sales of our coal. He says: "I propose to show that since the opening up of our mines, in 1775, the increase has been gradual every decade." This is the language used. The statement is found in the quotation which the hon. gentleman makes at very great length from the report of Mr. Poole, Inspector of Mines. No doubt, he is a very able and competent man to give an opinion on the coal business; but I regret to see that he has expressed an opinion with respect to shipping, as well as this gradual increase, that is not borne out by the facts. In this part of the quotation from Poole's report these words appear:

"Comparing the average returns for a number of years, a permanent though fluctuating progress is undeniable each decade, roughly speaking, doubling the out-put of coal."

Do the facts bear out that statement? That is the question. We have, as well as Mr. Poole's statements and those of the hon. member for Richmond, the returns which show the out-put every year since the opening of the mines, from which you will see whether the increase has been gradual or not. In the first decade, from 1791 to 1800, the out-put was

51,048 tons; for the next decade, from 1800 to 1810, 70,453 tons, an increase of about 40 per cent.; in the next decade, 91,527 tons, increase about 30 per cent.; next decade, 140,820 tons, increase about 50 per cent.; next decade, 839,981, increase about 600 per cent.; next decade, 1,533,798, increase nearly 100 per cent.; next decade, 2,399,829 tons, increase 70 per cent.; next decade, 4,927,339, or something over 100 per cent.; and for the last decade, 7,377,428, or 50 per cent. increase. Now, these figures do not bear out the statement either of the hon. member for Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Flynn) or of Mr. Poole in his report. There is also another statement to which I made reference already, the statement of the hon. member for Richmond; it refers to the tax on coal, and reads as follows:—

"It might, however, fairly be asked if a tax which checks imports from Great Britain would not so raise the rate of freight up the St. Lawrence as to practically defeat the end in view, and increase the homeward freight on grain and lumber."

If it did increase the homeward freight on grain and lumber, it would be to the benefit of the shipping, and not to its injury, as he stated. But it has not had that effect. The effect has been the other way, because with the coal freights which we have had from the coal ports up to Quebec and Montreal, we have had more remunerative freights than had we not had those coal freights. Another statement of the hon. gentleman for Richmond is this:

"The more I consider the question the more strongly I am convinced it is impossible to give the market of Ontario to the coal-producers of Nova Scotia with a less duty than \$2 per ton."

Now, we could have, last winter, if the railways had given us the cars necessary, placed in Ontario a larger quantity of coal—we lacked only increased facilities of transportation. At the prices asked in Ontario, we were in a position to compete successfully with the bituminous coal of the United States. With regard to the subject of transportation, I regretted exceedingly to hear the hon. Minister of Railways state that there would be nothing in the Estimates for the enlargement of the canals. If the canals between the lakes and sea-boards were enlarged to enable vessels sufficiently large to pass through, an inter-provincial trade would be opened up advantageous to all the Provinces, and which would enable Nova Scotia to send her coal into Ontario and compete with the United States coal—I do not care how low its price. One statement more of the member for Richmond I shall notice, and then I shall be done with him:

"Those hon. gentlemen opposite talk about protection to the farmers; but where are the benefits which the farmers of the Maritime Provinces have received from it?"

If the member for Richmond only came into the coal counties, where the coal industries are now carried on with energy, and where our coal miners and men employed about the mines have ample and sufficient work every day of the week and year to enable them to buy the produce of the farmers, he would then see the benefits which they derive from the National Policy. I am glad to say that we are in a fair way of giving them a market through our manufactories, too. We have in Nova Scotia quite a number of manufactories started under the National Policy. Some of them have been mentioned already, but I will give here a few of the new industries that are attributable to our new trade policy. Those that are already in operation are giving increased markets to our farmers and enabling them to get better prices for their produce than they would otherwise. We have two sugar refineries at Halifax, one sugar refinery at Moncton, a cotton mill erecting at Halifax, at Windsor, at St. Stephens, St. John and Moncton; woollen mills at Yarmouth and elsewhere; brass works at Moncton; boot and shoe factories at Halifax and Charlottetown, P. E. I.; glass

Mr. DOULL.

works at New Glasgow; new organ factory at Truro; a new cutter bar machine factory at Amherst; a nut and bolt factory at St. John. These are only the beginning of the many factories which will spring up under the fostering protection of the National Policy. I do not think that the National Policy interferes with the people of the United States coming to purchase in our markets. They come to our markets as they did before, and we have besides an increased home market and an increased inter-provincial trade. Now, what has been the effect of this policy upon the demand for Nova Scotia coal? I have stated that in 1878 our coal producers could not obtain a market; in 1881 we had a market for all we could produce, we had a demand for a great deal more, and I hope the effect will be to induce our coal producers to increase their facilities in order to meet the demand which the National Policy has created for our coal. It is not the fault of the National Policy if we have not been able to supply more coal to the markets of this Dominion; the fault is, to a large extent, with the coal owners in not increasing their facilities to supply the increased demands. The benefit to the coal districts has been very great. In 1873, at most of the mines the men were employed on half time, some of them less and some of them more. They are now employed full time, with an increased number of men at the different mines. This is surely a marked benefit, particularly to the localities where the increased labor is employed. I do not think any better illustration of the beneficial effects of the National Policy can be given than is presented by the result of the National Policy on the coal trade since its adoption—by the large increase of consumption which is created, not merely by its stimulating existing manufactories, but by creating new ones. In 1878, the total consumption in the Dominion of Canada was 1,415,516 tons; in 1881, it was 2,150,528 tons; an increase of 735,112 tons, or 51 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not say that that increase was caused by an increased population. How, then, was it caused? I can see no other cause than the increased consumption of the manufactories. In 1878, Nova Scotia supplied 643,511 tons out of the whole consumption of that year. In 1881, Nova Scotia supplied 1,035,014 tons, an increase of 341,503 tons, or 50 per cent. That is one of the benefits that accrued from this policy. Now, with respect to the supply of Quebec. The total supply to Montreal and Quebec, in 1878, was 328,074 tons; in 1881, 529,091 tons, an increase of 201,017 tons, or 61 per cent. Now, I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this statement. Nova Scotia supplied to Montreal, in 1878, 83,710 tons; in 1881, she supplied 268,628 tons, an increase of 184,918 tons, or 221 per cent. The total increase at Quebec was 61 per cent. The total increase that Nova Scotia supplied over and above what was supplied in 1873 was 221 per cent. So much for the displacing of foreign and English coal in the markets of Quebec. There can be no doubt that if it had not been for the National Policy, this increased consumption would not have taken place, and it would not have given the increased market for the Nova Scotia coal. Now, I want hon. gentlemen opposite to mark this: although the duty was 60 cents on bituminous coal, the coal consumers in Quebec received their coal cheaper in 1881 than they did in 1878, as contracts were made for Nova Scotia coal, and delivered in Quebec and Montreal, in 1881, at from \$3.50 to \$3.75 per ton, as against \$4.25 to \$4.50 in 1878, which is proof positive that, notwithstanding the duty, coal was supplied cheaper in the Province of Quebec in 1881 than in 1878. But the National Policy did more to benefit the Dominion of Canada than merely give a direct benefit to the coal industry. It increased the tonnage that was necessary for the carriage of this coal, and thereby gave us a benefit in our shipping industry which otherwise it would not have had. But it is contended that whatever this duty on coal may have done for the rest of the Dominion, it has not benefitted the Province

of Ontario. Now, I am of the same opinion—and I do not hold the opinion without sufficient grounds—that was expressed by the hon. Minister of Railways the other day, and which is strictly in accordance with the facts, in connection with the price of coal, as furnished by the coal owners in the United States. The hon. gentlemen may sneer at these facts as much as they like, but they cannot controvert them. It is well known to everybody who knows anything about the coal trade, that the coal owners of the United States have not one uniform price for the same kind of coal at different points, either in the United States or in this Dominion. The hon. member for Gloucester, (Mr. Anglin) said that these coal owners must be united, and that they must have an understanding between them; and we know that, as a rule, they are united, that they are a ring, a monopoly—that is, when they are agreed among themselves. Sometime they differ and then the country gets the benefit of the difference, but, as a rule, they are united, and they fix the prices precisely as the hon. Minister of Railways said in his able speech on the subject a few days ago. They fix the prices so as to secure the markets at competitive points, and prices are lower there than at non-competitive points, so that the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways that the prices were higher in Chicago than in Boston, is accurate and susceptible of proof. And if it had not been for the duty on coal in this Dominion, prices in Ontario to-day would be the same as in Chicago and not the same as in Boston. The very fact of finding coal introduced to the consumers of Ontario, at the same price as to dealers in Boston, is proof positive that the National Policy has caused the coal owners of the United States to place the Province of Ontario among their competitive points, and hence the consumer gets coal cheaper than if the duty had not been imposed.

Mr. KILLAM. Does that raise the price to the producer?

Mr. DOULL. It does, because we get the increased market even if we do not get it in Ontario. It is a fallacy to suppose that because the National Policy has reduced the price to the consumer it cannot be a benefit to the coal producers in Nova Scotia. The National Policy has increased the demand in two years 50 per cent., and if we do not get the market of Ontario we get the increased market in the Lower Provinces and outside the Lower Provinces. There is one other point to which I wish to refer in connection with this question. Hon. gentlemen opposite have contended that because the exports have been less and the imports greater, the National Policy has injured and not benefitted our industries. Now, I think that the coal industry will prove most conclusively that that reasoning is unsound, and I have no doubt that if we had the facts in regard to other industries they would equally prove the unsoundness of the same reasoning when applied to them. The exports of coal from Nova Scotia, in 1878, were 185,443 tons. In 1881, it is true the amount was a little larger, viz., 190,551 tons; but you must recollect that through the National Policy we got an increased sale for our coal in the West Indies that we would not have had but for it, and if you take off the increased sales we made to the West Indies—10,000 tons—from the 190,551, we have 180,551, or about 5,000 tons less than the amount in 1878. The imports in 1878 were 863,061; in 1881, they were about 1,203,186, an increase of 340,765. In that case we have less exports and greater imports, and I know, and this House and the country know, that we have had a largely increased sale for our Nova Scotia coal. That industry has been very much benefitted by the National Policy, and I have no doubt that the same may be said of every other industry in the country. If the coal duty was taken off the revenue would be reduced by between \$600,000 and \$700,000, and that would have to be

raised from duties on some other articles; and I do not see why coal should not bear a portion of the taxes as well as any other commodity. You talk about it being a tax on raw material; well, there are a great many raw materials. It is also spoken of as a tax on the fuel which is to warm the poor man; but we have a tax on the light which is to enable the poor man to see after night, and I do not know but one tax is about as right and reasonable as the other. The hon. member for Yarmouth sought to show that shipping was taxed under the present Tariff more than it was under the previous Tariff. The hon. gentleman knows more of the subject than I do, and if he says that the statement I am about to make is not correct, I shall accept his contradiction. From figures I have gone over, but which I have not here, I have the impression that under the present Tariff the shipping industry is less taxed than it was under the late Administration.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear, and the drawback being paid.

Mr. DOULL. Therefore that industry is not suffering under the National Policy. The hon. member for Yarmouth also referred to a speech made by the hon. Minister of Railways last year in the county I have the honor to represent. I do not think it was necessary for the hon. gentleman to come to this House to take care of Messrs. Jones and Carmichael, because I think they were both there to take care of themselves, and I do not think they very flatly denied the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways, which statement was not as reported, or as stated by the hon. member. The statement was, that these gentlemen supported a Government that brought down a Tariff which was going to tax shipping to the extent of one dollar a ton. At this late hour of the night I am not going to make any lengthened remarks; but I felt called upon to make the statements I have made in connection with the coal industry, as I have the honor to represent a county which is a coal centre, and as the statements made by the hon. member for Richmond, if they were uncontradicted, might have an injurious effect in influencing some minds against the National Policy.

Mr. RYMAL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to discuss at any length the question which has so long occupied the attention of this Legislature, and which has been viewed from almost every possible standpoint by different politicians. I have heretofore expressed my opinion of the result of the National Policy, and I have yet seen no reason to change it in the least particular. I shall only refer to its effects, as I have viewed them, upon that class of the community that I have the honor to belong to—the farmers; and unless an angel or some one more highly gifted than any man I have ever met shows to the contrary, I shall not be convinced, against my senses of hearing, and seeing, and knowing, that the National Policy has done any good at all to the farmers of Canada, or that it is possible that it can do them any good. I have said before that when we have more than we want, when we have a surplus of all kinds of products to export, the idea of raising the price by placing a duty on imports coming into Canada is sheer folly. But so much for the Tariff, and so much only. What I have more particularly risen for is this—and, from my age, being one of the oldest members of the Liberal party in the House, and after having heard the Liberal party and their record attacked, as they have been by some members in this House, I think I may review the record of that party and leave the people to judge whether they deserve the praise and applause, or whether they merit the condemnation of the people of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold that the principles of the Liberal party, the world over, are truth and justice, liberty and equality. I do not mean to say that it is impossible for a Conservative—or a Tory, as I generally call him—to tell

the truth, but I am afraid they sometimes fail to do it. John Bright, whom, I presume, knew the animal better than any man living, once said that when a Tory ceased to lie he ceased to be a Tory, and I do not know but I can go that length with John Bright. But I say that the eternal principles of truth and justice have been nailed to the banner of the Liberal party since there ever was a Liberal party. Let us see what they have done. I will commence with their record in the old land. Let us see what the Liberal party have done there for the amelioration of the condition of the people. What have the Reform party done for the people of Britain? They gave them Catholic emancipation. It relieved them from a system of bondage, and was looked upon by a great many people as a step in the right direction, and one towards which all Governments should tend, namely, that of giving the greatest amount of liberty to all people, so long as it was safe for them to be entrusted with it. They gave the Reform Bill, which enfranchised a great number of people that were not men in the full sense and acceptation of the word, because they happened not to be possessed of landed estates or pay a certain amount of taxation. The emancipation of the slaves, the abolition of slavery, was due to the Liberal party. The Liberal party, as a general thing, have opposed most of the bloody and unnecessary wars that have been carried on by England; and so far do they now carry that principle of peace and good-will and love for all mankind that they are sometimes stigmatized as the peace-at-any-price party. Now, these are some of the things that they have done in Britain; and what are they doing there to-day? They are endeavoring to bring unhappy Ireland, mis-governed Ireland into line, and to give it something like responsible Government, something like Home Rule, recognizing their manhood; and the Reform party to-day in Britain are endeavoring to bring about the pacification of Ireland and remove the wrongs and remedy the grievances under which that people have labored for many, many years. In contradistinction to that, what has been the record of the Tory party in Britain? They have opposed everything that tended to elevate the masses, everything that went to enfranchise the poor man, they endeavored to crush the manhood out of them. It was only through the efforts of the Reform party that the enfranchisement of a great number of the electors now in Britain was brought about. They have instigated, as the Reform party has opposed, most of the unnecessary, unjust and bloody wars that have cost England such an immense amount of money and drenched almost every country in the world with blood of British soldiers. The Tories of Britain, through maladministration of public affairs, drove the thirteen old colonies of America into rebellion, but had they pursued the policy of the Liberal party of that day Old England and New England of America might have been marching side by side to their ultimate destiny instead of being estranged. Now, I come nearer home, and I shall endeavor to show what the record of the Liberal party has been in Canada. Mr. Speaker, you are doubtless old enough to recollect the day when a Tory oligarchy existed in Lower Canada; when your countrymen were exposed to danger, unless they submitted themselves to the powers that were, and when the few ruled the many with an iron hand? To whom were the successors of your countrymen to ascribe the rights which they to-day enjoy—responsible Government—with which we are blessed, but to the efforts of the Liberal party. Those liberties were not secured without some sacrifices. Some men toiled and labored year after year, others laid down their lives; and the privileges that we enjoy at the present time were bought with some of the best blood of the French Canadian people. When I heard a French Canadian, the

Mr. RYMAL.

hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) enquire what the Liberal party had done, I thought that the descendant of an old Liberal who lived and died a member of the Liberal party might have known its record, and I was astonished to hear the descendant of a Lower Canadian Liberal ask that question. I am told that that hon. member himself was a Liberal until the last few years, that for some reason or other, which I cannot explain, has seen fit to cast the teachings of his parents to the dogs and make his mess with the dogs too. How strange it is that it should be left to a political renegade to denounce the teachings, to sneer at the sufferings and scoff at the whole Liberal party in having secured these privileges for his fellow countrymen. Suppose they had been left to the tender mercies of the Tory party at the time of the Lower Canadian rebellion, when they were being hunted from one post to another, and being destroyed by the troops at the command of the oligarchy, when the villages of Lower Canada were treated as rookeries by shooting the old and young birds. Had the advice of the Tory party been listened to at that time, the French Canadian people would have been exterminated, and it is to the efforts of the Liberal party at Home and in Lower and Upper Canada, that we enjoy to-day the blessings of responsible Government, and are free from the hateful rule of irresponsible family compacts and oligarchies such as Upper and Lower Canada labored under for a great many years. The hon. member for Niagara —

Mr. PLUMB. Oh, do not bring me in.

Mr. RYMAL. The hon. member for Niagara, no doubt, wishes to be considered a gentleman, and I would like to treat him as such, but his antics and cackling remind me more of a big chimpanzee that one finds in the wilds of Borneo than they do of the manners of a Chesterfield, and I am forced to believe that we have discovered in the hon. member the missing link of the Darwinian theory. I wish the hon. gentleman would consider the position he now occupies, and observe a little British fair play. When I think of the suffering that the people endured in Lower Canada, I cannot help but admire the heroism of the few brave men who stood out on behalf of the people, who dared to death to do what they believed was right; and when I hear of the name of Papineau —

Mr. PLUMB. Yes, he ran away.

Mr. RYMAL. If that hon. gentleman wishes to cackle and interfere, I cannot prevent him; but the name of Papineau and his compatriots who fought, bled and suffered will be fresh and green in the memory of Canadians when the memory of that hon. gentleman will be long forgotten. What is the record of the Reform party in Upper Canada? What state of things existed there prior to 1836? I became a politician very young. I happened to have access to the records of the House of Assembly at that time. I was then only thirteen years old, and my father related to me the incidents that occurred at a very trying time in the history of Upper Canada. Before that time the family compact ruled in Upper Canada, and had the ear of the Colonial Office. In 1834 the Liberals carried the Province by a strong majority. When they passed measures demanded by the people these measures were sent up to the irresponsible Legislative Council, and the respect that was paid to the laws passed by the people's representatives was shown by unceremoniously throwing them into the waste paper basket. This state of things continued until submission ceased to be a virtue. The only redress the people had was to stop the Supply Bill. That means was resorted to, and from that time the conduct of the Tory party was so hateful and repulsive that the people were goaded into resistance to their rule. Of course, the irresponsible junta that had governed the Province up to this time called that rebellion, and men were called

rebels and declared outlaws, cast into prison, tried for high treason, and some of them sealed their love of liberty with their blood. Just so soon as the people began to draw one another's blood, the Downing Street authorities began to consider that something was wrong, and instead of sending out an old half-paid military officer or poor-law commissioner, they sent out a statesman in the person of Lord Durham, who was instructed to enquire into the causes of the Canadian rebellion. He did so, and reported to the Home Government, and Her Majesty issued a proclamation pardoning all implicated in the troubles, and Lord Durham, in his admirable report, said that the people were justified in resisting the Government and standing up for their rights as Britons. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln enquired the other day what the Reform party had done. Well, I thought that he, at least, might have exercised a little charity towards that great party, for well do I recollect the time when he stood waiting for them to open their arms and take him into their ranks. Well do I recollect the time when hissed at, sneered at, and jeered at by the Tory party, he was willing to take service under a Liberal, and I thought he might have spared himself the trouble of asking what the Reform party had done. He went to his election and the Reform party refused to receive him. The Tory party had kicked him out, and the Reform party kept him out. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why he felt so strongly against them. For a time the hon. gentleman was posing between the two parties. He might have adopted the language that Hosea Bidgelow attributes to some other gentleman who was posing between two parties. He might have said with the poet:—

“ You see my head is too nicely balanced,
To say which party has most sense;
There may be men with greater talents,
But they can't sit slender on the fence.”

Well, he sat on the fence for a time, but he got off after a while, and the regular instincts of the Tory animal were disclosed, for although he washed himself of the filth and dirt which he at one time said the Tory party was mostly composed of, although he denounced them heartily, bitterly, and had the wishes he expressed in regard to them been fully carried out, some of them would have been in a pretty hot place just about that time. We found him in a few short months going back to his old love like the dog that returned to his vomit and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire. I thought that the hon. gentleman who had been ready to step in and take shelter under the Liberals might have spared himself asking that question, which he was so well qualified to answer himself. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, with his ability and eloquence could do much better than I in portraying all the good that the Liberal party has done to Canada. Some hon. member has said that the Liberal party had never inaugurated any great public work in Canada, or pushed it to completion. Now, it may be news to some, though I am sure there are some here who know it, that the Welland Canal which passes through my hon. friend's constituency, was promoted by William Hamilton Merritt more than by any other leading public man, and although he was never a strong party politician, I have sat in the House with him and always found him seated among the Liberals and assisting them in politics. Then look at the initiation of the Grand Trunk Railway. Under whose Government was it that the era of railways began in Canada? Under the Baldwin-Lafontaine and the Hincks-Morin Administrations. Oh, but some one will say, “ Messrs. Baldwin and Lafontaine and Messrs. Hincks and Morin were Tories.” How strange that they claimed them from the Liberals, the men whom in season, out of season, fairly and foully, they opposed, while living, and the garments of these noble men, most of them now dead, they would like to steal! The Tories would then appear like wolves in sheep's clothing, and would bray

like asses in the lion's skin. I say the Grand Trunk was initiated by the Reform party, who took steps to carry out the undertaking which was carried out. This party never opposed the building of the Grand Trunk Railway. They never had a word to say against it as a commercial enterprise. But when it was run in the interest of the Tory party, and was made a political machine and came to the Legislature year after year to assist the Tory party in maintaining itself, then the Liberal party denounced it as a Tory political engine, and refused to support it with the public money. Who initiated the Intercolonial Railway? That was a scheme that British statesmen had looked over, causing a survey of the route to be made by Major Robinson. But who was the first Canadian and leader of a party who spent money to further that scheme? Another Liberal, Hon. John Sandfield Macdonald, in the time of the Macdonald-Sicotte Government—those were the men who initiated that scheme, and who arranged with the Lower Provinces for the construction of that road on a principle not afterwards carried out. They were the first who voted public money for a Canadian survey of the route. I suppose the Tories will continue to claim that J. S. Macdonald was a leader of the Tory party too? Of course they will. But when he got out of his coalition Government in Toronto, and the Tory party asked him to assume the leadership, he simply, in his characteristic way and forcible manner, told some of them he would see them dammed first. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are the fathers of Confederation. Well, I do not dispute the fact, that they took an active part in initiating some of the constitutional changes which ended in Confederation. But you, Mr. Speaker, are old enough to recollect that it was only when they were defeated, when the choice lay between resignation and the seals of office, that they assented to constitutional changes—that the First Minister of the day consented to enter into a coalition Government to bring about constitutional changes which years before he absolutely and positively refused to assist in bringing about. And so it is always with the Tory party; place before them the alternative of sacrificing their principles, or leaving the flesh-pots of Egypt, and I will bet you five to one they will stick to the flesh-pots. I think that another great undertaking, which the Liberal party advocated early, was the securing of the great North-West, that country to which we now look with so much hope. I recollect, twenty-five years ago, when I first issued an address to the people as a candidate for their suffrages, introducing a paragraph in that address, stating that if they would elect me I would do all I could to secure the breaking up of the Hudson Bay monopoly, and the obtaining for the people, the rights they had to the great North-West, to secure it and attach it to this Canada of ours. Well, I know that when this thing was brought about, the coalition Government was in existence, and that not one party only can claim the credit to the exclusion of the other. In so far as I might claim any lot or part in the glory attached to bringing about this grand Confederation, I wash my hands of it. I do not believe in it either. I do not believe it is going to answer the expectations the people have of it to-day; for already the Federal Government are, I believe, encroaching on the rights of the Provinces, and already the Provinces are being arrayed against one another; and unless there is less maladministration of the affairs of the country than during the past three years. I venture to predict, although I do not profess to be much of a prophet, that this grand Confederation will fall to pieces like a rope of sand.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You will not live to see it.

Mr. RYMAL. I do not wish to live to see it. I would rather see us a great, happy, united people, cordially working together for the development of our country. I want to see Confederation a success, although I did not believe in it when

it was passed, and I do not believe unless, as I said before, wiser counsels prevail than have heretofore prevailed, that it will be a success.

An hon. MEMBER. It is all right.

Mr. RYMAL. I presume it is all right. I have never attempted to say anything except what I really and truly believed was all right, and in what I have said to-night there is not a solitary word that I do not believe. Now, we have lost the men who secured us so many of these blessings to which I have referred. The men who secured to us responsible Government have all passed away—there is scarcely one of them left. But, Sir, among the names recorded in the annals of Canada, to my mind there are none that appear so glorious as those men who, in the days of trial, dared to vindicate the principles they believed to be right, and who suffered, bled, and some of whom died, in order to secure the form of Government we now possess. And it will not be long before most of us who are assembled here to-night will follow in their footsteps, and the place that knows us now will soon know us no more. And what will be the fate of Canada then? It may be doubted if Canada could exist for any length of time without the services of her greatest statesman, the leader of the present Government. He is a man of extraordinary ability, I admit. As a manager of men I have never seen his equal. I have often wondered how it was that he was able to so completely mould the character and shape the actions of the men who supported him—whether it is magnetism or necromancy, whether it is the inherent strength that he possesses, or whether it is the weakness of the gentlemen he leads, and I am bound to say that as yet that question is unsolved in my own mind. Amongst his supporters are a great many able men; and I will not go so far as to say that there are not even a great many good men; but good or bad, able or unable, weak or strong, he wraps them round his finger as you would a thread. They are moulded to his will as completely as possible. I have heard some of them, in days when a crisis was likely to occur, denounce the measures of the Government to say, "Well, I can't go that." Still I have known hon. gentlemen long enough to believe that they would go it, and after there was a caucus they did go it every time. Now, I say, what would become of Canada were we to lose this great statesman? Take the position of Canada in 1854, when Canada was in a prosperous condition, when her constitution, as it then existed, had been working well, and yet in ten short years of mis-rule and pitting one Province against another he brought things to such a deadlock that he agreed to consider constitutional changes, a thing that only a few days before his defeat he refused to consider. Was that evidence of great statesmanship, that the constitution of a great country was in ten years rendered unworkable by the maladministration of which this great statesman was guilty?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). He is our leader; we did not desert him as you deserted yours.

Mr. RYMAL. There is a certain breed of politicians who, if they are suffered the run of the Government kitchen, never get away from it. Then, in the building of the Intercolonial Railway, this great statesman allowed \$40,000,000, or thereabouts, to be spent on a work that he said would not cost \$20,000,000. At all events, it cost twice as much as the most extravagant estimate; and under the able administration of Canada's greatest statesman, one of his colleagues, and one of his then colleagues, concluded that \$8,000,000 had been thrown away. What is the next evidence of his great statesmanship? Well, I suppose the unconditional surrender of a good many of our rights and privileges at the time he consented to the Washington treaty

Mr. RYMAL.

was another evidence of his superior statesmanship. After that I suppose that the Pacific scandal arrangement was another evidence of statesmanship, and lastly the contract he entered into with the Syndicate by which \$30,000,000 worth of road ready made was handed over to the Company, and \$75,000,000 worth of land, according to their own calculations, and \$25,000,000 in cash, amounting to \$130,000,000, in order that they might complete a work, which, according to their own estimates, was only to cost \$18,000,000. And that is statesmanship; that is statesmanship by which some \$80,000,000 of the people's money were handed over to a grasping syndicate for which we never receive anything. For, mind you, although we give them this \$130,000,000 for building the road, it is not ours when it is built; we give them the road besides. Moreover, they pay no interest on their property for twenty years, and we give them the monopoly of the trade of that country, the extent and value of which there is no man living at the present time can estimate. For I hold that, under the contract, the Syndicate can, if they will, and I believe they will, because they can, hold the people in their hands completely, and render the whole labor and toil of the millions who may settle in there during the next twenty years, tributary to their own interests. To-day they hold the best portion of that vast country, that heritage of the Canadian people which, according to my mind, should have been reserved for the deserving man who went in there, and allowed to have a fair share to make a home for himself and family. It will be held by grasping speculators, and ten chances to one the ills that now beset old Ireland from absent landlordism, jingoism and Toryism, will be felt in our great North-West for many years. Now, Mr. Speaker, what would happen the country if we should lose our greatest statesmen. I admit, Sir, it would be a great loss. But Canada does not depend upon the existence of one man or any dozen men. When every man of us shall have gone to his long home, I hope, I believe, that the people of Canada will be represented as well and better governed than they are at the present day. Then we have some other magnates whose loss would be great to the country if they were removed. My hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, is perhaps the most prominent representative of the Baron Munchausen family I ever heard, and his removal would be a great loss, for he is a great man, I quite admit, and I wish from my very heart that I could say that he is as honest as he is great. But even if he went the St Lawrence would continue to flow towards the sea as it does now, and Canada would find among her millions of people some one that would worthily fill his place. But, Sir, there is one thing that we could hardly afford to lose, and that is the gushing loyalty of my hon. friend from Niagara. When he fails then the time spoken of by the Prophet Jeremiah will have come, when the abomination of desolation will have come upon us. When that time will come in the life of Canada, then the golden bowl is broken and the fountain at the cistern will cease to flow, and men will go mourning about the streets—I say that when that time comes chaos and confusion will take possession of our country; but I hope that those of us who pray will pray that my hon. friend from Niagara will long be spared to sing us the loyal songs and give us the loyal speeches with which he has so long regaled us. But I hope that, clothed as he is now with all the majesty of a British subject, he will cease to annoy those who do not agree with him in all his political ideas, and will conduct himself so that I can, on every occasion, as I trust I am able to do, give him the right hand of fellowship, and declare to the world that he is not a very bad fellow after all.

Mr. GAULT. Before this debate closes I wish to say a few words in regard to the state of business in Montreal. In 1878 the majority of our industries were closed, and a

large number of failures had taken place among our mercantile and industrial classes. There were over 35 failures among dry-goods men alone, and the hardware trade and the boot and shoe trades were so depressed that I heard one large importing merchant say that if business continued in that state two years longer, there would not be a wholesale importing house left in Montreal. I have some statistics which I have collected with regard to the business and industrial classes of Montreal, which are presented in the following table:—

Name and Description of Factory.	No. of hands employed.		Weekly wages paid.		Wages increased
	Sept., 1878.	Sept., 1881.	1878.	1881.	
(a.) C. W. Williams Sewing Machine Factory	62	130	\$ 628 70	\$ 1,547 61	p. c.
Lawlor Manufacturing Co's. Sewing Machines.		54		675 00	
(b.) John Smith, Threshing Machine Manufacturer, St. Gabriel Locks, Montreal.	12	15	65 00	82 00	
Agricultural Implement Empire Works, C. B. Mahon & Co.	12 to 15	50 to 55	90 00	400 00	
(c.) G. R. Prowse, Manufacturer, Tin and Iron Ware and Wrought Iron Ranges, a specialty.	18	40	100 00	225 00	125
(d.) R. W. Warmington, Tin Ware Manufacturer.	50	80	160 00	290 00	
John McDougall, Caledonia Works, St. Gabriel Locks, Montreal Foundry Machine Shop, engine and boilers.	141	232	4,674 00	8,886 00	
Joseph Dunn, Nail Factory, Cote St. Paul.	29	34	140 25	209 80	
(e.) H. R. Ives, Hardware Manufacturer and Founder, Montreal.	150	225	750 00	1,100 00	50
Charles Garth & Co., Brass Finishers, Hot Water and Steam-fitters.	78	125	438 00	806 00	20
(f.) John Date, Brass Foundry, Coppersmith, Plumber, &c., Montreal.	26	40	181 50	253 00	22
Robert Mitchell & Co., Manufacturers of Brass Goods.	114	168			
(g.) Clendenning Foundry, Montreal.	150	250	900 00	2,000 00	33½

(a.) This is a new concern formerly carried on by Mr. Lawlor, who employed in 1878 none, now employs 100 to 110 men, which will double by next year.

(b.) I find business better this year than for twenty years past, and could have disposed of five times the number of machines if I could get them out.

(c.) During 1878 men were working on three-quarter time, and could obtain all the skilled workmen required since the adoption of the National Policy. I have had to double the facilities for manufacturing and employ more than double the men, as well as work over-time. Skilled workmen are now thoroughly employed, and very scarce. My workmen, with myself, are strong advocates of the National Policy, to which source we attribute the improvement.

(d.) Prices of goods are as low as in 1878.

(e.) The above does not include men who are indirectly employed by us, which would swell the amount somewhat.

(f.) We find the effect of the National Policy in the increase of our trade, and think it is a good institution for the country in general.

(g.) Mr. Clendenning says:—"The actual increase in wages is more than figures show, because men on piece work do not turn out as much per man when wages is high as when it is low. The increased demand is in every department of my business, and is from all over the country. Since September I have made my first shipment to Manitoba. I could have done a larger trade if I could have supplied orders, but could not procure the skilled labor. I have now more immigrants working in foundry than we ever had before, and I have as much work as my present facilities enable me to do. We are in daily receipt of orders from every section of the country for machine and agricultural castings. We have never been able this fall to meet the demand for the better class of castings. I have more men working to-day than I had in September. Our collections are better, our cash sales larger, and our bad debts smaller than any time since I have been in business, or say the past twenty-five years."

Name and Description of Factory.	No. of hands employed.		Weekly wages paid.		Wages increased
	Sept., 1878.	Sept., 1881.	1878.	1881.	
Canada Engine Works, Montreal.	35	203	\$ 547 00	\$ 1,470 00	p. c.
Rogers & King, Founders, Montreal.	47	91	363 51	770 43	111·94
Miller Brothers, Millwrights, Montreal.	20	45	210 00	500 00	7½
W. C. White, Boiler Manufacturer.	25	48	145 00	306 00	10
Vulcan Iron Works, Blacksmiths, &c., Montreal.	30	33	134 86	173 71	17
E. Chanteloup, Brass and Iron Foundry, &c., Montreal.	170	240	1,400 00	2,100 00	20
J. Cadorette, Plumber, &c., Montreal.	4	9	39 00	56 00	
Prevost & Co., Lamp and Chandelier Manufacturers, Montreal.	6	35 men, 8 girls.	48 00	300 00	
J. B. Mantha & Co., Door and Sash Factory, Montreal.		55 to 60		350 00 to 375 00	
McGauven, Tucker & McDonnell, Sash, Blind, Door and Moulding and Box Manufacturers, Montreal.	50	80	500 00	700 00	
Shearer & Brown, Saw Mill and Box Factory.	25	35	144 00	254 00	10
Mona Saw Mills, St. Cunegonde.	57	65	6 90	7 48	10
James Shearer, Sash and Door Manufacturer.	34	44	227 20	315 33	
Paquette & Robert, Doors, Sash and Blinds Manufacturers.	60	65	350 00	450 90	20
Ostell's Sash and Door Factory, Montreal.	28	33	295 00	325 00	10
Orguette, W. F. Abbott & Co Bread and Biscuit Manufacturer, C. Pitts & Co.	None	30		210 00	
Biscuit Baker and Confectionery, W. J. Lattrell, Cune-gonde.	16	22	85 00	125 00	
Thos. Patton & Co., Clothier.	100	150	350 00	480 00	
D. McIntyre & Son do	30	84	500 00	960 00	
J. O'Brien & Co., Clothing Manufacturers.	1,000	1,750			
Green & Son, Furriers &c.	125	200	250 00	1,190 00	10 to 12½
L. Gnaedinger, Son & Co., Furriers.	60	90	160 00	300 00	25
John Taylor & Co, Furriers and Hatters.	None	40		245 20	
McDonal & Co., Hatters and Furriers.	None.	31		165 50	
Washburn Manufacturing Co.	4	6	86 00	94 00	
Outram & Son, File Manufacturers.	28	50	140 00	208 00	
Montreal Malleable Iron Works	17	27	74 00	135 00	
Bell Factory, Clark, Côte St. Paul.	10	13	78 55	91 72	
J. Laurie & Co., Machine and Engine Works.	8	30	37 40	181 36	
Andrew Young, Engineer and Machinist.	None.	7		60 00	
Canada Metal Works, J. Mat-tinson.	13	15	160 00	190 00	
J. J. Lunn, Machinist, &c.	2	5	10 00	30 00	
Charles Aspinall, Blacksmith and Machinist.	None.	3		28 50	
Robert Moore, Ships' Smith and Boiler Maker.	4	6	48 00	65 00	
R. McKenzie, Brass Founder, &c	1	10	14 00	120 00	
W. Nish, Machinist, &c.	3	3	30 00	30 00	
Cutbert & Son, Brass Founders, &c.	22	15	110 00	120 00	40
Mullarky & Co., Boots and Shoes.		*400		1,500 00	
Galarneau & Blanchette, Boots and Shoes.	40	47	192 00	227 00	
Hodgson & Co., Boots and Shoes	None.	100		450 00	
Z. Lapière do	130	280	520 00	1,350 00	
Renberten & Turner do	None.	100		500 00	
R. McCready do	150	300	500 00	1,100 00	10
J. A. Rolland do	None.	90		400 00	
W. J. Webster do	None.	40		200 00	

* Men, women and children.

Name and Description of Factory.	No. of hands employed.		Weekly wages paid.		Wages increased	Name and Description of Factory.	No. of hands employed.		Weekly wages paid.		Wages increased.	
	Sept., 1878.	Sept., 1881.	1878.	1881.			Sept., 1878.	Sept., 1881.	1878.	1881.		
			\$ cts.	\$ cts.			p. c.			\$ cts.		\$ cts.
Laurin & Co., Boots and Shoes	None.	85		450 00		Canada Marine Works	54	44	232 06	234 55		
Ames, Holden & Co. do	225	275	1,300 00	1,600 00	23	Connelly, Manufacturer of Furniture and Upholstery	5	6	30 00	42 00		
J. McCreedy & Co. do	216	250	1,050 00	1,350 00	25	Brosseau's Coffee and Spice Mills		5		40 00		
— Lavoie do	12	12	70 00	70 00		Beauchinnan & Co., Threshing Machines	19	31	120 00	195 00		
J. W. Thurston do	None.	22		123 00	26	Wilks, Baylis & Co., Manufacturing Co.	6	6	60 00	67 00		
Fogarty & Co. do	200	275	3,550 00	6,100 00	12½	J. Cadorette, Tinsmith	5	8	48 00	68 00		
J. Witham & Co. do	95	185	450 00	882 00		Hudon & Paunchane, Furniture	None.	7		45 00		
Lenoir Frères do	39	51	225 00	325 00		Buckingham Carriage Factory	8	9	65 00	75 00		
T. & F. Bell do	100	140	550 00	800 00	4	Brunet & Co., Envelope and Bag Factory	8	29	42 00	160 00		
Geo. S. Slater do	80	95	400 00	500 00		Davis, Cigar Manufacturer	130	240				
Perry & Cassils do	82	89	347 00	608 00	75	S. Forest, do		18		60 00		
H. Gooderich, Last Factory	3	7	17 00	53 00	20	G. Fischel, do	20	80	70 00	350 00	16	
Pettener Boot and Shoe Machinery	14	23	96 00	166 00	20	Rattray & Co., do	114	150	525 00	675 00		
Kirfferth & Bros., Boots and Shoes	7	17	48 00	80 00		L. O. Grothe, do	8	30	27 00	75 00		
J. A. Craig, Cabinet Factory	75	118	550 00	900 00	20	A. D. Porcheron, Cigar Manuf.	15	45	40 00	175 00		
Payette Furniture Factory	3	6	15 00	35 00	10	Mona, Lessor & Co., do	80 to 100	65 to 80	350 00	300 00		
J. H. Bennet, Cabinet Maker	5	10	38 00	90 00	25	Paget & Ferguson, do	50	40	195 00	150 00		
Guenette & Nelson do	None.	7		49 00		Millen, Painting and Glazing	15	25	108 00	216 00	25	
Parriseau & Co. do	None.	6		40 00		J. Cowan, Sal Ammonia	2	5	9 00	27 00		
Labell, Bonin & Co. do	15	15	90 00	90 00		Burns & Gormley, Gas and Steam Fitters, &c.	20	45	120 00	300 00		
H. J. Shaw & Co. do	15	33	128 00	252 00		T. Crevier, Founder, &c.	25	40	180 00	300 00	4	
A. B. Steward, Carver and Gilder	3	7	15 00	40 00	30	Warren & Co., Scale Manufacturers	2	5	14 50	32 00		
Wm. King, Cabinet Maker	4	14	22 00	85 00	10	James Cox, Blacksmith, &c.	5	5	24 00	40 00	20	
Skelton Bros. & Co., Shirt and Collar Factory	155	300	550 00	1,250 00		Dominion barb Wire Fence Co.	None.	15		395 00		
Riepert & Co., Shirts, Collars, Cuffs, &c.	None.	60		350 00		L. Bredamaz, Carriage Works	None.	14		125 00		
J. Langlands, Coffee and Spice Steam Mills	4	6	28 00	42 00		Findley Stove Foundry	9	18	70 00	150 00		
Globe Coffee and Spice Mills	5	5	40 95	47 58	16	Jamieson & Co., Varnish Factory	6	7	72 00	74 00		
Wood Bros., Manufacturers of Case Goods, Satins, Velvets, &c.	4	30	25 00	160 00		Lyman, Sons & Co.'s Linseed Oil Mills, &c.	25-30	25-30	140 00	150 00		
Christy & Sonne, Sailmakers, &c.	6	7	40 00	35 00		Ramsay & Son, Linseed Oil Mills, &c.	14	42	76 33	237 87		
J. O. Villeneuve, Soap and Candle Manufacturer	8	8	40 00	72 00	72	Johnson's Linseed Oil Mills, &c.	None.	75		750 00		
C. A. Macdonnell, Union Marble Works	11	15	35 00	77 00	40	Montreal Saw Works	17	75	96 00	135 00		
R. Forsyth, Marble and Granite Works	64	73	292 00	550 00	50	Canada do						
Cunningham Bros., Marble and Granite Works	11	13	41 36	80 73		do Lead Works		33	62	190 77	406 26	33½
Stacy & Sons, Nail Works	74	52	375 00	450 00	40	do Linseed Oil Works						
Thomson & Son, Blacksmiths' Engineers	8	4	56 00	27 50		Excelsior Glass Co. (limited)	None.	410		3,100 00		
Campbell's Cooper Shop	8	17	56 00	130 00	12½	C. B. Lanctot, Statuary and Ecclesiastical Vestments	None.	8		60 00		
A. & W. Ogilvie, Flour and Feed Mills	45	50	356 00	405 00		R. Beullac, do	10	17	60 00	125 00	12½	
Canal Flour Mills	19	19	140 00	140 00		T. Carle, Statuary	4	7	42 00	51 00		
Montreal Brewing Co.	14	17	92 00	133 00	12	Senecal, Treehan & Co., Church Ornaments, &c.	None.	17		200 00		
Molson's Brewery	66	66	500 00	500 00		Chipman, Renaud & Co., Leather Belting	None.	5		32 00		
Williams' do	20	25	160 00	200 00	7	J. W. McLaren, Leather Belting, &c.	19	35	135 00	268 00	10	
Jean Baptiste Paré, Carosier	2	6	15 00	50 00		E. V. Mosley & Co., Tanning	None.	85		500 00		
Jules Lajennesse, Carriage Factory	15			90 00		J. H. Murney, do		60		480 00		
F. Ritchot, Carriage Maker	15	20	88 00	120 00		Victoria Straw Works	45	100	225 00	600 00		
Lariviere, do	22	37	163 00	291 00		Gas Works	158	162	969 18	1,198 18	24	
Ledoux, do	3	8	18 00	50 00		J. Mitchell, Organ Factory	4	13	24 00	85 00	18	
F. X. Roy, do	12	12	80 00	80 00		Martin's Black Lead and Lamp Burner Factory	55	60	183 00	185 00		
Ledoux, do	8 to 9	31 to 33	63 00	270 00		Spinelli Vermicelli Factory	2	6	12 00	36 00		
A. Ouimet, do	5	5	20 00	22 00		Montreal Blanket Jo	None.	34		211 00		
Burland Lithographic Co., &c.	100	150	750 00	950 00	25	Hosiery Manufacturers, Turnbull & Co.	None.	25		60 00		
Geo. Gebhardt do	None.	6		60 00		Lovell's Printing Establishment, &c.	99	106	40 00	60 00		
G. E. Desbarats do	14	30	89 69	193 83		J. Ennis, Book Bindery, &c.	10	15				
J. D. Whelan & Co., Lithographic Co., &c.	9	7	40 00	45 00		Post Printing and Publishing Co.	40	59	300 00	400 00	33½	
Hearn & Harrison, Optical and Surveying Instruments, &c.	3	3	50 00	50 00		Ray Press Factory	3	6	18 00	60 00	68	
Canada Last Factory	8	12	45 00	70 00	25	Silverston & Co., Manufacturers of Ladies' Dresses, &c.	None.	30		130 00		
Corrugated Elbow Co.	2	6	14 00	32 00		Decarie, Wire Worker	4	6	30 00	60 00	33½	
J. A. Martin & Co., National Pump Works	3	6	20 00	51 00		Fluid Beef Factory	60	90	500 00	750 00		
Power & Dawson, Die Sinkers and Engravers	2	18	20 00	94 00		Winclap Skate Factory	28	28	86 00	107 00		
J. W. Tester & Co., Confectionery	20	50	100 00	250 00		Montreal Coffee and Spice Mills	8	10		200 57	10	
Catelle, Macaroni & Vermicelli Works	5	14	18 00	42 00		Edwards, Safe Factory	15	23	157 75			
Clark's Canned Meats, &c.	5	28	30 00	120 00		Ewan & Son, Ready-made Clothing	220	350	1,645 00	3,283 00		

Mr. GAULT.

Name and Description of Factory.	No. of hands employed.		Weekly wages paid.		Wages increased p. c.
	Sept., 1878.	Sept., 1881.	1878.	1881.	
			\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
Godin's Hat Factory.....	10	40	60 00	400 00	75
Gross, Surgical Instrument	14	17	90 00	110 00
Gill, Carpenter and Box Maker	23	30	113 00	172 00
Hughes & Stephenson, Plum- bers and Gas Fitters, &c.....	None.	60	400 00
Canadian Wall Paper Factory.....	None.	40	480 00
Davis, Cigar Manufacturer.....	60	75	480 00	750 00
Heyneman do	None.	120	500 00
Rogers, Shoe Manufacturer	10	37	75 00	250 00
Shorey, Ready-made Clothing.....	839 00	1,269 00	50
Viau et Frères, Confectionery and Biscuits.....	60	75	325 00	375 00
J. Cleland's Die Factory.....	4	8	30 00	60 75
Tees & Co.'s Desk Factory.....	10	18	70 00	150 00
Electro-Silver Plating Co.....	None..	40	275 00
Dominion Electro Foundry.....	7	5	65 00	45 00
Lyburner Gold, Silver and Nickel Platers.....	2	6	15 00	60 00
Archer, Manufacturer of Wool Cards, &c.....	2	5	18 00	35 00	33½
Stafford, Pottery.....	65 to 70	350 00
Jellyman, Paper Box Factory..	75	100	300 00	395 00
Machine Button-hole Factory..	None..	30	150 00
Canada Sugar Refinery	5	404	56 05	3,000 00
Montreal Woolen Mills.....	None..	130	650 00
Belding, Paul & Co., Silk Threads and Ribbons	57	125	210 00	660 00	30
J. Irwin, Harness and Sad- dlery.....	8	11	60 00	90 00	10
Montreal Athletic Suspender Works	None..	12	100 00
Smardon & Co., Soap Factory..	11	10	72 00	84 00

There are now three silk factories in Montreal, and all are likely to do very well. One of the firms is now entering into the manufacture of ribbons, while another firm is turning out the finest class of goods, which are being sold in Montreal as foreign manufactures. They are now building a new establishment on the corner of Ontario Street and Papineau Square, that will give employment to 200 hands. Every paper you take up, of Montreal, contains an announcement respecting some new interest. Messrs. Ives have gone to Longueuil, which has given a bonus of \$10,000, to establish a foundry business there. I have travelled through many parts of western Canada, and the same activity prevailed there as in Montreal. At Brantford, Harrison & Co. were as busy as possible. They now want a larger plot of land to enable them to carry on their business. Messrs. Noxon, of Ingersoll, have orders for over twelve months on hand, being goods required for Manitoba and the North-West. The Waterous Co. took a portion of the Exhibition Buildings in Montreal, and as they were not able to forward any machines on account of being too busy, they offered anyone who specially wished to see their establishment to pay his fare up to Brantford. While the establishments in Montreal have increased and given employment to a large number of additional hands, they have also enabled the farmers to sell their produce at a very much higher price than formerly. The Chairman of the Market Committee informed me that one day over 1,000 carts and waggons came to Montreal with produce which they sold at such prices that if I could have obtained them when I was a farmer, I would have been a farmer still. When I was a farmer, I received 12½ cents a bushel for oats, 80 or 90 cents per bushel for wheat, 12½ cents per pound for fresh butter, and other things accordingly. I found I was not able to make it remunerative, and I therefore abandoned it. In Toronto the Dominion Bolt Works give employment to 181 people. As a proof of the great increase of wealth that has taken place everywhere in this country, I might instance Bank of Montreal stock which has advanced from 125

to 214, and Molson's from 109 to 127 and 128. The Windsor Hotel which we thought would be a complete failure has had its stock sold to-day at 70, which not long ago, was not considered worth over 10. Another matter that will show the prosperity of the people, is that the gentlemen in the club house of St. James, gave at New Year's and Christmas over \$100 in presents to the servants. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that great distress exists in Montreal. In 1881, 1,326 people were assisted, while in 1880, 2,157 were assisted, showing a falling off in the former year of one-half. In Scotland I saw 6,000 men employed in one ship yard, and I do not see why we should not have similar ship yards in this country. I was very glad to know that the Allans' line of steamers have passengers booked to their full extent for immigrants for two or three months to come, and I have no doubt the Syndicate will induce a large immigration to our shores this year. My own impression is that we have not used proper exertions to bring immigrants this way. At Castle Garden, New York, they are given every accommodation; but here the case is different, though at Quebec, I must say, I went with another gentleman to the immigrants' rooms and had as good a breakfast as one could expect. In 1878, in Montreal, from ten to twenty per cent. of the stores were to be rented. To-day they are all being taken up as fast as possible. On behalf of the mercantile community of Montreal, I return my thanks to the Government for having repealed the stamp tax, which was a source of great annoyance to the merchants of Montreal. There is one thing personal to myself which I wish to set right. With respect to the statement that I made a few evenings ago, that my cotton stocks only paid three per cent., I regret that I made that statement, and now withdraw it. I frankly admit that the statement is incorrect, and was made without sufficient thought on what I considered, at the time, to be good basis.

Mr. SNOWBALL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:05 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 22nd March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DUTIES ON CARBOYS.

Mr. BORDEN enquired, Whether carboys containing sulphuric acid, imported for use in the manufacture of fertilizers, will be allowed to pass to and fro in bond, duty being paid on the acid.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In the absence of the Minister of Customs, I may say arrangements have been made by which carboys, after having once paid duty, will be allowed to return free of duty.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS POWERS.

Mr. VANASSE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to modify the powers and attributes of the Montreal Harbor Commissioners at Montreal, and of the other ports of the Dominion.

Mr. McLELAN. A Bill will be introduced affecting the power of the Montreal Harbor Commissioners.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK AT LOCKEPORT.

Mr. TROW, in the absence of Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne), enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to estab-

lish a branch of the Government Savings Bank at Lockeport, in the county of Shelburne, during the present year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter is under consideration.

CANADIAN OFFICERS WHO TOOK PART IN THE RED RIVER EXPEDITION.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to distinguish, henceforth, in the Militia List, those Canadian officers who took part in the Red River Expedition, as is being done in England with reference to those officers of the English Army who joined the Canadian Expedition; and if such is the intention of the Government, whether such mark of distinction is to be the same as that adopted in England?

Mr. CARON. It is the intention of the Government to distinguish henceforth, in the Militia List, by a mark of distinction, those Canadian Officers who took part in the Red River Expedition. As to the second part of the question, the mark of distinction has not yet been decided upon, so it is not settled whether it is to be the same one as in England.

IMMIGRANT SHEDS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. ROYAL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in view of the immense immigration about to take place to Manitoba, this year, to cause additional sheds to be constructed at once, at various points along the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the temporary use of the families of the new settlers?

Mr. POPE (Compton.) The accommodation for immigrants will be very much increased this year. There will be an immigrant shed beyond Winnipeg, at Brandon. There is a new shed now almost completed at Winnipeg, and an old one is being repaired. Besides, the hon. gentleman himself knows that Winnipeg is erecting two sheds at the expense of the city.

WHARF AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. Fiset enquired, Whether the Government intend to place in the Supplementary Estimates a certain sum in order to raise and enlarge the wharf at Rimouski?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to make any addition at present to that wharf.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE HARBOR OF BIC.

Mr. Fiset enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause any works of improvement to be done this year in the Harbor of Bic?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This work is now engaging the attention of the Government.

POST OFFICE AT WHITE ROCK MILLS.

Mr. BORDEN enquired, Has the post office at White Rock Mills, King's County, Nova Scotia, been closed for some months? When did the postmaster there resign, who has been appointed in his place, and when was the appointment made?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am not aware whether it has been closed or not. The postmaster gave notice in October last that he intended to resign, and a successor was appointed in January. He was bound by law in the meantime to keep the office open. The name of his successor is O'Leary.

Mr. Trow.

SAVINGS BANK OFFICES IN ST. RAYMOND AND ST. CASIMIR.

Mr. VALLÉE enquired, Whether the Government has decided to open savings bank offices in the post offices of the parishes of St. Raymond and St. Casimir, in the county of Portneuf?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The matter is under consideration.

HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AT SOURIS WEST.

Mr. MUTTART, in moving for correspondence, papers, &c., received by the Government since the 17th February, 1881, relating to harbor improvements at Souris West, in Prince Edward Island, said: With reference to this motion I wish to observe that the Harbor of Souris West is a very important one to seafaring and business men, as well as to the farmers of a large section of country in the eastern part of King's County. Souris West Harbor is the last harbor on the Island to close in the fall and the first to open in the spring. The business of that place is considerable and steadily increasing. Before Confederation a large amount of voluntary labor was performed and about \$1,500 expended by the Local Government in constructing a breastwork along the eastern side of the channel with the view of deepening the water on the bar outside; but the work was not built sufficiently high to prevent the sand from washing over into the channel. A large petition has been presented to the Department of Public Works asking for a few thousand dollars for this harbor. It is believed that \$3,000 or \$4,000 would so improve this harbor that ordinary fishing and trading vessels could pass in and out with their cargoes without being caught on the bar. Previous to my leaving home last fall a number of meetings in connection with the proposed improvement of Souris West Harbor were held. At these meetings the claims of the place to a grant of public money were fully discussed. The Minister of Public Works, when in Scuris last summer, was waited upon by leading men of the village, who urged the necessity of at once taking steps to improve this harbor, and I sincerely hope the Government may see fit to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for this much needed public work.

Motion agreed to.

COAL HOPPERS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. ANGLIN, in moving for copies of all advertisements or circulars, tenders, contracts, correspondence, telegrams, accounts, vouchers and other papers respecting the purchase of second-hand coal hoppers from or through B. Burland, said: We have had, from time to time, with regard to the condition of the rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway, the official report that the stock is in the very highest state of efficiency, always maintained in perfect repair, and quite capable of doing its work properly. Well, Sir, it seems strange and inconsistent with that statement that the hon. Minister of Railways seems to have found it either necessary or desirable to purchase, or cause to be purchased, in the United States, or to purchase from somebody who did purchase in the United States, a number of cast-off, second-hand coal hoppers of some United States Railway. One naturally asks why this was done. Are there not in the Lower Provinces, or in the other Provinces, a sufficient number of workers in wood and iron to produce any number of coal hoppers that may be required; and have we not, in point of fact, lying more than half idle in the town of Moncton, a very large amount of machinery belonging to the Government, on which a very large amount of money has been invested, and could it not have been possible to cause a sufficient number of coal hoppers to be made at this place instead of resorting to this extraordinary means of obtaining

them? It would be impossible that any man in his senses can hereafter accept, without qualification, the statement that the rolling stock of that railway is in an efficient and perfect condition—in such a condition as the rolling stock of a great railway ought to be, when he finds that the hon. Minister, during one year, has purchased a large number of second-class coal hoppers. These coal hoppers, it is to be presumed, were found not to be good enough to be used on some private road in the United States, and were rejected for some reason or other by some coal company and perhaps imported into Canada and purchased by the hon. the Minister of Railways for use upon our railway, of which he is so fond of boasting, and of which we ought to be so proud, as a great public work to the credit of the Engineers who laid it out, and of all who were concerned in the constructing and working it. Now, to be frank with the hon. the Minister of Railways, and to give him an opportunity, if he chooses to do it, of removing an impression that has got abroad, should that impression be found to be unfounded, I may as well say to him that I have been told that this transaction arose out of the last Pictou by-election; that about the time the hon. gentleman was in the city of Pictou, or somewhere in that neighborhood, he either met or entered into communication with this Mr. Burland, who, I am told, is the son-in-law of a Mr. Moore, manager of one of the mining properties in Pictou, a gentleman who exercised very considerable influence at the last Pictou election. Of Mr. Burland himself I have not made particular enquiry, but I have been told that this Mr. Burland lives in Montreal, and that he is not a gentleman who is at all accustomed to meddle in transactions of this kind. I believe, if I am correctly informed, that he is an engraver, or something of that kind, and not a man in the habit of dealing in railway rolling stock. The statement further is that this Mr. Burland obtained from the Minister of Railways a letter of some kind, whether a letter promising to purchase those hoppers from him when he had first purchased them in the United States and brought them to this country, or saying to that effect something at all events which was held to be sufficient to give Mr. Burland the credit upon which, it is said, he bought these coal hoppers. These coal hoppers were admitted into the country at what appears to be a very handsome price indeed for second-hand articles, Mr. Burland having been paid the sum of \$24,000, I think—a sum probably considerably less than what would have been paid for new ones, but certainly a very handsome sum for old ones. The Minister of Railways will probably claim that these articles were only second-hand in name, and very valuable, but if that be the case these gentlemen must have used extraordinary inducement to cause the railway company in the United States to part with them, because, as we all know, at the present time, rolling stock of every kind is scarce in the United States. The workshops have not been able to furnish all the rolling stock required, owing to the largely increased business of late years. I have just received a note stating that Mr. Burland has always been in the railway supply business, and I am glad to make the correction. The whole transaction appears to me to be a very extraordinary one, and one which the hon. the Minister of Railways would do well, for his own sake, to explain fully if it is susceptible of explanation, and whatever he may say, the fact still remains that we purchased for our great Intercolonial Railway the cast-off coal hoppers of some road in the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am greatly obliged to my hon. friend the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) for favoring the House on this occasion with the rumors to which he appears always so ready to lend his ear, in relation to matters in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I can, of course, quite understand, why that hon. gentleman should be particularly alive to this matter, if it

were possible to connect it with the Pictou election, as I had the pleasure on that important occasion of measuring swords with my hon. friend, and of having some very pleasant and friendly passages at arms with him on more than one platform during that contest. I have no doubt, however, that he will be greatly relieved to learn that his information respecting this transaction is entirely inaccurate from beginning to end. The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, be glad to learn that at the time of the Pictou election, and long after it was over, I did not know that there was such a person in existence as Mr. Burland, and had never had any proposition before me in relation to these cars. I think it was on the occasion of my visit to Prince Edward Island and Pictou, after my return from British Columbia, and long after the Pictou election, that the matter was first brought under my notice. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will be pleased that I should set him right at the outset, on a very important point, with regard to which he seems to labor under a great deal of misconception. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the purchase of additional rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway involves a contradiction with the statement that the rolling stock of that road is in a thorough state of efficiency. The statement with reference to the efficiency of the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway applies to the rolling stock proper of that work. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that the rolling stock of any railway—the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk, or the Great Western—which is sufficient for its business at one time, the rolling stock which is furnished and charged to capital account for the purpose of doing the work in a certain condition of the traffic, is to be found sufficient if that traffic doubles. The hon. gentleman ought to know that on the Grand Trunk, the Great Western, and all these railways, when a great increase in the volume of traffic takes place the stock required to deal with the additional traffic is not provided from the revenue, it is provided and charged to capital account. All a railway is expected to do is to maintain in a thorough state of efficiency the rolling stock charged to capital account which was furnished in the first instance. The Intercolonial was equipped with rolling stock which was quite sufficient for the business required at the time, and what devolves upon me as Minister of Railways is to see that all that rolling stock, say 100 or 120 engines as the case may be, furnish a charge to capital account by the administration of the road, and all the cars, first and second class passenger cars, freight cars and everything connected with them are kept in a thorough state of efficiency under charges to revenue account. Now, what I have said—what I believe to be true, what officers in the Department tell me, men of the highest character and standing, men who enjoyed the confidence of the late Government as they enjoy my confidence, is that the rolling stock provided by the Government and Parliament for the Intercolonial Railway is maintained in a thorough and complete state of efficiency. That is to say: If a locomotive becomes disabled it is repaired or replaced by a new one, and charged to revenue, and if a collision occurs or a car is destroyed or damaged, it has to be rebuilt or repaired, as the case may be, and similarly charged to revenue. But the new stock required by the increased business of the road is not furnished and ought not to be furnished by revenue, when the rolling stock which was originally put upon the road, and was sufficient for the business done at that time, proves insufficient for double or treble that amount of traffic. The hon. gentleman will understand that when I showed an increase of nearly 50 per cent.—an increase of over 40 per cent. in the volume of traffic—that it is quite possible to maintain the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway in the highest state of efficiency, and yet to have to apply to Parliament for capital to furnish the new rolling stock that is required to meet the addi-

tional volume of traffic; and I am prepared to show and to prove that on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Great Western Railway that is the course pursued—when the volume of traffic altogether outgrows the traffic for which the road was equipped, they furnish the rolling stock that is required to meet the demands of the increased business, and charge it not to revenue but to capital account. So much, I have said, to show that the two statements to which the hon. gentleman refers are not antagonistic, but are perfectly consistent. I may say that when I found that this great additional and unexpected volume of traffic was making demands for additional rolling stock I applied for authority to purchase, and, having obtained that authority, tenders were asked from every one in Canada engaged in the construction of such rolling stock, from whom I had the least hope of obtaining the rolling stock required. And having learned by experience the difficulty of promptly obtaining from the sources we had in Canada, the rolling stock that would be required, I, at the same time, issued tenders to parties in the United States, from whom the Government had previously purchased rolling stock, and from whom I might expect to obtain it on favorable terms. I had these tenders all before me, and I found that it was not possible, either in the United States or Canada to obtain as promptly as the necessities of the road demanded, all the rolling stock that was required. A deputation of the coal proprietors of the county of Pictou waited on me, long after the Pictou election, and on my return from Prince Edward Island, I having also visited British Columbia in the interval, and pressed on me the necessity of providing for the very large engagements they had made for the delivery of coal in Quebec and Ontario. I told them the measures which had been taken, and the offer which had been made by Mr. Burland, who stated that he had an offer of some 200 coal cars in New York, which could be purchased at most favorable terms, and which would relieve the pressure of the coal traffic. On receiving that information, I despatched Mr. Whitley, Mechanical Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, and who has occupied that position from the time the Intercolonial Railway was opened, to New York to examine and report on these cars. Mr. Whitley visited New York and reported upon them, and stated that some fifty of them were practically new, having scarcely been used at all, that some fifty had been used to a large extent, and that the balance were what the hon. member for Gloucester has described as really second-hand cars. Under these circumstances I took no further action until great pressure was applied with reference to the demands and the necessities of removing the coal. I can show the hon. gentleman a score of letters from parties engaged in supplying coal in Montreal and elsewhere, in relation to the statement of the coal miners, that they were not able to obtain sufficient cars to furnish coal as promptly as was necessary to meet the engagements which had been made. I thereupon despatched Mr. Whitley again to New York, and told him to select some fifty of those cars which he had reported to be practically new; and upon Mr. Whitley making the selection of those cars, I obtained the authority of the Council to purchase those fifty cars at \$228 each, the price paid for hopper coal cars being \$432 each. Now, Sir, I think that is an explanation which the hon. gentleman himself will receive as quite covering the case; and I only thank him for giving me this opportunity of making an explanation which I have no doubt will not only satisfy the House, but that hon. gentleman, that everything done in this matter has been done in a manner that will bear the closest examination and inspection, and in a manner demanded by the public interest alone.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. the Minister of Railways has directed a great part of his speech to a question which I did not raise, or care to raise at all. I did not discuss the ques-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tion of the introduction of new rolling stock on the road. What I said was, that the purchase of second-hand hoppers for use on the Intercolonial Railway was in itself *prima facie* evidence that the rolling stock was not in the position in which we would like to see it. A purchase of second-hand stock seems to be an extraordinary transaction, and I do not think the statement of the hon. gentleman deprives it of that character to any person who has seen the entry in the Supplementary Estimates. His calculation does not seem to be correct, as the amount debited is \$24,000 for what I call second-hand coal hoppers. One of the things I objected to in my speech—and the hon. gentleman did not care to refer to that—was that, while we have in the town of Moncton large workshops and very valuable machinery, and while we have in the Lower Provinces hundreds of skilled workers in wood and iron who would have been delighted to obtain employment in these workshops at fair rates of wages, the hon. gentleman made up his mind to meet the demand for additional coal hoppers by purchasing them in the United States, instead of getting them built in Canada, by Canadians, from Canadian wood and Canadian iron, as one would expect from an advocate of the National Policy, who declares himself in favor of Canada for the Canadians. By taking the course he did, he has proved recreant to that policy which he is so fond of proclaiming as the policy most suitable to this country. The machinery and workshops are there, the workmen could have been obtained in a few hours, and Mr. Whitley would have been well qualified to proceed with that work, and turn out a hundred, or five hundred, or even a thousand cars in a short time. There was no necessity of going to the United States for these coal hoppers, and it is not creditable to the Intercolonial Railway that we should send to New York to purchase second-hand coal hoppers, which must have been cast aside by some railway company in the United States. No railway company in the United States would have sold coal hoppers worth \$432 for \$228, unless for some extraordinary reason. The hon. gentleman says he relied upon the report of his officials. What that report is I do not know. Perhaps it would be well to have it brought down. What I object to is, that without absolute necessity, the hon. gentleman did not choose to give employment to our own people in making hoppers that might be a credit to the railway, instead of introducing these second-hand hoppers, which, whatever he says, will not be regarded as fit rolling stock for the Intercolonial Railway, controlled and managed by the Government of this Dominion.

Motion agreed to.

MINING RIGHTS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all Orders in Council and regulations in connection with mining rights not already brought down, said: I observe by a return of correspondence in connection with mining rights, particularly in connection with gold mining rights, that various provisional permits have been given and interests created based upon the proposition that the Government are about to submit regulations, and that those parties may depend upon their interests being considered when the regulations come down. I also observe that among the interests which have been so created is one in favor of two parties, I think Messrs. Petley and Costigan, for bench or bar or drift gold mining on the Saskatchewan River, from a point four miles above to a point six miles below Edmonton, making ten miles on that river. I express no opinion on the present occasion as to the propriety of the Government granting such a right for ten miles along the Saskatchewan River to any one party. It may or may not be a prudent course to adopt in dealing with the subject; but that right, and other provisional rights, are such that it is important we should see what the regulations are, if they have been prepared, and if they have not been framed that they should be

prepared and brought down at a sufficiently early period of the Session to make discussion practicable.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to the motion. Of course if there are any new regulations they will be brought down at the same time.

Motion agreed to.

CONTRACTS ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for copies of all contracts for the construction of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway made by the Company with any person or firm since the date to which the previous order extends, said: I observe that since the order was made for copies of contracts, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a very large contract, for the construction of about 500 miles of that railway across the prairie, has been let, and it will be interesting, of course, that the House should possess information respecting the construction of that road up to the latest possible date. I have, therefore, given notice of this motion, which is simply a motion to obtain up to a later date that information which the House has already ordered should be obtained. I observe, from an advertisement published by the contractors holding this contract, that the grading on the first 200 miles is so light as to require only 12,000 cubic yards per mile of embankment, and we will be very glad to know the parties to whom that contract of such extraordinary ease has been let.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reply to the hon. member, that the Government has no such information in their possession as has been referred to by the hon. gentleman, but no time will be lost in seeking to obtain that information, and when it has been obtained it will be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the Government have the power to demand this information. That point was decided long ago with respect to the Grand Trunk Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the first occasion since I have had a seat in Parliament in which it has been assumed that Government had a right to ask for contracts made by companies which are subsidized by the Government. The Canada Central Railway was subsidized by the Government not many years ago to a large extent, as the hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware. But I am not aware of any hon. member having moved for copies of sub-contracts made by them for the construction of the road.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We were not aware of any sub-contracts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are contractors with the Government, and if they have let contracts for the construction of portions of their lines they are sub-contracts. I am not aware of any occasion on which hon. gentlemen opposite, or any hon. members, stated that because the Canada Central was receiving \$12,000 a mile for the construction of their road, they should submit to Parliament sub-contracts made by them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We were not aware of their having made any sub-contracts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think if the hon. gentleman had been of the same enquiring turn of mind as the leader of the Opposition, he would have ascertained that the Canada Central let sub-contracts and secured the construction of their work to a certain extent in that way. We will ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to furnish the information called for, and will lay it on the Table of the House as soon as received. The hon. gentleman will no doubt be only too glad to know, when the contracts are obtained, if they bear out the assumption of the hon. gentleman, that the Company

have discovered a very easy, level and admirable route for the railway; he will accept it as one of the advantages which the country gains by having the work placed in the hands of a company directly interested in it, instead of its being in the hands of the Government, who are obliged to rely on persons not so directly interested in the location and construction of the work.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN MANITOBA.

Mr. SCHULTZ moved the reading of the Journals of the House of Monday, March 7th, 1881, so far as the same relate to the petition of Henry J. Clark, Q.C., and others, of Winnipeg, Province of Manitoba, setting forth certain charges against the Hon. Edmund Burk Wood, Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. The other day it was urged, the leader of the House being in his place, that the petition and the answer to the petition should be printed and distributed to members before this motion came on, and as that has not been done I ask that this motion should stand. That was the course pursued in the case of the petition against Judge Leranger.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I do not understand the arrangement was made in that way. I call attention to this fact that any further delay will prevent the order being reached this Session.

Mr. BLAKE. I mentioned the subject at the earliest moment after the hon. gentleman had put the notice on the paper. The day following the notice of the hon. gentleman I called the attention of the leader of the House to the circumstance that the notice was on the paper, and to the fact that the address moving for the response of the learned Judge had not been complied with, and that without having the petition and reply in printed form the House could not intelligently deal with the matter. The leader of the House endorsed that view, and he said he would take care that the response was brought down at once, and that both papers would be printed immediately.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I understood the hon. member for West Durham to say that he did not think it was fair to submit a motion for the reading of the Journals, without announcing what ulterior action he would take. The hon. gentleman was to give us notice, and then to explain the ulterior action he intended to take.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Compton is confusing two days. When the hon. gentleman proposed to move his notice, he gave notice of his intention to move for a Committee upon that notice being on the paper.

Motion allowed to stand.

KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RAILWAY.

Mr. MACKENZIE, in moving for copies of all correspondence, petitions, or other documents in possession of the Government respecting complaints against the location and manner of working of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway in the city of Kingston, said: The road passed near a bridge at a very acute angle, and was a source of danger to passers-by. His attention had been called to the matter by correspondents, and he wished to know if the Government had given it any consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My attention has been called to the subject, and it has been referred to the Department of Justice to ascertain what authority the Railway Committee of the Privy Council can exercise in the matter. I understand the Company obtained the permission of the civic authorities to run on this street, and it is a question of doubt what power we have to interfere.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I happen to be very well acquainted with the locality. I witnessed on that spot no less than three runaways, two of which resulted disastrously. I know, at least, that one fatal accident occurred in crossing this bridge. I have seen many railway crossings, but never any so badly arranged as this. If it be not in the power of the Government to interfere under the existing Railway Act, it would be well to amend the Act so as to give it such power. The Ministry will understand, without any further explanation, how in the case of a crossing which 4,000 people must pass, there may be many risks to life, in the attempt to approach Kingston; there may be very serious accidents to life and limb at this point, unless some precautions are taken.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. On a recent occasion when the hon. the Minister of Militia visited Kingston, his attention was called to the position of the gate of the Tête du Pont Barracks, and to the necessity that existed for a change in its position, so that instead of its projecting into the street, it should be made flush with the barrack-wall, which would remove to a great extent the evil spoken of. I am in hopes that the representations made to that hon. Minister will secure this improvement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. To open inwards?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. To make it flush with the wall, and where it now projects to take away the bastions. I have also spoken to and laid a complaint before the Manager and President of that road, on the subject, and urged the necessity of removing the evil mentioned, which exists to a large extent; and I have been assured that this evil is not so great as was represented, and is only temporary; that the Company are building their freight shed, engine-house and other workshops away from the barracks, and at the other side of the embankment, and that as soon as this work is done, and the buildings occupied this spring, there will be no shunting of trains or any such inconvenience as has existed in the past. That gentleman assured me as soon as this was done the evil would be altogether removed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Huron respecting the Consolidated Railway Act and the powers of this Parliament, and with respect to the opinion that we have not authority to deal with cases like this, I propose to submit an amendment to the Act, to define and settle the question of our powers in such matters.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be well to consider whether joint action might not be had with the several Provinces? There is one crossing at Toronto, where some roads cross and start at the same point, and where others which have been chartered by the Ontario Legislature also cross; and to take measures for one class of road and measures for the other would be futile.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have already taken action in some of those cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will let us know when he is possessed of more information with regard to this particular case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am extremely glad to hear the assurance of the hon. the Minister of Railways. I would like to know whether any officer of his Department has examined and reported on the position of things at Kingston. There is no doubt that the suggestion made by the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), will to some extent, but only to a very slight extent, modify the risk which those travellers run in coming into Kingston.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton, I may say that we sent an officer from the Department here and the Government of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Ontario sent one of its officers, and they made a joint report in relation to this very matter. Joint action in this case was taken by the two Governments. I will give the fullest information on the subject, when procured.

Motion agreed to.

THE NEWFIELD AND THE WRECKED MORAVIAN.

Mr. KILLAM moved for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and any person or persons, respecting the employment of the Government steamer *Newfield* in connection with the wreck of the *Moravian*, with statement of the time so employed, the price to be paid, and the amount received. He said: In moving this resolution I do not desire to raise any question affecting the interests of the Allan steamship company, but simply to call attention to the principle involved in sending Government vessels to the relief of vessels not owned by the Government. I wish to enquire whether the right course was pursued by the Dominion steamer, and whether in such cases of shipwreck those steamers should be sent off promptly to the relief of wrecks. The custom of the English navy, when vessels are in commission and kept ready for service of that kind, is that they should always be prepared to assist any vessel in distress, and go to the rescue of life and property in such cases, and I believe no charge is made under such circumstances. In this country the circumstances are somewhat different. Our Dominion steamers are used for certain purposes; they are in no sense war vessels, although they may be useful some time for the protection of our coasts, when furnished with sufficient guns and men for that purpose. But as a general rule, those steamers are mainly employed in the maintenance of the Lighthouse Service, and in other services incident to the Fisheries Department. In this particular case the steamer *Moravian* was stranded on the 30th January, at Mud Island, and I understand that the *Newfoundland*, belonging to the same company, was not then able to go to her assistance and that of the passengers, to save life and property or assist the *Moravian* to get off. The agents of the Allan Company then applied to the Marine and Fisheries Department, at Halifax, for the assistance of the *Newfield*, and agreed upon certain rates and remuneration per day for her services. The steamer went as required, remained for several days, and returned to Halifax; but the Allan Company afterwards failed to pay the amount agreed upon. This is a matter of business perhaps between the Government and the steamship company. I should be the last to claim that any consideration should be given the Allan Steamship Company, on account of certain services rendered the Government, as some have insinuated. I merely refer to this subject for the purpose of raising the question as to whether it is the duty of the Marine and Fisheries Department, in the case of disasters to vessels, to send the steamers at their control to the aid of the distressed when assistance could be conveniently obtained otherwise. My own view is, that where local aid can be conveniently and efficiently procured, that it is not worth the while of the Government to send vessels to those wrecks; but that where there is a doubt in the matter or difficult to procure assistance in the locality, it is quite proper for the authorities to send a Dominion steamer to render all possible assistance without any charge to the owners of vessels, or with only such reasonable charge as would cover the expense incurred in the saving of the goods, in the saving of life and property, to be paid by the owners of the assisted vessels.

Mr. McLELAN. The correspondence is still going on upon the points raised by the hon. gentleman, and when completed it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF 1880.

Mr. BLAKE, in the absence of Mr. MILLS, moved that the following items of the Public Accounts of 1880 be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts for enquiry:—W. R. Brown, professional services (page 221), \$1,500; A. McArthur, professional services (page 222), \$750; W. Murdoch, C.E. (page 225), \$11,499.47. He said: My hon. friend informed me that those accounts were not investigated by the Public Accounts Committee last year, and that he had within the last few days received some information which lead him to believe that they were to be investigated, and he thought that it would be more convenient to do that than to move for the papers to be brought down; so that by this procedure they will get before the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no objection to these accounts being brought down, and to this motion passing. I may mention there is a misprint in the Public Accounts, and, of course, in this notice: the name is Bown, instead of Brown.

Motion agreed to.

THE TOWN OF PEMBROKE AND THE CANADA CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved for copy of a petition presented to His Excellency by the corporation of the town of Pembroke, in the county of Renfrew (dated 30th January, 1879), praying that His Excellency may be pleased to relieve the said town from the payment of a bonus of \$75,000, granted to the Canada Central Railway Company, on the 4th October, 1875, to secure the extension of the said railway from the village of Renfrew to the town of Pembroke. Also, copies of all correspondence between the Government, or any member thereof, and the said corporation, or any person or persons, in relation to the subject matter of the said petition. He said: The motion requires some explanation in relation to the reasons which induced the corporation of the town of Pembroke to make this application to the Government. I am aware that the mere bald proposal that the Government should take \$75,000 out of the public Treasury and hand it over to a municipality for the purpose of relieving them of the liabilities voluntarily entered into on their part, may seem somewhat extraordinary, even a preposterous request. But I hope to be able to show, in the statement which I am about to make to the House, that the people of this town are, under the circumstances, perfectly justified in making the request they have made to the Government. It will be necessary, in dealing with this question, to say a word or two with reference to the railway project of that locality. As long ago as 1853 the people of the county of Renfrew, a large portion of which was then almost an unbroken wilderness, realizing the advantages of railway communication, granted to the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company, incorporated to build and run a railway from the town of Brockville to the village of Pembroke, in conjunction with the county of Lanark, no less a sum than \$800,000. That road was commenced but never completed. It was built to a certain point about six miles within the county of Renfrew, and, in 1870, the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company permitted their charter to expire. In the meantime the Canada Central Railway Company obtained an Act of incorporation in 1861, which

"Authorized the Company to lay out, construct and finish a double or single track of railway from such point on Lake Huron as may be found best adapted for the purpose to the city of Ottawa, by way of Pembroke and Araprior, and from the city of Ottawa to Montreal."

I desire the House to mark the fact that this Act of incorporation imposed on the Canada Central

Railway Company the obligation, in building their line of railway from Lake Huron to the city of Ottawa, to pass by the way of Pembroke, because it is upon that point that I intend chiefly to base the arguments I propose to offer to the House. That obligation remained in full force and effect up to the time that operations were commenced by that railway company. They did not commence to build any portion of the line, which they were authorized to build in 1861, until 1870, and they then commenced, as I presumed they were perfectly authorized in doing, at the city of Ottawa and built a portion of their railway from Ottawa to Carleton Place. Subsequently, I think in the year 1872, they built another portion of their line of railway from Sand Point to the village of Renfrew, and they obtained control of the intervening link between Carleton Place and Sand Point, which had been built by the Brockville and Ottawa Railway. Well, Sir, under the authority of the Act of 1874—the Canadian Pacific Railway Act—and here I may say that up to the year 1875 the obligation to which I have referred, and which was incorporated in the original Act of incorporation to this Company, and which was continued by the subsequent remaining Act, still remained in full force and effect. In 1875, when the hon. member for Lambton, then leader of the Government, under the authority of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874, submitted to this House for its approval, an Order in Council granting a subsidy to the Canada Central Railway Company of \$12,000 per mile upon the following terms, which I shall read from a report of the Privy Council submitted to Parliament on the 13th March, 1875:—

"The Committee of Council have had under consideration the application of the Canada Central Railway Company, for the subsidy proposed to be granted to railway companies under the terms of the Act thirty-seventh Victoria, chapter fourteen, intitled: "An Act to provide for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway," and they advise that a subsidy of \$12,000 per mile be granted to the said Company to aid in constructing their line from the vicinity of the village of Douglas westward to the eastern end of the branch railway proposed to be built from the Georgian Bay by the Government, being about 120 miles, upon and subject to the following conditions:

1st. That the road shall be built upon a line to be approved by the Minister of Public Works, but which may be defined generally as ascending the Valley of the Bonnechère from the vicinity of Douglas via Golden Lake and Round Lake."

The temporary terminus of the Canada Central was then at the village of Renfrew, and, under the conditions that were imposed by the Order in Council from which I have quoted, it will be seen that the line, as defined by the then Minister of Public Works as the line which the Canada Central Company were obliged to adopt if continued westward from Renfrew, would carry them some twenty miles south of Pembroke. Therefore, it was impossible for the Company, under the Act as it then existed, to follow the line laid down by the Minister of Public Works. Knowing what the intentions of the Government were the Company applied to Parliament during the Session of 1875 for an amendment to their charter, relieving them from the obligation imposed on them by the original Act of incorporation and the subsequent Act amending the same. That Act is 38 Victoria, chapter 67, and is in the following terms:—

"1. The time limited for the deposit of maps, plans and books of reference of the Canada Central Railway, is hereby extended for two years, and the time limited for the completion thereof, for five years from the 1st day of September next, and from thence until the end of the Session of Parliament next thereafter."

"2. The said Company is hereby authorized to build the said Railway in the most direct and feasible route from Renfrew village towards Lake Huron, and is also hereby authorized to build a railway to Pembroke from said Canada Central Railway to be a part thereof."

It will be seen that in addition to the fact that the House relieved the Canada Central of the obligation imposed upon them to build by way of Pembroke, it also gave to the Company the right, which amounted almost to an exclusive right, to construct a road to Pembroke, and that concession was to be continued for practically six years

from the Session of 1875. Now, Sir, the Canada Central Railway Company were not slow to take advantage of the position in which Parliament placed them by this amendment to their charter. They came to the people of Pembroke, and said: "We have practical control of the railway avenues to your town for the next six years, and if you do not accede to our line, you will not obtain railway communication until it suits us to give it." The people of the town of Pembroke felt the necessity of obtaining railway communication, and I think my hon. friend for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), who visited the town in 1876, will agree with me as to the necessity of obtaining that communication.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was a still greater necessity for some political information about that time.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad that the hon. gentleman gave my constituents the political information, and that they profited thereby. In addition to the necessities for political information, the people, at all events, knew what the commercial advantages of obtaining railway communication would be, and finding themselves placed in the position in which they were placed they acceded to the proposition made them by the Railway Company and granted them a bonus of \$75,000 with certain other concessions, amounting in all to a considerable sum in excess of that amount, and the road was completed to Pembroke in 1876. Now, Sir, I am quite free to admit that Parliament had a perfect right to relieve the Company of the obligation which was originally imposed upon them, and if matters had been permitted to remain as they were in 1876, with the road so completed to Pembroke, I do not think they would have had any right to apply to Parliament or the Government for relief. But the road having been completed to Pembroke, as I contend by the enterprise of the people of that town, the Government found it convenient to change their policy in relation to the route which they chose, and in 1878 the then Minister of Public Works came down to Parliament with an Order in Council from which I shall read some extracts:—

"That the engineers of the Canada Central, and those employed by M. Foster, reported more serious obstacles in grades and engineering work, and difficulties after leaving the lower part of the Bonnechère Valley; and though the Chief Engineer stated that he believed that a more thorough exploration would prove that they were mistaken, it became necessary to obtain the facts with greater particularity.

"That this engineer has reported, as the result of the season's operations, that a fair line can be obtained on Mr. Hazlewood's plan, but that for a considerable distance the work will be somewhat heavy, in consequence of the prevalence of rock cutting, and that the maximum grade rising easterly would be 52-80 feet per mile in an aggregate distance of about seven miles, and that there are three miles of the some grade rising westward. That this grade, though not excessive, is much higher than Mr. Hazlewood expected.

"That the engineer employed by the Canada Central Railway Company has reported that so far as works of construction are concerned, a more favorable line could be obtained ascending from Pembroke on a line nearly parallel with the Ottawa River, and distant from the same after leaving the Petewawa River, an average of eight or ten miles, and touching in its course the south-east corner of Lake Nipissing.

"That though the line would be lengthened by this deflection to the northward, the western end of the subsidized line, would, as stated, reach a point much further to the westward of the previously proposed terminus, or juncture with that portion of the Canada Pacific Railway proposed to be built under the terms of this Act, to the French River, and would thus save to the public the cost of constructing about twenty miles of railway.

"That the estimated distance from Pembroke to the south-east corner of Lake Nipissing is about 130 miles. This point is about twenty miles further west than the point previously determined on as the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, thus saving to the public the construction of about twenty miles of railway."

There we have the statement twice repeated that by making Pembroke the starting point instead of Douglas, by carrying the road along the Ottawa River, there would be a saving in the cost of construction to the country of twenty

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

miles. The Committee of Council, after fully considering the facts as already summarized, recommended:

"That the proposition of the Canada Central Railway Company of extend their line to such point as may be selected by the Government as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near the crossing to the Nipissing Road at the south-east corner of Lake Nipissing, for the sum of one million four hundred and forty thousand dollars (\$1,440,000) should be accepted."

That sum represented the amount which was to be paid on the distance from Douglas the commencement of the subsidized portion of the Canada Central to Burnt Lake at the centre of a certain block of townships which was laid down on the map. This Order in Council also provides that the Company shall enter into an agreement to grant running powers to the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway for any railway in extension thereof from any point of intersection west of the town of Renfrew that may be approved of by the Governor in Council, to the Kingston and Pembroke Railway from the point of intersection of their line, provided it is west of Renfrew, and to such other companies as may have the termini of their systems on or towards Lake Huron, on such terms as may be approved of by the Governor in Council. It also provides that the Government of Canada and the lessees or future owners of the Government line, westward of the western terminus of the subsidized line, shall possess running powers on similar terms to the companies designated. You will observe that not only does this Order in Council declare that by making Pembroke the starting point instead of Douglas, a saving of twenty miles of construction would be effected, but it also gives to other railways the right of running their trains over a portion of the Canada Central Railway which was not subsidized by Government money at all, but the construction of which was secured by a subsidy granted by the town of Pembroke. Now, Sir, this saving to the country I estimate at not less than \$400,000; and when I show you the map, you will observe that by continuing the line from Pembroke, the terminal character of the town of Pembroke, that is as a terminus on the Ottawa River, was destroyed. Previous to the construction of the road westward from Pembroke, that town occupied the position of a railway terminus, with unbroken steamboat navigation for a distance of fifty miles westward, and the practical effect of that was that the town of Pembroke controlled the trade for lumber supplies for all points north and west of the town; but immediately on the continuance of the road westward from Pembroke, the base of supplies was moved further on, and instead of that town being now the terminal point, it is a mere way station on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not give that as a reason why the Government should accede to the proposition made by the town of Pembroke; I base my claim upon the ground that in changing the commencing point of the subsidized portion of the Canada Central Railway from Douglas to Pembroke, a very large sum of money was saved to the country; and I contend that, by the legislation of 1875, which relieved the Canada Central Company from their obligation to build their road by way of Pembroke, the people of that town were forced to accede to the demands made upon them by the railway company. That, by acceding to the demand, they secured the construction of the line from Renfrew to Pembroke, and thereby enabled the Government to adopt a line, as regards the subsidized portion of the railway, which had the effect of saving to the country, according to the estimate of the hon. member for Lambton himself, the cost of constructing twenty miles of railway, and that, in addition, that saving was effected to the country by the sacrifice of the local interests of the town of Pembroke; and I believe these reasons justify the town of Pembroke in coming to the Administration and asking to be relieved of that bonus. It seems to me wholly unjustifiable that a town with a population of 3,000 should be com-

pelled to contribute \$75,000 towards a great public enterprise such as this, and I am satisfied that when the Government and the House come to give this question fair and calm consideration, they will come to the conclusion that the town of Pembroke is justified in the demand it makes on the Government, and will not hesitate to relieve that town from the burden which it assumed.

Motion agreed to.

THE POSTMASTER AT GREENWOOD, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN, in moving for copies of all correspondence, petitions, reports or other papers in the Post Office Department respecting the removal from office of William Magee, lately postmaster at Greenwood, Nova Scotia, and the appointment in his place of Marsden Foster, said: I am sorry the Postmaster General is not in his place, as I wished to call his attention to this matter. I am informed by friends of Mr. Magee that he was removed from his office without any reason being assigned, and that he is in entire ignorance at this moment of any cause for his removal. A petition, signed by every person in the community, except the man who has been appointed in his place and his bondsmen, has been forwarded to the Post Office Department, asking that Mr. Magee be reinstated. I am anxious to see these papers, in order, if possible to get at the reason of the Government for making this change.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to the papers being brought down, and I have no doubt when they are brought down the hon. gentleman will see that there was good reason for the change.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was the reason?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers will show that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman not state the reason now? We would be glad to have the information he has himself.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers will show that when they are brought down, and then if the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss the matter further, we will be in a position to answer him.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF FISH.

Mr. KILLAM moved for a statement showing the quantity of each kind of fish inspected in each inspection district of the Dominion in which an Inspector has been appointed, the name of the Inspector in each such district, the fees charged for inspection in each case, and the gross amount of fees received, the whole for the year ended December 31st, 1881, or the next previous fiscal or calendar year, the returns for which are in the possession of the Government. He said: Since the sitting of the Fishery Commission at Halifax, we have had no returns to throw any distinct light on the amount of the catch of fish, or the amount of fish exported from the different parts of the Dominion. I spoke the other day I think all that was necessary in regard to the Inspection Act; but I would again call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to the necessity of placing before us such returns as are in his possession which will throw light on the catch of fish and the export of fish of the classes which come under the Inspection Act. I do not know whether the year for which the Inspector hands in his return ends 31st December or 30th June; that is not material, but if the Government will place the House in possession of fuller information before the close of the Session I shall be much obliged.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. The hon. gentleman spoke to me privately respecting the object sought to be attained by

this motion. I have consulted the Department, and I will see that the returns are brought down.

Motion agreed to.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier), moved that the amendments made in Committee of the Whole to Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister, be concurred in.

Mr. MILLS moved the following amendment:

That the amendments be not now considered, but that the Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same so that the law as regards marriage with a deceased wife's sister be made uniform throughout Canada.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Gunn,	Pickard,
Bain,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bannerman,	Haddow,	Richey,
Bill,	Hay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Hesson,	Rogers,
Bowell,	Irvine,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brown,	Jackson,	Rymal,
Burpee (St. John),	Killam,	Scriver,
Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Smith,
Cameron (Huron),	Lane,	Snowball,
Cartwright,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Strange,
Cockburn,	Mackenzie,	Sutherland,
Domville,	McLelan,	Tilley,
Fleming,	McQuade,	Trow,
Gillies,	Mills,	Wallace (York),
Gillmor,	Orton,	Weldon, and
Guillet,	Paterson (Brant),	Williams.—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Geoffrion,	Ouimet,
Anglin,	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Arnell,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Pinsonneault,
Beauchesne,	Grandbois,	Platt,
Béchar,	Haggart,	Plumb,
Benoit,	Holton,	Pope (Compton),
Bergeron,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bergin,	Houde,	Rinfret,
Bolduc,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bourassa,	Ives,	Ross (Dundas),
Bourbeau,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Brooks,	Kranz,	Routhier,
Bunting,	Landry,	Royal,
Burnham,	Langevin,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cameron (Victoria),	Lantier,	Ryan (Montreal),
Carling,	Laurier,	Rykert,
Caron,	Longley,	Schultz,
Casgrain,	Macdonald (Kings),	Shaw,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Skinner,
Colby,	Macmillan,	Sproule,
Costigan,	McCallum,	Stephenson,
Coughlin,	McCuaig,	Tassé,
Coupal,	McDougald,	Tellier,
Coursol,	McDougall,	Thompson,
Crouter,	McRory,	Tupper,
Currier,	Malouin,	Tyrwhitt,
Outhbert,	Manson,	Valin,
Daly,	Merner,	Valée,
Desaulniers,	Méthot,	Vanasse,
Doull,	Mongenais,	Wade,
Drew,	Montplaisir,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Dumont,	Mousseau,	White (Cardwell),
Fiset,	Muttart,	Wiser, and
Fortin,	Ogden,	Wright.—104.
Fulton,	Olivier,	

Mr. AYMOT moved the following amendment:—

That every marriage celebrated by competent religious authority is hereby declared valid and legal.

He said: I do not intend to speak at length on this amendment, but with the permission of the House I will, in a few words, give my reason for proposing it. In the

Consolidated Statutes of Canada, chapter 74, this principle is admitted :

"Whereas the recognition of legal equality among all religious denominations is an admitted principle of Colonial legislation ; and whereas in the state and condition of this Province, to which such a principle is peculiarly applicable, it is desirable that the same should receive the sanction of direct Legislative authority, recognizing and declaring the same as a fundamental principle of our civil policy. Therefore the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, so as the same be not made an excuse for acts of licentiousness, or a justification of practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the Province, is by the constitution and laws of this Province allowed to all Her Majesty's subjects within the same."

Now, I find the same law was enacted and given to this colony when first the British flag waved victoriously here. Since that time it has always been an admitted principle that all the religious denominations have free existence in this country. I do not think any one will deny that this principle is a fundamental law. Starting from that, my second proposition is that marriage, considered in itself, is a religious contract. This principle has been, I believe, admitted most emphatically or so implicitly that it cannot be denied, in the discussion that took place in this House when my hon. friend's Bill came up for the first time. It has been admitted by everybody that marriage is a religious contract. Of course, we have to apply to the civil law to get it recognized. Taking as a starting point that all the religious denominations in this country are free and their existence recognized by law, and admitting that marriage is a religious contract, I propose that the civil law recognize marriage contracts as they are celebrated and approved of by the different churches. This is entirely in favor of the free existence of all the churches that have been admitted in this country. It is also favorable to all the churches admitted by law, not only in one Province, but in every Province of this Dominion. If we take the Bill as it has been reported by the Committee of the House, we find it a most incomplete Bill. Under it a widow will not be allowed to marry with the brother of her late husband. If I were to go into details, I would probably find many other particulars in which the Bill is incomplete, and most probably every year we will have to come before this House and ask for further legislation on those religious questions, which are always difficult subjects to discuss. Religious questions should be always treated by the clergy of the different denominations, by those who have devoted their lives to the study and practice of the laws of the different churches. To bring these questions very often before this House would be only a loss of time. When under the law the divers religions in our country are free and receive the protection of the law, why should we not receive as law in the civil part which we have to administer, the laws which the divers religions enact themselves after mature study and experience in their churches. The amendment I propose says to the Protestant Church of any denomination: "What you do is right;" and it says the same thing to the Catholic Church. It does not interfere with the Confederation Act or with the celebration of marriage with which the Local Legislature has to deal.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain whether this Bill would apply to the Mormon Church?

Mr. AMYOT. I am happy to reply that the Mormon Church is not accepted by the law in this country, and I hope it never will be; so it is not necessary to consider that point.

Mr. PLUMB. I would like to ask whether by this amendment any marriage celebrated by a competent clergyman would be legal? Suppose a marriage was bigamous, performed by a competent clergyman, it would be made legal.

Mr. AMYOT. The marriage must be performed on a competent religious authority recognized by the State; if

Mr. AMYOT.

not so recognized it would not be legal. We have complete laws on the point. Marriages to be legal, must be celebrated by competent religious authorities, or such as are recognized by the law. But the law of certain Provinces prevents certain marriages that are allowed by certain churches.

Mr. PLUMB. I enquired whether a competent authority having celebrated a bigamous marriage that marriage would hold good. A clergyman may be called upon to marry a man and woman, the man being already married, and this resolution would make such a marriage valid.

Mr. AMYOT. There would be no marriage in such a case.

Mr. PLUMB. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. If this amendment is carried, it will transfer the legislative power of this House as regards marriage to the various religious bodies of the country. Any church would be able to decide what the affinities and conditions of marriage should be, and marriages might take place, no matter how inconsistent with the views of this Legislature, and yet be valid. And further, as the member for Niagara has said, if persons misrepresented their relations in social conditions to a clergyman empowered by this amendment to celebrate marriage, if he went through the marriage ceremony the marriage would be valid.

Mr. GIROUARD. I shall vote against this amendment for the reason that we have no jurisdiction on the point. The amendment provides that every marriage celebrated by a competent religious authority shall be valid. What about a marriage celebrated by a Justice of the Peace, as permitted in some of the Provinces? We have no jurisdiction in regard to the celebration of marriage. To-morrow, our Provincial Legislatures may pass a law permitting civil marriages, if not in Quebec, at least, in some other Province; for that reason I will vote against the amendment, because I believe we have no power in the subject-matter.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mills.)

THE EDISON ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY.

House resumed the consideration of Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada, as amended in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I gave notice that on the third reading of the Bill I would move an amendment, which I now present. This amendment is not designed, in the slightest degree, to interfere with the operations of the Company, but I think it is important in the public interest. It refers to a provision in the Bill. It renders it impossible for the Company, even with the consent of the municipal authorities, to put up poles on which they shall carry the electric wires on the same side of the street upon which there shall at present be poles with telegraph or telephone wires. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who had charge of the Bill, stated there was no report, that the scientific persons with whom he had communicated and who appeared before the Committee, said there was no difficulty whatever, that no injury would result to the telegraph or telephone

companies. Besides which he has introduced another safeguard, providing that the wires carried over-head or along the streets shall be entirely insulated. Of course telegraph and telephone companies, would not like any more wires in the streets at all, and it is at the instance of these companies that this provision has been put in. Now, what is going to be the practical result of this provision? We all know that in all the principal streets of all our towns there are wires at present along one side of the street, poles and wires of telegraph and telephone companies—in some cases I believe, on both sides of the street, and in that case you cannot have the light in any of the streets at all. If they be only on one side of the streets, in order to have the Edison light, you must have the poles and wires carried along both sides of the street, which in the first place, extremely disfigures the streets, and in the second place it is an appreciable element of danger and difficulty in case of fire, both in respect to the placing of the hose and ladders and also in the operations of the firemen. That has been stated by those who have had practical experience. Now, on the score of public convenience it seems to me an unfortunate thing that we should make a parliamentary prohibition preventing any poles from being put up on the same side on which telegraph or telephone poles now exist, and thus requiring, as the only condition upon which, through all the central part of our towns and cities, the Edison light can be enjoyed, that poles should be put up on both sides of the street, and in those cases in which poles at present exist for the use of telegraph and telephone companies on both sides of the street, absolutely precluding the use of the electric light, at any rate by means of poles and wires. For these reasons I think no sufficient reason has been given for the demand made by the telegraph and telephone companies, that the public inconvenience to which I was referring, should be suffered and the public unsightliness should be created; and I move that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the third clause by striking out the proviso, "that no electric wire on poles shall be carried along the same side of streets as any existing telegraph and telephone wires or poles, without consulting the telegraph or telephone companies respectively."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amendment that was proposed here and carried the other day was, as the hon. gentleman has correctly stated, at the suggestion of the telegraph companies, and perhaps of the telephone companies also. I must say that there is a good deal of force in which the hon. the leader of the Opposition has just said about the fact, in certain streets there are telegraph poles on both sides of the streets, and that consequently, under the provision put into the Bill the other day, the electric light could not be introduced in those streets. By removing this proviso the position of these poles would be left to the municipal authorities to decide. It would be for them to say whether, under the circumstances, these poles should be put on the same side, or whether there would be danger in case of fire, and in that case the poles might be put on the other side of the street, perhaps carried into another street, and thus secure the advantages of the electric light, or the wire might even be carried under ground. I do not say there can be any objection to the amendment of the hon. gentleman, and for my part I shall support it.

Bill amended, read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF PATENT.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 104) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Dickenson Brunton.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That is a Bill that should be explained before going further.

Mr. RYAN. The object of the Bill is simply to confer on the Commissioner of Patents power to extend a certain patent, held by John Dickenson Brunton, on machinery or apparatus for cutting, dressing, planing, turning and shaping stone. Mr. Brunton is a Civil Engineer residing in Kentish Town, in the county of Middlesex, England. He was elected domicile at the city of Montreal, Dominion of Canada. Under Letters Patent, dated 3rd March, 1876, he was granted a patent for an invention, by the name of "Brunton's improvements in machinery for cutting, dressing, planing, turning and shaping stone." The invention was in operation within two years from the date of the patent, at St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick, and has been continuously worked in compliance with the condition of the patent, up to the present time. The patentee has devoted much time and money in perfecting the invention. In the year 1880 he received from his patent agent a statement which professed to inform him that his patent was a complete patent, and that no further act on his part was required for keeping it valid and in full force in Canada during the full term thereof, as he confidently understood, for the period of fifteen years, and not renewable at the expiration of five years of its existence. On the 13th of February, ultimo, the patentee, for the first time, saw the patent in the office of his patent solicitor, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, and accidentally discovered that in accordance with the 17th section of the Patent Act, it was required at the expiration of the first five years to be renewed, which term of five years had expired on the 3rd of the preceding month of March. The patentee will therefore be deprived of all advantages to accrue to him, unless by Parliament, power is given to the Commissioner to extend his patent as though it had been done in accordance with the 17th section of the Patent Act. The patentee, on making the discovery of the inadvertent omission, without loss of time gave the requisite instructions for an application to the Parliament of Canada for such relief as would render his patent valid.

Mr. BLAKE. I have read the Bill, and I contend that Mr. John Dickenson Brunton has not shown good cause for the present enactment. It would appear that that gentleman obtained a patent, but that he never read the Patent Act, or the patent itself, and he supposed that he had obtained it for fifteen years, when it was only for five or ten years. We have had this subject before us several times for the last year or two, and a few Sessions ago a proposition was made to give the Commissioner power to extend these patents in a certain number of cases, but it was found impossible to overcome the objection of interfering with the law by granting this extension of powers unless the party applied within a reasonably prescribed time. Many of these cases are no doubt very hard. We have heard of cases where persons holding patents had instructed their agent to apply, but the agent had by some mistake neglected his duty, or a mail was delayed, and we were obliged to say in such cases that the party must have recourse against his agent for neglecting his duty, but that they could not come to Parliament, because, if the door were once opened for such cases the law would be always evaded. What we have done in one Session we will be asked to do in the next Session, and there will be a great many more cases than there were at first. Every one of us who has sat here for any length of time knows that in any case where we have passed a bad Act or granted an exceptional indulgence it is quoted time and again, and always as a precedent for doing something worse and opening the door wider. Therefore, as we have heretofore refused to grant relief in cases which certainly appeal to our sympathies, I do not think we would be justified in granting the prayer of John Dickenson Brun-

ton, whose case certainly does not appeal very much to our sympathies, and still less to our following what is the whole-sale rule of law. I move, in amendment, that the Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Last Session an amendment was introduced to the Act to give the Commissioner of Patents the power of extending the time in certain cases which it might be considered to require that extension. As a member of this House, I did all I could to prevent the passage of that Act, and it never went further than its second reading. But when a special case of this kind is brought before the House, it seems to me that we ought to take the ordinary course of allowing an opportunity to prove the preamble before the Committee on Private Bills. We cannot possibly go into the evidence here, as to the propriety of granting the extension asked by the Bill, and, I think, it would be exceedingly unfortunate if, in a case like this, where there is a fact to be ascertained, we should reject the Bill on its second reading. I have no hesitation in saying that, as the Bill stands to-day, I would vote against it on the third reading.

Mr. SCRIVER. If we allow this Bill to go to a second reading, we shall reverse what has been the invariable practice of the House in the past. Several years ago, I introduced a similar Bill, and pleaded for it as strongly as I could, and offered, I think, better reasons on its behalf than the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Ryan); yet the House refused, by almost a unanimous vote, to allow it to go to a second reading, and, I think, that was not the first instance in which the House took the same action.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think no case has occurred in the last ten years in which a Bill was allowed to pass, having for its object the violation of the law, and it would be a most unfortunate thing for the House to allow this Bill to go to a second reading. There is nothing whatever in it to call for our sympathies or to justify a violation of the law by the House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The case referred to by the hon. leader of the Opposition was still stronger than he presented it. The letter was registered and mailed in time to reach Ottawa and save the patent; but the connection at Montreal was not made and the letter arrived here after four o'clock, and as registered letters were not delivered after that time, it did not reach the Department till the next morning, when it was too late.

Mr. McCUAIG. In my case the patentee sent the necessary papers for a renewal to me early in the Session of 1879, and I unfortunately put them in my desk, where they lay for twenty-four hours beyond the time, when I called at the patent office only to meet a refusal to renew the patent. I think the case mentioned by the hon. Finance Minister is the strongest possible reason why this Bill should pass. I shall certainly vote with great pleasure for this Bill, and I hope it will give power to the Minister to grant relief in such cases as those mentioned.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I introduced the Bill last year, and I felt at the time that there was very great hardship suffered. Not that I believed in the general principle; but the law was a new law, and was not understood by the people, and I proposed to remedy the difficulty. The present case is, however, different, and there is always difficulty when legislation of this kind takes place. I would ask my hon. friend what notice has been given of this Bill, to enable parties in Canada interested in it to know of its provisions.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman must know that it passed the Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I understand that there was no notice, and that the rule was dispensed with for the purpose

Mr. BLAKE.

of allowing this Bill to be brought in. There may be fifty interests affected by this Bill, and the people have received no notice of it. While I would like to remedy all the cases that arise through ignorance, this man ought to have known when his patent ran out. I feel, under the circumstances, that the proper thing to do is to reject the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have just learned from the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee that the rule was suspended in this case. If so, that alters my opinion altogether. It is one of those cases in which the rule ought not to have been suspended.

Amendment, six months' hoist, agreed to.

FELLOWS' MEDICAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Mr. GAULT moved the second reading of Bill (No. 105), to amend the Charter of the Fellows' Medical Manufacturing Company.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not propose to object to the second reading of this Bill, but I think it is very objectionable, and it is well that the attention of the House should be called to it. The Bill has reference to a company incorporated by letters patent under the Canada Joint Stock Letters Patent Act, and it declares:

"That it is expedient that such capital should be proportionately represented on the Board of Directors of the Company, which it cannot be under the provisions of the said letters patent; and have prayed that they may be relieved from the restriction created by the said Act, as to the nationality and residence of the major part of their directors; and whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition."

The enacting clause is as follows:—

"It shall not be necessary hereafter that the major part of the Directors of the Fellows' Medical Manufacturing Company shall be persons resident in Canada, or subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization: Provided always, that the member of the Board who shall exercise the chief executive authority of the said Company in Canada, shall be a subject of Her Majesty, and shall reside within the Dominion."

Now, you pass a general Act in which you dispense with, rightly or wrongly, as your policy that the major part of the directors of companies incorporated under that Act shall be subjects of Her Majesty, and resident in Canada. Is that sound, or is it not? If it is sound, why should the Fellows' Medical Manufacturing Company be exempted from it? If it is not sound, why should it be continued in the general law? The way to remedy this, if it be wrong, is to alter the Joint Stock Letters Patent Act, and allow all companies to be incorporated without that restriction; but so long as you retain a General Act on the Statute-book by which you declare that these companies shall be subject to this restriction, it is certainly improper to grant exemption from that restriction without a cause. It may be said that there is no rule without an exception, and it is fit to deal with an exception, although there may be a rule; but there are no reasons given for this legislation, no special circumstances connected with the Fellows' Manufacturing Company, which is an existing corporation under the Joint Stock Companies' Act, why it should be excepted from the general rule. For these reasons I think the measure is one which is calculated to produce confusion, and I am strongly of the opinion that the efficiency of our Joint Stock Company's Act is dependent mainly upon our adhering strictly to its regulations. Modify them where they are found to be wrong; if experience convinces us that we have passed a law which is, in some respects, effective, let us change it and make it adapted to the circumstances of the country and available for the incorporation of various companies, but let all companies that come under it have no special authority which their neighbors and competitors have not got, but let them derive their authority from the general Act and not from private Acts of Parliament. We know that Private Bills contain most objectionable clauses and most extravagant powers; that is

the system of Private Bill legislation in contra-distinction to that of the general Act. It is because I believe the latter system is prejudicial to the public interest, and that the efficiency of the Joint Stock Act is dependent largely on our paying strict regard to its provisions, that I have thought proper to make these observations.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I am satisfied that the hon. member for West Durham is entirely wrong in his contention. No doubt we have a general law, but that is no reason why a company which is incorporated under the general Act should not come before the House with a Private Bill, and ask hon. members to consider whether they should not receive greater powers.

Mr. GAULT. I hope the Bill will be allowed to go to a second reading. A point had already been considered in regard to the election of directors, the majority of the stock being now held by foreigners, and, therefore, there can be no objection to the Bill going to the second reading, and being referred to the Private Bills Committee.

Bill read the second time.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

House resumed consideration of Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Amendment (Mr. Amyot) negatived on a division.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH moved that the amendment be not now considered, but that it be considered this day six months.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Amyot, | Daly, | McQuade, |
| Blake, | Elliott, | Montplaisir, |
| Boulton, | Farrow, | Mousseau, |
| Bourbeau, | Fiset, | Olivier, |
| Brecken, | Hackett, | Quimet, |
| Brooks, | Kirkpatrick, | Patterson (Essex), |
| Bunting, | Langevin, | Pope (Compton), |
| Caron, | Lantier, | Smith, |
| Charlton, | McDonald (C. Breton), | Thompson, |
| Cimon (Charlevoix), | McDonald (Vic. N.S.), | Tyrwhitt, |
| Cimon (Chicoutimi), | MacDonnell (Inv'ness), | Weldon, and |
| Coughlin, | McQuaig, | Yeo.—36. |

NAYS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Arkell, | Geoffrion, | Mongenis, |
| Bain, | Gigault, | Muttart, |
| Beaty, | Gillies, | Ogden, |
| Beauchesne, | Gillmor, | Orton, |
| Bécharde, | Girouard (Jac. Cartier), | Pickard, |
| Benoit, | Grandbois, | Pinsonneault, |
| Bergeron, | Guillet, | Platt, |
| Bill, | Gunn, | Poupore, |
| Bolduc, | Guthrie, | Reid, |
| Bourassa, | Haddow, | Richey, |
| Bowell, | Hay, | Rinfret, |
| Brown, | Hesson, | Robertson (Hamilton), |
| Bunster, | Holton, | Robertson (Shelburne), |
| Burpee (Sunbury), | Hooper, | Rogers, |
| Cameron (Huron), | Houde, | Ross (Dundas), |
| Cameron (Victoria), | Hurteau, | Ross (Middlesex), |
| Carling, | Irvine, | Rouleau, |
| Cartwright, | Ives, | Routhier, |
| Casgrain, | Killam, | Royal, |
| Cockburn, | Kilvert, | Ryan (Marquette), |
| Colby, | King, | Ryan (Montreal), |
| Costigan, | Kranz, | Rymal, |
| Coupal, | Landry, | Seriver, |
| Coursol, | Lane, | Skirner, |
| Currier, | Longley, | Snowball, |
| Cuthbert, | Macdonald (Kings), | Sproule, |
| Desaulniers, | Mackenzie, | Strange, |
| Desjardins, | Macmillan, | Sutherland, |
| Doull, | McCallum, | Tellier, |
| Drew, | McCarthy, | Tilley, |
| Dugas, | McDougald, | Trow, |
| Dumont, | McLennan, | Wade, |

Ferguson,
Fitzsimmons,
Fleming,
Fortin,
Fulton,
Gault,

McRory,
Malouin,
Manson,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,

Wallace (Norfolk),
Wheler,
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings), and
Wiser.—113.

Mr. STRANGE. I think it very unfortunate that this Bill should have been altered from what it was in 1878. It now makes no mention of the marriage between a woman and the brother of her deceased husband. I cannot find any objection to such marriage. I move, therefore, that the amendments to the Bill be not now considered, but that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to strike out all the words after "deceased wife," and substitute the following: "And between the woman and the brother of her deceased husband are hereby repealed, and such marriages are hereby declared legal and valid."

Mr. GIROUARD. I agree with the principle of the amendment, but that portion of the Bill of 1880 was left out to meet the views of some members of the Senate. For that reason it is important, if we wish the Bill to pass the other House, that the amendment of my hon. friend should not be accepted.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot quite agree with the view of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I voted for the amendment to strike out that clause the last time, but I cannot agree that we ought to pass the Bill precisely in the form in which it is acceptable to the Senate. The Senate can alter the Bill to please themselves and send it back to us; but to tell us that we must pass the Bill in a form we do not approve of or they will throw it out, is to tell us what I do not think is correct. I intend, at all events, to vote against the amendment, because I think the Bill, though a bad one as it stands, is better than if amended in the direction proposed.

Amendment (Mr. Strange) negatived on a division.

Mr. McCUAIG. I am opposed to this Bill altogether. It is contrary to the law of the Empire. Under the English law, two British subjects, if they leave for the United States or Canada, or any part of the world, for the purpose of evading the law of England on this question, the issue of that marriage is considered in England illegitimate, and cannot inherit title or property. I think, as we are a dependency of that Empire, our laws should be made to meet theirs. No man has a right to marry his deceased wife's sister when he knows very well that in the Empire itself the children of that union are illegitimate. The law is so particular that, although a person may marry in the United States, the issue of that marriage is considered in England illegitimate, as far as inheritance is concerned, and I think no man has a right to place that stigma on his children. I move that the Bill, as amended, be not now taken into consideration, but be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House, for the purpose of amending the same by adding the following proviso:—

"Provided that no clergyman or minister of the Gospel, authorized by law to perform the ceremony of marriage, shall be obliged to perform such ceremony if the woman is the sister of the former wife of the man to whom she desires to be married."

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest that the hon. member for Prince Edward get married to the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. gentleman speaks of the law of the Empire. There is no such law in existence. He speaks as if this were a new question, when he ought to know this marriage is legal in the Australian colonies, that opinions are almost equally divided in England on the question, and that an overwhelming majority of our people are in favor of removing the unjust restrictions now existing; and the remarks he made are not complimentary to hundreds of thousands of people in England who have contracted such marriages and who are as respectable as any members

of this House. The motion is absurd as well as wrong. We have no business whatever to direct a minister what to do or to prescribe the duties of clergymen. That rests entirely with the Local Legislatures. The motion is entirely out of order in proposing to do what the Act of Union declares we have no right to do.

Mr. McCUAIG. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that it is not the law in England, that if a man contracts such a marriage in the colonies, the issue is considered illegitimate as far as inheritance is concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Amendment (Mr. McCuaig) negatived on a division, and the main motion agreed to.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. AMYOT moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be declared the Federal Parliament has no jurisdiction to legislate on this question, but that the terms and intention of the Federal Act gave that right exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures. He said: I am in a position to prove that my motion is directly conformable to the law, and that the law has been so interpreted by the highest authorities of the country. In such an important question which excites so much public opinion, we are called upon to give a vote that will form a precedent at the beginning of Confederation, for we are still at the beginning of Confederation, that every one should know exactly the meaning of his vote. In the debates on Confederation what do I see? That on the second day a member who has retired from political life, leaving behind him, however, an excellent name—I mean the Hon. Mr. Dorion—asked the following question, as reported in the Debates on Confederation, page 267—and he was a gentleman who did not often change his mind, and I am sure that were he still with us, he would speak as he did on that occasion. He enquired:

"But what is meant by the regulation of the marriage question? Is the General Government to be at liberty to set aside all that we have been in the habit of doing in Lower Canada in this respect? Will the General Government have the power to determine the degree of relationship and the age beyond which parties may marry, as well as the consent which may be required to make a marriage valid? Will all these questions be left to the General Government? If so, it will have the power to upset one of the most important portions of our civil code, and one affecting more than any other all classes of society," etc.

The speaker went on to establish that it would be bad legislation to give that power to the Central or Federal Parliament. Now, an answer was given by the then existing Government, by those whom we justly call the Fathers of Confederation, and what was the answer and the reason why the law was framed in the existing terms? It reads as follows:—

"The hon. gentleman has asked the Government what meaning was to be attached to the word 'marriage' where it occurred in the Constitution. He desired to know whether the Government proposed to leave to the Central Government the right of deciding at what age, for example, marriage might be contracted. I will now answer the hon. gentleman as categorically as possible, for I am anxious to be understood not only in this House, but also by all those who may hereafter read the report of our proceedings. And, first of all, I will prove that civil rights form part of those which, by Article 43 (paragraph 15) of the resolutions, are guaranteed to Lower Canada. This paragraph reads as follows:—'15. Property and civil rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament.'"

Then the speaker goes on to explain his meaning, which any hon. gentleman may read at page 388 of the Debates, but I will only read his conclusion:

"So that the word 'marriage,' placed where it is among the powers of the Central Parliament, has not the extended signification which was sought to be given to it by the hon. member. With the view of being more explicit, I now propose to read how the word marriage is proposed to be understood:

"The word marriage has been placed in the draft of the proposed Constitution to invest the Federal Parliament with the right of

Mr. MACKENZIE.

declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rites of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong."

"There is something still more explicit on this point of great importance. He goes on to say that we should be thankful to them for the great care we have taken not to expose that important act of our lives to improper interference. I invite the attention of hon. members to these remarks:

"The whole may be summed up as follows:—The Central Parliament may decide that any marriage contracted in Upper Canada, or in any other of the Confederated Provinces, in accordance with the laws of the country in which it was contracted, although that law might be different from ours, should be deemed valid in Lower Canada in case the parties should come to reside there, and *vice versa*."

Some hon. members pretended that the clause was not necessary, while others argued that it was. The Speaker (Solicitor-General Langevin) thus replied on this point:

"It means that a marriage contracted in no matter what part of the Confederacy, will be valid in Lower Canada, if contracted according to the laws of the country in which it takes place; but also, when a marriage is contracted in any Province contrary to its laws, although in conformity with the laws of another Province, it will not be considered valid."

That was the existing law on this subject, and if there is anything plainer I would like to know it. But it will be said the question has already come before this House, and that the House seems to have declared that the Constitution should be interpreted otherwise. But since the question came before this House, the highest tribunal of the Empire, the Privy Council, has been called upon to decide an analagous question, and I will read its decision, as published in the *Globe* of 21st December last. The question was as to the power of the Provincial Legislatures to regulate insurance policies. In the celebrated case their lordships laid down the rights of the Local Legislatures on that point in the following language:

"Take as one instance the subject: Marriage and divorce contained in the enumeration of subjects in section 91. It is evident that solemnization of marriage would come within this general exemption; yet, 'solemnization of marriage in that Province' is enumerated among the classes of subjects in section 92, and no one can doubt, notwithstanding the general language of section 91, that this subject is still within the exclusive authority of the Legislatures of the Provinces."

I have quoted from the law and the words of its framers, recalling the solemn promise that was then given to the country by the father of Confederation—in order to establish that the meaning of the paragraph on marriage was not the giving of jurisdiction to this Parliament in regard to the act of marriage itself, or its conditions, but it was only intended to give the right to parties married in Lower Canada, or in any other Province, under a law different from that of the Province of Quebec, a right to be regarded in Quebec as legally married. We have the solemn promise of the old Canadian Legislature that such would be the law, and we have now the solemn interpretation of the highest tribunal on the same side. Under these circumstances should we be justified in passing a law in a contrary direction? Would we be justified in voting a law that would infringe upon the right of the Local Legislatures? Would it be reasonable, for instance, for the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to impose a law on the Province of Ontario? The Act of Confederation has secured to the majority of each Province the exclusive right to settle these questions. What would be the consequence, after the wrong we have received from the Privy Council? Our law would be declared to be unconstitutional, and 206 legislators would be declared by that Court to know nothing about their jurisdiction. I do not say whether the Bill itself is good or bad. But I say that if he consented to the Confederation Act, it was with the express understanding that these subjects would be left to the Local Legislatures. More than that, I think such is the interpretation given by the Courts to-day. Under these circumstances I make this

motion, that the law be declared unconstitutional, so that the Confederation Act may not be broken, and that the unity of Confederation may not be broken by such a law.

Mr. McCUAIG. The hon. member for Lambton contradicted the statement I made a little while ago. I have the *Law Journal* of Canada, containing the opinion of Mr. Todd, who is considered as good an authority on such matters as the hon. member for Lambton. Mr. Todd says:

"Whatever the effect of a Colonial law may be within a Colonial jurisdiction, I believe it to be at least most doubtful whether a marriage wanting in these conditions can be made valid in England by any Colonial law; and if this be not the case, if the validity of such marriages and divorces is confined at most to the Colony in which they take place, the greatest embarrassment might result from the prevalence of different laws in different parts of the Empire. Marriages legally contracted in one Colony would be inoperative, for all legal purposes, in another. Children legitimate in one part of the Empire might in another find themselves incapable of inheriting their parents' property anywhere else."

I stated that if this law passes, even the children of such marriages will be considered illegitimate in England, and that is confirmed by Mr. Todd.

Mr. BUNSTER. I would like the hon. members of this House to proceed to business instead of losing our time at this season of the year. We are trifling with the time that belongs to the people in discussing a Bill like this which, in my opinion, has no right to be here. The hon. member for Lambton threw considerable light on it. He said it was a matter for the Local Legislatures to deal with.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said the mode of the solemnization of marriages belonged to the Local Legislatures and not to this Parliament.

Mr. BUNSTER. I stand corrected, I was not taking any notes. In the various Provinces we have different laws on marriage, and the different churches regulate the laws of marriage better than we can.

Mr. GIROUARD. I wish to say one word as to the decision of the Privy Council. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not read the report as it is to be found in the *Law Report*. I have the *Legal News* of January, 1882, and here is what I find with reference to the jurisdiction of this Parliament on the subject of marriage:

"Take as one instance the subject of 'marriage and divorce,' contained in the enumeration of subjects in section 91, it is evident that solemnization of marriage would come within this general description; yet 'solemnization of marriages in the Provinces' is enumerated among the classes of subjects in section 92, and no one can doubt, notwithstanding the general language of section 91, that this subject is still within the exclusive authority of the Provinces."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member behind me is in conformity with the declarations which I made in Parliament fifteen years ago on behalf of the Government to which I belong. Those declarations were made in precisely the same sense, although not in the same words. We did not consider then that in placing the words "marriage" and "divorce" among the attributes of the legislation of the Federal Parliament, that we were giving that Parliament the right to determine what were to be the conditions of celebration of marriage, any more than the other conditions mentioned in the debate which took place at the time; but we were of opinion, and it was the intention of the then Government and Parliament, as well as that of the legislators and others busying themselves with the question in London, that the word "marriage" should be inserted merely to determine that a marriage contracted in a Province according to its laws, should be considered as valid in other parts of the country. Such was the only qualification we gave the word "marriage." Now, according to what has just been read by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), the highest tribunal of the Empire seems to agree with that opinion and endorse what I said on behalf of the Government fifteen years ago,

in 1867, when the measure came before Parliament. I did not think it was necessary to make this declaration to-day, as the present Bill—towards which I am, nevertheless, opposed—does not contain any declaration to the contrary; but since the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has made a motion in conformity with the declarations made by the Government in 1867, I will vote for the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. In the debates on the Confederation Act there was a declaration made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works with reference to the meaning of the word marriage. The hon. gentleman read a written statement of what the meaning of the word was, but he enlarged upon and expanded his view of the meaning of that statement. The written statement, I presume, was made on behalf of the Government, and the oral argument with which he embellished it, as he always does every subject he touches, was his own meaning of the written statement. I have always regarded that exposition to be rather more authoritative than the written statement. I observed that when the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) was making his statement, that his views appeared to be familiar to me, and the most of them appeared to be in an article from *Le Canada* of the 22nd of March. I see an extract in that from the hon. gentleman's speech. I observe that the written statement that the hon. gentleman made of what the word marriage meant, is this:

"Le mot mariage a été placé dans la rédaction du projet de constitution pour attribuer à la législature fédérale le droit de déclarer quels seront les mariages qui devront être considérés comme valide dans toute l'étendue de la confédération, sans toucher pour cela le moins du monde aux dogmes ni aux rites des religions aux quelles appartiennent les parties contractantes."

Now, Sir, that statement is susceptible, perhaps, of bearing the exposition of the hon. gentleman, but it does not necessarily bear it. He says the word marriage was placed there to give the Federal Legislature the right to declare what should be the marriages which should be considered valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederation. The hon. gentleman to-night has said, and called our attention to the fact, that the words "marriage" and "divorce" appear together. These are two subjects given at once in the same breath, and as part of the same section, to the Federal Parliament. Now, does he mean to say that the word divorce, where it is there put, means only that it shall be an attribute of the Federal Parliament to divorce; that a divorce legally effected, under local laws in any Province, shall or shall not be valid throughout the rest of the Dominion; or that it means that the whole law of divorce shall be vested in the Federal Parliament? It obviously must mean the latter. It cannot but be that the law of divorce, and by parity of reasoning the law of marriage, save and except that portion which involves the solemnization of the marriage itself, have been expressly inserted as belonging exclusively to the Federal Parliament. When you find marriage given to the Federal Legislature, and when you find the solemnization given to a Local Legislature, you have in the strongest way declared that all that was to be given to the Local and taken away from the Federal was the solemnization of marriage. There has been this subject of discussion, and the law officers of the Crown, at an early period, were asked by the then hon. leader of the Government to advise as to whether, with reference to the Confederation Act, it was not an attribute of the Federal Government or Parliament to deal with the question of licenses in connection with the solemnization of marriages. They decided, and I think rightly, that that power properly fell within the Local Legislatures, because it was in point of fact part of the solemnization of marriage; but to go further and say that the whole law of marriage is with each Local Legislature, subject only to this exception, that the Federal Parliament has a right to declare that a marriage valid according to the law of the Local Legislature shall be

valid through the whole extent of the Dominion, is not, in my opinion, to interpret in any proper sense our Constitution, but is to give it a meaning which cannot fairly be drawn from it. I maintain that we have the right clearly to determine between what parties it shall be legal to contract marriage and between what parties it shall not be legal, and to determine all that for every Province of this Dominion, but to determine how a marriage between persons who can lawfully contract it under our laws shall be solemnized, it is not within our power to adjudge. That is disposed of by the Local Legislature, and therefore, I think the motion of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Aymot), is not only unnecessary, but is a misinterpretation of the true meaning and construction of our Constitution, and I shall certainly vote against it.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, the motion such as presented by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) embodies, in my opinion, two things: first, a declaration that the Federal Parliament has not the right to legislate on the necessary qualifications for marriage; secondly, that the necessary legislation to determine the required qualifications for marriage, has been left, according to the terms and the intention of the Federal Act, exclusively to Provincial Legislatures. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the motion of the hon. member embodied simply the first declaration, our duty would probably be to vote in its favor, but if the hon. member declares by his motion that the Federal Parliament has not the right to legislate as to the necessary qualifications to contract a marriage, I do not see why it should grant to Local Legislatures the right of defining what these qualifications should be. If marriage is a religious contract, I do not see why the Local any more than the Federal Parliament should have the right to legislate on that point. Consequently, if the first proposition is true, the second which is its negative should succumb, and I propose an amendment, seconded by Mr. Desjardins, that all words after the word "marriage" be expunged.

Amendment (Mr. Amyot) negatived on a division.

Mr. STRANGE moved in amendment that all the words after "deceased" be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "and between a woman and the brother of her deceased husband are hereby repealed, and such marriages are hereby declared to be legal and valid."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Fortin,	Mills,
Arnell,	Fulton,	Muttart,
Barnard,	Gillies,	Pickard,
Beauchesne,	Gillmor,	Poupore,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Richey,
Bill,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Haddow,	Rogers,
Bolduc,	Hesson,	Routhier,
Brown,	Irvine,	Ryan (Montreal),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Ives,	Rymal,
Bunster,	Killam,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	King,	Skinner,
Casey,	Longley,	Strange,
Crouter,	Mackenzie,	Tellier,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan,	Trow, and
Elliott,	Merner,	Wheler.—49.
Fleming,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fiset,	Massuc,
Amyot,	Fitzsimmons,	Méthot,
Bain,	Gault,	Mongenais,
Beaty,	Geoffrion,	Montplaisir,
Bécharde,	Gigault,	Mousseau,
Benoit,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Ogden,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Olivier,
Bourbeau,	Gunn,	Orton,

Mr. BLAKE.

Bowell,
Brecken,
Brooks,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Casgrain,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Cockburn,
Colby,
Coughlin,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Doull,
Drew,
Dugas,
Dumont,
Ferguson,

Hay,
Holton,
Hooper,
Houde,
Hurteau,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Macdonald (Kings),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
McDonald (Vic., N.S.),
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McQuade,
McRory,
Malouin,
Manson,

Onimet,
Patterson (Essex),
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Reid,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Middlesex),
Rouleau,
Royal,
Ryan (Marquette),
Sproule,
Thompson,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace (Norfolk),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
Wiser, and
Yeo.—87.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to observe with reference to the discussion which took place a little while ago, that when the Bill on this subject was before the House, in the Session of 1880, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, on an amendment then proposed, which would have left the Bill in this shape: "marriage and a man with the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother, shall be legal," made some observations, in which he said:

"As a Roman Catholic I cannot admit that the Parliament of Canada has a right to legislate on the subject of marriage, pure and simple, which would be an interference with the rights and privileges of my church, which holds marriage to be a Sacrament. * * * I would have preferred to put in this Bill a proviso that any marriage contracted according to the rules and prescriptions of the church or the churches, to which the parties belong, between brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, would be legal; but considering the difficulties that such legislation would lead us into, and the difficulty there would be in determining the functions of the Legislatures and the Parliament on this point, I am ready for my part to vote in favor of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell. I cannot help thinking that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is mistaken, if he says that the matter of dispensations is within the power of the Local Legislature. The Local Legislature has, by the Confederation Act, power to legislate about the solemnization of marriage, and the mode of celebration necessary to render the marriage legal and binding; but nothing to do with regulating as to the parties who shall marry. That, it is admitted, belongs to this Parliament, in the legal sense of the Confederation Act."

Main motion agreed to on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Qu'Appelle Land Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Act incorporating "The Canadian Steam Users' Insurance Association," and to change the name of the said Company to "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada," (from the Senate).—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.—(Mr. Abbott.)

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of any Order in Council, correspondence, reports, instructions, or papers, touching the appointment of a Commissioner in connection with the revision of the Canadian Statutes; and a statement in detail, with dates, of all payments made in connection with such appointment.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the earnings, net and gross, of the Pacific Railway, constructed by the Government, and transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, including the Pembina Branch, in accordance with the agreement; from

the 9th day of April, 1881, to the 1st of March, 1882.—(Sir Albert J. Smith).

Copies of all correspondence and Orders in the case of Captain Glenn, of the 37th Battalion, Haldimand Rifles, during 1879 and 1880.—(Mr. Wallace, York).

Return showing the number and situation of fish-breeding establishments throughout the Dominion; whether situate on Government land or on leaseholds; from whom the property was bought or leased; what price paid for purchase or lease; sums of money expended on each since its establishment and the expense of management; the number of fry from each establishment in each year, and how distributed.—(Mr. Haddow).

Copies of the statement and complaint of Joseph St. Laurent, in relation to the killing of a horse by the cars on the Branch of the Intercolonial Railway at Rimouski; of the report of Mr. Rennie, and evidence thereunto annexed; and of all other documents and correspondence relating to the said accident.—(Mr. Fiset.)

The House adjourned at 10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 23rd March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GRADUATES OF THE MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) to provide for the admission to the profession of Dominion Land Surveyor, of the graduates of the Royal Military College. He said: I desire to say to the House that I have added the word "Royal" to the motion of which notice was given, as the proper name of the institution is The Royal Military College.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. HOUDE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) further to secure the independence of Parliament. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of preventing members of this House, except advisers of Her Majesty, from accepting offices of emolument under the Government of Canada during the Parliament for which they have been elected.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

RETURNS OF RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I wish to direct the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways to a conversation that passed yesterday, as the subject is one of great public consequence. I submitted a motion upon the subject of contracts made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, stating it was but supplementary to a former motion I had made, calling for the return. He suggested some possible difficulty, and I sent for the Statute, but it did not arrive in time to bring it up then. I wish to call his attention to the fact that, in consequence of an arrangement suggested by myself last year, we passed a general law requiring, not merely the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but all railway companies, to make annual returns, which should include, amongst other things, copies of all contracts made by the Company for the construction

of any part of the railway, and also a statement of the proceeds of all the grants of land, so that Parliament has recognized the propriety of this.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. After the informal conversation that took place across the floor of the House yesterday, I looked into the subject myself, and finding that we were empowered to call for these returns, I have called upon the Company to make them.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN. May I be allowed to ask when we are to have the promised Bill relating to the Supreme Court. We have now been waiting for it about six weeks, and, unless we are going to be carried along to June or August, the Government ought to bring forward that measure now. It is a very important measure. I do not see that the Government are taking any steps either one way or the other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Supreme Court Bill is one properly under the charge of the Minister of Justice, and belongs to the other branch of the Legislature. If he has not already introduced the Bill he will in a day or two.

DELAY IN THE RECEPTION OF MAILS.

Mr. FLYNN. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that it has been, this winter, a matter of frequent occurrence for the mails to be detained below Quebec. Previous to this winter the mails came by the Ottawa and St. Lawrence, although we got them late in the day; but this winter they are frequently a day behind. If we enquire at the post office the answer is, no mails from below Quebec. The connection is lost, and they are, at times, compelled to remain over.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Inverness). The members from Nova Scotia find that the mails take a much longer time to be carried from Nova Scotia to Ottawa—I think a full day. I do not know what the cause is, but, at all events since our mails have to come around by Brockville, a good deal of delay has been caused in their transmission. We have certainly been retrograding in regard to the transmission of our mails to and from the seat of Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was not aware of any delay. I will look into the matter, and if there is anything wrong it will be corrected.

Mr. ANGLIN. Perhaps, at the same time, the Postmaster General will give his attention to the delays which have taken place for several weeks past in the arrival of the mails in this city from New Brunswick. These delays take place almost every day, and I think on only three or four occasions since the House opened have they arrived on time. Sometimes the mail which should be delivered in the morning is delivered in the evening, and sometimes not until the following day. Perhaps the Postmaster General will endeavor to get his colleague the hon. Minister of Railways, who is, no doubt, primarily responsible, to look into the matter.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. SNOWBALL. In continuing the debate, I wish to make reference to a few remarks made by the hon. member for West Montreal (Mr. Gault) before the debate closed on Tuesday evening last. From a great many of that hon. gentleman's remarks I have no reason to dissent very

munch, but, like most hon. gentlemen opposite, he could not go entirely through his speech without making some references which we, on this side, cannot be expected to agree with. In closing his speech he thanked the Government on behalf of the mercantile community of Montreal, for the abolition of the Stamp Act. The abolition of this Act, no doubt, is a great benefit to the mercantile community of the Dominion; but the hon. gentleman's version and mine of how it occurred do not quite agree. I wish to read an extract from the *St. John Sun*, of the 13th inst., giving a different account of the proceeding from that related by the hon. gentleman. At a meeting of the St. John Board of Trade:

"The President read a telegram from Hon. Senator Boyd, stating that it was the petition of the St. John Board of Trade which secured the abolition of the Stamp Tax. Mr. Boyd said he knew this when he asked for the petition of the Board, for although Sir John was opposed to the removal of the Stamp Tax, he left it to the decision of Sir Leonard and Sir Leonard had done this for St. John."

Mr. Boyd, you will observe, asked for this petition. I should like to know, under these circumstances, why Montreal should interfere in this matter. Their effort to do so reminds me of a story of a worthy couple called John and Betsy, who lived in the backwoods. John was in the habit of visiting his neighbors in the evening, and getting a little elated, as many worthy people often do, and boasting of his exploits in the past, and of what he would do under certain circumstances—that he would venture upon death very readily, not only for the sake of his country, but, if necessary, for a very much less cause. It happened that this worthy couple having left the door of their house open, a hungry bear entered, and made for the cradle in which was their child. John speedily took up his position on the collar beam, while Betsy seized the axe and despatched the bear. When the bear was safely disposed of, John sallied forth to inform his neighbors of how Betsy and he had killed the bear. After telling it a few times he omitted to mention Betsy's name altogether and boasted of how he had killed the bear. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not care who killed the bear, whether John, from the upper portion of the house, or Betsy from below; what I wish to do is to vindicate the cause of St. John in this matter. We find, Sir, that none but the people of New Brunswick were invited to the funeral, and I think it unkind of the people of Montreal intruding. But to return to the debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take a good deal of pleasure in taunting us by saying that we are not agreed on this question of the so-called National Policy—or rather on the extreme imposition of taxes on this country. I can find no such disagreement among my hon. friends on this side; they think as I do that the whole system is obnoxious. We agree upon every step that should be pursued, and I think when the time comes hon. gentlemen opposite will find us always in line. These hon. gentlemen follow the multitude to do evil; we warn them against this evil. We do not believe in a system of hot-house protection in this country, which may prosper for a time, but is productive of nothing but evil in the end. We might, for example, produce pine apples in this country of a larger growth and better flavor than grow in their native clime, but it does not follow that the enterprise would be generally successful. You can force production in this country, but while in the one case you force it at the expense of a single individual, in the other you are forcing a community unwillingly to embark in an enterprise in which they have no interest. Now, I desire to refer briefly to the speech of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White). In that speech the hon. gentleman made some statements which, I have no doubt, were candid, and based on such information as he possessed; but as I, like him, am engaged in the timber trade, a few remarks from me in regard to those statements may not be out of place. I may say that he views the matter in an entirely different light from what the people of the

Mr. SNOWBALL.

Maritime Provinces view it; it must be remembered that the product of the forest in the section in which he is interested is quite different from the product of the forest in the country I am interested in; the former is almost exclusively pine timber, while the latter is almost exclusively spruce, and while it does not cost any more to bring one to the market than the other, the lumber he speaks of is worth twice as much as ours. Then, again, their market is largely in the neighboring Republic, while ours is almost exclusively in Europe; that being the case, what governs the price of lumber in Canada? Is it not the value of our lumber in Europe, and the value of theirs in the United States? Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that the price of lumber has been advanced by the National Policy? Unless the hon. gentleman can show that we have not to seek a foreign market for our productions of lumber, but have a market for it all at home, it is not possible that the National Policy, or any tax on the materials going into the production of lumber, can enhance the price in the foreign market; it only shows that the materials going into the production cost more on account of that tax, not that we receive more for the lumber that is produced. But the hon. gentleman did state that we had a home market, and in connection with that he made a most extraordinary statement. He told us that they sold, last year, 100,000,000 feet of lumber in Montreal city alone, and 80,000,000 feet in Toronto, for local consumption. Let us see how he is able to sustain that assertion. I suppose there is no record to show clearly what quantity of lumber went into the market of Montreal; therefore the hon. gentleman must have spoken from some figures compiled by himself. Now, I have here the Trade Returns of Great Britain for the year 1881, which, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite will not dispute; and which show the quantity of wood consumed in Great Britain during the year. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not claim that the people in any portion of this Dominion consume more wood per individual than the people of England; as in this country we have many resources to draw upon for our supply, while there they have, comparatively speaking, none but their importations. I find that Great Britain consumed last year 3,321,000,000 superficial feet of lumber, which, divided by the population of 35,000,000, shows the consumption to have been 95 feet per head. Now, multiply the 95 feet per head by 140,747, the population of Montreal, according to the last Census, and according to this calculation the city of Montreal would consume 13,370,000 feet; yet he states that they consumed 100,000,000 feet. Again, there are not so many ways of consuming lumber in Montreal as there are in England. A few weeks ago I visited a clog sole factory in England, the proprietor of which told me that they consumed 15,000 superficial feet of hard wood per day in the manufacture of clog soles and brush backs; and I claim that when I make the allowance of 13,000,000 feet for the city of Montreal, it is about double the quantity actually consumed there. How is it possible that, without any outlet except the ordinary building trade of Montreal, no extensive packing-case trade of importance or other consumption, except the ordinary building trade, which comprises a small proportion of the consumption of lumber in Great Britain that there could possibly be an outlet for 100,000,000 of feet, when it is quite clear that it did not provide any outlet for much over 6,000,000 feet. If that statement made by the hon. gentleman is so very incorrect, that he is 1,000 to 1,500 per cent. out of his reckoning, what reliance can be placed on other statements made by him in regard to other matters dealt with in his speech. He had not the same opportunity of getting so many millions astray, but he was, proportionately, out of the way. If the hon. gentleman made mistakes in regard to pork, beef and oats,

that enter into the production of the lumber trade, with which he should be thoroughly conversant, it was not surprising that he went equally far astray in dealing with other points. The hon. gentleman went on to make quotations to show what lumber would cost in 1878 and 1881, on account of the different values of the products of the farm that entered into the production of lumber in those two years. He told the House that, in 1878, pork was worth \$16 per barrel, and, in 1882, \$21; and gave the National Policy the credit of advancing the prices of pork to the farmers to the extent of \$5 per barrel. Why did not the hon. gentleman take the previous year, 1877, and he would find that pork was \$24 as against \$21, in 1881. Why, if the hon. gentleman was going to make a comparison, he must prove that pork was never higher than \$21 per barrel before the National Policy was introduced; and if pork was dearer before we ever heard of that policy, what had the policy to do with advancing the price? Pork raised in Canada is considered in Europe to be a superior article; it is fed better than that produced in warmer climates. The Canadian pork is supposed to be grain fed, and is worth more for exportation than for home consumption. If so, and we know we have a large exportation of pork, and it is more profitable to ship it to the European market and buy Chicago pork, what has the National Policy to do with the price obtained by our farmers? Nothing whatever. We do not use Canadian fed pork in the lumber woods. I have had considerable experience in the lumber business, and a barrel of Canadian pork never passed through my establishment; it all comes from Chicago and we pay the duty on it. We find American pork more profitable, it is salted longer, and goes further in the work of the woods than pork produced in Canada; besides, Canadian pork is dearer and we use that which is cheaper. The hon. gentleman also referred to flour, oats and other grains. He quotes flour at \$6.25 per barrel during the present year, against \$5.50 in 1878; but if the hon. member will look back to the year 1876, it will be found that flour was \$8 per barrel, and yet we had no National Policy. But the hon. gentleman will say that when flour was \$8 per barrel in 1876—I am not positive of the exact year—we had no flour to sell; but this year we have, thanks to the National Policy. Not one word is said about blessings received from Heaven, no credit is given to God, but it is all given to the National Policy and the hon. gentlemen opposite. Corn enters largely into the production of lumber. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that corn meal, which is so much used, is worth \$3.50 to \$3.75 against \$2.20 last year. Is that due to the National Policy also? The consumers have at all events to pay the 40 cents per barrel which the hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed. The hon. gentleman went on to deal with the question of wages, and detailed the rates in 1878 and 1881. But what has the National Policy to do with it? I would ask the hon. member what induced him to pay the additional wages last year? If he had not given them would the men have found employment in our factories or in industries springing up through the National Policy, or would they not have gone to Michigan and obtained there the higher rate of wages? But the National Policy must remedy everything, according to hon. gentlemen's opinion. I feel sorry to occupy the time of the House in dealing with these trivial matters; but if hon. gentlemen put forward these arguments we are compelled to answer them. The hon. gentleman talks of giving from \$12 to \$20 per month higher wages to certain men. Lumbermen from Michigan came into my mill-yard at Miramichi and took away teamsters, paying them \$35 per month, and advancing money to pay their expenses to Michigan. Did the National Policy compel me to raise my rate of wages? No, but the advance of the price of lumber in the United States, and the demand for men, compelled me to the increase wages in

order to compete. And the same cause also compelled my hon. friend to advance, but he now wishes to give the National Policy the credit. While referring to the question of wages, I had better deal with the whole question. The hon. the Finance Minister on page 12 of his Budget Speech, —and I am going to be very explicit in regard to these references—referred to wages. He said:

“The wages in 135 of the factories out of the 460 remained the same as in 1878.”

The hon. gentleman told the House there were 135 factories employing a large number of men, probably hundreds of men each, at all events, thousands in the aggregate, which had not been paid any increased wages since 1878, although the National Policy has been in force four years. If those 135 factories are paying to-day the same rate of wages as years ago, before we had a National Policy, and when we were told the country was in so depressed a condition that it was necessary to do something desperate to save it, one of two things is evident: either the country was not in the state in which it was represented to be by hon. gentlemen opposite, or, if it was, these manufacturers must have been out of their senses when they paid these rates of wages. Take the other factories in the country. The hon. the Finance Minister tells us the people employed in them are getting an increase of from 5 to 35 per cent. What a paltry increase of 5 per cent.? In the old times to which the hon. the Minister so often alludes, when people were starving, 5 cents might have been of some consequence, but in these days when the wave of prosperity is spreading over the whole world, not only over Canada, but over the United States and Europe as well, such an advance is not what we are entitled to, and we claim the people are not getting the full benefit of that prosperity. Take the rate of wages paid in New Brunswick. In New Brunswick, during all these bad years, and certainly they were bad years and wages were low, owing to the depression that existed all over the world, the people did not starve, as our friends opposite would like to represent. Wages were never as low there as in Ontario or Quebec, nor did the people suffer to the same extent, for they always had employment. Now we find that those engaged in the lumber trade, the principal trade of New Brunswick, are getting an advance of wages from 25 to 100 per cent. over what they got in 1878, they are, however, but little better off, because their increase of wages is not in proportion to what they have to buy. Hon. gentlemen say that farm produce has advanced in price. It has, but not on account of the National Policy. The advance is due to short crops in Europe. Our laborers have therefore to pay more for provisions, and when they come to buy clothes for themselves and families, they feel the weight of the Tariff. When from 25 cents to 50 cents out of every dollar has to be paid into the Exchequer, it is no wonder the people continue to be poor. The policy of the Government has the effect of making the poor poorer and the rich richer, to such an extent that the latter despise the country they live in. We find, as an effect of this policy, that some of those men over whom so much wailing was made in 1873-74, are to-day buying palaces in Europe, where they can revel in their wealth. Is this state of things to be tolerated? This is where the money goes instead of into the pockets of the people for whom this policy was supposed to be made. Are the people in these 135 factories not to get an increase of wages, and is this money to be wrung from them and put to purposes for which it was never intended. When this policy was being discussed last year, the hon. Finance Minister made a very gratifying statement to this House—one certainly for which I was not prepared to grant that importance which he did, but which appeared to give him great pleasure. The hon. Minister told us that, for the first time

in the history of Canada, our exports exceeded our imports to the gratifying amount of \$1,421,000. That was held up to us as one of the first apparent fruits of the National Policy. We were led to suppose that unless our exports exceeded our imports this country could not be prosperous, and to believe that in future, the hon. Finance Minister, in bringing down his budgets, would be able to congratulate the country on annual similar results. This year the hon. gentleman was silent on this matter; and as he did not choose to enlighten us I examined the returns and find that our imports exceeded our exports by over \$7,000,000. Now, if the theory of the hon. Finance Minister be correct—that unless our exports exceed our imports we are not prosperous, where must we be going to now? Are we again on the road to ruin? And must the hon. gentleman put on the brakes again, and give us another National Policy? I am not, however, so alarmed as the hon. gentleman was on this point, for I find that other countries that have prospered, and continue to prosper, import more than they export. The time will come when Canada's exports will exceed her imports, and that will be when she will begin paying off her liabilities. While our imports have increased so rapidly last year, the Mother Country, which, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, will go to ruin unless she adopts our policy, exhibits a return just the reverse. Great Britain imported last year \$80,000,000 worth of goods less than the previous year, while we are on the opposite track, our imports increased \$19,000,000. A good deal was said by hon. gentlemen opposite last year about England adopting a policy of Protection. I have no fear on that point. The advocates of that policy found the word "Protection" was obnoxious to British ears, and used instead the term "Fair trade." What do we hear of fair trade to-day? The cry is silenced, and while I maintain that it never had any hold on any considerable portion on the people of England, I hold that such a movement hardly exists at present. England does not want any fairer trade than she has got, or any protective policy. Her exports increased last year and her imports decreased under her policy of Free Trade. We find England prospering beyond anything that we in Canada are enjoying, we may ask why she is prospering so much? It is well for us to look into the facts, in discussing this subject of national prosperity, and learn the reason why any nation prospers. A large portion of the prosperity of England to-day is derived from her ship-yards and carrying trade. Not more than three years ago I saw the dock of England filled with steam tonnage unemployed, and was informed by persons generally well informed on such subjects, by cautious, shrewd business men, that there was more steam tonnage in the country than the world could employ, and that England had so largely overbuilt that they feared the consequences would be serious. What do we find to-day? We see trade so increased and flourishing that every one of those vessels is not only employed, but profitably employed, and the ship-yards of England are full to their utmost capacity, with orders sufficient to keep them employed for the next two years. What a contrast with the condition of Canada! While English shipbuilders have orders ahead for two years, the ship-yards of Canada are silent. We maintain that our friends on the Government side have neglected this trade—that they have not built it up or attempted to do so. The hon. Finance Minister representing a maritime city, who should take an interest in everything pertaining to that port, has not only not done anything to foster this industry, but has done all in his power to injure it. We find him telling us that he cannot do anything to assist this or the lumber trade, the latter a business the export of which amount to 73 per cent. of the total exports of his native Province; yet he has repressed that industry by putting a tax on materials that go into the production of lumber, and has done nothing to assist it. Is it possible that

Mr. SNOWBALL.

73 per cent. of the exports of his own Province are to bear such burdens—and what for? To sustain the factories in Ontario and western Quebec. Why should we be thus oppressed? I heard the hon. gentleman himself call the lumber trade a waning industry. If it is waning, so much the more reason why it should be assisted. The hon. gentleman contended that under his policy good would be done to all the working classes; to every person in the Dominion, including the toilers of New Brunswick. He spoke that way in New Brunswick, but did not pretend to have such anxiety about the interests of Ontario and other Provinces. His speech did not smell so strongly of the manufacturing interests of the western portions of the Dominion. His points were all made for the benefit of New Brunswick, whose interests were to be greatly assisted by his policy. We now want some of those benefits that he promised us. We maintain we have got none of them so far, though largely injured by that policy. I was a little struck, I will not say amused, on reading an article in an Ottawa paper a day or two ago, on the subject of a meeting held in London in reference to an International Fishery Exhibition which is contemplated, and at which Sir A. T. Galt informed the Prince of Wales and others in England that Canada at present was too apt to take its direction of thought from the people of England, and that Canadians following, at a distance, English public opinion. We taking direction of thought and following at a distance English public opinion. Well, I think we are following it at a very long distance—at all the distance between Free Trade and Protection—and that is as great a distance as you can get between any two points. He also remarked that in England's commerce is found the secret of her greatness. I maintain he was quite right there, and so in our commerce lay the greatness of Canada previous to this tariff. And in that commerce I expect to see our future greatness, for I expect again to see the day when the wooden ships of Canada will take their place on the ocean in an extended trade. I see no reason why they should not. There are no better ships employed in long ocean voyages, and none in greater favor for certain purposes, and the time will come when our friends on this side of the House will take their seats on the other side, and we shall see how much they can do, both for the shipping and lumbering interests. Some persons, discussing this subject, suppose that the lumber interest needs no protection—that we have got the markets in our own hands—that Europe must have our lumber, and at our own prices. I find from the official returns authentic information which any hon. gentleman may examine, from statistics printed by order of the British Parliament, that Great Britain consumed during the last year, in round numbers, \$70,000,000 worth of lumber. Where did she get that lumber? Of the imports into Great Britain, Canada produced something less than \$19,000,000 worth, or only 27 per cent. of the imports. Now, when we consider the value of some of our woods, our pine, oak, and other woods exported, we can see what a very small proportion of the shipping employed in the wood-carrying trade of England is engaged in the carry-ing trade from Canada. While England is only getting 27 per cent. of her lumber from Canada, whence is she getting the rest? From Norway, Sweden and the north of Russia she obtained \$38,690,000 worth, or 55 per cent. of her imports. Is England then dependent upon us? We have very little of her trade, and still less of the continental trade and little or none of the African, Australian and other business. The trade of Norway and Sweden in lumber extends even to South America. When the whole is computed—I have not the figures on that point—I think you will find that, of the lumber trade of Europe, our contribution does not embrace 10 per cent. of the whole. I think it may be said that, as to the pine of Quebec and Ontario, the dealers have the price, to a large extent, in their

own hands, by means of a limited production, in this way they may, to some extent, control the markets of Europe. But, Sir, when you come to the description of lumber, such as spruce and coarse woods, shipped from the Maritime Provinces, we have no control whatever. A large quantity of such wood comes from the north of Europe, and we have to take such prices as we can get in competition with them. They have every advantage over us. We have the Atlantic ocean between us and our market, and have to pay from 60 to 70 shillings per standard freight, whereas they send theirs in for from 10 to 30 shillings, so there is at once from £2 to £3 against us in the freight alone. In dwelling upon the National Policy, I am not prepared to say that there is no section of this country receiving benefit from it; but if there are sections they are very small ones, and they are not in the Maritime Provinces. What we claim is, that the whole country should not be compelled to suffer to such an extent for the benefit of such a small portion. If you are going to give back to every man just what you take from him, what benefit does he receive in the operation? If you are going to protect certain industries at the expense of the whole population, you make one section of the people support another section. It is just another system of pauperism. It is not encouraging people to rely upon their own resources, but you teach them to believe that all they have to do in time of adversity is to lean upon the Government. Now, I find that the hon. the Minister of Finance sometimes makes extraordinary arguments. In looking over his speech, on the third page of the *Hansard*, I find he tells us what would be our position under certain circumstances. He says:

"If the Mackenzie Government, during their term of office, had collected \$5,491,000, or more than they did collect, it would have amounted to \$1.38 per head. But the Mackenzie Government did not collect that amount, and the people have got the money."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is where the trouble was.

Mr. SNOWBALL. Exactly, they have got the money and the hon. the Finance Minister does not want them to have it. He wants to wring money from the people, whether they like it or not. Good times or bad times, the hon. the Minister of Finance seems determined to have the money, and the people have to suffer. The hon. gentleman not only tells us that, if the Mackenzie Government had done certain things, how much extra they would have taxed the people, but he also tells us that if he, the hon. Finance Minister had not collected a surplus of \$2,589,000, the people would not have paid 65 cents per head which they did however pay. He puts the two together, what they paid under him and what they did not pay under the Mackenzie Administration, and he makes it equal to \$2.03 per head. Of course, if the Mackenzie Government had collected it, the people would have paid it, but that Government was too considerate to burden the people at that time; but the hon. the Minister of Finance was not so considerate, for he collected \$2,500,000, which was not required, and the people had to pay it. But this is just in accordance with the hon. Minister's usual mode of argument. I will trouble the House while I read a few further remarks of the hon. the Minister of Finance. I find on page 9 of the *Hansard* report of his speech, he says:

"I desire to say a few words with reference to the predictions that were made on the opposite side of the House when this policy was introduced. I think, if my memory serves me, that every one of them have failed, and utterly failed."

Well, Sir, that is pretty good; we will see now how they have failed. He goes on to say:

"What were the statements that were made when this policy was introduced? One of them was, that it was calculated to interfere with the trade between the Dominion of Canada and Great Britain, that the policy was one that was in the interest of the United States rather than of Great Britain."

"Time solves many questions, and it has solved that. I have in my hand a statement—I have selected the year 1877 because the imports for consumption are nearer in that year to that of 1881 than that of any other year I could find under the old Tariff—from which I find that the gross imports for consumption in 1876-77 were \$97,300,483."

Well, Sir, on this side of the House, we say just the same thing still, that our predictions have not utterly failed, and I will go on to show, by-and-bye, how they have not failed. Then the hon. gentleman goes on with apparent though not real honesty to take the amount of grain that was exported from this sum, because hon. gentlemen on this side of the House objected to its being included, he deducts that, and then goes on to tell us that the imports from the United States during the year 1877 were 51 per cent. of the total imports, while the imports from England were only 43 per cent. Then further on he proceeds to show the superiority of their policy, what it had done for the country, that the imports from Great Britain in the past year were 48 per cent. while the imports from the United States were only 40 per cent. Now, there was a decrease under his policy in imports from the United States of 11 per cent. while the imports from England had increased 5 per cent. Now, what is the actual state of affairs? The hon. gentleman, with, as I say, apparent honesty, has taken out the grain that was exported, but he has included the quantity that was consumed in this country. Certainly we imported at that time large quantities of grain from the United States. How the markets of the country were then I am not prepared to say, but no doubt much of what we imported went into the Lower Provinces. Does that argument show anything at all as to whether this National Policy is working for or against the United States, or for or against England? I maintain it does not. Where do the Americans buy their own supply? Looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns published under the authority of the Parliament of Great Britain, I find that the United States were compelled during the last year to import goods for their own use, much in excess of former years. I believe that the prosperity of that country has been great, and no doubt hon. gentlemen will claim that that prosperity has been caused by the National Policy in Canada. No doubt the hon. Minister of Finance must take credit for it, because if there be prosperity anywhere it must be his doings. I procured the Board of Trade Returns for Great Britain for 1880, but unfortunately I was not able to procure the annual returns for 1881, except monthly issues, and I have not had time to recapitulate them. I find in those returns that the exports from Great Britain for January of this year were \$12,500,000 more than they were in the corresponding month of last year, but I am unable to say what portion of this went to the United States. The people of the United States have so large a consuming capacity that they have to import goods from other countries. We also find that the corn crop in the United States being an utter failure last year, they have not been able to supply us with corn for feeding purposes in this country, and consequently our imports from them have not been so great, and the National Policy again gets credit. In 1877, the very year the hon. gentleman takes for his comparison with the year 1881, the United States imported from England \$81,884,000 worth of manufactured goods. In 1880 she imported \$154,000,000, or nearly double. If the United States has to import goods for herself, how is she to sell them to us? Are the people of this country so lost to their own interests that they go to the United States to buy goods which they themselves import, instead of going to Europe, where we send our exports, and bringing back the goods we want in return? Is it not a natural thing that we should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest? If the hon. gentleman had been honest he would have told us that the cheapest market for us at the present time was Europe, a fact which our merchants themselves knew, for they

went there and bought their goods; and consequently our imports fell off from the United States because they had not the goods to sell us, but had to supply themselves from the markets of Great Britain. He goes on to say that one objection raised to the Tariff on this side of the House was that it would increase the taxation to certain of the smaller Provinces, and he asserted that we paid 14½ cents per head more than was collected from the people of Ontario and Quebec in the five years of the Mackenzie Administration—a small proportion certainly—while for the last two years we have paid less. He says, further, that the Tariff has had a beneficial effect on the smaller Provinces, especially Prince Edward Island. It will be found, he says, that if any person, or locality, or section had to complain, it is not the smaller Provinces that were arraigned here, and on behalf of whom the sympathies of the House were invoked, for the practical effect had been a reduction rather than an increase of their taxation. I find on page 11 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, the relative bearing of the Customs Tariff on the different Provinces of the Dominion, and the following are the results: The percentage of duty on total imports including free goods for the Province of Quebec, in 1831, was 15·79; Ontario, 18·27; Prince Edward Island, the Province that the hon. gentleman referred to, 26·58; Nova Scotia, 18·35; New Brunswick, 21·25; Manitoba, 22·60; British Columbia, 24·08. Prince Edward Island stands highest of all. While the hon. Minister asserted us she paid least, the Trade and Navigation returns show that all the smaller provinces pay in excess of the larger ones. The hon. Minister also referred at some length to the coal tax. We were informed that there were 400,000 tons more coal raised in the Dominion last year than in the previous year, which, the hon. gentleman claimed effected a certain amount of benefit. If we deduct the amount raised in British Columbia, this sum will stand at something like 350,000 tons. I may also refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) while on this subject. Among the many statements he made was one to the effect that the coal owners of the world were in the habit of forming rings for the purpose of forcing the people to buy at their own prices, and he said that when the rings broke the consumers got the benefit. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is well for us to know that under this policy we are liable to be preyed upon by the formation of these rings to which he refers. The hon. gentleman also told us that the coal owners of Nova Scotia did not raise enough coal; that they did not exert themselves. This is exactly what we say is the effect of this Tariff: that it teaches the people to lean on the Government instead of exerting themselves. The hon. gentleman asserted that the export of coal to the West Indies had been increased, but I would like him to explain what the National Policy has to do with that fact. Certainly there must be plenty of room there yet for extension, as only 15,000 tons went there last year. He said, also, that they could have sold more coal, but that it took them a great deal of their time to supply the home market. This is all very well, but I say that these facts—especially as it is claimed that they could send their coal as far up the St. Lawrence as Montreal at least, and had plenty of freights in the early part of the season—only proves that the people of Nova Scotia like the people of every other part of the world, wish to lean on the Government for support. They want to get a clear profit of 50 cents per ton, and they would sooner raise 1,000,000 tons with a profit of 50 cents per ton than 5,000,000 with a profit of 10 cents per ton. Let us look at the exports of coal from England, as shown in the parliamentary returns. The exports of coal from Great Britain increased last year, although the price did not increase one cent—in fact, was rather lower than before. In other words, unprotected England exported millions of tons more coal last year than the year before, and yet she did not

Mr. SNOWBALL.

charge any additional price, while you find that in Nova Scotia, no sooner was the trade open than an advance of 10 cents per ton at once took place, followed this year with a further advance of 25 cents. We were told at the time this policy was being introduced, that all that Nova Scotia wanted was an increased market—and that she did not want an extra price. They wanted a larger field; they got it, and they no sooner got it than they advanced the price of their coal 10 cents a ton. When I was in England, I received a circular issued by coal owners of Nova Scotia, stating that there would be a further advance of 25 cents from the 1st of January last, and there was a note at the bottom from a friend, saying: "You had better buy your coal in Europe." These gentlemen do not want the trade; what they want is a big profit. If the duty was not on, they would have to exert themselves in their business as other folks must do; but instead of increasing their production, which the hon. member for Pictou tells us they are not doing to the extent to which they should, they are advancing the price to the consumer. They have not only the advantage of the duty, but they have special advantages in the way of freight from the Intercolonial Railway, and still they squeeze the miners in their employ. It is an outrage, and the Minister of Finance should warn these people at once that the coal owners are getting larger markets, an advance in price, and that they are entitled to a portion of the profits. In crossing the Atlantic just six years ago in company with the hon. member for Pictou, a conversation arose at table in reference to coals, in consequence of the steamer making poor time. We were told that the cause of the delay was bad coal, and that it took about one day longer to make a voyage from America to Europe when Pictou coals were used than it did when using English coals. The hon. member for Pictou naturally became a little irritated because these coals were not appreciated. There are good coals in Nova Scotia, but I am sorry to say there are not many in the Pictou mines. In the course of this conversation, some person asked the hon. gentleman why he did not go to Parliament and raise his voice in favor of getting an import duty. He said: "I am going to Parliament at the next election, and I will raise my voice to have a duty imposed." Then I was asked what I would do, and I said: "I will go to Parliament too, and vote against him." And true enough, after the election, my hon. friend was here voting for a duty on coal, and I was here trying to cancel his vote, showing that much said in jest may prove true. Notwithstanding the heavy duty, we find that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the imports of coal are steadily increasing year by year, and the consumers have to pay the duty; so that I maintain that the coal duty affects the people of the Maritime Provinces injuriously as well as the people of Ontario.

Mr. DOULL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one word of explanation? He has attempted to disparage the quality of our Nova Scotia coal. I can inform him and the House that a test will prove that the quality of our coal is equal to the quality of any coal in the United States with the exception of one.

Mr. SNOWBALL. I am very happy to allow the hon. gentleman to say anything he can on behalf of Nova Scotia coal; but I know you can always get a very good analysis for coal as well as for other things. There is one mine in Pictou which produces fair coal.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I may state that the Ontario Government made comparative tests of Nova Scotia coal and American coal, and they reported to a large manufacturing establishment with which I am connected that 130 lbs. of American coal is equal to 160 lbs. of Nova Scotia coal.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When was this report made?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Last autumn.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the descriptions of coal.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Coal for steam purposes.

Mr. SNOWBALL. I do not dispute what the hon. gentleman states; I have not made reference to United States coal; but I have no doubt that, if the gentleman who made this analysis wished, he might have found American coal that would go as far and probably much further ahead of Nova Scotia coal. He seems not to know anything about Nova Scotia coal, because there are mines in Pictou so close together that in one you can hear the click of the hammer in the other, and yet there is no comparison between the quality of the coal in the two mines. I know it is not safe to send a tug to sea with a heavy ship, when supplied with many qualities of Pictou coal. I tell that to the hon. member for Pictou, and he knows it perfectly well.

Mr. DOULL. I do not; it is not correct.

Mr. SNOWBALL. That was the case as regards the steamer in which he and I went to sea. I am quite willing to stand up for the coal produced in that Province, if I can do so; but it is no use trying to force it on the public, because consumers ascertain very soon whether it is suitable for their purpose or not. We know, both as regards steam vessels and dwelling-houses, what is requisite is a coal of which the smallest quantity will produce the largest amount of heat. That is not found in the section of Nova Scotia which the hon. gentleman represents. Spring-hill coal will produce the heat, and it is a splendid coal for steam purposes, but it is very expensive; it goes off like a flash and you have not to keep taking ashes out, as with Pictou coal, you have to keep putting coal on. I know pieces of coal can be found that will show an excellent analysis; but when you come down to actual consumption it will be found that of the tug-boats owned in New Brunswick, as well as in other parts of Canada, not many of them use Pictou coal.

Mr. DOULL. I ask again permission to make an explanation. On the contrary, Pictou coal is preferable for steam purposes to the coal he mentions.

Mr. SNOWBALL. We do not build tug-boats with capacity to carry a coal mine, but we construct them to carry a small amount of coal to do a certain amount of work. If the Government compel us to pay taxes, we have to pay them, and we have to use imported coal, and the charge has to be paid by the people in employing the tugs. What is this coal duty worth to the people of Nova Scotia? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the coal owners raised 350,000 tons more coal last year than in the previous year. They would have raised that quantity under any circumstance. The consumption of the country has more than increased in that proportion. With the ordinary prosperity of the country that quantity would be required. The number of tug-boats on our rivers is increasing very rapidly, and, as our lumber gets exhausted, and business becomes more scattered, it is necessary to bring the different points together, and this can only be done by steam power which requires coal. Our railways and steamboats are constantly requiring more coal. The people in their households also consume more coal, and the natural increase would have been more than 350,000 tons, provided we had no coal tax, and the people would, have got their coal cheaper. What are the people of Nova Scotia paying for that tax? I take up the Trade and Navigation Returns and find that they paid \$44,000 duty on cornmeal. What for? Was it not in compensation for the duty placed on coal? Who has gained any benefit from the duty? The miners of Pictou are not receiving any higher wages, and therefore the coal-owner must be getting the

benefit. The poor people have been called on to pay \$44,000 duty on cornmeal alone to maintain the coal monopoly in Nova Scotia. I find that, although the Intercolonial Railway passes right through the whole of that Province in one direction, the people paid \$9,000 duty on flour, \$15,000 on Indian corn; that Nova Scotia paid on Indian corn, flour and wheat, last year, \$73,375 into the Treasury to maintain this monopoly. Are 350,000 additional tons of coal worth \$73,000 to the people of that Province? They are paying a still further additional charge on flour because it enables the Intercolonial and other railways to charge additional freight to the people consuming it. On buying flour last fall—and this is a circumstance that happened to myself—I complained to the parties in Toronto that the freight charged was excessive, and I asked for an explanation. They wrote that they would deliver flour in Liverpool, England, 10 cents lower than at Miramichi. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that I was not paying a charge on that flour equal to more than the duty of 50 cents per barrel when I was paying 10 cents per barrel more than it could be delivered in Liverpool? The people of the West when they have a surplus must sell their flour in Europe; they have to compete with the American flour in the market and must accept current prices. But, the railway companies know there is no other means to get flour to certain portions of the Lower Provinces except by railway, and they place the freight so as to put 50 cents in their coffers from the pockets of the consumers, and the farmers derive no benefit, but the country suffers. This is the effect of monopolies on trade. The country is suffering, but this is not half what the people of Nova Scotia pay indirectly. The section of the country that comes within the railway system, pay a tax of \$75,000 additional in freights and extra charges on bread-stuffs alone, making with the duty before referred to about \$150,000—to maintain what? To maintain a duty of 50 cents a ton on coal to enable them to raise 350,000 tons extra. If there is anything in the protective system, it is the people that have a right to protection against these charges. I am not fighting against the coal duties so strongly as against the whole principle of the system. The principle is one by which the whole country is made to suffer. The next subject dealt with by the hon. the Finance Minister was that of sugar. I do not intend to make any special reference to sugar, as it has been fully exposed already by the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Burpee), but I find that the hon. the Finance Minister, in regard to sugar duties, said:

"Still, I admit that, as regards refined and granulated sugar, there was the difference of 25 cents. I have a carefully prepared return showing the values during two periods in each year in New York and Montreal, deducting the drawback and adding 30 cents per cwt. as the expense of importation, because the calculation made up shows 50 cents per cwt. profit on transactions between the New York refiner and the Canadian consumers; giving the consumers the benefit of that, there was 7 cents less charged to the people of Canada on that line of sugars than if it had been imported from New York, under the old Tariff."

That was to say, that the people of Canada were paying 7 cents per 100 lbs. less for sugar than they did under the late Tariff. What do I find? I find in examining those returns (because in the few remarks I am about to make, I am going to bring the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs into direct antagonism) that the hon. Minister of Finance made a Budget Speech, and the other Minister made a report for the benefit of the country. As the hon. gentleman's report has a blue cover, I admit I put more confidence in it than I do in the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister. Of sugars above 14 Dutch standard there were, the Minister of Customs informs us, 70,000,000 lbs. imported into Canada last year which paid an aggregate duty of \$1,459,000. I find the first item in these sugar returns is 15,858,000 lbs., costing \$756,186 or \$4.76 per 100 lbs., and paying duty \$423,265 or \$2.66 per 100 lbs. Yet the hon. Minister of

Finance contends that the consumers obtained their sugar cheaper than if that duty had been removed. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile the two statements? He tells us that by the imposition of that tax, we get the staple 7 cents per 100 lbs. cheaper. Will this statement bear investigation at all? If our manufacturers could manufacture the sugar and sell it cheaper than if imported, why did they not do so? Do the importers not understand their trade, and did the consumers not know what they were doing when we find that over half the sugar consumed in this Dominion last year was refined for use when imported and paid a duty of over 2 cents per lb? The hon. Minister said:

"I trust I may be able to use as strong language, or language very similar to that employed by my hon. friend from South Brant, that the result of the increase of the Tariff had not been to increase the cost of the article to the consumer."

He says he took up, in the first place, cotton goods. In that reference he also said:

"It was not from any ill-feeling towards our neighbors that this Tariff was established; but we were gratified when we found that the policy we had introduced to give additional industry to our own people, would strike against the industrial interests of the United States, rather than against those of Great Britain."

According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 62, I find there were imported last year of unbleached cottons, sheetings, drills and ducks, goods not printed or stained, 8,895,733 yards, on which an import duty of 30½ per cent. was imposed on that portion coming from Great Britain. I have made up the percentage, and the figures are there to verify it. We find that on the same class of goods imported from the United States, there was only 25½ per cent. duty collected. Does this not discriminate against the trade of Great Britain in favor of trade with the United States? In reference to these goods, the hon. gentleman said, page 13 of his Budget Speech:

"I stated last Session with reference to the grey and white cottons and brown sheetings that they were selling at 10 per cent less than the price at which they would sell under the Tariff of 1878."

But that Tariff was 17½ per cent., and under the present one the duty paid amounted to 30½ per cent. How can he maintain that goods are sold less under a 30½ per cent. Tariff than they would be under a 17½ per cent. Tariff? The additional duty cannot have the effect of making the price cheaper. Two men are in trade, one sells Canadian while the other sells imported goods. The one sells to people to whom the cost is not so much an object provided they can get what suits them; the other sells to the working class to whom the price is a serious matter. The one sells Canadian manufactured goods and the other imported goods at 30½ per cent. duty. Will the hon. member tell us that the people do not pay this duty? If the people who bought these 9,000,000 yards of cotton in Europe and paid this heavy duty on them, thought they could buy them cheaper here, does any one suppose they would have imported them and paid this duty? The people that use those goods pay the duty, and the people that use the goods manufactured in Canada pay a similar percentage on every yard they consume. The hon. Minister, speaking of knitting cottons, referred to Mr. Parks, a very estimable manufacturer of the city of St. John, who, he said, sells a certain class at 39½ cents against 40 cents per pound, the price in the United States market. If those goods sold for 40 cents in the United States market, how does the hon. member explain the fact that \$8,073 duty was paid on the same class of goods imported into this country. Were the people mad in importing those goods from the United States when they could buy them in the factories here 30 per cent. cheaper? The hon. gentleman may console himself by smiling over any of these statements, but they are a little too glaring for the people of the country, who intend to get correct information on this subject, and are getting it very rapidly. This

Mr. SNOWBALL,

Blue-Book is very valuable; it is issued by the Department of the Minister of Customs, and should have great weight with the people. The hon. gentleman claimed that his Tariff did not discriminate against the people of Great Britain, hold a large amount of the cheaper goods—those almost entirely used by our laboring classes, are brought in from that country. There were nearly 10,000,000 yards of denims, bed-ticks and drills imported last year, that portion from Great Britain, on which we find 33 per cent. duty paid, and on those imported from the United States we find paid but 29 per cent., showing a discriminative duty against Great Britain of 4 per cent. These taxes the people paid against the 17½ per cent. duty of the late Administration. Yet the hon. gentleman will tell us that our people paid no extra taxes. With such official statements as these before us, where is the use of the hon. the Finance Minister making such statements as we now see published in his Budget Speech? The next item he dealt with was woollen goods. He said:

"Now, I have taken some pains to write to different parties who could furnish me with reliable information with reference to the price of cotton goods, and especially of woollen goods; and a gentleman sent to me, at the request of a friend, a letter, of which he authorized me to make any use I thought proper. I stated to the gentleman, to whom I wrote among others, that I wished reliable data—data that could not be upset by any statements of fact that could be produced in the House—because we wanted nothing but the facts, and if the manufacturers were getting large profits, it was just as well that we should know it, and deal with the facts as we found them."

The hon. gentleman gives the name of the firm from which he got his information, Messrs. Cantlie, Ewan & Co., Montreal, men of first-class standing, no doubt. He says:

"This letter I received from Cantlie, Ewan & Co., of Montreal, who, I believe, have been for years engaged in selling woollen goods. It has reference to the comparative cost of certain descriptions of woollen goods made in Canada, compared with the prices of the same goods previous to the change in the Tariff. It is as follows:—

"1st. Etoffes, tweeds and fabrics made from Canada wools and used chiefly by farmers, laborers, shantymen and mechanics in country districts are as low in price now as at any time during ten years previous to 1878. This refers to regular sales."

The gentleman who wrote this letter shows himself shrewd and cautious as a business man; he does not say what is the effect of the duty. He does not explain that the cheapness of woollens is largely due to the abundance of New Zealand, Australian and other wools, nor that the classes of goods manufactured from them are extremely low in England. The hon. Finance Minister got this statement, but he did not investigate it in order to arrive at the real facts of the case; so as to lay correct information before the people of the country as he should have done. No statement should come from the hon. Finance Minister unless it can be fully borne out by facts. If he may plead that his own time is fully occupied, but he has plenty of people in his Department to investigate so that he should give us nothing but correct information on such subjects. What do we find as regards those woollen goods? I find that as regards casimers, cloths, tweeds and doeskins, there was imported last year into the Dominion, \$3,403,000 worth on which the duty paid was \$1,094,000. Why was this duty paid? The duty on this class of goods, imported from Great Britain was 32 per cent. but upon those imported from the United States, 26 per cent. Was not that a discriminative duty against Great Britain? Under the old Tariff the duty would have been but 17½ per cent. How can the hon. gentleman tell the people that they are not paying any extra duty on those goods, and that they cost no more than under the Tariff of 1878. Such statements are not borne out by the facts. The next subject the hon. gentleman dealt with was flannels and blankets, in regard to which the same censure applies. I find from this Blue-Book that the duty paid on blankets was over \$81,000. Why did we import those blankets if we could have bought them cheaper manufactured in our country, and if there was not a monopoly ensuring our

manufacturers excessive prices? We paid 45 per cent. on these goods imported from Great Britain, and 32 on the portion from the United States, a discriminative duty of 13 per cent. against British products. The people have paid those large duties, and yet the hon. the Finance Minister states they did not pay them—there is no other way of putting it than to admit squarely that he and the Minister of Customs are at variance. We also find the same remark applies to a large amount of hats, respecting which he has a letter from a very respectable manufacturer. We are told there was no extra duty paid on hats at all—that the people are getting them cheaper than before; yet we find large importations and large sums paid into the Treasury on those goods. I suppose the only inference is that the people who pay for and wear those goods know nothing about their value, and buy them without any regard to price; that they import such articles just to gratify their whims. We know that the Tariff was supposed to protect certain manufactures, and we know it is protecting them, and that the manufacturers are not giving the people the benefit of cheaper products as they should. They are not paying the laboring classes the wages that they ought to pay, and are not manufacturing and selling as cheaply as we were promised. They have not yet increased productions equal to the demands of the country, because one-half the goods consumed are still imported. The hon. gentleman also spoke of tea, stating that the people would have a cheap breakfast table, and claiming that they are getting tea at 5 cents a pound less than under the late Tariff. He did not tell us the reason of this fall in price. He did not tell us that India has entered largely into the production of tea, and we know that tea was cheaper in Great Britain last year, not by 5 cents, but by 10 cents a pound, than the year previous. If the people of this country are getting tea at 5 cents a pound cheaper than formerly, the hon. the Finance Minister is not entitled to our thanks. At present tea is wonderfully cheap, and I do not suppose it will ever be as dear as it has been in the past. I contend that hon. gentlemen opposite are setting a bad example to the people of this country. As I said, they are teaching the youth of Canada that instead of relying upon themselves to rely upon the Government in time of trouble. The principle is a bad one. It teaches the young men not to do as their fathers did before them. These had to endure many privations and hardships, and they made considerable of a country of Canada before it fell into our hands, and if we do as much for it in the future as they did in the past, we may yet have a great country. But do not destroy the independence of the youth and teach them to suppose that the Government can assist them in every time of financial difficulty, but teach them rather to rely upon their own strong arms for assistance, and then Canada will become great and prosperous.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with wrapt attention to the various, and in some cases extraordinary speeches, of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House, on the subject of the fiscal policy of this Dominion, and I have yet to learn, through all their complaining utterances, one word suggestive as an improvement. Of course, I understand that they have no policy to recommend as an improvement to the one now adopted, but being in Opposition they feel they must needs take an opposite course. The subject of the fiscal policy is a theme so replete with argumentative matter, in support of its principles, so comprehensive in all its parts, so vital to the growth, industry and prosperity of this vast and important Dominion, that I feel none should sound a discordant note in relation to its wonder-working effects, and none do I believe indulge themselves in that way except those possessed of that party bias, and party spirit, and such uncontrollable feelings of a party nature, as to be incapable

of giving a conscientious and unbiassed expression with regard to its beneficial deserts, or an approving sentence with regard to its merits. All true Canadians, patriotic to their country, seeing the beneficial results accruing from this policy, willingly sound their exultation of praise with one heart and one voice, in support of its merited deserts, and with delight and in all sincerity proclaim it to be life, unending success and prosperity to our nation and people. This policy, I have no hesitation in stating, should have been adopted by us long ere it was; to have protected the mechanic, the farmer, the fisherman, and all other classes, and to have made us a successful rival of our neighbors the Americans across the border, to whom it has been unquestionably a triumphant success. Was there any reason why the policy was not adopted earlier? Was it that the Government under the Mackenzie regime was not reminded of this important policy? Let us take a retrospective view of the position of things, as far back as 1876, and see what was then suggested. We find in the spring of that year when the hon. member for Centre Huron, the then Finance Minister, moved the House into Committee of Supply, that our right hon. leader, then leader of the Opposition, moved in amendment, substantially:

“That the House do not go into Committee of Supply, but that there should be such a re-adjustment of the Tariff which whilst not imposing any unnecessary burdens upon the people, would stimulate and protect, the agricultural, commercial, manufacturing, and other industries of the country.”

But the Government preferring still to continue the old policy of a revenue Tariff, which meant rolling up deficits instead of surpluses, voted the amendment down. What did Henry Clay, one of the greatest statesmen America ever produced, say of the effects of Protection on the national prosperity of the Republic? Addressing the House of Representatives in 1824 he declared:

“That never in the history of the American Republic has there ever been such universal misery, want, financial and commercial ruin and disaster as from 1817 to 1824 under seven years of Free Trade.”

And addressing the Senate in 1832 he said:

“That never in the history of the American Republic has there ever been years of such universal prosperity, aggrandizement, and happiness as from 1824 to 1831 under a high protective Tariff.”

And he added:

“That whilst the opponents of Protection declared that it would be the ruin of the provincial, commercial, and agricultural interests of the country, unbounded success was the result.”

A satisfactory proof of the beneficial workings of a protective policy is shown by the fact that at the close of the Civil War in the United States, which commenced in 1861 and continued till May 1865, when gold was in the market at 280 per cent., and an immense war debt incurred, they were able from the balance of trade in their favor under the workings of this policy, to not only keep up the various requirements of the country, but to pay off every year, very largely of their indebtedness; and at present to place their paper on the market at par with gold. To show the present satisfactory working of the system I will instance the high protection they exacted on imported coal which was, and still is, 75 cents per ton, and how it affected Canada under the late Government's one-sided Free Trade policy: it gave them a home market, and at the same time a market in the whole of Upper Canada, and a large portion of the Lower Provinces—as a consequence, locking up the coal industries of Nova Scotia, and compelling her coal mining companies to see their mines either closed or sold to pay losses. Since 1878, when a duty of 50 and 60 cents per ton was

imposed on American coal coming into our markets, the mines of Nova Scotia have been running full time, and offering remunerative rates, supplying the Canadians previously supplied by the United States. From the statement by the hon. the Finance Minister a few days ago, I find the output of coal in Nova Scotia for the last four years was as follows: 1878, 770,603 tons; 1879, 778,271 tons; 1880, 1,032,710 tons; 1881, 1,116,248 tons, shewing an immense increase in 1881 over 1878. The protection on Canadian coal, shutting out the American article, and giving a market for our own, not only contributes to the revenue of the Dominion, but also to that of the Province of Nova Scotia, from the royalty paid in on the increased output; promising the coming season to be three times as much as it was in 1878, or about \$150,000, which will largely supplement her road and bridge service, so greatly needed in the Province. The high protective Tariff exacted on coal by the Americans, was not the only one from which we as Canadians suffered; for instance take the following as examples: Lumber, pine or spruce, \$2 per 1,000 feet, with an addition of 50 cents if planed on one side, and \$1 if planed on both sides; also an additional 50 cents if tongued and grooved; making a total duty on the article, if placed in their market in this condition, of \$3.50 per 1,000 feet. Thus entirely shutting out the Canadian labor in order to protect their own, and tying the hands of cabinet-makers, and depriving them of a living by allowing the same article, in the shape of furniture, to be returned into this country, under a very low Tariff. Furniture, 35 per cent. United States, as against 17½ Canadian; hats, caps, &c., 40 per cent. United States, as against 17½ Canadian; cutlery, 35 per cent. United States, as against 17½ Canadian; glass, 40 per cent. United States, as against 17½ Canadian. Fearing, however, that I am trespassing too much on the valuable time of the House in comparing these Tariffs, I would simply refer to the duties on tea and coffee, imposed by the late Government, viz., 5 cents per lb. on black and 6 cents per lb. on green tea; and 2 cents per lb. on coffee, both of which have been lately placed on the free list. Molasses also, which was 25 cents per gallon, is now charged 15 cents per gallon. I would also at this point, like to refer to the article of flour, upon which a duty of 50 cents per barrel is charged, to which duty some of the Maritime Provinces have objected, forgetting that they are part and parcel of our Dominion, and that they form as it were the arm, stretching out into the sea, of the great trunk of Canada; but were the duty to be removed, we should then be finding the Americans a market for their flour, and shutting out that of our Upper Canadians, who are already debarred from selling in the American markets by a duty more than double that imposed on American flour coming into our markets. The duty on flour certainly does not affect the price of the article to the consumer as it can be obtained from Upper Canada, through the American ports, in bond, at the same rates as American flour, and brought into Nova Scotia without any additional charge. These are absolute facts, and cannot therefore be controverted. To show the beneficial effects of the National Policy to my Province, I will compare the imports and exports of Nova Scotia in 1878 with those of 1881:

Imports, 1878	\$8 508,189
Exports, 1878	7,500,783
Balance of trade against us.....	\$1, 07,406
Exports, 1881.....	\$8,245,738
Imports, 1881.....	8,168,648
Balance of trade in our favor	\$77,090

To prove further that the export trade of Canada is increasing, and that manufacturers are encouraged, I observed some few days ago that a shipment was made to Russia of 180

Mr. KAULBACH,

reaping and mowing machines, the manufacture of Canada; and a large quantity of woollen cloth, from the woollen factories of Nova Scotia, to England and France, which has arisen since the inauguration of this policy. Cotton mills are now being erected in different parts of the Dominion; and two, I am happy to say, are in course of erection in my Province, which will give employment to thousands of hands, indirectly—young women more particularly. A glass factory has been started in New Glasgow, and is now being run night and day, the demand for the manufacture of glass being so much greater than the supply. A knitting establishment has also been started in Halifax and is running on full time, and employs upwards of sixty hands. Sugar refineries have been built, employing upwards of 1,000 hands; and I am happy to state that Nova Scotia has the advantage in this industry over any other of the Provinces of the Dominion, as through it the fisherman and the farmer—the farmer more particularly—receive a very large benefit, and in this way: Previously to the erection of the sugar refinery, the fish merchant in shipping fish to the West Indies would, as a rule, bring a return cargo of sugar to the ports of Boston or New York, where they would have to pay light dues, wharfage and dockage, tonnage, pilotage, commission on the sale of the article, disbursement of the ship, and another commission for the purchase of sufficient cargo for ballast, or pay for ballast itself, or perhaps the article of sugar refined, whereas now they usually return direct to the port of Halifax with a cargo of sugar, which they dispose of either at the refinery there, or wherever the most remunerative prices are offered, thus saving money to the shippers and making them give better prices to the fishermen for their fish, and in addition encouraging the labor in our own country and a transit over our own Intercolonial Railway. The exports of Canadian products, including Canadian manufactures, in 1878, were \$65,740,131; in 1881, \$80,921,379. Raw cotton imported for manufacture in 1877-78, 7,243,413 lbs; in 1880-81, 16,018,721 lbs. Wool imported for manufacture, in 1877-78, 6,230,084 lbs; in 1880-81, 8,040,287 lbs; showing very conclusively the great increase in the trade of the Dominion. At no period in the history of Canada has the financial position of the country stood better than at the present time, and instead of a deficit of \$7,500,000 which offered when the late Government went out of power, I am pleased to state that at the end of the last fiscal year we had a surplus of \$4,132,700, whereby we have been enabled not merely to take off the duties on tea, coffee, tin, and other imports, but to abolish the Stamp Act, and give a bounty of \$100,000 to the fishermen. The fishermen, renowned for their vigor and bravery, are a class in whom I feel particularly interested, as I am aware of the extreme toil, sacrifices and privations they have to undergo in prosecuting this most hazardous and dangerous industry, often having to leave their houses or cabin homes in the dark, dreary hour of night; tossed on the tempestuous waves of the stormy Atlantic in their frail little bark or boat; exposed at this season to the cold icy blasts of winter; often only to get a scanty living for their needy families—it is for them, whose interests I so greatly desire to cherish and protect, that I feel that this \$150,000 bounty is a prudent expenditure, and am pleased that after upwards of two years' entreaty, I, with the aid of my friends, accomplished my object, and hope now that the distribution will be a satisfactory one—that all will be satisfied. The fishermen being the main artery of success to this Dominion, and the bone and sinew of the county I have the honor to represent, I am greatly desirous of fostering this industry, and hope that under this policy the Government will see fit to largely augment this sum another year; and urge that encouragement should be given for

the construction of a particular class of vessels, propelled by steam instead of sails, to enable them to move more quickly to the different fishing grounds, much time being wasted at present with sailing crafts during spells of contrary winds and calms. Encouragement in this direction would offer employment to the machinist and others, as well as the shipbuilder, which the policy of this Government is designed to do and thus tend to expand this valuable industry. Whilst referring to the fisheries, I cannot refrain from drawing the attention of this honorable House to the unfortunate position in which the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces were placed at the hands of the late Government, by the seeming indifference they exhibited, in their interests, in securing the Fishery Award. It will be remembered that the Award was made in 1877, and Parliament, under the Mackenzie regime, sat in 1878; why was it that they did not then embrace the opportune moment, before the money was paid over to the Dominion, to advise the Imperial Government to pay it over for the benefits of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, who surrendered their rights to the Americans to use our territorial waters in common with themselves? Was it not right of the members representing the various fishing constituencies in the Dominion to have made the demand during that Session, instead of holding themselves in silence and not offering a complaining word till the matter was brought up by myself and others when this Government came into power? Was it not their duty—nay, their incumbent right—to fulfil their pledges to guard and protect the interests of their constituents, more particularly an industry of this kind, offering such immense proportions? Most assuredly it was. The fish taken in Nova Scotia in 1880 amounted in value to \$6,291,061, being nearly half the value of the entire catch of the Dominion, as the following statement for the fiscal year ending 30th June will show:

Lunenburg County	\$1,176,159 05
Halifax do	894,451 80
Shelburne do	857,307 00
Yarmouth do	669,572 05
Guysborough do	447,398 95
Inverness do	435,449 50
Digby do	402,714 00
Richmond do	375,812 13
Cape Breton do	297,329 25
Queens do	203,602 15
Victoria do	1,1,964 00
Annapolis do	105,899 00
Antigonish do	75,063 10
Colchester do	53,724 28
Cumberland do	46,979 20
Pictou do	45,989 75
Kings do	43,534 00
Hants do	23,212 25

To show the high estimation in which the fishermen are held by the Americans, I will give the quotation of John Quincy Adams, one of the most learned and distinguished of American statesmen:

“There is something in the very occupation of fishermen not only beneficial in itself but noble and exalted in the qualities of which it requires the habitual exercise. In common with the cultivators of the soil, their labors contribute to the subsistence of mankind, and they have the merit of continual exposure to danger, super-added to that of increasing toil. Industry, frugality, patience, perseverance, fortitude, intrepidity, souls inured to perpetual conflict with the elements, and bodies steeled with unremitting action, ever grappling with danger and familiar with death. These are the properties to which the fisherman of the ocean is formed by the daily labors of his life. These are the properties for which He who knew what was in man, the Saviour of mankind, sought His first, and found His most faithful ardent, and undaunted Disciples, among the fishermen of His country.”

That the fishing industry is one of the greatest and one of the most important of Canadian industries, the following comparative statement showing the number of vessels,

boats and flats employed in the fisheries in 1880, with the number of hands employed, will help to prove:

Province.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Boats.	Flats.	No. of Men.
Nova Scotia.....	731	29,087	11,210	29,276
Quebec	166	9,970	4,816	2,440	14,771
New Brunswick.....	220	4,411	4,219	8,566
Prince Edward Island.....	32	1,167	1,383	4,031
Ontario	18	253	865	2,130
British Columbia.....	14	650	317	16	1,843
Grand Totals.....	1,181	45,810	22,810	2,456	60,617

The fishing Industry, however, is not the only one that has been fostered and encouraged by the beneficial workings of our National Policy, every other, whether manufacturing or agricultural, has felt its benign effects; so that go where you will, you find things prospering and every one contented and happy; pleased that a way has been found to lead the country out of that dreary state of depression which existed during the time the Government was carried on by the hon. members opposite. Even American citizens do not fail to see our flourishing condition, and offer their evidences as a proof of our success, as the following extract from one of their journals shows. The Philadelphia American says:

“The Canadian Ministry are fairly entitled to boast of the success of their National Policy adopted in 1879. In three years time Canada has been lifted out of the slough of depression and distress, employment found for her surplus labor, her manufactures extended, and made prosperous, and her annual deficit converted into a handsome surplus.”

This statement so truthful, ought to be a source of gratification to every Canadian statesman and a great satisfaction to every person irrespective of party, who feels an interest in his country's prosperity. The purchasing power of the masses was never greater than at the present time, markets unsurpassed for good prices, exceeding anything that could have been anticipated. We do not find, as I was pained to witness, the poor standing in front of the Parliament buildings and Public Works office here, and hearing them beg for labor, as was the case at the opening of the first Session of this Parliament, under the ill effects of the policy of the late Government. But, on the contrary, the vision of the tramp and the beggar has vanished from our high-ways, and insolvency has dwindled into a mere shadow. The question has been, and still is asked, shall this Canada of ours be a market for our own people, or a market for the people of the United States? The answer was given; the cry went forth when that noble battle was fought and victory won on the 17th day of September, 1878. “A market at home, and as much as we can get abroad.” But capitalists desirous of investing their means in industries in Canada, are anxious, before doing so, to still more firmly establish the protective policy in this Dominion by another appeal to the people on the question, and letting the few who entertain the erroneous idea of Free Trade, see that the farmer, fisherman, &c., of this country, are not going to give up labor at home for their sons and daughters, as well as a ready market for their produce. The beneficial effects of this fiscal policy, if not expressed by every man for certain political reasons, I believe are certainly entertained (our hon. friends on the opposite side of this House not excepted), and I am satisfied that it certainly commends itself in the main to the judgment of every right thinking man, who has ever made the question the subject of unbiassed and intelligent study. Some are willing to advocate or favor any scheme of spoliation to meet their own personal or political ends instead of advancing a comprehensive

system of reform, tending to the growth, success, industry, and prosperity of this noble Dominion, and giving encouragement and employment to the industriously inclined, and working man. All our factories, all our industries, and all our enterprises tend to build up this Dominion as a great nation, and the money so disbursed in creating a diversity of employment is thus spent at home among our fellow country men, not sent abroad, as it had been in the past, to build up foreign capital and labor. Our aim has been, and still is, to encourage our own people to build, manufacture, and produce everything possible at home, and to retain and spend the money in our own country, and thus encourage a spirit of rivalry in trades as to bring everything to a par value in the market. Competition will bring about these results, and energy in this direction will work unmistakable success—by the imposition of a duty on foreign manufactured goods, as to enable us to produce all such manufactures as we require, and which, under favorable circumstances, can be manufactured in Canada, by the admission, free of duty, of all raw materials and commodities used in domestic consumption, and manufactures which cannot be produced in Canada. By the imposition of such duty on foreign agriculture as is imposed by foreign countries on our own, health and tone is given to this country, which does not enhance the price of imported goods in proportion to duty imposed, as illustrated by experience in the United States, but affords us a wholesome market at home, healthy revenues, and, at the same time, transfers the burden of taxation from the necessities of life to the luxuries, besides the many other happy and beneficial results. I am pleased to be able to stand in my place in Parliament, and conscientiously make this statement of facts so undeniably correct, instead of occupying the position of a complaining body, like our hon. friends opposite, unwilling to offer a remedy or formulate an idea, but simply to express a desire to return to their old system of one-sided Free Trade, which means rolling up deficits year after year, and sinking the country deeper in debt.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition are under very great obligations to the President of the Council for the excessive politeness with which he has treated them. He has told the House that the leaders of the Reform party are without hope, and that their resources of falsehood are very nearly exhausted. He has spoken of their incapacity; of their incompetence; and the member for Annapolis, who is on excellent terms with himself, calls them imbeciles. If those hon. gentlemen think they can give dignity to this House and strength to their party by expressions of this sort; if they think they can make vituperation serve the place of argument, we, on this side, have no great cause of complaint. Our impressions of the public taste differ from those of these hon. gentlemen. The public take some interest in the standing of the House of Commons, they have some regard for the decencies of debate. They do not confound the self-complacency of the member for Annapolis with political wisdom, nor the petulance of the President of the Council with sarcasm. We have no objection to a comparison of our success or failure as administrators, with the success or failure of our opponents. The President of the Council has boasted of the success of 1878, and the First Minister informs the country that Providence was on their side. These hon. gentlemen owe their success to misfortune, over which we had no control—over which they had no control; but the greatest misfortune to the country was the victory of the Conservative party. The period was one of darkness, not in Canada alone, but over all Christendom, and the success of the Conservative leaders was due to the calamities of the times. They told the

Mr. KAULBACH.

country that it was suffering from wounds and bruises which we had inflicted, and which they, as good Samaritans, were ready to heal. Time and the revival of commerce abroad, is curing the disease, but the country now discovers that it is in danger of dying from the attentions of its physicians. It has recently been well said by Mr. Gladstone, that during the periods of commercial depression the owls and the bats always go abroad.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Here they are at home you see.

Mr. MILLS. Now that the commercial condition of the country has improved, I think that the gigantic proportions which the owls and the bats assumed in the public minds, can be more clearly estimated. There is, Sir, a fitness of things in the success of those gentlemen during a period of darkness. It is in the night that the owls and bats come forth to seek their prey—the light is unsuited to them. The seemingly gigantic proportions which darkness gives them disappears with the light; and as they become incapable of seeing, they are themselves seen with all the more distinctness. The hon. gentleman boasts of the statesmanship of the Tory leaders. What important measure has, since Confederation, forced itself upon the attention of Parliament which these hon. gentlemen have successfully grappled with? Was it the Washington Treaty in which great interests were sacrificed, and important trusts betrayed? Was it the skill shown in putting the Fenian raids, and the raids of the Alabama upon the same footing? Was it in the temporary arrangement in relation to the Fisheries which left the headland question untouched? Was it in the skill with which the Minister of Railways succeeded in arraying the public opinion of Nova Scotia against Union? Was it the insurrection provoked in the North West? Was it in the position taken by the Minister of Public Works and his friends that the measure of the Government of which he was a member, was of so odious character that it justified a rebellion? That hon. gentleman spoke of that measure, as one of such tyranny that the people in the North-West Territory were justified in their course, or at all events their offence was to be extenuated in consequence of the inconsiderate and arbitrary manner in which the Government had dealt with them in seeking to bring them into the Union.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Never.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen is wrong. But on what ground did he undertake to extenuate the resort to arms against this country? On what ground did his recent colleague the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), speak of Riel being entitled to the rights of a leader of a revolution, and appeal to the principles of International law in order to justify or extenuate the course he had adopted? Was it in the terms upon which British Columbia was admitted into the Union? Was it in the terms upon which Sir Hugh Allan obtained the Charter for the construction of the Pacific Railway? Is it in the bargain with the present Syndicate? The President of the Council has referred to the Fishery Award and claims that the credit of that Award belongs to the First Minister. To the First Minister belongs the credit of ignoring the headland question, and of providing for a temporary settlement. But the success of obtaining an award of \$5,000,000 was wholly due to the skill and ability of the hon. member for Westmoreland. He managed the case very ably. The hon. the First Minister smiles at that remark.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. What would have been his position if he had been before that arbitration? The Americans offered to admit coal, lumber, and fish, free from duty for the privileges of fishing in Canadian waters. The hon. the First Minister refused this proposition. He and his friends

say that the Canadians pay the duty upon the coal and lumber sent to the American market. If we look into the question, we shall find that for the period for which this treaty has to run, the Americans will have collected \$16,000,000 upon these articles. Who pays this sum? We say the American consumers; but the men of capacious minds on the other side, like the hon. member from Annapolis, the hon. member for Cardwell, and the hon. Ministers, say it is paid by the Canadians. If they are right, the First Minister has thrown away \$16,000,000 in order to get less than \$5,000,000. But that is not all. The hon. gentlemen cannot take credit for the \$5,000,000 which were received. The credit of that is due to the skill and ability with which the hon. member for Westmoreland superintended the case on behalf of this country. The United States Counsel claimed that Canada was largely benefited by the free market with the United States for their fish. They had remitted \$2, I think, a barrel upon Canadian fish. They regarded this remission as a remission of tax paid by Canadians, and they insisted that this remission should go in reduction of compensation; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are right, their contention was unassailable. But the hon. member for Westmoreland took a different view. Being a free trader, he said these duties were paid by the American consumer; that their abolition was an advantage which accrued to the American consumer, and that they ought not to be regarded as a compensation. The hon. member for Westmoreland proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that he was right, and his opponents were wrong; and, if \$5,000,000 were obtained, it was largely due to this fact. What would have been the position of the First Minister or his friends upon this question? They would have said to the American Counsel, we concur in your view; you are undoubtedly right. The Canadians paid this duty, and this is now a simple question of account. All we have to do is to ascertain the amount of duty which you would have collected under your Tariff on Canadian fish, and credit you with this sum as payment of the Award. This question must soon come up again, and every one knows that the opinions held by gentlemen opposite will put them out of Court. They cannot obtain a farthing without abandoning their views upon Protection. They could not have obtained an Award of a dollar had they controlled the affairs of this country when the Halifax Commission sat. The hon. President of the Council has referred to the railway expenditure, and the railway construction of this Government and the late Administration, and his statement is as disingenuous as such a statement could well be. He says, that when the late Government retired from office, that there was not a mile of the Pacific Railway open for traffic. That from Lake Superior to English River, ninety-seven miles were built. That now there are from Lake Superior westward, 242 miles. That from Selkirk eastward there were seventy miles constructed there; that there are now 130 miles; that between Emerson and Selkirk, there were then twenty-two miles; that there are now eighty miles; that from Winnipeg westward before the advent of the present Administration, there was no road; that now 134 miles are in operation. And the hon. gentleman has referred to their patriotic endeavors to supply the missing link. If the hon. gentleman had striven to make a statement calculated to mislead, calculated to make impressions wholly at variance with the facts, he could not have made one which would have better served his purpose than the one he made to this House. Why, of this 134 miles west from Winnipeg does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that any portion of it is completed. Does he not know that the ties are laid down without any portion of the road being graded; that, in many cases, they are laid upon the ice, and that when spring opens, when the frost disappears, the road will be impassable?

Mr. BANNERMAN. Not for 120 miles, it is all graded.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says it is all graded; he will have an opportunity of considering that at another period.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman knows that west of Winnipeg the road has been moved several miles to the south to another track. There is not a mile in use of what they pretended to have built.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the point. The point is this: The hon. gentleman is making a statement that the 125 miles west of Winnipeg is not well graded, and I say it is.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman will permit me I will state my case in my own way, and if the hon. gentleman opposite does not agree with my view, if he disputes my facts, he will have an opportunity of correcting me, as I have no doubt he will. The hon. gentleman says, that but ninety-seven miles from Lake Superior westward was open under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. That now 145 miles more are completed. But was there nothing done upon these 145 miles before the retirement of the late Administration? The hon. gentleman says that there was not a mile of this road open for traffic. There is not a mile now. It cannot be opened until the two sections meet, and a continuous line is made. The hon. gentleman says, that but twenty-two of the eighty-five miles between Emerson and Selkirk are completed. Will he say how much was done after the accession to office of the present Administration? He knows that that road was about completed. He knows the trains were running upon it a few weeks after the defeat of the late Administration, and that nothing was done by the present Government to hasten the completion of that line. The hon. gentleman has referred to the missing link as he calls it. He does not consider it beneath his position as a Minister of the Crown to seek to mislead those about him and behind him, who prefer to be misinformed upon this subject. He knows that it was not to the public advantage that a contract for the construction of the central portion should be given before the contracts already let for the construction of the ends approached completion. The country was inaccessible except by means of the two extremities, and to let the contract for the construction of this middle section at an early day, was equivalent to increasing the contract price to an enormous extent, without at all hastening the period of completion. Suppose this contract had been let two or three years earlier, what useful public purpose would it have served? How were supplies to be taken in there? Even as it was, there are instances of provisions having to be carried for thirty miles on the backs of men over muskies, and through swamps and lakes, and what would have been the difficulties at a still greater distance from any proper base of supply? Would not tenders for construction have been necessarily confined to those contractors who controlled the existing means of ingress to the country? I have seen it estimated, that it would have cost from 10 to 15 cents a lb. on every crow-bar, shovel, spade, pick and barrow, taken at the nearest point of operation, and yet the hon. gentleman expects the country will agree with him in his wild animadversions upon the late Administration for not beginning railway construction at points which were for the time being inaccessible. The hon. gentleman has referred to the 134 miles of road built from Winnipeg westward. This is a very tender topic; one which I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman mention. I would have supposed that he would have preferred the discussion of almost any other subject than this one. He knows that his colleague had located 200 miles of the road. The Syndicate have refused to accept the location. They said that it was bad. They set it aside, and chose a line for themselves. The eighty odd miles of road which he had built, they have abandoned. The

Minister of Railways let a contract which paid so much more handsomely for ballasting than for grading, that I understand the contractor undertook to make the road bed with ballast. It was so well made that when the rains of autumn came, a considerable portion of it was under water, it can no longer be used; and there is now, a few miles from Winnipeg, a train frozen in the ice, and which has been frozen there since the early winter. There are some facts connected with this road which the House ought to know. We have a right to know whether the contractors were paid in full for a road built in this way. We have a right to know whether the Minister of Railways let a contract for the construction of a portion of the Pacific Railway upon plans and profiles so degraded that the road could only be used in the dry season of summer. I believe this statement is true. The Syndicate have found it to their interest to construct another line to Portage la Prairie and to abandon the line built by the hon. Minister of Railways. Who paid for the construction of this abandoned road—was it the Syndicate or was it the hon. Minister of Railways? What settlement has been made with the contractors of the second 100 miles who have not been permitted to go forward with their work? How was it the hon. Minister made such a mistake in the location of the road that the Syndicate found it necessary to abandon his line and to abandon all that has been done upon it? The hon. gentleman says that the Syndicate have now 134 miles built west of Winnipeg. I have good reason to believe that there is not one mile finished in such a way as to entitle the Syndicate to receive money or lands upon their contract, if that contract is strictly adhered to. Is it not a fact that a large portion of these 134 miles has been made by simply laying the ties upon frozen ground or on the ice? Is it not a fact that the road is neither graded nor ballasted, and that considerable portions of it must be unfit for traffic the moment the frost disappears and the spring opens? The hon. gentleman's statement, from beginning to end, can only serve to mislead. I am making no complaint against the Syndicate; they are men of great ability, who have gone into this railway as a commercial enterprise, who are studying their own interests, who are capable of understanding them, and who will do that—as they have a right to do—which they believe best for themselves. But the Government have not been equally mindful of the public interests, and the more the statements that the President of the Council has made, in reference to the Pacific Railway, is investigated, the more it will be found to be no ground for self-laudation. The President of the Council says that the present Administration have added \$100,000,000 to the wealth of the country, by keeping 100,000 Canadians at home. He informed us that 28,000 settled in Manitoba last year; and he adds that the Government have added \$28,000,000 thereby to the wealth of Canada. These are certainly novel calculations. There are not a hundred thousand people in Manitoba and the North-West. The Government have kept nobody at home. They have driven thousands abroad. According to the United States immigration returns our emigration thither was, in 1878, 21,474; in 1879, 31,156; in 1880, 99,000, and, in 1881, 125,000. The year 1879 was a year in which the Tariff was in operation for a little more than three months, and the emigration from Canada increased upwards of 10,000. The next year it was more than four times as great as it was in the year 1878, and during last year it was equal to the emigration for the five years for which the late Government held office. The hon. gentleman's arithmetic will, then, require to be reversed. Canada has lost, in the loss of her population, \$224,000,000, during the years 1880 and 1881. And what have we gained in population by the efforts of the hon. gentleman? It is the height of absurdity to count the

Mr. MILLS.

Canadians who go from Ontario to the North-West as a population gained. I have never heard of such a calculation except in a single instance; and it is so much like the calculation of the President of the Council that I will mention it. He shall have whatever advantage it may afford him. On one occasion a school teacher gave a class of boys an exercise in composition. One of them wrote an essay about pins. He began by saying that pins were highly useful things, for they had been the means of saving the lives of thousands of people. The teacher was astonished, and he asked his pupil how thousands had their lives saved by pins. "By not swallowing them," replied the boy. The Minister says the Government have added \$100,000,000 to the wealth of the country, and when we ask in what way he says, by keeping 100,000 Canadians at home, who are cheap at \$1,000 a piece. Why did the hon. Minister stop at \$100,000,000? Why did he not count the whole population, and he might have made the service of the Government to appear much more valuable. Although living may be dear at the present time, human flesh and blood is cheap at \$1,000 a head. A good steer is cheap at \$50, and an ordinary horse is worth \$100, and why should not an intelligent, industrious, sober young man, be valued at \$1,000 and placed to the credit side of the ministerial account? I am inclined to think that most young men will resent the ministerial calculation. I am inclined to think they will refuse to be put in the ministerial balance when the political day of judgment comes, and be weighed and sold for the advantage of the Government. The hon. gentleman may take whatever consolation he can get from the Trade and Navigation Returns. He may appeal to any monopoly that owes him gratitude; but he can hardly venture yet to look upon this country as a political slave market in which every man who ventures to go from one part of the Dominion to another part, is to have a value of \$1,000 put upon him, and then have this sum credited to the wealth-producing power of the Government and the National Policy. I am not sorry, however, that such a line is taken, and the result will be as well understood as the argument. The hon. President of the Council says that upwards of 21,000 additional hands have been engaged in manufacturing establishments since the introduction of the present Tariff. He says that these represent from 80,000 to 100,000 of an additional population. He ought to know that this is not the case. A very large number of these 21,000 are children. In many of the cotton factories, all the children of a family are engaged, and the number of the population represented by these 21,000 would be less than 50,000 in all. The annual increase in the number of those engaged in skilled pursuits before the introduction of the National Policy was more than double the number who had been added since. We ought to have had an addition of 44,000 instead of 21,000. It is not true, then, that the National Policy has helped us in this particular. Many mechanical pursuits have been seriously injured by the policy of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I have seen it stated that upwards of 90 per cent. of the stone-cutters have been driven from Ontario by the exclusion of Ohio freestone from the Canadian market. We do know that there has been enormous emigration from the country; that it has far exceeded anything hitherto known in the country. It has not been simply an emigration of unprotected farmers and laborers, but mechanics and artisans have also gone away in great numbers. Let me here refer in this connection to some very important statistics given by the hon. the Minister of Finance. They are anything but encouraging, and the results which they give are so disappointing that I am inclined to believe they have, indeed, very little value. The hon. the Minister of Finance told us that, in the city of Hamilton, there were employed, in 1878, 3,703 persons; in 1881, 9,054; giving an increase of 5,351

hands engaged in the manufacturing establishments of Hamilton within three years. The plant, he says, in 1878, was \$538,100, and, in 1881, \$1,174,750, an increase of 113 per cent. The aggregate production in 1878 was \$3,857,000, and in 1881, \$7,478,700. The hon. the Minister of Finance says that wages in 1878 were \$1.07½ a day, and in 1881, \$1.17½. Now, from these statements we see a great diminution per hand both of labor and of capital since 1878. The number of skilled laborers in the city of Hamilton have increased 144 per cent.; the value of the plant has increased 113 per cent.; wages have advanced 9¼ per cent., while the production has increased only 94 per cent. The annual production in 1878 was 7½ times the amount of plant; and in 1881 it was 6½ times the amount of plant. The production per man was \$1,041 in 1878, and but \$824 in 1881; and, if the hon. the Minister of Finance is right, in 1881 the wages of the laborer amounted to the enormous sum of 43 per cent. of the entire value of the articles upon which the labor was expended. I find in the United States that the wages amount to but 18 per cent. of the value of the articles upon which the labor is expended. The hon. the Minister of Finance gives the additional skilled laborers of Canada, since the introduction of the present Tariff, as 24,875. Now, the annual value of the products of their industry, at the estimate of the hon. gentleman, would be \$19,906,000. But the Census of 1871 would give us \$29,000,000, or nearly 50 per cent. more than the United States Census returns would place upon the articles upon which the same amount of labor has been expended—the value of \$52,635,000. If the hon. gentleman is right, under the present Tariff the manufacturer produces goods to the value of \$824 per man. In 1871, the manufacturer produced about \$1,200 per man, and in the United States the manufacturer produces upward of \$2,000 per man. If the hon. the Minister of Finance's statistics are at all to be relied upon, we are in a condition of utter helplessness. If the United States can produce \$2,100 worth of goods with the same amount of labor that produces \$824 worth of goods here—if \$43 out of every \$100 is required to pay wages here, and but \$18 out of every \$100 is required to pay wages there, it is as plain as noon-day that 100 per cent. protection would be wholly inadequate to exclude American goods. I do not believe that our industrial establishments are so disgracefully inefficient as the hon. gentleman has represented them to be. I believe the deductions which are suggested by his statistics, show that they are utterly worthless. In 1870, the value of the raw material used in manufactures in the United States was \$2,488,427,242. The wages of the laborers, \$775,584,343. The value of the manufactured products was \$4,232,325,442. We see that the value of the material is 59 per cent.; the value of the wages 18 per cent.; and the earnings of the capital 23 per cent. It would have been interesting had the hon. the Minister of Finance given us the value of the raw material used in the city of Hamilton. We have for wages, in Hamilton, 43 per cent., and if we were to put the value of the raw material at the same sum, we would have but 16 per cent. left to cover the deterioration of plant, the cost of fuel and the earning of capital. The total amount of the capital in buildings and plant, according to the hon. the Minister of Finance, is but \$248 per hand, which would represent an addition to manufacturing capital of the Dominion, during the past four years, of but \$4,664,061—a much less sum than the estimated surplus of the hon. Minister for a single year. If the hon. Minister is right in the data which he has given us, the amount of capital invested in manufacturing pursuits is less than \$1,200,000 a year, being not much more than one third of the sum similarly invested ten years earlier. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister of Finance thinks the House ought to accept the statistical information

which he has given us? I would like to know whether he is of opinion that the manufacturing establishments of Canada are producing goods to the value of but \$824 annually? Whether he thinks when he is shown that it takes nearly three men in Hamilton to produce as much as one man in Buffalo, he has proved the success of this policy? Whether he thinks that industry has been diverted into those channels where the largest measure of value is obtained by the smallest expenditure of capital and labor? I would like to know whether he does not think the information which he has undertaken to convey to the House is not wholly trustworthy? It has been conclusively shown here that the attempt to give the manufacturers strength and vigor by a system of protection has wholly failed. The hon. President of the Council has undertaken to show that in those States of the American Union where manufactures are established the farmer receives a larger return from his land, and he gave us the relative number of agriculturists and those engaged in other pursuits. In the State of Illinois, the number of agriculturists he says is 80 per cent.; of persons employed in manufacture, 20 per cent.; value of agricultural products, \$12.47 per acre; Indiana: agriculturists, 84 per cent.; others, 16 per cent.; products, \$12.47 per acre; Kansas: agriculturists, 81 per cent.; others, 19 per cent.; products, \$9.11 per acre; Connecticut: agriculturists, 65 per cent.; others, 35 per cent.; products, \$16.82 per acre; Delaware: agriculturists, 74 per cent.; others, 26 per cent.; products, \$15.00 per acre; Maine: agriculturists, 75 per cent.; others, 25 per cent.; products, \$13.51 per acre; Massachusetts: agriculturists, 55 per cent.; others, 45 per cent.; products, \$26.71 per acre; New Jersey: agriculturists, 66 per cent.; others, 34 per cent.; products, \$18.00 per acre; Pennsylvania: agriculturists, 70 per cent.; others, 30 per cent.; products, \$17.68 per acre; Rhode Island: agriculturists, 56 per cent.; others, 44 per cent.; products, \$29.32. Now, I may say, that the statistics of the hon. gentleman are wholly inaccurate, and if they were accurate they would be utterly valueless for the purpose for which he has used them. The hon. gentleman has left out of sight altogether the difference in the density of population, and he has also omitted the difference in value, depending upon the cost of transportation. Almost every kind of farm product has a higher value in Massachusetts than in Kansas, just as it has a higher value in Halifax than in London or Hamilton. Oats are worth more in Prince Edward Island than in Ontario, not because Prince Edward Island is a manufacturing Province and Ontario is not, but because it is nearer the market where the surplus oats are sent for consumption. But I find from the Census of the United States of 1870, the last which are available for this purpose, that the figures of the hon. gentleman are all wrong. I find that Massachusetts has but 73,000 of her population engaged in agriculture and she has 507,000 engaged in other pursuits. I find that Illinois had 375,000 engaged in agriculture, and 367,000 engaged in other pursuits. I find too, that the value per acre of farm products is not at all what the hon. gentleman represented it to be. I find that the value of farm products per acre was, in Illinois, \$10.93; in Indiana, \$12.20; Kansas, \$14.21; Connecticut, \$16.56; Delaware, \$11.42; Maine, 11.33; Massachusetts, \$11.03; New Jersey, \$22.10; Pennsylvania, \$15.90; and in Rhode Island, \$17.38. I find that the number of acres of cultivated land has, in Connecticut, diminished during the decade between 1860 and 1870, 184,000 acres; in Massachusetts, 1860 and 1870, 88,000 acres, and in Rhode Island, 1860 and 1870, 46,000 acres. I find that the value of farm lands in the New England States has fallen, and that none of those results, which are so frequently pictured in glowing terms, as the consequence of extensive manufactures, have there been realized. The hon. gentleman has referred to the shipping interests of Canada and of the United States, and he has endeavored to

show that the shipping interests of Canada are in a satisfactory condition. The testimony against him on this point is unanimous. We have had a great many attempts made to explain the decline of American shipping. We were told for some time that it was due to the piratical enterprises of the Alabama and her consorts. But, after all such piratical raids had come to an end, the decline continued; and when it was no longer possible to assign such a cause it was then attributed to iron ship-building. But Canada built wooden ships, Norway built wooden ships, Italy built wooden ships, and the tonnage of all these countries continued to increase. Their commercial marine prospered in spite of the iron ship building of the United Kingdom. No sooner, however, is a highly protective Tariff adopted here than our ship building begins to decline, and our tonnage is diminished, and hon. gentleman opposite import from Washington a reason just as they imported from Washington a tariff. Do they suppose that the House or the country will believe them? Do they suppose they can make the people believe that iron ship building, which did us no harm down to March, 1879, has suddenly become injurious since that period? How is it that iron ship building in England wrought such havoc with ship building in the United States at least ten years before it did any mischief here? How is it that we did not suffer from it sooner? How is it that neither Norway nor Italy suffer from it now? Do hon. gentlemen suppose they can persuade the people of this country to accept their reasons which they assign for the decline of a most important industry, as well as for the decline of our commercial marine which has hitherto been the pride of Canada? The hon. President of the Council has undertaken to explain the smallness of American manufactured exports, by saying that the United Kingdom is a very small country and the United States is a very large one; and that the only fair way to make a comparison is to mark out the size of England in the north-east part of the United States and to count all that is consumed elsewhere, exports. This, indeed, is almost a novel style of argument, I remember only one proposition like it. Curran, on one occasion, was engaged in a duel with a gigantic member of the Irish Bar, who complained that he was not fighting on terms of equality. He said Curran was a very small man and was much more difficult to hit than he. "We will chalk out" said Curran, "a figure of my size on you and all shots outside of that shall not be counted." If the United States have a larger territory they have also a very much larger population, and the 16,000,000 of excess in population are carrying on domestic manufactures for themselves, as well as the 36,000,000 which the hon. gentleman is willing to count. The business of manufacturing cotton is of very modern growth. It began in England and the United States about the same period of time. The United States had the advantage in a domestic supply of the raw material. For a time England had cheaper capital. At this moment there are 40,000,000 of spindles in England and about 9,600,000 in the United States. The United States are not supplying their own population. England is supplying nearly 300,000,000 of people outside the United Kingdom. In England there are 468,000 hands employed in the manufacture of cotton, or nearly ninety spindles to each hand. Now, when I look at the returns which have been submitted to this House, I am forced to the conclusion that they are either very inefficient or the information which has been given is calculated to mislead rather than to inform us of the actual state of things. The hon. Finance Minister has brought down a return which shows that since 1879 four new cotton factories have been established in the country, one at Brantford, employing 120 hands. One at Hamilton employing 125 hands, one at Coaticook employing 230 hands, and one at

Mr. MILLS.

Cornwall employing 225 hands, in all 700 hands. The Commissioners which the hon. gentleman appointed say they inspected thirteen cotton factories employing 4,021 persons. Those figures show that the tremendous stimulus of 40 per cent. has not produced so rapid a growth of those factories as we might have expected. But what I desire specially to direct the attention of the House to, is this: that, according to the English Standard these 4,021 hands ought to represent 390,000 spindles, but instead of doing so the hon. Finance Minister informs us that there are but 106,000 or 108,000 cotton spindles in Canada, and I am not at all sure that there may not be many more cotton factories in the country than those visited by these gentleman. We see that even if this represents the whole number, that labor and machinery in Canada, is to labor and machinery in England, as 26 is to 90. Now, when the hon. gentleman tells this House that the people of Canada are getting cotton goods cheaper than they ever got them before he is making a statement which it is impossible can be true. No such waste of capital and skill can be reconciled with the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister. The President of the Council disputes the proposition of the hon. member for Centre Huron, that our imports would have yielded us a sufficient revenue under the old Tariff to have enabled us to meet the expenses of Government if economically administered. This the hon. Minister denies, but it is plain to every one that if we would not have imported so largely, then the present Tariff has wholly failed in its main purpose, which is to exclude foreign goods from the Canadian market. The hon. Minister says that if we obtain as much Customs business under a low Tariff as under a high one, we are burdened as much by the one as by the other. I deny his proposition. I am astonished that he should make it. He will find no authority to support him. Facts and reason are equally against him. If the Government put a duty upon coffee and tea, whether it be high or low, the public get the tax, except it increases the price of some other article which is in part substituted for them; but I know none such. But this will not hold good with regard to spirits. We put Customs duty upon imported whiskey. Do we stop there? Not at all. We say to the distiller, we have imposed a duty of 80 cents a gallon on imported whiskey. The price of your home made article is in consequence advanced 80 cents a gallon, and this sum belongs to us. It is no part of the price which you by your labor and industry give the article. It is an additional price given by an Act of Parliament, and we shall appropriate it to public uses. Now that would not be the less a tax if the Government neglected to take it. It would be received by the distiller instead of the Excise officer; but it would be paid by the public all the same. The hon. Minister of Finance imposes a duty upon bread stuffs. He tells the producer, that, in consequence of this Government interference, he gets a higher price. He tells or should tell the consumer, in consequence of this interference, you are paying an Excise duty to the producer of domestic flour and cornmeal, and to the Government on imported flour and cornmeal. Is not this so? If this contention be correct, then the burden is the same upon the consumer of the domestic article as it is upon the consumer of the imported article. The public pay the tax; but, because the Government do not receive it, the Minister refuses to consider it a tax. It is the measure of duties imposed, and the articles upon which they are imposed, by which the amount of taxation is to be determined, and not by the amount of Customs duties paid into the public Treasury. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he promised, by legislation, to increase prices. He will not deny that, upon the products of this country, those increased prices have been paid by the consumers of this country, and if so they have burdens imposed upon them. They are

compelled to pay tribute money to their fellow countrymen, although it does not appear among the sums collected. I do no care to pursue so elementary a subject further. I have said enough to show this House that if the Government are at all right in their contention, the amount of taxes collected is not a measure of the taxations imposed—I dispute their propositions—I say they are alike contrary to reason and experience. I say they have not benefitted the producer, but they have burdened the consumer. Let us look for one moment at the agricultural products of the country. These gentlemen have told the farmers, we can help you by a tax on American cereals. Barley came free from the United States into Canada; barley was taxed 15 cents a bushel in going from Canada into the United States. What happened? The Americans have increased the quantity of barley produced in their country, during the last ten years, nearly eight fold, and the result is that the demand for Canadian barley has largely fallen off, and barley in western Ontario, at all events, has dropped again out of use as a farm product or branch of agriculture.

Mr. ORTON. There was more barley grown last year than in 1878.

Mr. MILLS. No; nor was there more wool grown. The price of wool has diminished till at the present time the market value is less than 25 cents. I believe the average market value in Ontario last year, of Canadian wool was 22 cents per lb.

Mr. PLUMB. The alpaca was manufactured.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, if a consistent protectionist, would insist upon a high duty on foreign wool; and if the duty was only made sufficiently high the farming population of Canada would give up the growing of combing wool and turn their attention to the growing of fine wool. But so long as there is no duty on foreign wool they find the growing of combing wool the more profitable of the two.

Mr. ORTON. I think there is a duty on all kinds of wool that compete with Canadian wool.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows there is no duty on any wool that competes with Canadian wool, though there is a duty on wool that does not. If the Government would exclude the wool that competes with Canadian wool, I understand that the woollen manufacturers will be obliged to work up the Canadian wools, and the public would be obliged to wear the cloth produced from them. But the Canadian Government takes good care to impose duties on those articles not to be affected by the taxation. Some have a tax on barley because none is imported into Canada. There was no barley brought in before except what was imported to keep the seed from deterioration.

Mr. ORTON. How about oats?

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman say that it affects the price?

Mr. ORTON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I know that in the section in which I live the value of oats has been increased, but it was increased before the adoption of the National Policy, by the building of oat mills, which made it possible when the oats were converted into meal to transport them to a distance in that form profitably, which cannot be done while the oats are unmanufactured; and some oat mills have been shut up by the Tariff because they could not get the necessary supplies to keep them running throughout the year. I return to the subject: were we overrun in consequence by the importation of American barley? Was all the produce of that other barley farm to which the First Minister so frequently referred, a few years ago, imported into Canada? No, except small quantities imported to improve the yield. We did not im-

port from the United States; large quantities were exported thither from this country. Why? Because they produced less than they required, and we produced more than we could well consume. Every one knows that the tax on barley has not been of the slightest consequence, except to inconvenience the farmers who which to prevent degeneracy of the product by an importation of seed. Now, when we come to manufactured goods, where the home production is less than sufficient to meet the home demand, there can be no doubt whatever that the tax will increase the price, in many cases, to the amount of taxation. It was for this reason, mainly, that an increase of duties was demanded. Every one who chooses to exercise his common sense will see that this must be the case; and yet the hon. gentleman proclaims that his Tariff has not failed; that prices have not been increased; that goods, wares and merchandise, were never so cheap as now. A short time ago the Americans had a very high duty on quinine. It was repealed, quinine was placed on the free list, and it is now in the American market sold at one half the price it brought four years ago. Then it was smuggled from Canada into the United States. Now it is smuggled the other way. Steel rails not long ago were, in London, bringing about \$30 a ton, and in New York they were \$35 a ton dearer. The tax amounts to \$28 a ton and the freights and charges to about \$5 more. Will any one deny that the difference between the prices of London and New York are due to the extent of \$28 to the American Tariff? The hon. Minister of Railways has referred to the coal Tax, and he says that the Americans paid the duty on coal. Now Prescott and Ogdensburgh are but a mile apart. The coal which sold a few days ago at Ogdensburgh at \$5.75, brings at Prescott \$6.65. The coal which at Windsor sells at \$7.50, sells at Detroit at \$6.75. Will the Minister tell the House that it will cost 90 cents to bring coal across the St. Lawrence; Does he think that any one would pay \$6.65 if he could buy at 5.75 at Ogdensburgh, and get the duties paid? The difference in price before the tax was imposed did not exceed 30 cents. It is now 90 cents. What makes the difference? The Minister says that to obtain the same amount of revenue under the old Tariff we would need to import \$21,000,000 worth more goods. The Tariff has, therefore, shut \$21,000,000 worth out of the country, and has given a home market to this extent. I wholly dissent from this statement. The purchasing power of the people in any one year is a fixed quantity. If you increase the price of all they eat, and of all they wear, of fuel and of light, a large portion, if not the whole, of \$21,000,000 is taken to pay this additional price leaving but a small sum if any for additional purposes. Every one must see that if hon. gentlemen have succeeded in securing better prices to producers, it is plain that more money will be required to purchase the same amount of commodities. The hon. member for Cardwell told us that the manufacturers of sewing machines in the United States sold them to Canadians for less than they did to their own citizens, that they always deducted the duties; so that if his statement is accurate, American sewing machines can now be imported into Canada as readily as if there was no duty at all. Both the hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Finance have said that no kinds of manufactured goods were as cheap in 1878 as they are to-day. Higher wages are paid; labor is less efficient, and yet every man is better off? The hon. member for Cardwell told us last year that sugar was never so cheap as it has been under the present Tariff. He has told us, if I remember rightly, that it is from 40 to 60 cents per 100 lbs. cheaper than before 1879. The hon. the Minister of Finance has said the same thing about cottons. Now what follows? That Canada never was a sacrifice market; that English and American goods were not sent in here and sacrificed. Mr. Drummond, of Redpath's firm, informed us, in 1876,

that we were getting American sugars at less than their actual cost, because the American refiner was paid a bounty by his Government. Now, we are told that Mr. Redpath is furnishing us with sugar at a lower price than the price of 1873, although that was below cost; that he is paying higher wages, and that he is doing a prosperous business! The same story is told of cotton manufactures—that it is prosperously lower now than the ruinously low prices of 1878; and yet these lower than bankrupt prices are producing handsome profits! I would like to ask the President of the Council what he has to say to this? Can he find no couplet from Biglow or Butler which will properly characterize the statement of his colleague? I have already pointed out the extraordinary features of the hon. Minister of Finance's statistics. Let me here notice the efficiency of our sugar refining. The hon. gentleman's commissioners visited four refineries in which they say 885 men are employed. Mr. Gladstone says, thirty-nine men will refine 100 tons of loaf sugar every week, or 292,000 lbs. per man each year. If we take the mixed sugars of the United Kingdom we find that 5,174 men refine 1,822,000,000 lbs., or 350,000 lbs. to each man employed. Now, if the information furnished the House by the hon. Minister of Finance is at all to be relied upon, that we have 885 men engaged in the refineries, they ought to turn out 300,000,000 lbs. of ordinary refined sugar, nearly three times the amount refined in Canada. The hon. Finance Minister has made a statement which shows that the refineries here, either owing to the defectiveness of their machinery or to some other cause, are producing not more than one-third of the quantity produced in the United Kingdom with the same amount of labor. I ask this House to say whether such labor is well employed? I ask it to say whether the country is not compelled to pay for this inefficiency? It may be that these refineries are not so wretchedly managed as the hon. Finance Minister would have us believe; but if they are not, is it not plain to every one that this House has wholly unreliable statements laid before it? It is impossible that this statement can be true. It is impossible to believe that men greedy of gain—eager to grow suddenly rich, would so mismanage their business, as to employ three men to do the work of one. I observe that the hon. Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, estimates the increased consumption of Canadian wool at upwards of 1,000,000 lbs. He says, that the exports in 1878 were 2,445,893 lbs. and, in 1881, 1,404,123 lbs., and he concludes from this fact that the difference is due to a larger quantity of Canadian wool being used in manufacturing. I do not think this is the case. My opinion is, that the number of sheep kept by the farmers has been very greatly diminished. The farmers of Canada turn their attention to the production of whatever pays them the best for the time being. Until the appearance of the wheat midge, the western portion of Ontario was largely devoted to the production of winter wheat. When the American war began, sheep raising and the growth of barley took the place of the growth of wheat. In 1860, there was less barley grown in the United States than in Canada. Within ten years the farmers increased their growth of barley eight-fold. The price of barley was greatly reduced. The price of Canadian wool has fallen year by year. Combing wool, last year, was not worth more than 22 cents, and the result is, that sheep raising and barley growing have ceased in the West to be agricultural productions. The dairy business, which, for a few years, was a leading branch of agricultural industry, has again fallen into the back-ground, and, during the past five years, the sale of wheat exceeds in value that of all other farm products taken together. I do not say that this is the most satisfactory method of farming, but I am simply stating a fact. A better price for oats has prevailed during the past six years than before, but it has

Mr. MILLS.

been wholly due to the erection of oat-mills, which send the meal to the Scotch market. I have no doubt whatever, if the hon. the Minister of Finance were to put a duty of 10 cents a pound on fine wools, the Canadian manufacturers could be supplied with home grown wool; and if his theory had any value in his own estimation he would have done this. The hon. member for West Toronto has referred to the fact that manufacturing industries have been recently extended, and he attributes the large consumption of home-grown articles to the exclusion of foreign products. This has been a favorite style of argument upon the other side, and yet a very cursory examination of the facts will show it to be most fallacious. The hon. gentleman admits that the importations of the past year were very much greater than in 1878. The imports for 1881 were \$105,330,840, and for 1878 \$93,031,427. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have all along argued that the demand for home productions in 1878 was less than in 1881, and yet the foreign importations of 1881 exceeded those of 1878 by more than \$12,000,000. If we take the years 1872-73, which hon. gentlemen referred to as a most prosperous year, we find that the imports exceeded in value \$128,000,000, being \$35,000,000 more than the year 1878, and yet hon. gentlemen do not say that the home manufacturers were driven to the wall in those years by excessive importations. The fact is that home and foreign products are, to a great extent, complements of each other. They are alike necessary to complete the assortment of the necessaries and the luxuries of life in this country. When the purchasing power of the community is from any cause diminished it effects this assortment all round. When there is a diminution of imports, there is also a diminution in the demand for home manufactured articles; and the years of the smallest imports are also the years in which home manufacturers are in least demand. It is because the same causes are operating with reference to each. The member for West Toronto has said that the question of Free Trade and Protection are not put in issue by this Tariff. That we all admit that there must be Customs duties, and it is a simple question as to the articles upon which these duties shall be imposed. I quite admit that the issue between us is not whether Customs duties shall or shall not be abolished. No one has spoken in favor of Free Trade on this side in the sense of wholly removing the shackles of commerce. It is not a question as between direct and indirect taxation, and the hon. member is only dealing candidly with this side of the House when he recognizes that fact. I have never hesitated to say, if a tax of 20 per cent. is necessary to meet the necessities of the Government, then I am ready to favor a tax of 20 per cent. If we cannot get on with less than 25 per cent, then I am in favor of 25 per cent. I set out with this proposition, that taxation in no form can in itself be anything else than a burden on the people; that it should be imposed only for public purposes and used only for the public benefit. There are certain canons which we ought to observe, I think, in the imposition of taxes. The tax should be imposed so as to take as little money as possible from the people beyond what finds its way into the public Treasury. It should be distributed fairly as between the Provinces; it should be borne by the population in proportion to their ability to pay; it should be so imposed so as to restrain commerce as little as possible. Now, in our estimation these are all burdens we impose on the population who are called upon to bear them, they are not benefits. It is not money paid into the public Treasury. It is not a tax to be justified by the benefits obtained. It is not applied in the public interest, but it is a tax imposed on one section of the population for the benefit of another section.

Mr. ORTON. I would ask whether it is not better, then, to propose a tax that gives the benefit to the farm producer?

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman thinks it is better he can undertake to establish that proposition, but I will undertake to say it is worse. Now, if the hon. member for West Toronto will consider these propositions, he will see that they are violated by the present Tariff; he will see that upon every one of them we are at issue with his friends, and that we have on our side every distinguished financier from Mr. Huskisson to Mr. Gladstone. His friends sometimes deny, and sometimes affirm, that taxation is in itself a burden. When British Columbia was admitted into the Confederacy it was said that taxation was a burden and this burden should not be increased for the purpose of giving effect to the terms of Union. When this Tariff was promulgated, a different doctrine was laid down, and it was said that, by a tax on coal, the industry of Nova Scotia would be revived, and by a tax on breadstuffs, the farmers of Ontario would be made prosperous. Here we have the theory enunciated that no matter what may be done with the taxes, the country is helped by their imposition. It is not their judicious expenditure which is to help the farmer and the miner, it is their imposition. Now, from this doctrine I dissent. They who promulgated it are the doctrinaires—the visionary theorists, who, like the hon. member for Cardwell, mistakenly suppose themselves to be practical men. I would like to ask the hon. member for West Toronto, whether this is not a very distinct issue between us? Taking the position that taxation is a public burden, we say the rich ought to bear their fair proportion. Do they do so? We deny that they do. Cheap cottons are far more heavily taxed than dear ones. Cheap woollen goods bear nearly double the tax of more costly goods. Cheap woollen or cotton goods are far more heavily taxed than the most expensive silks. If taxation is, in itself, a benefit then it may have been well to have measured out to the poor a double portion; but if it is not in itself a benefit, but a burden, a very different policy should be adopted. I have never, for one moment, doubted that any branch of industry might be stimulated by a sufficient bounty directly or indirectly given. But I have always contested the wisdom of undertaking to direct that which I believe is best left to the intelligence of our population. I do see serious dangers and difficulties in our road. I see that many branches of industry are approaching very closely to the line which separates prosperity from disaster. No one who has compared the manufactures of Canada with the manufactures of the United States, during the period of depression, can have failed to observe how many failures there was in that country, and how few there were here. The liabilities of those who failed of all classes in Canada, in 1875, were about \$26,000,000; and if we leave out boot and shoe makers, who were practically without any foreign competition, the manufacturer did not fail for more than 2 per cent. of this amount. I will venture the prediction, if a matter in itself so certain can be called a prediction, that another crisis must produce a very different result. Why did our manufacturers pass so successfully through the last crisis? Because they have grown up to meet the requirements of the country. They adjusted themselves to the local needs of the population, and their productions in but few instances exceeded the minimum requirements of their customers. The variable complement was the foreign import. In 1878, our boot and shoe manufacturers supplied 91 per cent.; the woollen manufacturers, 85 per cent. in their own lines. Saddle and harness makers, 99 per cent.; carriage manufacturers, 99 per cent.; merchant tailors, 95 per cent.; the manufacturers of agricultural implements, at least 95 per cent. Now there is not much room left in those industries for expansion beyond what is afforded by the growth of the country in wealth and in population. I say, apart altogether from the question of injustice done by duties in excess of the public requirements, you are misdirecting the capital of the country. We have only to look

at the Trade and Navigation Returns to see how much the purchasing power of the country varies. In 1873, our foreign trade amounted to nearly \$218,000,000. In 1879, the most gloomy year since Confederation, it was \$64,000,000 less. Now, there was a corresponding difference in our domestic and interprovincial trade; that is, a variation equal to 25 per cent. If we produce to the full extent of our market in years of prosperity, is it not evident that, in a year of depression, there must be great industrial disturbances? The number of employes in the more wealthier mills and factories will be diminished, and many of the weaker establishments will be closed. Is it nothing to have a large fixed population thrown out of employment? Is it nothing to have a large amount of capital, which, at frequently recurring intervals of time, is left wholly unproductive? Yet it is towards this destination we are hastily advancing, and the more apparent the success of the hon. gentleman's policy, the more certain is it that disaster must come. If our manufacturers had been allowed to obtain a safe foothold at home, if they had been allowed to manufacture under such favorable circumstances that they could have felt their way securely into foreign markets, then they would themselves, by crossing the frontier barriers, have protected their interests against the dangers of a contracted domestic market. I need not say more upon this point. We have no feeling of hostility to the manufacturing classes. We desire their prosperity, and we have marked out the line by which alone that prosperity can be made secure. We seek to promote the well-being of the whole people, and we adopt the policy which reason and experience alike demonstrate to be the necessary means to that end.

Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou). This debate has gone on at such length that I had not intended to address any remarks to the House, but for some observations made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Snowball) in reference to coal. His statements are so much at variance with the facts that I did not think I would be performing my duty if I did not challenge them. I refer, in the first place, to his observations with regard to the quality of Pictou coal. I thought that the quality of that coal was so well known and established throughout the country that no man would undertake to disparage it at this time of day. The hon. gentleman asserted that it was, generally speaking, of a bad quality, although in some exceptional cases it might be very fair. This statement is not borne out by the facts. If the hon. gentleman will only refer to the quotations of coal in the city of Montreal, where the largest purchases of Nova Scotia coal are made, he will find that Pictou coal—without any reference to any particular locality, or any particular mine in that county—is at a higher rate than any other produced in the Dominion. From actual experiments extending over ten days, with large quantities, and not from a single analysis, it was proven that Pictou coal was 10 per cent. better than Scotch coal; and in reference to the question of superiority, comparing the bituminous coal of Ohio with Pictou coal, I will read the testimony of a sea captain, who has had considerable experience in the business:

"MONTREAL, 2nd December, 1879.

"Mr. W. J. NELSON.

"DEAR SIR,—Referring to our conversation with regard to the comparative merits of Drummond and Ohio coals for steam purposes, I have no hesitation in saying that having used Ohio coal on board the steamer *Filgate* during the past season on Lake Ontario, I found that 40 to 50 per cent. more coal was required to give the same result that I obtain from Drummond coal furnished me for several years past by the Intercolonial Coal Company at Montreal.

"Yours truly,
"Captain S. FILGATE."

The observation made with regard to the quality of Nova Scotia coal was a most baseless slander on that great industry, and I was astonished that any gentleman should make such an assertion at this time of day. Perhaps I should not

be astonished, however, because an hon. gentleman reminds me that it is in accordance with the policy of a good many hon. gentlemen opposite to decry the industries of their own country. That hon. gentleman also stated that the coal owners were leaning on the Government. Such might be true, Sir, of gentlemen engaged in producing slabs and deal ends, but there is no great industry in this country that has received less consideration at the hands of the Governments of this country than the coal industry. A great amount of capital is required to maintain this industry—the proprietors have to pay a large price for their mines, and heavy duties on every article used in their equipment. There is no class of people who pay more to support the services of this country than the people engaged in that trade—there is also a charge for a royalty of 10 cents a ton to the Local Government on the coal produced. The hon. gentleman also stated that the increase in the coal output from 1878 was only natural. Perhaps he meant to say that it was only natural that there should be an increase from 1878 to 1881, under the operation of the National Policy, as he might have said that it would be natural that there should be an increase in the deficit under hon. gentlemen opposite. The increase in the sales of coal between 1878 and 1881 amounted to 341,000 tons; and, only for the destruction of one of the largest collieries, which had an output of over 100,000 tons, the increase would have been fully 450,000 tons. The hon. gentleman also states that he cannot understand why the National Policy should have increased the export of coal to the West Indies. I think that fact is quite susceptible of explanation. We know that by the fostering of the sugar industries, our ships now carry coal to the West Indies as a return cargo for the sugar they bring back. The hon. gentleman also stated that the condition of the working classes had not improved. I can say, having lived in the coal district for the last ten years, that there has been an advance in wages, and that the condition of the working classes is 50 per cent. better than it was during the period the late Government were in power. I was particularly amused at the arguments of the hon. member for Richmond regarding the condition of the laborers in this industry, which were intended to show that the improvement in the coal trade had not been of any benefit to them. I think the hon. gentleman could not have credited the members of this House or the country with much intelligence if he expected them to believe that statement in the face of the fact that the produce of the mines had increased 50 per cent. I know that for a few years previous to 1878, the average employment was not more than four days a week, while now work is on full time; such a condition of things benefits not only the working men themselves, but all who are indirectly interested in the trade. The hon. member for Bothwell, I think, stated that the duty was imposed for the purpose of obtaining a higher price. I think the facts do not bear out that statement; the object in imposing the duty was not to give a higher price, but to afford a home market to that industry to a larger extent than before; and that object has been secured, much to the benefit of the people of this country, because the great mass of consumers obtain their coal cheaper than they would if these collieries were allowed to go down, which would have occurred to a large extent if the policy of the late Government had been continued. I did not rise for the purpose of making any lengthened remarks, but before I sit down I desire to show some of the effects of the National Policy upon the industry of the country. That policy has now been in operation three years, and we are able to judge by experience how far it has been beneficial in its operation, and how far it has fulfilled the expectations of its friends. No person has denied that it has fulfilled the expectations of its promoters in producing a revenue not only sufficient to carry on the affairs of the country, but to produce a surplus. A cry familiar to my ears some months ago was

Mr. McDougald (Pictou).

that we had no prosperity. That cry, I am happy to say, is getting played out; like many other cries, it has served its purpose, and must now pass away. I think, after the evidence which has been placed before this House, that statement will hardly be repeated in the country with any expectation of its being believed. Speaking of the county of Pictou, with which I am acquainted, I can say that there has been great progress in the industries of the county, and that that progress is largely due to the National Policy. A new woollen mill has been erected near Hopewell, with a capital of \$30,000, and will soon be in operation for the manufacture of the finer quality of woollen goods. At Hopewell, another woollen mill has been enlarged, with a capital of \$20,000; and I know that all the woollen mills of the country, of which there are many, are fully employed. When I had occasion, not many months ago, to pay them a visit, to get a large order which I had received from Halifax, filled, not one would undertake to fill it as they were all fully engaged. Notwithstanding that fact, there is no increase in the price of manufactured woollen goods to the consumer; the goods are of better quality than formerly, and, owing to the large production and the competition, they are quite as cheap, as a rule, if not a little cheaper, than before the imposition of the duty. I have heard a great outcry about the increased cost of blankets, in consequence of the duty of 45 per cent; but throughout my county blankets are furnished of better quality and at cheaper rates than before the duty was imposed. There are other new industries which have been started in that county, which but for the operation of this policy would not have been commenced. There is one in particular, that of the glass-works which now employ 125 men with a pay roll for wages of over \$1,000 per week. There is a new factory erected, not quite in running order but it will be shortly, for the purpose of making car-springs, where it is intended eventually to employ about 300 hands. There are other industries which, under the operation of this Tariff have been largely extended, and I will give the House the opinion of the *Eastern Chronicle*, an authority which hon. gentlemen opposite will be glad to accept in cases of this kind, showing the progress in this single industry under the operation of the present fiscal policy, except for which they would have been unable to have carried on operations to the same extent. Speaking of the Nova Scotia Forge Company, that newspaper says:

"It is perhaps the most 'go ahead' iron manufacturing establishment in the county. In 1872, the present proprietors, Messrs. Graham Fraser and Forest McKay, started the 'spike factory' near the New Glasgow Station. From railway spikes they soon turned their attention to carriage springs and axles. In 1874, a steam hammer was added to the machinery of the shop, and they branched out into the production of car axles and ship's knees. About three years ago the present commodious factory was erected at Smelt Brook, and thus became the nucleus of what now bids fair to be the industrial centre of this county. The buildings, which cover some 4,000 square feet, are fitted up with the most improved machinery. Four steam hammers are in use the largest of which is a two ton double acting hammer, and is capable of forging very heavy shafting. Railway tracks run through the entire length of the building. The car axles and knees produced in this factory are made from scrap iron. Scrap is obtained from along the line of the Intercolonial, from Prince Edward Island and from wrecked steamships around the coast. The writer recently saw the hands employed in cutting up the scrap taken from the wreck of the ill-fated steamship *Atlantic* to be forged into car axles for the Canadian Pacific Railway, to be used in carrying the western bound pioneer to his home in Manitoba or the Saskatchewan. This Company employ about eighty men on the average, and the factory is kept running both night and day. The production of eighty car-axles is considered a fair day's work, which at 370 lbs. each, equals 4,440 tons per annum. This firm is also interested in the Nova Scotia Spring Works, now in course of erection at the same place."

Speaking of another industry, the Acadia Iron Foundry, the same newspaper says:

"Steam engines are constructed up to 250 horse power, and repairs to locomotives undertaken, their machinery being heavy enough to turn up the heaviest driving wheels. Fifty men are employed, and, for the greater part of the year, work is carried on both day and night. In the

boiler shop the greatest activity prevails. A new set of boilers for the *Scud* were made there during the past season, one of the largest jobs of the kind ever turned out of any boiler shop in this Province. They obtain their raw material chiefly from Londonderry, and fill orders from all parts of the Dominion, but chiefly from the Lower Provinces. During the past six months their sales have amounted to about \$38,000."

In addition to that testimony I can say that all manufacturing industries of the county are now fully engaged, whereas formerly they were languishing and in a very depressed condition. With respect to the coal question, the improvement in that industry is probably more marked than that of any industry in the Dominion. The sales of coal, in 1878, were 693,511 tons, which increased, in 1881, to 1,035,014 tons, being the largest on record. The hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Flynn) stated that it had been equalled by the out-put in 1873. The hon. gentleman may have been correct as regards the out-put, but the sales were less by 150,000 tons. If that quantity of coal were produced and not sold it was lying on bank at a loss to the Company. 465 additional men were employed in 1881 over 1878; there were 183,705 additional days labour in 1881 over 1878. This improvement is due to the duty and to the National Policy generally—the stimulus given to manufacturing industries, and the protection afforded them in obtaining the home market. I know from those engaged in the trade they attribute their prosperity to those causes, and there are no gentlemen better qualified to judge of the causes than those engaged in the trade. They would be fools to insist on retaining a duty in the face of the uniform opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, if it afforded them no benefit, and it is my opinion that, but for the protective shield thrown around them by the National Policy, half of those industries would have been extinguished by this time. As regards the question of wages, I think it will be found that wages have increased, and there has been a general improvement in the condition of all connected with the industry. In regard to the price of coal, the records will show that they have not been increased on account of the duty. No one will venture to say that prices in the Lower Provinces have been increased for that reason. In the Province of Quebec prices have not been increased, and no Province in the Dominion is more interested in retaining the duties than is Quebec from a consumers' standpoint, unless the collieries of the Lower Provinces be efficiently maintained it would be impossible for Quebec consumers along the St. Lawrence to secure their supply at anything like the moderate prices paid at the present time. What would be the position of affairs if they had now to depend on foreign importations for their supply. I am informed, on reliable authority, that the freights from Great Britain are from \$3.75 to \$5 per ton; add to that the price of the coal, and it will be found impossible that British coal can be landed at less than \$5 or \$6, whereas Lower Province coal can be obtained at least \$1 cheaper. Of course, I know that in occasional years the condition of the market may be different, once perhaps in two, three or four years, owing to vessels coming out in ballast carrying coal at a mere nominal freight. That is such a disturbing element in this trade that it is sufficient to paralyse, in years of depression, those industries, and the imposition of a duty removes this difficulty, while on the whole it does not impose burdens on the consumers in the Province of Quebec. As regards the price in Ontario, I think the imposition of the duty has not imposed any undue burdens on consumers there, because, by means of the duty, Nova Scotia coal has become a competitor with American coal at a good many points in Ontario, and the moment that is the case, American coal companies reduce their prices in order to meet that competition. It may be true that, in the western section of Ontario, the price has been somewhat enhanced on account of the duty, but the people there cannot complain,

they are in close proximity to the American lines, and are able to get their coal at a very cheap rate. It has been attempted to be shown that the competition of Nova Scotia coal has not reduced the price of American coal. To come to that conclusion we have to admit that competition in any branch will not reduce prices. Hon. gentlemen opposite argue eloquently on the effect of railway competition in reducing prices to competing points. The companies engaged in the coal trade in the United States are in many cases also engaged in railway traffic, and the principle that will hold good in the one case will hold equally good in the other. We know that Nova Scotia coal, notwithstanding the reduced price caused by competition, finds its way as far west as Cobourg. The arguments made use of by the hon. the Minister of Railways with reference to the prices of coal have not yet been refuted. In fact, scarcely an attempt has been made to refute them. The only denial made has been two statements from parties interested in the American coal trade. I do not know if hon. gentlemen opposite are in league with American coal proprietors, but their policy is in league with theirs. With regard to the price of coal at Buffalo, on the 1st of March it was quoted at \$2.25, and on that day a contract was made at \$2.65, ex-duty, being a difference of 60 cents between the price to the trade at Buffalo and the price at which sold for consumption in Canada, delivered at the International Bridge. I have said that the improvement in the coal trade is due to the National Policy, and has been obtained without imposing burthens on any section of the community. The proper method in discussing the coal duty is to consider its effects on the country as a whole. The duty has been opposed on account of its being a sectional tax. Those hon. gentlemen who opposed this duty which, after all, is really an ordinary revenue duty of 25 per cent. were not so sensitive in maintaining the protection of 150 per cent. on coal oil, an article of the same class as coal, so that it appears circumstances alter cases, and everything depends on where the sectional tax is imposed. The best test of the equality of a Tariff is the ability of a people to prosper under it. That has been eminently the case with the National Policy. There is no industry more deserving than the coal industry, of a fair and just treatment at the hands of any Government. It is an industry which dates back as far as 1785, and in which over \$12,000,000 is invested. This industry has been treated more unfairly than any in Canada. I will explain briefly my reasons for saying so, and for holding that it is entitled to a protective duty. It obtained its greatest prosperity about the year 1865, when the markets of the United States were open to us. In that year we shipped to the United States 465,994 tons. The following year the United States Government imposed a duty of \$1.25 per ton, which, in 1872, was reduced to 75 cents, but the result was that in 1879 only 51,645 tons were exported to the United States, or 8 per cent. of our entire sales, instead of 80 per cent as in 1865. The natural market of that industry was thus cut off, not through any want of energy of those engaged in it, but by the hostile legislation of a foreign country. The proprietors were compelled to seek new markets, and naturally turned to the Upper Provinces, but in consequence of the large quantities of coal that came out to the St. Lawrence in ballast, the efforts of our coal traders did not meet the success they deserved, and they only controlled that market in 1873 when coal was very high in Great Britain. In Ontario it was quite impossible to obtain an outlet, owing to the distance and the fact that American coal was allowed to come in free. There was not then, so far as I could see on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, a desire to deal fairly with this question. In order to obtain a home market, protection for this industry was sought by imposing on imported coal a duty which really did not amount to more than a duty for revenue. Yet that was refused by the

late Government, it has been granted by the present, and with the results we have seen. It has been said that if the Reform party obtained power they would do justice to every industry in Canada. We think it much safer for the people to judge them by their acts than by their promises. We have seen what justice they extended to these industries, and I think that when the opportunity arrives, the people will show they know with what party their interests are safest. I will only refer in connection with this question to the policy of the Opposition enunciated by its leader during his visit to my constituency last summer. Amid the varying policies, however, propounded on that side, it is very difficult to know which to choose; but in the ordinary course of things it is safer to take that of the leader. On that occasion I listened attentively to ascertain his policy, when he said to the people: "your natural channels of trade are with the neighboring Republic; your exports will find their best market there, and your imports should come from there." Now, under such a policy as that, it would be impossible to restrict the importation of coal from the United States, or afford us any relief. It is a policy which I do not hesitate to say is inimical to our interests and subversive of the advantages that ought to flow from the Confederation of these Provinces, which was designed to establish inter-provincial trade; and especially inimical to mining interests from the fact that the industry was about being crushed out. It is inimical to the industries of this country, because it tends—owing to our peculiar position and the competition to which we are exposed, in meeting the cheap labor and larger capital of older countries, and the protective policy of the United States—to aggravate our weakness and difficulties. It is inimical to the permanence of any industry in this country, and will only tend to the exportation of the labor which should be employed in Canada to build up our own industries, and increase the wealth of our own country. But that is a policy which the hon. gentleman opposite would carry out on the first opportunity. That is the policy which the hon. member for Gloucester predicted would be approved by my constituents when appealed to. I think I am as well acquainted with the people of my county, and know their feelings probably as the honorable member for Gloucester, and I think that when the opportunity arrives the electors of Pictou County will pronounce a verdict which will not be so favorable to that policy as the hon. gentleman thinks. I believe the people are alive to their own interests, and when the time comes they will utterly repudiate and disown a policy so injurious to the interests of the country, and will sustain a policy of moderate protection to the home industries of Canada.

Mr. RICHÉY. If I venture to solicit the attention of the House for a short time, I am quite sure that I need not claim that it is not due to any selfish desire on my part to be heard in this debate, but simply to a sense of duty to the constituency I represent, owing to the course which this debate has taken, and to a sense of my duty to the Government which I am here to support. I recall to mind the fact that we were summoned for the despatch of business; and I remember that Bacon, who said that true despatch is a rich thing—for time is a measure of business, as money is of wares—also said that long and curious speeches are as fit for the despatch of business as a robe with a long train is for a race. But we have the same high authority for saying that although iterations are commonly loss of time, it is a gain of time to iterate frequently the true state of the question. I trust, therefore, I may be indulged if I attempt to iterate a true statement of the question, avoiding the endeavor to follow the hon. gentleman from Bothwell through all that historical narration in which he indulged, concerning the past history of hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. I

Mr. McDougald (Pictou).

will confine myself to that particular point at present before the House, which I think has been well stated by my hon. friend who has just preceded me, when he said it was to consider whether, after the experience of three years of the National Policy, the predictions which were uttered by the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, have been fulfilled; whether our anticipations or their forebodings have been realized. I observed that the hon. gentlemen who have stood opposed to each other in this debate, have not always expressed the highest appreciation of each other. The hon. member for Bothwell chided us for our language. He informed us that vituperation neither added to the dignity of the hon. members who used it, nor to the dignity of the assembly addressed; and forthwith he proceeded by gentle insinuations to refer to hon. gentlemen on this side as owls and bats. I shall not follow that example. I desire to take a new departure and to recognize the ability and courage which have distinguished hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been the assailants of the National Policy. I think it required no little degree of courage to breast the flood of facts which the hon. the Finance Minister poured in upon the House. It required no small degree of ingenuity so to manipulate those facts and figures, if not to distort them, as to leave upon any candid mind the impression that the prosperity which this country now enjoys was, in no degree whatever, due to that policy. The course I intend to pursue is the very simple one of articulating some of the predictions uttered in 1879, when this Tariff was first brought down and passed into law, and appealing to the House to support me in the belief that these predictions have utterly failed. Among the objections which were urged, hon. gentlemen will remember, was this: that it was impossible the Tariff could produce the results expected from it, in the production of revenue and the protection of manufactures—that it must inevitably fail in one respect. That if it produced sufficient revenue it would not afford the required protection; and, if it afforded protection, it would not produce the revenue wanted. The answer to that prediction is found in the financial statements brought down from year to year by the hon. the Finance Minister—notably that which he has presented to us this year, in which, while he has been able to refer to millions of dollars of reserve, he has at the same time been able to show that the manufactures of this country were in a flourishing condition. He has been able to remove a million and a-half of taxation, and to sweep away entirely the duties on tea and coffee, and to grant the fishermen of the country the interest on that Fishery Award, which many of us had previously claimed on their behalf. He has been able also to refer to the prosperity of agriculture, a prosperity which, as hon. gentlemen opposite are not able to deny, they have attempted to refer entirely to the dispensation of Providence. Now, Sir, there are three providences to be considered in this connection. There is the Providence of the Supreme being, which was vouchsafed to those hon. gentlemen when they held office, as well as those who now control the Government. I find in the speeches of the Governor General of that time, words put into his mouth by his Ministers which recognized the bounty of Providence in that regard, in which he referred to the benefactions of Providence in the bounteous harvests which they enjoyed. But all these bounties of a beneficent Providence may fall short of their design if there be not superadded an intelligent Government and the providence of the people themselves. The hon. member for Centre Huron recognized this when he told the people of this country, and told them truly, that men could never grow rich by Acts of Parliament, but they must grow rich by frugality and hard work. But there was this to be considered, that their frugality was enforced, and their hard work was like that of the ancient

Israelites who worked for a Government which refused them straw. It was for want of providence on the part of the Government that those gentlemen failed, and it is by virtue of it that the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches succeed. There was another prediction that those hon. gentlemen very much dwelt upon, that the Tariff would be hostile to England and calculated to irritate the United States. I will cite the words of some of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on that occasion. The hon. member for Centre Huron said the people of England were to find their manufactures excluded from their own colonies, and we were warned by him that we were exposing great and important industries in thus rashly throwing down the gauntlet to 44,000,000 of our best customers in the United States. The hon. member for Bothwell said this was making war upon the commerce of the United States; and the hon. member for South Brant said that with all their protestations of loyalty, this Government had enacted a Tariff which discriminated against Great Britain, and which struck at the tie which bound the people to the Mother Country. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) said if this Bill passed the last link which bound Canada to England would receive such a violent wrench, that nothing but the most skilful management would prevent us from drifting away from our moorings, and landing in the arms of the United States. Well, Sir, with regard to the United States, I trust that we may ever be able to maintain the most amicable relations with that great country. Sharing with them the possession of a continent, which certainly affords sufficient extent and resources for us both; animated by the same desire, to work out for ourselves, under God, and those bounties of nature which we possess, the highest destiny which we may attain; I trust that nothing but the most generous rivalry will ever characterize those two countries, as regards each other, but in that rivalry, I claim, we are at liberty to indulge. I conceive it alike dishonoring to the country to which the warning is addressed, and to the country, the terror of whose name is invoked, when we are told that we are not to pursue the fiscal policy which we believe to be for our benefit, because it may irritate a neighboring nation, whose pursuit of that policy, to their own advantage, and our detriment, may be alleged as the very *raison d'être* of the policy we are pursuing. With regard to England, I believe that but one sentiment animates the people of this country, that of loyalty to the Throne and admiration for the institutions of Britain, a desire, not to sever, but to strengthen, by every means in our power, the tie that binds us to the Mother Country. The question that concerns us now is, have we alienated the affections of England, or have we brought upon us that vindictiveness by the United States which was prophesied? Why, as regards our American neighbors, we have had greater indications of a desire to renew reciprocal relations with us. We have noticed in their press their congratulations upon the success of our policy; they have bought more goods from us during that period, while we have taken less from them. Now, with regard to this Tariff operating so as to injure our importations from England, I shall have to trouble the House with a few statistics. In 1878, we imported from Great Britain less than from the United States by over \$11,000,000; in 1881, we imported from Great Britain more than from the United States by \$6,879,686, so there was a change of our import trade, in favor of Great Britain within these years of over \$18,000,000. We decreased in this time our imports from the United States, whilst we increased our exports to them. But there is one point to which I desire to direct attention, as presented in the speech of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). That hon. gentleman charged us with discriminating, under this Tariff,

against England, because, upon the goods imported from England, the average duty, taking the whole imports, was larger than upon those imported from the United States. I do not know that I can put my hand upon the language which he employed, but he made a comparison, if I remember correctly, by which, upon dutiable goods, the difference amounted to 2 per cent., and, upon dutiable and free goods together, nearly 5 per cent. I noticed that that hon. gentleman made no comparison of years; he confined himself to the operation of the Tariff in 1881. He will excuse me, I am sure, if I suspected that the reason why he made no such comparison was because he could not do it with good effect. I, therefore, had the curiosity to make some enquiry myself into the figures regarding the different duties, and with what result, Sir? With this result, that whilst under this Tariff we increased the average duties against Great Britain by \$2.91 in the hundred, we increased them against the United States by \$5.54 in the hundred, showing a discrimination in favor of Great Britain of \$2.63. If I go back to 1874, I find that the average duties were then heavier against Great Britain than against the United States by \$5.70 in the hundred. Did the hon. gentlemen, who are now so jealous for the maintenance of our relations with Great Britain, decrease the average? No, they raised it so that, in 1878, the discrimination against Great Britain, having for its basis the average duties, was \$7.37, so that their discrimination was more by \$1.67 against Great Britain, taking the whole average on dutiable and free goods, than in 1874. Has this Government increased it? No. In 1881, the average discrimination was \$4.70 on the hundred, or a reduction since 1878 by \$2.67. That, therefore, is the position in which we stand as regards the charge of discrimination against Great Britain. The charge which these hon. gentlemen make is true as regards the positive average, but as regards the comparative average the charge is fully met and thrown back on the source from which it emanated. But we should take into consideration, as regards the averages of the past year, that they are largely to be accounted for from the fact of the expensive goods we are importing from Great Britain, and the low duties on many of the raw materials and other goods which we import from the United States. We find that on silks alone the importation has doubled. We imported, in 1878, \$1,371,145 worth; in 1881, \$2,589,569 worth; and the importation of these goods shows the extending wealth and the increasing prosperity of our country, for that duty, of course, is paid by the rich and those whose circumstances are improving. Then, we had another prediction, uttered by these hon. gentlemen opposite, that this Tariff was to destroy the character and credit of our country. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) asked "if the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Finance were not calculated to injure the credit, the character and the reputation of his country at home and abroad." I ask, Sir, if ever the credit of this country stood higher than it does to-day? If we compare the loans negotiated by the present Minister of Finance with those of his predecessor, if we look back upon the career of that predecessor when time after time he came down to Parliament with his deficits, and look at the position of our revenue now, we have at once an answer to those predictions of theirs which need no further comment. So far with regard to the generalities in which these hon. gentlemen indulged—the objections which they took to the general operation of the Tariff. But they did not rest in generalities. They descended to details. We were told that the Tariff was to rob the lumberman and annihilate his industry:

"We are to have the lumber interest, employing some 45,000 to 50,000 men with their families depending on them put in the greatest peril, because it is impossible to concede from the House that the imposition of 30 or 40 or 50 cents per 1,000 on the manufacture

of lumber, will go very far to give that great industry its death-blow for the time being."

That was what the late hon. Finance Minister said. I need not dwell upon this question, because my hon. friend for North Renfrew (Mr. White) has so fully disposed of the whole argument and so ably discussed the matter, so far as it affects the lumbermen, that I think it is quite unnecessary to add anything to his remarks. I might, however, refer to the fact that whilst, in 1878, our exportation of lumber amounted to \$19,511,575, in 1881 it amounted to \$25,960,012, or an increase of nearly one-quarter. But this despoiling of the lumbermen was simply an example. The same hon. gentleman who used the language which I have just quoted, (the hon. member for Centre Huron, Sir Richard J. Cartwright) said that :

"They can understand from that illustration alone, how exceedingly trifling all the benefits which are proposed to be secured under this Tariff are, compared with the enormous mischiefs which will result from its operation. What is true of the lumber interest is true of the fishing interest, and of the transportation interest, and, as the agriculturists will find, true of their own interests also."

Sir, we can use that language to-day, but with a different signification. What is true of the lumbering interest is true of the fishing interest, is true of the transportation interest, and is true of the agricultural interest.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHEY. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) considers, perhaps, that I am making a bold assertion. I suppose that the duty, therefore, will devolve upon me of proving it to some extent. An hon. friend—not of this Legislature, but a member of the Local Assembly (Mr. Harrington, Halifax)—whose conversancy with all those commercial questions and everything pertaining to fishermen, fully qualifies him to give the statement which I now quote from him, referring to the operation of the Tariff upon the interests of the fishermen, said :

"The fishermen of to-day were in a far better position than they were in 1878, when the so-called Reform party were in power, and this he would prove from statistics which could not be denied. Taking 1878 as the basis of comparison with the year 1881, it would be found that there had been the following increase in the price of fish: No. 3 mackerel, from \$5 or \$6 to \$7 or \$10; herring, from \$3.50 to \$4.25; codfish, from \$3.25 to \$4.25; hake, from \$2 to \$2.50; halibut, from \$2.50 to \$3; salmon, from \$14, \$12 or \$10, according to quality, to \$19, \$17 or \$15."

Mr. ANGLIN. What is the cause of the increased cost?

Mr. RICHEY. The increase in the price, no matter from what it comes, whether from Providential interposition or from short supply, does not affect in any degree the argument I am using, and which I will wish the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) to understand. If fishermen get the highest prices for fish and have no more to pay for the goods they consume, the Tariff has not operated to injure them. Then, as regards the prices of goods they consume :

"Prices have been reduced as follows: flour from \$7 50 in 1878, to \$7 in 1881; cornmeal was as cheap in 1881 as in 1878, despite what the hon. member for Victoria might say; molasses from 50 cents in 1878, to 45 cents in 1881; tea from 45 cents to 39 cents; sugar from 11 cents to 9 cents; boots from \$3.50, \$3.75 and \$4 a pair, to \$3, \$3.25 and \$3.80 for the same qualities; clothes were no dearer; blankets, unbleached cotton and so forth, were all the same price; felt hats which, in 1878, cost \$1 and \$1.25, were now sold at 60 cents and 75 cents. In fact, everything that entered into the consumption of the fisherman and his family was as low or lower in price in 1881 than in 1878, though they received much more for the fish."

They may have received much more for the fish, from circumstances which Providence only controlled, but the National Policy, as is alleged on the other side, does not seem to have added \$6 to the taxation. Then, Sir, we ought not to forget that, under this Tariff, many articles which enter into consumption by the fishermen are entirely free from duty, such as twines and lines, salt, tar, pitch, and resin, and that the materials which they use for their sails has been put on the very low Tariff of 5 per cent. An

Mr. RICHEY.

argument has, no doubt, been formed in the minds of many people from the statement that the export of fish had to some extent decreased, not in 1881, because in that year there is an increase over 1880, but had decreased to 1880. The explanation of that is readily found in the fact that we have had a much larger home consumption—that fish which were formerly exported to the United States, and perhaps found their way through the United States back to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, now pass over the Intercolonial Railway to the Upper Provinces. It will be found that while it required only twelve cars to convey all the fish exported to the Upper Provinces in 1878, it required no less than 113 to convey them in 1881. With regard to the other allegation of the hon. member for Centre Huron, that the same statement as to the lumber interest would hold good as to the transportation interest, we have only to point to the change in the Intercolonial Railway. A deficit in the working of that railway of nearly \$750,000 a year has been changed into a surplus; and what is true of the Intercolonial is true of the other railways, and of our shipping interests. According to hon. gentlemen opposite the shipping interest was to be one of those most materially affected by this policy; and it has been claimed by hon. gentlemen in this debate that their anticipations in that respect have been fully accomplished. The answer has been already given in the statement that steam vessels have largely supplanted sailing vessels on the sea. I have a statement, showing the remarkable increase of steam in the ocean-borne commerce of all nations, which was recently laid before the London Statistical Society, and which is referred to in a late number of the *New York Shipping and Commercial List* :

"In the foreign trade of Great Britain the entrances and clearances of steam vessels at the various ports of the Kingdom reached 37,000,000 tons in 1880 against 15,000,000 tons in 1870. In 1880, Great Britain had 3,000 less sailing vessels than in 1870, whilst in 1880 and 1881 wooden vessels disappeared from the Register at the rate of about one thousand vessels each year. The loss of British sailing tonnage from the Register during the last decade is estimated at about 750,000 tons, but this was replaced by an increase of 1,611,354 steamer tons, which is computed at nearly 5,000,000 of effective carrying power. Thus the steamer tonnage added to the British fleet since 1870 represents more effective carrying power than the whole British sailing fleet in that year."

We have the hon. member for Gloucester telling us, when desiring to make a point against the hon. Minister of Railways on the coal question, that for the first time in the history of St. John, fifteen or sixteen steam vessels had put in there for coal and for deals. That very fact is in itself an evidence of the extent to which steam vessels are being substituted for sailing vessels. But, Sir, I desire to turn the attention of the House to a statement of the hon. member for Bothwell, that there had been an increase in the shipping of Canada up to the time these hon. gentlemen surrendered the reins of power, and that the decrease since was owing to the operation of this Tariff. Let me call attention to the exact condition of the shipping of this country. In 1878-9, we had laden inwards 1,839,039 tons, and, in 1880-1, 2,398,539 tons; we had laden outwards, in 1878-9, 2,765,946 tons, and, in 1880-1, 3,697,024 tons, an increase of 931,078 tons. The total tonnage inwards decreased, under the Mackenzie Government, an average of 5,693 tons yearly, and in the five years under this Government it has increased at the rate of 491,712 tons; the total tonnage outwards increased only 13,331 tons per year, or 65,655 in five years under the Mackenzie Government. It increased under the present Government 1,032,362 tons in two years; an average of 516,181 tons yearly, or at nearly forty times the rate under the Mackenzie Government. The total tonnage inwards and outwards gave the following average annual increase:—Up to the end of 1873-74, 700,000; to 1878-79, 7,438; to 1880-81, 1,007,893 tons. I think I may ask whether that is not an answer to the allegations made as to the decrease under the present Government, while it was contended there was an increase

under the late Government. In the coasting trade the increase of tonnage from 1878-79 to 1880-81 was, in steamers, 2,132,482 tons; sail, 917,601. Even in the matter of ship-building a point has been endeavored to be made in regard to the number of ships sold—that we have not sold as many as formerly. There is very little in that argument when it is considered that those who build ships might find it as profitable to hold them as to sell them under the improving condition of trade; but the fact is that from 1874 to 1878 the building of ships steadily declined. There was a decrease every year, the average rate being 19,254 tons, while in the past year, 1880-81, there has been an increase, small it is true, but still an increase of 10,000 tons. Then we were told “it would cripple all industries and force capital into less productive channels than it would seek if left to pursue its natural course, and it would prove absolutely disastrous to the country as a whole. It would stop the expansion of our manufactures.” Surely no man at the present day can contend that our manufactures have not increased rapidly, that they have not prospered under the operation of this Tariff. I think I might very fairly, after the remarkable manner in which those predictions have failed, appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite and ask them if they are not prepared to change their opinions and unite with the great party on this side of the House in going before the country and presenting before the world the spectacle of a united body determined to carry on the affairs of the country in harmony and with a single regard to the maintenance of its prosperity. I would not appeal to them without possessing some authority, for I might refer to the language of the hon. gentleman who long maintained the position of their leader in this House, who told us that when men ceased to change their opinions upon the great questions of the day they ceased to be fit to occupy the positions of representatives of the people. If that be true, I know of no opportunity that will be more particularly appropriate than the present to change their opinions and unite with us. I can conceive of none when they could more justly, in view of all the facts, unite with the Government of the day, giving in their adherence and allegiance and going to the country with us as a united body. However much I might indulge in that roseate view, I have little hope of their conversion. I am afraid they are wedded to their idols. But I have one prediction which I have reserved to the last, because the answer to it is only in process of evolution, and cannot be fully made until it is given by the people at the polls. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), said: “The mighty wave that rolled over the country on the 17th September last, and which floated himself (the hon. the Finance Minister) and his colleagues to the Treasury benches was gradually receding and the sober second thought of the people was beginning to assert itself.” If that hon. gentleman did me the honor to visit me in my home by the sea I might show him that the waves which gradually recede gather force and return with redoubled power upon the beach; and we have had during the past few years some opportunities of remarking the play of this popular wave. We have had many by-elections. It is true hon. gentlemen opposite won two seats from us. That might seem like a recession of the wave, but we gained six from them, and that seems like the wave returning with redoubled force, and I believe that all the signs of the times give token of a still greater demonstration of the feelings of the people when appealed to than was furnished by them in 1878. My only fear for the Government of the day, when the elections come and the returns are in, is, that they will lose strength for the want of the strengthening power of a strong Opposition. I am willing to confess that they have that now, an Opposition strong, if not in numbers yet strong in ability; if not in the ability necessary for the administration of affairs, yet in the ability required for

criticism, and that is no small advantage to the country. Sir, if I had my own way I would feel very much disposed to stereotype the character of this Assembly. There are very few hon. gentlemen whose familiar faces I would wish to miss, but I very much fear when the returns are made if we could hear the song which will be sung by those hon. gentlemen we would catch the sad refrain:

“ Who will fill our vacant places;
Who our speeches speak to-night;
Fate, alas, has not restored us,
Seats in yonder spacious pile.”

It will be, Sir, a marvellous inconsistency if, with all the other predictions unfulfilled, this which I have last stated should be alone fulfilled; if the people of this country should sweep from power a Government under which they are prospering, only to place in authority those under whose administration they formerly sank into the deepest degree of depression.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As it appears there is no other hon. member anxious to address the House before we go into Committee, I will ask the indulgence of hon. gentlemen present for a short time to review briefly some of the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I will do so briefly, both on account of the lateness of the hour, and also because nearly all of those statements have been answered satisfactorily, in my judgment, by hon. members on this side. But, Sir, I will also ask the indulgence of the House for a short time in referring to some matters of a somewhat personal character. My predecessor has, on former occasions, referred to myself in not very complimentary terms, but as my hon. colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, has settled that account, I do not think it is necessary for me to reply. I find it difficult to realize how much our cause has suffered, how much the policy we are advocating has suffered by its unfortunately having fallen to my hands to present it to this House. If my hon. predecessor was not able, from the construction of my sentences and my ungrammatical expressions, to understand what I meant, and if I am to judge by the way in which they were received by the House, and, according to the statements of the press, since received by the country, though presented in an imperfect manner, I can realize what would have been the position of our case if it had been placed in the hands of an educated gentleman like my hon. predecessor who could have so constructed his sentences that the country could have understood it far more clearly and fully than from my mode of stating our case. There is another matter of a somewhat personal character to which I may allude. I have noticed, and other hon. gentlemen have noticed that during the last three or four years, Session after Session, some of my hon. friends from my own Province, though most of them very young politicians, seem to have made it the great ambition of their lives, on coming here, to make speeches that would damage me in my own Province by presenting me as neglecting its interests. Though I have been thirty years and more in public life, and have had, as a general rule, the confidence and support, not only of my constituents but my Province; these gentlemen who come here for the first time, unfledged politicians—you can see the pin feathers sticking out as they flutter their wings and attempt to crow—find it desirable to attack me personally. That may be right. I do not mind it. When I first entered public life I was somewhat sensitive on these points; but I recollected hearing some time later a statement made by an eminent man, that has often reconciled me to a good deal of abuse, and which, were I to accept it as applicable to myself, would be most flattering to me. The statement is this: that “abuse is the tribute which envy pays to worth.” Though I felt that in many cases I could not apply this to myself, still there was comfort and satisfaction in knowing that if a man is worth

anything at all he is considered worthy to be abused. On the other hand, I have had a great many things said in my favor which I did not deserve. Therefore, I have not any great ground of complaint, and consider the account about balanced. But I was subject to a new scrutiny on the present occasion. The hon. member for Brant, not content with refuting my political views, went into a careful analysis of my costume. As my hon. friend was speaking on that subject, I was reminded of a circumstance that I saw narrated with reference to the early political life of the late President Lincoln. I read it just after his successful contest as a candidate for President of the United States. It appeared that that gentleman was brought into notoriety in his own State by the very warm and animated contest that took place between him and a Mr. Douglass for the position of Senator. The two candidates visited the different parts of the State together for the purpose of addressing the electors. On one occasion they arrived in a most westerly and newly-settled portion where the electors were not of the most intelligent character and not much versed in the political issues of the day. They mustered, dressed in the wool hat and red shirt, and Mr. Douglass came to the conclusion that to discuss protective tariffs and *ad valorem* duties would not be the course to take there, so he thought he would excite their democratic prejudices. So in order to impress these people unfavorably towards Mr. Lincoln, who was a tall, erect, military-looking gentleman, he said that a man of Mr. Lincoln's aristocratic, English carriage and bearing could not have much sympathy for the masses. Well, after he had got through, Mr. Lincoln turned the tables upon him by saying that his friend Douglass had referred to his English carriage. "Well," said he, "I recollect very well that my father, when he left Kentucky, had an old English carriage and brought it into this State. I have not seen that carriage for years, but the last time I saw it my father had converted it into a hen roost, and how Douglass could have known anything about that, unless he had been around that hen roost at night, is a mystery to me." It is not many nights since a member of my family was disturbed by a party seeking to obtain admission to my house through my coal cellar. I hope it was not my hon. friend from Brant endeavoring to find out what kind of coal I had in my cellar, or of what my wardrobe consisted. There was another *role* taken by my predecessor, the ex-Finance Minister, and that was with reference to the new system of appointments and promotions in the Departments of the Civil Service, referring to certain members who were said to have a great many relatives in the Civil Service. It so happens, and I am proud of it, that my ancestors were U. E. loyalists who came to New Brunswick in 1783. On both my father and mother's side they had very large families—on both sides twenty-two children—and you may imagine, Mr. Speaker, that, commencing with that number and descending down to the present day through four generations, there are few men in New Brunswick who have as many relatives as myself; and still, notwithstanding that I have been thirty years in public life and twenty years a member of the Government, I challenge any public man who has been half the time in public life or in the Government, with the same number of relatives, or anything like that proportion, to find fewer of them than I have in the Public Service. It so happened, however, that in the Department of which I am head—that is a case that has been referred to—that a gentleman was taken from a first-class clerkship who happened to have married my wife's sister, not a deceased wife's sister. That gentleman had been a number of years a first-class clerk, and it was found necessary, for the security of the public, that we should adopt a new principle with reference to our circulation. That gentleman had been twelve years in the British North America Bank and in a bank in British Columbia,

Sir LEONARD PILLER.

and, as I said, was a first-class clerk, with but one senior, in that class, and the man best qualified to take charge of the work. Consequently he was promoted from that office on account of his qualifications. Still we are told here and throughout the country that this is a new system adopted, this promotion of our relatives. It would be a new policy, to keep from a Civil Servant his promotion because he was a relation of a Minister. Let me come to another point of a somewhat personal character. How often has it been stated on the floor of the House, since I have become head of the Financial Department, and since Parliament has adopted the policy of the Government in the shape of the Tariff of 1879, that I have changed my politics on this question of Protection? I would venture to say, from the fact that I have never thought it necessary to call the attention of the House to the fallacy of that statement, that there are many hon. members on both sides who think that I was, till 1878 or 1879, what is called a free trader. It is just as well to take a few moments to dispose of this matter, and I will say that I hold in my hands the Tariff of New Brunswick for 1851. I was first nominated for St. John, N.B., by the protectionists, in 1850. The Provincial Governments did not frame the Tariffs then; they were framed by members from each county appointed for that special purpose. We, in the city and county of St. John were then working for two objects: first, to defeat the Government, and, next, to carry out the principle of protection; and in 1851, the first Session I had a seat in the Local Legislature, the Committee brought down a report with propositions that were stronger in protectionist principles than our Canadian Policy of to-day. I think I then voted for every one of those propositions except one. Allow me to read a few of the items of that Provincial Tariff. As to narrow axes, which we were making at that time, what did we do? We imposed 1s. 6d. on every axe—25 per cent. or upwards; and on peas and beans, 1s. 6d. a bushel; barley, 6d., or 10 cents a bushel; barley meal, 100 lbs., 40 cents; buckwheat, 10 cents per bushel; buckwheat meal, 100 lbs., 50 cents; clock or clock cases of all kinds, 5s.; coals per ton, 1s., or 20 cents; on fresh meats, 9s. 4d. per cwt.; on oats, 3d.; oatmeal, per barrel, 2s. 4d.; rye, per bushel, 2d.; rye flour, per barrel, 1s.; wheat, per bushel, 2d.; wheat flour, per barrel, 3s., or 60 cents. The unenumerated articles paid £1 10s. or 7½ per cent.; and on iron castings, cooking, box and other stoves, and iron frames made in the country, 15 per cent.; on boots, shoes and other leather manufactures 20 per cent., chairs and prepared parts of chairs, protection was afforded; and carriages, waggon, sleighs and other vehicles and mouldings, 30 per cent. Those were the articles we made in the Province at that time. It is quite true that, in 1854, when the Reciprocity Treaty was established, and when all the natural products of the two countries were exchanged free, there was a change with regard to those duties, because many of these articles came in free. But, in 1855, the Government of which I was a member, formed in 1854, for the first time in the history of New Brunswick, brought down a Tariff; and as I held in that Province a similar position to what I hold to-day it devolved on me, in conjunction with my colleagues, to frame the first Tariff ever prepared or submitted by the Government of New Brunswick. In that Tariff there was a clear and definite distinction drawn between the articles made and the articles not made in the country, and down to the time of the Union 15 per cent. was the average on the unenumerated articles, and on New Brunswick manufactures from 18 to 25 per cent., that is, the articles made in the country. That was a policy in operation in the various Tariffs introduced by myself and colleagues into that Legislature. Then, when we came here, what was our attitude? From 1867 till the end of the war in the United States, we adopted a Tariff that was protective, considering the state of things in the United States, though we did not collect on unenumerated

articles more than 15 per cent; but on certain other articles made there was a distinction, and that continued till 1873. It will be remembered perfectly well by members in this House who were members in 1873—when things were changed in the United States, when members of this House and persons elsewhere signified their feelings, in the elections of 1872—that a feeling was manifested throughout the country, owing to the change in the condition of labor in the United States and the then condition of their manufactures, that some protection was necessary in Canada, so much so that when I was Finance Minister in 1873 Members of Parliament waited on myself and the Government asking for a change in its policy. My predecessor, the late hon. Finance Minister, is not here; but I may say that he called upon me with one of his constituents and urged that we should impose a duty upon manufactured dye stuffs, upon the ground that dye stuff was manufactured in Napanee. Now, what is the fact? In 1873, when I made my financial statement, it will be within the memory of many members present that I then stated that the Government had representations made to them by gentlemen connected with the various manufacturing industries of the country, and that we recognized that the day was not far distant when these applications would have to be met with a favorable response. I said: "As we will have during the current year revenue enough for existing purposes, we shall postpone that matter till next Session." Hon. members will remember that, and it was indicated very clearly that as we would require more revenue, and as circumstances had changed in the United States, it was becoming evident that it would soon be necessary, in order to protect our industries, to give them more consideration than they had in the past. I did not hesitate to say that such was the deliberate conclusion to which the Government had arrived in 1873, and I will say to Parliament that if they had been in power when Parliament met in 1874 that policy would have been adopted and presented to this House, giving increased consideration to the manufactures of the country. I was anxious that we should have a renewal of the treaty in force from 1854 down to 1866, with reference to the natural productions of the country. Placed as we were then, we were prepared to accept that proposition and prepared to meet them more than half way; and that declaration was put upon record in 1879 when we asked for these changes in the Tariff. But in the absence of any such concessions being made to us the Government felt in 1878, when we came back to office, that the interest of the country demanded that we should give more consideration to the manufacturing industries than we had formerly. I make this statement because it has been said that I was a free trader. The other day it was stated here that one of my colleagues running for the city and county of St. John, in 1878, made a statement in my presence—and my not contradicting it, I therefore accepted it—that we deluded the people in leading them to suppose that we would not impose a duty on flour or coal, or various other articles, and that we gained the vote on that occasion under false pretences. I would ask the hon. gentleman from the city and county of St. John, whether there was any mistake as to our policy on that subject? I will ask him, if he and his colleague, a day or two before the election, did not send a circular to the electors, pointing out to them what would be the result of our election: that it would be to impose increased duties on the people's flour, that they would pay a dollar or two dollars a barrel more than at that time on what they would consume, and that they sent that circular over their own signature?

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister of Finance stated that he would vote against a duty on flour, and we asserted, and correctly as it turned out, that he intended, if he got into power again, to put a duty on flour.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I stated that if I had been in the House when this proposition came up, I would have voted against a duty on those articles separately. These gentlemen made the statement emphatically that we would revise the Tariff so as to give protection to the industries of the country. That is what we said; and it has been said here, and my remark has been quoted, that it was a simple readjustment of the Tariff we intended to make. When Sir John A. Macdonald was asked if he intended to impose a 35 per cent. Tariff? He said: "No; the people have been misled," and Sir John A. Macdonald was perfectly justified in making such a statement. The Tariff, as it stands to-day, with a large part of the breadstuffs imported now from Ontario, is a Tariff of 20 per cent. upon the whole imports. It has simply been a readjustment of the Tariff and an increase of taxation to meet deficits, and for the practical reduction of the debt. If the statement of my hon. predecessor had been reliable, if his estimate had been correct, that 2½ per cent. additional would raise \$13,750,000 instead of \$12,000,000, there would have been no necessity for an increase of taxation; but we had to come here and ask for a change in the Tariff that would enable us to raise about \$2,500,000 more to maintain the credit of the country and change the deficits to surpluses. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Burpee), in his speech yesterday, said the people of this Dominion must have been surprised when I declared that the taxation we imposed upon them last year was voluntarily paid by the people. No such statement was made by me that the people voluntarily paid this \$18,000,000. I was saying that in the last year the people paid \$2,000,000 more than estimated, but I said this large surplus was voluntarily paid, because the people purchased items of luxury, such as silks, satins, wines and other like beverages that were not necessities of life; that, owing to their improved condition, they had largely increased the consumption of these articles, thereby increasing the revenue on these items alone \$750,000, as compared with the year previous; therefore I said they have paid it voluntarily in contradistinction to the duties raised on the necessities of life. That is correct, and cannot be gainsaid. Now, with reference to the discussion that has been going on here: It has been said that the Maritime Provinces, and especially New Brunswick, have, under this Tariff, paid a great deal more than their share. I want to make a statement here; I wish to do it deliberately; I wish every word to be carefully reported, and I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite, when it is reported, to take it up and consider it and upset it if they can. I am sure hon. members of this House will pardon me for referring to the Province of New Brunswick when they recollect the way I have been attacked here as sacrificing the interests of my native Province by bringing it into the Confederation, by agreeing to the terms then accepted, and then by sanctioning and introducing into Parliament a policy that had increased, unfairly, it is alleged, the taxes of the people of that Province. I wish to state my case, and it is this: If we estimate the revenue that would have been collected from the population of New Brunswick to-day, by the *per capita* taxation for Customs previous to Union, that is, if they paid \$2.75 or \$3 per head in 1866, and if you apply that rate to the present population, I state this, that in the sum we handed to them this year and the sum that we will hand to them next year—that is, on the payments made to them—either on the interest of the debt we as a Dominion assumed or the direct subsidy paid to them for local purposes, one will cover the other. Now, I will repeat that, if the people of New Brunswick were paying per head of their present population what they paid before the Union, in the shape of Customs duties, to-day they get back every cent of it in interest that is paid by the Dominion into the Treasury of the Local Government for its maintenance. I go further. I state this also: that the Local Legislature has, since Confederation, ex-

pended a million of dollars in subsidies to railways in that Province. They have given of their lands 1,600,000 acres towards the construction of railways. That has necessarily reduced their income. The Government of the Dominion have constructed, since Confederation, at the expense of the Dominion in New Brunswick, 250 miles of railway. What is more, that Legislature voted a few days ago, or are now voting for their local purposes, such as their roads, bridges and education, more money per head of their present population than was voted before the Union took place, and they show by their statements that they have money enough to do it. I hear some one say: "But you collect more from them than you did before the Union." I admit it; and the question has arisen over and over again as to the exact amount the people of New Brunswick pay directly or indirectly into the Treasury, either through our officials in that Province or on goods imported from other Provinces. I have heard various calculations and statements made here to show that a very large sum over and above what is shown as received from that Province is received indirectly. One of the modes of proving this is by showing that before Union we had a larger amount of imports than we have had since. Well, admit that; but before we entered into Union we had no distilleries in that country and all our spirits were imported. This, instead of appearing in our Customs receipts appears in our Excise receipts; this item is of itself half a million of dollars a year. Then what was the course of trade previous? Prince Edward Island brought nearly all its supplies from Halifax or St. John, and the goods consumed in Prince Edward Island before Confederation appeared to a very large extent as imports in both Provinces, and exports as well. There is a large increase of inter-provincial trade, apart from our trade with Old Canada, that is absorbed and not reported at all. But I think the fair way to look at this, is as I stated—and it has not been contradicted except by the ex-Minister of Customs, the hon. member for the county of St. John (Mr. Burpee), who based his calculations on the taxation of the people on revenues collected during the five years they were in power. That was not a fair way. I showed during the time they were in power they would have had to tax the then population \$4.88, and in our time \$4.66 or \$4.65, and therefore I took this basis of my calculation that the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia consumed just about as many goods as the people of Ontario and Quebec per head. Therefore, though we collected 87½ cents less in the last two years than Ontario and Quebec paid, I am willing to accept as the scale \$4.88 or \$4.65, though we did not show we paid that by \$1 a head. Take that difference between what was collected in New Brunswick per head previous to Confederation, and that calculation of the taxes from 1874 to 1878, and from 1878 to 1881; then, taking the Estimates that are on the Table, the House would see that New Brunswick gets back every dollar for local expenditure that is in excess of the sum collected from them before Confederation. I challenge the hon. member for Gloucester to discover any fallacy in that statement, which I am prepared to prove by facts and figures. Whatever may have been the effect of Confederation I am satisfied that the people of New Brunswick, my native province, are in a better position with reference to taxation to-day that they were before that Union took place; and every year as we go on prospering, as we will in the Dominion of Canada, under this policy, which is the only policy for the country, although efforts have been made to belittle it in various ways—every year the position of the people of New Brunswick will continue to improve. In New Brunswick we were slower in feeling the full effect of the return of prosperity, because in St. John we lost \$20,000,000 by the fire in 1877, and we have not recovered from that yet. If it had not been for

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

that they would have been in a position to compare with other Provinces, because the people of St. John were emphatically a manufacturing people. In 1850 the voters of St. John elected candidates upon this policy, and undertook to establish manufactories there; and if they had had the means at their disposal they would have stood equal to any manufacturing centre in any portion of Canada. I feel that to the end of my days, and my children after me will be able to say that Confederation has not been an injury to New Brunswick, but a blessing which will, I am satisfied, be realized more and more every year, and the time will speedily come when there will not be a man who will not feel that they are part and parcel of a country that it is not only their interest to be a member of, but that they will have a just pride in claiming. Now, Sir, I have listened with a great deal of care and a great deal of attention to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. I missed a portion of the hon. member for Gloucester's (Mr. Anglin) speech but I have read it since. I have either heard or read all the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite; and to say that their case has been ably presented would do them no more than justice. I doubt whether hon. gentlemen behind me would have been able, had we had their case, to have presented it more plausibly. I feel, however, that the statements made on this side of the House have not been answered. There has been no attempt made to answer them; and I will point out briefly the fallacies in some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen. A word or two with reference to the question of loans. I was a good deal surprised that the leader of the late Government should have stated that I had attacked and abused the late Government. In order to vindicate the Government from charges made by the Opposition, it was necessary that I should draw contrasts; but there was not a single expression which fell from my lips which was not strictly parliamentary. I avoided as far as possible, though I can say severe things when necessary, anything of the kind. I do not think there is much to be gained by that. My object is always to induce men to listen dispassionately to me, because if a man's passions are excited you cannot get at his reasoning very well. Reference was made to a loan floated by my predecessor in 1874, and my predecessor said that loan was placed on the market just as Sir John Rose had placed a loan, and just as Sir Francis Hincks had placed a loan. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) repeated it, and I asked him when Sir Francis Hincks floated a loan? I knew of no such loan. The distinction between that loan and the loans that we floated previous and since is this. The hon. member for Middlesex said that the rule was to put in a minimum, to name a minimum. The rule down to 1873 was this: when you placed a loan on the market you placed a sealed minimum in the hands of your agents, so that if there was not a sufficient amount tendered you were not bound to take anything below that sealed minimum. Subsequently the gentlemen who manage these loans in London, and who understand their own interest very well, had an order made by which that minimum should not be a sealed but an open minimum. But there was this distinction between the loan floated in 1874 and the loans made since, which was that the open minimum was not fixed as the rate at which the loan should be sold, but a fixed price made at which the loan would be given; and the real cause of complaint was that three times as much was tendered for as sold, and it was not distributed equally to the parties tendering. Now, with reference to the surplus. There is no exception to the statement I made with reference to the surplus of last year. With reference to the surplus for next year, I may say that I think from the returns made since I made my Budget Speech, that it will exceed the sum I named. With reference to the debt, there has been no exception taken. It showed the position we occupied to-day, our condition at the time of the Union, and what our condition would pro-

bably be in 1890, when this road was finished. I did not say who had incurred this debt that has come up since. The late leader of the Government, I think, said that the only additional debt for which the late Government was responsible was the construction of the St. Peter's Canal. Another hon. gentleman has stated, I think, that the debt for which the late Administration was responsible, did not exceed \$200,000. The House will pardon me if I call attention to that point. It has been answered to some extent, but not fully, and I have the figures before me here. According to the Public Accounts, the increase of the debt between 1874 and 1879, that is from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879, was \$39,146,105; payments out of sinking fund, during that period. But when we are striking balances of the net debt, the sinking fund is taken into account, and, therefore, in making the statement as to the increase of debt between the two periods, we have to add for sinking fund, \$4,190,064, making payments made in the five years in excess of receipts, \$43,336,169. In addition to this there were expenditures made by the late Government under contracts let by their predecessors and previous to November, 1873, \$3,651,354; expended on the Intercolonial Railway, which, of course, they were bound to expend under the contract, \$6,560,227; and expenditure upon the Pacific Railway from July, 1874, to July, 1879, \$11,173,165, making a total of \$21,384,746.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). What about the canals?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This contains every item of expenditure that was contracted for. There were tenders accepted for the canals, but these were abandoned and new tenders were asked for, and, therefore, I hold that the late Government were responsible for the expenditures made under these circumstances. Therefore there was an increase of debt in excess of these expenditures during the period I have named of \$21,951,423. It is true, it has been said that these gentlemen were under obligation to expend certain sums of money because we had agreed to do it; but after taking the expenditures made under contracts previous to November, 1873, and the sums expended on the Intercolonial Railway and the Pacific Railway, a very large sum is left that they might have escaped spending if they had felt it in the interest of the country to do so. Now, Sir, we come to the question of expenditure during the two years that the present Government have had entire control of financial affairs, as compared with the previous five years. I undertook to show that the expenditure per head of the population was less during the last two years than it was during the five years previous. That has been questioned; but upon what ground? It was stated that during one year, that is, the year 1878, reductions were made in the expenditure by our predecessors, which resulted in showing a much less expenditure per head of the population during that year than the average of the past two years. But, Sir, is that a fair way to test the question for the people of this country? Certainly not. It is not fair to test the conduct of an Administration by its expenditure just before it goes to the people; because in the last Session, the repentant Session, in order to make a good showing to the country, they reduced certain expenditures. The fair way is to take the five years of Administration for which these gentlemen were responsible, and to compare them with the two years for which the present Government are responsible; and if you do that you will find that, as I stated before, the taxation per capita of the population was less during the two last years than it was during the five preceding years. But, Sir, the late leader of the Government undertook to show that after deducting extraordinary expenses, there had been a very large reduction in the expenditure during the Administration of his Government. And how did he undertake to prove it? Why, he deducted certain expenditures made in 1877-78 that were

not made in 1873-74. If we take from 1873-74 the expenditures that were not made in the year previous, we shall find the following charges: For railway management, and which should have been charged and was intended to have been charged originally to capital, \$567,000; return duties paid to a company which, I think ought not to have been paid, \$69,300; election expenses for which we were not responsible, \$200,000; and other appropriations, making between \$800,000 and \$900,000 altogether in that year for which we were not responsible. The reductions in 1877-78, as compared with 1873-74, were as follows: Militia, \$359,000; Dominion affairs, \$200,000; militia stores, \$144,000; boundary survey, \$35,000. The expenditures for Dominion lands were reduced by \$196,000; the lighthouses and coast service, \$38,000, by diminishing the number of lighthouses that were being constructed; immigration, \$138,000; Mounted Police, \$46,000; the culling of timber, \$33,000; amounting in all to \$2,930,100 less for 1877-78 as compared with 1873-74; and, deducting \$836,000 that was charged to railway management, and that should not have been so charged, and for which we were not responsible, it makes the difference in expenditures between those two periods, \$2,093,000. If you deduct that from the expenditure of that year, for the purpose of comparison with 1873-74, it will appear that the expenditure for that year, supposing we were responsible for it, was less than the expenditure for 1877-78. Under those circumstances, though a great effort was made at that time to reduce the expenditure, we must hold the late Government responsible for the average expenditures during the years they were in power, and in those years the average expenditure reached from 20 cents to 23 cents more per head of the then population than we expended in 1879, 1880 and 1881.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). The statement made by the hon. gentleman, a moment ago, was that the Government of which he was Finance Minister in 1873, were not responsible for the obligations in connection with the canals. I will read a short quotation from his Budget Speech of that year. It is as follows:—

"We are, however, entering upon new and increased engagements, involving a very large sum of money. We are entering upon works—we have already done so—which will require a large increase of our debt. We have \$10,000,000 to expend on the Intercolonial Railway. We have \$30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific, and the canal system that has been accepted by the Government will involve an expenditure of, at least, \$20,000,000. These are serious matters, inasmuch as they add \$60,000,000 to our existing debt."

The hon. gentleman, therefore, distinctly stated that he accepted the canal system.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We accepted it; but what did hon. gentlemen opposite do? They did not accept the tenders which had been received by their predecessors, but they invited new tenders. Upon whom then did the responsibility rest? I am not complaining, but I am making the statement that hon. gentlemen opposite increased the debt \$21,951,000 during the period they were in office. It was argued by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), I believe, that I should not have compared the imports and exports of 1877-78 as regards trade with Great Britain and the United States; but that I should have taken the five years previous.

Mr. ANGLIN. I pointed out this fact, that in comparing imports and exports, the hon. Finance Minister took one group of five years for one and another group of five years for the other; I did not take the same group in each case.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not do that. What I did was this: I took the year 1877-78 and compared it with last year, because the amounts were nearer than at any other period. But I might with perfect safety have taken the average of the five years previous, and it would have shown that in one case—the imports from Great Britain—there was an increase of \$1,700,000, and from \$4,000,000 to

\$5,000,000 decrease of imports from the United States. I only selected the particular year to which I referred because it was nearer in amount of imports than any other year. If you take those five years, it will be found that though the imports were greater from Great Britain in 1874, 1875 and 1876 than from the United States, there was a greater decrease last year as regards imports from the United States. It will be found that the effect of the present Tariff has been not to decrease, as has been stated, trade with Great Britain as compared with the United States, but to decrease largely the imports from the latter country. The late hon. Finance Minister declared that by this Tariff \$7,000,000 additional taxation would be placed on the people, while we would receive but \$2,000,000 additional revenue.

Mr. ANGLIN. The statement made by the ex-Minister of Customs was distinctly this: that according to his calculation, the present Tariff, applied to the imports of 1878, showed an increased taxation to the extent of nearly \$7,000,000, and as the Finance Minister, in his Estimates, had assumed he would receive only \$2,000,000 additional, the other \$5,000,000 must necessarily go into the pockets of the manufacturers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If my memory serves me right the statement was not made in that way. The hon. member took up the different items and said that, applying the present Tariff to the imports of last year, the result would be that \$5,000,000 would go into the pockets of the manufacturers. But when we are able to show that \$5,000,000 have gone into the Treasury, and that the goods, in almost all cases, are supplied to the consumer at nearly the same rate as before, the argument of the hon. member falls to the ground. Whatever may be the opinion of the hon. gentleman with reference to the operation of this Tariff, I think that after having listened carefully to the discussion that has taken place, we must admit that all the arguments have been on the side of the National Policy. The ex-Minister of Customs stated that the fishermen under the operation of this Tariff—and I can quite understand the object he had in making that statement—paid \$6 per head, or \$500,000 more into the Treasury than formerly, and that this \$150,000 to be given as a subsidy or bonus to the fishermen was only giving them back practically one-third of the amount taken from them by the operation of this Tariff. It so happens that there is no evidence either in the public records or the Trade or Customs Returns to show that the fishermen paid anything, or scarcely anything, more than they did under the old Tariff. We find that in Nova Scotia during the last two years, as compared with the average of the five years previous, the average amount of duty paid was only $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase, while the increase of the population was 7 per cent. If the fishermen of Nova Scotia paid \$250,000, where is it shown in the Public Accounts or Trade Returns? It is shown that the average payment for Customs during the last two years is but \$70,000 in excess of the five previous years, or an increase of 5 per cent., and that the increase of the population is 7 per cent. If that be the case, how could it be possible for the fishermen of Nova Scotia who have not, as a whole, paid more per head than they did in 1879-80, to pay \$250,000 alone more than they paid before? What did they pay it on? A statement has been read by an hon. member behind me to-night to show that the prices of certain articles used by the fishermen are as cheap as before, and tea and molasses cheaper. Except 10 cents per barrel additional on flour, and the duty on corn meal, you have no items to make up an increase. On the contrary, it would appear to me from the returns that owing to the articles used in the fisheries being admitted free, the fishermen pay but a very slight increase. When we ask Parliament to give \$150,000, it is not in return for any increased taxation, but to put the fishermen in the position they would occupy if they were without

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

competitors in their own waters, and for which we have received the award of \$4,500,000. From whatever standpoint you view this question, the National Policy stands to-day stronger in the confidence of the people than it did two years ago, and whenever an appeal may be made to the people I am satisfied they will heartily endorse it. Statements have been made to show that our estimates of the increase of population and increased wages are not correct. I brought down a statement placed in my hands by the Commission that was appointed, and which visited only a portion of the manufactures of the Dominion, showing that there were 95 additional factories, that is but a portion of the increase. The hon. Minister of Public Works has a statement showing, from returns made in the different constituencies, that the new manufactures number 140 instead of 95. But I simply use a partial return, showing the new industries in the Dominion that have been developed. They have used that return to prove that this policy has done but little, comparatively, towards increasing those industries, knowing that they only represent a portion. My estimate of increase was 17 in old factories, from which it will be found that the number of persons employed is largely in excess of that three years ago—that they are more profitably employed, and are working full time, though they worked only part time before. And when we look at the confidence felt in the country to-day as compared with the feeling at that time—when we recognize that the great bulk of the people understand and appreciate, that in those hundreds of new industries, you have not all the result—for if you were to wipe out every new one, there is such an improvement of the old in the amount of work done and wages paid, and in the amount of comfort enjoyed by the operatives, as to vindicate our policy, but take the two items together, and you will see there is an amount of confidence in the country not witnessed before. The hon. member for Bothwell said, a few hours ago, that by-and-bye there would be depression of trade and great loss to the manufacturing industries when the reaction took place. Well, notwithstanding such predictions, there is confidence on the part of the men who have put their capital into these industries. But his own prediction affords an answer to hon. gentlemen opposite, who say that we are making millionaires of the manufacturers. He says these men are to be ruined by the competition when the change takes place. But with the opening up of new markets for our manufacturers, they amounted to over \$5,000,000 last year in Manitoba alone. With such rapid increase, there is a confidence to-day with the manufacturers of the Dominion that has not been previously felt, because they see that this great North-West country is not only to be opened up, but populated, and that there will be ere long millions of consumers for the manufacturers—that while they will have increased competition, they will have a more extended market in the North-West, calculated to build up the country, as the opening up of the western States built up the manufactures of the Eastern States. They see that the tendency will be to the North-West, and it is only this very policy that can secure the prosperity of the eastern Provinces, as the prosperity of the eastern States has been secured by the growth and development of the western. Under those circumstances we must expect confidence, not only in our policy, and that the people will realize and support it. My hon. friends opposite will find that correct when they go to the country and undertake to make the people believe that they are not as happy and as prosperous as they were from 1874 to 1878. The hon. member for Bothwell told us to-night that from the day we came into power our shipping had decreased. You would suppose, from his remarks, that the decrease in the manufacture of ships commenced in 1879 when we took office. He did not point to the fact, well known to everybody, that iron vessels are taking the place of wooden. We find that in 1874 the tonnage built in the Dominion was 190,000 tons; in 1875, 151,000; in

1876, 130,000; in 1877, 120,000, and in 1878, 101,000. It did not require a protective policy to diminish the tonnage during those years; the diminution took place under the Government of the hon. gentleman opposite. And if the hon. gentleman had gone back five years and traced the change, we should have no objection to his taking the year 1879. But, in 1879, the tonnage built was 74,000; in 1880, 60,000; in 1881, 74,000; an increase again. We know perfectly well the cause of that increase. During the term of the late Government our tonnage constructed in the Dominion decreased one-half, yet he would still have the House and the country to believe that it only commenced when we adopted a protective policy, while the causes exist outside of any legislation by the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen now on the Treasury benches formerly pretended to be able to remedy all those things; they were capable of controlling everything, and called us flies on the wheel.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We did not pretend to be able to control everything. If we did we might hope to control hon. gentlemen opposite. We have given up hope of convincing them that we are right and they are wrong. But we know, and the hon. gentleman should have been frank enough to state that this diminution in shipbuilding was not due to the National Policy, but to the fact that iron ships are doing the business of the world much more largely than before. I may just intimate to my hon. friend that, under this National Policy, it may not be long before we compete with iron shipbuilders on the other side of the Atlantic. It is our policy to do it; but in the meantime we do not intend to construct and sail iron instead of wooden vessels. If hon. gentlemen opposite imagine that it was increased taxation upon ships' materials that diminished the tonnage constructed, they are entirely mistaken. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), though he undertook to make out a case of that kind, did not succeed; and I now tell him that in the case of 17 or 18 applications for a return of the duties paid on everything used by shipbuilders, showed that on everything except canvas, with one exception, they received an excess over their payments in the bonus given by the Government. I believe to-day, that with that bonus or drawback, they stand better than under the Tariff of 1878 without a drawback. The reduction of the tonnage constructed was not effected by the imposition of those duties; and it has been shown that there is an increase the past year over the year before, and as trade increases we will no doubt find occupation for our wooden ships. But whatever may be the case in this respect, I firmly believe that this policy is so firmly fixed in the judgment, affection and confidence of the people, that it will not soon be shaken. The resolution I now propose to place in the hands of the Chairman of the Committee, has been somewhat altered since I made my statement on the 24th of last month. For instance, fine salt, since 1879, was free from England, but paid a duty when coming from the United States. It is now proposed to impose the same duty upon all fine salt, no matter whether from England or from the United States, or wherever it comes from. It is proposed that the duty on all fine salt shall be the same as has been imposed during the last two years from the United States. In the proposition I made to the House, I stated that I proposed to ask the House to impose 4 cents each on vines imported into the country. We found upon enquiry that the value of the vines varies so much with reference to their quality and to their age, that it would not work fairly, and therefore we propose to drop the proposition of 4 cents and leave vines where they were. With reference to silver glass, it has been paying 25 per cent. It is now proposed, as we have increased the duty on the commoner kind of glass, window glass, of which a portion of silver glass is made, to increase the duty from 25 to 30 per cent., that

is, silver glass to be the same as ordinary window glass. Books, maps, and charts, used by literary institutions, by societies and public libraries, and public institutions, it is proposed to put them, when used for such purposes, on the free list. Vaccine and ivory vaccine points shall be free. There has been exception taken to a duty collected on an article of that kind, and the Government proposes to make them free. Wood for fuel in Manitoba and the North-West, when brought from the United States, to be free. Steel is now free under our legislation till the first of next January; it is proposed to be continued free till the next Session of Parliament. Then there is an article called fillets for card clothing, a compound India rubber canvas, not made in the country, and from which card clothing is made; it is proposed to put that on the free list as well as hard rubber imported for the manufacture of combs and rubber goods. These are the principal changes that are made in the propositions as I stated them briefly to the House in making my Budget Speech. I, therefore, now move that the Speaker leave the Chair for the purpose of considering those Resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*—That it is expedient to amend the Tariff of Customs duties, and the Schedule of free goods as contained in the Acts 42 Victoria, Chapter 15, 43 Victoria, Chapter 18, and 44 Victoria, Chapter 10.

By repealing so much of Schedule A as imposes any duty of Customs upon the following articles, viz:

- Brass old, scrap and in sheets.
- Britannia metal, in pigs and bars.
- Coffee, green.
- Quinine, Sulphate of, in powder.
- Quicksilver.
- Spelter, in blocks or pigs.
- Tea, black, green and Japan.
- Tin, in blocks, pigs, bars, plates and sheets
- Zinc, in pigs, blocks and sheets.

By repealing the rates of duty now chargeable upon the undermentioned articles, and substituting other rates in lieu thereof, as follows:—

1. Bookbinders tools and implements, including ruling machines and binders cloth, now fifteen per cent *ad valorem*, to be ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
Brass, in strips for Printer's rules, not finished, now 30 per cent., to be 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.
2. Glass, common and colorless window glass, now twenty per cent. *ad valorem*, to be thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
3. Iron, Old and Scrap, now two dollars per ton, to be one dollar per ton.
4. Lead pipe and lead shot, and all manufactures of lead not elsewhere specified, now twenty-five per cent., to be thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
5. Leather—Cordova leather, tanned from horse hide, and manufactures of, now twenty per cent., to be twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
6. Sand paper, glass, flint and emery paper, now twenty per cent., to be twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
7. Ships and other vessels, built in any foreign country, whether steam or sailing vessels, on application for Canadian register, on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery and all appurtenances, now ten per cent., to be as follows:—
On the hull, rigging and all appurtenances, except machinery, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
On boilers, steam engines and other machinery, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
Silvered plate glass, now twenty-five per cent., to be thirty per cent. *ad valorem*.
8. Spirits and strong waters, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, and although thereby coming under the denomination of proprietary medicines, tinctures, essences, extracts or any other denomination, including medicinal elixirs and fluid extracts and wine preparations in bulk or bottle, not elsewhere specified, now one dollar and ninety cents per imperial gallon, to be one dollar and ninety cents per imperial gallon, and in addition thereto twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
9. Posters and advertising pictures or pictorial show-cards or bills, illustrated advertising periodicals and tailors' and mantlemakers' fashion plates, now thirty per cent. *ad valorem*, to be six cents per pound, and twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.

By adding the following non-enumerated articles to Schedule A, to be charged with the rates of duty specified as follows:—

10. Bags, containing fine salt from all countries, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

11. Clock springs, ten per cent. *ad valorem*.
12. Fireworks, twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.
13. Iron : Lap-welded boiler iron tubing, not threaded, coupled or otherwise manufactured, one and one-half inches in diameter, and over, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.
14. Mustard cake, twenty per cent. *ad valorem*.
15. Paraffine wax or stearine, three cents per pound.
16. Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, when imported direct from the country of growth, seventeen and a half per cent *ad valorem*.
17. Trees—fruit trees—viz :

Apple,	all kinds,	two cents each.
Pear	"	four cents each.
Peach	"	three cents each.
Plum	"	five cents each.
Cherry	"	four cents each.
Quince	"	two cents and a half each.

18. Silk plush netting, used for the manufacture of gloves, fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

By the following alterations in, and addition to the descriptions of the undermentioned articles in Schedule A, viz :

19. Under the heading "Blacking, Shoe, and Shoemakers ink," after the word "ink" and before the words "twenty-five," insert the words *harness and leather dressing*.
20. Under the heading "Books," in the fifth item, after the word "Cheques" and before the word "receipts," insert the words *envelopes and miniature newspapers*, and after the word "drafts" strike out the word "posters," and also the words "advertising pictures or pictorial show-cards or bills."
21. Under the heading "Braces or Suspenders of all kinds," after the word "suspenders" and before the words "of all kinds," insert the words *belts and trusses*.
22. Under the heading "Clocks and parts thereof," after the word "thereof" and before the words "thirty-five," insert the words *except springs*.
23. Under the heading "Cotton, manufactures of." In the second item, after the word "Cottonades," and before the words "pantaloon stuffs," insert the words, *Kentucky jeans*. In the ninth item, after the words "cotton hosiery," and before the word "thirty," insert the words *and knitted cloth*.
24. In the eleventh item, after the words "in hanks" and before the word "twelve," insert the words *black and bleached three and six cord*.
25. In the fourteenth item, after the words "all clothing made of cotton," strike out all before the words "thirty per cent.," and substitute the following : *or other material not otherwise provided for, including corsets, lace collars, and similar articles made up by the seamstress or tailor; also tarpaulin, plain or coated with oil, paint, tar or other composition, and cotton bags made up by the use of the needle, not otherwise provided for*.
26. Under the heading "Furs," after the words "Fur Skins" and before the word "dressed," insert the words *wholly or partially*.
27. Under the heading "Furniture," after the word "mattresses," and before the words "stow cases," insert the words, *bolsters and pillows*.
28. Under the heading "Glass and manufactures of," in the first item, after the words "carboys and demijohns," strike out the words "pressed or moulded and cut glass," and after the words "glass balls," and before word "thirty," insert the words *and cut, pressed or moulded table ware*.
29. Under the heading "India rubber," after the words "other manufactures of," and before the words "twenty-five," insert the words *not otherwise provided for*.
30. After the heading "Iron and manufactures of," and before the first item, insert the words *wire and iron to be measured by Stubb's Standard gauge*.
31. In the item "Stoves and other castings," after the word "castings," and before the words "not elsewhere specified," insert the words *and forgings*.
32. After the items concerning "Wrought iron tubing," and before the item "Bedsteads and other iron furniture," insert the heading *Manufactures of iron or steel or of iron or steel combined*.
33. Under the heading "Oil cloth," strike out the words "for floors, table covers, window blinds and scenery," and after the words "painted or printed," and before the word "thirty," insert the words *flocked or coated*.
34. Under the heading "Paints and colors," in the items, white and red lead," after the words "red lead" and before the word "dry," insert the words *and orange mineral*.
35. Under the heading "Proprietary medicines," after the word "medicines," strike out all words before the words "fifty per cent.," and substitute the following in lieu thereof, to wit:—*All tinctures, pills, powders, troches or lozenges, syrups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences, oils or medicinal preparations or compositions recommended to the public under any general name or title as specifics for any diseases or affections whatsoever affecting the human or animal bodies, not otherwise provided for. All liquids*. After the heading "Salt" and before the words in brackets, commencing with the word "except" insert the word *coarse*, and after the word "duty," and before the words "in bulk," insert the words, *and all fine salt*.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

After the heading "Steel and manufactures of, viz : "Strike out the words,— "On and after the first day of January, 1883," and insert the following in lieu thereof : *After the end of the Session of the Parliament next ensuing the passing of this Act, unless sooner repealed*.

36. Under the heading "Varnish, not elsewhere specified," after the word "varnish," and before the word "not," insert the words *lacquers, japan and colloidion*.

2. *Resolved*—That it is expedient to amend Schedule B, being the list of goods free of duty when imported into Canada by adding thereto the undermentioned articles, viz :

Anatomical preparations.

Bees.

Books, maps and charts, specially imported by, and for the use of any society incorporated or established for philosophical or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use or by order of any college, academy or seminary of learning, provided that no more than two copies of any one such book, map or chart shall be so imported by or for the use of any one society.

Brass, old, scrap and in sheets.

Britannia metal, in pigs and bars.

Celuloid or xyolite in sheets.

China clay, natural or ground.

Chloralum or chloride of aluminium.

Coffee, green, except as provided by the Act 42 Vic. Chap. 15, Sec. 7.

Iron sand or globules, and dry putty for polishing granite.

Quinine, sulphate of.

Quicksilver.

Spelter, in blocks and pigs.

Tea, except as provided by the Act 42 Vic. Chap. 15, Sec. 7.

Tin, in blocks, pigs, bars and sheets, and plates, and tin foil.

Vaccine and ivory vaccine points.

Zinc, in blocks, pigs and sheets.

Woods, not further manufactured than sawn or split, African teak, black heart ebony, lignumvitae, red cedar and satin wood.

Fowls, pure bred, including pheasants and quails, for improvement of stock.

Wood for fuel, when imported into Manitoba and the North-West Territory.

Fillets of cotton and rubber, not exceeding 7 inches wide, when imported by, and for the use of manufacturers of card clothing.

Rubber, hard crude, in sheets, plain or moulded.

By adding to the item concerning "Salt,"—after the word "fisheries" the words *not otherwise provided for*.

By repealing the whole of the item in said Schedule B, concerning "steel," and substituting the following in lieu thereof :—

STEEL, in ingots, bars, sheets and coils, railway bars or rails, and fish plates, shall be free of duty, until the close of the Session of Parliament next ensuing the passing of this Act, unless sooner repealed.

3. *Resolved*—That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing Resolutions, and the alterations made in the duties on the articles therein mentioned, shall take effect upon and after the 24th February ultimo.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to propose to submit now to the Committee a different set of Resolutions from that of which he gave notice of motion ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They were not in Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. But you moved on the 24th of last month that we should go into Committee on them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I moved that we should go into consideration of the Resolutions, a synopsis of which I read to the House to convey an idea of their nature.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is very unfortunate the hon. gentleman should not have given us earlier notice of these changes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I imagine they are not of that serious import you infer on the first Resolution.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the item of sulphate of quinine,

Mr. BLAKE. Are there any manufactories of that article in the Dominion ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not aware of any. That subject was brought under my consideration in 1879, chiefly by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe the duty on quinine ought to be removed. I suppose that the hon. gentleman has felt that, in consequence of this high duty on quinine, there has been enormous smuggling in the west.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. MILLS. I believe nearly all the quinine consumed in the west the past twelve months has been smuggled. In fact I know that many of the population have found it to their interest to go to Detroit, paying their railway expenses, to buy quinine there and to bring it home without paying duty. They save money by the transaction.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I wonder the hon. gentlemen opposite did not find that out when they were in power, when it was $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. higher than it is now.

Mr. MILLS. When we were in power the Americans had a high duty on quinine that amounted to nearly 100 per cent. The result was that quinine was much higher in Detroit than it was on this side, and the smuggling was all the other way. But in the past two years quinine has been free in the American market, and the price has gone down 60 per cent. Competition there did not produce many of the beneficial consequences that have been promised by our Tariff here, and quinine was much higher than in Canada and England; but since it has been made free we find it is half the price on the other side the line that it is on this side.

Mr. BUNSTER. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance to add to the free list, powder and fuse for blasting purposes. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), says "blasted minds." He may have a blasted memory that is not very creditable to him. I wish the hon. Finance Minister to consider the question of taking the duty off powder. British Columbia furnished the stone to build the mint at San Francisco, but this stone was met by an excessive duty on blasting powder, and I think this duty should be taken off in the interests of the Dominion at large.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My hon. friend will remember that last Session or the Session before we did reduce the duty at his suggestion, but before concurrence, I will consider the question he has now raised.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Vancouver if this duty increased the cost of the article?

Mr. BUNSTER. The article is not made in British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. But it is made in Canada.

Mr. BUNSTER. The explosive nature of the article precludes us from importing it, and while we exported to the United States \$1,000,000 worth of gold and \$1,000,000 worth of stone for building, I think we should have the duty removed from this powder.

On the item of glass, &c.,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. Minister of Finance give us some information as to what he calculates will be the alteration in the cost of glass to the consumer by this change in the duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have made some calculation, and suppose the consumer paid the increased duty to the full. It would be, as I think, $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per box, or, upon an ordinary house of one and a half storeys, $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

Mr. BLAKE. The calculation is that the consumer will pay the duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not say so, as likely more will be sold by the manufacturer. If the industry proves a success it will not be five years before the whole of the common window glass will be made in the Dominion, and the competition will be such that it will cost no more than now.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what in his calculations are the advantages that the domestic manufacturer has over the foreign manufacturer in glass by the present Tariff, as well as the natural advantage?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have not considered the advantages. Labor is higher, and in many respects he can manufacture at present, with the difficulties he has to contend with, as cheaply as we can get it from Germany, and when the manufacturer gets the market we expect he will be able to sell at lower rates than at present.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a great objection to the increase of the duty on common glass. My opinion, from the very slight researches I have made, is, that the national advantages to the domestic manufacturer are very great, and in considering questions of this sort we should not assume any arbitrary rate of duty. The hon. gentleman has frequently spoken of the supposed veneration we on this side had for $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as if there was some magic in those numbers; but he seems to have an equal veneration for 30 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The 30 per cents. are very few indeed.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has introduced a number of 30 per cents. to-day. In the present case the object is not to increase but rather to diminish the revenue. The natural advantages to the domestic manufacturer of an article of this description are very great—such as the freight, the bulk, and expense of packing; and besides, a duty of 20 per cent. on an article of this kind would be as oppressive as 30 per cent. on many other articles. The bulk of our common glass—something like three-fourths of the import last year—comes from Belgium. Fifty feet of common window glass, such as I ordinarily used in a house in the country, would cost at Antwerp \$1, unboxed; the box would cost 20 cents, and the freight and charges to Montreal $18\frac{1}{2}$ cents, making $38\frac{1}{2}$ cents for boxing, freight and charges. The duty at present is 20 cents on the glass and 4 cents on the package, which gives you 24 cents of duty, making the cost at Montreal of that which cost \$1 unboxed at Antwerp, \$1.62 $\frac{1}{2}$. The cost of boxing fifty feet in Canada would be 7 cents only, which deducted from the \$1.62 $\frac{1}{2}$ would give \$1.55 $\frac{1}{2}$, showing a net advantage to the Canadian maker of 55 cents or $55\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., of which 24 cents is due to the duty and $31\frac{1}{2}$ cents to natural advantages. Of course the distributing points have to be considered, but I am taking Montreal for an example. As I have said, an article of this description should be lightly taxed, because under any circumstances the cost to the consumer is enormous in proportion to the prime cost of the article. The laid-down cost of \$1.62 $\frac{1}{2}$ at Montreal involves a wholesale addition of $27\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and a retailer's addition of 60 cents on box sales, making what would cost \$1 at Antwerp cost \$2.50 when going into the house; although in ordinary sheeting, or when fifty feet of glass is not wanted, the price would be increased to \$3.50 for fifty feet, so that this duty becomes about 50 cents by the time the stuff reaches the consumer. Yet the hon. gentleman proposes to add a new duty equal to 50 per cent. of the old duty to this article, the result of which will be to increase the ordinary cost to the consumer to \$3.77 instead of \$3.50 for what costs \$1 at Antwerp. Now, it seems to me that the protection which the Canadian manufacturer of common and colored window glass has, owing to the increased cost of boxing in the old country, the cost of freight from Antwerp to Montreal, and the duty which is equivalent to 24 cents on the package, is quite adequate to give all legitimate encouragement to that industry. Surely a duty of practically 55 per cent. is enough to encourage the manufacturer of window glass. And to add to that advantage a further advantage of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is to add that which is either unnecessary in order to the making of window glass

here, or if it be necessary, proves that it is not an industry which we can profitably undertake. If it does not require such an enormous protection, it should not be given; for the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that until that happy day arrives when, by virtue of his Tariff, there is more than one glass factory in the Dominion, in the meantime the duty will be added to the price, and that the people of this country, already taxed to such a great extent for their window glass, will be taxed to an additional amount by both the home maker and the Government—by the home maker to the extent to which he supplies them, and by the Government to the extent to which they import. The result then of his proposition is to prop up an industry which has now a natural advantage of between 50 and 60 per cent. by giving it 12 per cent. more.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman has stated that in spite of great disadvantages the price of window glass in Belgium is \$1 a box. He did not go far enough, or he would have explained to the House that Belgium is the most sedulously protected country in Europe, and that the enormous duty on window glass imported into that country is what has brought down the price. Therefore, the hon. gentleman's argument has contradicted itself.

Mr. HOOPER. In conversation with one of the proprietors of the Napanee Glass Works I put this question to him: "What effect would the imposition of an additional tax of 30 per cent. have on the consumer?" His answer was: "Not one cent; I shall be able to supply all my customers with glass as cheap, if not cheaper, than the price at which it can be imported into this country." The great competition in this country in foreign glass is with German No. 4, which is a very inferior article, and which in consequence of it not being able to find a market in Germany is exported here to this country and the United States, and the makers have heretofore been able to undersell manufacturers in the United States and any in this country. I also asked this gentleman what effect it would have on that class of articles. He said it would make no difference; he was prepared at all events to supply glass to consumers in Canada at prices equally as low, if not lower, than those at which they can be imported.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, of course, the manufacturer promises to supply the glass at a price equal to that at which it can be imported, because if he charged any more we would not buy it. But what we complain of is that the price of the imported article is to be raised by this duty to a point that is altogether exorbitant, and therefore the product to be supplied to us will be at a price altogether exorbitant.

On the item of white lead,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We increase the duty because we hope to encourage its production in this country. So far we have not produced the raw material from which the article is made, and having imposed a duty on the raw material it was found that a sufficient margin had not been left.

On the item of sand and emery paper,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are manufacturing sand paper in this country, and from enquiries made, it is thought that with this duty imposed, manufacturers will be able to make all that is required and sell it cheaper than before.

Mr. BLAKE. How many manufactories are there?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is, at all events, one in Toronto, and, it is understood, others will be established; but owing to the determined action on the part of American manufacturers to drive our manufactory out of the market, it has been deemed advisable to encourage the establishment of other factories.

Mr. BLAKE. Are there any others?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Only one that I know of.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. BLAKE. How many hands does it employ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know. The firm manufactures other articles besides sand paper, which is only a branch of the business in which a large number of people are employed.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, as I understand it, this is also an increase of duty in expectation of diminishing the revenue.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a very remarkable fact in connection with our manufactories, that they seem to make up very largely for the amount of duty.

Mr. MILLS. Would not a single establishment meet all our requirements?

On the item of silver plate glass,

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand the Finance Minister to say that the reason for this change was to bring up the duty to the same point as on colorless window glass.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, then, does expect that the price of colorless window glass will be increased by the duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, for a time.

On the item of spirits,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At the present time fluid extracts imported pay a duty of \$1.90. They are manufactured in the United States and England, but our manufacturers have to pay that sum on alcohol.

On the motion of books, &c.,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain what he expects to be the operation of this change?

Mr. BOWELL. It will prevent the undervaluation of posters and other printing brought in from the United States. A specific duty of 6 cents per lb. and 20 per cent. *ad valorem* will prevent to a great extent fraud and also tend to cause the printing to be done in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. To what extent will the increase run?

Mr. BOWELL. Not more than 10 per cent. on the proper valuations, but to 40 or 50 per cent. on the undervaluation constantly made of these posters.

On the item of salt,

Mr. BLAKE. What is the purpose of this change?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At present fine salt from the United States pays 5 to 8 per cent. duty, and that from England is free. This is to provide that all imported salt shall pay duty.

Mr. ANGLIN. There is a serious objection to this tax. It will be a serious burden on the farmer, for whom we have done nothing.

Mr. FARROW. I think no class of people has greater cause for grievance than the saltmen in the west. I do not think any one can reasonably object to the little tax. If the farmer wishes to avoid it, let his wife take the coarse salt and roll it down fine.

Mr. BLAKE. In what interest is the addition of 25 per cent. on the bags made? Is it the bag or salt-maker's interest, or that of both together?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The salt-maker's. They allege they are, to some extent, in an unfavorable position compared with the men who import the bags free; and to enable them to compete more successfully, this change is proposed, because the man who imports the fine salt now does not pay duty on the bags, it is so much added to the duty he would have to pay on the salt.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the value of the bag compared with the salt it contains?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not exactly know; perhaps it depends on the size of the bag.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps my hon. friend opposite, who was one of the salts of the earth, could tell us what the value of the ordinary bag is—the fine salt bag? How many pounds does the bag contain?

Mr. FARROW. Some are larger and some smaller. About 25 pounds; such a bag would sell for about 25 cents.

Mr. BOWELL. The prices of salt bags are as various as the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. The importers of this salt get the bags in free; and in their advertisements of sale, one of the inducements held out to buy the imported salt, even if not so good as Canadian, is the gift of the bag. The bag imported by a Canadian salt-maker has to pay 20 per cent., whereas the importer gets in free, and when it is empty he can sell it, to be used for towelling or other purposes. This affords a positive advantage to the manufacturers of salt.

Mr. BLAKE. This cloth is made here and the bags are made here, and surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that they cost 20 per cent. more than if there was no duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says the importer brings in the bag and does not pay the 20 per cent. charged to others. I wanted some notion as to the effect of this duty in raising the cost of importing fine salt. You say it is in order to advantage the salt-maker. How does it advantage him? What is the enhanced cost of importing fine salt by reason of this charge?

Mr. HESSON. The gentlemen are anxious for the duty on bags for the purpose of protection against fraud. Bags are brought in on the top of barrels, the salt being afterwards packed in small cotton bags. The reason they ask for a duty on these bags is, when they buy cotton here they pay the duty that goes into their manufacture.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HESSON. They do, however; and it seems reasonable if bags are permitted to come in free whilst cotton is taxed. I think they have a right to this protection, which I am glad the Finance Minister has given, though a mere trifle, in the interest of this great industry. Salt has been going down in the market and it has become cheaper and cheaper, and the attempt to fix it has but pressed it down. I have had to pay \$2.50 for salt which I could buy to-day for 75 cents, and at the factory for 55 cents. If this duty has the effect desired, it is not worth our while to complain and request the removal of the tax, as the cotton bags are permitted to come in free, while the cotton itself is charged a duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the cotton used in these bags made in the country?

Several hon. MEMBERS. Some of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is quite wrong to import it when they can buy it here; and if they bought it here they would not pay a higher price, but would get it as cheap as the imported article. I think the observations of the hon. member for North Huron and the hon. member for North Perth add a point to my question. Both say you are giving us a mere nothing; this is no advantage. I would like to know what it is. Surely the hon. Minister, before proposing that change, made some calculation as to the extent of its benefit to the home producer of salt, and as to the enhanced cost of the importation of fine salt. If not he did not do his duty to the Committee. I hope he will bring down this information. I regret he has not done it before submitting his proposition.

Mr. FARROW. There is a duty charged on cloth of a similar nature to that of these bags. The salt manufactured in this country is not packed in the same cloth as that

coming from England. The imported bags do not pay the duty, which is not fair to the Canadian salt interest.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member has misapprehended my question. I was simply asking how much?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The case was presented to the Government in this way. It was stated that a party manufacturing salt in the Dominion, and putting it up in bags, the bag cost from 10 to 12½ per cent. made up here more than it cost to import the salt in a bag free. In the first place, we did not contemplate charging the duty on salt, but to give them the benefit of that 12½ per cent. between the cost to the man who imported it in the bag free and the man who made it here; but, subsequently, a deputation came here who discussed the whole question, and we decided it would be right and fair to give that industry, which to-day has less protection than almost any other, an addition of about 12½ per cent., or to give them 8 cents per hundred on all fine salt imported from Great Britain and elsewhere.

Mr. BLAKE. I wanted to know the extent to which the cost of fine salt was going to be increased by this duty on the bags.

Mr. BOWELL. When the value of the bag is known it is easy to ascertain the increased cost. I know that the large jute bags in which coarse salt is placed, and some fine salt, are purchased in Glasgow at 8 to 10 cents each, and the Government, in order to encourage that industry in this country, passed an Order in Council, placing jute cloth, unpressed and unfinished, on the free list. We have the best assurance that these bags will be made in this country at as low a price to the salt buyer as they are now purchased—certainly not more than one cent more, and at the same price at which they are purchased in Glasgow. Now, supposing that the bag cost 10 cents, that would just add 2½ cents to the value of the salt contained in the bag, and the same proportion to all the bags ranging in price down as low as 2 cents each.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Several manufacturers in the west had communications with the hon. Minister of Railways, and a proposition has been made by which it is very probable that salt sent from the west will be sent to the Lower Provinces at a much lower rate than is charged at present. They can even ship it by rail from the west to the Maritime Provinces at the same rate as coal is brought from the east, so that salt will cost the people of the Maritime Provinces no more than it costs them now when brought from England and the United States.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has alluded to that interview, it reminds me that I understand by the newspapers that those people were benighted, enough to think that they were hardly used by the coal duty. They seem really to think that their fuel was raised in price. Perhaps the hon. Minister will give us some account of that interview.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman seems to have overlooked the fact that there are two bushels of salt in these larger bags. A bushel of salt is worth about twenty cents, and if the bag costs ten cents, that would raise the price of the bag two and a-half cents. Consequently, a two-bushel bag of salt would cost about 42½ cents. The hon. member for West Durham seems to forget that salt producers here have to compete with cheap labor in the Old Country, where these bags are made, and if these bags are permitted to come in free foreign labor is permitted to come into competition with our labor. I think it is continuing the same policy the Government have adopted, which I think is a wise policy.

On the item of iron boilers and iron tubing,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Might I ask the nature of this change; what has led to its being made?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have ascertained, beyond doubt, that a quantity of this tubing is below two inches. There were difficulties in the way that I could not explain to my hon. friend last Session; but after listening to his earnest appeals, I made further enquiries, and am now glad to be able to meet his wishes as well as to secure the interests of the country by making the change.

Mr. PATERSON. I am greatly encouraged to learn that though the Minister of Finance apparently turns a deaf ear to my counsels, yet after the lapse of a year he accedes to my proposals. Although he has been a protectionist from the year 1851 down to the present time, I believe if I keep on instilling good doctrines in his ears, by-and-bye, perhaps, he may come down to a sound revenue Tariff basis.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is in the time of protection.

On the item of mustard and mustard cake,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is merely to settle the question whether this is to be 20 or 25 per cent. Mustard cake is 20 per cent. and mustard manufactured 25 per cents.

On the item of paraffine wax, &c.,

Mr. BLAKE. Why this change?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is owing to a great difficulty experienced in the Department as to the value of this article. Demands have been made to have it entered at ports at a low rate, but we have taken the average value of the imports for the year, and have imposed this sum which is the more specific duty than the average would be *ad valorem*.

Mr. BLAKE. Are there various grades of this article?

Mr. BOWELL. Some cost 5 cents, some 6 cents and some 4 cents, but the attempt is often made to bring it in for 2½ or 3 cents, and this change is made in order to remedy the evil mentioned by the hon. Finance Minister.

On the item of fruit trees, &c.,

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). This is an item which I would like to hear the hon. Finance Minister explain. I see no provision in the Tariff by which seedlings are excluded from the effect of this item. Seedlings are almost exclusively imported, and the effect of this clause will be to include them along with trees. Cuttings also are imported for grafting; and I think with regard to the latter item that it would seem that the Finance Minister must have listened to the representations of some set of nurserymen, and framed the item accordingly.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), in making the remark which he has just made, is objecting to the general principle of the Tariff, as everyone of the charges have been made in the particular way he suggests. That is the general rule, for we all know that the leader of the Government announced in the General Election of 1878 that he would construct the Tariff on the representation of those who were interested in the various industries to be fostered; that he would find out how much was required, and he would give it to them. I notice that the hon. gentleman has omitted one article, the article of grape vines. Did he find a greater difference of values in that case than in the others?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Was there any representation made as to any large contract on foot for the importation of vines, as I received some information of that kind?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. BOWELL. Representations were made that 4 cents a vine would be altogether out of proportion to the 20 per cent., and upon investigating the matter we concluded that it would be too high, especially upon

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

that class mentioned by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), cuttings or shoots or buddings, and each one, of course, would be one vine, and from the invoices which I examined, I found that many of them were brought in from the United States at 2 cents per vine. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) is wrong with regard to any representation being made to the Department whatever with reference to the change on those articles. These changes were suggested from practical observations which took place in the different ports, as to the mode in which these articles were brought in, and it was thought better to make a low specific duty than to endure the constant annoyance that arose in every part of the country with regard to the importation of apple and other kinds of trees. I might say further that almost every nurseryman who has communicated with the Department since this was published have objected to it, particularly because they thought it included what the hon. gentleman calls seedling stocks. Now, as they are not specified, they are not interfered with, nor is the duty raised on that class of articles. The change affects only the articles which are mentioned. With regard to peaches, I may say that the only representations which have been made to the Department have been to raise the duty as high as possible, so as to make it even prohibitory, so as to prevent the importation of trees affected by the "yellows," a disease almost as contagious as smallpox, and which is almost unknown in this country, except in imported trees.

Mr. SPROULE. The principle which the hon. gentleman for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has mentioned as the one upon which the Ministry acted in framing the Tariff, I think, is a correct one, and one which I strongly support. The trouble with the late Government was that they took no notice of representations made by various classes of the people, but sat in their *sancta sanctorum* and paid no attention.

Mr. BLAKE. I have only to say, I do not find fault with the Finance Minister for finding out the people's grievances. I only wish that he would endeavor to find out the grievances of the other people who will be affected by these changes. These are his words to every question, and if you only hear one side you are not likely to form a sound judgment.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I am inclined to think, with regard to this matter, that the Ministry have gone into their closets in making these changes in the way described by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The changes are disadvantageous to the people of my constituency, and I shall take an early opportunity of placing my views on the subject on record.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state how the change will operate disadvantageously.

Mr. PATTERSON. I think it would operate disadvantageously in many respects. Those trees will be brought in subject to a specific duty, and they will be brought in under false pretences, such as 100 trees for 50c., 200 for \$1, &c. It applies to trees of all kinds, including seedlings, and unless seedlings are specifically excluded I am afraid the Customs' officers on the western frontier will consider it their duty to value them as trees. The hon. Minister of Customs states that I made some general charge about the nurserymen obtaining this change. I did not do so; but I think some persons interested in the sale of trees have been making misrepresentations. I am quite satisfied that no person from the part of the country I live in asked for the change, and I think Essex, Kent and Bothwell are as much a fruit-bearing district as any portion of the Dominion. I do not think this change is in the interest of the farming community, or will tend to increase the number of orchards in the western peninsula.

Mr. SPROULE. If this duty will have the effect of shutting out these peach trees I think it will be really in the interest of the farmers. A few years ago, the Legislature of Ontario found it necessary to pass a Bill to compel the owners of diseased trees to cut those trees down, and we know that men from many of the American nurseries are selling diseased trees which will effectually destroy an orchard in a few years, and many in my section last year expressed the opinion that it would be advantageous to have a prohibitory duty placed on these trees.

Mr. PLUMB. On the frontier where I live the cultivation of peaches is one of the greatest industries; 20,000 or 30,000 baskets a day being shipped from the town where I live, and there the greatest complaints are made, not by the nurserymen, but by the orchardmen themselves that they cannot get American peach trees excluded. On the other side the peach trees are touched with a disease which has not yet much affected our trees; but there is great danger of having that disease brought among us if American peach trees are not excluded by a prohibitory duty. There is an abundant supply on our own side for all purposes, and small nurseries are increasing to such an extent that it is not necessary to cross the border for peach trees. I think an absolute prohibitory duty would have been even better than a duty of 3 cents each, until we find that the disease of "yellows" has been entirely stamped out in the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire the statement of the hon. member for Essex to go forth uncontradicted. He says that he is informed by the Customs officers that seedlings and stock brought into the country for grafting are subject to the duty. I may say that there was some misapprehension on this point, and the moment it was brought to the notice of the Department a circular was issued informing the Customs officers that they were not to be so treated, but to be placed as formerly on the 20 per cent. list. I may inform the hon. gentleman that no nurserymen or any one else has suggested this change in the Tariff. Since he is very desirous of knowing how this change was made, I will tell him. We took the price lists of the large nurseryman in this country and the United States, upon which we based our specific duty which is lower than the 20 per cent. duty would be if the trees were entered for duty at the invoice price less the trade discount. I am sure no nurseryman will object to this duty when he understands it, and the only men who, I understand, object to it are the American peddlers who bring all classes of goods into this country in the spring and fall.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). He gave me no statement.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a matter of veracity. The hon. gentleman knows that he wrote a letter to Mr. McDougal, and came to me and showed it me, and I pointed out that those articles were not to be charged at that rate, but at 20 per cent., and with my approval he sent that letter.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). The hon. gentleman had better keep cool; anything I say in this House I shall be able to substantiate. I called upon the hon. gentleman in regard to this subject, and after explaining to him the views of my constituents he yielded on the matter of grape vines, and represented he would yield in the other matters. Perhaps I might have misunderstood him. I wrote a letter to one of my constituents and showed it to the hon. gentleman; he said it was all right, but he gave me no statement. The hon. gentleman has not, in my opinion, carried out in these items connected with the Tariff the terms which I was led to expect, or what I consider are in the interests of the constituency I represent.

Mr. LONGLEY. All classes of fruit trees can be propagated and grown in this country as well as elsewhere, and

you know well that such trees are much better than imported trees. If that be admitted, it seems to me that if there is one article requiring higher protection, amounting to prohibition, fruit trees belong to that class. It may not now be the time to advocate such a policy, as the Government will adhere to their proposals, but I hope the time is not far distant when we will have such a Tariff as will lead to the production of the various kinds of fruit trees within our own country which will serve our purpose better in the end than imported trees.

Mr. KILLAM. I look upon fruit trees as a raw material and I am surprised that the representative of a fruit-growing country should advance any doctrine or support any policy calculated to prevent the farmers from buying fruit trees in any market they might select.

On the item of cotton manufactures,

Mr. BOWELL. An article called Kentucky jeans is imported which is not a jean, and this change was to prevent that.

On the item of table glass. In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This proposal is for the purpose of adding to the other articles specified in the 30 per cent. list in the Tariff, cut, pressed and moulded table ware. When we imposed 30 per cent. duty on specific articles of glass ware made in the Dominion, we stated distinctly that it was because they were made in the Dominion, and the result has been satisfactory since, because prices have been greatly reduced. An establishment has been erected in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, where this description of moulded table ware is manufactured, and I doubt not we shall have other glass manufactories. It is proposed that as they are now made in the country, they should be placed on the same list with lamp glasses and other articles placed at 30 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. This proposal seems to be open to the same objection that I made to the former proposal with reference to glass. As I have said there is a real difficulty with any duties on these goods, on account of various considerations, and among these are their bulkiness and fragility, and the consequent additional cost of transportation. I have some information on the subject which I should have preferred giving to the Committee at an hour when they would have been disposed better to attend to business than now; but if the hon. Finance Minister insists on going on, I must give it now. I have here a statement of an invoice of ware of this kind, pressed glass and table ware brought into Montreal last month. The actual value of the goods was \$2,731.34; the packages cost \$240.13; and the freight from Wheeling and Pittsburg, \$391.58; making an aggregate of \$621.71; to be added to the cost of the goods, exclusive of the duty, \$3,353.05. It would be observed that the goods cost, to pack and carry, 22½ per cent. on prime cost. Being bulky and fragile, and expensive to move, this gives an actual advantage of very great consequence to the manufacturer in Canada, who can make them at a distance less remote from the point of consumption. Now, the late Tariff would have added to this cost of \$3,353, \$477.96, or 17½ per cent.; and so, under the late Tariff, those goods could have been laid down at \$3,831.25, or over 40 per cent. advance on unpacked goods to the point of Montreal. Under the Tariff as it stands they will cost, instead of \$3,831, \$3,962.85, or 48½ per cent. advance on the unpacked goods at the point of manufacture. The duty on the goods and packages is 22½ per cent. on the value of the goods. The packages are a lot of old flour barrels costing in the United States 35 cents, and weighing 30 lbs.; then the proportion of freight is 18 cents and the duty on them is 7 cents, making the total cost of the packages 60 cents; and they are sold for 10 cents after

the importers unpack the glass, so there is a loss on every package of 50 cents, of which 7 cents is due to the existing duty. Under the proposed Tariff the duty is 30 per cent. on goods and packages. The cost of the goods laid down would be \$4,281, or 55½ per cent. advance in the value of the goods unpacked and bought at the manufactory. The rate of duty on the goods themselves would be about 36½ per cent., but every barrel would have cost 10½ cents for duty, 18 cents for freight, selling afterwards for only 10 cents, representing a loss of 50 cents. The total cost of the barrels with freight and duty is thus 63½ cents. These goods weighed about 65,000 lbs.; the freight was 60 cents per hundred, equal to about 14½ per cent, or to 13½ per cent. on certain goods and packages. This proves that this class of goods is peculiarly expensive to export; because, with the duty added to the freight, the cost amounts to a large percentage on the value of the goods, including the packages; the cost is 14 per cent. on the value of the goods alone. Then on the goods, for their carriage, there is a large advance; there is the breakage and progress of transportation; the breakage in the shops, and the expense of the packages against those goods also. It is evident that the parties intermediate between the maker and consumer must make a large advance on such goods to make the business pay. The wholesale advance is 50 per cent. and the retailers 50 also. The result is the cost to the consumer under the old Tariff, \$8,619.76, or an advance of 315 per cent.; under the present Tariff, \$8,916.40, or an advance of 325½ per cent.; under the proposed Tariff, \$9,334.34, or an advance of 349½ per cent.; under the old Tariff the duty was 37 per cent.; present Tariff, 50½ per cent.; under the proposed Tariff, 73 per cent. So the consumer will pay, by virtue of the proposed duty, 73 per cent. advance on an article which, owing to its expensive transport and fragility, is in any case very costly. It is obvious that this is not a thing that ought to be lightly taxed. The factory which the hon. gentleman referred to is at New Glasgow, and gets its coal very cheap indeed. It gets a supply of that raw material which is of the utmost importance in the manufacture of glass at a rate exceptionally low. It gets, therefore, as I have shown, a protection in the shape of duty of 22½ per cent. on the goods and also the freight; the freight is 32 cents per 100 lbs. by the car load, as against 60 cents on the invoice to which I referred. So the freight amounts to 7 per cent. on the value of the goods, assuming the same values which rule at Pittsburgh; and the freight from Montreal to New Glasgow would be but 7 per cent. instead of 13 from Pittsburgh, or an advantage of over 6 per cent. over the foreign exporter. The combined gain under the existing Tariff is thus 28½ per cent., which is one extremely advantageous to the Canadian manufacturer. By the proposed Tariff the duty would be over 36 per cent., which will, with the bright advantage of 6 per cent., make a total of 42 per cent. in favor of New Glasgow, assuming Montreal as the distributing point. I have further information as to the practical operation of this duty. I have got a few of the articles of table ware made by this factory, with their prices, and the prices of the same goods made in the United States at the points to which I have referred, Pittsburgh and Wheeling. At Pittsburgh, sets of table ware, \$2.15; New Glasgow, \$3.25, or 51 per cent. in advance. Bowls and covers, Pittsburgh, \$1.75; New Glasgow, \$2.75, or 57 per cent. advance. Another kind of bowls and covers, Pittsburgh, \$2.25; New Glasgow, \$3.25, or 45 per cent. Tumblers and patters, Pittsburgh, 20 cents; New Glasgow, 30 cents, or 50 per cent. Goblets, Pittsburgh, 29 cents; New Glasgow, 40 cents, or 37½ per cent. Double egg cups, Pittsburgh, 40 cents; New Glasgow, 60 cents, or 50 per cent. more—thus giving an average of 48½ per cent. advance of New Glasgow upon Pittsburgh prices. My opinion is that they are the latest dates, and that they are contemporaneous. Of course, the

Mr. BLAKE.

New Glasgow works are the latest. Now, I have said that gives you an average of 48½ per cent. upon the whole invoice that has been furnished to me of the New Glasgow wares. They do not make many sorts; I am not sure I have got all the sorts they make; but I was given these particulars, and I was told they partly represented the rest. Of course, that is apparently an increased protection, but it is accounted for by the fact that this price of 48½ per cent. included delivery in car loads from New Glasgow to Montreal. I have already pointed out that the delivery to Montreal is at the rate of about 7 per cent., taking Pittsburgh rates, and if you take that from the 48½ you find the price at New Glasgow is 41½ in excess of the price of Pittsburgh, while the protection is 42 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the remarks of the hon. gentleman are only another illustration of the manner in which American manufacturers endeavor to crush out every industry established in this country. The quotation the hon. gentleman has given, according to my information, is quite correct. He stated the very latest prices; but I am informed that these prices were a short time ago up as high as \$2.50 to \$2.75, or higher; but the moment the New Glasgow works were established, and they began to sell their wares in this country, the Americans at once reduced the price of their articles in order not only to compete but to crush the industry in this country. The same principle prevailed when the western salt works were started. Salt was then sold cheaper from the Syracuse works, which are immediately opposite Kingston, at a lower price in Huron and the western section of Canada than in Belleville, which is hundreds of miles nearer the works. It is only another evidence of the manner in which every industry established in this country is endeavored to be crushed out by American manufacturers. I find no fault with them for doing that, but the result is that though these articles are manufactured in this country, they are sold cheaper to the consumer than before the establishment of the manufactories. There is not the slightest doubt that the same result would follow if this factory were closed. The American manufacturers, then, instead of selling at the prices the hon. gentleman has given to the House, would at once go up to the old rates, and then the Canadian consumer would have to pay advanced rates. Now, I have no doubt, from past experience, that when these works are fairly in operation these articles will be sold cheaper to the consumer than they were previous to the establishment of the glass works.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the American manufacturers have sold their exports here cheaper than they sell them in their own market?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that, but I presume such is the fact.

Mr. BLAKE. Then all I can say is that I should be very much surprised if that is so in this particular case, because in the invoice to which I refer, unless I misunderstood my correspondent, he gave me the duty actually paid on the invoice, and the duty actually paid was not the duty which the hon. gentleman is in the habit of charging, which, I believe, is based upon the value of the articles sold in the country where they are manufactured. I shall be surprised to learn that these goods have been valued by the hon. gentleman's officers at more than the prices at which they were invoiced. It is preposterous to suppose that the small market afforded in Canada would induce glass manufacturers in the United States to reduce, by those enormous rates, the supply for the whole of the United States themselves. If they are selling at reduced rates to Canada and keep them up for themselves, then, of course, the hon. gentleman would charge the duty at the cost in the country of manufacture, and, therefore, he would charge a higher rate of duty, *ad valorem*, than in this value. Now, I do not say

that has not been done in this case, but I shall be very much surprised if it has. If he has not done so then these are the Pittsburg and Wheeling prices for home consumption, and in that case the hon. gentleman's argument would fall to the ground. Now, I may say a word in reference to manufacturers. My opinion is that they are just of the same flesh and blood, animated by the same motives, and pursuing the same interests in all countries where manufactures are carried on. They get as much as they can out of the consumer; they enter into trade for that purpose. If they sometimes lower the rates it is always with the view of making more profit in the end. The hon. gentleman takes the United States manufacturers, as if they were peculiar in that particular; not a bit of it. The Canadian manufacturer does the same. He takes as much as he can, or as much as he dares. I do not blame him for it; it is for that purpose he goes into business. Therefore I do not blame these New Glasgow gentlemen, that when they could exact 42 per cent. they take 41½.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error as to the basis on which duty is collected. Neither the Customs Department nor myself fix any value upon the articles brought into this country. We fixed the duty to-day under the law proposed by the late Government. I know the hon. gentleman is finding fault and reiterating what is constantly repeated in the press that represents the hon. gentleman's views, for carrying out the law he himself and his party put upon the Statute-book. It is the duty of the appraisers and the collectors, in every instance where an invoice is presented to them, to ascertain as near as can be obtained, the value of the articles in the market of the country where they are sold. Now, that is not fixing the value by myself or by the Department. The value is fixed by the manufacturer or seller in the United States; but if he sells to a Canadian purchaser at a lower price than the price in the United States and the appraiser knows that to be a fact, his duty is, under the law, to raise the value for duty. If the hon. gentleman had a little experience he would know that it does not follow, because an invoice may have been passed by a collector or appraiser, or any other official, at a certain price, that that establishes the fact that that price is the market value in the country in which it is purchased for duty. The trouble is that these invoices, either by the negligence or the want of knowledge of the officer are too often passed, but when they are sent to the Department here they are placed in the hands of the Dominion Appraisers who have every facility for ascertaining the true market value in the country in which the goods are purchased. This causes a great deal of trouble and discontent, and the charge which is made against the Customs Department—too often by those who know better—that there is any imputation on the honesty of the importers, is not correct. If a man goes to New York or Buffalo and buys goods at prices at which they would not be sold by the seller to his American customers, it does not follow that because he endeavors to make entry at an export price that he is dishonest, because many a man purchases in that way without having an exact knowledge of the law. Still it becomes the duty of the appraiser to raise the price to the value at which the same goods would be sold for home consumption. With regard to what the hon. gentleman has said, I know that, in the article of lamp chimneys and glass lamps, in very many cases the price has been actually raised because they have sold to the Canadian purchaser at a lower price than for home consumption.

Mr. PLUMB. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why, in asking this calculation of freight, he made it 60 cents from Pittsburg to Montreal, and stated that the average was 32 cents.

Mr. BLAKE. I said the average rate per car load.

Mr. PLUMB. Does the hon. gentleman take into consideration the rate from New Glasgow to Montreal. He said the average was 32 cents.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I said the rate in one case was 32 and in the other 60 cents, and that one was 13 per cent. on the value of the goods.

Mr. PLUMB. But why take Montreal, the furthest point from Pittsburg, as the distributing point? Why not take Hamilton?

Mr. BLAKE. In that case you would have had the cost to Hamilton. Why not make it to British Columbia? I wish to say that I made no imputation against the Minister of Customs for observing the laws. He seemed to apprehend me, and to answer some enquiries in the newspapers. but this is not, perhaps, the time to discuss the newspapers. I said that he was in the habit of fixing the goods under the law, but that if he had done so in this case a greater rate would have been charged.

Mr. HESSON. It occurred to me when the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said the prices which he was quoting as being lower than the prices here are the prices of goods in a country which has protection to an unlimited extent—to a prohibitory extent—so far as glass ware is concerned, I am not aware that the Americans are importing the quality of glass that hon. gentleman has been giving the figures for to-night, but I know that we have never had lamp chimneys so cheap as to-day, and if we, with our comparatively low Tariff, can compete with the Americans with their high Tariff, I think the hon. gentleman should look at the matter in that light.

Mr. ANGLIN. I may say that I have had a conversation with a number of the largest shareholders in the New Glasgow works about the time those works were going into operation, and they were unanimous in stating that they were satisfied with the old Tariff. If any application has since been made for a change, I believe it has been made without the concurrence of the principal shareholders.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman say that they increased the price of their goods?

Mr. ANGLIN. I said nothing at all about the cost.

On the item of stoves, &c.,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The question has arisen in the different ports as to whether forgings were castings or not. Some are entered in the rough state and were really castings, and this change is made for the purpose of settling the question.

Resolutions to be reported; and (at 3:45 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 24th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MARINE TELEGRAPH LINE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to make further provision regarding the incorporation of a company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific coast of Canada and Asia, and for repealing the provisions of any Act inconsistent therewith.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman please explain the Bill?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill is composed of three clauses. The first is to extend the period mentioned in the Act of last Session, so as to give twelve months for the letters patent to issue; the second is for the purpose of giving to the Company an exclusive privilege, for the period of twenty years from the passing of this Act; and the third is to repeal the provisions of any Act inconsistent with the second clause. When the Bill comes up for the second reading I will enter fully into the reasons for introducing the measure.

Mr. BLAKE. Might I ask if there is any correspondence in the possession of the Government on the subject of this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; there is none.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

HARBOR OF THREE RIVERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of certain Commissioners for the improvement and management of the harbor of Three Rivers.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This resolution is the basis of a Bill for the organization of a Board of Harbor Commissioners at Three Rivers. There will be five Commissioners—the Mayor of the city, the Chairman of the Board of Trade, and three other Commissioners appointed by the Government. A chairman will be elected from the five by themselves. The Commissioners will act without payment. They are to be authorized to borrow money to the extent of \$300,000 on their works, without any guarantee on the part of the Government; and they will not be able to incur any expenses or borrow money without having first obtained the sanction of the Governor in Council or the Minister of Public Works.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN introduced Bill (No. 128) to provide for the improvement and management of the harbor of Three Rivers.

Bill read the first time.

CLAIMS ON THE BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that the sum of \$250,000 placed by the Act 24 Victoria, Chapter 8, at the disposal of the Governor in Council, for the purpose of paying off any claims on the Bank of Upper Canada, settled and adjusted under the fourth section of the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 40, subject to the conditions mentioned in the Act first mentioned, be increased to \$255,000, subject to the same conditions, and that the Act first mentioned be amended accordingly.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister be good enough to explain the precise reason why he requires this sum, as I understand it is an item of \$5,000 only.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I should like the hon. gentleman to state why he requires that amount, and why it is necessary to require a special Act?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under the Act referred to there was placed at the disposal of the Government \$250,000. In June, \$252,000 had been expended, and

Mr. BLAKE.

the Auditor General called the attention of the Department to the fact that there was no authority to make that over-payment, and on examining the claims to be brought before the Government, it appeared possible that \$3,000 more would be required. It is necessary to have a few thousand dollars to pay claims, and the Government therefore asked that the \$252,000 should be extended to \$255,000. The amount of the receipts from the assets of the bank down to the present time amounted to \$340,000, and \$70,000 more were expected to be realized within eighteen months, when it was hoped the matter would be finally disposed of.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. Minister has a list of all the claims against the bank. I thought a list had been submitted at the time it was placed in the hands of the Government. I am speaking from recollection as I have not examined the Statutes, but I think it is eleven or twelve years since the Act was passed under which the hon. gentleman is now acting. I thought all the claims had been put in when possession was taken.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is some circulation held by parties at this moment, and we have not money to pay it. A gentleman wrote since the opening of the Session asking why \$500 of circulation, applied for to our representative in Toronto, had not been paid.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then the amount is composed only of outstanding notes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think mainly so.

Mr. ANGLIN. We, from the Maritime Provinces, would like to receive some further explanation in regard to this matter. We are interested to know how the Government became responsible for winding up the affairs of the Bank and paying its creditors, and how the Government became one of the largest creditors. We would like to know how much is lost in that way, for although it was lost before our time we have to bear our share of the consequences. It is desirable to know how much was lost, why it was lost, and why the Government have undertaken to wind up the affairs of the bank, and whether there is any probability of ever getting back any of the money which the Government of Canada formerly had on deposit or otherwise in charge of the bank. Hon. members from Ontario are, no doubt, familiar with the history of this bank, and are quite satisfied that the Government are only taking the course they should take in the matter, but the House would like to have some further explanations. There have been rumors afloat with respect to the management of the bank in former times, and it has been stated in another place that it was the duty of the Government to enquire into the history of the transactions of this bank in years previous to its failure; and it is alleged, if such enquiry were carefully made, it would be found that persons contrived to obtain from that bank, improperly, very large sums which, if proper steps were taken, they might be made to disgorge, so that the public would be relieved somewhat from the loss it has had to sustain in consequence of its having entrusted public funds to that bank. At all events, we would like to know why and how it is we are involved in this business, whether the Government money has been absolutely lost, whether we are coming in as one of the creditors receiving dividends from the amount realized from the assets, and any further explanations.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This matter was fully discussed in Parliament when the first Bill was passed, 33 Victoria, Chapter 40. What the conditions and circumstances connected with the case were, Sir John Rose or Sir Francis Hincks, the Finance Minister at the time, fully explained when the appropriation of \$200,000 was made for the payment of the liabilities, the Government undertaking to pay the rest of the creditors, the Government taking the assets. When the affairs are closed, a dividend, equal to

12 or 15 cents on the dollar, will be received by the Government for their claim on that institution. If there is any fact which the hon. member for Gloucester wishes to elicit, or to ascertain whether there has been any improper conduct on the part of any person, creditor or debtor of the bank, let the hon. gentleman make a motion, and the Government will be happy to bring down information on the subject.

Mr. HESSON. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not asking for a sufficient amount to meet all cases yet remaining unsettled. One of my own constituents is a creditor for £300 sterling which he has claimed for the last twenty years, and interest on it. The case has been submitted to a legal authority, and I suppose the Government will not pay it unless they are compelled to do so. It is not a matter of circulation but a claim against the bank.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is it intended that these \$3,000 shall be applied to the liquidation of the claim of one of the constituents of an hon. gentleman opposite which has been in suspense twenty years?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have not personally heard of this case before.

Mr. BLAKE. I think before the next stage is taken the hon. gentleman should bring down a list of the claims, \$2,000 paid in excess and \$3,000 expected to be paid, because they are very stale.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When I submit the Bill I will bring down such a list.

Resolution agreed to and ordered to be reported.

DEEPENING CHANNEL BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise, by the issue of debentures in the manner prescribed by the Act 36 Victoria, chapter 60 (except as regards the rate of interest, which shall not exceed 4 per cent. per annum), a further sum, not exceeding \$280,000 to be applied, subject to the provisions of the said Act as amended by the said Act 44 Victoria, chapter 7, in meeting the expenses incurred and to be incurred in completing the dredging and deepening of the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is for the purpose of completing the channel to the depth of twenty-five feet, and the above is estimated to be the amount required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is it a loan to the Commissioners?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes. All the conditions of the general Act are to be in force, except that the interest be at the rate of 4 per cent. The Commissioners have plant on hand which, when the work is completed, will, they consider, realize a considerable portion of this loan.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I thought that twenty-five feet depth was completed through Lake St. Peter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the Commissioners have been working all last summer. They were under the impression that the \$1,500,000 put at their disposal was not all expended. Therefore they continued working through a certain period during the summer until the end, under that impression. When they made their report at the end of the season, it was found they had expended more than the amount put at their disposal. In the beginning they were authorized to invest a large sum in the purchase of plant, to the extent, I think, of \$450,000 or \$550,000. That plant is there, and

therefore reduces the amount to be expended by so much. When this came to the notice of the Government we called upon the Commissioners to explain and they gave a statement of the value of that plant. Then they gave another statement showing what was required this year to complete the improvement to the depth of twenty-five feet. The amount that will have to be expended this season to complete the work will be \$280,000. Then, the plant being sold, the amount realized will be about sufficient to recoup the Government for the \$280,000, and thus the whole amount, \$1,500,000 will not be exceeded.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is the plant the only security?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a Government trust as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. GAULT. I am glad to say there is no trust in this country that has so faithfully performed its duty from its very inception as the Harbor Trust of Montreal. Under the late Hon. John Young, Mr. Delisle, Mr. Cramp, and especially Mr. Robertson, the contracts have all been completed to the letter. I think it is very creditable to Montreal that we have always had such good men in the Harbor Trust.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. There are no contracts in this. The contracts were for the harbor. This is the river; and although the Harbor Commissioners had charge of this, they did the work themselves. The Government has, I understand, for security the tolls, besides the security of the plant.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understood the hon. the Minister of Public Works to say that this \$280,000 would complete the work. When completed, is the work of such a nature that it will require none or very small expense to keep it in order. I understand that the channel is 300 feet in length and twenty-five feet deep. Is it mud, or hard bottom.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At certain places it is mud, and at others hard.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is all mud in the lake.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. I understand from the Commissioners it will require some dredges to keep the channel clear. In spring they will have to examine the channel from end to end, to see whether any deposits have been made during the winter, and we expect the channel will be kept open to the depth of twenty-five feet. The Government have not considered whether they will ask Parliament to consent to providing for any greater depth. As hon. gentlemen on the other side must have seen, a meeting was held in Montreal to obtain the deepening of the channel to twenty-seven and a-half feet. Of course the Government did not take the matter up. We stated that there was no need of taking up that question at present, as there was enough work with the present channel to employ the dredges fully.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has said that there was a communication from the Commissioners, and an estimate; is that the estimate of the Commissioners, or the estimate of the Government Engineer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The estimate was shown to the Chief Engineer of the Department, and it was considered by him that the work would occupy a good part of the season, for a number of years; while, as a rule, the expenditure of the year was largely caused by payments of the dredges, fuel, &c., it was seen that this amount would be required for this season, inasmuch as the Commissioners have shown that it would require until the end of the season to complete the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will, at a subsequent stage, bring down the correspondence with the Commissioners, and the reports.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. ANGLIN. Perhaps the Minister will state whether there is a minimum depth of twenty-five feet in the channel from Montreal to Quebec.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In many places between those points outside the channel, there is a depth of twenty-five feet, but all the way there is not such depth, although the channel itself, which is 300 or 400 feet in length, possesses that depth from Montreal to Quebec.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Act 36 Victoria, Chapter 60, relating to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.

Bill read the first time.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise, by the issue of debentures in the manner prescribed by the Act, 36 Victoria, chapter 62 (except as regards the rate of interest, which shall not exceed 4 per cent. per annum), a further sum, not exceeding \$375,000, to be advanced from time to time, subject to the conditions embodied in the said Act, to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners, to enable them to construct the cross-wall and lock necessary to render available as a wet dock, the dock constructed by them at the mouth of the River St. Charles, and pay the balance of the cost of the said dock.

He said: The Government intended to introduce a Bill based on this resolution, for the purpose of placing at the disposal of the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec a sufficient sum to complete the docks.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know the total amount already advanced to the Harbor Commissioners of Quebec under the several preceding Acts to which this refers. I think it is not far short of \$1,000,000. I would like also to know generally what is the position of that Trust—how their revenues are holding out—whether they are able at present to pay their way—and whether they have reasonable prospects of meeting this additional charge placed upon them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to give the exact figures asked for, but shall be at the next stage. I think the amount voted by Parliament was \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000. The Act provided that something like \$750,000 of that amount should be employed in redeeming the debentures issued by the previous Trusts for the improvement of the harbor. I think some hon. gentlemen present have seen the plans for the building of this dock, and must admit that it is a very great improvement, but it requires to be completed. The hon. member for Lambton was Minister of Public Works at the commencement, and he had this matter under his consideration when the site and plans of the proposed dock were to be adopted. The scheme was laid before the Government of that day and approved of. The Commissioners have consequently gone on, after giving the contract for the work, which is now completed, to a very great extent—the tidal dock. The original plan and intention was to build, when the lock would be ballasted, the cross wall, in order to divide the large tidal dock in two, making the tidal dock from the mouth of the St. Charles towards this cross-wall, and then inside the cross-wall, a wet dock. The amount to be provided for is for that purpose, and to pay for the remainder of the work that has been done and build this cross-wall of the lock. The Commissioners

Mr. BLAKE.

cannot obtain now any revenue of any consequence from that dock until it is completed. As soon as the cross-wall has been built, and the wet dock is perfected, then they will be in a position to load and unload vessels on the wet dock without any difficulty, and then, being in communication with the Occidental Railway, they will be able to receive cargoes of deals from the west, and unload them in the dock. They expect to build up a large grain trade there. They intend to build either one or two elevators afterwards, or make an embankment in order that they may load grain there. The hon. gentleman knows that there is another dock on the other side of the River St. Lawrence at Lévis—a graving dock—for which there is a special vote. The work on that dock is going on satisfactorily, and I have no doubt it will be completed in due time.

Mr. ANGLIN. How many vessels, say of 1,000 tons, will the wet dock accommodate at a time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot exactly say; but, so far as I can recollect, the width of the dock, from the lower town to the embankment, is 800 feet. I suppose the depth from the cross-wall to the eastern end of the dock would be probably 1,200 feet, and of course the hon. gentleman may see what area that would give.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Though it may not be strictly in order, still it will save trouble afterwards if I may be allowed to call attention to another point. As I understand the hon. gentleman, the amount asked for makes up about \$1,500,000 or \$1,600,000 advanced to the harbor of Quebec, and on this we are to receive and they are to pay 4 per cent. I think on the sum already advanced they were to pay 5 per cent., and I presume that the whole amount has been or will be reduced to 4 per cent. That will make a change on the revenues of the Trust of about \$64,000 a year, and I would like to know what the revenues of the Trust are at this present moment. Are they paying their way as it is, or do they rely on the profits of this expenditure?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They could not pay interest on the money expended on the dock, if they were to rely on the present revenue, but they expect a large revenue from these docks when completed. The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, allow me to defer to another stage of the measure fuller details as to the revenues, &c.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask, also, for any papers or correspondence that may be in the hands of the Government on this subject.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think, Sir, there is some misunderstanding as to the amount. In addition to the \$1,200,000 originally allowed to be spent in 1873, there was another Act passed in 1875, authorizing the raising of a loan of \$500,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was for the graving dock.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; but it is under the management of the Harbor Commission.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; I said that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The amount will be \$2,075,000 when the vote is given. Would the hon. gentleman give a statement of the revenue of the harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I shall be glad to do so at the next stage of the measure. I may say that there was a special arrangement, either under the Act or by Order in Council about the graving dock, fixing the proportion to be paid by Montreal and the proportion to be paid by Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was conditional on the Montreal Commissioners agreeing to the arrangement. They did not agree to it, although I think they should have done so. The 6th section of the Act provides for the manner in

which the interest and Sinking Fund shall be paid. The original expectation was that the Harbor Commissioners would unite and allow the one graving dock to do for both.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What interest has been paid in compliance with the Act of 1875?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say at the moment. The sum of \$500,000 has not been all expended, perhaps \$200,000 of it was, and the contract is still going on.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Acts to provide for the improvement and management of the harbor of Quebec.

Bill read the first time.

TONNAGE DUTIES AT QUEBEC AND MONTREAL.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

There shall be levied upon every vessel, whether entering at the port of Quebec or at the port of Montreal, a tonnage duty of 3 cents per ton register of such vessel, for the purposes of the Act respecting Harbor and River Police of Canada, and the said duty shall be a lien upon the vessel, and shall be payable by the master of such vessel to the Collector of Her Majesty's Customs at the port; provided, that any vessel of one hundred tons register, or less, shall be subject to the payment of such tonnage duty on her first entry in either of the said ports in any calendar year, but not on any subsequent entry at the same port in the same year; and that any vessel of more than one hundred tons register shall be subject to the said duty on her first and second entry at either of the said ports in any one calendar year, but not on any subsequent entry in the same year, and that no vessel bound to or from the port of Montreal shall be liable to pay such duty at the port of Quebec for the same voyage.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman the reason for this resolution, and the changes it involves in the present law.

Mr. McLELAN. A Bill making arrangements with regard to the harbor and river police has passed the Senate, and a blank was left for this clause, providing a tax on vessels. The tax is the same as in the Act of 1868.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. At present, I believe, vessels pay 2 cents per ton, three times a year, instead of twice. By this resolution the tax is made 3 cents each time and twice a year, so that vessels going in twice a year pay as much as they now do three times a year.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no additional tax. I will read from the Act:

There shall be raised, levied, collected and paid upon every vessel entering at the port of Quebec, or at the port of Montreal, on or after the day last aforesaid, a duty of 3 cents per ton register, of such vessel, for the purposes of this Act, and the said duty shall be payable by the master of such vessel to the Collector of Her Majesty's Customs at the port, at the time of the entry, which shall contain on the face of it the register tonnage of the vessel; provided that any vessel of one hundred tons register, or less, shall be subject to the payment of such duty on her first entry in either of said ports, in any year, but not on any subsequent entry at the same port, in the same year,—and that any vessel of more than one hundred tons register, shall be subject to the said duty on her first and second entry at either of the said ports, in any one year, but not on any subsequent entry in the same year,—and that no vessel, bound to or from the port of Montreal, shall be liable to pay such duty at the port of Quebec for the same voyage.

Mr. McCUAIG. Does this apply to inland craft as well as ocean vessels?

Mr. McLELAN. The Act will be precisely the same as the Act of 1868.

Mr. McCUAIG. My object in asking the question is this: By a singular mode of measurement the tonnage of vessels from Upper Canada is reckoned upon the saloons,

state rooms and round-house, instead of on the hulls alone, as was the case some five years ago. Registered by the present mode, a vessel at 2 cents taxes would give a register of about 900 tons. I hope the hon. gentleman will consider the question of whether vessels should pay on the whole gross measurement, or on the hull measurement alone.

Mr. McLELAN. This makes no provision whatever with regard to measurement, and I think the practice has not been to collect from inland vessels.

Mr. McCUAIG. Does not it apply to vessels from Upper Canada?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no change whatever in the Act. It will stand exactly as it did before.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose, then, that it is intended to repeal the Act of 1868.

Mr. McLELAN. The Bill in the Senate is intended to make more clear the regulations for the harbor police of Quebec and Montreal, and it is proposed to introduce this clause into that Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. But it is not intended to repeal that clause in the Statute-book. Therefore the other will be repealed.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, certainly.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But it applies to vessels from Ontario as well as sea-going vessels.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

AMENDMENTS TO THE INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. MOUSSEAU moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1880, 43 Victoria, chapter 19.

1. By prescribing the license fee to be paid for a bonding warehouse when in the same building with a Customs warehouse.

2. By repealing the duty of 4 cents per lb. on common Canada twist, imposed by section 35, sub-section 10, and providing that it shall pay the same duty as other tobacco manufactured exclusively from leaf grown in Canada, under sub-section 8, such duty to be reduced from 14 to 8 cents per lb. for the two years next after the passing of the Act, and to 10 cents per lb. for the two years then next.

3. By reducing the duty, under sub-section 9 of the said section 35, on cigars made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, from 30 cents to 20 cents per lb.

4. By providing for a monthly payment, equal to the cost of properly surveying the establishment, by any party licensed to use a chemical still.

5. By making certain amendments to facilitate the working of the said Act, but not affecting the rates of duty imposed by it.

Mr. VALLÉE. I hope the hon. Minister will explain his resolutions, as they seem to be in contradiction with what the hon. Minister of Finance announced in his speech on the Budget.

Mr. McCUAIG. I have had several complaints made to me of the charges made by licensed warehouses in small places. The business done in a small town say like Picton would be much less than in a city, and yet the same rate is charged in both cases. This is a matter to which I should like the hon. Minister to give his attention, and, if possible, make a discrimination between cities and small towns. Of course the Government have very generously given every facility to merchants bonding goods, but I think the present charge is too high for small towns.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. The first resolution speaks for itself, and it is intended to do away with the very grievance mentioned by my hon. friend. At present every warehouse of the description referred to has to pay a fee of \$40, and it is intended hereafter to charge only \$10 or \$15. The second clause refers to Canadian grown tobacco. The Excise duty on tobacco imported from the United States or elsewhere to be manufactured in Canada is at present 20 cents. In 1880, for the encouragement of the home manufacture of

tobacco, we reduced the duty on manufactured tobacco grown in Canada to 14 cents. It is now proposed that tobacco manufactured from home-grown tobacco will pay only 8 cents per lb. for two years, and 10 cents per lb. for the next two years, instead of 14 cents. That makes a still greater discrimination in favor of Canadian tobacco. The Canada twist, which is generally manufactured by the farmers themselves, will have to pay 8 cents per lb. when it is manufactured for sale on the market; but when the farmers manufacture it for their own use, it will not be taxed. The duty imposed on cigars manufactured from Canadian tobacco is to be reduced to 20 cents per lb. These changes are made with the view of carrying out the Government's National Policy with respect to Canadian grown tobacco the same as other articles. Last year we imported from the United States alone 10,000,000 lbs of tobacco; we produced in Canada about 500,000 lbs., so that hon. gentlemen can see what a large amount of money is sent out of the country for his article. Notwithstanding what has been said against Canadian tobacco, it has been shown by experiments made in the Inland Revenue Department that our farmers produce tobacco of good quality, well adapted to the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes, and the quality of the tobacco having been demonstrated, it is in the interest of the country that that industry should be fostered more and more, and the best way to foster it is to induce the farmers to grow their tobacco and sell it in leaf to the manufacturers. For that reason it is wisely provided in the Bill that there will be no duty on Canadian leaf, and the object in raising the duty on Canada twist is to induce the farmers to cease making it, but to sell it to the licensed manufacturer. The total importations of tobacco, foreign leaf, free, amounted to 10,460,888 lbs.; manufactures of cigars and cigarettes, 152,911 lbs.; snuff, 19,317 lbs.; all other tobaccos, 144,046 lbs.; making a total of 10,876,842 lbs. We will now see how our own home-grown tobacco stands in the market. Canada twist, in factories, 433 lbs.; Canada twist, sold by farmers, 378,216 lbs.; cigars, exclusively from Canadian leaf, 1,853 lbs. So that it appears we did not furnish the market with even 500,000 lbs., while we imported nearly 11,000,000 lbs. of tobacco, and the Government thought that, in harmony with the National Policy, a change should be introduced. The Government have two objects in view: first, to encourage the manufacturing of Canadian leaf tobacco, for the manufacture of cut or smoking tobacco, and of cigars and cigarettes; second, to discourage, if possible, because we think it is more advantageous for the farmers, the manufacture of twist or roll, in order that they may sell their tobacco in leaf, and so cause the manufacturers to take their tobacco instead of importing tobacco from foreign countries. Full information has been sought and a close investigation has been made by the Government on this subject, and it has been established beyond any doubt, as will appear as the debate proceeds, that when the farmers were willing to grow tobacco after the proper method, they succeeded admirably, and they sold to manufacturers a large quantity of the best tobacco. In certain counties this industry has been a great source of prosperity, and in certain counties, especially in the county of Montcalm, there are farmers who grow from 10,000 to 50,000 lbs, and some few have even grown 100,000 lbs. Last year especially there were two farmers who grew the large quantity of 50,000 lbs. each. These have exercised good management and have produced a good article, and in this way they have realized more money from this industry than either from hay or grain or any other method of utilizing the land.

Mr. DUGAS. As the county which I represent produces more tobacco than any other county in the Province of Quebec, the resolution now submitted to the House interests greatly my constituents, and I think it is my duty to express my views on this subject. The prosperity which

Mr. MOUSSEAU.

my county has enjoyed during the last two years is chiefly due to the growth of this native plant; it is therefore the duty of hon. members to take all possible means to develop and encourage the growth of this plant and to protect equally the interests of the producer and of the manufacturer. I regret to see it stated in the resolution, which is against the interests of the producer, inasmuch as it imposes a duty of 6 cents per lb. instead of 4 cents as it now stands under the present law, and that the producers would have to pay 8 cents per lb. on the quantity they cultivated last season. I did not hear the hon. gentleman say there was any time stated so as to give to persons the right to sell all the tobacco which they now manufacture in roll, and that is the only fault I have to find with the resolutions. I am certainly against the manufacture of tobacco by producers in roll, because we know that producers envelope bad tobacco with fine leaf and offer it to consumers, thereby depreciating the value of the tobacco; but it would be tyrannical on the part of the Government to impose a duty of 8 cents per lb. on the crop cultivated last season, producers being under the impression that they would have the right to sell that crop under the terms of the existing law. But as I now understand the hon. member to say that this law will not come into force for a certain time, I have no objection to offer. With this explanation on the part of my hon. friend, I have nothing more to say. I did not understand my hon. friend when he made that statement, and I do not think he made it. With this proviso, I am willing to accept the resolution as it is, but without that proviso I am certainly opposed to the present resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. Minister has failed to explain the very wide departure that has taken place in the policy of the Government on this question since the hon. Finance Minister pronounced his Budget Speech. In that speech he expressly said that the duty on Canada twist would remain as it was, 4 cents per lb. The following is the statement he made:—

"It is proposed, however, to leave the amount collected on twist the same as it is now, and to license parties in different parts of the country, &c."

That was the policy of the Government on the 24th February, but the resolution introduced by the hon. Secretary of State is exactly the reverse of that policy. Then it was declared the duty would remain at 4 cents; now this resolution provides that it be removed altogether, and that after the present year it shall be 8 cents. My hon. friend is aware that after the declaration of the hon. Minister of Finance was made, the Conservative press of Lower Canada was very loud in praise of the Government on the removal of this most obnoxious duty. What will that press say now, when they find the duty on Canada twist is just doubled. That is not all. Next year the duty on Canadian tobacco will be 10 cents, and two years later it will be 14 cents. It seems to me all the arguments made use of by the hon. the Secretary of State and the hon member for Montcalm are destroyed completely by the policy of the Government, which is not to encourage, but to discourage the culture of tobacco, as far as it lies in their power to do so. We find that on this very large class of Canadian tobacco, the duty is doubled this year, increased 2 cents next year, 2 cents again the following year, and is then brought back again to what it is today. This does not apply to Canada twist alone, but as well to manufactured tobacco. The hon. member for Montcalm said he was opposed to twist altogether but was in favor of manufactured tobacco. How can he then approve of the policy of the Government which provides that after two years the duty shall be changed from 14 to 8 cents, then it shall be brought back to 4 cents, and then four years hence, when the elections will be over, it shall be again brought

back to 14 cents. Is that the policy which the hon. member for Montcalm is willing to support? He must see that the Government gives really no encouragement to the cultivators of tobacco in Lower Canada. I cannot conceive for what object this resolution has been brought before the House, unless it be that we are on the eve of the elections, since it is expressly provided that the duty shall be decreased only for a certain time, and, immediately after the elections shall have taken place, it shall be increased to the old rate. It seems to me the Government do not deserve the credit they take to themselves on this question. It looks like a political dodge on their part. Why decrease the duty from 14 to 8 cents when you provide that in the course of a certain time it should be restored to its present rate? If the Government are making an experiment, they are showing beforehand that it will end in failure since they follow the decrease by an increase. I cannot understand what object the Government expect to attain by decreasing the duty for two, three, or four years at the outside, then restoring it to its old figure, unless it be to make political capital on the hustings. They made a great amount of political capital out of that question in former times, and the hon. Secretary of State is still not above or beneath making political capital on the floor of the House. Speaking of myself, he said at one time, I said Canadian tobacco had a bad smell. The hon. gentleman should remember he is not on the hustings and should not stoop to make such an assertion here.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. You did use those words.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has a better memory than I have. To me, all tobacco has the same smell, for I do not smoke. There will be great disappointment in the Province of Quebec when it is found, after all the praises of the Conservative press, that the Government have simply altered the duty for the elections, and will then return to their old policy.

Mr. DUGAS. I hope the hon. member for Quebec East will not disparage in future, as he has in the past, the climate and soil of his native country, since experience has shown that the climate of Canada is well adapted for the culture of tobacco. He would at one time have us believe we were living in a country where the climate was like that of Siberia. The policy of the Government is a good one. We do not want to encourage the making of tobacco twist in the future. What we want is to provide good tobacco, and not wrap up bad tobacco in twists. By reducing the duty from 14 to 8 cents, we will give an impulse to the establishment of tobacco manufactories. There are but few such establishments in Canada—not sufficient to fabricate the twentieth part of tobacco grown in the Province. Therefore the reduction of duty from 14 cents to 8 cents will be an encouragement to the manufacture of tobacco, and create a home market for our producers.

Mr. LAURIER. I never stated what I am charged with. I know we can grow tobacco, and I am only sorry that we cannot grow it as well as Cuba, but we must take facts as we find them.

Mr. PLUMB. I remember very well two or three years ago that a similar discussion took place in this House, and then the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Laurier), who is now taking such an interest in tobacco growing, insisted that the climate of Quebec was not favorable for the growth of good tobacco. In this respect he was in perfect accord with all the gentlemen on his side of the House. One who lived in Quebec, for example, would insist that his native district could not grow tobacco, and another gentleman who lives in the coal districts would insist that it would take a Tariff of \$2.50 to bring a ton of coal into Ontario; and so these gentlemen go on fighting against fate, and endeavoring on every occasion to depress and belittle the capacities of their own Provinces for the purpose of a temporary political triumph. I

can tell those hon. gentlemen that the course they have pursued has alienated the people of Canada from them, and has given them the position, the humiliating position, which they now hold. I was very glad indeed that our Government had at last seen the propriety of endeavoring to promote the tobacco growing industry. I know perfectly well that until the farmers who produce tobacco are relieved very largely from the embarrassments which were thrown around the growth of that plant, that it will not be produced in Canada to a very large extent. Everybody knows that at the time of the American troubles, when the growth of Virginian tobacco could no longer be depended on, the Northern States, never having grown it before, never having been able to produce it previously, were induced, by the exigencies of the case, to turn their attention to its culture; and any man who travelled through the New England States last year would have seen along the side of the railway, leading from Albany to Boston, fifty miles on a stretch, tobacco crops, the value of which was almost incalculable. It was apparent that the Americans believed in the productive capacity of their own country. The representatives of Connecticut did not at that time rise in Congress, and say: "We cannot grow tobacco in Connecticut; we do not want any protection for this industry, because we know our climate is unsuitable to it"—as my hon. friend opposite said on one occasion, and perhaps now, for I did not pay attention to what he has now said with reference to tobacco culture in the Province of Quebec. We all know that Ohio, Connecticut, and Massachusetts now raise a tobacco crop of nearly equal value to the whole crop of Virginia, simply because they have been encouraged. In the district where I live, there is a soil perfectly adapted to the growth of that plant—2,500 lbs have been raised on a single acre. It is one of the most profitable crops that can possibly be cultivated. It requires great care, and great skill in the grower; but it is the duty of the Government to give the public every information on the subject, furnish the very best seed, and endeavor to persuade the agriculturists of Ontario and the sister Province, with which it is in close connection, to strive to make tobacco one among the crops of rotation. If we adopted the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, we should compel our agriculturists of Ontario and Quebec to do what? Simply to raise an indifferent crop for immediate domestic use. They have said they did not wish to encourage a home market. They would not help or benefit our agriculturists by the establishment of manufacturing centres—those centres which, according to the very eloquent statement made by the member for North Norfolk, would prove most beneficial, by adding a market for home consumption, and by securing rotation of crops of perishable material which cannot be shipped abroad. The whole policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to compel the farmers to do one of three or four things—either to raise wheat, a crop which has died out largely in Lower Canada, or raise barley on which they have to pay the import duty of the United States, which they do pay, no matter what the hon. member for Bothwell, with his usual hair-splitting sophistry, says; or to raise oats and rye or corn, which cannot be profitably raised in the eastern Provinces. Anything that can be done by this Government to enable the agricultural community to secure a rotation of crops, no matter whether upon a small or a large area, is a positive benefit to it; and any step the Government can possibly take towards that end is a step in the right direction. I remember well when an hon. member from Lower Canada, asked the late Government for some relaxation of the very rigid rules they had adopted in following up the farmer who had grown tobacco, by sending an Excise officer to stand at his back; and I remember well, how the late hon. Finance Minister appealed to the Opposition of the day, and begged us not to support the proposition, upon the ground that it would take \$600,000 or \$700,000 from the

revenue, and we all know he wanted it all very badly. He had deficits impending, and he knew perfectly well that without the revenue from tobacco his deficits would be much greater. I was lately delighted to learn that the tobacco growing interest would at last receive that attention from this Government which it failed to get from the late Administration. And I am glad also to know that the Government have, as a consequence, relaxed those stringent provisions which deterred the ordinary agriculturist from trying to raise tobacco. We do not yet know the extent of the capacities of Canada for that immensely valuable crop, a crop more valuable than any other that can be raised; and we do not know, because it has been the persistent policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to trip up the farmer by means of the tax-gatherer, who has stood at his back, and if he raised ten pounds of tobacco, has watched him, because the Government wanted a large revenue from that plant, it being absolutely necessary to the late Administration, as a consistent part of its policy, to wring from such industries the means of carrying on its operations, and meeting its extravagant expenses.

Mr. VALLÉE (in French.) Mr. Speaker, as the representative of a county which is largely interested in the cultivation and the manufacture of tobacco, I consider that it is my duty to express my astonishment at the change of policy just adopted by the Government in proposing this resolution. The members of the Province of Quebec have had a few interviews with the Minister of the Interior; we informed him of our views and of the wishes of that part of the population interested in the culture and sale of tobacco. When the hon. Finance Minister developed his financial *exposé*, he informed us of the decisions the Government had come to, and it was to the effect that the sale of leaf tobacco should be free; that the tax on tobacco, in coils, should be 4 cents; on manufactured tobacco, 8 cents, and on cigars, 18 cents. We were glad to hear of such a policy, and announced it to our electors. We asked them if these changes would give them satisfaction. They answered affirmatively, and steps have already been taken to reap the benefits of the new law. Yesterday, upon seeing the present resolution on the Orders of the Day, I enquired of the Minister to whose lot it was to present it, whether such was really the policy of the Government, for it was its policy; we were about to take new steps in order to have it modified, and to obtain a return to the policy announced by the hon. Minister of Finance. I was answered that the resolution was wrongly worded; that it had been badly translated, and that the translation did not give a version of what was in the Bill. But what is now my astonishment, when I hear the hon. Secretary of State expose as the policy of the Government, with regard to Canadian tobacco, precisely the one contained in the resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to declare that we have been twice deceived. The question may appear unimportant in itself, but it is one of great interest to our farmers, who are all affected by it, especially in our district. I think that the resolution should embody the policy foreshadowed by the hon. Minister of Finance. It has been said that licenses had been abolished and that the farmer might cultivate tobacco in any quantity without a license, yet I do not see anything of the kind in the resolution submitted to us. I do not see that the principle announced by the hon. Minister of Finance is mentioned in that resolution. Now, according to the change that has just been made, we have, perhaps, cause to fear that if that resolution is adopted, the Bill will contain some further restrictions, and I would like to have on that point some more definite and more lucid explanations. Is the sale of leaf tobacco to be free? That is, will the farmer be at liberty to sell leaf tobacco in the same way as he sells his other products? If I have understood aright the explanations of the hon. Secretary of State, he says that the farmer is to have the right to sell his leaf

Mr. PLUMB.

tobacco to licensed merchants only. Now, are these merchants to have the right to dispose of leaf tobacco in any way they may see fit? If they are to have that right, why not extend it to the farmers? But if the licensed merchant does not himself possess the right to sell leaf tobacco, if he is in his turn compelled to sell it to manufacturers or place it in bond, I maintain that the farmer is entirely deprived of the advantages accruing from the sale of tobacco. If there is a desire to foster the cultivation of tobacco, some advantage should be granted to the grower. We know that the National Policy has for an object not only the encouraging of the manufacturer but also the producer. Now, I contend that in the present case the law, such as amended, does not encourage the producer. When the farmers are being discouraged, one does but make a semblance of giving them a market. They are told that they shall sell their leaf tobacco to the merchant; but why place this middle-man between the grower and the manufacturer? In many cases the merchant will not buy his tobacco, or, if he buys it, he will offer him a low price, so as to be able, in his turn, to sell it to the manufacturer. As will be perceived, this arrangement is totally against the grower. Let him be allowed to sell his tobacco to the manufacturer direct, or to dispose of it freely on the market, and then the manufacturer will go into the market to get his stock, just as every other manufacturer has to do to procure the raw material necessary to his industry. A great deal of noise is being made about the removal of the obligation to take licenses. It is said that the grower will have the right of cultivating tobacco for his own use, but that is nothing new; he enjoyed that right in the past. The only change made is a small affair; it is simply to the effect that the grower will not be required to take out a license to cultivate tobacco, and that the Department of Inland Revenue, instead of ascertaining from the grower the quantity of tobacco manufactured, will seek that information from the manufacturer or from the buyer, and consequently the same restriction which existed formerly as to the cultivation of tobacco will still exist, as the grower is not at present free to cultivate and sell his tobacco. Now, what is asked is that that restriction shall be removed, and, in removing it, no serious damage will be done to the revenue. I heard the hon. Minister of Finance tell us that the proposed law would bring about a decrease in the revenue of about \$50,000. I do not know whether I have wrongly understood him, or whether his words have been incorrectly reported; but it is impossible that the revenue will be reduced by a sum of \$50,000, if the grower is allowed to cultivate freely leaf tobacco. During the year which has closed, the sale of Canadian tobacco, manufactured or not, has brought in to the revenue about \$15,000. Now, the only result that might follow from allowing the grower the free sale of tobacco in leaf, would be to make the Government incur a loss of \$15,000; but the Government would in reality not lose that amount, as it would no longer have to employ a number of officials at an expenditure of about \$7,000. Consequently, if, on the one hand, the expenditure is diminished by \$7,000, the loss to the Treasury will be very small. It is known that the cultivation of tobacco is a most important question to our farmers. Compensations have been granted to the other Provinces; Manitoba has been granted privileges; privileges have also been granted to the Lower Provinces; why should not, therefore a few advantages be granted to the farmers of the Province of Quebec? The Government enjoys a considerable revenue, and it has this year an enormous surplus. It has encouraged trade by removing the stamp duty off promissory notes; this has diminished its revenue by about \$200,000; why should the Government not make the experiment of allowing farmers the free sale of leaf tobacco? Let the manufacturer of Canadian tobacco be assisted by the imposing of a light duty, say

of 6 or 8 cents per lb., so as to bring him into competition with the foreign manufacturers. I think that such a policy would be agreeable to the country, and that the farmers would be satisfied. The Government is in a very prosperous condition, and the time has come to make the experiment. I very much regret the attitude taken by the Government on that question, and if the opportunity occurs, I intend to express my views more pointedly than I am doing at present. I say, therefore, that the Government is, with the present resolution, deceiving the House and the country. The hon. Finance Minister, in his speech on the Budget, told us what the policy of the Government was; and now, without any notice, the hon. Secretary of State presents a resolution which differs entirely from the declarations of the hon. Finance Minister, and then we are told that this resolution is erroneous. Now, I contend that in the face of such a statement our request should be granted, and the Tariff should be established, such as it was announced by the hon. Finance Minister, for the country is cognizant of his declarations. By presenting the resolution the Government has afforded a member of the Opposition the opportunity of making a little malicious, political capital, or showing, for the benefit of his party. Perhaps I am contributing a little myself to do harm to the reputation of the Government, but I would fain believe, as has been said, that the resolution is erroneous. I would fain believe that the declaration made to me by the Secretary of State is correct and true; that the Bill will differ from the resolution, and this Committee will so amend the resolution as to make it agree with the declarations of the hon. Finance Minister, or if at every change in the Tariff, the policy of the Government is to be in contradiction with its resolutions, what dependence can be placed on such legislation? None. I see that, according to that resolution, it is intended to place the duty on rolled tobacco at 8 cents. The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) differs with us on this point; he wishes to abolish this mode of manufacturing tobacco; nevertheless, in certain parts of the country, the farmer is desirous of being free thus to prepare his tobacco. It is known that rolled tobacco is a purely Canadian industry, and were this privilege taken from our farmers, the effect would be to deprive them, without any corresponding advantage to the Government, of a liberty which is ever valued by those who enjoy it. I, therefore, hope that the Government will reconsider the question, and I ask that the duty on tobacco in coil be left at 4 cents. It is pretended that the decrease of duty from 14 to 8 cents, would have the effect of establishing a number of manufactories of Canadian tobacco. But, Mr. Speaker, I have gone in quest of information among the Quebec manufacturers, and I think it will be very difficult to establish manufactories of Canadian tobacco even at that rate of 8 cents per lb., and this is the reason why: Upon hearing of the changes which the Government intended making in the Tariff, certain parties immediately resolved to get ready to start a manufactory. They entered into a correspondence on the subject, and a Mr. Haggarty, of Upper Canada, replied that he would not sell his tobacco, after keeping it stored and drying so that it would be suitable for manufacturing purposes, at less than 12 cents per lb., or otherwise he would incur a loss. Now, if the manufacturer cannot get the Canadian leaf at less than 12 cents per lb., he will not be able to manufacture Canadian tobacco in such a manner as to compete to any advantage with the manufacturers of foreign tobacco. It is true that between the tax on manufactured Canadian tobacco and foreign manufactured tobacco there is a difference of 12 cents per lb.; but this difference is almost reduced to nothing by the price of the leaf, for the foreign leaf is sold at from 4 to 5 cents per lb., and even 3 cents, and this foreign tobacco leaf is better adapted to manufacture than the Canadian leaf. It is a well known fact that the Canadian

leaf is coarser and that it weighs a great deal more; a pound of Canadian tobacco yields a quarter less in leaves than foreign tobacco, and consequently the Canadian leaf is in a very disadvantageous position to compete with the foreign leaf. Moreover, the few manufacturers of foreign tobacco in this country would wish to manufacture Canadian tobacco likewise; they have the machinery necessary to do so, but a restriction of the Department of Inland Revenue prevents them from manufacturing Canadian tobacco in the same establishment. Now, as the question comes before us of amending the law, I think that the Government should reconsider this point and allow these manufacturers to manufacture Canadian together with foreign tobacco, and in the same establishment. The answer to this is, and it is the answer of the officials of the Department of Inland Revenue, that frauds will be committed, and that it will be very hard to control their operations. On the other hand, manufacturers tell me that it would be as easy for the Government to control these operations as those concerning foreign tobacco, for the duties on foreign tobacco are paid in bond. Now, could not the same be done in the case of Canadian tobacco? Before such tobacco went into the factory the collector of revenue could collect the duty, and thus the interests of the Government would be safe. It is said, also, that the manufacturer of foreign tobacco would be tempted to largely mix the Canadian with the foreign leaf. Not so, for the weight of the Canadian leaf, and then the duty to be paid on it, as if it were foreign unmanufactured tobacco, would completely take away the profit which the manufacturer would wish to realize; consequently he is not interested in defrauding the revenue, and in mixing Canadian with foreign tobacco. I hope, therefore, that the Government will postpone this resolution for a few days, so that we may again submit these considerations to it. With regard to the manufacturing of tobacco into cigars, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has again changed, on this point, the declarations made by the hon. Finance Minister, who said, in his speech on the Budget, that the duty would amount to 18 cents per lb., whilst we find that in this resolution it is fixed at 20 cents. Well, if the Government wishes to encourage the creation of manufacturers of tobacco, I think it should show itself a little more generous; it will be free in future to amend the law; but why not for two years to come give greater freedom to the manufacturer? The only consideration which might prevent its doing so would be the loss of that source of revenue; but there is a considerable surplus in the Treasury this year, and I do not know why the Government, which is desirous of encouraging the growth and manufacture of Canadian tobacco, does not seriously foster it by favoring the establishment of new manufacturers. I think that with these few modifications the changes proposed by the Government would give satisfaction to the House and to the country. Besides, it is the Province of Quebec alone which produced nearly all the tobacco which is manufactured in the country. We see by public documents that last year, in the Province of Ontario, but 4,404 lbs. of tobacco were manufactured, whereas in the Province of Quebec the duty imposed on the cultivation of that plant amounted to about \$15,000. Well, I think, that when, to please the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec pays \$53,000 duty on flour, one might easily make us a present of a slight difference of \$15,000. Such are the views which I have thought it my duty to submit to the Government in the interests of my constituents, and of the whole Province of Quebec. I regret that I should have been obliged to make these declarations and to assume the attitude which I have taken with regard to the resolution submitted by the Government, for its general policy enjoys my confidence, and I have always supported it up to to-day; but it seems to me that, under these circumstances, which affect equally all its supporters from the Province of

Quebec, the Government should give us satisfaction by acceding to our wishes, and not place us in the humiliating position of having to go to our electors and tell them that we had been deceived when we announced that the policy of the Government would be so-and-so, or else that they themselves had been deceived when a policy was announced that had not any existence. It is a position that, for me, it will be hard to endure, and the Government should, I think, consider the false position in which it has placed us.

Mr. GIGAULT. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) say that he never decried the culture of tobacco in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly, I never did.

Mr. GIGAULT. I will read the speech of the hon. member, made on the 23rd of April, 1878, on this question. One hon. member had proposed to remove the duty on Canada tobacco, and the hon. member for Quebec East answered in this way :

" Was this country adapted to the cultivation of tobacco? * * * It was well known that, above all in the Province of Quebec, and in the Maritime Provinces, and also in Ontario, we could not produce tobacco which could enter into successful competition with the foreign grown article. We produced an inferior quality of tobacco, which was used for local purposes. The agricultural class was frugal and economical and it produced tobacco for its own consumption, but, on the other hand, it was equally certain that it was perfectly impossible to raise, in Canada, tobacco which could enter into successful competition with the foreign article, for the simple reason that we had not the climatic conditions necessary to its growth. The Province of Quebec, above all, and all the Provinces east of Quebec, could not raise tobacco on a considerable scale, for the simple reason that their climatic conditions were not proper to the growth of this plant, which was excessively sensible to such conditions. Again, our seasons were too short to admit of its successful cultivation; spring was too late and autumn came too soon; and, under the best possible climatic conditions, the tobacco which we cultivate could never attain maturity. The farmers were obliged to take it in before it arrived to perfect maturity, and then very frequently in Lower Canada, they were visited with frosts during the earliest months of summer, even in July and August, and it was known that tobacco was extremely sensible to changes of temperature and of the weather; and, under these circumstances, as an article of commerce, it lost much of its value, suffering in flavor and quality, and failing to command the price which it would otherwise secure. Owing to these considerations, the argument of his hon. friend lost much of its force. The object of the motion was to encourage the cultivation of tobacco in Canada, though of all the plants that Lower Canada could cultivate, the last thing which they could cultivate was tobacco, which could not become for them an article of export."

So our opponents are not satisfied in saying that our coal is not good, but they say that our tobacco is not good, and they go so far as to say that our climate is not good. But I agree with the hon. member for Quebec East on one proposition. He says :

" In a civilized country to pretend that tobacco ought to be exempted from taxation, is an error. It was above all, an article in which a revenue ought to be raised by every Government."

I believe, with the hon. gentleman, that a duty should be imposed on tobacco, because it is not an article which is absolutely necessary. The measure proposed by the Government is certainly a great improvement on the law adopted by the late Government under which no protection at all was afforded for the home-grown tobacco. The law as enacted by the late Government encouraged the foreign producer and the manufacture of foreign leaves, and the law proposed to-day is of such a character that the manufacturers in the Province of Quebec, will buy a very large quantity of leaf from Canadian producers, thus freeing the farmers from an injustice to which they have been subjected for a number of years. The object of this law is to encourage the culture of home-grown tobacco, and we know that we import every year about 10,000,000 lbs. of American leaf, and if the Government so amend the Bill that manufacturers shall buy that from our farmers instead of from abroad, they will do a great benefit to our farmers. The duty under the late Government was 20 cents per lb. on tobacco manufactured in Canada, and the present Government reduces that

Mr. VALLÉE.

duty from 20 to 8 cents per pound, so that there will be a considerable loss to the revenue of the country. We have to make that loss good by increasing, as the Secretary of State says, the duty on twist tobacco from 4 to 8 cents. But I may say that I do not like that provision, for I would rather have the duty on common twist tobacco only 4 cents the lb., as it was before. At the same time I acknowledge the force of the argument used by the Secretary of State that we can make the loss good by the arrangement he proposes. I think this measure is a great improvement on the others which existed before, and I do not see how our opponents, who always pretended that Canadian tobacco is not good for anything, can now take so much interest in the Canadian producer.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I must say that on this question I concur with a good deal of what has been said by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée). The hon. gentlemen who have just spoken seem to think the Government should encourage the culture of Canadian tobacco. I cordially share in this opinion, because since I have had the honor of a seat in this House I have always been opposed to the taxation of home-grown tobacco. The hon. Secretary of State proposes in his resolution to change the duty from 4 to 8 cents for Canada twist, that is Canadian tobacco which is rolled by our farmers. I do not think this increased duty will work in the sense of encouraging the culture of tobacco by our farmers, and of meeting thereby the wish expressed by the hon. member for Portneuf. I think if you wish to encourage the culture of Canadian tobacco you must cease to levy any duty upon it at all. Our farmers must be left free to raise, manufacture and sell their tobacco to whom they please and under whatever form they please. If I understand this resolution rightly you propose to compel the farmer to pay a duty on his manufactured tobacco, but to let him sell the leaf duty free. Very well, but you impose upon him the restriction of selling that tobacco to some particular individuals—to the manufacturers—and this restriction will certainly hurt his intention in the sale of his tobacco. Suppose the manufacturers agree to fix a price for the Canadian tobacco, the farmer is bound to accept that price and to submit to the conditions made by the manufacturers. I have some knowledge of the independent spirit of Canadian farmers and do not hesitate to say that they will not accept willingly this restriction. They desire to be left perfectly free to sell their tobacco to whom they please, duty free, and under whatever form they please; and I think that it is the only way you can encourage the culture of that plant. I would like to see the Government encouraging that article of farm produce. This Government pretends to give to the farmers the control of our national market by the operation of the Tariff with regard to all our farm produce. In my opinion that is one of the very few articles of farm produce in respect to which you can give protection to the Canadian farmers, by giving them the control of the national market. The Government can very easily give to the farmers complete control of our national market for the sale of their tobaccos. We do not produce enough for home consumption, and we are bound to import it. Therefore, impose heavy duties on imported tobaccos, and levy no duties at all upon the home-grown article, and you will have secured, in my humble opinion, the surest way of encouraging the production of tobacco in Canada.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I do not intend to enter into the discussion on the question, but I must say I was astonished to hear the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) depreciating his country. He says the State of Ohio and other western countries, with regard to the production of tobacco and cereals, are superior to any country in the world.

Mr. PLUMB. I say so now.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I am afraid my hon. friend has gone back to his original habit, when he lived in the United States, of depreciating Canada in every respect. He now comes and tells us—and his utterances are of course entitled to great weight—that the Province of Quebec cannot raise wheat at all; not only that, he says the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia cannot produce wheat and rye.

Mr. PLUMB. I never said any such thing.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. He certainly did say that Quebec could not produce its own wheat, and he said that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick could not produce wheat and rye. I think that is unworthy of my hon. friend thus to undervalue and depreciate his own country.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to trouble myself much as to the views of the hon. member for Niagara, but I think it is time the hon. the Minister of Finance should explain to us the apparent contradiction that exists between the resolution under my hand and the statement formerly made by him on the occasion of his delivering the Budget Speech. My hon. friend for Quebec East read correctly, I think, a statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance, that the duty on Canada twist was to remain as it was; and here we find that, instead of being, as heretofore, 4 cents, it is to be raised to 8 cents per lb. Well, that is a very material alteration—an important departure—from the policy laid down by the hon. the Minister of Finance a few days ago, and I think we ought to have some explanation from him as to the reason why, apparently, these resolutions put a double duty on Canada twist. The other points we can discuss more advantageously in Committee, but I would like to hear the hon. Minister give some reason for putting an expressly made statement of that kind in his Budget Speech, and now, without any apparent reason, altering it in the mode in which it is proposed to be altered by the resolution brought down by the Secretary of State.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 131) further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Montreal and Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Fulton.)

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Western Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 134) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 13) to authorize and provide for the winding-up of the Dominion Fire and Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 45) to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value thereof, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 53) to amend the Act incorporating the North American Mutual Life Insurance Company, and to change the name thereof to the Dominion of Canada Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Beaty.)

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Carling.)

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order being called to resume the debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mousseau, that the House go into Committee of the Whole, to consider a certain resolution respecting the duty on tobacco,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to increase the number of the constables in the North-West Mounted Police Force to five hundred men, with twenty supernumeraries.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On a former occasion I stated to the House the necessity the Government felt for increasing this force. The force has been very efficient and very valuable, and has done good service, on which the fact that peace has been preserved in the country for so long a time is sufficient evidence. As a preventive force, it has been almost perfect. It is found, however, that its strength is overtaxed. Again and again the Commissioner in charge of the force has represented that they are insufficient for the duties demanded of them, especially on the frontier, where, on more than one occasion, there has been great hazard of a collision with large forces of hungry and, therefore, discontented Indians. By a mixture of courage and discretion these occasions have passed by without collision; yet I need not remind the Committee of the continuous danger which exists of collision, and the necessity of endeavoring to avoid it by all means in our power. There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that the strong pressure brought to bear on the Government and on Parliament by the officers in command should result in an increase in the force. So long as the Indians were alone with a few Government officials and persons of a superior class, they were kept under control; but that control is passing away, as it has passed away in the United States, with the influx into the country of persons of all ranks and all degrees of intelligence and morals; and as in the western States, there is great danger—happily we have avoided it hitherto—of collision between the Indians and the white settler going in there and thinking that he can treat these wild sons of the prairie as he would a fellow white man. The Commissioner has reported again and again on that point. I will not now weary the Committee by reading his report, but I will just recall to them these repeated recommendations in favor of an increase of the force. The same opinion has been expressed by almost every person who has written on the North-West, and I would quote from a very able and sensible letter of the special correspondent of the *Globe*, written in November last. He enters into an account of the different Indian tribes—the Bloods, Piegans, and the Blackfeet—and proceeds to say:

"If so, there may be serious trouble brewing, for the Bloods, Blackfeet, and other wild Indians of the South are not the class of

men to be trifled with. They are, I think, more resolute and warlike than the Crees and Saulteaux of the North, and should they once break out in defiance of the police, I cannot but shudder to think of the possible results. Though so far the police have been able to make arrests of Indian depredators in the face of overwhelming odds, the general impression among the best informed frontiersmen is that this game of bluff is about played out, and that the day when three or four red-coated prairie troopers, through sheer pluck and coolness, can overawe a large band of Bloods, Piegans, or Blackfeet, is now nearly or quite passed by, and that in future the greatest caution will have to be exercised in dealing with these lawless, half-starved savages. Even now horse-stealing and cattle-lifting is going on in various quarters, in spite of the vigilance of the handfuls of police stationed at different points throughout this great stretch of country, and the settlers and ranchmen are threatening to take the law into their own hands. Should they do so, the most frightful results will be sure to follow and a general uprising of the Indian tribes might confidently be predicted. No matter what the cost may be, I think the police force should be doubled, and the Indian Commissioner invested for this winter at least, with absolute authority to grant to the Indians such supplies as may be necessary to keep them from starving to death. It will certainly be cheaper to feed these Indians than to fight them, and should they once set the authority of the Government at defiance, there is no force in this region that could reasonably be expected to enforce that authority in the presence of overwhelming numbers of hostile savages."

The article goes on to expatiate on this subject at considerable length. It is known that while there has been no actual outbreak, while through combined courage and discretion an outbreak has been prevented, yet, I regret to say, on two or three occasions, the forces of Indians were so overwhelming and their conduct so threatening, to the handful of police, that, *ex necessitate*, they were obliged to yield to the demands, sometimes insolently and arrogantly, with the consciousness of power pressed upon them by the starving Indians surrounding them. Of course, the less these facts are known the better, but I take the responsibility of stating, on the part of the Government, that they believe it is absolutely necessary to increase this force. In the Mounted Police Force Act which is now on the Statute-book, power is given to the Governor in Council, in cases of urgency, to increase the force from 300 to 500 men, but the words are such that I think the fair reading of the Statute is that the urgency must mean reasonable expectations of an immediate outbreak. And although it might warrant an increase of the force for a time to meet that anticipated outbreak, it would not be in spirit, although it might be in letter, sufficient authority to increase the force without the sanction of Parliament.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Of course, this is a very grave question. The proposed expenditure will, of necessity I fear, involve a permanent charge on the revenue. We are now going to have a force of 500, in place of 300 men, and, although no doubt the expenditure necessary to feed and maintain the men has been greatly reduced by the growth of the country, still I fear we cannot make up our minds, if the men are to be properly armed and equipped and supplied with a class of weapons thought necessary for such a force, that the expenditure cannot be much less than \$450,000 a year. I forget at the moment what the hon. gentleman estimates, I think \$430,000 or \$435,000, but it will be, undoubtedly, close upon \$450,000. I have looked over the hon. gentleman's report of the North-West. I do not know whether that report is intended to be supplemented or not. Is any other report to be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think not.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Not at all events during this Session. I observe from the report that there is a very considerable number of other items in addition to the actual pay and maintenance of the force, for which a pretty heavy expenditure will shortly be required. If I recollect aright—I have not got the report here, but the hon. Minister can correct me if I am wrong—almost all the forts erected for the use of the troops have fallen more or less into decay, and will require to be either constructed anew, or repaired to such an extent as to amount almost to

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

reconstruction. That, I think is the general tenor of the report. This is a matter to which I more than once called the hon. gentleman's attention, and I mentioned it to my colleagues in former times. I think it will be expedient to have a respectable number of pieces of cannon at headquarters; that is a thing which above all others gives trained troops an immense superiority over savage or half-disciplined men like the Indians, and, if I recollect aright, there are some pieces already in that country, but I do not know how many. The hon. member for Lambton says they were new when we got them; but, at all events, there are not more than half-a-dozen. That is a matter which deserves attention, and we require to have a considerable number of cannon and troops trained to their use. Then I notice that the officer in charge recommended the substitution of a new and somewhat expensive arm for the whole body of men under his command. I think he states that the arms which the troops already possess are of rather inferior quality, even inferior to those possessed by the tribes with whom the mounted police come in contact. I would also be glad to hear what scale of pay the hon. Minister proposes, the rate of pay for those men, particularly the 200 which are being added to the force, and the number of officers required for the troops. In connection with this I might say, it is quite clear that very great care will have to be taken in granting pasturage lands to the numerous candidates now applying for them. It is a very serious element in consideration of the policy of granting those lands, if a force of troops should be required for the purpose of protecting cattle on the ranches; and I think for that reason and others that very considerable care will have to be exercised in granting the numerous applications which are being made for those pasturage lands. I do not in the least degree object to such portions of the country suited to the purpose, being applied for, although it is provided that the Government retains the right of retaining portions of the land if found fit for agricultural purposes; but I think it would be an extraordinary course if we should place ranches in the midst of more or less turbulent tribes, who will be more tempted to commit depredations on cattle placed before their eyes than on any other form of property. I shall be glad to have some explanation as to what expenditure may be necessary in the various directions I have intimated, and this will be a good opportunity for the hon. gentleman to state somewhat in detail his policy with respect to granting cattle-ranches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I feel very glad to have an opportunity of speaking on those points, although the subject of cattle ranches is not immediately germane to the motion before the Committee. The various forts in the North-West are, I believe, in a state of decay. They were built after the acquisition of the country. Fort Walsh comprises merely mud and brush huts, and the sashes and doors in these are crumbling and in a very bad state of repair. With respect to Fort Walsh, however, which is the chief fort on the frontier, it is proposed to break up that establishment, and the buildings will not be repaired. It is found that the fact of the force being direct on the frontier induces the Indians, returning from following the buffalo into the United States and afterwards returning, as they did last year, without being successful, to hang around the posts; there was not a very strong force there, and the Indians could not be removed, more especially as Fort Walsh is immediately opposite Wood Mountain and Cypress Hills, which have been, from time immemorial, gathering places for the Indian tribes. The policy of the Government is to endeavor to get all the Indian reserves to the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to remove them from the frontier, and, as much as possible, place a check on the depredations that are going on on both sides, American Indians coming into this country, and Canadian Indians crossing over to the other side. Those occasional depredations, which can-

not be prevented, form the subject of correspondence between the Canadian and Washington Governments. Of course, when a complaint is made to Washington it is sent on here, and has to be dealt with. By removing the Indians to the north of the Pacific Railway, the danger of those lawless proceedings will be diminished, though I cannot hope they will be absolutely avoided. Then we propose to have some point selected on the Pacific Railway for the chief headquarters of the force, instead of its being on the frontier. They will be on the line of the railway, able to move east and west, and can easily, with some few outposts, keep the country between the Pacific Railway and the International Boundary in a state of order and peace. The selection of the point has not been settled. This selection is of very great importance, because the point selected will form the nucleus of a village or town—perhaps of a large town—and it will be the object of the Government to choose a favorable site, so that the Dominion may have some opportunity of selling lots at fancy prices, and thus more than recoup the Government for the expense of building barracks for the force. With reference to cannon, the force were given four light guns, I think, before we came in power. It is important there should be some one in the force capable of training the men in the use of cannon. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Huron that the exhibition of cannon to the Indian has a wholesome effect. Captain Cotton, an officer who has been trained in one of the batteries of artillery and is known to be a good artilleryman, has been transferred to the Mounted Police force, of which he is now the adjutant and is charged with the drilling of the men. The Commissioner speaks of the necessity of having the men armed with an improved style of arm. The truth is, our men are unevenly matched with the Indian in this respect. There are very few Winchester rifles owned by the force, while the western Indians are armed with these rifles which they obtain in the United States, and have besides, plenty of ammunition. Our men with the Snider carbine are therefore, not on equality with them. Now that there is very little buffalo coming north, we believe that judicious arrangements could be made with the Indians by which they would exchange their Winchester rifles for fowling pieces on being paid the difference in value.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman proposes to exchange arms with the Indians?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; by furnishing them with fowling pieces in exchange for their Winchester rifles and paying the difference. I am told that a very considerable number of the Indians are ready to exchange on fair terms, the ordinary fowling pieces being quite sufficient for the game they can kill in future. The hon. gentleman asks about the pay of the force. The pay has been steadily decreasing until it has arrived at just the point which is sufficient to get men and no more, as the hon. gentleman will see by looking at the Bill. As to pasturage right, the hon. gentleman knows that from the International boundary along the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, the country is especially suited for pasturage. Leases are given to companies that undertake to bring in a certain amount of stock. These leases are carefully drawn, so as to prevent anything like obstruction to settlement. The Government can, at any time, for any reason whatever, abrogate a lease on two years notice, and besides that the Government can, at any time, when there is an appearance of immigration or tendency to settlement, resume possession of any tract that is wanted for settlement on making a corresponding reduction in the rental.

Mr. TROW. I do not rise to make any objection to an increase in the police force. I think the force is a very

efficient one and it is essential an increase should be made in it, as it has a very large territory to superintend. I merely rise for the purpose of asking the Government whether the force could not be sub-divided in some way so that a portion would be stationed at Battleford or Prince Albert or Qu'Appelle, or any of those great centres of the North-West. I would ask further whether farms could not be established at those various places, and the force utilized at certain periods of the year in procuring hay for its use, the men receiving additional pay for this work. This would be beneficial to the health of the men, and be a very economical mode of procuring fodder for the animals. I merely ask for information in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The force has been distributed over various points; some men are stationed at Fort Walsh, some at Fort Calgary, some at Fort McLeod, some at Battleford, and some seven or eight at Qu'Appelle. The force is stationed at such points as the experience of the magistrates and the officers shows, may most need it. The main body will be held at some chief point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, so as to be able to supplement the force when wanted at any of the outlying positions. Those positions, of course, will change with the settlement of the country. We cannot foresee where the force will be most needed five years hence. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), has spoken of the men being utilized in raising hay, oats, and other crops. I am not sure the experiment would be successful. There is a police farm near Fort Calgary where the experiment was tried. But it is the opinion of all the officers, including the late Commissioner McLeod, and Col. Irvine, that they cannot be soldiers and farmers. With a very small force the duty has been so continuous and heavy that a great many men have been obliged to leave the force through physical inability to perform the service. Perhaps with a larger force the duty would not be so severe. But at several places the men have raised their own hay, and it is proposed their services shall be utilized whenever the point has been selected for the central barracks, as far as possible, in erecting the building. The men have raised hay, oats, vegetables and other crops, at Fort Calgary, but, I am told, the experiment has not been very successful. I have every confidence in the ability and desire of the present Commissioner to perform his duty, and to be as economical as possible, in order to save the country avoidable expense, by all the means in his power.

Mr. TROW. There is a small barracks at Qu'Appelle, where fifty men should be stationed. On one occasion nearly 3,000 Indians assembled there, for their pay, there being only six policemen present. The Hudson Bay officer stated there was great danger of an outbreak in consequence of the paymaster being three days behind time. A larger force would be required at such central point while the railway is under construction. I would further ask—can you not purchase the provisions necessary for the force from our own settlers? At Prince Albert there is quite a surplus of grain, as well as a mill. At present a large portion of the supplies is brought from the United States. I think our own settlers should get the preference even at an extra expense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The force is supplied by tender; and hitherto, I fancy, the immigrants have consumed all the crops raised by their predecessors. We have been attempting, and, I think, successfully, to prevent such large assemblages of Indians as the hon. gentleman spoke of. They have been found very expensive. The Indians would not receive their pay till fed, and would not go away when so required, and there was, as the hon. gentleman stated, not sufficient force to make them leave. It was arranged to have the bands settle down, and pay the Indians only in small bodies on their own reserves. They

are now not allowed to assemble in large numbers for their pay.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There will probably be a considerable number of new officers required. Does the hon. gentleman propose to appoint them from the cadets of the Royal Military College? Because this is precisely the sort of service for which those young men were intended to be made available when that College was instituted. I think the present Minister of Justice, when Minister of Militia, repeatedly confirmed the statement that it was the intention of the Government to offer such appointments to those graduates.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not proposed to increase the number of officers, although the force is increased. It is rather over-officered. It was broken up into troops and divisions as of a cavalry regiment, the troops consisting of fifty or sixty men with three officers. Experience has shown there is no necessity for that large number. The troops will henceforth number 100 men, for which three officers will suffice. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is important to get the best material for the command of this force. Two appointments were made the other day to fill up vacancies in the staff of officers, both gentlemen, as far as I can learn, highly qualified for their positions. One is Mr. Perry, who carried off the chief prizes as a graduate of the Royal Military College, Kingston, and received a commission in the Royal Engineers, but who, from an accident which injured him, was obliged to resign it. He promises to be a most distinguished officer. I am happy to say that he is now well, and to all appearance as strong as ever. His appointment is considered most suitable. The other gentleman appointed is Mr. Prevost, who served in the "B" Battery of Artillery. He has been most highly recommended as a first rate officer, by the Commanding Officer, Major-General Strange. The vacant office of Superintendent has been given to Colonel Mackenzie, of the Militia, who commanded for a long time at Barrie, and is known to be a first rate officer. Those are the three officers added to the force since I assumed charge. The only other change is the resignation of Colonel McLeod, recently in command, who has resumed his original office of Stipendiary Magistrate. He has been succeeded by the Assist.-Commissioner, Colonel Irvine.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not stated what proportion of the force he proposes to place at headquarters, the point on the line of railway which he designs as the central post.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will be a varying quantity, I fancy. It is supposed that, of the 500 men, there will be always, at least, a force of 150 at the headquarters, ready to support the different outlying positions in case of exigency.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt the circumstances of the country have changed very seriously, and it is not improbable that they may change still more. During the period I was in charge of the force, it was thoroughly organized upon the theory of headquarters, a central staff, one paymaster, etc. I found it was necessarily broken up into detachments, stationed in parts extremely remote, and inaccessible to each other for all ordinary purposes of discipline. It seemed to me, in that condition of the country, it was essential to recognize the necessity of dividing the force into groups with an efficient officer at a point somewhat decentralized, a policy which I found necessary when the men were to be paid. It is quite true the demands on the Mounted Police may have, to some extent, increased, owing to the settlement of the country, and the difficulties occasioned by the Indians wanting food. The hon. gentleman spoke of the labor being very severe. That must be largely in travelling, for I do not think there is much else for them to do unless they

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

are engaged in fighting. But it must be observed that this very circumstance upon which the hon. gentleman proposes to restore the theory of a headquarters, is largely to diminish the necessity. When you find a long line of railway stretching through the country, with the proposed branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway stretching towards Edmonton, you find larger lines, it is true, but still the force can be moved largely by the assistance of locomotives. Therefore, it seems to me that irrespective of other considerations, the period of railway construction will, without doubt, greatly increase the degree of efficiency and render the usefulness of the force greater than at any other period. But taking all these circumstances into consideration the advantages thus secured are entirely overbalanced by the other changes in circumstances, so that the force requires to be nearly doubled, and here the situation becomes serious. The hon. gentleman says we must nearly double the force. I do not know what that may mean, but it seems to me impossible to set a limit to it. On a former occasion the hon. gentleman has said that we must feed the Indians in order to keep them quiet, and it now turns out that we must keep up the Mounted Police in order to keep the white men quiet. I do not know how far the proposed operations of the hon. gentleman with these guileless children of the prairie may be successful. He says he thinks he will induce them, with his well known powers of persuasion, and there is no doubt he has been able to exert great influence over persons much more astute than the children of the prairie, and some of whom I have the pleasure of looking upon at this moment—I say I do not know how far his great powers of persuasion may be successful with them. He says he may have convinced them that fowling pieces are necessary, but the observations he has just made indicate that he expects occasions to arise when the Indian may be supposed to pursue the larger game of mounted policemen, and when that comes I have no doubt the Winchester rifle would be an arm much more satisfactory than that which the hon. gentleman proposes to present them with. I, therefore, do not expect to hear next year of any extensive exchange made of Winchester rifles for fowling pieces, unless the hon. gentleman should pay for the Winchester rifles about double what they are worth. It does seem to me that the proposed changes, which of course, do not involve so large an expense as they otherwise might, because the rate of pay has been very properly reduced—involve a consideration of policy, and if the policy which is to be adopted is to have a headquarters, if it is thought necessary—and I do not say it may not be right to place so large a proportion of the force in different and isolated parts, as 350 or 400 men, and to leave only 150 at headquarters for the purpose of mobilization—then I think we are engaged in dealing with the Indians in a policy which may lead us a long way in point of expense. It seems to me we have got to warn, in the strongest way, the white settlers who are going into that country that they must take care of themselves to a great extent, and to take care of themselves by the exertion of that prudence, restraint and self-command which ought to be enjoined upon them, and by pursuing a course entirely different from that pursued by the adventurous person who has settled among the Indians, and whose conduct or cruelty has provoked some of the Indian difficulties. While we must give some reasonable protection, and I do not say that the Mounted Police ought to be disbanded, we have to avoid giving the people who are settling in the North-West the idea that a very large and continually increasing, expensive force is to be maintained there at the expense of the Dominion. At the earliest moment we ought to adopt some arrangements for the utilization of local forces, for the organization of the militia, and for their organization under, perhaps, a special system of officering, which should give some special advan-

tages, incurring, perhaps, a greater expense, but giving a more efficient force, not merely in soldierly purposes, but also in those higher elements to which I have referred, self-restraint and moderation in the use of power. But to control the North-West by a large and extensive force of this kind would be an undertaking which I, for one, shrink from contemplating.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with my hon. friend in much he has said. Of course a force of 500 men can act as peace officers, serve processes, take prisoners and guard the courts, and do the whole of the work that has been done by the peace officers that are scattered over the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Five hundred men is not too large a force for this purpose. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that eventually that country should be organized under a special system, like a militia force, so as to perform the duty of keeping the peace and, when called upon, to aid the civil power, just as they are in the rest of the Dominion, but at this moment I am afraid that as between the white man and the Indian, the Indian will get the worst of it. Perhaps one danger as great as any in connection with the militia is that of the too active interference of the ordinary magistracy of the country. I might mention one instance of that kind which occurred. There was a rumor arrived at Prince Albert that an outbreak of Indians had taken place to the south, and one magistrate gave a requisition, calling out a newly formed militia company, and they started, fully armed to suppress the infant rebellion. They went down and if they had unfortunately come in contact with the Indians we might have had an Indian war. Luckily, however, they were met by an officer of the police force who remonstrated with them, sent them back, and quieted what was only after all an Indian riot. The hon. gentleman supposes this is a new plan with reference to having headquarters. The force always had headquarters, there having been about 125 men at Fort Walsh, and it is necessary to carry on discipline and training that a considerable force should be kept at headquarters. Those hon. gentlemen who have had military experience will know that a regiment scattered in detachments in order to be skilled and efficient in soldiering qualities are obliged to be kept together in large bodies in order to be worked up to the proper standard. That is one object we have had in view; but there is another, viz., the knowledge of a force at a central point, whence they can be moved east or west at any time at the shortest notice to give that support to the various outlying bodies which experience shows to be required. Of course we have to depend very much on the local authorities, the Indian Commissioner, the Lieutenant-Governor, and the Commissioner and Commander of the Forces—as to where men are required. We must trust very much to the reports of the officers on the subject, and I have every confidence, that with this additional force of police, the country may be reasonably expected to be as quiet for the next ten years as it has been for the last ten years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not at all satisfied as to the necessity for increasing the force. I can recollect that, in the early days of the late Administration, there was a military force stationed in Manitoba, and a police force was organized in the same year, and we were constantly receiving, for nearly two years, the most alarming letters, giving accounts of anticipated raids and other troubles by the Indians and others. We had to pay some regard to these communications, of course, but we never found anything serious resulting. A very bad class of white settlers came in from the western States, travelling northward, and bringing with them whiskey and other spirituous liquors. We succeeded, in the first two years, in forcing all that element out of the country. I do not think there are any very dangerous characters now in the Territories compared

with what there were at the time I refer to, and I fear that the hon. gentleman has been receiving, as we did, letters from parties who are interested or afraid, and who desire to have a military force in their own immediate vicinity. The moral effect on the Indians of an armed force of 300 or 400 men is quite as great as if the number was 1,000. If the Indians determined on resistance even the force that the hon. gentleman proposes to organize, with the existing force, would have small effect upon them. On the other hand, if as a simple expression of opinion of the central authority, 300 would be quite equal in effect to a thousand. I only ask the hon. gentleman to consider whether the representations he has received are not from the same class of individuals as those to which I have referred. I remember some of them were from the very highest authorities in the country, and that they were of a very alarming character. We were first dissuaded from depending on the militia force, and as soon as the police force was organized we received similar manifestations from parties who should have been above that, and should have known that all that is required—at least, that is my opinion—is, that the Indians should be fairly treated, that promises should be kept with them, and that no Indian agents should be permitted to traffic or trade with them in bounties or money; in short, that we should avoid those causes of trouble which caused disaster south of the boundary, and not trust to a mere expression of physical force.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite satisfied that the addition to the force will add to the safety and security of the country, and will give greater assurance to those who go to make it their home, and when the settlement of the country, which now promises to be very rapid, takes place, necessities for keeping up the force may be removed or at least diminished. Of course, it can very readily be diminished at any time if deemed necessary.

Mr. THOMPSON. I notice that, on a question which I asked the right hon. gentleman the other day, I am reported to have spoken of "old" volunteers, and I find by the answer of the right hon. gentleman that he misunderstood me. If I used the expression, I used it in a figurative sense. I wish, however, to draw the right hon. gentleman's attention to the position of the volunteers, as a class who deserve well at the hands of this country; and if by any means a few of them could be brought to present themselves for places upon this force, they would find them most efficient. They would appreciate such a trust very much I am sure; and their being placed upon the force would be a grand thing for the country, as well as for the force itself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall be glad to have able-bodied volunteers of the age of from eighteen to forty years, who are able to read and write and able to pass the medical examination required. In a few days, if the increase is sanctioned, those in the west will be asked to go to Toronto, and if they pass an examination, then they will be accepted. First come, first served.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would suggest that a certain number—say one or two—of names should be forwarded, say by the commanding officer of each battalion, out of which a number might be selected. I see that, according to the rate of pay, artisans are to receive 50 cents per day. I presume that is in addition to the regular pay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. ANGLIN. There is, unfortunately, some reason to apprehend that this Indian question may any day become a very serious one in the North-West, now that settlers are pouring so rapidly into that country. I rise to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a statement made to me, a few days

ago, by a gentleman who has spent a large portion of his life in that country, and is personally familiar with much that is going on there. He said that, in his opinion, a mistake had been committed in breaking up the Indian bands into so many small bands, who are scattered about on small reservations through so large a portion of the territory. I presume the policy was to prevent the Indians from feeling their strength too much by bringing them together in large bodies, and so, perhaps, encouraged them to make demands which otherwise they would not be inclined to make, and give trouble which otherwise they would not be able to give. But he apprehends that as the white men settle in the neighborhood of these Indian reserves, they will follow in what appear to be the instincts of the white men on this continent, viz.: to trespass on the choicest lands held by the Indians, and thus inevitably bring about trouble, and that blood once shed will continue to flow, possibly, until the race is almost extirpated. He says also that if the Indians were on larger reservations and kept more to themselves, the efforts of the Indians to become cultivators of the soil would be more successful than they are likely to be under the present circumstances.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt the hon. gentleman has brought up a very important point. The Indian reserves are provided for by treaties made with the Indians and selected by those Indians themselves. I am strongly inclined to doubt the accuracy of the judgment of the informant of my hon. friend. I think that the congregating of a large number of Indians in one place is a source of greater danger than their being scattered abroad in various reserves.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

INSPECTION OF STEAMBOATS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient further to amend and consolidate as amended, the Act 31 Victoria, Chapter 65, and the Acts amending it, respecting the Inspection of Steamboats, and for the greater safety of passengers by them.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The resolution does not indicate at all the change which the hon. gentleman contemplates. It is defective in that respect and I think he ought to explain it.

Mr. McLELAN. The object of the Bill is to consolidate the various amendments made by the Inspection Act, and to provide more fully for the inspection of the hulls of ships. The inspectors of steamboats are men mainly qualified to inspect boilers and machinery. It is proposed to appoint men specially qualified to inspect the hulls of vessels, and the certificates of both classes of inspectors will be necessary for a ship to be pronounced seaworthy. Regulations are also made to fix the number of passengers which each boat shall be allowed to carry. These are the two main features of the Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The rules require that, on any Bill relating to trade or to alter the laws concerning trade, being brought into the House, the proposition must first be submitted in Committee of the Whole. This is a simple notice of the Minister's intention to bring in some amendments, and I object to it as being entirely out of order.

Mr. McLELAN. The only change proposed to be made is to consolidate the law, and to define clearly the mode of appointment and qualifications of the inspectors.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is more than a consolidation, because the resolution tells us that "it is expedient further to amend and consolidate as amended," the various Acts. The objection of the hon. member for Lambton is that the whole purpose of the rule, which is to give the House

Mr. ANGLIN.

an opportunity to make any suggestions they wish, is entirely thwarted, unless in some sort the substance, the essence, of the proposed legislation is stated in the resolution upon which the House goes into Committee. That is the difficulty—how are we to know that it is expedient to alter anything unless we know what the alteration is?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House can pass a resolution, no matter how vague in its terms, declaring that it is expedient to amend the Act. The House can ask for a most specific statement unless it is fully satisfied with that made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think it is open to the House to adopt that course. It laid down very clearly that no Bill is to be brought in until the proposition has been first considered in Committee of the Whole. I ask the right hon. gentleman if he will state from the paper what the statement is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That it is expedient to amend and consolidate the Acts. A clearer or more specific statement could not be made.

Mr. BLAKE. What is to be considered is the proposition contained in the Bill. It is not sufficient that the Act shall be amended, but it shall be amended in some particular way, and it is that proposition that shall be submitted to the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER decided that the rule, as generally understood and interpreted by late English practice, simply required the House to go into Committee to consider a general proposition setting forth the expediency of bringing in a measure on a particular question; and that consequently in his opinion the proposed motion came sufficiently within the meaning of the rule.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think there is no necessity for this legislation in regard to an Inspector of Steamboats, because the law already provides that no one shall be appointed an inspector unless he is qualified to inspect the hull as well as the machinery and boiler. The Act of 1868 provides for the appointment of an Inspector of Steamboats and the second section sets forth that no person shall be appointed to inspect steamboats unless he has previously passed a satisfactory examination before the Board of Steamboat Inspectors as to his knowledge on the subject of hulls, boilers and the machinery of steamboats and the working of them. Accordingly, no Inspector can be appointed unless he is qualified to inspect the hull as well as the boiler and machinery.

Mr. McLELAN. If the ships were of iron the same officer would be competent to inspect the hull as well as the machinery and boiler, but in the case of wooden ships an Inspector should possess practical experience in the construction of such vessels. In practice the inspection of hulls has been neglected, and many accidents have been attributed to the want of that inspection.

Mr. McCUAIG. The existing Inspectors are not qualified to give an opinion as to the soundness and proper construction of hulls. Before the Bill was introduced the Minister kindly gave me an idea of its scope, and my experience, extending over twenty years, convinces me that the present Inspectors are unacquainted with the construction of vessels. In consequence of that the unfortunate London disaster took place. I, myself, consider, from many years' experience, that a hull inspector is necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. There must be a frightful amount of fiction in the Board of Steamboat Inspection reports if my hon. friend's experience be well founded. Since 1868, it has

been provided that after the 1st January, 1869, no person shall be appointed Inspector of Steamboats until he has passed a satisfactory examination before the Board of Steamboat Inspection, as to his knowledge of hulls, boilers, machinery of steamboats and the working of the same, and received from the Chairman of the Board a certificate, in writing, to that effect. If none of the Inspectors know anything at all about hulls, though they have of course all received the necessary certificates from the Chairman of the Board, the Bill should contain a clause to remove the Chairman of the Board.

Mr. McCALLUM. Was the Chairman of the Board himself qualified? The Steamboat Inspection Law has been altered several times by Order in Council. I am satisfied we have not men in this country who can combine the two requisites, that is, can pronounce at the same time on the engine and boiler and on the hull of a vessel as well as on her equipment, and decide, if she is a passenger boat, what number of passengers she ought to be allowed to carry. There is no country that I know of where there have been less accidents under this law than this country. So far as the London accident is concerned, it was owing to the overloading of passengers, and not to the inspection at all. The boat was but a scow, and left the wharf with about three times the number of passengers she could carry on board. This Bill, so far as I can see, is intended to give greater security to life and property by providing safeguards as much as possible against such or other accidents.

Mr. McCUAIG. My hon. friend from Durham will remember the case of the *Jane Miller* which came up before the courts of law. Nearly all the inspectors in that part of the country where the disaster occurred were examined as to her seaworthiness, and were found to be ignorant of the construction of a vessel. There should be proper inspectors appointed, qualified to pronounce on the hull and construction of a vessel whose certificates would relieve owners from all responsibility. This Bill is framed I think with great care, and provides that the inspector of the hull shall be a ship-carpenter.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us whether a vessel has to be certified by the Chairman of the Board.

Mr. McCUAIG. The Chairman is, no doubt, well qualified to give a certificate as far as the engine and boiler are concerned, but he does not profess to be qualified to give a certificate as to the hull examination.

Mr. BLAKE. But he does give it.

Mr. McCUAIG. All-I can say is that, during the time of the Mackenzie Administration, the same gentleman was allowed to remain as Chairman of the Board of Inspection, although not as well qualified as he should be. The London accident drew my attention, as it did that of other steamboat owners, to the necessity of having an inspector of hulls, and I called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine to it. It was proved in that case beyond doubt that there was a bar of iron over the boiler on deck to keep it in place, and that the boiler was supposed to be fastened below by a bolt. The evidence showed that the vessel was too shallow in the hull. The engineer was unable to fasten the boiler by that necessary bolt, and the consequence was, when the vessel canted, the boiler slipped overboard. There was a want, in the first place, of a skilled mechanic to build the vessel, and great carelessness, in the second place, on the part of the inspector.

Mr. BLAKE. Will my hon. friend say whether this serious defect in the fastening of the boiler would come under the supervision of the hull or the machinery inspector. There might be a conflict of responsibility here.

Mr. McLELAN. It would be part of the duty of the inspector of the boiler and machinery to see that the boiler was properly attached.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any provision for more than one inspection in the year? I think it is essentially necessary to have inspections at different times. Boats efficient at the beginning of the season, may become unseaworthy towards the fall. I think provision for the inspection of cargoes—to see whether they are safely stowed—should also be made. The loss of the *Jane Miller* seemed due to the fact that she had no ballast, and when she turned sideways to go in to the wharf she suddenly upset. Provision should be made to ascertain whether cargoes are properly distributed, and whether the boats are in proper condition at different periods of the season.

Mr. McCALLUM. If the boats were to be inspected at different periods of the season they could do no work. A hull is supposed good for five or six years, and the engines and boilers are inspected every spring. Who is to know better than the man who sails a vessel whether the cargo is properly distributed? His own life is at stake in the matter. I was sorry to hear my hon. friend behind me finding fault with the Steamboat Inspector on account of the accident at London, for which he was not to blame. Against that accident provision could hardly have been made. Under this Act mistakes and accidents, such as we have seen, will be provided against, because the shipbuilder will give a certificate as to the number of passengers a boat is qualified to carry; and there must be additional life-preservers. That, I believe, is the object of the Bill. If you inspected those vessels more than once a year, their owners might as well burn them up. As to my hon. friend's remark that a vessel owner should be exempt from all damages, if possessed of a certificate of inspection, I reply he may mismanage his vessel; there may be some other cause for an accident than defects of the boiler or machinery. There may be faults in navigating, and he ought to be responsible for all damages. This Bill is necessary in the interest of steamboat men as well as in the interest of life and property.

Mr. McCUAIG. The object contemplated by the inspection of steamboats is security to life and property. By this Bill the hon. Minister is endeavoring to secure the services of proper and competent men to run those vessels, not only mariners, but engineers acquainted with the construction of engines. In addition, the Bill requires that a skilful ship carpenter, of experience and judgment, shall inspect the vessel. When that is done, the owner has performed all he is able to do, and all that the law requires, as a matter of course, is a certificate. Should an accident happen after the vessel has been approved by the Inspector, the owner is free from responsibility for unseaworthiness. Of course he is responsible for the employment of men of good conduct and experience, but the Bill does not interfere with that matter. The Bill requires, first, that the hull should be inspected to determine its seaworthiness, and again inspected to see that the engine and boiler are all right. This is all that can be done for the public protection from such misfortunes as the wreck at London. I believe the *Victoria* was unfit for her work, and that the Inspector was guilty of gross dereliction of duty when he failed to have the boiler properly fastened. To that the loss of life was certainly due.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the argument of the hon. member for Monck is valid. There are many instances of loss from improper distribution of cargo, and the wearing down of vessels towards the end of the season, when they become unfit to buffet the winds and waves. We have the loss of the *Jane Miller* as a warning. When we consider the

frequent lamentable loss of valuable human life, no paltry consideration should divert us from the necessity of frequent inspection, with a view to prevent such calamities.

Mr. McLELAN. I propose in the Bill to provide for annual inspection, and certificates may be granted as the inspector may determine. If the inspector determines that the machinery and hulls are not sufficiently good to run a year, a certificate for the part of the year during which they would be serviceable may be granted. At least once a year there shall be an inspection.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that goes far enough, because, I repeat, vessels may run down or become damaged during the season, though all right in the spring, and may, late in the fall, be unable to stand severe weather. The inspection should be made early in the spring and early in the fall, and if they are found to be damaged, then the owners should be compelled to put their boats in order. I think that would result in a large saving of life and property.

Mr. McCALLUM. An inspector who inspects a vessel ought to be able to say whether she is fit to run all the season. If he thinks she is not, let him give her a certificate to run during the fine weather. I think that will satisfy everybody. I think just as much of the lives of seamen as the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig). Considering the number of steam vessels employed in this country, there is no other country in the world where accidents have been so few. As long as we are engaged in this business we must take steps to make it safe. In reference to the accident to the *Jane Miller*, no one knows the cause of her capsizing. How does the hon. gentleman know whether she foundered or how she was lost? All his assertions are mere conjectures. As for the Chairman of the Board of Inspectors being at fault in that accident, I stand here as a representative of the people and say, he ought to be held innocent. The hon. gentleman is altogether in error in stating that this boat was not deep enough in the hold for a man to crawl in. It is perfectly absurd that such notions as those of the hon. gentleman should guide the navigation of this country. Are we to have every man in this country punished because this little scow went down at London? This very Act will remedy that. There will be nothing of that kind in the future, because the certificate of the shipwright, to the number of passengers a boat may carry, will guide the captain in the number of persons he may take on board. The shipwright is the best judge of the number of persons the boat may carry. My hon. friend may say that because a vessel registers so many tons she can carry so many passengers. But that rule would not be found to work, because some vessels, being differently constructed, can carry a greater number of passengers, in proportion to her tonnage, than another vessel which registers a higher tonnage.

Mr. McCUAIG. I desire to say that, when this vessel was inspected after the accident, there was found a band of iron extending from the top of the boiler on each side, extending to the main deck, and which should have been fastened by bolts to the deck timbers. After the accident an examination proved that this was neglected, in consequence of which, the instant the steamer careened, the supposed iron stay yielded and the boiler shifted to one side, and finally slipped overboard, crushing and carrying with it several of the unfortunate passengers. If the Inspector had been careful in the discharge of his duty he would have discovered this band of iron was not fastened, and he would directed that it should be made secure, knowing it was the only stay for keeping the boiler in its place. That alone shows that the vessel was carelessly inspected, and shows the necessity of appointing a qualified ship-carpenter to see if the inspection is right.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is with great diffidence that I differ from eminent nautical authorities like the hon. member for Monck. He speaks of inspecting scows; but when this scow carries the lives of several hundred passengers, it becomes a matter of very great importance. I hope the Government will bring in a stringent measure with regard to vessels which carry passengers. We all know the importance that has been given to this subject by the English authorities, and the great work which Mr. Plimsoll has performed in connection with it; and I do hope the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that a stringent measure of protection is afforded the public.

Mr. ANGLIN. We are all agreed that it is of the utmost importance there should be a thorough inspection of steamboats, of their hulls and machinery, and that competent persons should be employed to make the inspection, such as will afford all possible security for the lives of passengers. The serious question arises as to how that inspection can be best obtained. I expected at first to find the hon. member for Prince Edward rather opposed to this Bill, knowing him to be a proprietor of steamboats, but my surprise was removed when I learned that he is himself the parent, or the putative parent of this Bill. I am surprised to hear him argue that a ship-carpenter or a shipwright has some special qualifications for examining a hull. The shipwright receives a plan of the dimensions of the hull, with instructions as to the quality of the timber that go into the hull, and he then builds the hull, without stopping to think what kind of machinery is to be placed in it. I think that the architect of the hull, who decides the proportion of the different parts to each other, is better qualified to inspect a steamboat and to say how many persons it can carry with safety, than a mere ship-carpenter, who may have been employed in constructing the hull. We have now a number of inspectors of steamboats who are presumed to be qualified to judge of the strength and efficiency of the hulls of these steamers. These gentlemen are not employed more than half the year; in fact I do not think any one of them works one hundred days in the year. They are, however public officers; they do not, I believe, any of them, attend to any other work or business. They expect to live on the revenue derived from their services as inspectors. If we pass the Bill in its present shape, I do not think it necessary that the hull of a vessel should be carefully inspected every year. If a vessel is built under the inspector, and sufficiently inspected afterwards, if it is built of proper material and of proper strength, it should last at least five or six years, just as sea-going vessels are classified for five or six or seven years, and are considered seaworthy for that time, unless they meet with some accident. It would not be necessary to have a careful annual inspection of the hull, and, therefore, we should not have another set of officers appointed who would have even less to do. Now, I cannot understand why it is not competent—if these inspectors are men of intelligence, and are possessed of sufficient knowledge of the machinery of vessels—to acquire, even if they do not now possess, such a knowledge with regard to the construction of the hull of a vessel as would be required to fit them for the position of inspectors. I really do not think that there is any such extraordinary knowledge required in those matters, and I do not think it is necessary that a man should serve eight or ten years as a workman in a shipping yard in order to be competent. I know that in the Lower Provinces ship captains who never handled an adze or a maul in their lives are year after year placed in the shipyards to inspect first-class ships—sea-going ships—and are regarded as the very best to look after those vessels. So, I think, any man of intelligence and experience who would make it his business to become acquainted with the construction and equipment of a vessel should be competent to discharge those duties. If these men do not choose to become

thoroughly acquainted with the business and are not able after a time to pass a thorough examination at the hands of men competent to carry on such an examination, they should be set aside and their places filled by men as intelligent or more intelligent and more willing to learn their duties. But I think we should hesitate before creating a new class of inspectors and placing them to some extent in control of the business of steamboat sailing, which has not been very profitable of late years.

Mr. McLELAN. The employment of captains to inspect the construction of vessels has entirely gone out of date in the Maritime Provinces as well as in England. It is sometimes thought desirable to employ them for a week or two before the vessel is launched in water, to look after the rigging and its connection with the hull; but after the construction of the hull, which is the main part of the vessel, it is thought that they are better without the presence of the captain, and in the Maritime Provinces they dispense with the services of the captain until a few weeks before the launch.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am aware that the acting Minister of Marine is well acquainted with shipbuilding, but I am rather surprised to hear him make the statements he has just made with regard to dispensing with the services of the captain. I know that it does not frequently happen that captains are employed in that capacity, but I have often learned that captains were placed in the yard for the purpose of seeing that the vessel is properly built, that the timbers are sound and put together in a proper way, and that in cases where captains were not shipbuilders and never had been.

Mr. McLELAN. I know that years ago that was done, but it is not done now. Vessels are all inspected by Lloyds' inspectors, and they will not admit sea captains as inspectors on the boats. These positions are all taken by practical ship builders.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), appears to think that one man ought to be able to perform the duties of inspector of hulls and inspector of machinery. I say that the man who may know how to mould a vessel from the keel to the truck is not the proper man to know how well the vessel will stand. I know that a shipwright is the only proper man to know the number of passengers that a vessel ought to carry, according to her build, and not the master of the vessel. He says further that these vessels, because they are classed originally for five or six or seven years, do not require inspection every spring, but I affirm that they will, because the boats, the life-saving apparatus, the appliances for putting out fire, and every thing of that kind, require to be examined every year. But that is not all. A steamboat inspector, wherever he may be, has the privilege of going aboard a boat and inspecting her anywhere, and is expected to do so, and I believe by this law a captain of a vessel is bound not to refuse the inspector a passage if he wishes to go in any direction to inspect a vessel. I believe the intention is to make the law more stringent. I do not know how inspectors in the Maritime Provinces act, but I know that in Ontario the inspectors have to work very hard, and that in certain seasons of the year they have more than they can do to keep up with their work. I do not like to hear hon. members say that these men are not fit for their duty. I know that some of the steamboat owners occasionally think they are too harsh, and that they find a good many faults—for if these inspectors find the Act insufficient they get Orders in Council passed. Furthermore, I say that there has been very little damage to vessels under their inspection. Of course, a very serious accident happened at London; but is there any man in the House who could have imagined that such an

accident would have happened on a mere mill pond. The water there is as smooth as glass, but the vessel was overloaded, and it was such that it had no more hold on the water than a man's hand. The trouble appears to have been that the men could not get into the hold to fasten the boiler, because the boat was so shallow. I am satisfied that the cause of that accident was that there were three or four people on that boat where there ought to have only been one; the master of the vessel ought to have compelled the people to go ashore, and he should not have left the dock until they did so.

Mr. McCUAIG. I do not wish to be misunderstood when I speak of the character of the inspector of boilers and engines of steamers. I bear willing testimony to their high character as a body, but I nevertheless say that the inspector who gave a certificate to the master of that boat was guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. Under this Bill, I do not think such a thing will occur again.

Mr. CURRIER. I think the Government ought to abolish the office of steamboat inspector altogether, and that they ought to make the law compulsory that the owners, not only of steamboats, but of stationary boilers, should insure in some of the insurance companies that are prepared to insure boilers. These companies have their own inspectors, and they take good care not to insure a boiler unless they think it is perfectly safe. I think this would be a great improvement, and would insure more safety to the public than the present system.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 117) to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examination and licensing of engineers employed on them.

Bill read the first time; and (at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 27th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 135) to amend Chapter 29, 33 Victoria, intituled: "An Act to extend certain provisions of 'The Seamen's Act, 1873,' to vessels employed in navigating the inland waters of Canada, and to provide for the collection of the wages of seamen and other persons employed on board vessels trading on the inland waters of Canada, in a summary manner."—(Mr. Guillet.)

THE PRESBYTERIAN TEMPORALITIES FUND.

Mr. SHAW moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 66) to amend the Act intituled "An Act to incorporate the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland," and the Acts amending the same.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I beg to move in amendment that Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 66) but that he do so this day week. My reason for moving this motion is that there are four Bills on the Order Paper, all relating to the

same or a cognate subject. The Bills which is the subject of the present motion has been reported by the Private Bills Committee, but the other three Bills have not yet been disposed of by them, and it would be much more convenient that the House should discuss the general subject than discuss it in detail, and thereby occupy nearly four times the length of time that would otherwise be occupied. It was also understood, if I recollect aright, that these Bills should proceed before the House and the Committee *pari passu*: that is to say, that they should come up for consideration together, and a general discussion take place on the whole of the Bills. The Private Bills Committee has only dealt with the first of them, and as it would be convenient for the time of the House, as well as to secure a proper and satisfactory discussion of the whole subject, to enter upon it as a whole instead of in four parts, I submit the present motion.

Amendment negatived; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLENNAN. I beg to move the following amendment:

That, whereas the union of churches referred to in the preamble was not complete, but left a minority of eight members out of thirty-three who had a vested interest in the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, which minority declined to become a party to such union, it be resolved that, before any disposition of this fund is made by this House, the right of the said minority should be maintained to a division of the capital of the said fund in such manner that the said minority shall control its proportion thereof.

I think it will be conceded that this Bill proposes to deal with vested rights in a manner that is quite new to this House. The fund of this Temporalities Board, it is well known, is not in its first creation the fund of a Corporation; it is the property of individuals, who have of their own motives and under conditions provided by themselves created the fund, and it is not left to be dealt with even at this late period by their successors. It happens that a number of the parties who have been dealing with this fund in the Church Courts, in the Law Courts, and before Parliament, are themselves the creators of the fund, and I think if anything more specific is required on this head, it is very distinctly stated in the deliverance of the Lords of the Privy Council, who state:

"The appellant is not a mere annuitant, and his right to an annual allowance does not constitute his only connection with the fund. He is likewise one of the commutants, one of the persons by whom the fund was contributed for the purposes of the Act 22 Victoria, Chapter 66, and in that capacity he has a plain interest, and consequent right, to insist that the fund shall be administered in strict accordance with law."

That the law was made by those creators of the fund itself is very clear and distinct. Having possession of that fund of \$8,000 or \$10,000 each, they determined to put it together to create a fund out of which an annual allowance should be drawn by themselves, and here are some of the conditions:

"That if any minister ceased his connection with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, he should thereby forfeit his interest in the principal and interest of the fund. The first principle that formed the basis of this compact was this: the fund was 'to be unalterable by the Synod without the consent of all the ministers agreeing to it.'"

It is true that after a period of years a Union was formed of certain churches, and a majority of those men elected to go into that Union. An Act was obtained from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec placing the administration of this fund in the hands of a new body, elected in a new manner, under which administration the creators of the fund would have no more than their life-interest in it, so that the very body by whom it was created was cut off from any further interest in the fund. Can this House take

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

up this question and settle it upon a judicial basis? I really think that the members of this House will hesitate before they undertake to do so, and I believe that no disposition of this large sum will be satisfactory in which the contending parties are not in agreement—that some consent of the parties must be obtained, to make a settlement satisfactory. There seems to be the more reason why this should be considered, because there appears to be a possibility of bringing about this result. The minority is always the difficult party to deal with in any ordinary money transactions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Especially in this House.

Mr. McLENNAN. Especially in this House, and this House is accustomed to granting liberal charters for the creation of funds and property; but it is a new thing for this House to take up the disposal of a fund that is already created, and created upon a basis susceptible of discussion judicially. I believe this question is even now in the Law Courts, and I believe it is quite understood that no Bill can be passed in this House against the consent of the parties interested if it will take it out of the Law Courts. We know with what asperity this contest has been carried, on and that there is very little probability of any Act passed in this House accomplishing its end by force. We know, indeed, that when a question between religious parties arises, the most bitter and acrimonious contention is the result. I have not been in the Private Bills Committee, but I have heard the echoes of the contest that went on there. I believe if this matter were discussed as gentlemen of our position whose forum is the stump discuss political matters, there might be some urbanity and good-fellowship and concession and charity in the discussion; but we find when it is a church question that is being considered there is no possibility of agreement. It is in a church question that all the acrimony comes out which is so well described by a great historian as the savage nature of man breaking through the thin crust of civilization. I am sorry this Bill has got this far before the House, because I think this matter should have been settled long ago, and the reason it is not settled is, because some encouragement has been, in many quarters, given to the pretensions of the majority, who consider they have all power in their hands. I think it is in the power of this House, by adopting a wise measure of legislation, to procure a settlement of this vexed question that will be in the interests of every party concerned, and of none more than of the majority in this House composed of the party of the United Church.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a question of order. The rule of the House is, that no notice of amendment may be proposed to the Committee of the Whole House unless notice has been given, and I find no notice given of any such motion at this stage of the Bill. The hon. gentleman has given notice that, on the third reading of the Bill, he will move that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, but that does not authorize his amendment when the House is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McLENNAN. When I require information on the rules of the House, I go to the Clerk. The Clerk has told me that I am justified in making the motion at this stage on the notice I have given.

The CHAIRMAN ruled the motion in order.

Mr. McLENNAN. Then I will go on with my remarks. We have been told that the opposition to this Bill is the work of a small faction. The statement has been made with a great deal of eloquence in the Committee, and has been circulated in print, that this small faction would fall to pieces if it were defeated in this House. I confess I am amazed at this statement coming from the quarters whence it has come. I shall be very much enlightened to know from any of these Presbyterian

gentlemen whether they would themselves consent to be snuffed out by an order of this House on any contest in which they thought their property was involved. I do not think any of them would conceive it was possible to do such a thing, and I do not think this small minority is made of such poor stuff that it will be snuffed out by any Bill this House will pass. The result will be this contest will be carried on in the Law Courts, and for what purpose? To save to this United Church the sum of \$50,000, or \$100,000. The thing is preposterous. The churches in this country have lived without funds of this kind up to this period. The strongest among them have obtained their strength, and retain it without any such eleemosynary aid. It has happened that while this contention has been going on between the United Church and a small minority, that, in some parts of the church, the situation has been changed—non-contents have been allowed to hold their property, and what has happened in this case has been that the united church has grown and has become strong, by generously foregoing that advantage, and leaving to those, who thought they had a legal right to it, the privilege of possessing and using them. I think this is what will happen under a fair distribution of this property—under such a distribution as may be consented to by the parties, and may be confirmed by this House. I think, for these reasons, that this method of disposing of the matter—I have reason to believe—is one that will satisfy, in the first place, the minority who are contending for this fund. I believe, in the next place, that it will satisfy the majority who are contending for it as soon as they can get out of the trammels of debate, and that reason will have asserted its supremacy over the passion that has been created by this contest.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What is your proposition?

Mr. McLENNAN. It is on the Table. It is a division of the fund according to the relative number of the majority and minority of the beneficiaries at the time of the Union. That is practically the substance of it. It does not belong to the church; it belongs to the ministers. I believe that it will dispose of a question that seriously affects one of the other Bills coming up in relation to the Queen's College. The College unfortunately cannot be divided as the fund can. It is a difficult subject to deal with, and this division will help to make a settlement of that unfortunate question, possibly, as well as the distribution of this fund. I think it is not only a measure that will be accepted and approved of by the contestants under the conditions I have named, but that it appeals to the good sense and fair and impartial judgment of this House as an arbitrator in this important question.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand now that we are now on the first clause of the Bill—am I right?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I apprehend that, as a Committee of the Whole, we are limited to the consideration of the proposed amendment of a clause or proposal that the Committee should rise and report progress, or rise without reporting progress. This resolution does not appear to be an amendment of the first clause, but it appears to be an abstract resolution designed to require that before further progress is made, something should be done. It is, in point of fact, the resolution that should be made in amendment to the motion for the third reading of the Bill, to which it is appropriate. It is not an amendment to the first clause. It does not alter the first clause at all. The motion is out of order on another ground than that on which you, Mr. Chairman, have over-ruled my views on the previous motion.

Mr. McLENNAN. I believe that this is a most pertinent amendment to the first clause.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Upon the consideration that I can give the matter, my opinion is, that the amendment should properly come up on the third reading.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). This question of order has already been disposed of by the Chair.

Mr. BLAKE. No. The first question of order raised was, whether this could be done at this stage without notice; but the Chairman over-ruled it. On the present motion being put in his hands I pointed out it was not an amendment to the first clause.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It is an amendment, for it proposes to provide for an amendment to the first clause—that they have power to amend that clause in a certain way. In terms it professes to apply to the first clause. The amendment reads: That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the first clause, so as to provide, &c. That amendment is pertinent to the first clause of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. In my opinion the motion in the Chairman's hands is no amendment at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That is not the amendment then in the Notice paper.

Mr. BLAKE. No; that is the motion the hon. member for Glengarry put in the hands of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in express terms an amendment to the first clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This subject is causing excitement among the Presbyterians all through the Dominion of Canada, and it is much to be regretted, although it is very natural, that any feeling should be aroused. I am going to move one or two amendments in the Committee, acting, as I believe, as moderator, thinking, perhaps, that we can arrive at a solution of the difficulty. I am going to move, in the first place, that after the word "following" in the 7th line on the 7th page, the following shall be inserted: "Shall be charges upon the fund in the following order." Then I move that the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st and a portion of the 22nd line, down to the word "ministry" be struck out. I then move that after the word "requirements," in the 24th line, these words be inserted: "provided always that adequate provision be made for the payment during life of \$450 per annum to those now entitled to it." I may as well state what other amendments I am going to move, although it may not be distinctly regular in Committee, in order that the Committee may understand what I would like to have adopted by the Committee and by the House. I shall move that in the 2nd clause in the 49th line after the word "extinguished," the following words be inserted: "Provided also that when the three classes mentioned in section one shall be fully satisfied, all the ten congregations which declined to enter the Union consummated in 1875, and who may not have entered the said Union subsequently, shall be each entitled to an equitable share of the residue of the fund, the said share to be proportioned to the number of congregations on the Synod roll on 14th June, 1875." Then, in the third section, I am going to submit that the words "the said Presbyterian Church" be substituted for the words "the said United Church" in the fifth and fifteenth lines of the third section, so as to allow the minority to have representation in the Board.

Mr. BLAKE. These seem to me, so far as I can judge, to be rather important amendments, and that we ought to have notice of them. It seems to me it is not regular to move these amendments at this stage. If the hon. gentleman desires to move them, he must give notice of moving

them on the third reading of the Bill, which stage cannot be reached to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For the sake of settling this matter, I do not think we ought to raise points of order. If these amendments would settle the matter, I dare say my hon. friend would overlook the point of order.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not profess to gather what the effects of these amendments are. They may be all right. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman speaks for both contesting parties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I do not.

Mr. BLAKE. If he announces that he is expressing the united voice of both parties, it is a different thing. But if he does not make that announcement then I think both the House and the parties have a right to some notice, so as to gather what are the bearing and effects of these propositions.

Mr. SHAW. It may be that notice may be required, but the promoters of the Bill have had some notice of what has been suggested now. The Bill is already a compromise. It gives to the dissenting party, the party in minority, greater right, perhaps, than they are really entitled to. We say that the property of the Church of Scotland went over to the united body at the time of the Union, consequently the Bill itself is a compromise. However, we are willing still to grant to the minority perhaps greater rights than they are really entitled to. They are small in number, and we think that we may well concede to them even more than they can justly ask for. Because we are much more numerous we do not want to have the appearance of trespassing on their rights. We say the Bill, as it stands already, provides for their rights; it provides for the payment of annuities to the minority. The amendment here to the first clause simply makes the Bill a little more explicit; it does not substantially alter the first section. When before the Private Bills Committee, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) proposed a resolution somewhat similar to the amendment now proposed. It was negatived at the time; but, on further consideration, we think that perhaps it would have made the Bill a little more explicit in its first section, and we are willing to accede to the amendment suggested by the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for West Durham will see how the matter stands, but I will not press my amendments if he desires delay. But I shall ask the Committee to report the Bill as it is, and then we can discuss the amendments on the third reading.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe that there having been no notice of the amendment, the true course would be to go through the Bill and report it in its present shape. Then the hon. gentleman could put a notice on the paper, and the next day that could be taken up so far as it is concerned. For my own part, after the statement of the hon. gentleman who promotes the Bill, or speaks as I understand with the authority of those promoting the Bill, it would not be material to press the point of order, but there are other amendments to be considered, and if the third reading is to be delayed, the Bill stands for them all.

Mr. SHAW. I only spoke in reference to the one section, and I regret that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) should take any such ground as want of notice, or presses it in regard to the Bill as a whole, seeing that we are desirous of getting along as amicably as possible, and seeing also that it must be apparent to all who have heard the discussions, that there is a great deal of feeling being engendered throughout the country in regard to the Bill. If it were possible to go on immediately and dispose of the matter as early as possible upon an amicable arrangement it would be much better to do so. I should

Mr. BLAKE.

like myself to see it disposed of as rapidly as possible. If the Bill is settled in Committee to-day, that fact will go a long way towards the settlement of the other Bills before the Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman make the same statement with reference to the other amendments as with reference to the first?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman who has offered to make what is in effect a compromise, if he has made this proposition on behalf of one party, or as a mediator. I wish to know whether the minority was willing to accede to this proposition to stop this litigation, and also the litigation which has been commenced with reference to Queen's College, Kingston—a Bill with reference to which stands in my name. I have heard nothing of this compromise, and I know nothing of it, but it strikes me as being desirable that we should know if the minority relinquishes the contest with regard to Queen's College and the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, or whether they are going to continue the contest with regard to other funds.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I may say, for my part, that I have never heard of the suggested amendment, which the right hon. gentleman has proposed, until he read it just now. I am informed, also, that what may be termed the minority are ignorant with reference to it. It seems, from the statement of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw), that he knew of the nature of these amendments, or had some previous knowledge of them. I was not able myself to catch sufficiently clearly the terms of the proposed amendments of the right hon. gentleman, and I do not now know their scope and effect. I am not prepared to discuss them at the present time. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw) spoke of the Bill as being passed by the Committee as a compromised Bill. It strikes me as a rather curious kind of compromise—one of the sort which the highway robber offers to a man who tears off his clothes, takes his property and empties his pockets, and then offers him 25 cents to pay his way home.

Mr. McMILLAN. I was the introducer of the Bill which is being promoted on behalf of the minority spoken of, and I may say I had no notice whatever in connection with this amendment. I am exceedingly sorry that any advantage has been taken of the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), because I think we should discuss the matter thoroughly here, and probably we would be able to simplify matters in such a way as to avoid three or four discussions during which we would be going over substantially the same ground. It seems to me extraordinary that the promoter of this Bill should have been aware of this amendment, while we, the minority, to whom the majority are so gracious, whom they wish to treat so kindly, had no knowledge of it at all up to the present moment. If we are going into a discussion of the Bill at all let us arrange it so that we may discuss the whole matter on its merits once and for all, and not go over it three or four times; or if that cannot be done now, let us postpone the discussion until some such time, and avoid as far as possible keeping the feelings of the country irritated as they are to a very considerable extent at the present time.

Mr. McDUGALL (Halton). I think what we have just heard shows, in the first place, the propriety of our rules, which require amendments of an important character to be spread upon our papers, so that we may have an opportunity of taking communication of them and know their nature when we come into the House to exercise our judgment upon them. This question has attracted a great deal of public attention. It involves very important questions between two sections of a very numer-

ous religious body of this country. It has been before one of the large Standing Committees of this House for some days, in which parties have been heard at great length, and the Committee, so far as I could observe, listened to them with the greatest attention, and endeavored as far as possible to meet the views of the promoters of the Bill and hear the objections of those who appeared to oppose it. There are two or three other measures which will stand on a similar principle to this Bill when it is finally settled, and I think when amendments are proposed here without notice which will alter the character of the Bill, and in fact destroy one of its main principles, it would be a more parliamentary course and more satisfactory to all parties to refer the Bill back, and hear the minority as well as the majority, who have apparently assented to a compromise without communication with the minority. As I contended before the Committee, and as I contend now, the question between the parties is one of no particular importance to this House. They merely come here because we are the only power who can make laws in the matter, and therefore after hearing both parties and after examining into the history of the case, we should legislate between them in accordance with right and justice. But, at the same time, if the parties choose to come to a compromise amongst themselves as to the dividing of the fund, or on any other matter in dispute between them, we would have been glad to have assented to any such proposal, and in fact they were urged to make some arrangement in the way of a compromise if possible. As every one knows who is familiar with the history of the transactions, there was a substantial minority of the church who declined to go into the Union, and, although they were out-voted, although, as a matter of law, they were left without legal rights as to property—as was contended and, I think, correctly—still we must remember that they are a large and respectable body, with friends and supporters throughout the country who sympathize with them, and it would have been a pleasant thing for the Committee to have listened to terms of compromise from those who are authorized to make them. But when the question was asked if the gentlemen who appeared on behalf of the United Church were authorized to agree to a division of the property, and assign a portion of it upon those who had no legal claim upon it, as was contended, they said they were not authorized to make that agreement; they did not feel that they were justified in telling the Committee or Parliament that they were entitled to assign a portion of this property, and therefore the Committee were forced to come to the conclusion that the promoters of the Bill, being legally entitled to have the control of this property, and to come to the Legislature for an Act to assist them in the modification of the machinery for administering it, passed the Bill in that form. And now, at this second stage, we are asked to agree to that which the promoters of the Bill declined to assent to, on the ground that they had no authority to give that assent, and I apprehend, also, that there was no just grounds for their giving it, even if they had the authority. Under these circumstances I say it is only fair to the minority to give them the opportunity of going back to the Committee with the compromise proposed; and the Committee will have to deal with the other Bills in view of the principle finally adopted in this case. I have studied the Bill with some care, and I confess I do not quite see the effect which the right hon. gentleman's amendments will have on the disposition of this property. But I think before we go back to our constituents and seek to justify our action in this case, we ought to know the reasons and grounds for our action, and it is only before the Committee that we can ascertain the views of the parties with reference to the proposed compromise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear that my well-intentioned attempt to arrange this matter is going to

prove futile, and, therefore, I fancy the Bill will go through without any amendment. I cannot help that. I would have given notice if I had had the opportunity, but I was only able to consider the matter on Saturday last, and had, therefore, no opportunity of giving notice of the proposed compromise. The Bill, I understand, passed through the Private Bills Committee, the minority expressed their views very strongly, the Committee over-ruled those views, and the Bill, I believe, passed without any amendment. If the minority do not like the Bill as it is, there is an end of it—I shall not move any further.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The minority do not know what the proposition is, and they do not know whether they like it or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the proper course is to pass the Bill through Committee, and to postpone the third reading until another day, when the different motions can be brought forward, and we can discuss them with a full knowledge of the case.

Mr. SHAW. I was misapprehended in what I said with reference to the amendments. My remarks only applied to the amendment of the first section. With regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. the First Minister, I am opposed to it. I think the Bill ought to be reported as it is.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It seems to me much better that we should not go on with the discussion now, but that it would be much fairer to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. McDougall), or that which I made at an early stage of the discussion, that the consideration of this matter in Committee should be deferred. I do not think any of the parties are in a position to discuss it now, in the face of the amendments made, and especially that of the hon. leader of the House. But if the House persists in going on, I think they should know what they are doing if they deliberately sanction this first clause. The first thing that startles me in connection with it is, that it undertakes to ratify and confirm everything that this Board has been doing since 1875. Now, are they aware that the Privy Council has declared that this Board has no legal right to administer that fund at all, and has been administering it illegally for the last six or seven years, and in such a way that the capital of the fund has materially diminished. Parliament has not before it the knowledge of what that Board has been doing all that time; and yet we are asked to ratify all its actions, although it has been declared to have been illegally elected. For my part, I am not prepared to do so; and I believe I would be failing in my duty as a member of Parliament, and to a large number of my constituents, who belong to that much despised minority, if I did not protest against this kind of legislation, when Parliament does not know what it is doing, and has not the necessary materials before it to form a judgment. We find that the fund, which originally amounted to \$462,000, has diminished to \$322,000. How has that diminution taken place? Is the House prepared to say that all the acts of this Board shall be whitewashed, or whether they have been guilty of the maladministration of that fund? For my part, I am not prepared to give a wholesale endorsement, at such short notice and without preliminary investigation, to all the acts of this illegally elected Board for the last seven years. Then the Bill goes on to provide for a defined appropriation of the fund, and there can be no question that it applies that fund in a manner totally different from that to which it was originally dedicated. That, of course, is the whole principle of the Bill. If it be said that this House is going to exercise its power to interfere with vested rights while they are in litigation before the Courts; if Parliament says it does not care whether these rights are in litigation before the proper tri-

bunals or not; if it says that it is paramount and will exercise its supreme power, well and good—because that is the principle upon which this whole clause rests. The fund undoubtedly was dedicated to a particular body, that body being the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. It is proposed by this Bill, after providing for the life annuities of those who were the original founders of the fund, to take away the capital of the fund and give the whole of it to another and different church, the United Church, a church composed not of the original Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, but a church of which that body forms about one-sixth only, the other five-sixths being composed of the Free Church, United Presbyterian and the Church in the Lower Provinces, which originally had not one iota of interest in the fund. It proposed to apply the whole funds to a Home Mission fund, to aid weak churches in the United Church, that is the Church of the Dominion of Canada: of the Lower Provinces, as well as Ontario and Quebec, a church composed of Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians, which, as I have said, constitute about five-sixths of the present United Church. If that is not confiscation—Parliament exercising its supreme power to take away one man's property and give it to another—I do not know what is. This legislation is of a dangerous character; if this principle were established, it would form a precedent likely to be fraught with such calamity and wrong in the future, if allowed to pass, that I feel I would fail in my duty if I did not protest against the clause passing in the form in which it is now drawn. While I do not think it is desirable, at this stage, to enter into the whole merits of the question, I shall avail myself of my right to do so at a subsequent period. The subject is a large one, it is one of the most important that ever came before Parliament, as affecting private rights or the rights of corporations or religious bodies, for the Presbyterian, Roman Catholic and other Churches have property endowments; and if Parliament begins by saying they will take the property of one church and give it to another church, it may, the following day, apply the same rule to the church to which some one of us may happen to belong. For these reasons I most earnestly protest against this clause passing in its present form, and I ask the House to pause before it passes such sweeping legislation without having a full opportunity of considering and discussing the matter. It is much to be regretted that the compromise suggested has not been arrived at. When the suggestion was made in the Private Bills Committee, the majority said they had no power to accept a compromise. They did not say that explicitly, but they implied that they, as the stronger number, would override the poor minority and take away all their property; that they would stand on their power and not discuss the question of right, and not give more than the pensions to those men to whom by right the fund belongs; that they would have no compromise, and they declined all overtures, on the plea of not being authorized to enter into such a discussion. On the other hand, the minority, represented by the moderator, stated their willingness to agree to any terms of a fair character that the Committee might think fit to prescribe; but the majority, strong in power, thought fit to say they would have no compromise, and they will not allow twenty-four hours or a week's delay to consider the matter. Although there are other Bills that have not yet been considered in Committee, they want to rush this Bill through the House without discussion; they want, in fact, to give no quarter to this small majority which is struggling before Parliament for their rights. Not only so, but the minority say that as regards our rights we have to appeal to the Courts to determine them, and determine whether the fund is ours or not; but the majority believe they are more likely to get a favorable decision from the majority of Parliament, inasmuch as they control a large

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

majority of Presbyterian votes, and through the strength of that majority they can influence members of the House who are dependent on the majority, and will at no distant day appear before their constituents; they have determined they will force this Bill and take possession of the fund, and give the minority a life interest in it as regards the poor old men who have become annuitants from it. There are seven surviving ministers of the minority, all old men who can live but a very few years. It is true they are to have the right to receive the annuities, but is that all to which they are entitled? Has the whole of the capital of the fund to be handed over to this United Church, five-sixths of which is composed of a foreign element, which has had no interest whatever in, or right to the fund. But no, say the majority, while we will give you annuities so long as the old men live, when they die the church to which you belong, to which you gave up your money, as the mover of the resolution has stated, \$8,000 or \$9,000 a piece, will no longer possess the capital of the fund which they created. The members of the old church gave their money to establish a fund, with the belief that its connection with the church would be perpetuated for all time; but this gormandizing majority now declared: "We will give you the annuities, but when you die we will take your money and confiscate it for the benefit of the United Church," is immoral legislation, which, if passed, will be a disgrace to Parliament, and I would feel I was recreant to my duty if I were not to protest, in the most energetic terms I can use, against this legislation, which will be a disgrace to this Parliament if enacted.

Mr. PLUMB. I believe this matter has been before a Committee of the House and the issue has been accepted by both sides. It is a rather novel proposition which has been submitted by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), that the House has not the power to legislate on matters referred to Parliament. This Bill has been before the Private Bills Committee for three weeks; it has been fully discussed there, and the result of that discussion is the Bill now before the House. I do not speak of the merits of the Bill, but I say no good purpose can be attained by sending it back with amendments to the Committee which has already discussed it fully, heard every argument which can be advanced and have sent down to the House, as the result of their deliberations, a Bill which they recommend to be passed. I was very sorry to hear that obstacles interfere from accepting amendments proposed by the hon. leader of the Government. They seem to be offered in a spirit of compromise from a majority to a minority. I do not think that the spirit in which he proposed them was reciprocated by the other side, and I believe the better course to be pursued by Parliament is, this matter having been under discussion in the Private Bills' Committee, to accept their conclusion, and at all events not to refer it back to them, but to discuss the matter, if there is anything to be discussed, in the full House. We all know that this Committee, which was held in the largest Committee room in the House, was always so crowded that members not appointed on it, could not obtain access to its deliberations, and the same result would follow renewed meetings of the Committee. Now is the time to settle this question if it is in order to do so. I seriously object to having the matter postponed. I regret that it has become necessary for two bodies who seem, so far as I can see, to differ only on some points of church government—a distinction without a difference—to come to this House in order to obtain a settlement of a difficulty which should have been settled between them. I do not think it is exactly proper for any hon. member of this House to say that the conclusion to which we may come solemnly by a vote of this House, will be an Act of spoliation, robbery and injustice. I repudiate any such idea, and am prepared, when the Bill comes to a vote, to vote upon it, and shall vote

upon it with a clear conscience in the fulfilment of my duty as a member of this Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Bill is asked for by the Presbyterian Church of Canada. They may not accept the Bill with the amendments which the House may make to it, but that will be for them to consider.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. We will do what we think is right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have got to do what is right, but they ask for incorporation, and framed a certain Bill. If they should not approve of it, as amended, on the third reading, it need not pass. The additions that I have suggested for the consideration of the Committee are those in favor of the minority. If the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw), who has charge of the Bill, does not like the additions, the Bill need not pass. I have simply to say that I speak in my individual capacity as a member of Parliament and a Presbyterian, and not as a leader of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. The proposition of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government may be such as may prove acceptable to the minority, but I do not understand what it is, and would like very much to have it explained. My own opinion is that these gentlemen who have come here to have the division of this fund settled ought to have been forced to make an arrangement between themselves, and I think very little pressure by the Committee would have forced them to do so. This fighting for the division of a fund is very unseemly. The proper plan would be to let those interested thoroughly consider the question and impress on them the feeling of the House that they should settle the difference among themselves, on such a basis of compromise as would be acceptable to all parties and the House. I move, therefore, that for the purpose of considering the amendment suggested by the right hon. leader of the Government, this Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 3,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If the majority of the House want to push the Bill through without giving any opportunity for discussion, I shall simply sit down. If not, I shall draw the attention of the House to the fact that, by the third clause, it is proposed to take the administration of the fund entirely out of the hands of the minority, many of whom were among the constituent members who created the fund. Is it right they should be left without a voice in its administration? Are these men who put their money into it to be shut out altogether, and have the administration of this fund handed over to a church with which they have no connection, and be obliged to take their pittance, as long as they live, from this strange church with which they have no alliance? This is only on a piece with the rest of the Bill, but it is well the House should know what it is about to do.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. As far as I can understand, the proposition of the hon. First Minister is, that this fund should be divided proportionately between those two churches. That commends itself to my mind. It is equitable and fair that this fund should be divided in proportion to the number at the time the severance took place, and the majority should accept that proposition. My sympathies are with the majority, but the minority are entitled to some consideration, and I cannot see any fairer way of doing justice to all parties than to divide this fund in proportion to the numbers at the time of separation.

Mr. SHAW. The object of the Bill is the benefit of the church. The church went into the Union, and having done so, the balance of the money should be the property of the United Church. The fund is not a personal one, nor

the property of private parties, but is a fund held for the purpose of promulgating a particular kind of doctrine, and in this respect there is no difference between the two churches. They are all the same, and that fund should be utilized for that purpose, and not given to private parties.

Mr. MACMILLAN. In consequence of the irregular manner in which this question has been discussed, it is very difficult to say where we are. But, before the motion is carried, I am desirous of saying a few words on the subject. It is well, indeed, before passing this measure, to understand what this Temporalities Fund is, and in what manner it was formed. In order to get at the facts and discuss them clearly, we must know the source of this fund. So far as I can learn, it was formed under an Imperial Act of Great Britain, passed in 31st George III, Chapter 31, which set apart certain lands in this country for the purpose of promoting the Protestant religion in Canada. Those lands were held for a considerable period in this country without returns being made on them, or at least with but very small returns. It was contended by the Church of England that those lands and funds arising therefrom belonged to it solely, but some time subsequently it was conceded by a certain portion of its members that those funds belonged to the established Churches of England and Scotland in the then Province of Canada. It was desirable that the lands should be disposed of; and in order to do so there was an Imperial Act passed authorizing their sale, which was known as the Clergy Reserves Act, passed in the 16th Victoria, Chapter 21, authorizing the Canada Government to dispose of them and to invest the funds for the benefit of those churches. Acting under that authority the Parliament of Canada passed an Act, 18th Victoria, Chapter 2, authorizing the sale of the clergy reserves and the investment of the proceeds in certain institutions for the purpose of making a return to the respective churches. The funds from Upper Canada were to be placed in the fund known as the Upper Canada Municipalities Fund, and those of Lower Canada were to be invested in the Lower Canada Municipalities Fund. At the time that Act was passed authority was given by a parliament to the effect that, in case those churches chose to compromise and get a certain amount of actual capital into their hands, they should have power to do so; in other words, they were entitled to commute. Acting under that law they did commute, and I will read the grounds on which, and the purpose for which, they did commute. It was decided that each clergyman of the Church of Scotland, of whom I believe there were seventy-two or seventy-three, was entitled to £150 per annum out of that fund, the amount of the capitalized portion for each reaching £2,200. Each had the right either to take that portion capitalized, if he chose to do so, or the annual allowance; and in fact one minister did put the capitalized amount into his pocket, the Rev. Mr. McLaughlin, and had all done so there would not have arisen the trouble we have to deal with to-day. Authority was given to commute this amount in each case: but the Government were not prepared, nor were they desirous of commuting upon any other terms than for the whole body; they were ready to allow them as a whole body to carry out such an arrangement. So this arrangement was carried out by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, that time. The following is the resolution passed for the purpose:—

“Resolved, 1st. That it is desirable that such commutation, if upon fair and liberal terms, should be effected; and that the Rev. Alex. Mathieson, D.D., of Montreal; the Rev. John Cook, D.D., of Quebec; Hugh Allan, Esq., of Montreal; John Thompson, Esq., of Quebec; and the Hon. Thomas McKay, of Ottawa City, be the Synod's Commissioners, with full power to give the formal sanction of the Synod to such commutations as they shall approve, the said Commissioners being thereby instructed to use their best exertions to obtain as liberal terms as possible; the Rev. Dr. Cook to be Convener; three to be a quorum; the decision of the majority to be final, and their formal acts valid; but

that such formal sanction of the Synod shall not be given except in the case of ministers who have also individually given them, the said Commissioners, power and authority to act for them in the matter, to grant acquittance to the Government for their claims to salary, to which the faith of the Crown is pledged, and to join all sums so obtained into one fund, which shall be held by them till the next meeting of the Synod, by which all future regulations shall be made, the following, however, to be a fundamental principle, which it shall not be competent for the Synod at any time to alter, unless with the consent of the ministers granting such power and authority; that the interest of the fund shall be devoted, in the first instance, to the payment of £112 10s. each: and that the next claim to be settled, if the fund shall admit, and as soon as it shall admit of it, to the £112 10s., be that of the ministers now on the Synod's Roll, and who have been put on the Synod's Roll since the 9th May, 1853; and, also, that it shall be considered a fundamental principle that all persons who have a claim to such benefits shall be ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, and that they shall cease to have any claim on or be entitled to any share of said Commutation Fund whenever they shall cease to be ministers in connection with the said church."

We have now got to the point of material importance. We have got the following from the Government, we have the money in the hand; and the course we have to pursue with reference to it is prescribed. We agreed on an arrangement with regard to that money which lasted till 1875; a Board known as the Temporalities Board, having been appointed in the meantime, for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of the commutants with reference to this fund. The Synod had no control over this fund in any way whatever, but only the Board, who had absolute control. At this time, 1874, it was contended that it would be desirable that the Presbyterian Churches in Canada should unite; and most of the ministers of the respective bodies, consisting of what was known as the Free Church, United Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, and a portion of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, decided to form a Union. But in forming that Union; they left a certain portion of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. It was contended strongly the other day by Principal Grant that the portion who separated from the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland and went into that Union had not lost identity in any way, but was absolutely the same church that had gone in. Now, it is a most singular circumstance, if that is the case. They either are the Presbyterian Church in Canada in conjunction with the others, or they are the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. Now, which are they? If they are the Presbyterian Church of Canada then they have lost their identity and are no longer the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. They themselves understood it at the time, and in fact the decision of the Courts since that time, refer to them as having gone out of the church. We see the same view taken in the Acts that were passed by the Ontario Legislature. In 38 Victoria, Chapter 75, an Act respecting the union of certain Presbyterian Churches, those churches are spoken of there as the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, as having united to form the Presbyterian Church in Canada. It is acknowledged that a certain portion remained out and did not go into the Union. Now, what is the name of that body, if they are not the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland? I call attention of the members of this House to the section of that Act which read as follows:—

"Provided always that if any congregation in connection or communion with any of the said churches, shall, at a meeting of the said congregation regularly called according to the constitution of the said congregation, or the practice of the church with which it is connected, and held within six months after the said Union takes place, decide by a majority of the votes of others who, by the constitution of the said congregation, or the practice of the said church with which it is connected, are entitled to vote at such a meeting, determine not to enter into the said union."

MR. MACMILLAN.

It is there stated explicitly that the minority remained out of the Union. If they remained out, no matter whether they numbered five, fifty, or one hundred, what is their name if it is not the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland? I would like to know what body they are. They still exist in a separate body with their moderator, their separate church government, and all the forms of their church carried on as effectually as before the Union. If the body that has gone into the Union is the Presbyterian Church of Canada, what is the body that remains out? Of necessity it must be the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. Now, this body had a perfect right, without the assistance of Parliament, to form this new body, but the difficulty is that they had no right to take the church property with them without the assistance of an Act of Parliament, and this is the Act of Parliament which proposed to take the funds into the United Church. Of course these acts were appealed against, and the Privy Council declared them illegal, it being held that this Board that was appointed at the time of the Union was illegal, that they had no right to deal with the funds of this Church, and that therefore every act performed by them was illegal. Now, Sir, what are we called upon to do by the Bill of my hon. friend from South Bruce. We are called upon to ratify all the illegal acts of that Board up to the present time. We are asked to make legal what the Court declared to be illegal. The judgment of the Court condemned the defendants who were in charge of the Temporalities Fund to the personal payment of the costs of that suit, because of the illegality of all their proceedings; but in this Bill we are actually asked to make legal what the Court positively refused, and absolutely ordered should not be done. It is true that the promoters of the Bill turn round now, and promise to strike that out; but, as a matter of fact, if they get this Bill they will turn round and make arrangement to pay these very costs that we have had struck out of this Bill. The whole matter is now thrown back to the position in which it was in 1875, except that this Board has depleted this fund from the sum of \$597,000, as it was handed over to them by the commutants, to the sum of \$332,000, a loss of two-fifths of the total amount. But we do not charge them with the blame of all this loss. We are desirous of taking as kindly a manner towards them as we possibly can. We are desirous of getting a certain portion of this fund, a portion to which we think we are entitled. In the first place, I may say that I have no doubt in the world that if the Courts were allowed to decide this matter the minority would recover every dollar of this fund and the properties throughout the country as well, but that is not our object. Our object is to deal as christianlike as we possibly can, if I may use the word.

MR. WRIGHT. That is a good word.

MR. MACMILLAN. In 1875, of these commutants who had a right to pocket their respective portions of the fund, there were thirty-three living. Their annuities had been regularly paid them out of this fund. The hon. member for Glengarry now asks to have this fund divided in perpetuity in accordance with the numbers as they then existed, ascertaining what that fund was at the time, and dividing it according to their numbers. At the time of the Union somewhere about twenty-five commutants went into the union, and eight remained out of it. My proposition in the Committee the other day was that as twenty had gone into the Union and seven remained out of it, of those who were now living, therefore, the United Church should take $\frac{3}{7}$ of this fund, leaving $\frac{4}{7}$ to be divided among the members of the minority, and that we should give these latter an act of incorporation authorizing them to control their own affairs. We thought this proposition would be a fair settlement of the difficulty and prevent any more unseemingly quarrelling between the two churches. I may say, Sir, that the Committee voted that down at the

time, and I think after all, that is the only fair way of deciding this matter. I do not hold it out as a threat, but I do say that if justice is not done to us by handing over to us the absolute control of our share of that fund, I believe that when the matter is again brought before the Privy Council—as the House may rest assured it will be—we will have the same result as before, namely, that the minority, weak as it is, will still be recognized as the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and entitled to the whole of that fund. That, I believe, will be the result if the House and the Board interested do not take the course which we advise.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman in addressing the House has not been able to rid himself of a certain spice of that personal feeling which seems to animate those who oppose this Bill, both in this House and before the Private Bills Committee. This is a question which we should discuss entirely without any ecclesiastical feeling, without any more feeling than we would exhibit in discussing the amalgamation of two loan companies, two banks, or two railways; what we have to deal with is not the ecclesiastical aspect of the case, but simply the money question, just as if these bodies were two lay corporations that were seeking to amalgamate instead of two church corporations. I think we who are outside both the churches concerned, and therefore able perhaps, to look at the matter more dispassionately than those within either of them, should not hesitate to state our impressions of the whole matter, and for that reason only am I inclined to lengthen the discussion. My hon. friend who has just sat down informed us about the origin of this fund. He says that when it was organized the clergymen entitled to it had a right either to the capital amount or an annuity, but that all of them chose to take the annuity and give up the capital. It was further agreed, he says, that the reversion of the principal should belong to the church and be applied to general church purposes, and every minister who seceded from that church should lose all claim to either the principal or the interest of the fund. That is the case as the hon. gentleman states it. If we took that as the basis for dealing with the Union which subsequently took place for the ministers who are now outside the pale of the Union, I think we should arrive at very different conclusions from those at which the hon. gentleman has arrived. The Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland if not a legally incorporated body was certainly acting on a fixed constitution and with fixed constitutional principles. They had certain rules which they must follow in taking any action as a church. It appears that in the year of the Union that church acting according to all the established usages thereof, after consulting all the parties who had a right to be consulted decided to enter as a church into a union with three other churches. Now, if—as a gentleman who appeared before the Committee very clearly put the case—a church has a right to unite with another church in any circumstance, it has a right to do so when it has followed all its rules and complied with the constitution under which it acts. This church evidently followed all those rules; it followed the principles of its constitution and acted as strictly in accordance with the representative nature of its institutions as it possibly could; and the Church, by an enormous majority, decided to enter into the Union with the other churches. After doing so, those who, as individuals or congregations, did not wish to remain connected with the new church were allowed to dissent—were allowed, as it was called, to vote themselves out of the United Church, of which their Church had formed part. They therefore, according to the common sense view of the case, and the legal view of the case—

Mr. MACMILLAN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to correct him? The exact words of the Act are:

“Determined not to enter into such Union,” instead of to go out of such Union.

Mr. CASEY. It appears, at all events, that, after the Church had entered the Union, certain ministers and congregations were allowed to say that they would not follow the other ministers and congregations into the Union—became, in fact, dissenting ministers and congregations, and, therefore, lost all claim to any share in the fund, either interest or principal. But the Church which entered into Union with the other churches was not inclined to take a technical view of the case, and it was arranged that those dissenting ministers and congregations, though technically forfeiting all claims to the fund, continued to be annuitants, and to be represented on the Board which managed the fund. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) said they objected to receiving annuities from a strange church, but he neglected to tell us that the dissentients were represented on the Board which administered the fund, and that, far from objecting to avail themselves of the fund, they have been for years receiving their share without objection. My hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) goes on to put a conundrum, and he says, if the secession has taken place, what are those people who dissent from the Union, if not the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland? That is a conundrum which I do not propose to answer, simply because I cannot. I do not think that dissenting body have a legal or technical or ecclesiastical right to any definite name as yet. Of course, it is quite proper for them to assume any name allowed to them by courtesy, as a voluntary association, or to ask this House to give to them any name which the House should properly give to them, describing who and what they are. They certainly have not the right to the name of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, seeing that that body has merged its individuality into a federation with other churches, and that no seceders, be they few or many, can claim to be the original church. The argument has frequently been used that those who went out of the Union went back to where they were before, into the former old kirk, and that they were then the old kirk again. I think no contention could be weaker than that. The old kirk was organized under a certain constitution; whatever the majority did was the act of the church, and if that church choose to unite with any other it disappeared as a separate organization for the time being. My hon. friend tells us that we are asked to make legal by this Act what the Courts have declared to be illegal. In a technical sense he speaks correctly, for the Privy Council has declared that the acts of the Temporalities Board were illegal in that they were unauthorized, but they were not illegal in the sense of being contrary to law. What we are asked to legalize are the Acts of the Temporalities Board, performed under legislation which they were advised to be legal, and granted by an authority which they believed to be competent. We are simply asked to authorize Acts which were unauthorized hitherto, and it is very unfair to say that we are asked to authorize what is illegal. At the close of his speech, my hon. friend dropped an observation or two, which if he conscientiously believed them, would render the whole of this discussion unnecessary. He says he believes that the body of the Ministers and laymen whom he represents have already a legal right to the whole property of the Church which entered the Union, and that they can recover it by going to law. If that is the case, I do not see why they should oppose this Bill. It is rather puerile to tell us, as he tells us afterwards, that they oppose this Bill because they do not want to be hard on the majority, but to give them a fair share of the spoil. I think if these dissentients were perfectly certain that they would obtain more than they asked by the proposed compromise without getting it, they would not take the trouble to get it. But speaking of a

compromise, this Bill as it stands, the basis of the Union effected between these churches was strictly of the nature of a compromise; and I think it would be very unfair for us to upset that compromise, which was obtained only after years of patient care and deliberate bargaining. I think, if we accept a compromise, assuming certain legal rights which these gentlemen say belong to them, we shall be interfering with the subsequent action which they declare they intend to take before the Courts. On the whole, I think there is no reason for thinking any injustice has been done to these gentlemen who have chosen to remain out of the Union which their Church as a church entered, but that the provisions of this Bill are extremely liberal, that they have no reason to complain that they are not getting either sentimental or substantial justice, and that the House should not consent to break down the Bill as it stands.

Bill reported.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was considered in Committee and reported:—

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Montreal and Central Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Fulton.)

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Western Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 134) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. VANASSE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to open a Post Office savings bank at La Baie or at St. Thomas de Pierreville, in the County of Yamaska, in view of the extensive trade carried on in those wealthy localities.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The application was made in August last for a post office savings bank at La Baie. Mr. Bourgeois, Post Office Inspector, was asked to report and has not yet done so. He has been written to to-day to ascertain the reason why he delayed making a report. There has been no application for a post office savings bank at St. Thomas.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ROUTE THROUGH ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether it is intended to propose to Parliament any legislation as to the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the Rocky Mountains or elsewhere.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to submit a Bill dealing with this matter at an early date.

DISALLOWANCE OF RAILWAY CHARTERS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether the Government has taken any, and if so, what action on the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the disallowance of two certain Manitoba railway charters, in addition to the South Eastern charter?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government has as yet taken no action.

Mr. CASBY.

LAND REGULATIONS.

Mr. ROYAL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause to be translated and printed, in French, for the use of the public, the regulations respecting the sale of lands in Manitoba and the North-West, together with the maps and plans of lands for sale?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention of the Government to issue the regulations in French, but the maps and plans do not require translation.

DREDGING GRAND LAKE FLATS.

Mr. KING enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the dredging of channel on Grand Lake Flats, N.B., and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have enquired in the Department about this place, but the locality is not known there. Perhaps it has another name but by the name given it is not known in the Department.

BREAKWATER ON THE RIVIÈRE BLANCHE.

Mr. Fiset enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, this year, to join to the mainland by means of a wharf, the breakwater on the Rivière Blanche?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The works begun two or three years ago require to be continued at some future time, but the Government is not in a position to do so this year.

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

After Recess.

COAL LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That the future of the vast Territories of the North-West is largely dependent on the supply of fuel at a moderate rate.

That the present information as to the country and the coal areas is not sufficient to warrant Parliament in creating long enduring interests in large quantities of the coal areas.

That the regulations as to coal lands laid on the Table make no provision for the application as a general rule, of the just principle of public competition to the acquisition of those valuable lands, and thus leave open the door to disadvantageous cessions of the public domain for the benefit of individuals.

That the said regulations make no adequate provision to check the consolidation of large blocks of the coal lands in few hands, and the consequent restriction of competition and enhancement of the price of coal.

That the said regulations make no provision to secure any working of the coal mine by the lessee.

That the said regulations provide, by the arrangement for twenty-one year leases, renewable, for the creation of interests of longer duration than prudence at this time would, as a general rule lay down.

That they, make no proper provision for the settlement of the terms of renewal.

That the said regulations do not become operative, if disapproved of by this House; and the House is responsible for their coming into operation.

That the House disapproves of the said regulations.

He said: As I said when I gave notice of this motion some time ago, upon which occasion discussion was deferred, in order that we should receive the printed information since laid on the Table, it is impossible almost to overstate the importance of this question. There can be no doubt whatever that the fuel supply of the North-West, whether we consider the question in the light of the acquirements of the country, as affecting one of the necessities of life, or in connection with those classes of manufactures which may be expected very early to arise there, including the smiths, &c., the supply of fuel in that country which does not, among its many advantages, possess a very mild winter, is of the last consequence. It is true that the latest reports before us

give a more favorable account as to the distribution of wood fuel than we formally possessed. There is some reference to that subject in the report of the Minister of the Interior to which I shall refer presently; but there can be no question whatever, I think, judging from that report—looking at the geological survey and the whole mass of documentary information we have with reference to the territory—that the supply of wood fuel is scanty—that for a great portion of the territories it is inadequate, and that it is of very great consequence that such timber that exists and as can be made available for that purposes, should be not used for fuel unnecessarily. But I need not dilate on this subject, because it has been thought to be of such present importance as to merit especial attention of the Administration; and they themselves have indicated in the strongest possible manner the inadequacy of the supply of fuel, and the importance of making special provision to meet the difficulty. For, among the items which were passed in Committee of Ways and Means the other evening, was one which renders free wood when imported into the North-West for the purpose of fuel; and, therefore, there is an express declaration on the part of the Administration that an importation of wood for fuel is possible, is necessary, and that it is important that the cost of that fuel should not be increased in Manitoba. We do not observe that it is at all likely that the same laws of political economy, which, it appears, makes coal cheaper by reason of the duty imposed upon it, are to be applied to the North-West with reference to wood. It is considered that the imposition of a duty there, on wood, does enhance the cost of the article; and the new method of procuring a cheap supply of fuel to the other Provinces of the Dominion, which is adopted by the Administration, is not to be applied to that particular locality. I think that the farmers of the North-West have some reason to be aggrieved, and to complain of hon. gentlemen opposite, because, having demonstrated as they did the other day, that they made the fuel of Ontario so much cheaper by the imposition of a duty on it, they are actually now about to raise the price of wood in the North-West, by repealing that duty, the existence of which would be productive of such beneficial results. But the scarcity of this supply, as I have observed, is indicated by the reports, more favorable though of late they be. The report of the hon. the Minister of the Interior in the following language, and also to the topic, to which I more particularly desire to call the attention of the House, states:

"The supply of fuel for the use of settlers in the North-West Territories is a question having a very important bearing upon the development of that country. The surveys and explorations conducted by the Dominion Lands Branch of the Department during the past few years have, to a great extent, dispelled the erroneous impression so long prevalent, that there is a serious scarcity of fuel material in or convenient to the prairie regions, and has established the fact that, with the exception of what is known as the Missouri Plateau, lying west of the Moose Mountains and Touchwood Hills, and south of the 52nd parallel of latitude, in which there are large tracts of treeless prairie, with but narrow belts of wood along the valleys of the rivers and streams, the timber is sufficient for the needs of settlers for years to come. It is now also proved, by the geological explorations of last season and of 1880, conducted principally in the district where timber is really scarce, that within a vast area lignite coal of fair quality exists in abundance. The most easterly discovered out-crop of this coal is at the Roche Per ée, on the Souris River, and the deposit is believed to underlie the whole of the plain to the westward, in beds from three to fifteen feet thick, extending to the very foot of the Rocky Mountains and cropping out on the flanks of the Cypress Hills, on the Bow, Belly and Red Deer Rivers, and in the valley of the South Saskatchewan. These facts satisfactorily dispose of the question of the obtaining of the fuel supply required for the future occupants of the territory."

And so again in the Geological Survey, first appendix, there are several passages which have a bearing on the question, and which I will submit. I quote from the report of Geo. W. Dawson, as follows:—

"In the eastern portion of the North-West Territory, including Manitoba and carboniferous system is not found at all, but the cretaceous rocks already alluded to overlap the limestones of the older Silurian and Devonian periods. The true coal formation can, therefore, in this region only be supposed to exist below a great thickness of cretaceous

rocks, and even if accessible the probability of coal of any value being found in it is—from analogy with the portion of the western States already mentioned—exceedingly small.

Neither do the cretaceous rocks (including under that name the beds to the top of Division No. 5 of Meek & Stayder's section), of the eastern portion of the plains' yield so far as known, any fuel of economic value, in their great stretch from the borders of Mexico to the northern part of the North-West Territory."

He also points out that:

"Overlying the cretaceous proper are the representatives of the Fort Union beds of the United States Geologists, and in these the extensive and numerous beds of lignite of the Souris River Region occur, and constitute the nearest available supply of mineral fuel, so far as known, for the Province of Manitoba."

Referring to one of the statements that were made as to the particular deposits, I find the following statements on page 21 of the report:—

"South of the last section, and about one mile nearly due north of the position of the wooden depot, is situated an exposure showing the most valuable lignite bed I have seen in the Souris Valley."

And he shows that it is then visible at the edge of the river, and for 200 feet alongside of the bank. So again, at the 29th page, he says:

"The most interesting and important section, however, in this region is that which occurs in a valley joining that of Porcupine Creek from the west, exhibiting a bed of lignite, 18 feet in thickness, and yielding also some of the most perfect and interesting remains of plants."

On page 41 he says:

"From the Souris River region to this point, near the 108th meridian, the lignite tertiary beds exist as a conformable deposit overlying the cretaceous, properly so-called. They are generally nearly horizontal, and, when they are cut away, the lowest beds exposed are these of the Pierre group of cretaceous, No. 4. A portion of the northern extension of the same lignite-bearing formation is described by Dr. Bell, in the Report of Progress for 1873-74, page 65, and analyses of lignite given. West of this point lignite coals are now known to occur on several horizons in the cretaceous series, a circumstance not ascertained at the time of publication of my report on the geology and resources of the region in the vicinity of the 49th parallel. The structure of this western region will form the subject of a forthcoming report."

And again, describing the quality of lignites, he says:

"The lignites, it will be observed, are, on the whole, uniform in composition and contain an average amount of over 40 per cent. fixed carbon, when the water content is estimated at 12 per cent. They are thus inferior to the lignite coals in the vicinity of the Rocky Mountains. The lignites here described, however, gain some advantage in a practical point of view from occurring in a horizontal position, and out-cropping in the sides of the valleys in such a way that they might be worked by simple adits, avoiding the expense and trouble necessary when vertical sinking has to be resorted to in the first instance."

And then he gives a very interesting account, pointing out that they do not appear suited for smelting purposes, and the smiths who tried them reported it difficult to obtain a smelting heat. He goes on to say:

"The same fault has been found, I believe, with even the best classes of similar fuels found in the vicinity of the Union Pacific Railway, and arises, no doubt, from the great proportion of volatile combustible matter to fixed carbon, and the quantity of hygroscopic and combined water. As the lignites do not coke, they would appear to be unsuited for the smelting of iron in the blast furnace. They are perfectly suited for puddling iron, and the metallurgical treatment of various ores, if burned in gas furnaces. Similar even inferior lignites are extensively used for steam purposes in various parts of the world, and may even be employed on railways, though locomotives intended to burn these fuels, in order to give satisfactory results, must have, compared to those worked on bituminous coal, larger grates and fire boxes, and longer boiler-tubes, giving a greater heating surface compared with the horse power. The value of the lignites of this region lies rather in the abundant supply, the offer of fuel of fair quality for local use in a country which, though adapted for stock-raising and agriculture, is practically without wood."

The statement of the hon. gentleman, therefore, being that that is the practical condition of that section of the country, at any rate. Now, the statements to which I have referred, show that lignite coal of fair commercial value, possessing very considerable value for fuel purposes, suitable also for many other economical purposes, exists in various regions. The report of the hon. Minister says, that it is believed it extends under the cretaceous rocks over a vast area, but our information as to that statement is as yet

extremely imperfect. Further information, it is said, in the Geological Report, will be given in the forthcoming report, and we have at present only the scanty reference I have given to the House, and some others, which occur in preceding reports and which do not add seriously to the extent of our knowledge. It is clear also that there are considerable economic advantages connected with particular veins and out-crops of this coal. Dr. Dawson points out the horizontal stratification and the circumstance that the deposit is frequently at the edge of a river, so that there is every convenience, supposing the river to be navigable, to transport the coal without handling almost direct from the mine into the water conveyance. This is a circumstance of the last importance with reference to the value of these fuels; and it is of the last importance with reference to the relative value of different beds of these fuels, because experience has demonstrated that the main expenditure in connection with coal is that of transport, and that where you get coal easily mined and easily placed on board cars or a vessel, you will get a cheap coal. There is some interesting learning upon this subject to be found in the bulletins of the last Census statistics of the United States. With reference to the bituminous coal supply of that country, which is known to be very extensive, the average price at the mines in 1880 was only \$1.22 per ton; and the elements composing that price consisted of an average cost of labor of 76 cents, of materials for getting out the coal of 12 cents, and the royalty, in case the lands were leased, or the profit, or royalty and profit combined, the return to the owner of the land whether he were the miner or not, and the mining together, was 34 cents on the average, being the interest on the value of the land and the profit on the adventure, making an aggregate of \$1.22. For the two great States from which we draw our coal supply as a rule, and with whose operations we are most familiar. In Ohio and Pennsylvania, the result were these: the average price of Ohio coal at the mine was \$1.29 per ton, composed of, labor 86 cents, material 16 cents, profit 27 cents, labor and material in the case of Ohio coal costing \$1.02. In Pennsylvania the average cost of the coal was only \$1.01 at the mine, labor being 60 cents, material 10 cents, thus making 70 cents for labor and material, and profit 31 cents. The reason of these differences, of course, is that the coal is more easily got in the Pennsylvania mines, that the miner is not paid lower wages—on the contrary, he is paid rather higher wages—but he is able to take out more coal in a day, and the cost of material is less. The result is that they pay for labor and material 70 cents a ton as against \$1.02 in Ohio, and that they are able to sell their coal for \$1.10, at a larger profit than the Pennsylvania people who sell their coal at \$1.29. The proposition which I stated is extremely clear, that the cost of getting out coal is the main consideration of cost at the mine. The value of the coal mine is dependent partly on those considerations, and partly also on the convenience of the mine to the machinery for transporting the coal to the place where it is to be used. Now, there are other statistics which have some bearing upon the question which I have to submit to the House with reference to the bituminous coal mines of the United States. There are reported in the Census returns no less than 2,843 establishments for getting bituminous coal in that country, and the area of and what they own is 416,642 acres, or an average of 139 acres to each separate establishment; of which 139 acres, seventy on an average are as yet wholly unworked, the rest are in process of being worked. In the great State of Ohio there are 618 separate establishments, which own 58,029 acres, or less than seventy-five acres to each separate establishment, of which fifty-five are unworked, and the rest in process of working. The value of real estate, not the plant but the value of the coal lands, is \$62,354,000, or \$151 per acre; and the value of the Pennsyl-

Mr. BLAKE.

vania lands is about \$230 per acre; while the anthracite coal lands of the United States, irrespective of plant, are valued at \$622 per acre. These figures indicate several points which are of value in considering the laying down of a policy for the acquisition of private interests in and for the working of the coal lands of the North-West. I am not, myself, an advocate for taxing the people for their fuel, unless, indeed, it be proved to my satisfaction, as it has not yet been proved, that it is a process by which they may get their coal cheaper; but I am desirous that they shall get it cheap. I believe that some day or other the people of the North-West will control their own lands, will administer their own lands, and, in that point of view, I do not myself object to our making some provision whereby there should be some rental, some royalty, some increment, from such coal mines if we permit them to get into private hands, particularly as there is no practical guarantee that the omission to charge a royalty would induce the supplying of coal to the inhabitants any cheaper. My desire is that we may, so far as we can keep the coal areas free; that we should not, beyond what the public interests and the present state of the development of the North-West indicate as essential, lock up, or permit to be locked up, create or permit to be created, large and long enduring interests in what may be extremely valuable areas of coal lands. The question of royalties I do not attach very great significance to as a source of revenue. The example of the Province of Nova Scotia is perhaps not wholly encouraging. No doubt some of the areas there are extremely valuable, but I learn that the facts which were illustrated during the late Session of the Nova Scotia Legislature would appear to indicate that the source of revenue to which an hon. gentleman alluded so glowingly the other evening has not been so extremely productive of late years. The information I have received is that the accrued royalties—the accumulated arrears for a period of thirty or forty years up to 1878—were about \$45,500 at the end of 1878. On the 31st of December last there was due for royalties \$104,000 by the mine owners of Nova Scotia, making an increase for 1879, 1880, and 1881 of nearly \$60,000 beyond the balance due at the period preceding that epoch. The statement made by the Commissioner of Mines, when he brought down this paper, was that he had pressed upon the mine owners—had threatened to avail himself of the powers with which he was clothed in respect to collecting this tax or royalty; but he had been told that the trade was so dull, that they were unable to pay the royalty, and if they were compelled to pay it at that time they must shut up their mines: so they were given time. This I state to the hon. the Minister of Railways, who will no doubt be glad to hear it, because it is in a sense a corroboration of his view that he has succeeded in making coal cheaper. They say that the prices they received for the product were so low that they could not afford to pay a royalty of 10 cents a ton to the Nova Scotia Government. Now, while the areas may be vast, as the hon. gentleman says in this country they are, it is quite clear that there may be infinitely greater value in some portions of the areas than in others, that the variability of the thickness of a particular vein, that the facility of access to it, the facility of loading the product, may make one mine of infinitely greater value than the average of mines or the bulk of mines. This is illustrated by the result in other countries. We all know that some mines are immensely valuable; that others, although they may possess a very good quality of coal at no great distance from the earth, are yet unworked. Take for example the case of the Spring Hill mine, where some licenses to work mines had actually lapsed. They were opened and taken up by parties and they were immediately, upon being taken up, valued at not less than \$250,000 or £50,000 sterling, and a very handsome sum was realized by those concerned in that

fortunate speculation. Now, in this view, having regard to the variability of value, having regard to the circumstances that some mines should be much more valuable than others, it is of extreme importance that we should see that those mines which are of very great value do not go for a song, and that the profit which is capable of being derived by the superior advantages—natural advantages—which are attributed to particular mines, do not go into the pockets of a fortunate applicant altogether, but that the public should to some extent, either by getting cheap coal when coal can be got out, or in receiving a royalty or rental or remuneration for the privilege—in one shape or another share the advantage. And for that purpose it seems to me important that in some shape or other the principle of competition should, so far as it may be possible to apply it, be applied in this and in all other dealings with our public lands. It is the only safeguard against impropriety. I do not say, Sir, that it is always applicable, I do not say that it may be applicable in all stages of dealings with particular classes of the landed interests of the country, but I do say that it is a principle which we ought to adopt as our fundamental principle, and that we should ascertain in each particular instance in which it is proposed to depart from it, a very over-ruling necessity for departing from it before we agree that it should be departed from. There are, indeed, so-called competitions, so-called advantages to the public which are illusory; but what I mean is a real competition, a real opportunity for the public at large to participate in the benefits to be derived from obtaining those locations. I say that there are illusory as well as genuine competitions, and I will refer once again for example to the same mine to which I referred a while ago. In that case an order was made by the Governor cancelling the licenses already existing over these particular areas, and a gentleman in Halifax named, I think, Mr. Black, stepped into the office of the Commissioner of Mines one morning about ten o'clock, just when the office was opened and said to the Commissioner that he wanted to be located for a certain mine. "No," said the Commissioner, "you cannot; it is not in the market." "Yes it is," said the other, "the licenses have been cancelled." "I have not heard anything about it," replied the Commissioner. "Well, here's the *Gazette*," said Mr. Black; and he produced a copy of the *Royal Gazette* which had been published or, at all events, printed as on the day before, and was published first for the Commissioner by the new applicant, Mr. Black, and Mr. Black, as one of the public, took the advantage of the public announcement of the licenses and dealing in fair competition ostensibly with the public became the licensee or the locatee of the valuable Spring Hill areas. That is an instance of a wholly illusory competition, the result being that the whole of the public were not put upon a fair footing. Take another instance, brought to my attention the other day. A friend of mine in the House received a letter dated at Winnipeg on the 15th March. The writer says:

"I have returned from a sale of Government land, which was to take place to-day, at which a little game was perpetrated, which it is well for you to know. At the time of the sale a very large crowd assembled, so many that one could scarcely find standing room. The bidding was very lively until it was announced that, by instructions from Ottawa, the actual cash or certified cheques would have to be paid for all purchases. A favored few, who had been posted, could then purchase, being provided with the cash. This reduced the bidding to about ten men out of the whole crowd. It being after banking hours, nearly every man was excluded but those who were posted."

There, again, you have another mode by which it is possible to arrange, transactions, apparently equal to all, but which are in point of fact unequal. An announcement is made for a sale the time being fixed after banking hours, the conditions such that access is required to the banks, and except to those who were favored with private information which was not supplied to the public,

or to those who carried their whole worldly wealth in their waistcoat pockets the competition was not a fair one. It is not that kind of competition which I wish to see applied—not that class of public freedom or fair play or equal standing—but a general principle of competition by which all interested may stand on the same footing. The valuable seams should be advertised, and auction or tender resorted to. There are other objections which it seems to me these regulations are open to. They make no adequate provision to check the consolidation of large blocks of coal lands in few hands, and the consequent restriction of competition and the enhancement of the price of coal. The regulation provides that no more than 320 acres shall be leased to one person. In the first place 320 acres may be a very large area. I have given you the average areas in the whole bituminous coal territory of the United States; I have given you the average area of coal in the State of Ohio; I have shown you that the block you propose to give to one person is more than twice as much as those to be found in the United States. But that is not all or the chief part of the difficulty. The chief part of the difficulty is that there is no practical preventive here for the consolidation of much larger areas. It is not provided that the lessee of coal lands shall not be at liberty to assign or sublease; it is not provided that he shall not be at liberty to assign to any other lessee of coal lands. Once a lease is made of one block to one person, and of another block to another person, there is nothing to prevent the two combining or the one buying out the other, and so one person becoming the lessee and proprietor, or two or three persons combining and becoming the lessees and proprietors of very large areas of coal lands. Now, the Minister himself has recognized the importance of a limitation of the area, else why provide that no more than 320 acres shall be leased to one person? But he has recognized it by a provision which I have shown is ineffectual to carry out the object of the restriction, because he has not provided, as it is essential to do if we desire to keep the coal lands in several hands, that an acquisition of interest by one lessee from another, shall be a cause of the forfeiture of the lease. That is essential if you want a genuine restriction. If you want a sham restriction, I admit that this regulation furnishes you with a very good one. Now, we have already before us the danger to which we are exposed in this regard. Amongst the papers laid on the Table is an application made in March, 1880, on behalf, I believe, of the Souris Coal and Fuel Company of Winnipeg, for the purchase under the regulations then existing of no less than 7,520 acres of valuable coal lands on the Souris river. They observed that it was important, perhaps, to have the application in different names, and they proposed the names of a number of gentlemen, one for one section, another for another section, and so on. We see that it was very easy to obtain applications in the names of different persons, with the object of concentrating in one ownership a very large area of lands. Under the law, but one of these sections could be granted to that company, a section in respect of which it appeared some claim existed on the part of some person who had applied and done some work on the coal area under the old law, and they were referred, as to the rest of their application, to the new regulations. But you see there the design, and the desire, if it be practicable, to obtain large areas of coal lands in few hands, and you see that if there be no effective restriction on the consolidation of large areas, it will be done. Nothing will be easier for Mr. Smith, Mr. Jones, or Mr. Robinson, each to apply for different areas, and after that to assign the different interests to one person on whose behalf they apply or to whom they may *bona fide* sell. There is another case disclosed in these papers which is worthy of attention. It is, indeed, a case of a very different character. I agree that the infor-

mation received, and the proposals made on behalf of Mr. Lethbridge, are such as justified the Minister in giving very favorable consideration to his plans; but I want to call attention more to the general principle rather than to the particular application to what appears to me to be a proposed departure from his plans. The surveyors' description and the map are not before me, so that I have not been able accurately to ascertain how Mr. Lethbridge applies for four different areas, comprising altogether 320 acres of coal lands, and 320 acres of farming lands as appurtenant to each area of coal lands. I put aside the application, which is not relevant to the present question. What is relevant is this: that it seems to be a mistake to put into one man's hands different areas in different places, though each happens to be less than 320 acres, but making 320 acres altogether. I do no injustice to the applicant in saying that he asks for these four areas because he thinks them most valuable, and that they are most convenient to the river along which he proposes to mine and on which he proposes to transport the coal. It may be, therefore, that there are four different outcrops at convenient points on the Saskatchewan, and that these points are really different mines, which are being absorbed by one person, because the whole four points comprise no more than 320 acres. This is, in point of fact, the leasing of four separate coal areas, and may be the creation of a practical monopoly of the coal supply there. I say practical monopoly, because if the conveniences of mining and of transporting are infinitely superior at these four points to what they are at the other coal areas in the neighborhood, it is quite clear that the owner of these four areas has a practical monopoly. Now, it is said that there are coal rings in the United States which control the price, and regulate it very effectually the whole year round. If that be the case, with many thousands of areas scattered over many States, and with such enormous interests as are involved in the simple statement that the coal lands alone, without the plant, are valued at \$64,000,000, how much easier it will be, in the early stages of the development of the coal areas of the North-West, to establish rings and monopolies there, and how doubly important it becomes that we should avoid as far as we can making facilities for the creation of such monopolies, and as far as possible take care that the valuable and convenient areas, the areas that furnish the greatest facilities at this time by water communication, and in the next eighteen months or two years by rail communication, for the supply of fuel, should be in separate hands, so that we shall have the benefit of the least restricted competition that is possible. I object again in my proposed resolution to these regulations, because they deal with the subject at a time when we are not sufficiently informed to be able to judge how it ought to be dealt with. I do not say that we ought to permit the coal mines to remain undeveloped because we do not know enough about them—far from it; but I do say that we ought not to adopt general regulations under which enormous areas of lands become open to lease, but that we ought to confine ourselves at the time to the opening of such mines as are required for the present and the immediately prospective needs of the North-West, until we learn more of these coal areas. Our geological force, in my opinion, ought to put forth the most active efforts in the North-West. I have for years believed that to be a prime duty; and I recollect a few years ago the hon. member for North Norfolk making a motion in reference to the surveys of that territory, with the view of obtaining reliable information as to the extent of our territories arable or otherwise. I believe further explorations in that direction will be of great consequence, and so far as economic mines and minerals are concerned we can afford to make extra efforts and explorations in order to ascertain what is the actual condition of the fuel supply of the North-West. Our present information imperfect and largely conjectural, and so far as

Mr. BLAKE.

information as to the economic value of the situations and the availability of the different mines goes, it is almost wholly useless. I object under these circumstances to the creation of such large enduring interests in the coal mines of the North-West. The plan proposed is one for a lease of twenty-one years, renewable—renewable not once but renewable indefinitely; and therefore it is safe with respect to conditions, a perpetual interest; if possible every twenty-one years to have fresh conditions. But those conditions are to be made by agreement between the parties, and no provision that I can see is suggested for what is to be done in case of disagreement, but the real owner is to continue to be the lessee; in effect he has a perpetual interest subject to the possibility of a change in the conditions of the lease every twenty-one years. I object further that there is no adequate provision for working the mines continuously. The clause of the regulations provides that leases may be worked in case actual operations have not been commenced within one year and the mine had not been worked within two years, but there is no provision for the continuous working of the mine thereafter. Now, the Nova Scotia Statute provides in a very different form in that regard. The Act says:

"When it shall be represented to, or shall come to the notice of the Chief Commissioner of Mines, that any mines or minerals claimed under a lease from the Crown, or under a lease granted pursuant to this charter, have been abandoned for the space of one year, have not been effectively or continuously worked, or have been worked only tolerably, or to prevent a forfeiture under the terms of such lease, or that the lessee of such mines has failed to comply with any of the terms, covenants or stipulations, in his lease contained, or by this charter required, or is acting in violation thereof, the Chief Commissioner of Mines shall cause a notice to be personally served upon the lessee or some one of them, and an enquiry shall be held."

There is in that Act an express provision for forfeiture in cases where mines are not effectively and continuously worked. If there be any justification whatever for entering into an extensive alienation of the coal mines of the North-West at this time, and with our personal knowledge, it is this and this only: that the needs of the country with respect to fuel present and prospective are such that it is incumbent on us to offer every encouragement for the development of the coal supply; and, therefore, I say, that if we find ourselves in that assumed necessity as the reason for making alienations of this kind, we ought to provide that there shall be an effective and continuous working of any mines leased under these regulations on penalty of a forfeiture of the lease. It is not enough to say that operations shall be commenced within one year and that the mine shall be worked within two years, but provision ought also be made that the mine shall be kept working. Under these circumstances I thought it to be my duty to lay before the House the views which I entertain with respect to these regulations. It is possible that on some points these views may be found not acceptable to some hon. members. I admit the question is surrounded with difficulties, that the application of the principle of competition in all respects may be difficult, that the question of exploration may be of some consequence, but I do say that it is infinitely better for us to go slowly than to go too fast in this particular; and I would very much rather give a discretionary power of making leases to a limited extent of areas particularly accessible after bids had been received or by auction, or by some way in which competition would be insured for a short time, it being the understanding that this power would be used only to such extent as the development of the North-West required, until after another year of exploration we know more than we now can possibly know as to the extent and availability of those coal areas, than to continue regulations which rendered possible, and which, having regard to these applications on the table, render it likely that very large orders of most valuable coal mines will be let at once, or within a very brief period, and will get within a

very short space into very few hands, into those hands without providing any adequate provision for continuous and efficient working, and with the danger of some of them being held by speculators paying the nominal rent of 25 cents an acre, which is not much to renew the lease of valuable coal mines, the result of which might be to greatly enhance the price of fuel to the people of that country. It is because I have felt that these considerations ought to be laid before the House, and because I felt there might be a difference of opinion with respect to some of the points in which the regulations struck me as being defective that I have couched this resolution in the form in which it is now represented. I have not asked the House to affirm all the propositions which occurred to my own mind as sound; but I only ask the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret very much that my hon. friend, in his very interesting speech, did not confine himself to the proposition that he has submitted to the House, and strayed into irrelevant matter. I specially refer to the statements which he got from some unknown informant, so far as I know, that certain persons in the North-West were posted as to the sale of certain lands to the disadvantage of certain others who were not so posted. I have never heard of this before, but I venture to say—and I will be very much mistaken if I cannot prove it to-morrow—that the hon. gentleman's informant was altogether mistaken, and that no such transaction occurred. No doubt there are a good many disappointed speculators, and one of those may be the hon. gentleman's informant. My hon. friend's speech was very interesting, but, interesting as it is, it is thoroughly unpractical. The hon. gentleman spoke as if we had laid out in a small tract of country a limited amount of coal, so that it could be ascertained by the Government, be put up at auction, and sold specifically to the different parties that were rushing to compete for it. In the first place, that country, as the hon. gentleman knows, is as large as Europe, and you might as well say that you would put up all the coal mines in Europe, and those south of us in the United States, for sale, have them surveyed and disposed of at public auction, as take the course the hon. gentleman indicates. Why, that is the very way to prevent such a consummation as the hon. gentleman wishes—the procuring of cheap fuel. In the first place, the hon. gentleman says there is a great scarcity of wood as fuel in the North-West, but he very fairly quotes the report of the hon. Minister of the Interior of this year which states that the apprehensions of scarcity of wood fuel are greatly exaggerated, that excepting in the Missouri plateau there is a large quantity of fuel quite sufficient to supply the incoming population for years to come. But supposing that species of fuel is scarce, the greater the necessity of opening coal mines, and the preparation of other fuel as speedily as possible. The way to do that is not to survey the whole of the supposed coal areas, and wait until the surveyors have parcelled it out into 320 or 160 acre blocks. Why the whole policy of the Government of which he was a member and the correct policy was, as is the policy of the present Government, to encourage explorers to find out beds of coal and other minerals, and, as a reward for their labor and enterprise, give them, at a fair rate, what they have, at great expense and trouble, and with a great deal of enterprise, discovered. The whole system in the United States was based on that consideration—that the explorers should be encouraged—and, although these regulations have been before the public for some time, and under the present and all the Dominion Lands Acts provision was made for coal mines, there has been no rush of capitalists or coal owners into that country, competing with each other for profitable mines. Why, there is not a single coal mine opened in the North-West. There are one or two applica-

tions—very few applications. The only practical application that has been made to open coal mines in that country has been made by Mr. Lethbridge, an English gentleman of very large fortune, who was anxious to invest money in the North-West, and he went in the most practical way to work. He sent out an experienced coal miner who wandered over, not the Valley of the Souris where this lignite lies, but in the vicinity of the North Saskatchewan and Bow River. This man discovered coal there in sufficient quantity and of quality to warrant Mr. Lethbridge in investing his capital there. He applied for three small areas amounting in all to 320 acres, and I am exceedingly sorry that in consequence of the necessity of receiving the approbation of this House to these coal mine schemes he has been prevented from entering this fall into the possession of these areas and of putting his miners to work. We have lost a season by it. It cannot be helped. It is proper that in a matter of this kind the consent and approbation of Parliament should be received. Mr. Lethbridge is a gentleman possessed of very great wealth and of the highest standing, and he is resolved to push this industry, not as a matter of speculation, not to sell the mines, but to send out his laborers and overseers and to put steamers on the Saskatchewan to carry that coal to market. I would be very glad if we could get others like Mr. Lethbridge here. There is no fear of monopoly in that market. Why the report the hon. gentleman quotes shows that from the Souris across to the foot of the Rocky Mountains there is one uninterrupted mass of fuel in the shape of lignite. It is a good fuel for the purpose of heating houses. It is fit for steam locomotives and steam engines, but is not as good fuel as bituminous coal; but such as it is, it is a valuable fuel, and in the absence of wood there is an unlimited quantity of it in that district alone. So much is that the case that Dr. Selwyn, the Director of the Geological Survey, who was requested by myself to go up last year in order to give his special attention to the district, says the quantity of coal is so great that it is absurd to ask for a royalty at all, that it is so plentiful it will have no special value, and that the land containing it should be sold as common agricultural land under the regulations for the sale of other farm lands, so that any persons who gets it may work the coal on his own estate without paying any royalty. It is known, not from the survey of the Geological Surveyors nor from any other expedition, but from the reports of surveyors who have been going over that country, that coal all along the valley of the North Saskatchewan crops out in such quantities and of such quality that the supply is without any limit, and, therefore, is of no special value. Now, the regulations which have been laid before this House are substantially the regulations of the Province of Nova Scotia, requiring 25 cents an acre nominal rental for the land and a royalty of 10 cents per ton put out at the mouth of the pit. My hon. friend opposite, speaking of Mr. Lethbridge, objects to the four small areas given to him, altogether amounting to 320 acres. If they had lain altogether in one tract or mass of 320 acres, there would have been no special objection, however. What is the consequence of his having four small equal areas? That, instead of opening one, he must open four mines. If he had but one clear area of 320 acres, and if he opened any portion of that area and sold a certain portion of the mineral, that would be accepted as a sufficient compliance with the terms of the lease; but, with four several areas, he has got to work four several coal mines and do four times the work he would have to do if he had a coal mine of only one area. But the hon. gentleman says we ought to have the principle of competition. If you have that principle you will have no explorations. Do you think any man would be fool enough to go up into that country and employ skilled men, or experts procured from the United States or England, spend summer after summer exploring, and,

after he had discovered a mine, after all that expense and enterprise—find his money was to be practically thrown away—that the last man who came in could take the possession of his mine, or force him to buy it at a ruinous price. As I said before, the ideas of my hon. friend are altogether unpractical. I would ask the hon. gentleman—if he can find, whether in the United States, Nova Scotia, in British Columbia, Australia, or any other British Colony, that the principle of putting up mines or coal areas to public competition has ever obtained. According to my information, that principle has not been adopted in any one of those countries, and I have no doubt for the same reason as has influenced the policy of this country—that the principle of competition is fatal, is unfair to the explorers, is calculated to impede the discovery of coal and other minerals and is thoroughly impracticable. Let us look at the resolution of my hon. friend and see what its objects are: The first portion reads:

“That the future of the vast territories of the North-West is largely dependent upon the supply of fuel at a moderate rate.”

I agree with that completely, and therefore hope that explorations will go on on a vast scale, that mines will be opened up very soon, and that every encouragement will be given to the explorers. And I should be very sorry that any pedantic delay, until the country was laid out in squares, circles or semi-circles, and put up at public auction, should impede the immediate production of fuel. The motion thus proceeds:

“That the present information as to the country and the coal areas is not sufficient to warrant Parliament in creating long enduring interests in large quantities of the coal areas.”

Why, the information is precise; it shows that even with our geological surveys, with explorations confined to the Souris, that if there were no coal elsewhere in the country, there is sufficient in the Souris region to supply the whole of that vast country. And we know that Mr. Lethbridge shows that there is a much more extensive one on the Saskatchewan. The resolution continues:

“That the regulations as to coal lands laid on the Table make no provision for the application, as a general rule, of the just principle of public competition to the acquisition of those valuable lands, and thus leave open the door to disadvantageous cessions of the public domain for the benefit of individuals.”

I have already stated that this competition would be unfair, unjust and obstructive of the object we all desire. Furthermore:

“That the said regulations make no adequate provision to check the consolidation of large blocks of the coal lands in few hands, and the consequent restriction of competition and enhancement of the price of coal.”

If there was a small area, of the size of a county or so, there might be some apprehension of a monopoly; but the first miner that goes in will be successful or unsuccessful. If he is successful in finding good coal and getting a good market, I should be very glad to see him buy the next area again and open them up also. The larger the capitalist and the more he has got invested in this work, the better for the country and the greater the chance of our coal mines being properly worked. The danger is of our getting hold of small areas and of holding them, not with the idea of working them, but of selling them to the larger capitalists who have larger mines in the vicinity. The resolution also says: “That the said regulations make no provision to secure any work of the coal mines by the lessee.” Such a provision would be nugatory. We provide that when a man gets a lease he must immediately commence work and show that he is in earnest; and it would be absurd to suppose that parties who found they were working at a loss, or that they could not sell their coal, would go on ruining themselves, not being able to find coal or a market for it. I believe that the regulations in regard to leases are amply

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

sufficient for all practical purposes. If a party commences to mine, and works it for two years, he must have put his capital into the business, paying men and setting up machinery, and if so, he has done all we can reasonably call upon him to do in order to the continuance of his lease. The hon. gentleman says the leases are too long. He must give a party sufficient interest in the mines to induce him to invest his money in them. What capitalist would go to the enormous expense required to procure necessary plant and labor—and the labor will have to be procured from great distances—and wages we all know will be high—if not sure of a sufficiently long possession of the mine to reimburse his outlay? So it would be absurd for us to expect that capitalists would go in there unless they have the fee simple of the soil. That is the mode adopted in most portions of the United States, if not all, of selling coal lands at a fixed price. Unless they have the fee simple, they must have the right of long leases. My hon. friend complains that the lease is to be renewable for a further period of twenty-one years, with such ground rent or royalty as may be at the time of renewal agreed upon between the Government and the lessee. That is substantially what will be in the lease. He says: “Suppose he don't agree.” Then there will be no renewal. The hon. gentleman cannot expect that all the covenants which are usual in such cases should be extended in the regulations. All the necessary provisions will be made to make these regulations effectual. If the lessee will not agree to a reasonable renewal of his lease then he will find a clause in his lease which will prevent him from either getting it or remaining in possession. That must and will be provided for with all the ordinary precautions that are put in all sorts of leases. Now, it is very important that these regulations should be adopted. The hon. gentleman sees from the return that is made that there has been no rush for these lands. The difficulty will be to get people to go there to offer for them, and he need not be at all afraid of the monopoly. These regulations are not to be the laws of the Medes and Persians. We want to induce explorers to go there; we want to induce capitalists to invest their money there, and if we find this day year, if we all assemble here again, that in consequence of these regulations being adopted there is a degree of competition, and that it will be in the interest of the country that these regulations should be altered, we can alter them, but in the meantime don't make them more stringent than they are. As I said, the Director of the Geological Museum informs me they are too stringent, and he says we should sell the lands the same as we do other agricultural lands at \$2.50 an acre. I might also quote my late Deputy, Col. Dennis, who is strongly in favor of reducing the royalty one-half in consequence of the enormous coal there, the great distances which the coal must be carried, the uncertainty of the enterprise, the paucity of settlers in the country, and the possible chances of a bad market. He was of the opinion that the royalty was too high. My answer was this: we have the example of Nova Scotia where the royalty is 10 cents, and if we find on experience that 10 cents is too high we can bring it down. It is much easier to reduce the rental than to increase it. I may say now that if it should be found that the royalty should be reduced from 10 to 5 cents, I think it will be a matter of future arrangement with the explorers. I hope the House will not involve the principle involved in these resolutions, by going into Committee on them.

Mr. BLAKE. If no other hon. gentleman desires to speak, I desire to say a few words in answer to the hon. gentleman. This position seems to me to be somewhat inconsistent. With one breath he tells us that the country is one mass of coal land, that you could not walk over it without finding coal land, every man had a coal mine on his farm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, In the ore country.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman then went on to tell us that even if a coal mine should be found, experienced coal miners would have to be sent out in a proper way at great expense, that it would take whole summer to work, and examine and ferret over the land, and if you did hit upon a coal mine, you were so deserving of commendation for your discovery, your expense, and the trouble you have gone to, that I almost expected him one moment to say that we ought to give him a handsome premium for finding the coal mine, and give him the coal mine into the bargain. It does seem to me that those two statements ought not to have been delivered in the same speech, because they do appear mutually destructive of each other. If it be a fact that coal is so plentiful that it is valueless, why is the explorer to be so highly commended? The truth of the matter is, that there may, and there probably is, so far as we can judge from these reports, a vast area of territory under which, at various distances and at various widths, there will be found strata of lignite coal of varying qualities. The truth, also, is that although there may be that abundant supply in that sense, there may be favored spots as I stated a while ago where you can get coal at a nominal expense for the getting, as it is technically called, and where it will be so close to a river or a railway that it can be transported at a nominal expense. Nor do I find from these papers that any one of the persons who have applied for various areas have done so upon the ground that they were explorers, or had employed explorers who had discovered coal mines. If it be the case, I say the claim to the consideration of the Government is that they spent money and went to work and explored the land, and after some difficulty found coal mines; all I can say is that projectors of that description who make applications usually, to adopt an old phrase, put their best foot foremost; they usually tell what they have done, and sometimes they even exaggerate their claims for expenses they have incurred; and you may read this return of all the applicants from end to end and you will not find—at least I have not found—a single statement on the part of any of these gentlemen that he explored and spent money and found a mine; and therefore desired to be put in fief of it. Not at all, Sir. My belief is that the most valuable of these areas have been lit upon by others altogether, largely perhaps by our own officers, engineers and surveyors. To a considerable extent they have been known from a very early period by the Indians or the Hudson Bay people. There is no instance known of before the House of the discovery of coal mines by any person at all. These regulations do not say that the explorer, profiting with the discoverer, shall have a right to the mine. They say simply the applicant. They do not advocate that it is a right based on the expenditure of time or money, risk or hazard in finding a mine, but whoever comes, the man who may have heard from a third party, the man who has applied for a mine which he has known to exist for a long time may get the mine, may get even the mine on the Porcupine River which Professor Dawson describes as the most valuable one he has met with in all his explorations. It is a question of whoever comes forward and asks. The hon. gentleman made a great deal of the inapplicability of the principle of competition in this particular class of transactions, and the whole argument was based on this point of explorations; but I say that the regulations are not based upon that at all. The Nova Scotia regulations give, I believe, a license to explore within a considerable area, and the successful explorer gets a right—that is to say, application follows for a lease of the mine in a moderate area within the explored area. But these are general regulations, under which any man who chooses can apply for any mine, no matter how well known, and obtain it at moderate rates. Now, although there may be vast

quantities of coal in the country, valuable coal mines may be few, at this particular time they may be very few. Those are valuable at this moment which are found along the line of water communication. Those will be valuable within a short time which are found within immediate reach of the railways which are being projected through that country; and it is the seams which are valuable as to location, or width, or facility of access which will be taken up. The hon. gentleman says that the regulations are based on the principle of the Nova Scotia regulations; but I tell him as I have told the House, that the principle of the Nova Scotia regulations is that unless you work the mines continuously and effectually the lease is forfeited. The hon. gentleman says: "Would you compel a man to go in if he could not find any coal." Certainly not, but it is no hardship for him to forfeit his lease, if he cannot or does not proceed to get out the coal. But by these regulations, if he simply goes to work in a year and mines any coal within two years he shall have the lease *in perpetuum*. The hon. gentleman says: "Of course he will not do all that and then stop." But that depends. He speaks of enormous expenditure on machinery, and the tremendous cost of labor in opening these mines, but Dr. Dawson points out that the great advantage of these mines I have spoken of is the facility with which they may be worked. He says all you have to do is to send a man with a pick-axe, and that he can pick it out along the banks of the river and drop it into the boat. That is all the machinery that will be required in many cases, and this question of enormous expenditure for working is quite beside the question, so far as the fulfillment of the conditions of these regulations is concerned. The hon. gentleman says he dreads the selection of small areas to hold and sell to capitalists. I dread the selection of small areas to be held and sold to capitalists. We are agreed about that. I propose that the hon. gentlemen should get rid of the difficulty by preventing anybody—the holders of a small or a large area—from holding it unless he continuously and efficiently works it. That would oblige the speculator in the small areas to go on and work the mine, or else give up his lease, and so the hon. gentleman would get rid of the difficulty he refers to. The hon. gentleman says: "I want consolidation; I am anxious to have it; I want the miner to add area to area, section to section, to go on enlarging his holding." Well, if that is his policy, it is singular that he should provide, in express terms, that no more than 300 acres should go to one person. If it is to be the policy of the House that illimitable areas are capable of being leased by any one person, why impose this restriction of 300 acres? This is only susceptible of justification in the theory, that it is proper to restrict the area, and yet the hon. gentleman says he will make the restriction an imperfect and inadequate one because, in my opinion, it is a good thing that there should be no restriction, and that as many areas as possible should fall into the hands of one person. But the more valuable the mine is, as I have already pointed out, the less labor will be required upon it; and in the choice mines, those along the banks of the rivers, where the coal would be got out with least labor will be the most valuable. These therefore, are the areas which will be appropriated; these are the areas from which we might have had a cheap supply, and these are the areas which will be appropriated on conditions which neither provide for their early, efficient or continuous working, only restricting the quantity to be held by one individual, for that wholesome competition which would ensure the reduction of the selling price. My view is, that the hon. gentleman has not made out a defence of the regulations. I do not propose anything so ridiculous as that the areas should not be sold or leased until we have surveyed the whole country. Nothing of the kind. I say rather let us deal with the question in the present imperfect state of things only so far as it is necessary; let

us deal with them according to the present needs of the country, and not permit the general regulations to go in force, and all the valuable areas to be appropriated until we receive all the information which will enable us to deal with the question intelligently.

Mr. BUNSTER. An allusion has been made to the coal areas of British Columbia. I hope that the leader of the Government had not altogether forgotten our Province, for it has not forgotten him and probably never will. I hope he will advertise British Columbia as well as he advertises the North-West. I do not think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is as well posted about coal matters as he should be. He will find when the iron horse is snorting on the Pacific shores that we have a quality of coal unsurpassed on this continent. I am informed that the coal from one of our mines—the Wellington—has been exported as far as Texas, and that it has been pronounced there better than any in the United States, and that coal was drawn 2,500 miles into Texas. Therefore, I am satisfied that British Columbia coal will not take a second place to any North-West coal.

Motion negatived on a division.

THE SYSTEM OF GRANTING TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. BLAKE moved:

That in the opinion of this House the existing system of granting timber limits is liable to result in gross abuse, and in the cession of valuable interests in the public domain for inadequate consideration to favored individuals.

That it is expedient to apply the just principle of public competition to the granting of timber limits.

He said: During the early history of the North-West it was not possible, I dare say, to apply the principle of competition to the granting of timber limits, and I have no fault to find with the principle or action that was adopted at that period in the history of the country. I think the time has arrived—and arrived for a good while—at which a change of policy is imperatively necessary. The hon. gentleman has said, with reference to coal lands, that he has not had many applications. That observation is not applicable to timber limits. The returns brought down show that there have been between one and two hundred applications; but I believe that a large number of others have been made, besides a vast number of permits to cut timber. There can be no question, therefore, that the subject of timber limits is of great interest to two classes—to the population at large, which is interested in obtaining a cheap supply of timber and lumber, and to a considerable class of the community which is interested in what is vulgarly called “grabbing” the timber limits of the North-West. Now, we have had in former days in the older Provinces experience of the system which is at present in vogue, and we know that the leasing of timber limits by private bargain gave rise to the grossest abuse and favoritism—that valuable interests in the public domain were alienated for inadequate considerations to political favorites; and so great was the abuse that the rule for a long time by statute has been that these limits shall only be sold by public auction. I believe that is the system prevailing in the sister Province, as it certainly has been so in Ontario from Confederation. This complete change in the timber system prevented any opportunity for that political favoritism to which I have referred, and the interest of the public was served to a large extent by the large premiums paid at public competition by intending lumbermen for the limits offered. Great fortunes have in some instances been made in the North-West already by the lucky men who have received timber limits, and considerable fortunes are now being made by those who have even moderate limits. The timber limits in that country are of a character that cannot endure; unfortunately there is not

Mr. BLAKE.

a very large supply of marketable timber, and, in many cases, the timber limits will not last for a very long time. It is, therefore, of the utmost consequence that those we have should be disposed of in the manner I indicate, in order that the public may have the value of the interest which exists in these timber limits. I received the other day an account of what had been done by one man who owned a small saw-mill. He produced between six and seven hundred thousand feet of lumber in the year, and he retired on a fortune of \$20,000. The profits of lumber milling in that country are enormous; they are seldom less than from \$10 to \$15 on every thousand feet. Now, that is an evidence of the real value of a moderate limit, and we have before us a proof of the eagerness and earnestness with which limits are being sought for, in the voluminous return on the Table, disclosing the names of the applicants for locations. I am told that a not uncommon transmutation is for an agent for North-West lands to become the owner of a limit. For a while he is in his agency, and conducts the business; during that period the limits are disposed of, I do not say by him, but from reports by him; but a little while after he ceases to be an agent, and the next thing you hear of him is, that he is a partner in a timber limit, and engaged in the business of converting lumber into gold. As I have said, the system is one liable to the grossest abuse, and, as an evidence that there are considerable frauds, we read in the appendix to the Report of the Minister of the Interior:

“During the year, one hundred and fifty-five applications for timber berths and one hundred for mining locations were received.

“Five leases and twenty-one licenses for timber berths were given, and three hundred and sixty-six temporary permits.

“The reports and schedules in relation to timber, which are appended, show that there are in the Province of Manitoba forty-six saw-mills in operation at present, and in the North-West and Keewatin Territories, nine saw-mills. From the statements in returns given by their owners, these mills are shown to have an average capacity for cutting ten thousand feet, board measure, each, in a day of twelve hours. From four to five months only in the year, of sawing at this rate, should give a total quantity of about fifty-five millions, board measure, of lumber. The returns made for the purpose of payment of dues would give but twenty-one millions of feet of all manufactures of wood during the year. Even with due allowance for the proportion of timber that would be obtained from other than Crown lands, there is still so great a difference between the quantities returned as cut and the capacity of the mills, that it is to be inferred that these mills are in operation to their full capacity for but about a fourth of the year, or else that the system of procuring returns fails to obtain accurately the amounts on which dues are chargeable.”

These are alternative suggestions which the officer makes to account for the discrepancy between the reasonable capacity of the mills and the Government returns. I will venture to say that the officer believed, and I think it pretty plainly to be inferred from the report, that it is not that the mills cut four or five months in the year only, but that the system under which the returns are made up is defective as a means of ascertaining what has been cut or the amount of Crown dues chargeable. A portion of the profits are obtained by reason of the ineffectual carrying out of the regulations and non-payment of dues to the Crown. That also is very likely to result from the continuance of a system under which timber limits are granted to individuals at the instance of the Ministry, of their officers, and not by a system of public competition. Where you find those limits granted as favors to those who are in the Ministers' graces, granted privately, without the security of public competition, you will be very likely to find those who have obtained the limits not very careful as to the payment of subsequent dues, or as to making returns. I am not charging or insinuating that these things have occurred; I am merely saying that the system is one liable to abuses of this kind; that it is one which gives the fortunate possessor of the limit the whole of the good fortune, instead of sharing it with the public by having open competition; that the experience of other Provinces, particularly that of Ontario, is wholly in favor of the latter system, and wholly against the former system; that there are so many applications for

timber berths as to make it all the more important and reasonable that a plan for open competition should be adopted. I am sorry to observe that the leader of the Government, after having in one case adopted the plan of open competition, receded from it. I refer to the case of the grazing lands. During the fall of last year a minute was adopted and sanctioned by the Government declaring that those grazing lands should be disposed of by public competition, but the new regulations of December altered that plan, and they are now disposed of according to another system; and the result of that system is developed in the returns which are laid on the Table, from which we find that numerous applications by mail before the Session, and some since the Session, for choice grazing lands in the North-West. I read some of those names with the pain of deep regret. I observe indications that the House is about to lose the countenances of many hon. gentlemen whom we would rejoice to see here many years to come, they being about to change their vocation from being representatives of Canada's constituencies to that of being cattle breeders. Tracts of land on the Kootenay, Bow River and other suitable places, Goshens in imagination, are applied for to the extent of from 35,000 to 100,000 acres, which are to be made valuable by hon. members, who have been up to this time more engaged in the business of attending to the concerns of men, but who from this time propose, under the auspices of the Government, to become herders of cattle. Or perhaps they do not intend to do so except by deputy, and, as the hon. leader of the Government suggests, with regard to owners of coal lands, they would sell the lands and turn an honest penny by the speculation. With respect to timber limits, I see no reason why, in face of the numerous applications, the limited areas and the advantage to the public in avoiding the danger of abuse, some system of open competition for timber limits should not be adopted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see the hon. gentleman has imported into Parliament the habits which he has gained from forensic experience, that when he has a weak case he attempts to draw his audience away from the subject. When he was discussing the coal lands the hon. gentleman read a letter about the sale of lots, and now, when discussing timber limits he goes off to grazing ranches. The hon. gentleman says that he does not charge the Government with having done anything wrong, but that the present system, in his opinion, is liable to result in gross abuses. I suppose he meant that, from having had so much to do with the administration of such affairs in the Province of Ontario that when he transferred his eloquence from the Ontario Legislature to the Dominion Parliament, he brought that feeling with him. The hon. gentleman made up his mind that when he came from the smaller area to the larger one, that he would bring with him the fixed conviction that this system of granting, as we are now doing, licenses for timber limits was liable to abuse and ought to be curbed. Strange to say, we are following the example forced upon us by the Administration of which he was a member. In the Session of 1872, the Government of which I was then the head passed through Parliament the law 35 Victoria, (section 50) which contains this clause:

"The right of cutting timber on such timber limits shall be put up at a bonus per square mile, varying according to the value of the limit, and sold to the highest bidder on competition either by tender or at public auction."

That was a Bill passed by our corrupt Government, but we disappeared and were succeeded by the late Government in November, 1873. Strange to say, the first act they did in 1874 was to repeal that clause, and this is the clause they put in its stead:

"Provided that in cases where application may be made for limits on which to cut timber, after survey of the territory has been made, the

Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, authorize the same to be leased for such bonuses as he may deem fair and reasonable."

Now, during the time that Administration was in power they leased 605 square miles of limits, and they did not put up one single acre to public competition. During the whole of the five years they, conscious of the abuse that followed such a practice, altered the competitive system and introduced the favoritism system—this system by which friends, political, personal, social or otherwise were to get limits. They carried it out to the extent of 605 square miles. I will give you an instance of the system. In the licenses that we grant now we provide that every license shall be forfeited, unless, within the year, a saw mill is erected to use that timber. The elections, I think, took place on the 17th September, 1878. What did we find? We all remember how we were attacked for appointing some of our friends just before we resigned.

Mr. MILLS. Nearly all were appointed then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They were all my friends. I am not in the habit of appointing my foes. I have no confidence in my foes except occasionally when I have a foe of such ability as the hon. member for Buffalo. On the 7th October, 1878, long after the 17th September, 1878, and a few days before they shuffled off their political coil, the mantle fell upon my shoulders, they passed an Order in Council granting to two mortal foes—I must admit that—the Messrs. Cook and Sutherland—how much? We limit our grants to fifty square miles. They granted 200 square miles to Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, and instead of giving it in one area, what do you think they provided? Explorations along the River Saskatchewan, show that the timber between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains is in small groups of twenty miles square each. The Order in Council was passed authorizing the granting to Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, of the timber limits, 200 square miles, on the North Saskatchewan and its tributaries between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains in isolated blocks of twenty square miles each. Thus every tree between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains was handed over by the late Government to their political friends Messrs. Cook and Sutherland, creating a monopoly so that no man can go in through that whole vast region of country. It must be this experience that is weighing on my hon. friend, and he fears that we shall commit the same atrocities—atrocities by the hon. gentleman's own account—that his friends committed. He dreads lest we should be guilty of the same favoritism, the same granting to monopolists, the gross abuse which he saw exercised by his own friends. But our practice has been this: the first few months we were in office there were two leases granted for twenty-one years, but we stopped that system and no leases are granted longer than one year, of course, with the same honorable understanding that exists in Ontario, that if a man puts up his mill, pays his dues, and acts honorably towards the Crown the Crown will act honorably towards him, and his license will be renewed from year to year as long as he keeps his contract with the Government. We have limited, except in very special cases, under special circumstances, and not with regard to the individual or the special circumstances of the country, the areas to fifty miles. Well, of the 605 square miles disposed of by hon. gentlemen opposite not one acre of it was under lease. One-third of all the territory on which timber licenses were granted by the present Government was put up by public auction, as the schedule before the House shows. During the whole five years that these gentlemen were in power they were granting leases, yet how much do you think they collected of dues? They collected \$6,000 altogether, or about \$1,000 per year. This shows either that these leases were all given to speculators or that the people took licenses

on them where there was no timber. During the three years that we have been in power, we have disposed, by private sale, of 1,546 square miles, and at public auction of 746½ square miles; and during those three years we have collected \$100,000 in dues, which are increasing largely every month. The principle we adopt is this: Immigrants are not going into one spot. Some will go to Bow River, others to Prince Albert, Battleford, Edmonton, Qu'Appelle—all over that country. These immigrants must have houses and must get timber. We cannot keep them along the twenty-four mile belt on each side of the Pacific Railway, they go where they please. They must go wherever they please, and we must, in order to assist those people and give them timber, grant timber licenses wherever timber is to be found, where the works are going on. But, if parties go and explore, they must make an application, and, if it is a reasonable one, if the applicant is respectable, if he enters into a contract within a year to put up a saw mill and pay dues, and give proper returns under oath, he will get a license. And so the immigrants, as they scatter all over the country, will find saw-mills, large and small and portable. They will be glad to get portable mills in the far distance. Any kind of machinery that will cut boards to build houses will be welcome. That is our system, and for the present I think it ought to be continued. When there is competition, two applying for the same place, it is to be decided by tender as at present; so one can bid against the other. Hereafter when we get on a little further, and the country becomes more settled—when the railroads have made progress, and the Canada Pacific stretches across the continent—timber can be largely carried from Georgian Bay, and the whole country reasonably supplied. When the country shall be more settled, we can probably adopt the Ontario system. At present it would be merely an obstruction, in my opinion. I think those men who have gone into the country with mills are doing yeoman's service, and are reducing the prices of lumber to reasonable limits. In regard to permits, parties received permission to cut for a limited period over a given area. The chief permits are granted for the purpose of supplying ties to railroads and poles to telegraphs; they are in the vicinity where timber is wanted, and if you did not grant the permits, the timber would be stolen without them, and you would get nothing. Timber for ties, &c., must be got out. This is merely a temporary resource for a temporary exigency. These are the reasons why I think that this resolution introducing the principle of competition is as yet premature. We have the sanction of his own Government to that policy. I suppose he was a member of the late Government in 1874.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events he was an ardent supporter; and he did not raise his voice that I heard of against the repeal or setting aside of the permission given by the previous Government in 1872, which was continued at the sole discretion of my hon. friend from Bothwell when a Minister. I have no doubt, as his successor, and I believe that he administered that Department with great ability and energy. He did his best; but he could not possibly have known the value of some of those limits, or he would have thought twice before he would have handed over those rather large, extensive, liberal limits in such a liberal, generous, unconditional, unrestrained manner to the Messrs. Cook and Sutherland.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has adopted a rather singular style of defence from the motion before the House. He has undertaken to show that the late Administration acted improperly in repealing certain provisions of the law which he says he put on the Statute-book.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that you did it improperly, but that you approved of the system we are now carrying on.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says now, that after a lapse of ten years, the system provided for in that Act was a proper system. He either now says that the law was premature, or that the late Government acted in a proper way in refraining from adopting the principle of competition in the first instance. Now, my hon. friend who has the resolution before the House, did not propose any more than in the resolution recently submitted, that the principle of competition should be adopted in the first instance. We know, and experience shows us, that that could not be done; that when settlers went into the North-West, when there was but little market for lumber, and the lumbermen were very indifferent, that it was impossible to carry out the principle of competition in the sale of timber limits in the first instance. The hon. First Minister has compared the small amount of duty collected on lumber while we were in power with a large amount now collected. But there is a much larger population in Manitoba and the North-West now than there was then. On personal investigation I found that, even as late as 1877, a great quantity of the timber cut at the mills in Winnipeg and the vicinity was obtained from Minnesota, in the vicinity of Red Lake; so that persons who had obtained timber limits from the Administration, in anticipation of the early failure of the timber limits of Red Lake, had not yet begun, to a large extent, to cut into lumber the timber on these limits. The statement I made will show the difference between the amount of timber duties collected at present and at that time; the greater portion of the timber cut into lumber was obtained in Minnesota. Now, I believe scarcely any is obtained in that quarter, and that the greater portion is obtained from the limits for which licenses have been granted. The hon. gentleman has told us that the timber limits granted to Messrs. Cook and Sutherland were very large, and was conceded to them after the defeat of the late Administration. That is true, but their application had been made at a very early period; and it was only in consequence of the pressure of business in the Department that it was not disposed of earlier. I may state here, whatever hon. gentlemen may think of the principle, that while I was in charge of that Department, while I did nothing that I thought might be more properly done by my successor—that all the matters with which I was conversant, that might have been disposed of at an earlier period, but were not disposed of—I thought it my duty to deal with as acts of administration, up to the last moment I was in charge of the office. I believe that was a sound principle, and that thus many matters were disposed of which, had they been left over, would not have been disposed of for many months. In fact, I believe there are some matters with which I was unable to deal entirely and which are not dealt with up to this moment. Now, as to the extent of this timber limit. The hon. gentleman represents 200 miles as a very extensive limit. Well, that is not the general opinion of lumbermen, and if the information I possessed at that time was at all approaching accuracy—and I have no reason to doubt it up to this moment—there is in that region an area for which this limit was granted at least twenty times the area covered with timber which is covered by the license granted to a brother of Mr. Hugh Sutherland and Mr. Cook. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has referred to that particular instance, but what are the facts? Those gentlemen proposed to erect a mill on the Saskatchewan. There was no mill upon the Saskatchewan with the single exception of Moore's. The settlers at Prince Albert had to pay as high as \$110 or \$120 per thousand for their lumber.

It was considered an advantage to the population for mill owners to be established in that district, and it was in order that competition might exist and that the people might obtain lumber at reasonable rates, that this license was granted.

Mr. HESSON. Has that mill been erected yet?

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman will ask his leader he will find that he cancelled the license. Further, I may say that at the time we retired from office there was a prospect of a considerable settlement at an early day in the region of Prince Albert and along the Saskatchewan. The location of the road was in that direction, and settlers were going in that direction in expectation of the construction of a railway through that region of country. I have no doubt whatever that if the location of the road had not been changed it would have been to the decided advantage of the people of the North-West Territory that this license should have remained in force and that greater facilities than now exist should be had for obtaining lumber in that quarter. What was right and proper five years ago may not be so now. Regulations which the Government were obliged to adopt temporarily at that time may be highly inexpedient at another period. The hon. gentleman knows there is a large population in that country. He knows the extent of timber area is somewhat limited, and that now there should be no difficulty in obtaining competition. We know there was great difficulty in the early period of settlement in the North-West Territories and Manitoba to obtain lumber at all, and therefore the lumbermen had to be invited into that region, and now that an opportunity for competition exists there is no reason why the principle of competition should not be made available.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think I understood the hon. Minister of the Interior to state that \$100,000 had been collected as timber dues. I would be glad if he would let us know to what date that comes down, what was the amount collected up to the 1st of June, 1881, and in what Department it is to be found.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot state now, but I will get him the information.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Where is it in the Public Accounts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know. I got this return from the responsible officer of my Department.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So far as I can see in the Public Accounts there appears to be no entry of that amount in 1881.

Mr. TROW. I am decidedly of opinion that the resolution now under discussion is a proper one for the consideration of this House. We have not under discussion what the previous Administration did or failed to do in granting large limits, but whether it is desirable now to grant them, or whether it is desirable to create monopolists in the timber interests in that great country. Notwithstanding the statement of the Premier in reference to the unlimited supply of fuel in that country, I must say that there is a great scarcity of timber. It is desirable that the Government should husband our forest resources as much as possible, and unless some check is put upon prairie fires, or some encouragement given to the settlers to plant trees, there will be a great scarcity of fuel in that country in the future. I am aware that in the old Province of Manitoba there is considerable timber, but outside the limits there is certainly a great scarcity from Fort Ellice to the Rocky Mountains. For hundreds of miles there is not a single tree, the Government ought to encourage the culture of timber, either by exempting the settlers from taxation or by granting them a small bonus of so much per acre of trees planted, or grant of land.

With reference to the coal interests which have been discussed, I have seen some of the coal in the Souris district, and found it of a very inferior quality. I question whether there is such an unlimited supply of coal as the Premier thinks. It is true, from reports we have received, there are large fields on the North Saskatchewan, and in reference to the Souris district the coal interest is not as yet developed; so far only an inferior sample of lignite has been found. I think the resolution should be thoroughly discussed and some means taken by the Government not to centralize our timber limits but to give as much privilege as possible to the actual *bona fide* settler. I am aware the Government has distributed the large proportion of timber limits—20 acre blocks, to settlers. That is right. But where there are large limits taken up by one individual it will be detrimental to that great country, because it will be to his interest to enhance the price of timber and keep up the price.

Mr. BLAKE. As no other gentleman desires to speak on this subject, I desire to say a few words in close of the debate. My hon. friend says I must have gathered my ideas in my experience in the Ontario Legislature. I suppose he knows, though he may have forgotten, that the law has always been in Ontario that the timber limits were at public competition, and I am not aware of any instance of abuse. On the contrary, I referred to the example of Ontario as indicating a state of things which proved the propriety of the step I was inviting the House to adopt. The hon. gentleman himself pointed out that twenty years ago this Government determined, experimentally, that the true mode of dealing with the timber berths was to sell them at public auction, and he and his friends put a law on the Statute-book providing for that. He says that the Government of my hon. friend from Lambton altered that law to the destination common to the applicants. Well, I do not know whether he was wrong when he passed that law in 1872, or whether the Government of my hon. friend from Lambton was wrong when they proposed the law in 1874. I do not remember that either of those laws were passed. I certainly did not oppose either of them myself. I supposed the hon. gentleman adopted the principle of competition as the sound and just principle to be adopted. I suppose that he thought the proper way was to sell timber limits at that time. I suppose he thought the time was ripe for the adoption of that system, even ten years ago, when there was hardly anybody in the country, when the question of getting a number of persons to bid was one I suppose he would be able to solve, but which he had not the opportunity of solving. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was called on to administer those affairs, and at that time, or after an experience of two years, I presume—I do not speak with authority, for I was not a member of the Administration and cannot speak as to his motives—but I presume he changed the law because he found the time was ripe and that the country was so new that, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, the difficulty was to get persons to cut the timber, and not that there was strong competition for the privilege of cutting it. I presume that was the reason, and I am quite sure that there was no dissent on the part of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) from the said doctrine that wherever it is applicable the principle of public competition should be applied, for I believe that hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) did not oppose the law of the hon. gentleman opposite when it passed. There was, therefore, a reason in the case of his Government, but it cannot be pretended that that exists at the present time. The return to which I have referred disproves the existence of any such reason, for I find that there were 155 applications for timber limits and 137 standing before the Minister—137 suppliant hands stretched forth to the Department begging his favor, and 134 perhaps since the return was made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Applications without limit.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, and patience without limit on the part of the suppliant until the Session is over or this motion disposed of. I understand that there was very great perturbation of spirit exhibited among the applicants at the mere notion that there should be any competition in their particular business. I have no doubt he has given to many of them by word of mouth, or sign, or nod, or in some other way some intimation that they might expect at an early and convenient day a favorable response to their applications so soon as the inconvenient investigations of Parliament are no more to be feared. I say that I have heard that there was considerable perturbation amongst the anticipants of the hon. gentleman's favors, at the bare idea that these matters should be submitted to a vulgar common competition, and that common people should have a fair chance of competing for the valuable timber limits in the North-West. The hon. gentleman says that, although ten years ago, when there were no people to compete with, he put a law on the Statute-book recognizing the principle. Now, when there are numerous competitions, when there is no difficulty in applying the law, I find that my proposal of ten years ago is premature to be madeto-day. "Wait," he says, "for another ten years, or twenty years, from the time I made the proposal for selling by auction, and then let the principle of public competition be applied." Well, it may be applied then, but the trouble will be that there will be no limits to put up then. The hon. gentleman has stated the course of the late Administration with reference to this matter. It appears that although they took power to grant licenses for these timber limits in this way, they granted only some 600 miles in the course of their Administration. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman includes those 200 miles which he has worthlessly—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only the 600.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has granted 2,300 square miles during the three years he has been in power, so it was very obvious that during the previous Administration there was not a very energetic use made of this power. The hon. gentleman has granted 2,300 miles, of which 1,550 were by private application or arrangement, and he has 130 applications before him at the present moment for more, so that we may expect before another year a large portion of the remaining area will be allotted. Now, it is perfectly plain that the circumstances which he thought suitable, ten years ago, for the principle of public competition, are very much more suitable now and that there is no reason why we should not have a principle which is practicable now, and was always sound even when it was not practicable; and I think the resolution is one which should be adopted by the House.

Motion negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Flynn,	Pickard,
Béchar, d,	Geoffrin,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Gillies,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Borden,	Gillmor,	Rogers,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brown,	Holton,	Rymal,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Killam,	Skinner,
Cartwright,	King,	Saowball,
Casey,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Thompson,
Charlton,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Trow,
Cockburn,	MacDonnell (Inverness)	Weldon,
Coupal,	McIsaac,	White (Renfrew),
Dumont,	Mills,	Yeo.—49.
Fiset,		

Mr. BLAKE.

NAVS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Girouard (Kent),	Mongenais,
Allison,	Grandbois,	Mousseau,
Amyot,	Guillet,	Muttart,
Arkell,	Hackett,	Ogden,
Beaty,	Haggart,	Quimet,
Benoit,	Hay,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Hooper,	Platt,
Bill,	Houde,	Pluub,
Bolduc,	Ives,	Pope (Compton),
Bowell,	Jones,	Poupore,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Reid,
Brooks,	Kirkpatrick,	Richey,
Bunster,	Kranz,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burnham,	Landry,	Ross (Dundas),
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Rouleau,
Carling,	Langevin,	Royal,
Caron,	Lantier,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Longley,	Ryan (Montreal),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Macdonald (Kings),	Schultz,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Shaw,
Coughlin,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Sproule,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Strange,
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Tellier,
Daly,	McCarthy,	Tilley,
Desaulniers,	McCuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desjardins,	McDougald,	Vallée,
Domville,	McLeelan,	Vanasse,
Drew,	McLennan,	Wade,
Elliott,	McQuade,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Ferguson,	McRory,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Manson,	White (Caldwell),
Fulton,	Massue,	White (Hastings),
Gault,	Merner,	Williams,
Gigault,	Méthot,	Wright.—106.
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),		

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move the adjournment of the House, but before doing so I wish to make a statement personal to myself. I did not happen to be in the House when the Orders of the Day were called, and, therefore, I take this opportunity of speaking of an article that appeared in the *Globe* of Friday. That article states that for the sum of \$2,500 I was sold to a contractor. I do not suppose that many gentlemen on either side of the House will believe that, and I would have perhaps passed it over only that the statement is specific, and it affects a contractor, Mr. John Shields, whose future may depend upon that charge being unanswered or answered. I can only state, Sir, that there is not the slightest truth in the statement, and I shall shortly relate the facts, although it is rather unpleasant for one to be obliged to relate one's own affairs. An action was brought against me by Mr. General Hewson, which I resisted. It was put down for trial here at the last spring assizes, in 1881. I was at that time, as most hon. gentlemen know, exceedingly ill; I was confined to my house, and a good many supposed that I would never leave it. However, I was preparing to go to England when this trial came on, and my medical adviser told me that it would be as much as my life was worth to go to court and give evidence in the matter. I did not like it to be said or supposed or insinuated that I avoided giving testimony in the case. Mr. Shields, who, though a contractor, is a friend of mine, was subpoenaed as a witness in the case, and he came to see me and offered his good offices to relieve me from the worry and annoyance of the matter. I told him to go and see to it, and to pay a sum of money to get it settled if he could. The result was that it was agreed to be settled for the sum of \$2,500, for which a release was to be given. That money was paid, but it was not paid by Mr. Shields; it was paid for me and by me. As I wish to be strictly accurate in the matter, I will say that not being a rich man, I had not the money at the time, and so my solicitor went and procured it from a friend, but not from Mr. Shields. Mr. Shields had nothing to do with it. It was lent to me,

and when I came back from England, I paid half of it, all I could afford to do, and on the 1st of July I will pay my friend the other half, with interest. Mr. Shields made affidavit to the truth of these facts. He does not even know from whom I borrowed the money. These are the simple facts, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to inform the House of them for the reason I have stated.

House adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 28th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILROAD CONTRACT IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter, respecting which I shall end with a motion—I refer to the letting of railway contracts in British Columbia. I shall not occupy much of the time of the House, not more than what is necessary to give a clear statement of the facts and to refer very briefly to the conclusions that must be deducible from these facts. On the 24th of October, last year, tenders were asked for the construction of certain works between Port Moody and Emory's Bar. Those tenders were to be received on 1st February, and the Government required that accompanying each tender there should be a cheque marked "good" by some bank or the cash in some case for \$20,000. Accordingly tenders were received about the 1st February, & amongst the tenders was that of Messrs. McDonald and Charlebois, whose tender was for the sum of \$2,277,000. On the 24th January this tender appears to have been made up by these contractors as on that day a cheque was obtained from the Bank of Montreal in Montreal marked "good for two days only." No further action appears, so far as the papers brought down to this House can show, to have been taken by the Government after the reception of tenders until February 1st, the day upon which they should all have been received, and I presume were received. On that day, as is usual in the Department of Public Works, the tenders were opened by Messrs. Schreiber, Chief Engineer; Mr. Trudeau, Deputy Minister, and Mr. Braun, Secretary of the Department. From the 1st February to the 6th, I do not see that anything further was done by the Minister or the Department; but on the 6th February, the private secretary of the hon. the Minister of Railways—not the Secretary of the Department—was sent to the Bank of Montreal in this city to enquire concerning this cheque that was marked "good for two days only," the object apparently being to ascertain whether the "two days only" was not some clerical error or an unintentional endorsement—to ascertain, in other words, whether the cheque was still good. Mr. Bradley, the Secretary in question, narrates the circumstance as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT RAILWAYS AND CANALS,
"MINISTER'S OFFICE, 6th February, 1882.

(Memorandum.)

"Re tender, Emory's Bar and Port Moody.—Under instructions from the Minister on Saturday last, I called, at about half-past 10 o'clock this morning, on Mr. Drummond, Manager of the Bank of Montreal here, and handed him a certain cheque drawn by McDonald & Charlebois, on the Bank of Montreal, dated 23rd January, 1882, for \$20,000, and stamped on the 24th of same month 'good for two days only,' asking him

whether he would pay it. On finding the cheque was marked 'good for two days only,' he shook his head and said it would be necessary to enquire at the head office. He suggested making enquiry, to which I assented. At about one o'clock this day Mr. Drummond called at my office, and handed me, in presence of Mr. Trudeau, the telegram from the head office, Montreal, which I, this afternoon, handed to the Minister, and which is attached hereto marked with my initials.

"A. P. BRADLEY."

"(Telegram.)

"MONTREAL, 6th February, 1882.

"To Bank of Montreal.

"Banker requisite to-day, please strike out 'for two days only,' from our acceptance stamp. The cheque will be good until paid.

"SHADBOLT."

"Handed to me by Mr. Drummond in my office about 1 p.m., 6th February.

"A. P. BRADLEY."

What strikes one as something remarkable, in the first place, with regard to this transaction up to this point, is this fact: that these contractors knew that the tenders would not be opened until the 1st February, yet on the 24th January they go to the Bank of Montreal and obtain a cheque upon which the regular stamp—not an ordinary endorsement—had impressed the words: "good for two days only." No man in his senses would have accepted such a cheque to send with his tender if he believed it was literally to be held good for two days only, because four days before the tenders could be received the cheque would be out of date. It appears from correspondence elsewhere in this return, that this was the stamp which was kept in the bank and was applied to cheques when they were required to be marked good by the bank, the short date, two days, being given to prevent these cheques from becoming current money. This appears to have been the object. We find the General Manager, in reply to the following letter from Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois:—

"MONTREAL, 23rd February, 1882.

"DEAR SIR,—On the 24th January last we obtained at your bank our certified cheque upon you for \$20,000, and it was known to you that the same was to be used in our contemplated tender to the Government for railway work.

"Notwithstanding the fact that our tender was the lowest, we are, nevertheless, in danger of being deprived of our right to the contract on the ground that the cheque in question was certified 'good for two days only.' We will be obliged if you will state whether or not the limit as to time in the certificate on the cheque in question was merely a clerical error, and that the intention of the bank was to guarantee the goodness of the cheque until paid.

"We will also be obliged if you will state in your reply to this if any enquiry was made from Ottawa as to the goodness of the cheque, and what steps you took to correct the error, and oblige,

"Your obedient servants,

"McDONALD & CHARLEBOIS,

"E. S. CLOUSTON, Esq., Manager."

Wrote as follows:

"MONTREAL, 23rd February, 1882.

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your letter of this date concerning the cheque for \$20,000 accepted by us on the 24th ult., for your use in connection with your tender to the Government for railway work, I beg to say that the limit of two days only was unintentional, and was simply an oversight, that this was not at once struck out. It was certainly our intention to guarantee the cheque until paid. On discovery of the flaw on the 6th instant our Ottawa manager wired us of it, and I replied requesting him to strike out the objectionable words, and saying the cheque would be good until paid; to which he replied by letter of same date: 'Your reply to strike out restriction clause as stamped, and the cheque will be good until paid, is satisfactory to the Department.'

"Yours truly,

"E. S. CLOUSTON,

"Manager.

"Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois,
Montreal."

The other thing that strikes one as very remarkable, is the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways waited for six days after the tenders were opened before taking any action upon this irregularity, and then sends his own private secretary with specific instructions to know whether the cheque is still considered good. This

message was delivered to the manager by Mr. Bradley, the secretary in question, in person, at 10.30 o'clock on the 6th February. Mr. Drummond suggested, very properly, he would ask the office in Montreal, and Mr. Bradley informs us in another place that he franked a telegram to Mr. Drummond to make the enquiry without expense to the Department. The enquiry was duly made accordingly; it must have been about 11 o'clock, and at half-past one it terminated. The manager of the bank here was able to wait on the Department of Public Works when he saw Messrs. Trudeau and Bradley at half-past one of the same day, the answer being that the cheque would be good until paid. What the object of the Minister was in enquiring whether the cheque would be good or not I cannot imagine, unless it was, and perhaps it is of increased significance, that he already made up his mind how to award the contract, and by imagining that the cheque was not good at the time he thought his position would be strengthened by getting a definite reply from the manager of the bank to that effect, in which his position would be much clearer. The reply, however, was entirely satisfactory as to the character of the cheque; it being good for the amount, so far as the bank could make the cheque good, until it should be paid. No action was taken by the Minister on that day, 6th February; but on the next day, 7th, he sends a memorandum to the Council stating, in general, the facts in connection with the acceptance of the tender and giving a schedule of all the tenders received. Then he says:

"That the 92nd clause of the specifications of the works embraced in this section states that no tender will be entertained 'unless a bank cheque, marked good by the bank, for \$20,000, accompanies the tender.' 'I had the lowest tender as above, that from Messrs. D. McDonald and A. Charlebois, is irregular, inasmuch as the cheque which accompanied it is marked by the Bank of Montreal on the 24th January, 1882, as good for two days only.

"That the lowest tender made in conformity with the conditions of the specifications, is that by Mr. Andrew Onderdonk, for the sum of \$2,486,255.

"That this amount is lower than the engineer's estimate of the value of the works to be performed, but the Chief Engineer, in a report dated the 6th February, 1882, states that Mr. Andrew Onderdonk has the necessary skill and resources to carry out the undertaking."

Then he recommends the acceptance of this tender of Andrew Onderdonk. He does not, however, inform the Council of the facts which occurred on the 6th of February; he does not mention that he had enquired whether this cheque was good, and found it was good; but he hints at a general statement that the cheque was marked good for two days only, and therefore he treats it as not being a cheque at all, or not being a representative of money which the Government could accept. On the day following, 8th February, an Order in Council is passed, which Order is, of course, as usual, a mere echo of the memorandum of the Minister, formally awarding the contract to the second tenderer, Andrew Onderdonk, for the sum of \$209,255 in excess of the tender of Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois. No communication appears to have been made, so far as I am able to see, after the communicating with the bank, on the 6th February, with the contractors themselves, for on the 10th, I think, they appeared to have been first apprised of the action of the Minister and the Government, by an article in the *Gazette*, and they telegraphed to Sir Charles Tupper:

"10th February.

"This morning's *Gazette* says that we were the lowest tender for Port Moody section, and as we failed to make the deposit the contract was awarded to Onderdonk. This is incorrect; we are only waiting notice from the Department to complete deposit. Waiting answer.

"McDONALD & CHARLEBOIS."

In their innocence they imagined that all that was required was a deposit of 5 per cent. on the full amount of the tender, the deposit required by the Government as security for the performance of the contract. They would appear, as I read the telegram, not to have entertained any doubt as to the position of the matter otherwise, as they were aware they

Mr. MACKENZIE.

had sent a cheque to the Government. Then they sent another telegram, of the same date, to the Secretary of the Department, Mr. Braun:

"Any decision in British Columbia tenders; awaiting notice to make deposit. Answer.

"McDONALD & CHARLEBOIS."

They received this answer, no doubt by instructions, from Mr. Braun:

"Contract was awarded to Onderdonk whose tender was lowest, as yours could not be considered for want of cheque marked good as required by specification."

Then, on the 14th February, McDonald & Charlebois sent a petition to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, in which they state the general facts already mentioned. The petition sets forth the following facts:—

"1. That during the month of October the Government of Canada advertised for tenders for the construction of one of the sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Port Moody and Emory's Bar, in the Province of British Columbia.

"2. That on the 1st of February instant, your petitioners filed with the proper officer in the Department of Railways and Canals, in the City of Ottawa, a tender for the construction of said works.

"3. That the deposit required by the advertisement and specifications was duly made with the proper officer of the Department of Railways and Canals at the same time as the said tender.

"4. That other tenders for the said work by other contractors were filed in the Department of Railways and Canals at the same time, and in like form with that of your petitioners.

"5. That the tender of your petitioners was the lowest of all the tenders so made and filed with the said Department for the construction of the said work.

"6. That the amount or difference in favor of the public between the tender of your petitioners and the lowest tender was about \$200,000.

"7. That on the 10th of February instant your petitioners were notified by the Department of Railways and Canals that their tender had not been accepted because a cheque upon the Bank of Montreal for the amount of the deposit was not marked good as required by the specifications, and that the contract was awarded to a higher tender as shown by exhibit No. 1 herewith.

"8. Your petitioners, complaining of this decision of the Department of Railways and Canals, humbly represent to Your Excellency in Council, that the said cheque was duly accepted by the Bank of Montreal, at Montreal, on the 24th of January last.

"9. That on the 6th of February instant it was presented to the Bank of Montreal, in the City of Ottawa, by Mr. Bradley, the private secretary of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that the answer of the Manager of the Ottawa branch of said Bank was that the cheque was good till paid, and good from the date; that the secretary of the Minister of Railways and Canals replied to the Manager of the said branch that his statement was satisfactory to the Department, as shown by exhibits 2, 3 and 4 herewith.

"10. That the said cheque is still good, that it would have been cashed or paid at any time, and the same is now in possession of the Department of Railways and Canals.

"Therefore, your petitioners pray:

"1st. That the Order in Council setting aside the tender of your petitioners for want of a cheque marked 'good as required by specifications,' and awarding the contract to Messrs. Onderdonk & Co., be reconsidered by Your Excellency in Council.

"2nd. That the tender of your petitioners, being the lowest regular tender, be accepted by the Department of Railways and Canals, and the contract awarded to your petitioners, who are willing and ready to execute the same.

"And your petitioners will ever pray.

"McDONALD & CHARLEBOIS."

Those contractors, therefore, urged that their tender, being the lowest, should be accepted. The reply to this petition is accompanied by various exhibits, showing the transactions according to the telegrams that had passed, and Mr. Bradley's interest in the matter when he called upon the Manager of the Bank of Montreal, and it is we find a telegram was addressed and franked by Mr. Bradley, secretary of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; you will find the ordinary frank.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am merely stating what appears on the records.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement is not true, because Mr. Bradley never saw the telegram, but franked a blank on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At any rate, it is of no consequence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is of great consequence.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The arrangement was made by Mr. Bradley to have the telegram sent, and he franked it; the mere question of whether it was franked by him or not is not a matter of importance, so long as the bank manager understood what was asked, which he appears to have done from that reply. The report of the Minister is simply this :

"On the facts having been submitted to Council, it was decided that no change could be made in the wording of the cheque, after the tenders had been received, and the contract was accordingly awarded to the next lowest tenderer, without reference to the informal tender sent in by Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois."

This was written to the hon. the Minister with the knowledge that the tender was not informal, but was strictly formal. The hon. gentleman knew also that no change was required in the wording of the cheque. It was not the wording of the cheque at all, but a mere endorsement by a stamp upon the cheque that contained the obnoxious words; and when the hon. gentleman, on the 6th, had the cheque early in the day, that cheque was still good. He was bound to account for his actions afterwards in some way or other, which he has not done in these papers. The transaction appears to be one of the worst I ever knew in connection with any transaction by any Government in this country. There is a deliberate withdrawing of the contract from the parties who were entitled to receive it, in the first place; there is no reason assigned, but that the cheque was marked good for two days only, although, from the hon. the Minister's own showing in the documents, he raised that objection himself by his telegram to the bank, to ask if the cheque was still good. Had he taken the ground that, on no consideration would he look at any cheque unless it was strictly according to his views on the technicalities of the case, his position would have been much better. But, even then, I think, where a saving of over \$200,000 would be effected in the public interest, it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to wait a reasonable time in order to ascertain whether this was good or not. Instead of that he rushes in hot haste—and if he was a special friend and advocate of Mr. Andrew Onderdonk, he could not have acted with more precipitancy or less judgment than he did in the interest of the public. Now, Sir, this is so serious a matter that I feel bound to record my own personal opinion of it by moving a motion which will go upon the records of the House; and I hope, notwithstanding the differences of political opinion between myself and the majority of this House, that a majority of this House will see that this transaction is one that cannot be defended upon any ground whatever, and that the motion I propose to make will be sustained by the majority of the House. If it be not sustained, I confess that I shall feel that my judgment was greatly at fault, trusting, as I do, to the common sense and honesty of hon. members of this House in relation to the public interest in a matter of this kind. As I said on rising to move this motion I have in my hand, that it was not my intention to do anything more than narrate the circumstance, bring all the facts in a regular narrative form before the House, I shall move a motion, which I believe will gather all the incidents of the case and give effect to the views I entertain, that the House will join with me in those views, that the conduct of the hon. the Minister of Railways in this case, and that of his colleagues, has been quite indefensible. I admire the hon. gentleman's ingenuity. He has carefully, on each occasion, taken good care to have his colleagues thoroughly committed with him to the passing over of everything except the presentation of the cheque.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell me if he was aware, on the 6th February, of the circum-

stance of his going to the manager of the bank here to see if the cheque was good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall probably have an opportunity of stating what I know, and I did know what the hon. gentleman asks.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, I will be able to obtain the information.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You have it now; the hon. gentleman says he did know.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Indeed, I was not aware he said so. However, I will move, in amendment to the motion :

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be *Resolved*, That from a return laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Railways, it appears that tenders were invited on the 24th of October for the construction of part of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Moody to Emory's Bar; such tenders to be received up to the first day of February, last; and that fourteen tenders were received varying from \$2,377,000 to \$3,531,832, and that the lowest tender was that of Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois for \$2,277,000, and that the next lowest, that of Andrew Onderdonk, for \$2,446,255, or \$209,255 higher;

That it appears that with their tender McDonald & Charlebois sent a cheque for \$20,000, the sum mentioned in the conditions, dated on the 23rd day of January, last, drawn on the Bank of Montreal, which cheque was accepted by the said bank, but the acceptance stamp contained the words "Good for two days only."

That it appears by letter from Mr. Clouston, the Manager of the Bank of Montreal, that "the limit of two days only" was unintentional, and as it was simply an oversight, that this was not at once struck out. It was certainly our intention to guarantee the cheque until paid."

That it appears by letter of Mr. Drummond, Manager of the Bank of Montreal at Ottawa, that he explained to the Department of Railways and Canals, that the limitation on the acceptance stamp on the cheque had been inserted by the Bank inadvertently, and without its being known when issued;

That it appears from a statement of A. P. Bradley, Private Secretary of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and of Andrew Drummond, that pursuant to instructions of the Minister, given him on Saturday, February 4th, Mr. Bradley called on Mr. Drummond at half-past ten in the morning of Monday, February 6th, and handed him the said cheque, asking him whether he would pay it, or whether it was still good, to which Mr. Drummond replied that he must enquire at the Head-Office, on which the cheque was drawn, and that it was then arranged between them that such enquiry should be made, and further that enquiry should be made as to how long it would be held good, and Mr. Bradley franked a blank telegram for the purpose, which Mr. Drummond filled in, and despatched;

That it appears that a telegraphic reply was received from the Head-Office, as follows:—

"Please strike out 'for two days only,' from our acceptance stamp; the cheque will be good until paid."

That it appears that Mr. Drummond at one o'clock on the said 6th of February handed this telegram to Mr. Bradley, who requested that it should be left with him, and that it was so left accordingly, and that Mr. Bradley on the same day handed it to the Minister of Railways and Canals;

That it appears that on the 6th of February, the Minister was in possession of the answer to his enquiry and knew that the restriction in the acceptance stamp so inadvertently placed there, was not held binding by the bank, and that it was to be struck out, and that cheque was and would be held good until paid;

That it appears that on the 7th day of February, the Minister reported to Council that "the tender of McDonald and Charlebois which was the lowest is irregular, inasmuch as the cheque which accompanies it, was marked by the Bank of Montreal on the 24th of January, 1882, as good for two days only, and that the lowest tender made in conformity with the conditions is that of Mr. Andrew Onderdonk for \$2,446,255," and recommending the acceptance of the latter;

That it appears that on the 8th day of February, an Order in Council was passed, based on, and according to the said recommendation awarding the contract to the said Onderdonk;

That the Report of the Minister to Council does not state the facts hereinbefore set out as to his enquiries about the cheque and the results of such enquiry;

That no enquiries were made or communication addressed to McDonald & Charlebois on the subject before the said Order in Council;

That on the 10th of February, in response to an application from McDonald & Charlebois, the Secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals informed them that their tender could not be considered for want of cheque marked good, as required by specification;

That it appears that on a petition of McDonald & Charlebois, a reconsideration of the matter took place, when the Council determined to adhere to the previous decision;

That the contract laid on the Table, and executed in pursuance of the said Order in Council between the said Andrew Onderdonk is not binding, if disapproved by this House;

That by maintaining the decision to reject the tender of McDonald & Charlebois, and award the contract to the said Andrew Onderdonk, a sum of \$209,255 will be lost to the country;

That under the circumstances stated the tender of Macdonald & Charlebois should be accepted, and the said sum of \$209,255 saved ;

That this House cannot approve of the said contract with the said Andrew Onderdonk, whereby the said sum of \$209,255 will be lost to the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I might safely have left the disposition of this motion in the hands of the House—I think I might say in the hands of both sides of the House—after the feeble manner in which it has been presented by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie). The hon. gentleman has exhibited a desire to wound without the power to strike, and if he has provoked a criticism with reference to his own conduct which I have hitherto spared, he has only himself to thank for it. I have, in the first place, to tender my obligation to that hon. gentleman for having so recently as half-past ten this morning given me an intimation of this motion, that being the first I learned of any intention to bring such a motion as the present ; but, Sir, it was the last motion which any hon. gentleman or any man in this country, who has listened to the story the hon. gentleman has to tell, would expect to be made. But I think I was entitled to a notice “good for two days only” if no more, but the hon. gentleman did not give even that notice. Why did he not take the usual mode in dealing with such questions, of giving the two days notice which the forms of Parliament require, and thus placing before the House and myself an intimation of the motion he intended to move. The hon. gentleman had two objects in not taking that course, one being to take me by surprise—to prevent me even having time, as I have not had time to run my eye over the papers in connection with this matter ; and the other was because the hon. gentleman wished to expand the resolution which he has read on the Journals of Parliament without giving this House an opportunity of meeting it by a corresponding amendment. Those were the reasons which prevailed with the hon. gentleman, and, conscious of the feebleness of his position, he thinks to attain some small, insignificant, contemptible party object by pursuing a course that was not a manly or a fair course. Now, Sir, when that hon. gentleman stood where I now stand, when he held the high position of Minister of Public Works in this country, and when I felt it my duty to submit to Parliament a criticism on his conduct, I dealt with him in a different manner. From my place on that side of the House where he now sits, I told that hon. gentleman the motion I proposed to make, and when I proposed to make it, and gave him full and ample opportunity of meeting it. He has not seen fit to return that courtesy, but I thank him that at last he has given me an opportunity on the floor of this House of showing what the position of the Opposition of this country is on questions that, as he himself declares, are the strongest and most potent ground of attack on myself and the Administration of which I have the honor to be a member. I might say, Sir, that in order to a right understanding of this question we must go back a little, and we must enquire why it was that a cheque marked “good” was required by the Government with the tenders that were to be put in. Let me say, Sir, that the volume in my hand laid on the Table of the House by the hon. gentleman himself discloses the ground. This volume, reciting the contracts which he himself, while Minister of Public Works, signed and carried on in this country from the beginning to the end discloses a condition of contract jobbery such as it will be difficult to find a parallel for anywhere. From the first hour that the hon. gentleman became Minister of Public Works down to the last hour of his term you have only to read his own record—and I invite hon. gentlemen to read it—I say you have only to read this return brought down by himself of contracts in the Department of Public Works from the 1st of July, 1867, to the 28th of March, 1878, in order to find that a system of the most open flagrant contract jobbery

Mr. MACKENZIE,

marked the Administration of the hon. gentleman from the hour he entered office to the hour he left it. I say more. I say that the first act of the hon. gentleman was in character with the whole. Where is it to be found ? It is to be found in a return brought down in answer to a motion made in the House for the tenders for contracts 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 14 of the Welland Canal. Now, what does that return disclose ? A return to be found in the Sessional Papers, number 58, volume 11, 1878. It discloses the fact that the Government of which my hon. friend the former Minister of Public Works, now Sir Hector Cameron—I mean Sir Hector Langevin (“Coming events cast their shadows before”) was a member, invited tenders with reference to these important contracts on the Welland Canal, and before we resigned and went out of power tenders were sent in and were ready to be acted on. The Government feeling that the responsibility of dealing with this great work was in the hands of the gentlemen who had been entrusted with power avoided awarding these contracts, and the hon. gentleman found—as I found under similar circumstances—that these tenders were left ready to be dealt with by himself. How did he deal with them ? By taking them up and examining them and dealing with them carefully as the public interests required ? No ; he swept the whole of them aside. And with what result ? The result is disclosed on the other page where it is shown that the hon. gentleman called for new tenders, the result being that the lowest of the old tenders as compared with the lowest of the new tenders shows a balance of no less than \$272,867 of increased cost to the public by the new tenders. Subsequently he let the contracts, and he let them in a way which he would be very sorry to have me disclose, here or anywhere else, because so far from having been animated by the high principles which he now pretends should govern in relation to such transactions, the hon. gentleman entered on the duties of his position with a determination to serve his friends, and serve them irrespective of the public interests. The return shows that in one case—that of section 12, finding that the parties to whom he wished to give the contract were the highest instead of the lowest tenderers, he did not award the contract at all, but what did he do for them ? He pushed Messrs. Ginty & Dickey—of whom Mr. Dickey had been closely allied with the hon. gentleman politically in every possible way—into the next contract, and gave them a contract for which they had absolutely never tendered at all, and rejected the lowest tender which was put in by the ablest contractors that could be found within the wide domain of Canada—a fact of which he was aware himself, because they had been engaged in important contracts—I mean Messrs. Denison, Belden & Company. I say that under these circumstances it will not do for the hon. gentleman to pose here as such a purist, and to say that this is one of the worst transactions which he has ever known in connection with the letting of public contracts. I do not despair, Sir, of convincing the hon. gentleman, before I close, that the only mode in which he can save his reputation as a public man, is to withdraw this motion. I will give abundant reasons which will convince him, whatever he may do, and every fair-minded man who sits behind him, that in the public interest and as public men, regarding the responsibilities of the past and the responsibilities of the future, when they may be called upon to fill such a position, they have no course as honest, fair-minded men, but to withdraw that resolution or vote it down. Now, Sir, as I say, I found contract broking and contract jobbing rife from the time the hon. gentleman commenced his career to the time he left office. I have shown what the first transaction was, and now what was the last ? He says, I allowed days to elapse before finally awarding the contract ; but I say, Sir, that he allowed weeks to elapse, and awarded

a contract at \$123,000 higher than the lowest tender, and without allowing the lowest tenderer to correct a mistake which he said his clerk had made in inserting \$95,000 for \$195,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What contract was that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The last contract the hon. gentleman let after his defeat and before he left office, and that was the contract for building the Custom house in St. John. But Sir, while I have felt a sincere desire never to add a single feather's weight to the heavy blow which fell on the hon. gentleman when he was dismissed from power, I feel that, having ventured to place before the House such a case as he has now presented, it is only right that I should show the hon. gentleman that his memory is a little treacherous when he is obliged to consider this one of the worst cases he has known. What were the steps the Government took in this matter? What is contract broking? It is this. When contracts are invited a number of persons come in for merely speculative reasons and tender, without any means or qualifications of doing the work, but with the hope of getting the contract and selling out to a person who has put in a higher tender; and contract broking means putting in bogus tenders which the parties themselves have neither the means, the ability, nor the intention of carrying out, but for the purpose of selling out to parties above them. There is only one means that I know of, of preventing that contract broking, and that is the process which was devised of requiring a substantial deposit to be paid in with the tender, which the party would forfeit if he put in a bogus tender. Well, Sir, these parties were required, and were notified to put in a cheque for \$20,000—why? Because this was not only a very large and very important contract, but the Government—as will be seen by reference to the papers laid on the Table of the House, and which disclosed the whole of this transaction from end to end—felt that the importance of having this contract promptly executed was very great. They felt the importance of preventing that contract broking, and of avoiding the danger of giving the contract to any one not able to carry it out, as was done in the case of a contract now on the Table of the House, which the hon. gentleman let to parties whom the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals declared, for a most important portion of their work, had only half the money necessary; so that the contract broke down, and was let at a large increase on the original cost. Now, the House is aware that the Government of British Columbia had sent a delegate to England to impress upon the Imperial Government the statement that this Government were not proceeding to carry out, so far as they were able, the terms of Union with British Columbia; and one of the things they claimed was the immediate construction of this section of railway from Emory's Bar to Port Moody, which the House had declared we must construct. It therefore became important that that work should be proceeded with, and pushed to completion. It also became important, because the Chief Engineer of the Pacific Railway reported that it would open up and develop the resources of that Province to an infinitely greater degree, if this portion of the line, which we were bound to complete within a certain time, was completed at once rather than postponed, so that there would be a continuous line from tide water navigation to Kamloops. The Government decided to ask for tenders for this work in a lump sum, believing that, as the Chief Engineer had reported, that the surveys were complete, it would be more in the interest of the public to let it in a lump sum and in one contract, and especially as the rails required would all have to be taken from tide water at Port Moody. Therefore the reasons for letting the contract in one sum and to one contractor, as submitted by the Chief Engineer to the Government, were considered conclusive. But for

the purpose of securing the prompt construction of this work, it was necessary to take measures to prevent bogus tenders being put in, and every contractor was furnished with a printed statement that his tender would receive no notice whatever unless it was accompanied by a bank cheque marked good. Now, Sir, what did that mean? A bank cheque that could be made good at the will of a contractor or at the will of some banker with whom he might be in collusion? Not at all. The whole policy was to have \$20,000 in money placed in the hands of the Minister, which would be forfeited, irrespective of any effort on the part of the person who had put that cheque in with his tender if he failed to carry out the contract. Now, the hon. gentleman pretends to say that this tender was not informal. How can he say that when the specifications require that every tender must be accompanied by a cheque marked good, and he himself says that the cheque which was opened with the tender on the first of February, instead of being marked good, was marked "good for two days only." Does "two days only" mean anything, or does it mean nothing? Does "two days only" mean for ever, or does it not? There was this one point which the hon. gentleman mentioned, and of which I am very glad to have the opportunity of giving the most full and frank explanation; and that is, that this cheque was not submitted to Mr. Drummond, the manager of the Bank of Montreal, until the 6th of February, whereas it came into the possession of the Department on the first day of February. Now, Sir, I think I can dispose of that at once in a very satisfactory manner. The hon. gentleman will not say that six days after receiving tenders of that kind, and before the Government dealt with them finally, was an excessive period, because the hon. gentleman, as I shall be able to show, expended days and weeks and months in dealing with and finally awarding contracts during his term of office. The hon. gentleman knows the practice of the Department—that in all these matters, requiring a large amount of capital, one of the first things the Government does in connection with them is to satisfy themselves, as far as they can, of the ability and resources of a tenderer before they award him a contract. Now, Sir, the moment these tenders came in, the figures, the names and the position in which they stood were shown by myself to my colleagues, and inquiries were being instituted as to the means possessed by Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois, the lowest tenderers, for doing the work. I asked the Chief Engineer to make a report, as is usual, as I wished to bring the matter up in Council (I think that was towards the end of the week), and he said he would at once prepare a report. I then sent for the tender and cheque, for the purpose of examining them myself; and that was not until the 4th of February. Why did I send for that cheque and tender? Those gentlemen must excuse me if I say it was because I had had dealings with them before. A large contract was awarded them by the former letting of contracts for work from Emory's Bar to Kamloops, and when they were called upon to deposit the money which, under the contract and specifications, they were bound to deposit in order to have the contract made, they deposited a cheque, I think, for \$137,000, and I found the money could not be obtained at the bank; I found the cheque had been obtained from the cashier of the bank without the knowledge of the directors or without the firm having deposited any money to back it; and, under those circumstances, the hon. member for Lambton will not consider me as acting unwisely in looking at the cheque for \$20,000 before proceeding to make a report to Council. I looked at the cheque—I am not a banker—and I will give the hon. gentleman the same opportunity as I had, and this cheque, which the hon. gentleman says is still good, I will send to him across the House. He will find, unless his sight is better than mine, the words "two days

only," are not sufficient to attract attention; there are some hieroglyphics there, but I could not make out exactly what they meant. I accordingly sent for Mr. Trudeau, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, I said: "Mr. Trudeau, is that cheque all right. Look at the others." "No," he said, "it is not like the others. I do not know exactly, I cannot say." He did not see the words "for two days only." I then called for my private secretary, Mr. Bradley, and told him to take the cheque down to Mr. Drummond and find out whether it was a good cheque. I sent no message to enquire whether the cheque would be made good, because every hon. gentleman will see that a more idiotic thing I could not have done. Why? The whole thing turned on the point whether I had \$20,000 that the firm could not get out of my hands, or whether the cheque was waste paper, for if the Bank of Montreal had sent half-an-hour after the tenders were opened that the cheque would be paid, I would have treated it as a piece of waste paper. Why? Because all they had to do was to go down to the Russell House the moment after the clock struck twelve, when the contractors would be checking each other's figures, and would then know how they stood, and telegraph an accomplice to make the cheque good, which otherwise would be treated as a piece of waste paper. After the experience I had of those gentlemen, when I got the answer from Mr. Drummond that he would not pay the cheque until he had enquired at the head office, I knew I was in this position: they had put a cheque in my hands not marked "good," but marked "for two days only," on the 24th, and when I came to ask for the money it rested with them to say whether I should have it or not. If they found themselves relatively in such a position as enabled them to get the bankers to respond to the cheque the money would be paid; if, on the contrary, the money was going to be forfeited, the requisite money would not be deposited, I would find myself in possession of piece of waste paper. Did I, not being a banker, take the right measures to ascertain whether the cheque for \$20,000 was good, when I sent my private secretary to Mr. Drummond, a banker of long standing and a man of high character, to ask if the bank would pay the money? That at once settled the question that I had a cheque that was not of a negotiable character. What was Mr. Drummond's answer? Let me deal with the specific statement, for if it be possible for an hon. gentleman to make a statement, which more overwhelmingly defeats his own case than that which the hon. member for Lambton read to the House, I shall be very much surprised to hear it. Mr. Drummond was asked: "Will you pay the cheque." He shook his head and said: "No; it is marked 'for two days only'" and he gave that as the reason why he could not and would not pay the cheque. Mr. Bradley had no instructions from me to make, and I never dreamed of making a communication to the head office; he had no instructions, except to ask Mr. Drummond if he would pay the cheque, so as to make assurance doubly sure, either that I held a negotiable piece of paper worth \$20,000, or a piece of waste paper. I learnt that it was a piece of waste paper, so far as I was concerned, because of the refusal of Mr. Drummond to pay the cheque. The statement that he would not pay the cheque without referring it to the head office proved, beyond a shadow of doubt, that, at all events, in Mr. Drummond's judgment, and I think the House will hardly expect me to doubt Mr. Drummond's answer to such a question, it was not a negotiable piece of paper for \$20,000. The hon. member for Lambton says that this cheque is now good, that the fact of its being marked "for two days only," does not mean anything, that a cheque good for two days only "means good for ever." Will the hon. gentleman open his mind, will he close his eyes to the partizan side of this question so as to be able to see that Mr. Drummond declared that the cheque was not of such a character as

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

would be paid: Will he open his eyes to the fact that Mr. Drummond said that he would not pay the cheque marked "for two days only" without authority, and that he telegraphed to the Manager of the Bank of Montreal asking "Is that a good cheque and for how long will you guarantee it." If the hon. gentleman will look at the cheque, which he says is a good cheque for ever, he will see there is only a stamp on it. I have laid on the Table of the House the cheque for Mr. Onderdonk's deposit. Let the hon. member for Lambton compare it with the one to which he referred, and what will he find. He will find it is stamped and marked, "accepted, Bank of Montreal," giving the date, and the name of the ledger-keeper, and the hon. gentleman has only to examine this cheque and compare it with that marked "good for two days only" and which was not accepted, in order to show beyond possibility of controversy, that the latter cheque was not such an one as would have been accepted as a good cheque by the Department. The hon. gentleman drew the attention of the House to the circumstance that the tender was put in on the 24th January. That is not the fact. This cheque marked "good for two days only," was in the hands of Messrs. Charlebois & McDonald down to 1st February, when it was deposited in the office of Railways and Canals. Taking the experience I had of those gentlemen, knowing that, without doubt, their tender was a speculative one, and that it was intended to secure the advantages resulting from putting in the lowest tender, and if that were not the case, of forfeiting nothing, I adopted the course I have stated. I had taken an opportunity of enquiring into the position of these gentlemen, and I found that their pecuniary circumstances, so far as I was able to learn, had not improved from the time they had been called on to make a deposit, and had given me an accepted cheque on a bank where there were no funds to enable the bank to respond to it; and when I said I must have a deposit on the Bank of Montreal, they were utterly unable to comply with the demand. Having had that experience in the past with these gentlemen, I had every reason to suppose, as I did suppose, that this was an attempt to trick the Department, and take an unfair and dishonest advantage of the other parties who had tendered. I leave to every fair-minded man in the House—I care not on which side—whether with the evidence before me, I was not right in coming to such a conclusion. Let us go a little further. In the first place, the question was, as the ex-Minister says, whether the cheque was good. I say that with my limited experience on such matters, I could not see anything upon the face of that cheque that satisfied me it was good, and I sent to Mr. Drummond, Manager of the Bank of Montreal; to ascertain if he would pay the money before I made my report to the Council. Mr. Drummond said he could not accept the cheque because it was marked good for two days only. That was the first time any of us in the Department noticed it was thus marked. This was on Monday. I had given Mr. Bradley instructions on Saturday to make enquiries but the bank was closed. On Monday morning he franked a telegram to the head office at Mr. Drummond's request, and I am glad Mr. Drummond did not confine his statement to the endorsement on the cheque, "good for two days only," because his enquiry shows that the cheque as marked was not negotiable. What did the bank say in reply to Mr. Drummond's telegram? Did it say: "Mr. Drummond, why do you ask this question? You know very well that the 'good for two days only' is but a form of speech and means nothing—that the cheque is good for ever." That would be the answer one would expect, if the contention of the hon. gentlemen is right. But the Bank of Montreal has never ventured to say that that "good for two days only" meant nothing, and that everybody must have known it was a good cheque. On the contrary, the statement of the

Bank of Montreal is not that the cheque is good, but simply authorized Mr. Drummond to strike out "good for two days only"—to remove the restriction. Then the cheque, in the first instance, was restricted. From the beginning to the end, everything shows clearly that I had every reason a man could have to suppose that the cheque was a worthless piece of paper, put in intentionally for the purpose of tricking the Department into awarding a contract to parties who had no intention of carrying it out, but only intended selling it to the highest tenderer. That branch of the subject I will take up a little later. The error, these parties say themselves, was not theirs, but that of the Bank of Montreal; and I say frankly that they have, by the evidence produced from the Bank of Montreal, acquitted themselves completely of any design to act dishonestly or unfairly with regard to this cheque; but that was not a matter within my knowledge, nor for me to ascertain. As I said before, I made no application to the head office of the bank, because I did not want to know—a week later, after the tenders were opened and known—whether they would make the cheque good. This cheque was worse than if not marked. One can suppose that when persons of high standing and means put in their cheque not marked at all, it was an oversight on their part and the cheque is perfectly good. But the hon. gentleman knows that cheques have been refused over and over again because not marked good within the terms of the specification, and it would be against all precedent to allow parties to change their cheques afterwards. Therefore it was quite impossible for me to arrive at any other conclusion than that at which I arrived. But the hon. gentleman ventured to say, and he will be compelled to take back the statement—that I concealed the facts from my colleagues. He ventured to say that I did not place them in possession of all the information but took measures to hide the facts from them. My colleagues are here and they know the statement I am making to be strictly accurate when I say that the first thing I did on the 6th—the first day I got this information on Mr. Bradley giving me Mr. Drummond's answer and shortly afterwards placing in my hands the telegram from the Bank of Montreal handed in by Mr. Drummond, authorizing him to make the cheque good—was to place the cheque before my colleagues and the statement of Mr. Drummond that he had the authority of the bank to make it good.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not in the hon. gentleman's memorandum as a Minister.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman ought not to jump at so extraordinary a conclusion as that I was concealing anything. I had nothing to conceal. All I had to do was to award that contract to Onderdonk & Co. without saying a word to my colleagues. The hon. gentleman knows that as Minister of Public Works when tenders are opened and placed in his hands, and there are undoubted informalities in any tenders which prevents their being considered, he may award, as he has often done, the contract to the lowest tenderer without consulting his colleagues. All I had to do if I wanted Mr. Onderdonk to have the contract was to decide the question with the evidence I had before me, that the cheque had to be altered which rendered the tender null and void, and warranted my taking the course I did to prevent contract broking and jobbery. But I placed my colleagues in full possession of the facts. I took, before any report was made in Council at all, on the 6th day of the month when I had the information, the cheque, Mr. Drummond's reply and the telegram from the Bank of Montreal to Mr. Drummond, and laid them before my colleagues and asked them what I would do. They said, every one of them—and some of them know as much about banking as the hon. member for Lambton himself—you cannot take the slightest notice of that tender because it requires the cheque

to be altered in order to make it a negotiable cheque. You have the evidence, Sir, that the cheque was good for two days only, and the evidence of the Bank of Montreal here, that they would not pay it, of the Manager of the Bank of Montreal himself, not that a mistake was made, and that the cheque was perfectly good, but authorizing the manager here a week afterwards to alter the cheque so as to make it good, and then the contractors themselves come forward, and admit that an error was made, and the Manager of the Bank of Montreal says it was an unintentional error. The hon. gentleman says that the cheque is perfectly good, but he is the only man who can be found to take that view of it, neither the Montreal Bank here, nor the Manager of the Bank at Montreal, nor the tenderers themselves have, and not one of these gentlemen has—dared to say that there was no error, or that the cheque did not require to be altered before it could come up to the terms of the specifications as they were made, and yet on such grounds, indeed, the hon. gentleman undertakes to ask hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House to support a motion, that, as I have said before, he is the last man in this House or out of it, who ought to have ventured to attempt to put on the Journals of this House. Sir, if I wished to take up and expand on the Journal's motions—which I could carry, and not impotent attempts like this, made with the design to wound but without the power to strike—I could blacken the hon. gentleman's character in such a way as to prevent any person from ever recognizing him, and I will find the necessary evidences in this volume which he himself laid on the Table of the House, and I will prove a score of cases where the hon. gentleman had not anything like a such justification as this for his conduct, and where there would be fair and legitimate grounds for challenging the hon. gentleman's conduct. What does he say to the contract which was wrested out of the hands of Dennison, Beldon & Co. I am wrong, the hon. gentleman was not here at the time, the hon. gentleman was then on his way back from England, when in hot haste, without permitting, at the instance of the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, a poor forty-eight hours delay, until the Minister himself could arrive—the Acting Premier, who is now leader of the Opposition, and the hon. gentleman who sits beside him, the late Postmaster General, forced through a contract, and gave it to a violent partizan, Patrick Larkin, whose tender was higher than that of the first contractors in this country, and men who, at that time, had proved that their ability to deal with public contracts was greater than that of any other men almost to be found in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, I shall reserve until the hon. gentleman's motion, which he has placed on the paper, and with which he has given me a legitimate opportunity of dealing—comes up, the comparison of the hon. gentleman's contracts with my own, and until he makes his motion with reference to the aqueduct contract, which has been laid on the Table of the House. But before I sit down, I will show to every man in this House, and I will convince every intelligent and fair-minded man on that side of the House—and they are all intelligent and they would be fair-minded if it were not for the party pressure which is applied to these hon. gentlemen—that, instead of the country having lost one dollar by the awarding of the contract to Andrew Onderdonk, the country has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars by this award; and I have shown that it would have been a fraud on every man who tendered to have accepted the tender in question. What had we done? We had given notice all over Canada of our intention to invite tenders for this work, and we had also invited an examination of the proposed undertaking, in order that tenderers might be in a position to state the lowest possible figure for which it could be done, and some of them had gone out there for this purpose. Ryan & Purcell, one of the most eminent firms of contractors in Canada, sent a gentleman out to examine this

ground from end to end, to ascertain exactly what they could do this work for, as they were very anxious to do it, the contract on which they were engaged being near its close. They took the best means of finding out what this work could be done for, and what was the result? Why, Sir, I hold in my hand the list of contractors, which the hon. gentleman himself has read, and what does it disclose? That, from all the ablest contractors in Canada and out of it, whom we had in competition for this work, no less than twelve tenders were received, and it shows that the average of these twelve tenders is no less than \$3,216,331. I may here say, Sir, that the very highest tenders came from parties in San Francisco and the adjoining territory, who had the best possible means of knowing what the work could be done for out on the Pacific Coast. How did Andrew Onderdonk's tender come to be so low? For this reason: That Onderdonk—as every intelligent man, and as the hon. gentleman himself knows—could afford to do this work for one-half million less than any other man in the world. And why? Because he is at present engaged in a gigantic contract from Emory's Bar to Kamloops, and because, if he had competition for labor, to which he would be exposed if the contract went into other hands, he might have to pay 25 cents extra a day per man. The sum would be enormous. Besides being engaged in a vast contract, he had the great mass of the plant, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, on the ground, the organization and everything complete; and everybody knows perfectly well that he could afford to do the work—and had an interest in doing it—for a lower sum than any other man, and on terms on which no other man could do it. What do we find? The next tender to Andrew Onderdonk—as I still regard it—is a speculative tender. I have not the slightest idea in the world that McDonald & Charlebois ever dreamed of undertaking this contract. And why? Because, when they tendered once before, they could not put up the deposit, and their means, as far as I am aware, have not since improved. I will show a dozen instances in which the hon. gentleman himself decided to refuse contracts and tenders because tenderers had undertaken contracts and had not given satisfaction before, and the hon. gentleman will not contradict this. What was the position of Charlebois? He was contractor under the Government, and the history of this transaction shows whether he was fit to be entrusted with that \$3,000,000 contract at Port Moody. The hon. member for Lambton gave him a contract on the Georgian Bay Branch, which was to be commenced on the 2nd of August, 1878, and to be completed on July 1st, 1880. But, Sir, that contract was taken out of his hands on the 9th of August, 1879, a short time before they were obliged to complete it, and how much work does the hon. gentleman suppose that Charlebois had been able to do? A mere trifle was at that time finished, because finding his utter inability to provide capital in order to deal with the contract, he had assigned and sold all right and interest in the contract to Smith & Ripley, who had energy and ability enough to go into the work. But the total amount payable—and the matter is now before the Supreme Court, and we have given him the last shilling to which he is entitled—is up to June, 1879, \$11,000 out of a contract for \$809,000, and yet that is the man who has come in to construct this work which would require \$200,000 or \$300,000 worth of plant before he could strike a single blow. Does the hon. gentleman think that there is any money lost to the people of this country in this transaction when a work had to be taken out of a man's hands and hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money to be spent, over and above the original amount granted, to get the work constructed. In the light of these facts does the hon. gentleman stand up and ask any man—even the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

strongest partizan who sits behind him—to believe that the public interests of this country would have been promoted by giving a contract to a man who had a contract, but was unable to deal with it with any more vigor than that the amount tendered in settlement in full in addition to the \$11,000, is \$13,807, or \$24,807 in all. \$24,807 worth of work done between 2nd August, 1878, and 9th August, 1879, on an \$809,000 contract, which was to be completed in July, 1880. Now, Sir, I need not waste the time of the House by saying any more on this topic; but I can affirm that, so far from considering the public interest to be promoted, if we had wanted to waste the public money, we would have accomplished it more successfully than by any other means, by giving this contract at these figures to these parties. You may ask me—what then was the difficulty? Why did you not award the contract to them? If they were unable to put up the deposit they could not take it. But we were all determined—as I was from the first hour after I entered the office of Minister of Railways and Canals—to put a check on this system of contract jobbing and contract broking. And the moment it was awarded to them, they would have been in a position to sell it, and the hon. gentleman instead of taxing us as he does to-day for not having awarded the contract in violation of good faith and honest dealing between man and man, would have taxed us for having let the contract to be sold to a higher party, and hon. gentleman opposite would have been engaged in finding out how much money Onderdonk had paid to them and in seeking to establish a case of contract jobbery and contract broking, which I defy them to establish against me since the first hour that I became Minister of Public Works. What more? This work was estimated after a most careful examination—and as the Chief Engineer of Railways knows, I was anxious to put it down to the lowest figure, that I could safely state to the House that it could be done for—to cost \$3,000,000. I came to the House, Sir, with every desire and anxiety and inducement to put the work at the lowest figure that I could state to the House; with Mr. Schreiber's estimate a year ago of \$2,560,000. We spent accordingly another year, and Marcus Smith, a gentleman of high position, who when the hon. gentleman was in office was Assistant Chief Engineer, and who acted as Chief Engineer to a very large extent when the hon. gentleman was in power, spent a summer with an able staff of engineers in going over every yard of this work, and in ascertaining the least that it would cost; and in these papers you have his testimony that it would cost \$3,000,000, according to the prices now paid for public work out there, where there is no competition between two contractors, to do this very work. I am going to lay on the Table of the House in addition to this, as I want to relieve the mind of the hon. member for Lambton from all impression that the public interest has been sacrificed in one jot or tittle, an estimate made out, according to McDonald & Charlebois' tender, as to what, according to their schedule rate, every yard of this work was worth. Is it \$2,275,000? No, Sir I have taken the schedule rates of every tenderer and made up the figures, and this shows, Sir, that, instead of this being the cost, according to their own prices, the work would have cost \$3,598,740; this is their own estimate. How does Onderdonk's tender compare, treated in the same way. His tender shows \$2,468,000, and the same principle brings out a cost of \$2,488,225, within \$2,000 of his tender, as applied to the entire work. I will lay these figures on the table, and no man will be better able to estimate their value than the hon. mover of this resolution. Murray & Co. are the next tenderers to Andrew Onderdonk, and what does the House suppose that these gentlemen, who are acquainted with and who are anxious to secure public works, were willing to do this work for, and on their estimate the House can come to a pretty accurate conclusion as to what it could be done for. Onderdonk tendered

\$2,486,000, and Murray & Co., \$2,864,000, or nearly \$400,000 more, showing that they all recognized the enormous cost of the plant required, and the enormous risk involved in procuring labor on the Pacific coast at the present day, which would render it unsafe to attempt it at any lower figures. Purcell & Ryan, who sent out one of the firm to go over every yard of the work, and who were most anxious to get it, tendered \$2,970,000; O'Brien & Co., \$2,999,000; Jas. Goodwin, \$3,062,000; Wm. Davis & Co., \$3,369,000, and so on to \$3,531,000; making an average of no less than \$3,216,331. and yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman ventures, in the face of these figures—and no person knows their value better than he—which he had in his hand, to insult the intelligence of this House and of this country by stating that the public had suffered to the extent of \$209,000. What would have happened had we let the contract as the hon. gentleman desires? Either these gentlemen would have obtained what I believe was their object, contract broking, and would have bagged a handsome sum by selling out the tender—and we would then have been compelled to let it at the present figure—or by some means or other they would have managed to make the deposit; and if they could not make their deposit two years ago, when their tenders were accepted, and they had to get a bogus cheque, and attempt to impose on us for money what was not money, I want to know where they could have raised a dollar to go on with this work? Where is the contractor in Canada who would have joined with them on the opinion of these other contractors as to what this work would cost? I have shown, apart from every other consideration, that the grounds on which this tender was rejected, was one concerning which the Government had no option because they must either have done that, or said that they were ready to be imposed upon by any party who chose to put in a piece of paper, which he was ready to make good or not as he pleased after the tenders were shown. Regardless of this, I have shown the House, by evidence of the most conclusive character, that the public interests were consulted at the same time, and that the only result of a contrary course would have been that a year or two would have been wasted, and that the work would have been put up again to competition, and that it would have then cost a much larger sum than it will cost under the present arrangement; while the country and British Columbia would not have obtained the prompt construction of the work and the Government would have paid half a million or a million more dollars for the purpose of securing its construction. It was not necessary for me to say one single word in reference to this matter. But, before I sit down, I intend to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the comments of their own press with relation to this question. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite may think that I want to hold them responsible for these comments. But, I am not quite so sure that they ought not to be. I do not believe in a leading public man in this country, or in this House, posing as a man of great justice and taking a very high stand as a man utterly irreproachable and unexceptionable in his conduct towards other public men, and, at the same time, having a lying, degraded press, from day to day, saying to the public of this country, what he dare not himself utter on the floor of this House. I say, Sir, that the conduct of the *Globe* newspaper, since the hon. gentleman became leader of the Opposition, has degraded, in this country, public journalism as it never was degraded and never has been degraded before; and I cannot believe, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is not himself responsible for having a hired assassin shooting from behind the hedge at a man whom he cannot meet in open and manly warfare. I say that they have that most degraded specimen of public journalism—yes, I say most degraded specimen of public journalism—and who is the man at the head of it,

Gordon Brown. Why Sir, he is a man who, without brains to attain any position as a journalist, as a leader of public opinion in this country, was a parasite fattening upon the reputation, character and talents of his late lamented brother—that is the man. And, Sir, he is a man so lost to common decency, that when that brother who had nourished and cherished him, was shot down at the hands of a foul assassin, he took advantage of it to succumb to the power of the present leader of the Opposition, and to trample upon the dearest instincts of that brother—I say that while George Brown possessed his manly vigor and was at the head of that paper, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was secure. All attempts, and many they were, and the basest attempts that ever a public man encountered in public life in any country, to drag him down from his position, were all foiled by the potent hand of George Brown who would not permit that injustice to be done. But when he lay grappling with death, shot down by an assassin, the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends seized that opportunity, in George Brown's helplessness, to dethrone the man that, while George Brown's arm remained unparalyzed, never could have been dethroned. And I say more, that having attained this position, Gordon Brown, who was craven enough to trample upon the dearest instincts of his brother, no sooner saw him in the grave, than he trampled upon that grave and held up to ridicule, as he is doing to-day the principles that George Brown fought for and contended for. I say that this craven hound, who shows that he is ready to submit to any indignity himself, thinks he can stab any public man's reputation in this country. What do you say to the man that, sheltered in the position that Gordon Brown is sheltered in, has assailed me as I have been assailed? What do you say to cowardice like that? I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they say to the cowardice of that man who, in that sheltered position, ventures to do that which he has never been able to goad any man on the floor of this House to do—assail my integrity? I ought to be the last man to say an unkind word of him. No man in this country owes more to Gordon Brown than I do. My feeble powers never would have placed me in the position I enjoy to-day, in the estimation of my party throughout this country, were it not for the unjust vituperation of that man. Over and above anything that I have been able myself to accomplish by a laborious life, devoted to the public and to my country—I say, over and above that, I owe largely to the slanders of that man the position I hold in the affections of my friends and of my party. What conclusion can you come to when you find a man trying to hound down a public man, and attempting to deceive the public mind and uttering lying slanders in relation to public affairs that no man in the Parliament of Canada, holding any responsibility for his utterances has ever dared to adopt—I say, what would be said of the man that goes on and does that persistently, from day to day, until he excites to nausea the intelligence, and the common sense, and the independence of every manly spirit in his party throughout this country? I say, under these circumstances, the cowardice is all there; the infamy of a life like that is one that sinks to a depth so low that no powers of mine can describe it. What do you say to this paper? They thought they had a case. The hon. member for Lambton thinks that "good for two days only" means good for ever, and that it was a thing so plain that the Minister of Railways, and every other man in this country, could not hesitate for a single moment to perceive it. What did the *Globe* say? Why, they were misinformed; they did not know the cheque had been limited for two days only. What did they say? Why, Sir, on the 15th of February they say:

"Suppose there was a trifling defect in the lowest tender. If Charlebois & McDonald were ready to rectify it the money could have been saved."

What does the late hon. Minister of Public Works say to that? Does he say he would allow tenderers, after the tenders were sent in, to rectify the errors that occasionally happen, as I will be able to show on a future occasion. But he would not like to say here that he would adopt that as a maxim to guide a Minister of Public Works. The *Globe* goes on to say:

"It is perfectly ridiculous to say that the Minister who acted in these cases would hesitate to have the tender of Charlebois & McDonald made regular if he wished to save the public money."

Well, Sir, the present Minister of Railways and Canals will not permit any tenderer to correct errors in his contract and to take an unfair advantage of other parties who tender. Then they get a little more light, as they suppose. The next edition of the paper said:

"Messrs. Charlebois & McDonald deposited this security in the shape of a cheque marked good for a certain number of days. All that the Minister of Railways had to do was to award them the contract and draw the money. But it seems he waited till the period for which the cheque was marked good had expired, and then awarded the job to Onderdonk & Company."

So the hon. gentleman thinks, I suppose, that a cheque marked for two days was good for ever, and was as good as cash; but the *Globe*, which professes to know everything, declared that my crime was not treating a cheque as worthless after the time for which it was limited had expired, but that I had held it over, it being good on a day not yet expired, that I held it until the time expired, and then awarded the contract to Onderdonk & Co. Had I done such a thing, I would have been open to the censure of this House, I would have been without the support of any member, because that would have been manifestly unjust. If the cheque was marked for a limited number of days, I had only to cross the street and draw \$20,000, and keep that in my possession till we had decided with reference to the matter. But when they found they were all wrong again, they turn round and say: "The Government had only to hold over awarding the contract till these days expired, to find a pretext, which was apparently desired, of giving the contract to Onderdonk." They themselves gave up the whole case by saying that, if the time for which the cheque was marked good had expired, the whole case was at an end. But when they found they were all wrong, when they found the time had expired before Charlebois & McDonald put the cheque in, and that it was marked good for two days only on the 24th of the month, that it was a worthless piece of paper, so far as we were able to learn, on the 26th, the tenders not having been opened till the first, they were equal to the occasion, and all the same it was a job, all the same they have defiled their paper from that day to this, by presenting in all its forms, and with a variety of falsehoods and misstatements, the same absurd story—for what purpose? For the purpose that they have succeeded at last in attaining, for the purpose of goading on some hon. gentleman opposite into doing what no man of them has ever dared to do down to the present hour—to come forward, not to attack my reputation and character as a public man, but to come forward and ask this House to disapprove of the mode in which this matter has been dealt with. They have succeeded in goading an hon. gentleman into making this attack, and it is the fault of the *Globe* newspaper, and not mine, if I am compelled to deal with that hon. gentleman, in relation to these matters in the discharge of public duty, hereafter as I have never dealt with him before.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron). I think hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would like very well if the motion which has been made, and the speech which we have just listened to, were allowed to pass unanswered, judging from the specimen, at all events, we had from the other side of the House a few minutes ago, when one or two of the supporters of the Government cried "question, ques-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tion," before the Speaker had finished reading the motion. That is the kind of fair play we expect to get on this side of the House from supporters of the Government. Now, Sir, however much one may disagree on general or particular questions with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, one cannot but admire the boldness and the audacity with which that hon. gentleman speaks. I have always noticed, in my knowledge of the hon. gentleman, and in my parliamentary experience, that the worse his case the bolder he is in making his assertions. I have always noticed that when he has no defence to offer, the hon. gentleman turns round and abuses the plaintiff's attorney, as he has attempted to do in the present instance, in abusing my hon. friend the member for Lambton. Now, what does the hon. gentleman state in his opening remarks? He says he might properly have left this motion in the hands of the House, because my hon. friend who sits before me (Mr. Mackenzie), presented his case in so feeble a manner. The fact is, Sir, my hon. friend did not require to present his case otherwise than he did. All that any man required to do is to relate the naked narrative of the events connected with the Port Moody job, and if any one will get up from the perusal of that narrative without being convinced that, at least, there is something wrong in connection with it, I am much mistaken. The hon. gentleman says my hon. friend has been goaded into making the present motion by the *Globe* newspaper. I have no concern with the *Globe* newspaper. As my hon. friend well knows, the *Globe* newspaper is very well able to take care of itself. But I think I can say that in something like fifteen years parliamentary experience I never heard a more scandalous or outrageous attack made by a member of Parliament on an absent man. Is that the kind of conduct you would expect from a Minister of the Crown? Is that the sort of magnanimity you would look for from a Minister occupying the position which he occupies. It looks to me—I do not say it now, but I would say it if I were not inside this Chamber—to be one of the most cowardly attacks I ever witnessed upon the floor of Parliament. A man who is not here to defend himself or answer the charges made against him, is attacked behind his back by an hon. member of Parliament. The hon. the Minister of Railways says that my hon. friend has been goaded into the present motion by the *Globe* newspaper. I know my hon. friend too well to suppose that he has been urged to make the present motion on any other ground or consideration than the public interest. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) hopes to gain some mean, contemptible, petty, political advantage, by presenting this motion to the House. Why, Sir, if my hon. friend expected to gain any such advantage as that, he would not have presented this motion in the calm, deliberate and temperate tone in which he presented it. He would have assumed the attitude which the hon. gentleman assumes who has just taken his seat. He would have thrown back his coat, rolled up his sleeves, and assumed a pugilistic attitude; he would have spoken in thundering tones that would have reverberated through the halls of this Chamber, instead of the calm and temperate manner in which he presented his case; and I do not think it was in very good grace that the hon. the Minister of Railways charged my hon. friend with having presented the motion to gain a petty political advantage. The hon. gentleman further said before he came to deal with the merits of the case, that from the pages of the Blue-book which he had in his hand and flourished, that he could show that my hon. friend was guilty while acting, as Minister of Public Works, of contract jobbery and contract broking, and that he would, if he could, blacken and ruin the character of my hon. friend. He said all that he had to do was to turn to the

pages of this Blue-book to establish that fact. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman has had abundant opportunities on public platforms and on the floor of this House, and yet he has never yet dared to prefer in Parliament any charge that would stick against my hon. friend. All I need do is to refer him to an hon. member who sits behind him, who supports him, and who is one of his devoted followers. This hon. gentleman is connected with one of the most prominent newspapers that advocates the interests of his party, and what does he say of my hon. friend? Does he give him the character which the hon. Minister of Railways gives him? Does he say that he was a man steeped to the lips in corruption; that he was guilty of contract jobbing and contract broking. No; the *Mail* newspaper says my hon. friend is one of the most honest men that ever stood in shoe leather, and yet the hon. gentleman says that he could, if he would, establish the fact out of a Blue-Book that my hon. friend has been guilty of jobbing in contracts. I challenge the hon. gentleman to do that. I defy him to do it. He has had three years to do it and he has failed, and if he were ten years more in his present position he could not convince the people of this Dominion, who know my hon. friend too well, that there is a dishonest bone in Alexander Mackenzie's body. The hon. gentleman has made the attempt, it is true; he has made the attempt by means of a Railway Commission to investigate and inquire into all the proceedings that took place while my hon. friend was at the head of the Department. We have never seen the report of that Commission, but we do know that some extraordinary and marvellous statements came out in connection with that report—statements that did not reflect much credit on gentlemen on the other side, and certainly did not throw any aspersions on the character of the hon. gentleman who sits before me. Why was not that document submitted to Parliament? Does not the hon. gentleman know that a great deal of the evidence that was taken by that Commission was of a kind that would not tell to the credit of the hon. gentlemen sitting opposite us?—and I have no doubt that that is the reason why that document has not been submitted to Parliament. The hon. Minister of Railways, says my hon. friend, was guilty of mis-conduct with reference to the letting of contracts, and he adds with his usual bluster: "Why, Sir, he would not wait a poor forty-eight hours in the public interest in order that a contract might be given to the person who was entitled to it in connection with the Welland Canal." I know nothing about that matter, but I know that the hon. gentleman would not wait a bare two hours, so that a telegram might be sent to Montreal, and an answer received at Ottawa, and the sum of \$209,000 be saved to the country; but in hot haste, without a moment's delay, on the morning of the 6th of February, the hon. gentleman rushed to the Council Board, and reports to his colleagues that the tender of McDonald & Charlebois was irregular, because the deposit cheque —

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House at the time, but I stated that the answer from Montreal was shown to my colleagues in the first instance, and before any action was taken upon it at all.

Mr. CAMERON. Very likely. The hon. gentleman said my hon. friend knew he could have awarded that contract on his own responsibility, at least I so understood him. I suppose, at any rate, that there is a sort of spirit in hon. gentlemen opposite that when the head of a Department presents a report to Council, the rest hold themselves bound by it. The hon. gentleman says his colleagues knew all about it. I say that only makes the matter worse. I supposed that only one man was guilty of what—if I were not in Parliament, I would call this a job, but I now find out that the hon. gentleman consulted his colleagues; that they knew

all about it, so that if there was a job every man on the Treasury benches was equally guilty with the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, what is the defence of the hon. gentleman, after all? Does the hon. gentleman suppose that he is going to defend himself in the eyes of Parliament, or even in the eyes of his supporters, by abusing the hon. member for Lambton? Does he suppose he is going to defend the granting of this contract to Onderdonk & Co., instead of to McDonald & Charlebois, by showing that Gordon Brown did something he should not have done? Is it to be accepted as a justification of the contract, or a defence against the charge made by the hon. member for Lambton, to abuse the *Globe* and say that it has published scurrilous articles about him, and destroyed his reputation so far as the *Globe* can do it? If not, I would ask him why three-fourths of his speech was taken up with abuse of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—abuse of the *Globe* newspaper, laudations of the late Hon. George Brown, abuse of the present managing director of the *Globe*? Does he suppose he is going to accomplish his defence by that kind of abuse? And, if not, what object had he in following that line of argument? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman practically admits the fact that my hon. friend bases his case upon; he admits that tenders were called for on the 24th of October; that on the 1st of February these tenders were sent into the Department; that the cheque for \$20,000 was handed into the Department on the 1st of February; and that, on the 4th of February, he requested his own private secretary to ask the Bank of Montreal whether that cheque was good or not. Now, I ask what object the hon. gentleman had in requesting his private secretary to go to the Bank of Montreal and ascertain whether this cheque was good or not? From the 1st to the 4th of February where was that cheque? It was in the possession of the hon. gentleman, and, on the 4th of February, he sent his secretary to the Bank of Montreal to enquire whether it was good or not. If these men had large contracts before, which they had been unable to fulfil, if the country was going to suffer by these men getting the contract, the hon. gentleman must have known that before the 4th of February, and, if he did know it before that day, he ought to have rejected their tender on those grounds. But the hon. gentleman does not pretend to have rejected it on that ground; the sole ground is that there was some irregularity in the cheque, and the hon. gentleman winds up his remarks by saying that these men could not complete the contract, because their tender was too low, and yet, Sir, on the 4th of February, with the full knowledge of that fact in his mind, and knowing these men as he must have known them, he sent down to the Bank of Montreal to ascertain whether the cheque was good or not. Sir, he knew perfectly well then, or he ought to have known, that this cheque was marked "good for two days only." His secretary could not go, however, on the 4th of February; he went on Monday, the 6th of February, and asked Mr. Drummond if that cheque was good. The hon. gentleman wants the House to believe that Mr. Drummond said that the cheque was not good. The papers show that Mr. Drummond said no such thing. What did he say? He did not say anything; he only shook his head, and then he said he would have to consult Montreal. The secretary went back and told the hon. gentleman that, and if he did not, he ought to have been his secretary no longer. This was done at about 10 o'clock on Monday forenoon; a telegram was sent, franked by the hon. gentleman's own secretary, and the answer came at one o'clock in the afternoon that the cheque was perfectly good, and would be good until paid. The hon. gentleman is in the habit of appealing to the honest and sensible men on both sides of the House, and I appeal to the honest and sensible men to put all these facts together, and to say what other conclusion they can come to than that up to the very

last moment the hon. gentleman intended to give this contract to McDonald & Charlebois, if the cheque was good. I say that any man who intended not to give the contract to McDonald & Charlebois, and who yet took the trouble to send down to the bank to inquire whether the cheque was good, would have been acting the part of an idiot. On the 4th of February it is quite clear the hon. gentleman intended to give them the contract. What changed his mind? It is quite clear that the fact that they had not fulfilled former contracts, that they had tendered too low, and that they were not able to fulfil this contract, had not the slightest effect on the hon. gentleman's mind. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that there was a doubt about the ability of McDonald & Charlebois to put up the security. Let the hon. gentleman turn to the papers, and he will find that the moment they found that their tender was the lowest, they were ready to put up every dollar of the money necessary to secure them the contract. And yet the hon. gentleman wants us to believe that all this was done for the public interest. All I can say is, that it is a most extraordinary way of serving the interest of the public. The hon. gentleman complains very bitterly of the course my hon. friend has taken against him. What else could he expect, after the course of conduct he has been guilty of? Let the hon. gentleman go before an impartial judge and jury, who will decide fairly between man and man, and I ask nothing but the bare, naked statement made by the hon. member for Lambton, and the answer, if it can be called an answer, of the hon. gentleman, and I venture to say that such a jury, without leaving the box, would bring in a verdict of guilty against the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has defended himself by abusing hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. He has quoted from the *Globe*, as he always does. Whenever there is a charge made against him on the floor of Parliament or outside of Parliament, what course does he take? Does he take the only course that an honest man is bound to take in order to vindicate himself before his fellow-countrymen? No, Sir. The hon. gentleman never does that. He launches out in a tirade of abuse against hon. gentlemen on this side, whether in Parliament or out of Parliament; against the *Globe* and other newspapers which venture, in the discharge of their public duties, to question and criticize the hon. gentleman's proceedings, and whenever a motion is submitted or allusion made to the hon. member he always assumes the same line of argument and the same line of defence. We have to treat the hon. gentleman as if he were, like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. I beg to take a different view of the hon. gentleman's political course and conduct for the last fifteen years in the Parliament of Canada, and we are not going to be deterred, whenever we find it to be in the public interest to do so, from attacking the hon. gentleman's conduct, policy and actions with respect to public affairs, because the hon. gentleman throws out defiances and challenges. I recollect well the line of argument he adopted. Why, it is the same old story. I have heard the latter part of his speech four times over, and I can almost repeat it word for word. He challenges hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to ask for a Committee of Enquiry, and declares he will submit his conduct to the judgment of the House. Why, it would be the greatest folly for any man to suppose (I have the highest respect for hon. gentlemen opposite personally) that were one of the great leaders of the Conservative party—the hon. gentleman who carries in his coat pocket the revisionary interest to the leadership of the party—put on his trial before his peers in Parliament, they would wash the hon. gentleman perfectly clean whether he was clean or not. Let us see what the hon. gentleman said when similar charges were made against him. He said:

"Not a single word of insinuation, not a single question was raised among those hon. gentlemen. The House rose, and the editor and proprietor of a public newspaper, the Toronto *Globe*, who I am glad to know is within the sound of my voice, drawing venom from the depths of his own black heart, said that in the columns of his newspaper, which if there was a word of truth in it, convicted the leaders of his party of being unworthy of public confidence."

The hon. gentleman took good care to say that when Mr. Brown could not answer him—not on a public platform where Mr. Brown would be present, but on the floor of Parliament when the Minister could not be answered. The hon. gentleman further said:

"Then I say, how dare any journalist so insult the intelligence of the public as to fill his columns with lying and slanderous utterances after Parliament had risen, and when, after all the facts were before the House, no man could be found in the party to venture an insinuation against me."

This hon. gentleman is above journalism and above criticism, and nobody should say a word against him. Insinuations are, however, made against him now, and he adopts the same course; he defies hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and the *Globe* and other papers, and thinks that is a conclusive answer. The hon. gentleman further said:

"They had these documents in their hands for weeks, and yet after all these denunciations in the press, Parliament rose without a man being found to endorse the contemptible utterances of that lying and slanderous paper. That was my position in this House, that is my position in this third Session of Parliament, and goaded on to desperation by my challenge on the public platform, to any hon. gentleman to formulate a charge against the integrity of my conduct as a public man—a challenge to discuss my conduct in the House or out of it—or to investigate it before any tribunal; it is only now that the hon. gentleman ventures not to formulate a charge, but to that which is the most unmanly act which one man can do to another—to throw out an unworthy insinuation."

The hon. gentleman asks us to formulate a charge before any tribunal. Pray, how are we to do so? He says we assailed his character, abused him and slandered him, and that the newspapers week after week abuse him. They do more, they charge the hon. gentleman specifically and distinctly, as I can show from the columns of various journals, with having committed acts of jobbery and corruption, and yet the hon. gentleman has not had the manliness to vindicate his character before the only tribunal where it can be properly vindicated. What have the papers charged him with? With every crime known in the criminal calendar.

Mr. PLUMB. From pitch and toss to manslaughter.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). With every crime known to the criminal calendar except murder, with every offence of which a politician can be guilty. Allow me to mention one or two charges made against the hon. Minister in connection with contracts, and let us see how he has dealt with them. "The nakedness of his jobbery is remarkable." I say this is a foul insinuation, if it is not true, against any man, and no Canadian statesman should for a moment submit to the charge without taking the earliest opportunity, not simply to deny it, but to compel its author to appear before a jury. "He is a wily and brazen corruptionist." When charged with jobbery and robbery in connection with the Carillon Canal contract, and section B and Port Moody contracts, the *Globe* says it has proved them, and adds: "We are ready to maintain them." The papers further say: "He must be considered guilty of gross jobbery just as Guiteau before being sentenced was guilty of killing President Garfield. He is persistently assailed because he persistently practices corruption." "This year he plunders the Treasury for Onderdonk & Co." "His official career began in corruption and goes on consistently." "He is a national disgrace." "He plundered the Treasury of \$264,000 to benefit a favored contractor." "The hardness of his falsifications is not more remarkable than the nakedness of his jobbery." These are charges on which could be based an indictment for criminal offence, and if not true the authors are liable to action for damages by the hon. gentleman. What

has the hon. gentleman done? He came to Parliament three years ago and challenged hon. members on this side of the House to establish their case before a Committee of the House. I prefer to go before some other tribunal, although I have the highest respect for Parliament. Respecting certain charges, the *Globe* says it is ready to prove them. If that be so, why does not the hon. gentleman give that paper an opportunity of proving them? If he wants to vindicate himself, clear his character, and show there is nothing in the charges made by the public press, and repeated day after day, he has one remedy, and one remedy only: let him bring an action against the *Globe*, or some other journal, and before an impartial judge and jury. If innocent, his innocence will appear; and if guilty, his guilt will appear. What would be the result if charges of this kind were brought against Imperial statesmen? They could not remain in office for one hour. Two or three years ago an English statesman was charged with having some indirect connection with a Portuguese railway. This charge was made against him, and he resigned his position in the Government, rather than such a charge should be made against a member of the Government. That is the correct course for an honorable man to take. I hold that a member of the Government ought to be above suspicion. The hon. gentleman is willing to assume that the members of this House will condone his offences, but I challenge him to establish his innocence, or rather to give us an opportunity of establishing that he is not innocent, before an impartial judge and jury of the country. That is the only way he can vindicate his character from the charge my hon. friend has made and established against him beyond all reasonable question. The only way the hon. gentleman can clear his character is by bringing an action in court against the *Globe* newspaper and others that have accused him in this matter, and, if he can, vindicate himself before an impartial tribunal.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McLENNAN. I have no wish to prolong this debate, but I think there are some points in it with which a supporter of the Government can very well deal. The last speaker on the other side suggested that the hon. member should exculpate himself through the law courts. The supporters of the Government do not ask their leaders to descend into that arena. It would be neither creditable nor profitable. I can tell you how I was struck by the first report of the transaction that leads to this motion of want of confidence. When I read the report I had no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the first motive with the Government was, that this work should be accomplished, that the contractors should be in every respect able to carry out the undertaking. I think all the debates that we have had here for the last two years, on the subject of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has made this point very clear, and I think the decision of the country has been very distinctly pronounced, that the first necessity of any contract should be that the party undertaking it be equal to the work, that the work be performed without unnecessary delay. It is not necessary that I should go over the whole history, or even any part of the history, of this Pacific Railway question to illustrate this point. It has been so clearly laid down on the floor of this House that it is quite unnecessary to repeat any of the arguments that have been made to maintain it. The supporters of the Government have maintained it from the first moment to the last of the discussion on this question. In carrying out a work of this kind, it has been decided that a corporate company was necessary. Whether that were so or not, it is necessary that contractors should perform the work. Well, without saying anything to the disparage-

ment of a very useful body, we all know that contractors are a necessary evil. Nobody knows that better than the hon. gentleman who has made this motion. When we come to discuss that which is a necessary evil, we find that no geographer has ever yet laid down the Rubicon that divides necessary evil from supreme good. The good to be accomplished in this case was to guard the interests of the country, but the hon. gentleman opposite have laid down this Rubicon, and its narrow line is marked across the floor of this House. That which is supreme good when the hon. gentlemen are on your right, Sir, becomes—I do not like to repeat the strong terms that were used on the other side of the House—something supremely bad, when it happens to be performed—on the same side of the line, it is true—but when these hon. gentlemen happen to be on your left. This is the whole question at issue, and I think it is a very simple one. I merely throw in my little mite to the debate at this stage to indicate how the matter strikes a supporter of the Government; and as one of those supporters, I must say that there never was a moment when I felt more strongly than now the duty imposed on me to support the Government and the Minister of Railways in relation to this contract.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not aware that the hon. member for Glengarry has at any period of his parliamentary career, expressed any hesitation as to the line he should take on any question that affected the Government of the day. If he has at any stage hesitated, he has been careful to prevent us from learning it, because his bearing, his discourse, his vote have been, as far as I can judge, those not simply of a staunch, but of an undeviating supporter of the Administration whatever it might propose. Now, the hon. gentleman has adopted some of those side issues with which the hon. the Minister of Railways endeavored to embarrass the consideration of the question before us, and it becomes all the more necessary that we should clear away those embarrassments and see what really is the question which we are called upon to decide. The hon. gentleman whose proposal to the Administration, sanctioned by the Administration, and brought here for review, has been this evening challenged, and he has answered that challenge with a degree of violence and vituperation unusual even for himself. He commenced his answer to a statement very different from his, distinct from his in all its features, a statement which was almost a judicial statement of the point at issue, rigidly correct as to the facts, and drawing no unwarrantable or even uncharitable deductions from those facts, by a wholesale attack upon my hon. friend's credit, character and public acts as the First Minister of this country. His answer was, as I have said, characterized by a violence of language and unmeasured amount of license in a speech remarkable even for him. I do not think that such a line of defence was the line fit to be adopted by an upright man, vindicating his position as a public man. Now, I should like to know was the position of the hon. member to be improved by the debasing and degrading—within his petty power to debase and degrade—the position of my hon. friend the member for Lambton? The question that we have to dispose of this night is not that of the merits and demerits of my hon. friend, or of his Administration. The question is whether the contract which is laid upon the Table ought to be approved or not; and this question is to be disposed of by the consideration of the circumstances surrounding the execution of that contract, and by determining whether on the whole it is in the interest of the country that the particular contract should receive the approbation of the House. I say that, even if the charges which the hon. gentleman has made against the hon. member for Lambton had been true, they would have been no fit or appropriate defence of him in the position in which he stands to-night. But if instead of being true, they are, as we know they are, wholly devoid and destitute of truth, are

much worse than the position of the hon. gentleman, in that he has made an attempt at defence upon such a sandy and such an unstable foundation as that. The hon. gentleman's friends and supporters have at intervals found great fault with my hon. friend for Lambton in many respects. They have found at different times divers defects as they conceived in his character, in his capacity and in his position as a public man; but, notwithstanding all the storms of invective with which they have assailed him, I believe there has subsisted and subsists to-day in the minds not merely of his friends, but of the great bulk of those who stand opposite of him in this House, a widespread, and, as I know, a well grounded conviction that he is a man of stern and unbending integrity, wholly incapable of doing those things which the hon. member has charged him with. I shall not endeavor to analyze the feelings and opinions which the hon. gentleman's own supporters entertained towards him in this regard. But I will say to him that the situation in this regard of my hon. friend the member for Lambton is so high that it ought to be his highest hope and aspiration, which some day or other, in some distant town, and by some great exertions, he may be enabled to place himself in somewhat the same position. The hon. gentleman did not confine himself to my hon. friend for Lambton. He reminded me of the old comparison of the cuttle-fish, and he exuded that dirty colored liquid with which that animal is said to defend itself, and poured it forth more upon my hon. friend from Lambton, though it was directed at myself. The hon. gentleman was pleased to indulge in various aspersions upon my character. I have, before to-day, told him, as I repeat to-night, that it is a long, long time since he wholly lost the power to evoke in me, in the slightest degree, emotions of surprise or indignation. The humblest of his followers retains that power but he has long since lost it. But, I may say, with reference to this charge which he was pleased to make to-night—with reference to the statement, first of all, that I had entered into some intrigue with Mr. Brown, to supplant or depose my hon. friend for Lambton, that I have before to-day, declared here and elsewhere, that the charge that I had entered into any conspiracy, or did or said a single thing to that end, was false and utterly baseless; and it is, if possible, more false and baseless still, when made in the particular connection in which the hon. gentleman was pleased to repeat it to-night. The hon. gentleman has charged me, I say, with these things, and with something more, with a fresh accusation—with being responsible for the articles that are written in the *Globe* newspaper about him, and, I presume, about other public men. Well, I am not responsible for the articles either in the *Globe* or any other public paper. There is a newspaper—there is more than one newspaper in the country—which is pleased from day to day and week to week to villify myself. I do not hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for the utterances of these papers in any degree, and for the great newspaper which especially supports them, I hold only one man out of the 208 who sit in the House responsible for the utterances of that paper. I do not understand upon what principle that hon. gentleman seeks to fasten responsibility upon any individual public man for the utterances of the public press. I may say to him that it is now many years since I expressed publicly the opinion that the utterances of the press on both sides of politics often went too far, and that much had been done to render more difficult than otherwise might have been the management of our public affairs, by a too reckless use of the powers of which the press unquestionably possesses. Such has been, such is my opinion—I state it frankly as I have held it for many years. But to observe of any particular public man without cause, without justification of any description, that he is to be held responsible for the utterances of any particular paper, is wholly unjustifiable. I

Mr. BLAKE.

should think myself wholly unjustifiable if I were to take up the columns of the *Mail* and read the epithets applied and statements made with reference to myself and charge them upon the hon. gentleman, because I have no evidence to prove that he inspires them; and but for his language occasionally, I should have hardly supposed even that he sympathized with them, though I cannot say that I am of that impression after what has happened to-night. I am disposed to believe that he does sympathize with them; but I do not hold him responsible, and do not expect to be held, either by him, or by his followers, or by any person in this country, responsible for anything except what I say, and for that I am always ready to make good what I have said; or if I find myself in the wrong, to retract it as a man ought to do. The tone of the hon. gentleman is fixed and habitual. He seems to believe that by the course he takes he will prevent criticism of his public acts—that he will prevent us from bringing forward as against him and his colleagues those grounds of complaint which we believe ought to be entertained. It is the tone of a bully and the true braggart. But I shall assure him that, while on the one hand, he will not induce us to follow his example in point of language, on the other hand we shall not be moved one jot or tittle from the discharge of our public duty, in bringing forward on every occasion, at the appropriate time, such cases as we believe we should complain of, and in stating them, not with the accessories of vituperation with which the hon. gentleman garnishes his orations, but stating them in that measured, calm and temperate manner justified by the facts, which we hold will be the best communication to the sense and feeling of the honest and moderate people of this country. Now, what is the question? The question is with reference to the contract upon the Table, which, under the law, is binding, if we do not disapprove of it. Under the law, we have the right to disapprove of it, and, under the law, our disapproval makes it not binding, and leaves the question open. We are responsible materially for this contract coming into effect, because, if he chooses to say so, this contract was not coming into effect, and it is upon the vote and decision of this House to-night that this question depends. It is true, it is in the negative form; the contract is binding unless we disapprove, and our disapproval nullifies the contract. Therefore, our constituents and the country hold us in effect responsible for the decision, whether this contract shall continue effective or not. Now, the contract is one let, not to the lowest tenderer, but to a tenderer \$209,000 above the lowest tender. It is, therefore, *prima facie* a contract let, not in the interest of the country; it is, at the first appearance and upon the surface, a contract which ought not to have been so let. Unless there be some good reason to the contrary, the lowest tenderer ought to have received the contract. Unless there be some good reason to the contrary, the fair presumption is that, by the letting of the contract, \$20,000 is lost to the country. The question is, what is the justification for this course? What is there below the surface which alters the appearance on the surface? What is there which justifies a letting of this description? Now, the hon. the Minister has to-day given several reasons why it was fit that this contract should be awarded to Onderdonk instead of McDonald & Charlebois, and, not content with giving reasons argumentatively, he has gone into the box and examined himself thoroughly, cross-examined himself with rigor, and given us evidence, argument, statement, indication, defence, retort, accusation and defiance all in a breath. Well, the reasons which the hon. Minister gives, which are not the reasons on the paper, and to one or more of them the hon. member for Glengarry alluded as the reason why—the hon. member for Glengarry read the papers, but it was not the papers that convinced him; he was satisfied that it was

better to give it to the higher tenderer; he was satisfied it was in the interest of despatch and economy that the contract should be given to Onderdonk instead of McDonald & Charlebois, and he agrees with the views of the hon. the Minister of Railways in that regard. Now the hon. Minister says he ought not to have given it to McDonald & Charlebois first, because there was some former transaction about a cheque for a permanent contract which was an unsatisfactory transaction; second, because Charlebois, I think it was, was a contractor, or one of the contractors for the Georgian Bay Branch, and he did not prosecute this work with efficiency; third, because he was satisfied that McDonald & Charlebois had not the means to prosecute this contract with efficiency; and fourth, because their tender was too low. These, I think, are the four points on which the hon. gentleman gave his evidence and gave reasons. He asks the House to sustain him on that ground, and the hon. member for Glengarry is ready to do it. But there is this fatal defect in this plea of the hon. gentleman, sustained by his testimony, that whatever force there might have been in these grounds, these were not his grounds. Whatever force there might be in these grounds, they were not the grounds of the Privy Council, they were not the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman dealt, judging by the writing, judging by the statement, and judging by what he recommended to his colleagues. Had that been so, if the hon. gentleman, after examination and enquiry, had satisfied himself that McDonald & Charlebois were unsatisfactory contractors, and unfit to be entrusted with the work, and that there was such a difference between their tender and that of the next, that it was doubtful if they could execute the works of their contract, and therefore that they ought to be passed over, I suppose he would have said so. I suppose he would have told his colleagues so, I suppose he would have reported so to the Council, I suppose he would have said, these are the reasons upon which I ask you to determine, irrespective of the question about the two days' acceptance, that it would not be a fit thing to deal with these men—he might have given them as exclusive, or he might have given them as supplementary reasons. He gave them not at all; we heard not a word broached about them, not a whisper of them, until the contract being asked, and the hon. gentleman being called upon to defend it, he brings forward these as the reasons why it was a proper thing to pass over McDonald & Charlebois and to give the contract to the higher tenderer. Sir, it is utterly impossible for us to-night to accept these pleas. They are not the groundwork of the action of the hon. gentleman. The groundwork of the hon. gentleman's action is that which we had in the papers before us, is that with which we have to deal, is that upon which this controversy must turn. It must turn not upon his statement made between the eleventh and twelfth hours, that there are other reasons why this contract was justifiable; it must turn upon the validity of those grounds and these justifications which he gave before, which are in the papers before us, for the action which he advises and for the action which was taken. Now, let us consider what those grounds are. He talks of an irregularity in the tender; there was none. He talks of an irregularity in the cheque; there was none. There was an irregularity in the acceptance of the cheque. The cheque itself was a perfectly good cheque, as we speak of cheques. The circumstance that the acceptance is limited to two days did not make it less a good cheque, but it did, after the close of those two days, render it possible that McDonald & Charlebois might withdraw their balance, and if their balance was withdrawn it relieved the bank of their liability for that cheque irrespective of the balance. That is precisely the state of the case as I understand it. That was the condition of things with that restricted acceptance. The hon. gentleman says that this accepted cheque system

was a device to prevent contract jobbing, of which he represents himself to be the inveterate and undying foe. A singular thing, if my memory serves me, that this effective plan to prevent contract jobbing; this plan which is so sacred that it is not to be departed from under any circumstance, but is to be adhered to in the literal manner which the hon. gentleman now proposes at whatever cost, was invented by the prince of contract jobbers, the hon. member for Lambton. I believe it was a security devised by my hon. friend who, the hon. gentleman has recorded this night, so far as his word or his statement can effect such a record with reference to any respectable citizen of this country, as having stamped his whole Administration with intended or designed jobbery—one of his first acts was to devise and carry out a scheme which the hon. gentleman says is the most effectual thing he can think of to prevent contract jobbing. Now, Sir, if this cheque was not good on the 6th of February, it was good to the extent to which I have stated it was; good to the extent of the drawers funds in the bank. The hon. gentleman committed a slight anachronism in the course of his narrative. He declared with great circumstantiality that Monday, 6th February, he saw the cheque for the first time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. The hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. I stated I saw it on Saturday, the 4th, but as the bank was closed my secretary was not able to present it until Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. I heard the hon. gentleman. He said in the first instance it was on the 1st of July that he first saw the cheque and the tenders. At a subsequent period he said he told his secretary on the Saturday to go to the bank for the cheque. He made both these statements, and I can call numerous witnesses here to the truth of my recollection of the hon. gentleman's statement. Now, Sir, he says he ordered on the Saturday his secretary to make enquiry at the bank whether the cheque was good or whether it would be paid, and the secretary went on the Monday morning to the banker's to make that enquiry. The cheque you will remark was not drawn on the Bank of Montreal at Ottawa, but on the Bank of Montreal, at Montreal—the head office—but the hon. gentleman sent down to the manager of the agency at Ottawa to know if he would pay the cheque, and then comes the circumstance emphasized by the hon. gentleman's private secretary, no doubt at his instigation, emphasized by the hon. gentleman in his most melodramatic manner, the circumstance which he enlarges upon and intensifies, because, he says, Mr. Drummond says: "No; I will not pay the cheque." But what really happened? When it comes down to the small end, Drummond shook his head. Why, Sir, what an expressive shake that must have been. I do not suppose, in the history of the world, there has been a shake of the head which cost \$209,000. The private secretary has recorded, and the hon. Minister reads with emphasis, the circumstance that Mr. Drummond shook his head, but he did not add by words to the cogency of this ominous shake, which, for all we know, might have been a nod, which would make all the difference in the world. He did not add by words the emphatic statement of the hon. gentleman. All he says was, that he must enquire at the head office, and the Minister's secretary authorizes him to do so, and franks a blank telegram in order that he might do so. The telegram is sent, an answer is received, and within an hour or two the enquiry of the hon. Minister—just as directly as it could be answered, seeing that he did not ask the banker of the office in which the cheque was drawn—was answered in the affirmative, namely, that they would pay the cheque, and that it was good and would remain good until presented. Now, the hon. gentleman says, that he believed that that was a trick; that McDonald & Charlebois—to whom, like most people about whom he speaks, he has not given the best possible

character in the world—had engaged in a deliberate trick; that they were about to raise a rig on the hon. the Minister of Railways, and put in a cheque which was not good, and by that means to have the opportunity of selling this contract if they got it, and if they failed to sell it, of withdrawing, because there would be no funds to answer the cheque. He avers to us that such was his belief. The hon. Minister was informed at the earliest possible moment after his enquiry that the cheque was good, and that the restrictive power ought to be stricken out. He was informed also by Mr. Drummond, early in the transaction, as appears by the letter of Mr. Drummond, printed at pages 53 and 54 of the book:

"This no doubt occurred inadvertently and without being known when issued, which I explained to the Department previously.

"Yours truly,

"A. DRUMMOND."

He makes no enquiry, at that time, of the bank as to whether this was a plan to which the Bank of Montreal was a party and which they only withdrew on the Minister's enquiry. He makes no investigation into the matter to ascertain if his suspicions of McDonald & Charlebois were correct or not, but he jumps to the conclusion of criminal conduct on their part. Like himself again, if there is a good and an evil motive, a charitable and an uncharitable view, the hon. gentleman chooses the latter, and decides against McDonald and Charlebois without further enquiry at the bank, without any enquiry of themselves, and that they had been guilty of attempting to defraud him and the public. He decided, therefore, that he should pass them over and let the contract to the next tenderer. He acknowledges to-night that that uncharitable conclusion of his was erroneous. He acknowledges that they were not guilty of any such design at all. He is obliged in face of the distinct letter of the Manager of the Bank of Montreal to admit that this restriction on the cheque was wholly and solely the fault or error of the bank; that it was not put in of design at all, and that therefore what McDonald & Charlebois arranged for, what they were entitled to get and supposed they had received, what the bank supposed they were giving them was an unlimited acceptance prepared in accordance with the regulations, and that the guilt, such as it is, arose solely from the unintentional oversight on the part of the bank in issuing an improper stamp. These facts might have been found out earlier by the hon. gentleman had he not chosen to jump at the conclusion that McDonald & Charlebois were trying to cheat him. But they came out time enough; they came out before the contract was signed; they came out at any rate before we are precluded from disposing of this question. They are the facts known now to this House and in the country; they are the facts with cognizance of which it is that we are called upon to deal with this question, and we have nothing to do with the Minister's report; we have nothing to do with the Order in Council; we have nothing to do with the Minister's report on pre-consideration; we have to do with the facts before us, which facts are, as the Minister now admits, that McDonald & Charlebois put in a *bona fide* tender, accompanied by a cheque for \$20,000, which they had arranged with the bank should be certified to an unlimited extent, in point of time, which the bank agreed so to certify, which the bank supposed they had so certified, which McDonald & Charlebois supposed they had so certified, and which, therefore, was wholly *bona fide* on their part. The whole difficulty is due to the circumstance that one stamp was used instead of another by the bankers. These are the facts with which we have to deal. Now, we are not to confirm this contract because the hon. Minister supposed that a fraud was designed, which the hon. Minister admits to night was not designed? The Minister says I dealt with this matter in the way I did because I was convinced at the time that an attempt was being made to

Mr. BLAKE.

cheat the Department and the public, but I acknowledge now I was wrong. I acknowledge, upon the further evidence brought forward, that that apprehension or view of mine was incorrect, and that there was no attempt to cheat the Department. One suggestion, indeed, was made by the hon. gentleman, which was that McDonald & Charlebois had the cheque in their possession for some time, and might have found out the error. But the hon. gentleman says he could not read the words in his acceptance; his deputy could not read them; so they had to look elsewhere for an interpreter and a spy-glass, to find them out, and I do not suppose that McDonald & Charlebois are to be charged with gross negligence, because they failed to find out what the hon. Minister—with the best intentions in the world, and with a high degree of vigilance for the public—failed to find out with reference to the acceptance. So it is with us to-night. Whatever difficulties beset the Ministerial mind, whatever notions of anxiety to guard the public against a fraud which he thought was attempted to be perpetrated by McDonald & Charlebois affected his action and the action of his colleagues, we can put all on one side; we know that it was all a misapprehension; we know that, as a matter of fact, Macdonald & Charlebois were intending to execute no such plot, but were *bona fide* tenderers, and were sending in a *bona fide* cheque, as they and the bank believed. Now, Sir, we are bound to consider, under these circumstances, whether the country is to lose \$209,000 because of that unintentional mistake on the part of the bank. The hon. gentleman's argument on this branch of the case is this:—He says: "You must observe in the strictest way this rule about the certified cheque, because if you take uncertified cheques, there will be no security at all." But, Sir, it is a reasonable deviation from the rigor of the rule not to observe it in the sense in which the hon. gentleman says that it should be observed, when it is proved incontestably by his own admission, that there was no intentional irregularity at all on the part of the intending contractor—when it is proved beyond dispute that the whole transaction was *bona fide*, and that the difficulty, if any, is occasioned solely by an oversight on the part of the stamping officer of the bank, I say that to decide under these circumstances that you will not accept the cheque is not to open the door to frauds; because you decide to accept it only when you find, from unimpeachable testimony, that the maker and giver of the cheque supposed that they were giving a good cheque, and that the bank believed the cheque to be good during an unlimited time. In any case in which that is satisfactorily established, as the hon. Minister admits, there can be no difficulty and no danger; and to accept the cheque under such circumstances is not to open the door to frauds. But the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, but we must observe our notice; we gave a notice, and we must observe good faith to the other contractors." But I suppose this notice contained the clause, which is usual in such notices, that the Government were not bound to let the contract to the lowest or any tenderer; and whether that was the case or not, I know of no right that any other tenderer would have to complain, if a *bona fide* tender \$209,000 lower, with a cheque issued and accepted under the circumstances disclosed in these papers, were accepted, even although by an oversight on the part of the bank, a two days' limitation had been inserted in it, nor would the hon. gentleman find a single man to tender the less for any such reason. No, Sir, I do not believe that this suggestion of the hon. gentleman to stick to what we may call the rigor of the law, to rule out a tender under the belief that a fraud was attempted, when we know and he acknowledges that it was all a mistake, and that no fraud was attempted, and so to lose \$209,000—I say I do not believe the people of Canada will understand that sort of dealing with public affairs, or appreciate an extra payment of \$209,000, justified

upon such fine points of law as those which the hon. gentleman proposes to justify this extra payment upon. No, Sir; all being in good faith, and the case being such as it is, we have one duty, which is to save the public money, and to save the public money by awarding the contract to the lowest *bona fide* tenderer; and being responsible to my constituents for the determination whether this contract shall be made for a certain sum or \$209,000 more, I for my own part have no hesitation in deciding by my vote that it shall not be let for the sum of \$209,000 in excess of that for which we know it can be let. I have not said or insinuated one word with reference to the motives of the hon. gentleman. We do not know his motives, and we are bound to suppose that he was animated by a sense of public duty, and that he persuaded himself that it was his public duty to pass over the tender of Macdonald & Charlebois in favor of that of Mr. Onderdonk. But, Sir, while I assume that the hon. gentleman did manage to persuade himself that that was his public duty, I hope he will allow me the liberty of coming to a conclusion as to what my public duty is; and I believe my public duty to be to dissent from the hon. gentleman's conclusion, and to vote for the motion which in effect gives us an opportunity of letting this contract to the lowest tenderer at a saving of \$209,000, instead of confirming a contract which involves that extra expense to this country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, commenced his speech by complaining in strong language, used by himself, of the language which he said was too strong, used by my hon. friend beside me. He says the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways stood in decided and unfavorable contrast to the judicial calmness with which the motion was made by the hon. member for Lambton. Sir, the tone of the hon. member for Lambton was quiet and calm, and if the language and insinuations, and the substance of what he said had been as moderate as the tone, there could be no objection to his speech. It was quite open to the hon. gentleman, if he thought my hon. friend was wrong in his course, if he thought the Government were wrong in agreeing with him, to say so and to make his motion; but it was not his duty, and he had no right, without the strongest foundation, to state that this was one of the worst cases that he ever knew in his Parliamentary experience. That language was used in a very soft tone, but it was a charge against my hon. friend the hon. the Minister of Railways, and it justified him in saying that it did not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to make such a charge, because whatever my hon. friend's conduct was, he could show that from the time that hon. gentleman had held office until the time he left, he had let contracts in a manner quite at variance from the doctrine which he laid down and which the hon. member for West Durham supported. My hon. friend had a right to state that the whole course of the hon. gentleman as Minister of Public Works was in direct contravention of the doctrine he laid down, and that he could prove again and again, from the State papers, that in granting contracts to favorites he had entered into contract jobs. My hon. friend had a right to state that if he thought so, and he said he had the papers in his hand to prove it, and he did prove it in one or two instances, and, if time would permit, he could prove it in many instances.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; he cannot do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen say we cannot do it. We might go from the smallest, meanest little job to the largest—from the Tolton one to the Belden one, from five pounds up to any amount of money;—the whole course of the hon. gentleman justified my hon. friend in using the language which he did, and he used it only in consequence of the charge made by the hon. member for Lambton that he had acted improperly and wrongly, and that it was the worst case he had

ever heard of in his Parliamentary experience. The hon. member for the West Riding of Durham says: "What if the late Government had done wrong. The question is, whether this act is right or wrong?" It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavor to draw the attention of the House from those considerations; they are only too anxious to avoid the *tu quoque* argument; to say, if we have done wrong, you have no right to quote it as a precedent and example of the hon. gentleman's party, and the action for which the country tried and condemned them. Now, Sir, with respect to this transaction, the hon. leader of the Opposition said, in the course of his speech, that my hon. friend had not consulted his colleagues as to certain portions of this transaction, that he had concealed certain portions of this transaction from them, and he asked the question across the floor if I knew of the going down to the bank, the presentation of the cheque, the sending of the telegram, and the answer from Montreal. I have no hesitation in saying that, whatever my hon. friend did in that matter, he did with the full knowledge and cognizance of all his colleagues, and I, as First Minister, declare that I assumed the whole responsibility of the transaction, in every respect, after being fully aware of the circumstances of the course taken by my hon. friend. And I say to this House and to the country that my hon. friend would not have been doing his duty to the public or to the tenderers if he had allowed himself to be induced, for fear of a cry that he was not giving the contract to the lowest tenderer, to do a striking injustice to all the other tenderers. These had rights as well as Messrs. Macdonald & Charlebois. They came, honest men I dare say all of them, here at public invitation, the Government asking them to undertake this great work and to place their money in the hands of the Government as security for their good faith. They had rights, and if my hon. friend had accepted this irregular cheque he would have been guilty of a wrong, of a dishonest act and an impropriety towards everyone of those tenderers, and especially towards Mr. Onderdonk who was the next lowest on the list. Let us look back at the whole subject of letting public works by tender. When we were in power before 1873 our practice was to receive every tender, to ask for no deposit as security of good faith, but not to be bound to accept the lowest tender. The reason why we pursued that course was that we thought by asking for any deposit it might prevent many young and enterprising contractors from entering into the field for contracting. We thought it was of great importance to induce upright and skilful men, experts in the various works they were called upon to execute, to come forward and tender. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they came into power, changed that practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And you objected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did, and I was just going to say so. I thought it was limiting the field in this new country, and that it was much better to allow every one to make a tender, and the Government should afterwards judge whether the parties who were lowest on the list were fully competent to carry out the contract. The hon. member for Lambton changed that policy, and I am free to admit that, after a full consideration of all the circumstances, he was right. I think that on the whole, although it has had the effect of greatly limiting the field of contracting, yet the greater security given to the public for the satisfactory performance of contracts was a sufficient ground for the charge, and it relieved, or it was expected or hoped it would relieve the Government of the day, whether in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite or of members on this side of the House, from the charge of favoritism which was always made in our experience in office. Whenever we did not accept the lowest tender it was sure to be said by those opposed to us

that we had robbed the country of so much money and had given the work to a political or personal friend. I thought that the hon. member for Lambton and his Government, by changing the plan and insisting on a deposit of money would relieve for all time to come Governments from that charge. I find, however, I was mistaken; that although a deposit of money shall be considered as a necessary precedent before giving out contracts or accepting a tender, even that does not save Governments from that charge, and now the Government are charged with favoritism. My hon. friend, the Minister of Railways, has been charged, or it has been insinuated, and it has been more than insinuated in the *Globe*, with having had a personal and perhaps pecuniary interest in the contract. I do not often read the *Globe* and do not know exactly the language used with respect to my hon. friend; but there is little doubt that it dares to insinuate that his action, although it was known to his colleagues and had their sanction, and in that action he had thirteen members of the Cabinet behind him, was due to a sinister motive in granting this contract to Mr. Onderdonk. The change that was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and which we have carried out and will carry out, is this: that as a pledge of good faith the party tendering shall make a deposit of money, not a promise to pay money, but a deposit of money. That was the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the proper one; that is the course followed by us and I believe the proper one, that there must be, no matter whether a Vanderbilt or a Rothschild might make a tender, a deposit of money in the hands of the Government as a pledge of good faith. We have given our banks the right to make money, and bills issued by them are money, and, therefore, a cheque marked "good" by a bank is just the same and the Government must hold it to be the same as if bank notes of the Bank of Montreal, in this case, were actually in the hands of the hon. the Minister of Railways. The cheque of Messrs. Macdonald & Charlebois might be good, the cheque of Mr. Vanderbilt would be good or the cheque of Mr. Rothschild would certainly be good, but if those were deposited they were not money; they were the promises of men to pay money, and of men able to pay, but they were not. The cheque of Vanderbilt or the cheque of Roth-child would not have been, under the circumstances of the case in which the advertisement stated that no tender should be received unless there was a cheque marked good, satisfactory, according to the advertisement, than if it was a slip of blank paper. This cheque was marked good for two days only. Then it was cash only for those two days. At the end of those two days it might have been a good cheque. Messrs. Macdonald & Charlebois might have had millions in the Montreal Bank, but after the two days the cheque was no longer marked good. It was not a cheque according to the advertisement, and therefore must have been thrown out. It was thrown out. It would have been improper not to throw it out; it would have been a fraud on the other contractors. That is the position I take. It is one which cannot be controverted. It would not be controverted in any court of justice in the world. I am quite satisfied that if the hon. member for West Durham were sitting in his judicial capacity, he would be obliged to rule that that cheque marked good for two days only was, on the third day, a cheque without that word "good" upon it and therefore must be ruled out altogether. Not a court in the country could decide otherwise; and if any one should I would have very little respect for that court or its knowledge of law or equity. So strong am I of the opinion that it would have been a glaring injustice to accept the cheque, that I declare here that if my hon. friend had accepted it without consulting me and his colleagues, he would have done that which could not have been justified and would deserve the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

censure of his colleagues. Supposing Messrs. Macdonald & Charlebois had put in a cheque without its being marked good at all, would the hon. gentleman opposite have accepted it? No, he could not, because it was in direct contradiction to the terms of the advertisement. Well, if he could not have accepted a cheque that was not marked at all at the time the tender was opened, he could not have accepted a cheque that was good seven or eight days before, but which, at the time the tender was opened, was simply the cheque of Messrs. Macdonald & Charlebois, as if it were unmarked good—which was simply an order on the Bank of Montreal by that firm to hand over that amount if it was at their credit. That is simply the case. There cannot be a doubt that my hon. friend would have been unwarranted in acting otherwise than he did. If my hon. friend had seen those words, he should have thrown the cheque aside at once without making any enquiry at the bank. The gentlemen ought to have known when they enclosed that cheque what they were enclosing. They ought to have known it was only marked good for two days. It was no part of my hon. friend's business to know if it was good or not. It was their business to see that their cheque was correct in every respect, just as it was their duty to see that every other requirement of their tender should be regular. But my hon. friend sent down that cheque, and what was the answer? The answer was, the banker shook his head. Well, I do not think the hon. gentleman, with his high sense of his own credit, would like any banker to shake his head at any of his cheques. He would consider that an insult, and the person who presented it would, no doubt, also consider it an imputation on my hon. friend's credit. Mr. Drummond shook his head and said he would have to telegraph to find out whether the cheque would be paid or not. Mr. Drummond gave as a reason for not being able to pay it that it was marked good for two days only, and therefore he could not pay it without instructions. Well, he did telegraph. Mr. Bradley had no right to give him a blank telegram. He had no instructions from my hon. friend to ask Mr. Drummond to make that enquiry. He acted on his own suggestion, and I think was very wrong in doing so and deserved to be severely censured by my hon. friend. But what was the answer of the bank? The bank did not say that that cheque was a regular one, but it said it was a bad one, an irregular one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Read the letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to express what I believe and know to be the substance and sense of the answer. The answer was that it was not a good cheque, that it was a cheque good for two days only, that the error was unintentional but to make it good. Well, if it had to be made good in order to bring it within the terms of the advertisement, it was not good until it was so made good. But it was not good on the 1st February when the contracts were opened, and unless it was good under the terms of the advertisement on the day when the tenders were opened, no subsequent credit given by the Bank of Montreal could cure the original sin on the face of that cheque. The very fact that it had to be made good proved that it was not good. Therefore the Government could not accept the tender of Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois, and had to award the contract to Mr. Onderdonk, as being the lowest tenderer. This is not a case of passing over the lowest tenderer. I say that the tender of Messrs. Macdonald & Charlebois had to be thrown out because it was irregular, contrary to the terms of the advertisement, and because if it had not been thrown out it would have been a great injustice to Mr. Onderdonk, who was really the lowest tenderer, and had complied with the

terms of the advertisement. The case is too clear to admit of argument. "But," says the hon. member for the West Riding of Durham, "the hon. Minister of Railways takes two lines of argument. In the first place, he says the cheque is bad, and, in the second place, he says these people ought not to have got the contract. In this, he says, there is inconsistency." The first part of the hon. member's argument was that he could not legally and properly, no matter how high might be the character and standing of Messrs. McDonald & Charlebois, have given them the contract. Then he went on to answer the charge that the country had lost some \$200,000. He went on to answer that—and I think he satisfied part of this House, and that he will satisfy a part of the country—that we have saved the country from a great loss by that accidental mistake, and that the country will not lose a single farthing. What was the previous conduct of McDonald & Charlebois? Why, if the hon. gentleman has at all followed discussions of this kind in the British Parliament, the idea of a contractor having once committed a fraud, or an impropriety of any kind, big or little, would, by the universal voice of the Commons, be declared sufficient to render him unworthy to receive a Government contract, no matter how advantageous his subsequent offers. Look at the English *Hansard*; the books are full of cases of parties ruled out for previous improprieties, and declared incapable, under any circumstances, of holding Government contracts again. What did Charlebois & Company do on the previous contract? They went to a young bank—not a very strong bank, but one in good credit—and Charlebois induced the cashier, without the knowledge of the directors, and behind the backs of all the other officers, and when they had no money to their credit, to put in a false cheque and go for how much? About \$137,000; and that was sent to the Government and was lodged as an evidence that they were never in good credit and of good means. The moment that was found out, the bank, in great alarm, repudiated altogether the improper act, and said that they were not responsible for it, and rejected it as a fraud. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways would have been justified, after that fact being known, in refusing to allow that man to appear as a contractor for any Government work in any part of the Dominion; but he did not do it, and if Charlebois' cheque had been right he would, under the strongest rule we have laid down, when the money had been paid and accepted, when there was a sufficient evidence of capacity to do the work—I say my hon. friend would have been obliged to give him the contract, and would have done so; but this necessity did not arise, and the character of the tenderers and their previous transactions were well known to the Government. We know he had fiddle-faddled or dallied with a previous contract in the manner described by my hon. friend, and that although he had to perform the work with pressing speed, a short period only having been given to him, that he had performed but \$24,000 worth on a contract of \$300,000 at the time the contract was taken out of his hands, and after a year and a half had elapsed. So my hon. friend had a right to argue, when the Government was charged with a strict adherence to what was right, and with causing a loss to the country, that we had no security, but had every reason to apprehend that if these people got this contract they would do the work as slowly and slovenly as that of previous contracts—that we should not have this contract fulfilled, that the work would not be done, and that the great aim of the Canadian Government, to build that whole railway from the Pacific to a junction with the Canadian system, within five years, would not be accomplished. We considered it of the utmost importance to the future of Canada and to the immediate prosperity of Canada that that great railway should connect the two seas as soon as possible. We have

pressed that work, and have been told we have sacrificed public money in urging the early completion of that road. It is of the greatest importance that there should be no failure in the contract to connect Port Moody with Emory's Bar. We know that Onderdonk was pressing his work with all energy, that he had great capital, and that he could and would perform the work within the time; and we were exceedingly anxious that those portions of the road that brought down the railway from Emory's Bar to the Pacific should be finished within the same time, so that our expectations might be realized. We could have had literally no hopes that Charlebois & Co. could perform the work. Notwithstanding our apprehension with regard to their insufficient security, I am satisfied we should have had to do to those persons, on this contract, what we were obliged to do with reference to the other—take it out of their hands on account of their inability to perform it. And what would have been the consequence? We should have been obliged to finish it either as a direct Government work, or offer it under the most disadvantageous circumstances, and, after an immense loss of time and the disappointing of our expectations of finishing the road in five years, at largely enhanced prices, which would have absorbed, not only the \$200,000 complained of in this case, but a great deal more. So my hon. friend was quite right in entering on the line of argument he followed, considering, in the first place, whether we should have saved money by acting differently, or were obliged to give the contract to Onderdonk; and, second, to tell the House that under all these circumstances there would be a pecuniary loss—whether there would have been an avoidance of all delay, and we should have had the road finished in time, and would have avoided all this difficulty, by preferring Onderdonk. A half finished work, when more than half the time had expired, and whatever the ruling prices at the moment, would not have been taken up by the contractors at prices for which they would enter into a work assigned them *ab initio*. My hon. friend had a right to argue that instead of this action entailing a loss, that action securing an honest, straightforward adherence to the advertisement or undertaking, to finish the road within five years, would occasion but a temporary loss, of the difference between the two tenders, while saving, in the end, two or three times that amount.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I have listened to this discussion and to my hon. friend's speech, and that of the right hon. gentleman with some regret that he has not impressed my mind more strongly in the direction of conviction. I have not felt that it was necessary in this discussion to import into it all the personal acerbities which the hon. the Minister of Railways may find it desirable to cultivate or cherish. I do not know even that the character which the hon. gentleman has seen fit to give the contractors, one of whom is a fellow-citizen of mine, is to be much undervalued, in consideration of the character which he also gave the hon. member for Lambton, who, if the hon. Minister talks truly, is not a respectable man, and does not even stand as well as those contractors, if what he said about them is entirely true. We all know, and the hon. gentleman himself and his friends know, that it was merely in the heat of unfair criticism he made these attacks on the hon. member for Lambton, and the country could perhaps, therefore, have thought it was in the heat of some such criticism he has spoken, as he has done, of the fraudulent intentions and the general bad character—and it has been endorsed by the right hon. gentleman—of the contractors who have been, as it appears to me, defrauded out of their rights. Well, Sir, I do not propose to go over the ground further than to express regret that the right hon. gentleman, with all his vigor, has not been able to satisfy me nor to induce me to feel so much like cheering as he seems to have done with some of his friends, some of whom

no doubt acted voluntarily, while others were constrained by the general pressure. For example, this attack on the contractors, what did it mean? If these contractors, who are gentlemen and whose conduct in the department had been such that the hon. the Minister of Railways was justified in considering that they were trying to put a job on him, that they were trying, at any rate, to defraud the Department—if the history of his relations to them had been such that he knew if he gave them the contract he would have to take it off their hands at an immense loss to the country, is it conceivable that he intended to give it to these men at such a detriment to the public interest as the right hon. gentleman has just explained? How could he justify himself? What did he go down to the Bank of Montreal for at all? Why did he go there, if this is not the case? He went to the Bank of Montreal, he went there with the cheque which he appears to have had back in his own Department. I do not know what there was peculiar about it, but he said it did not look right. He called his secretary, and he did not find it looking well. He called his deputy, who could not see anything the matter with it. It made him suspicious of the character of these men, who, he thought, were deceiving him. Then why did he not throw the cheque out altogether? But he went to the Bank of Montreal, according to the statement of the Prime Minister, and made enquiries, and, if the cheque had been good, he would have given the contract to these men; but the cheque was not good. The hon. gentleman admitted, as it has been stated here by my hon. friend, that he thought it was not good, but he found it was good. If the cheque was perfectly good, the right hon. gentleman has made an argument that you must have the actual cash, that you cannot take a cheque even of Vanderbilt's, but if his cheque was not good, perhaps the acceptance of the Bank of Montreal would not be a legal tender either—but the hon. gentleman went there with the intention of accepting this cheque, and awarding this contract to the lowest tenderers, if he found the cheque was good. His secretary, the right hon. gentleman rather suggested, ought to be dismissed because he went further than he was told, and had not paid any attention to the answer Mr. Drummond had given by telegraph. He found the cheque was not good, he found Mr. Drummond did not know it was not good, and he went to the officer in the bank who knew nothing about the transaction, but he found the officer ready to ascertain whether the cheque was good, and the officer did ascertain it was good. If this cheque was good and binding on the bank of Montreal, what rights of Onderdonk were sacrificed? Because there happened to be a stamp on the cheque which the hon. gentleman could not read; because, while the hon. gentleman through all this examination in his Department, found this cheque was suspicious; and because his faith in the contractors, which was not strong before, was thereby weakened, because the imprint upon the cheque was one which he himself could not read, which his deputy could not read, and which nobody could read; and, therefore, even if that had not been suggested to him, if they had got under the impression that there was something of that kind wrong, surely the hon. gentleman could have found it convenient to give Onderdonk the contract if he wanted to do it. The right hon. gentleman, I think, stated the case fairly. He says he wanted this excellent man, with his great executive ability and his great experience, he wanted him to have the contract, and if Mr. Drummond had given this cheque as only good for two days, it seems to me it would have been easy enough to throw these contractors out without this attempt to blacken their character. It appears to me—I say it under correction—but since he had determined to give these men the contract, since his own pretension was that the cheque was not good, it was not necessary for him to stand up here, the Premier endorsing him, and blacken the reputation of

Mr. HUNTINGTON.

these men and ruin them, as he has done, if the country has any confidence in the position he has taken. I do not understand how the hon. gentleman can justify himself to this country in stating that he intended to give this contract over to men whom he knew to have had fraudulent relations with the Department, and whom he believed, if he gave them the contract, would entail a loss on the country. I do not see how he can justify that position which he says himself he would have taken. But having placed himself in that position, having grounded himself entirely on the flaws in the cheque, I cannot see how he can endeavor to destroy the character of these two contractors. Of course the country is prosperous, we have four millions of money to the good; and if the country is anxious to pay the high prices for its public works which the hon. gentleman feels that we can afford to pay; if hon. gentleman opposite, with the flimsy explanation we have heard with regard to this matter, can justify themselves in voting that we ought to pay \$200,000 more than the contract was worth, why that is their business, I have nothing to do with it; but as the question presents itself to me, the country has to pay over \$200,000 for this contract more than there is any necessity of paying.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Before the question is put I would like to say a few words on the subject. It hardly needed, I think, the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior to satisfy every man who listened to the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways that the granting of this contract to Mr. Andrew Onderdonk was a foregone conclusion from the first, and that if this flimsy pretext had not been found to defraud the country of \$200,000 for the benefit of Mr. Andrew Onderdonk, some other equally flimsy pretext would have presented itself to the fertile imagination of the Minister of Railways or the equally fertile imagination of his worthy coadjutor and chief. Sir, the Minister of the Interior may have been right in saying that my hon. friend's tone was as mild and as quiet as his argument was strong. In the case of himself and the Minister of Railways, the absolute reverse is true; their tones were as loud as their arguments were weak. Sir, is there any man in this House who has listened to these speeches who believes for one moment that if the case had been reversed, if a cheque which was presented and thrown out because of an alleged illegal stamp, had been presented by A. Onderdonk, that the Minister would have been so ready to enquire into it that he would have needed to send for a magnifying glass or a microscope to distinguish what he himself admits was an illegible inscription which cost Canada \$209,000, or which, I fear, is to cost Canada \$209,000, if I am to judge from the tone and temper manifested, before my hon. friend had well got through reading his motion, by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Sir, the defence of these two gentlemen is singularly inconsistent. The hon. Minister of Railways hardly attempted to deal with the legal aspect of the question. He confined himself with his accustomed skill in vituperation to a most abusive attack on my hon. friend from Lambton, on the member for West Durham, and on those contractors whom he might as well have spared, and finally on Mr. Gordon Brown. Well, Sir, as regards Mr. Gordon Brown, all I can say is this, that I think that everybody who knows that gentleman will say that he is able to treat with perfect contempt the attacks made upon him, I must say, in a cowardly and disgraceful fashion by the hon. Minister of Railways; and to Mr. Gordon Brown's tender mercies, I leave that hon. gentleman and his attacks. But as regards the questions which are before us as regards this allegation, so well disposed of by my hon. friend, that this cheque was not good—because that is the question at issue—neither the hon. the Minister of Railways nor the hon. the Minister of the Interior have been able to advance a single argument. They have been able to show that there has

been a technical irregularity in the stamping it in an illegible manner. The hon. the Minister of the Interior did not attempt to contradict the position of my hon. friend who usually sits beside me (Mr. Blake), that the cheque was perfectly good so long as there were funds in the Bank of Montreal. That point was not attempted to be contradicted, and it is the vital point. What is the use of our taking tenders at all? What is the use of applying for tenders, if when substantial evidence is given, as in the present case, of the good faith of the parties, on so flimsy a pretext as this their tenders are to be disregarded and that at great loss and cost to the people of Canada, and if a man who is not the lowest tenderer, who is not within \$200,000 of being the lowest tenderer, is to have the contract, because the hon. Minister of Railways is determined from the first that he should. I call the attention of the House to the fact that whether the charge of the Minister of Railways against the firm of Macdonald & Charlebois be true or false, it applies only to Mr. Charlebois, and not to Mr. Macdonald or his character or standing. I did not understand him to be impeached in any respect—and I say that so far as that firm is concerned, there does not appear to have been any ground for the charge made by the hon. gentleman. As for the other position which he took, that Mr. Onderdonk had facilities, that he was the best man, that it was in the public interest that he should get the contract; why, Sir, did not the hon. gentleman state that in his report to Council? Why, Sir, did not he take the honest and straightforward course? Why did he not say that he was convinced that this was not a case for using the ordinary form of competing by tenders, and that he and the Government took the responsibility of assigning the contract to Mr. Onderdonk in an open straightforward fashion? They could have done that if they had liked; I suppose they might, if they had so chosen have passed a special Act through Parliament this Session to give it to him, and that would have been an honorable and straightforward course, if they thought that the public interests really required it. But this is a piece of pettifoggery—a paltry and dishonest attempt to evade the manifest meaning and spirit of the Act introduced by my hon. friend from Lambton, and as my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) rightly said, introduced by him for the express purpose of protecting the public, to see that a fair deposit of money was made, and that that was supplemented afterwards by a still more substantial deposit to protect the public. Now, these facts are present in this case. There is no gainsaying the fact, in the teeth of the evidence to us, that the \$20,000 would have been paid; there has been no attempt to gainsay the fact on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways, that the \$113,000 which were expected to follow would also be made good. What loss, what risk of loss, would there have been if the sum of \$113,000 were put up? and unless that sum were put up, then the hon. Minister would have been perfectly in his right, perfectly at liberty to have discarded Macdonald & Charlebois, and given the contract to the man he desired, Mr. Andrew Onderdonk. But he could not do that; he could not consent to adopt the straightforward course in the matter; he must, forsooth, although he was well convinced long before the matter came to Council, that the money would be forthcoming,—although he saw clearly that the error, if error it was, was not an error on the part of the contractors—he must avail himself of this purely technical plea to put the whole country to loss, and open the door, I will venture to say, to far more serious frauds in the matter of contract-letting than any he assumed to guard against by this extreme and forced construction which he puts on the phrase of the statute which he referred to. The hon. gentleman talked of his blackening the character of my hon. friend beside me. Sir, my hon. friend can afford to smile at attacks from him or any other hon. gentleman on that side. Let them look to their own characters. As

the London *Times* remarked of their chief, their's are characters and reputations which require the very tenderest handling; and I venture to say that a whole wilderness of Ministers of Railways might exhaust their efforts at vituperation for the disparagement of my hon. friend without causing one honest or intelligent man from one end of the Dominion to the other to think one whit less of Alexander Mackenzie or one whit more of the hon. Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman talks of his generosity. He talks of the generosity he was going to show my hon. friend. Well, we have had an example of it. He was scarcely warm in his seat before he issued a Commission charged with the duty of raking up every possible charge, of making every possible investigation and enquiry into the conduct of my hon. friend. Where is the evidence of that Commission to-day, and why is it not brought down? We know why. We have seen enough of it in the public prints to know it and to know why it is not brought down. The reason was that the Commissioners who stood in judgment on my hon. friend were forced, much against their will, by the evidence submitted to them, to bring forth evidence in the highest degree detrimental to the position and character of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and if the hon. gentleman were not so audacious as he is, I do not think he would have dared to make the faintest reflection against the character of my hon. friend, as the hon. gentleman will find to his cost before the session closes if the report is brought down. Sir, as was well said, if the hon. gentleman really thought that this was not a proper cheque, why was it that he sent his Secretary to inquire of the bank if it was good; or, when within two hours he had intelligence that it was good, why did he not take steps to save this money to the people of Canada? Is \$200,000 so small a sum in his eyes that no effort or exertion is to be made for the purpose of retaining it for the people of Canada? Why, one of his colleagues made a boast the other day that he was going to give \$150,000 to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, and that gift was heralded from one end of Canada to the other as an unparalleled instance of the care with which the hard-working toilers of the sea were treated by the present Government. But while after long years they find it difficult to make a gift of \$150,000 to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, they can, for the sake of a special favorite of the Minister of Railways, at once, without qualm, or scruple, or hesitation, throw away the sum of \$200,000. I should like to know what possible answer Mr. Drummond could have given to the enquiry of the Minister except to enquire at the head office? The hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that the cheque was made payable at the branch office; the cheque itself shows that it was payable at the head office of the Bank of Montreal. What else could Mr. Drummond do when he saw the cheque, but say that he would enquire at the head office whether the cheque was good or not? Sir, I do not pretend to say that this is the worst transaction in which the hon. gentleman has ever been engaged. I think possibly my hon. friend did speak a little rashly on that point; I fear much that there are worse—many much worse transactions behind; and although the hon. gentleman, strong in his brute majority, may vote down the motion of my hon. friend—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There is another tribunal before which this case will be tried, and I for one think that not all the bluster of the Minister of Railways, not all the special pleadings and ingenious sophistry of the Minister of the Interior, will succeed in convincing the people of Canada that it is just or wise or prudent or constitutional to throw away \$209,000 of the people's money, because the hon. Minister of Railways has a pet contractor whom he desires to favor at the people's cost.

Amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin,	Flynn,	Olivier,
Bain,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchar, d,	Gillies,	Pickard,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Borden,	Gunn,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Haddow,	Rogers,
Brown,	Holtan,	Ross (Middlesex),
Barpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rymal,
Barpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Scrifer,
Cameron (Huron),	Killam,	Skinner,
Cartwright,	King,	Smith,
Casey,	Laurier,	Snowball,
Casgrain,	McDonald (Victoria N.S.),	Sutherland,
Charlton,	Macdonnell (Lanark),	Tallier,
Cockburn,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Thompson,
Coupal,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Dumont,	McIsaac,	Weldon, and
Fiset,	Malouin,	Yeo.—45.
Fleming,		

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fulton,	Méhot,
Allison,	Gault,	Mongenaix,
Amyot,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Arnell,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,
Bannerman,	Girouard (Kent),	Muttart,
Barnard,	Grandbois,	O'Connor,
Beaty,	Gillett,	Ogden,
Beauchesne,	Hackett,	Orton,
Benoit,	Hay,	Ouimet,
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Hilliard,	Platt,
Bill,	Hooper,	Plumb,
Bolduc,	Houde,	Pope (Compton),
Boulbee,	Hurteau,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Ives,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Brooks,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunster,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Bunting,	Krantz,	Royal,
Burnham,	Landry,	Ryan (Marquette),
Carling,	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Scott,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lautier,	Shaw,
Cimon (Oicoutimi),	Longley,	Sproule,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Stephenson,
Costigan,	Macdonald, Sir John,	Strange,
Coughlin,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tassé,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Currier,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	McCarthy,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McCuaig,	Valin,
Daoust,	McDougald,	Vallée,
Dawson,	McDougall,	Vanasse,
DeCosmos,	McGreery,	Wade,
Dessaulniers,	McLelan,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Desjardins,	McLennan,	Wallace (York),
Domville,	McLeod,	White (Cardwell),
Drew,	McQuade,	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McRory,	White (Renfrew),
Elliott,	Manson,	Williams, and
Farrow,	Massue,	Wright.—128.
Fortin,	Merner,	

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no intention to-night of replying to the very extraordinary speech of the hon. Minister of Railways; that I will take another opportunity of doing. I rise, however, for the purpose of correcting one mistake into which the hon. gentleman has fallen. He accused me of only giving him a few hours' notice of the motion, and declared with his usual recklessness that they invariably gave the late Administration notice of intended motions. Now, Sir, so far as I can recollect at this moment, I never received notice of any motion of the kind. I can remember several motions made without notice—one by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell) on the purchase of steel rails, without the slightest notice of any sort; another, I think, by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDonald).

Mr. BOWELL. I gave you notice of another.
Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg your pardon; I gave you notice of the motion in reference to the Speaker.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is of no consequence, and it was not on going into Supply.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I know it was.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, I have no recollection of it. There was another motion made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) without any notice whatever; and I am satisfied that I could find many others. Now, I gave the Prime Minister notice on Friday last of my intention to move an amendment to the motion to go into Supply; he did not ask me what the motion was, or I would have told him; but he asked me last night and I told him, and to-day, fearing the Minister of Railways should not know, I informed him in the Railway Committee room. That notice I knew was amply sufficient; he had nothing to look up; he had the papers before him, as I had. There was nothing intended to be discussed by me, nor did I discuss anything but the one point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will thank the hon. member for Lambton, when he undertakes to repeat a statement of mine, to repeat it accurately, which he has not done. What I said I repeat, that when I had occasion to challenge the hon. gentleman's conduct as a Minister, I gave him ample notice from my place in the House, and that was the motion in reference to the Pacific Railway; and I said that under the circumstances I was entitled to a little more courtesy at the hon. gentleman's hands than to be informed of his intended motion at half-past ten in the morning, when the hon. gentleman knew that it was impossible for me to leave the Railway Committee or my other duties to consider his motion; and I repeat that it was not the courtesy due to me from his hands, in view of the courtesy I have extended to him. He has not cited a case of any motion I made of which I did not give him notice.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have had no opportunity of looking up cases, but I mentioned several cases in which no notice was given. The hon. gentleman holds gentlemen on this side of the House responsible for the newspapers in the country, but he declines to be held responsible even for his own colleagues, and he knows that the leader of the Government received notice on Friday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman told me on Friday that when we were going into Supply, he was going to move; but he did not tell me what. Last night, after the House adjourned, I met the hon. gentleman in the corridor, and I asked him what he was going to move. He said he was going to move on one of the contracts, and I wrote a note to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, informing him of the motion.

SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

1. Charges of Management..... \$169,834 01

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This will be a proper occasion for the hon. Minister of Finance to inform the House of the nature of the arrangements which he has made with Messrs. Baring and Glyn, with respect to the payment of interest and commission, and also of the functions which Sir Alexander Galt is henceforth to discharge. As well as I remember, when Sir Alexander Galt was appointed Commissioner, it was stated in the Minute appointing him that part of his duties would be to discharge a large portion of the duties which had formerly been discharged by the Financial Agents. I understand now that there has been a complete alteration—that practically, Sir Alexander Galt will have no financial duties to discharge, and that the whole matter is to be placed in the hands of the agents for

a period of something like ten years irrevocably. That is a matter on which it would be well for the hon. Minister of Finance to give the Committee some explanations.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I must say that I am a little surprised at the hon. member asking for information on this subject, because I thought the papers laid before the House gave very complete information with reference to that agreement. I may first be permitted to state that the first item of \$109 is an addition to the salary of the clerks in the office of the Assistant Receiver-General at Toronto; the next increase of \$300 is for additions to salaries in the office at Halifax. In Winnipeg the work has increased so rapidly and has reached such a volume that during the last six months the Government have been compelled to send an assistant from the Department at Ottawa, temporarily, in order that we may ascertain after the completion of the contracts for the building of the railway, whether an additional officer will be required permanently. But now it is pretty clear that an additional officer will be required, and in order to retain the services of the junior clerk at \$500, a considerable increase will be necessary, making the increase of the Department \$17,000. At Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, it is proposed to increase one salary by \$100 and appoint an additional officer; besides, the increase in savings bank deposits has progressed so rapidly as to render it impossible to keep up the work, and an additional officer will be appointed there after 1st July. With respect to country savings banks. In New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and British Columbia, it will be remembered that the officers are paid from \$200 to \$400, according to the amount of business they do, and as the amount of deposits has largely increased, no less than \$4,000,000 a year, these officers will be entitled to receive additional payment for the increased business. There are applications from various officers involving an increase of \$1,300. We will redeem, during the year, \$2,632,000 debentured debt of Prince Edward Island, bearing 6 per cent. interest, and save \$25,228.80. We next come to commission on payments of \$5,984,059 interest on debt, showing a saving of \$28,079. This brings me to the point referred to by the hon. member for Centre Huron. It is quite true that when Sir Alexander Galt was sent to London as High Commissioner, it was proposed to establish a financial agency, of which he should be the head. But a question subsequently arose as to the nature of the contract made by the Finance Minister of old Canada, and Finance Ministers since the Union, with respect to the floating of the bonds. On the face of the bonds it is stated that they are to be paid at the offices of Baring Bros. and Glyn, Mills & Co. when they fall due, and that the interest was to be paid by the same agents. It was alleged by the agents that this was a contract legally binding, and could only be broken with their consent or by arriving at a compromise. Considerable discussion took place by representatives of the Government in London, and it led subsequently to the proposal laid on the Table of the House, and its acceptance by the Government, by which those firms are to discharge certain duties for the Government for ten years from the 1st of January last, at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ instead of 1 per cent., for the payment of the coupons, by which next year a saving will be effected of \$28,079. I can give no further information than the copy of the agreement entered into, the proposal made by Glyn, Mills & Co., and the acceptance by the Government which has been laid on the Table. That contract provides that as regards \$35,000,000, that may be redeemed by the Government in 1885—and it has been decided by the Government to do so—bearing 5 per cent. interest, the agents have undertaken to substitute other debentures of the Dominion bearing 4 per cent. for the redemption of those, or in exchange for them, for a charge of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., whereas, under the original contract, if they redeemed the

debentures and floated a new loan for that amount, 1 per cent. would be charged for redemption, and 1 per cent. for floating a new loan. But, supposing a new loan were floated, there would be a saving of 1 per cent.; it would amount of \$35,000,000, to \$35,000. That of course, does not come into next year's engagements, but we will find the benefit of it next year by the reduction of the rate of interest $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the 5 and 6 per cent. loans. There are \$5,000 additional entered by the Deputy Minister of Finance on stamps, postage and telegrams. We are about to strike off a \$4 note, and the preparation of the plate and issue of the new currency will add to the expenditure of the present year, and will probably increase very considerably the circulation of Dominion notes. The result of the operations of next year as compared with the present, as regards charges of management, will be a saving of \$45,000, which I think, will be highly satisfactory to the Committee. I may state to the hon. member for Centre Huron, that it is not now proposed to place the High Commissioner in charge of the payment of interest on coupons, or any financial work, except such as may be thrown upon him in obtaining silver coin, and various services of that kind, but not with respect to payment of interest of coupons or the floating of debentures.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I observe under this head an item including four extra clerks in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes. I think the hon. Minister of Finance should make a charge of four extra clerks under the head of Civil Government.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My hon. friend is mistaken. This is simply continuing the four extra clerks who are employed in the signing of notes, and they are chargeable under this head. They may be increased or decreased, according to the number of notes to be attended to.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is gratifying to know we are able to save \$45,000 in the management of our large loan; but that gratification is considerably modified when we reflect that under this arrangement the plan proposed by the late hon. Finance Minister, and apparently adopted by the present Finance Minister and his colleagues, of establishing an agency of our own in London, through which we would hereafter pay interest, negotiate new loans and transact all the business transacted through Financial Agents, is altogether set aside. It was supposed that the High Commissioner should act as the head of that establishment while acting also in other capacities; and one of the reasons given for his appointment was that some such arrangement would be effected. All that has been abandoned without any reason being given, and now we are asked to congratulate ourselves on the fact that a new arrangement has been effected by which we will not pay as much in the way of commissions as formerly. The London agents, in this correspondence, claim they had a legal right to the old rates of commission, and pretended, in abandoning that right, they are making a very remarkable concession to our wishes. I cannot see from the correspondence why this arrangement could not have been effected quite as well without the intervention of the High Commissioner, and I cannot see why, because this arrangement has been made, we are to conclude that the appointment of this High Commissioner, at a large salary and heavy expenses attached to his office, was, in fact, an economy. Another point in this case is that charges of the gravest possible character have been repeatedly made in this House against those Financial Agents, by the hon. Minister of Railways in particular and some of his colleagues. They have been charged almost expressly, certainly by the strongest possible implication, with having abused their position for the purpose of plundering the people of this Dominion of millions of dollars. Even during the present Session it has been asserted that these Agents, in concurrence with the late Finance Minister—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. And the present Finance Minister.

Mr. ANGLIN. And the present Finance Minister—because if there is the slightest suspicion in the one case the same suspicion must inevitably attach to the other operation—but the charge was repeatedly made, that these transactions were not merely of a suspicious character, but bore on the surface indubitably the evidence of the fact that the Financial Agents abused their position, and, with the concurrence of the late Finance Minister, placed that loan in such a way that they were enabled to realize enormous profits. We were told repeatedly that the fact of the names of those to whom portions of the loan were allotted not having been given was *prima facie* evidence of the dishonesty of the transaction, although it is well known Finance Ministers have always refused to give those names. We were always told it was contrary to sound policy to disclose the names of persons to whom sums were allotted on these occasions. The present hon. Finance Minister has never laid before this House a list of the names of persons to whom loans were allotted. This omission on the part of the late Finance Minister was given as indubitable evidence of dishonesty, yet we find that the Government has entered into an arrangement which will give to those agents, whom they charged with dishonesty, the management of our financial affairs in London for a period of ten years. I never thought there was the slightest ground for the charges made against those gentlemen, but, under the circumstances, I think we are entitled to an explanation of the reason why an agency of our own has not been established in London and an economy effected greater than that effected under the new arrangement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The summer before last the Deputy Finance Minister was in London and made full enquiries, with Sir Alexander Galt, into the advisability of establishing a financial agency of our own in London. On his return he reported to me that the expense would be much larger than was at first contemplated. In view of this additional expense the Government considered it advisable to accept the subsequent proposition of their agents, which will enable us to save a very large sum annually. These are the reasons why they were accepted, and it was found that there was a staff sufficient to perform the work and all things necessary in connection with the transfer of those debentures and registered stock and all payments of interest—a larger and more expensive staff than was contemplated at the time Sir Alexander Galt took the position as High Commissioner.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is very satisfactory to find that in spite of the charge very foolishly made by the Minister of Railways, the present Government have such unbounded confidence in the Messrs. Baring & Glyn that they are willing to put our affairs in their hands for eleven years positively; because this memorandum of the agreement is for ten years, and hereafter one year's notice. I do not think the saving is going to be as large as the Minister stated. We save, it is true, about \$32,000 all told, in one way; but I see it requires \$5,000 additional for the expenditure in connection with the management of the debt, which reduces it to something like \$27,000. Then against that we have the expense of our High Commissioner, whose salary is \$10,000, and contingent expenses, \$4,000; and, if my memory serves me, there is probably \$5,000 or \$6,000 for other expenses, making in all about \$20,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I shall have the papers to-morrow, showing all the sums paid him since 1878.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then perhaps one or two of those items had better stand over.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I see no reason for that.

Mr. ANGLIN.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Considering the various expenses of the High Commissioner the reduction of the expenses spoken of does not amount to very much after all. I would like to know whether Sir Alexander Galt negotiated those \$35,000,000, and his report to the Minister; because I find no such statement in this return, that he had agreed to pay 1 per cent. redemption money on that loan. Of course I have no access to the papers in the Finance Department, but my recollection is that the point was not at all clear. I will not say they may not have had some claim, but I do not think they had anything like the same distinct settled claim that they had in the case of the loans negotiated by New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Is the Minister prepared to lay before us any statement from his Department, or any made by Sir Alexander Galt, showing we were bound to pay that 1 per cent.? I would like to know on what ground they insist on that payment, which is an exceedingly large one; and although it was justifiable in the case of loans made by the smaller Provinces, I do not know whether, without an express agreement, it would be held justifiable in the case of Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of their legal claim, but the correspondence of the last year or two shows very clearly that that was part of the agreement between them and Sir Alexander Galt and Canada.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We have not got it here.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; but it appears in letters that passed between them and the Department eighteen months ago.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Were they ever produced?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have them. Did Sir Alexander Galt himself declare that that was the understanding?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That was the understanding between the Finance Minister, Sir Alexander Galt, who floated that loan, and the agents in London.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The point I make is this: I only ask for information, and shall be quite satisfied if the hon. Finance Minister will refresh his recollection and state if Sir Alexander Galt made the assertion in question. My own recollection is not so fresh as the hon. Minister's is, that on this point there was very great doubt indeed, and that this loan was not negotiated upon the same terms at all as the loans of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. That is a point of considerable moment, as to the goodness or badness of the terms named, and the House ought to have very full information. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman will bring down portions of the correspondence with reference to this charge?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like the portion respecting Sir Alexander Galt's understanding with the hon. Finance Minister.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If it has not been laid on the Table—my impression is that it has been—I will submit it without any motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My ear caught a remark from the hon. member from Gloucester, when leaving the House, and as I returned, it caught a similar remark from the hon. member for Centre Huron, about some grave charge of mine touching the financial interests of Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co. and Messrs. Baring. I would be extremely

obliged if the hon. gentlemen would point out any occasion on which I ever made any charge against one or other of these eminent firms, as I am not aware of it. When the hon. gentlemen will show me from the records that their memory is not at fault, I would be prepared to deal with the question. Until then, the hon. gentlemen may find it convenient to shelter themselves under a mere imputation.

Mr. ANGLIN. In the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways on the Budget, he distinctly charged the late hon. Minister of Finance with having mismanaged the negotiation of a loan in London, with having put it in the market at a fixed rate instead of for open competition, and he has stated that the Financial Agents at that time took up a large portion of that loan and derived an enormous profit from it. What portion they did take up actually was not definitely stated, but he certainly did more than insinuate, he almost directly charged, that the agents misled the hon. Minister of Finance on that occasion and took advantage of his simplicity or his incapacity—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. ANGLIN. To induce him to put a loan in the market in that way, and that they profited directly and largely by the course they advised him then to take. I think if the hon. gentleman's language is quoted it will be found to carry out very fully that idea.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman wants to know what ground we have for alleging that we reflected, by imputation, at least, on Messrs. Baring & Glyn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything about them.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is perfectly well known in the city of London that Messrs. Baring & Glyn were responsible for every step that was taken; every bond that ever was issued passed directly through their hands, and if there was any malpractice of the smallest kind it could only have been done with the direct collusion of those gentlemen. The hon. gentleman talks about the possessors of the former bonds that he took across the Atlantic and disposed of to his friends. He says:

"That the men to whom he gave the \$4,000,000 worth of debentures are, at this moment, the happy possessors of \$2,920,000 more than they paid him for the bonds."

Well, if these were sold at a fair price in the open market there can be no question but that the men who bought them, and who are not the present holders, as the hon. gentleman well knows, unless the parties who originally took them have long since disposed of them; but if those men made any undue profit it was due to connivance of the present agents. These gentlemen, as a matter of course, conducted the whole negotiations. I do not know one single man to whom the Messrs. Baring in the first instance distributed the loans. The whole placing of them, the whole letting of them, was in the hands of the Barings and the Glyns, and if any favoritism was shown it was done by those gentlemen and not by me. It was for that reason the hon. member for Gloucester very properly enquired of the Minister of Finance whether he shared the extraordinary views of the Minister of Railways as to the character of these gentlemen; because if they are guilty of such connivance they are the last men in the world to have control of our finances for a fixed period of eleven years. If the hon. Minister himself stated that he made no imputation on these gentlemen, that he never meant to insinuate there was ever any impropriety, then it simply remains that in making an assault upon me he talked in glorious ignorance of what transpired in London.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentlemen have made a statement that I had seriously attacked the cha-

racter and standing of Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., and the Messrs. Baring, Financial Agents of the Government of Canada. They are challenged to produce the record. They cannot produce a word, nor anything that bears the slightest relation to it. The hon. gentleman must know that these London financiers are the servants, not the masters of this Government; they are the agents, not the masters of the Minister of Finance of Canada; and when the Minister of Finance is in London he is the master and they are his agents to carry out his instructions. He is not here as their deputy, but he is there to direct as the Minister of Canada, and if they offer him their advice he is himself to judge of the soundness of their advice. The hon. gentleman can never shelter himself for one moment under the respected and respectable garb of Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., or the Messrs. Baring, who, when he was in London, were his agents to carry out his directions. Now, the hon. gentleman says that this money all went through their hands. Suppose it did, it does not touch the case. My charge is that the hon. gentleman went into the money market of the world and put that loan on the market in a different mode than any Minister of Finance of Canada has ever done before.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Sir Alexander Galt did it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never. He never put a loan on the market for the Dominion of Canada since Confederation. I do not mean to say there might not be such a condition of things as to make such a step possible, but from the first day of the Dominion no Minister of Finance has ever undertaken to fix the time for which a loan was to run, to fix the interest and to make it impossible to have any competition so that the country would have a chance to get all the debentures were worth. My charge was that the hon. gentleman declared in his prospectus that instead of persons who tendered for this loan were to do so on the terms which he offered, receiving in *pro rata* according to the amount they tendered for, he provided, and so stated in his prospectus, that parties to whom nothing was allotted would have their money returned that they had sent in. So the hon. gentleman not only fixed the price far below what the bonds of Canada were selling for in the market at the time; he fixed it at a ruinously low rate, and he put it in the position that he himself could choose who were to be the beneficiaries, who were the parties to receive that loan; it placed him in a position so to deal with the parties who took that loan that they were nearly \$5,000,000 richer than they would have been if they had never seen that hon. gentleman, and had never taken that loan. That was the position. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says it will be impossible for any such thing to be done without the connivance of the Glyn & Mills Co. He must suppose that he is talking to children instead of men who understand business. Why, Sir, there was nothing to prevent him going to A, B or C, and saying "I am going to put a loan on the market, and I am going to fix the price at 90 for 100 pounds sterling, debentures of Canada. You have just to go in for a certain amount, say a million of that, and you will net a good thing." Was there anything to prevent that? Was there anything to prevent him, if not to do it directly, to do it through half-a-dozen persons, and thus make it utterly impossible to bring a charge directly home to him. When he fixed the loan, and provided now it should be allotted he was master of the position, and was in communication with the Financial Agents of London. Suppose they did take a certain amount of the loan, they had a right to subscribe at the rate fixed by the authority of the Government of Canada. They had a right to take as much as they could obtain. I say that under these circumstances the hon. gentleman stands in the position of being responsible for putting the loan on the market in that way, and of

putting it in the power of the parties who were the happy recipients of the loan to make an enormous sum of money at the cost of the people of Canada, because he did not allow that fair and open competition which my hon. friend the Finance Minister allowed when he negotiated loans in that market, and all of the Finance Ministers since the Government of the Dominion was formed. The hon. gentleman cannot shelter himself in any way whatever. There is the fact that he adopted this extraordinary mode, and the additional fact that when he was asked to inform us who were the happy recipients of this amount he refused to tell us, but we now know that the parties who had the good fortune to receive this amount are, as I stated, \$5,000,000 richer to-day than they would have been if they had never seen the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I did not think that the hon. gentleman would, in cool blood, repeat the extremely silly statement he made the other evening in heated debate. It is quite clear that if these people got \$5,000,000 out of me, they got \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 out of the hon. gentleman who sits beside him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never said anything of the kind.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That is as clear as daylight. If there was a difference of 15 per cent. in the loan which I negotiated a few years ago, there was a difference of at least 10 or 11 per cent. in the loan which the present Finance Minister negotiated.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I took the highest bid that I could get.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I say it is clear that if the people who took up my loan got \$5,000,000, several millions of dollars were put in the pockets of the hon. gentleman's beneficiaries and friends. The hon. Minister of Railways knows two or three things which he does not choose to include in the statement he has made. In the first place he knows that there was no loan negotiated on the credit of Canada since Canada became a Confederation until the loan of 1874 negotiated by me. The only attempt at it was the small sum of £500,000, which was included by Sir John Rose in a larger loan of £2,000,000, three-quarters of which was guaranteed. That was not a loan on the credit of Canada, but a mixed loan. The parties who took the one were obliged to take the other. The loan negotiated by the hon. Minister of Railways was guaranteed by the Imperial Government. It was a 4 per cent. guaranteed loan. I remember quite distinctly that when Sir John Rose was asked to bring down the names of the parties to whom he allotted the loan of 1868 or 1869, he refused to give that information. He refused to give it because it was contrary to the custom of the city of London, and would impede them from other transactions; and I have always myself thought that this was an unnecessary restriction, but it was a habit or custom, and we were not in the habit of flying against it. As to the profits of the loan of 1874, if the hon. gentleman knew anything of the affairs of the Stock Exchange of which he prates so lustily, if he took the trouble to look at the *Economist* for 1874 or 1875, he would see that all through the two succeeding years that loan was selling on the London market at 2 per cent. lower than the price at which I placed it. He will find this by the *Economist* or any other decent authority of the Stock Exchange which he likes to consult. He will find that it sold at retail at a considerably lower price than I placed it, and that is a proof that when acting with the fullest concurrence of the Baring's I fixed the standard at 90. I got the highest price that could be obtained, or safely asked for a new loan. I tell him more, that we were obliged to go to the Bank of Montreal and Baring and Glyn to take one and a-half mil-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

lions sterling in order to make up that loan, and without their aid it could not have been floated. Those were the facts stated in this House and proven over and over again, and they were perfectly well known to the hon. gentleman. And yet, knowing as he did right well that that loan was positively sold at a loss by the men who originally took it—by most of them at least—though it is possible that such strong houses as the Barings and Glyn's, who were able to hold it for years, may have made something out of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has based his whole statement on two palpable fallacies. In the first place he assumes that I said what I never said—that the beneficiaries of his loan made nearly \$5,000,000 out of it. No such statement has ever been made by me. What I did say I repeat: that if the happy recipients of his loan had held the debentures until to-day they would be \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 richer than they would have been if they had never seen the hon. gentleman. I have never said for a moment that it was not the rising credit of the country that has made the great increase in the value of that loan. But I do say that when the hon. gentleman sold the debentures of Canada at a rate at which they had never been sold before—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. By the Minister who made the loans.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am now speaking of the Dominion of Canada. Sir John Rose was sent to London to put a loan on the market. He did not put on a fixed price. He put it on the open market and asked parties to compete for it. I say that the hon. gentleman beside me, Sir Leonard Tilley, adopted the same policy. The late Finance Minister has endeavored on more than one occasion to shelter himself under the wing of Sir Francis Hincks. When he was brought into the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, he was considered by hon. gentlemen opposite a resuscitated mummy. That was the opinion they had of him. But when they found that when in the position of a bank president, and to a certain extent in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, they could extract some little compliment from Sir Francis Hincks, he all at once became an illustrious financial authority. This old resuscitated mummy was revived and became a great authority; but I have Sir Francis Hincks' authority in black and white for saying that the hon. gentleman did wrong in putting his loan on the market at a fixed price. I have his letter saying that he should have put the loan on the market with a sealed minimum, and allowed parties to bid as much higher as they could. So that the hon. gentleman has that prop swept from under him. Now, Sir, what is the other fallacy? It is that if these parties made all this money a large portion was sacrificed by my hon. friend. No money was sacrificed by him. Had the hon. gentleman done what Sir John Rose did and what the present Finance Minister did, had he given the people of Canada fair play by putting the loans on the market in any mode that would have given public competition, no man would have said a word or have wanted to know who got the loan, because everyone would have known that Canada received the highest price her debentures were worth. But the hon. gentleman did not do that; the hon. gentleman did that which gave the opportunity for the money to be placed in the power of a dishonest man, if a dishonest man dealt with it. I believe, as much as I believe my own existence, that fortunes were made by men who took the loans from the hon. gentleman on those terms; I believe those fortunes were made at the expense of Canada, because if the hon. gentleman had done otherwise, the people would have got all the money they wanted, and he would have been saved from the suspicion that exists, not

only in this House, but throughout the whole country, that he forgot the high position he occupied, and that he abused the high position he occupied, and made Canada suffer by the course he took; and, I tell the hon. gentleman, that he may raise these false issues, and put words in my mouth that I never used, that these \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 were taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada; I never said so, but I said that there were large margins between the amounts that Canada would have received had her debentures received fair play, and the amount they did receive by the foul play used by the hon. Minister.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The words used by the hon. gentleman were these:

"He cannot be impervious to the fact that the men who received these bonds are \$600,000 richer than they were before."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say so now.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. He does say that \$5,000,000 were taken out of the people of Canada. The fact of the matter is that money is 30 per cent. cheaper to-day than it was in 1874, and therefore those four per cent. bonds are worth 14 or 15 per cent. more than they were. But I repeat that with the exception of two or three strong holders, every man who touched the hon. gentleman's issue of £4,000,000 sterling lost money by it, and that the returns of the *Economist* newspaper show that the price obtained ruled largely below the price I got. Messrs. Barings and Glyn were no doubt directly responsible, as the agents of the Government of Canada, for the advice they gave; that every step was taken by their advice, and with their concurrence; they were very strong on the necessity of fixing their price, and they were right, because when I was placing a security for the first time on the London market, it was no time to run counter to the prejudices of the Stock Exchange. The hon. gentleman is quite safe in saying that no Finance Minister of Canada ever floated an independent loan save at 4 per cent., because no Finance Minister floated a loan before, and but for my success in floating these loans, the hon. Finance Minister would have found it more difficult to float his loans afterwards. But Sir John Rose and Sir Francis Hincks floated loans at fixed prices; the loans of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which that hon. gentleman himself conducted, were made at a fixed price. As to Sir Francis Hincks, when the hon. gentleman produces a letter from him, I will believe that Sir Francis Hincks used that language and not before, and I have good reason for what I say.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will say that Sir Francis Hincks told me, without any solicitation on my part, that he considered the loan an admirable operation. The hon. gentleman said that he imputed no evil on the part of the agents; but though he did not do so directly, his remarks implied as much. I can respect a man who makes a direct charge, but I have no respect for a man who insinuates a base calumny against his neighbor.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister of Railways is in the habit of making strong statements without really understanding what he does say. In his last speech he more than insinuated that an opinion was extorted from Sir Francis Hincks by improper means, and used by the late Government. Now, I do not think that Sir Francis Hincks, while he was a member of the Government of which that hon. gentleman was a member, deserved any such censure at his hands; I believe his conduct in this House was always honorable, and that we have no right to accuse him of making a statement which he did not mean to make, or which was not entirely consistent with his views on any particular subject. In the paper published in Montreal, to which Sir Francis Hincks is known to be a contributor, a number of articles appeared on this very loan, meeting the charges of the hon. Minister of Railways

very directly; and in these articles, which everyone attributed to Sir Francis Hincks, and which he never repudiated, the ground was taken that the late Finance Minister was justified in recognising the prejudices of the London market. The question this evening was not whether it was proper to put a loan on the market at a fixed rate or at public competition; there are various opinions on that point; and all who have studied this question know that nearly all the Governments of Europe have put loans on the money market of Europe at fixed prices; and it is hardly to be asserted that the Finance Ministers of those Governments knew less of the money market, or were less capable of negotiating a loan than a Canadian Finance Minister. The hon. Minister of Finance put his loan on the market and asked for tenders, and he gained a little; but that was a second 4 per cent. loan, and it was put on the market when money was cheaper than it had been when the former loan was negotiated. But the hon. gentleman, in determining which of these loans was the better - and probably neither was better than the other - should take into account all the surrounding circumstances, the condition of the money market at the time, whether there was a feeling of confidence, or of apprehension or alarm. The state of feeling in the money market, whether it is one of confidence or of apprehension, the condition of Europe, the probability of peace or war, all these things have to be taken into account when determining the relative merits of loans negotiated at different periods. It is a very important element that when our later loans were negotiated apprehension of war between England and the United States, for which Canada would be the theatre, had very largely passed away. That feeling had existed for a long time after the American war and affected very materially the prices of American securities in the English market. When a feeling of confidence returned these securities began rapidly to advance, and as the American securities advanced so the Canadian advanced as well, as because of the changed condition of the money market generally. But the special point to which I wish to direct attention is this: that I believe the hon. the Minister of Railways, in his speeches made at various times, did impute to Baring Brothers and Glyn, Mills & Co. a charge of having acted improperly as agents of this country, of having abused the confidence of the hon. the Finance Minister, who placed confidence in them, of having misled him, and by that means obtained for themselves a chance of very large profits at the expense of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman says he does not charge that any of the money was taken out of the pockets of the people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never said there was not a large portion of the money taken out of the pockets of the people. I said the whole of it was not.

Mr. ANGLIN. The statement of the hon. gentleman varies every time, but there remains this *residuum*, however objectionable it may be, that an imputation is levied against some one of having acted dishonestly in this matter. It is of little consequence when it is said that the Finance Minister made a mistake in adopting a fixed price when he placed the loan on the market; that is a matter of judgment, and any man may be mistaken; but it is an entirely different matter to impute dishonest motives. The statement that the happy recipients of the bonds are £600,000 richer, means something more than a change in the market value of the bonds. The statement is made to convey the impression, which the hon. Minister of Railways wishes the House to believe, that some one acted dishonestly or improperly in that transaction. My impression was, the hon. Minister of Railways spoke of our agents in England as if they were at least *particeps criminis*, and if there were any wrong doing from which the people of Canada suffered, they were the parties who mainly profited by it. It was stated years ago,

at the time the loan was negotiated and subsequently when charges were made, that the Financial Agents took a very large portion of the loan, which the hon. Minister of Railways seems to think London capitalists were eager to obtain possession of, and which that hon. gentleman declares the hon. Finance Minister might possibly have induced his friends by private hints and suggestions, to take at the low rate at which it was intended to be placed on the market. We know that the Financial Agents were obliged to take a very large part of the loan, and they would have properly reaped advantage from the subsequent advance. This advantage will, at all events, have grown out of the debate, namely, that the Minister of Railways has distinctly and positively repudiated any idea or intention of imputing wrong-doing to the Financial Agents of Canada. But he still lingers to the idea that there has been dishonesty somewhere, that the hon. Minister has gone down and suggested to friends on the other side that there was an opportunity of making a fortune at the expense of the people of Canada. There was no fortune if the fair market value of the bonds was paid, and that has been proved by the hon. member for Centre Huron. That hon. gentleman established that the ordinary money lenders in London were not prepared to take the whole of the loan of £4,000,000 sterling, even at the low rate fixed. The hon. Minister of Railways contends that there was a definite intention to confine the loan to particular individuals; but the hon. member for Centre Huron states distinctly that the loan was only successfully floated because the Financial Agents and the Bank of Montreal took up £1,500,000 of the total amount. That goes very far to prove that the loan was sold at the very highest that could possibly be obtained for it on the occasion and under the circumstances.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the amount subscribed was greatly in excess of the loan—the first loan?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It was not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it was. £6,000,000 for a £4,000,000 loan.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No, it was not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The returns prove that it was.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will get the correspondence.

Mr. ANGLIN. This is the first time the Minister of Railways has taken the present position. He never before controverted the statement of the hon. member for Centre Huron that all of the loan was not bid for by the money dealers of London. It is now stated that a very much larger sum than \$4,000,000 was subscribed, and therefore, there was no justification whatever for the Financial Agents taking any portion of the loan. Therefore, the charge against the Financial Agents becomes stronger than ever. They induced the Finance Minister of the day to place a loan at a fixed price, contrary to every principle of right and justice, according to the Minister of Railways; but more than that, when others had subscribed the full amount of the loan they obtained £1,500,000 for themselves. I had hoped to get rid of this charge once for all, as it is not creditable to the Government and Parliament that such a charge should be made and the slightest instigation cast on the Financial Agents, unless there was good foundation for the charge, and those making it were ready to substantiate it in a proper manner. I had hoped that by originating this debate I would put an end to this charge against the agents in Canada. I am sorry to say that it stands renewed by the late statement of the hon. Minister of Railways; yet notwithstanding his statement, we

Mr. ANGLIN.

find this new arrangement made which places the control of our money matters for the next ten years absolutely in the hands of those gentlemen, who, according to the hon. Minister of Railways, misled the late Finance Minister, when they found him incapable or ignorant, into a corrupt transaction, or were abetted by him in the dishonest scheme.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not hear the first part of the discussion, but I believe I know something about the transactions of 1876, and I congratulate the ex-Finance Minister on being defended by one whose defence has done him more damage than anybody could have anticipated. When the hon. gentleman went to England in 1876 there had been for a long time a great stagnation in the money market, and money was a drug on Lombard street at 1 to 1½ per cent. The hon. gentleman floated a loan. I do not know how he was advised. The Financial Agents do not take the responsibility of the operations of a Finance Minister; they presume that gentleman is able to take care of himself. They are willing to float a loan, but it is his business to say how it shall be floated. He, and not the Financial Agents is responsible to Canada; and the hon. member for Gloucester is trailing a red herring across the track when he talks of the arraignment of the Financial Agents by our hon. Minister of Railways. The Financial Agents are simply the Financial Agents, and when they saw a "Johnny Green" coming into market to negotiate a loan, willing to fall into the natural trap that was laid for him, it was not their business to warn him against it. When that hon. gentleman proposed to make that loan at a fixed price, they were very willing to take it at that fixed price. Had the hon. gentleman made his loan open to competition, there would have been plenty of competing applicants, on account of the abundance of money seeking investment at the time. But the fact is he represented to the country that he had made a loan at 92 when, considering all the allowances, it did not realize over 87½. I say it realized less than that. I have never yet been able to find out the charges made on that loan, but I do not believe it netted 87½. The loan was a 4 per cent. one. Yet when the present Finance Minister negotiated a 4 per cent. loan at 95½, at a time of disaster following the failure of the Glasgow and West of England Banks the hon. gentleman said, in his usual supercilious tone, that my hon. friend's loan was as good as the one he had made in 1876, though it did not net over 87½. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that he got 87½ net for it. I showed that it was not as good a loan as the loan made at 5 per cent. before, and produced tables to establish my assertion. The hon. gentleman said the calculation I made was not worth the paper it was written on. Still it was the calculation on which every financier of New York made his investments, and was very carefully made to show how much a loan, having a certain number of years to run and bearing a certain rate of interest, was worth to produce a certain rate. The hon. gentleman, then in the height of his power, with a very subservient majority at his back, could sneer at the statement I made, but that statement was absolutely correct and proved that the hon. gentleman did not receive for his loan anything like the return he said he obtained. The hon. gentleman knows he went before the country and stated he floated a 4 per cent. loan as if he had floated it at par and had reduced the rate of interest, when he knew he had not by that loan reduced the rate of interest at all. He raised \$12,500,000, and in-doing so lost \$1,500,000 on which the people have been paying interest ever since. That loan he made at a fixed price, although everybody in London knew perfectly well that a 4 per cent. Canadian loan was one of the favorite loans on the English market, except for whatever damage the hon. gentleman may have inflicted on the credit of the country by decrying it in every possible way and lamenting over the burden of debt thrown on him by his predecessors. The price having been fixed, of course nobody would give any more for the

loan. What did my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, do when he went to England, forced to make a loan by the laches of his predecessor who knew he had a loan to meet on 1st January, 1879, and who, although he ought to have gone in the month of June, 1878, to England, when money was cheap, risked the credit and the financial interest of this country in order to prosecute the campaign of 1878. He left my hon. friend to make a loan in December, 1878; the consequence was that he was forced, having taken office, and been obliged to go back for his election, having the loan falling due in June, to go in December into the English market at the most unfavorable time to negotiate a loan. There was stagnation in the money market, not more than 1½ per cent. being obtained for money in London. He was forced by the laches of the late Finance Minister to borrow at a time that the failure of the Glasgow and West of England Banks had created a panic on the market. And in spite of that what did he do? He had such confidence in the credit of the Dominion and in his future—such a perfect reliance upon the good faith of the people of Canada, that he advertised for public competition. He did not make any limit or prescribe any price; and although after advertising, he learned that the financial storm in Lombard street was so great, and was advised he would have to make a second application, he placed his loan at a higher price than our securities ever commanded before. This is a lesson to the hon. gentleman opposite who has vaunted himself on his financial achievements; but neither he nor his supporters will learn anything from it. They are given over to believe what it would not be Parliamentary to say. The hon. gentleman may sit in his place, and sneer at the criticisms on him; but if ever there was a financial record of disaster, it is the record of the gentleman who was Finance Minister from 1873 to 1878, and was in that year ignominiously expelled from that position by the verdict of an irate and indignant people.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Considering that I have heard all this about ninety-nine times before, I do not think it will make much impression upon me.

Mr. PLUMB. You will hear it one hundred times.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. If I heard it one hundred or even one thousand times from the same source, it would make no impression. But for the information of some hon. members who may not know all the facts, I will say that the Finance Minister did not float a Canadian loan in 1878, but a mixed loan, one-half of it bearing the Imperial guarantee, the other being Canadian bonds purely; and, guarding against any risk of my successor being put to any inconvenience and expense, I reserved £2,100,000 sterling to provide against any possible injury which might accrue to the Dominion credit, no matter what the result of the elections. It was that piece of foresight on my part which enabled that hon. gentleman to make that loan in December, 1878.

Mr. PLUMB. Foresight is not the proper word.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask you to keep that hon. gentleman quiet. He frequently interrupts, and deserves no courtesy from any hon. gentleman on this side; and unless he chooses to be quiet, I shall have to move that the Committee rise and report progress, and to repeat that operation till we have a proper opportunity for discussion. Over and over again it has been stated by hon. members opposite, quite inaccurately, that the Financial Agents of this country, who have been in the receipt of an annuity of \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year from Canada, for some 25 years, are not bound to act as the advisers of our hon. Finance Minister, to the best of their knowledge and ability, whoever he may be. I say Baring and Glyn are so bound and they acknowledge it; and they would be the very last men to assume that they were free to

make a profit out of the necessity of their clients. They are bound to do their best for their clients the people of Canada. It is on that score they were allowed their large commission. All through this discussion it has been assumed that they had a right to make a profit, an illegitimate and dishonest profit, out of the advice they tendered our Finance Minister. They had no such right; but, I repeat, we are bound to give them every assistance. In 1877 a question was raised as to the custom, when I showed that in the short space between 1871 and 1876, seventeen loans by every important State in Europe and elsewhere, aggregating £321,000,000 sterling, or between \$1,400,000,000 and \$1,500,000,000 had been issued in precisely the mode I adopted. I followed the customary habit of those best qualified to judge of the best mode of putting loans on the London market. Anybody who chose to examine the Budget Debate of 1877 will see those facts given in detail, and nobody has attempted to dispute them. The fact is that 1876, so far from being an easy time to float a loan, when I was in London the city was in a great state of commotion, and within twenty-four hours of my successful action, the Earl of Beaconsfield made his famous pronouncement at the Guildhall which brought Great Britain and Russia to the verge of war; and had that loan been deferred for two days we could not have secured it at all.

Mr. PLUMB. You did not float it at all.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. chairman, I will trouble you to keep that hon. member quiet. He may talk here or elsewhere as long as he pleases, but he shall not interrupt me. I repeat that in 1876 Europe was on the verge of serious disturbance, and it was a matter of touch-and-go whether we should succeed in floating the loan at all. As to the assertion that it was floated much below its value, there had been for several months previous no transaction to serve as a guide, except the borrowing of some small sums, those prices ranging, ex-dividend, from 92 to 9½; and it would have been a most preposterous thing for me to regard those transactions in any sense as a guide to the real price or value of money at the time. My hon. friend behind me was perfectly right in calling the attention of the House to the fact that after the assertions made with respect to the conduct of our Financial Agents, it was a very unpatriotic and improper thing for the Government to make them our agents for a fixed period of eleven years. If they are not true, and certainly hon. gentlemen, by their conduct, are contradicting them in the most emphatic fashion; then the Minister's conduct may be defended. But, in any case, when you come to deduct the expenses of Sir Alexander Galt's establishment, it is clear we are not making anything like the saving in this transaction the Minister indicated, because Sir Alexander Galt's salary and expenses were fixed with special reference to the fact that he was going to save a large part of these expenditures. That, it appears, is not the case, and, therefore, we must make considerable deduction *per contra* for the large additional expenses inflicted upon us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to the question of fact between the hon. gentleman opposite and myself, I think I can show that my memory is about as accurate as his. I undertake to say that when the \$4,000,000 loan was put on the market by the hon. gentleman, the question was as to whether the agent was compelled to take a large portion of that because it was not subscribed. I stated it was much more than subscribed, and I now read from a letter of those high authorities, Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., and Baring Bros., to prove what I say. The concluding part of the prospectus states:

"The allotment of the loans will be made as early as possible, and in cases where no answer is returned to applications, it will be understood that it has not been practicable to make any allotment."

Messrs. Baring Bros. & Co., and Glyn, Mills & Co., on the 8th of June, say in a letter to the hon. gentleman himself:

"In compliance with your instructions, we have this day opened a subscription for £4,000,000 in Dominion 4 per cent. loans."

And on the 24th of June, those gentlemen wrote to the then hon. Minister of Finance:

"We have the honor to inform you that the applications for the Canadian 4 per cent. loan amounts to £6,368,000, but as this amount includes, as usual, some applications of a speculative character, it appears to us most desirable, in regard to the future standing of the loan, to decline making allotments to any person who might be unable to comply with their engagements, and probably obliged to sacrifice their allotments without reference to price. After a careful revision of the list, we advise, therefore, that we should confine our allotments to about £3,750,000, although we could issue the remainder. * * * Under these circumstances, we beg leave to suggest the propriety of your authorizing us to subscribe the balance of the loan per account of Government, and we wait your instructions on the subject."

So that the hon. gentleman will find my statement that over £6,000,000 sterling were subscribed for the loan, and the parties were pledged to pay 20 per cent. down on allotment, and it was also provided that if they did not pay their calls, they forfeited the 20 per cent. on the allotment.

Mr. PLUMB. I think the loan the hon. gentleman made in 1876, was the occasion upon which he presented the silver side of the shield, of which we have heard so much, and it was on that occasion he represented that at least \$15,000,000 of surplus revenue had been accumulated. He says that if he had not made the loan of November, 1876, at that particularly critical moment, he could not have made it so well by several per cent. He told that to the *gobe-mouches* who were listening to him in the country; he would not have dared to say it in this House, where the statement would have been criticized. As if "several per cent." was an expression that a Minister of Finance could use when he was speaking of the credit of the country. As if it might have been as well 10 or 20 or 30 per cent. And those who believe everything that comes from that side listened to him with open mouth and applauded him. When he came before the House at the meeting of Parliament he stated that he had made a loan at about 92.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. PLUMB. I am quite sure he said he made the loan at about 92. He afterwards, upon investigating it—and we never could get to the bottom of it—stated the loan was made at 87½, but it never netted that, and I will tell the hon. gentleman he cannot prove he got 87½ for that loan to-day. Yet he has been before the country vaunting himself upon his financial achievements, but he has presumed to taunt my hon. friend for the mode in which he placed his loan in December, 1878, when he was forced into the market by the lashes of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I have only to say that in the first place it is quite clear from their statement that this £6,368,000 is not a *bona fide* subscription at all. That is the custom in London. A large number of people ask the agents to put in subscriptions for much larger amounts than they have the slightest idea of taking. That was the statement made by them to me. Technically, the hon. gentleman may appear to be correct; practically, the Messrs. Baring and Glyn were undoubtedly correct in the advice they gave, because they could not advise the placing, and they say so distinctly, of more than three millions and three-fourths. Speaking from memory—and I recollect it very distinctly—they reported to me that they could not place the whole.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is the statement under their own hand that they could place the whole issue.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. But they did not advise it. They say:

"After a careful revision of the list we advise, therefore, that we should confine our allotments to about £3,750,000."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

And as the hon. gentleman will see they gave two or three very good reasons why they did not recommend it. Now, both of the hon. gentlemen opposite should know that it is the habitual custom in London for parties to subscribe for a larger amount than they hope to get. So it was represented to me, and if false representations were made to me by our agents in London, then they are not fit for the position they have held for eleven years without reproach. These were the three first subscriptions which I have already named, and after those three a number of others rushed in.

Mr. PLUMB. And they should not know it beforehand?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. They declared that they were going to take it, and it was perfectly well known that they were going to take it. This was, however, as a lever for bringing in other subscriptions. This, I say, was done in the case of floating a new loan at 4 per cent., which never was tendered before for Canada or any other colony.

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. gentleman state, for the information of the Committee, whether a percentage was required when the loan was made.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not think it was made when Baring and Glyn had the allotment. They made an allotment and divided it among their friends and beneficiaries, to use the hon. gentleman's words—and if there was any impropriety or flaw it was on the part of these gentlemen.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's memory is rather hazy on this question, for he will find on referring to the return that 5 per cent. was required with the tender, and that this was forfeited if they did not take the tender if allotted to them.

Mr. PLUMB. Every one who knows the character of the hon. gentleman and his habits of mind knows perfectly well that their agents must have accepted the directions given by the hon. the Finance Minister of Canada. They were simply his instruments and agents, and it looks very much as if he had apportioned their shares before the competition, because, he says, the public knew how much these gentlemen would take.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I find that this is the statement of the prospectus:

20 per cent.	on allotment.
20 " "	" 10th August, 1874.
20 " "	" 21st September, 1874.
20 " "	" 30th October, 1874.
10 " "	" 1st December, 1874.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find that I was looking at another page of the book—the prospectus of the loan of 1878, in which 5 per cent. was required.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. So that the error of memory was not on my part.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wish to prolong the discussion on the previous item, but the hon. gentleman will find I am still right. If he will look at the prospectus of the loan for 1876 he will find that the subscription was to be 91 per cent., payable as follows:—

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. But we were speaking of the loan of 1874.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But it is rather an embarrassing thing that it should be required in the case of one of his loans and not in the other.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I have told the hon. gentleman once, and I repeat, that in floating an entirely new loan at 4 per cent. for Canada debentures, it was necessary to consult the feeling of the Stock

Exchange and take every precaution, as it was much more difficult than if the debentures were well known on the market. If, as the hon. gentleman says, he is in correspondence with Sir Francis Hicks, that gentleman will be able to tell him the reason.

4. The Department of Justice. \$15,500

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What are the increases, and to whom granted?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The increases are simply those of \$50 to certain members of the Civil Service. There is no increase in the number of the employes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. When we look at the whole Civil Government we find that the Government—the members of which when in Opposition denounced us as extravagant—have been adding an immense number of employes to those previously employed in their departments, with a corresponding increase of expenditure. In 1878 in this Department we had 390 employes; now 507 are asked for, or 117 more. It might be interesting to the House to learn the reason for this increase. The Civil Service Commission direct attention to the fact that the Government is adding to the number of clerks and employes without any practical regard to the work they have to do; that a great number of people are being put on by mere order of seniority at very large salaries, when their work is merely clerical. What the report of the Civil Service Commissioners says is, that the great bulk of the work of the service is purely clerical, which should be performed by clerks of the third class; that under the present regulations they are required to work six and a-half hours per diem, and that they are of opinion that for want of the necessary supervision the hours devoted to actual work do not on the average exceed much over two-thirds of that amount, so that, according to the Civil Service Commissioners Report, we are getting only three or four hours' work per diem out of these employes, and we have 117 more than we had three or four years ago. The total expenditure for the service in 1878, was \$812,000, while for the present year \$973,000 is demanded, and there, I fancy, is the reason why. Now, I know there are a great many very valuable and very good officers in the Civil Service, some of whom are underpaid; but it is quite clear that a great number of useless additions have been made by these gentlemen, though I do not see how they could add 117 employes and increase the expenditure by \$150,000 in the teeth of such a report as that brought down. The system inaugurated by these hon. gentlemen produces two results. In the first place, it is a very serious injury to the good men, whom you cannot pay properly when you are overloading the service in this way; and in the next place, it is a constant inducement for them to shirk the work. So far as I have been able to judge, these gentlemen to whom has been committed the task of reporting on the service, appear to be of opinion that there are a great number of people employed in the service who might be dispensed with, and that a very considerable number of the people who are put over the heads of others ought not to be made first class clerks, but that men should be carefully selected according to their merit, and that the bulk of the employes should be men of the third grade, or thereabouts, who should be compelled to work a reasonable number of hours, and to render the public the services for which they are paid. We find these increases in all the departments, and we have yet to hear first a satisfactory explanation of any of them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it is well to take up each case separately. It may be that we shall have a general resolution which will bring up a discussion of this whole question, when I think we shall be able to give a satisfactory explanation of each increase. In the present

instance there is an increase in the salary of the chief clerk, who, it appears, is a most valuable man in the Department, and who it has been considered has been underpaid in view of the nature of the services he has rendered; and it is proposed to increase his salary from \$1,650 to \$2,000. The other additions, with the exception of an additional clerk, are caused by the addition of \$50 to the salaries of such as are entitled to it by their length of service.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Well, I never heard that the Department of Justice was less efficiently administered when my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Blake) was at its head than it has been since. The opinion of the majority of the people of this country is that it never was administered so efficiently. I find that when he left there were nine persons in the Department, and there was an expenditure of \$11,700, and in the Penitentiary Branch there were four persons and an expenditure of \$33,900; while at present the expenditure in the former place is \$15,500, and in the latter \$5,450; and I do not believe there is any man here who will rise and say that that Department is more efficiently administered now than it was when the hon. member for West Durham was at its head.

Mr. BOWELL. It is quite as well.

Mr. PLUMB. The receipts of the country have increased about 33½ per cent. since 1878, and there is an absolute necessity for an increase in the staff required to do the increased business; and I can also say that upon a declining revenue, every year of the rule of hon. gentlemen opposite was signalized by an increase in their expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not in this Department. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Finance where the new clerk comes in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think he is a senior second-class clerk. The deputy is very anxious that a man of some little experience in the profession should be there to assist him, and the person who has been entered and is at present acting is a lawyer of some experience, whose services, I fancy, cannot be obtained unless we give him the pay of a senior second-class clerk.

5. The Department of Justice, (Penitentiary Branch). \$5,450

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose this is a statutory increase.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the principle adopted of granting those increases in all cases?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not in all cases, unless reported by the deputy-head of the department.

6. The Department of Militia. \$36,350

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the expenditure in this Department, particularly in the matter of salaries, indicated by the very high average paid, a higher average than is paid in any other Department of the Civil Service. Why that should be the case I cannot understand. I do not know any technical work in the Department, which requires the very high average salary of \$1,350 to officers in that Department. I hope the hon. Minister will find some means of explaining to the House why the Department should not be re-modelled somewhat on the line suggested by the Civil Service Commission. One, two or three chief clerks would superintend the work of the Department, which could be so organized as to obviate the large expenditure of \$36,350. The Militia Department, with the few volunteers we have and the small services required, does not require such a heavy staff at such large salaries.

Mr. CARON. The great difficulty that I have had to contend with since I became head of the Department, has been to reduce the staff, which I have to

a certain extent succeeded in doing. The only increases that appear in the vote are merely those provided by statute, recommended by the deputy-head and sanctioned by the Minister.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No doubt it would be unfair to hold the hon. Minister solely and individually responsible for the system which has grown up for several years back, but the question after all is not how far this party or the other party are responsible, but as to what is the present state of things. The Civil Service Report calls special attention to the fact, which is a noteworthy one, that while there was a very large expenditure for that purpose our Civil Government expenditure was very small. In 1864-65, the Civil Government expenditure was \$15,340 and departmental expenditure \$741,942; 1865-66, Civil Government, \$22,997, departmental, \$1,617,556; 1866-67, Civil Government, \$33,655, Departmental, \$1,379,276. The Civil Government expenditure having reached the last-named figure, it seems to have remained thereabouts. In 1877-78 the Civil Government expenditure was \$35,962; departmental, \$618,136; 1878-79, Civil Government, \$35,884, departmental, \$777,698; 1879-80, Civil Government, \$36,396, departmental, \$690,018. I am not certainly imputing the special fault to the Minister individually; but attention is very properly called by the Civil Service Commission to this state of things, and therefore it does appear as if a *prima facie* case had been made out for reducing the expenditure to less than \$36,000, or including the Minister's salary, \$43,000 for a departmental expenditure of \$700,000. I am sure the Minister will agree that it is unfortunate this state of things has grown up, and it requires a serious consideration as to whether the Department cannot be remodelled, either as the Civil Service Commission advises or in some other position, so as to reduce the Civil Government expenditure in proportion to the departmental outlay.

7. The Department of the Secretary of State..... \$41,415

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Here also, looking at the Civil Service Report, it appears that the Commissioners specially report that a very unnecessary expenditure is incurred in this Department. In 1878-79, the total expenditure required was \$32,370 as against \$41,000 required now, and there is an increase of about eleven additional officers. That is an unreasonable increase. There is no amount of additional work to justify the increase. The Civil Service Commissioners say:

"In the Estimates for the Department of the Secretary of State, 1881-82, we find provision is made for five chief clerks and four first-class clerks. We cannot concur in this estimate of the requirements of this Department, and we propose to reduce the number of chief clerks to one, and this we unhesitatingly assign to the Queen's Printer. The large number of chief clerks asked for is probably due to the difference between the estimate of the functions of that class of officers under the present Civil Service Act, and the estimate of them which guided us in framing the scale of salaries submitted in our first Report. The officers in charge of the Correspondence, Registration Branch, and Stationery Branch we propose to make first-class clerks."

After appointing that Commission and receiving their recommendation the Government does not appear to show much respect to these views, if we may judge from the Estimates submitted. The fact stares us in the face that there has been an increase of 25 per cent. in the salaries, and something like 30 per cent. in the number of officers employed in this Department. I am willing to suppose that a moderate increase of business may have occurred, but I see nothing in the reports of the Department to warrant us in supposing that this amount is required. It will be necessary, at a later stage, to see whether any reduction can be made in this excessive expenditure. An increase apparently of three clerks is proposed in this current year, 1882-83, at an increase of about \$2,400 of salary. It seems to me that increase is wholly uncalled for, and I think might be avoided

Mr. CARON.

by keeping the employes at work to the extreme limit of six and a-half hours instead of allowing them to get off with four or five hours, which appears to be the amount of work they are now expected to perform.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. This small increase is justified by the circumstances. According to the report business has increased considerably and the revenue has increased more than the excessive expenditure. We were obliged to create new functions and voted \$800 for two new third-class clerks. The rest of the increase comes from the statutory increases of \$50 a year.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister says there has been a very large increase of work. I often look over those reports, and I am always surprised to find how little work is done in that Department. The number of letters to be answered chiefly occupy the clerks and hon. Minister together, but lately some important documents have been issued by that Department, one of which has created intense excitement in one portion of this Dominion. It may be the preparation of that document required a very extraordinary increase of exertion, for it was a very extraordinary document, but taking it all in all the hon. Minister has not shown any large increase in work to justify this extraordinary increase in employes. In 1878 there were 27 employes, last year there were 35, this year another three are added. The hon. member for Niagara would perhaps tell us there is an increase in the Customs Revenue and Inland Revenue, and therefore we ought to be satisfied that no greater relative increase has taken place in any Department, but I think he will find it difficult to establish any proportion between the increase of work and increase of revenue in the Secretary of State's Department, a Department which I have always considered was necessary only to afford a Cabinet position for the thirteenth member of the Government. The hon. Minister says there is a great deal of work to do. I would like to know what work?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. If the hon. gentleman will read the Statutes of 1868, creating the Department, he will know what work is done there. The great document of which he speaks is not to be laughed at, and perhaps in the discussion that will take place he will have reason to repent of what he has said. If the hon. gentleman will look over the Statutes he will find that one of these extra employes is for the stationery, for the work is always increasing, and in the registry and corresponding branches two employes had to be added. It is rather a decrease than an increase, as the number of extra clerks will be diminished, and instead of voting \$7,000 for contingencies only \$4,000 will be voted. The revenue of the Department has increased \$1,700 or \$1,800, and the Department is in a very satisfactory state.

Mr. ANGLIN. That is an old plea about the extra clerks, but notwithstanding that there is an increase of not merely three clerks, but eleven clerks in this one Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not wonderful there should be an increase, considering the increase of work, especially in making up the large number of returns asked for? As for the increase of salary, you cannot get men to-day for the wages paid three years ago, owing to the increased facilities for employment and the increased prosperity of the country.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I will call the attention of the hon. member again to the statement made by these Civil Service Commissioners that the great bulk of the work is purely clerical, and that the clerks are required under present regulations to work 6½ hours per diem, but that they actually on an average work not much over two-thirds of the time. I think he will find that a tolerably satisfactory explanation of the reason why 11 clerks are required to be added within three years to this particular Department.

No doubt the hon. gentleman is to some extent right in saying that the iniquitous and unjust system of taxation to which we are at present exposed, does interfere with the purchasing power of persons living on fixed salaries. That is quite true. If those gentlemen were working up to full time, there would be some ground for saying they are crushed and injured by the policy of the Government, and perhaps the \$50 does not put them in as good a position as they occupied under the better and wiser system of some years ago. The hon. gentleman has come uninvitingly, I dare say, to the truth in that respect; but all that is no answer to the statement of my hon. friend behind me, nor can I congratulate the Secretary of State on any lucid explanation as to the character of the additional work. There may be many new returns moved for, and some that will take two or three persons and a few hours to prepare; but they may be brought down from some of the other Departments. Many mentioned by the hon. member for West Durham are still missing.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). Seventy-seven have never been brought down.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes; seventy-seven were wanting over a week ago, and perhaps more have been asked for since, which are not likely to be brought down. That kind of work hardly requires many clerks. The information as to whether the House requires a few extra clerks can be got readily enough without obliging us to add more than one-third to the total clerical staff of this Department. The explanation of the increase appears exceedingly unsatisfactory, and utterly at variance with the statements made by the hon. gentlemen opposite as to their excellent intentions in the way of economy, and with the attacks that used to be made upon us, when in office, about the number of our clerks.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I hold in my hand a list of questions and addresses for information on all subjects, showing they are more numerous than ever asked for before. The second cause of employment of these additional clerks is that the correspondence has increased to a voluminous extent—the correspondence first for the High Commissioner of Canada in England, and second, with the Provinces and many parties who apply for letters patent, charters for companies, and lands for sale. Those communications have increased to a great degree. Five or six extra clerks have had to be employed to meet the demands for information, and there has been an increase in the number of applications for lands in the North-West, all of which must be registered in our books.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is something new to be told that the number of motions for addresses and returns is larger than the time of the late Government, when hon. gentlemen opposite were determined to wring and extract every kind of information from it. My impression was that the number of addresses then moved for information was much larger than now. It was the boast of the Premier that the addresses were promptly attended to much more quickly than seen lately. The list of returns asked for goes on to the Commons, and the various Departments are called on to furnish them. The Department of the Secretary of State is merely the medium of communication between this House and the various Departments. A large amount of sheets of foolscap come from that Department with two or three words written on them; that is the work done in it. With regard to the office of the High Commissioner, it seems that is to be a cause of endless, incalculable expense in various ways. I did not suspect that the expenses of the Department of State were to be increased by a High Commissioner with a large salary and little to do, in England. With respect to the lands of the North-West, we really want some specific and definite information—and to know

how money is spent there, and the cost of the management of lands. We should know how much is charged for this service to the general accounts, and how much to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BOWELL. How would the information as to the expenditure for those lands, if you had it, affect the registration?

Mr. ANGLIN. We should know those expenses were to be charged. Whatever expense is attached to that ought to be a separate and distinct charge, and not charged to general expenses. I do not know why that we in the Lower Provinces, for example, should pay a portion of the expense of registering those lands of the North-West. If one-tenth of what we hear of those lands be true, they ought to be able to pay for management and much more besides. Those items are the merest matters of routine, not requiring a large staff of second class-clerks and increasing the number, as we find. It would be difficult for the hon. gentleman to state that the work of this Department has decreased in the three years, in the same proportion as the employes, from 27 to 33.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know what the Department has to do in engrossing deeds? As I understand the matter, the Department of the Interior settles what lands are to be given, and to whom; and the Department of Justice, if there is any question of title, settles the rest.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. And that Department sends the notices to my Department, where the deeds are engrossed and drawn out.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understood that they were engrossed and drawn first on a report from the Department of the Interior, countersigned by the Department of Justice, if there be any difficulty about them. We know perfectly well that the drawing, such is our present system of survey, is a very small affair. There is usually little difficulty in drawing a map of a section or a quarter section of lands in the North-West. Competent draughtsmen will draw, having instructions given them, an immense number in the course of a month. I do not think the total number of documents, which by the way the hon. gentleman has not mentioned, could be so great as to require any serious addition to his clerical force. In an ordinary law office that class of deeds would be got through with at the rate of twenty or thirty a day.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has called attention a number of times to the report of the Civil Service Commission. If he had been fair he would have stated that the remarks made by that Commission were not at all confined to the present state of the service, nor have they been for several years past, particularly during the time the hon. gentleman was at the head of a department. I looked at the expenditure of the Secretary of State and explained them two years ago, and I now repeat that there were then gentlemen on that staff who were paid, in addition to that staff, from \$1.50 to \$2 per day, and when they were regularly promoted to a class which paid them less than they were receiving under the hon. gentlemen, the attention of the House was called to it as an enormous increase. In many cases gentlemen who were employed by the then Government as extras, were paid at a higher rate than the provisions of the Civil Service Act permitted, and kept continually at those rates, and they were afterwards put upon the regular staff as third or second-class clerks at lower rates than they were receiving. I think I may safely say that the Civil Service Law as it now exists was never paid the slightest attention to by the Government of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Fortunately that has been changed, and no one receives a per diem allowance a larger sum than is allowed by the Civil Service Act.

The hon. gentleman has a happy faculty of misinterpreting what another gentleman says if it does not exactly suit him. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that owing to the prosperous state of the country you cannot obtain clerks as cheaply now as formerly. The ex-Minister of Finance says that the reason of that is the iniquitous Tariff on the Statute-book, which increases the cost of living. It is clear, however, that the effect of the Tariff has been to render labor more valuable and work more plentiful than it was under the Administration of our predecessors. In respect to this expenditure there can be no doubt that the issue of patents to-day is a hundred times greater than it was five years ago. No matter whether the document is long or short, it has to be engrossed, drawn and registered, its length does not affect the work necessary in the registering of a deed to a certain person, upon a certain date. We all know that the work of all the Departments has greatly increased of late. I have no doubt that the work in the office of the Secretary of State has increased in the same proportion as the others. I know my own has increased materially. I am certain that when you look minutely into the particulars of the expenditure under this head, you will find that the increase is caused by the statute as it exists, and from the extra work imposed on all the Departments. The hon. member for West Durham said he supposed all the clerks received an increase—he meant to say, I suppose, irrespective of their qualifications. Now, I do not pretend to say that is the fact, but I do know that clerks under the law are *prima facie* entitled to an increase, and unless they get it they are dissatisfied. The Committee has been told that these Departments should all be reorganized. I was about to ask the hon. gentleman what he would do with those who are on the staff at the present time, and were most of them placed there by the hon. gentleman and his friends by Order in Council. I can fancy the trouble that would be created in this country if any of these were to be removed. It would be declared that these dismissals took place for political reasons, and no other. We are denounced from the other side of the House when a civil servant is dismissed; and if one of them is relieved of the light work he has to perform, then the head of the Department, or those immediately under him, are denounced for dismissing people for political reasons. That is one of the great difficulties under our system that every Minister has to encounter. It requires some little courage to meet the storm of indignation that is aroused when you say to a gentleman, who has been appointed by Order in Council, that his services are no longer required. There is scarcely a dismissal, whether it be for robbing the Post Office, cheating the revenue, or neglect of duty of any kind, which is not made the occasion of a return for the cause of his dismissal, and when the Minister brings down and shows it was properly done, he is soundly denounced by those hon. gentlemen. We have had two such assaults from the hon. member for Gloucester, one because a man was not paid back the amount that was deducted from his superannuation fund, though he had been drawing a salary for two years, and yet had never done an hour's work the whole time. I mention these things to show what the Government has to expect from the hon. gentlemen opposite who think more of making a point for political reasons than the good of the country.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. Nothing so delights me as to listen to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down; and I have very great pleasure in finding that he displays a versatility of talent, and exhibits gifts which with all our admiration, we never discovered when he was on this side of the House. When he sat on this side of the House he never admitted that there was any growth in the country and any consequent increase of work and expenditure, but he now finds by virtue of his experience that things which he denied when in Opposition are perfectly true in

Mr. BOWELL.

the true source of Government. It is a sad thing to be a bitter partizan and to see only one side of a question. When the hon. gentleman was on this side of the House his only duty was to find fault and show that everything was wrong; but after spending five years in denunciation and finding himself on the other side, he is able to admit that the public expenses must necessarily increase, because of the growth of the country and the increase of public expenditure. I compliment the hon. gentleman on the capabilities of expansion which he has displayed in acknowledging that the growth of the country involves a corresponding growth in the public expenditure.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The explanation of the hon. Minister of Customs does not touch the fact to which I called the attention of the House—facts to be found in the Public Accounts, in the report of the Civil Service Commission and in the Estimates. Here we have an Estimate calling for \$150,000 more than we required three years ago. We spent \$823,000 for a service for which they now ask \$973,000. We found 390 servants enough for the work for which they now ask 507; we find further that the gentlemen whom they appointed themselves, and in whom they have confidence, report that we are getting very small hours' work for our money. The criticisms made on this side of the House are far less severe than those made by the Civil Service Commission, and I have merely quoted from these gentlemen with respect to the different Departments, and specially the Department of the Secretary of State, which has employed a great many men at high salaries for work which the hon. Minister himself admits to be of a purely clerical character. One point is that these gentlemen have not dealt with the difficulties at all, but that with 25 per cent. more officers than we had they are doing less work than we did. The expenditure on this one item alone has increased something like 20 per cent. I admit that the hon. Minister of Customs—though I admit it is no great compliment to pay him—has administered his Department, in a certain sense, impartially. I do not think he lays himself out to please his supporters or anybody else, if I may judge by the expressions of opinion which I have received. At all events, I do not expect that when we come to his Department we will find the same amount of unreasonable increase that we now complain of in respect to the Secretary of State.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I called at the Department of the Secretary of State a few days ago for a deed for a certain party, and I found that the officers of the Department had a very large amount of work on hand in connection with papers of this kind. I would like to ask the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), if it requires the civil servants to work only four hours a day to do the work of the Department at present, how many hours would it require to do the work when his Government were in power? If we consider the fact that under the improved condition of affairs and the better times, all kinds of labor better paid, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the cost of the Civil Service should be higher than it was when the late Government was in power. From 1875 to 1878 things were at a standstill, little public land was being sold and few deeds were required. I submit as a fact, patent to us all, that if you go into any of the Departments at the present time you can scarcely get a man to attend to you, as they are all from morning to night attending to the various returns required of them and the other work of their Departments. The position we took in Opposition was that as the price of labor was going down, as times were not flourishing and the revenue low, and labor could be obtained at a cheap price, it was not unreasonable to suppose that the work of the Departments could be done at a less cost than under a different set of

circumstances. But now when labor generally is of more value, it is reasonable to expect that the work of the Departments will cost more money.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. gentleman seems to be really serious in supposing that the cost of the Civil Service is necessarily and properly larger, because there is an improved condition of affairs over that which existed three years ago. The hon. Minister of Customs took up that note, but I thought he was rather amusing himself and the House in dealing with that thesis. But the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) seems to be serious in supposing that the salaries of the civil servants generally, should be reduced when the times are bad. Well, I do not know that the Civil Service of this country ought to be conducted on the principle of raising and lowering the salaries in the Departments in proportion to the rise and fall of wages outside; I do not think that rule has ever been adopted anywhere, and I never heard any idea of that kind propounded in this House during the worst times to which we can look back. The salaries have been fixed on another scale altogether; and although times are better, and there is more employment to day, wages are no higher, and, therefore, there is no reason why the salaries should be increased, unless it be that the amount of labor has increased. This continual harping on the prosperity of the country and the terrible depression of 1878, is being carried entirely too far, and hon. gentlemen need not hope to mislead the intelligent working classes of this country into the belief that they are any better off than they were before, because they know they are not. But we are now dealing with another matter; we find an extraordinary increase both in the number employed and the salaries paid, and we say there is no increase in the work sufficient to account for it.

8. The Department of the Interior..... \$51,740

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is \$45,150 asked for this service against \$47,850 last year. The deputy-head has been superannuated, and the chief clerk takes his place; this is one of the reductions, while the number of officers has decreased by three, and the difference is made up by the statutory increases, and in some cases by transferring first-class clerks to chief clerkships.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The Civil Service Commission, I notice, appear to think that this Department is also very urgently in want of revision. They point out, what is quite true, that here also the work is largely clerical work, and for this enormous staff there are two deputy-heads, I believe, and I do not know how many chief and first-class clerks. It is very odd that the Ministers, who, I suppose, had this report before them, did not appear to pay the slightest regard to it, or take the slightest pains to reduce the expenses of this Department, which we know, to our sorrow, is increasing at an enormous rate. We know that two or three million dollars a year are being swallowed up under the nominal guidance of this Department, and we find that day by day more men and more money are wanted for it, and I believe there is a proposal to create a complete independent branch of the Department at Winnipeg besides. Well, Sir, we will discuss the policy of that, no doubt, when we come to it; but in the meantime, when we know that this is going to be the case, it appears to me that rather less than sixty-six employes ought to be sufficient for the work here, and that of these a much smaller number ought to be in those very important positions at high salaries to which I have referred. I am not quite certain whether the work of the Indian Department is as great as it was during the term of the hon. member for Bothwell; I think, from my recollection, that it is not; the North-West Mounted Police, I believe, were formerly included in it, and they are

not now. Now, these are enormous increases, and although there is no doubt a considerable addition of work, we ought to have more information than is contained in the bald statement submitted by the hon. Finance Minister as to the reasons for these increases.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The Department of the North-West Mounted Police shows a large increase. In 1878 the expenditure was \$2,750, two clerks being employed; the Estimates before us are for three clerks, and an expenditure of \$4,750. The whole staff required by the Minister of the Interior in 1878 numbered 36; now 66 are required to do the same work. The explanation that would justify the expenditure has not been given, and there is no reason why the item should be hurried through without the Committee being sufficiently informed of the necessity for the large expenditure; there can be no necessity under the head of Indians, for no new treaty has been negotiated since 1878, and there is no greater number of Indians to pay now than then. There was no necessity for an increase in the Mounted Police Branch, as the force has not been increased since 1878, nevertheless there is an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. BANNERMAN. Since the boundaries of Manitoba have been extended it has become necessary to increase the Mounted Police to carry out the Prohibitory Law.

Mr. ROSS. I do not object to the Mounted Police carrying out the Prohibitory Law, but I object to an increase of expenditure in the Mounted Police Department without an increase in the force. The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba westward will reduce rather than increase the duties of the Mounted Police, because the Local Legislature will exercise certain jurisdiction, and the area under the supervision of the Mounted Police will be reduced.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand a new officer has been appointed at Winnipeg, in connection with the Department of Interior, at a high salary. I suppose that officer will discharge a portion of the duties heretofore performed at the head office.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; a portion of the duties. This officer, with the Chief Surveyor, will dispose of questions of doubt that may arise, or claims, or anything of that kind. It has been the duty of many hon. members to visit the Department since the House met, and I think they will appreciate the increased duties involving on its officers. The Department has assumed responsibility of over 150,000,000 acres of land at least, and to say that the work of the Department now is no greater than it was when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was at its head, is to make a statement which will not be believed by any person in the country, who knows anything of the facts of the case. During the last two or three months there have been so many applications pouring into that Department in connection with colonization associations and the locations of land from all quarters, that the clerks have not been able to accomplish one-half of the work, and it is only by attending office after hours that they can at all keep pace with the demands on their services.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentlemen just said they could not keep up with their work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are making every effort to overtake the amount of work they have to accomplish, and assistant draughtsmen and others have been called in for the purpose of getting through the business. I do not hesitate to say that there is not an appropriation this House can make that will be so acceptable to the people as an appropriation that would facilitate the location and settlement of lands in the North-West, and there is scarcely an hon. member who did not expect a large increase instead of a decrease in the expenditure of this Department. I have no doubt that by the arrangement now being made to

transfer a part of the work to Manitoba, matters will be better disposed of than in the past.

Mr. HESSON. It has fallen to my lot to visit that Department frequently, and I can testify to the pressure of work there, for I have had, to my regret, to wait for hours to get an interview with a clerk, much less than the deputy heads. I must say I did expect a large addition would be made to the vote, but to my great surprise the reverse is the case, and I think that a great deal of time has been wasted by the ex-Minister of Finance in discussing a result which he ought to have desired. With reference to salaries I know myself that the Department has lost a very valuable officer in Mr. Hamilton, who is now receiving \$2,500 a year from the Syndicate, when he previously received but \$800 a year in this Department, when he had charge of the timber limits.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt that since the Session this Department has been very much overworked, since the philanthropists have taken so great an interest in the North-West lands. The hon. gentleman must not forget that a tremendous jump had to be made to get the expenditure up to the level of last year, when it reached a point which absolutely appalled us all. I deny that there is a decrease in the expenditure because an expensive officer has been appointed at Winnipeg to do practical work which otherwise would have been done at the head office. For comparative purposes it is necessary, therefore, to add his salary and that of his clerk to the salaries of the Department of Interior, in order to compare the present estimate with that of last year.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will find, on looking at the conclusion of the Estimate, that there is a large increase of \$29,095 in the Dominion Lands outside service, which is under the control of this Department, and although there is a decrease under one head of \$2,700, there is an increase of \$4,250 in the next and cognate Department, so that I do not see, taking particularly into account the work done in Manitoba, to which my hon. friend has alluded, that there has been any decrease in the expenditure. On the contrary there would be, even supposing that Mr. Walsh's salary and those of his assistants do not exceed \$10,000, a pretty large increase of expenditure. I do not know exactly where that salary is to be found.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). It is \$5,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. And there are necessary collections, and there will be expenses upon the office at Winnipeg, which is a heavy item, and various miscellaneous expenses, so that I expect \$10,000 will be a very moderate estimate indeed. I would like to know how much further in the Estimates the hon. Finance Minister wishes to go to-night, as it is now past two o'clock and several of us have large Committees to attend this forenoon.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I would like to get more than five resolutions passed.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. But they embrace some sixty or seventy distinct items, and I shall want information on some of the following items.

9. Indian Affairs..... \$23,315

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It will be better to postpone that item, as I require information with regard to it, and it will occasion discussion. There is an increase of \$4,215.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What will help to explain the difference is the fact that one first-class clerk has been employed at \$1,800 and another at \$1,100. This will not increase the expenditure for the Indians; it is merely transferring those clerks from the outside to the Civil Service.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the object and policy of making this transfer?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They required the additional assistance in that office, and instead of increasing the expense it was thought proper to take two gentlemen employed in the Indian service, and not rendering, perhaps, that service to the Department which they could render in the new position.

Mr. BLAKE. They have been doing nothing elsewhere.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They were not really earning their salaries for a number of years, and it was thought well to place them where they could do so.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That is precisely what we ought to have full details about.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Then let it stand.

10. Office of Auditor-General \$19,600

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no increase in the number of persons employed; but one is promoted, and an additional clerk, not appointed this year, is provided for. There is the promotion of one or two upon the recommendation of the Auditor-General, with which the Government has not interfered in any way.

13. Customs \$31,345

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There appears a decrease in this item; so it must have been too large before.

Mr. BOWELL. No, it was not too large before. The reduction is the result of proper economy. The last year the hon. gentleman was in power, and for which they were wholly responsible, the inside service of the Customs Department, including contingencies, cost no less than \$44,610.21, while I only ask for the next fiscal year \$31,345, and for contingencies, \$8,000, making a total of \$39,345; showing a saving of \$5,265. Notwithstanding the annual statutory increases, over which a Minister has comparatively no control, deduct from the amount asked in the Estimates these statutory increases, amounting to \$4,960, and it shows an actual saving of \$10,225, as compared with the expenditure of 1877-78, notwithstanding the enormous increase of work which has been thrown upon the Department.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 2:10 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 29th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INSOLVENT ESTATES.

Mr. BEATY, in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) for the equitable distribution of insolvent estates, said: The object of the Bill is to provide some means when persons or traders become insolvent, for the distribution of their estates equitably or fairly among all the creditors. The Bill itself is substantially the Bill which was proposed, I believe, by Mr. Colby some time ago, and by a Committee of this House, with such alterations which seemed requisite for the purpose of adapting it to the present object—the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. The Bill provides, in regard to certain classes of persons who will come within its provisions or can be considered as in a state of insolvency, within the meaning of

the Act, that their property shall be placed, in the first place, in the hands of a guardian who may be appointed for each judicial district by the Government; or, in the case of failure to appoint a guardian, then the sheriff of the county or district shall be the guardian for the purpose of prompt management of the property. But at any time after the trader is declared insolvent, or is unable to pay his debts in full, an attachment against the property may be placed in the hands of the sheriff, and the guardians may come in and apply to the Judge for the purpose of having him declared insolvent within the meaning of the Act. There is no provision whereby persons may be driven into insolvency by creditors except by attachment against them, and except by intervention of the Judge such insolvency is declared. The idea is to protect debtors from their creditors, so that they shall not be driven into insolvency until such time that it is clear that they will be unable to manage their own affairs and to take care of their own business. There are a variety of cases in which persons may be utterly insolvent, and they are chiefly of the same character, which is well known to the House and to professional men and merchants, as the class called insolvency under the old Bankrupt or Insolvency Act. The creditors may at any time after the declaration of insolvency, or the existence of such a state of facts showing the inability of a trader to meet his liabilities, come in and appoint a trustee for the purpose of taking charge of the property, in which case, if confirmed by the Judge, the property vests in the trustee for the benefit of the creditors. When the trustee is appointed, he takes immediate charge and control of all the property and trade of the insolvent, and administers it under a clause provided in this Bill, with the object of distributing it equitably and fairly among all the creditors in proportion to their claims. The object is to facilitate the management and the winding-up of such estates, to prevent delays and to diminish expenses to a minimum, so that there shall be no greater expenses in connection with the management of estates than is possible to have in administering affairs of that kind. The Bill is necessarily lengthy, and hon. gentlemen will understand that a measure of this kind which hands over an estate to trustees, must have full and complete provisions for the purpose of meeting every case which experience has taught us may arise in the administration of estates of insolvents. With that object in view, I have adopted the language of other Acts, so far as possible, with the view of making it perfect, so that the trader whose estate is in insolvency, and his creditors may be protected to the greatest extent, the utmost value of the estate realized, and the distribution made as equitably and with as little delay as possible. There are many clauses introduced into an Act of this kind, which may rarely be needed, nevertheless, they are necessary in order to meet every contingency. The usual provisions are made for the purpose of administering the property by a trustee, in case the creditors appoint a trustee, which they can do, and the distribution of the estate is to be made, and the dividends are to be declared similarly as in the old Insolvent Act. But in this Bill it is provided that less expense shall be incurred in way of publication, which, I think, was unnecessarily large under former Acts, which required almost every notice to be published in the *Official Gazette*. The *Official Gazette* being not generally read by the public, I have provided that much of that formerly published in the *Gazette* shall be brought to the notice of creditors personally, such as all important transactions taking place with reference to the administration of an estate. Then there are general proceedings provided with reference to the powers of Judges. I have endeavored to frame the Bill so as to prevent appeals, unless they are absolutely necessary, and for the purpose of disposing of some important questions of law which might arise in the

administration of an estate. Heretofore, in the administration of insolvent estates, those who have sought delay, and who desired to promote litigation, have resorted to appeals from Court to Court, with the view of delaying the final distribution of the estates, or for some other purpose. In this Bill I have provided that no appeal shall be had without the consent of the Judge or Court appealed from. Mere matters of fact not involving large amounts, when once they have been adjudicated upon by a Judge and jury, should not be allowed to be appealed at the fancy of persons who may think thereby to delay proceedings. The usual provisions are made for reaching all the property of the trader, with the view that he shall not, by fraud or collusion with any creditor, or with the trustee or any other person, prevent all his creditors from obtaining the full benefit of all that he possesses, so that, if the estate cannot pay dollar for dollar, they may realize the largest amount possible out of the business. The idea throughout the Bill has been to adhere to the well-known principles of former legislation, in so far as they were found desirable. Another feature of this Bill is that it does not provide for the discharge of the debtor. It is not a Bill for relieving the insolvent. He is simply bound under certain circumstances, to place his property in the hands of the sheriff or a guardian, and the trustees may take it out of the hands of the sheriff or guardian, and so administer it that the creditor may realize *pro rata* all the estate will afford. There is no provision in this Bill whatever for the discharge of insolvents; it is simply made on behalf of the creditors. In cases where the Government do not appoint a guardian in any county or district, then the sheriff becomes the guardian and takes possession of the estate in the meantime, under the direction of the Judge, and he is subject to the direction of the Judge and of the creditors so long as and in the same way as the ordinary trustee appointed by the creditors. The particular feature which I would emphasize in this Bill is the one that a simple, fair and equitable distribution of the assets of the insolvent may be made for the benefit of the creditors, and it provides that no creditor who may get a prior execution shall have any advantage over other creditors who may get subsequent executions. The next Bill which I hope to introduce will explain why no discharge is provided for, and no provision for making a composition. Of course the creditors may do as they please; they can discharge their debtor, but there is no compulsory power on the part of the trader to force the creditors into granting him a discharge or a composition. The trader, of course, can make a voluntary assignment under this Bill as he can now. Any trader at the present time, whether he becomes an insolvent or not, may make an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and this Bill will not prevent him from doing so still. It does not take the matter out of the hands of the creditors. If the trader can come to an amicable arrangement with his creditors, he can still make an assignment and deal with his property just as fully after this Bill comes into force as he can now. I do not think there is much else of a special character, until the Bill is in the hands of members, to which I need advert in order to aid the judgment of hon. members. These are the general purposes of the Bill to which are added the usual clauses to prevent frauds and fraudulent preferences, so that traders may not deal improperly with their creditors, and prevent them from realizing as much as possible out of estates.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). There is a clause in the Bill, as explained by the hon. mover, which is so iniquitous that the Bill should not be read at all. It is that, after a man's property is taken out of his possession, he is still held to be responsible for any loss that may occur in the management of the property over which he no longer possesses control. Again, it is only a short time since the House, by a very large majority, repealed the Insolvent Act, and the country

has not shown any desire to have it re-enacted. I believe trade is in a better position to-day than it has been for many years, and that this is largely due to the repeal of the Insolvent Act. If the hon. gentleman had proceeded in the direction of abolishing all laws for the collection of debts after a certain time, he would have been moving in the right direction. For centuries laws have been enacted to regulate affairs between debtor and creditor, but I believe if the parties were left to settle such affairs themselves, they would be much better arranged, and I hold nothing tended so much to demoralization as the Insolvent Law did in the country. It created a recklessness in giving and in taking credit, because men who obtained credit argued that if they did not succeed in their ventures an appeal to the Insolvency Courts relieved them from their liability. That law acted most injuriously in the interests of the country; yet the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) proposes to enact another such law with a clause in it that is nothing short of iniquitous, for under it a man will be held responsible for the management of property which has been taken out of his hands. This provision is so monstrous that I cannot understand the House entertaining it for a moment.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I think we have got to use a little caution before we introduce any legislation of this character, and I only make this remark to urge on the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill and all those interested in it that they should be very careful that they do not counteract by introducing this Bill, some of the good which I think has been accomplished by the abolition of the Insolvency Law. In opinion I am very strongly with the last speaker, and I think honesty and fair dealing amongst all classes, amongst the commercial classes particularly, are much more likely to be fostered by having no law of this character with respect to transactions between them than by having some elaborate system of law; because when it becomes a mere question of honesty and credit between men doing business, I think it is more likely that honesty will be promoted without an insolvency law than by any artificial system providing for the insolvency of the debtor and the distribution of his assets. My experience, extending over thirty years, as to the distribution of assets by any machinery of the law, shows that it is pretty much abortive. The estate virtually passes into the hands of the sheriff, the assignees or his clerks, and neither the creditors nor the owner get much out of it. I do not believe it is necessary to introduce any such law, especially now, because through the policy which has been inaugurated by this Government, which has had such extraordinary success in bringing about general prosperity, we do not seem to require any such law. No doubt very soon there will be no debts to collect, soup-kitchens are no longer necessary and poor-houses are being abolished; and if the Government remain in power, about which there is no reasonable doubt, I do not think the country will require any law for the distribution of assets, unless it might be for the distribution of the political assets of hon. gentlemen. As far as the commerce of the country is concerned we do not want any putting in of the wedge again, which is likely to bring an insolvent law again into operation. I feel assured that the country has gradually been growing into such a better condition so that faith between man and man in all commercial transactions will be better maintained without a law than by any Insolvent Act or Act for the distribution of assets.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I do not agree with what has fallen from the hon. member who has just addressed the House. I think it necessary we should have a measure through which the equitable distribution of the assets of insolvents will be administered. The Bill is not to take an estate from a man who is able to pay his debts in full, but only when he is not able to pay his debts. It is within my knowledge at all events, if it is

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk),

not within the knowledge of other hon. members, that boards of trade in Ontario, if not in other Provinces, have had this subject under consideration for several years, and that it is the desire of the great commercial community of the Dominion at large, that there shall be some measure by which the assets of insolvent estates shall be properly and efficiently administered. We find, Sir, that the practice of the profession since the Insolvent Act has been abolished has been this: that there has been generally a race as to who can put a sheriff in possession of the assets of the insolvent first, and the consequence is that the man who is a little quicker and a little sharper than his next door neighbor will run away with perhaps the whole of the estate in order to make his debt, whereas the next man, who has quite as honest a debt, has to go unpaid. Now, that is not a desirable state of affairs. Creditors have a right to the distribution of the estate of an insolvent, *pari passu*. It is not fair or reasonable to allow one creditor to sweep away the whole of an insolvent estate at the expense of other creditors whose claims are just as honest and just as good as his. I hold in my hand a communication, which I believe has been somewhat widely distributed among members of this House, from the Chairman and Secretary of the Hamilton Board of Trade, with reference to this very matter. I do not know that we can approve, perhaps, of the whole of the Bill, but I certainly should hope that hon. gentlemen will allow it to be read the first time, so that it may be distributed amongst members, and if it is not such a Bill as we can generally approve, we may be able to put it in a shape which will be generally acceptable. The paper I hold in my hand is the report of the Committee of the Hamilton Board of Trade on the distribution of assets of insolvent traders. It sets forth this:

"*Resolved*,—That this Board is of the opinion that the commercial interests of the Dominion require a statute law which shall provide for the equitable distribution of the estates of insolvent traders; that this Board approves of the Committee's report just read, and directs the President and Secretary to transmit a copy thereof to the hon. the Minister of Justice, with a request that the Government prepare a Bill embodying the provisions of said report, for the action of Parliament during the present Session.

"Your Committee have considered the matters referred to them, and recommend that Parliament be asked to enact a law which shall embrace the following provisions:—

"1. As to when a trader shall be deemed insolvent. Your Committee adopt the provisions of the Insolvent Act of 1875 and amending Acts in this respect. See section 3, sub-sections *a* to *k* inclusive.

"2. A trader unable to meet his engagements may make a voluntary assignment of his estate for the general benefit of his creditors, to the Sheriff of the county in which he has his chief place of business. The Sheriff shall be guardian of the estate till the creditors appoint a trustee.

"3. When a trader has committed an act of insolvency, any creditor having an unsecured claim of \$200 or more, may apply to the County Judge for a writ of attachment, and the Judge, on being satisfied by affidavits filed that such trader is insolvent, shall direct a writ of attachment to be placed in the hands of the Sheriff of the county in which the trader has his chief place of business. The Sheriff shall seize and attach all the estate and effects of such insolvent trader, and summon him to appear before the Judge to answer said writ. The trader may, within five days after service, petition the Judge to set aside the writ. The Sheriff shall be guardian of the estate till the creditors appoint a trustee."

I do not propose to read the whole document, but I have read the first three or four clauses for the purpose of showing that an important Board of Trade, comprised of gentlemen who are all commercial men, and understand what are the wants of the commercial community in this respect. We know from the time that the Insolvent Act was repealed by this House that there has been a very strong feeling on the part of commercial men that, whether we should have an Insolvent Act or a Bankrupt Act proper, we certainly should have such machinery known to the law as will enable creditors to divide an estate, whatever it may amount to, among those who are justly entitled to it. I hope my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) will allow, in spite of the principles for which he has fought so

sturdily in this House and country, will allow the measure, at all events, to be read the first time, and will give his valuable assistance in promoting such a measure as the country really demands.

Mr. SHAW. I have no objection to the Bill being read the first time. I think it is fair to the hon. gentleman who has introduced it that it should be read the first time and afterwards fully considered. At the same time I am opposed to the Bill, and I take this opportunity of saying so. The difficulty with the late Insolvent Act was not the right or wrong of the Act but the administration of the law, and the same difficulty apparently will exist in regard to this Bill should it become law. There is no doubt that an equal distribution of the assets of debtors should take place, but the taking of property out of the hands of the debtor and dividing it amongst the creditors generally always seemed to me to increase the credit. Every one who observes the working of an insolvency law in this country must see that there will be a difference of opinion between the city and the rural constituencies on the subject. Amongst the latter I have heard no complaint since the repeal of the Insolvency Act, but in city constituencies I have. One must observe that a large quantity of the goods sold through the country are sold by agents who go around from place to place, and whose object is to get purchasers and to sell goods. They foist goods upon their customers, and more goods are sold than can be paid for. The benefit that has arisen from the repeal of the Insolvency Act has been to prevent extensive credit. Wholesale merchants have found it to be to their benefit to make careful enquiries before they made sales, and not so many sales have been made in consequence. There have been much fewer insolvencies since the repeal of the Act. It is to the benefit of the country generally that we should have no insolvency law. We have not a great deal of foreign commerce; we are not largely exposed to the loss of ships, or to great accidents. The necessity for the Act, if there be any, seems to arise from inland trade and in country places, and I certainly feel disposed to oppose the enactment of any Bill of this description, I think it would only be the commencement of further legislation which would be found necessary to discharge debtors. The whole matter is involved in great difficulty, but as there are few complaints that come from the country, and complaints only exist amongst commercial men, who are the sellers, I think we are better without an Insolvency Act. Two parties should be considered in all such legislation, the seller and the buyer. Most merchants seem to desire an Insolvency Act, because it is for their own benefit, but if the purchaser does not want an Insolvency Act, his opinion should be considered as well. He has a right to say in what way goods are to be sold—whether on credit or for cash; and if he believes that the absence of an Insolvency Act will tend to a better system of commercial transactions throughout the country, his view should be considered as well as that of the creditor.

Mr. GAULT. Speaking on behalf of the commercial community of Montreal, I believe it is their desire that such a Bill as the present should become law. It is not an Insolvency Bill, but a Bill for the distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. I know of many instances myself where failures have taken place and the interests of many creditors swept aside altogether. I may mention an instance of one debtor who came to Montreal and said to his creditors: "I will give you 50 cents on the dollar, and if you do not take that, you will get nothing." The creditors took the estate, and I believe they realized over 60 cents on the dollar from it. I know there are many instances of this kind, and I think this Bill should, at least, be allowed to pass its first reading.

Mr. FLYNN. When the Bill for the abolition of the Insolvent Law was introduced into this House, I opposed it, because I believed then, as I do now, that it was necessary in the commercial interest of this country that we should have an Insolvent Law on our Statute-book. The reason given for the introduction of that Bill was that the estate of insolvents were to a great extent wasted, and went into the hands of official assignees, and not into the pockets of the creditors. If such was the case, I held that it was altogether the fault of the creditors, because the moment a trader became insolvent, he placed his affairs in the hands of an assignee, who called a meeting of the creditors, who dealt with the estate as they saw fit; and, therefore, if the estate was wasted, I contended that it was the fault of the creditors, and that there was an unfair prejudice aroused in this country against the Insolvent Law. Now, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) says that there is no necessity for an Insolvent Law to-day, because this country is so prosperous; he says that there are no longer any soup kitchens in the country. If that is the case, I am glad of it; but let me tell him that many traders who had to succumb to the depression which existed from 1874 to 1878, if they had not been able to take advantage of the Insolvent Law, would not have been able to start again in business, although their failure was due to no dishonesty or fault on their part. Now, under our present system, the debtor can either make a preferential assignment to one of the creditors, thus defrauding the others, or, if he is unable to pay 100 cents on the dollar, and there is a hard creditor who insists on the pound of flesh and will not give him a release, he cannot do business again perhaps for years and years; and the effect of the system is, therefore, to drive many a man out of the country to do business in the United States. Therefore, I say that the prejudice aroused against the Insolvent Law was a meaningless one. While we are not aware of the character of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Toronto, I think it is nothing but fair that the House should allow it to pass its first reading, and then we can see what is in it and discuss it intelligently; and I trust that if it is introduced there will be a sufficient majority in this House to restore to this country what I consider a prime necessity, and that is, an Insolvent Law.

Mr. PLUMB. I hope hon. gentlemen on the other side will see that the "brute majority," as they were termed last night, can at least extend an act of courtesy to a fellow member who rises to address the House. I gave way to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, because he seldom addresses the House, and when he does he does it with courtesy and ability. The hon. member who proposes to introduce a Bill providing for the distribution of insolvent estates, in answer to a question of mine, states that he did not provide in it for the discharge of an insolvent debtor. During two or three years of the early part of my parliamentary experience, I always voted against propositions made for the repeal of the Insolvent Law; I thought that during a period of depression such as we were passing through, it was a simple act of mercy to permit an Insolvent Act to stand on the Statute-book, which would relieve the honest debtor when he parted with his property, when there was no fraud, when in many cases he was made insolvent through losses which he could not control. But, in 1877, a material change was made in the Insolvent Act as it then stood; and on that occasion I certainly did reverse my vote; and I remember the courtesy which was extended to me one afternoon when there was no particular excitement in the House, and when I rose on the other side to endeavor in a very few words to explain my course with regard to the Insolvent Act. I remember that the courteous majority on this side of the House kept me standing there for several minutes before I could make myself heard, by the slamming of desks, cat-calls, tin whistles, the playing of a jews' harp by a Cabinet

Minister, the squeezing of toy balloons, and the many howls and noises with which I was greeted on that side of the House. I succeeded, however, in stating, what is reported in a few lines, that I had changed my opinion on the Insolvent Act, because I considered that it was a crying injustice that men should be compelled to go into insolvency, and have their property thrown into the vortex of the official assignee's hopper, from which it would never come out again, and that they would never get a discharge unless they paid 50 cents on the dollar and made some special application that they were likely to fail in. I felt that an Insolvent Law containing such provisions was worse than a mockery, and I was glad when it was wiped off the Statute-book. I remember with what unfeeling logic those amendments were used by the hon. gentleman who brought them in—the then hon. Minister of Justice and the present leader of the Opposition. I was struck by the tone of his arguments, and by the evidence that he had apparently no sympathy for those people who were struggling in the darkest hours of adversity, and when bankruptcies were piling up, day after day and week after week, to the extent of about \$30,000,000 a year. Among those thrown into bankruptcy there were undoubtedly fraudulent men. There were undoubtedly men who went into bankruptcy for the purpose of cheating their creditors, but there were many more who were unjustly forced into insolvency at a time when no man's estate, suddenly brought under the hammer, would bring 50 cents on the dollar of its valuation, to say nothing of paying 50 cents on the dollar to the creditors. There was a slaughter market in Canada, not only brought about by the competition of American manufactures with ours, but also brought about by the sales by assignees of stock in bankruptcy which made property almost valueless, of that particular kind that comes most frequently into the hands of the assignees. It is well known that many men could have tided over their difficulties had a few months delay been granted them and not have incurred the disgrace of being put into the Insolvent Court; but the law provided that a man could be thrown into bankruptcy upon the default of \$100 or \$200, and we all know what became of a man's property when an official assignee got possession of it. I believe that in a debt due me of \$400, I got something like a dividend of 81 cents, through the courtesy of the official assignee, who, I suppose, got 10 or 15 per cent. out of the estate. A greater mistake could not be conceived than the amendment made to that particular section. That amendment reads as follows:—

"Section 65 is amended by adding thereto the words: Provided always that the Judge shall not grant any discharge under this section, in any case, unless some one of the following conditions be fulfilled, that is to say, that a dividend of not less than 50 cents on the dollar on the unsecured claims has been or will be paid out of the insolvent's property; or that such a dividend might have been paid but for the negligence or fraud of the assignee or inspectors; or that the insolvent had, on some one day prior to the proceedings in insolvency mailed, prepaid and registered, to the address of all his creditors, so far as known to him, a declaration acknowledging his insolvency, and that no proceedings in insolvency had been instituted against the insolvent for more than a month after the mailing of such notice, and that such a dividend would have been paid but for circumstances for which the insolvent cannot justly be held responsible arising more than one month after the mailing of such declaration."

It is evident, from those three propositions, that there was no desire to show any mercy to the unfortunate bankrupt. A dividend of 50 cents on the dollar might or might not have been paid out of his property, but it is evident he could have no possible control over it, and it is well known that when a man is suffering under the depression that arises out of complicated misfortunes which compel him to give his property and place him, as it were, out of the pale of business men, he loses his judgment and his ability, in a great measure, to direct his affairs, while he is also deprived of all sort of control, either by advice or otherwise, over the

Mr. PLUMB.

rapacious assignee who wants simply to make a fee and close out the affair to his best advantage regardless of the interests of either debtor or creditor. How was he to benefit by the second clause, which throws on him the onus of proving negligence or fraud on the part of the assignee or inspector, the man who has fattened out of the money wrung from him? How is he to reach this man? How is he, in any way, to prove a condition of this kind? Then every one knows that men, particularly those men, fall into bankruptcy through perfect honesty, but through lack of judgment are not likely to sit down deliberately thirty days in advance to mail a letter to each creditor, telling him that the debtor is insolvent. I cannot conceive there could ever be a case of that kind, because every man is hopeful. No man believes, until he reaches the precipice, that he is not going to escape. Those three propositions were the propositions that induced me to vote against the Insolvent Act *in toto*. At that time I was unable, owing to the extraordinary courtesy which was extended to me by the dominant majority, who always extended those courtesies, abetted and encouraged by the gentlemen who sat on the front benches, to make any extended explanation in regard to my position on that Bill. But the proposition of my hon. friend which has been brought in, and which, upon the questions I asked him, seems to embrace no provision for the discharge of an insolvent, has enabled me, while I propose to urge that his Bill may be introduced—for that is a courtesy due to a gentleman of eminent standing in the legal profession who takes the pains to bring up a measure of this kind—to make clear my position on this question. While I intend to urge that the Bill be brought in, I by no means pledge myself to support the principle of the Bill, or to say that I am in favor at the present moment of renewing the Insolvent Laws on our Statute-books. There are periods of depression when Bankruptcy Acts become necessary, and there are also periods when it is not desirable to have such laws. In fact there are many gentlemen of wide commercial experience, sound views and great legal acumen, who always oppose anything in the shape of a proposition looking to the discharge of a debtor in the Bankruptcy Courts. Many hon. gentlemen opposite are strongly impressed with this view, and we know there was a good deal of prejudice on the part of hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec in the former Parliament against the Act, because it did not permit farmers to have the benefit of it. There were propositions, I think, made once or twice to amend the law in that direction. The Act of 1877, as I said before, was passed largely amending the Insolvent Act, making it far more stringent in its provisions. I felt it my duty to reverse my vote upon that occasion, and mainly on account of the more stringent provisions that had been thrown around the discharge of the bankrupt—that the Bankrupt Act might not be a refuge for roguery, which, I conceive, such an Act may be made. But there were thousands of honest men, struggling under misfortune, to whom that Act was the only possible avenue of escape, men with their families depending upon them, men utterly crushed, many of them because they had been weak enough to be sureties for others, without any improper act of their own. I do not think that those men should be kept under the harrow, year after year, when there was a means of relieving them which did no possible harm to any one. The storm passed over. It is a matter of controversy between ourselves and hon. gentlemen opposite what was the cause of the clouds rising so suddenly, of the reappearance of the clear sky, and the return of the old prosperity. There may be honest differences of opinion on the subject. For my part, this return of prosperity was largely owing to the fact that, upon the 17th of September, 1878, the people of Canada reversed the verdict which had been snatched from them in January, 1874, and requested certain gentlemen to retire

from the trust; and that verdict stated, in unmistakable tones, that they had not administered acceptable to the majority of the people of Canada. We had an issue that was fairly tested, and that was so clear that no man could mistake it. That issue had been mis-stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and declared not a fair one. They have attempted to say that we did, as we know they did—deceive the people and filch a verdict from them. But the hon. member for Centre Huron, when the proposition for Protection was brought forward by Sir John A. Macdonald, stated that he was glad that we had now, for once, a direct issue that was known, upon which we were standing, and that the people of Canada could not mistake—upon which we went to the polls. There was no misunderstanding of it at that time; but they were glad to make out there had been such a misunderstanding when they found the people had pronounced against them. The returning weight of prosperity diminished the bankruptcies greatly. The Insolvent Law had been repealed, and although it was falsely charged by certain hon. gentlemen, who are arguing against the fact of returned prosperity, that the disasters of 1879 were to a certain extent chargeable upon the incoming Administration—which they stated had failed to produce the prosperity that they had promised, and which hon. gentlemen opposite insisted should spring up in a night, like Jonah's gourd—those bankruptcies were hastened, accumulated and swollen up by the fear that the Insolvent Act would be repealed; and men who were in a condition which made them fear they would require to take advantage of it, hurried into insolvency, while others were brought into it by their creditors, prior to the final repealing of the Act. Hence the number of bankruptcies in 1879 was swollen beyond the proportions possible under other circumstances. The Bankruptcy Act was repealed; still the iron hand was upon the poor unfortunate insolvent. The section which I have read still held the man who had been ground through the mill of the Insolvent Act powerless. Well, I wish to give all credit and thanks to an hon. gentleman who introduced a Bill to relieve those struggling unfortunates. There was no reason for keeping them any longer under the harrow. They have been stripped of everything, and were comparatively few; for it is almost always the case that the misfortune that attaches to a Bankrupt Act falls upon the honest and not the dishonest man. The crushed and helpless debtors and their ruined families were likely to be tormented by those creditors from whom they could get no discharge, and those poor men were proper objects of the commiseration of this House. My hon. friend from Prince Edward therefore brought in a Bill to relieve them, to his honor be it said, which Bill met with the general acceptance of this House. But the hon. member for West Durham still fastened his relentless grip upon the unfortunate debtors. He opposed in the strongest language the adoption of that humane proposition, employing the strongest language and using much the same arguments offered, with that skill of which he is a master, as a special pleader—he introduced almost the same arguments he introduced before. But the effect upon the hon. gentleman's followers was not what he anticipated. Member after member rose in his place and sustained the proposition of the hon. member for Prince Edward, and at length, after very considerable debate, most of those who spoke on the subject took strong ground in its favor, for there could be nothing that could more appeal to the hearts and sympathies of hon. members than that proposition: an evident fact that they were entirely in sympathy with them. That debate continued. A proposition was brought in for a six months' hoist, which was negatived. A vote was then taken upon the Bill, and in a thin house of 133 members, ninety-nine voted in its favor, and thirty-four voted against it, and I

fail to see in that division the name of the hon. member for West Durham.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Read the names.

Mr. PLUMB. I will read the names with great pleasure:

YEAS: Anglin, Bain, Béchard, Bolduc, Brown, Burpee (St. John), Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cartwright, Chariton, Dumont, Grandbois, Gunn, Hesson, Jackson, King, Landry, La Rue, McCallum, McKay, Malouin, Merner, Méthot, Olivier, Paterson (Grant), Perrault, Pinsonneault, Rinfret, Rouleau, Rymal, Scriver, Trow, Wiser, Yeo—34.

NAYS: Allison, Arkell, Barnard, Beauchesne, Bergeron, Bill, Borden, Boulton, Bowell, Bunster, Cameron (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Casgrain, Cimon, Colby, Connell, Costigan, Coughlin, Coursol, Currier, Guthrie, Dawson, Desjardins, Domville, Drew, Ferguson, Fleming, Fortin, Fulton, Geoffrion, Gigault, Gillies, Gillmor, Girouard (Kent), Guthrie, Hackett, Haddow, Haggart, Hay, Hilliard, Hooper, Huntington, Ives, Jones, Killam, Kilvert, Kranz, Lane, Langevin, Lantier, Laurier, Little, Longley, Macdonald (King's), Macdonald (Sir John), McDonald (Cape Breton), McDonald (Pictou), MacDonnell (Inverness), Macmillan, McCarthy, McQuaig, McDougall, McLennan, McQuade, McRory, Mills, Mousseau, Muttart, O'Connor, Ogden, Orton, Patterson, (Essex), Pickard, Platt, Plumb, Pope (Compton), Pope (Queen's), Robertson (Hamilton), Rochester, Ross (Middlesex), Royal, Ryan, (Marquette), Ryan (Montreal), Rykert, Scott, Shaw, Skinner, Smith, Sproule, Thompson, Tilley, Tupper, Wade, Wallace (Norfolk), Wallace (York), Weldon, Williams, Wright—99.

An hon. gentleman behind me says he does not recognize the hon. member for West Durham. Well, the hon. member for West Durham having made a speech against the measure, and finding that it was likely to be overwhelmingly passed, if my eyes did not deceive me, remained somewhere beside the Speaker's Chair, while at least a portion of the division was going on, but did not record his vote. It seemed to me to be one of those occasions when an hon. gentleman should have had the courage of his opinions. I am glad indeed that a large majority of this House took a different view from the hon. member for West Durham, and that among those were some of the chiefest of his followers. I am also much obliged to my hon. friend, my genial friend, my knightly friend, the hon. member for Westmoreland, for requesting me to read the names and giving me an opportunity of reviewing that record. Sir, I would like very much if the House could see its way clear to permitting my hon. friend for West Toronto to bring in his Bill. I do not think it is desirable in any case when an hon. member perfectly competent to do so has taken the pains to prepare a measure—and we all know that my hon. friend is perfectly competent, and would not bring in a measure unless he had taken pains with it—I think as a matter of course the House ought to allow the hon. member to introduce his Bill. It is sometimes the case that the House refuses to accept a new proposition. I know nothing of this Bill, but the general principle has been one that has often been discussed in the House, and I have no doubt that if there are objectionable features in the Bill he will be willing to modify it, and none of us, I fancy, would commit ourselves to the proposed Bill by sanctioning its introduction into this House. I am afraid that in making this explanation I have taken up more time than I intended to when I arose. I do not wish, on any occasion, to have it considered that when I make a speech in the House the 119th Psalm shall be appended by way of making it shorter. I observe that my hon. friend has a notice on the paper to introduce another Bill, the purport of which may, perhaps, obviate or neutralize the objections which have been made against this Bill. This is an Act for the discharge of past insolvent debtors. I do not know exactly who is meant by that. I dare say he will strike out the past tense, and will make a little grammatical correction which is quite in accord with the critical gentlemen on the other side of the House, who are nothing if they are not grammatical, and certainly nothing if they are not critical. My right hon. friend suggests an amendment to my expression; he says they are nothing if they are not grammatical, and they are nothing if they are; but that, I think, might be

discourteous, and if I make the statement I withdraw it immediately. However, I may say this: that in a certain grammatical sense they are just now very forcibly in the objective case, and I can tell these hon. gentlemen that I believe I speak the sentiments of the people of Canada when I tell them that they would not be very soon in the possessive. I notice that whenever they make an attack they have to defend themselves before they have got half through with it. I trust it will be the opinion of the House that my hon. friend have leave to bring in his Bills, the one, I fancy, to a certain extent explains the other. As a layman I should apologize to distinguished members of the bar, who wear silk gowns and sit in high places in the Courts, for having ventured to have made an address upon a subject which to a large extent is a technical one, and one which is best dealt with by the profession; but as a man of some experience in business, as one having seen several great crises pass over the country, having seen the operation of Bankruptcy Acts and Insolvency Laws, having been old enough to remember when it was considered the best thing that could be done with a man who was in debt was to imprison him for life by way of recovering the money, having seen that punishment modified into gaol limits one mile square, and that again abolished as a relic of barbarism, and Insolvency Laws enacted by which estates were pretty fairly distributed, I think a measure such as that proposed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) should always meet with the consideration of the House. I say, in closing, that Insolvency Laws should, upon general principles, be so framed as to give every encouragement to a trader who falls into difficulties to give up his property promptly and fairly, and to feel he is not dealing with an inveterate and implacable foe, but with a sympathizing friend who is inclined to help him as far as possible in his difficulties. But with the Insolvent Act as amended, it was like a death blow to any sensitive man and man of honor to place himself under the operation of the Act. The law has worked very well in the United States. Insolvency Acts have been passed during periods of depression, and have subsequently been modified, and when periods of depression returned they have again been enacted. A sweeping Bankruptcy Act was passed after the crisis of 1826-27, another was passed about 1847. These were periods of great crisis in the commercial history of the country; another was in 1857, another was in 1861, and another, more terrible than all, was in 1873. But there never has been any exhibition of harshness towards creditors there. One reason of the great prosperity of the United States, of the great activity of its business men, is that all men supposed to have dealt fairly and honestly, always meet with a candid response from their creditors when they make an assignment and surrender their property, and those disasters fall upon the most active, enterprising and industrious men, who are promoting large, speculative and new enterprises. It is to the credit of the United States, as it is to its advantage, that those men have not been kept under the harrow, and I can point to some of the most wealthy men in the United States who, having been placed in hopeless circumstances, have, by the generosity of their creditors, and by the beneficent operation of the Bankruptcy Law, have been relieved, and have paid their debts in full, dollar for dollar, afterwards, when prosperity returned to them, which never would have occurred except under the operation of such a law. I trust the hon. member for West Toronto will be permitted to introduce his Bill.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The subject proposed to be dealt with by the Bill is one of great importance and one which Parliament can deal with. We cannot discuss the merits of the Bill because it is not before the House; hon. members may discuss the abstract proposition as regards such a law, and it is therefore only due to the hon. member, who has

Mr. PLUMB.

undoubtedly given a good deal of thought and consideration to the subject, that he should have an opportunity of submitting his Bill to the House. It is due to the hon. gentleman as a matter of courtesy, and I think as a matter of right, as the subject is one in which the country has much interest.

Mr. McCALLUM. I have no objection to the hon. member introducing the Bill; but I understood from his remarks that it was framed in the interest of the creditor not of the debtor, and that it is merely to divide the property fairly among the creditors. There have been great doubts as to the advantage of Bankruptcy Laws formerly. I think the law is all right as far as the collection of debts is concerned; if a trader sells goods to a party the law should enable him to collect the debt if the man is able to pay it. There are, however, a great many wholesale dealers in this country who send out agents, and force goods on the people—in fact, many purchasers buy more goods than they should buy; and the dealers now want the power to place such men in insolvency the moment they are unable to pay and divide the property among themselves. Under the old system of bankruptcy, no one received any money except the assignee. I admit that after great crises a Bankruptcy Law may be necessary, and this practice has been followed in the United States. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) has pointed out that these propositions on the subject have been introduced by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), but this, the fourth proposition, is no better, but in some respects worse than those made by that hon. gentleman. When the Bankruptcy Law was in operation, and notices of assignment were sent me, I would not pay the expenses to look after them, because I received nothing in the end. I do not want a renewal of that system. It was almost a premium, based on rascality, in this way, that when a man entered into business, obtained credit, and succeeded, all was well, but, if he failed, he simply went through the Bankruptcy Court, got white-washed, and commenced business again. Speaking as the representative of a rural constituency, I consider it my duty to oppose, at the present time, the enactment of any Bankrupt Law in any shape. I do not say that, if the circumstances of the country should change, that a Bankruptcy Law might not be desirable, but, under existing circumstances, with the trade of the country prosperous and every man obtaining a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, we do not want a Bankruptcy Law.

Mr. SPROULE. It may appear a little unfair to express an opinion on a Bill which has not been read the first time, but the fact appears to be that from the experience of the past we are disposed to look with suspicion on any Bill which seems to tend in the direction of reviving the Insolvent Act. From the first law of the kind—the one passed I think in 1864—down to the time when the last law was repealed in 1879, the tendency of these laws appears to have been to put a premium on dishonesty more than anything else. They were passed in the interests of two classes—the wholesale men on the one side and the retail men on the other. The wholesale men were then, as now, in the habit of sending their travellers throughout the country, who did their best to sell all the goods they could, and in many cases they sold to irresponsible men, men of low standing and little honesty, and there was a strong temptation held out for men to go into lines of business of which they had no knowledge, the inevitable result being the ultimate ruin of both parties. These men sold the goods on the principle of long credits, and said to themselves that some of the goods would be sold; that they would get, at any rate, a share of the profits, and, if the crash came, they would go in with the others and get their share in the distribution of the assets. Then it was claimed that the Insolvency Act was in the interest of the

trader, because there were many provisions of the law which allowed those who were disposed to be honest to take advantage of it, and compromise with their creditors, and the result was that many men became insolvent once, and some as many as three or four times, and that they made money by every operation. On the other hand, the honest man who was struggling with poverty and unable to make his way, who might have accounts with these debtors, had to take his share with the rest so far as the estate would allow. Then the system of assignees who very often absorbed almost the whole of the estate, and the debtor was left without being able to get a discharge. His debts were not paid, and the stigma of dishonesty rested upon him so that he was worse off than before. To what class of men do these remarks apply? We will say that two men start in life. One man is a merchant and falls back on the Insolvency Law. He can whitewash himself from any blame and begin anew. The result was to encourage reckless speculation. Men went into businesses for which they were unfitted, and in which they had no previous experience, without any of the consideration which a judicious and right thinking man would have employed before making such a venture. On the other hand, take the case of the mechanic. He starts in business, and although he, perhaps, does not invest so much money as the other, he has to struggle with many difficulties, not merely in the way of business, but perhaps he has had sickness in his family, and under the pressure of circumstances he is compelled to succumb. The sheriff comes down on him and he is sold out, while the other can always fall back on the benefits of the Insolvency Act. Under that Act no protection was afforded for a very large class compared with the merchant, for whom it was specially intended, and this numerous class had not the chance of starting life *de novo* as the others had. We are always harping about the few that break down under these circumstances, but there is a very numerous class outside of this, such as farmers, mechanics, tradesmen and laboring men, who are entitled to much more consideration, on account of their numbers, than the class described as traders. There is no doubt that the last decisive verdict given by this House against the Insolvent Acts was such as to leave the impression on the country that it was not believed that such legislation was in the interests of legitimate trade, and that, in short, insolvent Laws had a tendency rather to make men deal in a way not considered honest by respectable people. Moreover, when the Act was done away with, we did not find any strong outcry in favor of its renewal. There was nothing like the objection to its repeal which some led us to expect. Three years have elapsed since that time, and we do not find insolvency increasing. In fact, the reverse is the case, and there is no strong feeling in the country in favor of going back to such a law. Such legislation is intended to benefit the very same class who were largely instrumental in bringing about the disastrous results which they tried to remedy by an Insolvent Law. At all events the principle of a law which affords a protection to one particular class and does not afford a similar protection to a much more numerous body such as the mechanics, farmers, and laboring men, is essentially unjust, and meanwhile it may be unreasonable to raise one's voice against a Bill before it has been read the first time. As I said before, the feeling is so strong against an Insolvent Act that we look with suspicion on anything like an attempt to renew it.

Mr. RICHEY. In common with many other hon. members, I think it is due to the hon. gentleman who has taken the pains to prepare a Bill, which certainly is a response in some measure to the wishes of the commercial community of the country, that he should be allowed to have the Bill read the first time, so that its details may be considered in Committee. The commercial community of the country

may not go to the extent of desiring a renewal of a general Bankruptcy Law, but they certainly do go so far as to desire a measure which shall preclude preferential assignments, and at the same time prevent the too active and exacting creditor from reaping the reward of his energy, perhaps to the injury of the honest debtor, or of the creditors at large. These are the reasons which induce me to vote for the first reading of this Bill. It is, of course, unnecessary to say that in doing so I do not commit myself to the details of the measure. With regard to the denunciations which have been pronounced against the Bankruptcy Act which was previously on the Statute-book, I believe that a measure which will not only procure the distribution of the estates of debtors, but will enable them to obtain a discharge from their obligations, so they may be free to again enter into business, is an advantage not only to the debtor but to the country; I hold that it is to the advantage of the country that all the business talent and energy should be free to be expended in the various trades and occupations. One important consideration in connection with measures of this kind is, that under the existing state of the law frauds are frequently perpetrated, as for instance when a man receives credit from friends, who find that soon an old creditor comes along and sweeps away all the goods which the trader has thus obtained. For these reasons, I shall unite with those gentlemen who have expressed themselves as disposed to vote for the first reading of this Bill; and if the hon. gentleman who has charge of it will move at the second reading to refer it to a Committee where all the details may be considered, I think a measure may be arrived at which will meet all the necessities of the case.

Mr. HESSON. I have very little sympathy with a Bill of this kind. It may be necessary in the interest of the trade of the country, but it is not popular in the country, and I have observed that the members who appear the most anxious to promote a new Insolvent Bill in this House, are as a rule from the cities. I know that the rural constituencies of Canada are not in favor of an Insolvent Act; and representing a rural constituency, I feel called upon to say that a measure, such as the last Insolvent Act, which marked so strongly the distinction between men in trade and commerce and others who make their living by the sweat of their brows, but who could not take advantage of an Insolvent Act to wipe out their indebtedness, is highly objectionable. I feel, therefore, that I have a right to take a position on this question which does not vary much, if any, from the position I took when the Insolvent Act was repealed at a former Session of this House. It may be a want of courtesy on the part of hon. members of this House to object to the first reading of the Bill, and I shall not go so far as to do so, because there may be some good points in it which might be worthy of consideration by an intelligent Committee, to whom, I presume, the Bill would be referred; but I take this opportunity to say that I am opposed to legislation in that direction altogether. I do not think the time has come to require such a measure; on the contrary, the improved condition of the country renders it less desirable than when the Insolvent Act was repealed. Upon that ground, and upon the ground that I feel that the introduction of a Bill, such as I understand this to be, in the interest of those in trade and commerce, and not of those in other branches of business, is objectionable; and although I shall not object to the first reading, I must raise my voice against it on the second reading, if it comes before the House.

Mr. McCUAIG. This Bill is only intended to distribute insolvent estates, and not to grant discharges. As the law stands now, a judgment creditor seizes upon the property of a debtor, and sells it at a great sacrifice—perhaps sells property worth ten dollars for one dollar—to get his own

money, to the great loss of the other creditors. As the law stands in Ontario at present, it encourages the sharp business man to sue and get judgment over the other creditors, and once he gets judgment, he can recover his money by sacrificing the property of all the other creditors. As I understand this Bill it is to prevent that, and to enable the property to be fairly divided.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

DISCHARGE OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS.

Mr. BEATY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) for the discharge of past insolvent debtors. He said: The object of this Bill is simply to provide means for the discharge of insolvents who are such previous to the passing of this Act. It is not contended that the Act should apply to the time during which it is in force, or run concurrently with that which has just been introduced; it is simply intended to apply to cases of persons who have already given up their estate, in order to enable the creditor to find out whether they have any property or not, and, if they have not been guilty of fraud in connection with their business, and obtained the consent of one-half in number and three-fourths in value of their creditors, to obtain a discharge. Under these circumstances the creditors may ask the Court to enforce the discharge against the creditors who do not agree to it; but that difficulty will only arise in cases where a large number of creditors are in favor of a discharge, but two or three may prevent it from having effect, and the debtor is obliged to struggle against difficulties which he cannot overcome. I do not think that there should be an Insolvent Act with a power of discharge running concurrently with the Act. Persons enter into trade and obtain goods from others knowing that they will be able to obtain a discharge and begin business again.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

DRAWBACKS.

Mr. BOWELL on moving the first reading of a Bill to amend Chapter 12, 44th Victoria, for the allowance of drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada and used by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, said: Under the Act of last Session the rebate could not be paid until the articles had been used on the railway and it was thought better, after a good deal of correspondence, the manufacturers of these articles should be placed in the same position as those of any other articles of which the raw material is admitted free. I propose simply to substitute the words "to be used" for "used by" the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to add a proviso that before any rebate is made to the manufacturer, the manufacturer shall give a bond to the Customs Department that these articles shall be used for no other purpose than that for which they are sold, and in case they should not be so used the Canadian Pacific Railway pledge themselves to pay back to the Government the rebate allowed. The Department obtains from the railway authorities an account of the exact quantity of materials used in the construction of every mile of railway, and according as certain portions of the contract is completed, the Department will ascertain whether a larger amount of goods has been imported free than was necessary, and in that case the railway company under their bond, will be called on to pay the duty on any goods imported in excess of requirements.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be very material to us to have all the correspondence and papers moved for in this connection, in order to discuss this Bill thoroughly, I do not propose--on a mere statement of the hon. gentleman--to enter into any discussion on its merits now. It appears to me, however, from the hon. gentleman's explanation, that the measure is one authorizing him to pay public moneys

Mr. McCuaig.

which, under the Statute, he would not be entitled to pay. It appears to me that a measure of this description, dealing with public funds in that way, was one which ought to be initiated upon resolution in Committee of the Whole, and not on a Bill, and, although it does not appear so, it is a notice, which is a mere notice, to introduce a Bill to amend the Act; and the hon. gentleman will probably find himself, on the second reading of this Bill, in a fatal difficulty, in prosecuting it further, if it turns out that it ought to be initiated by resolution. Therefore I take the liberty of calling his attention to that resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. I followed the course pursued by the hon. the Finance Minister in introducing that Bill last Session. If it is ruled that it must be introduced by resolution, I will not push the motion now. The Bill authorizes the payment of public funds in the shape of drawbacks. The old Bill provided that the manufacturers should be paid a sum out of the public revenue, not exceeding the duty which will be paid, if the articles they used were imported for a certain purpose. It was found in working it practically that we could not pay under that Bill any portion of the money until the article had actually gone into construction. What I ask the House to do is simply to put the Government into precisely the same position they occupy in reference to the Tariff resolutions, which, I think, are introduced by resolution in the first place, and to enable them to pay the money at another period.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite so; but it is an anticipated theory, and it is dealing with public money contrary to law; and, as my hon. friend the member for Lambton says, there is a question of trade involved.

Mr. BOWELL. I am content to let the motion stand as a notice.

Motion allowed to stand.

MILITIA RETURNS.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the Government when the militia returns I asked for some time ago are likely to appear. On Monday the Minister of Militia promised to have these papers down to-day. I understand General Luard is leaving the country on a long visit, and these papers have been kept by the Government until he is safely away.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Militia, who is not present, promised they would be ready to-day or to-morrow. He thought one would be laid before the House to-day; but I think they will be on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The General will be away to-morrow.

IMPERIAL MEASURE.

Mr. MASSUE, in the absence of Mr. BENNETT, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to prohibit absolutely the use of any measure other than the Imperial measure in the sale of grain, &c.?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. It is not the intention of the Government to prohibit absolutely the use of any other measure other than the Imperial measure; freedom is left to the trader to sell by weight, or by the bag, but when he sells by measure, it must be by the Imperial gallon.

PORT OF ENTRY IN CHESLEY.

Mr. GILLIES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a port of entry in Chesley, situated on the Port Dover, Stratford and Lake Huron Railway, and if so, when?

Mr. BOWELL. The application made for the establishing of an out-port in Chesley has been referred to the Inspector of Customs to report, and as soon as he makes his report I shall be enabled to state whether an out-port will be established or not.

MONUMENT TO THE MEMORY OF SIR GEORGE CARTIER.

Mr. HOUDE, in the absence of Mr. Tassé, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take action in relation to the credit of \$10,000, voted last Session, for the purpose of erecting a monument to the memory of Sir George Cartier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention of the Government.

LIGHTHOUSES IN LOTBINIÈRE.

Mr. RINFRET enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to retain lights in the lighthouses constructed in 1880 in the Parish of St. Emilie, county of Lotbinière?

Mr. McLELAN. These lighthouses were erected to serve the new channel that is being dredged. Till it is completed the old channel is served by those lights, which will be removed to the new channel when it is finished.

COMPENSATION TO JOSEPH CHARLES LISLOIS.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to compensate Joseph Charles Lislois for the burning of his building near the Intercolonial Railway; if so, in what amount; if not, why not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That matter was referred to the official arbitrator, who has reported that it is proved that the spark-arrester was in good order, and consequently that the Government are not liable.

CLAIM OF LUCIEN MORIN.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Why the Government has not yet paid the claim of Lucien Morin as to expropriation and damages in the Parish of St. Rochs des Aulnets, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, both as respects last year and the preceding year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That matter was referred to Mr. Simard, one of the official arbitrators, who reported that the amount of money required to be paid for the claim in this case had been offered to him judicially and had been declined. The claimant has requested permission to appoint an arbitrator, which, of course, cannot be allowed; but the matter has been referred to the full Board for their adjudication.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That was for the past year, but not for this year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is to cover the whole case. The matter being referred to Mr. Simard, he reported in favor of paying for each of the ballast pits \$100, and for the right of way to the ballast pits in order to use them, and annual rent of \$2; and for 100 feet of length, 40 feet width, during the time it was in use for the removal of the embankment after the track was removed, \$30. All this was offered Morin and declined. He requested the Department to appoint an arbitrator, which cannot be allowed. The whole subject, with the evidence taken before Mr. Simard, the official arbitrator, has been referred to the full Board.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That was the previous year, but not for the second year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is all the information I have before me.

WORKS CONNECTED WITH THE APPROACH TO ISLE AUX NOIX.

Mr. BOURASSA enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to complete the works connected with the approach to Isle aux Noix, and, if so, whether they intend to place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient for the completion of the said works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to give an immediate answer to the hon. member, but I can tell him that the question is engaging my attention at present.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—
Bill (No. 20) respecting the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

The following Bills were considered in Committee, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Currier.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Canada Mutual Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 11) to amend the Criminal Law and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Bill is now presented as amended by the Select Committee, to which it was referred, who took as their basis the suggestions made by the First Minister. As hon. gentlemen have the Bill in their hands there is not much necessity for explaining it. The amendments made by the Committee were made unanimously. I move the adoption of the first clause.

Mr. OUMET. I do not see why we should pass legislation in this House which is in force in no other country. It is legislation which has been deemed unnecessary in other countries, and I do not see why we should adopt such exceptional legislation here which will be, as it is, rather a bad certificate of our people to other countries. I move in amendment that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). My hon. friend is opposing the Bill on the ground that this offence is not made a criminal or statutory offence in any other country. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to look into the laws of other countries he would never have committed himself to such an announcement. There are few countries in the world except England and Canada which have not made this offence a statutory offence. It is a statutory offence in Illinois, Ohio, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Maine, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota. It is a criminal offence in India and some of the Continental States. When I moved the second reading of the Bill, I gave some instances which I thought would justify Parliament in legislating in this direction, and to show that it would rather be a disgrace, I was going to say, if we did not pass such a Bill. It has always appeared a

marvellous thing to me, that it has never before been made a statutory crime. I think the hon. the First Minister agreed that it was proper that it should be made a statutory offence, that it is an offence of a gross and scandalous character, and that a person found guilty of committing it should receive the severest punishment. The hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment knows that in his own Province, not long ago, a man was tried for having committed murder upon the offspring of a connection of the kind here provided against, and I know of three cases in which the offence has been committed, and the persons tried in a way in which they should not have been tried.

Mr. OUIMET. If there was an instance in my knowledge which would show that this legislation was necessary, I would gladly support the Bill, but I know of no instance in our part of the Dominion which could justify us in adopting such exceptional legislation as this Bill offers.

Mr. IVES. The argument which the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) has used with regard to this Bill might apply to every provision of the Criminal Law with precisely the same force. He says that to pass such a Bill would give the people of this Dominion a bad certificate of character, and that we should not pass a law which is not in force, as I understand, in the Mother Country. We might say the same thing with regard to the statutory provision against larceny—that it would give a bad impression of our people abroad, that larceny is committed sometimes in Canada notwithstanding the great morality of the people. I do not agree with my hon. friend that the passing of an Act of this kind would have any such effect. If, as he said, there is no necessity for the passing of a law that might be a reason why it should not be passed, but I do not understand that even that would be a very strong reason. If there is no offence of this kind committed, there would be no harm in having the law on the Statute-book. I do not see that either of the hon. gentleman's arguments, that it is not necessary or that it would be a bad certificate of character, is a very strong argument why the Bill should not pass.

Mr. MILLS. This was at one time the law of England; and it was only in consequence of the changes which took place in the functions of the ecclesiastical courts at the time of the Reformation, that there was a change in the execution of the law, which practically did away with the punishment that was attached to the offence. If the power formerly exercised by the ecclesiastical courts had been formally transferred to the criminal courts, this would have been punished the same as other crimes; and it is because we have followed the practice of England since the Reformation, and made no provision for the punishment of this particular offence by official legislation, that it never was a crime here.

Mr. DESJARDINS. If we were revising our criminal code of laws, I would be willing to add this special clause to the general legislation; but I do not see why, there being no cause shown for it, we should make a new law for this special case. Under the circumstances, I approve of the motion that the Committee do now rise.

Committee rose.

WITNESSES IN MISDEMEANORS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 10), to provide that persons charged with misdemeanors shall be competent as witnesses, said: The provisions of this Bill are very short; they are simply that all persons charged with what are known as misdemeanors shall be competent and compellable to give evidence—competent to give evidence in their own behalf, and compellable to give evidence in behalf of the Crown. The provisions of the Bill are confined to misdemeanors. My hon. friend

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has a Bill on the paper extending the provisions of the law as it now stands to all crimes of whatever nature. My Bill does not go quite that far; I prefer, in making changes in the Criminal Law, to go slowly, rather than to make changes rapidly, and without, perhaps, sufficient care and consideration. The principle of the Bill is not a new one; it is recognized by Parliament already. In 1878 this Parliament passed an Act making the defendant, in all cases of assault, competent and compellable to give evidence, and making his wife competent and compellable to give evidence also. Two years afterwards the provisions of that Bill were extended to batteries, and that is now the law of the land. That the provisions of that Bill have worked satisfactorily I think is manifest, because there has been no complaint as to its working; it has not been repealed, but still remains the law of the land. Now, I am aware that every change of this kind is opposed at some stage,—if not by a direct issue taken upon the principle of the Bill on the second reading, when the votes can all be recorded and given to the public, so that the public can judge of the conduct of their representatives in Parliament—is opposed in Committee of the Whole, where the votes cannot be recorded, and the public do not know anything about the way in which their representatives vote. I know that provisions of this kind are opposed by a good many lawyers and laymen. Every change that has been made in the Criminal Law for the last hundred years has been strenuously opposed, and it was only by the indefatigable labor of the great law reformers that changes have really been made. There was a time when a prisoner was deprived of the benefit of the clergy and of the benefit of counsel. When attempts were made by the law reformers of that day to make changes in this respect those attempts were strenuously resisted, and it was only after an expenditure of considerable time and labor that these cruel provisions were removed from the Statute-book. There was a time when capital punishment was inflicted for the forgery of a pound note, and when an attempt was made to repeal this provision, an eminent English jurist said that to repeal it would strike a fatal blow at the commercial business and prosperity of the country; and there was a time when neither a plaintiff nor a defendant was allowed to give evidence in his own behalf whether the amount was large or small. That law was changed, but only after a long struggle. Why, only thirty or forty years ago in England, and still later in this country, neither the defendant nor the plaintiff, nor the wife of either, was competent or compellable to give evidence, and no person who had the slightest pecuniary interest in the result of the litigation was a competent witness. If a man had been convicted of a felony, although he might have served out his full term of imprisonment, he was not a competent witness. Having been once convicted, the law assumed him to be for ever after incapable of telling the truth. The law has been changed after a good deal of trouble on all these subjects, and no person would now go back to the earlier system. And so with the evidence in civil cases. Why it was only a few years ago when neither the plaintiff nor defendant could give evidence in civil cases whether the amount were \$100 or \$1,000,000. But that law has been changed, and no one would think of going back to the old system. I recollect when this question was before the House, a year or two ago, that the then hon. Minister of Justice very strongly resisted the extension of the provision of the Bill of 1878, to any other class of crime than that of common assault. The same argument was used that is always used, when any attempt was made to amend the Criminal Law, that to permit the prisoner in a criminal case to give evidence in his own behalf would be to offer a premium and hold out an inducement to the committal of perjury, and very seriously diminish the

chances of conviction. It was said also that the change was contrary to the genius and spirit of the English law. These are the old stock arguments against change. The same arguments were used when it was proposed to allow litigants to give evidence in their own cases, but after discussion Parliament consented to the change. Everybody admits that perjury may be committed. It was committed before the change was made, and will be committed until the end of time or until the millennium. The object of all litigation is to obtain the truth in the shortest, best, and speediest way, and that may best be done by hearing every person who knows anything of the subject, whether he be an interested witness or not. How can we, in all fairness, exclude the testimony of the defendant or the prisoner in the case of a common misdemeanor or petty larceny, when you do not exclude it in other cases of much greater gravity. As to the other objection, that to admit this evidence would seriously diminish the chances of conviction, I attach no weight to that. I believe an innocent man has nothing to fear from an examination in his own case, and those who are accustomed to practice in criminal cases know that, under the test of a rigid cross-examination, a man who is telling an untruth will, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, break down. Mr. Crabb Robinson, an English lawyer of note, and a man of letters, who took an interest in this important question, and went further in his views than I propose to go, went to France to examine into the system that prevailed there, and, after a thorough examination, he came to the conclusion that, if he were a guilty man, he would prefer to be tried under the law of England, but, if innocent, he would prefer to be tried according to the law of France. If that statement is correct, there is no reason why, in this country, in the class of cases provided for in my Bill, we should not allow the defendant to give evidence in his own behalf. The third objection is, that it is contrary to the spirit of the English law. That objection is raised against every change made in the Criminal Law for the last half century. But I do not think it is an argument that amounts to anything or that ought to prevail. It is not a new principle that I am embodying in the Bill. It is on the Statute-book of the Dominion now, and my Bill simply proposes to extend it. It is to some extent the law of England, the principle being recognized in a limited sense. Under Mr. Plimssell's Act of 1871, it was made a criminal offence to send a vessel to sea in an unseaworthy condition exposing the lives of seamen to danger. In an indictment against a party under that Act, the defendant was made a competent witness. There is no reason, therefore, why the principle should not be extended to the class of cases provided for in the Bill. Having recognized the principle, I contend you should carry it a step further, and apply it to all cases—but at all events to all cases of misdemeanor. Now, the right to give evidence is limited to one of the parties in the case, namely, the prosecutor; but there is no reason why the defendant should not also be allowed to give his testimony. Let us say he wants to go into the witness box, and, to put his story in opposition to the story of the prosecutor, he wants to tell the jury all the circumstances that make in his favor, to point out the discrepancies in the evidence, and clear up special circumstances that make against him—why should he not be at liberty to do so? The answer of common sense and fair play is that he be allowed to enter the witness box and tell his own story; but the answer of the law is that it cannot be done. Counsel, of course, is there on his behalf to call the witnesses and explain the doubts and circumstances that make against the prisoner. The counsel may suggest doubts as to guilt, and clear up facts in favor of the defendant; but the man who can tell the whole story can say nothing, and

in many cases conviction is improperly obtained through that fact alone. I remember reading the case of an English Church clergyman who kept a school. He was charged by two females, pupils, with having committed an outrageous offence; and the girls went into the witness box and told what appeared a plain, unvarnished story, and their examination could not be broken down. The mouths of the defendant and his wife were closed, and the jury, always sympathizing with female purity, found the clergyman guilty. He was sentenced to transportation for five years. A few months afterwards, circumstances turned out that caused suspicion to rest on the story of the girls; the matter was investigated by the Home Secretary and the attorney and solicitor of the unfortunate man, when the Home Secretary became convinced that he was wholly innocent. The girls were then indicted for perjury, and the clergyman and his wife told their story in the witness-box; it was corroborated, and the result was that the two girls were convicted of perjury. The Home Secretary then pardoned the clergyman, who, had he been allowed to tell his story at first, would never have been convicted. His pardon was no great consolation for his unjust, disgraceful sentence, and the six months lost in transportation. I might give the House scores of cases of men convicted of offences which turned out subsequently they never committed, and also many cases of conviction upon circumstantial evidence—cases which would have been all cleared up had the accused been allowed to tell their own story to the jury. Take the case of simple larceny. A man is charged with stealing a piece of goods which is found in his possession within a week after the felony. The Judge tells the jury that all they have to find is that the goods were stolen, and were found in the possession of the accused within a reasonable time after the theft. The law assumes guilt, and throws upon him the responsibility of self-defence—of explaining how he became possessed of the article, without being able to tell his own story—and the result is, in a great many cases, his unjust conviction. There is now a proposition in England to extend this principle of law—the hearing of the accused—to all cases, both misdemeanors and felonies. A Commission was appointed in England to investigate the whole criminal law with a view to its codification, and they recommended that the defendants should be made competent to give evidence in their own behalf in all cases, whether of felonies or misdemeanors. The Attorney General of England introduced a Bill to that effect in 1879, which received the sanction of Parliament to a second reading. The principle of the Bill was recognized. It went to Committee, and considerable progress was made with it, but before its consideration could be completed Parliament rose. In 1880, the Bill was re-introduced and received a second reading, and was sent to the Select Committee, when it met with the same fate. In 1881 the Bill was not introduced, but it is to be re-introduced this year, and I have no doubt, from the recommendation of the principle by the Commission, and from the strong grounds taken upon the subject by English lawyers, that it will become the law of the land. I ask the hon. the First Minister can he justify the practice of allowing an accused to give evidence in his own defence in a case of assault and battery, and refusing him that privilege in a case of libel? That is a quasi-crime and why should defendant be allowed to be examined. There is no valid reason, and so in a nuisance, such as obstructing the highway—in such cases why should the defendant's mouth be closed? There is no reason in the world for it. Upon the whole, I see no reason why the provision of my Bill should not become law, the principle having been recognized.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree with almost every word that has fallen from the hon. gentleman opposite, and I am inclined, from the Bill which I have introduced and which

is on the Orders, to go still further in the same direction than the hon. member appears desirous of proceeding by his Bill. Now there is only one principle in his Bill that I do not think ought to be sanctioned—at all events without some little further explanation. It is a principle of English law, and a principle which I think we shall not be willing readily to depart from, that a man ought not to be compelled to disclose his own crime. We know that a witness is always excused from answering any question which will tend to criminate himself. Therefore, the objection I make to the hon. member's Bill is simply that a witness ought not to be compelled to give evidence, while at the same time it should be open to him to go into the box to explain the circumstances of the offence and tell the whole story. I hope the Government will permit both Bills to go to the Select Committee, before which this matter can be considered with a view to a report of what it deems prudent with regard to the subject. There can be no doubt at all, it appears to me, that where the object of a criminal trial is to arrive at the truth—and that of course ought to be the great object where it is not a trial in order to obtain a verdict against a man who is innocent, at the same time it is not the object to allow a guilty man to escape—it is the very height of absurdity to say that the person who knows most of all about the crime with which he is charged is not to be permitted to go into the witness-box to explain the circumstances connected with the charge. Now that of itself, I think, is a proposition which requires only to be stated to receive almost unanimous consent; and unless objections can be made to it—and I do not know that any objections can be made except those on the score of antiquity, and that the law of England which prevailed for so many years in a contrary direction is to be cited—unless that is an argument then, I think the principle of the Bill—and I may perhaps include also the object of Bill No. 50—should receive the assent of this House. Now what is the objection to it? We know that not very long ago, perhaps not fifty years, in civil cases not only could no party to a suit give evidence, but the law was so absurd that no person who had any degree of interest in the subject of the litigation was deemed to be worthy of credence. It went still further. The law was, as is well known to all those who are concerned in the practice of the profession to which I belong, that if a man had been convicted of a crime, no matter what the crime might be, but on the ground of infamy he was also prohibited from giving evidence in any trial. The absurdity of that took many years, as my hon. friend has stated, to induce the Legislature to amend the law, but gradually from time to time the law was amended, first, by permitting the opposite party to be called, and finally by allowing the party to give evidence in his own behalf, and I do not think any person who has had any experience in the conduct of civil or criminal matters would now desire to return to the law as it was. If in civil matters it is right and proper that people should be allowed to tell their own story—and the party to a litigation must know more about the circumstances than any one else—and ought not to be excluded from the witness-box, how much stronger is the argument in cases where not merely a man's property but his reputation, and possibly his life, may be in danger. Why should a person charged with an offence, against whom circumstances are managed as pointing to his guilt, why did he not be at liberty to open his mouth and to tell, perhaps in a few words, to explain away circumstances which, unexplained, seemed to tell so heavily against him? It is said it will open the door to perjury. No doubt it will. I suppose the more witnesses are called the more there will be of that offence; but I may say in my little experience, that I do not think there is nearly as much perjury committed as perhaps the public are inclined to believe. When I say

Mr. McCARTHY.

perjury, I mean that deliberate and wilful mis-statement, with the knowledge that it is mis-statement, which constitutes the crime of perjury. That people, not merely parties to suits but witnesses in suits, do state facts or do make statements which are not facts, I do not think can be reasonably denied, but they have perhaps reasoned themselves into the belief that they are stating what is literally true. I am satisfied they are not guilty of the crime of perjury, or of deliberately mis-stating facts, or making statements contrary to the truth. Now, even if that were so, is that to weigh against the other consideration? Fancy the absurdity of the position. A man is sued for \$10; he can be a witness and deny that he ever borrowed it. A man is charged with stealing \$10, and, while the prosecutor can go into the witness box, and say he did steal it, and although not the mere paltry sum is at stake, but the man's reputation and character, and his liberty as an individual are at stake, he is not permitted to go into the witness-box and tell his story about it; and so on, illustrations might be given in the same direction, which I need not weary the House with giving. When we look, therefore, at the broad merits of the matter, and when we see objections that can be made to it—and they appear to me to be very trivial—and notwithstanding what the Mother Country may have done in that direction, we ought to proceed and do what is reasonable and just in the amendment of the Criminal Law from time to time. Since I have had the honor to introduce the Bill, I have been favored with one or two suggestions from learned Judges. One learned Judge says that he has taken for many years, great interest in this subject, but he thinks, perhaps, we should not hasten too swiftly. He thinks it would be better merely to extend the law and make the offence a misdemeanor, not exactly in the direction the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) suggests, but in the direction of the Bill which I have had the honor to introduce; and afterwards if that was found to be successful it could be gradually extended so as to include all classes of crimes. The Chief Justice in one of the Courts in Ontario has also had the goodness to send me his views on the subject, and, strange to say, he concurs exactly in the observations which have been made to me in the first place by the learned County Court Judge. I am quite willing the matter should be thus dealt with. It would be a great advance indeed, I think, to have the law amended, if not to that extent, and the difference between my hon. friend—I do not know that there is any substantial difference—would be avoided, as he objects to depart from that bulwark, so to speak, that particular doctrine of the English law which we have in this country, which compels a man to go in and give evidence of his own guilt, that is the law in some cases of assault, and my hon. friend proposes to extend that to all cases of misdemeanor. Now, I think we should just draw the line there. There are cases, I think, when a man ought to have an opportunity to go into the witness-box and tell his story, because if we amend the law in that direction we would have to repeal many of the laws on the Statute-book; but in no case ought a criminal to be compelled to state what might tend to criminate himself. There is one other observation which I propose to make, I do not claim the credit—if there is any credit in connection with the matter—of having framed the Bill which I have the honor to introduce. I take the sections of the Bill from the part of the criminal code to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and it will be found there that protection is extended to witnesses of this class. The subject has received a great deal of consideration from eminent jurists, who agree that a man who is charged with crime, and who goes into a witness-box, should be protected to this extent, that on cross-examination, in the discretion of the Judge, he should be protected from giving a history of

his whole life. It may not be known perhaps to all the hon. members of this House, that when a witness goes into the box he is liable, with a view to test his credibility, to be submitted to an examination as to his whole life; he is to tell what he has not done as well as what he has done; he is bound to disclose, or he may decline disclosing on the ground that it would criminate him in charges which would be made against him; whereas the course they pursue in England—and I am inclined to think they are right in that respect—is that they do not permit a man to be interrogated in such a way, not with reference to the crime, but with reference to other transactions which would create a prejudice against him. The learned justice, to whom I refer, makes another suggestion. He thinks that where a person, charged with a crime, does not tender himself as a witness it ought not to be alleged against him. The House will at once understand that if a man charged with a crime has an opportunity of being a witness, and if he declines to tell his story, that would be a very strong presumption against him; it would look as if he dare not go into the witness-box, or was not willing to commit perjury, or if willing to commit perjury, would not dare to pass cross-examination. Well, I am not, I must confess, altogether of the opinion of the learned Chief Justice, notwithstanding it is well worthy of consideration. He makes a suggestion that there ought to be a declaratory part of the enactment, that where the accused had an opportunity, and did not avail himself of it, of going into the witness-box, no Judge nor opposing counsel should be at liberty to allege that against him as any evidence of his guilt. With these observations, I would suggest that both Bills should be referred to a Select Committee, and then, if the House agreed with the principle of them to that extent, the Committee could work out the Bills in one way or another, according to the suggestions that may be made on the second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, that both these Bills should receive a second reading and go to a Special Committee, who may report upon them for the information of this House. I am inclined very strongly to agree also with the proposition, that for the present, it will be better to confine the Bill to misdemeanors. It is better to have for a year or two, or for some years, the experience of the effect of having accused persons called as witnesses in their own defence in such cases. In cases of felony, especially of capital felony, I think the House should consider well whether the accused, the person charged with murder say, should be placed in the dilemma suggested by the learned Chief Justice to whom my hon. friend has alluded. No matter whether it is stated in the Act or not that it shall not be alleged against him, jurors will know it is the law. Take the case of a man standing his trial for murder. The circumstances are strongly against him, leading the minds of the jury to infer that he is guilty, but still there is not clear, unmistakable, incontrovertible evidence of guilt. If the criminal standing on his trial does not go into the box to explain away the suspicious circumstances, the jury will give great weight to that circumstance, and will, I am afraid, cause the jury to lean strongly against the prisoner. That will soon be known among criminals, it will pass from jail to jail and from lawyer to lawyer, and counsel will be obliged to let his client know that it is evident from the decision of juries that, if a prisoner declines to give evidence in his own favor, it causes the jury to lean against him, and therefore, prisoners, in order to remove the impression from the minds of jurors, will be forced into the box and swear in his own favor. Thus, I fear, the offence of perjury will be added to the crime of murder or other crime for which the man is on trial. That is the danger which has always occurred to me in regard to serious

offences, involving, on conviction, imprisonment for a long period, or for life. For that reason, I think it will be well for the present to limit the Bill to misdemeanors. Again, as to making a prisoner a witness against himself, such a proposal is foreign to the principles that have always governed the administration of Criminal Laws. No man should be forced to swear to his own guilt. The hon. gentleman says, in cases of assault, this practice prevails already; but an assault can scarcely be brought within the Criminal Law unless it is made with murderous intent. In ordinary cases of assault, two persons meet together in hot blood, and blows are struck, and the man who can run faster than the other gets out the first warrant, becomes the prosecutor, and he can give his evidence on oath. That offence is more in the nature of a trespass than of a crime, and might be considered trespass against the person instead of property. But, in cases of misdemeanor or felony, the person tried should not be forced to give evidence against himself. I suggest that the two Bills be read the second time, and referred to a Special Committee, which will, no doubt, be able to present a Bill which will be of practical use to the House.

Bill read the second time, and referred to a Special Committee, composed of Messrs. Brooks, Cameron (Victoria), Ives, Guthrie, Ouimet, Beaty, Mousseau, Laurier, Cameron (Huron), and McCarthy.

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Ives for the second reading of Bill (No. 12), to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1874, read.

Mr. IVES moved that the Bill be now read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon gentleman had better allow the Bill to stand.

Mr. IVES. It seems to me that the Bill had better be withdrawn or else read the second time. I have taken considerable pains to obtain the views of members on both sides of the House, and, although I do not find any great consent as to what should be done, I find that every one is disposed to make a change in the present law. I think almost every one considers that the present law rests on no sound principle. Many members are in favor of doing away with the deposit altogether, others are in favor of the present Bill, and others would make the deposit still higher. The only sound objection I have heard is, that the Bill places a new impediment in the way of candidates presenting themselves. I cannot look at the matter in that light. The present law requires a payment of \$50; the Bill merely requires a deposit of \$200 for thirty days. Unless a candidate is so straitened in his circumstances that it would be better to pay 300 per cent. interest than a deposit of \$200, the law, as I propose it, instead of being an obstacle will make it easier for persons to present themselves as candidates. Unless 300 per cent. interest in these Credit Foncier days is a legitimate rate of interest, the provisions of the Bill make it easier for the candidate than the present law. I have no objection to withdrawing the Bill if it is the wish of the Government, but it seems to me that the Government have had time enough to consider it. It was introduced early in the Session and the order has already stood half-a-dozen times; but, as I stated, if the Government want it withdrawn I will withdraw it. I am not particular, but I am quite satisfied that a majority of the House desire to have the law amended. I think, however, that if the Bill went into Committee we would have an opportunity of learning where the majority lies: whether the House is in favor of doing away with the deposit, whether it is in favor with my proposition, or whether it would increase the deposit. We shall

never learn the position of the House unless the Bill goes to a second reading and is referred to a Committee.

Mr. MILLS. I object to the principle of the Bill, as I did to that of a similar measure introduced some Sessions ago. I think its principle is one which will act as an impediment to persons who may be selected as candidates for election to the House of Commons. My impression is that the provision which requires \$50 to be deposited is an objection to the law as it stands. If we wish that candidates shall not be spurious—that they shall be genuine—it might be proper to require that a larger number of names should appear on the nomination paper: but I do not think that we should put any impediments in the way of the choice of the electors—but we shall be doing that if we adopt the proposition which the hon. gentleman submits to the House. I am opposed to the principle of the Bill, and if any proposition were made to do away with the deposit of \$50, which is now required, I would support it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend who introduced the Bill, says that he will withdraw it if the Government wish that it should be withdrawn. Well, it is not a question which the Government, as a Government, ought to deal with in such a manner as to have any influence with the House. Every hon. gentleman who has been elected to this House knows what elections are; most of them have had opponents, and they are, therefore, as competent to judge of the matter as the Government or any member of the Government. The reason only \$50 was inserted in the Bill originally as a deposit, was obvious. It was found that many places, especially in towns and in counties where there were several towns, an opposition was got up just for the purpose of forcing a contest, and having all the fun of an election; and it was said that in the towns that some tavern-keepers, the keepers of shebeens, got up an election contest just for the purpose of reaping the advantages in the shape of increased custom, cab fares, and so on. That was a reason why this particular sum is put in the Bill. The principle of my hon. friend's Bill is one which I believe obtains in the Province of Quebec, where instead of a candidate paying \$50 and losing it, he puts up \$200, and if the result shows either by his election, that he had a reasonable ground for offering himself, or by his obtaining half the number of the whole votes cast, that it was not a sham candidature, got up merely for the purpose of annoyance, and from a *bona fide* desire to become a member of Parliament, then his money is returned. Well, so far as I am concerned, I would rather deposit \$200, get it back after a reasonable time, than lose \$ 0 altogether. It is a question whether we should act upon the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and make the candidature free or have this check. If you have it free I think you will find a great many more vexatious elections than you have now.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman now proposes that there should be an election in every constituency.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course in every constituency where a Conservative runs there will be a majority for him, and therefore there is no chance of his losing money. There are three points to be considered in the question:—first, whether we shall do away with the deposit of a sum altogether; second, shall we lose our \$50; or, third, shall we adopt the principle of this Bill and compel the candidate to deposit \$200, and if he shows that there is good faith, then give his money back to him. I would like to have a general expression of opinion on those points.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a fourth point, that we should leave the law as to the amount of the deposit as it now

Mr. IVES.

stands and yet provide that the money should be returned on the condition stated by the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a matter of amount.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know. Fifty dollars was supposed to be a check, but I believe it will be found that the conditions required before were just as good a check against vexatious contests as the law as it stands to-day; whereas there would not be the sense of injustice that exists at present in a person who has a fair chance of election, and is afterwards elected, being himself compelled to contribute what is regarded as the general public expense of holding the election. I must repeat what I said on a former occasion, that I feel a great objection to interposing what may be very serious obstacles. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the \$50 ought not to be deposited with the expectation that it may be lost. I think the law ought to be amended, so that the \$50 might be recoverable on reasonable conditions; but to say that there should be \$200 deposited will be to interpose a very serious barrier in many cases; and I believe that law will be found to operate prejudicially to the freedom of election in the Province where it exists, as it would operate against the freedom of election in the Dominion, if the change proposed were made. If the whole question is left open, as the hon. member proposes, I for my part will vote for a second reading, in order that we may have an opportunity of deciding at a later stage what the law shall be; but if it is suggested that in voting for the second reading, we are committing ourselves to an increased deposit, I would object to so committing myself. I would vote for the second reading, in order that we might have an opportunity to say either that there should be no deposit at all, or, if it should be \$50, that the deposit should be recoverable on reasonable conditions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The law of the Province of Quebec, which the hon. gentleman desires to introduce into the Dominion, has not prevented candidates from coming forward, but the effect of that law is this: if there is a candidate who really believes that he has a chance of being elected, he does not object to depositing \$200, because he knows that, though he may come short of the required number of votes to elect him, he will receive more than one-third of the total vote, and will, therefore, get his \$200 back again; but the law in the Province of Quebec has very often prevented bogus candidates from coming forward, merely to annoy the real candidate of the people, because such a candidate knows that he will not receive anything like one-third of the total vote, and, therefore, will lose his \$200. We have found, therefore, that the law in the Province of Quebec has been better in that respect than the law of the Dominion. Of course, I am not in a position to say how far we should adopt that law here. I agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that it would probably be better to read the Bill the second time, when, I suppose, it will have to be referred to a Committee, and, after that Committee has considered it and reported to the House, we shall be in a position to decide for ourselves whether we should adopt the principle of the Bill, or leave the law as it stands, or make the change which the hon. member for West Durham suggests, that is to say: to leave the deposit at \$50, and adopt the principle of this Bill in other respects.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think this Bill should be referred to a Special Committee. It is not a question of detail, but a general principle, and I think it should be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. IVES. I am quite willing that the Bill should go to the Committee of the Whole House, and that the majority should regulate its provisions.

Mr. BUNSTER. I have no objection to the Bill going to a Committee; but I think it would be well that each of the candidates should put up \$200, and that the winning candidate should take all the money. I think the Committee should take that into consideration.

Mr. HOUE. I think the hon. member for West Durham has not been well informed as to the working of the Local Electoral Law in the Province of Quebec. It has worked very satisfactorily, both for the electors generally and for serious candidates. Hon. members from Ontario do not feel the same necessity for adopting such a provision, for this reason, that in that Province they have the American system of nominating candidates by delegations of the different parties; but it is not so in the other Provinces, especially in the Province of Quebec. I do not think it is either possible or desirable to introduce such a system there, because I contend that the American system of nominating a candidate by a convention does away, to great extent, with the free choice of the electors. It very often happens that nominations are due to the intrigues or to the influence of a small class of the electors; and the members of a party are thus often compelled to agree to some candidate to whom they would otherwise have great objection. Hon. members from Ontario speak of the free choice of the people; but I think the system followed in that Province is contrary to the free choice of the people more than the provision proposed by my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe. That provision cannot be an impediment to a serious candidate, because if a man cannot deposit, or if his friends for him cannot deposit \$200, for thirty days, he cannot be a serious candidate for this Parliament, but he must be either a beggar or an office seeker. For that reason I am in favor of the measure proposed by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe.

Bill read the second time.

PROMISSORY NOTES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Lanark), in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 73) relating to promissory notes and other negotiable instruments, said: I do not propose to enter into details of the causes for introducing this Bill. Those who are members of the legal profession know the frauds that are perpetrated by the sale of patent rights. The mode of operation is to obtain a patent for some farming implement then sell the patent to the farmer. It may be a patent for a reaper, or a roller, and the party represents to the farmer that it can be manufactured for a much less sum than he usually pays for the implement in the manufactories. A promissory note is given, but when the farmer takes the patent to the manufacturer he realizes for the first time that the cost of the machine is much larger than was represented, and is in fact so great that it is impossible for him to sell it. The result is that the note he has given for this patent right has been given without value. As the law now stands, the *bona fide* holder of that note is entitled to recover no matter by what means it was obtained in the first instance. As soon as the vendor of the patent right obtains the right, he goes to a shaver and discounts it, and the latter can force payment when it falls due. The Bill, which I have the honor to introduce, provides that a negotiable instrument given for a patent right must have an endorse on it "for a patent right," and when so endorsed the holder will have no more right to recover than the original holder, and where the patent right has no value a successful defence can be made. The next clause provides that where a man induces another to make a note for the sale of the patent right and does not endorse on it the words "for a patent right," he is

liable to be prosecuted criminally. The clauses are as follows:—

1. A promissory note or other negotiable instrument, the consideration for which consists, in whole or in part, of the right to make, use or vend a patent invention, or an invention claimed to be patented, shall have written or printed prominently and legibly across the face thereof, and above the signature thereto, the words "given for a patent right;" such instrument in the hands of any purchaser or holder shall be subject to the same defences as it would be in the hands of the original holder or owner; and any person who purchases or becomes the holder of a promissory note or other negotiable instrument, knowing it to have been given for the consideration aforesaid, shall hold the same subject to such defences, although the words "given for a patent right" are not written or printed on its face.

2. And any one who induces any person or persons to sign a promissory note or other negotiable instrument, the consideration for which consists, in whole or in part, of the right to make, use or vend a patent machine or an invention claimed to be invented or to be thereafter patented, without having printed or written on the face of such promissory note or other negotiable instrument, the words aforesaid, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to be imprisoned in any gaol or other place of confinement for any term less than two years, with or without hard labor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a very unusual Bill, and at first sight one cannot see why the consideration of a promissory note in the case of a sale of a patent right should be stamped upon a note more than any other transaction. However, I have been informed, since this Bill has been introduced, that there are serious frauds in the sales of these patent rights and there is special reason for this legislation. That reason being shown can justify the introduction of this clause. The second clause is to introduce a class of misdemeanor with a liability to imprisonment for two years. That, I think, is altogether out of the question. I have no objection that the Bill be read a second time and sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 50) to enable any person charged with an indictable offence to be admitted to give evidence on his own behalf.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

House adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 30th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that for the remainder of the Session Government business shall have precedence on every Wednesday.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman makes this motion prematurely. Heretofore he has been so careful of our healths on private members' day by early adjournments, that we have not done much towards clearing the Order Paper of private business. If this motion is adopted the practical result will be to take all days except Monday, and we know that there are very important private measures likely to come up, and if only one day is left many of these will not be reached for a long time. Then there are other measures to come up afterwards to be developed from the returns to be brought down, and there will be for them hardly

any chance at all. The practical result of the motion now will be to put the control of all business, which is not brought forward by the Government, except such as may not go on on Monday, in the hands of the Government. It is impossible to force any measure on the attention of the House, unless with the assent of the Government. It seems to me, therefore, it is too early for the hon. gentleman to propose this motion, from which I must dissent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I stated when I gave notice of this motion, the Government will take care that every opportunity will be given to every hon. member to bring up motions that stand in his name. But we have had such an exhaustive and long protracted debate on the Budget, that, if we wish to get through before midsummer, we must invite the House to allow the Government to get through with the measures on the Paper. We will give every opportunity for the submission, to the House, of motions and public and private Bills.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to give the hour for private business on Tuesday or Friday? That is not mentioned in the motion. On Friday there is an hour for private Bills after half-past seven, and Tuesday there is not. The motion should read for the hour for private business on Friday to prevail.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, I will assent to that.

Mr. MILLS. I think if the Government are going to take every day in the week but one, we ought to have earlier adjournments than we have had. We have been enabled, to some extent, to keep in fair health, by early adjournments on the day for private business, but we have been sitting here to an early hour in the morning on Government days. I do not think it will expedite business to have very late sittings, as it seems to me we ought to have some understanding that there will be earlier adjournments if the Government are going to take four days of the week.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I remember the robust health my hon. friend enjoyed for four or five long Sessions when he sat on this side of the House, and I am happy to observe that he looks as strong and as vigorous as he did then. This House is exactly in the position of a racer—we have been judiciously reserving our strength for the final push at the end of the Session, when we must have whip and spur.

Motion agreed to on a division.

DUTIES ON FUEL AND BREADSTUFFS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LAURIER moved in amendment:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that, in the opinion of this House, the public interests would be promoted by the repeal of the duties imposed on coal, coke and breadstuffs (*blé et farines*), free under the former Tariff, and by these articles being made free.

He said: I propose to call the attention of the House to the iniquity of the taxes which, under the present Tariff, are levied upon coal and breadstuffs. Whatever the idea had been in the past with respect to the intentions of the Government when they proposed their Tariff, there can be no doubt that to-day, after an experience of three years, the duties upon coal, and flour and meal, and upon imported food, constituted a very onerous tax upon a large section of the community without affording any benefit to any other section whatever. I need hardly remind the House that when the duties were imposed they were not imposed with the design and object of levying a tax upon bread and fuel.

Mr. BLAKE.

Whatever may be the opinions of the Government upon those matters at that time, the Government still adhered to the opinion that in matters of taxation duties should be levied first upon articles of luxury, and lastly and only lastly upon articles of necessity. It is true that since that time the Government have advanced in many ways, as we were told by the hon. the Minister of Railways in the Budget discussion. The hon. the Minister, on that occasion, went so far as to say he could not see any reason why coal should not be taxed as clothing is taxed. He argued, with some show of reason, that in a climate like this clothing is just as much an object of necessity as coal. But the hon. the Minister must remember that clothing is a very general expression; it embraces articles of very distinctive qualities, some of them being articles purely of luxury, and others articles of necessity; and as to the latter, if they are, as the hon. the Minister said, to be placed in the same category as coal, the conclusion to be drawn would not be the conclusion drawn by the hon. the Minister, that both should be taxed, but that both should be free. There are, no doubt, occasions when a nation is hard pressed that the taxation of those articles become a necessity, but even in such an event, bread and fuel should be taxed lightly. Three years ago the Government were not so far advanced as they are to-day. When they proposed their Tariff they did not hold out that coal should be taxed as clothing is taxed, with a view of raising the revenue from the bread and fuel of the people. They rather expected that not a dollar would ever come to the Treasury from that source. The policy they proposed was not that the taxes on those articles should contribute to the revenue, but that we would effectually close our doors against foreign importations, and afford the people an opportunity to supply themselves from such parts of the Dominion as produced those articles. Such was the policy proposed at that time, and such was the outcome. As far as breadstuffs were concerned, this idea was clearly expressed in the speech of the then leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister, delivered at Bury in the Eastern Townships, in which he said:

"In Canada, however, if by an unfavorable season, the crops are scanty, we are without such resources, and then the farmers of the United States pour in their produce upon us and we are defenceless. You (the farmers) who, in an ungenial season, might get some recompense for scanty crops in the enhanced price they would bring, find that hope gone from you. Even the little harvest the storms have left you, you find valueless when the products of the western States are poured into the markets of the Dominion. Shall we suffer in this way? Shall we not say, Canada is for the Canadians, and protect our markets for ourselves? Shall we not say, if we have a short crop our own people shall consume it, and pay us a fair price for it; and if we have a large crop let us not only have our own markets, but the distant markets of Europe. Let us say to the United States, we allow you to send the products of your country into our market, let us have the same privilege and send ours to your own."

Such was the policy then propounded, such as it was. It was, in my humble opinion, just as indefensible as if it had been proposed broadly and squarely to tax foreign wheat for the purpose of making the bread of the people contribute to the taxation of the country. However selfish it was in its conception, however cruel it was in some of its consequences, it was part of the protective system which was then put into operation. To argue against such a system, under the present circumstances, would be a useless waste of time, because hon. gentlemen opposite, like Rachel, who would not be comforted, would not be convinced, but still adhered to their convictions; but what I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to is this: that their policy, as it was originally designed, has altogether miscarried. It has not, at all events, realized the object they had in view. The policy of the Government was to give protection to the farmers. It has not given any protection whatever to the farmers. Their policy was that the duties on breadstuffs should not act as taxation on the people. It has acted as taxation

on the people to the extent of \$700,000 a year; and this, as I said a moment ago, has not given any protection to any class of the community. First, with respect to wheat, I have no hesitation in saying that the duty imposed on wheat and flour has not contributed one cent to the profits of the farmers of Ontario, though it has acted as a great injury to both Lower Canada and the Maritime Provinces. Why; is there a man in this House to-day or out of it who will venture to say that the duty imposed on wheat and flour has in the slightest degree benefitted the wheat growers of Ontario?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I hear some one dissenting from that statement. I seems to me, however, there is no reason to dissent from it; but if there is any dissent it is only an example of that human nature which allows disciples to exaggerate the doctrines of the master. What was the doctrine laid down by the First Minister in the speech to which I have referred, but that the duty should and could act only when there was a scanty crop. He never contemplated that the duty would act as a benefit to the farmers of Ontario, or any other section that grows wheat whenever we have a surplus, and since 1879 would have never had a scanty crop but always a surplus, and therefore, there has been no occasion for the contingency which the hon. the First Minister had in view when he spoke. I, therefore, say that to this day the duty on wheat and flour has not contributed whatever to benefit the farmers of Ontario. Experience is the best answer to any such statement. What is the condition of things at present? When we have a surplus on this side of the line, and when there is a surplus on the other side of the line, no one will deny that the market price of this country is regulated altogether by the Liverpool market; and, so long as we have a surplus of wheat, I venture to assert that this state of things will continue. It is true that the hon. the Finance Minister stated, last year, that the effect of the Tariff had been to increase the price of wheat to the grower at least 10 cents per barrel on flour. He made the statement within the recollection of the House, and he attributed that to the Tariff; but I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Finance ever gave any evidence except the mere statement. This year, however, the hon. Minister of Finance discussed the same question, and he repeated the statement in another form. He said that the Tariff operated to the benefit of the farmer—the grower of wheat—to the extent of 3 cents per bushel. He argued in this way—I do not quote his words, I quote from memory—that on a certain occasion wheat was 3 cents higher in Toronto than in Chicago, and this he attributed to the fact that the cost of transportation from Toronto to Chicago was just a shade less than 3 cents. He said that, if the Tariff did not exist, the millers and buyers of wheat would go to Chicago, and buy their wheat 3 cents cheaper than they could get it in Toronto. Now, I may say, *en passant*, that this is the best possible evidence of the soundness of our view that, as long as we have a surplus, prices must be regulated by the European market. The hon. gentleman was forced to admit that fact when he argued that there was a difference of 3 cents between the prices of wheat in Chicago and Toronto, and gave as a reason that the cost of transportation from Chicago to Liverpool was 3 cents higher than from Toronto to Liverpool, thereby making the obvious point that both parties must seek the European market, and that the European market regulates the prices. But what was the conclusion derived by him from this statement? He argued, and argued fairly at first sight, that if there was no Tariff the miller or buyer of wheat would go to Chicago and get his wheat 3 cents lower than he could get it at that particular time in Toronto, but he forgot that if the miller had gone to Chicago

he would have had to pay the cost of transporting his wheat to Toronto, and, according to my information—although I speak subject to correction—if he bought his wheat in Chicago 3 cents lower than in Toronto, and had to pay 10 cents for transportation, the wheat would have cost him 7 cents more than in Toronto. Even if the duty had not existed, the effect of the transportation is to give sufficient protection to the farmers, and the very fact that there is a freight of 10 cents per bushel to carry wheat from Chicago to Toronto, acts as a protection to the farmer, and makes the duty of 15 cents absolutely useless and of no avail whatever. I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, that any other evidence but this, which I have first quoted from the hon. the Minister of Finance, have ever been given in this House of the effect of the Tariff upon the prices of wheat to the grower in Ontario, and, if this is the only evidence, we need not go further to see that the Tariff does not operate, to any extent whatever, to the benefit of the grower in the Province of Ontario. But we come now to another side of the question. It will probably be said, and I am sure my fellow-countrymen from the Province of Quebec and hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, on the other side of the House, will say that if the duty is of no avail to the growers of wheat, in Ontario, it cannot act to the detriment of the buyers of wheat in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and that, therefore, in point of fact, at the very worst, the duty is inoffensive, and I have no hesitation in asserting broadly, that the duty on wheat has been a grievous taxation to the people of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. The effect of the Tariff on wheat reminds one of the old fable of the dog and the manger. It gives benefit to no one, but it is an injury to some. There were imported in this Dominion, last year, 195,802 bushels of flour and 76,625 bushels of wheat. This quantity of wheat reduced into flour is equal to 15,343 bushels, so that, last year, our total imports of flour into the country was 211,145 bushels, upon which a total duty of \$109,397 was paid. One thing is evident. If the price of wheat was the same on either side of the line, and perhaps even if it was a little higher in the United States, and if the price of flour was the same on both sides of the line, it is manifest that the whole of this duty was paid by the consumers of flour in the Dominion. Nothing can be said against that proposition. I quite understand that if it could be made to appear that the price of flour was lower in the United States than in Canada, it might be argued with some show of reason that part of the duty was paid by the Canadian consumer and part by the producer; but if the price were the same on both sides of the line, it is clear that the whole duty was paid exclusively by the Canadian consumer. Now it will be asked, what is the reason? If, as was said a moment ago, there is a surplus in this country, what is the reason that the people have imported such a large amount of flour—something over 200,000 barrels. If the buyers could have got it in this country, why did they find it to their advantage to go to the United States, and buy flour at the prices there, and bring it into this country, paying the cost of transportation and paying the duty? For this there are two principal reasons: The first reason is this—and I give it especially to my countrymen from the Province of Quebec—that the Province of Ontario does not produce a sufficient quantity to supply the market of the brand of flour which is consumed principally in the Province of Quebec. If you look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, you will find that the quantity of flour imported into the Province of Quebec from the United States was 106,391 barrels, for which was paid \$459,820, or an average price of \$4.33 per barrel. This shows that the flour is not one of the higher grades, but is one of the inferior brands, and on enquiry at Montreal and elsewhere, I find that this flour is

of the quality called "middling," it is made of spring wheat after the first quality has been taken. This flour is consumed exclusively by the poorer classes in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. It is evident, from the mere fact that it is an inferior brand consumed by the poorer classes, that it constitutes upon them a very onerous tax. The people of the Maritime Provinces do not so much consume imported flour; the flour they import is Indian meal. Nova Scotia alone last year imported 112,038 barrels of Indian meal, and New Brunswick 52,606 barrels, and the duty paid on that was \$65,857—this again shows that the farmers of Ontario receive no benefit from the duty, because they do not produce Indian meal any more than they produce the kind of flour consumed by the poorer classes in Quebec. Why, then, keep the duty on the Statute-book? Why continue to impose on the poorer classes in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces this obnoxious tax, when the very object you had in view, namely, to benefit the farmers of Ontario, is not attained? With regard to this matter, I would like to call attention to a resolution moved in 1879 by my hon. friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde). That hon. gentleman moved to this effect:

"That the said item be not concurred in, but that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of adopting the following resolution: Provided always that any time the Governor General in Council has reason to believe that the supply of wheat produced in Canada will not be equal to the demand for its consumption, then it shall be lawful for the Governor General, by Order in Council, to reduce or take off the duty on imported wheat, for such period as may be appointed and declared in such Order in Council."

This motion was not voted on, but was withdrawn, in consequence of a declaration made by the Prime Minister to this effect:

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said it would be exceedingly inconvenient, at this stage of the proceedings and at this stage of the Session, to go back into Committee of the Whole, and therefore he hoped the mover of the amendment would not press it. If he understood it, it was that the Governor-General in Council might deal with the subject. That was reasonable in itself, and would be given effect to."

I recall this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and this declaration of the Prime Minister, in order to invite the action of the mover of the resolution. He intended that if at any time the supply was not equal to the demand, then the Government should step in and remove the barrier which now stands between the producer in the United States and the consumer in Canada. If it is now shown—and the fact cannot be controverted—that in the case of the flour consumed by his countrymen in the Province of Quebec, and the flour consumed by the fishermen in the Maritime Provinces, the farmers in Ontario who produce them do not derive any benefit, because they do not grow these articles, why should the duty be kept on the foreign articles? It is of no benefit to anybody while it is a great injury to those poor people. It may be said that those people who buy the poorer brands can buy the higher brands at \$7 a barrel. So they can if they have the means, and I have no doubt they would be glad to do so; but the very duty which is imposed prevents them from buying the higher brands; they have to measure their expenses by their scanty means, and it is to their advantage to buy the poor quality of flour at \$4.32 a barrel, rather than to buy the higher quality at \$7. It is not on the wealthy classes that the Tariff is oppressive in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, because the higher grades are supplied in our own markets; but the Tariff weighs chiefly, I might almost say exclusively, on the poor people who have to buy the inferior grades. What is this if it is not a tax on poverty? And can there be, I ask, a more odious piece of legislation than this, which weighs, not upon the wealthier classes of the population, but upon the poorer? Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one reason why, though the prices are the same on both sides of the line, there is still such a large quantity imported from the United States—it is well known to the House and to the country—

Mr. LAURIER.

and that is, the natural facilities which the Maritime Provinces have for trading with the United States. Almost every man in the Maritime Provinces is more or less engaged in navigation; there are all the time small vessels trading between the Maritime Provinces and the United States, and they find it an advantage, when taking a cargo from their own country, to bring back flour and pay the duty, rather than to return empty. But this duty is a tax on their hard earnings—it is a tax on the poorer classes, and it is an impediment to trade. And what is the benefit? Why, the benefit is, in my estimation, nothing at all. But let me give the estimated value put upon it by the Minister of Finance himself. Speaking for the Government, he pretended that the farmers of Ontario were benefitted to the extent of the duty—50 cents a barrel on flour, and 15 cents a bushel on wheat. Why, the benefit conferred on the farmers of Ontario is an addition of 10 cents a barrel on the price of flour—all the year round? No, Mr. Speaker, not all the year round, but during two or three months in the year, and those are the months of July and August, when the new crops have not yet come in. And even if the price of flour is increased 10 cents a barrel during those two months, who reaps that increase? Is it the farmer? It is not, because the farmer has already sold his wheat; but the benefit, if any there is, is simply for the speculators who have been so fortunate as to store their wheat in the elevators. These are the parties who derive the benefit of this 10 cents a barrel, if indeed it is a benefit to anybody. The fact is, that this policy of a duty on wheat was an appeal made in 1878 to what selfishness there might be in the hearts of the farmers of Ontario. The farmers of Ontario have always been the bulwark of the Liberal party ever since the great struggle for liberty and constitutional Government. In 1878, the farmers of Ontario, a wealthy class though they be, were, like all the other classes in the nation, suffering from the depression which then existed. The time was thought to be opportune for the Conservative party to make a desperate bid for their support; they made that desperate bid, and the temptation held out to the farmers was that duty on wheat; they represented to them that if they had power, they would put a duty on wheat to prevent foreign competition, and that the farmers would reap a golden harvest. I think the farmers have now seen that this policy has, in that respect, been totally barren of results. But even if it had been productive of results, I would not hesitate for a moment to appeal to the justice and the patriotism of the farmers of Ontario, because they would see that such a gain as that had been reaped at the expense of the hard labor of their brothers in the east. An appeal to their justice and patriotism in this instance is not necessary, because they must see themselves that this policy, which is injurious to others, has not given them the slightest benefit whatever. What I have said of wheat applies with greater force to coal. In fact, there is not one single article in the Tariff which requires, in the throats of hon. members opposite, such powers of dilation as is necessary to enable them to swallow that duty on coal. There is not one single article which has caused hon. members such frantic efforts to facilitate to their followers that painful operation of swallowing—not one article upon which so many conflicting statements have been made to establish that what is a glaring evil is a great benefit. Why, even in this House we have not heard from the opposite side two statements agreeing completely with each other on the operation of this coal duty. In the first place, we have the statement of the hon. the Minister of Finance, in his Budget Speech, that the duty is paid partly by the American producer and partly by the Canadian consumer. Then, four days later, the hon. the Minister of Railways declared that the whole duty is paid by the American producer. Which statement are we to believe? Can

it be that one hon. Minister is wrong and the other right, and if so, which is right and which is wrong? Is it possible that the hon. Minister of Finance does not know to a farthing whence springs the revenue that swells the Treasury of which he is the custodian, and that he is ignorant, to the full extent, of the advantages of the National Policy of which he is the author. If it be true, as the hon. Minister of Railways said, that the duty is paid wholly by the American producer, that fact is a feather in the National Policy of which it should not be shorn. One thing is however certain, and that is that the hon. Minister of Railways is far more advanced in his views than the hon. Minister of Finance was himself last spring. Since then he has made a gigantic stride. In the Pictou election, last spring, we all remember the hon. the Minister of Railways said, not that the coal duty was paid wholly by the American producer, but that the \$400,000 paid as coal duty, was a tax on the people of Ontario. Which of these statements are we to believe—that of the hon. the Minister of Finance in this House, that of the hon. the Minister of Railways in this House, or that of the hon. the Minister of Railways in Pictou? For my part, I do not hesitate to say, that the true one is that made at Pictou, and that the duty is paid wholly by the Canadian consumer, by the people of Ontario and the people of Quebec, and, further, that the Nova Scotian miners derive no benefit whatever from it. This is the statement I make and which I believe I can prove.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought the hon. gentleman said my statement in Pictou was correct. I do not find that in it.

Mr. LAURIER. I agree to his statement as far as I have said. The hon. gentleman said in Pictou that the duty was paid by Ontario. So far I agree with him, but I add that the Nova Scotian miners do not derive any benefit from it. With regard to the duty, it must be considered in its effects, first, upon Ontario, then upon Quebec, and then upon the Maritime Provinces. With regard to the two former, the duty is a great injury to the consumers, and no benefit to the Nova Scotian producers; and with regard to the Maritime Provinces, it is neither a benefit to the consumer nor producer. The hon. Minister of Railways, as far as I could follow him, devoted the whole of his argument in this House to the effect of the duty in the Province of Ontario, and his argument can be reduced to this proposition—that the duty, instead of being an injury to the Ontario consumer, was a benefit to him, because the American producer, in order to destroy the Nova Scotian competition, was forced to reduce his prices, so that he sold actually cheaper in Ontario than he did in his own market. In order that there may be no misapprehension of the hon. gentleman's meaning, I will quote from what he said:

"So that here you have the fact clearly established that the very moment the duty was imposed the parties who shipped their coals to Toronto and Quebec, put these places into a different category from what they were before they made them competitive points and reduced the cost of coal to a larger extent than the amount of duty paid. It is impossible for any impartial mind to arrive at any other conclusion than that the imposition of a duty of 50 cents a ton has not only not increased the cost to the consumer, but it has lowered the cost to the consumer in Ontario."

Further on, he stated:

"This table shows, first, that prior to the 15th of March, 1879, the Philadelphia dealer purchased his coal at a cheaper rate than the Ontario coal dealer; second, that, after the imposition of the duty, the average price of the Ontario coal dealers was less than that of Philadelphia in 1880, by \$1.61, and in the fiscal year of 1881, by 50 cents.

Such was his statement and I repeat my *resumé* of it, namely, that in his view the American producer, in order to control our market, actually reduced his prices, and sold in Ontario cheaper than he did in the United States. When I heard this statement I could scarcely credit my ears, and read it

over in the *Hansard* to make sure I was not mistaken. Thus we have the statement from the hon. the Minister of Railways that through the National Policy the iniquitous process of which we have heard so much in past years, is still going on, and those wily, astute Americans are using our National Policy to make this country of ours a slaughter market. I do not know by what name hon. gentlemen opposite will qualify this process now, but we all know that during the last Session of Parliament it was denounced as a great injury to our people. Who can forget the lamentations of hon. gentlemen opposite on the fate of the poor country which was so reduced by the former Tariff that Americans could come here and sell their goods? Who does not remember the loud promises they then made that if ever they had the power they would put up such a barrier that the infamous process would not go on any longer. Well, the power has been given them, but lo! now they wheel around and say: "Look at the wonderful effect of our National Policy, which has forced the Americans to come into our country and slaughter their goods amongst us. It has made the Americans come here and sell us their produce cheaper than they sell it to their own people." Who has forgotten the last Session of the last Parliament, that when such an assertion was made—that the Americans were coming here and selling their goods in that way—the answer invariably was that they came and sold their goods under prices, and that we ought to be thankful to them for that course? But I remember very distinctly the torrents of abuse and invective which were hurled at us, because we believed in such a patriotic doctrine. I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their views upon this subject. It is an advance also, and an advance in the right direction, and one upon which we on this side can heartily congratulate them, because we still adhere to our doctrine, that the Americans come here and slaughter their goods, sell at under-prices, and if this is due to the National Policy, every one on the Opposition side will say bravo to the National Policy. But, unfortunately, the National Policy does not deserve so much credit. It is not a fact that the Americans are coming here and selling goods below prices, owing to the National Policy. The Minister of Railways, stated and quoted figures to show that coal had been sold cheaper in Ontario than in some of the United States markets themselves. I have followed the hon. gentleman's figures closely, and the more I do so the more I am convinced there must be errors in them, and that the same qualities of coal could not have been compared. If those statements and figures, the basis of his theory, are wrong, the effects he attributes to it have not existed. The idea of the Minister of Railways was that the Tariff had made the Ontario market a competitive market between the American and the Nova Scotian producer. I challenge the fact. It cannot be so, for this the best of reasons—that trade has not been as yet established in coal between Ontario and Nova Scotia. What is the extent of the coal trade so far as we know it, from the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite? Do we ever hear from them that a trade has been established between Ontario and Nova Scotia in coal? The only thing we heard was that a cargo of coal had reached Kingston, and another Guelph, but one swallow does not make a summer, and one cargo does not establish a trade. Whoever consigned that cargo to Guelph will not repeat the operation, because it could only be repeated at a loss. The reason why Ontario is not a competitive market between the American and Nova Scotian producers is this—the distance will not allow it as regards Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Niagara, the other day, stated incidentally that whoever made the assertion that coal could not be brought from Nova Scotia to Toronto or Ontario, for \$2.40 a ton, disparaged this country.

Mr. PLUMB. No; I stated that it was the contention of Mr. Jones and Mr. Carmichael, who were members of this House, from Nova Scotia at the time, constantly reiterated the statement that coal could not be brought into Ontario except by the imposition of a duty of \$2.50 a ton.

Mr. LAURIER. I think Messrs. Carmichael & Jones are perfectly right.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. The difference is only in words after all. I accept the hon. member's correction, and I agree with Messrs. Carmichael and Jones that Ontario cannot be made a competitive market between the American producer and the Nova Scotia producer, unless a duty of at least \$2 a ton is imposed on the American coal.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will have the patience to hear the argument, though he will not be convinced by it; it is this: Between the coal fields of Pennsylvania and Toronto the distance is only about 240 miles, whereas the distance between the Nova Scotia fields and Toronto is more than 1,100 miles. What is the freight then upon a ton of coal from the coal fields of Pennsylvania to Toronto, the 240 miles? So far as I have been able to find out, I believe it is \$2.40, or 1 cent a mile; I have this information from a business man in Montreal. It is a very high rate, but I take it, though I might have chosen a lower rate, to make it agree with the rate given by the hon. the Minister of Railways. He said that the freight from Buffalo to Toronto was \$1 a ton, the distance between Buffalo and Toronto, by the Suspension Bridge, being less than 100 miles; and this, at 1 cent a mile for coal from Pittsburg, the centre of Pennsylvania, to Buffalo, or little less than 150 miles, gives 240 miles from Pittsburg to Toronto. If, then, it costs \$1 for the 100 miles from Buffalo to Toronto, it follows that we may fairly argue that the freight from Pittsburg to Toronto would be \$2.40 a ton. Against this, what is the freight rate from the coal fields of Nova Scotia to Toronto. The rates of freight by the Intercolonial have been laid before the House in a voluminous return, with a table of the compound rates for coal upon the Intercolonial and Grand Trunk Railway. It is fair to assume that this rate of freight, which was made in 1879, when the hon. Minister of Railways was in the Department of which he is now in charge, was as low as it could be made in accordance with commercial rules. Now, the freight from New Glasgow, which is in the centre of the coal-fields of Nova Scotia, to Toronto, is \$39.68 per car of 22,400 lbs., or eleven and one fifth tons of 2,000 lbs. This sum of \$39.68 is distributed as follows: \$19.80 to the Intercolonial Railway and \$19.88 to the Grand Trunk Railway; that makes the rate per ton \$3.54. Now, I assume this is the cheapest rate at which coal can be carried from Nova Scotia to Toronto, \$3.54 against \$2.40, which is the rate on Pennsylvania coal from Pittsburg to Toronto. Now, that is not all, I assume, and I believe the assumption is a fair one, that this Tariff, which was made whilst the present hon. the Minister of Railways was in charge of the Intercolonial Railway, was as low as both the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway could carry coal. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister represented to the Grand Trunk Railway the great advantages which would accrue to it in the transport of coal from Nova Scotia to Ontario. I have no doubt the Grand Trunk Railway Company took these matters into consideration, and reduced their rates as low as commercial rules would admit. Now, what is the rate on the Grand Trunk Railway? The distance from Chaudiere Junction, which is the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway, to Toronto, is 498 miles, and the rate for this part is \$19.88 per car of 22,400 lbs., or \$1.76 per ton, so that the rate per mile is just a little more than

Mr. LAURIER,

one-third of a cent, or to put it exactly, .35. That is the lowest rate at which the Grand Trunk Railway can transport coal. Now, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the rate on the Intercolonial Railway by this table is just 34 per cent. less than the Grand Trunk Railway rates per mile. I have shown that the rate on the Grand Trunk Railway per mile is .35, the rate on the Intercolonial Railway, is a little more than one-fourth per cent.—exactly .26; so that a ton of coal which leaves the United States to go to Toronto, on the Intercolonial Railway pays .26 per mile and on the Grand Trunk .35 per mile, so that on the Grand Trunk it pays 34 per cent. more than on the Intercolonial Railway. It is fair to assume that at these rates that the Intercolonial Railway is the loser. If we add these Intercolonial Railway rates, so as to make the Government the loser instead of the gainer by the operation, what is the result? The result is this: take a ton of coal in Pittsburg, Penn., and bring it to Toronto, and take a ton of coal in New Glasgow and bring it to Toronto. The price of bituminous coal in Pittsburg is but \$1.22, the freight from Pittsburg to Toronto is \$2.40, which would make the coal cost \$3.62, now add the duty, 60 cents, and this makes \$4.22. Reverse the operation and take a ton of coal from New Glasgow to Toronto. The price of coal at New Glasgow is much higher than at Pittsburg. At Pittsburg it is \$1.22, I am informed that in Nova Scotia it is \$1.72, but for the purpose of argument I assume it to be equal to the price of coal at Pittsburg. What would be the result? The price of coal at New Glasgow being \$1.22, the freight to Toronto at the reduced rates, being \$3.54, the price per ton would amount to \$4.76. Now, to that we have to add profits to the dealers and other accessories as against the \$3.62 for American coal in Toronto, or, with the duty added, \$4.22. Now, the difference is this: Pennsylvania coal will cost less in Toronto by \$1.14 per ton than Nova Scotia coal, and if you add the duty it will still cost 54 cents less. This, as I have said, is upon the reduced rates on the Intercolonial Railway; but suppose the Intercolonial Railway adopted the same rates as the Grand Trunk, the result would be that the transport from New Glasgow to Chaudiere, instead of being \$1.76 per ton, would be \$2.31 per ton, so that the coal in Toronto would cost \$4.70 per ton. If the same rate had been charged on the Intercolonial Railway as on the Grand Trunk, the result would be that the coal, instead of costing, with the freight, \$3.54, would have cost \$4.07. So, Mr. Speaker, the result would be that, in order to bring coal to Ontario, in order to make coal an article of competition between Pennsylvania and Nova Scotia, the duty ought to be increased from 60 cents to \$1.14, at the very least, even upon the decreased rates of freight, such as they exist. But, in these comparisons, I have left aside, altogether, the cost of coal. It is dearer in Nova Scotia than in Pennsylvania; but for purpose of argument, I have assumed the price to be the same in both countries, though there is a difference of at least 50 cents. But even more. Suppose that instead of decreasing their rates on the Intercolonial Railway the Government had adopted the same rates as the Grand Trunk Railway, that is to say, 35 cents per mile, still the cost in Toronto would be \$4.09, so that even upon these rates, in order to bring down coal from New Glasgow to Toronto it would require a duty of at least \$2 per ton. Now, Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Jones were quite right when they said it was impossible, with the present duty, to bring coal to Ontario, and that in order to do so a duty of \$2 per ton would have to be imposed upon American coal. That opinion is not ours alone. We have heard in this House the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Doull) speaking of the duty of 50 cents, which was then imposed, say:

"With regard to coal, he might say that he feared the protection proposed in the Tariff was not sufficient. It was only 50 cents a ton, and

he believed it should be 75 cents on bituminous coal, to enable Nova Scotia coal to reach Ontario. Besides that, a duty of 75 cents would be more likely to result in the Americans proposing to take off their duty of 75 cents a ton on Nova Scotia coal entering the New England market, which, if the proposition was carried out, would give Nova Scotia its natural market. Then, if Nova Scotia got its natural market, it did not want the market of Ontario, and Ontario could get its coal without the payment of any duty. A duty of 50 cents was not going to benefit Ontario and Quebec. It was going to be a tax to the people of those Provinces, and as with that duty Nova Scotia could not get the market, it was not going to do Nova Scotia any good."

Such was the opinion of the hon. member for Pictou in 1879. The year following, the duty was increased from 50 cents to 60 cents a ton, but, with the expectation, of course, that this additional duty would enable Nova Scotia coal to reach Ontario. But we have, as a result that not a ton, except two cargoes, has reached Ontario. The reason is this, as Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Jones said: a difference at least of \$2 per ton would be necessary to secure that object; and I repeat, with these statements before me, that, unless you are prepared to place a duty of \$2 per ton upon American coal, Ontario will never be made a competitive point between Nova Scotia and Pennsylvania. If Ontario has not been made a competitive market between Nova Scotia and Pennsylvania, it follows that all the arguments of the hon. the Minister of Railways must be incorrect, because the very basis on which they were made falls to the ground. But there is something more. Against the hon. the Minister of Railways in the House of Commons, perhaps I will be permitted to quote Sir Charles Tupper in the city of San Francisco. This is what he said:

"Nature has provided that the Atlantic States should receive coal from Nova Scotia, and she has also placed the great coal beds of Pennsylvania in such a position that coal could be better supplied to the Province of Ontario than it is possible to get within these borders. So it was on the Pacific Coast. San Francisco was indebted to Nanaimo, British Columbia, for some of the rights she enjoys. Nature intended that so far as coal was concerned there should be a free interchange between the two countries. He believed the day was not far distant when both countries would adopt a common sense policy in relation to these natural products."

I see the hon. gentleman assents to this position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do.

Mr. LAURIER. Well then, if the hon. Minister assents to this position and his followers also assent to it, why do they legislate against nature? They will tell me that the Americans also legislate against nature. Can this reason ever be given in a civilized country, that because one nation legislates against nature we should also legislate against nature? The hon. gentleman reminded me of what is said of the Chinese mode of duelling. In Paris where duels are frequent, a man who is offended calls his adversary out, and they settle the matter between themselves, but in China, if a man is offended he commences by opening his bowels and when this is done the bloody sword is sent to his adversary who also opens his bowels, so that instead of one man going to the grave against the laws of nature two men do so. On this continent instead of having one nation legislating against the laws of nature you have two pursuing that course: If anything can show the fallacy of the argument on this question it is such a statement as this. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the laws of nature have provided that coal shall be supplied to the Atlantic States from Nova Scotia. The Americans have taken upon themselves to legislate against the laws of nature, and their people on the Atlantic coast have to bear the consequence and the additional expense. I agree also that nature has provided that coal shall be supplied to Ontario from the Central States of the Union, but because the Americans have inflicted an injury upon their people we must also inflict an injury upon our people and tax them \$400,000 a year, so that I think upon this point it can be safely concluded that a duty on coal is not a benefit to the people of Nova Scotia, because the coal owners cannot send their coal to Ontario, but it is a great injury to the people of Ontario who, under the Tariff, have to pay at least

\$400,000 taxation. Now, what is the effect of the Tariff on the Maritime Provinces? Every one will agree with me that the effect is *nil*. It cannot affect them, because, as the hon. Minister of Railways has said, the laws of nature have provided they should supply coal to the Atlantic States of the Union and Pennsylvania is too far distant from them. Coal cannot be sent from Pennsylvania to Nova Scotia or the Maritime Provinces, and therefore the duty there is inoperative. What is the effect in Quebec? It is highly injurious. We pay a very large duty upon coal, and there is a petition now on the Table of the House from the boat-owners of Quebec praying that the duty may be repealed. Is it an advantage to the people of Nova Scotia? It is not. Perhaps it might be, and would be, but for one circumstance, and this is the close proximity which nature has afforded Quebec to the coal-fields of Great Britain. So much of the coal used in Quebec comes in ballast from Great Britain, that it has been impossible, under the Tariff, to secure for Nova Scotia the market of Quebec. It is true, it will be said—it has sometimes been said in this House—that the duty will secure the Quebec market for the coal producers of Nova Scotia. It is said that the coal production of Nova Scotia is largely increased, and I admit that it has; but we say, and everybody knows, that this coal from Nova Scotia did not replace any coal from Great Britain or elsewhere, but was only an addition to the consumption of the people. The sales of Nova Scotia coal to Quebec advanced from \$3,000 tons in 1878 to over 2,000,000 tons in 1881. This is attributed, of course, to the Tariff.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal). Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I have just heard a "hear, hear," but if any one will pretend that this increase of the sale of Nova Scotia coal to Quebec is due to the Tariff, why does he not pretend that the increase of the sales of that coal to the United States is also due to the Tariff. The sales have increased in the same proportion. In 1879, the sales of Nova Scotia coal to the United States were 51,000 tons; in 1881, 113,000 tons. If it is contended that the duty has given the market of Quebec to Nova Scotia coal, why not contend that the duty has secured the market of the United States for Nova Scotia coal? There is just as much reason for the one as the other. No; in Quebec, as everywhere else, the duty has not been of any benefit to the miners of Nova Scotia, though it has been to us, as to every one else, a very injurious duty. Taken all in all, what is the result of the policy which the Government have placed on the Statute-book? What is the result of the duty on wheat, on flour, on meal, on coal? Has it benefitted the producer? I say it has not. Has it injured the consumer? It has largely injured the consumer. It has forced him to pay on the prime necessities of life a taxation to the amount of over \$700,000. On this point I cannot do better, in order to show the injurious and mischievous effects of this policy, than quote the opinion of a gentleman high in the opinion of the Conservative party just now, and a prominent member of their Government. In 1870, a similar motion to this was propounded in the House, and speaking in the other Chamber, Senator Macpherson used these words—he was speaking of the duties on breadstuffs and coal:

"He believed it to be exceedingly unsound to impose duty on coal and breadstuffs, or any natural products that were now free. He acknowledged that there was a difficulty in forming a Tariff that would be acceptable to all the people of the Dominion; but certainly it would have been an easy task to mature one that would be more just to all sections of the country than the measure now before the House. If it had been the object to devise a Tariff that would set one Province against another—that would create and perpetuate sectional jealousies and antipathies, the Government had certainly succeeded. Breadstuffs were to be taxed to please the people of Ontario, but he believed it was a great injustice to the agriculturists of Ontario to suppose that they were prepared to accept such a Tariff, or that it would be protection to them. The market where their surplus produce was disposed of fixed the price of the whole, and duty could not be of any positive advantage

so far as the price of their breadstuffs was concerned. Then duty would be a great obstruction to trade all throughout the country, which should, in accordance with the true principles of commerce, be left as unrestricted as possible. Not only would the Tariff be worthless to the people of Ontario, but it would be most burthensome to other sections—to fishermen and great masses of people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, as well as of Quebec, for it is a well-known fact that large quantities of breadstuffs are yearly taken into the latter Province from the United States. Then, as part of this great 'National Policy,' a duty was imposed on foreign coal as a means of propitiating the people of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec were taxed to satisfy Ontario; Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick were to be burthened to please a minority in Nova Scotia. Nothing could be more calculated to create dissension and to disturb the harmonious working of Confederation than such legislation."

Nothing can be more pregnant than these words. They are so true, so natural, and express so well the mind of everybody on this side, that I leave them to the hon. members of the House for their consideration in connection with this question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. mover of this resolution must no doubt have hesitated a good deal when he was asked to present it to the House. The hon. gentleman must have remembered that his ideas, his views, his principles on matters of Protection had changed a great deal. The hon. gentleman must have remembered that at a time when he had not the responsibility of office and was no doubt speaking his own mind, he thought that those who were in office—the present Government, with a very few changes—were not doing their duty towards the country, because, he said, they did not protect the industries and manufactories—they did not, in short, protect the people. The hon. gentleman at that period was a great protectionist, and went as far as any one of us go now. In fact, he went further than most of us would care to go. And why did he change? The hon. gentleman may say to-day that his views were not in that direction but the records are there—the records of his speeches, of the speeches of his friends and allies, and the writings of those who contributed to the press of his party. All these evidences are extant, and they show that the hon. gentleman thought that this country required protection, and protection to a very great extent. I will read a few extracts, not to refresh his memory, because I have no doubt that before the speech he has just delivered he read what he had said in previous times and what the press of his party had said on the same subject. In 1874, this was the opinion of the hon. gentleman:

"L'enquête qui se poursuit en ce moment annonce une idée générale et complète de nos manufacturiers, des causes qui arrêtent leur développement et des remèdes qu'il s'agirait d'apporter à la situation. La plainte universelle provient de deux choses différentes: La différence énorme qui existe entre le tarif américain et celui du Canada, qui nous exclut pratiquement des Etats-Unis, tandis qu'il invite la concurrence américaine au milieu de nous. Ainsi la plupart des produits manufacturés sont frappés d'un droit de 35 par cent à leur entrée aux Etats-Unis, tandis que ce droit n'est que de 15 par cent à leur entrée en Canada. En outre pour maintenir les prix chez eux les américains nous envoient et vendent à sacrifice le surplus de leur productions, ce qui fait à nos industriels une position d'indépendance intolérable.

This is what the hon. gentleman said, though he now reproaches us for saying that the Americans were making a slaughter market of this country, previous to the present Tariff:

"2°. Les manufacturiers anglais, ayant la main-d'œuvre à plus bas prix que nous et un marché plus étendu et produisant d'un autre côté un article inférieur sous bien des rapports, peuvent faire à notre industrie une concurrence féroce. Une taxe un peu plus élevée donnerait aux canadiens le contrôle de leur marché, leur permettrait de fabriquer sur une plus grande échelle et de fournir l'article à plus bas prix que maintenant. Il y a bien quelques autres obstacles soumis. ceux-ci sont les principaux et ils pourront être guéris de la même manière en portant à 20 et 25 le droit de douanes prélevé sur les marchandises à leur entrée dans le pays."

I need not quote more than this to show that the hon. gentleman was, at that period, a great protectionist. He thought that we should protect ourselves against the United States, by putting on a duty nearly as heavy as theirs, in

Mr. LAURIER.

order to prevent their manufacturers from destroying ours by underselling our goods. The hon. gentleman says in his motion:

"That in the opinion of this House, the public interests would be promoted by the repeal of the duties on coal, coke and breadstuffs."

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman wishes us to believe that this duty on breadstuffs is entirely an independent thing from the policy of this country—that it is not a portion of a system, but that it is a great separate burden on the people, and that by removing it we would not touch the Tariff but would relieve the poor people of the country. He says that the people are oppressed by this duty, that the people of the Province of Quebec are suffering greatly from it, that the poor people cannot get good flour, but are obliged to buy flour of an inferior quality; but I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the people of Quebec, previous to the adoption of the Tariff which is now in force, were purchasing different flour from what they are purchasing to-day. They are purchasing the same flour they used to purchase, and there is no difference whatever. Besides, Mr. Speaker, where are the petitions to this House from the people of Quebec or the people of Ontario for the removal of this tax? Are they now so heavily taxed, are they suffering so much, are they so overburdened, that they cannot bear that affliction? If they were, we should hear from them; we should see that Table covered with their petitions; and the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they think they have a grievance, take precious good care to have a number of petitions printed, and to send them throughout the country to be signed and sent back to this House. Why do they not do it in this case? Because they know that the people would not sign their petitions; but that from one end of the country to the other they are satisfied with the Tariff, and are happy and contented. The hon. gentleman said that the duty paid on flour last year was \$109,397. Well, divide that by the population of the country, and you will find that the people are suffering to the extent of a little more than 2 cents a head; that is the great burden on the people from this duty, which the hon. gentleman wants removed. Well, Mr. Speaker, when the time for the elections comes round, let the hon. gentleman make the best he can of that fact on the hustings; let him show to the people that, during the whole year they have been paying a little more than 2 cents a head in the shape of duty on flour, and let him ask them whether they would prefer that or to go back to the old Tariff. They will tell him that they remember the five years that hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, when they were not only unable to purchase the bad flour, as he calls it, which they now purchase, but when they had not money enough to purchase any flour. They could not do it, because there was no labor in the country. There were no manufactories, and the laborers and mechanics of the country were poor; but now they would say, as they said on the 17th of September, 1878: "Let us pay one or two dollars more a barrel for flour, but give us labor, because, if we have labor, we shall have money to procure flour." The hon. gentleman spoke also of the duty on coal; he says that it is a great burden upon the people, that they are suffering very much by it, and that those who suffer most are the poor people of Ontario, on whom he takes so much pity; he says they cannot bear this burden of 50 cents or 3s. a ton on their coal, and they are no doubt on the verge of an insurrection or a revolution. The hon. gentleman will remember a period when there was no tax on coal, but did we hear the people grumble then? Yes; they did not complain of a tax on coal, but they complained that there were no industries among them; and if you asked them then if they would pay 50 cents more on their coal, they would say: "If you can give us labor and money and prosperity, we will pay it." The people are reasonable

people, and they know that revenue taxes are required for the country; they are required for public works, for the great railway work we are building to connect the two oceans and the eastern and western parts of our country; they know that the Government of the country cannot be conducted without money, and they are perfectly satisfied to pay the taxes they are now paying, because they know this money is not squandered, but remains in the country, and will go back to the people in the shape of public works and improvements which increase the value of their property, give labor to the people, and therefore set money circulating throughout the country. Without entering into all the labored calculations of the hon. gentleman about carrying coal from Pennsylvania to Toronto, and from Nova Scotia to Toronto, I know, and we know, that the tax on coal has had the effect of stimulating the working of the mines, until the production has doubled and trebled and quadrupled. The hon. gentleman says that the tax has produced no good to the miners of Nova Scotia. Well, instead of having 1,000 miners at work to-day, we have 3,000 or 4,000. This, at all events, is a benefit to those 3,000 or 4,000 additional miners who had no work, and now have work and money to spend in the country, and, therefore, contribute to its revenue. Besides this, these men, instead of emigrating to the United States, and carrying their labor and their wealth there, remain in the country, are good citizens, and give value to our soil. They take from the soil the wealth that was there and was unproductive, and the result is, these men are a great addition to our population. But the true reason for imposing this tax on coal and breadstuffs is, that it stimulates a great industry, the coal industry, and the manufacture of flour, giving to the farmers an advantage they had not before. I know that in small grain, for example, in the Province of Quebec the farmers feel it is a benefit to them. But the other and the strongest reason of the two is this: that if we give up this tax on coal and the tax on breadstuffs, which taxes are so light that the people do not complain of them, we shall have nothing to offer to the United States when we wish to have with them a reciprocal treaty. We are always ready to reciprocate whenever they are, and Parliament has given the Executive power to do so at any time. The hon. gentleman must remember that we waited for thirteen years to see whether they would come and do the right thing towards us. Our friends and cousins on the other side of the line thought it was better to use those thirteen years in trying to get as much money from us as they could and give as little as they could in return. The result was that, tired of waiting, we said: "If you tax our produce we will tax yours, and will continue to do that until you find that you should act towards us as good neighbors and give us reciprocity, as we are ready to give it to you whenever you are ready." Therefore, we wish to continue that tax—a small tax if you choose—but one which will be a handle in our hands when the United States are ready to reciprocate with us. Why, in what position were we the other day when we had to negotiate through England and our High Commissioner at London with France? What had we to offer France for the concessions we wished to obtain? We had the duties on wines, and France, after negotiations, said that was not sufficient to offer them; and were we in the same position with the United States we would never have a chance to obtain a reciprocity treaty with them. I shall not delay the House longer, because in the speeches we have had on the Tariff before the House went into Committee of the Whole, all the different stages of the question of Protection and Free Trade have been discussed, but I will say I hope that the hon. gentlemen who support the Government will remember that this is a portion of the policy that has been adopted by the Government with their consent; and we ought not to remove

a stone and run the risk of bringing down the edifice. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not care if that should happen because the sooner they destroy it the prouder they will be. But we who wish to continue the protection of our industries and the prosperity that the country enjoys under the *regime* of this Government wish to continue the Tariff as it is, though, of course, whenever it is shown that an industry is not protected and should be protected, we are always open to conviction and are prepared to give it the necessary protection, feeling assured that the representatives of the people will support the Government in such action. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, wish to destroy the prosperity we enjoy. They say that should they get back to power, they will destroy the protection we have given our industries. The hon. mover of this resolution says that the people were deceived by us in 1878, that they thought we would give them prosperity, but that they had their eyes opened and the next elections would show a different result from that of 1878. Well, the hon. gentleman could not have spoken with the conviction that I have no doubt he has on other subjects. He knew perfectly well that since 1878, the people have had repeatedly, in all the Provinces, an opportunity of saying whether they had been deceived or not, and the result has been that our numbers, instead of being reduced, have increased to such an extent that to-day the Government is supported by a majority varying from 85 to 90. I wonder whether the hon. gentleman will find great comfort in the fact that these bye elections have, as a rule, resulted in additional support to the Government. Under these circumstances I shall vote against this motion.

Mr. BOURBEAU (in French). Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the motion presented by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), I must claim the indulgence of this House if I speak in French, as I am not sufficiently familiar with the English language to speak it with facility. I am, perhaps, better acquainted than any member of this House with the hon. member for Quebec East, and I have, before to-day, had the opportunity of hearing him make speeches, sometimes in favor of that very Protection which we have adopted, and which his own party neglected to adopt, and sometimes against that very Protection. That hon. member, during the election which took place in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska in 1877, was careful to ask me, in presence of the electors, if I was prepared to vote for the placing of a duty on flour, and he never failed to ask me this question in every parish where we had occasion to address the electors. My answer used to be, that I would do my best to ensure the getting of cheap flour, and on the most advantageous terms. Well, I think that, from our experience of the Tariff, that from what we see throughout the country, no one, except those who are desirous of making political capital, could to-day come forward and tell the electors that there are not to-day greater advantages for getting cheap flour than there was at the time of the election of 1877. But, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the second election which took place in the county which I represent, I was accused of having voted in favor of a motion introduced, I think, by the hon. member for Cape Breton, and which had for its object the placing of a duty on coal. The motion was a partial one, and we failed in obtaining the assent of the majority of the House to it; but I, who had been recently elected, and who had come before my electors as a protectionist, who had presented to the electors of Drummond and Arthabaska a protectionist programme, thought it my duty not to deviate from it, as the electors had seen fit to elect me on its basis. I voted for the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton, and, when I was afforded the opportunity of explaining my vote, my electors declared themselves satisfied, notwithstanding the efforts of the hon. member for Quebec East to make the people protest against it. Although he pointed out to them that I was the only member of the Province of

Quebec who had voted for that motion, the electors did not listen to the fine speeches of the hon. gentleman, and they voted for me; they re-elected me, as they did not consider I had committed the fault imputed to me by the hon. member. The hon. member for Quebec East has a peculiar facility for exhibiting his cause in a good light. His oratorical talents are well known; one is acquainted with his facility of speaking whenever he has the opportunity of doing so; but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, it is oftentimes noticed that his finest speeches lack bottom, a most necessary adjunct. I remember that when he was rendered the honor of being elected in 1877, his friends treated him to an ovation, and went in triumph to Arthabaska, where a banquet was given to him, and speeches were made; yet, I think that, had the excursion to be gone over again, they would not do as much. On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, attempts were made to prognosticate, and the hon. member himself, in order to convince his electors that his cause was good, he who was saying that he had just planted the Liberal standard on the Quebec citadel, he who had just won that victory, was kind enough to allow himself to be presented a piece of blue colored stuff representing the Conservative standard; in presence of an enormous crowd from Quebec East and a few electors of Arthabaska he tore this piece of blue colored stuff in two pieces; whilst his friends rent these pieces still further asunder and trampled them under foot, while saying: "Thus will we crush the Conservative party at the next elections." Such Mr. Speaker, is the mode of prognostication of the hon. member for Quebec East. We know what happened at the elections of 1878; we know that the blue Conservative standards floated over all public buildings from one end of the Dominion to the other in honor of the party to which I belong. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken to us at some length of this duty on flour. I presume he has the intention of coming back into the county of Arthabaska, or into some other county, in order to impress upon the electors the belief that this duty is damaging to their interests. I think that it would prove useless for him to speak at any length on that question; the electors are intelligent, and there is no necessity of addressing them at any length on the subject of the National Policy in order to cause them to admire its principle, and to form an opinion of the position which it occupies to day. In 1877, when I was elected in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska over the head of the hon. member for Quebec East, there was not any duty on flour, but, as has been said by the hon. Minister of Public Works, poor people had not then the means of buying flour. I am mistaken, Mr. Speaker, they did buy flour, but not flour made from wheat; they more frequently bought flour made from Indian corn because it was cheaper, but we all know what kind of an existence a man has who is obliged to feed himself with flour ground from Indian corn. The hon. member has spoken of the poor kind of flour which poor people use now, owing to there being a tax of 50 cents per barrel on imported flour; but if we consult the Trade and Navigation Returns, what do we see? We see that we, in 1880, exported 5,090,500 bushels of wheat, representing a value of \$5,942,042. Last year, we exported 2,523,673 bushels of wheat, yielding the handsome return of \$2,593,820. Two years ago, we exported 544,591 barrels of flour, giving the sum of \$2,930,950. Last year, we exported 439,728 barrels of flour, returning the sum of \$2,173,101. Now, those exports are exclusively the products of Canada, and if we are able to export wheat grown in Canada, I would ask the hon. member for Quebec East how it is that we should have to pay so great a tax on the flour which we import? But that which he calls a heavy tax, is but a small one, for, as has been stated by the hon. Minister of Public Works, that tax does not amount to more than 2 cents per head, and I think that our exports of wheat grown in Canada amply compensate for the amount

Mr. BOURBEAU.

which we pay in the shape of that small tax. When the hon. member for Quebec East sat on the Ministerial benches, when he had the honor of representing the county in one of the most exalted positions in this House, he attempted to introduce some changes in his Department. It will be remembered that he tried to introduce a Bill intitled the Stamp Act; the difficulty which he encountered when introducing this Bill, will also be remembered; it will likewise be remembered that this Bill, after having undergone all the changes made in it by the House in Committee, was so much altered that the hon. gentleman himself could not recognize it, and this Stamp Act was not passed. What a difference between now and then! To-day the hon. Finance Minister has abolished the stamp duty on bills of exchange, to the great satisfaction of all engaged in the higher branches of trade, and of those in the habit of transacting business by means of such bills of exchange. Now, Mr. Speaker, can a comparison be instituted between the policy of the hon. member for Quebec East and that of the present Government? Can a difference be established? If so, there is a palpable one. To-day we see prosperity reigning everywhere, and at every opportunity we see the Government striving to introduce measures calculated to bring prosperity into the country, and which will favor all classes of society; and if we instituted a comparison with the time when hon. gentlemen of the Opposition were in power, we get at the conclusion that instead of acceding to the wishes of the people, instead of listening to the petitions presented from all parts of the country asking for a change in the administration of affairs, instead of giving a hearing to the requests of electors approaching the Government, they refused to do so; no attempt was ever made to satisfy the people, and what was the result? We found poverty in all ranks of society; commerce was in difficulties; the poor man, on behalf of whom the hon. member for Quebec East appeals to-day for sympathy, was obliged to leave his country to seek for employment in the factories of the United States, our own being all closed. What else did we see, Mr. Speaker? The farmer was compelled to dispose of his produce at the very lowest prices, which far from compensated him for his labors. I have here the compared prices of agricultural products of the Province of Quebec during the years 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881. In 1875, the wholesale price of pork was 4½ cents, and, in 1881, it sold for 8 and 9 cents per lb., or twice as much. In 1875, 1876 and 1877, oats sold at 30 to 32 cents per bushel, and, in 1879, 1880 and 1881, at from 35 to 45 cents. per bushel. In 1875, 1876 and 1877, peas sold at from 70 to 75 cents per bushel, and, in 1879, 1880, 1881, at from 75 to 85 and even 90 cents per bushel. In 1875, 1876 and 1877, butter sold at from 10 to 11 cents per lb., and in 1879, 1880 and 1881, at from 12½ to 18 and 20 cents per lb. Now, if we take animals, we find a difference of 50 per cent. in the price of horses; of 25 per cent. in that of horned cattle; of 20 per cent. in that of sheep and poultry, and of 20, 30 and 40 per cent. in that of nearly all agricultural products. Well, with such a difference duly established, when the hon. member for Quebec East shall come before the electors of our rural districts in order to try and make them believe that times are not as good now as they used to be, when he presided over the destinies of the country, I think he will find it a hard task to make himself understood. As I have said, the electors are intelligent, and they know enough to explain why we enjoy so great prosperity to-day, why we can procure money with such facility. They can explain why the poor man has work at wages which are 25 to 50 per cent. higher to-day than when the hon. member was a member of the Government of the country. The poor workingman who earns a remunerative salary, can buy to advantage the agricultural products which he stands in need of, which recompenses the farmer for the labor he has expended in bringing forth these pro-

ducts. The trade resulting therefrom is also in a prosperous condition, because the traders and the merchants have customers who can pay for the goods they require. The wholesale merchant, the importer, is likewise enabled to meet his engagements owing to the remittances which he gets from his debtors. An attempt has been made, Mr. Speaker, to lead us to believe that, as the great majority of the articles affected by the remodelling of the Tariff in 1879, the consumers of this country had suffered a great loss. Well, I am in business, and I certainly do not wish to be blamed for stating things which are not exact. What did we see on the shelves of our town and country merchants? Why, goods imported from the United States. To-day, goods manufactured in Canada have taken the place of those which were imported previous to the time when we enjoyed Protection; and it is impossible now to buy any other cotton than that manufactured at Hochelaga, Cornwall, Coaticooke, and in New Brunswick. It will soon be manufactured in Quebec, and at St. Henri des Tanneries. It is impossible to procure similar cotton from the States or from England; there is none to be had, Mr. Speaker, for the cotton manufactured in Canada is of a better quality and we can sell it at a cheaper figure than that which we might import. Figures have been quoted, and it has been said that the cotton factories have not prevented the importation of a large quantity of cotton from foreign countries. Well, I am in a position to state that if cotton has been imported from foreign countries, it is because our manufacturers have been unable to produce a quantity equal to the demand. I remember that last year it was impossible to get in the wholesale market all the cotton that was required; manufacturers were not able to meet the demand, and the same thing occurred, not only with regard to cotton, but also with regard to tweeds and hats, which are manufactured with great profit in the Province of Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick; and we can to-day obtain these articles at far lower prices than at the time those hon. gentlemen were in power. To-day, as I have stated, farmers sell their products at much higher rates than formerly, and, nevertheless, they can procure the implements which they require to cultivate the soil at much lower prices than they could when hon. gentlemen of the Opposition were in power; these articles which the farmer requires, are assessed with a duty of 25 to 35 per cent., which, however, does not prevent the farmer from buying them at a lower figure than when the duty on them was but 17½ per cent.; this difference is explained by the fact that our manufacturers entering into competition with each other, can produce more cheaply, and the articles which we buy from Canadian manufacturers are not assessed with a duty of 25 to 35 per cent., but their products are free of duty, as they are produced within the limits of the Dominion of Canada. To-day, Mr. Speaker, we see plenty reigning everywhere; money circulating freely throughout our cities as well as through the rural districts; and if the present Government has succeeded in inducing capitalists of foreign countries to invest their capital in our industries, it is due to the good policy of that Government; if also we see the rate of interest decrease, thus enabling borrowers to obtain money on advantageous terms, it is again due to the sound policy of our Government. I well recollect that, in 1875 and 1876, the rate of interest in our rural districts as well as that of the banks, was 9 and 10 per cent. I recollect that banks charged 20, 25, 30 and even 50 per cent; even cent per cent. has been exacted, whilst to-day, the banks are glad to lend at 7 per cent.; capitalists are content to accept 4 and 5 per cent., and the lenders in our country districts are offering their money at 6 and 7 per cent., as against the 25 and 30 per cent. they used to get in 1876 and 1877. These facts are well known to the public; electors know them from experience, for the greater part have had the opportunity of borrowing money at those exorbitant rates

of interest; it was at a time when the workingman was compelled to work without being able to procure for himself all the necessaries of life, and was obliged to nourish himself with a kind of flour infinitely inferior to that which he makes use of to-day; but to-day, he has money and can buy and pay for the best flour. Another attempt has been made to create a noise about the duty levied on coal. I think that we will encounter some difficulty in exciting people in our rural districts with regard to this tax, because coal has not increased in price; it is sold to-day as cheaply as it was during the years preceding the remodelling of the Tariff. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a difference, it is that coal is cheaper to-day than it was before the adoption of the present Tariff. The duty levied on coal has produced the same result as that levied on agricultural implements, viz, that it has brought about the offering to the public of a superior article at a lower price. As a proof of the poor reception which would meet any one going into our rural districts to speak against the National Policy, we see every day in the newspapers that some municipal corporation or the other offering a bonus of \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 and sometimes even \$25,000 to any company willing to erect a manufacture in its locality, and binding itself to exempt it from taxation for a space of twenty years. If the population were opposed to manufactures, it would be opposed to the system of Protection, and it would assuredly not offer bonuses to manufacturers desirous of establishing themselves in the localities where this bonus is offered. There is, Mr. Speaker, proof that even in certain localities, where either out of pride, me thinks, or out of party spirit, people rant against the National Policy, people see that that policy is a sound one and advantageous to the country. Nevertheless, all the time that they saw this, they continue to cry out against that policy, but they do not object to the erection of manufactures; they do not object to being taxed \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 and \$25,000 in order to attract manufacturers to those localities. Here we have unanswerable evidence that the National Policy meets with a general approval, and without wishing to name an hon. member of this House who talks against Protection and the readjustment of the Tariff such as adopted by our Government, I may say that one of those gentlemen said in my presence and in that of several members, and that not so very long ago, that he made every effort to induce the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was in power, to adopt that National Policy which was clamoured for by the majority of the electors of the Dominion and which was refused by the then hon. leader of the Government. The same hon. member nevertheless continues to support his party and to speak against the National Policy. This shows that hon. gentlemen opposite are inconsistent in their speeches, and that what they say is not always what they think, and what they repeat later, as has been seen to-day by the quotations made by the hon. Minister of Public Works from a speech made by the hon. member for Quebec East in 1874, and I think that the hon. Minister of Public Works might have gone as far back as 1871, when the hon. member for Quebec East, at that time member for Drummond and Arthabaska in the Local House, made a speech in favor of Protection.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BOURBEAU (in French). Mr. Speaker, I endeavor, before the close of the sitting, to prove, and I think that I established pretty clearly, that the National Policy had brought about abundance and satisfaction throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. I think that were we to accede to the desire of the hon. member for Quebec East, who has proposed a resolution to take off the duties now levied on flour and coal,

we should, at the same time, be obliged to take off the duty levied on many other articles since the re-adjustment of the Tariff in 1879. But I am of opinion that the electors of the Dominion would be little satisfied with such a change, for it would have the effect, as we said in 1875, of closing our sugar refineries, our cotton, hat and woollen factories, our agricultural implement works; and we would be compelled to purchase from foreign manufacturers, as we did before the adoption of the present Tariff. We would also see our artisans and mechanics, thus deprived of work, leave the country; the farmer would be compelled to sacrifice his products, because trade becoming duller, the demand for them would become smaller; and the consumption of them likewise becoming smaller the farmer would be compelled to sell his products at the same price that he was selling them formerly. Assuredly, Mr. Speaker, the electors of the Dominion do not wish to return to those unhappy times which they had to endure during the régime of our Liberal friends. I have even heard it said by Liberals themselves, at public meetings, but they were Liberals who wished for protection: "Rather tax us and give us the means of earning money than return to the times when we were less taxed, and when we had not sufficient money to buy the necessaries of life." Moreover, were we to adopt the proposition of the gentlemen of the Opposition, we should thereby impede the encouragement given to the colonization of the North-West. I think that we have a great deal to expect from this colonization of the North-West. I think it important to encourage it, and the way to encourage it is to keep in force the Protection which we are enjoying, and to compel settlers to come and buy from the manufacturers of the Eastern Provinces, so that we may in turn buy our grain from the farmers of the west. We must make an exchange with them; let us encourage the farmers of the west, and let them encourage our manufactures; good will result therefrom, and money will remain in the country. But what astonishes me most, Mr. Speaker, is to see hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, in order to reach their goal, in their efforts to gain popularity, depreciate our national enterprises; it is to see them depreciate the quality of our coal, the quality of our soil, and even the climate of our country. To sum up, there is not a thing that they do not say in order to make electors believe that the National Policy is not a beneficial one; but, in my opinion, were they to reflect a little, they would perceive that if they do harm to any one, it is to themselves. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said in his speech that we were exporting less manufactured articles from the country than we did formerly, since the re-adjustment of the Tariff. The matter was thoroughly explained; he was well answered on that point; but better to depreciate the country, he mentioned the fact that there was an increase in the exports of certain of our products, and he instanced among others the exports of rags. I think, Mr. Speaker, that he might have dispensed with the mention of this, but since he has seen fit to do so, I will take the liberty of answering him, and I will tell him that if to-day we export rags, it is because we have the means of buying stuff of a better quality. When hon. gentlemen of the Opposition governed the country, our artisans were compelled to buy old clothes and old hats; they could not buy new ones as often as they do to-day; but now that through the effects of Protection they have the means of buying new clothes, they can well afford to export their rags. In the county which I have the honor of representing, Mr. Speaker, we notice a large increase in the number of manufactures. Although I belong to a rural country, manufactures are spring up in it, as if by enchantment; it is true, we do not possess manufactures on as grand a scale as those we see in great cities, but the public are surprised to see the aggrandizement of manufactures in our rural districts and to see the prosperity which reigns everywhere. I hold in my hand a

Mr. BOURBEAU.

statement prepared for me by one of my electors in the county of Drummond, which shows that in Kingsey, Grantham, Durham, Wickham, Wendover, St. Bonaventure, St. Guillaume and Drummondville, in all the parishes in fact, new mills are being erected; everywhere one sees springing up new manufactures, tanneries, foundries, creameries, woollen and saw mills, in a word, industries of all kinds that are bringing abundance into these localities, which are causing the farmer and the workingman to rejoice and which bring prosperity to those who invest in these manufactures. If, from the county of Drummond, we go to that of Arthabaska, we likewise see manufactures springing up there, as if by enchantment, and in the parish of Stanfold, formerly the stronghold of the hon. member for Quebec East, we witness the greatest activity; no less than ten furnaces are putting in motion machinery employed in manufactures of leather, wool, shingles, boots and shoes and many other industries, too numerous to give in detail. The factories of Messrs. Matté and Donovan employ a large number of workmen who prepare leather, not only for the home market, but also for the export trade. Previous to the adoption of the present Tariff, one could not export to England leather manufactured in this country; uppers, for instance, could not be exported; but since the adoption of the Tariff, there is manufactured to great advantage a kind of leather, which allows manufactures, when the local market is glutted, to clear it, by sending it into foreign countries. In that county we consume 2,500 cords of bark, which gives farmers the advantage of selling their bark at a higher price, when the price goes down in the United States. We see also the boot and shoe manufactory of Mr. Belanger as well as the mills of Messrs. Guay, Godbout, Lessard and other manufacturers. If, from Stanfold, we go to Arthabaska, we notice the saw mills of Messrs. Mercier and Crépault, the furniture factory of Mr. Baril, the leather factory of Messrs. Matté, Gravel and McFarley, the saw mills of Messrs. Frotier and Lambert and the Canadian tobacco and cigar factory of Messrs. Théroux and Berwiss. Some of these manufactures certainly existed previous to the adoption of the present Tariff, but all were not in operation one-half of the time, while at present they are all at work every day, and often at night, and they give employment to a great number of operatives. If, from Arthabaska, we go to Warwick, we find the leather factory of Mr. Richardson and the saw mill of Mr. Mercier. Kingsey boasts of a large paper mill, saw mill and shingle factories. I will not undertake, Mr. Speaker, to enumerate all these manufactures; I know that the time of the House is precious, and I do not wish to take undue advantage of the time that has been granted me to speak. I will say, in conclusion, that I have always worked in the common interest of farmers and of artisans, and I would not like to render them liable, through my vote, to an expenditure that would not turn out to be profitable; and it is for that reason that, my views being well known in the county which has done me the honor of electing me against the hon. member for Quebec East, I will vote against the resolution now before the House, because I think that the Tariff is the best we could have for the prosperity of all classes in the Dominion of Canada, and because I believe that the motion of the hon. member for Quebec East is made with the object of deceiving the electors.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened somewhat attentively to the remarkable speech just delivered by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska, and certainly, if we are to believe him, the National Policy has produced all those wonderful results, which he discovers through its prism. I must, however, be permitted to differ, and not to fully share his views. I do not doubt, and I am ready to admit, that the changes in the Tariff have been, and are the cause of a somewhat considerable advantage to certain classes of manufacturers; but I will not go as far as to say that this is entirely due to the changes wrought in the

Tariff. I do not wish to repeat here the arguments so repeatedly heard in this House, and I will only claim its indulgence for a very short time. The question before us amounts simply to this: whether the present Tariff is an equal, equitable and just one towards all the Provinces. I pretend to show that that Tariff is specially detrimental to the Province of Quebec. Any and every tax should weigh equally on all of Her Majesty's subjects in this country. One Province should not be taxed to the detriment of another, and if I look at the effects of that duty, what do I see? Instead of the trifling amount of 2 cents per head, as stated by the hon. Minister of Public Works, that duty amounts to a good deal higher as I am about to demonstrate; moreover, that duty, from the manner in which it is levied, is not equally distributed, because it falls more heavily on the poorer class, that which has to buy its flour. It is useless to say that that duty does not fall more heavily on the poor; I maintain that it does, for I know it from practical experience. Who is there who is not aware of what it costs the settler who goes to establish himself in the townships in order to clear land, to purchase a barrel of flour? Who is there who does not know the price he has to pay, and especially the additional tax of 50 cents, which he pays on a barrel of flour before it can come to his farm? I know personally a large number who complain bitterly of that tax. I have taken the trouble of consulting several influential and competent persons in my county, in order to find out what might be the amount of flour imported into that county, and from letters which I hold, I find that there are imported by the poorer class into the county of L'Islet, at least 5,000 to 6,000 barrels of flour, and this in three or four parishes only. But it will be said that this duty of 50 cents is not felt on these barrels of flour. It will be said that this tax of 50 cents does not amount to 50 but only to 10 cents. Pretend what you will, the tax of 50 cents represents the amount of the duty, and year in and year out, it always remains 50 cents, and in my county, I know full well that it has ever represented and still represents 50 cents. Now, if you calculate that these 50 cents are, in the first place, paid by the settler who goes to establish himself, do you think he is simply paying 50 cents? He is paying more, because to the account debited to him with those 50 cents is added interest; much more, if the trader who sells the flour to him on the appointed day, makes him pay double and treble interest on those 50 cents, so that there are barrels of flour which amount in cost to \$12 or even \$15, because they have not been paid at the expiration of six or nine months. Such is the advantage which the settler derives from that duty of 50 cents on flour, and if my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska, who is, I think, a trader, wishes to inform his customers of the amount of those duties, let him enter in their accounts the amount of duties with which he charges them, as it is done elsewhere, viz: in Prince Edward Island; thus will the settler know exactly the amount of duties which he is paying, and thus being cognizant of matters, he will know whom he has to thank for them.

Mr. BOURBEAU. Will the hon. member allow me a word in explanation? My customers would receive a very small account indeed, were I to inform them of the duties they pay on the goods I sell them, for nearly all those goods are manufactured in the country and do not pay any duty.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think that that argument will hold good with the people; it may with the House as it is now constituted, but the people will not accept it. Now, it has been pretended that this tax represented only 2 cents a head. I maintain that the Province of Quebec, has, since Confederation, been taxed in excess of the other Provinces, and if I am to believe the tables of Trade and Navigation for the present year, of which I hold an extract, it is clearly shown, that especially since the new Tariff has been in force, from 1878 to 1881, that the difference between the duties paid

by the Province of Quebec, as compared with those paid by the Province of Ontario and Nova Scotia, is excessively high. I will now state, in English, to the hon. Minister of Public Works, who spoke in English, what I have to say on the subject. I heard the Minister of Public Works say, in English, what I desire to contradict in English, and in spite of the interruptions of the hon. members opposite I intend to and will say it. That hon. gentleman said this: that the only difference to the people of Quebec, made by the coal, wheat and flour duties were a mere matter of about 2 cents per head. I would thank him for calling his flock to order and procuring silence. I was saying that the Minister of Public Works was totally ignorant—I presume innocently in error—in making this statement; but he did not lead me into his error, in saying that the duties on flour and coal only amounted to that much.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I put the question to the member for Quebec East—whether he had stated that the amount was \$109,397, and he said yes, when I replied: "Divide that by the population of the country, and it would be little more than two cents a head."

Mr. CASGRAIN. I understood you to say what I have credited you with. I did not want the statement to go to the country otherwise than I understood it. I will show you the difference between the taxation per head, borne by the different Provinces, from your own return, so that you can compare the contribution of Quebec with those of the other Provinces. I suppose if we in Quebec pay this additional duty it must be assumed that there is an enormous difference between the quotas of the different Provinces. What is the difference between the payments of Ontario and Quebec for 1878?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. the Finance Minister cannot laugh off his own returns. Ontario paid, in 1878, \$2.90 per head, and Quebec, \$3.79. I think that it is a little more than 2 cents per head. Nova Scotia paid \$3.14; that does not come up to \$3.79. Now take 1879: Ontario paid \$3.06; Quebec, \$3.97; Nova Scotia, \$3.05, or 1 cent less than Ontario. Now take the next year under this National Policy: in 1880, Ontario paid \$3.14; Quebec, \$5.03; Nova Scotia, \$3.14. What difference did that make? For 1881, Ontario paid \$3.33; Quebec, \$6.94, or \$3.62 more than Ontario, and \$3.54 more than Nova Scotia paid. We are willing, in Quebec, to pay *pro rata*, the same as any other Province; but what do we get in return? A tax on flour and a tax on coal. Well, what has been the immediate effect of that tax on coal? It was exactly the same as in 1869, when the rates for passengers between Montreal and Quebec were raised 50 cents per head. At present they pay this much more between those cities. We are willing to pay any duty provided it be equally divided among the population. What do we get in return for our surplus payments into the Treasury? Do we get a single immigrant that settles in Quebec? Do we not pay a contingent also for the immigration to this country? Does not this immigration for which we pay our share go to Manitoba and the North-West? What do we get for it? The people of my county asked last year and the year before a very small favor, a small station on the Intercolonial, on the Elgin Road, but were refused on the ground that it would cost too much. Our flour tax in the county for one year would build that and two or three more stations besides. I am sorry to say that our Province of Quebec is not treated with due consideration; considering our contributions to the revenue, our treatment should be better. It appears we have been told we must submit to it, and that to a certain extent we are an inferior race, that we are *taillables et corvéables à merci*. We do not desire to continue in this condition; and I think some of these days the Province will wake up and decide that if it pays the fiddler it will make

others dance. When the hon. Minister of Public Works arose, he began his speech by attacking the member for Quebec East. That hon. gentleman is very well able to protect himself; but it is no argument to say to him—at such a time you said this, or if you did not say it, the papers writing for you did, and then to go on to read an extract which pretended to favor Protection. That may establish more or less a writer's state of mind at the time, though I do not suppose he would be bound all his life by what he has written. But, if that style of argument is introduced, we can retort most easily. I hold in my hand a report of the very words of the late Sir George E. Cartier at the time he was a second member of the Administration to which the present hon. Minister of Public Works belonged; and I suppose he will not disavow the language of his colleague. In 1870, speaking of Protection, Sir George E. Cartier said:

“Protection meant the levying of taxes on the agriculturist and land owner for the benefit of a few. Its friends argued for a policy in this respect of discriminating duties which has never been attempted by a Colonial or the British Legislature since the inauguration of the present policy.”

In those days that was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have wholly changed it since. Circumstances alter cases it appears. But they cannot reproach others with having changed their ideas. To come back again to the question under consideration, I recollect the time, not far back, when an hon. member of this House from the Province of Quebec pronounced himself in favor of the principle of this motion. I hold in my hand a motion made on the 18th of April, 1879, by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée). I hope that hon. gentleman will be as consistent this year as he was then. He was speaking, not only for himself, but in the name of the electors of his county, and they bound him to vote down this tax on flour. He moved an amendment, and so zealous was he against this odious tax on flour that he did not give me time to put in a motion I had prepared in the same case. Here are the words of his motion:

“That it is not expedient, in the public interest, to impose a tax of 50 cents per barrel upon wheat flour imported into this country, and that this article should be placed upon the list of commodities imported into Canada free of duty.”

We will see presently how far that hon. gentleman is consistent. In explaining his motion, he said that he was fulfilling a promise made to his constituents. Well, I suppose he is a man of his word, and will keep his promise, as he did then. Not only that, but he said: “Quebec's share of the sacrifices in favor of the Dominion was a little larger than it was necessary it should be.” He was then of the opinion, as I am now, that we are paying a little more than our share of the taxes of this country. I want to say, for my own part, that, in the Province of Quebec, this tax on flour is considered a most iniquitous and odious one. We have no equivalent for it. We are placed between two taxes, one on coal, for the benefit of the Lower Provinces, and one on flour, for the benefit of the Upper Provinces. Both ends of this Dominion combine in order, I may say, to oppress the Province of Quebec. Therefore, I have made up my mind to vote in favor of the motion of my hon. friend from Quebec East.

Mr. HACKETT. In my opinion the hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion has done so for the purpose of making some capital in the Maritime Provinces. As we have to depend to a large extent on the people of Ontario for our breadstuffs the hon. gentleman imagines that he will make a strong point with the people of the Maritime Provinces. If I am credibly informed, I believe that hon. gentleman made a tour of the Maritime Provinces last year. I am told that he went down to Nova Scotia and said there that he intended to convince the people of that section of the country that they were very unjustly taxed. I am also informed that on one occasion the hon. gentleman was

Mr. CASGRAIN.

addressing an audience at New Glasgow in the county of Pictou, and his platform being a very unsubstantial and rickety one, he was precipitated below and came down at the feet of the people of Nova Scotia. I think the hon. gentleman will find that his present motion is just as unsubstantial and as badly constructed as that platform was, and when he and his party go to the people of this country in 1883, or sooner, they will meet with a similar misfortune, and will find themselves as they did then, scrambling in the dirt. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to make it appear that the people of this country are paying a certain tax on breadstuffs. The fact is that we in this country produce more flour than we can consume, and have to go abroad to find a market for our surplus flour, and while this is the case no one can make it appear that we are paying an exorbitant price for our flour. The price of breadstuffs is regulated by the markets of the world, and when we have to go to Europe to sell our products it is quite evident that we are not paying more for our breadstuffs than we would pay were there no duty upon them. But to prove my position I have only to quote the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He stated in his speech on the Budget that spring wheat was sold in Buffalo at \$1.45 per bushel, and in Toronto at \$1.26½ per bushel, or 18½ cents lower in Canada than in the United States. Now, Sir, we know very well that if wheat can be bought in Canada 18½ cents cheaper than in the United States flour must necessarily be bought cheaper also. We have the same facilities for manufacturing flour in Canada that they have in the United States. We have as good water power or steam power, as good skilled workmen and as good mills, and what is the reason that, if we can produce wheat in Canada 18½ cents cheaper than the United States, we cannot also have flour at a cheaper rate? Now following out the line of argument laid down by that hon. gentleman, what would be the result, taking as a basis four and a-half bushels of wheat for a barrel of flour? We find that flour manufactured from Canadian wheat could be sold in the markets of the world for 85 cents less than the flour of the United States of a corresponding grade. It is ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to endeavor to make it appear that, with a duty of 50 cents per barrel on United States flour, it is going to raise the price of Canadian flour. I come from a Province that possesses few manufacturing industries. Whether that be owing to a want of enterprise or to our isolated position, I cannot say. But it is impossible to prove that because we are shut out for a great portion of the year from the rest of the Dominion, and have to buy a large portion of the commodities we consume, that we are unduly taxed. Now, with regard to the article of breadstuffs, I will just state what has been done in that line last year. I find, in looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, that Prince Edward Island, last year, imported 2,200 barrels of flour, upon which duty amounting to \$1,100 has been paid. Is that any reason why we should take alarm at this flour tax? The amount collected from the importation of foreign flour amounts only to 1 cent per head of the population of the Island. Is that an exorbitant tax? Hon. gentlemen will agree with me that a tax of that amount, even if the people had to pay the duty, which I deny, would not be alarming. Those 2,200 barrels of flour were imported from the United States. Why were they imported? From the simple fact that we have some citizens of the United States doing business on the Island. They can buy in the markets of the United States a certain brand of flour very much cheaper than they can do in Canada. We have no brand of flour in Canada so low as the brand which they can buy in the United States. Flour that has been cast aside as not capable of bearing inspection is brought to the Island and sold to fishermen. Those 2,200

barrels are altogether of this description; they were of a low grade, so low and poor that they could not be sold to the people of the United States, and they had to be mixed with good Canadian flour before they were saleable. I am of the opinion that a duty of \$1 or \$1.50 on American flour would be better than the present duty of 50 cents per barrel, so as to shut out the American flour altogether. We have in this country a large extent of fertile land, as intelligent farmers as in the United States, and, with a good climate, we should be able to raise sufficient breadstuffs for ourselves and not be dependent on the United States. For myself, speaking from the standpoint of a Prince Edward Islander, I know the low grades of flour that are imported, and I shall be very glad to see such grades altogether excluded from our market. But apart altogether from the question of flour and wheat, there are other products of Canada that require protection. We raise large quantities of coarse grains, such as barley and oats, and our farmers require to be protected in that particular industry. They require protection against American oats and barley brought into our markets. Our opponents say a duty of 10 cents per bushel on coarse grains is no protection whatever. But what was the condition of things in 1878? We had a very large quantity of those grains imported. We do not say hon. gentlemen opposite did so for political purposes, but an hon. gentleman who is looking at me at this moment introduced a resolution setting forth that it was necessary, in the interest of our farmers, that a duty should be imposed on American oats and flour. Has the hon. gentleman gone back on his position? If so, he is the most inconsistent of individuals. In 1878, 340,491 bushels of American barley were imported to this country. Was it not necessary that Canadian farmers should be protected in some measure against such an influx. Hon. gentlemen will agree with me in saying that it was. What has been the result of the present tariff on barley? While we imported nearly 500,000 bushels in 1878, last year, 1881, we imported only eleven bushels; and that is a conclusive proof that the protective duty had the effect of shutting out those 500,000 bushels. Coming to oats, in which I am more immediately interested, I would remark that, in 1878, 1,633,778 bushels were brought into the Dominion from the United States. Hon. gentlemen may say that the price is low in the United States, and for that reason oats were brought into Canada. That is the very reason why the farmers should have Protection. As opposed to almost 2,000,000 bushels imported in 1878, there were only 2,573 bushels imported last year. Here we clearly see the result of the National Policy, under which our own farmers have the market to the extent of the former importation. What was the result of the policy in force in 1878, on the people of Prince Edward Island. Owing to the fact that oats were imported from the United States, and sold in Ontario and Quebec, the oats of those Provinces were forced into the markets of the Lower Provinces. Before that time we had the markets of the Lower Provinces almost to ourselves. The farmers of Prince Edward Island could send oats to different points in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and sell them at remunerative prices; but, in 1878, owing to the large quantity of oats entering the Upper Provinces these oats were forced down to the Maritime Provinces and reduced the prices to unremunerative rates. On account of the import duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats American oats are not sent into the Upper Provinces, the oats of their farmers are therefore sold in the home market and we command the Lower Provinces. Island farmers can now send their oats to Halifax and St. John, and all along the north shore of New Brunswick, and sell them at remunerative prices, and I therefore contend that I have thoroughly and clearly established that the National Policy has greatly benefited not only Ontario and Quebec but also the Lower Provinces. Hon. gentlemen opposite will argue that while the Islanders

are dealing with Ontario and Quebec they should deal with the people of the United States, and that the United States is their natural market. I cannot see that that has been clearly established. As regards certain commodities such as potatoes our principal market is the United States, but they meet us with a duty which almost shuts us out. If that is our natural market it would appear as if we were not the natural suppliers of that market, because the Americans impose a heavy duty before they admit our products. Is it consistent with political economy that the Americans should shut out our products and we allow them to bring in their products? It is an injustice, and hon. gentlemen who support such a policy are not a party who will receive the support of the people. The Province of Prince Edward Island in 1870 supported just such a policy as is at present at force in the Dominion. Looking at the Tariff of the Island for that year, which was three years before Confederation, and when the Island did not think it necessary to enter Confederation, and when every person was opposed to the proposal, the Government of the day imposed a duty on products coming from the United States. I have in my hands the journals of the Legislative Assembly for 1874, and I find that even at that day a tax of 11 per cent. was imposed on bread coming into the Island—a higher tax than is now imposed by the Government of the Dominion. I find also that every article produced by the farmers of the Island was protected. I find that such articles as butter, cheese and many other articles produced by the farmer were largely protected.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But you imported these articles. Mr. HACKETT. Well, the duty was put on in the interests of the Island, as it has been put on the Dominion of Canada, by a Government desirous of protecting the interests of farmers as well as other classes. I find that a duty of one shilling per barrel was imposed on corn-meal, so that it will be seen that the Island was in favor of Protection long ago, notwithstanding the statements of those who try to make it appear that they speak for the people of that Province, that they are heaven-born statesmen, who can speak for the whole Dominion. I represent as intelligent a constituency as any gentleman in this House, I care not from what part of the Dominion he comes, and when I speak for them I speak their sentiments and views and in their interests. When I say that we are not opposed to this tax, that we are willing to bear our share in common with the rest of the Dominion, I speak the sentiments of my constituents, who believe that this system is in the interests of the Dominion at large. Now, with regard to the tax on flour, hon. gentlemen opposite try to make it appear that the people of the Maritime Provinces are galling under the yoke of the present Tariff. These hon. gentlemen are trying to stir up sectional feelings to turn one Province against another. That is their desire, but the people are too intelligent, and well schooled in the politics of the country for hon. gentlemen of small ideas, of contracted views, to lead them astray on this subject. Now, with regard to the duty on flour, I find that, even at that time, though the Island had not joined the Dominion, the people of that Province felt that they should trade with their brethren in Canada; they recognized that as an act of patriotism, and in consequence they taxed American flour 1s. 6d. per barrel, and allowed the colonial product to come in free. They said we are going to protect the interests of people living under the British flag in all parts of this country; we will let their products in free and impose a tax on the people living south of the boundary line to the same amount as they impose upon us. And who are the hon. gentlemen who were at the head of the Government who imposed this tax. They are gentlemen who still live in Prince Edward Island; they still say that they belong to the great Liberal party of this country, and although they are represented in this House by a not very numerous party, in fact a most

insignificant party, still one occasionally meets them down in Prince Edward Island where they claim to belong to the great Free Trade Liberal party of this country. The leader of that Government has now a very snug place in the Senate of this Dominion. He is at present the only gentleman in the Senate from Prince Edward Island who supports hon. gentlemen opposite, and yet he was the man who said that the products of Prince Edward Island should be protected against the products of other countries. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Haythorne. Another was the Hon. Alexander Laird, brother of the ex-Governor of the North-West Territories, who was formerly a member of this House and a great free-trader. Hon. Peter Sinclair was another who was also a member of the last Parliament. Then there was the Hon. Benjamin Davis, who has been ensconced in a fine office in Prince Edward Island, as a reward for his services; and I think it comes with very bad grace from hon. gentlemen here, who pretend to be on the same side of politics with them, to oppose Protection for the industries of Canada. I believe that Protection is the settled policy of the people of this Dominion, and that nothing hon. gentlemen can say or do will change in the slightest degree the minds of the people, for the feeling is too widely spread, too deeply seated. Hon. gentlemen may move want of confidence motions, as many as they please, but the people will regard it as on a par with the clap-trap which these hon. gentlemen indulged in in 1878. Another redeeming feature of the present policy is this: that we are relieved from the pressure of alarming deficits of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are placed beyond the possibility of their repetition. Last year we had the large surplus of \$4,500,000, and the present year I hope it will be \$3,000,000 at least—a fact that shows that we are now starting on an era of prosperity. The people of this country realize that we are starting on an era of prosperity, and why should they abandon it for a more gloomy state of things. Hon. gentlemen need not imagine that they are going to carry away the people or change their policy by moving these resolutions, as the people are bound that they shall not depart from the prosperity, the peace and plenty which they are now enjoying under the present Tariff by adopting the one advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, if my memory does not deceive me very much, not very long ago the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, was not such a pronounced advocate of the policy of the Government as he appears to be to-night. If I am not very much mistaken, within a period of two years, that hon. gentleman declared, upon the floor of Parliament, that the policy of the Government was injurious to the Province he represented. If I am not very much mistaken, he made a most pathetic appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to consider the claims of the Island of Prince Edward, because the Tariff was most injurious to the best interests of that Province.

Mr. HACKETT. No such thing.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Light has dawned on his dark mind, and to-night we find him a pronounced advocate of the policy of Protection. I did not pay sufficient attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman to be able to follow him through his whole speech, nor do I propose doing so. I paid more attention, a good deal, as I always do, to the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works. However one may disagree with the propositions that hon. gentleman lays down, or with the conclusions that he arrives at—and sometimes he arrives at extraordinary conclusions—one cannot help, at all events I cannot help, admiring my hon. friend; he is always pleasant, good natured and smiling, and therefore I always pay a good deal of attention, and of deference I may say, to his observations. But I think the hon. gentleman in his opening remarks, was exceedingly ungracious to his colleagues who

Mr. HACKETT.

sat to his right and to his left. He undertook to twit my hon. friend for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) for having changed within the last ten years his opinions on Protection and Free Trade, but the hon. gentleman forgot that there were two of his own colleagues beside him, who, if my memory serves me right, were at one period of their history pronounced Free Traders. It was ungracious of my hon. friend, therefore, to allude to the change of opinion on the part of my hon. friend from Quebec East. If he did change his opinions, of which I know nothing; all I can say is this: that if my hon. friend from Quebec East changed his opinions, he got new light on the subject; he is going onwards, while they are going backwards. The hon. Minister of Public Works, was ungracious also to his colleagues in some of the other observations he made. He admitted that the tax on coal was paid by the people of Ontario, because it was necessary to have a tax of this kind for revenue purposes, as we were constructing great public works. A revenue from what? From the very articles we are now discussing—coal and broadstuffs. The hon. Minister of Finance, when discussing this question some time ago, admitted that the people of Ontario paid one-half of the coal tax—he did not think they paid more than one-half. But the hon. Minister of Railways, who is never at a loss, who never hesitates, and who never doubts, who never has any difficulty about the facts or figures—because if the facts or figures are not there, they can easily be manufactured to suit any line of argument he may adopt—was prepared to establish beyond peradventure that the people of this country do not pay a single farthing of the coal tax, but that it is all paid by the people who produce the coal on the other side of the line. Would it not be wise, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Public Works, and the hon. Minister of Railways to get together and settle this difficulty which they have among themselves before they announce their views to the House? They are evidently not agreed on the subject; one says that we pay half, the other says that we pay the whole, and the other says that we do not pay a farthing of the tax at all. There was another observation made by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and perhaps, after all, it was the most effective part of his argument; following the example of his leader, he appealed to his followers on both sides of the House—and I am sorry to say he has followers on both sides—to stick to the policy of the Government and to vote down the proposition of my hon. friend from Quebec East. Whether the proposition was right or not was of no kind of consequence; the taxes in question formed one of the bricks of the great superstructure, and it did not become any of the members on either side of the House who supported him to displace one of the bricks. It was of no kind of consequence to him whether the coal tax or the bread tax was obnoxious or not; that was not the question; the appeal he made to his friends was to vote down the proposition of my hon. friend from Quebec East, be the proposition right or be it wrong; and I have no doubt his advice will be taken. I have no doubt his followers in this House, whenever he raises his little finger and asks them to do a thing, will do it without murmur; there are no difficulties in the way that cannot be got over—no conscientious scruples or conscientious qualms. Now, Sir, I propose dealing with the coal tax as it affects the Province of Ontario. The bread tax has been dealt with by my hon. friend from Quebec East, and he has not been answered, in my judgment, and in fact, no one has attempted to answer him. I propose dealing with the coal tax and taking up a few observations made on the subject by the hon. Minister of Railways; I propose analysing the figures that hon. gentleman gave to the House; I propose to call into question the correctness of the statement made by him that the coal tax was not paid by the people of Ontario, but by the producers of coal on the other side of the

line: I propose to challenge the tables he has submitted to the House, and I propose proving, beyond doubt that the figures he presented to Parliament were cooked—I do not mean to say by the hon. Minister of Railways, but by the man who prepared the figures for him; I propose proving that those figures were false and calculated to mislead, and that they did mislead; I propose proving that the premises on which he based his argument were all wrong, and I of course propose following that up by proving that the conclusions which the hon. gentleman arrived at were equally wrong. Now, the hon. gentleman started out with two propositions: one was that the price of coal from the United States is fixed and governed by the competition it has to meet with in the United States, and the other was that the imposition of the duty, or the coal tax, has not increased the price of coal to the Canadian consumer; or, in other words, that owing to this competition, about which the hon. gentleman spoke so vehemently and so loudly the other night, the price of coal has been reduced in the American market, to the Canadian purchaser, and of course to the Canadian consumer. The hon. gentleman said, in his speech, speaking of his colleague, the hon. Minister of Finance, who said that the people of this country paid a portion of the coal tax:

“I am satisfied my hon. friend has not given that subject the close and exhaustive study that I have given to it, or he would have arrived at the opinion I now unhesitatingly state, that the imposition of the duty has not cost the people of this country anything, but the reverse. Now, Sir, my first position is that the price of coal from the United States is fixed and preserved by the competition that coal has to meet with.”

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman's first position is, that the price of coal in the United States is fixed by the competition there. Now, the argument of the hon. gentleman was that, by the imposition of 50 cents per ton on American coal, or coal coming into Ontario for consumption, its cost was necessarily reduced. Let us see what are the facts, and then we will be able to decide whether the premises laid down and the conclusions arrived at by the hon. gentleman are right or wrong. To make his argument worth anything, the hon. gentleman was bound to show that the competition met with by the Americans in the Canadian market was much keener during the past three years than during the three or any number of years preceding the introduction of the National Policy. But competition has not been much keener and the output from the mines of Nova Scotia has not been, to any appreciable extent, increased either by the National Policy or by any other cause in the last four years. As the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House a large number of tables on the coal question, I propose to submit to the House, in answer to the hon. gentleman, a number of tables that, in my judgment, entirely disproves his propositions and conclusions. If the argument of the hon. gentleman amounts to anything, it is this: that the keener the competition the more the price is reduced. If we can prove that the competition has not been any keener during the last three years than during the three years preceding the introduction of the National Policy, that portion of the argument falls to the ground. Let us see how the facts sustain the contention. According to the statement of the hon. Minister the other night, the sales of the production of Nova Scotian mines in 1873 amounted to 881,106 tons. In 1877, as appears by the report of the Commissioner of Mines, they amounted to 687,065 tons; in 1878, to 693,511 tons; in 1879, to 688,624 tons; in 1880, to 954,659 tons; in 1881, to 1,034,800 tons. This shows that, in 1880, with the National Policy, and, I suppose, the Nova Scotia mines in full blast, the increase of sales of Nova Scotia coal was only 73,553 tons over the sales in 1873; and that, in 1881, with the National Policy and the Nova Scotia coal mines still in full blast, and the country prosperous, and everything flourishing, as we hear continually from hon. gentlemen opposite, the increase was only 153,694 tons over the sales of 1873. Does the hon. gentleman mean

to say that because, in 1880, 73,000 tons of Nova Scotia coal were sold more than in 1873, the price of American coal was thereby reduced in the slightest possible degree? There is still another way by which one can test the correctness of the propositions of the hon. gentleman. If the Nova Scotian coal has come into sharper competition with the American coal, during the last three years than formerly the former must have displaced the latter in our markets to a great extent, and the importation from the United States must necessarily have fallen off. But what are the facts? This table shows that, instead of there being a falling off, the importation of American coal has greatly increased during the last few years, and especially since the introduction of the National Policy. I do not desire to trouble the House with figures, but as the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House figures with the intent of convincing the House and the country that the position he took was correct, I am going to trouble the House by a few figures to show that his position is a false and incorrect one. In 1876, the importations of coal, both hard and soft, into Ontario from the United States, were 472,706 tons; in 1877, they amounted to 607,747 tons; in 1878, to 588,412 tons; in 1879, to 643,385 tons; in 1880, to 667,164 tons; and, in 1881, despite the marvellous competition from the Nova Scotia mines, spoken of by the Minister of Railways, that affected the price of American coal and reduced the price to the Canadian consumer, the number of tons imported from the United States reached 810,970 tons. In other words, we imported from the United States, in 1881, into Ontario, 222,558 tons more than in 1878, before the National Policy was ever heard of. But the hon. gentleman argued that the imposition of this duty stimulated production, that production caused competition, and that competition reduced the price of coal. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that because, in 1880, we sold 73,000 tons more than in 1873, that therefore the price of 66,000,000 tons, the coal production of the United States in 1880, was thereby affected in the slightest degree? The hon. gentleman might just as well say that the prices of the 297,000,000 tons, the coal production of the world in 1879, were affected by the extra 73,000 tons of Nova Scotia coal put on the market in 1880 over and above the amount put on the market in 1873. The hon. gentleman must know and admit, if he only has the candor to admit it, that this unappreciable amount of coal which we put on the market in 1880 over 1873, cannot in the slightest possible degree have affected the price of coal in the American market to the Canadian purchaser and consumer. But, Sir, there is still another way by which I propose to show the fallacy of the tables submitted by the hon. gentleman. I do not know who prepared those tables for him, nor do I care. The hon. gentleman is responsible for them as he submitted them to Parliament. I pronounce those tables to be, from beginning to end, false and delusive, calculated to mislead the public, and I propose now to prove that they are false and delusive. To establish this proposition let us take the prices of coal in the three great markets of the United States, to the world—not simply to the United States, but to the world. The coal dealers make no distinction there. They do not ask where the coal is going to, or who is the purchaser, or who is going to consume it. They simply fix their prices and get them. Does the hon. gentleman know that, on the first day of every month in every year, the coal dealers of the United States fix the price of coal, and that price remains fixed until the first day of the next month? Does the hon. gentleman know that the price of hard coal is always fixed in the city of Buffalo, that of soft coal in Cleveland, and that the prices of both classes are, to some extent, fixed in Oswego, the three great coal marts of the United States, where every Canadian dealer, who wants to purchase coal, goes to supply his wants? If I can show you, by the clearest possible testimony, that, for the

last three years or since the imposition of the duty, the price has gone steadily up instead of going down, year by year, in the American markets notwithstanding that competition the hon. gentleman has laid such stress on, I have disposed of his argument. I am not submitting these figures without authority. I am not taking the figures prepared for a purpose by the clerks of the public Departments, or the evidence of unskilled or inexperienced men outside Parliament. The figures I am quoting are from the Secretary of the Board of Trade in Oswego, the Secretary of the Board of Trade in Cleveland, and from the manager of the coal companies at Buffalo. I have got their documents and letters in my hand, and their statements are open to the inspection of any body. I find, according to these returns, that the price of the best hard coal, nut coal, in Buffalo, where the price is always regulated, was on the 1st September, 1876, \$4.90. What is the price now—is it less? No; it is \$5.55 the long ton, and \$4.95 the short ton. And, here let me recall another circumstance that indicates the utter dishonesty of the statements submitted by the hon. gentleman—I do not charge intentional dishonesty in the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman took the quotations on the other side of the line for the long ton, while everybody knows coal is sold in Canada by the short ton, and he made no allowance for the difference between the long and short ton. But he ought to have known—I do not know whether he did or not—that, for the last three years, coal in the United States has been sold by the long ton, and he ought to have made proper allowance for the difference. In 1877, the price of the best coal, short ton, in the United States, was \$4.60; the price is now \$4.95, or 35 cents more in 1878, the price of hard coal, in Buffalo, was \$4.40; in 1881, 1st November, it was \$4.95, or 55 cents higher. In 1879, the price of this coal had gone down in the United States, when the very best hard coal could be bought for \$3.03 a ton. The price of that coal is now \$4.95, or an increase over 1879 of \$1.92. The price of hard coal, in Buffalo, in 1880, was \$4.80; and, in 1881, or now, \$4.95, 15 cents more than in 1880. So that, from 1876 down to the fall of 1881—and everybody that knows anything about the coal trade is aware that the season's supply is always purchased by Canadians in the fall, nobody buying in the winter—the price of coal has gone regularly up, and it is higher to day than it was in 1878, by fifty-five cents a ton. I give those quotations from the Secretary of the Lehigh Valley Coal Company, and there can be no mistake about them. I have their circulars for the last six years, which anybody can examine to see whether they are right or wrong. If the hon. Minister's argument were good—if the duty stimulated production, and that caused additional competition, and that again reduced the price of coal, it would be less to-day than in 1878, when the reverse is the fact. There is another way by which I propose testing the hon. gentleman's argument. I do not propose to leave him an inch of ground to stand on or the smallest hole to creep through. I propose submitting to the House facts, figures and statements from undoubted authorities on the other side of the line that even the hon. Minister of Railways, with all his audacity, will be utterly unable to answer. There is another way I say by which I propose testing the correctness of the figures of the hon. gentlemen—by considering the different kinds of coal and the prices of each, a course which the hon. Minister, in presenting his figures, cautiously omitted. Dealers in coal know that there are four or five grades of coal, hard and soft, sold at different prices. You find hard coal at Buffalo sold at one price, while another kind is sold in Toronto at a lower price, the different grades bearing different prices. But the hon. gentleman, to establish his argument, no doubt, took different grades at Buffalo and Toronto, and of course the different grades would be sold at different prices. To see whether the argument of the hon. gentleman is correct, you have to compare the prices of the different grades of coal in the United States with their prices in Canada; and if the hon. gentleman can satisfy the House that these prices have been reduced by the National Policy, I have not another word to say—I will admit that he is right and I am wrong. But till he can do so I will take a different view. The following table will show the correctness of my position:—

BUFFALO—BEST HARD COAL.

Year.	Price.	Price now.	Increase.
1876.....	\$1 90	\$4 95	\$0 05
1877.....	4 60	4 95	0 35
1878.....	4 40	4 95	0 55
1879.....	3 05	4 95	1 92
1880.....	4 80	4 95	0 15
1881.....	4 95		

I have still another table that will convince the most sceptical that my position is impregnable and that his position is assailable from every standpoint. This table gives the price to grate coal, egg coal, stone and nut coal, all the different grades sold in the market of Buffalo, which are sold to the Canadian consumer. Let us see whether a single one of these grades brought to the Canadian market has been reduced within the last few years. If those grades have been reduced, the conclusions of the Minister of Railways is correct; if they have been increased his conclusions are false and his deductions misleading, and calculated to mislead. The following table shows the price of the different varieties of hard coal at Buffalo since 1877, on 1st September, each year, 2,000, F. O. B. :—

Years.	Grate.	Egg.	Stove.	Nut.	
1877.....	\$4 45	\$4 45	\$4 70	\$4 60	
1878.....	4 55	4 65	4 90	4 40	} Long ton— short ton, \$4 95
1879.....	2 90	2 90	3 12½	3 03½	
1880.....	4 55	4 55	4 80	4 80	
1881.....	5 20	5 20	5 55	5 55	
	Short ton, \$4 64.				

Take grate and egg, which are sold at same price, and compare price now with that three years ago, and in every year there is increase:—

Year.	Grate, Egg, Price of.	1881.	Price of short ton, long ton, \$5 50
1877.....	\$4 45	now \$4 65	Increase over 1877, \$0 20
1878.....	4 55	" 4 65	" 1878, 0 10
1879.....	2 90	" 4 65	" 1879, 1 75
1880.....	4 55	" 4 65	" 1880, 0 10

The same remark holds good with respect to Oswego and the other American markets. There is still another way by which I propose to prove that the hon. gentleman's position is wholly unsustainable. I will prove it out of his own mouth. In the first place, his figures are wrong and misleading; and, in the next place, his conclusions are not warranted by them, even if they were correct. "It is impossible (the hon. gentleman says) for any impartial mind to arrive at any other conclusion than that imposition of 50 cents a ton has not only not increased the price of coal to the consumer in Ontario, but has lowered it." And then he submits a table from which you will find that the price of 1878 is put down \$3.85, but in 1881 the price was \$4.25, or an increase of 40 cents. He leaves out 1879, however. Is there any reason doing so? There is a good reason—namely, that the price was still lower in 1879. In 1880, he says the price of coal was \$3.04; in 1881, it is \$4.25, or \$1.21 increase. In the first place, I say those figures submitted by the hon. gentleman are wholly wrong. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that the price of hard coal, in 1881, even the lowest grade, could be obtained in the United States at \$4.25. But assuming the statement to be correct, what is the result? Why that his table proves that the price of hard coal, in 1881, was \$4.25, and, in 1878, it was only \$3.85. Has the price of coal therefore not increased? Is the hon. gentleman correct in saying that the imposition of the duty did stimulate production that that caused competition, and that again reduced the

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

price of coal? But the contrary is the result. The hon. gentleman's figures are all wrong. He put the price of coal, in 1878, at \$3.85, but he will find, by reference to the quotations from the Lehigh Valley Coal Company, that the price of coal there was \$4.55, or a difference of 70 cents; and, in 1880, he says the price was \$3.04, when, as a matter of fact, the price was \$4.55, or a difference of \$1.41. I refer the hon. gentleman, as to the correctness of these figures, to the Lehigh Valley Coal Company, who give the above quotations. I think that ought to convince any reasonable man that the hon. gentleman's position is not sound. The hon. gentleman's tables are calculated to deceive the House, and they do deceive the House and the country—though I would be very sorry to say that the hon. gentleman knew it—I believe the tables were prepared for him, but he ought to have verified them before venturing in submitting them to Parliament. There is another position the hon. gentleman takes that he cannot sustain. He is not satisfied with dealing with generalities but descends to particulars, and this line of argument is always unfortunate for him. He is always forcible when he deals with generalities but particulars are dangerous to him. He says:

"Here you have facts clearly established that the very moment the duty was imposed the parties who shipped their coal to Toronto and Quebec put these places into a different category from what they were before. They made their competitive points and reduced the cost to a larger extent than the amount of duties paid."

Well, that is an extraordinary proposition, but I will not deal with it just now in the general. I propose showing that his figures are incorrect. He goes on to say:

"At Oswego coal sold during the present year at \$5.75; freight from Oswego to Belleville, 40 cents; harbor dues and unloading, 28 cents; if duty were added to cost 50 cents the coal ought to sell at \$6.93 cents, while the price at Belleville was \$6.50, showing that the duty has been to decrease and not to increase the price of coal."

Now, let us consider on what he bases his argument. In order to fortify his position, what does he do? In order to prove that the competition reduced the price of coal to the Canadian consumer, he puts the price down to \$4.75 per ton. In order to prove that the consumer does not pay the duty, he increases the price in the American market to \$5.75, or \$1.50 more than he placed it at when establishing another proposition. In the same speech, he puts the price of hard coal in the American market at \$4.25, when he wanted to prove line of argument. He then wanted to establish the fact that the competition, induced by the coal duty, had reduced the price of coal to the Canadian consumer. Now, Sir, when he wants to show that the Canadian consumer does not pay the duty, he increases the price of coal from \$4.25 up to \$5.75 a ton. But that proved no difficulty in the hon. gentleman's way. He had two arguments which he wished to establish, and so he manipulates facts to prove his position. The hon. gentleman is never afraid of facts; they never stand in his way. In a struggle between the hon. gentleman and facts, the facts always come out second best, and so they do in the present case. In order to establish his argument that the consumer does not pay the duty, he puts the price of coal at \$5.75 at Oswego, freight to Belleville 40 cents, harbor dues and unloading 28 cents, making \$6.43, and, he says, that in Belleville this coal sells at \$6.50, leaving a margin of 7 cents a ton to cover interest, insurance, warehouse rates, contingencies, etc. The seller gets 7 cents, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, over and above what he paid for coal. Does any man believe for a single moment that that is the case? The thing is absurd. Let me give you the true facts, and I verify these in the same way I verified the facts given a moment ago—by the tables I hold in my hand, from the Secretary for the Board of Trade for the city of Oswego. The hon. gentleman takes Oswego as the starting point. He says, coal sold in Oswego for \$5.75 and in Belleville for \$6.50: Let us see upon what facts that is based? On the 1st of November, 1881, the price

of the very best hard coal in the city of Oswego per long ton of 2,240 lbs., was \$5.30; the price per short ton was \$4.73. The freight I assume to be correct, 40 cents a ton; harbor dues and unloading, 28 cents; add duty to these three items, and you bring it up to \$5.91. The vendor in Belleville sells to his customers, according to the hon. Minister's statement, that same coal at \$6.50, leaving a profit, after paying duty, of 56 cents a ton. It is manifestly clear from this that the consumer pays the duty. The hon. gentleman is unable to show to the House that, during any portion of the year 1881, or any portion of the year 1880, hard coal was sold in Oswego, by the short ton, at any such figure as the hon. gentleman has stated, and it was at no period of the year more, by the short ton, than \$4.73. Again, the hon. gentleman says that the price of coal is regulated by the competition, and that the increased competition in the Canadian market has reduced the price of coal to the Canadian purchaser on the other side. I say that is wholly incorrect, and I propose to establish that fact by the letter I have in my hand from the Secretary of the Board of Trade, Oswego, which is as follows:—

"I am in receipt of your favor of 10th instant. I am unable to give you the price of coal for the month of September in the years mentioned, but have obtained from A. S. Cook, agent of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Coal Company, the prices for 1st November of the same year, which, I trust, will answer your purpose. Mr. Cook also wishes me to state that your Tariff has not the slightest influence on the coal trade here, as that expense necessarily falls on the consumer. Prices are made here without reference to the Tariff."

That, I think, disposes of the hon. gentleman's statement that the competition the American coal meets with here regulates the price of coal on the other side. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Board of Trade of Cleveland, who, speaking of the same subject, says:

"These circulars are the general ones used for all parties, either Canadian or American, for shipment to the Western United States ports, such as Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, etc., etc., or Canadian ports."

The prices at all those points are precisely the same. It makes no difference as far as the American trade is concerned whether coal is shipped to Canada or to points in the United States. Precisely the same price is asked, and the hon. the Minister of Railways will search among the records of the coal companies of the United States in vain for a justification of the statement he submitted to the House, that the price of coal has been reduced a single cent from the day the duty was imposed up to the present time. The hon. gentleman went further, and he told the House that the price of coal (and perhaps it is as good a way as any to ascertain whether the Canadian consumer pays this duty or not) at Ogdensburg and Prescott showed very clearly that the Canadian consumer did not pay the duty, because the price to the Canadian consumer was no more than the price to Americans on the other side. He said:

"Further evidence is to be found in the fact that coal sold at Ogdensburg in the winter of 1880-81 for \$5.90, while at Prescott the retail price was \$6 per ton; the cost of freight to Prescott, harbor dues and unloading is 68 cents. If, the duty were added to the cost of the coal it ought to have sold at \$5.90 plus 68 cents, plus 50 cents, or, in all, \$7.08."

I say that statement is wholly misleading. I hold in my hand a table showing the prices of hard coal at Ogdensburg and Prescott respectively for three years before and since the duty was imposed. It runs as follows:—

Years.	Kind of Coal.	Price at Ogdensburg.	Price at Prescott.	Difference.
Nov., 1876...	Chestnut.	\$7.30	\$6.10 less by	\$1.20
do 1877...	do	6.05	6.10 more by	05
do 1878...	do	5.50	5.60 more by	10
do 1879...	do	4.60	5.00 more by	40
do 1880...	do	5.75	5.60 less by	15
do 1881...	do	5.75	6.15 more by	40

And so it is with regard to the different varieties of coal. Hon. members will find the same result if they take the prices at any Canadian point opposite to an American city of importance. Take Sarnia and Port Huron, and I venture to tell the hon. member that if he will examine the quotations for the last three years at those points he will find that the price at Sarnia exceeds that of Port Huron by the amount of duty. I do not care to trouble the House with figures for all the points in question, but those respecting Port Huron and Sarnia, Detroit and Windsor, Buffalo and Hamilton, and Ogdensburg and Prescott, show, in every instance, the same result, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to take the figures and show that the prices charged Canadian consumers are less than are charged on the other side of the lines.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know I am touching a tender and raw spot, and that hon. gentlemen opposite do not like the fancy figures of the hon. Minister of Railways to be successfully exposed. If you take Buffalo and Hamilton you will find the same state of affairs there. For the sake of convincing hon. members not in the Government, but who are interested in the subject, I will read quotations at Buffalo and Hamilton, showing, beyond a shadow of doubt, that the condition of affairs is very different from that stated by the hon. Minister of Railways. The wholesale sale prices in Buffalo and Hamilton were as follows:—

Year.	Variety.	Price at Buffalo.	Price at Hamilton.	Difference.
1876—	Grate	\$4 55	\$5 75	\$1 20
1877—	do	4 45	5 25	0 80
1878—	do	4 55	5 25	0 70
1879—	do	2 90	4 50	1 60
1880—	do	4 55	6 25	1 70
1881—	do	4 64	6 75	2 11

The increase has gone on steadily except in 1879, when the prices were very low on the other side of the line. The same thing occurs at Cleveland in regard to soft coal, and perhaps the best way to test the matter is to give the prices of the different varieties, because everything depends on that. The honesty of your argument depends upon whether you are quoting one variety in the United States and another variety in Canada. I do not say the hon. the Minister of Railways has done so, but I mean to say that the tables he submitted are not very clear on this point. The following are the prices of the three classes of coal at Cleveland:—

Year.	Variety.	Price.	Price now, 1881.	Difference.
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
1876	Massitton	2 80	2 80	None.
1877	do	2 60	2 80	Increase, \$0 20
1878	do	2 50	2 80	do 0 30
1876	Brier Hill	3 50	4 00	do 0 50
1877	do	3 40	4 00	do 0 60
1878	do	3 25	4 00	do 0 75
1876	Scranton	5 10	4 95	Decrease, 0 15
1877	do	4 20	4 95	Increase, 0 75
1878	do	3 80	4 95	do 1 15

What are the prices to-day? A large increase in every grade since 1878, and yet the hon. Minister of Railways wants his followers and the country at large to believe that the imposition of his little duty of 50 cents a ton on coal does regulate the price of Canadian coal. It is folly for a person to argue a proposition of that kind any further. I am not disposed to waste the time of the House in arguing against what to my mind is an absurd proposition on the face of it. Hon gentlemen opposite will no doubt question the figures. Why, Sir, if the hon. Minister of Railways said one thing and an angel from the upper world came down and said something

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

else, they would accept the word of the hon. Minister of Railways. But I am going to quote the hon. Minister of Railways against himself, and surely they will no longer hesitate and doubt if I quote Tupper against Tupper they will not object. Here is what the hon. Minister of Railways said at Cobourg:

“Can any person give me a reason why coal in a country where the revenue is raised as we raised ours—by indirect taxation—why coal should not be a source of revenue? I know of none. Is it because the masses of the people are not benefitted by it? I deny it.”

But that is not all; he winds up with this little tit-bit:

“Again Mr. Blake states that I said in Picton the \$400,000 collected in coal was paid by the people of Ontario. What if I did? Do you not think Mr. Blake would have acted the part of a candid man, if he had also told you that of the \$369,000 of revenue collected on wheat and flour, not one cent had been paid by Ontario, and all was paid by the Maritime Provinces.”

I hope hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces and especially those who laud the National Policy, and who are opposed to any change in this marvellously perfect Tariff, will take note of what the hon. the Minister of Railways admits in his speech—that the people of Ontario do not pay the tax on breadstuffs, but that that it is paid by the people down by the sea. And I hope the people from the other Provinces, who support the hon. the Minister of Railways, will take note of the admission of the hon. the Minister of Railways, that the people down by the sea do not pay the tax on coal, but that it comes out of the pockets of the people of Ontario. I will not trespass longer on the time of the House. I have established my proposition, and I defy the hon. the Minister of Railways or any of his supporters, to controvert my facts and arguments. I have shown the absurdity of the argument that the 73,000 tons of coal which we raised in 1878 over what we raised in 1873 could regulate the price of the 66,000,000 tons produced in the United States market in 1880. I have shown that the tables read to the House by the hon. gentleman are wholly misleading, that they are calculated to mislead, and that they will and do mislead. I have shown that the figures and quotations given by the hon. gentleman as from the American markets are not justified by the reports. I have shown that the tables were cooked by somebody. I do not know or care by whom they were cooked. I have shown that the conclusions drawn by the hon. gentleman from the premises he laid down are wholly fallacious and wrong, and I think I can leave it to the good sound common sense of the members of this House whether or not the position of the hon. the Minister of Railways is correct. At all events, as I have an abiding faith in the good sound common sense of the people of this country, I can leave it to them, and when the hour comes, as come it must—and I do not care how soon—when the people are called upon to pronounce on the policy of the Government, I am greatly mistaken in the intelligence and common sense of the people of Canada, if they do not sweep from power the men who in 1878 attained office by deceptive promises, which they have not fulfilled and are not able to fulfil.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not occupy the time of the House at this late stage of the debate if I did not represent a constituency which would be largely affected if this resolution carried. It is amusing to listen to some of the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite in their endeavors to convince the people of this country, that the views they advocate are right. In the first place, we have men from the Province of Quebec, one of the Lower Provinces, coming up to Ontario, and endeavoring to convince the farmers of that Province that their judgment and intelligence on questions of this kind is wrong, that they do not understand the situation themselves, and that these hon. gentlemen understand the business of the people of Ontario better than they do themselves. One of these hon. gentlemen says that the imposition of a duty on flour is injurious to the farmers of

Ontario. On the same principle the last speaker, a farmer from Huron, went down to the Maritime Provinces, and endeavored to persuade the people there that he knows their business better than they do. That appears to be the method pursued by the Opposition; but I think if, for instance, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who lives in western Ontario, dealt with the side of the question which affects them, that his people would be able to realize how near he comes to the truth, and be able to put an estimate on his arguments, because they deal with matters which affect them in their daily life. On the other hand, if the hon. member from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) would deal with questions which might affect the people of that Province, they would be able to value the worth of his arguments and understand and controvert them. It is strange to see the time that is wasted by hon. members of the Opposition in their endeavors to convince the people of the Dominion that it is in their interests to throw off the duty on every class of articles. In the first place, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) spent a large portion of his time in arguing that the imposition of the duty does the consumer a great deal of harm and does the producer no good. Now, this seems to me to be a contradiction. It is not orthodox to say that the duty does the consumer a great deal of harm and does the producer no good. He says at one time, that the imposition of the duty increases the price to the consumer, but I would like to ask him if the duty raises the prices of everything the consumer uses, and whether by a parity of reasoning it does not increase the price of the product to the producer. It was expected by the present Government before coming into power, that the effect of imposing a duty would be to create a home market, and how far have they justified that assertion we can now judge by the history and experience of the country since 1878 to the present. We are able to show by the Trade and Navigation Returns, by the condition of the country, by the prosperity of the people the effect which this Tariff has had upon the country, and to estimate its value as a factor in producing the wealth of the people. I ask, in the first place, if it has given us a home market? We can satisfy ourselves upon that point by looking at the Trade Returns. I will deal entirely with the agricultural products because, representing as I do an agricultural district, I believe it important that I should keep myself right with those people, that I should defend their rights and oppose anything which I believe to be an infringement upon their interests. I say it has given an increased market to the agriculturists of this country. In 1878, previous to the introduction of this Tariff, we brought into this country 5,635,000 bushels of wheat; in 1881, we brought in only 76,000 bushels, or, in other words we created a home market for 5,558,000 bushels; therefore I say that this Tariff has been operating beneficially for the agricultural interests of this country, and that it has been accomplishing the desirable result which we claimed it would accomplish, of giving an additional market to the farmers of this country for what they had to sell; and it has given them a better market than they had before, because they have been able to save the amount which it would cost to send their produce to foreign markets. Again, in 1878 we imported 2,162,000 bushels of oats, while, in 1881, we imported only 73,000 bushels; or, in other words, we kept out 2,088,933 bushels of oats, and to that extent gave an additional market to the farmers of this country for the oats they had to sell. Now, if that is not a benefit, I would like to know what is. I remember in 1878, when oats were selling for 20 cents in Chicago, and were 40, 50, and even 60 cents with us, the western oats were brought into Collingwood, Owen Sound, and Southampton, and forty-eight hours afterwards the oats in our own market lowered in value 8 or 10 cents a bushel; farmers in the country, who were holding their oats and expect-

ing an increased price in the market, were deprived of it in this way, and I know that men engaged in buying up oats lost money by paying a high figure, and when they got them to market they did not realize one-half of the amount they expected. Again, in the matter of Indian corn, while some say that it would be in the interest of Canada to allow that article to come in, that it would not interfere with us because we do not raise much of it, in our part of the country we find that when oats get dear, if corn is cheap on the other side, it is brought in, and takes the place of oats, bushel for bushel. In 1876, 1877, and 1878 large quantities were brought in. In 1878, we brought in 7,387,000 bushels of corn, which is more than all the corn that is raised in the Dominion of Canada, while, in 1881, we only brought in 2,043,000 bushels, or, in other words we kept out 5,344,000 bushels of corn, and gave our farmers an additional market for the same quantity of oats, besides over 2,000,000 bushels of oats that were kept out. So you will see that this Tariff gave us a market for almost every bushel of oats that we had to export in 1878; and if this is not a benefit to the farming community, I would like to know what is a benefit. How much logic it will require on the part of hon. gentlemen from Quebec to persuade the farmers that this Tariff is not in their interest I cannot say; but whatever standing they may have attained in the community, whatever respect the people may have for their intelligence and integrity, it is fast slipping away by the line of argument they are adopting; for the people know what is for their own benefit. Again, in 1878 314,520 barrels of flour were brought into Canada, and, in 1881, 97,000 barrels, or the farmers of Canada had an increased market for 216,939 barrels of flour; and as every barrel of flour represents four and a half bushels of wheat, we can easily see what a benefit that has been to the farmers of Canada. It requires no argument to prove to the farmer that the Tariff has caused this change, because these grains were coming in year after year, and the natural increase in the population enables us to consume more than we did in 1878. Again, in 1878 we brought in 14,704 swine, but, in 1881, we only brought in 2,447, or kept out 12,257, and got an additional market for that number at home. As an illustration of that, I may tell hon. gentlemen what has come under my own observation. There are a large number of lumbermen in my section of the country, with whom I have been acquainted for some twenty or twenty-five years, and I know for a fact that for several years up to 1878, these men supplied their lumber shanties almost exclusively with pork from the Chicago market; but to-day they come into our own markets and supply themselves there with every pound of pork they require. So with oats: in 1876 a gentleman engaged in lumbering told me that he found western oats so cheap in 1875, 1876, and 1877, that it paid him to buy his oats there and bring them into Canada; and the result was that he never bought any Canadian oats for the horses which he had engaged in his work. To-day the very reverse is the case, and our farmers have a large additional market to supply. In addition to the Tariff, another influence affects us very materially and favorably, and that is the increased demand from Manitoba and the North-West, for our products. Thus the very greatest adjunct to our Tariff has been given in the policy adopted by the Government, in opening up the North-West. The Tariff, by preventing the importation of American horses, cattle and products, has given us control of that market. The result is that, while previous to 1879, we had no market for our horses and cattle, we have to-day a good market for every animal as well as other products. If that is not a benefit to the country I would like to know what is, and our farmers, I believe, see this as plainly as they do the light of the sun when the sky is clear. No amount of logical ingenuity, whether it comes from the

high authority of the hon. leader of the Opposition himself, or from the lowest luminary that follows, will convince the farmers that it is not greatly in their interests to have a perpetuity of this Tariff. If the question whether the Tariff should be continued or not was asked on the hustings in every part of the country, the answer would be: "If you desire to promote our interests, do with the Tariff what the Dutchman did with his dog, let severely well alone." It is serving its purpose, and to continue it will be to move in the right direction. In my section, I have clearly shown, the Tariff has given us a better market for our produce. It has also given employment to our people which was deplorably scarce in 1878. No man need be out of employment to-day who is willing to work, and every man is getting higher wages for his work. The wages of the laboring man have gone up from \$1 and 90 cents, in 1878, to \$1.50 and \$1.25, and the wages of mechanics are from \$1.75 to \$2. I have been employing a large number of men for the last two years, and I know you cannot find a good mechanic willing to work for less than \$1.75 or \$2 per day, nor a good bricklayer at less than from \$2 to \$3 per day, and laboring men command at any time \$1.25 per day. It was claimed this Tariff would give us additional revenue. Has it done so? A glance at our revenue returns will be sufficient to prove that it has fully accomplished that object. Has it given us more money? Look at the deposits in the savings banks, both of the highest and lowest classes; look at the savings of the poorer classes, and the large amount of money deposited in those institutions to-day is most conclusive proof that the people are richer to-day than they were under the old Tariff. I was very much amused at one of the theories advanced by the hon. member for Quebec East. He said that we were violating a law of nature, because the Maritime Provinces could not import their goods from the United States, nor sell their produce to the United States. I have always thought that in developing our resources and in affording employment to our own people we were obeying the laws of nature. Nature has supplied us with a great amount of coal. Towards Stratford, along the lake shore, there is sufficient for the requirements of the whole Dominion. Is it reasonable we should not avail ourselves of this great natural resource, and allow foreigners to supply us with what we have in our midst awaiting development? Why should we allow foreigners to use our markets for the products of their country when we have these products at home? Why should we deprive our own people of employment to give employment to people engaged in foreign manufactures, when with our water power and raw material and natural resources, we have all that is necessary to supply ourselves with the commodities we use. In almost every paper to-day, of both sides, we find advertisements by small towns like Orangeville, offering bonuses of \$5,000 to any man who will establish a manufactory there. Stratford offers \$10,000, nearly a dollar a head of its population, to every manufacturer who will start a factory there. If it is not in the interests of those people to have manufactories started in their towns, why are they so anxious to tax themselves to such an extent to have those factories established in their midst? We do not find any clear Grit objecting, because it is not in the line of politics at all, and he believes it to be in the interest of his own locality that manufacturing industries should be established in it, and that the advantages to be derived more than compensate for the amount of bonus paid. In Toronto, Kingston, Montreal—every town and village throughout the Dominion, the people are willing to tax themselves to increase their industries. Is it not, therefore, in the interest of the country to attain the same object by putting on a Tariff that would give the men engaged in these employments a better return for their capital and labor. It is amusing to follow the course of argument pursued by the

Mr. SPROULE.

hon. members of the Opposition in reference to this Tariff since 1878. Early in 1879, when the Tariff was announced to this country, the cry from the Opposition was that it was going to ruin the farmers because it was going to destroy their market; that it would reduce the value of labor by making everything higher, and not give increased employment, and that the lumberman would be taxed so heavily he could not get out lumber at a profit. In short, the National Policy was going to break down the banking and commercial interests of the country. In 1879-80, we find they still pretended, but not quite so strongly, that it would ruin the country. Then they abandoned that cry and asked instead if the country was better than in 1878, before the new Tariff was introduced. They were justified in their assertions of predictions in reference to the results of the Tariff. In 1881, they began to find that prosperity was coming, and early. Now, in 1882, they acknowledge the country is more prosperous. Not a man in the Opposition but says it is more prosperous than in 1878, except the member for West Middlesex. I was very much amused with his logic no less than with his figures the other day. He said that this Tariff affected the manufacturers more injuriously than other classes, and than under the old Tariff of 17½ per cent. To prove that, he said that in 1878 we had 112 failures among manufacturers, and 745 among the traders. Where did he get those figures? I find by the return of Dun-Wiman, which I believe the most reliable, that, in 1878, there were 1,165 failures, or only a difference of 758.

Mr. ROSS. I quoted for 1876.

Mr. SPROULE. 1876 stands still worse in this respect. I believe the hon. gentleman's figures are as nearly correct as his logic, and that instead of proving those classes are now worse, it proved that they are much better off than under the old Tariff. If he only looks at the number of capitalists that were going down and the capital that was rusting in languishing establishments, not able to employ the workmen, and look at them to-day, and note the evidence of their prosperity, he will need no argument to prove their greater prosperity than in 1878. Then the hon. gentleman tried to prove that the Tariff he would adopt would be more in the interests of the manufacturers. He finds his logic for the last three years has failed to convince the manufacturers, the farmers and the laborers that his party are working in their interests, and that they are afraid to go back to the policy of the late Government. He tells those classes: "We will give you a Tariff that will work in your interests;" but, by oscillating between two powers, both affecting them, they hardly know what to do next. But, finally, the Opposition have settled down to their old love again, the Free Trade theory, which they now proclaim throughout the land. I very much mistake the intelligence of the people of this country if they will be deceived by this source, or if they will not return a still smaller number of those gentlemen at the next elections. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down said that if an angel came from heaven he would not convince the people—that they would still believe the hon. Minister of Railways. I have no hope of an angel appearing among the Opposition to convince anybody. We may safely adhere to our political creed, knowing that the men who took charge of the country when on the verge of ruin, had now brought it to the height of prosperity, which prosperity we may safely entrust to them. What stronger argument than this improved condition of the country do hon. gentlemen opposite want to convince them. They find the Government policy has given more employment, a better market, increased remuneration and prosperity to the people. It has given peace and contentment. These facts will not convince them. To use the scriptural simile, they would not believe though one rose from the

dead. I believe they now feel themselves on the verge of despair, and that they think it is better to fall back on their old Free Trade principles, from which line to convince the people, after failure from other lines. I was much amused at what I heard from a gentleman yesterday, who has lived for some time in the North-West; he said two things had benefitted the country during the last two years—one, the National Policy, and the next, the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He was liberal; and he said: "I am pleased we are in our present position." He added: "Two things have promoted our interests, mine as an old reformer and those of the men who have gone to the North-West; one is that our party got into power in 1873, because we then got the North-West, with its cheap lands, and men could go up poor and come back millionaires; we got places in the North-West and were able to invest it profitably. From 1875 to 1878, we had the advantage of everything; there was no great increase in the value of property. But the next best thing that affected our interests was the changed policy as to building the Canadian Pacific Railway, which changed the whole position of business and affairs in the North-West, so that men comparatively poor in 1878, find themselves almost millionaires to-day. Though this man was a strong reformer in 1878, he considers his party did him a great kindness in going out of power in that year. Why do we find multitudes from Europe, United States, and other countries going to the North-West to settle and invest, to-day? Why has property there gone up to such an enormous figure? Is it not the assurance that by giving the contract to the Syndicate that vast country will be opened at no distant day by a great transcontinental railway? This is the belief that is making that country so prosperous to-day and giving our farmers so profitable a new market. This and the National Policy have been the two great influences that have done so much for us in the past, and that we hope will do so much for us in the future. I would be sorry to give a silent vote on this resolution that designs a return to the state of affairs in 1878. I would consider myself recreant to my trust if I did not protest against it, knowing as I do, it would be one of the worst things for my constituency and the people of the Dominion at large.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to say a few words in answer to the position taken by the hon. member for Grey. I hope that in his diagnosis of disease, in his practice as a physician he is more accurate than he is in quoting agricultural statistics. If not, I should hate to have him dispense pills to me. One of his first mistakes is to confound the total importation of wheat in the period before the adoption of the National Policy with the importation of wheat for consumption in the period since. He next proceeds to inform us that the importation of oats from the Western States he had known to reduce the price 15 cents per bushel; I think he said, in forty-eight hours. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in what year, month, or place that was.

Mr. SPROULE. In the town of Goderich, in 1876, and I can give the month and day. I can give the market quotations from week to week.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have in my hand a statement of the price of oats in Toronto the third Wednesday of every month of every year since 1876.

Mr. SPROULE. That is no criterion at all. It is the local demand there that creates the price.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have in my hand a quotation of the market price the third Wednesday of each month in Toronto since the 1st of January, 1876, and there has not been a variation of 15 cents per bushel in any one year—much less in two days—and the variations from month to month range from 1 to 5 cents. The hon. gentleman's assertion is preposterous; it is made without foundation,

resting upon no fact whatever but upon the imagination of the man making the assertion, and which is designed to go forth to the country to produce an effect. The assertion is utterly preposterous. There never was a case in any market in Canada where the price of oats or any other grain has been depressed by importation 10 or 15 cents per bushel in twenty-four or forty-eight hours. The hon. gentleman informs us that after 1878 we imported 7,000,000 bushels of corn for consumption; it was 4,300,000, a little nearer than he usually gets it, but still over fifty per cent. astray. He tells us we have a better market for butter, cheese, oats—everything we raise. Why, we are exporting more in the last three and a half years of these articles than we did in the previous five years. The exports of animals and their products and of agricultural products, for the period ending 31st December last, since those gentlemen came into power, is greater by several millions of dollars than it was during the five years of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton. In not one of these articles have our exports diminished, but in every one of them our exports have increased. Yet the hon. gentleman stands up here and congratulates the country upon the fact, that under the operation of this policy we have had a much better market than we had before this policy was introduced. Then he tells us our people are contented. A great degree of contentment prevails in this country! Well, last year 118,000 were so contented that they left this country. The year before that, this state of contentment led to the emigration of 93,000, and the year before that of 31,000. More people emigrated from Canada during the last year than during the five years the hon. member for Lambton was at the head of the Government. In 1880, there were more Canadians in Dakota and Minnesota than in the Province of Manitoba. Yet they talk about the state of contentment that exists in this country, forsooth, when Canada furnished more emigrants to the United States last year than any other foreign country on the face of the globe. Then he tells us it is very fortunate for us we have adopted a policy that enables us to produce what goods we consume in this country, furnishing employment to our own men in the production; he seems ignorant of the fact that the importation of goods susceptible of manufacture in Canada last year, was some \$18,000,000 worth more than the year the hon. member for Lambton went out of office. Well, it is about the first time, for a good while, that I have heard any gentleman on the opposite side congratulate himself on the creation of that home market that our friends opposite are so fond of talking about when they made those roseate promises in 1878 that led to their being installed in the position they occupy. With reference to this home market, as I pointed out some nights ago, the exports of all articles of food or provisions have increased from year to year since the National Policy was adopted. The net export of grain, flour and meal for the five years ending the 30th June, 1878, was \$48,750,000. Now, I hoped to-night to have obtained a statement of the exports for the last six months ending 31st December, but was not able to do so. Through the kindness of the hon. the Minister of Customs I did obtain that report last year, and, according to it, the net export of grain for the six months was \$10,500,000. Assuming the exports had been as great for the six months ending the 31st December last, the exports for the three and a-half years have been \$55,500,000, against \$48,750,000 for the five years of the Reform Administration, showing that in three and a-half years the exports have been some 12 per cent. greater than they were in the preceding five years. Yet we have hon. gentlemen here so ignorant of the facts of the case as to congratulate this House upon the increased home market of this country. Why, Sir, take the years of 1877 and 1878, the two last years of the Mackenzie Administration, and compare them with the years 1880 and 1881, and you will find that in animals and their products

and in agricultural products, the exports for the first period were \$60,750,000, and for the second period, \$82,500,000, or \$21,600,000 more on those two articles in 1880 and 1881 than in 1877 and 1878. Then, if you look at the returns every fact you see demonstrates to a certainty the assertion I make that, so far from obtaining a home market, we are constantly increasing our exports of food and grain. Now, as I have occasionally stated heretofore, we have had in this matter an experience similar to that of the American farmers. The American farmers, for the last twenty years, have been creating a home market, and they have met with a success still more astonishing than ours. After subjecting themselves for twenty years to enormous taxation to procure this home market in 1880, that country exported \$400,000,000 worth of grain and provisions, and a total of nearly \$700,000,000 worth of the products of the soil. Of that quantity there were 98,000,000 bushels of corn, 153,000,000 bushels of wheat, 6,000,000 barrels of flour, and other articles in the provision line in proportion—food enough for at least 20,000,000 people, and all this time from 1881 down, the deluded tax payers of that country have been paying millions upon millions annually, under the delusion that they were creating a home market that would absorb the productions of their soil at home. After the American farmer had been protected by duties upon grain for a period of eighteen years, for the purpose of creating a home market, with the success I have pointed out, leaving him only a surplus of \$400,000,000 worth of food to export, after this brilliant success attending this policy for eighteen years, our Solons thought proper to protect the Canadian farmer against the American farmer, who himself had been protected against the Canadian farmer for eighteen years. And accordingly they imposed duties upon grain. Let me ask why should the protected Yankee farmer sell wheat and grain to the Free Trade Canadian farmer; why, if the duties upon grain were calculated to make a better market and protect American farmers and increase the price of grain, should Canada be the better market, and, if protection made the United States a poorer market than free trade Canada, why impose a duty on American grain in order to benefit Canadian farmers? The proposition is absurd on the face of it—absurd because any man who will examine into the condition of the trade of these two countries in grain must become aware that whatever surplus of grain the other country has to dispose of, a duty upon that particular grain can do no good whatever. Now, the Americans export no peas and no barley, and a duty on peas and barley unquestionably raises the price of those articles in the United States. The Canadian farmers, on the other hand, raise no Indian corn for export, and we have always admitted that a duty on Indian corn would raise the price on that article; but on all other grains raised in Canada an import duty can have no influence whatever on the prices, because this country has a surplus of those articles to export. With respect to butter and cheese, the country seemed to be ignorant of the fact that duties existed on those articles for many years at the same rates as now provided. I recollect the organ of the hon. member for Welland stating that great hardships existed because there was no protection on butter and cheese, although there was at that time a duty of 3 cents on cheese and 4 cents on butter; but the country never became aware of the fact, for the reason that there being every year a surplus of those articles to export, a duty had no effect on the prices because the prices were regulated by the foreign demand in England. So it has been and ever will be in regard to the protection of articles of which we have a surplus to export. I propose to call the attention of the House to some quotations as to prices ranging over the period from the commencement of the year 1876; and I may take this occasion to acknowledge the courtesy of the Secretaries of

Mr. CHARLTON,

the Boards of Trade at Toledo and Detroit, both of whom very kindly responded to the request I made for quotations ranging over those years. The Secretary of the Board of Trade, of Toledo, gave me quotations for the third Wednesday in each month for the years 1876 to 1881, inclusive. The Secretary of the Detroit Board of Trade gave me average quotations for each month, enabling me to arrive at the average quotations for every year. The comparison between the quotations in these two cities is not, however, thoroughly reliable, because it is not made on the same basis. The following are the quotations for five months in the years referred to:—

GRAIN QUOTATIONS.

Description.	Date.	Toronto price.	Toledo price.
1879.			
No. 2 winter wheat.....	August 20...	\$ 1 01	0 98½
do do	September 17...	1 05	1 03½
do do	October 15...	1 25½	1 35
do do	November 19...	1 24	1 27½
do do	December 17...	1 31½	1 37½
Average.....	1 15½	1 20½
1880.			
No. 2 winter wheat.....	August 18...	1 08½	0 96½
do do	September 15...	0 97	0 97½
do do	October 20...	0 95½	1 02½
do do	November 17...	1 03	1 08
do do	December 15...	1 11	1 00½
Average.....	1 03	1 01½
1881.			
No. 2 winter wheat.....	August 17...	1 24½	1 28½
do do	September 21...	1 30	1 43
do do	October 19...	1 34½	1 42½
do do	November 16...	1 30	1 34½
do do	December 21...	1 25½	1 33½
Average.....	1 28½	1 36½

Averages for same period of 1876, 1877 and 1878.

No. 2 winter wheat.....	1876	1 14½	1 20½
do do	1877	1 25	1 49½
do do	1878	0 93½	0 93½

Average for first seven months of 1878.

No. 2 winter wheat.....	1 16½	1 16½
-------------------------	-------	-------	-------

This table shows that in every year from 1876 to 1881, inclusive, except 1880, the prices of No. 2 winter wheat, at Toledo, were higher than at Toronto; in 1880, the average price in Toronto being 1½ cents per bushel higher. I have selected Toledo because it is the nearest corresponding market to Toronto that I could get. It is a large primary grain market, being, in fact, next to Chicago, and affords a better comparison than any other American port, although the prices should be somewhat higher in Toronto than Toledo, because it is nearer the sea. My next quotations are with respect to No. 2 spring wheat. I instituted a comparison in this grain be-

tween the prices at Toronto and Chicago, and find the following:—

Description.	Date.	Toronto price.	Chicago price.
1879.			
No. 2 spring wheat.....	August 20...	\$ 0 97	0 85 ³ / ₄
do do	September 17...	1 02 ¹ / ₂	0 93 ³ / ₄
do do	October 15...	1 19 ¹ / ₂	1 17
do do	November 19...	1 21	1 15
do do	December 17...	1 28 ¹ / ₂	1 27 ¹ / ₂
Average.....		1 13 ³ / ₄	1 07
1880.			
No. 2 spring wheat.....	August 18...	1 18	0 87 ¹ / ₂
do do	September 15...	1 06 ¹ / ₂	0 94 ¹ / ₂
do do	October 20...	1 12	1 00 ¹ / ₂
do do	November 17...	1 14	1 08 ¹ / ₂
do do	December 15...	1 16	1 07 ¹ / ₂
Average.....		1 13 ¹ / ₂	1 00
1881.			
No. 2 spring wheat.....	August 17...	1 26	1 32
do do	September 21...	1 32	1 29 ¹ / ₂
do do	October 19...	1 35	1 84 ¹ / ₂
do do	November 16...	1 33 ¹ / ₂	1 28 ¹ / ₂
do do	December 21...	1 31 ¹ / ₂	1 24 ¹ / ₂
Average.....		1 31 ³ / ₄	1 30

Averages for same period of 1876, 1877 and 1878.

No. 2 spring wheat.....	1876	1 07 ¹ / ₂	1 13 ³ / ₄
do do	1877	1 15	1 09 ¹ / ₂
do do	1878	0 99 ¹ / ₂	0 85 ³ / ₄

Average for first seven months of 1878.

No. 2 spring wheat.....	1 02	1 01 ¹ / ₂
-------------------------	------	----------------------------------

Those quotations show that during the two years, 1879 and 1880, the prices in Toronto were higher than in Chicago; but when you take into consideration the fact that the quality of No. 2 spring in Toronto is better than that of Chicago by several cents a bushel, we find that not even in 1880 would the difference in prices between Chicago and Toronto amount to more than the difference of quality and cost of freight. So not in one year during that period could the importation of American grain free of duty have depressed the prices of No. 2 spring in the Toronto market. I next invite a comparison at various points based upon quotations made in the third Wednesday of each month during the years 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881 at Toronto Toledo, and Detroit, the quotation at the latter place being the average price each month, and at the two former, being the

Average prices, 3rd Wednesday in each month:

			\$	cts.
1876.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 winter wheat...	1	08 ¹ / ₂
1876.....	Toledo.....	do do	1	22 ¹ / ₂
1876.....	Chicago.....		
1876.....	Detroit.....	No. 1.....	1	27
1877.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 winter wheat...	1	43
1877.....	Toledo.....	do do	1	49 ¹ / ₂
1877.....	Chicago.....		
1877.....	Detroit.....	No. 1 winter wheat...	1	53 ¹ / ₂

Average prices, 3rd Wednesday in each month:

			\$	cts.
1878.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 winter wheat...	1	06
1878.....	Toledo.....	do do	1	07
1878.....	Chicago.....		
1878.....	Detroit.....	No. 1 winter wheat...	1	09
1879.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 winter wheat...	1	07
1879.....	Toledo.....	do do	1	11 ¹ / ₂
1879.....	Chicago.....		
1879.....	Detroit.....	No. 1 winter wheat...	1	11 ¹ / ₂
1880.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 winter wheat...	1	13
1880.....	Toledo.....	do do	1	12 ¹ / ₂
1880.....	Chicago.....		
1880.....	Detroit.....	No. 1 spring wheat...	1	10 ¹ / ₂
1881.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 winter wheat...	1	18
1881.....	Toledo.....	1	33
1881.....	Chicago.....		
1881.....	Detroit.....	No. 1 winter wheat...	1	20 ¹ / ₂

So that during these six years there was but one year when the price of our winter wheat was a slight fraction higher in Toronto than Toledo; that was the year 1880, and in that year the advantage in favor of Toronto was one quarter of a cent per bushel. Consequently it is perfectly apparent that there was no possibility of buying wheat in Toledo, which is the corresponding market to Toronto, sending it to Toronto and selling it so as save the costs. If we institute a comparison in the matter of spring wheat, we find the following to be the result:—

Average prices, 3rd Wednesday in each month:

			\$	cts.
1876.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	03 ³ / ₄
1876.....	Toledo.....		
1876.....	Chicago.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	05 ³ / ₄
1876.....	Detroit.....		
1877.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	32 ¹ / ₂
1877.....	Toledo.....		
1877.....	Chicago.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	26 ¹ / ₂
1877.....	Detroit.....		
1878.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	0	96
1878.....	Toledo.....		
1878.....	Chicago.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	0	95 ¹ / ₂
1878.....	Detroit.....		
1879.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	0	96
1879.....	Toledo.....		
1879.....	Chicago.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	06 ¹ / ₂
1879.....	Detroit.....		
1880.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	19
1880.....	Toledo.....		
1880.....	Chicago.....	1	05
1880.....	Detroit.....		
1881.....	Toronto.....	No. 2 spring wheat...	1	22
1881.....	Toledo.....		
1881.....	Chicago.....	1	15
1881.....	Detroit.....		

So that there was only one of these years out of the entire six, when it would have paid expenses to buy No. 2 spring wheat in Chicago and sell it in Toronto, and in that year the average difference in price would barely have paid the freight, and the difference in the quality of the two grains which are graded No. 2 in Toronto and Chicago respectively. It will be noticed that

the year 1880 is the year when this difference in price occurs, and upon examination into the cause of wheat being higher in Toronto as compared with Chicago that year than any other year, I arrive at the conclusion that it was in consequence of the fact that the United States had an extremely large crop; that they exported an immense quantity, and that the price of wheat in the United States was governed by this export demand and wheat was sold in the United States market at a price which justified immediate exportation to Europe at the market quotations then prevailing. Now, Sir, when we come to examine into the difference between the quotations in these two markets in other grains we find a very remarkable contrast. I have shown, and the quotations have shown, that during these six years the imposition of duties could have no effect on the relative prices of wheat in the two markets; that the price was governed by causes entirely outside of the imposition of duties by either country; that the prices in the two markets were in all but one of these six years relatively higher in the American than in the Canadian market, and that in one year only was the price of wheat in Toronto higher than in Chicago, and that even in that year the difference in price was barely the difference in freight and the quality of the grain. Now, I propose instituting a comparison between the prices of coarse grain in the various markets of Canada and the United States respectively, and I shall furnish the markets of Toronto and Chicago. I will give the quotations on the 15th of July, the 15th of October and the 15th December in each year, in order to embrace the average prices as nearly as possible for the shipping season of each year:—

GRAIN QUOTATIONS.

Kind of Grain.	Date.	Toronto.	Chicago.
1876.			
Oats.....	July 15.....	34½	28
do	Oct. 15.....	39	28
do	Dec. 15.....	42	29
Average.....		38½	28½
1877.			
Oats.....	July 15.....	50	51½
do	Oct. 15.....	38	23½
do	Dec. 15.....	37	24½
Average.....		43	26½
1878.			
Oats.....	July 15.....	34	25
do	Oct. 15.....	32	19
do	Dec. 15.....	31	20½
Average.....		32½	21½

So that the average difference in prices through the whole three years was 12 cents a bushel on oats in favor of Toronto, and yet we are told it was necessary to impose a duty of 10 cents a bushel in order to prevent American oats slaughtering the Canadian markets to such an extent as to make oats lower here than in the United States. Again, take the 15th October and 15th December in each year (for it might be held that the quotation in July is not a fair quotation), we find that the average price in Toronto, each of these three years, was 36½ cents, in Chicago 24 cents, a difference in favor of Toronto of 12½ cents for the whole period. Well, if this was the case—if this market was so much better than the protected market of the Americans, who have been protected by grain duties for twenty years—how absurd it is to impose a duty of 10 cents on oats to make this a better market than the United States when at that moment it was 12 cents

Mr. CHARLTON,

better than in Chicago. Now, take the period since the National Policy, and I think we will find a change:—

	Toronto. Chicago.	
	cts.	cts.
1879.		
July 15.....	39	26½
October 15.....	35	29½
December 15.....	51½	39½
Average.....	37	32½
1880.		
July 15.....	38	22½
October 18.....	33	30½
December 15.....	34½	31
Average.....	35	28½
1881.		
October 15.....	43	44
December 15.....	45	46½
July 15.....	40	41½
Average.....	42½	44

So that the average difference in prices through the three years, since the National Policy went into force on the dates named, was 38 cents for Toronto and 35 cents for Chicago, a difference of 3½ cents in favor of Toronto. Or if we take the last two months, October and December, the average price was 37½ cents in Toronto, and 36½ cents in Chicago, a difference of 1½ in favor of Toronto; and yet I suppose the hon. Finance Minister will attempt to delude the farmers with the assertion that the duty of 10 cents a bushel on oats is beneficial to them. In this comparison it must ever be borne in mind that the Toronto bushel of oats is 34 lbs., the Chicago bushel 32 lbs., which swallows up the difference in favor of Toronto for the last three years. Why, oats have risen in Chicago, as compared with the price in Toronto, during the last three years under the National Policy, I am at a loss to say; I presume, however, that the Americans have stepped into a trade formerly done by us, namely, the manufacture of oatmeal for export. Previous to the introduction of this policy our oatmeal millers bought enormous quantities of Western oats for oatmeal exportation; but since its introduction this trade has been destroyed, and the Americans have entered into the business. At Cedar Rapids in Iowa, last summer, I saw a new oatmeal mill, which is said to be the largest in the world, and it is running almost exclusively for this export trade which the National Policy has transferred from Canada to the Western States. My hon. friend from Lambton reminds me that a great many of our oatmeal mills have been shut up by the National Policy.

An hon. MEMBER. Where?

Mr. MACKENZIE. One in Sarnia.

Mr. CHARLTON. And two in Perth. I know that these mills, which had to depend on American oats, have been either shut up or crippled in their operations by the adoption of this policy, while in 1878 we exported 174,000 barrels of oatmeal, in 1881 we only exported 53,000 barrels, showing a falling off in the production of oatmeal of within a fraction of three-fourths. Now, Sir, I propose next to institute a comparison of the quotation prices of barley and rye. The above quotations, made for three years prior to the adoption of this policy, and for three years subsequent to its adoption, show that not in one instance, with regard to either wheat or oats, has the price in Canada been sufficiently high, as compared with the price in the United States, to justify the assertion that the importation of American grain could reduce the price in this country. Now, I think some hon. gentlemen opposite contended, two or three years ago, that the imposition of a

duty of 15 cents a bushel on barley would raise the price, and some went so far as to say that it would raise the price to the extent of the duty. The Americans, as I have pointed out before, do not raise barley for export; all that is raised in that country is for home consumption, and they consume more than they raise. Canada happens to raise a kind of barley that cannot be raised in the United States, and that commands a high price among the brewers of that country. On the third Wednesday in September, October, November and December in each year, the average price of barley in Toronto and Oswego was as follows :—

	In Toronto.	In Oswego.
In 1876	\$0.81	\$1.08½
1877	0.66½	0.88½
1878	1.01½	1.22½

This was before the adoption of the National Policy. Now, let us see if the imposition of the duty on barley materially affected the relative position of the prices:

	In Toronto.	In Oswego.
In 1879	\$0.72	\$0.84½
1880	0.84½	1.00
1881	0.91½	1.07½

I defy any man to take any market quotation from 1876 down to this evening, and find that the market quotation for No. 1 barley is not materially higher in the United States than it is Canada; and yet we were told, and are still told, that it is necessary to keep this absurd duty upon barley in order to shut out the American article from our market, and to prevent it from depressing the price of barley in this country. The average price of rye on the third Wednesday of September, October, November and December, in each year, in Toronto and Chicago, are as follows:

	In Toronto.	In Chicago.
In 1876	\$0.60½	\$0.64½
1877	0.60½	0.53½
1878	0.5½	0.46½
1879	0.67½	0.66½
1880	0.83½	0.85½
1881	0.91	1.03½

And yet a duty is imposed in order to prevent the importation of cheap rye from Chicago to depress the market in Canada. These are specimens of the absurdity of the duty on grain, and I might show the same results with regard to peas, which are invariably higher in the United States than they are in this country. Now, with regard to the importation of wheat and other grains, it is well known to all who have studied the trade returns—although the hon. member from Grey (Mr. Sproule) does not seem to be aware of the facts—that the wheat imported was largely wheat *in transitu*—wheat passing through our canals for the purpose of being sent to the European market, although it was all entered as imported into Canada. We have spent millions of dollars in building very extensive canals for the express purpose of drawing American grain through these routes, and enabling our own people to handle these grains. I believe this Government received a protest from the Montreal Corn Exchange against these duties on grain, asserting that the effect of them was to deprive our own people of this trade and to lessen the usefulness of these canals, and that is certainly the effect of the duty on wheat. It is clearly evident, from the quotations of prices, that it does the farmer no good. It has raised the price of no article in Canada as compared with the prices in the United States, and it is clear the farmer has received no benefit. In fact, the hon. Finance Minister admitted last Session that the duty had not raised the price of wheat. He reminded me of Mark Twain's story of the beaver that was chased by the dog. The western hunter was describing in a bar-room one day the feats of a dog, and he informed a stranger that the dog chased the beaver so hotly that it had to take

to the shore, where it was so closely pressed it had to climb a tree to escape. "But," said the stranger, "beavers cannot climb; your story is very improbable." The hunter looked at him calmly and said: "Beavers cannot climb? Why, stranger, the dog was crowding on him so close he had to climb!" That was the way that the hon. Finance Minister was caught, and he was as loth to admit this fact as the beaver was to climb a tree, but he was so crowded he had to admit it. This year he fortified himself with the assertion that we do not pay more than half the duty on coal; and then proceeded to say that there had been one or two days during which the National Policy had raised the price of wheat 3 cents per bushel, because it happened that the price in Chicago was 3 cents less than in Toronto. The duty upon wheat, although it has no effect upon the price in Canada, and can have no effect as long as this country raises a surplus for exportation, yet it has injuriously effected the various interests in this country. I know of one case, with the circumstances of which I am intimately acquainted, where a miller, in my section of the country, engaged in flouring wheat for the purpose of making merchantable flour for the Montreal market, found it necessary to mix one-fourth red with three-fourths white wheat to make the article which the market demanded. Flour made of white wheat would not answer the purpose, and as no red wheat was raised in that country and he was unable to take advantage of the hon. Minister of Customs' order with reference to bonding, he was obliged to buy American wheat and pay the duty on it or not make the flour his customers demanded. The consequence was in that as in all similar cases, the miller was unable to pay the price for white wheat to his Canadian customers, that he would have paid had he been able to buy red wheat clear of duty. In this case, the operation of the duty was simply to deprive the farmers of that section of some 2 cents or 3 cents a bushel on the price of wheat. In the case of the millers on the Welland Canal, they must buy, to a great extent, American wheat, and they must be allowed to buy American wheat to flour, or be unable to prosecute their business. I believe arrangements have been made to allow them to flour American wheat; but that is an evasion of the law, and should the law at any time be strictly enforced, the consequence to the millers would be serious. While the duties do not, in any case, benefit the farmer, they injure various interests in the country. With reference to corn, we admitted the duty would raise the price because we do not raise all we require and buy largely for consumption. Our admission was only correct to a certain extent. The duty has raised the price of imported corn, but has failed to raise the price of corn produced in Canada one iota.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I know that is the case. I raise corn myself, live in a corn-growing country, and am intimately acquainted with the state of the market in that corn-growing belt. I know the duty did not raise the price one cent a bushel during the whole of last season in the market town of my county. Why did it not raise the price? Simply because there is a very small quantity of corn raised for sale, the farmers raising but little more than they require for their own consumption. Therefore, as there was but a small surplus and an entirely local demand, the imposition of the duty has not, in the slightest degree, affected the price of corn, in the corn belt in Ontario. The only parties affected are those that purchase American corn, as they have to pay the duty. The price of corn in my own county, which is all within the corn belt, is now lower than in Chicago, and has been for months. With regard to the corn question, I wish to show why the importation of corn is a benefit to Canada. The stock-raiser in the Western States can buy his corn to fatten his cattle

where he can get it cheapest, but the Ontario stock-farmer is in this respect placed at a disadvantage with the Western farmer—a disadvantage to the extent of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents a bushel on the price of corn. The reason the country largely imported corn during all the years it has imported it is simply this: Corn can be bought at a lower price relatively than other coarse grains. The farmer can sell his oats, or his barley or rye at a price that enables him to buy a corresponding amount of corn, and have a large sum to boot. I have two tables here, one made on the normal prices of different grains, including corn; and one on the abnormal price of corn this year. I found that the average price of corn in years past was 54 cents; and the price laid down at Toronto before the close of navigation, last year, free of duty, 66 cents. I find that if the farmer sells 34 lbs. oats at 39 cents a bushel, the average price for years past, and buys 56 lbs. corn at 54 cents, he makes in the exchange between 56 lbs. corn at 54 cents and 56 lbs. oats at this price, 10 cents. By selling 48 lbs. barley at 70 cents, he will make in the exchange between 56 lbs. barley and 56 lbs. corn, 27 cents. On 60 lbs. rye at 80 cents, he will make in an exchange of 56 lbs. rye and 56 lbs. corn at 54 cents, 20 cents. In the exchange of 56 lbs. of peas at 68 cents for 60 lbs., for 56 lbs. corn at 54 cents, he makes $9\frac{1}{2}$ cents; that is the simple reason why we import corn.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have heard it before.

Mr. CHARLTON. I dare say you have; but the truth makes very little impression upon the hon. gentleman; he is perfectly obdurate. But let me assure my hon. friend, whose practical knowledge is so small, that that is the reason why the farmer sells his coarse grains and buys corn, because he makes money in the exchange; and if he does not know that the man who can make money in such exchange, does not fail to do it, he had better learn the contrary as soon as possible. Assuming corn to be worth 66 cents a bushel, the exchange of 34 lbs. of oats, at current prices, for an equivalent amount of corn, will net the farmer 9 cents; the exchange of rye will net him $11\frac{1}{2}$ cents on every 56 lbs.; the exchange of barley will net him 32 cents on every 56 lbs., and peas $8\frac{3}{4}$ cents on the same quantity. It is absurd, then, for the Government to interfere with a business so profitable to the farmer by lessening his profits to the extent of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents a bushel on the exchange of those coarse grains. The hon. member for Grey alluded, some time ago, to the enormous importation of Indian corn in 1877. Now, in 1876, we had a short harvest, we fell \$2,137,000 short of raising our own breadstuffs; consequently we imported a large amount of coarse grains that year. I have a tabular computation of the quantity imported, which will show the gain to Canada resulting from the importation of corn and corn-meal in 1877; we imported that year 6,348,000 bushels of corn or meal, counting four bushels of corn to a barrel of meal. The value of all the exports of grain, flour and meal, in 1879, was \$2,597,659. The average cost of the meal imported, was \$3 per barrel, and of corn, 51 cents per bushel. Average price of flour exported, \$5.50; oats, 42 cents; barley, 71 cents; peas, 85 cents. I would respectfully ask the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to this interesting statement, which I think will throw some light on the corn question.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not imagine the hon. gentleman wishes to enlighten me.

Mr. CHARLTON. The total import of meal was 294,342 barrels; less exported, 1,499, net import, 292,843 barrels. The approximate gain to the country by substituting 292,843 barrels of meal for the flour, at \$2.50 per barrel on the increased amount we were thus able to export, was \$632,107. Now, the net import of corn, after deducting the meal, was 5,176,000 bushels. We exported that year 2,970,000 bushels of oats, equivalent to 1,800,000

Mr. CHARLTON.

bushels of corn, of which we imported 1,800,000 bushels more than we would have, had we consumed the whole of our oat crop. We received for the oats exported the price we paid for the same weight of corn imported, and \$252,000 more. We exported 1,745,000 bushels of peas. Had we not imported the corn that replaced those peas, we would have consumed them. As it was we received \$523,000 more for the peas than we paid for an equal weight of corn. Having imported enough corn to enable us to export our entire surplus of peas and oats that year, we still had 1,536,000 bushels of corn left, which enabled us to export 1,736,000 bushels of barley, which we should have been obliged to consume if we had not imported the corn. The profit on the exchange of barley for corn amounted to \$466,860. The result of this trade to the country was a gain; in the exchange of our flour for corn, was \$632,000; gain in the export of oats and import of corn, \$252,000; gain in the export of peas and import of corn, \$523,000; export of barley and import of corn, \$466,000, or a total gain to Canada of \$1,873,000. If we allow \$435,000 as the cost of freight on the corn purchased and sent to the interior, and the freight from the place of growth to the port of shipment on the coarse grains exported you have a net gain of \$1,435,000 to Canada in consequence of the importation of 6,348,000 bushels of corn; and yet we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that it was a great disaster to import that corn. If we had not imported it our net exports of grain and meal that year, in place of having been \$2,597,629, would have been but little more than \$1,000,000 worth. So much for the corn question. I repeat, the duty on corn has not raised the price to the producer of corn in Canada one iota. It has only raised the price to the importer for consumption. The importation of corn at low prices, enabling farmers to sell their coarse grains for prices relatively much higher, is a great gain. I have shown that for one year that gain exceeded \$1,400,000; and hon. gentlemen opposite, in opposing a duty on corn, were trifling with the public interests, and inflicting a very great injury on the farmers outside the corn belt. I now wish to call the attention of the House to the current quotations of farm produce on the 27th day of this month, and to ask those hon. gentlemen whether they think that, under the circumstances, the duty upon grains is necessary in order to keep them out of our market for fear that it would be slaughtered. By these quotations I find, on 27th March, the price of No. 2 winter wheat in Toronto was \$1.27; in Toledo, \$1.37, or 10 cents higher there; in Buffalo, \$1.40; Oswego, \$1.40; in Montreal, \$1.43; in New York, \$1.44. The same day the price of spring wheat was, in Toronto, No. 2, \$1.28; Chicago, \$1.35, or 7 cents higher there; Buffalo, \$1.48; Duluth spring wheat, No. 1, Buffalo, \$1.60; Toronto, \$1.30; barley, Toronto, 84c.; Chicago, \$1.00; Buffalo, \$1.07; Montreal, 65c.; New York, \$1.17. Oats, 34 lbs., at Toronto, 40c. to 43c.; Chicago, 43c. to 44c.; Toledo, 48c.; Buffalo, 54c.; Oswego, 50c.; New York, 63c.; against 37c. in Montreal. Rye, Toronto, 83c.; Chicago, 88c.; Montreal, 90c.; New York, 95c. Peas, Toronto, 80c.; Buffalo, \$1.00. Butter, best grade, Toronto, 30c.; Chicago, 36c.; Buffalo, 40c.; Montreal, 26c.; New York, 43c. Cheese, $13\frac{1}{2}$ cents at Chicago, $13\frac{3}{4}$ cents at Buffalo, 13 cents at Montreal, and 13 cents at New York. There is not one article in that list that would be in the slightest degree effected by the imposition of a duty upon their importation from the United States. In every case the duty is useless and has no effect whatever in raising the price of grain. None of these grains can be bought at the prices I have quoted, and imported into Canada for consumption, if the duty stood entirely out of the way. The benefit the farmer derives from these duties it would require a very powerful microscope to perceive. They remind me of the story of an old Scotch beadle, who wanted his minister to allow him to preach. The minister asked him if he thought he could draw an inference from a text. He replied that he thought he could. The minister said: "The text I will

give you, John, is this, 'And the wild ass snuffeth up the east wind.' What inference would you draw from that?" Said John: "The inference I would draw would be this, that he would snuff it up a long time before he got fat upon it." That is the case here. The farmers will be protected by these duties a long time before they get any benefit from them. Now, with regard to the duties in the Maritime Provinces, although that is somewhat beyond my province, I believe their operation injuriously affects the consumers in that section in this way—it obliges them to confine their trade to an unnatural channel. Their natural trade is to buy their breadstuffs where they sell their productions, in order to have return freight. If they send their vessels to New York or Boston with cargoes of lumber and coal, it is natural that they should be allowed to bring back flour, meal and provisions; and if they are obliged to buy these articles in Ontario it is an unnatural mode of prosecuting their business. The duty probably injures them and confers no benefit whatever upon the Ontario producer. I am happy to see the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) in his place. I had the pleasure this morning of visiting a cotton mill in which he is interested. I heard that hon. gentleman the other day say that he had not received 3 per cent. dividend on his cotton stocks yet.

An hon. MEMBER. He withdrew that.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am happy to hear it; I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. However, I found what would be the true inwardness of the matter, and while large dividends are not declared, I think they are payable, but they are used in doubling the capacity of the mill and doubling the value of the property. It reminds me of the case of the cotton mill up west which gave the information that it returned no dividend, in 1878. I ascertained by private enquiries that they had spent 10 per cent. of their earnings in increasing their plant, in order to meet their increased business. That is the case with the cotton mills that do not declare dividends just now. They are enabled to set at rest 30 or 40 per cent. in order to increase their capacity for earning great profits. I will not detain the House longer. I think that an examination of the quotations that I have presented will convince anyone that the operation of the duties upon grain has not been to the advantage of the farmer of Canada. I think it will also be apparent to any impartial observer that we are not realizing that home market promised to us very rapidly, inasmuch as our exportation of grains and flour is rapidly increasing. So far as the farmer of Ontario is concerned, the operation of this National Policy has not been to his advantage. It has increased the cost of various articles he purchases, and has not bestowed upon him the slightest advantage in the way of increasing the prices received by him for any article he produces for sale; and for that reason, as a representative of an agricultural constituency, and sent here by farmers to represent their interests, I shall vote for the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. TELLIER. The resolution submitted to the consideration of this House, by the hon. member for Quebec East, asks for the abolition of duties on coal, coke and breadstuffs, which were admitted free of duty under the former Tariff. In other words, it amounts, Mr. Speaker, to an attempt to destroy a part of the National Policy which was inaugurated on the 14th March, 1879, with the object of fostering and protecting the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of Canada. The question of protection was fully discussed in the presence of the electors at the last general election, and we all know and remember the verdict rendered by them on the 17th September, 1878. On that day the people declared themselves by a large majority in favor of Protection, not only for the agricultural but also for the mining and manufacturing interests of the country. Our farmers, previous to the remodelling of the

Tariff in 1879, sorrowfully witnessed our markets flooded with American products, admitted free of duty, whilst Canadian agricultural products entering into the United States were heavily taxed. They clamoured for a protective system that would keep a home market open to home products, and asked that the same duties shall be levied on agricultural products imported from foreign countries into Canada, as those levied on our products by those same countries. They complained of the unjust and unequal Customs relations existing between Canada and the United States with regard to the exchange of agricultural products. In this country, which supplies more agricultural products than the national consumption can absorb, we were importing every year from abroad a considerable quantity of grain and flour, which was offered for sale on our market, and which usurped the place of our Canadian products. We no longer held possession of the home market, for without paying any duty, foreign producers could sell there as readily as our own farmers. In that, Mr. Speaker, there was an injustice, a grave injustice, to our farmers. During the last Parliament, the Conservative party noticed the injustice and became the interpreter of the complaints uttered outside the House, and of the request that a remedy should be furnished against these existing evils. Several motions were made in this House, to obtain this much-wished-for Protection, but they were all defeated. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), a fervent Liberal, attempted, but without success, on the 9th April, 1878, to have a duty imposed on Indian corn and oats imported into the country. The Hon. Mr. Joly, the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, declared himself in 1876 in favor of levying duties on all foreign products, if not also on all raw materials required for our manufacturers. Yet the Liberal Administration turned a deaf ear to these legitimate requests, and persisted to the end in its refusal. The question was brought before the people in 1878, and the electors declared themselves in favor of a National Policy and of a system of general protection, and they elected representatives favorable to their interests in that respect. The electors relegated to the cold shades of Opposition the members of the Mackenzie Administration, which had persistently refused to render justice to agricultural and manufacturing interests. The Conservative party came to power with a programme approved of by the mass of the people of Canada. Its bounden duty was, therefore, to put into operation the sound policy which it had announced before and during the elections. Its first care has consequently been to fulfil the promises which it had made to the people, and to adopt a National Policy which, by a judicious readjustment of the Tariff, was to be of advantage to and foster the manufacturing, mining, agricultural, and other interests of Canada. What was, Mr. Speaker, the principle that was to preside at this readjustment of the Tariff? It was the principle of protecting everything that we could produce. The present Government set itself to work, and after laboring conscientiously, it gave to the country, on the 14th March, 1879, a Tariff which is essentially protective, and which has largely contributed to restore prosperity to all our languishing industries. Our agricultural interests have not been overlooked in this Tariff. They were suffering from a ruinous competition with foreign producers. In order to destroy that competition and to insure to our farmers a home market, the following Customs' dues were imposed on foreign agricultural products, which formerly were admitted free of duty: on wheat, barley and beans, 15 cents per bushel; on rye, oats, buckwheat and peas, 10 cents per bushel; on maize, 7½ cents per bushel; on wheat and rye flour, 50 cents per bbl.; on Indian meal, 40 cents per bbl.; on buckwheat flour, ¼ cent per lb.; on oatmeal, ½ cent per lb.; and all other kinds of flour, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. These duties have had the effect of decreasing imports for

consumption of foreign grain and flour, without injuring our export trade. The present Tariff has operated successfully in the agricultural interests. Nevertheless, the Reform party, in the ruthless and injudicious warfare which was carried on against this Tariff, would wish this House to declare that it would be better to re-establish the former state of things. In my opinion, that would not be a sound policy. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that previous to the adoption of the present Tariff, the Canadian farmer was placed in an unjust position. If we consult the Trade and Navigation Returns for the years previous to the new Tariff, we find that Canada exported every year to foreign countries large quantities of grain and flour, whilst every year also Canada imported for consumption considerable quantities of foreign grain and flour. We did not require these products, for each year our exports of grain and flour of Canadian production were in excess of our imports for consumption. Our market being thus invaded by these foreign agricultural products which we did not require, we were compelled to send our own products to foreign countries, and the greater part of our exports found their way to the United States. The Americans, who were sending us a large quantity of their agricultural products, had no duty to pay to come into our market; whilst we, to take advantage of their markets, were compelled to pay into the Treasury of the United States some considerable amounts. Under the Tariff formerly in force in Canada, foreign wheat as well as barley was admitted free of duty; beans, buckwheat, maize, oats, peas, rye, buckwheat flour, Indian meal, oatmeal, rye and wheat flour, all these products were admitted free of duty from foreign countries into Canada. Yet we were exporting the same products abroad, and when we did so to the United States, we had to pay on wheat, a duty of 20 cents per bushel; on barley and rye, a duty of 15 cents per bushel; on beans and buckwheat, a duty of 10 per cent.; on maize and oats, 10 cents per bushel; on peas and buckwheat flour, a duty of 20 per cent; on Indian meal, a duty of 10 per cent; on oatmeal, a duty of $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per lb; on rye flour, a duty of 10 per cent.; and on wheat flour, a duty of 20 per cent. You see, Mr. Speaker, that to be allowed to take these products to the American market, we were mulcted in heavy taxes, whereas Americans could bring those same products into our markets and offer them for sale without paying a cent of duty. This was most unjust to our farmers; attention was drawn to it by the people, previous to the elections of 1878, and the electors declared by their votes that they wished to see this state of affairs cease. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that our farmers were nursing the idea of a commercial reciprocity, between Canada and the United States, but was it possible to entertain such an idea in the peculiar circumstances wherein we were placed? On the one hand, the United States could freely bring their products into our markets, whilst, on the other, we were paying them on the same products, sent into their markets, large duties, wherewith to enrich their Treasury. Still we could not expect that the Americans would give up the advantage they had over us. On the products that I have enumerated, the duties which we paid to the United States, in 1877, amounted to about \$2,000,000. By whom was this enormous sum paid? By the Canadian farmer; and to prove this, I am going to make use of the argument used by our opponents in this House and elsewhere. They have contended that we had not the command of the market prices for grain. Very well; let us assume that such is the case and that we must accept for our grain the prices of the Liverpool, Boston and Chicago markets, or of other localities. In order for us to get the prices ruling in these markets, we must deduct from them the cost of transport, insurance and storage, as well as the Customs duties, which we have to disburse to reach these markets. There is, consequently, a considerable loss on the price of grain sold in Canada for

Mr. TELLIER.

export to foreign countries. Who is it that had to bear this loss? Why, the Canadian farmer, and no one else. It is a most interesting study, that of the Trade and Navigation Returns for the fiscal year 1876-77, to find out what were at the time our exports of agricultural products into the United States. During that year we exported into the United States the following Canadian products: 6,243,033 bushels of barley, representing a value of \$1,503,117, on which was levied a duty of 15 cents per bushel; 470,472 bushels of peas, representing a value of \$379,841, and charged 20 per cent.; 348,946 bushels of wheat, representing a value of \$376,019, and charged 20 cents per bushel; 118,281 bushels of beans, representing a value of \$117,320, and charged 10 per cent.; 405 bushels of Indian corn, representing a value of \$167, and charged 10 cents per bushel; 72,378 bushels of oats, valued at \$24,906, and charged 10 cents per bushel; 95,065 bushels of rye, valued at \$65,163, and charged 15 cents per bushel; 3,928 bushels of other kinds of grain, valued at \$3,018, and charged 10 per cent.; 30,405 barrels of flour, valued at \$173,989, and charged 20 per cent.; 11,991 barrels of oatmeal, valued at \$48,753, and charged $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per lb.; 2,377,120 lbs. of wool, valued at \$681,978, and charged 10 cents per lb. and 11 per cent. *ad valorem*; 26,195 cwt. of flax-seed, valued at \$182,979, and charged 2 cents per lb.; 7,496 horses, valued at \$668,467, and charged 20 per cent.; 13,851 horned cattle, valued at \$268,317, and charged 20 per cent.; 198,820 sheep, valued at \$536,648, and charged 20 per cent. The total amount of duties paid to the United States on the exportation of those articles reached about \$3,000,000. Yet, similar articles imported in considerable quantities from the United States during that year 1876-77 had nothing to pay to come into Canada, excepting, however, animals, which were charged 10 per cent. Thus, the American treasury was enriched to the extent of about \$3,000,000, to the prejudice of the Canadian farmer, whereas the American farmer had nothing to pay to the Canadian Treasury in order to get the privilege of our market. Thus did the Americans yearly largely take advantage of the privileges conferred on them by the former Tariff, which allowed them to flood our market with their agricultural products. They enjoyed the convenience of our market; they reaped the advantage of our prices, and they did not pay anything into the Canadian treasury. Well, it became necessary to bring an end to such a state of things. The Conservative party bound itself to do justice, and it did so liberally in 1879. The means employed by it were to impose the duty which the hon. member for Quebec East is desirous of removing to-day. This tax is advantageous to the Canadian farmer; it is therefore undesirable that it should be removed. It has had the effect of doing away with the ruinous competition from which our farmers suffered under the old Tariff. It is true that we still import agricultural products from abroad; but their importation has considerably decreased, and those which come into Canada for consumption are charged with a duty which goes to the public Treasury. The amount thus paid in is that much that the Canadian people are exempted from paying so. The present Government has fairly carried out the ideas it expressed previous to 1879 and the promises made during the elections. Those ideas and those promises have been realized by the protective Tariff given to the country in 1879. Our opponents have much criticized that Tariff; they have sought to ridicule it. At the time when it was adopted, Mr. Speaker, we could merely express our opinion as to its results, but to-day, our opinion is confirmed by what has happened since. If we consult the public records, we find therein the proof that the Tariff has produced the results which we expected. Have our imports of former times diminished? I have taken the trouble to prepare a statement with regard to the agricultural products which have been affected by the changes made in 1879. From it

I see that a considerable portion of our market which was occupied by foreign products has been kept for the benefit of our farmers. They have supplied for home consumption during the past two years an amount of \$23,298,005, representing articles which were formerly supplied by foreigners. This amount may appear extraordinary, but it is nevertheless correct. As a basis for my calculations, I have taken two years under the Liberal and two years under the Conservative regime. For the former, I have taken the years 1877 and 1878, and 1880 and 1881 for the latter; I have compared the exports and imports during these four years, so as to be able to form an opinion, and the following is the result I have attained. I will commence with wheat which has been affected by the present Tariff. Foreign wheat, which was admitted free of duty before the present Tariff, has been charged a duty of 15 cents per bushel. What has been the result of this duty? We are going to examine. Our imports for home consumption have been considerably less in 1879 than our opponents thought they would be. Thus, during the years 1877 and 1878, the total imports of wheat amounted to \$11,356,972, and the whole of this amount was imported into the country for consumption. Under the new Tariff, our total imports have amounted to \$15,880,666 for the years 1880 and 1881, but of that amount a value of \$62,000 only was imported for consumption. Such is the difference, Mr. Speaker. If we pass on to wheaten flour we find the same result. During the years 1877 and 1878 there was imported in all for consumption, wheaten flour to the value of \$4,830,374 as against \$1,703,306, whereof \$1,453,985 for consumption during the years 1880 and 1881. We also find that we imported all kinds of flour (with the exception of wheaten flour), during the years 1877 and 1878 for an amount of \$1,582,933, whereof \$1,582,431 was for consumption, and during the last two years, to an amount of \$926,929, whereof \$923,474 was for consumption, which shows a considerable decrease in favour of the present Tariff. Whilst I am on the subject of flour, I have a remark to make. The hon. member who has just addressed this House, has told us that several mills had closed since 1879 as they could not find employment. That assertion has been disputed, and I do not think it is exact. The figures which I have just quoted show that since the inauguration of the present Tariff, our imports of flour have decreased, and we have increased our exports of the same commodity. Thus, in 1880 and 1881, our exports of flour of all kinds exceeded those of 1877 and 1878 by \$640,068 worth of Canadian flour, and of \$373,563 worth of foreign flour. Our mills have, therefore, ground more grain and made more flour since the change of Tariff. If we look at the effect of the Tariff on maize, we find that during the years 1877 and 1878, maize was imported to the value of \$7,795,162, and the whole of this amount seems to have been consumed in the country. During the past two years, our imports have amounted to \$6,594,031, whereof \$1,639,169 for consumption. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take oats. During the years 1877 and 1878, oats were imported to the amount of \$1,262,123, and the whole of this amount appears to have been consumed in the country, whereas during the last two years, we only imported to the value of \$91,858, whereof \$60,452 was for consumption. As to peas, and beans, we find that our imports in 1877 and 1878 amounted to \$34,399 for consumption, whilst during the years 1880 and 1881 we only imported \$26,834, whereof \$23,996 was for consumption. If we take barley, we find that for the years 1877 and 1878, the imports reached \$324,387, and this amount appears to have been consumed in the country, whilst during the years 1880 and 1881, we imported barley to the amount of \$15,804, whereof \$14,926 was for consumption. Bran, rye and other grains imported in 1877 and 1878 amounted to \$142,114, and they appear to have been totally consumed

in the country, whereas, in 1880 and 1881, but \$58,376 was imported, whereof \$48,709 was for consumption. The imports of hay, straw, potatoes and other vegetables amounted to \$194,922, whereof \$193,922 was for consumption during the first two years, and \$217,629, whereof \$218,377 for consumption during the last two years. We imported, in 1877 and 1878, \$852,550 worth of animals, whereof \$785,976 was for consumption, and, in 1880 and 1881, \$609,345, whereof \$544,329 was for consumption. The trade in grain, flour and vegetables during the two years of 1877 and 1878, amounted to \$27,522,386 for imports; of that amount, \$27,521,488 was for consumption; and during the years 1880 and 1881, we imported in grain, flour and vegetables to the extent of \$26,533,899, whereof \$4,465,526 only was for consumption. These figures show that for the years which I have compared, we have diminished our total import trade to the extent of \$1,989,487, and our imports for consumption to the extent of \$23,056,358, in the matter of grain, flour and vegetables. This is a satisfactory margin for our farmers. Previous to the change of the Tariff, Mr. Speaker, we were compelled to seek abroad grain, flour and vegetables to the amount of \$27,521,884 consumed in the country, whilst since the change of Tariff, we have only sought these products to the extent of \$4,465,526. To what is due this decrease of our imports for consumption? I have heard our opponents speak of the Tariff. I have heard the doubts expressed by them as to its results. Each one of them admitted the prosperity that has reigned since its adoption, but each one became pious and thanked Providence for what has taken place, never attributing the result to the Tariff. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that we have much to thank Providence for. Providence has granted us good crops, has assisted us in giving us a number of representatives favorable to the National Policy, and especially in giving us good Government which has had the power to reverse the policy followed previous to 1879, and which has thereby contributed to bring about that prosperity which we are so glad to see reigning everywhere to-day. Were we to listen to our opponents, it would have been sufficient to fold our arms and wait. These gentlemen have so great a confidence in Providence, that in their eyes it is not necessary to pass new fiscal laws; it is sufficient to raise one's eyes heavenwards and to open one's mouth, to have food ready cooked dropped into it. As for me, I have always thought that one should help oneself. Thus did the electors help themselves by sending to this House a majority inclined to look after their interests, after the national interests, and we may say to-day that they did right in electing a majority which has labored here to protect industries in general, and the agricultural industries especially. With the figures that I have just quoted, Mr. Speaker, I have shown but a part of the question which engages our attention at present. I have shown that the predictions that were made to the people to the effect that a change of the Tariff would diminish the imports for consumption have been realized. Who are those that have been benefitted by the decrease of imports of agricultural products? It is our farmers who have found on our market a place formerly occupied by foreign products. In 1880 and 1881 they supplied grain, flour, hay, vegetables and animals to the value of \$23,298,005 in excess of that for the years 1877 and 1878. If we compare the last two years with the first two, we find that we have diminished the imports for consumption by an amount of \$11,294,932 for wheat; by \$3,376,389 for wheaten flour; by \$658,957 for other kinds of flour; by \$6,155,993 for maize; by \$309,461 for barley, and by \$93,045 for bran, rye and other grain, or a total of \$23,090,211. If to that we add an amount of \$241,647, or the decrease on the import of animals, and if we deduct \$24,415 for the increase of our imports for consumption of hay, straw, potatoes and other vegetables, and \$18,438 for imports of damaged grain

and flour, we find that we have eliminated from our home market a value of \$23,298,005. Here is the statement which I submit to the consideration of this House and of our opponents. It will be seen from this statement that we have increased the imports for consumption of certain products to the extent of \$42,853, but, on the other hand, we have secured to the Canadian farmers a market for an amount of \$23,298,005 by the decrease of our imports. Well, this seems to me a satisfactory result for which the farmers will not blame us when we acquaint them with the result. Mr. Speaker, I have merely spoken of the effects of the present Tariff on our imports for consumption. Our opponents have contended that our total import trade would be diminished. This decrease is not as considerable as our opponents are willing to believe; the decrease actually amounts to but \$2,232,692. Our opponents also prophesied that our export trade would be largely effected. I have examined the question from that point of view to find out if their predictions had been realized, and I have found that during the years 1877 and 1878 as compared with 1880 and 1881, our exports of Canadian agricultural products instead of decreasing, have increased by \$9,574,876, and that our exports of foreign products have increased by \$6,114,981. Here is the statement which proves my assertions:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF EXPORTS FROM CANADA DURING THE YEARS 1877-78 AND 1880-81.

	From Canadian Sources.		From Foreign Sources.	
	Years 1877-78.	Years 1880-81.	Years 1877-78.	Years 1880-81.
	Value.	Value.	Value.	Value.
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Wheat	8,118,578	8,535,862	7,614,760	14,650,519
Wheaten flour	4,221,904	5,104,063	58,014	385,774
Other kinds of flour	918,614	679,523	2,001	47,804
Maize.....	1,402	1,559	5,260,060	4,798,397
Oats.....	2,207,145	2,899,199	497,219	8,169
Peas and beans.....	3,674,765	6,650,175	14,601	191
Barley.....	8,882,690	10,741,868	327,399	900
Hay, straw, potatoes and other vegetables.....	2,750,959	4,493,256	51,382	36,855
Bran, rye and other grain...	350,795	1,599,223	27,714	9,522
	31,129,852	40,704,728	13,823,150	19,938,131
		31,129,852		13,823,150
Increase.....		9,574,876		6,114,981
Horses	2,052,950	3,974,416	20,122	18,522
Horned cattle.....	1,868,084	6,229,308	193,209	25,140
Pigs.....	35,066	53,122		75
Sheep.....	1,282,357	2,794,957		7,008
Poultry and other animals..	115,751	274,997	120	200
	5,354,208	13,326,800	213,451	50,945
		5,354,208	50,945	
Increase.....		7,972,592	162,506	Decrease.

Now, where are our opponents with their predictions? We have succeeded by means of this Tariff in securing to Canadian farmers the Canadian market to a considerable amount. Our total import trade only suffered a loss of \$2,000,000, and our export trade has increased in the proportion that I have just mentioned. It seems to me that the Government has reason to be generally satisfied with its National Policy, and especially in so far as it concerns agricultural protection. There is yet another point on which our opponents sought to become prophets. They contended that the change of Tariff would be detri-

Mr. TELLIER.

mental to our trade with England; that this change of Tariff would have the result of affecting injuriously our credit in that country. Well, if we consult the public records, we find that our trade with England has, instead of decreasing, increased, and that the present Tariff has specially operated against the United States, and in favor of England. Our credit has never stood higher. So there is another of our opponent's predictions that has not been realized. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has just made an appeal to this House; he asks us by the resolution which he has put into your hands, to give a vote that would have the effect of upsetting that National Policy adopted in 1879. But who complains against this Tariff? Is it the farmers or the consumers who complain? I represent a county in which the agricultural production is somewhat considerable. Sir, in that county political opinions are pretty equally divided. I have had the opportunity of meeting frequently both friends and foes; I have had the opportunity of speaking to them of the National Policy, and of the effect that it would have on agricultural productions, and I can say that not a single farmer has complained of that policy. Liberals and Conservatives alike endorse it. Were we to-day to ask of them a frank and square answer to the following questions: Do you wish to return to the former régime? Do you wish that we should abolish the duties levied on agricultural products? I am certain there would be but one voice in the county of St. Hyacinthe, to reply that we should keep in force the present system. Is it the consumer who complains? I have not heard any complaint from that quarter in the county of St. Hyacinthe or elsewhere; and why should the consumer complain? Is it because he is paying dearer for his purchases? As has been remarked in this House, the consumer earns more money now than in 1878, and he has now the means of buying the necessaries of life, which means he did not possess previous to the inauguration of the National Policy. No more than the farmer does the consumer wish to go back to the policy of 1873. I have listened to the discussions which have taken place in this House with regard to the question of prices. We have been told that we had no control over the prices of grain and flour, and that they were regulated by the Liverpool, Boston and other markets. Supposing such to be the case, are our farmers not in a position to supply us with the grain upon which it is sought by the resolution now submitted to abolish the tax? Are our farmers not in a position to supply us with this grain as cheaply as foreign farmers? I maintain that they are. If we have no control over our market quotations, and if we are obliged to accept foreign ones, we must add thereto the cost of transport, insurance and storage, and those foreign products will cost us dearer than if we bought them in the country. The consumer has not, therefore, any reason to complain. On the other hand, if foreign grain comes and takes the place of our products on our own markets, our farmers will suffer therefrom, for they will be driven to seek a foreign market to sell their products, and they will lose, as I have said, the cost of transport, insurance, storage and customs' dues. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the Canadian farmer, not having any foreign competition to fear, will be able to sell us his products as cheaply as foreign farmers, and even cheaper, and the consumer will not have any reason for being dissatisfied with the present policy, the effect of which is to create work for him and give him money. The results of the National Policy have, therefore, not done any harm to either the farmer or the consumer, whilst it has contributed to fill the public coffers. The Americans having refused to admit our agricultural products free of duty; efforts to bring about this result having been fruitless, it became absolutely necessary to protect ourselves against them and to

change the Tariff. It was only fair to make them pay duties equal to those which they were compelling us to pay when we wished to take advantage of their markets. The imports made after they change of the Tariff, have had the effect of pouring into the public Treasury a considerable amount, which has been employed in the expenses of Administration, and by this means the Government has been put in a position to put an end to deficits and to diminish the taxes on the necessaries of life which we do not produce in this country. Thus we have during the present Session seen the Government take the tax off tea and coffee. It was a considerable tax which weighed on the people, but owing to the Protection which has been established, owing especially to the amounts paid into the public Treasury through the importation of agricultural products, the Government has been able to take off these taxes. There was another tax which weighed heavily on the people; it was the tax on promissory notes. The Government has taken it off altogether, and has thereby eased the burdens of the people. The Government has also diminished the tax on Canadian tobacco, and the result of this will be to protect the farmers in a special manner. It therefore seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are specially interested in maintaining the present state of affairs. The change of Tariff has also had the effect of uniting more closely the different Provinces forming Confederation by establishing commercial intercourse amongst them. The complaints we have heard against the present Tariff had a tendency to bring the various Provinces into antagonism. Thus we have heard it said in this House that the wheat of Ontario was protected in an unjust fashion, and that the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces were compelled to pay considerable taxes on flour and wheat. It has also been contended that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec were compelled to pay a considerable tax on coal for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces. All these utterances were calculated to create prejudices and to snap asunder the bond which unites the various Provinces, and it seems to me that they should be answered in the interests of the union of the Provinces. The duties imposed on foreign products have had the effect of increasing the trade between the various Provinces of Confederation; these Provinces are each existing under different conditions and produce different commodities which they must exchange among themselves. They continually supply each other with products and avoid going to foreign countries for a great many things. That has been the result of the National Policy, and I am certain that the complaints made in this House will not find an echo among the people. Protection has been granted for the mutual benefit of the Provinces. The Province of Quebec has received its share of the benefits of the National Policy, through the Protection granted to its agricultural products, and it is only fair that it should bear its part of the tax levied on coal in favor of the Maritime Provinces. To conclude, Mr. Speaker, justice having been meted out to all the Provinces, and the country being all the better for it, it seems to me that it is our duty to continue the policy inaugurated in 1879. As for myself, I intend to vote against the resolution now submitted to the House, and which, if adopted, would have the result of destroying a part of that National Policy.

Mr. HESSON, I desire to say only a few words in answer to the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, which was to my mind a very marvellous speech. The resolution before the House, as I understand it, is that a tax upon bread is an injustice to the working people of this country. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk disposed of that proposition, and, if his speech could be made out, it would damage the position of the hon. member for Quebec East who moved the resolution. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk is entitled to the laurels. His whole effort

for a full hour, in what I call a diarrhoea of figures, was simply to prove that the National Policy had not increased the price of corn, wheat, flour, oats, barley and rye. Yet the hon. member for Quebec East moves that the National Policy is putting a duty of 50 cents on the barrel of flour and the barrel of meal, and that it is a tax upon the poor man. When these hon. gentlemen can settle this difficulty between themselves, it is not worth while for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to dispute their proposition. I suppose the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk is now defending the position he once before sustained in this House, that a duty on farm products does have the effect of raising the value of those products in the market. If that hon. gentleman is consistent, I think he is in duty bound to vote against this resolution. However, I venture to say that he will be found sustaining the proposition that there is a tax on flour and upon corn, and yet his whole effort was to prove that the farmers of Canada did not reap a single cent of advantage from the Tariff that was imposed upon them in 1879; and I am surprised that in this House a gentleman should take such a position as that. He may quote his figures from now till this time next year, but he will not succeed in convincing the farmers that they are not better off under the Tariff. I know for a fact that it has had the effect of keeping out thousands of bushels of grain from my own county and other counties, that otherwise would have come in to compete with the products of our farmers. Still the hon. member for Quebec East may be correct in saying that the imports of flour from the United States are paying a duty of 50 cents a barrel. We give the poor man labor and he can afford to buy flour, and he is not obliged to buy the American product. The farmers of the west can supply him with good flour, and he is not compelled to buy American trash and pay 50 cents a barrel duty. While we consume the coal of the United States we are willing to pay the duty, because we happen to be nearer the American market. I know for a fact there is no complaining in my part of the country in regard to the duty on coal. If there were complaints in the Lower Provinces because of a duty existing on meal and flour, we would have had the Table of the House covered with petitions. I am surprised that this subject should have detained the House six weeks, and there is not a single sensible man in the Dominion who is not satisfied that the country is in a happier and more prosperous condition than was ever anticipated with all our brilliant expectations of the future. Our broadest idea of what the National Policy would accomplish has been more than realized, and I am glad to say I can stand up and defend the National Policy with much more heart and sincerity, because I have seen its beneficial effects. I know what it has accomplished in my own part of the country. We had a wollen mill where the hands used to gaze at the shut doors and the closed windows, because it was in possession of the sheriff; but now it has more than double its capacity to do, and the proprietors are placing in it more than \$10,000 worth of improvements. The same statement applies to many other industries in the town. If time be given to the National Policy, great work will be accomplished by it.

Mr. FLEMING. I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite speak with some feeling, as the matter before the House is a tender one for them. They feel as if the citadel were in danger. The duty on breadstuffs is the cornerstone of the edifice; remove that and the protectionist policy will crumble to the ground. I contend, as I have long contended, that the reason why the protectionist system has existed so long in the United States is because the farmers of the Western States still retain the nominal and so-called protection for their agricultural products. So long as they retain this so-called protection, so long will the protectionist system exist there. No hon. member will

venture to say that the duty of 20 cents a bushel on Canadian wheat entering the United States is a protection to the American farmer. It is no more a protection than the protection of 3 cents a pound on raw cotton was to the planter of the Southern States; it is a duty which affords no more protection to the wheat-grower than did that on cotton, and makes no more difference in the importation of wheat than did the duty on cotton to the importation of raw cotton in the United States. If the farmers of the United States will accept this so-called protection, they are giving the manufacturers an argument to sustain the position they hold that they should be protected. Only a few days ago I saw in a paper, *The Protectionist*, published in the United States, an organ of the American manufacturers, a statement that it is absurd to say the farmers are not protected, and it points to the duties on agricultural products. That is as much as to say, that those duties are an equivalent for the high prices they are called on to pay for manufactured goods. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) declared that we on this side of the House contradicted ourselves by saying that in some sections the duty had not raised the prices, and that in others it had raised the price. Those positions were not inconsistent because it is quite possible they may exist together. From the conformation of the country it is quite clear that the duty may enhance the price in one district, although it may not do so throughout the Dominion; and I shall be able to show that the farmers have not obtained better prices because of the duty placed on grain, or that they have received better prices than the farmers of the United States. The hon. member for North Perth spoke of American grain and flour as trash; but how does it come to pass that the Americans get a higher export price for their trash than we do for our good article? This will be seen by the following table:

EXPORT PRICES.

1874-5 1875-6 1876-7 1877-8 1878-9 1879-80 1880-1

Wheat	United States.	\$1.12	\$1.24	\$1.16	\$1.33	\$1.06	\$1.24	\$1.11
	Canada.....	1.13	1.12½	1.15	1.22½	1.16½	1.02
Flour	United States.	\$6.00	\$6.20	\$6.47	\$6.35	\$5.25	\$5.87	\$5.27
	Canada.....	5.24	6.17	5.38	4.94

The average price of Canadian wheat for the four years, 1874-78 was \$1.15½, and for the two years, 1879-81, \$1.09½, thus showing that the price was less under protection than previously. The hon. gentleman spoke about a better market; it cannot be a better market unless there are better prices; it does not matter whether the article is consumed here or a thousand miles distant. I know a miller who is doing business in the Lower Provinces, and near him is another miller grinding for the Glasgow market. The prices are the same; better prices are not obtained from the miller grinding for the Maritime Provinces, for the price is regulated by the rates ruling at Liverpool. There is an important point which has been frequently referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who showed it very clearly in one light, and I will endeavor to show it in another—it is in regard to the home market. In 1876, the First Minister, in a speech he made in favor of a duty on grain and in favor of protection, said: "We should encourage the growth of coarse grains and foster manufactures that will create a consumption for all our farmers can raise." This was an intimation to the people of the country that if they would support a National Policy and restore that hon. gentleman to power he would bring about a state of things by which all the products raised by the farmers would be consumed. How long will it be before the hon. gentleman fulfils his promise; how many years before the manufacturers of this country will consume all that the farmers can raise. If we look at the state of mat-

Mr. FLEMING,

ters in the United States, we will have some idea in regard to a home market. By looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns of that country it will appear that they had a better home market and that they consumed a greater proportion of the products of the farm sixty years ago than they do now, they had a better home market at that time. In 1820, the exports of breadstuffs from the United States represented 53 cents per head. In 1880, they represented \$5.74, so that at this rate it would be several generations before the population would increase so as to consume all they raised. If we take a period of thirty years, from 1850 to 1880, the increase in population was 116 per cent., while the increased production of breadstuffs was 2104 per cent. Were the production of breadstuffs to increase at the same rate for the next thirty years, and the value of them to continue the same, the exports would amount to \$6,336,000,000. Supposing that was the limit of production, the rate of increased population to continue at 116 per cent., there would then be a population of 108,000,000, leaving the breadstuffs to be exported to be equivalent to \$58 per head, so that, if we followed in the same course, it would be a long time before we will have a home market for our own produce. If we take the exports of wheat and flour from the United States and reduce the flour to wheat at four and a-half bushels to a barrel of flour, we find that in 1850-51 the exportation was 5,641,526 bushels, or half a bushel per head. In 1881, it was 187,561,000 bushels, or over three and a-half bushels per head, or enough to support a population of 37,000,000 of people. This would be an increase of 3,224 per cent. on wheat alone, and if the production of wheat should increase in the United States at the same rate as it has in the last thirty years, there would be, in the year 1910-11, a surplus of 6,234,000,000, or 57 bushels per head for a population of 108,000,000. We are frequently told what a large extent of fertile country we have. How long would it be before we could export thirty or forty millions of bushels if the country is to be peopled as hon. gentlemen say it will be? It will not be long until at least ten millions of acres are sown in wheat, and at fifteen bushels per acre we would have 150,000,000 bushels, and where would we find a home market for the consumption of that amount? Yet these hon. gentlemen have undertaken to supply this home market by the promises they made to the people of this country. When hon. gentlemen go back to their constituents it will not do for them to say, "Look at the prosperity we have brought to the country." The farmers have been deceived once, it is true, but they are not very likely to be deceived again. They can see very plainly that it is to their own labor, under the blessing of Providence, that they are indebted for the better times they now enjoy. I conceive that the duties on grain and coal, in a country like this, are most impolitic. Grain is the staff of life, and we should try by all means to endeavor to have food placed within the reach of the humblest and poorest amongst us. The rich can buy all they require. It is no matter, so far as they are concerned; but the poorer classes should be able to obtain their food at the lowest possible rate. In our climate, the article of fuel is a matter of life and death in the winter season, and to put a duty on that article and thereby raise the price to the poorer classes is an act of cruelty and injustice. But this duty presses not only upon the poorer classes but upon all classes. All our manufacturers, except those who use water-power, require coal, and as the extra duty compels them to pay a higher price for their coal, they reimburse themselves for the outlay by imposing a higher price on their manufactured products. This duty is also a great injury to the farmers, because it puts an extra tax on the railways. They have to buy coal at an enhanced price, and as they have to compete with the American railways, which get their coal free of duty, and as

they cannot compete for the through traffic, they have to impose an extra charge on the local traffic, and for this the farmer has to pay. Living as I do amidst an agricultural population, I think I know the sentiments of the people on this subject. I had a letter from one of my constituents to-day, in which he says: "Talk about the National Policy giving us protection, I wonder at anybody, much less members of Parliament believing any such thing." I am satisfied that when the case is fairly stated to the people, and they consider it in all its bearings, giving due credit to their own industry, and giving no more credit to hon. gentlemen than they deserve, they will declare the National Policy a delusion and a snare.

Amendment (Mr. Laurier) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

- | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Anglin, | Geoffrion, | Pickard, |
| Bain, | Gillies, | Rinfret, |
| Béchar, d, | Gillmor, | Robertson (Shelburne), |
| Blake, | Gunn, | Rogers, |
| Borden, | Haddow, | Ross (Middlesex), |
| Bourassa, | Holton, | Rymal, |
| Burpee (Sunbury), | Irvine, | Scriver, |
| Cameron (Huron), | Killam, | Skinner, |
| Carwright, | King, | Smith, |
| Casgrain, | Laurier, | Snowball, |
| Charlton, | McDonald (Victoria, N.S.) | Sutherland, |
| Cockburn, | McIsaac, | Thompson, |
| Dumout, | Malouin, | Trow, |
| Fiset, | Mills, | Weldon, and |
| Fleming, | Olivier, | Wheler.—47. |
| | Paterson (Brant), | |

NAYS:

Messieurs

- | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Abbott, | Fitzsimmons, | Méhot, |
| Allison, | Fortin, | Mongenais, |
| Amyot, | Fulton, | Montplaisir, |
| Arnell, | Gault, | Mousseau, |
| Baker, | Gigault, | Mattart, |
| Baunerman, | Girouard (Jac. Cartier), | Ogden, |
| Barnard, | Grandbois, | Orton, |
| Beauchesne, | Guillet, | Ouimet, |
| Benoit, | Hackett, | Pinsonneault, |
| Bergeron, | Hay, | Pope (Compton), |
| Bergin, | Hesson, | Poupore, |
| Bolduc, | Hilliard, | Reid, |
| Boulbee, | Hooper, | Richey, |
| Bourbeau, | Houde, | Robertson (Hamilton), |
| Bowell, | Hurteau, | Ross (Dundas), |
| Brecken, | Jones, | Rouleau, |
| Brooks, | Kaulbach, | Routhier, |
| Bunster, | Kilvert, | Ryan (Marquette), |
| Bunting, | Kranz, | Ryan (Montreal), |
| Burnham, | Landry, | Rykert, |
| Carling, | Lane, | Scott, |
| Caron, | Langevin, | Shaw, |
| Cimon (Charlevoix), | Lantier, | Sproule, |
| Cimon (Chicoutimi), | Longley, | Stephenson, |
| Colby, | Macdonald (Kings), | Strange, |
| Costigan, | Macdonald (Sir John), | Tassé, |
| Coughlin, | McDonald (Cape Breton), | Tellier, |
| Coursol, | Macmillan, | Tilley, |
| Cuthbert, | McCallum, | Tyrwhitt, |
| Daly, | McCuaig, | Valin, |
| Daoust, | McDougald, | Vallée, |
| Dawson, | McGreery, | Vanasse, |
| Desaulniers, | McLellan, | Wade, |
| Desjardins, | McLennan, | Wallace (Norfolk), |
| Domville, | McLeod, | Wallace (York), |
| Drew, | McQuade, | White (Cardwell), |
| Dugas, | McRory, | White (Hastings), |
| Elliott, | Manson, | White (Renfrew), |
| Farrow, | Massue, | Williams, and |
| Ferguson, | Mernez, | Wright.—120. |

SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

14. Post Office Department..... \$116,120

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I perceive that \$4,720 additional are required for this Department, and notwithstanding all the declarations which, in former times,

were made touching the enormous expenditure of this Department, and the enormous number of clerks that were employed—I perceive that in the space of the current year there has been an increase of no less than ten clerks. The expenditure appears to have gone on increasing in a remarkable ratio. In 1879 we only required 92 clerks, and the cost of the Department was \$87,850, while now there is an addition of 30 clerks and \$28,000 or \$23,000. Now, making all reasonable allowance for the increase of work, I cannot see that there has been such an increase as to warrant such a large addition to the staff and to the expenditure. Besides all this, there is a very large figure for contingencies, involving a considerable number of extra clerks. I should be glad to get some detailed information from the Postmaster-General or the hon. Minister of Finance as to the reasons for this very heavy additional demand.

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry that the Postmaster General is not here, but the state of his health did not permit him to remain. I have had some data placed in my hands relating to this Department. The total increase is \$4,750. This is caused by the addition of several clerks, probationary clerks, except in the Money Order Branch, where the increased work necessitated the appointment of an assistant superintendent. The new clerks are three third-class clerks, and six probationary clerks. The other increases are caused by the increased \$50 allowed to such officers, as are entitled to it by law, and by the promotion of certain officers who have been a number of years in the Department. The work of this Department has increased very much, both in the Savings Bank Branch, the Money Order Branch, and the Accountant's Branch. The hon. gentleman will see that the new clerks, as a rule, are probationary clerks. The object of bringing in these young men is to make them accustomed to the work, so that they can replace the old men when the latter become unfit for the work. In a large Department like this, it is necessary there should be always a few provisional clerks prepared to fill the higher offices.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are besides a considerable number of promotions to the higher grades which the hon. gentleman has said nothing about.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have explained that. Not only were a certain number of officers entitled to the \$50, but besides there was a number who by length of service and by efficiency were entitled to higher offices.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sorry that the Postmaster General is not at his seat. I learn that certain promotions have taken place in his department, in which a certain number of French Canadians were set aside. If such be the case I do not think he can justify such conduct, and I would like to have some explanation on the subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the hon. member, I must say that I do not know that any injustice has been done to any one in that department. An employé may sometimes be the senior of another but possess less ability, and be less qualified to fulfil his duties than another, who by his abilities and aptitude is more deserving of promotion. The hon. member must bear in mind that promotion is not a right, that it is a reward for the services and the abilities of an official; but I am convinced that the Postmaster-General will not do an injustice to any of his officials.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I see that the Civil Service Commission particularly reports that in the Post Office Department a much smaller number of second-class clerks are required, and that twelve would be sufficient. There are more than double the number of senior second.

class clerks that the commission recommends. There is great force in their recommendation that, the work being largely of a clerical routine character, the work of the Department should be confined to third-class clerks with a moderate number of first and second-class clerks. Their recommendations are steadily disregarded. Do the Government intend having the slightest regard for the recommendations of their own Civil Service Commission or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think the gentleman is entitled to make that enquiry on the general question now. If he wants a question of that kind he should put it on the paper. Because the Civil Service Commission has made a report, these officers are not to be deprived of their promotion. When the Civil Service Bill passes the House, the Government will have to act on the new law, but until then the Government must follow the present law.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This is the time this should be discussed. In the Money Order Branch, nine promotions have been made at once from junior to senior and second class. There ought to be some reason for that.

Mr. BLAKE. There is also the serious point that not less than three new appointments are made in a class higher than the third class. No attention has been given to the report of the Commission which states that the work can be efficiently done by third-class clerks under the supervision of a few of a higher class. That their services are not of a character which gives to the clerks who are of a higher rank the right to a higher rate of pay, and the duties which will be discharged by the clerks of a lower rate of pay; that the great bulk of the service is, after all, of a routine and clerical character capable of being discharged by persons who are good, mechanical hands at writing, and who will get, perhaps, very much better and apt for their work after three or four years; that the system which involves as a proposition of right, as the hon. gentleman has allowed, it has done, the promotion of such persons from class to class, and salary to salary, is one which involves a constant increase of expense. I say, of right, provided there is good conduct and diligence in the performance of duty. The whole of these items are formed on the old supposition, that that system is to continue—that point of weakness which the minority concur in describing as exceedingly undesirable, is to be continued. They all agree that there is a weakness in the culmination from time to time of claims and demands on the part of those employees, although the class of services on which they are called on to perform does not certainly entitle them to higher rank and salaries; and we have in this Department an instance of this evil when you find it over-staffed, according to the statement of the Civil Service Commissioners, far beyond what is required. I think they may give twelve second-class clerks, if I judge rightly. My hon. friend says the number proposed is fifty-nine, of whom about three are turned into seconds on this occasion; so that we are not keeping up the system in entire conformity with the law with reference to the Department, in reference to which the remarks of the Civil Service Commission have their strongest application.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that the interpretation the Minister of Public Works has put on the Civil Service Act is one it will bear. I think he is wholly mistaken in his construction of the law; and I am satisfied it never was contemplated that everyone who enters the service, if he only remains in it long enough, should become a first-class clerk, wholly irrespective of his duties. What is the object of calling some first-class, others second-class and some junior clerks? Is it not that they are to be classed not merely as to the period of their services, but the nature of their work? It is a common idea in the service

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

that after a sufficiently long period, clerks are entitled to promotion into the next class above them. That was never the intention of the law, and it is wholly improper to act upon any such theory. If that principle were acted upon, the longer a Department retained its clerks the more expensive it must become, and the expense would ultimately become enormously great. I prefer the English system which recognizes third-class clerks as simply writers not entitled to promotion, but to increased remuneration. The present Canadian practice is wholly opposed to the spirit and letter of the law, and is entailing upon the public a constantly increasing charge.

15. Expenses in connection with the Department of Agriculture..... \$33,780

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Why have we additional messengers and clerks, and what are these various increases?

Mr. POPE. The work of the Patent Office is increased—doubled within the last three or four years; the extra expense, excepting the \$50 given as statutory increase, is on that account.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Three messengers are asked for instead of two.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are messengers for the whole Department.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The increase is not for the patent branch.

Mr. POPE. There were always three messengers until last year, when we had only two.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I understood there was an increase of clerks to replace others displaced. Some three or four were displaced when the present Government took office, but were replaced by more than three others, and are still in the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. There were also in this case, so far as I can judge, some appointments in the higher ranks, either probationary clerks or promotions. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would explain the promotions.

Mr. POPE. I cannot explain it now; there have been several promotions in the ordinary way.

Mr. BLAKE. We observed the clerks in the vote in 1882-83 are of different ranks with the clerks in the vote of 1881-82, and without explanations it is impossible to tell whether there has been a vacancy.

Mr. POPE. The clerks had come to the maximum of their class, and were put into the other class.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a perversion of the rule. I do not think that because a clerk has come to the maximum of his class he can keep on ascending, not merely by his conduct but as to pay also; that the nature of his case is such that there is a progressive value in his services, and that the system, as the hon. gentleman supposes, will bring everybody up to the rank of chief clerk.

Mr. POPE. I said that certain men, for their services and ability, were put into another class.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the hon. gentleman said that they had come to the maximum of their class and their abilities were such that they were entitled to that promotion. What are the promotions?

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell now.

Mr. BLAKE. This would be the proper time to tell.

Mr. MILLS. We, when in office, were obliged to go into the most minute details, and tell what new services clerks performed that entitled them to an additional compensation and a superior rank. The hon. gentleman said that these parties, from their ability, are entitled to this promotion.

I did not understand that was the intention of the law. A man who enters as a third-class clerk may be superior in point of ability to a man who occupies a much higher position. We want to know what increased importance there is in the service which entitles these men to this promotion. Where the office work continues the same I do not see that the fact that a man has served a certain number of years entitles him to go into another rank.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture why there is such a large increase in the officers? In the Estimates of 1878 and 1879, I see the number was 25, and their salaries \$28,890. In the Estimates brought down now he is asking salaries for 33 officers, amounting to \$35,788. Now, it is a well-known fact that we have not got the report of that Department yet, and surely with the increased number of officers we ought to have that report down within, at least, six weeks after the meeting of the House. Besides, I do not know that we have had any explanations as to the increased services to which he referred. Is he giving more attention to the agricultural resources of this country than were given some years ago, or is the patent branch overcrowded? The cavalier manner in which the hon. Minister of Agriculture refuses to give the Committee information is something that never occurred in days gone by, or if it did was warmly resented.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We ought to know who these gentlemen are. We are asked to increase the salaries by \$300 or \$400 a year. The hon. gentleman ought to know who he is promoting.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will get all the information he wants. I will give him the name of every man, but I have not them here to-night.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This is the time when all these items of information are brought down and ought to be brought down. It is a perfect farce to talk of passing the Estimates when the responsible head of a Department cannot give us information about details and the character of the men whom he is promoting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy these names were never asked for.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It was asked upon all occasions, over and over again. I never knew it refused.

16. Expenses of the Department of Marine and Fisheries..... \$31,020

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Mr. McLELAN. \$630 of the increase is under the statute, and \$200 is for the promotion of the engineer who was formerly at a lower salary. His name is Mr. Anderson, and he replaced Mr. Tomlinson.

Mr. BLAKE. There appears to be two new appointments of first-class clerks.

Mr. McLELAN. One of them is called an engineer. He was last year a senior second, and this year doing the duties formerly performed by Mr. Tomlinson, who is now in the Railway Department. He was formerly in this Department at \$2,200, Mr. Anderson, who is a senior second, now taking his place. The other one is a promotion, Mr. Gourdeau.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I observe an increase in the officers of this Department since 1878. In 1878, we asked for salaries for 20 officers, \$25,070; he is now asking for salaries for 25 officers, \$31,020.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand it was the appointment of some clerks who were on daily pay in 1878.

17. Department of Public Works..... \$31,010

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Decreases have occurred amounting to \$1,690; promotions involved \$1,550, leaving a

difference of \$140. The statutory increases accounted for the gross increase of \$510.

Mr. MILLS. I understand the architect who has recently retired has been placed on the superannuation list. He is not an old officer, and seems to be in the full vigor of manhood. It would be interesting to know why he was retired.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Chief Architect (Mr. Scott) asked to be relieved of his duties, on producing a certificate from his medical man that he had disease of the heart, and could not be confined to office work. The fact is he was very ill, therefore by Order in Council he was allowed to retire, and a retiring pension was granted him amounting to \$650.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Since 1878 the Department of Public Works was divided into the Public Works and the Railway Departments. With one head in 1878 the number of employes was 32, and salaries, \$49,780. With two heads of Departments there are 48 employes at salaries of \$72,280. I notice, however, that the salary of the Chief Engineer of the Government Railways is charged in the Estimates of 1881-82, giving an excess of \$15,500 over 1878. Perhaps the hon. Minister will explain this large increase.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is true the hon. member for Lambton was at the head of the Department of Public Works that comprised also the Railways. I would not have consented to have been his successor with those two Departments under me, and judging by the state of the hon. gentleman's health it is not desirable that such heavy work should be placed on any man. When we acceded to office the Department was divided by the sanction of Parliament. The works under my control have increased very largely, as also have canals and railways. Under the previous regime the staff for the building of the Pacific Railway was not considered a portion of the regular staff of the Public Works Department, but now the two engineers of the Government Railways in operation, now form part of the regular staff.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister might have added that some officers formerly on the staff at Miramichi have been transferred here. By this means the hon. Minister was able to say that he had reduced the management of the Intercolonial and that he had not increased the expenses at Ottawa.

18. The Department of Railways and Canals..... \$41,270

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Here also there are some increases to be explained, and apparently some promotions or an addition either of a messenger or a clerk. What is the present salary of Mr. Schreiber?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There are several statutory increases, and there were also two promotions. One from a junior second to a senior second, and if my memory serves me, an additional messenger promoted from the Department of Public Works, where he received \$17 per month, which was charged against the contingencies of the Department. His age now entitles him to receive \$300 a year. The other promotion is from a junior second to a senior second. These with the statutory increases make up the difference.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount of Mr. Schreiber's salary?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. \$5,500, which includes \$1,500 for services in connection with the Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to know if the Order in Council referred to in the Government note prescribes that this sum is to be paid during the construction of the whole work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It applies simply to the time when he was engaged superintending the work under contract.

19. Civil Service Board, amount required to cover salaries \$600

Mr. CASEY. It was admitted during the discussion last year that there was absolutely nothing to do by this Board, and that admission is backed up by the report of the Civil Service Commission. I would like to know, therefore, why the amount continues to be asked.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Board was constituted and has been continued for years. This is the usual annual vote; but I presume that when the Civil Service Bill is passed the vote will cease.

20. Departmental Contingencies \$140,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Our hope is that we will be able to reduce the expenditure below that of last year. I may take this opportunity of mentioning that one of the great difficulties with which the Department has to contend is the steadily increasing expenditure for telegraphing through all the Departments. This is an exceedingly difficult question to deal with, because public men and others outside the Department are in the habit of telegraphing frequently what really amounts to a letter, and the Departments are expected to answer. There are many such cases in which communication might as well be had by letter; but I venture to say this is one of the difficulties which hon. gentlemen opposite had to contend with when they were in office, and it largely explains many of the increases.

Mr. BLAKE. My experience is that there is a great disposition to make a wanton use of telegraphing in matters not of the slightest urgency, and which might be dealt with just as well by letter. One cause of it is that people often delay writing, and the result of their procrastination is that long telegrams are sent requiring lengthy answers. It seems to me, however, that this need not continue long if proper remonstrances were made by the officers of the Departments.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The difficulty is that persons outside of the Departments communicate in this way by telegraph.

Mr. BLAKE. But if a person uses the telegraph wantonly in this way, the telegrams should not be paid. I do not see any reason why they should be paid. I think it is extremely improper for them to telegraph in the way the hon. gentleman states, to write a letter by telegraph at their own will and pleasure, at the public expense.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Do the sums put down for contingencies cover cable-despatches.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think so.

Mr. KILLAM. I have been informed that it is impossible to send a telegram, even on urgent public business, without prepaying it. I should like to know if there is a rule in regard to telegrams of this nature, or if it is simply a question of whether the sender is a friend of the Government or of the Opposition.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no rule laid down as to whether a person sending a telegram is a supporter or an opponent of the Government. If my own friend wanted to send a telegram from Yarmouth on public business it would be taken.

Mr. KILLAM. I am glad to know that; but I have been informed, when I wanted to send a telegram on strictly public business, that no such telegram would be sent without being prepaid, because a rule had been made in the Departments to that effect.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to know whether the speeches and pamphlets of hon. gentlemen opposite, in the interest of the Administration, which have been circulated since we
Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

met last year, were charged to the public in these contingencies. Strong objection was made last year in Committee of the Public Accounts to what we regarded as an abuse. We found that speeches of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), of yourself, Mr. Chairman, Mr. White (Cardwell), and others were printed and circulated at the public expense, and I believe the same practice continues to prevail. Now, it seems to me that this is a very great abuse of the position of hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches; and if they are going to persist in that policy instead of voting an indefinite sum for this purpose, they ought to bring down a specific estimate and state what amount they are going to expend for the circulation of literature in the interest of the Administration.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like to point out to the hon. member for Middlesex, who is always comparing our expenditure with that of 1878, that the contingencies asked for, for 1876 and 1877, were \$175,000, while we ask \$140,000. In 1878, when they were going to the elections and thought it necessary to make some show of economy, they reduced the estimate to \$170,000. I find also that for three or four years they asked \$25,000 for contingencies in the Customs Department, and in the last year of their Administration they spent \$111,000 while I managed to get along with six or seven thousand dollars.

Mr. MILLS. We expended \$825,000 for the whole purposes of Civil Government. The hon. gentleman now demands \$975,000 or an increase of \$150,000. I submit to the Committee that the actual expenditure is a better criterion of economy than even Estimates. Last year the hon. gentleman expended \$915,000, not quite \$100,000 over our expenditure.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Let the hon. gentleman go a little further back and he will find the amount expended for contingencies was reduced under the late Administration. In 1873, the amount was \$223,802.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In four months.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The greater portion of it may have been expended during those four months. But take the year before, for which the late Government cannot be at all held responsible, the amount of contingencies was \$170,611, while under the Liberal Government, in 1877-78, it was \$158,366, or \$21,000 less than in 1872-73. In 1873-74, the departmental expenditure was \$823,685; last year it was \$915,000; now nearly \$1,000,000 is asked for Civil Government.

Mr. CASEY. The contingencies are a very large percentage of the expenditure. The estimated expenditure is \$990,000, of which contingencies are \$140,000, or nearly 25 per cent. of the annual expenditure. It seems to me a closer estimate should be arrived at.

21. Stationery Office, for stationery \$7,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This is an increase of nearly 30 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not see the balance, to learn the loss on the operations of last year, but the whole account is \$78,999. This does not represent a tithe of the whole expense; it is a profit and loss account—in order to meet any loss that may be sustained, for instance, the expenses of the Department. It is supposed this will meet any loss in connection with the operations.

Mr. BLAKE. It practically amounts to this, that the specific charges contained in the Public Accounts, and for the stationery supply, are under the cost of the operation of providing the stationery, by an assumed amount of \$5,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be better if the Departments showed what the stationery actually did cost.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They do so as nearly as possible; sometimes the difference is not over \$2,000. We might show a profit account by adding a little the other way.

Mr. BLAKE. After an experience of a large number of years in the expenditure of this item, \$7,000, it should be possible to come closer than five or six thousand dollars to what the actual amount is.

23. Amount for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner of Canada \$1,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is this for the rent of his house?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For the rent and to cover all contingencies.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that this covers all contingencies.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not of his office. Instead of keeping the account as it was before, amounting to \$5,000, for his house rent, &c., it was proposed he should have received \$4,000.

Mr. BLAKE. No. This was contingent upon the original appointment—there was to be given to Sir Alexander Galt, as an allowance for these objects, a fixed sum of \$5,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At first it was accountable by the first vote.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not now accountable, I understand.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is.

Mr. ANGLIN. Are the expenses of the High Commissioner on the trip to Canada and Manitoba, last summer, to be paid by the public.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this is or is not an accountable allowance?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is and originally was.

25. Dominion Police \$12,500

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a decrease this year of \$1,000 owing to the force being reduced by two men.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 3 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 31st March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 138) to authorize the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited) to issue preferential shares.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Rapid City Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bannerman.)

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient further to amend The Pilotage Act, 1873, and the Acts respecting the Montreal Harbor Commissioners and the Trinity House of Quebec, as pilotage authorities under the said Act.

He said: One clause of the proposed Act provides that the pilotage authorities may examine witnesses on oath in case of complaints made against pilots. Another clause provides that any Pilotage Commissioner, in the pilotage districts of Halifax and St. John, who may be absent during twelve months without leave, shall forfeit his office. It also extends the time within which complaints may be made against a pilot. Under the present law a captain is limited to four days, within which he may make complaints, and it is proposed by the Bill to extend the time to one year. It is also proposed that the pilotage authorities may fix the period for which a pilot's license shall be good. These are the principle changes proposed.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that while it may not be unreasonable to extend the time within which complaints may be made against pilots, still it is a question if the extension may not be an unreasonably long one. It is pretty well known, I believe, that there are a class of investigations in which the evidence is very often extremely contradictory. If a complaint which initiates the investigation may be made within a year the investigation itself may extend beyond the year, and it might be very difficult to obtain all the evidence otherwise available at the end of so long a period. I should be inclined to think that the period of a year would be too long, unless indeed the hon. Minister, who, I know, possesses a special knowledge of these matters, can assign a very good reason derived from practical experience. Of course, I presume, if a complaint is not made during the stay of a vessel in a harbor it cannot be made until the vessel returns, and while a period of one year might not be too long in the case of sailing vessels which go on long voyages, it might be well to allow a shorter time in cases of ordinary steamers and other vessels making a number of trips during the year, and I think it is very desirable that the investigation should take place as soon as possible after the occurrence of the fault, though, at the same time, a reasonable period should be given for investigation in all cases.

Mr. McLELAN. It often happens that a captain may be away at sea for a year, and yet he may have just cause of complaint against a pilot. Again and again, some captain may be in a position to make the complaint, which he would do, as a matter of course, as soon as he arrived at port, but the period of one year is fixed so as to afford an opportunity for captains going on long voyages to make complaint after their return.

Mr. ANGLIN. This is another attempt to pass a measure which was very strongly opposed in this House when it was introduced a year or two ago, by which the pilots of the Dominion would be placed absolutely under the control of the Pilot Commissioners of the various ports. It provides that pilotage certificates, instead of remaining in force during good behavior, shall be renewable annually only at the will of the Commissioners. I believe it is of very great importance that the independency of the pilots as a body should be maintained; that they should not be made mere dependents of the Pilot Commissioners who in most cases in the various cities and towns on the sea-board and great rivers are merchants and shipowners and who desire very much to secure control of the pilots. It is quite sufficient, after a pilot's competency has been ascertained and he has been admitted to practice as a pilot, that he should be held responsible for his conduct in all cases, and the Commissioners should have power, if he has been convicted on sufficient evidence of a serious fault, to suspend him or deprive him of his certificate. Further than that I think we should not go, and the Commissioners should not have any power to

control pilots. It is important that pilots should be as respectable men as can be induced to engage in that very perilous business, and it will not conduce to rendering the pilots more respectable as a body than they now are if they are made absolutely dependent on the good will of the Commissioners, as the measure proposed would, I believe, make them.

Mr. McLELAN. In practice it is found that the Commissioners are not shipowners and merchants, but are persons independent of the trade. Some of the ports have pursued the course of fixing the time during which pilots may hold their licenses. In other cases the certificates run until the pilots are sixty-five years of age, then they are renewable yearly. I thought it desirable, on the representation of the pilotage authorities of the different ports, they should have the power to say for what time the licenses should hold good.

Mr. KILLAM. What pilotage authorities made those representations?

Mr. McLELAN. St. John, and I think Halifax also, and, indeed, several ports have made the same representation, that it would assure greater efficiency if they had that power.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the hon. the Minister will bring down any written representations from pilotage authorities before the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 1.9) further to amend the Pilotage Act, 1873, and the other Acts therein mentioned.

Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient further to amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal by enabling the Commissioners to commute the dues on steamers in certain cases, to restrict the use of certain channels of the St. Lawrence to rafts and small craft, to make certain arrangements with railway companies, and to make by-laws for carrying out those provisions.

He said: The object of the resolution is to give the Harbor Commissioners power to commute the harbor dues on grain elevators and on vessels plying within the harbor, and to make regulations reserving the channels provided for large ships in the harbor for the use of those large ships, and compelling the smaller craft, except under stress of weather or circumstances they cannot control, to use the channels that have sufficient water for them. The Commissioners consider that the smaller craft, in using the channels intended for larger vessels, obstruct the navigation of the river, and they propose to make regulations to meet this case, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. They also ask for power to make arrangements with railway companies to extend their lines down to the wharves, and thus to connect with the shipping.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I suppose it is the Harbor Commissioners themselves who are asking for these changes?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's explanation is in one point in direct contradiction to the terms of the resolution. The resolution stated that the object is "to restrict the use of certain channels of the St. Lawrence to rafts and small craft," but the hon. gentleman states that he wants to restrict the use of certain channels to large craft.

Mr. ANGLIN.

Mr. McLELAN. That is the reason for restricting the small craft to certain channels, in order that other channels may be left to large vessels.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think it would be well if the hon. Minister told us what the present dues on steamers in port are, and in what point it is intended to reduce those dues. I have an impression that I saw some time ago in the Montreal papers a discussion of this question, in which some parties held that small steamers should be specially encouraged to come to the port of Montreal, on the ground that the trade of the port would be promoted, and that probably the decline in the shipment of grain and other articles of produce would thereby be arrested. I think it is doubtful whether such results would be arrived at by the proposed change.

Mr. McLELAN. It is not proposed to deal with the dues on vessels sailing to and from the harbor. The resolution only refers to small craft plying in the harbor.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are there to be any changes made in the schedule of fees in the harbor?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; he proposes to commute the fees on steamers.

Mr. McLELAN. The present Act gives power to commute the fees on elevators and other vessels plying in the harbor, and I think the Commissioners have, at present, power to commute the fees on ferry boats. The object is to enlarge that power.

Mr. ANGLIN. The power to make arrangements with railroads may be much more extensive than the wording of the resolution implies. There is one railroad entering the city of Montreal on the east side, which is now intended to be extended to the old Quebec Gate Barracks, and the Grand Trunk enters on the west side running to the Bonaventure station, and I am not aware that there is any means of communication between these two systems of railway, and I think I have seen it stated that it was desirable, perhaps, in the general interests, that some mode of connection should be established. This may be indirectly the means of bringing that about and, perhaps, in a manner that would not be acceptable to the citizens of Montreal, or to the general advantage. We ought to have that whole question very fully stated, and be placed in a position that will enable us to judge for ourselves whether any contemplated mode of connection between those lines will be such as we ought to approve of.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal). I may inform the hon. gentleman that the Grand Trunk and the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental, are already connected at the lower wharf, and at present negotiations are going on between the Harbor Commissioners and the city corporation with the view of having connection established during winter months on the upper level, Commissioner street, because during the winter months the lower level cannot be used owing to the rise of the water. The Harbor Commissioners are anxious to do everything possible to bring about such an arrangement. The proposition is one which generally meets with the approval of the citizens of Montreal, and is in the interest not only of Montreal trade but of the whole country. The Harbor Commissioners require this power in order to deal with this matter and compel the Grand Trunk to give other railways entering the city, traffic facilities over that track with the view of advancing the interests of the port and the city of Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the object to obtain power to deal compulsorily with the Grand Trunk Company?

Mr. McLELAN. No; it is only for the purpose of making and carrying out arrangements with the several companies, not for the purpose of compelling them to come to any arrangement.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed that this scheme of commuting dues is to be on some general scale applicable to all, or to give the Commissioners power to make arbitrary arrangement, I recollect that some years ago complaints were made of favoritism against the Harbor Commissioners by an elevator and transportation company.

Mr. McLELAN. Anything done will be on some general principle. There was a dispute between an elevator company and the Harbor Commissioners on account of measurement, and the difficulty was settled by the elevator being remeasured.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was more than that. There was the allegation of Mr. Ingle that the elevators which belonged to a company had privileges given them which were refused to him, that they were afforded accommodation denied him. I do not say there was anything in the complaints, but they were made.

Mr. McLELAN. No complaint of that nature has any bearing on the commuting of dues.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 126) further to amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.

Bill read the first time.

THE ONTARIO BOUNDARY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply,

Mr. PLUMB. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I wish to address the House on a subject which has engaged the attention of the country at large, and is of special interest to the Province to which I belong. It is a question which has been largely discussed in the public prints and in the Ontario Legislature, it was the subject of a voluminous report of a Committee of this House in 1880, and is one of great magnitude and importance both to the Dominion at large and the several Provinces of which the Dominion is composed. The subject is one that concerns the territorial limits of the Province of Ontario and of the Province of Manitoba and of the North-West. Perhaps I cannot better open the discussion upon it than by reading the calm, dispassionate, judicial review of the question which has appeared as a document emanating from this Government through the hon. Secretary of State. In commencing this discussion, I wish to say that, in any remarks I may make, I hope I shall not be led into anything that will look like partizanship, and I hope that when this question comes to be generally debated, hon. members will set aside all party prejudices and treat it with the dispassionate calmness befitting a subject that affects the interests and rights of the whole Dominion and of its greatest Province. The acquisition of vast territories in the North-West entailed new responsibility on this Dominion. It brought about also the consideration of questions which might otherwise have been long held in abeyance. It became necessary to ascertain precisely what were the true boundaries of the Province of which I have the honor to be a representative here. The proceedings of the Government of Canada in reference to the ascertainment of that boundary and its attitude towards Ontario, are succinctly but clearly and forcibly

stated in the paper which I shall now have the honor to read to the House. It is dated 22nd January, 1882, and is a reply to a paper which emanated from the Ontario Government bearing date, containing a series of serious charges against the Government of Canada, and an urgent insistence that we should accept the boundary award made by Sir Edward Thornton with his associates on the 3rd day of August, 1878. It reads as follows:—

"2. DESPATCH FROM THE HONORABLE THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF CANADA TO HIS HONOR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO.

"OTTAWA, 27th January, 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General has had under his consideration in Council your despatch bearing date the 31st December, 1881, relating to the disputed territory west and north of the Province of Ontario.

"I have now to state for the information of your Government as follows:

"1. The position of His Excellency's advisers has been uniform from the beginning. They have on all occasions been anxious to obtain from the highest tribunal approachable, an authoritative decision of the question in dispute, but have been unwilling, and have considered it inconsistent with their duty to treat the matter as one which might be dealt with by arbitration.

"2. There is a legal boundary between Ontario and the recently acquired North-West Territories; and as representing the various Provinces of the Dominion who have acquired that territory, it is the duty, it is considered, of the Government of the Dominion not to give away any part of it, nor to agree to arbitration upon its boundary, but to ascertain what its legal extent is.

"3. This disposition on the part of His Excellency's advisers was also the conviction of the Government in office at the time the territory was acquired, and for some years afterwards, and the anxiety which is felt now was expressed then by the several Orders in Council which are referred to in your Honor's despatch.

"4. The North-West Territories were acquired in 1870, and on the 9th of April, the 1st of May, and the 17th of November, 1872, the importance of settling the boundary, and of settling it as a question of law, which could be determined by a Judicial Tribunal, was pressed upon the consideration of His Excellency's predecessor, and communicated to the Government of Ontario by the several Orders in Council referred to in your despatch.

"5. Had the proposal then made for the submission of the dispute to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council been accepted by Ontario, the delays and inconveniences alleged in the communication under consideration to have occurred would have been avoided. The matter would long since have been settled by the highest authority in the Empire, and the boundary between Ontario and the then recently acquired North-West Territories authoritatively and finally settled.

"6. His Excellency's advisers believe that it is much to be regretted in the interest of Ontario, as well as of the Dominion at large, that a proposal so reasonable in itself, and which would have brought to the consideration of the legal question involved the most learned and accomplished minds in the Empire, and given every assurance of a speedy and satisfactory decision, and one which would have commanded universal assent, was not accepted by the Government of Ontario.

"7. It does not appear that any response was made by the Government of Ontario to the proposal to submit the question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

"8. The proposal of 1874 referred to in your despatch, that the question should be referred to arbitration, does not seem to have been treated by either Government as a mode of seeking an authoritative decision upon the question involved as a matter of law, but rather as a means of establishing a conventional line without first ascertaining the true boundary. In corroboration of this view it is to be noted, that of the three gentlemen who made the award referred to in your despatch under the reference of 1872, two were laymen, and only one of the profession of the law.

"9. His Excellency's advisers are of opinion that in advance of Parliamentary sanction, it was not only highly inexpedient, but transcended the power of the Government of the day to refer to arbitration the question of the extent of the North-west Territories acquired by the Dominion by purchase from the Hudson's Bay Company.

"10. That territory had been acquired on behalf of, and was in fact held for, all the Provinces comprised in the Dominion, and the extent of it was a question in regard to which, if a dispute arose, Parliament only could have absolved the Government of the day from the duty of seeking an authoritative determination by the legal tribunals of the country. Such a decision having been once obtained, if it had been found that it promised more to the convenience of Ontario and the adjoining Province that a conventional boundary should be established in lieu of the legal boundary, authority might have been sought from the Legislatures of those Provinces and from the Parliament of the Dominion for the adoption of such a conventional line.

"11. That the course pursued was not intended as a means of seeking a legal boundary is further shown by the course pursued by the Legislature of Ontario, who, under the provision contained in the Imperial Act 34 and 35 Vic., Cap. 38, enabling the Parliament of Canada to increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of a Province, with the assent of its Legislature, passed an Act giving their assent to the limits

of their Province being changed by Parliament to meet the award, whatever it might be. The passage of such an Act shows that it was not sought that the true boundary line should be ascertained, but that a conventional one should be laid down.

"12. It must further be observed that a Committee of the House of Commons has reported as follows, viz :—

"In reference to the award made by the arbitrators on the 3rd day of August, 1878, a copy of which is appended (page 2), your Committee are of opinion that it does not describe the true boundaries of Ontario. It seems to your Committee to be inconsistent with any boundary line ever suggested or proposed subsequent to the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). It makes the Provincial boundaries run into territory granted by Royal Charter in 1570 to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading into Hudson Bay, and it cuts through Indian territories which, according to the Act 43 George III., Cap. 138, and 1 and 2 George IV., Cap. 66, formed 'no part of the Province of Lower Canada or Upper Canada, or either of them,' and it carries the boundaries of Ontario within the limits of the former colony of Assiniboia, which was not a part of Upper Canada," showing how unwarrantable it would have been for the Government of the Dominion to have undertaken to ask Parliament to adopt the award as one defining the true boundaries.

"13. On assuming office His Excellency's present advisers found that no authority had been obtained from Parliament for the reference made in 1874 of the dispute to arbitration. They themselves were opposed to that mode of disposing of the question, conceiving it to be inexpedient and lacking in legal authority, and that the duty of the Government was to seek for the disposal of the matter as a question of law.

"14. It is to be borne in mind that when the proposal of the reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was suggested, and its expediency enforced by the Dominion Government in 1872, the Supreme Court of Canada had not been brought into existence, and there was therefore no high tribunal other than the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England by which the question in dispute could have been authoritatively settled.

"15. In 1875 the Act creating the Supreme Court was passed by the Parliament of Canada. The British North America Act, 1867, authorizing that Court to be created *inter alia* for the purpose of dealing with interprovincial constitutional questions, and upon the creation of that Court it would seem to have become the tribunal to which both Federal and Provincial Governments should have resorted for the decision of the question now under discussion.

"16. As in 1872 the Government of the day was anxious to submit the question to the then highest tribunal, so now His Excellency's present advisers would readily consent to use the influence of the Dominion Government with that of Manitoba to offer a submission of the whole question as to the boundary to the Supreme Court of Canada under the 52nd section of the Act of 1875, establishing the Court. They trust with confidence that their exertions with the Government of Manitoba would be attended with success, and that such submission would be agreed to by that Government.

"17. Another method of obtaining an authoritative decision was pointed out to the Attorney-General of Ontario at an interview sought for that purpose with him by Sir John Macdonald and the Minister of Justice, who, on the 21st of November last, proposed to Mr. Mowat, at his office in Toronto, that the Government of the Dominion and that of Ontario should unite in soliciting the good offices of some eminent English law functionary for the purpose of determining the true boundary line. The names of Lord Selbourne, who was then, it was reported, likely to seek relief from the fatigues of his office, and of Lord Cairns were suggested by Sir John Macdonald, who proposed that one or other of these noblemen, or some other distinguished legal functionary, should be invited to come to Canada, to sit in Toronto or elsewhere, for the purpose of hearing the evidence and deciding upon the boundary question, as one of law susceptible of being determined by evidence as other important questions are.

"18. The great advantage in such a submission would be that whilst legal ability and learning of the highest character would be secured for the decision of the question, it would have given both parties the opportunity of submitting such evidence as they might think proper, and the difficulty of agreeing on facts, and settling a case to be submitted to the Privy Council, would have been avoided. Evidence would be heard upon the spot, and the fact of the hearing and the argument of counsel taking place in the country would have tended to command general assent.

"19. This proposition was taken into consideration by Mr. Mowat, and it is only recently that he conveyed to the Minister of Justice his indisposition to accede to that proposal; but it is one which His Excellency's Government is still ready to adopt, if their previous suggestion of a submission to the Supreme Court of Canada should not command the assent of the Government of Ontario.

"20. As regards the assertion in Your Honor's despatch, that the enlargement of the boundaries of Manitoba has complicated the present question, this Government are unable to adopt the view put forth in the despatch. The original confines of Manitoba were very small, and the rapidly augmenting population of that Province had made the fact a ground of continued complaint, and the Local Government had urged upon the Government of the Dominion that the limited extent of their Province paralyzed their efforts in the development of the Province, in the establishment of municipalities, and the creation of means of communication, and otherwise. It was uncertain how long the disputed boundary question might remain open, and His Excellency's Government felt themselves constrained, finally, to recommend the enlargement of the boundaries of Manitoba, but Parliament did so in such a manner, and in such language, as carefully guarded against the steps

constituting any interference with the disputed question of the western limits of Ontario.

"21. It is believed that the Government of Manitoba would readily acquiesce in the question of the boundary line being brought for decision either before the Supreme Court of Canada or the high legal functionary, as suggested by Sir John Macdonald and the Minister of Justice, to Mr. Mowat, on the occasion referred to.

"22. His Excellency's advisers look upon the question as one which should be considered rigidly as one of law, on account of the fiduciary character which they hold in regard to the various Provinces of the Dominion, where money was expended in the acquisition of the territory, and who are now largely exerting and taxing themselves for the purpose of constructing a line of railway through it, to which the Government of Ontario (although the railway passes for upwards of 600 miles through its territory) have refused to contribute any aid in land, as has so largely been done out of the North-West Territories by the Dominion.

"23. The Government of the Dominion believe that the interests of the Province of Ontario are considered by the action which they advise as much and as strongly as the interests of any other Province. Their only anxiety is that a legal question in which Ontario is interested by itself, and in which it is interested also as a member of the Confederation, should be disposed of by a legal tribunal.

"24. They heartily wish that the proposal urged by the Dominion Government in 1872 for a submission to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but attribute much of the inconvenience and delay alleged in your despatch to have occurred to the refusal of Ontario to unite in such a submission.

"25. To the arbitration of 1874 His Excellency's Government was unable, for the reasons assigned, to give their adhesion; but with Ontario they believe it to be of the greatest importance that the dispute should be settled; and they will be anxious to further, in every way in their power the submission of the question either to the Supreme Court of Canada or to an eminent legal functionary, to be mutually agreed upon; or if it be referred by the two Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, although His Excellency's advisers would prefer that it should be decided in Canada, either by the high legal functionary, as suggested, or by the Supreme Court, with the right of applying to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for an appeal to the Queen from any decision that may be arrived at, should either Province desire it.

"26. The question of the title to the land in the disputed territory should not be confused or mixed up with that relating to the boundaries.

"27. The Indians, and the Crown, and those claiming under them, have rights which cannot be decided by the ordinary tribunals of the Province within which the land in dispute may finally be found.

"28. With respect to the timber, of which it is said in Your Honor's despatch that enormous quantities are being cut and removed by trespassers and others, this Government have ascertained that no licenses have been issued to cut timber east of that boundary since the establishment of the Conventional line in 1870. Information regarding all permits, licenses and other transactions would be readily furnished to the Government of Ontario as any time.

"29. The assumption in your despatch that the Conventional boundary terminated on the 3rd August, 1878, the date of the award referred to, seems to be without foundation; but if the Conventional line is to be considered as having been then abrogated, it must be considered as at an end for all purposes, leaving both parties to assert their own rights in reference to all the questions involved.

"30. As regards the Government of the country, and the enforcement of law and order in the meantime, it was intimated to Mr. Mowat, at the interview above referred to, that the Government of the Dominion would be ready to agree to such measures as were necessary to prevent confusion in these important respects. The suggestion was then made that all Justices of the Peace residing in the disputed territory should receive commissions from both Ontario and Manitoba, and that all the Judges of Ontario and all the Judges of Manitoba should be put in a joint commission as regards the disputed territory. The laws of Ontario and Manitoba being alike in most respects, no confusion would probably arise. That in criminal matters the Act 43 Vic., Chap. 36, had made, it was thought, satisfactory provision; or if there was anything deficient, the Government of the Dominion would be ready to supply it. That where there was found to be a practical difference between the laws of Ontario and those of Manitoba, the Government of the Dominion would use its good offices with the Government of Manitoba to induce them to consent that the law to be administered should be that of Ontario, as regards all matters of Provincial jurisdiction, until the legal limits of both Provinces should be finally ascertained.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"J. A. MOUTSEAU,
"Secretary of State."

That, Sir, was the despatch of the Dominion Government sent in reply to a despatch from the Ontario Government, in which the grievances were set forth that are answered in that despatch, and in which it was claimed that the award which was made by the referees was binding both upon the Dominion and upon the Province of Ontario. It will be found by examining the documents that there is no foundation for the assertion that that award was so binding. The

Province of Ontario, it is true, before the award was brought in, passed an Act which would have bound them to its acceptance, but it was necessary that proclamation should be made in order to bring the Act into effect. The Dominion Government, I believe, were applied to pass a similar Act, and the Dominion Government, at the head of which at that time was a gentleman who was in political sympathy with the Premier of the Province of Ontario, steadily and persistently refused to be bound by that award, or to pass a similar Act, and that is of itself, as can be proved by reference to the documents a sufficient answer to the question that the award should have been claimed in any degree as binding upon the Dominion of Canada. It is certain that in a dispute which involves an enormous amount of testimony, involves 400 or 500 different documents that are to be examined, involves great historical research, involves close legal examination, it is absolutely necessary, for the satisfaction of the people of Canada, that the decision which shall be arrived at shall be founded on absolute legal evidence and the absolute legal merits of the case. I think it will be found, upon examining the documents, that a legal boundary was not obtained by the gentlemen who composed the Commission that sat in August, 1878. I think it will be found that the voluminous documents which had been prepared were then brought before them, that they sat the first day for only a short time, that they met again, to hear the arguments on the second day and on the third day they gave in their decision. By whom was the case of the Dominion and by whom was the case of Ontario presented? The case of the Dominion, if I am correctly informed, was presented by a gentleman, who, however eminent he may be in his profession, will probably be unknown even by name to most of the hon. gentlemen who sit in this House—Mr. McMahon, then residing in the city of London, Ontario. The case of Ontario was made up by documents which were contained, a large number of them, in a report made by a gentleman of eminent ability, of great powers of research, but a gentleman not belonging to the legal profession—I refer to the late hon. Minister of the Interior; and I think when the report of his argument for Ontario was presented that he was Minister of the Interior for the Dominion, and was representing, or should have represented, the interests of the Dominion. It is upon record in the documents which I hold in my hand, that he received from the Government of Ontario the very handsome honorarium of \$4,000 for the preparation of their case, and in that case the hon. gentleman claimed that Ontario could claim to have its boundaries extended to the Rocky Mountains on the west. In fact I am not sure that in stating the case, from his point of view, he might not have extended the boundary of Ontario to the Pacific slope. The statement made by the Deputy Minister of the Interior, Colonel Dennis, which is cited as an argument in favor of the claim which was maintained and is defended by his then superior officer, the late Minister of the Interior, was made by Colonel Dennis while the hon. gentleman had already prepared his statement; it was probably made under the direction of that hon. gentleman, and we cannot suppose that Colonel Dennis, as to whose honor and integrity there can be no question, could have done otherwise than have recorded the views, the wishes and the decision of his chief. Therefore, his part of the argument goes for very little. The argument of the hon. gentleman is a very voluminous one, and it is characterized by all that ingenuity with which that hon. gentleman is known in this House to be able to present his side of the question. But the hon. gentleman was pleading a case, he was a paid advocate, he was hired for the purpose. Whether or not it was proper for that hon. gentleman, either before or after, to have taken an office in which he was the trustee and guardian of the rights of the Dominion in respect to the

North-West, remains not for me to say, but remains for others who are acquainted with the circumstances to decide, I will say nothing more about it than that the decisions at which that hon. gentleman arrived, and which have formed, very largely, the basis of the claim which has been made by the Ontario Government, and have been used as a basis for most of the argument which has been presented by the Attorney-General of Ontario, are entitled to just that consideration which should be given to those of an hon. gentleman who was employed to make the most favorable presentation for his employers, and who probably desired to earn his honorarium. Now, Sir, it is perfectly certain to any one who looks at the documents, that there was no absolute and legal western boundary of the Province of Ontario ascertained by that Commission. It is perfectly certain that in drawing the line defining the western boundary they drew a conventional and arbitrary line which did not comprise any particular line that had been claimed in any controversy in respect to boundaries. I can show the House that in running that line the Commissioners trenched upon territory that absolutely never could have been covered by the old Province of Canada or even by the United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada; I can show that they trenched upon the Province of Assiniboia; that they trenched upon territories which absolutely belonged to the Indian rules or and to which they had unsatisfied rights. I can show by evidence which was taken by the Committee appointed two years ago, and whose report I hold in my hand, that the Colony of Assiniboia was recognized by the Imperial Government. In Hon. Donald A. Smith's evidence I find the following:—

"193. With regard to the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company, I believe that part of the condition on which it was granted was that the Company should establish colonies within the territory which it covered. I believe that in carrying out this condition the Company established a colony called the Colony of Assiniboia. Is not that the case?—It is.

"199. As to whether that colony was recognized by the Imperial Government or not, that is an important question? I believe that on two occasions the Imperial troops were sent out to maintain order in the Territory; is that so?—Yes; that colony was recognized by the Imperial Government, and Her Majesty's troops were sent out there. The 6th Regiment and the Canadian Rifles were there at different times.

"By Mr. Weldon:

"200. At what time was the 6th Regiment there?—I think in 1856, under Colonel Crofton.

"201. And the Canadian Rifles, when?—In 1857 the Canadian Rifles were sent there under Major Seaton, and afterwards under Captain Hibbert. The Home Government also assisted in forming a body of pensioners for service in Red River after that time. Those pensioners were sent out there, and I believe some of them are, at this moment, in the Red River country, although not employed as a force.

"By Mr. De Cosmos:

"202. Who paid the force?—The Imperial Government paid the troops and the company contributed to their sustenance.

"203. Did the Imperial Government also contribute to the expenses of the pensioners?—Not further than their pensions.

"By the Chairman:

"204. The Imperial Government corresponded with the Governors and the Government of the new colony of Assiniboia, I presume?—With the Governors of the Hudson's Bay Company.

"205. Had the Government of that colony courts established and power to administer the law; had it, for instance, the power of life and death?—It had the power of life and death. There was a Council of Assiniboia, and a Recorder who was Judge—Judge Thom.

"By Mr. De Cosmos:

"212. What was the ascertained boundary of the Colony of Assiniboia?—I don't recollect exactly. I should state that I have given no particular attention to this subject for many years past."

The boundaries are given in another part of the evidence and fully sustain my position, and, I dare say, the hon. member for Bothwell was able to explain why it was that the award in question infringed upon the territories both of the Hudson Bay Company, of this colony, and of the Indians of the North-West. He may be able to explain why, in his report, he claimed there was a valid right in Ontario to those properties; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that there is a report in my hands, containing a statement made by Mr. Herman Merrivale, in England, which, I

think, has a very important bearing upon that question, and which he may possibly have overlooked. On May 27th, 1878, a memorandum was published which was prepared on 9th June, 1857, in which Mr. Herman Merrivale says :

"That the statements of Hudson Bay Company rights as to the territory, trade, etc., made by them to Earl Grey, on the 13th September, 1849, was submitted to the then law officers of the Crown, who reported that they were of opinion that the rights so claimed by the Company properly belonged to them."

The claim of the Hudson Bay Company thus explicitly acknowledged embraced an area north of the water shed, part of the territory which was included in the award upon which the dispute between Ontario and the Dominion is now going on.

Mr. MILLS. From what is the hon. gentleman reading ?

Mr. PLUMB. I am reading from a despatch. I have a portion of it here. It is a despatch published by the Ontario Government, I think.

An hon. MEMBER. Not much.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman will find it on the 25th and 26th pages if he looks for it. I presume it has escaped his eye. The Parliament of Canada, in declining to accept the award, was actuated by what I believe to have been a deep regard for the interests of the Province of Ontario, as well as of the interests of the Dominion at large. I believe that it could have answered no good purpose for the Parliament of Canada to be forced by any menace, or any threat, or any improper pressure into accepting a decision which was not one that could be defended on strictly legal grounds. I believe, Sir, that all of us here who represent the Province of Ontario are jealous of the rights of our Province; I believe that every one of us who support the Government is quite as desirous of keeping for Ontario anything which may belong to it that we are quite as anxious to protect its rights as any other gentlemen who are in public life or any other people interested in the matter, and I do not believe that we would have been acting in the true interests of that Province if we had hastily accepted, as we were asked and urged to accept, an award which cannot be shown to be based on any legal right—an award which was a conventional award; which fixed a conventional line, and which it is explicitly urged by one of those who made the award surrendered important of claims of Ontario, and did not attempt to define precisely what the rights of that Province were. I say that, for the harmony of this Dominion, for the peace and comfort of its people, there should be no question about the territorial rights of the different Provinces; and I believe that nothing could be more inimical to the true interests of the Province than that an award which was not satisfactory to all parties, to the acceptance of which no Legislation had previously bound it should have been accepted, and which, even under any circumstances, would have created dissatisfaction if it was known that the award was conventional one. We can trust—the whole country can trust—to the patriotism and generosity of the great Province, which is the main factor in the Union of these Provinces if there should be any necessity—after ascertaining the true legal limits of the territories in question to appeal to that Province and ask its aid in the fair and liberal adjustment of any questions in which its rights are concerned. And it is impossible for me to be able to say why upon considerations of justice, considerations of what is due from one Province to another, considerations of what is due to the interests of the whole Dominion, there should have been an undue pressure exercised elsewhere to compel the acceptance of the award by the present Parliament of Canada when the late Government were very careful never to put themselves in the position where they were committed to accept it. The argument that a vote of \$15,000 towards defraying the expenses of the reference bound Parliament to accept the decision of the

Mr. PLUMB.

referees forcibly, illustrates the flimsy character of the contention. It was to the credit of the hon. gentleman who led the Government from 1873 to 1878, it was characteristic of the prudence with which he carried on public affairs, that he did not take a leap in the dark, that he did not commit himself to accept the award beforehand; and that hon. gentleman, I believe, if the secret history of the transaction was known, when he was asked to take the same sort of action that was been taken by the Legislative of the Province of Ontario indignantly refused to do so. Sir, if it is proper to refer to what takes place in other legislative bodies beyond our purview, I venture to say that a most exciting discussion has lately occurred, in the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, on this very question—a discussion which was based on certain documents presented to that House by the Attorney-General of the Province—documents upon which it was urged that great injustice had been done to the Province of Ontario. But it is noteworthy that the *ex parte* statements which were made on that occasion—I wish to speak with all due respect of the discussion, and of the manner in which it was carried on, but I am constrained to say it was noteworthy that *ex parte* statements were made on that occasion and were made with a heat, with a passion, with a violence that did not at all comport, in my humble judgment, with the magnitude and the dignity of the subject. In that discussion, and other debates which ensued in another place, if I may judge from the newspaper reports, there does not appear to have been manifested an earnest desire to arrive at the truth of the question upon the part of the dominant majority, but it rather looked as if the subject was to be made one of a party character, and that it was to be used for party purposes at a struggle which might then be considered to be impending. I noticed with pain the tone that was adopted in that discussion. I found that when the leader of the majority was asked, in the course of the debates, whether he stood by his menacing assertion that if this award were not accepted he would be in favor of having Ontario retire from the Confederation of these Provinces, he replied: "Well, if the award is not accepted, so much the worse for the Confederation." It seems almost impossible to suppose that language of that kind could have been used in connection with a purely legal question—one which should be removed wholly from the arena of party politics, one which should be judged dispassionately, with the earnest wish on both sides to ascertain exactly what are the rights of the parties concerned. And it always leads one to suspect that there is weakness in a case, when so much passion and so much excitement is exhibited. Sir, my hon. friend the leader of this Government, and those gentlemen who sit with him, are entrusted with the solemn duty of equally maintaining the rights of Canada, and the rights of the several Provinces of this Dominion. It is certain that the newly-cemented Confederation requires delicate handling; it is certain that no man in public life should in any way attempt any course of action which might imperil or weaken the bonds which hold these Provinces together; and I cannot think that there has been any occasion or any excuse in a matter of this character, which is one of judicial consideration, for the violent harangues which have taken place in a public assembly, or for the inflammatory appeals which have been made in the public press; and I trust that the discussion which will arise here will be conducted in a calm and dispassionate tone, which will afford a contrast to the violence of the discussion which has occurred in another place. I believe the Parliament of Canada were fully justified in refusing to accept a conventional line as the western boundary of the Province of Ontario; I believe that if they had accepted it, they would not have been true to the interests of Ontario, or of the Dominion at large; I believe that it is possible to arrive at such a solution of this question as will fully satisfy the most exacting among those who have claimed to be exclusive defenders of the just rights of the Province of Ontario;

and, Sir, I cannot conceive that it is patriotic to refuse to accept the propositions which were made by the Dominion Government in regard to the reference of those claims. It is impossible that, either in the Legislature of Ontario or in the Parliament of Canada, a question involving the most laborious research, involving the most careful study, involving the nicest legal acumen and discrimination, involving labor such as cannot be conveniently performed by an assembly like this, can be fairly treated and fairly settled on the floor of either House; it must necessarily be left to the decision of those who can examine and weigh all the evidence. All that Ontario can claim, all that the Dominion can claim, and all that the Province can claim whose eastern boundary is dependent upon the final decision of this question, is that it shall receive the strictest attention of a competent tribunal, and that the exact legal status of all the parties to this issue shall be defined by that tribunal. Sir, I believe there is no gentleman sitting in this House who will not acknowledge when he examines the question that that legal status has not yet been authoritatively ascertained; and if not, it is evident that no award can be satisfactory to all parties to this controversy, and I doubt very much whether the claim, made by the gentlemen who have urged that it was in the interest of Ontario to take this award, is a just one. It looks to me as if there had been thrown into this question an element which should be carefully eliminated from it in this House; it looks as if it had been made, and designedly made, a question which should form part of a political issue; but I believe we owe it to ourselves, not only as the representatives of the Province of Ontario, but as the trustees of the entire Dominion, that we should insist that, before this Parliament consents to an award, it should be based upon a strict legal examination, conducted on strict legal principles. There can be no difficulty, with all the evidence which has been prepared, in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion. That the conclusion which was arrived at by the referees was not satisfactory, is evidenced by the vote of this House to appoint a Committee to report upon the case, and by the conclusions of that able report and their adoption here; and, under these circumstances, it would be impossible for the Government of the day, no matter upon what considerations, to have accepted that award—an award which the late Government was very careful not to commit itself to accept. I can remember that, not very long ago, an argument was made use of in this House, in respect to a solemn agreement entered into by the Government, with the consent of the Governor General, and brought before this House, that the act of the Governor in Council had no sort of weight, and should have no sort of weight, in influencing Parliament to ratify the agreement. It was argued by an hon. gentleman who sits opposite that we should not be bound by any such considerations; and that hon. gentleman went so far as to say to those whom he was anxious to persuade to take the same view as himself, that, if the engagement was repudiated by this House, he, for his part, would take no advantage of the defeat of the Government, and that, Sir, should be, with the supporters of the hon. gentleman, a strong argument in favor of the position which I have endeavored feebly to lay before the House. I believe that the Province of Ontario wishes to obtain nothing more than her just rights. I believe that Province is true to the Union into which she has solemnly entered, and I believe, also, that it is in the interest of the whole of this great community that a speedy means should be found for arriving at the final and just conclusion, in respect to those rights which is pressed upon us by the rapid growth and increase of the great North-West. It was stated, in support of the view, that the Hudson Bay Company had only a shadowy claim over the North-West; that the rights of that Company were sold for but one-fifth of the sum which the American Government paid for Alaska. If that means anything, it means that my hon. friend the First Minister made

a negotiation of such value to the country, made such an advantageous bargain for the country, that the bargain of the United States with Russia could not for a moment be compared to it. It shows that the hon. gentleman negotiated so successfully for the interests of the country, that he has obtained for us a territory the value of which is absolutely incalculable, by the payment of £300,000 to the Hudson Bay Company, and I am very glad that the important admission stands on record in the documents of the Attorney-General of Ontario now before us. But it is no argument with regard to what the territorial rights of that Company were—it is entirely beside the question—because the arrangement between the United States and Russia for the purchase of Alaska, was for a special political object, and the amount paid was absurdly great, and was ridiculed throughout the United States when the character of that ice-bound, desolate, uninhabitable territory became known. I believe nothing could be worse than to attempt to force this House, in the present condition of the controversy so persistently and angrily forced upon us, to assume the momentous responsibility of deciding upon the question involved in that award. I believe that it would be impolitic in the highest degree to ask this House to decide that it would be proper for it to take an arbitrary boundary line, which is only a compromise without foundation or legal evidence, and assume that as a final settlement of the question. I think it has got to rest on a much stronger basis. I think that, in view of the grave considerations which would be involved—of the dangerous dissatisfaction that would be felt both by the Province itself and by the Dominion at large, if that question were settled in the way in which the award proposed to settle it, that it would be most desirable that the House should adopt some other method of endeavoring to reach the Government of Ontario, and of endeavoring to put this question to rest. I believe that on this side of the House there is an earnest desire to have this question definitively closed. I do not believe that there ever has been the slightest intention to delay it. I think that nothing could have been in worse taste, nothing could have been more improper than the assertion which has been made from time to time, that my hon. friend the First Minister has delayed or dallied with it at the instigation of his supporters in a sister Province—has played with this question, because, forsooth, he means to revenge himself on the Province of Ontario, a Province that has sent to the support of that hon. gentleman sixty-four Conservatives to represent it in the Councils of Parliament. I do not think the hon. gentleman feels very much like revenging himself upon the Province for giving him such a noble backing; and I venture to say that he will have an equally good support in Ontario if he appeals to the country again, whether this question is kept in abeyance, as a political element, or whether it is settled, as I trust it may be, by the acceptance by this House of a resolution which I am about to propose, and by the acceptance, by the Ontario Government, of the terms which are offered to it in that resolution: I move

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be Resolved,—That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the western and northern boundaries of the Province of Ontario should be finally settled by a reference to, and an authoritative decision by, either the Supreme Court of Canada, or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain, or by the Supreme Court in the first place, subject to a final submission to the Judicial Committee as the Province of Ontario may choose; that such decision should be obtained either on appeal in a friendly action brought for the purpose, or by reference to the said courts, or either, or both of them, by Her Majesty, under the powers conferred upon her by the Imperial and Canadian Parliaments, as the Government of Ontario may prefer, and that the said reference should be based on the evidence collected and printed with any additional documentary evidence—if such there is—and that pending the reference the administration of the lands shall be entrusted to a Joint Commission appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario.

I think, Sir, that in dealing with this question we must not forget that we of Ontario are the representatives of a great Province that can well afford to be generous, that we are

else the representatives of the whole country, and that by sinking sectional issues and provincial differences and jealousies, we can best promote the peace, harmony and prosperity of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE. One thing which strikes me as very remarkable in this matter is that last year the Government, instead of dealing with the matter themselves, put up one of their supporters to move for a Committee and have a so-called investigation into this matter. Now, their man-of-all-work, the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), is put up to make this motion in order, apparently, to relieve hon. Ministers from doing that which naturally devolves upon themselves. The hon. gentleman, in moving his motion, was kind enough to compliment me upon a supposed intention of mine, and he was good enough to say that he had no doubt, if all could be revealed that had taken place behind the scenes, I would be found to have taken strong ground indeed against any preliminary action by this Parliament. Sir, I was called upon as a member of the Government of Ontario, in 1872, to deal with this subject, while Chief of the Government, the hon. member for West Durham being absent in England, and an arrangement was made by which we obtained the services of Mr. Mills, the present hon. member for Bothwell in this House, to go to Washington to search for maps, papers and documents relating to the boundary question. I was somewhat surprised, if not pained, that the hon. member for Niagara should have alluded to this in terms which are not respectful towards my hon. friend for Bothwell. Every one who knows that hon. gentleman knows that he is quite incapable of engaging in any service of that kind for the sordid reasons ascribed to him by the hon. member. He rendered services that were of great value; he spent months in the research he was engaged in, besides doing a great amount of literary labor in preparing the documents which he had procured during his visit to the Washington libraries. Instead of reflecting upon that hon. gentleman, every member in this House, as well as in the Ontario Legislature, is under great obligations to him for the services he rendered in this boundary matter. But, Sir, it is assumed that I was hostile to making good the award of the arbitrators selected, and stress is laid upon the fact that I did not take any action to secure the assent of the Legislature to that award of theirs. Well, it would have been somewhat difficult for me to do that, as I had no Session of Parliament at my command after the arbitrators had made their award. The hon. gentleman seems to think the award was made before the last Session of Parliament during which I held office.

Mr. PLUMB. I knew it was not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, the hon. gentleman must have known it if he had thought for a moment. How could I have ratified the award by legislation if I had no control of the House? The hon. First Minister knows very well I was prepared to assist him to give effect to that award if he chose to bring in a measure to do so. I never dreamed for a moment—whether I had succeeded again in controlling the legislation of the country or not—I did not believe that any Government would have dared to avoid giving effect to any arbitration solemnly entered into between the two Governments. Such action was wholly unprecedented. I can only tell the hon. member for Niagara that if I had been fortunate enough, or those who acted with me had been fortunate enough, to control the present Parliament, not one Session would have passed over without having that award properly ratified. Now I cannot conceive anything that is more dishonorable in a Government—in a political sense, of course, I mean—than to refuse to ratify the solemn engagements entered into by their predecessors. What would be thought of Great Britain if she had acted in that

Mr. PLUMB,

way regarding the Geneva arbitration as to the Alabama claims? There was not an Englishman of average intelligence, no legal man in England probably, who did not believe that the award of that arbitration was an unjust one; that to give the sum of \$15,000,000 to pay for the depredations of the *Alabama* was an outrage upon the very evidence submitted to them. But Great Britain never hesitated a moment to pay over the award according to the agreement made before the arbitrators commenced their investigations. So, similarly, did Great Britain believe, and we all believed, that the decision of the German Emperor with regard to the San Juan boundary in the far West was not according to the treaties that existed or according to the evidence submitted. But who dreamed of refusing to ratify that award on that ground? Would it not, in an independent nation, be a cause of war, if the Government of Great Britain had refused to ratify either award? But the hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government, and his colleagues, seem to think that it is perfectly right and just to repudiate the action of their predecessors in the solemn engagements they entered into with the Government of Ontario, in order to settle a question which the hon. gentleman kept unsettled for many years, as he does other very important matters, hoping that they may in some way or other inure to his own benefit in a political sense. Such were the views I held. But the hon. gentleman, following his leader, refers to the counsel employed. The hon. First Minister was unkind enough, and I think uncandid enough, to say that we gave away the case of the Dominion by not employing a more competent gentleman than Mr. McMahon. Now, Sir, we must remember this with regard to counsel, that the present Judge Armour was first employed by the Dominion Government, that he spent months in making investigations at the expense of the Dominion Government, that the present Administration have paid him \$2,000 for those services; and the first thing that was done with Mr. McMahon was to place him in communication with Mr. Armour and obtain from that gentleman the result of his enquiries. Mr. McMahon is a man of very great ability, whatever may be the opinion of the member for Niagara and the hon. First Minister. He had associated with him a young and promising lawyer of Montreal, Mr. Monk, and I have no hesitation in saying that they performed their work well. I have no reason to doubt that every exertion was made to place the case of the Dominion in the best possible light before the arbitrators chosen. Now, no objection has been taken to the names of the gentlemen selected for that purpose. The selection was that of Mr. Richards, then Chief Justice of Ontario, Judge Wilmot, the late Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, and the English Minister at Washington. Justice Wilmot, after spending considerable time on the subject, died suddenly, and we were deprived of his valuable services by his untimely death. When Mr. Richards became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada he ceased of course to act for the Ontario Government, and Chief Justice Harrison, a gentleman whom we all remember as a very distinguished lawyer and a popular and prominent member of this House for some Sessions, was selected to take his place. They both agreed, as did the two Governments, upon selecting again Sir Edward Thornton, British Minister at Washington. No three men could probably be found better qualified than were they to discharge those duties. After Justice Wilmot's death we had to select some one who was not associated pecuniarily with Ontario interests. Our selection fell upon Sir Francis Hincks, who had long been Prime Minister of this country, who occupied an independent position as regards political views and parties, and who, at all events, was not believed to be friendly to us politically, though I have no reason to think Sir Francis Hincks had any very strong political opinions that would make him take a prejudiced

view of any question on that account. Those were the three men who met here, as the hon. member for Niagara has been careful to point out, and spent two or three days in hearing the case. He assumes that this time was all that was given by the three arbitrators to the discussion of the subject, or to exchanging views, or to studying the question for themselves. The fact is, however, Sir Edward Thornton had all the documents that could be sent to him—that of Judge Ramsay, Mr. Mills, Mr. Lindsay, and all other documents—for years indeed, as had the other arbitrators, and there is no doubt whatever after perusing the books and documents sent there, they came to a conclusion on the subject. They had counsel, as they were bound to do, in order to see whether their arguments would affect their decision in their own minds before that time. These being the facts of the case, what reason is there for the Government refusing to give effect to the conclusions they reached. I can only say that I look upon it as a wilful violation of Government rights, of the rights of Ontario, and of the obligations which should exist between a Government and its predecessor in its management of public affairs. Every obligation of that kind should be held to be as sacred as an obligation between individuals. As the Government of Ontario seem determined to resist the spoliation of the Province, they were dealt with in severe terms by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). They are bound to defend their own Province and their own territory, and they are bound as guardians of that territory to keep the peace and to prevent interlopers from entering upon and taking possession of the property. The attempt to prove that Ontario is generous is needless, as everybody knows the generosity of that great Province. Every one knows the burden that Ontario bears to maintain the Dominion Government. Why should Ontario be called upon to do more than that and give up territory to the Dominion, territory which hon. gentlemen opposite claimed themselves twenty years ago and more, to belong to the Province of Ontario; that is to say, they claimed it belonged to United Canada, and whatever belonged to Canada then belongs to Ontario now? But the reasons which actuated the leader of the Government are to my mind utterly inexplicable. The hon. gentleman has not yet deigned to give those reasons to the House, he has not ventured to defend his conduct in refusing to give effect to the award consequent upon the arbitration entered into by the two Governments, and I cannot believe that on the motion of the hon. member for Niagara he hopes to obtain the sanction of the people of Ontario to one of the most gross acts of injustice which has ever been perpetrated in the history of this or any other country. The hon. leader of the Government on a former occasion stated, as indeed he did in a written document some years ago, that he objected to settle the question by arbitration. I give him credit for having taken that ground quite early, and if he had adhered to that contention his position at the present time would have been somewhat stronger. But having entered into an arbitration in which the British Minister at Washington, the Chief Justice of Ontario and a former Premier of Canada were the arbitrators, he now refuses to acknowledge that arbitration on the ground that it should not be settled by arbitration. The hon. gentleman has proposed to the Ontario Government to leave the question to the arbitration of one Englishman, but he would not acknowledge the award of three of the most distinguished men on this continent.

Mr. IVES. The question before the House is one of such great importance that I consider we should all approach its discussion in as near a judicial spirit as it is possible for members of Parliament ever to assume. I do not think that it is necessary or desirable, while we are discussing the resolutions before the Chair, to advert to the fact that this may be made a political question, or that political capital may be made out of it, with advantage to

one party or the other; but we should rather approach the consideration of the propositions contained in the motion with a view to determining in a judicial capacity whether those propositions are fair, reasonable and just, and such as are calculated to settle the difficulty which has arisen between the Governments of Ontario and the Dominion. I am aware that in rising to follow the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), I am laying myself open to a taunt similar to that which was applied to the hon. member for Niagara, who introduced the resolution. But, Sir, as this question is a legal question—as it is almost entirely a legal question, as its just determination depends almost entirely on a right understanding of the legal questions which are presented, I think that perhaps it is as well that I should speak at this stage, and discuss those legal questions, as I understand them, as at any other stage of the debate. I promise you that I shall not detain the House very long, and I shall confine myself almost entirely to what I consider to be the legal questions presented in this case. The first question which arose in my mind when I began to study this subject, was this: Did a legal boundary separating Ontario from the North-West Territory of Canada exist—a legal fixed boundary—at the time of the reference of this question to arbitrators, and if such a boundary did exist, where was it? Now, Sir, it has been generally admitted, in fact, I have not heard it denied in the public press, or in the voluminous discussions that have taken place between the two Governments, that a legal boundary actually existed at that time. There has been a good deal of discussion as to the legal interpretation of the clause of the statute which makes that boundary, but I have not heard it denied, nor do I think it will be denied in the House during this discussion, that a legal boundary existed both to the west and to the north of the Province of Ontario in 1874 when this question was referred to arbitration. Now, where was that boundary, and by what statute or enactment was it fixed and determined? That boundary was fixed by the Imperial Act of 1774, commonly known as the Quebec Act—an Act passed to determine the boundaries of the new Province which was then constituted by the Imperial Parliament—namely the Province of Quebec. That Act, an extract from which is to be found in the report of the Boundary Committee appointed by this House, describes the boundaries of the new Province then created, and, as I said before, it is not denied that it then fixed the bounds—completely fixed the bounds of the Province of Quebec then constituted, and the only dispute is as to the correct understanding of what those bounds are. Now, Sir, if we refer to that Act we find the following description, and as it is very important that we should understand the starting point or the basis of this discussion, I shall take the liberty of quoting it. It is to be found on page 15 of the report:

“That all the territories, islands and countries in North America, belonging to the Crown of Great Britain, bounded on the south by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the high lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea, to a point in forty-five degrees northern latitude, on the eastern bank of the River Connecticut, keeping the same latitude directly west, through the Lake Champlain, until, in the same latitude, it meets the River St. Lawrence; from thence up the eastern bank of the said river to the Lake Ontario; thence through the Lake Ontario and the river commonly called Niagara; and thence along by the eastern and the south-eastern bank of Lake Erie, following the said bank until the same shall be intersected by the northern boundary granted by the charter of the Province of Pennsylvania, in case the same shall be so intersected; and from thence along the said northern and western boundaries of the said Province, until the said western boundary strikes the Ohio; but in case the said bank of the said lake shall not be found to be so intersected, then following the said bank until it shall arrive at that point of the said bank which shall be nearest to the north-western angle of the said Province of Pennsylvania; and thence by a right line, to the said north-western angle of the said Province; and thence along the western boundary of the said Province until it strikes the River Ohio; and along the bank of the said river, westward to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson's Bay.”

The dispute which has arisen in this matter is more particularly confined to what is the western boundary of the old Province of Quebec, as stated in this Act of 1774, and the northern boundary of that Province. Now, as to the western boundary, as the House will at once perceive, everything depends upon the interpretation which is given the word "northward," which occurs in this description. After you have reached the point of junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and when you commence to form the boundary by proceeding northward, you will perceive that the only word used is "northward." It has been contended on the one hand, that "northward" means due north until a line produced due north intersects the southern boundary of the Hudson Bay Territory. It is contended, on the other hand, that "northward" does not mean due north, but that the words in this description should have been, and were intended to be, "northward along the bank of the Mississippi River." Now, Sir, there are two questions to be considered right here. The first is, the legal interpretation of the word "northward," and the next is, whether there is anything to indicate what was the intention of the Imperial Legislature at the time this Act was passed. I have no hesitation in saying, and I fancy all the legal hon. gentlemen in the House will agree with me, and not only the legal gentlemen but hon. gentlemen acquainted with boundary lines—surveyors, engineers, and scientific men of that description—that the legal interpretation of that word "northward," when occurring in a description like this, or a deed of sale, or other similar document, when used in unqualified or unlimited sense, means due north, and nothing else. And I venture to say that the expression "northward," in this connection, or in a deed of sale, unlimited and unqualified, is as definite, scientifically speaking, as the words "due north," because northward unlimited can mean nothing but due north. There is precisely the same probability of one angle to the right or left of due north being the meaning as any other. For instance, if we urged that northward meant a degree west of north it might with the same force be urged to mean a degree east of north, and if you were to take any one of the 45 degrees to the east or west of due north you would find precisely as strong probabilities in favor of one degree or one direction as you would find in favor of any other, and, therefore, scientifically speaking, "northward" means due north and nothing else, and it can mean nothing else, where it occurs without being qualified or limited. Of course, there are a variety of ways of limiting the meaning of that word; if it had said northward to a certain point which was east or west of north, that would have effectually limited the word northward; if it had said "northward" along a certain line, or a certain shore, or a certain river, then these words would have limited the meaning of the word "northward," and it would have been easy to conceive that northward was not due north; but as it stands in this connection, under no limitation whatever, I hold that it means due north or it means nothing; and I undertake to say that there is as much definiteness and positiveness, scientifically speaking, in the expression northward as in the expression due north, the only difference being that one may be limited and qualified, and the other may not. Then, Sir, looking at this description from a legal point of view, giving a legal interpretation to the word, giving the interpretation to it that would be given by a bench of judges if they were deciding upon a question of title or a question of boundary, I say the meaning of this description is due northward from the point of junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers—a line produced until it intercepts the southern boundary of Hudson Bay. But it is urged that, although legally and technically speaking this description means a line due north, there is evidence that something else was the intention of the Imperial Parliament—that what they intended

Mr. IVES.

was northward along the bank of the Mississippi River. Now, we have to enquire, in the first place, what was the object which Parliament had in view in passing this law—in creating this new Province. The object was, as we gather from the debate at the time, to create a new Province, a Territory which should include within its limits the bulk of His Majesty's French subjects. These people were scattered along the shores of the St. Lawrence River, and were settled in the central part of what is now the State of Illinois, and the plain object of the Parliament of Great Britain, in creating this new Province, was to separate the English colonists of New England from the French colonists of the north and west. Now, let us enquire whether a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers would as well accomplish such an object as a line running along the bank of the Mississippi. We find from history and from the location of settlement in Illinois, that it would. Then, Sir, when we are discussing intention, and when we find that intention is opposed to the strict wording of the description, it is fair to look into the description and enquire whether there is anything loose or careless about this description. If you look into it, you will find that far from there being any looseness or carelessness in its wording, it is worded with the very greatest precision; in several places you will find a line limited as it is said it was the intention of Parliament to limit the western boundary; you will find that it speaks of a line along a watershed, a line along a parallel of latitude, a line brought to the east side of a certain river, distinguishing between the east side and the west side, a line brought to a certain side of a lake, and you will find that when the Ohio is reached and it is proposed to proceed westward, the description is westward along the Ohio River; and I ask, after such great care has been taken in other parts of the description, how can it be argued that there was any looseness or carelessness in the last clause, which fixes the western boundary of the Province. Not, only, Sir, was there care used, but there was extraordinary care used. An amendment was moved by Mr. Burke during the discussion in the House of Commons, as representing William Penn and the Province of Pennsylvania, and his amendment was incorporated with the Act; and the greatest care was taken that the description should accurately describe what was intended to be included in this new Province. But, Sir, there is a reason, and a very strong reason, why Parliament should have adopted a meridian line rather than the course of the Mississippi River; for a very large part of it, was then unknown. If you will go into the lobby which leads to the library, you will find an old map of New France, dated about that time or a short time before, in which the rise of the Mississippi is marked as being very near to the western extremity of Lake Superior, and hon. gentlemen who claim that the boundary should be where the award places it, should surely be bound by what was then believed to be the source of the Mississippi River. There was the greatest uncertainty of the position of lakes and the course of rivers west of Lake Erie, and there was therefore the strongest reason why Parliament should have adopted a parallel of longitude rather than the course of a river when the course of that river was imperfectly known. But, Sir, if the course of the Mississippi River had really been adopted as the boundary, it would have been an incomplete description, because the Mississippi River came very far short of rising as far north as the southern line of the Hudson Bay territory, and there would have been a hiatus in the description. In the later part of its course, the Mississippi River runs for about forty miles due west; and if Parliament had taken that river as the boundary, when it approached the head of the river they would have found it turning off at an angle to the west, and there would have been no certainty where it would have gone. Therefore I

argue that, whether you consider the legal meaning of the word, whether you consider what may be gathered from the intention of the Legislature which passed this law, or whether you consider the remaining portions of the description, from whatever point of view you look at, you must come to the conclusion that the true boundary of the Province of Quebec as constituted by the Imperial Act of 1774, was a line produced due northwards from the point of junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to a point where it touched the southern boundary of the Hudson Bay territory. This matter has already been before the Courts of this country. It has been formally decided in the sense in which I argue by the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Quebec, held at the city of Quebec, in a criminal trial of murder—a trial of very great importance held years ago, at a period when our publicists and jurists were better acquainted with questions of this kind than they are to-day, and it was decided by no less able and distinguished a Court than one presided over by the late Chief Justice Sewell. In that case a murder had been committed, known as the de Reinhardt murder, at a place near Lake Winnipeg. The accused being tried at Quebec under an Imperial Act which has given the Courts of the Province of Quebec jurisdiction over the Indian territories forming part of British America. The plea of the prisoner's counsel was want of jurisdiction on the ground that the crime had been committed in the Province of Upper Canada, as it was then called, and that the boundaries of Upper Canada included this territory. The question was brought fairly and squarely before the Court, and the decision of Chief Justice Sewell and his associates was that this point which, by the present award, is included within the Province of Ontario was not within that Province, but was in the Indian or unorganized territories of Canada. We have, therefore, a judicial decision of the most careful and painstaking and reliable character that this point which is included within the present award is not within the Province of Ontario. I will not trouble the House with the reading of this decision. It is to be found in the records of the Committee of this House which had this matter in charge. But I would like to add that, so far as I can gather from this volume, the weight of authority is entirely with the view that the boundary of old Upper Canada was where I fix it, namely, a line drawn due north from the junction of these two rivers. Thus we have in favor of our contention the strict legal meaning of the word; we have in our favor probabilities that can be gathered from the other parts of the description; we have with us the fact that the Mississippi River would have been an uncertain and an improper boundary, and the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench of Quebec and the weight of all the scientific authorities which have been examined in this case as witnesses is with us. Therefore, I think I am safe in taking as my starting point the fact that the western boundary of the old Province of Upper Canada was fixed by the Act of 1774, and that it was a line due north from the junction of those two rivers.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 6) to amend and extend the Act to empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Tecumseh Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 23) respecting the Exchange Bank of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Killam.)

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

House resumed the consideration of Mr. Plumb's proposed amendment to Sir Leonard Tilley's motion for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. IVES. With regard to the northern boundary of the Province of Quebec, as determined in 1774, there has been but little contention. And I do not propose to occupy much time in discussing that question, or arguing that that boundary is the watershed which divides the waters flowing south into the great lakes and the St. Lawrence, from those flowing north into the Hudson's Bay. I am inclined the more to deal thus briefly with this part of the case because in one of the resolutions of the Ontario Legislature, passed at Toronto during last Session, on March 9th, it is stated that it is on the westerly side of this Province, independent of the award, the title of Ontario to the territory is most clear, and the territory is most valuable, and so on—admitting that the title to that part of the territory which is covered by the award, north of what the Dominion contend is the true boundary, is still weaker than their title to the western part of the territory. The original concession by the Crown to the Hudson Bay Company, which was prior to the organization of the Province of Quebec, and which fixed as the southern limit of that territory the watershed, which I have mentioned, dividing the waters flowing south from those flowing north, is my authority for saying that the northern boundary of Ontario, or the Province of Quebec, was that line. Having disposed of the questions as to the western and northerly boundaries, the next important matter, to my mind, to consider is the question as to when and how those boundaries as established in 1774 have been modified or changed. Of course they were changed by the treaty between Great Britain and the United States in 1783. The results of the War of the Revolution led the Imperial Government to cede to the United States not only that portion of the territory which was occupied by the thirteen colonies, but also a very considerable territory to the west of the then settled part of what is now the United States. Hon. members will find on page 17 of the Report of the Committee on Ontario Boundaries a description of the southern line of British America, and the northern line of the United States, as settled by the Treaty of Paris. This new boundary, of course, deprived the Province of Quebec, as constituted in 1774, of all the territory south of the great lakes. The description in the Treaty of Paris reads as follows:—

"From the north-west angle of Nova Scotia, viz., that angle which is formed by a line drawn due north, from the source of the St. Croix River to the highlands, along the highlands which divide those rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean, to the north-westernmost head of Connecticut River; thence down along the middle of that river to the forty-fifth degree of north latitude; from thence by a line due west on said latitude until it strikes the River Iroquois or Cataraguy; thence along the middle of said river into Lake Ontario, through the middle of said lake until it strikes the communication by water between that lake and Lake Erie; thence along the middle of said communication into Lake Erie; through the middle of said lake, until it arrives at the water communication between that lake and Lake Huron; thence along the middle of said water communication into Lake Huron; thence through the middle of said lake to the water communication between that lake and Lake Superior; thence through Lake Superior, northward of the isles Royal and Philippeaux, to Long Lake."

I understand that to be Rainy Lake.

"Thence through the middle of said Long Lake, and the water communication between it and the Lake of the Woods, to the said Lake of the Woods; thence through the said lake to the most north-western

point thereof, and from thence on a due west course to the River Mississippi."

Allow me to remark here, before passing on with my argument, upon the ignorance not only on the part of the Imperial authorities, but on the part of the American colonies with respect to the geography of that country as late as 1783; because you will observe that a line produced due west from the North-West Angle of the Lake of the Woods, would not come within 150 miles of the Mississippi River, and would pass 150 miles, certainly more than 100 miles, north of the sources of the Mississippi, the House will therefore see how much reliance is to be placed upon descriptions and titles as derived from descriptions when the parties furnishing the descriptions had such little knowledge of the physical features of the country to which they were referring. This treaty cut off, as I have said before, a very large portion of that territory which had been conceded to the Province of Quebec. Another change which was made was the division in 1791 by Imperial Statute of the Province of Quebec into the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. That division commenced near Montreal, and it is described by lines, parallels of latitude and degrees until it reaches the Ottawa River. It then follows the Ottawa River to Lake Temiscamingue, and then the description continues, as if there were doubt whether Lake Temiscamingue was sufficiently far north or not, in this way: by a line produced due north from Lake Temiscamingue to Hudson's Bay.

Mr. DAWSON. To the boundary line of Hudson's Bay?

Mr. IVES. To Hudson's Bay, or the boundary line of Hudson's Bay, as it is stated in some descriptions.

Mr. DAWSON. In the later descriptions?

Mr. IVES. I am unable to find, in the course of my reading of this correspondence and of the report, any title to territory beyond the watershed, except these descriptions which mention a line produced north from Lake Temiscamingue to Hudson's Bay or to the line of the Hudson's Bay territory. What would you think of a farmer who claimed all of the land on one side of a concession line simply because one of his boundaries was on the concession. In such a case would it be said that a line produced so as to go altogether beyond the boundaries of the farmer's land would give him a title to land all along the concession line? I repeat again—and I am sure if there is anything more we shall hear from the other side on this point—I have failed to find any excuse for the Province of Ontario, claiming that their territory runs north of the height of land, except the fact that in the descriptions of the boundary dividing Ontario from Quebec it mentions a line from Lake Temiscamingue produced north to Hudson's Bay. I say that they had no more right to claim a territory of that kind than a farmer would have to claim a territory because a concession bounded one end of his land. These, Sir, are the changes which have been made, so far as I can discover, in the boundaries of this territory. In fact the only change which really affects the magnitude of Quebec as constituted in 1774, was the Treaty of Paris which cut off the southern part of the Province and gave it to the United States of America. But hon. gentlemen mention certain Royal Commissions from His Majesty to various Colonial Governors, and they refer to the descriptions of territory which are found in these Royal Commissions. The first of these Commissions bears date in 1774, only a short time after the passing of the Quebec Act. That description, I am free to admit, while it follows the description found in the Quebec Act until you reach the point of junction between the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, then varies from the description in that Act, and says: "Thence northward along the Mississippi River to the territory of the Hudson Bay." Now, I would ask whether it can be conceded that as late as the last quarter of the 18th century

Mr. IVES.

that the King, by virtue of his prerogative alone, could extend or alter the boundaries of a Province which had been recently fixed by Imperial Act of Parliament to which he had assented. But, Sir, without stopping to discuss that proposition, I would ask hon. gentlemen—I would ask you, Sir—whether there is anything in the reading of this Commission out of which can be gathered the intention to increase or enlarge the boundaries of the Province of Quebec. The only possible thing that can be made out of this Commission of 1774 to Sir Guy Carlton is this: It may be said, and very fairly said, that it is proof that it was the intention of Parliament when they passed the Act, to make the Mississippi River the boundary. That may be argued, and I am free to admit it is a fair argument, and it is about the only confirmation of the statement that such was the intention of Parliament. But it should not be forgotten that the functionaries who drew the Royal Commission—the functionaries who varied the description in drawing Sir Guy Carleton's Commission—were not the same parties who passed the Act of Parliament. The Imperial House of Commons passed the Act of Parliament. It was a matter which was debated and discussed by the persons interested; it was a matter with reference to the description upon which Mr. Burke moved an amendment which was adopted, while, Sir, the Royal Commission was drawn by the King himself, or by his Ministers and not by the same functionaries who had passed the Act. Now, Sir, if it had been the Imperial Parliament which had adopted this form of description, which was used in the Commission, it might be fairly urged that they intended in the Act to have followed the Mississippi River, but how can it be fairly argued that they are bound by a description which was adopted by other persons over whom they had no control. But there is an inconsistency here. The same hon. gentlemen who urge that this is confirmation of their statement that the Mississippi River was intended as the western boundary will urge that the confines or boundaries of the Province are extended by virtue of that same Royal Commission and other Royal Commissions. Now, it cannot be said that it is both a confirmation of the view that the original boundary was the Mississippi River and also that it extended the boundaries from a line due north of the Mississippi River. The hon. gentleman must stand by either one or other understanding of these Royal Commissions. If these Royal Commissions *per se* altered the boundaries of the Province, then certainly they cannot be referred to as a confirmation of the original intention of the Statute of 1774. I cannot, for my part, see why it was impossible that the Government of England—the Imperial authorities—should have seen fit to have enlarged the jurisdiction of Sir Guy Carleton beyond the Province of Quebec. The whole territory then, west of the Mississippi River—west of a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers was territory claimed by England, and the Imperial authorities might have thought best, while giving Sir Guy Carleton jurisdiction over the Province of Quebec, to have extended that jurisdiction to the Mississippi River. We next come, Sir, to the Royal Commission of the year 1786—the new Commission issued to Sir Guy Carleton after the Treaty of Paris. In this Commission the description follows the description of the Treaty of Paris. It takes the southern boundary to the North-west Angle of the Lake of the Woods, and I apprehend that that is the only excuse which the arbitrators had for taking the North-west Angle of the Lake of the Woods as one of their starting points. I would ask you, Sir, what other authority is there for starting from the North-west Angle of the Lake of the Woods except this Royal Commission of the year 1786? If you were to follow the Mississippi River you would strike west of that point; if you were to follow a line drawn due north of the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi you would strike far east of that point. Then, I

ask, where is the authority for commencing this boundary, as the arbitrators commenced it, from the North-west Angle of the Lake of the Woods, unless it is to be found in the description in the Commission to Sir Guy Carleton, in 1786. I entirely repudiate that it was ever the intention of the King, or that he had the power to alter the boundaries of the Province as constituted by an Imperial Act of Parliament, by means of a Royal Commission issued to a Governor General. The next Commission is a Commission to Sir Guy Carleton, then Lord Dorchester, which was given several years later, and which is to be found on page 21 of this report. You will observe—and it is a very important matter—that this Commission in specific language revokes the former Commissions, which are here termed letters patent, in all their particulars; therefore, if the fact that the Commission of 1786 took the boundary to the North-west Angle of the Lake of the Woods is a reasonable foundation on which to base a claim, I say that the later Commission of 1791 completely and entirely revoked that authority. All the other Commissions are precisely the same in description until we come to the Commission issued to Lord Durham, which is to be found on page 25; and here, Sir, is a most important variance from the descriptions found in the previous Commissions, so important that I must ask the indulgence of the House while I read it:

"The said Province of Upper Canada being also bounded by a line drawn due north from the head of the said lake until it reaches the shore of Hudson's Bay; the said Province of Upper Canada being bounded on the south, beginning at the said stone boundary between Lancaster and Loagueuil, by the Lake St. Francis, the River St. Lawrence, the Lake of the Thousand Islands, Lake Ontario, the River Niagara, which falls (leads) into the Lake Erie, and along the middle of that lake on the west by the channel of Detroit, Lake St. Clair, up the River St. Clair, Lake Huron, the west shore of Drummond Island, that of St. Joseph and Sugar Island, thence into Lake Superior."

Well, Sir, if Royal Commissions changed and altered the boundaries of this Province, the latest change made is that which abides. The latest change is that made in the Commission to Lord Durham, and the same description is followed in all subsequent descriptions up to the Commission of Lord Elgin, which, I believe, was the latest which contained any description of territory. If these Commissions change and alter the boundaries of the Province, the last one must prevail, and the last one takes the boundaries of Ontario to the east end of Lake Superior, and if hon. gentlemen rely on these Commissions, they must be satisfied with the boundary which stops there. Then there will be two bounds—one where a line produced from Lake Temiscaming would reach a point on Hudson's Bay, and another at the outlet of Lake Superior. I think that is a point which it will be difficult to get round, provided it be admitted that the Royal Commissions affect the boundaries of the Province; but it is my opinion that these Royal Commissions do not affect the boundaries of the Province; it is my opinion that that boundary remained as it was originally established by the Statute of 1774, and the whole question depends on how that Statute is read and understood. Therefore, Sir, the conclusion to which I have arrived is this—that when this matter was referred to arbitration, there was a legal boundary, both to the west and to the north of Ontario, that the western boundary was a line produced due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and that the northern boundary was the height of land—the watershed—separating the waters which run south from those which run north into Hudson's Bay. If I am right in that view, the next important matter to consider is whether an order of the Privy Council of Canada, or even an Act of the Parliament of Canada, can legally change the boundaries of Upper and Lower Canada as they existed at the time of Confederation. If you look at section 6 of our Constitutional Act, you will find a positive affirmative enactment, providing what shall be the boundaries of the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec, and the

other Provinces which originally entered into Confederation. Section 6 reads as follows:

"The parts of the Province of Canada (as it exists at the passing of this Act) which formerly constituted respectively the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, shall be deemed to be severed, and shall form two separate Provinces. The part which formerly constituted the Province of Upper Canada shall constitute the Province of Ontario; and the part which formerly constituted the Province of Lower Canada shall constitute the Province of Quebec."

Now, Sir, I take this ground, that whatever has been positively and affirmatively enacted in our Constitutional Act, it is beyond the power of the Privy Council of Canada or of the Parliament of Canada to change or repeal. But it will be argued that power has been given subsequently, by Imperial Statute, to alter the boundaries of the Provinces, by chapter 28 of the Statutes of 1871. But if you look at the preamble of that Act, you will find that it was passed for the purpose of establishing the Province of Manitoba; and the clause under which it is claimed power has been given to alter the boundaries of Ontario is the third clause, which is in these general terms:

"The Parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the Legislature of any Province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such Province, under such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said Legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any Province affected thereby."

Now, Sir, the position which I take, and on which I can safely appeal to all legal gentlemen in this House to support me, is this: that the positive enactment in the British North America Act that the boundaries of Ontario shall be as they existed at the time of the passing of that Act, is not repealed or modified by a general clause in a subsequent Statute, like the third section of the Act to which I have just referred. I base my position on the maxim, *generalibus specialibus non derogant*, and I would refer, for my authority to Maxwell on the interpretation of Statutes, page 157, which I will read:

"It is about a particular application of the general presumption against an intention to alter the law beyond the immediate scope of the Statute, to say that a general Act is to be construed as not repealing a particular one by mere implication. A general later law does not abrogate an earlier special one. It is presumed to have only general cases in view, and not particular cases which have been already provided for by a special or local Act, or, what is the same thing, by custom. Having already given its attention to the particular subject, and provided for it, the Legislature is reasonably presumed not to intend to alter that special provision by a subsequent general enactment, unless it manifests that intention in explicit language. It is, therefore, a received maxim of statutory interpretation that *generalibus specialibus non derogant*. The general statute is read as silently excluding from its operation the cases which have been provided for under the special one."

Now, Sir, the boundaries of the Province of Ontario have been provided for by the Constitutional Act in the most special and marked language, and the position I take—and I have no doubt it is a sound position—is that a provision in general language does not repeal the special provision of that Act, but only applies to those general cases which are not specially provided for by previous legislation. There are a large number of examples which it was my intention to read to the House, but as I have already occupied too much time, I shall not do so. But those cases are exactly in point as showing, beyond any question, that section three of this Act gives no legal authority whatever for altering the boundaries of Ontario. You can see of what vital importance that principle of law is as applied to the facts of this case. If Ontario had a defined legal boundary at the time of Confederation, that boundary still remains as it was in virtue of the Imperial Act, and there is no power in Canada which can alter the boundaries of the Province of Ontario any more than of the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick. There are only two courses to take. The one is to seek Imperial legislation, which unquestionably would have the right, on memo-

rial from the Provinces of the Dominion, to alter the boundaries of those four original Provinces whose limits are specially stipulated for in the British North America Act. But with respect to those Provinces, neither that Statute nor any other provision of law that can be found affords any authority which would justify the Privy Council of Canada or the Parliament of Canada in altering the boundaries of any one of them. Then the reference to arbitrators, in so far as it proposed to leave to them the finding of the real boundary and the existing boundary, was all well enough, but the proposal to leave to arbitrators the finding of a conventional boundary, or the proposal that this House should approve and ratify a boundary—admittedly not the real but a conventional boundary—is entirely *ultra vires*, entirely out of the power of this Parliament. If that matter is settled, it is a very good answer to make to the Legislature of Ontario, and when that Legislature expostulates against the neglect of this Parliament to take action in this matter, we can reply that the award is a conventional and not a real boundary, and that we have no power to confirm that award. That ends the whole question. It is to be borne in mind also that there is a very good reason why the boundaries of the original Provinces should be fixed in a constitutional manner. The various Provinces of this Dominion have a vital interest in maintaining the boundaries of the original Provinces in their entirety. Were it otherwise, could a majority in Parliament alter the boundaries of any Province, and aggrandize it to the diminution of any or all of the others, where would be the safety of our system of Confederation. Will it be said, forsooth, that with the consent of the particular Province that is getting the increased territory, the Parliament of Canada may do what it likes with the boundaries? I could understand the claim that the boundaries of any Province could be altered with the consent of those that suffer by the change, but it is argued that with the consent of Ontario, Parliament may ratify an award which gives her a few hundred thousand miles of additional territory. I can understand there would not be much doubt about getting the consent of the Province to be benefited. I take it that the meaning of section three is that the change may be made with the consent of the particular Province that suffers by it, but not of the Province that is the gainer. This is not purely an Ontario question. It is one in which the other Provinces have a very large interest. Of course, under our system the Province of Quebec is the pivot Province so far as representation goes, the other Provinces having an increased representation as their population increases over that of Quebec; but not only Quebec, but all the other Provinces are interested in seeing that the great Province of Ontario, which we are all glad to see great, powerful and wealthy, should not become overpowering in its greatness. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues hesitate, when the authority is, to say the least, so doubtful, to confirm a conventional boundary which gives to Ontario this great increase of territory. I say, then, if I am right in my law, that there is only one way of increasing the boundaries of Ontario beyond the legal boundary as established in 1774, and that is by Imperial legislation. There are two or perhaps three ways of defining what is the legal boundary, and of laying it down across the country and on a map, and one of these would be by a reference to the Supreme Court, another by a reference to the Privy Council, and another a reference to arbitrators. And I find that the late Administration of which the member for Lambton was Premier, did not give the power to those arbitrators, in the Order in Council which appointed them to fix a conventional boundary. I also find that that position is taken by the Province of Ontario in their communication to the Privy Council. I can therefore easily understand why the late Government did

Mr. IVES.

not take immediate steps to bring about a ratification of an award which had been made without any authority in the reference to arbitration. The position which I take is this: that the late Administration, properly enough from that point of view if it was to be referred to arbitrators at all, empowered those men to determine what was the legal boundary, and nothing more, and these arbitrators taking that as their authority went to work to find a conventional boundary which began where no one ever dreamt of its beginning, which ran where no one ever claimed it should run, which ended at Hudson's Bay. Are the Dominion Government and Parliament to be blamed for not immediately taking steps to confirm, ratify and give effect to a conventional boundary, when the arbitrators never were asked or empowered to fix a conventional boundary, when the Order in Council forbade their undertaking to do so? I say, therefore, that the award is beyond the order of reference, that it was *ultra vires* of the arbitrators, that the award is illegal, that the matter was never left to them in that way, that the late Government was right in never ratifying it, and the present Government has certainly not been lacking in its duty in not taking any steps to confirm it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is aware that the late Government had not the opportunity of dealing with the question after the award was made.

Mr. IVES. I am quite aware of that; but I am also aware that the hon. member for Lambton, when leading a former Administration, had so little confidence in the arbitrators he named, and had such good reason to believe that his Minister of the Interior would act for Ontario rather than for the Dominion, that he never took power during two or three Sessions, or never gave power by Statutory enactment to the arbitrators to go on and act for the Dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We held that such an Act was not necessary; and the hon. member for Bothwell was not in the Government for two years after the reference was made.

Mr. IVES. The Province of Ontario thought it was necessary, and some of the correspondence includes a communication asking the Administration, or suggesting that they had better pass such an Act; and it seems to me it was only a proof of the hon. gentleman's prudence, foresight and caution that he did not commit himself to any action those arbitrators might take. What is the history of this correspondence? We find that it began in 1871, and that the Dominion Government, not the Government of Ontario, were the first to urge the necessity of having this boundary surveyed and settled. The Dominion Government on July 17th, 1871, called attention to the necessity of settling the true boundaries of Ontario, that is to say, the legal boundaries. On the 28th July the Privy Council adopted a report appointing E. E. Taché a Commissioner, &c., to settle and determine the boundaries of Ontario and survey the same, and appropriated the sum of \$15,000 to pay half the cost of the surveys; and the Ontario Government, on their part, appointed the Hon. Wm. McDougall as Commissioner, to act with Mr. Taché, to settle the true boundary line. In January, 1872, the Ontario Government, in the mildest sort of way and in the most insinuating manner, suggested that the Dominion Government should furnish them with a copy of the instructions given Mr. Taché, and such was furnished to Ontario; and they are very important in this connection. The following is the paper in question:

"Draft of Instructions to be given to the Commissioner appointed to act on behalf of the Dominion of Canada in the survey and location of the Boundary Line between the North-West Territories and the Province of Ontario, in conjunction with a Commissioner to be appointed by the Government of Ontario.

"1. The boundary in question is clearly identical with the limits of the Province of Quebec, according to the 14th Geo. III., cap. 83, known

as the 'Quebec Act,' and is described in the said Act as follows, that is to say: Having set forth the westerly portion of the southern boundary of the Province as extending along the River Ohio 'westward to the banks of the Mississippi,' the description continues from thence (i.e. the junction of the two rivers), and northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to Hudson Bay.

"Having determined the precise longitude west of Greenwich of the extreme point of land marking the junction of the north and east banks respectively of the said rivers,

"You will proceed to ascertain and define the corresponding point of longitude or the intersection of the meridian passing through the said junction, with the international boundary between Canada and the United States

"Looking, however, at the tracing enclosed, marked A, intended to illustrate these instructions it is evident such meridian would intersect the international boundary in Lake Superior.

"Presuming this to be the case, you will determine and locate the said meridian, the same being the westerly portion of the boundary in question, at such point on the northerly shore of the said lake as may be nearest to the said international boundary, and from thence survey a line due south to deep water, marking the same upon and across any and all points or islands which may intervene, and from the point on the main shore found as aforesaid draw and mark a line due north to the southern boundary of the Hudson Bay Territory before mentioned.

"This will complete the survey of the westerly boundary line sought to be established.

"You will then proceed to trace out, survey and mark, eastwardly, the aforementioned southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to the Hudson Bay."

"This is well understood to be the height of land dividing the waters which flow into the Hudson Bay from those emptying into the valley of the great lakes—and forming the northern boundary of Ontario—and the same is to be traced and surveyed, following its various windings till you arrive at the angle therein between the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, as the latter is at present bounded—having accomplished which, the service will have been completed.

"Your requisition for such assistance, scientific and otherwise, as may be necessary to enable you to determine the necessary longitudes with precision, and to effect the practical surveying operations in the field and for such instruments as may be required, will receive due consideration.

"Further instructions relating to the character of the boundary marks to be erected, and conveying other information which you will probably require will be duly sent you."

After these instructions had been received by the Ontario Government, there seemed to be a sudden change of mind with regard to the advisability of settling the true boundaries of Ontario; and the next thing we know is that Ontario notified the Dominion that they had instructed their Commissioner to take no further action under his Commission. The Dominion then asked the Government of Ontario to state their views as to what was the legal boundary. They complied with that request, and for the first time proposed a conventional boundary. On page 9 of the return is found the boundary which Ontario proposed, and they proposed it in the most diplomatic language, and, as we say in legal proceedings, without waiver of objections. The following is a description of the boundary proposed:—

"The boundary line of Ontario is the international boundary from the mouth of the Pigeon River, on Lake Superior, to a point of the Lake of the Woods, where the boundary line would be intersected by a line drawn north from the source of the Mississippi River; thence the boundary line of Ontario runs north to the point of intersection of the southern boundaries of the Hudson's Bay Territories; thence the boundary line of Ontario is the southern boundary of those Territories to the point where that boundary would be intersected by a line drawn north from the head of Lake Temiscamingue."

And they say in the despatch which accompanies this proposition, that they do not see any other way except to establish a conventional boundary to the north, and they think the boundary they suggest ought to be accepted as the western boundary. On the 9th May, 1872, the Dominion replied that a conventional boundary would not be legal or binding and would not settle the difficulty. They proposed a reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. You will remark that that was on the 9th May, 1872, and you will remark further that if that suggestion had been adopted, the matter would have been settled years ago, and we should not have been discussing the Ontario boundary question to-day. Ontario then called attention to the Imperial Act, which I have referred to, chapter 28 of the Statutes of 1871, and argued that under that Act a conven-

tional boundary would be legal, and they suggest that a Commission sitting here would be better than a reference to the Privy Council, but they do not refuse submission to the Privy Council. The Dominion then replied that the other Provinces have interests to be considered in this matter, and that if a conventional boundary is agreed to, it would be unfair to the interests of the other Provinces. Here the matter rested till the defeat of the Administration of the right hon. leader of the Government, and the incoming of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton. On the 12th November, 1874, the reference to the arbitrators was made by the Mackenzie Government, but that reference was to find the true boundary, and not a conventional boundary. On the 3rd August, 1878, the award was made. Ontario, in the meantime, having passed legislation empowering these arbitrators, and the Dominion Government having declined to introduce any such legislation. The conclusions to which I have arrived in applying the law to the facts are these: first, that Ontario had a legally prescribed boundary at the time of the Confederation; second, that the western boundary was a line due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and the northern boundary was the watershed dividing the waters flowing south to the great lakes, and the St. Lawrence from those flowing north to the Hudson Bay; third, the British North America Act declared that the existing boundaries of Ontario should continue to be the boundaries of Ontario; fourth, that enactment has not been repealed and cannot be, except by the Imperial Parliament, and neither the Parliament of Canada nor the Privy Council of Canada can legally accept any change of the boundaries of Ontario, as existing at the time of Confederation; fifth, the boundaries awarded by the arbitrators are not the legal boundaries of Ontario, and were never claimed to be such until after the award was made, and neither the Privy Council of Canada nor the Parliament of Canada have any power to confirm that award or make the proposed boundaries the legal boundaries of Ontario; sixth, the difficulty can be settled only by the legislative intervention of the Mother Country, moved by joint addresses of this Parliament and the different Legislatures, or by judicial decision as to what the legal boundaries are, and as this would settle the difficulty, I am glad to see it is the course proposed by the hon. member for Niagara in his resolution. Now, Sir, it seems to me, in conclusion, that if there is any fault to be found with this proposed amendment, it is to be found by the representatives of the other Provinces than Ontario. It seems to me that if this proposition errs at all, it errs by being partial to the great Province of Ontario. It is proposed that Ontario shall have the choice as between a reference to the Privy Council and a reference to the Supreme Court. It is proposed that that Province shall have the choice as to whether that case shall be a case made up by mutual consent between Ontario and the Dominion, or whether it shall be a case submitted by Her Majesty herself. Ontario has not, I am sorry to say, acted in the same spirit. I cannot help comparing the resolutions which were passed on one of the last days of the Session of the Ontario Legislature, with the language of those resolutions, with the moderate and conciliatory language which is used in the proposition now before the Chair. In the one case there is even a threat of secession or rebellion, and, in the other case, there is a proposition to leave the settlement of the matter with the highest judicial tribunals here or the highest judicial tribunals in the Empire, and to leave the territory and the right of parties in *statu quo* until that decision can be obtained. What, I ask, could be fairer? What could be more partial to the great Province of Ontario than this proposition? They say they propose to protect their interests from spoliation. But who has attempted spoliation? The Government of the right hon. leader has always been opposed

to a conventional boundary, has always urged that a conventional boundary would be illegal, has always contended that the only way to settle this question was to get a judicial determination of what are the legal existing boundaries. These were his views before his defeat in 1873, and these have been his views since his accession to office in 1878. But because the Province of Ontario, by some reason or other, have obtained a larger portion of territory than, according to my view, they are entitled to, they are of course in a great hurry to have that boundary confirmed, to have that territory conceded to them; but I think it would be at least fair to the other Provinces that the people of Ontario should defer their rebellion, should defer their civil war till the highest courts in the country, at least, should have an opportunity of declaring upon this matter, particularly as long as the Dominion proposes that the rights in the territory, to the timber limits and the laws should remain in *statu quo* till the matter is settled. I am sorry to see a disposition evinced in the Province of Ontario, in the Legislature of Ontario, to make what I must suppose political capital out of this question, to raise a sectional cry, to attempt to obtain a sectional advantage by making the most of that cry. Sir, I have only to look to the history of our neighbors in the south, to see what fatal results may follow from indulging in a course like that. We there saw from year to year an agitation, with respect to the question of slavery, an agitation which was kept up for the mere purpose of obtaining advantages at elections, and it resulted in a war which devastated that country, which caused the expenditure of millions of money, and the loss of thousands of lives. Sir, that is the very course the Legislature of Ontario proposes to adopt, to bring about a settlement of this question. They do not propose to leave this matter to the settlement of the Courts. They stand by their bond, and they demand their pound of flesh. They say: "We have got an award; you agreed to an award." It is true it is only the Privy Council that agreed to it; it is true the Privy Council only agreed to an award which should find the true boundaries; it is true the arbitrators went beyond their power. It is true they found a conventional boundary; it is true that that award is illegal; it is true the Parliament of Canada has no power to ratify that award, but we have got the bond, we have got the award, we have got the power and we mean to keep up the agitation, and we mean to obtain all that award has given us. I think that the better sense of the people of the great Province of Ontario will concur in the principles of this resolution, will concur in the view of the right hon. leader of the Government, that it is better to keep cool, that it is better not to get excited, that it is better not to take up arms at the present moment, but to make one further effort to have this matter settled by a tribunal which shall have the confidence of all parties. I believe that the resolution offers the only reasonable course that can be taken, and I shall support it with very great pleasure.

Mr. MILLS. It is not my intention to undertake to combat the observations made by the hon. member for Niagara in relation to myself. I do not think it is necessary to enter into any defence of my conduct in becoming a Minister of the Crown after having been an agent of the Government of Ontario, in preparing a case in their behalf. I think I need not before this House enter into any discussion of that subject, especially when we have one so important as that submitted in this particular resolution. The subject is one of very great interest to the people of Ontario, not only those opposed to the present Government, but to people of every shade of political opinion throughout the Province of Ontario. When the Prime Minister announced, in 1872, that the boundary of Ontario on the west was to be determined by a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers, and on the north by the watershed which separates

Mr. IVES.

the lakes from Hudson's Bay, the country was taken by surprise. The contention was wholly at variance with that put forward by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues not long before. If the line taken was not the subject of a great deal of controversy, it was because the people of Canada had, from the beginning, been led by merchants, by traders, by newspapers, and by public men of every shade of political opinion to believe that the Hudson's Bay Company were trespassers in the North-West, and in the whole interior country, and were at best possessed of but a doubtful title in the vicinity of Hudson's Bay. And the public of Ontario had no doubt, and could have none, as to the conclusions which must ultimately be reached. It is true that the highest court of Quebec had, at one time, decided that the boundary of Ontario upon the west, was a meridional line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio with the Mississippi; but it did so with a view of upholding its jurisdiction in a case which was before it. The purpose of the Act was wholly lost sight of. The true grammatical construction of the section of the Act under consideration, was wholly overlooked, both by counsel and by the court. It can be conclusively established, by surrounding circumstances, as well as by a careful examination of the Act itself, that, if that Act is still to be regarded as marking the limits of Ontario, it extends the boundaries westward, at least as far as the meridian of Lake Itasca, the source of the Mississippi, that if the word "northward," as used in the first section of the Act, applies to the direction of the countries, territories and islands from the boundary on the south, then the territories of the Hudson's Bay Company, make the northern boundary. But if it applies to the northern deflection of the southern boundary as a liminary line on the west, then there is no boundary given to Ontario on the north, and we are left to seek for a northern boundary from some other sources, and the present Province of Quebec would still retain as its northern boundary the line drawn by the proclamation of October, 1763. It is well known to every one who has studied the history of the fur trade, that the whole country from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, as far north as Lake Athabaska, and eastward in close proximity to Hudson's Bay, was occupied and held by France from the time that she first took possession, down to the surrender of Canada by the Treaty of Paris; that after the cession of Canada to Great Britain the country was, for several years, occupied by numerous fur traders, from Montreal, from Albany, and from Illinois; that after the United States had acquired their independence, this trade was carried on by merchants of London and of Montreal. That they ultimately formed themselves into a single company; that they had in their employment about two thousand voyageurs and traders, who were scattered over this immense region; that it was not until the beginning of this century that the Hudson's Bay Company ventured away from the shores of the Bay, and began to set up a claim to the whole basin of Hudson's Bay. I shall undertake to show you that the Government of Canada, having cognizance of these facts, disputed the pretensions of the Hudson's Bay Company, not only to a large section of country north of the watershed, but to the whole North-West Territories. I shall endeavor to make it clear that the Crown did not possess the territories professedly granted to the Hudson's Bay Company, at the time the charter was given; that it was by the due diligence of the Company that the Crown expected to acquire the sovereignty of the country; and that the sovereignty of the Crown and the property of the Company depended entirely upon the activity and enterprise of the Company in exercising authority and dominion over the territories formally granted. I will undertake to show you that not only was there no conveyance of the country which was in the possession of any other Christian Prince at the time the

charter was given, but there could be no valid exclusion of France, or of any other country, from the unoccupied territories of North America by this grant. I shall endeavor to show you that by the charter the Crown professed to grant a title in fee simple to one portion of the country in the vicinity of the Bay. That it professed to grant an exclusive right of trade over another portion of the country of which no title to the soil was given. I shall undertake to show you, that the claim to the whole basin of Hudson's Bay, is a modern claim; and that before the Treaty of Utrecht, the treaty upon which the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company are wholly dependent, they made no claim to any territory south of the fifty-first parallel. I will undertake to show that in appointing arbitrators to ascertain and determine the boundaries of Ontario, when those boundaries were contested by the Government of Canada, the Crown acted within its authority; that it was properly advised; that an award was properly made; that Ontario did not receive by that award a larger extent of territory than she was entitled to; and that that award ought to be affirmed and acted upon as setting forth the true limits of the Province of Ontario. The Government have said, in a recent communication to the Government of Ontario, that the territory has been acquired on behalf of Canada from the Hudson's Bay Company. That is a misstatement of the case. Canada has always disputed the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company, not only to the lands now in question, but to the whole North-West country. When the North-West Company amalgamated with the Hudson's Bay, the disputed territories lying far beyond the bounds of settlement, ceased for a time to be the subject of controversy, but it was not because the pretensions of the Hudson's Bay Company were admitted to be well founded, but only because the Province had no present interest in actively enforcing its claim against the Company. As early as 1857, an elaborate report was made by an hon. member of the Government, of which the present hon. Prime Minister was the Premier, in which the right of the Hudson's Bay Company to the territories in question was disputed, and the claims of Canada, on behalf of the present Province of Ontario, was asserted over the whole country to the Pacific Ocean. The Colonial Secretary informed the Government of Canada that an enquiry was to be made by a Committee of the House of Commons into the affairs of the Company, and into their claims to the North-West, and that Canada might desire to be represented before that Committee. The Colonial Secretary would not have given such an invitation had he not known that the people of Canada had long before disputed the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company to the country. The Government acted upon this invitation, and Chief Justice Draper was sent to represent Canada before a Committee of the House of Commons. He informed the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues that it was desirable to have a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as to the western limit of the Province of Canada, as well as of the northern boundary; and that he confidently hoped a decision would give to Canada a clear right west to the line of the Mississippi, and a considerable distance north of the watershed. In fact, Chief Justice Draper, who was a most able judge—and competent to form a correct conclusion—after a very careful consideration of the subject, intimated as his view, that the boundaries of Ontario were those which the arbitrators subsequently declared them to be by their award. In 1865, a member of the Government, of which the right hon. gentleman was the leader in the Legislative Assembly, still claimed the country as a part of Upper Canada, and only agreed to compensation to avoid the mischiefs of delay consequent upon a protracted suit before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. When the Federal Union of the four Provinces was consummated, the Government of the right

hon. gentleman declared their determination to acquire not only the territories hitherto claimed as a part of Upper Canada, but those formally granted to the Hudson's Bay Company in the vicinity of the Bay; and so little value did he place upon the title of the Company that he invited the Government of the United Kingdom to transfer the whole country to Canada, leaving the Hudson's Bay Company the privilege of upholding their rights, if they had any, not before the Judicial Committee but in the Canadian courts of law. The right hon. gentleman knew that the Company were a proprietary Government; that by their charter they had professedly conferred upon them the power to govern the country; and that the Crown had not the power to do what he wanted to have done, in the manner he proposed. The right hon. gentleman said, in defence of his policy:

"That we wished to take possession of this territory, and would undertake to legislate for it and to govern it, leaving the Hudson's Bay Company no right, except the right of asserting their title in the best way they could in courts of competent jurisdiction. And what would their title be worth the moment it was known that the country belonged to Canada, and that the Canadian Government and Canadian courts had jurisdiction there, and that the chief protection of the Hudson Bay Company, and the value of their property, namely, their exclusive right of trading in those regions, was gone forever? The Company would only be too glad that the country should be handed over to Canada, and would be ready to enter into any reasonable arrangement. The value of the Company's interest would be determined by the value of their stock; and what would that be worth when the whole country belonged to Canada?"

The right hon. gentleman proposed to deal with the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company, whatever they were, as he now undertakes to deal with the rights of Ontario. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman expected to succeed in the course he had marked out for his Government. He was informed that the Crown had not the power to do what he proposed, but he certainly did succeed in incurring the ill-will of the Company's agents, as well as of the settlers, in the North-West. He succeeded in stirring up a rebellion, which cost the country more than a million of dollars, and which has impeded the progress of the country ever since. The right of the Hudson's Bay Company, to the whole country, was energetically denied by his colleagues; and if compensation was granted to the Company it was in order to avoid protracted litigation, and not because it was supposed they had any claim beyond their property in their farms and posts which could be successfully upheld in a court of law. So far was the right hon. gentleman from recognizing any title in the Hudson's Bay Company, that, in January, 1869, two of his colleagues who had gone to England for the purpose of securing a transfer of Rupert's Land and the Indian Territories to Canada, informed Earl Granville that:

"The boundaries of Upper Canada on the north and west were declared, under the Constitutional Act of 1791, to include all the territory to the westward and southward of the boundary line of Hudson's Bay to the utmost extent of the country, commonly called or known by the name of Canada. Whatever doubt may exist as to the utmost extent of Old or French Canada, no impartial investigator of the evidence, in the case, can doubt that it extended to and included the country between Lake of the Woods and Red River. The Government of Canada, therefore, does not admit, but, on the contrary, denies, and has always denied the pretensions of the Hudson's Bay Company to any right of soil beyond that of squatters in the territory through which the road complained of is being constructed."

This shows very clearly that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, down to the time the country was surrendered to Canada, claimed it as a part of the Province of Ontario; and that when compensation was granted to the Hudson's Bay Company, it was not granted to them because they had any proprietary rights in the disputed territories, but in order to get immediate possession of the country. But what I have said does not apply to the territory south of the watershed and west of Prince Arthur's Landing. The Hudson's Bay Company never made any claim to that country, and it has been uniformly dealt with as a part of the Province of Ontario. As early as 1856 the Government

negotiated with the Indians for the surrender of the country westward of Thunder Bay, as far as the source of the Pigeon River; and before the Federal union of the Provinces no fewer than 35,000 acres of the territories so surrendered had been patented to private parties. When representation was given to the Algoma District it was included in that district, and the hon. member for Algoma claims to represent those people. They are electors within his district, although, if I understand his present views upon the question, he has no business here as a representative from Ontario. As late as April, 1872, I find the hon. First Minister sending accounts to the Government of Ontario for cash advances made for the erection of court-houses, and for the maintenance of a police force beyond what, he says, are the limits of the Province. He has also presented accounts for the amount due the Indians under the Robinson Treaty, although he holds that the territory does not belong to Ontario, for which he is demanding from it the amount promised the Indians for its surrender. In the ninth and tenth paragraphs of the despatch sent to the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, on the 27th of January last, the Secretary of State says:

"His Excellency's advisers are of opinion that, in advance of Parliamentary sanction, it was not only highly inexpedient, but transcended the power of the Government of the day, to refer to arbitration the question of the extent of the North-West Territories acquired by the Dominion by purchase from the Hudson's Bay Company. That territory had been acquired on behalf of, and was, in fact, held for all the Provinces comprised in the Dominion, and the extent of it was a question in regard to which, if a dispute arose, only Parliament could have absolved the Government of the day from the duty of seeking an authoritative determination by the legal tribunals of the country."

I deny the doctrine laid down in both these propositions. I will allude to the second proposition first, and I will say that, as to the question of the extent of the North-West Territories, and the fact that they are the common property of the Dominion does not limit the authority of the Crown with regard to their boundaries any more than it is limited in dealing with the Provinces—if there is a difference it is in favor of a Province—and the right hon. gentleman as First Minister did not fail to deal absolutely and finally with the disputed boundary of a Province, without the prior sanction or subsequent ratification of Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows that, in referring a boundary question to the Judicial Committee, he is asking for a decision not from a Court but from a Council of State.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is it not a Court of Appeal?

Mr. MILLS. It is governed by legal principles, but it is a Council of State and not a Court of Appeal. If the hon. gentleman will look at Mr. Finlayson's book on this subject, he will find that very fully discussed, but whether it is so or not, it proceeds, on all questions of disputed boundaries, as a Council of State, and the hon. gentleman will find, in the cases of the disputed boundaries of New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and the Plymouth Colony, that these questions were considered, not by any Court, but by the King in Council.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At that time there was no such thing as a Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MILLS. Exactly so. But the function of the King, in this particular, has never been changed. I remember very well the one case that I mentioned, the New Hampshire case, the claim of Captain Mason. The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, as members of the Council, gave advice precisely as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council do now. They entered into an elaborate discussion and proceeded upon judicial principles, but still they sat as a Council of State and concluded by advice and not by a judgment. Will the hon. gentleman mention any case in which the Judicial Com-

mittee of the Privy Council proceeded otherwise than by advice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Committee of the Privy Council is expressly declared to be a Court of Appeal for all ecclesiastical and all colonial questions. If the Queen passes an Order in Council which is a mere form, the hon. gentleman says it is but a matter of advice. It is by way of a solemn decision of a High Court of Appeal, and is unanimous, as decisions in appeal should be; there ought to be no dissenting voice.

Mr. MILLS. I am not going to discuss the question as to what ought or ought not to be the custom of Courts of Appeal. I am dealing with facts as they are. I stated that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council cannot do more than advise the Queen. They may possess some of the powers of a court, but they are still as they were from the beginning, a Council of State. The Judicial Committee does not render judgments; it gives advice. You do not know what the views of the individual members of that body are. They hear arguments, they deliberate in secret. But because its members constitute a Council, and not a court, there are no dissentient opinions permitted. The conclusion come to is the advice of the whole Council. And, were it necessary, it could be shown that the settlement of political boundaries have always been regarded as acts of State belonging to the political Department of Government, and not as judgments falling within the cognizance of the Courts. The first part of this paragraph is equally untenable, and it is all the more remarkable, coming from a First Minister, who has made it a point, all his public life, to act upon a wholly different rule. The hon. gentleman was a party to a treaty which ceded to the United States a right to navigate the St. Lawrence River, and who abandoned the right to navigate some of the rivers upon the north-west coast, and consented to the restriction of our rights in the navigation of others, without the prior sanction, or the subsequent confirmation of either the Parliament of this country or the Parliament of the United Kingdom. It is well known to the House that the boundaries between British Columbia and Washington Territory, as laid down by the Washington Treaty of 1846, were in dispute. The First Minister was a party to referring the question, not to eminent jurists, but to a powerful potentate, who was authorized to give an absolute decision by which this country was bound. He did not then seek Parliamentary authority or Parliamentary absolution for himself or his government. So far was he from referring the article in the Treaty of Oregon to the Emperor of Germany for judicial construction, that he was a party to an agreement which prevented the question coming before the Emperor on its merits. He was never asked where the provisions of that treaty required the boundary line to be drawn. Whether it was because the Emperor was not a jurist, and was not considered competent to construe the treaty, I cannot say, but I can say, he was not permitted to do so. He was told that the English contended that the boundary between Vancouver Island and the Mainland should be drawn through one channel, and the United States held that it should be drawn through another. He was asked to decide which of these two best comports with the provisions of the treaty. The Emperor decided in favor of the American view, but we know that, had he been free to have laid down the boundary under the treaty, he would have followed neither of those channels; he would have taken a line between them, which would have left the disputed island a Canadian possession. The right hon. gentleman, by his statesmanship, made San Juan a possession of the United States. In fact, the Island of San Juan, which, in the opinion of the German Emperor, was a part of British Columbia, by the Treaty of 1846, was made a part of the

Mr. MILLS.

United States, by the Treaty of 1871. We know that in everything which specially concerned Canada, the other British Commissioners deferred to the wishes—they followed the lead of the right hon. gentleman. Will the First Minister contend, that the Crown may enter into arrangements and compacts by which a British possession may be lost—by which it may be transferred to a foreign State by which it may be dismembered, without the permission of Parliament, but that it would be unconstitutional, that it would be beyond the power of the Crown to ascertain and determine the boundary between two Provinces of Her Majesty's dominions, without first having obtained the approval of Parliament to such a line of executive action? I will undertake to show that the late Government did not transcend its authority when it referred the question of the disputed boundaries to arbitration. The Secretary of State suggests, in his despatch to the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, that there was a conventional boundary formed by the arbitrators. Now, there is not a shadow of authority for such a suggestion; neither in the Orders in Council nor in the correspondence between the two Governments, nor in the case stated by each, nor in the arguments by counsel, nor in the award of the arbitrators, is there any other boundaries sought for or spoken of than the legal limitary lines which separate upon the north and on the west the outlying territories of Canada from the Province of Ontario. The question put in issue by the case of each party, the question argued by the counsel, the question upon which the arbitrators gave a decision, was this one,—where are the legal boundaries of the Province of Ontario upon the north and on the west? They said that the boundary line of Hudson's Bay mentioned in the proclamation of 1791 meant the shore of Hudson's Bay, and the law officers of the Crown of England had before said the same thing. They were of opinion that the Act of 1774 made the Mississippi the boundary of the Province of Quebec in the west as far as the Mississippi River extended, and Lord Camden, Lord Thurlow, Lord Loughborough, in England, and Chief Justice Draper, here, had also held the same view. In starting from the North-west Angle to draw the western boundary, they started from a point to which the International boundary of Upper Canada had before been set out in the Governor's Commission. Had the source of the Mississippi been further west the boundary would have been, no doubt, carried further westward; but the source of the Mississippi and the North-west Angle are so nearly upon the same meridian, that they may be taken as identical, according to the legal maxim, that "the law does not take notice of trifles." I shall in this connection refer to two classes of cases which involve the same principle as the action which the Government here contest. The first of these classes may be held to assert with much greater emphasis, than the action of the late Government in this case, the right of the Executive to deal with all such questions, limited only by the responsibility of Ministers to Parliament. Blackstone lays down the proposition that the Sovereign alone deals with other powers and that there can be no doubt, that at the conclusion of a war, the consent of Parliament is not necessary to enable the Crown to alienate British territory to a foreign State. Whether it has power to alienate territory in time of peace, has been a debated question, but it is, I think, now generally conceded that where the full dominion is in the Crown, where the territory has been acquired by conquest or by cession, the Crown has power to cede without either the permission or sanction of Parliament. It has been argued by Mr. Forsyth and others, that where the Parliament has extended its authority over the dominions of the Crown, and also where Provincial Legislatures have been created, that the Crown, no longer having full dominion, has not the power of cession. This I will show you is not in accordance with usage; and it will be difficult, on any constitutional theory, to maintain that

the Crown possessed, for the purpose of negotiating peace, powers, which, at any other time, would be held to be an encroachment upon the authority of Parliament. The Judicial Committee seemed to favor the views of those who contended that the power of the Crown in this particular was unlimited except perhaps with regard to those districts or colonies in which representative Government was established.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The power of the Crown is paramount.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know that the powers of the Crown paramount are at all different so far as this question is concerned from the powers of the Crown in other respects. Where the Crown has full dominion, as it is called, there can be no question as to its right to cede a territory. There are numerous instances of the exercise of this power. But even where the power of the Crown is limited by the intervention of the Imperial Parliament, or the creation of a Local Legislature, there are many instances where the Crown has undertaken to deal with a territory, and where it has ceded it and altered boundaries without the prior sanction or subsequent ratification of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the Crown, on the advice of the Canadian Ministry, could give the Manitoulin Islands to the United States?

Mr. MILLS. I am not arguing that question; but I shall answer the right honorable gentleman by-and-bye.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Crown paramount could do it, but the Canadian Crown could not do it.

Mr. MILLS. I am not now discussing what ought to be, but what is the prerogative of the Crown in this particular. There is no doubt a strong tendency in our own day to restrain the prerogatives of the Crown by holding Ministers more strictly responsible for their exercise. Parliament is more active and more interested in the work of Administration than formerly. Behind it and outside of it there is the great power of public opinion which will not permit it to remain an indifferent spectator of Administrative Acts in which the public are deeply interested. Parliament may insist upon being consulted with regard to any negotiations with a foreign State. It may insist upon controlling all negotiations. It may insist upon all matters being submitted to it before they are finally ratified. It may do this because it is the supreme authority in the State; and if it did so no Ministry would be likely to disregard its mandates. But it has not hitherto in such matters asserted its supreme authority. This has not, heretofore, been the practice. It is not the practice now. Parliament has left the administration of the public business to the Executive just as it has left the interpretation of the law to the courts. The negotiations with the North American Colonies are, in fact, no exception. When the Crown was about to make peace with the North American Colonies, it sought the authority of Parliament, but it did so because an Act had been passed expressly forbidding negotiations. There were also numerous Acts which extended to the North American Colonies forbidding their trade with foreign States. A statute of Charles I. expressly denied that the Crown had a dispensing power. Parliament legislated in that case, to vest in the King power to repeal and make void Acts of Parliament relating to America. The Crown could not recognize the independence of America without an immense cession of territory, yet the Act which conferred upon the King power to negotiate did not confer upon him power to cede any territories, much less other portions of his dominions. He, nevertheless, did cede the old colonies, as well as other portions, without the sanction of Parliament. Let me invite your attention briefly to what the Crown has done. Dunkirk was sold by Charles II. to the King of France without the sanction of Parliament. Parliament,

when the fact became known, impeached Lord Clarendon, who was held responsible as the King's principal adviser, but it did not question the validity of the act. By the Treaty of Breda in 1667, and by the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697, cessions and retrocessions were made by the Crown without the sanction of Parliament. In 1633 the Island of Tangiers was abandoned by the Crown in time of peace. The Island of Minorca was ceded to Great Britain by the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713. It remained a British possession until 1783, when, by the Treaty of Versailles, it was, without the authority of Parliament, ceded to the King of Spain. The Island of Tobago was ceded to the Crown of Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris. It remained a British possession for twenty years, when, by the Treaty of Versailles, it was ceded to the Crown of France without the sanction of Parliament, the only stipulation being that the King of France should respect and maintain the titles of British subjects to their property within the Island. In 1763, both East and West Florida were ceded by Spain to the King of England, and were, in 1783, retroceded to the King of Spain, for which no Parliamentary sanction was sought. By the Treaty of 1763 the King of France ceded Canada with its dependencies to the King of England. In 1774, the whole of the country to the Mississippi River was brought under the control of Parliament, and a Constitution was given to the population by Parliament itself; and yet, in 1783, the King, without the authority of Parliament, ceded a large portion of the Province to the Republic of the United States. While the Floridas were in the possession of the King of England, he established in each a Colonial Government. British subjects were encouraged to settle in East Florida. The Colonization of the Interior of the Continent was prohibited, the better to encourage this object. It was this fact mainly, that induced Lord Loughborough to question the authority of the Crown to transfer the Floridas to Spain. He was answered by Lord Thurlow. I shall refer to this subject again at a later period. In 1824, the King of the Netherlands ceded to the King of Great Britain all his establishments in India, and the Town and Fort of Malacca and its dependencies, and His Britannic Majesty in turn ceded to the King of Netherlands Fort Marlborough, Bencoolen, and all the English possessions in the Island of Sumatra. The cession by the Crown was tacitly admitted by Parliament. The treaty was recognized as valid by (George IV., chap. 85), by which Singapore, one of the possessions ceded by the Dutch, was transferred to the East India Company. I will now refer to the South African case. In 1836, the Dutch Boers of Cape Colony were dissatisfied with the mode of compensation adopted under the Act of Emancipation. They believed the compensation provided was quite inadequate, but they were disposed to submit. But when the Government provided that payment should be made in London only, and when the population found themselves obliged to sell their claims to brokers at the Cape for a mere fraction of the amount awarded them, they became greatly dissatisfied. Many were so exasperated that they were resolved to expatriate themselves from Cape Colony. They took with them their personal property, and retired into the interior beyond the Drakenburgh Mountains, so as to get beyond the limits of the British possessions. They settled in the valley of the Orange River and in Natal. They occupied Natal with a view to opening up a trade with Holland, and with other countries on the continent of Europe. The British at once took possession of the Natal coast to control their trade. The Boers resisted, were defeated, and were driven back into the Orange River country. There could be no question but that the Orange River country was beyond the limit of the Queen's dominions. The Government of Cape Colony had from time to time entered into treaties with Griqua Chiefs, who resided at Orange River, to protect the northern frontier

Mr. Mills.

of the colony against invasion. When Sir Harry Smith, in 1847, went out as Governor to the Cape, he informed Earl Grey, the Colonial Secretary, that both the Boers and natives desired that British rule should be established over them. He intimated that his position at the Cape was like that of many of the Governors who had gone out to India resolved not to further extend the British dominions; but who had ended by greatly enlarging the borders of the Indian Empire. His own view, he said, had been against the extension of the British dominions in South Africa; but he found its extension demanded both by Dutch and natives, and he recommended the Colonial Secretary to annex the Orange River country to the possessions of the Crown. The Earl Grey acted, contrary to his own judgment, but in deference to the earnest representations of Sir Harry Smith, and advised the Queen to assume the sovereignty of that country. It was soon manifest that the Colonial Secretary had been misled. Lord Grey quitted office before any change of policy could take place, but he left on record his opinion that the Crown should abandon the sovereignty of that country. He sent out Major Hogg and Mr. Owen as Commissioners to report upon the subject, and he awaited their report in order the better to accomplish his purpose. Sir John Pakington succeeded him. He concurred in the views of Lord Grey, but deferred action until the report of the Commissioners should be received, which was not done before he quitted office. The Duke of Newcastle was the next Colonial Minister. Holding the same views as his predecessors, he advised the abandonment of the Orange River country. He took the advice of the law officers of the Crown, as to the proper method of giving effect to this policy. The views of the legal advisers of the Crown are indicated by the course taken. The letters patent, which were issued under the Great Seal in March, 1851, constituting the Orange River country a distinct Government, were revoked by other letters patent, and Her Majesty, by Order in Council, approved of a proclamation which

"Declared, and made known the abandonment and renunciation of Her dominion and sovereignty over the Orange River country, and over the inhabitants thereof."

The question which presented itself for discussion in the two Houses of Parliament was, whether the Crown had the power to divest itself of the sovereignty of the country, once that Sovereignty had been assumed? It was admitted by all that the Crown might give up places of arms, military forts and trophies of war, such as Calais, Dunkirk and Tangiers; but it was denied, by Mr. Adderly and others, that this could be done with an ordinary possession of the Crown. It was argued that if the Crown could transfer its possessions to a foreign power, it could release parties of their allegiance, it could convert its subjects into an alien population. The Duke of Newcastle, in a despatch to Sir James Clark, the then Governor of Cape Colony, expressly denied that the withdrawal of the sovereignty of Her Majesty from the country at all affected the allegiance of those who were by birth Her Majesty's subjects. The law officers who advised the Crown at the time were Sir Alexander Cockburn and Sir Richard Bethell. The Attorney General said that Colonies acquired by conquest or by cession were subject to the absolute and undisputed sovereignty of the Crown, and those who settled in such possessions did not acquire any right to take with them the laws and institutions of England, and the Crown could cede or abandon such possessions without the sanction of Parliament. With respect to territories acquired by occupancy considerable difference of opinion existed as to whether the Crown had the power of getting rid of those territories otherwise than by an Act of the Legislature. Much might be said on both sides; but it was not necessary to enter on the question in the case of the Orange River Territory, because the mode of proceeding in that case rested, not upon the principle which regu-

lated territory by occupancy, but upon those principles which regulated territory acquired by conquest. Sir Harry Smith proclaimed the sovereignty of the British Crown over the country which the Boers occupied. They resisted his authority. They were subjugated. The Crown, without the intervention of Parliament, established its authority, and finding that it had been misled and deceived, as to the wishes of the Boer population, abandoned the sovereignty over the country without the intervention of Parliament. Sir Alexander Cockburn said that the legal proposition upon which they had proceeded was this, that what the Crown had acquired by cession or by conquest, and over which it still retained full dominion, it could deal with without the intervention or co-operation of Parliament. In the same discussion Sir Frederick Thesiger, a distinguished lawyer, said he would not offer an opinion upon the general question as to how far the Crown could constitutionally dispossess itself of any of its dominions without the assent of Parliament. He admitted the question was one of very great difficulty. Lord Loughborough had expressed an opinion one way and Lord Thurlow another; but he admitted that in the case before them it was not essential that the sanction of Parliament should be had in order to give validity to the abandonment. Mr. Phillimore, a very high authority, expressed strongly the opinion that the Crown had clearly the right to abandon a colony. The real check he said against abuse was the responsibility of Ministers to Parliament. He contended that the point admitted of no dispute; that English history furnished so many examples of its exercise, that it was to him a matter of surprise that any lawyer could entertain doubt upon the subject. During this discussion, Mr. Adderly contended that the Boers were British subjects and the Crown could not, by virtue of its prerogative, constitute part of its subjects an independent State. That allegiance was a contract between the Crown and its subjects. That its obligations were reciprocal; and that neither party could relieve itself from these mutual obligations—a doctrine which Sir Fitzjames Stephens expressly repudiated in a most able argument before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in an appeal case from the Bombay Presidency, and in his view the members of the Committee seemed to concur. Subsequently, the Crown entered into treaty obligations with the Boers, dealing with them as a foreign and independent Government; in this way doing the very thing which Mr. Adderly contended the Crown could not do. I have already referred to the fact that after the acquisition of Florida from Spain, the British Government put forward special efforts to secure its colonization by British subjects, the more effectually to protect it against the possibility of again falling into the hands of the Spaniards. In February, 1783, the King again ceded it to Spain. The treaty was made a subject of discussion in the House of Lords. Lord Loughborough concluded an elaborate speech against the terms of the treaty by particular reference to the cession of the Floridas, denying the right of the Crown, without the authority of Parliament, to alienate a portion of the British Empire, and to transfer the allegiance of British subjects to a foreign State. The report of this part of Lord Loughborough's speech is very brief, and we learn from the reply of Lord Thurlow, that much of what he said is not reported, but it is pretty clear that the point which he pressed against the Administration was this one: "You have encouraged Englishmen to colonize Florida. You have adopted a policy which led them to believe that they were not laying aside the common heritage of Englishmen when they complied with your wishes. You have by the treaty transferred Florida to the King of Spain. You have undertaken to transmute Englishmen into Spaniards. The Crown cannot transfer the allegiance of British subjects to a foreign State. That is the doctrine of Lord Loughborough, as I understand him. A doctrine from

which Lord Cairns seemed to dissent during the argument of the Indian appeal case to which I have already adverted. Lord Thurlow answered Lord Loughborough, and his thundering tones and impressive manner produced such an effect on the House of Lords at the time that he was long supposed to have effectually settled the point against his antagonists. He said:

"The noble and learned Lord had thought proper to allege, that the royal prerogative does not warrant the alienation by a treaty of peace, of territories which were under the allegiance of the Crown of England. If this doctrine be true, I must acknowledge myself strangely ignorant of the constitution of my country. Till the present day of novelty and miracle I never heard of such a doctrine. I apprehend, however, that the noble and learned Lord has thrown down the gauntlet on this occasion more from knight-errantry than patriotism, and that he was more inclined to show the House what powers of declamation he possesses in support of hypothetical propositions than anxious gravely to examine a power wisely lodged in the Crown, the utility, much less the existence, of which has never hitherto been questioned. One would have thought that when a great, experienced, and justly eminent lawyer hazarded an opinion respecting a most important point relating to the Constitution of this country, he would deem it fit to produce proofs from our legal and historical records, or at least that he would attempt to show that the common opinion and consent of Englishmen went with them; but instead of this the noble and learned Lord resorts to the lucubrations and fancies of foreign writers, and gravely refers your Lordships to Swiss authors for an explanation of the prerogatives. For my own part, I at once reject the authority of all foreigners on such a subject; however full of ingenuity Mr. Vattel and Mr. Puffendorf may be on the law of nations, which cannot be fixed by any permanent or solid rule, I deny their authority. I explode their evidence when they are brought in to explain to me what may or may not be done by the Sovereign I serve. Speaking from my own judgment, from the records of Parliament and the annals of the country, I do not think the cession of the Floridas at all a questionable matter. Let the noble and learned Lord bring forward the subject regularly and I will establish a doctrine clearly contrary to the extraordinary notion now sported by him, or confess my ignorance. I will not combat the noble and learned Lord with vague declamation and oratorical flourishes—these I contentedly leave to him with the plaintiffs they are calculated, perhaps intended, to gain—but with undecorated sense and simple argument. In my opinion, it is safer to stick to the process by which we arrive at the conclusion that two and two make four, than to suffer our understandings to be warped by the fashionable logic which delights in words, and which strives rather to confound what is plain than to unravel what is intricate."

Lord Chancellor Campbell observes, that in the discussion of the Ashburton Treaty, by which the Madawaska Settlement was ceded to the United States, he endeavored to raise the question, as to whether an Act of Parliament was necessary to give it validity, but was told that the prerogative to effect the transfer had been established by the unanswerable arguments of Lord Thurlow. In 1863, the subject of the cession of the Ionian Islands, which, by the Treaty of Vienna, had been placed under the protection of the British Crown, and which had, by the Crown, been transferred to Greece, was discussed. In many respects the Islands had been dealt with as a dependency. Possession of six of them had been obtained by force of arms during the war with France. Corfu, which was held by a French garrison, was surrendered shortly after the fall of Napoleon. While they were in the possession of the British Government, expensive fortifications were erected upon them, and for which Parliament had voted the money. They had no external political relations, except through the Government of the constitutional power of ceding them to a foreign nation. He said nothing as the advisability of such a course. All negotiations and conclusions of treaties rested with the Crown. If the Crown abused its authority the advisers of the Crown were responsible, and were liable to the censure of Parliament, and even to impeachment, if they advised the Crown to adopt a measure injurious to the Empire. There were precedents of cession made by treaty. The magnificent Island of Java was thus ceded, and, injudiciously, in his opinion, but he believed that in respect of that transaction it never was asserted that the authority of the Crown was overstepped. I will now refer to the most recent transaction of this class, the attempt to extend the authority of the Crown over the Boers of the Transvaal, their resistance, the

negotiations of the Government with them, and the agreement of Her Majesty to recognize them as a protectorate instead of a possession of the British Crown. The history of this transaction bears in every particular a close resemblance to that of the Orange River Free State. Sir Theophilus Shepstone misled Lord Carnarvon, as Sir Harry Smith had before misled Lord Grey. The Boers of the Transvaal resisted the attempt to treat them as colonists just as the Boers of the Orange Free State had done twenty-four years earlier. The Government of Mr. Gladstone, when it learned the real feelings of the Boers, adopted towards them the same policy that had been taken towards their western neighbors. They were more successful than their neighbors had been in resisting the British troops, but this did not prevent the Government from meeting their wishes as soon as it was known, beyond all doubt, what their wishes were. Her Majesty decided that negotiations should be opened, and treaty stipulations were made with those who were technically her subjects. The policy of the Government has been fiercely criticised; but the authority of the Crown to make these treaty stipulations and to give up the country as a possession without the sanction of Parliament, has not been raised. In the discussion which took place before the Judicial Committee in 1875-6, but which was ultimately disposed of on other grounds, Mr. Forsyth, who was arguing against the right of the Crown to cede territories in the time of peace, said, that in order to insure peace the Crown might cede possessions which had never been the subject of Parliamentary legislation, but could cede no others. Lord Chancellor Cairns asked him if he had any authority for that proposition. He said nothing beyond this fact, that to admit it involved the power to interfere with Parliament. He argued that the right to cede a territory at the conclusion of a war, was a right based upon supreme necessity, and he quoted Puffendorf to the effect that the power of a Sovereign is not such as to enable him to transfer his kingdom or his people without their consent; and that in the case of a partial alienation of territory, the consent of both the inhabitants of the parts retained and the parts ceded are equally required. When Savoy and Nice were ceded by the King of Sardinia to the Emperor of the French, the people were asked to consent to the cession. Lord Selborne pointed out to Mr. Forsyth that, if that doctrine were recognized, Parliament, no more than the Crown, would have a right to make a cession. The people themselves must be consulted. Lord Chancellor Cairns said that—

“The gist of the authority was this, that, if the inhabitants of a territory, cut adrift, are physically strong enough, they are morally justified in asserting their independence.”

Sir Vernon Harcourt and Sir Fitzjames Stephens cited several cases of colonies for which Parliament had legislated, or in which the colonies had Legislatures of their own, where the Crown had ceded the territory without the sanction of Parliament. There was the case of the cession of Bencoolin to the Dutch, of parts of Nova Scotia and Quebec to the United States, of parts of Newfoundland—St. Pierre and Miquelon—to France, and of the Gold Coast in 1867 to the Netherlands. Mr. Stephens instanced at least twenty-three cases in the British East Indies where the Governor General, not possessed of that paramount authority which the First Minister alluded to, possessed but a limited authority, entered into negotiations with the native princes, and, by transferring territory to them, obtained cessions of territory from them, altered boundaries of States and Provinces which were adjoining, which was establishing a better boundary where necessary—I say he instanced twenty-three cases of this sort as having occurred in India alone, and there were many cases where Parliament had legislated and where Legislatures

Mr. MILLS.

had been established, and where the Crown had not paramount authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Had not paramount authority?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly not, because where Parliament is fully established the plenary jurisdiction is in Parliament and not in the Crown, and that distinction, the hon. gentleman will find, is made through all these cases. It was upon that, principally, that the parties, who were denying the power of the Crown of its own motion to cede territory in the East India cases, relied. Now, there is another class of cases in which the Crown has acted without the consent of Parliament, and where its power to act has never been called in question. I refer to the class of cases to which this one more particularly belongs—the class of disputed territory. I will refer briefly to a few of these upon this continent. The territories on the north-western coast of America were, for some time, in dispute between the United Kingdom and Russia. The English Government claimed the whole coast south of Mount St. Elias to the forty-second degree of north latitude. This claim was based upon prior discovery, and upon the partial occupation of the country by Canadian fur-traders. Russia claimed the coast as far south as the Portland Channel, basing her claim upon discovery and actual occupation. In 1825 the claim of Russia was conceded, subject to the right of the British people to navigate the rivers which flow from the interior country to the sea. This concession of territory in the settlement of the boundary was made without the prior authority or the subsequent ratification of Parliament. And let me here call your attention to the provisions of the Treaty of St. Petersburg for another purpose. England and Russia occupy, under the Treaty of St. Petersburg, very nearly the same position that France and England occupied under the Treaty of Utrecht in reference to Hudson's Bay. Upon the western coast, under the Treaty of St. Petersburg, Russia holds the shore and England the interior of the country. In the vicinity of Hudson's Bay, under the Treaty of Utrecht, England held the coast and France occupied the interior of the country. Let us see what principle was recognized and acted upon in the Treaty of St. Petersburg. To Russia was ultimately conceded the coast, on the ground of prior occupation, but did this admission entitle Russia to claim the whole country to the sources of the rivers? The treaty itself negatives any such doctrine. The treaty did not admit the right of Russia to so wide an expanse of country. In most cases the rivers rise far in the interior—beyond the mountain range which girds the coast. That range is, in fact, not the watershed. The treaty simply conceded the principle that the Russian authorities only could claim a reasonable extent of country in the vicinity of the shore. In no case was it to pass the coast-height, and if the height was more than thirty miles from the shore, then the boundary was to be drawn at the distance of thirty miles and not upon the height. I shall undertake to show that the principles of public law which underlie the provisions of the Treaty of St. Petersburg, are to be observed also in reference to the respective claims which once existed of the two Crowns to the basin of Hudson's Bay; that what was done in the Treaty of St. Petersburg by express words was done at the Treaty of Utrecht by lines drawn upon a map; and that wholly apart from any express treaty stipulations and from the principles of public law applied to the varying fortunes of the Company, that the Government of Great Britain, in granting charters by which dominion was to be acquired for the Crown, and property and powers of Government for those to whom the charter was granted, no matter how extensive the dominions formerly granted might be, the limits were determined by the actual occupation and dominion of those to whom the grant was made. I will now refer to the

disputed boundaries between the Provinces of Lower Canada and New Brunswick on the one side, and the State of Maine on the other. By the Treaty of 1783, the boundary between the British Possessions and the United States in this region was to be a line drawn directly north from the source of the St. Croix River, to the highlands at the north-west angle of Nova Scotia which divides the rivers that fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which fall into the River St. Lawrence; thence south-westerly along the said highlands to the source of the Connecticut River, and down that river to the 45th parallel of latitude, and thence due west to the St. Lawrence. At an early day, differences arose as to the location of the highlands and the north-west angle referred to in this article of the treaty. Great Britain claimed that the highlands mentioned were south of the St. John River. The United States insisted upon going north to the highlands near the St. Lawrence. Shortly after the signature of the treaty, doubts also arose as to the river referred to by the name of the St. Croix. In 1798, it was agreed the one now so designated was the river meant, and that the north-east source of that river should be taken as the starting point of the line which the treaty required should be drawn directly north to the highlands. An exploration of the country soon made it obvious that a great deal of difficulty would be experienced in finding a line conformable to the words of the treaty. During the Government of Thomas Carleton, about the year 1790, many settlers from New Brunswick moved into the Madawaska District, and had, there, grants made to them by the Governor of New Brunswick. The Government of the United States earnestly protested against the occupation and government of the country by the English. The position taken by the British Government was this: disputed territory remains with the original party until the cession is made absolute. There could be no doubt that the territory once belonged to Great Britain; that she had not actually transferred more to the United States than she admitted by her own construction of the treaty; that she was, therefore, still vested with the exclusive jurisdiction over the disputed country; and that she could not consent to lay it down until it was shown that her construction of the Treaty of 1783 was wrong. She said that neither the question of title to the sovereignty of the country, nor the rights of either party, were prejudiced by this rule. Upon these principles she took her stand, and to them she adhered. The United States, on the contrary, maintained that the disputed territory was wholly unoccupied at the time the Treaty of 1783 was made; that the rule laid down by Great Britain was a rule applicable to ports, military towns and garrisons where there was actual occupation, and where because there was actual occupation, there must be an actual formal cession. But this rule has no applicability to an unoccupied country; that the possession of the Crown of Great Britain to the territory in dispute was at the time of the treaty a constructive possession, because the territory was unoccupied, and the renunciation by treaty was an adequate transfer of the country; that the United States did not acquire their rights to the territory by the Treaty of 1783, but by a force of arms. The Treaty of 1783 recognized, but did not confer territorial rights. It provided for a mutual partition; and the boundary set forth simply marked the limits between the territories of the two nations. In a case not long since, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Lord Cairns expressed opinions in consonance with the views enunciated in this discussion by the Americans, and there can be little doubt that the right of England to hold the disputed territory was not because it was not actually ceded until she gave formal possession, but because the settlement was hers. The actual dominion was hers, and it was necessary to prove her to be in the wrong, before she would be called upon to make a surrender

or to submit to joint occupation. The position in this respect of Great Britain in the valley of the Upper St. John, is the position of Ontario in the disputed territories. She has always claimed them, she has exercised jurisdiction for more than thirty years over the population. They are represented in this House as belonging to her, and she has a right to maintain her authority, apart from any award, against all encroachment, and by whatever means is necessary to make her defence of her dominion effective. In 1842, a compromise line was agreed to between the Government of Great Britain and that of the United States. Instead of following a height of land they followed the St. John River. According to the English view, a large extent of territory was surrendered to the United States. Mr. Campbell, afterwards Lord Chancellor, suggested that as a large extent of territory which had for half a century been held by the Province of New Brunswick, and legislated for as a part of that Province, was about to be given up, the consent of Parliament ought to be had. But the law officers of the Crown dissented from his view. They held that such consent was unnecessary, and upon the authority of the Crown alone, the Madawaska Settlement, and all that section of country west of the meridian of the St. Croix River, and lying between the St. John and its southern watershed, was surrendered to the United States. The territory west of the Rocky Mountains, between the forty-second parallel and the parallel of fifty-four degrees forty minutes north latitude, was, for many years, claimed both by the United States and the United Kingdom. By conventions, to which the Crown alone was a party on the side of Great Britain, the whole country was opened to colonization and settlement by both Governments. By the Treaty of 1846, the Government of Great Britain surrendered to the United States her claim to the whole country south of the forty-ninth parallel, without the sanction of Parliament. I might before have referred to the fact that the boundary between Canada and Louisiana under the Treaty of Paris, between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains was beyond all doubt the parallel of Lake Itasca, and yet by the Convention of 1818, the Crown agreed to a boundary nearly one and a-half degrees further north, surrendering to the United States by this convention and by the Treaty of 1846 a strip of country more than ninety miles in width, and extending from the source of the Mississippi to Vancouver Island, without any Parliamentary sanction in either case. I need not refer to other cases. The instances which I have given show, beyond question, what has been the practice and what has been the law in the case. They show that it was the business of the Administration to deal with the question. That the prior sanction of Parliament was not in any of these cases deemed necessary, and that subsequent ratification has never been sought. It would have been an unprecedented course to have taken the line which the right hon. gentleman says was the only one which we could constitutionally follow. So far as I know, there is not an instance in the whole history of the United Kingdom in which the views taken by the Prime Minister and his Government in this case was ever acted upon. I am sure he will not find a single precedent to support him, and the uniform usage of two hundred and twenty years has settled this point, at all events, against him. I do not say that what the Crown may do in the United Kingdom the Crown can do here: but I say the relation between the Crown and Parliament is the same here as there. I have shown on this class of questions the Crown acts without the direct sanction of Parliament, and so far as our powers extend the relation is the same. But, Sir, even though it were true that the sanction of Parliament was necessary to give validity to the arbitration, that sanction was obtained before the arbitrators sat. The Government came down to the House and asked for an appropriation to pay the expenses which would be incurred

by arbitration. If any one was opposed to arbitration it was open to him to take that line. No one did object, and Parliament expressed its approval of settlement by arbitration, by voting the necessary monies for the purpose. At least two years elapsed after that money was voted before the arbitration sat. It was open to the right hon. gentleman, or to any of those who then sat in Parliament, and who now support him, to have taken exception to that mode of settlement, but it was not done. If the right hon. gentleman believed that Parliament did not favor arbitration, why did he not move against it when the appropriation was asked for? Was it because he believed it could not succeed? It may be so. I have no doubt he could not have succeeded. But what does this establish? Why, that Parliament knew what it was doing, That it approved of the mode of settlement, and voted the necessary means to enable the Government to give effect to its policy. The sanction, then, which the right hon. gentleman says the Government ought to have had, it in effect did have; so that it is obvious that on none of these grounds can the award be successfully attacked. The right hon. gentleman, in pressing through the Manitoba Bill during the last hours of last Session, told us that there was no award; that the arbitrators had set out a conventional line; that this was outside the order of reference; and that, consequently, they had not done what they were alone authorized to do; and he referred to the award made by the King of the Netherlands in the case of the Maine boundary, in confirmation of the doctrine which he enunciated. Now, I deny that there is any similarity between the award made in that case and in this. And I also affirm that if there was, that that case does not sustain the line of action which he has taken or proposes to take. Let us look at the facts in that case. On the 29th September, 1827, the English Government and the Government of the United States agreed to submit the points of difference between them to an Arbitrator; and by a subsequent convention they agreed that the Arbitrator should be the King of the Netherlands. They submitted three points under the Treaty of 1783 to the King for his decision. I will read them to the House:—

"1st. Which is the spot designated in the Treaty as the north-west angle of Nova Scotia, and which are the highlands dividing the rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence from those falling into the Atlantic Ocean, along which highlands is to be drawn the line of boundary from that angle to the north-west head of the Connecticut River?"

"2nd. Which is the north-west head of the Connecticut River?"

"3rd. Which is the boundary to be traced from the River Connecticut along the parallel of the 45° of north latitude to the River St. Lawrence, called in the Treaties Cataract?"

The King of the Netherlands decided the second and third points absolutely; but as to the first, he declared it was impossible to find a north-west angle conformable to the words of the treaty. He held that the highlands sought for might be simply a summit level from which the waters flowed in different directions. 2nd. That the ancient boundaries of the North American Provinces were not maintained by the treaty of 1783; that they had never been distinctly ascertained, and in no way aided in the determination of the question. 3rd. That the highlands contemplated in the Treaty should divide immediately, not mediately the rivers flowing into the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic. That the word "divide" required contiguity in the things divided. That the northern highlands divide rivers falling into the Bay of Chaleur, from rivers falling into the Bay of Fundy. That the southern highlands divide the rivers flowing into the Atlantic from those flowing into the St. John; that neither height of land answers the description in the treaty; and that no award can be adjudged without departing from the principles of justice as between the two parties. The King adjudged the St. John River, lying midway between the two heights of land, as an equitable boundary. When the award was made and a copy of it given to Mr. Preble, he addressed

Mr. MILLS.

a letter to Baron Verstolk de Solen which he concludes with the following observations:—

"It is not the intention of the undersigned, in this place, to question in the slightest degree the correctness of His Majesty's conclusions. But when the Arbitrator proceeds to say that it would be suitable to run the line due north from the source of the River St. Croix, not to the highlands which divide the rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which fall into the River St. Lawrence, but to the centre of the River St. John, thence to pass up the said river to the mouth of the River St. Francis to the mouth of its south-westernmost branch, and from thence by a line drawn west into the point where it intersects the line of the highlands as claimed by the United States, and only from thence to pass along the said highlands which divide the rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which fall into the River St. Lawrence to the north-westernmost head of the Connecticut River, thus abandoning altogether the boundaries of the treaty and substituting for them a distinct and different line of demarcation, it becomes the duty of the undersigned, with the most perfect respect for the friendly view of the Arbitrator, to enter a protest against the proceeding as constituting a departure from the power delegated by the High parties interested, in order that the rights and interests of the United States may not be supposed to be committed by any presumed acquiescence on the part of their representative near His Majesty the King of the Netherlands."

The award made by the arbitrator was submitted by the President to the Senate, who declined to confirm it, and recommended further negotiations. The technical ground upon which the Senate based their refusal, was, that the decision of the King was outside the order of reference; that he had abandoned the character of arbitrator and assumed that of mediator; and that the decision, not being in conformity with the submission, could not be carried into effect. The real ground of the Senate's refusal, as stated by the Secretary of State, was, that the State of Maine refused its consent to any compromise and insisted upon the boundary given to it by the Treaty of 1783, whatever that boundary might be. I refer to this part of the history of that disputed boundary, because the First Minister has undertaken to drag it into the discussion for the purpose of showing that the Government were warranted in repudiating the award made by the arbitrators. It in no way sustains his position. The King of the Netherlands was asked to construe the Treaty of 1783; he was asked to indicate a boundary in accordance with its provisions, and in his award he says: "This cannot be done, and I advise the parties to accept something else." The American Secretary of State does not object to the King's recommendation; he does not say that it is unfair; but he says, "We cannot get the State of Maine to agree to it;" and he intimates his regret that the arbitrator did not make his award without stating that it was not in conformity with the treaty. The arbitrators in this case made no declaration like that made by the King of the Netherlands. They did not say that they could find no boundary in accordance with the principles of public law, and with acts of State upon which a proper decision must rest. The whole subject was discussed. Everything which could be found bearing upon the case was considered. The contention of the right hon. gentleman and of the Hudson's Bay Company were known. The cases submitted by each party showed beyond all question what the issue was. The arbitrators do not suggest a conventional boundary. They do not say that they have been unable to find the true legal limits of Ontario. On the contrary, they say they were appointed for this very purpose, and they determine and decide that the northerly boundary is the Albany River, and the meridian of the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods is the boundary upon the west. They keep themselves strictly within the order of reference. They do not give advice; they pronounce a decision. It is perfectly clear, then, that this award is in no particular like that made by the King of the Netherlands, and yet in that case the United States Government did everything in its power to persuade the State of Maine to consent to the line suggested by the arbitrator. It is plain, then, that the contention of the First Minister is wholly erroneous. Let me here, however, remind him what was done in another case. By the

terms of the British North America Act, the excess of the debt of old Canada beyond the amount assumed by the Federal Government was to be charged to Ontario and Quebec. Each was to appoint an arbitrator, and the Dominion Government was to appoint a third, and these three were to decide what portion of this excess was to be assumed by each of these Provinces. The arbitrators were appointed. They sat, and the subject submitted to them was investigated. Quebec was dissatisfied, and instructed her arbitrator to withdraw; and her Government said then, in that case, what the right hon. gentleman says in this, that there was no award. What was done? Did the Governments of the two Provinces throw the award to the winds, and go to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for a second examination into the merits of the case? Not at all. But they did submit this question: "Has there been any award, and is it binding upon the parties?" And the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council advised the Crown that a valid award had been made, and that the parties were bound. That is a precedent which the hon. gentleman might follow, if it can be possible that he has any doubt upon the subject. I do not say that it justifies an appeal, because that arbitration was not a voluntary one; but I say if he is resolved to break faith and appeal it points to what the issue should be. I do not speak for the Government of Ontario, but as a member of this House, and I ask the right hon. gentleman why he does not say to Mr. Mowat:

"I do not regard the award made by Sir Edward Thornton, Sir Francis Hincks and Chief Justice Harrison as a valid award. I do not think the Crown had power to appoint arbitrators to deal with this question without the direct and formal sanction of Parliament. I think the arbitrators went outside of the order of reference in making a decision, and I wish, for these reasons, to have a decision of the Judicial Committee upon the validity of the award."

My impression is, his wish would be gratified. The right hon. gentleman knows that that is the issue, and the only issue which he can raise at this moment. It blocks the way to every other, and if he believes he is right in his contention, he ought not to hesitate. If the decision is against him, the question is settled. If it is in his favor he will have cleared the way to the consideration of the whole question again upon its merits.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But Ontario offers to leave that to the Privy Council.

Mr. MILLS. There may be some offers made that have not been brought down to us. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Read the last despatch.

Mr. MILLS. I have read that. The Government in their despatch referred to a report made by a Committee of this House, and make a paragraph in that report an excuse for repudiating an award which cannot be disregarded without dishonor. I regret that time will not permit me to make a minute analysis of that report, and to show how utterly worthless it is. We know that a minority of the Committee declared that they had not even an opportunity of reading it. The chairman again and again put arguments instead of questions, secures from the witness an echo of his own views, and is almost invariably wrong both in point of fact and in point of law. The book, too, contains an immense mass of matter upon points wholly irrelevant. It contains opinions which are of no value, which are not evidence, and the men who gave them are separated by a hundred years from the events about which they testify. Let me invite the attention of the House, in the first place, to the testimony of some of the witnesses, and I will begin with that of Mr. Justice Johnson. I have no hesitation in saying that the evidence which he gave before that Committee was in the highest degree discreditable to him. He seemed to think that it mattered not whether his statements were true or false. Had an ordinary

witness gone before Mr. Justice Johnson's Court and talked as loosely and as inaccurately, he would have been utterly discredited. He told the Committee that Lord Selkirk, in the first instance, acquired his title to the country which he claimed, from the North-West Company. Now, this was not true. Lord Selkirk obtained in June, 1811, a grant from the Hudson's Bay Company for the whole Basin of the Red River. The North-West Company never pretended to have any title to the soil. They contented themselves with denying the pretensions of the Hudson's Bay Company, who came to the country many years after the North-West Company had been established there. Mr. Justice Johnson informed the Committee that the "boundary of Upper Canada on the west was always considered to be the line running north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi. He told the Committee that the boundaries of Assiniboia extended to the boundary of Upper Canada, and that that was the Height of Land, a statement wholly at variance with the one which he had made before as to the boundary of Ontario upon the west, and wholly at variance with the grant. Mr. Justice Johnson said that the two law officers of the Crown in England stated that if the Crown saw fit it could establish Courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction in Assiniboia; and he argued that this declaration was entirely at variance with the possibility of its being a part of Upper Canada, because Upper Canada having been granted legislative powers, was vested with the right of constituting Courts for itself. Will the House believe that the law officers of the Crown do not make the slightest allusion to the colony of Assiniboia. The subject was not for one moment under their consideration. The law officers of the Crown discussed, in the communication referred to, the powers of the Hudson's Bay Company within their chartered limits; but they do not venture to state what those limits are. Mr. Johnson showed himself, indeed, strangely ignorant of the boundaries of the district which the Hudson's Bay Company in 1811 professed to convey to Lord Selkirk, and which he again, in 1839, surrendered to the Company. So much of Lord Selkirk's grant as was north of the United States boundary, they created into a colony, and the eastern limit was the Winnipeg River. Mr. Johnson says that the Colony of Assiniboia was recognized as a *de facto* Crown Colony, and this seems to have been an opinion which the Chairman was most anxious to elicit from several of the witnesses. Now, let me ask what is a Crown Colony? It is neither a charter nor a proprietary Government. It is an ordinary Provincial establishment, ruled by a Governor, appointed by a Royal Commission, and the extent of whose authority is set forth in the Commission and in the instructions which usually accompany it; and he is assisted in the discharge of his duties by a Council appointed by the Crown, but not by a representative Assembly. This was not the character of the Colony of Assiniboia. Lord Selkirk had obtained a grant from the Hudson's Bay Company in 1811, which included 116,000 square miles. The Company assigned to him not only their title to the soil, if they had any, but along with it, their powers of government within the limits of the district so conveyed. Could they do this? Could they, having been made by the Crown a charter government create another charter government for a part of the territory so conveyed? Was the colony of Lord Selkirk a proprietary colony, or was it a mere voluntary association. If I were compelled to choose between the opinions of Mr. Justice Johnson and the hon. member for Algoma upon the one side, and Mr. Spankie, Sir Arthur Pigott and Lord Brougham on the other. I should prefer to follow the latter. These distinguished lawyers say that—

"The Company could not confer power upon Lord Selkirk to appoint Governors, Courts of Justice, or exercise any independent authority, nor could they, directly or indirectly, transfer their authority to him to be

exercised by him in his own name. Supposing the grant of land to be such a grant as falls within the power of the Company to make, their superior Lordship and authority would continue as before and must be exercised through them."

This opinion is not only upheld by a consideration of the legal principles involved, but also by decided cases. In the year 1620, James I made a grant to the Duke of Lennox and others, known as the Plymouth Company of New England. The religious sect known as Brownites were driven out of England by persecution. They purchased from the Plymouth Company all the country along the coast from three miles north of the River Merimac to three miles south of the River Charles. They obtained from the Plymouth Company not only a transfer of the land, but an assignment of the Company within the limits which they had purchased. They were advised that they could not exercise, legally, the powers of Government which had been conveyed to them. They applied to Charles I and obtained a charter from him conferring upon them power to govern the colony. In the year 1628, the King granted a charter to Sir Henry Rosewell and others making them a body politic by the name of "The Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England." By their charter they were to exercise their powers of Government in England. They transferred them to America, to the actual settlers, which some years later was held to be *ultra vires*. In 1621, Captain John Mason obtained from the Plymouth Company a grant of the country which afterwards was called the Province of New Hampshire. The Colony of Massachusetts claimed the same country as included within her limits. She established her jurisdiction over it, and governed it for forty years. The contestants brought the case before the King in Council, in 1679. The case was decided against Massachusetts, but the Council advised the King that the Plymouth Company could not assign or delegate away their powers of Government, and that the consent of the Crown not having been given, Captain Mason had no political authority. The Crown recognized him as proprietor of the territory, and issued a Commission for its Government. I might give other cases, but these are sufficient. Whatever Government existed then in the Red River settlement was simply a voluntary association. There have been several such within the British dominions. After the re-assignment of the Red River Company to the Hudson's Bay Company, they might, no doubt, establish a Government professedly under their charter, which the Crown did not question, just as it did not question the authority of Massachusetts in New Hampshire, or in Maine, nor the authority of Lord Baltimore in Delaware, until a decision was sought; but I will say here that its authority never entered there, and if it did it was forfeited by an attempt to convey it away. The hon. member for Algoma asked the Hon. D. A. Smith a number of questions and addressed to him a number of arguments, many of which were wholly irrelevant. He said: "You, then, consider the height of land on the St. Lawrence watershed to be the southern boundary of the territory of the Hudson's Bay Company?"—Ans. "The Hudson's Bay Company have always held it to be so." Mr. Smith no doubt spoke of the contention of the Hudson's Bay Company of late years; but down to the period of the Treaty of Utrecht, they never put forward any such contention, nor did they for many years later. The hon. member for Algoma has undertaken to show that the whole of the country west of Lake Superior was called the Indian country, and the Act of 43 George III, which gave to the Courts of Upper and Lower Canada jurisdiction over crimes committed in the Indian territories, was enacted to meet the case of crimes committed in the territories awarded to Ontario. But no such instance can be found: both Lord Selkirk and the Right Hon. Edmund Ellice declare that the Act was passed in consequence of crimes which had been committed in the vicinity of Lake Athabaska. They said it was passed

Mr. MILLS.

in consequence of contests between the two North-West Companies. Mr. Woden had been shot by one Pond, and was acquitted on the ground that the Court had no jurisdiction in the place where the crime was committed. Lord Selkirk says that the immediate cause for the passage of the Act was the shooting of one King by Lamotte in the vicinity of Lake Athabaska. He describes the event as follows:—

"In the winter of 1801-2, Mr. John McDonald managed the affairs of the old North-West Company in the Athabaska country; Mr. Rocheblave, those of the new company in the same district. Mr. McDonald had under his command a clerk of the name of King, an experienced man, of a bold and active character, and of a herculean figure. Mr. Rocheblave's assistant was Lamotte, a young man of a respectable Canadian family, of a spirited and active disposition, but much younger and of less experience among the Indians, and not to be compared to King in point of personal strength. In the course of the winter two Indians arrived as deputies from a band with which both parties had had transactions, to inform the traders that they had furs ready at an encampment at the distance of four or five days march. King was sent with four men to collect those due to the old North-West Company—Lamotte with two men for those due to the new Company. Both of them were charged to use the utmost diligence and to defend the rights of their employers with courage. They set out accordingly on their mission, and great activity and address were used by each to get the start of the other, but without success on either side. When they reached the Indian encampment, both parties proceeded to collect the furs due to them, but King, by means of the superior number of his assistants, got possession of all the furs except one bundle which was delivered to Lamotte by the same Indian who had come as a delegate to the new Company. King then came to Lamotte's tent, accompanied by all his men, armed, peremptorily demanding that bundle also; threatening violence and declaring his intention to take the furs by force if they were not given up to him. Lamotte was determined to defend the property of his employers to the last extremity, and warned King, that if he ventured to touch the furs, he should do so at his peril. King, nevertheless, was proceeding to put his threats into execution and to seize the bundle when Lamotte pulled out his pistol and shot the robber dead on the spot. King's men would have revenged his death, but the Indians interfered and expressed their opinion that he had merited his fate. Though it would be difficult to quote an instance of homicide more decidedly justifiable, all Canada rang with the claims of the old North-West Company against this murder, as they chose to term it. It was upon this occasion that the Act of 1803 was obtained, under the idea that the case could not be brought to trial, though it might undoubtedly have been tried at Westminster under the Act of Henry VIII."

I think this is sufficient to show where the crimes happened which gave rise to the Act 43 George III. The hon. member for Algoma refers to the killing of McDonnell by Mowat, but that was six years after the passage of the Act, and the question of jurisdiction was not raised. The name Indian Territories was a name given to the British possessions in North America not included within the limits of any Province. The country between Georgia and the Mississippi was called Indian Territory, and so too was the country beyond the Alleghany Mountains. After the Province of Quebec was carved out of Canada by the proclamation of 1763, the remaining portion was called the Indian country; and when the Province of Quebec was enlarged by the Act of 1774 the Indian country was the British possessions which lay to the north and north-west beyond it. The Act of 1803 provides for the trial of persons who have committed crime in the possessions of the Hudson's Bay and in the Indian Territories, by the Courts of Upper Canada or Lower Canada. I shall not waste the time of the House by discussing the question of jurisdiction under the Act of 1803 or of 1821. Those Acts were passed for the purpose of providing for the punishment of crime committed in distant parts of North America, and it was no part of the duty of the Courts to enquire into the question of territorial limits where those limits had not been actually marked out, and especially when traders going to the unpeopled parts of the Provinces were exposed to the same dangers as in the country for which the Act was intended to provide. It is not by considerations of this sort that we can arrive at any conclusion as to the boundaries of Ontario. I purpose now to consider the limits given to the Province of Quebec by the Act of 1774. The right hon. gentleman has given to that Act a construction which, in my opinion, it will not bear, and which it can be shown would have defeated the object of Parliament, as set forth

in the Act itself. It is a sound rule of construction that to interpret a law properly, it is necessary to look at all the surrounding circumstances. Let us do so in this case. Let us notice how this territory came to be a British possession; and how the Government proposed from time to time to deal with it, until they established the Province of Upper Canada. Both Great Britain and France claimed the country between the Alleghany Mountains and the Great Lakes. The dispute led to a war, and the war ended in the cession of Canada,—not precisely as it had been held by France, but as it was marked out by the 4th and 7th Articles of the Treaty of 1763. While Canada was a French possession, it included the country west of the Mississippi and north of the Missouri River. At the cession France retained that part of Canada west of the Mississippi River as a part of Louisiana, and gave up so much of Louisiana as lay east of the Mississippi, as a part of Canada. But all the territory claimed by France to the north and west of the source of the Mississippi, and over which the Governor of Canada had exercised jurisdiction, was surrendered to Great Britain, and when the Province of Canada is spoken of by the English Government, or in Acts of the Imperial Parliament, it is the territory that France surrendered, to which this appellation is given. After Canada had been ceded to Great Britain, and before the King, by his proclamation, established the Province of Quebec, that is between the 10th February, 1763, and the 7th of October of the same year, the country was called the Province of Canada. On the 30th April, 1763, the King issued a Commission to Henry Ellis, granting him the offices of Secretary and Clerk of the Council of the Province of Canada; and on the 23rd of September Nicholas Turner received a Commission granting him the office of Provost Marshal of the Province of Canada. In October, 1763, the King, by his proclamation, established the Province of Quebec, which was carved out of the Province of Canada with the following limits:—

“Bound on the Labrador coast by the River St. John and from thence by a line drawn from the head of that river through Lake St. John to the south end of Lake Nipissing, from whence the said line, crossing the River St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain in 45 degrees of northern latitude, passes along the highlands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the said River St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea, and also along the northern coast of the Baie Chaleurs and the coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Cape Rosiers, and from thence crosses the mouth of the River St. Lawrence by the west end of the Island of Anticosti, terminates at the aforesaid River St. John.”

These were the original boundaries of the Province of Quebec. The intention was to limit as much as possible the territories within which the peculiar laws of France should govern the population. It was intended that the French settlements which were scattered over the remaining portions of Canada should be put an end to, and the inhabitants transferred to other colonies. Sir William Johnson, on behalf of the British Government, had promised the Indians that this should be done; and the Indians pressed upon them the fulfilment of their engagement. Lord Shelburne had proposed to establish three more colonies, one having its centre at Detroit, one upon the Upper Ohio, and a third in the Illinois country. But this view was resisted by the Lords of Trade and Plantations. Captain Pittman was sent to the Illinois country to take the Census, and to report upon its condition; and the Commandants at other points were required to give like information. In 1772 proclamations were issued commanding the French to retire within the jurisdiction of the other colonies. A considerable number of the French had retired west of the Mississippi. They built forts; they supplied themselves with ammunition and arms; and it soon became evident that they could be more easily controlled within the territory than outside of it, and the policy of driving them from the country was abandoned. Between 1763 and 1791 we have three distinct phases of English policy. First, the restriction of that arbitrary system of Government

which had prevailed during the *regime* of France and which was confined in the Province of Quebec, within very narrow limits. Second, its extension by the Quebec Act to a large part, if not to the whole of Canada; and in the third place, its limitation again by the establishment of the Province of Upper Canada. It was the policy of most English Ministries to confine the English colonists to the east of the Alleghanies, and it was thought that this could in no way be so effectually accomplished as by the extension of French law over the whole country to the Mississippi. The French and English colonists had, for nearly a century, been engaged in border warfare, and the prejudice of the English colonists had been intensified by their long animosities. The State papers of the period also disclose that, as the English colonies grew more dissatisfied with the English colonial policy, the Imperial Government were more anxious to conciliate the French people. And, as indications of revolt became more marked, the Government at home resolved, in the end, to put themselves in a position by which the insurrection could be attacked on the one side by the fleet and in the rear by the French and their Indian allies. The English Government believed what had again and again been said, that, however much the French disliked England, they disliked her colonies still more. The policy upon which the Government had determined is as plain as noonday. Their reasons for that policy are equally obvious, and the preamble to the Quebec Act states this explicitly. It says that:

“There is a very large extent of country within which there were several colonies and settlements who claimed to remain there under the faith of the Treaty of Paris, who were left without any provision being made for the administration of civil government, &c.”

We have here a distinct indication of the purpose of the Act. It was to provide a Civil Government for the French settlements which were not provided for by the proclamation of 1763. As the Quebec Act was carried through the House of Lords it extended the boundaries of the old Province in this way:

“All the said territories, island and countries heretofore a part of the territory of Canada, in North America, extending southward to the banks of the River Ohio and westward to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward to the southern boundary granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay, &c, are hereby, during His Majesty's pleasure, annexed to and made part and parcel of the Province of Quebec as created and established by the said royal proclamation.”

When the Bill reached the House of Commons two objections were made to it. The one was that they admitted in this Bill that the territory which they proposed to annex had formed part of Canada, which they had denied in their controversy with France; and the other was, that they might embrace in such an indefinite description portions of New York. There was no attempt whatever to vary the policy of the Government. There was no attempt to give to the Province more restricted limits than those which the Government had resolved on. To meet the first objection they struck out the words, “heretofore a part of Canada,” and substituted the words, “belonged to the Crown of Great Britain;” and to meet the second objection, they defined a boundary on the south throughout its whole extent and described the country by its direction from this boundary to the country limiting it upon the north. Mr. Burke, the agent of New York, insisted upon having the southern boundary defined. New York had ceased to be a chartered Government, and had become a Provincial Establishment. A treaty not long before had been made with the Indians which made the whole western part of the Province an Indian reservation, and it was to prevent the western part from being included in the Province of Quebec that Mr. Burke insisted upon the boundary being laid down upon the south. Virginia claimed a large section of country north of

the Ohio River as being within her charter. But the Bill, in order to protect her claim, provided that—

“Nothing therein contained should in anywise effect the boundaries of any other colony.”

There is no room to doubt the meaning of this section as it originally stood. It is the territories, islands and countries that are extended southward, westward and northward. It will be seen, too, that from the word “Mississippi” to the end of this section, except a proviso of exclusion, no change was made in its original form. Now, to what does this word “northward” apply. Is it applied to the direction of a boundary line, or is it applied to the general direction of the country from a boundary laid down upon the one side to another British possession upon the opposite side? To me it seems plain that it does not apply to a boundary line. The first proposal was to describe the country, by describing its extension towards the four points of the compass, to ascertainable boundaries, southward to the Ohio, westward to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward to the Hudson’s Bay Territories. Now the only change made in the description, is this—instead of an extension in three directions you have an extension in one. You have a line drawn from the Bay of Chaleurs, which is to mark the eastern limit, to the Mississippi, the western limit, and between these two limits from the boundary so described upon the south, to the territories of the Hudson’s Bay Company, the territories, island and countries are to be annexed to the Province of Quebec. This gives an ascertainable northern boundary to the whole Province. Any other construction would leave the whole of the annexed territory without any boundary upon the north, and would leave the Province of Quebec with a boundary fixed by the proclamation of 1763. Let me make this further observation. If the word “northward” applies to a liminary line, it must apply to a line upon the south. No other line is spoken of in the section. The words are, “bounded on the south by a line.” Now, the word “northward” applies either to the countries, territories and islands, in which case the Mississippi must be the boundary upon the west, or it applies to the direction of this southern boundary line, the only one mentioned. If it applies to a line, then this is the construction, that the territories, islands and countries to be annexed are bounded on the south by a line which at first extends westward as far as the Mississippi, and from that point to the Hudson’s Bay Territories it extends northward. Hon. gentlemen cannot import into this section words which are not there, for the purpose of giving to it a meaning, which, without them, it will not bear. The direction of a western boundary cannot be given in the Act, for no western boundary is named. We point out the direction of what is set forth, and not of something not mentioned. We know that the word “westward” describes the direction of the southern boundary; and the word “northward,” if applied to a line at all, must describe the direction of this same line continued, because the Act speaks of no other. It is too plain to require argument that a southern boundary, deflected northward, cannot be a due north line; so that, whether this expression refers to the direction of the country, or to the direction of a boundary line, it cannot mean a line running directly north. To my mind the language of the section is perfectly plain. The plan of description in the section is easily understood; and if a long and parenthetic clause had not been introduced, to describe the southern boundary, the meaning could never have been mistaken. I have already pointed out that if the word “northward” is applied to the direction of a line, instead of to the direction of the whole country from a given base, the Province of Quebec, under the Act, from Lake Nipissing westward, would be left without any boundary upon the north. Now, you have, in a matter of doubt, this rule of construction, when one interpretation would leave an instrument imperfect or defective, and

Mr. MILLS.

another would make it perfect, the latter is to be preferred; so that, if there is doubt, the construction which will give you a boundary upon the north is to be preferred to that which leaves the country on the north wholly undefined. I might let this question rest upon this rule of construction; but I will say further, that another rule of construction is, you must interpret a law so as to give effect to the intention of Parliament. What was the intention of Parliament in this case? It is stated in the Act itself; it says the object is to embrace, in the Province of Quebec, “all the French colonies and settlements in British North America who had been heretofore left without any civil government.” The number without civil government were 4,613. If a meridional line were made the boundary, 2,600 of this population would have still been left without civil government. By following the Mississippi all the French colonies and settlements are included in the Province of Quebec. The purpose of the Act is accomplished. By drawing a due north line more than half of them are excluded; the purpose of the Act is defeated. This, too, taken by itself would be sufficient to determine the proper construction. Then it is also a recognized rule that when a natural boundary is reached, it is to be followed unless there is an explicit direction to the contrary; in other words, natural boundaries are preferred to artificial ones. The Mississippi is a natural boundary, it was also an international boundary, and it is to be preferred to an astronomical line. The word “northward” embraces the whole sector of a circle, that is, any direction between north-west and north-east; if there is no reason for preferring one point of the compass to another within this sector, then the middle must be taken; but if there is, no matter how slight, the direction will be varied within these limits accordingly. Now, we have seen that the centre of this sector, here, is a due north line, and we have, as reasons for departing from this line, first, a natural boundary is reached. We begin at the Mississippi River. Second, it is required in order that the purposes of the law shall not be defeated. And third, this Act differs from an ordinary Statute in this—that it is an Act of State, and reasons of State must be given due weight in its construction. Now let us remember this fact, that the Mississippi River was the boundary between the possessions of England and of Spain. Can it be supposed for one moment, that Parliament would have provided a Government extending the territories westward for a thousand miles, to the very borders of the Spanish possessions, to the international boundary at one point—within sight of several important colonies and settlements—and yet so draw the boundary line, as to leave these colonies and settlements without a Government; leave a strip of country several hundred miles in length and, in many places, not fifty miles in width, wholly without any established civil authority. Such a supposition is possible in conception, but it is not reconcilable with reason, and, therefore, not reconcilable with law, especially the institutional law of the Empire. I have said that the Quebec Act is not an ordinary Statute, regulating the acts of private individuals. It is a great Act of State, established by the supreme authority, marking out limits within which a Government is to be established and over which it is to exercise authority. The great officers of State have construed the law. The King, under the advice of his law officers and Ministers, declared the boundary upon the west followed the Mississippi River to its source. When a large section of this Province was ceded to the United States, and it became necessary to issue a new Commission to the Governor of what remained still British territory, the new boundary upon the south was again declared to extend westward to the Mississippi River. I refer to these Commissions to show you how the King and his advisers interpreted the law. I shall say no more upon the subject of the western boundary. I have said enough to show you

that from the confluence of the Ohio northward to its source the Mississippi was the boundary of Quebec upon the west. Before proceeding to indicate the northern limit it will be necessary to learn something of the dominion of the Hudson's Bay Company. If the word "northward" in the Quebec Act is made to refer to a limitary line, then that line is carried to the Hudson's Bay Company's possessions, and it there stops. No boundary upon the north is laid down between this point, wherever it may be, and the southern shore of Lake Nipissing. Quebec would still be bounded upon the north by a line drawn from the source of the St. John River to the southern shore of this lake, and there would remain, south of the possessions of the Hudson's Bay Company, and north of Quebec, a very large extent of country which was never transferred to Canada until effect was given to the proposal which I had the honor to submit to Parliament in 1878. I might, for the purpose of showing that this construction was never put upon the Act, refer to the separating line by which Quebec was divided. The extension of this line shows that there was a boundary upon the north. The Hudson's Bay Company received from the King a charter which professes to do two things, to give and grant to the Company the sole trade and commerce of all those seas, straits, bays, rivers, creeks and sounds in whatsoever latitude they shall be that lie within the entrance of the straits commonly called Hudson's Straits, together with all the lands and territories upon the countries, coasts and confines of the seas, bays, lakes, rivers, creeks and sounds aforesaid, that are not already actually possessed by or granted to any of our subjects or possessed by the subjects of any other Christian Prince or State.

"And that the said lands be from thenceforth reckoned and reputed as one of our plantations or colonies in America, called Rupert's Land; and, further, we do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors make, create and constitute the said Governor and Company for the time being, and their successors, the true and absolute lords and proprietors of the same territory, limits and places aforesaid, and of all other their premises hereby granted as aforesaid, with their and every of their rights, members, jurisdictions, prerogatives, royalties, appurtenances, whatsoever, to them the said Governor and Company and their successors, as of our manor of East Greenwich, in our County of Kent, in free and common socage, beside the land so granted and beside the privilege of trading, and from the limits and places aforesaid. The charter goes on to say that they are to enjoy the whole and entire trade and traffic to and from all havens, bays, creeks, rivers and seas into which they find entrance or passage by water or land, out of the territories, limits and places aforesaid, and to and with all the natives and people inhabiting within the territories, limits and places aforesaid, and to and with all other nations inhabiting any of the coasts adjacent to the said territories, limits and places which are not granted to any of our subjects."

Now, there are two things spoken of: there are "the lands and seas conveyed in fee simple, with the right of exclusive trade," and there is "the whole and entire trade of other seas and waters, and with nations inhabiting the coast adjacent to the said Territories." We have these two enquiries: which lands within the Straits of Hudson were conveyed in fee simple by this charter, assuming it to be valid, and which lands lie upon coasts adjacent to the said Territories, and of which no conveyance was made, but over which a right of exclusive trade was granted? It is worthy of observation that the Hudson's Bay Company have for a long time so interpreted their charter as to leave no country upon which the second provision could operate. Their claims of territory granted has grown larger by degrees, until not only the whole coasts of Hudson's Bay, but also the whole basin drained into the bay has been absorbed. The grant in their charter to the property in the soil, has swallowed up all other provisions, as the rod of Moses swallowed up the rods of the Egyptians. We have several questions to consider in order to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the boundaries of the Hudson's Bay Company's possessions. Could the King grant the territories not in his possession? If this question is answered in the affirmative, could he make a grant that would stand in the

way of any other monarch acquiring possession and sovereignty over any portion of the country so granted? The grant itself professedly excludes: 1st, any portion of the country possessed by any British subject; 2nd, any territory granted to any British subject; and 3rd, any territory possessed by any other Christian Prince or State. It has been argued that the King could not make a valid grant, because the country was not in his possession at the time the grant was made. When the French Government pointed out to the English that the French King had many years before granted a charter to his subjects of the same country, the Hudson's Bay Company replied that he could not make a valid grant. The maxim *nemo dat quod non habet* applied. I do not care to discuss just now the question of the validity of the grant. There can be no doubt of this, that no title passes by such a grant until the sovereignty of the country is acquired. We must look at the object and policy of such grants in order to understand their effect. They were invariably accompanied by a grant of political authority; and the private right of property was always held subordinate to the public trust which accompanied it. The policy of making these grants began with Henry VII and were continued until the time of George II. In many cases they were powers rather than grants of property already in the possession of the Crown. Where the Crown had not already the sovereignty of the country these grants, in form, profess to convey very extensive tracts of country; but they were held not to convey more than the parties to whom the grant was made succeeded in reducing to possession. The law and the usage have been so well established with regard to these formal grants, that I need but refer to a few instances to sustain this principle. In the time of Henry VII, in 1495, the King granted a charter to John Cabot empowering him or his deputies to sail into the eastern, western or northern sea to search for islands and countries before unseen by Christian people; to affix the banner of England on any place that he or they might discover, and to possess and occupy the country so discovered as the vassals of the English Crown. The patent was one by which Cabot was to acquire a paramount title for his master and a lordship for himself. At the time America was discovered feudal usages still strongly marked the political and social structure of western Europe. England had recently held extensive possessions in France connected with her according to feudal principles. Ireland and Wales were subordinate Governments, and within England herself there were several Palatine counties which suggested the method by which the dominions of the King were to be extended. Cabot sailed along the coast of North America from 56° to 38° north latitude. He made no settlement, and his patent was not held to have conveyed to him anything. Elizabeth, in 1578, granted a charter to Sir Humphrey Gilbert. By it he was authorized to discover and take possession of all remote and barbarous lands in North America not occupied by any Christian Prince or people. But this was not held to rest in him the whole of the unsettled portion of North America, but so much only, as he secured to his Sovereign by settlement and dominion. Under this charter he took formal possession of Newfoundland in the name of the Queen. He and his associates endeavored to carry out the objects of the charter. He failed; and he was not regarded as having any right of property in the Island, in consequence of this grant. The grant which was made to the Plymouth Company and to the London Company, extending from the Atlantic to the South Sea, were not supposed to convey to them more territory than they reduced to possession. New York, which was patented to the Duke of York, lay within the limits of the country formerly covered by the charter of other parties. The principle which I have stated shows that the title of those parties was not so much

the patent from the Crown as their arms and their merchandise; and we must look, not to the charter, but to what they accomplished under it, to ascertain what their title was, for it is not simply the extent of territory which they claimed, but the extent of dominion which they secured for the Crown by their energy and enterprise, that we have to consider. The Hudson's Bay Company had upon the shores of Hudson's Bay at the time their charter was granted but one post, Fort Rupert, on Rupert River. The King's patent, I suppose, may have conveyed to them this post with a reasonable area of territory within its vicinity. What more they acquired down to the time that their possessions were seized by France must be determined by a careful consideration of what they did and of what was done by France. I deny altogether that the King could convey to them by this charter a title to territory which was not only at the time not in possession of the Crown, but of which the company before the Treaty of Ryswick had not reduced to possession. From 1697 to 1713 the country along the coasts was in the possession of France. It was not possible, after this period, for the Company to acquire any fresh dominion on their own behalf. All the country which they had ever held looking towards Hudson's Bay was to be restored and no more. What they had held then at any time before 1697, was ever after the extent of their possessions. Their grant was a grant within the Straits of Hudson. They claimed it as extending from Grimington Island to Lake Mistassin. Before the Treaty of Utrecht, they made no claim to the ownership of the country south of the Bay. They were content with a claim to the exclusive trade.

Mr. BANNERMAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this Treaty of Utrecht that he is talking about was not later than that?

Mr. MILLS. What I stated a moment ago was a proposition of the Hudson Bay Company. It was accordance with the line drawn upon the map. The instructions of the English Commissioners were also in accordance with a similar line. The opinion given by Sir Arthur Pigott, Mr. Spankie, and Mr. Brougham, is a most carefully considered opinion. They say that the grant was not intended to comprehend all the lands and territories that could be approached through Hudson's Straits; that it is limited by its relation and proximity to the Straits; that it is not a grant of all the lands and territories upon the countries, coasts and confines of the seas and rivers within the Strait, to an indefinite extended distance. Still less is it a grant of all the lands lying between the seas, straits, rivers, &c., hundreds of miles away from the Straits. There is a point stated in the opinion of Mr. Holroyd which is of vital consequence in the consideration of this question, and which has been wholly neglected by those who are working to uphold the authority of the Hudson's Bay Company. They assume that the whole country must belong to the Hudson's Bay Company, unless it was previously held by the French King. Now, that is not the fact. If the doctrine, which I have already stated as the policy of those charters, is well founded, then the charter given to the Hudson's Bay Company could no more stand in the way of the French subsequently acquiring dominion, than the former charter, given by the King of France, could prevent the English reducing any part of the coast to a British possession. Mr. Holroyd says the charter will include all the country within the grant not at the time actually possessed by the subjects of any foreign Prince, and which have not been subsequently possessed by any foreign State previous to actual or virtual possession being taken under the charter. The charter could not convey the North-West Territories until the Company had actual or virtual possession of them on behalf of themselves or the Crown, and so as, by the law of nations, to vest the Sovereignty in the Crown. It could not stand in the way of France extend-

Mr. MILLS.

ing her dominion over this country. The charter to the London Company extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but whoever heard of that that charter prevented Spain from extending her sovereignty over Northern Mexico, or France from acquiring possession of Louisiana? Who will undertake to show the boundaries of Virginia by looking to the charter by which the Old Dominion was first constituted? It is absurd to do so. North America was open to all Europe to acquire. Each nation might undertake to establish its Sovereignty over any portion of it, in conformity with the law and usages of nations. Any monarch might say to a number of his subjects: "I will give you an exclusive charter to the whole continent, between certain parallels, subject to rights already acquired by other of my subjects, subject to rights already acquired by another Prince and another people." But while he excepted, as he was bound to do, vested interests, his charter had no force against subsequent settlement within these limits by any foreign Government. Another Prince might give a charter of exactly the same character to his own people either before or after; and if, under that charter, his subjects did not enter upon territory in actual or virtual possession of another State, they were acting within their rights. France was as free to take possession of the North West against the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company as she was to take possession of Louisiana within the chartered limits of Virginia. By the Law of Nations a title by discovery is an imperfect title; a title recognized by courtesy, by forbearance, and it must, within reasonable time, be supported by possession in order to make it valid and to establish the sovereignty of the discoverer. This is the doctrine of England. It was asserted in the time of Elizabeth. It was asserted by England in reference to her disputes with France relating to their possessions in North America. Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador, when he remonstrated against the expedition of Drake, was told by Elizabeth:—

"That she did not understand why her subjects or those of any other European Prince should be deprived of the traffic in the Indies; that as she did not acknowledge the Spaniards to have any right by the donation of the Bishop of Rome, so she knew no right that they had to any places other than those they were in actual possession of. For that their having touched here and there upon a coast and given names to a few rivers and capes, were such insignificant things as could in no wise entitle them to a proprietary further than in parts where they actually settled and continued to inhabit."

The Lords of Trade deny that the mere grant of a charter, without possession, can be admitted as having any force. In a communication to the King in 1721, they say that—

"A charter without possession can never be allowed to change the property in the soil."

And they point out that the French are now seeking to extend their territory by the erection of forts instead of relying upon their charters. In the year 1719, Commissioners were appointed to settle the boundary agreed upon under the Treaty of Utrecht, and they were specially instructed—

"In wording such articles as shall be agreed on with a Commissary of His Most Christian Majesty upon this head, that the said boundaries be understood to regard the trade of the Hudson's Bay Company only; that His Majesty does not thereby recede from the right to any lands in America not comprised within the said boundaries; and that no pretension be thereby given to the French to claim any tracts of land in America, southward or south west of the said boundaries."

This statement is as explicit as it can well be, that the boundary line which the Government proposed to draw under the Treaty of Utrecht, was not to be a line separating the dominions of England from those of France, but a line relating to the trade of each with the Indians. The English Government took, in fact, this position that the country between the settlements of Canada and those of Hudson's Bay was still an unoccupied wilderness, one which was still not so far possessed by either as to be under its dominion, and that this question of dominion was one to be settled by the energy and enterprise of Frenchmen and

of Englishmen in the future. Now, with this rule before us, as to the means of acquiring and extending sovereignty, let me look at the facts dealt with by the Treaty of Utrecht. By the tenth article of that Treaty the King of France agreed to restore to the King of England, to be possessed in full right forever, the Bay and Straits of Hudson, together with all lands, sea coasts, rivers and places situate in the said Bay and Straits, and which belong thereunto. No tracts of land or of sea being excepted which are at present possessed by the subjects of France. It is agreed on both sides to determine within a year, by Commissioners to be forthwith named by each party, the limits which are to be fixed between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French; which limits both the British and French subjects shall be wholly forbidden to pass over, or thereby to go to each other by sea or by land. These are the provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht which relates to the surrender of the country in the vicinity of Hudson's Bay to the English. Was this to be a division relating simply to trade, or was it a division relating to the sovereignty of the country? I shall assume that the parties to the Treaty intended that the sovereignty of the country should be divided and that the surrender to the English was a surrender of the sovereignty of the shore of Hudson's Bay, and I shall undertake to show that the places retained by France, called in the treaty places appertaining to the French, were north of the watershed, and the boundary was to be a line drawn between them and the English places on the shore of the Bay. The French plenipotentiaries at first objected to this clause of the treaty, because it might receive a more comprehensive meaning than the parties intended. Mr. Prior, in writing to his Government, said:

"As to the limits of Hudson's Bay Company, and what the Ministry here seem to apprehend, at least in virtue of the general expression, *tout ce que l'Angleterre a jamais possédé de ce côté là* (which they assert to be wholly new and which I think is really so since our plenipotentiaries make no mention of it) may give us occasion to encroach at any time upon their dominions in Canada, I have answered, that since according to the *carte* which came from our plenipotentiaries marked with the extent of what was thought our dominion, and returned by the French with what they judged the extent of theirs, there was no very great difference, and that the parties who determine that difference must be guided by the same *carte*. I thought the article would admit of no disputes."

Now this letter assists us in rightly interpreting the tenth article of the Treaty of Utrecht. It shows that the French were afraid that the English might claim under the expression, "all that England ever possessed on that coast," a part of their dominions of Canada. They were not afraid that the English would cross the watershed; but they were afraid that the country between Abbitibbi and the Bay; between their ports upon the Albany and the Bay, and other sections of the country which the French held as part of Canada and the shores of the Bay, would be claimed by the English. The plenipotentiaries had before them a map by which those who determined the difference, were bound to be guided. They were not to draw a line nearer to the Bay than that drawn by the French, nor further away than that drawn by the English. Mr. Prior tells us that there is no great difference between those lines. The line drawn by the French is described as follows:—

"The line of separation should commence at Cape Bouton, pass through the middle of the territory which is between Port Rupert and Lake Nemiskaw, of which Père Albanel Jesuit and Mr. De St. Simon took possession in the name of the King in 1672, follow at the same distance from the Bay along the eastern side in such manner as to divide in the middle the territory between the Lake of the Abbitibbis and Fort Monsipi or St. Louis, continuing at a similar distance from the shores of the Bay at the western side until beyond the river of St. Therese and Bourbon."

Cape Bouton is about the 61° of north latitude. The line drawn by the English was from Grimington Island in 56½° north latitude, south-westward to Lake Mistassan; beyond this no line is described. When the negotiations were opened in 1719 the English Commissioners disregarded

their instructions, and demanded that the line should commence upon the coast 2° farther south, and should be continued to the 49th parallel. The negotiations came to nothing, nor was it expected they would. The lines upon the map by which the Treaty of Utrecht was to be interpreted, were wholly disregarded in the English demands. Mr. Pultney, in writing to Secretary Craggs, admitted that he never expected any success, that the French view were opposed to the English; that their interests were directly opposite; and that the French knew that they (the English) were prepared to reject all their demands. If we look at the settlements, or trading ports, it becomes pretty clear that the line which it was proposed to draw, was a line similar to that drawn by the Treaty of St. Petersburg upon the western coast, a line which would leave to the English a moderate extent of country in the vicinity of the bay for the protection of their post, but which would not encroach upon the French posts in the interior. The line was one which neither was permitted to cross for the purpose of trade, but which was not intended to interfere with the freedom of trade by the Indians, remaining in the possession of either party. The charter of the Hudson's Bay Company was put an end to by the Treaty of Ryswick. The restoration of their possessions would not restore to them the franchises or the rights of property which that charter gave them. The mere possession acquired by the success of arms during a war does not amount to absolute sovereignty, but when it is followed by treaty there is a complete change of sovereignty and the political rights, the special privileges and the right of property, which reposes upon dominion, all go together. The Hudson's Bay Company claimed of late years, the whole Basin of Hudson's Bay; but they have not ventured to contest the possession of the valley of the Red River in Minnesota and Dakota. The Treaty of Ryswick terminated their chartered rights. The restoration of the Bay, and the land upon its border, to the Crown, could not revive the charter of the Company. The case of the Duke of York is a case in point. A patent had been given to James, of New York. He governed the country under it for nine years. The Dutch obtained possession of it, and established there a Civil Government. At the Treaty of Westminster it was restored to the King of England. The Duke again claimed the country, but it was held that his proprietorship had been extinguished by the Dutch conquest and Government; and that the title, after restoration, was in the King alone; and a second patent was necessary to give him any title to the country. Great political corporations are, by the Law of Nations, put upon a wholly different footing from private non-political holders. Their right of property and their powers of Government are inseparable, and they pass away together. Whatever dominion the Hudson's Bay Company subsequently acquired was a dominion for the Crown. I will rest content with simply stating this proposition, which, if time permitted, could, I think, be easily established. In 1809, when the country on the east of the River St. John, as far as the Labrador shore, was, by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, again severed from Lower Canada, and re-annexed to Newfoundland, it embraced the whole country northward to the Hudson's Straits. It included the whole coast to the 61° of north latitude. So far as I know, the Hudson's Bay Company never made any protest against this Act, and yet it included a large section of country which they have always claimed was granted them by their charter. After the Treaty of Utrecht the Hudson's Bay Company had no other claim than that which actual occupation of certain posts gave them. They had again and again offered to accept the Albany River as a boundary. They say that rivers are more certain and obvious than lines of latitude, and can be better laid down in a wild country. They had at no time before the Treaty of Utrecht, proposed to extend

their boundary further southward than Lake Mistassin, which is in the latitude of James Bay. They proposed that the French should not come beyond the 53° of north latitude or the Albany River on the west. When the British Government hoped to again so obtain a controlling influence on the North American Continent, they proposed to establish a great Province in which the people would be governed according to the principles of the British Constitution. The customs of Paris were to be confined to the country east of the Ottawa River. A boundary line was extended northward to Hudson's Bay, and all that portion of Canada to the westward and southward of this line to its utmost extent was to be included in the new Province. The deadly wound which had been received by the loss of the American colonies was, by this new establishment, to be healed. It was the first step in beginning colonization anew, by which a great British power was again to be founded. The description does not say that all Canada is to be embraced, but all to the westward and southward of the boundary named, and you have but to look at the map to see that the Albany River is a natural boundary upon the north. The expression is not due west or due south, but westward and southward. Due west and due south are directions which would exclude the whole peninsula west of Cobourg to the Detroit River, and on the north the boundary would cross the Albany River at about its middle distance. But the rule which I have already mentioned makes the Albany River, as a natural boundary, preferable to an astronomical line, and justified the arbitrators in declaring it to be the boundary. I shall not detain the House longer. I have said enough to show that the course taken by the arbitrators was a reasonable one. To show that if they erred at all it was in limiting Ontario on the west to the meridian of the North-west Angle; to show that in making the award they set forth what they believed to be the true legal boundaries. The Province of Ontario will stand by that award. She is entitled to do so. What it gave her the law itself gives her, for that award is final and concludes the parties to it. It cannot be repudiated without dishonor. No man will consent to have his property ruthlessly and illegally taken from him. No more will two millions of people. There is not a man from one end of the Province to the other who does not know that the Prime Minister has been driven on in this policy of spoliation by his Quebec colleagues. They refused to recognize that we are one Dominion, and that the growth and prosperity of any Province is an advantage to every other part of the Dominion. They envy us our rights, and they would filch from us a portion of our heritage. I can tell the First Minister that whether the people of Ontario be for his policy of high taxation or whether they be against it, whether they approve or disapprove of his land policy in the North-West, they will disregard all these to protect their Province against robbery to gratify the envious. There will be no two parties upon this question, and the very same feelings and impulses, which make us all one people to resist foreign invasion, will make us one people to resist to the death this attempt at dismemberment; and the man from Ontario who upholds the policy of the Government, no matter what his views may be on the question of the Tariff, will be regarded as an enemy of his Province, and when the day of election comes will receive at the hands of the people an enemy's reward.

Mr. DAWSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

Mr. MILLER

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 3rd April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

Mr. BÉCHARD, in the absence of Mr. STEPHENSON, moved that the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates of the House be adopted. He said: I may explain that the Committee at their last meeting decided that hereafter the French translator shall be paid on the completion of his translation on the deposit of his manuscript with the Clerk of the Committee, less 25 per cent. to be retained until the completion of the work. It was also decided that the French manuscript be sent to the printers through the Clerk of the Committee, who shall take a receipt therefor from the printers. It appears that the printers are behind in their work, and it was thought better to adopt the plan I have mentioned, so that Mr. Audet may be paid as his work proceeds, less, of course, the 25 per cent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a change in the contract, is it not?

Mr. BÉCHARD. It does not affect the contract with the printers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But Mr. Audet, as I understand, has to revise the printing and attend to the matter when it is printed.

Mr. DESJARDINS. By the contract there is a drawback of 20 per cent., and it is now proposed to have a drawback of 25 per cent., in order to secure the fulfilment of the contract in its entirety.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But, as I understand, this report from the Debates Committee recommends a change in the contract. I suppose the Committee carefully considered the question as to whether any change of that kind would invalidate the contract in any way.

Mr. BÉCHARD. The Committee were unanimous.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The translator himself also consented.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears to me, from what the hon. gentleman says, that the change suggested is a reasonable one, and is only carrying out the original design of the contract, which was to pay for the work done as it progressed, and if any party outside of and unconnected with the translator delays the work, of necessity or from any cause whatever which the translator cannot control, I think it is only reasonable that he should be paid as he completes his part of the work. The proposition, I may say, entirely commends itself to my judgment as one that is only fair; but I ask the hon. gentleman whether the Committee had considered the effect that this alteration would have on the contract itself?

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton). The change does not affect the validity of the contract at all. At present 20 per cent. is withheld from the French translator until the printers work is finished. That was found to be inconvenient to the French translator, and it is suggested that, on the completion of his work in manuscript, and on the certificate of the Clerk of the Debates Committee, he be paid three-fourths of his money, the remaining one-fourth being paid on the completion of the work by the printer.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I may say that the Chief Translator has agreed to this change, so that the contract is perfected by the consent of both parties.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Has the translator given security?

Mr. DESJARDINS. He is at present leaving a drawback of 20 per cent. as security that he will complete the work; but the Committee, with his consent, agreed that a further 5 per cent. should be kept as security for proof-reading, correction of the printing, and the completion of the whole work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I call attention to a proposition in the report to add \$300 to his compensation.

Mr. DESJARDINS. That is not for the Chief Translator. That is for Mr. Boyce, who was employed to assist the head of the *Hansard* staff; and for the work he is doing, such as the making of an alphabetical index, proof-reading, and so forth, it was thought that it would be fair to add \$300 to his salary, as he has been receiving only \$500.

Mr. STEPHENSON. In connection with this matter, I may say that Mr. Boyce is a practical man, thoroughly up in his business, and it is thought that we should have a first-class index. Letters have been sent to me as Chairman of the Committee, recommending certain gentlemen who have made indexes. Last year the index was not as satisfactory as it should have been. Mr. Boyce understood that he was employed during the Session only, at a salary of \$500. We took the matter into consideration, and we decided that, in order to have a first-class index, he should be retained long enough after the Session to complete it, and in consideration of the extra work he would have to perform, and the ability he has manifested, we recommend that he should have an increase of \$300. We think that by doing that we are doing what is right and proper, not only towards Mr. Boyce, but towards this House, because we think we shall save the money we give him by the amount of work he gives us. Therefore, the Committee unanimously agreed to recommend that Mr. Boyce should have this increase of salary.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that the report calls attention to the plan of reporting, on which I should like some explanation from the chairman. I should like to know whether in the type which is kept standing for three days subject to any corrections that a member sends in, there is any correction or revision by the *Hansard* staff or the editor, supposing no corrections are sent in by a member. I make that enquiry, because I observe that the same difficulties exist this Session that I called attention to in a former Session, namely, that, so far as I can judge, either in the transcription of notes or the proof-reading, there are a vast number of errors in those copies sent round, and those members who happen to be in the position which I have been in this Session, of not having time to correct these errors, will find the record of what they have supposed to have said very different indeed from what they did say.

Mr. STEPHENSON. This matter was before the Committee at its last meeting. On investigating the whole matter we found that the printers were in fault, and also that the delay in publishing the revised edition was due, in a great measure, to the delay of members in sending in corrected proofs of their speeches. If hon. members would send in revised proofs in accordance with the plan devised by the Committee—which is the plan adopted at Washington in the publication of the United States Congressional Report, our revised *Hansard* would be got out much earlier and in better form than it can be otherwise. I must say that the first copy set up had not that careful correction, so far as typographical errors are concerned, and we have endeavored, as much as possible, to have that defect in the printing remedied. I think hereafter the first copy will be, in that respect, more correct than in the past.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not at all complaining of the restriction as to the time in which members should send in

their corrections, but I was pointing out that there were a vast number of mistakes in the daily issue, as far as I could judge, both in the writing out of the reports and in the printing, through imperfect proof-reading; and I was enquiring whether any, and if so, what steps were taken by the *Hansard* staff or the editor to correct those mistakes in the case of members who, like myself, have not sufficient time to make their own corrections.

Mr. STEPHENSON. I have endeavored to put this matter in proper shape, and I think that the chief of the *Hansard* staff understands the matter. If the first issue be not more correct in the future than it has been in the past, we will take what steps we can to have any defect remedied.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I will take the opportunity offered by this motion to call the attention of the House to the considerable delay existing in the translation, and especially in the printing, of the French portion of the debates. I think that at the present time the French translation is more than a month behind, and as the debates of this House are public documents, which are distributed not only among the members, but which are sent to the representatives of the press, and which circulate throughout the whole of the country, I am of opinion that those who speak the French language, for some reason or the other, are not served with the same punctuality and the same good-will apparently exercised in serving those belonging to another nationality. I do not say that any ill-will is shown, but the system is certainly defective, and it ought, I think, to be remedied. I have not the intention of suggesting a remedy, but all that I have to say is that if this system continues to be carried out, a decided opinion will be given expression to in this House against a system hampered with so much inconvenience. As for myself, when this question comes before the House, if the evils I have pointed out are not seen to, I will consider it my duty to vote against the existing system.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). My hon. friend from Montmagny is quite right as to the delays in issuing the French copy, but to remedy that we have called attention to the delay on the part of hon. members in sending in their revision of their speeches. The reports are supposed to be put on our table by three o'clock the next day. Every hon. member then, who has interest enough in what he has said, or whose time is not too much taken up otherwise, is supposed to make the necessary corrections in his speech, and send it back to the *Hansard* room, whence it is sent to the printers, after which the editor compares the corrected copy with the proofs, in the revised form. Then only can this copy go to the French translator. If the rule laid down, and referred to in this report, were followed, there would be but little difficulty in getting out the French issue. If the corrected reports went back to the printer within three days after the revision of the speeches, the corrected reports would be immediately put in the hands of the translators, who could translate them the next day, and within a week at the latest, the French copy, completed, would be in the hands of the members. The difficulty has arisen from the fact that the printers and the *Hansard* staff have been unwilling to authorize the final printing of those speeches, the revision of which had not been sent by the hon. members who delivered them. The object of calling the attention of the House now to this is that the House may be made aware of the determination of the Committee to have the rule hereafter as strictly observed as possible. I may say, in answer to the hon. member for Durham, that even where an hon. member does not send in a revision of his speech, it is the duty of the *Hansard* editor to carefully revise that speech before it is finally printed, but it will be seen at once that no editor can possibly correct errors of fact or figures

that may occur in the report of a speech. He can only correct the typographical errors or incorrect phraseology. Therefore, it is desirable that hon. members should, at least, glance over the first report of their speeches, not to correct typographical or other minor errors, but to see that any figures or statements of facts have been correctly reproduced. As to this increase of \$300, the object is to have more efficient indexing and editing. In the first instance, Mr. Bradley, the head of the *Hansard* staff, was supposed to revise the reports, edit them, and make an index. It was afterwards found desirable that he should take his place at the reporting table on the floor, and as no one person could do the work of reporting and the other work as well, all this other work devolved on Mr. Boyce, who had previously been engaged for the Session, at a salary of \$500, as assistant to the Chief Reporter, to do the routine work of the office. Mr. Boyce, therefore, last Session read the proofs for press, finally revised the reports before they went to the printers, and made up the index from day to day. At the end of the Session he left, as he had a perfect right to do, having been only engaged for that period. But, at that time, the printing of the revised English copy was nearly a month behindhand, and the index had, therefore, to be completed by Mr. Bradley, who, not being familiar with the plan adopted by Mr. Boyce, continued it in a different way, and on that account the index was not as satisfactory as it ought to be. The object now is to have Mr. Boyce continue at work on the index after the Session, until the *Hansard* is got out in its finished form, and we believe that the index will then be much more satisfactory than it has been in the past. To enable the French copy to be got out promptly, but one thing is necessary, and that is that the members should understand that their speeches will go to press within three days after delivery. If, through want of time, or through indifference, they do not revise their speeches, and those speeches should contain, in their final form, any errors, hon. members will have only themselves to blame, because, with the difficulty of hearing, through the noises that sometimes prevail, and from any other cause not blameable to the reporters, it is exceedingly difficult for the reporters to follow with absolute accuracy the arguments of hon. gentlemen. I do not think it is too much to ask of hon. members that they should glance over, within those three days, their speeches; though, should they not do so, the duty of the editor is to read them over a second time with the view of making them as perfect as possible. I believe a very considerable degree of blame this Session is due to the printers. They have been overcrowded with work, as we can see by their delay in furnishing returns. It is with great difficulty, apparently, that they have been able to accomplish that work. I do not think they have a large enough staff. They may perhaps be unable to get all the men they want. They have the contract at very low prices, and as the wages of printers, like other wages of skilled mechanics, are going up, they may find difficulty in getting the work done as cheaply as they think necessary. There are twelve days' of corrected proofs in the hands of the *Hansard* editor which have not gone to the printers. From that fact it will be seen that the printers themselves are largely to blame for this delay.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I am not acquainted with the details of that contract with the stenographers; I merely look at the results. For my part, I must say that I admire the zeal and the devotion of the stenographers who report the debates in this House, but, on the other hand, I think that the existing system is very defective. The *Hansard* should not be the verbatim report of everything that is said in this honorable House; there is no country in the world where such is the case. The *Hansard* should be a succinct and complete *résumé* of all that is said; thus, at the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

end of the Session, we should not have an immense volume, and we should not be compelled to wade through seven or eight pages when we wish to find an idea. I think it is the duty of hon. members of this House to revise their speeches in such a manner as to eliminate therefrom all that is not absolutely necessary. I might quote as an instance of this what takes place in the Province of Quebec. We have there a *Hansard* prepared by a single man, Mr. Desjardins, and, *en passant*, I regret that our librarian should not have seen fit to procure a copy of it for our use, but I would fain believe that this is quite an involuntary omission on his part, and that it is shortly to be remedied. That report is not a complete reduction of what is said; it is a *résumé*, but we find all that we require. After all, what is the *Hansard*? It is a faithful record of the opinions of members as expressed in this House, which is to be of use to us next year and in years to come. Now, I think that were this better understood by hon. members of this House, we should have at the end of the year a more useful and less voluminous book to refer to. I must add that we have ever found that the *Hansard* staff show both zeal and capacity in reproducing the speeches made in this House. As to the French version, we are told that it is in the hands of the printer, and that it is he who is behindhand. This, no doubt, does credit to the French translator, but there should be a way of compelling the printer to better execute his contract. The Province of Quebec is desirous of having its reports as early as the other Provinces; I hope that the Committee which looks after this matter with so great a care, will henceforth be more watchful than ever, and will give the printer to understand that if he cannot fulfil his contract, steps will be taken to relieve him of it and to give it to one who will do his duty better.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I wish to say one word with regard to the Quebec *Hansard*. This is no doubt a very excellent publication, and one of very great value; but it by no means is a report of what takes place in the Legislature, and, moreover, it does not appear for three or four months after the Legislature rises; in fact, it is made up from reports in the newspapers and of speeches which are handed in by hon. members themselves to a very large extent, with, of course, some work done by Mr. Desjardins as well. I may mention, in this relation, that I had occasion, the other day, to look into the Quebec *Hansard* for the report of a very interesting discussion which took place on the subject of disallowance in connection with the Mines Bill of the Province of Quebec. It was a matter of very great public interest at the time, but I found the whole thing disposed of in about half a column, which was really not a report at all. I judged from this, that the gentlemen who spoke on this subject were gentlemen who were not in the habit of writing out their speeches and sending them in, and consequently they were not fully reported, although a description of the debate, as given in the newspapers, appeared. Besides if we adopted the Quebec plan, we would not probably get our reports for six months after the Session closed.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend, the member for the County of Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) to the following fact: The object of the House, in having reports made of the debates, has been to have a daily and complete record of its sittings. No doubt it was found that there were some inconveniences arising from this publication, but when it was sought to try another system, that of getting the reporter to give a *résumé* of the debates, greater difficulties were encountered, and the complaints made by members at the time, had the effect of causing that plan to be abandoned. So to-day, in conformity with the instructions of the House, we are determined to give as much as possible an authentic report of the sittings, and this report, when

corrected, forms the volume which is published at the close of the Session. Were we to adopt the suggestions of my hon. friend, we should be compelled to give up the daily record which is of great use. Moreover, I may observe that it has been decided that the speeches should be published in this record, in the language in which they were delivered; thus it becomes impossible for us to have the report of the speeches in French day by day, as is done in the case of the English speeches.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the principle has been well settled in this House, that we are to have full reports of our proceedings; and if this is the case, I think that it is money well spent to ensure the perfect accuracy of these reports, and also to ensure their being promptly printed and laid before us. There are objections to the present system of having roughly drafted reports first published, and then placed in the hands of members for revision. This is, however, I think on the whole, a better plan than to put the manuscript in the hands of members. One will not be likely to improve as largely upon printed reports as they might if the manuscript were in their hands. There are, of course, enormous difficulties attending the translation of the notes and the editing of *Hansard*, unless it is done by those gentlemen who take the notes themselves. It is obvious to every one, who has had reports of his speeches in his hands, that there are extraordinary mistakes which take place from the fact that those who afterwards correct the reports were not present at the time that the debate was in progress. It would be almost impossible to obviate this disadvantage unless some person skilled in the political questions of the day were retained for the purpose of revising these reports. The Quebec system, to which the hon. member for Cardwell has referred, would be simply of no use at all here. It would be of no value. It would be much better to depend upon newspaper reports—to take partizan reports on one side, and partizan reports on the other side, and then to strike a happy medium between the two, and consider this the authority which we should follow, than to adopt such a plan. When questions so important as are discussed in the Parliament of Canada are before us, I think it is desirable that there should be an authentic record of the utterances of members. I also think it is desirable that the original first draft of the report should go into the hands of members, and this should be promptly returned, with such variations as it may be absolutely necessary to make. I have no doubt that any gentleman who has been in the habit of trespassing on the labors of the reporters—and I may be considered one—will be very glad to hurry over the report, and get it back into the hands of the reporters as soon as possible. I wish, while I am on my feet, to bear general testimony to the accuracy of the reports, and I desire to warn hon. gentlemen, if we are to depend on this system, and have made up our minds to make it a permanent system and a permanent establishment in this Parliament, that we must be prepared to pay for the first-class talent which we employ remunerative and fair prices. There is no reason in the world why these gentlemen, who are at our bidding, and who are engaged in a most laborious duty, which involves special knowledge, which is a very rare talent, and a talent that very few possess—reporting accurately by sound—should not be fairly and liberally compensated, and it is not fair to them if this is not done. It is a very small matter to the country at large, while it is a very important matter to us, that we should have, and ensure as far as we possibly can, the utmost accuracy in regard to the reporting. It is, and must be, quite evident, that if there is any lack of that accuracy, the largest abuses may occur in tampering with the text after it is produced and sent to the speakers; but if the very best and most accurate reporters are employed—and I wish to say that we have been enabled

to secure very accurate reports—no man would presume to interfere with the text to the extent of making any important change in the meaning, or too extensive interpolations; but without the employment of first-class reporters, men were compelled to fumble for one's meaning and drift through sentence after sentence, as many are probably compelled to do, and then the report was still imperfect, leaving the whole matter open to the same objection that lies with regard to compiling reports in the manner which my hon. friend from Cardwell has just stated. I think that nobody could lay down a better plan than that which now obtains—as nearly as possible the securing of a written photograph of the debates which take place on the floor of this House; this is of the greatest use to gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber. It fastens—absolutely fastens—the responsibility, which we ought all to be willing to assume for any of our utterances here, although an exception may be made in the case of the gentlemen who claim that they are not bound this year by what they said last year. But we, on this side of the House, do not make any such contention. We are willing, whatever we say, that it shall be put down with the utmost accuracy, and to abide by it afterwards, although, of course, in the symbols used by shorthand writers, the negative is often stated in the place of the affirmative. It is also known that unless there is great attention paid to the connection of extracts and figures and of such statements as the reporters depend upon being furnished with, confusion will ensue; and it ought to be impressed on the gentlemen who sit on this floor and take down the debates, that they should use the utmost care whenever an extract is read, and whenever anything bearing on the question under discussion is produced, that they should note such catchwords as will enable them to trace out these extracts and identify them; so that no abuse may be perpetrated on us by having the authentic record, or what ought to be the authentic record, garbled, or in any way tampered with, while in the hands of those who may find it in their interest to make statements of one kind, and then to change them, as was the case in one instance, which may be familiar to many of us—where reports, which were read studiously on the floor of this House for one hour, were as studiously repressed in the edition of *Hansard*—as we found was the case when we came to look for those extracts. This is a kind of abuse to which *Hansard* is liable, if such guards as reporters well know how to use are, notwithstanding, thrown about it, in order to prevent the occurrence of anything of this nature. I observe that my hon. and genial friend opposite (Sir Albert J. Smith) smiles at this statement; and this is the reason why I shall be compelled to explain what I did not intend to say. I say now, Sir, that the hon. gentleman, by the complainant smile his features wear has compelled me to state that a gentleman who is not in this House at the present moment, but who sits besides the hon. member for Westmoreland, suppressed in *Hansard* page after page, extracts from Blue-books, in which he endeavored to belittle and decry the condition of things in the North-West. Only Archbishop Tache's extracts remain. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will smile a little more, but I will tell him that of nearly one hour's studious reading in this House, absolutely no trace appears in *Hansard* that came out the next day or the day after that. If the hon. gentleman admires that kind of thing, and feels like laughing at it, he is perfectly welcome to his satisfaction. The hon. gentleman is always happy and always genial, and we are always glad to see him enjoy himself, and no doubt he is glad and enjoys the fact that he has brought out from me this statement with regard to his quondam leader. This statement is within the memory of every hon. gentleman in this House, who

listened with pain to the studious attempt of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) to make an under bid for the support of his party, when he found that power was slipping out from under him, and that a cabal was working against him. These are the facts, and perhaps the hon. gentleman, having heard this explanation, will favor the House by rising to explain, or to contradict the statement. We shall be very glad to have an explanation or a contradiction from the hon. gentleman on that side of the House. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman is not in his place when I make this statement. He is fully able, I presume, to make the explanation which occurs very readily to him when any case of this kind presents itself against him. I also regret that the attitude of the hon. member for Westmoreland was such that I was compelled to say what I did not intend to utter with respect to his quondam leader, when I rose to my feet; but I wish again to state, I think that this side of the House is in perfect accord with any liberal measure which may be made in order to secure the most accurate record of our debates. I believe that the Committee have taken every pains to employ the very best men that can be found in the country; and I say that the fault rests with ourselves if, having these gentlemen, we are not able and not willing to pay them sufficiently, and have to depend upon lower qualifications for reporters, because there are reporters and *reporters*; there are some who understand public matters; who have a quick intelligence; who are perfectly accurate in the manner in which they are able to reproduce the words of the speaker, and who have sufficient practical knowledge and intelligence with regard to the public questions of the day to enable them, if they accidentally do not catch accurately the literal phrase of the speaker, to supplement it with sufficient accuracy as to express his meaning; and this is all we want. I would be very glad if it were possible to have a report put into my hands of anything which I may utter on the floor of this House, so perfect that it would not be necessary to touch it either with pen or with pencil. But, of course, there are always small inaccuracies which must be corrected, and most gentlemen who speak in this House will agree with me that it is an immense labor to read word after word, and line after line, and correct technically the proofs of our speeches, as we are sometimes compelled to do, and I think I may state here, that much inaccuracy and immense difficulty in connection with the report must arise in the compositors' department. There should be an accuracy in the proof-reading, which I think we ought to insist upon with the publishers of the debates, and I am of opinion that my hon. friend from Cardwell will appreciate that, and agree with me, when I say that the greater part of the trouble we have in looking over and revising the reports lies in correcting the technical errors which we cannot allow to pass, which are obvious and which every man ought to be able to correct himself. No man in reading a proof like that ought to let the word "scenes" stand for "seeds" or the word "grave" for "grain," or any words of this kind to remain unchanged, for we know perfectly well that if we do not revise them they will not be corrected in the final issue, and will thus escape alteration. I believe I utter the sentiments of both sides of the House when I say I wish to put on record the great confidence we have in the present staff and in the editor, who is a very painstaking and competent and intelligent gentleman, and I believe that it is money well spent—if we are to have the system at all—to get the most perfect accuracy that can be possibly obtained; and any gentleman who has had occasion to look back to the Debates of 1874, and go through that bulky volume, will perceive the comfort experienced by those who like occasionally to look back and refresh

Mr. PLUMB.

themselves regarding what has happened during the last eight or ten years, in having a big volume, with a good index, knowing exactly where to turn in order to find the little inaccuracies, on the part of our enemies, of which we like to make use when we are making political speeches. The Committee, I am satisfied, are endeavoring in the very best way they can find, to remedy any of the slight difficulties which may still occur, and I am satisfied that this House is only doing its duty towards those hon. gentlemen in sustaining them in any of the propositions which they may make, and in sustaining them in the very moderate demand which they have made on the House.

An hon. MEMBER. The member for Lambton has entered the House and you had better repeat your statement.

Mr. PLUMB. I am challenged to repeat the statement which I made on the floor of the House a few moments ago, in the presence of the hon. gentleman who has just come in, and who says, in that complimentary manner which is habitual to him and which has characterized all his utterances towards me during the last five years, that I am put up to make speeches in this House. This is the first time that this has been said, and that hon. gentleman is the only hon. gentleman who has ever ventured to state that an independent member of Parliament was put up to speak on a subject, which is a subject of great public importance, and a subject about which every man has a right to speak, and to form an opinion, and concerning which every man who is an hon. member of Parliament may be presumed to have formed his independent opinion, as the hon. gentleman himself, I have no doubt, has formed his independent opinion on it, without any party bias. I will say before the hon. gentleman himself, what I was induced to say by the superserviceable interference of his hon. friend who sits at his left hand, that, in reference to the reports, there should be the greatest care taken by the reporters to use certain catch words in respect to extracts, so that they could be easily identified and easily found; and I stated also that it had happened, probably for the sake of economy and making the report smaller, possibly for the sake of not trespassing on the patience of those who were to read them, large and copious extracts from the Blue-books which were produced in the House of Commons upon a memorable occasion by my hon. friend who is looking toward me, were suppressed in the *Hansard* and not published, and I never say anything behind a man's back that I am not ready to say to his face.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have not the slightest intention of replying except to one statement of the hon. gentleman, that I suppressed some report. I have never looked at the *Hansard* report this Session since I came into the House.

Mr. PLUMB. It was not this Session at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then I say the same as to the last Session.

Mr. PLUMB. It was not the last Session at all. The hon. gentleman sometimes protests too much; this time he has protested too little, and I can only say that it is useless for him to attempt to make any statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not at first know to what the hon. gentleman referred. I supposed he referred to some report in the present Session, and then to some report of the last Session. In regard to the passages the hon. gentleman refers to, when I received the report from the *Hansard* there was not a single word of those extracts in the report sent me, and I was not going to search from the volumes again to find these extracts for the sake of putting them in.

Mr. PLUMB. Well, Sir, those extracts had a most important bearing upon the value of our great public domain in the North-West, as they were based upon the arguments of

the hon. gentleman who was then leader of the Reform party; an argument of the utmost importance, as it had reference to the whole question of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the policy of his party; and I say that the hon. gentleman ought to have seen that those reports were properly put in the public records. I say the hon. gentleman owed it to himself, having produced those reports and having read them for nearly an hour—and the hon. gentleman does not pretend to deny it—I say he ought to have seen that they were properly put in the record for the House. The hon. gentleman never would have condescended to have read these reports unless he wished to have them form a permanent record of his statements in respect to the value of the North-West lands. Oh, no! it was not necessary afterwards that the value of those lands should be stated. It was seen afterwards that they should be called worth \$4 per acre, as my hon. friends opposite called them, or \$8 or \$10, as they have been called by ourselves. It was necessary to show that the Conservative Government was squandering millions upon millions by giving away the North-West, bound hand and foot to a grasping, soulless monopoly, who had 25,000,000 acres out of 200,000,000 acres, and were compelled to open their lands by the railway, and make over 640 acres which they got to give value to the 640 acres that the Government alongside of them had reserved. The hon. gentleman should have seen to it, when he observed, when the *Hansard* was brought back to him next day, that these reports were not in it—not even a word of them—he ought to have reprimanded the reporters; he ought to have insisted that the reporters should put in his utterances. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there was a surprise on this side of the House, which I can scarcely characterize or describe, when it was found finally in the *Hansard* that not one word of all the statements, except Archbishop Taché's, was left in the *Hansard* at the time he occupied three-quarters of an hour in the reading of them; and it was melancholy to see him do so at that time, when the present hon. leader of the Opposition, his successor, brought in his famous resolution, when he moved down from the back benches, where he had sat alongside of the hon. member for East Northumberland, where he took his seat in proud humility until the opportunity arose for him to strike. I thank the hon. member for Westmoreland for having, with that bland smile of his and that incredulous look towards me, compelled me to say what I am now saying on the floor of the House. I was not intending, of course, to do so—I was provoked to do so—and I can tell the hon. gentleman that some day or other they will find *nemo impune lacessit*.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). I am sure, as a member of the Debates Committee, I am exceedingly thankful to the hon. member for Niagara for the number of valuable hints he has given us as to the proper method of managing that Committee, also for the compliment he has paid us for its management thus far. Were I a reporter on the floor of the House I would also, in my heart, be very thankful to the hon. member for Niagara. I think if the reporters are only amenable to the influences which actuate the ordinary mind, the chances are that after being bespattered with so many compliments, the speeches of the hon. member for Niagara will be reported even better hereafter than before; and the reporters also will not be troubled with so many emendations as he has usually made in his reports, and, as a matter of consequence, the hon. gentleman's name will go down to posterity associated with all that is elegant in diction, all that is chaste and polished in composition. I know that the hon. gentleman wishes to leave not only the impression in this House that he is an orator of the first water—if I can use such a term in this connection—but he wants to leave the impression upon the face of the *Hansard* that he is also a literary genius of the very highest order. As a matter of course every proof that the hon. gentleman receives of his speech is

emended, polished and gilded, shall, I say, until it will put Longfellow to the blush. I do not know that even Thackeray, in his most polished sentences, could place in type, in gold or metal, such classic, chaste and exquisite utterances as they fall from the pen of the hon. member for Niagara after he has delivered his speech. That is, of course, a liberty that few hon. gentlemen in this House take to the same extent which my hon. friend does. Speaking for myself, of course, I am full of weaknesses, and, like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, of grammatical errors. I sometimes have to plead guilty to faults of that kind, but there are no such errors in the speeches of the hon. member for Niagara, not after they appear in the *Hansard*, but of weaknesses as they fall from his eloquent tongue. Whatever lack of unity there may be in the structure of his sentences, or whatever want of force there may be in the adjectives with which he qualifies his statements, when these are all adjusted and readjusted, and put in the crucible of that brilliant intellect which is encased in the cranium of my hon. friend, they come forth chastened and refined, like gold the seventh time, and thus they appear in the *Hansard* with such force that, if the *Hansard* should be blotted out from the records of this House, or should disappear from the shelves of our libraries, it would be a greater loss to the world than the burning of the Alexandrian Library. I hope no such calamity will befall future generations. I hope no such calamity is in store for myself, for in my leisure hours, when I want to delight, as I sometimes do, in reading entertaining literature, I shall want to place my hand upon the volume containing the speeches of my hon. friend for Niagara where I shall find, upon all subjects interesting to humanity, everything that is pure, chaste, noble and refined. I shall be very sorry if the hon. gentleman's name should not appear on the pages of *Hansard*. However, in passing from the character of the hon. gentleman's speeches, I am afraid I shall not be able to make the same remarks as to the statement he has made in reference to the speech of the hon. member for Lambton. That hon. member charged the hon. member for Lambton with suppressing his speech. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. If the speech was suppressed the reporters suppressed it.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not say he suppressed it.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The hon. gentleman made that statement. I took it down, and he reiterated the statement.

Mr. PLUMB. No.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Unless it is expunged from *Hansard* it will appear as the statement of the hon. gentleman, who now wants to take it back. It is not true. The hon. member for Lambton said it was not true. I wish to repeat the denial in order that the hon. gentleman may be careful as to the accuracy of his statements in future. If the hon. member for Niagara would do what he charged the hon. member for Lambton with doing, it would be sometimes an advantage. Instead of suppressing an extract, the hon. gentleman, if I mistake not, inserts extracts in his speeches or enlarges extracts as compared with those delivered on the floor of the House.

Mr. PLUMB. It is not so.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). There was a certain speech delivered by the hon. member which was printed and circulated extensively over and above the edition we have in the form of the debates, in which extracts were inserted at much greater length than were any extracts read by the hon. gentleman on the floor of the House. I have a very distinct recollection of that fact; I hope I am not misrepresenting the hon. gentleman by stating what is my recollection of his speech. If that statement be accurate, I

think the hon. gentleman is much more to blame for inserting lengthy extracts in his speech than was the hon. member for Lambton in refusing to give quotations which he could not be expected to give, and which the reporters might have taken down themselves. The hon. gentleman claimed, in criticizing the hon. member for Lambton—and it is very kind on his part to notice us on this side of the House—that he (Mr. Plumb) occupied the position of an independent member. I never heard the hon. gentleman make that claim before. I do not think the claim is a good one. If I mistake not, the hon. gentleman moved a resolution the other night at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I may be mistaken, but I have an idea it was suggested by the hon. gentleman. I know his imagination is brilliant, but I do not think he is original, and that the idea of moving it would have entered his mind; as a matter of political tactics he could not have conceived it. So if my premises are correct, the hon. gentleman is scarcely an independent member. I think he was set up to do that work. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will rise and explain, and perhaps he will deny that statement; but I have another proof that the hon. gentleman is not an independent member. I remember last Session when the resolution was moved by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), in favor of machinery for the manufacture of beet-root being imported free, the hon. member for Niagara supported very strongly the resolution as being in the interests of the country, and of a very important industry; I remember with what eloquence he appealed to the House in behalf of a new and rising industry, the manufacture of beet-root sugar, and the matter was very well put, as is the hon. gentleman's practice. However, when the leader of the House came into his place and cracked his parliamentary whip, one of the most ready members to fall into line was the independent member for Niagara. The very resolution which he defended on the floor of the House with his usual eloquence he voted against, and if hon. members will look in the *Hansard*, that *repertoire* and depository of great sayings and of epigrammatic statements, they will find that the hon. gentlemen spoke on one side of the question and voted on the other. Of course, the hon. gentleman is an independent member; of course, he is so independent as to be perfectly justified in speaking on one side of a question and voting on the other. I am sorry to occupy the time of the House unnecessarily, but I could not refrain from following in the same merry mood that was adopted by the hon. member for Niagara. I hope in the future, when the hon. gentleman refers to members of the Opposition, he will be sufficiently considerate not to charge men with acts they have not committed.

Motion agreed to.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that he had received from the Returning Officer of the Electoral District of New Westminster a certificate that Joshua Attwood Reynolds Homer, Esq., had been duly elected to represent that district in this House.

The hon. member was introduced by SIR LEONARD TILLEY and SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that in admitting Joshua Attwood Reynolds Homer, Esq., to take his seat upon the certificate of the Returning Officer, this House still recommends a strict adherence to the principle of requiring the production of the usual certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, of the return of the writ of election.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

THE TEMPORALITIES FUND.

Mr. SHAW moved the third reading of Bill (No. 66) to amend the Act intituled: An Act to incorporate the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Acts amending the same. He said: Although this Bill has been discussed at considerable length in Committee, and has been before the House for some time, I find that in regard to it there seems to be some misapprehension respecting the facts. I shall, therefore, make a short statement of those facts without reference to the several provisions of the Bill. It is well known, I dare say, that this fund, which is in dispute, arose from the settlement of the Clergy Reserves in this country—a fund which at one time amounted to \$509,000—and that it was the property of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. After the Clergy Reserve Act was passed, on the 18th of December, 1854, by which the Government granted the money to the church, the Synod of that church met and determined that the fund should be commuted. The Government of that day had a provision in the Bill, permitting a commutation to be made by each clergyman, but they desired that that commutation should take place through the church, and not through the individual members. The Synod formed a basis on which the fund should be commuted, and appointed commissioners to take charge of the fund and administer it, as that could not be done by the church, because it was not a corporation, but a voluntary body. In order to carry out their views, an Act of the old Province of Canada, 22 Victoria, Chapter 66, was obtained, incorporating the Temporalities Board for the management of this fund, and that Board managed it for several years. Under the arrangement agreed upon among the clergymen entitled to a share of the fund, each received an annuity of \$450, those clergymen who became beneficiaries between the time of the passing of the Clergy Reserve Act and the time of the passing of the Act incorporating the Temporalities Board, that is, between 1853 and 1858, some eleven in number, received \$400 each; and those afterwards put on the roll received \$200 each. The original commuters, who received \$450 each, were seventy-three in number. Negotiations afterwards commenced amongst the several churches in favor of a union, and after Confederation of the Provinces, it was determined, if possible, to form a union of all the Presbyterian Churches in the Dominion. After a discussion of the subject for several years, the Synods of all the different churches finally resolved upon it. It was determined upon by a large majority of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and was agreed to by all the presbyteries of that church, with the exception of one in Nova Scotia; it was also agreed to by 140 out of 150 congregations of that church, so that it may almost be said to have been determined upon unanimously. It was known, however, that this fund, which was managed by a particular Board appointed in a particular way, could not be legally administered by a Board appointed by the new church without legislation, and, therefore, previous to the completion of the Union, application was made to the Province of Quebec in February, 1875, and to the Province of Ontario in December, 1874, for the necessary legislation; they believed that these were the proper bodies to whom to apply for such legislation. Under clause 92 of the British North America Act, relating to property and civil right, the legislation was obtained in both cases, and the Union was formed on the 15th of June following. I wish hon. members to bear this in mind—that they did not form a Union and afterwards apply for legislation to confirm it, but they applied for legislation first, and never would have gone into the Union

had they not obtained that legislation and, as they supposed, power to control that fund and to appoint the Board to administer it. They contended then, and they contend still, that the fund was carried into the Union by the Synod of that church, that they retained control of the fund, but they knew that they could not administer it, and that the new church could not appoint members to the Board, because that Board was formed under an Act of Parliament, and the fund had to be administered in a particular way; and the Privy Council, the highest Court in the empire, decided that the members of this Board appointed by the new church had no power to control the fund. They did not determine, however, to whom or to what church the fund belonged; they carefully excluded that point from their judgment. The judgment of the Privy Council states:

"The appellant also seeks to have it declared that six reverend gentlemen, who, at and prior to the Union of 1875, were members of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, have ceased to possess that character, and that they have no right to the benefits of the temporalities fund; and he concludes for an injunction against the respondent corporation making any payment to them. Their Lordships are of opinion that these are matters which cannot be competently decided in the present action. Their decision depends upon the answer to be given to the question, which church or aggregate of churches is now to be considered as being or representing the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, within the meaning of the Act 22 Victoria, Chapter 66."

It will be observed that the Privy Council did not determine that question. We contend that that fund went with the Synod, and that the Synod had control over it; and we say that that position is fortified by the Act 22 Victoria, Chapter 66, which constitutes that property the property of the church and not of private parties. The preamble of that Act states:

"Whereas it hath been represented to the Legislature of this Province, that it is desirable that provision should be made for the management and holding of certain funds of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, now held in trust by certain Commissioners, hereinafter named, on behalf of the said church, and for the benefit thereof—"

The enacting clause, after mentioning the names of the Commissioners appointed under the Act, provides:

"And they and their successors shall be able in law to take, have, and hold and enjoy, possess and retain, and shall henceforth have, hold, enjoy and possess, in trust for the said church, and for the aforesaid firstly hereinabove specified uses, all moneys, debentures, bonds, bank or other stock and securities, which are now held by the said hereinbefore named parties as trustees or commissioners of the said church, in trust for the said church."

We say, therefore, that that fund belonged to the church and that the Synod controlled it; we say further, that the amounts of stipend paid to the several clergymen are guaranteed by that Act, as well as by this Act which we have introduced; and it was upon the faith of these Acts that these parties went into the Union. At the end of seven years it is found, by the decision of the Privy Council, that the opinion formed at the time of the Union by the different Legislatures, as to the extent of their powers, was unfounded, and we have to accept the situation. We ask to have this Act of 1858, by which this fund was placed under the control of Commissioners, amended in the same way as it was asked to be amended by the Acts of the Legislature of Ontario, passed in 1874, and of Quebec in February, 1875. We say that it is fair to these parties that this should be done. We relied upon the action of these Legislatures, and the Board entered upon the administration of this fund, and have administered it ever since, in accordance with these several Acts. The faith of the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario are respectively pledged to that body to carry out these several Acts. Any deviation from that would be looked upon by that large body as having placed them in a very unfair position. The only objection that I have heard

used in regard to this is, that it trespasses upon private rights; but my view of that position is, that it is very different to interfere with the right of a private party to his own money, or his own land or goods, than to interfere with a fund which had been dedicated for specific purposes. This fund was not private property. It was handed over to a particular church, with the object, no doubt, of teaching a particular doctrine; and when that church, by change of opinion, or by desire to unite with other churches, does so, the trust is not placed in a position different from that originally intended. There is no difference in the doctrine of the different Presbyterian bodies, and the object of this fund was to promote the teaching of the doctrine expounded in those churches. If the position is so altered that those doctrines could not be properly taught unless this fund go in the direction of the vast majority, Parliament should intervene and see that the fund be not misappropriated; and if it were not applied to the purposes of that large body it would be destined to go in a direction not originally intended. We know that in any country where a fund is provided for a specific public purpose, Parliament may intervene to see that the original intention of the founder is carried out. We ask that, and we think the request is a fair one. They say this is a robbery and spoliation of the fund. These are very strong terms, and I most certainly regret that they should be used, because I think there was no attempt on the part of this large body to do anything but that which was fair and right towards the minority. The Bill goes far in that direction. It makes the annual stipends of these parties the first charge. If I am right in supposing that when the Synod went into the Union the property went into the Union, and that those who remained out had no title to the funds, and the fact that this Act provided that although they did remain out they should get their stipends, be protected in their rights, and have the first lien on the trust fund, sufficient is shown to prove there is no desire on the part of the majority to act unfairly by the minority. It is said the minority want a division of the fund. But the different commutators and beneficiaries have to be protected out of this fund. It is made a first lien. If a certain portion of the fund is handed over *en bloc* to the minority, that would be unfair to the majority. The latter could not use this in the way they would desire; they must use it, under the Act 22 Victoria, Chapter 66, for the purpose of paying the stipends of the original commutators, and subsequently the beneficiaries who were placed on that fund, and it would be unfair towards the majority to place the minority in a better position than the majority. On the other hand, it has been said the fund should be divided according to the numbers that were upon the roll in 1875 at the time of the Union.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Hear, hear.

Mr. SHAW. I hear the hon. member for Hastings say, "hear, hear." I hope he will listen to what I have to say in respect to this, and if he does I believe he will come to the conclusion that the position I take is the correct one. If the fund should be divided, as they desire, seven to twenty-seven, and if there were 73 when the fund was created, it would be unfair towards the twenty-seven. They seem to go upon the principle that those who survive are the heirs of those who died. We say that the church is the heir of those who died, and that the survivors have only a right to their life interest. Supposing that it was divided the other way, and, I think, all went in but seven, then it would be seven to seventy-three, and, divided in that proportion, would give them about \$32,000. Now, that would not pay the stipends of the seven commutators, and I do not believe they would consent to it, except, perhaps, one or two who would be willing to take a sum *en bloc*, and desire to cease connection with the

church. But the interest on \$32,000, capitalized at 6 per cent., would only be some \$300 each.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). You admit they are entitled to \$33,000.

Mr. SHAW. I do not; I have not admitted that at all. I am speaking of an argument that has been used in favor of a division. I say they are not entitled to anything; they are not entitled even to the stipend of \$450 a year, but the Bill provides they shall have it, that it shall be made the first lien upon the fund. Now, divide it according to churches, divide it according to congregations, and the same difficulty arises. We therefore say that the only fair way of treating these commuters is to provide for the payment of their salaries; in fact, place them in the position that they occupied before in regard to the fund. Now, we should give them representation upon the Board of Management; they are not entitled to that, but we concede it to them in order that there may be no complaint of hardship. Now, I have heard something about pending lawsuits in regard to the appointment of these Commissioners, and I understand a writ of *quo warranto* has been issued requiring the Board to show under what authority it administers this fund. We contend the United Church owns the fund, and as it is administered under an Act of Parliament by which the appointments are made in a particular way, appointments made in any other way cannot be legal, that is the reason we are here, so that so far as these suits are concerned they need not be taken into consideration. These two writs I understand were served before the beginning of the proceedings in this House, and I understand other actions have been commenced, but I do not think we should consider them after we have commenced legislation. Another objection is that it interferes with the property of private congregations throughout Ontario; that in cases where the church is conveyed by deed to certain trustees for the benefit of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, it may be difficult to decide to what church the property belongs. Now, I do not think there is any difficulty on that point. I believe the Ontario Act provides for cases of that kind; at all events this House has no power to legislate in that direction. That property belongs to congregations in Ontario, and any legislation that will affect their position must be obtained in that House. All we are doing here is to legislate in regard to that particular fund. The proposition we make in this Bill goes no further than that, it does not refer to any other property. Those difficulties may be overcome in the Legislatures of Ontario or Quebec, as the case may be; but I take it there is no power here to legislate respecting it. With these remarks I move the third reading of this Bill.

Mr. AMYOT (in French) moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend it—

1st. So as to give the petitioners a corporate or legal existence, and everything necessary thereto or resulting therefrom.

2nd. So as not to adjudicate in relation to the property in, or the administration of the fund claimed by the petitioners (the Temporalities Fund), and so as to leave to the tribunals of Justice duly constituted and competent in that behalf, the duty of declaring to whom the property and administration of the said fund belong.

Mr. Speaker, the motion which I have the honor to make, has been for me the subject of special study. We have before us a most important question which affects an amount exceeding \$500,000 and about 500,000 of our population. We are asked to decide once for all to whom is to belong the principal part of the property of an old established church. The speaker who preceded me, gave us the historical aspect of the question, but I do not intend to follow him in all these details. I think that the whole question can be summed up in a few words. There was a church styled

Mr. SHAW.

"The Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland." This church came into possession of property derived from the Crown. The clergy of this church were free to appropriate this property to itself, but instead of so doing, it resolved to leave this property forever in the hands of the church, for a special purpose, for determined objects. A kind of contract was entered into between the several parties constituting that church. Later, a part of that church—the majority, I must admit—expressed a wish to form a union with other churches; steps were taken, the question was gone into, and, finally, the Union was accomplished by the majority, but not with the unanimous consent of the church. The question then arose whether a majority that forms an alliance with, or a kind of coalition, or of union with other churches, can compel the minority to follow it, or whether, if the minority which remains firm and steady in its own church has the right to say to the majority: "Change if you will, but I remain as I am." The question, therefore, to be ascertained, is whether the majority, in thus withdrawing its allegiance from the Metropolitan church, can compel the minority to follow it. The question has come before the Local Legislatures under most extraordinary circumstances. At first an Act was entirely refused, owing to certain influences unknown to the public, but at last Acts of incorporation were granted. The minority was not prepared at once to give up its rights and claimed protection from the Courts of law. The case has gone through all the Courts. In the Court of Appeal of the Province of Quebec, two Judges expressed themselves as strongly as possible, and held that the majority, in consummating the Union, had not taken with it the property of the church, what is called the Temporalities Fund, but that, on the contrary, the minority which had remained intact and complete, had preserved its rights over the property. The matter was taken to England, and there it was decided that the laws passed by the Local Legislatures were unconstitutional. In deciding this question, the Privy Council took care to remark that it did not decide to whom belonged the property of that church. This is what it said:

"The appellant, in his application to the Court below, asks a declaration to the effect that the fund in question is held by the respondents 'in trust for the benefit of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and for the benefit of the ministers and missionaries who retain their connection therewith, and who have not ceased to be ministers thereof, and for no other purpose whatever.' It is obviously inexpedient to make any declaration of that kind. It would be a mere repetition of the language of the Act of 1858, by which the trust is regulated, and would decide nothing as between the parties to the present suit."

Consequently, the Privy Council declined to decide as to the property, but it tells us that the question is a judicial one, and that there will be cause for much litigation if the Federal Parliament does not interfere. The majority now comes to us and says: "The Privy Council has decided that legislation is necessary, so now it is your duty to give all to the majority." This is a strange interpretation. Has the minority not the right to come to this hon. House and say: "The Privy Council has decided that legislation is unnecessary, so now it is your duty to give all to the minority." And why should it not enjoy a like privilege. The majority having failed before the Privy Council, now comes before this Parliament and asks it to legislate. It says: "Give us a legal existence, give us the Temporalities Fund, and approve and confirm all that we have done since we have acted illegally." For my part I am not ready to pronounce on that point. I am not prepared to say whether the majority is right or wrong, nor am I ready to say whether the minority is. When we are sitting on Private Bills, we hold a legislative and at the same time a quasi-judicial position. Now, I will ask hon. members what information they are in possession of with regard to the past of these churches, to enable them to adjudicate on this

property which is worth half a million. Which of the hon. members of this House, even those who have followed the discussion in the Private Bills Committee, is now in possession of facts, of authenticated figures, concerning these churches which will enable him to render judgment in a judicial capacity and render a judgment worthy of a judge presiding over the tribunals of our country. Mr. Speaker, we are asked to use our power to take the property of the one and to declare that it belongs to the other. We are asked to do that which does not exclusively, but almost exclusively, belongs to the Courts of law. I am too great an admirer of constitutional and representative institutions to wish in any way to take from the rights and prerogatives of this Parliament. I admit that this Parliament, according to the expressed opinion on that very question, would have the right to abolish that which is noxious, and to create anew that which is in danger of perishing, to direct towards new ends that which time has rendered useless, and that notwithstanding the customs and the express desire of the founders who gave this property to that church. I admit that there are certain cases where Parliament should interfere, and on that point, I can refer to an author well-known to hon. members of this House. The author is one of the few who has treated that question. I quote *Amos' English Constitution*, 1880:

"It is scarcely possible to appreciate the new attitude which Parliament has assumed towards endowments and endowed institutions generally, without studying some of the deep-rooted objections or prejudices by which parliamentary activity in this matter has been hindered. These objections still exist in a weakened form in many respectable quarters; but the whole force of them can only be understood by attending to the grounds upon which any legislative interference whatever was resisted, at the time when the passing of the Reform Act of 1832 had prepared men's minds for novel and courageous experiments which at an early date would have seemed, even to the most sanguine minds, to be a hopeless kind.

"It was said generally, in answer to any scheme for amending endowments, that the existing law, as administered by the Court of Chancery and the Ecclesiastical Court, provided sufficiently against scandalous abuses, and against any signal departure from the original purpose of the trust as declared by its founder; that the intention of the founder, strictly interpreted in accordance with the current modes of legal interpretations, ought, if the national good faith were to be maintained in its integrity, always to prevail, in the face of any new aims or purposes which the requirements of the present age seem to suggest; that if its intention were liable to be over-ruled by legislative interference, all security for property itself was gone; and that the casual and temporary advantages, which might be purchased by a new adjustment of a trust, would be dearly paid for at the price of encouraging all endowments for the future, and of introducing an instability in the most solid parts of the framework of the nations which could not be regarded without serious apprehensions.

"These arguments were met, not by ignoring their reality, nor by denying their cogency within the area to which they truly applied; but it was said that there were large classes of endowed institutions, the abuses and corruption of which were wholly beyond the power of the existing law to reach. That the legal rules for interpreting the intention of founders, being applicable mainly to the actual language used in wills and deeds, were wholly inadequate to determine the real spirit and meaning of the foundation in a state of society which the founders could never have contemplated; and that without in the least degree weakening the confidence which future testators would have in their general designs being strictly complied with, it was yet within the power of legislative art to reconstruct all existing endowments, especially those of ancient date, in such a way as to maintain all that was most characteristic in the wishes of the founders, and at the same time to confer on the objects of their munificence a far higher advantage than had long been possible. The question thus ultimately turned on matters of fact—that is, on what were the kind and amount of abuses to be remedied, on the nature and limits of the remedies proposed, and on the instrumentality of which the Legislature could avail itself for the purpose in view. The answer to the question is contained in the history of the passing of the various measures of the present and preceding reigns, for the reform of (1) ecclesiastical and religious foundations, (2) educational institutions, (3) endowed charities, and (4) municipal corporations."

It will thus be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the English authors who discuss this question tell us that it is purely a question of fact. We must first consider the abuses to be repressed, and, secondly, the remedy which is proposed. Now, I will ask the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw), what are the abuses created by the minority in the present case? No abuse can be laid at the door of that minority, and there is

consequently no ground for asking the exercise of this violent, unusual, and I may say tyrannical means to ask the Legislature to take the property of the one to give it to the other. In a case where an abuse exists one may do so, but in the present case there is no abuse. It has been admitted before the Committee that the minority has contrived to exist in all its force, with all its convictions, and with all its guarantees of intelligence and instruction as in the past. Secondly, we are asked a remedy—a remedy to cure what? Is there anything wrong anywhere? I can understand that the majority, owing to its large number, may demand this property, but is that any reason for us to grant it to them? The minority remains; it constitutes the original church; it has ever continued holding its Synod; it has always been in possession of the property, and by virtue of what right does the majority come and say to us: "Give us this property. It is a most extraordinary request, and I do not find in this country a single precedent in favor of the majority; on the contrary, I find one in favor of the minority. I find, moreover, that the English authors who have written on the subject are unanimous in favor of possession by the minority, and with the kind permission of this House, I will quote *Innes' Law of Creeds in Scotland*:

"The Lord Justice-Clerk gave his opinion distinctly that, in the ordinary case of our church tenures, if one congregation of a church simply objects to its forming a union with another body, it is not bound to follow the church into that union under the penalty of losing its property. 'The right to refuse to submit to any such changed government, or to concur in any such union,' is, in his opinion, the leading and fundamental principle of all such associations, which he afterwards expresses as 'the desire to keep separate—to keep up a sect apart from all others.'

"Be the objection (to union) in the opinion of others valid or fanciful, it is a change to which no congregation is bound to submit. For separation, then, when such union is to be entered into, no reasons, in my opinion, need be assigned. The right to refuse is absolute; and the notion that the majority of the congregation 'is to forfeit their property is, in my judgment, perfectly extravagant.' These very strong statements are slightly qualified by the words that immediately follow; for his Lordship adds, that such an idea is 'extravagant,' and without the slightest support from any evidence that such is a condition of the trust. Indeed, I did not hear it maintained that obligation to unite with other sects was an original condition of this trust held for a congregation of seceders. It would be a very strange condition to incorporate with any trust for a congregation of old seceders. This shows us the exact position upon this point of the Lord Justice-Clerk. He held that an obligation to unite with a separate body was not an impossible thing, but extremely improbable—not to be presumed, but to be clearly proved—and that union might be resisted by a particular congregation, which would still retain its property unless it were specially averred and proved that it was bound by the trust of its title deeds to go into it. Lord Cockburn objected to this doctrine, and to the principle of separation on which it presumed churches to be founded, holding that union—that is, the extension of what it thinks right—seems a necessary principle with every rational religious society."

And further on he adds:

"It may be that these principles have been laid down not as rules imported into all possible church trusts, but merely as *presumptiones juris*; but they are laid down very strongly, and with great authority.

"And they have been since reasserted, enlarged, and acted upon in extreme cases. In the last important case on this branch of the law of trust, that of *Thurso (Cowper v. Burn)* in 1850, where two church bodies united—the 'United Associate Synod of Original Seceders' merging into the Free Church by a vote of majority—the congregation of the former body at *Thurso* joined the union, also by a majority. An action was brought by the minority of the congregation to have it declared that they were entitled to the property of the Chapel, notwithstanding their dissent from the majority of the Synod and from the majority of the congregation. In this, as in the *Kirkintilloch* case, in the chief stress was laid on the fact that the majority, by union, had departed from the original principles of the congregation, and that those adhering to these principles, whether majority or minority, were, as doing so, entitled to retain the property—a view confirmed by the Court in their decision. But Lord Wood, in delivering the unanimous judgment of the Court to this effect, founded it upon the views of Lord Justice-Clerk Hope in the *Kirkintilloch* case, and held that not only a proved departure from principles by the majority of the church, but their mere union with a body hitherto separate, even were its principles the same, was a thing to which no congregation was bound to submit, and against which even the majority of a congregation could successfully reclaim. After stating the question, he says, 'Had the pursuers here been a majority of the congregation, instead of a minority, a direct answer would, we apprehend, be afforded by the judgment in the case of *Craigie v. Marshall*.' But on principle the case is the same when only a minority reclaims. 'A resolution to form a union with a sepa-

rate body is not an act of management properly falling to be regulated by the voice of the majority of the congregation. It is one affecting and altering the use, possession and destination of the property of the body."

Mr. Speaker, the quotations I have made are as direct and to the point as can be; they are based on all English precedents, and they tell us that when a Protestant church abandons either its principles or its identity to ally itself with other churches—in other words, when it forsakes the principal body to become part of another church, it therefore loses its rights to the church property. That is exactly the present case. I have given you, Mr. Speaker, the English law, but we have also the Canadian law. We have numberless decisions in our own country. I will quote amongst others the case of the Attorney-General vs. Christie, reported in the 13th volume of Chancery Reports (Ontario), p. 495, where the following was decided:—

"Held by Vankoughnet that so long as one remained to claim the property on behalf of the Free Church that body could hold the property."

The same decision is given in the case of the Attorney-General vs. Jeffrey, reported in the 10th vol. Chancery Reports (Ontario). Thus, according to the law such as it exists at present, such as it has been established by various precedents in the country, such as it has been applied by the Privy Council in its last decision to which I have referred, we can affirm that the property in question belongs to the minority which has never forfeited its rights to it. The minority has ever remained at its post, having in its favor all the rights that its past has given it, the statutes of the country, the union that exists between the members of that church, in a word, all that constitutes the code of legislation applicable to that church: and what are we asked to do now? We are told, notwithstanding this legislation, notwithstanding precedents, notwithstanding law, notwithstanding the unceasing claims put forward by the minority, you must take away its rights from it, as there are numbers on our side, and give them blindly to the majority. Well, for myself, I am not prepared to do it without having previously made a legal study of the question. I am not ready to vote to give to one what is ostensibly the property of another. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a far more important reason, if possible, which should prevent our voting in favor of that measure. It is a principle recognized by all Constitutional Governments—that a Government must never interfere with private affairs when there is litigation going on about them. Now, in the present case, the rights on which we wish to legislate are before the Courts, which are going to be called upon to give a decision, and it would be iniquitous on our part, it would certainly not be understanding the onus of our duties and of our responsibility, to interfere nevertheless and settle in advance these suits by a hasty legislation, when, so to say, we are not cognizant of the respective rights of the parties, when it has been quite impossible for us to study these rights. I will quote, with regard to the obligation under which Governments lie not to interfere when there is litigation going on, an author well known to this honorable House, Todd, page 282. In the foot note to this page he refers us to a large number of English precedents. I have myself referred to those precedents, and they all unanimously show that each time that a question has been brought before the United Parliament, and that it has been discovered that it was being submitted to Courts of law, Parliament has at once declined to take cognizance of it in any shape or form. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that it would be spoliation to give that property to either one side or the other. When the minority says: "If you take this property from us it will be spoliation," the majority cries out loudly; and when the majority says the same thing, the minority acts likewise. Well, as they cannot come to an understanding, let us leave the question

Mr. AMYOT.

to be decided by competent tribunals; the parties have existed six or seven years without the interference of Parliament, and I think that in the present state of things they can still exist for a couple of years. Let us leave to the Courts of law to decide to whom this property belongs, and then we shall be certain that Parliament has not committed any injustice.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. I think it is desirable I should say a few words in English on this subject. There are many reasons why this House should hesitate before granting the petitioners who have presented this Bill the power asked for. We are asked first to incorporate the Board of management of that church. For my part I have no objection to the legal existence of that or any other church; although I do not belong to that church, I have the greatest respect for all Presbyterian churches, and I think if any of them should come before Parliament and seek incorporation it should receive from Parliament legal existence. But the Bill goes a step further. It asks not only for legal existence on behalf of the church, but that Parliament should ratify all the acts of the United Church in relation to the Temporalities Fund, and that the United Church should take the whole fund into its possession. I ask the hon. members what they know about the management of that fund? In the judgment given by the Privy Council, it was expressly stated that the moneys of the fund should not be applied to pay expenses of law costs. Do hon. members know, for they have not a balance sheet before them, whether something has not been paid for law costs out of this fund. The House does not know in regard to costs paid, and, indeed, knows nothing in regard to the administration of the fund; nevertheless, the House is asked to ratify that administration. In the second place, the House is asked to give to the United Church all the property that formerly belonged to the Temporalities Fund. It is asked to do that not only in its legal capacity, but as exercising judicial power. If any law Courts were asked to decide on the same question, a decision would not be rendered until after witnesses had been heard, the law in Scotland and England examined, and the authorities investigated; but this House is called upon to decide this question in one or two evenings. The House is supposed to be able to adjudicate on that important question without any study or special knowledge of the question. Because there is a majority on one side we are called upon to apply this wrong and false principle that a majority is always right whenever private rights are concerned? I say the property belongs either to the United Church or it does not. If it belongs to the United Church, I do not see why that church should come before Parliament and ask it to give the church that property; and if it does not belong to that church, what right has Parliament to give it to that church? Parliament has undoubtedly the right to legislate on that subject, and, I admit, circumstances might occur where Parliament might interfere. Those circumstances are set forth by a writer, whom I have consulted, who says Parliaments have power of:

"Abolishing what is noxious, recreating what is perishable, and directing to novel ends what time has rendered obsolete in its older shape in the very face of customs however tenacious, and of the express language of founders however emphatic."

That I admit; but is it any reason why Parliament should interfere under all circumstances? Is it any reason why Parliament should in every case deprive one party of its property, and give it to another? Is it because we are asked to do it that we are bound to do it, or that we will do it in every instance when asked? To-day we are asked to do so by one church, to-morrow we may be asked to do so

by another church, the next day by another institution, and when once this wrong principle is established and pursued, we do not know what will be the consequences. We notice, too, that the general principle is that when Parliament uses its strength to commit an act of injustice, it is very apt to prove an act of suicide. This is not the first time that questions of this sort have arisen in Parliament. They have arisen in England and Scotland; discussions have taken place and decisions have been arrived at. I take the liberty of reading from *Amos' English Constitution* :

"It is scarcely possible to appreciate the new attitude which Parliament has assumed towards endowments and endowed institutions generally, without studying some of the deep-rooted objections or prejudices by which parliamentary activity in this matter has been hindered. These objections still exist in a weakened form in many respectable quarters; but the whole force of them can only be understood by attending to the grounds upon which any legislative interference whatever was resisted, at the time when the passing of the Reform Act of 1832 had prepared men's minds for novel and courageous experiments which at an early date would have seemed, even to the most sanguine minds, to be a hopeless kind.

"It was said generally, in answer to any scheme for amending endowments, that the existing law, as administered by the Court of Chancery and the Ecclesiastical Court, provided sufficiently against scandalous abuses, and against any signal departure from the original purpose of the trust as declared by its founder; that the intention of the founder, strictly interpreted in accordance with the current modes of legal interpretations, ought, if the national good faith were to be maintained in its integrity, always to prevail, in the face of any new aims or purposes which the requirements of the present age seen to suggest; that if its intention were liable to be overruled by legislative interference all security for property itself was gone; and that the casual and temporary advantages, which might be purchased by a new adjustment of a trust, would be dearly paid for at the price of encouraging all endowments for the future, and of introducing an instability in the most solid parts of the framework of the nations which could not be regarded without serious apprehensions.

"These arguments were met, not by ignoring their reality, nor by denying their cogency within the area to which they truly applied; but it was said that there were large classes of endowed institutions, the abuses and corruption of which were wholly beyond the power of the existing law to reach. That the legal rules for interpreting the intention of founders, being applicable mainly to the actual language used in wills and deeds, were wholly inadequate to determine the real spirit and meaning of the foundation in a state of society which the founders could never have contemplated; and that without in the least degree weakening the confidence which future testators would have in their general designs being strictly complied with, it was yet within the power of legislative art to reconstruct all existing endowments, especially those of ancient date, in such a way as to maintain all that was most characteristic in the wishes of the founders, and at the same time to confer on the objects of their munificence a far higher advantage than had long been possible. The question thus ultimately turned on matters of fact—that is, on what were the kind and amount of abuses to be remedied, on the nature and limits of the remedies proposed, and on the instrumentality of the Legislature could avail itself for the purpose in view. The answer to the question is contained in the history of the passing of the various measures of the present and preceding reigns, for the reform of 1) ecclesiastical and religious foundations, (2) educational institutions, (3) endowed charities, and (4) municipal corporations."

This is an important point as showing that the Legislature should only interfere when there is abuse or corruption—or when there is no way of applying to any one the funds that may have been held by a church. In England, Parliament has appointed Commissioners to decide all these questions. Here, we are called upon to decide the matter immediately in spite of all the claims of the minority of the old church. I shall read from a very high authority in England to show that it has been held over and over again that the majority has no right to carry the minority with it, and that the minority has a right to resist if it wishes, and that the church remains with the minority. The Lord Justice Clark said :

"He held that an obligation to Union with a separate body was not an impossible thing, but extremely possible—not to be presumed, but to be proved—and that Union might be resisted by a particular congregation, which would still retain its property, unless it was specially averred and proved that it was bound by the trust of its title-deeds to go into it. Lord Cockburn objected to this doctrine, and to the principle of separation, of which it presumed churches to be founded, holding that 'Union—that is, the extension of what it thinks right—seems a necessary principle with every rational religious society.'

In the present case, so far from having agreed to any such Union, the express understanding of that church—its funda-

mental principle at the very beginning, was the very reverse, for it was applied constantly to that old church, and nobody else. But I hear it stated very often that, when the majority of the three churches entered the Union, they did not change their faith. That is no justification according to the Judges I quote :

"According to the obvious spirit of the kirkintilloch principle, the like circumstances and reasons which are of sufficient potency to entitle an adhering and resisting majority to refuse to join a minority in a union with another religious body, without its being necessary to establish that the minority by the union would be departing from original principles, must also be available to an adhering and resisting minority."

That is the law as stated by our best authorities, and the law cannot be changed by a majority of a church. Whenever the minority remains, the church remains, and the funds remain with that minority; and to act contrary to that principle would be the mere crushing of a minority by force, would be a violation of the law, and would be tyranny

"We therefore hold that the principles and views recognized in *Craigie vs. Marshall* are sound in themselves, and, when duly followed out, legitimately lead to the same result where it is a minority of the congregation that refuse to unite, and thereby sink their distinctive name and testimonies, and their very existence, in a separate sect, which was arrived at when it was the majority that did so. Yet, upon the principles already quoted, and more fully detailed in the appendix to this charter, it should seem that a single individual in any dissenting congregation in Scotland may prevent that congregation from joining in a union with another church whose principles are alleged and not denied to be identical with its own—that, in short, not only unity of principle, but unanimity of individuals is required before any such union can take place, or at least, before it can take place without forfeiture of property."

There could be no stronger legal authority applicable to this case than these citations. Must we endorse the course of a majority which says: "Let us crush the minority; we do not care about the laws of the country, nor for the authors who have written on this subject, nor for the decisions of the Courts, nor for acquired rights—we want to have peace." It is very easy to have peace on this principle. Here are two contending parties, the majority and the minority. Say to the majority: "Take the whole," and you will have peace. Is that the way we should use the powers entrusted to us? I think not. For my part, if I were to use my vote to give to the majority or minority what does not belong to the one or the other, I think I would be betraying my trust as a member of this House. The minority could not, under the law, have been forced into the Union. The following are the general principles as laid down in "*Innes' Law of Creeds in Scotland*":

"(1.) That in the ordinary cases the trust is a trust for the congregation.

"(2.) That therefore the destination and use of the property must be regarded by the principles of the congregation—not of the ecclesiastical body with which it is connected.

"(3.) That when the church, or general ecclesiastical body, changes its principles, it cannot compel the congregation to go along with it.

"(4.) That when the church, without changing its principles, merges its separate identity by union with another body, it cannot compel the congregation to go along with it.

"(5.) That not only a majority, but even a minority of the congregation has a right to vindicate the congregational property in the two cases last mentioned. The minority of the congregation may demand the property in the event of the majority acquiescing in the departure of the whole church from (1) its principles, or (2) its separate identity."

In the present case, the Union or the majority have merged their identity with the other churches. What I have quoted is taken from the decisions in the highest Courts of England, and I am sure any one who will take the trouble to look at them will be convinced that, under the law, the minority could not be forced into the Union. The minority have always existed, they have always been going on with the organization of their church, and have still the same legal existence as they had then. I find that whenever any question of this kind came before a legal tribunal the decision invariably was in favor of the principles I have just expounded. I will

call the attention of the House to the opinion of two hon. judges of the Quebec Court of Appeals, Mr. Justice Ramsay and Mr. Justice Tessier. They held that the Appellant was entitled to an injunction on the ground that the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 64 was invalid, and that the majority of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland had no power to communicate any interest in the Temporalities Fund of that church to the religious bodies with whom they had chosen to unite themselves in 1875. It had been often decided that a majority could not force a minority, and in this instance two of the most learned and respected Judges of the Province of Quebec were emphatically of the opinion, after having carefully studied the question, that the majority could not claim this Temporalities Fund. But we hear this great argument that the Local Legislatures have passed certain laws, and that if those laws had not been passed, these churches would not have joined the Union. I have too great respect for the majority to believe, for one moment, that they joined the Union for the sake of the Temporalities Fund. I presume they had a higher object in view than that. Why should they not join the Union? The Court did not hold that the Union was bad. It may be for the interest of the church and for the enlightenment of the country, but that is not the question. The question is: to whom does the Temporalities Fund belong. The Privy Council have decided that the law passed is of no value. We are just in the same position as if no law had been passed. If those who went into the Union find their course was not a proper one, they may withdraw from it. But the minority say: "We give you all possible liberty, but give us also the same liberty." They say to the Unionists: "Join any church you like, but leave us our church." I do not see what obligation this Parliament is under to commit an injustice, because a blunder or an unconstitutionality has been committed. If the Unionists have suffered harm through the action of the Local Legislatures, they can apply to those Legislatures for redress. I am sure the minority would not hold the Union responsible for any expense incurred when they were of opinion that the Acts of the Legislature were valid. The question is, does the fund belong to the majority or the minority? I find, on the one side, that all the authorities are in favor of the minority, and that none are in favor of the Union. We are asked, in spite of that, to give what belong to the minority to the majority. We should not do that. We should give these parties a legal existence and then let them fight out the battle before the proper tribunal. It is not our duty to shoulder the immense responsibility of deciding to whom this fund belongs. There is another reason: that of public decency. The whole question is now before the tribunals of the country, and it is a well settled principle in England that Parliament must never interfere to decide questions that are before the Court. This is a question of private rights in which the public interest is not concerned in a general point of view. It would not be right to use our strength and power in such a way that we would be in danger of committing an injustice, and, secondly, we ought not to take this question away from the tribunals of this country. So, Mr. Speaker, in *résumé*, I would say this: I believe that we are not sufficiently informed to enable us to pronounce a verdict that would be good in a Court of law, and we cannot properly vote upon this Bill, granting this property to the one or the other party, without being possessed of such information, not only on points of facts but also on points of law. We have not before us all the necessary statements for giving an impartial verdict according to the law and evidence; and, secondly, we have nothing with which to reproach the minority. There is no reason why we should interfere against the rights of this minority with the view of taking from them by force this fund which probably belongs to that minority and to the old church

Mr. Ayrton.

which still exists. Thirdly, we should not legislate in such a way as to interfere with private rights; we should not legislate against the whole tenor of the legislation of this country, and contrary to the whole tenor of the courts of justice, nor should we take away from the consideration of the courts of justice a question which has been properly laid before them. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of proposing the amendment which I have placed before the House.

Mr. HAGGART. As a member for a constituency in which there is a large Presbyterian vote, and as a Presbyterian myself, I wish, before I vote, to give my reasons for so doing, on the extraordinary Bill—for certainly it is of an extraordinary nature—which is under the consideration of this House at the present moment. This Bill purports to be an Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and Acts amending the same. Now, in order to obtain the full consideration of this Bill, and in order to understand the subject, it will be proper for me to explain, Mr. Speaker, on what principle this fund was formed. It was founded by a number of ministers about the year 1854 belonging to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, who were entitled to receive from the Clergy Reserves a sum of money amounting to between \$8,000 and \$10,000 each, with which they decided to make a permanent endowment trust fund, which was managed by a board incorporated in the year 1858, by an Act of the Parliament of the Provinces of Canada. The interest and revenue of the trust so consolidated were to be employed first in the payment of the commuting ministers' £112 10s. per year, and then for aiding the missions of the church and for purposes therein mentioned, but under no circumstances was the principal of the fund to be entrenched upon. The interest and revenues were solely and only to be used to pay the commutators a certain amount per year, and for the other purposes specified, and if the interest and revenue derived from the fund were not sufficient to pay the commutators, they were obliged to take a reduced amount. The evident intention of these ministers was to form an endowment in perpetuity, which, with bequests from different Presbyterians throughout the country, would constitute a fund which would furnish salaries for the ministers of the church for all time to come. Now, what does this Bill propose to do? It proposes to legalize the acts of parties who had charge of this trust who entrenched upon it or applied it to different purposes from those for which the trustees intended it. The amount of this fund when the Act of 1858 was passed, was \$508,000, while on the 1st of May, 1881, it was reduced to \$332,000, showing a loss of \$175,807. This loss was not only due to investments, which turned out unfortunately, but cash was actually drawn from it to the extent of nearly \$60,000 between the years 1875 and 1881, and we are asked by this Act to legalize this illegal management, and to apply this trust to purposes which are entirely different from those of which the original parties intended. What does this Act contemplate? First, payment to a number of ministers \$150, \$400, and \$200 respectively during their life-time and good-standing in the church; and second, to the annual payment of \$2,000 in perpetuity to the Treasurer of Queen's College, for the use and benefit of such college, and this is an added amount which was not in the original Trust Act of 1858. There were several ministers—four I think—who were professors of Queen's College, and who were entitled to \$1,950, but instead of taking this sum from the fund, an arrangement was made with the Synod, according to which the College received \$2,000, and the ministers gave up the amount to which they were entitled from this fund. They have now been reinstated as participators in the fund and the College retains its grant. It provides the payment of \$200 to all

ministers on the Synod roll and to all recognized probationers and licentiates engaged in active service at the time of Union, during their lifetime and good standing in the church, and all salaries of \$200 are to be increased to \$400, and they shall also be entitled to the same when they have retired with the consent of the church from the active duties of the ministry. It is also provided that the Temporalities Board shall, if necessary, draw upon the capital of the fund, in order to meet the aforesaid requirements. This is another proposition directly contrary to the objects of the original trust as created conferring the power of payment of these certain sums to these different beneficiaries and of trenching upon the capital. Now, let us see what effect this will have on the fund. According to the amount returned in the report which was presented to the Committee, the other day, on the 1st May, 1831, it was reduced to \$332,192, and the total yearly expenditure from the fund, according to the report, of \$28,727. The total income of the fund from all sources was, per same report, \$20,139, showing a deficiency in the income necessary to meet the expenditure of \$8,588 yearly. But what does this Bill propose to do? To recognize the following annual payment as vested rights: to twenty-nine commuting ministers, \$450 each, \$13,050; to thirteen privileged and retired ministers, \$400 each, \$5,200; to ninety-two non-privileged \$200 each, \$18,400, or in all \$36,650; and to meet these annual payments the income derived from this fund, according to the report, independent of the amount due to Queen's College—which may be withdrawn and capitalized—as I have already stated was \$20,139, consequently the deficiency which is to be drawn from the capital under this Act is for each year \$16,510, which will dissipate the fund in a few years, and leave the original commutators without any security that they will be properly provided for or paid. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have shown what the effect of this Act upon this fund will be. It has been argued that this fund passed over with the Synod to the United Church. But the Synod of the church has no right to legislate or act in any such manner for the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, this is forbidden by the Confession of faith, they have nothing whatever to do with the practical affairs of the church. So much is this the case that they could not receive the fund which was provided for under this Act. In 1834, Sir John Colborne, the Governor, desired to throw the responsibility of appropriating all salaries from the Clergy Reserves in the Synod, but the Synod remonstrated, and submitted that it was purely a spiritual body, and must decline the distribution among its members of any bounty which the Government might be pleased to confer, and which ought to be managed by the Government itself, as heretofore, or by lay Commissioners appointed for that purpose. Again, in 1837, they sent to the Government a refusal to the same effect, and Commissioners were appointed to receive the fund. The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the church of Scotland is purely a spiritual Court. It is said that this church went into the Union. But whose opinion are we to accept as to the going into the union of this church. The question has been tried in several Courts of this country. It was heard in the case of McPherson vs. McKay, before Judge Moss. It was appealed to the full Court which decided that the present parties, who are protesting against the present proposed legislation, are the parties who belong to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. There can be no doubt about it,—that although a small minority, if they were left to carry on the case before the Courts and tribunals of the country, it would be decided that they would be entitled to the whole of this trust, and their repre-

sentatives to its management, the trust being solely and only for the Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is any legal doubt about this, or that any legal gentleman in this House who will say that this fund passed over with the majority when they decided to enter the Union; the Courts have decided that there is no identity, and that the very fact of a large and respectable minority having refused to enter into the Union shows that they differed, and, according to the quotation of my hon. friend the member for Bellechasse, from the laws and creeds of the Church of Scotland, the Lord Justice Clerk lays down: "The right to refuse to submit to any such changed Government or to concur in any such Union" is, in his opinion, the leading and fundamental principle of all such associations, which afterwards expresses as "the desire to keep separate, to keep up one section apart from all others." "For separation, then, when such Union is to be entered into, no reason, in my opinion, need be assigned." And afterwards the report says:

"Lord Wood, in delivering the unanimous judgment of the court, founded it upon the views of Lord Chief Justice Hope in the Kirkcilloch case, and held that, not only a proved departure from principles by the majority of the church, but their mere union with a body hitherto separate, even were its principles the same, was a thing to which no congregation was bound to submit, and against which even the minority of a congregation could successfully reclaim."

And, further, in the principles laid down in future for the government of these questions, as an absolute rule, it is stated:

"That not only a majority, but even a minority of the congregation has a right to vindicate the congregational property in the two cases last mentioned. The minority of the congregation may demand the property in the event of the majority acquiescing in the departure of the whole church from (1) its principles, or (2) its separate identity."

It is not at all necessary to prove a change of doctrine between the two parties, the simple fact that one church has joined another is sufficient to change its identity. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who thought that a compromise would be arrived at between the different parties to this legislation. I believed that these difficulties ought to be settled outside of this Parliament. I know that there is no Presbyterian—I believe at all events that there is hardly a Presbyterian throughout Canada—who would not prefer that it should be settled, and there is not one of them but acknowledges that although this minority did not go into the Union, it at least is entitled to a fair share of this fund and they object to this holding out for the extreme rights of parties to the contest, and I venture to say that notwithstanding what certain parties who choose to consider themselves as representing the Presbyterian body may say, no minister of the Presbyterian Church has the right to speak of anything except of things spiritual, and he is doing what the church does not authorize him to do when he interferes with the financial affairs of the church. But every layman has the right to speak of these principles, and to speak more freely than any minister; and I will venture to say that all the Presbyterian electors throughout Canada want to have a fair and equitable distribution of the fund. They have no desire that the one body should have the whole fund; and any minister who comes here and asserts anything to the contrary, I venture to affirm would not be sustained in any such preposterous or monstrous doctrine by any body of Presbyterian electors throughout the country. The minority have the right to hold their own opinions. The difference between the two bodies in point of doctrine may, perhaps, not be distinguishable, but they honestly believe there is a difference of doctrine. They believe that the old church holds different principles from the new church. They may be mistaken. I myself was favorable to Union, and would like still to see all the Presbyterian bodies united in one; but when one party

refuses to enter the Union, and believes honestly that there is a different doctrine involved, I do not believe that the majority should have the power to say: "If you do not follow the majority all the funds to which the original church was entitled shall follow the majority into the Union." I do not believe that is according to the first principles of religion. They are not honest men who come here to take the funds of that minority. Those men in equity are as much entitled to their share as the majority are. They are as much entitled to their opinion as the majority are, and I do not think this Legislature has any right to interfere; but if it does I hope that there is some power superior to this that will see that minorities are protected in their rights, that private individual's rights are not interfered with, and that where a trust is solemnly accorded the majority cannot come and overawe the House by telling us that there are a certain number of electors throughout the country, and that these electors are anxious the whole fund should go to one particular church, and those who support that principle will receive their support at the next election. My countrymen are not such. They will do right. They will ascertain, what is just, and they will support the right, and they will say that no person, for the purpose of enriching a church, shall do wrong to a minority. I hope that this House will see that there is a provision in the bill by which the rights of the minority shall be respected, and that any legislation that passes this House will secure to the minority their rights. I have been home to my county and have asked the Presbyterians belonging to the Union church about this matter, and they all stated that in equity and justice the fund should be divided between them; they The seven or eight commuting ministers in the minority paid a large sum of money out of their own pockets for the purpose of constituting this fund, the first charge upon which was to be the payment of their own salaries, and surely they have a right to control some portion of the fund. I believe the principle of the amendment which the hon. gentleman has introduced will cover the case. Give both of them legislation in order that they may hold their own funds, and if they cannot come to an agreement to divide that fund equitably between them let this Parliament distribute it equitably, and the only way of doing so is to distribute it according to the numbers belonging to the different congregations.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not propose entering into a full description of this subject, but I feel it right to say a few words on that special amendment. I think I ought to begin by expressing, on behalf of the Presbyterian body in connection with the Church of Scotland, their thanks to the hon. member who has moved this amendment, for the great industry with which he has devoted himself to this subject, and in which he has no personal interest, not belonging to that faith, and more especially as he tells us there are no Presbyterians in his county. I think every man ought to feel that there is a large and important principle of legislation involved in this Bill before the House, and that before we take upon ourselves the functions of Courts of Justice, we ought to pause and consider what we are doing. This is a case of such overwhelming importance that the ordinary tribunals for the administration of justice are alone competent to dispose of it. I think the latter part of the amendment my hon. friend has proposed strikes the proper key-note to this discussion at the present time when he moves that our legislation ought to be such as not to adjudicate in relation to the property nor the administration of the fund claimed by the petitioners, meaning the Temporalities Fund, but to leave to the tribunals of justice, duly constituted, the duty of declaring to whom the proper administration of said funds belong. Well, I had occasion

Mr. HAGGART.

to address the House the other day on this subject, and, perhaps, in too forcible terms, entered an energetic protest against this House constituting itself a court of law for the administration of justice. I feel that no more dangerous principle can be introduced than that whenever a dispute arises between parties as to the ownership of property they should come here to Parliament and seek by the influence of power over the majority to get Parliament to settle to whom the fund or the property belongs. I say, with all confidence in the prudence, honesty and good sense of Parliament, and I am only expressing the sober opinion of every hon. member of this House, that this Parliament is not the proper tribunal for adjudication upon legal or equitable rights. It is not for us to decide whether the fund or property belongs to one or to the other; we are not able to approach the subject in that dispassionate manner in which the Courts of Justice do; we have not the machinery for eliciting evidence and thoroughly investigating the question, and if we are to become the supreme judges of the country, as well as the law-makers, we shall be travelling out of our proper functions and introducing danger and uncertainty in the tenure of property and in the enjoyment of civil rights and property throughout the Dominion. I feel it is my duty to enter a solemn protest against Parliament assuming any such functions as are sought to invest it with in this particular case. My hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) has told us, just now, that the litigation which is going on on this question is unimportant. He is entirely mistaken in that statement. There are suits now pending which were brought last fall, in the month of October, before the judgment of the Privy Council was rendered, in which the vital point in issue is before the Courts for adjudication, suits that were brought in the city of Montreal to decide who were the proper administrators of this fund. At the session of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, held last summer, that body elected trustees who, under the terms of the Act of 1858, for the continuation of the old church, is the correctly and legally authorized body of trustees to administer that fund. They have commenced a suit in the nature of a *quo warranto* in order to have it declared that they are the administrators of this fund, and that the present trustees elected by the United Church have no right to meddle with it. Now, if the Privy Council have decided that point, they have decided that the trustees elected by the United Church since the Union have no right to interfere with nor manage this fund, and they granted an injunction to restrain them from doing so, but they did not decide the other point as to whether the trustees elected by the old church were the proper parties, because that point was not brought before them. Since the case was before the Privy Council the necessary steps were taken to elect a board which are the representatives duly elected by the old church to administer this fund. Now the whole question of the ownership of that fund necessarily comes up for decision in that case. It also involves the necessity of a decision by a Judge of the broad question as to whether the old church is the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland now, or whether that body is merged in the Union Church. While this question is fairly and squarely raised Parliament is asked to step in and say the Courts have no power and no ability, and are not competent to decide this question; but we, Parliament, by our prerogative right, and by our mighty hand, will settle it, and say which is the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland, whether that church went into the Union or not, and who were the duly elected trustees to whom the fund belongs; in a word, we will take the case out of the Courts and decide it ourselves. I ask every hon. member if he feels himself as competent, or the House, as a body, as competent to decide that question

as the legally constituted Courts of the country? Hon. members should, moreover, remember that this question does not concern only the interests of the Presbyterian churches but that it may come home to themselves at any time. The Church of England is divided into two parties, the High and Low Church; far more apart in opinions and doctrines probably than any two sections of the Presbyterian Church. Suppose a disruption should occur in that church, and it has been very near disruption on many occasions, and the majority belonging to the High Church chose to say that their opinions, their ceremonies and their ritual are more in accordance, or are so nearly in accordance with those of the Church of Rome we will join it; that the old differences of the time of the Reformation should be put aside, and they would unite in Christian harmony and go back to the old faith and church, would the minority, the Low Church, think it right and proper for Parliament to step in and say the majority of the Church of England has chosen to say it was so near in accord as to the doctrines, ritual and ceremonies with the Church of Rome that there was no reason why they should not unite and make a large and harmonious Christian body, and at the same time they should have the right to take with them all the endowments and property of the Church of England. Does the House think that minority, supposing the minority was the Low Church, would acquiesce or Parliament would be justified in saying: "Take away all the property of the Low Church and hand it over to the Church of Rome, because the majority of the Church of England have thought fit to join the Church of Rome." Or just a converse case. Suppose the Low Church comprised a majority in the Church of England, and decided they would join the Methodist or Reformed Episcopal Churches, and take with them all the property and call it the United Protestant Church or some other suitable name, what would the High Church Party say? Would they not be right in declaring that the proposal would be one which would destroy the very existence of the Church of England by merging it in the Reformed Episcopal Church or uniting it with the Methodist or any other sect with which it has no allegiance? But that is exactly the principle in the present Bill. The principle asserted is that a majority can control the very existence of a church, and because the majority agree they should be united with another church they have the right to take all the property and leave the minority stripped of everything. It seems monstrous for Parliament to be asked to step in and say that it will decide this question and not leave it to the Courts to say whether the property belongs to the larger or the smaller body, or whether it is so edged round with trusts imposed upon it dedicating it for the use and purposes of a particular church, that the Union should continue, and that the majority should not have the power to destroy its existence and wipe out the name of the church with which it was connected. That is the whole proposition. The minority are attached to the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland, it was their church, the church in which they were born and brought up, and they objected to having it destroyed. They objected to its Union with the Free Church and with parties with whom they had religious differences, though they had not of creed yet certainly they had of doctrine in many respects.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Tell us one.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). A most vital difference existed upon this very important subject of the connection of the Church with the State, one holding the doctrine that the State, as represented by the Crown, was paramount. The other holding that there should be no connection whatever between Church and State. It was proposed to destroy the name of the old church, to form a union with an overwhelming majority, about five-sixths of the body, with

which they had never before been connected; they said that although they entered the Union a miserable minority yet still they had the right to take with them all the property and endowments of the Church of Scotland. However, to confine myself to this particular amendment before the House, I venture to say that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has simply done his duty as one who has contended that Parliament should keep within its proper functions, and in expressing the hope that this House will pause before assuming to itself the functions of judge and jury, and deciding whether property belonged to this man or that man, to this church or that church.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was quite surprised to hear the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) commend the amendment now before the House. It is a motion to perpetuate litigation, and to set at defiance the right of the majority. It is a motion which, if adopted, would introduce discord over the whole country; and I have no sympathy with the hon. gentleman when he says this House is not competent to pronounce an opinion on a matter of this kind. The hon. member for Perth declared that none of the clergy had any right to express opinions on this matter of the Temporalities Fund, and now the hon. member for Victoria declares this House has no right to express an opinion. Who then are to express opinions on the question; who should deal with it but Parliament? The church has applied to it because it was found that the legislation obtained from the Local Legislatures had not been enacted in accordance with the Constitution. We are only called upon to give effect to what was agreed to by all parties some years ago. What was the position prior to this Union? In 1844 a large portion of the Presbyterian Church seceded, or rather the majority formed a new church in connection with the Free Church; if there was any connection with the Free Church or the Established Church, it was a mere myth and nothing more. In 1875 it was found desirable by all parties in the two branches of the church that they should unite. It is one of the pleasing features of Christianity, seen in all the Provinces during the last few years, that there has been a desire for union among Christians of various denominations. The Methodists have generally united, the Presbyterians have generally united, and I have no doubt the operations of the churches will be greatly strengthened and benefitted by the union of the different sects, holding no differences of opinion of any material consequence. The hon. gentleman who spoke last declared that there were vital points of difference between what he calls the Free Church and the Established Church sections of the Presbyterian Church. I called upon him to name one single doctrine to which they disagreed, for there is none that I am aware of—none that I ever heard alleged. As to the mere question as to whether it is wise or not to have church establishments, that is an abstract doctrine of little consequence nowadays in Canada or Scotland either, because here there can be no Established Church and in Scotland there will be none in a short time, more than in Canada, and I think within the lives of many of us present there will be no Established Church in England. That is a step in advance which we may be allowed to contemplate without any of that horror which has been expressed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron). Eight or nine years ago the question of uniting the Presbyterian churches came prominently before the people, and there was a sincere and anxious desire on the part of both of the great bodies to form a united church. Several years were spent in discussions, and finally it was resolved by the assemblies, or the Synods of both churches, that such a union was desirable. The question was sent down, according to the practice of those bodies, from the Synods or assemblies to the various Presbyteries, and I believe that all the Presbyteries agreed to the overture for union. From the Presbyteries, it was sent to the various congregations, and

with, I think, but two exceptions in the Free Church and six or seven in the other, they declared themselves in favor of union. The Temporalities Fund is still in the hands of the section of the united church that held it formerly—what is now known as the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. There was no attempt made, as I am informed, by any of the members of the church called the Free Church, previously to obtain the slightest advantage from the money in this fund. None of them have ever touched it, and none of them ever will. It will be distributed amongst those who are either the parties who originally commuted, or those who have come in since into that branch of the church. Every one has been given his share and every one will be given his share, and there is simply a small minority of less than a dozen ministers and congregations who actually desire—and the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment, promotes that desire—to take from them the entire property they possess, their churches and parsonages, their college and all the money that is let out at interest to produce the stipends they receive. Could anything be more monstrous than this proposition—that, because this small number did not go into the Union, they shall become the inheritors of the entire patrimony of the whole church. And now, when they find that a strong feeling exists in the country, and I am happy to say a strong feeling in this House, that no such outrage shall be permitted, they demand something else. They demand a division on such grounds as would not be equitable or right, and when that is not likely to be given, they pretend that we have no right to make any division at all, that we have no right to express any opinion. Now, Sir, I have no doubt whatever that the proposal submitted in the Bill by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw), is one which commends itself to the thoughtful sense of justice of every hon. member, and I am surprised that any hon. member should consent to promote discussion such as some hon. members seem to be promoting by the speeches they are making. The hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution, pretends to be learned in Scotch ecclesiastical law. Why, Sir, nothing could be more ludicrous than his quotations, and nothing could be more absurd than his pretensions. It was quite manifest from the first, and all the time he was quoting from those books, that they had been put into his hands by some industrious churchman who had rummaged the library to get authorities for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. AMYOT. I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it takes more than a few hours to post up even on Scotch ecclesiastical law, and that even if he were right in his interpretation—which I deny—we are not to be governed here by the ecclesiastical law of any other country, but we are to do what is just and right between the parties before us. The sole object of the Bill is to render valid what was formerly agreed to, and the legislation which is now desired is in consequence of the decision of the Committee of the Privy Council with regard to the Acts passed by the two Provinces on this subject. Now, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) knows very well that this legislation was suggested in the deliverance of the Privy Council judges. They said they had no doubt that the Dominion Legislature would make the matter all right, or some phrase of that kind, and here we are entrusted with the task which we cannot shun and which we should not desire to shun. The operation of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw) would have the effect of putting an end to the divisions which distract a small section of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and would promote that unity and harmony which every one desires to see prevail in every branch of the Christian church in this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE.

Mr. McDUGALL (Halton). I think it is impossible that the House should adopt the motion which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Amyot) has put in your hands, and for a very simple reason. We know, Sir, from the discussion which took place before the Private Bills Committee—and as they were continued for several days, all the parties contesting this matter had every opportunity of stating their case—that if the motion should pass the position of the matter will be simply this: that the Committee will be instructed to leave the question of the rights of the parties to these temporalities to the Courts of law. We know that if the matter goes to the Courts of law these Courts will be governed by the Statute of 1858, an Act of the old Province of Canada. There was at that time no church body which had these temporalities, but the body then known as the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and the Courts, if they come to deal with the matter now, will find only the small body now calling themselves the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, answering the description of the Statute which governs the Temporalities Fund. That being the case, the broad question to be settled by this Parliament is, I apprehend, whether this small remnant of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the greater part of which is recognized now as part of the United Church, is to be recognized as the owners of this property, which, if we do so recognize, shall pass out of the hands of the United Church. I think, on the bare statement of the case, we are compelled to deal with the question as a matter of law, as a matter of justice, and as a matter of equity. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, before whom the case was carried, hinted, and more than hinted, they stated, if I recall their judgment aright, that the question, as a legal question, was in the direction the hon. gentleman contends for, but they admitted that the Dominion Parliament was competent to deal with the question, and I think their admission clearly implies what their mind was on the matter. It was felt that, the Parliament of Canada being the only body competent to deal with the question, we should deal with it and do justice between the contending parties. Now, the question is before us, and I think we have simply to consider whether, under all the circumstances, it is proper to recognize the action of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, when they, in their highest court, their representative body, determined to enter into union with other Presbyterian bodies in this country. That is my view, notwithstanding the citation of Scotch authority and Scotch ecclesiastical law, which might be very proper if we were in Scotland; but they have no bearing upon the question submitted to us. In this country we have had questions of this kind to deal with before; they have been before our Courts of law; and so far as my observation and investigations have gone, and so far as the suggestions and arguments made before the Committee influenced me, it is clear to my mind—and I believe I am supported by the decision of the highest Courts in this country—that it was competent to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland to do what they did, to unite with other churches, according to their own rules and practices. If, therefore, as a voluntary association they were competent to make that arrangement, it follows that their churches, their colleges, their property of every kind, was carried along with them into that Union. We know that in a celebrated case analogous to this—the Union of the Episcopal Methodist body with the Wesleyan Methodists—this question came up: whether the conference of the Methodist Church was legally entitled to make this Union, and whether, in making it, they retained their property which they had as the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada. In that case there was a

feature which we do not find in this; there was a change in the very polity of the church; episcopacy, that peculiar feature of their church organization, was abandoned, and a large minority in this country declined to agree to that change, and they remained the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada. Disputes, therefore, arose as to property held under trust deeds in various parts of the country; and although the Judges were divided at first, when the question was finally decided in the Courts, it was held that, notwithstanding that change, not a change in doctrine, but in an important feature of church government—yet the conference, representing the whole church, was legally entitled to say whether they would go into this Union or not. They did decide to go into the Union, that Union was held to be a legal act and the property went along with them.

An hon. MEMBER. Not in all cases.

Mr. McDUGALL. Not in all. There were certain cases in which property was deeded to trustees remaining in the original church, and it was held that under the peculiar circumstances and terms of these trust deeds, the congregations should hold their property as against the Wesleyan Conference. A case was cited before us of a Presbyterian Church, or congregation as it is called, in Cobourg, in which Mr. Chancellor Spragge, one of our ablest Judges, held that that congregation were acting within their right, under the supposed Act of the Province of Ontario, in voting themselves out of the Union, and that they should hold their church. Provision was made for that in the Local law, and that law being supposed to be in force, the learned Chancellor simply applied the law. But it now turns out that it was not competent to the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec to pass any law relating to this matter, for the reason that the body extended over several Provinces, and for the reasons given in the judgment of the Privy Council. In consequence of that unfortunate result the parties are obliged to come before this Parliament, which is the only power competent to deal with the question, and I think, after the discussions which have taken place, after the representatives of the people in the Local Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec, having enabled the parties to display their respective claims to have the control of this property, held that it was just and right and proper to grant to the new church the powers which they claimed. That fact should have considerable influence upon our decision. I do not urge that as a precedent which should absolutely guide us, but I say it is entitled to great respect at our hands. Now, what is asked of us is that we should so alter the machinery of the Temporalities Board as to enable the new church to administer this fund, and I do not see how we can escape from that action. I do not speak here as a member of the Presbyterian Church; I have nothing to do with the Presbyterian Church or any church as a legislator, except to secure to them those rights and powers which are necessary to enable them to legally conduct their affairs. That is all that they ask at our hands. I felt, as I stated at the Committee, that it would be a graceful and a proper act of the majority in this case, to so far respect the origin of this fund, and the position of the respective parties entitled to it, to agree to a division of the fund after providing for the beneficiaries, who are now nearly all advanced in life. It was stated in the Committee that about \$90,000 would be sufficient to pay annuities to secure to all the beneficiaries of this fund the amounts due them during their lives, so that there would be a considerable sum remaining to be disposed of after satisfying all these parties who have these claims. I think, therefore, it would have been a generous and proper thing on the part of the representatives of the United Church to make such a proposition, with the view of establishing harmony at present and of ultimately bringing about that Union and agreement among all the congregations which, I am sure, every one desires to see prevail

throughout our country. If the representatives of the United Church had felt themselves authorised to agree to such a proposition, I would have been only too happy to confirm that arrangement by putting a clause in the Act, to that effect. But they did not make that proposition, and we have to deal with the question whether it is our duty to legalize this change in the Temporalities Board which will enable the United Church, as it now stands, to manage and secure the payment of the various stipends due under legislation of this country, to those gentlemen who are still living. I do not think it is the duty of this Parliament to concern itself about the internal organization or denominational policy of the various religious bodies which exist in this country. In 1859, the Parliament of old Canada, dealing with the clergy reserve question, adopted this resolution:

"To remove all semblance of connection between Church and State, and to effect an entire and final disposition of all matters, claims and interests arising out of the Clergy Reserves, the Governor in Council may, whenever he deems it expedient, with the consent of the parties and bodies severally interested, commute with the said parties such annual stipend or allowance."

It may be proper to remind those who have not given so much attention to this question as some of us older politicians have, that this fund arises out of the appropriation made by the Crown many years ago for the purpose of supporting the Established Church in this country. Great difficulties were experienced in the course of legislation in respect to this large reserve of land in this country for such a purpose, and ultimately the opinion of the people was so decidedly expressed at various elections that it became necessary for the Government to deal with the question. It was necessary, at that time, in the view of the lawyers, to obtain the consent of the Imperial Government to change the law so as to enable the Parliament of Canada to deal with the question. The Imperial Parliament assented to the proposition that in Canada hereafter there ought not to be any semblance of connection between Church and State, and so long as the Clergy Reserves were appropriated there was, not the semblance, but direct, practical connection. The very difficulties which have occurred here with reference to this very matter shows how impolitic and injurious it was that the State should have made appropriation for particular sects to sustain them in their operations in this country, leaving all the others without any special support. The original vice of this appropriation is seen through the whole history of this question down to this hour. Let us dispose of this at once and forever, as I hope we will when we will have handed over to this church this remaining portion of the Clergy Reserves. The Imperial Parliament, when asked to transfer to the Parliament of Canada the right to deal with the whole question, made the reservation that the stipends, which had been, under the previous system, appropriated to be given to certain clergymen of the Church of England, and the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, should be secured to them, because the faith of the Crown was pledged to those clergymen. In order to preserve the faith of the Crown to those individuals, this reservation was made. That is the origin of the Temporalities Fund, and that is why the question is a proper one to be disposed of, I hope, finally, by this Parliament. I cannot understand the reasoning by which some hon. gentlemen endeavor to persuade us that it would be our duty to leave this question to be decided in the Courts upon the technicality that the Act of the old Province of Canada still governs this subject, when it is clearly our duty to step in and prevent those disputes which cause so much irritation and bad feeling. If we permit those bodies to go to law and fritter away the balance of the fund in legal contestation, we would not act prudently, or justly, or in the public interest. I am disposed to vote against this motion and to support the Bill as it now stands for the third read-

ing. I do not know if the Temporalities Board, or, rather, the beneficiaries, as the law would stand if it should pass in its present form, would be competent to make a division of the residue fund, so as to secure to the dissenting congregations their share, but if there is a doubt I would be disposed to put a clause in the Act which would enable the beneficiaries—because the principle upon which this argument rests is that the fund belongs to the commutators or beneficiaries—their just share. The fund was not given to them separate from their church. They were to be secured in the whole amount of stipends during their lives, but many of them voluntarily surrendered a portion of their annual stipends for the purpose of creating a fund for the benefit of their church. That is the reason there is a larger sum of money accumulating in this church than would otherwise have existed, because the whole sum would have been annually consumed by the commutators themselves. Their generosity ought to be acknowledged, and one might come to the conclusion that those who survive ought to have some voice in the disposition of that residue which is the result of their voluntary and generous action in the past. I think it could be left to the commutators or beneficiaries, at their first meeting under the provisions of this Act, to provide for the disposition of this fund after the rights of the beneficiaries had ceased. I am glad, since this question has been before Parliament, that there does seem to be a disposition, even on the part of those belonging to the United Church, to deal generously with this smaller body, and if a clause were inserted in the Bill to give to these gentlemen, when they assembled, as provided in the fourth clause, power to arrange how that residue should be divided among the congregations which remained after the extinction or disappearance of the last commutator, it would be a very desirable power to give them. I refuse to assent to the doctrine of my hon. friend from Lanark, that it is our business to interfere and manage matters for this church. I hesitate to agree that Parliament should intermeddle in any way whatever in the internal organism or management of any of our churches. They have to come to us when they want legal enactments, and we should make those enactments when they do not injuriously affect the public; but we have no right to interject our views or express our individual opinions as members of Parliament on such matters. I do not know what course the discussion may take, but at the proper moment I shall be prepared to offer suggestions in the form of an amendment that I may deem necessary to the Bill.

Mr. McLENNAN. Before proceeding with my remarks I would ask the hon. member for Bellechasse to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. AMYOT. My hon. friend who represents the interests of the minority, asks me to withdraw my motion. As nobody has entrusted me with that amendment, I am at perfect liberty to withdraw it without asking anybody's consent. Before doing so, I must say I have been very much surprised at the way in which my humble remarks have been received by the hon. member for Lambton, though, if I were to judge by the way he used to treat his partizans, I should not be surprised at the way in which he treats his enemies. If he thinks that with his schoolmaster's rod, he will prevent us from doing our duty, he is greatly mistaken. I have expressed my views in the best way I could, and as the hon. member for Lambton has been so very kind as to ridicule my remarks, I will tell him that if he knew as much about my religion as I know about his, he would not assert before this House things that he cannot prove.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken if he thinks the amendment is put in my hands. I said some books of Scotch Ecclesiastical Law were put in my hands. I had no conception the hon. gentleman was learned in Scotch ecclesiastical law. I will compliment the hon. gen-
Mr. McDougall (Halton),

tleman in saying that I think he spoke exceedingly well from his point of view. I had not the slightest intention to cast any ridicule or contempt on the hon. gentleman's speech in the least.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. McLENNAN. In rising to propose the amendment of which I have given notice, I do not propose to go over the ground that I did in the Committee of the Whole. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Halton, and to the statements that have been made during this long discussion, both in the House and in the Committee. I am glad to see that my opinions are confirmed by one so well versed on the subject as the hon. member for Halton, who says that, in legislation for these voluntary bodies that come before Parliament, we must be guided in a great measure by the proposals in which they themselves concur. I think, after all we have heard, it would be very difficult to believe that this House can come to a decision of this question upon a judicial basis or a pure basis of right and wrong, as between the contending parties. If the question is to be decided upon such a basis, it is very clear that it must be decided in the Courts of law. There is a basis upon which we can decide it, and that is the basis of that gospel of peace upon which line this question ought to be decided. I think it is the function of this House to preach a sermon of peace to this Presbyterian Church and to mediate between the contending parties, if there is any possible basis upon which we can mediate in a manner satisfactory to ourselves. I believe we can find such a basis that will be satisfactory, not only to ourselves, but to the contending parties. The minority have already given a fair acknowledgment that they will assent to such terms, because it is in the interest of peace and of the progress of the church, the only basis upon which churches can exist and prosper. I would ask you and those hon. gentlemen who are contending for what they conceive is a principle, what the effect has been during the seven years that have been devoted to this contest? All for what? For some great principle? The principle in this is a sum of \$500,000 or \$300,000. It is simply a question of money, and nothing more. It is folly to tell us that there is some great principle at stake which cannot be conceded. If there is it is one with which this House cannot deal. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw) has stated the case very fairly so far as the law is concerned. Legislation was carried through the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and these Acts have been declared illegal. The result is that this church finds itself in possession of a fund to which it has no right. That is the only result. There can be no other; and it comes to this House to ask us to deal with this question—upon what basis? Well, every basis under heaven. We have been asked to deal with it judiciously, wisely, religiously: to consult the law of Ecclesiastical Courts of which we have heard, but of which we do not know anything. It seems to me we shall have to apply our plain common sense to it, simply, if we deal with it at all, and try to reach such a basis as we think will accomplish the end that I propose thus to bring peace into the church and so settle the question. Clearly it will not settle the question to pass this Act giving this property to the larger body, because the minority who have fought the majority will follow the indication given to them by the Lords of the Privy Council and continue that contest. If we could accomplish the end sought to be accomplished we can only do it by suggesting a compromise which, we have reason to believe, will meet with acceptance. It is in that sense that I propose the following amendment:—

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power

to amend the first clause so as to provide that, whereas the Union of churches referred to in the preamble was not complete, but left a minority of eight members out of thirty-three who had a vested interest in the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, which minority declined to become a party to such Union, it be resolved that before any disposition of this fund is made by this House, the right of the said minority should be maintained to a division of the capital of the said fund in such manner that the said minority shall control its proportion thereof.

Mr. SHAW. Before the motion is put, I desire to make a few remarks. The amendment of the hon. member for Glengarry, as any one will see by examining it, is very similar to that which has been withdrawn. It is an amendment to carry the Bill back to the Committee, but it lays down no principle on which the Committee shall proceed when it is referred; it is only an assertion that the fund should be divided. Now, suppose this amendment is adopted, we would be no further advanced than we were before. It would go back to the Committee, and I suppose the Committee would act as they have already done, because this matter has been discussed before the Committee for several days, and the Committee decided that the minority had no right to that fund, that the fund, as a fact, went with the church. Now, I dare say the Committee would arrive at the same decision again. To refer it back to them in such an indefinite way, would simply be to put this Bill off to another Session of Parliament. I think the hon. member for Glengarry is wrong in saying that the church is in possession of a fund that it has no right to. We say that we have as a corporation no right to administer this fund, but we claim that the united body of Presbyterians has a right to it. The act which was found *ultra vires* simply referred to the corporation, it had no reference at all to the fund itself. But here we are dealing with the corporation and not with the fund. If the Synod of the Old Church had made the appointments, instead of the united body, the Board would have been properly constituted, but unfortunately the united body made the appointments, and consequently they are illegal. We admit that the Board was illegally formed, because the Act under which it was formed has been declared *ultra vires*. I trust, therefore, my hon. friend will see that it is in the interest of the Presbyterian Church to withdraw this amendment. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says that he desires to see the parties come to a settlement, but certainly if it goes back to the Court, far from being settled, the matter will probably be the subject of prolonged litigation. I think it never could have been contemplated by the original commutators that this fund should pass from the control of the church. The object of the amendment is further litigation and further trouble, and the friends of the Presbyterian Church in this country would do well to prevent it by passing the Bill. I hope, therefore, the hon. member will either withdraw his resolution or that it will be negated by the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I think whatever merit the amendment might have in principle, it is destroyed entirely by the fact that it will be leaving the question just about where it was when the Session of Parliament opened. It is a well-known fact that this has been a burning question between those religious denominations for over three years. They have been unable to come to any terms of settlement. They have appealed to Courts one after another until the case had been carried to the highest Court of the realm; they have spent a very large amount of money in appealing to Courts to decide as to their rights—nevertheless, they stand to-day in about as unfortunate a position as seven years ago. I was very much amused by the line of argument advanced by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), namely, that this House would not deal with the question because it was *sub judice*. I think, whatever they may say in regard to the matter, that this argument, coming from such a source, is

susceptible perhaps of two interpretations. At least, one of the hon. members has been retained for some years, and as a lawyer on one side of the case, has been reaping a very rich harvest from it. We know there has been spent up to the present time something like \$20,000 in litigation over the question. How long will it be before the lawyers and the Courts will swallow the whole fund and leave nothing for the church. I do not wonder at lawyers opposing Parliament in taking up this question and settling it, because it affords a large harvest for them. It was originally believed that the Provincial Governments had the right to legislate in that direction, but unfortunately for both denominations, when the case went before the Privy Council, the Provincial Acts were declared to be *ultra vires*, and the hint was thrown out that Parliament should take up the question and make a final settlement. It is now creating much disturbance between the denominations; they cannot advance either spiritually or temporally, and although the dispute may be interesting to those lawyers who have the case in charge, it cannot be interesting to the country. Besides, a settlement of the question will enable the denominations to settle down to work again, and at some future time arrive at an amicable settlement. There may be a claim for the division of the fund among those parties who represent the two distinct sections of the church, but the amendment is not in that direction, it only asks the House to send back the case to the Courts where it has been ineffectually dealt with for seven years past.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman has thought fit to say that the reason why the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) and myself support the amendment now proposed by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is that, as lawyers, we wish to see litigation continued. I believe, although I did not hear it myself, the hon. gentleman remarked that I adopted that course because I was professionally concerned in the case. If he made that statement it was a most unwarranted one.

Mr. SPROULE. I said it was susceptible of that interpretation, when hon. members were aware of the fact that one of those hon. gentlemen had been engaged in the case.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It should neither have been said nor insinuated as a motive that would influence me or any other hon. member on the floor of Parliament in deciding what he thought was right and proper in respect to matters before the House. The hon. gentleman has shown, however, he does not know what he is talking about, because he has not the slightest idea as to what is the amendment of the hon. member for Glengarry. His whole speech might have been appropriate on the motion of the hon. member for Bellechasse; but considering that motion was withdrawn, and the motion of the hon. member for Glengarry is emphatically one to prevent litigation and settle this matter once and forever, the House will see that the remarks of the hon. member who has last spoken were entirely inappropriate to the amendment now before the House. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) has fallen into a similar error, because he has not read or does not understand the motion of the hon. member for Glengarry; nor does he seem to understand much better the scope and character of the Bill of which he has charge. The hon. gentleman spoke of the motion as tending to continue litigation, whereas it is to settle litigation; he also said his Bill did not deal with the fund, but only with the administration of it. I would ask the hon. member for South Bruce if he has read the Bill, if he knows what the first clause provides for, if it does not deal with the whole capital of the fund and with the disposition of it; yet he says he does not deal with the fund, but only the administration of it. Surely he could not have read the Bill which he

asks the House to read for the third time. That hon. gentleman has stated that the object of the Bill was to deal fairly with the minority, and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) made the statement that there was a disposition on the part of the majority to deal generously with the minority. I fail to see fairness or generosity in this transaction. The object of the Bill, as it now stands, is to take the whole capital of the fund and give it to the United Church, subject to the payment of existing charges to them. I ask if that is fairness to the minority. It says to the commutators who established the fund: "It is true you put in your money on a certain trust and gave up your property; you will be paid your annuity so long as you live, but when you all die the capital of the fund will pass to another church of which you were not members and which you expressly refused to join." That is what hon. gentlemen called dealing generously with the minority—taking the whole capital of the fund and giving seven surviving old men diminished annuities. Under the original commutation they received \$600 a year, but they have only been receiving \$450 since 1855, when they established this fund. The total amount of the fund was \$509,000, the seventy-three original commutators contributed an average of \$7,000; so the seven old men contributed about \$49,000, and the eighth man, who went out at the time of the Union in 1875, would make the account \$56,000. Now, inasmuch as they have survived, I think we might reasonably assume that their annuities were worth more, and that they commuted a larger sum than those who died. We may assume that the oldest man died first, and that the volume of the annuities was calculated by the age of the annuitant, and the probable duration of his life. We may therefore conclude that the annuitants that now survive must have put in more than the average of \$7,000, and that they put in \$8,000 or \$10,000 each, as stated in Committee. It is proposed to confiscate \$70,000 or \$80,000 capital of their money, and to hand it over—not to the purpose for which it was dedicated but to the United Church. Still they say this is dealing generously with the minority. But what do those who commuted and who still survive say about the matter? A petition has been presented which was read at the Table of the House and circulated amongst members, a petition signed by twelve of the surviving commutators, in which they expressly protest against this alteration of the purposes of the fund. They say they entered into arrangement, a solemn compact with a fundamental principle, which was that the fund was to be reserved for the benefit of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, to be enjoyed by them only so long as they held their position as ministers of that church. They say that the capital amount was not to be trenced upon but only the interest; but we find that the capital has been reduced, that it has been trenced upon for the purpose of paying the annuities, and it is now proposed to divide it, a part of it to be devoted to Queen's College, and the balance to be handed over to the United Church for the general purposes of that church, a church to which it never belonged. The proposition of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is to divide the fund in proportion to the number of ministers who survived at the time of the Union, and as there were thirty-three then surviving, eight of whom refused to go into the Union, the proportion will be eight to twenty-three. That is conceded on the part of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. McDougall). If I apprehended his meaning aright, he expressly conceded that this fund belonged to the beneficiaries, as he called them, and if so, they should decide what is to be done with it. If we should divide this sum according to the proportion of those who survived at the time of the Union, he should be carrying out his opinion consistently, and therefore we should vote for the motion of my hon. friend from Glengarry. It is proposed by this divi-

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

sion of the fund to leave the annuities of those who have gone out of the church a charge on the united body or on the major portion of the fund. Of course when the minority take their share, as they would under the division, they would look to the minority fund for payment of their annuities so long as they lived, and those who went into the Union would look to the major part of the fund for their share, so that in reality, the proposition of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. McDougall) is the same as that of the hon. member for Glengarry, viz.: that the fund should be divided according to the proportion of the commutators at the time of Union. There is one of the hon. gentleman's observations in which I cannot concur. He says it is competent for the Synod to go into Union as it was a mere voluntary association, and he referred to the Union, of the Methodist bodies, which took place some years ago, as a parallel case. With all the hon. gentleman's clearness of view in reading any legal decision or authority, I am of opinion that he has misread or misunderstood the two cases decided on that subject. I wish the hon. gentleman to notice that the property that was in existence in the case of the Methodist Church was held in trust for the Methodist Episcopal Church according to the rules and constitution adopted by the General Annual Conference; and the Court held that the Conference had the right to alter the character of the church, and that whatever it decided was the principle on which that property had to be held. It was not necessary to be held by the Methodist Episcopal Church as constituted, but the Methodist Episcopal Church according to the rules to be decided from time to time by the General Annual Conference. The General Annual Conference, by a large majority, decided that they would abolish Episcopacy in reference to the Methodist Church, and would adopt a form of government by which a chairman or president was elected from year to year, and to become associated with the Wesleyan body in England. They were an offshoot from that body, and it was owing to the circumstances of the country that John Wesley himself constituted Episcopacy by sending out the two first Bishops of the Methodist Church to found the church in this country. So it will be seen that these cases are no authority for the view expressed by the hon. member for Halton, that it was competent for the Synod to go into Union, as it was a voluntary association, and that their property went with them. The hon. member for Lambton spoke as if I was a supporter of disunion. I do not support disunion; and it was a matter of regret to me that the minority did not see their way to going into the Union Church. It would have been a great deal better if these questions had never arisen. I do not see, personally, what necessity there was for the minority remaining out of the Union, but they had reasons for remaining out, and it is not for me to dictate as to what church the minority shall belong. But while I should be delighted to see these congregations enter the Union, I do not think it is for me or for Parliament to insist upon them doing so, as they themselves were the best judges of their acts, and they should not be forced into a Union under penalty of losing all their rights and property. If Parliament passes this Bill it will practically be saying to these people: "You must either go into the Union or you must remain out stripped of all your property and possessions." Have we the right to say to them that they should not remain attached to the church of their forefathers, if they choose to remain connected with it? I feel that we have no right to impose such a penalty as the loss of their property, which is practically the same thing. The hon. member for Halton says that the majority had a right to go into the Union and to take their property with them, which is the same in effect as the majority coercing the minority by telling them that they shall lose their property if they do not join a religious association from which

they dissent. They have a right to dissent, and they say they have a right to hold their property, and we are acting unjustly, unfairly and unconstitutionally if we take away the property from them, because they did not choose to be dictated to as to what church they should belong, for that is the plain result of the legislation now before the House. The question has been raised as to what are the relative rights of the parties to this fund. I have no hesitation in saying, as a lawyer who has given some attention to the matter—having been professionally engaged in some of the cases which have arisen as to the ownership of the property—that as a matter of law I believe the Courts would be bound to decide that the fund belongs to the minority of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. I do not express my own opinion upon that point. I can refer to the opinion of the highest Courts in Ontario and the most able Judges in support of it; and they expressly hold that the minority who remained, continue to be the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and that the majority did not take that church into the Union with them. In the case of *Macpherson vs. McKay*, which was in relation to a church in the township of Eldon, in my own constituency, the late Chief Justice Moss, who decided the case, expressly held that after the Union, the Old Church remained as it had been before—that this dissentient minority remained the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. The property in dispute in that case was held under patent from the Crown, in trust for the minister of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, in the township of Eldon. Under the Act of the Ontario Legislature, the congregation were called upon to vote whether they would go into the Union or stay out; by a large majority, they voted to stay out, but the minister, who was a Unionist, went to the assembly and tried to suppress their vote and force his congregation into the Union. A suit was brought against him to eject him on the ground that he had ceased to be a minister of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and the Court so held, and he was turned out of his church and deprived of his manse, which was handed over to the trustees of the church of which it was declared he ceased to be a minister. That was the express decision of the late Chief Justice Moss. The minister was not satisfied, however, with that decision, and he carried the case to the Court of Appeal, composed then of Mr. Justice Burton, Mr. Justice Patterson, Mr. Justice Morrison, and Vice-Chancellor Blake, who decided unanimously that the decision of Chief Justice Moss was right; and when I tell you that the case was argued on behalf of the minister by a no less legal authority than my hon. friend from West Durham, you may feel satisfied that every possible point that could be taken was taken before the Court, and that the case was very ably argued. In giving judgment, Mr. Justice Patterson comments on the decision given in the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. McDougall) has referred to, as follows:—

"The question so elaborately investigated in *Doe vs. Bell*, and the other cases which arose out of the change in the Methodist body from its Episcopal government to a different kind of superintendence, and its connection with the English Wesleyan Methodists instead of with the church in the United States, was not the same which is involved in this controversy."

I think that sufficiently shows that the hon. member for Halton is in error in quoting this case as an authority for the position he has taken on this question. The learned Judge then goes on to say:

"If we set aside the consideration, and assume a substantial agreement between the different churches in all material particulars, we are still far from establishing their identity or proving that after a union

each can be treated as still in existence. * * * It seems to me that the principle of entire independence which the defendant has proved, by the evidence he has adduced, to have been a fundamental principle of the church of which he was a minister, forbids us to recognize the same church in a body in which the jurisdiction is shared with several other churches. If we recognize one of the united churches as still existing we must recognize them all, and the result I have just indicated follows. If we are to treat them all as merged in one united church, *cadit quæstio*. * * * Yet we cannot think of a Presbyterian congregation unattached to some Presbyterian church, and there is no suggestion to be gathered from the Statute that the dissenting congregations were regarded as ceasing to be Presbyterian congregations, or as ceasing to belong to the churches of which they had hitherto formed portions. * * * This seems to me to have been the essence of the scheme presented to the Legislature and acted upon in passing the Statute, and in my judgment it involves the recognition by the petitioning Synods of the dissenting congregations as continuing in communion with their original churches. * * * I think that from whatever point of view the question is approached the result is the same; and then we must hold that the defendant is no longer the person described in the patent as incumbent of the Church of Scotland erected in the township of Eldon, as he has ceased to belong to the church thus described."

Now, if that is good law, and it has never been questioned, does it not follow that this dissentient minority continue to be, and are, the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland? If they are, this whole fund legally belongs to them; but they do not come here and ask for the whole fund. The proposition made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is a peace offering. It is true, the United Church, feeling the strength of numbers, says: "We will not agree to any compromise; we will not hold out the olive branch; we will have the fund, the whole fund, and nothing but the fund." If they are strong, however, they ought to be merciful, even if they are not just and honest. They have abstained from evincing the first desire to compromise this matter or divide the fund on an equitable basis, and have said: "We are strong, we have a majority here, we will give these old men their annuities as long as they live, as long as they are entitled to them, and then we will leave this struggling minority out in the cold without any endowment, and will take the whole fund ourselves;" therefore, I say, that position is neither just nor honest. We do not propose to take the whole of the fund. We say we are legally entitled to it; but such a large majority went into the Union, we are content that we shall have the major part of it. We will divide it according to the number of commutators who were alive when the Union took place. They can take twenty-five parts and we will take eight. Give us an Act of incorporation, and let us deal with our share as we like, and you can deal with their share as you like. Let each party assume their proportion of the annuities which belong to the respective bodies, and let us go on in our work and live in harmony." Being in favor of this Union, I feel I am supporting what is a just and legal claim which, if granted, will lead to a just and permanent establishment of the best possible relations between the two churches in Canada, and I trust that the House will see that it does what is just and right and honest in supporting the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Glengarry.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I believe the motion which is before the House should not be allowed to pass, for two reasons: First, because it is not an amendment to the first clause of the Act. The hon. member should say, I move that a certain portion of the clause, which may be contrary to his views, shall be struck out, and the following words be inserted. This motion determines the exact manner in which this fund should be divided, and it should not be adopted, because it is not an amendment to the first clause. In the second place, the principle which is laid down in this motion is wrong. The hon. member lays down the proposition that this fund belongs to the commuting ministers, and should be divided amongst them *pro rata*. I hold, that if

does not belong to them, but to the church, and without going back to the origin of the fund, I find in the Statute of 1858, of which this Bill represents a proposed amendment, the express declaration of the late Parliament of Canada, that the said fund was not the property of the commuting ministers, but of the church. Here is the preamble:

"Whereas, it hath been represented to the Legislature of this Province, that it is desirable that provision shall be made for the management of certain funds of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, now held in trust by certain Commissioners, hereinafter named, on behalf of the said church—

Not, you will observe, on behalf of the commuting ministers—

"for the benefit thereof; and also of such other funds as may from time to time be granted and given, bequeathed or contributed in addition thereto; and whereas the said funds are so held in trust, and the revenues thereof are to be appropriated for the encouragement and support of ministers and missionaries of the said church, and for the augmentation of their stipends and towards making a provision for those who may be incapacitated by age or infirmity; and whereas, secondly, when and if it shall so please the said church, and so soon as other funds hereafter shall be contributed, subscribed or paid in from any source for the purpose, to the corporation hereby erected, it is desired that such other funds shall be appropriated for granting aid towards the erection and maintenance and endowment of churches and manses in connection with the said church, and the aiding of young men to study for the church, &c."

The first clause of this Act speaks of the incorporation of the Board of the Temporalities Fund which is now in question, and mentions the names of the Commissioners, who

"shall have and enjoy in trust for the said church, and for the aforesaid firstly hereinabove specified, use all moneys, debentures, bonds, and bank and other stocks and securities which are now held by the said hereinbefore named parties as Trustees or Commissioners of the said church, in trust for the said church."

There is only one meaning to this: that this is a church and institution held on behalf of the church and for the benefit of the church, and there is appended this special condition:

"But such holding is subject always to the special condition that the annual interest and revenues of the said moneys or fund now in their hands shall be and remain charged and subject, as well as regards the character or the extent and duration thereof, to the several annual charges in favor of the several ministers and parties entitled thereto, of the several amounts and respective characters and durations as the same were constituted and declared at the formation of the said fund."

We have in this Bill a clause respecting this condition, and especially providing for the same. This clause provides that a certain sum shall be paid as annuities to certain Ministers, and, therefore, this condition attached to the fund in the Statute of 1858, has been properly observed. As to the division of this fund, the motion of the member for Glengarry states that it shall be divided according to the number of the commuting ministers at the time of Union. I say that it should be divided according to the number of the congregations at the time of Union; if this fund is the property of the church, then it is not the property of the ministers, and it must be divided among the congregations *pro rata*, and not according to the number of the commuting ministers, who had only a life interest in this fund. Before the Private Bills Committee, the suggestion was made, by one of its members, that the fund should be divided according to the number of congregations, but the minority said no. Then we had a kind of Dutch auction, the figures commencing at \$125,000 and falling successively to \$100,000 and \$75,000. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is no way in which to fix the amount. It should be fixed according to certain data, and this principle is to be found in the Statute of 1858, which declares that the fund is the property of the church and not of the ministers. This is the second reason why I believe the motion of the hon. member for Glengarry ought not to be accepted. I am not prepared to say that this Bill deals fairly with the minority, and I regret that the amend-

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).

ments which were proposed by the leader of the Government were not moved to-day. I believe that the fund ought to be divided *pro rata* according to the number of the congregations at the time of Union. It was then 108 or 104, 96 entered the Union, and a small minority, some seven or eight, remained out, and in this proportion the fund should be divided. This is the reason why I wish that the amendments of which notice has been given by the leader of the Government, had been made. The member for Glengarry proceeds from a basis which is altogether wrong, and which is not consecrated by the Statute of 1858, and until an amendment is moved which will propose to divide this money among the different congregations according to their number I shall certainly vote against the motion of the member for Glengarry.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). Not being a Presbyterian it does not become me to offer any particular views with reference to this matter to the House, but I have the honor to represent many excellent Presbyterians who are very liberal-minded, and who belong to both sections of the church; some are in the Union, and others did not see their way clear to taking this step. I have also had the honor of presenting petitions from both parties to the House. Now, you can very well understand that I wish to do on this as on all other occasions, cast a candid vote, and not act in the interest of either one or the other party. I may here say that I advocate and admire the spirit which actuated the Presbyterian body in this country in entering the Union in question, because union is strength; therefore my judgment is with them in taking measures to increase their power for doing good. But, Sir, there is this to be remarked: what is the contention about? There is a very serious dispute. It seems to me that it does not concern Presbyterianism, but a certain fund. In fact, this trouble is all about a certain sum of money, and the question which arises in my mind is this:—and being on the Private Bills Committee, I tried to inform myself and take an impartial view of the matter—does this Church to-day exist as the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland? Now, Sir, either it did exist or it must be blotted out. But the United Church did not take the name of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, consequently those who remained out of the Union continued to be that church. We are indeed told that there is a living vital church known as the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. We have had its Moderator before us, who told us that the Synod had continued up to this day, that it had never discontinued. Now then shall we, by Act of this House, undertake to say who shall be the Presbyterian body of this country in connection with the Church of Scotland? Does it belong to us as a legislative body to decide a question of that kind? I am not a lawyer, but I hope I have common sense, and I would like to know where that church exists. Now, if that church exists, it must be the church to which the Clergy Reserve Fund was given. That fund was given so much to each individual minister, and they commuted their rights for the purposes of the church as a body in order to be more useful. The hon. member from Jacques Cartier says that this fund belongs to the church, not to the individual commutator. That may be, but who makes up the church? Who made up that fund? It was the Presbyterian Church of Canada that the Government commuted with; it was the individual ministers that it commuted with, and they by their own motion resolved to form a general fund. In 1875, when the Union was formed, a certain number of clergymen and of laymen decided not to go with that church. Did they cease to exist as a part of that church? Did they thereby forfeit their right to this fund? Now, I contend that those who went out from the

Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, have no right to participate in the fund, they have become something else. I do not know what they are, but we are told that the Old Church is still in existence. Now, under these circumstances, what is our duty, and for what purpose do these parties come before us? The Union party ask for a certain Act to enable them to control the fund. Now, Sir, there is no objection to that I would be sorry to injure them in any way whatever, but my opinion is that they are not entitled to the whole of that fund. Now, it does seem to me that we must do justice between the parties, and I think it would be just that we should decide the distribution of this fund according to the number of the living commuting ministers. Let the Church of Scotland, if it is in existence, take their fair share and do with it as they see fit. I believe that if the majority consented to such a decision they would have the sympathies of the people with them. They are a strong body and can afford to be magnanimous. It seems to me, however, that they do not want to have another branch of that church to exist. Now, is that a proper Christian spirit? If any one can satisfy me that, when the majority went over into the Union, they carried the whole body with them, and that the minority were bound to go with them, then I will give up my contention and say that the money ought to be divided. But after all I have heard in the House and in the Private Bills Committee, where the question was argued on both sides with an ability perhaps unequalled in this country, I fail to be convinced that the minority is bound by the action of the majority. I think we ought to take this matter into our own hands, and make a just and fair apportionment between the two contending parties. I know very well that in my own county, where I have both Unionists and non-Unionists for my constituents, I have failed to meet a single one who is not heartily desirous that the United Church should hold no fund and make use of no money that is not justly and fairly theirs. It does seem to me that the ministers, those who ought to be our teachers in inculcating peace and goodwill, are the hardest to bring to a reconciliation. I believe if it were left to the laity, without the interference of the clergy, the matter would be settled in twenty-four hours. If a vote was taken by the entire Presbyterian body they would say: "Let the money be divided." The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says it should go to the congregations. If I am rightly informed, the clergyman who was a commutator at that time, if he removes from one congregation to another, he carries that money with him. Then I would ask by what right he should leave it to the congregation to vote on a question of that kind, when they have really nothing to do with it? If they are fortunate enough to have a minister who is entitled to receive such money, then they may benefit by it, but not otherwise. I think the House will be doing wrong if they adopted the Bill, as it is now asked for, in its entirety; and I think it would be doing an injustice to an important branch of the church—a church that has existed for so long; and I would be sorry to be a party to blotting out that old historic church by my vote in that direction. I think it would be a mistake and an injustice to take such action against the Old Church. The United Church have my best wishes, and I will do everything I can for its members, if they show the spirit which they should show, of being fair and just to their brethren, and thus do good works of peace and goodwill.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I propose to answer one or two statements made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), a night or two ago, and which he repeated to-night. He stated, when the matter was up before, that the United Church was guilty of highway robbery, and that their generosity was somewhat similar to that of the robber, who steals a person's money and afterwards returns a

portion of it. To-night he was good enough to tell us that the fund, to a large extent, was confiscated by the Board of Management, and had been reduced to a very considerable extent since the re-establishment of the Board since the Union. It is true, that in 1853 when the fund was established it amounted to \$509,000. At the time of the Union it was about \$400,000, and it has declined since then by about \$50,000. But the hon. member for Victoria should have stated to the House, in all candor, and not have allowed the impression to go abroad through the country that the fund had been mismanaged, that the fund was invested by the old Board in banks, the shares of which became very considerably depressed before and since the Union took place, and it was owing to the depression of the shares that the fund declined to the extent I have named. There was another cause for the decline of the fund to some extent in addition to that already given. It is not correct to state that no portion of the principal of the fund can be trenced upon for the purpose of paying annuities to those who are entitled to receive \$450 each. Under the 4th section of the Act of 1858 the Board of Management had the right, if the interest was not sufficient to pay their annuities to each of the seventy-four commutators, to trench on the capital for the purpose of making good that payment. I am told, I do not know whether it is correct or not, that to some small extent the capital had been trenced upon for that purpose before the Union. If so, it was clearly within the power of the Board to do so. At the time the Union took place a large portion of the fund was invested in the shares of these banks, which I will not name at present. After the union had taken place the opponents of the Union obtained from the law Courts at Montreal an injunction against the Board of Management to prevent their dealing with the fund. Pending the injunction the stocks of the banks in which the funds had been very largely deposited and invested became still further depressed, until now the fund only amounts to \$332,000. If the fund has declined from \$509,000 to \$400,000 at the time of the Union, and has since declined to \$332,000, it is certainly not the fault of the Board; and I only mention this for the purpose of showing the House and the country that if the law, as it was enacted by the Legislatures of Quebec and Ontario, and was proposed to be enacted here, prevailed, there was no danger whatever but that the annuitants would receive \$450 each annually, because the Board had the right to trench on the capital for the purpose of paying these annuities. A word or two in regard to the hon. member for Glengarry. What principle is involved in the motion he has submitted; how does he propose to divide the fund? The hon. gentleman proposes to divide it between the thirty-three commutators, who were surviving in 1875. Why should we limit the division to that particular class? One would imagine from the resolution that no other person was interested in the fund; in fact, the resolution sets out that they, and they only, have a vested interest in the fund and in the annual revenue derived from the fund. The hon. mover, as a leading Presbyterian, should know there were others than those thirty-three individuals who had a vested interest in the fund. When the fund was first created in 1853 there were seventy-four commutators; between 1853 and 1875, seventy-four additional clergymen of the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland were added to the fund, and of course a number of those who were in existence at the time of the creation of the fund had departed this life and just as additional annuities fell in the names of other ministers in connection with the Church of Scotland were added, until, in 1874, the additional number of names amounted to seventy-four. Between 1874 and 1875, when the Union took place, forty-nine additional names were added, not as annuitants then entitled to rank in the Board, because there was not sufficient money to enable them then to participate, but they were

put on so that when the annuitants died they would be placed on the list. So when the Union took place there were 107 commutators or beneficiaries who were all entitled to participate in the fund and the annual increase thereof; yet the hon. gentleman who proposed this amendment wishes the fund to be divided among thirty-three commutators alone, excluding the beneficiaries. There was no fairness or fair play in that proposition. It would afford still further room for additional litigation and expense unless provision were made not only for the original commutators but for the beneficiaries who were just as much entitled to share in the fund as the original commutators. For my own part I cannot see any reason why there should be any division of the fund now at all. The men who remained out of the Union had I suppose reasons best known to themselves to remain out of that Union—reasons which, in my judgment, were not in the interests of Christianity or the Presbyterian Church—that is a matter between their consciences and their Maker, and I do not care to deal with them; but there is no reason why the seven or eight men who remained out of the Union in 1875 should now be entitled to share any proportion of the capital itself and especially to share it now. If the Union had not been consummated at all; had the Presbyterian Church in Canada not joined the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland—and we have as good a right to put the matter in that way as in the other—these seven men would not have been entitled to any portion of the principal, and all they were entitled to was the sum of \$450 a year as long as they lived. Where did the capital go when they died? They did not take it with them, it went back into the hands of the church, to sustain the missionaries and the ministers of the church. Why, then, should the dissentients get any proportion of the capital represented by their annuities just now? No one else interested in the fund gets it. It was not pretended that the portion of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church in Scotland that went into the Union, could get the capital now, and so on what principle could these seven that remained out get it now?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. For the benefit of the church.

Mr. CAMERON. They represent no church. Seven men remained out, as they had a perfect right to remain out, but the church as a church joined the Union. If any one will take the trouble of examining into the matter, they will find that one of the principles on which they joined the Union was, that the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland should in no sense lose its identity with the Church of Scotland, when they joined the uniting churches. My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Ross) says, that if he were satisfied that the Presbyterian Church in Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland has not lost its identity, that it is there still as a living, vital body, he is prepared to support the Bill of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Shaw). Let me read him the resolution which was passed by that church before it united:

"The Synod, in resolving to consummate the Union, does at the same time declare that the United Church shall be considered identical with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and shall possess the same authority, rights, privileges and benefits to which this church is now entitled, excepting such as have been reserved by Acts of Parliament."

That is the very foundation and ground upon which the Union was consummated, and, as I have said before, there is no ground for the amendment of my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) that the fund should be divided in the proportion of seven to twenty-seven. It would be a manifest and gross injustice if that were done. If there is to be any division of the fund at all it should not be on that principle, although I am not now

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

arguing the question as to whether or not there should be a division. We all know perfectly well that the condition of the fund as it now stands is such that with the investments we can now make we cannot pay the commutators or the beneficiaries under the law, out of interest or revenue derived from \$332,000, the amounts to which they are entitled, and we would have to trench on the principal in order to enable the Board of Trustees to pay these amounts; and if you have to trench on the principal now you have to do so until the last of the beneficiaries has departed this life, and by that time no living man can tell how much may remain when all the charges are satisfied. If we divide it on the principle advocated by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) the seven men who remained out of the Union would get nearly \$100,000, while the twenty-seven who joined the Union would get a little over \$200,000. If that be so, what guarantee is there that the fund and increase will be sufficient to pay these beneficiaries and commutators the yearly sums which should be paid to them under the provisions of the law and the rules of the United Church. So far as I am individually concerned as a Presbyterian belonging to the United Church formerly belonging to the Free Church, I do not care a farthing about the division of the fund. As a church, we have nothing to do with it until after the death of the commutators; the funds remain under the control and management of the Board of Management, as the law directs, and I say that if any division is to be made it should be on the principle that commutators and beneficiaries should be entitled to the fund and share in it in proportion to their members after all the charges are satisfied. That proportion would be as seven to 107, but it would be a still fairer principle to adopt the plan laid down by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), that the fund should be divided, if divided at all, according to the number of congregations that went into the Union and the number that remained out of it, that would be in the proportion of 10 to 150—but in no case should the capital be divided until the last commutator, the last beneficiary, has departed this life. If it is divided now what guarantee have we that the body which remained out of the Union shall have the share allotted to them fairly according to law. Let me ask the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who appears to take such an interest in this matter, whom does he represent? Does he represent any of the seven commutators? Whom does the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) represent here? Has any petition been presented to Parliament in favor of a division of the fund at the present time? We have had applications against the original Bill; but we have had no petition in favor of the proposition that the fund should be divided in the proportion of 7 to 27—and handed over to whom? To six or seven men who are not represented here at all? If these six or seven men petitioned Parliament for a division of the fund, there might be some reason in asking Parliament to divide it; but until they do that, I am not prepared to vote that this fund shall be broken up, and a portion of the capital handed over to men whom we know nothing about, and who are not members of the Board of Management at all. I am opposed to the resolution of the hon. gentleman, and I am opposed to every resolution in favor of dividing the fund without the sanction or approval of the seven commutators who remained out of the Union. My opinion is, that it would be better for those who remained out, as well as those who remained in, to have the fund kept intact, and to have every man paid \$450 a year until he is called hence. No man who knows anything about the Presbyterian Church in Canada will, for a single moment, say that this Union has not been of the first possible consequence to that church. The progress which it has made during the last few years have been simply marvellous, and I would regret that anything should take place to impair the harmony and success of the Union so happily consummated.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a member of the Ecclesiastical Court that sanctioned this Union on the part of the old Kirk of Scotland, I desire to call the attention of the House to certain plain facts which I think will lead to a proper decision of this question if they are borne in mind. The great mass of the members of the old Kirk, as it was called, for many years felt, in common with the members of the other Presbyterian bodies of the Dominion, that a Union of these bodies would be greatly to the interest of the whole church, and the matter was discussed for several years. In the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland this question was brought forward as early as the year of 1870. Finally, action was taken to obtain the sentiment of the church in the matter, with the result that of the 150 congregations, but ten voted against the Union, and in each of those ten congregations there was a very large minority in favor of it, and the eleven Presbyteries of the Church voted unanimously for Union. The parent Church of Scotland was also consulted, and it gave its hearty approval of the proposed Union. Our position, as members of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, was this—that, if this Union was brought about, it should be brought about by the action of the church and the consent of the parent church, and with the consent of the other Presbyterian Churches in Canada, and that the legislation necessary to the consummation of this Union should be secured. All these conditions were fulfilled; and, having thus laid broadly and securely the basis of Union, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, proceeded to take final action on this matter, and by a vote of 90 to 7 decided to join the other Presbyterian Churches, and form a church to be known as the Presbyterian Church in Canada. I hold that, by the action of the congregations, the Presbyteries, and finally of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, that church entered this Union, and all the rights, funds and privileges that belonged to it in its separate position belong to the United Church of which it forms a component part. But the rights of those who declined to enter into this Union were carefully guarded and looked after. All the beneficiaries of this fund who declined to enter the Union had their rights as carefully secured by the Act of Union as the beneficiaries who became members of the United Church. The Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland had a college—Queen's College—and an arrangement was made by which a certain proportion of this fund should be devoted to this college, and the balance to the mission work of the church. I hold that, in the consideration of this question, we have no right to assume that those who remained out of the Union, who were not sufficiently numerous to form a Synod under the laws of the church, who were merely dissenters, and whose rights were carefully guarded and looked after, had any right to constitute themselves a church, or declare themselves to be the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. I hold that, when this Union was consummated, the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, as a church, went into the Union, and that in its present position it continues to be invested with all the property, funds and rights which belonged to it before. This United Church is now before the House of Commons to ask it to confirm certain legislation given by the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec in good faith, in the belief that that was all that was necessary to consummate the Union then effected; and I hold that all we have to do, as the House of Commons, is to enquire as to whether this Union was duly consummated, and if so, to ratify it, as was done by the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec. I may say that the gentlemen who refused to go into this Union have shown a spirit which cannot fairly be

called a Christian spirit. In their litigation and in their attempts to secure this whole fund, they have inflicted great hardship on the beneficiaries of this fund, who look to it as their means of support. The matter is still in litigation, the fund is locked up, and the men who have to depend on it for their livelihood are unable to draw from it. I think, therefore, that it is high time that the Bill now before the House, which is an honest and fair measure, securing to all the parties their rights, should pass.

Mr. SHAW. I rise to correct an improper impression arising from the speech of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron). The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) referred to certain cases as showing that when a body entered a union, the church property went with it. The hon. member for Victoria referred to the case of Macpherson vs. McKay as maintaining the contrary view, but that hon. member forgot to tell this House that that decision proceeded upon an Act of the Legislature of Ontario, which reads as follows:—

"The Legislature of Ontario provided: As soon as the Union takes place, all property, real or personal, within the Province of Ontario, now belonging to or held in trust for or to the use of any congregation in connection or communion with any of the said churches, shall thenceforth be held, used and administered for the benefit of the same congregation in connection or communion with the united body, under the name of 'The Presbyterian Church of Canada.' Provided always, that if any congregation in connection or communion with any of the said churches shall, at a meeting of the said congregation regularly called according to the constitution of the said congregation, or the practice of the church with which it is connected, and held within six months after the said Union takes place, decide by a majority of the votes of those who, by the constitution of the said congregation, or the practice of the said church with which it is connected, are entitled to vote at such a meeting, determine not to enter into the said Union, but to dissent therefrom, then and in such case the congregation property of the said congregation shall remain unaffected by this Act or by any of the provisions thereof."

The learned Judge gave his decision upon that Act. He said:

"If this is congregational property I think that, under the second proviso in the Act, as I have already intimated, it remains where it was, and has not become part of the property of the united body."

The same learned Judge says, further on:

"I confess I found some difficulty in arriving at any conclusion as to the exact status which is occupied by what may be termed, for convenience sake, the old church, but I do not think that is material in the view which I take of the case. The question is, has the property to the united body so as to entitle the defendant to it as a minister of that body. I think it has not so passed, because I am of opinion that this was congregational property within the fair meaning of the Act to which I have referred."

Amendment (Mr. McLennan) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bowell,
Bunster,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Coughlin,
Coursol,
Cuthbert,
Dugas,
Dumont,
Fortin,

Gault,
Gigault,
Grandbois,
Haggart,
Hurteau,
Jones,
Landry,
Lantier,
Macmillan,
McDougall,
McLennan,
Montplaisir,

Mousseau,
Quimet,
Rouleau,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Strange,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wallace (York), and
White (Hastings).—35.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,
Anglin,
Arnell,
Bain,
Bannerman,
Beaty,
Beauchesne,
Béchar,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bill,

Geoffrion,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier)
Girouard (Kent),
Guillet,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haddow,
Hay,
Hesson,

Muttart,
Olivier,
Orton,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Essex),
Piockard,
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Reid,
Richey,

Blake,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Borden,	Homer,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Hooper,	Rogers,
Bourbeau,	Irvine,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Routhier,
Brooks,	Killam,	Rymal,
Brown,	Kilvert,	Schultz,
Bunting,	King,	Scrifer,
Burpee (St. John),	Kranz,	Shaw,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Lane,	Skinner,
Cameron (Huron),	Langevin,	Smith,
Cartwright,	Longley,	Snowball,
Casey,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Casgrain,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Stephenson,
Charlton,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Sutherland,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Macdonell (Lanark),	Tassé,
Cimon (Ochicontimi),	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Tellier,
Cockburn,	Mackenzie,	Thompson,
Colby,	McCallum,	Tilley,
Costigan,	McCuaig,	Trow,
Coupal,	McDougall,	Tupper,
Crouter,	McGreavy,	Tyrwhitt,
Currier,	McIsaac,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Wade,
Domville,	McLeod,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Drew,	McQuade,	Weldon,
Elliott,	McRory,	Wheeler,
Farrow,	Malouin,	White (Cardwell),
Fiset,	Manson,	White (Renfrew),
Fitzsimmons,	Massue,	Williams,
Fleming,	Merner,	Wiser, and
Flynn,	Mills,	Wright.—130.
Fulton,		

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved in amendment :

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the preamble by inserting in the first line, after the word "that," the words "a majority of the;" and in the fifth line, after the word "Scotland," the words "the Synod;" and in the twenty-fifth line by inserting after the word "by," the words "a majority of."

He said: The object of this amendment is to provide that the preamble of this Bill corresponds with the truth. It is asserted here that the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland have gone into the Union. What the minority say is that the whole Synod did not go into the Union, but only a majority of it, and that consequently, to accord with the true state of the facts, the amendment I have proposed should be adopted. The Privy Council in their judgment expressly spoke of the Union of the churches in that way. They say that on the 15th of June, 1875, the majority of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland united with the other churches in general assembly. There is a further reason for the amendment. The Bill that was introduced asking for a simple incorporation on the part of the dissenting minority, was rejected by the Private Bills Committee on the ground that its passage would be inconsistent with the preamble of this Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman cannot tell us what took place in the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. CAMERON. I did not do so. I repeat to the House only what is stated in the report of that Committee which formed the basis upon which the preamble was rejected. The Committee reported that the reason why they could not pass the present Bill was that it was inconsistent with the legislation which they had already passed in the Bill now before the House. I am, therefore, only stating what is recorded in the Journals of this House. The importance of my amendment is this—that this House may be entitled, without inconsistency, to do what is simply just. As the Bill now is you could deny to the minority the right to manage their own affairs. You could say to them: "You shall no longer be a church; you shall have no property nor power to manage property." I am only asking that common justice which is given to any religious body, no matter how small it may be. Any such body obtains incorporation when it asks to be incorporated. You have incorporated the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatche-

Mr. SHAW.

wan, which is a much smaller body than the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland. This Synod has certain property which they ask to be allowed to manage in their own way, and they wish to retain their own name. They do not want to be deprived of that right by what, with all respect, I call an arbitrary exercise of the powers of Parliament. If the Bill should pass in its present state, the former Bill could not pass, and, as I submit, with all respect to the House, common justice requires it, I propose that the preamble should be amended. Speaking of the measure, I wish to correct the hon. member for South Bruce in the statement he made—a statement which has been generally accepted, that an overwhelming majority of the whole Presbyterian Church in connection with the Church of Scotland voted for the Union. As a matter of fact, there never was an absolute majority of that church, or the members of the Synod, who voted for the Union. On the last occasion when a vote was taken there were only sixty-eight out of some 270 members of the Synod who were entitled to be present and to vote, and who voted for the Union. It is stated that the whole of the congregation of 138 who then composed the church voted for the Union except a dissentient ten. That is not correct. There were forty-six congregations that did not vote at all. But the majority say those forty-six must all be taken as assenting to the Union. I deny that. Had they been in favor of it, they would have voted in favor of it. Because they did not vote, is not a proof that they were in favor of it. Another matter to be considered is the number of congregations. Four or five, to my knowledge, have shown, by the proceedings in Court, that they tried to vote themselves out of the Union, and by a large majority did vote themselves out of it, but their vote was declared illegal on technical grounds. Take the case of the congregation of London, Middlesex, and Mayfield and many others which had voted themselves out of the Union, but were not allowed to go out on technical informalities. There was not an absolute majority in favor of the Union. Out of the 133 only sixty-eight in all voted for the Union; yet they say an overwhelming majority voted for it. Why, the whole Synod numbers 270. Forty-six congregations did not vote at all; ten voted themselves out, and a much larger number tried to do so but failed through irregularities in the mode of voting. I say, therefore, the amendment is one that is fair and right, to enable the ministers to manage their own affairs. Are you going to deprive them of their property and existence as a church? That will be the result of passing this preamble in its present state.

Mr. MACMILLAN. Before the motion is put, I desire to make a continuation of the remarks I made the other night on this, to us, important subject. Had I known that the member for North Victoria was going to move an amendment in connection with this matter, I might have consulted and joined him in the amendments I was desirous of making and one of which I had actually given notice in connection with this question. It is stated by many of the members here that, when this portion of the Church of Scotland which went into the Union took this step, although it actually became part and parcel of the Union Church, nevertheless, it retained its original position of being the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and this seems to me to be an extraordinary position for any Board to take—that it can be two separate and distinct bodies and yet be one and the same body. It is a well-known fact that a very large majority went into that Union, but the point is—and it is one which has caused considerable discussion—as to whether when a very considerable number of the body went into this Union, the entire body of the church entered the Union or not; and I am one of those who are prepared to contend that it did

not go in, though a large portion of it went in; and though the portion that remained out of the Union still is entitled to the name that we are asking to get, and that I brought in a Bill this Session for the purpose of having it established to us by a vote of this House; namely, that we were entitled still to be called the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, because, as a matter of fact, we belong to the same church. By a Statute of the Province of Ontario, those who remained and who voted themselves out of the Union, were not supposed to form part of the Union Church. Well, if we are not part of the Union Church, I would like to know to what church we really belong. It seems to me quite clear that we certainly belong to the church to which we originally belonged, namely, to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. Now, Sir, it is with reference to this fund, or rather with reference to this Union Church, that I desire to say a few words. We are told that the Free Church of Canada and the United Presbyterian Church seceded from the Kirk of Scotland, simply owing to the fact that they did not wish to have any endowments for their clergymen and no grants to be made them in any way whatever. They wished to have no connection between Church and State at all, and went out simply owing to the fact that they were not desirous of having any fund receivable in that way at all. They now have formed a Union with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, but they—the Free Church and the Union Church, said: "Oh, we have nothing to do with that fund." Well, all I have to say to you, Sir, is that this Bill then contains something which is very very false on the face of it, because as soon as the present incumbents, and as soon as the clergymen who were the original commutators to this fund die away, what becomes of this fund? Does it not go into the Home Mission Fund to be governed by the Trustees of the Union Church? This is stated clearly on the face of the Bill, and how hon. gentlemen can say that they are not desirous of being participants in this fund and that they have no interest in it, whereas, as a matter of fact, on the face of the Bill, it appears directly the contrary, is to me something remarkable. Now, this is as clearly a State Fund as anything possible can be. It was created a State Fund in the first place. A Statute of George III, set the Clergy Reserves apart for the special purpose of the promotion of Protestantism in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. After a while the lands that were set apart in this way were sold and the amount that was realized from them was known as the Clergy Reserve Fund, and the Kirk of Scotland got some \$509,000 as its share; but this amount has been depleted to a very considerable extent, namely, to the sum of \$332,000. Now, Sir, I do not say the present Board of Management are to blame for that at all. I do not say that anybody is to blame. It was a misfortune; but it nevertheless was a State Fund which was received by the Church of Scotland from the Clergy Reserve Fund, and that is given and brought into this amalgamated church. My Bill was simply this: it was, as my hon. friend from Victoria stated, to enable us to become incorporated under the name we sought for, under the name to which we were entitled, and under the name we have always had, because the other Board certainly is not entitled to it. They have become the Presbyterian Church in Canada and as such why should they not have control of their funds under the same name, which they themselves bear. Surely, if it is such a happy union as they speak of, they cannot be ashamed of the name, and yet one can barely see for what other reason they refuse to have anything to do with a Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, unless it is because they are ashamed of it. This seems to be the only reason why they do it, because they still affect the old name of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian

Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. Now Sir, as to the union that is created in this church, this family union that is spoken of throughout this country, I can say to you, Sir, and I have certainly a small knowledge, in connection with this subject, that these bodies are as separate and as distinct in this country, at this moment, as they were the day before they were united by Act of Parliament. They are just as separate and distinct. You go to any city in Canada, where there are and have been different churches, take the Free Church and the United Presbyterian Church and the Kirk of Scotland, which separated from us, and what is the result? Do you find that they associate with each other? That they are to be found in each other's churches, and are one family, as it is represented, dwelling in unison—as some of the clerical gentlemen would wish us to believe is the case? No, Sir; I can say from my own knowledge that in the case of the original Free Church, for instance, when any of the clergymen of that body, through ill-health or from any other cause, have their pulpits unfilled, instead of the people of their congregations going to one or other of these Presbyterian bodies, they do nothing of the kind, but go to the English Church, or to the Methodist Church, or to the Congregational Church, rather than to one of these other churches; and yet we are told by hon. gentlemen here, what a family union there is, and what a great bond of union exists throughout this country. It appears on paper and on paper solely. Now, if this great majority is desirous, if they had either the feeling and the desire to create a Union, would they have pursued the course which they are pursuing at this present moment? To my mind it is a great oppression. The vote, to-night, has been that way; but I am inclined to think the time will come when we will see things take a different turn, and that body which is attempted to be crushed now, will come forward and exist as a very respectable body in this country. It is stated now that they are only ten or fifteen clergymen, but it is also stated by our people that we have thirty-three congregations in this country that are not in the Union, and I think that is a very respectable number, more especially when we have had our friends taken away from us, as has been done by the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec and confirmed by this House to-night. It has also been stated that these Acts were declared *ultra vires* by the Privy Council, who suggested legislation in connection with this matter. Such was the case, but not such legislation as we have had here to-night. All that the Privy Council suggested was that the House of Commons in Canada was the proper place to go for legislation, but they did not suggest any special Bill. It seems an extraordinary thing that we should be asked to confirm Acts that were declared *ultra vires*. To my mind, if the conclusion of the hon. member for South Lanark is at all correct, we are confirming legislation to-night that it is really impossible to confirm, for the simple reason that the funds of the church as they exist at present will not carry out the suggestion that is being made by this Bill. Under the circumstances, although we have been defeated by a very considerable majority to-night, I still have hopes that we will get our rights in some other locality. In the meantime I must state, as I have stated before, that it is my intention still to try to get our body incorporated under the name of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, in order that we may have control of our own funds and be a separate and distinct body.

Mr. SCRIVER. While I think a good deal that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has not been at all relevant to the motion before the House, still I do not like to allow some of his observations to pass uncontradicted. He has ventured to tell this House that this so-called Union of the Presby-

terian bodies in 1875 has not been a real Union, that the distinctions which existed between the different bodies before that time continue to exist; that there is nothing like real harmony of sentiment or unity of action among those bodies now. Well, that may possibly be true in the neighborhood in which the hon. gentleman resides, but I can assure him it is far from being true in many parts of this Dominion. It was quite natural, perhaps inevitable, that some large and wealthy congregations in the cities should continue to exist as they did previous to the Union. Those who were members of those two churches at that time will continue to remain members of them for some time to come. Ministers who were in charge of these churches at that time will very likely remain so as long as they live, but it is quite possible that when these ministers die, the members of these churches will consult their own opinions in choosing their successors. But I know that in my county where two such churches existed before the Union, the result has been a United Church comparatively strong. What is more important still, in the missionary operations in the North-West of ours there has been, and there will be for all time to come, united action on the part of this body; and it was with this object in view, the object of uniting with regard to these missionary transactions in the North-West, perhaps more than any other object, that this Union was formed in the first place. As to the motion of the hon. member for North Victoria, the House will remember that it has already approved by a large majority that the Union which took place in 1875, so far as concerned the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, took that body from its former ecclesiastical relations into the new ones, that the Synod of that church united with the other churches at that time. To affirm his motion would be an indirect way of contravening what has already been done in another place.

Mr. CASEY. With reference to the motion of the hon. member for North Victoria, I think we cannot accept it without declaring, as a House of Commons, that no church can act as a body. It has been clearly shown to us that the Synods of the different churches which formed the present Union took all the necessary constitutional action, according to the established forms of those churches, to secure the assent of a majority of their members to such Union, and a majority as was essential under these forms and constitutions to carry any action that they might take as a Synod. The action they took was taken, not as individual members or members of the church, but as a body. I think that we, who are members of other churches not directly concerned in this dispute, should be very careful before we assent to the proposition that no church body can act as a body in changing its constitution or forming a Union with other churches. I think, instead of making the preamble of the Bill consistent with truth, it would be making it inconsistent with truth unless we are to accept the proposition that no church can act as a body. My hon. friend is very particular about the language; he says we must state the majority did so and so. Well, if we carried out the principle, the minority might dissent to any action that the governing body of a church might take. Nay, we might object to use the form of words that precedes every Act of the House, that Her Majesty enacts so-and-so with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons. We know it is very seldom that it is done with the unanimous consent of the Senate and House of Commons, and if we accepted the hon. gentleman's proposition we should have to change the preamble of all the Bills and say that Her Majesty enacts with the advice and consent of the majority of the Senate and House of Commons, so-and-so. I think my hon. friend will hardly be prepared to go to that extent. Like my hon. friend from West Middlesex, I can only corroborate what

Mr. SCRIVER.

has been said by the hon. member from Huntingdon, that in the country parts of my county that Union has been a real Union and has promoted kindly feelings and put an end to dissensions.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). I have given another notice of motion which I desire to put in the minutes, because it seems to me it is the only logical way of disposing of this matter. I do not intend to press it to a division because it is analogous to the amendment of the hon. member for Glengarry, and I therefore move in amendment—

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the amount of the Temporalities Fund shall be divided in proportion to the number of the now surviving founders of the fund adhering to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and to the Presbyterian Church in Canada, to wit, seven twenty-seventh (7-27th) part to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and twenty twenty-seventh (20-27th) part to the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and that the said Committee be instructed to give the necessary powers to said churches separately, to enable each of them to manage the portion accruing to each of the said churches."

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Halton) moved in amendment:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend Clause 4, by adding thereto the following: "At a meeting to be called and held as aforesaid, the Beneficiaries, or a majority of them may make provision for the disposition of the residue of the 'Fund' after the three classes of payments named in section 1 have been satisfied and extinguished, and they shall have power to determine that the congregations which declined to enter the Union, and which may not subsequently enter it, shall be entitled to a share of the said residue, such share to be proportioned to the whole number of congregations on the Synod Roll on June 14th, 1875. And if a majority of the said beneficiaries shall agree to an appropriation of the said residue as aforesaid, at the meeting so called and held as aforesaid, the said agreement and appropriation shall thenceforth be binding in law upon all parties concerned.

The object of this amendment is to enable the beneficiaries, who I think are entitled to express their opinion upon the destination of the fund after their claim has been settled, as is provided for in the fourth section, and if the majority of the beneficiaries are disposed to agree that the congregations which remained out ought to possess or are entitled to have and shall have their proportion of the residue of the fund, then if they so decide the congregations shall be entitled to their proportion of the residue. The difference between this motion and other motions made here is that it is merely an enabling clause; it merely places it in the power of the beneficiaries themselves to deal with the matter in the manner set forth. It is not forced on them, but it is rather an expression of the opinion of the House, that if those congregations so wished it, it would be a proper and just thing to do. They are empowered to do it by this motion, and if the action is taken it will become a legal act by all parties.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SCRIVER. While I do not object to the distribution to which the resolution points, I am opposed to the principle on which it is founded. I do not recognize the rights of the beneficiaries to determine this matter. I quite agree with the opinion which has been expressed that the beneficiaries long ago surrendered their rights to the fund, that it became part of the church and that the church should dispose of it. I question whether any practical good could result from the passing of such a resolution; there is nothing binding in it, and I doubt if it is practicable to get any considerable portion of the old gentlemen together at a meeting, and if they assembled a large majority would decide to keep the fund where it is going. While I agree with the hon. member for Halton, with regard to the distribution at which his motion points, which would not be

unequitable, but rather equitable, I am quite satisfied the end would not be reached.

Mr. McDUGALL (Halton). The motion cannot do much harm, and it will give a better opportunity of discussing the question and deciding one way or the other. If they do not choose to deal with it, or if a majority be opposed to it, there will be an end of the matter; but Parliament enables them to take the action covered by this motion. It is merely leaving to those parties who have an interest in the fund to do a gracious act towards the ten congregations left out, and I hope that before the time comes for the question to be considered, if this resolution were adopted, the whole matter would be finally settled. But in any case it would be an act of equity and of broad justice if Parliament gave these beneficiaries the power indicated in my motion. We did not impose it on them, but we gave them the opportunity of making the act when it is performed a binding legal act.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I am of the opinion that it would be prudent to settle this question now and not to leave it open to create discussion and keep up the divergence which now exists between the churches. I voted against the motion of my hon. friend from Glengarry on the ground that it was giving the minority church entirely too much. He suggested that they should get about one-fourth of the fund. I do not think they should have such a proportion. So far as I can understand there were thirty-three commutators, seven of whom dissented from the union; and in addition to these there were thirty-four beneficiaries, some receiving \$400 a year and some \$200. I have looked into the question to be just and equitable to all parties, and I think the minority church should get about \$30,000 out of the fund; and I think the majority should be willing for the sake of peace, for the sake of the church, and I might say for the sake of religion, should be willing to give some consideration to the minority. Both parties, it seems to me, should agree on these terms to discontinue litigation: the minority should abandon their claims with regard to Queen's College. I take this opportunity of arriving at what I consider an equitable arrangement of the fund.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, Sir, the principle laid down by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) for the division of the fund is the nearest we can approach in reason to a settlement, but I agree with the observation of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) that we are adopting an erroneous mode of reaching a conclusion. So far as I can judge the fund at this time possesses two characters, first, the character of a trust for the lives of those who are specifically and individually interested in it. We are preserving by this Bill those life interests but subject to a sacred discharge out of the fund, of those life interests, it seems to me the beneficiaries have no voice or part in the matter; that the fund became a church fund subject to them; but if we are to recognize the proposition that those who are in the majority are not entitled to the whole of this residue which we are now dealing with, then we have to consider in what proportion it could be disposed of. It seems to me, having discussed the matter a good deal with my friends here, that the conclusion which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) has urged is the best mode of dealing with the fund, viz.: that the surplus or residue, whatever it may be, after the satisfaction of the claims of individuals, should be divided in proportion of the number of congregations remaining out at the time of the Union with the number that went into the United Church at that time; therefore I feel disposed to adopt that conclusion. But, I confess, I feel a good deal of difficulty in assenting to the view that this is to be done at the will of the beneficiaries, because I do not think that they have anything to do with it, and because, if it

be just to act on the conclusion I have mentioned, I think we should do it. It is our right, and in fact we are exercising in this matter the delicate duty of adjusting what the rights of the parties were or ought to be, and if we decide that those outside have any rights, I think we should say that they have such rights and give them to them at once. If they do not choose to take them, that is another question, and, of course they need not accept them. But is it right for us to pass the Bill without giving them what we consider to be their rights. I should, therefore, prefer that when the various classes of payments that are provided for shall have been made out of the fund, the residue shall be divided in the proportion I have indicated, viz.: that each congregation which, having declined to enter into the Union, still remains out, shall be entitled to such a share as one bears to the whole number of congregations on the Synod role at the time of the Union. That would be as near an adjustment as we could make, and it would avoid the necessity for the proposed gathering of those elderly persons. It would avoid putting in their hands the decision of the burning question of whether the minority should have anything or not. It would affirm the view that the minority should have something, and give them that something on the nearest approach to justice which we can arrive at, and on the principle which the House is willing to assent to as the foundation of that discussion.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The proposition is substantially the same as the one which the right hon. leader of the House proposed the other day, but which the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) objected to at the time as not being in accordance with the rules of the House. The only difference is, as I have already pointed out, that the motion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) leaves the matter contingent on the wish of the majority of the commutators when they assemble, whereas it is now proposed to do it absolutely by a provision of the bill. I do not profess to have any authority to speak for the minority. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. Cameron) asked me whom I represented here. I represent the North Riding of the County of Victoria, and I am sent here to vote for and speak in favour of such legislation as I think right and proper. I have no interest in this matter other than that, nor, I presume, has the hon. gentleman. I am not here as the advocate of any particular church or body, but I have a special interest in this matter from the fact that one of the congregations that dissented from the Union is seated in my constituency. What I desire is not only to do justice to them, but to do parliamentary justice in the whole matter. I have taken the position I occupy in this matter; I have made the observations which I made, and I have moved the amendment which I moved from that simple desire. I do not, as I said, profess to speak for the minority church, nor do I say that they will accept the proposition. My own opinion is, and I have no doubt theirs is, that it offers most inadequate justice, and that it does not cover the true facts. If a majority of the House deliberately says that they will do no more the majority must do as they think fit.

Mr. McDUGALL (Halton). With reference to the objection raised by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the Bill as it now stands provides that:

"The said Board of management shall, within twelve months after the passing of this Act, call a meeting of the said beneficiaries at such time and place as may be found most convenient, and at such meetings the said beneficiaries shall have power to make by-laws regulating all matters relating to the mode in which notice of vacancies occurring as aforesaid shall be given to them."

and so on. It seems to me that that meeting would be a fit occasion to enable them to come to this decision; and now, with respect to the statement of the hon. gentleman

that the beneficiaries have nothing to do with the fund. The committee must remember that this fund was created by the commutators, that it was money which was assigned to them out of the Clergy Reserve Funds; that they had a personal and individual right to it, that there would have been no residue if they had not yielded up a portion of that to which they were entitled for the benefit of the body to which they belonged. If they had refused to commute there would have been no residue except the fund appropriated to meet these payments, and the annual amounts they would have drawn would have extinguished the fund. Since by their own act there is likely to be a fund remaining it seems to me there is a reasonable ground for saying that their decision in this question is a proper one, and I do not know who else is to make it. I repeat my objection on parliamentary or constitutional grounds to any interference by parliament in the arrangements of churches in matters of this kind. If the Synod of the church is a more proper body to deal with the matter I would be willing to substitute it; but, after discussing this matter with several gentlemen, who are thoroughly conversant with the whole question and with the feelings and views of a large number of prominent men in the United Church, it seems to them, as it seems to me, that by adopting this course we would put no coercion upon them, but would be putting before them our view of what we think ought to be done, and leave them to say whether they will do it or not. If they do not choose to exercise the power proposed to be given to them, no harm is done, and the Bill remains as before; but if it is adopted I believe this dissension between those two bodies will be composed by it.

Mr. SHAW. I have had some conversation with some of the parties interested in this legislation, and they have come to the conclusion that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halton would be a method of solving the difficulty. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Durham is very similar in its terms to that proposed by the right hon. leader of the Government the other day, which I objected to at the time, but which, on obtaining a copy of it and examining it, those proposing this Bill think would not be objectionable. It does seem to me, however, that the amendment now proposed would have a better effect than that one. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Halton remarks, that these beneficiaries will have to meet; they were connected with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and none have been placed on the list for the United Church, so that this fund will really be disposed of by the members who were connected with the Old Kirk. I therefore express not only the opinion of those with whom I have consulted, but my own opinion, when I say that we are in favour of the proposed amendment as a means of overcoming this difficulty which has sprung up in the Presbyterian body.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Halton, that the fact that there is to be a meeting of the beneficiaries obviates all difficulty, provided that action is taken at that meeting; but I do not agree with his view that the circumstances that this was the gift of the original commutators gives them the right to decide upon the division of the fund *ultra* their life interests. They had given up the fund to the church, subject to their life interests, and their life interests having been disposed, I maintain that they have no more right to say how that fund shall be disposed of than anyone else in the church. The quasi title supposed to belong to them, because they happen to be the donors, does not now exist in effect, because, as I understand, there are 107 beneficiaries, of whom only thirty-three were original commutators, so that the body proposed to deal with the subject would be composed of one-third of original commutators and two-thirds

Mr. McDougall (Halton).

who are not. There seems, therefore, the less pertinence in the proposition to place in their hands the power of deciding that justice shall be done; if it be in the mind of the House that justice should be done, it seems to me that we should better perform our duty by doing that act of justice by disposing of the fund in the way we propose it should be disposed of. Of course we do not finally dispose of it; we do not oblige the majority even to take our Bill on these terms. If they think they have a legal right to this fund they are not bound to accept this legislation; but if we conceive it right to confirm them in the possession of this fund and to give the minority some compensation, it does seem to me that it would be a more reasonable thing than to leave this question in doubt, depending upon it being settled at the proposed meeting of the beneficiaries, who have nothing to do with the question, to dispose of it at once by such an alteration as I have suggested, which would in effect provide:—

“After the first and third classes named in the Bill of payments made in extinction shall have been extinguished, and provision shall have been made for the annual receipt, in perpetuity, of the sum provided for in the second class of payments, each congregation which declined to become a party to the Union and which shall not have entered the Union before the time of the extinction of such payments, shall be entitled to a share of the residue, such share to be in the proportion of one to the whole number of congregations on the Synod roll on the 14th day of June, 1875, the date of the Union.”

Mr. BLAKE. We will so dispose of the question. We will leave nothing to the beneficiaries to decide, but will decide it on principles which appear to commend themselves generally, not indeed to the minority, but to the impartial members of the House, as principles just and applicable to the solution of the question.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The wording of the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham hardly meets what he apparently intends, because the first clause of the Bill provides for the annual receipt of \$2,000 in perpetuity. According to the phraseology of this amendment, this appropriation to the different congregations would only be when perpetuity came to an end.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not mean to propose that the capital fund should be dealt with until the life interests which are charged on that fund should be extinguished. I do not mean to propose such a deviation from the scope and view of the Bill as that would involve. I suppose some adjustment ought to be made of the payment which is to be *in perpetuum*, but I do not intend to propose that there should be a distribution of the capital of this fund until the life interest charged upon it has been satisfied.

Amendment agreed to and reported.

On motion for third reading of the Bill,

Mr. MACMILLAN moved in amendment:

That the Bill be again re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the Preamble so as to provide that the said Board, heretofore known as the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, be amended by changing the title of said Board to that of the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

The Amendment was negatived on a division, and main motion agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed; and (at 1:20 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 4th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE MANITOBA SUBSIDY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That, in view of the greatly increased extent and population of Manitoba, since the subsidy to that Province was fixed by the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 3, and of the fact, that its public lands are administered and the proceeds appropriated by the Dominion Government, it is expedient that the said subsidy be increased and the following amounts allowed therefor, yearly, on and from the First day of January, 1882, viz.: For the support of the Government and Legislature, \$50,000; on an estimated population of 150,000, at 80 cents per head, \$120,000; as an indemnity for the want of public lands, \$45,000; the said sums to form the yearly subsidy to be paid by the Dominion to the said Province during the ten years next after 1881, in lieu of the subsidy allowed by the said Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 3.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would suggest that the Government announce their intention with reference to the Easter adjournment. Before asking the hon. gentleman to make that announcement, I would again call the attention of the Government to the fact that the papers moved for in connection with the disallowance of the Streams Bill, have not yet been brought down. That measure was adverted to on the earliest possible occasion, namely, on the debate on the Address. It was said by myself, and agreed to by the hon. Minister, that the question was one which ought to be discussed early this Session. The papers, which cannot be very voluminous, have not yet been brought down. It seems to me no further delay should take place in bringing them down. With reference to the North-West lands, the newspapers state that from 300 to 500 colonization companies have been organized, but we have been unable as yet to obtain even a list of the names of the various companies. The extensive information asked for in the first instance has been reduced to the narrowest compass, with the view of our obtaining even a tabulated statement of the names, quantities, &c., yet we are without even that information. I would also direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the questions connected with the Pacific Railway Company on the subject of contracts, sales of lands and surveys. I observe in the report brought down, Railway Statistics, an official map at the end gives a route for the Canadian Pacific Railway, which appears to be entirely different from that which we were led to believe, from the hon. Minister's speech shortly before the Session, would be adopted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to the information from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I find, on looking at the law, that the hon. gentleman is, as I was myself, under a misapprehension as to the obligation of the Company to furnish information. If he will refer to the Act to which he drew the attention of my colleague in my absence, he will find that section 30 is amended by striking out the words "three months after the end of the calendar year," and substituting "three months after the first of July in each year." Thus we are only entitled to the information provided for in the Act for three months after the first of July each year. I lost no time in communicating to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company my desire that they should furnish all the information asked

for; but, at the same time, I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to this to show that we are not, by law, entitled to all the information he has asked for.

Mr. BLAKE. I was quite aware that the regulation to which the hon. gentleman alludes makes a return compulsory up to a fixed period in each year, but the objection that the hon. gentleman suggested on the last occasion when this subject came before the House was not to the character of that return, or the date which it should embrace, but to the principle of our asking this Company to give us information up to any date on this particular subject, or copies of contracts for the construction of their line. That objection is completely met by the fact that Parliament adopted the policy that the information shall be furnished of that character, and having laid down this policy in the Statutes, we are to get that information up to a particular date. There is no difficulty at all in reaching the view that if the public interest require later information of the same description we can call upon the Company to furnish it. The principle is in the Act that the Company is bound to give us the information before the 1st of July, and as there can be no objection on the point of principle, I cannot doubt for a moment that the Company will comply with the unanimous order of the House, and give us earlier that information which it is in the highest degree in the interest of the public we should receive this Session.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no controversy as to the obligation of the Company to furnish this information, but that obligation is confined by the Statute to a particular period of the year, and, of course, the House and the Government are only in a position to ask of the Company that which the law defines. I merely draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the Act of Parliament does not give us the authority to compel the Company to make the return which he demands. I have lost no time in calling the attention of the Company to this demand, and have no doubt the information sought for will be obtained. With reference to the map submitted yesterday and the location of the railway, the hon. gentleman will understand that all the officers of my Department whose duty it is to draft a map of that description can do so, when the map is made, to lay down as nearly as possible the expected, or proposed, or intended line of the railway. The hon. gentleman knows well that last Session it was contemplated the line should be carried to Callander, north of Lake Superior, going to a point fifty miles west of Callander. Down to this moment the Government have not authorized the proposed alteration in such a manner as to enable an officer of the Department to lay it down authoritatively on the map. I have no wish to withhold the fullest information from the House on this subject. We have been waiting in order that the Company might complete their survey and location of what was expected to be a part of the Sault Ste. Marie Branch and main line of railway. That survey having been completed, the Company have sent in applications for permission to locate the line in the mode indicated.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that, before the adjournment of the House to-day, the Government will be in a position to state till what day we propose to adjourn for the Easter holidays. With reference to the papers required by the hon. member opposite, respecting the disallowance of the Streams Bill and the boundaries of Ontario and the North-West, I will make enquiries at once. With reference to the colonization companies, I may say we cannot give the information yet, for the Government have not yet dealt with the applications.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the applications we ask for.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They will probably be dealt with before the House meets on Tuesday next.

Mr. BLAKE. We want the applications refused as well as the applications granted.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The matter will be attended to at once.

BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Plumb's amendment to Sir Leonard Tilley's proposed motion: That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the resolutions now before us will, I have no doubt, be largely supported in this House and in the country. They are so moderate in tone, and so reasonable in what is proposed to be done, that it is difficult to see on what grounds they can be opposed. Here is a question on which there are wide differences of opinion; a question involving points of law, of history, and of fact, which is not likely to be settled except by reference to a legal tribunal. And in these resolutions it is proposed, in the first place, to refer it to the Supreme Court of the Dominion, and, in the next, to the very highest judicial tribunal in the Empire, where it is sure to receive calm consideration, and be adjudicated upon without reference to party politics; while, in the meantime, it is proposed that the management of the disputed territory shall be entrusted to a Joint Commission, appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario. Nothing could be more fair or reasonable, and faction only, intractable and virulent as it always is, is likely to raise a voice against a proposition so just. Referring to me, the hon. member for Lambton has said that the leader of the Government had put up one of his supporters to call for a Committee. I may say in this regard that no one put me up to call for a Committee. The disputed territory was chiefly, if not wholly, within the district which I had the honor to represent. I happened to know something of this question of the Boundaries, and seeing that a most extraordinary award had been made, I considered it to be my duty to call for a Committee which should collect all available information and lay it before the House. This course appeared to me to be the more necessary, because, as it appeared to me, only one view of the case had been laid before the arbitrators. The Government supported me in this; but I was not interfered with even in the selection of the members of the Committee, and I think the Opposition have no reason to complain of that selection, for it was fully represented, as to numbers, in proportion to its strength in this House, and more than fully represented in the experience and ability of the members chosen. Of course, I could not choose from among the immediate leaders of the Opposition any more than I could from the members of the Government, but, next to them, I believe I selected the ablest members on the Opposition side. Let any one go over the evidence and notice the close and searching questions put to the witnesses by the hon. members of West Middlesex and South Perth, and he will see that the Opposition in Ontario was at least well and ably represented. On the Committee there were four members from Ontario, four from Quebec, and one from each of the other Provinces, making, in all, thirteen. I believe the present Government does not, as a general rule, interfere with its supporters in proposing measures or adopting action which they believe to be for the public good, and it certainly did not do so in my case. The hon. member for Bothwell has favored the House with a long speech, in which he has gone over much of the ground covered by his reports, and, before I have done, it is my intention to notice some of his statements. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman has allowed his fancy too wide a scope, and that he has wandered from his subject a good deal in calling attention to matters which are, in some

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

cases, quite foreign to it, and which, in others, have but a very remote bearing on it. The hon. gentleman, evidently with the view rather to show the extent of his researches and reading, than to throw light on his subject, has ranged over the wide world. You find him at one moment in the torrid zone, dealing with Indian treaties and conventions, in the next, at Vienna, then at the Ionian Islands, and from these he takes his flight to Africa, where he enlightens us as to the boundary disputes of the Boers of the Transvaal. Savoy and Nice are next visited, but he does not stay long there, and we soon catch a glimpse of the hon. gentleman on the Gold Coast, thence he wings his way to Alaska, where he lingers for a moment, and then darts off to the sweltering shores of Florida. In his flight he takes in New Brunswick, and finally swoops down on Hudson's Bay and the icy regions of the north. Really, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that an over-weight of boundaries has put the hon. gentleman somewhat by himself. At all events, I think that but few hon. members of this House will see any analogy between the international arrangements to which the hon. gentleman refers, and our domestic question of the boundaries between Ontario and the Dominion, which is not an international matter at all. Some of the hon. gentleman's remarks I shall notice before I have done. In the meantime, I may say, generally, that a great deal of misconception has arisen in regard to this subject, from the persistent efforts of partizan politicians in this House and out of it, in their writings and speeches and otherwise, rather to embarrass the Government than to advance the true interests either of Ontario or the Dominion. A strenuous effort has been made to produce the impression that Upper Canada, previous to Confederation, covered the whole of that part of the continent claimed as Canada to the westward and north-westward of the dividing line between the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada, and expression was recently given to this view in a neighboring Legislature, by several of its hon. members, without any one being able or willing to set them right, or at least taking the trouble to do so. No one could be more ready than I have always been to stand out for and assert the rights of Ontario in this matter of the boundaries, but her interests cannot be advanced by bringing forward claims that have nothing in history or in fact to support them. The Act of 1774 gave boundaries to the old Province of Quebec, and the Act of 1791, commonly known as the Constitutional Act, simply divided that Province in two, and Upper Canada thenceforward, embraced that portion of the old Province of Quebec which lay to the westward of the dividing line. No other view can reasonably be taken unless we are to be guided by the descriptions in commissions to Governors, which, however much they may have extended the boundaries of Upper Canada to the north, certainly did not, as I shall show before I have done, enlarge them to the westward. When the matter was first agitated in 1857, the Government of the united Provinces, in order to prevent a renewal of the lease, then about to expire, of the Indian territories to the Hudson's Bay Company, claimed that Canada covered the whole country to the Saskatchewan, and even to the Pacific Ocean, but that was a claim made on the part of united Canada, not on the part of Upper Canada alone, and had that claim been made good, which it never was, all the territory beyond the limits of the old Province of Quebec, or, in other words, beyond Upper Canada, which was cut out of that Province, would have been as much the property of the one Province as of the other. It would have been the property of united Canada, not of Upper Canada alone. This is a distinction which the present agitators deem it to their advantage, for party purposes, to ignore. But the claim, whatever its merits might have been, was never allowed by the Imperial Government and never in any way made good, and

many eminent men, the highest law authorities in the Empire among the number, have expressed the opinion that it never could have been allowed. Any unbiassed person who studies the evidence and documents accompanying the report of the Committee of 1880, will be of the same opinion, for it is in that evidence clearly shown that the Indian territories which were always treated as adjoining the Provinces and covering the country immediately to the westward and north-westward of the watershed at Lake Superior, had been declared by two Imperial Acts, those of 1803 and 1821, to be beyond the limits of the Provinces, although adjoining them. It is therein also shown that the colony of Assiniboia, which was within the Indian territories, had, as stated by Judge Johnson and the Hon. D. A. Smith, been recognized by the Imperial Government, and its boundaries came up to the height of land at Pigeon River. Moreover, the territories of the Hudson's Bay Company, which, according to their claim, covered these Indian territories, as they no doubt did by lease, at least, had to be taken into consideration, and in view of all the circumstances it is highly improbable, indeed quite evident, that the Imperial Government could never have admitted the claims advanced by Canada, and in fact it never did. The hon. member for Bothwell has quoted from a squib put forth by that erratic nobleman, Lord Selkirk, to show that the Indian territories of the Acts of 1803 and 1821 were on the Arctic watershed, but that absurdity was long since exploded, and I shall show presently what countries were always dealt with as Indian territories. In the meantime, to continue my argument, I may repeat that the Province of Quebec, as enlarged by the Act of 1774, had certain defined boundaries, and the Act of 1791 simply divided that Province into the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, giving to Upper Canada so much of it as remained to Great Britain after the war of Independence west of the dividing line, and to Lower Canada all to the east of that line. Upper Canada, therefore, as first constituted, embraced that portion, and that port on only, of Canada which remained to Britain and was within the former Province of Quebec, to the west of the dividing line. It has, as I have said, been claimed that Canada extended to the north and west, far beyond the limits of the enlarged Province of Quebec—I mean as enlarged by the Act of 1774—and for my part, I still maintain that it did so; but I fail to see that there is any inconsistency in saying that Upper Canada did not embrace the whole of that country, but only such portion of the former Province of Quebec as was defined in Imperial Acts. In 1857, the Government of the day was perfectly consistent in claiming, as part of Canada, limits far beyond the boundaries of Upper Canada. But the Attorney-General of Ontario is far from being consistent now in claiming, as he does in every document his Government sends in, that the claims advanced by the Government of that time were made on the part of Upper Canada alone, and that the Government of the Dominion, now that the country has been acquired by purchase, should hand over to Ontario the territory, or any portion of the territory, which was then and is now beyond the boundaries of the former Province of Upper Canada. But then the proclamation of General Alured Clarke, according to the hon. member for Bothwell, covers everything, and carries Ontario to the westward and southward, to the utmost extent of the country called or known by the name of Canada. But this proclamation, for which so much was at one time claimed, is meaningless in itself, except in so far as the divisional line is concerned, for it describes a mere geographical "line, as including all the territory to the westward and southward of the said line, to the utmost extent of the country called or known by the name of Canada." The instructions which General Clarke had, or rather which his superior officer, the Governor-General, for whom he was acting, had authorized him to describe the line of division

only as will be seen from the commission and instructions which I shall read:

" COMMISSIONS.

" 12TH SEPTEMBER, 1791.

" GUY, LORD DORCHESTER—*Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada.*

" GREETING :

" Whereas, We did by Our Letters Patent, under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, bearing date the twenty-second day of April, in the twenty-sixth year of Our Reign, constitute and appoint you, Guy, Lord Dorchester (then Sir Guy Carleton), to be Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Province of Quebec in America, comprehending all Our Territories, Islands and Countries in North America, then bounded as in Our said recited Letters Patent was mentioned and expressed.

" Now Know Ye, that We have revoked, determined, and by these presents do revoke and determine, the said recited Letters Patent, and every clause, article or thing therein contained.

" And whereas, We have thought fit by Our order, made in Our Privy Council on the nineteenth day of August, one thousand seven hundred and ninety-one, to divide Our said Province of Quebec into two separate Provinces, to be called the Province of Upper Canada and the Province of Lower Canada, by a line to commence at a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis at the Cove west of the Pointe au Baudet, in the limit between the Township of Lancaster and the Seigneurie of New Longueuil, running along the said limit to the direction of north thirty-four degrees west of the westernmost angle of the said Seigneurie of New Longueuil; thence along the north-western boundary of the Seigneurie of Vaudreuil, running north twenty-five degrees east, until it strikes the Ottawas River, to ascend the said river into the Lake Temiscaming, and from the head of the said lake by a line drawn due north until it strikes the boundary line of Hudson's Bay; the Province of Upper Canada to comprehend all such lands, territories and islands lying to the westward of the said line of division, as were part of Our said Province of Quebec.

" And whereas, by an Act passed in the present year of Our Reign, intitled: 'An Act to repeal certain parts of an Act passed in the fourteenth year of His Majesty's reign, intitled: 'An Act for making more effectual provision for the Government of Quebec, in North America, and to make further provision for the Government of the said Province,' further provision is hereby made for the good government and prosperity of our said Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada.

" Further Know Ye, that We, reposing especial trust and confidence in the prudence, courage and loyalty of you, the said Guy, Lord Dorchester, of Our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, have thought fit to constitute and appoint you, the said Guy, Lord Dorchester, to be Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of Our said Province of Upper Canada, and of Our said Province of Lower Canada, respectively, bounded as hereinbefore described.

" EXTRACT from His Majesty's Instructions to His Excellency Lord Dorchester, dated at St. James', the 16th September, 1791, viz:—

" 1st. With these Our instructions, you will receive Our Commission under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, constituting you Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada, bounded as in Our said Commission is particularly expressed. In the execution, therefore, of so much of the Office and Trust we have reposed in you, as relates to Our Province of Lower Canada, you are to take upon you the Administration of the Government of the said Province, and to do and execute all things belonging to your command, according to the several powers and authorities of Our said Commission under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, and of the Act passed in the present year of Our Reign therein recited, and of these Our instructions to you, and according to such further Powers and Instructions as you shall at any time hereafter receive under Our Signet and Sign Manuals or by Our order in Our Privy Council.

" 2nd. And you are with all due solemnity, before the Members of Our Executive Council, to cause Our said Commission to be read and published, which being done, you shall then take, and also administer to each of the Members of Our said Executive Council, the oaths mentioned in an Act passed in the first year of His late Majesty King George the First."

It will be seen from this commission and the accompanying instructions, that General Clark had no authority for the concluding words of his proclamation, and it is only valid in so far as it describes the dividing line. If the concluding words had any meaning at all they could only be construed as including in Upper Canada all that portion of Canada, or, in other words, of the old Province of Quebec which had been ceded by the Treaty of 1783, to the United States. Read in this way, and, if it is to be taken in the sense claimed for it, it admits of no other interpretation, it would

have been tantamount to a declaration of war against the United States, inasmuch as it would have amounted to an abrogation of the treaty; and it is reasonable to believe that if the Imperial Government had contemplated a renewal of hostilities, it would have taken a more formal and less unusual way of promulgating the fact, than that of adding a large portion of United States territory to a British Province by an ambiguously worded proclamation. This proclamation, meaningless as it is, from its wording, except in so far as regards the dividing line, has been largely made use of in claiming that the Province of Quebec, or that part of it of which Upper Canada was formed, extended beyond the limits assigned by the Act of 1774; but other grounds for claiming extended boundaries on the west have been put forward in a lecture, now in pamphlet form, delivered by Sir Francis Hincks, one of the arbitrators at Toronto, and with some of the statements contained in that lecture I propose now to deal. Under ordinary circumstances, in discussing a matter of such grave importance, it would scarcely be worth while to notice in this House a mere partizan lecture, delivered for party purposes, under the auspices of leaders of a political party. But as this lecture has been referred to by the Government of Ontario in an official document addressed to the Secretary of State, and treated, in fact, notwithstanding its erratic statements and weak argument, as if it were the judgment of the arbitrators, of whom the author was one, I believe there can be no impropriety in noticing it. Taking it, then, as a full and elaborate exposition of the grounds on which they arrived at their decision, as its author claims it to be, this House has good reason to congratulate itself on declining to sanction the award. Assuming the grounds of the decision to have been as stated in this pamphlet, it is evident that the arbitrators made an award without a due, I may say without any, consideration of the principal points at issue. The Hudson's Bay Company's claims which had been acknowledged for a century and a half, or more, by the Imperial Government, are practically left out of account, and the Indian territories which adjoined the Provinces, and covered the country immediately to the north and west of the watershed, and were declared by two Imperial Acts as well as by judicial decisions to be beyond the limits of Upper Canada, are barely alluded to, while the clearly defined boundaries of the ancient colony of Assiniboia, notwithstanding that that colony had been fostered and recognized by the Imperial Government, are cut through in the most arbitrary manner without a nod of recognition or the least acknowledgment of its existence. But let us examine this precious pamphlet a little more closely. Stated in few words, the contention of Sir Francis Hincks amounts to this, namely: that two legally established points for a boundary were found—one on the east, the other on the west—which they (the arbitrators) connected by a line drawn from the one to the other, as a boundary on the north. But if the points on the east and the west are wrong what becomes of the line on the north, and if the line on the north is wrong what becomes of the points on the east and the west? The fact is, that there has been horrible blundering to say the least, and I do not hesitate to say that the points on the east and the west and the line on the north are all alike astray. Let us look, first, at the point on the east, and examine the grounds on which Sir Francis Hincks says it was adopted; but first let me state a few historical facts. The Hudson's Bay Company, as is well known, for a period of thirty years or more, after they had obtained their charter had great difficulty in maintaining their posts at Hudson's Bay. There existed a chronic state of war between the French and English in that quarter, which treaties of neutrality or of peace seemed to have little effect in putting an end to, and in these contests the Hudson's Bay Company became so reduced that at the time the Treaty of Ryswick was concluded (in 1697) all their posts on Hudson's Bay,

Mr. Dawson.

except one, were in the possession of the French. Their condition about this time may be gathered from a memorandum which they addressed to the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations. I quote from Mr. Mills report, page 149:

[“Memorandum from the Hudson's Bay Company representing the state of their affairs at present, and what they desire.”]

“To the Honourable the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations.

“The humble representation of the Governor and Company of Adventurers of England trading into Hudson's Bay—

“SHEWETH:

“That the said Company being required by your Lordships to give in what they thought necessary in relation to their trade, and the security of their factory in Hudson's Bay, do with all submission lay before your Lordships the true state and condition thereof.

“They will not trouble your Lordships with a repetition of their undoubted rights to all Hudson's Bay, and that the French never laid claim to the same, or ever sailed a ship or vessel into those parts since the creation of the world, till the year 1682 (many years after the incorporation of this Company), and then in a piratical manner, without any commission or authority from His Most Christian Majesty, who was afterwards pleased to disown the said proceeding, as the Company have and are still ready to prove.

“These matters have been so fully and clearly made out by them, that even the French themselves, with all their sophistry and equivocation, have not been able to disprove.

“Therefore we shall proceed to inform your Lordships of the present melancholy prospect of their trade and settlement in Hudson's Bay, and that none of His Majesty's plantations are left in such a deplorable state as those of this Company, for by their great losses by the French, both in times of peace as well as during the late war, together with the hardships they lie under by the late Treaty of Ryswick, they may be said to be the only mourners by the peace.

“They cannot but inform your lordships that the only settlement the Company have now left in Hudson's Bay (of seven they formerly possessed) is Albany Fort, vulgarly called Chichean, in the bottom of the said bay, where they are surrounded by the French on every side, viz., by their settlements on the lakes and rivers from Canada to the northwards, towards Hudson's Bay, as also from Port Nelson (old York Fort) to the southward; but besides this, the Company have, by the return of their ship this year, received certain intelligence that the French have made another settlement at a place called New Severn, 'twixt Port Nelson and Albany Fort, whereby they have hindered the Indians from coming to trade at the Company's factory, at the bottom of the bay, so that the Company, this year, have not received above one-fifth part of the returns they usually had from thence, insomuch that the same doth not answer the expense of their expedition.

“The Company being by these and others, their misfortunes, reduced to such a low and miserable condition, that, without His Majesty's favor and assistance, they are in no ways able to keep that little remainder they are yet possessed of in Hudson's Bay, but may justly fear in a short time to be deprived of all their trade in those parts, which is solely negotiated by the manufacturers of this kingdom.

“Upon the whole matter, the Company humbly conceive they can be no ways safe from the insults and encroachments of the French so long as they are suffered to remain possessed of any place in Hudson's Bay, and that in order to dislodge them from thence (which the Company are in no way able to do) a force of three men-of-war, one bomb-vessel, and 250 soldiers, besides the ships' company, will be necessary, whereby that vast tract of land which is of so great concern, not only to this Company in particular, but likewise to the whole nation in general, may not be utterly lost to this kingdom.

“All which is humbly submitted to your lordships' great wisdom and judgment, by the Governor and Company of Adventurers of England, trading into Hudson's Bay.

“WM. POTTER,
“Secretary.

“Hudson's Bay House,
“The 19th January, 1701.”

Mr. HAGGART. When was that?

Mr. DAWSON. In 1701. In this, their dire extremity, they were willing to accept Albany as their southern boundary on the west coast of Hudson's Bay, and at the same time they protested in this way:

“But should the French refuse the limits now proposed by the Company, the Company think themselves not bound by this or any former concessions of the like nature, but must, as they have always done, insist upon their prior and undoubted right to the whole Bay and Straights of Hudson, which the French never yet would strictly dispute, or suffer to be examined into (as knowing the weakness of their claims), though the first step in the said article of Ryswick directs the doing of it.”

“By order of the General Court of the said Company.

“(Signed)

WM. POTTER,
“Secretary.

“January 20th, 1701.”

But the Albany boundary, although proposed under the circumstances I have mentioned, after a treaty which the Hudson's Bay Company said, left them the only mourners, was in fact never accepted nor in any way confirmed, and this is the boundary which Sir Francis Hincks calls a legally established one. Some years subsequent to the occurrences to which I have referred, or to be more precise in 1713, the whole Bay and Straits of Hudson were restored to England by the Treaty of Utrecht, the 10th Article of which I shall read :

"ARTICLE X.—The said Most Christian King shall restore to the Kingdom and Queen of Great Britain, to be possessed in full right, the Bay and Straits of Hudson, together with all lands, seas, sea-coasts, rivers and places situated in the said bay and straits, and which belong thereunto, no tracts of land or sea being excepted, which are at present possessed by the subjects of France. All which, as well as any buildings there made, in the condition they now are, and likewise all fortresses there erected, either before or since the French seized the same, shall within six months from the ratification of the present treaty, or sooner if possible, be well and truly delivered to the British subjects having commission from the Queen of Great Britain to demand and receive the same, entire and undemolished, together with all the cannon and cannon-ball, and with the other provisions of war usually belonging to cannon. It is, however, provided, that it may be entirely free from the Company of Quebec, and all other, the subjects of the Most Christian King whatsoever, to go by land or sea, whithersoever they please out of the lands of the said bay, together with all their goods, merchandizes, arms, and effects of whatever nature and condition soever, except such things as are above reserved in this Article. But it is agreed on both sides to determine within a year by Commissaries to be forthwith named by each party, the limits which are to be fixed between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French, which limits both the British and French subjects shall be wholly forbidden to pass over, or thereby go to each other by sea or by land. The same Commissaries shall also have orders to describe and settle the boundaries between the other British and French colonies in those parts."

From the date of this treaty until the purchase of the Hudson's Bay Company's territories by the Dominion Government in 1870—a period of 157 years—the Hudson's Bay Company were in quiet possession of all the country bordering on Hudson's Bay, and by the Act of 1774, the southern boundary of their territories became the northern boundary of the Province of Quebec, out of which Upper Canada was formed. The Commissioners mentioned in the Treaty, although appointed never met to determine the precise boundary line "between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French," but that is not material to my argument. The line of division known as the "boundary line of Hudson's Bay" was an inland line. The maps of the period, have it marked as such, the French maps placing it somewhat nearer to the coast than the English maps, but both purporting to give it as the line "between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French." This boundary line of Hudson's Bay is given in all the commissions to Governors, from 12th September, 1791, till 30th March, 1838, when an entirely new description was adopted, as the limitary line of Upper Canada on the north. The wording of the commissions, in describing the eastern boundary of Upper Canada, is "to ascend the said River (Ottawas) into Lake Temiscaming and from the head of the said lake by a line drawn due north, until it strikes the boundary line of Hudson's Bay." There is not one word said of the Albany either in the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) in the Act of 1774, or in commissions to Governors, and yet the arbitrators adopted it, because, according to Sir Francis Hincks, the Hudson's Bay Company had been willing to accept it, although, as I have shown, they never did. The Treaty of Utrecht, as the Attorney-General for Ontario justly remarked in his statement of the case in 1878, really settled all matters as to boundary between the English and the French, and that Treaty defined an inland line as the boundary "between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French," and yet the award cuts through this boundary and goes several hundreds miles north of it, on the flimsy pretext that the Hudson Bay Company, when driven to the last extremity in an early period of their history

nearly two hundred years ago, were willing to accept (but really never did accept) the Albany as their southern boundary on Hudson Bay. In modern times the commissions to Governors, commencing with that of 1838 to Lord Durham, carried the boundary line on the east to the shore of Hudson Bay, and these Sir Francis Hincks says :

"For a considerable time were in the precise words of the proclamation 'to the boundary of Hudson's Bay,' but in 1838 Lord Durham's Commission contained the words 'until it strikes the shore of Hudson Bay.' Now, I wish it to be clearly understood, as Mr. Wm. McDawson seems to imagine, that the decision of the arbitrators was founded on the commission that such was not the case."

So that it was not on commissions to Governors that the decision was founded, but merely on the opinion that the words "boundary line of Hudson's Bay" was identical with the shore, and the absurdity of this contention is self-evident. Sir Francis Hincks says :

"Still the fact that the Hudson's Bay Company made no claim to any country south of the Albany River is confirmatory of the correctness of the award."

This is falsifying the record with a vengeance, for the Company, as I have already shown in the extracts I have read, protested loudly against being driven so far north as the Albany. It, therefore, follows that the arbitrators had no authority whatever for adopting the Albany as the southern limit of the Hudson's Bay Company's territory, on the west coast of Hudson's Bay. From the date of the Treaty of Utrecht up to the transfer of the territory to Canada—a period of 157 years—the Company were in quiet possession of all the country bordering on Hudson's Bay, and that too for a very considerable distance inland, and surely if the Company had no other claim to the territory so long a period of peaceful possession should not be lightly thrown aside. In reference to the point which they chose on the west, the arbitrators, if we are to adopt Sir Francis Hincks' statement as an exposition of the grounds on which they arrived at their decision, were quite as unfortunate as they were on the east. Admitting for the moment that the Mississippi was the western boundary of the enlarged Province of Quebec, as it perhaps was, the fact of its being so did not at a subsequent date make the North-West Angle of the Lake of the Woods the western boundary of Upper Canada. The first commission issued under the Act of 1774 carried the boundary along the Mississippi, and I shall read it :

"27TH DECEMBER, 1774.

"SIR GUY, CARLETON—*Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Province of Quebec.*

"And further know you, that We, reposing especial trust and confidence in the prudence, courage and loyalty of you, the said Guy Carleton, of Our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have thought fit to constitute and appoint you, the said Guy Carleton, to be Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Province of Quebec, in America, comprehending all Our Territories, Islands and Countries in North America, bounded on the south by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the high lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea, to a point in forty-five degrees of northern latitude, on the eastern bank of the River Connecticut, keeping the same latitude directly west, through the Lake Champlain, until in the same latitude it meets with the River St. Lawrence; from thence up the eastern bank of the said river to the Lake Ontario, thence through the Lake Ontario, and the river commonly called Niagara, and thence along by the eastern and south-eastern bank of Lake Erie, following the said bank until the same shall be intersected by the northern boundary granted by the charter of the Province of Pennsylvania, in case the same shall be so intersected, and from thence along the said northern and western boundaries of the said Province, until the said western boundary strikes the Ohio; but in case the bank of the said lake shall not be found to be so intersected, then following the said bank until it shall arrive at that point of the said bank which shall be nearest to the north-western angle of the said Province of Pennsylvania, and thence by a right line to the said north-western angle of the said Province, and thence along the western boundary of the said Province until it strikes the River Ohio, and along the bank of the said river westward to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward along the eastern bank of the said river to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay; and also all such Territories, Islands and Countries which have, since the tenth day of February, one thousand

seven hundred and sixty-three, been made part of the Government of Newfoundland as aforesaid, together with all the rights, members and appurtenances whatsoever thereunto belonging."

This description was repeated in the Commission of 1777, to Sir Frederick Haldimand, and it will be observed that while these commissions carried the boundaries of the Province of Quebec to the Mississippi, they at the same time explained and interpreted the Act as to the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay Company's territories. The Province of Quebec, as explained by these commissions, met the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory, on the watershed of Hudson's Bay, clearly showing the views of the framers of the Act as to where the northern limit of Quebec and the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territories should be held to be. The Treaty of 1783 cut off a very large portion of the Province of Quebec, but it in no place added to it. Instead of the Mississippi, Pigeon River, the present boundary, became the western limit, and according to the Act, as interpreted by the commissions I have read, the Height of Land or Hudson's Bay watershed is the northern limit of the Province of Quebec; but in 1786 another commission was issued, and it unquestionably did carry the Province of Quebec into the Hudson's Bay watershed and to the North-West Angle of the Lake of the Woods. Thus:

"22ND APRIL, 1786.

"SIR GUY CARLETON, K.B. [afterwards Lord Dorchester]—*Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Province of Quebec.*

"And further know ye that We, reposing especial trust and confidence in the prudence, courage and loyalty of you, the said Sir Guy Carleton, of Our especial grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, have thought fit to appoint you, the said Sir Guy Carleton, to be Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Province of Quebec, in America, comprehending all our Territories, Islands and Countries in North America, bounded on the south by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the high lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean, to the north-westmost head of the Connecticut River; thence down along the middle of that river to the forty-fifth degree of north latitude; from thence by a line due west on said latitude until it strikes the River Iroquois or Catarqui; thence along the middle of the said river into Lake Ontario; through the middle of said lake until it strikes the communication by water between that lake and Lake Erie; through the middle of said lake until it arrives at the water communication between that lake and Lake Huron; thence through the middle of said lake to the water communication between that lake and Lake Superior, thence through Lake Superior northward of the Isles Royal and Phillipaux to the Long Lake; thence through the middle of said Long Lake and the water communication between it and the Lake of the Woods to the said Lake of the Woods; thence through the said lake to the most north-western point thereof, and from thence on a due west course to the River Mississippi; and northward to the southern boundary of the Territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson's Bay; and also all such Territories, Islands and Countries which have, since the tenth of February, one thousand seven hundred and sixty-three, been made part of the Government of Newfoundland, together with all the rights, members and appurtenances whatsoever thereunto belonging."

But this commission only held good until 12th September, 1791, on which date it was absolutely and completely revoked in these words:

"12TH SEPTEMBER, 1791.

"GUY, LORD DORCHESTER—*Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada.*

"GREETING:

"Whereas, We did by Our Letters Patent, under Our Great Seal of Great Britain, bearing date the twenty-second day of April, in the twenty-sixth year of Our Reign, constitute and appoint you, Guy, Lord Dorchester (then Sir Guy Carleton) to be Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over Our Province of Quebec, in America, comprehending all Our Territories, Islands and Countries in North America, comprehending all Our Territories, Islands and Countries in North America, then bounded as in Our said recited Letters Patent was mentioned and expressed.

"Now Know Ye, that We have revoked, determined, and by these presents do revoke and determine, the said recited Letters Patent, and every clause, article or thing therein contained."

Now, the commission of 1786 was the only one in the whole series of official documents which carried the boundaries of the Province of Quebec into the Hudson's Bay watershed,
Mr. DAWSON.

at least, to the north or west of Lake Superior, and when it was revoked the matter rested precisely where it did before. Upper Canada thenceforward embraced just so much and no more of the former Province of Quebec, as remained to Great Britain after the war of Independence, that is west of the divisional line. I have been accused of ignoring the Treaty of Amity of 1794, by which it was provided that if on survey it should be found that the Mississippi "would not be intersected by a line drawn due west from the Lake of the Woods, the two parties will proceed by amicable negotiation to regulate the boundary line in that quarter as well as the points to be adjusted by the said parties according to justice and mutual convenience, and in conformity to the intent of the said treaty," (that of 1783.) But this was a treaty giving power to regulate an international boundary, and it neither added to nor took away from the Province of Upper Canada, which only embraced what remained of the Province of Quebec, west of the divisional line, so that the authority for going to the North-West Angle of the Lake of the Woods at all, rests on nothing better than that of a revoked commission. There is absolutely nothing besides that revoked commission which carries the boundaries of Upper Canada to the Lake of the Woods, and yet the north-west angle of that lake is, according to Sir Francis Hincks, who utterly ignores commissions when it suits his convenience, the legal boundary which the arbitrators took as their starting point on the west. They do not, however, stop at that point, but run up north of it beyond the 50th parallel of north latitude to another point which they connect by what they call a natural boundary with the mouth of the Albany. But I think I have shown, however imperfectly I may have explained myself, that neither the points adopted on the east or the west have anything whatever to sustain them. Now, let us see what is said of this natural boundary on the north, which runs across no less than 15½ degrees of longitude—a very considerable portion of the earth's surface. Sir Francis Hincks has published a series of letters, as well as a pamphlet, and as his letters seem to me to be more explicit and less carelessly written than his pamphlet, I shall quote from them. In his letter of 10th February last, published in the *Globe* newspaper of 4th February, Sir Francis Hincks says:

"What the arbitrators made up their minds to was as to the south-western and north-eastern boundary. They further 'made up their minds' that there were no data whatever for declaring any particular place in the North-West as the north-westerly boundary."

And in his letter of 25th February, published in the *Globe* of 28th February, he remarks as follows:—

"I have always admitted that while the arbitrators determined all points in dispute, and found true and legal boundaries on the west and north-east, they had no data to guide them as to the mode of connecting the points established."

This is what Sir Francis Hincks says, but what does the Act say? Why, that all the territories, islands and countries, within certain given lines therein described, shall extend northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchant Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay. Sir Francis Hincks says that there existed no northern boundary; the Act says that a northern boundary does exist, and that it is the southern boundary of the territory of the Hudson's Bay Company. But, instead of reporting this untoward discovery of no boundary, he and his co-arbitrators set to work to make a boundary, and ran it across 15½ degrees of longitude. I was much criticised and somewhat abused for saying that the arbitrators did not find a boundary, but had made one. Sir Francis now comes to the rescue and acknowledges the fact. In his pamphlet, Sir Francis claims that he received a letter from Judge Harrison, in which this passage occurs:

"Singular to say, since the award was made, I have received from Judge McDonald of Guelph, an old lithographed map without name of

date, but evidently made long before the Constitutional Act of 1791, which indicates the northern boundary of Upper Canada to be on the precise line where we have placed it."

Sir Francis should really have said nothing about this letter, knowing as he must have done that Upper Canada had no existence "long before the Constitutional Act of 1791," for it was by that Act that Upper Canada was first constituted. But what is the inference to be deduced from this pamphlet and these letters of Sir Francis Hincks? Simply, that the arbitrators had given little if any consideration to the subject before meeting in August, 1878; that when they met they found the Attorney-General of Upper Canada and the Minister of the Interior in perfect accord as to the boundaries; and that, under these circumstances, they considered it superfluous to go into any lengthened investigation of the subject. They heard the arguments of counsel, as a matter of course, and proceeded to lay out a boundary with the assistance of Colonel Dennis, Deputy Minister of the Interior, who was, of course, acting under the instructions of his chief, the Minister, which met the views of the contending parties, or rather of the parties supposed to be contending, and this accounts for the unanimity of their opinions in reference to a subject about which no two people had ever agreed before. As to where the true boundaries are, I shall find another opportunity of giving my views. In the meantime, I would refer hon. members to the report of the Committee of 1880, and recommend them to study well the evidence therein contained, and I would draw their particular attention to the opinions of the English law lords and other eminent lawyers accompanying the evidence of the Hon. Donald A. Smith. They are at least quite as valuable as the opinions of the hon. member for Bothwell, or those of Sir Francis Hincks, who is a mere pupil, and not a very apt one, of the hon. member, for all his reasoning is taken, and very clumsily taken, from the reports of the hon. gentleman. I shall now notice very briefly, Mr. Speaker, some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell. He dwelt a good deal on the claims made by Canada previous to the acquisition of the North-West Territories, but these claims, as I have shown, were made on the part of United Canada, and not for Upper Canada alone.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It would have fallen to Upper Canada.

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly not, for the reason that Upper Canada was always supposed to have clearly defined boundaries. Any claim or interest to the North-West Territories beyond these boundaries, arose from the old French occupation, and if more territory had gained you might have formed a new Province out of it, but certainly it would not have formed part of Upper Canada. The hon. member for Bothwell, refers to the opinions of Judge Draper, but it should be borne in mind that Judge Draper was then acting as the advocate of Canada, in which capacity it was his duty to advance all he could in favor of his client.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He was the Chief Justice of the Province.

Mr. DAWSON. We employed him as an advocate; he was there to advance the claims of Canada, and any man, even a Chief Justice, when he goes to advocate the claims of a nation, will not be likely to make them any less than they are. If he had been giving a judgment from the Bench, he would have considered both sides of the question, and I venture to think that he would then have given a judgment which would have commanded general assent. But his opinions, expressed as an advocate, are at least open to criticism. He (Mr. Mills) says the member for Algoma, from the views he has expressed, has no business here. I venture to differ with the hon. gentleman. My views have been perfectly satisfactory to my constituents in the past, and I have no doubt

they will be so in the future. The hon. gentleman says that the payment of the arbitrators and counsel was tantamount to accepting the award, on the part of the Dominion Government, but I think few will agree with him. The laborer is worthy of his hire, and it would have been an extremely shabby proceeding on the part of the Government to withhold the allowances made to the arbitrators and counsel who came here at the instance of a previous Administration. In reference to the Indian territories the hon. gentleman has brought forward and read an old squib put out by the Earl of Selkirk when he was contending with the North-West Company, at whose instance the Act of 1803 was passed, to show that these Indian territories were on the Arctic watershed. Lord Selkirk subsequently gave the best practical contradiction to this assertion by having himself sworn in as a magistrate, under the Act of 1803, and issuing warrants under its authority as far east as Fort William. I have here a lot of documents dated Fort William, August, 1816, and signed Selkirk, J.P. The hon. member for Bothwell says that in the case of Mowat, who was convicted and punished for crime committed within the Indian territories, the question of jurisdiction was not raised. But the position of the Indian territories was so well understood and established at that time that no one thought of raising it. It was, however, raised subsequently, and it was decided by the highest judicial tribunal then existing that the country immediately west of the height of land was Indian territory, and that was the opinion too of Mr. Spankie, Sir Arthur Pigott and Lord Brougham. The hon. gentleman is fond of quoting from them, because they were hostile to the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company, but he does not quote what they say about the district to which the Act of 1803 applied. This question was, however, so fully dealt with by the Committee of 1880, that I cannot do better than read from its report:

"The Act 43 Geo. III, Chapter 138, was passed for the purpose of extending the jurisdiction of the courts of justice in the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada to the Indian territories. These Indian territories are described in the preamble as being 'not within the Provinces of Lower or Upper Canada, or either of them,' and there can, in the opinion of your Committee, be no question as to the localities where the 'crimes and offences' which gave rise to the Act were committed. It is a matter of well-known history that the disputes and rivalries between the fur traders culminated, towards the close of the past century and in the beginning of the present, in feuds which had their manifestation in numerous acts of violence and bloodshed on the upper waters of the Albany and on the Rainy River and the Winnipeg. On the Assiniboine, too, and even on Lake Superior, between the River Pic and the Grand Portage, outrages were of frequent occurrence. The Act was passed to provide the means of restraining and punishing such outrages, and it was subsequently applied and acted on in these districts. Your Committee are of opinion that the whole of the country, at least, west and north of the St. Lawrence watershed, was Indian territory, although, in part, no doubt, also Hudson's Bay Company's territories, and they are not certain that the country bordering on Lake Superior was not considered at that time to be Indian territory. At all events, cases arose both on Lake Superior and inland from it which were tried under the authority of the Courts of Quebec, conspicuous among which was that of one Mowat, who killed a gentleman of the name of McDonnell at Eagle Lake, a place on the route between English River and the Albany. This man (Mowat) was taken to Montreal, tried and found guilty of manslaughter and punished accordingly, by being imprisoned and branded, as was the custom of those times. This was in 1809, but the troubles still continuing, in fact getting worse, in the district intervening between Lake Superior, on the one side, and the prairie region about the Assiniboine and Red Rivers, on the other, the Governor General issued a proclamation, of which the following is a copy:

"By His Excellency SIR JOHN COOPER SHERBROOKE, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Military Order of the Bath, Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over the Province of Lower Canada, Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and their several Dependencies, Vice-Admiral of the same, Lieutenant-General and Commander of all His Majesty's Forces in the said Provinces of Lower Canada and Upper Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and their several Dependencies, and in the Islands of Newfoundland, Prince Edward, Cape Breton, and Bermuda, &c., &c.

"A PROCLAMATION.

"Whereas in and by a certain Statute of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, made and passed in the forty-third year of His Majesty's Reign, intituled: 'An Act for extending the Jurisdiction of the Courts of Justice in the Provinces of Lower Canada

and Upper Canada to the Trial and Punishment of persons guilty of Crimes and Offences within certain parts of North America, adjoining the said Provinces, it is amongst other things enacted and declared that from and after the passing of the said Statute, 'All Offences committed within any of the Indian territories or parts of America, not within the limits of either of the said Provinces of Lower or Upper Canada, or of any Civil Government of the United States of America, shall and be deemed to be offences of the same nature, and shall be tried in the same manner and subject to the same Punishment as if the same had been committed within the Province of Lower or Upper Canada.'

"And whereas, under and by virtue of the above in part recited Statute, Justices of the Peace have been duly nominated and appointed with power and authority to apprehend within the Indian territories aforesaid, and to convey to this Province of Lower Canada for trial all and every person and persons guilty of any crime or offence whatever :

"And whereas there is reason to believe that divers breaches of the peace, by acts of force and violence, have lately been committed within the aforesaid Indian territories, and jurisdiction of the aforesaid Justices of the Peace :

"I have therefore thought fit, and by and with the advice of His Majesty's Executive Council, of and for the Province of Lower Canada, to issue this proclamation, for the purpose of bringing to punishment all persons who may have been or shall be guilty of any such act or acts of force or violence as aforesaid, or other crime and offence whatever, and to deter all others from following their pernicious example, thereby requiring all His Majesty's subjects and others within the said Indian territories, to avoid and to discourage all acts of force and violence whatsoever, and all proceedings whatever tending to produce tumults and riots, or in any way to disturb the public peace.

"And I do hereby strictly charge and command all Justices of the Peace as aforesaid nominated and appointed under and by virtue of the above-mentioned Statute, and all Magistrates throughout this Province, and do require all others of His Majesty's subjects generally in their several and respective stations, to make diligent enquiry and search to discover, apprehend and commit, or cause to be committed to lawful custody for trial, in due course of Law, pursuant to the provisions in the above-mentioned Statute contained, all persons who have been, or shall be guilty of any act or acts of force or violence as aforesaid, nor of any other crime or crimes, offence and offences within the said Indian territories, to the end that the laws may be carried into prompt execution, against all such offenders, for the preservation of peace and good order therein.

"Given under my Hand and Seal at Arms, at the Castle of St. Lewis, in the City of Quebec, in the said Province of Lower Canada, this Sixteenth Day of July, in the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixteen, and in the Fifty-sixth Year of His Majesty's Reign.

"J. C. SHERBROOKE.

"By His Excellency's command.

"JOHN TAYLOR,
"Deputy Secretary."

"Those who argue that Lieutenant-Governor Alured Clarke's proclamation extended Upper Canada to the northward and westward of the St. Lawrence watershed, will here see that a proclamation of at least equal weight issued by the Governor General described the disturbed district of which Red River was the very centre, in 1816, as being Indian territory 'not within the limits of Lower or Upper Canada, or either of them.' The contention that the Act of 1893 was intended to apply to the Arctic watershed, is, in the opinion of your Committee, undeserving of serious notice.

"The suggestion seems to have had its origin with Lord Selkirk, who, when in England in 1815, wished to produce the impression that the Red River country which he was then attempting to colonize, was neither Canadian nor Indian territory, but, notwithstanding this, he, on his return to Canada, had himself and some of his adherents sworn in as Justices of the Peace under the Act, and they subsequently issued warrants as such, not on the Arctic watershed, but within the disturbed region west of Lake Superior.

"In 1816, the Government of Quebec appointed two Commissioners, Messrs. Coltman and Fletcher, to investigate the causes of the disturbances within the Indian territories. These gentlemen went to the Red River settlement, where they held investigations, not in regard to disturbances on the Arctic watershed, of which they had probably never heard, but in regard to the lamentable occurrences of which the Red River settlement was then the focus.

"That the country west and north of the watershed and west of the due north line, so often referred to, was Indian territory, was decided by the Court of King's Bench, Quebec, in the de Reinhardt trial.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Bothwell should have stepped out of his way to abuse Judge Johnson, for no better cause than that he had, in his opinion, made a mistake in answering a question in reference to Lord Selkirk's first advent to Red River. The question was this :

"By Mr. Ouimet :

"319. How did Lord Selkirk come into the possession of that vast territory called Assiniboia, and how did it pass afterwards into the hands of the Hudson's Bay Company?—The old Canada Company, called the North-West Company, gave certain rights in the first instance; what

Mr. DAWSON.

they were I do not know, and I have never seen any instrument attesting them to Lord Selkirk, who brought out a number of Scotch and Shetland Island emigrants and settled them there."

Now this is not, after all, a very great error, for it is well known that Lord Selkirk had entered into certain negotiations with the North-West Company long before he joined the Hudson's Bay Company, and I believe he was trying, with their assistance in the first instance, to get possession of a tract for his pet idea of a settlement at Red River. Of course, the North-West Company could not give him rights, but if we are to believe the hon. gentleman, neither could the Hudson's Bay Company. However, it was with the Hudson's Bay Company that Lord Selkirk finally allied himself. The mistake, if mistake it be, was hardly worth noticing. As to the unmerited abuse which the hon. gentleman has heaped on the Judge, I think he will be able to stand it. He stands in a position which any hon. gentleman here might be proud to reach. When the Government, in 1870, wished to send a person of pre-eminent ability to the North-West as Lieutenant-Governor, they selected Judge Johnson, and he did a great deal to allay the angry feeling then existing in the distracted settlement of Manitoba. He is a gentleman everywhere esteemed, not only for his talents and his knowledge of the law but for his personal qualities, which render him a favorite with all who have the pleasure of his acquaintance. At all events, no trust betrayed darkens his fair fame, and it ill becomes the hon. member for Bothwell to abuse him in this House. The hon. gentleman has criticized the report of the Committee of 1880 of which I was chairman. No doubt, it is somewhat imperfect, and there may be a good deal left out which should have been in it; but he should remember that our time was limited, that within a few weeks we had to collect documents and evidence, and many believe that we did remarkably well considering the circumstances. The Ontario Book of Documents is not the most perfect work in the world, it is open to criticism in many ways, and knowing this the hon. gentleman should manifest some little reserve in criticising the work of others.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron). I think, Mr. Speaker, it was not in good taste for the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to lecture my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to the way in which he dealt with Judge Johnson. Judge Johnson is still in the land of the living, and able to answer for himself. The hon. gentleman himself, about ten minutes before, undertook to cast an unwarranted and unjustifiable reflection upon one of the ablest and best Judges that ever graced the Bench of Ontario, who is now in his grave and unable to answer for himself. He ventured to tell us that the able paper of the late Chief Justice Draper, upon the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company to the territory now in question, was the statement and argument of an advocate—a paid advocate—

Mr. DAWSON. Allow me to contradict the hon. gentleman. I said nothing about a paid advocate, and I cast no reflections, and meant no reflections, upon Mr. Justice Draper, a gentleman for whom I always entertained the highest esteem, and I entertain now the highest regard for his memory.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not know the amount of respect the hon. member entertains for the memory of the late Chief Justice Draper. All I know is that the hon. member, in my hearing, did cast reflections on the honesty and integrity of a Judge who, he said, was an advocate. Why was he an advocate? And why should the hon. gentleman speak of him as an advocate except that this House and the country might be led to believe that very little reliance could be placed upon his opinions, and it was possible he might have advanced claims more than he was justified in advancing? If that is not a reflection upon the late Chief Justice Draper, I would like to know what is a reflection. Now, I do not desire to enter into a long argu-

ment on the merits of this question; I do not desire to go back 200 or 300 years and ransack all the old Acts of Parliament, proclamations and commissions that have any bearing on the present controversy. They are all important in their way, but the hon. member for Bothwell has dealt so fully and so exhaustively with that branch of the case that I do not propose troubling the House with any lengthened dissertations on that part of the early history of the North-West. I may say, however, that after having looked into these documents myself, I have satisfied my own mind, at all events, that the western boundary of Ontario is as far, if not farther, west than that fixed by the award; but these are not the only documents to which I wish to refer. There are other documents to which I shall have occasion to draw the attention of the House before I conclude my argument. I may say, Sir, that this is not the first time, and this is not the first Parliament, in which this important question has been up for discussion. It was a living issue in the old Province of Canada, years before Confederation took place. The Government of the Province of Canada, for a number of years, for at least a quarter of a century, was vigorously and steadily pressing the claims of the Province of Canada to the western boundary, as far, if not farther west, than the boundary fixed by the award. Upon that subject we have many valuable contributions, many valuable reports, and many valuable state papers; and I venture to say that any person who takes the trouble to peruse those documents submitted to Parliament in days gone by, will rise from their perusal with the conviction firmly impressed on his mind that the claims now advanced by the Province of Ontario are well founded claims. I must confess, Sir, that my own mind was led irresistibly to the conclusion that the claims of Ontario were well-founded claims, by the documents submitted to Parliament and the arguments and statements advanced by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, through his colleagues in days gone by. If the arguments so advanced twenty years ago were then valid and sound, they are equally valid and sound to-day; there is no pretence, so far as I have heard, that any new light has been thrown on the subject since Confederation. The hon. member who has just taken his seat, who has made this question one of his hobbies, and who understands it perhaps as well as most men in the House or out of the House, does not pretend to say that any new light has been thrown on the subject within the last twenty years. The hon. member referred to the report of the late Chief Justice Draper on this question. Let me also direct the attention of the House to that report. In 1857, the hon. member who now leads the House was leader of the Government of the old Province of Canada. Questions then arose as to the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company to the vast territory to the west of us, and as to the western boundary of the old Province of Canada; and the late Chief Justice Draper, than whom no abler man could be found to deal with the subject, was selected by the Government of the day to make an exhaustive inquiry into the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company under their charter, and into the subject of the western and northern boundaries of the old Province of Canada. With a zeal and vigor which were always characteristic of that distinguished Judge, he set to work on the duty assigned him. He made a thorough investigation, and what conclusion did he arrive at? The conclusion he arrived at was approved of by the hon. gentleman who leads the Government. And what was that conclusion? The conclusion he arrived at with respect to the claims advanced by the Hudson's Bay Company was that the right to the territory then claimed by the Company was more than problematical. It was extremely doubtful. The conclusion arrived at, with respect to the western boundary of Ontario, will be found in the document that the Crown published and such conclusion

fully justifies the award. If his conclusion upon that subject is correct, the western boundary of Ontario extends, at all events, westward as is described in the award of the arbitrators. That conclusion has never been repudiated by the Government of the day. It has never been repudiated by the First Minister. It has never been repudiated, so far as I am aware, until lately by any of the followers of the present Government. That is not all. Recollect, Sir, that in the statements I am presenting there is nothing original. There is nothing new; my arguments and statements are the arguments and statements of hon. gentlemen opposite when they considered this question from an impartial and non-political standpoint. If the arguments were right then they have equal force now. If the arguments presented by the right hon. leader of the House, through his colleagues, twenty years ago were correct, they are equally correct now. In 1857, a colleague of the present leader of the House, then Commissioner of Crown Lands was appointed by the Government to make an enquiry similar in character to the enquiry of the late Chief Justice Draper. After having exhausted all the material then at his command, and which was substantially the material and evidence submitted to the various Committees which have dealt with this subject up to the present day, what conclusion did he arrive at? He pointed out that in 1670, when the English Government granted the charter to the Hudson's Bay Company, about which so much has been heard in the last eight or ten years, the English Government had no right and no power to grant that territory, simply because the territory did not belong to the English crown. He further points out that by virtue of that charter the Imperial Government undertook to grant to the Hudson's Bay Company vast territories in the west which they did not own, and undertook to grant to the Company any undiscovered territories that they might discover which were not in the possession of any Christian Prince. He deals with the latter branch of the case summarily in his valuable state paper, from which I take the following extract, in reference to any supposed rights that the Company might have acquired by virtue of discovery. He says:

"In fact, except the Copper Mine River the Company never discovered anything or penetrated beyond the coasts and confines of the Bay to which, perhaps they at that time justly considered their rights restricted) for upwards of one hundred years after their charter, and that when they did so penetrate, the only discovery they made was that the whole country in the interior had been long in the peaceable possession of the subjects of another Christian prince."

The leader of the House through his colleague thus clearly points out that as discoverers of unknown territory the Hudson's Bay Company acquired no rights to the vast region under discussion, and that the claim of the Company depended on whether or not the Imperial Government had the right to convey the territory to them, and that right depended on a series of disputed facts. He then deals with the respective rights of England and France to the territory. He points out that in 1497 the Cabot brothers were supposed to have discovered this portion of the new world, but he points out also that no reliance whatever can be placed on the discoveries made by them, because no record was kept of what they did. No evidence appears at all events to-day, no evidence ever appeared that they ever landed on the shore, or took possession in any formal way, or if they did that they retained possession of any portion of that country. Therefore, so far as their alleged discoveries are concerned, no importance could be attached to them as giving to the English Crown the power to convey to the Hudson's Bay Company, and that no evidence existed of any specific territorial claims vested in the English Government in 1670. Then the colleague of the right hon. First Minister points out upon what ground the French based their claims. He says that in 1504 the fishermen of Brittany established fisheries on the shores of Hudson's Bay; that in 1506 a French map

was published by Jean Deny, indicating this possession by the French; that a geographical work was published in 1677 to which was attached a map which fixes the point of possession by the French fishermen at Hudson's Straits; that in 1523 a certain navigator named Jean Vereyzani, under instructions from Francis I. of France, visited the country and, for the Crown of France, took possession of the country and called it New France; and that then no one was in possession, unless it were the French. If the Cabots did discover the country they abandoned their possessions, and no one was then in possession of this vast section of country unless it were the French, clearly no one under the English Crown. Then the colleague of the right hon. gentlemen points out, in this valuable and important State paper, the fact of the discovery and the possession by the English, but subsequently abandoned, and the important fact of the discovery by the French and of the possession and retention of such possession by the French, and he then uses the arguments made use of by the English with respect to the Oregon boundary. He says:

"It is a circumstance not to be lost sight of that it (the discovery by Gray) was not, for several years, followed up by any Act which could give it value in a national point of view; it was not, in truth, made known to the world, either by the discoverer himself or by his Government."

Then the hon. First Minister, through his colleagues, goes on through a series of events subsequent to that, pointing out that all this country was in the possession of the French from the first discovery until the territory was ceded by France to Great Britain. He points out that, in 1540, de Roberval was made Viceroy of Canada, and that the description in his commission covered the Hudson's Bay territory; that in 1598 de la Roche was made Governor of Canada over precisely the same territory as that over which de Roberval was made Viceroy, and that these voyages and early discoveries by the navigators clearly show that the French were really in possession of the country and entitled to hold it at the very time the English Government granted it to the Hudson's Bay, and that therefore nothing passed under that charter. Then the hon. First Minister, through his colleague, goes further and contends vigorously that France was entitled to the territory by virtue of treaty obligations. He points out that by the treaty of 1632, the treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye, Canada was relinquished to the French, and that the territory in question was covered by that treaty. He points out still further, in confirmation of the views of the Government of that day, that in 1629 Champlain, who was the Viceroy of France, was captured in Quebec and carried to England as a prisoner of war, and that while he was such prisoner he published a map showing that the Hudson's Bay's country formed part of New France. He further points out that through all these years and down to 1670 when the English Government granted the charter to the Hudson's Bay Company, France and not England occupied this territory, and that, therefore, no rights were legally granted to the Hudson's Bay Company over the land in dispute. This condition of affairs remained unchanged for half a century, and during all that time France remained in undisturbed possession of the country. Then war again broke out between England and France. That war was ended by the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697; at that time England had possession of Fort Albany only—all the rest of the territory was in the possession of the French. But under the provisions of that treaty each nation was bound to deliver up to the other all the possessions they had prior to the war and especially in Hudson's Bay, and so under that treaty Fort Albany alone of all the vast territory claimed by the Company was held by it down to the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. And so, Sir, it may be said that the

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

rights of the respective Crowns of France and England continued unchanged until the treaty of 1763, when the territory was ceded, with whatever rights and franchises belonged to it, to Great Britain, up to the Mississippi River. But these are not all the arguments advanced by the right hon. gentleman's colleague on this important subject, and as the head of that Government he must bear the responsibility of the position then taken. He pointed out with great force and vigor, and with great energy, the fact that the Quebec Act of 1774 gave Quebec all the territory I have just spoken of, and that is covered by the description in the commission that was issued to Sir Guy Carleton in that year. It may be well to refer for a moment to what that description does cover, because it covers a good deal more territory than hon. gentlemen opposite are now willing to concede to the Province of Ontario, or to admit belonged to the old Province of Quebec, and as a consequence, to the new Province of Ontario, although not more than they themselves at one time contended for. After describing at some considerable length the boundaries of the territory over which Sir Guy Carleton was appointed to govern, the description in the commission thus proceeds:

"And thence along the western boundary of the said Province until it strikes the River Ohio, and along the banks of the said river to the southern boundary of the territory granted by the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay, and also all such territories, islands and countries which have, since the 10th day of February, 1763, been made part of the Government of Newfoundland as aforesaid, together with all the rights, members and appurtenances whatsoever hereupon belonging."

In the paper to which I have referred, and from which I have just quoted, the Commissioner of Crown Lands, who was a colleague of the present hon. First Minister, contended vigorously and strongly for that boundary. The argument presented is strong, forcible, and conclusive in so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned; but that is not all. At a much later period than that to which I have referred, hon. gentlemen opposite took equally strong grounds on this question. Some twelve years ago, two colleagues of the hon. gentleman who leads the House were entrusted with the important task of ascertaining the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company to this vast territory, and of ascertaining the boundaries of old Canada—the late Sir George Cartier and the member for Halton. They examined into this matter with very great care and upon that examination took stronger ground on this question than we on this side take now. It may be worth while drawing the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the strong grounds taken by the two colleagues of the First Minister, when acting for the old Province of Canada; it is also important to consider the matured judgment of these distinguished statesmen at a subsequent period. What did the hon. gentlemen say in their correspondence with Sir F. Rogers, of the Colonial Office, in 1869, on the subject. They said:

"The assertion of the Deputy-Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company that the country between Lake of the Woods and Red River is 'the freehold territory of the Company,' and that the so-called 'trespass' of the Canadian Government in sending provisions to the starving settlers, and assisting them to make a road for their own convenience and safety hereinafter, is 'an actual encroachment on the soil of the Company,' might, if unnoticed by us, be claimed by another proof or admission of the rights of the Company in that part of the continent. We, therefore, beg to remind His Lordship that the boundaries of Upper Canada on the north and west, were declared, under the authority of the Constitutional Act of 1791, to include 'all the territory to the westward and southward' of the 'boundary line of Hudson's Bay,' to the utmost extent of the country commonly called or known by the name of Canada. Whatever doubt may exist as to the 'utmost extent' of old, or French Canada, no impartial investigator of the evidence in the case can doubt that it extended to, and included, the country between Lake of the Woods and Red River."

When the correspondence between the Colonial Office and the First Minister's colleagues had gone a step further, another letter was addressed by them to the Colonial Office,

and as the arguments in this letter are cogent I will trouble the House with the following extracts from it:—

"1. The Charter of Charles II. (and for the present we raise no question as to its validity), could not and did not grant to the Hudson's Bay Company, any territory in America which was not then (1670), subject to the Crown of England.

"2. The Charter expressly excluded all lands, &c., 'then possessed by the subjects of any other Christian Prince of State.'

"3. By the Treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye (1632), the King of England resigned to the King of France, the Sovereignty of Acadia, New France, and Canada generally, and without limits.

"4. 'La Nouvelle France' was then understood to include the whole region of Hudson's Bay, as the maps and histories of the time, English and French, abundantly prove.

"5. At the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), twenty-seven years after the date of the Charter, the right of the French to 'places situated in the Hudson's Bay,' was distinctly admitted; and although commissioners were appointed (but never came to an agreement) to 'examine and determine the pretensions which either of the said Kings hath to the places situate in the Hudson's Bay,' and with 'authority for settling the limits and confines of the lands to be restored on either side;' the places taken from the English (i.e., from the Hudson's Bay Company), by the French previous to the war, and 'retaken by the English during this war, shall be left to the French by virtue of the foregoing (the 7th) article.' In other words, the forts and factories of the Hudson's Bay Company, established in Hudson's Bay under pretence of their Charter, and taken possession of by the French in time of peace, on the ground that they were an invasion of French territory, were restored, by the Treaty of Ryswick, to the French, and not to the Company.

"6. By the Treaty of Utrecht, 1714, 'the Bay and Straits of Hudson, together with all lands, seas, sea coasts, and places situate in the Bay and Straits, and which belong thereto,' were finally ceded to Great Britain.

"7. As no definite boundary was ever established between the possessions of the French in the interior and the English at Hudson's Bay, down to the Treaty of Paris, 1763, when the whole of Canada was ceded to Great Britain, the extent of the actual possession by the two nations for some period, say from the Treaty of Utrecht to the Treaty of Paris, affords the only rational and true basis for ascertaining that boundary.

"8. The evidence is abundant and conclusive to prove that the French traded over and possessed the whole of the country known as the Winnipeg Basin and 'Fertile Belt,' from its discovery by Europeans down to the Treaty of Paris, and that the Hudson's Bay Company neither traded nor established posts to the south or west of Lake Winnipeg, until many years after the cession of Canada to England.

"9. No other or subsequent grant to the Company was ever made which could possibly extend their territorial rights under their Charter. The license to trade in the Indian territories, which they obtained in 1821, was revoked in 1858, and has not been renewed.

"10. The country which, in view of these facts, must be excluded from the operation of the Charter, includes all the lands fit for cultivation and settlement in that part of British America."

It would have been well for the member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) before taking the ground he did, to refer to the arguments and the statements of the hon. gentleman that he with so much fidelity supports. He then took stronger and higher ground on this subject than we take now. He pointed out what the charter of King Charles the II. granted to the Company and exactly what the Company held under it. Now, I say that is conclusive against hon. gentlemen opposite. They are not my arguments, they are the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite, of the hon. First Minister and of his colleagues. They are powerful, they are unanswerable, and if they were strong and powerful in 1869 and 1857, they are equally so to-day. No new light has been thrown on the subject since. Nothing has taken place to warrant a change in the opinion of hon. gentlemen on the subject. Sir, if they were right then, they are clearly wrong now. To my mind these arguments carry conviction beyond a doubt, and if hon. gentlemen have changed their opinions as to the western and northern boundaries of the Province of Ontario, if they have arrived at a different conclusion now to what they entertained twelve years ago, it is not in the interests of Ontario or of the Dominion that such charges of opinion have taken place but to serve some political purpose best known to themselves.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON. When you left the Chair at six o'clock I had pointed out to the House that the Conservative party, led by the present Premier, was committed, as far as they

could be by their solemn declaration, to the fact that the boundary of the old Province of Quebec was, at least, as far west, if not farther west, than the boundary given to Ontario under the present award. I pointed out that at least four eminent Canadian statesmen who had occupied for years, and some of whom still occupy, a prominent place in the councils of the Sovereign, had given expression in no unmistakable manner to their opinions on this subject. I now propose submitting for the consideration of this House the opinions of two other Canadian gentlemen of eminent ability, men who perhaps above all others are supposed to be conversant with this question, men who are eminent in their own profession, and who have occupied for some years a distinguished place in the history of Canada—I allude to the Dawson Brothers, who have, in documents that are now public property, given expression to their opinions on this question in a manner that no man can misunderstand. I will first submit to the House the opinions of Mr. Wm. McD. Dawson. Of course, I do not suppose that either of them is any relation to the gentleman who has just addressed the House. I regret the hon. member for Algoma is not now in his place, because I am sure he would be very much interested in this part of my argument. I am sure those old historic reminiscences would be agreeable and pleasant to his cultivated mind. Mr. Wm. McD. Dawson, in giving his evidence before a Committee of the Legislative Assembly of Canada, on the question of the boundary of the old Province of Quebec, and the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company to the territory that was claimed by them, on the 8th of June, 1857, said, among other things:

"The result of my investigation has been to demonstrate that in the Red River and Saskatchewan countries, the Hudson's Bay Company have no right or title whatever, except what they have in common with other British subjects. Wherever they have any possession or occupancy, there they are simply squatters, the same as they are at Fort William, Lac Cloche, Lake Nipissing, or any of their other ports in Canada."

Again, he says with respect to the judicial decisions that the hon. member for Algoma referred to, and which, according to his view, placed this question beyond the region of parliamentary or other discussion. With reference to the judgment of the Court in the Reinhardt case, he says:

"In May, 1818, Charles de Reinhardt was tried at Quebec, for murder committed in 1816, on the River Winnipeg, under the Canada Jurisdiction Act. Exception was taken to the jurisdiction of the Court on the ground that the locality was not in the Indian territory, but within the limits of Upper Canada. The Court overruled the objection, and decided that the westerly boundary of Upper Canada was a line on the Meridian of 88° 50' west longitude from London."

Mark what the hon. gentleman says with respect to that judgment. Now, here is a man, eminent in the profession of Civil Engineer and Surveyor, who says about this judgment which the hon. member for Algoma accepts with such confidence:

"I hardly think that any surveyor, geographer or delineator of boundaries, of any experience or scientific attainments, would concur in that decision."

He goes further and says:

"I confine myself, in the foregoing remarks, to the Red River and Saskatchewan country. It will be seen that the Imperial authority, the military authorities and the Courts of Justice, have all ignored the pretensions of the Hudson's Bay Company as regards those countries."

Now, Sir, if Mr. Dawson was correct, when he gave his testimony as a witness before a Committee of Parliament appointed to investigate this question, I submit that that opinion is entitled to the utmost weight in a discussion of this subject. That is not all. There is another Dawson who occupied an equally prominent place in the history of this country, who has been in the Legislature of Ontario, and who occupied a seat on the floor of this Parliament. Anybody who has watched the course of events in the Legislature of Ontario between 1875 and 1878, knows exactly the pronounced opinion of that hon. gentleman on

this question. His contention has always been that the western boundary of Ontario extended considerably beyond the boundary assigned to it in the award. I contend that in giving expression to his opinion, I believe upon more than one occasion in the Local Legislature of Ontario, that hon. gentleman put his views on record, in the shape of a resolution, urging with the utmost vigor upon the Government of Ontario the propriety, nay the absolute necessity, of taking immediate and active steps to secure for Ontario the recognition of her boundary extending beyond the Lake of the Woods westward according to his then contention. Let us see what he said upon that subject in a famous state paper I hold in my hand. It is well to remind hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House of these expressions of opinion given by themselves or their colleagues and their followers in and out of Parliament, because if these expressions of opinion were correct in the days when they were given they must be equally correct now. On 8th June, 1857, S. J. Dawson, Esq., published a document of considerable importance in which he entered at length into the subject of the boundaries. Permit me, for the edification of the House, and for the information of the hon. member for Algoma, whom, I think, knows something of the document, to refer to it for a moment. After discussing the question for some time, and pointing out upon what slender foundations the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company were based, and how strong were the claims of Canada, he went on to say:

"The vast region now forming, in whole or in part, the States or Territories of Nebraska, the western portions of Minnesota and Dakota, Iowa, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado to the summit of the Stony Mountains, with several other States to the south, and a portion of the Dominion of Canada near the Rocky Mountains to the north, are within the territory which, at the date of the Treaty of 1783, was known as Louisiana. By the second article of the Treaty of 1783, the boundary established between the British possessions and the United States, in as far as regards the part of the continent under consideration, was a line 'from the most north-western point of the Lake of the Woods, on a due western course to the Mississippi'; and in a Royal Commission issued to Governor Lord Dorchester, in 1786, the part of Canada forming the then Province of Quebec is described as being bounded by a line 'from the most north-western point thereof (i. e. the Lake of the Woods) a due west course to the River Mississippi, and northward' to the southern boundary of the territories granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay.

"It will then be seen that the western limit of Canada, on the line running due west from the Lake of the Woods, was at that time a matter of interest to three nations. The United States could not go west of the Mississippi, or this boundary recognized as representing that river, nor the nation possessing Louisiana come east of it; while as regards Canada the Province of Quebec was to have both her western limit on the due west line, and her entire western boundary running north to the territories granted to the Merchants Adventurers determined by the point at which the boundary between the United States and Louisiana should meet the due west line from the Lake of the Woods.

"It is well known that the tributary of the Mississippi system, now called 'the Mississippi' is but a small stream in its upper reaches, having its source a little to the north of the parallel of 47°, in numerous brooks and countless lakelets far to the south and east of a due west line from the Lake of the Woods.

"It does not, therefore, meet the description, and the question arises as to whether it really is the Mississippi meant by the diplomatists who framed the Treaty of 1873, or whether it is not more reasonable to believe that both they and their predecessors who negotiated the Treaty of 1873 had in view the main artery of the vast river system to which the comprehensive name of the Mississippi was applied in those days."

What does the hon. gentleman mean by the statement published in this document? Does he contend that the western boundary of the Province is east of the Lake of the Woods? No; his whole argument in this paper is that the boundary line of the Province of Ontario is west by nearly 400 miles from the point at which the arbitrators fixed it. He says that the western limit is where a line drawn from the most western point of the Lake of the Woods would intersect the Mississippi river of the earlier geographers. That in those days the whole of the river system of that region was known as the Mississippi; that the line in question would not intersect the Mississippi of to-day, but it would the White Earth river, a tributary of the Mississippi, and that this tributary is undoubtedly what the statesmen and geographers of that day meant. The hon.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

gentleman not only analyses the testimony, but also the maps of the early days. No member regrets more than I do the necessity of reading extracts from parliamentary documents or from State papers to the House, but when I find an hon. gentleman declaring that the award in favor of Ontario is improper and gave her too much territory, when at a former period, and after calm deliberation, he entertained an entirely opposite opinion on the same facts, I think it is desirable that the country should know the fact, in order that they may be able to attach just as much value and importance as they deserve, and no more, to expressions of opinion given to-day on the floor of Parliament on those questions. Let us see what the hon. gentleman says on this question. After having analysed the maps, he said:

"3rd. That a branch or tributary of the Mississippi (or Missouri, rather, which is itself a branch of the Mississippi) called the White Earth River, is actually intersected by the due west line in question, within a comparatively short distance of the point at which the supposed river, represented on the maps as the boundary of Louisiana, and which it is evident they had in view, would have been intersected by that line.

"Judging from these maps, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the true intent, meaning and spirit of the Treaty of 1783 was that the western boundary of Canada and the United States and the eastern limit of Louisiana, on the due west line should be at a point upwards of 450 miles west of the Lake of the Woods."

But what need to make or adopt imaginary lines, or quibble about the word "Mississippi," which is in fact the name of an immense river system, when the true spirit and even letter of the treaty can be met by adopting the line already run on a due west course, as expressed in the Treaty, "to the Mississippi," or at least to its first waters at the White Earth River, which this "due west line" does intersect only a little way to the west of the supposed Mississippi which the representatives of the nations interested, as shown by the maps of the time, intended as the western boundary of Canada and the United States, and the eastern limit of Louisiana, on a "due west line from the Lake of the Woods."

What, Sir, has changed the hon. gentleman's opinion? What has come over the spirit of his dream? Why does the hon. gentleman object to the award? Does Ontario get more than she is entitled to? The hon. gentleman has not condescended to tell us what are his objections to the award, only he says it is an absurd boundary; that there is no justification, in fact, or law for it; and that there is no statesman or geographer, that ever studied the subject, would have dreamed of laying down a boundary such as the arbitrators have laid down. But let me go a step further. In order to fix the western and northern boundaries of Ontario, I attach great importance to the description given in the Quebec Act of 1774 and the commissions issued under it. The hon. gentleman says that these commissions do not aid us to an interpretation of the meaning of that Act. He points out that the first commission to Sir Guy Carleton cannot avail us, because it was rescinded within a few months of its issue. It is true the commission was so rescinded, but not by reason of any defect in the description of the territory over which he was appointed Governor. The hon. gentleman does not explain the reason of this rescission, nor why he changed his mind as to the effect of it. I do not know what has changed the hon. gentleman's mind, but I do not think it was the recession of the commissions, but rather the non-issue of a commission, about which the hon. gentleman knows something, at a much later day than the period of Sir Guy Carleton. I have disposed of the views of the eminent statesmen who have given their opinions on this subject, and amongst others, the Dawson brothers, and I wish now to refer to another question touched upon by hon. gentlemen opposite, and notably by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). That hon. gentleman started out with the proposition that the Quebec Act did fix a definite boundary—a proposition which is denied by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) and in this I am disposed to agree with him. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said that the two commissions which were issued, one on the 27th Dec., 1774, and the other in 1786 to Sir Guy Carleton, and the one to Sir Frederick Haldimand

in 1777, do not help us to an interpretation of the Act of 1774. He says there was a definite boundary fixed by that Act, and that commissions issued under it cannot be used to contract or extend the limits given by the Act. No one proposes to use these commissions for the purpose of extending or contracting the boundary fixed by the Act; but if there is any ambiguity in the wording of a Statute—any difficulty in defining its proper interpretation—these commissions may be used for the purposes of putting an interpretation on it; and, if there is any difficulty in putting a proper proper interpretation on the Act of 1774, we have a perfect right to consider the history of that enactment, what took place when it was passed in the Imperial Parliament, the surrounding circumstances, and what was done under it. These commissions were issued immediately after the passing of the Act, issued under the advice of the same law officers who advised on the passage of the Act, and the surrounding circumstances threw a flood of light on the interpretation to be put on the Statute. And if the interpretation we put on the Statute, aided by these commissions, proclamations and surrounding circumstances are correct, it is clear to every intelligent man that the western boundary of the Province of Ontario is at least as far west as that mentioned in the award. In the first commission to Sir Guy Carleton, in 1774, the description of the territory over which Sir Guy was appointed to rule, is clear, and it is equally clear that the territory now in dispute is within the limits of the old Province of Quebec—the old Province of Canada—and in consequence within the limits of the Province of Ontario. The description in that commission as follows:—

"Thence along the western boundary of the said Province until it strikes the River Ohio, and along the bank of the said river westward to the banks of the Mississippi, and northward along the eastern bank of the said river to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading to Hudson's Bay."

The Commission issued to Sir Frederick Haldimand in 1777—three years afterwards—was issued when the aim, object and scope of the Bill was fresh in the recollection of those who were engaged in passing it, and those who were interested in passing it. These two commissions were issued under the direction of the same law officers of the Crown who advised on the Act of 1774—men whose peers have seldom sat in the House of Commons—and they afford the strongest possible argument in favor of our contention that the boundaries westward and northward were, at all events, as far west and north as the boundaries fixed by the award. The second commission issued to Sir Guy Carleton in 1786, does not give precisely the same description as that of 1774, but it is the same in meaning and in substance. The description of that Commission is in the following terms:

"Thence through the middle of said Long Lake and the water communication between it and the Lake of the Woods to the said Lake of the Woods; thence through the said lake to the most north-western point thereof, and from thence on a due west course to the River Mississippi; and northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchants Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson's Bay."

This description to and beyond the Lake of the Woods, overlaps the due north line of modern days. In that commission is a description to the Mississippi River. Now, it is a clear principle of the law, as laid down by Vattel in his law of nations, that where the description of territories extends to a stream, the boundary of that territory is limited by that stream, and only limited by that stream, and I think that Vattel, on a subject of that kind, is entitled to as much weight as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), or the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), the latter of whom made such a powerful and eloquent speech on the subject. Vattel says:

"In case of doubt every country terminating on a river is presumed to have no other limits than the river itself, because nothing is more

natural than to take a river for a boundary; and wherever there is a doubt, that is always to be presumed which is most natural and most probable."

This question came up for adjudication before the United States Courts in the case of *Hadley vs. Anthony*, 5 Wheaton 696, and an eminent Judge of the Supreme Court said on the point:—

"In great questions which concern the boundaries of States, where great natural boundaries are established in general terms with a view to public convenience and the avoidance of controversy, we think the great object, when it can be distinctly perceived, ought not to be defeated by technical perplexities."

In other words, we are to deal with questions in which States are concerned, and this present question is in reality one between two States on a different principle from that in which we would deal with a question where the rights of private individuals alone are concerned. I now come down a little further in the history of this important question, and I find that, after the separation of the Province of Quebec into two Provinces, namely, Upper and Lower Canada, there is a description given of the boundary of the Province of Upper Canada, and that description is as follows:

"To commence at a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the cove west of Pointe au Beaudet in the limit between the Township of Lancaster and the Seigneurie of New Longueuil, running along the said limit in the direction of north 34° west to the westernmost angle of the said Seigneurie of New Longueuil, thence along the north-western boundary of the Seigneurie of Vaudreuil running north 25° east until it strikes the Ottawa river, to ascend the said river into the Lake Temiscaming, and from the head of the said lake by a line drawn due north until it strikes the boundary line of Hudson's Bay, including all the territory to the westward and southward of the said line to the utmost extent of the country commonly called or known by the name of Canada."

Why, the hon. gentleman tells us that to adopt a description or that kind would be to declare war against the United States, because in 1783, when the treaty between England and the United States took place, a large portion of this territory which was then necessarily claimed by Great Britain was ceded to the United States, and he says that this description would cover a large portion of the territory so belonging to the United States. But the hon. gentleman forgets to tell us, what is manifestly clear, that all the Imperial Government intended by this description was such portions, south and west, as belonged to England at that time. Now, I have shown by documentary evidence, by expressions of opinion on the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and by expressions of opinion by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that what we are now claiming for the Province of Ontario is not at all more than we are entitled to get. I have shown, I think, very conclusively, what interpretation was put upon the Act of 1774 by the framers of that Act, by the proclamations and commissions issued under it; and it does appear to me incomprehensible how any other interpretation can be put upon it than the one assigned to it by us. But that is not all. This matter was considered by the late Province of Upper Canada long before the union took place between Upper and Lower Canada, in 1841. After these Provinces were separated, in 1793, the Province of Upper Canada was entitled to Parliamentary Government, not to responsible Government, but still to a Parliament composed of the elected representatives of the people; and for that purpose the old Province of Upper Canada was divided into nineteen constituencies, with boundaries clearly defined in the Act, and proclamation creating the same. In 1792, or thereabouts, an Act of the old Parliament of Upper Canada was passed with respect to the representation of the people in Parliament; and we find that on the 16th of July, 1792, a proclamation was issued under the Great Seal, dividing the Province into counties, which were described in the procla-

mation. One of these counties we find described as follows:—

"That the nineteenth of the said counties be hereafter called by the name of the County of Kent, which county is to comprehend all the country, not being territories of the Indians, not already included in the several counties hereinbefore described, extending northward to the boundary line of Hudson's Bay, including all the territory of the westward and southward to the same line, to the utmost extent of the country, commonly called or known by the name of Canada," and that the said County of Kent as hereinbefore described shall and may be represented in the said House of Assembly by two members."

I find also that the Surveyor-General of that day, a man named Smith, in 1799 published a topographical description of Upper Canada for the Governor of that Province, in which he reported that Canada on the west extended to the Lake of the Woods and the Mississippi River; if that is so, and it is not denied, the northern boundary of Canada extended to Hudson's Bay and the western boundary to the Lake of the Woods, practically the boundaries fixed by this award. Then the hon. member for Algoma tells us that the western boundary of Ontario is altogether too far west, and both he and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe referred to the De Reinhardt case in confirmation of this view. I have read that case several times, and I think I can challenge any gentleman who reads it intelligently, to rise from its perusal with the conviction on his mind that that case settled the question in any way. Not one of the proclamations or commissions to which I have referred, was laid before the Judge who tried that case; all the documents were as completely ignored as if they had no existence. It is true, the defendant was defended by able lawyers; but strange to say all the documents to which I have referred were absent from the Court. In that case an eminent expert named Saxe was examined for the Crown, and he swore that the word northward did not mean due north, the Judge said that he could not understand that—that the man was talking nonsense. The witness repeated his statement, the Judge bullied him into silence. The Judge assumed to deal, and did deal, with the facts instead of leaving them to the jury. The question of the jurisdiction of the Court to try the prisoner was then raised by his counsel—that question was reserved by the Judge for the consideration of the highest court in the realm; and the only question submitted for the consideration of the court of appeal, was the simple question of jurisdiction. De Reinhardt was convicted; he was not executed, he was pardoned, but on what ground? The only ground, so far as one can judge, from the history of the case, was that the Court had no jurisdiction to deal with the case at all. So far, that case settles nothing; it simply leaves the question where it was; but if it did settle anything, it would be in direct conflict with the expression of opinion of some of the Judges in Upper Canada on the question under consideration, and so as a judicial decision it in no sense settles the controversy. So much for the De Reinhardt case as an exposition of the law and the facts. We have now reached a stage of this question which brings us down to the reference to arbitration and the award. We found gentlemen on both sides of the House pronounced in favor of the position of Ontario, nay, more, of an extension of the western boundary beyond the point where the arbitrators have fixed it; the Conservative party, in days gone by, were as pronounced in that position as the Liberal party; but the Liberal party adheres to its position; the Conservative party hesitates and doubts, nay, more, now claims that Ontario is not entitled to go farther northward than the height of land, nor farther westward than to a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. As I stated, that brings us down to the initiation of the proceedings before the arbitrators. The first intimation the people of Ontario or the people of this country had that these gentlemen were deviating

Mr. CAMERON (Huron),

from and going back on the record of the past quarter of a century, was upon the 12th March, 1872, when the Dominion Government intimated to the Ontario Government that they were not disposed to yield to their views with respect to the western and the northern boundary. It was then proposed that a commission should be appointed, with the view of settling the boundary to which I have just referred. The Ontario Government at once assented to such a commission for the purpose of settling the boundaries in dispute, but the Dominion Government would only agree to it on certain conditions to which the Government of Ontario could not consent. The Dominion Government made the reference to such Commissioners conditional upon a certain line being agreed upon, namely, that the western boundary should be a line due north from the Ohio and Mississippi, and the northern boundary the height of land—and that the duty of the Commissioners should be limited to fixing such boundaries on the ground. The Ontario Government could not agree to this, and thus the matter stood until the hon. member for Lambton acceded to office, when correspondence between the two Governments was renewed. This correspondence culminated in the Order of Council of 12th November, 1874, agreeing to reference to three distinguished gentlemen of the whole matter in dispute. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe strenuously contends that the reference was only intended to fix a conventional line and only did fix a conventional line. I contend the reference says nothing of the kind. I hold in my hand a copy of that reference. What does it say? It says:

"That the Ontario Government having named the Hon. William Buell Richards, Chief Justice of Ontario, as one of the referees, he submits the name of the Hon. Lemuel Allan Wilmot, formerly Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of New Brunswick, to act in conjunction with him, and advises that authority be given them to agree upon a third person, not being a resident of Canada, and that the determination of a majority of such three referees be final and conclusive upon the limits to be taken as and for such boundaries respectively."

Does that reference point to a conventional line? Not at all. If you will turn to the award itself, you will find it is equally clear, definite and distinct. There is, therefore, no ground for the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this reference was only intended to be conventional, and that the award itself only fixed a conventional line. I have a few words to say with reference to this award, and its binding affect upon the Dominion Government. I lay it down with great confidence that the award is binding both at law and equity. This arbitration was agreed to by both Governments. The Dominion Government agreed, by an Order in Council, dated 12th November, 1874, that this reference should take place; and that the boundary lines of Ontario should be settled by this arbitration. The Ontario Government agreed to the same reference, and the arbitrators entered upon the discharge of their duties. The award was made by the arbitrators on the 3rd August, 1878, shortly before the defeat of the late Government. It was the unanimous award of the three arbitrators; it was made after a most thorough and exhaustive investigation of all the evidence that could be submitted on both sides; it was made after having heard the arguments of able counsel; it was made after due weight had been given to every argument that could be advanced for or against the position of Ontario. Who was it made by? Do hon. gentlemen opposite challenge the arbitration or the arbitrators? Are they bold enough to cast any reflection on the honesty and integrity of the arbitrators? No, Sir, they have not the courage to do so. It is true they challenge the award, but they do not question the honesty of the arbitrators; they could not do so—more eminent or distinguished men could not well be found. Every one who knew the late Chief Justice Harrison knew him to be a man of transcendent ability and indefatigable labor—a man, who when he once entered on the discharge of any duty, stuck to it with unflinching ardour until he understood

it from beginning to end. I am satisfied that when Chief Justice Harrison undertook to deal with this question, he dealt with it thoroughly and exhaustively; and those of us who know Sir Francis Hincks, and Sir Edward Thornton, know they were eminently qualified to deal with a question of this kind—a mixed question of law and fact. The arbitrators made their award in August, 1878. Did hon. gentlemen opposite, when they came into power, repudiate the award? No, they did not. On the contrary, they ratified the award as far as they could do so without Parliamentary sanction. The Ontario Government drew the attention of this Government to the award on the 1st November, 1878. Was the answer a repudiation? No, Sir; it was simply an acknowledgment of the receipt of the communication, without any protest. On the 31st December, 1878, the Ontario Government again drew the attention of the Dominion Government to the award with the view of securing the ratification, at the ensuing Session of Parliament, and the answer again was a simple acknowledgment. On the 3rd September, 1879, and the 19th December, 1879, the Ontario Government again communicated with the Dominion Government, asking for a ratification of the award and pointing out the injurious effects in the territory of the unsettled condition of affairs. The reply was a mere formal acknowledgment, nothing more. The first intimation the people of Ontario had of the repudiation of this award was not until recently; and then for the first time the Government submit that this award should not be confirmed, on the ground that the Executive Government transcended their authority in agreeing to the reference. I do not propose entering on an exhaustive argument on the power of the Executive to agree to this reference without the prior consent of Parliament. The hon. member for Bothwell, than whom no man is better able to deal with a question of this kind, has dealt with it exhaustively, and I think no man, open to conviction, who has listened to his able argument, can fail to be convinced of the correctness of the position taken by my hon. friend. I, therefore, assume that the Executive had the authority. It is clear that this executive power has been exercised without question in many modern instances—the boundary between Maine and New Brunswick, the Oregon Boundary, the Geneva Award, the Washington Treaty, were all the result of executive action alone, in some instances subsequently ratified by Parliaments. Assuming, then, that the Executive had the authority to consent to a reference, the award should at once have been ratified—but even assuming that the Executive had no such power, still are we to be told now that when one Government, acting in good faith, and in the exercise of its functions, consented to a reference, in order to settle a question that remained unsettled for a quarter of a century, and the importance of which one cannot over-estimate, that the successors of that Government are not to be bound by the reference? No man and no Government would be safe in dealing with a Government that entertained such extraordinary views as hon. gentlemen opposite now contend for. Sir, I take the ground, and I take it with confidence, that it was within the competence of the Executive to make the reference, and that the Executive having consented to it, and both Governments being represented before the arbitrators, this country is legally, morally and equitably bound to confirm that award. But there is something further—I say that hon. gentlemen opposite have recognized this award; that the Government and Parliament have acquiesced in it. There is no clearer legal principle than this, that if two persons agree to a reference, even though the reference should be irregular, or void, yet if the parties, with a knowledge of the facts, appear before the arbitrators and take their chances, such parties are for ever estopped from questioning the award on such grounds. The point I desire to make here is that even if the reference were illegal, both Governments having taken their chances before the

political bias. Sir, if there is one thing more than another arbitrators, both are equally bound by the award; but in addition to all this, this very Parliament and Government have expressly recognized the award by voting \$15,000 to pay the cost of the reference. If this reference was illegal, and if this award is so much waste paper, it was the bounden duty of the Government to repudiate it at once and to repudiate any liability for the expenses; but the Government of the day fully recognized the validity of this award in the way I have suggested and otherwise. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Algoma sits to-day in Parliament as a representative of a portion of this very territory, as part of Ontario. By allowing him to sit in Parliament as a member from the Province of Ontario, representing a portion of this very disputed territory, the Government thereby recognizes that this portion of the country belongs to Ontario. If it does not belong to Ontario, the hon. gentleman has no business here, and he had no business to sit in the Ontario Legislature for four years, as a representative in it of that section. If the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct, the hon. member is an intruder, a stranger, here, and it is your duty, Mr. Speaker, to eject him from Parliament. What is the true secret why hon. gentlemen have changed their opinions on this boundary question, and now exhibit such marked hostility to the interests of Ontario? What is the true inwardness of this sudden and extraordinary change of base on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite? What new light has dawned on their dark minds? What additional facts have been brought to light and that has induced them to change their views? If there is anything to account for this change, no one has informed the House on the subject. Does not the *Mail* give the key-note to the motives and mainsprings that actuate hon. gentlemen opposite in resisting this award? Has the respectable politician who leads the Opposition in Ontario not given the key-note to the actions of hon. gentlemen opposite? Has the true inwardness of the movement not been unwittingly disclosed by the Ontario leader of the Conservative party and by the organ of the party? No doubt they have. Let us see what the *Mail*, that re-echoes the views of the leader of the Ontario Opposition, and that speaks the sentiments of hon. gentlemen, says on the subject, and when you hear its remarks you will say that I am about right in saying that it not is the merits of the case, or the interests of the country that actuates hon. gentlemen opposite, but the interests of the Conservative party. The *Mail* says:

"The Grit party has no possible hope of getting into power in 1883. If then it is essential that in order to obtain a settlement of the boundary question, parties in Ottawa and Toronto must be at one with each other, the public will probably think that it is better that Mr. Mowat should go out in order that Ontario should get all these millions rather than that he should remain in and sacrifice them. . . . If the people of Ontario are in earnest, they will speedily teach Mr. Mowat that he and his cabal must not stand between the Province and the acquisition of a territory which is declared to be of such inestimable value." Prodigious!

Does that article not give the key-note; does it not show that, in order to manipulate the elections in Ontario, it is necessary to convince the electors that they cannot get justice from the hon. gentlemen opposite while Ontario is controlled by the Liberal party, but that a change of Government in Ontario will be followed by a change of policy in Ottawa? Hon. gentlemen make a terrible mistake if they suppose that, by threats of the kind, they can influence the independent electors of the great Province of Ontario. Let me advise hon. gentlemen opposite to pursue the policy that statesmen ought to pursue, and to remember that honesty in politics, as in everything else, is the best policy; if the Province of Ontario is right in her contention, let that right prevail, and let this award be confirmed. Hon. gentlemen opposite never made a greater mistake than when they allowed the organ of the party to publish the extract I have just read, and to have it go abroad to the world that justice is dealt out according to

calculated to arouse the people of Ontario it is the conviction that wrong is being done them by political wire-pullers for political purposes. I believe they are aroused, thoroughly in earnest, and that when the time comes to pronounce on this subject at the polls, as come it soon will, the indignant voice of outraged Ontario will make itself heard—loud and clear—from Ottawa to the Hudson's Bay. There is one way, and one only, by which hon. gentlemen can escape. Let them carry out this award, and then they may expect to command the respect of this House and secure some share of the sympathy of Ontario.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I am afraid that there is something about the atmosphere of this question that has disturbed the mind of the member for South Huron, and deprived him of the ability to discuss this matter in a calm, judicious way. This is a question that should appeal solely to our reason. We should deal with it equitably and calmly and in a judicial spirit. The hon. gentleman scarcely displays that spirit to-night. He threatens us with the Province of Ontario, if certain results should flow from our action here, and he also threatens us with the results of the action of the *Mail*. So far as the Conservative party is concerned, it has had no special reason yet to complain of the action of the *Mail*. We are under the impression that the largely increasing circulation of that paper in diffusing sound views among the people, has enabled us somewhat to disabuse them of an erroneous impression they had of the merits of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and of the merits of his political friends. No doubt those hon. gentlemen hold a very hard position in Ontario, and it has been produced to a great extent by the diffusion of sound information and opinions through the *Mail*. But, asks the hon. gentleman what is the true inwardness of this question? I feel it my duty to tell him that this question has come before us under somewhat extraordinary circumstances. It appears that a sort of blasting wind seems to blow in the faces and disturb the peace of the hon. gentlemen opposite, when this resolution was moved by the member for Niagara. Why were they so disturbed—why were they so humiliated—why so utterly destroyed so to speak—and why did they lose their presence of mind? If I were like the member for Centre Huron, to make insinuations, I might take the position that those gentlemen rather hoped that this question would not be settled. They hoped it would remain a burning issue at the next elections, one in which they might stir up the people of Ontario and try to make them believe their rights were being trampled upon, for certainly I never saw such consternation among any set of gentlemen as I did on the faces of those hon. gentlemen when a satisfactory and legal solution of this difficulty was offered on the floor of this House. They were astonished to see a gentleman on this side of the House act as they expected to act. They mistake altogether the temper of the party on this side of the House. The Government and those supporting them believe that it is a highly desirable thing that this question should be settled, that is, should not remain a living issue. Hon. gentlemen opposite have found another element of difficulty in dealing with this question: that is that the people are not excited on this question, and it is difficult to excite them. They are not boiling over with the indignation described by the hon. gentleman and his friends. They are taking it very easily, because, in fact, they do not think the Province of Ontario is in danger, and they think it would be about as well to have this question settled. They are perfectly satisfied their rights will not be injured in any particular by this Government and by those who support it. They believe the true friends of Ontario are to be found behind the Government and not in front of it. They have no confidence in those men, and there are no signs in the politi-

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

cal atmosphere at present that the verdict pronounced in 1878 will be reversed. I take it that every evidence that we can gather shows that the people of Ontario, as well as of the rest of the Dominion, are in favor of the present Government and of their policy. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down wishes to give great effect to the finding of the arbitrators, whose finding, by the way, was to have no effect till it was ratified by Parliament; it is not ratified by Parliament and therefore it has no effect. He was wrong in his law also when he stated that the award that has been made cannot be impeached. An award can always be impeached if the arbitrators exceed their powers as they did in this case. The people of Ontario are not satisfied with the attempted settlement unhappily made by the hon. gentleman who used to lead the Opposition. It was not a happy one, it was not a fortunate one, it was not satisfactory to the people of this country. I have yet to learn, as a member of this House and as a lawyer, though perhaps not as eminent as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that there are circumstances surrounding the finding of these gentlemen that entitles it to the respect he would have us show to it. This is a question that we have been debating now at great length, and yet we are only able to treat it on the surface; so many are the details and so abstruse are the principles now involved in this question that with all the enormous research and labor that have been given to it, with all the material we have before us, we are only able to treat it superficially. And yet we find that when these three gentlemen met, they met on one day, heard the argument on the next day, and they gave their decision on the third. I say that it was impossible for any tribunal composed of men far superior in talent to these men, even the Privy Council of England or the Supreme Court of our own country, to determine this question, or any such cursory examination as was involved in hearing the argument, in one day. He says it was put before them by one of the ablest lawyers in Canada. I should be the last man to impeach the standing of a brother professional man, but I say no unfair thing, I make use of no illegitimate argument, when I say that the gentleman who presented the case to these arbitrators, Mr. McMahon of London, had no such standing in the profession in this country as to entitle him to the remarks that have been made, for, comparatively speaking, he is an unknown man and was unfitted to present such a case as that. But the effort of the gentleman who presented the case for Ontario was supplemented. It was supplemented with enormous advantage and an unfair advantage by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—I say Mr. Mills, because he was employed by the Ontario Government and well paid, and he should be well paid for what he did. But there was something wrong in his endeavoring to support his view of the case before those hon. gentlemen to whom this reference was made, when he was Minister of the Interior for this Dominion, for he was not unbiassed and was engaged and paid by the Government of Ontario. I have here the report he made and issued by himself, and in the front of it are these words: "Report on the boundaries of the Province of Ontario, containing in part the substance of a report prepared for the Government of the Province in 1872, by David Mills, Esq., M.P." Now mark these words that follow: "and afterwards revised and considerably enlarged by the author,"—by Mr. Mills, the gentleman who got up this work, for which he was well paid,—"for the purposes of the arbitration between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario." There, on the front of his report, we see the animus with which he was acting on that occasion. Sir, I do not think it was a fair course for him to take in the matter. I take the position in reference to this question, that the boundary of Ontario on the west and on the north have not been defined and settled, that the action

of these gentlemen not having been confirmed by Parliament, is of no effect, therefore this question is still unsettled. I say that there is every reason why this question should be settled now, distinctly and forever settled, on a strictly legal and constitutional basis. I say that is a view that no fair or honest man can oppose, and it is with wonder that we see the indignation and alarm in the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite when they see a satisfactory solution of this question offered. What was it that was referred to these three gentlemen? They were to ascertain and define the boundary of Ontario on the west and on the north. Well, Sir, I say they did not ascertain and define that boundary, and it is open and patent to every one, not only in the discussion that has taken place, not only from the opinions and expressions of experts, not only from the facts which are patent to us all, but from the utterances of those very gentlemen themselves, it is evident that they did not settle and define the legal boundary, but they agreed only to support their own convenience, or the conveniences of the Provinces, as they thought, and they had no right to do. Now, supposing them to be legally appointed—and with that question I do not wish to deal at any great length, it has been dealt with by abler hands than mine—then I say that it was a most unhappy mode of endeavoring to arrive at a solution of this vexed question. It was not a question that should properly be submitted to an arbitration, arbitration is not an improper mode of dealing with the rights of private parties. It is not a bad thing when a dispute arises between men, as to the rights of property, to refer it to arbitration. It may be often a very convenient mode of settling such a difference. But that is not the proper way of determining matters when provincial rights are in question, and when it involves the determination of boundary lines between two Provinces; then there is but one proper mode of arriving at a conclusion, and that was to define the strictly legal and constitutional boundaries; because when you go into a compromise on a question like that, if you allow the mere reason of convenience to prevail with men vested with the power of arbitrators, and who may feel disposed to come to some decision as quickly as possible and split the difference as is done in cases of private parties, no satisfactory conclusion is arrived at; but when the rights of Provinces are in question, the result will not be satisfactory until the strictly legal and constitutional boundaries are determined. If we do not do so, if a settlement, such as is proposed in this case, becomes a precedent, trouble may arise between the Provinces when it is shown that a compromise was made. I have heard it urged at considerable length, that, because questions of an international character arose between nations, which are sometimes submitted to arbitration, a policy of arbitration is the proper one in this case. There is no parity between the two cases. When disputes arise between nations, there is no mode of settlement except by arbitration, which is sometimes very happily adopted, or by war, because they have no Courts to which to make a final appeal. But here we have no difficulty of that kind. We have a Supreme Court and the Privy Council, which is the highest tribunal in the Empire, presided over by men who are inferior to none in ability, and, perhaps, superior to all juries. By that tribunal we can have it settled as to what are the legal boundaries. There is no difficulty in the matter, and no danger of bloodshed in this case—at least, I do not think any substantial danger. It is true the Premier of Ontario has threatened he will fill this much-coveted land with gore, but all who have known that gentleman through a long and peaceful life, are aware that he carefully avoids strife, and that he must have been urged forward by much more warlike minds than his own. It was understood that the leader of the Opposition at about the time the discussion occurred in the Local House, was

in hourly consultation with Mr. Mowat, and we rather think that hon. gentlemen suggested the very warlike attitude assumed by the Provincial Premier. And it was not an attitude without precedent. There is a fable told of a monkey using an animal for the purpose of getting nuts out of the fire. The hon. leader of the Opposition was well aware that the blame would recoil on the head of Mr. Mowat, not on his own. I asserted that the finding of the arbitrators, which has not the force of an award until it is confirmed by Parliament, was not an ascertaining of the true line, but the settlement of a conventional line, and I said that the consensus of opinion sustained that view. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not satisfied with the award in the abstract, for he holds that Ontario should have received much more territory. The Province of Ontario has a right to receive the last acre of her domain that properly and legally belongs to her. It is the right of the other Provinces that Ontario shall not receive an acre that does not belong to her; and no honest and fair-minded man in the Province of Ontario asks that the power of our own Province, of which we are justly proud, shall be added to by claiming a rood of land to which it has no proper title. We believe that to be the feeling of the people. Were she to take one square mile which does not belong to her, a wrong would be done to the other Provinces; were she to lose a mile, a wrong would be done to her to which none of her sons would willingly submit. They want right done and the proper and legal boundary established and nothing more. I will read to the House a paragraph from a letter written by Sir Francis Hincks, one of the chief of those gentlemen who so hurriedly made this finding, who suggested the reconciliation of existing difference, which was an objectionable proceeding in an arbitration between Provinces, for which action no power was given then, and if it were given the Executive had not the right to give it. Sir Francis Hincks stated:

"My object in referring to the proclamation, as I have already stated, was simply to prove that no precise boundaries were laid down, and that the arbitrators were compelled to determine them between certain established points in the manner most advantageous to the contending parties."

Here is this unimpeachable authority, stating in his own letter that practically they had no time to give to the matter, that they split the difference, and arrived at a result which was most convenient, taking only a day to hear the argument of counsel and giving a decision on the following. That being the state of the facts, there is no finding that has the effect of an award. The Opposition seem rather to desire that this matter should remain as it is; they wish the dispute to remain; they wish, if possible, to excite the public mind on this question. I do not think they will succeed because the country does not take sufficient interest in the few hundred or thousand square miles of barren land in that territory, which would cost more to administer than its revenues would amount to. I do not think the people of Ontario can be excited on this question, because they are very practical people engaged in the busy affairs of life, and are not to be disturbed unless they are suffering some actual wrong, or unless some of their rights are in danger. The people of Ontario do not feel in any such position. The only anxiety displayed appears to be on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are much disturbed because there seems likely to be presented some satisfactory means of settling this question. What we have to consider here is the best way of getting at the true legal boundary of the Province of Ontario—that is paramount to every consideration of convenience. No question of convenience arises here; there is no interest that will be imperilled; no damage to be done; no trouble that can arise. Yet it is better that the question should be settled now once and for ever, and settled on a strictly legal

and constitutional basis. I urged before, and I urge again, that there is no necessity for getting a compromise. Let us have our rights; we ask for nothing more, and then no one will have any cause of complaint. No matter what disputes may arise in after years between the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec, or between Ontario and the Maritime Provinces, or those Provinces that are growing up in the North-West, there will be nothing to show that there has been a dispute between the parties. But in after years it might be said, on the other hand, that the question was settled by arbitrators; that the parties were entitled to their strict legal rights, and they would insist on their strict legal rights as they should be insisted upon. But no such question can arise if the matter be settled as it is now proposed to settle it. Let us see what is proposed in this motion; whether it suggests a settlement to which no reasonable-minded man can object; a legal settlement—and whether anything can arise out of this mode of settlement which can be injurious to the interests of either party. Here are the proposed terms of settlement:

“That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the western and northern boundaries of the Province of Ontario should be finally settled by a reference to, and an authoritative decision by, either the Supreme Court of Canada or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain, or by the Supreme Court in the first place, subject to a final submission to the Judicial Committee as the Province of Ontario may choose, that such decision should be obtained either on appeal in a friendly action brought for the purpose, or by reference to the said Courts, or either, or both of them by Her Majesty under the powers conferred upon her by the Imperial and Canadian Parliaments, as the Government of Ontario may prefer, and that the said reference should be based on the evidence collected and printed with any additional documentary evidence—if such there is—and that pending the reference, the administration of the lands shall be entrusted to a Joint Commission appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario.”

Now, Sir, I fail to see what objection hon. gentlemen opposite, or, indeed, any fair-minded man in Ontario or anywhere else can bring forward against such a reference as the one proposed—namely, to either our own Supreme Court, or to the highest tribunal in the Empire, or to both these tribunals, just as the people of Ontario may prefer. If these hon. gentlemen were fair and honest in what they say, if they really wanted a quiet and peaceable settlement of this question, which has not become a vexed question, but which they are trying their best to make a vexed question, they would join hand in hand with us I say. Here is an easy and satisfactory statement of this question. But, Sir, they want nothing of the kind; they want to be able to go to the country at the next election, whenever it may come, and thunder forth the trampled rights of Ontario from every stump in their constituencies, and try to stir up the people and make them believe that they are being deprived of their rights. But to use a common, though vulgar expression, the people of Ontario have not stirred worth a cent yet. They do not see anything solid in the matter; there is nothing there worth having, and the territory is of such a character that it would cost more to administer it than the revenues would amount to; and I know this, that if the people of Ontario were to wake up, and take a live interest in this question, and bring it forward as a strong issue, whether the territory were of value or not, whenever the rights of that Province were in jeopardy, the people would resolve upon having their strict legal rights, and that is what we now propose to give them. If Ontario, under the award, does not get a sufficient amount of territory, then let her have her fair share. If she has more than she is entitled to, there is not a man in that Province to whom the question may be fairly presented who will wish one acre more, than belongs to that Province. It is a resolution which I hope will be read widely by the people of that Province, as well as the debate which is taking place upon it, in order that the people may see what the Government

Mr. BOULTBEE.

are prepared to do, and that they are anxious to settle this question in a strictly legal and proper manner. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred to what Sir Francis Hincks said upon this question—that we did not get enough land; but the facts are, that the arbitrators found what they thought was the convenient boundary; but, Sir, not a legal and true one, and that is what we want whether we gain or lose land. That is what is proposed to be done by the resolution before the House. They say we want no settlement; we say we do; and if the people of Ontario and the people of the Dominion have anything to say on the subject, they will say they want a settlement too. This motion suggests a settlement in a strictly legal way, by which right will be done on the strict legal status of the case, so that no complaints will arise afterwards; that is what the people of Ontario and the people of the Dominion want, and all the sophistry of hon. gentlemen opposite will not avail to convince them to the contrary. Then there is the forum to which this case is to be submitted. Is there any man bold enough, unfair enough, unpatriotic enough, to say that the Supreme Court is not a fitting tribunal to submit this case to? If there be a scintilla of a reason why the case should not go to the Supreme Court, that can have no reference to the Court which is out of the country altogether, which has nothing to do with our local interests, in which the Judges do not belong either to Ontario or Quebec, and have only a common interest in preserving the integrity of this great Dominion, and promoting harmony among our people. If they are not satisfied to leave the question to the Supreme Court, is there a man bold enough, unfair enough, and illogical enough, to say that we cannot get a satisfactory solution of this question before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest Court of Appeal in our realm? I do not think there is any man who can say that the final result of such a reference would not be a proper one. What would the final result be of submitting the question to either of these high courts? It would be, as I said before, that we would get a strictly legal adjudication of this question, that we would get it settled on its legal merits as it should be; and I have yet to learn that an argument can be advanced to show that that is not the proper mode of settling the question. I do not think any man who wishes to do what is fair and right, who wishes to remove difficulties, who wishes to smooth down any little feelings of acerbity that may possibly grow up between the different Provinces, can fairly oppose the settlement of this question in such a way. I say, Sir, that such an adjudication of this question cannot be distasteful to any man, or any set of men, unless to a man or a set of men who do not want to see it satisfactorily settled, so as to do away with any angry feeling that may possibly arise out of it. I say such a mode of settlement can only be distasteful to those gentlemen who sit on the opposite benches, who have long hugged themselves, apparently with the idea that when the next election comes, they will be able to make some small, petty, miserable political capital by stirring up the Provinces, and that they may carry a few votes, or perhaps a constituency or two. I say, if such a consideration prevails among them, it is a miserable, paltry consideration, unworthy of any men sitting in this House. But these hon. gentlemen have shown before this that their highest object, as representative Canadian politicians or statesmen, is not to bind this Confederation together, to make it a strong and great Dominion, inhabited by a happy, prosperous and contented people, but in every way that they seem to be able, they appear to me to be throwing aside every such regard, and to miss no opportunity to excite discontent and ill-feeling between one Province and another. In their discussions on the National Policy—a policy which is so deeply entrenched in the affections of the people of this country, that before long they

will cease to buck their heads against it—what do we find them doing throughout the country? We find them trying to excite the Maritime Provinces against Ontario by telling them that the tax on breadstuffs is only intended to injure them in order to put money into the pockets of the farmers of Ontario, and then coming up to Ontario and saying that the tax on coal was put on in order that a few dollars may be put into the pockets of these hungry people in the Maritime Provinces. But thanks to the intelligence of the people of Canada, their efforts have been abortive. The people of Ontario are willing that a tax should be placed on coal if the interests of Confederation are subserved thereby; and the people of the Maritime Provinces are patriotic enough to support the tax on breadstuffs in order that the great principle underlying the policy of this Government may have its full effect. Our wealth and prosperity are increasing on every hand, and the principle underlying this policy is becoming fully to be understood by the people. They had enough of the miserable principle which hon. gentlemen opposite were trying to develop, that the people should buy in the cheapest market; their market was cheap enough, but the people were becoming so poor and so embarrassed that things would have to be cheap, indeed, before they could buy even the ordinary necessaries of life. Not only have these gentlemen tried to excite the different Provinces against each other, but they have tried also to show that it would be better that we should deal with the United States than with each other. Thus they have been seeking in every possible way to excite a feeling of dissatisfaction with the present system of things, which I maintain is of great and inestimable benefit to this country; and I say that if, in the settlement of this little question—little, so far as the substantial issues are concerned, but great in its importance on the question of Provincial rights—I say, if we give effect to the terms of this common-sense resolution, we shall have performed another Act which will have entitled this Government and this House to the gratitude of the people of the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not know, Sir, whether I myself or my friends in the Opposition will be able, in considering this question, to attain to the extraordinarily lofty moral standard of the hon. member for East York. The precepts and the practices of that hon. gentleman both involve a purity of life, a purity of thought, and a purity of motives and actions, which I fear are beyond our reach. We shall be contented, on the present occasion, to consider the subject from a more practical point of view than that from which he has looked at it. There is one point, and possibly one point alone, on which I am disposed to agree with the hon. gentleman. He is right enough in saying that as regards the law on this question, that depends on a great variety of technical and highly complicated details, on which it is scarcely possible for a House constituted like this to form an accurate opinion. It must be settled by, and was properly referred to, a properly constituted tribunal, which gave a decision on the question. Now, this is a very remarkable proposition which has been laid before us, and I may say that it is rather unusual to have a proposal brought in this manner by a firm supporter of the Government on entering into Committee of Supply. It would seem to indicate that this question is looked upon as a vastly more serious and burning question by hon. gentlemen opposite than any other question with which they are called upon to deal. Strip this proposal of the verbiage in which it is robed, and what does it mean? This resolution, if passed, seeks directly to commit this Legislature, this Dominion House of Commons, to a conflict with the largest Province of the Dominion, which has already, within a few weeks, almost within a few days, by an overwhelming vote, after full and ample discussion, declared its purpose and recorded its resolution

on this very question. And I say that that, at any rate, as far as the hon. members from Ontario are concerned, deserves double respect, because, in the first place, the Ontario Legislature takes its mandate from the people at a later date than the hon. members for Ontario in this House; and because, in the second place, they are specially called upon and qualified to deal with questions in which the interests of Ontario are involved; and, as I have said before, they have, very recently, by an overwhelming majority, recorded their opinion as to what the rights of Ontario are, and what alone they can recommend the Government of Ontario to adopt. Then, I say, this resolution is, at least, three years too late. If this was to be the policy of the Government, it ought to have been announced at once, and all kinds of evasions would not have been resorted to by the Government to avoid being called on to commit themselves on the question which is now brought up at the eleventh hour, after serious mischief has been done to Ontario, after grave complications have arisen in dealing with lands and timber over this valuable tract of country in dispute. Although the resolution is a remarkable one, the choice of the champion to bring it forward was perhaps more remarkable. There was some significance in the choice of the hon. member for Niagara as the member, out of the sixty-four from Ontario that are said to support the Government, best fitted to deal with a question specially affecting the rights of Ontario. Was it due to a touch of disgrace on the part of the other members that an alien in birth, breeding and instincts should be called on to deal with a question peculiarly affecting Ontario? I trust it was so, and that no native born member from Ontario could be found to lead the attack on the rights of his Province. It may be as well to sweep away the legal cobwebs with which this question has been enveloped. I do not say that it was not necessary to deal with these legal questions, but these have been thoroughly dealt with by the hon. members from Bothwell and South Huron. But, after all, there are a few straightforward facts to which the attention of this House had better be directed than to all the technicalities which envelop the consideration as to whether this or that particular stream or branch of the Mississippi is or is not the point from which our boundary should run. What are those plain facts? First of all, let us consider them in the broad light in which they will strike every voter in the Province of Ontario, in which, I believe, they will strike every voter of ordinary intelligence throughout this Dominion. We find that a considerable portion of this territory with which the Government are now undertaking to deal, over which they are professing, in defiance of the Government of Ontario, to exercise their rights, has for many years back been in the possession and under the jurisdiction and authority of the Province of Ontario. Next we find that the rest of the territory was formerly awarded to that Province, that the award was made with the fullest knowledge of the late Parliament, that their consent was given in the most distinct and emphatic way, by voting, after a full explanation from the hon. member for Lambton, a considerable sum of money for the express purpose of paying the expenses of this Commission, on whose award the claim of Ontario now rests. We find also that it was accepted distinctly and clearly by the late Government of the Dominion. Now, I ask, looking at those broad facts which no man can deny and every voter can understand, the House to consider what the present Government has done. They have disregarded the solemn agreement entered into and agreed to by the late Administration. They have, after doing that, delayed further action for several years, although they knew that every day and hour and moment was adding to the complications and increasing the difficulty of dealing with the question. Then, Sir, last of all, they have

deliberately usurped possession of that disputed territory. They have given rights upon it, they have allowed parties to exercise the right of dominion upon it, despite the protests of Ontario, to the great loss of the Government and people of Ontario. And what is almost worse, they have attempted to drag in Manitoba to the quarrel. They have attempted to create a quarrel between Manitoba and Ontario. They have attempted, although it is in no way to the interest of Manitoba which gets the land and the timber, to make this the ground of quarrel or contention between Ontario and Manitoba. These men have done what the law forbids to be done in the case of the most ordinary, humble litigant. They have arbitrarily taken possession of property and land which was awarded to Ontario by a formal award, and which had been for years in her possession. Is there a single individual here who does not know that one of the most well defined, clearly pronounced rules of law is this; that when a party has obtained possession of any piece of real estate and enjoyed possession for a considerable time, he cannot be disturbed in the enjoyment of it until it is decided otherwise by some Court of competent jurisdiction. The humblest individual in the Dominion is not denied rights which are refused to the Premier Province of Canada, and then they presume to complain if the Government of Ontario remonstrates against this gross wrong and oppression. Let us consider for one moment what would have been the result had this case been reversed. I ask the Secretary of State what he thinks would have happened had this thing been done to the Province of Quebec. Let us suppose for one moment that Quebec possessed this territory by solemn award, and had retained it for years, undisturbed—I ask any hon. member, and especially any hon. member from Ontario, if this position had been reversed, would this or any Government have dealt with the rights of Quebec as they have not feared to deal with the rights of Ontario? I commend highly the attitude which Quebec members have always maintained when the rights of the Province were at issue, and I wish that the people of my own Province were so well united and determined to preserve her rights. Had that thing been done in the case of Quebec, within twenty-four hours after the Council had determined on such an act of usurpation and tyranny not one of the Quebec members would have remained in it, or would have supported a Government guilty of such a wrong. If the Ontario members would take such a stand, not twenty-four hours would elapse before Ontario would receive the justice which in the case of the sister Province the Government would never have attempted to take away. Let me say that we on this side of the House have always desired, and always will desire, to give Quebec everything she is entitled to. We wish to respect her rights, laws, language and institutions; we would not take away from her one jot or tittle of what she possesses. But I ask that our friends in Quebec would be willing to do likewise with Ontario. Why this extraordinary action? Why have the Government refused, in these circumstances, to do justice to Ontario? I do not believe that the majority of the people of Quebec grudge us our rights, but I do fear, from past experience, that there is a small selfish clique in Quebec who do desire to deprive Ontario of her rights in this matter; and I fear they have had far too much influence in deciding this question in the councils of the Dominion. I would warn these people of the folly they are committing. It is true it has been said here and elsewhere that Ontario is very slow to act. It is very long suffering of wrongs like this; and I do not say that even at this moment she is as fully alive as she is coming to be to wrong and injury done here. But it will be all the worse and most dangerous when our people do begin to move. I would warn the House there are limits to the patience of the people of Ontario. I can remember, twenty years ago, when I first had the honor to sit in the Legislature of the two Provinces, how Ontario had been

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

aroused and goaded to an extent which put her on the verge of separation, through the refusal of her just demands. I hope that the House will avoid any action leading Ontario to suspect that there is a disposition to deny her her rights in this matter. It is known that the present right hon. leader of the Government has, on many occasions in the past, yielded unduly to the pressure put upon him by a small section of his supporters from Quebec—a small but mischievous section; and I fear that in the present case that this pressure has been put upon him, and that he has yielded to it—I do not say voluntarily or willingly, but most improperly, notwithstanding—although he knows right well that in doing so he is injuring, not merely his own Province, but the whole Dominion. It is in the highest degree in the interest of Canada that every Provincial right should be respected. It is even more the interest of the smaller than the larger Provinces, and I say for my own Province that we ask no favors; all we want is bare justice, our barest legal rights. Is the House prepared, at the instigation of the hon. member for Niagara—who, we must suppose, is not a mere tool or mouthpiece of the Government—to trample on the rights of Ontario; and are the members of Ontario prepared to endorse him in that direction? I think there is one just and honest course for the Government to pursue: let them, if they actually condemn the award, and say it ought not to have been made or accepted by the late Government, assume the responsibility of that opinion. We did not shirk or shun that responsibility. We did our best to obtain a fair and honorable conclusion. Hon. gentlemen may say what they like that they will never agree to this award; that they found, when they came into office, that the award was made and that the reference was completed, but I say, according to every sound principle of constitutional law in practice, it was their bounden duty to have accepted that award loyally, and to have acted upon it and given Ontario her due. If they cannot rise to this level—if they cannot do what is just and right—they might do what Mr. Mowat has proposed: leave Ontario in possession of the lands, to exercise full control over them, and refer the proposition for the decision of a proper tribunal, and if there be ground to dispute the validity of the award, the Courts are open, the Dominion can go before them and upset it; and although I do not think it a wise, generous or constitutional course, at any rate there would be infinitely less to complain of than when the Dominion Government constitutes itself judge and jury and violently takes possession of property which has been under the control of the Ontario Government for many years already. I maintain that in the highest degree loyalty to Canada means loyalty to provincial rights, and Mr. Mowat and the Local Government are not permitted to allow the rights of Ontario to be trampled on. It would be the worst policy if they were to allow themselves to be tamely trampled on by the Dominion Government or any other authority whatever. If we were looking at this matter merely from a party point of view, I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite: Vote for this motion, refuse the Parliament and people of Ontario their just rights, and see whether you have or have not miscalculated in thinking that the people of Ontario are not aware of the practical importance of the point involved, and of the magnitude of this important issue. Sir, I repeat that there is danger, there is grave danger, lest, by the action you are undertaking now, you may convince the people of Ontario that they are not likely to obtain justice at the hands of the Dominion Parliament, and as one who always advocated Confederation, I would regret it, and deeply, because I can see nothing more certain to bring about the ruin of the Confederation than that a great Province like Ontario should come, even if it come hastily, to entertain that conclusion. I believe that the line I have taken, the views I have presented are those I have presented, and are present

ing themselves to the minds of ninety-nine hundredths of the people of Ontario, whatever their peculiar political complexion may be, and I believe hon. gentlemen will find it so and find it soon. Sir, there is but too much danger. I believe that this is but part of a plot—whether a defined plot, or whether a plot at present *in embryo*—on the part of many men on these benches against the provincial rights of the various Provinces. We know right well, because they are constantly betraying themselves in various ways, that many of those persons who entered into Confederation did so grudgingly, that they really desired a different form of Union. Sir, even if it had been possible, twenty years ago, in the case of the four original Provinces, to have had Legislative Union, that time has past and gone forever, and you may depend upon it that no greater injury can be done to our present form of Government than to attempt to belittle our Provincial Legislatures, to attempt to disregard our provincial autonomy and to attempt to interfere with provincial rights. Sir, I do not want to say anything which we cannot prove by fair grounds, but when I remember the language used by many of these hon. gentlemen's supporters, by many of their organs, and particularly by the organ to which the hon. member for South Huron referred, I cannot but feel that there is unfortunately too much truth, too much foundation for the statement which he made on the authority of these organs, and on the authority of these hon. gentlemen themselves, that the main reason why Ontario at present cannot get her rights is because Ontario at present is under a Liberal Government, because Ontario is at least a Liberal Province, because Ontario is known not to be likely to continue much longer to support the hon. gentlemen opposite, and because they feel convinced that they are insecure in their ill-gotten power so long as Ontario and the Government of Ontario are not within their grasp.

Mr. ROYAL (in French). Mr. Speaker, there is something in this discussion which must strike the members of this House; it is the wisdom shown by the Government in deciding to remove this question from the arena of those constitutional debates which have put their stamp on the discussion from the time it was begun. It is important that the settlement of this question should be made by a tribunal whose rendering shall be above all suspicion. It is of the highest importance, and the Government has full well understood it, that the decision which shall settle this burning question shall be rendered by men whose knowledge, impartiality, and position will place their judgment beyond the merest suspicion. Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba has just as great a right to take an interest in this question of the boundaries of Ontario as any of the other Provinces of the Dominion. We are directly interested in it because we hold that if the affair is settled according to the legal interpretation of the Statute of 1774, the Province of Manitoba, besides its intrinsic importance, besides the riches insured to it by the fertility of its soil and the development of colonization taking place within its territory, Manitoba, I contend will receive, by virtue of such settlement, a share of Lake Superior and its importance will not be merely limited to its agricultural products, but it will take rank by the side of the other Provinces in the system of navigation of Canada. But, leaving aside local interests, there is a higher interest which we should have in view; it is that of justice. In the light of justice, the interests of this or that Province must stand aside, especially when we see that in one of the Provinces, the public mind has been excited to such a degree that track has been lost of the principal question at issue, and that one has even endangered the fate of our young constitution. I have not the intention of making a very lengthy speech on this question. I will content myself with touching on certain points which have originated during the debate which we have heard for the last few hours in this House, especially certain points in regard to the legal and constitutional

aspect of the country. I will be brief, and shall have to refer to notes somewhat copious in order not to lose the thread of my argument. In the first place, there is a proposition, which is self-evident and every one will admit that Ontario has defined and legal boundaries. To assert the contrary would be to do so in spite of sound sense. The territory known to-day by the name of the Province of Ontario, came into the Confederation with a defined and legal boundary, otherwise the clause of the British North America Act would be stating a thing that had no existence, for that Imperial Statute says that the Provinces, at the time of their entry into Confederation, and to wit the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, shall keep the boundaries they had on the 1st July, 1857. Well, if at that date the Province of Ontario had defined and legal limits, what are those limits? Were those limits assigned to it by law, by Royal Commission, by Order in Council or by proclamation? As you see, Mr. Speaker, the question is not now, at least directly, of the effects which may have had the more or less serious occupations of the territory by the Hudson's Bay Company, by virtue of its Charter of 1670. Nor is it the effect which may have had the negotiations with regard to the treaty of Ryswick, in 1697. Nor is it, at least I think not, of the effects of the treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, because the Commissioners who had been appointed could not sit by virtue of claims of the Hudson's Bay Company, and were never able to come to an understanding. Nor is it a question at present of the negotiations entered into in 1857, by the Government of Canada, claiming as its own the Hudson's Bay territory. The lawyers who defend the claims of the Province of Ontario, do nothing but repeat the arguments adduced by the delegates of the Canadian Government, in 1857, claiming as its own the Hudson's Bay territory. It has been lost sight of; it seems to me that at that time, like in all similar cases, any one who defends a cause, any one who has claims to submit to a higher tribunal, is like a lawyer who pleads a case; he is not acting as a Judge, but as an advocate, and moreover, the fact that the Imperial Government has refused to recognize the claims of Canada, and which has compelled us to pay \$1,500,000 for the expropriation of the Hudson's Bay territory in addition to the transfer of a twentieth part of that vast stretch of land, proves that the claims of Canada, however exaggerated they were at the time, were not recognized by the Imperial Government. If, therefore, those claims were not recognized at that date, it is in bad taste and illogical to contend that the Province of Ontario must hold the same argument in upholding that question of the western and northern limits of that territory. Nor is it the question in the present case whether there is a contract in existence, but the question is the interpretation of a law affecting rights to a property and which must consequently be settled *ex æquo bono*. Consequently, if we place the question on that basis, we leave far behind the learned and diffused speeches made on the early days of the colony. We find in them, no doubt some very interesting historical facts for those who are interested in the early times of the colony; but I think that in calling into play these historical documents, all this historical research, in compiling these voluminous records, one has had but one object in view, that of causing the principal question to be lost sight of, and to render extremely difficult and ungrateful the task of examining the question to those inclined to study it. We have neither more nor less to do than to interpret the Statute which has determined the boundaries of Ontario or the Commissions which have established them; for in both cases Ontario has had boundaries and those boundaries were given to it by a superior authority. If, therefore, Ontario had legal and defined boundaries at the time of its entry into Confederation, it is of the highest importance to ascertain what they were, and the search

made in that direction by the Committee which sat in 1880, will prove of the greatest interest to us. Of all the Provinces Ontario is perhaps the one which has had its boundaries established more frequently than any other of them. We find no less than eight different boundaries between 1774 and 1878. In the first place, we have the famous boundary established by the arbitrators in July, 1878. It is that boundary which the arbitrators discovered and, which *volens volens*, one seeks to impose on us. That boundary is a purely conventional one. It is the determining of a new territorial boundary of a Province, and is consequently in contradiction to the clauses of the British North America Act, which says that the Provinces, on entering into the Confederation, shall preserve the same boundaries as theretofore. The result of accepting this arbitration would be to change, to amend a clause of an Imperial Act. Now, do we possess such a right? We know that the limits determined by the arbitrators, in 1878, placed the western boundary of Ontario some 400 miles further west. Instead of letting it remain at the entrance of Thunder Bay, at the extreme end of Lake Superior, as indicated by the Act of 1774, the arbitrators decision gives to Ontario, as its western limit, the Lake of the Woods. We next come to the boundary claimed by the Ontario Government in its despatch of the 18th April, which is to be found in a report brought down by the hon. the Secretary of State. This boundary is somewhat different from that of the arbitrators. It is as follows:—

“The boundary line of Ontario is the international boundary from the mouth of the Pigeon River, on Lake Superior, to a point west of the Lake of the Woods, where the boundary line would be intersected by a line drawn north from the source of the Mississippi River; thence the boundary line of Ontario runs north to the point of intersection of the southern boundaries of the Hudson Bay territories, thence the boundary line of Ontario is the southern boundary of those territories to the point where that boundary would be intersected by a line drawn north from the head of Lake Temiscaming.”

We now come to a third boundary, which is, I think, a paradoxical one, invented in an hour of good humour by the well-known author of the report on this question of the boundaries of Ontario. I am speaking of the boundary assigned by Mr. Mills the present member for Bothwell. Mr. Mills had been commissioned by his Government to study the subject and to go into researches in order to try and throw some light on it. By dint of search and of hunting up books in libraries, Mr. Mills came to the conclusion that if the Province of Ontario has a western boundary, it is the Rocky Mountains. Now, I think Mr. Mills showed himself to be logical; if it is true that one must give to the Province of Ontario as a western limit that determined by the Statute of 1774, *i.e.*, a line starting from the Mississippi and following the course of that river, it is equally true that that line will necessarily strike, not the line south of the Hudson Bay territories, but the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Mills was not only paradoxical, but I think that he came nearer the truth than many others. Then comes the boundary fixed by Lord Durham's commission in 1838. With regard to that boundary, one will do well to bear in mind that it is the last one that was given to Ontario, and it is a fact that Ontario upon entering into the Confederation had no other boundary than that defined in the Royal Commission delivered to Lord Durham. He was sent hither as High Commissioner in 1838, and we must go back to that Commission to find the last prescribed limits of the Province of Ontario. Lord Durham's Commission fixes the western boundary of Ontario at the entrance to Lake Superior, and the Commissions delivered to the Governors who succeeded him, all contain the entrance to Lake Superior as the western boundary of the Province of Ontario. Previous to 1838, we find a period of forty-seven years during which the prescribed limits of Ontario remain the same, *i.e.*, since 1791. When the old Province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada, the officers of the Crown fearing, I sup-

Mr. ROYAL.

pose, to commit some error with regard to this portion of our territory, which was then but slightly known, abstained from giving any precise and geographical boundary to the Province of Upper Canada; they contented themselves with saying, after having defined in a most minute manner the boundaries of Lower Canada, that Upper Canada was to be all that portion of the territory of the old Province of Quebec that was to be found westward of the Province of Lower Canada. This boundary existed forty-seven years, and we see it appear in all the Commissions granted to the Governors who administered the affairs of the country during that period. We now come to Lord Dorchester's commission in 1786, which speaks of the Lake of the Woods as being the western limit of the old Province of Quebec. After an interval of twelve years, we come to the Commission of Sir Guy Carleton, in 1774, which was issued a few months after the passing of the Imperial Statute of Quebec. The terms expressed in that commission to define the western boundary of the Province of Upper Canada differ from those made use of in the Imperial Statute; in that Commission are added certain words which completely change the meaning of the Statute, and it is precisely that Commission of Lord Carleton, which, it appears, furnishes the present basis of the claims of the advocates of the Province of Ontario. Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the eighth boundary of the Province of Ontario is found in the Imperial Statute of 1774. That Statute, which was enacted to enlarge the Province of Quebec, says expressly that the western boundary of Upper Canada is a line drawn northward from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to the southern limit of the Hudson's Bay territory. In presence of so clear an establishing of the boundary, one is surprised to see paradoxical systems which have sprung up during the last twelve years with regard to those limits of the Province of Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, among these numerous boundaries, which are the true ones? Are we to take the boundary determined by the Imperial Statute, or are we to take the last Commission, that issued to Lord Durham in 1838, which fixed the limits at the entrance to Lake Superior? There is a great difference between those two boundaries and a distance of 700 miles. Which one are we to accept, the last named one or that determined by the Statute of 1774. Therein lies the whole question. With regard to the exercise of the Royal prerogative as to the rectification of the limits of a province, there are two well defined opinions. There are those who contend, and that is the contention of Ontario's advocates only, that the Crown may at all times, whatever may be the Statute, alter, modify, enlarge, or diminish the extent of a province, and this at its simple pleasure. There is no need for me to prove the assertion that I am making as it is to be found in all documents and official reports published in the Province of Ontario, and in the report of the Committee appointed by this House in 1880. But if the Crown has the power to determine the limits of a province by increasing its territory, it can also diminish it. The greater includes the less. Thus, if the Crown, in issuing Lord Carleton's commission on the 27th December, 1774, increased the territory of the Province of Quebec by about 400 miles, it had the right in 1838 to diminish it by some 700 miles, and to establish at the entrance of Lake Superior that same western boundary of Ontario. It is impossible to suppose that one can make use of an argument for the benefit of one side of the question only; the argument holds good for the whole of it, and if it is by virtue of the Commission issued to Lord Dorchester that it is contended that Ontario can justly claim the Lake of the Woods as its western boundary, why should one not with equal force say that the Crown has cancelled all the Commissions existing previous to that one, and that that boundary is to be found at the entrance of Lake Superior? It has been said that to examine that boundary fixed by the Statute of 1774

in the light of all the circumstances which at that time made that country a legendary one, one must examine under what circumstances the cession of the country was made; one must not lose sight of the fact that the rights acquired in the past by the discovery of the country, did not make the discoverer the owner of the country, but occupation only gave that ownership to another, and so forth. Now, if ever there were solemn circumstances in which that Commission was issued to Lord Durham, it was assuredly in 1838. What was his mission in those days? You have not forgotten, Mr. Speaker, and none of the members of this House have forgotten, that this eminent statesman was sent to Canada in the wake of serious troubles, and he was consequently instructed to study the state of the country, to obtain information about its economical condition, of the state of the spirits and disposition of the population of the two Provinces of Lower and Upper Canada, and he was no doubt told that he had the power to unite Lower and Upper Canada, if he wished so to do. Well, the boundary was established with the greatest care at a time when the geography of the locality was well known, and the western boundary was placed at the entrance of Lake Superior. We can accept the fundamental doctrine upon which the advocates of the claims of Ontario base their plea, and say: "We accept your doctrine and we tell you that the commission of Lord Durham in 1838 is to be that which is to determine the western boundary of Ontario." Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are lawyers who are of opinion that when an Imperial Statute exists, that the Imperial prerogative cannot be exercised in contradiction with that Statute; that one Statute cannot be altered but by another. It is not necessary for me to name the eminent men of this country who hold that opinion. I will merely say that one of the eminent lawyers who formed part of the Commission appointed in 1880, Judge Ramsay, declared squarely and without any hesitation, that for him there was nothing doubtful about the question, that when there is a Statute defining a certain position, it cannot be set aside but by a statutory amendment, and that the Crown cannot deviate from it neither by instructions nor by proclamations, unless such power is reserved to it by a clause of the Statute. Now, there exists a law by virtue of which the old Province of Quebec was created; it is the Imperial Statute of 1774, and if later on, in 1791, that Province was divided into two parts, it gave to Upper Canada the boundary which the Province of Ontario has to-day, and the latter cannot have any other. Such is the certain and legal boundary of the Province of Ontario. Besides, the legal question has already been gone into and we can refer to jurisprudence in the matter. In 1873, the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Lower Canada had to try a case of murder. I am not going to recall the circumstances of the case, which are familiar to all the members of this House; I will merely say this, that being called upon to give the interpretation of the law on that same point of the western boundary of the Province of Upper Canada, Chief Justice Sewell, who is still a great authority in Lower Canada, declared that the Imperial Statute of 1774 did not admit of any doubt, and that the western boundary of Upper Canada was a meridian line drawn northward from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, until it met the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay Company's territories. If, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Ontario occupies in this case nothing else but the position of an unfortunate litigant, if Ontario is discontented, if Ontario feels itself aggrieved by the judgment of the highest court of the country at that date, there is a very simple remedy; a litigant who is dissatisfied with a first judgment must carry his cause to a higher tribunal. Such is the only proposition which the Province of Ontario could entertain, and in that I cordially approve the policy of the Government as expressed in the resolution submitted

to this House. I admire the attitude taken by the Government when it asks a decision of the highest tribunal, the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the highest tribunal of the Empire, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. One understands now, why those who are the determined defenders of Ontario, in spite of everything, call for arbitration and nothing else. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the present Government were repudiating the engagements entered into by a former Government; that the present Government did not wish that there should be any solidarity between its acts and the acts of its predecessors. But, Mr. Speaker, when the act of its predecessors has been declared illegal and unconstitutional, I think it is a sacred duty for the present Government to set it aside and not to hold itself bound by the decision of a tribunal of arbitrators. I have said that this arbitration was unconstitutional. The British North America Act says expressly that the limits of the several Provinces are to be those which they had on the 1st of July, 1867. By what right, then, does an arbitration come and change the limits thus existing? It is a well admitted fact that the decision rendered by the arbitrators in July, 1878, does not determine the law; it does not interpret the law, but it fixes new boundaries for Ontario, both west and north. Well, it is this British North America Act, which we cannot alter, neither by a Federal or by a Local Act, much less by an arbitration, but that can only be altered by an Act of the same Parliament which passed the first Statute; we must, therefore, go back to the Act of 1774. We must admit that the method of judging the question is not to change the law, but to cause the highest tribunal to define what the law is. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, all the Provinces of Confederation are interested in it. It is not an Act which concerns Ontario alone. Nova Scotia as well as British Columbia are interested in seeing that we should not have in our midst a Province seeking to aggrandize itself at the expense of the other Provinces, and which takes advantage of the preponderance it enjoys owing to its riches and to its commercial and agricultural prosperity to assume an over-important role. On the other hand, the Province of Manitoba, which I think, does not at present receive any fresh accessions of territory to increase its property, and the Province of Quebec are interested in the same degree that Ontario should not intrude upon the rights of the other Provinces. Those who, in the Province of Ontario, have heaped sophisms upon sophisms, paradoxes upon paradoxes, fiery speeches upon fiery speeches, desire that above all justice should be done, and that on that question Confederation should get what the law gives it, neither more nor less. Why will they not abandon that award of the arbitrators whose constitution we all know to have been unconstitutional in its formation, and *ultra vires* from beginning to end? Is the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Canada, is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, in its composition, in the men forming that magistracy, not above all suspicion? Are the decisions of the Privy Council in England not accepted throughout the whole British Empire with the respect and deference they are entitled to? Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the Province of Ontario really wishes to have its rights only, it must be of the opinion, and so must its representatives be, to refer the question to the highest tribunal and to the highest jurisdiction of the British Empire. The tone of the official despatches of Ontario is not in harmony with the quiet and dignified tone of the despatches of the Canadian Government on the same subject. It is clear to everybody that it is sought to make election capital out of it. Is that, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, the way of obtaining justice? Is that the way to put the country in a position to decide so important a question? I do not think so, and I do not think that any one here is deceived as to the effect which the local Administration of Ontario

has attempted to produce during the last days of its Session by the fiery speeches that were made in it; no more is any one deceived with regard to the somewhat excited perorations which we have heard within these precincts. To resume, the following are the conclusions to which an investigation of the question as a legal and constitutional one logically brings us: 1. Ontario has clearly defined and legal limits; its limits to the north and to the west are those fixed in the Commission of Lord Durham, *i.e.* at the entrance of Lake Superior and the shores of the Hudson's Bay, or those which are mentioned in the Commissions of Lord Dorchester in 1774 and 1786, *i.e.*, the Mississippi and the Lake of the Woods to the west, and the height of land between Hudson's Bay and Lake Superior to the north, or lastly those given in the Imperial Statute itself. 2. If Ontario professes as an absolute doctrine that the Crown has the right to alter the boundaries of a Province, independently of any express law on the point, its limits are defined in the commissions of Lord Durham, and its western boundary stops at Sault Ste. Marie, at the entrance of Lake Superior. 3. If, on the contrary, Ontario admits the doctrine which does not recognize to the sovereign the right of altering the boundaries of a Province except in the case where no law exists to govern the matter, that Province is perforce compelled to accept as limits those given to it by the Act of 1774. 4. Ontario became a party to the Federal compact of 1867 with the boundaries which it possessed at the time, and which was specially confirmed to it by the British North America Act; neither the Province of Ontario, nor Canada, much less a simple arbitration, can change an iota of them; it would be totally unconstitutional and *ultra vires*. 5. Only a high tribunal, the Supreme Court, or the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, has jurisdiction to determine, not conventional limits, not new limits, but to declare if the matter as decided by judgment in 1818, shall remain so judged, or, in other terms, if the Imperial Statute can suffer any different interpretation from that placed on it in 1818 by the Court of Queen's Bench of Québec. Such is the opinion of the Government; such is the only attitude which should be taken with regard to so important a question; it is the sense of the resolution before the House, and it is the line of conduct clearly traced to us by our duties as legislators for the good, the consolidation, the peace and the prosperity of the Confederation of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. The resolution now in your hands, and all the hon. gentlemen who have addressed you from the opposite side of the House, strongly insist upon the propriety of treating this question from a purely legal point of view. Acting themselves upon this principle, they have attacked, at great length, the award rendered by the arbitrators to whom the decision of this question was confided by the Governments of Ontario and of the Dominion. They have dissected this award minutely and have come to the conclusion that, had they sat on the Commission they would have reached a different decision from the one rendered by the arbitrators. They have piled up arguments, disquisitions and opinions, to establish that the arbitrators greatly erred when they decided that the word "northward" in the Act really means towards the north, whereas, in their opinion, it means simply north and nothing more. Well, everybody knows that in the past there has been no more prolific cause of discussion than the signification of words. In listening to-day to the learned and elaborate disquisitions of the hon. gentlemen opposite upon the meaning of the words "downwards," "northwards," and "due north," I was strongly reminded of a letter which is to be found in the appendix to the book of the hon. member for Bothwell, which was addressed by the Marquis De Torcy to Lord Bolingbroke, on the 25th Dec., 1712, at the time when the negotiations for the Treaty of Utrecht were going on. The letter of the Marquis De

Torcy complained that too much weight was put by the British plenipotentiary on mere words. He wrote:

"In the name of God, Sir, order your Plenipotentiaries to be less excellent grammarians. Ours, who also understand the force of Latin expressions, are out of patience when they see difficulties, which have been long adjusted, started again, and the difference between *cession* and *restitution*, and the meaning of those terms. In truth, Sir, such questions ought not to be the amusement of honorable men. They are, at best, excusable to those to whom we may apply, *amantium ira*. Finish these disputes which, if they continue longer, will only profit our enemies."

Well, there is nothing new under the sun, and one would really think that this letter was written expressly for the purpose of the present discussion, and if we substitute the words "north" and "due north" for the words "cession" and "restitution" it would exactly apply to the present case. In truth such questions ought not to be the amusement of honorable men unless they are excusable as being *amantium ira*. On this side of the House I may say that we have no patience when we see difficulties which have been long since adjusted, revived again by hon. gentlemen opposite on the perilous pretext that the meaning of the words "north" and "due north" were not properly understood by the arbitrators. This question has been settled. Why should it be opened up again? But what would be the benefit of opening the question? If, however, it is to be opened we are just as anxious as are hon. gentlemen opposite that the question should be treated exclusively as a legal one and should be approached in no other spirit, except a judicial one. But let me ask those hon. gentlemen who have urged on the House the propriety of treating it as a purely legal one, whether in such an event they have the right to criticise the award rendered. If they are sincere in their opinion, and I believe they are, that the question shall be treated simply as a legal one, and be approached only in a judicial spirit, can they ignore the great fundamental principle in matters of arbitration, that an award is binding on both parties and cannot be questioned, except for cause. And what is the cause in this case—what will be causes added to it to justify the award? The answer is, that the arbitrators have erred. The only cause adequate to contest the award is this: it lies with the party challenging the award to show there has been fraud on the part of the arbitrators, or that it is grossly unjust. This is a fundamental principle which no one will gainsay. Yet no fraud is charged against the arbitrators—they are above suspicion. No substantial injustice is charged. What is charged against them is this: that they may possibly have erred and taken a wrong view of the case before them. This cannot be brought as a charge against the award, and unless hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to say there has been fraud on the part of the arbitrators, or shocking injustice has occurred, they have no right to review and criticise an award as they have done. Although no charge of injustice is brought against the award, or fraud against the arbitrators, yet some objections are made by hon. gentlemen opposite. What are those objections? The first is that the reference of the question to arbitrators, which was made by the late Government, was made without the sanction of Parliament; and this they hold to be a fatal objection. In law and in fact this contention is unfounded. The hon. member for Bothwell has shown conclusively that it was within the power of the Crown to make such a reference. It may be said that such a prerogative of the Crown would hardly obtain under our Constitution; the most punctilious will reply that the reference was made with the authority of Parliament. It was, however, not made with the authority of Parliament, couched in an Act; but the authority given by Parliament was just as clear and as manifest as if it had been given by an Act. It is within the recollection of many hon. members, that during the late Parliament the question was often referred to on the floor of Parliament. Not only so, but in the Session of 1878,

Mr. ROYAL.

\$15,000 were voted by Parliament for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the Commission which had been charged with the settlement of the Ontario boundaries. I ask any fair-minded man if Parliament could have sanctioned anything on more binding terms than it did when it voted the necessary money to carry out the expenses of the Commission. Could any authority be more binding if Parliament had passed an Act to refer the case to arbitration? If these hon. gentlemen will look upon the question as a purely legal one—if they will look upon it in a judicial spirit, such as they invite us to do, they cannot come to another conclusion but that Parliament could sanction the action of the Government, and therefore the argument which we have heard so often repeated in this debate falls to the ground. It remains indisputable that Parliament gave its authority in the most open and binding manner that it was possible for Parliament to do. Another objection made against the award is this: it is said this is a legal question, and being a legal question it ought to have been settled by lawyers and Courts. Now, Sir, I cannot concede that the authority of the gentlemen who rendered the award is to be questioned because they did not all happen to belong to the legal profession. No one will presume to assert that justice, fairness and knowledge are the exclusive endowments of lawyers. We saw, a few days ago, in a Committee of this House, Doctors of Divinity arguing questions of law as ably and as skilfully as lawyers could have done, and I am satisfied that every one must admit that the arbitrators were endowed with all the qualities necessary to render such an award as would satisfy the most punctilious. First we have Mr. Justice Harrison, whose lofty character and clear and cool legal acumen shone so conspicuously in his career; then we have Sir Francis Hincks, whose fertile and versatile talents eminently fitted him for such a position; and then we have the British Ambassador, who, by his profession, his occupation, by his knowledge and character, was just as well fitted to deal with such a question as any professional man could have been. For my own part, I protest against the assertion that questions of law should always be settled by the law Courts. I say that the interests of society do not require that questions of law should always be so decided. The most trivial disputes that arise between men involve questions of law, but the interests of society demand that these disputes should be settled, if possible, by the contending parties, or, failing in this, by arbitrators appointed by mutual agreement, but that only as a last resort should they have recourse to Courts of law. Another objection is made against the award. It is said that the arbitrators have not solved the questions, but that they have made a compromise between the questions submitted by the respective parties. Mr. Speaker, it is very strange to me that such an assertion should be made, and so often made on the floor of the House, when every man should now know better than to make such an assertion. Sir Francis Hincks declared in his lecture, delivered at Toronto, that no compromise was made; that the arbitrators had applied themselves to the task which devolved upon them; that after hearing the arguments each separately took the case and separately came to the conclusion which was come to in the award, and that that award was therefore the unanimous expression of the conclusions arrived at separately by each arbitrator. I do not cite this declaration of Sir Francis Hincks because it can have any bearing on the case, but simply for the purpose of protesting against assertions which are persistently made when they should not be made, because they have no foundation in fact. It is impossible to carry on the public discussions of this country if the hon. gentlemen persist in basing arguments on assertions which are denied by the facts. But what, after all, is there in the assertion, if true, that the arbitrators have made a compromise? Supposing they made a compromise on the contentions submitted to them, what objection can the hon.

gentlemen make to that fact. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem very tender-skinned on that question. They say that the boundaries between Ontario and Canada exist by law, and that the Parliament of Great Britain alone is the power that can change these boundaries. To this proposition I am disposed to assent, but if this boundary exists by law, where is it to be found? It exists by law, but the law is not clear upon that point; and supposing the arbitrators made a compromise, does anyone pretend to say that they thereby sacrificed the rights of Ontario or the rights of Canada? If the arbitrators had taken the contentions of either party and had said: "We will not admit the one proposition or the other; but will take a little from one side of the case and a little from the other," who can say that they took away any rights that belonged to either? But whether or not this view be correct—whether the question was solved as a compromise or as a question of law—at all events there is the award, and it is binding unless you can show a better objection to it than has yet been brought forward. Of the award itself I will say nothing; it has been so ably defended by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that it would be preposterous in me to add a word to what he has said. Moreover, I do not see the necessity of defending it. It does not require to be defended, and the objections offered against it are of the most frivolous character; and supposing the proposition now before the House should carry and that the question should be referred to the Supreme Court or Privy Council, does any one suppose that the decision of whatever tribunal it might be brought before would satisfy every one concerned? No, Mr. Speaker; there are objections to the award now, and there would be objections brought against the decision of any other tribunal before which it might be carried. I think it is Jean Jacques Rousseau who said that no two men ever discussed a question without each remaining more convinced of his own opinion than before the argument began. So it is in every law Court. Where is the Judge that can satisfy both parties? The loser always thinks that he has been wrongly treated. So it would be if this question were referred to the Supreme Court. I shall not touch upon the merits of the award, but I say it is an award binding on both parties, and that it is the duty of both parties to receive it and carry it out in its entirety. In speaking thus, I am perfectly well aware that I shall be violently attacked in my own Province by the members of the Conservative party—

Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I see that I have not mistaken the spirit of hon. gentlemen opposite. I see that I have not mistaken the views of my hon. friends opposite. I know their prejudices too well, not to know in advance what their argument will be; I know that it will be an appeal to the baser prejudices of my fellow-countrymen. But, Sir, I have too much respect for the justice of my countrymen to fear the effect of those appeals. Two years ago, when a motion was made to appoint a Committee to investigate the award, I, in common with some of my friends on this side of the House, voted against such a Committee, because we believed then, as we believe now, that the question had been settled, and that it should not be again opened. We were attacked then, as we shall be attacked now; it was represented that we had sacrificed the interests of our Province for the sake of Ontario. It would seem to these hon. gentlemen that to do justice to Ontario means to sacrifice the interests of Quebec. It must be remembered that this award grants nothing to Ontario but what Ontario had before; it does not pretend to give any additional territory to Ontario; it pretends simply to award to Ontario the territory to which she is entitled. But we were represented as the enemies of our Province. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite, what I have often said elsewhere, that the Conservative party of to-day are not the

party that were led at one time by Sir George Etienne Cartier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentlemen who now take so strong objection to my language, pretend that on this question they hold the views that were held by Sir George Cartier? Do they not know that Sir George Cartier, in many State papers signed by himself, granted to the Province of Ontario far more territory than is granted to her by this award? In order that there may be no doubt on that point, let me refer them to the despatch signed by Sir George Cartier and his then colleague the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) on this very question. As hon. gentlemen remember, when the Dawson route was opened in 1869, strong objection was made by the Hudson's Bay Company against the Canadian Government opening a route through the territory between the Lake of the Woods and Red River, because they said it was invading their rights. To this Sir George Cartier and Mr. McDougall made a reply, in which they declared that whatever doubt might exist as to the limits of old or French Canada, no impartial investigator could doubt that they extended to and included the country between the Lake of the Woods and Red River. I have no doubt that if Sir George Cartier were still leading his party he would hold the same opinion, and I venture to say that this question would never have been raised, but the award would have been carried out. If there was a quality for which Sir George Cartier deserved to be admired it was his courage, and next to his courage his fairness to an adversary; and knowing him as we once knew him, I say he would not have gone back on his word, but would have given whatever justice was due to Ontario; and I repeat again, that those gentlemen who are proposing to erect a monument to Sir George Cartier are slapping that very monument whenever they raise any objection against the award. I find that the hon. member for Halton, a few months afterwards, as well as Mr. Cauchon, in 1867, when he was a member of the Canadian Government, also took the ground that the territory extended as far as Red River. If this question is referred to the Privy Council, in what position will the Canadian Government stand? They will stand in this position—that when it was to their interest, when they were fighting the Hudson's Bay Company, to claim that territory, they did so, and that now, when it is to their interest, they are asserting the very reverse. It may be that the Privy Council will hold their position to be legal, but certainly if it is legal, it will be neither honorable nor dignified. But let me refer to the position of my fellow-countrymen from the Province of Quebec. When it was asserted we were sacrificing the rights of our Province, it was objected that the territory of Ontario was already great, and that this award made it still greater; and it was added that if a large population settled there Ontario would have a large preponderance of power in the Dominion. Now, let us suppose that the question is opened anew. The award may be set aside, and it may be that Ontario will be increased to the extent claimed as her right by the Dominion Government, or it may be that the territory of Ontario will be increased to the extent claimed by Ontario, and granted by Sir George Cartier, namely, to Red River—what then? You will have the Province of Ontario made greater than it is by the award. As for a large population settling in that territory, does any one suppose that this will be realized for a hundred years to come? What immigration will go into that rocky country so long as the vast prairies in the North-West are to be filled up? The fear is perfectly chimerical. The whole dispute lies in the interpretation of the Act of 1774. The hon. member for Bothwell argued that the Province of Quebec, as constituted in 1774, was

comprised within the following limits: To the east by the ocean, to the west by the Mississippi River, to the north by the Hudson Bay Territories, and to the south by the lines which have been described. On the other hand, it is contended by the hon. members for Niagara, Richmond and Wolfe, and Provencher, and in fact by all hon. members opposite who have spoken on this subject that the term "northward" applies to a line to be drawn due north from the junction of the Mississippi with the Ohio, and that this astronomical line was to be the western boundary of the Province. The hon. member for Bothwell argued forcibly that if that contention were admitted, the Province of Quebec, which was then constituted, was left without any boundary on the north. If this contention be true, where is the northern boundary of Quebec to be found? If none was provided in that Act of 1774, it must be that established by the Royal Proclamation of 1763. In that case, it would be a line passing through the middle of Lake St. John. This territory has always been claimed by the Province of Quebec, and at this moment the Government of that Province are making great efforts to settle a large population there. I do not say the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell is right, but I say that if you deny Ontario the boundary she claims, she may deny Quebec her northern boundary, and those sectional cries which at one time were thought to be forever destroyed, would be renewed. This question having been settled, ought to remain settled. There is no occasion to open it anew. I do not fear the appeal that will be made against me in my own Province on the vote I intend giving. I have no hesitation in saying this award is binding on both parties, and should be carried out in good faith. The consideration that the great Province of Ontario may be made greater I altogether lay aside as unfair, unfriendly, and unjust. This is not a question of expediency, it is a question of justice. I do not grudge to Ontario the extent of territory declared hers under this award, and which does not constitute even the whole of what she is entitled to, according to the opinion of one of the most learned and industrious of my countrymen. The eternal principles of justice are far more important than thousands or millions of acres of land, and I say, let us adhere to those principles of justice, and in so doing we will have the surest foundation for securing justice on every occasion.

Mr. HAGGART. At this late hour I will be as brief as possible in answering the arguments of several hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. The most concise and logical argument on that side, and the only one to which I shall pay much attention, is that of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) but I cannot permit some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down to pass unnoticed. He assumes that there has been an award and a legal one. I will discuss this point afterwards, and, in my humble opinion, prove conclusively there was no such thing. As to the boundaries of Ontario, the hon. gentleman has fallen into the error into which the hon. member for Bruce fell in quoting the remarks of the late Sir George Cartier, who said: "There was no doubt the boundaries of Ontario extended at least to that country between the Lake of the Woods and Red River." If the hon. member paid particular attention to those remarks and the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell, he would remember that the old Province of Quebec was carved out of Canada and did not extend to the whole extent of that country; and the late Sir George Cartier, in his address to the Colonial Minister, did not claim that Ontario extended from the Lake of the Woods to the Red River. He said: "Whatever doubt may exist as to the utmost extent of old or French Canada, no impartial investigation into the case can doubt that it extended to and included the country between Lake of the Woods and Red River." That is the

Mr. LAURIER.

argument of the hon. member for Algoma, perfectly consistent with his remarks made long ago, and his argument to-day, that the Province of old Canada extended far beyond what is now claimed for the Province of Ontario. But before passing to the argument on that question, I will make a few remarks on the speech of the hon. member for South Huron. He seems to believe that the Dominion has deprived Ontario of some territory of which it has been in possession. I am not aware that the Dominion Government has in any way deprived Ontario of any territory of which it has been in possession, or that it is selling the lands or granting licenses on the disputed territory. The right hon. Premier, the other evening, declared that the Government had carefully abstained from granting licenses, or selling lands, or granting mining leases in any part of the disputed territory, except to the extent provided in the Pacific Railway Act, namely, the right of cutting timber for the construction of that road. The member for South Huron fell into the same error as the hon. member who has just spoken. The member for Algoma has held, and still holds, that old Canada extended far beyond the limits of the present Province of Ontario; that the Act constituting the Province of Ontario took that Province out of the Province of Quebec, and left a large extent of country beyond it which formerly belonged to Canada, and that the limits of Ontario are not further than that portion of Upper Canada carved out of the Province of Quebec, which is quite correct. I will now answer the member for Bothwell, who seemed to state his premises pretty logically. He says that is an award that we ought to submit to; that it is a legal award; that if the proposal was made, he thought that very many of the Opposition would have accepted it. Perhaps I may be mistaken, but that is how I understood the hon. member—that if the award is not a legal or binding one, he was perfectly willing, as were also his friends, to leave that question to be considered by a Court, and that it should be the first question to settle, and if disposed of it would have been a settlement of all the difficulty between the two contending parties—Ontario and the Dominion; that if that proposal was first submitted and the decision was found to be legally binding, that it should be considered an end of the question, but if not legal and binding, then the Court should find what was the true and legal boundary. I may be mistaken as to the time—perhaps he said it would not possibly be entertained now; but that if the proposition had been made a certain time ago there was not the slightest doubt it would have been accepted. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to prove that the award is perfectly binding and that it was a perfect award; that it was submitted to properly by the contending parties; that the Dominion Government, or the Crown, had perfect power to submit the question to arbitration, as had also the Ontario Government. He finds it requisite to prove that the Crown has the power of parting with territory in the Dominion, the same power being required to decide what the true boundary or lines between two different countries are as to part with a portion of the territory. He stated that the Crown had exercised several times in Great Britain the power of parting with territory without the consent of the Imperial Parliament, and he adduced several cases to prove that proposition. I admit that several learned and eminent lawyers in Great Britain have held that that position is right. Indeed, Lord Thurlow has held that it is the prerogative of the Crown to cede territory without the consent of Parliament. The opposite doctrine was held by Lord Loughborough and by several of the most eminent legal authorities in Great Britain—that even the Imperial Crown has not the power of parting with any territory without the consent of Parliament. At least it is a moot point whether the Crown in Great Britain has the power or not. The hon. gentlemen proceeded to argue, that not only the

Crown in Great Britain had power to do so, but the Crown in the different Colonies. He was prepared also to cite twenty-three or more cases in India where the Crown had parted with possessions belonging to the British Empire, and that it was held in England that the Crown could do so. I deny that a single case can be cited of the Crown parting with any property in India without the sanction of the Imperial Parliament, or that it had the power to do so. I will cite the case which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman was looking at. It is a judgment of the Privy Council in the case of Deoram Kanji, plaintiff, and Damodhar Gordhan, defendant. It was held in appeal from the High Court of Judicature, at Bombay:

“That the transfer of British territories from ordinary British jurisdiction to the supervision, laws and regulations of a political agency, by excluding such territories from the British regulations and codes theretofore in force therein, and from the jurisdiction of all British Courts theretofore in force therein, and from the jurisdiction theretofore established therein, with a view to a substitution of a native jurisdiction under British control, cannot be made without a Legislative Act. Such a transfer of jurisdiction, even if valid, would not amount to a cession of British territory to a native State, nor would it deprive the Crown of its territorial rights over the transfer districts, or the persons residents therein of their rights as British subjects.”

It has been held in this case that when the Crown has once exercised jurisdiction over a place—when they have passed Acts affecting that territory, when the people have become British subjects—that the power the Crown cannot deprive those subjects of their allegiance without the consent of Parliament. No central authority, no Governor of a colony or province can deprive any British subject of his allegiance to the Crown, except by Imperial enactment.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has misapprehended my line of argument. My statement was not that the Crown as represented by a Governor General has the power of the Crown in England; but my contention was that the relation between the Crown and Parliament in Great Britain was exactly the same as the relation between the Crown and Parliament in this country. But I refer my hon. friend to the case of the cession of that part of the Province of Quebec included in the Quebec Act, south of the lakes, which took place without the sanction of Parliament, by the Act of the Crown.

Mr. HAGGART. I contend that the Crown has no power in any colony to take any one part of a Province and add it to any other. I remember, when the hon. gentleman was making his arguments, that he was interrupted by the leader of the Government and asked, could the Crown part with a portion of Ontario and give it to the United States, when he denied, of course, that proposition.

Mr. MILLS. I know the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I told the right hon. gentleman I would answer him later, but he left the House before I came to that particular part of the subject.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the scope of the hon. gentleman's observations. He says the Crown in Canada has the same power in relation to Parliament that the Crown in England possesses, and he argues that the Crown can part with British territory without the consent of Parliament. I deny that the Crown in Canada can part, alter or change any part of a Province without the consent of the Legislature. I deny further, that without the consent of the Local Legislature, and without the consent of the Dominion Legislature, the Dominion Government can alter or amend the limits of any Province in the Dominion; and I hold that when there is a dispute between any of the Provinces, that the only power capable of altering or amending the bounds

of any Province in the Dominion, is the Imperial Government. Lacking an agreement between these two parties, the only course to be taken to secure a settlement of the boundary between one Province and another, is to get a judicial decision. My argument is that there is no power in this country that can submit to any arbitration, the finding out of what is the boundary between one Province and another; that that power exists only by mutual legislation of the Provinces interested. If they do not agree, it can only be done by the Courts or Imperial legislation.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Why don't they fix it by legislation?

Mr. HAGGART. I say the Ontario Government may fix it by legislation, with the consent of the Dominion Government.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Why do not they do it?

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose they cannot arrive at what is the true and legal boundary between the two countries, that there is a difference of opinion between them, and my contention is that there was no legal submission to the award of the arbitrators, and that there is only one power in this country that has a right to change the boundaries, and that is the Governments of the two countries interested. I may now go on to state what I consider is the true boundary of the Province. I do not think there is the slightest doubt about it. I think, when it is left to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council, there will be no difficulty in arriving at it, and that it will not be such a boundary as the arbitrators have awarded. In connection with that, I may answer the hon. member for South Huron, who says the people of Ontario will rise in their might and see that justice is done to them in the premises, or, if not, that they will punish the party on this side of the House. The people on this side of the House who represent Ontario are as much interested in her welfare and as able to look after her interests as the hon. gentlemen opposite. They are just as responsible to the people, and they will see that every inch of territory, every foot to which she is legally and justly entitled, she shall have. All we want is justice, all we want is an honest and legal decision of what the Provincial boundaries are, and that we will have and we want no more. Now, there is no doubt in my mind as to what the western boundary of the Province is, where the point to start from is the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi. It says: "Along the Ohio and the Mississippi and northward;" and taking all the circumstances into consideration I do not think there is any doubt as to what the intention of the Legislature was. The intention of the Act of 1774, as was well observed by my hon. friend opposite, was for the purpose of providing some form of Government for the French inhabitants, of whom there were a large number on the banks of the Mississippi, and it would be absurd to suppose that they intended to leave out that small wedge portion which would be caused by a line due north between there and the Mississippi River without any form of Government, especially as on the other side of the River Louisiana was in the possession of a foreign country. It was the evident intention of the Legislature in that Act that Quebec should extend at least as far over as the Mississippi River, and the Act as introduced into the Imperial Parliament mentioned it specifically. It is said, "along the bank of the Mississippi northward," and in all the debates on the question. The Bill passed was changed at the instance of Mr. Burke, who represented New York at the time, not for the purpose of affecting the western boundary, and the evident intention of the Legislature was to follow the bank of the Mississippi to the Hudson's Bay Territory.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH.—Does the award give too much or too little.

Mr. HAGGART. I am going to define what I think it ought to give. My opinion is it should follow the bank of

Mr. HAGGART.

the Mississippi northward to the height of land, that is the dividing land between the Hudson Bay Territory and the Province of Ontario. I think there is not the slightest doubt that that was the intention. A legal gentleman may interpret "and northward" to mean due north, but the instructions to the Lieutenant Governor afterwards in the same year, shows what evidently was the intention of the parties who introduced the Act into the Imperial Parliament. They said "and along the banks of the Mississippi northward." Then when we find what was the dividing land between Hudson Bay Territory and Quebec, we see that the Hudson Bay Company always claimed to the height of land. It is true that after the treaty of Ryswich they were content to take the Albany River. They proposed to the French Authorities that the Albany River should be the dividing line between them, but you must remember the country then was conquered by the French and was in their possession, but after the Treaty of Utrecht it was restored to the British, and you will see in the correspondence between the Hudson Bay Company and the Imperial authorities that the Imperial authorities were thanked for looking after their interest, and for restoring St. James' Bay and the territory adjoining it, and how they proposed in two or three years afterwards, as there was some difficulty as to what was the exact dividing line between the Hudson Bay Territory and the Province of Quebec, that the line of the 49th parallel should be the dividing line.

Mr. MILLS. That was after the treaty of Utrecht.

Mr. HAGGART. Three or four years after. It shows that after the Treaty of Utrecht, the British Government gave back again to the Hudson's Bay Company the territory which they were deprived of by the Treaty of Ryswick, that they occupied it and owned it, and that they claimed from the Imperial authorities that the dividing line between the two parties should be the parallel of 49, being as near as possible to the north of Lake Temiscaming, the dividing line, or the Height of Land between the Hudson's Bay territory and the Province of Ontario. It is the line which they suggested in the statement of their case to Earl Grey, who submitted it as late as 1849 to the law officers of the Crown, and the law officers of the Crown decided that the Hudson's Bay Company were entitled to the possession of the country from Hudson's Bay to the Height of Land. There is no dispute about that. It was always claimed by the Hudson's Bay Company—that portion of the country bordering the rivers which flowed into the Hudson's Bay to their source. There is no single argument to justify the decision of the arbitrators who say the Province of Ontario extended from Lake Temiscaming up to James' Bay, then following James' Bay up to the Albany River. Surely, the Hudson's Bay Company were entitled to the shores of the Hudson's Bay? Surely, they were entitled to it after the peace of Utrecht, when the fortresses taken from the French on this Bay were redelivered to them, and when they were repaid by the Imperial authorities a certain sum of money for the losses they had incurred after the Treaty of Ryswich, for certain properties taken from them by the French, and, that there is not the slightest doubt, if they owned any territory at all, they owned that portion of Hudson's Bay and of James' Bay which extends along the shores of Albany river to the south of James' Bay. The contention of the hon. gentleman is that in the Act of 1791, which made a dividing line between the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada it extended the country to Hudson's Bay. It does not mean anything of the kind. It describes it as the boundary line drawn north of Lake Temiscaming to the boundary line of Hudson Bay. That surely does not mean that it extends the country to Hudson Bay. The instructions to Governors for two or three years afterwards

followed the same line. I admit that in the instructions to later Governors it said "to Hudson's Bay;" but no instructions to any Governor would convey property from the Hudson's Bay Company to other parties; the Act was merely for the purpose of dividing the two Provinces—Ontario and Quebec. I think there is not the slightest doubt as to what will be found to be the true boundaries of Ontario. The only point which will be in dispute, will be whether you follow the bank of the Mississippi northward to the point of junction with the Ohio, or whether you take a due north line. The other part of the boundary will be decided to be the height of land between the two countries. What is the territory about which all this quarrel has arisen? It is a portion of land near English River and Rat Portage, the distance not being more than 67½ miles. In regard to that strip of territory, the hon. member for Lambton said it was not worth the annuities paid to the Indians in that territory. The proper manner of deciding this question is by the mode proposed. There is no power possessed by the Governor or anyone else in this country to change the boundaries of a province or of the Dominion; we will not, to use the language of the leader of the Opposition, submit even to the Imperial authorities parting with any portion of our territories without the assent of the people of this country. We will allow no alteration or limitation of the Provinces by the Governor in Council. Any alteration to be made hereafter must be made with the consent of the Province interested and with the consent of Parliament, and failing an agreement between the parties there is only one true and proper course to adopt in order to ascertain the proper boundaries of any Province or of Canada, namely, to submit the question to parties who will enquire carefully and legally into it and decide upon the legal merits of the case. We in Ontario want nothing more than that; we want every inch of territory to which the Province is entitled, and we will have it; but we do not desire any more territory than was given to it by the British North America Act.

Mr. WELDON. Being one of the minority which dissented from the report of the Committee on Ontario boundaries, I desire to state why I so dissented and at the same time I wish to express my views as a member from the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton), said he would approach the matter in a calm and judicial spirit as was the duty of hon. members, but while I agree with his theory I certainly do not think he carried it into practice, because if he had dealt with it in a judicial spirit and with his legal acumen he would have arrived at the same conclusion as is reached by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The question before the House has two aspects. First in regard to the award made on the 3rd of August, 1878, by the Arbitrators agreed upon by the Dominion and the Province of Ontario, and if that award were properly made it is binding upon the Dominion, both legally and morally. Second, assuming that the question arises whether under the law and facts the decision of the arbitrators is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case and according to the law and the true and proper construction of the Quebec Act, 1774. First, as to the award made by the arbitrators; a primary question which arises is whether the Government had power to pass an Order in Council referring the matter to arbitrators. This power, I contend, is vested in the Executive Government of the Dominion. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) held that under the B.N.A. Act, the boundaries being fixed by that Statute, they would not be altered except by legislation. I agree with that point; but the answer to the hon. member's argument is that this arbitration was not to change and alter the boundaries of Ontario, not to create new boundaries which never before existed, but to define the boundaries fixed

by the Quebec Act of 1774, that power is simply the same power which is vested in the Crown, which has been so exhaustively stated and commented on by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and it is precisely the same power which was exercised by the Crown in dealing with questions of boundary. The San Juan boundary was referred to the Emperor of Germany. The New Brunswick boundary question was submitted to the King of the Netherlands, and although the award was not assented to by the United States, it was not on the ground that the Crown had no right to refer the matter to the King of the Netherlands, but that one of the principal points had not been dealt with. When a final decision was arrived at with respect to the Ashburton Treaty, to which we assented, although great injustice was done to the people of New Brunswick, an agreement between Lord Ashburton and Mr. Webster was arrived at by which the Province was deprived of a large portion of its territory. The honorable member for Lanark contended that in order to change the boundaries we would require to obtain Imperial legislation; but Imperial legislation had, to a certain extent, been given to the Dominion and provinces by the Act of 1871, by which the Dominion, with the consent of any province could change its boundaries. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) seemed to argue that this would only apply to new provinces, not to old provinces, because it was general legislation. I dispute the proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman, and hold that the legislation was not general, but specific, and that power is given by the Imperial Parliament to the Dominion Parliament, to change and alter the boundaries of any portion of the Dominion. But it is not necessary in this case, because we take up the Order in Council on which the arbitration was founded, and we find it was to ascertain the legal boundaries of Ontario, not to create a new boundary, but to fix the boundaries between Ontario and territory claimed by the Dominion. The hon. member for Lanark declared that the Executive Government had not the power to submit the subject to arbitration, and that legislation would be necessary before such an arbitration would be made. I admit that after an award has been made, after the parties have agreed to be bound by quasi-judicial decision—not binding as that of a Court of Justice—it will require legislation in order to carry it out; but it is within the power of the Executive Government of the Dominion and of each of the Provinces to refer questions to arbitration, and that being done by them it was binding on their successors in office as are acts done by the Crown on the advice of responsible Ministers. Hon. members are aware that for many years the line run by the Act of 1774, which divided Nova Scotia from Lower Canada, came in question. The dispute occasioned vast trouble and difficulty not only between the two Provinces. That formed a subject of deliberation in the two Houses of Old Canada, culminating in an address to Her Majesty with a view to having the dispute settled; and finally in 1850 it was suggested by Lord Grey that the boundaries should be left to arbitration as boundaries under the Act of 1774. As the result of Lord Grey's despatch on the 30th September, 1850, a Minute of Council was passed under which the Governor General (Lord Elgin) referred the dispute to arbitration. By that reference two of the arbitrators might be laymen, while the third was either to occupy a judicial position or be a barrister of a certain number of years' standing. Under that Minute of Council arbitrators were appointed. And the award was made defining the boundaries of New Brunswick at the time. Be it remembered, that that province was an independent province, with the constitution which it enjoys to-day, and subject to the Federal power as at the present moment. The award was made by two of the arbitrators, and an Act was passed by the Governor—not by and with

the advice of the Legislature—but by and with the advice of his Council, declaring the boundaries of New Brunswick to be those described in the award. And not only so, but we find that this was done under the same Act that is in question in the present case, viz., the Act of 1774. The despatch from the Dominion Government to the Government of Ontario, says:

“9 His Excellency's advisers are of opinion that in advance of Parliamentary sanction, it was not only highly inexpedient, but transcended the power of the Government of the day to refer to arbitration the question of the extent of the North-West Territories acquired by the Dominion by purchase from the Hudson's Bay Company.”

This is an assertion that the Act of the Government of that day was illegal; that they had no power to refer, and that, therefore, the award is invalid. If that view is in accordance with sound constitutional principles, why do hon. gentlemen opposite hesitate to refer the question on that ground. If the Privy Council or whatever tribunal they might choose, should decide that their arbitration was valid, then the question would be as to whether the award could be sustained. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the award was a conventional one, but apparently the only reason they have for saying so is that they do not agree with it, just as the lawyer against whom a judge may decide imagines that the judgment is not a sound one. But his opinion does not alter the law or the facts. The evidence in the present case seems fully to justify the award, and the arbitrators declare that they did not agree upon a conventional boundary but that they discovered and laid down the line under the Act. With regard to the action of the Parliament of Ontario, it is said that because they passed an Act in 1879 under the authority of the Imperial Act, therefore the boundary is only a constitutional one. It might well be argued on behalf of the Parliament of Ontario that, seeing that difficulties might arise, and in order to prevent the matter being called in question, they passed an Act to confirm and carry out the principle and put the question at rest. But it does not follow that because they did so they do not necessarily abandon the position that the award was binding, and it may be regarded simply as a matter of precaution, just precisely as a man who disputes a claim may assent to an arrangement, not because he admits the claim but to set it at rest and to prevent it being called on again for settlement. Then, it is asserted that the award covers part of the Crown colony of Assiniboia, and with regard to that it appears to me that the only ground upon which that argument rests is because this colony was recognized by the sending up of a requirement of rifles there to defend certain claims on the part of Lord Selkirk and the Hudson's Bay Company. I contend that no act of the Hudson's Bay Company or of Lord Selkirk, or of any person acting under them, can destroy or override the Act of 1774, or the rights which Quebec and its successor, Ontario, acquired under that Act. Now, if there is nothing to show that these arbitrators selected, not a conventional line, but what they believed to be the true and legal line, then it is for the other side to show that they exceeded their authority in any shape. Even if the award is erroneous, yet in law the parties are held to be bound by it. This award having been made in pursuance, as I contend, of the proper authority, on what grounds can it be set aside? I contend that the same principle that applies to an award in common law is applicable to this case. The only grounds on which an award can be set aside are corruption or irregularity on the part of the arbitrators. Now, I assume that no hon. gentleman will accuse any gentleman who sat on that award of anything of that kind. It is true the hon. member for East York tried to insinuate that by the hurried manner in which they considered the arguments, they could not have considered the matter, and therefore it was not a proper judgment; but I can refer to many of the ablest, most learned and most

Mr. WELDON.

lucid judgments delivered on the English Bench, which have been delivered immediately after the arguments. But we find that the documents were printed, and all the documentary evidence was laid before the arbitrators, and they had the opportunity of thoroughly working up and investigating the subject beforehand, so that when they came to hear the arguments they had a perfect acquaintance with the subject, and the counsel on both sides were also familiar with it. Any one who reads the arguments of the counsel for the Dominion will find that they argued the question from their point of view as ably as any counsel could do it; and Mr. Justice Armour himself says that both personally and in writing he had given to Mr. McMahon, one of the counsel for the Dominion, points in the case. It may be said that the majority of these arbitrators were laymen; but we find that one of them was one of the ablest lawyers that ever presided on the Ontario Bench, and that of the other two, one was Her Majesty's representative at the American Court, a man standing high in the esteem of the English people and conversant with their diplomatic relations, and the other was Sir Francis Hincks who is well known in the Dominion. If hon. gentlemen opposite are so confident that the evidence shows that the award was not made according to the submission, and that the line fixed was a conventional line and not a legal line, why do they not refer that point? Hon. gentlemen talk of referring it to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council as a case. They can only refer it as an arbitration; they cannot refer it as a case unless it comes through a law Court and is appealed to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council. When we apply to the Privy Council, we have to apply to Her Majesty in Council, who appoints a committee, which is to report to her, and she then exercises judicial functions. The committee is still a committee, and its report is only binding on parties when it is confirmed by Her Majesty in Council; and whether that report is unanimous or not is not allowed to be known; whether the Court decides by a majority merely, or by the unanimous vote, is not divulged to the public. When the dispute between Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company was proposed to be referred to the Privy Council, what did Lord Westbury and Sir Henry Keating say? Speaking of the northern boundary between Hudson's Bay and Canada, they say:

“Under these circumstances we cannot but feel that the important question of the boundaries of the Hudson's Bay Company might, with great utility, as between the Company and Canada, be made the subject of a quasi-judicial enquiry. But this cannot be done except by the consent of both parties, namely, Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company; nor would the decision of a Committee of the Privy Council have any effect as a binding judicial determination.”

When my hon. friend spoke of its being a judicial decision, what guarantee, if this case should be referred to the Privy Council, have we that the present First Minister will hold this House bound by it?

“But if the Hudson's Bay Company agree to the proposal of the Chief Justice of Canada, that the question of the boundaries should be referred to the Privy Council, it being further understood by both parties that the determination of the Council shall be carried into effect by a declaratory Act of Parliament, we think the proceeding would be the best mode of determining that which is, or ought to be, the only real subject of controversy.”

It is within the power of the Executive to make preliminary arrangements, and then an Act of Parliament is necessary.

“The form of procedure might be a petition to the Queen by Chief Justice Draper, describing himself as acting under the direction of the Executive Council of Canada, unless which would be the more solemn mode.”

Now, what I say is this, that so far as this award is concerned, it was agreed to by the Dominion Government, and the arbitrators named; and we find that the arbitrator named by the Dominion, Mr. Wilmot, was a man well known for his integrity and the high position he held, and who, had not death suddenly cut him off, would have

probably agreed with the other arbitrators. Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is no feeling in Ontario. We, from the Lower Provinces, are not in a position to form personally an opinion, but we have to take the opinion expressed by the Ontario representatives in Parliament, and if they are right in their contention that that award is not valid, why not have that point first decided; but in order that it be effectually adjudicated on, it must be by agreement. Whatever might be the result of the adjudication, the consent and agreement of the parties would still be necessary to carry it into effect. With regard to the arbitrators, it has not been fairly and squarely stated that they were not fit men, but it has been insinuated that by their haste they were not able to form a correct judgment and not properly examined the question. The hon. leader of the Government in 1875, on this subject, expressed his satisfaction with the way the arbitrators performed their duties. That is the best evidence in their favor. Viewed in its legal aspect and by the light of authority, it is clear the Executive had the power to refer the question to arbitration. Having that power, and having exercised it in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, I say that the Dominion, even if the reference were illegal, is bound in good faith to carry out the award made by those gentlemen. With regard to the other question as to whether the award is in accordance with the facts and law, I quite agree with the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe that the question is one of law and fact, and so far as I can see, the western boundary is a matter of law, and the northern a question of fact—both submitted to this arbitration and both in its competence to decide. It is not necessary for me to detain the House by dealing at length with the Quebec Act. The great object was to preserve the boundaries of the colonies, and after the Act was passed and altered a proviso was added that "nothing herein contained shall affect the boundaries of the other colonies." We find the words: "to the banks of the Mississippi," and the word "northward" used—a word which is susceptible of two meanings. If the words "due north" had been used there could be no misconception, and we may fairly claim that the framer, if he wanted a line due north, would not have used an ambiguous term, and if a term is susceptible of two meanings we have to ascertain what was the meaning intended by the framer. The object of this Act was to extend to the possessions newly ceded to Great Britain, preserve to them their laws and religion, and extend the ægis of the British Government over them. There were settlements on the Mississippi at that time, and a large region was without any protection in law, while on the other side was the territory of Louisiana, owned by a foreign power. The Mississippi was the natural boundary of the British possessions, and if we apply the principle referred to by the member for South Huron, and laid down by the United States Courts in a number of cases concerning the boundaries of States, where good, natural boundaries are established in general terms, the great object ought not to be defeated by those things that may sometimes influence the relations of individuals. There was enough to show, under the circumstances of the Act, that the words due north would not be applicable to the circumstances of the case, or cover the meaning of the Act contended for. We find this Act was passed in the summer of 1774, and in the following December the Commission of Sir Guy Carleton was issued—the finding of the boundaries of Quebec to be along the Mississippi northward. The member for Richmond and Wolfe argued that the word northward means due north. I differ with him, as I believe that the exact meaning of the word depends upon the context. I think I am not alone in my opinion, as I can show from the evidence of Justice Armour, who was appointed by the Dominion to deal with this question, and whose opinion

would naturally be in favor of the views of the appointing power. I might also quote the views of the member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) and Chief Justice Draper. The question was put by Mr. Robertson, with reference to the height of land being the boundary—on the north as well as on the west? The answer was, yes; on the north as well as on the west. I refer to the Quebec Act, for the reason it speaks of a line drawn northward, and northward means due north if there is nothing to qualify it in the context. My own view is, that northward was applicable to the territory, and not to a boundary line; that is, that northward was intended to express that the territory then to be erected into the Province of Quebec was to be extended northward to the southern boundary of Hudson's Bay Territory. That is my view. Of course, there is legal authority against that in the judgment which has been given. That is a reference to the Reinhardt case; but, as pointed out by the member for South Huron, that case can hardly be cited as an authority, as it came up on a technicality. But there is a most important fact so far as this case goes, that the action of the Imperial authorities affords strong evidence that there was some flaw in the conviction, the crime being regarded as possessing more the character of manslaughter, the sentence would have been commuted, and the punishment ordered as for some lesser offence; but we find the prisoner was discharged. The law officers of the Crown were of the opinion that the construction put upon the Quebec Act by the Judges was wrong. Then we have the opinion of Judge Armour, Judge Draper and the member for Halton against this decision, which culminated in nothing, because the sentence was never executed upon Reinhardt. So far as the legal question is concerned it seems to me, from the principle of construction which applies to instruments of this kind, that the word northward, either taking the object of the Act or the circumstances under which it was made, and the contemporaneous documents, was a conventional word, and that the territory of Quebec extended to the Mississippi; and that the northern boundary, which is described as the Hudson's Bay, is the territory possessed by the Hudson Bay Company, when their charter was granted in 1670. We find that in 1690, by the Statute of the second William and Mary they got an Act confirming their rights, which was only enforced for seven years, and which, I believe, was never asked to be renewed by the Hudson Bay Company. There is an important provision in that charter. We know that at that time charters were given with an utter disregard either to the companies or the limits of their possessions, and that many of the territories granted such companies, extended to immense distances; and one famous case, the Warnocke charter, affecting an island of the American coast, near New York, a charter was granted for a territory extending to the Pacific Ocean. Now, I contend that the Treaties of Ryswick and Utrecht recognized that the French, at that time, were in possession of certain portions of the territory which were covered by the charter of the Hudson Bay Company. With regard to the construction of that, I turn to the opinion of Justice Holroyd in 1812, who said:

"I am not aware of any objection that appears to me to be a valid one to the grant of the soil contained in the charter. I think the grant will include all the countries the waters of which run into Hudson's Bay, as ascertained by geographical observation, that were not at the time of the charter actually possessed by the subjects of any foreign Prince and which have not been possessed of any foreign trade previous to actual or virtual possession thereof being taken under the charter, or by or on behalf of the Crown of England."

Then we find, lastly, that the law officers of the Crown, Mr. Bethel and Mr. Keating, state:

"The remaining subject for consideration is the question of the geographical extent of the territory granted by the charter, and whether its boundaries can in any and in what manner be ascertained. In the case of grants of considerable age, such as this charter, when the words, as is often the case, are indefinite or ambiguous, the rule is that they are construed by usage and enjoyment, including in these latter term

the assertion of ownership by the Company on important public occasions, such as the Treaties of Ryswick and Utrecht, and again in 1760. To these elements of consideration must be added the enquiry (as suggested by the following words of the charter, viz.: 'Not possessed by the subjects of any other Christian Prince or State), whether, at the time of the charter, any part of the territory now claimed by the Hudson Bay Company could have been rightfully claimed by the French as falling within the boundaries of Canada or Nouvelle France, and also the effect of the Acts of Parliament passed in 1774 and 1791."

Now, there is an important question of fact, whether the French were in possession of any portion of the territory of the Hudson Bay Company covered by the charter, or whether the subjects of any foreign Prince were in possession of that country. The subject has been thoroughly exhausted by the hon. member for Bothwell, who pointed out the early adventures of the French in that country. It is a pure question of fact, and in Court would have been within the province of a jury and not within the province of a Judge, to ascertain whether it was true that the French had been in possession of a portion of that territory. If that is a fact then *quoad* that portion of the Hudson Bay territory is clearly without the charter. The proposition contended for by Ontario is that up to and prior to 1670 the French were in possession of the territory up to the Albany River, and looking at that fact in connection with the proclamation with respect to the division of Upper and Lower Canada, I think they are justified in contending for that boundary. The three distinguished gentlemen to whom this question was referred, came to a similar decision after having examined all the facts and having access to all the documents. I think we cannot now interfere with their award. In Courts of Justice we have often heard Judges say that if they had been on the jury they would have given a different verdict to that which was rendered, but no Judge has ever ventured on that ground to disturb the verdict. Now, these arbitrators were a tribunal peculiarly competent to form an opinion of the fact upon the evidence before them, and certainly the evidence of Mr. Dawson, especially, clearly shows that the French were in possession of the Hudson Bay Territory—certainly up to the Albany River—prior to 1670. I think our honor as a nation is involved in carrying out this award in its integrity, no matter at what cost. In the Maritime Provinces we are not anxious that Ontario should be extended, and we do feel some little jealousy and alarm at the extension of the western country. We do not consent to the extension of the boundary of any Province unless justice requires it, but when justice does require it we will not shrink from giving our consent in order that the national honor shall be upheld.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I do not propose, at this late hour, to enter into the question in detail, as it has been sufficiently discussed to enable the House to arrive at a conclusion; I wish to say only a few words in respect to the very unhappy observations made by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). In some portions of his speech he committed political blunders, if not political crimes. He sought to prove in this House, as the only French Canadian who is willing to watch unpleasantly the advance of Ontario, and he sought to make it appear that Quebec Conservatives are always sorry to see Ontario obtain a good decision in its favor to become rich. I can perfectly well understand the feeling of the Ontario Grits—a feeling of which I have been the victim during the last Session of the Local House. One member of Mr. Mowat's Government thought proper, without having seen me, to attack me brutally in the House. When I first heard of that attack I wanted to know why I had been made the subject of it. I thought I had committed some crime; that I had been unfair to Ontario; but I ascertained that my only offence was that I was a French lawyer and a Conservative, and that Minister used towards me language which was more worthy of a common loafer than a gentleman, still less a member of the Government. We must not be astonished that, when people

Mr. WELDON.

treat us in that way when they do not know us, the hon. member for Quebec East, especially in the last portion of his speech, endeavored to make the House and the country believe we must have great courage to defend Ontario and defend the award which was made by the arbitrators on the 3rd August, 1878. We do not deserve such treatment at the hon. gentleman's hand, because he has always been well treated by us. The hon. gentleman has gone further and intimated that we had not followed in the footsteps of Sir George Cartier. Within two or three years we shall have the hon. member calling Sir George Cartier his lamented leader. During the whole life of that distinguished statesman he was assailed and hounded down by hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1872, at the time of the famous election, when he was defeated in Montreal East, we saw Liberals uniting with Programmists in order to crush him, and now, when he is dead, they come forward and say he was a great man, and perhaps the hon. gentlemen opposite will finish by calling Sir George Cartier their late leader. I think it is proper to put an end to such hypocrisy, for I cannot call it anything else. The hon. member for Quebec East sought to make the House and our opponents in Ontario believe that we were against that award because it would benefit Ontario. Before proceeding to offer some observations in regard to the award itself, permit me to look back to the past and see under what circumstances it was thrown to the public just on the eve of a general election. During five years those hon. gentlemen had been in power, they might have passed an Act of Parliament which might have made the award legal and constitutional. They neglected their duty, but when they appealed to the people they took credit for the award and called upon Ontario to say how much good had been done by the Government. This was one of the first circumstances which gave the award a bad character and inspired doubt in all the Provinces. Under those conditions it was impossible for any Government to maintain the validity of the award. There were other circumstances which showed that the Mackenzie Government had neglected their duty on this important question, and that they had forgotten they were charged with the protection of all the Provinces of the Dominion, and not of only one Province. The case put in, and the pleas and arguments advanced by those representing the Government, were entirely insufficient. In fact, there was almost nothing done; whilst, on the other hand, the Conservative Government had published very important documents and pamphlets on the subject, one of them being by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who has, as everybody knows, a great capacity for the work, and who had been devoting attention to it for many years; so that when the question was submitted to the arbitrators, the Dominion Government were not virtually represented. I say this because those representing this Government entered the case too late and had not time to devote the necessary attention to the subject, and especially the study necessary to meet the case presented by the hon. member for Bothwell. One of the counsel, a friend of mine, Mr. Monk, was retained almost at the last hour, and certainly only a few days before going before the arbitrators. These are some of the circumstances which induced the Government not to maintain that award. The hon. gentleman opposite himself gave up the whole case, when he acknowledged that the reference was irregular because it was not made with the sanction of Parliament, and he admitted that fact.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who admitted that?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier).

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing of the sort.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. He said that an Act was not necessary, because Parliament had sanctioned and recognized the reference by voting \$15,000 for the expenses of

the arbitration. That is equivalent to saying that the Government or Parliament intended to pass a law; but hon. members will notice that for some reason or other hon. gentlemen forgot to pass a law. Would it have been maintained by anybody that the mere voting of money to defray the expenses of the arbitration would be equivalent to passing the law? Mr. Speaker, here is the award rendered by the arbitrators, Robert A. Harrison, Edward Thornton, and F. Hincks. I may say, in the first place, that I profess for these gentlemen the greatest respect, and that I do not attribute to them the responsibility of the fact that their award does not command the respect and the prestige which it should command. The responsibility lies upon other parties whom it is not necessary to mention. Here is the award:

"To all to whom these presents shall come:

"The undersigned having been appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario as Arbitrators to Determine the Northernly and Westernly Boundaries of the Province of Ontario, do hereby Determine and Decide that the following are and shall be such Boundaries; that is to say:—

"Commencing at a point on the southern shore of Hudson Bay, commonly called James' Bay, where a line produced due north from the head of Lake Temiscaming, would strike the said south shore; thence along the said south shore westerly to the mouth of the Albany River; thence up the middle of the said Albany River, and of the lakes thereon, to the source of the said river at the head of Lake St. Joseph; thence by the nearest line to the easterly end of Lac Seul, being the head waters of the English River; thence westerly through the middle of Lac Seul, and the said English River to a point where the same will be intersected by a true meridional line drawn northerly from the International Monument placed to mark the most north-westerly angle of the Lake of the Woods by the recent Boundary Commission: and thence due south, following the said meridional line to the said International Monument; thence southerly and easterly, following upon the International Boundary Line, between the British Possessions and the United States of America, into Lake Superior.

"But if a true meridional line drawn northerly from the said International Boundary at the said most north-westerly angle of the Lake of the Woods, shall be found to pass to the west of where the English River empties into the Winnipeg River, then, and in such case, the northerly boundary of Ontario shall continue down the middle of the said English River to where the same empties into the Winnipeg River, and shall continue thence on a line drawn due west from the confluence of the said English River with the said Winnipeg River, until the same will intersect the meridian above described, and thence due south, following the said meridional line to the said International Monument; thence southerly and easterly, following upon the International Boundary Line, between the British Possessions and the United States of America, into Lake Superior.

"Given under our hands, at Ottawa, in the Province of Ontario, this Third day of August, Eighteen Hundred and Seventy-eight.

"(Signed) ROBT. A. HARRISON,
EDWD. THORNTON,
F. HINCKS.

"Signed and published in the presence of

"(Signed) E. C. MONK,
THOMAS HODGINS."

The date upon which the award was made is exactly thirteen days before the issue of the writs for the general elections of 1878. It is sufficient merely to read this document to see how the award arrived at was made. It shows that those who had to deal with the subject had not devoted to it that time and study which is necessary in order that their decisions may command the respect which such decisions should always command. We must not forget that there are seven or eight provinces in this Dominion, that the greatest, most powerful and richest is the Province of Ontario, and that the others are much smaller than that Province. That is no reason why justice should not be rendered to Ontario, because Ontario is not only a rich province, but it has a splendid population—a population who are intelligent and respectable and especially well educated—a population who carry out responsible institutions, better perhaps, than any other country in the world. They are generous, rich and prosperous, and though the people of the other Provinces do not envy them, they certainly admire and try to imitate them; but in certain circumstances you must understand that the Government, which is the Government of the whole Dominion, should see that when a dispute or

quarrel is to be settled amongst the Provinces of the Dominion, or between a Province and the Dominion, it should be settled in such a way and under such circumstances as would command the respect of even the losing party. That is one consideration which induced the Government not to accept the award of the arbitrators. It did not command the respect which it should have commanded, and it was appointed by those who wanted a decision before the general elections. That explains the whole matter. They had to decide speedily, so that they could go before the public, and especially the public of Ontario, and show how careful they were to attend to their interests. Well, this award is entirely illegal; the questions the arbitrators had to consider were legal questions, and not at all questions of fact. One of them did admit that he tried to compromise; but before coming to such a compromise, before coming to an adjudication of the facts, there were most important legal questions to be adjudicated upon, which only legal minds of very great training and ability could grapple with. They had first to decide what should be their guide in determining boundary lines—whether the Statute of 1774, the proclamations of the various Governors, the commissions or the Confederation Act. Before the Committee appointed in 1880 several Judges were examined, and we saw that the chief difficulties of the arbitration would be legal points. The report of that Commission stated:

"In reference to the award made by the arbitrators on the 3rd day of August, 1878, your Committee are of opinion that it does not describe the true boundaries of Ontario. It seems to your Committee to be inconsistent with any boundary line ever suggested or proposed subsequent to the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). It makes the Provincial boundaries run into territory granted by royal charter, in 1670, to the Merchants Adventurers of England trading into Hudson's Bay, and it cuts through Indian Territories which, according to the Act 43rd George III, cap. 138, and 1-2 George IV, cap. 66, formed "no part of the Provinces of Lower Canada or Upper Canada, or either of them," and it carries the boundaries of Ontario within the limits of the former Colony of Assiniboia, which was not a part of Upper Canada."

The questions which those arbitrators ought to have studied, discussed, and solved, are precisely the questions stated by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). Now, Sir, the hon. member for Quebec East says that the reasons against that award are frivolous. I would ask whether the reasons I give, and the reasons given by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulbee) and many others, are frivolous? I will go further and say that no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House answered those reasons, and no one declared that this award was regular, constitutional and legal.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the House will bear with me while I answer some extraordinary charges which have fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. In speaking of the remarks I made he went so far as to say that they were characterized by hypocrisy and cowardice because I had anticipated that I would be attacked as we have already been attacked in the Province of Quebec by the press of hon. gentlemen for voting against the Committee of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). When I spoke as I did I anticipated what would follow; I almost anticipated the speech of the hon. gentleman. I knew the language which had been used before, and in order to vindicate my remarks this evening I beg to quote from the *Minerve* of the 21st February, 1880.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I object to that unless I am to be allowed to answer. I will quote from the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in St. Hyacinthe in the local election.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will not escape from his position in this way. He said I had been inspired by hypocrisy and cowardice, because I said that when I voted on a previous occasion—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has already spoken. Of course the House will allow a personal explanation, but not another speech on the question under debate.

Mr. LAURIER. I think I have a right to make a personal explanation, and to refer to what is said in the press of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, what did I say?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LAURIER. I stated that we had been attacked in the press, and now I am prepared to show by quotations from the press of the hon. gentlemen opposite, that my remarks were perfectly justifiable. We were charged with sacrificing the interests of our Province in favor of Ontario.

Mr. VALLÉE raised the point of order that the hon. member had already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the hon. member was out of order.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). The line taken by the hon. Secretary of State and other hon. gentlemen on the other side is calculated to divert the attention of the people from the issue before them. The motion of the hon. member for Niagara does not put the issue before the country, as I understand it. The issue is whether the award made by the arbitrators should be ratified or not. The question put by the hon. member for Niagara is whether an appeal should be had from the decision of these arbitrators, either to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council. If I understand the sentiment of Ontario, as indicated by the public press or by the tone of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, the question which the people of Ontario will decide when they get an opportunity, is: Has this Government a right, under the agreement made by the previous Government, to submit this matter to arbitration after an arbitration was had and a decision given to set that award aside, or has it not? When we go to the polls, as we expect in a very short time, and the representatives or the candidates of the two parties meet before the people of Ontario on the different platforms, the question will, I think, assume the form in which I have put it; and I do not think the Liberal party of Ontario will allow hon. gentlemen opposite to cover their record under any such issue as they have attempted to raise. I will not allow them to put forth any such pretext at all. The Government had a perfect right to submit this matter to arbitration, and that arbitration had a perfect right to adjudicate upon it. What is the objection to that arbitration. Is it that the arbitrators were incompetent? Hon. gentlemen opposite have scarcely dared to raise that question, but the hon. Secretary of State has done what is a great deal worse than question the capacity of the arbitrators. He has questioned their honesty. He has as much as said that just on the eve of a general election these men gave what he called a "snap verdict"—a decision not on the true merits of the case, but one that would benefit the Government that appointed them. That insinuation is unworthy of the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he is a member, and if he is speaking with the authority of the Government, that Government has sunk lower than ever it did before. Hon. gentlemen have endeavored to cast discredit on the arbitration because the hon. member for Bothwell was a Minister of the Crown. Are we to cast discredit on the Orders in Council or the deliverance of the hon. Secretary of State, in opposition to the Ontario view, because he is a member of the present Government. I would suppose that, in his judicial capacity, as a member of the Government, he would give an opinion in accordance with the facts. The hon. member for Bothwell entertained decided views in regard to this question, but we have the statement of one of the arbitrators, Sir Francis Hincks, that he had no com-

Mr. LAURIER.

munication with the Government in regard to what decision he should give. He said:

"I have reason to think that it has been believed by some, that the award was the result of a compromise between the two Governments. For my own part, I never received the slightest intimation of the views of either Government, and I am convinced that neither of my colleagues did. All the documentary evidence, with the cases of counsel on both sides, were communicated to each arbitrator, and not a word was exchanged between them until after their meeting at Ottawa, when they found an entire concurrence of opinion on the points at issue."

There we have a distinct statement by one of the arbitrators that he had no communication with the Government or any member of the Government. How, therefore, can the hon. Secretary of State, or hon. member for Lanark, state, by implication, if not directly that the decision—

Mr. HAGGART. I stated it neither directly nor by imputation.

Mr. ROSS. I am, then, quoting the hon. gentleman incorrectly. It was, perhaps, the hon. member for East York. I know that two gentlemen on the other side intimated that the hon. member for Bothwell, being a paid agent for the Ontario Government, had considerable influence with that arbitration. One member of the arbitration has, at least, said that no member of the Government had any communication with any of the arbitrators. The award, therefore, cannot be questioned on that ground. On what ground can it be objected to? The case was discussed so fully that I fail to see on what ground any issue can be taken as to the validity or integrity or the honesty of the award made. There is another view of the question I wish to put forward, that is that the award, looking at it from an Ontario standpoint, is a very important one to that Province. It represents to that Province 100,000 square miles, an area that was estimated, at the last Session of the Ontario Legislature, to contain timber to the value of about \$125,000,000. As it is a pine timber district, and the Crown lands are the property of the Ontario Government, these lands would yield a revenue to the Province of Ontario. Our timber lands last year yielded us a revenue of about \$500,000, and the average revenue is in that neighborhood. Here we have a vast area that is tolerably well timbered, and which it is estimated would yield to the Province of Ontario a revenue of between \$300,000 and \$400,000 a year. It is connected with the Province of Manitoba by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would certainly be a very valuable tract of land to that Province. Now, we have this Government, in the face of this award, refusing the Province of Ontario the revenues she would derive from these public lands. Are the hon. gentlemen prepared to say that the award of an arbitration appointed as this one was, composed of men of the highest character, and only arrived at after the greatest deliberation and care, is to be set aside, and the Province of Ontario to be deprived of these territories and the revenues that would accrue from them? Every time the people of Ontario will be asked to contribute from their exchequer for public purposes, they will feel their resources are limited—not crippled, I am happy to say—because of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the line they are taking, the Government is acting up to the express views of their own friends in the Local Legislature. In 1881, Mr. Mowat moved the following resolution:—

"That this House deeply regret that, notwithstanding the unanimous award made on the 3rd August, 1878, by the arbitrators appointed by the joint and concurrent action of the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario, to determine the north-westerly and westerly boundaries of the Province, no legislation has been submitted by the Government of Canada to the Dominion Parliament for the purpose of confirming that award, nor has the validity of the award yet been recognized by the Government of Canada.

"That the omission of the Government and Parliament of Canada to confirm the award is attended with grave inconvenience, has the effect of retarding settlement and municipal organization, embarrasses the

administration of the laws, and interferes with the preservation of the peace, the maintenance of order, and the establishment of good Government in the northerly and north-westerly parts of the Province of Ontario.

"That it is the duty of the Government of Ontario to assert and maintain the just claims and rights of the Province of Ontario, as determined by the award of the arbitrators; and this House hereby reaffirms its determination to give its cordial support to the Government of Ontario in any steps it may be necessary to take to sustain the award, and to assert and maintain the just claims and rights of the Province as hereby declared and determined."

Now, that resolution is very specific, and it, was supported by every member, on a division, except one, the member for Ottawa. The vote stood 74 yeas and 1 nay; so that the representatives of Ontario, including Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, then felt it to be their duty to support the Government of Ontario, in asserting and maintaining the just claims and rights of the Province as determined by the arbitration. There then, we are at one with the Conservative party in Ontario, as to the rights and interests of that Province in this arbitration.

Mr. ORTON, I want to ask whether the legal boundary, if properly ascertained, might not possibly give Ontario a still larger territory?

Mr. ROSS. This is the legal boundary properly ascertained by three arbitrators appointed for that purpose, and the Conservative party in Ontario declared, by supporting this resolution, that they were prepared to assert and maintain that result. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will find a very strong opinion in his own county on that question. How did this change of base take place? Let hon. gentlemen opposite, at present so noisy, possess their souls in patience; it is only a month or six weeks, if report speaks truly, till they will have an opportunity of explaining their conduct before the electors. The Opposition in Ontario assisted the Mowat Administration in their contention until the large gathering that took place in Toronto last November, immediately after which there was a change of base—and why? Because I think it was found necessary, in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec should not be excited by the enlargement of Ontario. If hon. gentlemen opposite know a better reason, let them give it. Meantime, the leader of the Opposition in Toronto changed his base, as did the other Conservative members of the Local Legislature. I ask again, why? There must be some reason for it; they must have received instructions and felt the necessity of acting in Ontario with the Conservative party in the House of Commons. But I warn hon. gentlemen opposite, if they oppose the contention of Ontario, that she will be more aroused on this question, perhaps, than she has been on any other that has engaged the attention of people for years. Ontario entered Confederation loyally, expecting that her rights and interests would be protected in this instance. She has given the Confederation a loyal support from the first of July, 1867, down to the present. This seems to be the first time on which there was any apparent combination to deprive Ontario of her just rights; and I fear that it will have a serious effect on the public sympathy which Ontario has always extended to Confederation: I feel satisfied, further, that unless the rights of Ontario are respected in this instance, an agitation will arise that will not be satisfactory. I say most emphatically that unless Ontario's rights are respected, an agitation will arise that will not be satisfactory to those hon. gentlemen; and I am prepared, as a representative of Ontario, to meet hon. gentlemen who are denying us our rights. What are we here for, if not to protect the rights and interests of our constituencies and our Province. Let me not be understood as speaking from a sectional point of view; but I will say most emphatically that any man who neglects the rights of any Province, I care not whether it be Ontario, Quebec or

any other, and neglects the sacred institutions of this country menaces its future safety.

Mr. WADE. I was not alluding to the hon. gentleman at all, either upon an Ontario or any other question.

Mr. ROSS. I am speaking of this particular question at present, and I repeat my warning as to the consequences that may be involved in this act. I have no fear of the result to the Liberal party. If I wanted hon. gentlemen opposite to act in our interest I would advise them to pursue their present course. But I trust yet that even at this late hour the Government will reconsider their views, and do Ontario that justice which the impartial arbitrators decided she should early receive.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I will request for a few moments the attention of the House, which I trust will be given me, as I do not often trespass on its patience. I would not have taken part in this discussion, but for two reasons: first, a remark of the member for West Middlesex, to the effect that the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec have interfered with the opinions of the Government of the Dominion to make it decide that the award of the arbitrators should not be considered as it deserves. I must say that there is nothing to justify any such imputation. We have not interfered with this award in any way. If we have studied that question, it was not because we come from Quebec, but because we form part of Canada as a whole. We have studied it since 1867, when the four Provinces entered Confederation; and the basis of Confederation was the understanding—and every member speaking in good faith will say that it never entered the minds of the fathers of Confederation to say otherwise—that the limits of Ontario should not extend over the region claimed by the award of the arbitrators. It was understood at the time that the territory of Ontario was just that part of the land over which the two old Provinces, Quebec and Ontario, had control before Confederation; and we know that those two Provinces did not claim this additional territory before the Union. That is to say, that a line from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi due north—

Mr. MACKENZIE. Far west of that before Confederation, the Dawson road was built.

Mr. DESJARDINS. But it was not acknowledged as forming part of the territory of Upper Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was a resident magistrate beyond that line who administered justice there. There was a settlement there of the hon. gentleman's own countrymen, a church and a convent.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Was it acknowledged as forming part of the Government of Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Certainly.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Not at all. It was never acknowledged. Such was the case, but difficulties arose. I think, if the House will allow me, I would prefer to continue my remarks in French.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (In French.) Mr. Speaker, I contend that we are perfectly justified in refusing to accept the decision of the commission of arbitrators, when one of its own members admits that the boundaries established by it between Ontario and the North-West Territories are not legal ones, but a kind of a compromise between the respective pretensions of the Federal Government and that of Ontario. No one can dispute that according to the report of the Commission, Ontario's territory is made to extend far beyond the boundaries recognized at the time of the union of the Canadas. I am ready to repeat this assertion on every occasion, and I think that it could be confirmed by all those who followed the history of the country at the time of the establishing of Confederation.

Mr. LAURIER. What was that boundary ?

Mr. DESJARDINS. The boundary started from the junction of the Mississippi with the Ohio by a line going northward to the height of land separating Lake Superior from Hudson's Bay. If there is something which surprises one in this discussion, it is to see the Liberals of the Province of Quebec seek, to the detriment of the general interest and of that Province in particular, to capture the votes of the Province of Ontario, in order to make up for their numerical weakness in the Province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the explanations given by the hon. Secretary of State on this question, I regret that an assertion was made,—and I trust that it was done unintentionally—in answer to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). I was absent when that gentleman delivered his speech, but it appears that he compared the present policy of the Conservative party with that of Sir George Etienne Cartier, and the hon. Secretary of State saw fit to assimilate the position of a certain number of Conservatives of the Province of Quebec with that of the Liberals of that Province.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I referred to Mr. Beausoleil.

Mr. DESJARDINS. In that case, the matter should have been more clearly stated. The hon. Secretary of State has seen fit to say that the defeat of Sir George Etienne Cartier in 1872 was due to the alliance of the Liberals with the Programmistes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid of saying so to-day. I am a Programmist to-day, if to be one signifies what it did then, i.e. to be in favor of Conservative principles as they should be understood. I was a Programmist in 1872, and I do not remember that any of those who gave their adhesion to the programme had anything to do with the defeat of Sir George Etienne Cartier. If Sir George Etienne Cartier was defeated in Montreal East, the blame is due not to the Programmistes but to his own friends; we maintain this at present by causing the truth to be made known on certain questions of a purely provincial character; we were truer friends to Sir George Etienne Cartier and to the Conservative principles which he represented than those who surrounded him then, and who deceived the people and Sir George Etienne Cartier himself as to the real interests of the Province of Quebec and of the Conservative party. I think that the hon. Secretary of State has given utterance to an unfounded accusation and that he ought to withdraw what he has expressed. In 1872, the circumstances in which the Province of Quebec found itself, were of a quite peculiar nature. We had then local struggles; principles were at stake, which perhaps did not affect the local policy to any considerable extent, but which were of the highest importance to the Province of Quebec, from the stand point of certain local interests. Sir George Etienne Cartier, although he was ever looked upon by all Conservatives and by all friends of the Province of Quebec as the most faithful representative, generally speaking, of the aspirations of the Province of Quebec, had seen fit to interfere with questions which his position should have caused him to leave alone, and a certain number of us thought it our duty to protest against this interference. We did so, not as enemies, not as allies of the Liberals, but basing ourselves on those very principles according to which we understood that the Conservative policy could be upheld in the Province of Quebec. The false friends who surrounded Sir George Etienne Cartier then, prevented him from seeing what were his real interests and those of the Province. If he was defeated, it was not our fault, but solely that of those who thus advised him. The Liberals expect the benefit of this; all the better for them. It is perhaps due to that that from 1874 to 1878 they held the reins of power. They gave to us Conservatives and Programmistes the opportunity of comparing what they could do with what the Conservative leaders had done before them;

Mr. DESJARDINS.

the comparison has not been in favor of the Liberals, and the result has been that, after a trial of four or five years, the Province of Quebec has been glad to cast its vote in favor of the Conservative party, thus throwing back with opposition the Liberal party and keeping it whence it should never return.

Mr. RYKERT. I was somewhat amused at the tone of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). It seemed to me like the last dying gasp of a gentleman who knew exactly what was going to befall him. In anticipation of the general election, the hon. gentleman tries to throw dust in the eyes of the people of Ontario by telling them they have been robbed by the Conservative party. That is the old trick he is trying to play over again, the old jack-knife and mucilage story. The hon. gentleman knows quite well who is endeavoring to rob Ontario, and if he will only look at the Statutes of 1879, he will find that Ontario has been spoliated by the Mowat Government, and that she is entitled to have a larger amount of territory than she has got. Let that be pointed out to the electors, and then they will see who are robbing Ontario. The position taken by the Conservative party is: 1st, there was no proper submission of the question in dispute to the arbitrators; 2nd, that the award was not legal or binding; 3rd, it does not fix the true boundary; and 4th, Ontario has not got her just deserts. I propose to show by reference to documentary evidence, the position I take as an Ontario man. These gentlemen threatened us with the vengeance of the people of Ontario. I am not afraid to meet the hon. gentleman and his friends anywhere in Ontario. Let them name the day and the hour. Let the hon. gentleman select any platform in Ontario he chooses; let him take his own town of Strathroy, and I will meet him there and discuss this question. He hopes to convince the electors that the Conservative party have not been faithful to the trust reposed in them. I am ready to discuss that question with him anywhere in Ontario, hour and hour about. I will take him in his own county if he likes. The ground I take in the first place is that there has been no proper submission of this question. I would like the hon. gentlemen to point out where there has been a submission, if they can. Let the hon. gentleman consult his own organ and he will find there was no proper submission from a legal point of view, otherwise why would it claim that, that cautious gentleman, the member for Lambton, had reserved to himself the right to repudiate the award? If there had been a reference from a legal point of view, and such a reference as could not have been repudiated, by one party or the other; then, I say the hon. gentleman from Lambton would not have got the credit he got a few days ago of having been that cautious gentleman who reserved the right to repudiate the award. Let us see what his organ says.

Mr. TROW. Will the hon. gentleman quote the Order in Council passed in November, 1878, and approved by the Governor-General ?

Mr. RYKERT. We will come to that by-and-bye. The hon. gentleman seems uneasy. I expect to visit the hon. gentleman's county this summer. I expect to go on a missionary tour myself. In the *Globe* newspaper of February 14, I find the following:—

"Had there been any ground whatever for suspecting that the award was in the slightest degree too favorable to Ontario, the Dominion Government might have been justified in delaying or refusing to be bound by it. Mr. Mackenzie, with his usual caution, reserved the right to do so for cause."

That disposes of the question that I first raised as to the proper and final submission by the Government of this important question. If there had been a proper submission the Dominion could not for cause or otherwise have refused to adopt an award based thereon. I was surprised that

the member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), who claimed to discuss the question from a legal point of view, should have stated that because the award was made it was a finality. He knows, as a lawyer, that when an award shows on its face that it is not in accordance with fact or law it can be set aside; and the award itself, the documents and the evidence, show conclusively that the award was not founded on the facts, that it is not an award, defining the true boundary, as stated by Sir Francis Hincks. If the hon. gentleman will show to this House and the country that a proper submission was made, then I am prepared to show that the arbitrators did not follow the submission. They cannot show that a proper submission was made and, therefore, their case falls to the ground. The award is not a legal or a binding one, and if hon. members will examine the history of the submission of the question to the arbitrators, it will appear clear, that from the very inception of the proceedings the two Governments contemplated having the legal boundary fixed, and that the award should afterwards be approved by the Parliament of Canada. As far back as 1872, when the question was first mooted and Mr. McDougall was appointed by the Government of Ontario, as a Commissioner, it was then contemplated by the order of the Privy Council, that the true and legal boundary was to be ascertained. Follow the case a little further. In 1874 an Act was passed by the Ontario Legislature—and mark the action of the little Premier of Ontario. He wanted to have a little hole out of which to crawl; he was like the hon. member for Lambton, who desired to be able to get out of the award if it did not suit his purpose. In 38 Victoria, chapter 6, "an Act respecting the Northerly and North-West Boundaries of the Province of Ontario," I find the following recital:

"And whereas, subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Ontario, it has been agreed by the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario, that the questions which have been annexed concerning the said boundary should be determined by a reference to arbitration."

Mark the little addition—

"The Act shall not go into effect until the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall issue his proclamation in that behalf."

Will the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who pretends to be so thoroughly posted on all questions, and who appears to be so anxious to lay the facts before the House and the country, kindly tell the House when the proclamation was issued? He cannot do it; it was a little dodge of the little dodger of Ontario, a little hole through which he could crawl, and if the award had gone against him he would have said he had not issued a proclamation. Those hon. gentlemen had been repeatedly asked in the Local Legislature to produce the proclamation, but they had failed to do so. To show the intention of the Ontario Government in making that omission, look at the Act of 1879, just after the award was made, 42 Victoria, chapter 2, "An Act respecting the Northerly and North-Westerly Boundaries of Ontario." It states:—

"And whereas, it was agreed by the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario that the true boundaries should be determined by reference to arbitration."

Will hon. gentlemen say the true boundaries were discovered?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. RYKERT. The little Premier of Ontario gives the lie to that statement, for he said:

"And whereas the effect of the award is to give to this Province less territory than had been claimed on behalf of the Province."

That is what we have on the Statute-book of Ontario, and certainly an Act of that kind must have been passed after some deliberation. I submit that I have made out my case: that no proper submission was made of this important question, that whatever was submitted to the arbitrators they were

to consider and ascertain the true and legal boundaries, and that such boundaries had not been discovered. Let us call into the witness-box a gentleman who is a very good authority nowadays with hon. gentlemen, although I think the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) walked across the House some years ago, because his financial ability was considered to be inferior to that gentleman—Sir Francis Hincks. On the 10th February last, Sir Francis Hincks wrote:

"They further 'made up their minds' that there were no data whatever for declaring any particular place in the North-West as the north-westerly boundary."

He there gives the whole case away. But that is not all. At the end of the letter he says:

"They did not rob Ontario, for there was no established north-west boundary and no one has ever pretended that there is. They joined the legal boundaries in a perfectly fair way; but I have pointed out that if they had seen fit to adopt a different mode of doing so, Ontario would have gained a comparatively trifling extent of territory."

What avail, then, was it for the hon. member for Bothwell to deliver a speech extending over four hours to prove to the House and the country that there was an established north-west boundary, and to have published a document which cost the country \$4,000, and which might have cost \$8,000 had the people desired to go further in order to maintain that position. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) also spoke at length about an established north-west boundary, when, according to Sir Francis Hincks, such was not the case. The House must, therefore, come to this conclusion, that no proper submission was made, and that no legal award was made by the arbitrators. If the arbitrators were called upon by the solemn Acts of the two Legislatures to define the true and legal boundaries, that was not a valid award, because the boundaries established were compromised and conventional boundaries. If Ontario was satisfied with the award, why was it that two years ago Mr. Mowat placed \$10,000 in the Estimates for the purpose of bringing the matter before the Privy Council. Yet the hon. gentleman ignored that fact, and, as the *Globe* says, Mr. Mackenzie, "with his usual caution, reserved the right of refusing to be bound by that award." But I would like to know where is the leader of the Opposition to night. Why do not we have an explanation from him on this important question? What has his great legal mind to say on this matter? Why are the smaller luminaries, like the hon. member for Middlesex, the chief missionary of the party, put up to argue the legal points involved in this question? I wonder that the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has not had his say in the question. I know how well the leader of the Opposition can split hairs, and how well he can arrive at conclusions that suit his convenience. The country would like to hear from him, and if he has reasoned the matter to a logical conclusion, perhaps we would be satisfied with his conclusion. The country would like to hear his views on this question, and they are not so particular to hear from those who are quite irresponsible, and who can go before the people and say: "True, we did speak that way," but who are like the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who speaks equally well in favor of Free Trade and Protection. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) says we are too late in bringing the matter before the House; but what were these hon. gentlemen doing all the time from 1872 to 1878? They had four years, in which they did not do a single thing; and yet because this Government does not choose to adopt an illegal award, an award which robs Ontario of more than one-tenth part of her possessions, because the House has exercised the sound discretion which the Act says it should exercise, these hon. gentlemen say we are too late in now offering to submit the whole question to the Supreme Court or Privy Council. It was in-

tended that the representatives of the people should have a right to say whether the award should be annulled or not. If they find that the terms of the award are not correct, they have a right to say so as much as Mr. Mowat had when he stated that the award was not just to Ontario. The hon. gentleman says that Quebec is interested in having this property. I do not believe that Quebec is in favor of anything of the kind. I believe that Quebec is in favor of doing justice to Ontario, but wants to have a legal award; and if so high an authority as Mr. Mowat says that Ontario has not had justice done her, they are prepared to say that Ontario shall have justice done her. If the papers of the party, such as the *Globe*, the *London Advertiser*, the *Hamilton Times*, and all such rubbish as that, say that Ontario is only getting one-thirteenth part of her possessions, we have a right to say that Ontario shall have justice done her; and coming from Ontario as I do, I can bring these gentlemen into the witness-box to show out of their own mouths that Ontario has been robbed. But the hon. gentlemen and the *Globe* say that Ontario has been robbed by the Conservative party, but they have failed to bring forward any proof of that statement, while, on the other hand, I think I have proved out of their own mouths that the Grit party, led by Oliver Mowat, are the real spoliators of Ontario's rights. When the hon. gentlemen come before the bar of public opinion, they will be called upon to give evidence of that statement. I say that we are justified in saying that the award is not a finality; that it does not do justice to Ontario and we have a right to see that justice shall be done to Ontario.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not propose to trouble the House but for a few moments, for it was not my intention to say anything whatever on this question. Some remarks made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) seem to conflict with the remarks made by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Mousseau). The latter informed us that although Quebec took no interest in the matter, yet the inhabitants of that Province were surprised and amazed at the amount of territory awarded to Ontario by the arbitrators. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) tells us that Ontario has received by this award vastly less than she is entitled to. Here are two conflicting opinions before the House, and one or other of them is an honest opinion. I am willing to believe that the opinion of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Mousseau) was the honest one, and I am inclined to doubt whether the motive which animates the supporters of the Government from Ontario was the one assigned by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I do not propose to go over the ground in reference to this dispute but simply to present a few plain facts to the House and the country. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) says that the submission of this case was never legally made. I hold that it was legally submitted by the Order in Council of the Government and the Province of Ontario, and that by the submission of this case to a Board of arbitrators, composed of gentlemen of high character, the question was settled. I hold that the boundary found by the arbitrators was the true legal boundary, and we are bound to accept it as such. The language used by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) with reference to the Province of Ontario, I consider most disgraceful. The idea of any hon. gentleman standing up here and characterizing the head of the Government of the greatest Province of this Dominion as a little dodger, is one not very creditable to any member of this House. The hon. gentleman goes on to tell us that no legal boundary was found, that one of the members of this Board of arbitrators declared in a letter that there was no north-west boundary—that no such boundary could be found. I ask him, if he endorses that statement, how he proposes to ascertain that boundary and settle the question?

Mr. RYKERT.

If no legal boundary can be found it is not within his power to find the legal boundary.

Mr. PLUMB. Nor was it within the power of the arbitrators.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have been much amused by my hon. friend from Niagara to-night, and certainly he makes himself an object of amusement to us all. But if he would not interrupt the proceedings of the House we would be better able to get on with our business. The ground taken by the members from Ontario supporting the Government is a ridiculous one. They say they are not satisfied with the award because it gives Ontario too little territory. I say that Ontario is satisfied with the award, that she proposes to stand by the award and to enforce the award. They may talk of justice to Ontario. Ontario does not look to them for justice; Ontario intends to force justice for herself. I can warn these gentlemen that the feeling among the people of Ontario is not to be trifled with, even with the great majority they have at their back. Ontario has performed her duty to this Confederation from the day it was formed; she has without murmuring borne the chief burden of taxation; she has been the backbone of Confederation; and she intends to demand her rights, and if these rights are denied to her, she intends to enforce them. She intends to take possession of that territory which has been awarded to her by a Board to which both Governments were parties in referring the question, and to hold it; and whatever may be the conduct, whatever may be the action of the majority in this House, she will simply set that action at naught, and bid it defiance, if it is not right and proper. I warn hon. gentlemen opposite that they may now treat this matter with derision, but they will have to meet a people living under a sense of outraged rights, and they will yet hear from those people in a way that will not be agreeable to gentlemen who make light of Provincial rights and the rights of a great Province.

Mr. FARROW. I do not rise to reply to the hon. member for North Norfolk, because I conceive it would be a waste of time to reply to a gentleman who may take different ground to-morrow; we know what his erratic course in this House has been from 1876 to 1882. But I will try to reply to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for West Middlesex. That hon. gentleman made this subject a specialty. He seems to have been deputed by the Mowat Government to go through the length and breadth of the country to represent the views of the Attorney-General. He condescended to pay a visit to my riding; I do not know whether he was paid for it or not. I know that he has been receiving large fees from the Local Government, that he has a great liking for the party from which his bread-and-butter comes. He and the local members of my county come along *en masse*, to enlighten the people on the boundaries and Streams Bill questions, which formed their great cry. Now, it is evident that Mr. Mowat's Government is hostile to this Government; they began the Session by doing what did not belong to them—discussing the National Policy. The greater part of the Session was taken up with the discussion of the National Policy, the boundary question, and the Streams Bill. Now, why did they spend so much time on these questions? Just because they were hostile to this Government. I can well conceive the leader of the Opposition, finding that all previous cries had failed, meeting with the Attorney-General of Ontario and getting into conversation about the prospects of the party, and saying: "How shall we succeed? We must get up some burning question." And they agreed to make this boundary award the burning question. Why, their own party did not give them credit for it. I consider they have failed already in trying to make this an election cry. I am not a lawyer, but speaking as a layman I do not believe this Government

has power to take one inch or one foot of land from Ontario. Though I am as ardent a supporter of the leader of my party as any man ought to be, yet if I believed he wanted to rob Ontario, I would not go with him. Does not the Confederation Act say that the Ontario boundary shall be what the old Upper Canada boundary was, and that boundary is what we are trying to find out. Did not our leader in 1871 tell this country that the proper place to submit the question was the Privy Council. Was there not a contention between the Ontario Government and the Dominion Government as to the true boundary? Did not the Ontario Government contend that the western boundary was the Rocky Mountains? Did not—and this is a very important point—my hon. friend from Lambton contend differently? Did he not contend that the west boundary was not the Rocky Mountains? But, luckily or unluckily for himself, he came into power. I do not say that the Local Government manipulated him, but he left the matter to arbitrators, instead of submitting it to the Privy Council in England, but very wisely neglected to pass a resolution binding himself to accept the award. Why did he not pass that resolution? I say he was wise in not doing so, he acted the part of a wise legislator in not committing himself. Did not the Ontario Government act differently? Did they not pass a law that they would abide by the decision? Well, what does this amount to? It amounts to just this, that it left the award an open question. Suppose for a moment that the award had been that the boundary extended to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. What does the *Globe* say? It says, if that award had been to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, they could not have accepted it. It would have been preposterous; it would not have been a right boundary; it would have been a *reductio ad absurdum*. Following that line of reasoning, how shall we say that the line the arbitrators did agree to is a correct line. When an arbitration in ordinary affairs takes place, the parties bind themselves beforehand to accept the award. I have been chosen as an arbitrator often in ordinary matters, but I never arbitrated until the parties bound themselves to accept the arbitration. That is the way ordinary people do. I do not know how lawyers do, or how Governments do, but I know the ordinary practice in ordinary affairs is for both parties to bind themselves. Well, this was an extraordinary transaction it seems, and they would not bind themselves. If there is any fault to be found in not accepting this arbitration it lies with the hon. member for Lambton in not committing the Dominion Government to accept the award. Why did he not follow the same course as the Local House?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am willing to commit it now.

Mr. FARROW. Why not then? Why not make things secure before you began? You had it in your own power then. Now you have no power. It is said Sir John A. Macdonald wants to rob Ontario. He is the last man that would rob it. You might as well try to make the people believe that mothers would rob their daughters or fathers their sons. Who was it that took the large debt that Ontario ought to have paid, about \$7,000,000, off her shoulders and paid it out of the Dominion Treasury? Who was it that raised Ontario and this country out of the Slough of Despond? When our manufacturing interests were dying, when our farmers were becoming bankrupt, when our interests every way were languishing, who was it conceived the great National Policy that made this country prosperous as it is to-day? You talk about going to Ontario to put before them this abstract question of the boundary award, and think you are going to throw dust in the eyes of the people. They will never believe it. What do they care about the abstract question of the boundary award. I am not going to run down the territory that is claimed, but what does it amount to? You talk about the timber there, and the rivers. I

ask, what farmer from Ontario will settle there? If this country is of great value, what has made it valuable? Why, you told the truth yourself to-night, that the Pacific Railway has made that country valuable. You talk about Sir John A. Macdonald injuring Ontario. Look at the large amount of money to be spent in building a railway through that country, for hundreds of miles in the northerly sections. All those vast improvements will cost millions, which will benefit Ontario. I want to ask another question—who was it that gave away the Territory of Keewatin, which was a part of Ontario? According to the hon. gentleman's arguments a very wrong thing was done in giving away that country. While it is argued that our Ontario boundary reaches to the Rocky Mountains, the Territory of Keewatin was given away. Where is the philosophy of that? I have no hesitation in saying that there is no man in the House who ought to be more grateful to the Ontario Government than the late Minister of the Interior, who gave us a four-hour speech the other night, which cost the Ontario Government \$4,000, or \$1,000 an hour. I tried to listen attentively to that speech, as I wanted to get to the bottom of this question, but I must declare that after it was finished I was more perplexed than when it was begun. I do not say the hon. gentleman is a mixer and muddler like the ex-Finance Minister. No man in Ontario, I repeat, should try to carry out the behests of the Ontario Government with more zeal than the hon. member for Bothwell, owing to the receipt of that \$4,000. I think I would try to speak a good many hours for \$1,000 an hour. I am in favor of Ontario getting every inch of ground whether soil or rock, which she owns; but I shall vote with pleasure for this resolution. I believe the question ought to be submitted to the Privy Council in England, and until it is so referred, there can be no satisfactory solution of it. It would not cost much to send it to that tribunal, either in time or money, while its decision would be satisfactory to every man in the country.

Mr. ARKELL. We have been discussing this question of the boundaries of Ontario nearly three days, and I do not think we have arrived at an agreement yet. But I believe the discussion will show the people of Ontario and the Dominion that a large majority in this House are in favor of that question being settled; and if the Ontario Government does not accept the proposition of the hon. member for Niagara, it will be plain that it does not desire a settlement of this great question. And I believe indeed that this question will be kept open perhaps till after the general elections, and that the party on the opposite side are determined to make a handle of it for political objects. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has already done some missionary work in East Elgin. I have read his speech, made ten days before the meeting of Parliament, and which was delivered in the village of Aylmer, in which he was invited to address the Reform Organization on the question of the Ontario boundary award. The hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"Upper Canada, when we went into Confederation, had good claims to the land as far as the Rocky Mountains, while their claim had never been disputed to the land beyond the Rainy River. The Ontario Government and the Dominion Government arranged to settle the dispute by arbitration. Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister at Washington, Sir Francis Hincks, one of the oldest legislators of Canada, and Chief Justice Harrison, the eminent jurist, were appointed a Board of Arbitration. The whole dispute was referred to them, and they examined every treaty and all archives relating to the boundary. Counsel was heard on both sides, and then each arbitrator made up his award separately, but when they were examined they were all alike in awarding to Ontario that territory beginning at James' Bay, thence along James' Bay to Albany River, thence to the north arm of the Lake of the Woods—an area of 100,000 square miles or 64,000,000 acres, rich in timber, abounding in minerals and containing much rich soil. Ontario accepted the award and the Dominion would have ratified it, "but there arose a king who knew not Joseph" and who shirked the responsibility of refusing, but declared that the eastern boundary of Manitoba should be the western boundary of Ontario, with the design of handing to Manitoba what was awarded to Ontario, with this difference, that the timber on the land belonging to Manitoba belongs to the Dominion, while

Ontario owns the timber on her lands. Thus the Dominion would steal from Ontario \$150,000,000 worth of timber, and already are giving licenses to the Syndicate to cut timber on Ontario's lands. But the Ontario Government have resolved to go a step further and take possession of these lands. Nothing is so contemptible in Sir John's history as his offer to arbitrate the matter over again. He would like to play the sharper's game of "Heads I win; tails you lose." Why should Ontario submit to such injustice? It is the Province that pays three-fifths of the revenue of the Dominion; it is the heart of Canadian virtue, intelligence and enterprise, and it intends to assert its rights. It has long enough been made the cats-paw of French lick-spittles, and built the harbors and public works of Quebec. Now we say what is our own is our own. 'Whom the Gods intend to destroy they first make mad,' and Sir John seems to have been maddened to his destruction."

I merely read this extract to show what kind of speeches are made in Ontario, and I do say that the member for North Norfolk, in making use of language of that kind while the matter is under discussion in Parliament is trying to irritate the feeling in Ontario against a settlement of this question. They hope to make political capital by the cry of French domination. The Conservative party in Ontario never paid any attention to that; but you see now by that speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, that the Reform party still make use of it. However, I do not think, as has been stated already, that those tactics will "take worth a cent" with the people of Ontario. I believe they are alive to their own interests, and that this excitement which the Opposition are trying to get up will have but little effect when the people have a chance to record their votes.

Mr. TROW. I would not have risen to my feet, but for a taunt from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who, during his speech, stated that he would ask any hon. gentlemen to point out to him where the Dominion Government had submitted the question to arbitration. I merely called the hon. gentleman's attention to the Order in Council passed and approved by His Excellency the Governor General, in November, 1878, and instead of answering it he taunted me that I might expect a visit from him during this summer. I may say to that hon. gentleman that it is a matter of indifference to me how often he or any other supporter of the Government visits my riding, so long as the electors there are not deprived of their franchise. He may come every day in the week if it gratifies him for it can make no difference to me so far as the electoral vote is concerned. However, I may say, being a member of that celebrated Committee of which we have heard so much this afternoon, more especially from the hon. member for Algoma, who was chairman, that the Committee was composed of gentlemen from the various Provinces, nine supporters of the Government and four members of the Opposition, who devoted considerable time and attention to the subject brought before them. It is true the time at the disposal of the Committee was not adequate to the service they had to perform, and I think the chairman himself did a large portion of the work. I notice in the report that a great deal of matter has been introduced into it irrelevant to the case and that was not brought before the Committee. At the same time I think the chairman was thoroughly qualified for the task he had undertaken; the questions he put to the witnesses were often leading questions, and you may fancy the result. At all events, at the close of that examination I was satisfied in my own mind that the Province of Ontario had scarcely received justice in that award. I was strengthened in that conclusion by the evidence of the hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. McDougall), who is thoroughly conversant with the question, and considered the award was right in every particular. The evidence given by the chairman while member of the Local House was that the western boundary of Ontario extended several hundred miles beyond the limits sanctioned by the arbitrators. Now, when a matter is left to arbitration it strikes me forcibly that there is not a gentleman on either side of the House, who, if he left to arbitrators a dispute about any private matter, would not feel

Mr. ARKELL:

bound to abide by the award. I am surprised that any Government should refuse to ratify an award made by gentlemen of their own choosing and of superior ability. It has been said to-night that the arbitrators were premature in making their award, but it must be remembered that they were acting as judges in the case, they had eminent lawyers to prepare the case for them from week to week, to produce the evidence, the commissions, treaties and Acts of Parliament for a century back, and the arbitrators certainly required but very little time to deliberate. They took the legal evidence before them, and although sitting in different parts of the country, they came to a unanimous decision, unknown to each other before hand. Now it strikes me forcibly that the line is a proper one. The only reason for any dispute whatever is the meaning of the words "and northwards." Well, judging from the circumstances of the case, "northwards" must mean unmiss-takeably to follow the course of the Mississippi River to the height of land, at all events, if not to the North-West Angle. A line due north from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi would have excluded several settlements which then existed and which the Act was intended to include. The Quebec Act of 1774 is sufficiently plain in describing the limits, and the commission given to Sir Guy Carleton is also explicit; and I cannot see for a moment why any Government should refuse to ratify an award made by gentlemen of such ability, aided by the best legal talent in the Dominion.

Mr. HESSON. As an Ontario man and representing an Ontario constituency, I desire to say that this question is one of great importance to myself and my constituents, and I am called upon to vote upon a resolution which I heartily approve. I am not afraid to go into any constituency and defend the vote I am going to give to-night, on the ground that I believe the only true definition you can get of a legal boundary will be obtained in that manner. If we take the words that have been supposed to state where the boundary is, we find that even the Government who made the award have had to qualify them by the evidence that was adduced here to-night by the hon. member for Lincoln, by saying that it was not the legal boundary, but apparently the boundary, the best they could find. Now, I am not surprised at that. If the arbitrators simply gave a day or two to obtain the evidence I am not at all surprised that they failed to find a legal boundary. The Supreme Court would exercise a little more patience in arriving at a decision, or, if it were referred to the Privy Council, the Dominion Government would see that the case was properly presented there, that the best evidence was forthcoming and that Ontario would get fair play. I am not afraid that my Province will not get fair play, and I am prepared to trust the matter in the hands either of the Supreme Court or the Privy Council. It has been made to appear that hon. gentlemen opposite are perfectly satisfied with the award made by the arbitrators. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) said the line was a proper one; it was accepted by the people of Ontario, and they are perfectly satisfied with it; on the other hand the present First Minister of Ontario held that it was not such a line. In chapter 2 of the Ontario Statutes of 1878, Mr. Mowat said:

"And whereas the effect of the said award is to give to this Province less territory than had been claimed on behalf of the Province, and more territory than the Government of Canada had intended to be within the limits of the Province, or that was contained within the provisional boundary lines aforesaid, &c."

Hon. gentlemen opposite were prepared to accept less than the land to which the Province was entitled, but he, as an Ontario man was not prepared to accept less than the quantity to which the Province was entitled. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to adopt that course which is more than members on this side of the House will do, I am

not prepared to accept such terms, and I will not support a Government which will not give to Ontario all to which it is entitled, and the Government is pursuing the proper course in this matter. The trouble is that hon. members on this side of the House have anticipated the resolutions of hon. gentlemen opposite on this subject, and the speeches they have been preparing for days and months. It is not with them a question so much as to whether Ontario would be robbed of territory, because they are willing that this should occur, but we on this side of the House ask fair play for Ontario, and we will receive it.

Mr. RYMAL. I regret exceedingly that a question which should have been settled in an amicable and friendly manner between the Dominion and Ontario Governments has become a bone of contention. I express my sincere regret that such is the case, because if the people of Ontario feel they have been wrongly dealt with by the Dominion taking a portion of their inheritance from them, it certainly will weaken the affection which should exist between the members of this great Confederacy. I have always thought it was a proper matter to submit to arbitration, and I endeavored to look at the matter from a common-sense point of view. It was not an improper subject to submit to such a distinguished Board of Arbitrators as sat upon it. I think I might place the opinion of Sir Edward Thornton, Sir Francis Hincks and Chief Justice Harrison in opposition to the opinions of some of the lesser lights who have spoken on the other side of the House, and be guided by Sir Francis Hincks and his colleagues. I am sorry this matter has assumed a party aspect for the reason that it will prevent a settlement in a satisfactory manner. It is only a short time since it assumed that aspect. Up to within the last few months the representatives of the people in Ontario, Reformers and Conservatives alike, considered the award a proper one to be ratified; not only that, but they condemned the action or want of action on the part of the Dominion Government in not ratifying the award, which they asserted would only give Ontario justice: It is not uninteresting to enquire at what time and under what circumstances this change took place in the views of a number of members of the Ontario Legislature. It has been referred to by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) as having occurred just about the time some prominent members of the Dominion Government paid a visit to Toronto, and it gives ground for suspicion to those of a suspicious nature—and I am glad to say I am not of that nature—that some concerted action was taken at the time a great gathering took place in Toronto, for immediately afterwards I noticed Conservative papers changed their tactics, they began to adopt a different line, and they justified the Government in withholding its ratification to the award. I am bound to say, that unsuspecting as I am, and possessing great faith in the honesty of my fellow-men, this change was suspicious, and indicated concerted action of the Tory party. I have a word to say to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who unnecessarily undertook to belittle the Premier of the great Province of Ontario. He called him the little man, the little Premier, and the little dodger. Now, it so happens that the Premier of Ontario is not unknown in this House, and is perhaps as well known as any gentleman in the Dominion of Canada, particularly in Ontario, and this is the first time that I ever heard him stigmatized as a little man. He may not have the bulky proportions of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert); it is possible he has not an equally comprehensive mind; but the people of Ontario, I hope, will credit him with being a giant while the hon. member for Lincoln is a mere pigmy. When the hon. gentleman spoke of Mr. Mowat's little dodges he should have looked back at his own record, and he would not have spoken of Mr. Mowat as a little dodger. Little! Why Sir, he is a giant in comparison with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr.

Rykert), unless it be in gathering scraps, culling from newspapers, and making quotations from better speeches than he can deliver himself—pasting them together, and making speeches here by the hour. Little! Why, Sir, there never have been any transactions with which the hon. member for Lincoln has been connected which could be characterized as great. I think the Irish poet, Tom Moore, must have had some one similar to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in his mind when he wrote a stanza which I shall repeat to the House.

Mr. RYKERT. We have heard it before.

Mr. RYMAL. Yes, and it may do you good to hear it again. I do not claim it as original.

“There was a little man,
And he had a little soul,
And he said, ‘Little soul, let us try, try, try,
If it's not within our reach
To make up a little speech,
Just between you and little I, I, I.’
Then together cheek by jowl,
This little man and little soul,
Went and made that little speech,
To a tittle, tittle, tittle,
And all the people did declare
That this priggish little pair,
Never yet in all their lives
Looked so little, little, little.”

Amendment (Mr. Plumb) carried on the following division :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	Massue,
Allison,	Ferguson,	Merner,
Amyot,	Fiset,	Méthot,
Arkell,	Fitzsimmons,	Montplaisir,
Baker,	Fortin,	Mousseau,
Beaty,	Fulton,	O'Connor,
Beauchesne,	Gault,	Ogden,
Béchar,	Gigault,	Olivier,
Benoit,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Orton,
Bergeron,	Girouard (Kent),	Ouimet,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Plumb,
Bill,	Haggart,	Pope (Compton),
Bolduc,	Hay,	Poupore,
Boulton,	Hesson,	Richey,
Bourassa,	Homer,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Hooper,	Rouleau,
Brechen,	Hurteau,	Routhier,
Bunster,	Ives,	Royal,
Bunting,	Kaulbach,	Ryan (Montreal),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Rykert,
Carling,	Kirkpatrick,	Shaw,
Caron,	Kranz,	Sproule,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Landry,	Stepheason,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Langevin,	Strange,
Colby,	Lantier,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Longley,	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Kings),	Tyrwhitt,
Coupal,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Valin,
Coursol,	Marmillan,	Vallée,
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	McCaig,	Wade,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Desjardins,	McGreevy,	Wallace (York),
Domville,	McLelan,	White (Cardwell),
Drew,	McQuade,	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McRory,	Williams, and
Dumont,	Malouin,	Wright.—116.
Elliott,	Manson,	

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Gillies,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Gillmor,	Rogers,
Borden,	Gunn,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brown,	Guthrie,	Rymal,
Burpee (St. John),	Holton,	Skinner,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Huntington,	Smith,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Snowball,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Sutherland,
Casey,	King,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Trow,
Charlton,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Weldon,
Cockburn,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheeler, and
Crouter,	McIsaac,	Wiser.—44.
Fleming,	Mills,	

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House do, at its next sitting, go into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that when this House adjourns at its next sitting it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 11th inst., at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to; and (at 3:35 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 5th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE IRISH RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to state, as a matter of courtesy to the Government, that on the next occasion after to-day when a motion will be made that you, Mr. Speaker, leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply, I shall move an amendment that certain resolutions in connection with the state of Ireland be considered—unless some other arrangement be made to meet the question.

THE SUGAR DUTIES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I wish to say a few words with reference to a subject, which is a very sweet one, and which would remain so, had it not been for an element of bitterness which has been introduced into it by the late Tariff. I refer, Sir, to the article of sugar, on which I desire to offer a few remarks. This article, Sir, is one of the most important articles of commerce. It is one of the articles that enters into consumption by the people of this country to as great an extent, perhaps, as any other article in the country; and, therefore, any legislation which affects it by way of enhancing its price, bears upon all consumers of that article. When I remind the House that the consumption of this article in England is about 60 lbs. per head per annum; that in the United States, it is 40 lbs. per head per annum; and that in this country, it amounts to 31 lbs. per head per annum, leaving aside any calculation based on the use of maple sugar, we will see, Sir, that the subject we are approaching is one of considerable interest to the people of this country. It will be remembered that, in 1879, when the Tariff was introduced by the hon. the Finance Minister, that gentlemen on this side of the House said, with reference to the proposed change of the sugar duties, that it would have the result of decreasing the revenue which the country received from that source, and that it would also have the effect of enhancing the price of that article for the consumer. Exception, Sir, was taken to our statements at that time; exception has been taken to our statements with reference to this subject since then; and attempts have been made by the hon. the Finance Minister, and by other gentlemen of ability on the other side of the House, to endeavor to prove that we were wrong at that time in our forecast as to the effect of this duty; and attempts have been made to show, and demonstrate by figures conclusively, that we were mistaken. Now, Sir, the duty which devolves upon me to-day is to show that the

Mr. RYMAL.

position which was then taken by gentlemen on this side of the House was the correct position. I intend, Sir, first to prove that the price of sugar has been enhanced through the operation of this Tariff, and that through it the people have had to pay a great deal more for this article, and I have also to show that while the Tariff remains as it is at present on the Statute-books, the people not only have paid an extra amount, but that they are liable to pay it. I will endeavor, further, to show, Sir, that the duty upon this article is excessive, and that it is in the interest of the country, and the bounden duty of the Government, to see that this taxation should be reduced. Now, Sir, in approaching this subject, mere statements will carry no weight. Sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite object to the use of figures and of tables of figures, from this side of the House. They say: "Look at the general effect of our Tariff upon the country." They point to prosperity, they point to the country, and they say: "cause and effect." That may do, perhaps, to talk to men who have not had a business training, and who give no attention whatever to public matters; but it certainly is a line of argument that should not be adopted in the Canadian House of Parliament, where the representatives are supposed to be business men, and capable of judging business questions upon their merits. There will be no value in any argument that may be advanced on this question or on any other question, unless that argument is backed up by and based upon figures culled from our Trade and Navigation Returns, which will give to us the true state of the case in reference to the particular article which may be under discussion. Now, Sir, let me say, with reference to this article, to which I confine my remarks exclusively to-day, that it is, perhaps, one of the most difficult articles in the whole category to speak upon. It is the most difficult matter, perhaps, Sir, of any item we have in the Tariff, to ascertain what advantage, what amount of Protection the refiner of sugar has in this country; and the reason, Mr. Speaker, is not far to seek. There are certain secrets connected with sugar refining; these secrets are locked up—properly locked up—in the minds, in the breasts, and in the knowledge of the men who are engaged in that enterprise. When we had, Sir, in 1876, the head of one of the principal members of the only refining firm we had in existence in Canada at that time, before a Committee of the House of Commons, it was necessary, in order to substantiate his allegations that a bounty was paid by the American people to the sugar refiner on the sugar which the American refiners exported to Canada, to ascertain the amount of the refined sugar that could be produced from 100 lbs. of raw sugar. That was essential, Sir, to a right determination upon that point. And surely at that time when an effort was being made to understand the position of that trade and the grounds for granting relief to it, if it should be proved we would naturally expect that that gentleman at any rate might have given in confidence to that Committee the nature of his trade secret, for otherwise he was certainly estopped from urging any claim for receiving any greater consideration at the hands of the Canadian Parliament or of the Canadian Ministry; but, Sir, that gentleman emphatically refused to disclose what amount of raw sugar it took to produce 100 lbs. of refined sugar. I repeat again, he had a perfect right to do it. I will allude now to a remark made by the hon. member for Cardwell two years ago, when, in the course of some remarks on the same question, I said I admitted that the Redpaths had made \$600,000 last year; the hon. member for Cardwell said he could not very well see how I arrived at that conclusion. He did not think that the Redpaths were in the habit of showing their books to members of Parliament, to enable them to determine such a matter. That is quite correct. The Messrs. Redpath, or any other refiner or manufacturer in this country, is in no

way bound to show his books, either to myself or to any other member of this House, provided that he is not knocking at the door of this Parliament and asking for legislation to give him an undue advantage over the consumer of his goods. But if the Government undertake to make a man prosperous; to make a man rich, to make a man wealthy at the expense of the people of this country, the Government of this country have a right, and it is their bounden duty to demand that the books of that firm shall be open to their investigation in order that they, at any rate, shall know how much profit he is making out of the advantages which they are conferring upon him by legislation. But, Sir, we got it not. I have been forced, then, to look for the basis upon which to make my calculation to other sources. In this, however, I did not find so much difficulty, because, in the year 1875, when this question of export bounty to the American refiner was under consideration, a commission was appointed in the United States. They met, and, unanimously at that time, found that 100 lbs. of raw sugar would give 60 lbs. of hard stove-dried sugar, 23·60 lbs. of soft yellow sugar, 11·50 lbs. of syrup, and 4·9 lbs. of waste. These gentlemen were examined under oath separately. They gave different testimony, according to the classes of sugar which they turned out; but on the sworn testimony of these, and different sugar refiners when before them, the Committee unanimously arrived at the conclusion that a fair basis for calculation of the drawback was the production of 60 lbs. of hard sugar from 100 lbs. of raw sugar, leaving the soft sugar and syrup equal in value, at any rate, to the raw sugar, which may therefore be dropped out of the question, and this gives us the basis we work upon, of 60 lbs out of 100 lbs. of raw sugar, with 4·90 lbs of waste, or upon 100 lbs. of hard dry sugar, 8½ per cent of waste is incurred in turning it into granulated sugar. Now then, Sir, we have our basis, but I do not propose to work out the table on the basis of 8½ lbs. waste, in order to make the case so strong,—for the iniquity is so glaring. In order to persuade the members of this House, and show them conclusively that an undue advantage is being given to the refiner of sugar, instead of taking a basis of 8½ lbs. of waste, as I might have done in making my calculation, I will add 50 per cent. to that, and make the calculation on the basis of 12½ per cent. of waste. Taking this as a basis, Sir, the first table which I submit for the consideration of the House is this: That in the years 1879-80, and also in 1880-81—for this Tariff has been now for two complete years in operation—we imported 116,847,050 lbs. of sugar, I take off 12½ per cent. as I stated before in order to reduce it to a granulated sugar basis, I therefore have to deduct 14,605,881 lbs., and that leaves me a net result of 102,241,169 lbs. of sugar on the granulated basis. The average price in Canada of granulated sugar during that period was \$9.73 per 100 lbs., and from which I deduct 1½ per cent., which is 15 cents, leaving it \$9.58. The reason why I deduct 1½ per cent. is because the Redpath sugar refiners take 2½ per cent. off the price, while the New York refiners take off 1 per cent.; therefore taking the New York price in that, the 1 per cent., and the Redpaths with 1½ per cent. off, I have arrived at a firm foundation. This, then, was the average price in Canada—\$9.58, and that number of pounds, multiplied by this, shows that the cost of that quantity of sugar in Canada was \$9,794,703. During that same period the New York price was \$6.20 in gold per 100 lbs. The same number of pounds, multiplied by this, would give the cost in New York at \$6,338,952. Taking the cost, then, of this article in New York from the cost of it in Canada, and what do you find? That in Canada the people that year paid \$3,455,751 more for their sugar than they would have had to do if they had brought it from New York.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The table is there for any hon. gentleman to dissect. I am speaking now of one year. The people of Canada consequently in the year 1880, paid \$3,455,751 more for their sugar than they would have had to pay for this sugar in New York. Where has it gone to, Sir? You will find, from the Trade and Navigation Returns, that \$2,026,689 of it went into the public Treasury by way of duty, that is all right, that is perfectly legitimate; but this leaves \$1,429,062 which was taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, and which was not put into the Treasury. Will the hon. the Finance Minister, or any gentleman on this side of the House, say where this money was put. We will now take the next year. We then imported 136,406,513 lbs. of sugar which, on the 12½ per cent. basis, makes 119,355,702 lbs. of granulated sugar, as being the product of this quantity. The average price in Canada of this sugar during that year, was \$9.77 per 100 lbs. And this number of pounds multiplied by that price gives a total cost of \$11,661,052. The New York price during the same year was \$6.55 per 100 lbs., and this number of pounds multiplied by this price gives a total cost, in New York, of \$7,817,798. Taking this, Sir, from what we paid in Canada, and we find a difference of \$3,843,254. Where is it? \$2,459,142 of it went into the public Treasury by way of duty, that is right; but there was \$1,384,112 that year taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, that did not go into the public Treasury. Will the hon. the Finance Minister tell us where it is, and where it did go to?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Where did it go?

Mr. PATERSON. It went into the pockets of the refiners, or it was squandered, because our refiners could not produce as cheaply, owing to the want of keen competition—for the one or the other of these causes that amount was taken out of the pockets of the people of this country. That is my first table, Sir. I propose now to apply another test to it, and what test shall I apply? I think it would be a pretty fair test to take the profits of the New York refiner and compare them with the profit of the Canadian refiner—I think this would give us a test. Now, then, suppose we enter upon that test. I find that the refiner of the United States paid last year, upon his raw sugar, an average duty of \$2.45 per 100 lbs. Well, the Canadian refiner paid on his raw sugars an average of only \$1.75 per 100 lbs. The Canadian refiner had, therefore, an advantage of 70 cents per 100 lbs. over the American refiner on his raw sugar. In addition to that, Sir, in the year 1880 the Canadian price was, on the average during the whole year, 23 cents per 100 lbs. higher than it was sold for in New York; and, therefore, the Canadian refiner, with 70 cents less cost on his raw sugar, and 23 cents per 100 lbs. more profit on his refined sugar, has 93 cents per 100 lbs. advantage over the American refiner. Well, now, apply that 93 cents advantage to the 116,847,050 lbs. of sugar imported in 1880, and we find that the Canadian refiner would have \$1,086,677 more profit than the American refiner, provided he refined his sugar as cheaply as the American refiner did. To that, Sir, you will have to add \$500,000 which we were short in revenue, bringing the total up to over \$1,400,000, arrived at by the calculation made on the basis previously given. Take, Sir, the next year. On an importation of 136,406,513 lbs. that the Canadian refiner had an advantage over the American refiner on the raw sugar of 70 cents per 100 lbs., and an advantage over him to the extent of 6 cents per 100 lbs., on the enhanced price got in Canada for this sugar, over and above what the American refiner got in New York for his sugar. This makes 76 cents per 100 lbs. of advantage which the Canadian refiner had over the New York refiner, each in his own market, in the year 1881. Apply these 76 cents to

the importation of sugar in 1881, and you get, as the result, an advantage which the Canadian refiner had of \$1,036,689; to this add, in round numbers, \$500,000 of revenue short, under the calculation as it would have been under the Cartwright so-termed Tariff, and then you will arrive at a loss of \$1,500,000, or \$1,400,000, on that basis again. But Sir, I propose to apply a still further test. I now take as a test the figures of the hon. Finance Minister himself, contained in his speech of 1881, which will be found in *Hansard*, page 1023, and what does he say there:

"I have here the prices during every month of 1880 in the United States and in Montreal. The prices in the United States averaged \$6.52. Add the old duty (because I am making the statement under the estimate of the old duty), 25 per cent. \$1.63, 1 cent per lb., \$1, and all other expenses of every kind, 35 cents—that brings the price of granulated sugar to \$9.50, as against an average price during the past twelve months of \$9.75, or an increased cost of 25 cents per 100 lbs., as between the present price and what it would have cost to import it in under the Tariff of 1878. Now, I am also informed, on what I consider reliable authority, that the yellow refined sugar is now in the market to-day by the refiners and sold at from 14 to 19 cents per 100 lbs. less than it could be imported from the United States for, under the Tariff of 1878."

That is the utterance of the hon. Minister of Finance in 1881, in which he admits the Canadian consumer paid 25 cents per 100 lbs. more for his sugar.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Granulated. What about yellow?

Mr. PATERSON. Yellow? On the basis I worked out of turning raw into granulated, at 12½ per cent. more than covers all the yellows, because there is no loss in refining them, and I am giving 50 per cent. advantage on the calculation to the hon. gentleman's Tariff. It is well known to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Bunting) who sits behind him that the Canadian refiner understands, as well as the American refiner, how to take 100 lbs. and more than that of yellow sugar out of raw sugar, and leaving it of brighter color than it was before. The hon. gentleman told us that in 1876 under oath, and I am sorry to say he has since that time gone out of the trade. If he does not know it business men have no difficulty in knowing it; they know that what the hon. member for Welland testified in 1876 on that point is correct; and therefore when I am reducing it all to a granulated basis and giving 50 per cent. advantage to the hon. Minister of Finance, the question of yellow drops out altogether, because they are more than covered by the extra production from the raw sugar and from the increased benefit acquired by turning it into a granulated basis. Then 25 cents is admitted by the hon. Minister of Finance; to that he adds 35 cents in charges. What right has he to add 35 cents in charges by way of freight to sugars from New York in comparison with prices from Montreal to New York? Does the hon. Minister not know, is he not conversant enough with trade matters to know, that there is as much cost on freight on sugar from Montreal to the consuming points of this Dominion as there is from New York? It makes no difference to the consumer of sugar in Canada whether he pays 35 cents per 100 lbs. freight on sugar from New York, or pays it from Montreal. The average charges for freight on sugar from Montreal to the consuming points—to the consuming mouths—of sugar in Canada, is as great as from the port of New York, and, therefore, that 35 cents must be dropped out of the calculation altogether. Add that to his 25 cents that he admitted, and you have his own admission that the people of Canada paid 60 cents per 100 lbs. more for their sugar during the year he was making that speech, and the year before, than they would have paid under the old Tariff. In that year the people of Canada imported 116,847,050 lbs. of sugar; deduct 12½ per cent. to bring it to a granulated basis, and it leaves 102,241,169 lbs. Add to that the 25 cents admitted by the hon. Minister of Finance, and the 35 cents that he had no business to charge against the New York

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

sugar, that is, multiply it by the 60 cents, and what is the result? Why, you paid an enhanced price of \$617,447 for the sugar. But mark, Mr. Speaker, that is not all. If the rate of duty of 1878 had been applied to that quantity of sugar coming in, instead of the rate of duty the new Tariff imposes, we would have paid \$733,901 more duty. But the duty we lost, and the enhanced cost together under this calculation of the Minister of Finance himself, and you have as a net result a loss to the people of Canada of \$1,344,348, the hon. Minister of Finance himself making the statement. We have another valuable speech from the hon. Minister of Finance on the sugar question this year. I beg to call his attention to it. He will find on page 32 of his speech, as reported in the pamphlet of which I was able to borrow a copy from a friend, for I am sorry to say he did not send me one of them, though he favored some of my friends with large supplies. The hon. member for Lambton says he will give me twenty copies; I think he ought to distribute them among his friends, as it will be more convenient to carry them through the country than to carry the *Hansard*. On page 32 of the pamphlet, Sir Leonard Tilley says:

"The figures that I am now quoting can be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and they show this: that during the last year we paid into the Treasury for duties on sugar \$154,910 more than the average for the five years previous."

That was five years previous to 1879; his argument was based on that. Further down you will find he says:

"There is the fact: \$154,000 more were received during the last year than the average of the five years previous; so much with regard to the anticipated loss of revenue."

Again, on page 33, he comes back to this subject. He rolls it as a sweet morsel under his tongue. He says: "So far as the revenue is concerned there has been no loss." Sir, I propose to show to the House that that was a statement the hon. Minister of Finance ought not to have made. I propose to show that that was a statement made, whether designedly or not I do not know, which was misleading in itself, and should not have received the authority of his utterance. He hid the important fact from the people of Canada that though his calculation was based upon the amount of duty actually paid on the average of the five years previous, that there was, last year, imported 28,749,648 lbs. more sugar than was imported on an average during the five years for which he took his average.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Commoner sugar.

Mr. PATERSON. How much commoner?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Because it was refined.

Mr. PATERSON. I grant the hon. gentleman that, but what would that bring it down to in refined sugar? Let him give me his basis and I will work it out.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. You cannot work it out on my basis.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I can, if you will give it to me, in a minute. But I would say more than that. I understand there has been a deputation of sugar refiners to the hon. Minister of Finance wanting a drawback on sugar. Now, if he has listened to them it would be part of his duty, before fixing the drawback, to know exactly from them how much they would get out of 100 lbs. of raw sugar. Let me ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he has arrived at that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have not worked it out yet. We have not worked it out because the time has not arrived. We are at it now before we give them an answer.

Mr. PATERSON. Let me say this: that I have taken as a basis 12½ per cent., and the hon. the Minister of Finance dare not ask me to take a higher statement than that, because even that statement reduces the actual import and consumption of sugar last year down to a point that had

been reached under the Mackenzie Administration, and for him to take that point would have been tantamount to an admission that less sugar has been consumed by these hundreds of thousands of extra people that he has brought into the country, than was consumed before. That stopped him from taking that line of argument. He dare not go beyond 12½ per cent. Therefore, I think I am safe in holding him to my basis of 12½ per cent. Now let us work out his calculation. I have worked at his calculation, and I find that instead of \$154,910 more duty being paid in than during the average of the five years previous, that the average was \$145,856. But I shall not dispute upon that point at all. I will assume that the hon. Minister's figures of \$154,910 are correct. In order to ascertain the effect on revenue, we have to multiply that 28,749,648 lbs. by \$2.15 per 100 lbs., the rate of duty during the five years that the hon. the Finance Minister took, and we find that we should have had, on last year's importations, \$622,417 more of duty than we had during the average of the five years mentioned. Now, deduct from that the \$154,910 extra which he says we got, and we find that the net loss to the revenue was \$467,507. The House will agree with me that the hon. the Finance Minister, when he made that statement, was not justified in withholding the fact, when he stated that we had received \$154,910 more of revenue, that there had been 28,749,648 more pounds of sugar imported. Now, take that loss of revenue, and add it to the increased cost, and you arrive at the neighborhood of \$1,400,000 of a loss to the people of this country. Now, I desire to refer to some figures given to the House by the very valuable hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). I will do him the credit of saying he understands the sugar question as well as any hon. member on the other side of the House. In speaking in the House and the country of the figures he gave in 1880, he has stated that they had never been questioned on the floor of Parliament, that they had never been refuted, and therefore he understood that they were correct. Well, Sir, on the outside platform, where most of the iniquities of this Government have to be exposed, one has not time to elaborate on this sugar iniquity, and therefore I have pointed out that if what the hon. member for Cardwell says is true, that the people are getting their sugar for less money than they were when the old Tariff was in force, the Redpath refinery would never have been closed up. But I will show the hon. member for Cardwell where he was wrong in 1880; and I am sure that when I point it out to him, he will, with his usual candour, confess that he was mistaken in his figures, and that the deductions which he drew from them were therefore incorrect. On page 828 of the *Hansard* of 1880, the hon. member said :

"In November last, sugar was quoted in New York at \$8.00 per 100 lbs, net cash in bond, after the drawback was deducted. Under the Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite the cost in New York would have been \$8.00; 25 per cent. and one cent duty, and freight and the other charges, would have made the total cost of the sugar in Canada \$11.35 per 100 lbs. The highest price reached in Canada last year was \$10.33."

The hon. member for Cardwell made there a very strange mistake when he states that the highest price paid in Canada during that year was \$10.33, and I judge that he takes his figures from the report of the Montreal Corn Exchange, which I find are the same. Now, the highest price in November of that year in New York, instead of being \$8.00 per 100 lbs, as the hon. gentleman says, I find by the *Shipping List*, the accuracy of which no man will deny, was \$11.00 per 100 lbs. Deduct from that the drawback of \$3.17, and you will find that the net price, instead of being \$8 for 100 lbs., was only \$7.83 per 100 lbs.; so that the hon. gentleman was 17 cents wrong with reference to the New York price. He

also said that "the highest price reached in Canada last year was \$10.33;" and yet on a preceding page of the same speech, the hon. member himself inserts a table, taken from the Montreal Corn Exchange Report, showing that the highest price in 1879 was \$11.12 per 100 lbs. Now, let us work out the revenue from the correct figures. The net price of granulated sugar in New York was \$7.83, instead of \$8, as the hon. gentleman said, a difference of 17 cents; the net price in Montreal during the same period was \$11.12, instead of \$10.33, as he said, a difference of 79 cents; add the 79 cents that he was wrong in the Canadian price, and the 17 cents that he was wrong in the New York price, and you find that he was wrong to the extent of 96 cents per 100 lbs. Multiply the 100,000,000 lbs. in round numbers of refined sugar that we made in Canada by that 96 cents, and the result gives \$960,000 in favor of the Canadian refiner over and above what the hon. gentleman stated. To that you add the \$467,507, lost revenue, and you find that the total loss, in 1880, to the Canadian consumer, was \$1,460,000. I have still another table to give you. We know that the duties were imposed on refined sugar, and the average price, in 1880, was \$9.85—that is, the long price. The gold price was \$6.18, but I take \$6.20, for I have figured it out on this basis, and it is a little in favor of the hon. Minister. The duty charged under the Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite on granulated from the United States is what? The people of this country do not know how their sugar is taxed and what they are paying by way of duty. The granulated sugar from New York is taxed, if it comes from there, to the amount of 69 per cent., or 69 cents on every dollar. It is enormous. The rate of taxation on the raw sugar imported by the Canadian refiner, is 48 per cent; therefore, the Canadian refiner has a protection against the American refiner of 21 per cent. That was the result in 1880. In 1881 the figures differ, but worked out by the same process we find 67 per cent. as the average rate of duty on American granulated coming into this market, and still a protection of 21 per cent. to the Canadian refiner. Just imagine an advantage of 21 per cent. given to Canadian refiners! If it were not that the Tariff is somewhat easier against Scotch yellows and sugars from Glasgow, people would have to pay that enormous amount of taxation, or go without the sugar. Twenty-one per cent. on 100,000,000 lbs., the capacity of our refineries, would give over \$2,000,000 advantage; but that is somewhat reduced by the fact that the sugars were not imported from there. Let me give the hon. the Finance Minister, who sits chuckling there, some figures to chuckle over, which figures he furnished himself. Let him look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, and he will find that on number 14 and upwards, on Scotch refined and sugars of that class, there is an average duty on the raw sugar that the refiners brought in of 10 per cent. protection. Let him apply that to the 100,000,000 lbs. which our refineries can turn out, and it will appear that our refineries have \$1,000,000 advantage. Look at the question in the light of any of the tables I have given the House, and it will be found that a loss of \$1,400,000 or \$1,500,000 accrues to the people of Canada. The hon. the Finance Minister, in 1881, when he was talking on this question, admitted that we lost \$700,000 on the revenue, but said that part of the sugar that should be rightly charged to the revenue had been paid in during some months of the preceding year, and this quantity would have reduced the sum to about \$500,000. But he said, suppose that were the case where has that money gone? In the opinion of some it has gone into the pockets of the refiners, but he said that that was a mistake, he would tell them where it had gone. It had gone into coal consumed, 60,000 tons, of which the Nova Scotians obtained the benefit; 400 men employed at \$400 per annum, making \$160,000; a vast amount of shipping engaged between the West Indies and Montreal, and other ports, employing a certain number of men, and for

the use of which freight was paid; and the hon. gentleman gave the benefit to the Canadian refiners of interest on capital invested, of sinking fund to cover wear and tear, and every item of that kind, and he then says there is where the \$700,000 have gone. He contended that the people of Canada received all the benefit from that outlay, that while they lost in one way they gained in another. It is all nonsense.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That settles it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It cannot settle it in the estimation of the hon. gentleman, simply because I make the statement; but if I prove it from his own words, as I propose to do, he dare not refute it. The hon. gentleman talks about this extra money going back to the people by way of employment, but the figures I have given you show that over and above employing and paying those men, the purchase of coal, freight, the cost of shipping and everything else, there is a loss of \$1,400,000. On February 18th, 1881, the hon. Finance Minister said:

"Now, you will recollect that the duties collected in 1878, were upon refined sugar manufactured to a large extent in the United States and imported from there, and, therefore, we paid duty upon the labor of the refiner of the sugar upon which freight was paid, and upon other charges and expenditures in the same connection, which increased the value, under that operation, to \$746,390."

So the hon. Finance Minister himself stated that we had to pay for the coal, freight and labor used in the American refineries, just as the Canadian refineries had to pay for those items. Our calculations are on the refined sugar after it has been enhanced in cost by American refiners' expenses. The Canadian refiners might have kept their men at work, and the refineries open, and ships have brought sugar from distant ports, and yet this country would have been benefited by \$1,400,000, according to the tables I have given the House. I desire to read to the House, for I desire to give my authority—because the hon. Minister of Finance can do something in the sneering line, if not in the argumentative line—the statement of the proprietor of the Montreal Sugar Refinery, given before the Trade and Depression Committee, with respect to what he required in order to maintain his works in operation. He said:

"All I want from the Canadian Parliament is, that we shall have raw sugar admitted at as low an *ad valorem* as is charged on refined sugar."

Instead of the Government granting them what the refiners expressly desired in 1876 they gave them 21 per cent. advantage over the American refiners on white sugars, and about 10 per cent. on the English and Scotch sugars, besides the cost of freight to this country. And yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen will tell us, I suppose, that having given this advantage to the refiners they will not avail themselves of it. It is an insult to the common sense of this House to say that a man who has been given such an advantage by law will not use it, and the tables I have read to the House prove that these refiners have used it. Let us look a little at this matter of the \$1,400,000 of a loss that Canada has sustained for the benefit of sugar refiners, and see what use might be made of such a sum by a wise and judicious Tariff arrangement. If the duties were levied as they should be levied—if that \$1,400,000 which goes out of the pockets of the people of this country just as effectually as if it had gone into the Treasury—I say if it went into the Treasury and was then taken out for the benefit of the people, what would have been the effect? The free tea that hon. gentlemen talk about having given us, and the free breakfast table, would have been ours. The poor man's fuel, upon which he now pays \$600,000 taxation during the winter months, would have been given him free. The flour, the corn, the meal of the hardy mariners and fishermen which are now taxed so heavily would have been free, and you would have had within a fraction of as much money in the Treasury as you

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

have with the enormous taxation under the present system. Supposing that this \$1,400,000, instead of going into the pockets of a certain few favored men, went into the Treasury of this Dominion, and that it were afterwards taken out of the Treasury, what could be done with it? I have the figures furnished by the hon. Finance Minister himself. He tells us that the average wages of the employes in these sugar refineries are about \$400 per annum, but with this sum I have named the Government could bring 3,500 men from any other country into this, who, each with his wife and three children, would make up a total of 17,500 souls. They could bring these men into the country and board and keep them without doing a stroke of work—just give them \$400 a year for their support—and they would eat up the butter, the chickens, the corn and the eggs which the farmers would have to sell; and yet the people of this country would not be a cent poorer than they are to-day. Let us take it in another way. We could take these 3,500 men and divide them up among the counties of Ontario, and we could put 60 of these men, or 300 souls, in every county of that Province, where they could consume the farmers' products and furnish a home market for him. Or we could divide them up among the farmers to labor on the farms, whereby the farmers could get the benefit, instead of the few monopolists, whom I do not blame, as you and I would take the advantage they enjoy, if we had the opportunity. If we were to place these men in the Province of Quebec about the same state of things would exist. If you take them to the Province of New Brunswick, which I think has not been benefitted much by the Tariff, and distribute them among the fourteen counties in that Province, there would be about 250 men or 1,250 souls to feed. In Nova Scotia there would be about 200 men or 1,000 souls to feed distributed in the same way, or in Prince Edward Island, where, according to the hon. Minister of Finance, there are twenty-eight extra hands employed, under this Tariff, to consume the products of that Island, there would be about 3,000 people under the system I am suggesting and the country would not have to pay 1 cent for them. My first proposition was that the people of this country pay a sum greatly in excess of the cost of sugar from abroad, and I flatter myself that I have succeeded in establishing that proposition. My next proposition is that the people of this country are still liable to pay a greatly enhanced price over and above the price of that article abroad. In a previous discussion—to which I may be permitted to refer incidentally—I admitted as a business man, because I believe it, that when the manufacturing firms in a certain line become so numerous that they produced more than the country wants, then competition puts down the prices of the article to the consumer, and that the second stage is reached when the consumer has no more to pay for his goods. There were three exceptions which I mentioned: Either that the manufacturers will combine to restrict production and force up the prices, or that the raw material of the manufacturer, being taxed, he may be compelled to charge a higher price than the price in a foreign country; or, third, that the home manufacturer being unduly protected and not feeling the effects of keen competition, is left to get on with his business in a humdrum way, without efficient machinery, and is therefore unable to turn out his goods as cheaply as his foreign competitor. With these three exceptions, when you reach a point where there are more goods than the country wants, the consumer does not suffer loss. I am told that we have reached that point with regard to sugar, and I believe we have the testimony of one of the proprietors of the Redpath concern, that their capacity was 60,000,000 lbs. per annum. Two refineries of that capacity would turn out almost all the refined sugar this country requires, while we have four in operation, some of them not quite so large. One

of them, I believe, has suspended for a time, it is true, but, no doubt, it will resume again. The trouble is, that the farmers cannot combine to raise the prices of the articles which they produce. They have reached the second stage of Protection, but they are too numerous to put an extra price on farm products, and, as every one knows, you cannot get farmers to combine. On the other hand, it is quite clear that, when you have an industry in which are engaged, at the very most, two or three concerns, which are able to supply the whole wants of the country, they can get up a very close combination. They can at any time easily unite, when their interests point in that direction, and restrict the production, and put up the prices to as high a figure as the Tariff enables them to go. As the sugar refineries must always remain very limited in number, or, at least, for years and years to come, it is inevitable that they will have the power to combine. But there has been, and is now, an understanding with reference to their prices. You may ask them for their prices, and you will find they agree every time. The only deviation made, the only fall that occurs is when some enterprising importer imports from the West Indies a cargo of raw sugar, or, in spite of the 10 per cent. duty, a cargo of Scotch sugars. As soon as the refiners know that an importer has been public spirited enough to bring in foreign sugars, instructions go out, as I have been informed by men who know, to drop prices for the purpose of making that public spirited importer's venture so unprofitable that he will not dare to repeat it, and thus have the market of Canada exclusively to themselves. Whenever there has been a drop in prices, it has invariably occurred in that way. But, hon. gentlemen have said, the refinery at Halifax has been closed, thus disproving your statement as to the enormous profits. It disproves nothing of the kind. Not long ago we had a report, well founded, I am sorry to say, of the failure of a very large sewing machine company in this country. A day or two after the hon. the Finance Minister rose and read a letter from a similar factory in Montreal, stating it never did so good a business as then, never made such large profits. There you have within one week the statement of one failure and the contrary statement of heavy profits and large business by another firm. There are outside influences that enter into the successes of business men. The hon. the Finance Minister himself admits that this refinery at Halifax was not well managed, and if we might judge by the facts that come to our knowledge with reference to this sugar matter, we can understand, perhaps, how it is a firm of that kind should fail. The hon. member for Bothwell, the other night, told the House that Mr. Gladstone—who, unlike our hon. Finance Minister, when he was approached by these gentlemen wanting favors, never grants them until he probes their business to the bottom and learns exactly how much profits they are going to make—asked these sugar refiners who came to him for relief, how much sugar can a man turn out, and was told that a man could turn out about 350,000 lbs. per annum. That is what the operatives can do in the sugar refineries of the Old Country. The hon. Finance Minister told us there were 885 hands employed in the sugar refineries of Canada, turning out the quantity of sugar refined in those manufactories. The information supplied to Mr. Gladstone by these sugar refiners proves that 300 men in the refineries of Great Britain turn out what 885 men turn out here. If the sugar refineries of this country, through defective machinery, or carelessness, or anything else, are obliged to employ three men when one ought to be sufficient, are the people of Canada to pay for that kind of enterprise? It is no concern of the people of Canada whether the Redpaths or any other concern employ 50 men to do what one man can do in another country; but if the Government and the people of

Canada are paying the Redpaths they have a right to demand from them that they get as much labor from one man as that same man can give working in any other country. If this machinery is defective, must the Canadian consumer pay dearer for sugar for all time in order that these men may derive a large profit without incurring the expense of providing proper machinery? Not only have our people paid during the last two years, but they are liable to pay a greatly increased price for their sugar compared with what they would pay if it were imported. My third proposition is that the duties are excessive, as shown by my statement, and ought to be reduced. Let me refer to the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell in 1880, in which he alluded to the remarks I had made with reference to the profits of these refiners. He said:

"But we were told, I think, by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in those magnificent tones in which he addresses the House—"

I do not know how it is, but hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be disappointed with my voice. They seem to think I speak too loud. In almost every speech made by hon. gentlemen opposite, I find allusions to my tones. I do not know what is the trouble with them, but when I have truth to tell, I like to tell it clearly and strongly. I think there is nothing to be gained by mumbling over figures and facts. Therefore, if hon. members opposite will speak of my remarks in the complimentary terms used by the hon. member for Cardwell, I will be only too glad to acknowledge the compliment. Mr. White continues:

"That Messrs Redpath & Co. have cleared \$600,000 in a single year by the operation of this Tariff. How he managed to get the exact figures of their profits must puzzle most hon. members. It is not usual for merchants to give their account books to members of Parliament for the purpose of enabling them to state their exact profits."

They did not make that amount, the hon. member for Cardwell says. He asks, how did I know they did. I ask how did he know they did not unless he saw their books. I believe the hon. gentleman is a favorite with the sugar refiners. I believe they have found out what I found out some time ago, and formed the opinion that they required an advocate, and a more able one than the hon. gentleman they could not find, and they have been confidential enough, perhaps, to tell him that they did not make that much. But the hon. gentleman does not say how much less they make. Notice what follows. He says: "They did not make that amount, though I wish they had;" and then goes into an argument that looks as if it were very near the figure. He states:

"The simple question arises whether we had better not have, after the results I have shown to flow from this policy, \$600,000, made in a single year by Canadians, added to the wealth of the people of this country, than made by Americans, to be added to their wealth and strength and to be expended in the United States."

Now here follows a little good straight Tory doctrine. These hon. gentlemen often ask us for our policy. They will find our policy before the close of this Session. They will find it clear and defined. They will find it clear upon this sugar question, that is one of the planks. What does he say:

"The wealth of a country is, after all, to be found in the wealth of its individual citizens, and just in proportion as we can build up trade and make it profitable for capitalists to come here and make fortunes instead of going to the United States, adding by their wealth to the resources of our civilization, just in that proportion will we make the country desirable to live in, and protect and foster its best interests."

There is the old Tory doctrine. According to the Tory idea this country is to be made a desirable country to live in by taking out of the pockets of the working people, the laborers, artisans, mechanics, fishermen, lumbermen and agriculturists of the country, \$1,400,000 cash and give it to a few concerns, because, after all, great wealth in few hands is what makes a country desirable to live in. Sir, the Reform party hold that this is a wrong principle. The

Reform party are second to none in desiring to see men of wealth and energy in this country, but they desire these men to accumulate their capital by an expenditure of energy, and they object to the people being bound to give to any favored few men in this country the immense fortunes that they toil for, in order that we may have a few rich individuals who will be, as the hon. member for Cardwell tell us, after all, the backbone of this country.

Mr. FARROW. Is not sugar cheaper now than it was before.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad the hon. gentleman asked me that question, because I have not touched upon it, yet it is just one of those fallacies adopted by those hon. gentlemen opposite in order, if possible, to cover up the actual facts of the case. Why, Sir, what has the question, whether sugar is cheaper now, to do with the argument in this question? That may do for men who are talking to an audience that do not understand the question; but, in the Canadian Parliament, no representative ought to be found rising and alleging, as a reason, that a man's arguments and figures are erroneous because you get a certain article cheaper now than you did before. If I was to answer that hon. gentleman, I would tell him no. Before a duty was put on coal it was lower than it is now. A year after the duty was imposed it rose \$2 a ton. What is the matter? Butter, two or three years ago, sold at 9 cents a pound; within the past year it sold at 20 cents a pound. What is the matter? Why it is simply an absurdity for any man to allege as an argument in this House, when we are debating a question that is essentially a question of figures, that is essentially a matter of statistics, that is essentially a matter from which deductions must be drawn from facts and figures that are before us, to ask a question as to whether sugar is cheaper now than it was some time ago. Why, Sir, there are rises and falls in the value of articles outside the mere question of duties altogether. Whether there be no duty, or whether there be a duty of 100 per cent., articles of merchandize will fluctuate in value, one year up and another year down, but the fluctuations have nothing more to do with the argument we are engaged in now, than it would be to allege that because coal has gone up now some \$2 a ton higher than it was before, that the imposition of 50 cents duty had made coal \$2 higher—not one bit more ridiculous. Now, I do not wish to take up more time; I want to give the hon. member for Cardwell an opportunity to speak, and, perhaps, when he gets through, if he makes any mistakes, he will be kind enough to allow me to correct him, as I will esteem it a favor if he will correct any error in the figures I have given. I have only to sum up and say, that I have endeavored to prove that we have, during the past two years, paid an exceeding great amount for our sugar, over and above keeping our refineries open and employing labor, over and above all the duties that have gone into the Treasury for the last two years. I have proved it by reducing the total imports to a granulated basis, amounting to 12½ per cent. reduction, and the hon. member for Cardwell dare not ask me to take a basis higher than that, because it would reduce the imports of sugar down to what they were when, as he and his friends have told us, we were buying our sugar in England and Scotland. On that basis I have proved my statement by the fact of the advantage the Canadian refiner has in his own market over and above what the American refiner has, and I have arrived at the same results. I have proved it by the hon. the Minister of Finance's statement in 1880, taking his own figures, and working it out on the basis of an addition of 25 cents per 100 lbs. that he admitted, and 35 cents that he had no business to charge in respect to the freight. I have proved it by the statement made this year, when he hid from the people, in giving to us the increased amount of duty, the extra amount of pounds that had been imported. I have proved it from the figures

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

given to us in the calculations worked out by the hon. member for Cardwell in the year 1881. I have done more, I have shown, by figures that cannot be disputed, that the protection of Canadian refiners as against the American refiners, and as against the Scotch refiners, has had this result: that if it had been calculated on what sugars were imported over No. 14, on that basis we have lost \$1,500,000 in our sugar duties. In reference to my second argument, the hon. gentleman himself has admitted that the sugar refineries can never increase in number, and if they do, it must tend to restrict production, and in doing that we must pay their prices. Having established these points, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I tell them the sugar from the United States is taxed 69 per cent. that there is already an average of 48 per cent. on the raw sugar, which gives 21 per cent. against the American and 10 per cent. against the Scotch refiners; that there is, consequently, a crying injustice in the sugar Tariff as it is arranged, which warrants me in placing in your hands the following resolution, seconded by Mr. Gunn:—

“That under the operations of the existing duties on sugar the people have paid, and are liable to pay for that article, a price largely in excess of the cost abroad of sugar, after adding the Canadian duty and freight to the point of consumption,—that the duties on sugar are excessive, and should be so amended as to reduce the great burden they impose upon the people.”

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the hon. member for South Brant to desire to close the sugar refineries. As I understand his argument, it is that the duties should be so reduced or so readjusted, as that while largely lessening the burdens of the people, it will at the same time enable refiners, who look after their business, to carry on that business in Canada. That I understand is the proposition of the hon. gentleman. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is in error in his argument, judging from history in connection with the sugar refining business in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite were in office for five years. They had an opportunity of fixing the sugar duties as they might desire to fix them, and the result of their operations was that the only sugar refinery in Canada was closed, that a capital of from \$500,000 to \$600,000 was allowed to remain idle for four years, and that it was not until a change in the duties took place that the refinery was reopened and the refining business in Canada re-established. I would like to know why the hon. member, if he has discovered some talismanic method by which he can remove the burdens on the people, as he points out in his resolution, and at the same time maintain the refineries in operation, did not make the suggestion of the precise method of doing it to the late hon. Minister of Finance when he was in office. It certainly was not to the advantage of Canada that the sugar refinery should have been closed, that this industry, which all men who have studied these questions at all, admit to be of very great importance, should have been driven out of the country, and, therefore, I cannot but regret that the hon. member for South Brant, who appears to have made the subject one of special study, who appears to have ascertained with precise accuracy how much refined sugar can be obtained from a certain quantity of raw sugar, exactly how much profit the refiner can obtain, did not, when he had an opportunity, and was in the confidence of the party in power, make those suggestions, which they might have had some effect. Sir, I think the hon. gentleman, when he told the House—referring to the failure of the sugar refinery in Halifax—that there were various causes which led to the failure of people in business, that it required skill, enterprise, energy and attention to succeed in business, practically answered the whole argument which he presented to the House during the speech which he had delivered. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a business that realises the enormous profits of which he spoke, which has put into

he pockets of the refiners of Canada \$1,400,000 a year by way of profit over and above all expenditures which they have made in the operation of refining, ought to be able to sustain itself at least for a few months in Halifax. Unfortunately the failure of that business there, as the failure of a similar business a few years ago in Montreal, proves this: that all the stories of the enormous profits of refiners are simply fables, with which to tickle the ears of the people, that they have no foundation in fact, and that sugar refining in Canada requires quite as great skill and energy, and the expenditure of quite as much capital, as any other business in which the people of this country are engaged. Sir, there are two views which I propose to take of this question, two aspects with which I propose to deal in the remarks I intend to address to the House, and which, I hope, will not be very lengthy. The first is whether it is worth while to protect the business of sugar refining in this country at all. I am aware that during recent years the ex-Finance Minister has dealt with this question of sugar refining, as if it were a matter of very little consequence to the country. He spoke of "washing our sugar at home" as a matter of so little consequence that it was not worth while to give consideration to it; yet I propose to show that the hon. gentleman, only a few years ago, did regard sugar refining as of some value to the country, and was prepared, if Parliament had accepted his proposal, to have placed a Tariff on the Statute-Book, quite as protective as that which is on the Statute-Book to-day. When I had the honor of discussing this question on the floor of the House on a former occasion, I ventured to refer, as of some value, to the opinions of a gentleman in the United States, whose opinions have been frequently cited by hon. gentlemen opposite as those which ought to guide us in trade matters—I refer to Mr. David A. Wells—and I propose, very briefly indeed, to repeat one or two quotations which I then made, not for the purpose simply of enforcing the fact that even so great a free trader as Mr. Wells considered the question of sugar refining as one which stood out from the rest of the industries of the country, and was entitled, from its peculiar circumstances to the support and protection of the Government, but for the purpose of illustrating the argument which I intend later on to enforce. Mr. Wells, in a pamphlet which he wrote, strongly maintaining the importance of sugar refining and the wisdom of the policy of the Government which sustained that industry, used these words:

"Any exhibit of this great interest which should stop here would, however, be exceedingly incomplete, for, unlike tea or coffee, which are imported in a condition suitable to enter into immediate domestic consumption, nearly all the immense sugar product of foreign countries, which comes, or rather is permitted to come, under the existing Tariff, to the United States, as well as no inconsiderable portion of the domestic product, is wholly unfit to enter into consumption until it has undergone a process of refining or purification. According to the Census of 1870, this business of sugar refining, measured by the value of its product, ranked ninth in the order of importance of the so-called manufacturing industries of the country, 4,597 hands being employed, with an annual disbursement of \$3,177,288 in wages. But the statistics accepted by the trade, in 1878, give to the existing business of sugar refining a much higher place among the industries of the country than was assigned to it by the Census relations of 1870, and indicate a present employment of some 10,000 men, and also that before the 1,500,000,000 lbs. of foreign sugar annually imported into this country, enter into consumption, the refiners expend, in order to make the same marketable to the people, an average of 1 cent per lb., or an aggregate of some \$15,000,000 per annum. And yet further, that of this grand annual expenditure, a very large proportion accrues to labor of a multifarious character, employed in a great part directly within the refineries."

Here is the statement of Mr. Wells, that the refiners of the United States expend about one cent per lb. in the conversion of the raw sugar into the refined article fit for the tables of the people. After pointing out, Sir, that the higher the grade of raw sugar imported the less "home labor"—as Mr. Wells called it—is employed upon it, and the

lower the grade the more home labor, Mr. Wells went on to apportion the expenditure in sugar refining as follows:

"For labor direct 30 per cent.; for packages the material for which are derived entirely from the northern States, 30 per cent.; fuel, coal, 12 per cent.; bone black, machinery, cartage &c., 28 per cent. The 1,500,000,000 lbs. of sugar annually refined in the United States, require the expenditure at the very least, for refining, of 1 cent per lb. on the average, or what is the same thing, \$15,000,000 per annum, which is directly disbursed by the domestic sugar refining interest on account of labor, materials and capital."

Then, coming to deal with a question which, to an economist like him, was of great importance, the question of the cost to the people of the sugar that is produced, he made this statement:

"The American sugar refiners, the magnitude and comparative rank of whose industry has already been noticed, claim—and their claim is generally admitted—that they can make refined sugar cheaper than it can at present be produced in Europe, or any other country; and it is a fact little known to the American public that, if the duties now levied on imported sugars were deducted, the American refiners do now actually sell their sugar, on an average, some 11 cents per 100 lbs. cheaper than do the refiners of England, which country now permits the importation of all sugars free of duty."

That was the statement of a gentleman who, as I have already said, has certainly always been accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite as an authority on matters of trade. But, Sir, he is not the only authority which may be cited as of importance on this subject of sugar refining. I shall cite the authority of the hon. Finance Minister of the late Government. You will remember, Sir, that when that hon. gentleman brought in his first Tariff in 1874, he included in it certain modifications of the duties on sugar. The Tariff at that time was:—equal to and above No. 9 Dutch Standard, 25 per cent *ad valorem*, and 1 cent per lb. specific; below No. 9, Dutch Standard, 25 per cent *ad valorem*, and a specific duty of $\frac{3}{4}$ cent per lb.; melado, cane juice, &c., 25 per cent *ad valorem* $\frac{5}{8}$ cent per lb. The proposal made by the hon. gentleman was as follows: Equal to and above No. 16, Dutch Standard, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb. and 25 per cent *ad valorem*; equal to and above 13 and below 16, 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents per lb. and 25 per cent *ad valorem*, the lower grades being left as they were before. That was the protection which the hon. gentleman proposed to give to the sugar refining industry under the Tariff which he brought down in 1874. But the hon. gentleman had some difficulty with some of his friends in the country, and I dare say the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gunn) who sits behind the Knight from Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) will remember some of the circumstances connected with that difficulty with his supporters, who believed that a Tariff of that kind would practically shut out the higher grades of sugar and give a complete monopoly to the refiners of Canada, there being at the time but one refiner in the country. A fortnight later the hon. gentleman came down with a complete change of his Tariff—a change so complete that no one would have recognized in the later proposals the proposals which were made at an earlier period. On that occasion he made this statement, according to the report of his speech, published in one of the newspapers:

"He then alluded to the controversy in the case of sugars, and the difficulties there were in dealing with the question, and, in consequence the Government had decided to defer for the present any action in the matter. They did not mean to say that they were satisfied with the existing state of things; but they recognized the serious practical difficulty which existed, and they would restore sugars to the position they occupied previously."

Now, Sir, here was an announcement, a regretful announcement, by the hon. gentleman that he was not able to give, practically, a monopoly to the sugar refining industry. Here was a regretful announcement that, although for the time being he was compelled to give up that idea, the subject would be considered, and probably he would be able to do something at a later period for the refineries. And he did

do something later. A year later—in 1875—the hon. gentleman, I think, without reference to Parliament at all—I speak from memory and therefore under correction—but on the authority of an Order in Council he altered the duties, and on the 10th of April a circular was issued to the Collectors of Customs announcing the change. The duties were changed in this way: All above 13, 1 cent per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; 9 to 13 inclusive, $\frac{3}{4}$ cents per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; below 9 and melado, $\frac{3}{8}$ cents per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman who made the speech on this subject to-day, will take the difference between those figures and make a comparison, such as he made in his speech, he will find on his method of reasoning that there was a very substantial protection to the refineries. It may be asked if the hon. gentleman made an arrangement of that kind; if he issued a circular to the Collectors of Customs reducing very low the duty on the raw material—which in fact, constitutes a protection to the refiners of the country—why, notwithstanding that protection, the refiners broke down? The reason was this: I have reason to think, though I do not know, that he was pressed at that time to go one step further and protect these refiners against the bounty which the drawback allowed in the United States practically gave to the refiners of that country; and the refiners broke down at that time almost as much from the absence of some protection against that concealed bounty, as from the absence of adequate protection in the arrangement of the duties themselves. I refer to this simply for the purpose of pointing out that at that time, in the earlier career of the hon. gentleman as a Finance Minister, he recognized that sugar refining in Canada was an industry to be protected; and, in the first instance, tried to induce Parliament to pass a Tariff which was, in itself, far more protective than the one now upon the Statute-Book; and that, failing in that, he subsequently issued a circular, by Order in Council, under which he gave a very materially improved protection to the sugar refiners of the country. Now, Sir, we have these two great authorities on political economy, and on the relations in which the Government should stand to the industries of the country, Mr. David A. Wells, of the United States, and the hon. member for Centre Huron, united—in the one case in a pamphlet, in the other case in the form of an attempt to get an Act of Parliament and afterwards by means of a departmental circular—as to the importance to the country of sugar refining. I think I may, therefore, assume that it is too late for hon. gentlemen opposite to take the ground that the refiners ought not to have some reasonable consideration in the arrangement of the duties, so that they may be enabled to continue their operations in the future as they have been doing for the last two or three years. The hon. member for Brant, in the course of his speech, made some reference to the great loss of revenue resulting from this Tariff, and took the year 1879 and 1880 as one of the years for his comparison. Now, the hon. gentleman, in dealing with this question on the floor of this House, can surely afford to be fair. I hold that the year 1879-80, the first complete year under the Tariff, is not a fair year for comparison in connection with any matter affecting the Customs duties. But we may go back, and we ought to go back, to the year 1877-78, the last complete year before the change of the Tariff, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. Now, I find that the duty paid on all kinds of sugar, in 1878, was \$2,584,379, and in 1881, was \$2,440,855, or a difference of \$143,524 in favor of the former year. That is to say, we apparently lost in duty last year, as compared with the last complete year before the Tariff was brought in, \$143,524. Of course, we all understand that this loss was due to the fact that in the former years the importations were almost entirely of the higher grades, and during the latter year almost entirely of the lower grades.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. PATERSON. You forget the extra lbs. imported in 1881.

Mr. WHITE. On the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the quantity of refined sugar which can be obtained from the lower grades of sugar, I do not think there is very much difference between the two. Now, Sir, the value of the sugar imported in 1878, was \$6,142,014, which was imported by the merchants of Canada, and the value, in 1881, was \$5,070,040, which was imported chiefly by or for the refiners, a difference in the value of the imported sugar of \$1,071,974 in favor of the former year. Now, it has been said by the hon. gentleman that this difference, and the difference in the duty, together make up the profit of the refiners. Let us look at this proportion. In 1881, there were imported altogether, of all kinds of sugar, 135,126,176 lbs., and, in 1878, 108,951,920, or a greater quantity, in 1881, by 26,174,256 lbs. But if we deduct the importations over 14, which may be said to include the finer grades of yellow sugar, and all white sugar, we shall find that the quantity of sugar imported mainly for refining purposes last year was 119,268,171 lbs. Now, Mr. David A. Wells, the prophet of political economy of hon. gentlemen opposite, states that it costs one cent a pound to refine sugar, and this conclusion he says he arrived at after a careful examination of the books of several refiners in the United States. If we assume that to be correct, what do we find? That there was expended in the operation of refining the sugar imported last year, \$1,192,681, or a difference between the cost of refining the sugar and the difference in the value of the quantity brought in in 1881 as compared with 1878, of \$22,817. That represents the profit to the refiners, over and above the expenditures that they have to make, and a reasonable interest on capital, instead of the enormous profit of \$1,417,000 referred to by the hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, how is that money expended? I believe I am right in stating that there are employed in connection with the four refineries in Canada, about 1,200 men; if you put the wages of these men at an average of a dollar a day—and that is very much less than most of these men are receiving—you will have no less than \$360,000 paid in wages by these sugar refiners. Then these refineries consume from 50,000 to 60,000 tons of coal per annum, and I think I am right in saying that the coal consumed, as to nine-tenths of it, is Nova Scotia coal; and if you put that at a value of \$3 a ton, which is a very low estimate, you have \$180,000 expended for coal. Another item in connection with sugar refining is cooerage, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, 350,000 barrels are annually required, of which the staves, hoops, and heads, are all of Canadian wood. I venture to think that hon. gentlemen will agree with me that a very important market has been given to certain classes of woods that, before the opening of refineries, had no market whatever in the country. In addition to that there were the horses employed, and the cartage, and the number of subsidiary trades, such as engineers, founders, carpenters, masons and others, employed in the various operations, and in the repairs connected with refining. All these things are so much direct advantage to the people of Canada, so much expenditure in the way of wages among them, which, under the system that prevailed when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, used to go to foreigners instead of to our people. I will ask this honorable House whether it is to the advantage of our people that that extra \$1,000,000, which is the difference between the value of importations in 1878 and to-day, is not very much more to the advantage of Canada, whether it does not conduce more to our prosperity, than if it were expended in the employment of people in the United States. We are told, however—and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will admit, at any rate, that it is to our advantage that millions of dollars should be expended in Canada if there were no

compensating disadvantages—that there are compensating disadvantages, that the price of sugar to the consumer is very much greater than it would have been had the former Tariff remained in force. We must, in the discussion of this question, assume that if hon. gentlemen opposite were transferred to this side of the House—and God forbid that such a calamity should befall the Dominion—that they would go back to the Tariff which they considered a proper Tariff when they were in power. I do not know whether the hon. member for South Brant would have any more influence with the coming Finance Minister—and if all the stories be true, he is not likely to be the late Finance Minister—than he had with the late Finance Minister; but, under any circumstances, we must, for the sake of argument, assume that the sugar duties would be restored to their former position. That being the case, we can deal with this question as a mere mathematical problem. The speculations and fine-drawn theories of the hon. gentleman as to how much refined sugar you can get out of raw sugar, and the profit resulting to the refiner, may be accurate; but, as the hon. gentleman himself knows, even so great a statesman and economist as Mr. Gladstone was compelled to confess this question was one very difficult of solution, and which taxed even his great ability to solve, if he did succeed in solving it. If we can mathematically establish the fact that the people of Canada are not paying more for their sugar than they would under the Tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, and without the refineries in Canada—basing our argument on the experience of the four years during which we had no refineries, and had the late Tariff—that is a method of dealing with this question which this honorable House and the country will consider much more satisfactory than the theories of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman was good enough to read from a speech of mine in which he says I was inaccurate in some figure that I gave, although he admits that I myself supplied the antidote by a table of figures which I presume he admits were absolutely correct, since he has not questioned their accuracy. When I spoke on the question outside this House, I stated that the table in which I gave the prices of sugars for the three periods, the 5th, the 15th and the 25th of each month from 1876 to 1879—that that table has never been challenged. It was prepared with very great care by experts in Montreal, and I believe it to be absolutely correct. I have not the speech to which the hon. gentleman refers in which he says the error of a figure occurred. Whether the error was made or not, the hon. gentleman admits that the table I gave was correct, because he checks my argument with my own tables. But take the last fifteen months, and if it be any object to hon. gentlemen, I can give the average for each month during that time. The averages are as follows:—

AVERAGE prices of granulated sugar in New York and Montreal during 1881, and first three months of 1882:—

	1881.	New York	Montreal.
January.....	\$ 9 49		\$ 9 60
February.....	9 16		9 33
March.....	9 29		9 16
April.....	9 38		9 04
May.....	9 87		9 36
June.....	10 54		10 23
July.....	10 08		10 12
August.....	9 76		9 41
September.....	10 01		9 31
October.....	10 06		9 22
November.....	9 72		9 24
December.....	9 29		9 22
1882.			
January.....	9 50		9 06
February.....	9 25		8 81
March.....	9 38		8 80
Average.....	9 65		9 33

The average price of granulated in New York for the whole fifteen months, was \$9.65 per 100 lbs., that is the whole of 1881 and the last three months of 1882. The average price in Montreal during the whole of these fifteen months, was \$9.33. My hon. friend from Kingston, who knows a good deal about these subjects, will be able to check me if I am wrong in these figures. The difference in favor of Montreal—and mind you that is not my argument—in the average of that period was 32 cents per 100 lbs. How would this have been under the old Tariff, supposing the refineries were all wiped out. I take the price in New York \$9.65, less the drawback, \$3.15, leaving a balance of \$6.50 as the gold price in bond for exportation. I add the Canadian duty under the late Tariff, 25 per cent., or \$1.62½; 1 cent a lb. specific, \$1 per 100 lbs.; and then the carriage which my hon. friend disputes, 30 cents per 100 lbs.

Mr. PATERSON. Leave that out.

Mr. WHITE. I will strike it out for the hon. gentleman in a little while, but I prefer to add it in the meantime for the purposes of this argument. The effect of the 30 cents is to make the several distributing points Canadian instead of American points. The price would have been, under these circumstances, \$9.42½, as the average price for the last fifteen months in Montreal, importing from New York and taking as basis the prices in New York with the duty and charges under the old Tariff added. The actual average price in Montreal during those fifteen months, was \$9.33. Thus the average price in Montreal for the last fifteen months of sugar was, on that basis, 9½ cents per lb. less than it would have been under the old Tariff, and if the refineries were not in existence. But, Sir, there is something to be added to this. During the four years when the Canadian refineries were silent, when nothing was being done in the way of refining in Canada, the average price of sugar, gold in bond, in New York, was \$6.19 per 100 lbs., that is with the drawback off. The average price in Canada of that American sugar, with duty and charges paid, was \$9.62 per 100 lbs. These are the actual prices in the two places irrespective of any calculation. Now, Sir, what should have been the price under the late Tariff, the duty was \$2.55, calculated on the basis of 25 per cent and one cent per lb. and the carriage—the hon. gentleman will allow me to include it—30 cents, making together \$3.04. But the actual price was \$9.62, so that we paid no less than 58 cents in addition for general business of the merchant, his profit, the profit of the middleman, the wholesale merchant—my hon. friend from Kingston, for instance, who was a distributor in Canada for the products of the refineries of New York—in order to account for the ruling price in Canada. Fifty-eight cents is the actual result under a calculation, which is not a mere estimate, which is no fine-drawn theory, but which is the actual result ascertained; that is, if you take the average price, in gold, in bond, in New York for the four years before our refineries were opened, and add the duty under the old Tariff, and the 30 cents charges—I am bound to say that these are included—we have then still to add 58 cents as the profit of the merchants, who became the distributors in Canada for this sugar, in order to bring it up to the price which we paid for the American sugar during that time. Now, if we add 50 cents—and I have shown that it was 58 cents—to the average during these four years, what do we find? That during the last fifteen months the cost of this American sugar in Canada, under the late Customs Tariff, when our refineries were out of existence, would have been 59½ cents per 100 lbs. more than we paid in Canada during these fifteen months for Canadian refined sugar. Now, Sir, I will ask you whether that simple statement of facts—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has not Redpath's sugar to be distributed in the same manner as the American sugar was distributed?

Mr. WHITE. No, not in the same way.

Mr. PATERSON. It has to be distributed here.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, the smallest dealers in Ontario can and do buy sugar direct from the refiners.

Mr. PATERSON. But not at your prices.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, at these prices. There is no such distribution as the hon. gentleman speaks of, and that is the real ground of opposition to this Tariff on the part of my hon. friend from Kingston. If the wholesale merchants had this profit on the Montreal or Halifax or Moncton refined sugar, there would be no complaint about this Tariff at all. They are patriotic enough to desire, if they can make the same profits, that the expenditure on the refining should be made in Canada, instead of the United States; but it is because the smallest dealer almost comes into direct contact with the refiners here, which he did not do under the former state of things, that this difference takes place. I think, under these circumstances, I may fairly say that this is a sufficient answer to the argument of the hon. gentleman. But I will take the last three months, bringing it down to date; and I find that the average price of granulated sugar, in New York, was, for January, \$9.50; February, \$9.25, and March, \$9.38 per 100 lbs., making the average for the three months, \$9.38. I also find that in Montreal, during the same period, the average price was: For January, \$9.06; February, \$8.81, and March, \$8.86, or an average for these three months of \$8.89 per 100 lbs. Taking the comparison for these three months on the same basis, and taking the price at New York, and adding the old Tariff and the charges to which I have referred, and 50 cents for intermediate profit, I find that the cost of sugar would have been, in Canada, during the last three months, if we had had to import it under the old Tariff from the United States instead of refining it in Canada, the price, I say would have been \$9.59. While the average price in the city of Montreal was \$8.89, or a difference in favor of Montreal of 70 cents per 100 lbs.

Mr. PATERSON. Add another \$1 for contingencies, and you will have \$10.59.

Mr. WHITE. Then, Sir, I take the price of granulated sugar on Monday last—and this will bring the matter within the cognizance of any hon. gentleman who is engaged in the business or who knows anything personally about the subject, from contact with it, and I find that on Monday last the price of granulated sugar in New York was \$9.62½, while the price in Montreal was \$9.14; and taking the same process which I have pursued in the other case, and it will be seen that the price of this New York sugar, if it was brought in and the duties paid on it under the old Tariff, no refineries being in existence in Canada, would have been \$9.89 per 100 lbs., the Montreal price being \$9.14, or a difference in favor of the Canada consumer of 75 cents per 100 pounds. Now, Sir, that is in relation to granulated sugar. I venture to say, with regard to yellows, the case is still stronger in favor of the Canadian consumer, but granulated being the standard sugar, I have made up the calculation with regard to it. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman will probably ask—as he has asked before—when an argument similar to this was presented: where is the necessity for this protective Tariff, if we are getting our sugar cheaper than we would have done under the old Tariff, with the charges added? Why could we not have this state of things continued under the old Tariff, the hon. gentleman may say. Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is a very simple one. The reason why we have to put on this protection is simply this: that, in view of the much larger refining business done in the United States than is done here, of

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

1,500,000,000 lbs. of sugar being refined there, instead of 100,000,000 and some odd which are refined here, these refiners are and would be most anxious to cut away, if they could, this competition, or rather this home market, from Canada, in order that they might have the Canadian sugar market for themselves as they had it before; and until they were able to break down our refiners, they would be willing to give us our sugar a little cheaper. There can be no doubt about that; but what would we gain? Our refiners would soon be broken down, and then they would do as they did during these four years I have mentioned—charge us higher prices—the regular standard prices of their own market, and we would be obliged to pay higher prices for our sugar, with that inestimable privilege, as it appears to be according to hon. gentlemen opposite, of seeing spent \$1,000,000 among the work-people of the United States instead of among the work-people of Canada. Now Sir, what has been and what is the result of this policy. As I have said, I do not desire to detain the House at any length in connection with this subject; but, according to David A. Wells, a high authority for Free Trade, sugar refining is an important industry which ought to be protected, and according to the older view of the late hon. Minister of Finance, the member for Centre Huron, sugar refining is an industry which ought to be protected by such arrangements under the Tariff as may be made for that purpose. We have thus the opinion, as I have said before, of two very high authorities on the subject of political economy in favor of the principle of protection to our refiners. We have secured the expenditure within this country instead of the United States—on the basis of Mr. Wells' statement that it costs one cent, expended in the act of refining in order to produce refined from the raw sugar—of \$1,000,000, which was formerly expended in connection with foreign refineries. We have built up a West India trade and are building up a South American trade, which the hon. member for South Brant thinks is a matter of no consequence, and regarding which I venture to differ from him. We have not materially affected the revenue, because, as I have shown, the difference in the revenue for 1878 and 1881 is only some \$140,000. We have done all this, Sir, and we have secured for the people of Canada at the same time, as cheap—aye, cheaper, sugar than they would have had if we had not refineries in Canada at all, and had been compelled to import our sugar from the other side. I think that in view of these facts, we may very fairly say that this is a policy which the people of Canada are interested in maintaining, and not in destroying; and I think that we may fairly, under these circumstances, vote down the resolution which the hon. gentleman has presented to this House. The hon. gentleman read a quotation from a speech I delivered, in which I referred to the fact, that the strength and wealth of a nation was to be found in the strength and wealth of the individuals in that nation, and he calls that Tory doctrine. I am bound to say that if it is, I am a Tory. I say most decidedly—and I repeat it here—that the strength and wealth of a nation is to be found in the strength and wealth of individuals in that nation. But this does not say, and it does not follow, that this only means the strength and wealth of two or three people; but what does it mean.

Mr. PATERSON. There are only four sugar refineries.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman exclaims that there are only four sugar refineries, but there were merchants in Canada who made more in a single year than those refineries made. I may be excused for alluding to the late Mr. Forster, of Hamilton, who, in a single year, made as much more money in importing sugar, in watching the market and looking after it, and he employed comparatively nobody in the doing of it. There was no \$1,000,000 then expended among the people of this country. These hon. gentlemen consider that

there is no merit in making money, by employing labor and taking a fair profit off of that employment. They seem to think the money ought only to be made by rigging the Stock Exchange, or in lending money on mortgages at as high a rate of interest as they can get, or in speculating in lands in the North-West, as hon. gentlemen opposite are doing, and perhaps some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—I am not among the number—as well. They seem to think that the very moment a man undertakes to employ labor, and make a profit out of its employment, that instant he becomes an enemy of his country. That appears to be Liberal doctrine. Now, Sir, if that is Liberal doctrine, then I am not a Liberal. I prefer what the hon. gentleman has called the Tory doctrine; that the best interests of this country are to be found in the promotion of the wealth of the people of the country, and in the promotion of that wealth in such a way as to give employment to the people of the country, and to the largest possible number of them, instead of merely employing the comparative few who are used as middlemen in the distribution of the foreign goods which are brought into the country. That Mr. Speaker, is the distinction which I see between the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite and the policy which we favor on this side of the House. I may say, here, that when I was addressing the House on the Budget debate, I made some reference to Mr. Peter Redpath, provoked by the reference which was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Well, Sir, I find that the story which has been going about as to Mr. Redpath having purchased Chiselhurst, has not a word of truth in it; neither as an owner, nor as an occupant, nor as a tenant, has he anything to do with that magnificent establishment. He has bought for himself a quiet, unassuming, modest residence on the other side of the water, where he is living; and I only hope that before long we may have him back again amongst us. I do not desire to detain the House further, Mr. Speaker, but I think I have shown by figures, and not by fine-drawn theories similar to those of the hon. gentleman, that we are not promoting any injury to this country by the policy which has been happily adopted in connection with sugar refining; but that, on the contrary, we are thereby securing the material advantage of the country, as well as of the great mass of the consumers, who are better off than they would have been if the old policy had been in force, and our refineries were all destroyed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I beg to lay on the Table the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Royal Commission.

Mr. BLAKE. I perceive that this is not the report, but only the evidence. May I ask the hon. gentleman when the report will come down, because I observe that this does not contain the exhibits or written portion of the evidence, and therefore, it is very important that we should get the remaining documents as soon as possible.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was placed in my hands for submission to the House, and, from what I heard the other day, I thought that it was the report; but the rest will no doubt be placed before the House on Tuesday next.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 68) further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 81) relating to the Canada Southern Bridge.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 71) to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Managers of the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland," and amendments thereto.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 86) to amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to authorize the said Company to erect a bridge across the Ottawa River.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 134) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western Railway Company (from the Senate).—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 87) respecting a certain agreement between the Canadian Securities Company and the Liquidators of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Brooks.)

Bill (No. 30) an Act to empower the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company to wind up their affairs, and to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the dissolution of the said Company.—(Mr. Rochester.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 138) to incorporate The Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited) to issue preferential shares.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Rapid City Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bannerman.)

THE SUGAR DUTIES.

House resumed the consideration of Mr. Paterson's proposed amendment to Sir Leonard Tilley's motion for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GUNN. In rising to support the amendment of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) I feel, after the able manner in which he has presented the question of duties on sugar there is not a great deal to add. I have also to congratulate the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who has proved himself to be an able advocate for the refiners, though I think I shall be able to prove that he has not advocated the interests of his constituents. The Tariff as regards sugar shows a large loss to the revenue, while the consumer has to pay more for the article. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) referred to the refiners in New York, and he quoted from Mr. Wells, who is undoubtedly a high authority. On this point we might compare the prices in New York and Montreal. Take the last two years in New York, fair refining sold at 7½ cents; the average price of granulated was 9½ cents, or a difference of 2 cents. They paid a duty to the Government of \$2.45 per 100; our refineries paid a duty of \$1.70—a difference of 75 cents. The average price in Montreal for fair refining was 7 cents, and the average price for granulated was 9½ cents—a difference of 2½ cents in Montreal, against 2 cents in New York. In one of his speeches, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said the average price of granulated sugar in 1879 was 9 cents in Montreal. It was that year in New York an average in bond of \$5 64, with a duty of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, and 1 cent per lb.,

making \$8.05, or 95 cents less than Montreal. The lowest price in Montreal that year was \$8.25, and the lowest price in New York was \$4.84 in bond, the duty being \$2.21, making \$7.05, or \$1.20 less than Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but when he speaks of sugar being laid down in Montreal, does he include the freight charges?

Mr. GUNN. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). And nothing for merchants' profits?

Mr. GUNN. No. The hon. gentleman said there was a profit to the merchant of 58 cents, but there is not a profit of 56 cents, or even 51 cents, only about 1 per cent. to 1½ per cent., 10 cents to 15 cents per 100 lbs. is nearer the average obtained by merchants for selling sugar, as he will find if he makes enquiry. I would like very much to know where the hon. gentleman got the information on which he based these statements. There is a wide divergence between some of his statements and the facts, and I think he should explain to the House, for many of his statements have no reference at all to the question at issue. The question is not a party question but a question for the country at large—a question of political economy that we should all study. I do not think we are here as the advocates of the sugar refineries, but of the people who sent us here—the consumers. We have nothing to do with the refiners. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his speech of 1881, said that the refiners handled 300,000 barrels, which would be about 88,000,000 lbs. out of a total, entered for home consumption, of 117,000,000 lbs., or a proportion of three-quarters of the entire trade. We may estimate the amount last year, including the two new refineries, at 5 to 10 per cent. more. The hon. the Finance Minister has not brought down a statement, this year, to show us how much the refiners manufactured. Considering the large protection which he give these people, I think they should afford more information; and it is due to the House that we should have that information. The hon. member for Cardwell tells us about the number of coopers and workmen employed, and everything else, except what we want to know. He says it costs 1 cent per lb. to manufacture sugar in New York; if so, it should be manufactured for less in Montreal, because wages and other expenses are less there than in New York. Then we hear a great deal about cheap sugar. During the last two years and a-half, sugar has been cheaper in the primary markets than it has been in any year since 1868. During that period the average cost price has been \$3.63. For the last two years we imported an average of 126,000,000 lbs. each year, which, at \$3.63, would cost \$4,507,640, on which the duty received was \$2,353,169. During the last six years, prior to 30th June, 1879, under a revenue Tariff, we imported an average of 109,000,000 lbs., at a cost of \$4.90 per 100 lbs., or a total cost of \$5,348,490; prior to June 30th, 1879, 109,000,000 lbs., with \$2,352,169 duty, 70 cents more duty under the old Tariff than under the new. It will thus be seen that during the last two years and a-half the price of sugar in the primary markets was \$1.27 less per 100 lbs. than during the previous six years, and the duty was 70 cents more. During the last two years the price of fair refining sugar at New York was 7½ cents per lb., and granulated 9½ cents. If you deduct a cent, which the hon. member for Cardwell says is the cost of refining, you will have 8½ cents. Then deduct ½ cent to reduce raw for refining to granulated, and you have only \$7.66 or 9 cents per 100 lbs. less than New York refiners paid the past two years, and I think this ought to show to the House and the country that there is a large loss to the revenue, and that the people should get their sugar cheaper than they are getting it. If we reduce 136,000,000 lbs. to granulated sugar, we would have 119,000,000

Mr. GUNN.

lbs. The price in Montreal last year, up to the 30th of June, averaged \$9.70, which would make the cost of that quantity \$11,597,496, while the same 119,000,000 lbs. brought in from New York at the current price there, \$6.58, would have cost us \$7,853,604, showing a difference between the cost of Montreal and at New York of \$3,743,892. How much duty did we get from this? By the Government's own return, we find that we received \$2,459,141. This shows a loss of \$1,284,751; but that does not show all the loss, because in this 136,000,000 lbs. there are 15,880,000 lbs. above number 14, which is squeezed into the country, and on which we are charged \$2.66 per 100 lbs. duty. Let me tell, hon. gentlemen opposite that this is not a party question but a public question, and when they go to the polls they will hear more of it. I was going on to show how the apparent loss of duty to the country does not show the whole loss. There are 15,885,005 lbs. which paid \$2.66 duty, or 96 cents more than refiners paid. It is a well-known fact to the large trade—take Liverpool—that the refiner will buy a dark sugar equal to No. 12 at 24s. and produce a larger quantity than he received of a brighter color and sell it for 2s. less. But the hon. member for Cardwell said: "We give you yellows cheaper." How are we to know that? It is easy to say you have cheaper sugar when we can prove we ought to have cheaper sugar. If the primary market is down a cent we must get it cheaper. 15,855,005 lbs. paid \$152,236 in the fiscal year of 1881 more than it would pay if it came through the hands of refiners, making a total loss of \$1,436,987. Compare prices with New York for the present year ending 30th June, 1881, with prices in Montreal. Let us ascertain what sugar would have cost from New York, taking last year's trade. 136,406,593 lbs. of all kinds were entered for consumption, equal to 119,335,699 lbs. granulated. At \$9.70, the price in Montreal, this would give \$11,577,502. The same quantity at \$6.58, the price in New York, would amount to \$7,853,604, or \$3,723,898 less than in Montreal. Deduct duty collected \$2,459,141 from this, and the loss to the country is \$1,264,757. The 15,855,005 lbs. which paid \$2.66 duty or 96 cents more than the refiners paid, amounting to \$152,236, will, in future, go into the hands of the refiners under the operation of the Tariff, and thus produce an additional loss to that amount, which, added to the \$1,284,751, makes a total loss of \$1,436,987 to this country. Had the 119,000,000 lbs. been brought from New York as granulated and paid duty under the old revenue Tariff, 25 per cent. and 1 cent on the New York value in bond \$6.58, or \$2.64 duty, it would not have produced \$3,150,990, or \$691,549 more duty than we received, as compared with the old Tariff. Add to this 48 cents per 100 lbs., excess of price over New York, \$592,902. What duty would have been paid had the whole been entered at \$2.66, the rate at which the 15,855,005 lbs. had been entered? After allowing for difference in grade, there would be 125,000,000 lbs. at \$2.66, and we would have had a duty of \$3,325,000, instead of \$2,459,141 collected, showing a loss of \$865,859. It is proven by your own returns that you tax sugar, \$3,325,000 one-fourth of which taxes go direct to the refiners and the other three-fourths only reach the Treasury. You have made laws to tax sugar, a necessary of life, that should be taxed only for revenue, every cent put on it should go direct into the Treasury. Can you not see the refiners are working against you? 11½ per cent. is permitted to enter the Custom house at \$2.66, the remainder, 88½ per cent.—the great bulk—being farmed out to the refiners at \$1.70. I have a Customs return for six months ending 31st December last, excluding British Columbia, which shows 71,350,677 lbs. entered for home consumption paying \$1,216,436 duty, less than half the duty paid on 54,000,000 in 1878, one-third more of sugar under your 30 and 35 per cent. Tariff, paying less than 25 per cent. Tariff, produced in the last

half of 1878. In that year 108,000,000 lbs. paid \$2,567,803 duty. This year, with the trade pointing to 140,000,000 lbs. under the same Tariff, you would get \$3,500,000. Estimating the current six months at the same as the first six months, you will barely get \$2,500,000, or \$1,000,000 less than you should. Now, if you will compare trade tables for the first six months to the 31st December, 1881, with the prior twelve months ending 31st June, you will see that the trade has almost entirely passed into the refiners hands. For the fiscal year 1881, there was only entered, above No. 14, about 15,000,000 lbs. at \$2.66, or 11½ per cent. of the entire consumption. What have you got for the subsequent six months? Only 2,404,113 lbs., a small moiety, barely 3½ per cent., paying \$2.47 duty, the remaining 69,000,000 lbs. being entered at \$1.68. At the same ratio in which the trade has been seized by the refiners within the past six months, we will not be left 1 per cent. for the trade outside refiners the coming year. Does not this show that your Tariff is against the interest of the country? You have established your sub-treasuries, your branch Custom-house, you have taxed the people of this country and do not get the taxes. You have introduced a system similar to that which exists in countries governed by the Turks. You have appointed your middleman to collect your taxes. You would naturally suppose, that with a tax of 30 to 35 per cent. on sugar against a revenue Tariff of 25 per cent., besides specific duty, to get more revenue, but you do not—it is a misleading Tariff. In the jury that framed it there was no Matthew Hill, no miller with his dusty coat. It was a pecked jury. You promised, in 1878, to adjust the Tariff in the interests of the country. You have not done so. You have adjusted it in the interests of individuals, you have introduced monopoly into this country, and a system of taxation that existed prior to the great Reform Bill of 1832. You have taunted us with being a small body. If we are a small body, our principles will stand. You may crush us and leave us but a baker's dozen, but that baker's dozen will fight for the interests of the country and not be ashamed to fight for those interests. Though we are a small body, we are not ashamed to follow in the footsteps of the right hon. leader of the Government in England to-day. Where was he six years ago? Was he not laughed at? We are not afraid to copy from him. We saw him go to the country in opposition to a strong Government under its late able and lamented leader. With very little hopes of success he came back with an enormous majority. The Government was overturned. We expect the same fate as that which greeted the Liberal party in England then, for when these questions are discussed and understood in the country the people will give us their support. In your election campaign in 1878 you did not state fairly the questions at issue. You seduced the people from their affections. You seduced Reform constituencies that had been Reform for 50 years. Those counties will go back to their first love as soon as they have an opportunity. Stronger Governments than yours have been broken in a shorter time. I remember when I was in France in 1868, two short years before the fall of the French Empire, I was dining with gentlemen who asked me what sort of a Government we had. I said our Government is the in-and-outs—whoever can carry it on the cheapest. I was proud of my country. I was proud of seeing the Conservative Government, as I thought, doing their duty. "Mon Dieu!" he said: "What would you do if you had a despot at your throat?" That strong Government in two years melted like snow before the sun. We had a Conservative Government in 1867, who revised the sugar Tariff. It was so odious, that both Conservatives and Reformers united to substitute for it a revenue Tariff. That remained in existence during their own Administration. They saw no reason to change it. Why did they finally change it? Certainly not because the people asked

for a change, but it was changed in the interest of the refiners, of those who are interested in taking money out of the pockets of the people. Now, let us see how much duty you get under this Tariff. Supposing you had taken the whole of this sugar entered under No. 14, the 120,500,000 lbs., at the rate of \$2.66, which you charged on the 16,000,000, you would have got a duty of \$3,325,000, instead of the \$2,459,141 collected; that is to say, if the 136,000,000 lbs. paid duty at the average of what was entered over 14. This shows a loss of \$865,859 to the revenue. The present Tariff yields a revenue of only about two-thirds to the Treasury of the country, while the remaining third goes into the pockets of the refiners. The 71,000,000 lbs. imported during the six months ending 31st of December last paid a duty of \$1,216,436, less than half the duty paid on 54,000,000 lbs. in 1878. Then you had 25 per cent., and now you have 30 and 35 per cent., but still you get less revenue from the larger quantity. In 1878, we imported 108,000,000 lbs., which paid a duty of \$2,567,803. This year, with a prospective importation of 141,000,000 lbs., if we can keep up the quantity that came in during the last six months, which quantity would yield, under the former Tariff, a duty of \$3,500,000; instead of that you will barely get \$2,500,000 probably not so much, perhaps \$1,100,000 less than you should get. I pointed out to the House when the Tariff was introduced, that you would have a loss to the revenue. I think I have shown very clearly that you will have a large loss. Take the 120,500,000 lbs. entered last year at \$1.70; if it paid the same duty as the 15,000,000 lbs. you would have had \$3,349,965, or \$890,124 more. The hon. member for Cardwell said the New York people would cut sugars to get our trade. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the sugar trade is so large in that single port, the largest sugar port in the world, where they handled over 600,000 tons last year, that there is no cutting in sugar sold at its fair value every day on the market. The exports from the States, out of a total trade of 1,000,000 tons, amounted to less than 1 per cent. of the exports from all ports, or only 8,242 tons. Two cents was the average difference in New York between fair refining and granulated during 1880 and 1881, and only \$1.88 in 1879. According to the New York, shipping list Canadian refiners paid at least 75c. or ¾c. less duty than American refiners on the quantity handled by them, 110,000,000 tons, showing \$825,000 in their favor. With these remarks I think I will take my seat.

Mr. McLENNAN. I listened with great interest to the lucid statement of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn). His figures are very well in hand. It is true he does not surprise us with the oratorical music that we get from the hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Paterson); but his sugar question is one of figures, and with the exception that my hon. friend is a little astray upon some historical points, I think his figures are very instructive. That little incident that occurred in France calls to mind the fact, that if there are two Governments in this country just now, my hon. friend belongs to the Government of the Grits. With respect to Mr. Gladstone, I believe it is pretty well known that his financial policy, as it relates to sugar, is one that has varied very much according to times and circumstances, just as the Tariff of the hon. Minister of Finance has done, and that in its essential features to-day it is very much like the Tariff that exists in this country. I think my hon. friend is quite as far astray in his historical reference to the reforms of 1832 and 1834. I do not know that our sugar duties are upon any different basis than that of the rest of mankind except that they are for our own interest. But the figures of my hon. friend prove very conclusively two or three things. I think they give some account of the change that came over the dreams of the late Minister of Finance. I have no doubt that Kingston was a very important constituency in the country at that time, and was a centre of a very large sugar trade, and I can sympathize

with the feeling that my hon. friend from Kingston expresses with respect to that number of millions of sugar above No. 14 that has been squeezed into the country with so much difficulty and bother. I have no doubt the hon. member would like very much that a larger quantity of sugar above No. 14 would be brought into the country without squeezing, and I think the difference between the profits of the sugar trade to the importers and the process by which the sugar trade is made tributary to many other industries in this country epitomises the whole question of difference between the policy of Free Trade and the policy of Protection. The hon. gentleman is very much exercised about the amount of money that is lost between the places of collection and the Treasury. I should like to know if the collection of Customs costs any more, in proportion, to-day than it did in 1878?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not so much.

Mr. McLENNAN. If that be so, all the talk about \$1,000,000 lost between wind and water, falls to the ground. The essential difference between the Tariff that exists to-day and the Tariff in 1878, is the higher duty upon the higher class of sugars, and the different methods of valuation, by which higher classes of sugar do not come into this country at a reduced valuation after the bounty was taken off, as they did formerly, leaving that bounty to be divided between the dealer in New York and the importer in Canada. Whereas to-day larger quantities of sugar are brought into this country in cheap form, with this result that the shipowners who carry large quantities of raw material, and who bring up coal from Nova Scotia and other places, have some interest in it. The coal miner gets his wages out of it, the sugar refiner has his profit, every man that he employs has his toll out of it, thousands of people employed as coopers, draymen, and in other businesses connected with the preparation of that sugar for market; and the difference amounts to this: that whereas, under the old system, the profits were divided between the New York shipper and the importer in this country, the difference in this country being only that which went out of the Treasury, to-day, a very large part of that difference and a very large amount of money are contributed among the hard-working people of this country; and, as I said before, it is an epitome of the entire system of Finance that prevails in this country to-day. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) has said that wages and expenses are less in Montreal than in New York. If they are less, I should like to know if there is not business ability enough in this country to produce pressure and competition that will prevent us from paying a higher price for sugar than becomes necessary in this state of things. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was willing to drop this question of price, whether it was cheaper or dearer. It is impossible for a man like myself to keep in his mind tabulated statements of the prices of sugar from month to month, but we can form our opinion on these factors which enter into the method by which the price of sugar, as of everything else, is regulated; and this House may accept as a matter of fact that the methods of trade, the means of competition, and every incident that modern life brings into exercise will keep those interests right, and there is no danger of any great monopoly overwhelming us with all those powers of control within our own hands.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understood the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House said that the system of the taxation of sugar which Mr. Gladstone adopted in England was substantially the same as ours. Did the hon. gentleman say that?

Mr. McLENNAN. I believe it is as variable as that of the hon. gentleman who is speaking:

Mr. McLENNAN.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. "It is substantially the same as ours" is what the hon. gentleman said. I was informed by the public press, which is not always very reliable, it is true, that there was no duty at all in England just now, and I am not aware the duty has been reimposed during the current Session. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, whose information is somewhat antiquated, will revise his calculations before he again addresses the House on the subject of sugar. I do not much wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite find this a rather sore subject. It is truly, as the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) said, an epitome of this fiscal system. The Government have added 25 per cent. to the taxes. They have obtained 25 per cent. less revenue, and the people have been called to pay 30 per cent. higher prices. There is, in brief, the grand triumph of financial genius exemplified in every point, precisely as we told the country it would be, and precisely as it is the nature of such a system to be. I would like to call the attention of the House to some one of the dozen or so of fallacies set forth in the course of the discussion. Who was the framer of the late Tariff? It was not framed by me, for I found it in existence. It was produced by hon. gentlemen opposite who altered the Tariff and made it less favorable to refiners, and who, if any persons were responsible, were responsible for the extinction of that industry. It was stated by the hon. member for Cardwell that the Montreal refinery had been shut up for four years. My recollection is that the refinery was shut up a year and a-half and no longer, and I do not hesitate to say that I believe, particularly after the small alteration that was made in 1875, that refinery might, if no political reason and if no greed for greater gain had intervened, might have been run profitably to the end of the chapter. "But," said the hon. member for Cardwell, "we have one industry employing \$500,000 worth of capital which was kept idle for four years." Had that statement been true, it would have been infinitely better for the country that this capital should have been kept idle rather than \$1,250,000 should have been lost during three or four years for the sake of keeping that industry alive. It is not good economy, it is not prudence; it is not common sense to pay out of the public pocket \$5,000,000 in three or four years for the sake of keeping alive an industry which, according to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), represented \$500,000 of capital. Sir, let us see what this industry has cost the country, what it is costing the country and what it is likely to cost the country. But first let me call the attention of the House to this fact. Undoubtedly we had no wish to deprive the city of Montreal or the people of Canada of any industry whatever. It is true that we went rather out of our way to give this industry a chance under the peculiar circumstances that then prevailed, because it was true that at that time a very extraordinary bounty was granted by the United States, which, however, was subsequently very greatly reduced. It is true that, perhaps, we went a little too far in our zeal for that industry, but our policy was to do justice and act fairly by this industry so far as we could. What we would not do was to tax the whole people of Canada at the rate of millions of dollars for the benefit of three or four refiners. We considered that question well; we saw that the demands of the sugar refiners were extortionate and oppressive, and we refused to grant them. I believe, and I have good reason for believing, that that industry could have gone on and would have gone on if there had not been certain political reasons, and a desire to obtain greater plunder from the people. But be that as it may, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) talks of the changes which were made in the sugar duties, and the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) said the late Government had changed their sugar duties a dozen times. All Governments have changed their sugar duties time and time again,

and it is true that some make more changes, although but small ones. But, with respect to this question, allow me to remind the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who talks of inconsistency and changes, that we can recollect certain remarkable changes in the spirit of his dream. I can recollect that in 1873, when the paper, of which that hon. gentleman was editor, was for a time—though not for a long time—engaged in denouncing that infamous transaction known as the Pacific Scandal. I can remember quite well that he was whipped into the traces very soon, and now he is a peaceable and humble servant of the people he then denounced. I can remember that that hon. gentleman, when it was inconvenient for the Government to raise the trade question, was a strong advocate of a 15 per cent. Tariff, and he declared in public that he could conceive no earthly reason for protecting any industry in Canada which could not get on with a 15 per cent. Tariff. These are curious persons to talk of changes in the sugar Tariff. As regards hon. gentlemen opposite, I could point out at least a dozen different changes within the space of a few years, and I dare say we will see a good many more if it should happen that they shall continue in power. It might also interest the House to remember that when a change was proposed in 1874, the organ of these hon. gentlemen, the *Mail* newspaper, was the first to declare that:

"It is not of such protection that it should lead to the establishment of a couple of monopolies in a country, nor can it be contended that sugar refining is a Canadian manufacture in the sense in which these words are generally understood."

The present editor of the *Mail*, when examined before the Committee presided over by my hon. friend, was good enough to say that its geographical position was against the Canadian refiner, and that there were very good reasons why Canadian refiners could never compete with the American refiners. I listened with some astonishment to the calculations made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). That hon. gentleman on more than one occasion has indulged the House with some of the most remarkable financial calculations. I recollect that that hon. gentleman posed for five or six years as a financial critic, but scarcely a year had elapsed before we discovered that that hon. gentleman, in common with the Minister of Railways and Canals, positively did not know the difference between the Supply Bill and the Estimates brought down to Parliament every year. I do not myself entertain any great respect for the financial lucubration of such a pair of critics as those. I take one calculation that the hon. member indulged in. He said that Mr. Wells, who undoubtedly is a man of large research and wide study, said that sugar cost about one cent to refine. Then, said the hon. gentleman, we imported 136,000,000 lbs. last year at a cost of \$5,110,000. Of that, 16,000,000 lbs. were imported in a state fit for consumption, leaving 120,000,000 lbs. or thereabouts to be refined, at a cost of \$1,100,000. That makes \$6,220,000. To this, Sir, you may add a duty on the sugar which, as the hon. gentleman will remember, was refined in this country, of \$2,459,000. Now, if you take the cost of the first sugar you find that, including the cost of refining, the apparently total cost would be, in round numbers, \$7,250,000, including the duty, and the cost of refining. That was the sum the people of Canada paid for that. My hon. friend who was speaking lately (Mr. Gunn) could tell us that it cost the people of Canada in the neighborhood of \$8,750,000, and that there is \$1,500,000 which, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) truly said, was either wasted or went into the pockets of the refiners. It may not have all gone into their pockets, but if not it was because they did not know how to refine the sugar so as to enable them to compete with the refiners of other countries. I take another of the hon. gentleman's calculations. He declared that in New York, sugar was selling on the average last year at \$9.65 per 100 lbs.; that in Montreal it was selling at \$9.33, and he proceeded

to show that after paying the duty and making certain extraordinary allowances, to which I will afterwards call attention, the prices in New York of the sugar free in bond would be higher than the prices in Montreal, including the allowances. Now, we will see how that calculation will work out. Recollect that he admits that this class of sugar in Montreal costs \$9.33, and he admits also that in New York it cost in bond, \$6.15. He declares, correctly, I think, that \$2.62 would represent the tax on the very highest quality of sugar—the highest that we are granulating—at a duty upon the quality, under our Tariff, which cost \$8.77 as against \$9.33 at Montreal prices, being a difference of 56 cents in favor of New York, with the additional duty as imposed under the old Tariff. How did the hon. gentleman attempt to get round this? Why, by adding 30 or 35 cents for the charges from New York to points in Canada, when we know that in the great sugar-consuming districts of Canada it is quite as cheap to get sugar from New York as it is from Montreal. That is a geographical fact which all the alterations, all the acts, and all the arguments of hon. gentlemen cannot affect one jot or tittle. Now, Sir, remember that \$2.62 per 100 lbs. would have brought at least one-fourth, probably one-third, more revenue than the people of Canada are getting under the present Tariff. So that we have, first, an extra cost to the people of 56 cents on every 100 lbs., and a loss to the people of the difference between the sum the refiners pay and the sum that would have been collected under the old Tariff, and these two together would considerably exceed \$1 per 100 lbs. on every single 100 lbs. at present refined in Canada for consumption in Canada. Sir, all these gentlemen argue against competition with the United States. Have they forgotten that a very large amount of the sugar that came into Canada in former days came from England, where there was no duty, and no bounty in favor of the refiners; and do they not know that the English trade, which was a very large one, is being wholly cut off for the sake of these same refiners? They tell us that they only want to discriminate against the Americans. It is true they have put an absolutely prohibitive tax on all sugar coming from the United States, but they have likewise cut off very large receipts of sugar which formerly came from England. Now, Sir, as to how many persons are interested in this industry. I observe that these hon. gentlemen do not condescend to give the details; but we know from unexceptionable authority—from Mr. Wells' statement, from the reports made by the Glasgow refiners, and from statements made to Mr. Gladstone and other persons—that in the actual work of refining, as understood and practised in England, a little more than 300 men are ample. That does not take into account the number employed in cooperage, as to which I have been unable to obtain accurate details; but even supposing that 300 or 400 more were employed in that way, it is quite clear that the total number employed is quite insignificant as compared with the burden on the people. As to the freight, the only possible question is the difference in the freight on the quantity of raw sugar and the quantity of refined sugar brought in, which may be put roughly at 10 per cent.; and I think we got, and would get, as large a proportion of freightage in former times as we get now. I believe there may be a few vessels coming into Halifax that did not come before, but a very few I am told, and quite insignificant, compared with the burden placed on the people by this tax. Sir, this question is alleged to be a complicated question. There are very complicated questions connected with the subject, no doubt; nobody has been able exactly to ascertain what quantity of refined sugar can be produced from certain quantities of raw sugar—that Mr. Redpath and other refiners have refused to communicate, and doubtless with good reason—but we know, as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) truly stated, that there are certain classes of sugar

brought in by refiners out of which they actually produce a larger quantity in pounds than they import.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. They are so manipulated in the manufacture that that result is produced, and I believe the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Bunting) testified to that effect. But be that as it may, there is no doubt that a great many grades of sugar brought in which, although classed under the Dutch standard as very low, really contain a large quantity of saccharine matter. Moreover, we know that the American Government, which investigated this subject very closely, formally reported that in their judgment a very large amount of sugar was extracted even from apparently very coarse numbers. The only fault I have to find with the mode in which my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) dealt with the question, is, that he allowed far too large an amount for waste; I think he allowed at least 50 per cent., and I do not propose to make quite so liberal an allowance. Now, Sir, what is the real question at issue? It is not a matter of grave moment to the consumers of Canada at what price sugar is imported into the Dominion; the question of moment is at what price that sugar is sold to them, and if you want to ascertain what the real burden is on the people of Canada, you have to ascertain first at what price that sugar could be obtained were it allowed to be imported duty free from New York, Glasgow, or any other place, and then at what price it is sold by these sugar refiners; the difference between the natural cost without duty, and the price at which these refiners sell it, is the measure of the burden on the people of Canada. Now, that is not a complicated question; that is a plain, straightforward question, on which there is no better authority perhaps in Canada than the hon. member for Kingston. Now, let us see what are the actual prices. I have here a statement of the prices in Montreal and in New York from July to December last:—

	Montreal.	New York.
July	\$10 37	\$6 83
August	9 87	6 58
September	9 87	6 68
October	9 50	6 95
November	9 37	6 46
December	9 37	6 20

Now, you will observe that there was an average difference of 3 cents per lb., or \$3 per 100 lbs., between the price in New York and the price in Montreal. That is the measure and the true measure of the burden of the people of Canada, because, as regards the consuming portion of the people, I maintain that my hon. friend was right, and that the sugar can be laid down from New York as cheaply as it can from Montreal. If you take the total importation that we use, the 120,000,000 lbs. of unrefined sugar, and the 16,000,000 lbs. of partially refined, fit for consumption, which was brought in, you will find that about \$3,750,000 represents the difference between the sum the people of Canada had to pay the refiners and the sum for which they could have obtained that sugar, had they been allowed to import it without paying duty at all. Let us see, then, how much of that went into the Treasury. We find in the Trade Returns that we received \$2,459,000. The loss, therefore, to the people by the operation of this Tariff is the difference between \$3,723,000 and \$2,459,000, which did go into the Treasury, or in round numbers a loss of \$1,270,000. That is what we pay for keeping these 700 or 800 persons, including the coopers and others employed. That has been brought about, as I said, by adding 25 per cent. to the taxes on this article, a necessary of life, and by losing 25 per cent. of the revenue. I would have been astonished, if it had been anybody else, to hear the hon. Minister of Finance, in dealing with this subject, wholly ignore the large increase in the quantity of sugar being used by the people. Anybody

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

hearing him declare that the loss to the revenue was \$140,000, being the difference between the sum received in 1878 and that received in 1881, would have supposed that the consumption in each case was identically the same. What my hon. friend has said was the real fact of the case, namely, that something like 26,000,000 lbs. more were imported in the latter year than in the former, and after making all possible allowance for waste and loss in manufacturing, that shows clearly we had lost \$600,000 or \$700,000 revenue under this increased tax. What are the actual facts? In the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1878, we find that in that year we imported for consumption a total of 109,000,000 lbs. Of course, there was very little of that refined in this country, and we received a duty of \$2,567,000. Now, we imported 136,500,500 lbs., of which 16,000,000 lbs. was presumably fit to enter into consumption. That left us about 120,500,000 lbs. imported for the use of the refiners, on which we obtained \$2,035,000 duty. Deduct \$423,000 that we received on all above No. 14. You will observe that we consumed, in 1878, somewhat less than the quantity of refined sugar which that 120,500,000 lbs. would produce; and if you will deduct the \$2,000,000 duty which we received on that from the \$2,586,000 we received in 1878, and make allowance for the 13,000,000 lbs. additional not taken into account, being the excess in 1881 on that particular article, you will see my hon. friend was perfectly correct in stating that about \$700,000 in round numbers were lost to the revenue in the truth of the fact that the tax had been increased by 25 per cent. I do not think it is necessary, after the speech made by my hon. friend, to enter into any lengthy discussion of the general principles involved. I content myself with pointing out to the House that here you have an enormous increase of duty, an enormous loss to the revenue and a very considerable additional cost to the people, and that the total result is thoroughly stated, although the details are not given in the motion placed in your hands, that Canada loses about \$1,125,000 and that some 700 or 800 people find employment. That is good as far as it goes, but it is a most paltry and inadequate compensation to the people, for the fact that their taxes are increased \$1,125,000 under the operation of this Tariff. As my hon. friend well said, the Liberal party do not desire to injure any manufactory. They desire to assist, by all legitimate and proper ways, every manufacturer throughout this country. I am happy to say that many manufacturers are on our side, and that many more are coming over to our side under the knowledge they are receiving from day to day of the working of this iniquitous and oppressive Tariff. But I say the Liberal party will never consent, if they are true to their professions, if they understand anything of the real principles of the Liberal party, to allow a system of taxation in this country to be made a means of amassing great fortunes for a few individuals at the expense of the great bulk of the community. There is no more rampant instance of that injustice, no clearer proof of the folly of the system inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite, than is to be found in the statement of facts which my hon. friend made this afternoon, and which prove beyond contradiction that these men are, as he truly expressed it, assisted by the Government in putting into their own pockets \$1,250,000 of the people's money.

Amendment (Mr. Paterson, Brant) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Anglin,	Gillies,	Olivier,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Gunn,	Pickard,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriven,
Casey,	King,	Skinner,

Charlton,
Fiset,
Flynn,
Geoffrion,

Laurier,
Mackenzie,
McIsaac,
Mills,

Smith,
Snowball,
Trow, and
Weidon.—36.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,
Baker,
Bannerman,
Bealy,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Boulthee,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Brooks,
Bunting,
Cameron (Victoria),
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Costigan,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Outhbert,
Daly,
Dawson.
Elliott,
Farrow,
Ferguson,
Fortin,

Gigault,
Gironard (Kent),
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Homer,
Hooper,
Hurteau,
Ives,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
McCuig,
McDougald,
McDougall,
McLellan,
McLennan,
McRory,
Massue,
Méthot,
Montplaisir,

Mousseau,
Muttart,
O'Connor,
Ogden,
Orton,
Onimet,
Ponsonneault,
Pope (Compton),
Reid,
Richey,
Ross (Dundas),
Routhier,
Royal,
Ryan (Marquette),
Ryan (Macreal),
Ryker,
Shaw,
Stephenson,
Tassé,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings), and
White (Renfrew)—85.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for Restigouche did not vote.

Mr. HADDOW. I paired with the hon. member for London.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for North Huron was paired with the hon. member for Haldimand.

Mr. FARROW. I did not consider it a pair. I spoke to the hon. gentleman about it and he said that he would see me again on the subject, but he never did. I went to see if the pair was entered in the books and was told it was not. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) also said that I was at liberty to vote. I spoke to him about it.

Mr. TROW. I thought that the hon. gentleman was paired.

Mr. DALY. I looked over the pair-book before entering the House for the division, and I could not find such a pair. The book was inspected at the same time by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset), and he also will corroborate my statement that the hon. gentleman's name was not entered in the pair-book.

Mr. Fiset. The hon. gentleman's name was not in the pair-book.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

26. Kingston Penitentiary..... \$120,949.77

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to obtain some information with regard to the increased cost of maintenance, since the number of convicts has been diminished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The warden reports that this is due to the general advance in the price of provisions. The increase is 22 cents and a fraction per capita.

Mr. BLAKE. The cost is increased from \$70 to \$70.22 per head. There was a very considerable increase in the cost of last year over the amount of the estimate. The cost of last year was very much over the cost for the preceding year. Increase in cost of rations is nearly 25 per cent. over that of the year preceding; and in clothing, the increase is also very considerable. It is true the warden

reports the largest increase has occurred in cost of rations owing to general advance in prices, but I find that there is still further expenditure proposed for the ensuing year; and I was anxious to learn, as the operations are always worked out in detail, on what items the increase was to take place. If I remember right, we got the cost down to about 60 cents per head; but it is now over 70 cents per head, and I would like to know on what particular item this takes place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the specific information as to the particular articles of provision or clothing on which the cost has increased; but the warden reports that this is altogether due to the increase in the prices of all provisions and the material used in making the convicts' clothing, but if the hon. gentleman likes I will procure the particular items.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes. But we have heard so much about the authentic statements of the hon. Minister of Finance to the effect that everything is cheaper than it used to be; but it, nevertheless, seems that in this very surprising institution where we have wholly under our own control, a large village, which we supply with the necessaries of life, we are not able to supply the commodities that are required for that class of the population at any rate, except at a considerable advance. The hon. Minister of Finance has talked a good deal about clothing being cheaper, and I wish to state what the results are in this particular village. These are all able-bodied persons, who are clothed in the most economical manner. The material is bought at wholesale prices, and is worked up in the institution by convict labor; and therefore it is wholly in the cost of the material that the difference in question takes place. The clothing of the convicts, per capita, was in 1877-78, \$11.18, and for 1878-79, \$9.33, being for these two years, \$20.51, or an average of \$10.25½ a year per head; the cost of their clothing in 1879-80 was \$12.13, and in 1880-81, \$13.06½, making a total for these two years of \$25.19½, or an average of \$12.59½ against \$10.25½ for the other two years, showing an increase of \$2.34 per head, or nearly 23 per cent. of an increase between the average of 1877-78, 1878-79, 1879-80 and 1880-81, and still the advance goes on. I am glad to find that the boom is a thing which is now settled beyond dispute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The number of the convicts who may be confined in this institution is very uncertain, and we cannot prophesy what the number of occupants may be during the ensuing year, but with the increase of wealth and the increase of prosperity we may hope to see a further diminution of crime. The diminution which is already perceived will probably account for the present decrease. It is, no doubt, the fact that the transportation of convicts from the smaller penitentiaries to Kingston is ceasing owing to the completion of these institutions, and this may account in a measure at least for the diminished estimate of the warden.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the latter cause which the hon. gentleman mentions is the cause which the warden has given for the diminution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the one which he makes for a diminution. Of course there is no doubt there is a certain amount of diminution of crime in the country, and we all rejoice to know it; while at the same time there is a very remarkable amount, I am sorry to say, of crimes of a very outrageous character going on just now, an epidemic of very violent crimes; but as to the general amount of crime, there is, I think, a diminution. I attribute it in part to the cause which the hon. gentleman has referred to, and in part to certain other causes which it is not necessary now to discuss. But I believe the real reason why a lesser number is estimated for Kingston is that it is not expected there will be, as there

has been annually for some time, a transfer from St. Vincent de Paul to Kingston. From year to year Kingston has been rather increasing in its numbers. It did not get up to the maximum it at one time had before St. Vincent de Paul was opened, but it has been increasing. But as St. Vincent de Paul is now approaching completion, we may expect the convicts from the Province of Quebec will be for the future confined within that penitentiary.

Mr. ANGLIN. We have been lately creating many new crimes. It has been resolved in another place that certain actions with respect to railways shall hereafter be regarded as serious crimes; and the hon. member for North Norfolk has brought in a Bill here, which, if it goes into operation in any shape, will tend largely to swell the number in the penitentiaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman say especially from the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; he says if it were made retro-active.

Mr. ANGLIN. That would be rather a dangerous provision I think. I do not think we can get any such provision as that in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Present company always excepted.

Mr. ANGLIN. I find the staff has been somewhat reduced. We might dispense this year with the chief keeper, and also with one of the trade instructors. I see we also dispense with the assistant deputy-matron. Perhaps the same beneficent influence that has operated either to prevent the commission of crime or to protect criminals from the operation of justice, is also producing its effect at this establishment and rendering it necessary to have as large a staff as formerly. We would like to know how these criminals are employed. The nature of employment in which they are engaged was the subject of interesting discussion on former occasions. I think strong objection was taken from time to time to the mode in which a large number of these criminals were employed. I think it would be interesting now if we were told in a general way how they are employed.

Sir JOHN A. MADONALD. As to the mode in which the convicts have been employed, I think there has been no change of any importance since last year. I think the men are employed partly under contract, and partly and as much as possible under the direct supervision of the warden.

Mr. BLAKE. The labor in which the convicts have been chiefly employed during the past year has been in the manufacture of door locks, a most monstrous thing. It is the old contract for the manufacture of door locks for which I have heard the hon. member for Lambton and the Liberal Government denounced, and still it is kept in operation and has been going on ever since. Ever since they have been making door locks under contract and competing with that manufactory at Moncton. We were told a year or two ago that the sin of this door lock manufactory contract was venial, because the contractor had begun only on sufferance and it could be terminated any day; but it seems to be going on and on like the river forever. We do not hear of any change whatever in the employment of the convicts in a manner that obviously interferes so seriously with honest out-door labor and enterprise. It was the duty of hon. gentlemen when they came into office, if their views were at all in accordance with the views they endeavored to force upon us while they were out, to have put a stop to this monstrous contract. But instead of that there is still going on tailoring and shoemaking, not merely for the prisoners themselves, but also for the Dominion Government. Now, there are or there might be numerous contracts let, and numerous honest tailors and shoemakers employed in these various works which are now being let, but the hon. gentlemen are having them performed in the penitentiary.

Mr. BLAKE.

Now, I do not complain of that, because I think it a reasonable thing—in point of fact, I am responsible for introducing it into the penitentiary—but I complain of it being continued by hon. gentlemen who have said that it was a great abuse and would interfere with out-door labor. There does not appear to have been any new industry or any other arrangement for the employment of prisoners during the last year, which is, I think, to be regretted. I am aware that we have from 700 to 800 prisoners, mostly able-bodied men, and that they have not been provided with some fresh employment is something that is to be deplored. I mention one particular branch of industry which I hoped to have heard more of in this report, and that much more would have been done about it, and that is the farm. The idea formerly was that it would become a source of very useful labor in many respects to the institution. The idea was that it would be cultivated almost as a garden by spade labor, using very little machine power, and using the power of the convicts themselves. The idea was that out-door occupation of this class would be very beneficial to the health of the inmates, besides possibly being made a source of profit to the institution. I do not see, what I would like to see before concurrence, that a special effort is being made, as I think ought to be made, to employ a large proportion of these men on that farm in the way I have mentioned, to convert it more into a market garden, and the use of a great deal of spade labor and husbandry. In this connection I wish to make an enquiry with reference to a portion of the penitentiary premises which I thought it was intended to add to the farm. There was a portion of the premises under some lease or engagement, either to the corporation of Kingston or to some institution in connection with the city of Kingston. Arrangements were made during my time by which that term would have come to an end, I think, in the course of last year. The idea was that the institution would be best served by the enlargement of the farm. In fact, the Government purchased a considerable piece to add to it, the intention being to turn it into a large farm with a view to employing prison labor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I can give the hon. gentleman the key to the mystery in connection with the lock factory. There have been no complaints from manufacturers of locks and keys that the work in this institution has interfered with their industry, for this reason, that the lock makers outside of the penitentiary are fully employed and have as much, or more, than they can do. When trade is dull they may possibly complain.

Mr. MILLS. What then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And then we will consider whether we can properly employ convict labor so that it will not interfere with the established industries of the country. With respect to clothing: some of the bad habits introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite still linger and it is very difficult to get rid of them. The present leader of the Opposition introduced the principle of employing convicts in manufacturing clothing for Government purposes, and the institution is not yet free from the influences thus introduced. With respect to the farm: it was in rather a rough state when it became the property of the Government, but it now looks flourishing, and the warden says, as an agricultural experiment it has been successful. With respect to the exhibition at the Crystal Palace: I think there would be no resumption of the ground for penitentiary purposes. It was leased for many years, or rather it was a license of occupation for the Agricultural Association of the county, the ground covering twenty acres, I think. A great deal of pressure was brought by hon. gentlemen opposite to force the Association to surrender it, and the difficulty prevailing is to find elsewhere a convenient and

suitable place on which to place the buildings. A deputation from the Association will be here to-morrow for the purpose of discussing the question with the Department of Justice.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Last year, when this matter was under discussion, the hon. Minister of Justice agreed with the suggestion made from this side of the House that a statement should be submitted, showing the quantity of produce raised on the farm, in order that we might be able to ascertain what was about the real cost of the maintenance of the prisoners. I observe the chief keeper has been discontinued; what has become of him?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, I understand he has been transferred to St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. MILLS. Attention has been called to the fact that there has been a large increase in the cost of clothing, amounting to 23 per cent. The hon. Finance Minister has continually spoken of the reduced cost of manufactured products, that the people were getting their woollens, cottons, boots and shoes and other articles at reduced prices. All those statements were made to show that these blessings were showered down by the fiscal policy of the Administration. It is important to know why these advantages which everybody else has enjoyed, have not extended themselves to this institution, under the care and guardianship of the Government.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may just say, to show how little dependence can be placed on the proposition made in the form in which the hon. gentleman has made it, that every fourth year the officers receive their dress uniforms—

Mr. BLAKE. We understand that perfectly.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. So that an hon. gentleman might rise and begin criticising the item by saying that there was an increase in the cost of clothing amounting to \$1,700. The explanation is, of course, that these are exceptional years, just as in the case of the new suits which are given every third year. On the other hand, in the item for clothing in the convicts' shoe shop there is a decrease of \$553.40, owing to there being a stock on hand. Next year I might get up and claim the credit for the decrease. So with the item, convicts' material for tailor's shop, \$2,381. I mention these things to show how unfair it would be to compare the expenditures in the way adopted by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman shows that he is not conversant with the penitentiary items, because he assumes that the item of convicts' clothing includes the officers' clothing. Most of us are aware that there are certain items, such as those he mentioned which recur at regular intervals, but I did not ask about the officers' clothing. In the case of the convicts' clothing there may, of course, be some slight surpluses in some years, but in a well-managed institution such as I believe, generally speaking, this institution to be, there should not be any very large quantity of supplies carried over from one year to another. I did not pretend to compare one year with another, but I took the two earlier years and added the accounts for them and the two later years and added them together and then arrived at the result. These general results appear to correspond with the results arrived at by the warden, viz.: that the increase is due to the advance in prices of provisions and materials—the National Policy prices, in fact. I notice that the objections which we formerly made to the manner of keeping the farm accounts still apply, the result being that the cost of maintaining these convicts is much greater than appears on the face of the accounts. On the one hand, labor is charged at the famine price of 40 cents per day per man, while the highest possible prices are placed to the credit of the account. On this point I venture to press on the hon. gentleman the importance of using a

much larger amount of convict labor than is used at present. Instead of having two spans of horses for one now used I would much rather see the additional labor performed by the convicts in the institution.

Mr. CASEY. I think we ought to have some information in regard to the great difference in the relative cost of the staffs in the different institutions compared with the total cost of the institutions and the number of convicts employed. For instance, in the Kingston Penitentiary there is a staff of 73 to look after about 730 prisoners, or one to every ten prisoners; in the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary there is a staff of 60 to look after 400 prisoners, or one to about six and a-half prisoners; at Dorchester there is a staff of 44 to look after 130 prisoners, or one to about three prisoners; in the Manitoba Penitentiary the proportion is about one to four, and in the British Columbia Penitentiary, one to five. I know, as a general principle, that a large institution can be managed with a smaller relative staff than a small one, but I do not think that accounts for the tremendous difference shown here. I find, also, that in Kingston there is one guard to seventeen prisoners, in St. Vincent de Paul, one to fourteen; in Dorchester, one to six and a-half; in Manitoba, one to ten; and in British Columbia, one to twelve; showing a tremendous disproportion in this respect also. The same feature is apparent in comparing the salaries of the staff to the total cost of the institutions. In Kingston the salaries are to the cost in the proportion of 1 to 2 $\frac{1}{2}$; in Dorchester, 1 to 1 $\frac{7}{10}$; in Manitoba, 1 to 2 $\frac{3}{10}$; and in British Columbia, 1 to 2 $\frac{1}{10}$. Both the Manitoba and the British Columbia Penitentiaries are much cheaper, relatively, than the Dorchester Penitentiary, and those of us who are not familiar with the causes of this circumstance should receive some explanation with regard to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Kingston Penitentiary is, in the first place, the oldest institution of the kind in the Dominion, and is now almost perfect; as the hon. member for West Durham says, it is really a village, surrounded with high walls and fortifications, precluding any probability of escape, and therefore a smaller number of guards are required. I believe Kingston is managed very economically, perhaps more so than some of the others which are newer, and in which the officers are less experienced. The Department of Justice has adopted the plan of sending the new officers of the other institutions to Kingston for a training. At Dorchester Penitentiary, I believe, the wall is not complete, and of necessity a larger number of guards are kept than at Kingston. As regards the salaries, the officers holding the same rank, with the same requirements, must get the same salaries.

Mr. BLAKE. I was delighted to hear from the hon. gentleman that it was impossible to escape from Kingston Penitentiary; but on turning to the Report, which he evidently has not read, I find that six males escaped last year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These, I take it, were working on the farm.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that as soon as convicts were placed at any constituted industry, the Government considered whether that did not interfere with industries elsewhere. I hope the hon. gentleman does not deny that in Canada agriculture is a constituted industry. What right has he to compete with the farmers about Kingston in this respect? I would like to know, also, whether the Minister of Militia has sent in his resignation yet, because of the employment of prison labor to compete with free labor. Such is my respect for the consistency of that hon. gentleman, I cannot conceive that he would even dream of remaining in a Government which violated principles which he held sacred so lately!

and I would like to know what correspondence has taken place between him and his chief in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can say to the hon. gentleman that my hon. friend, I dare say, will be quite ready to throw up his office and emoluments, but my sense of duty to the country compelled me to induce him to resign himself to remain in office for the next year. I regard the convicts on the farm competing with the agriculturists outside. It is intended by degrees to reduce the spade labor of which the hon. gentleman speaks.

27. St. Vincent de Paul... .. \$85,684 89

Mr. BLAKE. I find that the expense of maintenance is \$83.33 per head, while in Kingston Penitentiary it is but \$70.22 per head, an excess of \$13.11 in St. Vincent de Paul. I do not see why the feeding and clothing of 400 men in St. Vincent de Paul should cost so much more per head than the feeding and clothing of 700 or 800 men in Kingston.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to inform the hon. gentleman what the causes are why the expense of maintenance is greater than at Kingston, but it is a fact, and we have got to pay the money.

Mr. BLAKE. I am extremely sorry to learn that it is absolutely necessary and now laid down by the hon. gentleman as a proposition which he cannot explain, but nevertheless exists, that it costs so much more to provide food and clothing in the immediate neighborhood of Montreal than at Kingston. The statement of the hon. member for Montreal shows when it came to be analyzed that the rates of wages there were exceptionally, in fact, deplorably low. While we have a statement of that kind on the one hand, we have the statement on the other hand that the cost of living is \$18.50 per head greater at St. Vincent de Paul than at Kingston.

Mr. ANGLIN. We heard a great deal last year and the year before of the deplorable mismanagement of this establishment, and during the recess we heard an attempt was made to reorganize it by the appointment of a member of this House to the post of warden, and subsequently by the appointment of another warden. A dreadful murder occurred there during the year, and the evidence showed that it was possible for the convict to keep a knife in his possession. We ought to have an explanation of the condition or state of this institution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt there have been irregularities, and a murder was committed under circumstances that showed laxity of discipline. The attention of the Department of Justice and the Inspector has been called to these irregularities, and it is to be hoped they will disappear. The hon. gentleman asks about rumors. I do not think we are called upon to meet every rumor. It is quite sufficient to have to deal with accomplished facts.

Mr. BLAKE. If we may not speak about rumors, but only about accomplished facts, I suppose we may ask for an explanation as to why it took so long to make an accomplished fact of the appointment of the present warden of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. I think that more than one member of this House could give an explanation on the subject. The hon. member for Bagot could do so, and there is another hon. member also who had a sort of local calculation for this office at the time, but perhaps the hon. Minister of the Interior will fill the whole bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that the hon. gentleman has got a right to give two days' notice of his question at any rate.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. Here is an institution which was thoroughly disorganized, the warden was suspended and afterwards dismissed, and a great deal of bickering, **Mr. MACKENZIE.**

jealousies, strifes and plots, which were extremely detrimental to the discipline of the institution, took place amongst the officers; and no doubt the cause of a great many evils, which appeared in the administration of the penitentiary, was due to the fact that the wardenship was not filled. The acting warden and the Roman Catholic chaplain pointed out very clearly the detrimental effect which the continuous want of a permanent head, had on the whole institution; and this does seem to me to demand a serious explanation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating that there was an unfortunate state of dissension and disorder arising from jealousies and some unexplained antipathies, which seriously affected the working of this institution and its machinery. The warden was removed very reluctantly, because he was in some respects a capable man; but, on the whole, it was found to be in the interests of the institution that he should be removed. Well, enquiry was made with the view of securing a good man for the position; and in the meantime, in order to get rid of these dissensions, and to have a perfectly impartial person in charge, Mr. Bedson, a very clever man from the Manitoba Penitentiary, who happened to be available, was placed in charge for two or three months to ascertain what was really the matter. He came from a distance, and was placed there for a time, and Mr. Laviolette was sent to Kingston in order that he might examine into the working of that institution. It is to be hoped that this will be the end of all these dissensions, and that Mr. Laviolette, just from seeing the working of the Kingston Penitentiary, will be able to carry out the same discipline, &c., in this institution.

Mr. BLAKE. When was Mr. Bedson sent there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was some time last summer.

Mr. BLAKE. It was some time in the fall of the year.

Mr. CARON. It was after last Session.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware that it was after last, and before this Session.

Mr. CARON. It was almost immediately after last Session.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal Centre). It was in September or in October last.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes. I think that is about the period. The late warden was granted leave on the 21st of June, 1880; the matter remained suspended until the 24th January before last, when he was finally removed, and his place was not filled until—I do not know when, but it was about a year afterwards, and Mr. Bedson was not sent down until in September or October last. There was, therefore, a period of about nine months during which the experiment was tried, and during this period another experiment was tried, not at the penitentiary, but in another institution, one of the counties of the Province of Quebec, which hon. gentlemen opposite thought was under their control. The real fact is that it was proposed to appoint a member of this House warden, but the political arrangements failed, and the appointment did not take place. The member for Bagot tried to effect an arrangement, but when he found that the contestants could not agree among themselves about the succession, my hon. friend, with a high sense of patriotism, determined to remain here instead of going there. But what I complain of is, that in the progress of these arrangements for conferring these species of patronage on a member of Parliament, much time was wasted during which this institution was obviously deteriorated. Investigation after investigation was held, but nevertheless no appointment was made for some nine months, and I think that this was not right, and to a very great extent there was a

very improper neglect of public duty which called for the earliest possible appointment, and the re-arrangement of the institution.

28. Dorchester Penitentiary..... \$42,245.30

Mr. BLAKE. The cost of maintenance in this institution is much higher than it is at Kingston, being \$81.36 per head. Is living more expensive in New Brunswick than at Kingston?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. They live better at Dorchester.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend says that they live better at Dorchester. I know he does, but what about the convicts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About the other convicts?

Mr. MACKENZIE. We must have some explanation about the high salaries of the staff at St. Vincent de Paul—it is \$91 for each convict. In Kingston it is much less; but in Dorchester it takes no less than \$200 for each convict to supply the salary of the staff. Really this is a most extraordinary estimate.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. There is no doubt a great deal of extravagance displayed in the management of this institution. That is really a most extravagant estimate. This cannot be accounted for by the statement of the hon. gentleman as to many of the convicts being engaged in farm labor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are only sixteen at Kingston, it appears.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There are a large number who go to the quarries as well as to the farm, and these require guards, perhaps more than the men who are engaged in farming operations.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. There is no doubt at Dorchester an extravagance which is not justifiable at all. They have a matron at a salary of \$500, and a deputy-matron at \$300, and at no time more than three female convicts in that institution, and now there are not two. It would be well to send these female convicts to Kingston where there is ample accommodation, and dispense with the matrons at Dorchester.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Westmoreland is in a good position to know that there is extravagance in the appointment of officers at the Dorchester Penitentiary. There are quarters, fuel, light and many other accommodations, and all for only two female convicts. More than that, the Inspector reports that even these quarters are not satisfactory for these two lady convicts. If you are to keep this staff of two women to look after two other women in an unsuitable place which, according to the Inspector, there is no intention of changing, while there is suitable accommodation at Kingston, it seems to me it would be better for the female convicts to be there at Kingston with others of their class and thereby save a great deal of expense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is a good deal in the remark about these two female convicts being transferred to Kingston. I think if it were a question that the female convicts in the whole Dominion were sent to one institution the number of matrons there would have to be increased.

Mr. ANGLIN. The whole staff at Dorchester is organized on a most extravagant scale. When first the proposal was made I pointed out that a consolidation of these officers could well be made. Now we have a warden, a deputy-warden and a chief keeper for 130 convicts; also an accountant, a store-keeper, a schoolmaster and a steward. I am strongly of the opinion that one man could very well discharge the duties of all these officers. The accountant and the store-keeper cannot have much to do. It

cannot take more than one hour a day to take in stores in an establishment like that. At all events the steward and the store-keeper could be combined. I have no idea what a schoolmaster has to do in that establishment. My impression is that we have very few young persons there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They teach adults. One object of a penitentiary is to educate the criminals.

Mr. ANGLIN. An hour or two a day is quite sufficient. The whole staff is organized upon the same extravagant scale. We have a hospital keeper at \$560 a year to attend to the one or two who may be sick. I am satisfied you may go into that establishment twenty times a year and not find one person in the hospital. In one institution at St. John where we had a much larger number, we had no such officer as a hospital keeper, and no need of one. The whole establishment was organized apparently with a view rather to provide positions for some who were to be cared for than for the purpose of having the duty thoroughly discharged. The matron at Dorchester is a lady who went there from St. John, where she was for many years matron of the St. John Penitentiary, and one of the most efficient officers we could possibly find. I know she gave entire satisfaction to all the Commissioners. However, it is a very serious question whether she ought to be employed in this particular institution where there are but two or three female convicts altogether. It would scarcely be right to turn her out of employment altogether, and I presume something else can be found for her to do.

Mr. BLAKE. The truth is that this additional man under the name of schoolmaster is a guard who discharges those duties, as is the case in other penitentiaries. I think the establishment should be overhauled. It is quite indefensible that so many officers should be retained for 121 convicts. No justification could be offered last year when the Estimates were passed; and when experience has shown that the large staff is unnecessary, some effort should be made to effect a reduction.

Mr. CASEY. The number of keepers and guards at Dorchester is one to five, while at Kingston it is one to fifteen.

Mr. ANGLIN. That can be explained to some extent by the fact that the Dorchester Penitentiary, in the first instance, was not surrounded by a wall.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Some effort should be made to reduce the salaries and the number of officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the salaries should be reduced, but the number of officers should be reduced. It was owing to the undefended state of the outworks of Dorchester Penitentiary that an additional number of guards was required. I dare say when the outworks are completed the number of guards will be reduced. Two or three officers of the Dorchester Penitentiary might be removed to Kingston and the staff reduced in that way; but it is pretty hard to discharge a person employed as a matron, after she has given a good many years' employment, and to send her away when perhaps she is unfitted for work of a different description. I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this matter, and the Government will in some way endeavor to reduce the staff.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the matron's political opinions are not in favor of the National Policy, it will be a good reason to dismiss her.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman's authority for that.

Mr. MILLS. A large sum is annually voted for the purpose of maintaining this institution, an amount that is altogether unnecessary. The Government have not taken the first step to establish an institution on an efficient and economical basis; on the contrary, it was organized in a

very extravagant manner and it has been so continued. The hon. the First Minister has suggested it would be improper to dismiss a matron who is not required. There was, however, the case of W. Kingsford, who for a good many years was employed in the public service, and who might find just as much difficulty in obtaining employment in the particular line in which he was employed. I do not know that the Government are called upon to make themselves a charitable institution for the purpose of maintaining a large number of persons, who, because they are no longer required in the public service are pensioned on the State. With regard to this particular item I have no doubt that the Government, if they had properly administered the affairs of the country, would have found no difficulty in greatly reducing the item, and that the utility of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, if they ever were useful, has departed.

Mr. ANGLIN. I notice, with regard to these penitentiaries, that the expenses connected with the Dorchester institution are very extraordinary compared with those of the Kingston Penitentiary, and so far from there having been a decrease by uniting the institutions at Halifax and St. John in some items, at least—though the expense was formerly largely due to the fact that short and common prisoners had to be maintained in St. John—the expenditure has increased. In comparing the staff of the Dorchester institution with that of Kingston, there appear to be some very extraordinary discrepancies in the salaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Since the hon. gentleman objects to these better terms being given to the Maritime Provinces, I promise him that we will look into the matter in the way of economizing.

Mr. ANGLIN. We are just as much in favor of economy in the Lower Provinces as in the far west, only we do not appear to be as likely to succeed in getting it.

29. Manitoba Penitentiary \$26,654 53

Mr. BLAKE. I notice that the cost of maintenance in this institution is 59 per cent. above that at Kingston. It seems to me that we should have the details of the maintenance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman should, after prorogation, take the craze to go westward he will find that the cost of food and clothing is infinitely greater in Manitoba than elsewhere, which will, no doubt, satisfactorily account for the addition to the expenditure. There is one item of addition to salaries—that of the engineer. Formerly the institution was heated by stoves, but furnaces have now been put in, and, of course, an engineer is necessary, but I suppose that he will save his salary over and over again in the saving of fuel. In the hospital expenses there is an increase of \$100 to enable the surgeon to obtain a supply of drugs.

Mr. BLAKE. The remarks of the hon. gentleman as to the increased cost of supplies in the North-West show a remarkable prospect for immigrants who may go into that country. So far as I can learn the cost per head last year for maintenance was \$87.80; and this year it is \$111.06, an increase of \$22.86 per head, or nearly one-third of the whole cost at Kingston.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I find that for fifty convicts in 1881-82, the estimate was \$4,381, and that for ten additional the amount was \$2,291. Apparently these ten are to cost \$229 a piece, which is certainly a remarkable figure, supposing it is the minimum cost of which a man can be supported in the North-West under the present Tariff.

30. British Columbia Penitentiary \$19,833 68

Mr. BLAKE. The maintenance in this case is \$95.86 per head, being 34 per cent. over Kingston. I would like to have some information on the details of that maintenance.

Mr. MILLS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, from his experience of British Columbia, knows that food, clothing and everything else, is dearer in British Columbia than in any other part of the Dominion, except Manitoba. I do not suppose there is any immediate prospect of the expense decreasing there; but by-and-bye, when the Canadian Pacific Railway reaches the Rocky Mountains, there will be a flow of immigrants and merchants into that country, and food will pour in from the prairies through the gorges of the Rocky Mountains.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is usually the case that when you have more convicts, the expense is proportionately less; but here you make provision for seventy convicts instead of sixty, and the expense is proportionately greater.

Mr. MILLS. I should like to know why the hon. gentleman provides for a larger number of convicts next year than he provided for last year. I can understand why the large increase of population in Manitoba should be a reason for estimating for an increase of convicts there, but I cannot see why the hon. gentleman proposes to provide for as large an increase in British Columbia as in Manitoba and the North-West altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that there is great paucity of labor in British Columbia, and Mr. Onderdonk and his Company have had great difficulty in obtaining it. There has been a considerable influx of Chinese labor, and both Chinese and whites are employed on the railway, and an increase of crime along the line of railway is estimated for. Until the road is finished, there will be an irregular population there, and of course an increase in the number of convictions.

Mr. MILLS. I understood that the hon. gentleman took the position, in a previous Session, that Chinese labor should not be employed but should be excluded from the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS. Did the hon. gentleman not grant a commission to consider whether these Chinese should not be excluded from the country?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House may have granted a commission.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is about time we should express an opinion about the employment of a chaplain in the other branch of the Legislature. We do not want to deprive the hon. members of that House of any means of grace, but our Speaker performs the duty quite as acceptably and as profitably as could any gentleman who dons a robe and is called by a title, and I do not see why hon. gentlemen of the Upper House require a chaplain any more than we do.

35. Publishing Debates \$20,000

Mr. BLAKE. When this question was up last year, we had a promise, which does not appear to have been redeemed, that a statement would be furnished showing the exact cost of the *Hansard* each year for a number of years.

Mr. BOWELL. I will obtain from the Clerk the statement required by the hon. gentleman.

37. Grant to Parliament Library \$7,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. We ought to have some understanding about the position of the Library. During the last six years, nearly the whole of the grant has been used in purchasing law books; and I observe that we are getting behindhand in respect to standard current works.

Mr. SPEAKER. A sub-Committee of the Library Committee has been appointed to look into the matter.

Mr. MILLS. We are not keeping up with the current literature of the Empire, in consequence of the smallness of

the grant. Of course, the Law Department has made serious inroads in the grant, but as this is really the only valuable library in the whole Dominion, we ought to take care that we do not fall behind in any branch of science, or of the literature of the age, and I do not think that this appropriation will be adequate to make up the deficiency which exists. If valuable books are not obtained at the time of publication, they soon get out of print; and this matter deserves the best attention of the Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope that the Library Committee, which I believe is very carefully selected, will take this subject up and consider the whole question; at present, it is neither the one thing nor the other. It is too large for a parliamentary library, and too small and confined for a public and general library. The vote is not very large, but I think that if the Library Committee were to set themselves seriously to work and consider what works should be bought hereafter, the ordinary vote might keep up the representation of almost all the standard English and French literature. I fear, from the casual glance which I take occasionally in the Library—and this is not very often at present—that there is an enormous quantity of trash and rot in some classes of the books on our shelves, which ought not to be in any decent library. I am not very strait-laced in these things; I think the literature of every kind, if first-class, ought to be permitted, but when it is light literature, the mere froth of *belles lettres*, it ought to be first-class to justify purchase; and the trash which is put on our shelves ought to be in a great measure excluded. If more care was taken in the selection of the works, I think that the sum voted would be very nearly adequate. As I understand it, the bookseller or the person in England who is supposed to purview for the Library, has the choice of any books which he thinks proper to send, and they are shovelled over here instead of being carefully selected. The annual catalogue ought to be in the hands of the Librarian, who ought to report to the Library Committee what books he thinks ought to be obtained. The gentlemen of the Committee are, of course, library men; and they ought to exercise their own judgment in looking over the list and in weeding out the annual publications. In this way you would find that we would get very nearly all the good books and avoid getting many of the bad ones. At present it is dreadful to look into some of the compartments and to see what kind of books are brought out day after day, which neither give pleasure, information, instruction, profit or entertainment.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with much of what the hon. gentleman has said. Anything in the nature of a historical work, of a political biography, of constitutional law, and works of that kind, ought to be secured, however imperfect the production may be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My remarks only applied to *belles lettres*.

Mr. BLAKE. I would therefore be disposed to divide into two classes the works in question, and point out one class which ought to be got as fast as they come, while as to the other, the greatest care in selection ought to be observed. Having over-expended the grant, we have been spending one-half of the usual sum during the last two years; but now we have returned to the vote of \$7,000, it may be necessary to do something in order to bring the Library back to a proper condition. It is clear that the line ought to be drawn much more rigidly than it has been, as a great deal of good money has been spent to no purpose whatever on the shelves of the Library. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, difficult though it is to draw the line, the line can be drawn much more rigidly than in the past, because a great deal of money has been uselessly spent in the Library.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It would be an advantage for a certain fixed vote to be given for the Law Department. It is a tremendously heavy item out of this vote, and it would answer our purpose better if we voted whatever might be required for keeping up the Law Library, \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year. There is no doubt, as the Minister of Interior has said, we are very deficient in a great number of works. We are short of statistical works. I have several times sought for statistical works and have been unable to obtain them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As I understand the matter at present the text works in the Law Library are all procured. What is now wanted is a sum for purchasing the yearly reports. The expenditure for law books since the establishment of the Supreme Court must be in the neighborhood of \$30,000.

Mr. BLAKE. By consulting the French Law Library at Paris and the Osgoode Hall Library we could ascertain the average cost of reasonably maintaining a Law Library. It might be well to purchase only the reports of the larger American States and then the English law reports, which are not very extensive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the Library Committee will take the whole subject up and report what they think ought to be a special grant for the Law Library and for other purposes, and the Government will take it into consideration.

Mr. CASEY. I think the suggestion is very good, and I think it would be advisable to take a little more than the usual sum for the next year or two. There might not occur a better opportunity for reasserting the stock in the Library. I notice a good many new importations consist of novels got out in expensive bindings.

38. Salaries of Officers, additional, and contingencies of Library..... \$6,050

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The additional means the statutory increase.

Mr. MILLS. I see no item to defray the expense of making a new catalogue. I understand the party for whom this appropriation is made has not completed his work.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the person who was employed was only taken temporarily. It was supposed the vote would not be required for more than a year or two, and it has been continued down to another time.

Mr. BLAKE. If the work is being efficiently prosecuted in the present way it ought to be given; if not, I suppose it ought to be prosecuted efficiently.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the Librarian did not ask for it.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be wanted I am sure.

Mr. CASEY. I see \$12,610 for officers and contingencies of the Library, and here again this item for additional salary. Is this in addition to the larger item?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say the Librarian asks for an increased vote for the contingencies of the Library. I think he recommended that the sum asked for, for contingencies, should be increased in order that the periodicals to which he referred should be paid out of the contingencies, leaving \$7,000 to be used for books. But it was considered desirable to leave the contingencies as they were, simply increasing the \$50 provided by Statute to the clerks who were entitled to it. I think about \$1,000 of the vote is for contingencies, and the rest is statutory.

40. Printing, paper and bookbinding..... \$60,000

Mr. MILLS. I hope the hon. gentleman will adopt a better style of bookbinding. In my opinion, we have the most unsightly system of binding in the world. There are

on books in the Library received in exchange for those sent out that are at all to be compared with those in this particular.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Some years ago there was an improvement made in the binding at a comparatively small cost. For a year or two the binding was very good, but has since gone back, and now the Statutes of two or three years ago can hardly be handled in many cases. I have repeatedly sent out this Session for volumes of the Statutes; at times I found it impossible to get them, and I sometimes found it impossible to read them. Either the Library or Printing Committee should look into the matter. The paper was poor, the binding worse.

Mr. BLAKE. The Library Statutes should be specially bound, as they are wanted for reference. The indexes of the Statutes should be so arranged as to have the Public Acts at the beginning and the Private Acts at the end of the volume.

44. To meet expenses in connection with care of Archives, \$5,000

In reply to **Mr. ANGLIN,**

Mr. POPE (Compton). There have been several persons here to examine the archives, respecting which they have spoken very highly. A good deal of progress has been made during last year, and the papers which we announced last year would be completed this year have been almost finished. The Archivist has made a report, which will shortly be presented to the House.

Mr. MILLS. It is very important that the archives should be placed in the Library of Parliament, where there are already some papers—the papers copied by Mr. Merritts some years ago from old papers in the British Museum, the Simcoe papers comprising several volumes, the manuscripts from Paris archives and some other English papers. I would have liked an opportunity of examining some of the papers before the boundary question came before Parliament, but I had no opportunity of doing so, and it was impossible for members to go over to the Department of Agriculture in order to examine manuscripts. There was another case, the papers regarding which were mentioned in the list which the hon. gentleman has had copied; and it would have been of the utmost importance to us if we could have had a copy of the Commission received from the Governor General at that period as bearing upon the question of the boundaries of Canada. I have no doubt it would have been found among the papers in the British Museum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is part of your work of four years ago.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all. The papers were not brought here at that time.

Mr. POPE (Compton). The fact is that there is not room enough in the Library for the books we have there now.

Mr. MILLS. Then there should be another.

Mr. POPE. That is another question, but in the meantime we have to do the best we can with the room we have.

Mr. CASEY. I notice that the Archivist is paid a salary of \$1,600 a year, but it has never been made very clear what he does for that sum. I would like to ask, with regard to certain documents which were copied in London, whether the money was expended by Sir Alexander Galt of his own motion or whether it was expended by the Archivist himself.

Mr. BLAKE. So far as I can understand this sum of \$5,000 in the Estimates includes the salary of the Archivist.

Mr. POPE (Compton). My impression is that it is not included, but that the extra amount is for one of the clerks

Mr. MILLS.

in the office who is a very hard-worked man. I may say that the copying is all done by contract at so much a line.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask whether any enquiry has been made with respect to certain valuable papers in connection with the early history of Canada which I believe exist at Boston and at Washington. Some discussion took place on that subject some two or three years ago, and I think the hon. Minister promised to make enquiries. In the early colonial days a good many documents of interest to us were accumulated in the hands of the Massachusetts authorities—of quite as much interest I think, as a good many of the documents in Paris or London.

Mr. POPE. I did say that enquiry would be made, but we had quite as much as we could do by looking after the documents in Europe.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 1 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 11th April, 1882.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PORT WARDEN OF MONTREAL.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to consolidate the several Acts relating to the office of Port Warden, of the Harbor of Montreal, amending the same in such manner as better to attain the objects thereof, and to facilitate their working.

He said: The object of this resolution is to amend the several Acts relating to the office of Port Warden and to make some slight amendments in them with relation to the inspection of ships and the survey of hatches of vessels on their arrival. These are the three points respecting which it is proposed to make any amendment, with the exception of taking power to reduce the fees, wherever the amount collected shall be more than meets the requirements of the office.

Motion agreed to; resolution considered in Committee, agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 122) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the office of Port Warden of the Harbor of Montreal.

Bill read the first time.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS' DUES EXEMPTION BILL.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to exempt vessels employed in fishing, from the payment of dues for the relief of sick and distressed mariners.

He said: I may say, Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, that we have had complaints from foreign fishermen, on one or two occasions, and also from their Governments, that we have charged them sick mariners' dues. We have found,

on examining into the matter, that it was only in exceptional cases that they have paid such dues; that the usual custom of foreign fishermen is to frequent our shores without entering at any port; and therefore that they escaped the payment of these dues, with this exception: that whenever they have on board a man who is sick, or disabled in any way, they immediately enter some port and pay \$2 or \$3, and leave the man a charge upon us, entailing quite a heavy cost. Consequently we have thought it advisable to take away the cause of the complaint which foreigners have made against us—of charging sick mariners' dues on any vessel that happens to enter any of our ports, and to remedy this by abolishing all such dues in relation to fishing vessels; and this is the object of the Bill.

Mr. KILLAM. Will our fishing vessels, in cases of sickness on board, be refused the benefits of the marine hospitals in our ports?

Mr. McLELAN. I think [that the hon. gentleman will find that our own vessels, which are engaged simply in coasting, do not participate in these benefits; that no vessel, unless she pays such fees, participates in these benefits; and that, therefore, being exempt from these payments they do not share in the benefits.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that our fishing vessels do not pay these dues. I think that they both pay the dues and participate in the benefits accruing from the fund. Of course the resolution implies that they are so liable now, as it is proposed to exempt them from the obligation; in fact they are liable for these dues as well as other vessels:

Mr. McLELAN. Some of our vessels which have made foreign voyages and paid the dues, have participated in these benefits, but it is proposed to exempt all fishing vessels from the payments in question.

Mr. KILLAM. Of course the resolution implies that fishing vessels are now liable to pay the dues, and may participate in the benefits of the fund; but what we wish to discover is: does the hon. gentleman intend to relieve these vessels of these payments, and prevent their participation in the benefits mentioned?

Mr. McLELAN. It is proposed to exempt both British and foreign fishing vessels from the payment of these dues.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. That is wholly.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. KILLAM. The fishermen object to these payments, because the fund is kept up very largely by fishing vessels.

Mr. McLELAN. The payment per vessel is very small, about \$3 in the year, and the expenditure has been very large.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand the hon. gentleman, our coasting and fishing vessels do not pay these dues at all?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. And they do not obtain any of the benefits either?

Mr. McLELAN. They do not obtain any of the benefits.

Mr. BLAKE. They are not allowed to enter the hospitals and they pay nothing?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And the hon. gentleman says that, when they go on foreign voyages and do pay and are entitled to these benefits, there are but very rare cases; and the

foreign fishing vessels pay the dues only when they find a man sick on board, in order to get the benefits which the fund confers.

Mr. McLELAN. Let the hon. gentleman understand me. Our own vessels which are engaged partly in fishing and partly in other business, when they go on foreign voyages are entitled, under the operation of the Act, to pay the dues and to receive these benefits.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not intended that any change shall take place in their position in that respect.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. As to foreign vessels, they practically do not pay the dues until a case of sickness arises, and then they run into some port and pay one or two dollars, to obtain the benefits in question, and the hon. gentleman believes that the practical result of the change proposed will be, that our own fishermen will not be deprived of any advantage which they now enjoy; while foreign vessels, which do not enjoy these benefits fairly, will be deprived of an advantage which they obtain, without affording any corresponding compensation.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. KILLAM. We must have further explanations; although the hon. gentleman's Bill may exhibit his intentions much more clearly. In case a fishing vessel makes two voyages to the banks in the summer, and takes a cargo to Halifax in the fall, will its crew be entitled to participate in these benefits? When will vessels have to pay? At what time of the year? I think the hon. gentleman is somewhat astray in his idea that the fishermen do not now participate in the benefits of this fund. I believe that they do.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Where it is decided that vessels are liable to pay, they have to pay, and there is no exception in the Act at all. All fishermen are liable to, and all do pay.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 121) to exempt vessels employed in fishing from the payment of dues for the relief of sick and distressed mariners.

Bill read the first time.

GENERAL PORT WARDENS' ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend The General Port Wardens' Act, 1874, 37 Victoria, Chapter 32.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the proposal is to give the Port Warden power to appoint deputies in certain cases; when the consignee or owner of a vessel or cargo cannot be found, it shall be lawful for the Port Warden to take charge of the property until the consignee or owner can be found. This is all that it is proposed to do under this Bill.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is there any necessity for this resolution. It seems to me extraordinary that a vessel should come into any port without a known consignee or owner.

Mr. McLELAN. Such cases have occurred.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Where did such cases arise?

Mr. McLELAN. In many of the large ports of the Dominion. At least it is so reported. The other amendment empowers the Port Warden to appoint deputies. In many cases this has been found necessary, and the question was whether such power was given under the Act, consequently it was thought desirable to ask for such powers.

Mr. ANGLIN. I regard the appointment of deputies by the Port Wardens themselves as very objectionable, and from what I know of the trade, I think it should rather be provided that those who appoint the Port Wardens may appoint the supernumeraries or extra officers, or anything of that kind. In St. John's, this will be a matter of very great importance. Nautical men and men of experience in business should be appointed Port Wardens, and very great care ought to be exercised in the selection of these officers. The Port Wardens themselves should not have this authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is much better to leave the responsibility rather with the Port Warden, in the selection of these temporary officers, who have to perform duties under him and for whose acts he will be responsible.

Mr. ANGLIN. In what way?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the same way as he is for his own acts. He will be responsible for the appointment of proper deputies, and for the misconduct of deputies, as he is responsible for his own misconduct. I think the hon. gentleman opposite on the front bench, once that the Government commenced to appoint such officers as Deputy Wardens, would say that the next thing would be applications for salaries; and, if anything went wrong, the Port Warden would say: "I am not responsible, the Government appoints deputies for me, of whom I do not approve;" therefore I think that, in regard to temporary offices, it will be better to leave the whole of the responsibility with the Port Warden himself.

Mr. ANGLIN. I speak from what I know of the appointment of Port Wardens in the city from which I come, St. John, where these officers are appointed, not by the Government, but by the City Council. Notwithstanding the statements of the right hon. gentleman, I am strongly of the opinion that these appointments should also be left with the City Council. These officers are entrusted sometimes with very delicate duties, and it is necessary that there should be a very careful selection to obtain proper men; and if the Port Warden has the right to appoint his deputies, he may choose men in whom he has entire confidence; but, who, nevertheless, may not have the qualities which the public at large feel that they ought to possess. The position of a Port Warden is sometimes a very important one. His decisions as to cargoes are at times of very serious consequence to the owners of vessels or of cargoes, or to the insurers, as the case may be; and it is of the utmost importance that the Port Warden should be very carefully selected.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The general Act does not apply to the ports either of Montreal, Quebec or St. John. Is it intended that this amendment shall apply to these ports?

Mr. McLELAN. There are special Acts provided for these ports. It only applies to the ports that the general Bill applies to.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Then it would not apply to St. John, Quebec, or Montreal. Do you propose to make the Port Warden responsible for all the acts of the deputy?

Mr. McLELAN. He appoints them, and is responsible for the men he appoints.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH,

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill No. (120) to amend the General Port Wardens' Act, 1874.

Bill read the first time.

HARBOR FEES AT THE PORT OF HALIFAX.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Act 35 Victoria, Chapter 42, providing for the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax:

1. By so readjusting the fees payable under the said Act on ships entering the said Port, that they shall not exceed the following rates, viz:—

On ships over 20 and not over 50 tons.....	\$0 50
do 50 do 100 do	1 00
do 100 do 200 do	1 50
do 200 do 300 do	2 00
do 300 do 400 do	2 00
do 400 do 500 do	3 00
do 500 do 700 do	4 00
do 700 tons.....	5 00

Ships not over 20 tons to be exempt.

2. By altering the times of payment of such duty, so that ships not over 100 tons shall pay it only once and ships over 100 tons not more than twice in any calendar year.

He said: The principal charge is the scale of fees. There was a special Act passed for the Port of Halifax and a scale of fees named in that Act, but it was found that the scale was not so applicable to the size of vessels frequenting that port as the scale under the General Harbor Masters' Act, and for some time past the Harbor Master of Halifax has been collecting under the scale of fees of the General Harbor Masters' Act. It is also proposed to alter the times of payment so as to make the fees, instead of payable once in twelve months for a vessel over 100 tons as at present, payable once in any calendar year.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KILLAM. Were the dues payable at Halifax under the special Act different from those payable at other Ports under the General Act?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. This resolution is to make the scale of fees at Halifax the same as that in force in other places. The scale for Halifax provides for the payment of the fee of \$3 on vessels of 400 tons, and on vessels of 500 tons, \$4; so that there is a reduction in these two classes.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Has there been any application from Halifax, from merchants or others, asking for this change?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been ascertained that at Halifax they have been collecting under a different scale from that which the special Act provided for. It was represented that the scale in the General Act was more just and was better adapted for the class of vessels visiting Halifax than the scale in the Act applicable to the Port of Halifax.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Did any one from Halifax ask for it?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware that there was any official application. But it has been recommended by the representatives from Halifax that the special scale was unjust, and that it was advisable to make it conformable to the General Act.

Mr. KILLAM. I thought the scale in Halifax was precisely the same as that in the other ports, and if there is any reason for changing the scale for Halifax, I think the same reason should make it good in the other ports of the Dominion. Is this intended to make the charge

less upon smaller vessels or greater on the larger vessels? Is it intended to produce more revenue or less? and can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of the amount of revenue obtained, and what has been done with the balance of it, after paying the Harbor Master's salary of \$1,600?

Mr. McLELAN. This will give the same revenue that has been collected according to the scale heretofore in use, but on smaller vessels it is less. As to the balance, it has been paid to the credit of the Government.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is this Act to legalize what has been illegally done by the Port Warden at Halifax? I understand he has been collecting fees on a scale different from that authorized by law. Is it proposed to legalize the collection of these fees?

Mr. McLELAN. The object is to have a legal scale of fees for the Port of Halifax, to make the scale the same as in the General Act.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I understand the Port Warden at Halifax has been collecting fees different from those which he was authorized to collect by law. Of course, his conduct is illegal in that respect, and it might be necessary to have some retroactive legislation to legalize what he has illegally done. If that is the object of course I have no objection to the Bill; but I certainly had not heard of any desire for a change in the scale.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 140) to amend the Act 35 Victoria, Chapter 42, providing for the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.

Bill read the first time.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the fifth sub-section of the eighteenth section of the Pilotage Act of 1873, by providing that the Pilotage Authorities of the District of Quebec shall not grant any new license to any person as a Pilot until the number of Pilots in the said District is thus reduced below one hundred and twenty-five, which number shall never be exceeded after such reduction, and also to repeal the twenty-sixth section of the said Act and to empower the said Pilotage Authorities to prescribe the number of apprentices to be indentured to the Corporation of Pilots, having regard to the requirements of the service and not exceeding the number now limited by the said Act.

He said: I will just say in explanation of this resolution that the pilots of Quebec complain that the amounts received for their pilotage fees does not give them a sufficient annual allowance to maintain them, and it is found, on enquiry, that the number (184) now employed is larger than the necessities of the port demand. The large number of steamships running to the port and the opening of railways have enabled the pilots to get down more readily to the ground where pilots are taken by vessels, and in consequence a much smaller number than 184 could perform the service. The Act under which they are operating prescribes that they shall not exceed 200; the maximum is fixed at that number and the minimum at 150, they now stand at 184 which gives an allowance to each of something over \$500, and they have made application for authority to increase the pilotage fees, claiming that the sum received does not pay their expenses and leave enough to support them. Instead of that, however, it is thought better to amend the Act so that the number may be reduced below 150, which is the minimum under the present Act. A large number of the men are aged, thirty-three or thirty-four of them being about sixty-five years of age and will soon be pensioned, when the number can be reduced down to the wants of the port. We consider 125 would be ample under present circumstances, as there is so much steam being employed both in shipping and railways, and it is proposed to reduce the number to 125 instead

of giving them larger fees and imposing heavier taxes upon the shipping visiting the port.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. As I understand this resolution, it is that no new pilots are to be appointed at all until the present number is reduced to 125, which number is considered sufficient for the wants of the port.

Mr. McLELAN. It may be necessary to provide that the apprentices now on shall remain. The wording of this resolution, perhaps, does not convey exactly what I intended, but the young men who are now serving apprenticeship—who are on the list of apprentices—may have to be provided for, but no new apprentices shall be taken on. The Act fixes the number of apprentices that must be on the list, at thirty-five I think it is, and says that the number of pilots shall not fall below 150.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This appears to be a Bill to provide for the limitation of our foreign trade, consequent, no doubt, upon the legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. If you continue to take on apprentices I do not see very well how you can restrict the number of pilots; you should restrict the number of apprentices also.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The pilots themselves will see that their interest is not to increase the number of apprentices, and they will have to reduce them in proportion to their own numbers. The maximum number of pilots as provided by the present Bill, is, as my colleague said just now, largely in excess of the wants of the port of Quebec. There is no doubt that at that time when there was no railway between Quebec and the Lower St. Lawrence, the number of pilots was required to be much larger than it should be at the present time, because now they can come up to Quebec or go down to Father Point or Rimouski, in eight or nine hours, whilst previous to the opening of the railway they had to go by schooners, and were sometimes several days in reaching the pilotage ground. Under those circumstances we did not think, two years ago, that we should sanction a by-law that had been proposed by the Pilotage Authorities in Quebec to the effect that the tolls on the tonnage of vessels should be received for the sustenance of these pilots, we thought we should rather see whether the trade could not be made to yield the amount fixed by the previous Act, that is to say, \$600 a piece. That was found to be sufficient two years ago, but last year it fell down to \$508 or \$510 a head, and while that amount was considered too small, we were not disposed to come to Parliament and ask that the tolls on shipping should be increased; we thought, however, that one mode of meeting the emergency was to see whether the number of pilots was not too large. Certainly the existing number (184) is too large for the present exigencies of the Quebec trade, with the facilities of communication which are now available; therefore my colleague has brought this Bill before the House, which, I think, will meet the difficulty, and, at the same time, insure the trade being served efficiently, as in the past.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 142) to amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.

Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Royal Commission,

DRAWBACKS ON CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY SUPPLIES.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations:

(1) For ascertaining the quantities and values of fish plates and other fastenings, spikes, bolts, nuts, and iron bridges, manufactured in Canada for use by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the original construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as defined in the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 14, and also the quantities and values of all telegraphic apparatus manufactured in Canada to be used by the said Company in the original construction and first equipment of a telegraph line in connection with the said Railway:

And for ascertaining the persons in Canada from whom such fish plates and other fastenings, spikes, bolts, nuts, and iron bridges and telegraphic apparatus, respectively, has been procured by the said Company.

2. That the Governor in Council, with the consent of the Treasury Board, and on such terms and conditions as may be thought proper, may pay over to the persons in Canada from whom such articles as aforesaid, manufactured in Canada, have been procured, sums of money not exceeding the amount of Customs duty which would have been payable on such articles, respectively, if imported into Canada at the time they were so procured by the said Company.

He said: I explained the resolutions fully when I first introduced the Bill, but it was afterwards thought better to proceed by the present mode.

Mr. BLAKE. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that an Order of the House has been made for a return of all correspondence and papers in connection with this matter, which has not been brought down.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not long ago that that motion was passed.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. No. It was since the question was discussed.

Mr. BLAKE. No. There was a motion made somewhere about the 15th or 20th of February.

Mr. BOWELL. By the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson)?

Mr. BLAKE. No. By myself.

Mr. BOWELL. I laid one return on the Table to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. I made a special motion, I think, on the 15th or 20th of February for all correspondence in connection with the drawbacks and an estimate of the total amount of the remission which would be made, assuming the articles to be manufactured in Canada. On the hon. gentleman making a statement that this was one of the subjects on which no enquiry had been made, I framed another motion which has not yet been reached, and, of course, I am not speaking of it. I am speaking of the old motion.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman may be correct, but if so, I have forgotten it. I will, however, make enquiry and endeavor to have the information before proceeding with the second stage of the Bill.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). I suppose the object of the Bill is to give the Government power to facilitate payment of these drawbacks more than at the present time.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The Bill provides at present that the drawback cannot be paid until the article on which it is to be paid has been actually used in construction. The proposition is to change the words "have been used" to "for the use of" to enable the Government to pay to the manufacturer an amount equal to the duties which would have been paid, had the articles been imported—this amount to be paid on the delivery of the articles to the Railway Company. The Bill will provide for a bond being given by the Railway Company that these spikes or other articles should be used for original construction and no other.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that the payment shall be made anterior to the manufacture or after the manufacture and before they have actually gone into use?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The intention is on the delivery to the Company, and on evidence from the Company that they have received them. For that purpose we may pay the drawback and thus put the manufacturer in precisely the same position as the importer now is who imports an article for special use, when, if imported for any other use, he has to pay the duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman able to give us any idea of the amount that will probably be paid under the operation of this measure?

Mr. BOWELL. No, not positively; but I think perhaps \$100,000 or \$150,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I meant not the claims made at this moment. Does the hon. gentleman mean that that is the amount of the claims just made?

Mr. BOWELL. No. I think that will be the amount of them altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. That is on the assumption that there is manufactured in Canada, or capable of being manufactured, all the articles required for the original plans of construction, which are referred to here.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; but, of course, I cannot state positively.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly. This is one of the points on which the return that I asked for would have given some information.

On clause 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Does this apply to the branches?

Mr. BOWELL. No; only to the main line. When the correspondence comes down, the hon. gentleman will find that the demands were made by them, and not by the manufacturers, and resisted by the Department.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Mr. BOWELL introduced Bill (No. 141) to provide for the allowance of drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada, for use in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Civil Service of Canada. He said: When I introduced this Bill the other day, I explained rather fully the provisions of the Bill. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman desires me to go over the ground again, as I thought I gave as full an explanation on that occasion as would be required. But, if the hon. gentleman wishes any explanations about some special clause, I am ready to give them now.

Mr. BLAKE. I certainly expected that the hon. gentleman was about to fulfil, in a larger and more liberal spirit, the promise he made a few moments ago, that he was about to explain the Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But it occurred to me, when I was rising, that I had explained it on the first reading.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, as to the minor details of the measure, this is perhaps not the most appropriate time to invite the hon. gentleman's explanations of specific clauses; but some clauses are of such great cardinal importance that I think attention should be called to them at this stage of the measure. The hon. gentleman, in bringing down

the measure, did not, so far as I remember, enter into explanations, which I think he was obviously called on to give, having regard to the official action of the Administration upon a former occasion when this subject was broached, and to the report of the Civil Service Commission which was a consequence of that action. The measure before us is one of very great importance to the public of this country, involving, as it must be assumed to do, an attempt to settle upon a permanent basis for a constitution and organization of the Civil Service, both inside and outside of the Departments, comprising a thousand or more officials, upon whose efficient discharge of their duties very much depends. The Administration acknowledges, on the occasion on which the Commission was issued, the wholly unsatisfactory condition of the system, and the defective results which had followed from the departure from the plan suggested by the law, and partly from the mode in which the law had been carried out or neglected. The report of the sub-Committee of Council, adopted by the Council on the 16th of June, 1880, under which the Civil Service Commission issued, states:

"Since the period referred to (21st Dec., 1869) a series of years have elapsed and many changes in the character as well as in the extent of the service required in each Department have developed themselves, the duties of some Departments and some branches of each Department and of certain officers in each Department have been varied, diminished or increased, and many men have, by old age, incapacity, bad habits or continued idleness, become unavailable for useful purpose—the number of men in each Department has increased, it is thought out of proportion to the needs of the Service. Young men have been appointed who from want of education or strength of constitution or general unfitness, have not made and will never become efficient public servants. The general expense has been increased by the tendency of the existing rules to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes.

"A careful reconsideration of the duties of each Department, including both inside and outside service, is eminently desirable with a view to seeking greater economy in all the Departments by the weeding out of men who from any of the causes named are no longer efficient public servants, by the creation of a new theoretical organization for each Department, which should regulate the number of each class of officers required for its work, the promotions from class to class and the steps by which salaries should be increased."

The Committee then proceeds to advise that a Commission should be appointed. Their report is adopted, the Commission is appointed on the 16th of June, 1880, and they have been engaged, more or less, at their work up to a very recent period, when their second or supplementary report is presented. Now, Sir, I desire to point out that the Government itself, in the passages of the Minute which I have just read, recognized certain defects in the existing system as it was worked, to which they wished special attention to be called, and for which they wished some remedy to be provided. These defects, so far as my present purpose is concerned, I may limit to two, although there are other and serious defects. These two are: The appointment of improper persons, whom the Government describes as "men who, from want of education or strength of constitutional or general unfitness, have not made and will never become efficient public servants;" and the retention in the service of men who "have, by old age, incapacity, bad habits or continued idleness, become unavailable for useful purpose." Owing to these defects there is a "tendency of the existing rules to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes." The question, in short, relates to the efficiency of the persons employed, and to the proper and adequate provision for appropriate salaries, having regard for the services rendered and the reward for such services. It is important to observe—and I press upon the attention of the House the fact—that the Administration itself was alive to these two difficulties, which they thought so serious as to require full investigation as to the character and extent of them, and as to the appropriate remedy, at the hands of the Commission they named. Although that Commission made a very thorough enquiry, although an immense amount of evidence

was taken, and although very clear and pointed conclusions upon many points were reached, we have not observed in the Estimates of the current year, in so far as the condition of things would have permitted regard to the proposals for reform, any indications that any such proposals were intended to be applied by the Administration at all. I quite agree that, in dealing with a subject of this description, what we have to do is to lay down good rules for the future, and apply them with a due regard to the state of things now existing, and that that may involve only a partial and slow application, so far as existing officers are concerned, of the rules, which but for the existence of these officers might be more rapidly, freely, and thoroughly applied; but so far as are concerned any new appointments, or a liberal system of promotion of officers in Departments where the Civil Service Commission reports that the great bulk of the business is of a routine character, I have observed no signs whatever of an attempt on the part of the Administration to carry out the recommendations, tending towards efficiency and economy, which that report contains. With regard to that point upon which the Administration and the Commission are agreed, the tendency to a culmination into the higher classes of officers and salary by simple time, I perceive no substantial remedy applied. If the report of the Commission is entitled to credence, and I think it is in most points, and in this point particularly, it is clear that of the inside service, at any rate, the great bulk of the work is clerical, or routine work. It is clear that what is required is a certain number of high class officials, capable of supervising the work of a very much larger body of persons, whose duties are more of a routine or mechanical description; and the evil which the Government saw was existing and was increasing, with other evils, the cost of the service disproportionately to the increase of work to be done, was this evil of the culmination into higher classes of men whose services, from their very nature, could not be more valuable after one or five years, than they were at an earlier time. To remedy this the Commission proposed that the service should be, roughly speaking, divided into two classes: the class of those whose service is of the mechanical or routine character, to which I have referred, and a higher class, in rank, intelligence, information and salary. I should be very sorry to propose that there should be, on the part of the larger class to which I have referred, any possibility of its rising into the other class at all. I think that would be a mistake. I think that men who are put into the writing classes, if they are of marked intelligence, assiduity or ability, should have a chance quite as great, perhaps greater, but, at any rate, a fair chance, together with the outside public, of rising into the other classes, but not by seniority, not by lapse of time, not by promotion in the ordinary sense. Whatever it may be determined to do with them, in the theoretical organization of the service, in the way of improved emoluments, ought to be done, so long as they remain in the writing class, solely with reference to increased efficiency in that class, if they are to remain in that class. If they are to go into the other classes, they should be promoted solely on account of superior qualifications. I perceive in the action of the Government no effort to grapple with this difficulty under which we find ourselves practically increasing the cost of the public service each year, without regard to increased responsibility, increased work, and increased efficiency. As to the other point, the question of appointments and promotions, I do not myself believe that the proposals of this measure will tend in any marked degree to remedy any of the existing evils. That is my opinion after a careful perusal of the measure. You, it is true, provide—but we have it now—an arrangement for examinations. You provide that examiners shall be appointed by the Governor in Council from time to time; that they may appoint sub-examiners, that there should

be occasional examinations &c., but you make no provision whatever to give an assurance to those who go in for those examinations, that they shall have the certainty, if they are at the top of the list, of a chance of being tried. I, by no means, affirm that you can by an examination determine that a person who passes successfully will make a good civil servant. That cannot be said, because he may, although he passes an excellent examination, and is a very estimable man, that his character is reported, truly reported to be of the best, and his health to be very good, and his writing or early career to be very excellent, he may turn out to be, from temper and characteristics of various kinds, in the actual trial not a good civil servant, he may turn out to be an unpractical man. Therefore, I would never propose that success in competitive examinations should be appointments to permanent office in the Civil Service. All that I say is, that we ought to give him the right to be tried, and if having passed the examination and gone into the service and stood the test of probationary trial, he is found practically to be efficient, then he ought to be appointed. But I do not perceive any encouragement whatever given to men to come forward to examinations which are to be held under this Bill, because I find no assurance whatever that their success, absolute or relative, in passing examinations will give that chance to which I have referred. On the contrary, the choice is with the executive officers of the Government absolutely, and, irrespective of merit. In its practical working I believe this will be the result: that those only will go up for examination who have had that assurance which can be given in various ways—various, slight and unnoticeable, but still sufficiently marked ways for the purpose—that if they succeed in passing the examinations they will be appointed to the service. You may at first, perhaps, have a few other persons who have no such assurance to go up for examination, but the practical result will be, after a little while, to limit the number to those who have been told: "If you pass the examination you will get a situation." That, of course, is a proposal entirely different, *toto celo*, from the proposal of the Commission. There is a fundamental cardinal distinction between the plan of the Government and the plan which the Commission has recommended. In giving their reason and their views as to that measure of efficiency which exists in the Civil Service, the Commission has pointed out the grounds upon which it reaches its conclusions in the 15th paragraph of the report, which says:

"15. While there exists in the public mind a very general belief that the Civil Service is defective and inefficient, and that the true remedy is the abolition of political patronage and personal favoritism in making appointments to public offices; there is, on the other hand, an impression that it is difficult and almost impracticable to apply the remedy and that those who possess the power of patronage will continue to exercise it at the sacrifice of an efficient and economical administration of public affairs. We believe this impression to be in the main erroneous, and that public men, realizing how much the prosperity and welfare of the country depends on a pure and efficient Civil Service, will not hesitate to abandon a patronage which is found to be injurious to the best interests of the country and which is generally admitted to be a source of weakness and annoyance to themselves, as well as demoralizing to the constituencies."

They point out further on that they proceeded to investigate, by the taking of evidence, what the actual condition of affairs was, and they added that there was a difficulty in the detecting of irregularities in the administration of or weakness in the system of some portions of the Civil Service. They say:

"For in presenting the evidence we feel it necessary to state that in giving their answers to the questions of the Commission some of the Deputy Heads and Chief Officers exercised a degree of reticence in their answers, which, however natural in view of the relation they bear to the Ministers on one hand and their clerks on the other, rendered their statements somewhat imperfect, and increased our difficulties in arriving at correct conclusions as to the state and needs of their Departments."

That, of course, is an observation which it was reasonable perhaps, to expect would be made under the circumstances,

Mr. BLAKE.

and which a perusal of the evidence tends to justify. Then they proceed to express the opinion which they have formed as to the effect of the present mode:

"The present mode of nomination by political influence and appointment, without examination as to qualification, which prevails so very generally in the service, seems to us and is frankly confessed by the majority of the witnesses we have examined to be defective in the highest degree. It affords no sufficient guarantee of fitness for the discharge of the duties of office. It embarrasses Ministers in providing an efficient public service, and it causes great and often irresistible pressure to be brought on Members of Parliament to force their consent to the nomination and appointment of unfit persons. It has, we think, a mischievous effect on the public mind in making the desire for offices too strong an impulse in political conduct; for while the higher offices of State are the laudable and legitimate objects of the ambition of statesmen, the scramble for a paltry patronage and for the smaller offices of the service, cannot but have a bad effect alike on those who exercise and those who enjoy such patronage.

"23. Notwithstanding the reluctance of witnesses to commit themselves to any specific statements as to the inefficiency of their subordinates, there is sufficient in their general statements on that subject to justify the conclusion that the service is susceptible of very great improvement, and that there have been many appointments to it of persons whose habits, lack of educational acquirements, or inaptitude for business could not fail to produce a state of affairs fully justifying most of the propositions stated in the reference to the Commission. But apart from any specific statements made in the evidence, we find in its general tenor and in what we have ourselves observed, abundant reasons for the conclusion that the service requires reform, and that it has not been sufficiently guarded against the evil effects of political patronage.

"24. To this baneful influence, we believe, may be traced nearly all that demands change. It is responsible for admission to the service of those who are too old to be efficient; of those whose impaired health and enfeebled constitutions forbid the hope that they can ever become useful public servants; of those whose personal habits are equally fatal objections; of those whose lack of education should disqualify them; and of those whose mental qualities are of an order that has made it impossible for them to succeed in private business. It is responsible too for the appointment of those who desire to lead an easy and what they deem, a genteel life.

"To the same influence may be ascribed most of the appointments of men taken from beyond the service to the best places over the heads of tried and efficient servants: and it may fairly be charged with all the discontent and demoralization arising out of the feeling, justified by bitter experience, that a faithful and zealous performance of duty establishes no sure claim to the prizes of the service, which, as is abundantly shown by the evidence, are too often carried off by persons whose claim to office is mainly founded on the political service they have rendered to their party. These observations, we may add, apply with greater force to the outside as compared with the inside service, in which there is but little chance of advancement or increase of pay. To this class of appointments and the consequent removal of the chief incentive to zeal, may perhaps be attributed more than to any other single cause, the languid interest which many of the public servants feel in the performance of their duties. They have but little motive for more than the most perfunctory performance of their work, because they feel they are in that way as likely to gain promotion as by the most active performance of it; and that should a vacancy occur above them, it would not probably be given to some favored politician whose qualifications for the duty have not yet been tested.

"Political patronage is responsible for other evils, and we do not hesitate to express the conviction that many unnecessary civil offices have been retained, and that new places have been created, for no better purpose than to provide for the followers of influential politicians."

So with reference to promotions:

"Sometimes promotions have been made by seniority, regardless of merit, thus—as suggested by the order of reference—filling the more highly paid places with men whose chief qualifications are length of service. In other cases they have been made regardless of either merit or seniority, and in this way men fully qualified and fairly entitled to promotion have been passed over, and others less qualified have, by undue influences, obtained promotion in their stead. We find, too, that in many instances men have been brought from beyond the service and either placed at once over the heads of long tried and efficient men, or, after temporarily filling minor positions, they have been elevated with unjustifiable rapidity to places for which they had no previous training."

And it points out the evils which naturally flow from such a state of things. The report goes on to say:

"Having stated what we believe to be the faults in the existing system of making first appointments to the service, and their cause, it becomes our duty to submit a remedy. This, we believe, can only be found in completely eliminating all trace of political patronage. The remedy involves the necessity of substituting some other mode of regulating entrances to the service, and this without doubt is a more difficult task than might at first appear."

After discussing some of the systems which have been adopted in different countries, including the English system, the report, at the twentieth page, suggests the adoption of

competitive examination and of promotion by merit and services:

"We do not claim that it follows as a matter of course that those who may succeed best in a competitive examination will necessarily succeed best in the performance of the duties of the position it may obtain for them, but we believe it will exclude the incompetent and lessen the chances of the appointment of unsuitable candidates, and that open competitive examination, having due relation to the work and duties to be performed and supplemented by proper guarantees as to age, health and moral character—with a period of probation before appointment—is the most just and practical means of supplying fit persons for appointment, and that—as has been proved elsewhere, so it will happen here—it will give the best servants to the public.

"We claim that it is the most effectual, indeed the only means of completely and permanently cutting away all opportunities for the exercise of political influence in making appointments and promotions in the public service, which we believe to be so injurious to the public interests."

And further remarks are made in the same sense. Now, the report, in dealing with the existing state of things, besides many other valuable suggestions and statements, adverts to the length of hours which is practically kept, and to certain other irregularities which it states exists. But I do not intend to trouble the House at this stage with those difficulties. Enough to say that there is a careful investigation, and it seems to me a fair result is reached from the evidence, indicating a condition of things which, co-existent with the presence in the service, I am glad to be able to agree to, of many very efficient and excellent persons; also stating that there are some to whom that character cannot be fairly ascribed, and that the system is one which does not tend to bring out the best there is in those who are there, which rather, to my mind, interposes difficulties in getting the best of the work of those who are there, and results practically in the public not being as efficiently served as it would be under another system. Now, it seems to me that the cardinal defects of the proposal of the Administration for a settlement of this long standing and vexed question, are, that although it gives a very formidable account of the preliminary examinations, etc., there are no guarantees either for a properly wide area of persons to be examined, or a properly efficient examination. There are no guarantees for the removal of those evil influences which are spoken of in the report of the Commission, as being the sources of the weakness and improprieties in appointments to the service, but the system, such as it exists, will be found, I am afraid, practically to continue. Secondly, there is no proposal, as there ought to be, no real, radical, thorough proposal for the separation of the service into two classes, into which it naturally divides itself—those who are, and must from the character of their occupation remain in the position of writers and clerks, of that description performing clerical work, and those who have different and much higher functions to discharge. I think that in these two particulars the practical operation of this measure, no matter what words or clauses we may find in this Bill, will be to leave things pretty much as they are. That they are in a wholly unsatisfactory condition, viewing the service as a whole—with striking exceptions, no doubt, as to efficiency under discouraging circumstances—is conceded by the Administration in the language which it used in ordering the issue of this Commission; and it is also established by the report of the majority of that Commission to which I have referred, agreed to and endorsed, as I believe, it is by the general public, that these evils and difficulties will be readily and practically remedied by the measure, or even greatly improved, I am afraid I cannot agree; and therefore it is, that I have felt that the hon. gentleman—face to face with the report to Council which inaugurated this Commission, face to face with the statements made in the report of this Commission—in asking for the second reading of this Bill, should have given some explanation of the general principles of the measure, and shown how it was that in its practical operation the admitted evils of the present would be remedied by the proposed legislation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must thank the hon. gentleman for the very calm and temperate manner in which he has discussed this measure, and for the suggestions he has made. Of course, I could not expect that the hon. gentleman would agree altogether with the provisions of this Bill, or the principles on which the measure is founded, but he will remember, I have no doubt, in discussing this Bill, that this matter must have come more than once before his Administration or that of his friends when they were in office, during a period of five years. They must have felt then that some measure should be brought forward, that some change was needed, and my hon. friend must recollect that it was left to one of the private members of his party to attempt, I think twice during two consecutive years, to bring in a measure to meet the difficulties that we all see in the public service. When the measure of which I speak was before the House, hon. gentlemen on the other side felt that though it showed a great deal of labor and research on the part of its mover, they were still not in a position to have it fully considered by the House, the consequence being that during those five years the measure was not passed. When we came into office, we thought that something should be done; that we should apply some remedy to the evils which we all admitted. We thought that this should not be a party measure, but that we were all interested alike in seeing that the Civil Service of the country should be a proper one, and that we should elevate that service as much as we could, and that we should make it as pure and as efficient as possible. Under those circumstances the present Government appointed a Commission of able men to examine into this very important question, to call witnesses and to make a report of their labors. Those gentlemen under their responsibilities have made their report, they have not all agreed, and there has been presented a report of the minority. Both reports are very important, they show a great deal of labor and much research, they display much talent and very great knowledge; but, on the other hand, the Government tried, when this report was brought before them, to assume their own responsibility in bringing the measure here. We had to consider how far we could go under the conditions which at present exist, for if we had to prepare a Bill providing for an entirely new service without considering that an organization of long standing had to be dealt with, we should have presented a different measure in many respects from the one which is now before the House. But we are not in that position at present; we find the public service there, and a law on the Statute-Book establishing that service, directing it, and directing the way in which it is to be renewed and maintained. We thought that the present law as it stands was not sufficient and should be changed, and in that view we are supported I think by the hon. gentlemen of the other side of the House, in fact the hon. member from West Durham has admitted it. That hon. gentleman has hinted that this Bill, in as far as the examination goes, will not meet the difficulty. Well, I must differ from the hon. gentleman on this point. The present Civil Service Act says that an officer may be appointed, but that afterwards within a certain time he must pass an examination; and then if it is found that he is able for the position, he may be confirmed in his appointment. The hon. gentleman must know, however, the difficulty which is found by all Governments when appointments are made and when the examination is to take place after such appointments. Very often it must be recollected that their examinations have been postponed from time to time, and I have no doubt that if we were to look very closely into the appointments which have been made during the last twenty years we would find that some examinations have been done away with altogether. It is quite possible, therefore, that we had no guarantee in the present case that the civil servant would be a good one,

or that he would have the qualifications required for his office. And why? Because when you appoint him he has passed no examination, he has been brought forward on the recommendation of his friends, and for that reason has been appointed to the service, therefore you have no guarantee that he is fitted for the office to which he is assigned, and you take him on the *parole* of his friends. To avoid that, we thought that the best mode under the circumstances was to enact, by this new measure, that no officer shall be appointed to any position in the Civil Service unless he has previously passed the examination, and, according to the premises of this Bill, has obtained a certificate that he is among those qualified to obtain an office in one or other of the classes mentioned in the Bill. Thus, no person under this Bill will be appointed unless he has obtained such a certificate, and appears upon the list of qualified men. That is a guarantee that the officer appointed will have the requisite qualifications, or at all events, as the hon. member for West Durham said just now, some of the qualifications; because I admit while you may have all the examinations in the world, and while you may have a candidate who possesses, apparently, all the qualifications necessary to obtain the certificate, he still may not be thoroughly suited for the office he is to fill. It stands to reason. The hon. gentleman knows that an officer who is appointed as a writer, for example, may have a good and a steady hand; he may be very expeditious in his work and steady in his habits, and yet not be found fit for his office, because his temper may be very bad, or he may have some other peculiarities which will not adapt him for office work under the Government. These peculiarities cannot be found out by examination but only by trial. That is the reason why we provide that these appointments shall not be confirmed immediately, but that the candidates shall be subject to trial. This, I contend, will be a very strong guarantee that the Civil Service will improve in the appointments to be made hereafter. The hon. gentleman says, that we have not adopted, in this Bill, the corner stone, if I may use the word, of the measure that was suggested by the Commissioners—that is to say, competitive examinations. We have not adopted the system of competitive examinations, because we thought that qualification examinations were sufficient. Competitive examinations would not place us in a better position. It would place us in this position: that the person who stood at the head of the list, according to the number of points he may have made, would have to be appointed to an office for which he might not, perhaps, be suited. He might be exactly the man you would not like to have there, because, though he might be a good accountant, he might want some other qualifications, and yet you would have to take him. But under the system of qualification examinations you may select from the list the man who best suits the place and is best able to fulfil his duties and his duties to the chief of his Department, and that is the strong reason why a change should be made in the recommendations made by the Commissioners. The hon. gentleman speaks of the appointment of improper persons as mentioned in the report, and the retaining of such persons in office. Well, so far as possible, if the party is an improper person to be kept in office he is dismissed. We get rid of him as soon as possible and appoint another more suitable man; but you may find a person who is not very able for his duties, but if he is in the office, under the old law, it is very difficult to get rid of him immediately. You may try as soon as possible to put him in another office, which he can fill and bring another into his place who is better qualified, but still that system is attended with very great difficulties. If the Bill becomes law those difficulties will be avoided to a very great extent, because as an examination takes place we will have a guarantee that the person is a proper person to fill the office, and we will be in

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

a position not to be accused—I do not speak of ourselves, but of all Governments—of retaining in the Civil Service persons who are not fit for their office. The hon. leader of the Opposition speaks of the increase of salaries of officers, and he takes objection to these increases being made according to the length of time a person may have served. Well, there is a great deal in that objection, no doubt. You may take a person for example who may have been eight or ten years in the service, and, according to the law as it now stands, he is eligible for promotion to the next class after five years' service. That system may lead to abuses. There may be an officer who may be a favorite and may not be as able to do his work as well as another who has served a less time, but under the law he is eligible for promotion, according to his term of service. I do not admit that that is a proper rule, or that it leads to the efficiency of the public service. On the contrary, I think that, under the proposition we are now laying before the House, that may be avoided. There will be only three classes. The length of service necessary for promotion evidently will be longer than under the present law, and the result will be that persons cannot be promoted only on account of length of service. The fact is that they will not be eligible for another class unless the Minister finds an officer very vigilant, finding that he deserves promotion, and that promotion is required in the Department—in that case only will an officer be promoted. Therefore, as the hon. gentleman said, the mere fact that an officer has served a certain number of years will form no ground for promotion. If a man who serves say for seven years is better qualified, if he shows by his service that he is fit for a higher class of duties, he should be promoted before one who has served for ten years, if the latter has shown less capacity, less ability and fewer qualifications for the office. The hon. gentleman says he sees nothing in the Estimates showing a reform, or an intention to promote efficiency or economy in the service. The hon. gentleman must see that we had to bring down the Estimates for the present service; the Bill is before the House, but it may not become law. We have to take the Civil Service as it is, but, if the Bill passes, then it will be the duty of the Government to apply the law fairly, and in the sense that Parliament desires it to be applied. The law will have to be applied by determining the theoretical organization of the Department. We will have to take the different Departments in the light of the evidence we have before us, and determine the number of persons, of the different classes, for each Department. Then we will have to apply to that skeleton—if I may call it so—the officers that are now in the public service. If some of them are not wanted the Bill provides for elimination; if more are required for certain Departments, it also provides for that; but the theoretical organization of a Department under this Bill should not be foreseen, and cannot be foreseen, until the Bill has become law, and therefore we could not provide in the Estimates for anything but the present service. After the Bill has become law, we shall be able to complete the organization: and then we shall be able to come down to Parliament next year and state what that organization is, and what it will cost. I have already answered the other remark of the hon. gentleman, that no substantial remedy is likely to be applied. I have shown that there will be a substantial remedy applied to the present state of things by the appointments which will be made in the way I have mentioned. We intend that the examinations will be real and true examinations, conducted by true and trusty men, and these examinations will give us good candidates for the offices to be filled.

Mr. BLAKE. You do not think they will be colorable examinations—the color blue, for example?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope not; I hope the examinations will be as fair as Parliament wishes them to

bc. I think these examinations should not be sham examinations, but real examinations. The qualifications required for the different classes should be known beforehand—what branches of knowledge the candidates will be examined on; and these being known beforehand, no candidate would come forward if he did not feel himself really able to be examined. Besides, as the Bill provides, there is always a preliminary examination, so that a candidate who was not fit to occupy a position in the Civil Service could not come and spend the time of the examiners, and keep the other candidates waiting for nothing.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Politics, I am afraid, would have something to do with the appointment, all the same.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite would never think of anything of that kind if they were in office; and they must give us credit for the same thing. The hon. gentleman may be sure that the fact that we are obliged to appoint all officers from the list of those who have passed a preliminary examination is a guarantee that the appointments will be better than they have been in the past. I have no doubt there will always be politics connected with appointments made by any Government. I have yet to see a Government which will appoint its opponents to office. As a rule, a Government appoints its friends; but in this case all, whether friends or foes, have to pass the examinations, and they will all be treated alike, because the examinations will be conducted, not by political men, not by Ministers or their friends, but by men who will have no interest one way or the other but to see whether the person who comes up for examination is qualified for it, and if he is, he will get his certificate. I agree with the hon. gentleman that promotion should not be regulated by seniority, but by qualification; that is the principle adopted in this Bill, and I think it is the only way in which we can have an efficient service. The hon. gentleman says that the success of the candidates does not give them a positive guarantee that they will be appointed.

Mr. BLAKE. That they will be tried—that they will have a probationary appointment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, these candidates run their chance, as they are doing to-day, but with this difference, that they will not have to compete with the world, but with those only who are on the list; and if they can show that they are the best men, that they have more knowledge, and more ability, and more experience than others, they will have a better chance of being appointed than others. We cannot take the list just as we find it; we must enquire who the men are, whether they are old or young, what training they have had, what their previous experience has been, and so on; and a man with previous experience would naturally stand a better chance than one without any experience. The success of the candidates will depend altogether on their qualifications and upon the number of their competitors. The hon. gentleman has said that there was no guarantee for the removal of these evil influences pointed out in the report. The evil influences are that appointments have been made in the past, under all Governments, by political influence, and I was answering that objection made just now in, perhaps, a peculiar way by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. The fact is, political influences will always have and always had something to do with appointments; but this Bill is, I think, a guarantee that there will be a minimum of those influences. Suppose the hon. gentleman were on this side of the House, in the place I had a few years ago—

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I expect to be there next.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will join us. In that case, he will be well received. Supposing he were on this side, and this Bill were passed, and

he had to make an appointment in his office, he would take the list and say: "Who are these men? I do not know these two or three men, but here is one that I know, or who is known by some of my colleagues or some other persons."

Mr. BLAKE. He is well recommended.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would, perhaps, be a strong inducement, and I think my hon. friend for West Durham would, in a case of that kind, certainly lean in that direction because he would say: "Well, I think I was right as these recommendations prove, therefore I will appoint him and have a good civil servant." I did not refuse the hon. gentleman when he got up first to give him the explanations required because I wished to give him an opportunity, after I had explained the Bill the other day, to make his remarks on it so that I would not have to trouble the House several times on the same subject. I wished to answer his criticisms and have done so, I think, successfully. I have shown that this Bill, though it is not the Bill exactly that the Commission have recommended, is nevertheless a great improvement on the present law, and is a Bill which I believe, if it becomes law, will give a remedy to a great deal of the evils complained of to-day. Speaking of the Civil Service I wish to say that, of course, there may be some inefficient officers in the service, but, all in all, we have a good Civil Service, we have good trustworthy officials, men who devote themselves, and have devoted themselves for years faithfully, not to their political friends, but to their public duties, and I am glad to bear this testimony to their worth, because in my long public career I have had an opportunity of seeing and dealing with a great many of these public servants. I have been at the head of different Departments, and I may say, all in all, our Civil Service can compare favorably with that of any other country. There are, of course, ways of improvement, and I think this Bill is a step in the right direction. Having said so much, I hope the hon. gentleman will, at least, admit that the Government have done a great deal to bring this measure before Parliament, and to remedy a great many of the evils complained of, and I hope the hon. gentleman will assist us in carrying the measure through.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to find that this question of reform in the Civil Service has at last attained the recognition of being brought before the House in the form of a Bill. I do not think many of us fully realize how very closely home the evils of the service come to our interests and our comfort; but we should recollect that, as far as concerns the public, the action of the Government, in its Executive capacity, is entirely represented by the Civil Service. The public who have business in the various Departments, only meet, in general, the subordinates of the Ministers. I might refer to the Department of Customs itself. My hon. friend the Minister does not come into contact with those with whom the Department has to deal. Those people gather their impressions of the way in which the Department is managed entirely from the subordinates with whom they come in contact. I have no doubt that, in many cases, the hon. the Minister is abused for acts which in his personal capacity he would not have authorized. Yet, the Government are responsible, because they have deliberately chosen those agents to act as their representatives in the Departments. The hon. the Minister began by using the *tu quoque* argument. He said we are to blame for not having introduced the principle of competitive examinations. You, on the other side, were frequently urged to do the same thing, and contended there are two or three things to be said in answer to that argument. In the first place, I did not bring up the matter quite as frequently as the hon. gentleman said. I only brought up the Bill once during the incumbency of my hon. friends in office, and it is generally understood, when a private member brings in a Bill of that kind, it is only to

be looked upon as a tentative measure, and the Government are not supposed to take the measure off his hands at the first blush, before they have thoroughly considered the matter. I have every reason to believe the then Government looked favorably on a system such as that I proposed, and, I have no doubt, had my hon. friends remained in office, we would have had a Bill of a different character from the present one. When our friends were in power they had no such detailed information in regard to the service as the Government have. To be sure, during one Session, a Committee sat, and took a considerable mass of evidence, and made some recommendations, and I am very glad to observe that the evidence then taken and the recommendations then made coincided almost identically with the evidence and recommendations laid before the House by the present Commission, but that enquiry has not to be compared, for a moment, with the very exhaustive one made by hon. gentlemen opposite. They appointed six very able gentlemen to enquire into this matter. Those gentlemen were invested with full powers, and were in Session for many months. I am glad to hear testimony to the thoroughness with which they appear to have carried out their enquiry and to the impartiality which they appear to have used in making their recommendations and report. These recommendations have been at the service of the Government for about a year, yet the evidence has been apparently neglected, the recommendations disregarded, and now we get from the Government the reasons why. Well Sir, I find that there was a minority report. It was signed by two members of the Commission, and there was a majority report signed by six members, one gentleman signed both reports, agreeing in the main with the majority but holding certain special views, which he presented in the minority report. We may take it for granted that these six gentlemen were practically agreed on the main principles of these recommendations, while one of the Commission was in opposition thereto. The hon. Minister says that after having gone to such expense and appointed such able men, who made such a thorough inquiry into the whole subject, they adopted the report of the minority instead of that of the majority; but, Sir, he gave us another reason why no change should be made in the system of appointing members of the Civil Service, this was that it was not as if we had a clean sheet before us, on which we could commence and construct a reformed Civil Service, but we had a Civil Service, which was already in existence, and, therefore, we could not introduce any new principle in its regard. This was a very strong reason, in my opinion. If we had not a Civil Service at present, we should not suffer from the evils which are authoritatively reputed to exist in it; there would be no need for Civil Service reform, and there would be no evils to remedy. The hon. gentleman says in effect, that because the service needs a remedy there is no room for its application, and that because we have a Civil Service, which is admitted to be very faulty, we must not remove the evil. Surely this must not be the argument which the hon. gentleman had in his mind; but it was certainly the argument of which he made use. I do not see, Sir, how these changes should injuriously affect the service as it now exists. The hon. Minister has admitted that changes of a certain sort would not injudiciously affect the service; some changes he considers to be of very vital importance; and yet he thinks that these should not be made owing to the fact that the service is in existence. He has made changes which he considers very vital. But a change in the mode of appointment would not be detrimental to the service, nor would a change in the manner of promotion injuriously interfere with the interests of the service, it would only do the justice which it is admitted ought to be accomplished. A change in the respect which is recommended by the Commission, should do no harm to those

Mr. CASEY.

who are in the service; and the fact that we are not organizing a Civil Service afresh is certainly no reason why it should not be adopted—when we are practically dealing with a service that already exists. But, Sir, to come down to the Bill itself, my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Blake) has said that the evils which are complained of by that Commission were left substantially untouched, by the Bill, as it now stands, and my hon. friend opposite thinks he has shown that these evils are removed or at least reduced to the smallest possible degree by the Bill; and in order to show this, he urges that he has introduced a qualifying examination as a necessary preliminary to entering the service; and he thinks, Sir, that this examination will absolutely prevent the evils spoken of, or at least greatly minimize them. Well, Sir, I cannot see that this examination will either abolish or minimize these evils. He claimed more than that: that such an examination would prevent the entrance into the Civil Service of persons unfit to serve therein. Well, Sir, if this examination were even what I am about to contend it cannot be, a thoroughly impartial and judicial examination, it would not prevent the entrance of unfit persons any more than would the system of competitive examinations to which the hon. gentleman objects. I contend that it would not prevent them at all. Even in that case, for although it professes or pretends to leave the examination open to all comers, it is practically an examination which is open only to those who are recommended by supporters of the Ministry in power at the time. My hon. friend from West Durham assumed that point, and the hon. Minister himself agrees that this assumption is correct, because he has told us in clear words, that no Ministry would ever appoint those who were their opponents to office. He says he has yet to see a Ministry which so appoints its opponents; that he never appoints opponents, and that he never heard of a Minister who did; and he says that a Minister would take the list of those who had passed the qualifying examination, look over it, and select therefrom those whom he considered fit for the appointments that might be in question. And he has very clearly said, that he would strongly recommend supporters of the Government for such appointments, this fact being about the strongest argument which can possibly be offered in favor of making a certain selection from such a list. Well, Sir, the meaning of all this clearly is: that no matter how one comes up for examination or how one passed, only those who previously or subsequently are recommended by supporters of the Government will get the places. It is then a perfect farce to say that these examinations are open to all comers, for although the examinations are open to all, only those who are favored can get appointments; and it is not fair, under these circumstances, to say that the fact of having open examinations will be evidence that the appointments which may be made under this system will not be conferred on improper parties. I said, I was about to contend that these examinations could not be thoroughly impartial and judicial. Hon. gentlemen will have noticed that the Bill provides that examiners may be appointed from time to time by the Government, to hold office during the pleasure of the Government, and that these examiners will conduct the examination. Now, Sir, who are these judicial individuals who are to decide as to the fitness or unfitness of those who enter the service? They are simply members of the Civil Service themselves; and they are as much at the mercy of the Government of the day, as are second or third class clerks in a Department. What is to be expected from ordinary human nature, and especially from political human nature, under such circumstances? No doubt the examiners will be chosen from among political friends, and what examiners, dependent for their positions and salaries on the influence of the Government of the day, will refuse to pass highly recommended individuals, if they

happen to come anywhere near the standard which the Government have chosen to set up. Even supposing that the examination was not such mere matter of form, as it is quite certain to be under these circumstances, we must remember that amongst those who pass any particular examination and who come up to any fixed standard, there may be the greatest inequality. Some may know two or three times as much as may be necessary to pass the examination; others may be barely able to scrape through, and between these extremely intelligent people, and those who had only a sufficient smattering to enable them to pass the examination, the selection will be made, and this will be done, as the hon. Minister admits, largely on political grounds—so largely at least, that no one who is not of the true political stripe will be appointed. The hon. gentleman does not say—and I am not assuming—that any unfit persons will be appointed, but it is quite certain, nevertheless, that no one, save those of the true blue color, will secure appointments under this system. This leads me to notice a vital and fatal—if I may be permitted to use two such contradictory adjectives—defect in this Bill, the absence of a Civil Service Commission. The hon. Minister has told us himself how difficult it was to carry out the law of 1868, how it was found that men once in the Civil Service could not well be got out of it again, although they did not pass the examination. It is declared by the hon. gentleman himself that this law has been systematically violated; and it will be found that this or any other similar law will be systematically violated by the partisans in power, no matter to what party they may belong, unless there is some Court to administer the law, and some tribunal by which such action shall be taken. There is not the slightest use in passing a good criminal or civil law, or a law of any other kind, unless impartial persons administer it; and consequently there is not the slightest use in passing a law of this kind, unless a tribunal is appointed to carry it into effect in both letter and spirit. The Commission felt this so strongly, that they recommended the appointment of a Civil Service Board, whose tenure of office should be the same as that of the Judges; and I think they showed good sense in recommending that this Board should control not only all appointments, but but also many other matters connected with the Departments. I will try and find what they say in regard to this subject. I do not pretend that any arguments of mine can have such weight as the deliberate recommendations of these gentlemen who were appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite to give their opinion on this matter. On page twenty-one of their report we read that:

“Having arrived at the conclusions above stated as to the advantages of the system we recommend, we have now to propose the means for giving effect to our suggestions. This, we believe, can only be satisfactorily accomplished by the constitution of a Board of Civil Service Commissioners as free from political influence as the Judiciary happily is. To the action of this Board we propose to refer all those questions which have heretofore hampered and impaired the administration of the Civil Service.

“We propose that this Board shall be composed of men holding an independent position, and capable of commanding general confidence; it should consist of three members, one of whom should be a French Canadian, and they should be appointed in the same manner and hold office on the same tenure as the Judges. We believe that the judgments and decisions of an impartial tribunal thus constituted would command the respect and confidence of the public and of the service.”

They go on to say that this might be objected to on the ground of cost, but they urge that this will not be very considerable; and they then continue thus:—

“Our estimate of the cost of the Board is \$25,000: less than nine-tenths of one per cent on \$2,800,000, the cost of the service. If the objects aimed at are attained by such an outlay—if the service is reformed as it is clearly shown it requires to be—and if by the action of the Board it is economically and wisely recruited, as we believe it will be, the money thus expended will be among the most judicious and most productive of all the expenditures incurred by the Government. For we have not the slightest doubt but that many times the cost will be

annually saved by the avoidance of unnecessary and unwise appointments.”

Those, Sir, are wise words on the part of the Commission: I think that they are very wise words with respect to appointments of the Board. I believe that the two defects referred to are the principal ones which are to be found in this Bill; and I consider that they are sufficient to make it utterly useless as a means for reforming the Civil Service. I mean the omission to provide that appointments should be made by competitive examination or by some other means which might be devised independent of political influence, and the appointment of a Board of Commissioners to see that the law is impartially carried out. It must not be forgotten, Sir, that the evils complained of, and which my hon. friend says his qualifying examination will remove, do not merely consist of the admission of uneducated persons into the service. The Committee hold and state their strong belief, that there are many other evils entailed upon the service by the mode of appointment. It is not only that improper persons get into the service in this way, but the whole tone of the service, and the tone of public morals throughout the country is deteriorated thereby. Although it was quoted by my hon. friend from West Durham, I may be excused for repeating a few words. The Commissioners wind up their knowledge of these statements by saying:

“Political patronage is responsible for other evils, and we do not hesitate to express the conviction that many unnecessary civil offices have been retained, and that new places have been created, for no better purpose than to provide for the followers of influential politicians.”

Now, Sir, those evils will be retained and created, as has been the case hitherto—under the operation of this Bill, for the simple reason that still the same political influences will continue to be exercised in order to make places for supporters of the Government, and get them into the service under this Bill; because it is to be supposed that most of those whom the Ministers wish to pass, will be able to pass the examinations. The hon. Minister expresses his confidence that all who come up will be able to pass. I hope this expectation will be realized, and I think it is very likely that it will. He said that as the candidates would know beforehand what qualification was required, no one would come up unless he was able to pass.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will explain. I said quite the contrary, but, of course, no doubt the hon. gentleman did not hear me. I said this: That to avoid having a great many of these candidates coming forward who were unfit, there will be preliminary examinations, under which those who were unable to pass would be rejected.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. Minister to say that if the requirements were known, candidates who knew that they could not pass would not come up to trouble the Board. I think however, the statement might be taken in the other sense, for I am sure that no person will come up unless he is recommended for a place by known supporters of the Government; and I think those who come up will get through. I was pointing out, before I made this little digression, that the only evils which could be removed by the qualifying examination, were those caused by the admission of uneducated persons to the service. If the examinations were perfectly judicial, these might be removed, but I say that it is not credible that examinations so conducted will be judicial or impartial. In any case, no matter how judicial or impartial they might be, the evils caused by political influence exercised in those appointments, would not be removed, and would be scarcely reduced. Even by that sort of examination, a man appointed owing to political influence would still be a partisan in the service the same as is the case now. It will be almost simply impossible to remove a man, even for unfitness, if he has strong political influence at his back, as

it is now impossible; and this is one of the chief evils of which complaint is made, that men who are obviously unfit are retained in office owing to the political influence which is at their back. Well, Sir, men who came into the service under this Bill, will still have political influence at their back, and it will be as hard to get rid of unfit men under it, as is now the case—this evil will not be reduced by the examination on which the hon. gentleman so much relies. In short, Sir, I must go back to the decision of the Commissioners and to the conclusions at which they arrived after so many months' careful examination—that after a full comparison of the system which is in vogue, with that which prevails in other countries, no possible change can effect a real reform in the service, unless the Government undertakes to introduce open competitive examinations and promotion by merit. Since no other change would eliminate political influence from the service, the hon. Minister raised the objection with regard to the introduction of the competitive system, that they must take him who is at the top of the list and put him into the service. Well, Sir, that is true, we must take the man who is at the top of the list, and give him priority, but we are not bound to keep him permanently. These appointments are made in England on six months probation, as is provided for in this Bill; but there is this difference: that in England a man is appointed solely on the ground of educational merit as shown in the examination; and if he fails in the slightest degree to be an efficient officer, he has no claim to, or pretension to keep the position; because it is not an appointment made owing to political influence. The hon. gentleman also contended that his being at the top of the list in a competitive examination was no proof that he would turn out to be a good officer. Of course not; neither is the fact that a man passes the qualifying examination a proof that he will turn out a good officer. Nothing but a six months probation will be any test in either case, whether a man will be an efficient officer or not. There is quite a difference between the two cases. If a man is a political nominee, and has passed the qualifying examination, he is apt to be retained whether he proves to be a good officer or not; but when an appointment is made solely on the ground of merit, he has no claim to be retained and is certain not to be retained unless he turns out to be an efficient officer; so that even admitting the existence of the difficulty which appears to be in the hon. gentleman's mind as to the retention of office, the competitive system is undoubtedly by far the more effective of the two systems, because it affords appointees a free and unprejudiced trial, which the other system does not give. I am sorry, Sir, I could not read in detail to the House the able report of this Commission. I think it expresses far more fully and conclusively than I could do, the reasons advanced in favor of the competitive system; for we may take it for granted that the present faulty state of the service admits of no argument, that being admitted by all parties. I am also sorry that the Government, having long brooded over this mass of evidence, this report, have not been able to adopt, to some extent at least, the opinions of the great majority, almost the unanimous report of those they appointed to consider the matter. I am sorry that the country should have reason to think there has been much ado about nothing, a great show of doing something without any real or substantial reforms or changes in the service. That is the impression that must go abroad to the country, the inference that I fear is the only correct one to be drawn from the premises. I do not intend to go into the details of the Bill on this occasion, such of them as I have objection to I will refer to when it comes up in the Committee on the third reading.

Bill read the second time.

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

Mr. CASEY.

After Recess.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No 102) further to amend an Act to amend and consolidate as amended, the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee).

Sir JOHN MACDONALD. The main object of the Bill is to carry out the resolution passed the other day, increasing the force. There are, however, some amendments, which I shall state as we proceed, or rather some alterations from the printed Bill, as in 1879. I move the adoption of the first section, repealing sundry sections of the old Act and substituting others.

Mr. BLAKE. Had we not better take the sections separately? The first section embraces all the sections in effect. We had better, I think, say No. 5.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, say No. 5. It reads as follows:

"5. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, authorize the Commissioner of Police to appoint, by warrant under his hand, such number of constables as he may think proper, not exceeding in the whole five hundred men, and to appoint from among them non-commissioned officers of different grades, and the Commissioner may delegate this authority to any commissioned officer of the force; and such number thereof shall be mounted as the Governor in Council may, at any time, direct: Provided that the Commissioner may appoint supernumerary constables not exceeding in the whole twenty men, in order to fill vacancies in the force, and may employ not exceeding in the whole ten men as scouts, at such rates of pay as may be authorized by the Minister charged with the control and management of the force."

The supernumerary constables are for the purpose of filling any vacancies that may take place, so that the force may always be kept up to the full strength. The only alterations are that the number of men is increased from 300 to 500, and making the number of supernumeraries twenty instead of ten. I move the adoption of the 5th clause.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended to mount the whole force?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will leave that, a good deal, to the Commissioner; not the same proportion mounted of the 500 as of the 300.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the present proportion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are nearly all mounted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are entirely mounted, are they not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been found that, for the purpose of expediting the movement of the force, in case of a sudden summons, it is well that the mounted men should be accompanied by a certain number of men in waggons—in those waggons that are used for travelling over the plains, carrying ammunition and military stores of different kinds; it greatly expedites the force and relieves the horses.

On clause 6,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause is as follows:

6. No officer or constable shall be appointed to the police force unless he be of a sound constitution, able to ride, active and able-bodied, of good character, and between the ages of eighteen and forty years; nor unless he be able to read and write either the English or French language: Provided always, that this section shall not be held to apply to any officer who has been appointed before the passing of this Act, nor to the Commissioner or Assistant-Commissioner.

The latter proviso is new, and of course does not apply to the Commissioner or Assistant-Commissioner, but they ought to be officers of fully matured age and great experience,

and the limit of forty years is inexpedient in their case. The reason why it is stated in this proviso that it should not apply to any officer appointed before the passing of this Act is in order that the appointment of officers who are at present appointed shall be held to be legal, because they act as magistrates, and some of them, when appointed, were over forty years of age. Two cases of such appointments occurred under the late Government, and one under the present Administration.

Mr. BLAKE. I was wondering what the meaning of this proviso was. It is in the Act of 1879, at least the clause appears for the first time in the Act of 1879. But prosperity makes the hon. gentleman oblivious to time; it was passed after the present Government came into office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. I fancy this was previous.

Mr. BLAKE. I find it in the Act of 1879.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is it was an Act to amend and consolidate several previous amendments.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand that the only variation in this clause is upon the point of age?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I would earnestly recommend altering the clause as to that limitation, it reads very queerly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why?

Mr. BLAKE. Will it say that no officer shall be appointed to the force unless of sound constitution, able to ride, active and able-bodied, of good character, between the age of eighteen and forty years—but strangely enough these recommendations are not to apply to officers heretofore appointed, nor to the Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must admit the correction.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman make any provisions for appointing graduates of the Military School to official positions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; there is no provision of that kind.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that we have no regularly constituted force in this country in the shape of a standing army, and it would be proper to utilize the services of those who graduate from the Military School in some such way as this force offers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although there is no provision in the Act for the employment of graduates of the Royal Military College, the Government, of course, is at liberty to make appointments from the ranks of the graduates, and it is as well that the hands of the Government should be left free in that respect. Of course, we consider that a young gentleman who has passed that school has *prima facie* the qualifications to render him an efficient officer. Since I have been at the head of the Department we have made three appointments from the Military School. One of them was Mr. Perry, who was appointed to the Royal Engineers. He met with an accident and his commission was held open for some time, but he has sufficiently recovered to avail himself of his commission, and has been appointed, much to his delight, I may say, to that place. Another gentleman who was appointed was Mr. Provost from Quebec. He had been serving in Battery "B." He received the highest testimonials as being a strict disciplinarian, a good soldier, and well trained to the management of artillery. He is the third gentleman who has been appointed to the military force.

On clause 12,

Mr. BLAKE. Under what regulations are these permits granted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Lieutenant-Governor exercises his own discretion. I think there has been no special instructions ever given to any Lieutenant-Governor as to permits. I believe there has been hitherto considerable laxity in this regard, especially in omitting to provide that after a permit has been used once it should not be used again but should be returned. It has been ascertained that permits have been used again and again without being brought back to the Lieutenant-Governor. That, however, has been prevented for the future.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the permit then taken possession of by the party who finds and seizes the spirits?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The party is obliged to give up the permit after having used it once.

Mr. BLAKE. My own impression is that this business of permits ought to be abolished instead of being extended, that the permit ought only to be granted for medicinal or sacramental purposes, and that there is no reason why we should leave permission in the hands of the Government to introduce spirituous liquors into that territory at all for any other purposes than I have mentioned. Of course, I understand the hon. gentleman is desirous of keeping the scales entirely equal. I believe with one hand he has granted some millions of acres to a Temperance Colonization Society, and last Saturday another large number, some seventeen townships, to a Licensed Victuallers Colonization Society. Whether it would be prudent with reference to the latter society that they should have permits to deal in spirituous liquors in their section of territory, I know not, but it seems to me, from all I have heard, this system of permits has been greatly abused, and that the power has not been exercised upon any well-understood principles. I think the plan here proposed is an objectionable one. But, I think that even if the power be continued it is not a reasonable one. If a man chooses to conceal and not disclose the spirits he is carrying into the territory, and if these spirits are found concealed, after "digging in, rummaging and searching"—as the Bill expresses it—and then should produce an old permit, I think it should be treated as so much waste paper. The clause is one of search, and if after the search you find concealed goods of that description, I think evidence of their concealment should be enough to show that they are there illicitly, and the production of a permit should not be held applicable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause applies to spirits found in any shape—in any store, or waggon or other conveyance—"bringing in spirits with the express purpose." It must be brought in in some way.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite so. But if you preserve a permit law, it should be the right of the constable to ask a person if he has any spirits or spirituous articles. The party declares he has not; then search proceeds, and if they are found, and then the party declares he has such spirits and produces a permit—the hon. gentleman proposes he should have every opportunity to escape. I think in such a case the party should not be allowed to escape by producing a permit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is some force in what the hon. gentleman says, and I feel disposed to insert some such words as "and not then, unless produced at once," after the words "Lieutenant-Governor." I do not think we can do away with the permits altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. Why not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It might be wanted for medicinal purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. I would allow for medicinal and sacramental purposes and none other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is another question which does not arise in this clause.

Mr. BLAKE. Under the law as it now stands the constable can forfeit, whether the person has a permit or not. The hon. gentleman proposes that his right to forfeit and destroy the liquor shall be limited.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But these words were inserted. All officers had power to seize, confiscate and destroy all spirits found, and the other Act of the North-West Government provides that the Lieutenant-Governor may grant permits. As the law now stands, spirits, to be used for medicinal purposes, and wanted decidedly, say for hospital purposes, might be seized by an officer, although a permit was shown.

Mr. MILLS. This seems to be a system of total abstinence, tempered by unlimited discretion on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor. It seems to me that the reasons which induced the Government to adopt the principle of prohibition exist, at the present time, with much greater force than at the time the policy was adopted. I do not think the hon. gentleman can make the change which he proposes without practically doing away with the policy of prohibition altogether. We have a much larger population going into the country now than when that policy was adopted. We have reason to believe that the number of persons going in will increase, year by year, and with railway construction going on, and other works of that sort; with a large laboring population, not always law-abiding, and many of them strongly disposed to use intoxicants; with the Indian population scattered over the entire country, I think we should rather endeavor to enforce obedience to the law and secure the government of the country at the least possible expense by adopting a policy of strict enforcement of the principle which the House unanimously adopted and entered upon, rather than undertake to modify it in the way proposed. The House should take great care not to adopt a policy which will practically neutralize that which was some time ago entered upon. If the House thinks that the policy of prohibition should not be extended to the North-West Territories that would be a good reason for changing the law altogether; but we have adopted a policy which was recognized by the Hudson's Bay Company in that country before it was transferred to Canada—for they inhibited the sale of intoxicants to Indians, and we all know the condition of things existing in the Blackfeet country before that tribe were brought under the conditions of the treaty which was made with them. I think, instead of doing as the hon. gentleman proposes in this Bill, we should rather impose stronger restrictions, and if this cannot be done in this Bill—because it would be well not to have this clause here at all—it is not necessarily part of this measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) object to the permit system altogether. Well, if the permit system is to be done away with it must be by altering the North-West Territories Act, which provides that permits may be allowed. Now, so long as that is the law on the Statute-Book, it is observed that the Mounted Police Act should provide that spirits coming in under a permit which is given by law, must be destroyed. This permit system is not ours. It is the system of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills.) This is a clause in the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell in 1875:

"Intoxicating liquors and other intoxicants are prohibited to be manufactured or made in the said North-West Territories, except by special permission of the Governor in Council, or to be imported or brought into the same from any Province of Canada, or elsewhere, or to be sold, exchanged, traded, or bartered, except by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant-Governor of the said Territories."

So that my hon. friend provided, not that the Lieutenant-Governor should give a permit only for hospital purposes—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not the hon. member for Bothwell's Bill at all. It is before his time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events he was a member of the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then it is my hon. friend's opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; I take the responsibility.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then he provides that the Lieutenant-Governor may give a permit to bring in intoxicating liquors or other intoxicants—Perry Davis' painkiller, Radway's ready relief, etc., etc., to any extent, for the purpose of being sold, exchanged, traded or bartered. But after the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I shall take an opportunity of reconsidering this clause to see whether the power given to the Lieutenant-Governor is not too great and should be limited; because, looking at it now, I see that he gives a very wide range, and a range, I think, without necessity. In the meantime, however, I think we must make the two Statutes consistent with each other; one Statute should not give permission to bring in the spirits, and another Statute provide that any spirits brought in shall be confiscated. The hon. member for West Durham says we are introducing two systems, an irritant and a counter-irritant, the temperance colony and the licensed victuallers' colony. I dare say they will get on very well together, and some of the licensed victuallers may go and have ginger pop across the line, and be enabled to trade, exchange, or barter to the temperance colonization society.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree that the Statutes should be made consistent; I do not agree that we should be forced by some inevitable necessity to make a change in the wrong direction. The hon. gentleman agrees that the power looks too wide, and it can be very easily corrected in this Statute. There is nothing easier than to amend the clause by inserting after the word "territories," the words "which permit shall be granted only for use for medicinal or sacramental purposes," and I move to that effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I object to that, it is inconsistent with the Bill, which only deals with the Mounted Police. If we are to have legislation on the subject, we must deal with the whole subject separately.

Mr. LONGLEY. I think some would be curious to know what objection there could be to the amendment, provided that it is really desired to keep intoxicants out of the North-West Territories except for necessary purposes. It seems to me that to empower the Lieutenant-Governor to grant permits to anybody and everybody who may choose to carry liquor into the North-West Territories amounts to very little restriction indeed. I understand that it is not at all difficult for anybody who fancies that he needs to take liquor with him into the Territories to get a permit to do so; and it is said that a permit so obtained frequently does duty tenfold, and is passed round from one to another until it answers the purpose of twenty different persons. If the object be to keep liquor out of the North-West Territories for beverage purposes, then it is very obvious that the amendment would tend in a large measure to effect that object; but if it be thought desirable that liquor shall, notwithstanding this seemingly stringent regulation, be freely admitted into the Territories, then I see very little good likely to come from the clause. It certainly is very desirable that whatever law we have should be made as clear as possible, and I quite agree with the hon. the leader of the Government that it is highly desirable that the different laws on this subject should harmonize; but really, although I am no lawyer, I think it would not be at all difficult to embrace in this Bill all that is required. I think every one will agree with me that there should be no way of obtaining a permit for the use of liquor except for medicinal or sacramental

purposes. I am an utter disbeliever in the value of intoxicants for medicinal purposes, in which I am upheld by the best medical testimony in the world; but still, many believe otherwise, and it might not be worth while to make any strenuous objection to liquor being introduced into the North-West Territories for these purposes. I had hoped that the hon. leader of the Government whose aim is, I am inclined to think, to do good, will not be content with doing good partially, but will go the whole length to attain the object which, I assume, is sought to be attained, namely, the exclusion of liquor from the North-West Territory for beverage purposes altogether.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Before this law was brought into operation great abuses prevailed in the North-West Territories in connection with the consumption of spirits brought into the country by traders from the south side of the line. So great were the abuses that there were, I think, about seventy murders committed in one year amongst the poor Indian population, maddened by drink. That induced the Government to make an effort to suppress the liquor traffic, and the police received stringent instructions to do this when possible. Large quantities of liquor were seized and parties who brought it into the country were imprisoned. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Durham seems a fair one. If the question of permits can be further restricted, so much the better. It always seemed to me that the difficulty always prevailed in legislation upon any moral question, would have less force in that sparsely populated country than anywhere else, and if a temperance organization, non-political in its character, could be got up anywhere, it could be in that country, when the population could grow up under regulations not known to us here. I would regret exceedingly if the Government now were to favor retrogressive legislation in this matter, they should rather endeavor to give force to the views which actuated us in the first place. I support the amendment very cordially, as I believe it is absolutely necessary something of that kind should be done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must understand that this amendment might as well be put in a Bill providing for the survey of the North-West Territories, as in this Bill, or very nearly so. If there is to be any alteration, the alteration must be made in the law which provides for the granting of permits. This is a Bill dealing with the organization of the Mounted Police and providing for their special duties. Their duty is to seize any spirits that they may come upon in their rounds and destroy the spirits, unless there is a permit. If the amendments were put in the Bill, it would not destroy the permit, but would simply give the police force power to seize liquor, whether introduced under permit or not. Unless, therefore, the police force happened to come on them, the spirits would still be introduced into the country under permit. The amendment has no relevance to this Act. I have not the slightest objection to submit to the House a measure greatly limiting this clause with reference to permits in the North-West Territories. The General Act provides that the Lieutenant Governor can give a permit. This amendment would provide that the police force could commit a breach of the law and destroy that permit.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman at all. We are dealing with the law which prescribes the mode in which spirits brought into the North-West Territories shall be dealt with. There is another law on that subject which prohibits bringing spirits into the North-West Territories at all, except by permission of the Lieutenant Governor. We have now a law pending that spirits brought in may be seized by the police and destroyed. The hon. gentleman proposes to alter that law by inserting a provision, unless they have the permit of the Lieutenant-Governor. I say it is perfectly competent for us, perfectly relevant to the

subject, to amend that law under this Bill to make the whole law entirely consistent. It is quite competent for us to say that, hereafter the Lieutenant-Governor's permit shall be granted only for limited purposes, and thus deal with that subject in this measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You can put it in any Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We might put it in the Temporalities Bill, if you like.

Mr. BLAKE. I think a private measure, like the Temporalities Bill, gives us quite trouble enough without introducing brandy and water into it. This Bill provides for the destruction of all spirits. It seems to me it will not be relevant to amend it in the way we propose. However, as the hon. gentleman has stated that he will bring in a Bill, in time, I presume, for discussion and disposal this Session

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I will withdraw my amendment.

On clause 14,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The term of imprisonment is extended one year for the purpose of punishing the serious crime of desertion, and the reason of increasing the term is that men put under arrest all winter were, when the six months were up, quite ready for spring work. The clause forfeiting pay during imprisonment was introduced, because it was held by the Commissioner that under the law the prisoner had a right to draw full pay while in confinement. There ought to be some check on that, and this provides that in all cases of sentence the pay of the offender shall be forfeited. The clause also provides that where the sentence to imprisonment exceeds one month, the case shall be reported to the commanding officer.

Mr. BLAKE. It did seem to me when I read this that there ought to be power preserved to the Governor in Council to commute. It is a serious thing to imprison for twelve months.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The pardoning power vested in the Governor General will be sufficient.

In answer to Mr. MILLS,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Charges have been brought against individuals in the police force. We cannot have a body of 300 soldiers all saints.

Mr. BLAKE. Was there any enquiry made into those serious charges made against the soldiers, by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal)?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there has been any special inquiry as to the general charges that have been made.

Mr. LONGLEY. I have no doubt that the police force would be pretty nearly right if the rum could be kept away. If these permits were not circulated so freely my impression is the police force would be a very worthy and very well conducted force.

Mr. BUNSTER. This prohibition has been noised about a great deal, but I do not see why men in the North-West should not have the same privilege to enjoy a glass of grog as well as men in the east, and if it is a free country in the east, it ought to be a free country in the west, and I for one would be sorry to see any such law enforced in British Columbia. The hon. member for Bothwell mentioned the Hudson's Bay Company, the way it carried on in days gone by. That Company has always had it in view to give their servants good rum and plenty of it to keep their spirits up.

Mr. MILLS. By pouring the spirits down.

Mr. BUNSTER. In the North-West there is a great deal of brackish water and alkali water, which requires the addition of a little stimulant, and if the Government intend to keep up the force in the North-West, it would be well to do as they do on board Her Majesty's ships—give them rations of grog. Let them have it once or twice a day. It will be beneficial to them. It is well known to be beneficial where there is such bad water, and particularly in a country where milk is scarce, where there are not so many cows. My hon. friend says there are no cows at all. Neither is there any ale to be had, and, if I do say it, no one need be surprised, because ale is acknowledged to be the national British beverage.

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask when it is intended to deal with these cases in which charges are made against a commissioned officer by any member of this force? Commissioned officers are excluded from the provision for punishing the several offences mentioned in clause 14. There appears to be no means of investigating a charge made against a commissioned officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will consider that. We will allow that to stand over.

On clause 19,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The alteration does away with the necessity of giving a written notice. The provision in the original Act is absurd. If a policeman deserts from his post and goes to Ontario or Quebec, the present clause provides that whenever he is found out of the North-West Territory, on being served with a notice signed by any commissioned officer of the force requiring him to return to his duty, if he neglects to do so he is liable to conviction and punishment. The present clause provides that any member of the force absents himself without leave from his duty is liable to punishment simply on his being found, without requiring a written notice to return.

On clause 22,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would call the attention of the Committee to the addition in the rates of pay—working pay to artizans, 50 cents a day. This is new. Extra pay to blacksmiths, carpenters, etc., has hitherto been granted under Order in Council. This Bill gives power to make it statutory. The Committee will see that these sums are the maximum. The clause says that the sums shall not exceed the amounts stated. As a matter of fact the constables do not get the pay that is provided under this clause.

Mr. BLAKE. About how many is it proposed as a rule—for by this time it must be pretty well understood, from the ordinary run of the service, how many artizans will be required out of the force—how many men is it proposed to give this extra pay to, and what is the present rate they are getting?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The number of artificers employed will vary, but will never exceed twenty. Attached to a company, division or troop, they may require certainly a shoeing smith, and when they have anything like barracks they may require a barrack carpenter. The pay of tailors, carpenters and other artificers is about 15 cents a day, excepting shoeing smiths, and their pay never exceeds 50 cents.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me to be a very large sum to add to the pay of a constable 50 cents, because it would make the whole pay of that officer \$1.25, while a non-commissioned officer receives as a maximum \$1. So I am pleased to know that this maximum is intended to apply only to the case of blacksmiths. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman intends to enlarge the ordinary rate which is given to actual artizans.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BUNSTER.

Mr. BLAKE. Before we pass this clause I might ask—I think it quite relevant—if the hon. gentleman would give us a little more detailed information as to the number of stations that he proposes at present to establish, and the number of the force at each. I do not know whether it was in the letter the hon. gentleman has received from my hon. friend from Bothwell, but I saw in some communication a statement that in those smaller posts, after sufficient arrangements were made for out door work, etc., there were just about sufficient men left to act as servants for the officers, so there was really no rank and file in the ordinary sense at all. I would be glad to know whether greater concentration is intended in the outlying posts, and how many there are at each post.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot well give my hon. friend the information he desires, but as I mentioned before, the Government wishes to do away with none of the frontier posts and to concentrate a large portion of the men at headquarters. In the first place, recruits will be sent to Winnipeg and will drill there for a time; a portion of the old barracks has been obtained where they will be quartered and drilled until they acquire some rudimentary knowledge of their duties. They will then be sent to headquarters which, it is proposed, will be placed somewhere along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, where they can be sent east or west along any branch railroads that may hereafter be built in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. There will be, of course, at Calgary, at Edmonton and at Prince Albert, a certain number of men, but as much as possible they will be concentrated.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What are they to be sent to Prince Albert for, surely there is population enough there to maintain order without the police being sent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend could only see the complaints of settlers when there is even a suggestion of moving any of the police force, he could quite understand the difficulty, and the sense of helplessness and defencelessness that comes over settlers when they go to any place where there is no police force. It gives them great confidence to have those men stationed near them, but when the country is settled to a greater extent than at present, that necessity will be done away with, and concentration will be carried out.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman must not pay too much attention to representations from well peopled localities. I can recollect very well the difficulty I had in withdrawing the volunteers from Winnipeg. We were threatened with all sorts of calamities if we did so. We did it nevertheless, and no harm came of it. I observed some time ago that at Prince Albert they had men enough to form a volunteer company. I do not know whether there are or not, but a company was formed, and I cannot think that a community of that size requires the rest of the Dominion to maintain a police force for their protection. I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider that, for if the force is to be enlarged for the purpose of placing guards at places such as that it is absurd, and an entirely wrong policy. The police force, as I understand it, has to maintain order in outstanding districts where there is no large resident population, but should have no occupation in populous places like Prince Albert.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true that where there is a large population as at Prince Albert or any other place they ought to be able to raise and organize a corps of citizen soldiers for the protection of the place, but at present I do not think it would be safe to risk volunteer corps coming into possible collision with the Indians. I think militia forces should be carefully handled. A case of that kind did arise, and a catastrophe was nearly resulting in consequence of a magistrate hearing of a like

libhood of an Indian disturbance or riot and issuing orders to a militia force to march against them. They did march, but were fortunately stopped by an officer of the Mounted Police Force, or there would have been a collision between the volunteers and Indians.

Mr. BLAKE. Besides, this police force is to be increased to 500, and they must be put somewhere—some at Winnipeg and some at Prince Albert—otherwise there would be no reason for the increase.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the wording of the 17th clause of the old Act, to which I previously referred. It is as follows:—

"17. Whenever the Commissioner shall deem it advisable to make, or cause to be made, any special enquiry into the conduct of any commissioned officer or other men of the force, or into any complaint against any of them, he, or the commissioned officer or officers whom he may appoint for that purpose, may examine any person on oath or affirmation, and shall have power to and may compel the attendance of any necessary witnesses, in the same way as if the proceedings were before Justices under the 'Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to persons charged with indictable offences.'"

However, I shall consider the clause to which the hon. gentleman has called my attention.

Bill reported.

PUBLIC LANDS OF THE DOMINION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of the Bill (No. 101) further to amend, and to consolidate as so amended, the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose the hon. gentleman will tell us what is new in this Bill. It seems to me that some provisions of the former law are left out, and I think we should be told why they are left out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The alterations in the law are evident in the Bill itself. The main object of the Bill, as I explained in the introduction, is to consolidate the three Acts which are now on the Statute-book. It is exceedingly inconvenient for the people in the North-West to have three Acts, all dealing with the lands in that country, and we propose by this Bill to consolidate them. The amendments are not many, and such as they are I think I could explain them much better as we proceed with the Bill in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAKE. So far as I can gather there is no indication in the Bill of what is new; at least, if there is I have been unable to find it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I should suppose that a Bill of something like forty-four pages would hardly be brought in unless there are very material amendments. Surely we are not to have a Bill of this size thrust upon us for discussion merely to amend two or three clauses; but perhaps it is introduced merely to swell the volume of the Statutes. Two or three Sessions ago we had a Bill consolidating the Railway Acts in which there were only two new clauses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend does justice to the measure, which is not introduced for the purpose of making two or three immaterial changes in the law, but to make one consecutive law which others besides lawyers can understand, instead of three Acts which only lawyers can fully comprehend by comparison of one with another.

Mr. MILLS. I think we should have a fuller statement from the hon. gentleman with regard to what are the new provisions of this Bill. We have not heard any explanation of what portions of the Bill are new, and for my own part, it is only by my recollection of the law that I am enabled to guess how it affects the former Acts. It seems to me that if it is intended to give greater powers to the

hon. gentleman, we should have explanations of why such additional powers are sought; and if it is intended to alter the policy which formerly prevailed with regard to the manner of dealing with the lands in the North-West, that also should be explained. We have heard a great deal since the Session opened with regard to the organization of colonization companies, the transfer of the lands of the North-West to private corporations and associations for the purpose of being subsequently sold to actual settlers, no doubt in the interest of the parties who have formed those private corporations and associations. Now, under the law as it formerly stood, the land was not to be sold at a less price than one dollar per acre, and no one person was able to acquire more than 640 acres. Here there is apparently power conferred on the Governor General in Council to adopt a different policy in special cases, but, if we may judge by what has come under our observation, to some extent, since we have been here, what were intended to be exceptional and special circumstances, have become the general policy of the Administration; and I think it is due to the House and the country that when the measure is introduced, when a new and different policy is to be inaugurated, that we should have some explanation with regard to the changes which are proposed to be made in the law. In looking over the Act I have been at some loss to know upon what particular provisions the hon. gentleman proposes to found the land regulations which he has made, and which, I suppose, will be made from time to time in the future. I do not see anything with reference to what modifications, if any, the hon. gentleman proposes with regard to the laying out of the township lines separating one from another, and, I think, with reference to the transfer of large sections of territory to colonization societies who are purchasing them for speculative purposes, and with reference to the sale of mining lands, it would have been well if the hon. gentleman had given some explanations to the House. There are some provisions of this Bill which, I observe, are new, and which may be, perhaps, more conveniently discussed in detail in Committee, but there are others affecting matters of public policy which, I think, had better be discussed on the second reading of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The regulations which now exist are based on the law as it now stands. The hon. gentleman objects to colonization companies. That is a question of policy, and whether right or wrong, as a matter of law the Government has power to make these arrangements. If the hon. gentleman has examined the regulations, he will have seen that great care has been taken to prevent monopoly, which I see there is a dread of in some quarters, by the preservation of the homestead right to the settlers. The settler can always get a homestead in the North-West on good agricultural land in every way fit for settlement. The colonization companies, we consider, will occupy the place for the present of the numerous railway companies in the United States, which have been proved there to be the best immigration agents—in fact, the only immigration agents in the United States. With the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have only one or two incipient railways of no great strength, which have not yet shown what they can do in the way of promoting immigration. The Canadian Pacific Railway will, no doubt, draw a great immigration, because homesteads are granted within the 24-mile belt. There has been a temporary reservation of a strip of land on each side of the belt in order to prevent the rush of speculators who are going in advance of the surveyors, and attempting to crowd out *bona fide* settlers who will be going in large numbers this spring and summer. That is the object in making this temporary reservation. These regulations, I contend, are under the authority of the Act as it at present exists; there is no change in the policy

which was commenced by the hon. gentlemen opposite, of encouraging parties to get in immigrants. It is quite clear that we must have some person who will be interested in inducing and aiding settlers to come into that country, and we cannot expect them to do so from philanthropic motives; they will do it as business men, just as the railways do, whose interest it is to get their lands sold and settled, in order to obtain business for their lines. Our regulations provide that under plan No. 1—I may say that there have been scarcely any applications under plan No. 2—the odd-numbered sections in a tract of land may be sold for \$2 an acre. The purchasers pay that price for the odd-numbered sections, and they are made agents for the settlement of the even-numbered sections, and for every settler they place on an even-numbered section they get a rebate on their purchase money; so that if they fully settle the even-numbered sections they will have their whole tract for a dollar an acre plus their share of the expense of survey. It is quite clear that the rebate of half the purchase money is a substantial inducement for these companies to use every exertion to procure settlers on their lands; and this plan is infinitely better than the principle of forfeiture. Forfeitures are considered in the nature of a penalty, harsh and hard, and I think the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite, and of everybody who knows anything on that subject, is that they are rarely enforced. But under the present system the purchaser pays \$2 an acre for the land he buys, and if he settles the even-numbered sections he gets an allowance for every settler, and if he does not do so the public treasury receives \$2 an acre, and the land that is unsettled reverts to the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I must direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we have no explanation of what is material in this Bill. When he introduced the Bill, he stated to the House:—

"There are some amendments with which I will not trouble the House at present, but which will appear fully marked in the Bill so as to be seen by every hon. member."

Well, we respected the hon gentleman's statement, and we find the Bill without the amendments, marked so as to be seen by every hon. member. The Bill is forty-three pages long, and the hon. gentleman says he will have it read the second time, and he will not trouble the House with the amendments because nobody can see them, but that in Committee he will tell what the amendments are. Now, what opportunity have hon. members to consider what the effect of these amendments is under these circumstances?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The main principle of the Bill is consolidation, and that is the only principle asked for on the second reading. As regards the amendments, I will move them in Committee, when every member will be able to discuss them as well as in the House; and if any clause arises on which there is any substantial difference of opinion, I have not the slightest objection to it being allowed to stand over.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware that they can be discussed in Committee, but I think the House had a right to be informed what they were; and he now says he will not tell us till we pass the second reading.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 1,

Mr. MILLS. This clause, in the first section, is open to the objection which the right hon. gentleman made to the amendment proposed by my hon. friend to the Mounted Police Bill. It is not germane to the Act, because it relates to the constitution of the Department of the Interior. What has

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

it to do with the subject of the Lands Act, that the Department of the Interior or any other Department be charged with the management of the Dominion lands?

On clause 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Are we competent to pass the second sub-section, providing that copies of documents attested by the Minister of the Interior or Surveyor-General or chief clerk shall be evidence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say we were competent, but the clause was in the Act and we left it there.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a sufficient answer. You are amending and consolidating an Act amended and consolidated in 1879, 1880 and 1881 and made right in 1882, only to be amended again. The hon. gentleman left out one clause because it was superfluous, and leaves in one which is beyond our competence to pass.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is absolutely necessary that either by the Dominion Parliament or Local Legislatures a clause of this kind should be introduced, and I have not heard the question raised in any Courts as to the admission of such evidence.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will find there are local laws dealing with this. There is no reason why we should pass a law quite beyond our competence.

On clause 4,

Mr. McDOUGALL. I notice that the second sub-section with respect to employes of the Department purchasing lands has been left out. Is it the intention of the Government to leave it open to the officers of the Department to purchase public lands?

Mr. BLAKE. In which is it to be found?

Mr. McDOUGALL. In the Act of 1879. It is there declared that no person employed in the Department of Dominion Lands can purchase lands without the authority of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. The Act of 1879 was a consolidation. I suppose that the hon. gentleman thinks that this was one of the clauses which I ought to have repealed, and he is repealing it now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that this provision has been omitted, but it was by inadvertence. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for bringing it up. I move that it be inserted in amendment to the 2nd clause, forming the 3rd sub-section.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. Previously there was a fixed width for road allowances, of one chain and fifty links between townships and sections; but now this is no longer the case. There has been, however, an alteration in the width of road allowances. It is stated in the report of the hon. gentleman, or of some of his officers, what the width is, and that it is intended to apply to the whole of the North-West, and it is calculated that the change proposed will effect a saving of about \$2,500,000 in surveys. If a general system is decided upon as to road allowances, it would seem expedient to state it here. Surely by this time we ought to have arrived at a proper system in this connection.

Mr. MILLS. It is stated the very wide roads are objectionable, as leading to the growth of Canada thistles and all sorts of noxious weeds; but there is no reason why the provision as to roads should not be set out in the Act if we are to make any change at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the road allowances, the answer given me is simply this: That if we provide for road allowances for sections, we will provide for road allowances for townships. Respecting the other

objection, that the width of the roads should be fixed, I understand that the section was inserted in its present shape in the Bill in consequence of the change which was made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The width of the roads was formerly one chain and fifty links, while it is now one chain.

Mr. McDUGALL. Have the surveys, which have been made up to this time under the existing law, provided for roads one chain and fifty links in width between the townships and sections?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. McDUGALL. Do you intend to abandon the roads between townships laid out on the old system?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; townships are an aggregate of sections.

Mr. BLAKE. That is true, but it is also true that this clause does not make it necessary to provide road allowances for sections; and it is not intended that this shall be done, if I understand rightly the report of the officers of the Minister of the Interior. It is important that the width of the roads should be stated. It may be quite proper that there should be a change, but what the change is ought to be made clear.

Mr. McDUGALL. When this matter was under discussion some years ago, I was strongly in favor of following the rule which had been found to be a good one in surveying townships in Ontario. Making the roads very wide entailed a waste of land, besides encouraging weeds and other evils to the farmers; and it was suggested at that time by a gentleman from Manitoba, that it was necessary to have wide spaces for their roads, inasmuch as that country was level and in many places swampy, while this also enabled them to avoid snow drifts. But, I suppose it is now understood by those who take any pains to make themselves familiar with that country, that they are less troubled with snow drifts than we are in Ontario; and our roads are quite wide enough as they are. I hope that as little extra space as may be necessary will be allowed for roads, and perhaps it will be better to leave the Bill as it stands, because there may be sections of the country where wide roads are desirable. Still uniformity and fixity by law is the right rule, whenever possible, because this binds surveyors, Governments and everybody.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that my hon. friend is quite correct in the explanation which he gives as to the original width of the roads, one chain and fifty links. This was the normal width of all the roads, and it was continued in the early surveys; but it was suggested, I believe, by the Surveyor General that it entailed a waste of land; and in consequence, all the new surveys which have been made during the last few years have been made for a width of one chain.

On clause 5,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the change which has been made in this clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The words "in all cases" have been struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. There has also been some change in the wording.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is merely shortened.

Mr. BLAKE. In the 3rd section, 3rd sub-section of the old Act, provision is made as to the measurement of township road allowances, but that does not seem to be stated here. We ought to have some authoritative explanation as to the causes for these alterations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Surveyor General states that the 3rd clause, 3rd sub-section, was left out as

not being required, and that the clauses as remodelled, are arranged for the purpose of being more concise and more explicit, while conveying exactly the same meaning.

Mr. MILLS. In the 5th clause, "the lines binding townships on the east and west sides shall be meridians; otherwise on the north and south sides shall be chords to parallels of latitude." Is it intended to convey the same meaning as if it read "shall be parallel to latitude?" Does it mean the measurement of a straight line joining two points of a circle drawn upon the earth's surface? If it does, then it is a change in the mode of measurement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the same as the old clause.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that some of these alterations are in consequence of the provision of allowing the Governor in Council to determine whether there shall be allowances for roads, and of what width they shall be. Amongst the omitted provisions is one which gives the width of the township. Now that is omitted in the clause which we have before us, and it is uncertain what the width of the township is to be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was applied to the township when the road allowance was a chain and a half

Mr. BLAKE. We have no statement of what the width of a township shall be, although in the 7th section it is provided that the townships shall be given their prescribed width

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A township is composed of a certain number of sections, and, therefore, the aggregate of the widths of the sections will make the width of the township.

Mr. BLAKE. You will have no road allowance at all then if you give the width of the townships simply from the width of the sections.

Mr. McDUGALL. Does it not follow necessarily that if a township is to contain so many sections of a prescribed area, with road allowances between them, that the aggregate of these will make the width of a township?

Mr. CASEY. The whole thing is left quite uncertain. It is said that each township shall contain thirty-six sections of as nearly one mile square as the meridian shall permit. Taking that uncertainty and the uncertainty as to the width of the road allowance, there is no way of giving a fixed size to the township.

On clause 7,

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the prescribed width of the townships in this Bill? It is stated that the townships will be given their prescribed width.

Mr. MILLS. I am inclined to think the numbering is the preferable way, as the division of a quarter section corresponds with the plan of a township. There is much less likelihood of a mistake in a description of this kind than in that supported by the hon. member for North Norfolk.

On clause 19,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The school lands as provided for in the North-West will be a magnificent endowment in the cause of education if it be preserved. For that purpose it is provided in the clause under the head, "Disposal of school lands," that these lands shall always be put up at auction at an upset price equal to the average value of lands in the vicinity. Every attempt is made to prevent parties settling on school lands, and making real or supposed improvements for the purpose of getting some claim, and raising the cry of harshness if they are dispossessed. The clause to which I draw attention is the 2nd sub-section of the 18th clause, which provides:

That on a township being surveyed, should such sections, or either of them, or any part of either, be found to have been settled on and

improved, the occupant or occupants conforming to the requirements of this Act shall be confirmed in possession, and the Minister of the Interior shall select a quantity, equal to that found to have been so settled on, from the unclaimed lands in such township, and shall withdraw the land so selected from sale and settlement, and shall set apart and publish the same as school lands, by notice in the *Canada Gazette*.

People at this moment are looking out for school sections and settling. A memorandum has been sent to me saying that it is in the interests of education that section 2 should be omitted. Everybody knows now what numbers the school sections are. Any man who settles on them now does it in defiance of law.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how that applies at all. This is a settlement in advance of survey altogether, when the parties have no means of knowing where the school sections are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They can ascertain with sufficient accuracy from the geometrical symmetry of the surveys. It occurs to me that it will be in the interests of education to omit that clause.

Mr. CASEY. I think this clause is bad and likely to be injurious, because, even supposing a settler had not specially selected a spot on these school lands, not knowing it to be a school section, it might turn out, after being surveyed, to be school land, and I think that the value thereof should inure to the school fund and not to the squatter. Suppose a railway was located through that place and a survey made afterwards which would give it value, the profit should inure to the school fund, and it would be better to give this squatter land elsewhere and allow him for his improvements.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey). In the first place, we declare a certain section shall be a school section; that becomes a portion of the endowment. If a man settles, squats it, he has no legal right to do so. I do not think that his claim that he gets by squatting should override a positive enactment of law which provides that a certain section shall, for all time to come, go for educational purposes. If a squatter is compensated for his improvements, and is offered another lot elsewhere fit for agricultural purposes, I think he ought to be obliged to take it. I think it is the duty of Parliament to try and guard that fund. There will be every attempt made to diminish it. There are now attempts to overload such lands with improvements in order to compel a sale otherwise than by auction. That is going on to a very great extent just now, and really that endowment will be frittered away unless we say that these lots set apart for a school fund must be held to be the property of the school fund, not of the squatter. This Parliament are the trustees of the fund, and may compensate for any improvements he may have made. The Hudson's Bay Company turn off the squatters on their lands without giving them any rights anywhere else. Why should not the school fund be as well protected as the Hudson's Bay Company?

Mr. MILLS. I do not think the hon. gentleman has quite stated correctly the case of the Hudson's Bay Company. That Company's Act makes special provision in case a party settles in advance of a survey upon a section that becomes a section. The Government was to grant to the Company an equal quantity of land elsewhere, and I believe in every instance the Hudson's Bay Company has agreed to accept lands elsewhere. It is only by changing the law there will be any force in the legal aspect of the question discussed by the right hon. gentleman. The question is, will the school fund receive any damage by leaving the law as it is? I hold that it will not. All the difficulties that have arisen are from parties, after the lands have been set out for settlement, thinking the Government would recognize that claim. It is very important to preserve the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

school fund, to see it is not frittered away, but that the lands are sold at a fair valuation, and to provide that the Government in no case should fix a valuation for those lands below the minimum sum of, say, \$5 per acre.

Mr. BLAKE. All the difficulties that have occurred were in connection with cases of parties who chose to settle upon school lands after serving, and when they knew precisely where the school sections were placed. The law at present provides that if a squatter shall have settled on a school lot his rights shall be protected; and it is proposed to sweep away that security, and turn him off the land, in order to hand it over to the school fund.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My suggestion is not that the clause shall have a retroactive effect, but after the passing of this Act the school fund shall be protected. I will ask the House to pass the clause as it is, with the power of afterwards changing it.

On clause 19, sub-section 3,

Mr. BLAKE. This was not an original proposition respecting school lands; it was introduced in the Act of 1880. The school fund should have its chance in this particular, and if it happens to include a section required for a station it should receive the benefit of an advanced price.

On clause 20,

Mr. HESSON. I think, certainly, that some attention should be paid to the volunteers in the war of 1837-38. This matter has been brought to the attention of the House before, and I think the Government should take this occasion of recognizing the claims of the men who fought in that rebellion.

Mr. MILLS. On which side?

Mr. HESSON. On behalf of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. Which side was that?

Mr. HESSON. I think that at the time they gave their services the understanding was that they should receive 200 acres of land.

Mr. MILLS. It was a mercenary war, then?

Mr. HESSON. No more so than in the case of the Mounted Police; and I think that some consideration should be paid the men who engaged in this war.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If there was a contract of the kind mentioned by the hon. gentleman it is a contract which affects the old Province of Upper Canada, and I believe there is land enough in Muskoka to supply the volunteers of 1837-38.

Mr. MILLS. Or in the disputed territory.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, or in the disputed territory; but I think there is no agreement to give them lands in the North-West, as it belonged at that time to the Hudson's Bay Company, or the greater portion of it. I do not think there was any agreement to give the militiamen who turned out in '37 to perform their duty, any portion of the North-West territory; but, being myself one who turned out and shouldered my musket at that time, I shall be glad to know that I own a farm in the North-West on that account.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that this contract, if it exists, is one which should be recognized by the old Province of Canada. I remember that in the Legislature of Ontario the claim of Montgomery was recognized.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I saw his house burned.

On clause 24,

Mr. MILLS. I believe that everything that has been done lately under this land craze which the hon. gentleman speaks of, has been done under the exception mentioned in

the proviso of this section. If the hon. gentleman is going to carry out the policy that seems to be entered upon, if the policy is to sell to anybody, to make a wholesale disposal of the whole of the North-West, to put it out of the hands of the Government, and into the hands of all kinds of speculators, who are, as the hon. gentleman says, and rightly says, crazed, there should be some change in the law different from what is proposed in this section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When I spoke of the land craze, I referred to speculations in and about Winnipeg, Brandon and other places. As to the colonization companies, I dare say they have some speculation in their eyes; but, as I explained, the regulations so guard them that they must either settle their district or suffer in pocket.

Mr. BLAKE. How far the land craze has extended might be seen from the account the daily papers gave us the other day of an occurrence in the ordinary peaceable city of Toronto, where a crowd of men, wild to secure a hundred dollars worth of stock in a land company that was for sale, smashed windows, broke plate glass and generally demolished the place. However, we shall have a discussion of this whole subject after the hon. gentleman brings down, about the middle of next month, the names of the colonization companies. I wish to point out how this clause is worked. There seems to be a constant fluctuation of decision and arrangement as to these lands. You find certain regulations issued, and then an announcement that lands are open for sale; application is made for lands, the answer of the agent is: "I am not instructed to sell"; the application is filed, various expenses are incurred, and after all there is an order countermanding the previous one, and directing that the lands should be sold by public auction. Whatever is the policy of the Government on this subject should be a well-considered policy, and such as the public may depend on being carried out. A letter has just been placed in my hands, in which a gentleman belonging to the neighborhood of Paris states that several residents of that town and of Brandon commissioned a person to select certain lands in the neighborhood of Birtle; that they repeatedly tendered the price, but failed to get the lands, the agent at Birtle having no instructions to sell, and that they had paid in expenses \$850; and the writer asks what the meaning of this is. This action was taken on the basis of the regulations of the 1st of January, providing that "the odd-numbered sections in class D shall be sold at \$2 per acre, payable at the time of sale, except where they may have been or may be dealt with otherwise by the Governor in Council." On the strength of this announcement people go up and incur expenses in making selections of land, and after they have made their selections, they are told that the land is not open for sale. I denounced the sale of these lands except on conditions of settlement from the first; I do so still; but the Government having declined to so limit the sales, and having announced to the public that they opened all the lands in the odd-numbered sections in class D for sale, thus inducing the public to locate the lands, ought to carry out their announced intention. I have been told by two or three persons from the North-West that applications were made for lands by intending settlers, who, after they went to their settlements, were told, "No, the lands are not open for sale." Why should these things be? Why should regulations be issued announcing to the public that certain lands are to be sold on certain conditions, if there is not an opportunity to secure these lands on these conditions? Nothing is likely to be more injurious to the sale of lands in that country. I believe, if lands are to be sold not on condition of settlement, to sell by auction is probably the fairer way; but what I wish to emphasize is that it is important that the Government should so thoroughly consider what it proposes that the public may be able to depend upon the carrying out of what

it does propose, which does not seem to be the case with respect to these last regulations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must not compare the regulations with advertisements for sale. The regulations as announced are statements to the public that lots will be opened for sale and settlement under terms specified in those regulations. So long as those regulations exist the lands must be sold and are opened for homestead under them, so that settlers going into the North-West know, on reading the regulations, what they have to expect in any land that they were to either purchase or settle upon as homestead. When the surveys are completed and the returns here then checked, approved and past, and lands are then open for settlement, special circumstances may arise in which the Government may think proper to make an exception and put any given district into the market. Perhaps the hon. member for West Durham will refresh my memory concerning the letter he read the other day.

Mr. BLAKE. I read a letter, in the course of the discussion on the North-West lands, as to an auction sale in the Winnipeg agency which took place on the 15th March. It stated that the sale commenced in the afternoon, that there was a large number of persons attending, and that bidding was very brisk at first; but after a few lots were sold, the auctioneer announced that the bidders would have to deposit the cash down, and as it was not "banking hours," and the people in the North-West did not carry their fortunes in their pockets, the majority ceased bidding, and ten or twelve persons who did happen to carry their fortunes in their pockets, did the bidding all to themselves. The hon. gentleman said this letter was written by some disappointed speculator, and that he would be able, on the morrow, to give an emphatic contradiction to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had lost recollection of the letter, but will be able to give a contradiction tomorrow. Every one knows those lots were put up for cash, but many went there thinking they could get the auctioneer to take their names instead. They went without money, thinking they could get special credit on their bidding and follow the example of many, of buying land and then waiting to sell it in advance before paying up the instalments. It was well known lands were to be paid for in cash. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot understand why it was announced that the office at Winnipeg could be opened at certain intervals. The agents here intended to open their doors on those days and receive applications for homestead or pre-emption or for purchase. A great many attempts have been made to file applications here for the purpose of acquiring lands at those offices as soon as they would be opened, and parties imagine that they obtain some particular right in so doing. So it was determined to prevent anything of that kind, that those claims should be considered of no value, and that all parties arriving at the office as soon as it was opened, should make their entries and get their land; but the agents were instructed, in case there was a rush similar to that experienced at Toronto, to close the doors, and offer lots by auction. That proceeding has been highly successful, and the proceeds of the sale will astonish hon. gentlemen opposite when the particulars are brought down.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says that these resolutions were not intended to advertise that sales would be open on a certain day; but if I recollect the advertisement in the *Gazette*, it says that after the 1st day of January, this year, land shall be open for sale at such prices and on such terms. If that does not mean that I could go up to Winnipeg any day after the 1st January and buy an odd section at fixed prices and on certain terms, I do not know what it means. He also said that the holding off of the lands for sale for a

certain time was in the interest of the actual settler and not of the speculator. The reverse I take to be the case. The actual settlers were dropping into Winnipeg at all times through the winter, expecting to be able to locate lots, but they found on getting there that they could neither homestead nor buy until such time as instructions were given to open the office. When I was in Winnipeg this winter, the great topic of speculation was when instructions would be given. Every speculator was full of the idea that he would get early information as to when instructions would be given to sell, so that he could have early at hand a man—the strongest he could find—with money to buy on the first preference. The effect of postponing the sale has been very detrimental to the interests of settlers. A man intending to settle could not afford to wait around Winnipeg, but the speculator could afford to wait there; and the result was that the sales made, for the first few at all events, would be made to speculators. The plan, on the other hand, of receiving applications in time would have avoided that. If you should want to sell to speculators, make a provision that every purchaser must be his actual settler. The first come should have been first served. If you do not want to sell to speculators you should make a proviso that the buyer shall be an actual settler, and then the first actual settler that presents himself should be first served. But actual settlers, who knew the places on which they wanted to settle, were prevented locating and, consequently, had to go home. The reason given for this was that the surveys were not completed and checked, and all that sort of thing. But the hon. Minister cannot pretend that the surveys in the Winnipeg district were not completed, and he also knows well that the surveys in the Birtle district were finished and the maps published a considerable time before the regulations were issued. This was also the case with the Souris and Saskatchewan districts. The postponement was not then made for the purpose of continuing the surveys in these four neighborhoods, and it must have been for some other reason which the hon. Minister has not explained. What it was I cannot begin to say; but I am quite sure of this, this postponement had a disastrous effect of the settlement of that country, with respect to actual settlers.

Mr. BOWELL. Actual speculators, you should say.

Mr. CASEY. Of course speculators were injured, but we will leave them out of the question. This step had a disastrous effect on actual settlers as well. In fact, these persons were especially affected by an indefinite postponement. No one but the speculator could afford to wait. Then there was the sudden change of terms. I do not think that any such sudden change from \$2 to \$2.50 an acre—a fixed price in offering the land by auction—should have been made at such short notice. Suppose the actual settler had chosen a piece of land and had just taken a sufficient sum with him to Winnipeg to buy it, he would be greatly inconvenienced when he found that the matter was kept extremely secret. Why a matter of public interest should be kept so secret I cannot imagine. The land was not offered at the prices at which it was advertised; and the same thing will apply to other sales in the Birtle and other outlying posts. The notice was somewhat longer in these cases, but the principle was just the same.

Mr. BLAKE. Was no notice given?

Mr. CASEY. No public notice was given that I am aware of, except what leaked out as to the instructions which were sent to the public officials there, and which also made it known. It was not published in the *Gazette* or in the newspapers, as far as I know. I only learned it from enquiring of the officials of the department. This sudden change of policy at such short notice was not fair, either to the speculator or settler, although we will leave the former out of consideration. In all cases this sudden change of policy had an injurious effect.

Mr. CASEY.

I quite agree with my hon. friend and leader that the auction system or a scale of prices based on auction is the fair thing. It might be impossible to auction off all the lands, but it would be proper to hold auctions at such intervals of time as the hon. gentleman stated he intended to do in connection with the school lands, and fix the prices between times. This would be much better than to sell at a fixed price, arbitrarily settled upon, for lands which may be of different qualities or values. The auction system is much the best, and due notice should be given of the sales.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I have to say in reply is this: The Department has received continual complaints against the practice of the Department from speculators, but we have received no such complaints from actual, or intending settlers. The effect of our policy has been this: The land has been prevented from being occupied in anticipation of settlement by speculators, during the whole of this winter, and the actual settlers, who are now going in there in crowds, are finding these lands ready for their occupation.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think so. I am aware that large and vast sums of money have been sent up to and spent at these land offices by speculators; and I believe, that in nine out of ten cases, the lands which have been sold since these sales began, have been bought by speculators; and I have shown that the chances are *prima facie* in favor of the speculators.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can the sale of the odd-numbered lots be against the actual settler who settles on Government numbered lots. The odd-numbered are sold, not even-numbered lots.

Mr. CASEY. Certainly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How does this possibly interfere with the actual settlement?

Mr. CASEY. Certainly it does. The hon. gentleman apparently does not think it possible that the settler may not want to buy an odd-numbered lot. As far as I am aware, homesteads were not open for homesteading during this time. Even-numbered lots were not allowed to be taken up by the actual settler, who was not permitted to homestead or to buy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very strange, then, that they are homesteading largely.

Mr. CASEY. They are since the offices were opened, but the land offices were then closed. The land agent for Birtle, was for a considerable time in Winnipeg on leave with his family, as he was not allowed to do anything at Birtle; and it is absurd to say that the actual settler then had an opportunity to settle, while the actual settler was then kept out.

Mr. HESSON. Were they prohibited from squatting?

Mr. CASEY. No; it was in the interest of squatting pure and simple.

Mr. BOWELL. Every squatter's right is recognized.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman seems to think it is a very easy thing to squat on the prairie 100 miles from Winnipeg in January. It is not possible to squat on the prairie in the depth of winter.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The even-numbered sections were always open for actual settlement.

Mr. CASEY. Not always.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of the Interior says differently.

Mr. WALLACE. This was not the case in the Souris, Birtle, Little Saskatchewan and Winnipeg districts, where

actual settlers were always able to get the even-numbered sections in any part where they were not already taken up.

Mr. CASEY. I know what I say; as a matter of fact the Birtle office was not open for a considerable time this winter. The man in charge was then in Winnipeg, and the Minister of the Interior states that this office was ordered to open for homestead entries on fixed days.

Mr. WALLACE. It was always open for homestead entries, though not for sale.

Mr. HESSON. I have had a number of letters from the West in reference to these land regulations, and they were always from gentlemen who went up with a view to purchase and not to locate. I have yet to receive the first letter complaining of these land regulations as far as the actual settler is concerned. I have had complaints only from gentlemen who, like the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), went up there with the view of purchasing, not to settle, and who felt perhaps a little bit annoyed about it because the arrangements did not suit them. I do not think that one person, who was willing to settle down, was driven out of the country because he could not take possession of the land, the even-numbered sections being for this purpose and this purpose alone. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he could not purchase even-numbered lots at that sale; but this did not prevent settlement. More than one-half of the actual settlers were those who squatted in the first instance, and who had their claims entered when the office was opened.

Mr. CASEY. In January?

Mr. HESSON. Yes, even in January, I had to get some cases set right. Certain parties got some timber out with the understanding that their cases would be recognized; and in every case the Government has protected these men in preference to any others, and I think that the hon. gentleman has no right to complain of these regulations as far as the regulations themselves are concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. I think you will find the result has been to impose middlemen between the settler and the Government and give a profit to the middlemen, or whoever arranged to be present at the auction sale. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us a general statement as to the quantity of lands that was sold on or about the 1st of April in these various districts, and the general range of prices.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not got a statement here just now, but I think the sales in all amounted to about \$750,000. I cannot make any statement as to the rate per acre, or the number of acres. Three auctions were opened.

Mr. CASEY. I did hear rumors amongst people interested that the auction was not going to be such a great success in putting up prices, with the exception of a few choice sections, and that those who would be present would have enough gumption, as they said, to make a nice little arrangement amongst themselves, and get the land at a comparatively reasonable price. Of course the Government could prevent such an arrangement as that if they chose to offer the lands for sale on a particular day, but it shows that even an auction sale does not prevent the speculators from having the innings. My objection to this plan was not that the speculator was hurt, but that the whole arrangement turned against the speculators as a class and against the settlers as a class. I learn that in some of these townships nothing was left but the odd sections which could only be had by purchase. Some of them were very fine and near railways, and offered special inducements in that respect. The settlers, however, could only obtain them by purchase, and could get no homestead because there was nothing more left for homesteads. Thus the actual settler and the speculator would have to compete for these lands.

Mr. HESSON. In what way would the hon. gentleman prevent the speculator and the settler from coming into competition? The lands would have to be put in the market at some fixed day, and they are both supposed to be on the spot. As the day would have to be set and the parties would be there, it would be worth as much to the speculator as to the homesteader. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that men select a homestead where they can get a pre-emption alongside. The homesteader, if he has been on the land for a year, is often bought out by the speculator, who pays the Government \$2 an acre in order to convert the land into a freehold. I do not see that the homesteader has any particular occasion to complain.

Mr. CHARLTON. In the 24th clause: "Provided also that whenever so ordered by the Minister, such unoccupied lands as may be deemed by him expedient, from time to time, may be withdrawn from ordinary sale and settlement;" does that include homestead lands for pre-emption?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that is only lands for sale, not lands for homestead.

Mr. BLAKE. We find that the regulations under some clauses of this Act provide for the establishment of large corporations, which are to have, not merely 640 acres, but many townships, as I understand, of which they are to be proprietors, subject in some cases to conditions of settlement. Now, I think it is well, since the policy of the Administration, as propounded in the regulations, is a policy which apparently makes sale to the individual the exception and the sale to the corporation the rule.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes. Because, where you find one clause providing for the sale of land to individuals at so much per acre, the great bulk of the regulations have in view the development of the schemes called colonization companies. We find that from 300 to 500 companies, according to some of the newspapers, have been organized, and many townships allotted to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not chosen to bring down the names yet, and so we cannot know what the number is. We have not been able to get the list from which I have assumed that it is as long as the list of Homer's ships. We are in a state of perfect uncertainty as to what the number of the companies is, and the extent to which they have been recognized by the Government. There is another system of selling land *en bloc* to railway companies. It has been stated that there are four railway corporations applying for such grants, three of which have obtained Orders in Council. The acreage will amount to 6,000,000, and if the application of the Portage, Westbourne and North Western Road is granted, the aggregate will be between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000. The Committee would like information on these points.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to colonization companies, the number of such organizations that have applied has been largely exaggerated, the number never having been 100, much less than 300 or 500. There have been some applications granted and terms settled, but this has only been done within the last few days. The reason why the statement with respect to colonization companies was not brought down before, was because it was intended to set forth the whole amount of the applications and those so far entertained by the Government. That return will be brought down in a day or two. Although it is true that this clause provides that a single individual can only obtain 640 acres, under the powers given to the Government, these colonization companies have been formed. The Government have desired to encourage them to a certain extent. Under all those plans the homesteads are reli-

giously preserved, the colonization companies being made the agents for the purpose of bringing out settlers and placing them on the even-numbered sections, they in return obtaining a rebate of \$1 per acre on the odd-numbered sections for which they pay in the first instance \$2 per acre. The plan is, I think, going to turn out, and I hope it will, to be a very effectual one.

Mr. CHARLTON. Do I understand that the rights of homesteaders are religiously preserved under all the colonization regulations, under plan No. 2?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not under plan No. 2; but there is a rigid clause providing for forfeiture in the agreement which is to be entered into by any parties taking land under plan No. 2. There have, however, been no applications as yet granted under plan No. 2. The parties say they cannot make money out of lands obtained under that plan, for which they would have to pay all cash down. I suppose the utmost extent of land which the colonization companies will secure will not be more than 7,000,000 acres, and that is not a very great proportion of what is fit to settle in that part of the country. If we obtain twenty or thirty colonization companies to settle and earn the land we are really procuring and using the most energetic mode of settling the country.

Mr. BLAKE. Under what clause of the Act do the Government possess the power respecting the colonization companies?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under the clause which gives the Governor in Council power to make special regulations.

Mr. BLAKE. So, in special cases, there may be a sale to one person of more than 640 acres, but that surely is not the warrant upon which the hon. gentleman grants powers to these various colonization companies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why not?

Mr. BLAKE. Because the warrant is not wide enough. The hon. gentleman has not given us any information about the railway grants. What about them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak exactly without the papers. Of course there is the statutory grant of 25,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then there is a grant of 3,840 acres per mile to the Manitoba South-Western Railway. As soon as they can satisfy the Government that they can complete that road, they have the right to buy in advance the acreage for the first 50 miles. On finishing it they can purchase the same quantity of land at \$1 an acre; the same for the second 50 miles, and so on as long as they build 50 miles annually. Then, in order to encourage the road to the Souris district, we have allowed an additional grant so as to make up the whole grant for that portion of the line, 6,400 acres.

Mr. BLAKE. For how many miles?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 300 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. And the rest?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the Rocky Mountains, perhaps. I am speaking from recollection, however, but the exact statement will be laid before the House. The Portage, Westbourne and North-Western is to have 3,840 acres from Portage la Prairie through Gladstone and Minnedosa to the Saskatchewan. The Souris Road has an Order in Council for 3,840 acres, and they claim the same right of 6,400 acres as the other line. There has been no Order in Council, but there was an understanding that they should be treated on the same terms as other roads. These are the only roads that have any claims at present. We have applications from two routes to Hudson's Bay, one by Nelson River and the other by

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Churchill. They are under consideration at the present time.

Mr. BLAKE. Does not the hon. gentleman think that it might be courteous to the House to allow us to see the Orders in Council he speaks of. The amounts are very large, and, I think, he might at least let us see them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has not moved for them.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not know that the grants were made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grants were made in 1830. That was stated over and over again.

Mr. BLAKE. But about the doubling up? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring down without notice the various applications made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no objection.

Committee reported; and (at 12:40 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 12th April, 1832.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to the House a resolution on the Government land policy in the North-West. I may say that I regret that circumstances compel me to move in the way I am about to do to-day. At an early date in the Session, returns were called for with reference to the land question. The information sought in these returns was necessary to an intelligent discussion of the question I am about to lay before the House. It was found it would be impossible to get these returns in full, and an attempt was then made to get the information in a summarized form. This information was promised from time to time, and fragmentary portions of it have been received, but owing to the delay in receiving it, the time has passed for putting a notice on the notice paper in the usual manner, and proceeding to the discussion of this question on that motion, and I am reduced to the necessity of moving, as I do to-day, in amendment to a motion for Committee of Supply. The question under discussion is one of very great importance to this country. We have in the North-West a vast region, the capabilities of which are just beginning to be fairly understood. We have in that country, Sir, a region of probably seven or eight hundred miles long by four or five hundred miles in width adapted for settlement and cultivation. It embraces two of the great river systems of this country, the Mackenzie River and the system flowing through Lake Winnipeg into Hudson's Bay. It has a chain of lakes almost equal in size and importance to the great chain of lakes upon our borders, between us and the United States. It is a country, Sir, which, as we become more intimately acquainted with its resources rises in our estimation. Its value is much greater than was supposed some years ago. As to the question of what population that country will support, I presume, from recent investigations, that we are justified in supposing the North-West will maintain a population of

25,000,000. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, the bearing of the management of that territory upon the question of our national development, upon the question of the ultimate power and position this country will obtain, is one of very great importance as compared with other public questions of the day. It overshadows in importance the question whether we have, by our Trade Policy, succeeded in adding a few thousand operatives to our population, whether we have added a few cotton mills to our industries, or whether our people pay 3, 5 or 10 per cent. more taxes than they did upon the various wares they buy. Of this country we may well say with the poet, Whittier:

"The rudiments of empire here are plastic yet and warm
And the fragments of a mighty State are rounding into form."

Well, Sir, the development of this country must be brought about, not by speculative movements, not by speculations in corner lots, or in town sites or in land even, but it must be brought about by the labors of the actual tiller of the soil. The country lying in its present state, a wilderness, is not an element of strength, not a source of power to Canada, and it can only become an element of strength, a source of power, when its soil is brought under cultivation, and that can only be done by the labor of the husbandman. Consequently, I hold that the interests of the settler, of the class that are to till the soil of the North-West, should be, in the estimation of the Government, paramount in importance to all other interests in treating this matter. The speculator will take care of himself. It is not necessary that the Government should look after the interests of the speculator or pay very great regard to his interests, but it is necessary to look after the interests of the settler. The operation of the speculator in many cases is not good for the country. At the present moment, I believe the speculative movement in the North-West is a source of danger, and at the best, Sir, the profits of the speculator in lands causes a loss to the yeoman. If the speculator invests in lands and sells at an advance to the settler, whatever the speculator may gain, that class who should be the first in the consideration of the Government and whose interests the Government should look after very carefully, will lose to that extent. My hon. friend the First Minister spoke of the state of things in the North-West as a "land craze." I think he very justly characterized the present movement. The speculative movement has reached very great development, and there is danger of its resulting in a mania similar to the South Sea mania, or the mania of speculation which brought about the prostration of credit in the United States in 1837. The indications now existing all point to such a danger. We have the city of Winnipeg filled with a horde of speculators; we have town sites advertised for sale in all parts of Manitoba and the North-West; we have anxious and feverish activity in those speculative ventures with fancy prices not based upon intrinsic value; and in all these the careful observer sees danger. It is in many respects like the land speculation in the United States, and it would, perhaps, be well to carefully state the facts in connection with that movement. In 1835 it commenced. The average sale of public lands each year, from 1796 to 1881, has been \$2,400,000, but the speculative movement in 1835 ran the sales of that year up to \$14,757,000. In 1836, the land sales amounted to \$24,877,000. The East was flooded with lithographed maps of sites, of towns and of cities to be built at such places as the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi, and the junction of the Missouri and Mississippi, and of various streams of the West. Almost every place that could be pointed out on the map as a good geographical point was marked off as a town site, and town lots were sold even in swampy places where no building was then, and where no building has ever been. These sales amounted to

enormous sums of money, and loans were actually made in the east upon the title to places of this character. For instance the site of the present city of Milwaukee, then a wilderness, was sold by its owner for a sum of money which he lost in less than three months in speculating in lands in the city which then had no existence. If we look the case carefully over I think we will find that the circumstances in the United States, and those in this country at this time, present the same features, and I have very great apprehensions that the result will be here as the result there was, a serious collapse of public and private credit, and the infliction of loss and injury upon the country. The effects already, of the removal of vast amounts of capital from Ontario to the North-West are being sensibly felt, and they will be more seriously felt in the course of a few months. The effects too of the migration of thousands and tens of thousands of the best class of the population of Ontario to the North-West are being sensibly felt. The value of property in the Province of Ontario is being depreciated, farms are being forced upon the market, causing a decline in prices, and there is no doubt that what will be a gain to Manitoba in this respect will be a loss to the other Provinces. I presume the Government will be disposed to claim that this speculative rush to the North-West is an indication of great prosperity, and that it is also an indication of wisdom on the part of the Government in the policy they have adopted with reference to this matter. I hold, on the contrary, that this high speculation, which threatens a speedy collapse, is largely promoted and fostered by the policy the Government have adopted, and that that policy will ultimately prove to have been most pernicious in the interest of the Dominion of Canada. The Government—and they will learn the truth of the assertion I am about to make—should avoid adopting a policy calculated to facilitate and promote the schemes and aims of the speculating class to the detriment of the honest and hardy yeomanry of this country. The aim of the Government should be not to secure large speculative sales of land, but to secure for the hardy sons of toil these wild lands, on which they will enter and commence cultivation. Its aim should be to foster and promote the interests of this country and let the speculators take care of themselves, and carefully hold themselves aloof from the promotion of all speculative movements. If this should be the policy of the Government, it then becomes a serious question for the Government to determine what shall be the degree of liberality that they shall exercise toward the settler in the inducements offered to him in order to get him to emigrate to the North-West. This question should be looked at from two stand-points. It should be looked at from the stand-point of what in itself *per se* is right and proper in the matter; and if the policy which the Government believes to be a just policy is calculated to secure settlement if no other obstacle is in the way. The next thing for the Government to consider is whether there is any competitor in the market seeking for emigration to settle its new lands, or if it is offering better terms than we are offering. The fact will confront the Government at this stage that there is a competitor for emigrants from Europe for its great waste of unoccupied lands, desiring to secure settlers upon these lands and pushing westward its settlements which has already reached far beyond the Mississippi. The Government will next enquire what are the inducements which this competing Government offers, and if the Government of Canada wishes to be a successful competitor reason will teach them at a glance that it will be at least necessary that they will offer equal inducements to those, and probably even greater, because the United States territory is more accessible. I hold that our policy hitherto has not been of such a character as to secure a large amount of immigration, because it has not been as liberal in its provisions as the policy of the

United States. When the United States Census was taken early in 1880—almost two years ago—the Canadian population of the State of Minnesota was 29,631, and that of the Territory of Dakotah was 10,678, or a total Canadian population in that State and Territory of 40,309. If we add to this the number of those of English, Scotch and Irish nativity who had emigrated from Canada to these States, I have no doubt that the population drawn from Canada would exceed 50,000 souls. One year later our own Census was taken, and that Census gives a population in Manitoba of 65,000. I presume to say that one year later the Canadian population of Dakota and Minnesota was at least equal to the total population of the Province of Manitoba. This shows, I think, conclusively that the United States had offered superior inducements, and through the operation of these superior inducements they had secured a much greater volume of immigration than we had. I propose to examine briefly what these superior inducements are, and why it is that the United States land regulations are preferred to our own. In the first place, all unappropriated lands in the country are open to homestead and pre-emption. There is no exception to this rule. There is no certain number of sections or townships set apart for special purposes, but wherever the settler can find suitable land he can homestead and pre-empt upon it. Then, in the United States outside of the railway belt, public lands are sold at \$1.25 per acre uniformly, and in all parts of the country. While in our own case, outside of the railway belt south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we sell our land at \$2.50 per acre, or twice the price, and north of the railway belt at \$2 per acre, or 75 cents per acre higher than the Government of the United States charges the settler or investor. Then in the United States they adopt a very liberal provision with regard to timber culture, by which upon the planting of ten acres of timber the settler secures a grant of 160 acres of Government land, and above all other things the United States Government makes no discrimination in favor of great landed proprietors. They never adopted a policy by which land can be purchased and held by the payment of one-tenth down, nor by the operation of which colonization companies, and speculators can secure large blocks of townships and exclude the actual settler from those blocks unless the lands are purchased upon their own terms. So much for the superior inducements offered by the United States. Just so long as that country continues to offer superior inducements, just so long as the settler can secure a grant wherever he can find unappropriated land for a homestead, just so long as he can buy land at one-half the price, just so long as the Government fosters speculators and shows more regard for corporations speculating in large tracts than it does for the actual settler, just so long the United States will secure the fullest share of emigration from the old world, and will secure a larger proportion of that from the older Provinces going to the West. A few words with reference to the past policy pursued by the hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches with regard to its land regulations. One thing in reference to that policy which must strike almost every observer at a glance is its vacillating character. This in itself would have worked serious injury to the interests of the country. In July, 1879, my hon. friend the hon. the First Minister issued a set of land regulations which were to come into force on 1st August. These land regulations were allowed to remain in force for two and a-half months, at the expiration of which time the criticisms of the most powerful newspaper in this Dominion, fairly compelled the right hon. gentleman to change the features of his land regulations, and on the 14th October we had another set of regulations introduced. These regulations continued in operation until 25th May, 1881, when we had another set of regulations introduced. These regulations were allowed to remain in force seven months, and on 23rd Decem-

Mr. CHARLTON.

ber last another set was introduced. How long these will be allowed to remain in operation, time will show, but in the ordinary course of events, after being modified by Orders in Council from week to week, and after existing for a few months, we shall have an entirely new set of regulations. With respect to the set of regulations of July 9th, coming into force on 1st August, 1879, by these regulations a supposed line on the Canadian Pacific Railway was laid down and five belts were laid out on each side of the line. The first belt A was five miles wide, the second fifteen miles wide, the third twenty miles wide, the fourth twenty miles wide, the fifth fifty miles wide, or in the five belts 110 miles on each side, or a tract of 220 miles on both sides of the assumed line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Homestead and pre-emption entries were not allowed at all in belt A, the first of these belts. In that respect the policy of the Government was different from that of the United States, which allowed homestead entries in all belts, whether in the railway belt or outside of it. In the second place, the Government restricted homesteads to eighty acres each, and pre-emption to eighty acres, outside of belt A. The settler would pass through the United States, where he could obtain a homestead entry of 160 acres, whereas in the North-West, where the inducements are less and the distance greater, he could only obtain one-half as large a tract as in the United States. The inducements were not very great, and settlers did not flow in very readily, and the criticisms of the great journal to which I have referred, compelled the Government, in two months and a-half, to change their policy and issue a new set of regulations. Then, by the regulations adopted in this country, only eight sections in each township of thirty-six were set apart for homestead entries or pre-emption, and, in that respect, as I pointed out a few moments ago, the policy of the Government was less liberal than that of the United States, and continues to be less liberal. Then, the price charged for pre-emptions in belts B and C, under these regulations, was \$2.50 per acre, while in the United States the price charged for pre-emption entries similarly situated was \$1.25 per acre. In belt D the price was \$2 while in the United States it was \$1.25. So, wherever a comparison was instituted by the settler between the policy of the right hon. gentleman, with respect to homesteads, in size, price, or location, and that of the United States, it was unfavorable to Canada, and would be calculated to divert immigration from the North-West. In addition to this feature, the right hon. gentleman introduced another and a still more pernicious feature—the system of credit sales. He offered land on credit, a payment of one-tenth down being required, and the balance in nine equal annual instalments. In the fifty mile belt, speculators, by paying 10 cents per acre, could secure control of the land. It was a magnificent opportunity when \$100 would secure 1,000 acres, and it was an opportunity of which speculators availed themselves with avidity. It was an opportunity which, whatever its advantages might be to speculators, was sure to work lasting injury to the country and to the interests of those who wished to till the soil. The effect of this policy, as I pointed out a few moments ago, was plainly visible in the Census returns of the two countries. The 14th of October came and we had another set of regulations, and those regulations made the terms of homesteading somewhat more liberal, very much more liberal as regards the quantity of land. They allowed the homesteader to enter for 160 acres, and allowed him to pre-empt another 160 acres. They also opened belt A to the operation of the homestead and pre-emption law, but they did not increase the area in each township allowed to be homesteaded and pre-empted, nor did they remove the discrepancy in price between the pre-emption entry in Canada and the United States; and the regulations also

continued the pernicious system of credit sales, and in these three respects the position of Canada as a field for immigration was much less favorable than the United States. These regulations remained in force until the 25th of May, 1881. In the meantime we had consummated an arrangement; a bargain which, I fear, will not cover hon. gentlemen opposite with honor, and will not, I fear, bring upon them the blessings of posterity. We had, in the meantime, made arrangements by which it became no longer necessary to hold that reserve of 100,000,000 acres of land for the purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We had made an arrangement by which we gave to a company, in completed road and surveys, a sum three-fifths as great as that which they were called upon to pay for the construction of the balance of the line; by which the company were given, in cash, one-half as much as the cost of the completed line; by which they were given a grant of land worth, according to the valuation of hon. gentlemen opposite, which is three-fifths of the rate at which the Syndicate are selling lands at the present time, one and a-half times the cost of the construction of the line. This favored company will receive two and a-half times the cost of constructing the line, besides the transportation monopoly and various other perquisites and privileges which made this, I was going to say, the greatest railway swindle of the age—but I will not say that—but made it a very soft thing for the gentlemen who made this bargain with the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. This arrangement having been made, it became necessary, of course, to adopt new regulations, and these were passed on 25th May, 1881. By these regulations belts were laid off on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and projected branches, twenty-four miles in width. In those belts alternate sections were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. In the alternate sections not granted to the Railway Company, the same conditions as regards homesteads and pre-emptions, were observed as under the former regulations: 160 acres for homestead and 160 acres for pre-emption claims were allowed, and the price of the pre-emption claims in the railway belt was fixed at \$2.50 per acre, which was exactly equivalent to the price in the United States within railway belts. Outside of the railway belt eight-thirty-sixths of each township were for homesteads, and an equal quantity for pre-emption entries; and the price of the pre-emption land was \$2 per acre, or 75 cents per acre higher than the corresponding lands in the United States. Under the two preceding regulations, Sir, we had the evil of credit sales and of violation, to a great extent, I believe, of the Statute with reference to the restriction of sales to 640 acres to each individual. We had, under the restrictions of the 25th of May, 1881, a new danger. Credit sales had ceased, and I presume the sales to speculators of any amounts greater than 640 acres, have ceased; but there is a new and dangerous feature in this system, a feature characterized as colonization schemes, but a plan which should be characterized as one that facilitates the creation of great estates; a plan for robbing the poor for the benefit of the rich; a plan for depriving the settler of the opportunity of purchasing his land at first cost in order that speculators and landsharks might compel him to pay such a price as they might be able to squeeze from him. The chief outlines of this scheme were as follows: In the first place, it was necessary to obtain the Government's consent to the purchase of lands without limit as to quantity. If the settler went to the Land Office to purchase one acre or a quarter-section, he would be charged the full price, but the speculator goes there and makes his bargain with the Government. He says: "I want this block of ten or fifteen or twenty townships on the terms which you have been gracious enough to accord to us, viz., at half the price you would sell it to the hardy son of toil." The company binds

itself to certain conditions. If these conditions were kept, at the end of five years the sale was consummated. If these conditions were not kept, then the Government might either cancel the sale or accept payment in full of regular price without interest. There was here a two-fold opportunity for corruption. There was the opportunity, first, in the granting of these colonization limits, and, secondly, in the power the Government reserved to either cancel the sales on failure to comply with the conditions or to continue them on—two very dangerous doors we had opened for the exercise of corrupt practices. The arrangement with reference to these lands was two-fold. The first referred to lands outside the twenty-four mile belt on either side of the main line or any branch line of the Pacific Railway. Under this arrangement the odd sections, except school sections 11 and 29 in each township, were sold at \$1 an acre, there being 10,240 acres in each township. The conditions were that within three years two settlers should be placed on each odd-numbered section and two settlers on each even-numbered section. The law also permitted the colonization company to aid immigrants or settlers on homesteads to the extent of \$500 each, and take a mortgage on the homestead claim at 6 per cent. interest. This was calculated to facilitate the operation of the colonization companies in enabling them to get one-half the number of settlers required without the outlay of any money that they would not be sure to be reimbursed for. The settlers, I take it, on the even-numbered sections might be purchasers to any extent. The purchaser of a forty-acre lot would be a settler; so would the purchaser of an eighty-acre lot. They might even be tenants, as I presume a tenant on the lands would be, within the meaning of the law, a settler. Now, the result under this plan would be that the cost to the company would be at the rate of \$10,240 per township. If the colonization companies sold to thirty-two settlers eighty acres at \$2 per acre, the amount would be \$5,120, which would leave 7,120 acres in each township, costing the company \$5,120, or 72 cents per acre. Or the colonization company might sell 5,120 acres at \$2 per acre, and they would retain 5,120 acres of land free of cost, and if the land was sold to the settler at more than \$2 per acre, as is not only highly probable but morally certain, the gains of the company would be proportionately greater. The settlers on the even sections might be tenants, and in that case the company would have 10,240 acres in each township at a cost of \$10,240. Now, under this plan No. 1 of this colonization scheme, the advantages were entirely in the hands of the colonization company. The Government took the public lands in these townships which it was natural to suppose the settlers of the country would ultimately want, because the scheme contemplates the introducing of settlers; but under the operations of these colonization companies the lands were taken which these settlers would ultimately want, or presumably want in a very few years, and placed in the hands of colonization companies at half price, the settler being left at the mercy of the company, who would ask and exact such prices from him as it might be able to obtain, and what the Government should have done was to have kept the land in its own hands, itself acting in the capacity of a colonization company, ready and anxious to sell the lands to actual settlers at a fair price, and allow no middlemen to intervene between itself and the ultimate cultivator of the soil. There was another plan in this colonization scheme in these regulations. Either the colonization company might buy land outside the railway belt, or, as the regulations provide, they might take from the settler the lands set apart by Statute for pre-emption within the railway belt. The Government would sell to the company 5,120 acres of land in each township or eight sections that the law provided should be set apart for pre-emption, thus depriving the settler of an opportunity of pre-empting any claim whatever in blocks of townships of that

character. Under this arrangement if the company within five years placed thirty-two settlers on its own lands and thirty-two settlers upon the homestead reserves, they obtained the land at \$1.25 per acre, that being one half the price within the railway belt. Here again the law permitted the company to make advances to homestead settlers of \$500 each and take mortgages on the homesteads. The possible result of this scheme might be as follows: that allowing thirty-two settlers had eighty acres each at the Government price of \$2.50 per acre, the amount would be \$6,400, the company receiving \$6,240, the sum it paid for the whole, and retaining 2,560 acres free of cost in each township. Or if more than \$2.50 per acre were charged to the settlers, the gains of the colonization company would be proportionately greater; or the company might place tenants on this land, and might get the whole of these 5,120 acres at \$1.25 per acre, or \$6,400 for all the pre-emption lands in the township, and in case of failure to carry out the conditions, the company might pay the other half at the expiration of three years, without interest. That is, if the company failed to introduce one single homestead settler or one settler on its own lands during the term the scheme ran, then, at the expiration of that period, it would pay the full price and retain the land; and no doubt, in many cases, colonization companies would prefer to take that course. So much, Mr. Speaker, for the character of the land regulations and the land policy of my hon. friends in the past. I do not wish to deal with this matter at very great length; I merely desire to give a brief of *resumé* of the course pursued by hon. gentlemen up to the time the last regulations were issued; and before entering upon the consideration of the present land regulations, I wish to call the attention of my right hon. friend to some calculations—I am quite willing to believe they were not his own, although he assumed the responsibility for them—which he presented to the House two years ago, with reference to the probable amount of the future land sales and the influx of immigrants into the North-West. In the course of a speech delivered by my right hon. friend on the 5th of April, 1880, he estimated that the cost of surveys in that country for the next eleven years would be \$2,000,000, and the cost of management of the Land Department, \$400,000. Well, Sir, I find that the sum expended on surveys in 1880 and 1881 was \$177,321, and that was just the beginning of the work; the estimated expenditure for 1881-82 was \$300,000, and for 1882-83 it is \$450,000; making a total for the four years of \$1,227,000, with the certainty that this expenditure will largely increase from year to year in the future. The estimated expenditure for the management of the Land Department for 1881-82 was \$70,466, and, for 1882-83, \$99,600, making a total of \$170,000 for the two years; and I am afraid that at this rate it will largely exceed the hon. gentleman's estimate of \$400,000 for eleven years. The hon. gentleman estimated that the land sales up to 1890 would amount to \$71,000,000. This was based on the reservation of 100,000,000 acres for railway purposes. One-fourth of that quantity has been granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and if I deduct one-fourth of one-half of the \$71,000,000 from that amount, the balance of the hon. gentleman's estimate for the period will be \$62,000,000. Well, Sir, I find from returns which I have received from the Department, that our total sales in cash and scrip, for the eleven years and a-half, from July 1st, 1872, to January 1st, 1882, amounted to \$972,835; that the amount due upon time sales on the 1st of January last was \$647,777; and that the amount due on pre-emption sales on the 1st January last was \$1,942,988; making a total in the eleven years and a-half of credit sales, pre-emption sales, cash sales, and sales for scrip, of \$3,563,600. The other calculations of the right hon. gentleman were equally widely astray. He estimates that the sales of lands for 1880, apart from homesteads and railway lands, would amount to \$1,440,000, and by a ratio

Mr. CHARLTON.

of increase which he gave us, that the sales for 1881 would amount to \$1,725,000; yet we find that the sales for 1881 amounted to \$191,626. He also estimated that 3,000 homesteads would be granted each year—and he comes nearer in that estimate to the truth than in other cases, because the actual number granted last year was 1,754, a little over one-half what he estimated. It may be pertinent to the question at this stage to make a few remarks with regard to the report which the hon. gentleman laid on the Table a few days ago. That report is singularly deficient in statistical information; all the statistics contained in it could easily be placed on one page; but so as to pad it out and to make it a volume of the size it is—and it is a very small volume at that—field notes were thrown in extensively; nine-tenths of the report consists of surveyors' field notes. Well, they may possess considerable value, but the information given in them might be placed in a more condensed form. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, if he will permit the suggestion, that we ought to have in this report the following information for each year since the North-West was acquired: A statement of the total number of homestead entries in each year, the total number of pre-emption entries, the receipts in detail, the number of acres surveyed, the cost of surveys, the cost of the Land Department, land offices, and various incidental expenses, the timber licenses granted and the revenue from the royalty on timber, the pasture leases granted, the colonization plans and the revenue from such, and the amounts outstanding from the sales of land. I think if the hon. gentleman will give us a report in each year embracing the information to which I have briefly alluded, it will make the report valuable to the country and interesting to the House, and this can easily be done. It is well known to all heads of Departments that the character of our reports is such that they will admit of great improvement, and they would not then be in a condition of perfection. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of the present land regulations, and with regard to these regulations, Mr. Speaker, we can only judge as to their character by the regulations which I hold in my hands. The right hon. gentleman informed us last night that a set of agreements had been prepared—I think he told us—which made these regulations very stringent. Well, there may be conditions in these agreements which may somewhat alter the character of the regulations, as they appear on the surface; but in the consideration of this matter, I shall be governed by the language employed in these regulations. The conditions which are set forth in these regulations, I shall assume are the conditions which are in force, whatever qualifications may be made by these papers which are to be brought down. Under these regulations, Mr. Speaker, the public lands in the North-West are divided into four classes—classes A, B, C, and D. Class A consists of the lands within twenty-four miles of the Canadian Pacific Road, or of any of its branches. Class B consists of lands within twelve miles of any projected line recognized by the Governor in Council, other than the Canadian Pacific line, or its branches. Class C consists of all lands south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific road, not embraced in classes A and B. Class D consists of all lands north of the main line of the Canadian Pacific road, not embraced in classes A and B. As before, pre-emptions and homestead entries are permitted in sixteen sections out of the 36 sections in these townships; that is, eight sections are devoted to homestead entries and eight to pre-emptions. The lands in class C, that is outside of the railway belt, south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, are held at \$2.50 per acre, double the price at which pre-emption entries are held in the United States where pre-emption lands of similar situation are held at \$1.25 an acre. The lands in class D are held at 75 cents an acre higher than pre-emption claims in corresponding localities in the United States, and the

disparity of price in these public lands is the same. Public lands are sold to actual settlers in class C at double the price which is asked for relative situations in the United States, and the public lands in class D are sold to actual settlers at 75 cents an acre higher than the prices of public lands in relatively the same situations in the United States. Sir, in addition to this restricted area which is set apart for homesteads and pre-emptions, we have under these regulations a rule for colonization schemes, which will give to speculators, at one-half the price, all lands that are reserved for homesteads and pre-emptions in this great region, which is embraced in Class D. By colonization plan No. 2, I repeat, that all lands in Class D, which covers more than one-half of the public domain of the North-West, may be retired from the market and placed in the hands of speculators; while homestead settlers and pre-emption settlers are excluded entirely from this vast region. And, Sir, upon the whim of the Minister, homestead lands and pre-emption lands may be withdrawn from entry and put up at auction sale, under section 2, sub-section C, of these land regulations. Now, here are two plans, by which the interests of the homestead settler and the interests of the man who wishes to make a pre-emption entry, are placed at the mercy of one man—at the mercy of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. The hon. the Minister of the Interior may give up the whole of that region to the operation of these pernicious colonization schemes, or he may withdraw the homestead lands and pre-emption lands in the whole of this belt D, from settlement and entry, and put these lands up for sale at auction. I hold, Sir, that the placing in the hands of any one man a power as great as this, is an act fraught with danger to the interests of this country. I hold, Sir, that no man should be invested with a power so despotic—powers that may be used to the injury of the great mass of the people of Canada in the manner in which these powers may be used; and with regard, Sir, to the authority for this scheme of colonization—the authority under which it is proposed to place millions upon millions of acres of land in the hands of speculators—the authority under which the whole of the public domain of the North-West outside of the railway belt may pass away for ever from the operations of a settlement policy conceived in the interest of the landless and those who are to become settlers—I say, Sir, the legislation upon which this vast policy rests, it seems to me is entirely insufficient. The little clause in this Bill upon which this policy is predicated, Sir, is as follows:—

“Provided that no purchase shall be permitted at a less price than \$1 an acre; provided also that except in special cases, where otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council, no sale to one person shall exceed a section of 640 acres. Sect. 21.”

Well, Sir, are these special cases? Are these the exceptional cases? Are these the insulated cases, where sales of more than 640 acres are to be permitted—cases that are to cover the whole country—cases that are to sweep away from the possession of the settler and the landless, not an isolated tract here and there, but the whole of belt D possibly, and all lands outside of the belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I hold that the assumption based on this little clause is a monstrous one, and that the policy of the Government in this respect is one pernicious in its character, and one not warranted by the character of the legislation which is contained in that Bill. Well, Sir, what are these plans? What are the features of this plan No. 1, and of this plan No. 2, contained in those regulations, by which the settler may be defrauded of his right; by which corporations may be invested with dukedoms and kingdoms; and by which the manipulations and operations of speculators may be made the curse of the whole of this vast region in future years? Here is plan No. 1. I understand that it is the popular plan at present, simply because it requires a very small payment in cash, a payment of one-

fifth down, and the balance to be paid in four equal annual instalments; and as it is provided that interest, at the rate of 6 per cent., is to be charged upon past due instalments, it is to be supposed that no very serious consequences will ensue if the speculators allow their payments to fall into arrear. Here is the plan—lands may be granted under this plan in belt D, and there is no restriction as to area. It may consist of lots and it may consist of townships. It is left entirely within the discretion of the hon. gentleman whether four townships, or ten, or thirty or forty townships are granted. He may, if he chooses, give to his favorites one-half of that great region, there is no restriction whatever; the grants are to be made in belt D and the price is to be \$2 an acre, and the payments, one-fifth down, or 40 cents an acre, and then the balance in equal annual instalments during four years without interest. The requirements of the scheme are as follows: the party purchasing the land is to place in each township thirty-two settlers on homesteads, and is allowed, as in previous cases, to advance \$500 to each settler and take a mortgage on his claim at 6 per cent. interest; thirty-two settlers are to be placed on Government lands, two on each section, making in all sixty-four settlers, which the company has to place in each township, and upon which they are to receive a rebate of one-half the purchase price, or \$1 an acre, leaving the net cost of the land at \$1 an acre. The time they have to fulfil these conditions is five years, and in each year upon the placing of a settler in this township they receive a rebate of \$120. Year after year as they place settlers, they receive at the expiration of the year a rebate of \$120 for each settler. At the expiration of the time, if the full number of settlers are there, they receive the full rebate of one-half; but if the full number is not settled they receive in the same proportion as if they were. They are to receive a rebate of \$160 for each settler, but it is provided my hon. friend may say that unless they fulfill the conditions contained in this colonization plan of placing sixty-four settlers in each township their rights may be declared forfeited and the land taken from them. The right hon. the leader of the Government said, last night, however, that the forfeiture condition was of very small consequence. I presume it is. I imagine that the cases where rights of colonization companies will be declared forfeited, in consequence of their not having fulfilled the conditions of this agreement, will be exceedingly rare. But there is a bad feature here. It strikes me it is a dangerous power to place in the hands of a Minister of the Crown, to say of a company whether their rights, involving possibly hundreds of thousands of dollars, shall be forfeited or not. It strikes me that, under such circumstances, there is a chance of introducing those influences which it was charged a few years ago, were used with Judges in the city of New York. I recollect reading of a case where a suitor, who was extremely anxious as to the result of a suit, in the course of adjudication had called upon one of the Judges. He had heard that Judges in New York were open to corrupt influences, and was a little doubtful whether in this particular case it would be safe to assume that was the case. After some conversation he said hesitatingly and fearfully: “I suppose, your Honor, it would not answer for me to make any suggestion as to compensation, or any thing of that kind in this matter?” The Judge said: “The sooner you get rid, my friend, of scruples of that character the more likely you will be to win your case in Court.” There is danger in a matter of this kind when one man has power to declare whether rights will be forfeited or not, of corrupt practices being used.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I call my hon. friend's attention to sub-section B, of section 10, of the regulations:

“But if it should be found that the full number of settlers required by these regulations are not on the tract, or are not placed on in conformity with sub-section B of clause 9 of those regulations, then for

each settler fewer than the required number, or not placed in conformity with the said sub-section, the party shall forfeit one hundred and sixty dollars of rebate."

Mr. CHARLTON. I am discussing, at present, the colonization plan No. 1, and I am dwelling upon section 10, sub-section C, which reads as follows:—

"If at any time during the existence of the contract the party shall have failed to perform any of the conditions thereof, the Governor in Council may cancel the sale of the land purchased by it, and deal with the party as may seem meet under the circumstances."

The hon. gentleman will recollect that last night he told us the forfeiture conditions were of very little consequence. I imagine it will be found they are of very little consequence under that sub-section which gives permissive power, and does not make it mandatory upon the Minister, I hold the door is opened for corruption, and that these regulations should say definitely what should be the duty of the Minister, and that there should be no choice in the premises left to him. Now, I come to deal with the possible results. Of course, speculators will examine carefully these regulations, and calculate what may be done under this or that condition of things, and what possible results they may be able to attain. Let us look into that question for a few moments. If sixty-four settlers are placed in each township, the company acquire their 10,240 acres of land for \$10,240. That, then, is the inducement to fulfil the condition of placing the full number of settlers there. Now, if they sell to thirty-two settlers 160 acres each, at \$2 an acre, they receive the amount of their investment, \$10,240, leaving them 5,180 acres free of cost. But if they sell to that number of settlers 80 acres each at \$2 per acre, it leaves them 7,680 acres, costing \$5,120, or 72 cents per acre. If they sell to thirty settlers 40 acres each, at the Government price of \$2, it leaves them 9,680 acres, costing \$7,680, or 85 cents an acre. If, however, they should sell, as it is highly probable they will, land at, at least, \$4 an acre—I understand the Canadian Pacific Railway is selling lands at \$5 an acre—they will have, after selling to thirty-two settlers 160 acres each, at \$4 an acre or \$20,480, will have remaining one half the lands of the Townships and \$10,140 besides. Should they sell thirty-two lots of eighty acres each at \$4 each, \$10,240, they will have remaining three quarters of the land of the township free of cost. Should they dispose of thirty-two plots of forty acres each to thirty-two settlers at \$4 an acre, which will give them \$5,120, they will still have left 8,960 acres, or they will have seven-eighths of the lands at a cost of 57 cents per acre. But they may place thirty-two tenants upon their own lands, and if these are to be considered settlers, they get their 10,240 acres at \$1 an acre. These regulations provide that a company shall have the privilege of obtaining all pre-emptions in townships upon certain conditions. The homesteads settlers may, through advances or otherwise, be placed somewhat under the influence of the company, and if they fail to have their pre-emptions entered within three months of the time of their failure to secure their rights in that respect, these corporations may step in and grab every pre-emption claim in the township. It is a beautiful arrangement in the interests of the speculators. I think my hon. friend in making this arrangement must have been aided by suggestions from hon. gentlemen who well understood how to manipulate matters of these land speculations, and make a handsome investment with their money. This colonization plan No. 2 founded upon that little three line clause, in this Bill, for exceptional occasions in which sales of more than 640 acres may be made, is held to enable the right hon. Minister to take himself authority to alienate to speculators the whole of the land in belt D. By this plan all lands in townships, except those reserved for Hudson's Bay, or for school purposes, may be sold to a company. A company may buy all public lands, all homesteads, all pre-emption claims, in a town-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ship, and make a sweep of the whole thing, except four sections reserved for the Hudson's Bay Company and for school purposes, and these purchases may be made in unlimited quantities; they may extend over the whole of belt D, which embraces half of the North-West Under that three line clause the First Minister has the power to deprive the settler, in the whole of this section, of his right to homestead and pre-emption, and to pass the whole of that vast region over to the speculators. It is a monstrous plan and it strikes me as most singular that hon. gentlemen opposite are so unfortunate in the policy they adopt. What necessity is there for them to adopt a plan like this, which is sure to be so unpopular, which is sure to work such injury to the country, and which can do no good to themselves as a party or as individuals? Well, Sir, the company having bought the lands under this scheme at \$2 per acre, is allowed a rebate of \$120 for every settler it places on the tract. It has a period of five years to place the settlers within these townships. At the expiration of five years, if it has placed 128 settlers in each one of these townships, where it has the whole land, homestead and pre-emption, it then has a rebate of one-half the purchase money it has paid and gets the land at the net price of \$1 per acre. But I do not notice here any stipulation as to the number of acres that each one of these settlers shall occupy. I do not notice any stipulations as to the location on which the settlers shall be placed. It does not say they shall be placed on alternate sections, that they shall have 160 acres each. They may all be placed in one corner of the township. A blacksmith may buy one acre and be counted a settler, and the laborer who goes there and cultivates two or three acres of land given to him by this monopoly is a settler. The settler who goes there and buys forty acres is a settler. They may complete the conditions of this bond; they may place there 128 settlers in each township, and these settlers may not occupy eight sections of land. These settlers may be so placed in the township as to give to the speculative company three-fourths of the land in that township in one continuous body. Well, let us see now this thing, to use a slang expression, will pan out—this rich thing; and the only reason that people are not availing themselves of this plan in preference to the other is that it requires a little larger outlay of money at the start. Under plan No. 1, the Company gets possession of the land at 40 cents an acre; under plan No. 2 at \$2 per acre. But in the event of having to deal with the settler it is a much better plan than the other. Ultimately the result will be more advantageous to the protégés of my hon. friend, the speculators. Let us see how it will work. If eight sections in each township are sold to settlers in forty-acre lots, at \$2 per acre, the company receives for the sale \$10,240; it gets in rebate for the 128 settlers at the expiration of five years, \$30,480. The result is it obtains 15,360 acres for \$10,240, or 67 cents per acre; but if it sells to the 128 settlers, in eighty acre lots making sixteen Sections, at \$2 per acre, the Government price, the result is it gets from the amount of sale and the rebate, at the expiration of five years, \$40,968. It retains 10,240 acres of land, costing it nothing except the cost of surveys, 5 cents an acre. But if it sells 128 forty acre lots at \$4 per acre, which is more likely to be the case, it receives \$20,480, and retains 15,360 acres, or three-fourths of the tract free of cost. It receives in rebate and in money received for one-quarter of the tract sold, the sum the whole tract cost. But if it sells 128 eighty-acre lots to the 128 settlers at \$4 an acre, it receives \$40,960 in money and \$20,480 in rebate for half the tract, leaving \$20,480 in cash at the expiration of five years, and 10,240 acres of land. Well, Sir, if the company sells its lands at \$2 an acre, the profits are 100 per cent; if it sells the land at \$3 per acre, the profits are 200 per cent; if it sells at \$4 per acre, they are 300 per cent; if it sells at \$5 per acre, the profits in the

transaction are 400 per cent. This matter may be arranged so as to sell half the land in each township and leave a block amounting to over 40,000 acres in one solid block taken out of a block of four townships. We were told last night by the hon. gentleman—at least I understood him to say—that the grants made already cover some 7,000,000 of acres. I understand that the applications made would cover the country twice over and would reach from the Red River to the Rocky Mountains and back again. I would like to inquire of the hon. gentleman whether he is leaving a neutral zone between the Licensed Victuallers' grant and the Temperance Colonization grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For my hon. friend's occupation.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I am afraid there will be future difficulty.

Mr. MILLS. That is for the police to look after.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, I am happy we have been able to learn as much as we have with regard to the amount of land granted and with regard to the number of applications. I have heard rumors floating around the Department that there were a vast number of them, heard, some days ago that over 300 had been made. I do not know, but I have been led to suspect that the hon. gentleman's supporters behind him were some of them, figuring in these transactions, and I am afraid it will give rise to reports floating around the country that political influence had been sold by gentlemen whose votes are essential to hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, in the promotion of this scheme. I am very much afraid of it. Of course, I would not imagine for a moment the thing was possible—I do not assert it is possible; but I am afraid the character of the hon. gentleman will suffer by the circulation of reports of that kind in the country where their probity and honor are not as well known as they are here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who circulates the reports? The hon. gentlemen?

Mr. CHARLTON. No; I say that I fear such reports will go into circulation and obtain credence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who starts the reports? Is it the hon. gentleman?

Mr. CHARLTON. I may remind the right hon. gentleman that the eyes of the whole country are upon him. The people are aware of the fact that there is a great rush of speculators to the North-West, they are aware of the fact that the supporters of the Government have already had some influence on former occasions in matters of this kind, and there is danger that these reports may obtain circulation and credence. Well, Mr. Speaker, the objections to these two plans may be very briefly stated. Plan No 1 deprives the settler of the chance to purchase any land except pre-emption at Government prices. It deprives the settler, I repeat, of all chance to purchase any public land at Government prices, the only lands he can purchase are pre-emptions; all the other public land in the country is granted to these companies, it passes into the hands of speculators whose interest is to obtain the utmost farthing they can, and they will do it. That is, in a word, the objection to plan No. 1, a plan conceived, not in the interest of the masses, but in the interest of the few. The objections to plan No. 2 are still more serious. It sweeps away the homesteads, it sweeps away the pre-emption claim, it sweeps away the public land, it sweeps into the remorseless maw of these colonization schemes the whole public domain. It leaves the settler no foothold, no pre-emption, no homestead, no possibility of his buying of this paternal Government, one foot of the public land at the regular Government price. As I have said before, applications cover the whole country twice over. The hon.

gentleman has acknowledged that he has alienated 7,000,000 acres of the public domain for the benefit of speculators and to the injury of the people who are ultimately to fill up the land. He has been remiss in his duty. He has forgotten the millions in remembering the interest of the few who come here to seek favors from him and perhaps promise him their support. What are the consequences to follow this? The settlers are obliged to buy the lands from speculators perfectly remorseless, whose sole and only object is to make money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend may laugh, but I do not imagine that these men are actuated by any philanthropic motives in the investments they are making. Their desire is to place money in their own pockets, and they are going to adopt the course that will best lead to that result without reference to the wishes or interests of others than themselves. Then, Sir, another objection to plan No 2, is that it offers great facilities for creating great estates. As I pointed out, the conditions of this land grant may be complied with, by placing 128 settlers in one corner of the township, and that secured, the company retains three-quarters of the land in the township in one body. It offers the best possible advantages for the creation of great landed estates in the North-West, and our hon. friends opposite seem to display a great degree of anxiety to create an aristocracy in this country. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance justifies his policy of taxation that builds up monopolies in this country, by broadly asserting that it is a fine thing for the country to have the wealth of the country in the hands of a few, who may live in large houses, keep fast horses, and fancy dogs, and allow the masses of the people to remain poor in order to benefit a few great men. My right hon. friend, a few nights ago, spoke of the creation of great landed estates and enormous farms as something to be desired. He said that on such farms we could have the advantage of maintaining the best kind of agricultural implements and keeping the choicest stock, that we could have the lordly owner riding in his carriage and his sons mounted on blood horses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who said that?

Mr. CHARLTON. My right hon. friend.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. A few days ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My right hon. friend, speaking of the great wheat farms in Dakota, said it would be a great blessing to have a policy that would lead to the establishment of great estates, thousands and thousands of acres farmed in one body, and thus we would have the best kind of agricultural development, and expensive processes of enriching the soil, expensive machinery and everything of that kind. But did it ever occur to my right hon. friend that the reverse of that picture might have some attractions to present—that the placing of thousands of freeholders on small holdings would be more conducive to national strength and national growth than the gathering together of nabobs holding great landed estates. I think it would be better for the country to adopt a policy that would foster the creation of small freeholds, rather than enormous estates such as those which plan No. 2 is calculated to create. Then, Sir, another feature I have to refer to is the remissness of the Government in posting these regulations. We have, first of all, the fitful vacillating character of these regulations, and that feature has been condemned in no uncertain tones in the west by the people who understand best the operation of this policy. The policy of my hon. friend has been condemned, and will be universally condemned in the west by the men who go there to make for themselves homes, and who seek to

identify themselves and their posterity with the growth of that country. Not a man of the millions who will ultimately people that country but will curse the policy which has brought such evils. The Government has also been remiss in informing the people of the changes in their regulations, and the agents knowing nothing about them the lands are withheld for sale. What for? I understand very well the advantage to the speculator of withholding these lands from sale and tiring out the actual settler, who is without means and who cannot afford to dance attendance for weeks and months on the agents and finally leaves in disgust. But the speculator with thousands at stake can afford to wait. He can enter into collusion with the authorities to procure delay and to drive from the country those who come there to settle, and who would interfere with his speculative investments. The true policy of the Government is to discourage speculation, to wash its hands of those men who seek to control tens of thousands of acres of the public domain for their own selfish purposes, who seek to get this land into their hands that they may charge the settler vastly more than they give the Government. The Government should allow no middlemen to come between itself and the men who are to till the soil. It should consider that domain a sacred heritage and itself the trustee charged with the management of the estate for the benefit of its wards, the people of the country. Its policy should be the greatest good to the greatest number. It should look to the future and strive to adopt a policy that will inure to the benefit of the millions of settlers, and not to establish a system that will result in the aggregation of vast fortunes in the possession of the few. There are other bad features in the Government land policy in addition to its provisions regarding colonization. In fact, Sir, the land policy of the Government abounds in bad features. We have the pasturage lease policy, a policy by which the Government is permitted to grant leases of great tracts of land, to the extent of 100,000 acres, to their favorites. And having granted these leases the Government has the power, at the mere whim or caprice of the hon. First Minister, to give two years' notice to terminate any of these leases. It can hold the rod over the leaseholder and compel him to become its supporter, and to do many things which a free man would not do. Then, with reference to the timber berths. The Government may let them without competition to its favorites. That is a bad policy, and a policy that every man should condemn. These franchises should be put up to public competition and sold to the highest bidder. There should be no hole and corner work, no dancing attendance in small cliques at the office door of my right hon. friend, seeking the favors which it is within his power to dispense under this policy. The door of corruption is opened wide, I do not say designedly, but is opened wide by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Private members may lobby for the promotion of various claims, they may sell their influence to procure grants under colonization plans No. 1 and 2; they may themselves become members of colonization companies under either plan. The result is that a corrupt influence is brought to bear upon the Government. Then, Sir, they may sell their influence again in favor of companies regarding which the Government has to decide whether to cancel their claims, they having failed to fulfil their engagement, or to make them pay and allow them to retain their lands. Here are two doors open to corruption on the part of private members, and when the door is open there will surely be some person to enter. In the nature of things wherever corruption is invited corruption will exist. Then, Sir, corrupt influences may be brought to bear upon my right hon. friend to withdraw pre-emption and homestead lands, for settlement and advertize these lands for sale at auction. I can easily conceive of circumstances in which it may be in the interest of colonization companies to make bogus returns as to the

Mr. CHARLTON.

number of settlers—to report that they have 128 settlers when they have not a dozen, or when perhaps not half of the number are actual *bona fide* settlers. Corrupt influences might be brought to bear in making false representations which would enable the company to get a rebate of \$1 per acre when they are not entitled to it. I can imagine cases where corrupt influences might be brought to bear in procuring timber licenses without having those licenses properly put up to auction. I can imagine cases where corrupt influences might be brought to bear in procuring pasture leases, and coal and mineral leases, and these corrupt practices might be engaged in by private members who might be induced to sell their influence with the Government for corrupt purposes. My heart is filled with pain when I think of the temptations that my immaculate friend the hon. the Minister of Railways may be subjected to. My heart is pained when I think of the temptations that the hon. the First Minister may be subjected to. We have a prayer which implores, “lead us not into temptation.” The Government is adopting a policy that is certain to lead them into temptation, and unless Divine strength is accorded them to deliver them from evil, they will be almost certain to fall into it. It fills my heart with pain to think that they should be subjected to such great temptations as inevitably await them under this policy. Let us see what these temptations are. Suppose the agent of a company desiring to make an agreement under colonization plan No. 1, finds that the gentlemen on the Treasury benches are not favorable to his proposition. Is there not danger that the man might be disposed to offer a consideration for the allotment of a few townships? Is there not danger that, unless the hon. gentlemen were perfectly immaculate, some hon. Minister might accept a bribe of that kind? My hon. friend tosses his head, but I can tell him that corruption has existed in Governments before to-day, that corruption will be found in Governments after to-day, and that a policy such as this is calculated to produce corruption and the people of this country will condemn this policy simply because it invites corruption. We are all human, and this policy is excessively human. This corrupt influence might also be brought to bear by the speculator in inducing the withdrawal of lands from homestead or pre-emption, and having them placed in the market at auction, thus depriving the settler of his chances of making pre-emption and homestead entries. Suppose there is a block of townships, sixteen sections in which are open to homestead and pre-emption, and speculators are desirous that they shall be withdrawn by the hon. First Minister from actual settlement, is there no possibility of corruption? Is there not danger that a large sum might be offered for their retirement from homestead and pre-emption? There is, and it is wrong that such a power should exist with the Government. The same difficulty exists with regard to the provisions for timber leases and pasture leases. The door is open in every one of these cases, inviting the use of corrupt means for the purposes of speculators. I have seen about the Departments an unusual number of strange faces this winter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What were you there for?

Mr. CHARLTON. I was there, from time to time vainly seeking to get a summary of the information that the hon. gentleman promised to bring down before to the House, that would enable us intelligently to discuss this question. I was there in the prosecution of my duty as the representative of a constituency, looking after the interests of my constituents, and it was then that I saw the things I am about to speak of. I did not go there looking after the interests of any colonization schemes. I did not belong to the right side. I find in the lists of stockholders of these schemes the names of many

political friends of the hon. gentleman. I have seen hundreds of strange faces about the Department, men gathered together in knots and groups, and men singly. The doors of the Minister's Department have been beset, and it was difficult to obtain an interview with the Secretary, much less with the Deputy Head or the Head of the Department. I do not know what they were doing there. I did not know but that some great public exigency had called these men to Ottawa, or that they were here from some patriotic motive, or in consequence of some great public danger. The lines of Whittier were suggested to my mind:

"Wherever outraged nature asks thought or action brave,
Wherever struggles labor, wherever groans a slave,
Wherever rise the people, wherever falls the wrong,
The bounding pulse of freedom's heart finds answer in his own."

I looked at those faces to see if they would fill the Bill, and thought they were not the men whom I would credit with possessing characteristics such as those. On the contrary, they were men who were evidently intent upon securing some gain for themselves, and it became evident to me that they were seeking favors in the way of colonization grants, and that their operations were facilitated and promoted by the regulations which my hon. friend has adopted, which permit chicanery and fraud, and political expediency to take away from the people what is their sacred heritage. We condemn the policy of the Government because it permits these varied influences to exist. We condemn the policy of the Government because it forgets that Canada is a free democratic land; because it favors the speculator, and seeks to give him land at half price; because it desires to create in Canada great landed estates; because it introduces, or seeks to introduce, the tenant system in Canada, because it would compel the *bona fide* tiller of the soil to pay vastly more for his acres than the Government receives, and because it loses sight of the future, and of the millions, and barter priceless inheritances and issues for the advantage of camp followers and gamblers. I beg to move the following resolution:—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved,—That the present Land Regulations provide that odd-numbered sections in the Canadian North-West, outside of the Canadian Pacific Railway Belt, shall be open to sale without conditions of settlement.

That the so-called Colonization Plan No. 1, provides that parties may purchase large tracts of land on credit at \$2 per acre, with a proviso for the rebate of one half of the price on certain conditions, thus reducing the cost to \$1 per acre; or one half the price charged to individual settlers for their pre-emptions, or other purchases in odd sections.

That the so-called Colonization Plan No. 2 provides that parties may purchase large tracts embracing all the Government lands within their area (from which homestead and pre-emption settlers are thus to be excluded), paying \$2 per acre, without any express conditions of forfeiture in case of non-settlement, and with the additional advantage of a large rebate, amounting under certain conditions to \$1 per acre from the price, in case the purchasers choose to effect a so-called settlement within each township, but without any provision as to the acreage to be given, or the interest to be secured to each so-called settler.

That these regulations are calculated injuriously to affect the future of the country by facilitating the creation of large landed estates; by placing extensive areas of the choicest lands in the hands of speculators, who have favorable opportunities in securing them in anticipation of the settler, and who may hold them for a large advance to be paid by the ultimate settler, whereby the country will gain nothing in price, and will lose through the diminished ability of the settler to contribute to the public revenues.

That in the opinion of this House our aim should be to people the agricultural regions of the North-West with independent freeholders, each cultivating his own farm, and paying therefore no more than the public treasury receives; and that, save in the case of town plots, or other exceptional cases, the sale of North West Agricultural lands should as a rule be made to actual settlers only, on reasonable conditions of settlement, and in quantities limited to the area which can be reasonably occupied by a settler.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I regret for some reasons that my hon. friend should not have pursued the course which is usually followed, and given at least a day's notice of the motion he was about to make. If he had done so, I would have had the papers here to meet his elaborate arguments, if arguments were required. However, I think I can trust my memory generally to meet

that portion of his speech which is at all relevant, and that portion I must say—and I leave it to the judgment of the House as to whether I am correct or not—is but a very small part of the long and able speech of my hon. friend. There was great deal of sack for a very little bread. My hon. friend commenced his speech with his usual power and his usual fluency, but he really forgot the place where he was speaking; he fancied there was a dissolution and that he was on the stump, addressing an audience far away from the centre of intelligence and information; and my hon. friend, from the beginning to the end of his speech, pursued the same course. He spoke about the possibility of corruption and the probability of corruption. The hon. gentleman said I may wash my hands, but there has been corruption and there was corruption. I thank the hon. gentleman for the implied compliment that there is not corruption. Perhaps in a change of events, perhaps as there was corruption and that not very long ago, the hon. gentleman hopes there may be an opportunity for corruption again; but the hon. gentleman has admitted that at present no charge of corruption can be brought against us. That language is unworthy of a member of Parliament; it is unworthy of a representative of the people, it is unworthy of a man who hopes and believes and expects to be the guiding-star of the country as a member of some future administration. Why, the Parliament of a country which has institutions like those of England should pay sufficient respect to the Government of the day to suppose it, unless there was a specific charge brought, to be incapable of corruption. If that principle is not laid down, Government is utterly impossible. Let the hon. gentleman bring a charge of corruption, let him rise in his place, if he dare, and state a single act, since this Government was formed, connected with the administration of land affairs in which we have not acted with the most perfect fairness and the utmost impartiality, and without asking what were the political proclivities or antecedents of any applicant for lands in the North-West. I defy the hon. gentleman to make the charge. I invite him to make the charge, and if he cannot make the charge, and if he does not make the charge I leave it to this House, and through the press to the country, to say whether the hon. gentleman was justified as a member of Parliament and as a representative of the people in using the language he has used. This much as regards his language about corruptors I challenge him, I invite him, I entreat him, to bring up any charge of any kind against the Department of which I am the head. It is quite open to him, and I admit it is the duty of every hon. member who does not approve of the policy of the Government, to attack it as severely as may be; but when he charges improper, sinister or clandestine motives, the hon. gentleman should be prepared to follow up his charge or to sit in his place ashamed and humiliated, and if he is not ashamed his friends who sit around him will be, if he does not follow up such language by a distinct allegation and distinct proof.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to disclaim having made any charge. I said the policy of the Government was open to the charge of permitting and inviting corruption. I made no charge of corruption.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what I complain of. The hon. gentleman did not make the assertion, but he made the insinuation, which is much more mean than the distinct charge. But the hon. gentleman is not only afraid of corruption, but he is afraid of an influx of aristocrats; that this country is going to be ruled by bloated aristocrats and capitalists, and colonization companies were going to make immense fortunes out of the hardy sons of toil. The hon. gentleman introduced that expression three times; why did he not follow it up with the expression

"the horny-handed sons of toil?" Whether there is going to be a monopoly by the lands companies, by individuals or by railway companies, monopoly is all the same. The hon. gentleman must remember, as the country will remember, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) introduced a Bill by which there would be any amount of railway lines running over the North-West, and the hon. gentleman—I cannot call him my friend after the language he has used to-day—was one of the strongest supporters of the measure, and he denounced small holdings and said it was absurd to suppose that a peddling policy would meet the case, but they must obtain large railway companies with large means to bring in settlers to the country. The hon. gentleman then was not afraid of a monopoly of railway companies, and he was not afraid of bloated aristocrats; the difference was that he had confidence in his own purity and in the purity of the Government he supported, and he has not the same confidence in those who sit on the Treasury benches with so much satisfaction to the majority of the House and equally so I believe to the people of the country. But the hon. gentleman was in favor of large grants to railway companies which were to be scattered broadcast over the North-West. Where, then, was the "horny-handed son of toil" to get his land? He was to go to the railway companies, to the middlemen, to the speculators, to those who had arranged to run railways east, west, north and south, and obtain land grants of millions of acres as in the United States, and he was to be compelled to go cap in hand to the middlemen according to the hon. gentleman's scheme. Just as the hon. gentleman varies from Free Trade to Protection and from Protection to Free Trade, he was a few years ago an aristocrat and a monopolist, now he is a democrat and a defender of the poor man. In the debate which took place in 1878 on the Manitoba Colonization Railway Bill, which was to give lands to everybody who chose to get up a bogus or paper charter—to use the hon. gentleman's expression—the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said:

"Some of the railways had perhaps been subsidized more than was necessary, perhaps more land had been given than was advisable, but capitalists would not embark their money unless they had a prospect of a fair return, and it was folly to haggle with them about an unimportant difference when important interests were at stake."

Again the hon. gentleman said:

"In the North-West they had lands which would give sufficient sustenance for fifteen or twenty millions of people; let them get inhabitants for them as soon as possible. If they could pour 50,000 a year into it, those settlers would pay into the coffers of this country, in the shape of Customs duties, £250,000 per annum, and the Government would derive a far greater revenue this way than from the sale of these lands."

The hon. gentleman was then looking at the matter through a pair of blue spectacles, but he now looks at it through a green—through a jaundiced pair of spectacles. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman should descend to the vulgarity of charging or insinuating the possibility or the probability of corruption. Governments of the day are supposed to be pure; they are supposed to have the confidence of Parliament and of the people through their representatives, and as soon as they prove unworthy of that confidence they are removed. James IV of Scotland when he went down to the Borders, which was then occupied by a wild set of Lowland clans of raiders and foragers, came to a place where the Lowland chieftain had a castle built on an island in the middle of a lake. There was no means of getting at or taking the fortress, and the raider, the forager or plunderer was quite safe in the absence of artillery which prevailed in those days. The king's remark on seeing it—I do not apply it to the hon. gentleman, but perhaps he will appreciate its force—was: "The man who built that palace is a thief in his heart." The man who makes a

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

charge of corruption, or an insinuation of corruption without being able to prove it, I leave it to this House to say whether he is not capable of corruption himself. But not only has the hon. gentleman distinguished himself as a democrat and a protector of the poor man—an anti-aristocrat and an anti-monopolist—but in the interests of the country, in the interests of pure morality, he plays the part of a detective. He says he went over to the office of the Interior and there he saw a number of men. He says he saw by their faces what they were—and what a heart a man must have who would use that expression with regard to a number of men he knew nothing about—he says he knew by their faces that the men who were hanging about there were there for corrupt purposes—for jobs, for speculations. The hon. gentleman is a physiognomist, but I tell my hon. friend that if every party will use the same skill in physiognomy that the hon. gentleman uses, then, perhaps, the hon. gentleman would not stand so great a chance of being a future Minister of the State. Then, too, Mr. Speaker, there has been favoritism, and hon. gentlemen sitting behind me have been induced to vote for me and my Government by clandestine methods, by giving improper grants; but I tell the hon. gentleman that the gentlemen who sit behind me were elected to support me in 1878 before any policy of this kind could even have been suggested, and they have been true to the pledges they made to their constituents—true to the pledges they made to the country, and I believe the country will sustain them as a body—sustain them individually and collectively. Whenever the appeal is made the country will say as they were elected to support the Government, they believe the present Government has so acted as to prove themselves worthy of that support and will send them back again to support the present Administration. Then the hon. gentleman supposes that these colonization companies are all formed of greedy men, selfish men, dishonest men; that they are formed for the purpose of robbing the immigrant; but Sir, they cannot be any worse than the railway companies which the hon. gentleman agreed to press into service, whom he thought should have large grants—who were not to be haggled with. We are not to consider, thought the hon. gentleman, whether we should give them four, or ten, or twenty townships—do not haggle with them, give them what they want; do not let us do business in a retail way, but let us do it wholesale. That was the policy of the hon. gentleman, but he supposes that every man who applies under a colonization system is a rogue in his heart; that he is a heartless man; that he wishes to rob the immigrant and cheat the settler. That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the lists of those who have applied for colonization grants, there are men with whom he agrees politically, whom he supports politically, or has supported; there are men whose characters stand in such a way that the hon. gentleman would not dare, for his soul, to say that any one of them would be guilty of any such conduct as he has characterized them by. What does he say? He says that they are harpies; that that they are griping, grasping and grinding to death the poor settler. No language of opprobrium would be too strong for the hon. gentleman; but I tell him that every one of these applications has been considered on its own merits without the slightest reference to political proclivities or antecedents—whether they are opponents of the Government or supporters. The hon. gentleman commenced by comparing the policy of the Canadian Government with that of the United States. The circumstances of the country when we took office, especially with regard to the North-West, were not in a healthy condition. The late Government had no faith in the future of that North-West. They had shown that they had no faith in it. They had in their places declared that we could hope for no great influx into that country so long as Kansas and Texas and other por;

tions of the United States were open. They said that progress would be slow.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We can turn up *Hansard* and prove it. We have read it again and again in the House, and if necessary we will read it again and again in the course of this debate, and prove the truth of what I state. Again and again was it stated that it would be by a slow process that the North-West would be settled so long as the United States continued to offer the great inducements which they were offering. Consequently when we entered office we took the earliest steps possible to induce immigration; we took the first steps that were ever taken to induce immigration. The late Government took no steps whatever for that purpose. When they laid out the Pacific Railway, the first thing they did was to declare that a belt of twenty miles on each side of the railway should be absolutely reserved from settlement. Our policy, on the contrary, is that every alternate section shall be open for free settlement and pre-emption, even if the railway runs across it. Such is our policy, and such was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. We were anxious to offer better terms to the settlers, because of the backward position of settlement in the North-West, because of the utter discouragement which had been offered to settlement there by the administrators of the affairs of Canada for the previous five years; and as the United States asked \$1.25 an acre for their land, we offered ours for \$1 an acre; as they declared that the homesteader must remain on his land for five years, we declared that he would get his deed in three years; as their pre-emption rights were to be sold for cash, in all cases we offered pre-emption rights on credit;—we did all this for the purpose of offering better terms in the effort to divert into Canada the immigration which was rolling in an enormous tide into the United States. We were only partially successful, thanks to the exertions and thanks to the language of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, there was not an advertisement inserted in any American newspaper by the great railway companies which had lands to sell that did not quote the language of hon. gentlemen opposite; some of the pamphlets issued by them had their pages adorned with their physiognomies, and Antwerp, Berlin, and every portion of Germany was flooded with translations in the best German of the disparaging remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite; and, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that such is the spirit of opposition—not to say thank you—that by some unhappy fate, whether they are in the Government or in the Opposition, these hon. gentlemen, like the bloody shirt of Nessus, seem to feel that the necessity of disparaging their country devolves upon them as an inevitable task. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken gets up and tries to show that the terms we offer are prejudicial to the settlement of the country—that they are not satisfactory to the immigrant. Strange to say, Mr. Speaker, the whole of Europe—at all events, the whole of England, Ireland and Scotland—as well as a considerable portion of the United States and all of Ontario, as the hon. gentleman says, have quite a different opinion. Was there any rush from Ontario during the time of the Government which the hon. gentleman supported? Was there any danger of that Province being depleted then? Was there any danger of an emigration from Lower Canada? The exodus from Lower Canada, as well as from Ontario, was to the United States. There was no assertion that there was going to be an improper rush of people to the North-West. But now, Sir, it is all changed. The hon. gentleman has quoted my language of April, 1880. I was one year premature, and if I was, there were two causes for it; there was a very early and wet season, which, together with the pernicious influence of the language of hon. gentlemen

opposite, had the effect of postponing immigration. But it was only for one year. The immigration of last year—and it is only approximately known, because we cannot arrive at the number of men who cross the border at all points of that great country—is shown by the population register to have been 28,000, and there will be nearly 20,000 by the 1st of May next, notwithstanding all the exertions of the hon. gentlemen opposite and their misrepresentations of the character of that country. Strange to say, although they declare that the terms in the United States are so much more favorable than those in Canada, there is a large and healthy immigration pouring into Canada all the way from Kansas; there are large numbers of people coming who are willing to endure all the injustice which the hon. gentleman has so eloquently depicted, who are willing to put themselves under the grinding wheel of a rampant aristocracy; and no thanks to the hon. gentleman. Why should they not listen to the hon. gentleman? Perhaps they will read his speech and turn back to that land of freedom and democracy from which the hon. gentleman himself came, and from which he has evidently derived some of the sentiments he expresses. Sir, as I said before, we were a new country in the North-West, we had no population, while the United States for the last twenty-five years had been receiving a growing tide of immigration, and a great portion of it was caused by previous immigrants. Much to the credit of the European immigrant, and especially of the Irish immigrant, so soon as he got his head above water on this side of the Atlantic, so soon as he had, by honest industry, been able to house himself and scrape up a little money, he sent that money home to his relatives to bring them out and settle them in the western States. That was a growing and increasing cause; as the snowball increases in rolling, so from year to year the increase of the Irish immigration caused an increase in the sums of money sent home to Ireland to bring out the friends of those already here. We had no such resources, and what had we to do? In the first place, we had to grant a certain sum of money to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. We granted \$25,000,000 for that purpose; but, with the exception of the railway, we had no agency for the effective promotion of immigration; and we all know—the hon. member for North Norfolk himself must admit—that the great and immediate cause, the principal cause of the rapid settlement of the American North-West, of the district growing into a territory, and the territory developing into a state, was the lavish grants of lands made to the trans-continental railways of the United States. My hon. friend from Bothwell, in a humble imitation of that policy, attempted to introduce the same system into Canada, and it had, perhaps, to a very considerable extent succeeded. We have carried it out to a limited extent, although I was rather reproved for it last night, if I may refer to a previous debate. But, as we had no immigrants on the desert plains of the North-West to send their money home, we endeavored to interest colonization companies. We had no railways except the Pacific Railway to advertise for immigrants, and we have attempted to interest capitalists in Europe, in England, in Canada, aye, and in the United States, to bring immigrants into this country. The speculation—if it be a speculation—is an honest one, and a business one; and, Mr. Speaker, in a great measure, it is going to be a successful one. Sir, the hon. gentleman says that our present policy is less favorable than that of the United States, because the United States gives the homestead grant without any restriction in any part of their territories, and sell their lands at \$1.25 an acre. Mr. Speaker, the fact is—and the hon. gentleman knows it—that this statement is merely made for the sake of effect, and that it has no real substance in it. The hon. gentleman knows that nearly all the land worth settlement is taken up; and if the hon. gentleman, if he has not read as I am sure he has read, the various reports connected with this subject,

laid before Congress, and at all events he ought to have read them before he made his speech, knows that it was alleged in the last commission which was issued on this subject, that the best and most valuable lands have already been granted, and to such an extent that there is a strong party formed for the purpose of revoking these grants, and resuming possession of the unsettled lands which have been granted to the railway companies. As the House must see, as every man of common sense must see, this must be the case; for if there were as favorable lands open in the United States for free lands as those which the railway companies possess, how in the world can these railway companies dispose of their lands at all? Why these companies have made their fortunes out of these lands. Settlers have rushed into these lands, and speculators have bought them up, because they were the only lands available, either as regards fertility or accessibility and railway accommodation. The very fact that this immigration, coming as it does from England, Ireland and Scotland, goes to the places where these railway companies own all the land, and buy up these lands, disregarding the homestead right, proves what I said, and what a mere perusal of the American records will show, that the main portion of the country's accessible lands are in such a position that it makes the homestead right very little save a farce. There are some in Kansas, and there is an unlimited chance for going to Texas; but, Sir, there is a large population moving this very year of our Lord, 1882, from Kansas to our North-West, abandoning their homesteads, abandoning this land of delight, abandoning this delectable country, which was praised in such glowing terms by hon. gentlemen opposite some years ago; they are abandoning all that, and are coming to this country this very year in very large numbers. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that we had better settling lands, and were not selling them. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that it was the policy of the late Government, as it is of the present, to appropriate a certain portion of these lands for the purpose of paying the expenses of building the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that this task was so herculean, and that the burden was so great for a population of 4,000,000 of people, that, while it had become a political necessity to carry out our good faith and open up and make useful our North West, which we had bought for this end, if to build the Pacific Railway, at the same time it was part of the policy of the late Government—and as the records will show it—as it is the policy of the present Government to make that country pay for its own railway, why in the name of heaven—and I speak with all due reverence—should the people of Ontario and Quebec, of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick and of Prince Edward Island be heavily taxed in order to open that western country to new settlers from all parts of the world. Why should they be ground down under that iron heel of the aristocracy and that relentless grasp of the tax collector? Why should they be crushed out, when there was a fair country as large as the whole of Europe that did not refuse the sacrifices, which the original settlers of Ontario—and to go still farther back—the original settlers from old France in the Province of Quebec, endured? Why, Sir, instead of being obliged to plunge into the forest, instead of being compelled with unskilled arms and old English broad-axes to hew their way through the woods before they could raise a potato or a cabbage, the immigrant can go now into the North-West, and if he has his agricultural implements, before the night after the morning of his arrival has fallen, he can run many a long furrow. Then, why, Mr. Speaker, should our people be taxed under these circumstances? This was felt and known in all parts of Canada. It was understood, and it was the policy of the present Government, and of the present as it was of the late Parliament, that

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that country should eventually pay for its own railway, and there was an appropriation which still stands on the Statute-book, of 100,000,000 acres of land, which were to be sold for the purpose of building this railway; and of these 100,000,000 acres 25,000,000 acres were to be handed over to the railway company, and 75,000,000 acres are to be sold—they are not to be used for homestead purposes—for the purpose of relieving the people of the older Provinces, who on the faith of this assurance and promise—and on this promise only—accepted the burden, and have at the polls recorded their sanction of this policy, which was settled some years ago, of building the Pacific Railway, of carrying out the pledge made to the people of British Columbia, and of opening the intermediate North-West, which was bought for a price taken out of our own pockets—they endorsed this policy on the understanding, that eventually that country would pay the whole of the expense. Sir, I am glad to say that by the persistence of speculators—as the hon. gentleman calls them—but of capitalists and gentlemen desirous of investing in the North-West, as I would describe them—it is safe, it is certainly beyond the possibility of doubt, to say that every farthing and every cent, and every dollar, that has been or will be expended in building the Pacific Railway, not one shilling of this burden will fall on our shoulders, or on the shoulders of the generation that will succeed us. We will be free from the whole amount of that debt. Why, Sir, as I told the House last night across the floor, that the sales to which so much objection was taken, of the 23rd March and 1st of April, at three several places, upwards of \$700,000 in hard cash, or nearly \$750,000, were paid into the Treasury. This is a very substantial commencement of the fund which is to pay off these \$25,000,000. This took place I may say in one day; there was a difference between the 23rd of March, at Winnipeg, and the 1st of April at the other two places, but nevertheless, I may say that, on one day, \$750,000 were received, which will be put to the credit of the fund and invested at interest, for the purpose of paying off the whole of these \$25,000,000. The hon. gentleman is afraid that the North-West is going to be swallowed up. I stated that the whole of the applications which have been granted, comprises only a few million acres, and although the hon. gentleman does not trust the Government, this House and the country will trust the Government, believing that they will not give away too much of these lands. It is an experiment, but it will be a successful experiment, as is shown by the success of the railway companies in the United States in this respect; and when we state that there are 250,000,000 acres of land in that country and that the whole of the land which has been granted in response to these applications includes only 7,000,000, and that there is no prospect of there being more than 3,000,000 more granted, making, in all, 10,000,000, and when I tell the hon. gentleman that by this year, there will be 10,000,000 acres granted to colonization companies, under plan No. 1, which means the eventual payment of \$10,000,000 into the Treasury besides the proceeds of such other casual sales as are made during this year, it will be seen that only a small portion of this heritage has passed out of our hands; and these sums will be used to meet the engagements which Canada has incurred on the account of the Pacific Railway. We shall have \$7,000,000. \$3,000,000 more may be fairly considered to be the extent to which the colonization grant will go. That will be \$10,000,000, and with the sales that will take place of the railway lands in other portions, we will have either, in money, or in what is as good as money, solid mortgages on every one of those colonization tracts, an amount equal to \$12,500,000. So that in one year we may fairly say we have got half of the whole \$25,000,000 that we are pledged to pay to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I should think that hon. gentlemen opposite, if they could for a moment cast aside their feelings of opposition, ought to join with us in rejoicing in the new field of prosperity that is opened to the country. They should rejoice to see that that country which was bought with so much misgivings, in the minds of even the most hopeful, should bring so favorable a return; that the engagements we entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the enormous charge undertaken, of civilizing and governing the whole of the North-West, have been met so successfully; that the policy which was originally hinted, or suggested by the Government of 1867, and carried out to a certain extent by hon. gentlemen opposite, and brought into full fruition by the present Government, has been carried to so successful an issue; and that from the United States, and from Europe, and old Canada, that country is going to be certainly populated by a large, industrious and civilized race of people, who will add to the strength, health, importance and dignity of the Dominion. If they would rise superior to their feelings of opposition and join us in rejoicing at this great change, this wonderful prosperity, it would redound greatly to their credit; and long after the temporary quarrels, disputes and differences between political parties are forgotten, it would in our future history be recorded to their credit; that they set aside their political prejudices, forgot the factional oppositionist in the patriot, and sustained the policy which is settling that country to the utmost extent, bringing immigrants to it from all parts of the world. But the hon. gentleman, with respect to the colonization claims, speaks of the middlemen coming in. Sir, that is not so. We will take now plan No. 1. Any immigrant can come in independent of colonization associations, and settle on an even numbered lot and make his entry for a pre-emption lot. No middleman interferes with him. He gets homestead land for nothing and pre-emption at the regulation price fixed by the Government. But if he has been induced to go in there by the company he will be counted into that company, and whereas they pay \$2 an acre for the quarter-section which they bought they will get a rebate of \$1 an acre, if the settler has, through their instigation, in any way been put upon even a quarter-section next to it. The fears of hon. gentlemen therefore are altogether unfounded. The policy of the Government has been fixed from 1878. Hon. gentlemen complain that we have altered our policy from time to time. Sir, we are not, as I said on a former occasion, Bourbons, who forget nothing, learn nothing. We have gone on, as experience has shown, with the rapidly changing features of the North-West changing our regulations, but in every one of those regulations we have kept as a cardinal point—and so long as that point is kept sacred the fear of a monopoly is at an end—that everywhere, in any tract of the country, the homesteader shall have an opportunity to get his land, and the pre-emptor shall have a right to get his land at regulation prices. I am one of those who don't think it is a loss to that country that men of capital should invest their money in it. There are hon. gentlemen opposite, who, I know, have invested there. I am very glad that they have done so; I am very glad that the hon. member for Centre Huron, and the hon. member for South Huron, have invested to that extent that they now hold 15,000 acres in South Manitoba. They are the harpies, they are the bloated aristocrats, who have gone into that country and actually speculated there. I am very glad that they have done so, and instead of 15,000 acres, I wish they had four times that amount. Those gentlemen will, I am sure, by their energy and ability, prove the best emigration agents that we could have. I know a colonization company which reckons among its members one of the leading members of the Opposition, the hon. member for Lambton. It must be with regard to him

that the hon. gentleman repeated a portion of the Lord's prayer: "lead us not into temptation," but I am sure the hon. member for Lambton does not require the hon. member's prayers. I know the prayers of the righteous avail much, but I don't think they are required in this case. Nobody supposes that because the hon. gentleman chooses to go into a transaction which affords a fair opening for the exercise of his energy, and a fair prospect of remuneration, in a business-like way, that any objection ought to be taken. The hon. gentleman condemns and looks with alarm on the prospect of the blacksmith and carpenter coming into the North-West and settling on a forty-acre lot. He says that under plan No. 2 a gigantic aristocrat may go in and squat a lot of them down in a corner of forty-acre lots, or one-acre lots. That is just what we want. We want all kinds of people in that country; we want the agriculturist to have his 160 acres, the blacksmith and mechanic his twenty or forty acres, or whatever quantity he desires. Any one of those men who will settle down under plan No. 2, or any other plan, on a forty-acre lot, will bring his wealth and industry and strength into this country. The hon. gentleman thinks that the North-West should be occupied by the agricultural settlers alone, but every mechanic that goes in there, every laborer, whether he chooses to settle on a one-acre lot, or a forty-acre lot, at the instance of an aristocrat, knows that if he is being crushed by the iron heel of grinding tyranny, all he has to do is to walk off and get 160 acres elsewhere. The clap-trap, unworthy, electioneering backwoods speech of the hon. gentleman has only exposed him to the ridicule of the House, as it will to that of the country; the hon. gentleman's friends are ashamed of him, and I leave him.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 69) to grant certain powers to the "C. W. Williams Manufacturing Company," and to change the name thereof to the "Williams Manufacturing Company."—(Mr. Gault.)

DOMINION LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resumed the consideration of Mr. Charlton's amendments to the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAKE. The right hon. gentleman, in the animated defence of his policy with which he entertained the House before Recess, complained that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had not given notice, according to the course heretofore pursued, of his intention to bring in this motion. Well, Sir, it did not lie in the mouth of the right hon. gentleman to make any such complaint. We, on this side of the House, had pursued that course, although it was not obligatory, until the hon. gentleman, by that example which is said to be more potent than precept, taught us there was another and more excellent way, when he set up one of his followers the other day to bring in, without twenty-four hours or twenty-four seconds notice, a discussion upon a question which required certainly more preparation and more notice than this question can be at all said to have required. After the course which the hon. gentleman pursued in precipitating that debate without notice, I think it was like himself to complain to-night that he did not receive notice of this motion, and in that particular his observation is perfectly characteristic. My hon. friend from North Norfolk, in stating to the House his grounds of objection to the policy which is presented by

these regulations, adverted to an objection which the hon. gentleman dealt with in the first part of his speech; that was to the opportunities which these regulations afford for the exercise of unfair dealings, of favoritism, of corruption. The hon. gentleman declared that these observations were highly improper, that Governments were supposed to be incapable of corruption, and that my hon. friend was altogether out of place in making any such suggestions. I have not so read the history of free and popular Governments; I have not so learned the duty of the representatives of the people in discussing proposals by which it is intended to place in the hands of the Executive of the day great and extraordinary powers. On the contrary, my reading of history has taught me that one of the great dangers of free and popular Governments is in this very direction, and that it is the duty of the representatives of the people to guard vigilantly the preservation of the constitution of the Executive, and of Parliament itself from the liability of improper practices growing from the giving of any such powers to the Executive. There was a period in the history of the mother land when, owing to a state of affairs now happily largely passed away, the British constitution was in serious danger of perishing from this very cause. We may well recollect the language which, at that epoch or shortly afterwards, Montesquieu, in discussing in a philosophic spirit the British Constitution and its probable duration, said: *Elle périra lorsque la puissance législative sera plus corrompue que la puissance exécutrice*. That was the danger then as he stigmatized it, and it is the present danger. But you saw it overcome by the growth of a better public opinion, by the growth of a higher standard in and outside Parliament, and by stringent enactments to limit the powers of the Executive as well. Now, Sir, under these circumstances, I think it is not merely within the right but within the plain bonds of duty of any member of Parliament to discuss the possibilities to arise from an undue extension of executive powers; and when we find, as we do find, an enormous estate, a country where the hon. gentleman is never tired of magnifying as to its area, its capabilities and its production, when we find the hon. gentleman telling us, in a word, that that domain, with reference to the disposal of which he takes such extraordinary powers, is so vast that the rest of Canada sinks into insignificance beside it; when we find that we, looking a little way into the future in this point of view, will form but an insignificant portion of the population, that will then inhabit the whole Territory; when we are dealing with these enormous interests it certainly is in the last degree important that we should see that interests so large as those being dealt with, and that the powers and opportunities of the Executive in connection with them should be carefully guarded. The hon. gentlemen says that all Governments ought to be believed to be incapable of corruption. Well, I recollect, not to go back to those old periods to which I have just now alluded as elucidating the liabilities of free constitutions to danger from this source—but to take a more recent case, I recollect a Prime Minister, about ten years ago, of a free country, with a popular constitution, informing the public in a speech, delivered out of Parliament, but in Canada, that was widely circulated, informing them, I say, that in times past charges had been made from time to time against Ministers, colleagues of his, of improper practices; that these charges having been investigated, the Ministers had disappeared from his Government, and the observation was, of course, very cogent that there was but one inference to be drawn from it, the inference not very creditable to those departed colleagues, nor to the country. But we might suppose from the hon. gentleman's observations to-night that Governments were incapable of corruption. Now, the hon. gentleman sought to distort, I must say, according to my view, my hon. friend's observations. We pass laws and we scrutinize laws with

Mr. BLAKE.

reference to the dangers which may grow from the passage of these laws. It is no imputation upon hon. gentlemen opposite to say, that they are exposed to the same frailties that the rest of humanity are exposed to. I do not merely admit, but I declare and declare with satisfaction—because it would be a humiliating thing, indeed, for this country, if one should be obliged to suppose to the contrary—that there are in the ranks of these hon. gentlemen who do not see eye to eye politically with myself, men as honorable, as high-minded, as conscientious, as any that I can find alongside of myself. I have never thought the contrary, but I do not pretend to place all those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to me on the same high level. There are amongst them some who are not up to that standard, and with reference to whom it is fit and proper that precaution should be taken. We do not build our laws with reference to the powers, or capacity, or incapacity, or proclivity for doing wrong of particular Governments; we build them so that we may be as secure as possible against wrong-doing by any Government, of which ever side it may be composed, at whatever time it may come into office, and whatever principles it may profess, and we are entitled and bound to consider what the effect of past legislation will be in that sense and with that reference. There is a constitutional confidence to be placed in the Government of a country, but a limited constitutional confidence—no more confidence in one Government in this sense than in another—and all our laws are to be framed so as to guard, so far as possible, against the abuse of power by those with whom it may from time to time be entrusted. This, however, is not the main point, although the hon. gentleman would gladly have made it so. It is a most important one, in respect of which in my belief the evil and mischievous effects of those regulations will become more manifest from day to day; but after all the point directly taken by the resolution before the House is upon the policy of these regulations in other respects, their effects upon the future of the North-West country, their policy irrespective altogether of the opportunities and dangers to which I have just now alluded. The hon. First Minister failed to apprehend the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton). I am sorry that he did so, because it is a misapprehension which appears to be chronic. Always we find the same misapprehension arise, and always we hear the same mistake and error as to our views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have brought forward the question involved in these resolutions and have applied them to other, though less objectionable, schemes of the Government in former days, and then, as now, we were met with the same answer. We were told, because we insisted upon settlement as a condition of sale, that we were going against sale altogether. It is not so. My hon. friend's resolution deals with the question of to whom you shall sell. He does not propose to interfere with or affect the free grant and pre-emption portion of the policy of the Administration. He does not propose to interfere with or affect the proposition that for the other lands a price shall be obtained. He does not propose to interfere with or affect the question of the price which shall be obtained, except in so far as the adoption of his views would secure to the Government on the one hand the payment of the full instead of the half price, and to the settler on the other hand, that he should receive his land at the Government price instead of at a price double or treble that price. The propositions of my hon. friend, therefore, are not fairly to be represented as propositions that would diminish in any sense the returns into the public exchequer from the lands of the North-West; on the contrary, they are propositions which provide that without increasing, nay, by diminishing, the prices to be paid by the settler, you will get more from the lands than under the

present system. The hon. the First Minister sneers at the idea of the creation of what he calls an aristocracy in the North-West. There are worse things than an aristocracy in the true sense of the term: a plutocracy is a very much worse thing, and it is that sort of thing which it is proposed to encourage in the North-West by these regulations; it is not an aristocracy in the proper sense of the term, but the creation of a class to be made wealthy by opportunities that are given them by the Government for fattening at the expense of the public and of the settlers. The hon. the First Minister said that the policy of this Government had always been most liberal, that they began by granting large free grants close to the line, and even along the line of the railway. The hon. gentleman's memory fails him. Although my hon. friend's words had hardly ceased to echo through the Chamber—in his speech in which he called the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. the First Minister's policy was not a policy of large free grants of 80 acres only, that the policy was not one of placing settlers close to the railway, but of removing free grants for distances of five miles from the railway, on each side, and that the hon. gentleman's subsequent policy was carried out, not from conviction, but from pressure placed on it from without—the hon. the First Minister stated, standing in his place, that he had been compelled or induced, although he believed his first policy was correct, to alter his policy in the direction of greater liberality.

Mr. PLUMB. No.

Mr. BLAKE. That is my memory against the memory of the hon. gentleman. The hon. the First Minister stated that as regards his calculations of the number of settlers in the North-West he was premature only to the extent of one year, and that the propositions predicting larger immigration and settlement failed from two causes, first the wet season, and second, the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I will not discuss the question of the seasons; but it is very amusing to observe the trick played by hon. gentlemen opposite. They represent us as wholly impotent, as incapable of impressing the people of the country in any respect, as incapable of doing anything to enforce our views here or elsewhere, as fighting against strength and struggling hopelessly, and only succeeding in converting people to views opposite to those which we hold. That is one position in which the hon. gentlemen place us. But if ever a prediction of theirs is falsified by events, if ever it happens that their predictions turn out to be thoroughly wrong, they say it was due to the potent and malignant influence of the Opposition. I leave hon. gentlemen opposite to reconcile these two views of the influence and power of the Opposition. The hon. the First Minister referred to speeches which have been delivered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and he referred to a speech of my own in a very pointed manner. Observations have been made in respect to that speech and partial and distorted extracts have been quoted; but it is in *Hansard*, and there is not a word in that speech, if you read it, which is objectionable, there is not a word untrue, and I am prepared at any time and under any circumstances to repeat the same sentiments and statements, convinced that they can be vindicated by the facts, and it contained nothing of which any man need be ashamed of having said. The hon. Finance Minister knows that what happened on that occasion was that two or three states of the Union were quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite as instances of an extraordinary immigration and extraordinary progress; and adverting to those very cases which they brought forward as possessing such elements of progress, I but gave what was commonplace information, what is unquestionably true as to the effects of that progress; and proceeded to discuss, after a fashion which I have not yet seen attempted to be controverted, the elements of that progress in immigration, with the view to

ascertain whence it had arisen. What was said then was, I believe, absolutely and unquestionably true, and I am quite prepared to vindicate the speech by a perusal of the speech itself, which will be found to be its own best vindication. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that he was but premature for a year, and that the delay in that year was caused by our efforts. Where? Abroad? The immigration has not come from abroad. Such immigration as there has been in the last year has been almost entirely from within our own bounds. Was it within our own bounds that we were able to falsify the hon. gentleman's predictions by what we said or by what we did not say? Was it within our own bounds, where both parties are known and where the weight attaching to their utterances is recognized, that this mischief happened? Or was it from abroad? We find that the immigration even of last year is almost entirely from within our own bounds. I have not been able to find from the statements of the report any evidence to show, with reference to the immigration of this past year, the figures amounting to the sum which the hon. gentleman has stated, viz., 28,000. I recollect that a while ago the Minister of Agriculture stated that he supposed, but he could not tell accurately, that there was about 28,000. Now, I find Mr. Grahame, Dominion Immigration Agent, attempting, so far as I can judge, to calculate the whole who came in by St. Paul by lake and other ways, and he calculates that those who came in with tickets from Canadian and American points by rail for the first nine months numbered 12,001, to which he adds 30 per cent for children, making a total number of 15,601. The number who came in by the lakes he puts at 4,061, or a total of 19,662, and he adds: "I have no doubt that during the months of October, November and December there will be arrivals into British territory which will bring the immigration of the season of 1881 to 25,000 souls;" but up to the end of September his calculation is 19,682 souls. With reference to the sources from which that immigration is derived, so far as it came from the States, Mr. Tétu says that the States of Massachusetts, Vermont, and Michigan have furnished the greater portion. Mr. Tétu, who is Immigration Agent at Emerson, gives the total number of arrivals at that point at 27,212, from which he deducts 17 per cent. for what he calls the floating population, leaving the number, according to his view, 23,586. Some may have come across at other points. They cannot, however, have been numerous, and against them is to be set those who departed from other points as well. How is that immigration distributed? There are of English, 1,937; Irish, 558; Scotch, 765; Germans, 80; Lower Provinces, 893; French Canadians, 1,028; and of what he calls Canadians, but which must be evidently emigrants from Ontario, 19,593; United States, 2,358; making a total of 27,212, from which the 17 per cent. is to be deducted. There you find the proportions, and you find that the bulk of this immigration has been from the one Province to which I refer. Now, if you look at the report of Mr. Hespeler, you find that he gives the approximate number of arrivals at Winnipeg during the year 1881 at 12,020. Of course that does not include the whole immigration, because some stopped short of Winnipeg and some moved past there and are not included, but none of these statements corroborate the estimate of 28,000 made by the hon. gentleman. Again, if I rightly remember—for I have not had the opportunity since the hon. gentleman spoke of referring to the paper—the prospectus issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think in the month of November, with reference to the sale of their lands, declared the prospects of their country estimates the immigration into the country that year at 20,000; so that I think the estimate of the hon. gentleman made to-night is not warranted by such figures as are accessible to this House, and such figures as the Government have presented to the House for its informa-

tion. But, no doubt, the immigration has been very considerable, and the hon. gentleman declares that it is going to amount to no less than 20,000 for the months of January, February, March, April, and part of May. He says these immigrants are coming in from all quarters—a large number from Kansas and other States, and a large number from the Old World—England, Ireland, Scotland and the continent of Europe. He says all are alive to come to the North-West, and have two reasons: first, he says, because the United States have no more lands to give, so that if immigrants must settle on agricultural lands they will have to go north; and, second, because they are better acquainted with Canada than they were. Now, Sir, so far as the immigration to the North-West is concerned up to to-day it is from within the bounds of the Dominion almost entirely that it has come, and from the bounds of the Province of Ontario principally. And the consequence of the continued depletion of that Province at the rate at which it has been depleted during the last year by departures to various quarters, principally, I hope and believe, to the North-West, will be, if continued, very serious. I said on a former occasion that I could not regret any removal of any portion of my fellow-countrymen from one part of this Dominion to another which improved their condition, increased their comfort and their capacity for discharging their duties to the country. I do not regret it, because we are all bound to rejoice in whatever may improve the condition of any one of our fellow-countrymen; but we must not ignore the consequence of such a change of population as has been and is going on in the Province of Ontario. Why, Sir, in the capital town of the South Riding of Bruce, I observed a statement, made two or three months ago, with reference to a proposal that was before the Local Legislature as to the voting on a by-law for a grant to aid a railway company. The law, I believe, required an absolute majority of the registered rated owners of the land in the town to compel an assenting vote, in order to the validity of that by-law, and it was represented by the municipal authorities that such a thing would be impossible, because 42 per cent. of the registered owners of land in Walkerton, according to a census they took for the purpose, were reported to be leaving for Manitoba in the spring.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman sneers derisively at that statement.

Mr. PLUMB. Certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose even with these departures the population of Walkerton will be larger than the hon. gentleman's borough, but it would be a very serious calamity to Walkerton to lose that number of its people. I know no more about it than that this statement was made by the municipal authorities and sent down to the Legislature as the result of their enquiries made for the purpose I have indicated; but there can be no doubt that there has been a serious change taking place in the population. I saw, but yesterday, a gentleman who had just returned from the North-West, and who saw a large band of immigrants who had just arrived from the Province of Ontario, almost exclusively. He said—and he had a good deal of experience with reference to immigrants to the western country—that he had never seen in his life such a lot of immigrants as there; they were the best lot he had ever seen, the finest, the most intelligent, the best off, the most enterprising men, who would get along anywhere, and still better in the North-West. While this is good for the North-West, how is it for the country that loses men of that class? What is it going to do for the Province of Ontario? Now, Sir, pausing here in these observations, to which I shall recur presently, I say, if the hon. gentleman is correct, if everything he has told us this night is to be justified by the

Mr. BLAKE.

events of the year; if it be the fact that the lands of the United States are exhausted so that the surplus millions of Europe must turn to the North-West; if it be the fact that, irrespective of that exhaustion, they are cheered and encouraged by the prospects we present to them and are ready and willing to go; if it be the fact that from England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany and Scandinavia, they are coming amongst us; if it be the fact that the proposals which have been made and scattered widely through these regions, have enlisted their favorable consideration and determined them to come.—why, Sir, everything that the hon. gentleman said, every declaration that he made, every promise and pledge that he gave to the people of this country as to the present sentiment of the North-West, is an argument in favor of the policy of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, as contrasted with the policy which the hon. gentleman proposes and which is his boast. Why so? Is it pretended that there has been a colonization scheme in operation? Is it pretended that the 20,000, or whatever it may be, of settlers who have gone to the North-West, have gone under the auspices of a colonization society? Is it pretended that a man is emigrating to the North-West under any such influence? No; the immigration that has taken place, the sentiment that has been created, the tide of feeling, to be followed by a human tide which the hon. gentleman has described, exists, not because it has been promoted, encouraged or created by colonization companies, but by virtue of the announcement that the lands were free to the settler; it exists by virtue of the announcement that any man can go there, choose, settle and buy. And if it be true that this vast tide of immigration is pouring into that country, what do we want of the agencies to which the hon. gentleman has alluded? He says that the Western States were colonized by the aid of railway companies, who are their great colonization agents, and we, having no railway companies to colonize the North-West—although I think I recollect that a year ago we were told that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company alone would relieve the Government from this business of colonizing the North-West—we having no railways to colonize the country, at least, if we except the Canadian Pacific Railway, which he threw in in a parenthesis as though it was hardly worth mentioning, although we have given it 25,000,000 acres of land on the express statement that it would be the most effective means we had ever adopted of inducing immigration—we decided to make our own plan, to adopt our own substitute, the great colonization companies. But I say, Sir, that, as the immigration which has come in is not due to colonization schemes, and is going to continue to fill up the country as rapidly as its good will require without them, why should we create the colonization schemes? Let us keep the land for the settler who is coming, so that the settler will have it at first cost; let us not create an agency which is calculated only to cause the settlers to pay a higher price for their land than they would have to pay if the land were left free to be dealt with between the Government and the incoming settler. The hon. gentleman asks, why should the older Provinces be taxed to pay for the Canadian Pacific Railway? Why, Sir, the answer is, because the hon. gentleman made a law to tax us—because he made a contract to tax us—because he made an arrangement to tax us; that is the only reason why we should be taxed. But, certainly, so far as we can escape from taxation by dealing with the lands of the North-West, let us escape. Upon that we are united; but what does the hon. gentleman propose? He says: "I offer 10,000,000 acres of land in class D to the individual settler at \$2 an acre—that is \$20,000,000;" but he says: "I am going to sell these 10,000,000 acres to the colonization companies this very year at \$1 an acre—that is \$10,000,000;" and when my hon. friend from North Norfolk says: "Let us sell it at \$2 an acre, which is all the settler will pay, and

which is double the money to be got under the hon. gentleman's scheme, the hon. gentleman says, forsooth: "You want to diminish the product to the Government from the sale of North-West lands." Why, Sir, it is perfectly obvious that the hon. gentleman's scheme is the one that will diminish the product of the Government from the sale of the lands; the very essence of it is to sell the lands at half price, in order that the settler may pay double the Government price in the end. The hon. gentleman says he will have \$10,000,000 this year. Well, that is a fine statement, but he was obliged to admit that he would not have the money; he will have sold 10,000,000 acres to the colonization companies, for which he will ultimately receive \$10,000,000, and he says: "I expect to receive from other sales—that is, those despised \$2 or \$2.50 sales—\$2,500,000 more;" or cash and the equivalent of cash to the extent of \$12,500,000, which the hon. gentleman says, amidst the uproarious cheers of his followers, is half the cost of the Pacific Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. He did not say that; he said half the subsidy.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, if the hon. gentleman simply said that \$12,500,000 is half of \$25,000,000, that is a simple question in arithmetic, and was not very well calculated to evoke the enthusiasm which he did evoke from those benches; but what the observation was understood to mean was, that one-half of the burden imposed on this country by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was going to be met in a single year. We know that that burden, irrespective of the indirect burdens which we have often referred to, approximates about \$60,000,000 instead of \$25,000,000; so that if \$12,500,000 were to be realized, which will not, this year, there would still be the burden which would not be half discharged; but there is something more. Sir, it was by some arithmetic of this kind that the hon. gentleman proposed a while ago to put to capital account the surveys of North-West lands. We called the attention of the hon. gentleman to it, and he agreed—but this, like other promises, has been forgotten—to open a public account which would be brought down yearly in which the North-West lands should be charged with the expenses connected with these lands on the one hand and in which the sales would be given on the other hand, and that the balance should be struck; and before you deal with your \$12,500,000—before you poach the eggs which are not yet hatched,—and deal with these \$12,500,000, you have got to remember that these are primary charges upon it—charges connected with the administration, the surveys, immigration, and other expenses incurred on account of these territories, which have to be met before you get a surplus for the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is very easy, Sir, if you conduct business on the principle on which the hon. gentleman proposes to conduct it, if we find out of other resources, out of the taxes of the people, all the money to carry on the business of the North-West, and treat every shilling which you receive from the lands as profit, without counting any of the expenses, after a year or two to make a show of having got something; but in order to keep the account as business people would keep it, as honest people would keep it, you must regard the expense account, as well as the receipt account; and you must strike your balance so. There is another little item that the hon. gentleman forgets perhaps, that we have spent a few millions on the Pacific Railroad, that we have borrowed money for it, that we are paying interest on it year after year, and have been for years; and that before he can settle the principal account, he has to settle the interest account too. So these glowing descriptions of the hon. gentleman which, I must say, seem to me to be directed to the entertainment of the idea, by his friends inside and outside of this House, that this year

they will wipe off half of the Pacific Railroad debt by the North-West lands, and the next year, I suppose, the other half will be paid, are very far from realization in any reasonable process of argument. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says he is glad that capitalists have gone in and bought lands in the North-West. Why, do we not know that they went there and bought those lands to make money by them? Do we not know that the only persons in whom we are interested in getting into that country are those who will be producers, who are to take up these agricultural lands, and farm them, and who, in the villages and towns which are to be created, will develop industries which, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, we may hope, will be introduced into that country. Do we not know that their ability to purchase is to be measured by the resources of the country as a general rule; and that inasmuch as the capitalist buys to make money, and only to make money, he must charge the settler more than the Government charges him, enhancing the cost in the North-West to the producer who is the only person whom we are interested in getting there, as the necessary result of these purchases by capitalists to which the hon. gentleman has adverted? It is as plain as day, that every man who is interposed as a middleman between the Government and the settler, or the producer, as a buyer by occupation, is a man who must be rewarded for his investment of capital or speculation, at the expense of the occupier; and, therefore, I do not at all rejoice that sales have been made to others than the ultimate occupiers, because I am confident that the sales, as a rule, have been of those lands of the classes which are best adapted for settlement, which would have been earliest chosen, and which would have been taken over by the occupier at the Government prices at the earliest day, and which now the occupier will have to purchase as he can, when he can, and at what price he can, to his loss; and that means the loss to the State, because contracted ability on his part is a loss to the State and no profit to the Government. The hon. gentleman has stated that these capitalists and the promoters of these colonization schemes are respectable. I do not doubt their respectability. I do not blame them for having proposed to make money under the regulations of the Government; not in the slightest; they are quite entitled to do it; but I believe that they entered into these plans with that view as business enterprises—as enterprises out of which they expect to make a very large profit indeed; and I believe that this expectation, if it is to be realized, is an expectation which cannot be realized only at a corresponding loss to the country at large. The hon. gentleman says that the immigration will be very great. I will say this: that to the extent to which colonization companies were formed upon the express proviso or arrangement that their energies were to be directed and their rewards were to be obtained by inducing an immigration from foreign countries, I quite understand such a policy; but I say that at this moment the observation which the hon. gentleman made the other evening, as to the land craze at present prevailing, was a fine observation, and an observation which applies not only to the North-West, but also to the Province of Ontario, and I do not believe that it is a wholesome thing for this Province, and perhaps, ultimately, for the North-West, to encourage people in the extraordinary manner in which this scheme will encourage that depletion of the Province of Ontario. I believe that it is being depleted by other processes, by the ordinary processes, quite rapidly enough, and that the creation of the colonization companies, who are still further to stimulate the spirit of unrest among our people and still further produce—if that is the fact—a rapid emigration to the North-West, will be certainly no unmixed gain. Now, Sir, as I have said, I do not believe it to be necessary. I adopt the statement of the hon. gentleman,

and I call upon him to vindicate the necessity according to his statements, which were that immigration is proceeding as rapidly as could be hoped; that as much is being done in that direction as could be expected, that his own expectations are being more than realized, and that everything is going on in that direction as it should. The hon. gentleman says that, under the first plan, the even sections are open for settlement; but he says that the company is only entitled to rebate, or allowance, in respect to the settlers which it puts on the intermediate sections. The words in the regulation are ambiguous. There is one portion of them which would support the hon. gentleman's contention, and there is another portion which goes to the contrary; but what is to be done is to enumerate the settlers. How is this to be found out; by whom the settlers were put on? Who is to tell? What provision is there made for ascertaining from whence the settlers came, or at whose instigation—to use the hon. gentleman's words—they came. It will be extremely easy to arrange with a settler, who is on an even section, that he is to be reported or to report himself to the enumerator, as having been put there at the instigation of the company. He gains nothing one way or the other except from the inducement to be held out to him by the company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is there, at any rate.

Mr. BLAKE. To share the spoils from the arrangement by which the rebate is to be given. "Better," the company will say, "to share the spoils with him than to lose it all. We will give you something, and it will be understood between us that we put you on." I say that there will be practically no result from this, save that every free grantee and every homesteader then on a tract, will come to the enumerator as having been put there by the company, unless it turns out that they were there before the colonization company was organized. If he gets there after the organization of the company, by whatever means he has got there, there will be a rebate in respect to that homesteader. The hon. gentleman says that he welcomes the blacksmith, the mechanic, and so forth. Of course he does; we all do. Of course we recognize the fact that the agriculturist of the North-West will require the blacksmith, and the mechanic, and the furniture and waggon-maker, and so forth. They are necessary to the agriculturist, as to all societies, and, therefore, we welcome them all. My hon. friend's remarks were not directed to discredit the immigration of those necessary adjuncts to every civilized community, but he pointed out that under plan No. 2 there was no security at all for the proper conditions for a rebate being carried out, because the mechanic, or blacksmith, or individual who took an acre, or forty acres—probably as a tenant—is to be counted as a settler. In all other provisions you have had stipulations as to who is to be considered a settler. You find he is to be an occupant of a quarter-section, that he is to have a right to pre-emption, &c.; but here you find it expressly left in so elastic a condition that laborers brought out for the purpose of working the vast estate, which may become the property of any one of those companies, on being given a few acres, will be counted as settlers, in order that that corporation may obtain the rebate. So that, if that company go into this speculation with the view of farming on this extended scale, they will be paid \$1.00 per acre over the whole tract on bringing out the laborers necessary to work their farms. You pay them that premium because they bring out laborers as necessary as to the working of the farms as the agricultural implements which they must import. The hon. gentleman has argued that events justified this policy. I deny that. Events which have taken place have not taken place in consequence of this policy, but so far as the policy is concerned, have taken place notwithstanding the policy; and the events which he anticipates,

Mr. BLAKE.

are events which he anticipates without reference to this policy; and the immigration to which he points with so much triumph, in the last year, with so much glorification, as to the present and future years, is an immigration which is the strongest argument against the existence and the necessity which would be the only justification for a policy like this. Are there to be 10,000,000 acres given this year to companies, on which they are to obtain, as compared with the individual settlers, a rebate of \$10,000,000? That is his statement. Is it needed that they should obtain, in comparison with the individual, a rebate of \$10,000,000? You say yes, this is needed in order to get settlement, but you tell us you got the settlement in and it is coming in without it. There is, therefore, no such need. Every settler who, you say, is coming in and would require these lands at the lowest price, is to be thwarted and hindered, not helped and promoted by a plan which would involve the giving to a company for \$1 what would cost the settler \$5.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A stranger, unacquainted with Canada and its Parliament, dropping in here this afternoon and listening to the very stirring speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and that which has just been addressed to this House by the hon. leader of the Opposition, would, I think, have arrived at the conclusion that some great calamity had befallen Canada; and, I think, about the last thing that any such person would have supposed had occurred was that a great tide of prosperity was flowing into this country. About the last conclusion at which he would arrive from listening to the speeches of those hon. gentlemen, would be that their prediction of the evils that would happen to this country have been altogether falsified by current events. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat said that the hon. member for North Norfolk was quite right in his holding up to the people of this and other countries, the impression that there was great danger that the Government of this country was entering upon a career of widespread corruption; that there was imminent danger, under the policy about to be pursued, of the Government being tempted to corrupt the people, and that the picture was true which he drew and which called down upon him rightly the reprimand that he received from the hon. the First Minister, for having taken a position in this House that was unworthy of himself, of this Parliament and of the country. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken said it was quite right to hold out these signals of corruption; but the hon. gentleman must learn this, and he may as well learn it now, that we do not intend to permit hon. gentlemen opposite to pose as the champions of purity, when to do so compels them to ignore all their past record. I say that when an hon. member in this House attacks the hon. the First Minister of the country and holds up his policy to execration, as a policy calculated to lead to a system of corruption, and insults hon. members on this side, as being engaged in and entering upon that very system of demoralization and corruption, he must not be surprised if he is met by his own statement and his own policy and his own acts, and it is shown that his language, instead of being that of a high-minded purist, of a man anxious to preserve the country from a course that he believes to be injurious to it, is the language of a hypocrite. If the hon. gentleman can be confronted with his own policy and shown to have sustained a policy the very same, only to a greater extent, as that which he is denouncing, he must not be surprised if, instead of being accepted as an authority in morals, he is accepted as one who is well fitted to sustain the leader of what was characterized by a gentleman who now stands high in the affection and estimation of hon. gentleman opposite, as an organized hypocrisy. I say that the time has come when hon. gentlemen opposite must be taught that we do not intend to permit them to adopt that attitude in relation to the Government

and those who are generously supporting it. The man who insinuates that which he is unable to prove shows that he is unworthy of the position he occupies, and we must not be surprised if these forebodings of corruption are accepted by hon. gentlemen on this side as the consciousness of that which is in his own breast and heart. Would any one suppose that the hon. gentleman who has held the hon. First Minister to task to-night as having opened up a system which is calculated to lead to general corruption, was a supporter of the late Government, in propounding a policy in relation to this very question of the settlement of the North-West, which is open tenfold to the charges that he brought against that of the hon. Minister of the Interior. I hold in my hand the embodied policy of the late Government in relation to this matter. I hold in my hand a Bill prepared by the sanction of the Government and laid upon the Table of the House by the late Minister of the Interior, a Bill which was supported by the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk just as vehemently as he has denounced the somewhat similar course of the present leader of the Administration. Now, Sir, if the leader of the Opposition supposes that he or any of the gentlemen sitting behind him are to be allowed, without their own past record being called up, to adopt a policy of that kind, I can only tell him he is most eminently mistaken. I need not tell the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that we have too good reasons for the remarks, too good reasons for the criticisms, too good reasons for the reproof which the leader of the Government gave in his recent address in regard to the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. When, Sir, we were struggling with this great national work, the Canadian Pacific Railway, what did these hon. gentlemen do? When they themselves had come to the conclusion that it was desirable to have that great enterprise carried out as a public work by the Government, and we came down and asked Parliament for such an appropriation of public lands as would enable us to construct that work without imposing undue burdens on the people, what did these hon. gentlemen do? Why, Sir, true to the policy they have ever pursued in Opposition—when on this side of the House they are eminently patriotic; then all is serene, and they can take the most roseate view of public affairs in every section of the country—but when in Opposition these hon. gentlemen, whatever policy is propounded, whatever the necessity of the country, feel that they are discharging their true vocation in decrying the country. They fear that the Government, by a wise, successful and judicious policy, may so advance the interests of the people of Canada as to entitle themselves to their confidence and support. That is the position. And when we were grappling with this great work, and dealing with it as we were bound to deal with it in the position in which they had placed it, instead of giving us that fair and manly support that we were entitled to, what did they do? When we asked Parliament to vote 100,000,000 acres, they denounced the policy as utterly futile and worthless. The hon. gentleman says he is prepared to repeat his speeches. He may be prepared to repeat them, but he will not convince any person in this year of 1882 that his statements were true. That stern logic of events, that most unanswerable and cogent logic, has proved the utter fallacy and futility of all the reasons the hon. gentleman gave, and there is no person in this House or out of it who can be found to take the same position in relation to that question. When we propounded that policy those gentlemen declared that we never could construct the road. Why? Because, they said, these lands are worthless. If they did not say so in terms they said so in fact. And then the hon. member for Lambton said we would be utterly mistaken if we supposed we could build the Canadian Pacific Railway with 100,000,000 acres of land, because it would cost all the lands would bring to get people to go on them to settle. He pointed out the

terrors of the climate. He pointed out the struggles that parties going into our North-West would have to endure, and he said such was the condition of things that we would actually be in the condition of giving the lands away, that we would have to pay people to go on there and live upon them. And the present leader of the Opposition, only too glad to re-echo and support such a policy, which was to prevent that progress and prosperity on the part of the country which would be the most fatal condemnation of their own past policy, and the most fatal contrast to the course they had pursued, backed up and sustained all these declarations. What did he say? Why, do they not know that the land agents of the United States, men keenly alive to the best possible means of carrying conviction to the minds of the public all over the world, not only actually copied the words of the hon. gentleman but emblazoned their advertisements with a portrait of his handsome person which they scattered over the country? Does he mean to say that the distinction he obtained at the hands of the enemies of our country, of the men who were engaged in advancing the interests of their country at the expense of our own, was solely by reason of the beauty of the picture and the attractiveness of the portrait that they presented to the public? No, Sir; it was to give greater effect to the language which the hon. gentleman had uttered here, language which could be made use of by the land agents of foreign companies to sell their lands in opposition to our own. What was the condition of those lands? The late hon. leader of the Opposition made a contract with Mr. Foster to construct the Georgian Bay branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in that contract he bound himself to pay 20,000 acres per mile, and that land to be in the North-West; because, when the subject was discussed, the hon. gentleman said that he had no land anywhere else but in the North-West to give him. The ex-Minister of Finance declared, in his place on the floor of the House, that Mr. Foster came back to them with this 20,000 acres per mile of 80 miles of railway, and said: "If you will give me 20 cents in money for each acre, instead of the land, I will carry out my contract." But no; they refused it. And yet these are the men who declared this land was not worth 20 cents an acre; although it was important to get this contract carried out, they would not give Mr. Foster 20 cents per acre in lieu of the land they had offered him. Now they come down, when all their predictions are falsified, when the logic of events has convinced the people how utterly unable they were to equal the situation, then hon. gentlemen now come down and do—what? Why, Sir, the whole wail of the hon. member for North Norfolk is a declaration that, at last, that what we had predicted would be accomplished, has been accomplished, and that the great tide of emigration is setting into that North-West and the whole character and condition of the country are changed. That is the position of things. These hon. gentlemen changed their position from the Ministerial benches, where they declared that their attitude was that of flies on a wheel, that they were utterly powerless, as they proved themselves to be, to do anything to promote and advance the interests of the people. Now that they have got on the other side of the House they have adopted another policy, not of flies on wheel, but of breaks on the wheel; not content with seeing this country enjoying the progress and prosperity which it sought for in vain while they were managing public affairs, their whole vocation now is a policy of obstruction, a policy of endeavoring to clog the wheels of prosperity and progress, whose onward roll is as fatal to them as the roll of the wheels of Juggernaut upon those who prostrated themselves beneath the car. It is under this condition of things that these gentlemen now come forward and say—not that we are mistaken with reference to what we believed could be accomplished by the development of the great North-West, not that we were mistaken in what

we believed could be accomplished by all these gigantic agencies which are now at work in favor of that country, when they made these desperate efforts, and with some success to attack our policy—we said we will endeavor to remove the Canadian Pacific Railway out of the category of partizan political questions, and we will place it on a footing that will close your mouths in future against uttering these diatribes against your own country that have been so injurious in the past. But what has been the result? Why, Sir, that with this contract, that the hon. gentleman still denounces, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway Canada has taken a gigantic stride ahead in the course of twelve months, such as no five years in her history has ever witnessed before. That is what these hon. gentlemen are suffering so keenly from now. But, Sir, not only did we wish to develop the North-West by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by all the new life and energy that would be afforded by the rapidity with which they would open up the country for settlement, but we gave to railway companies inducements to build other lines for the purpose of opening up that great, magnificent and fertile territory and making it the home of happy thousands and millions of people at an early day. Not only did we do this, but under the operation of colonization companies, of cattle ranch companies, and all the efforts we can use as a Government, we believe we are but discharging our duty to the whole people of this Dominion in combining all and every energy we can combine for the purpose of pouring in as rapidly as possible a great tide of immigration to that country. I say it is the success of our efforts that has produced this feeling of resentment and hostility on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Before proceeding further, I will direct attention to the utterances of the late Government on this question and contrast them with the utterances of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was one of the most ardent supporters of this policy when it was first proposed to the House. That hon. gentleman made a terrible point against the Minister of the Interior because he said there are certain things here that are left to the Minister of the Interior that are left to the Governor in Council, and inasmuch as such was the fact it is perfectly obvious that it would be opening the door to corrupt action between the parties coming to the Governor in Council and the Council itself; that you are going to lead to the corruption of Ministers because you are going to place it in their power to confer great favors, and by leaving that door open it is evident we are about to enter on a career of great corruption. Let me turn the attention of the House to the policy of the late Government in relation to the settlement of the North-West lands, which they did not value at 20 cents an acre. The then Minister of the Interior brought down a Bill, in which he provided that any fifteen men in any part of Canada could, in twenty-four hours, place themselves in a position to build a railway in any part of the North-West, if they pleased. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) shakes his head, but I have the Bill in my hands. I am sorry to say there is great difficulty in getting a copy of the Bill; but the document should not be allowed to go out of print so long as hon. gentlemen opposite so utterly forget their past record and take such an extraordinary course as is indicated by the resolution now before the House. This Bill provides that any number of persons, not less than fifteen, may organize a company for the purpose of constructing, maintaining and operating a railway for public use, and the conveyance of passengers in any part of the Province of Manitoba and the territories of Canada, or wholly within the territories. It provides that all they have to do is to form themselves into a company, subscribe in good faith (what evidence would the hon. gentleman take of their good faith? for I suppose that would be dealt with by that desperate autocrat, the Minister of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the Interior) a capital of \$12,000 per mile, and pay up 10 per cent.; and then they could go to work and build a railway in any part of the North-West, provided it was not within forty miles of the Canada Pacific Railway. When hon. gentlemen opposite were building the Pacific Railway it was a sacred thing, and it must be protected from any competition by anybody; and the only possible protection that can be afforded in this Bill is that no other railway shall enter into competition with it at a distance less than forty miles. I draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to that, among other extraordinary inconsistencies in the attitude they have now assumed. I will read that clause, because it is just as well that hon. gentlemen, who seem to forget it so much, should not forget it. It reads:

"No company shall be incorporated under the provisions of this Act for the construction of any railway having the same general direction of the Canada Pacific Railway, or any branch thereof, at a nearer mean distance than forty miles."

But we go on, and we find that the Company, before constructing any part of the road, shall make surveys and levels of the land through which the railway will have to pass, and maps, plans and profiles of the road intended to be surveyed shall be deposited by the President and Engineer of the Company. It did not even recognize the Governor in Council, but simply provided that the President and Engineer might make those arrangements for building a road in any part of the North-West Territory. What about those powers of the Governor in Council which the hon. member for North Norfolk is so terribly afraid will be abused, and which, when possessed by the Government, will afford *prima facie* evidence that they are about to enter on a career of extraordinary corruption. The Bill says:

"The Directors of the Company, by a vote of two-thirds of their whole number, may, with the approval of the Government in Council, change the route of any uncompleted part of their railway if it shall appear to them that the line can be improved thereby, and in such case they shall make a survey, map or plan, profile and certificate of such alteration or change."

So it was to be a go-as-you-please railway. After the company had been authorized and had deposited plans and maps, its route might be changed to go anywhere so long as it was not within 40 miles of the Sacred Pacific Railway. But this required the approbation of the Governor in Council. Does not the hon. member for North Norfolk stand aghast at the fact that this matter came before the Minister of the Interior, and if he were not found to be as pliant as desirable he might be approached, as the hon. gentleman himself said had been done in the country from which he comes. I will not say, in the courteous language of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) that the hon. gentleman is an alien by birth, breeding and instinct; but I say that those terms are as applicable to the hon. gentleman as those offensive terms were when used to an hon. gentleman on a former occasion in this House. When the hon. member for North Norfolk is raking up the records of corruption in the country from which he comes, and with which he is so extremely familiar, I would remind him that by this Bill introduced by the Minister of the Interior, the late Government were to be subjected to the frightful position of being tempted by a bribe to sacrifice the interests of the country. Although this was in 1878, the hon. member for North Norfolk has never discovered that it was in the Bill down to 1882. There are some other interesting points in this Bill. It provides:

"The Governor in Council may, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of any railway to be constructed under the provisions of the Act, reserve every alternate section of ungranted land by odd numbers, to the extent of ten sections per mile, five sections per mile on each side of the line of the railway, exclusive of the sections which, under the Dominion Lands Act, may have been reserved as school sections or may have been allotted to the Hudson's Bay Company; and for any line or part of a line of railway west of the 102nd meridian of west longitude, twelve sections per mile, and for any line of railway connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending into the Peace River District, twenty sections per mile; and whenever twenty-five consecu-

tive miles of any portion of any railway shall have been completed, equipped and in operation, the Governor in Council may convey to the Company the land so reserved or a part thereof, along the said railway, as far as the same is completed, and for each consecutive ten miles of the remainder of the railway the Governor in Council may, as the same may be completed, convey the lands so reserved along nine miles thereof to the Company."

Where was the leader of the Opposition when the Bill was introduced? He was a member of the House. Had the hon. gentleman the courage of his convictions or not on that occasion? Had he that same high sense of the importance of retaining all this land for the use of settlers? No; the hon. gentleman has too short a memory, and I tell him he cannot afford to take the high and lofty tone he assumes in this House when we are able to turn up the records and convict him, as I convict him now, of having one policy when on the Treasury bench, and another when in Opposition. That, Sir, is not the course that will inspire the people of this country with confidence in any man; what the intelligent people of this country expect, what the intelligent House of Commons of Canada expect is that a public man who essays to be a leader will, without favor or affection, in dealing with the great, gigantic interests of the country, whether they involve the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway, or the settlement of 250,000,000 acres of the most magnificent territory in the world, be animated by principles clear and distinct and defined in his own mind, and not have one policy when he is on this side of the House and another policy when he is on the Opposition benches. The hon. gentleman was ready to have the whole North-West cut up by these railways—built by anybody, built wherever they pleased, so long as they were not within 40 miles of the railway; he was ready to subsidize these capitalists, of whom he now professes such dread and with an immense tract of land for nothing, whilst every railway that has an acre of land from us, or to whom we have engaged to give such land, has to pay \$1 an acre for the land, and that only on the alternate sections, leaving our own sections to be greatly enhanced in value by the construction of the road. The very best terms which any of these colonization companies, who have to fulfil onerous and important engagements which will involve the expenditure of a great amount of capital, has obtained, is the payment of \$1 an acre for the land; and yet these hon. gentlemen were ready to run lines of railway east and west, north and south, all over these fertile territories; they were ready to subsidize these capitalists and companies to the extent of ten sections in one district, twelve sections in another and twenty in another. All the parties had to do was to form themselves into a company of capitalists at pleasure, and to be in a position to demand at the hands of the Minister of the Interior this enormous amount of territory, which, according to the valuation of hon. gentlemen, was not worth 20 cents an acre, for they refused Mr. Foster to take the land at that price in order to enable him to carry out his contract. And what more? Was the Governor in Council to have anything to say? Was the late Minister of the Interior to be exposed, in the language of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), to the frightful temptation of having these capitalists and railway companies by the dozen besetting his office—tempting him with considerations which the hon. member for Norfolk is ready to insult his country, by intimating on the floor of this Parliament, would be successful in swerving the mind of a Minister sworn to do his duty to the Crown? But what does that hon. gentleman say?

"The Governor in Council may entirely change the mode of disposing of Dominion lands lying within a certain distance of the Railway constructed under this Act."

The hon. member for North Norfolk occupied an hour in denouncing my hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) for changing the terms on which these lands are disposed

of. Does he suppose it possible that any Government could come into possession of 200,000,000 acres of land that was uninhabited and unoccupied—unopened for settlement by roads or railways, or anything else, and adopt a cast-iron policy which should last for ever? I ask the hon. gentleman if it would be a common-sense thing on the part of an Administration, in the case of a great experiment, such as the opening up of this country must be to a considerable extent—I ask him if the Ministry would not fail in its duty to the country, who did not study carefully from day to day what the interests of that country were and meet the demands of that country as they arose from time to time. And although the hon. gentleman would have a cast-iron and unchangeable rule adopted, although the leader of the Opposition, since he sat on this side of the House has come to the conclusion that no greater error can be made than to permit capitalists to enter the North-West, I tell him that this is the first time in this or any country that a public man has been found to stand up on the floor of Parliament and declare that it is a great evil that capital should be brought into a country. Here is an area of 250,000,000 acres of desert, as it was, only awaiting the operation of capital to be made to blossom as the rose, and yet the hon. gentleman deploras as a most gigantic evil the possibility that capitalists should be attracted to the North-West. I shall expect him next to ask for a commission to see that a man is in possession of not more than a very limited number of dollars, else he shall be prevented from entering that country at all. I have always supposed that the great object, in every country, and especially in a new country, was to draw as many capitalists into it as possible. The hon. gentleman seems to have also a great horror of mechanics, but does he not know that many of the most prosperous and flourishing districts of Canada have been settled by mechanics who were not agriculturists at all, but who have succeeded notwithstanding? What does the hon. gentleman fear from capital being attracted into the country? I say that a greater blessing cannot occur to that great North-West, than the introduction into it of untold capital. It is only yesterday that the hon. gentleman did not believe, nor did the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) that we could get anybody into the North-West without giving them land and paying them besides; but all is now changed, and the hon. gentleman is terrified for fear that the poor mechanics would not find places for the soles of their feet in that country. Does he not know that we have reserved 100,000,000 acres of land for free settlement or on terms that are practically free to the immigrant, and under these circumstances is there anything we can do so beneficial or so advantageous to the settlers who do come in as to bring capital into the country and bring the influence of capital to bear on its progress and development; I am not surprised that the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has found it necessary to go out and refresh himself a little when he is confronted by his own conduct on the floor of the House, and I hope that, being refreshed, he will be able to bear it when I tell him that but yesterday, when a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell, then Minister of the Interior, he was quite prepared to give the Governor in Council not only the power which he professes to dread so much, that is to vary the terms and alter the position of the settler, but to give away half of the land of the North-West to gigantic railway corporations. And I am not quite certain whether that hon. gentleman was not prepared to sustain that policy even further. I am not certain whether the hon. gentleman was not one of the parties who assisted in framing this Bill for the purpose of giving a number of these bloated capitalists—these harpies who are fattening on the vitals of the poor settlers—I say I am not at all certain that he would not have been one of the first, if the

Bill had become law, to take the position that he has found himself so very loud, if not so eloquent, in condemning to-night.

Mr. MILLS. Did you oppose that Bill?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What has that to do with it? Have I said one word in condemnation of the policy? Am I condemning it now? No, Sir, but I am telling the hon. leader of the Opposition who has just taken his seat that if he supposes he can venture to take the line he has taken to-night; if he supposes that he can venture to assume that the members of this House have forgotten all that has occurred, he is very greatly mistaken, or if either he or any other hon. gentleman imagines that he can pose as the great champion of purity when assailing the policy that they themselves were pledged to, he mistakes the independent spirit of this House and the tone and temper of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman does not like the tone of the bully and the braggart. But, Sir, there is a tone for which I have infinitely greater contempt—and that is the tone of the hypocrite and the poltroon. The hon. gentleman says:

“The Governor in Council may vary or entirely change the mode of disposal of Dominion lands lying within a certain distance of a railway constructed under this Act.”

So that all he had to do was to get fourteen of his associates in this House or out of it to organize into a company, and when he found a fine tract in any part of the North-West, all he had to do was to go down to the Minister of the Interior and say:

“We are building a road, there is our plan, and you must reserve for us ten sections in one district, or twelve sections in another, or twenty sections in another to the mile;”

And when the Minister of the Interior would say:

“That is a district which we have bound ourselves to reserve for settlement,”

The hon. gentleman might say:

“No, there is a clause which states that the Governor in Council may vary or entirely change the mode of disposal of Dominion lands lying within a certain distance of a railway constructed under this Act.”

So that all the hon. gentleman had to do to crush out the settler, to put his heel upon the settler, and to place the settler at his mercy, was to shake in the face of the Minister of the Interior the Act to which he had committed this House as the accumulated wisdom of all the hon. gentlemen opposite, endorsed by the Minister of Justice of the late Administration, and to tell him that he must not talk to him of the rights of the settlers, that he had to place them at his mercy, and that all he had to do was to make these changes and alterations which this railway company wanted, of which the hon. member for North Norfolk would probably be the President, or take the consequences from himself and his other supporters, upon whom he was relying in this House. I think, with the lofty sentiments which the hon. member for North Norfolk has of the material that Ministers of the Crown are made of, he would come to the conclusion that he would very soon wring out of the Minister of the Interior all his behests, even if at the sacrifice of those poor settlers. I will read this whole clause, which is worthy of being handed down to posterity:

“The Governor in Council may vary or entirely change the mode of disposal of Dominion lands lying within a certain distance of a railway constructed under this Act, as regards homesteads, pre-emptions, sales, and bounty land entries, by reducing the quantity which may be granted in free homesteads, or by withdrawing the homestead right altogether on such lands, and may fix a price for such lands, and order that such lands may be sold exclusively for cash, with or without conditions of actual settlement as may be deemed expedient.”

What does the hon. member for North Norfolk think of that? He became very excited a little while ago at the frightful act of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

and his colleagues, who supposed that it would be wise in some cases to limit the settlers to 80 acres; that was a frightful thing, and in comparison with the policy of the United States, was worthy of the loudest denunciations of the hon. gentleman; yet he was willing to pass an Act containing such a clause as the one I have just read. I do not wonder, Sir, that the hon. leader of the Opposition, under the soothing influence of my dulcet tones, has gone to sleep; I am not at all surprised that he should take refuge in sleep when he is brought face to face with such a thorough contradiction of all the hon. gentleman has, for three years, been endeavoring to force on the attention of this side of the House. Either he is incompetent to deal with public questions for the want of that memory which is essential for a public man, or else he is willing to pose in one position on this side of the House, and when the people send him to the other side, to adopt another role. When these hon. gentlemen, in the plenitude of their power, were dealing with the poor settlers of this country, they had no bowels of compassion. The poor settlers were to be placed at the mercy—I was going to say the vindictive mercy, if one may use such a contradiction of terms—of this act; and could anything be more vindictive, in the estimation of the hon. member for North Norfolk, than the way in which these poor settlers were to be trampled beneath the iron heel of power under the operation of this Bill. This Bill also provides:

“The Minister of the Interior may, in his discretion—”

Does the hon. gentleman remember how, an hour ago, he was denouncing the giving of discretionary powers to the Minister of the Interior, saying that it was cruel to the Minister of the Interior to place such temptations before him? and yet he was quite ready in 1878 to vote for an Act vesting in the Minister of the Interior the largest discretionary powers.

“The Minister of the Interior may, in his discretion, and subject to any vested rights, cause the lands immediately bounding the line of any railway under this Act, to be laid out in a tier of lots ten chains wide, containing 80 acres each, abutting the allowance for the right of way for the said railway on either side thereof, with a road upon the other or outer front of the same, and may, if deemed by him expedient, make the homesteads of persons found thereon at the time of the survey of the lands to conform to such lots: Provided that no person proving his right to a homestead on one of such narrow lots shall be entitled to purchase more than one of the adjoining lots of 80 acres.”

Now, Sir, I will read another clause in relation to this history of grosser inconsistency than even the hon. gentleman has branded himself with in relation to the fiscal policy of this country:

“Nothing in this Act shall be construed as binding the Government to acknowledge any right to land settled on, or for any improvements effected on and within the limits of any tract reserved for a village or town site along or upon the line of railway, after public notice shall have been given of such land being reserved for such purpose; and in case of any person having settled on land found to be necessary for a village or town site as above, although such settlement may have been effected previous to public notice as above, the Minister of the Interior may resume possession of such land and compensate such person by allotting him other land in lieu thereof and paying him for his improvements.”

Therefore, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in his discretion, took the fiat of one of these bloated aristocrats whom he had enabled to fatten on the vitals of the poor settlers—of the harpies, to use the eloquent language of the hon. member for North Norfolk—and determine to actually tear up by the roots the settler who had gone there, who had been invited to go there, surrounded by all the protection which the laws of the country could give him; and all this because the company of which the hon. member for North Norfolk might be president wanted his farm for a town site. Well, Sir, there was a Dominion Lands Act, as the hon. gentleman is aware; and it just occurred to the hon. member for North Norfolk or some other gentleman who had a finger in the pie, and who was engaged in putting this

policy on the Statute book and looking after the ulterior results; and the hon. gentleman came to the conclusion that possibly the Dominion Lands Act, as parties would say, was the law of the land; and how does it propose to deal with this subject? Oh, Sir, they were quite equal to the occasion. It is provided that the provisions of this Act should remain in force, except "as the same may be varied" at any time under this Act. Now, Sir, I think that if the hon. member for North Norfolk had remembered the policy which he had sustained in 1878, he would not have ventured to address to the House such a speech as that which he addressed to it to-day; and I think, Sir, that the hon. leader of the Opposition, if he had as vivid a remembrance of this Act as he ought to have, would have spared this House a good many statements which he has delivered here *ore rotundo* during the past two or three years. The hon. member for North Norfolk opened his remarks by stating the enormous value of the North-West. Well, Sir, when did he discover it? Where did this hon. gentleman make the discovery that there was any value in it? Was it when the late Government, which he was supporting so ardently, refused to value its lands at 20 cents an acre with reference to getting a contract carried out? Was it when he, with a solid phalanx of these gentlemen, declared that our attempt to build the Pacific Railway with 100,000,000 acres of its lands would prove an utter delusion and folly, and that it was madness to attempt any such thing? Was it then? No, Sir; but I will tell the hon. gentleman when these lands attained this value. They attained this value, and a greater value, when the people of this country dismissed the hon. gentlemen opposite from power, and when the people of this country brought back to the Treasury benches the men who had faith, and who always proclaimed their faith, in the North-West and in its resources. Then it began to obtain its value; and, Sir, it obtained a rapid and enormous increase of value in the great contract made in the interests of Canada. When the gentlemen, who were brought back again to power, were enabled to revert to their original plan and had again satisfied the country that it could place faith in its financial resources, which have been so completely broken down, and when they were enabled to so convince the world of the value and resources of that great and growing country, and of its capacity for development, as to be able to make the contract they did for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, then, Sir, it took the rapid and onward and gigantic stride, and that so rapidly, that in one short season has given to Canada an advance—as I said before—which in no five years of its previous history it ever had. The hon. gentleman, Sir, would like, even now, to belittle what is going on. He is unable to resist the evidence, as they are unable to resist the evidence of what the National Policy, the fiscal policy of this country, has done for Canada; so great is the tide and the increasing current of Canada's prosperity, and the tide of immigration which is pouring into the North-West, is such, that these hon. gentlemen are unable longer to resist. They cannot close either their eyes or ears to these evidences, but they set their unpatriotic imaginations to work to devise some means, some reason, some excuse, by which they may endeavor to belittle what is going on so happily and so successfully; but their belittling has had very slight effect, and I am glad to say the time is coming when it will be very little that they can do, when they are doing their little best to interfere and hold back the wheels that are onward rolling of Canada's prosperity. I say, Sir, that this is the position which these hon. gentlemen occupy. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that we are inconsistent; at one time you say we are impotent, at another time that we are powerful. Why, Sir, they are impotent for good. They have proved it. They had the management of pub-

lic affairs and the control of this country for five years, and during these five years, Sir, every step they took led the country into greater difficulty and into greater distress. But, I say, while they have proved that they were powerless for good they have not been equally powerless for mischief; and, Sir, the energy, the efforts and the enterprise which these gentlemen have shown in belittling the resources of the country and in endeavoring to prevent capitalists at home or abroad from having faith and confidence in it, has proved that they have not been impotent to do harm; but, Sir, I am glad to find the time is arriving when their power to do mischief will be almost as impotent as it was to effect good. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says it is true that there are a few people going into the North-West at last; but where are they coming from? They are coming from Ontario. Well, Sir, let me tell the hon. gentleman that there is no class of the population of Canada, nor of the world, that it is so important should go into the great North-West as the people of Ontario; and why, Sir? Because they have that experience in the very work which remains to be done in the North-West, which is of the most invaluable character,—they have the experience; and, Sir, the man who lives in any section of the great Province of Ontario—great and important as it is—who can better his circumstances and make two dollars in the North-West for one that he could make in Ontario, not only does right, but I say it is to the advantage of Canada, to every part of it, and a national advantage, that he should go from Ontario into the North-West. Every person knows that in the cultivated and populous districts of Ontario, families have grown up, and farms that afforded an independent income for a comparatively few persons who were on the farms, have become overstocked and a number of sons require to be provided for; and I say that these sons, the stalwart yeomanry of the country, with the industry, with the intelligence, and with the experience which is so valuable in a new country, by leaving to their younger brothers, as it may be, the management of the farm in Ontario and going to this magnificent and fertile country where they can make more money in one year than they could in five years if they remained in Ontario, are not only a blessing to their families, but also a blessing to the nation, because they increase the national wealth and the national prosperity; but, Sir, I hold in my hands, statistics which are taken from the report of the Department of Agriculture, and they show that in 1876, we had 14,499 people go into that country; in 1877, 15,323; in 1878, 18,372; in 1879, 30,717; in 1880, 27,544; and in 1881, 32,587. Then, Sir, we had reported with settlers' goods by the Custom House officers, in addition to this: in 1876, 11,134; in 1877, 11,759; in 1878, 11,435; in 1879, 9,775; in 1880, 10,961; in 1881, 15,404. The total number of persons who went into Manitoba and the North-West in 1881, was in round numbers about 23,600, ascertained as follows: Reported at Emerson, 27,212; the Graham party from the Western States, 393, and along the frontier from Emerson to Fort Benton, 1,000; while the nationalities were as follows: Europeans, 3,340; Canadians, 21,513; and from the United States 3,758, making a total number of 27,611. What does the hon. gentleman think of the figures now? I hold in my hand a statement of the total immigration into Manitoba. In 1880, it was in round numbers, 18,000; in 1881, 23,600. Every person knows that the great difficulty in getting immigration into a new country, is to get it started. Every one knows that the enormous advantage that the Western States of America had was that while we were employing land agents in Europe to circulate information with reference to the advantage of coming to our country, they had sure, and more successful agents at work in the people who, having gone into the Western States, had prospered and wrote to their friends

and sent them means to come out and share the prosperity of the prairie. The great difficulty with us was to get this initial settlement; to have a few hundred thousand people poured into the North-West, in order that they might exercise an influence in promoting an immigration much greater than could be exercised by any other agency. In 1880, how many people do you suppose went into Manitoba? In January, 30 in all; in January, 1881, 80, a marked increase, more than 50 per cent. at that most unfavorable period of the year. How many do hon. gentlemen suppose went into Manitoba in January of the present year—2,877. In February, 1880, 40 went in; in February, 1881, 240; in February, 1882, 3,179; in March, 1880, 124; in March, 1881, 220; in March, 1882, 7,300; and what do hon. gentlemen suppose is the number of persons that, in the first ten days of April that have elapsed, the latest information that we have, went into Manitoba? No less than 6,000 people. So that in these three months, in which we had in 1880, 194 immigrants, we have 19,000 in 1882. Taking into account the ten days additional, is it not manifest that, under these circumstances, the hon. member for North Norfolk and his hon. leader should take alarm; that they should feel it was time they should put on the brakes; that with this evidence of the unbounded success of our policy, with the evidence which the right hon. leader of this Government furnished as to the sales of land in the North West, and the applications for land made during the last year, they should take alarm and come to the conclusion that the brakes must be put on, and they must do their little best to obstruct this tide of immigration that is pouring into that country and is going to make it the most prosperous on the face of the globe. So the hon. gentlemen come down and endeavor to excite fear in the people coming into the North-West. They endeavor to make them believe that they are going to suffer a great evil, and thus deter that tide of immigration that is rapidly peopling up that country. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that this immigration is mostly from other parts of Canada. My hon. friend beside me says the hon. gentlemen opposite would rather they went to the United States. The course those hon. gentlemen pursue in reference to this and all other national questions that are essential to the development of the prosperity of the country, is one that will force on the intelligent public mind of this country the conviction that they would sacrifice the country itself at the shrine of party. Let the hon. gentleman take up any newspaper; let him enquire what has taken place with reference to the great trans-Atlantic steamers and note the thousands that are waiting for passage and overcrowding all the means by which immigration can be brought from the old world to the new, and then say if there is any reason for any other sentiment than that of congratulation. What is it these gentlemen fear if this Government call to their aid, as they are bound to call to their aid, the assistance of capitalists to promote the valuable immigration of able-bodied sons of toil, than by interesting capitalists in this work? Who alone can furnish these emigrants the means of coming into this country? The hon. gentleman deploras as a gigantic evil that large tracts of country under this policy are passing into the hands of capitalists. Let me tell him that the Primitive Methodists, who have applied for and are promised 100,000 acres, have secured all the population required to settle that large area. I have the information from a gentleman in the Department of the Interior who is familiar with the facts, and he assures me that this organization have secured a most valuable class of settlers from England. Who is there that, knowing the present condition of Ireland, the want and misery that are overwhelming thousands and tens of thousands of people in that unfortunate country, could regard unfavorably the formation of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

associations to furnish the starving and suffering population with means to come into our country flowing with milk and honey? With its richness of soil, freedom of air, and general condition, it would be impossible for those suffering thousands to exchange Ireland for our great North-West without being greatly benefitted by the change. But the hon. gentleman would shut down on a policy that is calculated to promote such assistance being given as is absolutely indispensable, because these people have not the means of coming unless they are taken in hand by capitalists. And supposing a company were to treat unfairly even the most suffering and helpless immigrant they would bring to our shores, the result would be that he would move into a lot in the possession of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and place himself under the aegis of this Government which has hundreds of millions of acres fit for settlement, that it is ready to give on terms that, in point of liberality, cannot be exceeded in any part of the world. The leader of the Opposition seemed to doubt it very much. He treated very much upon the statement that my hon. friend had made that the lands in the United States were all sold. My right hon. friend made no such statement, for it is well known that there are, unsold, enormous tracts of land in the United States free and fit for settlement. But you might give him better authority than the right hon. Minister of the Interior, or the late Minister of the Interior, and that is the man who, at this moment, stands as high as any man on this continent in point of intelligence and information—I speak of Consul Taylor, Consul at Winnipeg, for twenty years resident representative of the United States. This gentleman stated that three-quarters of the remaining wheat belt of North America lay to the north of the boundary line. I am also reminded of the statement of Horatio Seymour, and there are hosts of others, candid and patriotic Americans, who do not believe their duty to their country invokes the necessity of decrying Canada, as some of our own people seem to consider it is their duty to do. The Hon. H. Seymour, ex-Governor of the State of New York, in the course of a speech, said:

"I saw thousands and thousands of acres of wheat, clearing 40 bushels to the acre, weighing 63 and 65 lbs. to the bushel, and was assured by undoubted authority that, on Peace River, 1,200 miles north-west of where I was, wheat could be produced in immense quantities equal to the best I saw in Winnipeg, while great herds of cattle were being fed without cost on as fine grassy land as the world affords. In short, between our north-western line of 45 degrees and 54 degrees 40 minutes (General Cass' fighting point) there is a country owned by England with greater grain-growing capacity than all the lands on the Baltic, the Black Sea and the Mediterranean combined. The land laws of Canada are now as liberal as ours as to the homestead, pre-emption and free claims. People are crowding there rapidly, and towns are springing up as if by magic. Their great railway will reach the Pacific at the grand harbor of Puget Sound before our Northern Pacific will, and it will be extended eastward promptly to Montreal."

I place that as the intelligent, high-minded, independent American authority side by side with these miserable, contemptible efforts to retard the progress of Canada, because hon. gentlemen opposite believe that the country is going ahead under the present Administration too rapidly, not for its own interests, but for their own. I hope the hon. gentleman's speech and the speech of his leader will be attended by the same results which attended the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition in the town of Windsor, N. S. The hon. gentleman visited the very interesting town of Windsor, and I must say that although the town has great capabilities and a good many men of capital, they have not been quite as enterprising and quite as enthusiastic in putting their money into various industries as I think their interests would justify them in doing. But, Sir, happily for Windsor, the hon. leader of the Opposition paid it a visit and he delivered there just such a speech as he delivered to-night. He delivered a speech breathing out threatening and slaughter to his own country; he delivered a speech to show how utterly ruined Canada was. But the speech had a somewhat peculiar result, for,

shortly after the meeting closed, the people assembled and they said: "Why, if it be a fact that these manufacturers can make money so rapidly the sooner we go into manufacturing the better," and they organized a joint-stock company for a cotton mill and went at it at once as a result of the hon. gentleman's visit. So I hope the hon. gentleman's speech will have much the same result on the present occasion. Now, Sir, I was a little surprised at a remark which the hon. leader of the Opposition ventured to make in reference to a statement of my right hon. friend, that we were likely to receive money enough on the sale of the lands in the North-West to discharge at a very early date all the obligations of Canada in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman said he was astonished at the enthusiasm with which that statement was received on this side of the House. Why, Sir, is there a man with a spark of patriotism in his breast in Canada who would not rejoice to learn that everything had become so changed that we could, while reserving 100,000,000 acres for free settlement in the North-West, while giving 25,000,000 acres, instead of the 54,000,000 the hon. gentlemen opposite offered to give in vain to a company to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. But in the course of a very few years it was now perfectly evident that we would receive for the sale of the lands of the North-West, without interfering in the slightest degree with the free settlement, the \$25,000,000 that we require in order to secure the completion of that work. One would suppose that was a statement that might be cheered anywhere, where men have a spark of patriotism or the slightest desire to see their country take a position that free men ought to wish she should take. But the hon. gentleman says: "Where did the money come from?" He says: "The right hon. gentleman knows where the money comes from—it comes out of the pockets of the people whom he has taxed for that purpose." Is that so? Is that an answer to the statement that, irrespective of any taxation from the people, our coffers will soon receive from the sale of lands in the North-West, those valueless lands which the hon. gentleman opposite did not even value at 20 cents an acre, yet they have so increased in value as to warrant us in the statement, and to warrant the conviction in the mind of every intelligent man, that at an early date we will not only have the \$25,000,000 recouped to the Treasury, but we will go on; and, if we have not wiped out our other responsibilities, we will soon be in a condition to wipe out the engagements thrown upon us by the late Government, as well as those incurred by our own in reference to that great work. The hon. gentleman is a little mistaken in saying that my right hon. friend is the party who levied taxes for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am aware that the hon. gentleman, in several parts of the country, ventured the unfounded statement that the policy to which the late Government and the Liberal party in Canada had always adhered was the policy that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be constructed, if constructed at all, without any increase of taxation to the country. The hon. gentleman committed himself again and again to that statement. He made that statement in London, and he will find it reported in the *Globe* by the reporter who took his words down as they fell from his mouth. Now, Sir, I do not intend to answer him in that inflated manner in which that hon. gentleman, two or three times in the course of the Session, says: "I give that statement the most unqualified contradiction, and if it was parliamentary to use a stronger term"—I suppose he means a shorter one—"I would use it." He has treated this House to that statement a good many times and it always seems to fall fresh on the ears of the hon. gentlemen around him, and they always cheer it as if the hon. gentleman had not taken out a patent for that form of expression. I do not

intend to retort in terms so discourteous. I will not charge the hon. gentleman with making a statement for which, if it was parliamentary, I should use a more expressive and a more unqualified term than to say it was an entirely unfounded statement, but I will prove it. The hon. gentleman has only to turn up the report of Council by the members of the Government of which he formed a part, and he will find in black and white, the simple declaration that his Government had levied \$3,000,000 in taxes on the people of this country for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. They had increased taxation, and they declared that was an evidence of the good faith of the Government and of their determination to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, because they had levied over \$3,000,000 of taxation for the purpose of its construction. I ask the hon. gentleman to place that statement in the Minute of the Council passed by the Government of which he was a member—because he was a member when the taxation was levied and he had not evaded its responsibility at that particular day—alongside of his oft-reiterated statement? I could ask the House whether it is not sufficient to lead us to question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's memory if we do not venture to question the accuracy of his statements. When he remembers that, and the further fact that when the Canadian Pacific Railway is finished and a completed work, the taxes involved in its construction will not begin to approximate \$3,000,000, how can he venture to tell the First Minister that he is taking the money for its construction out of the pockets of the people in the shape of taxation? I feel that it is trifling with the patience of this House and with the intelligence of this country, for hon. gentlemen opposite to rise and in set phrase, day after day and night after night, propound statements such as the hon. member for North Norfolk has committed himself to in this resolution, diametrically opposed to the policy to which they were solemnly committed and pledged while they had the responsibilities of office upon them; and I recommend them in future before undertaking the hopeless task, the task that necessarily presumes upon the spirit of independent intelligence in this country, to suppose that hon. gentlemen may one day commit themselves to one line of policy, and the next day, when they are foolish enough to think it serves their own interests, pursue a diametrically opposite course, and still expect an intelligent people to consider that any opinions they may offer are entitled to respect. I say that Canada to day occupies a more distinguished position than it has ever occupied since it was a country. There is not an intelligent man in Canada who does not know that at the present moment we have concentrated on us the eyes of the world—not only of England but of the United States. Take up the press of England, and what will you find? Everywhere there is an entire change in the public sentiment in regard to the gigantic strides that the Dominion is making in the path of national progress and national prosperity. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that all this has been accomplished not only without their aid, but in spite of their bitterest efforts to obstruct. It is a painful statement to make, and I regret being compelled to make it, but the public records will show they have left no stone unturned to embarrass and obstruct the policy of the Government of the country in relation to its most vital interests; and so far have they carried that out that they are ready to seize upon any means or method, however unjust or however improper, if they believe they can gain some paltry party advantage. Why, the leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman who well deserves the high position of leader of the great organized hypocrisy of this country, that hon. gentleman whose qualities eminently fit him for the position he holds as the head of that party—what did he do the other day? He went down to Halifax and there, in the ab-

sence of his opponents, he first made the lamentable blunder of supposing, when he was talking to the Jones and Vails, that he was talking to members of the old liberal party; that he was surrounded by the genius and spirit of the Liberals who fought under Joseph Howe and William Young.

Mr. MILLS. Under whom?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the proper time arrived they united in a patriotic band to support the Confederation. The hon. gentleman forget that all the leaders of the Liberal party had sooner or later rallied round George Brown and the Conservative and Liberal party of Nova Scotia united on the common policy of sinking old party names, ties, and cries in the interest of their common country, and some of the recalcitrant Tories declared that I was too liberal for them to follow me. When did they leave me? When Mr. George Brown, in view of the troubled condition of the country, asked me as a patriotic man, and sustained in my own Province by a majority of two-thirds in both Houses, to aid in endeavoring to bring the country out of its difficulties, I responded, and recalcitrant Conservatives left me because they held that I had got into bad company. The hon. leader of the Opposition, forgetting that the time had come when every man in the old Liberal party of Nova Scotia, in favor of Constitutional Government, was united with me in favor of advancing the interests of our common country, expressed the delight he felt at finding himself in the company of Halifax Liberals. I would forgive the blunder, but he knew that the greatest crisis in the national affairs of Canada that ever occurred was when Confederation was adopted. I had thrown myself heart and soul into the movement with Sir John A. Macdonald, Hon. George Brown and Hon. William McDougall in the endeavor to build up a British nationality on this continent; but the hon. gentleman placed himself in antagonism to the popular sentiment, although he has more than once declared that of all the Provinces which had been benefitted by Confederation, not one of them benefitted to the same extent as did Ontario. That was the hon. gentleman's declaration, and I say, if that were true, then the hon. gentleman owed a debt to me for the aid and assistance I gave in accomplishing that which he himself declared had been so beneficial to this country. But, what did he do? Behind my back, when I was thousands of miles away, the hon. gentleman, in the metropolis of Nova Scotia, in the city of Halifax, endeavoured to excite and exasperate the public mind against me because I assisted in carrying Confederation. True to the same policy, I believe the hon. gentleman—I may do him an injustice, but when I see him engaged in such a *bouleversement* as this; when I find him ready to proclaim one principle to-day and trample it under his feet to-morrow, because it stands in the way of his own ambitious path; when I find that he was ready to strike me a blow beneath the belt in my absence; when I found him ready to throw contempt, not only on myself, but on George Brown and Alexander Mackenzie (because they were sailing in the same boat with me—what I had done in Nova Scotia these gentlemen had done on the floor of the Parliament of Canada); when I refused to put that question to the people at the polls, I had only sustained the policy which George Brown had declared on the floor of Parliament was the only constitutional mode by which such a question could be settled, and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) supported him in that view—I say that when the hon. gentleman was willing to throw contempt on his own colleagues and supporters, and his late leader, by the course he took; when I find that he did not hesitate in my absence to adopt the course I have referred to, I say I have a right under these circumstances, to suppose that if these hon. gentlemen felt it was necessary for their advancement, necessary for their own progress, necessary for their restoration to power, they would trample Confederation, with all the blessings it has

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

brought to this country and the national life of Canada, beneath their feet just as recklessly as they have trampled under foot their previous policy with reference to the settlement of the North-West and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MILLS. I am quite sure that if a stranger had come into the House when the hon. gentleman began his speech and had listened to him to the close, it would have been utterly impossible for him to know what was the subject under discussion. The hon. gentleman has spoken for nearly two hours, but he said nothing about the resolution that my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has placed in your hands. The hon. gentleman has devoted the whole of his time to giving a certificate of character to the Government of which he is a member. He has spoken in the most laudatory terms of his colleagues generally, and of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in particular. The hon. gentleman has told us how disinterested and patriotic his services have been, not only since Confederation, but for a long time before. It seems to me, however, that he has forgotten many things which would have added a great deal of interest to the discussion had he given to the House some explanations with regard to them. I am not going to enter into a discussion of all the points raised by the hon. Minister of Railways, but one would have supposed from a great portion of his speech that, instead of devoting our attention to the land policy of the present Administration, the House had under consideration the Bill which I had the honor to submit to a former Parliament in 1878. Well, Sir, I do not think it necessary to enter into a very lengthy discussion of the principles of that Bill. I believe they were sound. I believe those views would commend themselves to the majority of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman says now that he is in favor of the principles set out in that Bill.

Mr. PLUMB. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. Yes. He said he was. I know the hon. member for Niagara was opposed to the Bill, and I know he is under the impression that if he was opposed to it the hon. Minister of Railways must have held the same view, because, in the estimation of the hon. member for Niagara, there is a great deal of difficulty in distinguishing the Minister of Railways from that hon. member (Mr. Plumb). I remember on one occasion the hon. gentleman rose in this House and said that in consequence of the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways, instead of speaking for himself he proposed to make a speech on behalf of the absent Minister, and I think the hon. gentleman is sometimes under the delusion that he and the hon. Minister of Railways are the same person; but Sir, I might say to the hon. gentleman that, although he was opposed to the Bill, the hon. Minister of Railways said at the time nothing against it, and he said, to-night, that he was in favor of its provisions.

Mr. BOWELL. He stated that he said nothing against it.

Mr. MILLS. He said more. He said he favored the provisions. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways delivered a speech which was full of sound and fury, but signified very little. He told us we were flies on the wheel. He told us of the eminent services of the present Administration. He told us that hon. gentlemen on this side had no bowels of compassion, and in that respect the Administration have no doubt the advantage of hon. gentlemen on this side. The hon. Minister of Railways read some portions of the Bill, and read them, I think, unfairly, because some very important parts of the measure were left out of consideration altogether, and he said that the policy adopted in that Bill was precisely the policy adopted by the present Government; that we provided that no line of railway having the same general direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway should be

built, under the provisions of the Bill, within forty miles of that road. But, Sir, that was a Government work, and this is a private enterprise in the hands of private parties. The Government do not merely say, no road in the same general direction shall be built, but they say, no road in any direction shall be built—no road extending to any point towards the boundary between south-west and south-east shall be constructed in Manitoba or the North-West Territories. Then, Sir, provision was made for the voluntary incorporation of railway companies. Charters were to be granted as a matter of course, on the fulfilment of certain conditions. It was not a matter of discretion with the Government or with the Minister of the Interior; it was a matter of right that any parties who declared their intention to build a railway between certain points, who made the necessary surveys, who filed the plans and specifications in the Department of Public Works or the Department of the Interior and paid into the Treasury ten per cent. of the cost of the road, were to be entitled to receive the charter. But they could not obtain such a charter as a matter of right for a road within 40 miles of the Canada Pacific Railway and having the same direction. But the Government did not declare by the provisions of the Bill that parties would not have the right to come to this House and ask for incorporation on the proposition to build a road within 40 miles of the railway and having the same direction. The Government simply reserved to the Parliament of this country the right to say whether a road within the distance mentioned in the Bill should be or should not be built. The hon. gentleman said that railway companies are speculators, that they are just as much so as capitalists seeking to invest money in public lands. I deny that. I say they stand in a wholly different footing; that railway companies seeking to build roads within the territory have a special interest in the development of the country, in order that the people living along the line of the railway may furnish profitable employment to the road. It is upon the carriage of freight and passengers that their prosperity depends, and it is not so at all with regard to speculative land companies. The hon. gentleman says that he would like to know who is opposed to capitalists going into the country and investing their money in lands. Well, if the hon. gentleman knew something of the history of Upper Canada, if he knew something of the Canada Company and the English capitalists who invested their money in the wild lands of Canada, if he knew the unpopularity of that company, if he knew the extent to which it impeded the general settlement of the country, he would understand why the people of Ontario especially would not be disposed to favor the creation of similar companies in Manitoba or the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman says that we were very much opposed to the placing at the disposal of the Government 100,000,000 acres of land to assist in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, I for one was opposed to the proposition which the hon. gentleman then made. I did not believe it was practicable, and if practicable, I thought it was a very unwise proposition to agree to. What did the hon. gentlemen propose? They proposed that we should place at the disposal of the Government of this country, and of Commissioners in England, 100,000,000 acres of land, to be disposed of as they might think proper. What was implied in that proposition? Why, Sir, this was implied: that capitalists had not confidence in the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. That, at all events, was the opinion of the hon. gentlemen themselves; they said also in effect: "Although we have representative Government in this country, and although, under our representative system, the disposal of public lands is to be subject to the representatives of the people in Parliament, yet we propose that persons who are not residents in the country, and who owe no responsibility to this country,

shall control 100,000,000 acres of land in the North-West Territories." That was the proposition of hon. gentlemen, but it did not succeed. It was not because of any opposition that came from this side; the large majority of hon. gentlemen enabled them to carry their proposition through Parliament; but they found it impracticable, and had to abandon it. Well, the hon. gentleman has referred to and reiterated misrepresentations of the speeches made by the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. member for Lambton, in reference to the lands of Kansas and Texas. Hon. gentlemen have over and over again persisted in that course, and the press which supports them has followed their lead. They have not only misrepresented what was actually said, but the whole pith and spirit of what was said. It is well known to everyone here that it was not an American immigration company or an American railway company which published the pamphlet with the portrait of the leader of the Opposition. That pamphlet was published by Mr. Belford, an ardent and active supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was published in the interest, and I do not think I would be out of the way in saying at the instance, of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches; and if the books of the United Empire Club were examined, we should probably find who paid for these pamphlets. There was never a more impudent statement made in Parliament or given to the press of this country than the statement that that pamphlet was circulated or published by any railway company in the United States. The quotations that have been made, and the misrepresentations indulged in, are all in perfect keeping with the character of the pamphlet; but, to use a vulgar expression, that sort of discussion is played out, and these hon. gentlemen will not be permitted to use these misrepresentations without being met by a statement of the facts. The hon. Minister of Railways, not satisfied with the answer of his leader to the hon. member for Norfolk, undertook to improve on that answer. The hon. gentleman says it is highly desirable that large numbers of the people of Ontario should go into the North-West Territories. Well, it is a matter of uncertainty whether it contributes largely to the prosperity of the country to transfer a large portion of the population from one fertile district to another. I can well understand that if a large foreign population were going into the North-West Territories, a large immigration of people from Ontario or the other Provinces of the Dominion might be of essential advantage. They serve to introduce the habits, the mode of thought, the system of education among the foreigners which prevail in the older Provinces; they serve to make a homogeneous population. Every one who has studied the progress of American settlement westward knows the great value that the settlers from New England and the Middle States have been; they have converted the German, Irish and Scandinavian population into American people, who, after a generation or two, do not differ materially from the native population. Well, Sir, the immigration from Ontario and the other Provinces into the North-West would serve the same purpose, if a foreign population were going in there. But there has not been that population going in. The hon. leader of the Government has told us that 28,600 people went into the country last year; but he did not tell us how many came away. When he says that 17 per cent. left the country, I think he greatly under-estimates the number. I have taken some pains to look at the number of homestead entries, and if we leave out the number who have settled in the city of Winnipeg, I believe the homestead entries fairly represent the population which have settled in Manitoba and the North-West Territories each year. In 1877 there were 1,426; in 1878, 1,753; in 1879, 3,876; in 1880, 2,074, or nearly 1,800 less than there were the year before; and in 1881, 2,753, or nearly 1,200 less than there were in 1879. These figures speak for

themselves, and they show that there has not been that large immigration into the country, with the view of settlement, which the hon. gentleman has spoken of. The hon. gentleman has told us of a large number who have gone there lately. We all know that excursion trains have carried people up there to prospect, and it may be that many will go there to settle; but those who have gone there have not gone for the purpose of settling, but either for speculation or for prospecting with a view to future settlement. Both the hon. gentleman and his leader have referred to what they call the large emigration which formerly took place from Canada into the United States, but let me say this, that if the returns of the United States are at all to be relied upon—and I believe they are approximately correct, if not strictly so—the emigration from Canada to the United States last year was upwards of 120,000, and the year before it was nearly 100,000. Why, Sir, if you look at the whole period of the former Administration, you will see that a larger number have gone to the United States during the last year than the number that went during the five years the hon. member for Lambton was at the head of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no evidence of that.

Mr. MILLS. There is the evidence of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, the same statistics that hon. gentlemen opposite relied on when they prepared their manifesto. The hon. gentleman has said that we on this side declared that we would not consent to an increase of taxation for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, and yet an hon. gentleman on this side declared that \$3,000,000 were added to the taxes of the people of this country for the purpose of carrying forward that work. The hon. gentleman will remember that after the agreement to construct this railway was made with British Columbia, the taxation was reduced when Sir Francis Hincks was Finance Minister; and when the taxation was again raised, it was raised very little beyond the rate at which it stood before the reduction. Moreover, after this bargain was made with British Columbia other charges were made upon the public revenues. There was a large increase in the public debt; there was an increased amount of interest to be paid annually; there was the assumption of the debts of the various Provinces, and the taxation that was imposed, to be strictly accurate, was rather for the purpose of meeting these additional charges than to fulfil the obligations with British Columbia. It was only to put British Columbia in the position she was in before. It was not adding to the burdens of taxation, which already existed on behalf of British Columbia; but it was in order to keep faith with British Columbia, by putting the revenues, as far as possible, in the condition in which they were at the time when the contract was made. It is well, Sir, in considering the question in hand, to look at what has been done in connection with the settlement of the North-West country. Why that country was opened up for settlement by the hon. gentlemen who have said so much in confirmation of their ability and statesmanship; but who did not exhibit remarkable ability and statesmanship in getting possession of it, as they succeeded in provoking a rebellion in that country; they entailed very large burdens in repressing the rebellion; and in order to quiet those whom they had offended they were obliged to reserve 1,400,000 acres of land in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg. Well, Sir, when that country was first opened up for settlement they appointed land agents, but they were very dilatory in deciding where the half-breed reserves would be; and people who went into that country found that it was impossible to ascertain what lands were so set apart; and after remaining for a few weeks about Winnipeg, and being unable to obtain any satisfaction, the land agents stating that they had not

Mr. MILLS:

received such instructions as would permit them to give a decided answer, they left the country and settled south of the border. Large settlements were formed in this way along the Red River, both in Minnesota and Dakota; many of these settlers were from Ontario, and they have drawn to them nearly all those who have left the sections of the country in which they had themselves resided. Nothing is more natural when a man leaves a country with the expectation of bettering his condition, than that he should go where he knows people with whom he has already resided, with whom he is acquainted, who will assist him in selecting a favorable location, who were formerly his associates and neighbors, and who will thus become his associates and neighbors again. In this manner, if the hon. gentlemen will look at the statistical returns for Minnesota and Dakota, they will see that they have settlers from Canada all the way from Fargo to the international boundary. In fact, I believe, Sir, that to-day there are a larger number of Canadians in the State of Minnesota and in the Territory of Dakota than there is in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and they have been largely driven there by the policy which these hon. gentlemen adopted when they first took possession of that country and when they first invited settlement in to it. Sir, the hon. gentleman has spoken of the attempt in this House to advertise American lands, as an unpatriotic course. Sir, we never advertised American lands. We left that to hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, pamphlets were sent from the office of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and were circulated in this House and distributed abroad, which contained glowing eulogies on Minnesota and Dakota, which were written by a late colleague of theirs, the Hon. Peter Mitchell. These pamphlets contained advertisements of railway lands in Minnesota and Dakota, and in fact I do not know any persons who have been so cosmopolitan in making known the quality of lands of other countries beside their own as the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. Now, Sir, the Minister of Railways declares that it is unpatriotic to deny any statement; that in fact no matter how absurd, how exaggerated, how misleading a statement is when it is made in regard to this country, or rather in favor of the Government of the day, as was the case with the eulogies of hon. gentlemen opposite—it is highly unpatriotic, if not treasonable, to undertake to correct it.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. And tell the truth.

Mr. MILLS. And tell the truth. Now, Sir, as I have already said, we know right well how to drive away people and induce them to settle in a neighboring country as these hon. gentlemen did in regard to people who went to Manitoba. These people will draw large numbers with them; and no means for advertising any country is so effective as the letters which are written by those who leave a country to their former neighbors, who will be thus induced to become their neighbors again, and I know all through the West, people have gone from Canada, and many of them were supporters of these hon. gentlemen, and settled in Dakota and Minnesota. Why, Sir, I know, within a radius of two miles in the county in which I reside, twenty families during the last two years have gone to settle in the United States; and no matter where they settle in the American Union, they will be the means of drawing others with them, who are disposed to leave the country. Now Sir, the First Minister and the Minister of Railways have complained because my hon. friend from North Norfolk has pointed out what he considers to be the objectionable tendency of these land regulations, and of the policy that the Government has adopted. Well, he says, amongst other things, that this will lead to the formation of rings and have a tendency to induce corrupt bargains, and bring improper influences to bear on the part of the Govern-

ment. Well, Sir, why do hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches resent this as a personal attack upon themselves? It can only become such, if they undertake to uphold and maintain this policy, after it is clearly pointed out that such is its tendency. Why, Sir, is it because he believes that every man will be improperly influenced by the Government if any such policy is in force, that the hon. gentleman makes these statements? Not at all; but it is because it has necessarily this tendency, because some men may be influenced by it, and because some persons will undoubtedly be so influenced, therefore it is necessary to provide a check against influences of this sort by legislative restrictions being placed on the Statute book. The question is: Are these regulations open to objections of that sort? I think that my hon. friend succeeded in showing that they were; and that they are open to such objections. I consider that a powerful motive is held out to men that have money and are disposed to speculate, to use that money in an improper way. The hon. gentleman spoke about a certain religious body in this country becoming a colonization Company; and the hon. gentlemen may do the sort of thing to which he referred. In my opinion, it tends to prevent the body that controls any large degree of moral opinion in this country from being brought to bear upon the ethical character of the public acts and the policy of the Administration. This is wrong in itself and ought not to be permitted, ought not to be encouraged, and yet it is precisely what is being done. Let me take another one. Let me suppose that a large number of influential men, residing in a constituency of one of the Ministers and of a member of this House, especially a supporter of the Administration, formed themselves into a colonization society and come here and press this Administration for grants of land, I say that these men can influence the Government altogether apart from any bribe. For the very fact that they possess the power to influence the constituency may, of itself, induce them to improperly influence the judgment of a Minister or some of the supporters of that Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nonsense.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. the First Minister said that when the late Administration were in power they locked up the country, that they locked up twenty miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman did precisely the same thing. Under what circumstances was this done? Why, it was proposed that the land on each side along the line of railway should be taken to aid in the construction of the railway, and that railway should be constructed, if possible, by a company. It was also provided in the Bill submitted by the right hon. the First Minister in 1872, and which became law, that the Company, along with the Government, should have the power of fixing the value of the lands, and that this value should not be less than \$2.50 per acre. Well, that restriction against the settlement necessarily grew out of the settlement which had been adopted; besides, the lands along this line were not surveyed or set out for settlement, and the hon. gentlemen himself, up to this hour, does not encourage settlement beyond the limits of the surveyed districts. On the contrary, he said, the rights of settlers in certain cases would not be protected, if they settled beyond the limits of the surveyed districts. One hon. member shakes his head, but he has only to look at the proceedings of last night and see that my statement is correct.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. the First Minister only referred to school lands or what might be school lands.

Mr. MILLS. That is not my point at all. My statement is that the hon. gentleman does not encourage the practice of settlers going beyond surveyed lands.

Mr. BOWELL. Whether surveyed or unsurveyed, the squatters' rights are protected and recognized under the law.

Mr. MILLS. Further than that. I say that the lands were not surveyed beyond the limits of Manitoba, but when the late Government saw that there was no prospect of immediate engagement being made with any Company, so far as lands were surveyed, they were opened for settlement, but the settlers were notified that the price of lands must depend upon the provision of the Pacific Railway Act. When we look at these provisions, we see they are precisely what the hon. member for North Norfolk has represented them to be. This plan No. 2 is of such a character that a colonization company or other parties may get possession of the land, and put the whole number of settlers required upon a single section. They might retain 9-10 or 19-20 of the township in their own possession, and give the remaining, 1-20, to those persons whom they might induce to go into the country. They could count parties settling on village lots as settlers, and the hon. Minister who has charge of this Department justifies that policy by saying it is a margin for speculators. It is certainly a very broad one, one which the Government have to consider, and which they undertake to justify. When we look at these provisions we find that all those land regulations are simply impediments in the way of settlement. If the lands were kept out of the hands of speculators; if there were no middlemen who expect to make a large profit at the expense of the actual settlers, there can be no doubt whatever that this country would be much more rapidly settled, than under the special provisions of these regulations. There is no analogy between the land grants given to assist railway construction and lands given to private corporations for purposes of speculation. It is in the interest of railway companies to sell their land and have the country settled within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. I thoroughly understand the hon. gentleman's hear, hear, I say that the railway corporations have an interest in securing the settlement of the country within a reasonable time. They know that the traffic and travel over their road depends upon the settlement along their line of railway.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says: hear, hear, and thinks what I have said is a full justification of what the Government did last year; but where the railway is not limited in its charges it is a question whether, while the Government hold half-lands along the line open for settlement, it is not their interest to settle theirs, as the Government lands can be utilized for that purpose and the railway can make larger profits by increase in the value of their lands and by unlimited freight charges. I will just revert for a moment to the Railway Bill which the hon. First Minister spoke of as a bogus or paper charter. The hon. Minister of Railways took a different view, and the provisions of the Bill show his view was right, that it was not a bogus charter. Further, under the provisions of that Bill, the late Administration, if they had carried out their scheme, would have taken power to sell the lands instead of giving them to companies or placing them at the disposal of a railway corporation. The Bill provides that the Government may dispose of the lands and pay over to the railway company the proceeds of the sale up to the sum of \$10,000 a mile, but if the lands were sold for more than that the company would not be entitled to the money. Now, Sir, there is one further observation I will make in regard to these land regulations. I think they are objectionable on the grounds which have been stated by the leader of the Opposition and by the hon. mover of the motion that is in your hands. I believe they will impede instead of promoting settlement. I think no worse policy could be adopted than in transferring the pub-

lic domains of this country from the hands of the Government and from the control of Parliament into the hands of private speculators who will hold those lands purely in their own interests. While these lands are in the hands of the Government, while they belong to the Crown, they may be controlled by Parliament in the public interest. There are other considerations than the mere amount of money to be derived from their sale; there are other and more important considerations in the settlement of the country. Those considerations cannot weigh with the speculator who holds these lands for an advance in price, but they are everything to the Government of the country for the time being. But Sir, I observe there is no legal authority for these regulations. I observe that these regulations are framed under the provisions of a law passed in 1874, sections fourteen and fifteen of which authorized the Government to do what is done in these regulations. But I find by the Act of 1879 that these sections were repealed. In the consolidation of the law the hon. gentleman did, I suppose, what we see he has done in the Bill before us, trusted to others for the proper consolidation of the law, and left out these sections which authorized the Government to make regulations of this kind, so that we have regulations before us which are not only impolitic and detrimental to the public interest, but which are wholly unauthorized by any law that is now in force in the Dominion.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to notice a few points which have been raised in the course of the debate. The hon. member for North Norfolk has brought forward and spoken at at much length upon resolutions which embody very nearly the line taken on previous occasions, but it must not be considered that because the language is the same his position is at all consistent with his course in reference to the land policy either of the late Government or the present Government. The gist of the hon. gentleman's resolutions is that grants of our northwestern lands should be made to actual settlers only, independent freeholders, each cultivating his own farm, and that sales of land should be made on reasonable conditions of settlement to actual settlers only. Now, the first thing we notice in the hon. gentleman's speech is the charge that the present Government has not encouraged the actual settler; that the present Government has been induced to become the promoter of speculation in the North-West, to the exclusion of the actual settler. It may scarcely be necessary to do more, in replying to that baseless assertion than to read from the Dominion Lands Regulations, published in the *Canada Gazette* of Dec., 1881:

"The following regulations for the sale and settlement of Dominion Lands in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories shall, in and after the first day of January, 1882, be substituted for the regulations now in force, bearing date the 25th day of May last:—

"1. The surveyed lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories shall, for the purposes of these regulations, be classified as follows:

"Class A.—Lands within 24 miles of the main line or any branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on either side thereof

"Class B.—Lands within 12 miles, on either side, of any projected line of railway (other than the Canadian Pacific Railway) approved by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*.

"Class C.—Lands south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway not included in Class A or B.

"Class D.—Lands other than those in Classes A, B & C.

"2. The even-numbered sections in all foregoing classes are to be held exclusively for homesteads and pre-emptions."

Now, Sir, there is ample provision in the last paragraph that I have read for all the possible wants of all the possible settlers that will go to the North-West within any length of time under which these regulations may be kept in force. It is perfectly true that they have been changed from time to time, and will doubtless be changed again. It is equally true that as settlement goes on it may be found necessary, in the interests of the country and of the settlers, that changes should be made, but I hope there will never be any provision made such as was made by the late

Mr. MILLS.

Government, where forty miles of land was exclusively reserved on each side of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they then contemplated, and where no man could buy an acre of land at any fixed price, but he was allowed to settle on the land and pay \$1.25 an acre, and bind himself to pay such other and further indefinite sum as the Government should demand of him at any time thereafter. Those were the terms which the hon. gentleman vaunted as having been the liberal terms adopted by the late Government. Those were the terms which he now endorses and supports as having been the policy pursued by the late Government. The hon. gentleman, in discussing the land regulations, has not always posed as the particular advocate of the settler. Since his party was overthrown he has constituted himself the special protector of the settler, the possible settler, the probable settler, the settler who has not appeared, the settler who may come some time or other; but as usual the Premier and the Minister of Railways, by quotations from his speeches in the Debates of Parliament, have answered him out of his own mouth. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways, to-night, in hastily looking over the scheme embodied in the late Government's Colonization Railway Bill of 1878, which was endorsed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, did not state the case quite as strongly as it could have been stated, for he omitted one or two very pregnant conditions. In the first place it was provided in that Bill that any fifteen persons could unite together and could file a certificate with the Minister of the Interior, and could subscribe capital to the extent of \$12,000 a mile and thereby become a railway corporation. It was to be a railway corporation with power of eminent domain, with power to take lands exactly as railway corporations are authorized to do under the Railway Act, with powers practically unlimited as to the charge they should make for freight or passengers; in fact it was not restricted in the slightest degree as to the character of the road to be built, or as to curves, grades, rails or equipments, and the companies were allowed to build ten, twenty or thirty miles or more anywhere, and to charge any rates they pleased for carrying freight and passengers. Not only that, but the companies would have corporate powers when one-half of the capital was subscribed viz., \$6,000 a mile, and when 10 per cent. of that amount had been paid in, which reduced it to \$600 per mile. Then there was a provision that the companies should have a land grant; and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) himself has just stated that there was a provision by which they were entitled to a subsidy of \$10,000 a mile if the Government withheld and sold the land subsidy. That was the Bill respecting colonization railways, which the hon. member for Bothwell endeavoured to force on the House by means of the dominant majority.

Mr. MILLS. It was \$12,000 a mile.

Mr. PLUMB. These companies were allowed:—

"Every alternate section of ungranted land by odd numbers, to the extent of ten sections per mile, five sections per mile on each side of the line of the railway, exclusive of the sections which under the Dominion Lands Act may have been reserved as school sections or may have been allotted to the Hudson's Bay Company; and for any line or part of a line of railway west of the 102nd meridian of west longitude, twelve sections per mile, and for any line of railway connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending into the Peace River District, twenty sections per mile; and whenever twenty-five consecutive miles of any portion of any railway shall have been completed, equipped and in operation, the Governor in Council may convey to the company the land so reserved, or a part thereof, along the said railway so far as the same is completed, and for each consecutive ten miles of the remainder of the railway the Governor in Council may, as the same may be completed, convey the lands so reserved along nine miles thereof to the company."

And I repeat that the Corporation were required to subscribe but \$6,000 a mile, and to pay but 10 per cent., or \$600 a mile thereon. There was no limit to the number of railways that could be thus organized. Such is a brief synopsis of the Railway Bill which the hon. member for Bothwell brought in as the result of five years' cogitation, and

as the final embodiment of the railway policy of hon. gentleman opposite, brought in as a Ministerial measure as Minister of the Interior, and it must be accepted and insisted upon as being the expression of the views and opinions of the Ministers of that day and their supporters. What was the principle on which the passage of the Bill was advocated? The hon. member for Bothwell said, in advocating its adoption:

"This was a novel feature here in the incorporation of a railway company, but it was not a novel feature elsewhere. It had been the principle long recognized in the neighboring Republic. Almost every hon. gentleman was aware that after a railway was once incorporated, extending through a considerable portion of the territory, having acquired a considerable amount of local influence, it would always use that influence adversely to any corporation or any other railway company that was likely, in any way, to become a competition for traffic or travel."

The hon. gentleman further said:

"This Bill proposed to provide for the voluntary incorporation of railway companies."

Again he said:

"No railway company could invest capital freely, unless it was to the public advantage."

Still again he said:

"The money was only invested for the purpose of enabling the company to secure a dividend upon their investment by accommodating the public, either by furnishing facilities for travel or for traffic."

"They determined for themselves whether their investment was wise or unwise, and all this Bill proposed to do, was to give them an opportunity of determining whether they would invest their capital or not."

"They knew by the experience of the progressive settlement and development of the adjoining country, especially that section which lay west of the Mississippi River, during the past fifteen or twenty years, how largely railway accommodation contributed to the progress of colonization and settlement."

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman opposed that measure at the time.

Mr. PLUMB. It makes no difference to my argument whether I opposed it or not, but in this instance I will inform the hon. gentleman why I did so. I opposed it because it permitted a system of making herring-bone lines running South Easterly to the frontier from the Canadian Pacific Railway throughout the whole North-West and Manitoba which would effectually destroy the Pacific Railway, and the hon. gentleman seemed to have introduced the Bill for that purpose. That was my reason for opposing the Bill, and the hon. gentleman will find such a statement in practically the same words in my speech. The hon. member for North Norfolk was one of the most earnest defenders of the scheme; he said:

"If railways were essential to the development of the Western States, they were tenfold more essential to the development of the North-West. It was useless to think of opening up and settling this country without furnishing it with railway facilities."

Now he asserts that all the land should be reserved for the settlers. He said further:

"Some of the railways had perhaps been subsidized more than was necessary, perhaps more land had been given than was advisable; but capitalists would not embark their money unless they had a prospect of a fair return, and it was folly to haggle with them about an unimportant difference when important interests were at stake."

To-night the hon. gentleman opened his speech by saying that the lands in the United States were offered on fairer terms to settlers than the lands of our North-West. He said they were for sale at \$1.25 per acre, but he omitted to say that they were not in the neighborhood of railways, and were inaccessible to settlers. In support of the Bill of 1878 he said of the public lands in the United States and of ours:

"These lands were denominated double minimum lands and sold as readily at \$2.50 per acre as other lands did at \$1.25; and the result of railway land grants, so far as land sales were concerned, was that Government had actually received as much for its lands as it would have been likely to have done if the whole area had been sold at the ordinary Government price. Now, in the North-West there were untold millions of acres of land. They were told by the hon. member for Northumberland that this was the heritage of Canada, that it had been bought by the

people's money; but in its present shape of what value was the great wild, lone land to us? The question was how land was to be utilized, and for that purpose the Minister of the Interior had devised a Bill, which, in its conception was admirable and which, in his opinion, would, if carried out, attain the object of populating this vast country.

* * * * * In the North-West they had lands which would give sufficient sustenance for 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 of people; let them get inhabitants for it as soon as possible. If they could pour 50,000 a year into it, those settlers would pay into the coffers of this country, in the shape of Customs duties, \$250,000 per annum, and the Government would derive a far greater revenue this way than from the sale of these lands.

* * * * * He held that the only policy to open up and develop these large tracts of country was a liberal railway policy; and that, while it was proper to exercise due caution, it would not be good policy to propose the building of lines for the sake of saving a few hundred acres to the mile."

Every acre of which would have been part of a homestead for the hon. gentleman's intending settler, in whom he now professes such an intense and such a generous and unselfish interest. He said also in 1878:

"They could not induce capitalists to embark in a speculation of this kind except upon liberal terms, but he believed, with the hon. member for Peterborough, that it might be well for the Government to retain in their hands the sale of these lands."

Oh yes, it would be very fine; the Government, if they did retain the sale of these lands, were bound to give to these railway men, who were not chartered and were not even bound to give their names to Parliament, but merely had to file a certificate of organization with the Minister of the Interior, \$10,000 a mile upon a railway on which they had only to pay \$600 a mile as capital. No such gigantic and impudent speculation was ever laid before the House in the shape of a Bill by private promoters, as this of the Minister of the Interior, who was responsible as a member of the Government for the administration of the vast interests in the North-West which he is now so anxious to promote and protect. What further did the hon. member for North Norfolk say? He said:

"They were told that these railway claims were going to absorb the whole of the North-West."

See how moderate the hon. gentleman is in his demands for the public domain for these railway companies. He says, very complacently:

"Under no circumstances can they absorb more than half of it."

At that time the hon. gentleman did not appear to have the interests of the intending settlers so deeply at heart as he has now since the force of circumstances have compelled him to take the other side of the argument; and I must give him the credit of saying that he argues equally well on either side, and his arguments are entitled to just about the same consideration in this House and in the country when he argues on one side as when he argues on the other. The hon. gentleman said:

"He hoped that the Bill would be accepted, and that we on our side of the House would look with statesmanlike forethought to what were the real interests of Canada."

The real interests of Canada, as he regarded them in 1878, were to give away one-half of its territories in support of railways of the most flimsy character—railways on paper, the proprietors of which were only to pay \$600 a mile to entitle the right of taking lands, and if that right was to be taken from them they were to receive compensation from the Government to the extent of \$10,000 a mile in cash. He concluded by urging us to

"Accord to this measure the generous support which it most certainly deserves."

Another gentleman then came forward as an earnest advocate of that Bill—a gentleman whose eloquence is often heard in this House, and who also has the faculty of making rose-colored statements when he desires, and putting on darker hues when that serves his purpose better. The hon. member for West Middlesex said of our side of the House:

"Now, when a scheme was proposed for the colonization, the settlement and the development of one of the Provinces of this Dominion, they placed obstacles in the way; questioned the *bona fides* of the

scheme; and in various ways attempted to throw discredit on the plans of hon. gentlemen on the Government side for developing the material resources of the country. * * * He thought the Bill was one for which the Government deserves particular credit, and he trusted the opposition to it would be just as feeble as that already presented by the hon. member for Niagara."

Well, Sir, my opposition to that Railway Bill, as I stated before, was based upon the ground that it did not provide for sufficient capital, that it was giving too much power to people to organize Railway companies, and that it would postpone or destroy the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the ground I took, and that was the line of argument used by hon. gentlemen on our side of the House; and nothing could be more unfair than for the late Minister of the Interior to say that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was in favor of that Bill. He never spoke on the Bill at all.

Mr. MILLS. He said so to-night.

Mr. PLUMB. No, he did not say so to-night. I do not believe the hon. gentleman intends to misrepresent, but my hon. friend did not say anything to-night that could warrant that statement. Now, I have already referred to the fact that the hon. gentleman who brought in this resolution stated at the outset that the United States offered to intending settlers more favorable terms than this Government. I have read the terms offered by this Government, and I have shown how anxiously, how sedulously, how constantly this Government has endeavored to protect the rights of settlers; and I tell the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk that his speech and the speech of those who followed him, if they can have any weight anywhere, are calculated to warn the intending settler that he must not come to Canada but must go to the United States, where he will find better terms. These speeches are upon exactly the same principle as the statement made by the late First Minister that the difficulties and privations of settlers going into that sterile, cold, inhospitable country of ours in the North-West were such that with every facility and inducement that could be offered to them, there were inducements offered in the State of Texas far superior to any that we could hold out. This is on the same general principle as the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, which has been spoken of to-night—in a speech in which he spent hour after hour decrying this country, decrying our resources, decrying the ability of the North-West to furnish the means of building the railway; asking us to go back to 1872; saying that we never could fulfil the engagements made with British Columbia; ridiculing the bargain made with that Province; saying that it was made on the first of April—"fitting day for fitting deed"; and treating us to page after page in favor of the rapid settlement and growth of the Western States of America. He then cited Kansas as an instance of progress and prosperity. He mentioned the inducements that were held out to settlers by that State, and he certainly held them up in contrast with the advantages of our own western possessions. And without doubt he had in his mind the fact that it was better for immigrants to go to Kansas than to settle in our North-West. So far did the hon. gentleman advertise Kansas lands, that it is notorious that he has been made the endorser of the schemes of Kansas landtouts and railway schemers. He may not have intended it, but he has been made so to appear, and it is useless for the hon. member for Bothwell to say that the pamphlet which has been referred to in this House, was the production of the hon. gentleman's political enemies. The thing is too thin. The hon. gentleman knows in his own heart that there is no foundation for that statement. The hon. gentleman knows that this pamphlet emanated from railway agents in the United States; and I do not wonder at those crafty gentlemen for seizing with avidity on the recommendation of so eminent an authority as the

Mr. PLUMB.

present leader of the Opposition. I do not wonder that they were at great expense to get the hon. gentleman's countenance perpetuated in its most smiling expression on their pamphlet. I do not wonder that these gentlemen thought that they had found a treasure when they got the hon. gentleman to endorse their land schemes, or, at any rate, when they were able to so quote his language as to endorse them; and if any hon. gentleman reads this pamphlet, he will find the quotation which was made from a speech by the leader of the Opposition on the floor of this House, and which justifies all the statements that I have made. Sir, the whole course which has been pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite in this debate and in every other debate which has been sprung on this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, both in moving in Supply and in their other resolutions and other discussions, has been tinged throughout with exactly the same characteristics (interruptions.) I hear disturbances which, I hope, the hon. gentlemen opposite will cease to make. I believe that these hon. gentlemen are greatly indebted to us for our forbearance in listening to the kind of speeches which we have heard from that side of the House; and I can tell them, in recollection of what happened between 1874 and 1879, that it would not be a difficult matter for me or any other gentleman standing on this side of the House to create a kind of reprisal which would not be agreeable to the hon. gentlemen. Now, Sir, there are some other very curious facts connected with the presentation that has been made by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution. He has laid great stress upon the iniquities of colonization schemes that have been got up for the purpose, as he maintains, of robbing the intending settler. He has called them gigantic swindles, and he has called those who are engaged in them, "harpies." The hon. gentleman probably did not reflect that he made a little mistake in using the term "harpies," unless those persons have changed their sex, for I believe that the harpies were females, if I correctly remember the mythology of which they formed a part. But, Sir, harpies, whether male or female, he has denounced in the most unmeasured terms. Yet in looking at the *Canada Gazette*, I find the notice is given that application will be made for the charter of a company which is to have a capital of one million dollars, for the purpose of colonizing, developing and dealing in lands of the North-West, embracing all the objectionable features which my hon. friend has denounced so eloquently, and of which he has drawn such a terrible picture while one of the incorporators. I think the leading incorporator is the hon. member for Lambton. If hon. gentlemen opposite, or any hon. gentleman on that side of the House, denies that notice of any such application has been in the *Gazette*, I will look it up. I say that it has been made by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and others; and this application contains many, if not all, of those horribly objectionable features which the hon. member for North Norfolk painted so eloquently.

Mr. RYMAL. The hon. gentleman has not produced the notice.

Mr. PLUMB. You will get it in time. I am not bound to produce it, but I will do so. I must say if everything I hear is true, that the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me was not so solicitous to protect his friend, the member for Lambton, a year or two ago as he seems to be now. During that hon. gentleman's crisis, and when he (Mr. Mackenzie) was *in extremis*, I do not think the hon. member for South Wentworth then rose up to the hon. gentleman's defence—if this may be for his defence; but perhaps the hon. gentleman is anxious to fix this statement as a reproach upon the hon. member for Lambton. The hon. gentleman will now be gratified. The notice is as follows:

Notice is hereby given that application will be made to His Excellency the Governor General in Council for letters patent under the provisions

of "The Canada Joint Stock Companies' Act, 1877," by the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie, James Beatty, the younger, George Albertus Cox and so forth. The proposed corporate name of the Company is "The British Canadian Colonization Company (limited), and the purpose is the acquiring of lands in the Dominion, etc., the capital stock to \$1,000,000 in shares of \$100 each.

In another of the colonization companies, one of the corporators is a brother of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and two are among the patriotic gentlemen who proposed the second Syndicate. The hon. member for North Norfolk makes great objection to the introduction of capitalists as holders of land in the North-West. He is very much afraid of the bloated aristocrat, and wishes here and everywhere else, since he did not get his colonization road and the case is changed and it is convenient to take the other tack, that the actual settler only shall be permitted to take up lands in the North-West. I believe that the hon. gentleman, in his secret convictions, if he has any, agrees with us in believing that the very best thing we can do to promote the interest of the laborer is to send capital into the North-West to employ labor. We want to induce large proprietors to go in who will employ labor and pay liberal wages; we want to send laborers there, and to afford them the opportunity of earning sufficient money to take up their 160 acres of Government land and buy their farming implements. Those who advocate the policy the hon. gentleman advocates are in favor of keeping laborers out of the North-West. There is every reason to suppose that the mass of ultimate settlers who will make up the best population of the North-West, will be those hardy men who go in there as day laborers, and as soon as they can save enough will take up the 160 acres reserved specially for them by the Government. The hon. gentleman seeks to shut those people out. We, on the other hand, whom he denounces as acting in the interests of speculators, monopolists and colonization schemers, like the hon. member for Lambton, propose that there should be inducements for poor men to go there, that they should be find work on the railway, and with large holders, who wish to cultivate their lands, and that considerable tracts of land shall be sold to men who will have the means of employing labor at high prices. We have a broader, a more comprehensive and generous policy towards the actual settler than the hon. gentleman has ever dreamt of, or proposed on the floor of this House. Why, the hon. gentleman has never suggested any practical scheme which looked to the settlement of the country except that selfish one which he advocated. The Colonization Railway Bill of 1878, by which he could get for himself and his friends, without risking capital, large grants of land, and by which, he and those who acted with him, would have so absolutely impoverished the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, running across the fertile belt, that it never could have been built and operated around the north shore of the lakes, and would have been simply an adjunct or feeder to the Northern Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman for West Durham says that Ontario is being depopulated by the exodus into the North-West. I never heard that the State of New York complained that some of its population went from it to settle in Indiana, Illinois, and the States west of the Mississippi. I never heard of any objection made in the State of Massachusetts to the large exodus that went out of that State to settle in the west; on the contrary, every movement of that kind only drew firmer the bonds that united the Western with the Eastern States. The railways connecting those States by trunk lines running east and west and became the highways by which the people that went into the west, came back and visited their own homes. They kept up their old ties; and one of the strongest that binds the Union together to-day is the settlement of the west by the emigrants from the New England States, Pennsylvania and New York. The late Minister of the Interior admitted the same thing in the course of his argument when he said it was desirable that the people of Ontario should go into the

North-West in sufficient numbers to form the basis of municipal institutions in that country. If the hundreds of thousands, which those hon. gentlemen have predicted, go into that country Ontario will only furnish the leaven that will leaven the lump. Is there any desire on the part of our opponents that an Act should be passed to prohibit the people of Ontario from going into the North-West? Why, they go there because we have offered them inducements to go, because it is a prosperous country, and is rapidly filling up under the policy of the present Government. We did not hear much about the exodus to the North-West in the time of the late Government. There was no alarm felt then that Ontario would be depopulated under their rule for they had so ingeniously contrived their land regulations as to shut out all settlers. Such movements of an enterprising population as are now in progress are inseparable from the healthy growth and settlement of our new territories. They need create no alarm,—men with large families will send their sons into the North-West, while they themselves remain at home, instead of keeping their sons at home and subdividing their farms. It does us no harm. We are all parts of a great whole. We must learn to look upon this nation as a unit. Every man should be proud to know that we are able out of our surplus population to furnish means of building up loyal Canadian Provinces in the North-West. I have not heard a more selfish, a more narrow-minded argument uttered on the floor of this House than the argument of the leader of the Opposition in regard to that very point based upon a misleading statement of the numbers who, it is alleged, are depopulating Ontario and settling in the North-West. Another hon. gentleman opposite said that even large numbers were going into the Western States, into a country that was held up to us some time ago as an example of everything that was to be shunned on account of its high protective system. Yet we are now told that country with its terrible Tariff and frightful prices is attracting many thousands of our population—hundreds of thousands, according to the statement taken from reports of American Custom House officials, which were quite as truthful, no doubt, as those of the United States officers at Port Huron exploded by the hon. Deputy Minister of Agriculture. I tell hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, that men do not abandon their farms and go into new countries; they sell their farms for good prices, or they find good tenants for them, or they stay upon them. If they go away there is evidence that there is a demand for the farms they leave by those who stay behind. I remember well that when the hon. member for Gloucester on one occasion stated that half the farms were left desolate in his Province by people who were going to the United States, going to the most highly-protected country in the civilized world, it occurred to me that owners of New Brunswick farms would find purchasers or lessees before they left them, and would not rush empty-handed into another country. However, I think the statement of the hon. gentleman refutes itself, and I think there will be nothing gained to the Opposition by such arguments. In every case this Session, where a hostile resolution has been moved by the Opposition, I have had the satisfaction of seeing those who supported it put on the defensive, and they have been again driven to that position to-night. They have been utterly unable to meet the arguments of my friends. They have not attempted to reply to them. Nothing more damaging to the Opposition can be well imagined than the present exposure of their railway colonization scheme of 1878—a scheme that the Mackenzie Government would have forced upon the country had they not been compelled by their own friends, and by our vigorous remonstrances, to withdraw it. They dared not bring it to a vote. His party may thank their champion from North Norfolk, for the disclosure of a half-forgotten Grit railway scheme by which fifteen people could form a railway

corporation, self-chartered, and uncontrolled and by paying \$600 per mile, could demand a large land subsidy from the Government and could capitalize that subsidy for \$10,000 a mile. Why, Sir, it cannot be believed that these gentlemen were ever in earnest about building the Canadian Pacific Railway, or they never would have consented to such an insane proposition as that. The hon. leader of the Opposition spoke hour after hour last year in urging that the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, then under discussion, should be so changed as to deflect the line down to the American frontier, and thus give the traffic of the North-West to the United States, the traffic which the Eastern Provinces were striving to secure by large subsidies, and to which they had a paramount claim. There has been a sedulous attempt on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite to secure the construction of other lines which would tap the Canadian Pacific Railway and deprive Ontario and Quebec of the benefits of that road. In this they are consistent with their past policy, which has constantly tended to the injury of Canadian interests, and to diverting whatever advantages there may be in the trade of this country into the hands of our neighbors across the border. Now, while I am on my feet, I may notice a personal reference to myself which has been made by an hon. gentleman opposite. I am pained to see that he should have so far forgotten himself—I scarcely suppose he did forget himself, because I believe his slanderous words were simply the expression of his malevolent nature—as to state that I addressed the House, on a late occasion, as an alien with alien instincts, that I was put up to insult the Province of Ontario and endeavor to defraud her. Well, Sir, I always supposed that it was the policy of Canada to welcome strangers from all parts of the world who chose to come here and abide by her laws and to take part in endeavoring to promote her interests. I supposed, until I heard from hon. gentlemen opposite and from the newspapers, which are their organs, that it would be more acceptable to all Canadians that gentlemen who came to reside in these provinces should take the oath of allegiance and become British subjects rather than remain aliens; but many of those who heard the abusive words of the hon. member for Centre Haron, who would have taken the oath of allegiance and who were prepared to strike hands with Canadians and go forward with its people, will be deterred from doing so, and the blame will rest at the doors of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have taken up such a cry as that to which I am referring, which is disgraceful to themselves and a reproach to the country which sends them as representatives to sit in this House. I have no doubt that the motion which has been proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk in a speech which may be considered as a specimen of his very best special pleading—which, of course, will have all the weight which the hon. gentleman's utterances on the floor of Parliament heretofore entitles him to receive, and which will have all the weight with the Canadian people to which his precious record entitles him—will meet the fate which all resolutions offered on that side of the House on motion to go into Committee of Supply have met with. Still I believe there are hon. gentlemen opposite who are sufficiently moved by motives of patriotism, by feelings of fair play, and by the statements made on this side of the House in regard to the policy of the Government with respect to the settlement of the North-West, to pause before they accept at the hands of that hon. gentleman from North Norfolk the resolution which he has brought forward and offered for the acceptance of the House. I believe there are hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have a sense of fairness, who are not led away altogether by party considerations, and who feel that on a great question like the settlement of our Western Territories, it is well that we should sink party issues and endeavor, instead of obstructing the course of the Government, who have this onerous duty on their hands, to sustain them and promote their endeavor to bring

Mr. PLUMB.

the trade of Canada into Canada and not have it go to feed the insatiate country which adjoins us and which is ready at any moment to seize upon any pretext to check our onward career of prosperity in the North-West, and, if it were possible, would soon deplete the railway we are building and deprive these provinces of the benefit of its traffic; and believing thus, I hope that when the question is taken we will find that the hon. member for North Norfolk has gained nothing by his motion.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I agree with the remark made by the hon. member for Niagara, as he was resuming his seat, that the resolution moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk will be defeated as similar motions made under similar circumstances have been defeated before; still I am a little surprised at the reception which it has received from the House. I would have supposed that such a resolution, formulating a distinct principle, pointing out dangers which are common to new countries, would have been met with argument, that it would have been discussed on its merits and its principles analyzed, and if false the fact would have been pointed out, and the House placed in possession of such facts as would prove that the resolution should not be adopted. That course has not been pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite in any single instance, so far as I have observed. In no instance was a straightforward attempt made to show that the resolution should not pass; in every instance the hon. mover was met with abuse or something tantamount to it. The leader of the Government held up his hands in holy horror at the imputation or insinuation, as he called it, of the hon. member for North Norfolk, that the present land system in the North-West was calculated to induce corruption. The hon. gentleman was not to blame in making an imputation of that kind. He was only reminding the House of what the President of the Council had said regarding the Minister of Railways—namely, that he was the high priest of corruption. Such a statement not having been withdrawn or recalled, the hon. member for North Norfolk was certainly not to blame in insinuating that it was quite possible there was great danger to the political purity and honesty of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not particularly alarmed about their political purity and honesty myself. I would not propose the resolution on this ground. I think there is a sufficient degree of integrity in the breasts of hon. gentlemen opposite to lead them to do what is fair; at least I will assume there is. I am prepared to assume that Ministers being invested with such a great and important trust, would not degrade the high position by any act of corruption. The hon. Minister of Railways did not attempt to answer the propositions contained in the resolution before this House; he did not advance a single argument in regard to the position he took. Instead of doing that he drew a red herring across the path in order to divert the attention of the House from the resolution by referring to a Bill submitted by the hon. member for Bothwell a few years ago, and to show from that Bill that the members who advocated the position taken by the Opposition were poltroons or hypocrites. What is there involved in the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell inconsistent with the position taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The Bill proposed by that hon. gentleman was not a colonization Bill in the light of the schemes of hon. gentlemen opposite, but it was a Bill proposed with a view to opening up the North-West for settlement on precisely the same lines and involving the same principles as the scheme by which the Western States were opened for settlement, and which hon. gentlemen opposite approved. These two schemes are essentially different; one is for the settlement of the country, and the other is for a colonization system which may be opposed to the settlement of the country, and may retard it, and it is on that ground the hon. member for North Norfolk and those prepared

to support him protest against the system of land regulations introduced and sustained by the present Government. But, Sir, let me go a little further, and let us endeavor if we can to see what is involved in the resolution which is now in your hands. What is the question really before the House. The question, as I understand it, is the best mode of securing the settlement of the North-West. Now, I can see in a proposition involving the consideration of such an important question as that, no necessity for such strong terms as were used by the Minister of Railways, and by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). We have a large patrimony in that country—one that cost us a large sum of money. I see by a schedule attached to the Public Accounts for last year that we have expended about \$30,750,000 on the purchase, settlement, improvement and development of the North-West. We paid for it, in the first place, £300,000 sterling, and we are opening it up by the construction of an extensive railway system, which will tax the resources of the country to the utmost, as the hon. gentleman opposite has admitted. We have provided a system of Government for that territory, and we are paying annually a large sum of money for the maintenance of peace within its bounds. We are taxing ourselves annually three quarters of a million to promote surveys in the North-West. That country is the estate of the people of Canada, purchased by Canadian money; it belongs to the people of Canada, and the question which the House has to consider, and should consider honestly, apart from the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite, is: what is the best way of settling and developing that country? What the hon. member for Norfolk says, is, that the best way to secure the development of the country is to sell the lands to actual settlers, and in making that statement honestly, in repeating it this year, as he repeated it in 1880—for the fundamental proposition in both resolutions is precisely the same—he is met by abuse. He is charged with being a hypocrite, and we on this side are charged with being hypocrites and with being inconsistent. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to find a single resolution on the Journals of this House since the Reform party in 1865, 1866 and 1867, first advocated the purchase of the North-West, inconsistent with the position we are taking to-night—the position that we believe the prosperity of the country depended on the sale of these lands to actual settlers, and for the smallest sum consistent with the public interest. We in Ontario are familiar with land monopolies. We know what detriment it was to the prosperity of our country, that the Canada Company received a large grant of lands years ago; and what we are doing to-night is, warning hon. gentlemen opposite that there is danger that they may repeat in the North-West the same evil—the same crime, shall I say—that was committed years ago by the Imperial Government in giving the Canada Company such a large grant of land in Ontario. I venture to say that there is not a single gentleman who will vote down this resolution and who goes back to a constituency where there are any Canada Company lands, but will meet with the indignation of his people when they are told that he is attempting to repeat in the North-West the same grievance that was inflicted upon the people of western Ontario. I know something of that grievance by personal knowledge in my own county, and I do not think we see the worst of it there. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is now warning the Government that they may repeat in the North-West the same grievance which was experienced so bitterly in the western parts of Ontario. Let us narrow the discussion down, and what does it amount to? It narrows itself down to this: shall the land in the North-West be sold directly by the Government to the settler or by the Government to middlemen, who will pass it second-hand to the settler. Now, if the proposition is

sound, as I am satisfied it is, that the Crown lands of this country are the property of the people, and the next proposition is sound that it is in the interest of the country that settlement should be promoted, then I say that the Government should be exceedingly careful not to waste the Crown lands nor to dispose of them in any other way than for the settlement and development of the country. What is involved in the opposite course? Simply this: instead of our being in a position to encourage and assist in every possible way the settlement of these lands, we are putting obstacles in the way. We send immigration agents to Europe, and what offer do we make? We say: "We have abundance of land in the North-West; we have broad acres there awaiting the cultivation of implements suitable to that country. Leave your crowded cities; leave the small acres which you cultivate and on which you almost s'arve; come with us across the Atlantic and we may be able to plant you almost without money and without price on the fertile prairies of the North-West; but if the lands go into the hands of the speculators or into the hands of parties who will hold them until the surrounding lands are improved or developed, we are not able to offer these inducements to settlers." Settlers will ask what are the conditions of settlement, what are the prices of these lands, and it will be found that in proportion as the prices rise, in proportion as the first purchases of the land exhausts the slender means of the settler, to that extent do you diminish the chances of settling the country and developing its resources. I ask any hon. gentleman, familiar with the development of the Western States—Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota—if the statement I am now making is not true, viz., that the settlement of these States was mainly promoted by the fact that the lands were exceedingly cheap, that they could almost be got by paying for the cost of survey, and that in addition the Government offered inducements to railway companies whereby immigrants could be easily placed on the farms they were going to cultivate. We should adopt the same system. We are now building a railway. We are making it easy for the settler to reach his land, but we are making it difficult and in some cases expensive to get possession of the lands. We are exhausting the slender means which he may have when he reaches the country, and to that degree we are acting contrary to the best interests of the country, and I fear—I am speaking candidly—we are acting in such a way as will tend to retard the settlement of that country. Hon. gentlemen seem to rejoice in the fact that a large number of settlers are pouring into the North-West, but are these settlers pouring in for the purpose of settlement or speculation? I say largely for speculation. The statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the number of homesteads in 1880 were less than in 1879 proves this. It proves that those who are going there now are going with an eye to the main chance of buying up large areas which they will sell to those immigrants who are now coming from England and the Continent, requiring homes in which to settle themselves. Hon. gentlemen opposite, by pursuing this suicidal policy will lock up the lands in the hands of colonization companies, and those who can afford to lay out of their money for a while, and the consequence is that the settler, who has the first claim on the land, will have to pay an additional price; and this additional price does not go into the Treasury of the country, but into the pockets of those who may be fortunate enough to get possession of the land. The hon. gentlemen, in meeting our demand for candid consideration of this question, charged us with decrying the North-West. I think that charge is entirely out of place. The history of the Liberal party proves that they were the first to propose the negotiations by which the North-West became part of the Dominion of Canada. Besides, what object could we have in decrying the North-West? Are we not citizens of

this country, the same as hon. gentlemen opposite? It is unfair of hon. gentlemen opposite to try to fasten such a charge on the Opposition. What about the pamphlets that were circulated with the portrait of the leader of the Opposition, they say? What about the reference made to Kansas? Sir, hon. gentlemen know right well that if they wished to put these statements fairly, they would say that they involved no disparagement of the North-West, so far as the Opposition are concerned; and the pamphlets bearing the portrait of the leader of the Opposition were circulated by a Conservative agent of lands in the Western States, and for Conservative purposes. He was at one time editor or assistant editor of the *Toronto Mail*, and that gentleman no doubt circulated these pamphlets with the view of influencing the people of this country, politically, as well as with the view of doing a good stroke of business. And yet that is the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite—of men of extensive parliamentary experience—in meeting a proposition we make in this House that they should seriously consider an important question affecting the interests of this country. But hon. gentlemen opposite say the Government are bringing an immense amount of capital into the North-West. For what purpose? Is it for the development of the country? No. We would be exceedingly glad if the investments made in the lands of the North-West tended to the development of the country; but suppose every hon. gentleman opposite went and invested \$20,000 in wild lands, and returned at the end of a year with \$40,000 profit, would the capital thus brought into the North-West tend to its development? Not at all; on the contrary, the more capital brought into the North-West for this purpose, the greater the injury to the country, and the more serious the difficulties placed in the way of settlement. Outside of Winnipeg, and Portage la Prairie and one or two other towns on the Pacific Railway, of what advantage has the capital put into the North-West by speculators been? Of no advantage whatever that I can see; it may be of advantage to Ontario, where these gentlemen may spend the profits they make in the North-West, but it can only be an injury to the North-West itself. But these hon. gentlemen say further that they have a very large area of lands in the North-West, and although they may sell 10,000,000 acres to colonization societies, and give these societies peculiar advantages, still they have such a large area remaining that the injury to the country will be of small consequence. Is it not true that the best lands in the North-West are taken up by these colonization societies? And is it not true that if you diminish the productive capacity of that country by 10,000,000 acres, you retard the progress of the whole country? I believe that in 1871 we had only 17,000,000 acres of cultivated land in Canada. Give 10,000,000 acres of the North-West to the people who form these societies, and you practically lock up nearly as much land as was cultivated in 1871 in the whole Dominion of Canada. The hon. member for Niagara says that the speeches made by gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House have a tendency to deter settlers from going into the North-West. I cannot see how. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have given a cordial support to every fair proposition made for the development of that country; and I venture to say that there is not a young man in the Province of Ontario who talks of settling in the North-West this year, but will feel that the strongest friends he may have in his new home are the Opposition in the House of Commons of Canada to-day. What are the sentiments of the people of the North-West themselves? What were the utterances of the large meeting held at Portage la Prairie a few days ago? Were they not that the land regulations of the Government have a tendency to impede the prosperity of the country? These men knowing the dangerous influence of these regulations, have already expressed themselves, and perhaps may still more forcibly express them-

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

selves, to the effect that these regulations tend to retard the development of the country; and every settler from Ontario who finds that he has to pay two or three prices for these lands, knows right well that if the lands were sold according to the policy of the hon. member for North Norfolk and the Opposition, he could receive his lands at first cost from the Government, and would be to that extent in a better position to make for himself a home. Sir, I warn hon. gentlemen opposite of the feeling in the Province of Ontario in reference to these land regulations. The people of Ontario know that that territory was purchased largely by Ontario funds; they know the value of agricultural lands, and while prepared to pay a fair price for those lands, they are not prepared to pay fictitious prices, as the land regulations of hon. gentlemen opposite will compel them; and when these people from Ontario go into that country and feel the iron heel of the monopolist and the speculator, they will be disposed to express their opinion in such a way as will arouse the torpor and indifference of hon. gentlemen opposite to the true interests of the great North-West, and to secure for the Opposition a more generous support in the North-West, as well as in the Province of Ontario, than they have heretofore received. Sir, this resolution I think should pass; it is not inconsistent with the position we took before. I supported the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell for the opening up of that country by railway schemes, and I would be prepared to do so again. It makes no difference whether railways forty miles from the Pacific Railway are assisted by land grants or not; that policy has been accepted by both sides of this House. But it is not involved in the support of a system of railway colonization that we should support every system of land monopoly which hon. gentlemen opposite may be disposed to organize and to force through this House by their large majority. And, Sir, all we can do in Opposition, though we may be derided as unpatriotic, as hypocrites, and as poltroons, is to enter our protest, and to sustain that protest by our votes on the Journals of the House; and then, when the hon. gentlemen opposite give us the opportunity, we can tell the people of this country in language which they will not mistake, although hon. gentlemen opposite will not heed that our patrimony in the North-West was to a great extent sacrificed by their Land Bill; and that every young man from the Province of Ontario that went to that country had his success jeopardized by the policy of the Government; and that the thousands which he might take with him to make for himself a home in the North-West were reduced in their productive effect by the system which hon. gentlemen opposite initiated. I fancy, Sir, that when the good, sober sense of the people of Ontario is appealed to, hon. gentlemen opposite will then know that there is a public sentiment in this country which regards land monopolies and unfair land regulations as not congenial to this country, and not conducive to its welfare; and hon. gentlemen opposite who negotiated that system will receive the condemnation which they deserve.

Amendment (Mr. Charlton) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Dumont,	Olivier,
Bain,	Fleming,	Paterson (Braut),
Béchar, d,	Geoffrion,	Pickard,
Blake,	Gillies,	Rinfret,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rogers,
Brown,	Guthrie,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (St. John),	Haddow,	Rymal,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holtan,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Skinner,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Smith,
Casey,	King,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Trow,

Charlton,
Cockburn,
Crouter,

Macdonell (Lanark),
Malouin,
Mills,

Weldon, and
Wheler.—47.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	Manson,
Arnell,	Fitzsimmons,	Massue,
Baker,	Fortin,	Merner,
Bannerman,	Fulton,	Méthot,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Mongensais,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Mousseau,
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Muttart,
Bergin,	Hay,	Ogden,
Bill,	Hesson,	Orton,
Bolduc,	Homer,	Quimet,
Boulton,	Hooper,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourbeau,	Houde,	Plumb,
Bowell,	Hurteau,	Pope (Compton),
Brecken,	Ives,	Reid,
Brooks,	Kaulbach,	Richey,
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Rochester,
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Kranz,	Bouthier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Landry,	Royal,
Caron,	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Langevin,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Lantier,	Sproule,
Colby,	Longley,	Stephenson,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Kings),	Tassé,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tellier,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tilley,
Currier,	McCallum,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	McCarthy,	Valin,
Daly,	McCuaig,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	McDougald,	Wade,
Dawson,	McDougall,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Desaulniers,	McLellan,	Wallace (York),
Desjardins,	McLennan,	White (Cardwell),
Donville,	McLeod,	White (Hastings),
Drew,	McQuade,	Williams, and
Dugas,	McRory,	Wright.—112.

SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

45. To meet expenses in connection with Patent Record..... \$7,200

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I observe that in last year's Public Accounts the cost of this service was \$8,244, being \$1,000 more than the hon. gentleman thinks is now required. What is the cause of the reduction?

Mr. POPE (Compton). The expenditure up to the first of January last under this head was \$4,197, and I think we will be able to get through with the amount which we ask.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Is the Record published by contract?

Mr. POPE (Compton). Yes; the resolution was agreed to.

46. To meet expenses in connection with the preparation of Criminal Statistics..... \$4,000

Mr. BLAKE. I see that there is a decrease of \$1,000. To what cause is this due?

Mr. POPE (Compton). We found last year that \$4,000 were sufficient, and we think that the sum mentioned will meet our purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. A great portion of the value of a record of this description consists in comparative tables, and we have now arrived at a stage when such tables would prove very useful in saving a great deal of labor on the part of those who desire to obtain these results.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I think the suggestion is worthy of consideration, and I will consider it.

47. To meet expenses in connection with the Census..... \$60,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understood that we were, before this item was taken up, to get some further

information about the Census; and I think that the Minister promised to supply us with the first volume; but as yet we have seen only one statement.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I had hoped we would have had the first volume before this time; but I will give the hon. gentleman any information he may desire if he states what he desires to know.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We would very much like to know the number of people who were not in Canada when the Census was taken but who were included in the Census. If the Minister has succeeded in obtaining this information it will be of very great moment and interest, but I doubt that we will get it.

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask if this revoke of \$60,000 will, with the \$200,000, cover all the costs of the Census.

Mr. POPE. I believe the last Census, taken in 1871, which included the four old Provinces of Canada, cost \$511,000. This will still cost more than the revoke of \$60,000, and I fancy the whole cost will be \$460,000.

49. To meet expenses in connection with Health Statistics.....\$10,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like some explanation as to what he proposes to do with this particular \$10,000, and in the next place, what is the general scheme under which the Government propose to collect these health statistics?

Mr. POPE. I do not suppose it will grow much beyond the \$10,000. There was a proposition made to us by the Dominion Medical Board that with a small sum they could obtain reliable information of this character. We propose to make a proposition to them that if they will lay before us a scheme by which they can give us statistics in this question, we will give them a certain portion of this appropriation. It is entirely experimental.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that before the hon. gentleman launches his scheme before the House he ought to have looked into the plan and ascertained if it were at all feasible to ascertain reliable statistics over the whole country for any such sum as that fraction of \$10,000 which will be available for outside work after making a proper allowance for the office work. This matter has been mentioned in Parliament for many years and the objection has been that to procure reliable vital statistics would require a large organization and a large expense. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he has not considered the plan which the Board of Physicians have submitted to him, that he is going to talk to them after he has got the vote, and that if they satisfy him they have an efficient means for collecting statistics the scheme will go on; if not it will not. I think the hon. gentleman ought to have obtained that information before he asked for this vote. It is doubtful if this sum will be effectual to accomplish the object. He is, in effect, taking a vote of credit for the purpose of not giving any explanation to Parliament at all of the plan by which he proposes that the work should be carried on.

Mr. POPE. If I spend it I will give an explanation. My hon. friend is talking upon a very much larger subject than is contemplated by this vote. He says that we have often talked of vital statistics before. So we have, but we have talked about agricultural and industrial statistics before. In this matter there is not contemplated anything of that kind. I knew that the hon. gentleman would be quite willing to trust the expenditure of this \$10,000 to my judgment.

Mr. BLAKE. Will you promise not to ask for another \$10,000?

Mr. POPE. No, not till I give you a good reason.

Mr. ORTON. I think this subject has not received the attention it deserves. I entirely concur with the hon. leader of the Opposition that if vital statistics are to be obtained of any value, the sum that is set apart is utterly useless for that purpose. With regard to this subject, I desire to state that I do not think there is any subject that can more profitably engage the attention of this House than the collection of reliable health statistics. By that means, largely, can the people generally and the officials in the Dominion be instructed in the means to be taken to prevent serious epidemics occurring in this country. I believe that by a moderate but a sufficient sum, not only large benefit can be derived to the country, but we can do more with it than with the money that is expended in encouraging emigration to this country, in saving the lives of people that are born in this country and are natives of the soil. I regret that there has not been a larger sum placed in the Estimates for that purpose. I do not know what the schemes of the Government are, but I believe they expect to obtain from the medical men in the country voluntary returns during the year. There may be something done in that way, because we all know that medical men as a rule are willing on any occasion to render their services in the interest of the public; and I am led to believe from the interview which the representatives of the medical men of the Dominion had with the Government, that such is the idea, but I do say that this sum is utterly inadequate for the purposes that are sought.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I think this is a step in the right direction, and I hope the hon. Minister of Agriculture will move a great deal further. I regret we have no Department for compiling statistics affecting the general affairs of this country. If we want to get statistics of the Marine Department we have to go and search through all the reports from Confederation down, and the same with regard to all the Departments. If the hon. gentleman would go a little further and establish in connection with his Department a bureau where statistics of the industrial prosperity of the country would be compiled and published annually, if not monthly, useful information would be obtained as was the case at the present time of the bureau at Washington. It would not cost much, and I am prepared to support a moderate expenditure on that account. The Ontario Bureau of Agriculture and Statistics, which is now being established, will prove exceedingly useful.

Mr. ANGLIN. Before an appropriation is asked the hon. Minister should be prepared to lay definite plans before the Committee as to how it was proposed to obtain the desired information. It would be asking too much from medical men to ask them to furnish statistics. At the same time information of this kind must be accurate, or it would be misleading. If the vote were passed the hon. Minister should be prepared next year to explain to the House how it has been expended.

Mr. MILLS. It is inconsistent with our theory of Government that Parliament should vote money without having full particulars before it as to the proposed manner in which it should be expended. The proposed appropriation is not for a purpose well known to Parliament. It is proposed to collect statistics by some method, and the plan should be submitted to Parliament, as we have the right to know whether the proposition is a reasonable one or not. If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to give the information now as to the plan to be adopted, I think he should do so on concurrence.

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Mr. POPE. If we were to go into an extensive scheme of health statistics it would involve an expenditure of at least \$150,000 or \$200,000. By the present proposition the Dominion Medical Association are to collect the health

Mr. POPE (Compton).

statistics of the country for \$10,000. If they do the work they are to get this amount; if not, it will not be expended.

50. Immigration..... \$250,000

Mr. POPE. The first increase is \$100 on the salary of the Norwegian interpreter, who is an energetic and hard-working officer. In the London office, there is an increase of \$500 to Mr. Colman, the principal clerk, and an increase of \$600 to Mr. Just, and \$730 for messengers. There is a large amount of additional labor required this year for messages, &c. As to the increase of \$150,000, I may first mention what we did with the \$100,000 granted last year. We paid \$12,407 as commissions to the steamship lines; to the Grand Trunk, \$14,828.86; for general transport, \$1,144.34; to delegates, \$3,446.23; for printing and publication, \$15,543.86; to G. R. Kingsmill, \$475.50. My hon. friends were very anxious about the exodus last year, so I engaged Mr. Kingsmill to get them additional information, and he was paid the sum I mentioned. Mr. Kellam, who goes on the train and sees the immigrants through to their destination, got \$951.46, and we gave \$1,021.50 for the same service. Mr. Taylor, the Iceland agent, gets \$700.00; Mr. Waller, who is our agent at Chicago, and a very efficient agent he is, gets \$551.15; Mr. Williams gets \$100.00; Mr. Gerald gets \$148.00 for looking after immigrants at Prescott; Mr. Lynn, of Worcester, Mass., gets \$1,752.72 for inducing French Canadians in that part of the country to return to Canada, and from information I have received from him, I understand that a large number are going from there to the North-West in the coming year; Mr. Armstrong, who was in Manitoba locating immigrants, got \$252.50, but he is not now in the employ of the Department; Mr. Grahame, the agent at Duluth, expended \$4,075.67; for locating immigrants in the North-West, and this includes several parties, \$2,142.46; literary services, \$360.00; Queen's Printer, \$237.42; for ocean mail clerks, for giving information about the country to passengers, \$400.00; and sundries, \$4,692.52, making a total of \$90,000.00. The expenditure in the London office was as follows: Rent, £247 8s. 4d.; German delegates, £258 9s. 8d.; printing and stationery, £1,080 4s. 6d.; advertising, £185 5s. 9d.; sundries, £436 1s. 11d.; special expenses of agents, £663 1s. 11d.; making \$13,970.03, or a total expenditure for the current year of \$104,201.24. But we expended more. At the time last year's Estimates were brought down I supposed that the Government of Ontario were going to continue the arrangement we had with them, and were going to pay two-thirds of the inland fare to Ontario. They decided, however, not to do so, but it having been advertised, and their own agents having invited people to come to this country on the understanding that they would have a free inland passage, we were bound to carry that arrangement out. No matter what the Ontario Government or any Provincial Government might do, the Dominion Government were held responsible for everything in England, and we could not allow this statement to go across the Atlantic that Canada refused to carry out her engagements. For this reason our expenses were increased by about \$28,000, and I would not be surprised to find them increased before the first of July, 1882, by \$50,000. I wish every member of this House to understand that we feel it incumbent on us to use every effort to induce agriculturists and domestic servants to come from Great Britain, Germany or anywhere else to settle in this country, and that we will contribute one pound to assist each person to come. The estimate is at least \$80,000 for the coming year, which will account to a considerable extent for the increased amount which is placed in the Estimates. If we are to have this large immigration, I must see that these people are carried through the country, and must aid them in reaching their destinations, as far as Lower Provinces are concerned,

but nothing is done with reference to Manitoba and the North-West, save in the way of obtaining for them cheapest possible rates. We provide immigrants with passages from Liverpool to Winnipeg for from \$30 to \$35, which is the ordinary steamship passage. This is partly due to the grant of £1 per head, which applies to all parts of the Dominion, and partly to the reduction of inland rate. I ask hon. gentlemen to consider this question fully and to see whether it is not in the true interests of this country that \$250,000 will be as well spent as any other sum that we can vote for any other purpose. Besides, these immigrants have not come into the country with empty pockets. They add to the resources of the country; and last year they actually brought in four million dollars, while we expended \$150,000 in order to get them here. These four millions were added to the circulation, and we expect to double this immigration this year. It may be fairly estimated that it costs \$50 a year to bring up a child, and consequently a child sixteen years of age would have cost \$800. Thirty-two thousand immigrants came into Canada last year, and at a valuation of \$800 each, this would be equivalent to a valuation of twenty-five millions, apart from the four millions in cash which I mentioned, making twenty-nine millions in all. Under these circumstances, I think no objection at all will be taken to this vote.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us any information in regard to the success of his efforts in connection with tenant-farmer immigration.

Mr. POPE (Compton). During the last year, we invited four delegates from Germany, and one from Switzerland, and we have the most encouraging accounts in that respect to prospective German immigration. The other day tenant farmers from Great Britain, having with them something like half a million dollars, passed through to the North-West. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that our immigrants during the past year were of a very superior class. We ascertain the amount of the cash that they bring with them from information which is collected from the immigrants by our agents; but the amount mentioned necessarily falls very far short of the real amount, as only a portion of the immigrants are questioned in the nature of things, on this point. I never do anything to induce residents of the older Provinces to go to the North-West, but if any desire to change their location, I certainly urge them to settle in our own western country instead of proceeding to the United States. We contribute to the aid of French Canadians who went to manufacturing districts in New England some years ago and who return to Canada and settle in the North-West, exactly the same amount which we grant in assistance to European immigrants.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Can the hon. Minister give us the number of immigrants that have remained in Quebec for the last year?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Could he fairly say twenty settled there?

Mr. POPE. Yes, I can say 500 settled there.

Mr. IRVINE. The hon. Minister said every immigrant that came into the country was worth \$800. I do not doubt that assertion, but those who leave it must mean an equal loss to the country per head. I have just received a letter from Carleton, which I will read:

"One thing is to me quite alarming. Hundreds of our people are leaving here and going to Colorado, Montana, and the Western States. They have been going constantly for the last six weeks, and 120 are leaving the 1st of May. Tell Tilley he must put on more taxes to prevent this exodus."

Mr. ANGLIN. It is to be regretted the efforts of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to induce our people to remain

have not been more successful. The exodus this year is greater in my part of the country than it was ever before, and 99 out of every 100 go to the States. The statement of the hon. Minister that every immigrant who came out here brought out so much money does not agree with his statement that it is necessary to provide funds to bring them out. That does not seem to be a sufficient reason for adopting this new mode of inducing emigration, to induce the working classes of the City of London in which Sir A. T. Galt is interesting himself—not a very desirable class of emigrants—to come to this country. It would be necessary, no doubt, to reduce the rates of passage very materially; but I wish just now to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the claims of New Brunswick to some assistance in the way of emigration. Last year and the year before we claimed that emigrants coming from Europe by the Allan Line who desired to come to New Brunswick or Nova Scotia should be assisted as others were assisted to go to the Western Provinces.

Mr. POPE. So they were.

Mr. ANGLIN. I understood they were not, but I am glad the hon. Minister has found his way to doing what I think he objected to when the matter was brought up here before.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe on the page 21 of his report a reference is made to this sum of \$1,000,000. It reads thus: "To the above figures should be added the amounts of money taken into Manitoba by new arrivals, and brought in in 1881 by other arrivals from abroad." I wish to know the meaning of that statement.

Mr. POPE. That is the total. A considerable part of that total was not reported at Winnipeg, but a good deal was at Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. It would include then such reports as the agents at Duluth, Emerson or Winnipeg received from persons who come from other parts of the Dominion into Manitoba, as well as those who came from abroad.

Mr. POPE. It is only a portion of the foreign emigration. It also includes that from the Western States, but it is confined entirely to the foreign emigration.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe a statement in the letter of Sir, A. T. Galt as to the difficulty of emigration in consequence of want of means. On page 187 of the hon. gentleman's report I find he says:

"I find from the communications I am constantly receiving, that a very large number of working people in every part of the Kingdom are willing and anxious to emigrate, but are prevented by want of funds, the removal of entire families requiring an amount of money which their savings, only small on account of their families and the irregular nature of their employment, will not bear. I look to the formation of colonization companies in this connection with pleasure, and trust that a part of their efforts will be in the direction of helping deserving families of this kind. Such associations will have the security of the land for any advances made, and the risk will be lessened by the fact of the settler having nothing to gain by breaking his contract, being placed as he would be in a position he could not have hoped to occupy before."

Is it in reference to the class mentioned in this paragraph that the hon. gentleman proposes this plan of the £1?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there is to be a continued operation on the part of the colonization companies and the Government. We are to assist the efforts of the colonization companies.

Mr. POPE. No. The hon. gentleman understands wrongly the meaning of that report. Sir A. T. Galt referred to these Emigration Aid Societies particularly. It refers to the Emigration Aid Act of this country and also to the societies formed on the other side of the water, not upon this side at all. He was referring to these for the purpose of encouraging the Irish Emigration Societies as well as others; also those that came out under the Emigration Aid Act of 1872.

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Mr. POPE. The commission referred to in the \$12,500 was a vote taken in this House for commissions promised in 1877—\$8,000 of it, I believe. The other \$4,000 was for the three months. I found that emigration was lagging a little; I wanted to increase it if I could and I offered a commission to the steamboat agents until some time in September. After October comes in I do not think it desirable that we should induce people to come here very much. If they do come we will do the best we can for them, but we should not hold out any special inducements. It was during these months that we probably paid the ten shillings currency.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended to continue the system of paying commissions next season.

Mr. POPE (Compton). Nothing on the reduced rate. There will be a commission paid on the £4 rate.

Mr. LONGLEY. It has been a source of great satisfaction to all to witness the attention which the Minister of Agriculture takes in the subject of immigration. Allusion has been made to the very large emigration going on from the Lower Provinces. I do not myself believe there are one-fourth as many going from the Lower Provinces as has been alleged by the hon. member for Gloucester, but I am afraid it cannot be denied that too many are going away to the United States and the North-West Territory. My own impression is that a very considerable proportion of those who have gone and are going are removing to the North-West, but while we would very much prefer that the people should remain in the Dominion, yet as far as practical results go the depletion of the population of the Lower Provinces amounts to about the same thing for the time being. The question is whether the time has not arrived when there shall be a modification of existing plans for the promotion of immigration to this Dominion. There are very few of those who have a practical stake in the country who are emigrating from the Lower Provinces; but the young people of both sexes are leaving. The condition of things is this: that as far as agricultural laborers are concerned, it is almost out of the question to obtain a sufficient number to cultivate the soil. What we want, therefore, is an element to supply that deficiency, and the Ministry might consider whether agricultural laborers could not be landed at Halifax and St. John as well as Quebec.

Mr. KILLAM. I venture to express the hope that this country will be made as attractive to the people as are those countries to which they are going.

Mr. BUNSTER. It is very evident that the Ministry has totally lost sight of one of the most important Provinces in the Dominion—British Columbia—which is entirely left out of the list. British Columbia has not cost a single dollar to the Dominion, and I would like to know why we are not receiving some assistance towards getting us immigration.

Mr. ANGLIN. You have 2,000 Chinese coming in.

Mr. BUNSTER. We never asked the Chinese to come in and we do not want them, as they will be nothing but an injury to our country. I do not see why British Columbia should be slighted in this way when all we ask is a fair field and no favor. Our connection with Canada so far has not been very greatly to our advantage. The Americans would have built a railway through the country and around it over and over again for the sake of getting that Province.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. gentleman will look at the next page he will see that British Columbia gets \$2,000.

Mr. BUNSTER. What is that for a Province like ours? It is not enough to treat a good sized crowd, and unless you
Mr. POPE (Compton).

can give us more than that you had better take the item out altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. We were given to understand, when the arrangement was made for the construction of the Pacific Railway, that that Company would be a powerful promoter of immigration, and that our own expenses would be diminished. What arrangements have the company made for the promotion of immigration?

Mr. POPE. They have, I believe, an agent at Liverpool and one in Germany, and I think they are contributing something to assist people to come into the country. I know that they have contributed towards the reduction of the inland rates—that is, the rates over the railways in the United States—I cannot say to what extent. My own impression is that every immigrant that goes into the North-West will cost them about one half of what he costs us.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. A good deal was said about some negotiations between our representative in England and the Imperial Government as to immigration, which was to form part of Mr. Gladstone's remedial measure. Has anything at all come of this? Again, have any negotiations been in progress with the Imperial Government with respect to immigration from Ireland; we hoped the considerable amount of money which it was proposed to expend would have been used to bring Irish emigrants to Manitoba.

Mr. POPE. I am not in a position to make any definite statement on this head; but negotiations are in progress and are proceeding favorably. I think that they will be successful; but I can say no more on this subject at the present time.

Mr. KILLAM. I think that it ought to be the policy of the Government to induce our own people to remain in the country rather than to bring other people in to take their places. This is a very important matter and should receive the most careful attention. I am informed that during the last fortnight 380 people have gone from the counties of Annapolis and Kings, many of whom are active young men, farmers' sons and mechanics, and others who have deliberately gone to the United States with the intention of living there.

Mr. HESSON. Because there is higher protection in the United States, I suppose.

Mr. KILLAM. I hope the Government will take some steps in order to remedy this unfortunate state of things.

51. Immigration and Quarantine \$68,266

Mr. BLAKE. I notice an increase of \$10,000 in the item to meet expenses of precautionary measures for public health, and a new vote of \$20,000 for Pictou cattle disease; while there is also a new item of \$2,000 for quarantine purposes at Victoria, B.C.

Mr. POPE (Compton). The western cattle quarantine will be established at Sarnia for cattle coming from the United States, and the British Government declined for a long time to consent to this, while we were not scheduled; but they have finally agreed to permit one or two cattle quarantines to be placed in the western section of the Province. The establishment of the cattle quarantine was proclaimed in the *Official Gazette*, but no arrangements had been made for it; no buildings had been erected and nothing was done. But it is now proposed to erect these buildings this year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the location of the quarantine at Lévis. It is not a place fitted for a quarantine, though it may suit importers. It is not large enough and is in a populated centre.

There are islands which would furnish much more favorable places for the quarantine.

Mr. KILLAM. I was going to refer the hon. gentleman to this question of precautionary measure. I made a personal application to him about the admittance of animals for stock-breeding purposes into the western end of Nova Scotia. Yarmouth is well situated for that purpose. There is a doctor there who is paid by the Government, and I think he would not ask a large sum in addition for looking after four-legged creatures for a few months. We do not bring in many animals from the west to export to Europe, but a few occasionally for a certain purpose. I think my hon. friend might make some arrangements so that in Yarmouth a quarantine station should be established.

Mr. POPE. Call over to my office and we will talk it over.

54. To meet the probable amount required for pensions to veterans of war of 1812..... \$25,000

Mr. McCUAIG. There are two or three of these old men in my county in a helpless condition. Last year I was partly promised that the \$20 would be increased. I think that is too small a sum. The original intention was, I believe, to allow them as high as \$50 per annum. Several of them have died off. I think as they grow more helpless the amount should be increased.

Mr. CARON. The amount has been increased from \$20 to \$25, which is now paid to the veterans. There has been a decrease in the ratio of \$400 every year. Naturally, had we increased the sum from \$20 to \$25, it would be seen that the amount now upon the estimates is the amount which represents the increase which has been given to the veterans and to those who are entitled to pensions. We have adopted the very system recommended by my honorable friend. As soon as these old men drop off we may gradually increase the allowance.

177. Customs \$734,244

Mr. ANGLIN. I ask the Minister of Customs to state frankly whether he is satisfied that the preventive system along the whole frontier is as effective as it can be made, and whether smuggling can be more thoroughly checked by any reasonable additional expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. I think if we incurred an expenditure of \$400,000 or \$500,000 to establish a coast-guard along the whole frontier, there is a possibility that the whole of the smuggling that is going on might be stopped. The hon. gentleman had evidently no intention of having the question seriously answered. I believe the officers along the frontier are doing good work in preventing smuggling, but I am not aware that there is any greater amount of smuggling to-day than in the past or even under a revenue Tariff.

Mr. ANGLIN. There is a very much larger amount of smuggling going on, because certain duties are high enough to pay for the risk of smuggling.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). When the Board of Appraisers at Ottawa was first established it was spoken of as partly an experiment. I desire to ask how it has succeeded?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it has been very successful, not only here but as a means of giving information to every port where importations take place, enabling the officers to arrive at correct conclusions as to the proper values as to duties. I am quite satisfied from the reports made to me, and I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, that very large amounts of duty have been collected that would not have been collected had not the Board been established, and the gentlemen who have

given special attention to that Department, have been enabled to obtain information of the very greatest value in equalizing the duties on the same articles in each port.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and at 4 o'clock a.m. the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 13th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS' BILL.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved that with respect to Bill (No. 5) regarding the sale of railway passenger tickets, in view of the importance of the proposed measure and the advanced period of the Session, this Bill be placed on the Government Orders in the name of the Minister of Railways, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. BLAKE. Notice must be given of this motion.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is the first time I ever heard of the House determining what are Government measures.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is following a precedent which occurred two or three years ago in regard to a Bill about insurance, which was placed among Government measures.

Mr. BLAKE. The report of the Committee has not been adopted, and until that is done we cannot act upon this motion. Another Bill on the same subject was referred to the Committee, and it was supposed that they would both have been dealt with and brought down together. I see no reason why, without notice of the motion having been given and the report of the Committee not having been adopted, this Bill should be taken out of the category of the vast number of Bills in the hands of private members which are destined not to receive attention at the hands of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not desirable that the motion shall be pressed if objection is taken.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If the hon. leader of the Opposition raises this objection I must withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879, AMENDMENT

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 143) further to amend the Railway Consolidated Act, 1879. He said: The object of the Bill is, in the first place, to apply the Consolidated Railway Act to all railways within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, and to the companies owning the same, and to the companies working the same, except the railways to which the Government Railways Act, 1881, applies. The 3rd clause of the Bill is simply to correct a clerical error in the Consolidated Railway Act. It is in the clause that requires plans and maps to be deposited, and the word "all" was, by a clerical mistake, inserted instead of the word "and," because we require both maps and plans. The 4th section of the Bill sets out what is included in the words "working expenditure" in the Consolidated Railway Act, this being in accordance with a suggestion made by the Committee on Railways that we should have a statement inserted in an Act so as to avoid lengthy descriptions as to what are included

in "working expenditure" in the various railway charters granted by Parliament. The 6th clause is to provide for cases where railways are constructed, or authorized to be constructed upon or along, across any turnpike road, street, or any other public highway, this being in accordance with the suggestion of the hon. member for Lambton, the intention being to bring within the authority of Parliament, and under the control of the Government, such cases as that of the Kingston and Pembroke crossing. The 7th clause provides that whenever that portion of any railway which crosses, or is constructed upon or along any turnpike road, street, or any other public highway on the level, is out of repair, it shall be dealt with. The 8th clause is to provide for any case in which a railway may desire to extend its line either at the one end or the other. At present railway companies have authority, under the Consolidated Railway Act, to extend branches, and this clause provides that they shall not be obliged to go to Parliament to obtain power to make an extension, provided such extension do not exceed one half mile in length beyond either point.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state what railways, or what class of railways, he is bringing, by this alteration, under the operation of the Consolidated Railway Act which are not now under its operation, and also what particular cases have occurred which have given rise to the proposal in the last portion of the Bill, namely, to extend without any special authority the line beyond the terminus of the railway to half-a-mile. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will further state whether it is proposed to grant compulsory powers to expropriate lands for such extension, because the termini of railways, as a rule, are in large cities and towns, and it is an important thing for railways that have been in operation for many years to obtain powers to expropriate lands with a view to extending their lines still further through such towns.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that it was supposed until recently, and I have no doubt even by the hon. gentleman himself, that such railways as the Grand Trunk and Great Western were under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, but it was found when the matter came to be practically dealt with, that they were not. The object of the Bill is to bring all these lines of railway which are under the control of this Parliament, in relation to their corporate powers within its jurisdiction legislatively. For example, we passed a Bill with reference to the height of bridges overhead for the safety of persons connected with trains, but when the matter came to be further considered, it was found beyond our power. The crossings at Toronto and other things of that kind are in the same category, owing to the fact that these railways obtained their charters previous to Confederation. With reference to the other question referred to by the hon. gentleman, it arose in connection with the Canada and Atlantic Railway which is to run to Ottawa. It was desired to extend the terminal point beyond what was expressed in the charter, and that was an instance of the necessity of having means by which to make such an extension not to exceed half-a-mile for the purpose of making a more convenient point of communication with the town than would exist otherwise, and to avoid the necessity in such cases of coming to Parliament for the purpose of obtaining specific powers in each case. It was a doubtful question, and is, I believe, a doubtful question yet, whether, under the law as it stands, the same principle that applies in the other case applies to an extension, and it was thought better to have the doubt submitted for the action of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in assuming that I supposed until now that the corporations to which he refers came within the provisions of the Consoli-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

dated Railway Act. It is not so. If the hon. gentleman will look back to the history of those corporations, I think he will find that they were all incorporated before the passage of the old Consolidated Railway Act of the Province of Canada, that they were exempted from its operation, and that they have never been placed within the provisions of any Consolidated Railway Act; so it is not a question of misapprehension.

Bill read the first time.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 144) to authorize the construction, on certain conditions, of the Canadian Pacific Railway through some pass other than the Yellow Head Pass. He said: I may state that the object of this Bill is to place it within the power of the Governor in Council, if they think that the interests of the country will be thereby promoted, to authorize the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway through a pass to the south of the Yellow Head Pass. The Bill will also provide that such a pass must not be less than 100 miles from the American boundary. I may say that I entertain very strong doubts whether it will be found practicable to find a better pass than the Yellow Head Pass. I entertain strong doubts, from the best information I can obtain, as to the practicability of going through the Kicking Horse Pass, although I know the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are somewhat sanguine that they will be able to effect that object. If that object be effected—which I regard as, in fact, very doubtful—it will no doubt involve a great expenditure, probably greater than that involved by following the line by the Yellow Head Pass, but it would be of great importance to the country to shorten the line of the road by something like 100 miles and enable us to go through a much better country in the Province of British Columbia than we otherwise could go through. It may be convenient that hon. gentlemen opposite should know that I propose, on the second reading of this Bill, say on Tuesday next, to make my statement with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that we may have an opportunity of taking up any questions that may be raised in connection with that work.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated the other day that the Government had before them some other applications from the Canadian Pacific Railway, as to the location of part of their main line at Sault Ste. Marie, or the branch line to that place. These papers were received since the last return was brought down, and it was stated that the Government had under consideration an application for location. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has dealt with that application as yet; but whether he has or has not, it would certainly be convenient to have the Government deal with it in time for the discussion by the House of all questions connected with the route, so far as applications have been made. It would be important that we should receive at any rate the application of the Company with what plans and papers exist in support of the application, so as to be informed of the views of the Company formulated to the Government, at an early day. That could be done forthwith; and I think, accompanying that, there should be the decision that the Government has arrived at, so that we should have before us in one form the location of the line so far as it is settled, and as to the residue, so far as the Company proposed a settlement. I would like also to be informed if a further proposal has been made with reference to the location on the prairie north of Fort Calgary and through the pass. Amongst the papers sent down some time ago there was a brief application from the Railway Company suggesting an application to Parliament to give power to alter the route through the Rocky Mountains. If a

location has been laid down, or the old location extended further westward by an application from the Company, it would be important that the papers should be brought down. The hon. gentleman expresses very grave doubts whether the sanguine expectations, as he calls them, of the Company of finding a route through the Kicking Horse Pass, which I assume is the only pass looked upon as practicable with the exception of the Yellow Head Pass, will be realized. If the hon. gentleman has any fresh information as to the Kicking Horse Pass, beyond that which has been in the possession of Parliament for some time, it will be convenient for the House to be put in possession of that information; and particularly if he has—as I assume he obtained before he acceded to the proposition of the Company to invite Parliament to grant any authority of this description to the Governor in Council—if he has received from the Company those reports and plans and investigations which led them to the conclusion that they might expect to be able to get through the Kicking Horse Pass, these also ought to be before us. I assume that the hon. gentleman does not bring down this measure upon speculation, and without having called upon the Company to furnish him with all the information in their power, upon which they judge it proper to ask for this qualification in the terms of the bargain. That should be before him in order that he may judge whether they should have that qualification, and it should be before us in order that we may consider the subject in all the light which the experience and investigations of the Company may bring to bear upon it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I entirely concur in the reasonableness of all the hon. gentlemen has said in reference to this matter. On Tuesday next, or before, I expect to be able to lay on the Table of the House, and to place in the hon. gentleman's hands, not only the application of the Company for the change of location at the eastern end, but also the action of the Government upon that application. With regard to the location of the railway on the prairie, I may state that the Government have approved of the location only as far as Moose Jaw Creek, and we do not propose to authorize the location of any portion of the line west of Moose Jaw Creek, from which point it can easily be diverged to the Yellow Head Pass, until we are perfectly satisfied, not only of the feasibility of obtaining a line through the Kicking Horse Pass, but also of the desirability of that course being adopted in the interests of the country. The information obtained by the Company, while it has led them to be sanguine of being able to carry the line through the more southerly pass, has not been such as to enable me to arrive at the opinion that there is any strong probability of their being able to obtain a better pass through that part of the country. All the information in the possession of the Government on the subject will be laid before the House previous to asking any action upon it.

Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BUNSTER. I rise, as a question of privilege, to direct the hon. First Minister's attention to an injustice that was done to the ports of British Columbia last night by the Minister of Agriculture who said they were small ports.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. This is not a question of privilege.

Mr. BUNSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be allowed to put the Province right by informing the hon. Minister that the ports of British Columbia are not small ports, and I expect to be allowed to do it through you, inasmuch as I was cut short by the Chairman last evening. Now, I consider that the hon. Minister of Agriculture owes an apology to British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will have an opportunity of discussing that matter during the Session.

Mr. POPE. I accept the hon. gentleman's apology.

Mr. BUNSTER. I have not apologized to the hon. gentleman, and if the leader of the Government were here, he would probably insist upon the apology I am now demanding. Our ports are not small ports, as Her Majesty's fleet—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

56. Salaries Military Branch and District Staff..... \$20,480

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I perceive that a considerable reduction has been effected, and I would like to know how this has been done; also what the general policy of the Government is with respect to the officers whose salaries are included in this vote. I understand that the hon. gentleman has abolished several subordinate, and retained some eight or nine superior officers.

Mr. CARON. From the time that I took charge of this Department I considered that it was important to reduce as much as possible the expenditure on the staff, without at the same time interfering with the efficiency of the service. I believe that in Canada, with our militia force, it is important that we should give as much of the money which Parliament votes for militia purposes to the rank and file, and for drill, as we can; and the reductions in question have been made, I believe, without interfering with the efficiency of the service. We have reduced the staff by two Deputy Adjutants-General, of whom, instead of eleven, we have now nine. Colonel Laurie, who was Deputy Adjutant-General in British Columbia, resigned, and it is the intention of the Government to send a Deputy Adjutant-General out to replace him, but not to fill the vacancy which this will cause here on the staff by any new appointment. He will be replaced here by a Brigade Major, effecting in this manner a considerable saving. The Assistant Inspector of Artillery in Halifax resigned on the 28th February, 1881, and his office has not been filled. Another saving has been effected by the union of the positions of paymaster and store-keeper. Lieutenant Colonel Amyrauld, who was in No. 5 District as store-keeper, is replaced by Colonel De Bellefeuille, who will act both as store-keeper and paymaster. The reductions, consequently, comprise two Deputy Adjutants-General and one Assistant Inspector of Artillery, making a saving of \$1,700.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I should think that this would cause a saving of a great deal more than \$1,700; it should be nearly \$4,000.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman is quite right. The salaries of two Deputy Adjutants-General, at \$1,700 each, would make \$3,400, and with the salary of the Assistant Inspector of Artillery, \$1,200, altogether \$4,600.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would ask the hon. Minister if it is not possible to reduce the staff at headquarters. I see by the Civil Service Report that this was one of the reductions advocated by the Commission.

Mr. CARON. I consider that the staff at headquarters is a most efficient staff, and it has got as much work to do as it is possible for any staff to do perfectly. The staff at headquarters has already been reduced to its most extreme limit, and could not be further reduced without impairing its efficiency.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I could bring some facts to show that the reduction might properly be made. The staff have a great deal of work to do, but perhaps make a good deal of

that work themselves. I do not wish to find fault with the Department, but simply ask whether the Minister could not possibly make a reduction.

Mr. CARON. I do not see how it is possible to do so.

57. Brigade Majors' salaries, transport expenses,
&c..... \$17,500

Mr. CARON. The increase consists in the appointment of two additional Brigade Majors. Last year I thought it was possible to reduce the staff of Brigade Majors by two, but I have found since that it became necessary to re-appoint two Brigade Majors: one for Military District No. 8, headquarters at St. John, N.B., and the other for Military District No. 3, headquarters at Kingston. The reason of the appointment of the latter is the resignation of Colonel Laurie, which necessitated the appointment of a Brigade Major to replace him in British Columbia. As British Columbia is an important military station that cannot be left without such an officer, in case of any emergency.

Mr. ROSS. I cannot understand why the military service requires so many officials. As the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Domville) said a little while ago, the staff at headquarters is too large. It is large enough to run an army as great as that with which Napoleon conquered Austria years ago. Now we are to get additions to the staff of Brigade Majors. I greatly approved of the course of the hon. the Minister last year, which I thought indicated that he was going to dispense with Brigade Majors altogether. Had he followed that course I believe he would have acted in the interests of the service. The item is not heavy, being less than \$20,000 a year for the payment of Brigade Majors; still, if paid to the volunteers, it would be a much more judicious expenditure of money. Last year, or the year before, the hon. the Minister reduced the allowance paid to volunteers in a very peculiar way. Instead of allowing them for the day they were going to camp and the day returning, he did not allow them either of these days.

Mr. CARON. You make a mistake.

Mr. ROSS. If not last year, it was the year before that. If I can go back far enough, I can find the hon. gentleman making that rule. I am glad that he is now paying the volunteers for those two days, but at the same time I think that if he dispensed with the Brigade Majors the service would not suffer. I am aware there is some difficulty in dismissing officials who have rendered long and valuable service, but as the positions become vacant, through various causes, they should be allowed to remain vacant.

Mr. CARON. If Napoleon had not matured the plans of his campaign better than the hon. gentleman has stated the question, he, I am certain, would not have been so successful. The hon. gentleman has made several statements in connection with my Department which prove beyond doubt that he has not taken the trouble of looking into the facts, otherwise he would not have made those statements. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Militia force were not paid for the day of going into the camps of instruction or for the day of leaving the camp.

Mr. ROSS. I stated it was either last year, or the year before that, or the preceding year.

Mr. CARON. Of course, I limit my responsibility to the period I have been in charge of the Department. If I had to go beyond that I would have to assume responsibility for the acts of friends of the hon. gentleman, which I would not be prepared to assume at all. I can say that last year every militiaman who went into a camp of exercise was paid from the day of going in until the day he came out. As to the previous year, the hon. gentleman has stated on a former occasion that the money which Parliament voted—and I must say Parliament votes very liberally for militia purposes—had been, as a rule, distributed among the staff, and that

Mr. DOMVILLE.

the rank and file of the fighting men, if I may so call them, as they really are, did not have the share they were entitled to. Now, I will say to the hon. gentleman that if he had taken the trouble to look into the facts, he would not have made the statement he has made to-day. It will be found that in 1880-81 the following amounts were paid for each service in the Militia: A and B Batteries and School of Gunnery, \$114,909; militia schools and drill instruction in colleges, \$2,821; rifle associations, Dominion, Provincial and local, \$24,650; military stores, \$7,000; drill instruction, \$39,974; care of arms, \$26,160; annual drill, \$157,075; making altogether \$372,589, which has been paid out absolutely and completely on behalf of the rank and file, and extending military instruction to the very class who were entitled to get the money which Parliament voted. Now, if you take the total expenditure for 1880-81, of \$667,000, and deduct therefrom the amount as above detailed, of \$372,589, the balance represents the expenditure for military stores, drill sheds, and rifle ranges. I think it will be evident to the House that the hon. gentleman was in error in stating that the staff were receiving the larger portion of the money voted by Parliament, and the hon. gentleman himself will, I have no doubt, see that the rank and file are those who really get the largest portion of the money.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman has not indicated at all the line of action which the Department intends to take in connection with the service in the manner pointed out by myself a moment ago. I asked him as to the policy of the Government regarding the continuation of the service of Brigade Majors. Instead of answering, the hon. gentleman has endeavored to direct attention from that subject by charging me with ignorance of the details of the Department. I confess to my ignorance, and it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to instruct me on an occasion like this in reference to details about which information is asked. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to know as much of the details of the Department as the hon. gentleman. I do not have salutes fired for me when I go up and down at the expense of the country in order to view the camps and see the soldiers being drilled under the hot sun. I will again ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to continue the policy inaugurated last year respecting Brigade Majors and Deputy Adjutants-General?

Mr. CARON. I am, of course, entirely willing to give the hon. gentleman the information asked for. As to my trip to the west, I may say that I was very glad to meet the friends of the hon. gentleman who extended to me such grand hospitality, and I am very sorry, indeed, that during my visit I had not an opportunity of meeting the hon. gentleman himself. As to my travelling at the cost of the country, it is not often that I am accused of not paying my own expenses. If the hon. gentleman chooses to make enquiry, he will find that my personal expenses were paid out of my own pocket; and I do not regret the money so expended, as it gave me an opportunity of meeting the hon. gentleman's friends. As to the question of my hon. friend regarding Brigade Majors, I would have told him in the beginning, if I had not been diverted from it by his charges about the money having been expended altogether on the staff. I told him there had been a reduction made last year in the staff of Brigade Majors, but that two new appointments were being made in their places. This fact must have been sufficient to indicate that it is not the policy of the Government to abolish the Brigade Majors. Of course, I did not consult my hon. friend before arriving at that conclusion. I did not consider the efficiency of the service would be served by completely abolishing Brigade Majors or reducing the number. I believe it is the imperative duty of the Minister to reduce the staff in every possible way. The reductions that are being made in the staff of the Department, providing

they do not interfere with the efficiency of the staff, should be carried out; but I do not believe in making it inefficient by reducing the staff to an enormous extent, for if it became useless the people's money would be wasted, whereas now it is properly expended.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I did not wish to be severe, unkind or uncivil. The hon. gentleman must attribute a good deal of what I said to the tone in which he met my exceedingly kind enquiries with respect to his Department. I wish to settle a matter, either of veracity or accuracy, between us, and I do not do so in any supercilious or invidious manner. In the contingencies of the Department there is an item of \$504, travelling expenses. That payment may be quite right—I have no objection to it—but I am making this statement to justify the remarks I offered, that I might not have offered under different circumstances.

58. Ammunition, including artillery ammunition and the manufacture of small arms ammunition at the Cartridge Factory at Quebec..... \$25,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What have become of the guns which were manufactured at Montreal for the use of the Dominion? Some two years ago a predecessor of the hon. gentleman ordered some great guns to be made at Montreal. It was an experiment which was watched with interest, but we have not heard whether the guns have got into action or not. I shall be glad to receive some details from the hon. Minister.

Mr. CARON. Before answering this question I desire to refer to the matter of veracity mentioned by the hon. member for Middlesex, as I do not wish to be misunderstood as to the expenses which I claimed. The expenses of the officers who accompanied me on visiting the different camps were charged to the Department; and fourteen camps having been held in the different Provinces from Ontario to Nova Scotia, I think every hon. gentleman will admit that \$500 would not indicate any very great extravagance. My own private expenses were paid by myself, and I will say more, that having private passes on several of the railways, I did not make any charge. As regards the guns, I have been sadly disappointed as to the contract, which I do not mean to say has not been a success, because it is impossible to know yet whether it will be a success or not. My predecessor, Mr. Masson, who always paid great attention to any matters which he took in hand, bestowed particular attention on the subject of the conversion of old guns in Montreal. On more than one occasion I went down myself, to see how the contract was being carried out. The delay can be explained in more ways than one. Several experiments were taking place in England in converting guns, and letters were received from Sir William Palliser by my Department, stating that such experiments were in progress. Gilbert & Co., of Montreal, who have the contract for converting our guns, wrote to me, stating that, under the circumstances, it would be in the interests of Canada, as far as the conversion of guns was concerned, to wait until the experiments to which I have referred had been made in England. I thought so myself. Major-General Strange, and several officers of A and B Batteries, at my particular request visited Montreal, and inspected the guns, and they all agreed upon the propriety of waiting until we knew the results of the English experiments. The contract has been going on, and, according to the last report from Montreal, the guns will be perfected within two months.

Mr. CASEY. Is artillery ammunition manufactured at Quebec?

Mr. CARON. No.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the manufacture of small arms ammunition I should like to know what is the cost of that ammunition manufactured in Canada as compared with

the cost of importing it from the small arms factory at home.

Mr. CARON. The artillery ammunition we obtain from the Imperial Government at cost price. As regards small arms ammunition made in this country, the advantage arising from possessing the Canadian factory is simply this: The hon. gentleman, being a rifleman himself and taking a great deal of interest in militia matters, knows perfectly well how important it is to have this ammunition as fresh as possible; and besides, by having the factory in Quebec we save a lot of money which is annually spent in keeping up our reserve. So far as our stores are concerned, by having a factory in Canada we can manufacture just about the quantity of ammunition which we require for the service without having to send over to England or accumulate a large quantity in our stores until it becomes impaired in quality.

Mr. CASEY. A year or two does not make much difference as to ammunition.

Mr. CARON. Yes; but when you have to let it accumulate for several years it makes a great deal of difference, not so much to the ammunition as to the Treasury.

Mr. CASEY. I did not know that it was the custom formerly to import several years ammunition together, as I should have thought that it would be imported several times during the year and in moderate quantities, so that there would be no great loss of interest by keeping a store on hand. Still there is a good deal of force in the statement that by having a factory at home it can be manufactured as it is required. It is important to know whether the ammunition is of uniform strength with the regulation ammunition, because that makes a great difference in the shooting of men.

Mr. WRIGHT. And the shooting of cows too.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, and the shooting of cows. Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that the ammunition at present served out is supplied from this factory?

Mr. CARON. No; we have not manufactured yet, but we expect to manufacture this year about 1,000,000 rounds of cartridge; so that if the hon. gentleman has failed in his shooting he must put the blame down to the old ammunition.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understand my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) did not fail in his shooting.

Mr. CASEY. I understood, from the item being repeated in this way, that it was a continuation of the expenditure. The uniformity of strength is, however, a most important matter, because when the men go to the matches if the regulation ammunition is slightly weaker or slightly stronger than they are accustomed to, it will greatly impair their chances of success. I suppose that under this head would come up the armament of our volunteers—the nature of the arm which should be served out to them. I think a change in the arm could be made gradually in this way: A certain number of Snider rifles become unserviceable each year, and if a note were kept of the number returned as unserviceable, when this number reached a certain point, a battalion could have the old arms replaced by Martini rifles or other improved arms. It would be a great inducement to the volunteers to perfect themselves in drill and in shooting if the prospect was held out to them that the reward of efficiency would be the substitution of an improved weapon. There would be very little increase in cost, because the old rifles would have to be replaced at any rate, and I understand that there is little difference in the price of Snider and Martini rifles. Another point to which I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention is the waste of ammunition which takes place at the annual drill of the volunteers. Men are taken out in squads, who have not, perhaps, handled a rifle for a year and who are not perhaps in good condition to handle it then. They are

allowed to blaze away at the targets, and after firing a certain number of rounds, they are put down as having gone through their target practice. A great deal of ammunition is wasted in this way, and I think the only means by which this waste could be avoided would be to induce the officers to look carefully after the target practices.

Mr. BROWN. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia if some reduction could not be made in the price of the ammunition sold by the Department to the associations and to those practicing for matches. At present the cost which amounts to about \$20 a thousand, is a serious item to the men as they would soon expend their day's wages in ammunition. Every encouragement should be given to the men to become thoroughly acquainted with the use of the rifle. It is of a great deal more importance to be well up in the use of the rifle than it is to be up in company or any other kind of drill, as the man who is not thoroughly up in rifle practice is of very little use in drill and still less for active service. A return might be kept of the ammunition served out at a reduced cost to non-commissioned officers for practice in squads, and thereby less would be wasted at annual drill. My hon. friend from West Elgin speaks of men going to practice who have perhaps never had a rifle in their hands before, and getting forty or fifty rounds of ammunition, which they fire away without knowing where the bullet goes to. Then, with regard to the quality of the ammunition, a few years ago a very inferior quality of ammunition was used. To show the importance of good ammunition, I may mention that the 49th Battalion were challenged to a match by a regiment from Oswego, who were furnished with the Remington rifle and the best class of ammunition. The manufacturers furnished the crack New York team with both rifles and ammunition as an advertisement. Our men used the Snider-Enfield rifle, and the Oswego team beat them. I made application to the Department for Martini-Henry rifles, and when our men got them, they went to Oswego and beat the Oswego team. That shows the advantage of having a good article. It is very important that the quality of the ammunition should be looked after; if men have good rifles and good ammunition, they will take a pride in their practice, and a few days practice will greatly improve their shooting. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if there is any way of getting rifles repaired when they are injured, and where they are to be sent to.

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) I would say that I am very anxious to replace the old rifles by the Martini-Henry, but we have a large supply of the old rifles in store. What I am endeavoring to do is gradually to replace these rifles by the Martini-Henry, and at present there is a correspondence going on between the Department and a firm in Liverpool—Meyer & Co.—who wish to buy the old Enfield rifles from us. Of course, it would not be right for us to give them up at a very great sacrifice, but anything I can do in that direction I am endeavoring to do. As to the ammunition: what the hon. gentleman says is perfectly correct. I believe that in the camps and in rifle practice, a great deal of ammunition is uselessly expended, and the suggestion made by my hon. friend has already been taken into consideration by the Department, and instructions will be given to the officers commanding the different corps to pay particular attention to this matter. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Brown) asks whether it would not be possible for the Department to give the ammunition at a reduced price. The Department have been really doing all that is possible to do in that respect; we are giving out the ammunition to the associations at cost price, not including the freight, which the Department pays. I have every

Mr. CASEY.

reason to hope, that when the Canadian factory is completed, we may possibly be able to reduce the price. Although this \$25,000 may look to be a large amount, we pay to the Receiver-General a considerable amount of money in the shape of the ammunition which we distribute among the forces.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister give us any idea what he expects to manufacture this small-bore ammunition for?

Mr. CARON. The factory is not yet completed, but we are now working on the building and getting all the instruments that are required to test the ammunition to be manufactured. With the information in the possession of the Department at present, it would not be possible to state what would be the exact cost; but, from the information I have received from Major Prevost, who was sent to England for the purpose of taking a regular course at Woolwich and obtaining all the instructions that would fit him to take charge of our factory, I believe we can manufacture it a little below what it would cost in England. The following amounts have been deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General in 1880-81: For ammunition, \$11,598.67; for clothing, \$722; and for military stores, \$1,222, making altogether \$13,542. Of course, I need not say that I do not complain at all of the grants which Parliament has voted for the militia; but it will be seen that a large amount of this money—nearly \$15,000—is paid into the revenue out of my Department.

Mr. CASEY. The total outlay for ammunition being \$25,000, the actual cost to the Treasury is \$14,000, or thereabouts, \$11,000 being repaid by those who buy the ammunition. In view of this fact, I think the request of my hon. friend from West Hastings is very reasonable—that a certain fixed amount of ammunition should be sold to each rifle association or each battalion association even at less than cost.

Mr. CARON. We sell the ammunition at present at less than cost. We pay the freight.

Mr. CASEY. I mean at considerably less than cost; in other words, that the Department could well afford it, and the House and the country would not object to give a certain amount of free ammunition besides that which is now granted to the different rifle associations, because it is only in competitive shooting of this kind that any real skill in the use of the rifle is obtained. The ordinary practice in camps does not produce skill. Some time since, small prizes were given to the best shot in the battalion or in the company. I am not aware that this was done last year, but it was a system which worked very well, and at a comparatively small cost. It created a certain spirit of emulation, and prevented the careless waste which goes on when the men are shooting merely as a matter of duty. I think that this matter is worthy of consideration.

Mr. CARON. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that the vote of \$25,000 also includes artillery ammunition, which makes a further and considerable reduction. From what I have been able so far to gather, I have every hope that when our factory is completed, and we manufacture our own ammunition, it will be possible for us to deal still more liberally with these rifle associations. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that I anxiously desire to help those associations in every possible way. I think that we cannot do too much in this direction.

Mr. BROWN. Where can the men get their arms repaired?

Mr. CARON. We have fully efficient armorers, who are paid by the Government, at Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, Quebec, and Halifax, where, on the arms being sent, they will be repaired in a first-class manner. We also bear the charges of transportation.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How many suits does the hon. gentleman expect to buy with these \$50,000?

Mr. CARON. The amount provides for the purchase of upwards of 6,000 suits of uniforms. The prices of the military clothing supplied by C. and J. Webb & Co., of England, are, for dragoon suits, \$9.10; infantry, \$8.47; rifles, \$8.80.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How much do boots and great coats cost?

Mr. CARON. No boots are supplied to the militia, though I think we should have a supply of boots in case we should call out the militia on an emergency. The great coats cost \$5.80, and are manufactured at the Kingston Penitentiary, where there was a contract existing when I came into the Department.

Mr. CASEY. What number of great coats have been supplied?

Mr. CARON. Five thousand.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How long were these suits supposed to last?

Mr. CARON. We expect the uniform served out last year will last five years.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think there is a civil question which may very well be asked, as well as all these military questions that have been asked. Why is it that purchases of clothing for the forces of the Dominion are made in what is commercially a foreign country? Why is the clothing not made of Canadian cloth? Has the hon. Minister of Militia no faith in the National Policy? Does he absolutely disregard the utterances of all his colleagues on this important question? Does he, because his Department happens to be exempt from Customs duties, venture to go into a foreign country with the money of the people of Canada and purchase clothing which ought to be made in Canada by Canadian hands? This is a serious question. In purchasing clothing for the Canadian militia in Great Britain they declare that the National Policy is a sham and a humbug; that the Government who are administering the affairs of the country have no faith in it; that they are not true to their own professions; that they do not themselves believe in their own professions. Surely it is preposterous for this Government which spends the money of the people, in buying where they can buy cheapest and what is most suitable, to tell other people that they must not spend their own money where they choose and buy what they believe to be best suited for their purposes. Let the hon. gentleman explain to this country why he makes these purchases in Great Britain, and why the only persons employed in the Dominion to make up any portion of the militia clothing, are the convicts of the penitentiary? Are there none others fit to be employed? Does he mean to place convicts in the same rank as the artisans of Great Britain? Hon. gentlemen opposite go into ecstasies whenever they talk of the glorious benefits of the National Policy. The National Policy is the be-all and the end-all, the great weapon and the great object of legislation of the present day. Yet, I suppose they must have been surprised, I dare say they must have been shocked, when they found the hon. Minister reading an account in shillings and pence which evidently led at once to the conclusion that this clothing was not made and purchased in Canada. Have we not Canadian sheep growing Canadian wool? Have we not skilled weavers in this Canada of ours capable of manufacturing Canadian cloth? Have we not in this country men skilled to dye and scour Canadian wool? Have we not tailors fit to cut cloth for our Canadian militia? If we have all these, why is the hon. Minister permitted to go abroad to purchase cloth not made in Canada, made by men who never saw Canada, to send out of Canada the money of this country, the money which the acting Minister of Marine

tells us we ought to keep in this country at all hazards? Bring gold into Canada, says the hon. Minister of Marine, send gold out of Canada, says the hon. Minister of Militia, and buy abroad the clothing for our militia. If there is any good reason why the National Policy should be set aside in this instance, should be trampled under foot in this instance—why a gentleman holding the high official position of the hon. the Minister of Militia should set so bad an example to the people of this country—then I say we ought to know what those reasons are. Would it not be profitable to devise means, by a change in the Tariff, to compel the hon. the Minister of Militia to be true to the National Policy—true to the policy of his colleagues—and not set so monstrous an example, calculated as it is to create discontent and dissatisfaction, and to create the impression that the hon. the Ministers themselves, though they talk National Policy when they think it suits their purposes, laugh at the whole thing in their sleeves.

Mr. CARON. I am happy to see that we have one more convert to the National Policy. I have heard the hon. gentleman speak on more than one occasion, and I must say that he never convinced me so much as he has to-day. I am glad to see that, leaving aside all his utterances heretofore, he is now ready to stand by us in supporting the National Policy.

Mr. ANGLIN. Stand by which of you?

Mr. CARON. I am perfectly certain that, if it had been possible to carry out the views expressed by the hon. gentleman, it would have been done by my Department, as I am as great a believer in the National Policy as the hon. gentleman. He knows that most of our infantry must be dressed in scarlet cloth. The hon. gentleman says there can be no trouble at all in having the wool dyed scarlet. The hon. gentleman has not gone so far in favor of the National Policy as I have, because I went to the trouble of ascertaining whether it was possible to have the wool dyed scarlet in Canada. I enquired from gentlemen who have been in the business for many years, and found that it was quite impossible. I ascertained from gentlemen, like Mr. Patton and others, who have long been in the business, that the process of dyeing scarlet was so difficult and so peculiar, that it required a separate establishment for that purpose, or the suspension of all other dyeing processes in any of our established dye-houses; and that the quantity of clothing required in Canada was so small, that it would not be worth the while of any manufacturer to go to all this trouble. All the manufacturers with whom I communicated said that it would be necessary to suspend their ordinary business for a certain time if they attempted to dye scarlet. It is well known that in England there is a large demand for military clothing of this description, and this demand, combined with the demand from continental nations, is sufficient to support large factories in England for this special industry. It may be a question as to whether it would not be advisable to adopt another style of uniform for our Canadian militia force, so as to allow it being manufactured in Canada. Under the circumstances economy required that this clothing should be purchased in England.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is a little painful to see my hon. friend carrying his animosity to Canadian *rouges* to such an extent. I did not expect that of him. I thought better of him than of some of his colleagues, but I was not prepared for this exhibition of extreme partizanship. I think my hon. friend might partly have told us that the reason which influences him as a capable administrator in getting these things in England is not that they can be got there cheaper and better. Here is a pretty clear proof from the hon. Ministers themselves that this Tariff adds enormously to the cost of clothing the people of Canada. You cannot clothe these militia men within a third as cheaply by using Canadian

clothing as you can by getting the clothing in England. The hon. Minister is quite right from his point of view as an administrator. He goes where he can get the clothing the best and the cheapest, and why should the people of Canada not be permitted to do the same?

Mr. BERGIN. We are constantly hearing from the other side of the House that goods cannot be purchased in Canada as cheaply as in the Old Country. Now, this may be true in some classes of goods, and it certainly is true as regards scarlet cloth required for the uniforms of our volunteers. I have given a good deal of attention to this matter. I have been in communication with the different manufacturers on this subject, because I was anxious—far more so than the hon. gentlemen opposite who talk merely in irony—that this cloth should be made in Canada. Upon full enquiry I found that the statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia this afternoon was entirely correct. I was shown through the manufactory at Cornwall by the manager, who proved to me beyond cavil that it was impossible that such cloth could be produced in this country, unless at an immense sacrifice on the part of the company that undertook to manufacture it. He showed it would be necessary for the purpose of making this cloth, so as to be free from stain or defect of any kind, that they should alter their dye-house; that they should thoroughly clean every part of their factory through which that cloth would pass in the different processes of manufacture so as to eliminate all other colored products, no matter how trifling the quantity of cloth required might be. It was impossible to do this so as to obtain returns for themselves, and at the same time charge a price which the Government could afford to pay, because the quantity required would be so small they could not afford to make the necessary changes in their machinery. Everybody who knows anything about manufacturing must be aware that if changes are to be made in the machinery of a large factory it can only be done at an immense price. The hon. Minister of Militia, therefore, was perfectly justified in going to the Old Country for this kind of cloth. If we required an immense quantity of that cloth, as is the case in the older countries, then a factory could be devoted to the purpose of producing it; but it is monstrous to suppose that people are going to sacrifice large sums of money for a mere sentiment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGIN. Those hon. gentlemen do not seem to be aware that when they are applauding they are signifying their own shame; that they are showing to the country there is no honesty in anything they say. They tell us in one breath they are inspired by an ardent desire to economize, that their sole object is to save the money of the country, and in the next breath they tell us that their entire desire is—although everybody knows it is not true—to see everything manufactured in this country that can be manufactured here. If hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to impale themselves on this horn of the dilemma, that it is going to cost too much to buy scarlet cloth here, then they can impale themselves on the other horn. In any event, they are always doing that, and I do not suppose we on this side of the House can offer any great objection.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is not very long since the hon. gentleman was on this side of the House, and as he has had hardly time to become familiar with his new quarters he should not abuse his old friends, at least before he has become better acquainted with his new ones. I understand the difficulty which arises in regard to obtaining scarlet cloth, and I quite approve of obtaining the supply where it can be got best and cheapest. But that is not the question. The question is, that hon. gentlemen opposite intended, as they said, that everything should be produced that could be produced in this country.

Sir RICHARD J. CASTWRIGHT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The cry was: "Canada for the Canadians; let us manufacture for our own market and keep our money here." But I want to ask the hon. the First Minister whether it is not a fact that a comparatively small portion of cloth required for militia purposes is scarlet? Has the blue cloth been obtained from England or been manufactured here? I believe there is not more than one-quarter or one-fifth of the cloth required, scarlet cloth. The hon. Minister has not explained why he gave the preference to criminal labor in obtaining some articles from penitentiaries? This is the second time I have been compelled to call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. Minister has deliberately sacrificed free labor to prison labor, that he takes money from the honest artisan by having work done by criminals in the penitentiaries.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman has spoken as if no other kinds of cloth, scarlet always excluded, were being manufactured here. We have had cloth manufactured here for great-coats, but I think probably we have not been able to obtain it at as low a price as it could be got from England. Every one knows that the price at which it can be furnished varies according to the quantity manufactured, and we do not require such immense quantities here as at home, so the chances are we shall be obliged to pay more. I am not, however, now certain that the cloth manufactured here cost more than it would have done if obtained from England; but this I do know, that if we paid one cent a yard more for cloth manufactured here than the price at which it could have been obtained from the Old Country, hon. gentlemen opposite would have been the first to find fault, although to day they are so patriotic as to desire that we should manufacture all the cloth required in the country. The hon. member for Lambton has said it was not long since I had left the other side of the House. I do not think I have complained because I left the other side. I think I have lost nothing and the country has gained something. I left a party which was no credit to the country and certainly no advantage to it. During the five years it held power it failed to carry out a single promise it had made when in Opposition; there was not a single principle which it advocated when in Opposition that it did not falsify when in power. If I were to go on, as I might go, and if I desired to take up the time of the House in speaking as hon. gentlemen opposite desired, for the purpose of occupying time, I could show to the satisfaction of the country how utterly unworthy were hon. gentlemen opposite of the support of any honest man. I might carry the war into Africa in a manner which would not present those hon. gentlemen in a creditable light, and when the hon. member for Lambton taunts me with having moved to this side of the House, the hon. gentleman forgets that all round and about him in 1876, long after I left the Reform party, were howling protectionists, and to-day they are ready to rat again from Free Trade, and some of them are already talking about a 20 per cent. Tariff. They are almost altogether forgetting their revenue Tariff and they are ready to go back to where they were before; in fact, they would become stronger protectionists than we are if they thought by that means they could carry the next elections.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not import foreign matters into the discussion, except so far as to say that the hon. member for Cornwall had not so long left our ranks that he could afford to attack his old friends. It is quite true the late Government failed in some respects—they failed to make the hon. gentleman a Minister.

Mr. BERGIN. Let me take this opportunity of saying that I never asked them to make me a Minister, and I defy the hon. gentleman to prove that I did.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No doubt that was a very signal failure on the part of the Government, in the hon. gentleman's opinion. I wish now to say a word to the hon. Finance Minister. I think I heard that hon. gentleman say a moment ago that I desired to spend the time of the House—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That you wanted to make long speeches.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am as anxious as the hon. gentleman can be to get through the business of the House as rapidly as possible, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say anything such as he has just said. It is unworthy of his position. He is here, at the present moment, the senior member of the Government, and it ill becomes him to make such a remark of any member; and, for my own part, I do not intend that he shall use such language towards me with impunity. I have never, at any time during the period I have been in Parliament, occupied the time of the House at any greater length than I can possibly avoid, and I have always endeavored to avoid making unnecessary speeches. What I wished to ask the hon. Minister of Militia was this: if he could not procure the dark colored cloth in this country and get the clothes made up here as well as they could be made in England. The late Government did this to a great extent, and they also made an attempt to get the scarlet cloth, and though it was not quite equal to the English, we used a considerable quantity of it nevertheless.

Mr. CARON. After the feeling exhibited on the other side of the House in favor of the National Policy, I have no doubt that some of our capitalists will invest their money in a factory where these tunics, &c., can be made. The reason I referred more particularly to scarlet cloth was that, out of the whole number of uniforms imported from England, two-thirds are scarlet, and if the hon. gentleman will consult any business man who has investigated the matter, he will find that it is impossible to get this scarlet cloth made in Canada. It is impossible, because you cannot get the manufacturers to manufacture it, from the simple fact that the demand is very small indeed. As to the other uniform, that is an exceptional case, and however anxious I may be to see everything manufactured in Canada that can be manufactured, there are circumstances which every man who knows Canada and who knows England is aware are beyond the control of any Government or legislation in this country. In England there are manufactured in these factories not only the uniforms for the British service, but they have large contracts for continental armies, so that they can manufacture them at a much cheaper price than could be possible in Canada. The policy of the Government is not to attempt to produce an article which would be perfectly useless to the great mass of the people of Canada, and as this article is a specialty, of which only a very small number would be required to supply the force—which by the way I hope still further to reduce—it is perfectly right that we should buy the cloth where we can get it better and more suitable to our necessities than if it were manufactured here.

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

After Recess.

Mr. ANGLIN. When the Speaker left the Chair I rose to say that I must protest against the assumption of the hon. the Minister of Militia that, because I favor the employment of Canadian workmen in preparing to make up the clothing for the Militia, I ought to be regarded as an advocate of the National Policy. It is an assumption of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, at all times, that they and they only are the friends of the working people of Canada; that they and they only desire to see the working people

of Canada, well, fully and profitably employed; but when any real test arises, when any opportunity is presented of putting their professions on trial, it is generally found that their professions and practices do not quite accord. I say that we are and we always have been the real and true, and the only real and true friends of the working people of Canada. We would, in fact, cease to be a Liberal party; we would cease to have the slightest claims to the name of Liberals, if we were not earnestly, and sincerely, and honestly, and at all times the friends of the working people and the masses. The financial policy of the late Administration was a revenue policy, and the hon. Ministers endeavored, so far as they could, to get this clothing for the Canadian militia at home. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) says that they found it rather difficult to procure the scarlet cloth suitable in all respects made in Canada. For my own part, I cannot see, if the rest of the people of this country are to be compelled either to wear what the manufacturers of this country can produce or pay a heavy penalty for wearing anything else, why the volunteers also should not be expected to wear the articles that can be produced in the country. Why are they, Sir, to be clothed in brilliant hues while the rest of the people must be content with such clothes and dyes as can be manufactured here? For my own part, I think it would be rather a mark of honor than otherwise if there were a few specks or spots on the red coats of our militia, as they could be pointed to as evidence that they were willing to make some little sacrifice of appearance for the sake of employing Canadians to make up this clothing. The hon. Minister of Militia takes entirely different ground; he takes the ground of an extreme free trader, and asserts that it is not only his right, but his duty, having due regard for economy, to buy this clothing where he can get it best and cheapest. A more ultra Free Trade doctrine than that was never propounded in the Canadian Parliament. Moreover, he told us that England furnished the best and cheapest clothing for her own soldiers and militia, and also that continental countries got their clothing from England—those countries which are revelling in the advantages of high protective Tariffs, and which, we have been told, were competing with England in these very articles in which she has enjoyed the supremacy for centuries. That is a piece of information for which we have to thank the hon. gentleman; it is another argument, and a very conclusive argument, against the policy which hon. gentlemen are so loud in professing, but which they do not carry into practice. We on this side, as I have said, are the true friends of the working people; we do earnestly desire that all that can be reasonably and properly done in the way of securing employment at remunerative wages for the people of Canada, ought to be done. Another point, which was referred to by the hon. member for Lambton, is that even if it is admitted that scarlet cloth cannot be made in Canada so well as in England, yet scarlet cloth forms but a small proportion of the cloth used in the service. The hon. Minister of Militia stated that two-thirds of all the tunics are scarlet. Therefore one-third of all the tunics and the whole of the trowserings are made of a kind of cloth which can very well and properly be made in Canada. There is, moreover, this extraordinary fact, that the hon. Minister not only procured the cloth in England, but had it made up in England; neither he nor his colleagues seem to believe that the mechanics or seamstresses of Canada are able to make up clothing fit to be worn by the Canadian militia. The hon. gentleman says, and perhaps truly, that that work can be done more cheaply in England; but is cheapness to be an element in the consideration of a matter of this kind by hon. gentlemen who call themselves advocates of a National Policy? This is a comparatively small matter in one sense, but in another sense it is a very important matter, because it is one of the

cases by which the earnestness and sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the soundness of their principles, are thoroughly tested, and by which their principles are proved to be the very reverse of what is sound, or just, or reliable.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have been informed that a commission or board of officers not very long ago reported to the hon. the Minister of Militia in favor of supplying uniforms at cost price to the commissioned officers of the force—either uniforms or cloth suitable to make the uniforms. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he intends to carry out this recommendation. I think it would be very desirable to do so, as many of the officers have enough expenses to meet without incurring the additional expense of clothing themselves with the proper uniform.

Mr. CARON. As the enquiry to which the hon. gentleman refers took place during the busy period of the Session, I have not been able to examine the report—although I have read it—sufficiently to decide what action should be taken in the matter. The hon. gentleman has had a question on the paper on this subject, which he kindly put off a couple of times at my request, because I thought I might possibly be able to take this matter up. If the hon. gentleman wishes, however, I am perfectly willing to place the report of that Commission on the Table of the House.

60	Allowance for Drill Instruction.....	\$ 40,000
	Drill Pay and other incidental expenses connected with the drill and training of the Militia	250,000

Mr. DAWSON. While the Estimates are being criticised by the representatives of different sections, there is apparently nothing to be said for the district I represent. Last year when the Estimates were under discussion, I called attention to the fact that the very large and extensive district of Algoma had scarcely any militia organization—that there was only half of a company in the whole of that district. The hon. Minister was kind enough at that time to say that the matter would be taken into consideration, and I understood him to say that Algoma would be placed on the same footing as the other districts in the Province. We have a very large district extending for 600 miles along the frontier, and we have a very considerable population at Sault Ste. Marie, and eastward thereof we have no less than 13,000 and to the westward of Sault Ste. Marie and up to the height of land, we have 8,000, making in all 21,000 in Algoma. What I claim is this: that while a certain expenditure is made for militia purposes throughout the Dominion, Algoma should have its fair share of it. We have many young men who are very anxious to form volunteer companies at Prince Arthur's Landing, they have tried to do so for some years; and at Sault Ste. Marie and on Manitoulin Island, the same strong desire exists; and why this extensive district should be entirely left out in the cold in this respect, I cannot conceive, except it is on the ground that this is a new district, and that it has never before come under the attention of the Government or brought to their notice, although, every year, we have had more or less to say on this subject. I hope, however, that the hon. Minister of Militia, who seems so willing and so ready to do the best he possibly can, and who seems to have given such general satisfaction in what he has done, will not now lose sight of the strong claims of Algoma for his best consideration.

Mr. COCKBURN. I merely wish to advance the claims of my district in this particular. We have a large population, and we are very desirous of an opportunity to form effective volunteer companies.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I will not try to answer the charge which the hon. gentleman brought against me. He said I made the statement that a small portion of the money

Mr. ANGLIN.

which is paid for militia purposes went directly to the volunteers; and he answered this by reading a statement to the House to the effect that about one-half of the appropriation for Militia and Defence went to the volunteers.

Mr. CARON. The proportion is greater than that.

Mr. ROSS. What I objected to last year, and proposed to call attention to this year, is the large amount of money paid, and the small portion of it which seems to be and is expended directly on the training of our militia. The only object this House can have in voting money for this purpose, as I understand it, is that those who prefer to enter the service can receive such attention, and drill and instruction as will fit them, on the emergency arising, to defend the country. But here we are, voting \$750,000 for Militia and Defence, and only \$250,000 is expended for the drilling of our Canadian volunteers. I am quite aware that the same disproportion existed in former years, and under the previous Administration; but, it is no reason however, Sir, why the hon. Minister of Militia, who, I am quite satisfied, is quite competent to devise the ways and means, should not devise ways and means for changing the whole system. I am aware that the subject is surrounded with difficulties, that the staff is very extensive, that the staff of the city is very expensive, and that the officers require large salaries, and that all along the line there seems to be a large expenditure; but should not the Minister devise some less expensive means by which, when the House votes \$750,000, those who are bearing the heat and the burden of the day, at serious inconvenience to themselves, would receive a larger proportion? I think the pay of a volunteer is 50 cents a day. Could not the hon. gentleman devise some way whereby a more thorough drill could be given to our young men, who enter the service and who are called out for ten or twelve days yearly at much inconvenience to themselves, and who should obtain a larger remuneration? I am of opinion myself that our drill is not very effective. I am not saying that the officers are not anxious to do their duty, but I fear that the time spent in camp is not sufficient to make the drill very valuable. Besides, there seems to be such a want of fixity about those who enlist in the service, that we are hardly able to retain the same persons in the service for three years in succession. I am told that in filling up some of the companies, it is very difficult to get volunteers to continue in the service more than the few days which they spend in camp for drill. If the service is going to be efficient, it certainly requires more than twelve days drill to make it of any value to the country whatever. One of two things ought to be done: Either a fewer number of men should be drilled, and drilled for a longer time, and greater inducements should be offered volunteers to enter the service, or we should vote a large sum of money for this purpose. I do not think that the necessities of the country require a larger appropriation. I am not in the least alarmed as to the security of this country. I am not afraid of an invasion from any quarter. I believe that we can live at peace with all men; but if the House is disposed to vote such a large sum of money as would give a more thorough and effective drill for a fewer number of men, it should make the necessary arrangements. We have no object in assuming that we have a standing army of 20,000, or even 40,000 men, unless we have reason to believe that these men are drilled in such a way as to make them effective in case of necessity. It would be far better for the country and the service if a fewer number of men were called out and drilled more effectively. I think that the hon. Minister would secure a greater fixity and permanency in the service, if he were able to pay the men more liberally than is the case at the present moment. I know that many are obliged to give up positions, worth from \$1.50 to \$2 a day, in order to expend a certain time in camp at 50 cents a day,

at a serious loss to themselves under certain circumstances; and I call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia to these facts—not to obtain an immediate remedy, but in order that he may take the matter under his consideration, as no doubt he will do. I hope that he will feel that in making these criticisms we are actuated more by a desire to aid him than to find fault. If there is reason for finding fault, I do so unhesitatingly, but, at the same time, I would like it to be understood that in making these criticisms and in offering these suggestions, it is done with a view to improve the service rather than for any other purpose.

Mr. BUNSTER. I think that the expenditure which is proposed for this purpose is liberal for every Province with the exception of British Columbia, for which none is intended, and it is unfair that the farthest Province of the Dominion should be so totally neglected by the hon. the Minister of Militia. I have been met with the answer that we should furnish the lot and half the expense. The citizens of Nanaimo are pretty well prepared to furnish the lot and comply with the demand of the Department. The hon. Minister of Militia has been always so busily engaged that he promises to give Nanaimo his attention later on. I hope it will not always be later on, but that by this time twelve months he will see fit to do justice to that outlying Province. We had a first rate officer there who was not treated with that courtesy, not by the hon. Minister of Militia, but by other persons in the Province, to which he was entitled. Our volunteers insist upon having a first-class officer appointed to instruct them; otherwise, I fear our volunteer corps will not have that success which the Militia Department, and particularly the hon. Minister of Militia, would wish it to have. I hope the hon. Minister will take this into his serious consideration and give us a first-class officer to instruct the rising young men of our Province, who are willing to give their time to their country.

Mr. BROWN. I beg to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to the recommendation in the report of the Major-General with regard to enlisting volunteers for three years, giving them 25 cents for the first, 50 cents the second and 75 cents the last year. I trust the hon. Minister will not adopt that suggestion. I do not think that any one in Canada, either before or after the harvest, would work for 25 cents a day—twelve days time. The hon. Minister, I think, should give at this time, when labor is so high, 75 cents per day.

Mr. CARON. So far we have not adopted in this Department the suggestion of the Major-General, though I do not know what that suggestion may lead to later. The hon. gentleman mentioned, and I think properly, that the number of days drill are not sufficient, and I am glad to tell the hon. gentleman that, when the present Government came into power, we increased the number from eight to twelve days. If Parliament chooses to act with the same liberality in the future, as it has in the past, we will give our militia men sixteen days drill, including the two days coming and returning, which I think would be quite ample.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister has not told us what he proposes to do with those \$150,000. Does he propose to have camps in the various Provinces? I saw some rumors in the papers that he intended having a grand demonstration in Kingston, or some other place.

Mr. HOUDE. I wish to say that it is not desirable so much money should be expended in the way it is proposed by the hon. gentleman, more for parade than practical purposes. I think this year a greater number of battalions of the militia force should be drilled, and that the drill should not be confined to the city and frontier battalions.

Many of the rural battalions are not drilled, because the force of a company is fixed at forty men. I think it would be better to reduce the number to twenty-four men, so that rural battalions might have the benefit of instruction.

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. member for Centre Huron, I may say that the money will not be spent for a review in Kingston or anywhere else. I believe those reviews are well worth the money they cost, because militia men prepare for them by going into extra drill for which they do not get any pay. However, I had to cut my coat according to my cloth, and after investigating what the cost of a review would be, I found it would amount to between \$10,000 and \$15,000; but I fancy that, on the whole, this vote of Parliament for drill would be better applied in giving possibly extra days drill to a certain number of men than by having a review, although I should like to have had a review on the Queen's birthday. Now, I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Houde), who knows as much about volunteering as any other gentleman in this House, how twenty-four men in a company could possibly be drilled in battalion manoeuvres? We do not want skeleton battalions. I think it would be a mistake to change existing organizations and reduce companies to twenty-four men. I believe the militia force of Canada is really over and above the number of men we should have. Since I have been at the head of the Department, whenever I found a company not perfectly efficient I have disbanded it, the reason being that I thought it better to reduce the force and make it more efficient by giving the money to the really efficient corps.

Mr. HOUDE. I am not recommending a permanent reduction from forty-two to twenty-four men in each company, but only for purposes of annual drill. It would be absurd to have companies permanently composed of only twenty-four men. I refer specially to rural companies. In the country it is frequently impossible, from the nature of farm occupations, for all the men of a company to be present in camp. Sometimes the captains have to take men who do not belong to the force, in order to fill the ranks. These men go to camp for a week or two, receive their pay, and do not go any more during the year. I think it would be better to reduce the companies to twenty-four, so as to allow a greater number of battalions to benefit from the money voted, especially the officers and non-commissioned officers.

Mr. CARON. I will now answer the question of the hon. member for Centre Huron. It is the intention to hold camps as we did last year. Of course, there is nothing fixed yet as to where the camps will be. From the result of last year, we think it is the best mode of disposing of the money voted by Parliament to secure an efficient camp training.

Mr. HESSON. I would ask the hon. Minister if he contemplates drawing battalions from the country to the city? I have heard it said in the past, that more attention was paid to the city companies than the country companies. I agree with the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), that it is desirable to extend the drill as far as possible to the country companies. City companies have facilities for drill that are not afforded to country battalions, and in case of an invasion it would doubtless be the country force mainly upon whom the country would have chiefly to depend. I would be glad to hear the hon. Minister say whether he intends to give a fair advantage to the rural battalions in the contemplated drill for the coming season. Complaints were made that they had not an opportunity of accepting the advantages offered in these annual camps.

Mr. CARON. My views coincide exactly with those of my hon. friend, and in fact we have adopted the system of which he speaks. We pay more money, and possibly more attention to the rural corps, from the fact that they are not

numerous. They also get more pay for their drill than the city corps. The money paid out for drill last year was \$230,170 for drilling in camps, while the city corps drilling at headquarters cost only \$43,450.

Mr. BUNSTER. It appears to me that the hon. members wants to commence with British Columbia in reducing the force. I see an item of \$4,000 for a Major-General commanding the militia, and we have to contribute part of that amount, as well as of the \$22,000 for other things, and I think British Columbia ought to get some benefit from it. I have a right to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the gross neglect that Province has received. I have repeatedly, as the hon. Minister knows and as the ex-Minister knows, drawn the attention of the Government to the requirements of that Province. Whether they do not deem it worthy of their consideration or not, I cannot say; but this I do know, that they have not treated it fairly. They have allowed a very superior officer to retire from the Province, one who would have been of great benefit to our militia men who are willing to serve our Queen and country. If the hon. members will look at the Estimates they will see that not one dollar under this head will be expended for British Columbia. I ask the hon. Minister of Militia if this is fair, when he can be readily informed by the Minister of Customs that we contribute handsomely towards the revenue. I feel a little bashful in calling attention to this matter a second time, but I do not propose to have any Minister treat that Province with silent —, I will not say any more.

Mr. CARON. The hon. member is well aware, from our acquaintance and the expressions I have often used to him about his Province, that I would not treat it with contempt.

Mr. BUNSTER. I did not use the word contempt.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman will look at the amount of expenditure in the different Provinces of the Dominion he will find that, taking into consideration the population, British Columbia is treated as fairly as any other Province. If he had looked into the figures he would have seen that this Department was not open to attack for neglecting British Columbia.

61. Contingencies and general service not otherwise provided for, including grants to Artillery and Rifle Associations and Bands of efficient Corps.....\$46,000.

Mr. HOUDE. As regards grants to rifle associations, I consider that money is almost wasted, from a public standpoint. It goes for the greatest part to sportsmen who, if war occurred, would either be at their homes or would be officers not carrying the rifle. I think it would be better, if the Government intend to continue such grants, that they should be given to the soldiers, who must learn how to meet an enemy on the battle field, during the annual drill. It would be more for the public benefit to give the money to the real soldiers and thus encourage them during the year, and when they are in camp to exercise well and so become good marksmen, which is the very thing the country needs and for which money is expended. We maintain staff officers and field officers for the purpose of drilling our militia and enabling them to repel any enemy that might invade our territory. From the point of view of sportsmen, it is all very well that the grants should be continued, but in the public interest it is advisable that the system should not be any longer continued without changes.

Mr. CARON. I cannot agree with my hon. friend. Sportsmen on more than one field have shown themselves to be very good soldiers, and as a rule they have distinguished themselves in such a manner that they could not be supposed to be unfit for anything else than field work. A small military force like that of Canada must be well drilled and perfectly organized, and we cannot do too much

Mr. CARON.

to encourage rifle practice. We know the result of the last campaign in Africa where practical sharpshooters had to contend with a much larger and better drilled force, and which was supposed to be better prepared for the contest. Canadians at Wimbledon have shown that our riflemen are equal to those of other countries. Last year we sent a team to compete at Shoeburyness against English volunteer artillerymen. The result was that they not only competed successfully, but they brought home a prize; and if you consider that in Canada our teams have to be selected from 4,000,000 while in England they have an enormous population to select from, it must be admitted that great success has been attained by Canadians. Let me take advantage of this opportunity to say that within a few days I have received letters sent to me officially speaking in the highest possible terms of the Canadian teams at Wimbledon and Shoeburyness; and as an evidence that our volunteers were looked upon as all that could be required of artillerymen, is the fact that to-day the Artillery Association of England has adopted the very system which was introduced for the first time by the Canadian artillerymen at Shoeburyness in shifting heavy ordnance.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the case of one Francis Buchanan, who was killed at the Sussex camp owing to the negligence of some of the militia officers. It seems that a large number of shells were left on the field unexploded, and this man, not knowing the nature of the ball, attempted to melt it with the result that he lost his life. I was rather surprised to find that the Department would not pay for the support of this man's family, who were dependent entirely on him for their maintenance. It is not fair to the country, who grant this money for the Department, that such claims as these should be pigeon-holed, and the impression throughout the country is that the money we vote here is spent principally at headquarters and not as it should be in training the men. Now, we do not want an army which, like that of the King of Greece, shall be all generals and colonels. I repeat that I hope the hon. Minister, if he has not already done so under the item of Contingencies, will make some provision for the family of this man, Buchanan, as he lost his life through the carelessness of the militia. I have reason to believe that such a payment was recommended by the general commanding the forces, but it did not meet the approval of somebody else between him and the hon. Minister.

Mr. CARON. As my hon. friend has brought a charge of manslaughter against me, I must say that the circumstances under which the accident occurred are not exactly as he stated. The shell which the hon. gentleman speaks of was a shell fired from a gun, and the fuse was unexploded. My hon. friend's friend, not knowing what the consequence would be, picked up this shell and tried to break it, and not succeeding, heated a piece of iron and introduced it into the fuse hole, the result being that it exploded and the unfortunate man was killed. I regret that such an accident should have happened, but I cannot understand how it would be possible for me to apply the money which the country votes for the administration of my Department to the payment of such a grant as he suggests.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I beg to say that I stated the case correctly. The commanding officer did not take down a list of the shells unexploded, and a very large number of them were left on the field. This man, no doubt, had no business to pick it up, but then every one is not supposed to know that these iron balls left lying there were loaded, and I think some compensation should be given, owing to the negligence of those serving under the hon. gentleman. The man was a supporter not of me, but of hon. gentlemen opposite, and on that account I feel

it all the more to be my duty to advance the claims of his family.

Mr. WRIGHT. I regret exceedingly that one result of the great camp at Sussex, of which we heard so much, and which we understood was to be bloodless in its character, was unhappily an accident like the one mentioned by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Domville). We have heard something of this camp of Sussex. We heard how the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Domville) witched the world on that occasion with his noble horsemanship. I wish to say, however, that, taken all in all, I think we have much reason to congratulate the country on the appointment of the hon. the Minister of Militia to the office which he now holds, as I think he has illustrated the fact that he is the right man in the right place. In his visits to the different camps he has pointed out what organization is necessary to victory, and I have suggested that he should have the name of cornet instead of the one he now bears, as I think he has altered the militia and is doing his best to bring about the most fortunate and happy results. I visited one of his camps in my vicinity and was much pleased with the way in which the hardy yeomanry turned out and with the military aspect of the whole affair. The hon. the Minister of Militia, mounted on a white charger, assisted by my colleague the member for the city, who amid the muttered maledictions of the commanding officer, persisted in wearing his civilian's uniform, gave an aesthetic military bearing to the whole affair, which was much admired. Indeed the whole display, I thought, was a most excellent one, and I think he deserves a great deal of credit for it. But I have still the same standing complaint to make which I have always made of that Department. The county I have the honor to represent sends forth many of the best fighting men in the Dominion, yet the hon. gentleman will not consent to give us that proper military organization which I have constantly urged him to give; but I hope to be able in a few days to wait upon him with such a deputation as will convince him of the propriety of doing justice to that part of Canada.

64. Care of military properties transferred from the Ordnance and Imperial Government \$ 8,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. What properties are these? I think I expressed the opinion two years ago that any properties that ceased to be used for military purposes should be in the care of the Public Works Department.

Mr. CARON. The properties are at Niagara, Prescott, Montreal, Laprairie, St. John, N.B., Halifax, Victoria, B.C., and other places.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman state how this \$8,000 is to be expended?

Mr. CARON. The bulk of it is for paying caretakers' rents of properties, the removal of snow at Quebec and Montreal, and repairs to properties. But I must say that this is not altogether an unproductive expenditure, because during the year 1880-81 we received rents for the military properties under the control of the Department of Militia to the extent of \$5,678, leaving this vote in reality a very small one.

65. Royal Military College..... \$59,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think, in connection with this vote, that we might reasonably expect some statement from the hon. gentleman respecting the difficulties which appear to have taken place in the staff of the Military College. I observe that within the last few weeks or months printed circulars were sent round, containing certificates of character to Colonel Hewitt. One of these certificates was from myself. I gave it with great pleasure, and reverting to the course that gentleman had pursued as Commandant of the College, I

could not do otherwise. But I am bound to say this, as publicly as my letter has been circulated by that gentleman, that I gave that letter in ignorance of the circumstances that had recently occurred in the College, and I do not think it was fair of Colonel Hewitt to address me in the way he did in order to obtain that letter, knowing that there was anything but harmony at that time in the College. I do not pretend to know the difficulties which have occurred in the College, as I was out of the country for months; but from what I gathered in the newspapers, I was not able to come to the conclusion that the Commandant was without blame in the difficulties that occurred between himself and Major Ridout, and my enquiries since I have come home have led me to conclude that that officer was not properly used, and that the Commandant was wrong in the course he took. I regret very much to have to come to this conclusion. Great care was taken by the Government, at the time of Colonel Hewitt's appointment, to obtain an officer of the highest qualifications for the place. He was recommended by the Duke of Cambridge and appointed on that recommendation; and, during the time he held the office, the Government had reason to be very well satisfied with the appointment. I may be wrong yet in the conclusion I have come to, but from the evidence in the newspapers, I am unable to come to any other conclusion than that Commandant Hewitt acted with great indiscretion, and that Major Ridout was improperly used. I am sure the Committee will be glad to hear any explanation the hon. Minister may give, and I wish most heartily that that explanation may remove from my own mind the impressions I have received from the perusal of such documents as I have been able to see.

Mr. CARON. I know that a good deal of discussion has occurred in the newspapers in connection with the Royal Military College of Kingston. I am glad to say that I, as the head of the Department, concur altogether in the choice made by my hon. friend when he was at the head of the Government, of Colonel Hewitt to take charge of this College. I think that the result of his administration has shown that he is the right person for the position. As my hon. friend will understand, there has been a good deal of discussion going on, and a good deal of possibly bad feeling has existed between some members of the staff of the College and Major Ridout. It so happened that at this particular time, when this trouble was in progress, Major Ridout's time was up, and he could no longer serve in the College without getting further leave from England. I thought it was to the advantage of the Military College, that no trouble, no difficulty, and nothing of this kind existing between the members of the staff, should be allowed, in any shape or form, to interfere with the success of the institution; and as the time of service or leave of Major Ridout was up, without looking into the charges, and without examining into the case made on either side, I believed that in the interests of the College, and to secure the *bonne entente* which should have existed between the members of the staff, it was far better to take advantage of the circumstances, which allowed Major Ridout to return to his regiment with promotion, than to keep him in the College and render it disagreeable both to himself and to the other members of the staff. I am glad to say that he is replaced by two young Canadian cadets in the College, who are acting as aids to the Professors in instructing the cadets. Mr. Chairman, I can only say it has been my endeavor, ever since I have been in the Department, to help in every possible way the cadets who have graduated in the College. It may have been a question—and I said that it has been mentioned on more than one occasion in the different Provinces—whether at the period of time when this College was established, it was necessary; but I consider that Canada, with its future, and as a progressive country, cannot afford to take a retrograde step, which I believe it would be a mistake,

were we to-day to destroy the usefulness of this institution, which has secured for Canadians commissions in the British service. I am now expressing only my own opinion. Mr. Chairman, I am told that our cadets are educated for the British service; but I say that those cadets who serve in the British army are still Canadians, and must and will remain Canadians; and I maintain that when their period of service in the British army is expired, they will come back to Canada with their experience, and will become the educators of our young men who choose to enter the Military College and to our Militia Force. At present I know it is difficult to turn out cadets, who, fresh from the classes themselves, can become professors to men who are about their own age; but year after year, as we all know, this difficulty will disappear. Men grow older unfortunately, and the man who is accused of being too young one year is always a year older the year following, and is able to find behind him younger men than himself; and I believe that the training which our cadets will receive in the British army will make them valuable when Canada requires to use them in the interest of the Militia Force of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was under the impression that a Commission was appointed to make enquiry into these charges, but perhaps I was misinformed.

Mr. CARON. The papers which my hon. friend has asked for in connection with this matter and the whole investigation will be submitted to Parliament. This was a quasi-investigation, made by the Commission which is appointed for the purpose every year of visiting the College. My hon. friend will recognize it more easily under the name of Board of Visitors. When they went through the institution they were required and requested to look into these charges which were brought by Colonel Hewitt against Major Ridout. They did so and the whole matter was submitted to me; but as I have stated, without taking into consideration the charges and evidence *pro* and *con*. I thought it better, since such a feeling existed in the institution, to take advantage of the fact that Major Ridout's time was up and separate him from the other professors who were witnesses against him at the investigation, and in his own interests as well as in the interests of the department, allow him to return to his regiment and replace him by two Canadians.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Has this College effected the objects it was designed to serve? I noticed during last summer an agitation, or the symptoms of it, in our public press, declaring that the usefulness of this College was gone, and that it might just as well be abolished. I do not at all agree with this view. Through the kindness of the hon. Minister we were permitted to visit the College, and the good opinion which we entertained of it was largely increased by this visit; and I am prepared to say with the hon. Minister, that it would be a retrograde step on the part of the Parliament of Canada if we were to abolish the College. At the same time, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the unnecessary, if not the alarming, increase which has taken place in the staff of the College during the last few years. In 1878 the expenditure on the officers of the superior staff was \$13,946, while in 1881, it was \$30,571, showing an increase of something like \$17,000. Then the expenditure on non-commissioned officers in 1878 was \$2,581, while in 1881 it was \$3,579. The staff now seems to be out of all proportion to the amount of work done. The superior staff consists of fourteen officers; what is called the subordinate staff of six officers; and the civil staff of ten officers, or servants, as they are termed; and the other employes around the office numbers six, making in all thirty-six

Mr. CARON.

individuals. Now, the number of cadets, I am told, during the last year, was seventy-four, though perhaps I am not exactly right in this particular, the number has, however, more than doubled since 1878. Then, I think, there were seventy-five cadets in the College. I am willing to admit that the increased attendance may necessarily increase the expense; but, as I stated before, the expense is out of all proportion to the number of the cadets attending. The expense of maintaining the University College in the Province of Ontario, and the number of students attending, is as follows: the students number thirty-five, and they have eight professors, four lecturers, two tutors, and one demonstrator in physics—in all a staff of fifteen, or only one more than the staff of the Military College of Kingston, while the salaries paid amount to \$29,900; that is, the attendance is 351, and a smaller sum is paid in salaries to a smaller staff than is the case in this Military College. A strong friend as I am of the Military College, I am obliged to warn the hon. Minister of Militia that by increasing the staff and expenses of the staff, as he has done since 1878, the result cannot be otherwise than damaging to the interests of the College. I am aware the course is a very extensive one, and that in order to make it thorough it is necessary the staff should be large, that, according to our modern system of education, we have fallen into the vein that one man can teach one subject better by teaching it continuously than by teaching a variety of subjects. Yet, when we come to consider the number of professors in other departments of education and the amount of salaries paid, the comparisons we are obliged to make with the Military College will not be favorable to the administration of my hon. friend. I approve of the course of instruction pursued in that College, and I do not know any institution to which a young man could be sent at eighteen years of age and receive a more satisfactory and useful training than to this institution; but still there is this great deficiency, that the training he receives there is, outside of military training, of very little practical use to the student. If a student attends the High School in the Province of Ontario, the education he receives is of immediate practical value to him; it is a guarantee to him that by means of that education he is enabled to secure a livelihood. In the Royal Military College there is no guarantee to the student that after having spent four years there, he, should he wish to enter a profession, will receive any direct advantage from the course of instruction which he has gone through. What I would suggest to the hon. Minister would be that, directness should be given to certain portions of that course, which would enable the student, after he has passed through it, to enter any other profession without being obliged to undergo another preliminary course of instruction. My hon. friend has introduced a Bill to admit a student of that College to the standing of Dominion Land Surveyor. I would be glad to support that Bill, and if the hon. Minister can devise any other means whereby the student can be admitted from the College either as Dominion Engineer or Land Surveyor, he will confer one of the greatest benefits on the College that can be conferred upon it. I think, that although we are doing well in this country, we have not that class in the community that can afford to send their sons four years to the Kingston College and then another three or four years to a law society or university, or into another college, to receive an additional course as super-added to the military course. It would be very desirable for our young men if that could be done, but I may point out this matter to the hon. Minister, and I think it is a suggestion which is in the interest of the Military College. I hope he will be able to bring down some scheme before the House rises by which the advantages to be attained in that College will be of more practical utility than at present.

67. Pay, maintenance and equipment of "A" and "B" Batteries, Garrison Artillery and Schools of Gunnery at Kingston and Quebec.....\$128,000

Mr. CARON. The increase is in items which have always been in excess of the estimate. In "A" Battery, Quebec, a hired instructor was required who cost \$500. A collar maker, mender and blacksmith were attached to "A" and "B" Batteries at a cost of \$730; eight horses were purchased for "B" Battery, Kingston, under Order in Council of 17th June, 1881, which cost, with keep and veterinary expenses, \$1,200 altogether. In contingencies, the removal of worn out stores entailed an expenditure of \$1,570, making a total of \$4,000 increase on the cost of the two batteries.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. CARON. "A" Battery, at Quebec, numbers eight officers, including commandant, 155 non-commissioned officers and men, and eight horses. "B" Battery, at Kingston, numbers seven officers, including commandant, 171 non-commissioned officers and men, and sixteen horses. The number of horses is smaller than it ought to be, but as they have become very expensive since the American demand has sprung up, the Department has reduced the number as much as possible.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I should imagine eight horses would scarcely suffice for more than one gun. I would be glad to know what arrangement the hon. gentleman has made with respect to officers who are entitled to take long or short courses, as the case may be, at these batteries; what pay do they receive, and what length of time do they attend?

Mr. CARON. With respect to the horses, eight horses supply two guns. Besides, there are a number of horses belonging to the officers which, as they are kept at Government expense, are utilized for the purposes of the battery. The short course of instruction is three months. Officers get \$1 per day, and non-commissioned officers 50 cents. The long course is twelve months, and the gentlemen who follow that course, after passing an examination qualifying them to get their certificates, are naturally prepared to occupy any position in the militia of Canada.

66. Military Instructions in Schools, and Drill Instruction in Colleges \$ 6,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. CARON. We are endeavoring to carry out the views of my predecessor, Mr. Masson, in respect to drill instruction in schools. We cannot begin too early to drill men who are to compose the militia force of Canada. At Kingston, Principal Grant is heartily in favor of the scheme, and has co-operated with the militia authorities.

In reply to Mr. CASGRAIN,

Mr. CARON. All the accounts of the Department against the cities of Montreal and Quebec for the use of troops in quelling civil disturbances, have been paid.

125. Steam communication between San Francisco and Victoria, B. C..... \$17,640

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What length of time has this to run?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Four years.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The grant has been reduced, and I should like to know whether the same service will be performed?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Three times a month, the same as before. The amount expended before was \$54,000.

127. Steam communication between Grand Manan, N. B., and mainland, mail service..... \$4,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of this increase?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It could not be done last year for the amount voted. We hope to get it done this year by giving an extra \$1,000.

128. To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, to line of steamers to trade between Canada and West Indies and Brazil, provided a like amount be paid by the Brazilian Government..... \$50,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The Committee would, no doubt, be glad to be informed of the exact position of affairs, as to how far the experiment has succeeded, or is likely to succeed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is not in operation at the present time. I am not prepared with the details at this moment, but I will bring them down on concurrence.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell the Committee between what ports it will run, and how often the voyages will be made?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the winter the vessels will run from Halifax and in the summer from Montreal. They will touch at Rio Janeiro. It will be a monthly service each year.

129. For subsidy to line of steamers to run fortnightly between France and Quebec, provided the French Government appropriate \$50,000 for the same service \$50,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. On this item, also, the Committee would desire information as to the state of affairs.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The line is not yet established.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Have the French Government signified their willingness to negotiate?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Negotiations are still going on.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The services are not commenced and the negotiations have not yet been brought to a conclusion. It is understood that by reducing the amount to be provided by the French Government from \$100,000 to \$50,000, which it is believed will be sufficient to complete the service, it is understood that a line will be established.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who conducts the negotiations?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When Sir Alexander Campbell was Postmaster General the negotiations were commenced, and he has since conducted them, communications having also been made by Sir Alexander Galt. Nothing definite has, however, yet been obtained.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What are the ports decided upon between which the steamers shall ply? What is the port in France agreed upon?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that matter has not yet been dealt with.

130. For subsidy to the line of steamers to run between Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Liverpool and Halifax, N.S. \$25,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The terms of the vote this year were slightly altered, as that last year was for an alternate and combined service.

Mr. WELDON. How has the vote been altered?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not proposed to take the vote in such a way as to enable the arrangement to be made directly with St. John without the same parties being obliged to make a connection with Halifax.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to divide this sum between Halifax and St. John?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. The number of voyages has not yet been arranged. This sum, it is hoped, will

stimulate the steamers to make regular trips, as it will be an addition to what business they will get by calling at these ports. It is hoped that an arrangement will be made for regular communication.

Mr. FLYNN. I would like to ask why the subsidy for steam communication from Halifax to Murray Harbor and Charlottetown alternately, granted last year, has been omitted in this year's Estimates?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was an error in the preparation of the Estimates, and the item will reappear in the Supplementary Estimates.

135. To provide for a subsidy of \$1,500 a voyage, for five voyages of steamers from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain and back..... \$7,500

Mr. BRECKEN. I would suggest that the steamer *Prince Edward* be allowed to call at continental as well as British ports, so that shippers of cattle may be able to avail themselves of the best market.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We had better then insert the words "or continental ports" after Great Britain.

137. For the providing of a steamer to replace the *Glendon*..... \$30,000

In reply to Sir Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. McLELAN. The *Glendon* was condemned on examination, and was sold on tender for \$4,200.

139. For purchase of life-boats, life preservers, and rewards for saving life \$3,000

Mr. ANGLIN. Where is this money expended?

Mr. McLELAN. A certain amount is expended yearly in providing lifeboats at different stations on the lakes and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The greater portion is given, however, as rewards for the saving of life from sea going ships; small sums are paid to individuals who engage crews and provide boats, the crews being furnished by volunteers.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. McLELAN. There is one life-boat at Cobourg on Lake Ontario.

Mr. McCUAIG. A life-boat service is imperatively demanded at South Bay Point and at the entrance to Presqu' Isle and Weller's Bay, and I hope the matter will receive the prompt attention of the hon. the Acting Minister of Marine, with a view of establishing these much needed stations for the preservation of life and property, and without further loss of time.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think it would be well if the hon. Minister would give us some further information as to where those boats are. There are many points where there should be such a service, but where it does not exist now. I think it would be well for the Government to consider the propriety of organizing a regular life-boat service, though not on a very extensive scale at first. This is a matter of very great importance on which I think the Government ought to take some action.

Mr. McLELAN. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this is a matter of a great deal of importance, and I have been giving it considerable attention, with the view of organizing one or two services in the coming year as experiments.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There is a very long stretch of coast on Lake Huron, where several wrecks, usually attended with loss of life, occur every year, and my impression is that there is not a single life-boat station on that coast. For about 200 miles along the eastern side of that lake there are hardly any harbors, except such as have been constructed at great cost by the Government of this

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

country, and it is almost impossible for a vessel, if driven on this coast, to escape, unless it can make one of these harbors. There is a peculiar necessity, therefore, for a life-boat service to be established there.

Mr. CASEY. I may say, in continuation of what has just been stated, that there is another dangerous stretch of coast on Lake Erie, from a short distance east of Port Stanley westward. The wind that does the mischief there is a south-westerly wind, which drives vessels on this exposed coast, on which there are no harbors of refuge. In the neighborhood of Port Stanley frequent wrecks have occurred. I do not know of any life-boat station on the north shore of Lake Erie, and I think the neighborhood of Port Stanley would be the proper place to establish one.

Mr. McLELAN. Every lighthouse keeper is provided with a boat for the purpose of rendering aid, if necessary. This is the only kind of life-boat on the coast of Lake Huron.

Mr. BUNSTER. I regret that there is no provision made in the Estimates for life-boat stations on the west coast of Vancouver Island and the east coast of British Columbia. I think the hon. the Minister of Railways, who visited that country, should have instructed the hon. the Minister of Marine of the necessity of erecting life-boat stations there. We have been totally neglected on that coast. We are liable to have many disasters. Some have already occurred, and we have lost a great many of our citizens. This is a very serious and important matter, and the hon. the Minister of Marine should look into it, and establish, not one life-saving station merely, but three or four; and when we offer such inducements to immigration into that Province, and have such resources to be developed, we are certainly worthy of some consideration.

140. To provide for investigation into wrecks and casualties, and collections of information relating to disasters to shipping \$1,500

Mr. BUNSTER. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries taken into consideration the fact that the lighthouse which is being erected in British Columbia is in the right place or not? It may be swept away at any moment; and a few small lighthouses would afford a great deal more light, and be more useful, not only in the interests of the Province as well as of the Dominion.

142. Montreal and Quebec Water and River Police \$38,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I notice that there is a considerable increase in this vote; and with relation to the disturbances last year, I would like to know how far the police succeeded in maintaining proper order?

Mr. McLELAN. Last summer, in Montreal, the police were of great service and they were assisted by men from Quebec. The increased extent of wharfage has rendered necessary a small addition to the force.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the present strength of the force. I see that an additional \$3,500 is demanded.

Mr. McLELAN. During the winter the men are off duty, and with the exception of one or two sergeants, are not in receipt of pay; but in summer, about thirty men are stationed at Quebec, and from thirty to forty at Montreal.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Do they use steam launches or boats?

Mr. McLELAN. No steam launches are employed at Montreal, but both are used at Quebec.

143. Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers.... \$1,500

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). What does the Department propose to do with the wreck *Live Oak* now lying in

Wrayton's Harbor, Shelburne county? I understand that tenders were invited for its removal.

Mr. McLELAN. A contract has been awarded for that work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What will it cost?

Mr. McLELAN. I think about \$500.

144. Salaries, allowances, &c., of Lighthouse Keepers\$159,666

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Details relating to the lighthouse service in the various Provinces should be given separately. There was a considerable amount of fraud committed with regard to stores in former times as there are at present, and that is the reason why it is desirable that in the item of stores some fuller details should be given than are given at present.

Mr. BUNSTER. I would like to see a statement of expenditure in the different Provinces. The hon. member for Centre Huron said frauds were perpetrated on the Government. I hope his remark does not apply to British Columbia. It would be more satisfactory to the different Provinces if they knew exactly what it cost them for maintenance of lighthouses. I am satisfied British Columbia would be far below the average, although it has a great length of coast.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It costs twice as much to keep up lighthouses in British Columbia as anywhere else.

Mr. BUNSTER. The hon. ex-Minister said it costs twice as much to keep lighthouses in British Columbia as anywhere else, but perhaps the service rendered is four times as valuable as that rendered anywhere else. I am only sorry that, during the days of his Administration, he did not give us more lighthouses than he did; still, he gave more than has the present Administration.

146. Maintenance and repairs to lights, fog-whistles buoys and beacons, humane establishments and provision depots..... \$265,000

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I presented a petition in the early part of the Session to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, urging the importance of improving or protecting the entrance to Lockport Harbor. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to comply with that request? During foggy weather it is almost impossible for vessels to find their way into this harbor.

Mr. McLELAN. I have that under consideration, but I am afraid this year the Government will not be able to comply with the request.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). There is another question to which I would call the hon. Minister's attention, and that is the bell buoy at Brazil Rock, which is of no value whatever. This rock lies in the direct route of steamers plying between Boston, Portland and Halifax, and it is of the utmost importance the Government should replace the bell buoy by an automatic buoy.

Mr. McLELAN. We are making enquiry now about the expediency of placing something there which will serve the purpose desired.

Mr. KILLAM. The hon. gentleman ought to tell us before concurrence, whether the Government have adopted any scheme for protecting that portion of the coast at the entrance of the Bay of Fundy. There are a number of dangerous rocks there, and some means should be taken to warn navigators of them. There is the Lurcher, off Yarmouth, and the Gannett Rock just below. These are great obstructions to navigation, and from time to time applications have been made to have something done to point them out.

Mr. McLELAN. We propose to put two or three automatic buoys in the places the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. McCUAIG. I called the attention of the hon. the Acting Minister of Marine to the dangerous state of the wharf at or near the Cressey Lighthouse, known as Convers's, and the necessity of a liberal appropriation to make the necessary repairs for its preservation. I hope the matter will not be overlooked. Also to the necessity of placing a buoy at Nigger Island, in the Bay of Quinte, near Rednersville, and the desirability of constructing a lighthouse, similar to the one recently placed at South Bay Point, on the most northerly of the Islands in the Bay of Quinte known as the Brothers. The construction of this lighthouse is much needed in the interest of all vessels passing and repassing this narrow portion of the Bay of Quinte.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I see a notice that the hon. gentleman proposes to discontinue the light at Fort William on the Kaministiquia River. I presume, although it is not expressly stated, there has been a good deal of complaint made in consequence of the destruction of these lights, and I would like to know why the Department had concluded either to remove or discontinue them.

Mr. McLELAN. It was reported to the Department the lights there were not required. The beacons have been left standing, and they can be re-lit hereafter if required.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who made this report?

Mr. McLELAN. The officer of the Department recommended a change at Prince Arthur's Landing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Who is the officer?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think we are entitled to know who this officer was, because it is an extraordinary report. The Government of Ontario spent \$22,000 in dredging that channel, and this Government spent a considerable sum. Vessels have gone up there every year, and when the Department ordered the discontinuance of the lights, I understand the people held a meeting and made representations to the Government against the proposal. The Government had determined to destroy the structures that supported the lights as well as the lights themselves, but finally they graciously consented to let the structures stand on condition the people would maintain the lights at their own expense, which they have done ever since. It would appear that it was done for no other purpose than to discredit the selection by the late Government of the Kaministiquia River for the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have deliberately and wantonly destroyed the lights in a place where they were very much needed—much more than in hundreds of other places where there are lights—for the purpose of reaping a petty revenge.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has used strong language unnecessarily. Reports came from one of the engineers who was employed on some of the works there that the lighthouses had been carried away by a flood, and that the channel was filled up. Similar reports came from a gentleman employed on the Board of Works, and from the lighthouse keeper. After a good deal of investigation it was decided it would be useless to re-erect the lighthouse on that particular spot, from the fact that the channel was constantly filling, and the chances are that every spring the channel will fill up. I am aware that small tugs have been going up the river, but no large vessels have been able to ascend that river since the spring floods, when the necessity for the light ceased to exist. I know that some vessels heavily laden with rails were compelled to discharge their cargo at the landing because it was impossible for them to ascend the river. It was from no petty spite against the

hon. gentleman that the lights were discontinued, for many other people thought it was an improper site for the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The opinion is not confined to members of the Government that that place is utterly valueless as a terminus of the large trade which it is hoped will grow up in connection with that road. The decision of the Department was taken purely in the interest of the navigation and trade of those ports, and particularly from an economical point of view, as we believed it would be utterly impossible for the Government to keep that channel open except at a large expense. I was up the river during last season and I found a channel staked out and it was about as crooked as any channel ought to be, even for boats of very light draught to use. It was marked by stakes driven into the mud so that small tugs could ascend the river; it certainly was not a channel as large boats navigating Lake Superior should be asked to ascend.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Channels are staked out on Lake George.

Mr. BOWELL. Not with eight or ten feet stakes driven into the mud.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Regarding the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Customs, the local paper at Fort William reported nearly all he has said. It is stated in one number that one of the immediate results of putting out the light was that a steamer with rails could not go into the river, but was obliged to proceed to Prince Arthur's Landing, from which there is a branch to Fort William and to the so-called harbor of the Landing, and instead of the rails being at once put in their place they had to be placed on Mr. Mark's wharf, and wharfage of something like 50 cents a ton had to be paid. Altogether a few hundred dollars for nothing were placed in the pockets of a political friend. I know nothing about the matter except what is stated in this paper.

Mr. BOWELL. I spoke on the authority of Mr. Beatty, who came to my office and consulted me in reference to the matter. I sent him to the then Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Pope). He told me it would be impossible for him to ascend that channel in the day time or at any other period. He did not require any light to go up the Kaministiquia in the day time, but there was not sufficient water to enable the vessel to cross the bay, and he asked whether he would be permitted to lay the rails at Prince Arthur's Landing. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will enquire from Mr. Beatty, whom he knows better than I do. He is an honorable man of high character and position, and I do not think he would make representations to the Department, in order to save the trouble of running five or six miles up the river.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in supposing that any course has been taken in respect to the selection of the terminus of the railway at that part of Lake Superior, whether at the Kaministiquia, selected by them, or at Prince Arthur's Landing, in favor of which place, the hon. gentleman knows a great many persons held very strong opinions. I may say, when I entered upon the duties of the office which the hon. member for Lambton formerly held, I found a very considerable amount of money had been expended by the Department, previous to my entering it, in dredging the mouth of the Kaministiquia. The hon. gentleman selected Fort William as the terminus, and expended a good deal of money in dredging the mouth of the river, for the purpose of facilitating the entrance of larger vessels to that point. I examined the subject with all care and attention, and all the information that was available to me in relation to the controverted point, as to whether Prince Arthur's Landing or the Kaministiquia was the better place; and I am free to say that my judgment, in the light of all the information I could get, leans very strongly to the impression that a mistake had

Mr. BOWELL,

been made in selecting Fort William. But I never considered the matter sufficiently conclusive, either the one way or the other, to determine, down to the present moment, where the terminus should be. It never became necessary. There was no immediate necessity, as the hon. gentleman knows, until the road should be nearly completed, at all events between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay, of coming to an absolute conclusion; and I came to the determination that before arriving at any definite conclusion as to whether the place selected by the hon. member for Lambton, or Prince Arthur's Landing, was the better place, to go there with the ablest officers of my Department and give the matter the closest possible investigation before deciding where the terminal buildings should be placed. It has not become necessary to construct, up to the present time, any terminal buildings at that point. That is the position in which the question rests to-day. No selection has been made, and since the road has been placed in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of course the views and opinions of that Company, of their officers and engineers, will have a very important bearing upon the selection of the point. But I may say that finding, after a large expenditure of money in dredging by my predecessor, the water on the bar of the Kaministiquia was no deeper than when the hon. gentleman commenced—I now speak of the spring of the year, the flood having brought down the debris—I abandoned expenditure and dredging, and no expenditure has been made, nor do I intend any to be made until the question is finally determined whether the point selected by the hon. member for Lambton or the place which other persons suppose to be better, Prince Arthur's Landing, or some point between the two, will be the ultimate place of the terminus. I give this explanation to the hon. gentleman frankly as to the position in which the matter stands, and I am free to say I never arrived at an absolute conclusion, although my judgment was very strongly shaken as to the Kaministiquia.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I thank the hon. gentleman for his statement. In the light of it I ask the hon. Minister of Railways if he does not think it was somewhat premature for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to order the lights to be discontinued at a time when it was actually not decided whether the principal harbor should be at the Kaministiquia or not?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to express any opinion on that point, for I did not know any change had taken place in that regard. I was not aware whether it had been removed by the direction of the Department or carried away by accident.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The inhabitants have been obliged to maintain the light ever since—at least so I am informed.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for Lambton is wrong in supposing there was any vindictive feeling in removing the lights from Fort William. A new state of things arose last spring which has not been taken into account, and which I have not heard mentioned here. A flood occurred there last spring, and that river (the Kaministiquia) is liable to floods of a very peculiar character. In a late and cold spring, when the ice remains firm in Lake Superior until a late period, the ice in the river is brought down against the ice of the lake and there it forms what is called a "dig" or a "jam." It has done so on several occasions within the memory of the present generation, and is liable to do so at any time. As hon. gentlemen are aware the bottom of that river is a soft alluvial soil, and the ice of the river coming against the ice of the lake backs the water of the river, so that sometimes the people have to sail about the flats in boats, and, as any person can understand, the water which rushes down under the ice on the soft

alluvial bottom heaps up the sand in advance of it. It did so last spring, and the Government gave orders to erect a light at Prince Arthur's Landing where it was needed. Orders were given at the same time to remove the lighthouse at Fort William; but that was a mistake which the Government immediately remedied, and gave orders that the structures should not be removed, and they are there still. The hon. gentleman says that the people of Fort William have kept up a light themselves. I believe the municipality has kept up a light for such small craft as can go in, but from the very time that the country was opened the people of Prince Arthur's Landing, without any aid, have kept up a light on the wharf which has served for the purposes of navigation. At Fort William, even in its best days, when the channel was kept open, the number of vessels was exceedingly few. The larger Beatty boats went in on one or two occasions, I mean the *Ontario* and *Quebec*, when the water was very high, but they went with extreme reluctance, and the Beatty's have always protested against sending their large boats in, although they have sent smaller vessels there with railway iron. At Prince Arthur's Landing, since 1870, when the military expedition went up, the yearly average has been about 230 vessels, and there has been the same number of departures coming and going in spring through the summer to the fall, and yet there has not been one single serious accident; there has not been one vessel lost. What better proof could there be of its being an excellent harbor? According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, Prince Arthur's Landing is the third port in Ontario, according to its shipping, and if it has been left twelve years without a light, it shows that access to it must be very easy. With the range lights at Fort William, when it was at its very best, when a narrow channel was kept open, even then vessels went sometimes aground at the mouth of the river, but the experience of last spring has demonstrated that it would be useless to attempt to make a harbor there, because it would be liable every year to what occurred last spring. I believe there is a way in which a harbor could be made, at the mouth of the river; but with such a good harbor at Prince Arthur's Landing I do not see that such would be necessary. The hon. gentleman has referred to the report of a newspaper published at Fort William. There was a newspaper published in that place by some people who were interested in a large land speculation, and the paper was established there to advocate their interests and abuse every person opposed to their interests, or who advocated the general good. Like some other institutions, that paper has now deserted Fort William and gone down to the Landing, and it is now as eloquent an advocate of the interests of the Landing as it formerly was of those of Fort William. What reliance can you place on the reports of a paper of that kind—a paper which was employed to write up the interests of one place which it has now deserted in favor of its rival?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose that is the custom of the country up there.

Mr. DAWSON. Not always; but, with regard to this harbor, what happened last spring is liable to occur again at any time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I shall not, on the present occasion, enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of this harbor, but shall defer that to a proper occasion. As to the shipping belonging to the port which the hon. gentleman eulogizes so much, I do not think there is a single vessel belonging to it at all. The vessels which are so numerous are those of the Sarnia and Collingwood Line.

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, and some American vessels.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The last time I was there the largest American vessel that ever entered was in the Kaministiquia River, and I have no doubt, from estimates with

which I agreed, rather than formed, that this is the right place for the harbor. I was there in 1864, but paid very little attention to the matter; but when the Chief Engineer selected that as the proper harbor, so far as I was able to form an opinion, I coincided with his views, and thus I am glad to know that there has been no accident at Prince Arthur's Landing; but I know that in many cases vessels have not been able to go in there, for it is not a harbor but a roadstead, and when the wind is blowing from the mouth of the bay, it is impossible for a vessel to lie there. But all I ask now is that the Government, especially as they are considering the question of the terminus, should see that the lights should not be wantonly destroyed for no reason whatever.

Mr. McLELAN. There was no wanton destruction, but the lights simply went out of range in the channel, and they were put right.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to their being out of range. The hon. member for Algoma will not say that the channel has shifted, but that it was partially filled up.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not know that the channel shifted, but it partly filled and the light shifted by the pressure of the ice and the people set to work to put it in range again. With regard to what the hon. gentleman said of Prince Arthur's Landing being an open roadstead, I can only say that vessels put in there in all storms, and have lain in perfect safety. Very little has been done towards making artificial works beyond running out jetties, and if they were extended a little further out the harbor would be perfectly sheltered.

Mr. GUILLET. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the necessity that exists of a light being placed on the west part of the harbor of refuge now being constructed at Cobourg. The harbor-master has directed my attention to the fact that the only light there is a small lamp which has been placed there by the local authorities, and he thought it would be the duty of the Government to place an efficient light there which would not cost more than a trifle each year. He says the danger is that vessels approaching the harbor in dark nights are not warned of the east pier, and that consequently accidents are likely to occur for which the Government would perhaps be held responsible.

Mr. McLELAN. The Government have not made provision for this because it has not been brought specially to our notice; but the matter having now been brought up by the hon. gentleman, we shall give it our consideration.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Having some knowledge of what the hon. gentleman has just mentioned, I might say that it is absolutely necessary that the lights should be put at the end of the extended works, which reach considerably farther out in the lake than the present lighthouse.

148. Completion and construction of Lighthouses and Fog-alarms..... \$40,000

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). The hon. Minister has stated that he intends to provide for the erection of a fog-alarm at the mouth of Shelburne Harbor this year. I hope the Government are sincere in this intention, because this is the second occasion on which they have made the same promise. Serious injury will certainly be done to the Conservative party in that county unless the hon. the Minister of Railways urges upon his colleagues the necessity of constructing this fog-horn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not necessary to say another word.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I sincerely hope that the tenders will be asked for and the work commenced before the elec-

tion. I do not imagine that it will do the Liberal party any injury, because it has been delayed so long.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is now afraid that it will now be done.

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, I have been urging it for the last four years, only I want the hon. Minister to see that it is done.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to passing the vote as we have not the details, but it ought to be distinctly understood that this item will be discussed as fully and as freely on concurrence as could be done on the present occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This will be permitted.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Is a light to be placed at the western head of Barrington Harbor?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not so decided.

149. To complete construction of a new lighthouse on Sands Head entrance to Fraser River, B.C. \$5,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. An hon. gentleman (Mr. Bunster) states that this lighthouse is in danger of being carried away before it is built. What information has the Minister of Marine on this subject?

Mr. McLELAN. The proper officers report that its situation is good, and that it is being securely built.

150. Salaries and disbursements of Fishery Overseers and Wardens..... \$93,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This is a very considerable sum. I observe that \$30,000 are to be expended on fish-breeding, fishways and oyster beds. I would like to know generally how these matters are progressing, and, in particular, what is being done in the way of farming or renewing new oyster beds. A good deal has been said at various times as to what the Department expects to do in this direction, but I do not know that, as yet, any absolute success has been attained, particularly in the matter of oyster beds.

Mr. McLELAN. The Minister of Marine last spring made some enquiry as to the mode of cultivating oysters practised in the United States, but unfortunately he was taken ill shortly after he made this investigation and had visited the oyster beds in the United States. The matter has so rested since his illness, and I have not been able to give it any attention; but no great expenditure has been made, except in a survey of the different oyster beds in the Dominion.

Mr. KILLAM. Has no attempt been made to ascertain whether other places are suitable for the cultivation of oysters? I called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine to the subject last year, and, of course, I regret his illness, which has not enabled him to pursue his investigations to the extent which the matter deserved. I take this opportunity of saying again to the hon. gentleman that I think oysters could be profitably cultivated in Mary's Bay. The locality is suitable, and oysters which have been planted in similar waters have done finely. If the hon. gentleman takes the subject into consideration he will find it to the advantage of the Dominion, while it will not occasion much expense, and we will be able then to procure oysters all winter.

Mr. McLELAN. I will certainly take the matter into consideration.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Has the attention of the Minister been called to the exhaustion, or the possible exhaustion, of the lobster fisheries in the Maritime Provinces? I speak subject to correction, but I understood a con-

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).

siderable time ago, from gentlemen who were there resident, and also from members of this House, that these very valuable fisheries were showing signs of exhaustion owing to the manner in which these fisheries are conducted. I am informed that a difficulty is experienced in enforcing the close season.

Mr. McLELAN. Those engaged in the fisheries agreed, a year or two ago, on a close season. Representations were made on this subject to the Minister, and on two or three occasions, this season was extended; and last year, after I came into the office, application was made from Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, for the extension of the fishing season, but owing to all the information I could gather as to the condition of this fishery, I thought it unadvisable to do so, and I decided on the strict observance of the close season as appointed. I think that in this way only can these fisheries be preserved; and this is in the interest of the fishermen themselves.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. There has been no change in the close season since the hon. gentleman has taken charge of the Department?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I understand that those who are engaged in the business—very many of them in New Brunswick, and some in Prince Edward Island—have represented to the Department that they consider it inexpedient to have a close season at all, and have asked for its abolition.

Mr. McLELAN. Applications were made for an extension of the fishing season, but I strictly adhered to the close season according to the regulations.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman state how far the assertions which are made touching the diminution of these fisheries are correct or not? This is a matter of very considerable practical importance, as it concerns a very valuable industry, which, with proper care, will become of more, instead of less, value. We all know that these great canning establishments will destroy the lobster fisheries unless they are well watched, and they have really done so in some places.

Mr. McLELAN. We are taking every means to secure the strict observance of the close season.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Was the catch of lobsters last season more or less than usual?

Mr. McLELAN. It was very much larger than is usual, last year.

Mr. ANGLIN. There is a general impression that there is a falling off, that the fish are diminishing in size, that the fish taken now are not as large, on the average, as they were some years ago. In the county I represent, there is a large number of packing houses, and in visiting them I have found opinions to vary so widely as to the close season that it is impossible to arrive at a conclusion. Many assert positively, there is no such thing as a close season, that the close season for one fish is not the close season for another. Some assured me that the regulation preventing fishing in shallow waters would be the most effectual way of preserving the fish—they say that fish in spawning time proceed into the shallow waters, and that if fishing there were prevented it would be perfectly right to allow fishing to go on in the deep waters during the whole of the season; others contradict that assertion. I am of the opinion that the habits of the fish vary at different places, depending a great deal upon the tides, warmth of water and other influences. Some, again, would like this open season to extend well into the fall. Others allege that even now fish are unfit to be taken in many places during the late portion of the open season, and that the most valuable fishing

would be in what is called the close season, when the waters become warm, and the fish are recovering from spawning. All those statements are made by intelligent men, and it is difficult to know what is best to be done. My own impression is there ought to be a close season, but I have not been able to make up my mind as to what the close season should be. I believe it should vary in different districts; for instance, on the Atlantic coast where the water is open all the year, warm early in the season, the season may commence much earlier than in the Gulf of St. Lawrence where the waters are ice-bound up to a very late period and the water remains, after the ice disappears, so cold that the fish is of very inconsiderable value from the advanced period of the spring. It would, therefore, be unfair to make the close season there open at as early a period as on the Atlantic coast. I made representations on this subject some years ago, and it was owing to that, I believe, that the change was made in the law. I had the honor of submitting to the Minister the representations of a number of persons engaged in fishing in my county, and I presume others made similar representations and that our combined efforts led to the change in the clause with respect to the fishing in that locality. There is very little room to doubt that the season varies in different localities and that the habits of the fish vary as the temperature varies from different causes. Unfortunately, for the last year or two, our fisheries have been very unprofitable, because the market has been overstocked. From one reason or another the habit of canning fish has extended very largely; not only lobsters but almost every variety of fish are now canned, and owing to this the market seems to be so much overstocked that last year every one engaged in business lost money.

Mr. KILLAM. I do not intend to weary the Committee with any lengthy remarks on this question, but I want to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine to some parts of the subject which, I think, are worthy of his consideration. Of course, fishing is very different in different parts of the Dominion, and the regulations are different for the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, Atlantic and Gulf coasts. Our fishermen on the Atlantic coast have to commence their fishing at a different date under the regulations. I do not think the regulations are exactly what they ought to be. I have considered the subject carefully, have discussed it with many fishermen, and am prepared to say what, I think—although it is not my business to propound a policy for the hon. gentleman opposite—will be the close season that would be most satisfactory to the fishermen, so far as any fishery officer is able to say will protect the fishery as well as it can be protected. I should propose that July and August should be the close months, say from 10th July to the end of August on the Atlantic coast and Bay of Fundy, and during all the rest of the year lobsters should be allowed to be caught for canning or for export in any way. If that does not meet the views of the hon. Minister, I wish that he would recommend that in the western part of Nova Scotia lobsters could be caught in the fall, after the end of the close season, for the purpose of exporting alive, to boil, and not for canning. The export of lobsters in the shell is, I think, going to be an important industry, and I take this opportunity of directing the attention of the hon. Minister to it. I would like him to give us before we take concurrence, if he cannot now, positive information on this subject. The question of the lobster fisheries has received, I have no doubt, much attention from the officers of his Department. I referred to it last year and was promised by my hon. friend, who, I regret, is unable to be present, that this subject would be looked into. For some occult reason, the fishermen are prevented from catching fish when they ought to be allowed to catch them. This difficulty should be removed. I am not aware whether these fishermen are to receive the benefit of the

\$150,000 devoted to fishermen; but at all events, they should receive this consideration from the Department, that their desires, with regard to the close season, should be granted and that they be allowed to have more than two months in the year in which to ply their calling.

Mr. OGDEN. This question has come before the House every year. Some hon. gentlemen say they entertain serious doubts as to the regulation being a proper one. Well, Sir, I profess to know something about the lobster business. I maintained here some four years ago that there should be protection afforded to this valuable industry, and I advocated that the close season, such as is now in force, was the proper close season for the whole coast of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that is, from the first of August to the first of April next year. I think the present regulation is about right. I was at one time largely interested in the lobster business, and I was charged on the floor of this House with having influenced the Government to make this regulation for my own personal benefit. The hon. member for Gloucester has stated to-night that the market is overstocked. It is overstocked, and I am sorry to say that there are many lobster packers who are not so solvent as I would like to see them, on account of the market being overstocked. The business of fishing has become a necessity on certain parts of the coast. The fish became smaller and scarcer, yet the fishermen had to earn as much money for the support of their families and had to ask a higher price than they previously obtained, consequently they obtained a smaller quantity of fish for the same money than they had in years gone by. Therefore the cost of production became much greater than before.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Whose policy was it?

Mr. OGDEN. It was the hon. gentlemen opposite who made the regulations; and on the representations, I think, of Mr. Jones, of Halifax, they rescinded the Order in Council on Monday which they passed the Saturday before. They did not have backbone enough to pass an Order in Council and carry it out regardless of consequences. I am sorry to say the hon. member for Westmoreland was at the head of the Department at the time. The Order in Council as it now stands, I believe to be in the interests of the packers and fishermen, and of the country at large. I have received the following letter from an influential firm in Portland doing business in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia:—

“PORTLAND, Me., 24th January, 1882.

“ALFRED OGDEN, Esq., Ottawa.

“DEAR SIR,—We trust that Parliament will make no alteration in the law for the protection of the Lobster Fishery, which law, you well know, has proved to be the wisest measure that could have been adopted for the protection of a business which is now of so great importance to the Province.

“Operating fourteen factories on the coast of Nova Scotia, and our former senior partner, the late Mr. Samuel Rumery, having been the first in the business on the coast of Maine, our long experience teaches us that if the season for fishing were to be extended beyond its present limits, the supply would soon become as limited as it is on this coast.

“Had our law here been raised before the Lobster Fishery was beyond redemption, the business would have prospered; but the lobster is now so nearly exterminated that we are obliged to close our factories here as they become unprofitable, which during the past few years has been at about the rate of one each year.

“On the contrary, we find that in Nova Scotia, in consequence of reasonable protection measures, our factories there are producing rather more than they did during the same months before the adoption of the present law. We, of course, feel deeply interested in the future welfare of the business, and sincerely trust that no measures will be adopted, which we feel confident will result disastrously to the interest of both packer and fishermen.

“We remain, very truly yours,

“ONTARIO PACKING CO.”

That firm is operating largely in the counties of Shelburne and Yarmouth. The opinion of these gentlemen ought certainly to be worth something. I said I was at one time interested in the business. I remember at one time having

packed as many lobsters as any packer in the Dominion. But I have sold out my whole interest and have not now a dollar invested in the business, consequently I speak as one having no personal interest whatever in the business, but solely in the interests of my constituents, who are largely engaged in this business, and dependent upon it for their daily bread. I know that some hon. gentlemen have tried to make political capital against me, because they said that this regulation was made in the interest of myself and other packers to the detriment of the interests of the fishermen; but they cannot say so now, as I have gone out of the business altogether. I can go back to my constituents tomorrow and tell them I urged the Government to enforce this Order in Council, which has not only been the means of perpetuating the lobster business in the Maritime Provinces, but has been the means of protecting the fish. If the present protection is maintained to that valuable crustacea the effect will be to perpetuate the business and keep people home who would otherwise have to go to a foreign country to earn a livelihood. I am sorry hon. gentlemen opposite so far forget their duty to themselves and their constituents as to try to make a little political capital out of a measure which is for the public good. The hon. gentleman from Shelburne smiles; but I remember two or three years ago there was a lobster packer in his county who was one of his warmest supporters, and he too was anxious there should be no close season, but I think to-day that gentleman has changed his mind, both with regard to the regulations and to the former opinion of the hon. member. I have yet to hear from one packer that there should be no close season, either in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. That is the case not only in Shelburne, but in every other county throughout the Province of Nova Scotia. I remember three years ago many of my friends from Prince Edward Island begged for an extension of time. They said: "Our fishermen cannot earn a livelihood, as the time is too short." They have now ascertained that the present regulation is a proper one for the protection of all parties concerned. I felt it to be my duty to make these remarks. Having never missed a division since I have been a member of Parliament, I was careful to be present when the lobster fishery came up. If any change in the regulation is made, making the close season shorter than it is to-day, it will be detrimental to the interests of the fishermen along the coast. I speak not as one personally interested but as an independent man, and while some were opposed to me on this question in the past, I believe there is not a man to be found who is opposed to me to-day.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I have paid some little attention to this matter, and I have acted in the interests of my constituents. I have had the honor during the last two or three years of presenting a large number of petitions on this subject, including a petition from Guysborough, signed by 500 of the hon. gentleman's electors. The lobster packers are, no doubt, in favor of the close season which exists, but there are other interests to be considered. The hon. member for Guysborough has told the House that the Order in Council was passed in the interest of the lobster packers, and for their special benefit. I beg to differ with them, and to say that the Order was passed for the purpose of affecting the price of lobsters in the London market.

Mr. OGDEN. You favored it yourself.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I did not. The hon. gentleman referred to the lobster packers in my county who are in favor of the present close season. Those lobster packers were like all others in Nova Scotia, and they asked for the close season adopted by the Government. The fishermen along the coast were opposed to the present close season. The Government proposed to give the fishermen four

Mr. OGDEN.

months—April, May, June and July. In April, on the south coast of Nova Scotia, it was impossible for the fishermen to prosecute their work. After the first week in July lobsters become very scarce, and the business usually ended at about the end of that month. All I have asked the Government was that we should have May, June, September and October, being months in which fishermen can prosecute the business. In regard to the matter urged on the Government by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), permitting the exportation of lobsters in the shell during certain times of the year, I think it should receive the attention of the Government. Arrangements have been made in the western portion of Nova Scotia, for the exportation of lobsters in the shell by the steamer *Dominion*, and the counties of Shelburne and Yarmouth are much interested in this, which will prove a large and profitable business. If the fishery inspectors would carry out the regulations, to fine heavily lobster packers who destroyed small and female fish, and gave four months in which to catch the fish, an act of justice would be done to the fishermen. I have, however, given up all hope of Nova Scotia fishermen receiving justice at the hands of this Government. We will see what is the result of the lobster fishery during the coming year.

Mr. SNOWBALL. I am glad the hon. Minister has not rigidly enforced the regulations respecting the close season.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not extend the fishing season.

Mr. KILLAM. There was an extension of ten days.

Mr. McLELAN. I am speaking of this season.

Mr. SNOWBALL. In 1881 it was refused. I would urge upon the hon. Minister the necessity of looking into this matter carefully, and consider the time fishermen have been able to fish before refusing an extension. The season on the Atlantic coast, Nova Scotia and Gulf portions of New Brunswick is entirely different. We seldom get new lobsters before the middle of May or even June. Last year the season was much earlier than usual.

Mr. McLELAN. You have a longer period than they have.

Mr. SNOWBALL. It is necessary we should have a different season because we do not get the fish so early. There is a great deal of force in what was said by the hon. member for Yarmouth. Many fishermen maintain that part of July and August is the proper close season; but there is this to be considered, that in the Gulf they cannot fish in September. It is so stormy they are not able to fish in deep water. The fish should be protected when on the shore, and the fishermen should be compelled to fish lobsters in deep water. Fishing in deep water no doubt costs much more than near the shore, owing to the expense of traps and great loss by storms, and can only be prosecuted during the early months of the season. The hon. gentleman says that packers generally want to have the close season as it now exists.

Mr. OGDEN. I did not say so. I said I had a letter from a firm who said that any alteration in the law would be detrimental.

Mr. SNOWBALL. After the 1st of September you cannot catch enough to keep the factories open, and because they have to close the factories they should not want the people on the coasts prevented from catching the fish for their own use; they would sooner have them accumulated for the following season, but I maintain it would do no harm to allow the fish to be caught for the local markets any time after the first of September, as the spawning season is over. The freezing of salmon, and shipping them fresh, has almost done away with the canning of that fish in the Maritime Provinces, and so it will be with lobsters in after years; for

even now the margin on canned lobsters has been reduced to the lowest possible point. I hope, therefore, that the Acting Minister will do everything in his power to foster among the people of the Lower Provinces the trade which by every appearance will be the trade of the future. The fall which has taken place in the trade has been owing largely, if not exclusively, to the number of people who have gone into the business, and the fact that the fish caught on the muddy bottoms in parts of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick are of a dark color, and that they are mixed with the brighter lobsters when sent to the markets of Europe, gives a character to our exports to Europe of that article which is not favorable, and which has its effect in depressing the trade.

Mr. HACKETT. I think the impression has been got by some hon. gentlemen that the fishing season of Prince Edward Island was extended last year, but such is not the fact. I know that great pressure was brought to bear upon the Acting Minister to extend the season, and it was felt that the season was too short for the interests of the people embarked in that industry. We have very late springs there, and the fishermen are unable to set their traps before the 1st of June, and they have to take them up by the 20th of August. The season is, therefore, so short that people engaged in them have had little opportunity of getting any remuneration. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) said that the Government had taken particular care of the lobster packers, while they had taken no interest in the fishermen. That is quite incorrect. The lobster packers of Prince Edward Island last year tried their best to extend the season, but the Government would not give way, and, of course, they considered that they had suffered on that account. So far as the spawning season is concerned the regulations are intended for the purpose of protecting the lobster, so that it will not be exterminated. I know that, owing to the vigilance of the officers, so careful are the fishermen, that they remove all the spawn before taking them to the factories, as they know that otherwise they would be fined. I am very much surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Snowball), who said that the lobsters taken off the coast of Prince Edward Island, when packed, are of a dark color, and not up to the standard of those taken in the other Provinces. I deny that; I say that the lobsters taken around Prince Edward Island are equal to any taken in any part of Canada, and if the hon. gentleman visits the Island he will find that we have as clear a water and as clear a bottom as can be found off the coast of any part of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. HADDOW. Mr. Chairman, I think the time suggested by the member for Yarmouth is the time best adapted for the close season for lobster fishing, at least I think the close season should be in July and August. I don't say that it should be necessary to take the whole of both months, but within those months the close season should be made. My principal object, however, at present is to direct the attention of the Minister to the fact that among the fishermen along the Restigouche, which is celebrated for its salmon fisheries, there is at present a deal of discontent with the regulations of the Government, who prohibit them from taking fish even for their own use. Of course, there is a question as to the right of these people to fish opposite their own land; this question is now before the courts. I have no doubt it will soon be settled in favor of the settlers, but I think the regulations are pretty severe, and I would ask the hon. Minister to relax them if possible, as the case of those people, who live in isolated districts, far away from the privileges which belong to more settled localities, is a hard one. A Commission of enquiry visited that locality

last summer, and from the evidence they gathered it appears to me that there is a great deal in the whole question that is worthy of consideration. I have been informed that the Acting Minister was met at Metapedia by some of the inhabitants, who urged him to allow the Commission to investigate other questions than the simple charges made against the warden—questions involving, to some extent, the action of some officers of the Department, and they complain now that the investigation has not been so full as it ought to have been. I think the whole question of granting fishing licenses, not only to settlers on the river above tide-water, but to those on the coast, is worthy of being considered by the Government. There is continual trouble at present, owing to some men being able, through political influence, to obtain rights which they should not enjoy, while others, who are poor and deserving people, do not get any rights at all.

Mr. McLELAN. The question of regulating the rights of the fishermen along the Restigouche is surrounded by difficulties, but it shall have my consideration with a view of producing harmony. With regard to the investigation held last year, the opinion at one time prevailed that it should be limited to the charges originally sent into the Department, but owing to representations afterwards made to me by some of the inhabitants, I told the Commissioners that they might extend their enquiries, and I think the investigation was very full and very exhaustive.

Mr. BUNSTER. The hon. Minister of Railways, when he visited British Columbia last summer, must have seen the desirability of encouraging lobster fishing on our shores. We have a great many men employed in catching fish on our coast; our fisheries are very valuable, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget his promise to give us a hatchery.

Mr. BORDEN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the fishery of the gaspereaux. A few years ago a very valuable fishery was then pursued in catching alewives and salmon; but since then a mill has been erected on the river, and the fishery has been almost entirely destroyed. While the late Government were in office, I brought the matter under the notice of the then Minister, and some improvements were made in the ladder at the dam across the river. When the present Government came into office, they thought it necessary to dismiss all the officials on the river at the time, and I had reason to hope that under the new régime some improvement would take place; but I have received a letter from a member of the municipal council in my county informing me that still no improvement has taken place, and asking me to bring this important matter once more to the attention of the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. We have had a special examination made of a number of woirs in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with the view of removing obstructions on these weirs, for the very purpose of allowing the smaller fish to ascend them, and increase the number of the smaller fish, in order to attract the larger fish to the coast. The report of the inspector is now before us, and probably some action will be taken with a view to remedy the evils of which the hon. gentleman has just spoken.

Mr. OGDEN. The hon. member for Northumberland referred to the months of August and September, stating that August was a very stormy month, and that it is more expensive to fish in deep than in shoal water. I would just like to correct the hon. gentleman. It is more expensive to fish in shoal water, where the sea breaks the traps and nets, than in deep water, where it has no effect on the traps or nets. I think the hon. gentleman knows as little about the lobster business as he does about the coal industry; and, consequently, I do not think that he will carry off the palm with respect to either. Many people consider that the

lobster question is a trifling little matter, which deserves no consideration. The hon. gentlemen opposite passed the greater part of a day on a discussion about a pig only worth \$3, but here is a question of great magnitude, which must be passed over without any remark. I will now read to the House the following interesting statistics from a circular issued by Isaac H. Mathens, of Halifax, of the number of cases of preserved lobsters and salmon imported into the United Kingdom for each year since 1874 :

LOBSTERS.

1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881
89,392	113,944	129,559	139,780	170,510	178,773	232,139	257,668

SALMON.

1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881
82,918	182,300	292,005	305,410	317,920	364,020	257,242	552,467

Thus, you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the lobsters above, at \$5 a case, amount to \$1,288,340, chiefly the products of the Dominion of Canada. None were shipped from the United States, and but a very small quantity from Newfoundland. The salmon were the product chiefly of British Columbia. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of considerable importance, and should not be passed over without being given due consideration. The hon. member for Northumberland has tried to demonstrate the want of value of the Prince Edward Island lobster. I am very sorry to say that he has made statements here which, if they were quoted perhaps on the other side, would be very much against the interests of these packers; but it appears to be the height of the hon. gentleman's ambition to decry every industry in the country. I am sure that the lobster packers in his own county will not thank him for having done so. With reference to what my hon. friend has said here with respect to the ascending of rivers by alewives and gaspereaux, I am very sorry that there is not a larger sum in the Estimates for the protection and preservation of the river fisheries. It is evident that our fisheries along the coast are becoming exhausted. The fishermen have to go further out to sea and in larger crafts in order to catch codfish; but if our river fisheries were protected and our streams were kept clear of sawdust, and if useful fish-ladders were erected, salmon and alewives and other fish would ascend our rivers to deposit their spawn and attract the codfish to our shores. As soon as our river fisheries become exterminated then I say that the codfish will forsake our shores, and the living of many hardy sons of toil will be lost. The only fault which I have to find with the Government is that they have not given that attention to the river fisheries which they deserve. I believe Mr. Whitcher has been a good and faithful man in that respect, and I am only sorry his hands have been tied, and that a larger sum has not been expended in protecting our river fisheries.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I wish to make a few remarks about a new branch of fishery which has sprung up lately in New Brunswick, on the St. John River—the sturgeon fishery. As it is a new industry, the Government, I presume, have been at a loss to know what regulations it is necessary to make to protect it. On this river there are some three districts, in each of which a warden is appointed. These wardens have been authorized to

Mr. OGDEN,

grant licenses to catch these fish for the last year or two. Before that no notice was taken of this fish, but since there has been a market for sturgeon, principally in the United States, the Department have ordered that licenses be granted to catch those fish in certain districts. These wardens have acted separately, each issuing licenses to fish in his own district, but the licenses are so drawn that any party who has one can fish in any part of the river. Hence difficulties have arisen, litigation has nearly taken place, and a good deal of confusion has resulted. I would enquire whether any policy has been decided upon in reference to the extent of territory covered by these licenses, and with reference to the close season, about which there was some difficulty from the fact that it is scarcely known what time of the year these fish do spawn. In fact there never was a close season until last year, when one was fixed to some extent.

Mr. McLELAN. This is a new business, as the hon. member has stated, and is not so systematized as it might be. A good deal of correspondence is going on between the Department and the officer at St. John, with respect to this matter. Licenses are to be issued this year, but as to whether they ought to be issued generally over the river or locally, I am not positive, but I think they will be confined to districts so as to prevent confusion.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Some regard should be paid to our own people, and these wardens should, as much as possible, give licenses, not to foreigners, but to our own people. It is very annoying to find foreigners coming in for a few months catching all the fish and making all the profit.

Mr. McLELAN. I enquired into this matter, and the answer I got was that Americans would go to the man living on the shore and get the license in his name.

Mr. KAULBACH. The neglect of our river fisheries in some of the counties in Nova Scotia, preventing the access of fish up their waters, has been the subject of complaint for many years, but I am sorry to find little has been done up to the present time to remedy the grievance. For some years past, and more particularly since I have had the honor of representing my county in this House, I have given the matter much attention; and during the last three years I have frequently brought the matter before the notice of the Department, and made repeated appeals for aid in protecting the fisheries and removing the obstructions that offer on many of the rivers of the county of Lunenburg, especially on the river La Have. This is certainly the finest river in the Province of Nova Scotia, and was in former years greatly frequented by salmon, shad and gaspereaux in large quantities. It is now, however, so completely obstructed by mill-dams, debris, etc., that the fish have to a great extent left its waters, and are but seldom met with beyond the head of the tide. I have no desire to interfere with the milling interests on this river, and besides there is no necessity for it, as both the fishing and milling interests can be accommodated without the one interfering with the other so long as sufficient interest is taken by the chief river officials to see that proper fishways are provided thereon. The grand secret to the success of the deep sea fisheries is the proper attention to the river fisheries for the culture of the young fry, as through it the larger fish frequenting the deep sea would be attracted to the shore after the smaller fish frequenting the bays and rivers, and success as an inevitable result would thus attend the pursuit of the fishermen. I am sorry to find so small a sum is in the Estimates for this important service. Money could not be appropriated in any better way than in clearing our rivers, for the better access of fish up and down their waters. I hope my county will be fairly treated, and the money required for the improving of its respective river fisheries be granted, so that the dissatisfaction now existing may exist no longer.

Mr. KILLAM. It would have been interesting had the hon member explained what has been done by the hatching establishments, and what is proposed to be done in introducing the spawn into our different rivers. Salmon fishing has commenced in Nova Scotia, and at this season the salmon is very valuable, the average value to the fisherman, as it is taken from the water, being \$1 per lb., during the latter part of March and the first part of April. In the United States markets these fish are quoted at \$2.50 per lb. The officers of the Fishery Department, I am bound to say, have been generally efficient in their duties. But I wanted to say that in the distribution of this fish spawn that river should not be overlooked, because the fish that are hatched there come to maturity sooner, and are more valuable than the fish anywhere else.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I think the remarks of the hon. member for Kings, and the hon. member for Lunenburg, with reference to the river fisheries, should receive the immediate and earnest attention of the Government. There is no more important fisheries in the Lower Provinces than the river fisheries, but for the last eight or ten years they have been seriously neglected or destroyed in some important rivers. The mill-dams across the rivers prevent the fish from passing up, and the Government have patented a fish-ladder, manufactured by a Mr. Rogers, which is of no more value in assisting the fish up the rivers than a stairway would be. Until the Government takes some steps to have some portion of a river bed set apart for the use of the fisheries, they never can expect to have the fisheries restored. It must be evident to this House that there is too much politics in the service. If the hon. gentleman would just lay aside politics in this Department and select men for their qualifications, instead of for their politics, we could then hope to have some improvement in our river fisheries.

Mr. SNOWBALL. Is it intended to pay the ex-fishery warden, Mr. Perley, the claim he has against the Department? I understand that claim has been favorably reported upon.

Mr. McLELAN. I find the claims were passed upon by the hon. member for Westmoreland and decided against Mr. Perley; and they were also passed upon by Mr. Pope with the same result.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 1 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 14th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that on Tuesday next the House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that an annual grant of \$150,000 be made to aid in the development of the sea fisheries and the encouragement of the building and fitting out of improved fishing vessels, and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen.

Mr. FLYNN. Would the hon. gentleman explain the principle on which he proposes to apportion the money among the fishermen.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When the resolution is moved I will give a full statement of the intentions of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman might answer the enquiry briefly unless the motion is a mere form. I suppose the object of the motion is that such explanations may be given as to satisfy the House of the propriety of its going into Committee. Of course, this is not the time for debate, but I think we might have a brief statement of the intentions of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that is at all the parliamentary practice. The object of giving notice of a motion to be moved at a future day, is that the House may not be taken by surprise. The principle of the grant is specified in the resolution; the question as to how it is to be applied is a matter of detail, which will be properly gone into when the House goes into Committee on the resolution.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think the present is the time when we should have the explanation of the resolution. It is true that the notice is sufficient to meet the parliamentary requirements in the case; but I think it is the invariable custom, when such motions are made, to explain to the House why they are asked to adopt them. We are now virtually asked to commit ourselves to the principle of the expenditure of the money, and I think we have the right to ask how it is to be expended. I am interested in a large number of fishermen who are desirous of ascertaining how they are to be affected by this grant, and I have received a number of letters on the subject. In a very short time the fishing season will be open, and all these men will be engaged in their pursuits, and they are anxious to know what they have to do to be entitled to a share of this bounty. For every possible reason I think we ought to have the explanations now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the fishermen are anxious, not to get a statement from the hon. Minister of Finance, but to know the decision of Parliament, and that can only be arrived at in Committee.

Mr. KILLAM. I have no doubt that this is a difficult subject to deal with. The question of relief and assistance to the fishermen has engaged the attention of the Government for the last three years, and although no provision was made for them in the National Policy, it is pleasing to see how anxious the Government are to take their case into consideration. I presume that the hon. the Finance Minister cannot give any explanation at the present time, because he is occupied in deciding what he will do about the drawback on sugar, as he was in finding out the proper duty to impose on sugar, when he forgot to consider the case of the fishermen before.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before the House proceeds to the Orders of the Day, I wish to make a statement in regard to a matter in which I am somewhat interested. Some days ago I gave notice that unless some other arrangement should be made, I would move to take up the discussion of the question of which I gave notice some time ago, as an amendment to going into Supply. Some of the papers reported that I had announced that I would move my resolutions on the next occasion on which the motion was made to go into Supply, and those who read that report of course were curious to know why I did not make the motion on either of the two occasions that have since arisen. I make this explanation to show why I did not move. I still hoped that I might get the consent of the leader of the Government to move the resolutions in some other way at an early day. I therefore now ask the leader of the House if he will give me an opportunity of dealing with that question at an early day. I know that there is no hope of reaching it in the ordinary way on the private

days, as there are so many notices of motions before it. I would like to reach it, if possible, on Tuesday next, and have it understood that it would come up on that day, so that people outside might be aware of the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The request of the hon. gentleman is a reasonable one, considering the importance of the subject involved in his resolutions, and I will undertake to give him an early opportunity of bringing this subject up. I prefer not fixing Tuesday, because my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is to bring down his railway policy on that day, but I would say Thursday next. I will arrange that he shall have an opportunity of bringing up that question and discussing it fully on that day.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am quite satisfied with that arrangement.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Since the right hon. leader of the Government is willing to fix a future day for the motion of my hon. friend opposite, I have a Bill before this House which interests the public of Canada much more directly than the motion of my hon. friend, however important it is, and I would like the hon. Prime Minister to renew, if possible, the engagement which he made last Session, and fix a day when I can bring forward that Bill. As it stands on the paper, it is not likely, even if the Session be prolonged, that we can reach it before prorogation. Therefore if the hon. gentleman would give that Bill precedence on the paper, so that it may be brought before the House this Session, I think the country would be very much obliged to him.

Mr. GUILLET. I have charge of a very important Bill, which comes before the hon. gentleman's Bill on the Order Paper, and, as it concerns the interests of the seamen of the Province of Ontario, I think that, if these favors are to be generally accorded, my Bill should have precedence of the Bill of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ANGLIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways when I may expect the returns with relation to Intercolonial rolling stock purchased outside of the Dominion; sidings which were built during the last year or two; and the number of employes, and the salaries paid them two or three years ago and at present? Some of these returns, I think, could be made up in a very short time; but, so far, I have in vain waited patiently for their appearance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state he is aware that it is impossible for me to furnish any one of the returns to which he has alluded, without reference to the local headquarters of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, as these returns have to be there made up. I lost no time in making this reference, and I received last night two of them at all events. I suppose that they will go to the Secretary of State's office to-day, and that I will be able to lay them on the Table of the House on Monday next. The last one, I think, will take more time; but, at all events, instructions were given to use all possible expedition.

Mr. KILLAM. I moved some time since for returns respecting the prices of stores, &c., purchased for the Intercolonial Railway; and I would like to know whether they are in such an advanced shape that they will likely be laid before the House within a few days. I wish very much to get this information before we discuss the corresponding item in the Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that the same course was taken with reference to the motion of the hon. gentleman. Instructions were given to use all possible despatch, and as soon as they are received, they will be laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. IVES. As I understand the matter, the Bill of the hon. member for L'Islet more particularly interests a very

Mr. COSTIGAN.

small portion of Her Majesty's lieges, the contractors, while the Bill of the hon. member for Northumberland refers to the seamen of only one Province, Ontario.

Mr. GUILLET. It seeks the enjoyment of rights which other seamen have already obtained.

Mr. IVES. But I have charge of a Bill that interests the Dominion generally, and the members of this House very particularly. I always had the impression that charity begins at home, and it would be well for us, in giving precedence to different measures, to consider one that has more particular reference to ourselves. I refer to the Bill with respect to the amendment of the Election Law. I know that a very large amount of interest is taken in this Bill by members of both sides of the House, and I think that an early opportunity ought to be given to go into Committee on this Bill with a view of passing it into law.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call attention to the very defective character of a return which has been laid on the Table in answer to an order from this House, with respect to the expenditure on the part of the Pacific Railway Commission, and any possible further expenditure, with a copy of all correspondence. Papers in possession of the Commission themselves have been sent down, but nothing of what has been done by the Administration. The return contains no statement of the process by which the work of the printing of the evidence was transferred to the Government Printers from the house of Messrs. Stephenson, who appear to have received the contract; nor does it contain a statement referred to in one of the letters, as enclosed in that letter; nor a statement which purports to be an account for printing work. The letter is there which says the account is here; but the account is not here. The order of the House was also for an estimate of what the expenses not already made, would be; and, although the whole of the printing has been completed, and although evidently the accounts of the parties have been rendered—I presume that the account for the whole of the work has been sent in—there is no statement of the expense for printing work whatever. An estimate of the different expenses generally to be incurred was also asked for, but there is no statement of the estimated expenses for the Commissioners at all; so that the statement is quite imperfect. We were led to understand, last Session, that the rate for the Commissioners services had been fixed, but the letter of the Secretary says it is not easy to give an estimate on that subject, that, with the exception of himself, no fixture has taken place as to the remuneration of the Commissioners. The hon. Minister of Finance, in answer to a question to myself, stated what the rate of remuneration is to be; but there appears to be some question as to allowances. The work of the Commission is over; the printing is done; we want to know what the expense is to be. The House granted the order; but the return, although it is voluminous and although it contains a great many letters, does not give any idea as to what the expense is to be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will soon get that.

DISALLOWANCE OF STREAMS' BILL.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Mr. Speaker, those who, like yourself, are old enough to remember the party struggles, the party triumphs and the party defeats in the old Parliament of Canada, under a legislative union, the form of government that prevailed before Confederation, have a lively recollection of the circumstances and causes that led to these party conflicts in the early days of Canadian history. Old Upper Canada, whether right or wrong, I am not now going to discuss, always persistently and earnestly contended, that

under the Union of the two Provinces, she never had fair play. We know that many questions of vital importance to the individual Province were constantly coming to the front of the political stage—questions of a purely local character that affected the Province only, and that the voice of a majority of representatives of the people from the Province affected by the proposed legislation was often overridden by the voice of the whole House. We know something now, historically at all events, of the long and gallant struggle to abolish the clergy reserves, to change the seigniorial tenure, to secure to each Province a fair share of local legislation suited to its wants and requirements, and a fair share of local self-government and public works. We know that such local questions were constantly cropping up. We know that on some occasions these questions were disposed of contrary to the voice of a majority of the representatives of the people from the Province affected. We know that great dissatisfaction and discontent prevailed as the result. We know the keen and bitter struggle that followed. We know that parties in the old Parliament of Canada were so evenly balanced that neither party could successfully carry on the Government of the country. We know that at one time, at all events, Governments were made and Governments were unmade by the vote of one man. We know that then we were face to face with a grave and serious danger, and the hon. gentleman who now leads the House said, in his speech in the old Parliament of Canada on Confederation, that men of all parties and of all shades of politics became alarmed at the aspect of affairs. Under these circumstances, it was easy to see that the then condition of affairs could not long continue to exist. If it was desirable that our allegiance to the British Crown and to British institutions should be continued, that the growth and prosperity of the Provinces should be secured, that local affairs should be placed absolutely under the control of each Province a new condition of affairs must necessarily spring out of the chaos, and the confusion and the deadlock that, to some extent, prevailed in those early days. Various schemes were then suggested, as a remedy for the prevailing discontent. The double majority was tried, it failed. Government by coalition was tried, it failed. The hon. the First Minister, in the speech to which I have referred, pointed out other remedies. One was the dissolution of the Union between Upper and Lower Canada, and leaving affairs in the condition in which they were before the Union of 1841; the second solution of the difficulty was, representation by population; and the third solution was, a federal Union of all the British North American Provinces. The result was a federal Union of all these Provinces, willing to join the great Confederation. This Union was based on the principle long contended for by the Liberal party, especially of the Province of Ontario—the principle announced at their various conventions and gatherings imitated by the leaders of the party and supported by their followers—the principle that all local affairs should be dealt with by the local authorities, and that all affairs of a national character should be disposed of by some joint or federal power. I am satisfied that the Union of the Provinces would not have taken place, at all events at the period at which it did take place, had that not been the guiding principle in the minds of the leading statesmen who had to do with that question. I am satisfied it was one of the principles that moved the various Provinces to join Confederation—the absolute, unchecked, unrestrained control of their own local affairs. Had they thought otherwise that, notwithstanding the Union of the British North American Provinces, the local affairs of the individual Provinces, affairs assigned to them by the constitution, and over which they were supposed to have sole control, should be subject to the revision, and the disallowance of the Dominion Government, these Provinces never would have joined the Great

Confederation. It was known after Confederation did take place that, although the powers given to each of the Governments were reasonably clear and well defined, still, under our constitution, new and untried, different interpretations might be put upon the different powers reserved to the different Governments, and so, at an early day in the history of Confederation, it became necessary to lay down some clear, well defined, and permanent rule by which the Dominion Government would be guided in passing upon local legislation, and by which the Dominion Government would be restrained from the exercise of the power of vetoing reserved by the British North America Act to the Dominion Government over the Legislation of the different Provinces. It was of the first consequence to the well being and prosperity of each Province. It was of the first consequence to the security and permanence of the Union, that the interpretation put by the Dominion Government upon that portion of the constitution which assigned to each Government its authority and power in matters of legislation should be certain and permanent. The hon. gentleman who now leads this House and who then guided the destinies of this country—who was then and is now Prime Minister—aware of the necessity of having these powers well defined, he, at an early day in the history of Confederation, did, so far as human skill and human ingenuity could, define the powers assigned to each of the Governments and especially the right of the Dominion Government to pass upon local legislation. Upon the 8th January, 1868, the right hon. First Minister prepared a State paper, which I hold in my hand, dealing with this important question. Permit me, for the satisfaction of the House, to read from that reliable and important document, the views which the hon. First Minister then entertained with respect to the right and power of the Dominion Government in passing upon local legislation:

"In deciding whether any Act of a Provincial Legislature should be disallowed, or sanctioned, the Government must not only consider whether it affects the interest of the whole Dominion or not, but also whether it be unconstitutional; whether it exceeds the jurisdiction conferred on the Local Legislature, and, in cases where the jurisdiction is concurrent whether it clashes with the legislation of the General Parliament"

"As it is of importance that the course of local legislation should be interfered with as little as possible, and the power of disallowance exercised with great caution, and only in cases where the law of general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand it, the undersigned recommends that the following course be pursued:

"That on the receipt by Your Excellency of the Acts passed in any Province, they be referred to the Minister of Justice for report, and that he with all convenient speed, do report as to those Acts which he considers free from objection of any kind, and if such report be approved by Your Excellency in Council, that such approval be forthwith communicated to the Provincial Government.

"That he make a separate report, or separate reports, on those Acts which he may consider—

- "1. As being altogether illegal or unconstitutional.
- "2. As illegal or unconstitutional in part.
- "3. In cases of concurrent jurisdiction as clashing with the legislation of the General Parliament.
- "4. As affecting the interests of the Dominion generally. And that in such report or reports he gives his reasons for his opinions."

That is not all. These are the grounds, as I understand this paper, upon which the hon. gentleman thought in the early days of Confederation that the Dominion Government would be justified in passing on local legislation, in vetoing or disallowing it. But, even assuming the local legislation was in violation of the rules laid down by the hon. gentleman, even then, Sir, he did not appear to think that the Dominion Government would be justified in at once disallowing local Legislation without notifying the Local Government and giving them an opportunity of repealing or amending the obnoxious features, because he goes on to say:

"That where a measure is considered only partially defective, or where objectionable as being prejudicial to the general interests of the Dominion, or as clashing with its legislation, communication should be had with the Provincial Government with respect to such measure; and that in such case, the Act should not be disallowed, if the general in-

terests permit such a course, until the Local Government has an opportunity of considering and discussing the objections taken, and the Local Legislature has also an opportunity of remedying the defects found to exist."

Sir, that paper bears date the 8th June, 1868, shortly after the inauguration of Confederation, and that exposition of the constitutional rule, in dealing with local legislation and the grounds upon which the Federal Government would be justified in vetoing local legislation, was approved of by His Excellency the Governor General on the 9th of June, 1868; and to this day, at all events, with one exception, no other exposition of the constitutional rule has been laid down that I am aware of. On the 17th of June, 1868, the various Local Governments were made acquainted with the conclusion arrived at by the then Minister of Justice, now the First Minister. Now, Sir, I submit that the hon. gentleman then took a sound position, that his interpretation of the power of the Local Legislatures and of the right of the Dominion Government to interfere with their legislation, was a reasonable and correct one, and I am not disposed to quarrel with the propositions the hon. gentleman then laid down. Had the hon. gentleman adhered to the proposition thus laid down in the State paper from which I have just quoted, had he not departed from the principles therein set forth, had he and his followers not subsequently claimed, as I submit they do claim, the absolute, unconditional and unrestricted right of interfering with and disallowing all local legislation, whether within or beyond the local legislatures to pronounce upon, had a new departure not been taken. Had the principles on which he first acted and on which he has acted since Confederation, been acted on throughout, I would not now be about to place in your hands the amendment I propose to place in your hands before I resume my seat. Those of us who know something of the hon. gentleman, who have watched his career for the last quarter of a century, who know the means by which the hon. gentleman obtained power, and the sources from which he has drawn and still draws his strength—those of us who know something of the hon. gentleman's opinions as to a federal and legislative Union, those of us who know that the hon. gentleman was always a pronounced advocate of legislative Union of all the Provinces, are not I surprised at the ground he has subsequently taken, and that he should, by his course, endeavour to so handicap local legislation as to make the Local Legislatures practically playthings in the hands of the Dominion Government. Under the new system of Government the hon. gentleman came into power on the 1st of July, 1867; he remained in power till the 5th of November, 1873; he again came into power in October, 1878, and he is in power to this day, and during all these years, with one exception, the hon. gentleman has acted upon the principle laid down in this paper of the 8th of June, 1868. Sir, for many long years the hon. gentleman has led the Government; he has been the ruling spirit in the various Governments of which he has been a member for the last fifteen years; he has been the main spring by which the various pieces of machinery in the Cabinet of curiosities have been set in motion, and during all these years, until very recently, when, no doubt, strong personal and political pressure was brought to bear upon him, has acted upon the principles laid down in the paper of the 8th of June, 1868; and it was only when, that strong personal and political pressure, that could no longer be resisted, that the hon. gentleman departed from the course he at first marked out for himself and transgressed the rule he at first laid down. It was only then that the hon. gentleman yielded his better judgment and his sounder convictions to the exigencies of the hour, or perhaps it would be more correct to say the exigencies of his party and openly transgressed the rule laid down by himself and strained the constitution to its

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

utmost limit. Now, Sir, I have pointed out the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman thought the Dominion Government would be called upon to interfere with local legislation. I now propose pointing out that on these principles the hon. gentleman has acted for the last fifteen years while he was in power, with the one exception of the Streams' Bill, that his interpretation of the rule laid down, and of the right and power of the Dominion Government to interfere in local legislation has been uniform and consistent; to do otherwise, to recognize and admit that the Federal Government, without let or hindrance, without rule or principle, except the arbitrary will of the Minister of Justice for the time being, have the right to interfere with, to check or veto local legislation, although that legislation is within the scope of the powers assigned to the Local Legislatures under the constitution is to admit that the Local Legislatures are not within the constitution—legislative bodies even when legislating within the powers assigned to them by the Constitution and, Sir, I am not prepared to admit any such proposition. I am not prepared to admit by sanctioning the hon. gentleman's course, in disallowing the Streams' Bill—a question I propose to deal with shortly—that there is in the hands of the Dominion Government a power that cannot be checked and that cannot be controlled; that the hon. the Minister of Justice, sitting in his chair in his office at Ottawa, knows better what is in the interest of a province and what is for the benefit of the people than the sworn advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor, aided and assisted by a free Parliament. I prefer adopting the constitutional rule laid down by the hon. gentleman that the Local Legislatures within the scope of the powers conferred in them should not be interfered with unless in violation of certain well defined rules. I prefer adopting the opinion of Mr. Todd, who says that local legislation should not be interfered with except "where it appears that the proposed legislation is contrary to the policy which, in the opinion of the Governor General in Council, ought to prevail throughout the Dominion in lieu thereof," and that the power of veto should only be invoked where the legislation is "likely to prove injurious to the interests of the Dominion." Now, Sir, I propose for a moment or two to point out that the hon. gentleman has acted upon the principles he has laid down. I propose going a step further, and showing by a series of Acts that passed under the review of the hon. gentleman, that for fifteen years, while he occupied a position in the Government, and when those Statutes were submitted for his inspection, he, in every single instance, with one exception, has followed out the course laid down by himself in 1868. The hon. gentleman has even gone further, and where provincial legislation was in violation of the rules so laid down he did not assume the responsibility of disallowing that local legislation, without giving the Local Governments notification of his objections to the Bills, and giving them an opportunity of amending that legislation and making it in conformity with the laws as interpreted by the hon. gentleman. This is a most important question; it is a grave question; it is a question that affects the well-being and prosperity of every individual Province; it is a question that affects the security and the permanence of the Union, about which we hear so much from the hon. Minister of Railways; and therefore I offer no apology to the House for taking up some time in going over the Statutes of the various Provinces that passed in review before the hon. gentleman, which were in violation of the rules laid down by himself, that he did not disallow in the first instance, but which he, in the judicious exercise of the functions of his office, notified the Lieutenant Governors were objectionable and gave the Local Governments an opportunity of amending or correcting them. I find the Province of Quebec passed an Act continuing the Bankruptcy Laws of that Province. That Act passed in review

before the hon. gentleman. It was clearly unconstitutional, it trenched upon the powers of the Dominion Parliament. Did he disallow the Act in the first instance? Nothing of the kind. He drew the attention of the Local Government to it, and suggested the propriety of allowing the Act to expire, and I believe it was allowed to expire accordingly. The Legislature of the Province of Quebec passed another Act respecting corporations doing business beyond the Province of Quebec. That Statute also passed in review before the hon. gentleman. It was clearly *ultra vires*; the Legislature had no such power; but the hon. gentleman did not assume the responsibility of disallowing the Bill, although it was clearly a violation of the rules laid down by himself. He drew the attention of the Quebec Government to the obnoxious provisions in the Bill, and I believe the Bill was subsequently amended. The Legislature in Quebec passed an Act respecting the Recorder's Court of Quebec. The Bill was in violation of the rules laid by the First Minister, because it trenched upon the criminal law and the power of dealing with the criminal law is vested exclusively in the Dominion Parliament. The hon. gentleman did not disallow that Bill; he drew the attention of the Local Government to its obnoxious features. I believe it was subsequently amended by the Local Government. The Legislature of Ontario passed an Act authorizing the publication of the *Ontario Gazette*, and making provision for enquiries respecting public matters. This Bill also passed in review before the hon. gentleman, subsequent to the time when he laid down the rules to which I have referred. He pointed out several provisions of that Bill that were objectionable as trenching on Dominion legislative powers, but he did not disallow the Bill. He allowed it to go into effect. He did not assume the responsibility of disallowing it, although it was contrary to the rules laid down by himself. The Ontario Legislature passed an Act respecting gold and silver mining. That Bill also came in review before the hon. gentleman. It was not disallowed, although some of its provisions were clearly unconstitutional, he drew the attention of the Government to its obnoxious provisions. The Legislature of Ontario passed an Act respecting registrars. That Act was also in some of its provisions an encroachment upon the powers of legislation assigned to the Dominion Parliament. The hon. gentleman did not assume the responsibility of disallowing it, he allowed the Bill to take effect, and drew the attention of the Local Government to its provisions. The Ontario Legislature passed an Act for the encouragement of agriculture. It was also defective in some of its provisions, one of which was a violation of the rules laid down by the hon. gentleman in regard to disallowing Local Acts, when they trenched upon the legislative powers of the Dominion Parliament. He did not disallow the Bill, but permitted it to take effect, drawing the attention of the Local Government to its obnoxious provisions. The Ontario Legislature passed an Act respecting municipal institutions, one of the provisions of which provided a qualification for Dominion parliamentary electors. The Bill was clearly *ultra vires*; yet the hon. gentleman did not disallow it but permitted it to take effect. The Ontario Legislature passed an Act to continue for a limited time the Acts therein mentioned. It was in violation of the rule laid down by the hon. gentleman, because it undertook to continue the old Bankruptcy Law, which was a subject with which Local Legislatures had no power to deal. The Ontario Legislature passed an Act called an Act respecting the Clifton Bridge. The hon. gentleman had this Act in review, but he did not veto it although it was in violation of the rules laid down. It enabled a corporation to construct a bridge extending beyond the boundaries of the Province of Ontario, and was therefore *ultra vires*. Did the hon. gentleman disallow it? It was not within the

competence of the Local Legislature, because the subject was one beyond their power to deal with, yet the hon. gentleman did not assume the responsibility of vetoing the Bill. Another Statute passed in the same year, by the Ontario Legislature, was intitled: "An Act to incorporate the Board of Trade of the Town of Guelph." The hon. gentleman had that Act in review before him, and, although he reported that one clause was defective because it undertook to deal with trade and commerce, and, therefore, beyond the power of the Local Legislature, yet he did not undertake the responsibility of vetoing the Bill. He notified the Local Government of the fact, and it amended the Act as it thought fit. Another Statute passed by the Ontario Legislature was: "An Act to incorporate the Simpson Loom Company." It came also under review. The hon. gentleman pointed out that the second clause was beyond the jurisdiction of the Legislature as it dealt with the Patent Laws—a matter within the exclusive power of the Dominion Parliament; but it was allowed to go into operation, drawing the attention of the Local Government to the defect. There was an Act passed by the Legislature of the Province of New Brunswick relating to the Synod of the Church of England, in the diocese of Fredericton, and Province of New Brunswick. It came in review before the hon. gentleman; it was objected to as being unconstitutional and beyond the power of the Local Legislature. But the hon. gentleman said of it:

"Having carefully examined the provisions of the Bill, I am of opinion that it is within the jurisdiction of the Legislature of New Brunswick, and no rights of the Crown are affected by it, and recommend that it be assented to."

Now, here was a Bill within the competency of the Local Legislature. It was objected to, it was allowed to go into operation solely because it came within the power of local legislation. There were three other Acts and only three, on which I have been able to lay my hands which passed in review before the hon. gentleman, and which were clearly unconstitutional, but which the hon. gentleman did not disallow. He submitted them to the English Law Officers of the Crown, who pronounced them beyond the power of the Local Parliament, and subsequently, I believe, they were either disallowed or repealed by the Local Parliament. One of these Bills, Sir, was the Act respecting County Court Judges. In that Statute, the Local Legislature undertook to define and limit the tenure of office of County Court Judges. The hon. gentleman in a State paper on the subject points out, clearly enough, that that was beyond the power of the Local Legislature; that such Legislature had no right to deal with a question of the kind; that it was solely within the authority of the Dominion Parliament; and that the Local Legislature could not restrict or extend the tenure of office of County Court Judges. Another Statute passed by the Local Legislature was intitled: "An Act to define the privileges of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario." The hon. gentleman pointed out that some parts of this Act was *ultra vires*. The third was the Supply Bill of the Province of Ontario. In that Bill provision was made for the payment by the Provincial Government in part of the salaries of the Judges of the Superior Courts there. The hon. gentleman took objection to that Bill also, but he did not take the responsibility of disallowing either of them, although they were clearly beyond the power and competence of the Local Legislature. He took the more cautious course of referring these three Bills to the Law Officers of the Crown, who pronounced them all *ultra vires*. But it is of importance what the hon. gentleman did say in his report upon these Bills. It is worth while reminding the hon. gentleman himself what his expressions of opinion were upon this subject. It is worth while reminding the followers of the hon. gentleman who are now disposed to extend and enlarge the powers of the Dominion Government, of what

the hon. gentleman said twelve or fifteen years ago when dealing with these Bills. He said:

"The undersigned recommends that the attention of the Government of Ontario be called to the two first mentioned Acts, and the 6th clause of the last Act, suggesting that they should be repealed next Session and action taken place upon them meanwhile."

Now, Sir, the manner in which the hon. gentleman dealt with the Streams' Bill, with which I propose to deal, was very different from the delicate and tender manner in which he undertook to deal with the Bills to which I have just referred, and notably with the three last Statutes of the Province of Ontario which I have named. What is the reason that the hon. gentleman now lays down and acts on a rule so entirely different to that laid down and acted on years ago? Is there anything in the political atmosphere which would justify a change in the sentiments of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and followers? We know that when the hon. gentleman presented this report on these three Bills the Government of the Province of Ontario was in the hands of friends of the hon. gentleman—the two Governments were in harmony, and we know that now a different state of things exists. The Government of the Province of Ontario whose legislation has been crippled and checked by the hon. gentleman, is not in harmony with his Government. Is it the object of hon. gentlemen opposite now to handicap and cripple the legislation of the Government of Ontario? Having said this much on the character of the legislation that passed in review before the hon. gentleman, and of the way in which the hon. gentleman dealt with it, I shall for a moment or two deal with the Streams' Bill—the one which is immediately before us for consideration and review to-day. The Streams' Bill, as it is known, was passed on the 4th of March, 1881, by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, and it is intitled "An Act for protecting the public interests in Rivers, Streams and Creeks." One clause provides:

"All persons shall have and are hereby declared always to have had, during the spring, summer and autumn freshets, the right to and may float saw logs and all other timber and all rafts and crafts down all rivers, creeks and streams, in respect of which the Legislature of Ontario has authority to give this power."

Now, one would imagine that there was nothing very formidable or objectionable in that clause. It gives a measure of protection to those engaged in the timber trade in this country. There is nothing which one can imagine would arouse the objections and animosity of hon. gentlemen in Parliament or out of Parliament against that provision. There are a score of precedents in the Statute-Book for exactly such legislation, and I will be in a position to show, before I resume my seat, that this Bill is not objectionable in any feature; or no more so at least than scores of Statutes to which the hon. gentleman has assented. Another section of the Bill provides that a person making improvements on any such streams should not have an exclusive right to them or to the use of the stream. Section four provides that tolls may be collected, and that such tolls shall be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Section five provides that the Act shall apply to improvements made after the passage of the Act, as well as to those made before; and section six provides that a person who makes improvements shall have a lien on the lumber passing down the stream as reasonable compensation for the use of the improvements. Now, Sir, the right to float saw logs and lumber down a stream was a right secured to the people of this country by an old Statute of the Province of Canada. That right was re-enacted in the Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada and in the Revised Statutes of Ontario. To a plain uninitiated mind, it would appear that under the provisions of that Statute, these rights were reserved to every person who saw fit to use those streams, and that the Act applied, according to its very language, to all streams, not merely

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

to streams floatable in a state of nature. The evident intention of Parliament was that the Act should apply to all streams. Let me read the clause to which the Streams' Bill purports to be an amendment. It provides that:

"All persons may during the spring, summer, and autumn freshets, float saw logs and other timber, rafts and crafts, down all streams, and no person shall, by felling trees or placing any other obstruction in or across such streams, prevent the passage thereof."

Now, the right which Parliament secured to the public by this Act was supposed to extend, according to the very language of it, to all streams. It was supposed to extend to streams down which saw logs or other timber could be floated, with or without improvements, and if that right did not exist what would be the position of the trade to which I have adverted? Take one of the smaller streams of this Dominion down which timber has been constantly floated to the great markets of the east and the Mother Country. Suppose a man owns a limit on a portion of that stream, and a neighbor owns another further up the stream. If the contention of the hon. gentlemen be correct, if the construction they put upon the Statute be correct, then the man who owned the limit down stream had it in his power to prevent the man further up from taking the produce of his toil and labor to the markets of the world. I do not think that the law meant any such thing. Unfortunately what gave rise to the litigation and to the Act of Parliament in question, and to the conflict of authority between the two Legislatures, was an interpretation put upon the old Statute by one of the Courts of Ontario. That Court, in the case of *Boale vs. Dickson*, held that the wording of the old Statute only applied to navigable streams, or streams floatable in a state of nature, and did not extend to streams that were not floatable in their natural condition. Resting on that authority, a man by the name of Peter McLaren, who owned a limit in the county of Lanark on two streams, one of which was called Buckshot Creek, and the other Louise Creek, neither of which were floatable in a state of nature, and on which improvements had been made by McLaren to render them floatable, undertook to restrain and prevent the use of that stream by a person having a limit further up the stream. He claimed the absolute and unconditional ownership of the stream itself and the bed of the stream, by virtue of patents which he alleged he had obtained from the Government; and, as riparian proprietor and relying on such claims, a man named Caldwell, who owned a limit farther up the streams, was prevented and restrained from bringing his timber to market by McLaren. This man McLaren, in order to restrain Caldwell from using the stream, filed a Bill in the Court of Chancery, and it may be well to read one clause of that Bill to show the extraordinary grounds on which Mr. McLaren based his claim to the absolute and unconditional ownership of the streams in question—streams which I contend belong to the people of this country. He says that the streams flowing through his parcels of land were not navigable streams, "nor floatable for logs and timber," while in the Crown, nor until after the improvements set forth in the Bill were made on the said streams by the plaintiff; and that in their natural and unimproved state, they would not, even during freshets, permit of saw-logs or timber being floated down the same, but were useless for the purpose. And in the 10th paragraph the plaintiff thus states his rights:

"The plaintiff is entitled, both as riparian proprietor and as owner in fee simple of the bed of the said streams, where they pass and flow through the said lots respectively, to the absolute, exclusive, and uninterrupted user of the said streams for all purposes not forbidden by law, and amongst other purposes, to the absolute and exclusive right to the user of the same for the purpose of floating or driving saw-logs and timber down the same."

He then goes on to say that on various parts of the said streams which run and flow through lands therein

described, the plaintiff and those through whom he claims have expended a large amount of money in making certain specific and very valuable improvements, which he sets out in a number of the following paragraphs of the Bill. The case came up before Vice-Chancellor Proudfoot, and the Vice-Chancellor gave judgment in Mr. McLaren's favor, without argument, resting on the authority of the case of *Boale v. Dickson*, with a view of having the law settled in the Court of Appeal. It did go to the Court of Appeal, the highest Court in the Province of Ontario, and that Court sustained the appeal with costs. I cannot present the case in a clearer or better light or describe more accurately the position and the rights of the different parties, and the rights of the public involved in this question, than by reading from the judgment of one of the ablest Judges that ever graced the Ontario Bench. The Judge says:

"Having reached the conclusion that all streams are by public authority dedicated as highways to at least the extent essential to the defence in this action, I have only further to remark that when the obstruction which stood in the way of the enjoyment of the legal right is removed, when the traveller by land or lumberer seeking to float his lumber down a stream, finds the highway unobstructed, he is at liberty, in my judgment, to make use of it without inquiring by whom, or with what motive, the way has been made practicable. He finds the rock on the road allowance blasted, or the chasm that crossed it bridged, and he pursues his journey along the highway thus improved; or he finds that the fresher covers all obstacles with a sufficient depth of water, and he floats his logs down the highway thus made useful. It may be in appearance and perhaps, in reality, rather hard on the man at whose expense what was a highway only in legal contemplation becomes one fit for profitable use, has to allow others to share in the advantage without contributing to the cost. That is, however, a matter for his own consideration when he makes the improvements."

Now, Sir, this judgment was given after the Streams' Bill became law, it was given after the Streams Bill was disallowed by the Government. While the case was before the Court of Appeal, the Minister of Justice, without waiting for the judgment of the Court of Appeal, without cause, without reflection, without conference with or notification to the Ontario Government, without following the rule which the hon. gentleman says should be followed on every occasion, on the 19th of May, in hot haste, *ex parte*, upon the statement of Mr. McLaren or Mr. McLaren's counsel, disallowed this Bill. He knew nothing of the reasons which induced the Local Parliament to pass this Bill; he knew nothing of the reasons which induced the Lieutenant-Governor to lend the sanction of Her Majesty to this Bill. He knew nothing of the circumstances which made such a Bill necessary in the public interest, but on the *ex parte* statement of one of the litigants, he disallows the Bill. Sir, if he were acting as counsel for one of the litigants, one could understand his action; but acting as the Minister of Justice, bound to conserve the rights of the different Provinces, and to see that their legislation is not improperly interfered with, the hon. gentleman's disallowance of the Bill, and his reasons therefor, are most extraordinary. I will trouble the House with an extract from the reasons the hon. gentleman gives. After a review of the position of affairs between the parties, pending the litigation between McLaren and Caldwell, the late hon. Minister of Justice says:

"He (Caldwell) attempted to float his logs down McLaren's stream and through his improvements. To prevent his doing so the suit in Chancery, above referred to, was instituted, and a decree was made declaring Mr. McLaren exclusively entitled to the use of the streams and improvements, and restraining Mr. Caldwell from floating logs down the stream.

"The effect of the Act now under consideration must necessarily be to reverse the decision of this suit.

"The effect of the Act as it now stands seems to be to take away the use of the property from one man and give it to another, forcing the owner practically to become a toll collector against his will, if he wishes to get any compensation for being thus deprived of his rights.

"I think the power of the Local Legislature to take away the rights of one man and vest them in another, as is done by this Act, is exceedingly doubtful, but assuming that such right does in strictness exist, I think it devolves upon this Government to see that such powers are not exercised in flagrant violation of private rights and national justice, especially when, as in this case, in addition to interfering with the private rights in the way alluded to, the Act overrides a decision of a Court

of competent jurisdiction by declaring retrospectively that the law always was and is different from that laid down by the Court."

Now, Sir, it will be observed that the two grounds on which the late hon. Minister of Justice advised and recommended the disallowance of this Bill are: 1st. That the Act in question is in violation of private rights; and 2nd. That it is retrospective, and overrides a decision of a Court of competent jurisdiction. The hon. Minister of Justice admitted the competence of the Local Legislature to deal with this question. He admits that it was a question of property and civil rights only. He admits that the Dominion Government had no power to deal with it, and he admits that the Act did not clash with Dominion legislation, rights or interests. He knew, as I have indicated, nothing about the merits of the case. He did not take the trouble to communicate with the Local Government on the subject. He knows the case is in appeal. He does not wait for the judgment of that court; but, at the instigation of one of the litigants, the hon. Minister of Justice at Ottawa undertakes to disallow this Bill. Sir, I say that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will search in vain among the precedents laid down by themselves, among the parliamentary records, and among the Blue-Books, where these things are recorded, to find a precedent for the line of action which was pursued by the late hon. Minister of Justice. Now, Sir, it is not pretended that it comes within the rules laid down by the present hon. Premier when Minister of Justice; nor that the Act is unconstitutional; nor that it trenches on Dominion legislation. Why, then, I ask, Sir, should the hon. gentleman undertake to veto this legislation? Is there any reason for it, outside the constitutional rule laid down by themselves? One will rise from a perusal of the whole history of this transaction, and of the documents submitted by these hon. gentlemen to Parliament with his mind firmly impressed with the idea, that there was something behind the whole transaction which does not appear on the surface, and that there was something outside of and beyond the interests which the hon. the Minister of Justice was bound to guard, which induced the late Minister of Justice to veto this Bill. Now, as I have said, the Minister of Justice undertook to veto this Bill on two grounds: one was that it was in violation of private rights, and the other that it was retrospective, and overrode a judgment of a Court. Moreover, hon. gentlemen opposite have over and over again allowed just such legislation to pass into law. The First Minister has over and over again sanctioned and allowed to become law Bills retrospective in their character, and that overrode the judgments of Courts, and that interfered with private rights. If I can show you, Sir, that a score of Bills of this character were ratified by the hon. First Minister, when Minister of Justice, during the last fifteen years, and that the hon. gentleman over and over again stated that when a Bill was within the competence and power of the Local Government, even though it was retrospective, the Dominion Government had no right to and should not interfere, I think that I will have made out a case sufficiently strong to warrant me in placing in your hands the resolution which I propose to move. I will first deal with the assertion that this Act was retrospective and overrode a judgment of the Court. I find, Sir, that the Parliament of Ontario passed a Statute intitled "An Act to enable municipalities along the line of the Grand Junction Railway Company to grant aid thereby and to legalize certain by-laws granting such aid"—to legalize by-laws, which were wholly illegal. This Act came before the Minister of Justice. It was protested against and objected to. Some of its provisions were clearly retrospective. It interfered with private rights. But what

did the hon. gentleman say in reporting on the Bill? That many petitions were presented against it, but that as it was within the competence of the Local Legislature, it should be allowed to come into operation. Now, Sir, here was a Bill which expressly interfered with private rights, which made that legal which was not legal before, which made a corporation responsible and liable for debts for which they were not liable before, and which imposed on them responsibilities and duties that were not imposed on them by law, and yet the hon. gentleman allowed that Bill to go into operation, while the late Minister of Justice disallowed the Streams' Bill, which is no more retrospective, and no more interferes with private rights than the Bill to which I have just referred. Now, Sir, as to the other branch of this objection, namely that the Bill in question overrode a judgment of the Court. I find that on several occasions Parliament did pass Bills, the effect of which was to override a judgment of the Court. Some of us have a lively recollection—and I dare say also, the hon. Prime Minister—of the case of *Hammond vs. McLay*. In 1859, Hammond was appointed registrar of the county of Bruce. Under 9 Victoria, Chapter 34, this Statute enabled the Government to dismiss the registrar upon certain grounds specified therein. Hammond was dismissed by the Government upon a ground which was not mentioned in the Statute. He was superseded under the great seal of the Province of Ontario, and another man by the name of McLay was appointed in his place. Hammond brought an action for the fees, contending that the Government had no power so to dismiss him. Pending the litigation, and before a judgment was finally rendered by the Court of Appeal, the Government passed a Statute which changed the tenure of office from good behavior to during the will of the Lieutenant-Governor. Now, Sir, this was an *ex post facto* Act, which interfered with the judgment of the Court. This Act, Sir, was not questioned. It is true that it was before Confederation, but then the Imperial Government possessed precisely the same rights with regard to Colonial Legislation, that the Dominion now possesses respecting Provincial Legislatures. This Statute, Sir, was both retrospective, and it clearly overrode a judgment of the Court. I will give you another case—*Jones vs. Ketchum*. The action was brought against the defendant for exacting an illegal rate of interest. Pending the suit, the law on the subject was changed, and the plaintiff was thus deprived of the right that was vested in him at the commencement of his suit. This law interfered with a suit which was before the Courts; and so, Sir, I could go on submitting case after case until the House would be wearied of them. I will content myself with laying down the proposition, that it is no new principle in the legislation of this or of the Mother Country, that Parliament may interfere with a judgment of a Court. I attach more importance to the second ground in which the Streams Bill was disallowed, namely, that it interfered with private rights. I now propose to submit to the consideration of the House a number of Bills which were retrospective, which interfered with private rights, and which overrode a judgment of the Courts, and which all passed in review before the hon. gentleman, and which were all left to their operation. Now, Sir, the Legislature of the Province of New Brunswick passed an Act to exempt the homesteads of families from levy and sale under execution. This Act came before the hon. gentleman, he pointed out that some clauses in the Bill were objectionable, but he had no objections to the rest of the Bill. On reading the Bill you will find that it is in direct interference with private rights. It expressly interfered with judgments against debtors. Before this act was passed, the law enabled creditors to enforce the payment of their debt out of certain assets of the debtor, this law interfered with that remedy. It was an

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

ex post facto law of the most objectionable kind. But it was not to its operation. And so, Sir, you will find Acts of precisely the same kind passed by all the Provinces, and all left to their operation. I wish to draw the particular attention of the House to one passed by the Province of Quebec, its an Act respecting the "Society L'Union St. Jacques de Montreal." Now, this was an *ex post facto* Act, in the worst possible sense of the term. It proposed the enforced commutation of the existing rights of two widow ladies, and, who, at the time it was passed, were annuitants of this society, under the law and the rules of the society. This Statute proposed to enforce the commutation of their annuities, and it was clearly an interference with vested rights. It compelled those ladies to take a certain sum, when by law they were entitled to more. It deprived them of rights which were secured to them by the law of the land. What was the result? Like others, it passed in review before the hon. gentleman. It was not objected to. It was allowed to come into operation. It interfered with private rights, and yet the hon. gentleman allowed it to become law. What was the result? Litigation was the result of this Bill. It came before the Courts of Quebec, and the case was ultimately appealed to the Privy Council. What did the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council say? They said:

"Clearly this matter is private, clearly it is local, so far as locality is to be considered, because it is in the Province and in the city of Montreal, and unless therefore the effect of that head of section 92 is for this purpose qualified by something in section 91, it is a matter not only within the competence but within the exclusive competency of the Provincial Legislature."

Let me go a step further. The Province of Ontario passed an Act relating to the Government road allowances and the granting of timber licenses thereon. Hon. gentlemen who are disposed to take a different view of the right of the Dominion Government to disallow the Streams' Bill, who are disposed to give the Dominion Government unlimited power and unlimited control over local legislation, had better with care and caution read the report of the hon. First Minister upon the Bill which I have just referred to, containing the grounds upon which he allowed that Bill to become law. Now, under the law as it stood, when that Bill was passed, the road allowances in the Province of Ontario were vested in the municipalities, and all the timber upon the road allowances became, and was, the private property of individual corporations. The Government of Ontario granted timber licences to this very man McLaren, who induced the Dominion Government to disallow this Bill, and to others as well, and included within such licenses the timber that was growing on the road allowances, the fee simple of which was vested in the corporations. The municipalities protested against McLaren and others cutting timber on their private property; one of the corporations brought an action in the Court of Common Pleas against McLaren and others, and the Court gave judgment in favor of the plaintiffs on the grounds that the Local Government had no power to grant licenses to cut timber in lands which was not their property. The case was carried to the Court of Appeal, but before judgment was given in that Court this Act was passed by the late Sandfield Macdonald Administration in Ontario. What are the provisions of that Act? One of the clauses provides that:

"Every Government road allowances included in any timber licenses heretofore granted, shall be deemed to be and to have been ungranted lands."

Was not that retrospective legislation? One would naturally think that it was legislation of a retrospective and most objectional and vicious character. Here was a property that belonged to a municipality subsequently leased to a private individual. The lessee claims the timber on lands that never belonged to him—the municipality pro-

tests and the Legislature passes a Bill providing that the timber upon this property was included, and intended to be always included, in the licenses so granted. Section 2 provided that

"The licensee shall be deemed to have, and to have had, all rights in the trees, timber, lumber thereon, or cut thereon, as if the same were cut on any patented land of the Crown."

Now here was an Act that was respectful in its character, that interfered with private rights, that directly took the property from one person and vested it in another without compensation, that overrode the judgment of the Court and rights of the municipality. The corporation of the county of Frontenac petitioned against this Act, and the Act passed in review before the hon. the First Minister with all its objectionable features. Did the hon. the First Minister disallow the Bill? Not at all. He said: "It is clearly within the competence of the Local Legislature, and the undersigned recommends that it be left to its operation." When the Streams' Bill came before the hon. gentleman he did not take that ground; it was admitted that it was within the competence of the Local Legislature, but though it was within the competence of the Local Legislature it was a violation, according to the Government's opinion of private rights, as now expounded by them, it was retrospective legislation, it was vicious legislation, and therefore, at the instance of political supporters they at once disallowed the Bill. One rule is laid down where a Bill is objected to by a political opponent. Another where a Bill is objected to by a political friend. Sir, if I could only trespass on the patience of the House I could mention a score of cases where the hon. gentleman has acted on principles entirely different to that in which he acted in disallowing the Streams' Bill. The hon. gentleman in disallowing this Bill has not a foot to stand on—he has transgressed all rules and all precedents, his own precedents, his own record for fifteen years, constantly springs up against him. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look at the Blue-Books they will find he has in this matter, as in others, transgressed the rules laid down by himself. Let me refer for a moment to another case—the Goodhue Will Case. Goodhue made his will leaving to his children a life estate, in his property, with a reversionary interest, to his grandchildren. The children agreed to make a different distribution of the estate, to that mentioned in the will and sought to have their agreement ratified by the Local Legislature. The Local Parliament did ratify it, without the sanction of some of the parties directly interested in the estate, some of whom were minors, and some Her Majesty's subjects residing out of the Dominion of Canada, and despite the solemn protest of the trustees appointed under the Bill. The trustees protested to the Local Legislature, then to the Lieutenant-Governor, and finally to the Dominion Government, they protested against sanctioning a Bill that made for another man a will he did not make for himself. Did the hon. First Minister disallow that Bill, as, perhaps, he ought to have done; because, if there is any kind of legislation which ought to be disallowed, it is legislation that makes a will for man that in his lifetime he never contemplated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." He does not appear to be able to grapple with the distinction between the Stream Bill and the Goodhue Will Case. But all the same there is a clear distinction. In the one case, an individual undertakes to control the navigation of a public stream; to prevent everybody else from using that stream; to get absolute possession of the stream, and to hold possession of it; and, under the interpretation the hon. gentleman put upon the law, as it stood before the Streams' Bill was passed, he has got the power to

retain possession of it, and prevent those working limits further up the stream from getting the product of their labor to market, and thus interfering the public user of a public stream. In the other case the Legislature undertakes to make a new will for a dead man. Yet the hon. gentleman cannot see the distinction between the two cases; in passing upon the Goodhue Will Bill, what did he say? He recommended that this Act though strongly protested against should be left to its operation solely on the ground that it came within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. There is another Bill that came before the hon. gentleman, the Orange Bill, which passed the Local Legislature but did not receive the assent of the Crown, it was a reserved Bill.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman does not see the distinction between a Bill that has received the sanction of Parliament that has become the law of the land unless vetoed, and a Bill reserved for the consideration of the Dominion Government. It appears to my mind very clear that there is the greatest possible distinction between the two cases, and nobody knows that better than the hon. First Minister. What did the hon. gentleman do with the Orange Bill? He admitted that it was within the competence of the Local Legislature. Of course it was. It came before him, he had the power, with the stroke of his pen, to make that law, which was not law before. Instead of doing that he undertook in advance to advise the Lieut.-Governor what to do, in case the Bill again received the sanction of the Local Legislature. The hon. gentleman said this:

"If these Acts should again be passed the Lieutenant-Governor should consider himself bound to deal with them at once and not ask Your Excellency to interfere in matters of provincial concern, and solely and entirely within the jurisdiction and competence of the Legislature."

Now, why did the hon. gentleman who was not prepared to advise the Governor-General to interfere in a matter within the competence of the Local Legislature, who was not prepared to advise the Governor-General to allow that Bill to come into operation although it was within the competence of the Local Legislature and should have received the assent of the Lieut.-Governor, why should he now, in a matter he must admit is within the competence of the Local Legislature, instruct his Minister of Justice to advise the Governor-General to disallow the Bill, a Bill as much within the competence of the Local Legislature as the other. In the one case it suited political purposes to throw the responsibility of the legislation on to the Local Government. It suited his purpose to hamper, annoy and embarrass, if possible, the Local Legislature. It suits his purpose now to conciliate a strong personal and political friend, and he is conciliated accordingly. How anxious the hon. gentleman was in the one case to sustain the Local Legislature, how anxious is he now to embarrass, hamper and annoy the Local Government. What a sudden and serious change in the views of the hon. gentleman. I am, Sir, quite satisfied that the change in the hon. gentleman's opinion as to the right of the Dominion Government to interfere has not been brought about by a due regard for the public interest. Now, Sir, there is another Bill to which I wish to refer, and in dealing with that Bill, the hon. gentleman has put upon record, in the plainest possible manner, his views of how far the Dominion Government is justified in interfering with local legislation. I refer to the New Brunswick School Bill. Now, in my judgment, if there ever was a Bill within the competence of the Local Legislature that the Dominion Government would be justified in disallowing, that measure was one of them—I speak for myself only. It was a Bill that seriously affected a large portion of the population of that Province; with our Roman Catholic fellow subjects it

was a Bill that compelled these people to contribute to a system of education that they could not conscientiously avail themselves of. It was a Bill that affected not merely one individual, as the Streams' Bill did, but a large class of the population; it was a Bill that affected a large class of people, and which they contended violated, if not their legal, at least their equitable rights. Yet the hon. gentleman allows that Bill to pass into law. It came before him for examination; it was strongly protested against. He had a grand opportunity of dealing fairly and justly with that class of the community who thought they were wronged by that legislation. Now, it is well to remind the hon. gentleman of these things, because I know that in the multiplicity of his avocation, he cannot be expected to go back on the records of fifteen years. What did he say in his report of the 20th January, 1872:

"The Provincial Legislature has exclusive powers to make laws in relation to education. It may be that the Act in question may act unfavorably on the Catholics or other religious denominations, and if so it is for such religious bodies to appeal to the Provincial Legislature which has the sole power to grant redress."

And he is of opinion that no other course is open to the Dominion Government than to allow the Act to go into operation. The hon. gentleman's opinion is that if there is anything objectionable in the Bill, the remedy is not to be obtained from the Dominion Government or the Dominion Parliament, but from the Local Legislature, from the hon. gentlemen who controlled the destinies of the Province for the time being. The remedy is not to be sought from the Minister of Justice, but from the Local Legislature. Now, in connection with this subject I wish to read a very forcible State paper, published by the Executive Council of New Brunswick, valuable as a solemn protest against any proposed interference by the Dominion Parliament or the Dominion Government with the rights of the Province to deal with questions within the competence of the Legislature. That paper said:

"The assumption by the Provincial Legislature and Government of Canada of the right to seek the imposition of further limitations of the powers of the Provincial Parliaments is subversive of the federal character of the Union, tending to the destruction of the powers and independence of the provincial law to the centralization of all power in the Parliament of Canada.

"The people of New Brunswick cannot, and will not, surrender their rights of self government within the limits of the Constitution."

Sir, I admire the pluck of the Executive of New Brunswick. I admire the courage and the patriotism that impelled them to send to the Dominion Government this solemn protest worthy of all praise, a policy which would do credit to the first constitutional Government in Europe. The State paper goes on to say:

"The Executive Council in Committee therefore hasten to warn the Government and Parliament of the danger involved in the passage of said resolution, which if passed must stand as a precedent of innovation of provincial rights—fruitful of evil; and, in the name of the people of New Brunswick and invoking the protection of the constitution, the Executive Committee in Council protest against the passage of such resolution, and emphatically assert the right of the Legislature of New Brunswick to legislate upon all questions affecting the education of the country free from interference by the Parliament of Canada."

Sir, I say again that that protest is worthy of all praise, and one that hon. gentlemen opposite, and notably the hon. First Minister ought to lay to heart. That is not all. There is a State paper published by the First Minister in the New Brunswick School Bill containing a more effective protest even than that. The hon. gentleman shortly after the publication of the State paper from which I quoted had under consideration this School Bill, the solemn protests of the Roman Catholics of that Province against it, of the people, the clergy and hierarchy, and an earnest appeal to the Dominion Government to exercise in the public interest the power of disallowance, what answer did Dominion Government make to that appeal. The hon. gentleman says:

"One sole matter which presented itself to the Government was whether, according to the British North America Act of 1867, the Legis-

Mr. CAMERON (HURON),

lature of New Brunswick had exceeded its powers. As the officer primarily responsible on such subjects, he could only say that he had taken uniform care to interfere in no way whatever with any Act passed by any of the Provincial Legislatures if they were within the scope of their jurisdiction. There were only two cases in his opinion, in which the Government of the Dominion was justified in advising the disallowance of local Acts. First, if the Act was unconstitutional and there had been an excess of jurisdiction; and, second, if it was injurious to the interests of the whole Dominion."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that, because Mr. McLaren's rights were prejudiced, according to his contention, the interests of the whole Dominion are affected by it? Is Peter McLaren the whole Dominion? Will the hon. gentleman undertake to tell this House that the interests of the whole Dominion are affected because the Government of Ontario undertook to pass a Bill protecting the public interest in the streams and creeks of Ontario? The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"In the case of measures not coming within either of these categories the Government would be unwarranted in interfering with local legislation.

"In the present case there was not a doubt that the New Brunswick Legislature had acted within its jurisdiction, and that the Act was constitutionally legal and could not be impugned on that ground.

"On the second ground which he had mentioned in which he considered the Dominion Government could interfere, it could not be held that the Act in any way prejudicially affected the whole Dominion, because it was a law settling the Common School system of the Province of New Brunswick alone.

"The Government of the Dominion could not act and they would have been guilty of a violent breach of the constitution, if, because they hold a different opinion, they should set up their judgments against the solemn decision of a Province in a matter entirely within the control of that Province."

Sir, I ask the hon. gentleman what can be clearer or more cogent than that? The hon. gentleman's line of argument is unanswerable, and because unanswerable the disallowance of the Streams Bill is wholly unjustifiable. The hon. gentleman sets up his opinion against that of the Government of Ontario, and a large majority of the people of Ontario. He sets up his views of the constitutional rule of to-day against that in which he has acted for fifteen years. As the hon. gentleman is in an unenviable position, as he cannot reconcile himself with himself, I leave the hon. gentleman just where he is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How long?

Mr. CAMERON. Not longer than I can help. Now, Sir, as I have disposed of the hon. gentleman's practice and the hon. gentleman's precedents. Let me refer the House to one or two opinions of one or two eminent men on this subject, and then I have done. Lord Carnarvon, to whom as Colonial Secretary, was referred a resolution of the House of Commons respecting this same School Bill, says:

"That he laid it at the foot of the Throne, but that he could not advise Her Majesty to take any action in respect of it; that he could not advise the Queen to advise the Legislature of New Brunswick to legislate in any particular direction as that would be an undue interference."

Further on he says:

"Holding, as I have already explained, that the constitution of Canada does not contemplate any interference with the Provincial legislation, on a subject within the competence of the Local Legislature by the Dominion Parliament, or as a consequence by the Dominion Ministers."

Sir J. D. Coleridge and Sir G. Jessell say of it:

"Of course, it is quite possible that the new Statute of the Province may work in practice unfavorably to this or that denomination therein, and therefore to the Roman Catholics; but we did not think that such a state of things is enough to bring into operation the restricting powers of appeal to the Governor in Council."

And so I might quote Todd on the subject, who lays down precisely the same doctrine; but I am not disposed to extend the discussion any further. I have shown conclusively the rules laid down by the hon. First Minister himself.

I have shown that for years he loyally adhered to the rules thus laid down. I have shown that whenever Local Legislatures encroached on the rules thus laid down the hon. gentleman, did not disallow said legislation; but directed the attention of the Local Government to the obnoxious features of the Bill and allowed it to go into operation. I have shown that for a period of fifteen years, of all the local legislation passed by the various Provinces of the Dominion, not a single Bill of the Province of Ontario was disallowed with the exception of the three already mentioned, and none without the Local Government having had their attention directed to the vicious features of such legislation. I have shown that the Streams' Bill was not in violation of the rules so laid down, that it was within the competency and power of the Local Legislature, and that its disallowance was an unwarranted interference with the rights of the Local Legislature. I have shown that this Bill was not only within the competency and power of the Local Legislature; but that it was a Bill in the public interest, in the interests of the lumbermen, in the interests of trade, and of the people of this country. I have shown that the Parliament of Canada has, over and over again, passed laws retroactive in their character, interfering with private rights, and overruling the judgment of the Courts. And now I say to the hon. the First Minister, to this House, and to this country, that if we submit to the interference, the unwarranted, unconstitutional, unjustifiable interference of the Minister of Justice in a case of this kind we may as well abolish Local Legislatures altogether, for they will be Parliaments only in name, not in substance, not in reality. And I say, further, that if we tamely submit to this unwarranted interference of hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather to that of the hon. Minister of Justice, we are tamely permitting the Dominion Government to strike a fatal blow at the autonomy, the rights, the powers, the independence of the Provinces. And I am not prepared to submit to that. Already Local Legislatures have been shorn of a considerable portion of the power supposed to have been secured to them under the Constitution. During this very Parliament the great Province of Ontario is about to be legislated out of the power it always had of dealing with County Court Judges. The hon. Minister of Justice, if we sanction and approve of what has been done with respect the Streams' Bill, will deprive the Province of the right of legislation, and if effect is given to the vote of a majority of this House, Ontario will be shorn of a large portion of her territory and of her territorial rights. I say then that this is not simply an Ontario question, but one that affects every Province of this great Dominion of ours, and every representative of every Province should solemnly protest against this unjustifiable and unconstitutional interference by the Dominion Government with local legislation, because it is a direct violation of the terms on which we entered into Confederation; it is a violation, if not of the letter, at all events of the spirit of the Constitution. It reduces Local Legislatures to a position below that of County Councils. It makes the hon. the Minister of Justice, and not the Local Parliament, the Judge as to whether or not legislation is proper and in the interests of the people of the Province. It gives to the Dominion Government rights which the Constitution never contemplated they should have. But, Sir, I say we should do something more than protest before this high Court of Parliament; our protests here are vain, our warnings are unheeded. There is another and a higher Court to which we can appeal with every confidence that justice will be done—I mean the great Parliament of the people. To that court and before that tribunal, with firm faith in the justice of our position, I challenge hon. gentlemen to carry this question, and with an abiding faith, in the integrity and impartiality of that court I have no doubt of

the result. Now, Sir, in order to give hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of being consistent, I beg to move the following resolution:—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be *Resolved*,—That in the opinion of this House, the power of disallowing Acts of a local nature conferred by "The British North America Act 1867," is vested in the Governor General in Council, and that His Excellency's Ministers are responsible to Parliament for the action of the Governor General in exercising or abstaining from the exercise of the said power.

That it is of the essence of Federal principle as embodied in our constitution that the said power should be used only in cases where the law and the general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand it.

That it would impair the Federal principle and the independence, constitutional powers, autonomy and institutions of the several Provinces to allow of the exercise of the said power in regard to legislation on subjects within the exclusive competence of the Local Legislatures, on the ground that in the opinion of His Excellency's advisers, or of the Canadian Parliament, any such legislation is wrong.

That the question of propriety is under the Constitution one to be decided exclusively by the Local Legislature on its responsibility to the people of the Province who are the sole judges of such action.

That the only exception which has heretofore been proposed in such cases is where the measure prejudicially affects the interests of the Dominion generally.

That it has been the rule ever since 1868 not to exercise the power of disallowance on the ground that a measure is considered only partially defective or objectionable, as being prejudicial to the general interest of the Dominion without communication with the Provincial Government, nor (if the general interests permit such a course) until after the Local Government has an opportunity of considering and discussing the objections taken, and the Local Legislature has also had an opportunity of remedying the defects found to exist.

That it appears from the papers laid on the Table of this House that an Act passed by the Legislature of Ontario on the 4th March, A.D. 1881, and intitled: "An Act for protecting the Public interests in rivers, streams, and creeks," was disallowed by His Excellency in Council on the 19th day of May, A.D. 1881, by Order approving a report which does not assert that the said Act is beyond the competence of the Local Legislature but expresses an opinion adverse to the propriety of certain provisions of the Act.

That the said Act was within the exclusive competence of the Local Legislature, and was not of such a nature as to render its provisions subject to the judgment of or disallowance by the Government of Canada.

That the Minister of Justice and the Government of Canada had, under these circumstances, no right to act on their opinion whatever it might be as to the propriety or impropriety of the said Act.

That it appears from the papers that no communication was had with the Government of Ontario on the subject of the said Act prior to the disallowance, nor was any opportunity given to the Government of considering or discussing the objections, or to the Legislature of Ontario to deal with the alleged defects.

That the papers laid on the Table show the importance of such communication; and the danger of action by the Minister of the *ex parte* statement and argument of a Petitioner against the Act.

That the said exercise of the power of disallowance was not in accordance with the principle of the constitution, and that the said Act should have been left to its operation.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not, Sir, without some hesitation that I rise to address the House on the question now before it. It is well known that in the suit to which reference has been made in the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Cameron) and the resolution which is now in your hands, I happened to be counsel for one of the parties—the gentleman to whom he has referred to so repeatedly as the one at whose instigation the Dominion Government disallowed the Bill. But, although a counsel in that case, as indeed was my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, I have, after consideration and after consultation with men who are better acquainted with parliamentary affairs than I can pretend to be, come to the conclusion that it would not be proper for me because of the position which I occupied in the suit of McLaren against Caldwell, to refuse to take part in the discussion of a matter so important as this is. The question is no longer of any interest to Mr. Peter McLaren. My connection with that suit has long since ceased, or, at all events, ceased so far as this is concerned, because I have no personal interest, nor any interest such as I might be expected to have if my client's interests were affected. I propose, therefore, to let the House understand, perhaps a little better than they did by the speech of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat,

the facts connected with the case, the history of it, and how it was that, in the end, Mr. McLaren was obliged, for the protection of his rights, to petition His Excellency the Governor General, and ask him to disallow the Bill, which practically deprived him of a very large and valuable part of his property. In the early part of the year 1880, Mr. McLaren, as was his custom for several years, had got out a stock of logs to be floated down the stream called the Mississippi. That stream was not, according to the decision of the learned Judge before whom the question of fact was tried, after a long and patient investigation by him, a stream which, without artificial means, was capable of floating saw-logs, or timber, or anything else to market. The means by which that stream has been rendered useful, has been rendered capable of being used for the purpose to which Mr. McLaren has applied it, were obtained by a very large expenditure of money. That expenditure is stated in the petition which is now on the Table of the House—having been brought down in answer to an address—to have been in the neighborhood of \$250,000, and by these improvements the timber which was on Mr. McLaren's limits could be brought down to Ottawa, and in doing so he had been obliged, not only to improve the main stream itself, but to carry the property on the tributary streams, and make vast improvements upon them so that the water might be brought down in the season in which the lumber was gotten out. It was shown in that case, and it is not denied, and I believe every practical lumberman will acknowledge the truth of my statement, that while the stream was useful for one man and for the logs covered by one controlling power, when the water could be let on in order to float the logs to market, it could not be made use of by more than one individual, at all events in the one year. So that when in that same spring, Mr. McLaren himself having got out a large stock which he desired to bring to market that year, when Mr. Caldwell, also for the first time, endeavored to intrude upon him by getting out a large stock with the intention of bringing it down by the same means, the position Mr. McLaren found himself in was this: If I am to have the benefit of the expenditures of my own capital in the improvement of this stream, then I am required and called upon, in my own interest, to see that Mr. Caldwell shall not occupy the stream to my disadvantage. It comes to this: either I am to have the use of the stream for the purposes for which I have made the improvements upon it, or a person who has not spent one dollar in making those improvements is to occupy the ground and deprive me of my vested rights. Under such circumstances he appealed to the Court. He appealed upon what was recognized as the law of the land; he appealed upon the authority of three or four decisions which had, for fourteen or fifteen years, been universally acquiesced in; he appealed because he had purchased a vast proportion of this property and had made improvements on other portions of it, relying upon the law of the land which said that this stream, which was incapable of use in a state of nature, was not to be opened to the public because it was made floatable by artificial means. Upon that proceeding he obtained an injunction prohibiting Mr. Caldwell from using his improvements, not from using the stream so far as it was navigable or floatable, as in part it is, but from using his improvements as he threatened to use them, which would have deprived the true owner of the right of using them in the same year. Well, Sir, in due course, the case came to a hearing, and in December of that year, at the town of Perth, after a long and careful investigation, Mr. Justice Proudfoot determined that the stream in a state of nature was incapable of being used for floating timber, or for any other useful purpose; and relying upon the decisions which, up to that time, were supposed by the public and by

Mr. McCARTY,

the legal profession to be the law of the land, he determined that Mr. Caldwell should be perpetually restrained from using or attempting to use the improvements made by Mr. McLaren. Now Sir, if that was good law, I think I shall be able to satisfy this House and every fair-minded man that the law ought to prevail. If, on the contrary, that law was wrong, then this Bill, about which we have heard so much, was and is unnecessary; so that the question comes to this—that if the law is, as it has been declared by repeated decisions to be, that no person has a right to use improvements made on a stream by another, which of itself was not floatable, then I contend—and I think that not only this House, but the higher Court to which the hon. member has ventured to appeal, will say—that the law of the land ought not to be altered to suit private individuals because they happen to be political friends. If, on the contrary, the law, as expounded by the Court of Appeal is correct, then Mr. McLaren must submit then that this Statute was unnecessary, and this discussion and all that has given rise to it ought never and would never have taken place. Now, Sir, what was done? In the Session of 1831, Mr. Caldwell, having lost his suit, appeals from the courts of the country to the Provincial Legislature, and having been a supporter of the Local Government, having a large influence, having, I believe, a nephew in the House, he approaches the Local Government and induces them to pass the law which has been referred to as the Act for the protection of streams and rivers; and it cannot be properly or fairly denied that the whole object of that general law was to despoil Mr. McLaren of his property and hand over to Mr. Caldwell, his rival in business, that which belonged to Mr. McLaren. The hon. member admits that; but, Sir, I am not contented with that hon. gentleman's admission, because I will satisfy the House, by the papers I have here, that that was the sole object of this legislation, and then if the House is prepared to censure this Government because it used the power given to it by the Act of Confederation for the purpose of protecting the property of a private individual, and for the purpose of preventing a man from being despoiled of his property in the interest of a political opponent who happened to be a friend of the Local Government, I would not care to have the honor of a seat in this Parliament. But I believe there will be no such result, either here, or in the country, or wherever this matter is discussed. Well, let me show to the House that at the very earliest stage, Mr. Caldwell appealed to his friend, Mr. Pardee, the Commissioner of Crown Lands. So early as the 4th of May, almost immediately after the Bill was filed, hon. gentlemen will find in the return brought down that a letter was written by Mr. Pardee in the tone of an autocrat, in a tone which I do not understand any Minister of the Crown has a right to use to the people of this country in respect of their own rights. If hon. members will look at page 29 of that return, they will find that Mr. Pardee expresses himself in this way:

"Although the information given in this latter respect is deemed reliable, the Department has great hesitation in crediting it as a fact that you, a holder of licenses to cut timber on the public domain, have assumed the position of obstructing the free passage of timber down the river, as such action would be not only unjust and ungenerous on your part to other licensees from the Crown, but also detrimental to the interest of the public revenue by interrupting the legitimate operations of other limit holders, and on these and other grounds could not be sanctioned, or in any manner permitted by Government."

The Local Legislature, if a man happens to differ from them in politics, will not sanction his exercise of his rights; the Local Legislature, as led by Mr. Mowat and Mr. Pardee, says that if a man is opposed to them in politics, whose rights a friend of theirs in politics desires to encroach upon, they will not sanction him in using his rights, but

those rights will be annulled by those who have the power to annul them.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). That is too strong.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is too strong, I admit, for a free people to submit to any such action as that for the benefit of a man who happens to be a friend of the Local Government. Well, Sir, protests were made to the Local Legislature; the press spoke, I think I may say, in loud and grave tones concerning the outrage which was being perpetrated. The Bill was opposed, but the Local Premier called upon his majority, letting them know that it was for the interests of the party that McLaren should be despoiled and that Caldwell should be advanced, and the Bill became law so far as the Local Legislature could make it law. The result was—what? That when the Act became the law of the land the suit which had been at that stage decided in favor of McLaren, was virtually reversed, the injunction which McLaren had obtained in perpetuity according to the decree of the Court, and which prevented Caldwell using his property, was, by an Act of the Legislature, which is just now before us, for our consideration, was reversed, and that suit was virtually determined in favor of Caldwell, the defendant to it. Well, Sir, what was the result in another respect? Why it was this: Here was a property which, as it was shown in the petition presented to His Excellency, had cost the proprietor of it in the neighborhood of \$250,000. It was a property that was worth to that man as much as \$250,000; and it formed for him a valuable asset, that he could sell and dispose of to any person who desired to purchase his property and his improvements; and yet the result of this Act of the Legislature, was—if that law were allowed to stand—that this property worth \$250,000 to a private man to-day became public property by this Act to-morrow; so that an asset which, if this man was making up a statement of his accounts and an inventory asset, would have shown to-day, as improvements on the different rivers and streams which are referred to in this Bill—of which my hon. friend has made mention—to be of value to him to the amount of \$250,000, or whatever they cost, to-morrow, was by an Act of Parliament, swept all away, and is as public as the streets in this city, or the highways throughout the country. It has ceased to be the private individual property of the owner, and has become the public property, as the streets are in the towns and the roads in the concessions in the country parts of the Dominion are to-day; the result is, that in making up a statement with regard to these assets on the next day, he would have to blot out this asset of \$250,000, which had stood properly put down as property yesterday. Now, Sir, I stop to challenge contradiction as to the fairness and exactitude of the statement, as to results which I make concerning the position of the litigants in the suit of McLaren vs. Caldwell—a result brought about by legislation which the Local Government passed. Now, Sir, what was he to do? He had sought in vain, as this paper fairly brought before His Excellency in petition in this book of extracts shows, by petition to the Local House, by representations made in every manner known in a free country, in order to induce the Local Parliament to stay its hand. He had sought to prevent the passage of this Bill, and he had sought in vain. The law had been passed. His property had been swept away. He had, in lieu of it, what the hon. member has ventured to call tolls; and I think that, when the hon. gentleman comes to understand it, the hon. member who spoke of tolls as being an adequate compensation, will have to admit, if not by his vote, at all events in his heart and conscience, that it was no recompense or compensation for property which was taken away by Act of Parliament.

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

After Recess.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONSTRUCTION COMPANY BILL.

Mr. BOULTBEE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the International Construction Company.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 2,

Mr. BLAKE. I think this Bill should have undergone the supervision of the Railway Committee. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite have had their attention specially drawn to this measure, but from a cursory perusal of the clause which we are now on, it would appear that it would lead to important results. I would call the particular attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to this clause. It sets out:

The Company may enter into contracts and agreements with any person or corporation for the constructing, equipping, maintaining and operating of railways, telegraph lines, canals and bridges for railway or general passenger or freight business, and in like manner for the building, equipping, maintaining and working steam and other vessels, and, in conformity with such contracts, may build, construct, equip, maintain and operate all such works and undertakings, for and on behalf of the persons or corporations authorized by the laws of Canada to build, construct, equip, maintain or operate the same, or on their own behalf, as may be agreed upon in the contracts respecting the same.

It will be observed that this goes further than construction under this name; it is a Bill to create a corporation for the purpose of operating in public works, and it enables this corporation to obtain a contract for a railway from any individual person authorized to work a railway, and to undertake the operation of a railway. We give franchises to railway and telegraph companies to build and operate these works. Franchises are also given to corporations whom we know, and recognize, and authorize; but this measure would authorize these particular persons, and any other persons or corporations who may become shareholders to operate any railway company in the country with whom they might contract. For example, suppose they entered into a contract with the Great Western or Grand Trunk Railway Companies to operate these roads, they might do so under the provisions of this Bill; and it seems to me that such wide powers, not merely of construction, but of operation, are important to consider before we grant them.

Mr. BOULTBEE. Mr. Chairman, this matter came up in the Private Bills' Committee, and the Bill was held over for several sittings to have this point considered. They cannot build railways or telegraph lines unless they have charters for them. It is quite true they have the right to work the Great Western or Grand Trunk Railways or any other private work; and why not? I know no reason to the contrary if the shareholders of those companies wished it, they should be able to do so as well as any other private party. The Bill was most carefully considered and discussed in the Committee, and I do not know why there should be an attempt to delay the Bill because the hon. member for West Durham says that they have certain power to do certain things; and why not?

Mr. BLAKE. This is no attempt to delay. What I say is this, and I hope the hon. Minister of Railways understood it: This Bill confers very extensive franchises and powers, to work different railway enterprises. The old Parliament of Canada chartered the Great Western and Grand Trunk Companies, and they operate under these powers; but this is a Bill which would authorize this particular corporation to get hold of all the railways in the country, by contract with the different corporations, and

operate them all. The hon. gentleman says: "Why not?" I do not offer any opinion, because I have not fully examined the Bill; but, under the circumstances, I think it would be better that the Committee should rise and report progress.

Mr. BOULTBEE. That will cause delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Better have delay and have the Bill carefully considered, than precipitately adopt the Bill which seems at first sight to contravene that which has been adopted so far in the present Session.

Mr. BOULTBEE. At this late hour the effect of asking permission to report progress would be to delay the Bill, and probably cause it to be lost. When that Bill came up before the Private Bills Committee, a member of the Government asked that it be referred to the Railway Committee, but on examination he was convinced it properly came within the cognizance of the Private Bills Committee. The slightest consideration will show that this railway cannot have any such power as the hon. Minister of Railways suggests. It has simply to build and work railways and contract public works. If this company has the right to work the Great Western Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, it could only work those under their charters and would have no power of amalgamation. I venture to suggest that if the hon. Minister of Railways will only take the time to examine this Bill, he will see it cannot possibly have the effect he suggests.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Any Bill that provides for the constructing and operating of railways ought to go to the Railway Committee. I would like to have an opportunity of considering the Bill to-morrow with my colleagues. That will not lead to any delay, the Bill will not lose its place, and very possibly assistance will be given my hon. friend to carry it on. I should fail in my duty if, holding the opinion I do, I did not ask that short time, and the lack of disposition shown by my hon. friend to allow that time makes it all the more necessary that it should be given.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I do not know why, when I am endeavoring to secure the passage of a Bill in which I have no personal interest, it should be suggested that my anxiety renders it at all dangerous. It does not follow that because we are allowed under this Bill to build a railway that we can build one without getting a charter. A member of the Government had this Bill laid over in the Private Bills Committee, because it was suggested that it would go before the Railway Committee; but it was known to the Committee that the Bill gave no power to build railways whatever, unless the Company got a charter, therefore it was considered that the Bill should be dealt with by the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think I recognize in this Bill an old friend in a new face. It was introduced in the Local Legislature of Quebec about a year ago, and came very nearly passing until it was discovered that it simply meant a Bill which might be instrumental in securing amalgamations of Companies which could not otherwise be obtained. I take some little credit to myself for having done something in having this Bill defeated in that Local Legislature. I think the passage of this Bill, therefore, ought to be postponed, and I would not be sorry to see it postponed altogether.

Mr. BOULTBEE. The hon. member for Cardwell would like to get it postponed altogether, because he gave some advice to the Quebec Government; but his advice on that occasion must have been more valuable than on the present, for he knows nothing whatever about this Bill. I venture to say that no legal authority would give the opinion that this Bill confers any power of amalgamation whatever on the Company, and if it does not there can be no objection to letting it go through.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does it not confer the power on the Company of operating the Great Western Railway Company?

Mr. BOULTBEE. It does.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And to operate the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company?

Mr. BOULTBEE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If so the amalgamation is accomplished.

Mr. BOULTBEE. Has not the Great Western Railway Company the power to carry on its business where the Toronto Grey and Bruce Railway does? I should like to have the opinion of the leader of the Government as to whether any power of amalgamation is given in this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is just what I would wish to have time to consider.

Bill reported.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills, were considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Company—(Mr. Scott.)

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the St. John's Bridge Company—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Richelieu Bridge Company.—(Mr. Baker.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. MILLS. As a matter of privilege, I wish to call the attention of the House to a paragraph in the *Morning Herald*, of Halifax, to which my attention has been directed. The paragraph reads as follows:—

"The debate on the Ontario Boundary Award question brought up once more the singular and explicable fact of Hon. David Mills having, while Minister of the Interior, accepted a fee (or bribe) of \$4,000 from the Government of Ontario in this very dispute,—it being then pending."

In the report of Mr. Plumb's speech the following passage occurs:—

"The money this Minister of the Interior received from the Ontario Government to prepare a case in Opposition to that which he should have advanced as a Privy Councillor of Canada, was \$4,000."

"A VOICE. Who received that \$4,000?"

"Mr. PLUMB said the member who received the \$4,000 was the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the late Minister of the Interior, and for that sum he prepared evidence to show that Ontario extends to the Rocky Mountains."

"An hon. MEMBER. He would have proved that Ontario extended to the Pacific for another \$4,000. (Hear, hear and laughter.)"

"Mr. PLUMB said this was not all, for the statement on behalf of the Dominion was prepared by Colonel Dennis, who was in the member for Bothwell's Department. It was not to be supposed that the member for Bothwell would send a statement from his Department at variance with his own views. This is beyond question one of the most disgraceful things which has ever been brought home to any public man in Canada. Mr. Mills was not a lawyer so that he cannot claim that he was retained professionally, even if it were permissible for a lawyer in his position to have taken a fee—which it certainly would not be. He was simply a layman holding the position of the Minister of the Interior of Canada."

I mean to say this, that neither the statement of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), if he made it, nor the observations of the *Herald* are true. They are both malicious falsehoods. I was never the employe of the Ontario Government after I became a Minister of the Crown. I was asked by the Ontario Government to undertake a report upon the question of the boundaries in March, 1872, and I made the report in December, 1872. Mr. Mowat again asked me to undertake the preparation of the case in 1875—in June I think it was. In August, 1876, I made a second report on the case for the Ontario Legislature. I was appointed a Minister of the Crown in October following. For my first report I received from the Government of Ontario—they paying the expenses I incurred for tracings and photographs of maps—\$1,000; and for the preparation

the case they paid me \$1,500 or \$2,500 for the two. I know no impediment in the way of my undertaking the work. I find that hon. gentlemen opposite paid a gentleman for investigating this subject on behalf of the Dominion Government, who never undertook to put the results of his labors on paper, as much as I received for both these reports. If I had known this statement had been made by the hon. member for Niagara, I would have contradicted it then, but I do so now, the first time I have observed such a report was made. I say the report is untrue, and the statement in this paper is a malicious falsehood.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It seems to be in order to call attention to little items published in the papers when they reflect injuriously on members of the House. I desire to call attention to a paragraph which appears in to-day's *Globe*, in which my name is mentioned. In the *Globe's* correspondence from the capital, it is stated that:

"It is more than hinted that several members of the House largely supplement their indemnity and mileage by fees for promoting Bills. How far their constituents approve of their representatives tying their hands in this way, so that they cannot vote upon important questions, it would be interesting to know. An equally important point is to know how such members justify their violation of the Independence of Parliament Act."

My name is coupled as one of those receiving fees. I have not directly or indirectly received any fee or reward whatever for promoting any Bill which would be contrary to the rules of the House, and as a professional man I do not do it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I find my name also included in the category. I can only say that I have not had a Private Bill in charge during this Session; that I have not been interested directly or indirectly in any Private Bill, except the Canada Landed Credit Company, which was in charge of the hon. member for West Toronto. I declined to take charge of said Bill, because my partner was solicitor for the Company. I have not received any fee or been in connection with any Private Bill, and any statement to the contrary effect is utterly unfounded and untrue. Perhaps, while I am addressing myself to this point, I might also mention another matter, to which I dislike very much to refer, as these personal matters are always disagreeable. I am told, although I did not see it, that this same correspondent of the *Globe*, at the Capital, stated that I was the holder of a timber limit or an applicant for a timber limit, and when I voted on the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, on this question, I voted contrary to my duty, and on account of my interest in that matter. That, Sir, is untrue. I never applied for a timber limit, directly or indirectly, and I never owned or had any interest in one.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I have just been informed that my name, also, is made the subject of remark in the paragraph. With respect to the Bill which I was endeavoring to put through the House, I was conducting it for the gentlemen whose names appear on it, and I never received a cent for doing so, or asked or suggested that I should receive a cent. With regard to the Thunder Bay and Minnesota Bill, which was thrown out in Committee, I did not get a cent for looking after it, nor do I expect to get a cent for it. With regard to the Lake Superior and Hudson's Bay Road, I am one of the incorporators, and I did not get a cent, nor do I expect to get a cent, for my connection with it. So with the Souris and Rocky Mountain Bill. I think it is rather hard that, without authority, these papers, simply for the purpose of making capital in the country, and injuring us before our constituents, should go so far as to make such scandalous assertions as these. We take a great deal of trouble to go through a great deal of hard work, and anxious and watchfulness in connection with these Bills, and I say it is rather hard that, after trying to do our duty, we should be made the subject of such charges as these. God knows I am

poor enough, and I am likely to remain poor enough so long as I am in Parliament. I am sorry to say that being in Parliament does not increase ones wealth, and I do not think it is desirable to increase it in that way, because if a man receives anything for promoting a Bill in Parliament, he would disgrace his position on the floor of the House and in the country. Charges like these cannot be answered, for if you were to write a reply they would simply reiterate the scandal and charge you with something worse. There is no way of making a defence in such a case, but I think there should be some plan of regulating these matters so that we who are doing our duty in Parliament to the best of our endeavors should not be met with scandals and charges like these. The repetition of such charges is calculated to make one feel disgusted with doing the best he can to carry out his duty to his constituents and to the country.

DISALLOWANCE OF STREAMS BILL.

House resumed the consideration of Mr. Cameron's (Huron) amendment to Sir Leonard Tilley's proposed motion that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McCARTHY. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was proceeding to consider that part of the Bill which deals with compensation. Perhaps I might first be permitted to state, however, what I understand to be the meaning of the word "compensation," when applied to the sovereign right of expropriation. Now, I do not pretend to dispute, and I am quite willing to admit in the amplest possible manner, so far as my judgment goes, that this Act of Parliament was, subject to one consideration, within the power of the Local Legislature. If that one consideration be overlooked there is power in the Local Legislature as in every other sovereign body—and the Local Legislature is sovereign so far as its jurisdiction extends—to expropriate property for public purposes. But, Sir, as I understand the doctrine of expropriation, as we call it, or as it is better known on the other side of the line, the exercise of its power of eminent domain, there are two limitations to the exercise of that power. The first and most important is that it should be exercised only in the public interest. There is no right, in the exercise of the power of eminent domain, to take from one man his property and hand it over to another unless it be in the public interest. The next important qualification in the doctrine—and perhaps it is more than the other, and at all events to the individual—is that the expropriation should be only on payment of full compensation. Now, that compensation, as you know, is always given where expropriation is exercised in the ordinary and familiar instances of railway companies or bridge companies. Under a Railway Act, before property can be taken for public purposes, the fair value of the property is to be given to the proprietor, and that fair value is arrived at in the manner pointed out by the Act—by arbitrators selected, one by the company, one by the individual whose property is taken from him, and the third by one of the Courts of the land. But it is perfectly plain that where this doctrine is perhaps better understood than anywhere else, in the United States, no exercise of the power of eminent domain is legal or constitutional, according to their law, unless it is accompanied by compensation—payment in money at the time, not payment postponed to any future date. Now, I am not unaware that there is no such limitation in our law; I am not unaware that, according to the doctrine of the British Parliament, the power we have and the power the Local Legislatures have in their spheres comprehends the power, though not the right, to take away a man's property without compensating him. But I challenge my hon. friends opposite to point out in the history of British legislation any instance in which the right of a

person whose property is taken from him to receive compensation has been departed from. Although there is the absolute power, that power has been so exercised under our free form of government that it has not been found necessary to limit it as it is limited in the United States. Now, I wish to point out another feature of this measure—that not merely, as I shall endeavor to show, is it an exercise of the power of eminent domain without adequate and proper compensation, but it is also an Act of Parliament relating peculiarly to past events. It is retroactive in its enacting clause; it does not speak merely for the future, but it legislates for the past, and thus two principles of sound legislation—principles of paramount importance—have been violated. First, property has been taken from an individual without adequate or proper compensation; and, second, the Act is retroactive in its effect, and in point of fact, determined the litigation then existing between the parties, and which gave rise to this measure. The power of eminent domain is said to be the supreme right of property appertaining to the Sovereign—the power by which private property acquired by the citizens under the sovereign's protection—may be taken, or its use controlled for the public benefit without regard for the wishes of the owner. The doctrine is thus stated by Judge Colley:

"It is the rightful authority which must rest in every sovereignty to regulate and control these rights of a public nature which pertain to its citizens in common, and to appropriate and control individual property for the public benefit as the public safety, convenience, or necessity may demand."

The limit to that power is this:

"That compensation shall be made therefor; and this compensation must be pecuniary in its character, because it is in the nature of a payment for a pecuniary purchase."

It is said by a learned Judge, in one case in which the matter was discussed, that

"This authority amounts to nothing more than a power to oblige a private individual to sell and convey while the public interests required it."

Mr. Chancellor Kent, in his able commentaries, thus speaks of it:

"The settled and fundamental doctrine is that the Government has no right to take private property for public purposes without giving just compensation; and it seems to be necessarily implied that the indemnity should, in cases which will admit of it, be previously and equitably ascertained, and be ready for reception concurrently in point of time with the actual right of eminent domain."

Again Judge Colley says:

"While the owner is not to be dispossessed until compensation is provided; neither, on the other hand, when the public authorities have taken such steps as to finally settle upon the appropriation, ought he to be left in a state of uncertainty to wait for compensation until some future time when they may see fit to occupy it."

Well, Sir, to quote once more:

"But whatever be the necessity and however important the public use, compensation must be made in money, and not in incidental benefits, in order to meet the true spirit of the constitutional provision upon that subject."

The general rule is clear, that although steps preliminary to expropriation may be taken without providing compensation.

"Before any definite act be done towards the construction of the improvement which is in the nature of the assertion of ownership, payment must be made or tendered or a certain and adequate remedy be provided, and unless this is done in the Act authorizing the work, the Statute is wholly unconstitutional and void."

I have troubled the House with these extracts because I think that they lay down correct principles of legislation. I do not mean to say, Sir—and I have carefully avoided, I think, stating—that these regulations apply to our legislation here; but what I do mean to say is, that the same spirit which regulates the written law on the other side has governed and always governs British legislation. I defy my hon.

Mr. McCARTHY.

friends opposite to point, in all the Statute-books of British legislation, to an Act of this character, intended to deprive a man of his property without giving him adequate and suitable compensation. Now, Sir, does this Act in any way come up to the terms of what I venture to say it should be, in order to bring it within the principles of sound legislation. The first section of the Act declares that notwithstanding any effect of the judgments of the Courts up to that time, all streams during the spring, summer and autumn freshets were open to everybody to float and transmit saw-logs and timber of other kinds. The second clause of the Act says: "that any person may go on the land and construct in any such rivers, creeks or streams any improvements he thinks proper, in order to facilitate the passage of timber." The third provision says, that the rights therein given, and the provisions therein made—contained in the foregoing sections 1st and 2nd—shall extend to and apply to all rivers, creeks and streams mentioned in the 1st section of the Act, that is to all rivers, creeks and streams which whether floatable or navigable in the state of nature, or not, have been made floatable or navigable by artificial means by any one; and the 4th section purports, or pretends to give compensation, and how does it read? The Lieutenant-Governor may fix the amount which any person collecting tolls under this Act shall be at liberty to charge on saw logs and different kinds of timber, or rafts, or crafts, and may from time to time vary the same; and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in fixing such tolls, is to regard certain matters. Now, how does this matter stand practically? This property is as I pointed out before Recess, when this Act of Parliament was passed, was the property of Mr. McLaren. On the passage of this Act, it ceased to be his private, and became public property. It ought not, every hon. member, I think, will admit, to have been transferred to the public, unless the public had paid compensation for it, or unless there was certain and sure means pointed out by the Statute by which that compensation was to be recovered. I do not think that any hon. member in this House or that any fair-minded man in this country will for one moment contend, even supposing that the use of this river was all important in a public sense, even supposing that it was a great wrong on Mr. McLaren's part to use it solely for his own purposes, and denying its use for everybody else, that it ought to have been taken from him for public purposes, without his being paid a compensation for his property and proprietary rights. Well, Sir, what does this Act do? It says that tolls may be collected, and more, what has been done? Property which was McLaren's to-day was to-morrow public property. It is worth so much money; call it \$100,000, or anything you like, whatever it may be; but where is he to get that money, the interest on that money, or the principal. It is said he may get it by tolls. But wherein is any person compelled to use that stream? Does it follow that this stream will be used by any person? Is there any certain, sure way, such as constitutional writers point out, by which this money, or the interest or the capital, or any other compensation will be given to him for depriving him of his property, which this Statute affects. I think, Sir, it is perfectly plain that this pretence of giving him compensation is illusory. It is perfectly certain that, across the border, this Statute would be deemed unconstitutional and void. It is perfectly clear that the authorities say, if this law was enacted by any State of the Union, that it would be, according to their constitution—and it would be declared in the Courts in that country—void and of no effect. It is not here, because the British Parliament is omnipotent because the Legislature, within its sphere, is omnipotent; because, when that Act goes on the Statute-book, and is assented to by royal authority, it becomes the law of the land, no matter how unjust its provisions may be in depriving a man of his property and giving it up to public uses; but this is not

according to the spirit of the constitution. It is not according to the way in which the laws are administered. It is not according to what is believed to be right and honest between man and man, that for public or any other purposes, a person should be despoiled of his estate. Well, Sir, my hon. friend stated it was an outrage, that a man, by making an improvement upon a stream or some portion of it, should close that stream, so that no person else could use it, thus he said: "The toil and labor expended in getting out timber, would be lost because it could not be got to market." As proof, and perhaps the strongest proof, I can offer to show that the Bill was undoubtedly passed for the purpose of injuring one man and enriching another, I will show the House what is perfectly well known to every man engaged in the lumber business, that there was no necessity for this legislation at all. If it was essential in the public interest that this river should be open to the public, Sir, there is a law on the Statute-book of the Province of Ontario, which is referred to in this Act, and which says, that any five men can by taking certain steps become incorporated, and being incorporated, may acquire from any proprietor improvements on any river or stream; that they may expropriate; that upon payment, just as a railway company can, they can expropriate the river improvements, on the payment of the just value, and can hold the stream and collect tolls and work them, if they find it profitable. Well, Sir, what are we forced to think? Either that Caldwell could not get any other four persons to join him in expropriating this property, that he knew it would not pay him to do so, or that it would not pay for the investment of the capital necessary, or that the Local Government, in order to favor one man, their supporter, deliberately passed this Act of Parliament to deprive McLaren of his property, and, in point of fact, to hand it over to one other person who desired to use the stream, and this was Caldwell. Another statement has been made, and a good deal has been attempted to be made of it; it is this: that Caldwell was practically denied the right to bring his timber to market by this stream. If this were so, it would not be any justification for such an Act of Parliament. But the contrary is the fact. The limit belonging to Caldwell, was worked long before Caldwell had it. It was, and had been, the property of Hon. Mr. Skead, and during the time he worked it he took the timber from it by its natural waters, the Madawaska, which are the nearest and most convenient; and the only fact which makes the Mississippi more convenient for Caldwell is because he happens to have a mill at Carleton Place on that stream. This being the condition of affairs, what was to be done? Here was a Statute, which I think I have shown was intended to deprive one man of his rights without compensation. There are no constitutional safeguards, such as they have on the other side of the line, by which an appeal could be made to the Courts of the land. Here was a Statute, retroactive in its operations, which declared that what was law yesterday in the Province of Ontario shall cease to be law to-morrow. The effect of that was to interfere with litigation, and take from the man his property and his right. And what appeal had he? Why, he had the appeal to the foot of the Throne. The only redress that was left to him, as a British subject, was to go with his petition to the representative of the Throne in this country—to His Excellency the Governor General—and point out to him how the matter stood, and ask His Excellency, under the circumstances, to disallow the measure. Was that wrong? Is it to be said that, in no case, under no circumstances, can an Act of Parliament, which is within the power of a Local Legislature, be disallowed? No person pretends to assert that doctrine, though I believe the resolution in your hands, Mr. Speaker, does assert it. My hon. friends in opposition to it, during the time they were on this side of the House, clearly laid down

the opposite doctrine; clearly showed that the Acts of the Local Legislature could be disallowed, not only when they were *ultra vires*, but when they contravened some principle of legislation, and they were, in some instances, set aside on the latter ground by hon. gentlemen opposite. No fault could be found with them. The British North America Act has introduced this very great change, and this discussion here this evening shows the importance of the step we have made. Before Confederation this Bill could have been disallowed by the Imperial power. Application would have to be made and applications were made from time to time to the sovereign power to disallow measures that interfered with those rights, but now the power is resting, and properly resting, under the Confederation Act with his Excellency the Governor-General, as was pointed out in the able State paper of which the hon. leader of the Opposition was the author, during the time he was Minister of Justice. It is now discussed on the floor of Parliament, whether that power was properly exercised or not. To hear the hon. member from South Huron talk, one would think it was merely the *ipse dixit* of the hon. the Minister of Justice, and in Ontario it is the habit to say it was a Frenchman—the Secretary who happened to be acting for the hon. the Minister of Justice is called the Frenchman—who disallowed and overrode the legislation of the Ontario Parliament. Does not every hon. member know, even if the hon. member for South Huron forgets for a moment, as his speech will seem to indicate, that it is on the report merely of the Minister of Justice, and that it is an Order in Council, made by His Excellency the Governor General on the advice of his Ministers, that the Bill can be disallowed. Will it be thought that the power of disallowance will be exercised in an arbitrary manner, that the hon. First Minister with the large following he has from the Province of Ontario, the legislation of which was disallowed with the knowledge that the members of all the Provinces are jealous of their rights and privileges of local self-government will dare to disallow any measure unless he is able to justify to this House and the country the power he assumes? I am prepared to put the ground of this disallowance on this broad principle. I have shown the legislation was contrary to such principles, that this Act was a violation of the rights of private property, without pretence of justification, and if, in this British Colony, we have no means of redress, we will have to introduce the same law that they have in the States, put an article in our Constitution that no Acts of expropriation shall be lawful unless they be accompanied by payments of compensation so that the Courts shall have power to determine whether the parties are properly compensated or not. Either we are unfit to exercise the right of disallowance that is exercised by the Imperial Government, without violating the rights of private property, or we will have, by a law, to prevent the possibility of a hostile majority in any Local Legislature despoiling a man of his property for reasons which are altogether unjustifiable and insufficient. Mr. McLaren came to the Council with his petition. He set forth the facts; and perhaps there is more made of the fact that the disallowance took place without communication to the Local Government than of the disallowance itself. A paper was read by my hon. friend which was prepared in the early days of Confederation by the hon. the First Minister, who was then the hon. the Minister of Justice. In that document it was stated—so careful was he and so careful, I may say is he now, not to override the rights of Local Governments—that, where there was any necessity or use for it, before a Bill could be disallowed, communication should be had with the Local Government. But, Sir, that is not Statute Law or an imperative necessity. It is simply a reasonable provision. Why? Because in the same case a Bill might pass a Local House without having had that

attention given to it that its importance deserved, and might contain provisions that, in the hurry of legislation, had a much wider significance than was supposed at the time. It would be, therefore, only reasonable and proper, if there was no immediate necessity for disallowing it so as to prevent irreparable mischief being done, that communication should be made to the Local Government. What was the case? Mr. McLaren, in his petition, presented to His Excellency the Governor General a statement of the facts. In that statement it appeared that so early as May, 1880, Mr. Pardee wrote the letter threatening Mr. McLaren, if he did not permit Mr. Cardwell's timber to come down, with the vengeance of his Government. In the following year this Bill was introduced deliberately by the Ontario Government; it was passed by the Ontario House on the very grounds which were afterwards presented by Mr. McLaren to His Excellency. All the facts of the case were known and the press had very fully discussed the subject. Now, I want to know what object would there have been in writing to Mr. Mowat to ask the question: "Why did you pass that nefarious Bill?" Mr. Mowat did it openly. If the law was *ultra vires*, it could be at once disallowed. If the law was within their jurisdiction and could be explained, an explanation should be called for; but if it was done deliberately, if it was the settled policy of Mr. Mowat to pass a law in violation to the rights of Mr. McLaren, certainly it would have been the idlest possible ceremony to have communicated with him in order to have an explanation of his views on the subject. Therefore what would, in some cases, have been very proper, was not applicable, and could not be applicable in a case of this kind. And why? In the month of March, just about the time that Mr. McLaren wanted to use his improvements, he had obtained his injunction from the Court of Chancery, and by that stayed Mr. Caldwell's interference. The very object, the benefit of his suit, would be lost unless His Excellency the Governor General, on the advice of his Ministers, disallowed it. For these reasons it appears to me perfectly plain, that if ever a measure can be disallowed, other than one which is *ultra vires*, this was one, and it was not only disallowed, but disallowed properly without communication to the Local Government. Now, the House has been treated to the views of my hon. friend the hon. the First Minister, on this question of disallowance, and we are always delighted to hear the hon. members of the Opposition quote the language of my hon. friend with approval. But, Sir, is it not a strange thing that my hon. friend from Huron, ardent Oppositionist as he is, should swear only from what fell from the lips of the First Minister. He appears to have been altogether blind in reading from these Blue-Books to what had fallen from the hon. Minister who leads him. He appears to have ignored from what fell from the Hon. Mr. Scott, acting as Minister of Justice. He appears to have ignored altogether what fell from Mr. Justice Fournier when he was Minister of Justice, but he has given to the House the statements that have been made from time to time by the hon. First Minister. Now the Goodhue case was mentioned, and I will say this: that if at this time of day, after several years of Confederation, if such a measure as that was not disallowed, if a measure changing a man's will, as the Local Legislature professed to do in that case, was not disallowed by his Excellency, I think the action of the Minister of Justice and the Administration in refusing that disallowance, would be hard indeed to justify. But it will be remembered that in those days Confederation was young. In those days the Provinces were sensitive, and perhaps the rights of individuals had to some extent to yield to the public necessities of the day. But, Sir, because in that case the hon. the Minister of Justice failed to do what, with more enlarged experience of the working of Confederation he could not hesitate to do at this time of day, is that a reason to be urged against the propriety of the course he recently took?

Mr. McCARTHY.

Let me read what a learned Judge, one of the ablest perhaps that ever adorned the Ontario bench, has said with reference to this power of disallowance, with reference to this very measure. I am not reading the language of a politician, I am reading the language of the learned Chief Justice Draper, who was then Chief of the Court of Appeal, and he said in this celebrated Goodhue case:

"In regard to the absence of a Record chamber, it may be further observed, so far at least as estate or Private Bills are concerned, that as such Bills involve ordinarily no mere party political considerations, all those whose interests may be touched have a right, in the first place, to expect a careful examination of their contents on the part of the Provincial Executive, and a withholding of the Royal assent if it is found that the promoters of the Bill are seeking advantages at the expense of others whose interests are as well grounded as their own; and further, if from oversight or any other cause, provisions should be inserted of an objectionable character, such as the deprivations of innocent parties of actual or even possible interests, by retroactive legislation, such Bills are subject to the consideration of the Governor General, who, as the representative of the Sovereign, is entrusted with authority, to which a corresponding duty attaches, to disallow any law contrary to reason or to natural justice and equity."

Now, here is the expression of an able Judge upon the clause in our Act which, of course, we all know is not confined to disallowance merely in cases where there has been an excess of the exercise of jurisdiction, but in every and all cases. Let me now pursue this subject a little further and see what hon. gentleman have thought with reference to it when the necessities of the case arose. My hon. friends from Prince Edward Island will remember the long struggle they had with reference to the land laws. They will remember the attempts that were made by Local Legislatures to do away with the proprietary right, and to accomplish what was accomplished here at an earlier date in Lower Canada in regard to the Seigneuries. They will remember that several appeals were made to England on that subject, and that the English Government invariably refused to carry out their propositions because they were interfering with vested rights. I will quote on this subject—because it is very apposite, it appears to me—the language of Sir George Grey to Lieutenant Governor Daly of Prince Edward Island:

"Her Majesty's Government have considered these Acts separately and with an anxious desire to do justice between the community of Prince Edward Island in general, and the proprietors of the soil, and to allow the fullest possible scope to the principle of local independence in legislative matters, subject only to the paramount duty not to advise the Crown to assent to any measure inflicting any manifest wrong on any of Her subjects * * * and Her Majesty's Government cannot take upon themselves the responsibility of advising the Crown to give its assent to Colonial Acts which are at variance with the principles of justice, and invade those rights of property which are the foundation of social organism."

Now, Sir, that was the opinion of Sir George Grey, and I think it would not be difficult to find that other colonial Ministers had dealt with this subject in the same way. My right hon. friend reminds me that Sir George Grey was an extreme Liberal, not one of the old Tories, not one of those who held on to prerogative rights, but one who was desirous to give, as his despatch states, the fullest scope to responsible Government. Well, in 1874 another Act of that kind was passed, and it came here for the consideration of the Government of this country. It was accompanied by a despatch, I believe, from the Lieutenant Governor of the Province to the Governor General here, urging in the strongest possible manner that this law should be assented to. Mr. Justice Fournier was then the Minister of Justice of the Government of that day, and he goes over the matter with reference to the petitions that were sent in, and winds up his opinion on it in this way:

"The allegations in these petitions are very forcibly urged, and represent features which cannot but be regarded as contrary to the principles of legislation in respect to private rights and property."

"The undersigned is of opinion that the Act is objectionable, in that it does not provide for an impartial arbitration in which the proprietors would have a representation for arriving at a decision on the nature of the rights and the value of the property involved, and also for securing a speedy determination and settlement of the matters in dispute."

"Under all the circumstances of the case the undersigned has the honor to recommend that the Bill so reserved, intitled 'The Land Purchase Act of 1874,' do not receive the assent of Your Excellency in Council."

The right given to poor Mr. McLaren was to go before the Hon. Mr. Mowat who was to fix, in the interest of Mr. Caldwell, the tolls and dues he was to pay. Well, Sir, this report was duly approved, and the Bill was disallowed.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was not assented to. I will come to that in one moment. That is one of the fine points I may expect from the leader of the Opposition, one of those things that occur to him as of very great force; but I think to an ordinary mind it will not have much bearing on the subject. In 1876, another law with regard to this was passed by the Island of Prince Edward, and it was sent here in the same way, and then it was that the Hon. Mr. Scott, who was Acting Minister of Justice for the present leader of the Opposition—who I suppose approved of this Act on his return, or else he would no longer have continued to remain in office; of course, it passed the whole Council, but I believe at that time the hon. member was absent. Now, what was said with regard to this? It was not very unlike the Act with regard to streams and rivers. The first thing the Act does is to reverse the law of the land, to declare that which the Courts at that time declared to be the law was not and never had been the law of the land:

"The effect of the first portion of the Act appears to be that the interpretation of the Supreme Court of the Island of the Act of 1875, upon which certain awards of Land Commissioners were held bad, is reversed, and the awards in question declared as valid."

In conclusion he says:

"That without giving weight or consideration to any great extent to the allegations in the petitions which are unsupported by any actual proof, he is of opinion that the reserved Bill is retrospective in its effect; that it deals with rights of parties now in legislation under the Act which it is proposed to amend, or which may fairly form the subject of litigation; and that there is an absence of any provision saving the rights and proceedings of persons whose properties have been dealt with under the Act of 1875."

Therefore, he recommended that the Act should not be assented to or approved. Well, I think that is pretty much like the present case, yet the hon. member for South Huron overlooked these important State documents. He has no faith in the language, in the sentiments, in the State papers, which emanate from his own side of the House, and he has to come here to get his constitutional law. Well, if he would only take it altogether we would not have so much objection to it; but, taking it in part he does not digest it well, he does not assimilate it. The present hon. leader of the Opposition was Minister of Justice at one time, and I do not think we will find he ever disallowed anything, but that he generally went both ways; he would point out very forcibly that the Act should be disallowed, and yet it would not be disallowed. That is evidently the character of the hon. gentleman's mind. I have read opinions prepared by the hon. gentleman, in which he set forth that this course might be taken or another course might be taken; that one Judge might think thus and another Judge might think that; and you rose from the perusal without knowing very much exactly what his opinion was on a given case. So it is with respect to his opinions in these questions. But they go the length of showing that the hon. gentleman was in favor of the principle that, in some cases at all events, Acts which are contrary to the sound principles of legislation, ought to be disallowed. The Act before the hon. gentleman at the time was to compel assurers to take out a license in Quebec. He declared:

"The policy of laying a tax of this nature is open to great objection. It must fall, in the end, upon those interested in the assurances. It may be considered to be a tax upon providence and thrift, and its

operation may have an injurious effect far beyond what may be recompensed by its pecuniary results, but there are views which, although they should be fairly weighed, and although they might, in some cases, force upon the Canadian Government the necessity of disallowance."

The Act was within the power of the legislation to pass, and it was one which might be good policy to enact, but the hon. gentleman said there might be some cases in which the Canadian Government would be forced of necessity to disallow Acts. That is the principle for which I here contend; that is the sound constitutional doctrine which I venture to say no statesman can deny, that there are instances and there may be cases, it is to be hoped they will not often occur, where sound principles of legislation have been violated to that extent that it becomes the duty of the Governor in Council upon the advice of his Ministers to disallow the Act and prevent it from going into operation. I think I have shown that this law cannot, upon any reasonable principles, be upheld; that it is contrary to ordinary principles of legislation respecting private property; that it is within the legal power of the Governor General in Council to disallow a measure of this kind; that since we have no longer in this country with respect to local legislation the power of appeal to England, that power being now vested in the Governor in Council, the Government of the day would be recreant to their duty if they did not give to any man whose rights were invaded, as Mr. McLaren's rights were invaded by Act of Parliament, that redress which, before Confederation, he would have been able to obtain at the foot of the Throne; and if I have shown that, I have established that disallowance in this case was one that ought to be commended and not condemned. I should be very sorry to think indeed that the rule for one Province should not be the rule for another. I admit that the larger the Province, the less likelihood there is of the violation of rights of this character. We know, for instance, that an Act of the Manitoba Legislature was disallowed, I think, by the present leader of the Opposition, though I am not quite certain on that point, with respect to matters clearly within its jurisdiction, namely, the half-breed lands, simply on the ground that legislation was not necessary in the opinion of the Dominion Government. But whatever is the rule for Manitoba should be the rule for Ontario; and whatever is the rule of Quebec should be the rule of Ontario; and whatever is the rule of one Province ought to be the rule of another, and this essential, if we are not to alter our constitution. If the people are not to be driven, in self-defence of the rights of property, to have the Constitution altered by introducing legislative prohibition which exists on the other side of the line with respect to the exercise of eminent domain, this power should be carefully exercised, it is true, but still it should be exercised in every case where the rights of individuals have been sacrificed by a law passed by a Local Legislature. Matters of policy are quite different. I do not intend to discuss the vexed question of the New Brunswick school law. It was, however, one of policy and not of vested rights. It was not discussed as destruction of property or of right, but as an improper exercise of legislative power in a matter on which men might well differ. The line is broadly and clearly drawn between a matter of that kind and this. If a private Bill had been allowed to pass the Local Legislature, and handing over one man's property to another, that would have been a good reason for vetoing the Bill. If the principle is vicious, it is only the more startling because it has been assented to by the Lieutenant Governor. It would seem hard that a man who had been deprived of his property should be told that he must wait till the next election; that this is a question beyond all doubt upon which the people will judge, and they will turn out the Government and hand back the property.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear,

Mr. McCARTHY. If that hon. member who says hear, hear, had property taken from him he would find that the issues of an election were mixed up with boundary questions and matters of much greater importance, and his little matter connected with private property would not induce people to reverse their votes and desert their property. Practically we know that nothing of that kind can be done. The elector would say that notwithstanding that legislation he would vote for Mr. Mowat and Mr. Pardee because there were greater questions at issue, and therefore no man can hope, unless such attacks on private property repeatedly occurred and became great questions, to obtain that redress by turning out the Government which had authorized legislation of that character, which he can get promptly by appeal to the foot of the Throne. I must not omit to refer to the difference between refusing to assent and disallowance. I venture to say there is no substantial difference. Can any one pretend to assert that because a Lieutenant-Governor has gone through the form of assenting to a Bill which has been introduced by his Ministry and passed by a majority of the House, there is any substantial difference between that and the Lieutenant-Governor reserving that question for the consideration of the Governor General? Why, Sir, what position does the Lieutenant-Governor occupy? He occupies, I suppose, strictly speaking, the position of a Dominion officer. His duty probably would be to see that he assented to no legislation that interfered with the rights of the Dominion or Dominion property. He would be bound to do what the Governor General here does; obey the instructions from the office here, but, as we know, our Lieutenant-Governors have no instructions. They are left without directions what course to take in any given measure, and consequently the result is that they give *pro forma* their assent to a measure, which thereby becomes law, subject to being disallowed. It is, in fact, an *ad interim* allowance and becomes an *ad interim* law. I know I cannot convince my hon. friend who differs from most other men and certainly differs from me on this subject, but it appears to me that the matter is one of shadow more than substance. Suppose the Lieutenant-Governor reserved this Bill to-day, would there be any practical difference from his having reserved it? What earthly difference would it make? If the law is a good one it is not made better by his assent, and, if a bad one, it is not made good by the form of the Lieutenant Governor assenting to it. The main question for the Governor General would be whether it is a good or bad law; whether it is beyond their power, or if within their power, whether it controvenes the well-known principles of legislation. The assent of the Crown to the Acts of a Local Legislature is obtained, in a limited manner, from the Lieutenant-Governor, and that assent does not become perfect until a certain time elapses, when the assent becomes perfect, and a time is allowed for the Bills to undergo consideration, as with regard to our legislation here.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it so with our legislation for the last two years?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, it is so, and the hon. gentleman will not deny it. All of our legislation within two years can be disallowed, but until disallowed it is perfectly good. If this Parliament could be guilty of passing an Act like this, —though they could not pass such an Act to-day—would a man be denied the right to go to England and lay a petition before the Crown and ask for disallowance? Would my hon. friend pretend to say that under such circumstances an Act of this Parliament would not be disallowed.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I differ from the hon. gentleman altogether. If the hon. gentleman would trace the correspondence between the Home Office and the colonies up to the

Mr. McCARTHY.

time of Confederation, he would see that no law the principle of which is to destroy the property of private individuals or do a manifest injustice received the assent of the Crown. Now, Sir, there is much more to be said on this subject, no doubt, but other hon. members are to speak upon it and I would be taking up the time improperly if I were to prolong my remarks to any greater length. I have endeavored to state, and I am satisfied I have stated correctly, the facts of the case, and why it was that I think the Act was contrary to every principle recognizing the rights of, I may say, civilized man. The primary object of all Government is the protection, not merely of life and liberty, but of property. All this vast scheme of law-making power, which is invested in this Parliament, is for the purpose of affording protection to life, liberty and property. Certainly there are other objects of legislation, but the primary matters of legislation are those which I have mentioned. But what is the danger that has been found to exist on the other side of the line, and is likely to arise here? Let me read an extract from a very eminent writer on Constitutional Law, Mr. Sedgwick, whose work on that subject is recognized, not only on the other side of the line, but here as well:

"And it is to be observed also that the unjust action of the Government writers is most likely to take the shape of attacks upon the rights of property. All Government, indeed, resolves itself into the protection of life, liberty and property. Life and liberty in our fortunate condition are, however, little likely to be injuriously affected by the administration of the body politic—and property is very differently situated."

Then he points out the rule by which we ought to be governed. He says:

"With this qualification the great provisions referred to, *i.e.*, compensation for private property taken for public uses, sanctioning of contracts and law of the land, seem to furnish the principal guarantees of our liberty and rights."

These principles have been violated in this measure, and for that violation one of the parties applied to the Government of the day for the only redress that was open to him, that the Act could be disallowed, and I say this House by a large majority, and, I believe, the common sense of the country, will endorse and sanction the course which was taken by the Administration in disallowing a measure so contrary to every principle of legislation, so contrary to every right, so contrary to the spirit of justice.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat told us in the opening of his speech that he was no longer an advocate or counsel for the party who, he says, has been injured by the Local Legislature of Ontario. But, Sir, I think if we take his statement—his one-sided statement—regarding the facts of the case, and his partial statement regarding the meaning and effect of the Ontario Act, and if we refer to the fact that the case is still pending in which he is counsel, and that the Act has been re-enacted by the Local Legislature of Ontario—and I suppose the question of its being again disallowed is pending now before the Government here—we can easily see that, however the hon. gentleman may have tried to divest himself of that feeling of partizanship which every man in his position naturally has, he has failed. What have we heard here? That Mr. McLaren had a property said to be worth \$250,000. Why, Sir, in his own bill in Chancery he puts it at \$100,000 less, and he did not, so far as I have read in the proceedings, offer any evidence that even that loose allegation in his Bill was sustained as a matter of fact. We find that this Mr. McLaren, on the strength of having a few parcels of property along that river, professes to control the operations on 200 miles of the river, and to prevent every other lumberman in that vast region of country from taking a log or stick of timber down that stream. Not only so, but he claims the benefit of a law of Ontario to take his timber through other people's property, while at the same time he says that that same law shall not interfere

to protect the rights of other people against him. The value of his property depends on the law of Ontario, which gives him the right to float his logs along that river for 200 miles. Without that law, if his extreme contention is correct, he would have no right to float logs on that stream; and shall it be said that the Legislature of Ontario is not to interfere to give other people rights as well as him? What more do we find? We find that not only does Mr. McLaren's property depend for its value upon the law of Ontario, but that he absolutely refused to permit Mr. Caldwell to float his logs over his improvements, as he calls them, although Mr. Caldwell offered him any compensation that was reasonable, and offered to refer the matter to arbitration. When Mr. Caldwell offered him every satisfaction that any reasonable man could demand, he acted like the dog in the manger; he would do neither one thing nor the other; he said: "I have an absolute and exclusive right to property at different places along that river, and I shall prevent any man, no matter what his necessity may be, from floating logs down that stream, even though he is willing to compensate me in every reasonable way." The hon. gentleman has failed to tell us that the public interests of Ontario, not only on this stream, but perhaps on a hundred other streams in the Province, are seriously jeopardized. We all know that the Province of Ontario derives from timber dues a very large proportion of its annual revenue—some hundreds of thousands of dollars a year; and that revenue depends upon getting lumber out, and upon its reaching market; and in nine cases out of ten—yes, I believe, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the getting of that lumber to market depends upon the use of streams that have been improved, as it is called, just as this stream has been improved. That whole country would be locked up if Mr. McLaren's claim were acknowledged. If the hands of the Legislature were tied, as the Government here says they shall be tied, there would be locked up a tract of timber country consisting of hundreds of square miles from development or access. These rivers have been treated, we may say, for generations, by the Legislature of Old Canada and the Legislature of Ontario as public highways for timber. The law under which the Legislature of Ontario professes to act has been in force for a great many years, and all that was done by the Act of 1881 was really to declare what a great many people believed to be the old law, what was intended to be enacted by the original law. It is only by the construction placed upon the former Act by the decision in the case of *Boale vs. Dickson*, that its operation was limited so as to enable men like Mr. McLaren to defeat the law. That Act said:

"Be it enacted that it shall be lawful for parties to float rafts and craft down all streams in Upper Canada during the spring, summer, and autumn freshets, and no person shall, by felling trees or placing any other obstruction in the course of such streams, prevent the passage thereof."

That is the law as it stood for many years. What was the construction placed upon it in the case of *Boale vs. Dickson*, on which Mr. McLaren based his Bill in Chancery? The construction was that that only applied to streams which in a state of nature were capable of floating logs. Now, let us see what Chief Justice Spragge, in giving judgment in this case in the Court of Appeal, says with regard to that construction. He says:

"No such qualification of the right given by section 15 is to be found in the Act, nor in any previous Acts thereby consolidated. There is nothing in the context of any of these Acts, showing or tending to show that any such qualification was intended."

That is, that all streams only meant all streams which in a state of nature were capable of floating logs.

"And were we, from what we find in the Act taken in this case, confining the right given by section 15 to such streams as are described in the passage I have quoted, we would go far to defeat the avowed policy

of the Legislature. Evidence was offered that in none of the streams in the Province, in their natural state at the date of the passing of this Act, could saw-logs or timber be floated down without improvements curing freshets. But upon the evidence that was given in the case, it is apparent that if section 15 is to be read with the qualification given to it by *Boale vs. Dickson*, a very large number of the streams of the Province would be excluded from the operation of the Act."

In fact, if the narrow construction which was given to the Act in *Boale vs. Dickson* were to prevail, the Act would be practically useless, because the streams that were at the time of its passage capable of floating logs without improvements, even during freshets, were few if any. Well, what do we find? We find that the whole Province of Ontario is interested in the passage of this measure, that the public revenues are deeply concerned, that the lumbering interest throughout the Province, which is of enormous importance to all other interests in the Province, was jeopardized by the construction which Mr. McLaren insisted should be put on the law that was never intended to have such a construction. What do we find then? Not that the Ontario Government or Legislature were actuated by partizan motives. We do not discover a trace of partizanship in their proceedings from beginning to end, and the charge made by the hon. member for North Simcoe is an unworthy one to make against a Government and a Legislature. They passed not a measure affecting the Mississippi River alone and not a measure affecting Mr. McLaren alone; but a measure affecting the streams throughout the Province of Ontario, and all the lumbermen in it. We find that they passed a measure which is calculated to conserve and properly conserve the revenues which that Government derives from the timber dues in the Province of Ontario. Is that not an Act formed in the public interest? Is it not an Act which is calculated in every way to do what is right and just in the premises? The hon. gentleman tells us that this Act does not provide any compensation at all; he says that the payment of tolls is not a proper compensation, and that there is no mode—I think he so said—settled by the Act in which these tolls could be collected.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say so.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then you left that impression upon my mind. He said: "How is Mr. McLaren to get these tolls?"

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the hon. member allow me to correct him. I said, how could he get these tolls, because they were dependent on the use of the improvements?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Let me call attention to what I consider to be the wise and fair and equitable provisions of this Act, both for the imposition of tolls and for their collection. This Act says: That the party who has made improvements on the river to be used for floating saw-logs and other timber shall be entitled to receive reasonable tolls. It says further, that in fixing those tolls, regard shall be had to—what? The original cost of the construction of the improvements, the amount required to maintain the same, and the interest on the original cost, as well as such other matters as under the circumstances may, to the Governor in Council, seem to be just and equitable. Now, Sir, could any fairer measure of compensation for the particular circumstances of the case be devised? What further do we find? I stated that there is the most complete protection to men in the position of Mr. McLaren for the collection of these tolls. Section 6 says:

"Every person entitled to tolls under this Act shall have a lien upon the saw-logs or other timber passing through or over such stream or improvements for the amount of such tolls, such lien to rank next after the lien, if any, which the Crown has for dues in the respect to such saw-logs and timber, and if such are not paid, any Justice of the Peace having jurisdiction in the locality shall, upon the oath of the owner of the construction or improvements, or of his agent proving that the just tolls had not been paid, shall issue a warrant for the seizure of the logs."

Then power is given to sell them and collect the tolls; then we find still further provision for the better protection of the owners of these improvements; namely:

this, that every person entitled to collect tolls under the Act may make rules and regulations for the purpose of regulating the same, and the orderly transmission of saw-logs, rafts and crafts over the constructions and improvements, these regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council; that is, he may make reasonable regulations, so that his property may be protected, so that it cannot be injured; and so that his own use of the river may not be substantially interfered with. All that the Act requires is that he shall not prevent other people having the fair use of what were always considered in Upper Canada as public highways for the public benefit for the floating of timber and saw-logs. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the facts. What do we further learn, Sir? We find that the defendants in this case, the Caldells, allege that Mr. McLaren's improvements did not cost anything like what he said. Further, that they purchased the limits on this river in good faith, believing that they could use the river, and expended an enormous amount of money in acquiring the property in that belief, and that if they were prevented from using the river their property would be comparatively of little value. They also proved that this Mr. McLaren himself was using the public highways for purposes of his own, and that he was exercising rights he had no right to exercise; that he was dependent upon the goodwill of those who owned the property all the way above him for the exercise of his so-called rights; and they say that they were perfectly willing to pay him such damages as a Court of law would award. All they wanted was that he should not take proceedings and ask for an injunction which would absolutely prohibit them from using the river, even if they were willing to make ample compensation for its use. What do we find the Dominion Government did? because this Act of disallowance is, of course, the act of the Government. We find that they accepted the *ex parte* statements of Mr. McLaren and his counsel with regard to the whole of this matter; that they listened to a tirade—for the petition is hardly anything but a tirade of bitterness—giving his partial statement of the case, concealing and affording no light as to the defence offered by the Caldells, saying nothing as to the motives that actuated the Ontario Legislature in passing this law, and concealing the fact that the public revenues and the interests of the whole people of Ontario were deeply concerned. They lay the case before the Government here entirely from their own point of view; and more strange to say, in a hasty and apparently precipitate manner, without calling either upon Caldwell, who is the other party to the contest—if it is to be treated as a private affair—to give his version of the case or upon the Ontario Government to explain the motives and reasons for this legislation; and acting on the *ex parte* statement, unsupported by evidence or by proof, of Mr. McLaren, this Government rushed to his aid, at the suggestion of himself, or of his friends, and disallowed a Constitutional Act, and a proper Act, which was passed by the Local Legislature. Now, then, how can such a course as was pursued be justified for a moment in view of the principles so clearly enunciated by the leader of the Dominion Government himself in 1868, and as was shown by my hon. friend from South Huron, invariably followed since that down to the present time. The course then pursued was this; when a Local Act was considered objectionable, and was thought beyond the powers of the Local Legislature, the attention of the Provincial Government was called to the objections, and an opportunity was given them to consider the matter and present their views to the Government here, and to repeal the Act if it was found that it was not within the scope of their authority. My hon. friend from North Simcoe has steered clear, if I may use the phrase, entirely of a large part of the able speech, supported as it was by

Mr. GUTHRIE.

precedents, of the hon. member for South Huron. We hail from my hon. friend from South Huron not one case, not the Goodhue will case alone, not the New Brunswick School Case alone, but we had instance after instance given of constitutional practices, constitutional interpretations of this veto power, interpretations of the most deliberate character given by the Government of this country in the course of many years from Confederation, and this point was incontrovertibly established that what this Government would regard, and the only thing it would regard, in dealing with the question of disallowance was the competency, the power of the Local Legislature to pass the measure. Now, these show that the fact of interference with private rights did not warrant this Government in departing from that constitutional rule. The fact that the legislation was retroactive did not limit the rule. The fact that there was legislation pending not warrant the Government in limiting the rule. They laid down the broad rule that if the legislation of the Local Parliament was within its powers, and did not affect the Dominion jurisdiction, it should not be interfered with, but should be allowed to take its course. I contend that this constitutional interpretation was put upon the veto power under the British North America Act, not by the Dominion Government alone, but by the Home Government in dealing with the question of disallowing legislation of the Dominion Parliament. An Act was passed herein, I think, 1874 to regulate the construction of marine and electric telegraphs, and that Act was reserved for the consideration of Her Majesty's Imperial Government. Objection had been taken in the Senate here to the constitutionality of the Act, and out of deference to the Senate and possibly to Royal instructions, as it might be considered to interfere with rights and property of subjects of the Queen not residing in Canada, but residing beyond the jurisdiction of this Parliament, it was reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure, although the Government here expressed the conviction that it would be beneficial to Canadian interests. In regard to this Act the fact that it was a measure not assented to by the Governor General, and therefore not law, but reserved without that consent for the consideration of the Home Government, strengthens the argument in favor of the view I have presented, immensely, in my opinion. What became of that Bill? The hon. Secretary of State in England, said, in refusing to interfere:

"It seems to me to be clearly within the competency of the Dominion Government and Parliament to legislate on this subject without any interference on the part of the Government of this country, it being a local question involving no points in respect to which it would appear necessary that Imperial interests should be guarded or the relations with other colonial or foreign countries."

Here the principle is laid down most distinctly, that if the subject of legislation concerns our domestic interests and does not concern Imperial interests, the Home Government will not interfere, even though they are invited to consider it, without the assent of the Government here. Not only in that case, but in the celebrated case of the removal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, the views of the Home Government are laid down most emphatically, that it was a matter for ourselves to settle, although the question, apparently, was one of almost Imperial concern, and they refused to interfere when invited to do so. Now, the power of disallowance by the Queen of Dominion legislation corresponds exactly to that possessed by the Government here over Local legislation. The same clause in the British North America Act which confers power upon Her Majesty to disallow Dominion Acts, confers power on the Governor-in-Council to disallow Local Acts; and we can have no better guide as to what should be the fair and constitutional practice in considering the question of disallowance under the British North America Act than to look at the way in which Her Majesty regards it in dealing with

Dominion legislation, or questions of Dominion Executive Government. It is, therefore well settled by constitutional usage and by constitutional practice, both in England as regards Dominion legislation, and in Canada by the Dominion Government with regard to Local legislation, that the rule is that if a Local Legislature does not step beyond its powers, and if its legislation does not affect Imperial interests or legislation, or Dominion interests, as the case may be, its measures are not interfered with by the higher authority under the British North America Act. What does that Act provide? In discussing this matter, it is well to consider the precise language of our great Federal charter, the British North America Act. Section 92 says, in as plain terms as could be employed, that the exclusive power of making laws in regard to this matter and cognate matters is, in the legislatures of our Provinces. We find that, not only have the Local Legislatures exclusive jurisdiction over matters of property and civil rights, but they have most extensive powers in regard to municipal institutions, in regard to education, with certain restrictions in regard to the Administration of Justice, in regard to the management and sale of the public lands of the Province and of the timber growing thereon, and in regard to the management of other important subjects. If the principle contended for here by the Government and its supporters, is correct, there is not an Act of any of our Provincial Legislatures, dealing with any of these subjects, that these hon. gentlemen may not choose to say, for some reason or other, they do not think in the public interest, they do not think is a good law, and, therefore, they may disallow it. If what they have contended for is correct, if this Government can sit in judgment upon the wisdom or policy of Acts passed by the Local Parliaments, then, not merely regarding property and civil rights, but regarding all the classes of subjects, municipal, educational, judicial and others that I have mentioned, this Government may exercise the veto power, and so effectually destroy the independence of the Local Legislatures. Now, Sir, let us see in what spirit the question of disallowance should be approached. In the State paper of the 8th of June, 1868, the right hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government laid down principles that appear to be sound. The question should be approached in a judicial and fair spirit, and ample opportunity should be given to the Local Government concerned to make their explanations and to change their legislation if just exception is taken to it. We find it said in Mr. Todd's book on Parliamentary Government in the Colonies:

"No mere calculations of political expediency, or difference of opinion in regard to the policy of colonial enactments, would suffice to induce the Crown to veto the same, provided only it was within the legislative competency of the colony, and did not seriously affect the interests of other parts of the empire."

And again on page 425, it is said, with regard to interference by the Dominion Government in local concerns:

"But, in the discharge of this duty, in a system so complex and delicate as that of the Canadian Confederation, great caution and forbearance must be observed, so as to avoid the suspicion of party influences, or of a disposition to encroach upon provincial rights of self-government. * * * But, when we note the zealous care which is apparent throughout the British North America Act to define and regulate the exercise of the 'exclusive powers' assigned by that Statute to the Provincial Governments,—whether these powers appertain to the Executive or to the Legislature,—it is manifest that it was the intention of the Imperial Parliament to guard from invasion all rights and powers exclusively conferred upon the Provincial authorities, and to provide that the reserved right of interference therewith by the Dominion Executive or Parliament should not be exercised in the interest of any political party, or so as to impair the principle of local self-government. Prior to Confederation, this principle was earnestly and successfully contended for, as a restraint upon undue interference by the Imperial authorities in matters of local concern. It is no less essential now, when the diverse interests of separate Provinces, heretofore independent of each other, require to be harmoniously combined,—without infringing upon the freedom of any Government within the sphere of its constitutional powers,—so as to ensure unity and co-operation for the common good."

The hon. member for North Simcoe has treated us to some extracts from American Constitutional writers, but those extracts deal with cases where no compensation is provided for. What we say here is, not only is Mr. McLaren not deprived, in the sense of a deprivation to his own exclusion, of this property, but he is not deprived of the use of his improvements. He is at perfect liberty to use them yet. We find that such a compensation as the nature of the case will admit of, ample compensation properly secured, has been provided; so that even if the quotations with which we were favored were applicable to our constitution,—and the hon. gentleman admits they are not, although he thinks they ought to be embodied in it—they are not applicable to the circumstances of the case in hand. What other provision can you make for the use of a bridge or of a highway than that of tolls? What other compensation is made by railway companies exercising running powers over other railways than that of paying tolls for the use? They are not compelled to purchase the road. The Grand Trunk Railway and other roads using the International bridge are not compelled to purchase the bridge, they pay tolls for the use of it, just as this Act provides that tolls shall be paid for the use of this timber highway in the Province of Ontario. I think, therefore, that there are two errors in the hon. gentleman's statement. First of all, he is in error in speaking of this as a deprivation of Mr. McLaren's rights, when it is no such thing. He has the use of the improvements, and all they are good for is to use them in the floating of timber; secondly, it is another error to speak of the compensation as being inadequate or improperly secured. But supposing it were, we say that so far as our Constitution goes and our Constitutional practices are concerned, this law, even if it so affected him is still one that ought not to have been disallowed, because it was within the competence of the Legislature which passed it. This cry about compensation, about interference with private rights, has been heard in the Mother Country during the past year. The Irish landlords have unanimously objected to the Bill passed for the relief of Ireland on the ground that it interfered with private rights, with contracts, that it did not provide proper compensation, and that it injured their position severely. Is that any reason for saying that that Bill should not have received the Queen's assent. It did receive the Queen's assent and is in operation now. The mode of compensation may not suit the parties concerned, but it was felt to be in the public interest that it should be passed, and the representations of Irish Landlords and of men in the position of Mr. McLaren were disregarded. So here it is idle to talk about Mr. McLaren being injured. He could use every one of the improvements affected, and not only so, but he could make money out of the improvements if he had given a reasonable and fair use of them to parties up the same river, who were as much entitled, under the spirit of the old Canadian law, to use the stream as he was himself. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has said there is no distinction between disallowing an Act which has become law by the assent of a Government, and refusing assent to a Bill that has been reserved. In making that statement the hon. gentleman is affected by partizan blindness. There is a wide distinction. A Bill reserved has not the sanction of one branch of the Legislature, it is not an Act at all; it is merely a proposal an incomplete Act and it is merely submitted as something that is suggested as proper to become law, but it has not the character of law. Two things are necessary to make a law under the British Constitution. One is the assent of the Parliament or Legislature, the other is the assent of the Crown; and, in the case of a reserved Bill, the Act has not one of those essentials, it has not the assent of the Crown. It comes before the a higher power for its consideration more in the shape of a submission for the opinion of that power. It does not

come before it in the same way as a Bill which has been actually assented to and which, until disallowed, has the character of absolute law, so that a very different rule should govern the consideration of this question as between a Bill submitted for the opinion of a higher authority, not sanctioned by a representative of the Crown—and a Bill which has formally passed into law and has all the character and authority of law. I again call the attention of the House to the fact that we have had, as the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) has plainly established, since 1867, about a dozen cases where Acts have been allowed that invaded private rights which were retro-active in their character and did not meet the approval of the Ministry here, and even where Acts have interfered with pending litigation. We have the practice constitutionally established that the Dominion Government should not interfere with any measure passed by a Provincial Legislature when it is shown to be within its jurisdiction and did not trench on the rights of the Dominion. We have the same constitutional usage or interpretation of the veto power established in connection with the dealings of the Home Government with Dominion legislation and Dominion Executive Acts; and, we have, moreover, the emphatic declaration of the British North America Act, that the exclusive power to legislate on certain branches is reposed in the Local Legislatures. If that be the case, then this interference was of an unconstitutional, harsh and arbitrary character. Let us preserve the independence of the Provinces. It was to obtain the control of her local affairs that Ontario was induced to consent to the measure of Confederation—that she might legislate upon municipal matters, private rights, education and other local matters free from any control by outsiders who did not understand so well as her own people the necessities and circumstances of the country. If we deprive her of the freedom and power to legislate for herself, and declare that her legislation may be interfered with by a Ministry here who may not possess her confidence, who may be sustained in power by the votes of members from other Provinces, then I say farewell to Confederation and farewell to that boon which Confederation promised us, independence and freedom of action in the management of our local affairs.

Mr. HAGGART. I will premise my remarks by offering a few observations in reply to the hon. member for South Huron. He drew a picture of the troubles which had occurred in this country for the last twenty or thirty years, and the efforts made to sustain responsible Governments in this Province, and he told the House if all the efforts had ended in the action taken by the Dominion Government in regard to the disallowance of the Streams Bill what the effect would be on the people of Ontario. The hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House that the principles which have been violated by the passing of the Bill are principles which were bought hundreds of years ago, the right of every individual to the property he is possessed of, and that no Government and exercise of authority by any person who would lead the people to submit to the taking of their property, without granting compensation. What is the history of this measure? There were two parties to a suit; one affirmed that he possesses the certain rights on a river situated near my county, and another party claimed the right to use those privileges. Let me give the House a brief description of the property. The River Mississippi empties into the Ottawa River. For sixty miles up the river at every point where there is a fall the property is owned by individuals and companies before Mr. McLaren's improvements are reached. For at least forty or fifty years those individuals have exercised the right of ownership to those particular parts of the river, and exercised the right of collecting tolls—refusing to allow persons to pass over that portion without receiving compensation. Some of those properties were expropriated by an Act passed in 1857 by

Mr. GUTHRIE.

the Province of Ontario, which allowed the expropriation of such property for improvements and allowed anyone to use them by paying toll. What was the object of that? It was to prevent any party who became the owner of any improved property to exercise a sole right, and in a cheap manner to allow the public to earn the property. Mr. McLaren and every one who has used the stream for the last forty or fifty years has had to pay toll. It was the law of the land, as decided by the Courts, that where a stream or any portion of it was impassable in spring, summer or autumn freshets, the owner of the banks became the actual possessor of that part of the stream, and if he exercised it contrary to the public interests, it could be taken from him by allowing him compensation. Mr. McLaren, when he commenced operations on the Mississippi, purchased these improvements; when he became proprietor, he exercised sole and only control over the property. As his means admitted he made these improvements further and further up the stream until they reached the present dimensions. In some of these cases he had for years before making these improvements, drawn his logs and timber for 15 or 16 miles past these places, and others the same. Others have taken their logs, &c., by other streams; but he, by purchasing land, by digging canals through his own property, by building slides on his own property, by blasting and dredging, by the expenditure of large sums of money, succeeded in making the stream navigable. In other places where the stream disappeared through crevices or under the rocks, when the land lay over it he built dams and drowned the lands in that particular portion, he purchased the land, and for years, wherever a private owner in that stream owned any particular part of it, he, believing in the interpretation which he puts on the law, and believes to be the correct one, purchased the right of possessing that place. My hon. friend says it is only by this law that he was enabled to pass down the stream, but there was no part of it that was unnavigable in summer, spring or autumn freshets of which he has not purchased or hired the rights by expending large sums of money. He does not depend on any other person, or company or Government for the right of passage down those streams. In some cases he has paid for the passage of his own material for a single year in one of those places \$2,000 or \$3,000, and for some of the adjoining properties he has paid as much as \$11,000. What is the effect of the law framed by the Ontario Legislature? Who are the public contemplated by that law? The fact is there is but one man demanding the use of that stream, and I ask any legal gentleman on the other side of the House if it was right that the public should take an individual's property for the purpose of handing it over to the use of another individual. Was there a single petition signed by any person in favor of the Act? There was not a single man who wished to use that stream but Mr. Caldwell himself. The hon. gentleman says: "But Mr. Caldwell offered compensation." But I tell my hon. friend that dreading litigation for the subject he warned Mr. Caldwell and forbade him using the improvements, and he offered to allow him down for the compensation which Caldwell himself offered if he would acknowledge his proprietary rights over the same. These are the facts of the case. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat talks about compensation in the form of tolls. That hon. gentleman is a legal gentleman, but I would like to ask him or any other lawyer if he knows of a case where he knows of an expropriation of property is made in which the compensation is not in the form of cash down or about the time of taking the property. Did he ever hear of an expropriation being made, and a compensation allowed in an uncertain form years afterwards, and in which a jury or the party himself has nothing to do with defining such compensation? Why, Sir, the parties who took Mr. McLaren's property from him are to give him what compensation they choose. They are to

go to the Ontario Legislature and ask what tolls he shall receive, where the rights of eminent domain is exercised. Where property is taken for public uses, it is a well known maxim of national law in every country that a just compensation shall be given, and that the compensation shall be in cash paid at or about the time of expropriation is made, and that the party from whom the property is expropriated shall be a party to say what is a just payment. Well, what does this Bill propose to do? It not only takes his property from him, but it destroys it. Is he to keep up that property ever afterwards for the use of the public, if there is not provision for compensation? Nothing of the kind. But, not only is the property taken from him and dedicated to the public, but there is actually no provision made for the repair of the property. When was this? When Mr. McLaren was before the Courts endeavoring to get a legal status to his case and find out whether the judgment under which he purchased the property and the law under which he held it, was right. The case was tried before one of the Chancellors of the Court of Equity—Mr. Proudfoot, I think—and a decision was given in accordance with the case of *Boale vs. Dickson*, which judgment was supported by, I believe, nine or ten of the first Judges in Canada. One of these Judges, I believe, was Chief Justice Draper, and another Chief Justice Richards. I do not think any legal gentleman will get up and say that Mr. McLaren had not a reasonable right to believe that he was legally possessed of the property which he was endeavouring to prove his right to before the Courts. The decision of the Court was left unreversed for fourteen or fifteen years. Surely if a person acquires property under decisions which remained unreversed for fourteen or fifteen years, that, if nothing else, should give him a title to the land. Supposing the decisions were wrong, the law remained unrepealed on the Statute-book, and every lumberman knew what the law was; he knew that when he came to a part of a river that was unnavigable during the spring, summer and autumn freshets he had not a right to use that part without the consent of the owner of the property through which it passed. The hon. member for South Huron read a statement made by one of the Judges of the Court of Appeal to the effect that if a party living upon a highway removed some obstruction on the highway in the shape of boulders, he would not have the exclusive use of such highway. No person advanced such an absurd doctrine. But if a road leads up to a man's own private property and he extends that road through his property, and uses it for his own purpose, does he thereby dedicate it to the public and give every man the right to pass through it? Many streams in this district are navigable for thirty or forty miles; and supposing a person digs a canal from one part that is navigable to another part that is navigable, is the public to have the right to use that particular part of the stream?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. No, he has not the right.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is it right for one man to have the exclusive right of a river?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not the exclusive right of a river; it is the exclusive right of a channel passing through his own property.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. He is using the water.

Mr. HAGGART. He has a perfect right to use the water from his own property, passing through his property. Suppose I dig a channel through my own property from one lake to another, and put stop-logs at each end of the channel, so as only to use the water when I want it, has a person coming along one of those lakes a right to take out those stop-logs, and use the water in my channel in spite of me?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. By paying for it, he has the right.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no such law. Either I am entitled to the absolute ownership of the property or I am not; if I am entitled to the absolute ownership, I am not bound to receive tolls for passage through it. Now, I contend that my friend was the absolute owner of these particular portions of the stream. He did not use the stream to the disadvantage of the public; the public, represented by five individuals, could at any time expropriate those particular portions; there was a form of compensation provided, and they had a right to expropriate them by paying compensation. But this Act of the Ontario Government takes the property absolutely from him, transfers it to the public, and provides no compensation whatever. If there was a form provided in that Act to arrive at the value of the property and the improvements which had been made, and to fix some legal tribunal to assess tolls or damages, there might be some show of equity in it. But there is none whatever. Mr. McLaren's property is given over to another individual for his use for such tolls as he chooses to give him. I think there never was a more unjust piece of legislation in this country. I think the first duty of every Government, after the protection of a man's life, is the protection of his property; and after he went to the Ontario Government and urged his case to the fullest extent in his power, he had the right of every British subject to appeal to the foot of the Throne. But that appeal being prevented by an Act of this Parliament, he came to the representative of Her Majesty at Ottawa, and complained of the injustice which had been done him, and asked for some remedy. Hon. gentlemen say that the rights of Ontario have been infringed. What right has been infringed? The Government of this Dominion are responsible to the people of this country as well as the Local Legislatures. Has the Dominion Government no right of veto at all on any Bill unless it is *ultra vires*? If I understand the argument of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, he holds the doctrine that no Bill ought to be disallowed unless it is *ultra vires* or unless it interferes in certain cases with Dominion policy. This Government disallowed this Act, and the Ontario Government have repeated it—and why? For the purpose of enabling Mr. Caldwell, a political friend of theirs, who exercises considerable influence in the riding next to the one I have the honor to represent, to take his timber through the improvements of my friend, who happens to be a supporter of the Dominion Government. I venture to say that if Mr. Caldwell had been a supporter of the Dominion Government they would never have passed that Act.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Suppose the opposite case; suppose Mr. McLaren's politics were different.

Mr. HAGGART. He might not have urged the case as well as Mr. Caldwell did. I think it was a most unjustifiable interference with a man's private rights. The timber of that district would not have been of any use to the Crown, and the Crown would not have received any revenue from it at all if it had not been for Mr. McLaren's improvements on that stream. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, said that this question affected numerous streams throughout the country. We are all accustomed to such cases in my section of the country; a man who owns property on a stream which is unnavigable for certain portions of the year, owns the stream; there are a great many streams owned by private individuals; a great many streams are owned by the Dominion Government who have improved them, and the Dominion Government have often exercised the right of eminent domain. But there never was such an act perpetrated by any Government as the taking of a man's property from him, giving it to the public, and telling him that he might collect such tolls as the Governor in Council might decide to be just and fair. I

congratulate the Government upon the disallowance of this Bill, and I think when the matter is fully explained to the people throughout Ontario, their action will be endorsed, and I will venture to say there are a great many supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite that think that the Government which would take from an individual like Mr. McLaren, property of which he was possessed, without compensation, will remember it of them at the time of voting at the next election. I will venture to say that the people who understand the differences between these individuals in which these differences occurred, have no hesitation in arriving at the conclusion as to who was right and who was wrong, and I will venture to hope, as the Ontario Government has passed this other Bill, that the Dominion Government will find it necessary to advise His Excellency that this Bill shall also be disallowed as soon as possible.

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark). I can well understand why the Governor in Council disallowed this Act. I think that anybody who understands the history of the celebrated case of McLaren *vs.* Caldwell must acknowledge that more partizan and more misleading statements could not be made than have been made by the two hon. gentlemen who preceded me on the Government side; and, Sir, when this last hon. gentleman states that the people in the constituency of Lanark, where this stream is situated and where these gentlemen reside, are in favor of the plaintiff in the suit of McLaren *vs.* Caldwell, and of the disallowance of this Bill by the Government, I can tell that hon. gentleman he is quite mistaken, so far as North Lanark is concerned. I will tell him, Sir, what is more: that I will resign my seat to-morrow if he will do the same, and contest either North or South Lanark on this simple question—if he dare do so.

Mr. HAGGART. You have no chance of being elected again, and you may resign at any time.

Mr. MACDONELL. When you came into my constituency, in 1880, it assisted me by increasing my majority. I will not only defeat him in his own constituency on this question, but any man who may oppose me on it. It is true that Mr. Caldwell resides in my constituency, and is a warm supporter of mine; I must admit that, but I must also state that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is a strong friend of Mr. McLaren, who is his staunch political supporter, and although my statements may have some degree of partizanship, they are not so much so as those of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. Now, this stream, of which we have all heard so much, has been used for years and years. Mr. McLaren never in all his life refused to anybody the use of the stream except during the last few years; nobody in fact dared to use it; and what was the result of this state of things? It was to lock up a large tract of country, it allowed him to hold all the timber limits in that section and pay what wages he liked to the laborers there, and it allowed him to give to the farmers whatever he wished to give them for their produce. These are the facts, and the reasons which Mr. McLaren desired to prevent Mr. Caldwell from occupying and using this stream was not because he did not wish Mr. Caldwell to reap any benefit from the use of the stream; but the moment Mr. Caldwell or anybody did so, he became a competitor in the way of wages and of payments made for produce in that section, and the result would be that the farmers would obtain a fair price for their labor and produce. And more, what is the result if he could shut up this 250 miles of timber limits? Why, he will compel the people who have timber in that section to sell it for a mere trifle. He has already forced farmers there to sell timber for what he is willing to give for it; and why—because they could not get it down to market as he had the only highway for this purpose. Rather than allow the timber to stand in the woods, they are obliged to sell it to

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. Peter McLaren, of whom we have heard so much this afternoon; and Mr. Caldwell bought these timber limits at a sale at which Mr. McLaren was a competitor. Mr. McLaren would not pay as much for them, and at that moment he shut down this highway, thinking probably that he would thus compel Mr. Caldwell to sell out the limits to him at a reduced figure. These are the simple facts, which probably the House and those who live in distant parts of the Province do not understand; but the people of Lanark understand them thoroughly. The hon. gentleman talks about Mr. McLaren being ruined, if Mr. Caldwell is allowed to use this stream. No one ever heard of such a thing there. The Act referred to makes ample provision for his remuneration. On the lumber interest the people of that section solely depend for a living, and the Government of Ontario derives still half a million yearly from timber dues; consequently it is of vital interest to the Ontario Government the timber limits of this Province should be protected and the timber should be got to market. The people were so interested in the lumber trade in 1849, that an Act was then passed which says that all persons may float saw-logs and other timber and rafts and crafts down all streams during the spring, summer and autumn freshets. No one but Mr. McLaren ever thought that this public Act was other than that which it purports to be; but some years afterwards the case of Boale *vs.* Dickson arose. My hon. friend on the other side is mistaken in his reference to it. This case arose in my riding; it concerned the Indian River—a small river that was not navigable under any circumstances. Dams were erected by Boale. Dickson owned a limit above. He never disputed that Boale had a right to charge tolls, after he got his timber over the dams and slides, until Boale sued for it and the case was tried at Perth. The question there was whether Dickson had promised to pay these tolls, or not; and this was what the jury decided; but the Judges, when it came up, decided what had never been raised at the trial,—that the Statute gave the right to float saw-logs, etc., down only such streams as in their natural state will, without improvements during freshets, permit saw-logs, &c., to be floated down. This was the interpretation of the Statute by the Judges in term. The present Chief Justice in Appeal, said it was not construction, but it was legislation. Everybody till then thought that the law was different, and that they had the power to float timber down all streams. I will quote a letter of Mr. De Blaquère who was a member of the Legislature when the Bill was passed in 1849, to show what was the intention of the Legislature in passing this Bill. It is as follows:—

"As the Act of 12 Vic., cap. 87, was originated and framed by me, and introduced at my instance by the late Hon. Henry John Boulton, I am able to say that the construction put upon it by Chief Justice Spragge, in his judgment, McLaren *vs.* Caldwell, is in strict accordance with its true intent. I will not trouble you with the detail of what led to its enactment. I will say, however, that it had no reference to any Act then in force, but was intended to convey a mere right, viz.: to allow logs, timber and lumber to be rafted down all streams, large and small, in Upper Canada during the spring, summer and autumn freshets whether improvements were or were not required, whether or not the streams were floatable at such times, and whether the lands over which they ran were held in fee simple or not. It was held that no man should be allowed to render valueless, timber, the property of others, on streams above him."

That is the opinion of the originator of this Bill, but by the decision in the case of Boale *vs.* Dickson the Judges put a contrary construction on that Act. We can only gather what a law is very often from cases. I know that laws are often passed which have a contrary effect to that which it was intended they should, and it is the duty of the Legislature of Canada to re-enact any Act that has not had a proper construction put upon it by the Court. It was through the case of Boale *vs.* Dickson found out that this Act of 1849 had a wrong construction put upon it, and it was the duty of the Ontario Government to step in and declare what the

Act of 1849 was. The Act that the Ontario Government passed was not a new law, it was not an Act in the true sense of the world; it was simply declaratory of what the old law was and had no reference, one way or the other, to the case of McLaren against Caldwell. The Act which was passed by the Ontario Government and is now disallowed, gives the right to all persons to float timber down streams and provides for tolls. The hon. member for South Lanark apparently has overlooked that clause of the section which reads:

"That the Government shall also have the power of stating the amount required to maintain those improvements."

So far as the Ontario Act is concerned, it makes ample provision for cases such as that of McLaren vs. Caldwell. Hon. members who have just spoken seem to think that the Ontario Act was passed simply with reference to McLaren vs. Caldwell. It was nothing of the kind. As stated by the hon. members who spoke on this side of the House, there are hundreds of streams in Ontario to which this Act applies, and if it were not passed men who owned land on the mouths of streams could erect improvements there, and thereby close hundreds of streams in the Province of Ontario, and shut up large tracts of timber. Nobody ever dreamt of such a thing—none ever knew they had that power except McLaren; and he is the only one, in my recollection, that ever refused lumbermen to send their timber through timber slides. If it was known, if this power existed, there might probably be hundreds of men such as Peter McLaren who would close up mouths of rivers and large tracts of timber limits. The hon. member has said also that Mr. McLaren agreed to allow Mr. Caldwell to use these improvements. For the information of this House, I will read a letter from Mr. Caldwell to Mr. McLaren:

"LANARK, 5th April, 1880.

"PETER McLAREN Esq., Perth.

"DEAR SIR,—We have some saw-logs on the Mississippi River and above your improvements. We write to ask what will be your lowest charge as slidge per piece, or rate per year, for coming through these improvements. Are willing to pay you a fair and reasonable price.

"Please answer at your very earliest convenience.

"Your truly,

"B. CALDWELL & SON."

To this Mr. McLaren sent the following answer:—

"PERTH, 12th April, 1880.

"Messrs. B. CALDWELL & SON, Lanark.

"DEAR SIRS,—I am in receipt of your favor of the 5th instant, asking what would be my lowest charge for slidge per piece or rate per year, for permitting logs to go through my improvements on the Mississippi River.

"I have to remind you that in the summer of 1878, I permitted you to take your logs through the slide I have made or acquired on the river, but you failed to pay for the privilege you enjoyed for the logs you took down by means of my improvements. I have further to remind you, that last year, in violation of my proprietary rights, and after the men whom I had employed in guarding my property had (assuming that you would not attempt to take your timber down on the Sabbath day) gone to their homes, you, by force and violence, drove your timber over my slide at High Falls.

"Having regard to these circumstances, and to the large amount of capital that I have invested in the improvements on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, without which they were neither navigable nor floatable, and to the difficulty experienced in purchasing expensive lots for the use of the improvements, I have determined that for the future I shall not permit you or any person to avail yourselves of the facilities for the transportation of timber which I have been at such pains and expense to create.

"I therefore must decline to fix any charge or rate, or to allow you to use my slides.

"I may add, that should you attempt, after this notice, to go through my improvements on the river and its tributaries, that I shall take immediate steps to have you enjoined from trespassing on my property.

"Yours truly,

"PETER McLAREN."

Here there is a fair offer from one man to another asking for the use of his improvements.

Mr. HAGGART. Read the subsequent correspondence.

Mr. MACDONELL. I will refer to that in a moment. There is the offer from one man to use the other's improvements and the decided refusal of the other. But Mr. McLaren subsequently writes a letter in which he says: "If you acknowledge my right, I will allow you." What is the meaning of that acknowledgment? Once the right was acknowledged, the next year Mr. McLaren would say: "You have acknowledged my rights and I will not allow you hereafter to use the improvements." That is the reason. There is no sane man who will not understand why Peter McLaren wanted Caldwell to acknowledge his right. Why, the moment he filed his Bill in Chancery, Caldwell's mouth would be closed, and that was the trap that Peter McLaren, through his agent and legal adviser, set for Caldwell. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but the people of Lanark who know McLaren understand. I can well understand why hon. gentlemen support the interest of Mr. McLaren to such an extent. The people who know all these facts will hardly credit their statements. Why did not these hon. gentlemen tell us of the large amount of property that Mr. Caldwell had on this river? Why did they not tell us of the thousands of dollars' worth of timber now in these streams belonging to Mr. Caldwell that cannot be floated down to market? Why did they not tell us that by this Act being disallowed a great quantity of timber could not be got to market? Did they tell us that the people of Ontario would be defrauded of the dues to which they are justly entitled by the disallowance of this Act? No, they did not. Did the hon. member for South Lanark tell us that his own constituents at Carleton Place were deprived of their summer's wages by the disallowance of this Act? Did he tell us that Mr. Caldwell's mills at Carleton Place were closed on account of the disallowance of this Act? No, he did not tell us that. He did not tell us that thousands of dollars of the people of Lanark were wasted by the disallowance of this Act. But the people of this country understand why he did not tell these things. Now, Sir, there are one or two reasons why hon. gentlemen say that this Act should be disallowed. One of them is that it interferes with the rights of private individuals, and another is that it is retroactive in its effect. Now, let us see how far these arguments are good. It may be well to refer to the First Minister's declaration on that point. Everybody admits that the Governor General in Council has power to disallow any Act of the Provincial Legislature, but the justice of disallowance in all cases is quite another thing. When the people of Canada entered into Confederation, the present First Minister gave them to understand, in the Quebec resolutions, that they were to have exclusive power over civil rights and property. Again, the First Minister, in June, 1868, stated as follows:—

"The undersigned begs to submit, for the consideration of Your Excellency, that it is expedient to settle the course to be pursued with respect to the Acts passed by Provincial Legislatures. The same powers of disallowance as have always belonged to the Imperial Government, with respect to the Acts passed by Colonial Legislatures, have been conferred by the Union Act on the Government of Canada. Of late years, Her Majesty's Government has not, as a general rule, interfered with the legislation of Colonies having representatives, institutions and responsible Government, except in the cases specially mentioned in the instructions to the Governors, or in matters of Imperial and not merely local interest. Under the present constitution of Canada, the General Government will be called upon to consider the propriety of allowance or disallowance of Provincial Acts much more frequently than Her Majesty's Government has been with respect to colonial enactments. In deciding whether any Act of a Provincial Legislature should be disallowed or sanctioned, the Government must not only consider whether it affects the interest of the whole Dominion or not, but also, whether it be unconstitutional; whether it exceeds the jurisdiction conferred on Local Legislatures, and, in cases where the jurisdiction is concurrent, whether it clashes with the legislation of the General Parliament.

"As it is of importance that the course of Local legislation should be interfered with as little as possible, and the power of disallowance exercised with great caution and only in cases where the law and general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand it, the undersigned recommends that the following course be pursued;

"That on the receipt by Your Excellency, of the Acts passed in any Provinces, they be referred to the Minister of Justice for report, and that he, with all convenient speed, do report as to those Acts which he considers free from objection of any kind, and if such report be approved by Your Excellency in Council, that such approval be forthwith communicated to the Provincial Government.

"That he make a separate report, or separate reports, on those Acts which he may consider:

"1. As being altogether illegal or unconstitutional.

"2. As illegal or unconstitutional in part.

"3. In cases of concurrent jurisdiction as clashing with the legislation of the General Parliament.

"As affecting the interest of the Dominion generally. And that in such report or reports he gives his reasons for his opinions.

"That where a measure is considered partially defective, or where objectionable as being prejudicial to the general interests of the Dominion or as clashing with its legislation, communication should be had with the Provincial Government with respect to such a measure; and that in such case, the Act should not be disallowed, if the general interests permit such a course, until the Local Government has an opportunity of considering and discussing the objections taken, and the Local Legislature has also an opportunity of remedying the defects found to exist."

That is the opinion of the First Minister, and I think it is correct in every respect. Now, Sir, as to the assertion that it is retroactive, there is hardly a Session of the Ontario Legislature, even of this Parliament, which does not pass Acts with a retroactive effect. Why, this very man, Mr. Peter McLaren, had an Act passed at his own instance that was retroactive—not only retroactive but it interfered with a judgment of a Court of law where he himself was defendant. I refer to the Act 34 Vic., cap. 19, relating to the Government road allowances and granting timber licenses therefor. Before this Act was passed the municipalities owned the road allowances and the timber thereon. Mr. McLaren had a timber license from the Ontario Government under which he cut timber on the road allowances, and an action was brought against him for the recovery of the value of the timber so cut. The Court held that although the Ontario Government granted the licenses, and that it had power over the Crown timber growing on the road allowances, the timber belonged to the municipality. Mr. Sandfield Macdonald was then in power. Mr. McLaren went to the Ontario Government and got this Act passed, which states:

"Every Government road allowance included in any Crown timber license, heretofore granted, or which may hereafter be granted, under section 1 of chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, shall be deemed and taken to be, and to have been ungranted lands of the Crown, within the meaning of that section, and liable as such as to be included in such license."

Then it goes on and gives him power to cut timber, and even gives him the timber that he had already cut. If anybody could object less to legislation that is retroactive in its effect, it is this same Peter McLaren. Did we hear him or any of his Tory friends coming to this Legislature and asking this Government to disallow it? No. And what is more, when this Act came up; when the municipalities were defrauded of their timber; when their property was taken from them which they had recovered in action at law, they petitioned the First Minister (Sir John A. Macdonald) to disallow this Act. And did he disallow it? No, because they had not the warm supporters, they had not the agents in this House that Mr. McLaren has. What, then, did the First Minister do? He said: "No, I will not disallow this because it is in the competency of the Local Legislature." Did it give compensation to these municipalities?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. MACDONELL. No. Here is the Act. The first clause certainly does not. The second clause says:

"The licensee or nominee named in any such license shall be deemed and taken to have, and to have had, all the rights in respect to every such road allowance, and the trees, timber and lumber thereon, or cut thereon, as by the second section of said chapter twenty-three, were or are conferred upon him in respect of any other Crown lands embraced in such license, and the trees, timber and lumber thereon, or cut thereon, except that he shall not be entitled to take or keep exclusive possession of any such road allowance."

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark).

The third clause says:

"No by-law passed, or to be passed by any municipal council, for preserving, selling, or otherwise appropriating or disposing of the timber or trees, or any part thereof, on any Government road allowances included in any such license, shall be deemed, or taken to have had, or have any force or effect against any such license."

The fourth clause says:

"In case the council of any township, organized as a separate municipality, or the council of any united townships, have passed, or shall thereafter pass, any by-law for preserving or selling the timber or trees on the Government road allowances within such township, or within the senior township of said united townships, and included in any such license, the corporation of such township or united townships shall be entitled to be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province, a sum equal to two per centum of the dues received by Her Majesty for, or in respect of, the timber and saw-logs which, during the existence of such by-law, were cut within the said township or within such senior township, under the authority of such license; but no corporation shall be entitled to such percentage of the dues received for timber or saw-logs, cut during the times or seasons when any timber or trees on any such road allowances were cut or removed, for which cutting or removal such corporation shall, before the passing of this Act, have obtained a verdict against any such licensee or nominee."

Mr. HAGGART. The timber in the whole county was to go to the Government, and the proportion was 2 to 100, and they got 2 per cent.

Mr. MACDONELL. They owned the lumber and they were allowed 2 per cent., and only in certain townships; it did not refer to all townships. There are townships in my riding which were deprived of that timber and never received anything. Does the hon. gentleman say that this Act compensates all.

Mr. HAGGART. I say it does.

Mr. MACDONELL. Do the dues represent the value of the timber?

Mr. HAGGART. They represent the actual value received for the timber by the Government.

Mr. MACDONELL. But who owned the timber before this Act was passed?

Mr. HAGGART. Timber licenses were described by limits and bounds and covered all road allowances in the townships. Upon the trial of the case an order was made to pay a certain amount for timber cut, which was paid to the municipalities, which the municipalities held, but which the Government refunded to the licensees; and the Government, in view of the townships owning the particular timber on the road allowances, calculated what proportion the roads would be of the whole township, and they gave the proportion which they received for the timber to the municipalities.

Mr. MACDONELL. Now, we have got this: that they gave 2 per cent. of the dues because the townships owned this timber absolutely. But how could they have recovered judgment unless they only had a title to the timber on the road allowances; they must have had some better title before the Judge gave a verdict for the full value of the timber. That is one case which Mr. McLaren should not complain of with respect to legislation with a retroactive effect. There is another case, and I will only refer to those two cases to show that the First Minister has turned his back on his first record. The second is the Goodhue will case. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) endeavored to prove that the First Minister had made a mistake in the Goodhue case; but it would have been better for the people of Ontario if the hon. gentleman had followed his course in the Goodhue case. In that case the Ontario Legislature altered a man's will. A man named Goodhue, of London, left a will, devising his estate to his children and afterwards to his grandchildren. The grandchildren consented to an agreement to have the property divided, and in order to do that, an Act of the Ontario Legislature was required, and that Legislature, under Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, passed an Act confirming the agreement without the consent

of the trustees. The First Minister's attention was called to this glaring act; but he stated the Government would not disallow the Bill because it was within the competency of the Legislature. Those are the only two Bills to which I refer as diametrically contrary to the precedent laid down for the disallowance of the Streams Bill, and it is well that the people should know that, according to the hon. member for Simcoe, the First Minister made a mistake in not disallowing the Goodhue Bill. The question of disallowance, I think, should not be considered as a local one, although the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is more deeply interested than the members of the Provinces. When you find a Province as intelligent as the Province of Ontario sending representatives to Toronto to enact laws that are to govern the people, only to find those Acts disallowed by this Government, it is time the people should know what Acts are to be allowed and what Acts disallowed. If the Local Legislatures are to exist, if the Confederation is to be what it was intended to, then I tell those hon. gentlemen on the other side that they must not interfere with the legislation of the Provinces as they have done in the case under consideration. The people of Ontario are too intelligent to allow their rights to be trampled upon in that way. Yesterday, part of their Province was taken away, to-day their powers are restricted by this Government, and if this is to go on the people will ask if it is worth their while to send representatives to Toronto and expend large sums of money in their Legislature if their Acts are to be disallowed on the mere whim of a political supporter of the Dominion Government. Is the validity of their Acts to be governed by the fact of whether they are Reform or Conservative? If these are the principles upon which their legislation is to be allowed or disallowed, I think the people of the Province of Ontario at the first opportunity will decide that their Acts shall not be disallowed, as in this case of the Streams Bill, and place in power men who will guard over their interests and rights.

Mr. BRÉCKEN. It is not my intention to occupy the attention of the House for many minutes. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Macdonell) that this is not a legal question, although the Bill which has brought the matter before the House is of a legal nature. I feel the force of a remark made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that the smaller the Province the more likely is it to suffer from any tyrannical use of this power of veto on the part of the Dominion Government, and I feel, as a representative of the smallest Province of the Dominion, that it would not be out of place for me to make a few remarks on this subject. I am not going into the merits or demerits of this Streams Bill. They have been discussed on both sides with great ability, and the case has been presented with a special clearness by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I think, from all the information I have been able to gather, it is quite clear that the law is that in streams which are not floatable for logs at all seasons of the year private rights may exist. The fact does not seem to be controverted that Mr. McLaren had private rights and had expended a large sum of money for the purpose of rendering the river serviceable for the branch of trade in which he was engaged. It seemed to me that the question resolved itself into this: Had Mr. McLaren private rights, and if he had not, where was the necessity of asking the Legislature of Ontario to legislate on the subject? Public highways are public property, and with regard to them the Government is the trustee of the people. They are to preserve the rights of the people, and if the Mississippi was such a highway there could be no necessity for going to the Legislature of Ontario for legislation, and the very fact that he went to that Province for legislation stands against his case. Why did he go there if the Constitution and common law had given him the rights which he asked? If there were no private

rights vested in Mr. McLaren, why do they complain of injury done to Mr. Caldwell or the public. But it was not on that particular point that I rose to speak. When I had the honor of filling the position of Attorney-General in the Legislature of my native Province we had an example of the power of veto exercised by the Dominion Government some years ago. As the matter is one of considerable importance as a precedent in the present case, hon. members will pardon me if I enter into it somewhat fully. After years of agitation in the Island on the celebrated land question a Bill was introduced by myself in 1874 for the purpose of expropriating the lands then held by proprietors over an area of 500 acres. Certain machinery was provided, and among other things a court of arbitration; but here is the point to which I wish you to refer. That Act was passed, I believe, by the unanimous vote of both branches of the Legislature, and I believe it was heartily endorsed by every man, woman and child in Prince Edward Island. I believe that I drew up the reasons for the passing of the Act, and it is true that the Lieutenant-Governor withheld his assent to that measure, not that he disapproved of the Act, not that he had conscientious scruples about the Bill becoming law, not that he was not as fully impressed as any member of his Government or any member of his Legislature, or any suffering tenant on the Island, that the Act should become law; but simply on the ground that the Act interfered with the rights of private property, simply because there was an expropriation, because it was an unusual Act or one in which the exercise of unusual powers were asked for. He considered it of such vital importance that it was submitted to the consideration of the Governor General in Council. I venture to say that if you look to the correspondence that emanated from the Lieutenant-Governor of the Island, you will not find one word or syllable disparaging to that Act. On the contrary, the hope breathing throughout the whole correspondence is that His Excellency will see the propriety of the Act becoming law. What was the effect? Under the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), his Minister of Justice (Mr. Fournier) withheld the consent of the Government, and the Bill was vetoed. The point, I believe, was raised by the leader of the Opposition to-night, that there was a difference between the case in which the Lieutenant-Governor reserved his assent and one in which such assent was given. Now, the case to which I have referred is a striking instance in point. There was an Act which everybody wished passed, and it was simply on account of the importance of the Act that the Lieutenant-Governor preferred sending it up to the Governor General; and yet the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), who appears in the estimation of his followers to be incapable of doing any wrong, incapable of trampling on the constitutional rights of the Province, ignored that Bill to the sore disappointment of ninety-nine men out of every hundred in the Province of Prince Edward Island. I would ask, in the interests of Constitutional Government, in the cause of Liberalism—which my hon. friends on the other side profess to favor and condemn us for opposing—if any hon. gentleman will point out the difference between the Governor General vetoing an Act, assent to which has been refused by a Lieutenant-Governor, and the veto of an Act to which the Lieutenant-Governor has not assented. In our case both parties made common cause and the Act was passed by both branches of the Legislature. Let my hon. friends pursue that argument a little further. What is a Lieutenant-Governor of a Province since Confederation? He is the nominee of the Dominion Government. He may be as unpopular a chief magistrate as Andrew Johnson was when he scarcely escaped impeachment; and yet, forsooth, my hon. friends say: "You do not interfere

with popular rights; you do not check popular aspirations because the nominee of the Dominion Government has put his imprimatur on the Act." When this Act came back I introduced it a second year. And if it was a crime in this Government to withhold their assent to this Act because it interfered with private rights, it was ten times a greater crime, ten times a more serious encroachment upon popular rights and upon the independence of a Province, for the Liberal Government under the leadership and direction of the hon. member for Lambton, to disallow an Act which the people of the Province had demanded with one voice, but to listen to the protests of a few absentee proprietors, whose voices appeared to have more weight with the former Governor-General than the unanimous voice of the people of Prince Edward Island. Under the first Act one arbitrator was to be chosen by the Local Government, another by the proprietor, and the third by two arbitrators. That was considered an unfair way to constitute the court, and we provided that the Local Government should appoint one arbitrator, the proprietor one, and the Dominion Government the third; and I must make this acknowledgment, that it was a very happy suggestion that the Dominion Government should appoint one of the arbitrators. Lord Dufferin appointed no less a man than the Hon. Mr. Childers, and I have no doubt that to his ability and the way in which he presided over that court, was to be attributed largely the happy result arrived at. The interests of the country were greatly concerned in those awards, and we introduced an Act to amend the old Act to confirm the awards, and omitted from the operation of the Act a case of Miss Sullivan's, which was then pending—an appeal to the Supreme Court. You will find, on looking at the papers, that the Lieutenant-Governor withheld his assent again. Our Lieutenant-Governor at that time was a very conscientious and extremely cautious man, and never was guilty of assuming too much responsibility; and yet he strongly recommended this Act for confirming these awards. That Act was also passed by the unanimous voice of the Legislature. I think the Minister of Justice at that time was the Hon. Mr. Scott, who was acting for the present leader of the Opposition, and the assent of the Government was withheld. I will not delay the House any longer. If I understand the principle embodied in the amendment, and the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is not that it does not come within the terms of the British North America Act, but that it is contrary to the spirit of the constitution of the Dominion, that the Dominion Government should disallow any Bill unless it is *ultra vires* or interferes with the general interests of Canada. Now, I would ask in the name of consistency why these two important measures to which I have alluded were disallowed, when there was not a foot of land outside of Prince Edward Island that could possibly be affected by them. The hon. gentleman who last spoke gave a timely warning that every Province should beware, as none knew how soon their legislation would be attacked, as that of the Province of Ontario had been. Yes, Prince Edward Island felt that when these Acts were vetoed. The case was one of such importance that when we entered this Confederation the Dominion Government appropriated \$800,000 to enable us to attain the position that the sons of the Emerald Isle are now declaring for. Liberal as that measure was, wise as it was to remove absentee landlordism from the free soil of America, be it remembered that the tax placed on progress, liberty and reform, was placed on them by a Government which called itself liberal and the friends of the people.

Mr. WELDON. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that this question affected not only the Province of Ontario, but the autonomy of the different Provinces of this Confederation. I also hold that while this Parliament should preserve the powers given to it by the

Mr. BRECKEN,

British North America Act, the powers of the Local Parliaments should be equally preserved. The Acts of which my hon. friend has just spoken were Acts affecting the whole of Prince Edward Island. These rights, which are assured to the Legislatures by the British North America Act, should be preserved intact. The Dominion Parliament should exercise the powers given to it; and the powers granted to the Local Legislatures should be equally preserved. The Acts of which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has just spoken affected the whole Island; and it was because the proprietary rights of the Crown were interfered with that the Imperial Government interfered, and this was the legitimate ground upon which the Imperial Government has interfered with Local legislation. I claim that the cases which the hon. member from Prince Edward Island has placed before the House are not at all analogous to this question which affects Ontario as a whole. Objection is taken to this Bill, because, forsooth, the private rights of an individual are interfered with; but, Mr. Speaker, no law can be passed by any Parliament without more or less affecting the rights of individuals; and I take it, as a principle in either Local or Dominion legislation, that the question of private rights shall not interfere with the public good. So far as these questions are concerned, we have nothing to do with them. My hon. friend from North Simcoe gave a pretty strong statement of the facts of the case, but with these I do not intend to deal. Standing here as a member of the Dominion Parliament, I take it that we have nothing to do with the merits of the case between McLaren and Caldwell. We have only to deal with the principles of polity, which should actuate the Government of the Dominion with regard to Local legislation. By the British North America Act, certain powers are granted to the Local Legislatures. Within these limits, their powers are just as paramount as are the powers which are granted to this Parliament; and in dealing with Local legislation the principles which were laid down by the Premier in the memorandum of June, 1868, should be observed. A great deal has been said on this case, in defence of private rights; but we, sitting here, have to deal with an Act of the Legislature of Ontario. This is a general Act for the regulation of streams in Ontario, and whether it is retroactive or retrospective, the fact is immaterial so long as it comes within the jurisdiction of the Local Parliament. My hon. friend from North Simcoe urges very strongly that this Act interferes with private rights, and that it is unheard-of legislation; but we can refer to many cases where Parliament has stepped in and interfered seriously with private rights, even when actions are brought before the Courts. Many years ago, there was a contest between the House of Commons and the Court of Queen's Bench. A man who felt himself aggrieved by a publication endorsed by the House of Commons brought an action of libel against the publisher. The Court justified the action; and on the 4th of April, 1840, the Parliament of Great Britain passed a law which stayed the proceedings. It was felt to be for the general and the public good that the Act should be retroactive and retrospective, and that the proceedings should be stayed. So it is in every case: private rights must be interfered with more or less in legislation. As far as I understand the question, in this case compensation was given in the shape of tolls, and it seems to me that any stream on the borders of which lie public lands from which the Government derive a revenue, is clearly under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature when any individual seeks, as in this instance, to close its navigation, and thus practically destroy the property from which the Government obtains a revenue. Property and civil rights are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. No doubt, the arguments of my hon. friends from

North Simcoe and South Lanark could be fairly addressed to the Local Legislature of Ontario, but it is not for us to pass on the merits of the case. We have the right to assume that the Legislature of Ontario fully weighed the whole matter, and that so far as the interests of Ontario are concerned, it was for the preservation of public rights and the administration of public justice, that this law should be passed. If it interfered with the rights of the Dominion, or the interests of this Government, or destroyed any principle which is laid down in the Premier's memorandum of June, 1868, it would be a different matter; and this memorandum I take it, has been the basis upon which the right to refuse assent to Acts which Local Legislatures have passed, has been based, and it has been followed not only by the Ministry of which the right hon. gentleman is the head, but also by the Government of which the hon. member for Lambton was Premier. But it does not appear that such is the case. So far as private rights are concerned, no more flagrant violation of the rights of individuals could have occurred, than happened in the case of a Bill which was passed by the Local Legislature of New Brunswick. I was counsel in the case. The will of an individual was under discussion; a decision had been obtained from the Court of Equity, and I was appealing to the Supreme Court, when without notice to the parties, by a suspension of the rules in both Houses, a Bill was passed and assented to, dividing the property in question. We applied to this Government, setting forth the facts; but acting upon the principles laid down by the Premier in that memorandum, this Government declined to interfere because it was a matter within the province of the Local Legislature. So far as the cases I have cited in which I was refused the petition for disallowance, the petition was refused to a strong supporter of the Government, my political opinions being of no avail against the principles of the predecessors of the Government I support. So far as the question of McLaren vs. Caldwell is concerned, we have nothing to do with that. The Local Legislatures were to deal with property and civil rights, and that is the tribunal with which Messrs. McLaren and Caldwell have to deal. So far as legislation is concerned, if the Legislature of Ontario transcend the powers given to them in the Act, the Courts of Ontario have the right to declare their action *ultra vires* and protect the rights of Mr. McLaren; but if the Ontario Legislature, in its wisdom, pass this law in the interest of Ontario, and it infringes any of the interests of that Canada which affect solely the interests of that Province, its disallowance is not an Ontario question, but a question affecting every Province of the Dominion by which the autonomy of each Province is affected.

Mr. McDUGALL. I think it is very much to be regretted that a question of such grave interest and constitutional importance as has been raised by the amendment put in your hands, Mr. Speaker, should be discussed as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply. It is, of course, the right of hon. gentlemen who wish to bring a proposition of a general character before Parliament to avail themselves of this opportunity, but the difficulty in which the question is placed thereby is that it is made to assume the character of a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. As in the motion of the hon. member for Niagara.

Mr. McDUGALL. But it happened that that proposition was not moved with that intention and was not received by the House as having that effect, so that I think the difficulty was overcome in that case. I do not object to the Opposition making use of this opportunity, to place their views with regard to public policy before the country, but I merely point out that they place a large number of members in this House, who have not yet made up their

minds, whatever they may do in the future, to express by a solemn vote of Parliament a want of confidence in the general policy of hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, under the necessity of refusing to affirm in a particular case, a proposition which they may be ready to affirm, because the vote they give will have a different meaning from what they intend it should have. With regard to this particular question, I think it is unfortunate that a question of the power of Local Legislatures to pass laws, and of the power of the Dominion Government to disallow laws, should be involved with the private rights of individuals, as they are in this particular case, and especially in a case which was under the consideration of the Courts at the time this law was passed. The propositions which the hon. gentleman has placed in your hands are such as I, for one, cannot affirm or approve of, because I do not find them in the Constitutional Act. Part of the argument on that side to-night has gone this far. Hon. gentlemen appear to be of opinion that it is improper for the Governor in Council, acting for the whole Dominion, to disallow any Local Act that is not *ultra vires*. What would be the use in that case of the power of disallowance, since the Courts would disallow any Acts that were *ultra vires*? It is clear that the provision in the Constitution is intended to apply to cases which would not be held by the Courts to be *ultra vires*, but the propositions contained in this resolution go so far, argumentatively, at all events, that no question which is within the competency of the Local Legislatures, and in which the Local Legislatures have exercised their legislative authority, and which is not *ultra vires*, is within the power of the Governor in Council to disallow, and that to disallow such an Act would be an infringement on Provincial rights. I might for a moment ask the attention of the House to the consequences which would follow such a proposition as that being affirmed by a vote of the House. I will put one case which arose in a conversation which I had with some English gentlemen. It was with reference to the character and safety of investments in municipal bonds. We all know that a few years ago State bonds of the United States were not found to be a safe investment, because the State passed laws, as they had a right to do under their Constitution, by which their debts were practically wiped out and their foreign creditors, the holders of the bonds, robbed of their money. I was asked—what is there to prevent your Provincial Legislatures from passing laws by which the advantages that investors in your municipal securities now have in the machinery by which they can levy on the property of every taxpayer in the country, may be taken from them? What is there to prevent a Local Legislature, in cases where public feeling has been excited, as was shown by the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., in the case of the Bill passed by the Legislature of that Province and properly disallowed by the Dominion Government, passing a law that would deprive investors of their rights and security? I said there was the power of disallowance by the Governor in Council; that in this new Dominion we had, at the time, and probably would have for many years to come an English nobleman as Governor General, and it would be open for them to lay their case before him and they might be satisfied that in a case of such gross injustice, the Act would be disallowed. That answer was sufficient to the Englishman. He said: "If that is the way your Constitution works, I can see very clearly that any change in the law of a Province by which foreign creditors would be deprived of their legal remedies and property is not likely to be made. I have no doubt, on petition to the Governor General, their legislation would be disallowed." The particular case of disallowance present under discussion, is perhaps a weak one. It involves, as it appears, only a question between two individuals. I feel fully the force of the argument that has been used by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that

where there is a practical confiscation and interference with the rights of parties which would leave them without remedy, it is quite within the power—and if justice requires it, it is the duty—of the Governor in Council of this Dominion to protect parties against such injustice, and public opinion will sustain them when they do it. Now, Sir, this resolution proposes to declare that hereafter it shall be deemed contrary to the principles of the Constitution; they say it destroys the autonomy of the Provinces; if the power be exercised of disallowing laws that have been passed referring to the subjects that are pointed out in the 92nd section of the British North America Act. Sir, I can affirm no such doctrine as that. I agree that any interference with the powers which are given to the Local Legislatures for the framing of laws, unnecessarily, through political feelings, or national, religious or other motive, except on the broadest public grounds, would be injudicious and improper, and this is the tribunal to which hon. gentlemen who advise action of this kind, are responsible. Indeed, the resolution itself points that out, that the Ministry are responsible to Parliament. It is the people of this great Dominion, the representatives of all the Provinces assembled here, whose duty it will be to protect the people in any particular Province from any injustice or improper Act of the Administration of the day; and I think the people have ample protection in this great tribunal, representing, as I said, all the Provinces, sending, presumably, its principal men—if the people do not send their principal men then they are answerable for the consequences of their negligence—but we must assume that Parliament represents all the Provinces of the country, and the very fact that it is composed of the representatives of the different Provinces who have different local systems and who must always be jealous of their Provincial rights, entitles the people to leave in the hands of the Administration of the day, the ultimate authority over these questions, whether it be composed of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House or on this side of the House. We have seen in the cases cited that when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they felt that duty to be imposed upon them, and I believe they exercised that power judiciously, so far as I have seen. In one particular case referred to to-night I felt that my hon. friend's argument was a little inappropriate. I apprehend he felt it was an improper interference in that case on the part of the Government in refusing its sanction.

Mr. BRECKEN. I expressed no opinion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I inferred, when he said that 99 men out of every 100 were not in accord with the decision of the Government, that he felt it was an interference with Provincial rights.

Mr. BRECKEN. I said an interference of political influence. As to the constitutional right I think it was quite proper.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not hear my hon. friend say that the people of Prince Edward Island threatened rebellion.

Mr. BRECKEN. We are too loyal for that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have not heard that they were so resentful against the Government because it interfered, even against this great majority, and protected the rights of parties who were living beyond the jurisdiction of the Province. I have not heard that the people there were disposed to revolt against the Dominion because the Government exercised their power in that particular case; and I do not think the people of Ontario will sympathise with the cry that this case, paltry in itself, is a proper occasion for laying down these general principles of restriction, for making a new constitution in fact; or, for putting a limitation upon it by a resolution of this Parliament, because Mr. Caldwell and Mr. McLaren have had some difficulty about their streams. I do not think we are yet properly informed upon this subject; but I do protest against the invitation to lay down such proposi-

Mr. McDOUGALL.

tions and such rules as are contained in the resolution placed in the Speaker's hands in regard to the duty of the Dominion Government in dealing with laws passed by the Local Legislatures. They must exercise their discretion and judgment upon these laws, because if they are injurious to the people of any province, or of a section of a province, or if they interfere with the trade and commerce of the country, they will be held responsible for the consequences. I think that is a question worthy of consideration whether this case is really provincial; it appears to me that it touches very closely the question of trade and commerce, for it deals with timber which is not confined to the Province. Logs pass through these various rivers down to the Province of Quebec, they form part of the great export trade of the country, and it seems to me therefore that this is one of those questions which quite justifies the Government in looking narrowly into the laws which relate to a matter of that kind, and at all events, it is clearly within their constitutional right to disallow such acts if they think the case warrants. Even if the question were before the House in a different shape, I should feel it my duty to record my vote against any such general affirmation of the inability of the Government of the Dominion to deal with local laws as that resolution contains.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not propose to detain the House more than a few minutes in discussing this question. I propose to show that the Government cannot shield themselves behind the reasons they put forth for disallowing this Bill, namely, that they were protecting private rights. I am prepared to show that, and I believe that I can prove before I sit down, that in matters of this nature the Government have two weights and two measures, one set for its friends and one set for its adversaries. I know this is a pretty serious charge, but I make it deliberately though I make it open to correction, and I would be glad it were proved incorrect. But I think it is warranted when I tell the House that almost at the same time that the Government had before it the petition of Mr. McLaren asking for the disallowance of this Bill, they had another petition from two large companies from the Province of Quebec and thirty-eight different individuals asking for the disallowance of a Bill of a somewhat similar character to this one, and if this one is held to be bad the one I refer to is far worse. These companies and individuals I refer to were asking for the disallowance of a Bill passed by the Legislature of Quebec on July 24th, 1880, which was an Act respecting Mines. This Bill organized the Province of Quebec into different mining districts, and section 14 of the Act reads as follows:—

"In the conceded part of the seigniory, called Rigaud Vaudreuil, in the 'Chaudiere' mining division, where there may exist any persons, firms or companies owning mining rights, under valid titles, any proprietor of land, comprising in such conceded portions, who has not already divested himself of his mining rights, in favor of third parties, and who takes a license for that purpose,—or in his default any other miner, who conforms to the provisions of this Act, in such case, may mine for gold or silver upon such lands; but in all cases, such persons, firms or companies, possessing the said mining rights, may exact from any such person mining thereon a sum not exceeding three per cent. upon the gross amount of the gold or silver obtained, over and above the duty payable to the Crown under the Act."

That was on the 24th July, 1880. If it is held, as it was contended on the other side of the House, that the Streams Bill was an invasion of provincial rights, by what name shall we adequately describe this section, which provides that a person holding not a doubtful title but a valid title to mining rights shall not work the mines. Anybody may go on the land and mine against his will. Is not this an invasion of property? As was said a little time of the discussion in the Quebec Legislature, this is a communistic principle; it is worthy of the Paris Commune. It is a glaring violation of the rights of property. It has been said that the Ontario Act was retroactive in its operation. Let the House look at section 15 of this Act from which

I am quoting. This was protested against by two large companies, by three different parties, also by 38 members of the seignior; but notwithstanding all those petitions the Government did not disallow the Bill. They did not grant or refuse the petitions, but they allowed the time to lapse and let the Act take its course. What conclusion can we come to except this, that the Government has two different ways of dealing, one for their friends and one for their enemies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who are enemies?

Mr. LAURIER. The enemies are the Ontario Government, who are not in sympathy with this Ministry, and the friends are the Government of Quebec who are in close sympathy with this Administration. It is evident that the present Government have no fixed and immoveable standard of justice, but that the balance of the scales may turn with friend or foe. I do not blame the Government for not having disallowed the Mines Act, for I think they acted properly. In regard to such legislation the onus lies with the people of Quebec. It is said that the Provincial Legislature may do wrong—and it did wrong in this instance; but this Government may also do wrong; and in whose favor shall we decide? There is a standard rule dividing right from wrong within a Province. The Legislature should be supreme. Within the whole Dominion, the Dominion Parliament will be supreme; but it does not lie in the mouths of the hon. gentlemen opposite to say that the Dominion Parliament is responsible to the people of the country. It is responsible to the people of the whole country, but the Legislature of Ontario is responsible to the people of Ontario, and so it is with respect to Quebec; and to allow the Dominion Government to judge their Acts according to their standard of what is right and wrong, would be to apply a remedy that will be far worse than the evil itself. This is a proposition which will commend itself at least to hon. members who come from the Province of Quebec. It is a well-known fact that if we are to-day in a Federal instead of a Legislative Union, it is due to the peculiar circumstances in which Quebec is placed. It is for the benefit of the people at large, because it must be admitted that it would be impossible to govern this large extent of territory under any other than a Federal system. I call the attention of my fellow-countrymen to this question, because it is one on which we are unanimous in sentiment. There is but one sentiment in Quebec on this question, that if the Federal system has to be upheld we should not sacrifice a particle of the Federal system under any circumstances. Conservative journals of Quebec, referring to the Bill of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), respecting marriage with a deceased wife's sister, have expressed the opinion that the question is not within the competency of the Dominion Parliament, and is purely a provincial matter. I think this is a debatable matter, but the more debatable it is, the more it shows how keenly the people of Quebec feel on this question. It is true this question does not really affect us, but the people of Ontario; still if the Mines Act had been disallowed there would have been a unanimous protest from Quebec members against the Government's action. It is not, I say, affecting us as it is Ontario; but what takes place to-day in Ontario may occur to-morrow in Quebec, and we desire to give the same measure to our fellow countrymen in Ontario, that they would expect to receive themselves, if the rights of legislation were at stake. The occasion may arise some day when the rights of our Province may be interfered with, and then if we fail to get the measure of justice which we should expect we shall have only ourselves to blame. While this may be to some extent a question of party, I hope my fellow countrymen from the Province of Quebec will adhere to the view that before it is a question of party it is a question of nationality

—a question of right and justice. I say that in such a case there is but one vote to give, and that is to hold that the Provinces are supreme in their sphere, and that their judgment should not be superseded by the judgment of another power.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman's appeal to his fellow countrymen will be as fully responded to as was a similar appeal which he made, the other night, with regard to the Mining Act, which the hon. gentleman says the Federal Government refused to disallow. I wish to point out to him that the private parties affected by that Bill were heard before the Privy Council, and the Legislature of Quebec repealed the obnoxious clauses, so that justice was done to all parties. That was one point upon which the hon. gentleman laid great stress and it has fallen to pieces. Section 71 was repealed, as it had been agreed to, and the parties had declared themselves satisfied. If the Quebec Parliament had not done that I dare say that Bill would have been disallowed as well as the Streams Bill. The hon. gentleman tried to charge us with having embodied in our Quebec legislation communistic principles. When my hon. friend tried to act like his old leader, Sir George Cartier, he posed as the greatest Conservative in the country; to-day he changes his policy, he becomes more conservative, and charges us with communistic principles. The hon. member says it is a pity that we should agree with the Government in the disallowance of this Bill, because if we commit injustice to Ontario to-day it may turn against us to-morrow. Well, I am glad that there are in our Constitution two great safeguards which will ensure the success of Confederation; the first is that the Dominion Parliament may dismiss Lieutenant-Governors, and the second that we may disallow Bills passed by the Local Legislatures. In the Provinces, when passion runs high, great injustice may sometimes be committed, and gross outrages attempted. What have we seen in our own Province? We have seen the Lieutenant-Governor appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite entering into a most outrageous conspiracy to kill their political opponents in our Province, and to destroy our liberties. That conspiracy was approved of, and was blessed by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. That conspiracy had two objects—first, to put out a Government which had the greatest majority ever possessed in Quebec, and to rob us of our liberties, as they tried to rob our elections on the 1st of May, 1878, by resorting to all kinds of dishonest means—by calumnies, by lies, by falsehoods. The consequence was that our Province was for several weeks thrown into turmoil, revolution and great uneasiness. Well, this Government and this Parliament interfered, and thanks to that valuable security contained in our Constitution that man was dismissed. And what did we see two years after? We saw the *coup d'état* of 1878 when the whole Province rose like one man on the 2nd December and declared that the conspirators had their end in our Province. The second safeguard is that we have the right to disallow Bills not only when they are *ultra vires*. That would be absurd, as was well observed by the hon. member for Halton, because a Bill that is unconstitutional is not dangerous, as it will be set aside by the Courts. But those Bills which we have the power to disallow are Bills against peace and harmony, against the general interests of the country, and it is well that we have the power to deal with them. What is there in this country more valuable or precious to a citizen than to feel that he is safe in the enjoyment of his life, his liberty and his property. The Bill called the Streams Bill was the most dangerous attempt of a partizan Parliament to rob a man of his rights. That outrage has never been surpassed, and it has only a parallel in the outrage perpetrated by the Liberal party in our Province. I am not surprised to hear my hon. friend from Quebec East, after blessing Mr. Letellier for

having kicked out the Quebec Government, now blessing the Ontario Government for trying to rob one of our friends. I think the House will vote against the motion made by the hon. member for South Huron, and supported by my hon. friend from Quebec East. That hon. gentleman the other day tried to betray his friends on the boundary question; this time he tries to betray his Province by pretending that the Government are interfering with the rights of the Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. At last we have heard from one member of the Administration some statement of the views which the Government entertain upon the important question which has been debated for so many hours. That hon. gentleman, in announcing the Ministerial view of this measure, has used language which I think ought to be repudiated by every respectable man in this House. The hon. gentleman has dared to state that some 60 out of 88 members of the Provincial Legislature, which is as respectable as this House is, and a Government which is as respectable as this Government is, have been engaged in a conspiracy to rob one of their friends, and that he puts the case upon this ground: that that Legislature and that Government having decided to rob one of the friends of this Government, they stand by their friend. These good Samaritans found him stripped, wounded and bleeding, and they have applied the cruse of oil and the ointment, have given him assistance and have put him on his feet again. It is well, Sir, that this debate which was commenced on the Ministerial side by the counsel for Mr. McLaren, should be closed, so far as yet is shown, by the Ministerial announcement of a member of the Government that this is the love, this the attitude, and this the language which they venture to use towards an independent Legislature—*independent at any rate until this vote is taken—and I think independent as it will shortly become by the decision of the people of this country, with regard to a measure which it has passed.* Now, Sir, the hon. member for Halton stated several objections which he has to giving an assent to this motion. I know that no man can more ingeniously find difficulties with respect to pursuing any particular course than can the hon. member for Halton; and no man suffers more pangs inwardly—and sometimes outwardly—before he reaches a happy conclusion; but I observe that before the question is put, somehow or other, the hon. gentleman does always manage to find a reason to vote in favor of the Government, and his vote is recorded accordingly. The hon. gentleman, in the first place, objects to the mode in which the motion is brought forward. He says, Sir, that it is a very inconvenient mode for an independent member who has not yet formed or expressed an opinion on the subject; and he does not like to favor it, because, in the mode in which it is put forward, it involves a vote of want of confidence. I did not hear the hon. gentleman so speak with regard to the motion of the hon. member for Niagara the other day, or point out a difficulty, because the motion was one in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. The hon. member for Niagara moved in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, as my hon. friend from Huron moves an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply; but the hon. member for Halton then found no difficulty, no insuperable difficulty in supporting that motion; but on the motion of my hon. friend from Huron, although he might approve of the motion, it would be quite impossible for him to support it, because it is put as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and to vote for it would involve a vote of want of confidence in the Government. This is his first proposition. We have heard a little about two weights and two measures, and I think that whatever application that principle may have to the general line of policy pursued by the Government of the country, it has a direct and very serious application to the mode in which the hon. member for Hal-

Mr. MOUSSEAU.

ton is disposed to deal with the form of this motion. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) has referred to an important question connected with the Ministerial crisis at Quebec. How was that brought up in the House? It was in the same form—by an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and the hon. gentleman found no difficulty about it. They proceeded in that form deliberately to discuss that question. Another reason for so introducing this subject is this: It is the only mode in which we could possibly bring up this question. I do not know that I will be able to convince the hon. member for Halton, as far as his vote is concerned, but, perhaps I may be able to convince his judgment. Still another reason for this course is this: It was only two days ago, if I remember aright, that the papers were brought down to this House on which the motion is founded. The subject was mentioned in the debate to the Address. It was then announced that it would be a subject of discussion here. The papers were moved for, as soon as it was possible, and we asked for them a score of times since. They were not voluminous; but nevertheless they were brought down only after repeated requests, two days ago. What was the condition of the business of the House two days ago? The Government had taken every day except Monday: the Order Paper was crowded and it could not have been reached for many days; it was very possible that it could not have been possibly reached even on Monday next, when we will have a debate on the Montreal Telegraph Bill. It was utterly impossible, in any other mode, to bring up this question before the House this Session. After the action of the Government, and their delay in bringing down the papers, this mode was adopted; and so the hon. member for Halton's proposal is that, out of delicacy for the tender feelings which the hon. gentleman possesses, we ought not to have brought this motion on in the only way in which we could bring it on at all. Indeed, the hon. member for Halton would have objected even if we had brought it forward in any other way. It is very difficult to satisfy the hon. gentleman. He objects to the general proposition, but I think, Sir, that before I have done, I will show the hon. gentleman that there is very good authority for the language used in this motion. I think I shall be able to read the statement on which the motion is based, which was uttered by an authority to which he always pays the gravest deference. Now, that hon. gentleman did not give such an account of the motion as its form fairly bears. In the first place, it declares that the power of disallowing Acts of the Local Legislatures conferred by the British North America Act is invested in the Governor in Council, and that His Excellency's Ministers are responsible to Parliament for the action of the Governor in Council for the exercise of this power. This proposition is not disputed, and this shows that in dealing with this question we are exercising our right to hold the Ministers responsible to this Parliament for the mode in which they exercised this particular power. Secondly, it declares that it is the essence of the Federal principle, as embodied in our Constitution, which sets forth that this power should be used only in cases where the law and the general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand it. I do not think that any one objects to that proposition. Can it be that this is a proposition to which the hon. member objects? Can any member of this House, who is a real, true lover of the Federal system, find any possible objection to this proposition? Where the law and the general interests of the Dominion imperatively demand it, then and then only shall the power of disallowance be exercised; but it would impair the Federal principle, and injuriously affect the autonomy of the institutions of our several Provinces were this power to be exercised on subjects which are within the exclusive competence of the Local Legislatures, on the ground that in the opinion of His Excellency's advisers, or of the Canadian

Parliament, any such legislation is wrong. The phrase may perhaps be objected to. I see a mark on the resolution just opposite this passage. I do not know who made it. There is sometimes an advantage in borrowing your language from an authority; and I will read the observation, which seems to indicate that this was once the opinion of the great authority to which I have lately referred. In the debate on the New Brunswick School question, the hon. gentleman, the leader of the present Government, uses precisely the same phrase. He points out that it would be impossible to interfere in these matters, for otherwise this Legislature, instead of being as now the great Court of Parliament for the decision of Dominion questions, would become simply a Court of Appeal to try whether the Provincial Legislatures were right or wrong in the conclusions at which they arrived. Then he says that the question is, under the Constitution, one which ought to be decided exclusively by the Local Legislature on its responsibility to the people of the Province, who are the sole judges of such action, and once again, terms used in this motion are embraced by the language to which I have referred, while he uses other language from which I will read a more extended quotation, which I intend to make from the same speech. He states that the only exception which he would propose in such cases, is where the measure in question prejudicially affected the interests of the Dominion generally. The motion which is before the House then proceeds to state the mode of dealing adopted in 1868, and pursued since in the exercise of this power, and points out that it has been the rule ever since 1868 not to exercise this power, on the ground that a measure is considered partially defective, or objectionable, or prejudicial to the general interests of the Dominion in thus communicating with the Provincial Legislature in question, when general interests permitted such a course to be pursued, in order that the Local Legislature might consider and discuss the measure anew, and remedy the defects that existed. This is borrowed from the hon. gentleman's own recorded views in 1868. It is in the words as well as in the spirit of that statement, and it is not merely the statement which he then formulated, but it accurately represents the practice which has, so far as I am aware, without exception, except in this particular case, been pursued since that time. The resolution goes on:

"That it appears from the papers laid on the Table of this House that an Act passed by the Legislature of Ontario on the 4th of March, 1882, intitled: 'An Act for protecting the public interest in rivers, streams and creeks,' was disallowed by His Excellency in Council on the 19th day of May, A.D. 1881, by order approving a report which does not assert that the said Act is beyond the competence of the Local Legislature, but expresses an opinion adverse to the propriety of certain provisions of the Act.

"That the said Act was within the exclusive competence of the Local Legislature, and was not of such a nature as to render its provisions subject to the judgment for disallowance by the Government of Canada."

It points out that, under these circumstances, being not of such a nature as to render it subject to disallowance, the Governor General and the Minister of Justice had no right to act on their opinion, whatever it might be, as to the propriety or impropriety of the Act, and it points out that no communication was had with the Local Government, and no opportunity given them to discuss the objections made to the Legislature or to remedy the alleged defects, but that the rule laid down, and up to that time pursued without exception, was without cause violated in this case; and submits on all these grounds that the position taken by the Government and their action on this particular measure was wrong, and that the Act ought not to have been disallowed. I do not see anything in these propositions which differ from the generally accepted views of our Constitution and the views without which we have nothing as a Federal constitution whatever. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) declares that

there was no practical difference whatever between the cases of dealing with Bills reserved and Acts assented to. That is an interesting question, but the only importance it has in this controversy is upon the question of consistency and the question how far the action of the late Government and of different Ministers or Acting Ministers of Justice, in dealing with Bills reserved, has proved they adopted a view which, if it were to prevail, would entitle this Government to disallow this measure. Certainly I need hardly say that if it can be demonstrated that the view taken at the time by those who dealt with Bills reserved in the way in which they did deal with them, was that there was such a distinction, that it was an entirely different thing dealing with a Bill reserved from dealing with an Act with a view to disallowance, the argument, whatever its value, and I do not attach much to it, deducible from the proposition in the resolution before us falls to the ground. I shall prove, in a moment or two by the most conclusive evidence, recorded contemporaneous with the action on my own part to which the hon. gentleman referred, that such rightly or wrongly was my own opinion. The hon. gentleman was pleased, unnecessarily I think, to inform the House that he had read many of my legal opinions and that from the way in which they were framed, representing considerations on the one side and the other, it was extremely difficult to draw conclusions from them. I do not know how it could be extremely interesting to the House to know the opinion of one professional man as to the mode in which another professional man discharged his professional duties. I suppose I was responsible to my clients, when I was happy enough to have them for the mode in which I gave advice, and if they thought I did not give them clear advice they would not come again; and I am glad to say that I did not want for clients so long as it was possible for me to pay them any attention. But that is a private matter, and I will discuss it no further. I am of opinion that the statement made this night on the subject of dealing with reserved Bills, betrayed great absence of consideration of the whole question, and would not have been uttered had it been given any reasonable degree of attention. Now, the question with reference to the reserved Bill, as it arose with us, was one different in many respects as to the line that was taken by the first Government from the question of dealing with Acts. In the first place, no instructions were given at any time to Lieutenant-Governors on this question of reserving or not reserving Bills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not complaining of that. I am not saying about it anything except the fact that there was no indication on the part of the Federal authority to the officer *pro tanto*, or perhaps to a certain extent the Federal officer, as to whether he should or should not reserve any Bill, and on what principle he should deal with the subject. In the second place, while the hon. gentleman charged with the duties, as First Minister and Minister of Justice, of dealing with this question, thought it fitting, as early as 1868, to lay down rules for his own guidance, and for the guidance of the Government, as to the mode of dealing with Acts which came up, he never brought forward any such statement, or proposed to lay down any such rule with reference to the exercise of the power of advising assent or declining to act with regard to Bills reserved. So that both with reference to the instructions to Lieutenant-Governors and the action of the Federal Government on cases of reserved Bills, that matter to use a simple phrase was left at *lucendo* in the early days of Confederation. It happened, with reference to some of the Provinces, more particularly, I think, from the Province of Manitoba, and to some extent more than the others, the Province of Prince Edward Island after its admission to the Union, but it happened very largely both during the tenure of office

of Governor Archibald and particularly that of Governor Morris, that the power of reserving Bills was used in a very liberal manner; and a great many Bills, considering the total number of Bills that were passed and the total number that were reserved over the whole Dominion, came from Manitoba. I think the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island—I have forgotten his county—

Mr. BRECKEN. Queen's.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman spoke as a man who represents the county of Queen's ought to speak. He spoke as the advocate of the prerogative. He seemed to think that an officer appointed by the Federal Government, though the most unpopular man in the land, had the right as Lieutenant-Governor to reserve a Bill. I deny it. I say that he has no constitutional right as a rule to reserve Bills. The constitutional rule with reference to reserving Bills and of dealing with Bills which may be objected to by Ministers or Governors is clear and well settled under the principles of the British Constitution, and applicable in its broadest sense and fullest extent to the action of the Provincial Legislatures. If a Governor disapproves of a Bill it is his duty to settle that matter with his Ministers while the Bill is yet before the Assembly. It is his duty to say "Gentlemen I disapprove of your proposed measure, and I will not allow that Bill to become a completed Act." If he chooses to take the responsibility of making the quarrel between himself and his Ministers upon that subject he has right to do so; but when he permits the measure to pass through the Local Legislature and it comes before him for assent, he has no right to refuse assent. He has no right to turn what would be a conflict between himself and his Ministers into a much more serious thing, a quarrel between himself and the Assembly by declining to assent to a Bill after it has been passed. So again with reference to the Ministers to advise reservation. I am, of course, speaking generally. There may be exceptional cases which we have never yet defined, as almost all rules have their exceptions, but speaking generally the Ministers have no right whatever to permit a measure to which they are opposed to pass through the Legislature and afterwards advise exercise of the power of reservation. Their duty is to make the quarrel one between themselves and the Legislature, and to decide at once whether their views are to prevail on that body or not. In a word, avoiding special cases, the power of reservation is to be used on the advice of Ministers. The question in both cases must be settled before the Bill comes up for assent. I say that if the Lieutenant-Governor disapproves of a measure which is passing through the Local Legislature, it is his duty to settle that question with his Ministers while that measure is still before the Assembly, and if he chooses to take the responsibility of quarrelling with them on that subject, he has the right to do so; but once he permits the measure to pass through the Local Legislature and come before him for assent, he has, at that period, no right to refuse his assent and provoke a conflict, not simply with his Ministers, but between him and the Assembly, or the two Houses. So, again, with the rights of Ministers to advise reservation; I am, of course, speaking generally. There may be exceptional cases—as almost all rules have their exceptions—but speaking generally, the Ministers have no right to permit a measure to which they are opposed to pass through the Local Legislature, and advise the exercise of the powers of reservation afterwards. The question, in both cases, must be settled before the Bill comes up for assent. Bagehot puts the case in which the Queen is supposed to have presented to her a Bill passed by both Houses for her execution and says she would have no constitutional right to decline assenting to it. I am not prepared to go quite so far. I think there would be a little too much human nature in a King or Queen to sign that document, but you cannot put more strongly the view of that constitutionalist as to the

Mr. BLAKE.

entire abrogation of the power of refusing assent. Of course, it is a different thing to reserve a Bill and to refuse assent to a Bill, but this bears upon the question of reservation. The true constitutional doctrine with reference to Local Legislatures and this Legislature is this, that, barring exceptional cases, local legislation is to be completed within the bounds of the Local Legislatures and is to come up here for disallowance or to be left to its operation in that state, and that barring exceptional cases Federal legislation is to be completed in the Federal Legislature and is to go across the water in a completed state for disallowance, or to be left to its operation; and the last fragment of the view that the power of reservation was to be exercised as an ordinary thing or to be exercised even in exceptional cases, was, happily for the growth and development of our autonomy, swept away in the instructions to the Governor General as the result of representations made to the Imperial authorities by the late Government. Up to that time this power of reservation had been made a practical power by order of the Governor General in certain classes of cases. I think there were eight or nine different classes—for example, the Divorce Bill; but even so far as Bills imposing differential duties are concerned, the reservation was swept away, and we are entitled to complete on our own responsibility our own legislation and send our laws home to be dealt with under what, I believe, is almost the effete power of disallowance. The hon. gentleman will still persist perhaps in the argument that it is practically the same to decline to assent to a Bill as it is to disallow an Act. I want to show that a very different view was taken, in point of fact, by both his leader and myself. I think it would be news to a very large portion of the community in Ontario and through the Dominion to know that the hon. the First Minister disallowed the Orange Bill. I think that the 12th of July would present a pretty lively scene if it were determined that the hon. gentleman had disallowed the Orange Bill. Did he practically or virtually disallow it? Did he do the same thing as disallow it? According to arguments advanced to-night, he did. According to them it was just the same thing to refuse assent to this Bill that was reserved as to disallow it. Was it the hon. Minister of Customs who settled this, or the hon. the First Minister? Has the former been supporting for five or six years with all his vigor and energy a man (and is he now the colleague of a man) who did that most outrageous thing, in the opinion of that portion of the community—disallowed the Orange Bill?

Mr. BOWELL. What he did was with my consent and by my advice.

Mr. BLAKE. I know that a gentleman high in the Order thought that he was not disallowing the Orange Bill, and felt rightly that it was quite a different thing from what disallowance would have been. I do not charge him with having disallowed the Orange Bill. It is his own friends who contend that to refuse to assent to a reserve Bill is practically the same thing as to disallow an Act of Parliament. I had to deal with an Orange Act and left it to its operation, but the hon. gentleman had to deal with an Orange Bill, and he left it where it was. We both left a thing where it was. I left an Act which it was in the competence of the Local Legislature to complete, as they did complete it; the hon. gentleman left the Bill, which he said they ought to have completed, where it was, and sent it back to them to deal with. The principle upon which the hon. gentleman proves, that to refuse the assent—

Mr. McCARTHY. It depends on the grounds.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not depend on the grounds at all. If you refuse to deal with a Bill because it ought to be completed by the Local Legislature within whose competence it

is, you prove conclusively it is not your opinion that you are disallowing that legislation. What is the hon. gentleman's statement? The hon. gentleman says:

"Under the system of Government which obtains in England as well as in the Dominion and its several Provinces, it is the duty of the advisers of the Executive to recommend every measure that has passed the Legislature for the Executive assent. The provision in the British North America Act, 1867, 'that Your Excellency may reserve a Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure,' was solely made with the view to the protection of Imperial interests and the maintenance of Imperial policy, and in case Your Excellency should exercise the power of reservation conferred upon you, you would do so in your capacity as the Imperial officer, and under the Royal instructions. So, in any Province the Lieutenant-Governor should only reserve a Bill in his capacity as an officer of the Dominion, and under instructions from the Governor-General.

"The Ministers of the Governor General and of the Lieutenant-Governor are alike bound to oppose in the Legislature measures, of which they disapprove, and if, notwithstanding, such a measure is carried, the Ministry should either resign or accept the decision of the Legislature, and devise the passage of the Bill. It then rests with the Governor-General or the Lieutenant-Governor, as the case may be, to consider whether the Act conflicts with his instructions or his duty as an Imperial or a Dominion officer, and if it does so conflict, he is bound to reserve it, whatever the advice tendered to him may be, but if not, he will doubtless feel it his duty to give his assent, in accordance with advice to that effect, which it was the duty of his Minister to give. With respect to the present measures, the undersigned is of the opinion that the Lieutenant-Governor might not have reserved them from Your Excellency's assent, as he had no instructions from the Governor-General in any way affecting these Bills. They are entirely within the competence of the Ontario Legislature, and if he had sought advice from his legal adviser, the Attorney-General of Ontario, on the question of competence, he would undoubtedly have received this opinion, that these Acts were within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. This is evident from the fact that (as appears by the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislature) the Attorney-General voted for and supported the Bills, as a member of the Legislature. Under these circumstances, the undersigned recommends that the Lieutenant-Governor be informed that Your Excellency does not propose to signify your pleasure with respect to these reserved Acts, or to make an action upon them. The Legislature will, at its next Session, which must meet before the expiration of the year, within which by the constitution, Your Excellency has the power to signify your pleasure, have the power, if it pleases, of considering these measures anew, and re-acting them or rejecting them at its discretion.

"If these Acts should again be passed, the Lieutenant-Governor should consider himself bound to deal with them at once, and not ask Your Excellency to intervene in matters of provincial concern, and solely and entirely within the jurisdiction and competence of the Legislature of the Province."

Now, Sir, there was a statement by which the hon. gentleman avoided the responsibility of saying yea or nay to the question whether the Orange Bills should be sanctioned. He said: "I decline to give these Acts vitality, not that I am opposed to them, not that I favor them, I say nothing about them, but simply because they ought not to have been sent up." Because an Act of the same kind in another Province had been reserved and disallowed, by parity of reasoning, it was argued that it having come to the knowledge of the Government they ought to assume that, and to deal with it as if it had been a measure which had been once disallowed. To-day if we were to pass a Bill and it was to become an Act, and was to be disallowed, it would be within the competence of the Governor General, if that measure was once again presented for his signature, to make it an Act, and the operation of disallowance could be repeated if he thought fit once again so to deal with it. Now, I wish to show that we acted upon the view that the case was entirely different. I will read you a few words from a report of my own, on the 4th of October, 1876, upon a Bill from Manitoba, which will show you that while I stated that if that Bill had come before me as an Act I would not have advised its disallowance; if having come before me as a reserved Bill I advised that His Excellency should not signify his pleasure at all upon it, because it was the duty of the Lieutenant-Governor to complete legislation of that character. And I wish to show that at the very time the hon. gentleman argues that I thought that it was the same thing to disallow and to decline to give effect to a measure, my opinion was different.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the hon. gentleman said he was going to prove in this particular matter that my views justified this particular disallowance, and that he was going to prove it by showing my dealing with a reserved Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I referred to your dealing with the Quebec Bill, which was not a reserved Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I am going to deal with that presently. I wish to show what I have stated. What I stated was this:

"This power is unlimited, and, under this statute, a loan or investment so may be incorporated and so obtain unlimited power to borrow; and upon the whole, therefore, the impression of the undersigned would have been (had this Bill come before him as an Act with a view to his decision whether it should be disallowed or not) that it should be left to its operation, but this is not the question.

"The question is whether Council should advise His Excellency to assent to this Act, which is a reserved Bill.

"It appears to the undersigned that, as a general rule, the Lieutenant-Governor should himself act with the advice of Ministers upon the question of assent.

"To this rule there will no doubt be, from time to time, exceptions, but the undersigned submits to Council whether this Bill comes within the exceptions. Upon the whole, considering the difficulties to which the undersigned has adverted, and the inconveniences which might result from the Governor in Council being called upon to give vitality to Provincial legislation of this description, the undersigned recommends that no action be taken upon the Bill in question. If re-introduced into the Local Legislature, the Local Government will be able to consider the difficulties which have been stated, with a view to recommend such amendments as they may think expedient."

There you will see that I thought, rightly or wrongly, that if that Bill had come before me as an Act it would have been my duty to advise that it should be left to its operation; while I did think that, coming before me as a Bill improperly reserved, it was my duty not to advise His Excellency to give it the vitality which would make it an Act. Now I think that nothing can be more obvious than that it would be the most dangerous thing in the world to hold any different view. We do not want Local Governments or Local Governors, or persons in any of the Provinces, to shuffle their responsibilities on to the shoulders of the Government here. We want these matters discussed in the Local Legislatures by the people who are responsible for their disposition. If a time had been laid down, if instructions had been given, or a State paper prepared on the subject dealing with reserved Acts, which I believe it would have been prudent for the hon. gentleman to do in the first place, we would have laid down principles which would have made it more apparent on what grounds we ought to act with reference to reserved Bills. I lay down this as a general proposition that the conclusion not to assent to a reserved Bill is entirely different from the conclusion to disallow an Act which is completed. For my part I had nothing to do with this Prince Edward Island Bill. I knew nothing of it, until I saw it in the Journals; but of course, I had the technical responsibility of a member of the Government who remained in the Government after that Act came down to Parliament, and I do not shirk that in the slightest degree. But, in the conclusion, that the Bill should not have been given vitality to here, I for my part concurred, and the reason is because I thought it ought to have been completed in the Local Legislature. My opinion is that that measure ought to have been brought into life, ought to have become an Act of the Local Legislature, and ought then to have been submitted to the Government here for the question whether they would leave it to its operation or disallow it.

Mr. BRECKEN. Of course, the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman is the correct one, that if a Lieutenant Governor withdraws his assent from a measure advised by his Council, that Council must resign; but I will refer the hon. gentleman to the Journals where he will find as regards the Act of 1875, introduced for the purpose of making those awards valid, the Lieutenant-Governor actually advised the passing of the Act, and in fact there was no collusion between the Lieutenant-Governor and his Council, but he

simply reserved the Act on account of the magnitude of the principles involved and of its extraordinary character.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to repeat a portion of his speech, which I still remember. I knew the point before the hon. gentleman made it; but it has nothing to do with the question. Here you have a Representative Assembly and Elective Council, which is also a Representative Assembly, the Local Government and the Lieutenant Governor all agreeing with a measure which they could pass but which they dare not pass. It is so important that we, the wisecrackers of Prince Edward Island, cannot solve the difficulty but must send the case to Ottawa. This is the fact, that while 99 out of every 100 of the whole population were in favor of the Act, and the whole Legislature, the Legislative Council, the Government and the Lieutenant-Governor, they did not find themselves men enough to pass it. I am ashamed of the Island which the hon. gentleman represents. I am quite sure they never will commit the folly again, and there will be such a growth from weakness to strength that after this discussion we will find very few reserve Bills, and the Local Legislatures will take their own legislation into their own hands.

Mr. BRECKEN. You did not help us to carry it.

Mr. BLAKE. It should never have come here, and the people of Prince Edward Island ought to have been able, under the authority which they possessed under the Confederation Act, to have conducted their own affairs in this particular without the assistance of the Dominion Parliament. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) dealt with another subject which, I think, he treated in the same spirit which, not unnaturally, must influence his mind, he not being superhuman, in dealing at all with this case. The hon. gentleman said that the wholesome, the reasonable, the safe and the proper rule laid down as to the mode of dealing with Acts which were thought to be defective, was all right. He could not say anything else, because he copied his leader's statement—but it was intended to have a limited application. That was intended, he said, to deal with cases which had been treated without due consideration and which Local Legislatures had thus passed into law. Under those circumstances it was intended there should be an opportunity of explaining, discussing and considering the objections surrounding it. But if Local Legislatures acted with deliberation, if subjects were fully discussed, and if an Act was carried by an overwhelming majority, it was not intended they should have another opportunity of considering their views. What a ridiculous proposition. They were to be allowed to further consider in those cases in which they were presumed to have acted in mistake, but they were not allowed to deal with questions on which they had formed a deliberate opinion beforehand. I appeal to history. The hon. gentleman had to deal with two measures of the Ontario Legislature among some others. One was the measure for making payment to the Judges. He believed, and I agreed with him, that the measure was an unconstitutional one; and I may pause for a moment here to point out how shallow and false is the argument that cases *ultra vires* would be entirely answered by an appeal to the Courts. It could not be done. Take this very case—where could it have been answered? The measure was beyond the power of Local Legislatures to pass, but what Court of Justice was to decide whether this payment of \$1,000 to each Judge should be made or not? How would you raise the point; who was to raise it? I know of no manner by which the question could have come adversely before a Court at all; and yet the Act was *ultra vires*. There may be cases in which such a general confusion and disturbance of the general interests of the Dominion may occur, from the continuance on the Statute-Book of an Act which

Mr. BRECKEN.

is *ultra vires*, long before that question can be tested in the Courts—that it may be a reason for exercising the power of disallowance, and in point of fact there are many such cases in which the hon. gentleman and other Ministers of Justice thought this and the other portion of an Act was *ultra vires*, but that it might be inconvenient to obtain a decision of the Court at that time. We have all allowed Acts to go into operation which contained provisions that were *ultra vires*, because the general public could not interfere, and I believe we are bound not to interfere, although after some disturbance and difficulty and some years have elapsed during while the Act was assumed to be legal, it was determined to be unconstitutional. On all Bills supposed to be *ultra vires* it is of the utmost importance that we should stay our hands and use cautiously the power of disallowance. I will tell the House why. If an Act is allowed to remain in operation you leave it open to being tested in the Courts, but if a Government proceeds to disallowance they make themselves the final authority and no opportunity is afforded to obtain the decisions of the Court. Strong reasons of general interest ought therefore to exist before resort be had to disallowance; that power should be set aside and every Act possible should be dealt with by the Courts. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that we are fond of referring on this occasion to precedents which hon. gentlemen opposite have set, and to their declarations. Why should we not? Why, Sir, it is a State paper which forms the foundation of our action for fourteen or fifteen years back on this subject—a paper which was not controverted—although a paper which I myself do not wholly approve of in every line and syllable and letter. I have had occasion to deal with it, and I have guarded my approval of it in its entirety; but in so much as it is practically in accord with this motion, and more, I have always accorded and have always testified my adherence to it. That paper has formed the foundation of the action of the Government for five years. They have left it unimpeached in any material respect. It has formed the foundation of the subsequent action of that Government and succeeding Governments. Nothing more solemn could be found as interpretative of the true meaning of the statute as an instrument of that kind issued in such a manner. Now, whatever defects there may be in an unwritten constitution, and ours is in many ways an unwritten constitution, this advantage is left: that we know that in the relation of the Executive to Parliament it is the spirit of the British Constitution to which we look. Whatever difficulties may have arisen from the absence of precision, we have one advantage which, in my humble belief, not merely counterbalances but far outweighs these difficulties, and that is this: that we have a Constitution which is susceptible of growth and development, and we have an advantage in the practical carrying out of this spirit without violent revolutions, without those difficulties which attend a change in any written document, but by a growth and development of the principles of freedom amongst the people who are happy to be governed under such a Constitution. So was it under the British Constitution—a Constitution under which while there was always, even in the earliest days of which we speak of Constitutional Government, a strong element of popular rule—even in these early days when the people were excited, they were still paramount, but unless you excited the people, unless you had some great cause to bring before them, the King was the ruling power. You see the same Constitution passing through the period of the revolution changed it is true, but still the same Constitution. When the King had gone further than the governing powers which, under ordinary circumstances, he possessed and chose to touch Englishmen upon that point upon which English battles for liberty have always been fought, viz., the right of taxation, you saw in that particular, and in some other particulars, the old constitutional principles reformed, and

what happened? We know that in the practical working of that Constitution there came a time when the King did not govern, but in place of the King there was an aristocracy—a party in England which, by its authority, by its possessions, by its weight in the country, by the defective state of the popular representation, by the system of borough-mongering, was enabled to govern the country. Why, in the cabinet of the great William Pitt there was only one commoner, all the rest were peers. We had the same Constitution, but we found a Government of peers instead of a Government by the King; but by slow degrees the balance of power changed, until we find that now the government is in the House of Commons; and we know that during the whole of this time the struggle was going on to narrow the prerogatives of the Crown, to hold that those prerogatives should be exercised only on the advice of the Ministers. We know that under the exercise of the great principles of freedom there has been a gradual narrowing of the prerogatives of the Crown. There are remarkable instances of that, and it is said by Bagehot that the people of England would be as much surprised to find that an Act which had passed both Houses had not been assented to, as they would be to look out some morning and find a volcano on Primrose Hill. So it is that the great blessing of the Constitution, which in this particular we also enjoy, is that it has within itself a principle of growth and development in favor of popular rights; and if I were called upon to-day, Sir, 15 years after we took the stride which we took in 1867, if my duty were to-day to say to you that, whatever were the views then entertained as to this elastic power, whatever were the constitutional restraints which were recognized as good and proper in the early days of the Confederation, we had outgrown them—if I were called upon to say to you, at the end of 15 or 16 years after we confirmed the ever-blessed principle of the growth, the freedom and the enlargement of our powers, that it was found improper and unnecessary to restrain where there had been restraint before, I should have an argument for which I should have the whole of British history at my back. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) told us that it might have been necessary to give greater powers to the Provinces in the early days of Confederation, but that the freedom which might then be necessary should now be withdrawn. He turns back the dial of time. He says the freedom and the liberty which we had in 1867, in 1868, in 1869 and 1870, might have accorded with our condition then, but it has now to be withdrawn—that we are now unworthy of those principles and of that system of Government which has been so strong in protecting the popular privileges. Why, Sir, there is a clause in our Constitution under which any Act, passed by any Local Legislature, of whatever nature, may be disallowed. No man, however lost to the feelings which ought to animate a British subject everywhere, dares to say that that clause has in its wideness a practical application. No man but acknowledges that it is a clause which is limited by other considerations. No man dares to say that there is—there may be the power, but that there is the constitutional right to disallow any Act whatever. All admit a limitation—where do we find it? We find it, Sir, in the spirit of the Constitution. That is the only place where you can find it, and if you find it in the spirit of the Constitution, you find it carried out. I hope and trust in a spirit of growth and development in favor of popular rights, and not in a spirit of lessening and narrowing down popular rights, of centralization instead of decentralization, of informing the people that in the early days, in order to prevent them from being irritated, they were allowed some liberties, but now these liberties are to be withdrawn and more contracted principles to be applied. Now, I maintain that we have, what we had at first, very good

reason for saying that there is no need to go further in order to establish the impropriety of this disallowance. I do not say there is no need to go further. There may be a need to go further; but the hon. gentleman admits that within the limits of recorded practice there is nothing more to say—that this Act should not have been disallowed. What does he say? Referring to the Goodhue case, he says: "I admit that that was a case in which there ought to have been a disallowance, and I justify the act of the Minister, if I justify it at all, on the statement that the Confederation was then new, and that it was not politic to exercise a power that ought to have been exercised." Well, Sir, contrast that Act with this. That was an Act by which the Legislature, without any pretence of public interest whatever, without the slightest suggestion that the public were in any way concerned, took the property which had been devised to certain devisees and altered the devolution of that property. Although that measure passed, I think against the vote of the leader of the Government, certainly against my own vote, who occupied a position on the opposite side of the House, the hon. gentleman declares—what? He has not one word of objection to that Bill. He does not say anything about it except that it is within the competence of the Local Legislature, like the prior Act to which he refers in his report, which was also an Act interfering with vested rights; and, therefore, he says it should be left to its operation. If he felt that the Confederation was a little more knit together, he would be disposed to disallow; but then he did not think it prudent to do so. He lays down the bold principle that this is within the right of the Local Legislature, and although it is a wanton interference with private property, a transference of property from A to B, without a pretence of public interest, yet it was for them to decide, and he had nothing to do with it. That was the case, and I acted upon it cordially and cheerfully. I was opposed to that Bill, I voted against it, but the hon. gentleman never heard one word from me of condemnation for that disallowance. I never had the slightest misgiving in my own mind but that the hon. gentleman would act as he did act on that occasion; not because I thought he would approve of the Act any more than Mr. Sandfield Macdonald or myself did, but because I was satisfied that he would feel that it was a matter belonging exclusively to the Local Legislature, and not affecting the interests of the Dominion in any such way as to justify interference by disallowance, and that he would leave it to its proof. That was the rule the hon. gentleman then laid down and the practice he pursued; and it is too late to-day to denounce that rule and that practice, and to say that the people of this country were to be deluded into a practical acceptance of Confederation upon a false statement of what the true reading of the constitution was until they could be placed in such a position that more rigorous measures could be safely applied to them. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that this course ought to be pursued only in cases of surprise. I say to him that in the case of the Judges to which I have referred, the measure was debated in the Local Legislature thoroughly; it was the subject of an adverse vote; the unconstitutionality of the measure was there alleged. The Legislature acted deliberately; yet the hon. gentleman proceeded after his own fashion. He expressed his opinion; he fortified himself behind the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in England. True, he did not proceed to disallow; but he proceeded in the proper constitutional course which he himself had chalked out. He communicated his objections to the Ontario Government; he obtained from them their answer; he rejoined to that answer; but he adhered to his own opinion; he placed the law officers, as a buffer, between himself and responsibility, as he used to do; but he said: "Unless the Local Legislature repeals this Act, it must be disallowed," and it was not until the last day on

which disallowance could take place that it took place at all; and, therefore, after the fullest opportunity had been given for discussion and action by the Local Legislature, the hon. gentleman acted with reference to that Statute, which was not a Statute passed in haste, but deliberately adopted against remonstrance, and upon division upon the part which proved fatal. In the same Session the hon. gentleman had another Bill, one to alter the tenure of the County Court Judges, and to make them hold office during pleasure. That Bill was adopted in the Local Legislature, and it was divided upon. The hon. gentleman formed the opinion that that, too, was beyond the power of the Local Legislature; he fortified himself in the same way; he pursued the same course, sent his communication, gave an opportunity to the Local Government to reply, rejoined to them again, and not until the fullest opportunity was given to them to repeal the Act did he proceed to disallow. There is present in my mind several instances in which a different course was adopted, excepting this one, and is it not wise, is it not a statesmanlike proposition for hon. gentlemen to avoid as far as possible exciting angry feelings and the chances of collision with the Local Legislatures, and to give them the utmost opportunity of making the matter right and of putting it into shape by these agreements, by arrangements, by these discussions and by these suggestions, which should take place; and if that is so, Sir, with regard to measures in which the objection which is taken by the Federal Government is one of public policy, which is one of great and general interest to the whole country, and in which this is a question of that kind in which the people generally are concerned; how infinitely more obvious is the argument, that an exceptional course ought not to be pursued, when the Government interferes with regard to a measure which is exclusively within the competence of the Provincial Legislature, and when the alleged defect concerns only the private rights of one individual. Is it because that private right of one individual is the right of a man who is called Peter McLaren, who is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who is a friend of the hon. member for Lanark? Is that a reason why an exceptional line of procedure should be pursued in this case? Is that a reason why an insult and a slight should be offered to an independent Local Legislature and to a Local Government that was never offended before, and yet that is the reason given; because they did this so deliberately they were not entitled to consideration or consultation or the opportunity to offer an objection. What was done? A long paper is put in. I have not read it. It is a great printed volume of—I do not know how many pages long. What is it composed of?—of *ex parte* statements of articles and suggestions; and that is put in before the Government. A long petition is also put in.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not consist of newspaper articles and of speeches altogether. There is in it the speech of Mr. Pardee when introducing the Bill and of Mr. Mowat in reply.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope that the hon. gentleman does not say that this is not an *ex parte* exposition of the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not *ex parte* in the sense which you mean.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the speech of Mr. Pardee's the only speech?

Mr. McCARTHY. All the speeches are there as far as I know. There are Mowat's and Frazer's speeches and the whole debate.

Mr. BLAKE. And articles from the newspapers?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE: His own seizure of the case is reported, and then there is a report—a report taken from the *Mail*.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. McCARTHY. Who says so? How does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. BLAKE. Only the speeches were not reported if the report is taken from the *Mail* that it is all.

Mr. BOWELL. Speeches in the *Mail* are much more honestly reported than they are in your own organ.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not saying that the speeches of opponents are reported honestly in either paper. I maintain that it is an absurd statement to make—to give a report of a man's speech from the paper of the opposite side of politics. But I do not care about that the hon. gentleman had a right to be informed of the views of the Government officially; but these were *ex parte* statements presented on the authority of Mr. McLaren, on his statement. Then there is his petition and declaration as to values and all other things, which he alleges were laid before the Government, and on this petition there is a memorial from the Minister of Justice, who felt himself qualified to judge. A Minister of Justice? a Minister of *in-Justice*. Why, he does not know the first principles of justice. The old maxim is that he who is called upon to judge, if he judges without having heard the other side, although he may decide justly, has committed an act of injustice. To hear both sides is the very first thing which should have been done and was a part of the memorandum which has been so often referred to. It is the paramount duty, recognized in all Courts, by common sense, and by the sense of justice of all mankind at large, which of you are to decide question, to hear what is said on both sides before you give a decision. Now, Sir, we do not know when this petition was presented. It is put in without a date. The date of its receipt is not marked, there is no acknowledgment of it. There is not even a letter from my hon. friend from Lanark accompanying it. There is not even a recorded interview with the Minister of Justice or with anyone of the Ministers about it. There is nothing from my hon. friend from North Simcoe about it, not a word. What passed? Were there petitions by mouth as well as petitions by letter? Were there representations of any other kind on the subject? Was Mr. McLaren in the office of the Minister of Justice? Were his friends there? Was there a series of petitions and representations and statements because these are just as effective really as if there are written; and sometimes a little more effective, because sometimes arguments by word of mouth presented in a private office with a locked door, are more effective than when they are presented on paper, to be brought down, to Parliament afterwards. I say, Sir, were there more representations and more consultations presented on this subject? But how was the case of the Province of Ontario represented? How was the Government of Ontario represented? How was the Legislature of Ontario represented? How was this case, which you degrade to the level of a private contention between two individuals, which I do not choose to do—argued before the Government? How was the case with regard to the other party presented, if at all? It was forgotten. It was ignored. No! it was not forgotten. But the Government wilfully failed to observe the first of the cardinal principles of justice. They reached their conclusion without giving an opportunity to the great public and important private interests to represent their views. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, the member for North Simcoe, has represented that the law is so and so. There is no doubt about the law. There is one little difficulty, however, you know about the law being so-and-so. The highest Court in the Province of Ontario has said that it is not so-and-so. What the hon. gentleman declares to be the law is at present, by the judicial decision of the highest Court in Ontario, not the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. Allow me to interrupt. I made no such statement. I said merely that, at the time the Bill

was passed, the contrary was declared to be the law of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but the hon. gentleman went a good deal further. What the Legislature said in this case was this: They said that they had the power to declare what the law was. They said that they knew better than others what their intention was, and that they, as the successors of the Legislature that passed that law, could declare what it was. The hon. gentleman has acknowledged frankly that we were not here, so far as we can interfere with private rights, to do so; but that the Local Legislatures, in the much larger measure in which they are interested with authority to deal with private rights, are not restrained by constitutional prohibitions which render it impossible for them to do things which it is impossible for the Legislature of the Dominion to do, but he proposed to apply to the Local Legislatures the same prohibitions in effect. I will tell you, Sir, what the hon. gentleman proposed. This is his proposition, Mr. Speaker. He says that under the Constitution, things, which it would be impossible for the Local Legislature effectually to deprive the subject of his property except under certain conditions and with certain restrictions, existed which did not exist here. I admit that under the Constitution of Canada and the Provinces, the Local Legislatures have the power to deprive the subject of his property under these conditions; but I say that if we import into our Constitution, into the Constitution of Confederation a restriction upon that power and declare it as a majority in this House propose this night to declare, we will declare it to be the right and duty of the Government wherever that power, which he admits exists, is to be exercised, to nullify its exercise by disallowing such Acts. The hon. gentleman says that you find this in the Constitution. Why? You do not find it in the Constitution. The hon. gentleman says that the spirit of the Constitution shall be violated; that the assent of the Constitution shall be broken, and that a new clause shall be inserted in the Constitution, giving you not the certainty of a Court on the point, but the discreted determination of a political body trying a case without hearing the other side, as to whether it comes within their competence, what the United States Constitution would forbid, and upon their arguments to decide that the law should be nullified. No, Sir, I am a friend to the preservation of the rights of property, not, perhaps, after the form of the hon. gentleman, and many of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, but I believe in the subordination of those rights to the public good. Let me tell the hon. gentleman what happened under the wholesome influences of that interpretation of the Constitution which he, in earlier and happier days received. Let me tell him that the discussions which took place with reference to the Smith will—to the will of Sir Henry Smith—and followed by the discussions which took place with regard to the Goodhue will, proved the importance, morally as well as materially of the possession here belonging, of the power to decide for themselves what should be right and what should be wrong in these cases. The people of Ontario and the Legislature of Ontario found, that there was to be no appeal to some good art of a machine, no appeal to some superior power, but that they had that right as a State, which each of us has as a man—the right to go wrong—and they determined to go right. A Session did not elapse after the passage of those mischievous measures—after they had become the law of the land, that Legislature at once taking steps on the resolution which I had the honor of introducing, to render practically impossible for the future any such interference as had taken place in the Goodhue and Smith will cases. They proceed to pass a law under which estate bills were to be referred to the Judges. They passed that law, and subsequently the reports of the Judges were made on all estate

bills, and the opinion of the Judges was invariably accepted. The hon. gentleman says this is an imperfect remedy; he advises that an appeal should be made to the people, and if it is impossible to obtain a satisfactory settlement in a Provincial appeal to the people on account of the other questions which would complicate it there, what does the hon. gentleman propose by way of remedy? Why, that it should come here to this Government, which is responsible to this Parliament, which Parliament is responsible to the whole Dominion; so that the ultimate recourse of an Ontario subject should be to the general election of the Dominion, complicated with all the issues of the general election itself. Just suppose that the action of the Government had been what it was not; suppose that the hon. gentleman had said: "We refuse to deal with this measure;" what would have been Mr. McLaren's remedy? His remedy would have been an appeal to the people—first to Parliament, and if Parliament refused to agree with his views, then from Parliament to the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh!

Mr. BLAKE. Well, what other remedy would he have? I know that the hon. gentleman is aware that that remedy would be wholly inadequate. As to Mr. McLaren getting a remedy by appealing to the whole Dominion on the question whether the Government was right or wrong in disallowing this measure in his private interest, that would be quite hopeless. Therefore this remedy, if hopeless in the Province is hopeless in the Dominion. I deny that the people of my Province are insensible to or careless about the true principles of legislation. I believe they are thoroughly alive to them, and I am content that my rights of property, humble though they are, and those of my children, shall belong to the Legislature of my country to be disposed of subject to the good sense and right feeling of that Legislature and the good sense and right feeling of the people of that Province. I do not believe his own friends will echo the shameful statement of the Secretary of State that the Act of the Legislature is an act of robbery to oblige a friend, no more than I impute to the hon. gentleman opposite, what I might well impute after this statement, that he has disallowed an Act of the Local Legislature in order to oblige a friend—no more than I might impute that to him, and with infinitely greater force, because I say that he did it without giving the opposite side an opportunity to be heard. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Prince Edward Island Act, to which I have also made reference, saying that it was a reserved Bill. He has referred to the second Prince Edward Act, which was also a reserved Bill, and he has referred to two other Acts which I had to deal with—one compelling assurers in the Province of Quebec to take out a license. In the first place that Act was not disallowed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, but the Legislature of Quebec were told that if it did not amend it, it would be disallowed.

Mr. BLAKE. No, they were not, and they did not amend it, and it was not disallowed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, they were told so.

Mr. BLAKE. No, they were not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I think so. Read it, and you will see if that is not the meaning of it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will find that it does not say so. In the first place, I maintain that Acts with reference to taxation stand on a wholly different ground from Acts of the character we are now considering. There is, with reference to taxation of a particular description, a practical concurrent power in the Parliament of Canada, and in the Local Parliaments. The Local Parliaments cannot create taxation of an indirect character, and this Act was thought

to be, and was afterwards adjudged to be, taxation of an indirect character. I wish to point out, in the first place, that I declined to interfere. The question was then before the Courts, and I thought it might be determined by them. In the second place, I maintained that on the assumption on which the rest of the opinion preceded, the Act was within our competence. I maintain that with reference to direct taxation they have a concurrent power, and where there is a concurrent power I have always been of the opinion that we must have the controlling power. For example, if we determined to adopt a particular source of direct taxation—say an income tax—and we found that the Local Legislature afterwards proposed to lay another heavy income tax which would interfere with the operation of our own tax, and render it practically impossible or much more difficult to collect it, we have a right to say that our machinery for collecting the revenue which is necessary for the whole Dominion must not be interfered with by your legislation for direct taxes in a way that prevents the success of our legislation. I may be wrong in this view as to the power of the Local Legislature; if so, I am going with the hon. gentleman; but such has always been my conviction. I do not see how, practically, you are to carry out the powers of direct taxation which are given you, unless you assume the right—to be cautiously exercised, not without obvious public necessity—to say that you have the right to tax the Provinces directly. We have done so. We have exercised before concurrent power in a way with which your action entirely interferes; and as one or other of us must give way, those who are at the top will prevail. Then this being the case with reference to taxation, I maintain that we might interfere. I may be wrong in this criticism. It may be that my advice was impertinent, but I do not think, at any rate, it can be strained or constrained into a disallowance of the Act. Now, if even there was a case in which a portion of an Act was indispensable in point of policy, it was this very Act. I am not now speaking of the policy of laying a tax on assurances, upon which I took the liberty of expressing an opinion, but I am speaking of that portion of the Act which laid a tax upon existing insurances for life, upon the gross returns from the companies. You will perceive that if the insurance companies have contracted with you or me to insure our lives on condition of a payment, of say \$50 a year during the term of life, we have contracted with the understanding that the companies should get \$50; if not its net profits, not its gross returns, are by subsequent legislation exposed to taxation, it is quite clear the whole basis of the contract, which was to endure for 50 years more would be altered, and therefore it is clear that this is very objectionable. I considered rightly or wrongly that as this affected the Federal as well as the local taxation, we had the right to consider it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. I said the right to consider it.

"Had the Parliament of Canada adopted this as a subject of taxation, other considerations altogether might apply and it would become necessary to determine whether the double taxation, which would under such circumstances be imposed, should be allowed."

There I stated plainly my opinion, right or wrong. There is the belief expressed that there is concurrent power. I may have been wrong, but if I was right, I take it out of the category of those cases in which power of the Local Legislature is exclusive. It is these conclusions with which we are now dealing.

"The policy of levying a tax of this nature is open to grave question. It must follow the end upon those interested in the assurances. It may be considered to be a tax upon Providence and thrift, and its operation may have an injurious effect, far beyond what may be recompensed by its pecuniary results, but these are views which although they should be fairly weighed, and although they might in some cases force upon the Canadian Government the necessity of disallowance, are yet subject to this observation, that the people of a Province who require to raise a

Mr. BLAKE.

revenue for their local wants and who tax themselves for the purpose, may rightly claim and must fairly be permitted a considerable latitude in the determination of what their taxes shall be, and that considerable confidence may be placed in local public opinion, as a remedy for the indicated evils where they may exist."

Now, Sir, you can point to a score of lives of men in which as I have pointed out Acts very objectionable are yet not disallowed because they were within the exclusive competence of the Local Legislature. I took rightly or wrongly a different position. I stated nothing whatever inconsistent with the views which I have always held, and which until this Streams Bill was disallowed, I always thought the Government held, with regard to the power of the Local Legislature with reference to such subjects.

"The undersigned, however, feels bound to point out that in one particular this Act appears objectionable.

"It is well known that the bulk of assurances on life are effected on contracts extending on the part of the Company over the whole term of life or a long number of years conditioned on the payment by the insured of periodical premiums at fixed rates. This Act, however, requires payment by the companies of the tax of one per cent upon the premiums for the renewals of life assurance policies, although made before the passing of the Act."

"This imposes upon the company which has already contracted at a specified premium calculated upon various elements not, however, including a taxation of the gross premium—a deduction not from its net profits but for the gross premium. The company is not in a position to recoup itself by calling upon the insured to pay the tax.

"This seems objectionable in principle, and calculated to produce a feeling of insecurity abroad with reference to Provincial legislation, and the undersigned recommends that the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor should be called to the provision with a view to its amendment during the ensuing Session, at any rate, in so far as it affects contracts made before the passing of this Act."

There is no statement that the Act would be disallowed if no such amendments were made. I have never heard that any such amendments were made, and yet the Bill was not disallowed. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman referred to one other Act with which I had to do; that is the Manitoba Act of 1876, with reference to half-breed lands. Now, that Statute was an amendment to a former Statute which was assented to at Ottawa, and on page 54 of the book of returns for 1877, it will be found that Governor Morris reported in 1873 that he had reserved the Half-Breed Land Grant Protection Act, and he pointed out to the Minister of Justice that this Act which was reserved was an Act which was retroactive and dealing with existing contracts and cancelling them. I am obliged, in order to explain the exact position of the Act, to read the report of the Lieutenant-Governor upon the subsequent Act:

"The subject of these grants attracts a good deal of attention, and a movement was on foot to obtain legislation to prevent such of those lands as fell to the heads of families from being sold by them, in order that the lands might descend to the children.

"The project was abandoned and the present Bill was introduced and passed."

It seems that speculators have bought largely from half-breeds their claims to allotment at low prices, ranging as low in some cases as \$15, the maximum being \$50. These sales, of course, only give the vendees a right of action, to enforce the contract when the vendor would become entitled to his land. The object of the Bill is to cancel all these sales, and give the vendee an action to recover back the price, which, if in goods, was to be charged at ordinary prices.

"The considerations made a lien on the land, which may be sold for the recovery of the price paid."

That was the position. This Act cancelled all these contracts and provided that the vendees who had paid in money or goods should have the right to receive back or recover their money or their goods at ordinary prices. This came before the Minister of Justice at that day, not as an Act of Parliament but as a Bill. He had the question before him whether he would sanction and give vitality to this measure. Such being its provisions,

the Lieutenant-Governor proceeds to report the objections to the Bill, as follows:—

"The objections to the Bill, the intention of which is, no doubt, good, are these—

"1st. It is retroactive—dealing with existing contracts and cancelling them.

"2nd. It opens a fruitful door for litigation, the prices charged for goods being opened up for examination in each case where those formed part of the consideration.

"3rd. There is no machinery provided for carrying out the sale of the land on which the lien is established; but this, of course, could be remedied next Session."

He then adds:

"I have no sympathy with those who may have purchased these claims to land at inconsiderable prices, or in an unfair manner; but as the law is novel and retractive in its character, I feel compelled to reserve it for the signification of the pleasure of the Governor-General; though it must be borne in mind, also, that if the Act be sanctioned it may be taken as a precedent for other restrictions with regard to the holding of these lands."

How did the hon. gentleman deal with that local Act? He dealt with it by giving it vitality. He advised that the assent of the Governor General should be given to it, and but for this action it would never have been in the Statute at all. He who is about, presently, to point out to us the gross injustice of dealing with existing rights, advised not that the Act should be disallowed, but that the Bill sent to His Excellency should be assented to. With reference to the amendatory Act passed in 1877, and reserved, and which modified the provisions of the former Act in some material particulars, not to the advantage of the half-breeds, it provided:

"That when a half-breed, having sold his interest and received therefor a consideration, shall return or tender to the purchaser the full consideration and the purchaser's expenses with interest at 12 per cent. per annum within three calendar months from the passing of the Act, the agreement shall not be binding; otherwise the bargain, if in writing, shall be valid and the half-breed shall assign the granted lands within three months after the receipt of the patent from the Crown."

It also provided that notice of the passing of the Act shall be given in the *Manitoba Gazette* for three months after it has been assented to by the Crown. Let us pause for a moment by the old Act which had been assented to on the advice of the hon. the First Minister. The contracts had been absolutely cancelled and the half-breeds had been restored to their rights in the lands subject to the lien for consideration, so that at the time this amended Act was passed, the half-breed had got his lands back again by law subject to that lien. The lands were still unallotted and ungranted and in the Crown, and while in that condition the Act was amended providing that in case the half-breed would not return the purchaser the full consideration and expenses with interest, the contract would be binding. That is, that the agreements which had been cancelled four years before were to be revived and were not to be binding only in case the half-breeds, within three months after the passing of the Act, return the purchaser full consideration and interest. It was felt by the Legislature of Manitoba that they must give some notice to the half-breeds that their lands were taken away under this clause. It provided that notice of the passing of the Act should be given in the *Manitoba Gazette* for three months after it had been assented to by the Crown. What I believe justified the policy of dealing with the reserved Act at Ottawa, notwithstanding my observations against so dealing on principle, was the circumstance to which I had more than once called the attention of the House, that it was dealing with ungranted lands of the Crown of Canada under arrangements made by the Crown of a peculiar nature with reference to the half-breeds. I may be right or wrong in my opinion, but to show that I entertained it I need only refer to the report I made the day before in another Act, page 305 of the Sessional Papers of 1877. It is on the Act to amend the Registry Act and is as follows:—

"The amending clause provides that any instrument mentioned in the 17th clause of the original Act, registered in pursuance of the Act

affecting any lands, whether there has been any grant from the Crown of such lands or not, shall be adjudged fraudulent and void against any subsequent purchaser unless registered as in the Act provided. This appears to be a direct interference with the devolution of the title of lands before patents are issued. When the lands are the property of the Crown and the Province, the legislation would be within the competence of the Local Legislature, and might be beneficial; but the position of Manitoba in this respect exceptional. The lands, until patents issued, are the property of Canada, and the provision as to assignments, etc., of unpatented lands ought to be made by the Canadian Parliament."

I merely quote that, not for the purpose of raising a discussion as to what my opinion was, but to show that was the opinion I entertained distinctly at the time, of the condition of the law and the relative distribution of power with reference to that subject. Where the property was vested in the Crown of Canada and not in the Crown of a Province, such as the lands of Manitoba, I entertained, rightly or wrongly, that we alone ought to decide as to the disposal of these lands. Then they become part of the subject by means of which the Local Legislatures will deal with them. That places this case which dealt with unpatented lands in an exceptional position. The hon. gentleman said it was a change of view to disallow the Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not hear any one refer to the disallowance of that Act.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for North Simcoe did. I am dealing with the Half-breed Lands Act, which the hon. gentleman quoted as proof that the hon. member for South Huron should not have moved his motion, because I would have to vote against it.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is so.

Mr. BLAKE. I am pointing out that he says I am right on a wrong principle; I am showing that he was wrong, that the principles involved are wholly inapplicable. I have proved it was within the competency of the Canadian Parliament only to deal with lands before patents were issued. All that I have to do to show that that was my opinion is to produce my report. But I go further and show that the case was probably the most peculiar that was ever presented, not in the nature of the Bill, but in the circumstances under which it came before us. I do not suppose such a case can ever occur again. I have a witness—the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) who was then Attorney-General in that country. This Act, which altered the half-breed grants, provided they should not have lands unless within three months of the year passing they paid the consideration money and interest; it provided for three months' notice. I referred it to the Minister of Interior, who reported as follows:—

"The undersigned having failed to find in Ottawa any evidence of compliance with the 3rd section of the Act, referred for information on this point to the Hon. Mr. Royal, Attorney-General of Manitoba, now here, who states that no notice of the passage of the Act in question was given, and that the same has not been considered."

There has been a little misquoting. That is the close of the Report of the Minister of the Interior, and these are my words: "Under the circumstances the undersigned concurs in the recommendation of the Minister that the Act should be disallowed." I have shown it was intended that the Local Legislature should have given three months' notice to the half-breeds to afford them an opportunity of redeeming the lands. The Local Government had not given the notice, they told us the Act was not considered as in force, and no notice had been given because it was thought the Act would not be allowed here. What would have been the consequence of allowing the Act? No adequate protection would have been given to the half-breeds, and without notice their rights would have been swept away, the moment the Act was placed on the Statute Book. The circumstance that the Act was not supposed to be in force would not have moved the speculators who had dealt with the half-breeds, and the hon. member for Provencher

(Mr. Royal) would not have failed to accuse us of neglect of duty if, after the notification made that the notice had not been given, and that the Act was not considered in force, we had not disallowed it. The hon. gentleman next referred to the Caldwell-McLaren case, and having read the judgment, continued: There is the judgment—and I notice that the hon. gentleman smiles with the smile he puts on when he is hard hit—there is the judgment of the dissenting Judge. He thought that was the effect of the Act. There is the view, not taken by advocates or agents or political friends in private conclave, but by a learned Judge, with the whole evidence and the whole arguments of counsel before him. The dissenting Judge declares that although he cannot concur in points of law with both his brethren, he is pleased that they arrived at the conclusion at which they arrived, because a contrary conclusion would be against the public interests. The Legislature has declared, and according to the Court of Appeal has rightly declared that the law was such, that Caldwell had a right to use these improvements and take the timber down. They declared, as the Legislature declared, that he had a right to take it down without compensation. They provided him with rights, which rights he has been deprived of by the disallowance of this Act without compensation; the property has to be used by Caldwell and others, and the hon. gentleman arguing the matter to-night, I think led the House and the country to believe that it will not be proper to disallow the other Act referred to in order that Mr. McLaren may be deprived of any compensation. The hon. gentleman stated that he had no longer any interest in the matter, but I maintain that, arguing as he has, we all know that there is another Act, the fate of which is to follow the decision of this House, and the hon. gentleman has been arguing his client's case, and the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has been arguing the case of his principal. I will not read the two quotations which I promised from the language of the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you mean by my principal and my being an agent?

Mr. BLAKE. I mean McLaren to whom you have been agent. I do not say a paid agent; I do not believe a paid agent, but an agent.

Mr. HAGGART. I am his representative here and his friend, but no agent whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. His agent outside and his representative inside.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, it may be a shame, but it is true.

Mr. HAGGART. You are and were his paid agent.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I was his counsel.

Mr. HAGGART. You gave as your opinion that the law of the Ontario Legislature was bad, and I have your writing.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that the law was altered.

Mr. HAGGART. Not to the extent that you advised it should be altered.

Mr. BLAKE. The law was altered after the hon. gentleman showed me the law. The hon. gentleman knows also that that was not an opinion in the sense in which he would apply the word. It was not a paid opinion, but simply the language of an hon. member speaking to another.

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite willing to stand by the opinion, and I am willing that the hon. gentleman should produce the paper. When the question was raised the hon. gentleman declared as follows, and I may say that I

Mr. BLAKE.

quote from the *Mail* report, as being the fairer to the hon. gentleman:

"He had been from the first in favor of a legislative union, and had believed that the best interests of the country might have been promoted by a Legislative Union of all the Provinces, aided by a subordinate system of municipal institutions with large powers. However, he had been overruled in that respect by large majorities in the old Parliament of Canada. The feeling had been unmistakable, not only in Canada but also in the other Provinces, that we could have only re-union on the Federal principle, and as he had thought then, as he thought still, that the union of the four Provinces was essential to the future development and progress of British North America, he yielded to his own opinions and went in with the Government of which he was a member for the establishment of a great Dominion on the principle of a Federal Union, and he had loyally, and to the best of his judgment, power and ability endeavored to carry out that principle faithfully. It was true that he had been charged by some hon. gentlemen with a desire to strengthen the central power, to the disadvantage of the Provincial Government and Legislatures; that he had given any doubt resting in his mind against the authority of the Local Legislatures, and to strengthen the central power, it might be so, though he had endeavored to prevent his own predilection for a Legislature over a Federal Union from preventing it. Still it might be that he had rather leaned in favor of centralization, but if a resolution like this was adopted formally and solemnly by the Dominion Legislature, he must say that his original ideas had been fully carried out, that a Federal Union of the Provinces was at an end; that the Legislative Union had commenced, and the whole real power and authority of all the powers of Government had been transferred from the Provincial Legislature to the Dominion Parliament. They could not draw the line. It might be, and he did not hesitate to say, that from his own point of view it was so in this case, that the minority, the Catholic minority in New Brunswick, suffered a wrong by this legislation, but there might be wrongs not only in questions of education or religion, but in questions of finance, of civil liberty, and in questions of every possible kind. And if the ultimate power of decision as to what is right and what was wrong was to be vested in this Parliament, where was there a vestige of the use of the power, of the benefit or advantage of all our paraphernalia of Provincial Governments and Provincial Legislatures. (Hear, hear.) If they were to deal here authoritatively and to order the Governor-General, the representative of the Queen, to disallow such Bills as they thought the Local Legislature ought not to have passed, they would have wiped off the slate as with a wet sponge, the influences and authority of the Local Governments and Legislatures, and have centred it all in the Canadian Parliament. Was this House prepared for this? Was it prepared to assume that new responsibility and to alter in spirit the Constitution? It might be that they might keep up the sham of Provincial Legislatures, but what would they be but sham, if at any time the members of the other Provinces disagreeing with the policy deliberately adopted by the Legislature of any one Province could alter that policy? Take the Province of Quebec, which was the most obvious instance he quoted, he believed we might have had a Legislative Union instead of a Federal Union if it had not been for the Province of Quebec. The other Provinces were of one race of Anglo-Saxon ancestry. To a great degree the majority in the other Provinces were Protestants, and their laws were based upon the common law and institutions of England. Lower Canada contained a different race and used a different language. The majority had a religion which was in the minority in the whole Dominion, and they claimed, and justly claimed as a protection to them, to those institutions which they held so dear, to their old associations, to their religion, and to the education which in that Province was based on religion, that we should not have a Legislative Union; but that in all the questions relating to the tenure of their land, their property, their institutions, and so on, they should have a Legislature having the power to act as they pleased; as they thought they ought to act in consonance with the wishes of their people. The Lower Canadians drew themselves up, and said, if the Constitution were not so drawn up as to give them the power to protect beyond a doubt their institutions, their religion, their language, and their laws, in which they had so great a pride, they would never consent to a union; and if that had not been agreed to, we should not now have had the Dominion of Canada. The same principle applied to all the Provinces. They had their rights, and the question was not whether this House thought a Local Legislature was right or wrong. But the whole question for this House to consider, whenever such a question as this was brought up, was that they should say at once that they had no right to interfere so long as the different Provincial Legislatures acted within the bounds of the authority which the Constitution gave them. (Hear, hear.) There was this fixed principle."

And here the hon. gentleman went to the root of the matter.

"That every Provincial Legislature should feel that when it was legislating, it was legislating in the reality and not in the sham. If they did not know and feel that the measures they were arguing, discussing and amending and modifying to suit their own people, would become law, it was all sham. The Federal system was gone forever, and the system which he had vindicated was adopted. He did not hesitate to say that it would have given him great pleasure if he could have come to the conclusion that the Act was beyond the competence of the New Brunswick Legislature. He believed they had made a great mistake, and many others agreed with him that they had better have left the law

as it was. He spoke *sub judice*, because those who passed the law had a right to maintain its wisdom; but from his own point of view he believed it was a great mistake to have repealed the law and raised this question for but little purpose. (Hear, hear.) But that was a question for the Local Legislature. The question of education, except under the peculiar circumstances of the establishment of separate schools in Upper and Lower Canada, was left exclusively in the control of the Local Legislatures. It was withdrawn altogether from the supervision of the General Legislature, so that the people in each of the Provinces might educate their children after their own fashion."

Then, Sir, to quote another passage:

"If this House undertook the great responsibility of interfering with the local laws, they must be prepared to discuss the justice or injustice of every law passed by every Provincial Legislature—(hear, hear)—and this Legislature, instead of being as now the general Court of Parliament for the decision of great Dominion questions, would be simply a Court of appeal to try whether the Provincial Legislatures were right or wrong in the conclusions that they came to. (Hear, hear.) If this House was prepared to take that course and adopt that principle, then the Government of the day, while it would have much more responsibility, would also have much more power; for, besides conducting and administering the affairs of the whole Dominion as one great country, it would also have the power, the authority, and the control of a majority over every Bill, every Act, every conclusion, every institution, every right of every Province in Canada. (Cheers.)

"He believed that the institutions and laws of no Province would be safe hereafter. For all these considerations he hoped that this resolution would not be adopted. If it were adopted, if this House undertook the great responsibility of interfering with the local laws, they must be prepared to discuss the justice or injustice of every law passed by every Provincial Legislature, and this Legislature, instead of being, as now, the general court of Parliament, for the decision of great Dominion questions, would be simply a court of appeal to try whether the Provincial Legislatures were right or wrong in the conclusions they came to."

That is a position in which we ought not to be placed; that is the position in which the hon. gentleman places us, when he calls upon us to vindicate his disallowance of the Act in question on the ground that it was wrong, that it was an Act that the Local Legislature ought not to have passed, though it was within its competence. For his advice, and for the advice of his Government, he is responsible to us. It is our duty to consider whether his position is right or not. If he goes even further in the direction of old Tory doctrine and says he is not responsible for that advice, that the advice which was given is not subject to the criticism of Parliament, I would say if we are free, as we must be free to discuss everything advised by Ministers, then obviously if they have advised as to the propriety or impropriety of an Act of the Legislature on a subject with the exclusive competence of the Local Legislative Parliament, we must decide as to that decision. I have not entered into the question, and I decline to minimize this question, enormous as it is, by consideration, as to whether the compensation provided in this bill was exactly right, whether even the principle upon which that compensation was right is granted. I say we have the right to a hearing. The Government has no right to take into its hands the discussion of a question whether this compensation was right or not. My own opinion has been that no plan could be devised to meet this case except that of tolls, the old and recognized mode in such cases, recognized by the courts which declared it proper. But I say that if we are all convinced that this Act was wrong we are none the less bound to confirm it, leaving the responsibility with the people of the province. I suppose that appeal will be fruitless, but I would have hoped but for the expressions that have greeted us in the course of this debate, that upon a question of such pre-eminent magnitude, having such far-reaching consequences, in which there has been a deliberate attempt to reverse the free spirit and full and fair interpretation of our constitution under which, until now, we have lived, to go back, instead of doing what British people have done all over the world—go forward—and take away from us undisguisedly something we were told—the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) now says improperly—was ours in early days; instead of taking a retrograde and humiliating step we should by our vote this night announce and declare that these rights and liberties which we obtained as Pro-

vinces in 1867, which were recognised as ours in 1868, which have been recognised as ours ever since, shall not be tampered with or trampled upon by any Ministry however powerful, or the supporters of any Ministry however servile or subservient. If that hope is to be futile, I place my hope in that further and ultimate Court of Appeal before which this question will shortly be tried and I shall be satisfied to live under whatever form of constitution a majority of my fellow countrymen shall decide to be right; but as my belief is that they value their federal rights and liberties beyond anything else that this constitution gives them, so my belief and my hope is that they and I, after the appeal is passed, may be found in harmony in this, as I think we shall be in harmony on many other questions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At half-past three in the morning I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House for the same length as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I shall, however, shortly endeavor to reply to some of the remarks he has made in his long, his able essay on the Canadian Constitution. I am glad we have at last got a resolution of this kind before the House. I am very glad that this issue is brought before the House was apprehensive originally that we might have another and not so agreeable nor pacific a mode of defending ourselves, the Government, and perhaps this House on this subject. Why, the belligerent Premier of Ontario had threatened to march with his armies into the North-West because the present Government had asked for the reference of a disputed question to the highest Courts in the land; and I did not know but that the same belligerent might come down here because we had advised His Excellency, the representative of the Sovereign, to use the Royal prerogative of disallowance. I was afraid that he might come down here like another Oliver and order our Sergeant-at-Arms to "take away that bauble" and break us up. It has now assumed a milder form, it has assumed simply a vote of censure upon the Government. The hon. gentleman said of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) that he found no difficulty in voting against the resolution, and that he and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House found no difficulty in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend for Niagara the other day and yet they object to this resolution. I have great respect for the municipal law of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I have still greater respect for the constitutional law of my hon. friend for Halton. My hon. friend knows the difference between a resolution which did not involve a want of confidence, which did not involve censure, and a resolution expressing the principle of a grievance or a statement for the public good. My hon. friend drew the distinction at once. The hon. gentleman opposite does not seem to understand it, or at all events if he did understand he misrepresented the constitutional principle. The hon. gentleman wound up at near the conclusion of his speech by stating that he would not condescend to go into the question of compensation; whether there was compensation enough, whether treated rightly or wrongly,—there are much greater questions and great constitutional questions. Mr. McLaren might be wronged, his property might be taken away from him and handed over to another person, but he must suffer. Down must go this individual, because the great constitutional principle that he advocated must be fought at all hazards, and the hon. gentleman must make high falutin spread-eagle speech with the hope that it will have, in the desperate state of affairs of the hon. gentlemen opposite, some little effect in the elections of Ontario. The hon. gentleman commenced his speech with an attack on my hon. friend the Secretary of State, He said my hon. friend had insulted the Legislature of Ontario because he had stated that a Bill was passed by that high-minded independent Legislature to help a political friend.

Mr. BLAKE. To rob a friend of his.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman forgets that the Secretary of State was attacked in language disgraceful to an individual and that by a Minister of the Ontario Government. He was attacked and reviled, both himself and his race by a member of the Ontario Government, and the hon. gentleman who was so anxious that we should preserve all due respect for the Legislature of Ontario, said in his winding up remarks that I was supported by a senile and obsequious majority. That is the dignified language of the hon. gentleman towards an hon. member seated in the same House with him, a representative of the people as much as he is, and to use his own language, just as respectable as he is. The hon. gentleman went into a long argument to show that there was a difference between disallowance and reservation for Royal assent or the assent of the Governor General. Of course there is a difference. If a Bill is disallowed it must first have passed—it must have become law. If it is reserved for the Royal assent it is not law, until that assent is given, but in both cases the will of the Legislature had been expressed. The question of the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor or reservation of the Lieutenant-Governor is an act I may say of the executive branch of the Legislature; but in both cases the will of the Local Legislature, the will of the representatives had been equally expressed and I was surprised to hear the argument of hon. gentlemen, that the Lieutenant-Governor had a right to reserve Bills for the Royal assent. I was going to pursue that line of argument. The hon. gentleman laid down the law correctly. The fact of the matter is this: That the Queen cannot confer on the Governor General, and the British North America Act does not confer on Lieutenant-Governors greater powers than the Queen herself possesses. The Queen, as the hon. gentleman has truly said, cannot refuse a Bill which has been passed by both branches of the Legislature. If a Bill containing, in fact, her death-warrant was placed before her she would be obliged to give her assent to it, and the hon. Minister would be obliged to proffer that Bill to her for the purpose of getting that Royal assent. The same principle applies here. The hon. gentleman is quite right, that the Governor General is obliged to pass any Bill that has passed this House and the Senate: If the Bill is passed against the will of the Ministry, they must either adopt it and recommend it to the Governor General for his assent, or they must resign. So it is with respect to a Lieutenant-Governor. The British North America Act provides clearly that Lieutenant-Governors hold their office during pleasure subject to any instructions given to them from the Governor General, and I say, that without such instructions the Lieutenant-Governors of Ontario, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba would commit an unconstitutional error if, by the advice of their Ministers, they should refuse their assent to any Bill. The Ministers have no right to give that advice. They are not more powerful than the Government in England, and that Government is obliged to submit a Bill which has passed both Houses, and the only difference between England and the Provinces arises from our colonial stage of existence. The Governor-General has a two fold position, first as representative of the Sovereign with a responsible body of advisers, and secondly as an imperial officer, and if he gets instructions to reserve a Bill he is obliged to do so and the Ministers in England are responsible to the British Parliament for the proper use of the Royal prerogative. So in the same way the Lieutenant-Governor has no right unless instructed from the Governor-General to reserve a Bill, because that would be a breach of the principles of the British Constitution. The fact that a Bill is disallowed, especially on the advice of the Local Government, makes the case much worse for the Local Government. How great is the condemnation that the hon. gentlemen has pronounced upon the Local

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Government with respect to the Orange Bill. The hon. gentleman declares that the Dominion Government are trying to crush the independence of the Local Legislature notwithstanding the declared opinions of this Government. Mr. Mowat, on the contrary, has chosen to disregard his own legislation and to invite the Dominion Government to disregard the rights of the people, to set at naught the expressed will of his own Parliament. The hon. gentleman spoke about the conduct of the Dominion Government being an insult and an injury to the Local Legislature. What is the case? Here is the Orange Bill which affected no interest of the Dominion, Imperial or otherwise, and yet that gentleman spat in the face of his own Legislature, offered them the insult that the hon. gentleman says we are doing, and actually invited this Government to commit this wrong against his own Legislature—the members of that Parliament who are keeping him in his place, and what was still worse, he advised the Lieut.-Governor to reserve the Bill which he approved of himself and for which he himself had voted, and we know why that was, and if ever there was an instance of a man who degraded, who humiliated himself, it was that of the First Minister of the Province of Ontario, and for the meanest and most sordid of reasons. He voted for the principle of the Bill that the Orange body should be incorporated, and yet, as Stephano said to Trinculo, "Thou shalt be King, and I shall be Viceroy over thee." But there was a one-man power behind the throne, Mr. Speaker, there was a man called Christopher Fraser, and he said to him, "Pass that Bill if you dare." Then they concocted their little scheme. "We are in a position we do not like to hold. If we pass the Bill we alienate the Catholic vote, and if we do not pass it we alienate the Orange vote. We will commit a breach of the constitution. We will swallow our own words. We will say that this Bill ought not to be passed although we voted for it, and we will advise the Lieut.-Governor to send it down to Ottawa, and we will throw upon John A. all the annoyance and all the embarrassment which has now come upon our heads." But, Mr. Speaker, I am too old a bird to be caught with such chaff. I said, very politely, in very constitutional language—it was read by the hon. gentleman—"Gentlemen, this is none of our funeral. You may deal with your own measures," and we handed it back to them. Now this same gentleman who insulted his own Legislature, who, after voting for a bill, stating it was a good bill and ought to become law, supporting the principle of it to avoid this difficulty, broke upon the principle which the hon. gentleman has contended for so long and so eloquently—broke upon the principle which the hon. gentleman has defended so strongly. And now he comes through the hon. gentleman, through—I was going to say, his agent over there—at all events he is not a paid agent of the Government; he comes here and he gets the hon. member for West Durham to get up and denounce the Government for their action with regard to a bill in which a great interest was involved and a great wrong was contemplated; while at the same time he withdrew from his own Legislature a measure in which nobody was wronged, nobody was hurt, and nobody but those who desired to be incorporated cared one farthing about it. The hon. gentleman in his argument gave up the whole case. He quoted my language. I am very glad; it read very well. I laid down the sound and true principle, that the autonomy of every province, the independence of every province, the independence of every Legislature, should be protected unless there was a constitutional reason against it. The Government here are not to set up their opinion against the opinion of the Local Government or the Local Legislature. But the hon. gentleman approved of my letter of 1868. And, Sir, under those resolutions, those different stipulations, those different conditions and terms upon which I reported to the Governor General, that I thought

there might be over interference with the Local Legislature—Isay, Sir, that this Bill violated distinctly the most important of those conditions. The hon. gentleman knew that his Government had done the same thing. He knew it would be quoted against him, and what does he say? "True, we did so, but these cases were exceptional, these were all exceptional." Well, this was an exceptional case. I do not say the hon. gentleman was not right in what he did. I do not say he was not right in every disallowance or every expression of opinion against Provincial Acts, but it does not rest in his mouth to object if we follow his example at a humble distance, when we think great interests are involved and we desire to protect them from wrong and destruction. The hon. gentleman to show how strong his feelings were in favor of the independence of the Local Legislatures, says many other things. "Why," says he, "I have known measures in the Local Legislature, when I was a member, which I disapproved of and voted against, and yet when they became law I never raised my voice in favor of disallowance." And he mentioned the Goodhue Bill. Why, Mr. Speaker, he voted for it.

Mr. BLAKE. No, Sir.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, he voted for it.

Mr. BLAKE. No, Sir.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, he voted for it. Mr. Speaker, there was only one division on the whole Bill, as I am informed by a gentleman who has just gone out for the Journals. At all events, I will read you what took place when the Goodhue Bill came up for the third reading. I will just say, before reading the resolution, the House will see that it was drawn up especially for the purpose of doing away with the iniquity which the hon. gentleman says was in the Bill, and for the purpose of carrying out the principle which the hon. gentleman says he has taken care that, for the future, shall always be carried out—the reference to a legal tribunal. I will read from the Journals of Ontario, 1870-71:

"The Order of the Day for the third reading of the Bill (No. 12) to confine the deed for the distribution and settlement of the estate of the Hon. George Jarvis Goodhue, deceased, having been read,

The Hon. Mr. Carling, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood, that the Bill be now read the third time,

The Hon. Mr. Richards moved, in amendment, seconded by Hon. Mr. Graham (Hastings),

"That all the words after that be omitted and the following words substituted therefor: the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back forthwith to a Committee of the whole House, with an instruction to amend the same by inserting as the fourth clause the following:—'4. Provided always, and it is hereby declared, that the foregoing enactments or any of them, shall not take effect until it shall have been decided by a majority of the Judges of one of the Superior Courts in this Province, that the interests of the testator's estate, by the said will bequeathed in trust for all his children who shall be living on the death of his said wife, were on his death, or at any time thereafter before the passing of this Act, vested interests in the children of the testators. And with a further instruction to insert the necessary provisions for obtaining the decision of such Judges.'"

The amendment was put and lost on a division of 7 for and 45 against, and I read among the nays the following names: Anderson, Barber, Baxter, Beatty and Blake.

Mr. BLAKE. You will find my vote recorded against the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill passed. There was a clause introduced for the purpose of protecting those vested interests which the Bill attacked, for the purpose of referring the case to one of the Superior Courts of Toronto, so that the rights of the children would be protected; and the hon. gentleman voted that down, and this nefarious Bill, with his assistance, was read a third time, and became the law of the land. The hon. gentleman says there are exceptional cases, but cases are only exceptional when he chooses to decide they shall be so. He says I may be right

or wrong; but this at all events, was my opinion, and the hon. gentleman reads his opinion. There was no division on the second reading. The hon. gentleman holds the opinion he gave at the time as conclusive evidence that the case was an exceptional one; and although the autonomy of the different Provinces was to be attacked and their independence destroyed, the hon. gentleman says I gave my opinion—I may be right or wrong, but that is a sufficient answer.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to read:

"The Order of the Day for the House to resolve itself into a Committee to consider Bill No. 12, to confirm the deed for the distribution and settlement of the estate of the Honorable George Jarvis Goodhue, deceased, having been read;

"The Hon. Mr. Carling moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Wood,

"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

"The Hon. Mr. Richards moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Cumberland,

"That all the words after 'That' be omitted and the following words substituted therefor: 'The consideration of the Bill be postponed until this day three months,' and a debate having arisen, and it being twelve of the clock, midnight;

"Friday, 27th January, 1871.

"The debate was continued, and the amendment having been put, was lost on the following division:—

"Yeas:—Messrs. Blake, Boyd, Cook, Craig (Russell), Cumberland Finlayson, Gow, Graham (Hastings), Macdonald, McCall (Elgin) Read, Richards, Wallis—13."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman did not vote against the principle of the Bill at the second reading. This is a vote to adjourn the debate. The hon. gentleman voted to adjourn the debate for three months, because it would take three months for him to make up his mind on the Bill. He found out a few days afterwards that he would make up his mind a good deal quicker, and he voted for the Bill. The hon. gentleman's first impulses were virtuous. He would show great consideration to the children, and not take away their property, but his scruples, like Bob Acres' resolutions, slipped through his fingers, and a few days afterwards he voted for the third reading.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It passed unanimously, everyone in the House voting for it. He did not raise his voice in the protection of the children's rights, but he voted against a resolution which, if passed, would have protected in a great measure these children from the nefarious state of things which the hon. gentleman now says was prevented by that Bill. In this way we see some evidences of the high spread-eagleism and enthusiastic patriotism of this political and social saint. But, after all, the hon. gentleman's chief complaint is that we did not give notice according to the memorandum I prepared in 1868. Why, if we had communicated with Mr. Mowat, we should have been laying ourselves open only to an insulting answer. That hon. gentleman and his Government had, through the Crown Lands Commissioner, endeavored to bully Mr. McLaren out of his rights, and in a letter received by him it was said that he must give up his rights. This Bill was introduced, not for the purpose of altering the general law, but for the simple purpose of carrying out the threat in Mr. Pardee's letter and robbing him of his property. Something has been said about political reasons actuating the Dominion Government in the disallowance of that Bill. There is one thing clear, the fact that Mr. Caldwell's nephew, his stool-pigeon, the young man who was elected there through his uncle's influence in the county, the agent and representative of his uncle's estate—agent is a parliamentary word—was holding up his finger to his mouth. A letter had been sent intimating to Mr. McLaren that unless he gave up his property, they would show him something. They did show him something. All arguments were used that could be used against that measure, but

dressed in a little brief authority, Jacks-in-the-box, trampling on the man as they said they would do, they pleased Mr. Caldwell and robbed Mr. McLaren. An hon. member has stated that the Streams Bill was not intended for Mr. McLaren, but for general application. The highway robber is bad enough, there is something of manliness about him; but it is mean of the sneak who creeps down the backstairs and steals the kitchen utensils, or the fellow who comes behind you and picks your pocket—they are men more to be despised than the highway robber. It would have been more manly if the Ontario Government had introduced a Bill to hand over Peter McLaren's property to Wm. Caldwell; they dare not do so, and therefore, they passed a Bill respecting Rivers and Streams. It was a wretched, flimsy and transparent device; it deceived nobody, but it was only by being a public bully that the Government could introduce and carry it; otherwise there must be a petition. It had the effect of depriving Mr. McLaren of his property under the pretence that it was in the public interest. Nothing more contemptible or sinister could be done by a Government or Legislature. It was a Bill to take from Mr. McLaren his property and hand it over to Mr. Caldwell. True, Mr. McLaren had spent, some say \$250,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite say from \$100,000 to \$150,000—I do not know how much it was—but it was Mr. McLaren's property. The river at that spot was not a navigable river, and the Judge who heard the evidence and viewed the facts stated that it was clear that at the place where the improvements were made it was not only not navigable but not floatable. It would scarcely allow a plank or a slab to go down any more than upon a ditch. Caldwell's timber and logs could not go through there until the improvements were made. Mr. McLaren, with his usual industry and perseverance, in order to carry on his extensive business, made a dam and a slide out of his own timber, for his own purposes and on his own soil. Mr. Caldwell had no right to use it without his consent and without paying for it. It was absolutely the property of Mr. McLaren. Mr. Caldwell said: "Now this slide has been put up I may as well run down my timber;" and when he tried to induce Mr. McLaren to allow him to use it Mr. McLaren said: "I will allow you if you will acknowledge my proprietary rights." Mr. Caldwell had set up a claim to use these improvements and sent his timber over them, although the stream might be filled with Mr. McLaren's own timber. No matter, although he might be thrown back for the whole season, the improvements threw it open to Mr. Caldwell or anybody else who chose to send their logs that way. What he did say was: "If you acknowledge my proprietary right, you can use my slide." The hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Macdonell) says that he would not be caught in such a trap. He was going to use the improvements himself. He was going to take the position as if they were his own. He wished to set up a claim to use the river and all these improvements without paying for them. He would not fall into the trap. If he was an honest man he would have admitted that right. He would have said: "If you put up these improvements I could use them, and I have a right to acknowledge your proprietary interest and I will pay you for the use of them." That he should have admitted that proprietary right is shown by the Bill itself, because the Bill says that Mr. McLaren has a right to levy tolls and that could only be by virtue of a proprietary right, because if he had not such a right he would be an usurper and he could not ask him to pay a cent. The Bill itself admits that he had a proprietary right although Mr. Caldwell would not fall into the trap and tried to cheat him out of his proprietary right.

An hon. MEMBER. Nothing of the kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. McLaren put the improvements there and Mr. Caldwell claimed to have a right to use them. The cuckoo watches the linnet building

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

its nest, and just as the nest is finished it goes in. Mr. Caldwell is the cuckoo who asks the linnet to walk out. He says: "Give up your proprietary right to me. I am not in a position to build a nest, lay my eggs and raise my little brood." That may be a very clever trick on the part of Mr. Caldwell, but ornithologists all agree that the cuckoo is a very dishonest and thievish bird. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) spoke in language of contempt with regard to compensation. He has a soul far above dollars and cents. I think, however, that the hon. gentleman made rather a slip in his law when he speaks of the material, earth and logs, and water and stone as an easement.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The right to use it as an easement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know what the hon. gentleman said. He said the only way to recompense a man who had an easement was to pay him toll. Now, he put this up at the expense of some hundreds of thousands of dollars. It was one of the many enterprises by which Mr. McLaren has risen from a lorny-handed son of toil, to use a favorite expression, to the position of a wealthy man. He did not know but what his limits might be taken away from him by Mr. Pardee, and he was obliged to count the sticks as they were going through the slide. He would be obliged to make up a report each time, and then to make a careful aggregate of the tolls he received for many years on account of this easement. That was the argument of the hon. gentleman opposite. Supposing an honest old farmer's wife would expropriate her neighbor's hen and say: "I shall keep this hen, and you shall feed it right and see that it lays and at the proper time, and I will pay you by giving you a share of the eggs." That is the proposition which they made, and the hon. gentleman during all his long, instructive and able essay on Constitutional law, did not venture to say one word in favor of the measure. He could not do it, for a very substantial reason—because he had given his opinion solemnly to Mr. McLaren's agent that the Bill was a rotten Bill and should not pass.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman quoted the Bills that were disallowed. I have already stated that it makes no difference whether a Bill is disallowed, or whether it is reserved; in either case the will of the Legislature is expressed, and whether the law is set aside by the Governor General by disallowance or by provincial advisers of the Lieutenant-Governor by their advising him to reserve it for the consideration of the Governor General, the injury or insult to the Local Legislature is the same, their independence is equally attacked, and all the fine wire drawing of the hon. gentleman to show a distinction between the two cases should be set at naught. The argument of my hon. friend for North Simcoe on that point cannot be answered. The hon. member who moved this amendment had not quite the candor of the hon. member who spoke last. He went in to make a speech against the Government for the disallowance of this Bill, and he made a severe attack upon us, and quoted several Bills that had been disallowed, but he did not condescend to make a single allusion to any one of the measures which had been disallowed or disapproved by the Government of which he was a supporter; and from all we could gather from his speech, he believes that the Government have permitted a series of atrocities against the liberties of the Provinces, while they were immaculate always, the friends of the people, and had always taken the opposite course. But the hon. member for West Durham could not get away from their own Acts, and he tried to show the difference between those cases of disapproval and the cases which came under my former and my present supervision. Their cases were exceptional cases; but the hon. gentleman argued that if any Bill was within the competence of a Local Legislature,

we under no circumstances should interfere with it. The hon. gentleman read the passage in my speech which I made on the New Brunswick School Bill, and pronounced *ore rotundo* the sentences in which I advocated, as I have always advocated, the protection of the rights of the different Provinces. The hon. gentleman read them with great approval, and yet he himself, as a member of the Government and as a Minister of Justice, recommended the disapproval and disallowance of certain measures which he admits were within the competence of the Local Legislature. The hon. gentleman denied my statement across the floor that he had threatened the Quebec Legislature with the disallowance of their bill about assurers taking out licenses. I say he did exactly what was tantamount to disallowance; he did exactly what was the proposition contained in my resolution of 1868; he wrote to the Legislature of Quebec, pointing out all the evils of that Bill, and called their attention to the necessity of amending it at their next sitting. That was the proposition in my resolution; and again and again, as Minister of Justice, when I saw a Bill that was objectionable, either as being *ultra vires* or affecting the interests of the Dominion, I have called the attention of the Legislature to it, saying that such and such a clause is *ultra vires* or objectionable for this or that reason, "and I write you this letter so that you may have an opportunity of amending it at the next Session." We know that that is an intimation that if it was not amended at the next Session it would be disallowed. But what about that second Half-Breed Act from Manitoba? The first Act, the hon. gentleman says, was highly objectionable. It was reserved by Mr. Morris, the Lieutenant-Governor, for the assent of the Governor General, and although it was a very bad Bill, and very objectionable on every ground, yet such was his respect for provincial autonomy that he allowed that Bill to pass.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the hon. gentleman that allowed it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I am very glad to hear it. So then I am not the man who trampled on the independence of the Local Legislature.

Mr. BLAKE. Not then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They passed that Bill; and objectionable as it was, I in my regard for the autonomy and independence of Manitoba recommended the Governor General to give it his assent. But a change came over the Government, and when the amended Act came down it was disallowed by the party which is now appealing for provincial rights. The first Act was recommended for the Royal Assent, and I recommended that the Royal Assent should be given. The amended Act came down when the hon. gentleman was in the Government, and when it was law—because it was both passed by the Legislature and assented to by the Lieutenant Governor—the hon. gentleman, this guardian of provincial interests, disallowed it, and gave his reasons therefor—because it was an exceptional Bill. And I have no doubt that when that hon. gentleman becomes Minister of Justice again—*absit omen*—there will be many, many of these exceptional cases found whether the patent is issued or not. No matter, the parties had their own rights, subject to getting a patent and transfer of the Government title and of the patent; they must be governed and ought to be governed by the law of Manitoba, and not by the Dominion law of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman said he thought that the Dominion law should apply. We all know, he said, that it comes from Ontario. Why we know, Mr. Speaker, that whether the patent is issued in Ontario or not, the question whether these rights are legal or equitable, is always considered; but they cannot be revised. If the property had belonged to the Queen in her royal capacity; if the land were still owned by Her Majesty and were to be disposed of by the Imperial Government, any person going on that land could not affect the title

of the Crown, but the transfer of this property from one man to another, and the devising of and dealing with this property, must be governed by the law of Manitoba and not by the law of England.

Mr. McCARTHY. It was scrip.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that it was scrip, which passes from hand to hand. Why this land scrip once given is like a promissory note, or like a bond. It can be handed from man to man, from half-breed to half-breed, from white to white, governed as they ought to be and must be by the law of the locality, subject to the rights of the Crown, but the rights of the Crown in the Crown lands in Manitoba and the North-West, must be dealt with here, and as far as this Bill is concerned the separate rights of the half-breeds must be dealt with under the same law, under the same construction of the law, and liable to the same law. They are not infants or minors under the charge of the Government as trustees or guardians. Half-breeds have the same rights and the same responsibilities and the same independence as the white man; and their properties being in scrip, or lands, or in goods, must be governed by the law of Manitoba; and yet the hon. gentleman says that this is a matter which only affects people up there in which no great interest could be involved, and in which no Dominion interest could be in any way affected. The hon. gentleman in his report said—what did he say? Why, he said that the Bill was disallowed on the report of the hon. Minister of the Interior, that no notice had been published in the *Manitoba Gazette*, as one of the clauses pretended and recommended disallowance, because in his opinion—and we have no right to express our opinion here—the original Act 37 Vic., chap. 44, conferred all the necessary protection to the purchaser of half-breed lands.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now, do not throw over the Minister of the Interior. Do not disavow him because there is added the words: "concurring in by" the Minister of Justice, Mr. Blake, and approved of by Council, 7th October, 1877.

Mr. BLAKE. I concurred in the resolution, but not in the recommendation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In other words, the decision of the hon. gentleman was that although all the reasons given—

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, although some of the reasons given by the Minister of the Interior were bad, and although he did not approve of them, yet he comes to the same conclusion, and he insults the Legislature of Manitoba. He trampled on their autonomy. He snuffed them out, because, forsooth, in their own opinion, overriding the opinion of the Legislature of Manitoba, he thought they were better off with the old Bill than with the new one. These are the gentlemen who are protecting the rights and the autonomy of the different Provinces. Why, Mr. Speaker, the whole House laughed at him. You can see the absurdity of the Opposition in which the hon. gentlemen are placing themselves in their endeavor to make political capital in this wretched way, as they have no merits of their own, no acts of their own, by which they can claim the confidence of the people; they must raise these little questions; but when we find written before us that they have done the same things, that they have contrary to their speeches, contrary to their press, and contrary to the attacks which they have made on this Government, again and again carried out that policy, what can be said of them; and we are compelled to use the term which was employed with regard to them the other night, and declare that they are an organized hypocrisy. Sir, this Bill is retroactive. Oh, but it is a general Bill. It

was introduced as a general Bill; otherwise it could not have been got through at all. A Private Bill must be introduced by petition; notice must be given of it. As a Private Bill, Mr. McLaren must be heard before the Committee on Private Bills, and it was, even for that Government, too strong a measure to pass a law expressly to take one man's property and hand it over to another; and so the Government introduced this Bill. The greatest proof of fraud is shown by the style of the Bill. What would be said, Mr. Speaker, if the Legislature of Quebec some years ago—and perhaps it is the case now—when the Magdalen Islands all belonged to Admiral Coffin, who was sole proprietor, had legislated against Admiral Coffin. He was sole freeholder, and the Islands were covered by his tenants; and suppose they wished to make Admiral Coffin pay all the taxes, and would say: We cannot directly say that he shall pay the taxes of all the people of the Island, but we will pass a Bill stating that it is proper to declare that all the taxes on the Magdalen Islands shall be paid and defrayed by the freeholders on the Island, there being only one freeholder. That would look very much like fraud. This was the same kind of fraud, and it was done with the same fraudulent intent. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I would say that the report was made by the Minister of Justice, the present Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, my namesake, Mr. McDonald. I heartily approve of it. I take the responsibility for it, and my colleagues will join me in doing so. We were protecting a man from a great wrong, from a great loss and injury, from a course which, if pursued, would destroy the confidence of the whole civilized world in the law of the land. What property would be safe? What man would make an investment in this country? Would capitalists come to Canada if the rights of property were taken away, as was attempted under this Bill? This was one of the grounds on which in that paper of mine, of 1867, I declared that, in my opinion, all Bills should be disallowed if they affected general interests. Sir, we are not half a dozen Provinces. We are one great Dominion. If we commit an offence against the laws of property, or any other atrocity in legislation, it will be widely known. England is so far off that she is not affected by it; she is not so likely to disallow our Bills, however bad they may be, because the consequences fall on our own heads. But here where we are one country and altogether, and we go from one Province to another as we do from one county to another and from one town to another, is it to be borne that laws which bind civilized society together, which distinguish civilization from barbarism, which protect life, reputation and property, should be dissimilar; that what should be a merit in one Province should be a crime in another, and that different laws should prevail. There may be differences in the laws in detail, but the great grand principle, that every man should have the right to occupy his own house and property, sit under his own fig-tree, cultivate his own vine, and be protected in all this, is the common law of all civilized countries and must prevail throughout the Dominion. The hon. gentleman has threatened us with an appeal to the people. Sir, we have no objection to go to the people. If I told these hon. gentlemen that the elections were to take place on the 17th of September, 1883, why, Sir, Grit stock would go up 20 per cent. Their faces have been lengthened so that their longitude is almost as long as their speeches. From the reading of the amendment it is clear that the hon. member for South Huron is not to be fully trusted. Sir, I have no doubt that the honest men of the country will vote to support the Government in this measure. I do not mean to say the hon. gentlemen are going to vote against their consciences, but the country will believe that they were fully conscious of what they were voting.

Mr. CASEY. I do not rise to enter into the merits of the case of Caldwell vs. McLaren, but I do protest

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

against the tone adopted by the right hon. leader of the Government. He has treated the whole matter in a light and careless strain as if it were one entirely undeserving of public attention. The right hon. gentleman was occupied trying to give to his supporters some excuse which they might offer their constituents for giving the vote they are now asked to give. That excuse took the form it always takes in the case of a man who is utterly without logical defence of his position, unmitigated abuse of a man concerned in this private suit—a man who is not here, and whose acts are not before the House, with whose character we have no concern, and unmitigated abuse of the Ontario Government, which he compared to an arrant sneak thief. Is that dignified? Is it language that any Ontario man can listen to tamely without protest? I am sure my Conservative friends felt ashamed of the excuse made for the conduct of their Government. They dared not repeat that language in any Ontario constituency. I do not intend going into the merits of the question, but I would say with reference to Quebec, which has, above all other Provinces, an interest in this question, that the day may come when the members from that Province will regret the stand they are taking. Members from the smaller Provinces, too, are particularly interested in this matter. Ontario is a large Province and can afford to be snubbed in this way, for she can take her revenge, but if it should unfortunately happen that one of the smaller Provinces should be pitted against the Government, it would inevitably have to be crushed. The hon. gentleman speaks confidently of the result of the General Elections. If he will fix the date early in June, he will have an opportunity of seeing how short his anticipations will fall of realization.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I rise to correct an erroneous statement of the hon. member for West Durham. The hon. gentleman stated that the right hon. First Minister was responsible for the disallowance of the first Half-Breeds Land Act. I find, on looking at the Minutes of the Council, that the disallowance of that Act took place on the 2nd February, 1874. True, the Act was sent here in March, 1873, by the Lieutenant-Governor, but it remained unacted upon until the 27th February, 1874, when it was reported by the Governor in Council. Another erroneous statement was that the reason why he advised the disallowance of the Half-Breeds Land Grant Act was that it dealt with the ungranted lands of the Crown. The right hon. Premier read a part of that report which the hon. member for West Durham tried to get out of by saying it was the report of the Minister of the Interior and not his, but on reference to it, I find it is signed: "The undersigned concurs in the recommendation of the Minister of Interior that the Act be disallowed." I should like to know if the hon. Minister of Justice, upon whose report alone the Bill could be disallowed, concurring in the recommendation of one or the other Ministers, is not responsible for every word of that recommendation and every statement contained in it. The hon. Minister of the Interior recommended that the Act be disallowed, as in his opinion the original Act opposed the necessary protection to half-breed lands. It is assigned as an afterthought, and is brought up to try to get rid of the manifest fact that that legislation was disallowed, that the then hon. Minister of Justice had recommended the disallowance of that Act as being improper, unjust and unnecessary for the Local Legislature to pass, and not because it interfered with the right of the Crown. There is one point more I have to refer to. If it is a reason that legislation was unnecessary for the disallowance of the Act. A reference to the law of Ontario as it stood at the time this Act now in question was disallowed would show that this particular Act was wholly unnecessary. The point I wish to make is this: if Mr. Caldwell had chosen, honestly and fairly, to pay what he ought

to have paid, or to take the proper steps that he could, under the law as it stood without any new legislation, have taken, he would have obtained a remedy and the use of Mr. McLaren's improvements on these rivers without this kind of confiscating and unjust legislation which the Ontario Legislature passed. There was in force at the time, and is still in force, an Act for the formation of joint-stock companies for constructing works to facilitate the transmission of timber down rivers and streams. Under that Act Mr. Caldwell could have incorporated a joint-stock company in the ordinary way with five persons, and could then not only have made such works as he liked upon the stream, but could have expropriated all the improvements already made by Mr. McLaren then in existence on the stream. Under the 51st section of the Act of the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario, it is provided :

"In case there is already established by any party other than a company formed under this Act or some other Act of the late Province of Canada, or of this Province, any slide, pier, boom or other work intended to facilitate the passage of timber down any water for the improvement of which a company is formed under this Act, such company may take possession of the works, and the owners thereof, or (if they have been constructed on the property of the Crown) the persons at whose cost they have been constructed may claim a compensation for the value of such works either in money or in stock of such company, at the option of such owner or the person at whose cost the same was constructed, and may become shareholders in the said company for an amount equal to the value of such works, such value to be ascertained by arbitrators."

Now, it is quite evident that under that clause all Mr. Caldwell had to do was to form a joint-stock company, and then he could have proceeded honestly and fairly. He could have gone to Mr. McLaren, or his company could, and said : "We expropriate your improvements, we take them for the benefit of this company, for the purpose of facilitating the transmission of timber down streams, but we will have to pay you the value, that is, your expenditure of capital upon these works, the compensation to be decided by arbitration," and which undoubtedly would have given Mr. McLaren fair and reasonable compensation which, under the operation of this Act, Mr. Caldwell would have been obliged to pay him. But instead of that Mr. Caldwell goes to the Ontario Legislature and gets men to pass an Act which was wholly unnecessary, because under the Act then in force he could have accomplished all he desired, but he wanted good faith. He need not have procured the legislation he did ; but under the legislation he did procure, all he had to do was to pay Mr. McLaren the tolls which he might get his friend, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or the members of the Government that passed this, what I deem iniquitous, legislation, to fix for him.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to correct a mis-statement made by the Secretary of State, and also by the hon. First Minister who leads the House. I am not going into a discussion of the general principles of this measure ; I have no doubt it will soon be transferred to another tribunal where we will have an opportunity of discussing the question very fully. I will only say this with regard to the merits of the question. If the hon. gentleman will look at the second section of his Land Bill he will see whether he can reconcile the statement he has made here to-night in regard to the Streams Bill with the provisions he has inserted in the Act we have under discussion. The Secretary of State made a statement with regard to the disallowance of a certain clause in the Quebec Act, contradicting the statement made by the hon. member for Quebec East. Now, I find by examining the Act that these sections, which my hon. friend from Quebec East quoted, have never been repealed.

Mr. BOWELL. What he said was that these portions of the law have been complained of.

Mr. MILLS. I have the statement here before me. The petition and complaint are directed against these two parti-

cular sections that allowed companies to appropriate the rights of certain parties in mines without any compensation, and these sections still stand a part of the law. My hon. friend was strictly accurate in his statement, and the Minister was wholly wrong. Now, Sir, with regard to the other statement made by the First Minister in reference to the disallowance of a certain Manitoba Act relating to half-breed lands, I may tell the hon. gentleman that he himself has always acted on a different principle from what he has laid down here to-night. I hold in my hand the Dominion Lands Act of 1872, of which the 28th section reads as follows :—

"And whereas effect could not be given to the above-mentioned Order in Council until the lands in Manitoba had been surveyed, and in the meantime many of the said men so entitled as above have assigned their interest in such free grants, such assignments duly made and attested, and having the certificate of discharge in the case of non-commissioned officers or private soldiers attached thereto, and filed in the Dominion Lands Office before the issue of the warrant, shall be held to transfer in each case the interest of the man so entitled in the warrant when issued, which latter, in every such case shall be attached after registry, to the assignment on file, and held for delivery to the party entitled thereto, or for location."

Now, Sir, the question as to whether these lands were to be transferred under the law of Manitoba, or whether they were to be transferred under an Act of the Legislature, was in this Act decided that they should be transferred by an Act of this Legislature and not by an Act of the Manitoba Legislature. Then I find that the 4th sub-section of the 33rd section reads :

"Questions as to the homestead right arising between different settlers shall be investigated by the local agent of the division where the land is situated, whose report and recommendation, together with the evidence taken shall be referred to the Secretary of State for decision."

Now, Sir, the question is not referred to some party appointed under the local law of the Province of Manitoba for the purpose of being disposed of. It refers to that local law, and it was referred to the agent of the Dominion Government, acting under the authority of this Act. Then again the 12th sub-section of that section says :

"When both parents die without having devised the land, and leaving a child or children under age, it shall be lawful for the executors, if any, of the last surviving parent, or the guardian or guardians of such child or children, with the approval of a Judge of the Superior Court of the Province or Territory in which the lands lie, to sell the lands for the benefit of the infant or infants, but for no other purpose ; and the purchaser in such case shall acquire the homestead right by such purchase, and on carrying out the unperformed conditions of such right, shall receive a patent for the land upon payment of the office fees."

Now here is a question with regard to the law of succession, with regard to the manner in which the property shall be transferred to the heirs and how it shall be disposed of, all provided in this Act. The hon. gentleman did not then lay down the doctrine he has laid down to-night. He does not say how the rights of those persons are to be dealt with under the local law of the Province. That has nothing to do with the law of succession, and all we have to do is to dispose of the land and the law will regulate into whose hands the land shall fall. The hon. First Minister misrepresented the hon. member for West Durham. That hon. member did not speak of Mr. McLaren having an easement on those improvements on the river, but he stated that those who had the right to float logs down stream and utilise Mr. McLaren's improvements had an easement which could be paid for by tolls on the logs.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :
Messieurs

Bain,	Fleming,	Olivier,
Béchar,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gillies,	Pickard,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Brown,	Guthrie,	Rogers,
Barpee (St. John),	Haddow,	Ross (Middlesex),

Burpee (Sunbury),
Cameron (Huron),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Cockburn,
Crouter,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Holton,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
Macdonell (Lauark),
MacDonnell (Inverness),
McIsaac,
Malouin,
Mills,

Rymal,
Scriver,
Skinner,
Smith,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Weldon, and
Wheler.—50.

NATS:

Messieurs

Arkell,
Baker,
Barnard,
Beaty,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bill,
Bolduc,
Boulton,
Bourbeau,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Brooks,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Cuthbert,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Domville,
Drew,
Dugas,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Ferguson,

Fortin,
Fulton,
Gigault,
Girouard (Kent),
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hesson,
Homer,
Hooper,
Houde,
Hurteau,
Ives,
Jackson,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kranz,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Lautier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
MacDonald (Cape Breton),
McCallum,
McCarthy,
McCaig,
McDougall,
McDougall,
McLellan,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McRory,

Manson,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongenais,
Montplaisir,
Mousseau,
Muttart,
Ogden,
Orton,
Patterson (Essex),
Pinsonneault,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Rochester,
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Royal,
Sproule,
Stephenson,
Tassé,
Tellier,
Tilley,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Waide,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Williams, and
Wright.—110.

SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

98. Public Buildings in Nova Scotia.\$31,000

In reply to Mr. Mills,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason of this item being double that of last year is that it includes the vote of last year which was not expended because the title to the property for the Truro Custom House could not be obtained. The second vote of \$750 is for an addition to the Marine Hospital.

After some discussion, Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the item of \$750 for Marine Hospital be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

New Glasgow Public Buildings \$6,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There is an addition here of \$2,000. What position is this building in, what is its purpose, and what has the \$4,000 heretofore demanded been expended for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The money voted before has not been expended. The site is to be furnished by the locality, and the money is not to be expended until the site is furnished. The building is for public offices, such as the Custom House and Post Office.

Halifax Cattle Quarantine Station \$5,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for the erection of a cattle quarantine station at the request of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. KILLAM. I would like to ask what is being done towards the establishment of a quarantine station on Bunker's Island in the county I represent. Such a station is very badly needed. A veterinary surgeon could be procured without much cost to the Government, and facilities could be afforded to those who wish to import cattle to do so without running the risk of bringing dangerous diseases into the country, and at a very small cost to the Department. I am sorry hon. gentlemen have not yet decided to accede to the wishes of the people there, and I can tell them that their refusal is only another nail in their coffin. It is not to be taken for granted, and the hon. gentleman knows it. When we were on the other side of the House no such thing was ever dreamed of or attempted as putting through these things in this fashion without information, and hon. gentlemen opposite would have cried out against us if we had done so. We distinctly object to this item going through until we get this information.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I move that this item stand until we have fuller information respecting it.

Motion negatived.

Mr. MILLS. It is very extraordinary that we cannot obtain this information, but we must discharge our duties to the people, although we are a small minority. It is also an extraordinary hour 6 a.m., for the Government to rush through the Estimates in this manner.

Mr. HESSON. It is just the hour when the hardy son of toil goes to work. It is consequently proper to proceed.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. During my 20 years experience in Parliament, I never saw an attempt made to put through Estimates after a 16 hours continuous sitting. This is a gross abuse, and a gross act of tyranny. The items are important, and in the nature of things we cannot give them proper attention. The First Minister knows very well that this will not expedite business. When we were in office, not six or seven days, but six or seven weeks were consumed in getting through the Estimates, although we were ready with all the information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House, we were again and again kept until two, three and five o'clock, in the discussion of the Estimates.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Not till six, certainly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps not. But allow me to point out to these hon. gentlemen that during the present Session in England, Mr. Trevelyan made a motion at three o'clock, and Mr. Childers at half-past two o'clock, and the votes for the Army and Navy were taken at about this hour.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a most extraordinary thing that objection should be taken when the item has been repeatedly explained. The only question relates to the locality at Halifax, where the building is to be erected.

Mr. BLAKE. We asked where the quarantine is to be, what proportion of the \$5,000 was to be expended on land, and what in buildings, and of what capacity the station will be.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How many importers are we going to have who will import the cattle? Is this station to be for one, or two, or three importers?

Mr. BOWELL. For as many as like to buy cattle.

Mr. LANDRY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to know the color of the cattle.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I protest against this lengthy sitting. I think proceedings such as this tyranny and coercion. The night before last we sat up until four in the

morning and last night until two o'clock, and to insist on our remaining here at this hour cannot be at all justified.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I notice a new item of \$15,000 for the Truro Custom House, Post Office and Savings Bank. We would like full information about this.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost of land and buildings will be \$20,000. The land is not purchased yet, because we had no money voted by Parliament. We ask for \$15,000 this year, with which we will be able to purchase the land, and begin the construction of the buildings. I suppose the land will cost something like \$3,000. The business and revenue at Truro have very largely increased during late years. In 1870 the total amount of revenue from Customs and Excise was \$10,513; in 1881, it was \$42,719.

Mr. ARKELL. During last summer the Minister of Public Works visited various public works in Ontario. The reception of the hon. Minister at St. Thomas was most cordial, there being between 200 and 300 persons present when he was entertained.

Mr. MILLS. The people expected to be recouped.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister of Public Works, it will be remembered, made a tour in Western Ontario. I happened to be in Detroit and noticed his car standing on the Canada Southern road. I noticed a man in gold lace, and I enquired whether the hon. Minister was there or would be present. The reply was in the negative, and it appeared that the hon. gentleman was going east by steamer, so it required a steamboat and palace car to carry the hon. gentleman a few miles.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). The hon. member for Norfolk has drawn entirely on his imagination. I happen to know the facts and to be able to correct them. I am glad there was a servant there, also that the car door was locked, otherwise the hon. gentleman's private papers might have been endangered.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the point of order?

Mr. CASEY. The point of order is that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) has, in the heat of debate, insinuated that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would steal the papers belonging to the Minister of Public Works. If that is not what he means I hope he will explain his meaning.

Mr. PATTERSON. Hon. gentlemen may take it as they please, but I say if the car had not been locked and attended to by a porter, it is possible that some of Sir Hector Langevin's papers would have been missing.

Mr. CASEY. I have no objection to the hon. Minister of Public Works making a political tour or a stump-speaking tour throughout the country; I am sure everybody was glad to see him personally, and he made himself agreeable, but I do object to the statement that the meetings were non-political. When the hon. gentleman came to St. Thomas he made no secret that his visit was a political one. Some of his friends gave him a banquet, and I know that Reformers were invited to subscribe to it under the impression that it was to be a non-political affair, but when the banquet took place the hon. Minister took occasion, as was naturally expected, to refer to political questions. He enlarged on the fact that the Government had secured a great surplus, and he invited all towns and localities in want of public works to come and state their needs, and the tone of his speech was calculated to evoke such a remark as that made by Mr. Rowe.

Mr. MILLS. Since the Ministry are so anxious to go on at this late hour of seven o'clock in the morning, I think it is rather strange that the Minister in charge should be absent.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to; resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 7:30 o'clock, a.m., Saturday) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 17th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to refer to an incident which occurred in the debate in Committee of Supply on Saturday morning last. On that occasion a reference to a visit of Sir Hector Langevin to my constituency last summer was imported into the debate in connection with a vote for Public Works in Nova Scotia. The hon. member for North Norfolk, who I regret not to see in his seat, took part in the debate, and used language that seemed to me to imply that he had obtained his information in a manner not in accordance with customary usages. I resented the attack on the hon. the Minister of Public Works because I knew that his mode of travelling, whether by rail or water on that occasion, was exclusively his own affair, and did not cost the country a cent. I resented it also, because the hon. Minister was the guest of my constituents and myself, and without premeditation, or that deliberative calm which invariably characterizes hon. gentlemen, especially hon. gentlemen opposite, in their language when addressing this House, I made use of words from which it might be inferred that I imputed to the hon. member for North Norfolk a capability of descending to a degree of criminal meanness which I would be very sorry indeed to impute to any hon. member of this House. I feel that I owe it to my own self-respect, if I have been wrong, to make amends; and I beg to state frankly to this House that at the time I used that language I did not intend it to imply the sense or the meaning which has been extracted from it; that I have no reason to apply any such language from anything I know of the private character of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and that I thought at the time the hon. member resented it, that he did so in a mock-heroic strain, because he must have known that, from our personal relations, I could not have intended any such attack upon him in the words I used. I beg, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, from the consciousness I feel of what a member owes to his own self-respect, and from the consciousness of what is due to the dignity and the deliberations of this House, and also what is due to the hon. member for North Norfolk, to express my regret for having used those words, and to ask permission to withdraw them.

INTERNATIONAL CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

Mr. BOULTBEE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the International Construction Company.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I would like some statement from the hon. Minister of Railways in reference to this Bill.

Mr. BOULTBEE. The hon. Minister of Railways has placed in my hands an amendment to be attached to the operative clause, to which I have no objection, and which

may meet the objections of the hon. member for West Durham and other members. It reads as follows:—

Provided always that nothing in this Act contained shall enable the said Company to release or operate two lines of railway which connect with each other or have termini in the same city, town, or municipality without the previous sanction of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be well to add the words: "railways which connect with or intersect each other" before the words "city, town or municipality."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think these words are unnecessary, and that the object will be attained by the present wording of the amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. The railroads will not connect unless proper arrangements are made by some such words as I propose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe the amendment covers the case perfectly as it is. The Bill provides that no two railways connected with each other can be operated by this Company without certain conditions and arrangements which will guard the public interest in the manner desired by all parties.

Amendment agreed to; and Bill read the third time and passed.

FELLOWS' MEDICAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Mr. GAULT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 105) to amend the charter of the Fellowes' Medical Manufacturing Company.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. When this Bill was before the House on the second reading, I suggested that there was a serious question whether, without some reason given, the exceptional powers asked for by this Company should be granted, and if there were no special reason, whether it was not a case for amending the General Act under which the Company is incorporated, rather than for granting it exceptional powers. The Bill reads as follows:—

Whereas the Fellowes' Medical Manufacturing Company, a corporation created by letters patent of the Dominion of Canada issued under the authority of the "Canada Joint Stock Companies Letters Patent Act, 1869," have represented, by their petition, that they are carrying on a large business in Canada, the capital for which is mainly subscribed beyond the limits of the Dominion; and that it is expedient that such capital should be proportionately represented on the Board of Directors of the Company, which it cannot be under the provisions of the said letters patent; and have prayed that they may be relieved from the restriction created by the said Act, as to the nationality and residence of the major part of their Directors; and whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. It shall not be necessary hereafter that the major part of the Directors of the Fellowes' Medical Manufacturing Company shall be persons resident in Canada, or subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization: Provided always, that the member of the Board who shall exercise the chief executive authority of the said Company in Canada, shall be a subject of Her Majesty, and shall reside within the Dominion.

The general policy of the Legislature, whether that policy was well or ill-founded has continued unchanged, and it is that the major part of the directors shall be subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization. It does not appear to me that while this policy exists, we should depart from it in the interests of any joint stock company except for some extraordinary reason. The great benefit of this General Act is that it should lay down general rules under which all companies should be bound; and if it is sufficient to say that the law should be changed at the instance of one company without giving a reason, there would appear to be

Mr. BOULTBEE.

a good question as to the necessity of a General Act at all, and we would have all the companies coming in, and would be no longer able to point to a General Act as prescribing the limits regulating the formation of these companies, but would have to look at special Statutes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt something may be said in that view; but I do not see any possible objection that could arise in the case that is now under consideration. Of course, every case will have to stand on its own merits. It is well known that this Company has been incorporated for the purpose of manufacturing what is known as Fellowes, Syrup of Hypophosphites. It is also well known that that remedy has become one possessing a wide-world reputation. We can readily understand that under those circumstances it might be desirable to have it relieved from the restriction which requires the nationality and residence of the major part of the directors. It is obviously the case that where a remedy obtains such a wonderful notoriety as this, it might be extremely desirable to establish it upon a large scale at some great central population, such as London or Paris, or on the continent. When in London, a year ago, I received a prescription from a very eminent physician of syrup of hypophosphites, and I went to one of the most famous drug stores in the city of London, and they told me the only syrup they had was Fellowes' syrup. I found, therefore, it had obtained a very high standing in the estimation of the medical profession at that grand centre of medical literature, London. Under these circumstances, I think, where a person in Canada has been enabled to establish so great a reputation for a remedy that has come in general use all over the civilized world, it would be a pity to do anything calculated to prevent a company organizing for its manufacture on the largest possible scale, and under the most advantageous circumstances.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am sure that the proprietors of this medicine must be obliged to the hon. member for West Durham for having given the hon. Minister, himself an eminent member of the legal profession, an opportunity of speaking in such high terms of this particular remedy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Especially when my professional reputation is vouched for by the hon. member for Gloucester.

Mr. ANGLIN. I wish I could speak as well of the hon. gentleman's political reputation.

Bill read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 96) to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I move that the following words be added: "Nor shall each body word beyond ten words, in such message cost more than one cent." That is, at any rate, a reasonable arrangement. As we are adopting a maximum rate for ten words, we should adopt a maximum rate exceeding ten words.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It is quite true, as my hon. friend has said, that the rate at present charged is one cent beyond ten words; but the Company do not wish to be bound peremptorily by that charge, and the reason is, that if so they would be laid open to what is known as a system of packing messages by sending ten messages in one, as is done habitually in cabling. They might be compelled in fact to charge for the additional words at a rate far below

one cent per word. The system in reference to packing is this: a man starts the business of collecting messages and sending them, through correspondents in the different places, all in one message, and abbreviating in many cases, and paying the charge fixed by the tariff of the Company of one cent higher for the message. This is done in cable messages in a great measure, for the purpose of saving the addresses and signatures, and also for the purpose of leaving out unnecessary words. In the same case, if this clause is made compulsory upon the Montreal Telegraph Company, the system of packing would no doubt come into use, and a message or a number of messages for which the charge would be \$2.50, by packing will be reduced to \$1.25, and it is not the intention of the Company to charge more. If this charge is imposed upon them as an arbitrary condition, which will extend over the period of ninety years, the result will be that the Company will be at the mercy of these packers, which will injure the telegraph and cable companies contrary to the fair interpretation of the Act. For that reason the companies object to this one cent clause, and for that reason only. They have never charged more than one cent for the additional ten words in Canada, and it is not the intention to do so, and they are reluctant to be subjected to this limited tariff.

Mr. BLAKE. That is just the sort of argument that applies against Parliament imposing any tax at all. We have here a state of things which will produce practically a monopoly of the telegraph system in Canada.

Mr. CAMERON. Far from it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says far from it. The promoters of this measure adopt wholly inconsistent views of argument. They tell you there can be no such thing as successful competition in telegraphy; that all attempts of that kind are followed by one mistaken result. There is a period of low prices followed by desires for amalgamation, and that we cannot have a successful telegraph service on the principal of competition at all; that it is in its nature, as proved by experience, a thing that must be reached by a monopoly. That is the argument in favor of the view that if no harm results it is necessary it should be a monopoly. But when we come to the other branch of their argument, we are told that if it is a monopoly we must protect the public to some extent. We are told that there are to-day 100 miles of independent wire, and there will be many more to-morrow. In one breath they blow both hot and cold. Now, Sir, however difficult it may be to establish a competing company, after the organization which is to take place under this Act, it is obvious these difficulties will be greatly enhanced. It is quite clear that any new company will have a hard time, or much harder time than any competing company will have but for this. We are therefore interposing additional barriers with respect to competition. The Government recognize the importance of a maximum clause. They recognize the importance of some protection to the public under these circumstances. They insist upon that as a condition of these additional powers being given to the Montreal Telegraph Company. They are introduced into the Bill. Why are they justifiable? What is the reason for introducing a maximum clause at all? It is because we know we are creating a monopoly, practically, and because we know that as a condition of the monopoly we have a right to protect the public by prescribing to what extent the public shall be charged. That is the only principle which justifies us in prescribing a rate. The hon. gentleman says: "If you do this they may pack the messages." But I say, in answer, that if they do this, the Company may exact other and higher charges. The measure is in our hands, and now is the time to deal with it. The question is, what charges shall be made for messages that run over ten words. Your 25 cents may be rendered altogether nugatory with reference to

this class of messages that run over ten words if you leave the Company free to charge any rate they please for the words exceeding ten. The hon. gentleman says that messages will be packed to the prejudice of the Company, and that they will have to submit. But there will be no temptation, and if the agent receives ten or fifteen messages and packs them and sends them off to John Jones, he has got to arrange with John Jones to have the delivery established, which will enable him to collect and deliver the messages. We have not heard anything yet of this difficulty. This one cent rate has been in vogue for a long time. Will the hon. gentleman bring forward evidence to prove that there has been any packing of messages in the past? We have not heard any company complain of this difficulty in the past, and what reason have we to apprehend it in the future? If any difficulty of this kind does arise in the future it will be open to the Company to come to Parliament to seek a remedy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was just about to make the same remark. This proposition seems reasonable in itself, and if these apprehended difficulties follow to the serious injury of the Company it will always be open to the Company to appeal to the Legislature to remove those difficulties. I think that the present proposition, being reasonable in itself, should be accepted, not only with respect to this amendment, but with respect to any other monopoly in the country.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. In order to avoid the possibility of the Company making the date and address a portion of the message, I would move to insert the word "body" in the preceding part of the clause, so that the body of the message of ten words shall be exclusive of the date and of the address.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think that the House ought to bear in mind that this Bill is asking for a consolidation of the different Acts affecting this Company. This question was very fully discussed in the Committee. A decision was arrived at, and the Bill is now reported to the House after that deliberation. The hon. gentleman opposite, of course, has the right to make this motion, but the House has a right to consider the propriety of a motion which regulates rates and fixes a maximum charge for this particular Company. Now, Sir, no such maximum has ever been fixed with reference to any other telegraph company in this country. There are several other telegraphic corporations besides the Montreal Telegraph Company, and I really do not see any principle or any reason which justifies Parliament,—because this Company is now before it asking a very reasonable thing, to have eight or ten Acts consolidated, and another very reasonable thing: to have the same powers and privileges, which this Parliament has on several occasions granted to telegraph companies organized since the Montreal Telegraph Company, conferred on it,—in imposing such restrictions. The Montreal Telegraph Company is the pioneer telegraph company in this country, and it has conducted its business hitherto by general consent, I think, with advantage, and at a reasonable cost to the country. The service has been well rendered, enormous difficulties have been overcome, great distances have been covered by this line, and the result was, that a year or two ago they found themselves unable, from the ordinary business of the Company, owing to the competition which had sprung up in the meantime, to pay their proprietors, or shareholders, the usual and the reasonable amount of income to which they were entitled on their investment of capital; and certain arrangements were reached between the other telegraph companies and the Montreal Telegraph Company. Now, Sir, I do not see the principle on which Parliament should take advantage of such a position to place its peculiar notions—

or rather the views of the hon. member—on record and put in the Act the rate they should charge, and how they should carry on their business. Recollect, Mr. Chairman, that this is a private Company, they have not any public advantages in the way of bonuses or favors. They ran the risk of investing their capital in this enterprise, and I cannot see, if you are going to establish this principle, that when any corporation, any steamboat company, any railway company, any manufacturing company comes to Parliament and asks for any amendment to any Act of incorporation, you will impose your own views and your own notions on them as to the way in which they ought to carry on their business, and the price at which they shall manufacture commodities or offer them for sale, what justice there is in it. That is what it amounts to; and I do not see that we have any right to make such an interference. This Telegraph Company is exposed to competition. The hon. gentleman calls it a huge monopoly. Now, Sir, that is a very easy word to utter, and it is a very unpopular word; at least it has become so very recently. The word amalgamation in this Act has alarmed some hon. gentlemen in this House and some people outside of this House. It is a terrible thing now for companies to amalgamate; and yet, during this Parliament, I have seen a great many Bills pass through Parliament amalgamating companies having franchises from the public and bonuses from the public, being *quasi*-public institutions in a much stronger degree than this Telegraph Company is. Now it is said, it is a very improper thing to grant these powers. Why, Sir, if there is any business carried on in this country, in which the power to amalgamate and to unite with other lines of communication is necessary—by the very nature of the business, it is telegraphy. What does it do? A man wishes to send a message to New York, or to San Francisco, or to Edmonton, and you must send it—if you send it for a reasonable price—under some general arrangement over a continuous line. You cannot have this unless you endow various companies which have taken up franchises in the different parts of the territory to be covered, with power, and allow them to make mutual arrangements, and business arrangements, which will justify them in reducing their rates and still make a sufficient profit to warrant them in carrying on the business. This is the very nature of the enterprise or business of telegraphy. The use of electricity to send messages and carry on business over the whole of the continent requires, in its very nature, that there should be union, confidence and amalgamation between the different companies which occupy this great continent; and yet, because this privilege is asked for, the same privilege as I have said which has been granted to other companies, and which you do not propose to withdraw from them, you hamper it with restrictions. If it is necessary in the public interest that any change in the law should be made, then come forward and take over these various companies' lines into your own hands. Do as they did in England—take them over as a Government work. If that will be more convenient, and more satisfactory to the public, try that experiment. These corporations are liable in the public interest, of course, to submit to such a policy. You have a law on the Statute-book—in the Consolidated Statutes of the old Provinces—which authorizes the Government in the first place to take possession of these lines and use them for public purposes in case of difficulty. I remember very well, Sir, that when we were threatened with an invasion of our territory, a few years ago, it was necessary, and it was found very useful, to take possession of the telegraph lines, and ascertain what was going on. Being under the control of a Minister of the Crown, the telegraph lines were ours, and we ascertained some very important facts, which were very useful and which saved a very large sum of money to the people, due to the possession of this power and right. We have, under the same Act, also power to take possession of the Company's property altogether on payment of such

Mr. McDOUGALL (Halton).

compensation as may be found proper. There seems to me no possibility of any middle course except to allow the telegraph lines to carry on their business as any other corporations do, or to take possession of them and use them as part of the public means of communication through the country, and make them a Government institution. In the present case, the Company simply desires to have, as I understand it, the same powers and privileges with reference to their line and their property, which Parliament has freely granted to other companies since they were organized, and I do think it is unfair to attempt to fix, by an arbitrary standard as now proposed, the price which should be charged. The hon. gentleman has another amendment, which we will be presently called on to consider, a proposition to regulate a reduction in the charges in the event of any improvements being discovered, by which telegraph communication can be carried on with greater facility than has been the case hitherto. Sir, there might be some reason in that if we were to take control of the matter altogether; but the hon. gentleman makes no provision for the other case. Improvements may be rendered practically useless owing to improvements in the telephone.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A line is established between Toronto and Hamilton now, and I am told by persons connected with the Montreal Telegraph Company, that there is a very considerable diminution in their receipts from the more frequent use of the telephone there than was formerly the case. We cannot tell what improvements may amount to, and I think that the hon. gentleman ought—if he wishes to act fairly—to allow companies to increase their price if this be found necessary. If persons must use telegraphy for certain purposes and can use the telephone for other purposes, and are thereby put in the position of having their large capital invested with inadequate remuneration, we then should have the right to increase the price so as to secure a fair profit.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. They can then come to Parliament.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman says that they can come to Parliament; but after Parliament had put the Company in this difficult position, and claimed the right to fix by an arbitrary rule the amount to charge, I do not think that this would be a very favorable place for them to come to. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if the Company would take my advice in this matter, they would withdraw this Bill. It is not necessary for them to come here. I believe that they have the power to do all they wish to do, in the clause to which such objection is made. This is a question of law, and the case is now before the Courts. The decision of a Judge has been given adversely on this point; but I will leave it to any legal member of the House, whether the first clause, which gives the Company power to let, convey, or part with their property as to them may seem fit, is not as large a power as can possibly be obtained by the employment of any words in the English language. This matter is before the Courts, and the Company desire to have it made clear and plain, and simply ask that a clause similar to that which was given to the Dominion and Great North-Western Companies, be placed in their Act of Consolidation, so that these companies will be on an equal footing. Mr. Chairman, a very large sum of money depends on the solution of this question; in fact, at the present time, \$2,000,000 of capital, mostly owned in this Canada of ours, and a portion of it in England is in peril. Many of these people are dependent on the operations of this Company for their daily income, and we see from what has recently occurred, how very sensitive this property is, and how it can be reduced in value by movements in

Parliament or elsewhere. We have observed the great facility with which the brokers in Montreal can cause this property to rise or become depressed in value, so that they may make it a means of profit when it goes up or comes down. Is that a convenient state of things? Is it fair to leave this property to all this risk and danger, when Parliament can put an end to it at once by simply giving to the Company the same rights as to other companies? I object on general grounds to the assumption on the part of Parliament, that when any private corporation comes here for an amendment to its Act of incorporation we have a right to enquire into its tariffs, to examine into its affairs, and say how much they shall charge. We are not competent to do that. We should have a Committee of Examination to take evidence and enquire into the whole subject of the expenses, the risks involved, the dangers and the profits. If we are going to deal with the question in that way, we, in effect, say that because a company carried on their operations for years at a particular price, we ought to fix that price; no matter what changes may take place in the condition of telegraph communication in this country, no matter what rivalries may be established, this Company shall not charge more than so much. This is contrary to the public interests. It is contrary to the liberty of the subject and it will not do to apply it in this case, because we cannot apply it to others, and it has not been applied in previous cases. The hon. gentleman says there is a monopoly, I say there is not. There can be no monopoly in telegraphing in this country so long as it is open for all persons to combine their capital, put up poles and string telegraph wires along the country. So long as they can do that under the law, there can be no monopoly. The General Act of incorporation throws open the whole subject of telegraphic communication to competition by the simple *fiat* of the Government of the day, so that it cannot be described as a monopoly. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who, I see, by his approval of this suggestion, to preserve the same rate, is desirous of securing the interests of the publishers throughout the country as well as of the public, but it is open to him and his friends in the newspaper business to build a line for themselves if they wish. Lines have been built between Washington and New York, and between other points in the United States by the newspaper proprietors and brokers, and it is open to my hon. friend and his colleagues of the press, who are now large contributors to the profits of the telegraph companies, to build lines of their own and prevent anything like a monopoly. A monopoly in its bad sense, as I understand it, is the right to do something exclusively—do that which no one else can do. This is the nature of monopolies which public opinion has so strongly condemned in the past. In the present case it happens that certain capitalists have taken all the risks involved in constructing a telegraph line in this country. They had to build their line over long distances, they had to incur the hazards of storms and every other possible climatic difficulty to be met with in a country like this, and if the wires go out of order by these or other means the public suffers thereby. I, therefore, protest against the attempt to avail ourselves of the opportunity presented, on the mere proposition to consolidate the Company's Acts of going into other questions and assuming to regulate their business, and say what the Company can afford in the way of serving the public. The Company assented to the 25 cent rate; but even if they had not, my argument would have been just as strong against this attempt to fix the other rate. My hon. friend, having succeeded in getting one advantage out of the Company, is now attempting to hamper them still more. He is insensible to the arguments of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who has examined the question carefully, that it will expose the Company to be plundered by a system of

scalping such as was in operation with regard to railway tickets. It will be perfectly possible, and it no doubt will happen, that persons may cheat the Company by putting in a dozen or a hundred messages and calling it one. That has been done before with reference to cable communications, and if these scalpers are given the protection which is proposed to be given them by this amendment, there is no doubt that that system of scalping will become common.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that I am insensible to the arguments of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) as the hon. gentleman has stated. I admit, too, that I do not attach equal weight to that which I usually attach to the arguments of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. The arguments of the hon member for Victoria are the arguments of the counsel for the Bill. The arguments of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down are, of course, the arguments of the hon. member for Halton, but speaking for the Great North Western Telegraph Company, of which he told us the other day he is one of the directors, The hon. gentleman exhibited an amount of warmth—a certain electric sensibility on this occasion which I am sure he does not usually exhibit in his addresses to the House. I can understand it, of course, considering the curious circumstances under which the hon. gentleman wishes Parliament to adopt his views, but they are not reasons why we should accept those views as possessing any greater impartiality than the views of the hon. gentleman wish it to possess. The hon. gentleman has discussed some of the clauses which we have not come to yet. Though I hope some of them will be amended I shall not anticipate any of those proposed amendments, nor shall I refer to the discussion of the one which the Committee has adopted. The alteration which took place in the Committee took place at the instance of the Government of the day, who were represented by the hon. the Minister of Railways. Speaking in the name of the Government he admitted the view that Parliament had a right to impose a maximum under the circumstances which apply in the present case. The clause is indefensible unless we are entitled to prescribe the maximum, and it follows from that, that we are entitled to make the maximum what is a reasonable amount, and prevent anything being done which would render the maximum wholly useless. I do not understand the objection of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) as I propose to insert the word "body" so as to carry out the real meaning and intention of his proposal as in point of fact it is. With reference to the statement of the hon. gentleman opposite, that we have no more right to deal with this Company than with a steamboat or a railway company, I say they are two different things. We do deal with railway companies, but not with steamboat companies. We do not deal with steamboat companies because the water is free, but do with railway companies because we give them peculiar privileges which entitle us to deal with them, and, because unless we incorporate other railway companies, they will have a monopoly, and even if we do they are practically monopolies to a large extent. Every railway company is practically a monopoly as between the smaller way stations of the line, because it is impossible to incur the capital expenses which would be necessary to give railway competition along each line. So with reference to a large portion of its traffic, it is a monopoly, and that is one of the large reasons why Parliament has always adopted the rule that the Governor in Council has to approve of any tariff or tolls and may alter the rates.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Only on condition that the Company is earning a certain percentage on its capital.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not so. That is the condition applied to parliamentary interference. The interference of the Governor in Council is narrower, as the hon. gentle-

man will find if he looks at the Act. The hon. gentleman says that we do not interfere with railway companies. We do; a railway company cannot charge a cent until the Governor in Council approves of its tariff of rates as fair and reasonable. I do not think there is any danger, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's impassioned argument, of Parliament adopting this Act without taking certain precautions for the protection of the public. What these precautions are is another question. The hon. gentleman says I evolve my objections from my inner consciousness. I evolve them from my experience of the practice of the telegraph companies, and I considered them without bias of any kind, not happening to be either director or counsel of either of the corporations concerned.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has not stated the true position of the clause under discussion. He has stated it as if the Government had assented to advise Parliament to impose on this Company the obligation of a maximum rate, as if the exercise of that power were a proper function of Parliament. I do not understand that to be the true position of the matter at all. When the Bill was before the Railway Committee, I stated, in reply to a proposal to limit the rate, that the rate was already limited by the contract between the Montreal Company and the Great North-Western Company. A remark was made by a member of the Committee that that rate could be altered by agreement between the two companies, and that the rate should be fixed by Act of Parliament. It was on that view that I acceded to the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and as I protested then I protest now, against Parliament imposing on the Company a particular restriction as to rates which it had not thought fit to impose on other companies. In the logical reasoning of the hon. member for Halton I entirely agree; but in the particular circumstances of the case, as an agreement had been entered into for the long period of ninety-seven years between this Company and another company, whereby the rate was fixed at 25 cents, I was prepared, as that arrangement was a permanent one, to allow Parliament to say that it was a permanent one; but when you propose to add a term that is not in that agreement, I think the position is entirely different. I therefore objected, as I object now, to the introduction of that one cent a word clause, and I stated that it has been the practice, for a long time past, to charge one cent a word for additional words; and, as the hon. member for Halton has pointed out, it is only fair to suppose that the Company whose Bill is now before the House, may be subjected to the inroads of telegraph agents who occupy the same position towards telegraph companies as ticket scalpers do towards railway companies, defrauding both the public and the Company, and therefore the Company opposed this amendment. I leave the matter, however, in the hands of the House, but I do not wish to imply that I assent to the amendment. With regard to putting in the clause relating to body words, I have no objection to it, because the practice is only to charge for body words. Before I sit down, however, I would beg to say to the hon. member for West Durham, that I think it would be just as well if he were not so ready to impute motives and make personal reflections. He has applied to me the term the counsel for this Company. The statement is not true. I am not and never have been professionally connected with the Montreal Telegraph Company, although, as I stated to the Committee, I am the counsel of the Great North-Western Company. The hon. member for Halton stated to the Committee that he was a director of the Great North-Western Company. I am not aware that the matter is of vital interest to that Company one way or the other. It vitally concerns the Montreal Company, but to the Great North-Western Company it is a matter of indifference whether this Bill passes or not; but I

Mr. BLAKE.

would venture to suggest to the hon. member for West Durham that these imputations of personal motives would be much better omitted, either in the Committee or in the House. I might just as well assert, with regard to a matter that was under discussion in the House the other night, that personal motives or personal feelings affected his action on that matter in another House.

Mr. BLAKE. Which is that?

Mr. CAMERON. I refer to the Goodhue Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, my action on the Goodhue Bill was to vote against it. With regard to what I stated, I beg to recall the term counsel of the Company, and substitute the more accurate term of counsel of the Great North-Western, whose President, Mr. Wiman, has been manifesting his interest in this Bill by lobbying and button-holing hon. members.

Mr. McDUGALL. I may say, with regard to the observation of the hon. member for West Durham, that I am not much given to the *tu quoque* style of argument. I do not think, because one man has done something in his political career that is contrary to correct principles and to his honor as a public man, that justifies me in taking a similar course; and I do not choose to make any references to the past, although I might avail myself of this opportunity to refer to one or two passages in the hon. gentleman's public career of which I have personal knowledge. All I wish to say is, that I am a director of the Great North-Western Company, holding just shares enough to make me a director. I think there is no law which prevents a member of Parliament from holding stock in a public company, else a great many members of this House would be affected by it. I take a great deal of interest in this special telegraph combination, because it so happened that my opinion was asked in reference to a matter in which some personal friends and relatives of mine are interested; and, consequently, knowing something about it, and ascertaining that a very great injury was about to be inflicted on persons who had invested in the Montreal Telegraph Company, I have taken a warm interest in protecting, so far as I could, that property. I have been in Parliament some time longer than the hon. member for West Durham, and I can say that to this hour I never had, as a director or a person holding stock—in fact I was too poor, as a politician, to have much money to invest in stock—I never had any interest in any matter that I had to pronounce on in Parliament. To be quite sure that I was right, not only in speaking, but in voting on this question, I have ascertained from the English authorities that a member of Parliament, to be prevented from voting, must have a direct interest in the matter. I have no direct interest in this Bill. It cannot be of advantage to the Great North-Western Company, because that Company are under obligations to pay to the Montreal Company a large sum of money; and my advice has been, that if they could without dishonor get rid of this agreement, they would be able, out of the 8 per cent. which they have to pay, to add to their lines and to their facilities for carrying telegraph messages, and thus save a large amount of money. But they have made a contract and it is their duty to carry it out in a fair spirit. They would have to come to some pooling arrangement for the same object if the present agreement should fail. They had cut down the rates until at the verge of ruin—in fact, until the Dominion Company was obliged to call in the assistance of the great financier, J. Gould, to prevent its collapse. Knowing all these facts, I have felt perfectly justified in urging upon Parliament, as I still urge, non-interference in the matter, which does not require it upon any public ground—non-interference in the private affairs of a corporation like this. I shall not make any further reference to the imputation which the hon. member for West Durham has chosen to make as

regards my motives and conduct. It falls perfectly harmless so far as I am concerned. I have met that hon. gentleman on the stump on some former occasions, and may meet him again with the public records in my hand, when I shall be able to defend my motives and public course as quite worthy to compare with his own.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is quite welcome to attack me at any time and place he pleases, when I hope I shall be able to answer him.

Mr. McDOUGALL. You were not there on the last occasion.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what occasion the hon. gentleman refers to. I have not considered the question whether the hon. gentleman has a right to vote or not; but even if he had no right to vote, he might have a right to speak. What I said was, that having regard to the interests the hon. gentleman possesses in this question, it is impossible to attach the same weight to his acts that we should attach if he had not that interest. If it was to the interest of the Great North-West Company to have this Bill defeated, I understand the hon. gentleman could have acted in another sense. But the President is using every exertion to procure the passing of this Bill, and I must suppose the Board of Directors are harmonious in the matter. That Board have agreed that upon the whole, whether it is in the interest of their Company or not, they will promote the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). One reason why one of the directors of the Montreal Company came here and urged the adoption of the Bill was that he felt in good faith his Company were bound to assist the Bill, and get the legislation that would make the agreement valid and binding. But so far as the interest of his own Company was concerned, it was perfectly indifferent to him what he did and how it fared.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken are unduly touchy in regard to the reference to their connection with this Company. If they are perfectly clear that there is nothing in the slightest degree improper in that connection—and I am not saying there is anything improper in their speaking and voting on the Bill—they need not object to the House knowing the nature of their connection with the Bill. I have no doubt that the hon. member for North Victoria has arranged the matter so that he is not in any way interfering with the letter or spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act. But it is a matter of importance to the House, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, to know that he is counsel for one of those companies asking for amalgamation. It is not so important to know the position of the hon. member for Halton in pushing his case. If their relation to those companies is perfectly harmless, there is nothing offensive to those gentlemen in the House knowing it. But the argument of the hon. member for Halton and the hon. member for North Victoria, and the general argument that this House has no right to impose conditions on companies asking certain powers or powers of amalgamation, is most extraordinary.

Mr. McDOUGALL. You have the power but not the right.

Mr. CASEY. I think we have exercised both the power and the right in almost every similar case that has come before us. We usually limit the freights of railways and control many of their arrangements, and still more when proposals of amalgamation come before us. But suppose a Bill came before us to sanction the amalgamation of all the great trunk railways of the country, so as to create a vast monopoly, would the House sanction it without strict limitation with regard to freights, and a hundred other matters affecting the public? This brings us to consider the meaning of the word monopoly. The hon. member for Halton says it is absurd to state that this Bill creates a monopoly. In the

strictest legal sense of the word it does not; for there is nothing to prevent other people building telegraph lines, except the fact that this Company would be so wealthy and powerful, and would so control the great avenues and business of the country, that no roads would have sufficient capital to compete with them. In the same way, if all the railways amalgamated, there would be a practical monopoly. The hon. gentleman suggests that bankers, newspaper men and others might combine and build lines of their own—that there is always some way in which the public can free themselves from the pressure of a monopoly. But I think that it is strange that there should be no remedy left to the public except such extraordinary measures. I conclude that we should not propose the limitations to the efforts of Companies unless they are companies to which special powers are given by the public, or unless the amendments of their charters are such as to create practical monopolies controlling the whole country, or a considerable portion of it. In those cases, I think it is not only our right but our duty to propose such limitations as are now under consideration. But the hon. member for Victoria says that the limitation as to ten words is very different from the limitation of the price to 25 cents. He told us, in a condescending manner, that he was willing to allow the House to put in the agreement because it was an agreement between the two companies. He was kindly willing to allow us to ratify anything that had already been done, but was quite unwilling to allow us to do anything to which the Company had not agreed. As far as I can see, the limitation as to the charge for words over ten is absolutely necessary in order to secure any general limitation as to the cost of a message that exceeds ten words. Otherwise, the Company could charge 5 or 10 cents a word over ten, so that really a limitation of 25 cents for ten words would not amount to anything. The hon. member says if we make this limit, it will give rise to what is called the packing of messages, or sending two or three in one. I cannot conceive of circumstances to which that could be done.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Company has now the power to prevent it, because it has no limitation.

Mr. CASEY. The thing has, heretofore, never been done to any extent, or the Company would have exercised its power to prevent it. The fact that they never had to raise the tariff shows this operation of packing has never been attempted. I apprehend the power to raise the tariff would be used in another way. The Company, under pretence of protecting themselves against packing, would raise the tariff on extra words for the purpose of obtaining larger profits; and it will be impossible for the public to say that the Company was wrong in thus acting. Another peculiar argument is that possible improvements in telegraphy might necessitate in increasing the tariff. I never heard before of an improvement in telegraphy that increased the cost of telegraphing; it has always been the other way, and it will be much more reasonable to provide that if the Company adopted improvements, they should reduce their tariff.

Mr. BLAKE. That is provided in another amendment.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It should be understood there is no wish on the part of this House to do any injustice to any one connected with this Telegraph Company. Had the Company not consented that a maximum rate should be imposed, it would have been unfair to impose a restriction upon it that is not imposed on others; but as the parties representing it agreed to this restriction, I had no hesitation in sustaining that section of the Bill which imposes it. The amendments now under consideration follows that, because the Company could neutralize that restriction entirely if they were to raise their tariff on words beyond the ten words.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would suggest that we should restrict land companies organizing in the North-West

from selling their lands at more than a certain price per acre. If we go into this system of new restriction, we may extend it indefinitely.

Mr. ROCHESTER. The burnt child dreads the fire. The name of the man who is at the head of this institution is quite enough to make the people of Canada careful how they pass laws for him to handle. That individual has preyed upon the vitals of the commercial community for years. He has made himself wealthy by levying blackmail on our commercial community. We have had, already, a little taste of this grand monopoly, for whatever legal gentlemen may say, common sense will teach us it is a grand monopoly. Immediately after the amalgamation we had to pay 25 cents for 20 cents, and immediately after that we had to pay the carrier boy 10 cents for delivering a message—making in all 35 cents instead of the former rate 20 cents. Hon gentlemen say they shall not be restricted to this one cent a word—I say they shall.

Mr. McDUGALL. Why?

Mr. ROCHESTER. From the simple fact that they charged 35 cents instead of 25 cents.

Mr. McDUGALL. Cannot the hon. gentleman charge what he likes for the beer he sells?

Mr. ROCHESTER. I do not sell beer. I have no more to do with selling beer than has the hon. gentleman. But if I had, and came here to get an Act of Parliament to sell beer, the probability is that the House would want to restrict me just as I want to restrict the vulture that is preying on the vitals of the community. Every man, big or little, rich or poor, from \$5 to \$500 must pay for that book. If he does not, notices are sent, not only throughout Canada, but the United States as well, saying: "Call at the office." Everybody that gets a book knows it. And then that gentleman's credit is gone, he is down if he has not capital enough to carry on his business. It is just so with a large portion of the commercial community who have not capital enough to carry on their business. They are afraid to say a word. They are under the ban of this vulture. They have not courage to say a word. The thing was brought up in this House a few years ago, but the trouble is there are too many members of this House in the same condition. They are afraid of this man, and I say the name of this individual throughout the country is quite enough to make this House very careful what privileges they grant to the man at the head of this great monopoly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This Bill does not provide a remedy for the case you put.

Mr. ROCHESTER. No; but I am only giving to the House the reason why I think they should restrict this Bill so that Mr. Wiman, who is at the head of the institution, shall not put on 2 or 3 cents, as you said, in place of one cent additional for every ten words. In fact, my own impression is that the Bill should have been thrown out of the House altogether. I do not think the Bill should have been brought before the House; I do not think the Committee should have passed the Bill as far as they have. The hon. member for Halton has said that he advised the Company to withdraw the Bill, and I think it would be a good thing for the country if they did withdraw the Bill. Now, I will only say that I hope this House will put every restriction in their power to prevent that individual from tyrannizing over the people of Canada, so far as the telegraph system is concerned.

Mr. CAMERON. I have only a word to say in reference to what has fallen from the hon. member for Westmoreland. His course of reasoning, I think, should lead him to vote against this proposed amendment about the one cent, because the Company do not agree to that, and only agree to the

Mr. McDUGALL (Halton).

other amendment in consequence of its being in the contract which they had entered into, while the one cent is not. Now, those of us who have had any experience of telegraphy in England know that there the rate is one shilling for twenty words, which includes addresses and signatures; but when there is one word more than that you have to pay three pence extra, that is to say, three pence for any number over the stipulated number, so that one extra word beyond the number cost six cents. Now, I would have no objection, inasmuch as the sole reason for objecting to the one cent is the fear that the Company will be victimized by this system of packing—and would have no objection if the amendment was put at 2 cents. The principle is only to charge one cent, there is no intention of increasing it, you might send ten additional words for 20 cents. And inasmuch as four-fifths, at least, of all the messages do not exceed ten words, the public would not practically suffer. It is the interest of the Company to encourage long messages rather than short ones, because as the address, signature and delivery are all the same, the more words there are in it the better it pays the Company, even at one cent a word. So the public would not suffer in any way, and I think it is unfair that the Company should be subjected to what would be an imposition on them, which they have every reason to believe would be practiced, if they were prevented from protecting themselves against this injustice.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think we are assured it is the intention of the Company not to charge more than one cent per word for each additional word beyond the body of ten words, and they can have no reason to complain if the House imposes a restriction to that extent. I had given notice of a motion exactly similar to that of the hon. member for Westmoreland, and I did it for this reason. It will be remembered that prior to the reduction of the rate from 25 cents to 20 cents for ten words the charge for each additional word was one cent per word, and it seemed to me, in view of the fact that the expenses of these companies will be very materially reduced by the reduction in the number of their offices, operators, and general expenses by consolidating the two companies, there can be no great hardship in imposing upon the Company the restriction that they shall not charge for each additional word beyond the body of ten words, more than one cent per word, particularly as the promoter has declared it is not the intention of the Company to make a greater charge than that.

Amendment, inserting the word "body", agreed to.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I move, that the word "twenty" be substituted for the word "twenty-five" in the said clause. I do it for the reason that we are now establishing in Canada what is really a practical monopoly. We know what has been the history of telegraphy in the United States in reference to the Western Union. A number of opposition lines have sprung up from time to time, have existed for only a short time, and have then been consolidated with the Western Union; and when you unite the whole of the present telegraph system of Canada—because the Mutual Union can hardly yet be called a telegraph system, although it has started its work and is doing it fairly well—when you undertake to unite the whole telegraph system of Canada under a combination such as this, with the backing of an enormous interest, it makes it simply impossible, unless something should occur in the United States to make the leading financial genius who has control of these telegraph companies on the other side, feel it to be his interest to drop the Western Union, and take up the Mutual Union of the United States, unless something of that kind should occur to maintain independent lines. I am satisfied none of these lines will exist in Canada, and that as this Mutual Union will sometime share the fate that the other smaller

companies have done in the past in the United States, this also will be wiped out of existence and bought up by this existing company. Under these circumstances we may fairly assume this Company will have, for all time to come, speaking in general terms, so far as we are concerned, at any rate, the monopoly of telegraphy in Canada. Now, we know that this Company had a 25 cent rate in the past with the opposition of the Peoples' Line and afterwards of the Dominion Line; we know that with the opposition of these lines and a 25 cent rate, and one cent for additional words, it was even then able to pay large dividends. I have here their sheet showing that from 1871 down to 1875, they paid 10 per cent. on their capital, and they paid this, I say, in spite of opposition during the whole of this time, more or less severe, of other telegraph companies in Canada, and they, moreover, paid it on a 25 cent rate. They have paid since that time $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and during the last three years, 7 per cent. They have succeeded in paying 7 per cent. interest on their capital, at a 20 cent rate, although they had the opposition of the Dominion line united as it was with the American Union, and this too at a time of very great depression in Canada, when business in that line was not so great as it now is. Under these circumstances, if we are going to unite the telegraph companies, to put them practically under one management, and to do away with the necessity for double offices, and different lines running into small towns, consolidating and concentrating the whole system under one management, I am bound to say I think that they ought to be able to do the service at as low a rate as they were able to do it and pay themselves 7 per cent., when they had the opposition of the Dominion Company, as was the case during the last couple of years. Under these circumstances, I do not think it is at all unfair to insist that we shall be continued with an amalgamated system in as good a position as we were in when we were in possession of two systems, as they existed in the past. I am aware it is said that during the last year, the Montreal Telegraph Company allowed their line to run down; and I see a statement made by Mr. Wiman, who takes no possible interest in this measure, who in fact would rather it was thrown out than otherwise, who is perfectly indifferent to the whole thing, notwithstanding that he has paid for columns and columns of so-called interviews in the public press of Canada, to show how much it is to the advantage—not of the Montreal Telegraph Company, but of the people of Canada—to have his benign influence over the telegraphic system of this country—declaring that they have paid out some \$150,000 since they got possession of this line for the purpose of putting the Montreal line in condition to enable it to do the work efficiently and properly. Well, Sir, that seems a very large sum of money. Where did they get it? I find that up to the last meeting of the Great North-Western Telegraph Company, all they had called in was \$50,000 of their capital. This is the statement made by themselves. Now they say they have spent \$150,000, and they have only called in from their shareholders \$50,000. Where did they get the other \$100,000—mind, I am giving Mr. Wiman's own statement. I will tell you where they got it. It is from their profit over and above the 4 per cent. which they paid to the Montreal Company, and the 3 per cent. which they paid to the Dominion Company on the working of this line during the first six months of the agreement. Then we all know in connection with telegraphy, the improvements are every year becoming very great. The announcement was made only the other day that the Great North-Western was putting in a new instrument, which is going enormously to reduce the cost of telegraphy. I saw the statement made the other day—I have no personal knowledge, and it seems to me an extraor-

dinary statement, yet it is made by a gentleman who is a thorough adept and experienced in these matters—that they have now an instrument by which they can send 1,000 words in a single minute. With the wonderful progress which is being made in electricity and the application of it to the necessities of life, one can readily understand that there will be great improvements of that kind going on. Under these circumstances, I think that it is not too much to say that as these two companies are combining, they ought to be able to give us, with the combined control and a monopoly of the whole business—and I do not use the word “monopoly” in the ordinary offensive sense of the word—as good rates as they were able to do when they were separate undertakings, and at a time when the Montreal Telegraph Company paid a dividend of 7 per cent. I beg to move, that the word “twenty” be substituted for the word “twenty-five.”

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will not be accepted by the Committee, as I do not believe that it will be in the interests of the public. While referring to this matter, I may say, Sir, I noticed with great regret a comment upon my action in the Railway Committee, in the paper for whose utterances I have usually very great respect. I inserted a clause preventing the Act having any bearing on the litigation now taking place; surprise was expressed as to what possible motive should have induced me to support the proposal to grant this amalgamation, and I feel bound, Sir, to say here, that the only motive I had was to endeavor to act justly towards this great Company, which comes before this House and asks for powers, which I thought were not unreasonable, and at the same time to consult what I believed to be the public interest. I believe, Sir, that the interests of the public are more likely to be promoted by allowing the amalgamation to take place, and thus enabling the work to be done in a satisfactory manner and at a fair and reasonable rate, than by rejecting the proposal to allow this amalgamation to take place, and leave us in the position of having companies unable to compete with each other without agreeing to charge a much higher rate than that which is at present charged. I believe, Sir, that the proposal to reduce the rate to 20 cents is unreasonable, and that it would not be fair to the interests involved to adopt it. The public interest, in my opinion, will be amply provided for by the proposal to fix the maximum charge at 25 cents and to supplement this by the additional amendment to which I think there is no objection. I consider that it follows as a corollary with the other, that for additional words, the charge should be 1 cent each; this appears to me to be a fair and legitimate restriction, but to go beyond this, and defeat the measure depriving this Company of the powers which they have a right to ask of this House—the same powers which were granted to a rival, the Dominion Telegraph Company, Parliament has decided to grant these powers of amalgamation to the Montreal Telegraph Company because they believe that the powers of amalgamation, with reference to railways and telegraphic companies, should both be obtained by special legislation, and that a case should be made out before such powers are sought for before Parliament which holds this control in their hands. I think that this is reasonable proposition, and the fact that the Montreal Telegraph Company is not allowed to amalgamate with this Company ensures competition. If money is to be made by transmitting messages at 25 cents for ten words, the maximum charge, and 1 cent each for additional words, we are quite certain to have competition. If, as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, believes,—we are on the eve of new discoveries—if in fact new and very great discoveries are taking

place, by which telegraphic messages can be communicated with much greater speed and celerity and at a much cheaper rate, we shall no doubt receive the benefit of this by the competition which will be thus excited; and if this service can be carried on at a cheaper rate than 25 cents, through the agency of any such means, we shall very soon have such competition established—just as the Dominion Company was organized in competition with the Montreal Company. I believe, therefore, Sir, that the interests of the public will be sufficiently protected, and, at the same time I would press upon the friends and promoters of this Bill the desirability of accepting without question the restrictions which have been offered, and which we consider to be legitimate restrictions, while I would ask our supporters in the House to prevent being carried what I believe is unreasonable, the restriction of the charge to 20 cents per ten words, as has been proposed by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat.

Mr. BLAKE. There is very much to be said in favor of the view that the great economies and facilities offered by this amalgamation, and which have been adverted to in very glowing terms by its promoters, will result as the member for Cardwell says. I think both the experience of the past and the hopes of the future will lead to the view that the tariff of 25 cents is extremely liberal. But at the same time, if it only can be carried in the future—if our hands can be kept entirely unfettered—if a motion something like what I have put in the notices paper can be carried, in that view we are not to be considered as interfering with the vested rights given by this Bill to continue the maximum of 25 cents. I am disposed rather to err on the side of liberality rather than otherwise, and leave the rate as the hon. the Minister of Railways would have left it, 25 cents for each ten words. Until, however, I ascertain that the Committee declines to keep the hands of Parliament perfectly free and insist on making the rate for all time to come, I propose to adopt the views of the hon. the Minister of Railways and not at the present moment vote for any reduction in the 25 cent rate.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the reason given by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) for proposing this rate is not a sound one. He says that when two companies like these amalgamate a number of persons are cut off, and the cost of operation must be reduced, and that therefore they should be in a position to reduce their rates. I think he overlooks the fact that though the cost may be reduced the returns are also reduced. Under the old management if a message was sent to a place in which there was only the office of another line the cost was 50 cents instead of 25, whereas now the rate will, of course, be the ordinary rate. As to the expense of delivering messages which was spoken of by the hon. gentleman, I was connected with a telegraph office for seven or eight years, and I never knew the rate to be collected although for distances of over a mile it is collectable I believe. It is apparent, from the pamphlets which have been circulated in the House, that business men who have used the lines since the amalgamation are well satisfied with the service, and the letters we have received point in the same direction, namely, that the amalgamation has produced greater efficiency in the management. I think that, considering the amount of capital invested in it, it would be unreasonable to restrict the Company in the manner suggested, as it would be likely to impair the efficiency of their operations.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). With reference to the amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), it is quite impossible that the Montreal Company could accept it, as its adoption necessarily means the breaking up of the arrangement with the Great North-Western Telegraph Company. It is utterly impossible for them to pay a dividend of 8 per cent. to the Montreal Company and 6 per cent. to the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Dominion Company, unless the rate of 25 cents be allowed instead of that of 20 cents, so that the fate of the Bill depends entirely on the rejection of the amendment offered by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). I wish, however, to call attention to the fact that Canada undoubtedly provides, even at the 25 cent rate, the cheapest and at the same time the most perfect and most complete system of telegraphy in the world. There is no other country so well supplied with telegraphic facilities at such a cheap rate, and the result of the adoption of this Bill to complete and make permanent this arrangement between the companies will be to ensure for all time—for ninety-nine years means for all of us—that our telegraphic communication shall never cost more than 25 cents for a usual telegram and one cent additional for every additional word. I think the country will be satisfied with the alteration when it is united to the certainty that that rate will be made permanent, and they will be satisfied that Parliament has only done its duty to a company that has invested so large an amount of capital by giving them security and permanence for the investment they have made.

Mr. GUTHRIE. In Committee I supported the 25 cent rate, as I did not think we had sufficient evidence to form a basis upon which to reduce the rate, and because I did not think that under the circumstances the 25 cent rate was excessive. What we should aim at is not merely to get cheap telegraphic accommodation for the public, but efficient and prompt work, and I think we have every prospect of having that secured by the arrangement between the two companies. I rose principally, however, to say a few words regarding an attack made upon Mr. Wiman, the President of the Great North-Western Telegraph Company. I do not think the hon. member can know Mr. Wiman. There are many hon. members who do know him, and who will agree that wherever he is known he is regarded as a man of honor and of business capacity, and that he is highly respected and esteemed. I think my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Rochester) has only ventured to say what he said regarding Mr. Wiman, because he is ignorant of his true character as a business man and a gentleman.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I do not know Mr. Wiman personally. I would not know him if he were to come into this House, but I tell the hon. gentleman and I tell this House that I have good reason to know him otherwise. I defy him or any other man to say a single word against my credit in any way, and yet I was blackmailed one end of the country to the other by this Mr. Wiman, and I am not the only individual who has been used in the same way. I went to the agent of the Merchants Bank in Montreal, who it was said had started the story, and he told me that my paper had often passed through the bank, and that he had never known a note of mine to become overdue or to go to protest. I never had a note of mine protested, and yet that man or his agent went to my agent in Montreal and demanded \$80 for his book time after time. My agent wrote to me. I wrote to him saying that I would have nothing to do with it, that I had nothing to do with a blackmail in my life and never would. The next day or the day after I was published from one end of all the States to the other, and from one end of the Dominion to the other as a bankrupt. If a vulture preying upon the commercial community is an honest man, Mr. Wiman is one, and if it is not, he is not an honest man.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 14,

Mr. BUNSTER. The American commercial agency system has done a great deal to discredit commercial men in Canada, and the sooner the Government take cognizance of the fact the better. A political opponent of a commercial

agent must be pretty careful or he is rated low. The commercial agency business in Canada ought to be watched with a jealous eye, and the sooner the hon. Minister of Finance directs his attention to the affair, the better for the business community of this country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I move as a proviso:

Provided always that all rates charged by any Company purchasing or leasing the line of the Montreal Telegraph Company under the powers by this Act conferred, as respects all classes of despatches, shall be at all times charged equally to all corporations and persons, and after the same tariff in respect of all despatches of the same class and description, transmitted under like circumstances; and no reduction or advance in any such rates shall be made, either directly or indirectly, in favor of or against any particular person or corporation sending or receiving despatches of the same class and description.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I would like the hon. gentleman to state what classes of despatches he intends this to apply to, and to state whether there is any grievance, existing or anticipated, to which it can apply.

Mr. WHITE. I have no hesitation in saying that the clause applied to press despatches, and without it, it would be in the power of this corporation simply to crush out any newspaper it pleased in Canada. If a newspaper does not choose to see eye to eye with the manager of the Company, all he has to say is that: "We will charge you \$100 instead of \$30 or \$40 for your despatches." There can be no objection to a clause of this kind, which does not fix the rate in any way, but leaves it to the Company to say what they will charge. Although there are only one or two newspapers which ventured to speak against this amalgamation, the press will find before they are a year older that a different result from that they anticipated has been come to. All I desire is to see that we shall have something left free from the influence of this Telegraph Company, and I think the best thing we can have free is the press of the country.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Does the hon. gentleman wish that the same charge shall be made to country newspapers as to city newspapers? The result of that would be to compel all the country weeklies in the Dominion to pay as much for their despatches as the city dailies, which they do not do now. The Company at present gives special facilities to country newspapers, by way of furnishing them market reports, &c., at a low rate; but a clause of this kind would render it impossible for the country newspapers to get any press despatches at all. Then again, the Telegraph Company is obliged to charge different rates for different classes of news to the same paper, and they very frequently make a special arrangement as to a particular message. For instance, I think you heard the other day that a speech of the hon. member for Cardwell, delivered one evening recently at Kingston, had been transmitted at the rate of 8 cents per hundred words, and it only cost him about 56 cents to publish that speech the next day for all the numerous readers of the *Montreal Gazette*. If the Company were compelled to lay down a stereotyped tariff, they would necessarily fix it at a maximum rate, and the result would be that my hon. friend and others interested in newspapers would be unable to get the benefit of those telegraphic facilities which under the existing rule they do get. It is a matter of indifference to the Company, but I understand of considerable interest to the country newspapers and their readers.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say that the reference made by my hon. friend from Halton the other day to an alleged report of a speech I delivered in Kingston was incorrect. The fact is there was no report of that speech at all. How does my hon. friend from Halton know the price and cost unless the matter has been communicated to him?

Mr. McDUGALL. I was told it by an operator.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). All I can say is that this is a specimen of the beginning of things under this new arrangement—that the private business of a private gentleman, contrary to the law, is thus exposed in a Railway Committee for the purpose of being used in a controversy of this kind. I say this is a matter that ought not to have been exposed.

Mr. McDUGALL. It was a public speech.

Mr. WHITE. But the contract for the transmission was not a public but a private matter. This incident shows that this kind of proceeding has been employed all through by Mr. Wiman. A contract made by a private party with this Company was a matter that should not have been made public, which should have been regarded as sacred. There was no report of a speech, but simply a short descriptive notice of the meeting. I do not think that the prices paid and the amount of work done was a very serious matter, as the hon. gentleman tries to make out. It is quite easy to say a speech was transmitted for 56 cents; but when there was only a short description of the meeting, involving some twenty-four minutes work of one operator in the transmission of about eight hundred words, the smallness of the operation will be understood.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Would it not operate against the country newspapers?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It would not. They get their despatches at the same rate as the evening newspapers in the cities, at so much a word.

Mr. BERGIN. This amendment would work most injuriously against the country newspapers, and to say those papers will receive their despatches at the same prices, is to say that they will be equally able with the city papers to pay those rates. I think there is some reason for proposing this amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell, and if he will strike out the words "reduction or," it will show he is desirous of having a fair rate established for both country and city purposes. I think this Company will establish a fair and just rate for newspaper work; and if we provide that no advance in these rates shall be made as against any newspapers or corporations, we shall have secured in effect what is desired. I do not think we ought to introduce the words "reduction or," for we would prevent the country newspapers getting their despatches at tolerable rates; and we know they cannot afford to pay such rates as are paid by the newspapers in the cities.

Mr. McDUGALL. I do not know the particular arrangement with regard to newspapers; but I am told by those particularly familiar with their means and operations, that it is totally impracticable. The hon. gentleman shows by his amendment that he either wishes the destruction of the country press or some other equally undesirable result. I understand that the telegraph operators in different parts of the country are active assistants of the newspapers in every part of the compass; but at all events they save them an enormous expense. The rates charged to the country newspapers are a mere bagatelle, and will satisfy them thoroughly. A clause that should compel the Company not to discriminate in favor of the cheaper and poorer press, would practically prove their annihilation, and ought not to be entertained for a moment.

Mr. BUNSTER. Mr. Gisborne has got a scheme before the Dominion that probably will call the attention of the country seriously to it. Within the next eight or ten days, he probably will have it completed. Every newspaper office will probably then have a telephone of its own, and correspondence from some thousands of miles. I am not able to say much about the inventor; but I received my information from Mr. Gisborne who is well known to the House and country for his many inventions. It would probably be

well to delay a vote on this matter for eight or ten days, to allow this gentleman's operations to be finished.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I think that in discussing this matter, we should be rather careful in our zeal not to go too far for the public good, in fixing the rate at 25 cents. We are going I think correctly on a very advanced principle; but in proceeding beyond that, in saying the Company should not charge more than one cent for every additional word, we are extending that principle perhaps a little too far. I took a good deal of interest in this Bill, because I have received more communications from people interested in this company than in regard to any measure before the House. My correspondents all urged the passing of this Bill in the protection of their interests, and I think we should be careful in protecting the public interest that we do not ruin the interest of private stockholders. While I can vindicate the rate of 25 cents for ten words and even one cent for each additional word, I think the proposal of the hon. member for Cardwell is preposterous. I think it springs from some personal interest of his own, as it seems the general opinion that it would be detrimental to the smaller newspapers. It would not be wise or right to give great advantages to great newspapers like the *Montreal Gazette* and crush out the smaller, including the country newspapers, compelling the Company to act on the hard and fast rule of doing for one set of paper the same as for all others. It would be simply preposterous. The hon. member for Cardwell is pressing this matter too much. He shows a degree of interest in this matter which leads us to think that he has some feeling and interest in it connected with his own paper. His proposal would seriously damage the small country papers, which have not the means to pay prices that can be borne by great dailies, like the *Gazette*, *Globe* and *Mail*. No one will say the country newspapers are not exceedingly useful, fulfilling their purpose well, nor that anything that makes it more difficult for them to fulfil their mission would be highly undesirable. They have great difficulty now, exposed as they are to the rivalry of the ably conducted city papers, without having additional difficulty imposed upon them in the attaining of news. I trust this amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). I cannot see how the interpretations put by hon. gentlemen on this clause can be put upon it. It only says that the same rate shall be imposed upon the same class of people for the same class of messages. I do not believe that the country newspapers get messages as cheap as the city newspapers; the latter get a great many more words, and it is the rule of all companies to deal most liberally with those who trade most largely with them. I do not believe this would be disadvantageous to country newspapers.

Mr. GUILLET. I can readily understand that a company like this contracting our whole telegraph system might reap vengeance on a newspaper which might have opposed its interests, and make less reasonable arrangements with it than with others. It would not be right to give it that power.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg further to move:

Adding to the clause 13a a provision that the Company shall not be entitled to avail itself of the powers of purchase, lease or amalgamation granted by the Bill, unless it be provided in the agreement therefor, that returns of the revenue and expenditure and of the operations of the Companies concerned therein in such form, as shall from time to time be prescribed by the Governor in Council, shall be laid yearly before Parliament.

It seems to me not unreasonable we should insert that provision. It is one which ought to be, I think, in all charters. Some objection may be taken, on the score of its not being in all charters. It may be passed as a general law at any time, but at present, as this amendment is reasonable in

Mr. BUNSTER.

itself, and also seems material in connection with the proposal I am about to make, that the privileges granted by the Act shall not be deemed to be infringed, should hereafter the rates provided be found to be exorbitant, and be reduced. I cannot see any objection to the amendment. We know that the railway companies are obliged to make returns in prescribed forms as the Governor in Council may from time to time require. There seems to be no reason, now that we are practically granting a monopoly, that we should not provide one of the conditions of the new creation to be the furnishing us yearly with this important information.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman admits that this is exceptional legislation, and a proper plan would be a general Act applied to all cases. I do not know why this particular Company should have the experiment tried on it of exceptional legislation. If the hon. gentleman thinks right and proper that every company, chartered by Parliament, should be required to make returns of this kind, let him introduce a general Bill for that purpose; but I submit that it is not right to hamper and embarrass this particular Company with the experiment of a clause of this kind. That might be well enough if applied seriously to all companies, but should not be applied exceptionally to this particular Company.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What harm will it do the Company to make any statement?

Mr. CAMERON. That is not the question.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will observe there are practically, as we know, two Companies—the Dominion and the Montreal—besides the Great North Western, which are concerned in the matter, and the clause proposes that they shall not avail themselves of the power of amalgamation unless the agreement provides that all companies concerned therein shall make their returns.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ascertain from the hon. member whether he means by that clause to exclude the Company from the exercise of the powers and privileges it now enjoys under its charter.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If this is to be applied only to the new powers granted under this Bill, I do not object to it, though I do not see very much good in it.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a tax to the proviso to avail itself of the new power. I will add the words "granted by the next preceding section" to prevent any possibility of doubt.

Mr. BERGIN. This is unnecessary as well as exceptional. There can be no doubt whatever that this Company is obliged to make annually its return to the shareholders. I do not see why we should be called upon to insert a clause of this exceptional nature. We are not to look upon this Company as dishonest, and intending to deceive the public as to their returns.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. I move the following amendment:—

Inserting after the clause 13a a proviso to the effect following:— Provided, also, that whereas inventions, improvements and economies in telegraphy may hereafter result in a great diminution in the cost of the service, so that the maximum rate herein provided may become wholly exorbitant, no Act of Parliament passed in that event and reducing accordingly the maximum rate herein provided, shall be deemed an infringement of the privileges granted by this Act.

Parliament has recognized it by imposing a restriction of a 25 cents rate, which restriction can only be justified on the supposition that this will be a practical monopoly. It seems to me the observations made by the hon. member for Cardwell—which are patent to all of us, and which have been reinforced with his usual ability and zeal by the hon. member for Vancouver, who has told us we are on the eve of great discoveries—render it extremely important that we should

look a little to the future. It may be said that Parliament should have the power, without this clause, to reduce this maximum. I admit that Parliament, of course, has the power to reduce the maximum. We all know that it would be regarded as an extremely violent thing, and that there would be tremendous appeals from shareholders and others, if there was no such clause in the Act as to the interference of Parliament. With reference to the railway companies we have provided in the original charters that they can be interfered with. With reference to the Bell Telephone Company we provided the same thing when we gave it exceptional powers a Session or two ago to carry their wires along the poles in the streets. This was objected to, and the Company replied that they could not do it in any other way, that there had not yet been sufficient discoveries, sufficient facilities obtained, to carry the wire under ground; but we expressly provided that in case it should afterwards be discovered that there was a means whereby these wires could be carried underground, it should be deemed no infringement of the privileges of the Act if Parliament should, under such circumstances, direct that they should be carried underground. When investigation was in its infancy and the invention was new, we thought that the hands of Parliament should be quite free to say in future, in case greatly improved facilities were discovered, to say to these gentleman: "Take your wires off the polls and put them under ground." In the same way in the present case, when we are on the eve of further discoveries, when we know that within the last few months great inventions have been made and a new instrument has enormously enhanced facilities and encouraged the cost of the service, it would be a great mistake to declare practically that the maximum rate should always be 25 cents. This Parliament should keep its hands free to create such a diminished maximum as shall be both just to the Company and consistent with the interests of the public.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BUNSTER. When you retired from the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I had just received a compliment from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), stating that I had afforded some information on this Telegraph Bill. Since then I have seen the promoter of what I consider will be a revolution in telegraphic operations in the Dominion, as well as on the continent. Such will be the revolution that our telegraphic arrangements will comparatively be done away with. I asked the Government to delay the Bill in the interests of the public, as I was in duty bound to do. Contrary to what Mr. Gisborne told me this morning, which was ten days, he now claims thirty. I therefore claim the indulgence of the House and withdraw my request to the Government, leaving them to do what they consider right in the interest of the Telegraph Company; nevertheless, from what I know is going to take place in the next thirty or sixty days, I am satisfied that my standpoint is correct. We all remember when the great American nation of 50,000,000 people failed in their attempt to send a cablegram across the Atlantic, America weakened on it but the Britishers did it. England came to our assistance, and hence to-day we, as Britishers, can well feel proud and boast that the cable across the Atlantic belongs to Britain and to British America. I also feel just as confident that the telephone, when the scientific gentlemen who now have it in hand shall have completed their arrangements, can operate 1,000 miles as well as it now operates 100 miles. We have no reason to lose faith that the scientific gentlemen will succeed in what they have been experimenting on for days and for months, and it is to be hoped that Canada will be able to say that we have completed a telephone system throughout the world.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). With all respect to my hon. friend from West Durham, I object to his third amendment as impracticable, illogical, and not in accordance with the first demonstration of the laws. His theory cannot be carried into actual practice. I confess my regret and my disappointment that this third amendment of my hon. friend has not come up to that standard of practical utility, which he usually adopts in all his utterances, especially when he founds them on the faith of an idea. The first thing I have to observe with reference to this amendment is, that it is wholly unnecessary. It is within the paramount power of Parliament to pass any legislation which it thinks proper on this or on any other subject without infringing on anything in this Act; my next observation is, that it is manifestly one-sided. It provides very carefully for a diminution of the rate, but wholly fails to provide for its increase. Now, it is just as likely as not that circumstances may occur hereafter which would render the contract made on the faith of this legislation, or already entered into by these companies now in question, unfair and onerous. It must be borne in mind that the Great North-Western Company has already undertaken the responsibility of paying to the Montreal Company a dividend upon their entire capital stock at the rate of 8 per cent. per annum for the next ninety-nine years, and they have no power to cancel that agreement, they have no power to reduce the dividend to 6 per cent. or to any other rate, they have no right to say that in consequence of the improvements which have been made it is impossible for us to earn as much as we expected; we are carrying on this business at a loss and therefore hope and expect and claim the right to be relieved from our contract; and yet under this amendment, if it be adopted, they will be placed in this position: that while their charge may be reduced by statutory enactment, their charge under no circumstances could be increased, and that improvements in telegraphy must not necessarily result in cheapening the service. It is quite true, that improvements in mere telegraphy would probably have that result; but you must bear in mind that there are a great many other branches of the telegraphic art—if I may apply this term—which come into daily competition, which competition is being daily increased with the telegraph system. Some reference was made just now to the telephonic system. Possibly some hon. gentlemen are not aware that the invention of this system has very greatly reduced the income of the telegraph companies, and is likely in the future to diminish it more. Between the cities of Hamilton and Toronto, the telephone is in daily and hourly use, day and night, and it is within my own knowledge that messages of one particular character, which were formerly sent from Osgoode Hall to Hamilton, and *vice versa*, to the number of hundreds every day by telegraph, are now almost without exception sent by telephone; and the profit of all this business goes to the telephone, instead of to the telegraph company. It was stated the other day in the Committee of the House, that a telephone company proposed establishing a continuous line from place to place along the whole front of Ontario and Quebec between Toronto and Montreal, and that for this purpose a series of links would be formed; for instance, Toronto would be connected with Whitby, thence to Cobourg, Port Hope, Belleville, Kingston, &c., all down the front of the Lake and River, the result necessarily being that a very large part of the business now done by telegraph between these places, if not almost the whole of it, will be done by telephone. The system of telephoning is progressing and becoming steadily more profitable. You will see, therefore, that this clause is practically entirely one-sided. It proposes that the Company shall be bound by the existing contract entered into for ninety or 100 years; but that Parliament may interfere and cut

down the rates on which this contract is based, and on the faith of which the Company has undertaken to pay 8 per cent. dividend to the Montreal Company's shareholders. To make it logical, it should contain another clause providing that in the event of the existing Act of Parliament being hereafter passed, all agreements and contracts previously entered into, may at the opposition of any company or person, be rescinded and cancelled. Now, I ask this House whether it is prepared to go into wholesale legislation of this kind and provide for cancellations and dissolutions hereafter on uncertain contingencies of contracts entered into on the faith of this understanding, for this would manifestly be the logical consequence of this resolution which the hon. member for West Durham has proposed to the House. The Montreal Company has wished to make a firm and certain contract, and to give a permanent value to their stock, removing it from the field of speculation, and for these reasons they think that this clause would be disastrous to their interests, and would render to a very great extent nugatory the permission which it is proposed by their Act to ask Parliament to give to them. Then, again, consider the extreme vagueness of it. We have no expectation—no immediate expectation—that the cost of telegraphy can in the near future, at any rate, be materially reduced. Parliament has the paramount power if totally altered circumstances arise, to interfere and alter this Act, without the necessity of having any such clause in this Bill. The clause is therefore unnecessary. It is unfair. It is one-sided. It is unpractical; and for all these reasons, on the part of the Company, I object to the passage of any such clause.

Mr. BLAKE. If without this clause, Parliament can do all that it implies, how is it so unjust, I want to know? how so unpractical? If it is quite unnecessary, why all these adjectives? These are obviously those which the hon. gentleman would apply to the proposed Act. If it happened to come before the House, then it would be urged how unjust this is! how impracticable it is! notwithstanding that you knew the state of affairs that existed, and notwithstanding the fact that the costs of telegraphy has been reduced; and how unjust it is, when you prescribed a maximum rate of 25 cents, and when you allowed us to enter into this amalgamation, and knew that we were going to amalgamate, how unjust now to demand such a modification. The hon. gentleman says that this amendment would now be extremely unjust. How much louder would the cry be if after this amalgamation had been effected under this Bill, any such change were proposed. Parliament of course has the power to modify any contract in matters within its legislation, and to so alter any Act it has so passed; but then the demand, which the hon. gentleman would make, would be for compensation. There is no reduction without parliamentary action; there can be no increase without parliamentary action, and if the Company applies to Parliament at some future day—and the hon. gentleman has not proposed to reserve the right for them—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You said there could be no reduction, but they may reduce without parliamentary action.

Mr. BLAKE. Not by law. There can be no reduction of the maximum without parliamentary action; no increase without parliamentary action.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By law?

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman told us that the clause was one-sided, but the House will notice that what the clause says is, that if Parliament in a later state of things should in its wisdom reduce them, they shall not interfere with the privileges granted to the Company, but if Parliament should decide that the maximum would be increased that would not be any infringement. It would simply be

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

giving them an additional privilege. The hon. gentleman says that the Company must be bound by its contracts, and that it is a logical sequence of our putting in this clause that all contracts entered into by them shall be valid. No. The Company has to make all the bargains with or without the clause, and Parliament having, as the hon. gentleman contends, paramount power to make or reduce the maximum. It may be so in case Parliament does determine to reduce the maximum; then the contract shall disappear. That is for the Company and those who contract with the Company do. And the hon. gentleman says he will take the risk of Parliament interfering in this clause when inserted; but I do not want it passed if our present liberal rate should be regarded as extravagantly liberal, that Parliament shall not have to continue to do what it is proposing to do to-day, viz., to show fair play between the Company and the public.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman has not satisfied the House, or, at all events, he has not convinced me, that there is any necessity for this clause on any ground of public policy. If Parliament has the right, as it undoubtedly has, at any time to interfere by its great power in the legislation of this country and modifying this Bill, why is it necessary to provide by this clause against its being an infringement of any privilege given by this Company? What purpose does it serve? It is assuming that Parliament, by interfering in such cases, is guilty of an infringement. Well, it is interfering now, and that objection is urged, but it does not seem to have had any influence on the House, nor do I think will it have in the present case; but I state what I believe when I say that the effect of this clause will be injurious upon the Montreal Company's property and stock. I say at once that I cannot believe that my hon. friend opposite would lend himself to any improper action on the part of those who are interested in putting up or putting down the stocks of the Company; but still by passing this clause you cast doubt on the value of the property of the Company; you throw suspicion upon it; you say that if any mention is made in future tending to cheapen or simplify telegraphy Parliament may interfere and cut down the rates. One hon. member tried to persuade us to-night that we are on the eve of a great invention which would revolutionize telegraphy, and that therefore we should not give them those powers because a reduction might shortly occur. Well, we all know the effect of these pretended inventions—how they take hold of the public mind, and the effect of keeping this condition suspended over the two millions of dollars of property of the Company. Of saying to the world that Parliament has been invited to cut down the rates of the Company, will have no doubt an effect upon the stock. There is no doubt but those interested in stock speculations will use that fact for their own purposes. I cannot see any honest, fair ground for passing the clause, inasmuch as it gives us no additional power to what we have. As such a provision seems of no public use, and as it may produce great injury to the value of the property, I think it is the duty of Parliament to refuse to assent to this proposition.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) reads as follows:—

Inserting after the clause 13a a proviso to the effect following:—Provided, also, that whereas inventions, improvements and economies in telegraphy may hereafter result in a great diminution in the cost of the service, so that the maximum rate herein provided may become wholly exorbitant, no Act of Parliament passed in that event and reducing accordingly the maximum rate herein provided, shall be deemed an infringement of the privileges granted by this Act.

I do not see any real necessity for this amendment, because Parliament will always have the right, in the event of the state of things arising contemplated in the amendment, of incorporating another company, and thereby bringing about

a reduction of rates if they prove to be exorbitant. Another objection which I have to the amendment is this : that it is not necessary to save the rights of Parliament, because those rights always remain, and besides, the effect of the clause would undoubtedly be to lower the value of the Company without giving us any real power that we have not to-day. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman should not insist on his motion, but I, for one, will certainly oppose it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. It appears to me that when the Company has asked for power to amalgamate, and we have with great reluctance, so far as some of us are concerned, granted that power, we have a right to impose certain limitations on the exercise of their franchise. Well, we have done so. We have skipped out of the usual course, and said that the Company shall not receive more than 25 cents for ten words and no cent for each additional word. It might happen in the future, and that before long, that telegraphic science may make such advances that the operations of the Company may be carried on at a much cheaper rate than at present. The cost would be much less, and there ought therefore to be the power at some future time, without the sense of interfering with vested rights, of this Parliament stepping in and cutting down the rates which we now say are sufficient. It is said that we have that power. Theoretically we have; but I understand it to be a pretty well settled principle that where a company is chartered with certain branches and certain rights, those branches and rights become a vested interest which should not be interfered with; and if that is so, we have a right to indicate that while granting the increased powers which he have granted to this Company, we wish them to understand that in altered circumstances and without violating the principles to which I have referred, we can cut down their rates. I am therefore unable to see the force of the argument that we have the power already. We have the power but not the right without compensation; and I want it placed on the Statute-book, that we have a right to interfere with these franchises in the public interest without compensation. I shall, therefore, with much pleasure, support the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. There is, I think, a very serious difficulty in the way of the adoption of the motion of the hon. member for West Durham. In the first place, it is placing upon the Journals of Parliament a declaration which I think carries us too far—a declaration that we cannot become parties to modifications in an Act or charter that is brought before us without incurring certain obligations to surrender the power this Parliament possesses. But that is not the principal objection which I have to this motion. It is admitted that unless cheaper means of establishing telegraphic communication are invented, we are bound by this compact between the Company and Parliament, fixing certain rates. Now, I stated to the Committee, when this question was before it, that the Government had under its consideration the question of taking over the whole telegraphic system of this country, and that we had decided that it would be cheaper, if such a policy were adopted, to construct telegraphic lines ourselves than to pay the price we at present would have to pay to acquire this system. Now, there is no barrier that you could oppose to such a movement on the part of the Government of the day, whoever they may be, greater than the adoption of the motion now before the House, for this reason: that if it would be an injustice to this Company to reduce the rate below 25 cents under any circumstances, because they have allowed us to fix the maximum on this occasion, then I say it would be ten-fold a violation of the

compact made if, having made this arrangement with the Company, we next year proposed to establish competition all over this country by establishing telegraphic lines in the hands of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say, therefore, that this is a barrier in the way of that free and independent action of Parliament, which it may find necessary in order to meet what is held to be a monopoly, and that the power of the Government and the power of Parliament would be hampered in taking that very action which we hold it ought to be essentially in a position to take at any time the public interests require it.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems to receive that in a manner which indicates that the argument has not much weight with him; but all I can say is this: that on the grounds on which the hon. gentleman bases this resolution, we oppose it; it implies that there is a compact between this Company and ourselves to maintain that rate unless in the contingency I have adverted to. I do not think we should place ourselves in that position. They come here and ask for powers of amalgamation, which the House appears disposed to grant them, in consideration of certain terms which we have dictated, and that is the fixing of a maximum rate of charge. I think that is going far enough. I quite agree with the motion the hon. gentleman has made in reference to returns. I do not see any reason why he should not have these returns made, although I confess I would rather see this requirement embodied in some general Act that would apply to all telegraph companies, and I think it would be quite proper, when the Mutual Telegraph Company's Bill comes before us, to embody a similar provision in it. But I cannot go further and support the hon. gentleman in his motion, because if it is held that this is a compact between Parliament and the Company, there is an implied intention on our part of not promoting that vigorous competition which may be found necessary under the operation of this Act. I trust, therefore, that the Committee will not adopt this resolution, as I feel that it will fetter our hands, and interfere with the wholesome exercise of the power which Parliament possesses over that Company.

Mr. BLAKE. It is certainly a far-fetched objection to my motion to say that it prevents the Government and the Parliament of this whole Dominion from doing that which any five individuals in the community may do under the law as it stands. I believe it requires but five, under the General Act, to incorporate themselves as a telegraph company. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he is virtually repealing that Act? Does he mean to say that we are bound to prevent anybody else from forming a company? Surely not. We do not agree that these people shall be monopolists, although we say that the effect of the Bill is to make them monopolists. I cannot conceive that Parliament can be held to be tying its hands in the sense the hon. gentleman suggests by the passing of this clause.

Mr. PLUMB. During the whole of this discussion I have not uttered a word. I have no interest in this matter at all; but a sense of justice impels me, at this state of the debate, to interpose and say a few words in justification of any possible necessity which may arise for me to record my vote on this matter. The Montreal Telegraph Company was chartered at an early day, when telegraphing was a new art. The gentlemen who put their money into that Company, sunk their whole capital. I think that is a sufficient answer to the hon. member for Cardwell, who has asserted that those gentlemen have drawn 7 per cent. on their capital. They ought to draw a good deal more to com-

pensate themselves for having risked absolutely and made worthless their whole capital, for there is nothing in their telegraph poles and wires that will bring back money, and 7 per cent. does not compensate them. Then those gentlemen took the risk of inventions, however deficient or non-deficient. I do not think the member for West Durham has given to this House a sufficient reason for adopting the amendment which he has proposed in saying if there is any new improvement by which telegraphing can be more cheaply performed, these gentlemen who have stood in the fore front and given us lines when they were not paying, would get the benefit of it. Why should they not be entitled to the benefit of it? It is their privilege and advantage, if any new or cheaper method of telegraphing can be devised, to enjoy the advantage of it. They took the old, cumbrous system; they have witnessed one or two advances or improvements that inured to their benefit, and are entitled to any further improvements. I did not relish very much the union of those companies with an unknown company in the west; but it has become a fixed fact, and the proprietors of the Dominion and Montreal companies are in this position, if this agreement is not carried out, they will be largely injuring their properties, and if the stock goes down there is no reason in the world why the large operator in the telegraph stock should not make use of a greater disadvantage to the people of Canada than the rejection of this Bill. You cannot possibly conclude commercial operations of that sort that will be governed by the course of the market, by the rise and fall of stock, and no legislation here will prevent anybody from going into the market to become the possessor of that stock, and either directly or indirectly overthrow those companies. You may pass as many laws as you like, but the law of supply and demand in the market will rule the matter. The Dominion was chartered as a rival to the Montreal Company, with which it had a right to amalgamate. This Company is asking nothing more, and when they claimed to be put on a par with the other Company, we say that in the first place they should be restricted to 25 cents for ten words. The price was not reduced to that, but with those charters originally granted was set that restriction. Then we had another restriction, which I understand will be adopted that they shall only charge one cent for every word above ten. Now, we are asked to say that in view of any possible improvement or invention which this Company may obtain, and which it has as good a right to use as a railway company has to avail itself of improved machinery, a better track or steel rails, it shall be fined. That is practically the effect of the amendment of the member for West Durham. A sense of justice compels me—without having any communication with the Company, or anything more than the feeling which any man who sits in the House and in its Committees and listens to their debates, ought to have—to say that I think the amendment would be an injustice to the shareholders of the Company. I am not going into the discussion as to its President, whether he is obnoxious to Canada or not; but I think of the shareholders of the Montreal Telegraph Company in this matter, and object to any legislation which will make its shares any longer a football in the market of Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). One must be considerably astonished at the opposition this amendment meets with from those friendly to this Bill, or to the clause to which the amendment was made. What are the arguments advanced? In the first place, the hon. member for Halton argues that improvements have taken place in telegraphy and in telephoning, so that the telephone is now used or may be used extensively instead of the telegraph, and that the Company may find itself injured by an opposition of that kind. I may say that they may also use the telephone, so that if there is any value in this operation, they can enjoy it to

Mr. PLUM.

the fullest; and having both telegraphy and telephone they have a decided advantage over any company possessing only one. So there can be no objection to the amendment on the ground that this Company may suffer serious injury on this score. Then we have the argument of the hon. member for Niagara, that it is going to injure the stock of the Montreal Telegraph Company, with a powerful appeal against the stockbrokers who have been making a football of this stock. What is the fact? This is not a question that affects beneficially the stock of this Company at all. These clauses are all contingent on the amalgamation. If it takes place the North-Western Company is bound to pay 8 per cent. to the Montreal Company for 96 years. So there is no danger that the stock of that Company being affected in the slightest degree by any clause in this Bill. They so fixed the quantity in the meantime that it will so remain, unless those gentlemen will withdraw their Bill. So there is nothing in the argument that will injure the stock of the Montreal Company. Then we are told by the hon. the Minister of Railways—and I am bound to say that, for a gentleman of his ability, his argument shows it was impossible to find anything like a good argument—that if we pass this amendment, we shall break a compact with this Company—if this Parliament should ever charter a new company or permit the Government to build a new telegraph line, and take the telegraph system into their own hands. There is nothing in this clause to effect this in the slightest degree. What is the clause? We have put into the Bill a maximum rate of 25 cents, and have declared that if it amalgamates, the maximum rate for Canada shall be 25 cents for ten words and 1 cent for every additional word. We desire to go a step further and have said: If, at any time, the Company, which is not before us now, but is working these lines, and which is paying 8 per cent. to the shareholders of the Montreal Telegraph Company, and 6 per cent. to those of the Dominion, still make an enormous profit out of proportion to the capital put in, this Parliament will be justified in reducing the rates, and such reduction will not be considered as a violation of any vested interest. We have heard a great deal about the Montreal Company and the sympathy they are entitled to, but who are the Great North-Western Company. The whole amount of their capital was \$50,000, according to their own statement; and if the stories on the street be true, the distribution of the \$50,000 held by a number of gentlemen was simply a distribution of paid-up stock granted to them for the purpose of obtaining their names as directors of the Company. That was really the fact with reference to the distribution of stock held by Canadians. Whether that was true or not, there is nothing in this clause affecting the North-Western Company, unless they considered it so serious a menace to their future profits that they preferred to withdraw altogether from the arrangement; and in this way the Montreal Company might be affected injuriously, though I think it would be to its advantage. If this Bill passes with that clause in it, and the North-Western Company complete their bargain, they are bound for ninety-six years to give to the Montreal Company 8 per cent., nothing more or less; so that we need not be the least alarmed as to the effect of this on the Montreal Company's stock.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not agree with the hon. member for Cardwell, when he says this amendment, if passed, will not affect the Montreal stock. The effect is, that if discoveries are made in telegraphy which will render the telegraph systems cheaper, this Parliament will reduce the rate to 20 cents or 15 cents according to circumstances. I have no doubt, if the Great North-Western Company be well advised, as it has been, it will stipulate in its agreement with the Montreal Company, should this amendment be carried, that should Parliament, at any time, reduce the rate, the agreement shall become of no effect, or the dividend be

reduced *pro tanto*. Further, for a month or two before every Session of this Parliament, brokers and others interested in stock-jobbing will raise rumors of applications being made for the purpose of reducing rates, and the stock will be liable to serious fluctuations. Are we going to sanction a clause that will favor such a state of things. It is certainly not one in the interest of the shareholders or the public.

Mr. BRECKEN. I shall vote against the proposed amendment, because the most that can be said for it is that it is merely a notice to the Company that possibly, if great improvements take place in telegraphy, the rates may be altered. I am won over to a great extent to this opinion by what was stated by the hon. Minister of Railways, that should we adopt this amendment it might be a barrier in the future to the Government taking hold of the telegraph system. In Prince Edward Island we labor under a very great hardship. As far back as 1852 an Act was passed to incorporate the Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island Telegraph Company, to construct land lines across the island and lay a cable to New Brunswick. Some few years after this cable was broken and communication interrupted. After several Acts were passed, in 1869, an Act, 37 Vic., Chap. 34, was passed granting to the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company, who had meantime complied with the Act of 1862, and thus maintained their charter of 1854, a perpetual monopoly to land cables upon Prince Edward Island, a perpetual subsidy of £600 equal to \$2,000, and authority to add 50 cents plus the relative proportion upon extra words over and above the previously existing tariff rates. To send a message from Prince Edward Island to the mainland costs us 75 cents. We have to pay 50 cents on the usual rate, and so in proportion for every word above ten words. When the hon. member for West Durham was Minister of Justice, an Act was passed in 1875 in the Legislature, by section 17 of which it was provided:

"This Act shall not affect any franchise, right or privilege which the New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company, or any other company or person lawfully entitled thereto, may have actually acquired and exercised or operated in Prince Edward Island."

We have heard a very warm and interesting debate as to whether the tariff shall be 20 cents or 25 cents, and how far the price should be restricted. What would hon. members say if they represented a Province where we have to pay over and above the ordinary tariff 50 cents for every ten words and in proportion for every ten words. The only hope I see of this monstrous monopoly being done away with is in the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that the whole telegraph system may some day come under the control of the Government. I am not going to occupy your time by enquiring how far we are justified in amalgamating this Company. That is better understood by hon. Ministers who have taken more interest in it than I have, but I look forward very anxiously to the day when Prince Edward Island will be relieved of this monopoly which is weighing down its commercial prosperity. I do not go in for repudiation, although I should say that this Act was passed at the instance of Liberal Government in Prince Edward Island, and we are now smarting from its effects. When we have to pay a tariff of 75 cents for what was fixed at 50 cents we are deeply interested in getting that relief from the Government which we have a right to expect.

Mr. JONES. I am inclined to agree with the remarks of the hon. members for Halton (Mr. McDougall) and Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), that the effect of this Bill will be to encourage stock-jobbing on the markets of Montreal. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) appears to argue that because this Bill has passed through the Railway Committee it is a fixed fact, as he says. Now, I think

a great deal of legislation is brought to this House in a very crude state from the different Committees, and I think the legislation is shoved through in a summary way, and it behoves us to watch more closely than we do the legislation which is sent us from those Committees. Now, with regard to amalgamation itself, I have always opposed the amalgamation of telegraph companies, and I think that in arguing with regard to the rates we are going beyond the question properly before us. This Company was refused amalgamation some time ago by this Parliament, and what does it do? Why, it goes off and amalgamates under the Great North-Western Bill, which was partially smuggled through this Parliament, and then they come back here for us to ratify that amalgamation. When we refused to allow them to amalgamate they did so in spite of us within six months, and now they come back here and ask us to ratify it. I have always opposed this amalgamation; I have opposed the Bill *in toto*. The moment the amalgamation was made, although they were working a single line with a less staff and a less expense, what did they do? Why, they at once raised the rate from 20 cents to 25 cents, and the public suffers. If the Dominion Telegraph Company was making money even at the 20 cents rate, and working in opposition to the Montreal Company, how much more money was the Montreal Company making? This Company can well afford to guarantee the Montreal Company 8 per cent., and I dare say they would be willing to make an arrangement to give 8 per cent. more. If it comes to a vote I shall oppose amalgamation altogether. This is all bosh talking about widows and orphans. We do not come here to legislate for sentiment, but for the interests of the public, and I think if we can have a 20 or 15 cents rate, we ought to have it. When did this Company begin? Why, it begins with that very Company. The Mutual Company and all the others will soon say: "We will sell out to this grand establishment, we will have a regular monopoly through the whole of this country." There will be another Company starting up, as the Dominion Company did, and ask for amalgamation. For my part I shall oppose this Bill in so far as amalgamation is concerned.

Mr. SNOWBALL. I shall have to support the amendment now before the Chair. Hon. gentlemen supporting the Bill have said that this was the pioneer company, and was the best and cheapest telegraph service in the world. I think that is, to some extent, open to doubt. It may be that it was the pioneer company, but I remember when the Dominion Telegraph Company was formed and when it complained very bitterly of the arbitrary conduct of this Montreal Company. As soon as the Dominion Company got protection, then the Montreal Company appeals to this Parliament to give them additional powers. Now, Sir, as long as they had power over the weaker company, their affairs went on very nicely; but matters have changed. As soon as they find the tables have turned, and that the Dominion Company have got the ascendancy, they want further protection. I think the statement that our telegraph system at the present time is the cheapest and best in the world cannot possibly be sustained. It is by no means best. It may be a very fair system; for so young a country as ours, it is possible a pretty good one. But that it is good in comparison with the British system, I entirely dispute. I also deny that it is cheap in comparison with the system in Great Britain. I think the hon. member promoting this measure stated that under the English system the address and signature were charged for.

Mr. CAMERON. No, I stated that they charged for words beyond the stipulated numbers, for one word as much as for five. For each five words additional they charge three pence, so if you send one word beyond twenty words it costs you three pence more.

Mr. SNOWBALL. In many respects the English system is a great improvement on ours. You can send a telegram to the most remote part of the Kingdom for a shilling. If at a distance from a telegraph office you can post your telegram at any post-office box. These are taken possession of every hour, sometimes sooner, and carried to the telegraph office without any inconvenience to the sender whatever. The delivery is also free of charge. In no case is there any charge beyond a shilling for twenty words. It is true they do not make any distinction between twenty and twenty-five words, each additional five words over the twenty costs three pence, but the rate of twenty words for one shilling is just one-half what we pay in this country. Now, we are told by hon. gentlemen that if this Company amalgamates with others and charges additional rates, all we have to do is to build additional lines to secure competition, that companies will at once spring up and build additional lines over this country. Now, how can companies spring up and build additional lines. Has not the Minister of Railways given to this very Montreal Telegraph Company the exclusive right of building lines along the whole length of the Intercolonial Railway? If he has done this, how is it possible for any other opposition company to extend lines along this railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. SNOWBALL. Then it has been done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I did not do it.

Mr. SNOWBALL. Then the hon. gentleman allowed it to be done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. BOWELL. Who did it?

Mr. SNOWBALL. I do not know. But it has been done and this is all that the country wants to know, in the meantime. If no other company can build opposition lines, how are we to get redress, if this Company takes advantage of the Bill permitting amalgamation. This Company having the exclusive right, when the Dominion Company wished to extend its lines into the Maritime Provinces, they could not do so; or, at all events, they were unable to get right of way along the track of Government railways, because that had already been granted to the Montreal Telegraph Company, which Company also has the exclusive right from many other railway companies, including the Grand Trunk, the Great Western, and branch lines in the Lower Provinces. We know the great telegraph companies will not build lines except along railways at the present day. The lines which are run along highways are too expensive to keep up, and, in order to make a profit, they must build along great lines of railway. This is the only route which they can follow. If this be so, how is it possible to get other companies to build lines in opposition to this Company, even if the rates charged are excessive. All we have to do is to grant the privileges that are asked for in this Bill; and in a large portion of the Dominion, and in the Maritime Provinces particularly, it will be impossible for the people to get redress. It is necessary for us to be particular in guarding ourselves when this Company comes before us to get its charter altered. If they do not want it on these terms, let them proceed under the Act they have, and they can then charge what they like, subject to fault-finding only on the part of the public. But when the Company asks Parliament for additional powers, we must see that the interests of the mercantile community and of the people are most carefully guarded. The amendments, I maintain, do not go far enough. Still, as I find a disposition in this Parliament to accede all it possibly can to the Montreal Telegraph Company, I will willingly join in granting these additional powers, but in consideration of their being granted I want as many safeguards, as we can reasonably claim, made for the preservation of the interests of the public.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

Mr. PLUMB. My hon. friend from Leeds misapprehended what I said in the few remarks which I made in respect to the Committee. I did not say that because this Bill passed the Committee, it was a fixed fact. I had not the slightest idea of anything of the kind. It passed the Committee, came down to the House and is now here for its consideration. My hon. friend misunderstood me entirely. I only intended to say that the contract between the two companies made the amalgamation in some form or other a fixed fact, and I thought that to reject the Bill would be to play into the hands of the stockbrokers. The Committee had nothing to do with the original contract. In some form or other, the companies were to be amalgamated either with or without the consent of Parliament, and if this Parliament rejects the Bill, the stock will become a football in the stock market, and powerful people who wish to monopolize the stock, would buy it at their own price. The argument of the hon. member for Northumberland is simply an argument in favor of the Government assuming the telegraph lines. I would be very glad if the Government, sometime or other, would see their way to do such a thing; and the very fact that the Government can assume these lines, and get control of them, is one of the objects on which I depend to prevent any abuse of the telegraph system in this country. I may say the hon. gentleman has not properly stated to the House that the Montreal Telegraph Co. has no privileges in the Maritime Provinces. It extends a line to Brockville and that is all. We depend on other lines for the transmission of intelligence there; we have not come here to have their progress either curtailed or extended. We must depend on them, and therefore that part of the hon. gentleman's argument falls utterly to the ground. I trust that the House will see that the amendment brought in by the hon. member for West Durham is exactly in the same sense as if he were to ask us to provide that we should interfere with railway traffic and reduce the charges on telegraph lines, because some improvement was made by which a locomotive was run with less fuel or because of some improvement in railway tracks. That is the whole story, and if we are prepared to go so far as that, then we might adopt his resolution, but not otherwise. If we are prepared to adopt his amendment it will kill the Bill that is before us, for it is sustained by those who, I know, are desirous of defeating the Bill, and the adoption of this proposition would be the readiest means of accomplishing their object.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not think that the mover of this amendment, or any gentleman who has supported it, has succeeded in making out a case which at all justifies it. It is quite true, the new discoveries and new improvements may be made in telegraphy before long; but if they are, depend upon it, the discoveries of these inventions will be the means of forming companies which will come to this House and ask for charters to enable these improvements to be brought into use. In all probability, the Montreal Telegraph Company may not have one cent of interest in such companies, and it is not at all likely that it would be able to get any interest in them. There is nothing, at all events, that prevents the promotion of new companies, nor is there anything that will prevent this Parliament, even if this amendment could not be introduced into this Bill, from altering this Bill, as it is now before the House, at any future period. The hon. member for Cardwell said that this stock was being made a football of by stockbrokers, particularly on St. François Xavier street. I do not know any way—

Mr. WHITE. That was said by the hon. member for Niagara.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. member for Niagara was right. There is no way in which it may more readily be made

the football of stockbrokers than by passing this amendment. What would be the effect? Before the next meeting of this Legislature, all sorts of rumors would be circulated through the streets of our different cities, and in all probability, petitions would be presented to Parliament asking for amendments to the Act. The effect of all this would be that their stock would be made a football of, it would fall in price, until people would sell the stock; and the same thing would be repeated at each succeeding Session, to the great loss of honest holders—many of these being women—of the stock, and to their great loss of capital. This would occur Session after Session, until the new discoveries and inventions, of which the hon. gentleman who has introduced the amendment has spoken, were brought into use. The object of this Bill, as I understand it, is to enable the Montreal Telegraph Company to carry out its engagement with the Great North-Western Telegraph Company. It is looked upon, at all events, by a great many that the contract entered into between these two companies now is illegal, and the consequence of passing this amendment may be that the Great North-Western Company may refuse to enter into an arrangement with the Montreal Telegraph Company; and we all know, Sir, that the Montreal Telegraph Company was almost on the verge of bankruptcy when they entered into this arrangement which gives 8 per cent. to their shareholders for so many years, this dividend being guaranteed by the Western Union, the strongest telegraph company on this continent. Are we prepared to so imperil the interests of our own people—the holders of this stock—as to pass an amendment like this, that may prevent them from rescuing their property from destruction? It may be that although the Great North-Western Telegraph Company may not go so far as to refuse to enter into a contract with the Montreal Company, it may make such stipulations as will so reduce the value of the stock to its holders as to do infinite damage to them, and they may insist upon reducing the interest from 8 to 6, or even 4 per cent, or less, if the amendment passed. For these reasons I shall vote against it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I rise to call the attention of the House to the sense of fairness entertained by my hon. friend for Cardwell (Mr. White). He said the clause was perfectly fair and would work no injustice, because the contract between the Great North-Western Company and the Montreal Company was a fixed fact—that the former Company had to pay the other 8 per cent. dividend, no matter what the rate was. But if Parliament reduced the rate it would manifestly be unfair to hold that Company to a contract under which it would have to pay 8 per cent. The hon. gentleman says this Company need not be afraid of the telephone company, because it has the right to use its own lines for telephone purposes; but he forgot that the whole telephone system was in the hands of the Bell Telephone Company, and that no other company has the right to use their system, as they would be infringing on their patents. If hon. gentlemen wish that the stock of this Montreal Company shall continue to be the butt of the stock-jobbers and stockbrokers of Toronto and Montreal, they had better adopt this clause, because no more ready way could be devised of making the stock uncertain and the subject of continual speculation than by adopting this clause.

Amendment negatived on a division.

On clause 14,

Mr. BURPEE (St. John) moved:

To amend the 14th section by providing that the Company shall not be entitled to avail itself of the powers of purchase, lease or amalgamation, contained in the 13th section, unless it be provided in the arrangement therefor, that the maximum rate of 25 cents for ten body words shall apply to all messages sent from any point to any other point within the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brun-

wick, over any of the lines of any of the companies connected with or operated under such purchase, lease or amalgamation, had or procured.

He said: I hope the promoters of this Bill will see their way to accepting this amendment, as I think it is one which it will be in the interests of the amalgamating companies to accept. It is well known that the effect of this Bill will be to put the whole telegraph system of the Dominion under the control of the Western Union. It will extend from Sarnia to Sackville, a distance of 1,250 miles, and the distance beyond that in British Columbia will be very short indeed. Under the Bill you could send a message 1,250 miles for 25 cents, but unless amendment is made they too may charge 40 or 50 cents if the message is sent another mile.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). We have no objection to the amendment if the hon. gentleman will strike out the words "connected with, or" in the last line but one. I may say that although the Company has a connection with the Western Union we cannot possibly assume to control the rates of the latter, as it is a powerful corporation to which we cannot pretend to dictate as to rates.

Mr. BURPEE. The Dominion Company, previous to the amalgamation, had lines through New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. If I were sure that they would give us the same privileges that the Dominion line gave us I would have no objection to striking out the words mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON. Whatever lines were amalgamated under the provisions of this Bill, we understand shall be subject to the same 25 cent rate.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the Dominion Telegraph Company had at one time a considerable network of lines in the Maritime Provinces. Has there been any alienation of any portion of those lines, or is the system as complete as it was established by the Dominion Company?

Mr. CAMERON. The Dominion Company leased their entire system to the American Union, it was afterwards transferred to the Western Union, and afterwards to the Great North-Western. My own impression is that the Western Union work those Dominion lines connected with the cables in order to maintain their local connection, while the local business is carried on by the Great North-Western. I understand that it is intended, so far as New Brunswick is concerned—I have had no communication with reference to Nova Scotia—that the rates there shall be the same as in Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. ANGLIN. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the lines erected by the Dominion Company will pass under the control of this amalgamated company, and therefore be subject to this provision with regard to the maximum rate. If that be so, it will meet our case to a very great extent. I think it would also be desirable to extend the same rule to Nova Scotia, through which the Dominion Company have extended their line. At present it seems to be unfair that while messages may be sent for a thousand miles through Ontario and Quebec for 25 cents, it should cost 50 cents to send a message from Ontario or Quebec to the Maritime Provinces, perhaps only half the distance. For some time past the rate from Ottawa to St. John has been 30 cents, but it may be 50 cents, as it was formerly, unless we are protected. As I understand the clause, however, it will apply to Nova Scotia as well as to New Brunswick.

Mr. CAMERON. Wherever the Great North-Western extends in its operations, we are perfectly willing that the rate should be subject to the 25 cent. rule; but with regard to the lines owned or controlled by the Western Union, we have no power to dictate to them, and for that reason I wished the words "connected with" struck out. We are perfectly willing that every thing we do under

the powers you are giving us should apply to the Maritime Provinces as well as to Ontario and Quebec. More than that we cannot do.

Mr. BURPEE. The heading of all the telegraph blanks of this Company is "Montreal and Dominion Telegraph Companies' lines, operated by the Great North-Western Telegraph Company of Canada." That, I think, indicates that this Company has control of the Dominion Telegraph Company, as it will have of the Montreal Company if this Bill passes; therefore I claim that whatever benefits accrue from this amalgamation to Ontario and Quebec should extend to wherever the Dominion lines exist.

Mr. DOMVILLE. While I should like to see the 25 cents rate established in New Brunswick, I do not think that it is necessary to make any alteration in this Bill that will embarrass this Company, because we all know that the Montreal line comes to Sackville, and that from that point to St. John and on to Nova Scotia the lines belong to the Western Union. If I remember rightly, the Dominion line comes down the centre of New Brunswick, and consequently we are dependent on the Western Union. The Western Union will not be bound by any arrangement we can make here affecting the Great North-Western. We cannot compel them to give us the 25 cents rate.

Mr. SNOWBALL. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the Dominion Company has a line from Sackville to St. John, and also from St. John to Fredericton, and I believe to Woodstock; it has also a line from Sackville to Truro, from Truro to Antigonish, and on to Torbay; so that if the hon. promoter of the Bill will agree that the 25 cents rate will extend over the Great North-Western, the Montreal and the Dominion lines, it would be all that we could reasonably ask for.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I stated that the Dominion line came down the centre of New Brunswick and then proceeded to Nova Scotia. If a message went that way, of course this Company would have some control; but if it goes down to the North Shore, it gets entirely in the hands of the Western Union.

Mr. WELDON. It would be all right to Sackville, whence there are two lines running to St. John, where a company is organized by the Western Union, and, as I understand, it has got the rights of the Dominion lines to Nova Scotia, which they control. The difficulty I see is to control the Western Union. The Dominion Company leased the line to the Western Union originally, of which the Western Union is now the assignee. The transfer would affect the Western Union and the other two lines in connection with the cable. The Western Union has the lease of our local lines which have so far worked satisfactorily to the people of New Brunswick, and the question is whether we should handicap it by these conditions. I think 25 cents should be the only charge between St. John and Ottawa or between any part of Ontario or Quebec. New Brunswick should have the same privileges as Ontario or Quebec. Under this Bill you could send a message from Northumberland to Chatham or Sarnia for 25 cents; but for a message to New Brunswick or Halifax the other company could charge what they pleased. I would like some change to be made by which we would get the benefit of this proviso.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What we want is plain and simple, a telegraphic message from St. John to Moncton or Dorchester for 25 cents. This Company have the control of lines which enable them to give us this privilege. We pay 30 cents instead of 25 cents, which is very unequal. I submit to the promoters of the Bill whether it is not within the competency of the Company to grant the concession we ask for. If you want to telegraph to Moncton or St. John we should have the same reasonable

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

right as to any part of the Dominion. I presume this organization will be prepared to grant us what we ask, which is reasonable and fair.

Mr. BOULTBEE. It seems gentlemen opposite imagine we should legislate for them just as we please. My hon. friend opposite clearly says that he wants 5 cents struck off his telegraph messages. But it would come out of the pockets of the Great North-Western or some other company, and not out of his pocket. The promoters of the Bill say we will concede 25 cents as our charge; but gentlemen opposite want them to go further, and make this unfortunate Company not only convey messages from one end of the Dominion to the other for 25 cents, but to grant concessions in regard to messages over other lines for 25 cents.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This Company controls the Dominion line, which owns a line from Sackville to St. John, and it is upon this line we have to pay 30 cents. Now, inasmuch as this large Company controls that line, they should give us the same privilege, as to rates, as people elsewhere.

Mr. BOULTBEE. On whatever lines that are controlled by this Company, they are willing to concede the reduction of 5 cents, but not for such lines as they do not control; on them they cannot control or reduce the tariff. It seems manifestly unfair that their revenue should be reduced by carrying messages over the whole length and breadth of the Dominion, under any circumstances, at 25 cents. They do it under such arrangements as they can control, and it would be most unfair to extort any more.

Mr. BORDEN. I am informed that the Dominion Company, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, has been absorbed by the Western Union. If that be the case, there can be no security for a low rate, if the modification suggested by the hon. member for North Victoria be made in the proposed amendment of the hon. member for St. John. Our position will be a very hard one, and probably we shall be called upon to pay the full rate to the Montreal Company, and then whatever rate the Western Union charges in Nova Scotia; and although the hon. member for Victoria says that the Bill does not control the Western Union, a provision might be inserted that the Montreal Company should not charge a higher rate than they now receive. I presume they do not get 25 cents on a message to Nova Scotia—perhaps but 15 cents. But under this Bill they will be able to charge 25 cents, and we shall have to pay an additional charge to the Western Union. There should be some provision protecting Nova Scotia in that respect, to which I call the attention of the hon. member for Victoria.

Mr. PLUMB. We are legislating for the Dominion or Western Union Company. So far as I can see the Dominion Company has the right to amalgamate with any other Company, and make whatever arrangements it likes. The Western Union is out of our reach. I do not see why we should compel the Montreal Company to be an intermediate Company, and propose to the other companies' terms they are not bound to adopt. They come here to unite, and to ask the same privileges that we granted to a rival company some years ago. The position of hon. gentlemen opposite is most extraordinary and illogical.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would ask whether the Great Western does not control and operate the Dominion line in all parts of New Brunswick? If they do not control it by virtue of this arrangement, I do not see that it is reasonable of us to exact it, but if they do control it it seems reasonable we should exact.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have just received a memorandum from the agent informing me that the Great North-Western do not control lines east of Sackville, but those lines are under the control of the Western Union; consequently, supposing the latter charged 5 cents for transmit-

ing a message from Sackville to St. John or Cape Breton, the Great North-Western would only get 20 cents, as they would have to pay the Western Union the other 5 cents.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The lines from Sackville to St. John, Moncton, &c., are westward, so that they are under the control of the Great North-Western.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. member for Niagara can afford to be very magnanimous and generous to this Company at the expense of the Lower Provinces. Ontario is all right under the Bill as it stands, but we of the Lower Provinces suffer now and do not wish to suffer any longer. I, at first, understood the hon. member who has charge of the Bill to say that the Dominion lines in the Lower Provinces are now held by the Great North-Western Company, the Western Union having a certain right of control for the purpose of controlling cable messages.

Mr. CAMERON. I said I was aware they had reserved so much of the Dominion lines down there as was essential for their controlling communication with the cables. I do not know the exact nature of the reservation they made; but it was not only to control the lines for cable purposes, but to have so much control as will give the Company entire control of communication with the cables.

Mr. ANGLIN. They have entire absolute control of that portion of the Dominion lines.

Mr. CAMERON. I believe so.

Mr. ANGLIN. That would be held to mean all the lines east from St. John, including all lines in Nova Scotia; therefore that resolution would be of very little value to us. These lines are not absolutely necessary for the transmission of cable messages; but only necessary for the purpose of establishing a monopoly in the transmission of cable messages.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is what I pointed out to the hon. member just now. The motion had better be withdrawn. My opinion is it is valueless. The Western Union have such arrangements down there, that they cannot be broken by any legislation of ours. If this clause is likely to be inoperative, it is far better to let it drop.

Mr. BURPEE. I do not propose to withdraw the motion. Hon. members must remember that while the Western Union Company are not legally bound by any legislation here, they are partners with the other Company. The Western Union will form part of the amalgamation, and therefore are as much interested in carrying messages from New Brunswick on Dominion lines as the Montreal Telegraph Company. I am willing, however, to let the motion stand until the third reading, to enable further information to be given in the meantime. After this expression of opinion I am willing to let it stand to the third reading and then get some more information on the matter.

Mr. McDougall. We have all the information necessary to determine the question as to whether it is proper, in this Montreal Telegraph Company's Bill, to put in language which will operate on other companies. Now, my hon. friend has explained again and again that these words "in connection with" are broad enough to include arrangements with the Western Union, and as this Company is connected with the Western Union it varies the terms, and it would be absurd to put language of that kind in this clause: In amendment to the Montreal Telegraph Company's Bill, leave out the words "in connection with" in the original clause. Then all the lines operated by the Great North-Western Company in New Brunswick will be subject to this rate. That concession has been made. I should have made it, but I understand from those who are better informed in the matter that those who have a right to speak on behalf of the Company have conceded that, and the hon. member, I think, will do well to take what is offered, without compelling us to oppose the clause altogether.

Mr. BURPEE. After what has fallen from the hon. members for Victoria and Halton I am willing to take those two words out.

Amendment agreed to and reported.

On motion for the third reading,

Mr. BLAKE moved the following amendment:—

Provided, also, that whereas inventions, improvements and economies in telegraphy may hereafter result in a great diminution in the cost of the service, so that the maximum rate herein provided may become wholly exorbitant, no Act of Parliament passed in that event and reducing accordingly the maximum rate herein provided, shall be deemed an infringement of the privileges granted by this Act.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think there is some misconception as to the character of this amendment. It does not affect in any way this amendment; it is simply a declaration that Parliament shall hold itself free hereafter to do justice to the general public without feeling itself bound to make what may be claimed as compensation by this Company because of any reduction in tolls. I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Railways that it would be better to make this a general declaration, so that all persons and all companies may understand that we will hold ourselves absolutely free for all time to come to make such modification in the rates and charges upon all railway and telegraph lines as the public interests may require.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken that it had reference to the previous clause. The suggestion had reference to the return to be made. I said it would much better appear in a general Bill which would apply to all telegraph companies. The hon. member will remember that I took exception to this clause as being most objectionable.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think, however, he was willing to accept it as a general proposition. I know he did object that the clause as it stands would to some extent or in some way impair the powers of this Parliament and Government in dealing with companies of this kind. It would be simply impossible for us by any resolution of ours to impair the powers of Parliament. The powers of Parliament remain precisely what they are, no matter what we resolve to do with them. We may impose certain moral obligations upon Parliament, we cannot possibly impair their force in the slightest degree. I do not think that in passing a resolution of this kind we impose any moral obligation on this Parliament at any future Session or on any future Parliament, not to deal as we think right in the public interest with companies of this kind. When we adopted the maximum rate in this Bill we fully entered into a contract with this Company. We do seem to agree that it is the proper way, and we do seem to bind ourselves in future Parliaments not to reduce the rate below 25 cents under any circumstances. If the principle laid down by the Minister of Railways is sound, we should not adopt in this Bill any maximum rate. We should take some other mode of arriving at it, such as leaving it to the Governor in Council to approve of any rate that may be imposed. The proposition is simply a declaration which, I think, it would be well to make—a general declaration, and though it appeared in this particular Bill, providing that we shall have the right to fix the maximum rate in future as circumstances may justify and the public interests require.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that we should put a general resolution into this Bill which is a private one. How resolutions stating that in case of any improvements in telegraphy Parliament may reduce the rate which will affect the railways or steamboat lines or any other industry, is something which I cannot see. For

general purposes we must have a general Act. The hon. gentleman says we cannot bind future Parliaments, and that by the passage of this clause we give them no legal rights; but, Sir, I do not think we have a moral right, so what is the use of it in the Bill? There is one thing quite clear, that the uncertainty which would be produced by passing this resolution would have the effect, certainly, of shaking the confidence of the shareholders in the value of their property. It will deteriorate the value of their property, and do no good. On the hon. gentleman's own argument, the sovereignty of Parliament is so great that when we find that a private Act works against the public interests we have the right to legislate. I think, if I am not mistaken, the interpretation of the Act gives us specifically that right, but, at all events, the hon. gentleman's argument is clearly that there is neither a legal nor a moral right in the Company to claim compensation, so what is the use of hurting these people's property?

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have not given notice of the amendment which I have in my hands; but, of course, if there is any objection on technical grounds we can also take the objection to the third reading of the Bill and it must stand over. The amendment is as follows:—

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same, by restricting the clauses relating to leasing and amalgamation to companies or telegraph lines already established.

Now, as I understand the position, the Minister of Railways, both in the House and elsewhere, asserts that Parliament is unwilling to give general powers of amalgamation, that when powers of amalgamation are asked for, the parties asking for them should come down and specify the particular amalgamation they require, and the object for which it is sought. This amendment cannot affect the particular arrangement which has been the subject of so much discussion in the House, so I think the promoters should accept it. It is important in this respect: If, for instance, any telegraph company should be established it might turn out to be in the interest of this country to grant, say to the Mutual Union Telegraph Company, powers of amalgamation, in order to enable them better to compete with this strong combination. It was thought necessary to grant such powers to the Dominion Company, and for that specific purpose, but we should provide that, having granted those powers to another company, this company should not have power to amalgamate in order to swallow it up.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The charter of the Dominion Telegraph Company is not restricted in this way.

Mr. WHITE. I know it is not; but the Montreal Company, which was then a strong company, had no powers of amalgamation, and therefore no amalgamation could take place between the Dominion and Montreal Companies. The Montreal had its business arrangements with the Western Union for the exchange of messages, and so on, and they were of a character amounting almost to amalgamation. When the American Union Company was established in opposition to the Western Union, the Dominion Company here asked for powers to unite with it, in order to be placed in a more efficient position, it was thought desirable to give it powers of amalgamation; but the amalgamation of the Canadian lines could not take place, as these powers were not given to the Montreal Company. The hon. gentlemen say the Canada Mutual is established and that this amendment would not apply. That is true, but some other company may be established hereafter. Next Session we may have an application for another company; and in case we have I think it is desirable that we should restrict the powers of amalgamation in this particular company to lines now in existence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Amendment (Mr. White) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Arkell,	Fulton,	Mousseau,
Baker,	Gigault,	Muttart,
Beaty,	Gillies,	Orton,
Béchar,	Grandbois,	Ouimet,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Patterson (Essex),
Bill,	Haddow,	Plumb,
Blake,	Haggart,	Reid,
Bolduc,	Hay,	Richey,
Sorden,	Hesson,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Rochester,
Bourbeau,	Homer,	Rogers,
Bowell,	Hooper,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brecken,	Hoode,	Rouleau,
Brooks,	Huntington,	Routhier,
Bunting,	Irvine,	Royal,
Burnham,	Jones,	Ryan (Marquette),
Carling,	Kilvert,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Kirkpatrick,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Kranz,	Scott,
Casey,	Laundry,	Scrifer,
Casgrain,	Langevin,	Sroule,
Charlton,	Lantier,	Sutherland,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Longley,	Tassé,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Macdonald (Kings),	Tellier,
Colby,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson,
Coughlin,	McCallum,	Trow,
Coupal,	McCarthy,	Tyrwhitt,
Crouter,	McDougald,	Vallée,
Cuthbert,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Desaulniers,	McLeod,	Wade,
Desjardins,	McRory,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Domville,	Manson,	Wallace (York),
Dumont,	Merner,	White (Cardwell),
Farrow,	Mongenais,	White (Renfrew), and
Fleming,	Montplaisir,	Williams.—108.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Gault,	Malouin,
Bain,	Gillmor,	Masseu,
Boulbee,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Méthot,
Brown,	Girouard (Kent),	Mills,
Burpee (St. John),	Gunn,	Ogden,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Guthrie,	Pinsonneault,
Cameron (Huron),	Hurteau,	Pope (Compton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Killam,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cockburn,	King,	Schultz,
Costigan,	Lane,	Skinner,
Coursol,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Smith,
Elliott,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Snowball, and
Fiset,	McDougall,	Weldon.—40.
Fitzsimmons,		

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ANGLIN. My impression is that this amendment is useless. It can hardly be expected that even the most intelligent of the public will imagine that a clause of this sort inserted in the Bill is done for no object or purpose whatever. It will have no effect save to gratify the hon. gentleman who had moved it, and who seems to be determined to get through some amendment to this Bill. We all know that any other future company may ask for a charter and obtain powers to amalgamate or lease; and consequently, it will have no effect on future amalgamations, while all existing lines may amalgamate in the one corporation. This clause cannot have the slightest possible effect on the future legislation of this Parliament, but it may have the effect of injuring the property of the Montreal Telegraph Company, as it may create the impression that it restricts or deprives this Company of some valuable privileges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says in effect that we voted for this amendment because my hon. friend moved it, but he cannot object that we should help him in a most laudable attempt. The hon. gentleman

(Mr. Anglin) seems opposed to all amendments or improvements. I think, Sir, that this clause, instead of having the effect of injuring the stock, will have the effect of greatly strengthening it. It is a conservative measure, not in the party sense, but it is in the best sense of the word, conservative. We have chartered other companies in our wisdom; they are in existence; and this clause prevents future companies leading us away, or watering this stock.

Mr. CAMERON. When this amendment was proposed, I felt that it was of no importance whatever, whether it was passed or not; but it seems to me absurd to deal with companies which are not yet in existence. As far as the Montreal Telegraph Company is concerned, I do not consider that the amendment has on it the slightest possible effect in any way whatever.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister says that this is a conservative and good measure, in the best sense of the word and not in the party sense. I quite agree with him that, if conservative at all and beneficial, it could not be so in the party sense.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I voted against this amendment, and am now opposed to it, because I do not see the object of legislation here unless it is intended to accomplish some good effect; and this amendment cannot possibly be beneficial, while it may be hurtful. If a company is formed in this country and incorporated in the future, and it would be injurious to permit amalgamation, this House would not then grant the power of amalgamation; but if in the future amalgamation with only such companies were then desirable, then this amendment would be hurtful, because another Session must pass over before an Act permitting such amalgamation could be passed.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think that this is not fair legislation at all. Power to amalgamate was given to the Mutual Union Telegraph Company.

Mr. WHITE. Such power was stricken out.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. At all events the Dominion Telegraph Company possesses unrestricted power to amalgamate, and why should this be denied to this Company? I see no reason for it whatever. Our legislation ought to be uniform, and what we give to one Company we ought to grant to any other similar Company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must vote for this amendment as the House has ordered it.

Amendment agreed to and reported.

On motion for the third reading,

Mr. WHITE. I have another amendment which I think is very important; it is the amendment against differential rates. When I moved it in Committee an objection was raised that it was going seriously to injure the country newspapers. I have been a country newspaper man myself for a long time, and I have as great a sympathy, I think, with the country press as anybody in this House or out of it. I am satisfied that the country newspapers would not be hurt by giving them the same rates as the city newspapers. But I have altered the amendment in such a way as to remove that difficulty, if in the mind of anybody it exists. I beg leave to move:

Provided always that all rates charged by any company purchasing or leasing the line of the Montreal Telegraph Company under the powers by this Act conferred, as respects all classes of despatches, shall be at all times charged equally to all corporations and persons, and after the same tariff in respect of all despatches of the same class and description, transmitted under like circumstances, and to persons or companies residing or carrying on business in the same place, and no reduction or advance in any such rates shall be made, either directly or indirectly, in favor of or against any particular person or corporation so residing or doing business in the same place, sending or receiving despatches of the same class and description.

Mr. ANGLIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what the result would be if this became law and the Company violated it? There is no penalty attached for the violation of it, neither do I think it would go so far as to vitiate the charter.

Mr. HOUDE. I think it would be unjust to the French press of this country if that amendment should pass. I am not at all interested now in journalism; I entirely withdrew from it some time ago; but the French daily papers have not only to pay for the despatches, but for the translation of them, which sometimes costs pretty heavily, and as the amendment stands, I am afraid that it would operate very unjustly towards the French press.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. WHITE. I beg leave to move:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by substituting the word "twenty" for the word "twenty-five" in section 13 thereof.

The object of this is simply to make the rate 20 cents instead of 25 cents, and I think, in view of the fact that the two companies, when acting in competition with each other, were able to pay fair dividends with the 20 cents rate, and when the business of the country was not in anything like the prosperous condition it is in to-day, that they ought to be able now to give us the rate of 20 cents. I do not propose to detain the House, but I do propose to divide it on this motion.

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend hardly states the object of the amendment accurately. The object of the amendment is to kill the Bill, and that would be the necessary result of it if it were adopted.

Mr. McLENNAN. I have not heard any argument yet to convince me that the telegraphy of this country should be made dearer than it has been for several years past; and this is practically the effect of this Bill. It is well known that this Company and its competitor paid very fair dividends while the business of this country was in its most depressed state—dividends beyond those paid by almost any other interest in the country. We are told, indeed, that in one year the Company only paid 7 per cent. Does anybody in this House remember that large moneyed institutions, which were dependent upon commercial earnings, were obliged to reduce their dividends in many cases one-half, and in some cases paid no dividends at all? The moment business revived, this Company began to get on its legs again. It is true, it suffered some diminution in its dividends, but the reason was that for several years previously, during the time of the depression, the property of the Company had run down. The other argument we have heard has been chiefly intended to warn us against the operations of the stock exchange, where there is not so much respect for private rights as appears to have visited this House. From my own knowledge of the Stock Exchange, I have reason to believe that the gentlemen who operate there weigh the interests in their hands with great care, and we have heard that the stock of this Telegraph Company was something like British Consols, with such a fixed permanent value that it had very little possibility of variation. The fact is that the stock of this Company has varied from par to a premium of 100 per cent. while it was earning very large dividends, and we never heard about danger from operations in the stock market. It is well known that stocks that are on a much broader and firmer basis than the stock of this Company have fared in the same way. But what are the facts, known in as well as out of this House? That the greatest stock-jobbing operations we ever heard of in connection with telegraphy is the amalgamation under which the companies are proposed to be placed. But while a big company is

formed there is to be a very small capital; and whilst it secures a dividend of 8 per cent. to the Montreal Company, there is no limit to the amount that may be made out of it by people who put in the magnificent sum of \$4,000. That is the simple fact with regard to stock-jobbing. I think it is the duty of this House to guard the public interest by keeping down the monopoly that is being created by all these means taken together and the permission to charge 25 cents, when it has been proved beyond question that a rate of 20 cents is amply sufficient for all the operations of telegraphy, up to this time, without counting the fact that the profits of the Company must increase very much with the increasing business of the country, and that the prospects from a rate of 20 cents are very much greater than anything done in the past. For those reasons I shall vote for the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. White) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Aikell,	Haddow,	Reid,
Baker,	Haggart,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Rochester,
Brecken,	Jones,	Ross (Middlesex),
Brooks,	Lantier,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Macdonald (Kings),	Ryan (Marquette),
Carling,	McCallum,	Scott,
Casey,	McCarthy,	Tellier,
Colby,	McLennan,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	McRory,	Trow,
Coupal,	Merner,	Tyrwhitt,
Crouter,	Méthot,	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Mongenais,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Fleming,	Montplaisir,	Wallace (York),
Guillet,	Muttart,	White (Cardwell), and
Hackett,	Orton,	White (Renfrew).—48.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fitzsimmons,	McIsaac,
Anglin,	Fulton,	McLelan,
Bain,	Gault,	McLeod,
Beaty,	Geoffrion,	Malouin,
Bébard,	Gigault,	Massue,
Benoit,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Bergeron,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,
Bergin,	Girouard (Kent),	Ogden,
Bill,	Grandbois,	Quimet,
Blake,	Gunn,	Patterson (Essex),
Bolduc,	Guthrie,	Pinsonneault,
Boulbee,	Hay,	Plumb,
Bourbeau,	Holton,	Pope (Compton),
Brown,	Homer,	Richey,
Bunting,	Hooper,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (St. John),	Houde,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hurteau,	Routhier,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Royal,
Caron,	Killam,	Ryan (Montreal),
Casgrain,	Kilvert,	Schultz,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	King,	Scriver,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Kirkpatrick,	Skinner,
Cockburn,	Kranz,	Smith,
Costigan,	Landry,	Snowball,
Coursol,	Lane,	Sproule,
Desaulniers,	Langevin,	Sutherland,
Desjardins,	Longley,	Tassé,
Domville,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tilley,
Dugas,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Valin,
Dumont,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Vallée,
Elliott,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Weldon,
Farrow,	McDougald,	Wheeler, and
Fiset,	McDougall,	Williams.—93.

Bill read the third time and passed.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, and reported:

Bill (No. 77) relating to the Canadian Electric Light Company, and to confer certain powers upon the said Company.—(Mr. McDougall.)

Mr. McLennan.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Tassé.)

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Act incorporating "The Canadian Steam Users' Insurance Association," and to change the name of the said Company to "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 138) to authorize the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited) to issue preferential shares.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Western Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Williams.)

House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 146) to repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act and the Acts amending it.—(Mr. Landry.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 144) to authorize the construction on certain conditions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, through some other pass than the Yellow Head Pass. He said:—About a year ago I had the pleasure of submitting for the consideration of this House a contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I have now the greater pleasure of calling the attention of the House to the results of the adoption, by Parliament, of that contract, and of its ratification. The ratification of that contract was made, and letters patent under it were issued, on the 16th February, 1881. I may safely say that the progress made in that great work from that time to this has been eminently satisfactory. The most convenient mode in which I can make a rapid survey of the work will be to commence at the eastern end, or the point termed Callander, at the eastern end of Lake Nipissing, where the contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway properly commences, and I may say that considerable progress has been made towards the construction of the first section of the line at that point. It was hoped that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the subsidy granted by Parliament, from Pembroke to Callander would have been completed at an earlier date, but it has not been found practicable to complete that section at an earlier period than something like the 1st of July of the present year, and it will be readily seen that it would be very difficult indeed for the contractors to make very material progress with the first section until they had obtained easier access by the completion of that which was formerly the Canada Central, now a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to that point. Notwithstanding that, I may say that a careful re-survey and re-location of the line has

enabled the country to obtain a better line in every respect than was supposed to exist up to Sturgeon River or the point where the line became common to the interior line, passing away to the head of Lake Superior or to the branch as it was when proposed from that point to the Sault Ste. Marie. The papers which I have just laid on the Table disclose the fact that an application has been made after examination of the subject by the Canadian Pacific Railway for permission to locate their line from the point that was common to the Sault Ste. Marie branch, to the north of Lake Superior in the direction of the Sault Ste. Marie; that that which was formerly regarded as a branch of the Sault Ste. Marie, shall, to a large extent, become a portion of the trunk line. A careful survey which had been made of the section from Algoma running easterly to connect at the point where the Sault Ste. Marie branch commenced, has shown a very favorable section of country for the construction of the road, with the advantage that at Algoma Mills connection is made with navigation at the waters of Lake Huron.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest that the hon. member would state, as he goes along, what particular survey he refers to. For instance, in 1877, a survey was made on nearly a direct line from Cantin's Bay to the mouth of Peak River.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not the survey to which I am now referring. I am referring to the survey and location which was made under the hon. gentleman's Administration, and subsequently re-surveyed under my instructions, from Callander for about sixty or seventy miles on the first section of the line which I call the interior line, running from that point north to the head of Lake Superior; and although a good deal of care had been taken in reference to that survey, a further examination of the line with the view of carrying it westward instead of northward in the direction of the Sault Ste. Marie, has resulted in obtaining a very favorable line from Callander to the crossing of the Sturgeon River, and away on from that to Algoma Mills. For that distance, from Callander to Algoma Mills, a distance of 182 miles, through a favorable country, the most severe grade encountered is one of fifty-three feet to the mile. It is confidently anticipated that the Company will be enabled to lay track upon fifty miles this season west of Callander. That is the calculation, and they have already placed under contract a section from Algoma Mills, running eastwardly to meet the line from Callander for a distance of sixty miles, on which it is expected the track will be laid this season, so that it is, without doubt, ascertained that communication during the next season—that is in the year following the present—will be complete from this point to the waters of Lake Huron at Algoma Mills, a point 182 miles west of Callander Station. The sixty miles east of Algoma Mills are under contract, and it is expected the track will be laid upon that portion this season, so that the seventy-two miles intervening between Sturgeon River and the portion now under contract to Algoma Mills will be attacked at both ends, and be consequently completed during the year. The main line, as it is now proposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is intended to run westward from Algoma Mills to within twenty or thirty miles of Sault Ste. Marie, running through a favorable country. They have made formal application for this change of location. The Government have passed an Order in Council, of which I have just placed a copy in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, agreeing to adopt that location provided it is found upon further survey that they are able to show the plans and profiles of a through line from that point within twenty or thirty miles of Sault Ste. Marie, running nearer to the coast to the head of Lake Superior. Until that plan

and location are submitted for the approval of the Governor in Council it is not the intention to pay any portion of the subsidy intended for the Canadian Pacific Railway upon any portion common to that line, and what I call the Ontario line, running from the north of Lake Superior to a point sixty or seventy miles north-west of Callander Station. I have no doubt myself, after the information I have received from the engineer of the Company, that a very fair line will be obtained in that locality. We have only very recently received information from the able engineer who has been going over the most difficult portion of it, that, although the line will be probably attended with greater cost in construction, it is believed that a very good line, with grades not inferior to those that we would have been obliged to encounter in the interior line in the neighborhood of the upper part of Lake Superior, will be attained. There will be very great advantage, as hon. gentlemen opposite will see, from the adoption of the proposed line. In the first place, I may say that the line is assumed to be no longer, the distance will be no greater in the one case than in the other; it is about 650 miles, whether you go by the interior line from Callander Station to the head of Lake Superior, or whether you go to within twenty-five or thirty miles of the Sault Ste. Marie line and thence away to the north to Thunder Bay. I may say it will be at once seen that as the line will run in the neighborhood of the waters of Lake Superior, there is much less likelihood of its being obstructed by the snowfall, the snowfall not being so great on the coast of Lake Superior as it would be on the interior line. There will also be greater advantage in construction. While you would be compelled to carry on the construction of the interior line to a large extent from the two ends, the one from the head of Lake Superior running eastwardly, and the other from Callander Station running westwardly, the bridging of the various rivers and inlets from the waters of Lake Superior will enable this work to be attacked at different points along the line, and will enable supplies to be thrown in much more easily than otherwise would have been the case, and in that way enable the time to be very much shortened during which the line can be constructed than it would be possible if constructed on the interior line. As I have said before, I have every reason to believe that it will be found quite practicable to construct a good line in that locality, and it will be obviously desirable to do so for the reasons I have mentioned, in case it be found practicable. When that day arrives it is proposed to adopt the location of the line, and then to treat all that portion of the line from Callander Station running to within twenty-five or thirty miles of Sault Ste. Marie, on by the head of Lake Superior to Thunder Bay, as a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper. It is also proposed, during the coming summer, to finally locate the line from Thunder Bay to the head of Lake Superior running eastwardly, and it is expected that by the end of the present season they will be enabled to put under contract some fifty or sixty miles of road running from Prince Arthur's Landing in this direction towards meeting the other line which is being extended from this side. Now, Sir, I may say that there will be an additional advantage from having the line constructed in the mode proposed, because so soon as the waters of Lake Huron to Algoma Mills are tapped there is a means of bringing traffic from these waters on to the line, and the proximity of the line to the waters of Lake Superior will also furnish an additional means of reaching the main line and carrying on the traffic in connection with it. It is expected by the Government, as I held out the hope a year ago, that we will open the road from Prince Arthur's Landing through to Winnipeg in the month of July next—not that the road will be completed, but that that will be accomplished to which we have steadily worked, the getting a through track laid over that distance, so that we may carry immigrants into the

great North-West through our own country, over the lines of railway from Quebec to the waters of the Georgian Bay, thence by water to Prince Arthur's Landing, and so over our own line into the great North-West, furnishing a much easier, a much cheaper, a much more rapid, and I may say, so far as the difficulty of getting immigrants through a neighboring country is concerned, a much safer line of communication in our own interests than any which at present exists. Of the whole of 433 miles from Prince Arthur's Landing to Winnipeg, the track has now been laid upon 401 miles, leaving only thirty-two miles to complete the link. On contract 41, from the 193rd mile to the 233rd mile, the road is expected to be finished early in the present season. On contract 42, from the 233rd mile to the 300th mile, it will take a considerable portion of the next season as well as of this to finish the work. The contract time for finishing that work is July of next year, but I shall be extremely glad if the work can be quite finished during the next two or three succeeding months. However, as I have already stated, I have every reason to believe that during the coming month of July, we shall have through communication by rail, there being only thirty-two miles of track now remaining to be completed on that line. The total expenditure on the line from Prince Arthur's Landing to Selkirk up to the present time is \$13,234,000, and the balance, which I estimated last year would be sufficient to complete it, of \$1,470,100, making \$14,705,000, or the estimate which I ventured to lay upon the Table of the House last year as the cost of that work; and after an additional year's experience the House will be glad to learn that I have no reason to suppose that that estimate will be exceeded.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give the figures of the present expenditure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The present expenditure is \$13,234,900, leaving a balance of \$1,470,100, to complete the work as covered in my estimate of a year ago. The moment that the through track is laid in the month of July now coming, we expect to be able to carry, without materially interfering with the progress of the work, some traffic and the through immigrants which require to be provided for. I may say, Sir, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has decided to establish its headquarters in the city of Winnipeg. The station grounds, the workshops and all the paraphernalia that are needed to carry on and operate a great line of railway, are to be placed at that point; and this decision having been reached, an investigation was made by them as to the most direct mode of carrying the line westward. As the House is aware, the Government had placed under contract the first 100 miles of that road, west of Winnipeg. The Company decided that it would be better to run a direct line west from the city of Winnipeg, in the direction of Portage la Prairie, than to continue to follow the line which the Government had adopted, and they were therefore permitted to abandon that portion of the line between Stonewall—a distance of twenty-one miles—from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, and construct the road from Winnipeg in a more direct line to Portage la Prairie. By this change, the distance has been shortened between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie thirteen miles. The Company, however, are bound to continue to operate the line under this alteration—which was agreed to—for twenty-one miles from Winnipeg to what is called Stonewall, the principal place on the line between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, over the line which was being constructed by the Government before the work passed into the hands of the Company. The line as now located is therefore a direct line between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, and in the same westerly direction crosses the Assiniboine at Brandon. It then follows the general course of the Qu'Appelle River to Moose Jaw Creek, a dis-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tance of 404 miles from Winnipeg, which is the most westerly point up to the present time approved of by the Governor in Council; and I may say here, that it is not the intention of the Governor in Council to approve of any further portion of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, or make any payments in regard to any construction west of that point, until it is ascertained that there is a better line in the interests of the country, so far as we are able to judge, through Kicking Horse Pass, than that we had previously obtained through Yellow Head Pass. From Moose Jaw Creek, we are quite aware there is no difficulty in getting a line to the Pass which was authorized by Parliament, and the Bill, which I have now submitted for the consideration of the House, asks for authority to make the change only if we believe it to be in the interests of the country. I will come more particularly to that point a little later on. I may say, however, Sir, that the section of the country through which the line runs direct from Winnipeg, in the most direct course that could be obtained from Winnipeg to Moose Jaw Creek, and as it is proposed to be constructed, is very favorable both as regards the grades of the railway and also as regards the character of the country which is to be opened up. The district is one of a very promising character, which will undoubtedly be very rapidly filled with a vigorous and enterprising population. Now, Sir, it is expected of the Company that they will be able to lay no less than 500 miles of track in that direction this season; there are 161 miles from Winnipeg now under traffic to a point which, I think, is called Flat Creek, about thirty-one miles from Brandon, which, as you are aware, is about 130 miles from Winnipeg. The Company expect to be able to lay some 500 miles of track in a direct westerly line during the coming season; but, as I have already stated, the Government does not intend to make any payments on any portion of the line beyond Moose Jaw Creek until they are satisfied that a better line can be obtained for the Canadian Pacific Railway by going south to Kicking Horse Pass than had already been obtained in the direction of the Yellow Head Pass. The location of the Canadian Pacific Railway being more southerly than was intended or contemplated two years ago, I think will be attended with this advantage: that the branches will require to be fewer, and, as is perfectly obvious, the fewer the branches are the longer they will be, and the greater the facility with which they can be operated. The whole of the country to the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway is open for the construction of long branches running in various directions, and from their length, they can be operated with greater advantage and to greater profit than short branches could be worked. The Company have about 8,000 tons of rails now at the end of their track, and a very large quantity of sleepers, and an enormous quantity of rails are now in transit from Great Britain and the Continent, to carry on with great vigor the prosecution of these works. The payments up to the present date to the Company have been \$1,610,000 in cash, and 1,610,000 acres of land. All the branches of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the House is aware, are, 1st. The branch from Winnipeg to Emerson, which, including the cost of the road to Selkirk, has cost, up to January, 1882, \$1,538,033. The earnings upon this branch during the ten months that the Government operated it, before it was transferred to the Company, up to the 30th April, 1881, amounted to \$291,498. I mention this more especially because I think that a return which was moved for by the hon. member for Westmoreland has not yet been laid on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. What have been the receipts since?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will be very glad to give the hon. gentleman that information when we come to that point. The traffic has increased enormously since that date.

From 1st of May, 1881, to 31st of March, 1882, there were no less than 21,486 through passengers, and the present rate of passengers, as I understand it, is from 300 to 1,000 per day; the passengers in March last numbered 5,684, and from the 1st to the 15th April, no less than 3,354. I may say that as they take all persons below twelve years of age without tickets, those passengers only embrace what we may term adults, or do not embrace what I suppose would quite double the number of the passengers, if those children were included, as was of course the case in the number of immigrants, as stated by me on a former occasion as having come in. I may say, for the information of the hon. gentleman who seems very anxious to anticipate fit—that the receipts from the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the time that it passed into the hands of the Company, on the 1st of May down to the present time, and to the last date of information was over \$600,000.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the last day of the information?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see by the paper that the earnings from May, 1881, to February, 1882, inclusive, amounted to \$193,000 for passengers, \$391,000 for freight, and \$10,000 for mails and express; making a total of \$603,000 for that period.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. For the whole line?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, for the whole line under operation—from Rat Portage on one side to Flat Creek, thirty miles beyond Brandon, on the other, and from Winnipeg to Pembina. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in addition to the line they have constructed from Winnipeg westward, and which is now in operation for the 161 miles, have also laid some eighty-nine miles of a branch which is called the Winnipeg and Pembina Mountain Branch, running in a south-westerly direction from Winnipeg to the border, and with a branch of twenty miles connecting that point with the town of Emerson at the frontier. For 100 miles this branch it is expected, will be opened for traffic during the present season. It is now ready for the rails with the exception of the twenty mile branch to Emerson, and it is expected that 100 miles of this branch will be in operation during the coming season. They have also projected another branch from Brandon south-westerly, about fifteen miles, to Souris, thence west, in all 195 miles. I should have mentioned also that the length of the Winnipeg and Pembina Mountain Branch is 235 miles.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where does the Souris Branch strike the main line?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At Brandon, running thence south-westerly about fifteen miles and then westerly, with about fifteen miles between it and the main line. The next section I come to is, of course, the one which will be dealt with last, and it is the main difficulty with which the Company has to engage—I mean the portion through the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops. I may say that I only received this morning the latest information as to the grounds which led the Company to be somewhat sanguine that they would be able to obtain a better pass for the railway than the Yellow Head Pass—not better in point of grades, because that would be impossible. If they get through Kicking Horse Pass I am afraid it will be by heavier grades than the other; but it is so obviously in the interests of the country and of a great trans-continental line like this, that it should be rendered as short as possible, that great exertions are being made, and the Company are prepared to incur great expense provided they can shorten the line, as they believe they can, by some seventy-nine miles. This is a matter which would be of great importance not only to the line but to the country, because it would

penetrate the best district in British Columbia, that is the Kamloops district—a district which would only be skirted if the road went by the Yellow Head Pass, at the confluence of the Fraser River and Lake Kamloops. I will read to the House the latest information obtained with reference to the probability of getting a pass by the line which is proposed by this Bill—or rather the Bill proposes that the Governor in Council, if they believe it is in the interests of the country, may authorize the Company to deviate from the pass which was fixed by the contract and the Act of last Session. This telegram is from Mr. Van Horn, the Superintendent who is in charge of all the operations at the central point of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was telegraphed this morning to Mr. Drinkwater as follows:—

“Major Rogers reports that there is no question about feasibility of good line with easy grades through Kicking Horse Pass although work will be very expensive. The crossing of the Selkirk Range is the only thing in doubt, but explorations have progressed sufficiently to justify belief that they can be crossed by use of some long tunnels. The worst that can happen in case of failure to cross Selkirk is, that the line may be forced round the great bend of the Columbia, which would considerably increase distance; but to save this distance work will be undertaken that would ordinarily be considered impracticable on account of expense.”

W. C. VAN HORN.

That is to say, it is now found that the Kicking Horse Pass is perfectly practicable as we have known for some time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Since 1873.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, since 1873. But the difficulty, of course, as my hon. friend knows, is that presented by the Selkirk Range, which all the surveys carried on by the Government led to the belief was not practicable. If it be found to be practicable it will only be so by undertaking to shorten this line by some seventy-nine miles, probably by considerable increase of the expense of construction over that which would be involved by passing through the Yellow Head Pass. The importance of making that saving of seventy-nine miles is evidently considered so great by the Company that, as they state, they would be prepared to take it even at an expense that would ordinarily be considered quite impracticable. The engineers of my Department—those who have any knowledge of the subject—concur in the opinion that if this shorter line is obtained by piercing the Selkirk Range, it will have to be done at a very great cost indeed. The line, I presume, would be considerably shortened by going through the Kicking Horse Pass, and round what is called the big bend of the Columbia River; but there is not sufficient information to enable one to speak with any certainty as to how the distance would compare with the Yellow Head Pass. The section of country opened would not be quite as favorable in that case as in the other. I will now read the memorandum which Mr. Smellie, who is Engineer in Chief at the Company's headquarters in Montreal, has placed in my hands with reference to this matter, as I told him there was a desire on the part of the House to get the fullest, latest, and most authentic information that could be given on that point. He says in the memorandum, which is dated the 15th of April:

“From the report of Mr. A. B. Rogers, who conducted the surveys in British Columbia during the season of 1881, I obtain the following particulars.

“That a thorough preliminary survey of the country was made between the Kicking Horse Creek and Mount Back, including the Vermilion and White Man's Pass routes, and a partial survey of the route from the head of Bow River to the summit of Howse Pass, and also of the Kananaskis route. The time occupied on these surveys extended only from the 1st of August to the 1st of October, the parties not having arrived as early as was expected.

“The route selected for location passes up the Bow River to its junction with Bath Creek, thence up Bath Creek westerly about five miles, thence south-westerly about one mile to Summit Lake, about one mile long, and from which the waters flow in both directions. This lake lies from four to five miles farther east than is shown on the maps as the summit of the Rocky Mountains. At this point, the line will

thence follow down the east branch of the Kicking Horse Creek to the Columbia River.

"From the results of the surveys, as far as made, Mr. Rogers is sanguine that the descent from the Kicking Horse summit to the Columbia River will not exceed eighty feet per mile, and that the gradients from Bow River to the summit will be raised.

"Mr. Rogers also made a reconnaissance from Kamloops easterly to the summit of the Selkirk Range, and from general observation and barometric readings he states that gradients will be obtained not exceeding sixty-six feet per mile between Kamloops and the north fork of the Illicille West River, and from thence to the summit of the Selkirk Range the gradient will not exceed eighty feet to the mile.

"In consequence of difficulties which beset Mr. Rogers, arising from a scarcity of supplies, he was unable to specially examine the country between the summit of the Selkirk Range and the East Branch of the Columbia River, a distance of about thirty miles.

"Before leaving the summit, however, he ascended the "Divide" and while seeing generally a very broken country to the eastward, he observed that one of the ravines led in the desired direction for a distance of quite ten miles. There is also on the west side of the Columbia a large stream, Beaver Creek, which has its source in the vicinity of this broken country. From these observations Mr. Rogers feels assured that the distance in which difficulties may be expected in crossing the Selkirk Range, will be reduced to ten or twelve miles."

That, I may say to hon. gentlemen opposite, is in substance all the information we have in our possession. As will be seen by the Bill now under consideration, it is not proposed to ask authority from Parliament to permit the adoption of any pass, however feasible, that is nearer than 100 miles from the boundary on the United States, which will, I think, be regarded as a quite sufficient distance to protect thoroughly the national character and interests of the line. I will now, Sir, refer to the progress of the work from Kamloops to Emory's Bar. That work, as hon. gentlemen opposite are aware, has been vigorously pressed, and the total value of the work done under the contract covering that 127 miles, is \$1,979,973.

Mr. ANGLIN. To what date?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is to the latest date to which I have information of the progress of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. What date is that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this moment it is not in my power to state the exact date to which this information is brought down. I may say that the date at which that work is required to be completed under the contract is July, 1885, and that I have every reason to believe that the work will be finished within the time stipulated by the contract. Apparently, the amount of the work is not sufficient to indicate that that would be done; but hon. gentlemen will perceive that the expenditure on the initial works has been applied in such a way as to render the future progress of the work much more rapid than was possible until a large portion of very heavy and difficult work was undertaken, and means of access were thus obtained to the other portions of the line. As hon. gentlemen opposite are also aware, eighty-six miles from Emory's Bar to Port Moody have also recently been placed under contract, at an amount of \$2,486,000, and the date fixed for the completion of that work is the same as the other. It is easier to complete that eighty-six miles than some sections, even in their present condition, above that, in consequence of the work being reached more easily by the Fraser River and Barrard Inlet, the contractors thus being enabled to attack it at various points more easily than it was possible to do in regard to the other work. It may, perhaps, be interesting to the House for me to glance at the estimates which have been made for those contracts on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to state the results, so far as it is in my power, down to the present moment. The first contract from the Kaministiquia to Sunshine Creek was a contract for forty-five miles of road from the Kaministiquia to Shebandowan, but twelve and a half miles of that line was abandoned owing, to a change of policy on the part of the Government. The amount of the contract for the whole forty-five miles was \$406,194; but if you deduct the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

twelve and a-half miles, it would leave the contract price for the thirty-two and a-half miles at \$293,360. I am glad to be able to say that that contract will be completed according to the present estimate—and of course the work is so far completed as to enable one to speak with a great deal of certainty—for \$313,200, or only \$19,840 in excess of the price estimated for in the contract. From Sunshine Creek to English River, contract 25, the present estimate for the work is \$1,417,203, and the contract price was \$1,037,061, and the construction of the work will exceed the contract price by \$380,147. From English River to Eagle River, contract 41, the present estimate for the completing of the work is \$1,767,357, and the contract price was \$2,300,196, or \$532,839 less than the amount we expected to be obliged to pay when the contract was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I thought the contract was for \$2,203,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it was for \$2,300,196; and I may say we hope to be required to pay a larger amount, and for this reason: The contract was so made, that if the track was laid during the past season, by the 1st of July, and if the contract was completed by the 1st of July of next year, the contractors were to be entitled to the larger sum named here. Well, it is quite true the rails were not laid by the 1st of July; but the object the Government had in making that contract was attained, and that was to provide the means of attacking the adjoining contract from both ends; and so the work was so far completed as to have the track laid at a comparatively short time after the 1st of July. And as the contractors incurred great additional expense in making that advance, an Order in Council was passed declaring that if they complied with the second portion of the contract, requiring the completion of the work by the 1st of July next year, they should be held to have complied with the portion of the contract which depended on having the track laid by the 1st of July this year; because the expenditure made was commensurately great, and the advantage to the country is the same as it would have been had the original arrangement been adhered to. I wish to explain the manner in which I am treating these figures. Should we be able to complete that work for the closest estimate we could make at the present, we shall save \$532,839 as between the cost of the work and the price at which it was let. Hon. gentlemen are aware that great efforts have been made to improve the location of the line after the contract was made, and both on this and the adjoining section Mr. Fleming was able, by great exertions, to shorten the line, although most elaborate surveys had been previously made. When the Government had undertaken to do the work, it was found that by great efforts the line could be shortened by several miles, as well as very considerable reductions made in the work in addition. There were some changes in the character of the structures that were contemplated, which also enabled us, especially on the adjoining section of the work, to make a very considerable saving. On the section from Eagle River to Keewatin, 42, the present estimate is \$2,904,153; the contract price was \$4,130,707; so we expect to effect a saving on this section of \$1,225,554. On the contract from Keewatin to Cross Lake, section 15, as the House is aware, a change was made in the character of the work.

Mr. ANGLIN. Will the hon. gentleman describe that change.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it has been the subject of such elaborate discussion, and there is so much information in the hands of the hon. gentlemen concerning it, that I do not think it would be right to trespass on the indulgence of the House by detaining it by a further specific

statement. But I may say, in general terms, that solid embankments were substituted for trestle work, and the reasons for that will be found in the reports of the engineers during the time my hon. predecessor was in office, and also in documents subsequently laid before the Government, and which led them to the conclusion that the change would be in the interests of the country. That change has added to the cost something like \$250,000. So, as estimated, the figures stand thus: The work is almost finished, or expected to be actually finished immediately; the estimated cost of the section is \$2,619,583—and the contract price is \$1,594,085. Added to that price is \$250,000, caused by the change in the character of the work, and you have \$1,844,085, or an amount at present, of \$775,500 more to construct the work than the contract price agreed upon.

Mr. BLAKE. Not more than the original price.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not the original contract price; but the hon. gentleman will see that you add to the original contract price \$250,000, making a total of \$1,844,845. There is between that and the cost of the work the sum \$755,500. Now, I come to the work from Cross Lake to Selkirk, section 14, between the contract just referred to and Red River. The contract price for that work was \$402,950, and the estimated cost is \$733,602, or \$330,652 more than the contemplated cost. I now come to the four contracts between Kamloops and Emory's Bar, 60, 61, 62, and 63, making 127 miles; and I am glad to be able to say that on 63, while the price of the contract was \$1,746,150, the amount we expect to complete the work for is \$1,192,600, or \$553,550 less than anticipated.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does your first estimate embrace the \$250,000 set down for contingencies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am taking the actual estimate of the work to be executed; and in that case, although great attention and expense were devoted to as careful and as thorough a survey as possible, it had to be made through so rugged and difficult a country, one almost impassible, that it was utterly impossible to expect to obtain such correct location surveys as could only have been made when a staff of engineers were on the ground, engaged in the construction of the road, and which it may be in their power to secure, with a reduction of the work, by every possible means they can devise.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman state what reduction was made on the radius of the curves?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have sacrificed nothing in that respect that will, in the least degree, injure the character of the road; and having travelled, as I have, over the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railways, around curves much sharper than any to be met on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway—at a very considerable speed—I am able to say that our road will compare, not only most favorably, but is a first-class road, as compared with the roads to which I have referred. In fact, all these contracts contemplated the construction of a first class railway. On the first section, I was saying \$553,550 were saved on the amount stipulated in the contract. On section 62, the contract price was \$2,056,950. We expect to complete it for \$1,368,670, or \$688,280 less than the price contained in the contract when granted. For section 61 the contract price is \$2,573,640, and we expect to complete it for \$1,927,000, or \$646,640 less than the contract amount. On the sections from Emory's Bar to Port Moody, of course the contract being for a lump sum, we expect, with the careful and accurate survey which was made and the thorough knowledge of the work obtained before the contract was let, to complete it for the amount stated in the contract—\$2,436,000. On section 60,

the contract price was \$2,727,200, and we expect to complete it for \$2,324,000—a saving of \$403,200. So that I may state, in round numbers, that on contracts 13, 25, 15 and 14 the cost will be \$1,560,139 more than the contract price; and on contracts 41, 42, 60, 61, 62 and 63, the saving will be \$4,051,630, or that amount less than contemplated when the contracts were made. I give this information to the House because it is of very great interest, and I know how glad the House will be to learn, that in those remote and difficult sections of country, we have been enabled to make so great a reduction of cost, to save so very large an amount of money to the country. I may say, that in regard to the work that is being constructed by the Government, the greatest possible care has been taken to secure a first class road. I may say, in addition to that, that the policy which I propounded to the House by changing entirely the character and class of railway to be constructed, by building the cheapest possible line through the prairie country, was abandoned by the Company when they came in possession of the road; and I can challenge the closest scrutiny of the subject when I say that not only are we carrying out the portion of the road to be constructed by us, notwithstanding these great savings in such a way as to secure the construction of a first-class railway, but that it is not possible to construct a better description of railway than is being constructed in the North-West by the Company. The finest rails to be found on this continent are those they are now importing. They are the highest class of steel rails; and my hon. friend and predecessor, will perhaps be surprised to learn that they use a better fish-plate than that on the Intercolonial Railway, or the Canadian Pacific Railway as carried on by my hon. friend and after him by me until this change took place. The adoption of a fish-plate in the form of a knee—giving much greater strength than the excellent pattern we used, shows they are determined to economize in the operation of the road by the construction of the very best description of road possible. Instead of laying out a road upon the prairie with merely a sufficient amount of ballast to enable it to be operated—as I contemplated at the time I found so much difficulty, owing to the want of support of hon. gentleman opposite, in carrying on the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government undertaking—a raised road, so far as snow, water and all those difficulties are concerned, is being constructed not only on the trunk, but on all branch lines. The result of this to the country will be most important; because we shall have in this country, extending from sea to sea, a class of railway of the very highest character, over which the greatest amount of speed can be obtained, and the largest volume of traffic carried at the cheapest possible rate. In the construction of a national line of railway, the House will see of what vital importance it is to Canada, in view of the competition with those great national projects to the south of us, the Northern Pacific, the Union and Central Pacific Railways, that to secure the traffic through Canadian channels, the Company should have adopted a much higher class of railway than they were compelled, under their contract, to construct. I mention that because the late Minister of the Interior labored under the somewhat strange delusion as to the want of care in the construction of the line shown by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Some person had pointed out to him that they were laying rails on the ice. I believe something of that kind did take place. I am afraid it took place in consequence of a portion of the road constructed by the Government between Winnipeg and Stonewall, being overflowed by water, and instead of taking up the track it was more convenient to lay it over the ice, and I dare say some sidings in connection with the traffic required to be for the time to be laid on the ice. I can only say that having travelled over 130 miles of the road, from Winnipeg to Brandon, in company

with Mr. Schreiber, the Government Engineer, and after a most careful examination of the mode in which the Company constructed the road, I was delighted with it. They were making every mile of the road, whether main lines or branches, the finest description of road. Of course, it involved in constructing a road on the prairie no such expense to make a first class road as in the rougher portions of the country. I may now, by referring to the line through its entire extent for a single moment, draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the position we will occupy when the railway is completed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, I would like him to state one thing he has omitted, namely, the amount expended by the Government on the first 100 miles west, and the condition of that flat country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I have not mentioned that to the House, because I have already laid on the Table of the House a full statement of all expenditure made by the Government, about \$700,000, and the statement of the payment of that claim by the Company to the Government. It would have been embraced here but for the fact that it had been dealt with in a specific return, and I will be very glad to supplement that return if the hon. gentleman finds any point in it in which there is not the fullest information.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have not seen it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I am not particularly proud of that portion of the work which was carried on under my charge, and throw the blame a good deal on hon. gentleman opposite—

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Who were very stringent in the means that were placed at my service for the construction of any portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I was compelled, under the difficulties of the position, to fall back upon adopting through the prairie, another class of road; and I am afraid that the contrast between the operations of the Company and my own, in regard to the construction of the railway through the prairie section, is one certainly that I do not consider particularly flattering to myself, so that the hon. gentleman will excuse me if I do not dilate quite as fully upon that branch of the subject as I might otherwise have been tempted to do. Now, I may say that, assuming that seventy-nine miles is to be saved—and Major Rogers seems to be very sanguine that he will obtain a saving of seventy-nine miles—if it be not saved of course these figures will have to be changed—but I assume that it will be saved, and we shall then stand in this position: That from Montreal to Port Moody by the Canadian Pacific Railway the distance will be 2,850 miles; from New York to Port Moody, *via* the Canadian Pacific Railway and Montreal, the distance will be only 3,260 miles; from New York to Port Moody, by the Canadian Pacific Railway and Brockville, the shortest means by which they can reach the point, the distance will be 3,140 miles. Now, Sir, from New York to San Francisco which is some 500 or 600 miles further to the south than Victoria, *via* the Central and Union Pacific Railways, and the shortest connecting lines in the United States, the distance will be 3,330 miles, whereas from Montreal to Port Moody it is only 2,850, and from New York to Port Moody by our road is a shorter distance than it is from New York to San Francisco, showing that for all through traffic we ought to be able, with our shorter distances, with our better line, with our better grades and curves, and with the advantage of having a road not burdened with the enormous bonded debt that the Central and Union Pacific roads are charged with, we ought to be able to compete over the Canadian Pacific Railway, with fast steamers

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

connecting San Francisco and Victoria, for a considerable portion of the trade, even between San Francisco and certain portions of the western States. That may be thought to be a very extravagant idea, but I believe that with the advantages we enjoy and with the character of the road being constructed, we may not only hope to hold all the traffic of our own country over our own lines, but we may be able to enter upon a sharp and successful competition with either the Northern Pacific Railway or the Central and Union Pacific Railways for the traffic between different sections of the great Republic itself. From Liverpool to Montreal the distance is 2,715 miles, from Liverpool to New York, 3,040 miles, from Liverpool to Port Moody *via* Montreal and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the distance is 6,063 miles; from Liverpool to San Francisco *via* the shortest route that can be obtained in the United States, the distance is 6,830 miles; from Liverpool to Yokohama in Japan, *via* Montreal on the Canadian Pacific Railway, 10,963 miles; from Liverpool to Yokohama *via* New York and San Francisco, 12,038 miles; so that we shall have over the Canadian Pacific Railway the distance from Liverpool to Port Moody *via* Montreal 767 miles shorter than *via* New York and San Francisco, showing that so far as through traffic is concerned, it will be utterly impossible for any route on this continent to begin to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then, Sir, from Liverpool to Yokohama, *via* the Canadian Pacific Railway, the distance is no less than 1,070 miles shorter than *via* New York and San Francisco, showing that not only in reaching the Pacific Coast, but in reaching Asia, and for through traffic, we shall necessarily make our road the highway between Europe and the East. Then, Sir, looking at it in another bearing which comes a little closer home, the figures will be regarded with very great favor by the House. From Liverpool to Halifax the distance is 2,410 miles, from Halifax to Quebec 680 miles, from Quebec to Montreal 176 miles, from Montreal to Port Moody 2,850 miles, or 3,706 miles from sea to sea. From Halifax to Port Moody the distance is 3,706 miles, from Liverpool *via* Halifax to Port Moody 6,186 miles. From Liverpool to New York the distance is 3,040 miles, from New York to San Francisco 3,790 miles, making 6,830 miles.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In the distance from Montreal to Liverpool does the hon. gentleman calculate by the Straits of Belle Isle or by Cape Race?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I am taking it by the shortest line I can get; but I think that in taking the distance from Liverpool to Halifax it is not usual to go by the Straits of Belle Isle.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; but the previous figures referred to the distance from Montreal by sea, 6,063 miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From Liverpool to Montreal, 2,093 miles, I presume would pass by the Straits of Belle Isle. From Liverpool to New York and San Francisco, the distance is 6,830 miles, or 644 miles from Liverpool to San Francisco *via* New York more than it is from Liverpool to Port Moody *via* Halifax, giving another evidence why, in our great national line of railway which we have now provided from sea to sea, we shall not only have a great through line of a most inviting character from one ocean to the other in our country, but we will have a line from Liverpool to Port Moody on the Pacific 644 miles nearer than by the shortest lines that can be obtained by going to New York and thence to San Francisco. Now, Sir, I am quite certain that this statement is one that will be regarded with great satisfaction by the House; and that the Government who assumed the great responsibility a year ago of submitting this contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the consideration of

Parliament, have great reason to be satisfied, that, after a year's experience, the only change they are obliged to ask Parliament for, is one to authorize a change in the location from Yellow Head Pass to one that will shorten the Canadian Pacific Railway by seventy-nine miles, if it should be found to be practicable.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman supplement his remarks as to distances to this extent—if he is so prepared. Assuming that Kicking Horse Pass is not found practicable, he proposes, as I understand it, that the main line shall be diverted north to the Yellow Head Pass from the upper end of the Qu'Appelle Valley, can he give the distance in that case to the Yellow Head Pass.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. gentleman has asked me that question, because it is a very important one; and one to which I have directed my attention. From Moose Jaw Creek, the westernmost point to which we have authorized the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway *via* the Yellow Head Pass, will not as I believe, increase the length of the Canadian Pacific Railway over what was contemplated, when we had this subject before the House a year ago; and when we anticipated the adoption of a more northerly course from Winnipeg than has since been taken. The country through which the road passes is better than would have been traversed by the other route. The grades and curves—but I need not speak of the curves, as they do not affect the question—the grades are less severe than those we would have been compelled to adopt on the line contemplated a year ago, and the change will not materially lengthen the line, if at all, if we have to fall back on the Yellow Head Pass, while seventy-nine miles will be saved by obtaining access through the Kicking Horse Pass. Now, Sir, I may say it is a source of no little satisfaction to me to be able to make so gratifying a statement as I have presented to the House with relation to this matter. After we have had the opportunity of looking at this question—not in the light of an abstract question, in which we were to some extent compelled to view it a year ago, but in the light of a year's experience—I have shown the House the enormously rapid advance which has been made in the construction of this great national work, for it is a great national work, whether it be in the hands of the Government of the day or in the hands of a Company subsidized—largely subsidized, hon. gentlemen opposite will say—by the Government of the day, or by Parliament. And I say it is extremely gratifying to find that the most sanguine predictions which any hon. gentlemen on this side of the House made, as to the progress of this great work, have been more than realized by the vigor which has been exerted on it by the gentlemen who are engaged in it. And perhaps, Sir, after this year's experience, which we are able to look back upon, it may not be unadvisable before I sit down for me to notice how far the fears, that were entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite a year ago, have been proved to be well founded, or unfounded, when submitted to this crucial test. Sir, I now think we have the data for expressing an opinion, and a very sound opinion, on a great many points, which troubled hon. gentlemen opposite when Parliament was called upon to ratify this contract. During last Session, I have taken up, Sir, a volume—I was going to say, of forgotten lore. I have taken up, Sir, the expansion on the Journals of the views of hon. gentlemen opposite during last Session, but it has ceased to be regarded—in the excitement that the country has felt, and in the interest that all the country has manifested, in the wonderful progress of this work, and in the remarkable development of the country under the operation of this progress—with any attention; and that what

seemed so fresh and full of life and vitality a year ago has actually become forgotten lore. Why, Sir, I forget whether twenty or thirty amendments were drafted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake). He will not say to me that he did not draft all these amendments. The hon. gentleman will not say that in the discharge of his duty as the leader of the Opposition he did not do so. I think that some hon. gentleman referred to an hon. gentleman as having been put up on this side of the House, because an important question was moved by him; but, Sir, I will ask the hon. gentleman if he did not put up twenty members on that side of the House last Session to move resolutions which were all drafted by himself, for the purpose of attracting the attention of the House, and, as was assumed, of reaching the attention of the country; but what is the fact to-day, Sir. From that day to this so occupied and interested has the country become in the rapid progress of this work, and in a rapid expansion of the country under its influence and development, that these resolutions have been utterly forgotten and if any gentlemen was asked on the other side of the House to recite one of them, I am quite certain it would puzzle him as much as it would puzzle some persons to recite the Lord's Prayer, and if some one of these hon. gentlemen was called upon for instance,—I would not be a bit surprised if I called upon the member for North Elgin to do so, if he commenced the recital by saying "Now I lay me down to sleep." Certainly these resolutions have all been laid down to sleep; and after having slept, they are now in a perfectly lethargic position,—consequently if I now stir them up a little, I am sure that the hon. gentlemen who spent so much time and ingenuity, will not blame me if I refer to them; and I may say that the manner in which some of these resolutions were drafted, reflects a great deal of credit on the hon. gentleman's head, whatever may be said of his heart. Well, Sir, what is the first resolution with which I think the hon. member for Westmoreland was entrusted. It was that the said resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that in the opinion of this House tenders should be invited for the construction and operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway before Parliament is asked to ratify any contract for the same. Well, Sir, if ever a resolution which an hon. gentleman proposed in the presence of this House, exposed him to the imputation of being a Rip Van Winkle, and a man who had slept for years and did not know what was going on, certainly it was the character of this resolution. Did not the hon. gentleman know that tenders had been asked for, and that the Government of which he was a member sent tenders all over England and the United States and Canada, for months, inviting competition for this work? Did he not know that these tenders declared that the Government, of which he was a member, was prepared to give 54,000,000 acres of land and \$27,000,000, and 20 per cent. on an unknown sum, which tenderers were invited to state.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The time for receiving them had expired.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh! the hon. gentleman says, the time for receiving tenders had expired. But why had it had expired. Why, Sir, it expired only because there was no person to be found in Canada, or out of it, who would look at their proposition to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway for 54,000,000 acres of land and \$27,000,000, and an unknown sum, which tenderers were asked to fix for themselves over and above the maximum price. This was the offer of the hon. gentleman and of the Government of which he was a member. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific

Railway was as dead as Julius Cæsar at that time. The hon. gentleman knows that the people had ceased to talk about the Canadian Pacific Railway as a thing in which to invest any money, and for very good reasons, as I shall presently show. The hon. gentleman is aware that after giving it the widest publicity, we were able to make a contract for \$78,000,000—valuing the land at \$1 per acre—while they had offered \$31,000,000, calling the land \$1 per acre, and they could not get a bid from any part of the world where they had sent their applications. Under these circumstances, I think it was hardly in place for the hon. gentleman to take the exception that tenders were not invited, for the hon. gentleman himself had been inviting tenders for months with the effect which I have named. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) also wished to explain his views, the views of the hon. gentleman who drafted the resolution and placed it in his hands—I mean the leader of the Opposition. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman was not quite in his right, or was not discharging his duty, in drafting the resolution, or that it was the slightest reflection upon the members of that side of the House to accept the resolution or the services of their leader in preparing it. There was nothing extraordinary in that, but it reminded me of a story I once heard of a Presbyterian Church in which one or two influential parties were becoming rather restive. They talked about going over to the secession or leaving the church with which they were connected. A consultation was held with the venerable pastor of the church, and the question was taken up as to how to secure these people who were becoming dissatisfied? His solution of the difficulty was expressed in these words: "Make deacons of them." So, Sir, when we found the hon. gentleman putting separate resolutions on this question into the hands of various members of the patriotic band who sit behind him, I concluded that he was making deacons of some of these gentlemen, feeling it necessary to put them on record as being bound by the resolution for fear they should become restive. In the resolution moved by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), I find it stated:—

"That the arrangements for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be such as the resources of the country would permit, without increasing the former rates of taxation, and that the work, if to be constructed by a Company, should be let only after tenders had been obtained therefor, and should be subjected to purchase by the Government at 10 per cent. over cost."

Now, Sir, I have a curious commentary to make on that resolution. There is a resolution drafted by the right hand of the leader of the Opposition, to which the leader of the Opposition pledged himself by voting for it—as is shown by his name standing recorded for it on the journals of Parliament—that he believed it to be true. If the hon. gentleman believed that the policy of all parties had been, as stated, in the resolution, then the hon. gentleman's memory was sadly at fault. I do not now know whether he was a member of the Government at the time the Order in Council was drawn up which was approved by His Excellency on the 8th of July, 1874, but if he was not, he had ceased to be a member but for a very short time, and at all events he was a member when the Tariff was passed to which the Order in Council makes reference.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I was not at either date.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Still I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to get the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) and every man who voted for that resolution to withdraw it, or else he will be in the position of charging his colleagues whom he had but lately left, of going in the face of their own document, the Order in Council of the 8th of July, 1874. I will read what was stated there, and you will remember that they were drawing up an Order in

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Council which was to be sent to the Imperial Government, that they were solemnly declaring the policy of their Government. And here are the remarkable words they use:

"In order to enable the Government to carry out the proposals which it was hoped the British Columbia Government would have accepted, the average rate of taxation was raised at the late Session about 15 per cent. The Customs duties being raised from 15 per cent. to 17½ per cent., and the Excise duties on spirits and tobaccos a corresponding rate, both involved an additional taxation exceeding \$3,000,000 on the taxation of the year."

Yet, Sir, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues having put their names to this solemn declaration that the Government of the day, that the Government of which he had so lately ceased to be a member, while he was a member of it, had come to Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was not this increase passed by the hon. gentleman while he was in the Government?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, he must have favored them with the light of his countenance but for a very short time, for this increase referred to was in the first Budget Speech brought down by the Government. It would be like fixing an *ignus futuus* to fix the hon. gentleman's movements in the Government and out of it; but I must be excused for supposing that he had not abandoned them quite so soon after having lent them the weight of his name to get into office. But it matters not whether he was a member of the Government or not. There is the solemn declaration to this House and to this country, as well as to the Mother Country and to the Imperial Parliament, that instead of their holding to the policy that the rate of taxation should not be increased, they had declared that they themselves had increased it to a rate which gave them over \$3,000,000 in a year for the express purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think if the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), who is usually so frank and candid in his statements, if his attention had been called to this Order in Council—would have hesitated a good deal before saying that; the policy of all parties was that there should be no increase in the rate of taxation. Now I may pass on—

Mr. RYMAL. No; take them all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I can find enough in them to afford plenty of amusement to the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Rymal), and I can see he is very much amused already, by the broad smile which illuminates his countenance at this moment. The hon. member for Iberville closed his resolution with a remarkable declaration, to which I now invite his attention:

"That that contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, laid on the Table, involves violation in the above and other particulars of the settled policy in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and should not be ratified till after the people have had the opportunity of expressing their opinion through the medium of a General Election."

Well, Sir, a year has gone over since all these doleful predictions as to the effect the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway would have upon the country, and the people are a great deal better qualified to pass upon that great question, that greatest of all questions which have been submitted for the consideration of this Parliament, the National Policy excepted, than they were a year ago. They have not only the statements, the opinions, the views of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, but they have the best light with which to examine the question, and that is the light of practical experience. And yet Sir, these hon. gentlemen, who felt very anxious a year ago to go to the country, now that the country has seen what has been accomplished in a year under the operation of this contract, do not seem so anxious to talk about a General Election—do

not seem to relish a General Election with quite so much fervor as they did a year ago.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. How are they on your side ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thank the hon. gentlemen ; there is not a man on this side of the House who does not know that we are entitled to receive, and believes that we shall receive, the approval of an overwhelming majority of the people of this country from end to end. That is what they feel, and the hon. gentlemen knows it right well. Well, Sir, as I said, the great organ of their party, after howling at us because we would not give the people an opportunity of expressing their opinion at the polls, after the people have had a year's experience by which to judge of this work, now says that we are attempting to put a great surprise on the people, that the taking of the opinion of the people is the very last thing that a respectable Government would think of doing. I give that to the hon. gentlemen as a corollary to what hon. gentlemen said a year ago ; and I say that I for one would be only too proud of having the opportunity to show to this country how this Government dealt with this great question. Now, I come to the next motion, from which I excuse the leader of the Opposition, because it is a financial one, and I suppose I must give to the late Finance Minister the credit of having drafted this resolution for himself. In fact, there is a recklessness about it that indicates that its paternity was not far from the mover. I will read it to the House :

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway involves a total expenditure by the country in connexion with that work about \$80,000,000, exclusive of interest, and the cession of 25,000,000 of acres of choice lands, worth at the estimate of the Government last year at least \$79,000,000, making a total consideration of about \$140,000,000, while the railroad itself is estimated by the Government to cost not more than \$84,000,000, and that the consideration proposed to be given is excessive."

Well, Sir, suppose it did cost a good deal, suppose there was any foundation for the statement that it would cost \$140,000,000 to the country to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, whom have we to thank for it ? Who are the men responsible for having spent five years in exaggerating the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in questioning its usefulness after it was constructed ? Does the hon. gentleman forget that in the first Budget Speech he made, he himself said that to construct it in ten years—though this Company is going to construct it in less—would cost from \$150,000,000 to \$160,000,000 in cash ? Does the hon. gentleman forget that if any man in Canada, or out of it, is responsible above all others for the difficulty of securing the construction by his own of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was the wild, hap-hazard, reckless assertions which the hon. gentleman himself made when he was occupying the position of Finance Minister of this country ; Why, Sir, no man can read the speech the hon. gentleman made without coming to the conclusion that, to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, would be to irretrievably ruin the financial credit of the country and destroy the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada for many long years to come. And when the hon. gentleman came to consider the question of operating the road after it was constructed, his utterances were still more appalling, because, although he considered that the country would be involved in financial ruin by the amount of money that would be required to secure its construction, that was trifling compared with the frightful bugbear which the hon. gentleman conjured up as to the enormous burden of taxation under which the people of this country must groan to the end of time for the purpose of operating the road. Why, Sir, what did he do ? That contract proposed to pay \$28,000,000 for the construction of those portions which the Government were engaged in constructing, and which were to be handed over to the Company ; it also provided that we should pay \$25,000,000 more, in

all \$53,000,000, and 25,000,000 acres of land to secure the construction of this work, which the hon. Minister of Public Works, then at the head of the Government, and the hon. leader of the Opposition themselves concurred in, declaring at the lowest estimate must cost \$121,000,000 in cash. Well, Sir, let the hon. gentleman consider the proposal that he himself was party to, and that was to give 54,000,000 acres of land. Let him multiply the 29,000,000 acres of land, which is the excess proposed to be granted by them over what we propose to grant, by the price he estimates, and he will find that \$87,000,000 would be saved to the country in the land grant alone under this contract. And when it is remembered that in addition to that, he was prepared to give \$27,000,000 of money, it only excites surprise that any hon. gentleman, standing in the position in which he stood, and knowing as he did the gigantic character of this work, the difficulties in the way of its construction and operation, should have ventured to put on the journals of Parliament such a resolution as this. How can the hon. gentleman be surprised that all the series of resolutions and amendments which hon. gentlemen expanded on the journals, have become forgotten lore ? Why, Sir, I ventured to say a year ago, when we were discussing this question here, that when the time came to go to the people in a General Election, hon. gentlemen opposite would be only too glad to forget that they had ever attacked that contract. And, Sir, I believe now that the last thing any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, on going to his constituent throughout the wide realm of the Dominion, would think of would be to read one of these resolutions that they considered so important when they moved them a year ago. Why ? Because the light of one year's experience has revealed so much information with regard to this question as to warrant me in saying that if they are not ashamed, they ought to be, at the unsound principles to which they formerly committed themselves. I do not, of course, mean ashamed in any other than a political sense. I now come to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Sunbury, setting forth that at present the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway is premature.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The resolution reads thus :—

"That the resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, that at present the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia is premature, and which involves the country in an expense beyond its reasonable capacity, and would lead to the maintenance of too high a rate of taxation, while the postponement of that part of the undertaking till after the prairie section is finished, would enable it to be constructed at a much less cost and within a reasonable time."

What does the hon. gentleman say in the light of a year's experience of his epithet premature ? What does he say when he finds not only what has been accomplished under the contract, but that Canada is moving ahead with such giant strides towards national life, as we have witnessed within the last twelve months ? The hon. gentleman would require to be blind and deaf to shut out from his intelligence the knowledge and information now attainable, and the fact that everywhere, right and left all over this country, the influence of the Government, having grappled with this great work and determined to open up that magnificent country to the industrious thousands and tens of thousands outside, has, with the rapidity that nothing else could achieve, given to the position and character of Canada in reference to this great national work an impetus that could not have been anticipated one year ago. Look at the fact of 21,000 immigrants going into Manitoba since the 1st of January last, and tell us what that means ?

An hon. MEMBER. Where from ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have already told the hon. gentleman that it matters little where they come from if

they go into that country and develop it, and furnish the means of inviting industrious immigrants from other lands, by showing that in that country they can use their labor and capital in a manner more beneficial to themselves and families than in any other part of the world. The very fact that in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario, at this moment all alive with industries, rapidly advancing in every possible way—where a condition of prosperity exists, affording bread to every man in the country—at a time when all the Provinces, Prince Edward Island included—I say the very fact that we have opened up a region of such unbounded extent and resources as to tempt people to leave their happy, prosperous homes in these older sections of the country—affords abundant evidence that the interests of Canada were never more thoroughly considered than when measures were taken to open up our magnificent North-West to the industry and energies of all outsiders. Well, what does this mean, so far as our natural wealth is concerned? If the hon. gentleman will turn to the report of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, that the 23,000 immigrants brought between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 of hard cash into the North-West during the past year, and adding the value of their effects, we have a total of over \$4,000,000—an important addition to the wealth and capital of the country. With such facts, can any one venture to say that, grappling with this great work, as a whole, and dealing with it so as to show the world that we intend to have a great trans-continental line, stretching from sea to sea, from Halifax on the Atlantic to Port Moody on the Pacific, that that policy is not calculated to attract attention to the country and to stimulate its progress, and to benefit the country as the expenditure of the same amount of capital in no other direction could do? Suppose the hon. gentleman had been told that no sooner would this contract be entered upon, no sooner would the attention of settlers be drawn to the greatness and fertility of this great North-West, that in a short year applications would be made by colonization companies for no less than 23,000,000 acres of land, what would he have said? He then thought it premature, or beyond the resources of the country, to enter upon this work, but he was not so considerate when asked to vote \$3,000,000 of additional taxes in 1874, by hon. gentlemen opposite, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1881, however, he was unwilling that 25,000,000 acres should be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway for grappling with this great undertaking. If the hon. gentleman had been told that those 25,000,000 acres were wanted by colonization companies within one year, would he have said it was premature to undertake this great work? I have mentioned the \$4,000,000 in cash and settlers' effects brought into the country by those 28,000 immigrants. What does this mean as a source of revenue to the country, when we remember how valuable every inhabitant added to the country is as a source of revenue? I believe the returns of the Customs' revenue, at Winnipeg, between the 1st of July, 1880, and the 1st of March, 1881 inclusive, show a total of \$196,453.53.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is for 1880 and 1881.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and this was obtained under the policy of the present Government. In relation to Winnipeg, hon. gentlemen opposite know that when we came into power Winnipeg was dead—that the policy of the late Government struck a fatal blow at Winnipeg. It had decided to carry the Canadian Pacific Railway from Selkirk, away twenty miles from Winnipeg, across through the narrows of Lake Manitoba, and with what result? From that hour until we came into power and changed that policy, Winnipeg was dead. Hon. gentlemen know that there was no enterprise—that everything was in a state of despondency; any person could then have gone into that

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

town and purchased for \$1,000 property which he could not get to-day for \$100,000. That was the condition of things. The hon. member for Westmoreland thinks that an extravagant statement; but I tell him that it has been proved over and over again that a property which would not have realized \$1,000 before that policy was adopted, has within a year after its adoption realized \$100,000, and instead of using terms which are extravagant, I am greatly within the mark when I make that statement. If the hon. gentleman had been told that this policy would have had the effect of giving \$582,743 into the Customs Department alone, for the same period to 1st March, 1882, he would have hesitated a great while before using that word "premature," before he would ask this House to declare that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was premature. Suppose the hon. gentleman had known that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was going to lead to a degree of attention on the part of Great Britain and the United States with reference to Canada, that is of incalculable money value to this country, he would have hesitated before taking that position. Why, what was the value of the North-West to Canada, or the Crown, or anybody a few years ago? The most marvellous thing in history is the fact that the Hudson's Bay Company, employing as they were obliged to employ, hundreds of intelligent, enterprising men, were able to hide half this continent from the knowledge of the world for half a century. All that is changed now. What was the value, of the North-West, when in Great Britain it was regarded as a frozen wilderness, destitute of vitality or the means of sustaining a population. It was as rich and as valuable then, in natural resources, as it is to-day, but it had no appreciable value except as a hunting ground and a country for the raising of fur. But all that is changed, and I ask hon. gentleman to look at its condition under the influences that have been brought to bear on its development, under the attention that has been directed to it by this great national work. I say that instead of its being premature, the wisest and most judicious step ever taken by a Government in this country was that taken by this Government when they not only grappled with the work of building the Canadian Pacific Railway, but succeeded in placing it in the hands of a Company possessed of unbounded resources and of great enterprise and ability. The hon. gentleman knows the tone in which Canada used to be spoken of a few years ago in the press of England. He knows how successful the Finance Minister was in impregnating the English mind with his peculiar ideas with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, as to its hopeless character. But all that is changed. Let me read from an article in the *London Morning Post*—one of the great organs of public opinion in England—published the other day. I will not read the whole article, but only some of the references in it to the visit of His Excellency the Governor General had made through the North-West, and I will say here that I believe that as Lord Dufferin's visit was attended with advantage to this country, it is impossible to overrate the value to Canada of the wide notoriety that the resources and fertility of the North-West have obtained through the able zealous advocacy of the present Governor General. In reviewing some of his speeches, the *Post* says:

"First, from a simple point of view, it is of great importance that the political future of British North America shall be assured, and there is no more certain method of affecting this than by settling the immense tract of country between Fort Garry and the Rocky Mountains, and building a trans-continental highway through British soil. The next phase of the matter presented to us is the Great North-West, which appears as an inexhaustible wheat granary for our own countless consumers on this side of the Atlantic. The last, but not the least, ground for congratulation, if all that is said of it be true, is the conviction that within little more than a fortnight of London there is an unlimited field for the profitable employment of British capital and of British talents and sinews. The Monroe doctrine fades into mist before the fact that the

acreage of British America is greater than that of the United States. Even the mist vanishes as the boundless undulating prairies of the North West, embracing between two or three millions of square miles, furnish employment to countless ploughs and reaping machines, or become the home of vast herds of cattle, claiming for their progenitors high-priced sires from Hereford or Kirklevington. There seems to be abundant testimony to the quality of the cereals raised in Manitoba and the Valley of the Saskatchewan. Scotch and English farmers have been there, and have returned much impressed with what they saw. Thirty bushels an acre, with no need of manuring for many years to come, seems to be a pretty general average. As regards emigration, it cannot be doubted that if the right man goes there he will make his way, whether as owner or workman, in a manner at present denied to agriculturists in these islands. He will be under the British flag, in a country where his own native tongue is spoken, and where his sons may come to be legislators for the benefit of a generation which will see a mighty British American Empire established between the old Maritime Provinces and Vancouver Island, a chief factor in the magnificent result being the Canadian Pacific Railway."

I ask the hon. gentleman to tell me the money value of such an article as that. Look at these great steamers that are now crossing the Atlantic to this country, crowded with people, full of high hope and expectation, carrying their industry into the North-West, where they will become energetic sons of the soil of Canada. It is statements such as these which have entirely changed the current of public sentiment on the other side of the Atlantic with reference to this country. Then, what do we find across the border? Let us go down among our neighbors in the United States. I read an extract here from the late Governor Seymour's speech bearing testimony to the inexhaustible fertility of the North-West. Let me now give a short extract from a speech delivered in the United States Senate on January 10th, 1882:

"The report of the Canadian Commissioner of Agriculture shows that they have in the Canadian North-West over two hundred million acres of wheat-producing country; the reports of the individual farmers show that their yield of wheat varies from twenty-five to fifty bushels per acre, weighing from sixty to sixty-six pounds to the bushel. Their great Pacific Railroad will be soon completed, and the trade of China, Japan, Australia and the Indies will pass over it. It is nearly completed to Lake Superior now; thence the products of that country pass through the same chain of Lakes as ours has to traverse, and Fort William is as near Buffalo as Chicago is. Their now enlarged Welland Canal overcomes the obstruction of Niagara, and their line is shorter by rail through Montreal to Liverpool by over six hundred miles than any route we can take to get the wheat of Dakota through New York to England."

I ask the hon. gentleman whether a measure calculated to attract such attention on the part of the United States and of Europe to the Dominion, does not lead him to doubt the soundness of his opinions when he undertook to say that it was premature to engage in the construction, on the favorable terms we were able to obtain, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The *Chicago Tribune*, referring to the same subject on September 12, 1881, says:

"The wheat crops of Manitoba and the boundless empire which stretches far away to the north-west of Winnipeg, must be the test which intending immigrants will apply to the country. Reports for the past four years from nearly 150 different localities, show the following averages of wheat productions: 1877, 26½ bushels; 1878, 26½; 1879, 26½; 1880, 29½, and 1881, 30 bushels. The imagination stands appalled in its endeavor to contemplate the inconceivable possibilities of this country."

Reports from nearly 100 different localities for 1877, 1880 inclusive, show that the average yield of potatoes has been 204, 398, 302 and 318 bushels per acre, respectively; peas, 32, 34, 32½ and 38½ bushels per acre. But this is accounted for by the fact that the soil is so rich that vines grow too rank. Barley for the same years, 40½, 36, 67½ and 41 bushels per acre; oats, 59½, 58 and 57½ bushels per acre."

I give this to the House as the evidence of what in one short year has been accomplished in relation to the attention attracted to our country abroad, and the result of it he finds in the tens of thousands of immigrants—I suppose little short at this moment of 30,000—since the 1st of January that are pushing across the border to enjoy the blessings and advantages, and engage in the development of our country that has been opened to their view. I give this to the hon. gentleman as the evidence of the un-wisdom of the declaration that the time was premature when we could depend upon the contributions

to the revenue of this country that must come from its rapid development and from the industry and capital that are being poured into that Great North-West. Turn to any evidence you please, take any means of forming a judgment you please, and you find that not only at this moment is there no place on this continent that can compare for a single moment with the rapidity of the progress in our Great North-West, but that the great western States that have had such great advantages in the body of emigrants that have been drawn into their country, have failed in their efforts to accomplish such results as I have shown the hon. gentleman is exhibited in relation to our own country.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When the House rose I was endeavoring to convince my hon. friend from Sunbury that we were not premature in taking up and grappling with the question of the immediate construction of the whole Canadian Pacific Railway, and I endeavored to disabuse that hon. gentleman's mind of the fears he entertained when moving that resolution, by referring to the very great progress and growth of the country that had taken place in the meantime. I drew his attention to the fact that the application for land at the present moment, by the colonization companies alone, has reached the amount of 23,855,680 acres, and by the end of this week we will undoubtedly have applications for a sufficient quantity of land which, if entertained, would recoup to the Treasury the entire amount that we are called upon to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in money. I may say that these land and colonization companies, these parties who are made use of by the Government to bring immigration into the country have their lands on the terms that they pay \$2 per acre for the odd-numbered sections, under No. 1 of the Dominion Land Regulations of the 23rd of December. The even-numbered sections throughout the district applied for by these colonization land companies are obtained for free settlement and homesteads, and the companies are obliged, under their engagement, to put two settlers instead of one upon every section so obtained, and when two settlers are placed upon each section within five years to the extent that the land that has been sold to them at \$2 an acre, they receive a rebate of \$1 per acre, and they receive a rebate of \$160 for every settler placed upon the homestead and the pre-emption section. The terms are one-fifth cash, and one-fifth annually for four years, so that the hon. gentleman will see that in a comparatively short period, we have received applications enough from colonization companies alone, which, if entertained, would refund all the money to the Treasury that we are called upon to pay, thus removing altogether the doubt the hon. gentleman had that we were engaging in something beyond our reasonable capacity, and which would involve a high rate of taxation. Now, I may say that down to the 31st October, 1871, 2,258,163 acres have been allotted in free homesteads, and applications have been made for pre-emption for 1,270,751 acres. In addition to that 1,400,000 acres have been allotted for half-breed children; there are sales to the extent of 1,277,680 acres; and there is a settlement belt of 320,000 acres, or 6,526,574 acres, and that is without reference to this 23,000,000 acres already applied for by colonization companies. Now the hon. gentleman will see that under the policy of the late Government that land which is now being applied for by colonization companies, and upon which, in order to get lands at the rate of \$1 per acre they are obliged to put two settlers upon every section, would all have gone to the railway companies without any payment whatever, or any return whatever to the Treasury

so far as the lands are concerned; because the then Minister of the Interior proposed to give ten, twelve or twenty sections according to the locality for every mile of railway constructed as an inducement to parties to construct the railway. Now, Sir, I may say, while touching upon that subject, that this is independent of the amount of lands that are applied for by various railway companies, and some of whom have received pledges from the Government to receive lands for the construction of railways by private enterprise. The South-Western Railway has already constructed fifty miles; the Westbourne and North-Western Railway has constructed some thirty or forty miles, or has it ready for the rails and part of the rails laid; the South Saskatchewan Railway Company propose to construct a line in another direction; the Souris and Rocky Mountains Company in another direction, and they have all received pledges for lands to a greater or less extent, in most instances 3,640 acres of land per mile; and instead of obtaining the land, as under the policy of the late Government, for nothing, they pay into the Treasury of Canada \$1 for every acre of that land along the lines of railway they construct or which they receive in connection with the construction of the railways. Then, Sir, I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have sold lands already to the extent of 433,760 acres, and have agreed to give to colonization companies 1,930,000 acres, or 2,363,760 acres, which are pledged and disposed of practically up to the present time, or for which engagements have been made. The Hudson's Bay Company have also sold farm lands to the extent of some 400,000 acres, so that my hon. friend will see the marvellous progress that has taken place, and the wonderful development, which, under these circumstances, is going on in that country. I may mention, Sir, in connection with the increased trade of the country, which bears immediately on the prosperity and progress of the older Provinces, as well as of the North West, and its influence upon them, that in the year 1878, the amount of goods taken in bond from the older Provinces through into Manitoba, was \$1,374,311, while this amount, Sir, in 1881, rose to \$5,351,665; and I may say, Sir, that, to a very large extent, these are goods manufactured in Canada for the purpose of supplying the North West, thus affording a great increase of business in the older Provinces, and furnishing various home industries with employment. I may say, Sir, that in the short month of February last, the city of Hamilton sent \$103,252 worth of goods into Manitoba; the city of Toronto, \$301,213 worth; the city of London, \$60,000 worth, all in bond, making, in that short month, no less than \$464,965 worth, or nearly \$500,000 worth of goods which went into that country; and for the six months ending December 31, 1881, \$4,875,991 worth of goods were sent into that country. I am quite sure, that this, will settle the question in the mind of every hon. member, who is open to conviction, that we made no mistake, were not premature, and had not over-estimated the ability of the country, and did not involve it in any unnecessary burthen, when we took the step we did it for the development of the North-West. When we came into power at the close of 1878, there was not a mile of railway in operation in Canada west of Lake Superior; and on the 1st day of August next, traffic will pass over 971 miles of railway from Lake Superior and Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, and on the main line and branches of the Canadian Pacific Railway, without reference to the fifty miles constructed by the South-Western and thirty or forty miles built by the Westbourne and North-Western. I am quite sure, Sir, I need not detain the House further than to say that with a surplus of \$4,000,000 during the past year; that with the power to remove the duties from tea and coffee and reduce the duty on tobacco, with the abolition of the Stamp duty and the giving of \$150,000 to the fisher-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

men, and doing all this without, in the least degree, increasing, and instead of increasing greatly reducing the taxes of the people, I think the hon. gentlemen will see we were quite justified in adopting not a bold policy, but the statesmanlike and common-sense policy of grappling with these great questions, and putting the country in the position we have. I think, Sir, I need not detain the House longer in dealing with the motion of my hon. friend from Sunbury, but I am quite certain that hon. gentleman, with the fair-minded candour which I know forms a large part of his nature, will come to the conclusion that he had been premature—and not we—in moving such a resolution. I will now come to the next resolution, moved by my hon. friend from Quebec East, and I think that this hon. gentleman would find, if he were in the House—I am sorry to see he is not here—that he had been a little premature in moving the resolution which he undertook to propose. He moved, Sir:

“That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, provides for the construction of between 600 and 700 miles of railway to the north of Lake Superior between Lake Nipissing and the junction with the road from Thunder Bay, through a difficult and uninhabited country, and at a vast expense, that a mere fraction of the cost of this road would, if applied as a basis of credit, secure the construction of those 63 miles common to the through line and to the Sault Ste. Marie Railway, and also of the remainder of the line to Sault Ste. Marie within 3 years; that the line by Sault Ste. Marie would give Ontario, Quebec, and the East, railway connection with the North-West of nearly the same length, and of better quality than the proposed North Shore line; that it would also give to Canada a great trade from an enormous area of the western States, extending from the boundary to a point south of St. Paul, and even now inhabited by about 1,200,000 souls; that it would secure a way traffic; that it would thus give within 3 years, and at a fraction of the cost of the other line, greater benefit than can be secured by that line in 10 years, which is the period stipulated for its construction; that it would bring both the western States and the Canadian North-West into connection by rail with the ocean steamers at Montreal and Quebec on a route shorter by about 300 miles than the existing route to New York; that this advantage, together with the further gain of about 250 miles in the ocean voyage to Liverpool, would give this route a commanding position, and secure great benefit to the country at large; that the construction of the line to the Sault or Goulais Bay would also give a first-class rail and water route *via* Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay, within our own limits, by the shortest possible line for the transport of emigrants, goods and produce; that the construction of the line from Sturgeon River to or beyond Thunder Bay to the north of Lake Superior, is under the circumstances premature, and should not be now undertaken.”

Now, Sir, I think that the hon. member for Quebec East, after having heard the statement which I have made—and I take this opportunity of saying, I have laid my hands on the report from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asking for the change of route and also on the report of the Chief Engineer, on it, and will send it across the House to the leader of the Opposition to complete the papers bearing on that question—will find, no doubt greatly to his satisfaction and greatly to his delight, that everything which he stated in his resolution as desirable to be attained if a different policy from ours was followed, is going to be attained by our policy, and this not only without sacrificing and making subservient and subsidiary a great national line, connected from end to end through our own country, and without making this line dependent during any portion of the year on a foreign country for access from one section to another of Canada, and that everything which he indicated here as so important and so vital to the interests of the country, is all attained under the policy of the present Government, and under this contract. The hon. gentleman will find rapid construction within the three years he indicated, during which it might be accomplished of the road to Sault Ste. Marie, and at the same time that the amount from work done, with the exception of thirty-five miles from the trunk line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Sault Ste. Marie, will all form a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman will find that the direct route to the sea-board at Montreal and Quebec, which he so much desired to secure, will be secured, and this too at an earlier period than that at which he could possibly have expected to obtain it. The hon. gentleman will find

that everything that he has stated here in his resolution as so essential in his judgment, and as being so much better than the proposal of the Government, is not only all attained, but is attained without the sacrifice of what he proposed to sacrifice—of a through line through our territory, open at every period of the year, not leaving us dependent for six months of the year on the long, circuitous and expensive route, through the United States of America. The hon. gentleman will also find that under this changed policy we confidently believe that instead of requiring ten years which the contract gave these gentlemen for the construction of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, within five or six years from this time at the furthest this line will be open for the traffic of the country from end to end. As we have disposed so entirely to the satisfaction of the hon. member for Quebec East of the only objection he had to our policy, as set forth to his resolution, I pass on to the next—the resolution of the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Mills.) He moved :

‘That the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, while it gives to the Company the absolute and perpetual right to build branch lines of railway from any point or points along their line, to any point or points within the Territories of the Dominion, and cedes to the Company, free, all Government lands required in connection with such branches, provides that for twenty years no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion Parliament, or by any new Province, to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from any point at or near that railway, except such as shall run south-west, or to the westward of south-west, nor to within fifteen miles of the boundary between the United States and Canada; the same contract cedes to the Company the only existing outlets to the North-West, namely, the Pembina Branch being the outlet southward, and the Thunder Bay line being the outlet eastward; the Company embraces the chief proprietors of the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway, the only present means of railway communication with the North-West; and, thus not only is there no provision for securing competition, but there is provision securing the Company against competition, and they are secured in a monopoly of the trade and traffic of the North-West for at least twenty years, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable.’

Now, Sir, it is rather singular that the hon. gentleman should have taken so much trouble to expand on the Journals of Parliament a contradiction of his own policy. Here was a great Company undertaking to construct a great line of inter-communication through our country, and yet Sir, they were to build those branches right and left, without receiving one farthing of money or one acre of land as a bonus towards their work. Yet the hon. gentleman's policy was to allow any persons who chose to organize a Company to construct lines through the country, and pledged the country to give them ten or twelve, or twenty sections of land per mile without returning a single cent to the Treasury of the country. I think, Sir, he should have been the last man to censure the Government for permitting lines to be built which were to be built at the sole cost of the Company and not at the cost of the country. The hon. gentleman took great exception to the fact that two of the parties prominently engaged in this Canadian Pacific Railway were connected with the Manitoba, Minneapolis and St. Paul Railway, and he thought that was a very great objection. Why, Sir, let those documents answer this objection. Before the contract was made with this Company we had a great and powerful Company having the only means of access by railway to our own North-West—a company who were directly interested in preventing immigrants who might pass over their road from going out of their territory into ours. But what are the gentlemen connected with this Company doing now. They are scattering thousands of documents and pamphlets throughout the country, not showing a little strip of land at the top of the United States map calling it the Canadian North-West, but we find statements, over the signature of the Managing Director, that the finest land in the world is in the Canadian North-West. It has happened, just as I told Parliament, last year, it would happen. I said that the minor interests would be sunk in the major, and that as these

gentlemen would have ten times the interest in the Canadian Pacific Railway that they had in their own road to the south of it, we would expect that all their energies and efforts would be directed, not towards keeping people from going into our country and passing over their lines, but in disseminating such information and adopting such other means as would be necessary to direct the tide of immigration into our own country. These two vigorous and energetic men, Mr. Hill and Mr. Angus, are doing their very best to make public the attractions of the Canadian North-West and induce people to settle in that country. As it appears to have been the case that in the absence of sufficient material to furnish so many resolutions, some points were repeated in different resolutions, I shall not refer to them all, so I shall pass over the resolution of the late hon. Minister of the Interior merely saying that while the Bill which the hon. gentleman introduced is to be found amongst the archives of the Canadian Parliament, we will always have the most effective and perfect answer to the resolution which he moved that it would be possible to present. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) moved this resolution :

‘That the contract, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, provides for a distribution of the money and land to be given for the work, wholly arbitrary and disproportionate; that land and money, far in excess of the proportionate cost, is assigned to the prairie part, the easiest and most productive portion of the railway, which is alleged, will be constructed within three years, by which time, the Company will be entitled in cash and lands to a surplus amounting, according to the Government estimate of the land, of \$3.18 an acre, to over \$34,000,000, which surplus should have been reserved and applied towards the construction and working of the eastern and western ends, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable.’

But the hon. gentleman overlooked the fact that it was of the most vital importance to Canada, that progress should be made in a most vigorous and efficient manner, first, in opening up the Prairie districts of the North-West. He overlooked the enormous capital and plant required at the outset by the Company, in order to carry on the work with proper vigor and efficiency, but he will now be relieved to find that vigorous progress is being made on the eastern end of the road, and that the work is being grappled with in such a way that by the middle of next season it will give abundant assurance to the country, that so far from neglecting the progress of the eastern end it is held by the Company to be of vital importance that they should complete that section at the earliest possible moment. They propose during the coming season to lay the track on fifty miles from Callander west, and some sixty miles in addition from Algoma Mills going eastward to meet that point, and to place under contract fifty miles from Thunder Bay to the head of Lake Superior, thus showing that they are determined to push on the work as rapidly as possible. The great expenditure they are now making in endeavoring to obtain a through route at Kicking Horse Pass, is also an evidence of the vigor and energy with which they are prepared to grapple with the western end of the line. The hon. member for South Perth, who has given this question of the North-West an amount of consideration which, I may say, has rendered him an authority on the subject—and I do not hesitate to say that there is perhaps no hon. gentleman sitting on the Opposition benches, with perhaps the exception of the hon. member for Lambton—and even he has not been able to give the North-West that personal examination and attention which the hon. member for North Perth has given it—who is personally familiar with that country—I say that I am quite satisfied that hon. gentleman cannot regard the enormous development taking place in that country without feelings of the liveliest satisfaction and the keenest possible interest. But the hon. gentleman was extremely anxious a year ago as to the position that the settlers would be in who went into

the North-West. The hon. gentleman was afraid that under our system, we were giving too much attention to the construction of this great trunk line, and were not sufficiently caring for the position in which the settlers would be placed who located a long the line of that railway. Now, Sir, I think what has taken place within the last year will have convinced that hon. gentleman that his fears were totally unfounded. I think what has taken place will convince him that no person who was settling in the North-West would be placed at a greater disadvantage than were the settlers of the older provinces with respect to railway communication. I will direct his attention to his resolution. It says :

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway exempts 25,000,000 of acres of choice lands of the Company from Dominion, provincial, and municipal taxation, until such lands are either sold or occupied for twenty years after the grant thereof from the crown ; that such exemption is unjust, and will impose undue burdens on the settlers on the alternate sections, who will be obliged to make improvements and incur expenses, enhancing the value of the company's lands without receiving their fair share of the cost of such improvements and expenses ; that such exemption by freeing the company from the burdens of taxation, will reduce the inducements to the company to sell their lands early, and will enable the company free of expense to hold their lands till their value has been greatly enhanced by the labours of the adjoining settlers."

Now, Sir, I ask that hon. gentlemen in all candor to say whether, what has taken place between the time that he moved that resolution and to-day, it has not given him the most perfect and complete answer which it is possible for any person to give, to the resolution he moved. Why, Sir, what is the fact? The fact is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are placing the whole of their 25,000,000 acres of land in the market at \$1.25. Instead of adopting, the policy of holding them which it was alleged they would adopt ; instead of doing what the hon. gentlemen feared that the Company would be induced to do, namely, hold their lands until they would acquire a value by the cultivation of the adjoining sections, which would be taken for free homesteads,—what have they done? Why, Sir, they have said to the world : "We have determined not to sell our lands to speculators at any price." Offer them \$5 or \$10 an acre, or what you like for their lands, and the answer will be : "We do not want your money, but if you are ready to cultivate the land, you can have it for \$1.25." They have put up their lands at the maximum price of \$2.50 per acre, for the whole 25,000,000 acres, and for every acre cultivated within four years they return to the purchaser one half of his purchase money, thus reducing the cost of every acre of land to \$1.25. They do more—they treat the construction of buildings and the making of improvements as meeting the case of the cultivation of the lands, and accept that in lieu of cultivation to a certain extent ; and in all their regulations from the very first, they have aimed at placing their lands in the hands of persons who would cultivate and settle them at the lowest possible rate—at a rate that cannot yield them more than \$1 an acre, because no person can say that they can administer their lands at less than 25 cents an acre ; so that practically their 25,000,000 acres of land are open to all persons who will chose to settle on them at \$1.25.

Mr. TROW. That is on the express condition that the rebate is paid, which is an impossibility, because the settler cannot comply with the contract to cultivate one-half in four years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will find that he is laboring under a great mistake. I am told that persons who make it a business to break land estimate forty acres for a pair of horses in a year, that is to say, that one pair of horses, engaged in doing nothing else, can break the land and make it ready for putting under cultivation, at the rate of forty acres a year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. ANGLIN. What would the settler live on during the year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not saying what he could live on ; but I say this : that if a man, with a pair of horses, can in one year break forty acres of that land—and, after it is once broken, as the hon. member for Perth knows if the hon. member for Gloucester does not, its cultivation is a mere bagatelle, so easy that a man with a pair of horses can farm 100 acres a year if he wishes—then I say any man of any energy and vigor can succeed in breaking up within the four years—especially taking into consideration that the value of his houses and improvements are held to balance the want of cultivation of a certain portion, one half of his land, and if he does, he gets the whole of it at the rebate. Now, Sir, I say in that state of things the hon. gentleman's fears must be removed. These gentlemen show that they understand their business too well, to hold their lands at a high price. That every acre of land put under cultivation is worth twice as much to them as it would be if they got \$10 an acre for it at the end of ten years. So that that objection is swept away. I do not wish to detain the House on this point, but I have had a letter, which was published in the *Montreal Gazette* by the secretary of the Company, placed in my hands, which hon. gentlemen may read for themselves, and from which they will find that gross mis-statements have been made in reference to the terms of sale and settlement required by the Company. These terms were too restrictive, I think, in the first instance, but they were adopted with the first object of shutting out the speculator and getting their lands in the hands of men who would cultivate the soil ; and they have been rendered so liberal that every difficulty in that respect has been removed, and the best evidence has been given that these gentlemen are willing to part with the whole of their lands for agricultural purposes at a price that will not return to them more than one dollar an acre. The colonization companies they ask to pay \$5.00 an acre, and on what terms? They compel them to put settlers on the land to break them up, and they will grant the rebate of \$3.75 an acre if within five years they will put settlers on and cultivate the land ; so that the land costs the colonization companies under their terms, only \$1.25 an acre, and taking off 25 cents for the cost of administering the lands, the House will see that the land granted to them is not intended or desired to realize more than \$1 an acre. Now, Sir, what about municipal taxation, about which the hon. gentleman opposite was so anxious? I have an answer which I think he will regard as entirely conclusive. The city of Winnipeg is not prevented from imposing taxation to their heart's content ; but what did they do? Show their eagerness to get an opportunity to tax these lands and make the municipality rich by the taxes which they would derive from the Company who were increasing their wealth a hundred-fold? No ; they understood the interests of Winnipeg too well, and the first thing they said to this company was : "Make this your head quarters, and we will give you \$200,000," and they voted a bonus from taxes they paid themselves, to this Company of \$200,000 forthwith. That is the best evidence of whether the municipalities consider that to tax the property of this Company, or whether to obtain a railway to their own doors, is most in their interest. The little parish of St Andrew's, on the Selkirk Branch, actually come forward with a bonus of \$65,000 ; more, the Manitoba and South-Western Railway also obtained from the municipalities along the line \$100,000 in bonuses to induce them to bring the line to those points. Instead of showing any eagerness to get an opportunity of taxing the railways, they know that the greatest benefit that they can receive is railway communication, and provided they can receive that, they are prepared to tax themselves in order to give this large bonus to the Manitoba and

South-Western Railway. The township of Louise gave \$65,000 more in order to get another location, making \$165,000 altogether granted to that Company. Although the Canadian Pacific Railway runs through Portage la Prairie, so thoroughly do the people of that town appreciate the importance of having it made a railway centre that they ask the Portage, Westbourne and North-West Railway Company to bring their line to that town, and they will give them a bonus of \$100,000; and Westbourne, which includes Gladstone, supplements that bonus with \$75,000 more. So that here is \$605,000 or over half a million in a single year, contributed by these municipalities for the purpose of obtaining railway communication, showing whether they think it was important to have an opportunity of taxing the companies, or whether they believe they will be the gainers by taxing themselves in order to bring the railways to their own doors. Under these circumstances, I think I may venture to pass on from the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Perth, perfectly satisfied that the hon. gentleman, knowing as he does the condition of that country and the intelligence manifested by these various municipalities in taking the course they have taken, will find that the last thing that need ever concern any hon. member of this House is to bestow his sympathy upon the inhabitants of the great North-West, who have railway communication brought to their own doors without any cost to themselves, because they are deprived of the power of levying taxation, a thing which they show they have no desire to do. I now come to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who was very anxious to get the railway out of my hands. It did not look like it, however, and I may say I felt greatly flattered when the Government laid upon the Table of the House a contract proposing to sever my connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to hand it over to a Company, when I found the keen anxiety exhibited by every hon. gentleman opposite that that contract and work should remain in my hands. I could not but feel that great mark of confidence bestowed upon me by the deep reluctance they showed to have the work taken out of my hands and placed in those of great capitalists. After a year's experience I am afraid those hon. gentlemen will have discovered that I was right and they were wrong; that in the conclusion at which I had arrived that an independent company could grapple better with this great railroad than any Government, and that the work would be advanced more rapidly, more economically, and be carried on more satisfactorily by private enterprise, in the light of last years transactions is being clearly proved. The resolution of the member for Brant complained that we had not attained a finality. His objection was stated in the following terms:—

That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, laid on the Table, does not insure finality as to the public obligations in that regard, but imposes on Canada, besides the grant of large sums of money and acres of land, the construction by the Government for the benefit of the Syndicate of the most expensive parts of the railway which are to be built by the Government during the next ten years, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, I repeat, professed great regret at seeing that work pass from my hands to those of a company; but he took also the objection that there was no immediate termination of the connection of the Government with this work. But he will see how much we have done to relieve him. We have reduced the period of our connection with the road to less than five years. His objection was based on the fear that that connection would last ten years, that being the period fixed for the construction of the branch from Emory's Bar to Port Moody. But he will see that by the vigorous course of the Government it is proposed to have all the works, everything the hon. the Minister of Railways has anything to do with in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, entirely out of my

hands by 1st July, 1885—that the finality the hon. gentleman was so anxious about, in three years will have been attained. I stated with confidence to the House one year ago, that I believed all the expenditures of the Government might safely be estimated at \$28,000,000, for the sections in its hands, embracing all the outlays up to that time. After a year of further experience in the subject, having been able to make closer estimates, I am glad to be able to reassure the House that I expect before the 1st of July, 1885, to have severed our connection with the construction of the Government's sections, and to have achieved that finality the hon. gentleman was so solicitous about a year ago, without extending that answer.

Mr. ANGLIN. Your connection with them will be severed long before that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, so far as I am personally concerned I may say that those who have to discharge duties so arduous, so responsible, and under such conditions as mine, will not feel great regret at having their labors lightened and such connections severed. But I see no hope of it, desirable as it may be so far as my health, comfort and longevity are concerned. So far as the country is concerned I am afraid that the course hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued in relation to this great question as well as to others is one that will compel us to have the pleasure of looking upon them on that side of the House for many long years. The motion of the hon. member for Lotbinière has been disposed of already. His party was short of material and he had to make use of material already used before. It reads thus:

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway contains provision for ceding to the Company 25,000,000 acres of choice lands in the North-West, but it does not, as it should, embrace any provision that such lands shall be open to actual settlers at any maximum price; that the absence of such provision will enable the Company to lock up the lands at their pleasure for a long time, and so be injurious to the progress of the country, and add to the labors and difficulties of the early settlers, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable."

I have already dealt with that motion which was contained in a previous resolution moved by the hon. member for North Perth, and which, therefore, requires no further notice. The maximum price established by this Company itself, for its lands makes them available to all, ready to cultivate them at the enormous price of \$1.25 an acre. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), moved this resolution:

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway exempts 25,000,000 acres of choice lands of the Company, from Dominion, Provincial and municipal taxation, until such lands are either sold or occupied for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown; that such exemption is unjust and will impose undue burdens on the settlers on the alternate sections, who will be obliged to make improvements and incur expenses, enhancing the value of the Company's lands without receiving their fair share of the cost of said improvements and expenses; that such exemptions by freeing the Company from the burdens of taxation, will reduce the inducements to the Company to sell their lands early, and will enable the Company, free of expense, to hold their lands till their value has been greatly enhanced by the labors of the adjoining settlers, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable.

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway exempts perpetually the railway and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances, required for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the Company, from taxation by the Dominion or by any other Province to be hereafter established, or by any municipal corporation therein. That the property of the Corporation will be in substance a gift from the public; and its exemption from taxes is unjust, creates an unfair incidence of taxation, and gives an undue advantage to the Company over other railway companies, calculated to prevent the construction of competing lines, and the contract is, in this respect, objectionable.

Well, that hon. gentleman has also been answered. All that was covered in the previous resolution; and it is answered by the bonuses given by the municipalities out of their own taxation, over \$600,000, to secure the benefits of

railway communication. So I may now pass to the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Middlesex, as follows:—

“That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway provides, that Parliament shall not have power to interfere with the tolls, charged by the Company, unless the same produce, first the working expenses of the whole line, including the British Columbia and Lake Superior sections, which working expenses comprise all expenses of maintenance of the railway and of the stations, buildings, workshops and appurtenances belonging thereto, and the rolling-stock and other stock and movable plant used in the working thereof, and also hire of engines, rents, charges and interest on lands not paid for, and all expenses incidental to working the railway and the traffic thereon, including stores and all consumable articles, and also rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accidents or losses, also all salaries and wages of persons employed in connection with the railway or traffic, and all office and management expenses, including directors’ fees, agency, legal and other like expenses, and thereafter a profit at least of 10 per cent. on the capital expended on the construction of the railway which includes the public money and the proceeds of the public lands so expended, thus restraining Parliament from interfering unless the Company receives at least \$8,000,000 a year profit, on a private capital of merely nominal amount; the Parliament ought to have power to regulate the tolls on the railway from time to time, as and when the public interest requires, and that the contract is, in this respect, objectionable.”

He charged that the profit will have to be \$8,000,000 before the tolls could be lowered. An answer was given to the hon. gentleman before the House rose last year, by an amendment to the Canadian Railways Act embodying in that Act what was the understanding with the Company and ourselves, that their capital should be regarded not as the amount which they had received from the Government of Canada, but as the actual capital they contributed themselves. But, Sir, the hon. gentlemen seemed to overlook the fact that not a cent of toll could be charged to any passenger or for a pound of freight carried over the Canadian Pacific Railway, until the Company had the sanction of the Governor in Council to enable them to charge that toll. He seemed to forget that the right hon. the First Minister stated that it was the intention of the Government to fix those tolls that should thus be collected, and only to make the Order in Council for a certain specific term until the condition of the country and the road and matters appertaining could be reconsidered and the tolls re-adjusted in such a way as to do full justice to the country. The answer to that, I think, will be quite as conclusive as those I have been already able to give. I hold in my hand a statement of the tolls that this corporation are authorized by the Governor in Council to collect from the inhabitants of that country who obtained such a large amount of sympathy from hon. gentlemen a year ago. I have made a comparative statement of the tariffs of the Intercolonial Railway, Prince Edward Island Railway, the Canada Central Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway when operated by the Government, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, the Western and North-Western, the Grand Trunk and others. Hon. gentlemen will see that while I have taken leading lines in Canada, so as to make a clear contrast, I have dealt, to a considerable extent, with railways opening up the North-Western States and running through, as the hon. gentleman knows, sections of country where there is a certain amount of similarity with our North-West, but where there is a much greater degree of settlement than in our Canadian North-West. As this is a matter to which the hon. leader of the Opposition devoted a great deal of attention, and which I understand he deplored more deeply than any thing else in connection with this contract, I am quite sure the House will bear with me if I take the opportunity, at some length, to show the hon. gentleman that his sympathy was thrown away; that it was not required, and that there is no room for him to bestow any more of it in that connection. Of course, the charges upon railways are in proportion to the distance that freight is carried. That is the mode in which all railway tariffs are constructed. The following is the comparative statement:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Railway	Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.				Distance in Miles.	Class per 100 lbs.								
		1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.		1.	2.	3.	4.					
Intercolonial Railway	20 to 25	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	75 to 100	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	do	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	do	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	do	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
Prince Edward Island Railway	do	14	12	9	7	do	20	16	14	10	do	24	20	15	11	do	30	24	17	12	do	30	24	17	12
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	do	14	12	9	7	do	20	16	14	10	do	24	20	15	11	do	30	24	17	12	do	30	24	17	12
Canadian Pacific Railway (under Government)	do	17	14	11	8	do	24	18	15	11	do	29	22	19	15	do	34	22	22	17	do	45	36	29	23
Central Vermont Railway	do	18	15	12	9	do	25	19	15	12	do	30	23	19	15	do	35	27	22	18	do	45	36	29	23
Toronto, Grey & Bruce Railway	do	17	14	10	8	do	25	19	14	11	do	33	25	19	15	do	42	33	25	19	do	45	36	29	23
Canada Central Railway	do	18	15	12	9	do	26	20	17	13	do	31	26	21	15	do	36	30	24	18	do	45	36	29	23
St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway	do	18	14	11	9	do	28	20	17	13	do	38	30	24	19	do	48	38	29	23	do	45	36	29	23
Northern & North-Western Railway	do	14	12	10	8	do	27	21	20	17	do	50	40	30	25	do	58	48	38	30	do	50	42	33	25
Grand Trunk Railway	do	16	13	11	9	do	24	18	17	13	do	35	30	25	19	do	35	30	25	19	do	50	42	33	25
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway	do	20	17	13	10	do	28	23	19	14	do	38	32	25	19	do	38	32	25	19	do	50	42	33	25
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway	do	22	19	17	14	do	35	30	25	22	do	45	40	37	32	do	55	45	37	32	do	69	59	49	39
Northern Pacific Railway	do	25	20	15	13	do	30	25	21	16	do	45	40	38	32	do	52	45	38	32	do	75	65	55	43
Union Pacific Railway	do	25	23	19	15	do	38	33	30	23	do	61	50	45	35	do	61	50	45	35	do	80	66	59	48
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railway	do	19	18	17	17	do	33	28	23	21	do	46	42	37	35	do	46	42	37	35	do	66	57	48	39
Chicago & North-Western Railway	do	18	16	13	12	do	30	27	23	19	do	46	40	33	24	do	46	40	33	24	do	59	49	39	29
Chicago & North-Western Railway	do	20	17	14	11	do	27	21	17	14	do	36	29	23	17	do	41	34	26	19	do	59	49	39	29

It will be seen by this statement that the first thing this corporation did was to reduce their tariff below the amount which the Government had charged for the same service before the road passed out of their hands, and that its rates are considerably below those of many roads. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway charges 75 cents for the service for which the Canadian Pacific Railway charges 45 cents. The Northern Pacific charges 80 cents for the same service; the Union Pacific 60 cents; the Chicago, Burlington, Quincy Railway, 59 cents; and so on the same relation is held with the various classes of freight for the various districts I have mentioned. I am asked by my hon. friend behind me if there is any one of these sixteen railways which charges less than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to the best of my knowledge, holding the paper in my hand, I do not see a single case in which the charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway is not as low as any one I have stated.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has already stated some instances himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, I leave the Government railways out of this comparison for the reason I have already stated, but among all these other companies I do not see one case.

Mr. BLAKE. There is the Northern and the North-Western.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Central Vermont I see is a cent lower, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, which has been complained of so much, is also 3 cents lower—that is in the short distance and for the first-class freight; but, as I said, I will ask permission of the House to publish this table exactly as it stands in the *Hansard*, as a matter of record, and a very useful one it will be in dealing with this very important question of freights. Yes, the Northern and North-Western is 16 cents to 17 cents for the first-class, which is a cent lower, but on the longer distance I do not see any of these of which I have the amounts given which is lower than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as I have shown in the distances of 145 miles to 150 miles it is very greatly lower. I think the same will be found which referred to the charges for 70 to 75 miles and from 95 to 100 miles. I think it will be found that there are no charges lower than those of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the 95 to 100 miles. From 79 to 75 miles, the charges are 29, 22, 19 and 50 cents, but I see no instance in this table, which is compiled so far as the figures could be obtained for the various distances in which the Canadian Pacific Railway is not the lowest. From 45 to 50 miles the charges are 24, 18, 15 and 12 cents according to the class of freight. I think for the distance from forty-five to fifty miles there is not a single instance, so far as I am able to see at this moment, among all these railways, that the charges are not higher than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there are only a very few instances in the distance from twenty to twenty-five miles in which the charge is higher. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver) was very much afraid this Company, in the latitude they were allowed of locating the line subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, would deflect the line through the Prairie County in such a manner as largely to defeat the main object of establishing a great central route through the North-West. I give the hon. gentleman the evidence that his fears were unfounded from the fact that the first thing they do is to rebuild the line from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie with one main object of shortening the distance by thirteen miles, and the evidence that they are expending at this moment a large sum of money in endeavoring to obtain the most direct line by the Kicking Horse Pass in order to make this a through continental line by shortening it by every possible means in their power. Then the hon. member for South Wellington

(Mr. Guthrie) moved a resolution, which I need not go over, because it has been all embraced in two or three of the other resolutions. It is with regard to this question of reducing the tolls, and the question of capital which was dealt with by the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), and which I have already answered, I think, by showing that the first thing they did was to lower the rate that the Government were charging, and that the Governor in Council has only authorized a rate that is in almost every instance greatly below that of railways that are similarly situated. The hon. gentleman for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) dealt with this question of tolls, which seems to have agitated hon. gentlemen opposite very much, but I need not say anything more with respect to that. I now come to the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), who said:

"The contract does not make satisfactory provision for securing the traffic to and from Montreal and the last by the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, against preferential charges which the Canada Pacific Railway may establish in favor of the Canada Central Railway, the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway, the Coteau Railway, or other lines of railway to the south and east."

Well, Sir, I think that objection has been removed. The first thing this corporation does is to obtain, by an expenditure of \$4,000,000, a through line from the capital of the country to the initial point of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Lake Nipissing, by the purchase of the Canada Central Railway, and having done that, evidently with the view to meet the anxiety of the hon. member for South Huron in this matter of not giving fair play to the line between the city of Ottawa and Montreal on the Quebec side of the river, this Company has acquired by a further outlay of some \$4,000,000 the line from here to Montreal; so I think, Sir, they have effectually disposed of the objections the hon. gentleman stated in this resolution by providing, in connection with the purchase, for traffic arrangements with the line from Montreal to the harbor of Quebec, thus obtaining power to make the rate themselves over that road to Quebec, and practically giving the country a through line of communication from Port Moody, on the Pacific, to the great centres of commerce of Montreal and Quebec, and bringing these into the most easy and perfect communication with the seaboard on both sides of the continent. I need not say that it is an open secret with the House—I believe the fact is well known—that it is proposed by providing for a ferry at Quebec and shortening the communication from Lévis to the Intercolonial, to make that the most rapid and perfect communication from Port Moody on the one side down over this great national undertaking to Quebec, and thence to Halifax, carrying the trade and business of the country on a through line from ocean to ocean and providing every facility for bringing the commerce of the country over our own great national highway. Then the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) was afraid that the revenue would suffer by our providing for the admission, duty free, of all steel rails, fish-plates and other fastenings, spikes, and nuts, timber and all materials for bridges to be used in the original construction of the railway. Well, Sir, I have already told the hon. gentleman that, of course, steel rails are free. I have told him that the finest description of steel rails ever imported in this country are being imported for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the fastenings as well, in the construction of that road. I may also tell hon. gentlemen that the bridges are all iron and that the revenue does not suffer on them in the slightest degree, because they are constructed in the Province of Ontario. Therefore, we may pass by that resolution without further attention. The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) moved in amendment, stating:

"That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway makes no sufficient or satisfactory provision for the construction of the work in a proper manner, or its efficient operation afterwards, nor does it, as

it should, provide that so much of the work as is done by the Company shall, in case they make default in completing the railway, belong to the Government, and that the contract is, in these respects, objectionable.

The hon. gentleman has been informed that the road is first-class in every respect, that the rails were of the best description, and when I ventured to say a year ago that we had a better guarantee than any standard that might be laid down, in the fact that these gentlemen were obliged to operate their road for all time to come, after it was constructed, and said that that was the best possible assurance that they would not fail to construct the road in the most efficient manner, because just in proportion as they did so they would be able to operate it cheaply and efficiently. The evidence is now before the country, and I have stated to the House that they have taken precisely the same view of that question which was taken by me, so that the fears of the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) have proved as unfounded as the others. The fact that the Company have been able to handle \$603,000 worth of business between May and February is the best evidence that they are to operate the road efficiently as well as to construct it in a first-class manner. Then the hon. member for Bellechasse, (Mr. Larue) moved a resolution in which he exhibited a great deal of patriotic anxiety that this road should not pass into the hands of foreigners,—and evinced also a good deal of jealousy of certain foreigners connected with the work. He moved the following resolution:—

That the said resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved, That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway makes no provision for the creation or continuance of a substantial Canadian interest in the stock of the Company; nor does it guard against the transfer of a controlling interest to foreigners at any time of the incorporation of the Company; and it provides that the Company may appoint and fix places of business beyond the limits of Canada, where the business of the Company may be transacted, and at which the directors and shareholders may meet; that under this provision the important business of the Company may be transacted, and its directors' and shareholders' meetings held in St. Paul, Minnesota, or New York, or elsewhere in the United States; that such power should not be given, and that the contract in this respect is objectionable.

It will be remembered that the late Finance Minister took very much the same ground. I believe that hon. gentleman had not the same dread of meetings in connection with the Company being held in the United States, as the hon. member for Bellechasse, but he exhibited the same great anxiety that the road should not pass out of the hands of the gentlemen who had undertaken it. That hon. gentleman (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) bore ample testimony of the high character and standing of the parties to the contract. He admitted that it would be difficult to find Canadians possessed of greater resources or means of handling a great work than this Company. He admitted that George Stephen, Duncan McIntyre, J. S. Kennedy, R. B. Angus, J. J. Hill, Donald A. Smith, Henry Stafford Northcote, Pascoe du P. Grenfell, London; Charles D. Rose of London, and Baron J. de Reinach, of Paris, were men possessed of great wealth and abundant resources to undertake such a work. Some of these men had been engaged in the construction of a similar work through a prairie country and in the sale and settlement of lands. The late Finance Minister drew attention to the fact that, eminent as were the positions of these gentlemen, there was no guarantee that they would remain in the work. He assumed that they would, under the contract, put a gigantic operation on the market, and sell out, at an advantage of several millions to themselves, and having divided a fortune amongst themselves, they would disappear and that we had no guarantee whatever for anyone of these parties remaining in the work and devoting to it the skill, the enterprise and the energy which they possessed. But what do we find after a year has passed? We find every one of these gentlemen to the fore; we find that, just as I said a year ago, they are regarding their operations with Minnesota and Dakota as comparatively trivial compared with the construction of this enormous

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

work in the North-West. We find that these gentlemen, instead of transferring their headquarters to St. Paul and creating this a subsidiary work, to that railway, as was feared by the hon. mover of this resolution, have not done so; and Mr. Angus, who had removed from Montreal and was resident at St. Paul, has changed his quarters, returning to Montreal in order that he might give his whole and undivided attention and great financial ability to dealing with this work. We find, Sir, that this Company instead of transferring their headquarters as the hon. member for West Elgin—between whom and myself there was a rather unpleasant misunderstanding in relation to something which the hon. gentleman said on the subject a year ago—feared, his fears are entirely disposed of; and that although one of these gentlemen who is the manager of that railway and also lived in St. Paul and lives there still, and manages the railway, he devotes his time to sending handbills of the most attractive character all over this and all other countries for the purpose of showing that the most attractive wheat field in the world is to be found north of the Boundary Line instead of in Dakota and Minnesota. Mr. Angus has gone to Montreal and this Company has invested in 200 acres of land in Montreal to be used for their headquarters, and great machine shops and everything of this kind, costing \$150,000 and paying £83,000 more for their general offices, or an expenditure already at their headquarters of \$233,000, giving, I say, every evidence that it is possible to give, that these gentlemen have the most unbounded faith and confidence in the success of this enterprise; that instead of being anxious to be rid of it, and letting it pass out of their hands, their ambition is to make this great international highway the highway between the Old World and the East; and that they intend to spare neither time, nor labor, nor money in making their work first-class work, a credit to themselves and a credit to Canada. It is not necessary, therefore, Sir, that we should take up more of the time of the House in relation to this matter. But Sir, my friend the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell) moved an amendment, and his amendment expressed the fear that the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway does not preserve to the Government the right to give other corporations running powers over the Thunder Bay Line, and Pembina Branch, but improperly cedes to the Company the absolute and exclusive right to these avenues. Now, Sir, that hon. gentleman will be glad to learn that so far from a desire to oppress, or embarrass, or obstruct any companies engaged in the construction of railways in the North-West, this Company had decided to build, and were engaged in projecting, a line from Portage la Prairie up in the direction of Prince Albert, but the Portage, Westbourne and North-West Company went to see them, to ascertain what terms they could make for the purpose of their taking up this line. And how do you suppose they were met. In a spirit of obstruction or embarrassment? Not at all. The Company said to these gentlemen: "We are only too glad to have the aid, assistance and co-operation of any persons who are prepared to take up a work of this kind and connect their line with the Canadian Pacific Railway and increase the traffic and business which will be brought over our line. If you will organize and take up that line of railway, we will not only withdraw from the ground, instead of building a rival line and endeavoring to obstruct or embarrass you, but we will pledge ourselves and bind ourselves by a solemn agreement to give you terms of running and of traffic arrangements, by which all your traffic brought to the Canadian Pacific Railway, will not only be carried to Thunder Bay, but we will give you an independent outlet at Thunder Bay upon terms of an equal

rate with ourselves, and a great advantage over our ordinary mileage rate." They entered into this arrangement, and this Company have secured an independent outlet, under these terms, to Thunder Bay, by which all the products which they can bring over their line, when constructed to Prince Albert, will not only have free course over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and have an independent outlet, but they will pass over the Canadian Pacific Railway upon terms which are eminently satisfactory and favorable to the Company that is engaged in the building of this branch. This, I am told, Sir, is the spirit in which they are prepared to deal with any of these parties. I think I have said everything with reference to these resolutions that is necessary, except with regard to a resolution which referred to there being no other outlet to the trade of the North-West. Why, Sir, it is perfectly well known that, at this moment, two lines of railway are not only projected, but that companies are organized, embracing wealthy capitalists, who are determined, and have decided to take up the construction of lines of railway from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay; and who believe that they have satisfied themselves that beyond question it is perfectly practicable for several months in the year to keep open a short and easy line of communication *via* the Hudson's Bay—so much so as to warrant the construction of 600 miles of railway between Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay, and thus furnishing an independent outlet in that direction as well as the one to which I have already referred. I think Sir, I have now covered the ground, so far as taking a brief notice of these various resolutions and objections made a year ago is concerned; and I am in the judgment of the House when I a-k, whether I am not warranted in view of the facts as they stand out now in the history of the country and in the light of the experience of the past year, in making the statement that one single year's experience has given the most conclusive and complete answer to one and all of the objections that a year ago were conjectured in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which I suppose they felt it to be their duty to give utterance to by bringing them, in formal manner, under the notice of the House. I congratulate the House, Sir, and I congratulate the country upon the immense progress that this great work has made. I congratulate the House, and, Sir, I congratulate the country upon the enormous, the unanticipated and the unprecedented development of our great North-West, as has been witnessed during the past year, and I say that I pity the man who from any cause—whether it be partizan political feeling, or party interest, or anything else, who can regard what is taking place in this country in connection with the mode in which this great national work is being carried out, without feeling a throb of exultation, and a throb of joy, that we are striding in the independent and rapid and effective manner in which we are towards national life. I say, Sir, to the great Conservative party of this country—I say, Sir, to the great Liberal-Conservative party, to whom this country owes its present condition—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, Sir, I say that this country owes its present condition to the Liberal-Conservative party. Contrast the life of to-day with the lethargy and death which was exhibited in relation to these great interests three years ago, and then tell me, whether I am not warranted in saying that to the great Liberal-Conservative party, Canada, this country owes the new life and vigor which has been infused into the development of all its great material interests. I say, Sir, I congratulate the great Liberal-Conservative party on what it has achieved—achieved, I would be very glad to add with the manly aid and hearty co-

operation of hon. gentlemen opposite. We were entitled to receive that aid. We had every claim that a party could have on those hon. gentlemen, owing to the position in which they had placed the public affairs of this country, and especially in connection with this work, for that independent support that one party, whatever they may be called, is entitled to receive from their opponents under such circumstances. But I say, Sir, we sought that aid in vain; and to-day, to the great Liberal Conservative party, it is not only due, but it is due to them alone, that this country has been lifted out of the condition of prostration which was witnessed in our country three years ago, into a condition of advancement and prosperity and progress to-day which will compare favorably with the advancement of any portion of the civilised world.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I simply rise to make a correction. The hon. the Minister of Railways fell into an error, when he was speaking with reference to a resolution that I moved last year. He did not read it correctly, as I understood him, but in the sense that it referred to the postponement of the building of the whole line, while it only related to the postponement of the British Columbia section.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I read the hon. gentleman's resolution word for word as it appears in the Journals of the House. It is as follows:—

"That at present the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia is premature and would involve the country in an expense beyond its reasonable capacity, and would lead to the maintenance of too high a rate of taxation, while the postponement of that part of the undertaking till after the prairie section is finished, would enable it to be constructed at a much less cost and within a reasonable time."

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has taken advantage of this little Bill—to alter one of the objective points of the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to enable the Government to authorize it to pass through the Rocky Mountains by Kicking Horse Pass instead of Yellow Head Pass—to make a general statement of the position of that enterprise, and to engage in discussions, some part of which may more appropriately come under review when we go into Committee of Supply. With reference to the financial aspect of the Government works under contract, and the works of the Pacific Railway Company, we are to receive explanations in the Committee, and I think, for my own part, I shall not trespass on the time of the House by dealing with that particular portion of the hon. gentleman's explanations in any degree of detail. It is obvious that a discussion in the Committee of the Whole, when an inter-locutory discussion can be carried on, is the proper mode of dealing with that part of the subject. I am not now complaining that the hon. gentleman has given us the information which he gave us on that point, but I am pointing out that it is impossible to discuss these things effectually except in Committee of Supply. The hon. gentleman, as I say, went through a wide range of discussion. He has found, Sir, at the end of a year, that, after all, it is worth while to discuss the resolutions we moved a year ago. He did not think it worth while to say anything about them before the vote; but a year's reflection and sober consideration has convinced him that it is well to engage in a controversy on that subject, and we are quite prepared to meet him as we were then. But before I enter into a discussion of that subject, on which I hold views, not unnaturally, opposite to those of the hon. gentleman, I will proceed to review his glowing account of the condition of affairs, in order to ascertain how far that condition of affairs, whatever it may be, is induced by those parts of the policy of the Administration which were opposed to the policy the Opposition propounded. Now, Sir, I aver, as the guiding note of this whole part of the controversy, that whatever progress has been made, what-

ever results have been achieved, whatever changes have taken place with reference to the North-West, are due to the portion of the policy of the Administration which in the year 1880, when it was first propounded, in the year 1881, when it was secondly propounded, was not merely not opposed, but cordially seconded by gentlemen on this side of the House—namely, the proposition that the North-West should be developed by the construction of lines through the prairie as rapidly as settlement required, aye, and even in advance of its requirements; and that whatever drawbacks there are to that country, whatever difficulties and impediments exist there, dealing with that portion of country alone, and not considering for a moment the general effect on the country at large, of the whole policy, the requirements and interests of that section should be carefully considered. But the views of the Opposition were not assented to, and by reason of the adoption of the policy to which they were opposed, and to which they believe events indicate they were rightly opposed—although in many particulars it will require a long time to develop the evils to which they referred, the country is already encountering very serious difficulties. The hon. gentleman began very properly at one end and went to the other end of the railroad, and there is a marked contrast between his language respecting the eastern and his language respecting the middle section; not that he was not vigorous, and did not use a considerable number of adjectives, mostly of the superlative kind, in describing the progress of the work in any part. But what have we got with reference to the eastern end? At the eastern end we are told considerable progress has been made towards construction. Now, the principle was that construction should commence on the 1st of July last, and should go on so rapidly on the whole work to assure completion by the time mentioned. It was then the policy of the Administration and of the Railway Company, to adopt an interior route between Callander Station, and not Thunder Bay, but Linkoping, some fifty-seven miles beyond, on the way to Winnipeg, and the statement was that that portion of the railway would be begun on the 1st of July, and vigorously prosecuted, so as to have that section completed within ten years. Now the hon. gentleman is obliged to admit, that that vigorous prosecution has not taken place. I think we have just cause to complain of the scantiness of the information we have received with reference to the details of the actual progress of the work on this portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The report which the hon. gentleman brought down, giving us a few lines upon that subject, is the only written information we have received; and since that time we have received nothing satisfactory until we got the oral statement of the hon. gentleman to-night. He has told us something has been done, that there were some difficulties and that the Canada Central did not get to Callander till about the 1st of July. Well, it was about the 1st of July, the work of constructing was to commence from Callander to the west. I, therefore, do not see that that has much to do with the question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I said we did not expect they would be able to lay the track to Callander much before the 1st of next July, from the absence of more vigorous work.

Mr. BLAKE. That accounts for the absence of more vigorous work, but not for the breach of contract. The contract was that they were to commence on the 1st of last July. What have they done on the first fifty miles from Callander station up? What is said here is: that a staff of engineers had been operating in the field beyond Callander, but no information was given as to any practical work in the way of construction having been performed. That is all the information that the House and the country

Mr. BLAKE.

has as to what has been done on the eastern section. What has been done? How much work has been completed—how much money expended with reference to these fifty miles? We know nothing at all about it. The hon. gentleman, however, is satisfied. If he knows anything, he ought to have told us; but simply to tell us that the work of construction is in progress is to tell us in reality nothing at all. Under these circumstances, as promises and assurances of a very free and emphatic character had been made in reference to the eastern section, it was necessary to exhibit on this occasion, so I suppose, a very great show of anxiety and energy in another way. It will be found that in the course of debate of the last Session, the First Minister said:

"We stipulated in the contract that the Government should cause to be completed the Lake Superior section by the dates fixed by existing contracts for the construction thereof."

Now, I say that this section can only be regarded as the main line, and we have no evidence of substantial work having been done from Callander westward. We have a report, dated 1st November, from the engineer as to the branch lines, including the statement that engineers had been employed in locating a branch line from Sault Ste. Marie. But shortly after that another announcement was made—the hon. the First Minister stated at a public gathering at Toronto, about the third week of last November, what I shall read:

"They expect by next fall to have built the railway and have it running between Winnipeg and Fort Calgary. They are bound to build that railway in ten years. They are bound to build it round Lake Superior. They are bound to do so, and, gentlemen, I have it from the Board that although at first when they entered into the contract with the Canadian Government they had a great deal of hesitation and a great deal of doubt as to the expediency of building the road to the north of Lake Superior, they now see that the Canadian Government was right. I have a letter from the Board telling me the tenacity of the Canadian Government was the cause of the road being so located, and that we were right, and they were wrong; and so strongly are they now convinced of the desirability of having a railway every inch of which shall run over Canadian soil—(applause)—that they say in a letter to me, that if the Canadian Government proposed to them to give up that portion of the road, they would refuse to do so, because it is essential to the success of the line as a whole. I have further to tell you that later surveys have shown that the railway can be built not far away behind Lake Nipigon, but on the lake shore and looking into the very waters of Lake Superior, and that route is in fact preferable in every respect. It is going to be more costly; but they say they are willing to bear the additional expense, because if they constructed the road *via* Lake Nipigon they could only attack it from one end, and it would take the whole ten years, but by building the railway close along the lake shore they can attack it in a hundred different places, and carry by water from one point to every point along the whole line of the railway supplies to build the road. (Cheers.) I have a letter to-day from the president authorizing me to make that statement to this meeting, that they hope and believe, in consequence of this change, they will be able to build the road in five years instead of ten. (Continued applause.) Gentlemen, I need not tell you how delighted I was with that announcement. As I said to-day in the convention it is pleasant to everybody, and especially consolatory to a man of my age. I stated last year, on my arrival at Quebec, that I hoped to look down from above on the completed railway. I now have some chance, if I remain as strong, please God, as I now am—I now have some chance of travelling over it in person before I am just quite an angel!"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Arch-angel.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman expects if he reaches that position he will travel any other way than by wings. But he seems to think he will travel by rail even after he is an angel. The hon. gentleman continued:

"I may add that the proposed alterations in the line will be of great and especial advantage to Ontario and the cities and commerce of Ontario, and to no place will this advantage be greater than to the good city of Toronto. (Cheers.) The road will run from Callander to near the Sault Ste. Marie. It will not touch that place, however, but strike near there, and run along the coast; and the effect of that is, by the construction of the road to Lake Nipissing, the supplies for the great North-West will in a great measure come from Toronto and London; and Ontario, which was in a considerable degree to have had the go-by if the road had run to the north of Nipigon, and gone straight through the wilderness to Montreal, will have its fair chance and full opportunity in trade and commerce and manufactures to supply all that great North-West country."

That is an authoritative statement from the First Minister, the Minister of Interior, announcing in very emphatic

language that a decision had been reached, and that the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was to go along the shore of the lakes and to come within a very short distance of the Sault Ste. Marie. We all understand that the investigations necessary to reach that conclusion had been completed, that the information had been handed to the Government, that the Government had satisfied themselves that that was practicable, that the result had been achieved, and the hon. Minister announces this great change. What is the fact? The fact is that nothing of the kind had occurred. In March or April instant the Government reports that that is a practicable through route by the new line. The fact is no evidence is offered the Government that there is any practicable route at all as a through line in this direction. The hon. Minister reports:

"By a letter dated the 30th ultimo application has been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for approval of the location of a section of their line between Callander Station, Lake Winnipeg, the western terminal point of the subsidized portion of the Canada Central Railway and Algoma Mills, Lake Huron, such section being part of a contemplated line between Lake Nipissing and the Sault Ste. Marie, originally proposed as a branch, but now intended to form part of the main line of the railway.

"That the said application having been submitted to the Chief Engineer he has reported, under date the 3rd instant, to the effect that the section of location between the points named, appears to be very favourable; that the route above described appears to be of no greater length than the more inland route proposed by the Government, and that in the event of satisfactory evidence being given that connection with the existing line at Prince Arthur's Landing is practicable by the new route, there can, in his opinion, be no objection to its adoption as part of the main line. As to such practicability, he states that although himself unable to form an opinion, from lack of the necessary information, both the Vice-President and the Engineer in charge of construction for the Company express themselves as confident upon the point.

"The undersigned accordingly and upon the further suggestion of the Chief Engineer, recommends that, as required by their Act of incorporation, the approval of His Excellency the Governor General in Council be given to the location of the line as now submitted by the Company and as above described, such line to be part of the trunk line, it being made a condition of such approval that the Company shall at some future time satisfy the Department of Railways and Canals that the route proposed is practicable, payment of any subsidy upon any portion of the Eastern Section which would not be common to both the present shore route and the interior route surveyed by the Government being deferred until such satisfactory evidence of practicability has been furnished by the Company."

That is all. The Vice-President and the Engineer are quite confident the result will be attained, but no information has been furnished to the Engineer of the Government or the Government itself. It is expressly declared by the Government, in the Minister's report, that there was no evidence whatever before them to show that the new route is a practicable one for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and without any such evidence they approved of the new route as far as the Canadian Pacific Railway asked them to approve of it. But they say this approval which we give is to be conditional on you at some future time, proving to us it is a practicable plan. What is the object of this? What is to be gained by this very extraordinary proceeding to approve of the location of a portion of the line along a route which you say you have not been shown any evidence to prove it is a practicable route? Does it advance matters? No; because the Canadian Pacific Railway are about to construct, under any circumstances, a branch to the Sault. All that it was necessary to say was: Go on; you are building to the Sault at any rate. We will wait until you satisfy us that you are proposing a practicable route for the main line, and then we will approve of the change of location, but cannot do so in advance. But the Canadian Pacific Railway asked it of the Administration, and the Administration granted this privilege in advance. The hon. gentleman has said this change will be of great advantage to the through line in many respects. I am glad he considers it now an advantage to go to the Sault. I recollect when he used to think it treasonable to go to the Sault.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, the hon. gentleman called it treason. I dare say he has forgotten it. I am not surprised that an hon. gentleman who says so many contradictory things, should sometimes forget some of them. He says it is a very good thing, and tells us, amongst other things, the route will be 650 miles from Callander to Thunder Bay. The figures he gave us of the former main line were, from Callander to Linkoping Station, 686 miles; from Linkoping Station to Winnipeg, 371 miles, which would make 1,057 miles from Callander to Winnipeg; from Callander to Thunder Bay that hon. gentlemen says will be 650 miles, though I do not see we have any evidence satisfactory to us of that, but I do not know what the sources of the hon. gentleman's information are. From Thunder Bay to Winnipeg is 458 miles by the line, which gives 1,057 miles against 1,036, or an elongation of 21 miles by the proposed new line. When we discuss the enormous saving of 75 miles at one end, it must be remembered that this proposed change involves, according to the hon. gentleman's figures, a loss of 21 at the other end. I maintain that the development of the country, the progress which has been made, of which the hon. gentleman boasts so much, is not in the slightest degree due to the surveying, the cutting of timber and other work done on the eastern end of the Canadian Pacific Railway. With reference to this same point I might observe that in an official memorandum as to the prospect and position of the Canadian Pacific Railway, dated 21st November, and issued therefore about the time of the speech of the hon. First Minister, to which I referred awhile ago, the Government say:

"From Lake Nipissing, where the Canadian Pacific proper begins, to Thunder Bay, on Lake Superior, a distance of about 650 miles, the line is partly under construction; and, it having been all but finally decided to locate it by way of Sault Ste. Marie, skirting the waters of Lake Superior to Thunder Bay, it is confidently expected that this whole section will be completed within the next five years."

Then again, in the statement of their intention, they speak with the utmost confidence of the location of the railway being according to the new line along the shore, and I suppose that confidence was justified, and that that result was about to be attained. Under these circumstances, if the voice of Parliament was to be heard upon the question of the expedience of the action of the Government, I think it was the duty of the Government to point out to these gentlemen that they should have used due diligence in prosecuting surveys with reference to the other parts of the intervening distance, inasmuch as both the Vice-President and the Chief Engineer are confident it is all right. I suppose they did prosecute the service, that they have the information, and that if not, they should have supplied the information, so that the Government might have been able to decide and Parliament might have been able to criticize and pronounce an opinion on that decision, which we are now unable to do. We are told there is an additional privilege of a new main line, which privilege is conditional upon the new main line being practicable and being proved afterwards to be a practicable main line. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to deal with the distance from Prince Arthur's Landing to Winnipeg. Here I may observe that the hon. gentleman stated that the line will be located from Thunder Bay eastward, and 50 or 60 miles will be put under contract from Prince Arthur's Landing along the new line. I take it, therefore, the hon. gentleman, although for form's sake he has inserted a saving clause in his approval, has decided in his own mind that the line is to go in that direction, although he felt that he could not, without any evidence being brought before him to show it was practicable, formally approve of it and decide that this change shall be made. Now the hon. gentleman proceeds to enter upon the figures and the transactions upon the intervening distance. This, I think, will more properly come up in the Committee of Supply when we discuss the hon. gentleman's estimates for

such works as are to be provided for the ensuing year. The hon. gentleman, dealing with the prairie line, said :

"The Company decided to run a direct line west from Winnipeg to the Portage, and they were permitted to abandon the line from Stonewall to the west."

At a subsequent portion of his speech he rather disclaimed any credit for that portion of his administration of public affairs which is involved in the location and arrangements for that line of 100 miles west of Winnipeg. I am glad to know the hon. gentleman is somewhat sensible of the circumstance that these transactions do not give him very much credit. It seems that the Railway Company found the line ill-located and circuitous, and that it was better to abandon a large portion of the work and the contract which had been laid down in order to get a better line. The report of the Engineer states :

"It passes over a comparatively dry country and runs through a settlement all the way, and is also about 15 miles shorter than the existing line."

That is the description of the new line, a line which passes over a comparatively dry country as contrasted with the country through which the other line passed, that it is direct, with light grades, and saves fifteen miles in the short distance of sixty or seventy miles. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the line proposed by the Company was very much preferable; so much so that I feel very great difficulty in understanding how the hon. gentleman hit on the other line, how it was possible to make the mistake that was made, as he found in all its particulars on this particular portion of the enterprise. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to let a contract for 100 miles more, and that was let under such circumstances, under such miscalculation of facts and figures, and under such difficulties, that he cancelled the whole contract and put an end to it. The transactions of the hon. gentleman with reference to the line through the prairie, I quite admit are evidence that some companies will do business of this kind better than some Governments; I do not say that all companies will do it better than all Governments, but that some companies will do it better than some Governments; because I do not suppose that, considering the circumstances, considering the information which had been previously acquired, considering the facilities for surveys and ascertainment, it will be possible to point out two mistakes more grievous than those which are connected with the letting of the first 100 miles west of Winnipeg, and the second 100 miles under the hon. gentleman's administration. Now, the hon. gentleman has pointed out that the line is now located to Moose Jaw Creek, and he says it will not be located any further until the ascertainment of the location of the point of crossing the Rocky Mountains. He says that the line is favorable to Moose Jaw Creek, good grades, and the character of the country is excellent, and that a contract for 500 miles further will be let in that direction during the coming year. The hon. gentleman says truly that the line has been deflected southerly. It has been very severely deflected southerly, and the bulk of the branches as projected are not now projected, as was suggested at the time of the making of the contract, to the north and to the south, although, of course, they reach northerly and southerly necessarily, but they are projected in a very different fashion from what we were led to expect they would be, and serve a very different purpose. It will be recollected that at the time the idea was that the line would be a great central line, and that branches would be made north and south. The First Minister pointed out this feature of the proposed scheme in the speech he delivered in the debate on the contract. He said :

"To encourage them to build branches, we give them a large and valuable allowance, so that the whole country may not only be opened up east and west, but be penetrated by herring bone lines running northward and southward into the interior."

Mr. BLAKE.

That was the general idea—herring bone lines. I apprehend this plan of deflection was arranged with the view to securing in the easiest manner the largest measure of practical monopoly to the Company, for it certainly means that some lines shall go for a certain distance northerly, and a certain distance southerly, but as a general rule, and as the hon. gentleman's own description of these lines will have indicated to the House, the tread of the lines is in a westerly direction, westerly on the north side and on the south side—line to the Touchwood Hills, a line to Edmonton, a line along the Souris River—lines of this description which are, in point of fact, lines in the same general direction as the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, only so far altered as to make feeders of them to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, the reports as to these projected branch lines are, of course, more extensive than the extent to which the hon. gentleman has referred, for he apparently only dealt with those which have been located, whereas the Company has given formal intimation to the Government of their intention to construct them to a much greater extent, only they are not yet able to lay down the exact line on the locations. The hon. gentleman says that this is a very advantageous arrangement, because there will be fewer branches; and that these will be longer and more easily operated. Well, I believe that there are considerable advantages in having all these branches running in certain directions, but I conceive, also, it is quite clear that the change which has taken place, is one that does practically cover the country very much more by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its branches exclusively, to the exclusion of other lines, than a central route would have done. The portion to the southern, the portion to the northern must necessarily— whoever builds the northern—come into the Canadian Pacific Railway. The portion to the southern is comparatively limited, and the possession of that has also been taken by the Company. Now, the hon. gentleman proceeded to state what the receipts and returns of the Company had been, and no doubt these receipts and returns are eminently satisfactory to those who are engaged in working the line. When we reflect that the great Government enterprise, with all its mileage and all its resources for the development of traffic, and with the vast amount of train mileage that was run during the year, has produced gross returns of some \$1,750,000 in round numbers—for the whole year—while the Canadian Pacific Railway in six months by the report of the Directors has produced some \$460,000, if I remember aright, and in a few months longer \$600,000, it is quite obvious that very large returns are being reaped even at this early stage by this Company. The hon. gentleman says that this is not due to high rates. Then, if it is not due to high rates, it must be due to a very large traffic indeed, because it will be remembered that the mileage is not treated as the mileage which they are now working; it is to be remembered that the mileage of the Company has been increasing from day to day, that the great bulk of this has been earned over a comparatively small mileage, and that the returns therefore per mile of a really earning road must be very much larger than what at first sight appears. Now, the statement of the hon. gentleman with reference to the allowances of the route lead to an observation; I see that application has been made on several occasions by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for allowances on different portions of the route, in different localities, and that these allowances have been made in almost every instance. I observe that the Engineer, on the 13th of July last, pointed out it was impossible for him to act intelligently in advising whether the location was such as should be permitted without receiving a profile. I observe that so late as October—I think the 21st of the month—he points out that he had not yet

received this, although more applications had come in, in the meantime, and he says that he wants in future to get these profiles; so that the allowances which had taken place, up to that time, and which took place at that time, were made without those materials being before the Engineer, which he himself declared were essential in order that he might reach an intelligent decision as to whether the location was such as should be approved of, or not. I am not aware whether the last applications which have been made are accompanied by the profiles; but it does appear that the great bulk of the allowances which have been made in the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, have been made on the face of the Engineer's own report without those materials being in his hands which are necessary to enable him to discharge his duty at all intelligently. The hon. gentleman says it is very important in making the change to which he refers, and with which this Bill deals, if it is practicable; and he has given us some information of a very distant date upon that subject. It strikes me as very singular that the Company is not called upon for all the information which is accessible and available before the Administration decided that they would bring down this measure; but it appears from the memorandum of the Chief Engineer, which the hon. gentleman read—and I think that its date is three days ago—and a telegram, which I think he only received to-day, that this information has been detained, not in order to settle the policy of the Administration, not as a means of forming a judgment, but in order to present this Bill in the most acceptable shape before the House, because it is felt, after the observations that were made the other day on this subject, that it would be wholly unreasonable to call upon the House to deal with this matter at all, unless the Company presented some information on the subject. Of course, Sir, it is impossible to crowd much into a brief general statement and a telegram which is special on the day when the hon. gentleman speaks, but I observe that the hon. gentleman says, that the difficulties of the Company are very great; that these difficulties are enormous, that there will be other sacrifices; and the Company will encounter great difficulties in order to accomplish that great result; namely, the shortening of the line by 79 miles. Well, no doubt, Sir, that will be a great result. It will be a great result for them. It would be a very important thing to shorten the line and have its maintenance through a difficult country by 79 miles. We do not know, of course, the relative difficulties of the country between the new and the old route, from the foot of the hills of the Rockies until you reach Kamloops. Assuming them, however, to be on the average the same, and that these 79 miles will save, that is the calculation of the hon. Minister himself to be the cost of maintaining the route by the Yellow Head Pass, and he states it, if I remember right, at \$40,000 a mile. I think that the Engineer estimates the cost at \$43,600 a mile, but the hon. gentleman takes \$3,600 off these figures and makes it \$40,000 a mile. We then find a saving of nearly \$3,200,000 in 79 miles of road, and I need hardly say that a very much larger expense can be incurred per mile on the not very long mileage of this mountainous section if you save 79 miles than what it would cost on the average under the old and decidedly easier route, \$3,200,000. It is quite possible that a very much larger expenditure may be made, running into the millions, and yet no greater expenditure. Not so great an expenditure in the lump may be made in order to pass the road by the new Pass than as would be necessary by the old route; and it is quite clear that if the Company have fixed the price of their work and are able to find a shorter route, for the same fixed price, the Company makes an enormous gain, because all the expense of maintaining 80 miles of railway and all the expense of carrying rolling stock over 80 miles of railway for all time, is the net saving to the Company. Assuming that it

pays as much for the diminished mileage, reduced by 80 miles. I do not know what the precise percentage that would be on the whole mileage of the mountainous section; and it would be 80 miles less than they would pay for on the other route by the longer mileage. They receive the same sum from the Government and pay no more in the cost of construction and get a shorter route, while they save in the cost of maintenance and in the cost of transit. Now, Sir, to that there can be no earthly objection. We must all agree that the best route for the Company in this particular, at the crossing of the Rockies, is probably the best for the country. There can be no difficulty in coming to such a conclusion, but after we have made a bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, based on their going to the Yellow Head Pass and building some 80 miles more railway, based largely on their obtaining the road and running the trains over 80 miles more railway of difficult country, which, according to the hon. gentleman, would not pay expenses for a large number of years, and it is found to be to their interest to change that route and take a shorter line at the same expenditure of money, it is quite clear that they are very large gainers by that change. What I say is that it is not unreasonable to consider that this ceding should be allowed for in dealing with the change. It appears to me that if a change is to be made by which the Company is to be greatly the gainer, the Company should consider the interests of the public in a pecuniary as well as in the other particulars. If we had made a change involving a more difficult enterprise for which we have agreed to pay a more liberal price, I say that when a change is made which is to secure to the advantage of the Company some consideration should be allowed for the change which involves inauguration in the conditions of the contracts. The hon. gentleman proceeded to declare the results of further enquiry with reference to Government contracts between Kamloops and Emory's Bar. Of course we have not had the figures; the report of the engineer does not give the details upon which the hon. gentleman estimates these considerable reductions. When the hon. gentleman applies for the votes in Committee of Supply for the purpose of carrying on these contracts, I suppose he will have prepared this further information, showing how the further savings are effected, and deal with the questions of alignments, and curves, and grades the alterations of which are detrimental to the character of the line on which the former savings, it was said, had been effected. The instructions to Mr. Fleming, and his response to them, were all based on the adaptation of the line to the sinuosities and the abrupt character of the ground, and if further savings have been made it is important to know whether they have been effected by a still further deflection, or deal with the ground as it is, or in what way it is that the previous estimates are incorrect in point of excess. The hon. gentleman's statement in the gross at another period of his speech indicates to us that the total results of the whole of his operations, the calculations he makes as to the cost to the country of those portions of the work which are to be built or which have been built by the country, are the same. There is more in one part and less in another, because he summed up in another part of his subject the result of the whole year's operations by saying that, whereas last year the estimate was \$28,000,000 for the Government portion of the works, he is able to-day to say that \$28,000,000 is what the work will cost. The hon. gentleman excludes, of course, the \$3,000,000 and odd for surveys and other minor charges, but the estimate is the same—\$25,000,000 of a cash subsidy. There are \$28,000,000 for the works, \$3,000,000 and odd for the surveys, which makes \$56,000,000; \$1,500,000 for the Canada Central, which makes \$57,500,000; \$1,000,000 for the Telegraph, \$58,500,000; minor charges, \$500,000—making, in

all. \$59,000,000, exclusive of the old interest before the contract was handed over; so that the sum we have named several times \$59,000,000 to \$60,000,000 is the cash cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway according to this arrangement. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to give us a statement of calculation of mileages from different points on the globe to other points on the globe. The hon. gentleman gave these figures with great energy and vivacity, as if he were communicating new information; but the only difference between his statement and those which we have had for many years, those which had been in the earlier reports of Mr. Fleming, is this, that he subtracted 59 miles by going through Kicking Horse, but he has made no allowance for elongating the line by going along the shore of Lake Superior. The hon. gentleman says that these results show a glorious prospect, and he points out that for new traffic with a shorter distance and a better line, with better grades and curves, and without any bonded debt, it should compete for San Francisco trade as well as for our own.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say: "With no bonded debt."

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, the hon. gentleman said it and I took it down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said, without the great bonded debt which presses on the Union Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman had, in fact, borrowed the phrase from the prospectus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or rather, I am not sure whether they borrowed from him or he from them, but they say with all the advantages it possesses, of less mileage, of easier grades, and being free from the bonded debt the Canadian Pacific Railway will be in a free position to command its share of the traffic from China and Japan, and so on. It seems to me that I have found the origin of that portion of the hon. gentleman's speech. Now, these speculations are very encouraging, particularly as to the absence of a bonded debt which presses our other railways. The Company itself feels that very strongly, as I have pointed out. They have stated it in their prospectus, and I think they should feel happy and very grateful to the hon. gentleman who placed them in a position to enable them to make such a statement. The hon. gentleman declares that these results are due to the policy of making the contract a year ago, and he takes up the amendments moved last year, and points out that events justify him in declaring that these amendments have been falsified by those events. Now, Sir, as I said before, I repeat, that the progress and the development to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, the immigrants of whom he has spoken, the various changes to which he has referred, would all have been achieved without the serious and growing embarrassments and difficulties to which I am about to allude, by an earnest, diligent and vigorous prosecution of the work from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg through the prairie country—without this contract or the enormous burdens which it has placed upon the country, aye, and placed largely upon the North-West itself, to the detriment of that country for a long time to come, in order to carry out that portion of the hon. gentleman's policy to which we objected as ill-timed, premature and unduly burdensome. We complained of the course of hon. gentlemen in doing more at the time and under the circumstances in which we were placed than developing the North-West. We affirmed that that was the prime duty, to carry the route through the prairie country, to get in immigrants, and to so increase the value of the land as to give us a basis on which we might proceed at a future day to make a contract to construct the ends at an infinitely burdensome cost than he will do it.

Mr. BUNSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman what kind of emigrants he alludes to?

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, Sir, look at the kind of immigrants this policy has brought. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the immigration of those three thousand Chinese now on the ocean—and I suppose he does not hope they are drowned—is due to anything else than the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They refuse to cut off their pigtails, they refuse to allow the Chinese to be taxed, they refuse to allow any discriminating provision that would prevent them from working on the public works of the country. My hon. friend will not work, his friends over there will not work, and the Pacific Railway contractor has to get the Chinese in; for they are coming in, my hon. friend complains, and his complaints are wholly due to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, I say that the peaceful progress of British Columbia would be much more encouraged by a wholesale immigration of characters such as my hon. friend and the hon. gentleman (Mr. DeCosmos) who sits beside him, than it will be when two steamers come together in the harbor of Victoria, with two or three thousand Chinese on board.

Mr. BUNSTER. Two have arrived and three are coming.

Mr. BLAKE. With how many Chinese?

Mr. BUNSTER. Too many.

Mr. BLAKE. Five thousand too many. We maintained that the part of prudence was not to make the contract which was laid upon the Table for the construction of the Eastern and Western ends. We said that the business in hand was to develop the North-West itself, and afterwards to make some other and better contract which would be open to us in a very short time for the construction of the ends. Now, Sir, what was happened in the space of this short year to which the hon. gentleman has alluded? What was happened in reference to the Eastern end? We know perfectly well that last year the hon. gentleman justified this enormous expenditure of land and money, these great gifts, these princely donations, on what score? Because he said: "After the railway is built, we have to give this gentlemen millions to maintain it; for many years the Eastern and Western ends will cost an enormous sum of money to run, and we have to provide for this." That was his justification; he could not pretend to justify this contract as a contract for construction; he did not pretend to justify this as a reasonable price for the construction of the road which was afterwards to be owned by the company constructing it; but he said that because they were to incur such an enormous loss in the compulsory keeping open of the Eastern and Western ends, therefore it was that this great price became no more than reasonable. Now, what is the fact to day? I refer once again to that interesting document, the speech of the hon. First Minister made in November last, in which he said:

"They (the Company) are bound to build that railway round Lake Superior. They are bound to do so, and, gentlemen, I have it from the Board that, although at first, when they entered into the contract with the Canadian Government, they had a great deal of hesitation and doubt about building the road to the north of Lake Superior, they now see that the Canadian Government was right. I have a letter from the Board telling me that the tenacity of the Canadian Government was the cause of the road being so located, and that we were right and they were wrong; and so strongly are they convinced of having a railway, every inch of which will run over Canadian soil, that if the Canadian Government asked them to give up that portion of the road, they would refuse to do so, because it was essential to the whole."

When they first called on the hon. gentleman, they objected to building that line; they told him it was ruinous to build it; they exaggerated the difficulties of going through the Rocky Mountains and around Lake Superior. They said: "it will cost us a still more enormous sum of money to run the line for many years; do not ask us to do it." Well, the Government insist, and the Company say: "Well, if you ask us to do it we must charge you pretty steeply for it," and they named the figures. We do not know what these figures are, because the first agreement which was made across

the water, and which the hon. gentleman announced to be a firm contract, has not been brought down. But we know quite enough, from the statement of the Minister of Railways, from the statements of the supporters of the Administration and the members of it, that they attempted to justify the price they paid by the representation that the eastern section was an enormous burden to maintain and run for many years. One short year has proved, however, that the eastern section is essential to the completion of the whole line, and that the Company would not abandon it on any consideration. It was held that the view that enormous sums ought to be paid for maintaining the eastern section is fallacious, that it is a proper and a profitable line, that it would not be abandoned and that we are asked to abandon it. We have got the same little paper and document of their own in which they speak of that line. I have already read that portion of the prospectus which speaks of the location. They proceed to say :

“From Callendar Station westward and throughout the whole of the Lake Superior section, the road runs through forests of valuable timber, which will furnish fuel and lumber for building purposes to settlers in the prairie country, and passes through valuable mineral lands abounding with silver, iron and copper ore.”

That is the encouraging description they now give of the eastern section. So that I believe I may apply to the western the observations they apply to the eastern; and what I have heard from the authenticated declaration of the leader of the Government as to the views of the Company in November last, that having given their contract a trial, I have heard that many millions were added to the price which the county will have to pay for the road. But we did not understand wait a little. We did not understand what we were doing, in making a contract prematurely for the whole of the line, particularly the eastern and western ends. Now as to the cost, we are not to know the facts; the Company declined to send down what they call sub-contracts for the construction of some works on the line. I have not had the opportunity of examining, since I saw the return made to the Commons on that subject, what the language of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act is. But I will remember that under that Act contracts for different parts of the work on the line were submitted to the approval of the House. The contention of the Company is that as they do not contract with anyone individual to complete the construction of the whole or any one part of the line, with any one to iron the road and build the line, but only with sub-contractors, they are not bound to produce those contracts. So Parliament and the country is being left in ignorance as to the cost of the prairie line. We find a general statement made as to the alignment and curves; and advertisements by the contractors that 2,400 cubic yards of embankment per mile is the average on the first 200 miles, and new contracts are called for 500 miles, and that to this extent the rest of the line will be equally favorable for a new road; that is, for the elevation of the road above the prairie, the work will be limited to 2,400 yards of embankment. So this is all that the Company have got to do in the way of roadwork, including the proper expense of raising the road above the prairie. I suppose that is as cheap a road to build above the surface of the ground as it is possible to conceive, and that our expectations of last year with reference to the cheapness of the prairie line will be more than realized, and that when we get to the facts—as some day doubtless we shall—we shall find that the cost was so insignificant that probably the Company will be able to construct the prairie line for less than their cash subsidy, while they are receiving 12,500 acres a mile and a certain quantity of cash bonds for the average line till they reach the Rocky Mountains. Then the prospects of the Company, as the hon. gentleman has said, are bright. The Company, in the paper to which I have referred, say :

“The 800 miles of road west of the Red River runs through one of the finest agricultural countries in the world, the settlement of which has

been hitherto impeded by the want of railway facilities, but is now making rapid progress. It is estimated that 20,000 immigrants have arrived in the North-West during the past season. The country is a gently undulating prairie, well watered throughout. Wood is plentiful along the streams, and the soil is uniformly deep and rich, and fully equal to the best agricultural lands in any part of the United States. Practical farmers reckon a moderate average crop of 28 bushels wheat, 49 barley, and 56 oats per acre. The wheat commonly grown, and known as ‘No. 1 hard,’ commands a higher price than the ordinary quality of wheat. The soil is also exceptionally favorable to the growth of potatoes, turnips, etc.”

Then they refer to independent testimony, to which the hon. gentleman has also alluded. As to the traffic expected, we have the advantages pointed out as follows :—

“As to the local traffic to be developed along the line, there is no good reason to doubt that the earnings of the entire road, as the country becomes settled will be as good as those of roads in the United States similarly situated. The gross earnings of the following roads for the nine months ending 30th September, were—

	Per Mile.
On the Chicago & North-Western.....	\$5,561
On the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul.....	3,737
On the Central Pacific.....	6,304
On the Union Pacific.....	5,506
On the Northern Pacific (incomplete).....	3,271

“And on the portion of road operated by the Company in the North-West, since 1st May last, the total gross earnings for the six months ending 31st October, were \$424,000.”

That is the view which the Company presents to the people as to the prospects with reference to traffic when the road is completed and as the settlement of the country goes on. While this prospectus was sending forth these advantages, it is remarkable for omitting certain important advantages given to the Company, which they stipulated for and on which they insisted, as that hon. gentleman told us, as a condition of their entering upon the contract without a larger sum—the question of monopoly, exemptions from taxation and other benefits. The estimate of the Government the year previous, for the work which the Company is now to construct, when preparing to construct it as a Government work, reached but 48½ millions of dollars. Now, having stated that he has found everything more favorable than he expected, including the reduced estimates for the British Columbia sections, that much less is to be paid for various sections, including contracts between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay, it is not unreasonable to conclude that, if there be any difference in the figures and calculations it will bear in the same improved direction, and that, therefore, 48½ millions will be diminished instead of increased. But, supposing it to remain as it stands, the position of the Company is that, having to build for 48½ millions they get the cash subsidy of \$25,000,000, and have mortgaged their land grant for 25 millions more, which it is said, is being rapidly disposed of. Although the first lot of bonds of \$10,000,000 was sold at 90, I suppose to initiate the operation, the others are being disposed of at par; so a sum approximating \$25,000,000 is to be realized by the mortgage of those lands, and, therefore, they will get a sum equivalent to the amount required for the construction of the balance of the works of the Company. Add to that the proceeds of the land grant bonds, and you get enough to do all that which the Company has contracted to do, and you find them possessed of the whole railway, and the surplus value of the lands, whatever that may be. Then the hon. gentleman has not adverted to the value of the question of the value of the lands in any particular form on this occasion; but we have got various estimates of their value from which we may form some conclusion as to their value to the Company. We have got, for example, the Government themselves, who, to-day, advertise odd sections in districts not extremely remote from the railway, but not as advantageously situated on the average as the railway lands at \$2.50 an acre, and we have their advertisement of other lands in Birtle and other districts, not so well situated in point of location, but of better soil, at \$2 an acre. The Hudson's Bay Company are selling their lands in a very

remote district, the furthest for which they have made arrangements to sell at all, at from \$6 to \$7 an acre. We find besides that, the question of the Colonization Companies. I was amused, the night after the debate on the land policy of the Government, to get a note from a gentleman at Winnipeg saying that the chief person concerned in one of the new colonization companies had just been up there offering the townships which the company had under charter, for \$2.50 an acre. All these statements prove the value of the lands, and we know the lands alongside the railway are being reserved, as well as all those with special advantages; and we know a very large sum, many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been made by the Company in the town of Brandon, that at their stations large sums have been made, and that the system has been adopted by which the Company obtained practically nearly all the advantage to be derived from the lands adjoining their stations, which, if the present excitement continues, and the sales around the stations pay anything like those at Brandon and other places, they will go far to implement the cost to the railway section on the prairie. There can be no doubt whatever that beyond the receipts of the mortgage on their lands which the Company have made by their land grant bonds, there is an asset of enormous value coming into the Company in these lands. So that they being able with the subsidy and the mortgage on their lands to do all the work on the railway, they will be competent to obtain the railway and many other millions of dollars from the redemption of the lands. The hon. gentleman adverted to these events. He proposed to deal with them, one after another, and he evinced his unfamiliarity with the Lord's Prayer by telling us how much it puzzled him to recollect it and his familiarity with other words of expressions of an opposite character, when he spoke of my devilish ingenuity and my hon. friend's devilish ingenuity in drawing up and proposing these amendments. These amendments show the defects in this contract. I cannot pretend to the credit of having exclusively prepared them; I had a hand in the preparing of them, and voted for them heart and hand, and am as responsible for them as if every word had been written by myself. The hon. gentleman referred to those amendments in a manner which it seems to me is deserving of some attention. In the first place, he likened my hon. friend from Westmoreland and said the amendment he proposed that tenders should be asked for, was one that could only be proposed by a Rip Van Winkle. There are some points, of course, in which the experience of the year cannot give light at all; there are some in which the experience of one year is not sufficient to give light, and there are others in which the experience of the year can give a good deal of light. As to this it does not depend upon the experience of the year at all. The proposition of my hon. friend was a wholly reasonable one. We thought it reasonable then and think so now. Nothing that has happened in that year can alter the grounds of attack on or sustaining that amendment. The hon. gentleman contends it was unreasonable and improper because first of all tenders had been invited; of course tenders had been invited for the construction of the railway some time before, but under conditions so different that it is not possible to make any comparison between the two schemes. The old scheme under which tenders had been invited was substantially, with some modifications, the original scheme of the previous Government; the old business of \$30,000,000 cash and 50,000,000 acres of land.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A little more than that.

Mr. BLAKE. There are more lands and less money.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). And more money too.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think so. I think it is on the same general lines; the scheme of the hon. gentleman had

Mr. BLAKE.

turned out abortive. It was suggested that large inducements would be required, and the proposal of my hon. friend to insert those large inducements passed through without the slightest objection. What did the hon. gentleman say in 1880 or 1879, when he discussed this Bill. He said the whole aspect of affairs had changed since the previous Government had been called on to consider the question; he said, on the former occasion, there were difficulties that did not then exist and that the position of things had entirely changed. Far different from his attitude to-night, he then declared that during the five years in which the Government of my hon. friend was concerned in this matter the work done was of great consequence and importance, and that the progress made towards Winnipeg was of much more consequence than construction of British Columbia, and placed the scheme in a much more favorable light than hitherto. The hon. gentleman said to-day, in a vain glorious way, that when the late Government went out of office there was not a mile of road in operation, and that this season there will be 905 miles running. Somebody must begin railway construction. A period of a year elapses before the railway is fit to be used through a difficult country. Although the work was going on, and the hon. gentleman gave due and reasonable credit to the Government for it, although the work was going on, I think many years before, the hon. gentleman does not choose to give any credit for it, and yet but for the exertions made by my hon. friend, but for the work that was done and for the progress made during those various years, there would not have been 905 miles; nay, there would not have been ninety-five miles running at this time. That is due to those exertions, due to those works carried on under great difficulties and when the country was in a different condition, that the hon. gentleman can make the boast he has made. But to refer to this question of tenders. I say both the conditions are different and the condition of the country wholly different. The hon. gentleman himself in 1880 said: Don't you know the condition of the whole country has changed? "Don't you know that whereas you offered this work for contract and advertised it everywhere and could not get a single offer, if I were to advertise tomorrow for a week I could get offers for it? Don't you know everything has changed now and the old things have become new?" But in 1878, he says: "Oh, it was advertised for in 1878;" and the contract was advertised in 1878 under these different conditions of the country, different state of the foreign market, different value of railway securities—because it was advertised for under wholly different conditions, that is a sufficient excuse for our not advertising for tenders under these new conditions. Whoever heard, whoever supposed, whoever dreamed of such a thing as that there was to be an expenditure of \$58,000,000? Nobody supposed it. I need not go over all the other conditions; they have been gone over again and again; but it can be shown that in twenty important particulars the conditions upon which the hon. gentleman let the contract differed from the conditions under which, up to that time, any tender had been asked for or any tender authorized. Next the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, but we did advertise for tenders." He refers me again to the political pic-nic held at Bath, at which the leader of the Government said to his friends that the Government had under consideration at that moment two offers from capitalists, with reference to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that they might depend upon it—the contractors would go on. He says this was an advertisement for tenders. The whole country is always watching when the First Minister speaks, every contractor is watching—I do not doubt but that every contractor is watching—everybody interested in public works is watching; his words are weighed, and this was better than a thousand advertisements in newspapers that a Minister should say at a political pic-nic that the Government had under consider-

ation two offers—not made under tender—but two offers for the construction of the railway, so that he advertised for tenders. But on what terms was this advertisement made? Did he say, did he dream of them at the time? No, he did not; he had no idea at the time of these terms. Did he say they were going themselves to finish the road on the British Columbia section? Did he say they were going to give some \$53,000,000, plus the value of the surveys and the other risks? Was that talked of? Was it thought of? Were the monopolies thought of? Were all these exceptional conditions in the slightest degree talked of at the time? No, Sir, not at all. Therefore, it is preposterous to talk of this or anything like an opportunity to the public to tender. The hon. gentleman says that it was hardly worth while to take exception on that ground. Well, I think it was quite worth while: The policy of Parliament, which policy had been the subject of discussion for years, had been that the work was to be let, if let at all, by tender. We had gone to the elections, and no person had raised their voice against the adoption of that policy. We had come back, and there that policy remained in the Statute Book, and the hon. gentleman says: We will prefer the plan of private bargain, of private negotiations—although he admitted a year before that he could not advertise for tenders successfully—and we will depart from the policy of Parliament ratified by the popular voice that the contract should be let by tender only. The Government could not let a contract for a section of the Pacific Railway without advertisement; it could not let a contract for any public work without advertisement under special conditions which are prescribed in the Act of Parliament according to what emergencies may arise. They could not have let this work in that way without violating the law. They acknowledged it was in excess of their powers the course they took, and I say that not merely the extraordinary conditions which are embodied in the instrument, but also the events which took place upon the presentation to the public of this contract that these terms indicated, proved and demonstrated that the result of giving an opportunity to the public to tender upon the terms which the Government decided would be acceptable, the general basis of principle and action would have been to effect an enormous saving to the people of this country; and therefore as we maintained last year, so we maintain to day that it would have been proper at that time, when Parliament had this whole subject before it, when we were free to say yes or no, instead of declaring that this contract should be implemented, to declare that the Canadian Pacific contract should be a subject of public advertising and tender. Then the hon. gentleman says that the resolution of my hon. friend for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) was one which ought not to have been adopted. I believe that resolution to be perfectly sound. The hon. gentleman in the first place, in the recital in the statement of facts in this resolution, says: "That prior to and during the general election it was the policy of all parties that arrangements for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be such as the resources of the country should permit without increasing the former rates of taxation, and that the work should be let only after tenders." I stated a while ago that the Canadian Pacific Railway Act was the settled policy at the time of the last general election. The Canadian Pacific Railway Act was not impeached by hon. gentlemen opposite on their appeal to the people, it remained the embodiment of the common sense of Parliament and was, in fact, ratified by the people as to the general sense in which this question should be disposed of—I do not mean in minor details, in small matters, but in the large fundamental and vital principles it was disposed of. It was certainly not incapable of being altered by Parliament, but it was a matter which ought not to be altered without the gravest cause and without an opportunity for the people to

speak upon it. In the particular as to taxes the hon. gentleman has repeated the statement he has so often made upon that subject, but which is wholly incorrect. In the first place, the resolution deals with a condition of things prior to and during the general election. Now, Sir, in the year 1876, it was resolved, as I have often pointed out before, by Parliament, that the arrangements for the construction of this railway should be such as could be accomplished without further increasing the existing rates of taxation. This resolution, as I have often pointed, was reached by a vote of this House unanimously, with the exception of ten dissentients. There were but ten including my hon. friend from British Columbia, and three or four more who dissented from the proposition. It was the common sense of Parliament. It remained unimpeached during the next Session. It remained unimpeached at the election; no one, I ever heard of, was found to raise his voice against that proposal, no matter for a moment whether the rate of taxation had been raised or not. I will deal with that matter presently. During the tenure of office of my hon. friend from Lambton, it had not been raised since the passage of this resolution, and that resolution declared that the votes of taxation should not be further raised, and it was practically adopted with unanimity. I believe that it was adopted with unanimity in the country; I believe that throughout the country, no man could have been returned—outside of British Columbia—who would have gone before his constituents and opposed the resolution, and declared it was wrong to have carried it; and "if you return me to Parliament, I shall favor increasing the rates of taxation in order to build the Pacific Railway." I believe that no man who would have ventured to propound that policy would have been returned, and I believe that no candidate did propound that policy outside of British Columbia; and therefore I say it is correct, and in accordance with the facts, that this proposition which in 1878 was adopted, and which in subsequent Sessions was continued, remained the policy of this country at the elections. It was the policy, and it was then the settled policy of Parliament and the country; but the hon. gentleman is very fond of alluding to the circumstance, that there was an increase in the taxation. Well, there was an increase in the taxation. But I pointed out in the debate in 1880, what the actual facts with reference to this were. Sir, the position that was taken in reference to taxation in 1871, was that the then existing rates of taxation were to be raised. Subsequently in the year 1871 the then existing rates of taxation were lowered very considerable, and the change that was made by my hon. friend beside me was a change which did not do much more in its results than bring the votes of taxation up to what they were at the time of the bargain with British Columbia.

Mr. BOWELL. He did not raise them for that purpose. He raised them for no other purpose except to get more money.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, I am now pointing out that the original bargain was, that certain then existing rates of taxation should have been increased, and this was the resolution of the House, but after that, the rates of taxation were lowered. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but they were. They were lowered; and after that time, they were lowered; but before you can ascertain what the real cause of taxation for this purpose was, you must take into account this fact. Now, I went into a calculation in 1880, and I said this:

"Allowing for the temporary duties imposed in 1870, and taken off in 1871, by a proceeding which came into operation prior to the date of the taxation resolution, the rate of taxation on the imported goods, free and dutiable, which were consumed in the four years from 1867 to 1871 was, upon the average, 13.90 per cent. This then, I take it, to be a fair ascertainment of the burden of our Customs' taxation in 1871. But I may say that, even if you make no allowance for the temporary duties to which I have referred, the average rate will be raised only to 14.21 per

cent., an increase which you will see is not sufficient materially to affect the results. During the subsequent years (1872, 1873 and 1874), in the course of which there were considerable remissions of taxation, and in which also the very large consumption may have somewhat disturbed the relation between the quantities of free and dutiable goods, the average rate fell to 12.33 per cent. In 1875, the first completed year after the increase made under the late Government, the rate was 14.32 per cent., a larger increase indeed, an increase of nearly one-sixth, on the average of the preceding three years, but after all a very trifling increase, an increase of only one thirty-third, on the average rate between 1868 and 1871."

So that the increase which my hon. friend made, as he stated, was a considerable increase. Undoubtedly it was a considerable increase. It was a considerable increase over the then existing rates of taxation, but it was not a considerable increase over the rates of taxation as they existed at the time when the resolution with British Columbia was ratified. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that it was all wrong to propose that the people should have an opportunity of speaking on this subject. But I do not agree with him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him. Is this true or false: "In order to enable the Government to carry out the proposals which it was hoped that the British Columbia Government would have accepted, the average rate of taxation was raised at the late Session about 15 per cent." Is that true or false? Because, if for the purpose of carrying out the agreement concerning the Pacific Railway, the average rate of taxation was increased 15 per cent., and increased to over three millions—and no person will pretend that we had lowered the rate of taxation more than two millions per annum. Was there or was there not an increase of one million per annum over and above the rate which existed at the time that the engagement was made in the British Columbia?

Mr. BLAKE. I have given, Sir, the exact results of the increase, as I have ascertained them from the books. The hon. gentleman has always declared that the taxation was increased three millions a year, but he knows perfectly well—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The minutes of Council say so.

Mr. BLAKE. That while this was the estimated result of the change in the taxation, it was not the actual result.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But was it the policy of the Government?

Mr. BLAKE. I am not talking about policy, Sir.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAKE. I say it was not the result. I have shown you how the rate of taxation was increased. It was increased very much. It was increased from an average rate of 12 odd to an average rate of 14 odd per cent. It was increased very heavily over the rate as it had been during the preceding years; but what I say and what the hon. gentleman will never choose to take into account is, that it was not sensibly increased beyond the rate as it existed at the time of the bargain with British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it was, most certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I have shown the figures, which have never been controverted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that we reduced the rate of taxation more than two millions per annum; and yet the late Government declares here to the British Government, who was informed of it by the whole of his colleagues, that the increase in the taxation was to the extent of three millions per annum, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, if we did not reduce the taxation over two millions, and if you increased it three millions, there was clearly an increase of one million per annum at the very least for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. BLAKE. I have shown quite distinctly, Mr. Speaker, more than once, that while it was estimated that it would, it did not produce three millions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is another story, altogether, it has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BLAKE. Allow me to retain my own opinion. What is spoken of in the resolution shows that the burden of taxation had been increased.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. What is spoken of in the resolution is, that it has always been the policy of the Government and has not increased the rate of taxation.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not speaking of that resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought that you were defending the resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman interpolated the word "always."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; it is there.

Mr. BLAKE. Will you show where it is?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It sets out that "prior to" it was the policy.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said it was there when he interpolated it; it is not there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it is there. I say that the spirit of it is there.

Mr. BLAKE. That the spirit of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say it is there—the spirit is there.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, the spirit. Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear that the increase in the rate of taxation as it was at that time and as it stood under the taxation which had been imposed by my hon. friend, amounted to not more than one-thirty-third of the whole cost of paying this enormous sum. My hon. friend spoke only of the period prior to and during the elections which is covered by the passage of the legislation unanimously agreed to by Parliament, I think in the year 1876, since which time there has been no dissent from that proposition. Then the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, you wanted an election, but you are not so anxious for an election now as you were." We wanted an election then in order that the people might have an opportunity of deciding whether this bargain should be made or not. We wanted an election then in order that the people might have an opportunity of deciding for themselves whether this enormous burden of these tremendous stipulations should be imposed on the country. We wanted then to choose the policy to be given to the people, while the people might choose, and the hon. gentleman says now you do not talk now about having an election. Why, Sir, we perfectly understand all this talk about an election. If the hon. gentleman is going to hold them this year the reason is that he knows next year will be less favorable to him—that the ordinary time of holding an election will expose still more than to-day the fallacies, the errors, the mistakes, the blunders of this rule. It is because he believes it is dangerous to delay—that he says to the hon. First Minister, "what thou doest do quickly." I agree with him that he will be weaker next year than he is to-day; that the longer he sits there the weaker will he be; that the longer his policy is in force, the longer time is given to prove it, the worse will it appear. There are many things concealed and half understood to-day which will be fully revealed and brought to light in the course of time, and that revelation and the full discussion of these things will weaken his position. He is right, he is wise in his own generation when he thinks it is dangerous to wait. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the motion of my hon. friend who sits beside me (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) was a motion which he will not lay on my shoulders because it required the

peculiar—I think devil-may-care recklessness were the parliamentary words he used—of my hon. friend. What does that resolution say. As to the money it says: "The contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway involves a total expenditure by the country in connection with that work of about \$60,000,000, exclusive of interest." Now, how near is that correct? In the first place we have a paper lately brought down by the Government, a Minute of Council, with reference to the application of the Province of British Columbia, for compensation.

Mr. BUNSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to read a previous minute for the information of the House and particularly of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster). Amongst other things I find this statement, that the contract which has been let within the last year involves an expenditure of about \$53,000,000 in money. Well, we all know how the \$53,000,000 is arrived at, and I quote this passage to show that we are not far apart, with regard to that. The \$53,000,000 is based on the \$25,000,000 subsidy and the \$28,000,000 for works, but it leaves out the amount for surveys which is stated in another part of this very minute to be about three and a half millions; it leaves out the Canada Central subsidy, the telegraphs, and these items added to the \$53,000,000, make an amount approximating \$60,000,000. I now wish to read a statement which will be interesting to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster). The House will recollect that the hon. Minister of Railways has repeatedly insisted, when it served his purpose on the proposition that the action of the late Government had created a binding obligation on this country between it and the Imperial Government, to do all the things which were specified in the award known as the Carnarvon Terms. He has since and again declared that the result of the action of the late Government was to create that obligation and if even he had to justify something of his with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway he said: "Consider what you bound the country to, consider the contract you made by the Carnarvon Terms." Now, let us hear what the Minister of the Privy Council says about those terms:

"Lord Carnarvon's suggestions were entitled to every respect, but although adopted by the Government of the day, they never received the sanction of the Parliament of the Dominion, and never acquired the force of a national compact. On the contrary, in the Session of 1875, with the view of seeking to give effect to these terms, a Bill having been introduced by the Government into the Canadian House of Commons providing for the construction of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo line, a step which would not have been necessary, it may be observed, had that line formed necessarily a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Bill, though passed by the House of Commons, was lost in the Senate, and consequently Parliamentary sanction was refused to the construction of what was regarded by the majority in the Senate as a Provincial work quite unnecessary to the fulfilment of the terms of Union with British Columbia."

So that the hon. gentleman will see that his friends in the Government have declared that the Carnarvon terms required the sanction of Parliament, and that never having, acquired that sanction they had no force.

Mr. BUNSTER. I believe that the hon. gentleman while he was Minister of Justice, and consequently the instructor of the Government, they accepted the Carnarvon arbitration.

Mr. BLAKE. Not much.

Mr. BUNSTER. I have not the documents with me just now, but I will take an opportunity later on of proving it; and if the present Government have ignored the Carnarvon terms it is no fault of British Columbia or of its representatives.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say so. I am only pointing out to the hon. gentleman another reason for reposing confidence in the Government. Then, Sir, we were told by the British Columbians that we were guilty of impropriety and low, il-

liberal and narrow-minded conduct in making allusions to the financial results between that Province and the Dominion at large. Business-like, we were sordid enough to state the amount of the expenditures in and the receipts from that Province, and to strike a balance which was not wholly favorable to it, and the hon. gentleman and others were indignant because we adopted that book-keeper's manner of dealing with public matters; but our bad example in that respect has been followed, for I find this in the minutes:

"It will be seen by official statements hereto annexed, that our expenditure in the Province since it entered the Union has been made by the Dominion Government of \$5,996,289, against which the receipts have been \$4,173,238, and this expenditure is entirely irrespective of disbursements on account of the railway."

And then we find a

"Statement of payments in the Province of British Columbia from 1871 to 1880 inclusive, with exception of payments made on account of Pacific Railway, as prepared by the Financial Inspector:

Year 1871-72.....	\$481,330
1872-73.....	637,544
1873-74.....	717,348
1874-75.....	741,909
1875-76.....	750,082
1876-77.....	681,736
1877-78.....	668,685
1878-79.....	682,344
1879-80.....	635,311
	<u>\$5,996,289</u>

Statement of receipts in the Province of British Columbia from the year 1871 to 1880, inclusive, as prepared by the Financial Inspector:

Year 1871-72.....	\$356,099
1872-73.....	381,711
1873-74.....	387,146
1874-75.....	455,914
1875-76.....	544,952
1876-77.....	456,976
1877-78.....	493,756
1878-79.....	579,144
1879-80.....	517,540
	<u>\$4,173,238</u>

So that the same course which met with such strong reprobation on the former occasion has been followed, and the same account struck, with similar results, only that the debit balance is larger. Now, my hon. friend, after dealing with the \$60,000,000, proceeds to deal with the \$79,500,000, as the value of the land, making the total estimated cost \$140,000,000. Well, that is not disputed; we have it in the report of the Minister of Interior; we have their own prices, with this exception, that while these statements apply to the average value of the lands along the line, and within a wider distance from the Pacific Railway, the average in this case ought to be higher, inasmuch as all these lands are choice lands. The statement, therefore, is a consideration of \$140,000,000, while the road itself, as estimated by the Government, cost no more than \$84,000,000. That also is true; that is the hon. gentleman's own statement. In point of fact, he said that he only estimated \$82,000,000, but that Mr. Fleming, with his usual caution, had added \$2,000,000 more. We take the figures in the most unfavorable way for our calculation, based on the Government's own estimates and acknowledged facts, and we deduce certain conclusions, which were embodied in the resolution which the hon. gentleman declares shows a devil-may-care recklessness. And what is his answer? He does not deny that he estimated the class of road we are getting to cost \$84,000,000, but he says: "The year before, you made an estimate of \$121,000,000; I know it was entirely erroneous, but you made it, and I adopted it." Well, we have a score of times pointed out that that estimate of \$121,000,000 was the aggregate estimate of the engineers and officers of the Government, based on their view of what was to be the cost of the class of line proposed. If that estimate was erroneous, it was not our fault; I could not form a judgment, the hon. member for Lambton could not

form a judgment, the hon. gentleman himself could not form a judgment of what the cost would be; but the estimates of the engineers were taken, and these figures were arrived at from their statements. But at the time that estimate was given, it was pointed out that it did not apply to the hon. gentleman's proposal; it was pointed out that the same engineer who had estimated the cost at \$121,000,000, was the same man who was now estimating a total cost of \$84,000,000. The hon. gentleman brings down a report from his engineer that he can cut down the cost to \$82,000,000 by degrading the road; that was his own statement. I do not question these estimates for that class of road; it is simply a question of Mr. Fleming's and Mr. Smith's estimates of one year as to one class of road, and their estimates the next year as to a road of a wholly different class. Then the hon. gentleman went over the old ground about the lands; he says, "take those 54,000,000 acres which the hon. member for Lambton proposed to give and I will value them at what you like, and value these 25,000,000 acres the same." Time and again we have pointed out that that 54,000,000 acres was land to be taken along the whole line, and therefore in British Columbia as well as in the North-West territories, that it was not to be choice land, but the average land along the whole line, and that it was to be taken from a much greater distance from the main line, the nearer the railway the more valuable the land, and the farther away the less valuable. Then there is the element of time in fixing the value of the lands. The hon. gentleman who said in 1880 that much had been done to render this enterprise possible and to enhance the value of the lands, will not regard the element of time, but says that if that land was worth \$5.00 an acre a year ago, we must not rate it at any more than that to-day, and yet the hon. gentleman said to-day that land in Winnipeg that was worth \$100 when the late Government went out could not be bought to-day for \$100,000.

Mr. BOWELL. What has given value to the land?

Mr. BLAKE. The enormous and lavish subsidies which the Government has given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by which it is enabled to construct that railway through the prairies, the whole cost of which we give them in cash, and give them the land besides.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose the road was built under your regime, would it not have the same effect?

Mr. BLAKE. I pointed out that railway access had already been obtained by the Pembina Branch, and that it was about to be obtained by the Thunder Bay Branch into the country, and that it was quite plain that the expenditure of \$100,000 would give you a hundred miles into the prairie. It is quite clear that it did not want this contract to give value to the land; the large preliminary expenses on the railway would give it the railway value; and it is plain that it had a larger value at the later than it had at the earlier date. Then the hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) moved a resolution which he would argue was a premature resolution. Now, the hon. member for Sunbury's motion is, I think, a perfectly good motion still. The hon. gentleman's resistance to that motion which was based upon a proposition which can well justify my hon. friend from Sunbury in supposing that he omitted to look at his words, including "in British Columbia," because the whole of his argument was based upon the advantages that had resulted to Canada in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the prairies; and therefore he would argue apparently that the motion against any construction was a premature or improper one. But my hon. friend's objection was to the construction of the road at that time in British Columbia. He did not object, not a single man on this side objected to the construction of the road that would give value to the North-West—that on the

Mr. BLAKE.

prairies. We wanted it, and we wanted the freedom of the prairie country and of its lines preserved. We wanted them constructed without monopolies, without exemptions, without the country being fettered and bound and taxed unnecessarily for the construction of unnecessary ends. The member for Sunbury objected to the road in British Columbia as premature, and the Minister of Railways has answered him by saying that 21,000 emigrants were expected, some make the number 23,000, 24,000 or 25,000—there is great diversity on the point. Where are the people going—is it to Winnipeg and the North-West or to British Columbia. My hon. friend from Vancouver knows it is the Chinese that are coming into British Columbia, and the Minister of Railways will not insult him by saying that they are desirable or of advantage to the country.

Mr. BUNSTER. Allow me to say British Columbians never intended to sell themselves to the Chinese Government. If they made the mistake of leaving the old flag and joining the Dominion flag, they thought the Dominion would do them justice. But we do not consider it is doing us justice in allowing the Chinese to interfere with our happy homes. Our Local Legislature and the United States with 50,000,000 have pronounced against them. I am not sure whether the member for West Durham was the Minister of Justice or not, or whether it was the present Minister of Justice, who pronounced our Act illegal.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The present Government, of course.

Mr. BUNSTER. I am rather inclined to think it was, and it is not very creditable to them either; and they have got to take warning that it will be the next plank in their platform, and that out of office they will go.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Railways, in answer to the member for Sunbury pointed to the emigration to Manitoba as if that had been produced by the work between Kamloops and Emory's Bar, and he spoke of the \$4,000,000 of cash brought in by the emigrants and of the applications of colonization companies for 24,000,000 acres in the North-West as if they had anything to do with the British Columbia works. Were any lands asked for in British Columbia by colonization companies, to interfere with the hon. gentleman from Victoria? Not at all. Those companies all made for Manitoba and the North-West. Then the Minister of Railways replied that the Government could receive in a week from such companies for land the whole \$25,000,000 to be paid the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Well, we all know those companies do not pay their \$1 an acre down, but only one-third; so that the hon. gentleman's statement about the receipt of \$25,000,000 from the sale to companies of 25,000,000 acres, in a week if desired, when those companies were to pay only 20 cents an acre, seemed very surprising.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that. What I said was that already 23,000,000 acres had been applied for by companies, and within a week the amount would reach 25,000,000, at the rate at which applications were coming in, and that at \$1 an acre the amount would reach \$25,000,000. I said the amount paid down would be one-fifth.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a difficulty on our part, it would seem, in apprehending the meaning of the hon. gentleman. But he went further in reply to the member for Sunbury, who contended the construction of the road in British Columbia just to show how wrong he was. He said: "I will give him another proof, accumulative proof of how wrong the argument of the member for Sunbury is, and what is my next? That the Customs dues have largely increased at the port of Burrard Inlet or New Westminster."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. But that is not what the hon. gentleman said. He spoke of the increase at Winnipeg. I am dealing

of the way in which he metaphorically knocked down my hon. friend for Sunbury, and I am showing that he was proving him to be wrong in saying that the construction of the road in British Columbia was premature, for, forsooth, the Customs dues in Winnipeg, not at all affected by the work of Emory's Bar and Kamloops, had increased largely in the last few months. Then the hon. gentleman asserted that great attention had been excited on the part of Great Britain and the United States, and, I think he said, on the part of the whole civilized world, with that grandiloquence of language which besets him, and that was due to what? To the building in British Columbia of 127 miles of railway? Not a bit of it; what has attracted the attention of the world is the North-West, and the magnificent article the hon. gentleman sent from the *Post*, which in general does not circulate largely among the emigrating classes, and other articles to which he refers relate to the North-West. My hon. friend from Vancouver knows that they speak of the fertility of the soil of the grand rolling prairies, and of the thousands of miles of railway spreading through the country. They speak of the grain to be raised, not on the Pacific slope but on the prairies and to be sent by the Atlantic seaboard to England and the Old World. These are the conditions of the excitement and attention abroad with reference to the North-West. Then the hon. gentleman spoke of a speech of Mr. Beck, of Kentucky. I do not think he said much about British Columbia or Kamloops or Emory's Bar, but he spoke of the North-West.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman hear what he did say—that the great Canadian Pacific Railway would soon be finished to the Pacific, so soon as to attract the trade of China and India, which now goes over the United States Pacific. Does that refer to British Columbia or the North-West?

Mr. BLAKE. It does not refer to the development of British Columbia, but to the transcontinental effect of our railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Beck was speaking of the trans continental effect, and the hon. gentleman denied it.

Mr. BLAKE. I was talking of the prairies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman contended that Mr. Beck had spoken with reference to British Columbia, and not with reference to the prairie section. I have shown the hon. gentleman that Mr. Beck has drawn the attention of the Senate of the United States to the fact that the construction of this great railway was going to give us a position of such importance as to attract the attention of leading gentlemen in the United States.

Mr. BLAKE. When I was telling of what Mr. Beck said, I was speaking of that development of the country itself, which had taken place under the impulse as it was alleged by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was not speaking of the trans continental character of the road at all. The hon. gentleman said there would be 30,000 people in by the 1st of May; his leader said there would be 20,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. More than 20,000 have gone in since the 1st January.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course there are the figures, but those people are not all settlers. We know that hundreds and thousands are going into Manitoba who have no intention of settling there, but are attracted by that land craze of which the hon. Minister of Interior spoke the other day. Has the hon. Minister of Customs said anything?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I was only thinking aloud.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman thinks aloud he thinks something, though it may mean nothing. The hon. Minister says that under the colonization plans, thousands

of settlers will come in, and for the purpose of determining the financial condition of the country with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, presumes that 20,000,000 acres are disposed of; but we have the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior that 10,000,000 acres is the extreme amount he expects to dispose of according to that scheme, but the hon. gentleman takes the applications and uses those figures to show what resources are available. Then the hon. gentleman yet comes down to hard pan, and gives a number of acres granted free up to 31st December. Much money would not be made out of them except in the way of increased revenue to the Customs Department. There are a certain number of pre-emptions and half-breed lands to which the same observation applies, and the sales amounted to 1,250,000 acres, yet the hon. gentleman made up a grand aggregate of 6,500,000 acres disposed of. The returns do not show a very large balance just now to the credit of the Government, after deducting expenses after the sales of land. The hon. gentleman speaks of the sales of Railway Company lands, and referred to the great quantity of goods sent during the last six months. Of course, you cannot have a very large number of immigrants coming in and you cannot have a country not able yet to produce sufficient for the support of its inhabitants, without having a large amount of goods coming in, and we must expect a very large importation of goods for some years to that country, if it is at all to progress. Then the hon. gentleman says all this has been fulfilled, not by increasing taxation, but by reducing it; he refers to the reduction made this Session, but omits the increase made before. The rate of taxation which before was a trifle over 14 per cent. has been run up to a trifle over 20 per cent. The rate of taxation had increased 30 or 40 per cent. under the hon. gentleman's Tariff. He adds on us a heavy burden and takes off a few pounds and then tells us we are doing all this work without increased taxation. The motion of the hon. member for Quebec East was, the hon. gentleman said, of no consequence, and why? Because what my hon. friend submitted in his motion was going to be done. The policy of the Administration was to have the railway in the interior, and not to have all railway communication for ten years. My hon. friend pointed out that by running to the south there would be railway communication within three years, and he suggested that ought to be done, and the remainder shall not be undertaken at present. The hon. gentleman has come to assume that position, for while he declares on his responsibility as a Minister that he has no information that the road from the Sault is at all practicable, he is making the main portion of the line the road to the Sault. My hon. friend's policy has been successful. What he suggested is to a large extent carried out, and we find the hon. Minister applauding as a statesmanlike policy the plan to go to Sault Ste. Marie as fast as possible. I think my hon. friend may well rejoice that so much of his views have been attended to, that by the course that is being pursued we are getting in a business-like way to the Sault Ste. Marie, which, as I have said before, is the key of the position, although we are paying an enormous sum for it, which we would not have paid had my hon. friend's motion prevailed, which we would not have paid had all the circumstances been known which at present are known; because, as I have pointed out, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself considered that this road is essential to the success of the whole line, and, therefore, we could not have been called upon to pay those enormous millions which we are called upon to pay to maintain that road for ten years, for it was necessary to the success of the Company, and need not have been subsidized by us. Then the hon. gentleman adverted to the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and he dealt with that motion certainly in a way which surprised me. Now, Sir, the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell was a declaration

"That the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, while it gives to the Company the right to build branch lines of railway from any point or points along their line to any point or points within the Dominion and cedes to the Company free all Government lands required in connection with such branches." Now, the hon. gentleman took up the parenthesis as the motion, and he attacked the parenthesis, he attacked the statement about the contract giving the right to build branch lines, as if that was my hon. friend's argument, as if that were the motion; and he said my hon. friend was estopped from saying anything about that because of his Coteau Railway Bill, but the hon. gentleman did not say a word about the rest of the motion. After that recital, my hon. friend's motion proceeds to say:

"The contract provides that for twenty years no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion Parliament, or by any new Province, to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from any point at or near that railway, except such as shall run south-west or to the westward of south-west, nor to within fifteen miles of the boundary between the United States and Canada. The same contract cedes to the Company the only existing outlets to the North-West, namely, the Pembina Branch, being the outlet southward, and the Thunder Bay line, being the outlet eastward; the Company embrace the chief proprietors of the St. Paul & Manitoba Railway, the only present means of railway communication with the North-West; and thus not only is there no provision for securing competition, but there is provision for securing the Company against competition, and they are secured in a monopoly of the trade and traffic of the North-West for at least twenty years, and that the said contract is, in this respect, objectionable."

That was the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell, and that is the motion to which the hon. Minister addressed the argument that my hon. friend was estopped from saying anything about branch lines because he proposed a Colonization Bill to Parliament which was not carried. Not a word about monopoly, not a word in the speech about this provision in the contract which, as the hon. gentleman knows, was always one of our gravest objections to this whole contract, an object in which, however grave it was at the time, has become grave by lapse of time and by the transactions which have since taken place. Now we find the Company making an application upon this contract. Let me first of all ascertain how our objections were met. They were met by the First Minister, who declared in his speech:

"In order to give them a chance, we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you the Dominion Parliament; we cannot check any other Parliament; we cannot check Ontario; we cannot check Manitoba—shall for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence."

Well, the hon. member for Cardwell reinforced the same argument. What does he say:

"But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any other railway into this country. To what does that apply? Simply to the territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter for a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organization to build a railway from Winnipeg to West Lynne, on the boundary. And after this agreement is ratified, this provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses. In fact this Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract is that their traffic shall not be tapped far west in the prairie section, thus directing the traffic away from their line to a foreign line, but there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba within the Province that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side."

Such was the attitude taken by the leader of the Government, and such was the exposition which one of his ablest followers, an independent member of the House, gave on the faith of his statement. Such was the general understanding. Those of us who sit here on one side or the other, always assumed that was the result, and what we complained of was that the license, or whatever it might be,

Mr. BLAKE.

which was taken away from Manitoba was not a license or a liberty which was adequate, because it might be essential to the freedom of the territories and within the boundaries of Manitoba, and therefore that this supposed means of exit was an inadequate means of exit against the operation of the monopoly. The fifteen mile clause and the provision as to the west and south-west lines, does not in terms apply to Manitoba, it does not in terms apply to Ontario or any other Provinces, it applies only to territories under the control of the Dominion, and new Provinces formed out of such territories. Now, Sir, grave as were the objections to the fifteen mile and other restriction clauses, so limited by the Minister himself, they become infinitely graver according to the new interpretation that has been placed upon affairs by subsequent State papers. The hon. gentleman has dealt with the application from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That Company, in October last, called the attention of the Government to the passing of three Acts by the Manitoba Legislature, during the Session of 1881—the Act incorporating the Winnipeg and South-Western Railway, the Act called the Manitoba Tramway Act, and the Act called The Emerson and North-Western Railway Company's Act. The Company proceeds to say:

"The Board of Directors regard with extreme anxiety the granting of such powers to these companies. As you are aware, one of the most essential of the conditions upon which this Company undertook the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and more particularly of the eastern division of it extending from the Thunder Bay Branch to Callendar Station, was that no interference with the traffic which the Company might reasonably be expected to carry over that division, would be permitted by the construction of railways tending to tap the traffic of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and to divert it into American channels. I need not remind you that before the execution of the contract with this Company, the Government had adopted a policy based upon the considerations which give rise to this condition, and had put in force on more than one occasion when charters for railway running to the international boundary came up for discussion in Parliament."

Now there is the first point, that there has been a policy adopted by the Government itself under former circumstances restrictive of the rights to build railways of this description. The second point is this:

"In the negotiations which preceded the contract your Government at once conceded the principle that the same protection which it would have claimed for itself, in respect of lines in the interest of United States railways, if it had built the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be granted to this Company."

There is the second point. Now let me deal with these two points, first, because they are the points based upon considerations outside the contract. The first one, that it was the policy of the Government formerly to permit the construction of railways in the North-West, but it was under an entirely different set of circumstances. First of all, we say while the Government itself was building and was about to run the Canadian Pacific Railway there can be no monopoly of a Government railway. There are no interests but the public interests to be secured. The question is not how high rates will be charged, but how low rates will be charged. There is no difficulty about rates in public service; there is no contract binding or fixed to prevent the construction of other lines. The influence which dominated the situation both as to service and the rates charged on the Government line, Session after Session, will also dominate the situation as to whether another line should be built. That is the state of things; and it is not at all unreasonable at any rate that, pending the arrangements for the Pacific Railway and the direction of the route, we will do so, but while it is wholly under the control of the Government, the Government should keep their hands free; but to allege that the same policy is of necessity to exist and to apply when the Government has wholly parted with its interest, when the road is in the hands of a private corporation, when private and not public interests govern, and when we are acting under the cast-iron terms of a 20 years agreement,

which we cannot change from year to year as the public interests may require, to allege that during the existence of this policy we are to apply under such allowed circumstances the continuation and prolongation of the state of affairs which existed under Government management, is to use a wholly fallacious argument, to my mind. I will now deal with the statement. It has a most dangerous tendency. I am amazed to see it in this paper, that Company says "that in the negotiations which preceded the execution of this contract your Government at once conceded the principle, that the same protection which would have been claimed by itself in regard to lines connecting with United States railways should be granted to this Company," as much as to say we were dealing with these preceding negotiations; we were dealing with concessions of principle made by the Government; we were dealing with private understandings arrived at between the Government and the Company. No, Sir, but we were dealing with a written paper; we were dealing with a contract that was submitted. We were told that this was the result of long and painful and earnest negotiations which had lasted many months. The hon. gentleman told us, when we asked for papers, that we were not entitled to them. What were these papers? They concerned negotiations based on the statements of the day, *pourparlers*. We had nothing to do with them. They brought down the result. This was the conclusion of the whole matter. But it was not. It seems an understanding was arrived at between the Government and the Company, irrespective of what the contract was, that they should be given the same protection, acting on any principle that the Government would ensure and apply to itself, if the Government had kept this railway in their own hands, and so preserved the public from the dangers of a monopoly, and from the protection of private, in contradistinction with public interests, in running the railway. Now, Sir, I deny, I wholly deny that this Company has the least right to insist upon any understanding which was arrived at upon anything else than what appears upon the paper; and I maintain that the Government would have been guilty, has been guilty, as this statement as to the contract shows, of a grave breach of public duty in coming to any understanding, in making any arrangement, in coming to any view as to how they should exercise their powers as to what they should do in this matter, which was not embraced in the contract communicated to the House. Now, Sir, what is the meaning of this statement that the Government has given the same protection to this Company which it could itself have invoked? What is its meaning as applied to the circumstances of this case? That the veto power would be used. But if the contract had contained this provision, would the First Minister have been able to say: "We cannot check Ontario; we cannot check Manitoba," nor would the hon. member for Cardwell have been able to say that Manitoba is as free after it as it was before, to build other lines. What authority would there then have been for saying that the country was protected against the monopoly, the independent rights of Manitoba and Ontario being intact, if this had been in the contract; of course this would not have existed, and this would not have been said. But it was not in the contract, nothing was said to the contrary, and we had the right to interpret the contract. But now we are told we had no right to properly interpret the contract on the faith of the Act, which was the sole refuge against monopoly, and which was followed up and presented by the hon. First Minister. This is all to be put on one side because there was a preceding understanding, that whatever protection the Government could have, should be extended to this Company; that is to say, whatever protection the public could extend to the public, and give to itself, had they continued to own and run the Canadian Pacific Railway, was to be given to this Company,

although it was not in the contract. What next? What other terms are we to hear of from day to day? Where are we to stand? On the contract? Not at all. But on something wholly different. There may have been verbal understandings. Perhaps there were written understandings. Perhaps there were secret understandings. Perhaps there were negotiations which have not been brought down. We have heard of secret articles in treaties, we have heard of secret articles in the treaty who was signed by the Government of the Premier's prototype. How the credit of that Government was enhanced by the secret articles that referred to Cyprus. That is to say: a bargain is to be made with a company; certain terms are put on paper; these terms are submitted to Parliament as a contract; the Parliament of the country and the people of the country are told that protection exists against monopoly, as private railway companies can be chartered, which will give competition; and then we are to be told a year afterwards, and when the contract has been made, that a private understanding existed all the time, that the veto power should be practically used to prevent competition. This is to be told something, Sir, which it is easier than it is parliamentary to properly characterize; and then, Sir, the directors says it is essential to the protection of the interests as well as of the rights of the Company, that the operations of the line along the section to the north of Lake Superior should be sustained by such other traffic as can reasonably be obtained for it in Manitoba and the North-West. This is their second statement, and I do not observe anything in this contention of the Company, speaking from a hurried glance into it, as to the express language of the contract giving them this right. I observe that they speak of these other reasons altogether, all they speak of is independent of the express language of the contract, and they have their claim on the other reasons to which I have referred, while the Engineer-in-Chief on the 28th of October, reporting on these charters, says that two of them give powers to their respective companies to run lines to the boundary between the Province of Manitoba and the State of Minnesota, "a provision, which undoubtedly conflicts with the spirit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act," and he quotes section 20 of this Act. Here the Engineer departs alike from his duty and from the questions which he should consider. He proposes to construe a contract. He proposes to give a construction to a section of an Act of Parliament. He proposes to deal with that somewhat difficult question as to the spirit and letter of that Act of Parliament, and to deal with a great question of public policy which he says is not involved. I do not know, I am sure, how it was; but so it was, that he gave his legal opinion, that this conflicted undoubtedly with the spirit of the 20th section of the Act. Then comes the Minister of Railways, and the Minister says, that the Chief Engineer had reported that these several charters gave running powers to the boundary between the Province of Manitoba, which undoubtedly conflicts with the spirit of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act and section 20; and so he follows his engineer, not only in mere engineering matters, but also in the exposition of an Act of Parliament, which he himself heard his leader declare in this House, had no such effect at all. We were told that Manitoba was not interfered with, that the charter left that Province free, but the hon. gentleman adopts the statement of his engineer that the clause undoubtedly conflicts with the spirit of the 15th section. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to state:

"That during the Session of 1880, when the Government were carrying on the railway as a Government work, he was authorized by the Government, after the fullest discussion, on this question in all its bearings, to state to the Committee of the House of Commons on Railways and Canals, that the Government would not assent to the incorporation of any line running to the American frontier in an easterly direction, it being considered essential to the interests of the Dominion that the

traffic of the North-West should, as far as possible, be retained on the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Then he speaks of the state of things to which I have adverted, and he goes on to say:

"That while such was the view taken in 1880, the importance of this policy became doubly manifest in 1881, when arrangements were completed for the construction of the new line running to the north of Lake Superior, and the same policy was adhered to last Session."

But if it were doubly manifest in 1881, why did we not hear of it? Why was it not in the contract? Why was it not in the Act of Parliament? Why is it that we are told that the policy has been departed from: that Manitoba was free and had power to build lines which would be a check upon the monopoly.

"For the reason above stated, he is of opinion that the best interests of Canada would be imperilled by the construction of the proposed lines of rail communication, and, therefore, recommends that His Excellency the Governor General be advised to disallow the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba."

Well, of course, it is a large thing to do all at once, and the Government determines that they would dispose of the charters one by one, and they began with the Winnipeg and Great Eastern, and that one was referred, I presume, to the Minister of Justice. He reports with regard to the 20 year clause and he says that possibly railways might run through the new territory of Manitoba, and he proceeds to call attention to the Order in Council of the 18th April, 1879, which speaks of certain arrangements made by Mr. Norquay and Mr. Royal, who, I suppose, is the present member for Provencher. He says:

"The Government will oppose the granting of a charter for the present Session, at least, for any Railway in Manitoba other than the other recommended by them from Winnipeg, south-westerly towards Rock Lake. The Government think it very desirable that all railway legislation shall originate here, and that no charter for a line exclusively within the Province of Manitoba should be granted by its Legislature without the Dominion Government first assenting thereto."

These hon. gentlemen, the Prime Minister and a leading member of the Government of the Province of Manitoba, it is said, agreed in 1879 to this policy. But this was a policy ulterior to this contract at a time when the proposition was to construct the railway as a Government work. These two gentlemen agreed, as far as they were concerned, to abrogate the rights of their Province to independent legislation; they agreed that no railways should be authorized there, unless the Dominion Government assented to them. We do not hear, however, that that agreement was brought to the Legislature of that Province, that the people were told of it, but we found only that two Ministers of that Government assented to a suggestion of this description. The hon. gentleman proceeds to express a doubt

"which exists as to the power of a Provincial Legislature to authorize the construction of a railway, the manifest intention of which is to connect the Province with the United States, and practically to extend beyond the limits of the Province."

Now, you may talk of the manifest intention, but we are not going to disallow of a local legislation on account of what the hon. gentleman calls a manifest intention. The Local Legislature has only the undisputable powers of the Local Legislature to charter a railway, which shall extend from end to end of the Province, and if it proposes to run outside it proposes to exceed its powers. What did the Province of Ontario do? It authorized the construction of the Canada Southern Railway, extending from end to end of the Province, and, in the sense of the phrase of the Minister of Justice, it was manifestly intended to connect beyond, but the Local Legislature could not give it power to make that connection, but it has power to authorize the construction of any line which does not extend beyond the limits of the Province. I repudiate the doctrine that there is a doubt of the power of the Local Legislature to authorize the construction of a railway from

MR. BLAKE.

one end to the other of that Province. The hon. gentleman advises the disallowance of this Act:

"Because it conflicts with the settled policy of the Dominion, as evidenced by the clause in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company above set out, which was ratified and adopted by Parliament."

Who is right? The Minister of Justice, who says that the construction of a railway in Manitoba, which may go to the boundary line, conflicts with the clause, or the Prime Minister, who told us, when passing the Act, that this was not the construction of the clause. Is it to be borne that Parliament is to be induced to pass a contract on the statement of a Minister that such is the construction, and that we are to be told by a Minister, confirmed by the Privy Council, that it has a different construction entirely. The other Acts are left to be disposed of afterwards; and we hear from the ordinary sources of public information that some arrangement has been made as to one of these companies; that in order to avoid too much collision, too much friction, an arrangement has been made whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been good enough to undertake the construction within a portion of the sacred 15 mile belt, which by this construction is imported within the Province, though it was not there a little time before. The Pacific Railway Company want to keep control, and that arrangement, which I presume has been made after the charter was mutilated, it would not be necessary to disallow. There you have the plain fact that the Minister stated to his followers, stated to the House and to the country, and the country understood that by this clause there was a certain though inadequate relief from the monopoly in the undisputed, unfettered, unprejudiced rights of the Local Legislature, to charter railways. We were told that we were wrong in saying there could be no competition because these hon. gentlemen said Manitoba could charter railways and connect in this way. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) amplified his leader's declaration, and pointed out how railways might run through the railways and tap the traffic there. The Minister himself compared the railway to that magnificent river, the Rhine, which ends in bogs and silt, and he said this would be the condition of the Eastern section if other railways were allowed to bleed the traffic. Now it is perfectly clear that a construction is sought to be imported into the contract which is not a true construction, which we were told was not a true construction, and we have not to go on a principle which we were told was not the spirit of the contract. We are to go on the contract, and I maintain that the suggestions which have been offered to us to-night by the Minister of Railways, and not for the first time—his view as to the freedom from monopoly, his suggestion as to the Hudson's Bay being a source of relief is a suggestion which was not made by his leader, which was the one to which I have referred. Therefore the hon. gentleman carefully evaded the gist and force of the objection of my hon. friend from Bothwell, which was that there was a monopoly by reason of the 20 year clause, by reason of the 15 mile belt, by reason of the prohibition southerly and westerly, and that was an objection of the gravest possible character, which exists in all its force and integrity to-day, not weakened but strengthened by time, and infinitely strengthened by the action of hon. gentlemen who have sustained the proposition that private understandings reached between them and the Company antecedent to the contract are to govern their policy, that the old policy of the Government applicable to a Government railway is to be applied in favor of a private corporation now existing, that what they please to call the spirit of the contract is to prevail, and that Manitoba is to be placed practically in the same position as the other territories—practically so, because if the veto power is to be used on every occasion on which the intent of this clause is violated by the Local Legislature of Manitoba,

we might as well have a prohibition against the construction of such railways. Well, it is said, you cannot limit the exercise of a constitutional power. Well, if we cannot limit it, this Parliament can control the exercise of it, and if hon. gentleman had that understanding they were bound to make it public and to say: "it will be our policy to exercise the power of veto in Manitoba and Ontario, and so practically put them in the same position as the territories are in." Then the hon. gentleman reverts to the motion of the hon. member for Gloucester, and he says that the display of the vigorous action which has been made in the work at the eastern end proves that there was no foundation at all for that motion. Now, what was the motion of the hon. member for Gloucester? It was that the subsidy of land and money were wholly disproportionate to the cost of the work, and the hon. gentleman gives as an answer to that that some progress has been made on fifty miles of the railway on the eastern end. We do not know how much. That is not an answer. I say there has been too little done, and the hon. gentleman has had to make an excuse for it; and if the argument was to be affected by the operations on a single portion of the line, they are in favor of the motion of my hon. friend rather than against it. But the motion was against the iniquity of paying for the prairie section three or four times the price which it was to cost the Company to construct it. We said, what is quite true, that no doubt what the Government were doing would stimulate the construction of the prairie portion, because every twenty miles they built gave them a fortune, gave them a large estate, and of course they would earn their money fast; it would cost them nothing, the Government would pay them all the cash they required, and besides that, they would get valuable lands; but we said: "These resources which you are squandering now are the resources which you should reserve for the construction of the other parts of the road." The hon. gentlemen next referred to the motion of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), and he said he would prove by the events of the year that that motion was altogether out of place. That motion was against the exemption from taxation of the land grant of the Company; but the hon. gentlemen took up the question of the exemption of the station buildings and the property of the Company in certain towns, and gave this as an answer to the motion of the hon. member for South Perth. That is no answer to the motion. He says: "I will prove that you are all wrong, because the city of Winnipeg, so far from taxing the Company, is willing to give \$200,000 for their railway station." No Sir, they were not willing to give it, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company said to them: "You have offered \$200,000 to another Railway Company, and if you do not withdraw that, we will not come to your town." Well, the city of Winnipeg said: "We will not give \$200,000 to the other Company," and then the Canadian Pacific Railway approached them and said: "If you will give us \$200,000, we will put our station grounds here." So they gave the \$200,000. I do not think it was an act in which the people of Winnipeg took great heart; they were perhaps wise in their day and generation not to want to lose the station; but I wonder what man of the whole 200 of us thought when they were giving these great subsidies that one of the first acts of the Company would be to exact \$200,000 from the chief city of the Northwest as a condition of putting their station grounds there. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the Company have placed their land for sale at \$1.25 an acre. We know what they did in reference to their lands; we know that their lands were placed at \$2.50, subject to certain conditions of forfeiture. The hon. gentleman has acknowledged that these conditions were too stringent. They were undoubtedly too stringent—so stringent that they were found entirely unworkable, and practically prevented the sale of their lands in the first instance. These conditions were

relaxed, I think, three times, each change showing that the Company were disposed to adopt conditions as stringent as the public opinion of the country would allow. The hon. gentleman says this is practically an offer of the land at \$1.25 an acre. I am not disposed to agree with that view; I am disposed to believe that it would be found difficult for the average settler to apply these terms so as to get the land at \$1.25 an acre. In order to get the land at \$1.25 he has to break it, and I do not think he can break or keep within cultivation the amount of land which will enable him to obtain it at that price. Then again, many of the lands are not open for sale at all—the lands along the line of railway and other lands. I do not propose to enter into an elaborate discussion of the terms and conditions of the sale of Pacific Railway lands, but I think practical experience will show that these conditions will produce, not \$1.25, but a much larger return. Under any circumstances, however, that exemption from taxation is a condition tending to results which, as the member for Perth pointed out, gives a greater opportunity to the Company to build their lines than they would have if they were subject to municipal taxation, and rendering them free from that share of taxation, borne by other landholders, so that it is acting entirely to the prejudice of the settlement of the country. The motion of the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is one which the hon. gentleman said was very unfortunate, because it opposed the Government remaining so long a contractor or dealing with those railways. The motion pointed out that there was an absence of finality in the action of the Government. The argument of my hon. friend was that we did not know when the Government would cease to be connected with the railway as a good portion of the work remained to be constructed. The Minister of Railways contended that a great benefit accrued to the country from the arrangements for hastening the completion of the road—that a great evil was connected with a lengthened Government connection. But there is this evil from the present policy, we have to provide the money, and really we double the annual provision for the immediate cash construction of the work. The hon. gentleman referred to a motion of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), stating that the best reply to it was that the Railway Act had been amended. But that Act was not amended when the motion was made. My hon. friend dealt with the Act as it was. I deny that the amendment of the Railway Act is an adequate answer, because it did not deal with the evil existing at the time. It is a new thing to say your amendment is useless because we were convinced by it and your arguments that our law had to be amended. Then with regard to the tolls on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. gentleman made a comparison with these of a number of other railways. I am not able to analyse it because I do not know how far it applies to what is the great question at present and will be for a long time, the question of through rates. We know that through rates are very different from local rates, and that the local rates of almost all these great railway companies are practically monopolies. It has long been the complaint—almost since the first, as to local rates—that the Companies charged a great deal too much; and what I understood the hon. gentleman to be bringing forward was practically the local rates on first-class railways.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had no means of dealing with anything else.

Mr. BLAKE. Why not? Does not the hon. gentleman know that there is a difference between through rates and local rates? He does not seem to know.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We cannot control rates all through.

Mr. BLAKE. Does he not know that there is a different rate, for through traffic from the rate for local traffic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There would be a decrease not an increase.

Mr. BLAKE. That shows how much the hon. gentleman knows about trade. There would of course be an increase for local trade, and that is the very point of observation. The question is what the rate for through freights is. On the 7th of May next the undermentioned rates will be charged: From Emerson to Selkirk, \$24 a car for a special rate No. 6, and for special rate No. 5, \$22. There are certain other rates—25 cents for first-class merchandise, for second-class 22 cents, 21 cents for third-class, and 14 cents for fourth-class all the way between Emerson and Selkirk. Then it has its local mileage freight which is of course wholly different.

Mr. PLUMB. Why should it not be?

Mr. BLAKE. I do not say that it should not be; but I am pointing out several questions affecting Ontario and the older Provinces and the North-West, all of which are concerned in getting the enormous quantity of imports to the North-West at moderate rates, and in settling the question as to what the through rates should be. We want to know what they are. I do not mean the through rate at this moment—the through rate from Winnipeg to Montreal—but the arrangement for the rate to be charged over the Canadian Pacific Railway for that portion of its traffic which is not way but through traffic; and the comparison of the rates charged by other railway companies similarly circumstanced, which form connecting links between one point and another for that portion of this traffic which is through as compared with way traffic, would be of some value. The hon. gentleman will find, if he takes a carload of stuff from Montreal to Winnipeg, that the Grand Trunk Railway charges on the through rate for so much of its line as is passed over, such a rate; that the other railways between the end of its line and Winnipeg charge so much for what passes over them; that those rates are entirely different from their local rates; that the rates charged by some of those companies up to St. Paul, were as a rule, when I last investigated the subject, entirely different from the local rates and were enormously lower. Compare the rates charged by each company whose line is used between Montreal and Chicago and let us ascertain the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway as compared with those of the other companies, and then we shall know something that is quite as important and interesting as the local or small distances from 25 to 100 miles within the North-West country itself. Then he said we took great care about this; we saw that the Railway Company adopted a proper scale of rates; the Governor in Council settled this matter. I want to show how he settled it. In April last the Canadian Pacific Railway applied that its tariffs of rates be allowed. In April the Chief Engineer reported it was satisfactory. In April the Minister of Railways said it was satisfactory, and I think on the 7th of May, the Council approved of it for one year. That tariff was merchandise 1, 2, 3, 4, special rates, and other rates 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; as to these different special rates, it changes. Unless you know what the different classes are you cannot tell anything about those freights at all, or what the burden and incidence of that tariff was.

Mr. PLUMB. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose he imagines the same classes prevail in all places. They did vary; and you do not know, because of any general provision or understanding of that kind, what the regulation is, as often fourth class in one is first class in another. The Government did not know what the classes were. When did they learn? Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks it is of no consequence they should learn. Perhaps he thinks without learning, but there came a time when they perceived it was important they should

Mr. BLAKE.

learn. In January last, and it was after they approved of the tariff, they wrote a letter to the Canadian Pacific Railway, saying: "you will be pleased to send us a classification of the rates referred to in the tariff approved of in April." The hon. gentleman says the motion of my hon. friend as to the deflexion of the line southward is all nonsense, but the deflexion has taken place. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the motion of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) as to differential rights; he says the motion is entirely a mistake. So far from there having been any such dangerous result in injuring the Occidental Railway, the result has proved the reverse. The Canadian Pacific Railway has obtained control of the Canada Central, also the Brockville and Ottawa, and the St. Lawrence and Ottawa. It has all the roads in the Ottawa country as the people are beginning to find out, and because an arrangement has been made with the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway it does not prove that the motion was not a judicious one at the time, as then no such arrangement was mooted. But the hon. gentleman referred to only half of the motion. The motion began by pointing out the possibility of danger to the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway and the Ontario interests, and the hon. gentleman has not answered that portion of the motion. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the hon. member for Yarmouth's motion, and said he need not be afraid of a loss to the revenue to the country, as they were going to build iron bridges in Ontario. But would not that entail a loss of revenue? When the Bill of the hon. Minister of Customs becomes law, every shilling of duty paid on the raw material would be returned, and that would be in addition to the difference between the duty on the raw material and manufactured articles. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the other motions. He says that the motion of the hon. member for Rimouski was in error because the road was first-class. But the hon. member pointed out that the contract did not provide that the road was to be first-class, and if it be a fact that the railway is to be first-class that does not alter the correctness of my hon. friend's motion. The hon. gentleman adverted, in the course of the discussion upon this contract, to another great advantage. The Speech from the Throne said, and so did its mover and seconder, that one of the great advantages we would gain from this arrangement was to be the saving of expenditure in the promotion of immigration, which would be carried on by this great corporation. But we know that the cost of immigration is larger than formerly. I maintain that, instead of events which have elapsed being proof of the unwisdom of this side of the House, they are proofs of the wisdom of our policy. They have demonstrated that evils, difficulties and dangers of the most serious character will arise in the North-West from the restrictive monopoly clause to which I have referred, and the enormous burdens which have been imposed prematurely by the construction of the railway, because it has been made plain, that as to the eastern end it is not so difficult as it was supposed to be, and the western end will not be the great burthen expected. It is proved that the price we are agreeing to pay is inordinate in another respect, because who can doubt that if the railway through the prairie country had been built by the Government during this current year, the emigration would have gone on, settlement would have gone on, the value of land would have increased, the boom would have gone on, and we would have been able to sell our lands at a much better price than we have sold these 25,000,000 acres to the Canadian Pacific Railway? Who can doubt that if what we proposed had been done, if we had our hands free to-day, if we could say now that, instead of in April last deciding to let this contract for the whole work, we had vigorously prosecuted the line through the prairie country,

we would be able to breathe freer and easier with reference to the development and future of that country? We would have had all the settlement that has been referred to, all the improvement in the condition of the country that has been referred to, we would have had our 25,000,000 acres of choice lands, with no monopoly, no exemptions, no enormous contract for the construction of the ends. We would have been in a position to say: Now, gentlemen contractors, with such prospects as these before you, with such prospects as this single year of railway construction in the North-West offers, what chance have you, what offer will you make for our lands? What offer will you make for the construction of the railway? We would have been in a position infinitely superior to grapple with the construction of the ends of the line if the construction had only been delayed for one short year. If we were in the same position with regard to the whole road as we are with regard to the ends of it, we could have made an infinitely better bargain pecuniarily and in all other business aspects for the construction of the rest of the railway this year, than the bargain we made last year. Therefore, I say it is demonstrated that the policy of the Opposition was both prudent and statesmanlike. We had proposed to provide the very points which were important. We had proposed to deal with these very questions, to deal with them as they arose, as circumstances should point out the most advisable way. We had proposed to establish the North-West as a North-West, to enter upon the construction of the lands with a basis of lands having reached an augmented value. Instead of that the hon. gentlemen prematurely—once again to adopt the words of the hon. member for Sunbury—would deal with the whole question while the North-West was as yet in the condition in which it was last year. They would say that extra price in money and land, in works, in monopolies, in exemptions, which it is impossible for us to measure. They have agreed to pay it, they have bound the country by it, they have saddled the country with it, and the country, I suppose, has to bear it. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman supposes that we are ashamed of these amendments or of the position we took last year, if he supposes that we desire to forget them or to do anything else than to have an opportunity to demonstrate their statesmanship and the wisdom of the policy they indicated according to the circumstances that existed at the time, and as demonstrated by the events of the past year, and by the circumstances of to-day, he was never more mistaken in his life.

Mr. HOMER. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House at any length in making a few remarks on the question before the House. In changing the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the Yellow Head Pass to the Kicking Horse Pass, I believe the Government will not only contribute to the profits of the Railway Co., but will benefit the interests of British Columbia in particular and the Dominion of Canada in general. The country through which the road will pass by taking the southern route is much more valuable in mineral, agricultural and grazing lands than the region of the Yellow Head Pass. It will develop the grazing lands and the agricultural lands lying to the west of the Rocky Mountains. It will also be easy of access to the well-known gold mines of Kootenay, and will decrease the rate of transportation, so as to enable the extensive deposits of rich lead ore on the Kootenay lakes to be developed with advantage and profit to those who invest capital in them, and will thereby add to the country a very important industry. It will thence pass on to what is known as the gold quartz bearing regions of the Big Bend, which only requires cheap transportation to make it profitable to the country. It will then pass on to what is known as the silver region of British Columbia, which is looked upon by all experts as the great future silver region of British Columbia. This is

one of the resources of British Columbia which requires only cheap communication to its development. From this silver region the line will pass on to the fertile valley of Spillamachein and Shuswap, giving an outlet to an extensive grazing and agricultural country surrounding the Okanagan Lake. It will then pass through the well-known Kamloops district, connecting Savona's Ferry with the second line now under construction, and at which point the line to the Yellow Head Pass will terminate. The region at the Yellow Head Pass contains but very little mineral; but it does contain a comparatively large extent of agricultural lands; but as these lands are all accessible by water there is not so much necessity for a railway as there is through the southern district. By adopting this southern route you not only develop this important section of country but you will create a large way traffic which will support the road as soon as it is completed. It will thus prevent the south-eastern portion of British Columbia from passing into the hands of our neighbors to the south of us. At the same time it will secure a portion of the trade south of the line, which could not possibly be secured if the road came by the way of Yellow Head Pass, and the House will see from these facts the advantage to be derived from the Government adopting the southern pass.

Mr. BUNSTER. This is a very important question, deeply affecting the interests of British Columbia, and I would like to ask for an adjournment of the debate until such time as the Premier and the junior member for Victoria are in their seats.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Opportunity can be had for discussion of this matter in Supply on the Estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does not the hon. gentleman wish to give an opportunity to any one else to speak on this subject save himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, any one who wishes to speak on it can do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think that 2 o'clock in the morning is a fit time to continue the debate. I must necessarily speak, owing to the hon. gentleman's allusions to myself. I would consequently like to obtain an adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would be very sorry to do anything which would put the hon. gentleman to the least possible inconvenience; but, as the leader of the Opposition suggested, the fullest and most legitimate opportunity will be afforded in the discussion of the Estimates, for treating this question in all its bearings—under these circumstances I think the hon. gentleman should allow the business of the House to proceed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think that this is the business of the House. This is new matter altogether. This discussion was deliberately raised by the Government on a notice given to the House two days ago, and yet we are refused an opportunity to discuss it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman wishes not to speak at the present time, and prefers to deal with the subject on this Bill, I think his desire to have an adjournment should be met; and I shall be glad to have it met, because we can adjourn the debate and go on with other business. I hope that the hon. gentleman will move the adjournment of the debate, in order that he may have an earlier opportunity at which to make his remarks.

Mr. BUNSTER. I have already asked for an adjournment of the debate. I was ahead of the hon. member for Lambton. British Columbia has grievances to lay before Parliament, but I think it only fair in the absence of the member for Victoria, B.C., that an adjournment of the debate should be granted. I was pleased to hear the able speech of the Minister of Railways, who since he has visited

our Province is probably more impressed with its boundless resources than he ever was before. I believe there was a celebrated writer named Sam Slick, who once said that the ports of Halifax on the east and Esquimalt on the west, would be the two greatest ports in the world, and when the right hon. Premier conceived the idea of making this one great nation he probably was reading the opinions of Sam Slick, better known by some hon. gentlemen as Mr. Haliburton. History sometimes repeats itself, and it has probably done so in the present case. The hon. Minister of Railways paid a visit to our Province last year, and I am satisfied he obtained information which will be of interest to the Dominion at large. I heard him speak very fluently to-night about his ride on the Central and Union Pacific Railway, but it would afford me much more pleasure to hear him speak of his ride on our Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent. It was British Columbia that gave an outlet to the whole Dominion, and it is an outlet of which every Canadian should feel proud, inasmuch as it has not cost the people one dollar, but British Columbia has been a heavy loser for the last six or seven years owing to the non-fulfilment of that contract. Men bought property under the idea that the contract would be carried out. There has been a great deal said about developing the North-West; but what has been done in that direction for British Columbia, which gives an outlet to the North-West? The Minister of Railways does not advertise our Province as he does the North-West, though he knows that we have a superior climate to Manitoba. I see by a German pamphlet that American immigration agents are circulating the fact that in our North-West no one can get any liquor, and the Germans are not likely to go to a country where they cannot have their glass of beer or lager. We live in a country where men can have their grog, and I do not think it was in the interests of the North-West or of British Columbia, because it is part of the North-West from a geographical standpoint, to have passed those prohibitory laws.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. You have beer in British Columbia.

Mr. BUNSTER. Yes; and she had beer before she entered the Confederation, and she will have it as long as the British flag floats over Britain.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved the adjournment of the debate.
Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 128) to provide for the improvement and management of the Harbor of Three Rivers.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Bill (No. 129) further to amend the Acts to provide for the improvement and management of the Harbor of Quebec.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 130) to further amend the Act 36 Victoria, Chapter 60, relating to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 140) to amend the Act 35 Victoria, Chapter 42, providing for the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.—(Mr. McLelan.)

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 141) to provide for the allowance of drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Bowell.)

House adjourned at 2 a.m.

Mr. BUNSTER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 19th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House for a few moments, to a question of privilege. Two articles have recently appeared in the *Globe* newspaper referring to me. I do not know that I should have thought it necessary to make any remarks in reference to them, but for the fact that the other evening some other members of this House whose names were mentioned, thought it necessary to bring the matter before the House and reply to that article. Since then the same newspaper has followed up the attack made in the first instance by another more particularly personal to myself. Had I been in the House on the occasion when the first article was called to its attention, I should have joined the other gentleman in disclaiming any liability for the motives therein cast upon us; but not having been there I did not think it worth while to occupy the attention of the House by any discussion on the subject. But this other article which appeared in the *Globe*, on Monday last, renders it necessary that I should say a few words in reply to it. I do not, however, wish to be understood as acceding to the principle, for one moment, that every member of this House who appears to be personally attacked in foul and scandalous abuse in any newspaper is to choose this arena for vindicating himself. I think that would be an improper doctrine to urge, and I do not intend to do it. But the charges made in this practical article so specially refer to the Independence of Parliament and my action in the House, that I think it is necessary to say a few words in reference to it. The first article which I will read, said:

"A little light was thrown upon the manner in which some members discharge their public trusts. This morning in the Railway Committee room, when Mr. Hector Cameron declined to vote on the Telegraph Bill, he intimated that his not voting was because of his professional connection with the Bill. It is more than hinted that several members of the House largely supplement their indemnity and mileage by fees for promoting Bills. How far their constituents approve of their representatives tying their hands in this way, so that they cannot vote upon important questions, it would be interesting to know. An equally important point is to know how such members justify their violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. A full statement on this point from Messrs. Cameron (Victoria), Boulton, McCarthy, Kirkpatrick, and others would be in order."

The article of Monday last is somewhat lengthy, and I do not intend to trouble the House with it at length. After referring to the Bill in reference to the Montreal Telegraph Company, it states:

"It was introduced by Mr. Hector Cameron, member for North Victoria, who made several speeches in its support. Thereupon arose in opposition Mr. Thomas White, member for Cardwell, who, having been interrupted by Mr. Cameron, retorted that the learned gentleman appeared before the Committee with his fee in his pocket, meaning thereby that he was not, in the advocacy of the Bill in question, a fair representative of the people of North Victoria, but a lawyer employed by parties interested. To the astonishment of all present Mr. Cameron did not deny this statement, but retorted that if Mr. White made such statements he would resort to *tu quoque* argument, meaning thereby that Mr. White was open to the charge of personal interest as well as himself. Mr. White denied this, and demanded proof. Soon afterwards a vote was taken upon an amendment to the Bill, and Mr. Cameron refrained from voting. Mr. Blake drew attention to the fact, whereupon Mr. Cameron declared that he did not vote because he had a personal and professional interest in the measure! A few minutes afterwards, however, a member moved an adjournment, when Mr. Cameron rose, and protested as a member of the Committee against the motion. Thus, in the space of five minutes, he placed himself before the Committee and the public as a hired advocate, and also as an independent legislator resisting the motion of a fellow member."

It winds up in this way :

"Nothing can be more clear from these statements than that Mr. Hector Cameron, in declaring that he had personal and professional interest in the Telegraph Bill, and yet appeared as its advocate before the Committee, was guilty of a gross breach of parliamentary rule, and has exposed every act of which he is capable as representative of the people of North Victoria to the imputation of mercenary motives. If a member receives a fee for supporting one Bill, why may he not receive bribes for sustaining others? If a lawyer can be paid for parliamentary service, why not any member of the House? If the House of Commons does not purge itself of Mr. Hector Cameron it will lower its status very seriously in the estimation of the people of this country, and will justify any future accusations which may be made of undue influence. It is for the Government to take action in this matter. Mr. Cameron is one of their supporters, and no doubt they will be reluctant to condemn him, but condemn him they must, and that speedily. Their standard of purity we all know is not high, but there are some things that Sir John A. Macdonald will not do, and therefore we hope to see him place upon the notice paper a declaration of the impropriety of Mr. Cameron's act with a penalty attached to the repetition of it. We shall leave the electors of North Victoria to deal with the peccant member as their moral sense will direct them."

Now, in reference to this matter, I have only to repeat what I said before, that with the Montreal Telegraph Company I have not now and never had any kind of professional connection. I stated candidly to the Committee that I held the position of standing counsel to the Great North-Western Telegraph Company, and that that was the reason why I declined to vote on this particular question. I did not state, as is falsely asserted in the last article, that I was personally or professionally interested in the Bill. I have neither personal nor professional interest in that Bill, nor any other Bill before this House, and I have been very careful on every occasion not to have any such interest. I have not received any fee and I have no expectation of receiving any fee, for this or any other legislation coming before this House, or for any service connected with my duty as a member of this House. It will not put one cent into my pocket whether the Bill is carried or lost. It does not make one iota of difference to me personally what the result of the Bill may be; but I am not aware that the fact of a professional or personal interest towards that particular Company, which is only indirectly if at all interested in this Bill, precludes me from saying what I think fit to say as an Independent member of Parliament in reference to any legislation before this House. The legislation in question I should have supported on public grounds, quite irrespective of any professional interest in the matter. If I thought fit to adopt different views, I do not suppose they would have altered or changed my relation to the North-Western Telegraph Company. My connection with it is a purely professional one, and in no respect involves any parliamentary duty towards it. The charge from first to last, as to this Bill or any other Bill before the House—and I challenge any member of this House to adopt the suggestion put forward by the *Globe* newspaper, and put upon the journals of this House, or upon the notice paper of this House, a motion to call in question my parliamentary action on any point as to whether I violated the Independence of Parliament Act. As a member of the late Parliament I had sufficient occasion to study very carefully the provisions of that Act in the cases that then arose. I am well aware of them all, and I say without hesitation that, neither in reference to this Bill or any other Bill with which I have been connected, have I ever had any personal or professional interest which in any way could possibly interfere or prevent, or make it an act of impropriety on my part, to discuss and judge a Bill and to express my opinions upon any private or public measure before the House. It has usually happened that I have had occasion to take charge of a good many Bills, this Session more particularly, possibly owing to what is really a misfortune that I am a reasonably active member of the different Committees, that I have that kind of professional knowledge of legislation that enables me to take charge of them, perhaps with more readiness

than members who are not so skilled. I have been engaged to accept with great reluctance the charge of many Bills, but in no single instance have I had any personal or pecuniary interest in any one of them in the remotest degree. I think that is a sufficient answer to the general charge. I shall only conclude by saying that this attack upon me is, of course, as every one knows, instigated by political hostilities. It has come to my knowledge that the idea of it originated in the Committee when this matter was under discussion; that the managing editor of the *Globe* was then present, and that he said in the hearing of some of my friends who happened to be wedged in close to him in the crowded Committee room, that he would make what then occurred the subject of an attack upon me; that he repeated that statement publicly in a public conveyance, in a railway train between here and Toronto, and this article is simply following up the threat then made use of by him; that he would endeavor to make political capital against me out of what occurred in that Committee room. I have been informed of that, and I have no doubt of the veracity on that point of my informants. As for that individual, the managing editor of the *Globe*, I have, fortunately for myself, for a great many years past—seven or eight years—not had any kind of personal acquaintance or intimacy with him. I have had such a contempt for his conduct and his action and the manner in which he conducts that newspaper, that I have felt that it was an advantage to me that I was not obliged to acknowledge an acquaintance with him even when I met him on the street. The remarks the hon. Minister of Railways thought fit to make upon him the other night, I entirely endorse. His action is that of a cowardly assassin who has not the courage to attack a political opponent upon public and legitimate grounds, which ought to afford a basis for attack if any attack should be made, but he comes behind and tries to stab his political opponent in the back in a cowardly and contemptible manner. I do not think it is desirable to notice all the personal attacks of this kind that are made upon members, but inasmuch as it has come to my knowledge, as I have stated, that this article was inspired, and not only inspired but actually written, by that individual in pursuance of a threat that he openly and publicly made, I think I am quite justified in referring to him. Why, he actually has the audacity, in the concluding sentence of this article, to talk about the moral sense of the electors of North Victoria, as if he could have the slightest appreciation of what moral sense was. I should like to know whether the articles in the *Globe*, in reference to its political opponents, show that the writer of them has the remotest idea of what moral sense is? Why, he has not the moral sense of a dog. A dog attacks his enemy openly. It barks and flies at him openly and fairly, but this contemptible journal by its contemptible managing editor, comes behind in a sneaking and contemptible manner, like a snake, and tries to spit its venom into its enemy, trying to kill its victims in the dark and on the sly. I feel such a contempt for the course which this journalist has pursued in reference to every man who happens to be opposed to him politically, that, perhaps, I am too warm in the expressions I am making use of; if I am I apologize to the House. But really it is impossible not to feel indignation against a journal who has for years past continually violated every principle of legitimate warfare. If it has anything to say against any man let it say it openly and plainly. If it has anything to say against any member of this House let it say so openly and plainly, and not bring forward insinuations and foul attacks which neither it nor any of its friends dare attempt to justify openly against myself or any other hon. member of this House.

Mr. TASSÉ. I regret very much to have to follow the example of my hon. friend and trouble this House on a per-

sonal matter. In the course of last week, on Wednesday, the *Free Press*, a Liberal organ in this city, published the following paragraph:—

"Is it true that one of the city's representatives received \$250 from a certain dry goods firm in Ottawa, as a consideration for his services in getting for them the job of supplying carpets to the Government?"

The following day this paragraph appeared in the *Citizen*:

"The interrogatory form of the above paragraph is a cowardly way of stating a base falsehood; but it is in perfect keeping with the disreputable organ's despicable conduct and notoriously mendacious propensities. If the statement were true, if it were not a malicious invention, it would have been made with distinctness, and not in the above contemptible form. We have the authority of both members for saying that there is not the slightest foundation for the statement."

The *Free Press* repeated its charge from day to day, not directly, but by insinuation, and a few days later I sent to it the letter which I will read; but that paper refused to publish it, and I had to publish it in the *Ottawa Citizen*. The letter reads as follows:—

"Editor of the *Free Press* :

"Sir,—I shall consider you as a cowardly slanderer so long as you decline to name the 'city member,' charged by you with having received \$250 for political influence used in the interest of a mercantile firm for securing orders from the Department of Public Works for carpet supplies. Rest assured that so soon as you muster sufficient courage to name the 'city member' referred to, you shall have full opportunity to make good your infamous charge—which, in my own behalf, I deny in the strongest possible terms. In the meantime, the public will stamp as mean and cowardly the subterfuge of dragging in the names of two city representatives—for in either case one must be grossly slandered, both by suspicion and the still more reprehensible insinuation.

"Your obedient servant.

"JOSEPH TASSÉ.

"Ottawa, April 17th, 1882."

The *Free Press* has, since, not withdrawn its statement, nor has it, as challenged, made a direct charge either against my very esteemed and senior colleague Mr. Currier, or myself, and if I rise now it is not with the view of complaining of that paper, because in this city it is well known as one of the most unreliable, unscrupulous and corrupt papers which exist in the whole Dominion. If it were not out of order, I would quote from its files to show that in July, 1874, at the time of the elections, it was then fighting the same battle with us against our friends on the other side, and two months later, as soon as its columns began to be filled with Government advertisements, it commenced to publish splendid eulogiums of those whom it formerly traduced. I do not rise, as I say, to complain of the *Ottawa Free Press*, but as the same slander has been telegraphed by the editor of that paper, Mr. Carrol Ryan—who, I am sorry to say for my confreres on the press, is President of the Gallery—to the *London Advertiser*, I wish to take this opportunity to declare from my seat in this House that the charge made against me by insinuations is nothing but a complete and cowardly slander.

Mr. HESSON. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the manner in which I have been attacked in the *London Advertiser*. We all know the character of that paper, and if the attack had not been copied in some respectable journals, through mistake or otherwise, I would pay but little regard to it. Had it been confined to local papers, I would not have felt any particular cause for referring to it here, because a man can stand criticism at home, where he is well known. But when an attack of this kind is circulated through the length and breadth of the Dominion, it should be held up to public censure. The article reads as follows:—

"There are two representatives in Parliament from this Province who are entitled to special attention, and we invite it from their constituents. We are opposed to the Administration and to their fiscal policy. We are perfectly aware that many respectable people differ from us and think their fiscal policy statesmanlike. But they surely can find men having some regard to the ordinary proprieties of civilized life to represent them. There are two men on the Tory side from this Province who would be hardly tolerated in a council of Digger Indians. We refer to the renowned Charley Rykert and the pompous Mr. Hesson.

Mr. TASSÉ.

They seem to think that those who are on the Opposition side of politics have no right to be heard, and that it is a part of their duty to groan and whistle, and to make all sorts of disturbing noises when a Reformer rises to speak. It would be difficult to find a man more ignorant and more conceited than Mr. Hesson. He is distinguished for very broad and comprehensive ignorance, and for sufficient self-complacency to supply all his party."

I take this opportunity to deny that I either whistled or groaned in the House, and that I made no disturbing noises, as hon. members can all vouch. I repudiate the whole thing. As to my self-complacency or ignorance, I am prepared to leave it to the judgment of the House and the public. I say this article is a piece of rascality that no man should tolerate, but which is only on a par with the character of the paper which published it.

Mr. CURRIER. With reference to what has been said by my colleague, Mr. Tassé, with respect to what appeared in the *Free Press*, I can endorse every word he uttered as to the character of that paper, and its unjustifiable attack. I have had the honor of holding a seat here for nineteen years, and have never received \$250, or any other sum, from any dry goods establishment since I have occupied a seat in this House; for anything I have been able to do for my constituents, pertaining to my duty as a member, and for the credit of my constituents, I beg to say, that no one of them ever approached me with any such offer or suggested the payment of any sum, small or large, for anything I was able to do for them or that I was called upon to do as pertaining to my duties as a member of the House. I trust it will not be necessary to again make an explanation to the House in consequence of any such attack as that which has been made; I think my colleague (Mr. Tassé) has properly characterized the attack made in the *Free Press*.

DELAY OF MAILS.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the delays which have occurred in the mails in the Lower Provinces. In consequence of these frequent delays our correspondence has been delayed twenty-four hours on many occasions.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for the second reading of Bill (No. 144) to authorize the construction, on certain conditions, of the Canadian Pacific Railway through some other pass than the Yellow Head Pass.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I take now, as I have always taken, a deep interest in everything that concerns the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, therefore, I listened with the closest attention to the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Railways, in laying before the House a statement of the present condition of that work, as well as its prospects. I only regret that the hon. gentleman chose to make his statement, which was couched throughout in moderate terms, a vehicle for attack on his opponents. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman eulogizing himself as much as he pleases; that we expect, and that he generally contrives to do, so much so that it is quite unnecessary for any person to undertake it. But I think, in making a statement of a great work to the House, he might have refrained from a repetition of some of the charges, or rather insinuations, made in various speeches, that have some remote connection with that work. The hon. gentleman was good enough, in one part of his speech, to take credit to himself for everything done on the road. There was not, he said, when he assumed office in 1878, though we had spent public money during five years on the work, one mile of the road in operation, and he expected within a year to have not less than 900 miles either in operation or close upon it, thus conveying the impression to any stranger who

might happen to be in the House that the hon. gentleman's predecessor and the late Government were sadly remiss in prosecuting this public enterprise. In the first place, I never believed, nor did a majority of the members of the House believe, in the excessive bargain made with British Columbia, which bound the Government of the Dominion to an extraordinary and extravagant expenditure. Nay more, we know that before we took office in November, 1873, a protest of complaint was lodged by British Columbia against the Canadian Government for non-fulfillment of the terms of Union. I confess now, as I have always done, that I felt it to be my duty as a member of the late Administration, and in that my colleagues all agreed with me, to endeavor if possible to supplement the bargain, without intending on any account to do so at the expense of any vast increase in the country's taxation. When we came into office we found that the previous Government had expended \$1,391,000 in exploratory surveys. I might very easily say they had expended \$1,500,000, and not one foot of road was located. I do not do that, for I scorn to take any undue advantage of an opponent in debate. I think it was absolutely essential in the interests of the road itself that a thorough survey of the country should be made. The hon. gentleman who filled the office of Minister of Public Works during that period, no doubt acted, in directing the surveys, so that he would obtain a general knowledge of the principal features of the country in order that by studying its topography he might be able to advise the Government of the proper course to be pursued in selecting a route. After I acceded to office it became a very large portion of my duties to consider what should be done. I had, on previous occasions, when not saddled with any responsibility as a member of the Government, taken the ground that the first thing to be done was to get full possession of the North-West country, to throw in a large population there, which would be the nucleus of settlement and enterprise in the centre of the continent, and towards the adoption of that policy all our efforts were directed. We felt it absolutely essential that we should open the prairie region as soon as possible, and our whole course, whether wise or unwise in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite, was governed by that one consideration. At the time we assumed office it was practically next to impossible for any immigrants to reach the prairie country. It required a journey of some eighteen or twenty days in the carts of the country to travel from St. Paul to Winnipeg. And I remember very well some people coming here, during the first year of my incumbency in office, who had been nineteen days upon that journey going out of the country. To send in immigrants, therefore, under such circumstances seemed to be utterly absurd, and the first matter to which we directed our attention, therefore, was to obtain a highway into the country by the best possible route. It is not interesting to know, as this House possibly does not know, or as many members of it do not, that one member of the present Administration denounced us in the most unmeasured terms, because we attempted to make a line from the boundary northward, and for extravagance in building the road between Thunder Bay and Red River. The hon. Minister of Railways seemed to forget all this. He is possessed of a weakness of memory that is simply marvellous where it affects any of his particular friends, but his memory is exceedingly good in matters affecting prejudicially, in his opinion, any of his opponents. Indeed, Sir, I am not sure but that the hon. gentleman himself said something adverse to us in regard to the building of the line from Pembina. I put myself in communication with the people acting for the Dutch bondholders of the road from St. Vincent to St. Paul. Owing to financial difficulties some time before our acceptance of office, I felt the first thing to be done was to build a road to our country, and

I held out to them the hope that we would be able to meet them at the boundary, as by that time they could construct the road on their side of the line. For some time that effort was unsuccessful. In the meantime we thought it advisable to proceed with the grading of the road, and it was graded some time before an arrangement was made with Mr. George Stephen, who had, in the meantime, become proprietor of the road on the United States side of the line. Even that was objected to by hon. gentlemen opposite, for though the Bill I introduced in 1878 in the House of Commons passed there, it was defeated in the Upper House, or, at least it was so mutilated as to make it impossible for us to accept it, and that arrangement fell through. Another arrangement was made, however, by the same parties for the operating of the road, so that before we left office the road was ready for carrying freight and passengers into the country as far as Winnipeg. In taking a rapid review of matters connected with the road, I shall endeavor to avoid anything to which the hon. the Minister of Railways can take exception. It is not my intention to discuss the matters which were so ably discussed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition last night, but to confine myself to the survey and selection of the route and to matters cognate thereto. I recollect very well, Sir, the torrent of abuse poured out upon myself because I had selected Fort William as the terminus, on Thunder Bay generally. I was not particular as to Fort William. Whatever place the engineers selected as the best terminus at Thunder Bay, I was willing to accept. But Thunder Bay I fixed upon in my mind as the most desirable place at which to have the terminus in preference to Nipigon. The Government, of which I was a member, decided not to build the eastern portion, between that port and Lake Nipissing, for some time, the object being, as I have already said, to have the line built as soon as possible into the prairie country from the nearest point at which navigation could be reached from the side of the country to be traversed. Still, Sir, I might say that in one sense I had no responsibility for the adoption of the Fort William or Thunder Bay terminus, because before I came into office at all my predecessor in the office of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) had despatched a large party of surveyors to survey the line from the mouth of the Kaministiquia westward, and it was many months before I could communicate with those parties as the winter had closed in. It was upon those surveys ordered by hon. gentlemen opposite that our ultimate selection of the route depended. I recollect also that we had obtained such surveys as satisfied the Chief Engineer that we could fairly let the work, and upon that report we proceeded as soon as possible to do so. The Chief Engineer's idea, as developed in a memorandum which was published at the time and distributed among members of the House, was that it was desirable to obtain very accurate knowledge of the country during two or three years explorations, but as soon as any particular route was fairly settled upon, to commence to clear the track, build telegraph lines, and otherwise make preparations for the general work of construction which was to follow immediately afterwards. This policy we adopted and went on with. We had to give out the contract for building a telegraph line upon the route as it should be located. This was done to the best of our knowledge and ability. I am not, at present, about to discuss the questions brought up by the report of the Commission lately presented to Parliament. They will come up in the discussion of that report. I am merely stating facts in connection with the road. We had some reason to believe, chiefly from the writings and observations of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), that it would be possible to obtain a straight line from Fort William, by way of Sturgeon Falls, to certain islands said to exist in the Lake of the Woods, but which had in the meantime disappeared from view, and

we should be able, by crossing to the narrows of the lake, to obtain the shortest line to Winnipeg and its neighborhood.

Mr. DAWSON. They are there yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am glad they have come back, but it is rather too late. Well, Sir, we had also in the meantime endeavored to keep up our search for another route if this should fail, and it became evident, in the first years' operations of Mr. Sandford Fleming on the track I have indicated, that the country between Sturgeon Falls and the Lake of the Woods was impracticable for the railway, and that the crossing of the lake imposed very serious difficulty. That was therefore given up, and the route which is now about completed between Selkirk, on the Red River, and Fort William, on Thunder Bay, was selected by us. So urgent were we in prosecuting this work, that we let a contract on the east end, forty-five and one-half miles long, very early in 1875, or the fall of 1874, I forget the precise moment, thinking we would be able to take the route to Shebandowan, which, in consequence of the explorations showing the impracticability of the country, we had to abandon. We were able, however, to take thirty-two and one-half miles to Sunshine Creek, and another contract to English River, a distance of 116 or 118 miles. We then let out a contract, No. 14, from Selkirk eastward to Cross Lake, in the meantime prosecuting the work under contracts Nos. 15, 41 and 42, altogether a distance of 200 miles, as rapidly as we fairly could, in order to obtain a route preferable to the one we had abandoned. The hon. gentleman opposite has an advantage in one respect in debate on this subject, over myself or any other person, that he has had three men to assist him, strong partizans of his own, to make out as strong a case as possible against his opponents, and avoid every possible reference to anything that might be discreditably or foolish on his own part; and one of the statements of these three men who were selected for a special purpose—and they have prosecuted their mission with very great zeal—one of these statements is that we made a mistake in locating the road to Selkirk, and that by taking it in the first place from Rat Portage, a common crossing, to Winnipeg, we had permanently lengthened the line by twenty miles. This was very extraordinary news to me, and how these gentlemen managed, even with all the strong partizan feeling manifested in their report, to reach that conclusion, is a perfect mystery. They have it on record in the published reports of the Engineer in Chief that to take the road from Winnipeg westward to the south of the lake towards the neighborhood of Fort Pelly would increase the distance by thirty miles. Mr. Marcus Smith, in his second survey, under the instruction of hon. gentlemen opposite, appears to have reduced that distance to about twenty miles. Now, in the first place, the hon. gentleman endeavored last night to evoke some sympathy for Winnipeg, because I had determined that the main line should not go to that point. In selecting the line of the Pacific Railway I was bound as a Minister, bound in every sense, not to look upon Winnipeg or any other place in the territories as a point to be reached unless it coincided entirely with the public interest. Winnipeg was not the objective point but the Pacific Ocean, and at the time we acceded to office the case appeared to have been settled; that after two years' explorations in the Rocky Mountains south of Yellow Head Pass, it was determined by the Chief Engineer that there was no practicable route through the Rocky Mountains south of that pass. We therefore determined to make all our lines subsidiary to the question of reaching Yellow Head Pass by the most direct route possible. I never lost sight of this fact, or those two facts, that the success of a great trans-continental railway depended upon two things, to get the shortest

Mr. MACKENZIE.

route and the best as to grades and curves. That those could be had at Yellow Head Pass was beyond a doubt, and therefore we had no difficulty in deciding at a comparatively early day, upon the adoption of the route laid down by Mr. Sandford Fleming to that point. It may be said that I am trying to place the responsibility upon Sandford Fleming as Chief Engineer. No doubt I do as far as the engineering goes, but in respect to the general policy of the Government I and my colleagues are responsible. I had this to say then, and I have it to say now, that I am not aware that at any time any serious difference of opinion arose between the Chief Engineer and myself or my colleagues. I am not aware that we ever entrusted the work of surveying to any new men after our accession to office. We found Mr. Sandford Fleming, as Chief Engineer, Mr. Marcus Smith as Chief Assistant, and Messrs. Cambie, McLennan and others able lieutenants of both. All those gentlemen were continued in the positions they held, and all their energies were devoted to the best interests of the great enterprise which for the time was committed to our care. That those interests were well cared for by them I have no doubt. That mistakes were made by them is beyond doubt, and that mistakes may have been made by ourselves is equally beyond doubt; but I am not able, at this present moment, to recall anything of importance whatever that I would not have done under similar circumstances in the working of the line. We had to consider the interests of the whole North-West Territory, and it seemed to us that the best mode of considering their interests was to have the road pass as nearly as possible through the centre of the fertile belt in such a direction as would make it comparatively easy to build lines to the north and to the south which would become tributary to the main line. There were two courses which we might have taken. One was the course which the Syndicate has taken. They have decided to build the line from Winnipeg nearly due west, and at present it seems to be decided both by the Government and the Syndicate that it shall reach Moose Jaw Creek, and from that point it shall take the direction which may be found necessary, either in the direction of the Kicking Horse or the Yellow Head Pass. That road traverses a country which is comparatively level. The country which we traversed with our line north of Lake Manitoba, or through the narrows of that lake, was also a level country. Indeed, it was pronounced by many hon. gentlemen opposite in their criticism to be far too level, too wet, but it could hardly be more wet than that described by the hon. gentleman opposite when he told us, as he did last night, that the track was laid for many miles upon the ice. I do not think any part from Selkirk westward to Fort Pelly, could have exceeded that for wetness, nor am I aware that it is more valuable for settlement than a very large portion of eastern Manitoba. The present hon. Minister of Railways himself decided, after more than a year's exploration, upon making a change, and instead of taking either the southern or the northern route I have indicated, he took a line between the two, and instead of following the country where the natural features were most favorable for railway construction, he appears to have chosen the roughest district that could be found, making his road over hill and valley between the two routes indicated, in such a direction, and through country as made it impossible to construct a first-class road, and we had the humiliating admission in this House that he had given up hopes of building a first-class road, and had determined to build one suited to colonization purposes, with very high grades and very sharp curves, which would have made heavy traffic impossible with profit for all years to come. The Chief Engineer recommended in his earlier reports that the Government should confine themselves to two grades east and west—that going westward being no more than forty feet to the mile, and that going

eastward no more than twenty-six feet to the mile, as the heavy traffic would be towards the east. These grades have been adopted as far as Selkirk, but west of that point the hon. gentleman determined to adopt a line on which he could not by any possibility get these grades, without an expenditure that would be far in excess of anything he would think of making for the construction of the road. The hon. gentleman, however, seemed to complain last night, or he implied a complaint, that we had spent too much time in surveying—that we had been five years in office and had not left a single mile of road constructed. But I remember, and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen around me will remember, that in the last Session of the last Parliament, that is in 1878, the hon. gentleman and his leader both complained that we were not giving attention enough to surveying the Pine River Pass nor the Peace River district; and one of the first things the hon. gentleman himself did after his accession to office, was to send a strong party to survey the country afresh from Fort Simpson on the Pacific up the Pine River Pass, and thence eastward towards Fort à la Corne. My hon. friend behind me, states that he also determined upon the selection of a route without waiting for the report of these parties. My recollection is that he stated to the House he had a telegraphic report, which gave some information though it was not a full report on which he acted. In the meantime, we had, in 1876 and 1877, various schemes for reaching the Pacific through Yellow Head Pass. We had our choice of three routes—one by the Nechaco Valley and the Salmon River, one to Bute Inlet, and one to the present terminus at Port Moody. We determined at one time, so favorable were the features of the country, principally towards Bute Inlet, to locate the line as far as Fort George, at the great bend of the Fraser, and we hoped without any doubt by the next season to obtain such favorable intelligence as would enable us to locate the line westward from that point, either to Dean Channel or to Bute Inlet. The information we received, however, showed that it was impossible to obtain more favorable grades than 105 feet to the mile on one line, and eighty-eight feet on the other. We determined therefore to have the Fraser Valley re-surveyed, and before we left office, we determined to adopt that as the permanent line of the Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman opposite, cancelled that order, as he considered it premature, and after his very hurried survey of the Pine River country, he fell back on our route; and at the present moment, from Fort William to Selkirk, and from the Yellow Head Pass to the Pacific Ocean, the hon. gentleman has followed precisely in our track without making any change whatever, showing that, after all, the expenditure made by us was made with such a result as has proved most satisfactory to the hon. gentleman himself as well as the Ministry of which I was a member. Now, the hon. gentleman has a Bill before the House to authorize the Syndicate to choose another place for crossing the Rocky Mountains. I could have no possible objection to that, but, upon the statement made by the hon. gentleman, I think there are very serious objections. During his early remarks I was led to suppose that a comparatively straight line could be obtained seventy-nine miles shorter, with grades equal to those on the Yellow Head Pass route. Along that route there are no grades exceeding fifty feet to the mile; but I was astonished to hear that the hon. gentleman rather favored the adoption of the southern pass with a grade of eighty feet to the mile. That is a grade at least seventeen feet in excess of any grade I knew of on Canadian railways. It is about nineteen feet, I think, in excess of the highest grade on the Intercolonial Railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. There is a grade of over seventy feet, I think, on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is at Bedford.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, it is a fatal grade to traffic. This is what the result will be—we shall save seventy-nine miles of travelling, but a powerful engine cannot take more than from twelve to fifteen cars, with an ordinary load, up that incline, while upon the grade we adopted of forty feet to the mile, an engine would be able to take from twenty-five to thirty cars. On the Canada Southern Railway, on which the maximum grade is only fifteen or eighteen feet, a freight engine is able to drag forty loaded cars; I myself have seen forty-four behind one engine. Every one can see how very unprofitable it will be to have a high grade of this character upon so important a line as the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I do not hesitate for a moment in expressing my own decided preference for the Yellow Head Pass route, with its lower grades, to accepting a shorter route by seventy-nine miles, with grades so high as the hon. gentleman represents. I do hope the Government will not accept any grade so steep as that, because it will be a loss for all time to come, and it will require either supplementary locomotive power on the spot, or some other means to assist engines in dragging up a heavy train. I am aware that on the United States Pacific lines there are grades that are high, and perhaps higher, but we know that they have not been able to do a profitable trade up these grades, and at several places they have engine stations to assist the trains up the grades. This might be done on our line, but it would be a thousand pities if we made a mistake by adopting so steep a grade as eighty feet to the mile, which would practically destroy the harmony of our grades eastward. I may refer to what the hon. gentleman said last night about cheapening the construction of the line between Kamloops and Emory's Bar. I was informed, and the hon. gentleman will correct me if am wrong, that, in order to avoid some of the heaviest parts of the works, there are grades on that part of the line not more than 60 feet in radius. Is that correct?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot say at the moment. I shall enquire.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I may be wrong, but I consider my authority good. If there are grades so sharp, or many of them, it is a fatal economy to cheapen the line with that result. It is utterly impossible for an express train to travel with safety and with a high rate of speed along such grades. I am told there is only one grade on the Intercolonial that approaches this radius, and that is near Halifax, at a point which, when Minister I visited for the purpose of considering how we could have a longer radius, and of course a less sharp turn upon the road. I have now referred to the general features of the scheme provided by the late Government, in consequence of information they obtained, and will have a few words to say in regard to the contracts themselves. The hon. gentleman read a statement from the report of his three Commissioners, showing the expenditure upon certain contracts and the amounts represented by the original tenders.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, I have not read a line from the statement to which he refers. The figures I read from are in the table prepared in the Department by the Chief Engineer.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He must have got a copy from the other parties. I have read the figures; I have not compared the matters, but I saw a table of figures prepared in precisely the same way, which I assumed to be the same thing. I may be wrong, but I accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not seen them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This statement was made by the hon. gentleman apparently without view. See how gently and nicely my estimates were passed compared with those

of my predecessor. They did not show there was a reduction in cost, whereas on those let before his time there was an increase in cost. There is one thing that will perhaps surprise many members. Up to this hour the hon. gentleman has not let a single contract, except upon tenders obtained by us, upon our surveys; for sections A, B, 41, 42, we had sent three distinct parties over the ground in order to get the figures more correctly. I had not the slightest conception until a very few minutes before the close of the Session of 1878 that the figures that were given upon 14 and other numbers, including 25, were so delusive. I accepted the estimate made by the engineer on the tender as approximately accurate, and we took the greater pains with the other sections which the hon. gentleman had the credit of letting, though not of surveying, in order to obtain as accurate information as possible. With regard to the selection of the line from Rat Portage westward, I see it is the conclusion of the Commissioners that there was a mistake made, not particularly with regard to the heavy work upon some portions of the road, not up or following on to Cross Lake, but notably the crossing of swamps of almost unknown depths that swallowed an immense amount of material. But Mr. Fleming, before the Commissioners, declares that he sees no reason even now to change the opinion he formed regarding that line. I may say frankly that if I had known the existence of those vast swamps, some further enquiry would have been made; but I was not aware of their existence. I accepted the statement of quantities given by the engineer as sufficient for the purpose of making estimates upon; and those estimates would, as a matter of course, depend upon the accuracy with which the surveyors had done their work. Upon section 14 it would not depend so much upon that as upon the examination of the ground which they were to traverse, whether the swampy peat which forms the soil for many miles in some places, and of a depth of eighteen or nineteen feet, sufficed to carry a road even with the aid of timber. All this had to be looked at afterwards when the road was pretty much constructed, and accounts for the extraordinary expenditure over the figures estimated by the engineers. With regard to the contract of which the hon. gentleman took so much credit last night, if any one is entitled to credit for obtaining those surveys, it is myself. I was not aware, as I have stated, that the others were deficient in accuracy; but it was perfectly clear to any one that that 185 miles which forms the connecting link should be examined as carefully as possible, both with regard to getting a shortened route and the smallest amount of work that could be obtained by re-surveys; and, as I have stated, three times parties were sent over that road for the purpose; and I gathered from the hon. gentleman last night that even after that, some changes were made which lessened the distance and increased the estimate of quantities. And I can only say that I am very glad it turned out so. I regret the hon. gentleman's want of generosity when he took the whole credit to himself, as he did in such a self-regarding air that was almost ludicrous to witness. The distinguished position he holds, to use his own words, should have induced him to be more moderate in applying praise to himself and censure to his opponents. He did not refer to another matter last night, but I have nothing to shun or keep back, and shall refer to it myself. I have been blamed by some hon. gentlemen opposite for steps taken to improve the navigation of the internal lakes between Fort William and Lake of the Woods. If I did wrong, I acted in the interests of the country, because I sought to obtain an easier way into the North-West for our people than could be obtained by the railway. Since 1871, parties have been out surveying that country, and we were told last night it would take another year to finish the road on these two sections. I take it for granted

Mr. MACKENZIE.

that no time was lost by the hon. gentlemen opposite before we acceded to office, and I am quite sure that none was lost by us while in office. The many works at the Fort Francis Locks and Rainy River were undertaken by us with the view that we would be able to send, as Mr. Dawson had done, over the Dawson route, some traffic through our own territory into the North-West before the railroad would be available. It was quite uncertain for a year or two after we reached office whether we would get a connection with the United States system of railways or not. It was quite certain in my estimation that six or eight years would elapse before it will be possible to finish that road entirely from Fort William to Selkirk, and at the same time, obtain the shortest possible line. Therefore, we determined, if possible, to obtain access to the country, to some extent, by using these navigable waters. I was taunted with advocating an amphibious system, part land and part water. I was quite indifferent whether it was land or water, so that we used it first, and used it best for the purpose of getting people into our country. That was our object, and if it was a crime, it was one closely allied to patriotism. I have always said, although it has been denied in some electioneering pamphlets issued during the last elections, that not one mile of road was built but what was in the precise direction required for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway as a whole. Of course, there is a difference of opinion between reaching the Red River at Selkirk and at Winnipeg. Personally, I would rather have reached it at Winnipeg. I would rather have gone by the south, where the country was probably more open, and probably more accessible at the time for settlement; but our object being to obtain the shortest possible route across the continent, and the line that would serve the largest extent of country, we deliberately chose the line we did, from Rat Portage across to Selkirk, offering immediate opportunity for the navigation of Lake Winnipeg. We did not know very much about the country, except what information we got from two or three parties that had gone from Hudson's Bay to Winnipeg, or from Lake Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay; but we do know that there is a very large extent of valuable land, and merchantable timber around that lake, so that we could obtain ties and other timber for all purposes in almost unlimited quantities; and we could not, viewing the public interest as we did, neglect the interests represented by those quantities of timber and other materials available for building, and for shipbuilding, and other industries of that kind. Where the road now crosses, if it should be continued from Selkirk, and no crossing afforded there—if it should, in other words, be taken in a straight line from some point eastward from Winnipeg, we shall not be able to obtain the navigation of the river without immense cost. We knew that the rapids between Winnipeg and Selkirk at low water afforded only two feet of water and it was with great difficulty some of our rails could be taken down and others had to be kept over until the road was built from Selkirk to Winnipeg. Where we made the terminus, there was some facility for reaching the great stretch of water navigation to the north. We had this further inducement to select that point: that the Saskatchewan River falls into Lake Winnipeg, and as the Grand Rapids are comparatively short, means of transit would not be expensive there, which would open the navigation of the Saskatchewan River, north and south, as auxiliary to the operation of the railway further south. All this presented itself to us when discussing the line on which we shall ultimately fix the railway, and while I have no objection whatever to offer to the line that has been adopted by the Syndicate, from Winnipeg westward, I am still of opinion that the northern line would have been the more advantageous one for the country, and would have afforded every advantage which the south-west line now affords. The late Minister

of the Interior, my former colleague, has been attacked repeatedly for his extravagance in connection with the scheme for promoting colonization roads. I think, however, if I remember rightly, that the hon. Minister of Railways agreed with him that the scheme was a wise one. In the first place, it must be remembered that that scheme was brought down solely for the purpose of discussion, without any intention of passing it that Session. I do not think that either the Government as a whole were committed to it in any formal way whatever. We would be committed to it, as a matter of course, if we brought it before the House as a matter to be carried; but like some other measures which hon. gentlemen opposite have laid before the House, for instance the Bill on Elections and the Supreme Court Bill, and several other measures brought down avowedly for the purpose of discussion, it was laid before the House without the slightest intention of having it carried through this House. When the hon. gentleman insinuates, as he did yesterday, he only shows how entirely unacquainted he is with the policy of the Liberal party in Ontario. He does not appear to know that twenty-five years ago great efforts were made by the Liberal party in the west—in fact, it was a plank in their political platform to obtain possession of that country. We became aware, through the efforts of Mr. Isbester and others who were thoroughly acquainted with the Red River settlement, of the vast extent of domain which could be peopled in that country, and our efforts were unremitting to obtain possession of it out of the hands of the monopolists who held it as a barren waste. When the railway question first came up our only consideration was not whether it was wise to build the railway, but whether we were not premature in going to such an enormous expense for the purpose of obtaining it in a given time. As the hon. member for West Durham remarked, last night, no one ever opposed the building of those sections that led into the prairie country, and we lost no time in obtaining access through the United States in advance, by six or seven years, of any possible access through our own country. Instead of depreciating the value of the road, no one more highly appreciated it than we; but, on the other hand, we had to consider the interests of other sections of the country—whether it was wise to incur an expenditure of \$120,000,000 for the purpose of constructing the road within a certain given, very short, and wholly inadequate time. It was our discussions in relation to the limitation which could alone justify the hon. gentleman in imagining that we had the slightest hostile feeling towards the Canadian Pacific Railway as a scheme. I did not believe then, and do not now, that it was wise to incur such a heavy expense to get beyond the prairie country. Of what earthly benefit will it be to a large portion of British Columbia, except the small strip that it passes through, no one can say. As for the scheme the hon. gentleman has for Asiatic travel, he reads Mr. Sandford Fleming's notes of last year as to distance, and it is gratifying to know it is the shortest road across, and it is gratifying to know, also, that by steaming up the coast and taking a slight circle, we are nearer Yokohama and the other places than San Francisco. But the question still remains to be decided whether the traffic from these countries can be profitably carried over the road or not. I hope it may be, and it should be tried. But, on the one hand, our scheme, if carried out, would have enabled us to have the road opened quite as soon to the prairie country as the hon. gentleman has succeeded in doing it; while, on the other hand, our colonization scheme, or something like the one submitted to the House in 1878, would ensure settlement and the building of the railway through the prairie country not visited by our own great national line. The hon. gentleman referred last night to the terms of the Act of 1874. He said that we had no reason to complain of if they took 25,000,000 acres when we proposed to take 54,000,000 acres. Now, Sir,

we did not propose to take 54,000,000 acre, we proposed to take 20,000 acres per mile. The mileage was uncertain, but was generally supposed to be about 2,500 miles, and to reach the same figure that hon. gentlemen opposite had in their Bill of 1871 too. Their proposal was to take 50,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000. Our proposal was to take \$10,000 per mile and 20,000 acres of land, but our land was to be taken in a very different process from that in which the hon. gentleman has taken his land. The hon. gentlemen in their scheme have provided that the Syndicate shall get the very best land to be found in the North-West. That is practically, in a few words, the scheme of the hon. gentlemen, and it is doubtful if they do not own the lands there also. Our policy was this:

"That a quantity of land not exceeding 20,000 acres for each mile of the section or sub-section contracted for, shall be appropriated in alternate sections of twenty miles each along the line of the said railway or at a convenient distance therefrom, each section having a frontage of not less than three miles nor more than six miles on the line of the said railway, and that two thirds of the quantity of land so appropriated shall be sold by the Government at such prices as may be from time to time agreed upon between the Governor in Council and the contractors, and the proceeds thereof accounted for and paid half yearly to the contractors free from any charge of action or management,—the remaining third to be conveyed to the contractors. The said lands to be of fair average quality, and not to include any land already granted or occupied under any patent, licence of occupation or pre-emption right, and when a sufficient quantity cannot be found in the immediate vicinity of the railway, then the same quantity, or as much as may be required to complete such quantity, shall be appropriated at such other places as may be determined by the Governor in Council."

This, Sir, made it incumbent upon the contractors, whoever they should be, to have the line which we owned in British Columbia, made it incumbent upon them, if we succeeded in obtaining the land from the Government of Ontario, east of the boundary line near Rat Portage, to take the land there also. We applied, in fact, as a Government, to the Government of Ontario to give us the land required to fulfill this section in their territory. Our request was not granted, and we thought that as the road was to be built through that portion of Ontario, the land might possibly be given us by the Government of Ontario in return for whatever advantages it might derive from the building of the road. They, however, took another view of it, and we did not receive the land. Now, the hon. gentleman is aware that at the time the contract, was made with the Syndicate, there was under contract or built from Selkirk to Fort William, 1,410 miles—I am not sure now as to the mileage, but it is about that. From Selkirk to Pembina, eighty-three miles; from Kamloops to Emory's Bar, 127 miles, and ninety miles from Emory's Bar to Port Moody, or a mileage altogether of 710 miles, assuming the entire mileage to be 2,650, leaving 1,823 miles, 20,000 acres per mile for which would amount to 38,460,000 acres. Well, that is for all classes of lands a fair average of the quality of the country it passes through. Now, in the prairie region, extending a distance say of 1,000 miles in rough numbers, the quantity would be, of course, just about one-half, or 19,000,000 acres in the prairie country, and the same quantity will be obtained in the rough or wooded country. This will show a very different result indeed, as to expenditure, from what has been presented in the scheme the Government ultimately adopted. Now, Sir, with regard to that scheme I have a very few words to say. I do not desire to enter upon the general discussion, but I have to say this: the hon. gentleman knows very well that they had no right to enter upon that contract at the time he did. They had not asked for tenders in any way, except indeed, as the hon. gentleman told us, that they got their leader in a stump speech to say they had been conferring with some parties. Even he did not in that speech invite tenders from any parties, nor did he intimate that any new policy had been decided upon or any new departure had taken place. The law strictly prohibited giving out any contract without publicly asking

for tenders. Now, no one would object to any small works being undertaken for which a necessity suddenly sprung up, without compliance with this condition. It is a different matter altogether from the present case. The hon. gentleman says also that we asked for tenders, and that the tender, as I understand him to say, from Messrs. Stephens & Co. might be called—he did not say it was—a response to that invitation for tenders. Now, Sir, we had named a period in our advertisement within which we would receive tenders, and I recollect asking the hon. gentleman after he came into office whether he had received any tenders after that time. His reply was that one tender had been received, but of such a nature that made its consideration useless or inadvisable. The asking for tenders was therefore entirely closed, and the policy was evidently reached by a more understanding, which the hon. gentleman afterwards followed out. In 1880, there was a policy laid down of setting aside 100,000,000 acres for that purpose. They went to England; they utterly failed to attract the least notice there. The hon. gentleman should have remembered that last night, when he spoke of our failure to obtain any notice to our advertisement in England, the hon. gentleman made quite as signal a failure. The fact is that the project is one which required a good deal of time and a great deal of advertising, to bring it fairly under the notice of the class of financial contractors who were likely to undertake a work of that kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite proceeded on precisely the same course. When they came back, after announcing their great success, they were obliged to confess an utter failure in 1880. In 1881, when the House met again, it turned out they had received some offers before leaving Canada, which they appeared to have rejected. That is my inference from what has been stated. After going too long, they failed to obtain any proposal good, bad or indifferent, or if they did they have denied it and hidden the fact from the public. On returning to Canada, hon. gentlemen opposite were obliged to throw themselves into the arms of those gentlemen called the Syndicate. If any gentlemen were to obtain a good thing at the hands of the Government, I have no objection to these gentlemen obtaining it. I am not like the hon. member for Ottawa who said the only thing he regretted was that such a good thing should have gone into the hands of gentlemen opposed to the Government. I have no feeling of that kind, I believe they are all good men and true, and I was delighted to hear the hon. the First Minister one night, and the hon. the Minister of Railways another night, pronouncing eulogisms upon Duncan McIntyre and Donald A. Smith. It shows the hon. gentlemen are of an appreciative and forgiving disposition. It is to be hoped that Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Smith will appreciate the kind references made to them. Time was when it was different, but perhaps it will be well that I should not further enter into this matter, because I desire to discuss the railway question on its merits. I cannot, however, avoid referring to those matters, because the hon. the Minister of Railways tempts me to do so by his declaration, last night, that everything done wisely and properly about the railway was done by himself, and everything done unwisely was done by his opponents. I might, although I do not intend to do so, discuss at very great length many matters connected with the history of the Pacific Railway. I have only to say this, and it is all I intend to say, that the past record and history of the Liberal party in connection with this great work is one to which we can refer with every feeling of satisfaction, for we tried to do our duty to the country, and if hon. gentlemen opposite can say as much respecting every step they have taken, I have nothing further to say. But I protest against the course that has been pursued by the hon. Minister of Railways in belittling the efforts of his political opponents, in a scheme which has given so much

Mr. MACKENZIE.

trouble and difficulty to the Government, abstractedly speaking, not to my own Government or Administration, but to any Government in prosecuting a work of this kind. I do not think in any of my annual statements when Minister, that I ever gave any occasion to the hon. gentleman to refer to myself as having taken credit for everything that had been rightly done, after denouncing everything that had been done by my opponents. If I had believed in such a course, I should have changed the whole course of proceeding the moment I took office; I should have adopted the hon. gentleman's plan in other respects, and have obtained men in whom I had more confidence to conduct the work connected with the railway, and to have proposed the changes which were inevitably to be made. The hon. Minister of Railways has stated that within a year, more than 900 miles of railway will be either built or nearly built, and that when he came into office not one mile was built. We had under contract at the time hon. gentlemen opposite acceded to office, 228 miles between Fort William and Selkirk, 83 miles were half or actually finished from there to Pembina, constituting together something over 311 miles. At the present time no more of the line is built, except 161 miles constructed by the Syndicate. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of our expenditure on location. We spent \$500,000 and every inch of the road was taken up and moved some miles to the south. On leaving office we had nearly half of the distance of which the hon. gentleman is now able to boast of now as being constructed or nearly constructed, and yet the hon. gentleman desires to take credit for the whole work. I intended to refer to some other matters, but with every desire to proceed, I find my voice has failed me, and I must defer any further observations to some future occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to a question asked by the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that the sharpest curve is one of 700 feet radius, and that trains can travel over it at a speed of 40 miles per hour.

Mr. DAWSON. I think it will be generally admitted that it is highly desirable, if a shorter route can be found from Moose Jaw Creek to the Pacific coast, that it should be adopted. It is very much to be regretted that the energetic and practical men who now have the Canadian Pacific Railway in hand had not had control of it sooner. If such had been the case, a great saving in distance between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg would have been effected. A survey was made from Thunder Bay to Sturgeon Falls, at the head of Rainy Lake, and the line was favorably reported on by the engineers. As to the crossing of the Lake of the Woods it was quite practicable. It is true that in order to condemn that crossing several islands were spirited away, but even that was not enough. An engineer was set to draw a plan of a tremendous bridge which the opponents of the route said would be necessary at that place, and its cost was put at \$1,000,000, and in this way the line which should obviously have been followed was set aside. However, engineers quite as reliable as those who constructed that enormous bridge, drew a plan of another bridge, showing that this spot could have been bridged at a very moderate outlay, and the saving in distance from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, without going to Selkirk, would have been no less than thirty-five miles, making every allowance for curvatures. That is a very important saving in distance—a distance which would have been saved for all time; and I believe the original cost would have been reduced by millions, because, for one thing, the great swamp to which the hon. gentleman has alluded and in which a large amount of capital has been swallowed up, would have been avoided. I have no desire to reflect upon the management of previous days; I am perfectly willing to concede that everything was done with the best intention; but it is very much to be regretted

that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) had not had time to go over the ground. Had the hon. gentleman, with his practical knowledge and his acquaintance with railway matters, had an opportunity of going through the country, I believe the result would have been very different; we would have had a much shorter line between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg, but unfortunately the thing has been done and it cannot now be helped. The hon. member for Lambton, in speaking of Nepigon and Thunder Bay, said he moved the terminus to Thunder Bay because he thought it was a better and more convenient place and possessed more advantages. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right. Nepigon Bay remains frozen for a very long period in spring, while Thunder Bay opens early. I will not now refer to the question of the Kaministiquia or Prince Arthur's Landing as harbors, as that matter has been very much discussed before. All I can say is that if the line as originally laid down and contemplated to Sturgeon Falls had been followed, taking advantage of the water navigation between that place and the Lake of the Woods in the meantime, 20,000 people who have gone to Minnesota would have now been in Manitoba. The line would have been open much earlier, and it would have been possible to pass through immigrants, and we would not have lost the immense number of valuable settlers who, because they were compelled to pass through Minnesota and saw beautiful and fertile land in that State, were attracted to settle there. There is one very remarkable circumstance in connection with all these old surveys and explorations, and that is, that the practical men who now control the Pacific Railway have not adopted one single yard of these expensive lines, but have laid out lines for themselves which are very much better than those formerly selected. In regard to the change of the location of the Pacific Railway from Callander Station westward, I think it is a very important thing for that portion of the country which I have the honor to represent that the Company have decided to keep near the shores of Lake Huron and Lake Superior. For 600 miles the line will pass within easy distance of the shore, and the result will be that every river valley along that immense distance will be opened up for settlement. It has long been believed that this great region, bordering on the great lakes, known as Algoma, was barren and rocky and unfit for settlement; but recent events have shown that this is not the case. The fact is, there are very large areas in Algoma which are fit for settlement, and they are being rapidly occupied. The Census of 1871 showed a population of 7,018 in the whole district, more than half of whom were Indians, while the last Census has shown a population of close on 21,000 in Algoma proper—I mean Algoma south of the height of land. That is a very large increase in ten years, but I believe it is only the beginning of what we shall see in the future. With this railway passing along the coast and opening up every river valley, the large areas of agricultural land and the minerals which abound in that extensive district, including iron, copper, silver, lead, and I believe gold, will all be developed. The progress of settlement has been very much retarded of late for the want of roads. I received a number of petitions this winter from the people on the Island of Manitoulin, complaining that the mails were delayed and very irregular. These I sent in to the Government. But how is it possible to have the mail matter of 12,000 people, amounting to over half a ton a week, delivered regularly when there are no roads, not even between Parry Sound and the shore opposite Manitoulin Island, and the mails have to be carried on men's backs or in dog sleighs, as they used to be years ago. This difficulty, however, will be overcome by this railway, and we shall soon see that this very much abused district of Algoma is fitted to support a very large population. I remember six or seven years ago reading an article in a prominent news-

paper published in Toronto which called attention to the fact that wheat had actually been grown on the north coast of Lake Huron. Why, there is not a better country in the world for wheat growing than the north coast of Lake Huron; the climate is quite as good or a great deal better than the climate of the North-West Territories, where population is now pouring in. I merely mention this to show that this change of route of the Pacific Railway, the cost of which will be borne by the lands of the North-West and will not be a burden on Ontario, will have the result of opening up that magnificent country for settlement.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I rise to prolong the present debate. Had the hon. Minister of Railways chosen to confine himself, as he very well might, and I think wisely had done at this stage of the Session, to an explanation of his policy and his proceedings with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but a short discussion need have taken place; but that hon. gentleman, for reasons best known to himself, chose to incorporate with his statement a series of attacks upon a very considerable number of the Opposition, and among others he chose to draw attention to certain statements made by me in my capacity of Finance Minister in former years, and also to draw attention to a motion which I had the honor to put in your hands about a year ago. Sir, the whole object of that hon. gentleman was clear enough; he wanted, by a series of misrepresentations—the public having probably forgotten to a very great extent the circumstances of our connection with the Pacific Railway, and fortunately for that hon. gentleman and his colleagues, having also apparently forgotten some of the circumstances of their early connection with the Pacific Railway—his desire was, I say, to misrepresent our action with respect to that great work to the utmost of his power. Now, Sir, as my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) and my hon. friend from Lambton have most truly said, there is no party, there never was a party, in this country who have more right to say than the Reform party of Canada, that for generations back, long before that hon. gentleman knew anything or was in any way connected with the politics of the country, it was the object and the earnest desire not merely of the leaders, but of the whole Liberal party, to obtain the control of that great region and throw it open to settlement. For many years the Reform party had seen with great regret that numbers of the people were seeking homes in the United States; and of all men, living or dead, no man deserves the thanks of the country, more than the late Hon. George Brown for the steady and persistent energy and eloquence with which he, not merely through the great organ of public opinion he controlled, but by word of mouth, and in his place, both inside and out of this House, directed continually the attention of men of all ranks and classes in Canada to the value of that prairie region and of the extreme desirability of obtaining it. And if I were to believe the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall)—whom I do not see in his place—it was with the greatest difficulty, he says, that he succeeded in spurring up his negligent colleagues to take any steps for acquiring that property. Why, to quote from memory from that valuable tract which the hon. gentleman on his return from the North-West composed, but which is not, unfortunately, as easy of access as I could wish, I think his words were these: That on the day when the Government of Canada consummated the folly, he called it, of throwing eight millions of dollars into the sea in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, he moved a resolution in the Council binding the Government to make or take the necessary steps for securing the North-West Territory. And after, at the instigation of that gentleman, as he states, the Government were stirred up to take those steps, and had succeeded in obtaining the cession, so far as the Hudson's Bay Company could give it,

of our territory. I should like to know who were the men who mismanaged our affairs in such a way as to cause what ought to have been a friendly exchange to be one stained with bloodshed and rebellion. I say that those hon. gentlemen from the time they took possession of that territory till they left office in 1873 had this claim to our consideration; that they blundered at every imaginable point in connection with the North-West Territory, and blundered not least, but most of all, in that most absurd bargain which they made in 1871 whereby they bound themselves to the hopeless project of constructing a railroad across the continent by 1881. The members of the Liberal party never in the slightest degree opposed—and the hon. gentleman knows it well—any expenditure in the slightest degree within the means of the people of Canada for the purpose of opening up communication with the North-West. What they did oppose was the blundering of hon. gentlemen opposite, the trifling with the resources of Canada, and the wantonly throwing away of many millions for objects and purposes in no degree connected with the opening up of the North West Territory. And it was from the effect of those blunders, of that mismanagement, of that legacy of trouble and mistakes which those hon. gentlemen have left behind them, that my hon. friend beside me found himself very greatly embarrassed in dealing with that question, was obliged to make concessions, which, as he stated at the time, were made simply and solely, because we were obliged by the conduct of those hon. gentlemen to make them, although we knew they were straining and overburdening the resources of the country intolerably. I fear those hon. gentlemen are blundering still as badly as ever before. They succeeded in doing nothing for the opening of the North-West, beyond what my hon. friend had done, for three years after they had taken office. Nothing was done by them. All that they have done, as my hon. friend has truly said, was to carry out certain contracts which he had made, was to perform certain portions of work which he had already set on foot. But they have done much to throw away all the good fruits which were ready to drop into the lap of the people of Canada. They have succeeded in most needlessly creating new monopolies, having very burdensome privileges to be paid for at the cost and expense of the people of Canada. They have flung away deliberately, openly in the face of this House, in the face of the country, many millions of acres of the most valuable land and many millions of the people's money, and have done that when there were many—with all respect to my friends of the Syndicate—as capable, as ready to do all that would have been of the slightest value to the people of Canada that these gentlemen are doing. In addition, they have, besides creating those monopolies, besides granting those exemptions, besides throwing away all the money and land I have spoken of, further enormously impeded the proper settlement and development of the North-West by their outrageous fiscal policy, which adds enormously to the cost of all the articles required by settlers whether from Old Canada or from the Old World. What they have done has been purely mischievous. The resources of the country are so great, that I believe they will largely overcome the mischievous fruits of their policy. But although I believe the Syndicate have pushed their works with vigor, and so far are doing good work, the hon. Minister of Railways and his colleagues have done literally nothing. All they did was to lay down a certain number of miles of road, so badly located and constructed that the only thing to be done by the Syndicate was to pull up the rails and alter the location at the cost of many hundred of thousands of dollars to the people of this country. I believe the course of their policy in a very few years will not merely prove the wisdom and foresight dis-

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

played by the Opposition in resisting it last year, but that it will provide troubles for coming generations, of the most serious kind. As soon as Manitoba becomes filled up, as soon as the people begin to feel what sort of a yoke these gentlemen have subjected them to, either those restrictions will have to be removed, or the people of Canada will, in all human probability, lose the North-West for which such sacrifices are being made. And if the people of Canada, being warned, do not heed that warning, and exert themselves to break down those monopolies, to get rid of those chains which they never ought to have allowed to be imposed—and to do them justice they were imposed behind their backs—because those things were done without the slightest knowledge of the people, no man at the last elections ever dreamt that such terms would be granted the Syndicate. If the people of Canada do not do that they will deserve to lose the North-West by reason of apathy, and supineness and indifference to the commonest principles of liberty and freedom. I would like to know who it was that made approach to the North-West country possible? To whom are we indebted for the possibility of that progress which, I rejoice to see, is going on from one end of the North-West to the other? There were two persons who, by dint of their energy and determination did a very great deal, did as much as individuals could, to make access to the North-West possible, and thereby to enable all this tide of immigration to flow into it. One of these gentlemen is my hon. friend the member for Lambton. Through good report and ill-report, at a time when the state of our finances might well have excused him for hesitation—and, as I said before, there was no man in a better position to know than I myself. I can bear witness that my hon. friend never flinched, never hesitated, but always in Council, in Parliament and elsewhere, avowed his determination, so long as Canada was able to find the means to do it, to go on and open up that country. He expended, as the House knows, many millions in the early construction of the road, from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, which is one necessary avenue of approach to that country, and he did it in spite of many severe attacks, which, if not made by the hon. gentleman immediately opposite, were made by many of his followers. We have not forgotten that my hon. friend was often told, and I think by a member of this Government, that he had no business to expend public money in attempting to construct a road of 400 miles through that region. The other gentleman was a man who is now engaged in carrying on the Canadian Pacific Railway, my friend Mr. Donald Smith. It was largely due to his energy and enterprise that communication with the American system of railways was obtained. I need not tell the House what sort of a reception that hon. gentlemen's efforts met with two or three years ago, from the hon. Minister of Railways and his colleagues, and the opposition which was made to the proposition to give him and his friends a short lease of the Pembina branch, which was a necessary portion, no doubt, of the railway scheme they were then engaged in carrying through. Need I remind the House of the torrent of abuse that was more than once poured on the devoted head of that hon. gentleman by the very men who are now, in their own despair, obliged to crouch as supplicants before them, in order to get them to relieve the Government of the consequences of their own incapacity. These gentlemen dare to talk to us of tenders. Was there a man in Canada, in England, in the whole civilized world, who ever dreamt that it would be possible in the year 1881, to find a Government so blind and deaf to all the lessons of civilization and to the knowledge of everything that had been passing on the other side of the border, as to deliberately propose to put a country comprising one-half of a continent under the absolute power and under the abso-

lute control of a railway corporation. Well might my hon. friend say that no man ever dreamt until these resolutions were laid on the Table of the House, that a Government could be found so insane or a Parliament so lost to all considerations of constitutional propriety as to sanction a monopoly of twenty years over a country extending from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean. If that be true, and no man can contradict what I say, if it be the simple fact that such privileges, monopolies, exemptions from taxations, not to say such large sums of money and grants of land were given to this corporation, as had never been dreamt of by any man, until that contract had been laid on the Table, how can that hon. gentleman say that fair competition was asked for, that fair tenders were asked for, that capitalists of Europe or America knew anything whatever of what the hon. gentleman was going to do. The thing was done in a hole-and-corner manner, and the hon. gentlemen have to thank themselves, if acting thus behind our backs without the knowledge of their most trusted friends, their motives have been suspected and probably will continue to be suspected. I must proceed to make a remark or two on the absurd fallacy which underlies the statements, not merely of the hon. gentleman, but of his followers throughout the country. They talk of us as if things were in precisely the same position in 1880 as they were in 1872-73-74. They pretend to say that because the railway can be built now, it could have been equally built ten years ago. That is simply an absurd fallacy. The whole position of things is altered from the bottom up. What was our position in 1874? It was this: That there was no practical communication whatever with that country; the nearest American railway did not go within 100 or 150 miles of the Canadian frontier and there was no possibility of bringing in goods except at an enormous expense to our own country. The hon. gentleman knows how enormously such a state of things would have increased the cost of that railway had it been then built. Besides that, and wholly apart from the great depression in North America which then existed, and which had necessarily an enormous influence on the minds of people on the other side of the Atlantic, the special blunder, mal-administration and incapacity displayed by those gentlemen in dealing with the Red River country, produced an armed rebellion that caused the death of some of our subjects, and which, no doubt, created a very unfavorable impression in the minds of many against the North-West Territory. The very first task, therefore, that fell to the lot of the hon. member for Lambton was to get rid of the burning embers which those men had left behind them, and to produce, as he did succeed in producing, peace, order and quietness in the North-West Territory. Moreover, allow me to recall to the recollection of the House that in 1874, 1875, 1876—certainly for two or three years—there was a very serious infliction in a large part of the North-West in the shape of the grass-hopper plague, which destroyed the harvest of the settlers, and on two or three occasions we were obliged to bring down grants of money in aid of the settlers, and if you consider the effects of these influences, the lack of communication, the fact that the rebellion had been but recently suppressed, the grass-hopper plague, and the great commercial depression all over the continent of North America, and you will see that the wonder is, not that more was not done, but that my hon. friend's tenacity and perseverance enabled him to do the very great deal he did in the time at his disposal and under the existing circumstances. The hon. gentleman talks about the value of the lands at that time, entirely ignoring the fact that its value has increased ten-fold, perhaps a hundred fold since the time it was first proposed to construct the road. It is well known that at the time my hon. friend proposed to give 20,000 acres per mile, bounty warrants for 160 acres of land could be freely

purchased at Winnipeg for \$30 or \$40. In other words, in an open market, the right to take land in a favorable position in that Province, was then only worth 25 cents, and no doubt would have continued to be worth only that but for the exertions of my hon. friend Mr. Smith and his friends in opening up communication with that county. My hon. friend from West Durham showed clearly enough that in that amendment which I moved, and of which the hon. gentleman complained, not one word had been said, not one expression had been used, which was not based on the calculations submitted formally to the House by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, the hon. gentleman's own colleague. There is no doubt the calculation I submitted did involve a very large amount of money, that it did show we were squandering a great amount of public money and means in the contract which we were making with that Company. But, Sir, that was those hon. gentleman's own estimate; the cost of the railway was taken from the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways himself; the value of the lands, which I do not believe to be an exaggerated estimate, was taken from the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior himself. What right, then, has the hon. gentleman to say that I spoke in a devil-may-care manner on a devil-may-care resolution—unless, indeed, in copying the statement of those hon. gentlemen, I had come into unpleasant proximity to the gentleman he refers to? Then the hon. gentleman declares that as Minister of Finance I had again and again spoken disparagingly of the railway, spoken disparagingly of the North-West, that I had enormously over-estimated the cost of that road. Now, Sir, I defy the hon. gentleman to show that I spoke disparagingly of the North-West country. I will tell him what I have done: I have spoken again and again—I probably will speak again and again—very disparagingly of the estimate of men calling themselves statesmen to agree to build a road of 3,000 miles through a country of which not one foot had been surveyed, within a period of ten years. But no man ever heard me say a word in disparagement of that great and fertile North-West, upon which, Sir, I look quite as eagerly and quite as often as the hon. gentleman, as the home of the populations which are swarming away from Ontario. It is perfectly true, and I did tell the House, and I now repeat the statement, that had we, in 1874, under the circumstances I have related, without any means of communication or approach to that country, gone on and constructed that railway in a period of seven years, it would have cost every penny of \$150,000,000, if it had been decently built. I repeat that statement. I say there is no earthly doubt about it, and what is more, I call the attention of the House to it. I was speaking at the time of a road such as those hon. gentlemen proposed to construct which includes an enormously extensive piece of railway along Vancouver Island down Esquimaux in British Columbia—that was their bargain, and that would have added about \$30,000,000 according to the statement of Mr. Sandford Fleming.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must be aware that he has himself passed a Minute of Council and sent it to the Imperial Government, declaring that it was not under an obligation incurred by the previous Government to construct the road on Vancouver Island.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of the late Government. The late Government had passed an Order in Council fixing Esquimaux as a terminus.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman passed an Order in Council declaring that the Order in Council that we passed did not oblige Canada to construct the road on Vancouver Island, and denied that any such engagement existed.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, I am not talking about that. I am talking of the road which those hon.

gentlemen proposed to construct, and as they proposed to construct it, that is what I referred to in my Budget Speech in 1874, and I now deliberately repeat the statement, that had that road been completed by 1881, I very greatly doubt whether \$150,000,000 would have covered the cost. I have very good reason to say so, because in making that statement I am giving the opinion of an eminent engineer on that subject who had occasion to study it, and because we have evidence even in so small detail as the transport of rails to that country before there was railway communication through the United States, that the present expenditure would have been necessarily most enormously increased. It is quite possible that before 1891, that road might be constructed, not to Esquimaux, but to its present terminus, for the sum of \$80,000,000 or \$84,000,000, but it was equally true that the road as it was originally designed and laid out by these hon. gentlemen would have cost \$150,000,000, and I say that obligation was wholly and entirely beyond the then resources of Canada. Then, Sir, as to the question of running that road, the hon. gentleman did not state, as he might have stated, and I think ought to have stated, that I did not presume to give my own estimate of what the cost of running such a road would be. If he chooses to look back to Mr. Sandford Fleming's report on the subject he will see that at that time that gentleman estimated, under the conditions which then existed, that it would no doubt be a very expensive thing to run and keep in running order if it were completed in 1881, as doubtless it would have been. Well, Sir, the late Government saw the absurdity of the position, they saw the utter impossibility of fulfilling the mad bargain these men had gone into, and they at once told British Columbia honestly, they told the British Government honestly, that the Government of which that hon. gentleman was a member had pledged Canada to an impossibility. We said: "We will do all that can fairly be done to redeem the honor of the country," and we did every thing that could be done at the time, more perhaps, than we ought to have done. If my hon. friend is liable to any charge it is this: That he felt himself, perhaps, a little too much bound by the action of the Government that had preceded him. But I do not admit he is liable, I take my full share, and always will take my full share, of the responsibility of the action of that Government, and I say that our action in going on with the Thunder Bay Branch was, as present events have now shown, wise and well considered. I say likewise that the action of this Government in making the arrangement they did, was most unwise and most foolish, and has been the source of great troubles, and that the present contract is equally unwise and foolish, and will be the cause of very great trouble and injury to this country in the future. That, Sir, is what I said, and I say that we were the men who obtained the indulgence, if indulgence it can be called—because it was after all a mere question of possibilities—to take twenty years which events have shown was absolutely required to construct the road. We stated the difficulties fairly and clearly, so much so that even British Columbia, loth as it was, had to acquiesce in the justice of the decision, that twenty years were required to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway to the sea. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman proceeded to accuse us of having, contrary to our declarations, contrary to our pledges and promises to the House and to the country, added \$3,000,000 to the taxation of the country in order to carry on the work. Well, Sir, what was it we did? We found that those hon. gentlemen, after they had entered into a bargain with British Columbia, had thrown off about \$1,250,000 of taxes. The hon. gentleman said \$2,000,000. I do not think it was as much, but I think they did remit about \$1,250,000 of taxation. We find also that they had deliberately, needlessly and wantonly added a

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

large amount to the annual expenditure of the country which they were not called upon to do, which had been done by them of their own proper notion, without any excuse or necessity so compelling them. We felt as honest men that we were bound not to add to the taxation of the country, but that we were bound to put British Columbia back in as good a position as she had been in 1871. That we did, and it was for that we added \$3,000,000 of taxation—although it did not produce quite \$3,000,000. In so doing, we did our duty and redeemed our pledges, did all that Canada was morally bound to do—although I do not say legally—and that is what the hon. gentleman complains of. Sir, I say that those hon. gentlemen added \$1,750,000, or thereabouts, needlessly to the expenditure of the country, and that they remitted \$1,225,000, and before we could go to British Columbia and fairly say to them: "We are willing to do what we engaged to do, we are willing to do what we are morally bound to do, that is, put you back in as good a position as you were in before." We were bound to see to it that we had tried to replace that amount, and that is the entire fact of the matter as far as regards the increased amount of taxation imposed. But the hon. gentleman tells us, in the teeth of the facts stated by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and of the knowledge of every member of this House who has attended to the debates, that the Government have provided against monopolies. Hon. members heard the hon. First Minister and his followers, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), tell the House and the people of Canada there was no fear of monopolies. Why? Because those clauses merely affected the land over which the Dominion Parliament had control, because we had no power and no right to check the Governments of Ontario and Manitoba, and I say there is scarcely parliamentary language which will enable me justly to characterize the conduct of men, especially of a Minister of the Crown, who will make such statements. I do not think the iniquity of the railway contract has a parallel in civilized times, and you cannot find a parallel to the statements made by Ministers, and by the First Minister of the Crown. I am aware that the truth and nothing but the truth is the last thing the hon. gentleman, who made many allusions to the power in the nether world in introducing the measure, likes to hear.

Mr. PLUMB. We do not often hear it from the other side of the House.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then you must stop your ears; you must be deaf as well as blind to the signs of the times. But if the rights of Manitoba are to be trampled on, if the rights of Ontario are to be trampled on, if warnings are to be allowed to pass by as the idle wind, we still, according to hon. gentleman opposite, have a remedy. By the construction of 600 miles of railway, to Hudson's Bay, those hon. gentlemen propose to relieve the monopoly they have wantonly and needlessly created. There is no man in the House and in the country who knows whether Hudson's Bay navigation is open for three or five months. I have pressed on the Government, and I take the opportunity of pressing again, the desirability of calling upon the British Government to aid them in settling the question, in obtaining information which they have not got, which nobody at the present moment has got, but which I admit, viewing the extraordinary state of things which the Government have brought about, it is of great importance to the people of Canada to obtain. Whether they will take my advice or not I do not know, but I again call attention to this, and especially after the declaration of the hon. Minister of Railways, who points to Hudson's Bay as the sole means of relieving the monopoly; and I tell the hon. gentleman that it is his duty and the duty

of his colleagues to take immediate steps to ascertain, if they can, whether the navigation of Hudson's Bay is practicable, as I would fain hope it may be, for four or five months in the year. I called the attention of the Government in the early part of the Session to the subject; but I do not suppose, as one of their independent supporters says, they will take any advice from me; nevertheless, I would again call attention to the fact that very little is known respecting the navigation of Hudson's Bay, and it should be an easy matter to arrange with the British Government to employ one or two vessels of the fleet in deciding questions respecting this route. But though I do not undervalue this route, and though I desire that this should be done, I say this, that at best no grain can go out of Hudson's Bay until nearly one year after the grain has ripened, and that it will be a most inadequate method of relieving the people from the dangers which threaten them under the present monopoly. We have seen enough in by-gone days of the extraordinary misrepresentations in which the hon. Minister of Railways indulges, but I will venture to say that, although he was a little quieter in his demeanor than usual, he never was so thoroughly himself as when, on a late occasion, he attempted to show the people and members of this House, some of whom, at all events, are cognizant of the facts I have stated, some of whom must remember those things of which I have spoken, that it was due to his exertions, and to those of his colleagues, that the North-West has been thrown open to settlement and civilization. Once for all I deny, and that most emphatically, that the hon. gentleman, so long as the matter continued under his own control, displayed any energy, activity or skill, in doing anything for the purpose of opening up that country. We have the record of his three years' Administration, and what does it amount to? Simply to the construction of fifty or sixty miles of railway, through a prairie section. The hon. gentleman did absolutely nothing; and yet he attempted, and his followers cheered him to the echo, to belittle the hon. member for Lambton, who did all that it was possible to do to secure an easy approach to the North-West, under our own control, and that without being a monopoly for anybody, whereby would have been afforded the great desideratum of cheap freights for those who went to live in the North-West.

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

After Recess.

CANADIAN ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY.

On the Order for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 77) relating to the Canadian Electric Light Company, and to confer certain powers upon the said Company, being read,

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am instructed to withdraw the Bill. It is so altered and changed in its character that the promoters have decided not to proceed with it. I move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Massue.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of no little surprise to me to hear the hon. the Minister of Railways in

submitting a very small measure to the House—a measure having for its sole object the changing of the point where the Canadian Pacific Railway is to pass through the Rocky Mountains—enter into a discussion of the whole question, go again into the merits of the contract the Government entered into with the Syndicate, and discuss in detail the amendments which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House submitted twelve months ago. The hon. gentleman did not think fit to discuss those amendments at the time; but after considering them for twelve months, he has concluded that it would be well to make some observations with regard to them. Now, Sir, why has the hon. gentleman adopted this course? It is perfectly obvious that it is not because the Government have a great deal of time on their hands, and do not well know what to do with it. It is true, they have made very little progress. We have met here day after day without an opportunity of considering those measures which the Government promised at the beginning of the Session; we have still to have brought before us some of the most important of those measures, and yet the hon. gentleman occupied a large portion of yesterday, and has forced hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to discuss a question that was disposed of by the vote of this House at the last Session of Parliament. It is perfectly obvious that the hon. gentleman sees mischief before him. The hon. gentleman knows right well that the policy on which the Government have entered is not likely to bear fruits favorable to the Administration; he knows right well that the country are already alarmed at the evils likely to grow out of that policy, and that the longer he delays, the greater the difficulties of the Government are likely to become. The hon. gentleman is like Macbeth, who seeing the ghost of the murdered Banquo, says: "Do not shake your gory locks at me; do not say that I did it." But the hon. gentleman did do it; it was he who forced this policy on Parliament last year; it was he who refused to give Parliament the information to which Parliament was entitled. He has entered into a discursive discussion of almost every conceivable topic with which this House has power to deal, upon a measure consisting of but one clause. The hon. gentleman, I dare say, has read in the Arabian Nights Entertainments of the genii who was found closed up in a keg, and who when set free became a tremendous smoke; but he did not end in smoke, but assumed the gigantic proportions of a human form, and was likely to prove destructive of his benefactor. The hon. gentleman sees the same object before him; he sees a body of gigantic proportions, called into existence by the Administration and the sanction of Parliament at its last Session, and he sees that this tremendous body is likely to prove disastrous to its friends. Sir, the hon. gentleman has threatened the House with a dissolution; he has told us that we on this side of the House are very much afraid of a dissolution. I do not think the hon. gentleman has seen or heard anything in the conduct of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to warrant him in concluding that we are afraid of an appeal to the country. There can be no doubt whatever that if an election had taken place the next day after the election of 1878, the result would have been entirely different. The hon. gentleman knows that they succeeded in a great measure because of the over-confidence of our friends, and if it had been supposed that the Government were likely to be defeated there can be no doubt that the result would have been different; and the hon. gentleman knows right well that the Government are not likely to succeed in an appeal to the country, although they think their chances of success are better now than they would be at a later period. Sir, it is perfectly obvious that if these hon. gentlemen believed that the country was with them, and had confidence in their own policy on this and other questions, they would not have been occupying nearly

three months after the House met in determining how they would re-arrange the constituencies in order that they might succeed by the aid of an Act of Parliament in doing that which they could not do by a fair and open submission of their policy to the people at large. Sir, they who are confident of success do not have recourse to such conduct; it is because these hon. gentlemen are afraid that they will not succeed that we hear so much of gerrymandering in every part of the country, and that we see scattered about the floor and the lobbies of Parliament, indications of the pressure which has been brought to bear upon the Administration by their friends in order that they may be made secure in the event of an election. Well, Sir, I will say that I do not think that the Government have any right to a dissolution. I think it would be a gross abuse of the prerogatives of the Crown if they want a dissolution. I do not hesitate to say it because I find by the British North America Act that the members of this House are elected to sit five years subject to the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown when a constitutional reason for its exercise arises. Let me call the attention of the House—because it is well we should discuss this question—to the fact that while perfectly ready to go to the country, I am not going to be a party, even though certain of success, to any such abuse. Yes, I say certain of success. It is not more certain that day succeeds night, than that when a dissolution does take place the Reform party will sit on the other side of the House. Those hon. gentlemen opposite have indicated their intention of abusing the prerogative of the Crown and violating the constitution, by dissolving the House while supported by a majority of the Parliament, before the usual time for which Parliament is elected has expired. Let me call attention to the English doctrine on this question. I will read an extract from the speech of Lord John Russell on the resignation of his Government in 1852. He said:

“And then the right hon. gentleman tells me there is a change in the opinion I held when I was in Her Majesty’s Council, in which I said—I would not advise Her Majesty to dissolve the Parliament. There were two circumstances at that time, one was that if we had dissolved Parliament at that time we should have been liable to the objection stated by Sir Robert Peel in 1846—that it would have been using the prerogative of the Crown. It would have been so understood and represented in order to maintain a party in power, and that was not a legitimate use of the prerogative of the Crown. Sir Robert Peel on the occasion referred to by Lord John Russell said—We have advised Her Majesty to accept our resignation at once without adopting that alternative to which we might have resorted, namely, recommending to the Crown the exercise of its prerogative and the dissolution of the present Parliament. I do not hesitate to avow, speaking with the frankness which I trust will offend no one, that if Her Majesty’s Government had failed in carrying in all their integrity the main features of commercial policy which it was my duty to recommend, that there is no exertion that I would not have made, no sacrifice that I would have not inured in order to assure the ultimate success of these measures, or at any rate to give the country an opportunity of pronouncing upon the subject. For such a purpose I would have felt justified in advising its dissolution, because I think the continuance of doubt and uncertainty on such important matter would have been a greater evil than the resort to a constitutional mode of asserting the opinion of a nation. But there has been fortunately no necessity for dissolution of Parliament on that ground. Those who dissented most strongly from our commercial policy drew all factions in unseemly opposition, and protesting against our measure they have finally allowed them to pass. Those measures having thus become the law, I do not feel that we should thus be justified for any subordinate considerations for the mere interest of the Government or party in advising the exercise of the prerogative to which I have referred and the dissolution of Parliament. I feel very strongly, that no administration is justified in advising the exercise of that prerogative unless there be a reasonable presumption, a strong moral conviction, indeed, that after dissolution they would be able to administer the affairs of the country through the support of a party sufficiently powerful to carry their measure. I do not think a dissolution justifiable for the purpose of merely strengthening a party. The power of dissolution is a great instrument in the hands of the Crown; and it would have a tendency to blunt the instrument if it were employed without grave necessity, if the purpose were merely to enable the country to decide whether ministers have been justified in proposing the measures of commercial policy brought forward at the beginning of the Session. Those measures having passed into law, I do not think that such a purpose alone would be a sufficient ground for a dissolution.”

Mr. MILLS.

Again, in 1858, Lord Russell, in speaking on this same subject, referred to a speech made by Mr. Disraeli, a short time before at Manchester, in which Disraeli intimated that if Lord Derby’s Government were not supported by the Commons, in which it was known they were in a minority, Parliament would be dissolved. That was the statement attributed to Disraeli as made out of Parliament. In reply, Lord Russell said:

“It appears that the right hon. gentleman told his constituents that if a majority of the House had voted a censure upon Her Majesty’s Government, they would have to defend their opinions upon the hustings.”

Now, I beg leave to remind the House what have been the maxims upon this subject, of other statesmen while possessing the confidence of the Crown. They have thought that when there was a great question depending upon which no satisfactory conclusion could be obtained in this House—when the House and the Minister of the Crown were decidedly at variance such as was the case upon the great India Bill of 1784, upon the Reform Bill of 1831, upon the question of Free Trade of 1841—that the solution of any such question should be sought by an appeal to the electors of the United Kingdom. But it is quite another matter where a particular Prime Minister or a particular party remain in office. And when Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, explained his conduct in the House on resigning office, he stated that he had declined to propose to or to advise Her Majesty to dissolve the House, because it was his opinion that that was a most delicate and sacred prerogative of the Crown, and ought not to be exercised for the purpose of any individual who might be at the head of affairs or for the purpose of any party. Now, that entirely agrees with my opinion. But there seems to be an opinion acquiring weight with the hon. gentleman, which I am sorry to observe, that upon any occasion he may have recourse to that which Burke called a penal dissolution. The same doctrine is laid down by Mr. Gladstone in 1874. Defeated on the Irish University Bill he resigned his position as Minister. Disraeli was called on to form an administration, but declined, and Gladstone remained in office, but having found a number of elections going against him, and seeing that he was unable to carry out his full policy which he had entered upon in 1868, he advised a dissolution. Mr. Gladstone, in his address to the electors of Greenwich, said on that occasion:

“In the month of March last the Government were defeated in their effort to settle upon just and enlarged principles the long disputed question of the higher education in Ireland, if not by a combined, yet by a concurrent, effort of the leader of the Opposition and by the Roman Catholic prelate of Ireland. Upon suffering this defeat, the Government, according to the practice of our Constitution, placed their resignations in the hands of the Sovereign. Her Majesty, in the just and wise exercise of her high office, applied to the leader of the Opposition, he, however, declaring that he was not prepared with a policy, and could not govern in the existing Parliament, declined to fill the void which he had made. Under these circumstances, we thought ourselves bound by loyalty to the Queen not to decline the resumption of our offices. But this step we took with an avowed reluctance. We felt, that in consequence of what had happened, both the Crown and country were placed at a disadvantage, as it was established that, during the existence of the present Parliament, one party only could govern, and must therefore govern without appeal. We also felt that a precedent had been set, which fast diminished our strength and weakened the general guarantees for the responsibility and integrity of parliamentary opposition.”

“Of this diminution of strength we were painfully and sensibly reminded during the Session by the summary and rapid dismissal, in the House of Lords, of measures which had cost much time and labor to the House of Commons.”

“But we remembered that in the years 1868 and 1870, when the mind of the country was unambiguously expressed, the House of Lords had, much to its honor, deferred to that expression on matters of great moment, and I cannot doubt that it would have continued in this course, had the isolated and less certain, but still frequent and fresh indications of public opinion at simple elections continued to be in harmony with the powerful and authentic, but now more remote, judgment of 1868.”

“This state of things, which was satisfactory at the close of the last Session, and which has not admitted of remedy by the method of resignation and a change of Government, has not improved during the recess especially the latter part of the recess, and the time has now

arrived when the Administration, able to anticipate and survey the principal parts and the general character of the work which awaits it, has been called on to consider whether it would reasonably undertake such work without a fresh access of strength and to frame its advice to Her Majesty accordingly.

"The question whether Ministers ought to retain or to abandon office should be decided by a General Election, with the opportunity which it affords for broad declarations of policy and issues truly national, and cannot be satisfactorily solved by isolated contests, of which the issue is in a greater degree dependent on close discipline and finished and concentrated organization.

"For a state of things thus full and casual, we desire to pass to one in which the nation will have had full opportunity of expressing will and choice as between the political parties. The Government of the day whatever it is, will be armed with its just means of authority both within and without the Legislature. The Opposition will enjoy the power, and doubtless will not shrink from the duty of taking office. The House of Commons will be reinstated in full possession of Constitutional authority, and when it shall see cause to withdraw its confidence from an Administration, it will not leave the Sovereign without resource."

Those opinions expressed by three distinguished statesmen who have been Prime Ministers of England for many years, are sufficient to show what the constitutional doctrine is. If the Administration finds it is so weakened that it is unable to carry out its policy, and it has important measures to carry, and believes the country will sustain it on an appeal to the people, it is entitled to advise the Crown to dissolve. If, however, it is a mere question of Administration, and the opposite party are strong enough to carry on the Government, it has no right to advise a dissolution; but if some great and important national question has arisen since the last election, and the Government are desirous to obtain the opinion of the country upon it, then they can dissolve, as, for instance, in such a case as that of the contract with the Syndicate last year, which we asked to be submitted to the country, but which hon. gentlemen refused to consult the country upon. I say it is perfectly clear from those statements that those hon. gentlemen would be abusing their constitutional prerogative, if this year they were to advise a dissolution of Parliament; but I do not think that that will be any reason for believing that such advice will not be given. At every step these hon. gentlemen are prepared to violate the principles of the Constitution, as in more than one instance they have violated it in reference to this particular measure. It is perfectly true that the hon. member for Lambton, in 1874, advised a dissolution, but the Parliament which he advised the Crown to dissolve was not one elected under his auspices, with the view of carrying out the policy he was prepared to submit to the country and upon which he asked the opinion of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The elections of 1878 were not carried under our auspices.

Mr. MILLS. More than that the advice to the Crown for dissolution was proper at that period. We had a statement of a distinguished person in this country, that he himself had carried the elections of twenty-seven members from the Province of Quebec, who were elected through corrupt means, for the purpose of giving effect to his wishes and protecting his interests. I hold that the facts of that declaration left no other course open to the Government than to recommend the Crown to dissolve Parliament. But the hon. the Minister of Railways tells us that we are going to consult the country to ask it to approve what the Government have done with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway—to approve the Syndicate contract, with all the incidents connected with it, and all the consequences which must necessarily flow from it. That is the statement of the hon. the Minister. Last year, these hon. gentlemen were unwilling to consult the people, they did not believe the people were competent judges; they had no confidence in the intelligent opinion of the electors of this country. But after they have carried their measure, after the mischief has been done, after it is impossible that what was done can be undone, these gentlemen are going to consult the country. They

are going to ask the country to approve of that which the country, if they disapproved of it, have not the power to reverse. The hon. gentleman referred to the resolution which I submitted last year, and upon which we took the opinion of the House. The hon. gentleman says, that the twelve months have falsified the statement set out in that resolution; there is one statement I admit, this resolution so far as facts are concerned, is wrong in stating. It states:

"That no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion Parliament or by any new Province to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from any point at or near that railway except such as shall run southwards, &c."

We have found by what has since happened that the exception of monopoly in that resolution was a mistake, and that the Government has disallowed charters granted by the Legislature of Manitoba, within their constitutional domain. I may say upon that point I was misled by the statement made by the right hon. leader of the Government in his speech. He said:

"We know perfectly well that it would require all the exertion and all the skill and all the management of the country to make the eastern and western sections of this road fully compensate them and fairly compensate them for their responsibility and for the expenditure during these ten years. In order to give them a chance, we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament; we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road into which they are putting so much money and so much land a fair chance of existence."

The right hon. gentleman therefore told the House as explicitly as he could, that he had no power to disallow an Act of the Legislature of Ontario, or of the Legislature of Manitoba on this subject. What did the hon. gentleman mean by that declaration? It was perfectly obvious he did not mean us to believe he was going to exercise the veto power and disallow Acts of the Manitoba Legislature relating to Railways within that Province. I say it is obvious he did not mean us to understand that he was going to advise the exercise of the power of disallowance in the interest of this Railway Syndicate. He told us distinctly, and as explicitly as could be told, that, this Bill was one with which the Crown had no right to interfere. He has changed his view with regard to the constitutional supervision of this Government over the Provincial Legislatures since we met here last year. Then I find that the hon. member for Cardwell made a similar statement. He said:

"But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any other railway into this country. To what does this apply? Simply to the territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter for a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a Company in course of organization to build a railway from Winnipeg to West Lynn, on the boundary. And after this agreement is ratified, this provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses; in fact, this Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this Company has under the contract is that their traffic shall not be tapped far west in the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from the line, but there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba, within the Province, that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side. That is the position with respect to this matter."

Now, Sir, that speech was made after the speech of the right hon. gentleman, and no doubt the hon. member for Cardwell based his contention upon the explicit and emphatic statement made by the First Minister. We see that the hon. gentleman did this from the statement brought down to Parliament, from the communication made by the Syndicate to the Administration, and it is perfectly obvious that the Administration has acted upon the assumption that they contracted beforehand with the Syndicate to exercise the power of disallowance arbitrarily, and in an unconstitu-

tional way to interfere with the rights and liberties of the Province of Manitoba. I say that if they had the power of disallowance, it was a highly improper thing to enter into a contract with any party to exercise that power on behalf of that party. But I deny altogether it was ever contemplated that the power of disallowance should be exercised by the Administration with reference to measures falling within the exclusive domain of the Provinces of the Dominion. Now, let us look at the state of things which existed before Confederation. What was meant by conferring upon the people of this country the right of self-government? Was it not that the Government of England stipulated that they would not exercise the power of disallowance upon measures that were local in their character; that if a measure passed by the Local Legislature did not interfere with the policy of the Empire, did not encroach upon the legislative and governmental powers of the Imperial Parliament, no matter how objectionable that measure might be in principle, the Government of the United Kingdom would not interfere with it? Why, Sir, take our Tariff; every one knows that there is no party in England that approves of the policy we have adopted in that particular. There is no party in England who does not believe that our Tariff policy is a gross violation of the rights of property. That necessarily flows from the opinions that are held there upon commercial questions by men on both sides of politics. But, Sir, has any Administration in England ever proposed to disallow our Tariff legislation because it is contrary to the general policy of the Empire, because it interferes with the rights of properties? Not at all; the Local Legislatures are the guardians of their own local authority. They are responsible to the people of the Province, and we are responsible to the people of the Dominion for the proper exercise of powers that the Constitution has given us exclusively. Within the exclusive domain of Local Legislatures, we have nothing to do, yet we find in this measure that contrary to the express declaration of the Minister to Parliament he has advised the exercise of the power of disallowance in the interest of a private corporation and in the fulfilment of a private contract. Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways censured the action of the former Administration with reference to the location of this line. He says that Selkirk is not the proper point, that the route might have been shortened by being built directly to Winnipeg. The hon. member for Lambton has stated that in going to Selkirk he was going to a point favorable for the crossing of the river, going to a point where the lake navigation terminates, and a point at which the railway would be brought into contact with the whole navigation of Lake Winnipeg and of the Saskatchewan River. Sir, there are some matters connected with this Railway Bill that it was highly proper the hon. gentleman should have explained to the House. The hon. gentleman devoted four hours to the discussion of matters which are not in this Bill, which are not germane to the Bill, but referring to the debates which took place in the Session last year when this contract was before Parliament, referring to the policy of an Administration several years ago; but the hon. gentleman never informed the House as to the position in which those sections of the road completed from Winnipeg westward stand at this moment. The hon. gentleman commenced railway construction, and he built some 100 miles from Winnipeg westward. The rails had to be laid on the ice, and a train, until a recent period, was frozen in the ice and stayed there during the whole winter, rendering it impossible that the line could be used. Now, how was it the hon. gentleman located the road so badly that the Syndicate would sooner abandon the line than to use it; and how was it that the Syndicate preferred the construction of another line to the acceptance of one the Government built? Have the

Mr. MILLS,

Syndicate paid for this line, or has the Government paid the money independent of the Syndicate? What is the position of these contractors for the 100 miles still further west? We know that when we met here, last year, there were 200 miles of this under contract. We know that 100 miles of the line so let were not touched by the contractors, and they were ordered not to proceed with the work. Well, those contractors, no doubt, will ask for compensation? What are their claims? Have the Syndicate agreed to compensate them, or have the Syndicate refused compensation to these men, and are they to be paid for the damages they have sustained, out of the public Treasury? I say we are entitled to information on that subject, but up to this moment the hon. gentleman, although he has spoken for four hours in discussing every other matter except the particular matter in hand, has not deigned to give to the House any information on this subject. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the unpatriotic course of this side of the House, and our disposition to favor any other lines rather than our own. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman is now favoring the construction of this road to Sault Ste. Marie. Last year the hon. gentleman declared that it was treason to go there. The Session before he was willing to go there. He stipulated with the Grand Trunk Railway Company that when the Government bought the road east to Quebec they should spend their money in the State of Michigan, before the Government would enter into a contract with them. Now, Sir, I think the House is entitled to further information on that subject, and after the hon. gentleman has devoted so much time to the discussion of things that he thinks may be advantageous to the Administration, it would be well if he were to devote a few minutes to the consideration of the Bill, and to giving the information which this House is entitled to receive from the Government.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). During the discussion of the subject before the House the hon. Minister of Railways referred to the resolution which I moved last year when the question was before the House. I desire to read that resolution again that it may go upon the *Hansard* correctly, for up to this time it has never got there in correct terms.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman did not make what I call a speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He addressed the House on the subject.

Mr. BURPEE. I wish to read the resolution to which I refer, so it may go upon *Hansard* correctly. It is as follows:—

“Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Rogers, that all the words after ‘that’ to the end of the Question, be left out, and the words, ‘the present construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia is premature, and will involve the country in an expense beyond its reasonable capacity, and will result in the maintenance of too high a rate of taxation, while the postponement of that part of the undertaking, till after the completion of the prairie section, will enable it to be constructed at much less cost, and within a reasonable time,’ inserted instead thereof.”

When the hon. Minister of Railways referred to this resolution I understood him to leave out the words “British Columbia,” thus making the resolution as if it were one for postponement of the construction of the whole line. I thought I was correct in what I said last night, and I will give the reason why I thought so. Last year’s *Hansard* inserted the resolution as I thought he read it, omitting the words “British Columbia.” Another reason why I was very sure the hon. gentleman read it, as I understood he read it, was the fact that he referred to it in the same terms as he would speak of a motion to postpone the construction of the whole Pacific line, and he elaborated upon it. He spoke over half an hour on that point and referred to it over and over again as postponing the construction of the

railway. I desire that the whole country should understand the terms and the resolution which was moved by me and for which almost 60 members voted. Honorable gentlemen opposite will declare that the policy of the Opposition is to postpone the construction of the whole line, and they will prove it by the resolution as quoted by the hon. Minister of Railways and by his speech. I said last night that my only object was to have the resolution placed correctly on *Hansard*, and I would not accuse the Minister of Railways of deliberately mistating it. I presume he took it out of last year's *Hansard*, where it was incorrectly stated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I read it out of the Journals of the House word for word.

Mr. BURPEE. It appears from *Hansard* that the hon. gentleman read it otherwise, as I have said he read it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I read it from the Journals of the House, and I read it twice.

Mr. BURPEE. It is my duty to correct that mistake. If the hon. gentleman read it from the Journals of the House his speech is all wrong, part of his argument being entirely out of place and falling to the ground. In fact the best and the most vigorous portion of his speech must be eliminated. As I stated at the time the policy of the late Government as indicated by this resolution was to have the prairie section built first by the Government, and to postpone the British Columbia end until after the prairie section was completed and the country settled, when the Dominion would be better prepared to build the British Columbia section of the road. I make these explanations in order to place myself and the country right in respect to this resolution which might otherwise place the Opposition in a position which they did not occupy.

Mr. DeCOSMOS. I presume this House is wearied of this subject, but notwithstanding that fact I ask its indulgence for a few moments. The remark made by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) just now brings forcibly before me the fact as to how generous a man may be with other people's property and rights. The hon. gentleman, in moving a resolution respecting the construction of the Pacific Railway, said the British Columbia portion should be postponed, that it was premature. Now, Sir, I deny that it is premature, and I maintain it is wrong that it should ever have been postponed. I will not, however, proceed to the discussion of that subject at the present moment. At a future time I will take up the whole subject of the railway in British Columbia, either in Committee when the appropriation comes down for that Province, or when the resolution comes up for concurrence, so that I may spread on the records of the House the true state of that question, and place it in such a way that it may be verified. I will make this brief statement to the House, a statement which may be verified and that cannot be refuted—that British Columbia has paid the average of the taxation of the Dominion during the whole period she has been a member of the Dominion. I make this further statement that British Columbia has not merely paid her proportion of the taxation of this Dominion, but that she has paid in excess of that \$1,700,000, a sum equal to the total interest upon the total amount of money expended on surveys and construction of the Pacific Railway from 1871 down to June 30th, 1880; but I say, in addition to all this, British Columbia had to pay up to June 30th over \$200,000 in excess of paying the interest on the capital borrowed for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and her proportionate rate of interest. I leave that statement for the House and country to consider. I will hereafter, as I remarked a few moments ago, take up this whole question. I will state further, for the information of this House, and particularly of my hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), that during

the last fiscal year the Province of British Columbia paid into the Consolidated Revenue of Canada \$685,000. After paying the ordinary and current expenditure of the Dominion in and for that Province it left \$116,000 surplus. The hon. Minister of Railways stated, in the early portion of this Session, that \$1,634,300 had been expended on the Onderdonk contract on construction, on which the interest was \$64,000, and this was not only paid but a balance of \$50,000 odd was paid to the Dominion Treasury and is there now. In other words, we paid all the money that was expended in the Province in that fiscal year; we paid the whole interest on the capital expended on the Onderdonk contract, and \$50,000 besides. I would draw the attention of the House to one fact further. The hon. Minister of Railways told us that we would have on the 1st of August next 951 miles of railway in operation. Now, Sir, does it show honesty, fairness, or uprightness, on the part of either this House or the Government or the Opposition, that 951 miles of railway will be in operation in the eastern part of this Dominion on the 1st of August, when not a single mile is completed in British Columbia? Common fairness, common honesty, common justice, between man and man, must denounce such a state of things as dishonorable alike to the hon. members of this House and the Government of this country, as unworthy, in fact, of any person, whether in or out of this House. We entered the Dominion of Canada on the condition that the railway should progress simultaneously from each end, and here I repeat again before I sit down, we have 951 miles ready and in operation in the east, and not a single mile in British Columbia; yet we have paid, I repeat, the whole interest on railway expenditure up to June, 1880.

Mr. ROSS. I do not intend to prolong the discussion, but I wish to make a few remarks before the question is put. Those who remember the plain and businesslike statements of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), when he was Minister of Railways, must have remarked the contrast between his statements and those of the present hon. Minister of Railways in moving the Bill which is now in your hands. We expected, Sir, that the hon. gentleman having charge of the Department since 1878, no doubt familiar with all its details, acting on the advice of engineers in whose ability he has the utmost confidence, when he made his statement to this House, would state the difficulties he encountered in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would present to the House such an explanation of the policy of the Government as would enable us fairly to understand what to expect in the future. True, Sir, he did for an hour or less, shall I say, entertain the House with an exposition of some of the difficulties he had to overcome, but it was evident throughout the whole prefatory part of his speech that he was preparing to indulge in one continual boast as to what the Minister of Railways had been able to accomplish compared with the late Minister of Railways. I cannot tell whether I was struck more with the difficulties the hon. gentleman had to encounter, or did encounter, in laying before the House the policy of the Government, or the ease with which the hon. gentleman indulged in those flights of imagination so peculiar to him. Sir, in dealing with the policy of the Government from the very inception of his remarks to the very close it was quite apparent the hon. gentleman had risen, not so much to explain the policy of the Government, as to boast of what the Government had done or was going to do. In the first place he dwelt very briefly, and I do not wonder that he dwelt so briefly, with the difficulties encountered in the eastern section of the road. We were told last year that the aim of the Government was to give Canada a great through route from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We were told that immigrants arriving at Quebec would be carried along the line north of Lake Superior all the way through on

Canadian territory, and be planted on the Canadian prairies. He said he would be able to show substantial progress in the eastern section. What does he tell us to-day? Why, he says that he has encountered almost insuperable difficulties, and that he is not able to begin as he expected, in July next, the construction of that section, that he has been obliged to change the location of the road, that he has changed the great interior line to a line along the lake shore. Is this done in the interests of the country? He does not say so. It is in the interests of the Syndicate. We have here a fair indication that the policy of the hon. gentleman is one adopted in the interests of the Syndicate. Let me refer to a point or two. He says we have abandoned the interior line and taken a line which is less subject to winter snow storms, and which can be more rapidly constructed. These are not reasons in the interests of the country but in the interests of the Syndicate, because in both these cases the cost in the interests of the Syndicate will be reduced. Had he adopted the line to the north sixty or seventy miles from the water line of Lake Superior we would have had an extensive country opened up; and the hon. gentleman in Ontario last year, when pleading in the interests of the Syndicate throughout the Province, pointed out that the construction of the eastern section on the proposed line of the Government was in the interests of Ontario, that it was calculated to open up large timber districts back of Lake Superior, and to furnish a market for the timber products of that country. If Ontario had an interest in supporting the hon. gentleman last year, that interest is taken away and the vast timber districts on Spanish River, which were to have been developed, are left to be developed as they may by private enterprise. This is the first proposition made by the hon. gentleman. The next is a boast that by the 1st of July next year we will have an all-rail route from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg. This is nothing new in the light of the statements made in this House a few years ago. Here is a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) when he was Minister of Public Works in 1878. He says:

"It will be, of course, absolutely necessary that we should not merely control the rates of our own road, but also control them on the road with which we connect, so as to prevent if possible discrimination. With regard to the term of the lease, I think we may fairly look forward to the completion of our own road, through our own territory, in the space, say, of four or five years."

Here we have the promise made in 1878 that in four or five years, that would be in 1882 or in 1883, we would have an all-rail line from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg. But does the hon. Minister of Railways give any credit to the hon. member for Lambton for the energy he displayed in the construction of that road? Is he generous enough—shall I say candid enough—in making his statement to say that the hon. member for Lambton had exercised such foresight, and had so bent his energies and the energies of this country to the construction of that road, that in 1882 we are to have an all-rail route from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg? Not at all; but after coming in to reap what another hon. gentleman had sown, after coming in to complete the results of another hon. gentleman's labors, he takes to himself credit that does not belong to him, and boasts in the presence of the members of this House, who know right well the energy put forth by the hon. member for Lambton in the construction of this road, that he and his Government in completing the intermediate links of that section, have the right to claim the credit for what could not have been done but for the energy of his predecessor. Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways would have done more credit to himself and the party of which he is a distinguished member, if he had been candid and generous enough to acknowledge the services performed by the hon. member for Lambton in connection with this gigantic project.

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

But the hon. gentleman goes further; he boasts that he has achieved a wonderful reduction in the contracts already let for the construction of this road. How has this reduction been accomplished? By fresh investigations as to the cost of that railway? By discoveries of new routes? By fresh alignments of the road? Not at all. It has been accomplished simply by taking the estimates of the late Minister of Railways, and by finding out that in certain instances these works do not cost as much as the previous engineer estimated they would cost. There is nothing in that for which the hon. gentleman should take credit. I would be willing to give the hon. gentleman credit if he had accepted the lowest tender for all the work that was done—if, for instance, he had accepted the lowest tender for the work between Emory's Bar and Port Moody, and saved the country \$209,000; or if he had accepted the lowest tender for the work on section A and section B, he might have something to boast of. But notwithstanding the fact that in these two contracts the hon. gentleman has wasted nearly half a million of public money, he has the effrontery—I must use mild language, because the hon. gentleman himself uses mild language—to stand up in the presence of hon. members of this House and boast that he has saved millions of money—I think he said four and a half millions—of the people of Canada on the contracts which he has already let. Why, the hon. gentleman has not spent this money. The expenditure was not required in the public interest; it was made on the estimates of the previous Government; it is the natural outcome of a contract over which the hon. gentleman has no control after it is let; and in the face of this fact, the hon. gentleman boasts that he has saved large sums of money on these contracts, and that he and his Government are therefore entitled to public confidence. The hon. gentleman says further that he has selected the shortest route across the continent. We heard that years and years ago. Has he readjusted the geography of the continent of North America? To listen to the hon. gentleman one would suppose that he had discovered a fresh parallel of latitude never known before, and that by readjusting Halifax and Liverpool and Winnipeg, he had so reconstructed the map of this world that he had shortened the route between England and Yokohama. What has he done? He has just located the line of railway according to the route selected by Mr. Sandford Fleming in 1874, and if anything he has lengthened it, on his own admission, by some 79 miles. And yet he attempts to deceive the people of this country—for his speech was made to the country—by alleging that he has discovered a shorter route than the shortest route ever known to any Minister of Railways. I said the hon. gentleman was speaking to the country. We are not easily deceived by the tone of the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, however they attempt to hide their intentions; and however they choose to tell their followers that they are opposed to a dissolution, we hear it in every sentence that drops from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite, we can discern it in every statement they make, we know from our experience of these hon. gentlemen in 1878, that they are preparing by disingenuous statements, by concealing half, if not more than half the truth, to beguile the electors of the Dominion of Canada into giving them that support which they received in 1878 by a precisely similar course. But the hon. gentleman goes further, and he boasts of the cheapness of his plan, of the plan which he asked this House to ratify last year for the construction of the Pacific Railway. How can he boast of its being a cheap plan? We have not yet seen the end of it; we can better tell twenty years hence whether the system proposed by the hon. gentleman is a cheap system or not. The hon. gentleman has not yet shown us what advantage there is to the Syndicate, and what loss there is to the country in the monopoly which he has given over the trade of the North-West for twenty years to come;

he has not told us what the value is to the Syndicate of the exemption of their property from taxation forever, and of their land for twenty years; and these are only a few small items in the cost of the Pacific Railway to the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman ventures to make comparisons between the scheme he submitted to the House last year and the plan submitted by the hon. member for Lambton some years ago. Sir, I am prepared to take the Railway Act of 1874, I am prepared to discuss it clause by clause, and I am prepared to compare the land grant or the money grant of the two schemes, and I am not in the least afraid but that I can convince the intelligent electors of this country that the scheme proposed by the hon. member for Lambton in 1874, under the circumstances at that time, was infinitely cheaper than the scheme submitted by the hon. gentleman last year. Sir, there is no comparison between the two schemes. There was a larger land grant in the scheme of 1874, but not so large a land grant in the prairie region as in this scheme, nor was the quality of the land the same. Nor was the scheme of 1874 surrounded with such objectionable privileges in favor of any company that might construct the road as this scheme. Whether it is taken in the main or in the details, I venture to say that when the scheme of the hon. gentleman is submitted to the intelligent jury of this country, as I trust it will soon be, there can be but one opinion, and that is that the scheme of the hon. gentleman is not one that will commend itself to their intelligence. The hon. gentleman, more than one year after we have brought down our amendments, chooses to examine them and pronounce upon them, and to ask this House to condemn these amendments. I have listened to every word the hon. gentleman said, and have read his speech very carefully through, and I have risen from the perusal of that speech convinced of this one thing, that every amendment we proposed last year was substantially in the interest of the country; and our predictions in regard to the evils from which we attempted to divert the country were fulfilled so far as the management is concerned. Let me take one of those to which the hon. gentleman made but a passing reference, the amendment of Mr. LaRue, in which he objected to handing the Pacific Railway to a company, mainly foreigners with a foreign capital, having their offices in a foreign country, and disposed to do everything to advance the interests of their own company. I find every day gives fresh proof that what we predicted is going to be realized. Why, as to the head of the company, who is the Chief Engineer—who is Superintendent—is he a Canadian? Do we find Canadian engineers in that Company? I have here a statement received from Winnipeg a few days ago, which says that in appointing conductors the majority were Americans; out of eleven six were Americans. I will read a short extract from it:

“WINNIPEG, Man., April 17th.

“It having been stated that only three Canadian Pacific Railway conductors have been discharged, and these for drunkenness; further, that their places have been filled by Ontario men, the *Sun* gives the following list of conductors appointed:—Kennedy, American; Lovelock, Canadian; Jallow, Canadian; Steele, American; Smith, American; Metcalfe, Canadian; Gaulder, Canadian; Milan, American; Bannister, American; Bryning, Canadian; Conkian, American, conductors discharged. Deike, Canadian; Bonter, Canadian; Biscoifa, Canadian; Millican, Canadian; Gilbert, Canadian, conductors suspended. Hawkins, Canadian; Harding, Canadian; Green, American, formerly of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, has replaced Templeman as yardmaster at Winnipeg. G. S. Cameron, Canadian, who has had charge of the wood tie trains, has been replaced by an American. Fox, American, caterer of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, is to have the Point Douglas restaurant. An American has been appointed yardmaster at Brandon. Herring, Canadian, station master at Whitemouth for two years, has been replaced by an American. Egan, Canadian despatcher, has been replaced by Shields, American. Huff, American, has replaced Ross, Canadian, as Assistant Superintendent of Construction. Leary, American, has replaced Patterson, Canadian, as Superintendent of Bridges and Waterworks. Kilson, American, has replaced Nelson, Canadian, in another position. Other Canadians, who cannot be got rid of for just reasons, are having their berths made so warm for them that they will have to leave if they want to live in peace.”

That was something we predicted last year. Here is a railway subsidized by the people of Canada to the enormous extent of \$25,000,000, and 25,000,000 acres of the most valuable lands handed over to a Syndicate on the ground that its early construction would be in the interests of the Canadian people. Then we have the fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite were going to preserve Canada for the Canadians; that they instituted a system that would give Canadians employment at home, and preserve them from going to the States to seek their bread; and here we have Canadians on a Canadian railway already replaced by Americans in large numbers. I find no fault with the Americans, *per se*, but the fact I have mentioned is a fulfilment of the predictions we made last year, that this road would practically become foreign so far as this country is concerned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us an important railway that has any Canadian engineer or manager? Has the Grand Trunk or the Great Western?

Mr. ROSS. Yes, the Great Western has.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is Mr. Broughton a Canadian, or Mr. Hickson?

Mr. ROSS. Is not Mr. Schreiber a Canadian?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Schreiber is an Englishman, not a Canadian.

Mr. ROSS. He is a Canadian; he came to this country to make his fortune, was appointed to an important position and occupies it as a Canadian. If the hon. gentleman is right, half the members of this House are foreigners, and in the same sense the hon. member for Niagara is a foreigner.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Smellie, who is Chief Engineer at headquarters, receiving \$4,000 a year, is not as much a Canadian as Mr. Schreiber.

Mr. ROSS. Perhaps Mr. Vanhorn is as much an American as the President of the United States. Canada for the Canadians was the cry of hon. gentlemen opposite, when appealing to the electors in 1878, and now it is the Canadian Pacific Railway for the Americans which suits the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask, would the Canadian people think the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were consulting the interests of Canada as well as their own, when they obtain from the United States the services of a man with longer experience for the work to be performed than any man we can find in Canada, or should they take an inferior man because a Canadian?

Mr. ROSS. I do not expect the Syndicate to consult the interests of Canada, but I would have expected the hon. Minister of Railways to do so, and to see that when he was passing a Bill to pay perhaps \$140,000,000 to a Syndicate, that the interests of Canada would have been properly guarded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say we ought to have provided in the Bill that the Syndicate should not have liberty to obtain the services of the ablest man in the world? Mr. Vanhorn at this moment is receiving \$15,000 a year from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for his services, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he could find a man in Canada receiving a similar salary for similar services.

Mr. ROSS. I did not expect him to insert a clause in the Bill to prevent the employment of Americans, but I did expect, last year, when we had a tender from a company purely Canadian, including some of the best blood in the Dominion, that he would have paid it some attention and deference, instead of allowing that grand, gigantic enterprise, as he styles it, to pass into the hands of foreigners. We warned the hon. gentleman last year, but he scouted our warnings, and to-day we have the realization of our

predictions, in seeing some of our best Canadians displaced by Americans, and obliged to seek a living in the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the second Syndicate was more Canadian than the present? Does he not know that the capital behind them was mainly New York?

Mr. ROSS. The capital of the second Syndicate was Canadian capital, made by Canadians in this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are Canadians in the present Syndicate who could buy up the whole of them—a single one of them, in fact, could buy up the whole party.

Mr. ROSS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell better what Canadians can buy up. I know very well that the second Syndicate was quite as competent to construct the road as the first. The hon. gentleman found fault with the resolution asking for a dissolution; and he says a dissolution would have been improper. He knew last year that if the Governor dissolved the House, with that scheme fresh in the minds of the people, it meant the dissolution of the Government. The hon. gentleman says in his boasting, confident way that he is not afraid of the people of this country. Let him try an appeal to the people and test his courage. He sometimes thinks he can browbeat members on this side by threatening dissolution. I speak for myself, and I think for many more on this side. I am prepared now if he chooses to go to the country. If he will give us sufficient time, and will not make a midnight attack and spring an election before the electors are prepared, we can meet him any time, and it requires very little prescience to know what the result would be. We have a public sentiment in this country. The people of Canada are not corrupt. They know when their rights are encroached upon; they know when a Government proves recreant to every promise which it has made; when it falsifies its own record; when entrenched on the Treasury benches it forgets all its promises, and sells the interests of the country to establish a monopoly to enable the hon. Minister of Railways to boast he has been able to do with one stroke of the pen what another Government was advancing slowly and steadily to accomplish. That was the purpose of the hon. gentleman in bringing down his scheme last year; and the scheme may serve its purpose for a time; but once let him face an aroused public opinion and he will no longer be able to boast of his majority or the success of his scheme. The hon. gentleman found fault with the hon. member from Westmoreland because he asked the House last year to wait until tenders were called for. Did the hon. Minister last night face the fact that he had given the contract to this Syndicate without asking for tenders? No. Not only the law, but the procedure of his Department was against him. Day after day we see advertisements calling for tenders for the construction of a lighthouse or the enlargement or construction of a lock, or some little public work that will cost about two or three thousand dollars. The hon. gentleman, however, submitted to this House a scheme for the construction of a railway involving an expenditure of \$80,000,000 or \$100,000,000—I do not know what figures to assume, the figures are changed so often—without any tender asked for or submitted. The hon. gentleman took the law into his own hands, and in his own way, in order to serve his own purposes—perhaps in the secrecy of his own office, surrounded by his own councillors, perhaps in the dead of night, with the lights turned down—agreed with the Syndicate for the construction of the railway, confident he had a majority at his back that would rather see him through with it than return to their constituents. I challenge the hon. gentleman, if he chooses to read the history of this or any country that has a representative or constitutional Government, to show me on the pages of its history any such

Mr. Ross (Middlesex):

gigantic scheme forced upon an unwilling Parliament as this Syndicate scheme passed last Session. Amendment after amendment was brought down without a word of reply. His majority knew perhaps what they were doing, but they were led, I fear, by that hon. gentleman to their doom, supporting him at every stage. Now he is going to the country, and I hope he will receive what these gentlemen should have given him last year, viz., the punishment he deserves. The hon. gentleman objected also to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Bothwell in regard to the monopoly of the North-West. Did he show that the Syndicate had not the monopoly of that trade? Not at all. He brought down a tariff of rates. Does that prove anything? It does not prove that the Syndicate has not the control of the North-West trade. What does the disallowance, on the representations of the Syndicate, of the three Acts of the Manitoba Legislature mean? It means that this House has been gagged by these hon. gentlemen. It means that the Province of Manitoba has been practically boycotted by the hon. gentleman, and charters passed by Manitoba, in the exercise of their provincial rights, previous to the inception of this gigantic scheme, have been disallowed at the request of the Secretary of the Canadian Syndicate. Is it for that we are sold body and bones to this gigantic monopoly? Here we have the line on the eastern section changed from an interior to a frontier line at the request of the Secretary of the Canadian Syndicate. Now we are going to change the road from the Yellow Head Pass to the Kicking Horse Pass, at the request of the Secretary of the Syndicate. Then we have last, but not least, the legislation of the Province disallowed because the Secretary of that Syndicate calls the attention of the Canadian Government to the fact that it interferes with their particular preserves. Where are we going? Are we a free people, or are we in the grasp of a Minister of Railways who will sell our dearest rights to a company of monopolists that will be able for years to come to crush the settler and hinder the free development of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to put us in the wrong with reference to our railway policy, as in all other matters. I do not propose we shall be placed in the wrong. Our policy was to open up the prairies of the North-West as soon as possible, or, to quote Artemus Ward, "immediately, if not sooner." That was our policy. I challenge the hon. gentleman to establish wherein we have failed in one iota in the fulfilment of that policy. I challenge him to show wherein he has done one iota more than we would have done or were doing in the fulfilment of that policy. Has he opened up the North-West more rapidly than we were doing? Not at all. The hon. gentleman has only got to Brandon, about thirty miles further than we reached; he has simply been carrying to completion the works we were constructing. He tells us we will have an all-through route from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, precisely what we would have done. He says: "Look at the prosperity of Winnipeg; look at the goods that are going into that country and the increased revenue to Customs; look at the value of the lands." What has the hon. gentleman done to improve the price of the lands. He has done nothing more than we should have done under our system. The hon. gentleman is simply a copyist; he is simply walking in the steps of the hon. member for Lambton, pushing to an energetic conclusion works that were energetically begun. If the prairie has been opened for settlement; if we are entering upon the possession of those lands, it is because the hon. member for Lambton, in the face of almost insuperable difficulties, true as the needle to the Pole, persisted in opening up the prairies of the North-West to settlers. The hon. gentleman says that things were not as lively in 1878 as in 1881; that may be very true; but does he not recognize the great changes for which he cannot claim any credit.

Was it the hon. gentleman who built the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway and extended that line of railway that runs north of Chicago from Minneapolis to St. Paul and St. Vincent? He knows well that the development of the North-West depended entirely on the completion of the American railways, and that were it not for the completion of that system, that development could not go on more rapidly than it did three years ago. The road from Emerson to Selkirk was completed, and in fact the house was all but erected when the hon. gentleman came into office. All he had to do was to enter in, and when he did he looked around at the magnificent superstructure which his predecessor had reared, he expanded his arms in that rhetorical manner in which he often expands his imagination, and said: "Behold the magnificent superstructure I have erected; look at this vast system of railways that is due to my foresight, due to my genius. See the locomotive crossing the prairie from Winnipeg to Moose Jaw Creek. See the road built from Thunder Bay to Winnipeg, ready for immigrants by the 1st July. See the land boom in Winnipeg which I by my genius have created. See what I have done, me, the great Minister of Railways, me, the apostle of engineering of syndicates and monopolies; the most wonderful inventor, shall I call him? No; the most wonderful high priest of economy that we ever knew in Canada." I congratulate the hon. gentleman on entering in, on the eleventh hour, and claiming credit to himself for what others have done. A more honorable man, a more generous man, would have given credit to whom credit was due. The First Minister, the other night, talked something about the cuckoo going into the linnet's nest and taking possession of her eggs. The hon. gentleman has done the same thing with the hon. member for Lambton. He found a nice nest—he found the road to Kamloops was almost completed; he had scarcely to chip the shell; he looked at that and *presto!* the eggs were all hatched; then he turned round and said: These are my eggs, I hatched them; these are my chickens, and I will do the cackling. I was astonished at the hon. gentleman, and trust we will have no more of this boasting and this self-glorification. I hope the hon. gentleman will hereafter give honor to whom honor is due, and I think that if he does cross Moose Jaw Creek and Kicking Horse Pass and connect the railway at Kamloops with the British Columbia system of railways which we surveyed and located, and if he does go to Port Moody on a Canadian Pacific Railway by-and-bye, as an ex-Minister of Railways, then we will rejoice to know that this great system is completed, and that Canada has a trans-continental railway worthy the ambition of this young Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There were a good many bold things said by the hon. Minister of Railways in the House, but I think perhaps the boldest thing he ever uttered was that the Opposition would be afraid to touch upon the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He thought that the events which had transpired since the subject was under discussion in the House last year were of such a nature that our mouths had been effectually closed, that it would be impossible for us to approach the subject because of the deterrent influences of either fear or shame. Such was the bold avowal he made in our hearing; and, Sir, it must have seemed extremely ludicrous to you, sitting in your chair and observing the actions of both parties in this House, to observe that the hon. Minister of Railways had challenged debate and invited in this marked manner a discussion on this subject; that while seven or eight members of the Opposition that he said would be afraid or ashamed to touch upon this subject, have been forced to rise one after another without one gentleman on his own side daring to rise in support of the position he took. Sir, the same silence that characterized those hon. gentlemen when, on the night that we were kept here till eight o'clock in the morning a year ago, the hon. Minister of Railways had influence enough to lead them up

to a silent voting down of principles that stand recorded in the Journals of the House, placed there by members of the Opposition, he had not influence then to cause them to open their mouths to defend the votes they gave, and following their course of last Session not one of them has attempted a defence of the act perpetrated last Session. The appeal of the hon. gentleman has been in vain. Not one of them has dared to rise in his place to utter one word in justification of the iniquitous bargain made at that time, in marked contrast with the seven members who have spoken from the Opposition side. If the hon. gentleman desires it there is not one of that little band but is ready to rise, and every one of them affirm that every resolution they voted for before they would re-affirm to-day. There is not one member of that band who is not ready to re-affirm to-day that every event that has transpired from that day to this has strengthened the position he took at that time. Sir, what was the debate? The Canadian Pacific Railway debate will long be remembered. It is written in the annals of the history of this country, it is printed upon the Journals of the year. Sir, after the Minister of Railways ceases to be Minister of Railways, after the members of this House cease to be members of this House, after we have all passed off this stage, there will be found recorded the votes of hon. members composing the Parliament of 1881; and, Sir, I for myself say that I am glad, if I leave any posterity behind me, that not one of these shall have to blush to find their father's name recorded in favor of a bargain while the men who voted for it dare not rise and defend. Sir, what was the nature of the bargain? The Government came down to the House and put a statement into the mouth of His Excellency which was not correct. They came down to us at the commencement of last Session and told us they had entered into a private contract with certain capitalists to build the Canadian Pacific Railway and take it off our shoulders. That is not true, as I understand it to-day. It is not true, I believe, if the Journals of the House are to be taken for an authority. Was a contract made by the Government with certain contractors to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, I ask? If so, why the invitation for tenders, several of which were opened only a few days ago, to build a portion of it? If, so, why are we to be asked to vote millions of dollars to go on with that work? No, Sir, a contract was not made with certain capitalists to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, but a contract was made to build certain portions of a railway which, when completed, with other portions to be completed by the people of Canada, was to constitute the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Sir, this is purely a question of business, and business men are not afraid to approach it and to consider it on a business basis. What was the estimate of the cost of the work the Syndicate was to construct, the Minister of Railways himself, giving the figures to the House; these figures were \$48,500,000—\$15,500,000 from Jasper to Kamloops, \$13,000,000 from Selkirk to Jasper, and \$20,000,000 from Thunder Bay to Callander. Those were the figures given to us by the hon. Minister, and if he dares to deny them I can refer him to the pages of the official *Mansard*—given to us only a few months before he set out in his negotiations with these very men to whom he gave this contract. The hon. Minister stated that he had taken Mr. Sandford Fleming's figures, a man whose ability was only exceeded by his caution, and however much those figures might be reduced he was sure they could not be exceeded. The hon. Minister came down fortified with the report of his engineer to that effect. Then we have the Minister of Railways fixing the price, the Chief Engineer under the Minister of Railways corroborating the price—the price, the cost of the work to be done by the Syndicate at \$48,500,000. What did we give them for this work? \$25,000,000 in cash—there is no trouble in arriving at that value—and 25,000,000 acres of land. What price

should be put on the land? Not the price of the hon. member for Lambton, or the hon. member for West Durham, or myself, because, as opponents of the Government, we might be charged with dealing unfairly by them, but the price which the men who signed the contract on behalf of the people of Canada placed on it, \$3 an acre, and that is greatly under the average as stated by the hon. leader of the Government, and I have *Hansard* under my hand in which I can turn up the page. When did the hon. gentleman put that price on the land? Only a few months before the hon. Minister of Railways attached his signature to that contract. You have the 25,000,000 acres which the man who made the bargain said was worth \$3 per acre, giving \$75,000,000 in land, which with \$25,000,000 in cash, made \$100,000,000 as the amount given to those men to build work estimated at \$48,500,000. Do the hon. gentlemen say these figures are nonsensical? They dare not say it, as they would be declaring that the Minister of Railways, standing in his place in Parliament, and stating on his responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, talked nonsense, for they are his figures. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say the price is ridiculous? They dare not say that, because the hon. First Minister stood in his place and told the representatives of the people that this price was greatly under its value. There is \$48,500,000 worth of work to do for which the Government give \$100,000,000 in cash and land according to figures furnished by themselves. What more? Why, when they had done that they gave the Syndicate the road besides. Surely, when they gave the Company \$51,500,000 more than the work would cost we might have owned the road, but the Government gave the Company the road. What more? They exempted the Company forever from all taxation. What more? The 406 miles of railway from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, passing through the Lake Superior region, is to be constructed and paid for with the money of the Canadian people at a cost of from \$16,000,000 to \$18,000,000, and when constructed it is to be handed over a free gift to the Syndicate, which has already \$51,500,000 more than the whole work will cost them. Is that all? No. That portion of the road building in the canyons of the Rocky Mountains, from Yale to Kamloops, at an estimated cost of \$10,000,000, is to be built and paid for out of the pockets of the Canadian people, and when completed it is to be handed over a free gift to the Syndicate. The ninety miles from Yale to Port Moody, for which tenders have just been received, and which will involve an outlay of \$2,500,000 out of the pockets of the people, is, when constructed, to be handed over to that Company, to be theirs forever. The Pembina Branch already completed and in running order and paying great dividends, is also to be handed over to the Company as a free gift, although the Company receives \$51,500,000 over and above the cost. This is the equivalent we gave them in money and land according to the price placed on it by the Government. Our position is stronger by the lapse of a year, because if hon. gentlemen were disposed to raise objections to the statement of the hon. First Minister, as regards the value of the land, we have now the fixed and determined value by the Syndicate. What is the price the Syndicate asks for these lands? The hon. Minister of Railways will agree that the first offer before there are many settlers in the country and the tide of immigration has set in will be the lowest price. The lowest price placed on it by the Syndicate is \$2.50 per acre. The hon. the Minister of Railways has told the House that it is \$1 and \$1.25 per acre; but the price was \$2.50, with a rebate of \$1.25 per acre. Does that affect the price put on the land? No, because the hon. Minister of Railways forgot himself, and in one part of his speech he furnished a very important argument to the Opposition. He said the Syndicate understood their business too well to hold their lands at too high a price. Every acre of land put under

MR. PATERSON (Brant).

cultivation was worth twice as much to them as if they had got \$10 an acre for it at the end of ten years. By placing the lands under cultivation, the Company would make \$20 per acre. The hon. Minister furnishes us with an argument of very great value. References have been made to certain amendments moved by hon. members on this side of the House, and the hon. the Minister of Railways declared we are afraid to allude to them. I allude to one amendment proposed. It was to the effect that in letting this contract there should be a clause inserted giving the Government the liberty at any time to buy back the work by paying the contractors 10 per cent. over and above the cost. Allusion has been made to the Act passed by the hon. member for Lambton, and it will be remembered that Act contained an express stipulation that any portion of the road would be bought back from the contractors, by paying 10 per cent. over and above what it cost them, they returning bonuses they received in land and money. We pressed that amendment, but the majority voted it down in silence without debate. What would have been the effect of the resolution, if passed, with respect to the central section? I have the figures at hand, and it is a calculation that every business man can make. It requires very little skill to determine it, because we have the figures supplied to us by the hon. Minister of Railways. It is 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper. What is the estimated cost? *Hansard* is under my hand, in which the hon. gentleman is reported as having stated that the line could have been built and equipped for \$13,000 per mile. In reply to a question of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) the hon. gentleman said, "Yes, that was it." He would be justified in saying \$10,000, but as he wanted to give the outside figure he placed it at \$13,000—1,000 miles at that rate would cost \$13,000,000. What did we give the Company? \$10,000,000 in cash and 12,500,000 acres of land, which, at \$3 per acre, being the price given by the Finance Minister, made a total of \$47,500,000. Then give them 10 per cent. on their \$13,000,000, that would be \$1,300,000. The Syndicate would give back to the people the money bonus we gave them, the land bonus we gave them, and we would give to them the cost of the road and 10 per cent. added. Had that clause been in the contract we could have got back from the Syndicate, if the figures of the leader of the Government and Minister of Railways were to be relied upon, the road constructed with our money, and \$33,200,000 cash besides. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) laughs. His laugh is at the expense of the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and of the Prime Minister. *Hansard* is here, and if any hon. gentleman denies it I will read the figures and statements to the House. Take now the actual price of the lands, the price at which they are being held by the Syndicate, \$2.50 per acre, besides owning the road we would have \$26,950,000. Yet the hon. gentleman says that when we meet the electors we will be afraid to mention to them that we had moved an amendment intended to secure that result. But the hon. Minister of Railways says: "How about the running of the road? We don't want to own the road. It would ruin us to own it." Let us see what the hon. Minister said about the running of the road. I have it here in *Hansard*. It is worth while to notice what he says. It is to be found on page 1422 of *Hansard*, 1880.

An hon. MEMBER. Dispense.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I will not dispense. It may be all very well for the hon. gentleman who, I have no doubt, is an opponent of the Minister of Railways to want me to dispense with the reading of the words of wisdom of the hon. gentleman, but I am too great an admirer of the hon. Minister

to accede to that wish. In the speech to which I have referred he says:

"I dare say I will be told by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake): 'Granted that your figures are correct, assuming that you can build this railway for even less money than you have estimated, you have only encountered the first difficulty; you have then to operate the line, and the cost of that will be so greatly beyond anything you can hope to obtain from it, that you will place an intolerable burthen upon the people of this country.' I must address myself for a few moments to that question.

Then after giving a statement of the Pembina Branch he proceeds:

"By July, 1882, we will have about 700 miles of this road in operation; we will have 85 miles from Selkirk to Emerson or St. Vincent; we will have 200 miles in operation west of the Red River, which, with the branch of 16 miles to Winnipeg, will give us some 700 miles in operation, without reference at all to this section in British Columbia. I have every reason to believe that every mile of that road, from the day it is opened, will make an ample return for all the expenditure incurred in its operation. I think it is safe to say that in every succeeding year, as we extend gradually this road towards the Rocky Mountains, it will furnish such an additional volume of traffic from Red River to Thunder Bay, which will become the great *entrepot* of that country, as will prevent it from burthening the people, and give us some fair return for the interest on the money used in its construction."

There, Sir, is the declaration of the hon. Minister of Railways that every mile that was opened would pay the interest on the money expended. That is the road we have given away. It is no longer the heritage of the people of Canada. Paid for out of the people's money—\$50,000,000, and on top of that \$28,000,000 of finished road all going into their hands besides a dividend-earning road from the very moment it is built, if the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways is to be taken. Yet the hon. gentleman says that we will be afraid to call attention to this matter before the electors. Sir, there is only one thing that would make us hesitate to do so; if any one came before the electors and told them the real facts they would think that he was drawing upon his imagination and that what he said could not be true. Knowing that, Sir, I always appear before them with the official documents of the House in my hand, so that if any one is skeptical of the truth of what I say I invite him to the platform there to read of the business done in this House, as I invite now the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) to read that on the pages of Parliament which even a member with the audacity of the member for East York dare not contradict, and cannot successfully controvert. Well, Sir, the hon. Minister of Railways did me the honor to allude to a motion of mine objecting to the bargain because it did not secure finality in the liability of the Government. I had a right to move that resolution. The Government came down to the House and put into the mouth of His Excellency a statement that they had made a contract for the construction, maintenance and working of that road with a body of capitalists, but when we opened the contract we found it was not so. There was no finality in the Government liability. Canada was to be burdened with the building of some of the most expensive portions of the work extending over a period of years. I declared the contract was objectionable on that ground. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) declared that it was peculiarly objectionable on that account, when addressing his constituents. The hon. gentleman knew it was objectionable, yet I secured only about fifty votes to my motion stating so. The hon. Minister of Railways succeeded in inducing his supporters to vote against it, but with all his persuasive powers he was unable to draw one of his supporters to his feet, to explain why he voted as he did. Another resolution was moved against the exemption from taxation of the lands of the Company. The hon. Minister of Railways referred to that very little. He referred to the exemption of stations and road-bed and buildings and grounds, but said nothing about the land. They told us that it was nothing, that the Syndicate should hold their lands free, while the settler on

the adjoining lot, with a Syndicate lot on either side, should have to pay for roads, for erecting school houses and all municipal expenses. Hon. gentlemen think that we will be afraid to mention that before the electors. The electors in many cases have read this contract, and others will hear of it when we have an opportunity to go to them with the official documents in our hands, and then we will be prepared to take the verdict of the people which we were anxious to secure before the contract was passed upon, and which the Government decided should not be appealed to, the Prime Minister stating that no more imperfect tribunal for the trial of such questions could be found than the people. The Reform party have faith in the intelligence of the people. They hold that the expenditure of the people's money is a thing that vitally concerns the people, and that it is a thing upon which the people ought to be consulted. It was denied to them at that time; but thanks to the constitutional safeguard which we enjoy, the people will yet have the opportunity, if they cannot prevent that bargain, at least to declare that the men who were instrumental in making that bargain shall no longer represent them. Sir, we shrink not from the conflict or from the presentation of this question as one of the main features of that conflict. Speaking for myself, one of the chief charges that I shall bring against the Government will be their having entered into this contract. Some constituencies in Ontario have had an opportunity to pronounce upon it, and the result has been a loss to the Government of 50 per cent. in those elections. This carried out in the next election will show the hon. gentlemen opposite, who in their mighty force thought they could bear down men struggling for the rights of the people, that the people are faithful and that they will support those who truly represent them in Parliament. Sir, if there be this great confidence that we hear so much of from hon. gentlemen opposite, in an appeal to the people, why all this talk about legislating us out of this House? Why all this talk about cutting up our counties in order that the verdict may not be given by the same people who gave it in 1878? How bold these hon. gentlemen are, who dare not take the verdict from the same constituencies that gave it in 1878, who dare not wait till another year shows more clearly the effect of their policy, but who wish to bring on their election now. But bring on your election when you like, and we can stand up in the consciousness of our integrity, and ask the people of this country to say whether we are right or wrong. Why, in the face of all these advantages, do we find the rumor in the papers that no less than nineteen hon. gentlemen, supporters of the Government in their Ontario contingent alone, decline to face the music at another contest? Why do we find them stepping aside that new men may take their places? Why, except perhaps that it may be alleged by them—as it was alleged by some of the new candidates in 1874, when a certain matter was under discussion that would not bear investigation—"I did not sanction that; I know that was wrong." So, perchance, we shall have new candidates who may say of the Pacific Railway contract: "I was not in the House when that was submitted, or I would have voted against it." But let the statements be what they may, the Minister of Railways has found out that no less than seven members of the Opposition have met his challenge, while not one of his own supporters has stood up yet; and he will find that seven members more, or three times seven are ready to take up this discussion and denounce that contract as soon as any of his supporters venture to defend it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always kind to me. They know that if I do have to find fault with their policy, that I do so with evident pain—that only the oath which I have taken as a true representative makes me mention some things which I would rather not mention. But I would say here, that while

I would not take from the hon. Minister of Railways one iota of the glory that is his, while I would not detract from the credit he deserves for the amount of work he has to do—for I believe the labor he is engaged in is telling on his own health, and he brings a great deal of energy to his own department.—I cannot withhold the praise due to the hon. gentleman who preceded him, and who today gave evidence that in the honest fulfilment of his duties in that office, he had so impaired his health that he could not address the House to the length that he desired or that the House desired. Therefore, I think the hon. Minister was unfair when he sought to take to himself all the glory of the prosperity we see in the North-West and the progress of the Pacific Railway. Grant that thousands have gone in and that hundreds of thousands are going into that country, grant the increased value of property there, how do the immigrants who have raised the value of lands go in? Upon one mile of railway built by the present Minister of Railways? No, Sir; every man who has gone into that territory passed over not one foot of railway built by the present Minister of Railways, but every man found his way over the road built by his hon. predecessor; and if there is any development in that country, it is due to the gentleman who promoted the railway and successfully built it, and that is the hon. member for Lambton, who sits there to-day, a man honored by the people above the man who seeks to share his honors.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It is not my intention to occupy very long the time of this House, nor would I have spoken at all but for the course taken by the hon. Minister of Railways. It was fair and reasonable that he should have made an exposition of the progress of that work, and when he did so during the first hour of his speech I was very much interested; but in the last portion, when he showed an intention to revive the whole discussion, and assailed the resolution which I moved, and the resolutions moved by other members on this side, and thereby challenged the discussion of this subject at this stage of the Session, after we have been in session for seventy days, it seemed to me that he had not thought of the economy of time, and that he did not wish to shorten the Session, as we on this side are desirous of doing. Now, I think it was imprudent and unwise for that hon. gentleman to revive that question. I do not think any hon. member would have spoken on this side, except perhaps the leader of the Opposition, but for his action; and if two or three weeks are not consumed in this discussion, it is only due to the forbearance of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman referred to the Act of 1874. He said that Act offered greater advantages to a company to construct this railroad than has been granted to this Company by the contract which has been made. Now, let me say that in 1874, that country was a comparatively unknown country; and when my hon. friend acceded to power he found that this country rested under an obligation to British Columbia to construct that railway within a time in which it was absolutely impossible to accomplish it, and he passed the Act of 1874, by which he offered certain facilities for the construction of that road. The country had up to that time been very slightly surveyed, and it was very little known. We find in that Act one clause which particularly guards and protects the people of this country, and which is absent from the contract of which the hon. Minister of Railways boasts. The subsidies to be given were large, but the Government reserved to itself the right to resume possession of the road, and pay the contractors the amount they had expended, with 10 per cent. profit for themselves. This provision is so important that I will read it:

"In every contract for the construction of the said railway, or of any section or sub-section thereof, the Government of Canada shall reserve the right to purchase, under the authority of Parliament, the said railway or such section or sub-section thereof, on payment of a sum equal

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

to the actual cost of the said railway, section or sub-section, and 10 per cent. in addition thereto. The subsidies in land and money granted or paid by the Government for the construction of the said railway being just returned or deducted from the amount to be paid, the lands sold being valued at the full amount the contractors may have received from the sale of such lands as may have been sold."

Suppose, under that Act, the Government had given contracts, 20,000 acres of land and also a subsidy, and reserved the right to retake that road by remunerating those contractors, by guaranteeing 10 per cent. profits. Have we any such provision in this contract? Let us weigh this provision in the Act under consideration. Let us say the Government had the right, having had the same regard to the public interest, when they prepared this measure, they would have retained powers to acquire the road. What would have been the position of the matter? What is this Company called on to expend under this Act? My hon. friend behind me stated it clearly; the present contractors are to expend \$48,500,000 to complete their contract. What, under the provisions of this section, would the position of the Government have been? They would have had the right to assume this work on paying that amount, with 10 per cent. added, or less than \$53,000,000. But what is the condition of things under the present contract? The hon. Minister of Railways said last year that everything was let by public tender and competition, and that the contract was issued under the provisions of the Act of 1874, when it was shown and clearly proved that not a single provision of that Act had been regarded in the making of the contract. What did he say then? That it was made under the Act of 1872. Then we produced evidence to show that the Statute of 1872 had been repealed, so his assertion was baseless. The present Syndicate are obliged to expend \$48,500,000 and no more. What is the Government giving them for that expenditure? A subsidy of \$25,000,000, 25,000,000 acres, of land, \$28,000,000 expended in the construction of the road, and \$3,000,000 spent in surveys, besides exemption from taxation of their property forever, and a monopoly of this country. And what is this worth? I was astonished when the hon. Minister of Railways portrayed the great glory achieved by his Government in this matter, and particularly by himself—and that the letting of this contract had achieved the present marvellous prosperity. It has been made manifest that this Government has really done nothing in this direction. They had undertaken to build 100 miles of the railway west of Winnipeg, which it seems had been located wrong, and from which the rails had to be taken. They simply carried on the work initiated by my hon. friend the member for Lambton, until this contract was made for which the hon. Minister of Railways takes so much credit to himself in the most egotistical fashion. When the hon. gentleman talked about the boom in the North-West, and the great enhancement of the value of its lands, he did not tell us how the Syndicate had participated in that advantage. The contract last year was based on the assumption that the lands were worth \$1 an acre. He says nothing now about their value. How has the great rush of immigration affected the value of those lands? Will the hon. gentleman deny they are to-day worth more than \$3 an acre? If so, what becomes of the position he took last year that the lands were worth only \$1 an acre? Being worth \$3 an acre, how much does that give the Syndicate? Fully \$132,000,000 in money, railway and public property for an expenditure, by it, of \$48,500,000. This is no fiction; this proposition can not be controverted by hon. gentlemen on the other side. He did not tell us how much the Syndicate made by the sale of their lands at Brandon and other stations along the line, where I understand they made hundreds of thousands of dollars. Does not the light of experience show the unwisdom, folly and unpatriotism of having made this contract, and giving this Syndicate so many millions of public property which, had we had the same provision favored by hon. gentlemen on this side, might have been got for

\$50,000,000. The hon. gentleman says this contract was let by public tender and competition. That is a statement wholly baseless. There is a principle regarded as sacred in every country that public contracts should be put up to public competition and tender. To ignore that principle is to inaugurate a system of corruption and favoritism. The Statute of 1867 requires that all public works shall be put up to public tender. It is the Act relating to the Public Works of Canada. Clause 20 reads as follows:—

“It shall be the duty of the Minister to invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works except in cases of pressing emergency, where delay would be injurious to the public interests or where from the nature of the work it could be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the Department.”

There is a provision inserted in the first Act passed after Confederation relating to the Public Works. What did the hon. Minister of Railways, in 1874, do? He had regard to that principle and had it enacted that any section or sub-section of work should not be given out except by tenders. Here we find by the Act of 1874 the Government inserting a provision which required that the railway should be built only after tenders and competition. There is no other safe principle for the public protection. The hon. gentleman says that this work was put up to competition. I challenge him to point out any legal authority which he or his Government had in making this contract. I affirm that he has violated every provision of the Act of 1874 which was the only Statute relating to the Pacific Railway. What do we find? We find that not only was this contract not put up to public tender, but that the public mind of this country was lulled into a false security by the undisguised declaration of the Government in 1880, that their policy was to construct the road as a Government work, and not put it in the hands of individuals. The statement of the hon. member was this:

“What the policy of the late Government would have been, we do not know, but when we came into office, we decided to undertake it as a public work.”

What changed that policy? There seems to be a mystery surrounding this transaction that has never been elucidated. What did the hon. Minister of Railways say in that connection? He said:

“I had no hesitation in saying that the whole sentiment of the country is changed on this question. I am not at all ashamed to say my own opinions are changed in relation to the character of this great work. I remember when the First Minister brought in his Act in 1874, for the construction of this as a Government work, I felt we were incurring too great a responsibility. I believed it was unsafe for the Government to undertake the construction of this great work from end to end; but I do not hesitate to express my opinion that the whole condition of Canada has changed since that time.”

These were the utterances of the hon. Minister of Railways in 1880. When the hon. member for Niagara comes to speak, he, being in the confidence of the Government, will explain, no doubt, how it is and why it is they changed their policy. They changed their policy in secret. They did not at the next Session declare their change of policy before Parliament; but they changed it in the interim without giving any previous notice. The hon. Minister of Railways says the Government advertised for public tenders. In what newspaper? Was it the *Canada Gazette*. What conditions were prescribed? As I have shown, the Government violated every provision of the Act of 1874. If the hon. Minister wanted honestly to advertise for tenders, would he have not said: We propose to give the railway already constructed and to build other portions of the railway; we propose to exempt this railway from taxation and to give a monopoly of railway traffic in that country for twenty years. Now, how much will you take to construct the balance of the railway? That would have been an honest notice to give to the public, and nothing less should have been given. On what principle can the hon. Minister of Railway say tenders were asked for this work? If he can, I pause for a reply, because I am

anxious to know. The strong point we advanced in opposition to the Syndicate last Session was that the Government had changed their policy without giving any notice to the country. The hon. Minister of Railways says that the hon. First Minister at some pic-nic—they say it was a religious pic-nic—I did not know that he was in the habit of attending them—declared that the Government were then negotiating with some parties to build the railway. That the hon. gentleman said was equivalent to a notice to the public and an advertisement for tenders. Such a statement as that is an insult to the intelligence of the House. What did the Government do? They went to England and entered into communication with individuals there, and it was announced on their return that a contract firm had been made, but no contract was made at all. The contract was made only after they came to this country, and it was made behind the backs of the people. I believe that the sentiments advanced by the Government in 1880 was a sentiment of which the people approved. I felt myself that in view of the light and additional information we had, and I think it was the general feeling of the country, that that railway would be better built by the Government than if it were in the hands of private individuals. We have now a contract with the Syndicate involving hundreds of millions of dollars and no information given as to who tendered. The details were not given to the public. We sought to get the information, but it was absolutely refused, and we do not know that any persons excepting those persons constituting the Syndicate ever tendered for the work. Never was a Government contract in any country, as great as this contract, let without public competition. Take the policy of England or the policy of the United States; in the latter case the population by twelve times greater than ours. The contract would involve \$1,200,000,000 yet the Parliament of that country would not be consulted before letting it. This Parliament was called, as a mere matter of form, to approve of what had been done by the Government, and unless the House approved the action of the Government a dissolution would take place. The people of this country were coerced into approving of this contract. As I said before, I do not intend to protract this discussion, but I felt it my duty to repudiate the assertion of the hon. Minister of Railways that he had let this contract by tender. The contract is not based on a single provision of the Act of 1874, but is in direct conflict and direct violation of the Statute. He said last Session it was on the Statute of 1874. He then shifted his ground and said it was on the Statute of 1872, but he showed that that Statute had been repealed altogether. I think I have shown beyond question that this contract was let without any public competition or tender; that it was in direct violation of the law of the land, in violation of that principle which every one of us regards as sacred if we want to preserve the purity of the administration of this country. The Government ignored that principle, and I charge them that they stand convicted before the people of this country with having let a contract involving a \$100,000,000 without giving the people an opportunity of tendering for the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say he was in favor of doing it as a Government work?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I mean to say that the Act of 1874 makes a double provision, it authorizes the Government to conduct it as a public work or to construct it through the instrumentality of a company. All the light and all the information we have now go conclusively to show that it would be wise and patriotic if this country had built the Canadian Pacific Railway as a public work instead of giving it to a company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I would like the hon. gentleman to state why he was not in favor of doing this as

a Government work. After having carried it on as a Government work for four years he advertised for tenders all over this country for a company to take it off his hands.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. We advertised for tenders to carry it on as a public work. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister at what time, in what manner, he changed his mind which he expressed fully here in 1880. He changed his mind and ignored his utterances on that occasion and came to the conclusion that it should not be built as a private enterprise.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I dare say the hon. gentleman has heard that sometimes it is easier to ask questions than to answer them.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I see that is your case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask the hon. gentleman why, if he considered it was wise on the part of the Government to construct the Canada Pacific Railway as a Government work and not transfer it to a private company, why, after carrying it on as a Government work for four years, he closed his career as a Minister, and the Government of which he was a member, at the end of their four years experience, advertised all over the country for a private company to come and take over the whole of this work.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I will tell the hon. Minister what I will do. I think I have already answered the question satisfactorily, but I will answer it more fully, provided he will answer the question I have just put to him.

Mr. RYMAL. I presume that the second reading of this measure in relation to which the hon. gentleman has reopened the discussion on the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be acceded to, and think it is almost useless to present any piece of legislation to the House that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company desire, because it is a foregone conclusion that whatever they ask they will receive. I said last year when this matter was under discussion, that I thought the most dangerous feature of the whole thing as it then presented itself to my mind, was the absolute bondage in which the Syndicate held the Government, and as time has elapsed we have plenty of evidence that the Syndicate have only to express their desire, no matter what that desire may be, and it is immediately acceded to by the Government. If they wish to change the location of the line, that is acceded to; if they wish the legislation of a province to be ignored all they have to do is to instruct their secretary so as to intimate their wish to the Government and the legislation of a province is ignored at once, the autonomy of a province is destroyed; and I believe that this one thing will tend to a disruption of the whole Confederacy. I think there is pretty strong evidence that the Syndicate have only to ask that they may receive. Last night I saw their paid Secretary on the floor of this House, pompous and conscious of the strength that he possessed as a representative of that great Company, inflated with wine and infuriated with strong drink.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, oh!

Mr. RYMAL. After having bulldozed the Government, after having, as a representative of the Syndicate, demanded from them what they should not have acceded to; standing here, I say, conscious of his strength, after having bulldozed the Government, insulting Parliament by insulting one of the most prominent members of the Parliament of Canada, telling him his utterances were false, false, false; that it is not so, that it is bosh, bosh! What shall we come to if the paid Secretary of that Company, who is so conscious of the strength he possesses by being its servant, can come here with impunity and insult Parliament after having bulldozed the Government? I do not wonder much at the Government being bulldozed if my suspicions are correct, and I venture to say that the man is now living who will learn of some fearful disclo-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tures in the near or remote future, which will show that the hold which the Syndicate have upon the Government is what compels them to yield to every demand that the Syndicate may make. What is our country coming to when the representative of that Company may come on the floor of Parliament and insult the most prominent member of the whole House by giving him the lie direct, if not in so many words. I say it is a shame and a disgrace, and the Syndicate should be taught that their servants, at least, may not enter the people's House and insult the members when they are speaking upon a public question. The Government should blush to think that the representative of their masters had no better manners than that, and they should blush to think that they had sold the heritage of the people of Canada to a company who can so far forget, through its servants, what is due to the representatives of the people. But having robbed the people through the Government of their heritage I suppose they may add insult to injury. This is the first fruits of the infamous bargain they entered into last year, and when the full fruition of this bargain may be reached remains to be seen. I venture to predict that the time is not far distant when the country from one end to the other will shake off the insatiate grasp of this grinding monopoly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not intending to say anything, but I wished more particularly to bring up the conduct of one of the servants of the Company on the floor of this House, in order that public attention might be called to the impudent and insolent manner which this Syndicate assumes towards the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled. If the Government has been bulldozed I have no doubt there was good reason. I said a moment ago that I believe the time will come when disclosures will be made which will bring a blush of shame to the cheek of every man who has been connected with the concoction and carrying out of this infamous robbery of the Canadian people. How soon that may come remains to be seen. We know a few years ago things were going on smoothly, and the Tory party was so strong that they fancied they would have a long lease of power, but Providence, I trust it was, sent a stroke of lightning, and in a few months they were obliged to retire from the positions they had disgraced. I hope and trust that Providence, on behalf of the Canadian people, may send another stroke of lightning that will reveal some of the dark doings which I believe have taken place in connection with this transaction, for I believe the Government have done more to bring reproach upon the Canadian people and to rob them of their heritage than all other Governments combined. I asked a year ago of the hon. Minister of Railways the same question which has been put to him by the member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), why it was that a sudden change in the Government policy took place. When that is successfully explained to me, perhaps it will remove some of the ugly suggestions that have taken possession of my mind. I do not wish to leave Parliament and public life with the impression on my mind that any of our public men have been engaged in transactions which they are ashamed to explain. I think they should have taken Parliament into their confidence and told it why this sudden change of opinion took place. The hon. Minister of Railways will ease my mind by telling me why it was that he so suddenly changed his opinion as to the propriety of carrying on the construction of the Pacific Railway, as a Government work and giving it to a private company, and he will do much to remove some ugly impressions which have taken possession of me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise, for the purpose not of discussing the question which has been asked of me by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), and repeated by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, but for the purpose of explaining to

the House that I am unable to answer the question. The question asked is to state the time when and the reason why it was I changed my opinion from being in favor of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work and reverted to its policy of having it carried on by a private company, aided by the Government. The reason I am unable to state when that change in my opinion occurred is because no change ever did occur in my opinion. The reason I am not able to say why it occurred is because I have never held such an opinion. More than that I stated a year ago, when submitting the policy of the Canadian Government to the House, that it had been the invariable policy from the commencement down to that time of all parties in this House and country, that this work should be constructed as a private work aided by the Government. I may recall to the recollection of the hon. member for Westmoreland the fact that the Government of which he was a member gave the most conclusive testimony they could give that that was their opinion at the time, but I have only to turn up the speeches of the leader of the late Government to show that from the very inception of the work he declared he was compelled to deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway as a Government work, not because he desired to do so, but because all attempts to get it done by capitalists, aided by Government, had entirely failed, and the hon. gentleman consistently maintained the position and said again and again in this House that while compelled to proceed with it *ex necessitate rei* as a work in the hands of the Government, he would be prepared to revert to the policy of handing the work over to a private company. True to that policy the hon. gentleman as one of his last public acts published advertisements broadcast over the country inviting tenders and endeavoring to ascertain if a company of capitalists would undertake to carry out the work, take it out of the hands of the Government; finish the construction of the road and operate it. I will give to the House the most conclusive proof it is possible to give of the statement, but I never changed my opinion because I never entertained any other opinion than that it was most desirable that this work should be carried on by and in the hands of a private company aided by the Government. When I found myself in precisely the same position as the hon. member for Lambton was in when leading the Government, when I found as Minister of Public Works there was no possibility of proceeding with the work by any other mode than as a Government work and carrying it on as such, I was compelled to adopt that policy; but I will read to the House as the most complete answer to the questions of hon. members opposite the statement I made when I came down and asked the House to place 100,000,000 acres at the disposal of the Government to assure the carrying on of that work.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. That was in 1879.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In 1879. I am now stating the view I held, and it is the one I still maintain, was that when dealing with it as a Government work, and when asking the House to carry it on as a public work, I never changed my opinion. I said—I am reading from page 1894 of the 2nd volume of the Hansard of 1879:

"Exception may be taken to the appropriation of such a large extent of land for the building of this road, as exception was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to the appropriation of 50,000,000 acres of land, to be under the control of a company. We do not propose here to put the land under the control of a company, although I confess, so far as I am concerned, I would be glad, did the condition of things permit of it, if a company, liberally aided, could be found to take this work up, and, at their own responsibility and risk, carry it to completion. But, in the absence of that means of attaining our object, we believe we are right in placing in the hands of a Commission—in which the Imperial Government shall be with us, jointly represented—100,000,000 acres of land for the construction of the work."

I trust that the hon. member for Westmoreland has the fullest and most complete answer I can make to the ques-

tion he has asked. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will feel that it is not in my power to explain why I changed my opinion, for the best of all reasons that I never had but one opinion.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I suppose it will be admitted that the leader of the Government propounds and settles the Government's policy, and that the utterances of the leader will overshadow the private opinion of the Minister of Railways. Does the Minister of Railways mean to say that he repudiates the policy which was announced by his leader, who said:

"What the policy of the late Government would have been, we do not know * * * but when we came into office we decided to indicate it as a public work."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have explained to the hon. gentleman that there was no alternative but to take it up as a public work and carry it on as we were doing.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But the First Minister said: "when we came into office we decided to undertake it as a public work."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly, because nothing else could be done. The hon. member for Lambton did the same thing but he did not change his opinion.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What I mean to say is that we must look to the announcement of the leader of the Government. The opinion of an individual member cannot be taken. The policy of the Government must be taken from the leader of the Government. The Minister has not undertaken to make any announcement that the policy was changed. He may have had an individual opinion as to the policy of the Government but that could not affect the announcement as made by the leader.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister of Railways yesterday undertook most unnecessarily to run amuck in this House, to take hon. gentlemen on this side to task who had taken a prominent position in the debate on the Pacific Railway question last Session. I am sure, Sir, that on this side of the House the attack was entirely unexpected, but however we may regret that so much time has been so unexpectedly occupied we feel that our thanks are due to the Minister for having afforded us this unexpected opportunity to declare before the House and the country what our views upon this question were and what they are to-day. Why the hon. Minister said that we were afraid to repeat what we had formerly stated, why he imagined that we would willingly recede from the position we had occupied, why he chose to speak of the resolutions of last year as forgotten literature, it will be for him to explain; but the hon. gentleman knew that throughout the Lower Provinces of this Dominion, at all events, during the whole summer we called upon the people in every important centre to come and hear what the leaders of our party had to say upon the National Policy and upon the question of the Pacific Railway contract, and he must know well, Sir, because he undertook to reply to what the leader of the Opposition and other members said—what the topics discussed before the people of this country were. So long as the state of the weather permitted public meetings to be held we went in amongst the people. I will not say we went down amongst the people, because we are always down amongst the people, on this side of the House—and asked them to hear our explanations of the nature and character of this contract, and unless we were greatly mistaken in the impression of popular opinion, the people throughout all these Provinces, with scarcely an exception, joined in the condemnation of that contract which we asked them to censure and condemn. Mr. Speaker, a more extraordinary charge even the hon. Minister of Railways never chose to make against hon. members on this side of the House, than that they had forgotten or wished to forget or would shrink from

bringing before the public their conduct on this question. He chose to say that I as one who moved a resolution on this matter must have seen reason to believe that I was, at least, entirely mistaken in the resolution I proposed. That resolution was a very plain and simple one, and so far as I can judge of the effects of what has transpired during the past year the truth of the statements made and the value of the objections then urged have been very much strengthened and confirmed by what has taken place. I moved in effect, I believe, that in giving so large an amount in money and lands for the construction of the central portion of the Pacific Railway the Government was acting injudiciously and improperly. The amount given, as I find from the contract already referred to—and I shall not dwell upon it at length—was, for the 900 miles of the prairie section, \$10,000 a mile in cash. And I believe the hon. Minister referred to what had actually taken place and to the cost of construction of 100 miles through the swamps selected for the purpose, which was \$10,000 per mile, and this he said was allowance enough for the construction of the road through the prairie country. All that we have heard of the work in that part of the country goes to show that \$10,000 a mile is a very liberal allowance indeed. It is said the Syndicate is building a much better road than they were bound to do under the terms of this bargain or than the hon. Minister intended to construct when he degraded the character of the whole line, declaring that he would build a new colonization road, but still it is by no means an expensive road. I have been told by those who seem to be familiar with the manner in which the work is done on the prairies that it is of the simplest possible kind. A furrow or two is run on one side, and a furrow or two on the other side of the proposed road and then by means of a machine called a scraper the earth or gravel is thrown up into the centre and forms the road-bed, and that is in fact the mode of grading the whole of the road along the prairie section, except in some spots where it is more difficult. This may be an effectual process, but it is by no means an expensive one, and \$10,000 per mile for a railway so constructed is ample. But in addition to that we propose to give them 12,500 acres per mile of choice lands, the Syndicate having power to select it themselves, and laying right along the line of railway. For other parts of the country they might have to choose their lands some distance from the line, but in the prairie section they have it on either side of the road and if the land throughout the country is worth \$2 or \$3 an acre surely this must be worth \$3, \$4, \$5, in some cases even \$10, per acre. The hon. Minister of Railways told us that the land would sell at the nominal price of \$2.50; but owing to the liberal rebate allowed by the Syndicate, the real price to the actual settler will be \$1.25, that a rebate of one-half the price is allowed on conditions under which, however, in the opinion of nine out of ten of the practical men of this country it will be impossible for the settlers to become entitled to their land. It is said that it will be utterly impossible for a man going out there with the amount of capital that ordinary immigrants possess, to settle on the land, build a house for himself and shelter for his cattle, break up and cultivate his land, raise food for himself and family and for his cattle and bring eighty acres into actual cultivation within the time prescribed. By the modification of these terms lately made, it is said something will be allowed for the house the settler will build and that this will be taken into account in the calculation which will determine whether or not he is entitled to his lands; but in nine cases out of ten the settler will be unable to fulfil the conditions. There is another very important point which the hon. Minister of Railways, I suppose, chose not to speak of. It is this: that so far as we can ascertain, the Syndicate does not put all their lands upon the market. They withhold all town

Mr. ANGLIN.

sites, all mill sites, and all timber and mineral lands, and when the settler goes in to select land for settlement, he finds that his area for selection is very much narrowed, and that the Company retain so much valuable land subject to their own control, that it is absurd to estimate the value of the lands on the basis of the price the settler has to pay. The value of the lands, we know, is very much greater. We hear of enormous sums paid to the Syndicate themselves for town lots in the paper towns along the line of the railway, and we hear a good deal of the enormous sums which are extorted from some of the towns and cities by the extraordinary powers the Company possess under their charter, and the still more extraordinary powers they possess by their influence over the Government of this country. The hon. gentleman actually boasted that the Company had obtained \$200,000 from the city of Winnipeg, and \$60,000 from some other town. Why do the Syndicate extort these moneys from these people, who find themselves suddenly at their mercy, compelled to accept any terms the Syndicate like to impose, and compelled to pay money bonuses or surrender one-half or two-thirds of the lots in the town or city where the station is to be placed? Entirely because of this—that while the Syndicate are nominally subject, in the selection of their line of railway, to the control of the Governor in Council, they possess the absolute power of going where they please, and of saying to the people: "If you do not choose to submit to our terms, we will not carry the line of railway through your property, but ten or fifteen or twenty miles away." Why, Sir, it is impossible to calculate, at this moment, what the value of that land really is. Should the present extraordinary excitement continue, should the tide of population into that country go on as is anticipated, these lands will become very valuable. They are vastly more valuable to-day than they were when I spoke last year, they are vastly more valuable than they were two or three or five years ago, and some will be vastly more valuable four or five years hence, long before the Syndicate will have disposed of all of their lands. Well, Sir, were this a Government road, were these lands under the control of the Government still, were they to be disposed of by the Government on fair terms to actual settlers, the Government would obtain a large portion of the expenditure on this road, and we would have a people free and independent, and therefore able to contribute more largely to the revenue of the country than it is probable they will be able to do. Sir, the history of the last year has proved all this. If, as has been announced by the Minister of Railways, some 24,000 or 25,000 people have already this year gone into that country, the greater portion, I suppose, to settle in the country, all this goes to show that instead of over estimating the value of the lands last year, and the value of the bargain to the Syndicate, I entirely underestimated the value of the lands, and I did not put as strongly as I might have put the extraordinary character of this arrangement—an arrangement which gives to that Company a total of 11,250,000 acres of land over and above all that the road will actually cost them, all that it would have cost the Government if the Government had chosen to build it. It was said last year that this was given to them for two reasons. First, in order to furnish them with a basis of credit, and so enable them to carry on the work. The Minister of Railways did not take that position; that was the position taken by the First Minister. The Minister of Railways is fond of boasting of the ample means of the gentlemen who form the Syndicate. He is fond of telling us that the capital furnished by them is raised by themselves or on their own credit, and that they may go on expending untold millions in the same way; but we find that these gentlemen have not been very slow in getting \$25,000,000 of their land bonds placed on the market, and they are able to draw from the Government their share

of the cost as the work progresses; so that without calling at all on their own resources or their own credit, they have ample means not only to carry on this work, but also to purchase other roads in the country. They have become possessed of the Canada Central road, not by any payment of cash, but by a subscription of stock; and we heard lately of their purchasing the road on the other side of the river; and all this is pointed to by the hon. gentleman as evidence of their unlimited resources and their great credit. The people of this country have furnished them with means enough to do all they have yet done, and the probability is that as the work progresses they will have money enough to do all they have to do. Like a huge spider they are spreading all over this country. They are men of great energy, no doubt, who thoroughly understand the position of the country and their own position, and who are doing no more than they are perfectly justified in doing; but whether that is consistent with the well-being of this country, whether it is a state of things which the Government and the Parliament of this country should promote and foster is another question altogether. So much in defence of the position I took last year. I do not wish to speak at any length, but really, after the challenge the Minister of Railways chose to hurl at each one of us, he scarcely could have expected that we could do anything else than hurl defiance back and tell him that we are prepared to meet him on this question, or any other question, either before this House or before the electors of this country. It is amusing to hear the hon. Minister brag and boast as he did of his own wonderful achievements, and of all his policy had effected. You would suppose by that policy the whole of the North-West had been almost brought into existence, and had ceased to be a wilderness; that his restoration to office vivified that vast territory and inspired the whole people of the country to go in and possess themselves of the land. According to him Winnipeg was dead when the late Government was in office, and Winnipeg became alive, active and bustling when he returned to power. Winnipeg might have been hurt by the selection of Selkirk as the crossing place of the railroad and by the running of the line north of Winnipeg; but Winnipeg is not the whole North-West, and to the country as a whole it may not have mattered whether the chief town was at Winnipeg or Selkirk. For Winnipeg the present state of things is very much better. But, really, what ground is there for all this boasting in the hon. gentleman? Why does he seek in this manner to challenge enquiry into his whole conduct? Did he think his boasting would be allowed to go forth to the people as something the Opposition dare not contradict, knowing it to be well founded—boasting in his own grandiloquent way? We are not prepared to admit the truth of one-half or one-quarter of what he asserts, or that the late Government were lacking in energy, and failed to do all they should have done to open up the great North-West. We certainly admit he and his colleagues did do much towards opening it up. But what have the hon. gentlemen opposite done for the North-West? What is there to justify all their boasting and self-glorification? Years ago, on that side of the House, when the hon. Minister of Railways had no seat there, during the time of the Parliament of old Canada, if I have read the history of that time aright, the Liberal party were the party continually clamoring for the opening up of the North-West. They adopted the patriotic view that it should belong to the Provinces of North America, that the Hudson's Bay Company were usurpers, whose claims should not be recognized and that the country should be thrown open at once. I think they created that demand for that territory which finally effected so much. But I never heard of any Tory joining in that demand, or taking any special energetic steps towards opening up the North-West. It

was only after Confederation, only when the Imperial Government desired, for purposes of its own policy, to see all those countries formed into one confederacy, that the Tories suddenly awoke to the importance of the great North-West, which they then determined, for the first time, should be opened up. But they took a very extraordinary way of opening it up: instead of insisting, as they should have done, that the North-West did not belong to the Hudson's Bay Company, and that the British Government only had proprietary rights, and should compensate that Company for its claims, and hand over the territory without price to the people of Canada—and more than that that the Imperial Government should assist Canada, then struggling and not wealthy, in opening up and governing the North-West. That was the position taken by the late Mr. Howe, when the proposal was first brought up, and it was one in which he had the support of most Liberals. But hon. gentlemen opposite took a different course; they bought out the claim of the Hudson's Bay Company for £300,000 sterling. I said then, as now, that it was a mistake to pay that amount, but a greater mistake to allow them to retain 5 per cent. of all the lands in that territory. Next, those hon. gentlemen went to work and commenced the Dawson road. We do not hear them boast much of that work, though we hear something of the Fort Frances Lock. Nor do we hear much of the steamboats built up there, at that lock, which, I am told, are now nearly rotted, though they might have been very useful in opening that part of the territory, as might also have been the lock if properly looked after. What next did they do? They granted a Constitution to the North-West which recognized no rights on the part of the people, and which treated them as more worthless than the buffalo. It did not recognize in them rights in property possessed by themselves and fathers for generations; and hon. gentlemen opposite selected a Governor for them whom the people up there had learned to fear. The people were thus goaded into rebellion. Is that something of which hon. gentlemen opposite are proud? Will they recall the memory of those times with all the self-satisfaction and glorification which the hon. Minister of Railways likes to engage in? We had a rebellion and sent up an army to subdue the rebels. We had all the cost and glory, and we found the people there quailed before our armed force and showing a desire to be peaceable. I do not know that we treated them very well; they lost a large portion of their independence and were branded as rebels and outlaws; and it was not till the successors of hon. gentlemen opposite had time to deal with the subject, some time after, that peace was finally restored. Then they made with British Columbia this extraordinary bargain that we were to commence within a certain time and to complete within ten years a railway from the existing system of Canadian railways across the whole continent to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. PLUMB. The Americans did it in six years.

Mr. ANGLIN. If all the Americans were like the hon. gentleman they would build it in less time. We never thought that it was a thing we could do in six years, and hon. gentlemen opposite have been in office for more than six years since the day the bargain was made, and the road is not yet completed. They made that extraordinary bargain, and many times since they have endeavored to draw public attention from the nature of that bargain, because the hon. member for Lambton consented to the Carnarvon Terms. The hon. First Minister has said over and over again that by consenting to those terms, the hon. member for Lambton increased enormously the obligations of the country, seeking to excuse his policy by repeating that assertion—an assertion which is entirely contrary to the fact. Well, they made that bargain, and introduced a Bill to provide for the con-

struction of this railway. As we found out afterwards they passed also about the same time charters for rival lines. Their proposal then was, as it is now, to build, though on different terms, by means of a private company assisted by a subsidy of money and lands. They chartered a company which undertook the construction of that road, but failed. What then did they do to show this extreme energy, their great zeal for opening up the North-West. They had their surveying parties out it is true, and spent \$1,500,000 to \$1,750,000 in a work of surveying the North-West. During all the twenty odd months they were in power those men of unbounded energy and great ability did not locate a single mile of that railway. Nothing but the most scanty information was obtained by them. When the hon. member for Lambton was called upon to form a Government he had to meet this heavy obligation, and what support did he receive from hon. gentlemen on the other side? How was it that the very policy since pursued by the hon. gentlemen themselves, as the only policy under the circumstances, was attacked and derided by them. We all know how year after year the hon. Minister of Railways denounced the policy of the hon. member for Lambton, laughed to scorn his proposal to use water stretches, and demanded that an all-rail route should be commenced and completed from Nipissing to Nepigon and from Nepigon away across the prairie to the Pacific Ocean. Hon. gentlemen complain because we sometimes object to their policy. We are obstructionists, traitors to Canada, because we do not choose to agree with every thing they do. But during those years the hon. Minister of Railways never ceased to find fault with the policy of the hon. member for Lambton, never ceased to hold it up to the ridicule of the country. The hon. member for Lambton proceeded with his work, and as he came to the end of his term he was denounced for having done so little. The hon. gentlemen succeeded. What have they done? When the hon. member for Lambton went out of office he left the line between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg almost completed at both ends. He had surveys made over and over again so as to obtain the best possible route, through one of the most difficult countries in the world. There were difficulties to be encountered that perhaps might have been obviated. The railway was not completed as cheaply perhaps as it might have been, after some time had been devoted to the work of survey and examination, but it is very easy to be wise after the event. What did the hon. member for Lambton do then that he ought not to have done; where was he wanting in ability or energy? Did he not push this work forward in all directions? He put those sections under contract. It is now said he did so too soon. Perhaps he did. At all events we had not sufficient information. One of the results of the Commission of hon. gentlemen opposite which has acted as a boomerang in retorting upon themselves is that it has exposed their mode of doing business and defended in every possible respect the policy of the hon. member for Lambton.

Mr. BOWELL. You have not read the report.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have devoted a great many hours to the report, and I find that with every disposition manifest upon the part of those selected to bring in the hon. member for Lambton guilty of some dreadful malfeasance, they have not been able to do so. Every one of those old charges were revived; they fished for evidence in the endeavor to find something that would tell against the hon. member, but in vain. They are now making charges against the chief engineer, Mr. Fleming's mode of conducting the work, which was not at all to their satisfaction. They find great fault with him and all employed under him with regard to the work along those particular sections, and with the mode of letting those sections. Mr. Fleming has always maintained before Committees of this House

Mr. ANGLIN.

that letting the work by schedule rates, as was done, it made no difference in reality whether the actual quantities were ascertained nearly or not. They do not pretend to argue that the hon. member for Lambton, as Minister, was guilty of any improper conduct in acting upon the advice of his chief engineer in the matter, or that he wilfully did anything wrong, and their opinion as against that of the chief engineer, must just go for what it is worth. But this much was ascertained, that the quantities were not properly ascertained before the work was done; that the amount of work to be done, and actually done since, was largely in excess of their estimates; but as Mr. Fleming says, it does not matter much if it had been correctly ascertained what were the original sums calculated on the schedule rates. They would have been very much larger than they were, but the country has actually paid no more. But the hon. member for Lambton is now charged with having been too precipitate in letting these contracts, though at the time the charge was that he was not going fast enough. The continual cry in those days was that he was not going fast enough. But the hon. member for Lambton, when Minister of Railways, proved that he was in earnest. He pushed that work as fast as possible. When he had proof that the original surveys were defective he had new ones made. When he found it was necessary to alter the location of portions of the road that were let, he did not hesitate to alter them to points where the water-stretches might be utilized. He had surveyors all through that region and beyond the Rocky Mountains, to find out the most passable pass. No man in the Dominion has done more than the then Minister of Railways to secure a passage to the Pacific coast as far north as possible. The Minister of Railways was never tired of dwelling upon the value, extent and fertility of the Peace River district; he never tried upon the Ministry of that day the importance of constructing the road so as to open up that district. Well, the hon. member for Lambton seems to have had the same view; he appears, at all events, to have thought that the view might be well founded, for I find he surveyed the pass and made the greatest efforts to find a passage to the Pacific coast north of the Yellow Head Pass. Everything in fact was done that the Minister could do, whatever might have been the faults of the engineers employed on the works, to ascertain the best possible route to the Pacific coast, and to ascertain it as quickly as possible. Meantime the policy of the Government then, like the policy of the present time, was that it was desirable to open up the prairie region as soon as possible, that the first work to be done was to build as good a road as could be built with the easiest possible gradients, running from west to east, between Thunder Bay and Red River. Another work, the importance of which could not be over-rated, was the Pembina Branch, as a means of opening up the North-West Territory. Why was that not constructed at once? Simply because there was no railway with which to connect. The Northern Pacific Railway, as we all know, had become a failure, other roads up there had broken down, and therefore it was useless to push the Pembina Branch. But just as soon as there was a probability of being able to get railway connection the construction of that branch was pushed forward. As the hon. member for Brant said a while ago, not a man, woman or child in the North-West to-day has reached that country over a part of any railway built by the present Minister of Railways. Every one of them has gone in over the branch built by the hon. member for Lambton. In the old times it required eighteen or twenty days to go merely from the frontier up to Winnipeg. Now, Sir, a few hours will carry an emigrant to the North-West over the same road. And because facilities are greater to-day, because there is a railway system to-day by which you can take a car in this city and be carried in that car to Winnipeg, is the reason why we see such a

large number of emigrants going into that country. By whom were these facilities afforded, Mr. Speaker? Not by the Minister of Railways, who boasts that all the progress of the North-West is due to him and his colleagues, but by the hon. member for Lambton. Since then the depression which prevailed at that time has passed away, and it is not found possible to proceed with an all-rail route to Winnipeg. But, Sir, where are the grounds for all the boasting and the self-glorification to which we listened last night and at which the House was amused, and with which we might have been content to remain amused but for this, that we knew it was intended for the country, and there may be still some people in the country who, if these assertions had been allowed to pass unchallenged and uncontradicted, would have believed that the Minister of Railways had really some claims for their thanks for all that had been accomplished. But what has he really done? He found the sections between Thunder Bay and Red River completed and the railway located further on. He says he has made a further survey, that he has since obtained various improvements in the line. It is possible he has done all that, but the same thing was done precisely under his predecessor. But he had not the letting of these contracts. Now, the letting of these contracts, especially contract B, has caused more talk than the letting of all the contracts under the late Administration. There has been more said about it, whether rightly or wrongly, than about the contracts that have been let for the Canadian Pacific Railway. However, the contract was let and a way has to be provided for the expeditious completion of the work. Even this has not been quite successful, although he tells us that he intends to propose that the contractors shall be paid as they finish their work within the time they stipulate, provided the work be completed in the other time stipulated. Still, so far, the work has not been carried on as the Minister of Railways intended. But he has now been nearly four years in office. He took office when one of these sections was completed, another one nearly completed, and when facilities were afforded them for carrying on the work, when there was nothing more to be done but to let the works out to tenderers. Nearly four years have elapsed, and though he over and over again charged the hon. member for Lambton with delaying it, because he had not within five years succeeded in building the road from Lake Superior to Red River, the hon. gentleman himself, four years afterwards, finds it matter for boasting that he has succeeded in doing what my hon. friend had done five years previous. He takes all that has been done in five years, and he requires four years more to complete the work which he says should have been commenced and completed within five years. Such is the boasting of the hon. Minister of Railways. What else has he done towards opening up the North-West? Nothing as yet. Not an immigrant has yet passed over any section of the railway. But the hon. gentleman says: "Look at a contract let on the Rocky Mountains." Has that anything to do with opening up the North-West. Does any one imagine that that contract has brought a single settler into the North-West? But the crowning glory of the hon. Minister of Railways, is the making of the Syndicate contract, which he claims has changed the whole face of things, not only in the North-West but throughout Canada; and has altered the position of Canada in the eyes of the world and is the means of attracting here a flood of immigrants, of which we have seen not much as yet. We say that the contract is calculated to inflict incalculable injury on the people; that it is a contract which should never have been entered into; that it has not one good redeeming quality, and that it is irremediably and absolutely bad and objectionable. The Syndicate put their hands on the material and sold some of them, they have built 100 miles of railway through one swamp in order to avoid

another swamp, and some 150 or 180 miles on the prairie after the manner I have described. Was that the cause of all the prosperity we hear of? Has that done much towards carrying the people to the North-West? Would they not have been more willing to go if the policy of the hon. member for Lambton had been carried out, if the railroad had been carried, as it was intended it should be, not where it would prove the most profitable to the Company having the contract and having their own interests only in view, but where it would be most profitable to the people of the whole Dominion, and where it would open up most of the lands of the fertile region to settlement? If the railway had been built just as rapidly as was necessary, keeping not merely abreast of settlement, but far in advance, leading settlers into the wilderness, would not the people, knowing they had to deal with the Government, who were responsible to them as well as to the other portion of the people of the Dominion for the management of the road, knowing it would be free from monopoly, have been more ready to have gone into the country when it became opened as it now is rather than when they know that the road has been handed over to a Company which locates the line where it promises to be most profitable, which holds the best region under lock and key, the members of the Government being merely the jailors for the people of that country, refusing them the right to come out of it by any other means than the Syndicate choose to provide. We know that a much larger number of settlers, who will become the strength of the country, would, under those conditions, have entered the country than have done so under the present system. Hon. members who came to look at the matter from a common-sense standpoint, and people who have enquired, will agree with us on that point. Thus it appears that the glorification of the Minister of Railways, instead of being something respecting which they can boast, is, in reality, an act which they must really deplore, for the hon. gentleman has done nothing and the Syndicate has done very little. The Syndicate was to have commenced the Lake Superior section, but nothing has been done, the difficulties having been too great, and although it was supposed that the road would run along the Lake Shore rather than into the interior, that is now a matter entirely unsettled and undetermined. Carrying the line along the Lake Shore was, according to the Prime Minister, the very best thing which the Syndicate desired; but when the Company proposed to pass through the interior then the same hon. gentleman told the people of Ontario that one of the great advantages they would derive from the railway was the opening up of the vast timber region in that portion of the Province. Hon. gentlemen opposite vary their story from day to day, they take up our ideas one day and the next day claim them as their own. This was notable; the case in regard to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). Hon. gentlemen opposite also took credit for the change made in the standard of the railway; but they hardly knew what was meant at the outset, and our agitation of that point had the effect of producing a change in the policy propounded by the Company. The character of the undertaking had been altered somewhat, but as yet very slightly. I cannot resume my seat without entering my protest against the position taken by the hon. Minister of Railways with respect to the employment of Canadians on public works of the country. If 25 years ago, before we had any considerable experience of railways, objection had been taken to the introduction, not to one or two, but to a whole State of American officials, the Act might be held to be justifiable, but I can hardly imagine that the Minister of Railways himself understood how far he was carried away by excess of zeal on behalf of the Syndicate in this respect. He perhaps did intend to imply that we have not in Canada men acquainted with the management of railways,

and yet nothing else can be inferred from what the hon. gentleman said. He said: "Where in Canada is there a man having a salary as large as Mr. Vanhorn is getting." Mr. Vanhorn gets \$15,000 a year, and is, perhaps, worth it in the position he occupies. Perhaps there is nobody else in Canada getting so much, but can no man in Canada discharge the duties so well as Mr. Vanhorn does?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think there is a man in Canada with the experience and ability necessary for that position, and that is the reason the authorities who required the services of such a man go to the United States and pay \$15,000 to secure the one they want.

Mr. ANGLIN. That is *prima facie* evidence that he is a good man in the position he occupies, but it does not prove that the people of Canada are different in experience, intelligence, education or energy, or any of the qualities that would fit a man to fill such a position as creditably as does Mr. Vanhorn, and the hon. Minister holding the position he does ought not to insinuate that it does. He talks about our being unpatriotic. If we object to a single statement made on the other side, we are unpatriotic; if we doubt that there were so many millions of acres of fertile land in the North-West, we are accused of being unpatriotic; if, while we admit that we have a vast and fertile region in the North-West, we fail to accept the same exaggerated statements made with regard to it, we are told that we are unpatriotic. Yet, at the same time that the hon. gentlemen were crying "Canada for the Canadians," they believed in no Canadians except themselves and that Canada was all for them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that he is very much mistaken if he supposes that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not been desirous of obtaining the services of Canadian engineers. I may say that there is not an engineer of ability in my service I have not found it difficult to retain, in consequence of the greater inducements offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Smellie, who was the chief in the office here, was receiving \$3,000; they gave him \$4,000. Mr. Duncan, the division engineer in one of the most important sections, has been taken out of my hands—a Nova Scotia engineer, a man of ability and standing—because they are able to give him a much higher salary than I could offer.

Mr. ANGLIN. I was not at all finding fault with the Company. They are doing what they think best in their own interests. They give high pay for the services of those men they believe will serve them most efficiently; but what I am finding fault with is the way the hon. Minister replied to the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), that on this work a very large proportion of Americans are being employed. The hon. gentleman quoted a telegraphic despatch, that a number of conductors had been dismissed lately. The hon. Minister surely does not imagine that we have not men in Canada fit to be conductors; that we have not men in Canada with enough of brains and experience to fit them for such positions; that we turned out of positions the conductors, and Americans were put in their places, and the hon. Minister at once jumped to his feet—to defend the action of the Company, by saying that they had to procure the services of the best men wherever they could be found.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that the gentleman whom Mr. Vanhorn succeeded when they gave him this inducement to leave a road in the United States was an American, Mr. Stickney.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. gentleman, I am glad to see, tries to recede a little from the position to which he was hurried by his zeal. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) was pointing out the fact that under the control of the American influences that are paramount in the road

Mr. ANGLIN.

to-day Americans are being put into the places from which Canadians are removed, and he spoke in general terms of the principal positions being held by Americans, and the hon. Minister of Railways defended the conduct of the Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. ANGLIN. And more than that, he attributed to us Canadians the want of intelligence, ability and other qualities to fit men for these positions, and then he took the very extraordinary position that many of us are not Canadians at all, that those who have come here within five or ten or twenty or thirty years to throw in their lot with the people of this country, were no more Canadians than men who had crossed the line to accept employment and who would go back to the United States as soon as they could get better positions. He would have none Canadians except those who are born Canadians, and perhaps he would make it necessary that their parents should be Canadians also. It is not a matter of great importance, but I object to the statement made by the hon. Minister, after the long experience he has had in public life, after the experience he has had at the head of railway affairs in this country, that he is of opinion that we have not in Canada men to be trusted in such positions as that of Mr. Vanhorn. If he holds this opinion why does he not give this gentleman control of the very difficult portions of the road in his own hands. Why are Canadians put at the head of these most difficult parts of the road, if the plea is to be urged that we have no men to fill the easier ones under the Syndicate? He, as Minister of Railways, is carrying on the work in the infinitely more difficult portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I do not think that any one of us has ever asserted that he had not ability to fill the position which he holds, though a Canadian; and I do not know, Sir, that we are inclined to charge any gentleman employed under him with want of ability, though they are Canadians, one of them I believe, however, being an Englishman who came here ten or fifteen years ago, hoping to become a Canadian. The real hard part of the work, the contract through the Rocky Mountains and the Cascade Range, is entrusted to Canadians, but it seems that no one has the ability to carry on the work on the prairie section. We object also very strongly to the extraordinary power possessed by the Syndicate over the Government, and through the Government over the Parliament of this country. The complaint made by the hon. member for Wentworth was a well-founded one. The man who so misconducted himself here last night would never, twelve months or two years ago, no matter how full of wine, have displayed the gross malevolence which he did towards the leader of the Opposition. He was inflated, not merely with wine, but with his sense of power. He who had to convey the will of his masters to the Government on the opposite side, naturally thought, when he was a little elevated, that he was at liberty to come into this Parliament and attempt to browbeat the leader of the Opposition while engaged in the discharge of his duties to the people of this country. It was an exhibition that we all deplored, and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite deplored it as much as we did, but they did not resent it, not as servants against their masters, but as the manifestation of the power which to-day controls the legislation of this country. How does their Secretary, writing to the leader of the Government, express himself? He says:

"In the negotiations which preceded the contract, your Government at once conceded the principle that the same protection which it would have claimed for itself in respect of lines on the interest of United States railways, if it had built the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be granted to this Company."

He goes on to say, with reference to the railways which were chartered in Manitoba:

"They are directly in conflict with the declared policy of the Government, with the conditions of the contract of the Company with the

Government, and with the terms of the charter which had been granted to it."

Well, Sir, I find that after this letter goes through the ordinary routine of being reported upon by Mr. Schreiber, and in turn by the Minister of Railways, the charter is disallowed; but before it is disallowed, the question goes before the Minister of Justice, and I think the statement made by the Minister of Justice on behalf of the Government, should be held up as soon as possible and as strongly as possible to the reprobation of the people of this country. He says that in an Order in Council previously passed and forwarded to the Government of Manitoba, this extraordinary principle was propounded:

"The Government think it very desirable that all railway legislation shall originate here, and that no charter for a line exclusively within the Province of Manitoba should be granted by its Legislature, without the Dominion Government first assenting thereto."

If that is good doctrine for the Province of Manitoba, it is good constitutional doctrine for Ontario and Quebec, and it lays down the broad principle that we have seen so much of lately, in attempts to tighten the control of the Federal over the Provincial Governments. If this doctrine is laid down, then hereafter no Provincial Legislature must venture to legislate on any important railway matter without first obtaining the assent of the Dominion. This is almost equal to what was known in the old time as Poyning's Act—an Act which required that every Bill presented to the old Irish Parliament should emanate from the English Government, or first go to the English Government for its consent. Another letter from the Secretary of the Company has been placed in my hands, in which he requests the Government to consent to a change of the location of the line of railway from Portage la Prairie to the crossing of the Assiniboine River. They simply intimate to the Government that a particular change of location, made entirely for their own benefit, is necessary to be sanctioned, and forthwith the Government of this country ratify the decision of the Syndicate. Taking all these things into consideration, I do think, Sir, that we are placed in an extraordinary position; but I have this consolation, that I think the hon. Minister of Railways probably wishes in his heart by this time that he had confined himself to his statement with regard to the progress of the work on the Pacific Railway, and that he had not attempted to slash and cut down, right and left, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I wonder if he fancied that we were afraid to discuss this matter. I wonder if he thought that we would allow his criticisms of these resolutions to pass, so that by-and-by he might stand up at public meetings and say: "I said so-and-so in the Parliament of Canada, before these hon. gentlemen, and they did not contradict me." If the hon. gentleman made any calculation of that kind, he finds himself greatly mistaken. We have dared to contradict him, and we tell him that we denounce this contract as injurious to Canada, subversive of the interests and the liberties of the people of Canada, and we will be delighted to go before the people of this country and ask them to condemn the men who imposed this bargain upon them. The people will condemn them, and hon. gentlemen know that amongst their own friends, who for other reasons support them, this charter is not approved of—that it was not approved of by many hon. gentlemen opposite who were induced to support it last year; but the remonstrances and the censures of the people of this country will not so easily be set aside or suppressed. I trust the people will soon speak, and speak loudly, plainly, intelligently and honestly—speak as people who love their country, who are true-hearted and truly intelligent—people who detest mismanagement and who will never be willing to become the tools of a policy which is calculated to involve their country in such difficulties and misfortunes. The country will speak, and we, on our side, have no doubt as

to what its utterance may be. Hon. gentlemen opposite may hope they will take the country by surprise and snatch a verdict in their favor. But I believe they will not be able to snatch a verdict or to come back and boast of a majority. Some of them will come back, but when they do we shall not hear any such boasting and glorification and great distortion of facts such as we have listened to last evening, and such as we were compelled to occupy nearly all this day in refuting and rebutting.

Mr. CASEY. I think, like the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that the Minister of Railways is perhaps rather sorry for having excited this discussion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How can you think he is sorry?

Mr. CASEY. Considering the amount of the hon. gentleman's shortcomings it would be hard to say when he could be sorry enough. The words, devilish ingenuity, was used by him in describing the manner in which this amendment was drawn, and that word may become after his use of it, a proper parliamentary expression, but I do not impute that phrase to the policy of the hon. member in challenging this discussion. But I think, on the other hand, his intention was excellent, perhaps, to carry off a triumph by challenging a discussion that he thought would not come on; but the contrary has been the result and his plan has miscarried. I think it was the duty of everyone who attached his name to any of the amendments of last year to meet the hon. gentleman's challenge, and show whether he held to his sentiments and was prepared to meet his constituents on the motion to which he set his name. During this discussion it has been plainly shown that many of the evils then foretold have come to pass. The hon. gentleman claims great credit, because some of these evils have not yet come to pass; but the fulness of time has not yet arrived for the culmination of those evils. He has not told us, however, that a single evil we then predicted has been shown to be impossible, or improbable. That being the case the balance of the whole discussion is in our favor and against the policy of the Minister of Railways. If part of our predictions have come true, the rest is likely to be realized, which casts the balance in our favor. Take the question of monopoly in the North-West; it has been clearly shown that monopoly has existed, and in a sense that nobody anticipated when the Syndicate contract was before the House, and which the leader of the Government said could not exist. In that respect our predictions of evil have been more than verified. The Minister of Railways attempted to do away with the force of an objection with regard to this monopoly by showing that the local rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway was in some cases the rates of other roads owned by private parties. He admitted, of course, that those rates were higher than they would have been if this had been a Government road. He let us take the case without considering the question of what the rates would have been on a Government road, and for the sake of his comparison with other railroads he gave us only local rates of roads whose length was only 145 miles, in other words, the whole completed line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Emerson to Brandon. But he forgot to tell us what is really the fact that while other railways give through invoices at vastly reduced rates, the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the simple reason that it has no competitor gives through rates very little less, if anything less, than local rates. The local rates are also the through rates and are vastly higher than those of any other railway of the same length. Of course through rates as a rule are very much lower than local rates, and for what reason? Simply because on through traffic railroads have competition. In this case the railway has no competition, and has no object in charging a lower rate for a car of wheat from Brandon for Montreal than

from Brandon for Emerson. It must go over their line to Emerson, in any case. Therefore, the exporter of grain from Manitoba and the Manitoba importer of merchandise have to pay as much for their freight over these 145 miles as they would have if only using the line from Emerson, instead of going 100 miles further. The hon. gentleman's comparison is utterly fallacious and should not have been brought up in serious discussion. Then he discussed the price we are paying for this road. He enlarged at very great length and with his usual verbosity and eloquence, with that vigor and force and fire which he puts into everything he utters on the vast prosperity of that country, and I am bound to say, from what I personally know of it, that he has scarcely spoken in too high terms of its prosperity. It would be almost impossible to overrate the prospects of a country that is having railroads built through at an extraordinary rate, and which contains the most fertile lands in America, if not in the entire world. I quite concur in these praises; it would be unpatriotic to deny these facts. But he ascribes this vast prosperity, this sudden and wonderful increase in the value of the lands of the North-West to the fact that the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was let to the present Syndicate. Hon. gentlemen then tell us that it was in consequence of the Syndicate bargain that prices of land had so gone up. He must know that in such a statement he was misleading the House. It is not the bargain with the Syndicate which has caused the tide of prosperity to flow in there; that had begun and was already progressing at a very rapid rate while the Government had control of the road. It had begun when the hon. gentleman's predecessors had let the contract for the road from Emerson to Winnipeg, and grown in volume every year with increasing knowledge of the country; and when the Government declared their policy of building a line across the prairies, at the rate of 100 miles a year or more which was then considered a very rapid rate, this boom certainly took a new impetus. If the hon. gentleman had gone on building the road as a Government road, the boom would have been as great and as enduring and have reached as high a culminating point as it now seems likely to do. But there would have been one grand difference, the profits arising out of the enhanced value of the lands sold would have inured to the Government instead of to this private Company, and the settlers would have had to deal with the Government, whose interest it is to get the country settled, instead of with a company which is only a land speculating company. Let us look for a moment at the enhanced value of the lands caused by the building of the railway. The hon. Minister must know that farm lands close to the railway are now held by private parties at \$8 or \$10 an acre. The land sales at Birtle in the early part of this month, averaged nearly \$4 an acre cash, and the choice lands sold at from \$4 to \$7, and this at a distance of 60 or 70 miles from the track of the railway. The hon. First Minister referred to those sales the other night in congratulatory accents, and said the Opposition would be surprised to hear what prices these lands had brought; the Opposition were not surprised, but gratified to know that their predictions of last year had proved true as to the prices the Government could have got for the 25,000,000 of acres, had they kept them in their own hands. If we take the Birtle lands alone at an average of \$3.50 an acre, we have eighty or ninety million dollars for the 25,000,000 acres of land, but if we take the higher prices which lands close to the railway are worth, say \$6 an acre, we have \$150,000,000 as the price for that land grant; and this does not include the enormous sums that the Canadian Pacific Railway have been receiving from the sales of town sites. The plot of Brandon alone, with the additions made to it, must have netted the Syndicate more than \$1,000,000. This boom which is taking

Mr. CASEY.

place in land, instead of being a cause of congratulation to hon. gentlemen opposite, is a standing disgrace to their power of foresight in making the contract. There is no doubt that one feeling which urged supporters of the Government to accept the Syndicate bargain was that they would thereby have something like finality in this contract, that they would know what they were going to pay for the railway. This expectation has been destroyed, there is no finality under the terms of the contract. Instead of the finality we were to have we have been landed in a wider sea of uncertainty than we were before, because while the construction of this road was in our hands his conduct was noticed more closely, more closely watched by his supporters and by the country, than when he is simply acting as the adviser of the Government in making a private arrangement and giving knowledge which he is authorized to give by the terms of this contract. In fact, Sir, the manner in which the Government have acted towards this Company is the most disheartening thing in connection with the whole contract. So far from Government acting as a controlling power over the Company, we find the Company acting as a controlling power over the Government. Instead of the actions of the Company being watched by the Government in the interests of the country, the actions of the Government are carefully watched by the Directors of the Company in their own interests. Even on the Railway Committee, when private Bills with regard to other railways are up, we have seen the solicitor of that Company sitting beside the Minister of Railways and dictating to him from time to time what policy the Government should assume with regard to other private railways. We have seen the result of that domination in the disallowance of those local charters about which so much has been said. We have seen in the grants of timber which have been made in territory which we do not yet know whether it belongs to this Dominion or not. We have seen it in the proposal to allow the Company to shorten its route in order to diminish the subsidy it will have to pay. We have seen it in a hundred instances, and as challenges are in order I must challenge the Minister of Railways to name one instance in which this railway have asked anything of any importance and had it refused to them. If such has been the case we will all be glad to hear of it. In fact the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Rymal) was too limited in the scope of his remarks when he called the hon. gentleman who was at your left last night the servant of his masters, meaning the Railway Company. I think those masters have many servants, and the opinion is certainly borne out by the whole course of the Government since last year, showing as it does that the most obedient of their servants are the members of the Government of this country. In fact, they are extending their influence over the whole railway business of Canada. They are constantly using their influence to make themselves more wealthy and more powerful than we ever imagined they could be, and tending to make themselves the dictators of this country. The real power behind the Throne, which regulates the action of the Government in connection with all railway business, appears to be the influence, of whatever nature it may be, if it is not political influence, of this gigantic cry of railway men and land speculators.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

99. Public Buildings in Prince Edward Island.....\$3,600

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,
Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$600 asked for the Charlottetown Marine Hospital is to meet a balance on the contract that has been given.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. Minister explain about this \$5,000 asked for the Summerside public buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For a Custom House and Post Office in place of the present old building. We pay over \$300 per annum rent., and the buildings, which are very old, do not belong to the Government. I think the new building will be brick.

100. Public Buildings, N.B.....\$84,000

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). \$10,000 were voted last year to the St. John Marine Hospital; \$15,000 additional were asked. Will that gross amount complete the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The estimate is \$25,000 for the whole. The ground is the property of the Government. It is proposed to go on with the work this summer.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The cost of the building for the Woodstock Post Office and Custom House will not exceed \$10,000, and that of the land \$3,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Woodstock, I believe, is an inland port, and it is somewhat unusual in some cases to erect special buildings for Custom House purposes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The value of the exports is \$65,000, imports \$58,000.

Mr. IRVINE. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work this summer, and what kind of building is it proposed to erect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to go on this summer as soon as the plans are prepared. The building is intended to be all stone. With respect to St. Stephen's Post Office and Custom House, \$15,000, I may state that the population is a little less than 3,000; Postal revenue, last year, \$12,000; Customs, \$46,000; exports, \$96,000; imports, \$368,000; value of goods entered for consumption, \$320,000. With respect to Sussex Post Office and Custom House, the population is 3,584; the Postal revenue about \$1,500. The intention of the Government is to proceed with the building as soon as the vote is obtained.

Mr. CASEY. Has the hon. gentleman a return of collections made at this port?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not in the surrounding country. I have only a statement for Sussex; the amount is \$3,000.

Mr. CASEY. But as the hon. Minister proposes to put up a building costing \$12,000 for a population of 1,000, and to collect a Customs revenue of \$3,000 it certainly seems a very extravagant estimate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so. It is a place that is increasing and will increase. It is an important place, and will yield a large revenue.

100. Moncton Post Office and Custom House..... \$15,000

Mr. SNOWBALL. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the necessity for Post Office accommodation at Newcastle. The trade of the port is very largely increasing. The town is a very thriving one, and with the benefits of railway communication and the increasing lumber trade it is growing very rapidly. The hon. Minister visited the place last summer, and I have no doubt his

attention was called to the need of Post Office accommodation.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I suppose the \$15,000 does not represent the whole amount of the expenditure. Property is very dear on the main street, and it will cost considerable to get a good site.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know that the place is a thriving one and will increase largely. It is calculated that \$2,000 will pay for the site, and the balance of the vote is to be expended on the building. That will be enough, it is expected, to finish the building.

Mr. ANGLIN. Bathurst had the honor last year of a visit from the hon. Minister. He found the town not a very large, but a thriving one, a great deal of business being done at the port. The Post Office and Custom House are very much separated, and I have no doubt the hon. Minister's attention was called to this.

Mr. KILLAM. I would like to ask whether, in cases where new post offices are to be built, it is the intention to pay the postmasters by salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman. If he will renew his question when the hon. the Postmaster-General is here, he will, no doubt, receive an answer.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think that the postmasters in all these places are paid by salary.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would like to ask whether there is any change in the contractors?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The original contractors were four brothers named McManus, but one of them died, one, I believe, left the country, and one lost his health so that he could not continue the work. The one who remained, the active partner, asked to be recognized as the contractor, and the Governor in Council agreed to that.

100. Dorchester Penitentiary \$25,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the total expenditure upon this penitentiary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were \$270,000 besides this \$25,000. The total amount will be \$380,000.

Mr. CASEY. Will this vote be used for enclosing the grounds so as to do away with the necessity of keeping so large a number of guards?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; a separate vote will have to be taken for that in another year.

101. Public Buildings, Quebec.

Lévis Fortifications and Military Buildings.....	\$ 2,500 00
Quebec Fortifications	15,000 00
Dufferin Terrace—To complete.....	6,000 00
Quebec Citadel	15,000 00
Quebec Examining Warehouse	20,000 00
Securing cliff under Citadel, &c., Quebec—To complete.....	2,500 00
Cartridge Factory for Small Arms, Quebec.....	2,300 00
Three Rivers—Fitting up old Barracks for Public Offices	4,900 00
Sherbrooke Post Office, Custom House, &c	20,000 00
Montreal Inland Revenue Building—To complete additions to and alterations of	9,800 00
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary	8,750 00
Hull Post Office and Inland Revenue Offices.....	9,000 00
St. Helen's Island Military Buildings.....	2,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$2,500 for Lévis Fortifications and Military Buildings is for repairs. The vote of \$15,000 for Quebec Fortifications is to continue the renewal of the walls that was begun some years ago. The sum of \$6,000 is asked to complete the Dufferin Terrace. We have not rebuilt the whole, but the lower portion of the wall between the buttresses has been filled in with timber painted the same color as the stone, which was done to save expense, and when we have more money we will replace some of that timber work with stone.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is the work on these fortifications done by public tender, or by day labor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We began by calling for public tenders and by giving the work to the lowest tenderers; but the work was delayed a good deal by strikes, and for a time we tried to keep up the work ourselves, but it cost us much more than if we gave it to a good contractor and paid him well for it. So we finally adopted the system of calling for tenders from ten or twelve of the best masons, and giving the work to the lowest tenderer. The next vote is for the Quebec Examining Warehouse.

Mr. CASEY. Does the vote for the Citadel include anything for armament?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; only the walls. We would require \$25,000 for that purpose; but we propose \$10,000 for next year.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will that put them in thorough good order?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think another \$10,000 will. As to the Quebec Examining Warehouse, we have no Government building. We have a number rented from the town, old and unsafe. We think it better to have a Government building on Government land, and I think we will require \$10,000 more. The next item as to secure the cliff under the Citadel, \$15,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I observe this is to complete the work; what has been its total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$35,000. With regard to the item of small arms, \$2,300, we had a previous vote of \$2,000 for heating apparatus, for additional machinery, repairs in the central section, &c.

Mr. CASEY. Will that finish the building to be used as a cartridge factory?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$6,000 will be wanted. The vote for Three Rivers public offices is to repair and make the buildings complete.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Are these works done by tender?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Does the item of \$10,000 for the Sherbrooke Custom House complete that work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it will complete the old building, including the fittings and furniture.

Mr. CASEY. The cost will be \$35,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be nearly \$40,000. We have a balance in hand of \$14,000, and there is required to complete \$24,000. We are asking \$20,000, leaving over \$5,000 to next year.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation as to the population of Sherbrooke, and the collections at Sherbrooke.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The population is 7,227; Postal revenue, \$7,220; Customs \$46,678; Excise, \$49,600; Weights and Measures, over \$1,000; total exports, \$154,000; imports, \$779,000; entered for consumption, \$778,000. With regard to the Montreal Inland Revenue building, to complete additions and alterations, we had two votes, \$9,000 in 1881, and \$10,000 in 1882, and we need \$8,800; the total will be a little over \$24,000. With regard to the item St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, \$1,000 will go towards providing offices for the stores, and \$500 for tools for the carpenters, &c.; repairs to prison and buildings, \$600; cast-iron fence and gates, \$350; temporary wooden building for storehouse, \$600; salaries to clerks, keepers and trade instructors, \$3,000. With regard to the Hull

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Post Office and Inland Revenue Office, \$9,000 will be wanted. A site has been donated. It will require a little more to complete the work, probably \$2,500.

Mr. ANGLIN. What is the population of Hull?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not quite 7,000. The vote for St. Helen's Island is for repairing the military buildings—this completes the work.

102. To defray expenses in connection with public buildings in Ontario \$196,025

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would have been glad if the hon. gentleman would have allowed that to stand till the member for West Durham was present, as he wanted to speak on it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He will have abundant opportunities.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad to see the Government are allowing \$20,000 for the Belleville Post Office and Custom House. I think the lot there is a suitable place, and there is a decided want felt for the construction of the building in which the Post Office, Customs, Inland Revenue and Weights and Measures may be all combined. I have no doubt the hon. Minister of Customs will see that the building is suitably put up and is worthy of the city which he hails from, a city which, I think, will compare favorably with any other in the Province.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost will be \$48,000, of which \$5,500 will be for the land. I am now asking for \$20,000 of that sum, and next year we will have to ask for \$15,000 more. The land was purchased last year for \$37,000. The \$40,000 will be towards the erection of the building, which will cost, when finished, over \$200,000. That will include the Post Office, Custom House, Inland Revenue and Weights and Measures. The Stratford Custom House will require \$13,500, and we may have to ask for two or three thousand more next year. St. Thomas, \$20,000—this is for the Post Office and Custom House. The whole amount required will be \$40,500. The land alone cost \$7,000.

Mr. CASEY. I notice that this is exactly the sum which is put down to Cornwall and Brockville and a number of smaller places. Now, St. Thomas is a city of over 20,000 inhabitants, and is growing much faster than some of these smaller towns. Now, we must come to one of two conclusions, either Cornwall with its population of 4,300 is getting too much, or St. Thomas of twice the size is getting much too little. St. Thomas is a place more strictly comparable to Belleville and ought to have a sum corresponding to the allocation for Belleville. If \$40,000 is too much for Cornwall I think you ought to give \$90,000 to St. Thomas.

Mr. ARKELL. I give credit to the hon. member for West Elgin for being so solicitous for St. Thomas. I have been working this to-night pretty well, and I am quite willing to leave it in the hands of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose by working it up the hon. member must refer to those little transactions which took place last summer, although I do not for a moment suppose those reasons could have influenced the hon. Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman has seen fit to make another allusion to the matter which came before the Committee at a previous meeting in regard to my trip to Ontario last summer having been made at the expense of the country, I will now take the opportunity to reply to the insinuations then made. The hon. gentleman stated that I was travelling in a special car and was attended by a man with gold lace, and that I had a steamer at my disposal. I may say now that it was so late the other evening that I could not answer the hon. gentleman, and I did not desire to prolong the debate. But I am

bound to inform this Committee now and the hon. member who made the accusation, and who, I regret to say, is not present, that the special car was placed at my disposal by the Great Western Railway Company free of charge, that it did so in compliment to myself as a representative of my Province and of my race and a member of the Government. I need not speak of the steamer, because the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) truly stated that all the cost of that excursion on the river was paid by my friends, Reformers and Conservatives, in that region. I may add now that the Grand Trunk Railway Company also placed their special car at my disposal under the same circumstances; and that none of these cars in which I travelled in Ontario cost the country a single cent. The journey cost no one anything, but myself in the work, anxiety and fatigue which I experienced. I think that even the most robust of the hon. gentlemen opposite would have been considerably fatigued had they been obliged to undergo the same journey. Now we come to the next item, the St. Catharines Post Office and Custom House, \$16,500. The total amount voted for St. Catharines in 1881 was \$6,000; in 1882, \$15,000; and \$16,000 is now asked for, making a total of \$37,500. \$16,000 will be required. At Chatham the work would cost \$40,000. We have \$8,000, and \$20,000 is now asked for. London Post Office would require for minor improvements, \$7,500.

Mr. KILLAM. On what principle are applications for Custom Houses and Post Offices granted? In many cases Custom Houses and Post Offices are being provided in towns which are not so important as others which are entirely neglected. In regard to the salaries of postmasters, it may not be known that the Post Office Act fixes the salaries of postmasters in different towns on a certain fixed principle, that is they are paid 40 per cent. of the receipts, taking the average receipts for a number of years. In some towns allowances are made for fuel and light, but in certain cities where buildings are provided by the Government, fixed salaries are paid to the postmasters.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the attention of the Department is called to a want of public buildings at any place, I send an officer to examine the facts or I go myself. Last summer I visited Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces, especially such points as were stated to require public buildings. I informed myself about the wants of the different localities. When I found public buildings were required I reported the fact to my colleagues, and the result is seen in the Estimates before the Committee.

Mr. KILLAM. Then no comprehensive system has been adopted by the Government, but only such places as the hon. Minister has seen fit to visit received the benefit of his attention. He has not taken the trouble to look at large over the Dominion and has visited some places of minor importance to others that have been omitted.

103. Public Building in Manitoba..... \$87,500

Mr. HOOPER. The Immigration Office at Emerson is not worth \$400 or \$200, but I observe that last year \$400 were voted to complete it. The immigration shed is altogether too small, and a further sum should be placed in the Estimates for buildings for the accommodation of immigrants and an immigration office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not expect the hon. gentleman to put a question about the Estimates of last year. If he wishes the information, I shall be happy to give it to him on concurrence. So far as I am informed there is an officer there maintained by the Department and one agent, and the shed has been enlarged.

103. Manitoba Penitentiary..... \$32,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is for the heating apparatus and for alterations in the cells and the roof and blinds and charges. Authorized but not paid for, \$3,000.

103. Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg..... \$30,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to continue the contract given last year. \$90,000 was stated as the expected cost, but I think we will have to ask a thousand and more on account of the increase in labor and material.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How is it that we are obliged to build Parliament Buildings for Manitoba.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the other Provinces came into Confederation they had their Parliament Buildings and these were allowed by the Federal Government to be used by the Province. As Manitoba was a new Province and had no buildings, Parliament last year voted a sum for the purpose of constructing public buildings and a residence for the Lieut.-Governor.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The cost of the Lieut.-Governor's residence was expected to be \$55,000, including furniture, but I think we shall have to have more owing to the increase to which I have referred in labor and material.

Mr. CASEY. There is no vote this year for the Post Office in Winnipeg. We know by bitter experience that the Post Office accommodation there is not good and that letters are much delayed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We intend doubling the Post Office, and putting in two doors so as to allow a separate exit and entrance. The Government has also under consideration the project of building an entirely new building.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There seems to be a very serious deficiency in the accommodation for immigrants, and some of the hardships suffered by people going into that country have, no doubt, resulted from this. I would like to know if any improvements are to be made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government is increasing the accommodation of the immigrant sheds throughout the West, and we will have in the Supplementary Estimates a sum of money voted for that purpose.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that by following the example of enterprising hotel proprietors in Winnipeg and erecting large tents they could accommodate immigrants perfectly well for the summer, and avoid the delay that would be caused by putting up buildings.

Mr. TROW. I would like to ask if there are any regulations as to the time when immigrants shall remain in the sheds.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that that is a matter that can best be regulated on the spot. Immigrants are sent on with the land guides as soon as they have ascertained definitely where their lots are.

Mr. TROW. I spoke of this because I know of cases of persons remaining in the immigrant sheds while the head of the family was off working, the people occupying rooms in the immigrant sheds to the detriment of others more deserving.

104. Public Buildings, North-West Territories..... \$15,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to keep up the buildings and prevent them from being destroyed. There is \$10,000 re-vote for the lunatic asylum.

105. Public Buildings, British Columbia..... \$38,000

In reply to Mr. BUNSTER,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For a quarantine station, at Victoria \$5,000 is asked by the Minister of Agriculture,

in order that the Province of British Columbia may have the same facilities in this respect as the other Provinces. The vote of \$16,500 for British Columbia Penitentiary is for general repairs, including a new flooring, a heating apparatus and an hospital for contagious diseases. For a Post Office and Custom House at New Westminster \$11,500 is asked, and \$4,000 or perhaps \$5,000 more will be required.

Mr. CASEY. It does not seem prudent to spend such a large sum at New Westminster in view of the size of the place, and also in view of the fact that the great-city of that district will be a few miles from that point, at Port Moody, the terminus of the railway.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a contract last year for the work.

107. Public buildings, repairs, furniture, heating,
&c..... \$255,300

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The increased number of buildings in the Dominion makes the claims on this vote greater every year, and therefore we have to ask for \$165,000 this year for outside buildings, though hon. gentlemen will remember that when we had the workshops this vote amounted to \$225,000, and sometimes more; so that there is a saving now of \$55,000 or \$60,000. We ask for \$6,000 for the Parliament grounds, as \$4,000 was not sufficient, the expenditure last year having been \$5,924.

Mr. ANGLIN. What is to be done with the beautiful fountain in front of the main building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a question whether that basin should be there, or whether it would not be better to have two fountains, one at each side, and leave the place where the present fountain stands as open ground. Until that is decided, I think it better not to purchase a fountain.

108. To defray expenses in connection with the
harbors and rivers in Nova Scotia..... \$583,000

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to make one or two observations before the hon. member makes his explanations, as I want to refer to a few matters not mentioned before, and perhaps he will be able to answer me. Is there any general principle of public policy upon which these grants are given for wharves and breakwaters; are engineers sent impartially to the different parts of the Province in reference to these expenditures of the public money, or are they sent, and is money voted to those counties that happen to send representatives here to support the Administration? At the time of Confederation there was a question as to whether these piers should receive grants from the Dominion Government at all or not. Most of them have been constructed by grants from the Government of Nova Scotia, and the people conjointly. They were situated in districts inhabited by fishermen and seafaring people not able to keep them up. I think, in 1871 or 1872, the policy was adopted to give grants for the maintenance of those breakwaters, and in some instances for the construction of new ones. I, myself, during the previous Administration was able to get a number of grants for work of this kind in my county. Since I have made application, by petition and otherwise, to the present Administration, but never have been able to get any. I think it is proper the enquiry should be made, upon what principle these votes are given—whether the Government is justified and whether the public expects it to use the public money for the purpose of influencing the different counties in the Dominion favorably towards them or in the case where a county is represented by a member opposed to them, in attempting to punish those people for not having sent a representative to support the Administration? I think I can give a case in point. Previous to the election of 1878, in my own constituency, I had succeeded in getting the Minister of that day to set apart, out of the

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

general sums voted for breakwaters, two amounts for two places in my constituency.

Mr. BOWELL. Was that just before the elections of 1878?

Mr. BORDEN. I said before that it was. That will prove the position I am now taking.

Mr. BOWELL. It proves that is the principle on which your friends acted.

Mr. BORDEN. Two sums of \$500 each was set apart for two harbors—Baxter's Harbor and Pickets Harbor, and the engineer had recommended the expenditure, having visited the localities, but after the election, as soon as the change of Government took place, I was informed that the grant had been cancelled. Now, I think there is a case in point. Those expenditures were justifiable and they should have been carried out. But it seems because there was a change of Government, because my constituents happened to elect me opposed to the present Administration, they were to be punished by striking out these grants. At that time I called the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact, not the present hon. Minister, but the member for Cumberland, but he gave me very little satisfaction. In the early part of this Session I sent a petition to the present hon. Minister and addressed a letter to him, calling his attention to Baxter's Harbor but could get no satisfaction. I have not received even an acknowledgment of the receipt of that petition. I have made similar applications for other places in my county, but without avail. Now, my constituency is paying a very much larger amount into the revenue to-day than under the previous Administration, because taxation is higher. I think it is not fair or in the public interest, and not contemplated by our system of Government, that we should be entirely cut off from public grants because I oppose the Ministry of the day. The Ministry will find that pursuing a course of that kind will not bring about what they might desire—a change of sentiment in that constituency. I will simply call the attention of the Minister further to two applications I made the other day for surveys in that county, and I respectfully ask him to grant them during the coming summer. They will not cost much and I think it would be in the public interest to have them made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman's petition has not received any acknowledgment it must have been an oversight of my Department, because as a rule all letters and documents are immediately acknowledged.

Mr. BORDEN. I never received any.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry; the hon. gentleman may be sure it is not intentional. I remember receiving two letters last week, when I gave orders to acknowledge them. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has received the acknowledgment.

Mr. BORDEN. Not yet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a great pressure of business in that Department, but he may be sure they will be acknowledged and considered by myself as soon as I can do so.

Mr. BORDEN. Favorably?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will do my best, but I am now so busy in Committees all morning that I cannot spend more than ten minutes in my office every day. Then we remain in this House a little late. As to the principle of these votes, the hon. gentleman must see he is entirely mistaken if he thinks we make distinctions in favor or against a county, according to its representation. Just a minute ago we passed a vote for Moncton, which I do not think sends a member to this side of the House. It was the same thing with regard to West Hastings.

Mr. BORDEN. Is the pier at Annapolis to be a public pier? Will there be a Dominion official appointed to take charge of it, and will other vessels that come into that port besides this particular line of steamers be allowed the use of it? Also, will it be used in the public interest and not simply in the interest of this particular steamship company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be a public pier for the public in general, and I suppose it will be under the same regulations as other piers in the Dominion.

Mr. ANGLIN. This is the introduction of a very important innovation, the policy of the Government in regard to public piers and harbors. Hitherto, so far as I know, all Governments have acted on the policy of only voting public money for the erection of harbors of refuge and for breakwaters to make them safe, but they have always refused to spend public money in providing accommodation within the harbor for the benefit of trade and commerce. Hitherto, in my own county, when I have been asked to apply for aid for piers of this kind, I have replied that it was contrary to the policy of the Government to appropriate public money for the accommodation of trade and commerce within a harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a special case. There is here a line of steamers that is doing a great deal towards encouraging trade. This county has expended a large sum of money. I was there last summer, and they have changed the appearance of the place altogether. The other day a steamer sailed from Annapolis carrying 9,000 barrels of apples and 400 barrels of herring, and another steamer was to sail shortly after.

Mr. KILLAM. The hon. member for Gloucester is right in saying that this raises an entirely new principle in the construction of piers by the Government. Now, this is a splendid wharf and it suits the purposes of the Company exactly. It furnishes facilities to the counties on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway to ship their productions easily and cheaply. However, the real question is, whether it is the business of the Government to build the pier in a particular harbor to accommodate a certain business. The Canadian Steamship Company was incorporated last year, and everybody wished it success. They intended at that time to purchase or build steamships and run a line. Up to this time they have not done so, but they have chartered a number of steamers and have carried on, I believe, a successful trade. But the point is, whether the Government are justified in establishing a precedent which will enable them hereafter to assist any other harbors along the shore where it is necessary to have an outlet. For this reason I moved for returns concerning this pier early in the Session. I have the returns and I am quite satisfied the representations to the Government made by the individuals concerned are perfectly correct. They are no doubt patriotic individuals who are working for the country and making their own fortunes at the same time. The principle still remains to be decided whether it is in the public interest to build a pier of that sort in a particular harbor, as the hon. the Minister of Public Works says, to recoup the Company for the expenditure they have incurred, and thus serve a private company at the public expense. I have no objection to the expenditure, but let it be under certain restrictions. The hon. gentleman must remember that in consequence of this vote other places will be asking for similar favors, and no doubt will be getting them under some future *regime*.

Mr. HADDOW. Two years ago a petition came to the Government from a district called Charlo, in my county, asking the hon. Minister to build a pier in that neighborhood. I called upon the hon. Minister and he gave me to understand the terms on which they would build such works were that the people in the locality would be required to contribute half

the sum necessary for the construction. He told me that was the principle upon which they were building one in Bonaventure county, just opposite the county of Restigouche and on the other side of the bay. Last year I put the question to the hon. Minister and found that nothing was granted to us. In the county opposite, on the north side, two wharves have been made during the last year, and surveys have been made for five wharves altogether in that county, while in my county there has only been one survey made, which the hon. Minister ordered two years ago, but no money has been granted. Charlo is a station on the Intercolonial Railway, and while it would be an accommodation to the people in that neighborhood it would be an equal or greater accommodation to the people of Bonaventure, and I think the hon. Minister will find in his Department a petition from the people of Bonaventure asking that this wharf should be built at Charlo for their accommodation also. It is a matter worthy of the consideration of the hon. Minister of Railways, as well as of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to have a pier at that place which would, as I have shown, accommodate the people of two or three counties. There are also two other stations, New Mills and Jacquet River, on the Intercolonial in Restigouche, fronting on the Baie des Chaleurs, at which it is desirable in the interests of the railways and the public, to have piers erected. The distance across the Bay is but a very few miles, and the residents in Carleton, Maria, New Richmond and New Carlisle find it very inconvenient to cross the Bay in their boats to ship and receive supplies by the railway. The Minister explained to my hon. friend that the Government makes no distinction in favor of or against a county according to its representative. Bonaventure county, on the opposite side of the Bay, whose representative supports the Government, has had grants for three wharves and five surveys, while my county has had only one survey and no money granted, although it was surveyed two years ago. People can draw their own inferences from these facts.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is important to promote trade between the two sides of the Bay, and this could be largely promoted by establishing small piers at some points.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The item would be creating a very strange precedent, as I understand the wharf belongs to a private company.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I took care that when payment was made to the Company the wharf should not be an exclusive one for the Company but for the benefit of the country at large.

Mr. LONGLEY. I am very glad to find there seems an almost unanimous feeling in favor of the grant, and I am well assured the Minister has fully satisfied himself that the Company is deserving of it. In addition to the wharf it has nearly a mile of substantial railway, and the expenditure up to a certain period is \$30,442. The wharf in question has been thrown open to the public already. An iron steamer belonging to another line has already loaded there, and two vessels could have been loaded if the wharf had been prepared in time. Yesterday I read a telegram to the effect that a steamer is loading 9,000 barrels of apples for the English market. The trade which is likely to be opened out through the instrumentality of the Acadia Steamship Company will be worth thousands of dollars to the western part of the Province.

110. Harbors and Rivers, N.B. \$49,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$35,000 was placed in the Estimates for a breakwater at Negro Point, which has cost since 1874 \$280,000. At Port Hood there is to be a breakwater on the western side of the harbor, 300 feet in length and twenty feet in width, at a total cost of \$15,000.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a work at Anderson's Hollow, in my county, to which I called attention two sessions ago. The former Government made an expenditure, and the work was commenced of building a harbor of refuge. I would like to have a further amount voted, but I notice there is nothing in the Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My attention had not been called to the matter.

Mr. ANGLIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he intends to go on with the Charlo Harbor work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Supplementary Estimates not having been approved in Council, I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I would like to enquire with regard to the work at Oromocto, and to ask if it would be gone on with. Certain recommendations were made by the Chief Engineer for the improvement of the River St. John at that point by the erection of another breakwater to deepen the channel.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the plans were shown to me last year, I found that the breakwater had not been constructed according to the plan, that it leaked very much. I ordered the necessary repairs to be made, but I must say I have not been able to recommend to my colleagues the construction of any large pier on the other side of the river in order to still further confine the current and give greater depth of water.

112. Harbors and Rivers, Quebec..... \$137,000

Mr. Fiset. Before this sum of \$137,000 is voted, I hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow me to ask him if of the item of \$10,000 set aside for repairs and improvements of ports and rivers in the Province of Quebec, a portion is to be applied to the improvement of the harbors and breakwaters in the county of Rimouski? I speak of this particular item, because in the preceding items I do not see any sum set aside for the county of Rimouski, which I have the honor to represent. The hon. Minister knows as well as I do that the harbor of Matane needs improving, and that the works, begun under the late Administration, are insufficient for the general wants of navigation. The breakwater at Rivière Blanche, although of great service, such as it is, cannot be considered complete until it has been connected with the mainland. The quay at Rimouski requires to have its height increased and to be widened; in its present state, especially since rails have been laid on it, to allow the running of cars on it, it does not meet the requirements of trade. I may also mention Bic Harbor, so favored by nature, and which requires but slight improvements to become the safest harbor of the south shore of the St. Lawrence. The hon. Minister will therefore greatly oblige me if he will let me know whether he intends to apply a portion of that item to the improvements which I have mentioned, and concerning which petitions have, at different times, been forwarded.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With regard to the quay at Rimouski, I have to state that it is not under my control. The hon. Minister of Railways, under whose control it is, and to whom I spoke about it some time ago, seemed to me to think that the quay was sufficient for the requirements of the railway. With regard to the quay at Matane and the one at Rivière Blanche, I will ask the hon. member not to press for an answer. I have received petitions from these two places, which are now being taken into consideration by the Council. When the Supplementary Estimates are presented, I am certain that if the hon. member sees an item allotted to these works he will be content; in the contrary case, I shall be glad to explain the reason why.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

In reply to Mr. KILLAM and Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The vote of \$20,000 for harbor of refuge at Nicolet is a continuation of the vote of last year. There will still be required between \$35,000 and \$39,000 to complete the works, which will cost altogether between \$55,000 and \$59,000. The work at Yamaska will cost about \$55,000 altogether, and about \$7,000 more will be required to complete it. We are building a lock and a dam there. At Three Rivers, \$25,000 is asked to deepen the river and remove boulders, so that large ocean vessels may have sufficient space to swing round. The vote of \$1,000 for Philipsburgh Harbor is for the construction of a pier, of which the locality will furnish the same amount. The total cost of the work will be about \$19,000.

113. Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... \$159,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are progressing with the works in the Cobourg Harbor. We had difficulties with the contractor, and had to take the work off his hands. We have had very unsatisfactory contractors there.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Did the hon. gentleman pay the workmen?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the contractor failed we took possession of the plant and there was a drawback and a deposit of money in our hands, and we used as much of that as was safe in paying the workmen and persons who had furnished them with materials and supplies. The Government may have had a deficiency of \$500 or \$700 to do this.

Mr. BROWN. I think the item for Belleville, \$5,000, is not sufficient for the work. The work was not completed, and the dredge is there now. A very little more would complete it, and clear the west side of the harbor of earth and debris, so it would be of great advantage to have it completed now, as it would cost less than at any other time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The \$5,000 has not been expended altogether there.

Mr. BROWN. Not quite.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My idea was, after the 1st of July, should the amount not be quite sufficient and should \$500 or \$600 be required, to take it out of the general vote for the work. I did not think it worth while asking a special vote.

Mr. TROW. What is the expenditure on Toronto Harbor for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote of \$12,500 was set down before Captain Eade's report came in, for the dredging of the harbor. But since I have recommended an additional amount, which will be made known to the Committee by a Message soon. It will take a little time to complete the harbor work. I will give explanations when the messages are received.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What about Goderich, —is the vote for repairs or for new works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To complete the works contracted for by the lowest tenderer; to make repairs; to dredge the shoal at the entrance, and open the mouth of the Maitland River; and construct crib-work on its north side. We shall have cribwork built on the north side of the Maitland to catch the sand, make a new beach and relieve the Maitland. With regard to Wireton, a railroad has been built to it, and Government intend to build a pier in connection with the railway, which will complete the works. This \$35,000 will be our contribution and sufficient.

No. 114. Harbor and river expenses Manitoba.. \$13,000

Mr. TROW. Are the Government in a position to dredge the mouth of Red River.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have set down a larger sum to induce some contractor to put a dredge on that river, on account of the amount before not being sufficient. There may be some cribwork to be constructed to close some of the mouths of the river and throw all the water into one course to scour the entrance.

No. 115. North West Territories Rivers..... \$20,000

Mr. TROW. Will the hon. gentleman explain this item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had so many works in hand last Session that we could not attend to the Saskatchewan. But an engineer is going to that river this season to remove boulders and set dams.

Mr. TROW. The principle obstruction will be at the junction of the North and South Saskatchewan, at Coal Flats.

Mr. ANGLIN. When may we expect the dredges to commence operations. The hon. gentleman, I believe, made some promises.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My promises were very few. They only amounted to this, that I would consider the matter, see whether it could be done, and submit it to my colleagues. Otherwise I would be binding my colleagues.

Mr. KING. Is it the intention of the Government to do anything in Grand Lake or Washademaak the coming season?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not call my attention to Grand Lake before; this is the first time I heard of it.

Mr. KING. I hope, when the hon. gentleman does come down, he will favor us with a visit. Application was made for a dredge at McMahon's Cove two years ago, and received a reply that a survey would be made. Nothing has been done since. Very great difficulties are experienced at certain seasons of the year in consequence of the shoals at McMahon's Cove and Janiseg. I hope the hon. gentleman will look into the matter, and have the channels dredged.

Mr. KILLAM. I think we ought to have some general explanation of the operation of the dredges during the coming season. I would like also to call attention to some localities which required dredging and have been neglected since the hon. gentleman came into power. At Yarmouth and Pubnico dredging requires to be done. In Pubnico, a large harbor and settlement composed of people of the hon. gentleman's nationality, some consideration should be paid to its wants. One of the dredges should be sent there to enable the people on the west side to get a better approach to the place where they have to bring their vessels up and land their fish.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN read a statement of the different places where the dredges were employed.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). The *New Dominion* was not at work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. She was laid up for repairs. She will be in repair to work this season.

Mr. BURPEE. Last year she was to be employed at a port in Sunbury.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is true, but she was out of repair.

Mr. BURPEE. She was sent to another place, and if I am not mistaken, the hon. Minister of Public Works himself gave orders that she be sent to Marble Cove.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember that. I was visiting the place myself and a deputation waited upon me. The deputation wanted to dredge the channel to get to the public landing, and the people said they had been waiting

several years to get it done, but the Minister of Public Works had not been able to visit them. I thought their request was a reasonable one and accordingly ordered the dredge to be there the next day, and the work so performed was a public benefit.

Mr. BURPEE. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman state that he was entirely impartial in the expenditure of public money, and I felt quite indignant when some of his supporters meanly said that no public work should be undertaken in any county that did not support the hon. gentleman. I was fully aware at the time that they were misrepresenting the hon. gentleman. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman dredging this Marble Cove, which is a private place, but I would remark that he leaves uncared for the river St. John, where many vessels pass every day and have to unload their cargoes to get over a shoal. I think I have some reason to complain of that. Then with reference to the point of which the hon. member for Queens has spoken, in reference to the shipping of coal. It is an important point. At a certain period in the year it is impossible for boats carrying coal to get up to the wharf and the coal has to be shipped in scows. Although this is in the county of Queens, some of my constituents are much interested in these desired improvements, as there are coal mines in the county of Snabury, and it would be a great relief to them if this dredge could be sent there for a few days.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very sorry that any of our supporters should have circulated statements that caused so much indignation to the hon. gentleman. I hope they will never do it again. As to the Oromocto shoals the hon. gentleman must remember that we have expended a large sum of money there already, and there was no complaint about them when I was there last summer. However, this matter will be looked into again. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in supposing that the Government will construct public works in whatever county the public interest may require them, whether the county supports the Government or not.

Resolutions ordered to be reported: and (at 4 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 20th April.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 144) to authorize the construction on certain conditions of the Canadian Pacific Railway through some other pass than the Yellow Head Pass.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. gentleman should insert a proviso in the Bill that a change shall only be sanctioned upon obtaining grades equal to those upon the Yellow Head Pass route.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that I think that would be fatal to the Bill. I do not expect it will be possible to obtain grades equally favorable to those of the Yellow Head Pass.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am sure the hon. gentleman sees the extreme disadvantage of having such high grades as he mentioned. It would be no advantage to the Company in the running of the road. It seems to me it would be far

better to take a route seventy-nine miles longer and have easier grades.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I entirely concur with the hon. gentleman that every foot that is added to the grade is extremely objectionable. Of course, it will become a matter for the most careful consideration of the Government if they find a practicable pass there, to go thoroughly into the question of grades obtainable, and how far we would be justified in increasing somewhat the severity of the grade in order to obtain the important object of shortening the distance. That matter will, of course, receive the most careful consideration, but I think it would not be right to put it in the Bill because it is not in the least degree probable that we shall get a grade equally favorable to that of the Yellow Head Pass. I fully entertain, however, the principle the hon. gentleman has laid down as to the desirability of having easy grades.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will not put the hon. gentleman to the trouble of dividing upon the question, and as this conversation will be reported I shall ask it to be passed on a division, because, as far as I am concerned, I am entirely opposed to the Bill.

Bill read the third time and passed.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAKE. It was understood that the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) had some motion to make upon the House being asked to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I beg leave to move an amendment to the motion now made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that this House do now go into Committee of Supply. Before placing that motion in your hands, it is my duty to trespass upon the time of the House in order to explain the reasons why I invite the attention of the House to the subject of the motion which I intend to move. At an early period of this Session my attention was called to this subject. I was consulted by friends who sympathize with our fellow-countrymen who are suffering in Ireland, and who have been, for a long series of years past, seeking relief from what they consider the unsatisfactory system of Government under which they now live. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that this was a question, the introduction of which into this Parliament was of very great importance. I felt that to invite the consideration of this Parliament, and to ask this Parliament to express an opinion, was to ask it to take a very serious step. I have given the question all the consideration that I could, with a desire to discharge my duty faithfully towards my fellow-countrymen, and also towards the people of Canada. When I was approached on the subject, I stated at once that, so far as I was personally concerned, I would not hesitate at any time to undertake the duty of moving a resolution similar to the one of which I gave notice some time ago, in favor of reform in Ireland; but I would much prefer that the proposal should come from the people outside the House, and not be made subject to the mere desires or opinions of any individual members of this House. After a very short period I received such indications as led me to believe that a very large portion of the people of this country would view with very deep satisfaction a movement of this kind in order to obtain from Parliament an expression of opinion on this very grave subject. Believing that I was fully justified in undertaking the discharge of this important duty I at once took the steps necessary in order to bring it about; not only did I take the steps necessary to bring about the moving

Mr. MACKENZIE.

of the resolution, but also to secure the harmonious adoption of the principle by this House. I feel that to invite the House of Commons of Canada to express an opinion, to ask anything that the representatives of the people here in Parliament assembled might consider unreasonable, would be not to advance the interests of those whose case I seek to advocate, and in whose favor I ask an expression of the House. In consultation with friends, it was decided that in regard to the form of the resolution which should be moved in Parliament it would be well to consult those hon. members who might be expected more particularly to sympathize with us on that question. Those gentlemen from both Houses, the Senate as well as this House, were invited to attend a meeting to take the subject into consideration. A meeting was held and the subject discussed. A special Committee was formed at that meeting with a view of preparing resolutions which might cover the ground as expressed by resolution passed in the different cities and towns in Canada. I am glad to say that that duty was performed without any great difficulty; that those gentlemen gave their assistance cheerfully, and that there was on the part of those who did attend and took part in the work, an earnest and honest desire to frame such a resolution as the Parliament of Canada might be asked to adopt. The gentlemen present were equally anxious with myself that the sympathy of Parliament should be enlisted with the people of Ireland, and I am sure they felt they would not be justified in the discharge of the duty they owed to Canada to ask the Canadian Parliament or its members to pronounce in favor of a resolution which might be inconsistent with the position this Parliament occupies towards the Mother Country. I felt from the first that perhaps no motion which was brought before Parliament would obtain more real sympathy from the members than a motion of this kind. It would be well, perhaps, at this stage of my speech to say that after several drafts of resolutions had been prepared and submitted, after they had been carefully considered, many changes were made, all with a view of avoiding difficulties which we knew we had to contend against. When the resolutions of which a copy stands on the notice paper, had been before the House for some time, when hon. members had become familiar with the terms of those resolutions, I had occasion to feel my way among hon. members on both sides. I may say that I did not make a particular canvass, I did not make an individual canvass, either of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House or on this side; I trusted to the honesty of the cause, I trusted to the resolutions themselves, I trusted to the history of Ireland and its government, I trusted to the sense of fair-play and justice which every man representing a Canadian constituency must feel and be influenced by, and it is in full confidence of the existence of that sentiment that I introduce the resolutions to-day, and ask for them the sympathy and support of hon. members of this House. But I found that even though all our caution and tact were used in framing the resolutions so as to avoid objectionable features, they were still objected to by some hon. members on both sides of the House; therefore it is that in moving the resolutions to-day I hope the House will not be surprised if the wording of the resolutions has been modified, not interfering, however, with the principles involved, from that which I gave notice I would move. In moving these resolutions I cannot call it a difficult duty I have to perform, because I can say it sincerely and honestly that the difficulty appeared trifling to me. The importance of the duty I have to discharge, the conviction I entertain of the right I have to discharge that duty, are sufficient justification for my rising in this Parliament and taking advantage of the position I now hold and have for some time held, to move resolutions which I believe every fair-minded man in this country admit to be unobjectionable and unassailable. It

is because I feel in the Canadian Parliament, where the liberties and rights of the people are so safe and so well secured—it is because I believe in the Canadian Parliament that we have rights and liberties not enjoyed by the people in Ireland, that I think the people here, feeling and enjoying those blessings, having had experience of a wise Government, and a wise system of government, will readily extend their sympathies to those less fortunate in that respect. I believe the force of the old maxim will be admitted by hon. members of this House, and they will be willing to do to others as they would wish to be done by. I am satisfied there is a feeling in the House, and it is shared by the people of this country, that Ireland stands alone among countries; where hardship has existed, where harsh treatment has been used towards its people, where we in Canada and this Government under which we live—the British Government—have not been foremost in expressing not only a sentiment of sympathy in favor of oppressed people in all parts of the globe, but in taking active steps to carry relief to those people; and it will be hard to convince me that, in the opinion of any public man or intelligent man, Ireland alone should remain mis-governed and have no hope of a better state of things. It will not be my place to attack the policy of different Governments that have ruled Ireland in times past; it will not be my place to show to what an extent the mis-government of that country has been carried. I might create a hostile feeling if I were to attack the Government of any particular party; but I say this, without fear of contradiction, that I need not make any accusation against any Government, in order to establish that point, but I need only quote the opinions of leading Ministers themselves, to prove that it has been admitted by all parties that Ireland has not been wisely and well governed. We find recently that on Mr. Forster visiting Ireland; he was the first, on meeting with the people of Ireland, to declare that they were mis-governed, that they were rendered unhappy by mis-government, and that he would do every thing he could to give them that good government which they had not had before, and he trusted that they would be as happy and prosperous as the people of England were. These, Sir, are admissions which prove, beyond a doubt, that there is a necessity for some change in Ireland, and in the resolutions I shall ask this House to express its sympathy in favor of some measure of self-government for Ireland. I hope I will not be accused of interfering with the rights of the British Parliament. I hope I will not be accused of attacking the policy of that Government because I move in this direction, authorized by the leader of the Government of the day and by his public expression when he announced that the time had come when the self-government of Ireland was a debatable question. It being admitted by the leader of the Government that it is a debatable subject, that is one reason why we, to-day, ought to feel that we have a right to approach it. That is one of the reasons why we offer the long experience we have had as a people of self-government and the happy results of it, should respectfully represent that a like system in Ireland would produce a like favorable result in that country. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a great change has come over the public mind, and that that change is going on from day to day, and that the time is not far distant when men will not say it is too soon to grant this reform, and the wonder will be that it has not been granted many years ago. We all admit that the question of governing Ireland is a very difficult one, that there are difficulties almost insurmountable; but it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, and I think it appears to the majority of reasonable men in Canada, that if some experiment were made in the way of extending to the people of Ireland a system by which they could legislate for their own local wants, leaving Imperial matters to the Imperial Parliament, that would find the solution of that

difficulty that has puzzled them for so many years. There is, Mr. Speaker, another point to which I may be allowed to allude. I know how difficult and dangerous it is to deal with questions sometimes, which, either in the past or present or possibly in the future, might give rise to discussions of a religious character. Sir, there is no one in the Dominion of Canada who would regret the expression of any word in this debate that would tend to wound the feelings or excite the hostility of any special body of people in the country more than I. I intend, Sir, to make some few allusions, and in the allusions it will not be to decry the minority of our countrymen in Ireland, but to disabuse the mind of some who cling to the fear, more often expressed in the past than the present—but I trust these expressions will disappear in the future—that if Home Rule were granted to Ireland, the minority would suffer persecution at the hands of the majority. At this day that fear is not entertained by a large number of people either in Ireland or out of it. I would be sorry to think, and I have no reason to believe, that there was ground for that fear. The facts of history are all against it. Many men who have laid down their lives and have sacrificed liberty and all they held dear for the rights which they believed Ireland ought to have, many influential men who have ranked among the greatest of Irish patriots have been those who were not Roman Catholics. I will not, however, rely upon my own views or ask you to consider what may be my own opinion upon this important question, but I will quote the words used by a man who was not a Roman Catholic, of a Protestant who took a very active part in the politics of Ireland, and who did a great deal to remove the prejudices that existed in that country, and to secure harmony between the different elements of the people. Sir, I allude to the expressions made use of by Mr. Butt, a prominent man in the history of Ireland:

“Immediately on the fall of the Irish Church, he saw what was coming in Ireland. He knew the feelings—the fears, the hopes, the questionings—that surged in the breasts of his fellow Protestants. He determined to use the great power which now rested with him in an endeavor to close forever the era of revolt and bloodshed; to unite in the common work of patriotism Irishmen long divided by class and creed distinctions, and to establish between Ireland and England a union of friendship and justice which might defy the shocks of time. At this Bilton Hotel Conference he listened long to the utterances of his fellow-Protestants, many of them the familiar associates of his college days. He marked their fears, their apprehensions that the Fenians and the Romanists would be content with nothing less than separation. He rose to his feet and spoke with great earnestness. ‘It is we—it is our inaction, our desertion of the people and the country, the abdication of our position and duties—that have cast these men into the eddies and whirlpools of rebellion.’ He said: ‘If you are but ready to lead them by constitutional courses to their legitimate national rights they are ready to follow you. Trust me, we have all grievously wronged the Irish Catholics, priests and laymen. As for the men whom mis-government has driven into revolt, I say for them that if they cannot aid you they will not throw out your experiment. Arise! behold! have faith; have confidence and you will save Ireland; not Ireland only, but England also.’”

He concluded by proposing:

“That it is the opinion of this meeting, that the true remedy for the evils of Ireland is the establishment of an Irish Parliament, with full control over our domestic affairs. The chairman put the resolution to the meeting, ‘As many as are of opinion that this resolution do pass say, ‘Aye.’ A shout of ‘Aye’ rang through the room. ‘The contrary will say, ‘No.’ Not a dissentient voice was heard. Then every one, greatly astonished, burst into a cheer; the first heard that evening, so grave, and earnest, and almost solemn had been the tone of the deliberations.”

“That was the birth of the Irish Home Rule movement.”

This expression of such sentiments as this must do much to pacify conflicting passion and to bring about in Ireland that state of harmony and good feeling without which, good government is impossible in any country. Doubts have been expressed whether it would be expedient, even if it were possible to give to Ireland a system of self-government. I have been asked during the present Session, since this question came before the attention of the House, what

guarantee, what reason had I to believe that if Ireland had Home Rule, it would be more prosperous than it is at present. Well, I will not take up the time of the House, by dwelling upon details, I will not give my own opinion, but what may be accepted as facts by this House. In order that the House may judge whether a system of self-government for Ireland would prove beneficial to the Irish people, I will give them the true record of the past, when the Irish people possessed the rights which they want to have once more :

"Self-government had not been an idle toy, but an efficient weapon in the hands of Ireland. After 1782 her commerce was extended, her manufactures fostered, wages rose, and the value of land increased. The bankers and merchants of Dublin, naturally a cautious and conservative class, declared in petitions against the Union, that the prosperity of the Kingdom had wonderfully grown under the care of a native Parliament. But statistics spoke with more stringent force. During the period of parliamentary independence, when the use of tea increased 45 per cent. in England, it increased 84 per cent. in Ireland; the use of wine increased in England 22 per cent. in Ireland 75 per cent.; coffee increased in England 79 per cent., in Ireland 600 per cent.; and so of the other taxable articles, the consumption of which measures the rise of prosperity. After the Union the proportions were reversed; in some cases, notwithstanding the growth of population, an actual decrease of consumption followed the loss of independence."

Sir, at the same time, we all know, the population of Ireland was much larger than it is now. We have been told that the true remedy for the evils of Ireland is to find an outlet for the population, to tell the people to pack up their traps, and come and find a home on this continent. But, Sir, where a national dissatisfaction exists, this is no remedy. If there is any people on the face of the earth who love their own land, who are attached to the soil on which they were born and brought up, it is the Irish people; and to tell them that their liberties are to be fettered, that their system of government is more stringent and oppressive than any other system of government in the world, and still tell them that the only hope for them is to pull up stakes and come to our North-West or the north-west of the neighboring republic, is to add insult to injury. Sir, I would like to see any of our people come and take up their homes amongst us: I would like to see those who leave Ireland come and settle in our North-West, where I know, by their industry and toil, they would soon become independent, happy and prosperous, establishing comfortable homes for themselves, and contributing to the prosperity of Canada in which they would become citizens. But still I do not think that is really a true and generous way of meeting the grievances of the Irish people. I had hoped for a better feeling; and if there is any people in the world whom I would like to see exhibit that better feeling, it is the Canadian people; if there is any people in the world who ought to prize the rights and liberties they enjoy, it is the people of Canada, who are living under a form of the most perfect self-government in the world. Sir, I will not appeal to the warm sentiments which might arise in the breast of every man in this Parliament, by asking him what he would do in the same circumstances; but I will ask them, when the wire flashes accounts of outrages in Ireland across the Atlantic, not to be hasty in their judgments; I will ask them not to be too severe against the Irish people. I will go half-way and tell them that I blush at some of the crimes committed in Ireland; I will tell them that the great body of the Irish people condemn any indefensible acts perpetrated in Ireland as strongly as any people in the world condemn them. We are told also that these agitators are responsible for all these acts. Sir, I take a very different ground. It is my solemn conviction that if the leaders who are imprisoned in Ireland to-day were still at liberty to use what they believe to be constitutional means to advocate the cause they have at heart, there would be more order among the people than there is to-day. I believe that the fact that the outrages, of which the telegraph wires tell us from day to day—though I believe they have been exaggerated in many cases—have

Mr. COSTIGAN.

not been more numerous, is largely attributable to the fact that the men who are imprisoned from the time they first headed this movement to the time they were imprisoned, confined themselves to constitutional means of agitation. On this point, I admit there is a difference of opinion. There are many who claim that Parnell and his associates did use means that were not constitutional; but even to these men I will say, will you criticise with so much nicety and so much severity men who are striving and struggling to bring about reform, men who are seeking the redress of grievances that have been endured century after century? Sir, I think it would be only fair to say that the Government themselves are responsible for a great deal that has taken place in Ireland. I do not ask the members of this House to hold the Government of that country responsible; but in asking the House, in judging of the merits of this question, not to be too severe in their estimation of the men at the head of this movement, I may use this argument in order to show that a good deal of consideration ought to be allowed for the circumstances of these men who are found battling for what they call their rights in Ireland, and for what are generally conceded to be their rights. We, Mr. Speaker, are not the only people who are influenced by a desire for Home Rule. The very proposition itself, independent of the claims of the Irish people or the Scotch people, is on the face of it one that ought to be well considered by the people of Canada. Our own experience of the system of government we live under shows us, and many able writers are beginning to express the same view, that the time must soon come when the system of legislation in England must be changed. Suppose that, to-morrow, the House of Commons, in England, were relieved of that portion of legislation which might fairly be distributed among the different portions of the Empire; it would certainly be in a better position. We can imagine the difficulty we would labor under in this country, if we had to legislate for all the Provinces in this Dominion; and, how much more difficult it must be for the House of Commons, in England, to legislate for the whole country, on subjects which, in this country, are settled by the municipal council. Sir, we find that the people of Scotland are also awake to the idea of a measure of self-government. I am aware that many who have admitted the necessity of self-government for Ireland, believe that it would be a prelude to separation from England. I think that the majority of Irishmen, who have suffered in their own country and fought for it, are not open to such a suspicion. But, while Irishmen have suffered, more than any other portion of the Empire, I say that they have not been behind any other element that constitutes the British Empire, in the defence of the country, and in building up that power, of which Englishmen, to-day, are so proud. I do not, for this reason, think that Irishmen have a right to ask what is unreasonable, unconstitutional, or what is inconsistent to the rights, liberties and freedom of their neighbors; but they have a right to ask the same measure of freedom and liberty freely conceded to other elements in the Empire. My own opinion is that the more you relax the bonds which now fetter Ireland, the more strongly you bind her to England. I believe, and will appeal to the experience of hon. members in this House and to that of the old Provinces of Canada, as well as the experiences of those other Provinces now constituting the Dominion, which did not always enjoy that measure of freedom and responsible government that we are now so proud of, to say if the concessions that have been made to these Provinces by the Imperial Government have weakened the tie between them and the Mother Country? I say no. Nothing has tended more to strengthen that feeling of loyalty and attachment to the Mother Country now prevailing than the fact that she was willing to extend to this country those liberties

which every free man has a right to expect. The same results would follow concessions to Ireland. You can make Ireland faithful. Irishmen have been as faithful as Englishmen in every great battle and in every great undertaking for adding glory and lustre to the British flag. If you deal with Irishmen as with other intelligent beings—if you admit that they are created by the same God, and are entitled to the same rights as other men, and give them a measure of self-government—give them the rights that every man has a right to expect, you will find them, like Canadians, loyal and true, ready and willing to support that Empire which would shelter and not crush them. I think that argument is one that will shortly disappear. I am satisfied it has no great force. I am not one of those who generally feel angry at expressions that I may consider declared by prejudice to my country or creed. I entertain a very different feeling when any such attack is made. I experience a sense of pain rather than anger—a sense of pain to know that any fellow man who should treat me as a brother, should refuse to concede to me the same rights and liberties that I would concede to him. And I am a firm believer in that broad principle that actuates every right thinking man, in every country, that we are all necessary to one another, and that we cannot do too much to discharge the duties we owe each other, and that every thing we can do to promote the harmony and well-being of that society of which we are all component parts, we should do, to discharge our duty as fellow citizens. I might turn to the pages of history, and suit the ear and taste of any man in this audience by selecting different authors to show the cruelty and oppression that has been dealt out to the people of Ireland under the land system that exists and has existed for centuries. But I will not undertake that. I do not appear here to-day with the view of making a brilliant and effective speech. I think hon. gentlemen who have sat in this House for fifteen years will acquit me of any vanity of that kind. I have never troubled the House except when I felt it my duty to speak, and then I have felt how weak I was and how far short I fell in discharging the duty I desired. But my only desire is, if I can in my humble way, with my humble abilities, state my case in such a way as it may recommend itself to the hon. members of this House, and enlist the aid of those of our friends who are more eloquent, to give me the benefit of their eloquence. Should I succeed, I shall feel that I have discharged my duty in a humble manner. I will not read the reports or call the attention of the House to facts and pictures which members have often seen respecting the harsh and cruel tragedies often enacted in Ireland, in the turning out of their little huts, or if you will call them homes, men and women who have in them reared their families and earned their humble livelihood. In many cases it is a painful and dreary livelihood they have earned; but the places wear the sacred character of home, and if you could go with me in imagination and see the landlord with his bailiffs and police turn out from those little huts an aged father or grandfather, on his dying bed, to leave him on the roadside to die without shelter and without covering, your deepest feelings of pity would be stirred. This is no fancy, but a true picture, and one of the results of the land system against which the people of Ireland have long cried aloud. I will say what has been often said of the Irish people, that neither poverty nor oppression could beat them down nor crush out those feelings of nationality by which they have been so long animated. They feel they have the rights; but it has taken a long time to convince their rulers that a better and wiser policy should be adopted towards them. Let me give you the words of a British statesman, spoken in the House of Commons, with reference to landlordism in Ireland:

“Sir Robert Peel had a general horror of exterminating landlords, though he had not adequate courage to restrain them by law. A

few years later, speaking in Parliament of the extermination in Clare, he said: ‘I must say, I do not think the records of any country, civilized or barbarous, ever presented such a statement as that which has been presented to the House in a letter by Mr. Kennedy. This gentleman—an officer, I believe, in Her Majesty’s service—I presume of unquestionable veracity, states this fact, that in one union, at a time of famine, within one year 1,500 persons have been driven from their homes; and that within the last month, 1,200 more persons have had their houses levelled to the ground. I know not, Sir, if it be possible for the law to apply a remedy to that system, but in the House of Commons, at least, it provokes the expression of our deepest indignation.’”

I would like to call the attention of the House to the opinion of a Protestant writer, who has written an extended history of the difficulties in Ireland, on this question. With regard to the cry raised in Ireland to divide and separate the Irish people, he says:

“The dread that the Catholics would usurp all the power of the State were concessions made to them is a phantom. No such danger exists. An increase of their power is much more to be apprehended from a continuance of their restraints. Their accumulation of numbers alone must in time render them formidable; but, before that period arrives the voice of wisdom will be heard, and we shall then see in what consists our danger. How often was it repeated in the House of Commons, during the discussions on the slave trade, that the suppression of the slave trade, that the suppression of that detestable traffic, would sign the death warrant of the few white inhabitants in our West Indian Islands? Events have falsified the predictions. And are not the negro slaves as tractable and obedient as before that memorable Act, which has shown them that the British Legislature is alive to humanity and justice? If the prophecies of interested men, respecting the West Indian negroes, have been falsified by events, is there not the same reason to believe that the pretended dread, that the Roman Catholics, if admitted to a full enjoyment of their rights, would seek an undue superiority over the Protestants, and in their turn become the oppressors, is entirely void of foundation.”

In moving this resolution at this stage of the Session, to trespass one moment longer on the patience of the House than I might be justified in doing, would, I think, be committing a great mistake. I know, perhaps, how disappointed many of my friends may feel. I know what those hon. gentlemen who sympathize with me in this movement may think, that I might have done more in the discharge of my duty in introducing these resolutions. But if I am deficient in those qualities which constitute an able applicant in introducing a measure to the attention of an intelligent body like this, it is my fault, and it is their misfortune. But I hope that any deficiency in the arguments I have tried to use in the feeble manner I have introduced these resolutions, may be supplied by the good will of those hon. gentlemen with whom I have sat so long, though I am far from asking that they should decide as a mere question of sympathy with myself or my friends. No; I ask them to decide on this question on higher considerations, but I ask them to give me any favor in the discharge of my duty, which this sympathy will prompt. I mention this, because, in moving my resolutions, as I am forced to do at a time when, if the ordinary rules of debate were strictly applied, I would not be allowed to move it. I feel that I am under an obligation to the House and knowing the anxiety of hon. members to get through with the labors of a long Session, I will bring my remarks, at present, to a close, and ask their indulgence for a few words at the close of the debate. I thank the House for the attention they have given my remarks, and beg to move the following resolutions:—

That an humble Address be presented to the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty, in the following words:—

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly, in our own name, and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty’s person and Government.

1. We have observed, may it please Your Majesty, with feelings of profound regret and concern, the distress and discontent which have prevailed for some time among Your Majesty’s subjects in Ireland.

2. We would respectfully represent to Your Majesty that your Irish subjects in the Dominion of Canada are among the most loyal, most prosperous, and most contented of Your Majesty’s subjects.

3. We would further respectfully represent to Your Majesty that the Dominion of Canada, while offering the greatest advantages and attractions for those of our fellow-subjects who may desire to make their homes amongst us, does not receive that proportion of emigrants from Ireland which might reasonably be expected, and that this is due, in a great measure, in the case of many of our Irish fellow-subjects who have sought foreign homes, to their feelings of estrangement towards the Imperial Government.

4. We would further most respectfully represent to Your Majesty, that in the interests of this, your loyal Dominion and of the entire Empire, it is extremely to be desired that Your Majesty may not be deprived in the development of Your Majesty's possessions on this continent of the valuable aid of those of Your Majesty's Irish subjects who may feel disposed to leave their native land to seek more prosperous homes.

5. We desire respectfully to suggest to Your Majesty, that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of Your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to Your Majesty's Empire, and that Your Majesty's Irish subjects at home and abroad may feel the same pride in the greatness of Your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of Your Majesty's rule, and the same devotion to, and affection for, our common flag, as are now felt by all classes of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Dominion.

6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom be extended to those persons, who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's Reign may, for Your people's sake, be long continued.

Mr. BLAKE. If no other hon. member proposes to address the House on the subject, I do not, for my part, feel disposed to give a silent vote upon it. It is now two years ago since, in the course of a very important discussion here, I ventured to suggest in my place in Parliament that the accession to power which had then recently taken place of the Liberal Administration in England, would lead very shortly to the concession of some measure of Home Rule to the Irish people. I believed, as I said, that such a solution as could be obtained of the land question, such a solution as had been from time to time reached of other questions, would, after all, not settle the Irish question, and that unless the dictates of prudence and of justice alike were observed and fulfilled by the granting of some measure of control over their local affairs, we would see that which has been the disgrace and the humiliation of the British Empire for many years still continued. I also observed, as the hon. gentleman in his speech and in his motion has observed, that we had one amongst many material interests here, in Canada, in the solution of that question, in the change which might be expected from it in the attitude of the great bulk of the Irish people towards the Empire, that we had a material—although I regard that as a much lesser interest than the interest which has been mainly discussed—we had a material interest of a serious character with reference to the chances and the opportunity of immigration to our soil so long as the present state of feeling continued. Now, I propose to justify the attitude which I took upon that occasion and which did not then meet with any very animated response in the House or in the country; I propose to justify it by a reference to some obvious historical facts which it appears to me can lead to only one inevitable conclusion. In order that we may understand the grounds upon which, as I conceive, some action in this direction is demonstrably necessary, it is by no means needful to go further back than to the time of the Union. It is not needful here to recur in detail to the more ancient events in connection with Irish history, to the history of the conquest, to the history of the confiscations, to the history of the proscriptions, to the history of the penal laws, directed at one time against Protestants, and at one time against Catholics, to the history of these penal laws of the most serious and terrible description, laws and events to which I have briefly alluded, but which ought to make us all, when we recur to them, blush

Mr. COSTIGAN.

with shame, and which had left the marks of human error and of human crime almost indelible, and enhancing, there can be no doubt, even to-day, the difficulties of the situation. I say it is needless for the purposes of this discussion that we should revert to them in detail, for I am willing that this question should be tried not upon the history of the past eighty years, but upon the history of the government of Ireland under the present constitution of the United Kingdom. That history begins with the Union Act—an Act secured, as you all know, by means of the basest corruption. However beneficial the public men who carried that measure may have believed it to be, I do not suppose it will be urged to day that the end justified the means, and I have myself a strong belief that the nefarious means by which that measure was carried, operated very largely to increase the difficulties of its working and produced a state of feeling which gave it a poor chance of being satisfactory to the people of the country which was by such means brought into more intimate connection with the Empire. But, Sir, since that period, for a little more than eighty years has Ireland been managed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom and I do not hesitate to say that the result of that management has been a dreadful failure. There has been time enough to try the question out. Eighty years in the history of a country, and such eighty years as Ireland has experienced, is surely time enough to try the question out. Now, let us apply some obvious, plain and palpable tests as to whether there has been a good and successful administration of Irish affairs under the existing system. The population of Ireland in 1726 was 2,300,000, in 1805 it was 5,400,000, and that increase, more than doubling, occurred during a time of difficulty, of religious proscription and of emigration. In 1841, the population had abnormally increased under circumstances which it is not necessary to discuss, but it had increased to the number of 8,200,000. But since 1841 the history of Ireland has been a history of periodical distress, of famine and of emigration, and the result is that the population, which at the time I have stated stood at 8,200,000, stands to-day at 5,160,000 only, or 235,000 less than eighty years ago at the time of the Union, and 3,000,000 less than it was forty years ago. In the last thirty years, from 1851 to 1881, there has been an emigration from that country of no less than 2,750,000. Now, it may be said that Ireland is over-crowded. I deny that Ireland, as a whole, is over-crowded. There are parts of Ireland in which the distribution of the population is probably too dense; but I maintain that, judging by all the tests which we can reasonably apply to it, Ireland, as a country, is not an over-crowded country. The number of inhabitants to the square mile in France is 180; Italy, 225; Belgium, 421; Flanders, 718; England and Wales, 442; in the whole of Great Britain, 333; in Ireland, 161. The acreage of Ireland is 20,325,000 acres, of which there is at present arable 13,465,000 acres and an additional acreage easily made available for tillage of 4,000,000 acres more, making a total of land actually arable and available for tillage of 17,465,000 acres. How many acres are cultivated at this time—only 5,200,000; and this is the case with respect to a country of which the soil is indubitably very fertile, which has raised in times past enormous crops, comparing favorably in past times with crops at the same time raised in England, of wheat, rye, barley, peas, beans, potatoes and turnips, and no one doubts the capacity of Ireland for raising cattle. It has very great advantages. It has great quantities of bog land from which is produced a very cheap fuel, and which lands when reclaimed are inferior to none in the world whether as wheat or as pasture land. It has splendid coal fields, although these are hardly used at all. It has magnificent, perhaps unequalled fisheries in regard to the quantities of fish caught and har-

bor and other facilities in connection with the industry. It is possessed of valuable mines of gypsum, gold, silver, lead, copper and zinc. It has, besides, great facilities for manufacturing both as regards facilities for the transport of manufactured goods, for the supply of raw material, and for the cheapness of the labor to be employed. It has, moreover, great water power, encouraging the manufacture of the raw material into the perfected article. It has a people confessedly very free from crime of the ordinary kind; a people which, whatever their prospects and chances and capacities may have been demonstrated to be in their own country, have shown in every other country than Ireland, that they possess the capacity to rise, and, by their industry, their ability and their force of character to take their own place in the world, wherever their lot may be cast. They are also a people confessedly affectionate, and grateful; and possessing, in a large degree, the organ of veneration, are easily impressed by any act of kindness shown towards them. With such a people, with such a soil, with such natural advantages, how does it come that we have such a result, with respect to population, as I have mentioned? How does it come to pass that the population of Ireland should have diminished instead of increased, that the emigration should have been so great, and that the condition of the country should be such as we know it to be? The whole is due to the chronically wretched state of Ireland—its miseries, social, material and political. That is the reason why. Although there may be, although there has been, as we all rejoice to know, some improvement in the physical condition of some portion of the population during the last few years, this is to-day a pressing question, and no man holds that the condition of Ireland is satisfactory when viewed in those aspects to which I have referred. The condition of the people materially, in this as well as in other respects, is one which ought to create in all of us who call ourselves British subjects a feeling of shame. I say that the condition of Ireland to-day is due largely to the want of security and contentment, to the want of identification with the soil and attachment to the Constitution, to the want of hope of improvement and of bettering their condition, which is really the most essential thing to induce men to labor. I say that it is due to a feeling that their grievances are not redressed, to the lack of a feeling that their Government is conducted according to their needs and wishes, and to the lack of any machinery for the management of their local affairs. There can be no doubt that Ireland, at and before the time of Union, was subject to some great political grievances. There can be no doubt that those grievances were not of a sentimental character, but were such as to a large extent are to-day, acknowledged to be grievances which demand the attention of legislators, and should be redressed by legislation. If you go back over the history of the parliamentary government of Ireland for the last eighty years, and if you begin your enquiry by a reference to those great and important land marks or grievances, and should enquire as to the time when, and the circumstances under which, those grievances have been, so far as they have been, redressed, you will find a very good reason there, if you sought no further, for a deep-seated and justifiable dissatisfaction in the parliamentary government of Ireland, by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. There was the question—at that time as much a question of justice and of right as it was at any later time—of Roman Catholic emancipation. There was the question—at that time as much a question of justice and of right as at any later time—the disestablishment of the nominal church of the minority. There was the question—at that time as much a question of what was called here the lamentable question, but still in the condition of the country none the less a pressing question—of a proper measure for the relief of the poor, required because of the

unnatural conditions that ruled distribution. There was a question of reform of the land laws, by the creation of proper interest in the soil by those who occupied the soil. There was the question of creating local institutions to manage local affairs, and rendered very important because of the abrogation of the rights of the Parliament of Ireland and the transfer to Westminster of the management of those minute affairs which, up to that time, was under the control of the Legislature which sat in the capital city of Ireland. These leading questions, to which I have referred, have been in part—all but the last one, and that one has never been substantially dealt with—disposed of, and it may be asked, since such is the fact, why do I refer to them. I refer to them, because I see that the circumstances under which, and the time under which, those questions were dealt with, demonstrate more clearly than anything else can do, the unsatisfactory character of the Government of Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. When was the question of Roman Catholic emancipation dealt with? It was not dealt with until nearly thirty years after the time of the Union. Thirty years is about a generation, and it required about a generation for the Parliament of the United Kingdom to nerve itself to the task of dealing with that question. And how was it then granted? Was it granted them as the boon of a cheerful giver? No, Sir. It was granted grudgingly and of necessity. It was granted, avowedly granted by the Ministry because they were forced to do it, not because it was just, because they had been proclaiming to the ends of the earth that it was not just. Not because it was right, because they had been proclaiming that it was wrong. It was granted, because, as they themselves stated in Parliament, the question was between granting that concession and civil war. The condition of things had come to that pass that there was to be an immediate outbreak, a civil war, unless Roman Catholic emancipation was granted. Well, Sir, did that do good? Of course, you could not remove, even under such circumstances, a monstrous injustice of that description without some good being done; but I say the good was minimized by the delay which took place, and the attitude which was assumed by those who received and by those who gave that Act. The Irish people were taught that dreadful lesson, so far as the Administration of the Parliament of the United Kingdom could teach them it, that England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity. They were taught this by the delay, and by the disposition with which those Ministers acceded to the grant. They were taught not to rely upon that constitutional agitation which is the proud basis of our system, and which every one is free to engage in, but upon other and worse methods of accomplishing by unconstitutional revolt. I say that no doubt something was done by the removal, even under those circumstances, of that great blemish, yet nothing was done towards relieving, or conciliating the feeling of the Irish people, towards leading them to believe that they had a right to expect from the unconstrained sense of justice of the British Parliament the relief which they had a right to have; or towards obtaining those golden fruits which might have been reaped from a great act of justice cheerfully performed, in sufficient season. The next great measures of relief for Ireland—and I am dealing now only with remedial legislation—I am dealing with those measures to which the English Parliament may point with the greatest pride as marks of its parliamentary government with reference to Ireland—the next great measures of remedial legislation occurred, how long after? Nearly twenty years after. It was not until nearly twenty years had elapsed that we had the measure for the relief of the poor to which I have referred, followed shortly by, and intended at the time to be followed as soon as possible by an Act for the sale of encumbered estates. The years,

1846 and 1849, are, I think, the years in which those two measures were passed; one fully twenty years after, the Emancipation Bill, and the other a few years earlier. These Acts, as I have said, were not of a late date, they were not the offspring of fresh institutions lately developed. They were the approach by the English Parliament, the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to dealing with old difficulties, and how again was it that they were brought about? How was it, that the public opinion of the British people and the opinion of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, was aroused to action, such action as was then taken in these two particulars? Sir, it was not the hand of the insurgent upon that occasion, it was not the hand of the agitator, so much as the hand of famine and of pestilence. It was not until the direst calamity which has beset the modern Christian world came upon us, and until a famine took place in which more human lives were lost than in all the wars with which England has reddened the soil of Europe or the world, it was not until that had happened, that the public opinion to which the House referred was sufficiently aroused to deal with this question. Such was the unhappy condition of Ireland, and the measure passed for the relief of the poor was a great boon to them. The Encumbered Estates Act, too, was greatly needed. It was hoped, however, that that Act would have had an indirect effect very beneficial to the tenants, but that hope failed. The condition of the tenants as a whole from the practical operation of the Act was not mitigated, because it happened that the sales of many of the lands that were sold under the Encumbered Estates Act were made to persons entirely new to the country, and who, in a great many instances, were wholly neglectful of and defiant of those customary—I cannot call them rights—but those customary favors which were granted by the former proprietors to the tenants, and the system of rack-renting and the other difficulties which might naturally be expected to grow from such an unnatural system as existed, were aggravated and intensified by the new proprietary; and so it happened that the demand for the tenant right became more—pressing as it was before—became still more pressing by reason of the practical operation of the Encumbered Estates Act. Well, Sir, about twenty years more elapsed before the next great remedial measure for Ireland was carried through the British Parliament. It was, I think, in 1868 the law for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church was passed, nearly fifty years after the Union took place. Now, who can pretend that that act of justice was not as much an act of justice at the time of the Union as it was at the date it became law. The principle on which the disestablishment was carried is immutable, eternal, and the question had been raised, as we all know, generations before. Public men in advance of public opinion of the United Kingdom and of Parliament—intelligent men, statesmen, had raised it, had pointed out that it was impossible that that establishment could be defended and maintained—had proposed that an act of justice should be performed, but it was utterly impossible to make progress in that direction. An old, old grievance, a grievance so old as to be almost out of date, a grievance of the most pressing character—how, I ask, was redress to that grievance obtained? Now, Sir, I shall give you an authentic account of how it came that Parliament and the people of the United Kingdom decided to remove that ancient grievance. I shall give you the account which the author of that great measure for Ireland himself gave in 1878 in the Midlothian campaign. These are the words Mr. Gladstone used in explaining how it came about that the Irish Church was in 1868 disestablished and disendowed:

“Down to the year 1865, and the dissolution of that year, the whole question of the Irish Church was dead. Nobody cared for it. Nobody paid any attention to it in England.

Mr. BLAKE.

“That is the nobody in England and Scotland, not the nobody in Ireland, nobody paid any attention to it in England. Then circumstances occurred which drew the attention of the people to the Irish Church. I said myself, in 1865, and I believe that it was out of the range of practical politics, that is the politics of the coming elections.”

Now, what was it that brought it within the range of practical politics; what was it made it possible to carry that measure of reform? Some new events, some new chain of reasoning that led to conviction on the part of the people that it was a just measure? I will read you what it was:

“When it came to this, that a great jail in the heart of the metropolis was broken open under circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the State of Ireland; and when in Manchester policemen were murdered in the execution of their duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and the question of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics.”

That is the reason in this great measure of legislation by which the people and politicians of the United Kingdom were led to the belief that the question was within the range of practical politics, and led to see what was their duty to the people of Ireland. Once again there was the same moving cause to the remedy. Once again there was the same long heart-breaking delay, and once again English and Scotch opinion would not act until compelled to do so. Once again, therefore, there was no need of grace in the measure so obtained. It was forced from the British Parliament, and was so acknowledged, and therefore if it did remove the grievance it did not—as timely and cheerful legislation would have done, as any consideration of justice would have done—contain the element of grace and did not excite a feeling of gratitude in the hearts of those to whom the benefit was granted. Sir, that measure was a great measure in two distinct aspects. First of all it destroyed the pre-eminence of the church of the minority. It removed a crying injustice; it changed a condition which had combined the religion of the majority with their patriotism, a patriotism which, so long as it was the policy of the Parliament and people of the United Kingdom to maintain the church of the minority, was necessarily an anti-national patriotism. Besides that, there was the material gain that Irish funds to the amount of many millions were set free for legitimate and proper Irish purposes, not denominational, not sectarian, not for the minority, not for the majority, but for the whole people. Besides all this, the practical results of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, it had the indirect effect hardly less important. It was the first effective measure for giving to the occupiers of the Irish soil a great and tangible interest in the soil, and for increasing the number of Irish proprietors. The just provision which gave to the tenants, on church lands the pre-emption right to purchase those lands on moderate terms, a very small sum being payable down, and the residue being spread over instalments for thirty-two years, compounding principle and interest at a low rate, which made the annual payment not materially more than the accustomed rent, gave the tenants of church lands an opportunity of which they gladly availed themselves of becoming the owners of the lands they occupied. And thus it added no less than 5,000 to the number of Irish proprietors of the soil. With our notions, having regard to the figures I have given as to the population, you may say that 5,000 Irish proprietors is a trifle. What is the use of saying so much about 5,000 Irish proprietors? I admit that it is a drop in the bucket, but then the bucket had very little more than a drop in it at the time. The total number of Irish proprietors at that time was but 16,000; so that this measure in its operation added no less than 5,000, or very nearly one-third, to the number of Irish proprietors, and a measure which has such an effect cannot but be regarded as a very important measure of relief. Now, Sir, Ireland is a country of small agricultural holdings,

and in considering this question, we must not forget that circumstance. There are in Ireland no less than 533,000 distinct farm tenancies, of which no less than 450,000 are under 50 acres, and no less than 50,000 more are between 50 and 100 acres, showing that the great bulk are under fifty acres, and no less than 500,000 out of the total 533,000 are under 100 acres. Although there are exceptions, as we know, principally in one of the provinces of Ireland, but also in the case of many estates scattered through other parts of that country, yet the bulk of those 533,000 holdings are yearly, and they are yearly in a country in which the custom has been that the tenant shall make the improvements, a custom which is wholly incompatible with the conditions of yearly tenancy. Now, Sir, while that is the number of Irish farm tenancies, let us see to what extent the ownership of farm lands prevails. In Ireland, one in every 257 persons, owns farm lands, while in France one in every eight persons owns farm lands; in central and northern Europe, the tenure of land is widely diffused; and while we have seen a very gradual growth and a very imperfect development, in the continental countries of Europe, of the principles of popular and responsible government—while in that regard they are far behind the United Kingdom, yet we have seen, since the days of the French revolution and the Napoleonic age, large advances made—much larger advances than have been ever dreamed of in England towards diffusion of the tenure of land, and the abolition of that most objectionable portion of the feudal system. In the Rhine Provinces, including Westphalia, there are 11,000,000 acres of cultivable land—and how many proprietors? 1,157,000 proprietors, or one to every ten acres of land; and if you read the history of the contentment and comfort, the work and labor, the energy and industry—the indomitable industry—that is displayed in many of these countries by the proprietors of these small areas, you must be convinced that the only thing that enables the Government of these countries to be carried on at all, burdened as they are with enormous expenses, with an imperfect development of constitutional government, with great military armaments, and with an oppressive system of conscription and military service—the only thing that gives the people heart and hope, and enables them to struggle on at all, is that wide diffusion of the ownership of land than which there is nothing better calculated to promote the stability of the people, to whom the land belongs. Take the State of New York, in which there are 22,200,000 acres of farm lands, and in which the holdings are large, as is natural in a new country, where there is so much land undisposed of as there is on this continent. There the owners of the land, in 1870, were 216,000, against 21,000 in Ireland, including the owners of church lands. Look at two portions of Ireland, which may be selected as examples: take the agricultural counties of West Meath and Cavan, which comprise 1,360,000 acres, and in which there are 612 owners of less than 50 acres in that whole district; in the counties of Galway and Mayo there are 2,760,000 acres, and there are only 225 owners of less than 50 acres. The number of small owners is insignificant in England, but that number is computed to be about ten times as large in proportion as the number is in Ireland, and that in a country of which I believe the greatest practical blemish to-day is its own land laws. I believe there can be no doubt that the greatest blemish in England and Scotland to-day is the condition of the ownership of land; but even there that difficulty was diminished relatively to the condition of things in Ireland. Now, Sir, there can be no doubt that the old penal laws, which among other relics of barbarity prohibited for a long time Roman Catholics either from owning or inheriting lands, had much to do with the creation of the present state of things as to the landholding in Ireland, and that state of things being once created and marked deeply upon the country, it became of

course proportionately difficult to obliterate it. The result was a practical serfdom; the people who cultivated the lands were only left with enough to subsist on in a miserable manner. All concede that there were many landlords in Ireland who granted proper leases, and behaved with propriety towards their tenantry; yet in the main, the practical result was that the whole profit of the lands, with the exception of a poor, miserable subsistence to the tenant who worked them, went to the landlord, and also that where improvements were made, an early opportunity was taken to increase the rental of the lands to the extent to which they had become capable of producing, by virtue of the improvements which the tenant and his family had made. This was a state of things which of course did not merely diminish, but destroyed, that hope of bettering himself, which is the spur by which you can expect men to rise, and under the influence of which you can expect happiness and contentment to be diffused. The first or one of the earliest writers on the subject of land holding—Young, I think—says: "Give a man but nine years' lease of a garden, and he will turn it into a desert; give him a freehold of the naked rock, and he will turn it into a garden;" and I believe that not untruly represents the relative condition of things between the short holder under the customs that prevail in Ireland, and the proprietor. Now that situation would have been bad enough, if the rents so exacted from the tenantry were rents in any proper sense of the term; but the whole produce of the soil goes, not to enable the unfortunate people to clothe themselves, but to live in rags, not to feed themselves, but to keep starvation from them, and above that, the whole of the produce of the soil is taken by landlords who do not live in the country, because a certain measure of improvement and prosperity would necessarily have arisen from the expenditure on the soil by those enormous rents. But to make a condition miserable enough, God knows without it, still more miserable, the bulk of those who received these rents were absentee landlords; and so it happened that, speaking once again in the main, not merely a fair share and increment of the production of the soil, but the whole produce of the soil of Ireland, with but wretched livings for those who raised it, went away from Ireland—was rather a tribute paid by Ireland to foreign countries, than legitimately applied within the land itself, and which would have occasioned the development of trade and manufactures, which would have given more employment, agriculturally as well as otherwise, and produced some mitigating circumstances at any rate to relieve the darkness of the picture to which I have referred. I say it happened there was luxury for the absentee landlords, misery for the resident tenant, as the rule, and that in a country of which it has been said, not I believe rhetorically, but in sober truth, that if you wiped out the tenant's improvements you would convert nine-tenths of Ireland into a desert again. I have said enough to show that the question of the land is at the core of the Irish question, and to show how great was the importance of any measure, such as the Irish Church Act, which should have tended even in a moderate degree to unite the diverse interests of the occupant and of the land he occupied, and to create a land proprietary in Ireland. That measure was followed within a year or two by the Land Act of 1870, an Act which was, no doubt, a useful Act, and which was, probably, in effect, I have no doubt, quite as strong and sweeping a measure as the public opinion to whom I have referred, and the people of the United Kingdom would suffer to be passed at that day, but which in consequence of that public opinion not being sufficiently appreciative of the situation, was far behind what the necessities of the situation called for, and both the Church and Land Act were brought about, not from a sense of the need of

either or both measures—were brought within the domain of practical politics, not because interested or selfish landlords or wealthy tenants had come to the conclusion, from some new turn of reasoning, that the condition of Ireland was one of injustice that required amelioration, but because a great gaol in the heart of London was broken open, and some policemen in Manchester were killed. That it was this that aroused England's attention to Irish affairs and rendered possible those measures of reform is beyond doubt, and again the same fatal error, and again justice and measures of propriety and prudence too long delayed, and again those lessons taught the Irish people, has borne for so many years such fatal fruits which as those to which Mr. Gladstone referred. That Land Act was useful in its way but it was not wide enough; the land clauses most hopeful in theory, which struck largely at the root of the question, turned out in practice not so useful as the land clauses with reference to the Irish Church owing to difference of condition. The truth was that in other respects the land laws of Ireland, as of England and Scotland were grievously defective, and the expense of a voluntary transfer of land in small parcels was almost prohibitory. The search for titles, and copies and conveyances and conveyancing itself were such that whatever price you might fix for those moderate portions of land, which were the utmost aspiration of the occupant would in many cases fail to meet the expenses of conveyancing. That was one difficulty with which legislation was unable to grapple. There was another, in the want of sympathy on the part of the Treasury and other departments of the Government with those classes which savoured a little too much, in the then public opinion of the country, with a feeling of interfering with the sacred property in land—which looked a little too much towards a denial of the divine right of landlordism, which looked a little too much like a practical recognition of the motto that property has its duties as well as its rights, and it so happened in practice that there were but 160 sales a year on the average, or a total of 800, by the last return I have been able to obtain under the provisions of the land clauses of the Act of 1870. So, therefore, you will observe that the Act was wholly defective as a remedy for the evils complained of, and, which by experience, was proved to be wholly inadequate. Then, in 1880, the last Land Act was passed, under continual pressure, under similar pressure increased and aggravated by events; a great measure, but in itself not likely to settle the great question. I will not discuss the complicated details of that measure; but I will say that a measure which is based upon the ground and founded upon the reason upon which that measure depends, and which makes no provision at all for dealing with cases of arrears of rents—cannot be regarded as a final or satisfactory measure, if there were no other defect. If you look at the history of the ills which preceded that measure, and at the circumstances of the country, as stated by others, you will see that such a measure must be to a large extent wholly inadequate and entirely beyond practical application towards many, or most of the grievous cases that can be supposed to exist under it, unless it deals with arrears. The most grievous cases will be those of parties unable to pay their rents. However, no one can doubt but that that measure was an immense active relief—that it was a measure that gave more than was expected by many, or thought possible to be obtained from the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and nobody can doubt that it was obtained also from Parliament only by continued difficulties. The state of Ireland, as it had been, was becoming more aggravated still. Things were growing worse and worse before the adoption of the last remedial measure, and the conviction at length impressed itself on the United Kingdom that something more must be done to remedy those evils. But the same fatal errors which attended the agitation for the introduc-

tion of the previous remedial measures, attended this. It came so late that a large portion of the benefit, so far as feeling was concerned, and so far as the conviction that Ireland could depend on the justice of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, that there was any prospects of an ending to their sufferings, that this last remedial measure had wholly lost its grace. I say it is as plain as the day that true statesmanship pointed to earlier action, to action under other and different circumstances when a measure, even less thorough going than this one, would have produced an amelioration in the condition and temper of the people of this country, much greater than could be expected from the measure brought in and carried at the time, and under the circumstances and under the pressure which attended its being carried. That is the record of eighty years of remedial legislation for Ireland. These are the important landmarks of the acts for the remedy of wrongs, and the delay of justice that have distinguished British legislation in the past eighty years. There are others, no doubt, subsidiary acts; it did not take quite so long—I forget whether more than a couple of Parliaments—to induce the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass a Sunday closing Act, which was demanded by the unanimous voice of the Irish population, and was applicable to them only, but which did not agree with the sentiments of the British publican, and which, therefore, it was thought wrong to give to the Irish people. But, it came at last, and minor measures of this description have come to Ireland from time to time, but the large and important measures of statesmanship which had agitated the public mind are those to which I have referred, and which have been accomplished only after the delays and under the circumstances I have briefly stated. Can anybody wonder then that there should have grown up early, and that there should continue with an ever increasing volume and urgency, a cry for a measure of Home Rule. Put the question to ourselves. If we had been for eighty years in the position that these people have been in for that time; if we had to agitate for one generation for one measure of justice, for three-quarters of a generation for the next measure, and two-thirds of a generation for the third; if as each of these measures had been obtained, it was due not to the recognition of the justness of our cause, but to the recognition of the danger of further delay, what would have been our feelings and how earnestly we would have demanded some portion of control over our affairs. But there is a darker side to the picture than that. While remedies were refused, force was at the same time constantly applied. While you have the miserable record of remedial Acts to which I have referred, you have the record of Arms Acts, Coercion Acts, Restraint of the Press Acts, Suspension of Habeas Corpus Acts, and all those legislative means of coercing the people passed from time to time with the utmost freedom by the same Parliament which was denying and delaying what is now admitted to have been only justice to the people. I do not mean to say that the conduct of the Irish people—a large portion of it—under these circumstances was justifiable. Far from it, I do not mean to say that it might not have been necessary sometimes to pass these Acts. True friends of Ireland have, from time to time, concurred in their passage, but I do mean to say that the condition of things lasting for eighty years, with such a record on its brighter side of remedial legislation and such a record on its darker side of coercive legislation, is a record that proves that the experiment of Local Government for Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, has been a disastrous failure. Besides, legislative coercion, there were other methods of coercion employed. There is an army under the guise of a constabulary, of 12,000 or 13,000 of, I suppose, the best troops

in the world, the Irish Constabulary, and we have had from time to time large portions of the military forces of the Empire quartered in Ireland. From time to time not less than 50,000 men—I believe to-day not less than 50,000 men of the British army are stationed in Ireland to keep the people down, and large detachments of the British fleet frequent Irish harbors for the same purpose. Whether right or wrong in this controversy it cannot be contended that the Government of Ireland for eighty years has been a Government by constitutional means, but it must be admitted that it is a Government by force. That is the large result of the whole business. Now it is acknowledged—as the hon. member for Victoria has said—freely and frankly acknowledged—that Ireland was being misgoverned all these years. What a humiliating condition is that which the mother of Parliaments, the mother of constitutional freedom throughout the world, occupies on this question. Which of us did not feel with a pang of humiliation the keen shaft of the satirist, who forged, so to speak, the letter from the Sultan of Turkey, not long since calling, in response to some calls that had been made in England on him to remedy some grievances of his subjects, on the British Government to remedy the condition of the Irish people. Who did not feel that such a letter might have been fairly written, that such a complaint might have been fairly made, and that the argument sometimes urged in this House of *tu quoque* might have been fairly used. Of these resolutions it is needless to speak. No doubt Ireland is largely in a state of anarchy, ruled as far as the Kingdom is concerned, mainly by force, mainly by, so far as a large portion of the people is concerned, an organization without and beyond the control of the law, and I mention that it is the delays which have taken place in their passage and the circumstances under which these measures of pressing justice and importance have been at length gradual, which are responsible for the distressed condition of that country. There were, for these delays, two reasons: Reformers, and I do not use the word in a party sense, or as defining wholesale the Reform party of England, as compared with the Conservative party, though I might so use it—but still there have been honorable exceptions in the Conservative party—Reformers, in the larger sense of the term, have from time to time pressed upon the public and upon Parliament, long before these reforms were granted, their justice and necessity; but the great body of public opinion was unquestionably hostile to Ireland. By a Parliament of the United Kingdom, in which the opinion of the majority must rule—it was impossible, under the constitutional system, that that justice or expediency, by which the majority were not alive, could be pushed forward. I believe that long ago many of these measures would have been carried by far-sighted statesmen, except that they felt it was impossible to carry them, except that they were, as Mr. Gladstone has put it, beyond the realm of practical politics, because the aristocratic, the large land holding interest, the Conservative interest, and many other interests were entirely too strong to enable the relatively small band of advanced Reformers free to carry them at all. In a word the public opinion of the United Kingdom did not recognize the importance of it, and was not sufficiently advanced to discharge the duties of efficiently managing Irish affairs. The second difficulty was the want of time. Parliament was overweighed with its concerns, it had to deal with large imperial concerns it had to deal with local concerns which were supposed to be more pressing, and it was unequal to its task. We know that for a great many years Parliament has been unequal to its task in that regard. We know that measures have been brought in by strong Governments Session after Session and have been just

crushed out by the pressure of other affairs, have not been reached. It takes years as a rule before that which is deemed sufficiently ripe for legislation to be actually brought into Parliament by a Government on its responsibility, can reach that stage of discussion, unless there be some extraordinary reason of urgency such as lately attended the discussion of the Irish question. It has so happened that men have been too apt to say with reference to the large questions to which I have referred, and which have been settled: "Oh, that question is not yet within the range of practical politics," just as Mr. Gladstone said on the Irish question in 1865, and so they say of these questions until gunpowder, murder, assassination explosions, a condition of chronic disaffection breaking out in some particular manner, brings them to the conclusion forthwith that the question is within the range of practical politics and has got to be dealt with. Now, I say that even if Parliament could now take up what it ought long ago to have taken up, we might hope it would be dealt with, but it also was dealt with so late as to obviate all chance of its settlement being concurrent with a resolution of better feeling between the people of the two countries, and thus it is that I am brought to the conclusion that it is the duty of every man who entertains a strong feeling for the Empire, who entertains a feeling of pride in its glories and of shame in its failures and its faults, to do what he can in his sphere towards pressing forward this Irish question to a solution while there yet be time. Now, so long ago as 1878 the statesman to whom I referred a while ago, Mr. Gladstone, spoke in this manner, prior to the General Election which took place at that time:

"In the matter of Local Government there may be a solution of some national and even Imperial difficulties. * * * If you ask me what I think of Home Rule I must tell you that I will only answer you when you tell me how Home Rule is related to Local Government. I am friendly to Local Government, I am friendly to large local privileges and power, and desire, I may almost say, I intensely desire to see Parliament relieved of some portion of its duties. I see the efficiency of Parliament interfered with, not only by obstruction from Irish members, but even more grossly by the enormous weight which is placed upon the time and minds of those whom you have sent to represent you. We have got an overweighed Parliament, and if Ireland or any other portion of the country is desirous and able to arrange its affairs, that by taking the local part or part of its transactions off the hands of Parliament, it can liberate and strengthen Parliament for Imperial concerns, I say I will not only accord a reluctant assent, but I will give a generous support to any such scheme.

"One limit, gentlemen, one limit only, I know to the extension of colonial Government, it is this, nothing can be done in my opinion by any wise statesman or right-minded Briton to weaken the authority of the Imperial Parliament. Because the Imperial Parliament must be Imperial in the three Kingdoms, nothing that creates a doubt upon that supremacy can be tolerated by any intelligent and patriotic man. But subject to that limitation if we can make arrangements under which Ireland, Scotland, Wales and a portion of England, can deal with questions of local and special interest to themselves more effectually than Parliament now can, that, I say, will be the attainment of a great national good. The Scotch members who always show in Parliament—I must say, speaking of them as an average, and perhaps it is all the more true because the majority of them are Liberal—who always show in the transaction of Scotch business remarkable shrewdness and efficiency, yet all find cause to complain and complain seriously and gravely, that they cannot get the Scotch business properly transacted.

"The Parliament is over-weighted. The Parliament is almost overwhelmed. If we could take off its shoulders that superfluous weight by the constitution of secondary and subordinate authorities. I am not going to be frightened out of a wise measure of this kind by being told that I am condescending to the prejudices of the Home Rulers. I will condescend to no such prejudices. I will consent to give to Ireland upon principle nothing that is not upon equal terms offered to Scotland and to the different portions of the United Kingdom. But I say that the man who starts to devise a machinery by which some portion of the excessive and impossible task, now laid upon the House of Commons, shall be shifted to the more free and therefore more efficient hands of secondary and local authority will confer a blessing upon this country, that will entitle him to be ranked among the prominent benefactors of the land."

I think Sir, having regard to that speech, I was justified in hailing the accession to power of the Liberal party, as I did in the year 1880, as giving an omen of some measure of redress for Ireland in this particular. But Sir, another

speech was delivered by that same statesman, under the responsibility of office, in the Imperial House of Commons, not very long ago, in which he once again recurred to this subject and said:

"We attach great value," said Mr. Gladstone, "to the extension, perhaps I should say to the establishment—(hear, hear)—of the principles of Local Government in Ireland. We believe that one of the great evils under which Ireland labors is the want of local administration, and a more central system of authority. We believe that the state of Ireland never can be satisfactory until its people have acquired and learned by tradition and practice to exercise those powers of Local Government which were so beneficial in other portions of the Empire. Moreover, we believe that where the Irish people had the opportunity within a limited range of giving proof of their powers and qualities and capabilities for Local Government, as they have done under the Poor Law Acts and through some other channels, they have administered well. Indeed, no one can doubt that, or their perfect capacity for such a duty. But this is speaking on the question of purely local administration. The motion of my honorable friend embraces matters of wider scope. I wish to point out to those honorable gentlemen that neither they, nor so far as I know Mr. Butt before them, nor so far as I know Mr. O'Connell before him, ever distinctly explained in an intelligent and practical form the manner in which the real knot of this question was to be untied. The principle on which they profess to proceed is that purely Irish matters are to be dealt with by a purely Irish authority, Imperial matters to be left to the Imperial authority of a Chamber in which Ireland is to be represented. But they have not told us by what authority it is to be determined which matters taken one by one are Irish, and which matters are Imperial. Until they lay before the House a plan in which they go to the very bottom of the question, and give us to understand in what manner that division is to be accomplished, the practical consideration of this subject cannot really be arrived at, and I know not how any effective judgment upon it can be pronounced. I am well convinced that neither this Parliament nor any other House of Commons will at any time assent to any measure by which the one paramount centre of authority necessary for holding together in perfect unanimity and compactness this great Empire can possibly be in the slightest degree impaired. (Ministerial and Opposition cheers.) We are entitled and bound to ask a clear and explicit explanation as to the mode in which that vital matter is to be determined. Who is to say what purposes are Imperial? Who is to determine the circumscription within which the Irish authority is to have a final voice? Quotations have been made in reference to the positions of other countries—for example, Finland in relation to Russia. But this affords no practical illustration of the matter. It would be just as rational for those gentlemen to quote the case of the Channel Islands. With regard to the Isle of Man, we have sometimes interfered in the matter of Custom duties, but not in my recollection have we interfered in the legislation of the Channel Islands. We have left it entirely to their own authority, and we have not felt any inconvenience flow from that arrangement. Thus while some development is given to the principle of Local Government without any practical inconvenience, I think the case of Finland and Russia is not different from the case presented by England and the Channel Islands. The case of Austria and Hungary has also been cited. I fully grant that the magnitude of that case is such that if you can, by the development of that case, show it affords a precedent for us, you certainly make out a strong case. I have heard of the alleged and the great and paramount difficulty of this question to which I have just referred, namely, the establishment of a dividing and a divided authority—as in the case of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—by a reference of the matter to the personal authority of the Sovereign. If that be so, am I really to understand that it is the proposal of those members of this House who take the view I am now referring to that the personal authority of a Sovereign in this country is to decide the question of what subjects are to be referred to the Parliament of Ireland and what subjects are to be referred to the Imperial Parliament of this country. If that is the doctrine held, then I say you are immediately involved in a dilemma more hopeless than any that has presented itself to you, because on the one hand the subjects are to be decided on the authority of responsible Ministers, or on the other hand by a personal will or whim. If the decision is to be determined on the authority of responsible Ministers—the responsible Ministers of Great Britain or the responsible Ministers of Ireland who are to exist under the plan that is now proposed (hear, hear), evidently you can't refer to the responsible Ministers of Great Britain the power of drawing a distinction which involves the most vital, delicate and practical parts of the subject. Then, if in the highest and nicest matter of Government you are going again to set up the personal responsibility of the Sovereign apart from the advice of responsible Ministers, you are at once proposing a revolution in this country more profound than you need bring about by the establishment of any form of Government whatever. (Hear, hear.) I express for myself, and I am sure for my colleagues, that we are most favorable to the introduction of a rightly understood principle of Local Government in Ireland, and most desirous to promote it. For the first of the purposes they have in view they cannot take the first step, they cannot establish one foot of ground upon which and from which to address their arguments to the House of Commons, until they have proposed a plan in which it shall be clearly set forth by what authority, by what machinery, they mean to divide Imperial and local questions, and so to give satisfaction to the members of this House upon its first and most paramount duty, namely, the maintaining of the supremacy of

Mr. BLAKE.

the Imperial authority for every practical purpose relating to the interests and the purposes of this great Empire." (Cheers.)

Now, Sir, in that speech, while announcing once again his adhesion to the principle of Local Government, that great statesman has endeavored to shift from the shoulders of the responsible Government of the Empire to the shoulders of those who are in a hopeless minority, a question which belongs to that Government to solve. I say that it belongs to those who are responsible for the good government of the Empire, who have the majority, who have the power, who can initiate legislation themselves to grapple with the difficulty. I say that those who admit that the present system is unjust, who admit that the present condition of Ireland cannot be satisfactory without some change, who acknowledge that a change can be made, are in an untenable position when they tell the minority: "Gentlemen, come forward, propound some plan, solve every difficulty, tell us how you would settle this question, and until you do that we are not called upon to act." That is not, in my opinion, language worthy of any statesman, be he Conservative or Reformer. It is not upon such statements that the Irish question can be settled. It would be folly to blink the consideration that any measure that Mr. Gladstone may propose on this question would be unsatisfactory to many, and at any rate it would not be accepted by the Irish people as a final settlement of the question. But I maintain that the longer you delay, the greater the difficulties, and I maintain that though the proposition you are able to propose may not be satisfactory to all, it is no ground whatever for declining to do that which you yourself acknowledged it is just should be done. True justice will do that which is right, and will give that measure for relief which it knows is just, and which believe it will give that added measure of safety and security which will result from the changed state of affairs. What is the state of affairs? The Prime Minister of England says the condition of Ireland is unsatisfactory, because the Irish people have not the measure of Local Government which they ought to have, and he says: "I will not give that measure of Local Government to you; I will not stir hand or foot in the matter until the Irish members in the House of Commons, who are in the minority, and are powerless to do anything, shall propose a measure which shall be satisfactory to themselves, and that they will undertake to deal with this complicated and exacerbated question, so full of difficulties and in the light of all the errors and circumstances of the past.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I will not engage in a discussion of the various hypothetical cases and somewhat strained difficulties which it seems to me are dealt with in that speech on that question. I frankly admit that the division power, local and federal is one of them; but how there can be a difficulty in deciding how that is to be regulated and in determining how it is to be regulated by a general Act of justice, I cannot at all see. There can be no doubt whatever that the difficulty which occurred to the Prime Minister on this occasion, was the view which he has entertained and expressed so freely and which is that same difficulty which has prevented justice being done to Ireland in former years and under other circumstances; it is the difficulty of having to deal with a recalcitrant and inert mass of public opinion not sufficiently advanced to enable him to grapple with the subject. To him I believe the words of the great poet of the adjoining republic apply when he says:

"His statecraft was the golden rule,
His right of vote a sacred trust,
Clear above threat and ridicule,
All heard his challenge 'Is it just?'"

I believe that a love of justice and of generous and liberal treatment is an instinct I might say of that statesman's nature; but he must be sustained, his hands must be held up in order to give him the power to accomplish the task which, though advanced in years, remains for him to do in order to crown a life spent in the service of his country. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution (Mr. Costigan) said that Scotland was also moving on the subject. Within the last ten days a very important meeting was held which came to the conclusion to ask for a Local Legislature for Scotland with triennial elective Parliaments; and there can be no doubt, notwithstanding the remarkable business tact and talent by which the Scotch business has been managed in Parliament, there have been great and injurious effects in the management of that business. What has been accomplished, has been accomplished by a sort of imperfect federation in that regard. We know that, in regard to all parliamentary measures, the Scotch members have met together and agreed as to what was wanted for the country, and what was agreed upon has been passed through Parliament, unless it trench upon the prejudices and views of others almost without debate. They have not succeeded in all things—they have not succeeded in many important things. They have had strong fights when questions came up which involved the interests of other parts of the United Kingdom; but this agitation in Scotland cannot fail to have an important influence in maturing public opinion on the Irish question. I maintain that the English Parliament cannot deal efficiently with these questions, that from lack of knowledge and sympathy, in consequence of being, as Mr. Gladstone has said, wholly over-weighted, it is not competent, and its incompetency has been proved and confessed by the present Premier, to deal satisfactorily with these questions. Let the British people then give to the Irish people this legitimate vent for their somewhat restless energies, and utilize them in the legitimate occupation of dealing with their own concerns. I have once again to trouble the House with another extract from a still later speech by Mr. Gladstone. Speaking of Parliament the hon. gentleman said:

"Sir, this a subject on which I have very distinct and clear opinions, which I have never scrupled to declare. They are not shared by many gentlemen; probably in this House they may be considered of a speculative character, and it is highly unlikely that I shall ever be called upon to take a practical part in any matter relating to these opinions, but I have the very strongest opinions, upon the advantages of Local Government, and I have the strongest objections to the tendency which I see constantly prevailing to centralization. Not for Ireland merely, but for England, I would take and profess it at all points a cardinal rule of policy, so far as I can with safety to the general structure of the Empire, to decentralise Parliament. We believe that the institution of secondary and local authorities in a country is a great source of strength, and that in principle the only necessary limit to these powers is an adequate and necessary provision for the supremacy of the central authority. (Hear, hear.) I believe that when the demand is made from Ireland for bringing purely Irish affairs more specially or more largely under Irish control outside the walls of Parliament the wise way to meet that demand will not be the method recommended by the member for the University of Dublin, who, if I understood him aright, said that anything recognising purely Irish control for purely Irish affairs must be necessarily a step towards separation, and must therefore be fraught with danger. (Opposition cheers.) That I do not believe to be either a wise or a just method of dealing with that demand. In my opinion the wise and the just method is to require that before any such plan can be dealt with or can be examined with the view of being dealt with on its merits, we must ask those who propose it; and this is the question I have invariably put—"What are the provisions which you propose to make for the supremacy of Parliament." That has been my course, and that is the course I intend to pursue. I am bound to say I have not received an answer to that question. I have never heard in the time of Mr. Butt or from the mouth of any other gentleman any adequate or satisfactory explanation upon that subject. To this declaration I have only one limitation more to add, and that is I am not prepared to give to Ireland anything which in point of principle it would be wrong to give to Scotland if Scotland ask for it. (Home Rule cheers.) That is, I apprehend, what Irish members, those members of the most popular classes, will be ready to accept. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman was determined to make out that these declarations on my part were a formidable novelty and he said he believed that I had in Mid-Lothian—the scene of so many misdeeds—(laughter)—and likewise at the Guildhall, which might have been considered a more consecrated precinct—

delivered opinions of this kind. Well, I cannot recall all the speeches I have delivered on the subject, but I have taken the pains to recall six of them—(laughter)—which seems to me a very tolerable allowance. One was made in 1872 at Aberdeen, when I was Prime Minister. The next was in 1879 in Mid-Lothian, and another was made in the Guildhall in 1881. But the three speeches made out of Parliament were balanced by three made in Parliament, for in 1872 as Prime Minister I made a reply to Mr. Butt precisely in the same spirit of the declarations I have now made, and in the spirit of the sentences I uttered last week. I did the same in 1874, when I was not Prime Minister, but leader of the Opposition, and I did the same thing in 1880, when I sat on these benches as an independent member. Perhaps I may be allowed to read a few words of that speech. My hon. friend the member for Cork (Mr. Shaw), in the beginning of 1880, on the 27th of February, made a remarkable speech upon this question. He made a proposition which I could not accept any more than I could accept the proposition of my hon. friend the member for Tipperary (Mr. P. J. Smyth) the other night, and, professing himself an advocate of what I think he termed Home Rule, argued for it and pleaded for it in a spirit I own won my sympathy and regard, and I did not hesitate, as I do not which now, to use these words. (The hon. gentlemen then quoted the words in which he said that from the tone of the hon. member's remarks, if the relations between England and Ireland were to become satisfactory, the most important contribution to that essential end would have been made by Mr. Shaw.) That was the spirit in which I received the declaration made by the hon. member as leader, for he then was leader of the party from Ireland, and every one of the speeches to which I have referred is, I believe, in complete and exact conformity with the brief outline of my opinions upon this question."

Now, Sir, I have read that speech for two or three reasons. First of all, because you will observe that the hon. the Prime Minister, after an interval of reflection, comment and criticism reiterates the demand as an essential condition preliminary to any action on this subject, that a satisfactory solution of all these difficulties should be propounded by those who ask for it on the Home Rule benches. Therefore we find the suggestion that it stand until a day which may never come. Secondly, there is a declaration which he says he has made for ten years, and therefore we find no advance in his views upon this question. Lastly, and most importantly, we find him using these same fatal words with which Irish questions, as I have proved, have been always postponed until the day of grace and utility were passed. This is a practical question. I do not expect to be called upon to deal with it. I care nothing for these speculations. I say it is a practical, a burning question. It is the most practical and burning question we can conceive, and when the Minister has stated that the results are not satisfactory as they stand, that there ought to be a change, that there ought to be a grant of local rights and privileges, that justice demands it, and that it cannot be expected that they will be satisfied if the Parliament of the United Kingdom does not discharge that duty, justice demands that those who have the power and the responsibility should propound that legislation. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of another branch of this question, and that is whether we have any interest in this question calling upon us to interfere in it, and I deal with that branch of the question now, partly because the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, and partly because it is not the first occasion on which a great Irish question has come under the consideration of this House and has been treated by this House in one way or another. I alluded a while ago to the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as one of vast importance both in its direct and indirect relations to the condition of Ireland, and it happened that while that question was under debate a late respected member of this House, the hon. Mr. Holton, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, moved on the 31st of May, 1869:

"That this House do immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

"1. That in the opinion of this House the measure now pending before the Imperial Parliament for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church will, if it becomes law, by the removal of one of the chief causes of the deeply rooted discontents which have long existed among a numerous body of Her Majesty's subjects, promote the tranquillity, increase the prosperity and add unmeasurably to the strength as well as the just renown of the great Empire of which this Dominion forms no inconsiderable part.

"2. That this opinion is strengthened and supported by the recent experience of the late Province of Canada; for the controversies which

had during many years disturbed that Province and retarded its progress were finally and happily terminated in 1854 by an Act of the Provincial Legislature, bearing a close resemblance in its essential features to the measure now before the Imperial Parliament.

"3. That a royal and dutiful address, founded on the foregoing resolutions, be presented to Her Majesty the Queen, and that a Special Committee of Members be appointed to prepare an Address and report the same."

To this the hon. gentleman moved, seconded by Sir George Cartier, the previous question, and the previous question was upon that occasion carried by the hon. gentleman with the assistance of his supporters, against the vote of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman supported his motion for the previous question by a speech. He said:

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD replied that he did not doubt that the hon. gentleman was influenced by patriotic motives, but it was quite certain that his object was just as mischievous as his mode of bringing it up. The hon. member appeared to give up the whole case when he admitted that, as a matter of legislation, we had no right to deal with it. The Parliament of the Dominion, he acknowledged, was only authorized to pass laws for the good order and peace of Canada. Therefore, the hon. member said that all we could do was to give a simple expression of opinion—nay, more, that we should not do so ordinarily, except on important occasions, or in respect to a matter of supreme necessity. Now, the question immediately suggested itself—Where was the necessity for the present motion? The measure has been approved by the public opinion of Great Britain—it had been sanctioned by an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons, and the hon. gentleman himself had been certain that the House of Lords, in due submission to the popular sentiment, would agree to its passage. Now, surely, it was an extraordinary course on the part of the hon. member to ask the House to deal with a matter with which it had no concern, and render itself amenable to the answers that 'it should mind its own business.' The hon. member acknowledges that our Parliament should not deal with such a matter except in a case of supreme necessity.

"Hon. Mr. HOLTON. I said on a question of supreme importance to the Empire.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no supreme necessity for the motion—it was not of supreme importance to the Empire what our opinions on such a question might be—whether we were favorable or opposed to the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland. The hon. member had asserted that we were in the habit of passing addresses to the Sovereign on matters of interest, affecting herself or family. Now, the Queen of England was the Sovereign of Canada, every one had an interest in herself and family. In the very Act of Confederation, the first clause (sanctioned by the British Parliament), declared that the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland shall be our own Sovereign for all time to come; and, therefore, it was quite within the limits of our jurisdiction and propriety to refer to matters connected with the propriety and happiness of Her family. The hon. member had also said that we had expressed an opinion respecting peace and war; but every one would see that the moment such a state of things arose, every section of the Empire was virtually affected. Therefore, as loyal and devoted subjects, it was our duty and interest to sympathize with the heart of the Empire. But in the case of the present question, neither our loyalty nor our interest was at stake. He for one would not go into the discussion of the merits of the measure—he would not say whether it was good or not, for it was not the place to debate it. The hon. member had no right to force an expression of opinion in the Canadian Parliament, and he must have known that there was a very considerable and respectable minority in the country immediately affected, who received the Bill with heartburning and the deepest dissatisfaction. The people of Canada lived in harmony and peace—or had no religious or other antipathies to excite us; and yet the hon. gentlemen wished to transfer to the Dominion the heart-burnings and animosities of the Old World. If the policy of the hon. member were sanctioned, then we should see the sad spectacle of different religious sects in this country coming forward, embodying their respective feelings on this vexed question. The hon. member had not even assumed to discuss even the merits of the question—to go into details, and show that it was worthy of the support of the House. Yes, he was calling upon the House to express a decided opinion on a question respecting which it had only a general idea. There could only be one object in such a motion, and that was, to create an ill-feeling between the Protestants and Catholics, to bring discord into this now happy country. It was quite obvious, that if the cause of the course of the hon. member was legitimate, then it would be within the province of the Legislature to deal with the Reform Bill, and other questions of equal importance affecting Great Britain. On the same principle, the House would be found interfering in the affairs of Spain, and referring to her ecclesiastical establishments. Nay more, the Parliament of the Dominion, with equal justice, might be called upon to give a strong expression of sentiment respecting separate schools, or church endowing, or other matter of interest to the people of Lower Canada. In whatsoever light he viewed the question, he could not avoid seeing the impropriety of the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Chateaugay, and was convinced that the House would deal with it promptly and effectually, so as to prevent the introduction of similar resolutions in the future. In conclusion, he would move the previous question in amendment to the motion before the House."

Mr. BLAKE.

Now, Sir, I maintain that the hon. gentleman was on that occasion mistaken as to the real feelings and sentiments of the great majority of the Canadian people. I believe that, so far from that motion being, as the hon. gentleman said, calculated to excite discord, heart-burnings and religious difficulties, we would have all agreed—had he but seen the question in another light—in favor of that solution of that question, just as we had, in the old Province of Canada, lively though were the feelings of religious difference in that old Province, when we settled a somewhat similar question. I refer, Sir, to this statement, because I wish to express the hope that in the interval between 1869 and 1882, the hon. gentleman has advanced in his views, has observed the current of events, and will now be disposed to take a different line, and instead of arguing on the precedent which he himself created by moving the previous question on that occasion, as he stated there would be an effectual barrier to similar resolutions in the future, he may be disposed to admit our right to tender some advice on this occasion, and give his support to the motion before the House. I say we have an interest, as a part of the great Empire—as sharers in its prosperity, as sharers in its shame; we have an interest in everything which will tend to develop the strength and the unity of that Empire; we have an interest in every great and important question affecting the general constitution and organization of the Empire at large. Nobody can doubt that, through chaos and without any formal system, the gradual tendency of the constitution of the Empire has been more and more—perhaps through drifting, perhaps otherwise—towards the adoption of the federative form. We ourselves are the out-crop of that idea. Our present position is due to its partial, unsymmetrical, unreasoned, but practical development; and I say, Sir, we must consider that, without power effectually to interfere, without power of legislation, we yet have a right, as members of the Empire, to express an opinion upon this subject. As a part of the Empire largely peopled by old country men—by Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen—we have a deep interest in a question which must materially affect the prosperity and happiness of our countrymen in the old land. As a country wanting immigrants, as the hon. gentleman has said, we have a material interest of a very great degree. We all know where the Irish immigration goes; we all know that those who cross the sea and land upon the shores of America, go almost wholly, particularly those of the Roman Catholic faith, to the United States instead of to Canada; we know that our share of the Irish immigration is insignificant, and that our share of Irish Roman Catholic immigration is but a very small proportion in these latter days of even our share of Irish immigration. We know, on the other hand, that enormous numbers of that people have gone to the United States. When I said two years ago that that was due largely to the difficulties to which I referred, and hoped that a better feeling might be engendered by remedial measures applied to the state of Ireland, hon. gentlemen opposite did not seem to sympathize with that remark. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman repeat it to-day, and I hope it has become, to a large extent, the accepted sentiment of the people of this country. We are interested materially in another sense in this question. We and our neighbors have a common frontier of 3,000 miles long. That country is, and must always be, a country in our cordial and friendly relations with which, must lie a great part of our own prosperity; and no man can doubt that the existence of the Irish question is a main feature of the difficulties between the United Kingdom and the United States, and cannot but react most unfavorably upon us. We recollect what has happened in former days; we recollect when our peace was broken, our territory invaded more than once, expense was incurred and blood shed; we recollect that such a state of things existed in the United States,

that redress, whether by expression of regret or by pecuniary compensation, was absolutely denied, on the score, I presume, that the state of feeling in that country rendered it impossible for any such concession to be made. If you look at some of the figures of the recent Census, you will see how directly and indirectly—directly, as wanting immigrants ourselves, indirectly as those with whom the people of the United States should be on friendly terms—we are interested in this question. Take the State of Massachusetts in which out of a population of 1,625,000, the foreign-born people, if I remember rightly, number some 420,000 souls, and of these no less than about 240,000 were born in Ireland; so that more than one-half of the foreign-born population of the State of Massachusetts is of Irish birth, while if you add to those the number who are the descendants of Irishmen in that State, you will see what a powerful factor in the prosperity and the progress of that country is the Irish immigration. Of that immigration we want a share for ourselves and we want still more earnestly that those who choose the Republic instead of the Dominion, shall not choose the Republic with feelings of animosity and disaffection towards the Empire of which we form a part, but with those friendly feelings which animate the Englishmen and Scotchmen who also happen to prefer, for material reasons, the republic to the Dominion. Now, Sir, there is another reason why we should interfere—we can speak with authority on this subject; we are federalists ourselves; we are experienced in the benefits of Home Rule; we know what it means; we know that it is our most precious possession; we know that there is nothing that we will part with with greater reluctance or more difficulty than our portion of Home Rule; we know that there is nothing that we would sacrifice more to retain than our portion of Home Rule, whether you revert to that portion which the Dominion has in relation to the Empire, or that portion which the Provinces have in relation to the Dominion. In reference to the important Federation which exists between Canada and the United Kingdom, or the more perfect form of federation which exists between the Dominion and the Provinces, if any people in the wide world can speak of the difficulties engendered from the want of Home Rule, and the benefits to be secured by the grant of Home Rule, it is the people in whose name and for whose interests we sit and deliberate in this hall this night. Now, Sir, the descendant of Irishmen myself—my grandfather by the father's side a rector of the church to which I have referred, and sleeping in his churchyard, and my ancestor by my mother's side slain in conflict with insurgents, while it might have been my misfortune, had I been born and bred in the old land, to adopt from prejudice views very different from those I hold this night, yet, it having been my good fortune to have been born and bred in the free air of Canada, and to have learned those better, those wiser, those more Christian and just notions which here prevail, upon the subjects of civil and religious liberty, class legislation, and Home Rule itself, I have always entertained ever since I have had the opportunity of thinking on this subject, the sentiments to which I have given feeble utterance this evening. I believe that these are the sentiments native to our own sense of freedom and justice, of forbearance and toleration, and a desire to deal in this subject, as the hon. gentleman said who moved it, in that spirit which says: "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you." I had been anxious that this discussion should be raised, and had myself prepared a motion on the subject when private circumstances called me from my desk here. On my return I learnt that the same hon. gentleman to whom the hon. member for Victoria has alluded had taken the matter in hand, and it was thought better not to meddle with them, or with the course that they, under his leadership, might propose. But although I remained silent I felt that it would be doing

but a scant justice to the feeling of Canadians, French, Scotch, English or Irish to suppose that there is any material difference in the intensity of their feelings on this subject from those whom the hon. gentleman who brought forward the motion more particularly seems to represent. I believe our sentiments are based on the general principle of political action to which we have been educated and which has advanced our prosperity and our intellectual and moral standing in the world. Now, I heard the hon. gentleman's resolution with some regret, for one reason that I find it emasculated. I find it very much weaker than the resolution which he put on the paper in the first instance. In some particulars it does not legislatively suit my view. He has fallen into something like the error ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, and not willing myself to repeat that error, I would prefer to vote for the best resolution we can get. Yet I will vote with reluctance for the measure which hypothetically refers to the grant of a measure of self-government to Ireland. The hon. gentleman says in the altered resolution:

"And we would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard."

"6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them."

We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that its best security is to be found in a united Irish people, managing their own affairs. I say that the possession of such a measure is essential to the maintenance of the Empire. There ought to be no ifs or ands in the expression of the views of the 'Canadian' people upon this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view that the possession of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire that we can agitate or act with the effect in dealing with this matter. I am not disposed to act hypothetically. I am not disposed to deal with this question with ifs and and's. I am willing to advise conciliatory measures and ample justice to Ireland. I should like the Canadian people, through their representatives in Parliament, to say to the Imperial Government, politely, that, in their opinion, as 4,000,000 of British subjects, they believe that, the integrity of the Empire demands self government for Ireland. So with reference to the clause that speaks of those men deprived of constitutional right of trial by jury, I do not understand them to invite the clemency of the Crown. I do not understand them to be charged with political offences. I understand them to be imprisoned under a law which does not call on the Government to charge them with any crime whatever. What we ought to have asked for those gentlemen is the restoration of the *habeas corpus* and a trial by their peers of any charge which the Government of England may think fit to make against them. It is not an application for clemency and mercy that they demand and that we should express, but a hope that the ordinary constitutional right of every British subject may be extended to these particular British subjects—namely, the right of *habeas corpus* and of trial by their peers for any offense with which they may be charged against the law of the land to which they belong. I hope that the resolution, weak as it is, unsatisfactory as it is—failing, as in my opinion it does in those two points, in a manner which I do not myself admire, will yet pass; because it is not amendable, and it is infinitely better that it should pass than be rejected because some may think it too weak and others too strong. In this question I have shown we are interested in many ways, although we have

no direct voice in the legislation of Great Britain, notwithstanding we have a right to venture our counsel and express our views. We have a right respectfully to approach our Sovereign and strengthen the hands of Her Prime Minister whose sentiments are not hostile to reform. We have a right to give the influence of 4,000,000 of British subjects to the redress of grievances too long maintained, to attainment of rights too long denied, and so to enlarge the strength and increase the unity of the mighty Empire of which we form a part.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I can congratulate my hon. friend from Victoria, on the manner in which he introduced the resolution now under consideration. His tone and manner were unexceptionable. With his usual modesty he disclaimed the idea of using any rhetorical artifice. No rhetoric can be so effective in this House or country, as plain, unvarnished statements, such as made by my hon. friend, in the fullness of his heart and in the exercise of his reason; and notwithstanding his overflowing sympathy with his countrymen in Ireland, his speech clearly, loyally and logically forced itself effectively upon the calm consideration of every member. It must have in the House and out of the House, a greater influence than if he had adopted a different and a stronger tone, but this he has always followed in taking up a question of any kind, showing sincerity in his advocacy of any question. He had no sinister object, political or otherwise. But his object, his sole reason for addressing the House was that his proposition, sincerely offered, should be carried out. How different is the appeal, the carefully prepared, the elaborate address of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, spoken, or rather read with great vigor and energy to this House. The object of the one hon. gentleman was quite different from the other. The one wanted to secure the object of his resolution, and the other wished to make political capital. When this resolution was first placed on the notice paper, I am free to confess I looked at them with considerable apprehension of the consequences that might arise from the discussion in this House and Parliament. But in carefully looking at the resolutions even as they were originally prepared, and still more as they have been modified by my hon. friend, I can see no objection in the world, but much good, from an expression of the opinion of this House of Parliament. The hon. member for West Durham speaks disapprovingly, almost sneeringly at the emasculated resolutions—of the changes that have been made in them by my hon. friend. Then again you can see the difference in the objects of the two hon. gentlemen. The mover of these resolutions wished to draw them in such a manner as to attract the strongest, the most united vote of the House, a unanimous vote to secure for them the greatest influence on the converts of England. What does the hon. gentleman opposite care whether Home Rule is carried in Ireland or not? What does he care whether the suspects are kept in gaol for this, or next, or for many years? He would rather there should be a crying grievance that he might address, as he has done to-night, a speech to the Irish Catholics of the Dominion, to produce an effect on their minds, without the most distant care or consideration of the mischievous effects his speech would have in England and with the British Government. What was the object of my hon. friend for Victoria? He knew that he was powerless to force the matter in this Address upon Her Majesty's Government or the Parliament of England, so he desired in the first place that we should, by a moderate, calm statement of the fact that we had good, prosperous Home Rule in Canada, and by the statement that we hoped that as Her Majesty would find it opposed to the disintegration of the Empire, she would grant the same mode of self-government to Ireland as similar to ours as the different circumstances would permit. He asked that as the notion of force with the British Government is out of the question,

Mr. BLAKE.

that we should pass a resolution praying the British Government and Parliament to adopt a somewhat similar system to that which happily prevails in Canada. For that purpose language of presumption must not be used, but language of approbation so far as we could approve of the course of Her Majesty's Government in that direction—but not language of disapprobation. While the hon. gentleman spoke with great laudation of the ability of Mr. Gladstone—an opinion in which every one shares—he has told us that he has withdrawn his confidence from Mr. Gladstone, although two years ago he was the greatest statesman in the world, and now the hon. gentleman tells us that every one of his measures was ineffectual, from one cause or another—one, the Land Act of 1870, being too late, the other, the disendowment of the Irish Church, being inadequate; and last of all, the present land system on which Mr. Gladstone has pledged the standing and status of his Government by a perfunctory measure, which is destined to be as unsuccessful as every other measure has been for the relief of Ireland, and must be followed by more drastic measures. That hon. gentleman holds a position too high in Canada, and holds it deservedly from his great ability, not to warrant us in believing that the words which have fallen from his mouth will be read by the members of the British Government and the House of Commons and generally in England. Mr. Gladstone is human, and, like every leader, is strong in his opinions, and does not receive kindly anything like disapprobation of his measures. When, therefore, this measure goes to England, if it does go, as I hope it will, the commentary will be that all Mr. Gladstone's measures will be failures, because in that one instance they were too late and in the other imperfect; and Mr. Gladstone's Government will not meet with much favor resolutions propounded and carried in that spirit. But they are not and will not be carried in that spirit. The moderate tone, the loyal tone, the beseeching tone of my hon. friend asking for sympathy for his fellow-countrymen, asking for what he considers to be for the good of his country, will be contrasted with the mischief that would be caused by that strong disapprobatory speech of the leader of the Opposition, of all that has been done by English statesmen. It will do much to neutralize it, and I believe that the good sense and moderation and the generous tone that will be adopted in this discussion, will wipe out to a great extent the mischievous and improper language of the hon. gentleman. Suppose that the hon. gentleman had moved these resolutions in the place of my hon. friend from Victoria; suppose that no other person had spoken on that debate but he, and these resolutions had gone home with the hon. gentleman's speech as a commentary, what chance would there be that any attention would be paid to an Address based upon and supported by the one support of a speech like that of the hon. gentleman. Why, they would have been thrown at once to one side, because, on reading through the lines of the hon. gentleman's speech, its object appears to be solely to secure political advantage by keeping up distractions in Canada. The hon. gentleman quoted some portion of my speech in 1869 in sympathy with the motion for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and says he hopes that since then I have learned something. I approve of every word of my speech, and under the same circumstances, on the same measure, I would take the same course I did in 1869. The measure for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland was safe. It had, in effect, passed. It was known it was safe. It required no expression of approbation or sympathy from the people of Canada. That measure was destined for good or evil to become the law of the land. Therefore, the late Sir George Cartier and I objected to the motion because its object was

to throw the apple of discord among the people of Canada. It was moved, simply, for the sake of trying to get a vote that would either irritate the Irish Protestants or the Irish Catholics. The object was so clear that the lamented Sir George Cartier and I joined in saying, by moving the previous question, that we should not express any opinion on that subject, as it could only do mischief by increasing dissensions on a religious question, and could do no possible good. The hon. gentleman says that the conclusion the House came to on that motion that the question be not now put, was not in accordance with the feelings of the majority of the people of Canada. No man is more mistaken than he. You know that the disestablishment of the Anglican Church involved the deprivation of the Anglican Church of all its property, of all its endowments. The two went together, and the whole of the Roman Catholic population of Lower Canada, the whole body of French Canadians who were yet a quasi-established church under the Treaty of Paris, who have got legal rights that cannot be affected, who have got large estates and endowments that are secured to them by the Treaty of Paris, and the arrangements between France and England when this became a British colony, the whole Catholic hierarchy felt that if the representatives voted for a measure of this kind, the next thing they might expect was their disestablishment and disendowment, the taking away of their own property. The whole of the hierarchy and the priesthood of the Roman Catholic laity felt that if they voted for a measure of this kind, praying for the disestablishment and the deprivation of the property of an established church, that if their representatives did that in the Parliament of Canada they might next expect their own disestablishment and disendowment, the robbing and taking away of their own property as a consequence. And so I say now with the same confidence that the people of Canada would say, if a similar question of this kind arose in England, we cannot and ought not to allow this question to be brought up in Canada. That is the ground Sir George Cartier and I took, the plainly sensible ground, and it met with the cordial approval of Parliament; and, Sir, the attempt failed—the wretched attempt to introduce religious dissension amongst us, and God knows we have enough of it, even in this free country—and we heard no more about it. But, Sir, while I say that if that same question, involving the same consequences and the same disturbance of public opinion, were brought up now, I would take the same ground. The question in these resolutions is not a question of that nature. I said a little while ago that the hon. gentleman has voted want of confidence in Mr. Gladstone, certainly he has no want of confidence in himself. The hon. gentleman says that he disapproves altogether of what Mr. Gladstone did. He read a paragraph of his speech made the other day, and said he was wrong, that it was a fatal error—unhappy man that he was in not having the hon. gentleman opposite at his elbow to advise him—when Mr. Gladstone said, and he still adheres to that opinion—that when parties proclaim they have a grievance and desire to have it redressed, the grievance being admitted, the answer is this: “Well, you claim you have been aggrieved, what remedy do you propose?” That is what Mr. Gladstone said, and what any man of common sense would say. But it does not meet the views of the hon. gentleman, and he pooh-poohs, he sneers at the weakness, the folly, the want of statesmanlike wisdom in Mr. Gladstone, because he says: “Well, if you want a thing tell us what you do want.” Sir, I said before that at first I looked with apprehension upon the consequences of these resolutions, but I think they can do no harm—they may do much good. In the first place, they are based on the one single object of doing good to Ireland by their effect on the British Government in legislation for Ireland, and that is a businesslike foundation. The hon.

gentleman is kind enough to approve the motion. It says, and truly, that we do not get a fair proportion of the emigration from Ireland. That is an unfortunate fact. It states that these fellow-subjects of ours, the strength of the Empire, are going to a foreign nation, and it may be, in the course of events, a hostile nation. It states that fact, and it regrets it, it regrets it on the best grounds, because while we can improve the condition of the distressed who come to this country, at the same time it adds to the strength of the Dominion, and if it adds to the strength of the Dominion it *pro tanto* adds to the strength of the Empire. This is a proper ground, the ground of self-interest, the interest we have in having peace, prosperity and satisfaction restored to Ireland, and a position of unity and affection restored between Her Majesty and Her advisers and the population of Ireland. Then, that basis being laid down, the resolution goes on and asks a favor of the British Government. The hon. gentleman who moves the resolution has no selfish object, he does not desire to raise himself at the expense of the Irish people in Ireland, to raise himself up as a great leader among the Irish in the Dominion, not desiring to make political capital out of it, not desiring to place himself at the head of a popular movement amongst his countrymen here, nor with a single mind to carry out the object of his address. Above all things he assures Her Majesty and the people of Ireland, that the Irish people in Canada are happy, contented and loyal subjects of Her Majesty, as desirous, as we are, to remain under Her beneficent rule, as ready as we are and others are, not of that race, to shed our blood in defence of the old flag which is alluded to expressly in the resolution, and if need be on our soil in Canada, in America, to renew the glories which Irishmen have earned on every field of battle where Englishmen have been martialled against a foreign foe. The hon. gentleman might have made himself a popular demagogue, he might have pursued the same political objects which moved the hon. gentleman opposite with scarcely a disguise, not a thin veil to hide the nakedness of that object—he might have raised himself up as a demagogue and might have ranged his countrymen under him to take extreme measures in the politics of Canada. But my hon. friend desired that one thing, and Sir, he will succeed, notwithstanding the speech of the hon. gentleman which, I dare say, may have disinclined many hon. gentlemen in this House who have heard him to vote for this resolution, who without that speech, might perhaps have had no hesitation. I hope and believe that these resolutions will be adopted by this House; I hope that Ireland will in some way be advantaged. How we cannot see, how we do not venture to dictate, how it would be folly in us to dictate, not having the same infallible confidence in our own opinion as the hon. gentleman, not having the same ability to settle the whole question. But we hope it will be settled in some way to the benefit of Ireland, and consistent with the integrity of the British Empire, but so that the Irish people may be governed according to their own wishes, and governed by Irishmen so far as is consistent with our common good and the integrity of the whole Empire. It is easy to see the difference between a demagogic speech and a patriotic speech. My hon. friend, in his resolution, asks for Home Rule in Ireland in so far as is consistent with the interests and well-being of the Empire, that the rights of the minority shall be fully protected and secured. My hon. friend is an Irish Catholic. From his great ability and long parliamentary experience, and from the general sense of his political and personal honesty he stands high among his countrymen, and yet he knows he is more than an Irish Catholic; he is an Irishman and he desires the happiness and peace of all Ireland. He knows that there is a powerful and wealthy and intelligent minority, and he, a Catholic, asks that the Protestant minority, as Gladstone asks, that

the rights of his Protestant countrymen shall be protected. This is the language of a man rising above everything like being a demi-god, it is the language of a man who rises above sectional or religious differences, it is the language of a man who seeks the prosperity, not of the Celts or Catholics, but of all Ireland; and by the wording of the resolution, by the care with which it has been drawn, after consulting, as he told us he had done, with members on both sides of the House, he has a reasonable hope that if adopted it may meet with the favor of the Government and Parliament of England. The hon. leader of the Opposition has delivered a lecture against landlordism. Well, landlordism may be bad. We have none of it here; every man is his own landlord, as we say in this country.

Mr. CASEY. Except in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An hon. member says except in the North-West. We have homesteads there for every Irishman and every Irish family. If the whole population of Ireland, man, woman and child, Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile, were brought here by Her Majesty's fleet and every transport and steam vessel belonging to the Empire, there is room for them and for thousands besides. Every man in this country is his own landlord. Landlordism may, however, be good or bad, the ownership of property may be good or bad. I dare say the hon. leader of the Opposition would like to have a large estate even in Ireland. Some hon. gentlemen beside him have large estates now in the North-West and are landlords, speculators, and they have been described by a gentleman, who ought to know the feeling on that side of the House, as harpies. But this Home Rule, if granted at all, must be granted by a Parliament of landlords. It can only be carried in the House of Commons and afterwards in the House of Lords, through the votes of landlords in those Houses. They have a predominant interest and an overwhelming influence in the House of Lords, as well as very large power and influence in the House of Commons; and yet, in order that our humble request for Home Rule may be granted by the landlord Parliament of England, we tell the landlords that we are doing it for the purpose of removing them, for the purpose of letting Ireland be governed by Irish ideas; that a process should be adopted by which landlords would be exterminated, and the Land Act of last year extended and followed up by legislation both in England and Ireland, so that landlords would be swept away altogether. This is a specimen of the gentle tone in which the hon. member for West Durham wishes us to tell the Lords and Commons of England that we want to destroy and take away their property and crush out the landlords and reduce them to a position of operative laborers. With respect to the release of political prisoners, it is well known that this is a question of the greatest importance and one which is agitating the United States and Ireland. It is a burning question in every sense of the word; it is a question on which much must depend, and regarding which the Parliament of Canada must exercise the utmost caution. Therefore, my hon. friend who moved the resolution was well advised when he used these terms: "We venture to hope when the time has come when Her Majesty's clemency may be exercised in the cases of those persons who are now suffering imprisonment in Ireland charged with political offences." In regard to men who are in gaol for committing murder or outrage of any kind, the hon. member for West Durham would ask that they should be released. The hon. gentleman takes this action in order to have an effect upon extreme men who sympathise with the most extreme parties which unhappily are existing in Ireland. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Costigan) is well aware that it would be worse than useless to seek for the release of such persons. Already some good has been

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

effected in regard to the release of persons charged with political offences only. I have Celtic blood running in my veins. I have always had great sympathy with the people of Ireland, who have suffered from the centuries of misrule inflicted upon them. The hon. mover of the resolution is not so violent as hon. gentlemen opposite would like him to be. He is not so unwise as to make a request which would lead to our resolution being returned to us with a reproof which we would richly deserve. The hon. member for Victoria expresses the hope that the time has come when persons charged with political offences, whether rightly or wrongly, may be released, enjoying the estimable blessings of personal freedom. The hon. gentleman will, I hope, succeed in having his resolutions adopted by the House; I hope they will receive the votes of a majority of the House. This is not a Government question, although it was moved as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply. But it is certainly not a Government question, and I, as First Minister, and I believe speaking with some influence, would ask all my hon. friends in this House who can conscientiously do so—I ask no man to vote against his conscience—to support the resolutions. And it is only by the support of the Ministerial majority in this House that this resolution can be carried. Hon. gentlemen I dare say were disappointed that these resolutions were not brought up as substantive resolutions and dealt with by a motion of the previous question. They would then succeed in the object which they are opposing with so much effect, and the hon. gentleman with so much ability, of being the defenders of the wronged Irishmen, and then if an election should come on they would say these people on the other side voted for oppressing the people of Ireland. They are disappointed, I know, they are rightly disappointed. I say distinctly that the stand taken by the hon. gentleman shows that he wants only to make an appeal to the Irish Catholics of Canada, that he is regardless of the prejudicial effects upon Irish people in the Old World; but I hope a majority of this House will be able conscientiously to vote for this Address and send it to Her Majesty. And I hope the *Hansard* going home to England will be delayed by the printer to such a late day that Mr. Gladstone will have assented to the principle of this Address before he gets the speech of the hon. gentleman, for if that comes into his hands the Address will surely be rejected. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for these resolutions with every pleasure and with some hope that they will have some influence with Her Majesty's Government.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on this question, but first, Sir, I wish to correct as gross a misrepresentation as in the course of my parliamentary experience I have ever heard. I appeal to you and to the members of this House, I appeal to every man within the sound of my voice, was ever anything more grossly incorrect—and that is far too mild a word—than the words put by the leader of the House in the mouth of his opponent than those placed by the Minister of the Interior into the mouth of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake)? He said my hon. friend proposed to let loose on demand—that the English Government should let loose—criminals guilty of certain offences upon the country. He asked nothing of the kind, but this only: that men charged with certain offences should have the right of trial. Could there be a more just or fairer or more reasonable demand than that? and yet, said the hon. the First Minister, he proposed to let loose upon society men guilty of the worst offences men could commit on their fellows. I desire, as I said, to make a few remarks upon this question. I have been long and intimately connected with Ireland. On the mother's side I am an Irishman myself, and I have reasonably well proved it. I have spent not a few years in Ireland; I may say I know the Irish people well. I have had the opportunity of

seeing how they live, how they are treated, and of seeing and dealing with all classes of society in Ireland; and I may venture to say, Sir, if the hon. the First Minister himself had ever resided in Ireland but for a few weeks, if he had seen anything of the condition of the Irish people, he would not have used the language he has seen fit to use on this present occasion. Sir, that hon. gentleman talked of the contrast between the hon. member who introduced this resolution and the speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I think, Sir, every member who listened to him must have been drawing a contrast between the statesmanlike mode in which my hon. friend beside me handled the question and the evasions to which the hon. gentleman had recourse. Sir, that hon. gentleman dared to charge my hon. friend with insincerity. He talked of his being a popular demagogue, and of his taking up this question for political effect—that he held no honest and true motive in it. Who is the man who makes this charge of insincerity, when dealing with questions of this kind, against my hon. friend? Why, Sir, it is not so many years ago that there was a burning question in this country, when all classes of people were irritated to a very great degree by reason of troubles in the North-West, and I can recollect the hon. gentleman after expressing a wish to his Maker that he might succeed in capturing Mr. Riel, deliberately turned round and charged my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) with having induced that person to leave the country, to the great danger of Canada. That is one reason. I have the record here, but I will not mar the occasion by referring to the facts, but I will remind the man who talks of insincerity on the part of my hon. friend that eighteen months had barely elapsed before he, before a Committee of the House, was obliged to confess that he had furnished Riel with money to enable him to leave the country. That is the man who talks of insincerity, who talks of being influenced by a desire to make political capital. Sir, he alleged that my hon. friend had lost confidence in Mr. Gladstone. He told us that my hon. friend thought poorly of Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship; but the whole argument he addressed to this House was intended to show how powerless Mr. Gladstone was to carry out his desires for the benefit of the Irish people, by reason of the fact that their affairs had to be dealt with in the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, and he showed conclusively, I think, how it was that proper attention was never paid to the affairs of Ireland until they had passed a stage at which it was almost impossible to remove the evils complained of. Is that my hon. friend's opinion alone? Is it not the opinion of every man who has written with any degree of care on the affairs of Ireland for the past thirty years at least. He threatens us with the displeasure of Mr. Gladstone if we presume in our capacity of Canadian legislators to deal with a subject which affects the interests as well as the sentiments of a very large number of the people of Canada. The hon. Minister paid an involuntary compliment to my hon. friend when he mentioned that he would not likely be swayed from the path of his duty when he thought anything was to be done which the interest of Canada required him to do, by the desire to propitiate the Ministers of Great Britain. That has not always, I fear, been the course pursued by that hon. gentleman himself. I think I could name more than one instance in which he has sacrificed our interests, and in sacrificing our interest, has sacrificed the highest interest of the Empire itself, for the purpose of currying favor for a time with Mr. Gladstone or some of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues. Sir, he talks of the eloquent language of my hon. friend as mischievous and improper. I would like to know is there one Irishman in this House, is there one man of Irish parentage or Irish descent in Canada who, when he peruses those words, will echo the sentiments of the hon. gentleman; and if there is,

I would like to know that man's name, and I think the Irishmen of Canada would like to know it too. He talks, Sir, of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as an act of spoliation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It meant nothing else.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The language used by the hon. gentleman could have no other meaning. He used language which implied that he meant that the Irish Church, by being disestablished, were deprived of the property which properly belonged to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind. I said it involved this endowment as well; I neither expressed an opinion for or against the disestablishment, but I said the two went together.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's language went further and meant more. If he simply means that they ceased to be an established church, he said the truth; but if he means that they were improperly deprived of any property, then I say no church was ever more liberally dealt with than the Irish Church when it ceased to be the nominal church of the nation—a thing which the hon. gentleman well knows it never was really; and we know that a very large proportion of the funds that belonged to it were assigned to the individual members of it. Sir, I do not believe there ever has been found a case in which, under similar circumstances, the members of any church were more liberally dealt with than the members of the Irish Church; and any man who has seen the mode in which the services of that church was administered, and the mode in which that establishment was kept up, knows that it was a crying shame and injustice to the majority of the people of Ireland that that course had not been taken long before. He tells us, Sir, that he looked with apprehension on the resolutions as they were originally framed, and he goes on to tell us that no doubt the hon. member member for Victoria was well advised when he amended them. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman makes that statement with cause; I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, when he calls them well advised, speaks with proper respect to the advice which he himself gave; I have no doubt that they were carefully and well considered over by the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Victoria, and although I do not question the motives of that hon. gentleman, still I say that in the main I agree with my hon. friend beside me, that the resolutions as he originally proposed them were better adapted to his purpose, and likely to have more effect than the weaker ones which he has subsequently submitted. The hon. gentleman tells us that my hon. friend beside me had no business whatever to make any attack on the land system of Ireland or on the landlords who ruled Ireland; and he tells us, with a certain amount of truth, that it may be ill-advised to do so, because the Parliament of Great Britain is almost entirely dominated in both branches by the landlord interest. Sir, could there be a stronger argument advanced than the argument used by that hon. gentleman in favor of the proposition of Home Rule for Ireland? Does he not know that at this present moment the landlords are on one side and the vast majority of the Irish people on the other? Does he not know that of the 108 Irish representatives on the floor of Parliament, a large portion are not landlords or representatives of landlords, and are pledged to Home Rule? And if he be correct, although I do not think he is, in saying that the landlord interest is paramount in the House of Commons, he supplies, I repeat, the strongest argument that could possibly be supplied, why the destinies of the Irish people should not be left to depend entirely on

the caprice or the decisions of such an assemblage. Sir, the hon. gentleman tells us that he desires that none of his friends should in this matter vote against their consciences. Well, Sir, unless the hon. gentleman has been much misrepresented, but a few months have elapsed since at a meeting which he attended in the city of Toronto, he was good enough to tell his followers that he did not want them to support the Government when they were right but when they were wrong; and this is the man who first attacks my hon. friend for insincerity, and then tells his followers that he does not want them to vote against their consciences when he does not particularly desire or want them to do so. Now, as I understand, there are two questions in these resolutions. One is a question of fact. I agree with the mover, with my hon. friend beside me, and with the hon. Minister himself, in thinking that only in circumstances of an extreme character would we be justified in offering any formal expression of opinion to the British people; but, Sir, no man who knows anything of the state of Ireland for the past thirty years at least, no man who has paid any attention to the way in which that country has, from decade to decade, been depopulated, no man who knows anything of the condition in which the vast mass of the Irish people live, can pretend to say that the condition of Ireland does not warrant every man in the British dominions who has any connection with Ireland in expressing his opinion—and that is all we propose to do—that that condition is eminently unsatisfactory, that the condition of the Irish people is one to which no civilized people before have ever been reduced, and that no exertion is too great, no measure too stringent or too drastic, if it will give relief and satisfaction to the Irish people. My hon. friend alluded to the extraordinary depopulation which had taken place in Ireland. That, Sir, will bear a few words of further remark. It is well known that prior to the Irish famine the population of Ireland approached 9,000,000 of people; 8,750,000—I speak from memory—was, I believe, the estimated population of Ireland by the Census in the year 1846. Five years from that time that population had fallen to 6,500,000, in ten years to 5,750,000, in ten years more to 5,400,000, and in thirty-five years it had fallen to 5,159,000. Now, Sir, no man who has paid any attention to the way in which population moves can fail to know that these figures in themselves alone reveal a tale of depression, a tale of distress, a tale of misgovernment, such as no other country in Europe can show. It is well known that men of the most opposite opinions, men as wide apart as Mr. Carlyle and Mr. Lecky, who differ in all other points almost, agree in this, that the whole condition, the whole Government of Ireland, not for the time my hon. friend speaks of, but for centuries back, has been such as to call for the reprobation of the whole civilized world. And though I would deprecate as much as any man acts committed by many of those people within the last few years—although I am not a friend of anarchy, or of communism—still I am bound to say that nothing the law can do ought to be omitted to provide a better means of existence, greater means of comfort, and of leading a reasonable Christian-like life than have recently been within the power of the Irish people. But I will not waste words on a point which the universal concurrence of all impartial observers bears out. From my own knowledge of the condition of the people of Ireland, I can say it has been such as to deprive any Irishman of bettering his condition so long as he remained in Ireland. I shall proceed to consider what is perhaps more pertinent to our present purpose, our rights as subjects of the Dominion to express our opinion on this point. In the first place the whole composition of our people, which is to a large extent an Irish-Scotch colony rather than an English one, gives us a very large interest indeed in this Irish question. It is well known that we have not succeeded in obtaining as large a proportion as could be de-

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

sired of Irish immigration, probably one-fourth of the English-speaking part of our inhabitants are Irish by birth or descent. It is only too well known what that great mass of Irishmen must bring with their descendants. Several millions who have gone to the United States have been unfortunately, I am sorry to say, but not unnaturally, imbued with a feeling of very bitter hostility to the English people and the English institutions. Now, how has that reacted upon us? Does not every man know that the whole position of Canada has been jeopardized, not once, but again and again, by reason of the animosity felt toward us by Irish Americans? Must I recall to the memory of hon. members the fact that for five or six years together we were obliged to stand in arms against attempted inroads on the part of these people, and that hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people of Canada, and many valuable lives, were sacrificed to repel those invasions. And must I, in the last place, recall to mind this unfortunate disgraceful fact that the Government of England proved themselves quite unable either to exact any reparation for those inroads. I am willing to make all reasonable concessions for the sake of peace. I know how deeply our interests are involved in maintaining friendly relations with the great people opposite; so I am always desirous to speak of them with the utmost possible consideration, but no such consideration should warrant the British Government in consenting, as they did, at the time of that ignominious capitulation, to forego our just right to have satisfaction for the outrages committed on us by the Fenians, and at the same time to consent to reparation for injuries inflicted on American commerce by cruisers fitted out in British ports. I believe it is not one of the least reproaches against the hon. Premier that he is the first Minister of Canada who put his signature to a treaty which practically deprived us of all right, or power at any rate, of enforcing our just rights in that matter, or of obtaining any satisfaction. We stand in a position such as no other colony of England does or can occupy. We have experienced in our proper person the bitter fruits of the English misgovernment of Ireland for many years; and we therefore have the right which belongs to men who have suffered injuries to lend our advice to the Throne in this matter, if in no other. Moreover, as was observed justly by the hon. member for West Durham, we have special grounds for saying that we ourselves having tried the experiment for nearly fifty years, having previously had a different form of Government, are able to speak with knowledge and experience of the advantages of a local form of Government for Provinces of widely different character. No man, I think, at any rate no man who really desires the welfare of his country, will desire to see the old Legislative Union brought about. Therefore, having so far, with reasonable success, carried out this project, which the best statesmen are admitting would be a very desirable thing to carry out in England and in Ireland, we are able to speak with some authority on that branch of the subject. It is no secret, it has been no secret for many years, that English statesmen of the highest rank—Mr. Gladstone himself and a great many others of equal note—have been obliged to point out again and again that the attempt to carry on the enormous affairs of the British Empire in a Parliament charged with the pettiest local details as well as the most important issues, was, from the very multitude of affairs thrust upon their hands, becoming a failure. What is it, at this moment, the British Parliament are engaged in doing? They have got great questions to decide. They have this burning question before them, yet almost their whole time until now has been taken up in devising some means whereby the very cumbrous procedure may be simplified and they may be able to carry on their ordinary business. I cannot but regret that the right hon. the First Minister should have taken the line he did towards my hon. friends. My hon. friend had a right to speak as he did.

This is a subject on which he has thought long and thought well. He, if not an Irishman born, is so closely connected with Irishmen and Irish interests that he may be pardoned for feeling warmly and expressing himself warmly. I can well believe, as the right hon. the First Minister has stated, that my hon. friend's speech will be read and pondered on and quoted largely by many men in England, but I differ entirely from the views taken by the hon. gentleman that Mr. Gladstone will be so small minded as to take umbrage at the expressions my hon. friend has used. I say the fact that this House will pass, as I hope it will, by an overwhelming majority, these resolutions, will have the effect of showing Mr. Gladstone and the people of England that this question of the right of settlement of the wrongs of Ireland is much more than a mere question affecting the British Isles, that it affects in the largest and highest degree the British Empire, and we still believe that until the wrongs of Ireland are fully redressed, the British Empire will be shorn of a very large part of the strength, not to speak of the honor and dignity that properly belongs to it.

Mr. WRIGHT. It appears to me that the resolutions introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, are couched in such loyal, liberal and appropriate terms, as to merit the favorable consideration of every member of this House. That a state of things exist in Ireland discreditable to the Empire, and discreditable to the civilization of the nineteenth century, must be admitted by every one. If this evil is to become chronic, if this deadly canker is to eat up and destroy the Irish body politic, then we must mourn the destruction of a gallant and generous people. Connected with us by the closest tie of consanguinity, and whose history is bound up with many of the brightest and some of the darkest portions of that of the Empire, I think that, under the circumstances, the Canadian Parliament might with propriety suggest that a great political problem which has received a favorable solution in Canada, might, by the application of the same methods, produce the same results in Ireland; that the concession of a system of self-government similar to our own, and an amelioration of the landed system, might make Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland as happy, contented, prosperous and loyal, as are Her Majesty's subjects in Canada. It may be said that we have nothing to do with this matter, and that this Parliament has no right to discuss the condition of things which exist in another part of the Empire. We might be told that it is *ultra vires*, and that the inferior cannot advise or dictate to the superior Legislature; but I would submit that what touches the honor and well-being of one part of the Empire touches the honor of all. At any rate, we are free men, in a free Parliament, and from time immemorial every British subject has had the right to lay his petitions and remonstrances at the foot of the Throne. Only the other day when Her Majesty's life was attacked by a vile assassin, it was thought right and proper that the Canadian Parliament should give expression to the feelings of loyalty and devotion which animated the whole Canadian people. If this was fitting in a case affecting Her Majesty's life, it cannot, surely, be improper in a case affecting Her Majesty's honor, for Her Majesty's honor is intimately concerned with whatever affects the well-being and good government of every portion of Her Dominions. We have a great destiny before us. It has fallen to our lot to build up and maintain a great Dominion for Her Majesty in the northern part of this continent. We are bound to hold against all odds, this outpost of the Empire. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to us that every ship that crosses the Atlantic should be freighted with gallant and generous defenders, and not with deadly and dangerous foes. It is of the greatest importance to us that the men who come to aid us in this great work should honor and revere British institutions, and not be imbued with feelings of hatred and horror of the English name.

Contrast the condition of things which exists in Ireland with what exists in Canada to-day. Every one must have read with feelings of pain the reports of the progress of Her Majesty's Secretary, Mr. Forster, through Ireland. In his visit that gentleman was protected by an army of soldiers and policemen. It was regarded as a most daring act that Her Majesty's representative was able to pass through that portion of Her Dominions with safety. These reports remind us of Russian, and not English life. One can fancy such things occurring under the sway of the Czar, but not under the rule of the noblest monarch and the most loving woman that ever the sun shone upon. In Canada Her Majesty's representative is protected only by his own nobility of nature, and by the love, loyalty and respect of the entire body of the Canadian people. It will be a happy day for Ireland and the Empire when her people are as happy and contented as the people of Canada. The history of Ireland is a sad one. All historians and statesmen agree as to this. Mr. Goldwin Smith tells us: "that during one period of the reign of Queen Elizabeth the eagles took wing and flew to the Spanish main while the vultures swooped down on unhappy Ireland. And from that day to this they have never left her. With sharp beaks and cruel claws they have tugged at the heart-strings of these unhappy people." All classes, Protestant and Catholic, have become the victims of these birds of prey. The race of Valentine McClutchey, the vulture tribe, fattened and still fatten on this unholy feast. It has been one long saturnalia of the landlord, the middleman, the informer, the process-server, and the Sheriff. Ireland, like a caged eagle, has beaten its wings against the bars in a vain attempt to escape from the talons of its tormentors. The best and the proudest of her sons were forced to seek in foreign lands that prosperity and position denied in their own. We are told that a like fate befel the Jewish people, and that on a dark night Jerusalem agonized and died. The great city was lost to the Jewish people, but they took the world in exchange. The Irish land was lost to the Irish people, but practically they took the world in exchange. By dint of dauntless valor and patient perseverance, they succeeded in obtaining that position in foreign lands which was denied them in their own. Only in Ireland were Irishmen outlawed from human reason and justice. In the face of what Lord Beaconsfield calls this great misgovernment, it will be well to consider what has been suggested as a remedy for these evils. The main object of every Government is the greatest good for the greatest number, and in almost every country in Europe this has been observed, except in England and Ireland. The rule has been to give the land to the many instead of to the few. The most practical suggestion for the relief of the Irish has been resolved into three propositions: 1st. A local system of self-government similar to that which exists in Canada. 2nd. A re-arrangement of the landed system, so that the land may be divided among the Irish people, the landlords to be paid in full for their property, and the land resold to the Irish people. 3rd. In sections which are over-populated, emigration is the remedy proposed. Some years ago, I was introduced by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to an English gentleman, of the name of Tukey, who had given much attention to this subject. He had, I believe, been Commissioner for Mr. Gladstone for the sale of the glebe lands belonging to the Disestablished Church. He informed me that the lands had been sold in small parcels to the peasantry. I understood him to say that sales had been made to ten thousand people, and in every case the payments had been promptly met. The result being that some of the most disorderly districts in Ireland had been converted into the most peaceable and law-abiding. His remedy for the existing evils was the elimination of the

landlords, and the establishment of a peasant proprietary, self-rule and emigration from over-populated districts to Canada. He asked me as to the condition of the Irish people who settled in Canada. I was happy to be able to inform him that they were just as happy, contented, prosperous and loyal as any other portion of Her Majesty's subjects. That the Irish people were men of marked ability, energy, and enterprise. They had secured by their sterling qualities some of the finest positions in the country. They have become Ministers of the Crown, Members of Parliament, Judges, eminent Lawyers, Wardens and Mayors, and are prominent as successful agriculturists. These men were succeeded by another class of emigrants, the survivors of the Irish famine. These also have been successful under discouraging circumstances. I recollect a visit I made to a newly-settled township. Our meeting was in the open air, in the very heart of the forest. I was much struck by the appearance of the settlers as they came to the place of meeting; some were suffering with fever and privation, and were most unhappy. They looked as if they had escaped from some beleaguered city, where plague, pestilence, and famine had done their deadly work. They were imbued with an awful hatred of the English name, and every man had his tale of wrong oppression, misrule and outrage to tell. A few years after I revisited this scene; it was transformed as if by magic. The dauntless valor, the patient perseverance of the exiles had done their work. The forest had been replaced by broad fields covered with waving grain. The tall pines had given place to pleasant farm-houses. The pallid looks and wasted forms had been replaced by the hues of health and the strength of manhood. Stalwart sons and blooming daughters gathered about the hearthstone, and altogether they were as contented and happy a population as ever the sun shone on. If to-day Her Majesty's throne was attacked, among the first to rally round the English flag would be the gallant exiles and their descendants. We have been told that the Irish are malcontent, and will never be satisfied, we have been told that they are unable to govern themselves, and we are pointed to the outrages so frequently occurring that disgrace a noble cause, and a gallant and generous people. It is admitted by every right-thinking man that these outrages should be sternly suppressed. No country is worth living in where life and property are not protected. It is a proof of what Lord Beaconsfield calls the great misgovernment, that life and property are not protected in Ireland. It is likewise a proof that there is something radically wrong when a Government is unable to perform its natural and legitimate functions. I think that Lord Macaulay has considered a similar state of things in terms which are singularly applicable to the Ireland of to-day. He refers to the outrages that occurred during the great English rebellion:

"We are not careful to answer in this matter. These charges, were they infinitely more important, would not alter our opinion of an event which makes us to differ from the serfs who crouch beneath despotic sceptres. Many evils are, no doubt, produced by civil war, they are the price of liberty. Is the acquisition worth the sacrifice; it is the nature of the devil of tyranny to tear and rend the body which it leaves. Are the miseries of continued possession less terrible than the struggles of the tremendous exertion. If it were possible that a people brought up under an intolerant and arbitrary system could subvert that system without acts of cruelty, half the objections to despotic power would be removed; we should in that case be compelled to acknowledge that it produced no pernicious effects. We deplore the outrages which accompany revolution, but the more violent the outrages, the more we feel that a revolution was necessary; the violence of those outrages will be proportioned to the ferocity and ignorance of the people, and the ferocity and ignorance of the people will be proportioned to the oppression and degradation under which they have been accustomed to live. The Government had prohibited free discussion and had done its best to keep the people unacquainted with their duties and their rights. The retribution was only natural. If the rulers suffered from popular ignorance it was because they had taken away the key of knowledge, if they were assailed with a blind fury it was because they had exacted an equally blind submission; there is only one cure for the evils which acquired freedom produces, and that cure is freedom. When a prisoner first leaves his cell he cannot bear the light of day. The remedy is not to remand him to his dungeon, but to accustom him to the rays of the sun. The blaze of

Mr. WRIGHT.

liberty may at first dazzle and bewilder the nations accustomed to the house of bondage, let them gaze on and they will be soon able to bear it. In a few years men learn to reason, the extreme violence of opinion subsides, hostile theories correct each other, the scattered elements of truth cease to contend and begin to coalesce, at length a system of justice and order is educed out of chaos. Many politicians of our time are in the habit of setting it down as a self-evident proposition, that no people ought to be free till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story who would not go into the water until he had learned to swim. If nations are to wait for liberty until they grow wise and good in slavery they may well wait for ever."

I think there are unmistakable signs that the dark night for Ireland is passed and that the hour of deliverance is at hand. It appears to me that English statesmen and people are at last aroused to the necessities of the situation. Lord Beaconsfield said that while they had not listened to earthquake and lightning, that the still small voice would reach the conscience of England. I think that before long the English Parliament and the English people will concede those rights which they claim for themselves. It may be said that this is a question which will create dissensions among our people. I do not believe that this is the case. Protestants and Catholics alike are interested in the solution of this great problem. I am assured that Irishmen and their descendants all over the world would like to see the same rights given to Ireland which are enjoyed by other portions of Her Majesty's dominions. Mr. Forster, at the close of a long and eloquent speech which he delivered in Ireland, concluded by making use of the form of words appended to all revolutionary documents, namely, "God Save Ireland," and I am certain that every generous heart throughout the world will earnestly and devoutly repeat that prayer. We trust that the prostrate form so long bowed in the dust may at last stand erect in all the dignity of freedom; that the people of Ireland may be as happy and prosperous in the future as they have been unfortunate in the past; that there may be the most perfect union among all classes of her people and that they may be guided by wise counsels and just judgment; that they may be saved from their own fierce passions and those outrages which disgrace a noble cause and a gallant and generous people; that they may be saved from the wiles of desperate demagogues, and that at no distant period Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland be as happy, loyal and contented as Her Majesty's subjects in Canada. And that the Irish land may belong to the Irish people, and that with her own free Parliament she may prove the glory and pride, the strength and bulwark of England, instead of being, as she now is, the weakness, the menace, and the abomination of desolation of the Empire.

Mr. COURSOL. It will be my pleasing duty to vote for the resolutions which have been submitted to this House. This duty will be the more pleasant to me as I have had in the course of my life to express on many occasions the sentiments contained in those resolutions. I have lived in a city where the Irish population is numerous, and where we have had ample opportunity to appreciate the qualities of that noble race. On many occasions they have proved themselves worthy citizens, and loyal to their Queen and country. Notwithstanding the grievances of which they have had to complain in Ireland, they have nobly done their duty in this country in circumstances where a different course on their part would not have been surprising. But I sympathise with the Irish people in their desire for a greater share of self-government. I speak from the standpoint of the experience of my own countrymen; no people can be subjugated by measures of coercion. They may be temporarily subdued by the force of arms, but only temporarily; we have had an example of this in Lower Canada. The French Canadians claimed a right of self-government, which claim was resisted by the Imperial authorities, and many of my countrymen were shot down, imprisoned and exiled, but they persisted in their demand, and finally a sense of justice of the Imperial Govern-

B

ment granted them what they asked for. Great Britain has granted responsible government to this country, and the French Canadians have proved themselves well worthy of the trust, and on all occasions have been loyal and true subjects of the Queen. They have proved themselves just as capable for self-government as the people in any other portion of the Empire. Now, why should we not grant to Ireland the same rights that we have in this country? Why not restore once more to the Irish people the longed-for Parliament of their own choosing at College Green? I am not referring to past history, but I am speaking of the present position. I remember the words used by that great statesman, Mr. Disraeli, when he said: "It is the business of the English statesmen to confer upon Ireland by policy what, if she were strong, she would gain for herself by revolution." Those are noble words, and fitly expressed. Yes, I think England, at the present moment, could do a great service to itself, to humanity and to Ireland. If Mr. Gladstone, who is now guiding the destinies of the British Empire, really desires, as I believe he does, that Ireland should become happy, he can do so by adopting a bold and straightforward policy. Nothing else can save Ireland and nothing else can relieve England from its present embarrassing position. It is an embarrassment to any Government, strong as it may be, to have a part of the Empire disturbed, to be obliged to keep on a war footing thousands of soldiers and to expend millions of pounds to maintain the peace in a country like Ireland, or indeed any portion of the Empire. Let England, noble as she is, come to the rescue; let her pass laws which the Irish desire; let Ireland have a Government, and see what it can do. Let the Irish people be able to discuss their own affairs, and we shall then see whether they will not prove themselves equal to the task. They have done so everywhere, they have done so in this country, and they do so now. Surely when I see myself surrounded by so many hon. gentlemen of Irish descent, when I see the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has made a magnificent oration on Ireland, I cannot fail to feel that the Irish in Ireland will be the same as here, and I hope the day is not far distant when that extension of Irish privileges will be accomplished. Let England, instead of paying money to keep the peace in Ireland, spend it as it has been done in this country. Did not Canada, a few years ago, pay three or four millions to abolish seigniorial tenure, although it was not a great burden on the country. Did not that measure relieve Canada of great difficulty and increase the contentment of the people? We want to live in peace here, and Irishmen will feel when they land on our shores that they are as happy here as at home. I am satisfied and convinced that no part of the British Empire will be more loyal than the Emerald Isle, if the Government could be made satisfactory to her. I am satisfied that Ireland would prove equal to any part of the Empire if that were done. Irishmen have added much glory to the British flag, because in every sphere of life we find Irishmen prominent: on the battle-field, adorning the Bench, and in every possible position where science and art are displayed, you find Irish names everywhere. Marshal McMahon, the famous general, is descended from an Irish family, like Marshal O'Donnell in Spain. Most distinguished citizens of Irish descent are to be found in all provinces of Canada and in all the other British colonies. The Imperial Government is contemplating at the present time to extend representative institutions to her newly acquired colony of Cyprus. Is not Ireland hundreds of times more entitled to Home Rule than these new members of the British Empire? Let England give Ireland Home Rule and change a tenure of land which is the most backward of all Europe and more oppressive than slavery; for with this system slaves are sure to have a home whilst Irish tenants are not. Let those facts be remembered.

I shall be glad to see the resolution unanimously adopted, and that we determine to set aside in this discussion party politics in deciding to make representations to the British Government, and I am sure that when the interest we manifest here is observed, that our resolutions will not be the only resolutions adopted by colonies of the British Empire.

Mr. CASEY. It is pleasant to an Irishman to hear such words as have fallen from the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), an hon. gentleman of a different nationality, but entertaining deep sympathy with the Irish race. If anything were wanting to add to the force of the arguments addressed in favor of the resolution it is furnished in the experience of his compatriots in this country. No stronger arguments could be urged in favor of the claim to Home Rule for Ireland than is that furnished by the French Canadians in the Province of Quebec, that a large majority differing from the minority in race and religion have been able to manage the local affairs of the Province, including property and civil rights, without trampling on the rights of individuals. It must go far to remove the prejudices of many a Protestant throughout Canada and the Mother Country to know that a Catholic majority of a foreign race in the Province of Quebec have not hitherto shown any inclinations to oppress, injure, or wrongly use the Protestant minority. Why is it? That majority is placed upon its honor. They have the power in their hands to do right or wrong, and they act honorably. If that majority had been for a long period ground down and oppressed by the minority, as the hon. gentleman says they were for a short time, the result might have been different. Oppression makes tyrants, and if the French Canadians had been compelled to bear a long series of oppressive acts, they would not have been quite so temperate in the use of their present power. But we feel it is not too late for Ireland in that respect. We feel that if a power was placed in the hands of the Irish to govern their local affairs, perhaps gradually and with restrictions, it would be exercised as temperately and as well as it is exercised by the Roman Catholic French majority of Quebec. So much for the valuable contribution which the hon. member for Montreal East has given to this discussion. But I must say a few words in regard to the extraordinary speech which has been delivered by the leader of the Government. The hon. gentleman began by eulogising the temper and tone of the speech in which the resolutions were proposed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan). We are all aware that that hon. member has the faculty of treating delicate questions in a tone calculated to prevent the trouble that might naturally arise from the nature of the questions themselves. It is not the first time the hon. gentleman has done so, and I hope it will not be the last. It is with strong feelings of satisfaction that I heard one of the hot-blooded race of Irishmen discussing political affairs with calm impartiality and with complete control of temper when he has an object to obtain. And, Sir, I think this speech not only stands on its own merits as a good speech upon this question, but it gains very much by comparison with that of the leader of the Government on the same question. The Prime Minister has told us in effect why the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) was so quiet and restrained in his manner of dealing with this question. He has pointed out to us that without the support of the Ministerial majority in this House these resolutions could not be carried. He has let us see rather clearly by the tone of his speech that he himself has some prejudices upon this question, and has allowed us to infer that his supporters may have prejudices also, and it must be that the member for Victoria was less passionate in urging the evils under which Ireland suffers than he would otherwise have been did he not fear to arouse those prejudices and so prevent the passing of the resolutions. I think he did wisely, and I hope

his fellow-countrymen will feel that it is not from any fear of irritating the English or Irish landlords, or of hurting the feelings of Mr. Gladstone, that my hon. friend was so self-restrained in his advocacy of these resolutions. The hon. leader of the Government says that we ought to take a beseeching tone in approaching the Parliament of England, many of the members of which are Irish landlords; that we ought to go to them very much in the attitude of a poor tenant who is a year or two behind with his rent and begs not to be evicted. That is not the tone natural to an Irishman in conducting a discussion of this great national importance. They are not apt to take a beseeching tone when discussing something which they believe to be due to them, as a matter of right, and I hope that no Irishman will so far forget his dignity as to take such tone on any such question as this. I do not say that we should take a bullying tone. There is a medium between the two. We feel that we are asking something that belongs to us as a matter of right and justice. We should demand it firmly on grounds of principle and on grounds of principle alone, and it is just because the hon. leader of the Opposition has taken that tone and expressed that demand firmly and strongly, backed by the facts of history and by arguments drawn therefrom, that the hon. leader of the Government affects to find fault with his tone—because he did not adopt the beseeching tone, because he was not humble enough. He complains that the hon. leader of the Opposition has found fault with the whole of British legislation on the subject, and pointed out how utterly some of their measures had failed and how others came too late to be of any real value. If those measures had not failed, if all the evils which exist in Ireland had been overcome by wise legislation, there would have been no grounds for those resolutions, and no reason to demand Home Rule. But, Sir, if the right hon. leader of the Government had merely criticized the effectiveness with this House and with the Home Government, of the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, his remarks would have been unobjectionable, for that would have been within his right. But he went further. He imputed motives which I do not think occurred to any other hon. member of this House. He was the first to import into this discussion that feeling which it was the object of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) to exclude from it and which every other hon. member wished to exclude. He tried to do so, but I am glad to say without effect—because I notice in the discussion that two of his supporters have alluded to the speech of my hon. friend in the terms which it deserved, which they could not have done had they believed it was a party speech made from party motives; and I, Sir, as a humble follower of the gentleman, repudiate, on behalf of myself and others with whom I have conversed in this House, any intent to import a party feeling into this discussion at all. I think, Sir, that if anything could injure the prospects of the success of this Address when it is presented to the Home Government, it would be the fact that the leader of the Government had attempted to make it appear, perhaps successfully with the Home Government, that the support this resolution had received in this House was due to an intention to secure the Irish Roman Catholic vote of the Dominion. But, Sir, the hon. leader of the Government, in dealing with the resolutions, adopted by no means the same aggressive, active, fiery tone that he did in speaking of the address of the leader on this side of the House. He did not speak heartily or warmly in favor of the resolutions. In fact he did what he himself referred to in the course of his remarks—he damned with faint praise. He “hoped it would do some good;” and in that faint hope he advised his followers to support it. And, Sir, was it because he thought it was going to do some good he advised his followers to adopt it, or was it because, as he hinted himself, the Opposition were not going to catch

Mr. CASEY.

him advising his followers to oppose anything which was known to be so popular as this resolution? He said we were disappointed at their not opposing it. We were anxious to have this resolution passed. If we were disappointed it was an agreeable disappointment, because we knew, as the hon. leader said, that without the assistance of the Ministerial majority it could not be carried. I do not know that we were disappointed in any sense, because we knew, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, that public opinion of all shades in this country is distinctly favorable to the principle involved in these resolutions, to the principle of Home Rule for each part of the British Empire that has interests peculiar to itself. Now, Sir, as to the question before the House, I do not intend to go into the state of Ireland or the remedy therefor in any detail; that has been done more eloquently than I fancy can be done by any other member of this House. I simply wish to say in general terms that it was evident, from the fact that the measures which have been hitherto introduced have not corrected the state of affairs there existing, that some new cure must be tried. It is clear that the cause of these evils does not lie in the nature of the Irish people themselves, because we all know that Irishmen who have the opportunity become industrious and prosperous members of the community, and have as great an aptitude for politics and the different professions and occupations as men of any other nationality. If, therefore, the man who succeeds everywhere else, stagnates, falls into mischievous idleness, becomes the prey of agitators, becomes almost uncivilized, in the home of his race, it is clear that there must be some cause outside of himself for his condition. It has been stated that that cause is landlordism, and there is no doubt that is the chief factor in the degradation of so many Irishmen; but it is not landlordism in the abstract. The hon. leader of the Government asks why we should attack landlords, and says that when we attack them we attack the rights of property; yet there may be rights of property apart from landlords, by the expropriation of land and its resale to the peasants. But there are landlords and landlords. It is the peculiar kind of landlord that exists in Ireland that has made that feature of the case so fatal in that country. Landlordism prevails in England, Scotland and other places; and yet in no place are the results of that system so bad as in Ireland. This is partly because the landlords are absentees, partly because they are aliens in race and religion from their tenants, unable to sympathize with them or take that paternal care of them that other landlords do; but I think it is also due to the fact that these landlords are the governing body of Ireland in all local affairs, and politically, too, as members of the British House of Commons; it is because the landlord is not only the landlord but the ruler, and in many cases the despotic ruler of his tenants, that landlordism has wrought such evil in Ireland. That is the sort of landlordism that could be done away with by introducing Home Rule in Ireland—a system of local government, which would enable them to look after their own municipal and provincial affairs. If it should be found impossible for one body to manage those affairs, if the orange and green could not pull together, there are natural divisions in Ireland which have existed from time immemorial, and each of these might have its own governing body if one was not found to work. If that peculiar phase of landlordism were to disappear, I believe Ireland would be no worse off than any other country where individuals own large estates and rent them out to tenants; and if nothing else were produced but a change in the current of landlordism, even though landlordism itself were not obliterated, I think it would be worth the while of the British Government to try the experiment of Home Rule for Ireland. With regard to the second of these resolutions, which relates to the release of the suspects—the men who are not charged with anything, but who are held in prison

under special legislation simply to keep them out of mischief—there is, possibly, some difference of opinion. It might be held, with some show of force, that it is out of our province to give advice to the Home Government in regard to the treatment of these men; but, I think, considering the peculiar and exceptional nature of the legislation under which they are imprisoned, considering the liberty of speech that ought to be allowed between a daughter country and a mother country, that we are quite justified in giving our opinion, and our not too pressing advice on this matter in the terms in which it is embodied in these resolutions. The hon. leader of the Opposition thinks they ought to be made stronger. I think perhaps it might have been better if the phraseology had been arranged so as to express the real state of the case more clearly—not to ask for clemency for these men, but to ask that they should have a trial, and that their offences should be established or they acquitted. As to the propriety of addressing the Home Government on that subject, I entertain no doubt. If I did, I would still desire to see the resolutions adopted by the House, because of the other things they contain; and as they cannot be amended in this particular, I would vote for them as they stand. The hon. leader of the Government referred to the Irish Roman Catholics as the only ones whose sympathy and votes he said were sought for in this connection by the leader of the Opposition. He seems to infer that nobody but Irish Roman Catholics take an interest in the affairs of that country. I can speak with perhaps some authority on this subject, as I am connected with both the Scotch Protestants of the North of Ireland and the Irish Roman Catholics of the South—and the Protestant Irishman of the North is as thorough an Irishman, I might even say as much a Fenian, in many of his views, as the Irishman of the South. It may seem strange to say so, but I know men of the most true blue North of Ireland blood just as thoroughly Irish, just as glad to see a little advantage taken of the British Government, who would glory just as much in acts of obstruction and home rule as any man in the South could do, and these men and their descendants, even of half Irish blood, take as much pleasure in laudable Irish movements as the Roman Catholics and pure Celts. I think every person who speaks in support of this motion, should say he has no sympathy with any of those crimes often, but I hope wrongly, imputed to the Land League. It is disgusting to every true Irishman that people who claim the name of Irishmen should so disgrace their nation and make it a byword. The assassination of fellow farmers and the mutilation of brute animals, are crimes which it is disgusting to see committed by men of Irish blood. We claim they are not true Irishmen, though perhaps of Irish birth and utterly unworthy of Irish sympathy. The member for Ottawa County wound up his remarks very appropriately by the well-known motto and prayer, "God save Ireland." We can all say that from our hearts, and do something more. We know that Providence makes use of human assistance in carrying out His ends. I think we may rejoice that we have on this occasion an opportunity of assisting Providence in His great and benevolent designs in regard to Ireland. If we can do anything tending to promote the salvation in a moral, material and political sense of that island, we may feel we have done something worthy of us as Canadian legislators.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex.) When the member for Victoria did me the honor, and I esteem it a great honor, of asking me to second his resolutions, I had not the slightest idea of the reception they would meet with in this House; and feeling that it might need some support, I addressed myself to the subject and prepared some notes. But I find from the unanimous tone from both sides of the House on this subject that much which I would have thought

necessary to have said under different circumstances, can properly indeed be spared this hon. House. I had thought it possible it would be necessary to defend the right of the Canadian Parliament to address Her Majesty on a subject affecting the welfare of the Empire; and I had prepared myself to prove, by precedent, that we were within our right in passing the resolutions of my hon. friend. I think that this matter nearly and deeply touches the interests of Canada as well as the Empire as a whole, and I must congratulate myself, as an Irishman to-night on seeing so many men of Irish blood and descent cropping up in this House, even the honorable and gallant gentleman, the member for Central Huron, has pulled for us a sprig from his genealogical tree, and has informed the House of his Irish descent on the maternal side. I am sure in future we will bear with him "when that rash humor which his mother gave him makes him forgetful." I am free to accept him as a brave Irishman, for I, for one, have never failed to admire his courage in dealing with his foes in Parliament or elsewhere. I regret the passing allusion to local politics which marred the harmony, as a whole, of the speech of the member for West Durham; and I, for one, if disposed to be critical, might take advantage of some expressions in it; I might remind the hon. gentleman of a resolution similar to the one we are discussing to-night, still it would be unworthy of me, as an Irishman, to meet a brother Irishman in that fashion, after listening to the lengthy speech for the benefit of Ireland, which he has addressed to this assembly to-day. It is indeed most satisfactory to me to find that the House is a unit in sympathy with the resolutions of my hon. friend from Victoria. It is more than I had anticipated, because I was led to suppose that some hon. gentlemen had certain doubts as to our right to address the Crown on the subject at all, and that others differed from us as to the view that Home Rule was possible in Ireland, and as to the claims of the gentlemen, some of them members of the Imperial Parliament, who are now suffering imprisonment for political offences to an immediate release or an immediate trial by a jury of their countrymen. For my part, knowing as I do, the history of my country, while I listened with pleasure to the speech of the hon. gentleman for West Durham, I think he scarcely went far enough back and scarcely located the core of the disease. He might have shown what is among the greatest causes of Irish grievances the deprivation of the Irish peasant of the ownership of, or of tribal rights in Irish land. I was glad to notice lately a speech of the Marquis of Salisbury, leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords, in which he laid down as a policy for his party in case they attained power the purchase of the land rights of the landlords on the voluntary principle, and the sale of the land on reasonable terms as to price and time, to its peasant cultivators. That indeed would be a great remedy for such grievances. We, in this country often hear of Irish crimes, and I am satisfied there is often much exaggeration in the reports. I also believe we should make allowance for the people who suffered such wrongs so many hundreds of years. In speaking of them we are not speaking of a class of men who have had the education and the opportunity of the lowest class among us. We are dealing with a people who have been kept in a state of semi-serfdom for centuries, who have been deprived of the most common justice, and ground down under penal laws, such as will scarcely be believed by this House. Do we suppose that remedial legislation brought about in the 19th century can wipe out the wrongs of 700 years. The iron has sunk into the souls of the people. There is not a green hillside or sequestered valley that does not remind the Irish peasant of some wrong, some act of tyranny on the part of his oppressors. When we remember the wrongs they have treasured up in that unwritten history handed down from father to son

and which is far more accurate than any published history of Irish affairs, we must make allowances for some of the outrages we all deplore. For my part, as regards the political prisoners, I would not have hesitated voting for these resolutions, even though more strongly couched. I think that to find a parallel to the imprisonment of Mr. Parnell and his colleagues, members of Parliament, we have to go back to the early days of Charles the First, and the sufferings and imprisonment and death in prison of Sir John Eliot, whose sole offence was defending in Parliament the constitutional right of the English people. I find no parallel in 250 years for the treatment accorded them. I do not agree with many of their sentiments. I disapprove of the "No rent" programme; I think that is injurious in its character and calculated to weaken that sense of moral obligation for which the Irish race are famous; but I think they have done much good to Ireland, and I believe had it not been for the agitation carried on by Mr. Parnell and his colleagues the measure of justice contained in the Land Law would not have been dealt out for years. In my humble opinion Mr. Parnell, Mr. John Dillon, and their fellow prisoners in Kilmainham are higher in the esteem not of men of Irish blood merely, but of all lovers of freedom, than are the so-called statesmen who have violated in their persons the rights and liberties of the subject. I believe with the hon. member for West Durham that what has been given has been given, not from a sense of justice, but from a sense of danger. I think it is a reflection on the civilization of the nineteenth century, that a nation which has aided every suffering race throughout the world could not afford to treat her sister Ireland as a sister should be treated, that she could not treat Ireland as an equal or give her the rights which she gave to Scotland or to Wales and the various colonies in her possession, but instead ground her down and made the Irish people feel from generation to generation that they were a conquered people. I have felt it to be a melancholy illustration of the inverse ratio which Radical promises bear to Radical performance that the first piece of legislation introduced by a Government in which Radicals hold the balance of power was a Coercion Act. The Coercion Act seems to be the first piece of legislation that a Liberal Government can for years offer to Ireland. It is really a repetition of the policy again and again condemned by O'Connell when he spoke of the base, bloody and brutal Whigs. They seem to be unable to comprehend the country with which they deal, and fail to recognize the differences of race, customs and situation. Reference has been made to the weakening of the force of these resolutions as now introduced, compared with those on the notice paper—as far as I am concerned it would not have made any difference had they been introduced as first moved. I will vote for them with pleasure and feel that in so doing we are only doing some small measure of justice to the cause which my hon. friend had at heart when he introduced those resolutions. But we must remember that we are sending these resolutions to men who understand very accurately all the niceties and refinements of the English language. We are dealing with English statesmen and diplomats who can read between the lines, who can as readily appreciate the point of the rapier as the stroke of the bludgeon, and my hon. friend's object was to have these resolutions worded in such a fashion as to gain unanimous approval; they are sufficiently plain to let the British Government know the sentiments of the Parliament and people of Canada as regards what would be doing justice to Ireland. I might, did I desire to dwell on this subject at greater length, quote, not from the writings of Irishmen, but from English historians, from Lord Macaulay, from Mr. Green in his recent history of the English people, from the speeches of Lord Beaconsfield and many others, to show what the opinion was of the manner in which Ire-

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

land has been mis-governed. But to come back to a subject more prosaic perhaps in its nature, that is the manner in which we are affected by the indifference of the English Government, the question of immigration, it cannot be denied that we are unfavorably affected as regards immigration from the older countries of Europe. With the possible exception of England and Scotland there is not a country in Europe where the emigrants do not prefer when leaving their homes to live under the flag of that so-called ideal Republic, to living under the flag of a country which is connected in any manner with monarchical institutions. While we cannot control that as far as foreign nations are concerned, had the policy of Great Britain towards Ireland been different in the past, we would not have labored under that disadvantage as far as the Irish immigrants are concerned. If I do not weary the House, I would like to quote here some remarks from the views of one who will not be accused of sentiments too favorable to Ireland. Mr. Froude, the English historian, says:

"During the last quarter of a century, nearly four millions of British subjects—English, Irish and Scots have become citizens, more or less prosperous, of the United States of America. We have no present quarrel with the Americans; we trust most heartily that we may never be involved in any quarrel with them; but undoubtedly from the day that they became independent of us, they became our rivals. They constitute the one great power whose interests and whose pretensions compete with our own, and in so far as the strength of nations depends on the number of their fighting men and women composing them, the United States have been made stronger, the English Empire weaker, to the extent of those millions and the children growing of them.

"The process is still continuing. Emigration remains the only practical remedy of the evils of Ireland."

I do not give them as my sentiments. I think there are other practical remedies for the evils of Ireland, but at the same time I am reading to you the sentiments of an English writer:

"England and Scotland contain as many people as in the present condition of industry they can hold. The annual increase of the population has to be drafted off and disposed of elsewhere, and while the vast proportion of it continues to be directed on the shores of the Republic, those who leave us leave us for the most part resenting the indifference with which their loss is regarded. They part from us as from a hard stepmother. They are exiles from a country which was the home of their birth, which they had no desire to leave, but which drives them from her at the alternative of starvation.

"England at the same time possesses dependencies of her own, not less extensive than the United States, not less rich in natural resources, not less able to provide for these expatriated swarms, where they would remain attached to her Crown, where their well-being would be our well-being, their brains and arms our brains and arms, every acre which they could reclaim from the wilderness so much added to English soil, and themselves and their families fresh additions to our national stability.

"And yet we are told by politicians—by some directly in words, by almost all in the apathy with which they stand by and look on—that the direction of our emigration is of not the slightest consequence to us, that there is no single point in which an emigrant who settles on the St. Lawrence is of more value to us than one who prefers the Mississippi. In either case if he does well for himself he becomes a purchaser of English goods, and in this capacity alone is he of use to us. Our interest in him, so far as we acknowledge an interest, is that he should go wherever he can better himself most rapidly, and consume the largest quantity of English calico and hardware in his household. It is even argued that our colonies are a burden to us, and that the sooner they are cut adrift from us the better.

"They are, or have been, demonstratively loyal. They are proud of their origin, unconscious of the value to themselves of being part of a great empire, and willing and eager to find a home for every industrious family that we can spare. We answer impatiently that they are welcome to our people. If our people choose to go to them, but whether they go to them or to America, whether the colonies themselves remain under our flag or proclaim their independence, or attach themselves to some other power, is a matter which concerns themselves entirely and to us of profound indifference.

"Such an attitude of a Government towards its subjects is so strange, so unexampled in the history of mankind, that the meaning of it deserves study if only as a political curiosity. The United States have spent six hundred millions of money and half a million lives in preserving their national unity. The Russians, when they find a pressure of population in Finland, load ships of war with as many as desire to emigrate and give them homes on the Amoor River. English subjects were once so precious in the eyes of our Government, that we did not allow them so much as a right to change their allegiance. When we look down the emigration tables we find only the Germans who are doing anything in

the least resembling what we are doing, and the Germans cannot help themselves, for they have no colonies. America is not a rival of Germany, and the strengthening of America threatens no interest of any German State. Had Prussia settlements in one hemisphere and France in another, do we suppose the Court of Berlin would see the peasants from the Elbe and Oder denationalize themselves without an effort to reclaim them? No intelligent person will believe it. The Spaniards and French indeed parted with tens of thousands of artisans to England during the wars of religion, but they did not part with them willingly, nor was the result of the experiment such as to tempt a repetition of it. It used to be considered that the first of all duties in an English citizen was his duty to his country. His country, in return, was bound to preserve and care for him. What change has passed over us, that allegiance can now be shifted at pleasure like a suit of clothes? Is it from proud consciousness of a superabundant strength? Are our arms so irresistible that we have no longer any enemy to fear. Is our prosperity so overflowing and the continuance of it so certain, that we can now let it flow from us elsewhere because we can contain no more? Our national arrogance will scarcely presume so far! Is it that the great powers of the world have furled their battle flags? Is the Parliament of man on the way to be constituted, and is the rivalry of empires to be confined for the future to competition in the arts of peace? Never at any period in the world's history was so large a share of the profits of industry expended upon armies and arms. Is it so certain that we shall never be entangled again in the quarrels of the Continent?

"Is it that the experience of the results of the emigration to America so far has been so satisfactory as to convince us that we have no occasion to interfere with its direction? The Irish in Australia and New Zealand are as well-disposed towards us as the rest of the colonists. The Irish in America are our bitterest enemies. The Irish vote will be given un-animously for war with us if at any time any question between the two countries becomes critical, and their presence in America, and the influence which they are supposed to possess there, is the immediate cause of the present humor of Ireland itself. The millions who fled from the famine carried with them the belief that it was England, which, in one shape or other, was the cause of their misery; that it was England which was driving them from their homes. The land was theirs and we had taken it from them, and therefore they were starving.

"It was their belief then. It is their belief now. Nine parts of it may be absurd, but one part is reasonable. We had superseded the Irish law and Irish methods of management by English law and English methods of management. Landlords holding under our system had allowed the population to outgrow the legitimate resources of the country, because subdivision increased their rents without cost to themselves, and then when the change came, and the landlords' interest lay the other way, they said to their tenants, 'There is no room for you here; you are not wanted, you are an expense and a trouble to us; and you must go.' Their removal in itself was inevitable. In many instances, the cost of the removal was paid for them; but they identified the system under which they suffered with English tyranny, and they went away with hate in their hearts and curses on their lips. Those who went hated us, because they were obliged to go. Those who stayed behind hate us, because fathers have lost their sons and sisters, brothers and friends have been parted from their friends.

"In all ranks families have to learn to be separated. England suffers from it as much as Ireland, and does not complain. This is quite true. But if when the famine came we had said to the Irish peasants, 'Through no fault of yours, a terrible calamity has fallen upon you; there are more of you living on the land than the land will support, and we take blame to ourselves, for we ought (or those who by our means are placed above you ought) to have prevented the multiplication of you where the decay of a single root might be your destruction; when we look back upon our management of Ireland, we cannot acquit ourselves of being responsible for you; and therefore, as you must go away, we will give you land elsewhere; we will take you there and settle you, and help you to live till you can maintain yourselves.'—if we had said this, there would have been at least a consciousness that we had done our best to soften their misfortunes. The million that we might have sent to Canada or Australia would have drawn after them the millions that have followed.

"Our colonist would have doubled their population, and there would have been no Irish vote in America for party demagogues to flatter by threats of England, and no Fenianism at home.

"We are told that Government has no business with emigration; that emigration, like wages, prices and profits, must be left to settle itself according to laws of nature. Human things are as much governed by laws of nature as a farm or a garden, neither less nor more. If we cultivate a field it will yield us corn or green crops.

"The laws of nature will as assuredly overgrow it with docks and nettles if we leave it to govern itself. The removal of a million poor creatures to Canada and the establishment of them there, would have been under present circumstances considerably more easy. It was a question of money merely.

"To send them to Canada, might have cost, perhaps, as much as the Abyssinian war. Had we feared they might cross the border after all into the States, and had preferred Australia or the Cape for them, it might have cost a little more, and it would have probably turned out on the whole a profitable investment."

Perhaps in making quotations of this character I am wandering a little from the subject before us, but in one sense I do not think I am. When we allude to it as a grievance that Irishmen do not come to this country and help to build

it up, but on the contrary go to a foreign country and live there in a spirit of hostility to the Empire, I think that the views entertained on the subject by an eminent English writer, like this writer, are well worthy of the attention of the House. I believe it to be the duty of the Government of the day to bring a matter of this kind under the notice of the Imperial Government, and even at this late hour we may yet succeed, with the aid of the Imperial Government, in securing a large immigration from Ireland. I desire to make some further quotations from the same writer, Mr. James A. Froude, the historian, who certainly is not prejudiced in favor of the Irish race. Relating again to this question of emigration to the colonies as against emigration to the United States, Mr. Froude says:

"The *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Times*, and the Liberal press in general tell us that the English intending emigrant can earn half-a-crown in the United States where he can earn but a florin in Canada, and that it is therefore sentimental nonsense to expect or even desire him to prefer an English colony. The fact, in the first place, is not true. There is a better organization at New York for the reception and distribution of the emigrants, but the wages of labour in Canada are as high as they are in any part of the American continent except California, and the cost of living is less. If, however, the American wages were distinctly higher, it is the first time that the chief duty of man has been proclaimed so nakedly to lie in making money.

"Admiral Maury was offered rank and fortune if he would take charge of an observatory in Russia. He prefers a pittance as a schoolmaster in the crushed and still suffering confederacy. At the risk of being called sentimental, I declare that I would sooner myself earn reasonable wages in the English dominions than be a millionaire in New York. The working men themselves do not appreciate the kindness of their advocates. The Irish consider it the fault of the English Government that they cannot remain at home. Those who stay hate us. Those who go hate us. We have four millions of the bitterest enemies in the Irish Americans. We have Fenianism in Ireland itself, and the danger is growing steadily with every fresh ship load which is landed on the shores of the Union. The English and Scotch laborer or artisan has struggled hard hitherto to not fast his nationality. He has gone to Canada, to the Cape, to Australia, or to New Zealand. To the States, so far, he has gone sparingly and unwillingly. The tide is changing at last. The hundreds of a few years ago are now becoming thousands, but there is the same resentment among them which we see in the Irish.

"The English workman does not consider that he ought to be enabled to live at home, but he does not like to be flung aside as if he was of no value. The State, he thinks, ought to help him to go to one of its own dependencies. He, too, goes away bitter and savage with the old country. His friends at home are no better pleased. In a few years we may have, we indisputably shall have, a million or two of Anglo-American citizens with an equally agreeable disposition to do us all the harm they can, and the great mass of English workmen at home looking to America as their best friend.

"Yet, in the face of these phenomena, even the Prime Minister holds up the Irish emigration as an example to be imitated, as a splendid proof of the success of the voluntary principle, and as an argument against the interposition of the State. The emigrant believes himself the victim of injurious neglect. His one thought thenceforward is the hope of revenge. He is a citizen of the great rival nationality, and should so frightful a calamity as a war with America overtake us, he may be relied on to do his worst for our humiliation. The situation is so transparent that writers who still insist that the state shall remain passive cannot be blind to it."

I will not trouble the House with further quotations, possibly other hon. gentlemen desire to address it on this question; but I will say in conclusion that I, for one, consider it a subject far beyond the sphere of mere party politics in Canada, and I never would have seconded the resolutions had I not believed that the mover moved them in a spirit far removed from party politics, and I will not believe that hon. gentleman opposite in addressing the House, as some of them did with evident sincerity, were not as honest in their motives as the hon. mover and myself. With respect to the question of Home Rule I wish to touch one point. I am an Irish Protestant and the descendant of Irish Protestants; but while I am willing to support the resolutions as they stand, guaranteeing rights to the minority I would have been willing to support the resolutions had the rights of the minority not been specially protected. I have entire confidence in my fellow-countrymen. It is all a myth that danger may possibly arise in Ireland in consequence of the Irish Catholics having control of the local affairs of the country. To suppose such an event was to suppose that

the Irish people were the only people who stood still for the last 240 years, and that because outrages occurred in 1641, when the state of civilization throughout the world was entirely different, we should have a repetition of such lamentable occurrences if local self-government were restored to Ireland to-day. No; I do not believe that a race so intelligent as to be capable of governing other countries with the most conspicuous ability is incapable of governing itself in the land of its birth, so I am confident that the Imperial Government might, with safety, leave the control of local Irish affairs in the hands of Irishmen. I am satisfied from what we see in Ireland to-day that Catholics and Protestants will harmonise together and seek to govern the country for the good of the whole. Have we not seen that in the most Catholic county in Ireland, a Presbyterian minister has been elected to represent the people in the Imperial Parliament? In resuming my seat I desire to express my conviction that as regards the position of Irish Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, it has been largely brought about by the tools of the Government, whose policy was to divide and conquer, and it was not due to the spirit prevailing among the Irish people themselves. The day was when the population of Ireland, as regards religion, was much more equal than it is at present. The trade policy of the English Government drove the Protestant nonconformists out of Ireland. Their fiscal policy, by which they crushed out the manufactures of the country, drove out those men, those intelligent mechanics and artzans—a policy, the consequences of which were seen at Bunker's Hill and Lexington. I am satisfied from my knowledge of Irish history, from information derived from friends and relatives in Ireland, that had it not been for the machinations of unscrupulous politicians—I speak now of a century ago—the unfortunate differences between Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland would never have been brought about. It is within my knowledge as a student of the history of my country, that up to that time and even to a later period the Presbyterians in the North of Ireland were in perfect harmony with their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen as to the rights of the country and the reforms which were necessary. I do not desire to detain the House. The speech I might have made has been anticipated by gentlemen who preceded me. I am glad to notice the kind and brotherly feeling which hon. gentlemen opposite have shown to us on this side on this question; and that feeling I wish to reciprocate, and to thank them for. That brotherly feeling has enabled me to dispense with much that I might have said in vindicating the rights and exposing the wrongs under which my unfortunate country has suffered. It is my earnest hope that these resolutions which it has been my privilege to second may have some weight with the Imperial Government. That British statesmen may be aroused to deal with the Irish question, not grudgingly and of necessity, not in the old-time spirit of jealousy and of distrust, but in that broad spirit of British fair play which is claimed to be the mainspring of their constitutional system, and that the result may be a new order of things in Ireland, which in turn must most beneficially affect England, Canada, and the Empire as a whole.

Mr. BRECKEN. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House, and I am the more confirmed in that intention when I see the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) ready to tell his sentiments on this question; but being from a Province where, perhaps, Irishmen are more numerous than any other nationality and where we have had a taste in a milder form of absentee landlordism, perhaps you will pardon me if I make a few remarks. I must congratulate my hon. friend the member for Victoria, N. B., (Mr. Costigan), the mover of the resolutions. I must congratulate him, Sir, upon having made a very temperate, a very patriotic,

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

and a very manly and judicious speech; and I must congratulate him, Sir, in presenting a cause before this honorable House that very often people look upon with a degree of sensitiveness; and I think the manly and temperate way in which he has introduced these resolutions has gone very far to win for him and for his cause the sympathy of every free man irrespective of nationality and irrespective of creed. I listened also with pleasure to the speech, or to that portion which I heard, delivered by the leader of the Opposition. It was a practical speech, and it was a *resumé* of the history of Ireland since 1880. I was not present when he attempted, if he did attempt, to turn it to a partizan purpose, but if he did, I think he made a mistake. This is a subject which ought to be approached above and beyond all partizan feeling. When I heard these resolutions, my first idea was as to how far we could interfere with matters which strictly belonged to the British Parliament and people. But the remarks which have fallen from the leader of the Opposition, in which he claimed that these reforms should be brought forward by the Government and not left to be propounded by the occupants of the Home Rule benches were justified, then I think the Parliament of Canada cannot be charged with officiousness or impertinence in entertaining these resolutions and discussing this important matter. Coming from an Island which has been redeemed from the forest and made a smiling garden by the strong arms of the sons of Erin, knowing them as I do and living among them as I have lived, and being most intimately acquainted with them, I cannot but feel that there is no privilege which any other nationality enjoys to which they have not as great a right. If the Government of their country has been unfortunate, it is time that that unfortunate state of things should be remedied. I am not going to detain you, because no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has something more philosophical and more original than I have. I may say that in the Island of Prince Edward we have had many thousands of immigrants from the Emerald Isle, and when they landed on our shores they were, in a money point of view, probably not worth \$2 a head. They have made excellent pioneers; they have been successful farmers; they are contented and loyal people, and when the agitation against the system of absentee landlordism was going on, I believe they acted in as temperate and as restrained a manner as any other nationality could have done, and when the lands of absentee landlords were expropriated, while they stood up for their rights they did so in a dignified manner. Through the generosity of the Government led by my right hon. friend, a sum of money was granted which rendered us free from that disadvantage, I was about to say from that curse. A prominent member of the present Administration in England, a friend of Mr. Gladstone, was appointed by Lord Dufferin to occupy the position of arbitrator to settle our difficulties. The hardships that the tenantry of Prince Edward Island had to endure were nothing compared with the hardships of the tenantry of Ireland. The hon. leader of the Opposition told us of the hundreds of thousands of tenants in Ireland who held their farms from year to year, and he told us that the practice was that not only the temporary, but the permanent improvements were made by the tenants; and in Prince Edward Island, although speaking generally the leases were for 99 years, and the rent perhaps nothing for the first five years and gradually advancing to not more than a shilling an acre, still that was considered a grievance, and for this reason: The settlers when they first came to Prince Edward Island were poor, perhaps without money enough to buy a hoe or a spade, and they had to go into the forest and cut their homes out of the wilderness. The consequence was that the rents accumulated. The landlord, it is true, did not press them, and why? Because

they were not worth the powder and shot. Like the men engaged in the seal fisheries of Newfoundland—who, when they find any young seals basking on the rocks, leave them because they are not worth taking, and return in two or three weeks and slaughter them when they are large enough to be slaughtered—the landlords of Prince Edward Island, while their tenants were toiling among the stumps, enduring all kinds of privations and obtaining hardly enough to clothe themselves and their families or to give them the scantiest support, did not press them; but after they had improved their farms, and were about to lay themselves in their graves after having spent a lifetime of toil, they had not the consolation to know that there was a stick or an implement on their farms that did not belong to the landlords. That is the reason that the uncongenial plant of absentee landlordism does not flourish in the neighboring republic. It has been rooted out of Prince Edward Island, and will soon, we trust, be rooted out of the Emerald Isle, and possibly out of every part of Great Britain. It is a matter that we ought to be thankful for, that when political questions, affecting Ireland, have come to a crisis, fortunately for that country we have had a Liberal Government in power—a Government led by the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone, who has gone through all the phases of political life from the time he wrote his book on Church and State to the time he disestablished the church in Ireland. We have a Forster, a Bright, and a Chamberlain, men as broad and liberal in their views as the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Bothwell, or the hon. member for Gloucester. And those who call themselves Liberal-Conservatives may raise their hands and thank God that Toryism is not to be blamed for the policy that refuses to redress the grievances of Ireland, and that the howl cannot be raised that if a Liberal Government were in power everything would be done for her. As soon as the sons of Erin enjoy the same blessings of self-government as we do in this country, the sooner will peace, contentment and harmony return to Ireland. I believe with the hon. member for Victoria, that there is no desire among the masses in Ireland to sever their connection with the British Crown; and while we look with horror and detestation at those crimes of assassination, they are perhaps the natural outcome of misrule and mismanagement, and of a reluctance to grant to Ireland those privileges which on this side of the Atlantic we claim, not as a favor, but as the right of a free people.

Mr. MILLS. I was a little surprised at the violent condemnation of the hon. leader of the Opposition by the leader of the House. I did expect that when the First Minister made up his mind to support this resolution, he would rather have made a speech pointing in the direction of conciliation, than a speech seeking to excite party hostility upon a question which it is admittedly beyond our power to deal with directly and efficiently. It is well known to this House that the hon. leader of the Government is an advocate of a legislative union, that he opposed the introduction of the Federal system into this country, and that he has over and over again expressed his regret that the Federal system has been adopted; and I must say that on this ground alone, I was rather surprised not to find him opposing the proposition of the hon. member for Victoria. I thought, Sir, that an hon. gentleman who considered a Federal system of government a very defective one—one which he regretted we had adopted in this country—would not himself have become an earnest advocate of the Federal system for the people of another land. But the hon. gentleman has thought proper to support the motion of the member for Victoria, and I trust in future we shall have fewer attacks on the rights of the Provinces, seeing that he now thinks the Federal system well suited to Ireland. I have no doubt myself that it is of immense consequence to the peace and well being of the Empire that

Home Rule should be granted the Irish people. I believe that the legislative union of the United Kingdom is wholly unsuited to a heterogeneous population. I do not believe that any such Government will ever prove satisfactory in a country where the people do not sympathize with it or its legislation. It is obvious that if a legislative union was a failure in this country, it could not be successful in a great country like the United Kingdom. My hon. friend has said that, the Irish and English legislative union has had a trial of eighty years, and has proved a great failure. No doubt of it. Wherever it has been tried it has proved unsuccessful. Austria sought to strengthen her Empire in 1848 when she undertook by revolutionary violence to take away the parliamentary rights of Hungary and to unite all portions of her Empire in one legislative union, and the experiment was tried for nearly 20 years, proved a disastrous failure, and the Austrian Government was obliged to restore to Hungary the rights she enjoyed before 1848. I have no doubt that the Parliament of the United Kingdom will be obliged to bestow on the people of Ireland, in part, those rights which were taken away by the Union of 1800. The people of Switzerland, composed of Germans, Frenchmen and Italians, of different languages and religions, have been a loyal united people for several centuries; and we find the people of the United States, some portions of them favoring universal freedom and others slavery were enabled to exist in one Federal Union, notwithstanding hostile interests for more than a century. We know there are serious difficulties connected with the Government of Ireland, with which the English people have never sympathized. In the first place there are two distinct races in Ireland, one the governed and the others the governors. Ireland has not merely suffered from the want of British sympathy, but from the system of justice administered by the dominant population. We have the testimony of Archbishop Whatley and others to the fact that the administration, as between landlord and tenant, has been most mischievous. In fact Arthur Young, to whom the member for West Durham referred, has told us that if a magistrate were to grant a warrant against a rich farmer or proprietor in the interest of a tenant, he would certainly be called out for it. While justice might be administered between one peasant and another and between one proprietor and another, there was no such thing as a proper administration of justice in many parts of Ireland between peasant and proprietor. The magistrates were, in many cases, the agents of the landlords, and they often issued warrants on their own behalf, in the name of the landlord, as against the tenants, who would be fined by the agent who had issued them. The great mass of the people of Ireland found the law simply an instrument in the hands of a dominant class, administered in their own interest and regardless of the rights of the masses. As a result, the people have been compelled to combine in self defence. So you have had in Ireland almost since the establishment of the union two governments—one the formal government administered from Dublin Castle, in the interest of the few, and the secret organizations which have everywhere existed throughout Ireland for the protection of the interests of the peasantry. That is a very unsatisfactory state of things. It necessarily leads to anarchy. No such thing could exist in a properly governed country. If there was a government in which the people had the slightest confidence, those secret organizations among the peasantry, would never have had an existence. My hon. friend from West Durham has referred to many important remedial measures that were carried through Parliament long after they were demanded by the interests and well-being of the country. Many other changes were required besides those to which he has referred. Many abuses have still to be dealt with, including the administration of justice by the ordinary magistracy of the

country. There are many local wants that can only be dealt with by those possessing local knowledge, and to which the Imperial Parliament gives no attention. It is just as necessary in the interest of the Irish people that they should have a local Parliament as that we should have a local Parliament for Canada. What would be our condition if you were to abolish this Parliament and the Local Legislatures, and give the people of this country in proportion to their numbers representation in the Imperial Parliament. Our local interests would be wholly neglected. The important public questions which present themselves to the attention of the Imperial Parliament would be first considered. The external relations of the Empire or the relations between one foreign country and another which might affect the welfare of the Empire would be considered to the exclusion of our local interests. Such a consideration of things would cause the very same dissatisfaction here, that is exhibited by the people of Ireland. When we look at the subject of Federal organization we see that it grows out of the local circumstances of the population. I will venture to say that it would be impossible to establish a single Legislature for the Dominion of Canada that would give this country the satisfaction obtained under our present system. We have many distinct Provinces. How was it that the whole of British North America was not under our Government from the beginning? It was because such a Parliament could not properly deal with the local interests and wants of the population. What interest could we have in Ontario with the local wants of the people of British Columbia or Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick. Serious abuses might occur in the local administration of affairs for want of the necessary local legislation, which would not in the slightest degree affect other portions of the Dominion. We wisely, in my opinion, created local Legislatures to take charge of those local matters. In a country possessing upwards of 5,000,000 people, as Ireland does, there can be no doubt it is just as necessary that a local Parliament should exist for the purpose of dealing with local matters. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. First Minister speak in the manner he did with regard to the resolution submitted to this House by the hon. member for Victoria. It seems to me that that resolution is not at all so decided in the expression of opinion as it ought to be, coming from this Legislature. I do not, myself, feel disposed to ask the Imperial Parliament, as a matter of grace, to set free those who are confined in Ireland for political offences. This resolution does not refer to parties guilty of murder or who have gone about as midnight marauders destroying the property of their neighbors. This does not ask that Her Majesty shall extend her clemency towards them, but it asks that Her Majesty shall extend her clemency toward those who are guilty of differing in opinion from the Administration and from the ordinary Opposition in the two Houses of Parliament. I do not think that to say that the Land Act does not go far enough, or, to use the words of the hon. the First Minister, that it is not drastic enough, is to be guilty of an offence that should be punished by deprivation of liberty. They are not asking for clemency, they are asking for justice, and it seems to me that if this House is to speak on the subject at all, it is a pity it should ask for clemency for those who do not need it. If they are fairly dealt with they do not need the clemency of Her Majesty, but only the ordinary rights and privileges accorded to British subjects in other portions of the Empire. The hon. member for West Durham said the Land Act of last Session did not go as far as it ought to have gone. I think, in all probability, that it went as far as Mr. Gladstone felt he could safely go, and that if he had gone further he could not have succeeded in getting his measure through Parliament. We have a right to say, if we think so, that that measure was not sufficiently com-

Mr. MILLS.

prehensive. We know that for several years there has been a failure of the crops, and the Irish peasant was unable to pay his rent. We know that exorbitant rents were charged, and the consequence was that when his crops failed he was unable to pay his rent, and the measure of last year did not deal with the cases of thousands who were in this position and it left them to the tender mercies of the landlords. The hon. the First Minister said that he supported this motion and that he opposed the proposition relative to the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church because it was a mischievous proposition, calculated to set Irish Protestant against Irish Catholic. I believe the hon. gentleman is wholly mistaken. I believe that nine-tenths of the Irish Protestants who may have been in favor of the State Church have after residing in this country become satisfied that the Disestablishment and Disendowment Act was a beneficial one. There is no analogy between the position of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec and the Protestant Church in Ireland. The latter was the church of the minority, and the former is that of the majority. The Protestant Church in Ireland was supported by those who are not members of it—by the poorest class of the population, who, in consequence of their zeal for their own church, supported it out of their poverty, and who were compelled besides to support the church of those who possessed the wealth of the entire country and were in a minority in that country. I do not know an instance where the Roman Catholic Church of the Province of Quebec has called upon the Protestants of that Province to contribute towards the support of that church. In what instances, under what circumstances, have the Roman Catholics of Quebec undertaken to deal with the minority as the Established Church in Ireland dealt with the great majority of the population? Sir, there was no danger to the Roman Catholic Church of the Province of Quebec, in consequence of any action that the Parliament of this country might have taken upon the proposition submitted to it some years ago by the late Mr. Holton. Now, the First Minister said that my hon. friend from West Durham was all wrong in what he said with reference to Mr. Gladstone's observations on Home Rule. But he misrepresented the position taken by the hon. member for West Durham. What is the position of Mr. Gladstone? Does he say it is a doubtful question? Does he say, "I do not know whether Home Rule is a proper measure or not, but when you submit your proposition I will consider it?" No, Sir, he says that he is convinced that a measure of Home Rule is necessary not only for Ireland, but for Scotland, England and Wales. He says Parliament is altogether overweighted, that there are many questions requiring to be dealt with that there is no time to deal with; that the country is suffering in consequence of a large accumulation of work in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. It seems to me, therefore, that the hon. member for West Durham took a consistent position in saying that if you admit that Home Rule is necessary, that Parliament is unequal to the work it has in hand; that when you are in power it is your business to provide a remedy; it is your business to give effect to the convictions you entertain and to grant the means of relief which you believe will remove the serious evils that exist at the present time. The hon. Premier says the hon. member for West Durham delivered a long lecture on the evils of landlordism. Now, he did nothing of the sort, but he did point out that serious evils grew out of absenteeism in Ireland, and there can be no doubt of that. Anyone who has read Mr. Taine's book on the ancient *regime* of France will remember that before the revolution he describes a condition of things existing in France almost precisely like that which has existed in Ireland for many years past. The landlords resided in Paris, there was famine and suffering, and the people were unable to pay their rents, and many abandoned their holdings and took to the wayside. According to his

statement, in 1719 not fewer than five million people died of starvation. So they had there almost the same state of things, produced by the same causes, that you have had in Ireland since 1840. Well, Sir, we have, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, and as other hon. gentlemen have said in the observations they have addressed to the House this evening, the fact that this country is very detrimentally affected by this state of things in Ireland in consequence of the disaffection which exists there; and the Irishmen who leave that country do not come to this country, do not go to other portions of the British Empire, but they go to a foreign country and contribute to increase its wealth and become useful and important citizens of that country. Now, Sir, when we find that a people thrive in every country except their own, are prosperous, contented and law-abiding in every country except their own, it shows the evil is not with the race or the religion that race professes, but it is with the Government which produces that state of things—that poverty and discontent which we find existing in Ireland at the present time. It seems to me, therefore, that in the resolution which has been submitted to the House the opinion is not expressed in sufficiently pointed terms that, on account of Home Rule having been tried and found beneficial here, it would in our opinion be found to be beneficial in Ireland. We know what is the result of a Legislative Union here. There are some who think that a Government having a large amount of power is necessarily a strong Government, but that is not our experience. Our experience was that the attempt to establish a Legislative Union here and to weld dissimilar populations into one people had the effect to produce a conflict of races between one section of the Dominion and the other. Under a form of Legislative Union we had practically two Governments. We had an Attorney-General for Quebec and one for Ontario; we had two sets of Ministers, two systems of legislation and jurisprudence, we had one set of laws for Quebec and another for Ontario, one municipal system for Quebec and one for Ontario, one assessment of property for Quebec and a different system in Ontario, so that all those things which a Federal system exists to give effect to we had, in fact, under a Legislative Union. What was more we had the mischief that arises out of having measures distasteful in one Province forced upon it by the representatives of another Province of a different race and a different way of thinking. Now, Sir, it is a common notion among Englishmen that a system of government that is good for England must be good for all the world, and Ireland has been largely governed on this principle. The dissatisfaction existing in Ireland under English rule may be in a large degree a matter of prejudice, but it is necessary to the well-being and progress of a nation that some respect should be had to its prejudices as well as to its intelligent convictions. As far as Ireland is concerned, not only its prejudices have been disregarded, but its sentiments have been almost wholly overlooked. In fact, no important remedial measure, as the hon. member for West Durham has said, has been carried out for Ireland, unless it has been secured by threatened civil war or by a revolution. I know that a Government who will undertake to do justice has a very formidable task because its difficulty is that it has to overcome the prejudices of 25,000,000 of people who reside outside of Ireland, and whose opinions and prejudices in the Government of Ireland have to be consulted. Now let me call the attention of the House to the address that was issued by the late Lord Beaconsfield, when he went to the country in 1879. When he dissolved Parliament he knew that a large section of the Irish people were demanding Home Rule, and that the question would be made a very important issue in the elections in Ireland. Let me call the attention of the House to the view which he entertained of this question of Home Rule:

“Nevertheless, a danger, in its ultimate results scarcely less disastrous than pestilence and famine, and which now engages Your Excel-

lency's anxious attention, distract that country. A portion of its population is attempting to sever the Constitutional tie which unites it to Great Britain in that bond which has favored the power and prosperity of both.

“It is to be hoped that all men of light and leading will resist this destructive doctrine. The strength of this nation depends on the unity of feeling which should pervade the United Kingdom and its widespread dependencies. The first duty of an English Minister should be to consolidate that cooperation which renders irresistible a community educated as our own, in an equal love of liberty and law.

“And yet there are some who challenge the expediency of the Imperial character of this realm. Having attempted, and failed, to enfeeble our colonies by their policy of decomposition, they may perhaps now recognize in the desintegration of the United Kingdom a mode which will not only accomplish, but precipitate their purpose.

“The immediate dissolution of Parliament will afford an opportunity to the nation to decide upon a course which will materially influence its future fortunes and shape its destiny.

“Rarely in this century has there been an occasion more critical. The power of England and the peace of Europe will largely depend on the verdict of the country.”

It is perfectly obvious from this letter which Lord Beaconsfield addressed to the Viceroy of Ireland, that he held that any demand for Home Rule meant disintegration, that you cannot confer on the people of Ireland the right of local self-government, without seriously weakening the bonds by which the Empire is held together. We know in this country that has not been our experience. The Legislative Union which existed between Upper and Lower Canada, instead of consolidating them into one people had the tendency of arraying or antagonizing the people of one section of the Province against the people of another section. It is well known that no such feeling exists at this moment between Ontario and Quebec. From the very moment each Province took charge of its own local affairs, the Union became stronger. So soon as certain portions of the executive power passed into the United Parliament, and other powers were vested in the Local Legislatures, it strengthened, and did not weaken the Union. The same effect will be produced by a federation of the United Kingdom. We believe that our experiment shows this fact, that if you give to a united body power to deal with questions in which only a portion of the community are interested, and geographical sections of the community are alone interested, you weaken instead of strengthening the bond between the people so united. This has been the case with the United Kingdom. If the people of Ireland had been allowed a measure of local self-government, and had been permitted to manage their local affairs in their own way, there would have been no standing ground for Fenianism—for those who advocated the disintegration of the Empire or the entire separation of Ireland from the United Kingdom. In my opinion this House would have been justified in going very much further in the expression of its opinion than it has done in the Address proposed by the hon. member for Victoria. We on this side of the House have no doubt that a Federal system of Government is the only one suited to a large country. We believe a Federal system would prove a great improvement if it were tried in the United Kingdom; we believe it would give contentment to Ireland; that in giving the people control of their own local affairs and the right to manage them in their own way, the sense of justice would save the minority from being dominated over by the majority. Holding these views and opinions, that men ought not to be incarcerated for political opinions expressed in a constitutional way, as many of the Home Rulers were doing, we were prepared to vote for resolutions in which those views are expressed in a much more clear and decided tone than that in which they are enunciated in the resolutions before the House.

Mr. BUNSTER. As the resolution asks for a simple act of justice to be done by Her Majesty's Government in the interest of Ireland, I do not understand why so much time has been occupied in the discussion. It should have been

allowed to go to a vote after the hon. member for West Durham had made his able speech, which will not be soon forgotten, particularly by Irishmen. I am sorry to observe that hon. members do not take more interest in securing the release of my fellow-countrymen, who are incarcerated in felons' cells for exercising freedom of speech. Hon. members may laugh at the idea, but freedom of speech is just as pleasant to one British subject as to another. But I for one do not blame the British Government so much as I do the bailiff in Ireland, who has no interest further than to get his percentage for the collection of rents for absent landlords. When a corpse is brought back to Ireland to be interred in a coffin which happens to be a valuable one, the bailiff sells the coffin for rent, as he holds a plain wooden coffin will be sufficient. Hon. gentlemen may think such is not the fact, but I know to the contrary. Many people send corpses from Australia, and they do not send them in cheap coffins. Therefore, when the bailiff with his Jew's eye observes them, he removes them after the wake has been held. Would you blame any person for shooting the bailiff? I would not. If I could not make a good shot once I would shoot twice. I could go on to relate for one or two hours cases nearly as bad as that to which I have referred; but it is bad enough to show that the people of Ireland have a grievance. There has been a great deal said about the religious question in this debate. Where I was raised in the old country, as a matter of course, I was taught that it was wrong to have anything to do with Catholics; but since I have travelled and have had opportunities to form opinions of my own, I have seen a great deal of good that priests have done, particularly in British Columbia. In British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you the priests, and they alone, have civilized our Indians, who are now a superior class, and our settlers and farmers are proud of them. There is a scheme, I understand, before the Parliament of Great Britain by which they intend to do justice to Ireland, a scheme to divide up the land of the absentee landlords and allow the tenantry to purchase it at a small rate of interest. I think that will be a great step in the right direction. The address, Mr. Speaker, is sufficiently mild, and I am glad to see it so ably drawn. There is nothing in it objectionable, and nothing but what I would like to see the Parliament of Canada endorse. It will probably have a good effect with the British Parliament in inducing them to grant the prayer of this House.

Mr. ANGLIN. Mr. Speaker, I find, Sir, that it is entirely unnecessary for me to make a speech on this subject. I retained my seat until this hour in the morning for two or three reasons. The first was that I desired to give way to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to express what seems to have been a universal feeling of sympathy for the people of Ireland in their present state of suffering and trial, every hon. gentleman who has spoken supporting the resolutions now before the House. I thought it possible that in the course of the debate, even those who meant well might fall into some errors with regard to the condition of affairs in Ireland which it might be well for me to correct. But I find there has been shown on the whole a knowledge of the condition of Ireland which it was scarcely possible or at least reasonable to expect. The errors have been so few that it is hardly worth while to take any notice of them. There were a few slight historical errors, and some created by the deliberate misrepresentations of the cablegrams to which we have all to resort for information regarding Ireland. I was sorry to find my hon. friend for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) fall into the very common error that the Land League is in some way responsible for such outrages as have unhappily been perpetrated in Ireland of late years. The Land League were not in any degree responsible for those outrages. The

Mr. BUNSTER.

simple fact is since the Land League has been suppressed the number of outrages of a serious character, as well as those that owe their importance to the misrepresentations of the cablegrams, have greatly increased in number. The people, driven from the modes of a peaceful and constitutional agitation, have in far too many cases had resort to what has been called the wild justice of revenge; they have taken the law into their own hands, and in many deplorable instances crimes have been committed that have sent a thrill of horror throughout the civilized world. None have more deeply deplored these outrages than those belonging to the Irish people who have Irish blood in their veins, who sympathise most cordially with the people of Ireland in their struggles. But the number of these outrages has been deliberately exaggerated. We have had the most circumstantial accounts of murders which it has afterwards been found never were committed. We have had the full particulars of houses blown up, how they were entered, how undermined, and have afterwards found that nothing of the kind had ever taken place. We are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in England, in proportion to the population, the number of crimes of violence is vastly greater than in Ireland, which is reported to the rest of the world as steeped in crime, and almost reeking with the blood of its victims. In almost any great city of this continent more crimes are committed, sometimes in a week, than are committed in a whole year among the five millions in Ireland. All the crimes in late years have been attributed to the Land League, and were all set down as agrarian. There is no doubt that too many crimes have been committed; we must abhor bloodshed, no matter what the provocation is, but it is not right to saddle the Land League, nor any other league organized openly and fairly for the purpose of constitutional agitation, with all the crimes of violence committed in the whole country—crimes committed often under the greatest possible provocation, which would almost exculpate the unfortunate men who committed them. In that error I was sorry to see the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) fall. He did seem to exempt the leaders of the League, however. Other errors of the same character hon. gentlemen fell into in the course of the evening, but they were remarkably few indeed. I was sorry to observe the tone and manner in which the hon. leader of the Government replied to, or rather commented on, the very able and powerful speech of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). I, myself, would have some reason to complain with that speech if I had intended to put the case of Ireland before the House this evening, because he covered so much of what I would have had to deal with. There is still more to be said, but I will not call the attention of the House to a full argument upon the question. The hon. Prime Minister appeared provoked by the reference made by the hon. member for West Durham, to a speech the right hon. gentleman delivered in 1869, on a motion of the late Mr. Holton; but that reference was justifiable on this ground, that the hon. member for West Durham had no reason to know that the Premier had changed his views since that time as to the right of this Parliament to meddle in affairs not coming strictly within its purview. He had a right, in that view, to make that reference and the right to argue that in that case the right hon. gentleman was mistaken, and to anticipate as he did that the views of the right hon. gentleman had in the meantime changed. Perhaps, Sir, that reference was of a provoking character, though I thought not so intended. At all events, the hon. Premier chose to commence by charging the hon. member for West Durham with having made his speech and taken the position he did in a partizan spirit and for partizan purposes. Surely, after the statement made by that hon. gentleman that he had himself, in the early days of the Session, contemplated moving resolutions in this same direction,

but going somewhat further, that he had been prevented from doing so by the calamity in his family, in his sorrow for which we all, I presume, sympathized, and that on his return, finding that some of the other Irish gentlemen in the House and the Senate were holding conference on this matter with the view of introducing a resolution, he forbore to move his resolution—surely after that statement, unless the hon. gentleman thought it was a fabrication, it must be clear to every hon. gentleman that the hon. member for West Durham had no party object in view. Had his able advocacy of this question been for the purpose of obtaining a greater amount of Irish Catholic votes in the next election, he would have taken quite another course; it was quite open to him to have put his resolution on the notice paper and to have brought it before the House; but instead of doing that, he chose in a spirit of fair play—shall I say of self-denial?—to withdraw from the position he held and await the action of those other gentlemen. The hon. member for West Durham said he preferred the first resolution to what he called the emasculated resolution now before us. Perhaps that phrase was also somewhat provoking; because no hon. member can doubt that the changes made in the resolution are the work of the right hon. leader of the Government himself. If he did not write them all, I think he wrote the greater part of the amended resolutions, or at all events dictated the changes that were made, his style is so familiar to the whole of us that there can be no doubt on that point. Well, the right hon. gentleman perhaps felt that when the hon. member for West Durham designated these as the emasculated resolutions, it was an attack upon his own pride of authorship or upon himself personally, and in the course of his speech he alluded to these resolutions in the highest possible terms. He also charged the hon. member for West Durham with having attacked Mr. Gladstone—with having said something calculated to give offence to Mr. Gladstone when Mr. Gladstone should, as he said, read that speech. I am glad to think that that speech will be read—that speech so well conceived and so well delivered, so eloquent, powerful and telling as it unquestionably was—a magnificent oration, as the hon. member for Montreal East described it; a powerful and convincing speech, as the hon. member for Essex described it—a speech not only of remarkable ability and great power, but delivered with all the evident earnestness and sincerity which was not only the outpouring of the intelligence and the historical knowledge of the hon. gentleman from his acquired stores, but also the swelling out of his affection for the land of his fathers—that speech, I have no doubt, will be read by the statesmen of England, and give force and efficacy to these resolutions we are about to pass, which they otherwise would not have. I am glad to think, too, Sir, that it will be read by all the Irish people throughout the world, that in every paper that circulates among Irishmen this speech will be republished, and that Irishmen everywhere will learn the gratifying fact that here in Canada they have a man holding a high and prominent position, a man of great ability, who sympathises thoroughly with them and with the people in the old fatherland. The right hon. gentleman also complained that the hon. member for West Durham had said that much of the remedial legislation of the British Parliament came too late—too late to be effective, too late to produce the good effects which it might have produced had it come at an earlier day, had it been the spontaneous offering from the English people, a desire to do justice, rather than something extorted from an unwilling Parliament. And that is the historical fact. Mr. Bright himself is reported to have said not very long ago, before the change of Government, that during the last fifty years the British Government had often done justice to Ireland, but was never known to do justice for justice sake. Every

instalment of justice—and some of them were very small instalments indeed—was extorted by agitation, by threats of rebellion or insurrection, or by some other methods to which the people of Ireland should not have been compelled to resort. The result of every one of these struggles for justice was that the Irish people were taught that from the British Parliament they need never expect to receive spontaneous justice or fair play. The lesson was often taught to them that if they were to be well governed—governed according to Irish feeling, and for the promotion of Irish interests—they must be governed by an Irish Parliament sitting in Ireland. The hon. gentleman also said that the Land Act of 1870 proved to be a failure. The fact that Mr. Gladstone himself introduced another Land Act last year is evidence that the Act of 1878 proved a failure. I believe that he thought the Act of 1870 would effect a great and beneficial change in the land laws of Ireland—that thereafter the rights of tenants, at least to the property they had themselves created in the soil, by their industry, would be protected. But the fundamental weakness was regarding the freedom of contract as too sacred to be interfered with, when a short time the landlords found, to use O'Connell's phrase, that they could run a coach and four through the Act. In Ireland no real freedom of contract existed, men bid for and had to take land on such terms as the landlords chose to prescribe; for centuries they and their ancestors had occupied it, but now they had to contract themselves out of all benefits which the law was calculated to confer. In the Bill of 1880 there is no such thing as freedom of contract, and this Act is also defective. Some charge Mr. Gladstone with dishonesty of purpose and desiring rather to build up the landlord system than render justice to Ireland. I believe that opinion entirely unfounded. I believe Mr. Gladstone is actuated throughout by the most honest, conscientious and patriotic motives, desirous of doing the fullest justice to the tenantry and the whole people of Ireland, and I do not think him blameable for any failure. It has been said the present Land Act goes practically as far towards creating tenant propriety in the soil as was possible in any Act that he could hope to carry. I must confess, when he introduced his Bill, although it showed many defects to one so familiar with the condition of Irish affairs as I am, my first impression was that it was a Bill he never could get through the Commons, not to speak of the House of Lords. It was only by the condition of affairs in Ireland, by the height to which the agitation had reached and the formidable appearance of the combined tenantry, under the guide of the Land League, acting strictly within constitutional limits, but still wielding the powers they possessed so effectively as to render the collection of rack rents, but still more the arbitrary evictions of tenants, impossible in many cases and difficult in all, that the English Government was compelled to take the action which ended in the last Land Act. To the surprise of all who know the condition of things in the Old Country, it was a great surprise that the most earnest supporters of the Land Bill in the Commons, were those who represented the landlord interest of Ireland. They wanted to go much further. In some respects they assisted the powerful Act of Mr. Gladstone, and in some respects they rendered it less beneficial than it otherwise would have been. They introduced amendments and struck out some sections which impaired the usefulness of the measure; but on the whole they were willing to see the Act pass, and the fact of their eagerness helped the Act to pass so readily through the Lords. But even then the defects of the measure were manifested. Mr. Gladstone wished that when he established his land courts, and those courts had investigated some cases and determined the rates to establish a scale upon which the rents could be fairly fixed, that the landlords themselves would come forward and agree with the tenants on that subject. And it was reason

ably said that after all there would be a few hundred or a few thousands to be disposed of; but those who know the landlords of Ireland and the agents of the absentee landlords felt they would do anything to facilitate a change beneficial to the tenantry, calculated to reduce their own incomes, or more than that, to remove the tenantry from a condition of bondage in which they were placed. It was not merely that the tenantry were intended to pay everything that could be abstracted from the land, save their own share of the coarsest of food, but landlords and agents would come into their families and prescribe how they should live and even the persons whom their children should marry. Even on the estate of the Marquis of Landsdown, who has been held up as a model landlord, it was absolutely the law that if a man allowed his son to get married without the permission of the agent he forfeited his right to the holding, and it is notorious that that penalty has been enforced. That was the condition from which it was hoped this Land Act would relieve the tenantry of Ireland. The hope, unfortunately, has proved unfounded. To-day there are 70,000 to 90,000 cases. The landlords are fighting those cases inch by inch and on the most trivial grounds appeal from the decisions of the Courts, and the tenants are absolutely unable to contest the appeals through lack of money to pay costs. Another point which the hon. member for West Durham pointed out was, this Act does not deal with the question of arrears. A year before it was introduced, the Government provided that no eviction should be permitted for arrears until the Act then in contemplation had been introduced and passed. The people, no matter how they sustained themselves, though in many cases they received relief from abroad, were unable to pay their rents, and arrears had accumulated which were not arrears of fair rents, as determined by the Courts, but arrears running forty to sixty per cent. above fair rents. In cases where an account was open for several years preceding, had a fair rent been charged the whole time, instead of the tenants being in arrears the landlords would be in their debt; yet although the House of Commons recognized the justice of such a provision and passed a Bill to that effect, dealing with arrears, which was rejected by the House of Lords, yet when the Land Act was passed it contained no provision whatever affecting those tenants. They could still be evicted for non-payment of those arrears. The right hon. First Minister should not find fault with anybody for simply saying that the Land Act had not proved beneficial. To-day that question is the burning question. There are many others that demand the attention of the Irish people and of the Government, but the land question overshadows them all. Last year the Parliament felt itself called on to vote \$100,000 towards the Irish people. We felt then we had a right to interfere in the affairs of the Old Country by generously voting that handsome sum of money. We have a right to-day to interpose in this behalf also by asking for such remedial legislation as will put an end to their sufferings and trials. At the time this land agitation began to attain its enormous proportions, Home Rule was placed in abeyance by the more active spirits of that movement, because they felt if the people were to be saved and Ireland remain a nation it was absolutely essential this land question should be settled. This very attempt of the British Parliament to deal with this question, and its deplorable failure, has revived the feeling that Home Rule alone is the true remedy, the drastic remedy, to use the expression of the hon. the First Minister, for the situation. The people of Ireland feel they are able to legislate for themselves, they have shown in their management of such local affairs as are entrusted to them—the Poor-law Unions and corporate bodies—a capacity for self-government that has rather surprised those who were formerly disposed to treat them as a people to be ruled and unfit to rule themselves. Mr. Gladstone deserves the credit of being the first, holding

Mr. ANGLIN.

the high position he holds, that Ireland ought to be ruled by Irish ideas and feelings. It cannot be through an Imperial Parliament. That Parliament is over-weighted with work and even with the best possible disposition there is a want of information and sympathy in it that renders sound legislation for Ireland almost impossible. We have unfortunately in Ireland a governing class and a governed class, and the former has to a very great extent the sympathy of the ruling class in England. We know also that many of the landlord class hold land in both England and Ireland, and the landlord classes of the two countries are so bound together by alliances and by interests that the Irish landlords in the enforcement of their peculiar ideas, have always had the sympathy and the support of the English landlord class who are still the most influential class in the Legislature of that country. The conviction is growing that Home Rule is the only remedy for the evils and misfortunes of Ireland, and that if the Irish people were allowed to govern themselves according to their own ideas of what is right they would succeed in obtaining such a measure of happiness and prosperity as other people governing themselves have generally succeeded in obtaining. I have gone more at length into this question than I intended when I rose. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have, with great unanimity, with great earnestness that is most gratifying, and indeed somewhat surprising, accepted the broad proposition that Ireland has been sadly misgoverned and is still misgoverned; that it is to-day in a deplorable condition for itself and a dangerous condition when we look at its relations towards the Empire at large. They have also admitted that Home Rule, such as we enjoy in this country, is the true remedy for that state of things. I join in the regret that these resolutions are not more direct and positive. I expressed the wish from the first that the resolutions, no matter by whom presented, should be so drafted as to give not the slightest umbrage to any member of this House, or hurt the prejudices, if any prejudices existed, of anybody belonging to any nationality or religion. I felt it was of the highest importance, if we moved in this matter at all that we should succeed in carrying with us the unanimous, or nearly the unanimous opinion of this House, and I felt that in order to do that, the resolutions ought to be drawn in the mildest possible manner, and that we ought to ask what we desired in such a way as to meet with the concurrence and the approval of all the hon. gentlemen in this House. Therefore, I have not the slightest objection that the resolutions prepared by a number of members of both Houses of Parliament should have been modified afterwards by the Prime Minister or any other hon. gentleman in this House, provided the modifications were evidently calculated to render the resolutions more acceptable to the House, and provided, at the same time, that they did not give expression or suggest anything that would be in itself objectionable. But I think they ought to have been, so far as they went, direct. They do not deal with the land question, and that is quite proper, perhaps, because Home Rule embraces the land question. Give the Irish people Home Rule and it is to be presumed you give them at once every remedial measure that it is possible they could obtain, because they would then have in their own hands the power to deal with all those matters relating to their internal affairs. But I think that if we thought they were entitled to Home Rule we should have asked for it directly and plainly without the "ifs" and the "ands" and conditions I find in the resolution. I quite agree in saying that we desire respectfully to suggest to Her Majesty that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under the Federal System, leaving to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government. That is the recital of a simple fact in which we all agree. When Mr. Gladstone chose, in that extraor-

inary speech he made a short time ago, to admit that the question of self-government has become a practical question, but at the same time to demand from the Home Rulers that they should formulate their demands in such a shape as to be acceptable to the people of Great Britain, he certainly demanded what he had no right to ask, and by making that demand he seemed to wish to evade the responsibility which rested upon him as leader of the Government. If he believes the time has come when there must be a reconstruction of the parliamentary system of Great Britain, and when there must be a central and local Parliament, it was for him to frame such a system as would be applicable to the present state of things and which is best calculated to maintain intact the power and the interest of the Empire, and it was not for the forty or fifty gentlemen who represent the Home Rule party in Parliament, and who have no power to give effect to anything they may propose. I think the hon. member for West Durham offered no opposition to Mr. Gladstone in dissenting from his own views of what the duty in this particular is, and I think that Mr. Gladstone was mistaken as to what his duty is, and I think he was also mistaken when he argued as if he were not aware that there was in existence anywhere in the world a system which might form the model for the system he seemed to think was desirable. There was in the United States a Federal system which might have formed the groundwork of some such system. There is also here in Canada a Federal system which the Imperial Parliament itself has created and upon which he might have formed a scheme to suit the necessities of Great Britain. It is true that in our Federal system there is a considerable amount of friction which it is desirable to avoid, but even in that system he could find something worthy of imitation. It is not impossible to devise a system, and it was scarcely just to throw upon the Home Rulers the duty of formulating a scheme when, according to the English Constitution, it is the duty of the Imperial Parliament to provide for the proper legislation of every portion of the United Kingdom. We do not ask our Governor General to determine any question of the kind. There was a time in the history of the old Irish Parliament, when notwithstanding restrictive legislation that crippled it and really deprived it of all right of independent action, it certainly awakened to a sense of its own rights and without asking the sanction of the British Parliament, it simply declared its own power to renew and exercise its powers. But that was the case of an independent Parliament, having a separate existence, not one depending on the British Parliament, by its own right. To-day, however, there is nobody, certainly no one whose opinion possesses the slightest value or influence, who pretends to say that the Imperial Parliament is not absolutely sovereign and supreme in this matter and may pass just such laws regulating legislative action and creating new legislation or apportioning new legislative powers, as they see fit to pass. The Imperial Parliament has the right to pass such acts, and the Legislature passes such powers as the Act describes. There is therefore, no necessity of resorting to such a clumsy and unconstitutional manner to determine these matters, as Mr. Gladstone seems to think is the only course open for the Home Rulers to adopt. But while I believe all this, and while we are glad to see, notwithstanding our party differences, that we are in an eminent degree showing all the essential excellencies of the Federal system applied to a country grown too large for a single Legislature, we might have said very plainly that a similar system should be adopted in Ireland; that Ireland should be given the blessings of self-government of which we all cherish. Therefore, I do not like the words:

“We venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of

meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to Your Majesty's Empire.”

I regard that as seriously objectionable and to be contrary to the opinion expressed by many hon. members who addressed the House. We have all declared that we believe Home Rule should be extended to Ireland, and that such extension is not unpatriotic with the safety of the Empire. Some have declared that it has become absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the Empire in its integrity and power. In this resolution we are raising considerable doubt on that point. We are also expressing doubts as to the good faith of the Irish people, for the resolution says: “if the rights of the minority are fully protected and received then we hope” certain things will be done. If there is a country in the world where the rights of the minority, and more than their rights almost their privileges have at all times been respected and held sacred, it is in Ireland. It will be impossible to point to a single instance where the rights of the minority have been disregarded by any body of Irishmen. There have been times in the history of Ireland since those religious differences have occurred, when Catholics were in the ascendancy, when they had control of the Government of the country. They had it in the reign of Queen Mary, and during those years there were prosecutions or persecutions of Protestants in England. Many fled from England to Ireland; they were received in Dublin hospitably and were maintained at the expense of the city; there was again another time when what was known as the Confederation of Kilkenny had control of Ireland, and in no one instance did the minority suffer the slightest injustice or injury at the hands of the majority. To-day what is the state of things? For years and years the corporations of Ireland have been close boroughs, Protestants only being admitted to a share in the Civil Government, and in some cases, Protestants were only permitted to be burgesses. One of the measures obtained by O'Connell was a change of the municipal law in Ireland. The Catholics possessed a large majority in many of the cities and towns. How did they treat the minority? In Dublin, to this day, it has become the rule that the mayor shall be one year a Catholic and one year a Protestant, although the Catholics are three to one in the Common Council which appoints the mayor and six to one in the city. The same is true of other cities and towns in Ireland. With regard to parliamentary representation, one of the most Conservative counties elected, a few years ago, a Presbyterian Minister, and we have every day Catholic constituencies preferring Protestant candidates. I never heard of a case in Ireland where the fact that the candidate was a Protestant was considered objectionable; on the contrary it is rather in the candidate's favor that he belongs to the religion of the minority. To-day the very leader of this great agitation, not the man to whom it owes its origin, but its parliamentary leader, Mr. Parnell, is himself a Protestant, as are many others of the same class, and they are not the less admired and esteemed because they happen to belong to the religion of the minority. Therefore I do not think it is desirable that the Canadian Parliament should, by adopting a resolution of this character, throw any doubt upon the liberality of the majority in Ireland. If I believed the results of Home Rule if obtained by the Irish people would be that the minority would be oppressed, wronged or aggrieved in any degree by the majority, I would never record my vote in its favor. And I believe, Sir, a very great number of Irish Catholics throughout the world are of the same belief. And then the extraordinary expression we find here, is “the rights and status of the minority protected.” What does he mean by status? One has to almost guess that. I am not aware, Sir, that legally the minority holds a different status from the majority, but as a matter of fact they hold a very different status indeed, inasmuch as the majority occupy all the

lucrative appointments under the Crown. The law prohibits the appointment of a Catholic Lord Lieutenant. There has never been a Catholic Secretary, and at the Castle I have never known more than one or two Catholics in important offices. There are a few Catholic judges, and several Catholic lawyers have forced their way to the bench; but though the great majority of the lawyers are Catholics the great majority of judges are Protestants. Is that what he meant by the status of the minority? Are we to ask that they are to be put on an equal footing with the majority?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Lord Lieutenant is the only one.

Mr. ANGLIN. Does the hon. gentleman mean that for all time to come that that shall continue?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is a representative of the Queen. The Constitution provides that the Sovereign must be a Protestant.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am aware of that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, it is held by constitutional lawyers that the office of representative of the Sovereign there—the Lord Lieutenant is a Viceroy—must be a Protestant also.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am aware of that, but that is a matter that can be changed by due course of law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. ANGLIN. Materially it was not a matter of much consequence, but considered as one of sentiment and believing it is a matter of very great consequence that we are by law prohibited from occupying that office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so. I would be glad to see it repealed.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am trying to find out what this means, "the status of the minority is to be protected and secured." That is the only case in which the law makes any difference. I think it would have been very much better if those words were omitted. I shall not propose that they be omitted, in fact under the rules I could not, but I do not want to do anything that would prevent the unanimous passage of these resolutions. I think it of the greatest possible importance that they should be passed unanimously and the people and Government of England should hear us with one voice ask that Home Rule be granted to Ireland. There is another point I object to in these resolutions, that is, with regard to those called suspects. The passage says:

"We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them."

I hope the hon. leader of the Government misunderstood the remarks made, for if not he treated very unfairly what was said by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). He assumed that the hon. gentleman wished to ask that persons charged with the most serious offences should be set free, that the jail doors of Ireland should be thrown open, and that persons guilty of the most enormous offences be allowed to go out. The hon. member never stated anything of the kind, and I cannot understand how the leader of the Government could have misunderstood him. What he did say and what I am prepared to repeat is that men who have been arbitrarily arrested and who are arbitrarily held in prison on no charge whatever, but on the extraordinary charge that there are reasons of their being suspected of committing some crime, and this in a country supposed to enjoy the glorious privileges of a British constitution, surely, Sir, it is a monstrous state of things that the Government of the country should sweep over that country, and upon information furnished it, may be by the very members of that landlord class who are affected by

Mr. ANGLIN.

this agitation, and have learned to hate the agitators, seize them and put them into prison, without trial or hearing of any kind, merely because it is said they are reasonably suspected of being guilty of some political crime. These men deny that they are offenders of any kind. I find that there are, according to a telegram we received a few days ago, 510 of these men now in prison throughout Ireland, some not charged with political offences at all. There are men imprisoned for being suspected of murder, of arson, of violence against the person, others of provoking, others to like crimes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The original resolutions which, I believe, the hon. gentleman saw and approved of, referred to the political prisoners in much the same terms as these.

Mr. ANGLIN. The original resolutions were defective in that respect, and I should probably have spoken of them in the same way that I am speaking of the present ones. Among these prisoners are such men as Mr. Parnell, a member of the British Parliament, a man of high character, of whom no one has ever been able to say that he has ever been guilty of any crime even the most venial; Mr. Dillon, another member of Parliament, as well as four or five others also members of the House, are also among the suspects accused of being suspected of the same treasonable practices. Mr. Arthur O'Connor, in Parliament, succeeded in extorting from the Irish Attorney-General an admission that a warrant was awaiting him should he ever set foot in Ireland, and yet he had the right to sit in Parliament the peer of any member there. He challenged the Government to put him on trial, that he was prepared to meet the charge against him openly, moving all plea of want of jurisdiction. That challenge was, of course, not accepted. That is a state of affairs that is, in my opinion, utterly unjustifiable and inadvisable. I have always deeply regretted, with my great regard for Mr. Gladstone and my high opinion of his ability and honesty of purpose, that he has allowed himself to be driven to resorting to means of this kind for the purpose of suppressing crime in Ireland. Some state, and not without some show of reason, that for the mere indulgence of personal spleen or pique he allowed himself to resort to measures which in history will attach to his name a stigma that I would gladly see removed from it. But we ought to ask for these men no clemency; when we ask for clemency, we place them in a position from which clemency only can relieve them. They would not ask clemency for themselves, Sir; they ask for justice and fair play; and only what they would ask for themselves should their friends ask for them. I would be ashamed, were I the mover of that resolution, to ask for clemency; I would ask for a trial and fair play. I know it has been said that it would be useless to put these men on their trial—that it is impossible to obtain the conviction of a political offender in Ireland; but for that there is no foundation whatever. A short time ago a number of persons were arrested charged with being members of a band of what are called "Moonlighters," charged with intimidating throughout the country, with seizing arms, and committing other illegal acts. The person who gave the information, as it turned out, was the person who organized these men. He was himself an old soldier, and when he was arrested by the police, on his person were found a watch and various other articles. That man's evidence was scarcely worth receiving against men charged with any serious offence; but in this case, which was tried in the City of Cork, which was said to be the very focus of discontent, there was no difficulty in obtaining a conviction of five of these men. That fact is conclusive proof that if these men were put on their trial, their would be no difficulty, if they were guilty, in convicting them. I have no hesitation in voting for the passing of these resolutions, but I wish it to be

understood that I do not believe in asking for clemency for these men, because I do not wish to ask for clemency for men who have been convicted of no offence. These words were not in the resolutions originally agreed upon, and I am sorry they are used here. I am glad, on the other hand, to find that the resolutions are going to pass unanimously, and that they have been received in such a kind and sympathetic spirit by hon. gentlemen of various nationalities in this House. The hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), I am glad to know, has always manifested a warm sympathy with the Irish people; one of the first speeches I heard from him some years ago was on a similar subject, and he spoke then with the same earnestness and ardor and generous feeling that we all admire in him. I am glad to find that a better sense of the condition of things in Ireland is prevailing; I am glad to find, as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) said, that prejudices which came with the mother's milk are gradually disappearing. We are learning to appreciate and understand each other more thoroughly, and to find that if one man is a Protestant and another a Catholic, one an Episcopalian and another a Presbyterian, it matters little, that every man should act and think for himself, and that notwithstanding these differences we ought to combine in all that relates to us as a people, by having one heart, one mind, one thought, and one vote.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am very glad that hon. gentlemen have discussed this resolution in such a calm, gentlemanly, courteous manner, which has removed a great deal of the opposition I had to it. The hon. member for West Durham certainly made a speech that was very creditable to him as an Irishman, and I was proud to hear him, though in some instances he went too far. He found fault with one of the best friends Ireland has ever had in the English Parliament, and that is Mr. Gladstone. But in the remarks made by the different speakers, not one has told how a great deal of Ireland's troubles could be remedied. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down speaks of Home Rule. Home Rule will not do it, unless the tenantry of Ireland own the land; and I would ask, how in the name of common sense, if they get Home Rule, are they to obtain the money to purchase the land from the Irish landlords?

Mr. WRIGHT. From the English Government.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman has struck the key note; the only way the Irish people can own the land is by the credit and capital of the English Government, which voted the people's money to liberate the slaves, and the world honored it for what was done. Home Rule means nothing without the people owning the land. It is said the late Land Act of Mr. Gladstone was very defective. But who did the most to make it defective? Parnell and his followers, its great enemies in the Commons. I say unhesitatingly that were there a Parliament in Dublin composed entirely of Irishmen, no such liberal bill would have been passed. The most tyrannical landlords in Ireland are those who belong to the Roman Catholic Church, and the most tyrannical agents and most unreasonable constables are Roman Catholics. No reform has ever been given to Ireland but the present Protestant minority has accepted and worked it out most industriously. I heard the words that fell from the member from Ottawa with which all will agree.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, and interruptions.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to say that I have been a member of this House for thirteen sessions and have never interrupted anyone during that time by making noises on the desk. Mr. Vallée ought to be ashamed of his conduct.

Mr. VALLEE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken; I am not disturbing him.

Mr. WHITE. If mistaken I beg pardon. I do not intend to say a word to offend any one. But what do these resolutions amount to? What will the English Parliament and

Government say of them? The member who has just taken his seat knows well that the great difficulty the English Government has in regard to Home Rule is that a large portion of the people of Ireland are opposed to it. The minority fear it, convinced they would not enjoy the rights and privileges they now possess. I believe the day is not far distant when Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury will find a solution for the great difficulty that now overshadows Ireland, and that if we did not pass this resolution it would be better for the Irish people and the English government. Why should we interfere and petition the Home Government as to how to govern Ireland? Do they not know better than we? How should we like their passing resolutions that we should impose a duty on this or that article or to manage in this and that way the different Provinces of the Dominion? We would deliberately tell them to mind their own business—that we could manage our own affairs. I am not going to divide the House on these resolutions, which can be carried on a division; but I think there is a good deal in them of a political nature. I believe one of the great political parties of this country is anxious to pull the wool over the eyes of the Catholic Irishmen of this country, by bidding for their votes. But a large majority of the Irishmen of the country are satisfied this motion will not benefit Ireland to the value of the paper. I may be wrong, but I think that if a large number of hon. members expressed their own convictions they would use the language I am employing. If we petitioned the Home Government to purchase the land from the landlords and give them to the poor, afterwards Home Rule would come, when the people would manage their own affairs well. I believe also the majority, if they held a stake in this country, would do justice to the minority. The remarks of the hon. member for West Durham as to the sufferings of the Irish people were very true—everything had to go to the landlords and tax collectors; but in many instances the landlords are not quite so much to blame. The people liked to live close to each other, and cut up their farms small and paid high rents for the purpose. Besides many good landlords were willing to spend their capital and live among the people, but they would take offence at them, shoot them and drive them out of the country. I believe these resolutions will do harm by encouraging parties in Ireland to do that which the good Irishman is ashamed of, and will discourage the friends of peace, prosperity and happiness. Trouble is largely maintained in Ireland by parties going from the States, for not treating whom more severely the Government is to blame. If those Irish Americans were kept out of Ireland a solution of this difficulty would soon come, and peace and harmony be quickly restored. I believe that the Land Bill passed by Mr. Gladstone could be so worked that much good would be derived from it, and I trust the day is not far distant when the remarks made by the Earl of Salisbury lately in Liverpool will become fact, that is that the Government will assist the Irish people to own the land, and then I believe peace and prosperity will come to that unhappy land, then the English Government could well afford to give to Ireland a system of Municipal Rule. The hon. member for Gloucester said that he objected to these resolutions because there was a clause in it that the minority should be protected. I believe that portion of the resolutions. It is the best part of them, and will show the minority in the old country that they have friends here who are willing that they should be shown justice and fair play. As a whole I am opposed to the resolutions. To interfere at the present time would only give more trouble to Mr. Gladstone in his anxiety to try and get over the Irish difficulty. Had the hon. gentleman not brought the resolutions before the House at all it would have been much better. What do they amount to? Not the paper they are written on. All that Mr. Gladstone can say, as the right hon. First Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition know, is

that he has done all that he could and must bide his time to see what the result is. I only rise to enter my protest against this House interfering directly or indirectly with the affairs of the Imperial Parliament.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, if I take a part in the debate it is merely to protest against certain utterances of the preceding speaker. Answering the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) has attributed to the large Catholic landlords and their agents the acts of oppression complained of by the Irish people. I do not know whether he intended to convey thereby the idea that Catholics were more or less the cause of the oppression endured by the Irish people. If such be his intention, I have to protest, and I do so energetically against such an assertion. It may be that in a country where the majority are Catholics, that Catholics are accused of certain misdeeds, but from that it must not be concluded, in regard to those misdeeds that we are now dealing with, that it is because certain men are Catholics that they have committed the acts for which they are blamed. The hon. member has found but one feature to please him in the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan), and that is to be found in that part which provides for the rights of the minority being respected. If the hon. member is of opinion that the rights of a minority should be respected, the first thing he should do would be to respect those of the minority in this House, to respect their religious belief. If, on the other hand, his words are not intended to convey the idea which they seem to imply at first sight, he should in all justice explain them and divest them of the acrimonious intent which are implied by them.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the discussion which has taken place to-night on this important question. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) and of the other members who have spoken in favor of Home Rule in Ireland, and I have still to learn definitely what these hon. gentlemen mean by Home Rule for Ireland. Are powers to be granted similar to those given to the Provinces of the Dominion? I do not think to-day that if Ireland got those local powers it would be any great advantage, unless she also got powers of concurrent legislation. What Ireland requires to-day is what Canada has—a protective policy. No policy could be more beneficial to Ireland than a protective policy. I disagree with the remarks of the hon. member for Gloucester, when he objects to pressing the clause referring to the rights of the minority. That hon. gentleman was anxious a few years ago to have the rights of the minority respected in his Province. By the Act of Confederation the rights of the minority of Quebec were respected; and I am very much surprised that this clause should be objected to. I am not very much in favor of these resolutions, and I believe, with the hon. member for Hastings, they were introduced for political purposes. Though I object to a certain extent to the principles contained in them, and to what I believe to be the motives of the promoters, I agree in great part with what has been said, that Ireland has great grievances, and that they ought to be redressed; and that the English Government are not taking all the steps they should to redress them. If the passage of this resolution would have the effect of inducing Mr. Gladstone to pay more attention to Irish affairs, and introduce measures for the relief of Irish grievances nobody would be more gratified than the people of Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. At this late hour and after the manner in which the resolutions have been accepted I hope the House will not consider that I am abusing a privilege if I take the liberty of briefly closing the debate. I have re-

Mr. WHITE (Hastings).

son to feel proud that I have been the mover of these resolutions. I have reason to feel proud of this Parliament, and proud that I live in a country where these resolutions find such hearty and unanimous approval in a Parliament representing all classes, creeds and nationalities in this country. My object is accomplished, but I must discharge another duty. I must say in the first place that I listened with pride, as an Irishman, to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition. It is not for me to thank that hon. gentleman for simply doing his duty as an Irishman and as a member of this House. In that respect he has done no more than myself. I think everyone will read that speech with pleasure and interest. But I have been more pained, I must say, by the remarks of the last speaker than by anything that has occurred during this debate. It is very painful to me that my motives should have been called in question as they have been by a charge that I have been actuated by a desire to make political capital out of a motion which I hold to be one of the most sacred, and to which I adhere with the most earnest conviction. I had no political motive to serve in this resolution. If my motive was to strengthen the party with which we are both connected it would ill-repay me by the remarks he made. I was only actuated by a sense of duty towards my people, and I feel proud to-night that I did not miscalculate the tone or temper of the Parliament of this country when I moved these resolutions. I think the tone in which this discussion has been carried on is most creditable to this Parliament. If an attempt were made to give this a political character, I should feel it my duty to do all in my power to prevent it. Objection has been taken to the reading of these resolutions. There is a little inconsistency in the argument of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin). If he has proved anything in his able and lengthy speech on the merits of these resolutions he has proved that he was wanting in his duty as an Irishman in this regard. If the resolutions are not what they ought to be; if they do not contain principles which he cannot endorse, it comes with a bad grace from him to criticise them as he has done. I hope I shall not be accused at the close of a happy debate with an intention of wounding the hon. gentleman's feelings, but I must say that although we are not on speaking terms, and have not spoken to each other for many days—and that is not my fault, perhaps, more than his—I must say that I did take the necessary steps to have that hon. gentleman's co-operation. I invited him to attend the meeting, and through his friends, as well as personally, did all I could to obtain the benefit of his wise counsels in framing these resolutions. I think the hon. gentleman might join me, after this happy debate, in thanking this Parliament for having gone further—if these resolutions are adopted—than any legislative body have yet gone on a similar question in any colony under the British Crown. I will not delay the House any longer, but will thank the House for the kind manner in which they have listened to me.

Resolutions agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As these resolutions have now passed the House it will become the duty of the Government to present them to His Excellency for transmission to Her Majesty. I am not at this moment prepared to say what will be the best course for carrying out these resolutions, but the necessary steps shall be taken to have the address prepared and all the forms carried out when we send it to the Senate for their concurrence.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I hope that in my desire to return thanks to the House, which I do most sincerely, I shall not be charged with having forgotten another duty—that of thanking sincerely the leader of the House for the kind manner in which he has received the resolutions.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved into Committee of Supply.

178. Salaries of Officers and Inspectors of Excise \$198,466 66

Resolution ordered to be reported; and (at 2:15 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 21st April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS OF LADING.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I beg leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) to annul unjust conditions in bills of lading. I may briefly explain that the object of the Bill is to declare that carriers shall be liable for the loss of or damage to goods resulting from their negligence or that of their servants, notwithstanding any condition to the contrary, in the bill of lading, or general notices of the company. The immediate occasion of bringing up the subject, I may mention, is that very serious losses have lately occurred in an important branch of the trade, namely: the exportation of live stock from Canada to the Mother Country. Shippers of live stock have lost in some cases as many as 100 cattle, and have had no redress from the steamship companies, but on examination of the bills of lading, by eminent counsel, it was found that they contained most extraordinary provisions. It was found, in fact, that the carrier was protected from claims by the shipper in every eventuality which could occur. It was found that the bill of lading entitled the carrier to full freight upon the live stock, irrespective of the number landed, and irrespective of whether or not the ship reached her destination. It was discovered also that the bill of lading empowered the carrier to throw every animal overboard and set aside the general law of average, which would enable the owner of the animals to compel contribution from the carrier; but, on the other hand, if any other part of the cargo was thrown overboard, the owner of the animals was compelled to contribute in general average to that loss. In fact, looking at the bill of lading as now used, it provides for the protection of the carrier, as I said before, from every claim for damages on the part of the shipper, no matter how those damages may have been caused. Now, the ordinary bill of lading in common use, as given in the latest works on the subject, is very short. It would not cover more than perhaps half a page of writing, and it only contains three or four exceptions, very reasonable ones, such as that the carrier shall not be liable for damage resulting from fire or from the perils of navigation; but the bills of lading in use by some of the steamship companies will cover six pages with various special conditions, and they are printed in such small type one almost requires a magnifying glass to read them, and they are drawn with such skill, and cover so many cases, that it is almost impossible for the shipper to recover for loss of his goods, even if the carrier has neglected his duty or been guilty of wilful misconduct. The principle I seek to incorporate in our law is not a new one. This is simply an endeavor to restore the old common law. Similar attempts have been made before, and in some cases successfully. For instance, in our Consolidated Railway Act of 1879 we provide that in an action for damages the company shall not be relieved by any notice, condition or declaration, if the damage arises from any negligence or

omission on the part of the company or its servants. We have something of the same kind in the Act passed in 1874 respecting the law of carriers—I think myself that only applies to carriers upon inland waters—and we have in England the celebrated clauses in the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854, which may be briefly described as embodying this principle: That no special condition in any notice or receipt will exempt the railway or canal company from liability for loss of goods resulting from negligence of the company or its servants. That is the principle I wish to see embodied in our laws in regard to carriers generally, and particularly in regard to carriers of goods from this country to England. I hope that, although it is late in the Session, something may be done to forward the passing of this Bill, because it will have an important effect upon one of the greatest branches of trade in this country, namely the trade in live stock from Canada to England.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BUNSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to an item in the *Montreal Herald*, personal to myself. It is there announced that I am not going to be a candidate at the forthcoming elections. I beg to announce that I am coming back here after next elections.

THE IRISH RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to an error which appears in the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday. I think it was distinctly understood that the motion introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, was carried on a division, whereas it would appear from the Votes and Proceedings that the motion was unanimously agreed to. I would only appeal to the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) and other hon. members, to sustain me in what I have already said. Many of us were not wholly in favor of the resolutions introduced, but owing to the moderate tone of the debate, we thought the motion might be allowed to be carried on a division without taking any vote. We desire to have it understood that we did not approve of all that has been said in the debate on the motion. I think it will only be necessary to call your attention to the matter in order to have the mistake rectified.

Mr. BLAKE. No division was called, and the hon. leader of the House announced immediately after you, Mr. Speaker, declared the motion carried, that, as the House had unanimously agreed to the motion, he would take the necessary steps for a concurrent Address from the Senate.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I, myself, did not wish to enter into a discussion on this much vexed question, for the simple reason that I am not in the habit of ventilating my opinions as much as some other hon. members. I, however, raised my voice against the motion being carried unanimously, and the hon. member who sat directly in front of me (Mr. McCarthy) heard me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for East Hastings and the hon. member for West York, said they were going to vote against the motion, but when I put the motion no one said "on a division."

Mr. TYRWHITT. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I did.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman said "carried on a division," and you, Mr. Speaker, said "carried on a division." The hon. member for West Durham cannot contradict this statement.

Mr. BLAKE. I was quite prepared if any hon. member had called for a division to have given him an opportunity of recording his vote; but when no division was called for by any hon. member I allowed the motion to go.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. member for South Simcoe said in my hearing "carried on a division"—that was the remark he made, and I sat beside him. There were eight or ten members who asked for a division. We wish the motion to be entered as carried on a division, and it will not hurt any one if that is done. I hope the motion will be so recorded, because the hon. member for South Simcoe and the hon. member for East Durham both insisted that it should be carried on a division.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear any such remark, and I waited long enough to give an opportunity to every member to express his opinion by his voice. If such a remark were uttered, it was said in such a low tone of voice that I did not hear it. I am afraid it is too late to alter the record now.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that Bill (No. 25) to amend the Criminal Laws and extend the provisions of the Act respecting offences against the person by providing for the punishment of adultery, seduction, &c., stands at the head of the list of Public Bills on the Order Paper, and, in all probability, will not be reached this Session in the regular course. The hon. the First Minister was kind enough to promise me that an opportunity would be given to have the Bill taken into consideration, and I take the liberty of asking the Government at what time this promise of the hon. the First Minister will be redeemed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. leader of the Government said an opportunity would be afforded the hon. member, he may depend upon it that it will be given.

RE-DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS' BILL.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that we are yet without the Bill for the re-distribution of Seats, which was promised in the Speech from the Throne, and which was repeatedly promised to be brought down early. The last occasion on which I asked the hon. leader of the House as to the intentions of the Government was just before the Easter recess, on which occasion he told us that it would be brought down immediately after the Easter recess, and it is quite indefensible that the Bill has not been laid before the House before this stage of the Session.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. leader of the Government were in his place, I think he would be able to state that the Bill will be down in a day or two.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAKE. Before this motion is adopted, I desire to call the attention of the House to a subject which appears to me to be of great and growing importance. I should have been glad to have taken this step earlier and in another form; but the circumstance to which allusion has been so frequently made this Session, that papers moved for are brought down late or not at all, has compelled me, in the first instance, to delay; in the second, to proceed in this form, which is the only form available; and, in the third, to proceed in the absence of papers which were ordered by the House at an

Mr. WHITE (Hastings).

early day; but which have not been brought down—I refer to the papers on the subject of our commercial relations with other countries. My belief is that such advances have taken place, such information has been obtained from other sources than those authentic papers to which I have referred, that the time has arrived for a definition of what the views of the representatives of the people of this country are on this subject; and for a definition, as I hope and trust, in the sense of a step in advance. Our constitution, as I ventured to observe to the House the other day, is in many of its features the British constitution. Some portions of that constitution which are embodied in our own are unwritten; and I repeat that with the disadvantages—disadvantages of vagueness, of uncertainty, of the absence of accurate definition—which are inseparable from an unwritten constitution, there are great, practical, countervailing advantages which we have experienced ourselves, and which the people of the United Kingdom have experienced, in the unwritten form of the constitution. The capacity for beneficial change, for development, for progress, without the difficulty which is involved in the change of something so rigid, so cast-iron as a written paper, is an important advantage, and one which has been made available on many occasions with the best results. There has been, as I have said before, and as I repeat, in reference to the British constitution in its application to the people of the United Kingdom itself, an almost continuous growth and development. The underlying principle and spirit of the constitution has been the development of the popular principle of government; and this has been continuously enforced and realized, to a greater and greater extent, as there existed and were made apparent, greater capacity in the people to exercise the powers of self-government, greater knowledge, greater information, greater training on the part of the people to take a larger share in their own government; and what applies to the constitution as it exists with reference to the internal organization of the United Kingdom, applies in quite as marked a manner, in later years, to the relations of the Empire to the colonies and to the political condition of the various dependencies of the Empire. There was a time in the early history of many of these dependencies when they were supposed to be governed by the prerogative of the sovereign, and not by the power of the Parliament. The Parliament absorbed that share of the kingly prerogative, and I am not at all certain that that absorption was an unmixed good, because my belief is that had the Executive power and Government continued in that which was even at that time the weaker branch of the Government of the whole country, many things would have been left undone, which the greater and more sovereign power of the Parliament dared to do; and the measure of self-government and freedom to which the colonies attained, would have been attained at an earlier day, and events on this side of the water, which we are all familiar with, could not have occurred. But, Sir, so it is, that at home and abroad, and particularly with regard to the relations of the Empire to the colonies, while there is no system, while our whole arrangements are full of anomalies, while you cannot discern any particular plan or system out of which you can logically evolve a series of propositions, you perceive a principle of growth, of vitality, of development, and of progress. It would be impossible that it should be otherwise, so vast are the dominions of the Empire, and so variously composed—composed of small military posts, of Crown colonies, of small dependencies inhabited by populations, scanty in number and untrained in representative government, of enormous dependencies also inhabited by persons wholly untrained and unfit for representative government, and also composed of those colonies which, in varying numbers, are filled with a population from the three Kingdoms, and from other countries instructed and trained in self-government, and to whom has been

accorded, from time to time, as they demanded them and were deemed fit for them, a greater or less share of representative institutions, of freedom, of self-government. Indeed, no one can survey the condition of the British Empire in this particular regard, without being convinced, not merely that a cast-iron system, applicable to all the dependencies, is impossible, but that the various dependencies of the Empire present, in their conditions and circumstances, in the character as well as the number of their populations, a problem which must be a changing problem from day to day, or at any rate from decade to decade—that one community may in its circumstances and situation, be fit for a greater, another for a less, another, as yet, for no share of self-government at all; and, therefore, taken as a whole, the relation of the Empire to its dependencies must be one of flux, of change, of progress, just as in earlier days, in those days which preceded Confederation, the relation between United Canada and the two parts of United Canada, Upper and Lower Canada, though in form original, was, in its substance and its practical working, an approach and struggle towards the adoption of a federative system—under great difficulties, in a most imperfect form of development, contrary to the letter as well as contrary to what one would suppose to be the spirit of the constitution; but, Sir, the feelings and wishes of the people, their condition, and their sentiments overcame to a considerable extent all these difficulties. And if you look to the form, if you look to the question raised with reference to double majorities, if you look upon the system upon which matters peculiar, or thought to be peculiar, to the people of each Province were disposed of in the joint Legislature, you see a struggle however imperfect, in the days which preceded that Confederation, for that which was a more equitable condition of affairs than that of a legislative Union, the struggle towards the adoption of a Federal system. So here, with reference to the relation of the Empire to the colonies which are capable of self-government, you observe, not in terms, not written in a book, not declared in a formal Act of Government, but none the less substantial, none the less palpable, none the less plain, anomalous it may be, with defects, laxes, deficiencies, with excrescences, with many difficulties, but still you observe the struggle towards a federative system. In the essence of a federative system is the recognition in part of a great community which is for some purposes united—of the existence of separate rights and interests, political and otherwise in different parts of that political community to be disposed of, handled and controlled by the local bodies. And it is this application of that portion of the Federal system to which I refer, when I say that of late years it has witnessed, and in no case so markedly as in our own, a marked development. What in the case of our part of the Empire may be the exact range of the subjects committed to the charge of the local community—what may be the divisions of powers, what may be the limitations upon the rights of local government, these are questions which you cannot answer precisely. The answer varies from year to year, and from generation to generation, and to this question the same answer cannot be returned in the case, perhaps, of any two dependencies. A different answer will probably be returned at one part to that which would be fitly returned to another dependency. Applying these general propositions to the condition of the country, I say that this proves the existence of those conditions which indicate the conclusion that there is no dependency of the Empire entitled to such a proper measure of self-government as Canada. Take simply the question of our number. We number over 4,000,000, a very important number. We are counted only by the head, which is able to exert an important influence upon affairs abroad, and able to maintain itself in the vigorous state of self-government at home. But I count it not by the head only; but in the quality, and

conditions which we fulfil, which in a certain sense enhance our actual number. This is no community such as that other great dependency of the Empire, Hindostan India, with its many millions, who are all of them incapable of and unaccustomed to self-government, who are governed still, for their own good it is true, despotically and as a conquered country. We are 4,000,000 of Frenchmen, Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, and Germans, instructed in, trained in the right of self-control and of self-government. Educated with the system of primary education of which we have just cause to be proud; having learned through trials and difficulties, but, as we have good cause to know substantially, the great lesson which ought to be apprehended from the true consideration of civil and religious liberty; having struggled in the past for that measure of rights which we thought we were entitled to, and having won them, proved our capacity for the self-government accorded to. So with reference to territorial extension. The vastness of our area is such—even if it were wholly, as its in the largest part, unpeopled—as to attract the attention of the world. It is as yet, in its greatest expanse, unpeopled. But there is there a source of wealth, of strength, of power, of capacity, of progress and development which places us even with our number of 4,000,000, in a position infinitely superior to that which we would occupy had we 4,000,000 of people cribbed, cabined and confined, within some contracted sphere and without those possibilities of development and of enlisting additional strength from the world at large, which are due to the vast territories we control. So with reference to the form of our government, which, so far as it is a local government, presents an *imperium in imperio*, which shows here a state with its central part, dealing with those concerns common to the vast territory comprised in different Provinces and dependencies of the Dominion—which shows no less an exemplification of the Federal system in no less than seven Provinces of greater or lesser dimensions, already existing, and which exhibits one of the proudest attributes which can belong to a free people, the capacity and power of creating fresh Provinces from time to time out of the unpeopled territories of the North-West. So, again, with reference to the variety of our important interests—our agricultural, our lumbering, our fishing, our mining, our manufacturing, our commercial interests, all important, many of them largely developed now—our maritime interest, also largely developed now—many of them with a capacity for growth and extension. And so again with relation to our responsibility, including the development of our North-West Territories—responsibility especially great with reference to the circumstance that we are neighbors to the great republic to the south, with a frontier common to both countries of 3,000 miles—naturally involving us, whatever the form may be, practically in the responsibility of the conduct of those affairs, of the management of those affairs arising out of so close contact along such an extended line of two people having so many mutual relations—the true management of which may tend to the perpetuation of cordial relations—of relations of which it is of consequence, not merely to us, but to the people at large, should be, and continued to be, of the most cordial character. Our possibilities under these circumstances are great. The possibilities, not yet developed, the expectation which, we may fairly entertain, if only prudence, firmness, and wisdom should guide our relations, are such as we have a right to be proud of. But, Sir, our developments must be not merely material. It consists not merely in an addition to our territory, to our population, or to our wealth. It must consist also in the development of the moral, intellectual and political character of the community. And as it must, so it has been. We have from time to time received a greater measure and exercised a greater measure of power and control over affairs corresponding to our increased growth and

increased capacity in the management of our affairs. We control now our trade, we establish our own trade relations, and we thus practically decide by legislation our commercial relations with other countries. It is quite true that is an imperfect mode of adjusting those relations, but it is none the less true that we had in that imperfect mode, by the practical absolute control we have over our Customs duties, decided largely, as far as action on one side alone can decide, the commercial relations which should subsist between the Dominion and all other countries including the United Kingdom. The last relic of exceptional subordination in this regard was swept away upon the instructions which, up to the time of the present commission, had required that Bills imposing differential duties should be reserved were altered by the elimination of all instructions with reference to the reservation of Bills. From that time it has become, as it ought to have become before, that we had our right to complete legislation upon all matters within the legislative control of the Parliament, to complete that legislation, make it valid, effectual and final, subject only to the reserved prerogative of disallowance. Thus, even, although we might decide to create a different tariff, that tariff would become the law and properly become the law in this country without reservation, subject, as of course all other Acts are, to the powers of disallowance. While such is our legislative power with reference to our commercial relations with foreign countries, I maintain that it is abundantly clear that our numbers, though as large as I have described them, are, comparatively to the the question, sparse. There are many classes of manufactured commodities capable of being produced in this country, which require, for their economical production, a large market. There is nothing clearer as to numerous classes of commodities, that, within certain limits which far transcend our population, the larger the market the cheaper the goods can be produced; and long ago, in some particular cases, we had supplied to the full the home market, created to some extent a foreign trade, and were dependent, for the further extension and growth of our manufacturing interest, upon the facilities that one might obtain by cheap productions and reasonable arrangements with foreign nations, in sending forward our goods into their countries. That development of manufacturing to which I have referred is one not interesting to the manufacturer alone, but of interest and importance to the whole community, to the consumer as well as to the producer, because it is based upon the theory that economy of production will ensue from the largeness of the production, and from that economized production, the consumer will obtain a portion of the benefit, so that if it may be argued that there are in other respects apparent or real divergencies of interests between the manufacturer and consumer, it cannot be said in this respect that there is even an apparent still less a real divergence of interest. A fair and reasonable arrangement by which foreign markets can be obtained for domestic products, whether natural or manufactured, must redound to the benefit and advantage of all classes of the community, and a gain to each class without being a loss to any. In this, I think, all parties would concur. We may differ about the means. We may be of opinion—some of us—that in order to obtain an effectual expansion of our manufactures, it is essential that the cost of production should be further reduced, and that some provisions of this Tariff are peculiarly hurtful to trade in that regard. I do not discuss the subject of the drawbacks because practical experience has shown us, that that is of no consequence in this matter, and if I were to enter into that subject I would have to discuss the question as well as to the domestic as the foreign consumer in that regard. I maintain that while there are serious differences of opinion as to the effect of the Tariff upon the manufacturing interest, in so far as it lightens the cost of the raw material, we are agreed about our ends,

Mr. BLAKE.

though we may differ about our means. We are agreed it is important to extend the trade of the country, to enlarge its commercial relations, whether in natural or manufactured products, as far as we possibly can. I have said, that we exercise to-day the right by legislation of completing, as far as can be done, our trade relations with other countries, nor is it necessary to do more in order to establish that proposition than to refer to three clauses of the Tariff of 1879, the sixth clause provides:

"6. Any or all of the following articles:—that is to say: animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

There you find a regulation by Act of Parliament which enables the Administration to alter the fiscal system with the express view of reciprocating Tariff arrangements hoped to be made and expected to be made by another country, to what end? Obviously in order to encourage under those circumstances freer commercial intercourse between the two countries, and we completed this ourselves, within ourselves, by an Act passed here which enables us, without reference to the authority of the United Kingdom at all, if by any means we can secure the adhesion to our views of the United States; which enables us, I say, to alter the fiscal system with a view to improving the commercial relations between the two countries, and rendering less restrictive the trade and commerce between them. So again, in another direction; but demonstrating once more the practical extent of our legislative powers exercised completely within ourselves by the seventh clause of the same Act it is provided that:

"If at any time any greater duty of Customs should be payable in the United States of America on tea or coffee imported from Canada, than on tea and coffee imported from any other country, then the Governor in Council may impose on tea or coffee imported into Canada from the said United States, an additional duty of Customs, equal to the duty payable in the United States on tea or coffee imported from Canada; Provided that tea or coffee imported into Canada from any country other than the said United States, but passing in bond through the United States, shall be taken and rated as a direct importation from the country in which the tea or coffee was purchased."

Once again, you find completed by ourselves legislation with a view to regulating the commerce and trade relations between ourselves and a foreign country in a particular article and under a particular circumstance. Lastly, by the 12th clause it is provided:

"That the whole or part of the duty of thirty per centum *ad valorem*, imposed by this Act upon wines imported into Canada, may be remitted upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction, that the Governments of France or Spain, or either of them, have made changes in their Tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties now in force in the said countries."

There, again, you have another instance, the third in the same Act, designed to produce Free Trade relations between ourselves and the countries of France and Spain, if only the conditions which the wisdom of this Parliament thought fit to impose—the condition of a reduction of duties on their part—are acceded to by the Governments of those countries. Now while that is so, while we thus insist rightly and act upon our view that we have the right to regulate practically our commercial relations by the scale of duties we impose, by the conditions placed upon that imposition, by the relaxation of further imposition according as we deem the interests of the country in its relations to a foreign country may be advanced, it is equally obvious, and has been confessed by all parties for a long time, that more is wanted than put

ting this clause in the Act, that more is wanted in order to accomplish the purpose which the clause would serve, that what is wanted is communication and negotiation with those powers and countries with which we desire to enter into freer commercial relations. We want communication, we want to give information, we want to enter into negotiation to give full information as to our position, to ask for full consideration of our mutual interests in order that satisfactory conclusions may be reached, and that effectual arrangements may be made to carry out the objects which are indicated in the clause to which I had referred, and which are indicated in a larger sense by the policy which those clauses foreshadow in this direction of procuring by negotiation and communication freer foreign markets and better trade. What has been done? What has been done since the period of the Reciprocity Treaty? Nothing effectual has been done since the abrogation of that treaty. England in her commercial treaties has not—speaking in the large—helped us. She has, as a rule, regarded in the making of these treaties her own trade only, her own interests only. She has negotiated only with reference to that trade and those interests. She has not, as a rule, invited information. She has not, as a rule, invited negotiation on the subject in the consideration of this and, I suppose, her other dependencies, and it is admitted that—from the circumstances that the French Treaty was of the limited character to which I had referred—disastrous results ensued at a period at which those unfavorable results could least of all have been fortunate for the ship-building trade of Canada, and particularly Quebec followed. We know that some twelve or thirteen years afterwards the Government of the French decided that it was a wrong interpretation of the French Treaty, on the assumption that it extended to the dependencies of the Empire, when in truth it did not extend beyond the United Kingdom. The duty was raised from 2 francs to 40 francs and the trade was thus impaired, and it languished, and we also proceeded to fortify ourselves, under those circumstances, by raising the duty upon an article which we have largely imported from France, the article of wine, and the consumption of that article was largely diminished; while in our export in ships, although there was some increase between 1874 and 1877 it was so trifling and disproportionate that it was quite obvious that the trade between the two countries suffered, and was impaired by the construction which was placed on the French Treaty, and upon the legislative action in making that change to which I have referred, our efforts have been futile. We have accomplished nothing. There has been much cry but little wool. There has really been nothing done except to make a stir and to pay some large bills. We have been unable as yet to make any efficient progress. All our efforts have been complicated and embarrassed by overshadowing English interests, and by that complicated system of diplomacy which prevails under the existing arrangements. I cannot do better perhaps in this connection than to quote the words of the present High Commissioner of Canada, Sir A. T. Galt, delivered in 1870, when this subject came up for discussion in this House. He said:

“There is another advantage that would arise from the adoption of the course indicated by these resolutions. It is the avoidance of repeated reference to the Imperial Departments in connection with negotiations for trade relations between other countries and Canada. If there is one thing that embarrasses such negotiations more than another, it is the fact that they have to go through so many hands. First, they have to be reported on by one Department, then referred to another, and still another before they can possibly come back to the Government of the people most interested in them.”

Now, it is said that great recent improvements have been effected. I deny it. I find no proof of any improvements having been effected since that time. I call for the results, for the proofs. I want to see what the change is that has taken place for the better. I say the results are nil, and I

say that the fact that those results are nil is partly due to our being unreasonably embarrassed by supposed British interests. For example, we send our Commissioner to Spain, and we, ourselves, built some castles in that country in the expectation of the fortunate results of his mission. But like other castles in Spain they came to nothing, and why. He says he postponed negotiations in Spain because they might possibly interfere with and embarrass some trade negotiations of Her Majesty's Government for some better trade with Spain. Now, I have been unable to find, in the correspondence or by any examination of the question, what there could be of real complication or embarrassment if only the true fundamental and underlying principles were once clearly set out, and that is that circumstanced as we are, and as the United Kingdom is, our trade relations with these countries are separate and distinct, each to be managed and settled for on terms suitable to each different community, not one in the slightest degree dependent upon the other. The other day the hon. First Minister declared that he was proud to be able to inform the House that the British Government had graciously agreed that if and after the negotiations with the French Republic failed, we might be allowed to try our hand for Canada, after the negotiations for a larger trade had failed. Once, again, you find the complication of such a conjunction of these things which are really separate, which have not and cannot have any practical or substantial relation with each other. But there are other proofs than those that the circumstances still exist in our present system to which Sir Alexander T. Galt alluded in 1870, in the passage which I have read, and that difficulty has resulted disastrously to us. In explaining last Session the fruitless mission made shortly before to France, the hon. First Minister—I quote from the *Hansard* March 8th—used these words:

“When Sir A. T. Galt went first to France the Canadian Government were within an ace of obtaining an important result; if it had not been for a delay in the London Foreign Office of forty-eight hours we would have succeeded in obtaining a reduction of duty on Canadian vessels of from 4 francs to 2 francs per ton, but unfortunately the Government of Austria gave notice in the meantime to all the European nations that they withdrew from all their commercial treaties and at once prevented France, in consequence of the favored nation clause in several treaties, going on with the negotiations for a time, and solely over which Sir A. T. Galt had no control, the arrangement which was all but completed was thrown over.”

A little later the hon. gentleman substantially repeated the statement. He was in Paris waiting for official authority from London, and before that arrived the notice from Austria came. Now, what I say is that it is proved by this very example that the difficulties resulting from our not being allowed to manage what is exclusively our own business, it practically resulted in evil. You find here the hon. First Minister telling us that Sir A. T. Galt had made his arrangements, but official authority was wanting from London to enable them to be formal and binding. Why? Why should we not decide for ourselves our arrangements for the reduction of duties on wines imported into Canada, and in consideration of that get a reduction from 4 francs to 2 francs per ton on ships? What in the world has any Foreign Office to do with that? They have nothing at all to do with it. Any arrangements in that direction are in one sense British policy because they involve a reduction of duty, but this arrangement in spirit and substance had been communicated beforehand to them, and such is the diplomacy that burdens the system to which we are tied under present arrangements that we could not conclude a matter, however vital and essential to us, until the Foreign Office took its time to decide. Probably it was returned in the Board of Trade, and though we had the benefit of a telegraph and all the facilities for the quick despatch of business, we were forty-eight hours too late, the Austrian notice had arrived, and so the negotiations miscarried. I do not blame Sir Alexander Galt, but I maintain he ought to have had control over the question. I maintain he ought to have been able to

conclude that arrangement, that the occasion for the delay ought not to have taken place, and that, in this most recent instance which is before us, it is proved that there is, not merely in theory but in practice also, a defect in our present arrangements. Now, Sir, there is a great deal of talk about the efforts of British diplomacy, and I want to point out to you the difficulties that beset negotiations for treaties arising out of that system. I wish to reinforce the position taken by Sir A. T. Galt in 1873, by reading you a few words from the private journal of Mr. Cobden, the Joint Plenipotentiary with Lord Cowley in the negotiation of a French Treaty some twenty years ago. He speaks thus of the result to him of the Foreign Office meddling in connection with the French Treaty:

"This convention was ready for signature, so far as the negotiation here was concerned, on the 18th September, and the delay which has taken place is attributable to our Foreign Office, to their habitual procrastination, the desire to meddle, and I fear also to the willingness on the part of some of the officials in that department, to find fault with my performance. My position is that of a poacher, and their feeling towards me is akin to that of a game-keeper towards a trespasser in search of game."

That is the view which, in the privacy and unconstrained circumstances in which a man writes in his private journal, he took of the situation. There is the true inwardness of Foreign Office management, as he conceived it. Now, there was the case of a gentleman, towards whom this jealousy was extended, though he was appointed at the express wish of the hon. the Prime Minister, and he was trained to the diplomatic service in England. If he was regarded as an interloper, how much more would that apply to a Canadian agent occupying a more qualified and subordinate position as our representative under the present circumstances? How much desire would there be to show that he was wrong, to show what difficulties there was in the way, to criticise, to delay, to create more difficulties, not on the part of the Government, but on the part of these subordinates, which in these matters are very powerful indeed? Once, again, the same eminent statesman spoke on the same subject:

"I am paraded at meetings of plenipotentiaries, with my hands tied, without the power of solving the merest question of detail. When I filled the post of commercial traveller at the age of twenty, I was entrusted with more discretionary power than is now shared by Lord Cowley and myself while filling the office of Her Majesty's Plenipotentiaries. The name might be more appropriately changed to that of multipotentiary, the points on which this delay is created by the Foreign Office are so trivial and unimportant as almost to defy comprehension."

Well, Sir, neither in the character of the transactions of the office, nor in that human nature which animates officials, is there I apprehend any very great change between the year 1860 and the year 1882. In the life of Mr. Cobden, from which I have taken these extracts, a few further words are used with reference to this policy, which may also fitly be brought under the attention of the House. I quote the substance only:

"From the proposed reference to the Foreign Office a most dangerous delay would take place. Lord Cowley did not feel that he could give way, and a copy of the Tariff was sent home. When the Tariff reached London, the Foreign Office hesitated to accept the figures without reference in detail to the Treasury, the Customs and the Board of Trade. The president of the Board of Trade was away on his yacht and nobody knew where to find him. Meanwhile, his Department advised that the Commissioners act should be adopted. The Board of Trade said one of its precedents is merely an opinion-giving Department and our advice is often disregarded, especially when it is right. It was disregarded now, and the Tariff was brought up in the most stubborn of all the circumlocution offices; the French Ministers were astonished at this unintelligible delay."

There, Sir, is, with reference to this treaty, a little practical exemplification of the difficulties which surround negotiations, even when the negotiation is by a British Plenipotentiary, and involving the interests of the United Kingdom. How much greater must these difficulties be when the negotiation is conducted in the manner and under the circumstances by which this treaty was conducted. English feeling is to-

Mr. BLAKE,

day just about the same as it was in 1865, and in that year the Foreign Office, through Mr. Hammond, now Lord Hammond, used these words:

"I am to request that you will state to Secretary Cardwell, that his Lordship concludes that, as regards foreign countries, the agents who are sent from the British North American Colonies will not approve of any independent character, or attempt to negotiate or conclude arrangements with the Governments of foreign countries, but will only, as proposed by the seventh resolution of the Council on Commercial Treaties, as regards negotiations with the United States, enclosed in Lord Monk's despatch of September 23rd, be authorized to confer with the British Minister in each foreign country, and to afford him information with respect to the interests of the British North American Provinces. A similar process has been adopted in various negotiations for commercial treaties, in which Her Majesty's Government have recently been engaged with foreign powers."

That was the idea in 1865. You are told to make no arrangement, you are not to conclude anything at all, but you may talk to the consular representative, you may give him information, and we will keep in our own hands the negotiation and the determination whether what you may deem reasonable, or what you may deem to be feasible, shall be adopted. Something of the same spirit appears to have pervaded the manner of the negotiations with respect to Sir Alexander Galt's appointment. The memorandum which was sent in by the hon. First Minister and two of his colleagues to the English Government upon the subject suggested:

"It is further submitted that the very large and rapidly augmenting commerce of Canada, and the increasing extent of her trade with foreign nations, is proving the absolute need of direct negotiation with them for the proper protection of her interests. In most of the treaties of commerce entered into by England, reference has only been had to their effect on the United Kingdom; and the colonies have been excluded from their operation, a fact which has been attended with most unfortunate results to Canada, as relates to France. This is, to a certain extent, unavoidable, in consequence of the control of all Customs having been granted to Canada; but a necessity has thus arisen for providing separate and distinct trade conventions with all foreign powers with whom Canada has distinct trade. With the differing views held by the Parliament of Canada on such subjects, from those of Her Majesty's Government, there is a manifest difficulty in asking the latter to become responsible for the representations required to be made, and foreign Governments find it difficult to understand our present system. The Canadian Government therefore submit that when occasion requires such negotiations to be undertaken, Her Majesty's Government should advise Her Majesty specially to accredit the representative of Canada to the foreign court, by association for the special object, with the resident Minister or other Imperial negotiator."

That was repudiating it in as far as this particular question is concerned by this statement, as to the position of the proposed officer:

"'He would therefore,' says Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, 'primarily communicate with this Department on the various subjects which might be entrusted to him, and while Her Majesty's Government would readily avail themselves of any information he might afford, and give the fullest consideration to any representation he might make on behalf of the Canadian Government, it would, of course, rest with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to determine in each case in what precise capacity his services might best be rendered in the event of any negotiations with a Foreign Court, on subjects affecting the interests of the Dominion. In some instances, for example, it might be desirable for him to remain in London and advise with Her Majesty's Government there, while in other cases he might, in accordance with the precedents which have been quoted, be more usefully engaged in assisting Her Majesty's Representatives abroad.'

Once, again, you find a position which is inconsistent with the position taken in the memorandum, indicating the terms of the proposed appointment—a condition of entire subservency. The Secretary of State for the Colonies is to decide as to the capacity in which the Canadian agent may be made most useful; he is to determine how the agent is to be used. Sometimes he will say to him go there and he goeth; sometimes he will say to him stay here and he stayeth; sometimes the Canadian agent will remain in London and give information to the Foreign Office; sometimes he will go abroad and advise with Her Majesty's representative. How was that answered? It was answered by declaring:

"The Committee would further respectfully submit, in elucidation of the views contained in the memorandum, that the Government of

Canada, in respect of negotiations with foreign powers, in no respect desire to be placed in the position of independent negotiators. On the contrary, they are fully convinced that it is through the influence and support of Her Majesty's Government, and by the effective use of their carefully trained and thorough diplomatic service, that they can alone look for any measure of success. And it is with the view most thoroughly to satisfy foreign Governments of the identity of interests of Her Majesty with themselves that they have so strongly sought the most official recognition possible for the representative."

So we find an express declaration in accordance with the Colonial Secretary, that it is not a position for independent negotiation at all on this subject, but one simply of giving advice and availing ourselves of that Foreign Office, which has done so much for us, and so successfully in the past, and through which we are to continue to carry on our negotiations on trade questions in future, after the same manner, being a singular discordance with the view contained in the memorandum, which pointed out there was a difference in the interest, in the commercial economy, in the principles of negotiation, which referred to the difficulty of making Her Majesty responsible for the representations, whereas this memorandum is in order to show how thoroughly identified in interests the two Governments are. There is this mistake in my opinion: Her Majesty's Government, on those matters which are of local importance to this country and to this country alone, should act by the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Canada, and negotiations should proceed direct, and if not, until we decide to make that request no effectual change will take place, no effectual removal from the groove and the rut in which we have been, I can hardly say travelling but standing still for so long a time in this matter, will take place. None are so fit to negotiate as our own people, who thoroughly understand our situation, our capabilities, our wants, our requirements, what we have to offer, what we want to attain. The very principle of the negotiation, as they observed in the memorandum which I have read, was different. The very principle of the regulation of trade relations as it is to be looked at in our country and as it is to be looked at in England, is different, is opposite. England endeavors to convince the nations which have high Tariffs that a high Tariff is injurious to the nation that imposes it, more injurious to the nation which imposes than to the foreigner upon whose exports it is imposed, and endeavors to establish, by reasoning, that proposition, with a view to throwing down Tariff rates in the sense that they are injurious to those who set them up. Some of us believe that Tariff rates are injurious to those who set them up; but Tariff rates have existed here in the past; they are made higher now; and they will exist, no doubt, for a long time to come, and, therefore, for a long time to come, we will be in a position which, whatever may be the relative merits of the one and of the other great commercial systems, is essentially different from and antagonistic to the English system, and one which unquestionably, although its advantages may far counterbalance the advantages of that system, whatever its advantages may be, gives this advantage in dealing with a protectionist nation, that you can meet them on equal grounds, and you can say: "I quite agree with you that your Tariff is a benefit; I say our Tariff is a benefit; but if you will pull down your wall a little we will do the same," and that which was a benefit under other circumstances by reductions made on the principles of mutual concession will become a greater benefit still. We have something to offer, we have set up a wall and offer to pull down a stone or two; that no doubt in view of those countries which have adopted a similar system is something deserving of attention. But there has been and is, as has been stated in this memorandum, a great practical difficulty in English diplomatists bringing forward any such arguments. They do not believe in them. They think they are mistaken. They think they are contrary to sound principles

of political economy, and they have acted on that theory in their negotiations. A large school of them believe that commercial treaties themselves are an entire mistake because they are in violation of those principles. I do not, myself, share that view, but that is beside the question, because whether they be in violation of those principles as they exist in practical application in England, there can be no question that they are not in violation of the principles that have been, since we were confederated and before, in existence in this country. I say, Sir, that the circumstance of this difficulty has been called to our attention before to-day. In the negotiations with reference to the Treaty of Washington Lord Kimberley, in a despatch to the Canadian Government, in June, 1877, used these words:

"Her Majesty's Government are bound to add that whilst in reference to the strong wishes of the Dominion Government they used their best efforts to obtain a renewal in principles of the Reciprocity Treaty. They are convinced that the establishment of Free Trade between the Dominion and the United States is not likely to be promoted by making admission to the fisheries dependent upon the conclusion of such a treaty, and that the repeal by Congress of duties upon Canadian produce upon the ground that a protective Tariff is injurious to the country which imposes it would place the commercial relations of the two countries on a far more secure and lasting basis than the stipulations of a convention framed upon a system of reciprocity."

They, therefore, advised us, circumstanced as we were, having ourselves a very considerable Tariff, and our fiscal condition being, and necessarily being, founded upon a wholly different view, they advised us to abandon all the arguments which might fairly arise from our own state of circumstances as it practically stood, and to go on a basis of English commercial diplomacy, and to argue with the United States that their Tariff was injuring them and ought to be put down, instead of proposing a system of mutual concessions which it was in our power to carry out. The Tariff was there, and it would have been the height of pedantry not to take such advantages as were properly to be obtained from the existing fiscal conditions and Tariff of the country. Now, Sir, our system is wholly different, as I said. We do restrict. We restrict both for revenue and for protective purposes. We designedly restrict importations, and we are prepared to lower those restrictions if under particular circumstances with foreign countries we can obtain corresponding concessions which may be advantageous. We admit the great importance of improving our commercial relations with foreign countries. We admit the great importance, therefore, of successfully arranging conventions upon that subject; yet we make no progress in promoting them. Now, Sir, I say this can be done effectually only by altering our system, and by dealing with the subject through our own negotiators and according to our own views. But, Sir, objections are made to this. What are those objections? The first that occurs to me is the statement that our Envoy would not be treated with respect. I repudiate that suggestion. The Queen is the Queen of Canada as well as the Queen of England, and an Envoy sent by the Queen, through her representative in Canada, is the Queen's Envoy as much as if he would have been sent from the Court of St. James, and we need only ask that it should be so looked at, and that is the true constitutional view in which it is to be looked at. The authority is vested in Her Majesty; it is exercised by her representative here in her name, upon the advice of the Queen's Privy Council in Canada, and obtaining his power our Envoy would be received with all the respect due to the Queen's Envoy. Again, it is said we are a small country and that our interests are trifling. That, also, I entirely repudiate. I suppose they are trifling, but they will receive no more attention in consequence of the medium through which they are presented. In matters of trade, the magnitude of the interests involved measures the attention bestowed. The question in a matter of business is, what have you to sell and how much do you want from us.

Therefore, trifling interests will receive trifling attention, no matter by whom presented. It is not a question of influence, not a question of favor, not a question of affection, but a question of business; and the question between business people is what business can we do with you and on what terms can we do it, and even though our interests were trifling, which I deny, the respect paid would not be affected by the manner in which those interests were presented. Once again, it is said the United Kingdom would not go to war to enforce the provision of any treaty that might be made. I do not believe they would; I do not hope they would, and I think at this time, at this period in the world's history it is preposterous to think that sensible people would go to war in order to keep their trade. The smallest war would create a greater interruption of the most restricted relations between two civilized countries than the breach of any treaty, and we find applying more and more, at least to business matters, and I hope more and more, extending beyond business matters, and into those affairs which more arouse the feeling of pride and passion of the overpowering sense of importance, which still exists amongst States, though they have largely vanished amongst individuals—a better feeling, and that more and more we will scorn to believe that for such treaties as this at any rate, we have the best safeguard of their maintenance in the sense of honor and of justice of civilized nations, and general public opinion throughout the civilized and Christian world. I do not believe that for the breach of any commercial treaty made by England to France, or any other country in which her interests were involved, though that breach were wanton, that she would go to war. And further, it is suggested that we cannot have the guns and fleet of England to maintain amicable trade relations. I pass this point by as too ridiculous to demand further answer. It is said that we cannot have the benefit of the diplomatic service of England. Much good it has done us, Mr. Speaker. The history of the diplomatic service of England, as far as Canada is concerned, has been a history of error, blunder, wrong and concession. It is certainly not a history which would lead us to believe the service was specially valuable to us. The diplomatists of these modern times who have been most successful in matters of business have been those who were most conversant with the matter in hand, who knew best the needs, the wants, the capabilities, the resources of the country and the details of the question. Business men dealing with business questions are most successful. Mr. Cobden, who conducted the negotiations which resulted in the treaty between France and England, stepped into the position without the slightest previous training. The wisest, best and most acute of diplomatists, if only crammed sufficiently, will make a miserable failure, compared with a man of even less ability, born to the soil and thoroughly familiar with the details of the matter in which he is concerned. But we should not lose the benefit of the diplomatic service of England. We could ask for it when we want it, and when we think our interests are concerned. Again, it is said it would cost a great deal to maintain a useless staff of ambassadors and consuls. This is ridiculous, because our present system could be continued by which we would send an envoy where we want him, and when we think we are justified by the favorable result. As to having, in consequence of this, consuls and permanent ambassadors at foreign capitals, that is quite out of the question. It does not follow because you negotiate a treaty from time to time, a treaty which in its essence is one enduring for some years, that you should have any representative at a foreign capital pending the existence of the treaty; and if the arrangement be by mutual legislation, it is only when some proposals are made of change that the question of negotiation would arise. Then it is said that this is practically a separation from the Empire. I deny

Mr. BLAKE.

that with equal strength. To-day, as I have pointed out, we make laws to accomplish this result. To-day we have on the Statute-book a law which would enable us, to-morrow, if the United States Congress would pass a certain provision, to alter our fiscal system entirely by order of the Governor in Council, in order to get better trade relations with them. To-day we have laws which would enable us to reduce the duties on articles we import from France and Spain, if the French Government or the Spanish Government made laws or other provisions reducing the duties on certain other articles in which we trade with them. To-day, therefore, this latter is in such a position that all that is required is the intermediary, the negotiatory, to bring what we want into practical execution, by whom this foreign Government will be induced to do that thing which by our Statute we have said we would induce them to do, by which, without the intervention of the British Government at all, we could at once reduce our Customs duties. Then it is said the interests of England might be prejudiced by our acting. Not at all; I cannot see how that might be. Her interests are that the duties should be reduced; her advantages and interests are that we should arrange our fiscal system as best suits ourselves. If she has—which I do not believe—selfish interests, I deny that she has the right to judge between us and her on the subject of our selfish interests; I deny that she has the right to decide any more than we have the right to decide, and I maintain that by the law, by the constitution, by the amount of practical self-government which has been accorded to us, we have the right to decide for ourselves what our rate of duty shall be—and that is the whole of this question. We decide for what reason we shall lower duties or elevate duties, and our reasons do not concern any other people than ourselves. We determine to lower or to heighten—we determine to lower in order to attain a certain object, namely, to obtain concessions from other States as to the admission of our products; we determine to heighten for the protection of our products against theirs. We do this without the interference of England, maintaining our right to do so, although England may entirely differ from our policy, may deem it unjust and unfair, may deem that it operates harshly and injuriously on her trade with us. But it may be said that there will be a direct negotiation with a foreign power. Yes, but by the Queen of this country, and our Acts by the advice of the Privy Council of this country. But that is a mere question of form; the question of substance is the direct conduct of the negotiation; and I propose, as sound principle demands—as is done and as ought to be done I believe in all treaties, as is done in almost all commercial treaties, as was done in the Reciprocity Treaty, as was done in the Treaty of Washington, as is done in the Tariff arrangements with France, Spain, and Italy, as was proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance to be done in case Sir Alexander Galt succeeded in negotiating a treaty with France, the hon. Minister saying that the negotiation was necessarily subject to submission to and ratification by the Parliament of Canada—I propose that our commercial arrangements ought to be, in that sense, made subject either to the prior assent or the subsequent ratification of the Parliament of Canada by an Act. Such an Act would be, like all other Acts, subject to disallowance. There would be the safe measure of authority, whether substantial and real, or technical and formal, in respect to that matter as in respect to other matters in which we pass Acts of Parliament; and if it were thought fit by those in power to take the responsibility, they would have the power of nullifying the arrangements by disallowing the Act. I believe that by proceeding in this direction, we shall be taking a practical step towards obtaining that which the country wants—towards obtaining an extension of our commercial regulations; we shall be taking a practical business step in addi-

tion; we shall be doing matters of business in a business way. I believe that we shall be acting on these same principles of growth and development to which I referred a while ago—that we shall be evolving those principles of vitality and development upon which the continuous growth and expansion of the Empire really depend; that we shall be proceeding in the direction of accomplishing that on which the maintenance of the Empire really does depend—such an organization of its internal parts, such an arrangement of external regulations, such a system—unsymmetrical and full of anomalies, if you please, but partaking of the federative character—as will be calculated to make it continue and exist more and more, not indeed as the arrogant dominator over any power, but as the mighty moral force—proving, as well by its internal organization as by its external relations, the truth by precept and example of those principles of freedom, justice, and liberality, which should sway the modern Christian world. I move, under these circumstances, this resolution:

“That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be *Resolved*, that Canada no longer occupies the position of an ordinary dependency of the Crown; she numbers four millions of free men trained in the principles of constitutional Government; she comprises one-half of the North America Continent, including seven Provinces federally united under an Imperial Charter, which recites that her Constitution is to be similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom; and that she possesses executive and legislative authority over vast areas in the North-West, out of which one Province has already been created, and in time others will be formed.

“That special and increasing responsibilities devolve upon the Government and Parliament of Canada in connection with the development of her resources, the improvement of her condition, her general progress in the scale of nations, and her geographical situation which renders her even more responsible than the Government of the United Kingdom for the maintenance of international relations with the United States.

“That having regard to these considerations, there is no possession of the Crown, beyond the limits of the United Kingdom, which is entitled to such an ample measure of self-government, or so full an application of the principles of constitutional freedom, as the Dominion of Canada.

“That it would be for the interest of Canada to obtain freer access to the markets of the world; and that a more extended interchange of commodities with other countries would augment the national prosperity.

“That in most of the treaties of commerce entered into by England, reference has only been had to their effect on the United Kingdom, and the Colonies have been excluded from their operation, a fact which has been attended with unfortunate results to Canada, especially as relates to France.

“That the condition of Canada, and the system on which her duties of Customs have been, and are now imposed, vary widely from those existent in the United Kingdom, and open to the basis and negotiation of commercial arrangements with other States or British possessions, views and considerations which do not apply to the case of, or harmonise with the policy of the United Kingdom; which it is difficult for the Government of the United Kingdom to advance; and which can be best realized and presented by the Government of Canada through a negotiator named by her for the purpose of providing separate trade conventions with countries, with which Canada has or may expect distinct trade.

“That the complications and delays involved in the reference to the Departments of the Government of the United Kingdom of points arising in the course of trade negotiations enhance the difficulties of the situation, and diminish the chances of success; and have already resulted in loss to Canada.

“That it is expedient to obtain all necessary powers to enable Her Majesty, through Her representative, the Governor General of Canada, acting by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, to enter by an agent or representative of Canada, into direct communication with any British possession or Foreign State, for the purpose of negotiating commercial arrangements, tending to the advantage of Canada, subject to the prior consent, or the subsequent approval of the Parliament of Canada signified by Act.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose that the main proposition of this resolution or amendment is, in the first place, that it is expedient we should extend the trade relations of Canada with other nations. There can be no objection to that. It is for the advantage of Canada to have trade relations with every nation that will trade with us. The next proposition is that it is expedient—I do not know whether the resolution goes further, and says that it is absolutely necessary—that we should have direct communication by an envoy of our own with those foreign countries. If Her Majesty's Government, the Queen of England and the Queen of Canada as well, will extend our powers and

enable us to send special envoys to foreign countries she will, as Queen of England and Canada, see to the enforcement of treaties we may make. That would be to our advantage. Nobody could object to it, and we should be grateful for it. But I think the hon. gentleman is far too sanguine in his expectation that Her Majesty's Government would agree to the proposition so long as we remained—however important we may be, and far be it from me to minimize the importance of Canada as regards its numbers and wealth—a colony of Great Britain. England is not likely to consent, so long as we remain a dependency, to our having separate ambassadors and envoys of our own; and more than that I think the motion betrays an absence of knowledge on the part of the hon. gentleman of the principles that actuate other Governments in dealing with Canada, so long as it is a dependency, and while the relation between nations are carried on by accredited ministers, several ranks are established. There is great jealousy between nations as to the rank of their envoys sent from one nation to another. If it is an important nation they have ministers, plenipotentiaries and ambassadors in the highest sense of the word. Then they have resident ministers; they have *chargés d'affaires* and secretaries of legation. And if England made a proposition to France or to Spain, that her colonies should have that power, both nations particularly would resolve, as history has shown, to maintain the dignity of the diplomatic service, and they would refuse, so long as we are a dependency of England. Nor could we expect consequently to be able to confer the necessary rank upon an officer who would be our envoy. No foreign nation would deal with it on these terms. We must remember that France and Spain, two nations to which the hon. gentleman especially alluded, have colonies; and they would not and could not according to the principles that govern their policy with regard to their several dependencies, accept the proposition. And we all know how important their colonies are. They could not and would not grant power to colonies of England which of necessity they would refuse to their own. Spain has continuously and deliberately refused to allow direct negotiations with the Chaplain-General or local authorities of Cuba or the Phillipian Islands. Cuba is her principal and wealthiest colony. France would not allow for a moment Algeria or the West Indies, or her colonies and dependencies in the east, to enter into direct communication with any foreign nation. They would say it was altogether inconsistent with the colonial relations and would refuse to their own colonies such a demand or such a request, if it was made; and, therefore, as they would refuse it to their own colonies, they certainly would not grant it to the colonies of England. The new born zeal of the hon. gentleman for Canada, in assuming this position, is rather amusing, when we look back for the last seven years. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman or those with whom he acted, ever considered that our commercial prosperity ever depended upon direct relations with foreign nations. I am not aware—my memory may be at fault—that those hon. gentlemen opposite ever made a single advance to any foreign nation or sought to develop the trade of Canada in any part of the civilized or uncivilized world. I believe it was in our time that the development and extension of our trade was commenced, and I am proud to say that our Mother Country is truly a Mother Country, in the best sense of the word, always assisting us, especially of late, in any attempt or any expressed desire of Canada for the development of her trade with any and every country in the world. England is an old country. She, of course, does not move with a revolutionary rapidity that the hon. gentleman would desire, therefore it is she marches with a steady and distinguished pace. Perhaps a querulous gentleman like Mr. Cobden would grumble because the various responsible departments in England carefully

watched the progress and checked the untutored zeal with respect to the French Treaty, and I believe that had the French Treaty, if it had been left to his unaided exertions without the delays, restrictions, conditions and red-tapeism which the hon. gentleman complains of, would not have been so satisfactory to the people of England, and its renewal was earnestly desired. Those delays, although curbing the desires of Mr. Cobden to come back to England as a successful negotiator and thus annoying him, eventuated in a satisfactory treaty—satisfactory to England, though I am sorry to say not so satisfactory to France. Canada has been progressing rapidly in prestige, in population and in wealth, so that although I rather dislike the want of taste shown in these resolutions in saying that we are the most important of Her Majesty's colonies and entitled to have a different position from the others, yet we are, with a population of 4,000,000, rapidly approaching to 5,000,000, a people of sufficient importance to claim of the Mother Country the important advance in our position that we have a right to claim—additional assistance, greater energy and a larger meed of independence in our negotiations than when we were scattered, separate and feeble Provinces and colonies. I must say that, rapid as our progress has been, we never yet made an advance that England has not, after due consideration, met more than half way and assisted Canada in all the negotiations she has made. She is not a step-mother, she is as anxious to see Canada prosper as she is proud of Canada and her colonies, and if we look back we will see that Canada never desired assistance without obtaining it at her hands. Even in cases when the commercial policy of the Mother Country might vary from ours, she has always tried to carry out our wishes. The hon. gentleman read in contravention of that statement, a despatch of Lord Kimberley when he was Colonial Secretary, stating that while in obedience to the express wishes of the Canadian people, the British Government would do anything that they could to promote a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; yet in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government—that Government which was then a Free Trade Government as it is now, and Lord Kimberley, a Free Trade doctrinaire of the most restricted and illiberal kind, if I may use the term—yet, neither he nor Her Majesty's Government, I am satisfied, by word or expression at Washington in the negotiations with the American Government, ever for one moment allowed their own opinions as to what would be best for Canada, to interfere with their pressing her claims and expressing our wishes. The whole correspondence will show that England did everything that persuasion, argument, ingenuity and pressure could produce to induce the United States to renew that treaty. The hon. gentleman says that we are exceedingly embarrassed, because England makes treaties, having reference to the Mother Country. Sir, whenever Canada or any of the colonies express a desire to be included in those treaties, I am satisfied that that wish will be granted. The reason why England of late years—I do not speak of old times—of a quarter of a century ago—had limited those treaties with foreign nations was this: It was to leave the trade of Canada and the colonies unrestricted by any of the conditions of those treaties. The "favoured nation clause" that England has until lately put in all her treaties is a clause that would operate greatly against the interests of Canada, because wherever Canada entered into a reciprocity treaty we would be obliged to grant to every nation the privileges we had granted to the country with whom we had made a special arrangement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You do that now.

Mr. MILLS. There are many treaties in which this is applied to Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is exceedingly mistaken, there are not many; there were one or two and there is one of these that works so prejudicially to Canada—a treaty with some of the German States—that it greatly hampers and would greatly hamper her in negotiation with other countries. As I have said before, it is useless to talk of asking the Queen to allow us to send our envoys to other countries unless those countries are willing to receive us. We have the example the other day of what France did. When M. Lefavre, the French Consul in Canada, opened an un-official correspondence with the best intentions—an officious correspondence they would call it in France—for the purpose of developing trade between France and Canada, the French Government were exceedingly annoyed at it, and M. Lefavre received a rebuke and a reproof at the hands of his own Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is because he was never authorized.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course he was never authorized. The hon. gentleman knows that the consular system of France is altogether different from that of England. Consular agents in England are merely commercial agents, holding no diplomatic character whatever, while in France they are a branch department, they rise from being consuls to being ambassadors, while in England the two services are entirely separate. And so M. Lafavre, as consul here, was not authorized to deal with any particular subject. We opened an unofficial correspondence for the purpose of seeing whether steps could not be taken so as to superinduce an official negotiation, and yet this act was repudiated. Sir, as matters stand now, I think Canada's position is as favorable as it well can be. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that we can, by legislation, without anything like a treaty, regulate our commercial principles and practices, and the hon. gentleman quoted three of the clauses of the Tariff of 1878, showing that we have exercised that power by legislation—in fact to make treaties according to those three clauses, with every nation who chooses to meet Canada on those terms. But the hon. gentleman says that is not sufficient. Well, what is sufficient? As we cannot have ambassadors he says we must have special agents of our own. Well, Sir, besides the impossibility of our agents being received in a foreign country, and the importance the language of the resolution would claim for them, I can see that, great as we are, powerful as we are going to be, when we have the prestige of England, the whole diplomatic service of England, however strong and able we may be, we are greatly strengthened and aided in advancing our interests and developing our trade. Now, Sir, I am not aware that before 1878, any step of any kind was taken by the Government to develop our trade. But the first thing we did was to attempt to develop our trade with foreign countries, and after the deliberate expression of the people of Canada in favor of the National Policy, we at once, as it was our duty to do, made a forecast of the future, and we had to discount posterity to a certain extent. We had to provide for an occasional over-production, we supposed there might be sometimes a plethora of manufactures, that our markets would be glutted, and so we commenced at once negotiations, *pari passu* with our National Policy, in order to make arrangements with foreign countries which would be likely to exchange commodities with us. I am not sure but that we got a great deal of sympathy from the hon. gentlemen opposite, though we did incur a good deal of ridicule, and I do not know but that before we get through this Session we may have a special vote charging us with our extravagant course in our first humble attempt to have an ambassador. We are told now that he is good for nothing, that we had better withdraw him, that our very first attempt to have commercial independence is costing us tens of thousands of

dollars, and that it would be true economy to withdraw our ambassador altogether from England. Sir, that is not our policy. We commenced at once. In the first place, we went to a nation on this side of the Atlantic, and we have now got the official—the not ostentatious, but to a great extent the expressed assistance of Her Majesty's representative at the Court of Brazil, and we now have a line running monthly between Canada and Brazil, and although that trade is in its infancy, I think the indications are clear that one of our best markets in the future will be Brazil. The commodities of the two countries are of such diverse nature that we can profitably send our productions to Brazil and receive hers in exchange. Then, Sir, considering, in the language of these resolutions, that our interests are of greater volume and value than they were before, we took the step of appointing Sir A. T. Galt, a gentleman well known in Canada, a gentleman who has held a distinguished position in the Canadian Parliament, who has been a Minister of the Crown, and has administered the finances of Canada for a number of years. We sent that gentleman to England, notwithstanding the reproaches of the waste of money involved in the appointment. He has been there ever since, and, Sir, he has done good service, notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, that all our negotiations have been unsuccessful whenever they have been opened with foreign countries. That is a mistake. The first thing we did was, through Sir A. T. Galt, to apply to Her Majesty's Government to strengthen his hands and authorize him to go to these countries. He first went to Spain, and Mr. West, now the very able ambassador at Washington, then ambassador at the Court of Madrid, was specially instructed to assist him in every possible way, and to put him in direct communication with the Government of Spain. Of course any official arrangement would have to be signed by the accredited Minister of England at Madrid. No other signature would give validity to a treaty, because treaties are not made between colonies and a foreign country, but between two nations. Any arrangement that Sir A. T. Galt as our agent might have made must have been countersigned and approved by the ambassador to give it validity and effect as a treaty, and of course it had to be ratified by the Government of the Mother Country who undertook the great responsibility of sanctioning it or disapproving it. Sir Alexander Galt, our agent, was in communication with the Spanish Government, and he made great progress there. Signor Camaras, then First Minister of Spain, and a great statesman, was in power at the opening of the negotiations. We did not think at first when the instructions were given to Sir Alexander Galt, that it would open so large a question as the establishment of trade between Spain, the Mother Country and Canada. We commenced more modestly and more practically by asking, through the British Government, with the consent of the Foreign Office and of the Imperial Government, for leave to enter into direct negotiations with Spain, in order to open up a trade with Cuba and Porto Rico and the Spanish colonies in America, and that was at once granted; but Signor Camaras stated that he would prefer, now that propositions had been made, that negotiations should be made wider and that the negotiating parties should deal not only with the Cuban trade but with the trade between European Spain and Canada. Negotiations were afterwards suspended not only with Canada but with England until the Cuban representatives had been elected. By the Spanish system, as well as by the French system, their colonies have direct representation in the Cortez and Chamber of Deputies of the two nations, and the Cuban representatives to the Cortez had not arrived, and the Minister said those Cuban representatives would be consulted on the various questions before direct negotiations would be entered upon. By the time the Cuban members arrived, or rather before it, one of

those political revolutions which occur so frequently in Spain took place, and Signor Camaras was unseated, and a period of semi-anarchy, not in a warlike but a political sense, or rather not a period of anarchy but of paralysis occurred in the struggle between the contending parties, and Signor Camaras' successors were not at all in favor of enlarging commercial relations either with England or Canada. If Sir Alexander Galt failed in his praiseworthy and able attempts to secure an arrangement between Spain and her colonies and Canada, the failure was an equal failure on the part of England, because Spain refused to negotiate either with the Mother Country or with Canada. But we ought not to be discouraged by obstructions of that kind, and Sir Alexander Galt has closely watched the various political currents and especially the various changes of political disposition in Spain on economic questions, and he has lost no opportunity of pressing the subject on the attention of the Spanish Minister, because having once got the right to communicate with them, he keeps that up either by communications with Spain or more directly or more indirectly through the Spanish Minister, in London. Although I have not authority to state officially, because I have it not officially, Sir Alexander Galt stated in one of his letters to me that the Spanish Ambassador was exceedingly anxious—personally, of course—and when he speaks personally, he speaks in his representative as well as his personal character—to see the development of trade between the two countries, and he told him, not officially, that it was his intention at an early day to come to Canada in order to see this country, ascertain its production and resources, and aid us in obtaining a treaty. So we felt we must do as Lincoln said, keep pegging away until we succeed. So with respect to France. France is now an intensely protectionist country, and England cannot renew her commercial treaty with her. England's offers have been refused unless she makes concessions, which she declines to make. An unfortunate circumstance occurred which might have occurred with any Government or Department. Our request that the duty of 40 francs a ton on Canadian ships, should be reduced to 2 francs, would have been acceded to if it had not been that Austria gave notice to every nation with which it had commercial treaties that they were to be terminated, and on that account the whole negotiations failed. Now, however, France by a general law allows Canadian ships to enter at the same rate of duty per ton, namely, 2 francs, as ships built in England, the United States, or elsewhere. So we only suffered a short and temporary inconvenience in that sense. Sir Alexander Galt has several times gone to Paris for the purpose of carrying on direct negotiations, and as in Spain so in France, Lord Lyons was instructed to offer every aid, to give the whole force of any influence that England might be supposed to have with France, to carrying out the wishes of Canada for direct negotiations, and for the interchange of commodities under an arranged system of Tariff without reference to England; and Sir Alexander Galt as our agent was placed in direct communication with the various Ministers of Finance and of Trade and Commerce there, whether Mr. Girard, the great protectionist, or his successor or M. Gambetta, who is as great a Free Trader as he dare be without running counter to the general feelings of the Government and the people of France. Sir Alexander Galt has communicated with them, and we hope he will be able to make an arrangement, and a promising sign is that the Ministers of France have expressed themselves strongly in favor of adopting joint action, whereby we would have a line of steamers running between France and Canada, just as we have now between Canada and Brazil. And Sir Alexander Galt says, that he thinks that proposition will be carried out, and if carried out it will result in a trade which will so attract the attention of the French

Government and French people so that we may hope that they will find that we can give them something by reducing our duties, and that they can give us something by reducing theirs, thus giving us reciprocity. So, Sir, during our short period of three years or a little more, we have not been idle. We have pressed the claims of Canada in England, to have her interests urged in all foreign ports. That has been granted in no stinted or restricted manner. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's despatch, which was read by the hon. gentleman, was the inception of the negotiations for giving a higher status to Canadian commerce and more direct means of communication with the various nations. Things have gone on rapidly since that time and we may hope, we know, experience shows, the manner in which Sir Alexander Galt has acted, that we are only in the beginning of a great enterprise of this kind. The despatch of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was guarded as a despatch at the opening of negotiations and from the representative of England should have been. We have received, as I have already told you, perhaps at too great length, not only the assurances, but those assurances carried into action, as well as the earnest co-operation of the Mother Country to strengthen our hands. The hon. gentleman pooh, pooh's the idea of war arising out of the breach of commercial treaties. Sir, war may not break out, but what is nearly as bad, in a commercial point of view, a cessation of political intercourse may take place. At this very day, and for years and years there has been no diplomatic communication of any kind between England and Mexico in consequence of the action of Mexico in matters in which England thought she was injured. There is no communication now between them, considerably to the interruption of trade between the Mother Country and that nation. But, Mr. Speaker, commercial treaties do not signify merely the interchange of commodities. The Reciprocity Treaty was not only an arrangement, a convention, a bargain for the interchange of commodities, free or at a regulated duty, but it handed over for a consideration the rights of fishing in our waters. We know, Mr. Speaker, what trouble Canada has had respecting these same fisheries, what expense Great Britain has been put to to guard our rights, and that a serious and angry diplomatic correspondence with the United States occurred because she upheld the interests of Canada with respect to those fisheries, and we know that Her Majesty's ships and Her Majesty's seamen have been employed in guarding and protecting Canadian interests there without asking us to pay a single farthing of the cost. I think we would not be benefitted by becoming in effect an independent nation, making our own treaties and being obliged to enforce them or to submit to the breach of them without any means of protecting them. Now, Sir, we have England at our back. England, if a treaty is once made with her, whether it affects her Canadian subjects or her South African subjects, or the people of England, Ireland or Scotland, will use the whole force of the Empire—I do not say necessarily in war, but will bring the whole force of her national prestige to bear—in vindicating the rights sanctioned by those treaties. I think we would be penny wise and pound foolish if we—for the sake of a little immediate advantage and for the purpose of avoiding a few delays by the round-about-way of communicating by the Foreign Office or the Colonial Office, and in order to have more speedy communication, and the immediate advantage of having a treaty made for the benefit of Canada—threw away the advantage we now have in having all our treaties made between Great Britain and the nation, not between Canada and the nation. If this be so, Mr. Speaker, I think these resolutions will do no harm in England. Disguise it as you will, this means separation and independence. The hon. gentleman is moving on by slow degrees to that point. This is a commercial movement; by-and-bye we will have something

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

else; until at last we take a step for political independence. I have said to the House before, that a British subject I was born, and a British subject I hope to die. The best interests of Canada are all involved in the connection between the Mother Country and her loving and loyal colony. I think the adoption of this resolution would do a great deal of harm. I think it would be calculated to frustrate and obstruct the kind assistance that we have received from England. England might say at once, if you are going to have ambassadors of your own, if you are going to make your own treaties, we will no longer trouble ourselves about you, fight your own battles, do your own business, and see what you will make of it. The people of this country do not want that. They desire the continuance of this connection, and they believe as they give a most loyal affection to the Mother Country, so they believe the results to Canada, morally, financially and in every way, will be to enhance the progress of the country, and that we will receive the strongly pledged and never forgotten promise of the Government of England that they will stand by us, that they will not treat us as strangers but as a portion of the great British Empire, bound by loving ties to the Mother Country though separated by miles of sea. I think this resolution is a boastful assertion of our coming strength discounting our future, containing an ill-concealed wish that this should be the stepping stone to something further, that in some way our independence should increase and our dependence and support decrease, and that we should, as soon as convenient, be cast upon our own resources. This, Sir, would be an injury, a destruction, a ruin to Canada.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 80) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Arkell.)

Bill No. (95) to amend the Act incorporating "The Bell Telephone Company of Canada."—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen's Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.—(Mr. Abbott.)

THE TRUST AND LOAN COMPANY.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 35) to amend the Acts relating to the Trust and Loan Company of Canada, and for enlarging the powers of the said Company.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Bill reported.

On the motion for third reading,

Mr. WALLACE moved, that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for amendment, inserting the words "not exceeding 8 per cent. per annum." after the word "whatsoever," in the third clause. He said: I think 8 per cent. is a sufficient rate of interest for any loan company. It is said that by making a limitation of the rate of interest, we should prevent money from coming into the country. This Company has been doing business in the country for a very long time, and has been satisfied with 8 per cent. and I see no reason now why that rate should be increased. In fact I think it rather ought to be decreased. Money is lent the farmers at such a ruinous rate of interest as it is impossible

to pay, which accounts for so many having been sold out. As it is, I do not believe it is beneficial to the country to draw foreign capital into it at such a rate; the more that this comes in the worse for the country, and therefore I move that resolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know that the sense of fairness which characterizes my hon. friend will prevent him, after a moment's reflection, to support that motion. If he thinks the law respecting the rate of interest should be changed, it is perfectly right that he should take such steps as he may deem proper for the purpose; but he will hardly say that one law should be applied to one loan company, and another to another. While the law remains as it is, nothing can be fairer than to allow companies to obtain in the various Provinces the rate allowed by the law.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). We are a just Parliament and ought to be generous. Why did we pass a law the other day limiting the rate of interest with a company only a short time in the country, and which in all sections of the country has done a great deal of good. There company has been in existence the last twenty-five years, possessing the reputation of being a good and fair company, and which has treated justly all borrowers. If they did well for the last twenty-five years at 8 per cent, why now ask an increased rate? We refused the other company a higher rate of interest, and should certainly refuse this application. Within the last twelve months the Trust and Loan Company have changed the interest on mortgages from 8 to 7 per cent., without solicitation. Why do they now ask more than 8? In order that they can lend their money in the North-West. So far as we are concerned the North-West has very few representatives to look after their interests in this House, but I believe the representatives from all over the Dominion will see that the people of the North-West should not pay too high a rate of interest. 8 per cent. is more than should be paid on mortgages of any kind in any part of the Dominion. I had hoped, after the hint thrown out by the hon. Minister of Railways, that the hon. gentleman who has taken so deep an interest in the financial matters in this country, the hon. member for South Norfolk, would bring in a Bill to limit the rate of interest to 7 per cent. in all parts of the Dominion. I believe, had he done so in the earlier part of the Session, it would have gone through both Houses and became law. We would then have less loan companies and less farms to be sold, because it is a fact that throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, go where you will, notices are posted up of farms for sale by those companies. They have charged interest as high as 10 and 15 per cent., and some even as high as 20 per cent. The time has come when this House should put a stop to this wholesale charge inflicted on parties who are ignorant of the amount of interest they pay. I hope the hon. gentleman will press his motion to a division and we will see whether those members who refused to allow the "Credit Foncier," which contributed so much to reduce the rate of interest during the year, to increase their rate, will now allow a company that has done business for a quarter of a century to charge what interest they please.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I do not see why we should deal more leniently with this company than we did with the "Credit Foncier." The latter appealed to this House, a week ago, to be authorized to loan money at a higher rate than its present rate; its application was refused. Here is a company claiming new powers, and among those that of lending money at any rate they please. I do not see why we should grant to this company what we refused to the other. I think the hon. member for South Perth is still too generous; he should ask that this company should be limited to 6 per cent., and if his amendment be not carried, I intend to move one, providing that the rate be limited to 6 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be remembered by hon. members of the Committee of Banking and Commerce, that the "Credit Foncier" was incorporated with extraordinary privileges not given to any other company incorporated in Canada, and their incorporation was agreed to because they agreed to furnish money at not over 5 per cent. under their charter.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. That was the local charter.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That company was given these privileges on account of that engagement. That they came to this House and asked that the rate be increased to 7 per cent., but their Bill was rejected on account of these privileges. The Bill now under discussion was referred to a special Committee of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which reported the provisions of the Bill as now before the House.

Amendment (Mr. Wallace) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Rinfret,
Bannerman,	Gunn,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Beauchesne,	Hesson,	Ross (Dundas),
Béchar,	Holton,	Rouleau,
Benoit,	Houde,	Routhier,
Bolduc,	Irvine,	Royal,
Brown,	Jackson,	Rykert,
Casgrain,	Kranz,	Rymal,
Costigan,	Landry,	Shaw,
Coughlin,	Lantier,	Skinner,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Inverness),	Smith,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Snowball,
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Sproule,
Daoust,	McIsaac,	Sutherland,
DeCosmos,	McLeod,	Tassé,
Domville,	McQuade,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McRory,	Trow,
Elliott,	Malouin,	Vanasse,
Farrow,	Merner,	Wade,
Flynn,	Mongenaï,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Fortin,	Montplaisir,	Wallace (York),
Fulton,	Muttart,	Wheler,
Geoffrion,	Orton,	White (Hastings),
Gigault,	Ouimet,	White (Renfrew), and
Gillmor,	Patterson (Essex),	Williams.—79.
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	McDougall,
Barnard,	Girouard (Kent),	Mills,
Beaty,	Guthrie,	Ogden,
Bill,	Hackett,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Haggart,	Pickard,
Bourassa,	Hay,	Plumb,
Brooks,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bunster,	Hooper,	Richey,
Bunting,	Huntington,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burpee (St. John),	Killam,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Kilvert,	Ross (Middlesex),
Cameron (Huron),	King,	Scriven,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Tilley,
Cartwright,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Mackenzie,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McCarthy,	Valin,
Dawson,	McQuaig,	Weldon, and
Drew,	McDougald,	Wright.—55.
Fitzsimmons,		

House resolved again itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. I think the proposition now before the Committee is one they ought to consider with great care. We have had, for a number of years, Free Trade in money, and the result is, very large sums have been sent by English and French capitalists for investment in this country. The rate of interest is lower than it has ever been in the history of these colonies, even when we had laws against

usury. It is neither in the interests of the lender or the borrower that restrictions of this sort should be imposed; no doubt the effect will be to induce capitalists to withdraw money from investment in this country, and the rate, instead of being reduced, will actually be increased. It is perfectly obvious if we introduce the restriction in one matter we can not stop then. We cannot impose restrictions on one class of lenders that we do not impose on others similarly situated. But here upon a measure that would be regarded by many a measure of subordinate consequence, we are about to lay down a principle which cannot be confined to this measure, but must be applied to the same thing, seeking to invest money in this country. I would therefore move that the Committee rise.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the hon. member for Bothwell is right. If we have to-day a legal rate of interest of 6 per cent. for all debts that have accrued, on the worst kind of security, then I think that as you lessen the security you can afford to lower the rate of interest. Many storekeepers in the country are doing business on the strength of their accounts and they get no security at all for payment. If after a certain length of time these men come to collect their accounts they find that the law allows them only six per cent. If a company loans money to a farmer the principle is generally adopted that it does not loan for more than half the value of the farm. Landed security is the best security, and if we are to say that the legal rate of interest shall be 6 per cent. upon the worst security, then upon the best security why should we not say that it should be more?

Mr. GIGAULT. The hon. member for Bothwell, a few days ago, when the Bill affecting the *Crédit Foncier Canadien* was before the House, voted not to allow that institution to loan money at a higher rate than 6 per cent., but now he is opposing a reduction in the rate of interest. I voted to allow that company to lend money at a higher rate than 6 per cent., and I think we should adopt the same rule for all monetary institutions. I thought that on account of the crisis in France, we should allow that company some more latitude. If we had four or five millions more of French capital in this country to compete with British and Canadian capital, the rate of interest would be lowered. I think it was not fair to say to the *Crédit Foncier Canadien*: You shall lend your money at 6 per cent. or close your doors, while we allow other institutions to lend money at 7, 8, 9 and 10 per cent.

Bill reported.

On motion for the third reading,

Mr. BÉCHARD. I voted for the amendment because I thought it was preferable that the Bill should pass with the amendment than that it should pass in its original form. I repeat now that the rate of interest at 8 per cent. is too high, and I believe other hon. gentlemen in this House are of the same opinion. I therefore move that the Bill be remitted with instructions to amend it so that the rate of interest imposed by the company shall not exceed 6 per cent.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has been no notice given of this amendment, and therefore it is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think, according to the 67th rule of the House, the amendment is not in order, because according to that rule there can be no important amendment to a Private Bill in Committee of the Whole, or at the third reading, unless one day's notice of the same shall have been given.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I have seen it done many times.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not with Private Bills, it may have been done with Public Bills.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. MILLS.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

House resumed the debate on Mr. Blake's proposed amendment to Sir Leonard Tilley's proposed motion for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS. I propose to address the House briefly in reply to the observations made by the First Minister on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Durham. The right hon. gentleman, at the head of the Government, has laid down a number of propositions in reference to the motion of my hon. friend for West Durham, to which I cannot subscribe. I neither concur in the principles he has enunciated, nor in the line of argument he has adopted. The hon. gentleman said in the first place that England would not give her consent to the principles laid down in the resolution before the House, and that it was not our interest that she should do so. The hon. gentleman also stated that we were quietly feeling our way in precisely the same direction. The right hon. gentleman next contended that if the policy set out in this resolution were acted upon it would lead to the separation of Canada from the United Kingdom. Now, Sir, I do not concur with any of the statements which the right hon. gentleman has made. Let us consider for a moment what are the principles of the motion before us. Sir, the arguments which the hon. gentleman addressed to the House this afternoon were similar to those which were addressed to the old Legislature of Canada and to the people of England when we asked for responsible Government in this country. A good many members in this House no doubt will recollect a pamphlet that was issued many years ago by the late Chief Justice of Canada, Sir John Beverley Robinson, in which he argued that if local self-government were conferred upon the colonies it would lead to the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country. He said that the Governor of a Province was an Imperial officer acting under instructions from the Colonial Office, and he asked how he could possibly obey the instructions received from the Colonial Secretary and at the same time act upon the advice of responsible advisers in this country. He held that the necessities of his position rendered it impossible that responsible Government could be established in any of the colonies. That inference was denied by those who were friends to the introduction of responsible Government; it was combatted by Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Lafontaine and other gentlemen acting as leaders of the Reform party. Those hon. gentlemen said that it was perfectly consistent with loyalty to the Empire and with the continuance of the connection that the people of the colonies should exercise the rights of self-government, that so far from leading to the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country it would tend to strengthen the bond of union which existed between them. We had had almost a half century for the trial of this experiment, and we have little doubt as to who was right in the line of argument which they adopted. We find, instead of the bond between the colonies and the Mother Country being weakened by an extension to the colonies of the principles of self-government, it has been strengthened. The people instead of being dissatisfied are satisfied, their own opinions are respected, their own views are acted upon, and there has been no time in the history of the country when the bond of union between the British North America Provinces and the United Kingdom was stronger than it is at this moment. The same reasons which necessitated the adoption of responsible Government, which made it right and proper we should exercise control over our own local affairs, have made it necessary that we should seek for a wider sphere of government than that which we have enjoyed. We are not asking for the introduction of any new principle, we are simply asking for the extension of an old principle, to new circumstances; we are met by an old

argument, applied to an altered condition of things. What were our circumstances when responsible Government was established in this country? We were simply great municipal corporations; we sought to build roads and bridges; to provide for internal improvement, and to furnish facilities of communication between one portion of the Province and another, and one settlement and another; and the result of those local improvements has been that the whole of British North America has been prepared for the establishment of this Federal Union. We have increased in wealth and in population, and we have at the present time a more extensive commerce than the United Kingdom had a hundred years ago. To-day the commerce of Canada amounts to \$200,000,000; we carrying on trade with the West Indies, South America, the adjoining Republic, with Spain, to some extent with France and Germany, and to a very large extent with the United Kingdom. The question that presents itself to us is, should we direct the policy and control the operations of our people in the field of commerce as we have controlled them in ordinary local affairs? It is just as necessary to exercise the principle of self-government in the one case as in the other. It is not held, that before we possessed local self-government the United Kingdom desired to do us any harm. They desired to further our interests as far as they attracted their attention, their actions being such as they believed would be most beneficial to us; but we know they were not the best judges of our circumstances, that they did not take the same interest in this country as we felt ourselves, and every attempt to extend to us those kind attentions was felt to be an injury rather than a benefit. By the concession of the principles of self-government we were enabled to deal with those matters in the way in which the people desired. We have outgrown that condition. Our interests are no longer confined within the limits of the Dominion. Our relations with foreign countries are more extensive, as I have said, than were the relations of the United Kingdom with foreign countries a century ago, and we have just the same interest in promoting our external interests as any other people with the same wealth and commerce, in any other portion of the globe has in theirs, and the Government of the United Kingdom and its officers are no more competent to take charge of those external relations than of our internal and domestic affairs. This is a reasonable proposition. Why should we not seek to promote our own commercial well-being? Why should we entrust our external relations to other people who are pre-occupied with other affairs? Certainly we have more leisure, we have a greater interest in attending to what we believe the commercial well-being of this country than it is possible any other people can have, and it can no more interfere with the existing relations between Canada and the Mother Country, than can legislation upon the Tariff, upon property and civil rights, upon the ordinary domestic affairs of the country. I say that no people have so much interest in our well-being as ourselves. I was reminded, by an observation made by the right hon. leader of the House, of what came under my own notice some years ago at Buffalo. A Canadian vessel carrying a cargo of poles, was obliged to throw a large portion overboard. The result was that when the vessel reached port, duties were charged on what were shipped and not on what reached port. The owner brought the matter under the notice of the English Consul, but he not being responsible to the Government of Canada and not feeling specially interested in the subject of the complaint, paid no attention to it whatever; and I said then if we had had a consular agent at Buffalo, responsible to the Canadian Government, who might be removed for neglect of duty, his conduct would have been wholly different from the ambassadors and consuls of Great Britain. They are looking for promotion to the Government which appoints them. They look after the affairs which

affect the well-being of the people of the United Kingdom. They know the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible to the Parliament that sits at Westminster, and not to the Parliament that sits at Ottawa, but if they do anything at all by way of promotion of commercial interests, they do it by looking after the interests of the people of the United Kingdom and not those of any dependency or colony. If we wish the Agents and Ambassadors residing at foreign ports to take a special interest in the commercial well-being of this country, we must have men whose positions are more or less affected by the attention which they give to the interests of the people of this country, and it is only in this way that these people will ever seek to promote our commerce and give our manufacturers, merchants and farmers that information regarding foreign markets which will stimulate industry at home and contribute to the well-being and prosperity of this country. The hon. the First Minister told us of the ranks of Ambassadors and the different ranks to which they are raised in proportion to the dignity and importance of the country they represent, and I could not but think from the observations he made that he was reading the condition of the diplomatic corps of foreign countries as it existed a century and a-half ago rather than as it exists at this moment. Hon. gentlemen will remember a description given by Macaulay of the difficulties of negotiating peace between England and Holland on the one side and France on the other, how the Ambassadors were afraid to approach each other for fear that they would seem to be making improper concessions, how they watched each other's legs for fear one would sacrifice the dignity of his country by taking the first step; and we know that at the Treaty of Onabruck, before negotiations could be entered into, a circular place of meeting had to be erected with as many doors as Ambassadors, as no one would consent to another taking precedence of him by entering first; and in order that all might be on a footing of equality a round table was made and placed in the centre of the room. Well, Sir, I did not know that in these days of common sense and commerce men wasted their time in that way, and I think the hon. leader of the Government must have been looking at the musty records of former periods rather than at the acts of living men of common sense in this day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman told us on a former occasion, when a subject similar to this was brought before the House by Sir Alexander Galt, that if we were to appoint an Ambassador to negotiate a treaty with a foreign State the first question would be: Who are you, who do you represent, where do you come from; and it would be said: We do not know such a country as Canada; and that they would refuse to negotiate with us. The hon. gentleman said something very much like that to-day, but he also made statements of fact hardly consistent with this line of argument. He told us that Sir Alexander Galt had gone to Madrid, that he had been put into communication by the British Minister with the Premier or representative of Foreign Affairs in the Spanish Government, and that that hon. gentleman was most happy to enter into active negotiations with him, and the hon. gentleman assured us that Sir Alexander Galt was just on the point of succeeding when he failed to succeed. If the hon. gentleman's statement is correct the Government of Spain, at all events, made no objection to entering into negotiations with Sir Alexander Galt as the representative of Canada. I would like to call the attention of the House to this fact: Supposing Her Majesty, instead of sending Sir Alexander Galt there with letters to the British Minister, and the British Minister giving him an introduction to the representative of the Spanish Government, he had been appointed by the Queen a Plenipotentiary extraordinary to deal with this important question of the trade relations between Spain and Canada, will the hon. gentleman pretend that the Spanish Government would have refused to acknow-

ledge or to receive him as Her Majesty's representative, because he was a native of Canada? What! is it the business of a foreign Court to ask a British Ambassador whence he comes, and if he is a native of England, Ireland or Scotland, or lives beyond the limits of the United Kingdom? They have no right to put such a question; such a supposition is preposterous. The only thing is, are you properly accredited in this business; are you properly accredited to this Court by the Queen. It is not the English Ministry, not the English Parliament, but Her Majesty that is known abroad. Negotiations are carried on in her name, and the man who goes to a foreign State to carry on negotiations for the United Kingdom or for any part of the Empire, has the right to deal with a foreign State and is subject to the instructions he has received from Her Majesty. As the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said, the Queen is not merely the Queen of the United Kingdom, but the Sovereign of this Dominion, and if she appoints an Ambassador or Plenipotentiary or Agent to act on her behalf for the purpose of communication and treaty between this section of the Empire and any foreign State he is just as competent to act as the resident Ambassador. The hon. leader of the Government made the extraordinary statement that no treaty, no engagement, is binding, or can be made with a foreign State unless it is signed by the resident Ambassador. Now, I say this is a most preposterous statement. He could not have remembered the negotiations between the American representatives and those of the United Kingdom, in 1783, in Paris. All will remember the disputes between Mr. Fox and Lord Shelburne, as to whether the negotiations with the American representatives should be carried on by the Colonial Office or the Foreign Office. The American colonies had claimed their independence, and it had not been recognized; and there was a conflict between the two Departments as to which should carry on the negotiation; but there is no doubt about this, that whoever the Government appointed for the purpose of carrying on these negotiations was the properly accredited person for the purpose, no matter whether he wanted the authority of the Foreign Office or of the Colonial Department. Well, Sir, when you look at the treaty that was negotiated in 1855 by Lord John Russell, at Vienna, for the purpose of concluding the Crimean war, it is true it was not ratified by the House, but it is true also that it was not negotiated by the resident Minister, but by a Plenipotentiary extraordinary, a Minister of the Crown who was sent for the purpose of carrying on that negotiation on behalf of the British Government. It is therefore utterly preposterous for the hon. gentleman to stand here and undertake to mislead and misinform this House by making such a statement. There is no doubt that the representative residing at a foreign Court could conduct these negotiations as he is the accredited agent of his Sovereign. He is specially acquainted with the manners, customs and circumstances, having long resided on the spot, having in this respect an advantage over a person specially appointed for the purpose; but there is no doubt that, if the Sovereign chooses to confer upon a Plenipotentiary extraordinary the power to negotiate a treaty or to carry on any business with a foreign State, the Sovereign has the right to do so. It is perfectly clear, then, when we look at the facts, that if Her Majesty gave us the power, if the English Government consented that we should have the power asked for in the resolutions submitted by the hon. member for West Durham, we should have the right to advise Her Majesty to appoint some one from Canada to act on our behalf—to negotiate a treaty with a foreign State; and the person so appointed would be perfectly competent, and would act by the authority, not of the Government of Canada, but by the authority of Her Majesty, and it would be simply as Her Majesty's representative that he would be known at that foreign Court. The hon. gentleman has referred to the attempt at negotiation

Mr. MILLS.

with France, but the hon. member for West Durham showed the roundabout and dilatory manner in which these negotiations were carried forward. The ancient rules and red-tapeism still adhered to in the Foreign Office, rendered it almost impossible that the negotiations should be carried to a speedy conclusion. It is perfectly obvious that Sir Alexander Galt failed to secure commercial relations with France because of the obstacles which this routine placed in his way. It is true, the right hon. gentleman said, he failed, but that we lost nothing by it; it is true, he said, at that time France was imposing a tax of 40 francs a ton on Canadian shipping offered for sale in the French markets, while only two francs a ton were charged on British shipping, but that now the tax was reduced to 2 francs on Canadian ships. But the hon. gentleman only stated half the truth, and his statement was therefore misleading. At this moment, although the duty on Canadian-built ships has been reduced from 40 francs a ton to 2 francs a ton, Canadian ships are in a worse position than they were when Sir Alexander Galt was carrying on these negotiations. What are the facts? Why, that France at this moment pays a bounty of 30 cents a ton on home-built ships for every thousand miles of sailing they do; she pays a bounty of \$12 a ton for the construction of these ships, and a bounty of \$22 a ton on the engines and machinery employed in ordinary steamships, so that these bounties today are a greater impediment to the sale of Canadian-built ships in the French markets than was the old tax of 40 francs a ton. The hon. gentleman has referred to a censure that he says was pronounced on the French Consul at Quebec, because he undertook to negotiate here without the authority of the French Government. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman misstated the fact. It was on the colleague of the right hon. gentleman that the censure was pronounced, not by the French Government, but by the Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Sir Charles Dilke. If I am rightly informed, the British Minister asked the right hon. gentleman—for he was in England at the time—how this matter came about, and he asserted that his colleague had no authority for entering into any negotiations; and Sir Charles Dilke censured the hon. Minister of Public Works in Canada for entering into negotiations without any authority with the French Consul at Quebec. The right hon. gentleman says that we have begun by sending an Ambassador—where? Why, to the Government of the United Kingdom, to a Government with whom we are in the most intimate relations, to a Government who have a representative here to whom we can speak—sending a representative where we have least need of one. When Sir Alexander Galt was appointed, the right hon. gentleman did not represent that this was the principal object in appointing him; the principal object, he said, was to save a large expenditure to this country by the visits of Ministers to England for the transaction of business. We required to borrow money in the English market; we required to do something to promote emigration from the United Kingdom to this country, and it was said that Ministers would no longer require to visit the Capital of the United Kingdom, and Sir Alexander Galt was appointed for this purpose. But we learn that now Sir Alexander Galt was appointed not for this, but to act as our Ambassador, not only to the Court of St. James, but to the whole universe; he was to be our Ambassador to Madrid, to Paris, to Berlin, and to every other Court on the continent of Europe. We are also assured that he is to be our Plenipotentiary extraordinary to the Emperor of Brazil. The hon. gentleman has told us that we are opening up trade relations with the Empire of Brazil, that an extensive trade is growing up between the two countries, that the productions of the two countries are such that they are well adapted to trade with each other, that there is no rivalry or competition between them, but that one is supplying to a large degree the wants

of the other. That we have subsidized steamers for that trade, but that while we are carrying on these trade relations, it would be snapping the tie that binds Canada to England if we were to deal directly with Brazil on our own behalf. I cannot see how it would sever Canada from the United Kingdom to appoint a representative to Brazil any more than it would if the Government of Great Britain appointed an Agent to act on our behalf. Is it not absurd to say, while we are carrying on an extensive trade with Brazil and are negotiating with the view of promoting that trade, that no one from Canada should go there to enquire into the natural products of the country and to ascertain how far these trade relations could be promoted and the trade augmented? We have no representative there now. The English Ambassador at Rio Janeiro and the English Consul at every port is interested in looking after the trade between Brazil and the United Kingdom; they are not to make any enquiry into the trade between Canada and Brazil; that is not a matter which interests them; they are not to receive any reward or promotion, or any recognition for what they may do on our behalf; we are not represented in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and we have no power to bring to bear on their condition. Therefore it is not our interests that specially concern them; their interests point in a wholly different direction. They are acting properly and wisely; they are doing an essential service to the Government that appoints them; but they are not doing a service for us. We, Sir, must act on our own behalf if we are ever to promote our own commercial relations, or to secure to ourselves that share of the commerce of the world which our population and our wealth entitle us to expect. The hon. gentleman has told us that it is inconsistent with our position of dependence. Let me suppose that Sir Alexander Galt were sent by the Queen upon the advice of the Government of Canada as Plenipotentiary extraordinary to the Empire of Brazil for the purpose of reporting upon the prospects of establishing more intimate commercial relations between the two countries—would that in any way affect our relations with the United Kingdom or tend to sever the tie? On the contrary, if the Government of the United Kingdom offered us facilities for carrying on those enquiries, if it seconded our efforts, and we in consequence secured a more extensive commerce with Brazil, would it not, on the contrary, tend to strengthen the tie that binds us to England rather than to sever it? I can see no difference whatever between negotiating on our own behalf and being negotiated successfully for by the representative of the Government of Great Britain. That we are more likely to succeed, acting on our own behalf than by entrusting our business to others who have no special interest in the success of such negotiations, I have no doubt. I do not believe that if Sir Alexander Galt was commissioned by Her Majesty, at the instance of the Government here, to go to Brazil to negotiate a commercial treaty, that he would be asked: Where do you come from; are you a native of Canada?—and that if he were to say he was, that they would reply: We cannot negotiate with you—you have Her Majesty's commission, which shows that you are authorized to negotiate only for that portion of her Empire, called the Dominion, and therefore, we will not treat with you. It is preposterous to suppose that any such objection would be made. The hon. gentleman has said that the Government here has a National Policy, that they expected there would be over-production in consequence, and were anxious to secure commercial relations with foreign States, in order that a market might be found for the excess of our products. We have always had an excess in certain lines—in lumber, fish and agricultural products, for which we have needed a foreign market; and we have for years required the right to negotiate treaties with Foreign States in order that

greater outlets for our trade might be found. If our foreign trade depended upon the surplus products flowing from the miscalled National Policy, I am inclined to think that it would be a long time before it would be necessary to submit to the House a motion like that of the hon. member for West Durham. The right hon. gentleman also referred to the case of Mexico, and spoke of the great inconvenience that exists at present in consequence of Great Britain having withdrawn her Ambassador from the Mexican capital, and he stated it was owing to the non-fulfilment of certain treaty obligations on the part of Mexico. That is not correct, I believe. The Mexican Government appropriated the property of English residents, it despoiled them of their rights, and refused to compensate or give any satisfaction, and the English Government withdrew its Ambassador, and broke off negotiations with the Mexican Government. The hon. gentleman has also said: Supposing you had power to negotiate treaties, how would you enforce your rights? If we make a treaty, it will be a voluntary compact between a foreign State and Canada; we shall have an interest in the treaty which we believe to our advantage, and the foreign State will be similarly placed and will act in good faith for the same reason; and it is absurd to suppose that each party, seeking to advance its own welfare, would put impediments in the way of the carrying out of engagements beneficial to both. The hon. gentleman has also expressed the fear that commercial independence, so to speak, or the power rather to enter into commercial relations with foreign States, would lead to the separation of Canada from the United Kingdom. The proposition of my hon. friend is that the Government of the United Kingdom shall have a veto, to be exercised in cases similar to its exercise upon our legislation. We do not ask for anything more, and believe that so far from the change asked for, tending to sever the ties that bind us to the United Kingdom, it would be the very means of promoting and strengthening those relations. You cannot govern the boy of seventeen or eighteen as you would the boy of five, or apply to him the same rules, or subject him to the same absolute commands. No more can you deal with a people of 5,000,000, who have extensive commercial interests, in the way in which you would deal with a new colony with no commercial relations whatever. If this country is going to continue an integral part of the Empire, the Government of the country must change, and be adjusted to the altered circumstance of the people of this country. Just as we required the right of self-government, for the purpose of dealing with our own domestic affairs, to the exclusion of Imperial interference, so now we require to extend the principle to our foreign commercial relations. They exist; we best understand them; we alone are specially interested in them, and we have the same right to deal with those interests, to protect and promote them as the people of the United Kingdom have to deal with theirs, and make such foreign engagements as those interests demand. So far, then, from the power asked for by this resolution, tending to the early severance of Canada from the Mother Country, I believe it will tend to prolong the existing relations which, certainly at an earlier day, would be terminated, if it was found that our foreign interests, which are daily becoming more important, were not regulated and directed by the mind of this country. It is rather extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should be so much afraid of the separation of Canada from the United Kingdom, when, during the elections of 1878 his organ—a newspaper published by the hon. member for Welland, acting under his direction, speaking his sentiments, and inspired by him, declared that if it was found the connection between Canada and the Mother Country was incompatible with the National Policy, it was so much more the worse for the connection. Those hon. gentlemen were ready to sever the connection be-

tween Canada and the Mother Country in the interest of that small class who have enjoyed the fostering care of the Minister of Finance. He at present is not prepared to run any such risk when it is to protect a commerce that amounts to upwards of \$200,000,000 a year. I have no doubt upon this question that just as the recognition of the principle of local self-government tended to quiet the public mind, to allay dissatisfaction and to cultivate a spirit of contentment towards the Mother Country, so the promotion of the right to deal with and regulate treaties, to enter into commercial relations with foreign States when our interests demand that it will, instead of severing the tie which binds us to the Government of the United Kingdom only tends to make that tie more durable. We know that the people of this country are a progressive people; their circumstances are changing; they are every day becoming more and more a nationality, and we propose not a sham National Policy, which means class legislation, the promotion of the interests of one portion of the community at the expense of the rest, but a real National Policy that will promote the interests of a whole people, give them control over their own affairs, and enable them to manage those matters with which they are especially concerned, and which they best understand. It was said many years ago by Mr. Gladstone that the people of Canada ought to provide for their own defence, that the Imperial troops ought to be withdrawn from Canada, and he said no people could be any more than a dependent population unfit for self-government in the highest sense which did not provide for their own self-defence. I believe that that was true, and I never desired to see the burden of our ordinary defence thrown on the Imperial Treasury. For the same reason, I have no wish the Imperial Government should discharge a duty on our behalf, that we are well qualified to discharge for ourselves. I deny the proposition by the right hon. First Minister. I believe that if we ask for the power to negotiate commercial treaties, we shall have no difficulty in securing it, and so far from its severing the ties which bind us to the United Kingdom, it will tend to prolong the existing relations between Canada and the Mother Country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have only a word to say for the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. It is about the correspondence alluded to between Mr. Lefebvre, the French Consul, and myself. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Lefebvre had not been censured by his Government, or if he had, that at all events the Minister of Public Works of Canada had been censured by Mr. Dilke in England. Is that what the hon. gentleman said?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say this to the hon. gentleman that, as a Minister of the Crown in Canada, I was not under Mr. Dilke in England. I had no responsibility to him or any one else then. I was responsible only to the Governor General of Canada and the people who have elected me, and the correspondence which took place between Mr. Lefebvre and myself, took place upon the responsibility of the Government in Canada, especially of the right hon. First Minister, and is a correspondence that can be defended anywhere. There has been no censure either in England or here of the Minister of Public Works. At all events, a censure in England I would not have accepted, because I had no responsibility in that direction.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I am glad that the hon. gentleman on my right has presented this resolution. It is a proof that on his part and on the part of his supporters, they believe the Imperial Government are unable to manage the trade affairs of Canada. We had a statement of a similar nature made by the right hon. leader of the Government when he said they had sent an Ambassador or a Chief Commissioner to England to attend to the affairs of Canada, and to Paris and

Mr. MILLS.

to Madrid. It appears, therefore, to me that both parties in this House are not satisfied with the way our commercial affairs have been managed by England, and now the Opposition ask that some address or despatch, or Order in Council, or Minute of Council may be sent to England in order that Her Majesty may place this country in such a condition that we may be able to attend to our own commercial affairs. Although my hon. friend who has just sat down has labored to show this House all the minutiae of diplomatic affairs and to show us the history of the past hundred years, I think it matters little to us what was done in the respect to this matter. As the hon. gentleman has said to-day it did not require a first-class diplomat to attend to mere matters of business. I am one of those who believe that this country should have the right to negotiate its commercial treaties. I go a step further, I believe this country should have the right to negotiate every treaty. The tendency of this resolution is, as the right hon. First Minister pointed out, in the direction of independence. I see no reason why the people of Canada should not look forward to Canada becoming a sovereign and independent State. The right hon. gentleman stated that he was born a British subject and hoped to die one. Sir, I was a British colonist, but do not wish to die a tadpole British colonist. I do not wish to die without having all the rights, privileges and immunities of the citizen of a nation. The tendency of the right hon. gentleman's remarks is that we must still hang on to the Imperial Government. I believe it would be well for Canada if she would hang on for some considerable time longer, because I believe the Constitution of Canada is not adapted to well-working under Independence. Before this country can assume the position of an independent State its Constitution must be changed. I hold to the view that obtains on the American side, that each Province should be an independent State. As it is now, instead of the Provinces having similar rights to the reserved rights, the expressed rights, they have none. Holding these views I congratulate the hon. member for West Durham in bringing forward the resolution. I also congratulate the Government in sending Sir Alexander Galt to England, to France and to Madrid. Although his mission was very successful, it shows that public opinion in Canada is drifting in the direction pointed out by this resolution. If Canada is ever to become a separate and independent State without the shedding of blood, it will be by a union of the two great parties in this country. Sir, I am one of those who believe that this country is not in a condition to ask for Independence. In the first place, our territory is not complete, Newfoundland lies on the east, and British Columbia on the west, a Province that has been oppressed as much as ever Ireland has been.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DECOSMOS. Hon. gentlemen may sneer and laugh, but every word I state will prove to be truths of history, and when the time comes for the people of British Columbia to raise historical monuments, they will raise one to the perfidy of Canada; and it may be that some of those hon. gentlemen who haw-haw now and sneer will find their faces on the panel, and the children of the present generation of British Columbia will point to them with scorn. I repeat that I concur in the object of this resolution. I do not say I can concur in all its terms, but I do heartily concur in the spirit of it. I am one of those who believe that the Imperial Government is not capable of doing the foreign business of Canada, but that Canada ought to do her own foreign business, and I shall therefore vote for the resolution.

Mr. OUMET (in French). Mr. Speaker, without wishing to make a speech, I am desirous of stating in a few words the reasons for which I am about to record my vote in favor of the resolutions. All that is asked for by these resolutions

now before the House, is that a humble address should be presented to Her Majesty, setting forth that it is in the interest of Canada to have the control of the commercial treaties which we may have to enter into with foreign countries, and this request is not an excessive one. So far, no one has ventured to say that such a request was not a legitimate one, or that it was not the natural crowning of the National Policy inaugurated by us in 1879. This request does not embody anything disloyal; it does not embody anything objectionable to the Mother Country if she wishes to treat us as a mother treats her children; she cannot take umbrage at it except in the case that she would wish to keep this country under the control of her own merchants, in contradiction to the interests of our common country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am myself in favor of these resolutions, although my vote is not to be considered one of non-confidence in the Government on that question. On the contrary, I maintain that this proposition is not a vote of censure against the Government, for to the present day the Government, instead of being open to censure on this subject is deserving of praise for the fact that the policy that it inaugurated in 1879 is the policy upheld by the resolutions now moved. If we may control our own Tariff we may also and we should control our commercial relations with foreign countries. We ought to have control of those commercial treaties which will enable us to utilize and dispose of the surplus products of our manufactures in the near future. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that, as I said just now, these resolutions are injurious to our interests. I do not, moreover, think that they bring us directly towards political independence from the Mother Country. The Imperial Government is not obliged to grant them to us, and should it not see fit to do so it will not, to use popular language, give us a beating for making it; we shall simply be told that the Imperial Government does not feel inclined to grant us so great a latitude as that that would be given us by conceding to us our commercial independence. Possibly then the country may give vent to some expression of the popular feeling; it may happen that upon our request being refused the country will enquire if an injustice is not being done to it. Time will settle these matters, and when I speak of time, many years may go by until it does come, but with time will rest the settling of that important question of the independence of our country. We have a sufficient extent of territory, we have a sufficiently large population, our country is rich enough to aspire to a national existence. We have oftentimes been told in the course of the debates on the National Policy, that the object of that policy was to build up a country and to establish the basis of a great nation. I do not, therefore, see, Mr. Speaker, why we should not at once adopt the consequences of the principle which we have established, and I consequently fail to see why the resolutions now before the House should be charged with being disloyal. I repeat it—my intention in voting for these resolutions is not to show disloyalty to the Mother Country. She has granted us much already, and will probably grant us this new request, for the Mother Country apparently sees that our country is making too rapid strides; that this country is already too great a one for her to control its destinies in an arbitrary or despotic fashion. Thus, if our request be granted, so much the better; it will be a cause of rejoicing for the country. Since it has been considered advisable to spend such considerable amounts to obtain for us commercial treaties with France, Spain and the East Indies, there is no doubt that if the present request is granted to us, that we shall at once have obtained the object which we have had in view up to this day. Mr. Speaker, as I said just now, the vote that I propose to give on this question is not one of non-confidence. It is a vote expressive of an opinion which I have held long since, an opinion which I have expressed on other occasions before the electors and before the public

and I do not think it is forbidden to give utterance to one's opinions on subjects of this importance in this Parliament, simply because we are told that it is inopportune to make such a request. I do not look at matters in that light, Mr. Speaker. I do not see that the matter implies an insult or that it is inopportune to make the request to the Mother Country. If she refuses, we will repeat our request; we will insist, and before the unanimous expression of that feeling by Canada she will have to give in some day, as she has already given in on many other points. That day will be a grand one for the country, and those who have to-day the courage of their opinions will be able to congratulate themselves later on for having rendered so great a service to their country. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of the resolutions of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

Mr. COURSOL. I am prepared to express my approval of this resolution in the abstract. I have devoted a good deal of attention to this question, and after full deliberation I have come to the conclusion to give my assent to the proposition. It may appear at first sight to be a motion of non-confidence in the Government, but I do not view it in that light, if we are to believe the remarks made by the hon. mover in introducing the resolutions. Like the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I do not consider that in voting for the resolution I am expressing a want of confidence in the Government, but I wish to affirm a principle which I believe to be correct. If the right of petition belongs to the humblest British subject it certainly belongs to this Parliament, and in this instance the resolution asks Her Majesty the Queen to take into consideration a certain request which we make. We ask the Government of Great Britain to consider whether it would not be advisable to grant us certain concessions which we believe will be for the benefit of this country. It may be said that this is not the proper way to approach Her Majesty, that in our present circumstances we cannot obtain such a power, and that it must necessarily be refused. Mr. Speaker, if the English Government were to refuse such a request, I, for one, would like to know the reason why. But if, because we are in the dependent position of colonists, we are refused this petition then, as loyal subjects of Her Majesty the Queen, we should accept the situation. I would have preferred that this resolution should have been made at another time and under other circumstances, also that it should have been expressed in clearer and plainer language. Nevertheless, their principle I approve; I see no impropriety in voting for this resolution. I declare again that it is not, in my opinion, a motion of want of confidence in the Government. We have already had two instances, this Session, of resolutions being moved in amendment to the motion to go into Supply, when the resolutions were moved by the friends of the Government. Last night we voted in favor of an Address to Her Majesty, asking her to accord certain political rights to Ireland. If we may pray for political rights for Ireland, why may we not pray for our own rights? Therefore, holding the views set forth in the conclusion of the resolutions—views which I have already expressed before my constituents—I feel it my duty to vote for the resolutions.

Mr. ROYAL (in French). Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the resolutions of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) for two reasons: First, because I look upon it as a vote of non-confidence in the Government, and, secondly, because I do not think that this method of discussing the independence of the country is the one which should be adopted. I believe in matters that are clearly defined. Place the question in a pure and simple form before the Parliament, divest it of all that can take away from the force of debate, and my opinion will not be an undecided one. Moreover, we have no complaints to make so far against the Govern-

ment, for in its appointments of commercial agents abroad, by its National Policy inaugurated in 1879, by its several administrative measures since it is in power, consciously or unconsciously, its policy has tended towards independence. What really does the word National Policy mean if not a Tariff made by an independent nation, or one striving to become so. Mr. Speaker, I think it is but logical to vote against the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham, because it proposes an impossible method of attaining what he seeks, and, secondly, I repeat it, the policy of the Government itself tends towards national independence. Moreover, I think that the time is not far distant when that question will force itself upon the attention of the members of this House. I think the time is not far off when we shall have to take that question into consideration and pronounce the word independence without fear of being charged with disloyalty to the Crown or to the constitution of our country. But the question must come before us in a clear, precise and defined form, and then we will discuss it, but not in the shape in which it has been placed this evening before the House by the hon. member for West Durham. This question, which is already a theme for discussion in the household, in merchant's offices, in the press and in public, must ultimately come before the House and compel us to discuss it. But, Mr. Speaker, the present moment would be inopportune for its discussion, when Ontario, or at least an important portion of the Province of Ontario, is uttering threats which threaten to imperil our very constitution, and when we see the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) give utterance to a wail which bears a strong resemblance to a threat of secession. Consequently, I say and believe that at the present time it is the duty of all to vote against the resolution, because the affirming of it would be to cast a blame upon that policy which logically tends towards independence, a policy which has been approved of by all the members of the great party to which I have the honor to belong; to resume, because the method proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for Durham West is not the proper one according to which a question of this importance should be discussed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (in French). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) finds that the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) does not necessarily tend to the independence of this country. My hon. friend from Laval should nevertheless have remembered that the motion of the hon. member for West Durham must have, as a natural consequence, the political independence of the country, although it does not say so in so many words.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. member for West Durham, who thoroughly understands French, will permit me, and will give what I say a little of his attention, he will see what I want to say. The hon. member wishes us to go to the British Government and ask of it to allow us to appoint diplomatic agents abroad, and to conduct ourselves our diplomatic and commercial negotiations, with foreign powers. Now, let us suppose that the Mother Country allows us to appoint our agents abroad, the first thing we shall have to do will be to pay those agents, accredited to the various foreign Courts, provided always that those foreign Courts are willing to receive them; and then, when the time shall come for us to enter into negotiations with those powers, what additional strength can we bring to bear upon them to that which we enjoy to-day? We shall find ourselves alone, a country with a population of 4,000,000, possessing neither an army nor a navy to enforce our rights, and being consequently without any moral force in the eyes of those powers; and if these same powers enter into commercial treaties with us, what will there be to prevent them, the day following or

Mr. ROYAL,

the day following that, should their interests demand it, from violating those treaties. Thus will we find ourselves stranded, without the strength, without the power, without the authority to cause our rights to be respected; for we have neither army nor navy. Perhaps the hon. member will say: "But if we are placed in such a position, we shall necessarily have the necessary force to enforce our rights." That is where the question of the political independence of the country will at once come in, for England will, as a matter of course, say to us: "You have wished to conclude your commercial treaties by yourselves; those treaties are not in harmony with the policy of the Imperial Government, now defend yourselves." Such will be the necessary consequence, and the force of circumstances will compel us to have prematurely an army and a navy to defend us. And I would very much like to know who there is in our midst who could go before the electors of the country at the next election and say to them: "We are ready to incur the responsibility; we are desirous of enjoying commercial independence. We wish to have the right of concluding commercial treaties with foreign powers, but remember that this brings with it the obligation of having an army and a navy; millions will have to be spent to keep them up; but it is the necessary consequence of the policy which we have adopted." Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the country is ready to assume such a responsibility. We are but 4,000,000 of a population; we are now opening the country by railways and canals from one end to the other. We are calling thither a population from abroad to settle upon our soil and to people it, and it is not a suitable time for us to incur the responsibility of having an army and a navy, and to send our consuls and ambassadors abroad. Nevertheless, the hon. member cannot say that such is not the logical consequence of the position which the hon. member for West Durham wishes us to assume to-day. We saw a short time ago the junior member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) in conversation with the hon. member for West Durham; the hon. member for Victoria took special care to speak of his hon. friend on his right in order to countenance him and endorse his contention, and he told us that he supported that policy, because the natural consequence of it was the independence of the country, and that he himself was in favor of that independence. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well that such a policy should reveal itself clearly before the House and the country; it is as well that we should know what we are to expect. If we are to have elections this summer, or next year, it is as well that the people should know by the vote we are about to record this evening if we are in favor of that independence, and if we are prepared to assume the responsibility of the expenditure which we should have to incur, were we to adopt the position which it is attempted to make us take. For my part I do not think that the population of Lower Canada, or of the Dominion, is in favor of the independence of the country. At present we enjoy, relatively speaking, a considerable amount of independence. We enjoy independence almost wholly, and the large cost of it is paid by the Mother Country. If we get into difficulties with a foreign power, who pays for the army and navy? Who comes to our defence? It is England which supplies the necessary funds, merely calling upon us to supply our *pro rata* share, as indeed we ought to do, to the expenditure of the Empire on our soil. But should we become independent to-morrow, we are left entirely to our own resources; we are left alongside a neighboring power which has a population ten or eleven times as numerous, and that will act as does every neighbor in politics; the big swallow the small and we shall find ourselves at his mercy. We are, to-day, the best of friends because England is there with her army, her fleet, her money, her prestige, and her flag to defend us, and hence it is that we are respected. It is not because we are strong of ourselves, but because England stands by us

and guides us in the ways which we have adopted. It seems to me that the policy adopted by the country is wide enough; that we have enough to do within the limits of our attributions, without attempting to put on important airs which ill-becomes us, because we have neither the numbers nor the money, nor the necessary resources. All this will come later on; our population will increase and so will our resources, and if our descendants do not find that their position is the proper one, they will complain to the Mother Country. She will not raise any difficulty as to terms; she has already shown that on several occasions, and if in those days our descendants find that they are too grown up to be guided by England and to be protected by her, they will see what it is best for them to do; but in our day, I do not see that we have anything to gain in that direction; we have, on the contrary, everything to lose. We shall lose England's protection; we shall lose the resources afforded us by its revenues; we shall lose its fleet; we shall lose its army; we shall lose its flag, which in itself is a safeguard of our liberties. England does not meddle with our affairs in Canada; we are as free as a foreign power; we are simply told that we cannot negotiate our own treaties of commerce. Yet we have to-day in London our commercial agent, Sir A. T. Galt, and when we asked that he should be allowed to be present at the negotiations with France and with Spain, so that he might give advice in so far as our affairs were concerned, was this request refused? No; England assented. Now, what does that cost us? We have incurred no responsibility and such a position has not cost us anything. We reap all its advantages without having to bear its burdens. It is to be regretted, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Laval should have seen fit to separate himself from us on this question. I know that he is right when he says that the idea is not a new one with him, still I had hoped that he would have seen that the time has not come to develop it; that, on the contrary, that it is more opportune for us to remain *in statu quo*. We are growing in the shade of the British flag, let us continue to do so. Have we not made considerable progress during the past ten or fifteen years? We have been granted Confederation and the charter of our liberties, and it is a Confederation and a charter which many other nations would gladly enjoy. We have at times heard other nations tell us that they would be glad to possess our charter of liberties. We should not therefore change that position, for it is one worthy of ovation of 10,000,000 and even 20,000,000 of a population. We are not in the position of India which is simply governed by a Council, which I might call a Special Council and a Governor. Here it is the people who govern themselves through representatives freely elected by them; we have no other Council than that of the nation. We have our representatives of the various Provinces, not only chosen by the representatives of the Sovereign, but the organs of the great majority of the national representation in this House. It is consequently the people who govern the country, and what more can we desire? We wish to change our position simply to be able to say, that instead of obtaining a commercial treaty with France through a British ambassador in France, that we are going to obtain it direct through a Canadian commercial agent. I do not think that this position will be accepted by the House or by the country. On the contrary, I think that the position which we have accepted is the rational one, and that which the people desire to see maintained; the people wish for a long time to come to remain in the shade of the British flag, under the ægis of the British fleet. We and our children will grow up under such a condition, our country will become peopled, important and happy, and happier than it is to-day, for we are as happy as any nation of the globe, but a powerful country, a numerous people capable of deciding what we have to do. (The hon. gentle-

man continued in English): I regret that my hon. friend from Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) has taken the course he has adopted. The hon. gentleman does not believe that this is a vote of want of confidence against the Government, because if he thought so he would not cast his vote in that way, for he would not separate himself from his political friends. He says that the reason why he does not consider this a vote of non-confidence is because he has seen during this Session two motions proposed in amendment on the motion to go into Supply, and the Government did not take them as votes of non-confidence. The hon. gentleman forgot that those two motions were moved by friends of the Government and were accepted by the Government, and that they having been so moved and so accepted, could not be considered as votes of non-confidence. But this a different motion. It is a motion made by the leader of the Opposition, and he proposes therein a policy entirely contrary to the policy of the Government, and therefore we have to select between the policy of the leader of the Opposition and the policy of the leader of the Government. That is the position which the hon. member for West Durham has taken and that is the position he wants us to take. Well, we have no hesitation about it. We saw the hon. member for West Durham alongside of the junior member for Victoria. He was, no doubt, encouraging the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I rise to a point of order. I ask that the words of the hon. gentleman be taken down. I ask the hon. member for West Durham if I said a single word to him about this question or he to me.

Mr. BLAKE. Not a word passed between the hon member and myself in respect to this matter in the slightest degree.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The interruption is out of order. The hon. member had no right to interrupt me because I was stating this. I was saying that the hon. member for West Durham was alongside of the junior member for Victoria, and I said I had no doubt he was there encouraging the hon. gentleman. But the junior member for Victoria did not give me time to finish my sentence. He says: "I want those words taken down." "That he was encouraging the hon. gentleman." If that is not a parliamentary expression, I would say he was discouraging the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for West Durham was encouraging the hon. gentleman by his presence alongside of him, and the junior member for Victoria rose and assented to the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham. He said he was in favor of the motion and that he would vote for it, because he found that the principles advocated by the hon. member for West Durham would lead as a necessary consequence to the independence of the country. It is that point I want to bring out. The hon. gentleman is quite logical; he must not think I want to speak against his reasoning—these are his own ideas; but I want to have them out to show that the necessary consequence of the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, the leader of the Opposition, is the independence of the country. It is as well we should know it in this House; it is as well the electors of the country should know it. The House has to select between the principles of the leader of the Opposition and those of the Government as advocated by the First Minister. The leading principle of hon. gentlemen opposite is the independence of the country; we on this side wish to remain as we are, connected with Great Britain. When I so speak I speak as the representative of my Province, on behalf of the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec and of French Canadians all through the Dominion. We do not want a change, we are quite satisfied as we are. Our religion and language are different from those of the Mother Country, but that does not matter—that is not the question with

us. It is whether we, as a body politic, are well off as we are or whether we are not. We find we are protected by the flag of England, by its navy, by its armies, and by its diplomatists, and we do not want to change that condition. Why should we ask England to have diplomatic agents of our own all through the world? Do we think we would gain anything by taking that position, that we would secure more authority, influence and respect at those Courts than we do to-day, were our affairs transacted by the Ambassadors and *chargé d'affaires* of England? No, we would be in this position; we would be a small people of 4,000,000 without any army or navy as we are to-day, begging those powers that they would do something for us. But when we are represented by the mighty Empire of Great Britain, then we have influence, power and authority. Our representatives, that is to say, the British Ambassadors, speak on equal terms with the men whom they address; but we could not be in such a position otherwise. The hon. gentleman will say: "If you are in that position and you have Ambassadors and Consuls all through the world you must take the consequence, and therefore you must have an army or navy in order to be respected," which means a very large sum of money annually to be added to our Budget. I wish to know from those hon. members who will vote for the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, whether they will go to the electors of this country and tell them: "Gentlemen, our policy is changed since we came before you on the last occasion, our policy is now one of commercial independence which will involve political independence as well, and as we are now separating ourselves from the Mother Country we must have a navy and army, Ambassadors and Consuls, and as we shall have to tax the people to pay the expenses we must add so many more millions to the expenditure." I wish joy to the hon. gentlemen who go to the electors and tell them this, if they hope to receive their votes. We are content with the position we hold as a country, with the protection of England; her flag is there to protect us and her flag is a power that gives us safety. When we have required the help of Great Britain, when we have required the protection of her flag, of her navy, of her army, did they ever fail us? They never failed us, and they will never fail us. When we went in 1866 to England as the representatives of this country to ask England to give us a charter for our Confederation, to change our position in order that we might better serve the country and the Empire, did they refuse us? They took our charter, word for word, as we laid it in their hands and passed it so. And why should we change our position in order that we may have the pride and consolation of saying: "This man at Paris, this other man at Lisbon, this other man at Madrid, this other man at Berlin, these men are the Ambassadors of this great and mighty people of four millions." Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not wish that. At all events on this side of the House. We wish to speak of our British Ambassador at Berlin, at Paris or Madrid, and wish to be able to say that these gentlemen represent us as well as the rest of the Empire. We prefer to remain attached to England with all its power, authority and influence than to have the small satisfaction of saying: "We are independent." Independence may come perhaps, but it will not come in our days nor in the days of our children, nor, I believe, in the days of our grandchildren. When this country has a population of 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 of people, it will be for the people of that day to say whether it would be better to change the position they hold to-day, or, all being well, whether it would not be best to leave well enough alone and cling to the old flag of England under which their forefathers fought and under which they would fight as well. I regret exceedingly that my hon. friend from Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) should have taken the course he has, and separated himself from us on this question. He said there was no reason why this

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

should be considered a want of confidence resolution, seeing that two other motions of amendment for a Committee of Supply were passed, and yet the Government did not withdraw. As I said in the first place those two motions were prepared by our own friends and in the second place the Government assented to them because they met with our approval. Having said so much, Mr. Speaker, I resume my seat, confident that the large majority of this House will vote against this resolution.

Mr. HOUDE. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say more than a few words, and I shall not detain the House long. I wanted only to say that I approve of the principle involved in the motion which the hon. member for West Durham made, but I had decided not to vote for it, considering the way in which it was presented to this House. But the manner in which the hon. Minister of Public Works has put the question before this House and before the public obliges me to vote for the motion directly as it stands, for this reason, that I understand the motion of the hon. member for West Durham did not go so far as the Government intends to go on that question—that is to say, to put the question of the complete independence of Canada before the people. I understand that the hon. member intended only to put the question before this House and the country of obtaining greater facilities for negotiating treaties with foreign countries directly through our own representatives, but the Government say that we cannot follow such a course without going directly to the complete independence of Canada and her complete separation from the Mother Country. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. Minister of Public Works contended that we could not vote for the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blaïke) without voting non-confidence in the Government. I just explained why I was obliged to vote for that resolution, yet, notwithstanding the position the hon. Minister takes, I do not intend to imply by that that I vote non-confidence in the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot do that.

Mr. HOUDE. We had some instances of that during the present Session, and if we want other instances to justify such a vote, I can refer to the vote of this House in 1873, when it passed a similar motion, made in amendment to the motion to go into Supply, bearing on the policy of the Government, and the Government did not consider it a motion of non-confidence and did not resign. And I think I may congratulate myself and the country on this modification of the extraordinary and unreasonable interpretation of Ministerial responsibility which some would try to continue to this day, interpreting adversely to the Government a vote of this kind. We must not carry that idea of the responsibility of the Ministry so far as to leave to private members no opportunity of expressing their opinion on the merits of questions submitted to them. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Public Works told us that we were going before the country either this year or next, and that we shall have to discuss this question before the people. I thought we were not to make that question an issue in the next general election; but of course the Government can make it a question of the day and oblige their friends and the Opposition to debate it before the electors. I can say this, it will not be the first time I shall have discussed this question before my own constituents. When, four years ago, I was discussing before them the National Policy, propounded by the hon. members of the present Government, I foreshadowed that the next step to be taken would be to look for more foreign markets, outlets for the products of the country, which products would be increased by the policy we advocated, and that opinion has been so far justified that no later than two years afterwards the Government themselves felt the necessity of looking for more extensive markets for this country and sent a delegate

to England to be accredited to the different countries, especially France and Spain, purposely to open new markets there for Canada.

Mr. STEPHENSON. The substance for a shadow.

Mr. HOUDE. The hon. member asks me, why leave the reality for the shadow. I believe we are looking for the reality; I think that in our worthy representative in England we have only had the shadow for the reality. While I approved of that appointment and thought it was a step in the right direction, yet our representative has encountered so many difficulties that he has not had until now very great success—at least not as great success as we expected when we sent him across the Ocean. What do we ask by the resolution now before the House? We ask the power to negotiate commercial treaties with foreign countries. Well, I consider that step, Mr. Speaker, the crowning of the National Policy which we inaugurated three years ago, and I do not interpret it as a step in the direction of our complete independence of the Mother Country. I know there is in Canada a party, very few in number, who look after that complete independence; but shall we allow ourselves to be intimidated by the cries of those who say treason? No, Mr. Speaker. When responsible Government was asked for in this country, a party cried treason. Were they right? No, Mr. Speaker, they were wrong; experience has proved that when the Mother Country granted responsible Government to Canada, she only made closer the tie which united Canada to herself. And again, when the policy of the present Government—a policy which met with my sincere approval—was propounded, with such ability and talent and force by the present Government, we heard the party whose chief organ is the *Toronto Globe* cry treason, and try to make the people believe that if they adopted a policy of protection it would tend to our complete separation from the Mother Country. Well, we know that it had not that effect—that it will not have that effect; and I contend that the principle involved in the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham will not have that effect either. The hon. Prime Minister said that he was born a British subject, and that he hoped to die a British subject. I have no doubt that he will die a British subject, although I hope he will still live many long years, for the advantage of the country, and to see the benefits of the policy which he has helped to inaugurate. He said that in presenting that resolution, the hon. member for West Durham had an afterthought. I shall not defend the hon. member for West Durham, who is able to speak for himself; but I can say that my hon. friends the members for Laval and for Montreal East and myself have no afterthought; we go for the motion for what it contains only. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is no danger of separation from the Mother Country, unless it be by the fault of England herself or by the fault of her statesmen. Some years ago, when Lord Lisgar was Governor General of this country, he tried to make us understand—and I suppose he was the mouthpiece of the then Government of England—that the Mother Country would be satisfied to let us go. Well, if the Mother Country has statesmen who do not wish Canada to be united closely to the Mother Country, it is not our fault; and I contend that those who seek for greater commercial liberties for Canada are just as loyal and attached to the Mother Country as those who believe differently. I should be very sorry, Mr. Speaker, if in the next general election, should I have the strength and health to solicit again the suffrages of my constituents, not to be among the supporters of the present Government; but it will be no fault of mine if I am not. They know, and the House knows, that I have been a firm and sincere supporter of that Government since I have been a member of this House; but apart from this particular question, upon which I am afraid the Government anticipate too

much, and try by the voice of the hon. Minister of Public Works to carry us too far, and to make us pronounce upon a question which is not now, and ought not to be, before the public—the question of complete independence—if apart from that question, I cannot be counted as one of the supporters of the Government, I will be very sorry, and as I have just said, it will not be my fault. I approve of the intelligent, patriotic policy of that Government, and I still trust to be able to continue to support them, although on this particular question of commercial treaties, it is my misfortune not to be able to be convinced by the arguments they have advanced.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no man in Canada, Sir, who holds party obligations stronger than I do, and no one in Canada who would sooner reject party obligations than lift a hand or a finger, by motion or otherwise, to disturb the relations that exist between Britain and her Colonies; and although something very like threats may be used occasionally in order to compel an argument that is otherwise devoid of force to be presented to some persons' minds in a forcible way, we must look at the facts in the case, and consider for ourselves whether the policy propounded by my hon. friend from Durham is one that would have a tendency in the direction I have indicated. I have lived long enough, Sir, in Canada, to know that it has been the policy of the Tory party, almost from the beginning of our history, whenever a movement was made tending to expand the liberties of the people, to cry out that there was danger of the connection with Great Britain. I have found from the earliest period of our parliamentary history that this has been the case; and I am surprised and pained to find that, at this advanced period of our history, leading statesmen in the country can still resort to that paltry policy. I listened, Sir, to-day, with the greatest possible care, to every word that fell from the hon. leader of the Government in his somewhat impetuous declamatory reply to the member for Durham. I can only say he failed entirely to convince me that there was the slightest danger of what he pretended to fear. The hon. gentleman usually makes a much better appearance in argument than he did to-day. What position are we in? The Minister of Public Works spoke with great contempt of the number of our population, our paltry four or five millions, and asked were they to be compared with the interests of the Dominion? Why, I believe, on the other hand that everything that extends the liberties of Canadians, everything that accords to Canada and her statesmen greater breadth of view in the management of their own affairs is more likely to conduce to the advancement of Imperial interests and greatness than any curbing policy that keeps us down to the grindstone. It has been the policy of English statesmen who have had the management of our affairs from the first to consider colonists as inferior to themselves. I can recall the words even of such men as Lord Grey, Lord Russell and of Lord Metcalfe, everyone of whom had placed on record their belief that full responsible Government was not well suited to colonists, and I have read the despatches of Lord Russell and Lord Glenelg to the Governor General frequently warning him not to extend the principle of responsible Government to Canadians further than so far as might be consistent with the maintenance of the colonial relation. I believe we are really as capable of managing our own political affairs as the House of Commons in England. Some years ago when visiting England, I happened one day to be in the company of a leading statesman. He asked me in reference to a bill that had been passed through our legislature, if I thought it was just to a certain interest. I told him I thought it was. He enquired, did I not think there were interests involved. I replied, No; but if there are, we have provided means whereby they can be brought before and dealt with

by the courts. "Oh yes," said he, "you mean Canadian judges." "Yes," I said, "I mean Canadian judges, and let me say to you that the judges that sit in our Canadian courts are quite as high in point of honor, if not of ability, as the judges in any English Court of Justice, and that the interests of any Englishman, in any company or society such as that you have mentioned, are just as safe in the custody of our officers of justice as they are in yours." There is an inevitable belief, a belief that cannot be dispelled from the minds of leading British statesmen of all parties, that there must be something inferior in the colonial relation. Now, I do not believe that. I recollect very well when Sir F. B. Head was Governor of Canada, that he thought the establishment of municipal institutions was sure to lead to our permanent separation, at a very early day, from the British nation; and he was pleased to characterise them as sucking republics which would gradually grow up until they became a great republic. At a later day another Governor occasionally was pleased to express an opinion of the same sort, and the late Lord Derby, in one of his speeches, so late, I think, as 1854 or 1855, expressed his opinion that if a measure then sought—that is a change in our relations as to the Upper House, if I recollect—a right became law, then we might say farewell to British connection with Canada. Such have been the opinions of leading men in Britain for many years, of which I have given some examples. But I am surprised to find the Premier of Canada countenancing such opinions at this time of day. Has not every measure passed for the extension of the franchise, for the consolidation of the Colonial Empire on this continent, tended to promote that connection and make it still stronger? If I believed the adoption of this resolution, and still more the adoption of the policy indicated by this resolution, was to have any permanent or immediate injurious effects on our relation to Britain, I for one should immediately oppose it. I look forward with great anxiety and great pleasure to the result. I anticipate no danger to the relations of the colonies to the Mother Country. I believe that Great Britain and her Australian Empire, and Canada and the other portions of that Empire will possess a growing influence which will make itself felt in every quarter of the globe. I believe our commercial and political relations are safer, giving the utmost possible latitude to Canadians, than they would be if a restrictive policy, conformed to the ideas that prevailed in former times, existed. As an example of what we may expect sometimes, from English statesmen, we heard Lord Kimberly eulogized very greatly to-day by the hon. gentleman opposite, on his liberality and breadth of view.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I spoke in a directly contrary sense. I stated he was a Free Trade doctrinaire of the most restricted, bigoted kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A doctrinaire in Free Trade, but a model of liberality otherwise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of that kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He stated he did not say that and does not believe it—neither do I.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not express any opinion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Lord Kimberly, six or seven years ago, sent a dispatch to Earl Dufferin, stating that it was not necessary to consult his ministers except where it suited his purpose. That is a specimen of the modern whig statesman. I think it of the first importance that our statesmen should manage our own affairs. One thing is perfectly certain, that we can understand our own interests, and another thing is clearly certain, there would be a method contrived if we should reach that stage, by which the general assent of the English Crown could be obtained to any such negotiations. There could be no serious difficulty about that. Of course the

Mr. MACKENZIE.

right hon. gentleman, some ten years ago ridiculed a motion brought up for the same purpose. But I was glad to-day to find that even he had made some progress; because when denouncing the resolution of the member for West Durham, he afterwards glorified himself and his Administration for having made some progress, because they had appointed Sir Alexander Galt, as a sort of quasi-ambassador to Europe. He has been ambassador to France and Spain, and as proof of his status, has to sit in an outer room when the two ambassadors are discussing matters and if his opinion is thought to be worth anything, he is called in, and asked questions, and that is the position which the hon. gentleman desires to assign a Canadian ambassador. The excellency and usefulness of the position is such that it appears from the papers that he is not disposed to submit to it any longer. The hon. gentleman said that great progress had been made with Spain and France, and related to us with great gusto interviews with certain statesmen in both countries. We know that it has cost us some \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year, and not one step has been gained yet by Sir Alexander Galt or the Government he serves in the direction of trade and commerce with other countries. The establishment of a steam service once a month with Brazil, which has not yet begun to run, is not an ambassadorial function at all. It is a mere matter of business, which any merchant could arrange. As to the tendency of such a motion as this leading to a complete separation of this country from Great Britain, we need only consider the fact that there never has been a discussion on constitutional changes but what we have had the same threat presented to us. When we first began to advocate a Federal union of the Provinces, when in 1859 the Reform Convention of Ontario decided on some method of uniting the Provinces by a Federal compact, with some general authority for the management of general business, we were at once assailed by the Tory members, and if I recollect rightly by the right hon. gentleman, as taking part in a movement which had for its end the separation of the colonies from Great Britain. Yet, who does not know that the relations of Canada to the Empire when Lord Durham came out here were of the most delicate and tender kind; that the grievous political wrongs suffered by this country, the tyranny exercised by Governments and persons in authority and the nepotism and corruption which prevailed; who does not recollect the anxiety with which the people, especially in Lower Canada, entered into the consideration of those political grievances in 1839 and 1840, and who would have been surprised, looking at the history of that period, if those difficulties had culminated in the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country. But from that day to this the growth of public sentiment has been in one direction. The extension of the freedom and privileges of the people has gone on rapidly, almost uninterruptedly; and keeping pace with the progress of public opinion, actions and measures have shown the loyalty and devotion of the people of Canada to the Empire of which we form so important a part. I have no patience with that littleness of soul which instead of using argument threatens us with being vain reactionaries and revolutionists. Such efforts form no portion of my argument. Let us consider this measure on its merits. If the hon. gentleman could show one single argument or reason which could lead to the conclusion he maintained those resolutions would result in, I would join him with the greatest alacrity, for I prefer maintaining the existence of our relations with Great Britain, to obtaining a temporary triumph at the expense of that connection. I hold, therefore, that gradual action in relation to obtaining perfect freedom of commercial relations with other countries is entirely consistent with our duty to, and our present relations with, the British Empire. But assuming the hon. gentleman was as earnest as he was vigorous in his declamatory speech to-day what reason does he give for sending Sir Alexander Galt to Eng-

land. Why should Sir Alexander Galt be sent there if it is much better to obtain all we want through the British ambassador? If a Canadian ambassador is to be sent there does the hon. gentleman always desire he shall enter at the back door while the other ambassador goes in by the front? This almost leads me to digress for a moment to enquire if Sir Alexander Galt was really sent to England because of a pressing necessity to have a quasi-ambassador residing in London. We remember that Sir Alexander Galt was the very champion of the principle embodied in the resolutions which are now before the House; he spoke for it and voted for it, and, if I recollect aright, he characterized the right hon. gentleman on that occasion as the "Pecksniff" of the House. Was it because Sir Alexander Galt was estranged until 1878, was it because he declined any relationship with the right hon. gentleman, was it because he could not be taken into the Government here that room was made for him in England, and an office created for him full of profit, full however of national degradation and productive of no benefit to the country. The hon. gentleman said also that no progress was made in regard to commercial treaties or our dealings with foreign nations up to 1878. That wonderful period ending on the 18th September, 1878, is an epoch in our history. On that day the right hon. gentleman came back to power and from that time onward to the present, he told us to-day, that great efforts had been made by himself and his colleagues in order to develop the growth of national traffic, and trade and commercial relations with other countries. I would like to know a single step that has been taken. To be sure no grievous error has been committed which will tend in the opposite direction. The hon. gentleman, by his National Policy, has deviated from the Imperial policy of Britain which characterizes the legislation of all her colonies but one and ourselves and has thereby dealt a blow at the Imperial relationship which it will not be very easy to make good by remedial legislation. And that is absolutely the only thing he has done. We find that during the last two years our foreign trade has declined under the pressure of the incubus he has placed upon it by his policy. He stated there was another method by which commercial relations could be carried on. There was nothing to prevent Canada presenting by an Act of its Parliament certain advantages in its relations to another country and having that country reciprocate by passing a similar Act. Both being put in force would enable the two to exchange products on equal terms. I object most seriously to any attempt to obtain commercial advantages by legislation of that kind. A legislative reciprocity is in my opinion not only impracticable but most mischievous. Suppose we pass a bill admitting certain products of the United States free on the condition that they should pass a bill admitting some of ours free. That would not bind us or them for any specific term of years and the next season might find circumstances so altered in their legislature as to lead to the repeal of the enactment, and the reconsideration of former relationships, while in the meantime commercial establishments would have been established which the change would greatly injure. There is nothing in my opinion more dangerous than to tamper needlessly and carelessly with commercial legislation. What our business men want is permanence of purpose and a reasonable consistency in our policy. That is that there should not be constant changes made. I would rather have a large measure of protection even than a constant change of policy and a constant change of duties in the legislation of the country. I deny the proposition of the hon. gentleman that nothing was done in the way of advancing commercial business of a colonial kind during my own Administration. We set on foot a negotiation at Washington in order to obtain if possible a new treaty; we succeeded in having that treaty negotiated, but failed in getting it implemented by the Congress of the United States. That

was not our fault. We endeavored to do that, and we obtained from Her Majesty's Government a commission as plenipotentiary to our agent who went there, a thing unprecedented in the history of any colony. I do not think there was any instance where a colonist was appointed a joint plenipotentiary in order to negotiate a treaty. The right hon. gentleman was himself a joint high commissioner on one occasion in 1871 or 1872 at Washington. He had an opportunity to distinguish himself if he chose to do so, but he distinguished himself in a retrograde fashion by being a consenting party to a treaty which was one of the most shameful capitulations in English history in matters between nations. Everyone knows the humiliation that was experienced by almost every one in the country at the consent of the hon. gentleman to that legislation; and so far as I am concerned I can only say that I heard that opinion expressed by men of high standing in the old country when considering the results of that treaty in regard to the Fenian outrages on the frontier and the Alabama claims.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that one of his colleagues in the Government at his right and another one behind him voted for that shameful capitulation? Yet he took them into the Government of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have not forgotten it, Sir, but I dare say if my hon. friend had to give that vote now, he would not vote that way. I cannot at this moment recall a single treaty with the United States managed by British statesmen--and they were all managed by British statesmen--in which Canada and British America did not get the worst. Our boundaries were dealt with by English commissioners, and in their ignorance of the country and of the maps and of the people they had to deal with, we were deprived of a large extent of territory, and I believe that the only real diplomatic work that was ever done by Canadian statesmen was that of the arbitration at Halifax and managed by ourselves.

An hon. MEMBER. The Washington Treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Washington Treaty had nothing to do with that. It provided that there should be an arbitration, and when that arbitration was delayed from day to day and from year to year by the American Government, we entered our protest and with some difficulty got the English Government to make a protest for us. At last when we obtained the requisite authority to enter upon the negotiations the English Government sent a gentleman out here to attend to the matter, whom we declined to act with, making a demand upon them that a Canadian should be appointed, whom we would nominate. We did nominate a Canadian and we managed the whole business ourselves, and the result was the obtaining of that large award--not any larger than it should be, but still an award that was on the whole reasonably satisfactory to all parties. Now, I do not desire to occupy any more of the time of the House. I rose for the simple purpose of explaining my own position and pointing out to the House the constant recurrence of accusations of the kind mentioned by the hon. gentleman opposite, having been so frequent in his history and the history of his colleagues that they should be treated very lightly by other people. I have sat, I think, two Sessions, opposite the hon. gentleman, and I am sure during that time I have heard the same threat many a time, and many a time have seen gentlemen like the hon. Minister of Public Works raising the British flag with the greatest enthusiasm in order to rally his dispirited followers. It is an easy matter to raise the flag, but let us raise the flag of common sense for a little while, and let us consider, not those high-flown sentiments of extreme devotion and loyalty which the hon. gentleman dealt in so greatly to-night, but let us consider soberly and reasonably

what is best for Canada as Canada, and what is best for Canada as part of the British Empire. I have no doubt whatever our true policy is to obtain self action in almost everything which relates to our own business. Only one Act, I think, of this Parliament has been disallowed by Her Majesty, that was one relating to the Governor-General's salary, if I recollect aright. We have the most perfect freedom of action in legislation. Why, Sir, twenty or thirty years ago—certainly forty years ago—it would have been accounted extremely dangerous by all British statesmen, Whig and Tory alike, to have accorded to us the freedom we now possess, and to have trusted to us the legislation connected with half a continent under the British flag. Now, Sir, English statesmen know that British interests are just as safe in our own hands as they can possibly be in theirs. They know also, and must be taught if they don't know it, that a Canadian Privy Councillor is Her Majesty's Privy Councillor, and as such they occupy no inferior position, and although the position may not be precisely similar to that of Austria and Hungary with reference to the capital in each country, they discharge duties very much the same, and there may be other changes which may, perhaps, draw us quite as close as we are under our present relationship. But whatever may happen we know this as an established fact, that we now have perfect liberty of action in legislation, and that Great Britain trusts Her Majesty's Ministers and Her Majesty's Ministers trust us, and why should we not have the same freedom of action in negotiating business with other countries. The hon. gentleman spoke of the ambassadorial duties to-day as if they were something that required a training school, a college for training diplomats, whereas a business man, a statesman who has any knowledge of commercial affairs, knows tolerably well what will suit and what will not suit, and surely men enough can be found in our own country to discharge those duties with which we have hitherto trusted English statesmen, and generally greatly to our sorrow. I for one give my cordial support to anything that will extend our liberty of action and make us entirely equal in all respects to other Legislatures and the Ministers of the Mother Country itself.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I must repeat an observation I made on a previous occasion, that it is unfortunate, and inimical to the fair discussion or consideration of a great matter of public interest, that it should be presented to this Parliament under the circumstances in which this resolution comes before us. But, Sir, it is one of the privileges of an Opposition in Parliament, and it is availed of by them, and has been availed of by hon. gentlemen on this side when they sat on the other, to bring up their views, no matter how embarrassing it might be to the Government of the day, and the Government of the day in that case voted down, without any hesitation or difficulty, propositions which, perhaps, they approved, because they came up under such circumstances. And I have no doubt that a great many members of this House, without perhaps expressing otherwise their opinions with respect to this important matter, will find themselves in a position, politically, to take the same course on this occasion. But, Sir, for myself, occupying, perhaps, a peculiar position in this House and country as a public man, I cannot sit here as a member of Parliament and hear the views and statements made by responsible Ministers of the Crown with regard to the consequences which are likely to follow from the assertion on the part of this Parliament of its desire to have the control of its own commercial affairs and the settlement and management of commercial treaties with other countries without protest. Thirty-two years ago I had the honor—I consider it an honor to-day, when I look back upon that time and at what has since transpired—to propound a political platform, as the editor of a public journal. In looking over the various propositions, the opposition that was made to them, the ridicule that was heaped upon them, the opposition offered

Mr. MACKENZIE.

to them by hon. gentlemen in this House, some of whom are Ministers to-day, I take courage, for I can, in being able to look back upon that time and upon the events which have since occurred with respect to those propositions, and to-day I find every one has substantially been passed upon and adopted into the constitution and laws of my country, except one, which is embraced in the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Durham, viz.: That Canadians ought to have, and also should seek to have the right to make commercial arrangements with other countries suitable to our own condition and wishes. We have made a good advance in that direction. We have been permitted through communications which have passed between this Government and the Government of the Mother Country to send an ambassador, as he is called, with semi-plenipotentiary powers, and in connection with the English representative he has discussed various questions with France, Spain and other countries. But I do not know that our experience of that step in advance, so far as it goes, is calculated to give us very much confidence in its beneficial results, and I, for one, unable perhaps to understand all the delicate relations which exist between Canada to-day and the Mother Country, cannot see what damaging effect it would have upon the relations of the Mother Country with us, in what respect the tie which binds us to the Mother Country would be weakened, by simply agreeing to an arrangement by which Canada itself would, through its own agents, propose and make arrangements with any country which might be willing to make an arrangement with her, under the protection, under the supervision and with the support of the Mother Country. Why, what is the spectacle we have before us? We have here a Government representing what is called the Conservative party in this country, which claims, to be, and many of its friends claim it to be *par excellence*, the custodian and rightful heir of British principles. Yet we find them going as an opposition to the country at the last election and proclaiming a policy with respect to our Tariff which we all know was obnoxious to British statesmen of both political parties and by the British people, as being contrary to their policy, and objected to their views of what was for the interest of Canada itself, because Free Trade and Protection do not form a dividing line between English political parties. The present leader of the Conservative party, Sir Stafford Northcote, is as strong a free trader, if we may judge by his writings and speeches, as is to be found perhaps in the ranks of the Liberal party. English parties, I say, are not divided by any such line; and yet in this country we proposed, and I was one of those who concurred in the proposition to change our Tariff, to impose duties upon foreign commodities and upon the products and manufactures of the Mother Country herself so as to serve our own needs and purposes, to obtain revenue for the conduct of our own affairs and to afford protection to our manufacturers. We considered that those local and Canadian objects were of more importance than any consideration of what might be in accordance with the policy of the Mother Country or the political relations subsisting between Canada and the Mother Country. Hon. gentlemen opposite who took the platform against this policy resorted to the argument that it would tend to weaken the connection between Canada and the Mother Country, but this argument did not have very much effect even in the ranks of their own party. I take the decision of the people at the last election on that question as the strongest evidence we can have that the wishes of the people of Canada, that the rising aspirations of the young men of Canada, are in favor of our assuming our own Independence in the management of our own affairs, and especially in regard to all commercial matters. I believe that is the

sentiment, and we have had here an exhibition of it in the speeches made by three or four hon. members on this question. Without regard to the effect it might have on their political friends on the Treasury Benches, they have asserted their determination to support the motion even when moved by the Opposition, which declares the right of Canada to be the arbiter of her own destinies in regard to her trade and commerce with other countries. I think hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, instead of endeavoring to put down opinions of that kind, or to prevent their expression on the floor of this House by holding up to the House the threat of evil consequences, or assuming that consequences of the kind indicated would flow from such expressions, would do well to look about and to ascertain what is the condition of the public mind, and as they have done on many former occasions take a step in advance. It will be a better policy to adopt in discussing this question, especially if we are now to have a general election, as it is rumored in and out of this Chamber. For my own part I do not know whether I shall offer my services to any constituency at the next election. I did feel on the occasion of the last contest that it was my duty as a Canadian to support the National Policy, as it is called; and one of the chief reasons probably in my mind was that it contained the principle which is embodied in the resolution moved by the leader of the Opposition—that it was a declaration of the right of the people of Canada to make their own Tariff and to regulate their own affairs. I do not know—but if this is to become a political question, if the Government of the day expect to rally their followers at the next election upon the cry of the flag, upon the declaration that we must not make any further advance on the road to nationality than it has pleased them to agree to, I do not know but that I may feel it to be my duty, though having spent as many years in parliamentary service as one man ought to be expected to do, and very fruitlessly in some respects, to take the field again; and I have no fear but I will be able to find a constituency. I do not think, Sir, there is any reason to fear, in the first place, that the Government of England—the present Government of England or even a Conservative Government, if one should succeed to power—will object for a moment to give Canada the authority she asks, if it follows in the track which was pointed out by the hon. gentleman opposite. I have had some little experience as a member of a Government, I have had communications with Ministers of the Crown in England of both political parties, and with respect to matters involved in this very question. It is known to those who have taken the trouble to look into the history of this country prior to Confederation that I was appointed chairman of a Commission that visited England and the West Indies and other countries, for the purpose of negotiating with and making better arrangements for commercial relations with those countries, and though it is not exactly proper, perhaps, to refer to the discussions which took place with Her Majesty's Ministers, that they may have regarded as confidential, yet I may say, in the first place, I did not find, and my colleagues did not find, that there was any disposition on the part of the Government of England at that time to encourage the attempt to establish new relations in commerce and trade with our own colonies. A very extraordinary doctrine was propounded by an English Minister at that time, he said it was contrary to the treaties with other countries, particularly those containing what is known as the "Favored nations clause," that the West India colonies should make any special arrangements with Canada, that we, portions of the same Empire, members of the same family, should make arrangements between ourselves by which commodities were to be interchanged at differential rates of duty. That doctrine was laid down in a formal correspondence. It

was finally withdrawn, and we were allowed to make propositions to foreign countries and to the West Indies. But nothing came of it. I had a very strong suspicion—I shall not mention the particular facts upon which it was founded at the time—that the despatches which we carried were not the only despatches sent to those Governments and those colonies. If we had the power conceded to us of making such arrangements open and above board, I believe a very different result would follow from negotiations of this kind, but I will say as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) has said, that if any arrangements of that kind had the effect of loosening the tie between the Mother Country and Canada, or lessening the loyalty which we feel toward her, would make us less glad to be associated with England, to be subject to Canada so far as an independent colony ought to be, and must be subject, if it would have the effect of weakening the intense loyalty of the people of Canada to the British authority, I would say so far but no farther; we have gone as far as we can; by going a step further political consequences are likely to follow which will be injurious and oblige us to change our political relations. I believe it would be a relief to British statesmen if Canada were in a different position from the one she occupies. Consider the position of Canada with respect to the United States in regard to the late negotiations. Do you think it was not a subject of great embarrassment to England that England insisted upon the Imperial Government using its power for the purpose of securing to Canada compensation in money for the fisheries? We have only to look at the despatches. When I heard that this question had arisen—I did not hear the speech of the hon. mover of the resolution, nor did I hear the reply of the Prime Minister, though I heard of it—I referred to the despatches sent by the Imperial Government to the Canadian Government on the occasion of the Washington Treaty negotiations, and there was one despatch that struck me as being particularly pertinent to this question. Lord Kimberley in his despatch showed the reasons why Canada should accept the terms of the Washington Treaty. It was conceded to be our privilege to dissent from that Treaty and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I remember, moved a resolution which practically amounted to a refusal to agree to it and to pass the necessary Act for the purpose of carrying out that Treaty, and he was perfectly right in a constitutional point of view. I took the opposite course. I thought it to our advantage. I thought it was the duty of Canada, considering the results to the Mother Country and the difficulties that would arise between England and the United States with regard to this matter to agree to the terms of the Treaty. I have not changed that opinion, but still it was our right to disagree, and even the little Island of Prince Edward might have disagreed with the Treaty which the Mother Country had made with a great people like the United States. And in the argument intended to persuade us that it was our duty to concur in that Treaty, Earl Kimberley says:

"Canada could not reasonably expect that this country should for an indefinite period incur the constant risk of serious misunderstanding with the United States, imperilling perhaps the peace of the whole Empire, in order to endeavor to force the American Government to change its commercial policy; and Her Majesty's Government are confident that when the Treaty is considered as a whole, the Canadian people will see that their interests have been carefully borne in mind, and that the advantage which they will derive from its provisions are commensurate with the concessions which they are called upon to make."

And in another passage:

"Her Majesty's Government have no desire whatever to attempt to interfere with the entire right of the Colonial Legislatures to refuse to pass the Acts necessary to give effect to the Treaty, though they would deeply deplore that a course which they believe would be most impolitic, should be taken; but on the other hand they have too much confidence in the wisdom of those free assemblies to anticipate any such re-

sult; and they are confident that the Canadian Government would be as desirous as Her Majesty's Government that no untoward collision should occur during the present season which might prejudice the fair consideration of the Treaty."

Now, Sir, that shows us that even under the relations which existed at that time between these British North American colonies and the Mother Country that we had the right, and that we might exercise it of disagreeing with the policy of the Mother Country in her relations with the United States. Still our position was an embarrassment, for so long as this question was in dispute there was danger of collision between England and the United States. There was danger to the people of England, Ireland and Scotland, that they might be called upon to engage in a great national contest for the purpose of defending or protecting the interests and rights of the people of Canada in respect to their fisheries. Do you think it would not be a great relief to the Mother Country if all danger of any such consequences as these were removed? And therefore, if the proposition which is embodied in the resolution in your hands, or the policy which that proposition would necessarily lead to, were adopted, I think England might say, and England would say, that she was relieved of great dangers and great difficulties by Canada having to make these bargains and these arrangements herself. Well, Sir, suppose we were in that position, do you think there would be any great difficulty on our part? Do not we know, better than any one on the other side of the Atlantic, what will be for our advantage, understand better the character of our neighbors, their industries, their commercial operations? We know all about them, and they know all about us; and we can make better bargains for ourselves, if bargains are to be made, than anyone in England for us. We came near losing some of the advantages we had achieved in this fishery arrangement. I know there was a very strong disposition, of which we see evidences in this despatch, to restrain Canada in the demands she was making with respect to the Fishery Treaty. They thought we were asking too much, and pushing the matter too far; it was of no consequence to them; they were indifferent whether we got a million or half a million or nothing at all; and, therefore, it was only by pressure, by insisting on our right—not merely by the Government that finally concluded the negotiations, but by the preceding Government—that English statesmen, English diplomatists were pushed along, and almost compelled to take that high ground which ultimately resulted in so favorable an arrangement being made as was made. By the adoption of this principle, we would be relieved of all that difficulty, and England would be relieved; England would be disembarassed in all such relations between the great Dominion of Canada and the United States. I for one as a Canadian have no apprehension of the future. I believe we shall find Canadian statesmen, Canadian politicians, Canadian parliamentarians, sufficiently versed in the facts, sufficiently patriotic in their impulses and their determination, and sufficiently wise, to make proper and satisfactory arrangements in all commercial matters with our American neighbors; and I believe, Sir, if our position were recognized to be such as I have described, that our American neighbors would be better disposed to make favorable and friendly arrangements with us than they are at the present moment. It is not the people of Canada that they are dissatisfied with. When attacks were made upon us, as we all remember, a few years ago, it was not the people of Canada, it was the flag over our heads that excited animosity; but if Canada were practically independent, if she acknowledged but the Imperial Sovereignty, the Imperial Crown, and had the management of her own local affairs altogether, I have no doubt, in any commercial arrangements and transactions that might take place between the United States and Canada, that the most favorable arrangements would be made

Mr. McDougall (Halton).

between us, for there would be no disturbing element to interfere with our negotiations. Now, Mr. Speaker, this question is brought before the House, as I said, in a way that is not calculated to give it a fair position. Several hon. members who have spoken on this side have expressed their approval of it, but one must see that they have done so under great difficulty, and we must see by the lecture they have received from the Minister of Public Works that others are inclined to take the same position. It is not giving the question itself fair play, and therefore I regret that it has been proposed in this manner. Yet we have had two examples of motions made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in amendment to going into Supply, not made with the view of expressing want of confidence in the Government, and not received by the Government in that sense; although, with respect to the important question raised last night, of which I may be allowed to say a word, not having had an opportunity to speak on it at the time, I think we were travelling a little out of the record. I think it would have been far better for the Parliament of Canada to concern itself about the affairs of Canada, to deal with matters over which we have constitutional control and personal knowledge, than to travel across the Atlantic and attempt to direct Mr. Gladstone how he should deal with the Irish question. I intended to say so much last night, and I say it now. At the same time, the terms in which the motion was proposed, and the unhappy circumstances of the case, perhaps may have justified a parliamentary expression of opinion; but I did not feel, as the representative of the county of Halton, that I was authorized to say what their views or opinions might be upon a question of that kind. It seemed to me that I ought to have information from them before voting on the subject; I had no petition, no letters, and the question was sufficiently long before the public for them to form an opinion—and I really believe the resolutions did not express the opinion of a majority of the electors of that constituency. I believe, when we go back to them, and have an opportunity of discussing this matter, that we shall be told that they did not take the same view of the causes of the evils which afflict that country, or the remedies best adapted to remove those evils, which the hon. gentleman expressed in his very eloquent speech. But reverting again to the resolution now before us, I am disposed to vote for that resolution, which I do not think expresses or is intended to express want of confidence in the Government. But I may remark that I have want of confidence, and strong want of confidence, in the doctrines announced by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and the position he takes with respect to the right of members of Parliament to express their opinions upon a question which so intimately concerns the best interests of Canada.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Malouin,
Baine,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Béchar,	Gillies,	Quimet,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Girouard (Jacq. Cartier),	Pickard,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Brown,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (St. John),	Haddow,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Ross (Middlesex),
Cameron (Huron),	Houde,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Huntington,	Scrifer,
Casey,	Irvine,	Skinner,
Casgrain,	Killam,	Smith,
Charlton,	King,	Snowball,
Coupal,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Conroy,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Thompson,
Orouter,	Mackenzie,	Trow,

DeCosmos,
Dumont,
Fiset,

McDougall,
McIsaac,

Weldon, and
Wheler.—58.

NATS:
Messieurs

Allison,
Amyot,
Arnell,
Baunerman,
Barnard,
Beaty,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bolduc,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Brooks,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Coatigan,
Coughlin,
Cuthbert,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Domville,
Drew,
Dugas,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Fitzsimmons,
Fulton,
Gigault,
Girouard (Kent),

Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hesson,
Homer,
Hooper,
Hurteau,
Jackson,
Kilvert,
Kranz,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McCarthy,
McQuaig,
McDougald,
McGreavy,
McLellan,
McLeod,
McQuade,
McRory,
Manson,
Merner,
Mougenais,
Montplaisir,

Mattart,
O'Connor,
Ogden,
Orton,
Patterson (Bessex),
Pinsonneault,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Ross (Dundas),
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Royal,
Ryan (Marquette),
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Stephenson,
Tassé,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Hastings), and
White (Renfrew).—101.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

68. Canada Central Subsidy..... \$120,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. How much of that subsidy is unpaid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This completes the payment of \$1,440,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Was that used in the way of a grant, a sort of endorsement in the hands of the contractors, or paid in actual hard cash?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They adopted the alternative of using the moneys and raising the money.

69. Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River
(Pacific Railway)..... \$1,567,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to amend that resolution by substituting the figures \$1,067,000, which is all that is required for this service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How is this to be spent? Is it altogether upon 41 and 42?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mainly upon these portions; a small amount will be required for all the contracts.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have heard that a considerable portion of the work at A and B is being constructed with a sort of tramway, upon trestles in the meantime.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is right so far that there was a considerable alteration made in the form of crossing a number of those ravines, and that trestles were substituted to a larger extent than originally intended. The work is being finished by the substitution of trestle bridges, where originally it was intended there should be mere embankments. It is to be a permanent mode of crossing those sections.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In that case, the saving in many cases the hon. gentleman referred a few days ago is largely connected with this change of structure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure has been considerably reduced by the alteration of trestle work and bridges for the more permanent embankments.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am desirous of seeing the work proceed in every way, and would be glad to see it done well; but I have been told, on what seems very good authority, that those structures are anything but stable, and some are particularly dangerous.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They have been most carefully examined, and the work is of the most substantial description.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am glad to hear they are going to be substantial; but I was an eye-witness of the modes of construction of some of them, and if a more disgraceful piece of work could be turned out by an engineer than some portions, I would like to see it. I was over some of the work from Thunder Bay to Red River and may refer to the piece at Muskrat Lake; and if there was ever an engineer who turned out a disgraceful piece of work it was the man at this place. The piles were running in every way, looking at one another. I do not blame the Minister, but think it right to bring the matter up.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is entirely wrong in saying I am not responsible for the work. I have gone over it with engineers of the highest standing, and whose interest it was to criticise it, but all concurred in the opinion that it was of the most creditable character. And I am very much astonished that he, who is not an engineer, should utter an opinion so unfounded.

Mr. DOMVILLE. It is not the first time I have been criticised by the hon. member, and I am not prepared to take his censures on this occasion. I repeat the work is most disgraceful. I am not an engineer; but I know when a pile stands perpendicular in the water, and when a train is to cross over works at such places, they should have a proper foundation. I do not know that it reflects any credit on a Minister to pitch into a member for expressing his honest opinion. If the hon. members of this House are to be made mere voting machines it is time we knew it. I for one will not submit to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will have to submit to the truth being told; and when he states this road has been constructed in the way described or that there has been any want of first-class engineering skill, he is making a statement unfounded on fact. The engineering work on those contracts is of the highest character, reflecting the greatest credit on its authors. I will not permit my hon. friend or any hon. member in this House to make such an unfounded statement, derogatory to the Department over which I have the honor to preside, without meeting it by an explicit denial. No doubt a great many of these places were crossed over by pile work for the purpose of carrying trains over and to enable permanent embankments to be more cheaply and easily constructed.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am not going to take back one word I said. I am sorry that my remarks should have aroused the ire of the hon. Minister. I think it is too bad that representatives in this House should criticise anything; it is unfortunate that there are any members at all, that the counties could not vote by proxies and having passed the Supplies we might all congratulate ourselves on the happy event. I have a great deal more to say about that road, but I do not wish to say it now. I could point out where the rails were laid and became twisted and bent, because not looked after, but I will reserve my remarks, and may state that I do not blame the hon. Minister but the engineers.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister tell us roughly what number of miles of trestle work was constructed on that road, and give us an idea of the average

height? If I remember rightly, Mr. Sandford Fleming expressed a strong opinion adverse to the use of trestle-work, and mentioned among other things the extreme danger of a large portion being destroyed by fire in the dry season.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That referred to section 15 where embankment has been substituted. I cannot state the amount of trestle work that has been substituted, or the distance, but the trestle work has been reduced as much as possible. We went to great expense substituting a permanent embankment for trestle work. It was found greatly to the advantage of the road, both in point of time and in saving of expense to use a certain amount of trestle work.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman obtain the information I ask for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Chief Engineer has just sent me word that there is about one and a-half miles of trestle work from fifteen to fifty feet in depth in the 410 miles.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister of Railways stated that he had caused such alterations to be made in the plans of the railway between Lake Superior and Red River as to very materially reduce the cost. He admitted the character of the road was very considerably degraded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not.

Mr. ANGLIN. If the hon. Minister did not use that statement exactly he made one to the effect that alterations were made which would reduce the expenditure—alterations in the grades, &c.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not. I stated that we had reduced the length of the road several miles by careful location.

Mr. ANGLIN. And that the road was to be inferior to what he had previously intended; and he found it desirable to reduce the expenditure by building a less expensive road. I feel it my duty to convey information to the hon. Minister, which I believe to be well founded and which corroborates the statement of the hon. member for Kings. I received it from a very high authority. I am informed that some of these trestle bridges of thirty or forty feet deep, did not rest on piles, but were driven not more than three or four feet in the soft mud. There is not the soft tenacious bottom that was supposed to be there, but merely a deposit of three or four feet of loose mud on a rocky substratum into which the piles have not penetrated. They are merely held in their places at most, and it is dangerous to use them for the purpose of running trains on them. That is the statement I have received from a person whom I do not feel at liberty to name, but he has a very intimate knowledge of the state of things in these sections. The Chief Engineer of the Department no doubt receives the report of his engineers and relies upon them, and the Minister receives the report of his Chief Engineer, and makes a statement which he believes to be strictly correct, but my information goes to show that both he and his Chief Engineer are mistaken with regard to the character of these trestle bridges. It is a serious matter if my information is correct, and it is strongly corroborated by the hon. member for Kings, (Mr. Domville).

Mr. HESSON. With reference to the statement that the hon. Minister spoke of degrading the character of the road I recollect well that he referred to the prairie section, and as I had a trip last season over the prairie section of the road I am aware that the portion the Government have been prosecuting until they let the contract, was of a very degraded character indeed. I remember distinctly that it was to be considered merely as a temporary means of sending emigrants into that country, and that something better might be substituted. The rails were laid upon the sod of

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

the prairie without the slightest embankment whatever. That portion of the road, with the exception of a little piece that goes to Stonewall, is now of the very best character. I carefully observed the road while I was passing over it, because I expected that it would be made the subject of criticism in the House. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Kings, I know nothing of them. I have heard other gentlemen say who have gone over the road, that it was of a very substantial character and would do credit to the country.

Mr. DOMVILLE. We are not discussing the prairie section at all, but the section from Red River to Prince Arthur's Landing. There are no trestle work bridges over any lakes. I went over the prairie and did not see any trestle work, and I have no reason to find fault.

Mr. HESSON. The question was raised as to the character of the work that was being prosecuted, and the Minister was charged with having stated in the House last year that the portion the Government were constructing between Prince Arthur's Landing and Red River, was going to be deteriorated in its quality. My recollection is just the contrary. I did not misrepresent the hon. member for Kings at all. I said distinctly that I had not seen that part of the road, but that I heard no complaint made by gentlemen who had gone over it.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In any case the Minister admitted that he had substituted an inferior class of work by reason of expense. I desire to ask him what amount he calculates was saved by the substitution of trestle for embankment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About \$650,000.

Mr. McCALLUM. In reference to this trestle work, it may not have been completed at the time the hon. member for Kings went over it. If the work was reduced and it is a cheaper road, that is the business of the Syndicate, and the hon. gentleman need not be uneasy about it. If we save money that way we think it will be all right. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Kings was mistaken in looking at the road.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Were any alterations made in the road?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The grades have been preserved in all respects both east and west.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I moved for returns some time ago asking information with regard to the amount of gross and net earnings on the railway built by the Government and handed over to the Syndicate on the 1st of May last. Why have we not those returns?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I told the hon. gentleman at the time that it would be difficult to comply with his request. He asked what had been received by the Government up to the time they handed it over. In making my statement I gave the hon. gentleman the exact amount received by the Government, but I did not expect to be able to tell him how much the Syndicate received for that portion of the road subsequently, because they do not keep a separate account. All I could get was what I had already stated. I have given the hon. gentleman the amount the Government received from the roads until they handed them over to the Syndicate, and the \$603,000 received by the Syndicate for the operation of the roads was earned from the 1st of May to the 28th of February.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The Minister's return shows the amount they received up to the time they transferred the road to the Syndicate. I asked for the amount the Company had received from the Government since they had taken possession of the road—the gross and net earnings.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. At what time is the road likely to be completed throughout for traffic.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the contract the road is to be entirely completed from Thunder Bay to Red River on the 1st July, 1883; but I do not expect it will be completed at that date. I anticipate that it will take a large portion of the following season's work to finish the road. The contract time, as I have said, is July, 1883. In July, 1882, the track has to be laid by that time; but we expect it will be September or October, 1883, at the earliest, before the road is thoroughly completed.

70. Pacific Railway in British Columbia..... \$4,400,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That amount covers \$3,000,000 on the contract from Kamloops to Emory's Bar, and \$1,500,000 from Emory's Bar to Port Moody.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of miles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. 127 miles from Kamloops to Emory's Bar, and 86 miles from Emory's Bar to Port Moody.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How much has been spent on the section from Kamloops to Emory's Bar?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$1,900,000 up to 1st March, which is the last return I have.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect to spend \$4,500,000 on 200 miles of railway in one year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am assured by the contractors that they expect to require that amount. There may be a balance next year, but we must be prepared to meet whatever expenditure is made.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is at the rate of \$22,000 a mile on the whole; 200 miles. How long would the work last at such a rate?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe the contracts will be completed at the time stated, which is three years from 1st July next, 1885.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Could the hon. gentleman give an approximate cost of the railway over the prairie; 180 miles have been nearly completed from Winnipeg westward.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know what it cost me to build the portion I constructed, but I am not able to say what the cost is for the construction which is taking place at present. We expended \$700,000 on the portion of the road we constructed from Winnipeg; we opened communication with Portage la Prairie, a distance of seventy-five miles, and laid the track in a very imperfect way for some thirty miles beyond that point.

Mr. DECOSMOS. Can the hon. gentleman inform the Committee when the contractor will commence the construction of what is called the Port Moody and Emory section of the railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As such an extensive work has to be executed and the time is so short for carrying it out, it will be attacked from every available point. Access can be had at Port Moody, and no doubt it will be attacked there, and also at Fraser River where the road runs near the water for a considerable distance, and it also can be approached at a short distance from New Westminster by a road that is being opened up there. I understand it is the intention of the contractor to attack the work at the various points at which access can be had in order to hasten the construction as much as possible.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I thank the hon. Minister for his information, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I take occasion to enter my protest against any money being spent at Port Moody. Every gentleman of any experience in that country, who knows the geography of that country, would not

support the Minister in spending money at that point. Beyond the possibility of a doubt, Sir,—and I may parenthetically remark that it is not my intention to make a speech, as I propose to deal with this matter when it comes up in concurrence—the railway ought to proceed to English Bay and no other point, and any money expended at Port Moody, in my judgment, will be a mistake.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is thirteen miles away.

Mr. DECOSMOS. Fifteen miles according to Mr. Cambie's report. I remark that this gentleman, who was sent specially to examine the country, refers to Port Moody as the temporary terminus, but to English Bay as the permanent terminus. I may further remark, Sir, that the road by reaching English Bay, will enable a railway ferry to be put on to reach Vancouver Island within thirteen nautical miles, landing passengers within sixty miles of Victoria, so that we can have a through railway ferry across the Strait of Georgia that will carry freight trains and cars.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The question raised is a very important one and did not escape the attention of the Government. My hon. predecessor had located the road down the Fraser, from Kamloops to Port Moody, and the view presented by the hon. gentleman has been presented to me by gentlemen from British Columbia, and full investigation was made into the matter. With the reports of the best engineers and after the fullest investigation we concluded that the decision of the late Government to carry the line to Port Moody was best. I visited the place personally and found that to carry the road down to Coal Harbor or English Bay—and then we would only have reached an open roadstead—would increase the cost by something like half a million dollars. At Port Moody there was a safe and commodious harbor where easy access could be had to the road. After full investigation we confirmed the late Government's location.

Mr. DECOSMOS. My reading of the Orders in Council did not lead me to the belief that the late Government had settled definitely on Port Moody. The ex-Minister of Public Works is here, and I would like to hear him speak on the subject. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman (with all due respect to the Minister of Railways), from personal knowledge of the country, it is as certain as that the gas-light shines upon us that the road will run on to English Bay, and that the ferry will cross to Vancouver Island. Engineers say that in order to have a town at Port Moody, it will have to be built on terraces, like some of the villages on the Rhine. To make the terminus at English Bay would be much more in the interests of the country. I would like to hear from the ex-Minister of Public Works as to whether Port Moody was finally chosen as the terminus or not?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not exactly remember. The Admiral for the coast looked upon English Bay as probably the best place for some purposes, but we found a good harbor at Port Moody, and that by going there we could reach the ocean in the meantime, and if in the future, it was thought desirable to extend to English Bay, it could be done.

Mr. DECOSMOS. Will the hon. gentleman say whether they looked upon Port Moody as a permanent or only a temporary terminus.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no definite recollection of the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was as far as you expected to go for some time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The calculation made is that the 213 miles from Kamloops to Port Moody will cost \$11,738,100, which gives an average of \$55,100 per mile.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,
Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a large amount of tunnelling. The longest tunnel will be 1,600 feet.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My recollection is that there will be about two miles of tunnelling to be done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About that.

71. Telegraph Lines \$35,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, Sir, that \$35,000 is to pay Messrs. Oliver & Davidson, for maintaining the line from Prince Arthur's Landing to Selkirk which is still under contract, at the rate of \$4,160 a year. For interest on drawback, \$1,463; also in accordance with the express terms of the contract, cost of maintaining the line from Prince Arthur's Landing to Edmonton, \$29,377.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The contractors get the receipts. As will be observed the telegraph from Selkirk to Edmonton can in no way now be considered as in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it is a source of considerable expense, and as several applications have been made to me by telegraph companies and other parties to take over that line and operate it, an Order in Council has been passed authorizing an advertisement, inviting tenders from parties who will take over the line from Selkirk to Edmonton, and maintain telegraphic communication from Winnipeg to Humboldt, Battleford and Edmonton, and asking them to specify the rate they would charge and the terms on which they would take it over.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Purchase or lease.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The terms on which they will assume it and operate it as their own property, so that it is practically a purchase. In that case, as hon. gentlemen will see, a considerable portion of this sum will not be required to be expended; but I thought it safer to take the vote.

72. Station accommodation, Pacific Railway.....\$32,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the contract, we are obliged to provide stations on the portions of the line being constructed.

73. Subsidy, Canadian Pacific Railway Co.....\$8,500,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the \$4,000,000 voted last year have been paid over to them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, only \$1,610,000. The reason the balance is not put down as a revote is that it is retained for the purpose of meeting any expenditure before the 1st of July.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The two sums amount to \$12,500,000, which is half of the whole subsidy. Half of the work will not be done before the 1st of July, 1883.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, there will be a considerable balance remaining; it does not really matter.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It does not matter very much, but it is desirable that the Company should know what the Government expect. As I understand, the Syndicate themselves hardly expect to construct more than five or six hundred miles additional by the 1st of July, 1883, and that certainly would not entitle them to anything like the sum of \$12,500,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, having made the contract, we have to take the estimate largely from the persons engaged in the construction of the road, and their calculation furnished to me is that there will be 600 miles of the Western division constructed during the year, and 150 miles on the Eastern division, which would entitle them to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

a total of \$8,307,691. They have 60 miles under contract from Algoma Mills, running easterly, and they expect to construct 50 miles running westerly from Callander Station during the present season. From Thunder Bay they expect to put under contract from 50 to 60 miles, running easterly, during the present season.

Mr. BUNSTER. The hon. Minister of Railways has made no provision whatever for the railway on Vancouver Island. The hon. Minister knows that, according to agreement, and according to the Order in Council that was passed, Esquimalt was to be the terminus and not Port Moody. This vote will bring the railway only as far as Port Moody; yet it will be found that commercial necessities will require it to be carried ultimately to Esquimalt. The hon. Minister would be the gainer by bringing the railway there, because the land that has been ceded to him by the British Columbia Government would build the whole road through British Columbia. The portion of the road that ought to have been commenced first was that at Esquimalt which to-day would have been a paying road. It would have yielded enough money to have built one-half of the Canada Pacific Railway, and probably more than enough to build the whole, taking the royalty they charge on coal and coal lands in British Columbia that the Government and people were willing to concede. In this matter great injustice has been done to British Columbia. The hon. Minister of Railways who has been out there and knows the value of those coal lands, will admit that injustice. American capitalists have offered to build the road from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, for the sake of the coal lands of the Island, that coal being the best on the Pacific coast. If they do us justice they will see the iron road completed early. They have now got the land ceded to them by the British Columbia Government, but by their neglect they have retarded the settlement of the Province at least ten years. The Government have been unjust to the commerce of the Dominion in nominating Port Moody as the terminus of the Pacific railroad, as will be seen when we have to compete with the Union and Central Pacific, at San Francisco, and the Northern Pacific at Puget Sound. They will have to bring the Canadian Pacific to Nanaimo yet. We were proud and independent enough not to take from the late Government \$750,000, for the sale of our rights, and we are now entitled to demand from the present Government the fulfilment of their contract with British Columbia. We have a claim against Canada for the injustice done us, in not fulfilling the agreement entered into with British Columbia. So far as I am concerned I will see that we get justice and damages. The Premier got the best seat in our gift, and he should do his utmost to secure us the justice we are entitled to. I am aware that the Government has many difficulties, but when they see the value of the land, they should endeavor to turn it to proper account. I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the great injustice that has been done our Province. No one knows it better than he, inasmuch as he has totally left out our Island railway from the Syndicate bargain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The subject to which the hon. gentleman has alluded is of very great importance. At the request of the late Government a bill was passed by the Local Legislature of British Columbia reserving for the use of the Government for the construction of the railway a belt of land on each side from Victoria to Nanaimo. The present Government were very much in hopes that the Syndicate would have found it to their interest to construct the road. When I went to British Columbia, I conferred with the Government of that Province as to the land they would give, and an informal arrangement was made to appropriate in addition to that twenty miles a further concession of land running up the Seymour's Narrows, and I was very sanguine

that the Syndicate would be induced, for the lands thus offered, to construct that portion of the road; they sent a very able contractor, Mr. Ross, to examine the country and report, but his report was not of a sufficiently favorable character to induce them to undertake the work. I am glad to learn however that a San Francisco Company are prepared to construct the road for the lands which the Government are prepared to give. I have a telegram from Mr. Trutch saying that the Government of British Columbia have given the charter to Mr. Clements and his associates, and have repealed the Act of 1875 reserving the lands for this Government. The difficulty, therefore, to which the hon. gentleman referred is removed and these lands are now in the hands of the Local Government free from the restrictions placed in the Act.

Mr. BUNSTER. Let me state the difference of opinion between the hon. gentleman and myself. We have made an agreement with Canada which they have not fulfilled. It is not right that this Government should let a San Francisco man make a contract with our Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will wait until concurrence we will be better able to discuss the subject, for then we will have full information.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have looked through the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways and find that his recollection was correct and mine incorrect with reference to the quality of the road. I hasten to make the correction. Will the hon. Minister state whether the Government has yet resolved what they will do in regard to the road to Hudson Bay?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for South Renfrew will be able to give a great deal of valuable information in connection with that subject. I may say, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman, that applications are before the Government, but no decision has been reached in reference to that matter as yet.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Have the Government had any communication at all with the Imperial Government in the matter? I have suggested more than once the desirability of endeavoring to have some of Her Majesty's ships explore the navigable waters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to state definitely with reference to that. I shall ascertain and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. BANNERMAN. I shall be glad to give all the information I have got concerning it at any time. I think I have information that will satisfy the hon. gentleman that a route is practicable to take the year's crop out to greater advantage than by the St. Lawrence or by New York. Our Company have been at large expense during the last two or three years in that direction. At the present time the fur trade is of secondary importance for the Hudson's Bay Company to their interest in the land country in the North-West. I think I can show to this House that it is not a matter of six weeks, as was stated in the Railway Committee two years ago by Mr. D. A. Smith, but from the information I have we have six months of open navigation.

74. Increased accommodation at St. John, N. B., in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. \$150,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is known to those who are at all acquainted with the subject that the accommodation at St. John has been of a very inferior character, in fact only of a temporary make-shift character. A large and important contract was entered upon there by my predecessor in the construction of the wharf which furnishes wharf accommodation for shipping. The station buildings, and everything connected with the St. John arrangements, are on a scale altogether inadequate to the interests of the city. The expenditure of \$150,000 for the improvements is asked for to purchase additional land, renew buildings and com-

plete sheds. Bonded warehouse, \$20,000; flour sheds, \$20,000; grading streets, sidings, &c., \$20,000; building a branch service, \$15,000. It is not proposed to go down nearer the water. We take more ground at the side.

In reply to Mr. BURPEE (St. John),

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The work will take up more space. The hon. gentleman knows it is entirely inadequate to the business of the place. No passenger station is provided in this. It was proposed to deal with the freight accommodation in the first place.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to railway accommodation on the Intercolonial in the County of L'Islet. The road is in very good order, satisfactory to the public and well managed no doubt. Last Session I called his attention to Elgin Station, which is fed by the long road, going as far as the Townships. There is no accommodation there at all for freight or passengers, except what is afforded by a building belonging to a man named Bourdeau.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know the hon. gentleman takes a great interest in that, but it is impossible to meet all the demands for additional station accommodation. The business there, as the hon. gentleman knows, is very limited indeed. However, I will look into it and see what can be done.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have no doubt some day or other it will have to be built, but I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to it so that he will see the necessity of having something done there.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the employes on the Intercolonial receive very little remuneration for their services in proportion to the increased rate of wages other employes are receiving in other parts of Canada. If you can get good men to operate the railway, to work night and day and risk their lives and lose them, as one man did the other day from fatigue, they should be properly paid. It is true it is said that this man overworked himself at his own risk. In the interest of the public, men should not be allowed to work over hours, for in such cases justice cannot be done to the public, and loss of life and property is liable to ensue. The men should be adequately paid for their work. In some branches no fault can be found on this score. The heads of the Department and the engineers are well paid, and live in comparative ease, while those men who are seeking to earn a little more are overworked. I hope the hon. Minister will take into consideration the condition of the men and if possible try, in view of the increased prosperity of the country, to do something for them. I am glad the man did get something done for him. After bringing a great deal of influence to bear, and waiting on those under the hon. Minister who had charge of the subject, this person, who holds a position in St. John, received the munificent advance of five cents a day on his wages. I hope if the men are unable to obtain more they will be able to secure that amount.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry I am not able to agree with the hon. member on this occasion any more than on the other. I have no doubt he considers he has only discharged his duty in making this representation, and calling my attention to the alleged fact that the higher officers of the Department are being highly paid while their subordinates are being underpaid. It is the very reverse. I tell the hon. gentleman he is entirely mistaken. He cannot find me a railroad to compare with the Intercolonial, in point either of length or importance, on which the higher officials are so poorly paid as on the Intercolonial. He will find from the Chief Superintendent down through all the higher officers, that the

average of their salaries is smaller than that of officials on any railway in this country. While as regards other employes we have been enabled to increase their pay, and the payment made to conductors and the various employes in connection with the road, from laborers upwards, will compare favorably with the rates paid on any railway in the country. From time to time, as we have increased the receipts and diminished the expenditure, we have been enabled to make these increases. When it was necessary to reduce the expenditure in order as far as possible to make the receipts and expenditure balance, I stated on the floor of Parliament that it was with great regret I was obliged to decrease the emoluments of those in the public service, especially those who were in a comparatively humble position, although as regards the laborers their wages have never been diminished but maintained at the same rate. From time to time wages on the Intercolonial have been increased until I think the payment made to officials on that road will compare very favorably with those paid on other roads. There are some cases in which it may be desirable still to extend the increase, and I shall be only too glad to do so when it is within my power. I travelled from one end of the railway to the other, and as far as possible came in contact with the employes, personally investigated the cases and their merits, and the manner in which they discharged their duties, and I endeavored by readjusting the payment to do justice to all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is it true that men worked forty-eight hours without rest.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If any person has been overworked it has been not because he has been required to do so, but because he sought it. As is well known, conductors on all railways are allowed extra pay for extra work. The conductors on the Intercolonial Railway, are as well paid or better than the conductors on the Grand Trunk, and the rank and file are better paid than on the Grand Trunk. It is quite impossible to maintain a staff of officials that will be equal to every emergency without drawing to a greater or less extent upon their energies. If there is a sufficiently large staff to meet all emergencies, and large and necessary expenditure is involved, the officials as far as possible are careful not to permit men to work to the injury of their health.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Did the hon. gentleman see a letter in the *Halifax Chronicle*, making certain statements and giving names and dates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I sent it to the Superintendent for report, but I have not yet received any statement. I need not say to the hon. gentleman that it would be very unwise to accept the statement of disappointed officers or of those who have been dismissed from the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I admit that, but this letter gives names, dates and facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It gives dates and names. I am not certain of the facts; those remain to be investigated. The matter is being investigated as is everything of the kind. You cannot work a railway without accidents happening occasionally.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No doubt; but we have had the same kind of accidents on other roads. There was one at Trenton, where the conductor being overworked was unable to keep awake. Then there is the case on the Intercolonial which has been mentioned. It is true that this man was forced to continue at work so long as is stated, some one must be blameable, and it becomes a very serious matter. I would like to ask if the statement is true?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not true. No person deploras his untimely death more than myself, but he was

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

not compelled to perform the duties. It was entirely voluntary, and I suppose he fell asleep and the accident was the result. It is a source of gratification to me to state at the end of three years that notwithstanding the great number of persons carried such a long distance over the Intercolonial, not a single passenger has lost his life. The hon. gentleman knows the difficulty of avoiding accidents on a line of road of such length. The instructions of the Department have been not to overwork any official, and if any case of that kind should be brought to my notice it would be followed by a strong reprimand. I saw the letter the hon. gentleman refers to, but I do not attach much importance to it. It is very easy for discontented parties to write in that strain. I have called upon the Superintendent for a full report on the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He does not appear to have been dismissed. He appears to have left.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Any person knows that persons are sometimes unreasonable, and it is impossible to meet the demands always of those in one's service.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. Minister says that the officials were allowed to do extra work voluntarily, but if there was a proper number of officials on the road this would not be necessary. With regard to the pay of officials I do not object to the payment to the higher officials of proper salaries; but I have certainly heard that in many cases the lesser officials are underpaid. I am glad to hear from the hon. Minister that recently their salaries have been increased, because it is understood that when he first took charge of the Department the salaries were reduced and a large number of officials were dispensed with. Now, this matter leads to the consideration of two accidents which have recently occurred on the road, and which are exciting a great deal of attention among the people of the Maritime Provinces, and which may have a very serious effect upon the welfare of the railway. There is an impression that these accidents have been the result of overwork on the part of the officials. With regard to the first accident, the matter is certainly, at this moment, in a very unsatisfactory condition. A collision occurred somewhere near Windsor Junction, resulting in the death of one of the train hands, a man by the name of Cameron. An inquest was held to ascertain the cause of death. It appeared that there was a conflict in the evidence as between the train despatchers at Truro and the station masters at Windsor Junction. The train despatchers swore that they had telegraphed Harris, the station master at the junction, to stop No. 13 train. He distinctly swore that the instructions he received were to stop No. 15 train, and this misunderstanding or failure to act upon instructions resulted in the death of this unfortunate man. Now, the coroner's jury brought in a verdict which did not amount to very much or did not throw very much light upon the question, except a suggestion that letters should be used in transmitting messages instead of figures in future. The friends of the man who was killed had Harris, the station-master, arrested for manslaughter. Subsequently further investigation was held, and he was released. The books of the train despatcher at Truro, which, strange to say, were not produced at the inquest, on being examined, it is said, showed marks of being tampered with. Since that some of the officials at Truro have been dismissed. Now, I think it is of the highest importance to the country to know when that mistake occurred first, and I think the hon. Minister will not be discharging his duty to the friends of the unfortunate man and to society at large if he does not cause a further investigation to ascertain all the facts in connection with the accident. The second accident resulted in the death of conductor Geldert, which has been referred to already. There can be very little doubt that that accident resulted from two causes; first, that he had an engine too weak to carry the train it was required to carry; secondly,

because he was over-worked and unable to perform his duty and fell asleep while on duty. These facts seem to be pretty well established. At any rate a letter written recently which has been referred to by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie)—written by an engine driver—makes that charge most specifically. This matter has been considered of sufficient importance in another place to be made the subject of a motion, and the hon. gentleman who made that motion said :

"In the first case the station master at Windsor Junction was committed for manslaughter, but the result of the enquiry was that the man was discharged and the fault seems to have been laid to the system not so much to the station master. In the second case there appears to have been no excuse except the same system that permits a train leaving one station before it is known that the track is clear and running on recklessly to another."

It is very clear to me that there must be something seriously wrong in its management to have induced that hon. gentleman, who lives in the county represented by the Minister of Railways, and is his strong personal and political friend, to make this a subject of a motion which was certainly a motion of want of confidence in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. We have frequently heard the statement from the Government that the expenditure had been cut down very largely on this road, and that a wonderful system of economy had been inaugurated. It is well to have economy; but I doubt very much if the people of this country will justify any system of economy which results in a series of unfortunate and fatal accidents such as those that occurred lately. I hope the hon. Minister will take steps to enquire into the circumstances of the first accident I referred to, and ascertain where the cause of it lies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In answer first to what the hon. gentleman said last, I may say that the safety of life and property on the Intercolonial Railway is not exceeded by that on any other railway in Canada, so that there is no ground for the imputation that any economy has had anything to do with the unfortunate accidents which have occurred. There is no road the hon. gentleman can point to where such a staff of officials is kept that extra demands are not sometimes made on their time; there are occasions when there is such a press of business that, unless you keep a large staff of men idle most of the time, a little extra exertion is required on the part of the officials, but, of course, that must be confined within narrow limits, and over-working must be avoided. With reference to the accident at Windsor Junction, the matter was enquired into by a coroner's inquest, and they attributed the collision to a mistake on the part of the station master, and the friends of the deceased man had the station master arrested on the charge of manslaughter. I had a full report sent up to me here which I went into closely, and I came to the conclusion that a serious oversight had taken place. The result was that the closest investigation was made, the evidence was submitted in court, the station master was honorably acquitted and discharged, and the investigation left no doubt on my mind as to the parties who were to blame, and one of them anticipated his dismissal by resigning, and the other was dismissed. As I say, it is quite impossible, while trains are moved by telegraphic communication between stations, that errors will not sometimes occur, that collisions will always be avoided. The motion referred to by the hon. gentleman, as having been proposed by an honorable gentleman in another place, that hon. gentleman holds a very strong opinion about the introduction of the system of warnings known as the Block system—a system which I examined a year ago and concluded that it would be entirely impracticable, while it would double the cost.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I was down to the Province the other day, and I found that a great many of our valuable men

were leaving because they were getting better paid elsewhere, and that they could not be replaced by good men at the wages paid; and I only hope, if any accidents occur, on this account, that my warning may be remembered.

Mr. BORDEN. Has the suggestion contained in the verdict of the jury at the inquest, that letters or words should be used instead of figures, been adopted?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it has not. The work is not done by writing at all, but by sound.

Mr. HESSON. Along the whole line of the Grand Trunk, perhaps one of the most important on the continent, Stratford has the largest number of employes connected with the running department, something like 300. I have occasion to see many of those people, and am acquainted with their position and experiences. With regard to time and overwork, it is a matter of choice to do so. They like it as a favor to be granted. They are frequently required to lay off while their engines are in for repairs, and to make up that loss they desire to work overtime. Accidents will always occur, despite the utmost care. A good deal depends upon the management of the telegraph operators, in which some carelessness is occasionally shown. Perhaps it would be well that those men should be on duty only a certain number of hours by night and day. But the men in charge of the trains ought to be well protected between the telegraph stations. Then again, the effect of an accident on the Intercolonial is no proof either of carelessness or inefficiency on the part of the hands. Good men are always going away and other good men taking their places, but they must have an opportunity of getting the necessary experience.

75. To pay for Wharf and Elevator at the Halifax Terminus.....\$125,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is that the total cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not more than has been found actually necessary to carry out the work in an efficient manner; to extend and build the wharf, with approaches, \$36,000; elevator, \$57,600; removing buildings, \$5,700.

Mr. ANGLIN. What is the total cost of the work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure last year was \$130,000.

Mr. KILLAM. Is there likely to be, next winter, any grain trade to employ profitably this elevator and wharf extension, for the benefit of the port of Halifax?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We hope so.

Mr. KILLAM. On what ground has the hon. gentleman founded his hopes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am assured by merchants in Halifax, that when we provided the proper facilities they would bring the business.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Where is the elevator to be built?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At West's Wharf.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be more convenient at Richmond.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. ANGLIN. What would be the whole expense of the extension of the railway, the purchase of property along the line and the improvement in the wharf?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Altogether about \$146,271 has been expended, and the sum now asked will complete the work, and we shall have one of the finest deep water termini any railway could desire.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman say anything about Mr. Shanly's position at present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have taken no vote for Mr. Shanly at present, because his services will terminate by the end of the fiscal year.

79. Rolling Stock.....\$305,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. I call the attention of the Committee to the extraordinary increase on capital account of rolling stock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have a detailed statement which I will lay on the Table of the House and it can be discussed on concurrence as the hour is too far advanced to discuss it now. The capital expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway, exclusive of the expenditure in connection with the Riviere du Loup Branch, is as follows: 1876-7, \$314,295; 1877-8, \$408,819; 1878-9, \$226,829; 1881, \$268,430.

80. Superannuation refund.....\$986

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was the practice to have a large number on the superannuation list. That has been changed and those parties who are no longer on the list are entitled to have the money refunded which they paid into the fund, and this is the amount required to be repaid.

81. Surveys and Inspections ... \$10,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to meet expenditure entailed in consequence of our being called on frequently to make surveys in regard to projected roads, &c.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That same charge appears in three places. You cannot want this item of \$10,000 for service on capital account.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I will not use it then.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is there any refund from various railways for inspection.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. KILLAM. I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways when we are to get the returns to the motions that we moved some time ago for the tenders for materials furnished by the Intercolonial Railway and the prices generally.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have instructed the Department to use all possible despatch, and I hope to be able to place it in his hands before concurrence.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 3 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 24th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE QUEEN'S ESCAPE.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LORNE

The Governor General transmits, for the information of the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, acknowledging the receipt of an Address from the Senate and the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, congratulating Her Majesty upon her escape from the recent attempt upon her life, as followeth:—

Earl of Kimberley to the Governor General.

Copy
Canada
General. }

DOWNING STREET, 30th March, 1882.

My Lord,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch, No. 39, of the 3rd March, and to request that you will inform
Mr. MACKENZIE.

the Speakers of the Senate and of the House of Commons, that the joint Address from both Houses has been laid before the Queen, who was pleased to receive it very graciously, and that I am commanded to request you to convey to them Her Majesty's thanks for their congratulations on her escape, and for their assurances of loyalty and devotion to her person and Government.

I have, &c., &c.,
(Signed)

KIMBERLEY.

Governor General

The Right Honorable

The MARQUIS OF LORNE, K.T., G.C.M.G.
&c., &c., &c.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 21st April, 1882.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BUNSTER. I rise to make an explanation. *Hansard* attributes to me part of the speech of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) on the subject of the Irish resolutions, submitted to the House on Thursday last. Inasmuch as we are totally different in politics, and, I may say, in religion, I, of course, could have nothing to do with any such error. I suppose it was merely a clerical error on the part of the reporter, but I hope, when the proper time comes, it will be placed in its true light. I do not want to steal any hon. gentleman's—

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Thunder.

Mr. BUNSTER. Whatever you like to call it, I would say eloquence, because the hon. gentleman certainly did speak eloquently. I hope the House will accept this explanation in justice to both the hon. member for Gloucester and myself.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, limited.

Motion agreed to and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 16,

Mr. MACKENZIE. We find resolutions placed on the paper by the Government which, practically, make this a Government work. The Railway Committee did not consider it to be a Government work at all, and I do not think it is treating this House fairly to allow it to go through the Committee, and before it could reach the House to announce the intention to grant a subsidy to it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It was stated in the Committee by the promoter of the Bill, Mr. Ketchum, that he hoped and expected to receive Government aid.

Mr. BLAKE. We all hope to receive Government aid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hope was so near fruition at this time that it caused some surprise. Was this matter considered by the Government before it went to the Railway Committee?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was considered by the Government before.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman not think it would have been courteous to have announced that to the House before the Bill went to the Railway Committee?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that at all.

Mr. KILLAM. We want to know distinctly what the policy of the Government is on this matter. My county is deeply interested in it, and I think the hon. the Minister of Railways ought to explain his views on the subject. Has the Government abandoned the policy of building the Baie Verte Canal?

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think this is the occasion to discuss the policy of the Government. The

proper time will be when resolutions of the Government come up in the usual order.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This clause provides that the Company shall receive 10 per cent. in addition to the cost if the Government assume the work. The Government have undertaken to provide \$3,000,000 of the capital, and the total cost, as estimated by the promoter, is \$4,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman opposite has a little understated the cost of the canal, and overstated the amount of the proposed subsidy.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That depends on what you estimate the rate of interest at.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think so. I think my hon. friend will find that the amount of the subsidy proposed, capitalized at 4 per cent. for twenty-five years, is about \$2,343,000. The hon. gentleman will see that, under these resolutions, the entire capital for this work, which is estimated to be over \$4,000,000, requires to be raised by private enterprise, and the work must be completely finished and put in effective operation before a single dollar of the subsidy is given; and that the subsidy then stops at the moment the parties have constructed that work with a capital, raised in the first instance by themselves, or have failed effectively to operate it; so that the entire responsibility of the construction and the efficient operation of the road is placed in the hands of the Company. They are obliged to raise a capital of \$4,000,000 for the purpose of accomplishing the work, and then to take the entire risk of it. The hon. gentleman knows that this work has been demonstrated to be practicable by the hydraulic lift, put in effective operation in the London Docks, where it raises vessels higher than it is proposed to raise them here, vessels of much greater weight, and that being raised and placed on the rails they can be managed without injury. In this case they will be moved over what is a dead level. The cost of the work is expected to exceed \$4,000,000. Mr. Page, to whom the estimates were referred, thinks that is the minimum that can be set down. The work will require to be done in a substantial manner to avoid being ruinous to the Company. The lowest estimate at which it was proposed to construct a canal to do a similar work in this locality, was between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000, if I remember aright. The Chief Engineer of Canals thought that altogether an under-estimate. The cost was really found, according to his view, to approach something like \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000. Therefore, it was the promoters of the Company who accomplished the object which they had in view, when they provided for the construction of the canal at that place, and at a cost which is only equivalent to \$2,343,000, and which places the entire risk and responsibility upon the Company. I think it is a proposal that ought to commend itself to the very favorable consideration of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was complaining that this Bill was discussed in the Railway Committee during the hon. gentleman's presence, and that not one word was said as to the intentions of the Government to do anything in the matter. The Railway Committee therefore discussed it in ignorance of the Government's proposals. What has been said now proves it as a Government Bill. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about the estimate of \$2,340,000. The position of the matter is this: the promoter stated to the Committee that the cost was estimated at \$4,000,000; and this grant of \$150,000 would enable anybody to go into the London market at present and raise \$3,750,000 at the same per cent., contingent upon the completion of this work. In other words, the \$150,000 would pay 4 per cent. upon \$3,750,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are treating it as a permanent arrangement, instead of a twenty-five years experiment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is a question for discussion—is it or it is not a Government work? What I complain of is, that we were not informed of that in sufficient time to influence the discussion. If I had known the Government proposed to do this, I would have asked for some time to look up the reports on the canal system formerly contemplated at that place. I never believed for an instant that such an enterprise could or would be carried on by private parties, and therefore gave comparatively little attention to the subject. The hon. gentleman also proposes to make the interest 10 per cent. instead of 5 per cent., should it assume the work, and that means the Government should pay 10 per cent. over and above the cost of the work, to the promoters after assuming it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may be wrong, but I think 10 per cent. was the amount stated in the Pacific Railway Bill of the hon. gentleman opposite that was to be paid the Company in addition to the cost should the Government assume the work. If so, we had a very good precedent.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not 10 per cent. interest only. The proposal is that the Government should add 10 per cent. to the cost. But I observe the hon. the Minister of Railways has rectified his views as to the mode of calculating an annual subsidy for a certain number of years. I recollect very well when it was the hon. gentleman's desire to ascertain the cost of the Georgian Bay Branch, he assumed an annual rate per mile was to be granted for a number of years for which it was granted; he funded the amount of the charge, stating that as a portion of the cost, and upon my arguing that that was not a true calculation, or a true way of ascertaining the true value of the subsidy, lasting a certain number of years, he pooh-poohed that idea. He does not take that mode of calculation to-day; but tells us the capitalized value is \$2,343,000, I think, subject to the rate of interest at which it will be capitalized. I agree with him as to the treatment of the temporary subsidies. I am glad to see that he takes a juster view on this subject than he did formerly. There is no allusion to the position that any Government aid which may be granted shall be taken as part of their profits upon the work in the calculation of what should be due to the Company on its assumption by the Government. The next point is that no rate of interest is stated as what may be payable by the Government to the Company in case the work is assumed. It is material that the terms upon which this work may be assumed, should be settled upon proper principles, and this inasmuch as the Bill indicates the possibility of it actually being received. It seems right that any Government aid received should be accounted as part of the profits of the enterprise. And, second, that the rate of interest which is to be computed on the capital account in case of the assumption by the Government, ought also to be agreed upon. But at any rate there is nothing at all said as to the rates of interest at which the work is to be taken over, nor is anything said as to taking an account of the present value of the works. It may be the works would give a high degree of profit, but adequate attention not being paid to them might lead to their being given up; practically the repairs might absorb the annual profits, and when the public interests require the taking over of the work, they would, under this plan, be obliged to pay the whole of this principle although low profits should be realized by the Company, which were not in reality profits, because a portion was not devoted to repairs.

Mr. CAMERON. The Bill effectually provides for what my hon. friend has pointed out. As it went before the Committee of Railways and Canals it stipulates that the amount to be paid by the Government shall be a first charge and the interest also, and the profits received by the Company in working the project. Now, the profits manifestly must mean, the balance after giving credit for

the amount of any subsidy received. But they will come under the Income Act with regard to any profits received. Inasmuch as a clause provides for arbitration, we may assume the arbitrators will not lose sight of the Government grant, which expressly requires them to give credit for the amount of the profits received by the Company on assuming the road.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot see how the subsidy is to be dealt with as part of the profits on absorbing the road.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The remedy is obvious; the original figure is 6 per cent. You can add "that deducting the profits, including any Government subsidy." That will meet the case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It will.

Mr. BLAKE. These two positions will make the first two points clear; that it is the intention of Parliament that the rate of interest shall be 6 per cent. Then remains the other point which demands attention. Suppose the Company builds a railway; suppose it is operated for six or eight years, the works being new and no repairs made, and that the whole sum granted by the Government is absorbed in profits over the running expenses; suppose the practical result to be that a profit exceeding 6 per cent., or a so-called profit of 6 per cent. is received, that then the Government think proper to take over the work, they will have to pay the whole cost and 10 per cent. over, though the works may have largely deteriorated by the management of the Company, who may have received a second profit from the annual wear and tear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman for Westmoreland is a reasonable one, and will meet the difficulty raised by the hon. member for South Durham.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that the provisions of this Bill are wholly inadequate to such a measure, under the circumstances of the case—aid being received from the Government. There ought to be some provision by which the Government could ascertain the actual amount of money expended on this road at the time of completion, and care should be taken that the money subsequently expended to keep it in repairs should not be counted as capital. There ought to be some provision for the fixing of rates of tolls by the Governor in Council or Parliament. It would be better that the Committee should rise and the hon. Minister of Railways take time to consider what changes should be made to make the Bill meet the altered circumstances of the case. This Company stands in a wholly different position from what it would were it an ordinary business enterprise. It is perfectly obvious, from an examination of these clauses, that the measure will not at all meet the requirements of the case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right. I am certain the law provides that the tolls shall be approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that this clause be added to meet the views of the hon. member for Bothwell:

The tolls and charges to be levied and collected by the Company for the use of their said works shall be subject to the approval from time to time of the Governor in Council, and shall thereafter be collected by, and paid to, the Company.

Mr. BLAKE. The approval from time to time would refer to the approval of existing tolls which might, from time to time, be levied.

Mr. CAMERON. I think that is provided for by the words, "Shall thereafter be collected by the Company."

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware that after the Government have approved of one system of tolls, they might subsequently disapprove of it. We want a power of revision of the existing tariff by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH moved to amend the clause by adding the following words:—

Provided, however, that no tolls shall be exacted until a tariff of tolls shall have been submitted to, and sanctioned by, the Governor in Council, who may, if the public interest require it, revise the same from time to time.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA LANDED CREDIT COMPANY.

Mr. BEATY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 47) to extend and amend the Acts relating to the Canada Credit Company.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BEATY. I propose to strike out the last four lines as printed and adding the words: "In the Province of Ontario, and in the same manner the same rights, powers, and privileges as are now possessed by the same Company in the said Province of Ontario." This is intended simply to extend the charter under which they can charge 8 per cent. to Manitoba and the North-West Territories. In the amendment suggested in Committee it was intended to allow the Company to charge the same rate of interest as could lawfully be taken by individuals, the same as the Joint Stock Companies' Act. In consequence of the vote the other night it was thought best to bring forward the amendment now proposed. This is to bring it within the charter and within the vote of the House.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk). No notice has been given, and I think I will have to object to this amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. On that ground I must rule it out.

Mr. BEATY. I consent to the limitation of 8 per cent. in Manitoba and the North-West Territories; but I do not want the charter limited as it applies to Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL. If the rate in Ontario is now limited to 8 per cent., I see no objection to adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for South Norfolk.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I understood from the mover of this Bill that under their charter this Company are limited to 8 per cent. in Ontario, and, therefore, I did not see any objection to the amendment; but now it would appear that in Ontario they are unlimited.

Mr. BEATY. Not at all. The original charter limits the Company to 8 per cent.; but this Bill is simply intended to extend the powers of that charter to Manitoba and the North-West. The hon. member for South Norfolk wishes to insert the words: "not exceeding 8 per cent.," to which I agree; but if this is made applicable to Ontario the preamble must be changed and the whole Bill reconstructed.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. If the Government wished, it would be easy to amend the Act so as to cover the whole ground; the insertion of three words would secure a proper amendment.

Mr. HESSON. It must be evident that the feeling and experience of the House is against such legislation, as would enable corporations to collect a higher rate than 8 per cent. The feeling is that 7 per cent. would be enough, and by some that it excessive. I will support the amendment of the hon. member for South Norfolk with pleasure, although I would prefer 7 to 8 per cent. to be the limit.

Mr. BEATY. There need be no misapprehension on this subject. Under the charter of the Canada Landed Credit Company they have power to take only 8 per cent. This Bill desires to extend this power to Manitoba and

the North-West. The Committee has reported this Bill according to the terms of the Joint Stock Companies' Act on which they were enabled to take such a rate of interest as they might lawfully take in the Province in which their transactions were carried on. Now, we abandon that in consequence of the decision of the House the other evening, and we say we will take the same rate in Manitoba and the North-West that we take in Ontario. I see no difficulty about this matter.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman is sincere it is very easy to provide that the rate of interest shall not exceed 8 per cent. Insert that limitation in the Bill, and strike out the last clause, and I shall withdraw my opposition.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The hon. member for South Norfolk should bring in a General Act, or the Government should do so, limiting the rate to 8 per cent. But 8 per cent. should not be allowed in one case and refused in another. The rate should be uniform.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The observations of the hon. member for Westmoreland raises a large question. I think the majority of the House would not fix an arbitrary rate of interest. I do not think that special provisions as to a special company, are reconcilable to the theory of legislation. I would prefer that the matter be left open, but as the promoters of the Bill assent to a limitation of 8 per cent., of course there can be no objection.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose the hon. member for Westmoreland thinks there has been so much retrograde legislation the last three years that a little more would not make much difference. I hope the Government will not go wrong in this matter as in other commercial legislation. We are bad enough now, but to chase capital out of the country by restrictive laws is an act of folly we should not be guilty of.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We voted against that the other evening, but were defeated.

Mr. WALLACE. I think I heard the hon. member for Lambton say that it would be bad to restrict the interest of money and drive capital out of the country. I believe there has been no greater wrong done to the country than allowing a free rate of interest. It has brought in money, but at a rate that has ruined the people of Canada. I heard an hon. gentleman the other evening eloquently discourse about the wrongs inflicted upon Ireland, by high rents and otherwise. Now, what is the interest on farm mortgages but rent, and what more obnoxious landlordism could exist in any country than that. It has been well said that corporations have neither bodies to be kicked nor souls to be damned; they have no feeling whatever, though the worst wretch of a landlord has some shred of feeling. They say that absentee landlordism is wrong. What is this Company doing but borrowing money in England to loan in this country? Is not this absentee landlordism of the very worst kind? These hon. gentlemen speak of rack-renting and middlemen. What is this Company but a middleman, that borrows money in England and loans it out at a higher rate of interest to the people of this country, and rack-renting the people by taking all the interest they can? Hon. gentlemen will say that men have violated the law. That is true. But is it any reason, because men will extort that this House should legalize extortion; because men will steal that theft should be legalized; and because people will kill, that murder should be made lawful? That is the reasoning of these hon. gentlemen. Because a wrong is done you must give it the sanction of the law. They speak of evictions in Ireland. I ask them to look over this country for the last eight or ten years, and see the number of evictions made by these loan societies, growing out of

extortion by lending money at a rate higher than it is possible for the farmers to pay.

Bill reported, read the third time, on a division, and passed.

QU'APPELLE LAND COMPANY.

Mr. Boulton moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Qu'Appelle Land Company.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk) moved that the second clause be amended by adding the words: "not exceeding 7 per cent." He said: With regard to the old charters, I could not limit the rates more than I did, because I thought it would be unjust to the shareholders to limit them to a lower rate of interest than they had invested their money at. This is a new Company, and I am convinced 7 per cent. on real estate is a high rate. I would have gladly made it lower if I thought there was any chance of its being carried.

Mr. PLUMB. I understand this clause enables this Company to furnish needy settlers with the material for carrying on their business. I think it would be against the interests of the settlers that the rate of interest should be limited as proposed by my hon. friend. It would simply prevent the poor man from being able to get farming material and supplies from this Company, which would be of great service to them. This is not like an ordinary land company. It does not and cannot have the same sort of security. It does not come within the same category at all, and I think my hon. friend who is probably opposing this through a principle which he has adopted in respect to all these companies, is quite mistaken, and is really, by his amendment, restricting this Company from doing what they propose to do. He is acting against the interests of the poor settlers who must be helped if we do not want to confine the settlement of the North-West to men who go there with a large amount of ready money in their pockets. That clause should be permitted to stand. In the western States, which have flourished tolerably well, in the State of Iowa, which has a population of 1,650,000, being an increase from 300,000 in 1860, the regular rate is 10 per cent., and nobody is hurt, the people can pay it more easily than people in England can pay 4 per cent. The land they buy doubles in price in a year or two. There is no hardship to the people; the lands are sold from \$6 to \$7 per acre, and the purchaser gives notes bearing 10 per cent. interest. They are free to take any rate they like, and it is not hindering the settlement of the country, nor has it wrought, in the slightest degree, any hardship on the people. This system means that the Government may supply material for the people who are going there to work, and if you take a man's note, you can sell it for whatever it happens to be worth. There will be plenty of rival companies, and if these gentlemen charge too high a rate, somebody else will come forward and loan money for less. I am sure the rates charged in the western States have been infinitely higher than these, and they have in no way worked any hardship, nor has their been any complaint nor any attempt to change the rates.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think the hon. member for South Norfolk is consistent, because he has not fixed at what chattels, horses and other animals may be sold. Why not place a limit on the sales of other things as well as on the sales of money? If that is done there will be some consistency in it. There is as much competition in selling money as there is in selling grain and horses. At

any rate, let us be consistent and fix the price of everything that people have to buy.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Lambton has evidently given the matter very little thought, otherwise he would never say that money is like everything else that people have to sell. No man can make money; he can earn it, but only the Government can make it. There is nothing except money that is of no use to a man until he parts with it. There is nothing else a man can be compelled to take in payment of a debt, except money. It is because money has so much power, that that power ought to be restricted, and if the hon. gentleman thinks a little more he will know more about what he is talking.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am sorry that all the thinking of this House is confined to the hon. member for South Norfolk.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He has thought to very little purpose when he is coming back to the dark ages with his legislation.

Mr. WALLACE. That is your opinion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, it is everybody's opinion nearly. The hon. gentleman says we cannot make money; well, neither can he make oxen, I presume.

Mr. WALLACE. I can raise them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is nothing more absurd than to attempt to fix the price of one article without fixing the price of every article, because there is more extortion in selling goods than in selling money.

Mr. WALLACE. That shows still more clearly that the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. The price of money is fixed by law, and the money itself is a fixed quantity by law.

Mr. HESSON. I think it would be impossible to fix the profits to be derived from the sale of goods as the hon. member for Lambton suggests. We do know that money is restricted, not only in quantity but restricted in its production by the Government. Every man is at liberty to go into trade, to manufacture goods in the country, and therefore there is all the competition which can be afforded by fair play. But we have no occasion to complain of a limitation of interest when it is remembered that no less than \$92,500,000 are lying in the banks, according to the bank reports of last March, and \$47,500,000 of that is on demand, and therefore I presume not bearing interest. Now, it is said there is a disadvantage in restricting the rate of interest in this country, that it is going to shut out foreign capital. While we have \$90,000,000 in our banks unused we have no right to say that interest shall be restricted. I feel satisfied the hon. member for South Norfolk is proceeding in the right direction. The incorporation of new companies here ought to be limited, and I am sure there is nothing in the state of the money market in this country to warrant an unlimited rate of interest on money. My own impression is that 7 per cent. is a very fair rate, when it is considered that banks are not attaining more than three, and that half the deposits in the banks to-day are not earning a cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When this subject was under consideration, it was thought fair by the Committee that it should be left subject to the laws in force with reference to the rate of interest in the country where this Company was operating; but a majority of the Committee decided adversely to that principle, and fixed the maximum rate of interest at 8 per cent.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The rate of interest is uniform all over the Dominion.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But it referred to the Provinces in which the operations are carried on. I have been

Mr. MACKENZIE,

looking at the Act of 1877, and I am under the impression that there was a company incorporated in England that are doing business in Manitoba and the North-West to-day, who are not limited in the rate of interest they shall charge. If that is the case, of course, a limitation of other companies might place them at a disadvantage as compared with the companies that are incorporated in England and doing business there. As the hon. member for Westmoreland said, we should have a uniform rate of interest, and that it may be a question for the Government to deal with. There may be something in what he says, and if the opinion of Parliament is that the rate of interest should be limited, then it would be a question whether we should allow parties to do business there without any limitation as to the rate of interest. It seems to me that, on Friday night last, we decided on 8 per cent., and to fix it at 7 now would be a new deviation from the principle of the Committee. However, I think we should have a uniform system so far as possible.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The legal rate of interest is 6 per cent. in every Province of the Dominion, when the rate is not specially fixed by the parties, and it is open to all parties to agree to any rate of interest they choose. There is no limitation whatever, but it does seem to me that if you limit one company you ought to limit them all.

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot quite agree with the hon. Minister of Finance when he says that if we limit the rate in this case it will give to the other companies an unfair advantage who have the right to lend without any limitation as to rates. I think if two or three respectable companies are loaning money for 8 per cent., the new company will not be likely to get any more. I apprehend the effect will be to bring the general rate of interest to 8 per cent. instead of allowing them to loan at a higher rate. If it were possible to bring in a Bill to limit the rate of interest to 6 per cent. or even a lower rate, I would bring it in and carry it through if possible. Knock usury on the head every time you can, that is my motto.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I propose the rate be made 8 per cent. I am of the opinion that it will be unjust to limit one company to 7 per cent. and another to 8. It is true the former company may be an older one and this is a new one, but why we should make a difference of 1 per cent. between them I cannot see. I move that the rate be 8 per cent.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Canada Provident Association.—(Mr. Currier.)

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Rapid City Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bannerman.)

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Great American and Short Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Montreal and Central Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Fulton.)

MILITIA CLOTHING AND ACCOUTREMENTS.

Mr. THOMPSON enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to lay before this House, the report of militia officers recently made to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, on the clothing and accoutrements of the Militia, and when?

Mr. CARON. This question has been for several days on the paper, and I told the hon. member that although the report was incomplete, I was quite prepared to lay it

on the Table of the House, and I hope to lay it on the Table to-morrow or the following day.

INFORMATION RESPECTING THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. HOOPER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to maintain permanently, at Ottawa, the office recently opened by the Department of the Interior, to afford Members of Parliament and others, facilities for obtaining official information from the Public Records respecting Dominion Lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All the facilities which are now offered will be continued, and I hope there will be additional facilities ere long.

ELGIN STATION, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GUTHRIE for Mr. CASGRAIN, enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to build some sort of station or shed for freight and passengers at Elgin Station on the Intercolonial Railway, County of L'Islet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My colleague has not yet decided this question. It is still under consideration.

LAND PURCHASES BY RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether arrangements have been made to permit the purchase by the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company of a large quantity of land? If so, at what price, and what is the estimated acreage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Arrangements have been made to permit the purchase of 3,840 acres per mile at \$1 per acre by Order in Council of the 5th of July, 1880. The area of the land cannot be given as it will depend on the mileage of the railway built. Application has also been made for an additional grant of 2,560 acres per mile. This application has not yet been complied with.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether arrangements have been made to permit the purchase by the Manitoba and South Western Colonization Railway Company of a large quantity of land? If so, at what price, and what is the estimated acreage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An arrangement has been made to grant to this Company, provided certain conditions described in the Order in Council authorizing the grant are complied with, 6,400 acres at \$1 per acre. The quantity granted will depend on the number of miles constructed.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether arrangements have been made to permit the purchase by the South Saskatchewan Railway Company of a large quantity of land? If so, at what price, and what is the estimated acreage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is one of the railway corporations to which by Order in Council of the 5th July, 1880, 3,840 acres per mile are to be granted at \$1 per acre.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether arrangements have been made to permit the purchase by the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company of a large quantity of land? If so, at what price, and what is the estimated acreage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By Order in Council of the 17th of February, 1881, this railway is to receive 3,840 acres per mile at \$1 an acre, and a further grant of 2,560 acres per mile at \$1 an acre, on such evidence being furnished that the Company has completed one-half of the line for which it has obtained its charter.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether arrangements have been made to permit the purchase by any other railway com-

pany than the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Railway Company, the South Saskatchewan Railway Company, and the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company, of a large quantity of land? If so, what Company and at what price, and what is the estimated acreage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not made any arrangement with any other companies than those named.

PIER AT CRANE ISLAND.

Mr. LANDRY enquired whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient to complete the construction of the pier between the "block" and the shore at Crane Island, now in course of construction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot answer this question either way to-day, as the Supplementary Estimates are still under consideration.

SURVEY OF THE BASIN OF MONTMAGNY.

Mr. LANDRY enquired whether it is the intention of the Government to cause a survey to be made, at a suitable period during the coming season, of the Basin of Montmagny, in order to ascertain the possibility and necessity of making it a harbor of refuge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have received a request from the hon. member to that effect, and I have instructed the Engineer in Chief to study the question so as to enable one to decide it in the affirmative, if possible.

SEMAPHORE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN GROSSE ISLE AND MONTMAGNY.

Mr. LANDRY enquired whether the Government have decided to establish, this year, communication by means of Semaphores between the Quarantine Station at Grosse Isle and the Village of Montmagny, or any other place which may be found to be most suitable?

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

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY PRINTING.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any printing work has been done for the Government in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the Dominion Lands, or both, by the Company owning the *Herald*, of Halifax? If so, in what year, and to what amount, and whether under tender or contract, or not, and under what heads in the Public Accounts are the sums charged?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as I am aware, the Halifax *Herald* has not done any work for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the Dominion Lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have certainly not done any for the Dominion Lands.

GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE.

Mr. ROGERS enquired, Whether the Government have abandoned the scheme of Government Life Insurance recommended to the consideration of Parliament in the Speech from the Throne in 1879, and outlined in the resolutions proposed by the hon. Minister of Finance in that Session? If the scheme has not been abandoned, when is it proposed to introduce it to Parliament?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have not abandoned their intention of bringing this subject under the

consideration of the House, but they do not propose doing so at the present Session.

CODIFICATION OF DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. LANDRY enquired, Whether the Government have appointed a French Secretary to the Commissioners for the codification of the Dominion Laws; and if not, whether it is their intention to make such appointment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is at present only some preparatory work to be done before the issue of the Commission for the codification of the Dominion Laws. When that Commission is issued there will be either a French Commissioner or a French Secretary.

FISH HATCHERIES IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. WELDON enquired, Whether the fish-hatcheries are to be continued on the St. John, Restigouche and Miramichi Rivers; and what quantity of salmon fry it is proposed to place in these rivers; and in what other rivers in New Brunswick during the coming season; and what quantity was placed during the past season in the rivers of that Province?

Mr. McLELAN. The fish-hatcheries are to be continued. There will be about 1,750,000 of salmon fry placed in these rivers. It is not yet determined how much will be placed in the other rivers in New Brunswick.

Mr. WELDON enquired, Whether a hatching or fish-breeding house is being erected at Indian House, on the Restigouche River, from whom was the site purchased, and the amount paid for the same; also, the probable cost of the building?

Mr. McLELAN. Some expenditure has been incurred in procuring material, but operations have been suspended, pending the selection of a site. The building will cost about \$3,000.

FISHERY WARDEN MOWATT.

Mr. WELDON enquired, Whether any action has been taken upon the Report of the Commissioners appointed to investigate the charges against Fishery Warden Mowatt, and whether any other person, and who, has been appointed Fishery Warden in his place?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Burt has been appointed in his place.

THE POSTAL SAVINGS BANK SYSTEM.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk) for Mr. JONES, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to assimilate our Postal Savings Bank system, as far as may be, to the system existing in England?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That subject is under consideration.

THE STEAMER *RIMOUSKI*.

Mr. Fiset enquired, For what purpose and for what reasons the Government have offered for sale the steamer *Rimouski*?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The steamer *Rimouski* has been pronounced unfitted for the service by the Post Office Department.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY TARIFF.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether the Government has received a classification sheet of the articles classed 1, 2, 3, 4, under the head merchandize in the Canadian Pacific Railway Tariff approved 29th April, 1881? If so, when such sheet was received, and will it be laid on the Table?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have received a duplicate of the classification sheet, which will be laid on the Table, I think, to-morrow. I cannot state the date when it was received.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether the Government has received an application from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the approval of a Tariff to come into force on 29th April instant? And whether such application and Tariff will be laid on the Table?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have not yet received it.

PRICES OF HARDWARE GOODS.

Mr. PLUMB for Mr. KIRKPATRICK, enquired, Whether the prices quoted in the *Iron Age* newspaper, are to be taken for Customs duties as the prices of hardware goods purchased in the United States? And if not, where the standard of prices or market values of hardware goods for the purpose of Customs entries can be from time to time ascertained?

Mr. BOWELL. The *Iron Age* is not accepted as the standard of price; the standard of price can be obtained in the markets in which the goods are purchased.

DAMAGE TO THE WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. ARKELL enquired, What was the extent of the damage done to Lock No. 1, on the Welland Canal, by a propellor belonging to S. Neelon, carrying away the gates in the fall of 1881; whether any and what amount was paid by the owner of the propellor; whether any security or bond was taken from the owner of the propellor before releasing it, and whether or not the lock has been properly and efficiently repaired, and at what cost, since the destruction of the gates?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The vessel *Europe* is now in St. Catharines in the dry dock undergoing repairs. Mr. Neelon, the owner, has been served with a bill of costs, amounting to \$3,599, and a bond has been prepared with two sureties; the vessel, in the meantime, is held as security, and will not be released until the bond is executed.

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

After Recess.

INSTRUCTIONS TO GOVERNORS GENERAL OF QUEBEC, &c.

Mr. MILLS moved for copies of the following papers:—

Instructions to all the Governors General of Quebec, of Upper Canada and of Lower Canada, from 1773 to 1847.

The proclamation of Lord Dochester, 24th July, 1788, wherein the District of Hesse is described.

The proclamation of Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe, 16th July, 1792, dividing Upper Canada into counties.

The Commission of Governor Simcoe, as first Governor of Upper Canada.

The correspondence between the Colonial Office and the Hudson Bay Company, relating to their territories in North America, between 1855 and 1870.

Correspondence between Canada and the Colonial Office, upon the same subject and for the same time.

The opinions of the law officers of the Crown, for the same period, upon the same subject, including the report of Sir Fitzroy Kelly and Sir Hugh Cairns, of the 30th of October, 1858.

All communications from Chief Justice Draper, during his mission to England, including that of 12th of June, 1857. Also, all instructions addressed to him upon the subject of his mission. Also, report of Hon. George Brown to Governor General, 1865. Also, all permits and licenses to cut timber west of the Provisional boundary line.

Also, copies of all grants, licenses, permits, regulations and papers, relating to transactions affecting the disputed territory.

Reports of grants to the Pacific Railway Company for the railway and for supplying timber.

All maps, field notes, &c., relating to surveys in the disputed territories.

Mr. DAWSON. As the return moved for by the hon. gentleman will require years for its preparation, I contend

it should be made as complete as possible, and I therefore beg to move the following addition be added:—

Together with all documents and correspondence whatever relating to the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company, the evidence taken before the House of Commons of England in 1857, and the instructions to Lieutenant-Governors of Upper Canada from 1791 up to the date of the Union of the Provinces."

It is highly desirable, as this large volume will cover over 100 years, it should be made as full as possible, and the hon. member can have no objection to the addition.

Mr. MILLS. I have no objection to part of the addition, but I do not see the particular relevancy of the evidence taken before the House respecting the Hudson's Bay Company. My anxiety was to obtain certain Commissions and papers which are not in our possession, and perhaps it will be necessary to go to the Colonial Office for them. Some of these papers will prove exceedingly valuable in the discussion of this question, and are equally as important to the Dominion Government as to the Ontario Government. A few of these papers are, no doubt, in the office of the Secretary of State, but many of them will not be there, and it is very desirable we should get them. None of the evidence adduced before the English House of Commons Committee, in 1857 or 1858, has any particular bearing on the subject, except two papers put in by Chief Justice Draper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We might as well obtain all the papers possible. No delay will result from adding what the hon. member for Algoma wants, and in this way we shall obtain a full return.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

LEGAL TENDER NOTES.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk) moved the following resolutions:—

Resolved,—1. That all payments hereafter to be made by the Government of the Dominion for the construction and maintenance of Public Works in Canada, shall be made legal tender notes issued under the authority of Parliament, such notes to be a full legal tender within the Dominion for the payment of all debts, public and private, and to be convertible at the option of the holder thereof into either of the following securities:—

1st. A bond or bonds of the Dominion which shall be reconvertible at any time by any of the holders thereof into the legal tender notes, and which shall be payable by the Government at its option at any time after three years from the date of issue, such bond or bonds to bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum, payable semi-annually on the first days of January and July, in each year.

2nd. A bond or bonds bearing interest at the rate of 5 per centum per annum, the said bond or bonds to be receivable together with the accrued interest thereon, in payment for any lands sold or to be sold by the Dominion.

That the Government shall set aside out of the revenues of the Dominion, a sum equal to the total amount of land bonds issued in each year, and to all the net yearly proceeds of the sales of Dominion Lands, such sum to be used as a sinking fund to be applied to the payment of the foreign public debt of the Dominion.

He said: I regret, Sir, that some hon. gentleman possessing more ability than I do, and whose utterances would have more influence and weight in the country than mine possibly can have, has not undertaken the advocacy of what I believe is a great reform. But, Sir, while I say this I would not have it understood that I am either afraid or ashamed to advocate the principle of paper money as it is commonly called. I submit, Sir, two propositions which I think will not be gainsaid. One is, that it is a fact that the periodical panics or crises which sweep over the commercial world, bringing ruin and misery in their train, are caused by a defective monetary system; and the other fact that there is nothing without a cause. I ask what is the cause of these panics? I aver and shall endeavor to prove that they are the result of a false monetary system. Money is an invention which is a benefit to the world, but by a false system it is made the means of misery. I will now undertake to show what money is, what are its uses, and why it causes the

panics to which I refer. Money is unlike anything else. It is not a natural product. There is no such thing among the productions of nature as money. Men cannot make money. They can earn it, but if a man makes money and puts more gold or silver into it than should be in the coin he is making, it is called a crime, and he is liable to punishment. What is money then? It is simply a creation of the law. And what are its uses? Its use is to measure values, and facilitate their exchange. I may be told, as I am often told: "Start a printing press and you can make money, and make men rich." That is not impossible, if money is wealth, because if the Parliament of this country were to start a printing press and create millions of legal tender notes, and give a grant of them to any individual, I apprehend that grant would make him rich. And if you were to start a printing press and make bonds and debentures, if they are wealth, you can make men rich by giving them these bonds and debentures. What is the value of money? It is not valuable because it is made of a commodity of value; its usefulness is its value. Then what is its usefulness? Its exchangeable quality; and what creates its exchangeable quality is its legal tender quality. Then money is a commodity created by the law, and it is a commodity of value, and like all commodities, it is subject to the law of supply and demand. Quantity regulates the selling price and marketable value of every commodity that has value. So it is with money; the quantity of money regulates its selling price, its marketable value, the same as any other commodity; but it does not regulate its money price, because that is a fixed quantity by law. A barrel of flour that costs \$10 is no more valuable as an article of food than if it only cost one dollar. So it is with a dollar of money; a dollar of money that would buy twenty pounds of butter is no more valuable than a dollar that would buy ten pounds of butter. Its exchangeable quality is no greater; it will pay no more debt. A dollar of money that takes two days labor to earn it is no more valuable for the payment of debt than a dollar that is earned by one day's labor, because it is a fixed quantity by law. Then, again, it is said you cannot make value by law. Well, the law can take an article that is of no value, and by converting it into money, can give it a value. Paper or metal money will rise and fall in accordance with the law of supply and demand; but neither can get below the value of the commodity that is in it; and all that there is in a dollar is this: that a man who owns a dollar has the guarantee of the Government of the country that he has something that will buy or pay for an equal quantity of the production of some other man. No man can be compelled to sell anything for money, whether it is made of paper, gold, or silver; but, having sold, he can be compelled to take money in payment. The truest and most perfect money would be that which of itself had no value, because then it would not fluctuate as a commodity; it would only fluctuate in accordance with the law of supply and demand in the thing itself; but money being a double value, fluctuates both as money and as the commodity of which that money is made. Then I hold that gold or silver, or any other commodity of value, is not fitted for money, because money is a measure of value, and a measure to be of any value must be a fixed quantity; but this money, being made of a commodity of value, never can be a fixed quantity, because it is subject to the law of supply and demand. Money does not make value; it only measures, just like a yard or a pound weight. To attempt to make any commodity of value a standard, is an absurdity, because, being a value, it fluctuates. You may take a commodity of value, and a man may say he will give so many bushels of wheat for so many grains of gold; but neither is a standard or a measure of the other. The wheat is as much the measure of the value of the gold in that case as the gold is of the

wheat. If that is not money, it simply becomes barter exchanging one commodity of value for another. Money should have no real value; because its increase in volume may so decrease the value of other articles that they cannot be produced at the price at which they would have to be exchanged into money, and their production would have to stop, because they would not pay for production. Money of value, that is, made of a commodity of value, should have no price, then it could rise or fall without increasing or depressing the price of the articles which you undertake to pay or exchange for it. Money they say is like everything else, but money earns nothing and produces nothing. If you put away \$1 for one hundred years it will only be \$1 at the end unless the value has been changed by law. Unlike other things in this respect, it is of no use to any man until he parts with it. A man might possibly have in his pockets all the money in the world, and yet it would be of no value until parted with. A man may make use of everything else while in his possession, but money to do anything for him must be parted with. The best money is that which is most convenient, and no hon. gentleman will say that paper money is not more convenient than silver or gold. It would be inconvenient to carry about a thousand dollars in gold or silver, but convenient enough to carry it in paper. The truest is paper money, because it has no value of itself; and therefore is the least subject to fluctuation from the law of supply and demand. A valueless money is a patriotic money, because every man who has a dollar knows it is of no value except for its use as money, and he has this in addition to his patriotism to induce him to sustain and support the governmental institutions of the country. If a man has \$1,000 in paper money the value of which exists only in the country of its creation, while it may not be worth 10 cents outside that country, he has an incentive to support its institutions, in addition to his patriotism, because he knows if the country goes down his money will be valueless. But the man with a \$1,000 of gold in the bank, which he knows will be taken in any part of the world, can readily withdraw it and leave his country if it should get into difficulty; he is not obliged to fight its battles. Therefore a valueless money, that is a money made of a commodity of little or no value, is a perfect money. We often hear hon. gentlemen speak of a limited money. Unless money is limited it will depreciate in value or become of no value. Money is the motor by which production and commerce are moved, and as they are a constantly increasing quantity, I ask why money should be a limited quantity? You might just as well say you will limit the number of railways, although the business of the country demands more, or limit the number of steam vessels or any other convenience for carrying on trade, as to say you will limit money, because it is simply a medium for stimulating the exchange of productions; and as production increases by inventions and the increase of mankind, therefore I hold that a limited money is a bad money. Money ought to be able to expand in accordance with the expanding commerce of a country; and if it cannot do this, it must be an insufficient and bad money—a depreciated money we hear so much about. Money, whether of gold, silver or paper, will decrease in purchasing power in accordance with its increasing quantity. But I do not believe that the history of the world can show an example of the money of a solvent country depreciating. I may be referred to the American greenback. What was the reason of its depreciation? The first \$60,000,000 of Treasury notes the American Government issued were made a legal tender for Customs duties and all debts due the Government, and these notes never depreciated, always commanding as good a premium as gold. But I care not what money the American people might have had at that time, it would have depreciated in its purchasing power, because it was superabundant. If they had two or three thousand of millions of gold money

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk).

to-day, without an increase of the goods to be bought, or the payments to be made, the tendency would be towards the depreciation of the purchasing or paying power of that money. Another reason for the depreciation of the American greenbacks: It was not money to be used everywhere; the American people issued it as payments between man and man, but not for the payments of debts owing by the nation to the Government. The Government would not take it in payment of debts due them which fact caused its depreciation, I do not propose to issue a promise to pay. A promise to pay may depreciate in accordance with the ability of the promisor to fulfil his promise. But I propose to issue a note that shall be a legal tender for its face value, and be receivable in Customs or other debts due the Government in the country. Then again hon. gentlemen will say: "This money may be all very well to carry on the internal trade of the country, but it will be of no value outside." This is incorrect; for instance, if it be a paying power in this country it would have value outside of it, the same as the American note had. The American greenback had always a value in this country because we knew we could always buy a dollar's worth of anything with it in the United States, although not so much as a dollar would purchase in our country. But labor was much higher in the United States, on account of the larger amount of money in circulation and its reduction in value. Hon. gentlemen will speak of an inconvertible currency. There can be no such thing; the very use of money is its convertibility. If it were incapable of being converted into anything, men could not use it. People also speak of irredeemable money, there is no such thing. Money is a finality—if I may be allowed the expression, it is the instrument of redemption. Every time you exchange money you redeem it. If the baker pays it to the miller or the miller to the farmer is it not redeemed. It is true I advocate a money that would not be convertible into a given quantity of gold; but it is a money that would be convertible into other things, and empowered by the law to be convertible into everything else, though not redeemable in any given article, but redeemable in everything. The worst money of all is a scarce money, because it being scarce stops commerce for the lack of a medium of exchange by which the productions of one man can be exchanged for those of another. Commerce is stopped and production ceases, this I hold is one of the causes of the depression through which we have passed. The scarcity of money prevented the exchange of productions at profitable rates, therefore production had to cease as no man could pay the rate of interest demanded for money. Scarce money, has begotten credit and usury, the two monsters, one of which creates debt which demoralizes and destroys a man, and the other eats up his substance. Scarcity of money has begotten credit in this way, that there not being enough money to carry on the business of the country, credit takes its place, and the expansion of credit carries on the industries of a country for a while, until, perhaps, some man overstrains his credit and fails. His failure brings down others, and through that cause we have all panics; and I believe that a scarce money and a fluctuating money are the causes of a panic. Scarcity of money begets usury. No man can deny that usury is to-day eating up more of the profits of the producer than anything else, and what does it do? It only keeps a lot of men living in idleness, who produce nothing, but eat the substance of those who work. How would it be if yard measures or pound weights were scarce. Would it not stop commerce to a great extent. It is just the same with scarce money. It stops production and commerce, puts back the trade of the country, and creates misery and ruin. Scarce money is always dear money and every man knows whenever money is dear everything else becomes cheap. We have had an illustration of this in this country during the last four or five

years. Money was scarce and labor was low and the country was in a depressed condition. The result is different now. Money is now abundant and cheap, and men must employ their money to get a living. They therefore employ labor and make the country more prosperous. This is one of the great causes of the prosperity of this country to-day. The National Policy and the compelling of the people to manufacture more and buy less, was one of the causes, but one of the principal causes is the increased quantity of money in circulation. The increase has made it cheap and given an impetus to the business of the country, and any hon. gentleman can convince himself of this truth by comparing the bank returns of to-day with those of 1878. In 1878 our circulation was under \$16,000,000; at the end of last month it was nearly \$32,000,000. A fluctuating money is a bad money because as you increase the quantity you stimulate business, and as you decrease the quantity you decrease the quantity of business, and the value of every article; so that you see that a fluctuating money and a scarce money are the two great evils and causes of the panics that inflict the commercial world. I hold that if there was no credit, there could be no panics. A man might lose all he had in speculation but his loss would not create any disturbance. It would injure him but the money would have passed into the pocket of someone else. There would be no loss of money to carry on business with; but you take the failure of a man who is carrying on business at credit. His failure hurts someone else and thus disturbs the trade, and the disturbance creates a panic. If there was an abundance of money there would be no necessity for credit and this is the cause of depression and panics. These panics intensify themselves in this way: the men who have capital withdraw it from circulation, and that withdrawal intensifies and magnifies the difficulty. This is the experience we went through a few years ago. I do not believe that the wealth of this country from 1874 to 1878 was less than from 1870 to 1873 when the country was much more prosperous than it was in the three later years; but there was no credit to carry on business, and men with capital were afraid to invest because they did not know whom to trust. They would not invest because they could not sell what they produced at a profit, and men would not borrow capital to do business because they could not afford to pay the interest that owners of capital charged. This was the principal reason of the great depression that existed in this country from 1874 to 1878. It was not because there was less wealth in the country, not because the productions of men were less required, because there were as many men to feed, clothe and house as in previous years, but they could not get anything to eat, comparatively speaking. Their trade was destroyed and they had to stop consumption; the stoppage of consumption stopped the demand for goods and the stoppage of the demand stopped the production of them. Now, I hold that the way to preserve credit and to prevent these panics is to make money abundant, and how can that be done? I say by the Government making it, for the Government can alone make it, and paying it out for the public works we carry on, and for the services rendered to the Government, and supplies furnished to the Government, make it a public duty to pay for value received until money is, as it ought to be, the cheapest thing in the country, until a man could not live by loaning money but would have to go to work and earn his money as the toilers do. Then I ask why should Government make it necessary to pay a high price for the use of that which it can create and make cheap? It seems to me sometimes, as if this Parliament were in league with the usurers of the country to rob the people, but knowing the hon. members, I think this cannot be. Then again it seems to me that they ought to have intelligence enough to frame a system of money that would suit the

requirements of the age. I think they are intelligent enough, and why do they not do it? Simply because they do not study the question, that they do not give the matter thought. They are willing to accept what is and go along in the old rut without undertaking to make any change. Then, Sir, I ask why should the Dominion borrow money and pay interest upon it when they can make it? When the Government go to Great Britain to borrow money what do they take? They take paper, they take bonds of this country over there and get the money for them. Now, why can they not issue smaller bonds, and let the people have the benefit of them, and save the interest upon them? There is no reason except that they will not undertake to do it. Again, Sir, I think the Government of this country can save to the people the interest on the \$32,000,000 of bank circulation. I hold that if the Parliament did its duty in this respect, and saved to the people at any rate the interest on this \$32,000,000, the Government would have the use of that money and pay it out for public works, and the people would have the use of it to do their business with and save nearly \$2,000,000 interest at 6 per cent. that is paid on this money. The Government would also save to the people the losses on their notes that the banks now get the benefit of, if the Government did, as I think they ought to do, issue the circulating medium of this country. I hold it is wrong to allow any set of men to issue the circulating medium and make money out of it, when it is both the duty and the right of the Government to create money, or anything that passes as money. Then, I say that gold is not fit for money because money is the measure of value, and gold being a commodity of value cannot be a measure, because a measure to be of any value must be a fixed quantity and this no quantity of gold ever can be, because, being a commodity of value, it is subject to the law of supply and demand and must be regulated thereby. I say gold is not fit for money because it would make a fluctuating money. The moment that gold is of more value in any country than it is in this it would go there because it is a commodity of value, because it is not money out of the country in which it is created, but it is a commodity of value and would go out of the country where it is made money to another country where gold, as a commodity, was of more value than in that country, and therefore gold money must be always a fluctuating quantity and will go where it can buy more than it could in the country of its creation, and make money scarce in that country, changing the quantity of money in that country, therefore it is a fluctuating money, and a bad money. Gold is not a standard of value, as some hon. gentlemen say, because it does not measure its own value, it is measured by the labor it costs to find it; it is not a standard of value, nothing can be a standard of value. A man's necessities are the only standards of value. A man would give all the gold in the world, if he had it, for a loaf of bread when he was starving, or a drink of water when he was thirsty; so you see gold is not a standard of value. As I said before it does not measure its own value, it is determined by the labor it costs to find it. If gold is a standard of value, as hon. gentlemen contend, it would at all times buy the same quantities of every article, but it does not. We know that to-day flour may be \$10 a barrel, and a week hence it may be only \$8 or \$6, and that shows you clearly that gold is not a standard of value, because these articles fluctuate. If they were regulated by the value of gold it would at all times buy the same quantity of all these articles, but every man knows that it does not, therefore gold is not a standard of value. Then, again, it is said that gold is valuable for money, because it is indestructible, but indestructibility does not make value. If an article is of no use it is of no value, and if an article is of no use indestructibility would make it a greater nuisance, because you could not get rid of it. Therefore, indestructibility does not create value at all. Usefulness is the only creator of

value; if a thing is of no use it is of no value. Then, again, it is said that gold is suitable for money because it is divisible. This is another absurdity. You take an article that is a nuisance and divide it and you would only have a greater number of nuisances. Take a silver dollar and divide it into four parts; you have not four quarters and you have destroyed a dollar. You have four pieces of silver that will be worth so much, but you have destroyed the amount of money so far as that is concerned. Then scarcity does not create value. If an article was the only one of its kind in the world, but of no use, it would have no value. If an article is valuable its scarcity will regulate its selling price, but it will not create value, because an article that costs ten times as much is of no more real value although its selling price has increased. As I said before, take a barrel of flour costing \$10, it is of no more intrinsic value, it will feed no more men; it will be of no more use as an article of food than if it only cost \$1, but its price has increased. In this resolution I am about to submit to the House there is a guarantee that money can never become too plentiful, because the moment a man has more money than he can use at a profit paying him more than 4 per cent., he can invest in Government bonds and then draw off the superfluous quantity of money. On the other hand, it can never become too scarce, because the moment it becomes of a higher value than 4 per cent. the bonds will be converted into money again, and that will be a regulator preventing it becoming too scarce or too abundant; it will relieve an abundance of money by giving men the power to invest in Government bonds, and it will prevent a scarcity because if the interest becomes too high a man would convert these bonds into currency, being able to do better with the currency than by keeping the money in bonds. I see the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) laughs. I do not believe all the wisdom of the world lies in his little head, although he thinks a great deal lies there. It is not always wise men who laugh. It will be said if there is no interest for money how can men derive an income from it. There is another side to this question and perhaps the payment of interest on it makes it much harder for men to make a living, and when you take this fact into consideration and put it against the other of the payment of interest it will appear that the latter prevents more men and women from earning a comfortable living than there are of men who get a comfortable living from interest on money. It will be further said, how would women make a living if no interest is allowed on money. On the other side perhaps washerwomen and women of that class would make better livings if it were not for interest charged on money. If more people had to work in order to live instead of living on interest I believe it would be better for all classes of the community. Then, again, capital is only labor realized, and if labor realized, receives more than active labor, then the former is getting more than its share; and I apprehend there is no hon. member acquainted with the business of the country for the last fifteen years who does not know that capital has had more than its share when interest has ranged from 6, 8 or 10 per cent. Farmers have sold their farms and lived on the interest, because they could do better than by tilling the land. Business men retired from business and became money lenders, because they found it more profitable to lend money than to conduct an active business. I apprehend also that 4 per cent. is a high rate of interest, because the aggregate wealth of the nation has not exceeded 3 per cent., and in view of this fact 4 per cent. is an excessive amount. If the average wealth of countries has not increased more than 3 per cent., why should money bring more than that rate of interest? I know the difficulty of getting the rate reduced. The monetary institutions have such power that they almost compel men to vote for their interest as against the general interest of the public. I admit that a higher

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk),

rate of interest on bonds payable in lands is justifiable because the country has plenty of lands and it is better to pay 5 per cent. on bonds secured on lands than to have 4 per cent. taken out of the earnings of the people. I think if this country is ever to get out of debt we ought to set apart the whole receipts from the sale of public lands in the North-West for the payment of that debt. It is the only possible way of doing it, because for three or four years past this country could not raise sufficient revenue to meet the current expenditure. We were absolutely borrowing money to pay the current expenditure.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. WALLACE. Was that not the case three or four years ago?

An hon. MEMBER. Not in our time.

Mr. WALLACE. We cannot tell how soon our circumstances may change and this country enter upon a period of adversity. We are liable to do so, and the more prosperous a country is the greater is the danger, because the more prosperous a country becomes the more quickly will it outgrow its money or gold basis, and the more it outgrows that basis the greater is the danger because more business is done on credit, and credit is the cause of the disaster. I am, therefore, an advocate of setting aside the product of the sales of all lands in the North-West for the payment of the present debt and the construction of the Pacific Railway, and I believe if this is not done Canada and the people of Canada will be heirs to a debt that will be upon them for all time to come, because after the lands are sold how are we going to pay the debt? Where are we going to get the money? It is a debt payable in gold amounting to \$157,000,000. We have no gold, and where are they now going to get it? We may get it by selling the lands to people who bring gold with them, and as I have said the money thus realized should be set apart for payment of the debt and for the construction of the Pacific Railway, and for all other purposes we should not go beyond what we ourselves can pay. In this way we could convert a large share of the debt into a debt due to our own people. It will be held that there is no difference whether we owe the money to other countries or to our own people; but it is much more desirable to pay a debt within ourselves and give employment to our labor than to send our money to foreign countries, as has been done. Look at the condition of things at the present moment. This country is paying \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 in interest to foreign countries; it goes out every year and is lost to our people and that might have been avoided by a different mode of carrying on the public business. We are rich enough to hold the debt ourselves. It may be asked, is this impracticable? What has been done in the past may be done again. The Americans floated a loan among themselves of \$476,000,000 to carry on a war, to destroy life, to waste property and to make a large portion of the country a wilderness. Out of that sum \$346,000,000 is still in circulation. On that amount the country never had a cent of interest to pay. These notes were always at par with the bonds of the country which bore interest. If the American people could loan their Government \$470,000,000, or, taking the population of the Northern States, about \$15 per head in three or four years, the people of Canada can surely loan a sum of money sufficient to carry on the public works of the country and keep the interest within the country, if the Government had only courage enough, and if Parliament will only give them power, to adopt this system of carrying on the business of the country. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) says that \$470,000,000 of paper currency were so discounted as to be only equal to \$120,000,000, but he will remember that they only paid their soldiers \$14 a month, and they could not have paid them much less than that in any case. But admitting

that it was true that this amount of money was only worth \$120,000,000 of gold, their bonds were equally depreciated and if they issued \$470,000,000 they had the twenty years since the war discontinued to pay them. They would have paid twice that sum in interest, but they never paid a cent of interest on greenbacks which were issued and which have been in circulation since that time. Under this system the power of the people in this country to construct public works could only be limited in one way, and that would be until so much of their surplus production was invested in public works that they would not have enough to pay for the necessities of life which they could not produce. There will be no limit in this way, because the money invested would be given to the people, would circulate amongst them, would give employment to labor, would create more wealth, which would enable them to do more business to advance the interests and develop the resources of the country. There is no doubt that the American manufacturers started into business immediately after the war when there was abundance of money and men felt disposed to go into all sorts of enterprises. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that they started too many manufactures and that hence there was an over-production and ruin. But ruin was not caused by over-production, but by contraction of the currency in the United States as any hon. gentleman will see who takes the pains to trace the history of that depression. It was not over-production, but the fact that the consuming power of the people was stopped. They could not earn the wages they had formerly earned and they were thrown out of employment. But why were they thrown out of employment? It was because the currency was contracted and money was so high, that they could not use it in their business. Again, why is it that we who have more wealth in this country than England, have, however, to go to England to borrow money? Do not all our fertile lands, our forests, our minerals, constitute wealth? In only two respects is England more wealthy than we are. She has more labor, and consequently more labor realized. But we have the labor and we have the wealth. Were we only to utilize that wealth so as to enable us to use it within ourselves, we might, instead of borrowing money in England, use our own money and develop our own resources. Money itself can do no good; it must be labor which creates. Now what is the difference between the labor employed with the gold dollar, and the labor employed with the paper dollar? Would not a paper dollar earn that labor? Is it not as much a representative of the labor that earned it as the gold dollar is the representative of the labor that earned it? Would not one be as useful as the other for the purposes for which a man requires money? I hold that it would, and I say it is humiliating to see our hon. Finance Minister running to England to borrow money when we are more wealthy than the people of England. I say it is humiliating to see the hon. Finance Minister of this country going, hat in hand, to the Shylocks of Lombard street to beg a few millions to carry on the public works of this country. I say it is a degradation to any Canadian to hear their hon. Finance Minister saying that he had to show the silver side of the shield in order to get the financiers of Great Britain to lend him their money. What was that but getting money under false pretences? Has it come to this, that the people of Canada have to play the part of swindlers, as the late hon. Finance Minister said they had, in order to borrow money in England? I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides, not to think of the imperfect way to which I have been able to bring these propositions before them, but to throw aside their partizanship and do what they believe to be best in the interests of the country; and although this scheme may not be the best, let them see if there may not be evolved out of it something which may be for the

benefit of the country. I believe there can. I believe it is wrong to compel the people of this country to borrow money and pay interest which can be avoided; and therefore I beseech hon. gentlemen, calmly and dispassionately to look at this question and see if they cannot devise some better plan of raising money than the one now adopted.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. mover of this resolution spoke at the close of his remarks of the imperfect manner, as he was pleased to say, in which he had presented his case. Now, it is perhaps doubtful if there is any other gentleman in the Dominion of Canada who has given this subject more consideration, who understands the subject better, or who could present it in a more forcible manner than the hon. gentleman himself. But Sir, notwithstanding that, I for one, am so obtuse that I have not been able to accept my hon. friend's proposition, nor am I prepared to say that I can give him my vote for it. The hon. member, in advocating it, makes use of this language: "Why borrow and pay interest for money when you can make it?" Now, that is a taking proposition; if we can make money for all the purposes for which we require it, by simply the authority of Parliament, it is a very cheap way of paying our debts and building our public works; but my hon. friend, in order to give a value and a currency to this very paper to which he refers, provides that we shall have to pay an interest on it practically, because he says that any person in Canada, holding \$100 or \$1,000 or \$100,000 could go to the Government and obtain a 4 per cent. security for it—or a 5 per cent. security under certain circumstances, for which he could pay for Dominion Lands. Now, what is the practical effect of this? I admit that this proposition would give to the money a value that it would not possess under the ordinary proposition in favor of an irredeemable currency; but if my hon. friend were to succeed in obtaining an issue of \$15,000,000 to pay for the public works for which Parliament will vote the supplies this Session, this paper would return to the Government, and we would have to pay 4 or 5 per cent. on it. Now, at present we do not require as much as this, and we get all the money we need from the working people of the Dominion to-day at 4 per cent.; and if we had to take this paper money and use it for public works, we would have to say to the industrial classes everywhere, whose money we are now receiving: "We cannot receive it from you at all, unless you buy 4 or 5 per cent. securities for it." We would be at the expense of printing the notes, besides having to pay 4 or 5 per cent. instead of 4 per cent. Supposing we paid to contractors and others \$15,000,000 in these notes, in the first place would they take them—would they be bound to take them under their contract?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Pass a law to make them take them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Suppose the law made them take them, and suppose they went to pay them into a bank from which they had obtained advances to enable them to carry on their work, and the banks would say: "We will take these at 20 per cent. discount."

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Make the banks take them also.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. You can do a good many things by law; but if a man wanted to pay these notes into a bank, and he found that he could not convert them into gold except at a discount, the result would be that, if he had to accept a discount of 10 or 20 per cent., he would come back to the Government and say: "You must pay us for what we lost on this circulation." It is quite clear that we could not issue circulation for any large amount, as is proposed by this resolution, to pay for public works chargeable to capital. We could not put into circulation, this

year, \$15,000,000 of this irredeemable paper without depreciating its value. The discount might be large or small, but still it would be a discount, and every man, woman and child, for every dollar we gave them of it, would only receive 90 cents, or whatever the discount would be, and would lose the balance. My hon. friend makes some provision against loss by saying that if the banks would not take these notes the Government would have to take them in payment of Excise and Customs duties; but when the Government wanted exchange to send to England in payment of interest, I doubt if we could get it for anything like what we can at present. The hon. gentleman's proposition that the proceeds from the sale of lands in the North-West shall be taken and used for the redemption of debt and the construction of public works, I am entirely in accord with. I may say that the Government have decided that the money we shall receive during the present year shall be so used, either for the redemption of debt or the construction of the Pacific Railway. Although the hon. gentleman has given a value to his notes by providing that they could be exchanged for 4 or 5 per cent. securities, that would not prevent them from depreciating.

Mr. McDougall. Would the interest be paid in the same note, or in other money?

Sir Leonard Tilley. There would be some little saving in that, but that would not make much difference, because if we paid the interest in them, we would have to take them for Customs and Excise duties. Under the circumstances, whenever the vote is taken, I cannot promise to support the proposition of my hon. friend, although the latter part of the motion is important and I am entirely at one with him on it. But on the circulation of notes, I will not be able to support him.

Mr. Charlton. There can be no doubt the member for South Norfolk deserves respect for the earnestness and honesty with which he advocates his views, but I cannot but regard them as radically wrong, and in the highest degree dangerous. He informs us that the truest money is paper, because it has the least value; and that the less value money has, the more properly it fulfils the functions of money. We have had several experiments in history with that money. Several nations have used money perfectly worthless, and in every case it has been found quite the reverse of good. Money of that character has invariably involved the nation in serious difficulties, and in almost every case in bankruptcies and ruin. The hon. gentleman tells us, that if a man has gold, he can take it to any part of the world and that is not true money; that we want a money kept at home and that will not circulate abroad—that cannot be exported. Well, there are various articles that cannot be exported that we do not consider of value. We cannot export rotten eggs, spoiled bacon, or anything worthless; and it is simply for the reason that paper money is valueless that it cannot be exported. Gold, on the contrary, is an article worth its nominal value in any part of the world; consequently it can be exported. But it is an article which, he informs us, is not money in his estimation. Then he tells us we ought to have a money that we can expand. Under our bank system, we can expand our money; the banks are always ready to extend the circulation, and the amount of circulation they can secure is actually in proportion to the demand for money. Scarce money creates usury, he says. Now, it is a singular fact attendant upon the issue of irredeemable and worthless money, that the rates of interest are always high. In the United States, during the greenback period, interest in New York ranged from 13 to 18 per cent. per annum. It is because the lender of money has an article that he is certain will return to his hands depreciated, that he requires a very high rate of interest, not only to afford legitimate rate of

Sir Leonard Tilley.

interest, but to cover the supposed depreciation between the time he lends and receives back that money. Consequently, it is a feature of depreciated money in all cases, that the rates of interest are extremely high. There is no country in the world that the rates of interest are lower than in England, which has the most stable currency, based in gold and the smallest amounts of money current in proportion to its business. Besides, the effect of paper money on labor is uniformly disastrous. When money begins to depreciate, it is always found that the price of food rises more rapidly than the price of labor. In the United States, while such articles of necessity, used by the laboring classes, advanced 100 per cent. in value, the advance in the price of labor was only a trifle over 50 per cent. The same state of things existed when the people of the United States attempted to return to specie payments—the fall in the price of labor was uniformly more rapid than the fall in the necessities of life—so in both cases labor was the principal sufferer. The hon. gentleman tells us also that a fluctuating money creates scarcity and is bad. At different seasons and in different years the demand for money varies. In the fall when the crop has to be moved a larger amount, of course, is required than in spring, when there is no unusual demand; and the most commendable feature of the present feature is that when money is not required it is drawn into the bank. When it is required it goes into circulation, and the amount in circulation conforms to the want of the public. When money is not redeemable it has to be kept afloat, and various serious evils result. The hon. gentleman seems to mean that he could create a state of things when we should have a perfect Utopia for the impecunious, for the improvident and the shiftless, when but little interest would be exacted. I think he is much mistaken; the experience of the world shows the exact reverse of the case. He tells us we have gold to pay our public debt with. What does he propose to do with that debt, exceeding \$157,000,000. It is contracted on the condition that it shall be paid in gold or its equivalent? Does he propose we should repudiate that debt, when he succeeds in getting the country to adopt his theories; or how does he propose to dispose of it? He then proceeds to tell us that the American notes were always on a par with bonds. He is entirely mistaken. The American bonds almost immediately after the close of the war were at a premium, which have advanced since. These bonds were payable in gold, however. The notes issued by the Government were not received in Customs dues, which were payable in gold, and for that reason as soon as it became apparent that there was a prospect of the Government ultimately redeeming their bonds, they at once advanced beyond their par value in the currency. They are above the value of gold to-day, and have been above the par value of American notes ever since 1865. He also tells us that ruin in the United States was caused by the contraction of the currency. I will not deny that when attention was turned upon those notes, upon the vicious course in fiscal matters pursued by the Government, when the people considered the large amount of irredeemable currency, that when the time came for the Government to retrace its steps that the process was discovered to be an injurious and painful one. There will, in the course of the getting rid of the irredeemable currency and arriving at a specie basis, be some difficulty in the way, of course. That difficulty was experienced in the United States, but the fact that depression in the United States continued for five years up to the very moment that they resumed specie payment, 1st January, 1879, and from that moment a tide of prosperity set in that has continued to the present day, is conclusive evidence, in my opinion, that a currency basis of gold is a proper currency for a country. I do not intend to detain the House with this question at any length. I rose for the purpose of presenting a few plain facts that would set at rest forever in the mind of any intelligent man, all fine specie theories, such

as those propounded by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The world has had a good deal of experience in this matter. It extends back many ages, and has uniformly been diametrically opposite to the theory of my hon. friend. As long ago as the ninth century Cluna anticipated my hon. friend by issuing fiat money and secured its circulation by making the penalty death to refuse it. Yet the fiat money, after entailing loss and ruin upon the country, finally passed away. The American Colonies, also thinking that they were wise above their day and generation, tried the same policy, and suffered serious distress in consequence of issuing money of this character. When the thirteen colonies revolted, they issued a large amount of "continental" money. That money fulfilled to the letter the requirements of my hon. friend. It being an abundant and a worthless money, some \$250,000,000 of it were floated, and it was finally got rid of by repudiation and bankruptcy—three thousand dollars being purchasable before it passed finally out of circulation for one dollar specie. The French Republic also failing to profit by the experience of the George Law scheme, tried the same plan of issuing abundant money. It was issued to the extent of many billions of francs, and it is the testimony of history that the result entailed more disaster, more hardship upon that country than all the horrors of the revolution and all the wars that followed the revolution. That is the testimony of history, of every public man in France; and the experience that France has had in this matter was so salutary, that I venture to say ages will pass before that country will ever make a similar attempt. England, under the press of circumstances, was obliged to suspend specie payment, and England is one of the very few cases where a nation which once embarked on that principle returned to specie payment without going by the road of bankruptcy and ruin. At a great sacrifice she returned to specie payment, and her struggles lasted until specie payment was resumed. The Confederate States of America issued a currency almost exactly conformable to the requirements of my hon. friend. It was not redeemable. They did not profess it to be redeemable until after they achieved their independence. That currency was worth only three cents on the dollar, and finally was obliterated by bankruptcy and disaster. The United States issued greenbacks, and it is the testimony of men conversant with the subject that had the United States, at the time it required \$275 in greenbacks to purchase \$1.00 in silver, had a further issue been made the result would have been the utter prostration of credit, the utter ruin of the United States, and their inability to suppress the rebellion. They had the wisdom to refrain from a further issue, to decree that no further issue would be made and that the Government would resume specie payment at the earliest possible date. This declaration inspired a degree of confidence sufficient to carry the nation through its great crisis. At the present day we are able to point within a reasonable period to the fact that England, having tried the currency system, returned to the specie payment; that the United States having tried it also, returned to specie payment; that the Kingdom of Italy, after having tried an irredeemable currency for many years, is taking steps to return to specie payment, and will speedily do so. I repeat that the lessons taught us by history point uniformly to the fact that the adoption of this principle advocated by the hon. gentleman for South Norfolk has in every instance entailed great loss, and in the majority of instances bankruptcy and utter ruin upon the nation that adopted it. The greenback party in the United States has almost ceased to be a party. It has passed away before the stern and logic effects which have demonstrated that the theory is entirely wrong. I hope the day will be far distant when any but a few theorists will ever entertain any views such as those propounded by the hon. member for South Norfolk to-night.

Mr. McCALLUM. I may not go the length that the hon. member for South Norfolk goes, but I go this far: I hold that the Government should issue all bills for this reason, that a dollar would be good in all portions of the Dominion. I hold further that if the Government should issue all the money, and if the Government made currency in notes and bonds drawing 4 per cent. interest, the interest being payable in gold, semi-annually, and have the one convertible into the other at the option of the holder, it would give cheap money to this country, and cheap money is very desirable in the interests of the people. The hon. Minister of Finance says we can borrow all the money we want from our people at 4 per cent.; that is something new to me, and I hope hereafter we shall not go to England for any more money. If the Government had the issuing of all the money, whether notes or bonds, the one convertible into the other at the option of the holder, that money would keep up to par. Supposing we issued to the extent of \$80,000,000, \$10,000,000 bonds and \$40,000,000 notes, that \$80,000,000 would cost the people but 2 per cent. If the one was convertible into the other, at the option of the holder—if money become as dear as 6 or 7 per cent. in the country, a man holding bonds would get them converted into paper money and obtain the benefit of this increase of interest. When that money would go into circulation it would lower the rate of interest down to 5 per cent. If the value of interest fell below 5 per cent. a man would rather have Government security, and the money would come back for bonds, and these changes would take place according to the law of supply and demand. It would keep money cheap, and cheap money is very necessary because capital and labor jointly produce wealth, and whenever capital gets more than a fair share of course labor must suffer. I was surprised to-night to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk abusing the American greenback. Well, he must admit that the people of the United States tried to borrow money from the capitalists of New York, and all the money they could borrow amongst their own people was something like \$20,000,000, for which they had to pay 10 or 14 per cent. Then they issued paper money and compelled people to take it. If our Government issued greenback money it would be for the purpose of paying public improvements, whereas the United States issued money to carry on their war. If we issued money it would come back here; certainly, the Government should take it for all debts due the Government. Of course it would not cost them anything but the printing; that is very little, and I say now that the Government of the country ought to use its credit in order to save the interest on the circulation. Then whatever is made in the circulation will belong to the people collectively and not to the banks as at present. The Government should not give the banks the power to issue money, but they should have kept that power in their own hands. The Minister of Finance says that the contractors would not take this money because it would depreciate and be below par. Now, I do not think that money issued by the Government of this country, backed by all the resources of the country, is going to depreciate. The Minister of Finance asks where we are going to get gold to pay our foreign indebtedness. Would you have any less gold than you have now if the Government were to issue paper money? You would not. How do you get gold now? By digging it out of the ground and by receiving it in exchange for our products. Now, if the Government issued paper money in order to save the interest on circulation, are we going to have less production in this country and less gold-mining out of the ground? I say no; but I say that we would have less use for it, and we would have the same facilities in making our exchanges with foreign countries. I believe if the Government of the country were to take the power for themselves it would be a good thing for this country. You may say it is a little too

lute and that it ought to have been done before the bank charters were granted; but there is no harm in agitating this question and I think it will do good, and I think the time is coming when the Government will be called upon to take the issue of money into their own hands and make the profit on it for the benefit of the people.

Mr. HESSON. I rise to express my sympathy with the resolutions of the hon. member for South Norfolk. They may not be in a shape perfectly acceptable to the House and the country, but I think there is something in this proposition that would be in the interest of Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk said a few minutes ago that the greenback issue had been an injury to the United States during their civil war. Sir, I hold that the greenback issue of that time by the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Chase, saved the nation. Nothing else could have saved it but the issue of paper. It did depreciate for a time, owing to the gold brokers of the country. The necessities of the country required a very large issue just then, and the brokers naturally commenced to fix a value according to the gold basis; and it is no surprise to me, in looking back to that time, that the greenbacks should depreciate. I think the hon. member should not have instanced that as a case in point. The hon. member for South Norfolk does not propose to issue greenbacks to pay the national debt, to destroy trade and commerce by a war, but he proposes just the opposite of it. His purpose is to create wealth in the country by building up great arteries of commerce, railways and canals and other public works, and surely no purpose can be more directly opposed to the purpose designed by the United States Government. The wealth of the country does not consist in the gold and silver we possess, but it consists in our mines, our minerals, our forests, our lands and fisheries, and above all it consists in our labor. It takes all these to create wealth in the country. The greatest portion of the gold and silver in the country is held by the banks, and yet we find from the last returns that they held only \$6,719,595. Sir, there is no gentleman in this House, and there is no intelligent man in the country, who will say to-day that that is a fair basis for the trade and commerce of this great country. We find that on the 31st of March last the paper circulation issued by the banks amounted to \$32,124,142. Besides this liability they owe to depositors no less than \$92,500,000, and they owe to the Government deposits of \$5,726,118 payable on demand; they owe to the Government, payable on notice, \$4,968,516; to the Provincial Governments, \$2,444,082 of deposits; total deposits, including circulation, \$144,619,988. Will the hon. gentleman say that \$6,919,595 is a sufficient reserve and a fair proportion to hold against liabilities such as I have named, and I must confess they are liabilities in the true sense of the term. I refer to the deposits, and I will say nothing about paid-up stock and capital. On those two items alone we have an amount which would pay only five cents on the dollar, held in banks to-day in the shape of specie reserve. I know hon. gentlemen will say that the banks have large assets besides that sum. What are they? They are composed of promises to pay. Discounted notes amount to \$129,165,593. I will ask any hon. member if that asset is equal to gold? If individual promises to pay are equal to Government promises to pay. It is a surprise to me that the hon. the Finance Minister has not affirmed that the notes issued by the Government are not better security than those issued by the banks; and I have proved from their own returns that the amount of specie in reserve is equivalent to not more than five cents on the dollar on all the liabilities of the banks, their deposits and circulation. I have another reason for supporting this resolution. I feel we have great public works to construct, and I know that unless the receipts from those sources on which the hon. Finance Minister is now depending, the Savings Banks deposits and the Post Office deposits, continue to come in to

Mr. McCALLUM.

such an extent as will meet the expenditure there is but one other course to adopt, the Finance Minister again goes to England and borrows money. I will trouble the House for a few moments by reading a brief statement of the amount of interest this country has had to pay, not to our own population, not to circulate in Canada, but to go to foreigners and to increase their wealth. In 1867 we paid in interest, \$4,851,710; in 1868, \$4,974,279; in 1869, \$5,188,641; in 1870, \$5,355,614; in 1871, \$5,371,082; in 1872, \$5,435,599; in 1873, \$5,549,374; in 1874, \$6,122,844; in 1875, \$6,340,056; in 1876, \$6,753,171; in 1877, \$7,132,408; in 1878, \$7,100,038; in 1879, \$7,281,018; in 1880, \$7,625,065; in 1881, \$7,703,735. The total debt in 1867 was \$93,046,051. If hon. members will look at the figures and consider the rate of progress made from that time to this in the national expenditure, and remember that the interest has gone out of the country, it will no longer be a matter of surprise that the banks have such a small amount of gold in reserve. There is no hon. gentleman who will deny that the Government must meet this interest, and that it will be more prudent if the interest were paid to our own people instead of sending it abroad. Almost all the receipts rising from the labor of this great country have to be exported surplus, because after the products of the farm, the forest and the mine have gone to the Old Land, they have to be sold for gold to pay the foreigner interest, instead of being sent back here in gold. I hold we cannot have a gold basis under such circumstances, and if the Government do not alter this present arrangement in that respect and not allow the interest to continue as it has been, the increase in the last fifteen years averaging no less than \$6,000,000 omitting fractions, a most alarming state of things will present itself; the Government has great works still to carry on, it has still to go abroad to increase our national indebtedness by borrowing, thereby increasing the interest we have to pay and exporting that back again to the Old Country in gold and silver, it is impossible we can ever reach that position in which we can reduce our foreign indebtedness. The issue of Dominion notes has not been as satisfactory, according to the hon. the Finance Minister, as he had a right to expect. I believe that any legal tender is redeemable if a Government will accept it and make it to be accepted by all parties. It is not necessary to have paper money that would be accepted for purposes of exportation; even if such were not the case, it might prove very beneficial in our own country. If I wanted to buy a sterling draft I would have to go to some bank or broker; I cannot export Bank of Montreal bills, but I must go and exchange them and pay the current rate. The Dominion notes, would occupy a better position because they would be employed all through the country. The dealers in cattle and farm products, fish, and other commodities, would gladly accept Dominion notes, and commercial men engaged in the exports of the products of the country would bring back here sterling bills or gold; and by that means the Government would be placed in a position to obtain what they required for the purpose of paying the foreign indebtedness, either the sinking fund or interest. Again, the Government requires an amount in the neighborhood of \$26,000,000 a year for current expenses. The hon. Finance Minister says he will find it necessary during the present year to issue no less than \$15,000,000 or obtain no less than that; he hopes to obtain that from the present deposits in the banks and borrowing further from the deposits. They require larger quantities of sterling exchange than any private individual possibly can require, and they can go into the market and get it on satisfactory terms. I think the Government will have no difficulty under such circumstances, especially with the energy which we possess, and also from the fact that we would not be creating a national debt and are to a large

extent relieving ourselves of interest, and thereby placing ourselves in a better financial position than any country can hope to be placed in under other circumstances. Holding these views I feel that I am justified in supporting the resolution of my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace). I would go even further than he has suggested and would give the banks five or seven or ten years to redeem the circulation gradually. The banks have a paid-up capital of \$59,702,637; their circulation is \$32,524,142; their gold reserve is \$6,719,595; their Dominion note reserve, and which they are compelled to hold by Act of Parliament is \$9,598,431, making a total reserve of \$16,318,026 lying idle to protect a circulation of \$32,524,142, and beyond which they dare not issue without further locking up their capital by increasing the reserve required to be held under their charter. It will be seen then that the \$32,524,142 circulating has to earn interest not only for itself but also for the reserve locked up and which they dare not circulate. Now, if their whole paid-up capital stock of \$59,702,637 were in Government notes they would be at liberty to lend every dollar so long as they got good security, and thus a lower rate of interest would in the end prevail, possibly better for themselves, and most certainly for the borrowing public. No panic could be possible, nor would they be called upon to redeem these notes, or limit their loans as at present. On this basis I assume their own issue would be called in gradually and Government bills take their place. I say it is not in the interests of the people of this country that any private institution should have the advantage of issuing promises to pay to such an unlimited extent as the banks now possess that advantage. The Government as the representatives of the people should share in that advantage. Under the proposed plan the \$32,000,000 required to do the business of the country would be paid out by the Government for labor. They would receive full value for it, it would circulate through the country in legal tender notes; and upon those notes there would not be a dollar of interest to pay. The laboring man and the mechanic or business man could go to the Government with his savings and say: "I will exchange the circulating medium for Dominion notes at 4 or 5 per cent," and it is only upon that that the hon. Finance Minister would be called upon to pay interest and that amount would be retained in the country instead of being exported as it is to-day. For these reasons and others I support the resolutions.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). I think we should feel thankful to the hon. gentleman for the able manner in which he has placed his resolutions before the House. In my opinion they are a step in the right direction—they are in the direction of a measure which would meet with the hearty approval of the people. There is nothing that would be more popular with the people than a feeling that the Government are prepared to give them every opportunity to place their money at the disposal of the Government and receive for it a certain rate of interest, and this is a question which ought, it seems to me, to engage the earnest attention of the Government. We have great public works whose completion is necessary to the progress of this country, and we should, if possible, devise some means whereby to carry them on without going to foreign countries to borrow money. I do not believe it would be a popular movement for the Government to go to England to borrow fifteen or twenty millions to complete these great works, yet I believe the people will demand that these great works should be completed. It is well known that in the United States there are great railway monopolies, and we are getting the same thing in Canada, but we are in a position superior to that of the United States, because if we had our great water communications under way I defy the establishment of any great railway monopoly. I believe a scheme can be introduced by which

these great public works may be proceeded with immediately and with rapidity, so that they may stand no longer in a half-finished state, in a state almost disgraceful, the two ends being finished while the middle is imperfect. It would be in the interests of the taxpayers to have these works completed, supposing there was not a toll collected on them, except sufficient to pay the cost of management; and it is not beyond possibility—it is within the reach of the Government—to devise a plan by which that work could be proceeded with at a rate and in a manner which would not be injurious to the financial condition of the country. Our national debt is a very large one, and we should be very careful of increasing it, and although the present may not be the best plan, still it is in the direction of a plan by which we could proceed with these works without exciting the people of this country with the idea that we are piling up a national debt which cannot be wiped out. With the great domain we have to sell and the other means we have at command by which money could be reproduced, there is no reason why money could not be put in circulation to wipe out this debt and to carry on our public works. I have no apprehension that our currency would be depreciated; I believe the people would be only too ready to make use of it. The only thing that stands in the way of the adoption of such a system is the great banking interests of the country, with which we seem afraid to interfere with. These banking people build beautiful and costly edifices; they become millionaires; they are almost above doing anything like work, but all their gains come out of the pockets of the people, and if our Government had the nerve to say to these people that the Government of the country would assume the circulation, the people would be the gainers. I do not intend to prolong the debate, but I think the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) deserves the thanks of the House and the country, for the earnest attention he has devoted to this subject, and I believe his resolutions are in the right direction. I hope he will live to see the day when the scheme he has initiated to-night will tell in his favor.

Mr. WALLACE (South Norfolk). I cannot agree with the Finance Minister that it is necessary to make these notes convertible into bonds to make them current in this country. I think the fiat of the Government alone would be sufficient to do that. Let the Government create money and make it a legal tender, and every man will be glad to get it for the payment of debts. It is only for the payment of debt that money is of value, and it would not be a legal tender unless it had the fiat of the Government upon it. The hon. member for North Norfolk talks about fiat money. I would like him to tell me of any money that had not the fiat of the Government. Take a sovereign and melt it down and it would not be money, because it would cease to have the fiat of the Government on it; it would be value, but it would not be money. Then the hon. Finance Minister says these notes would return to the Government. I apprehend that many of them would be wanted for circulation. He says that this year we want \$15,000,000. The difference between this year and 1878 in the circulation of the country is \$16,000,000, and I do not believe there is a man in Canada who would say that we have too much circulation, or enough. What are the facts? To-day our circulation is equal to eight dollars a head of the population; that of the United States is twenty dollars, of England twenty nine dollars, of France forty-four dollars a head of the population. The hon. member for North Norfolk says the business of England is largely done in gold and silver. Why, Sir, I read that the business of the world—ninety transactions out of every hundred, are done upon credit. That hon. gentleman refers to the money of the United States Confederacy. Why, the Confederacy itself was swept out of existence; and the power of the Confederate money or of any money is only equal to the power

that created it; when the nation ceased to exist, its money was of no value. It is true if its money was made of gold and silver, as a commodity of value, that would have value, but it would not be money. The hon. gentleman also refers to the assignats of France. They were promises to pay, and not money at all. But there was paper money in Venice, and for hundreds of years the paper money of that city was at par, and many times at a premium over gold, and they had to pass a law making it criminal to take a greater premium for it than 20 per cent. And the hon. gentleman cannot point to an instance in the world in which the paper money of a solvent country has depreciated. The promises to pay of a nation may depreciate, as those of an individual do. Look at the absurdity of a country or of a man promising to pay what they have not got. The Government of Canada are making promises to pay \$100,000,000 with only \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 of gold to pay for it. The hon. Finance Minister asks where are we going to get gold to pay the public debt with? Well, I apprehend the only way is to sell our productions and get gold for them. As my hon. friend from Monck has said, would the paper money give us any less productions to sell, or bring any fewer people to this country to produce, than if there was no paper money? No; the increase of paper money would increase the employment of the people, and give us better facilities for getting gold than we have now. The hon. Finance Minister says that if we went to a bank and wanted to buy exchange on England, he apprehended that the bank would ask us a discount for exchange. If the balance of trade were against us exchange would be high, just as it is now. I do not believe there is a man in this Dominion who to-day would not rather have the money or the note of this Dominion than the note of any bank in it. I would like to know if the money issued by the Government of this country, backed by all the property of this country, is not better than any bank note backed by gold, when the gold is not there—as we have learned to our sorrow in many cases—in the case of the Bank of Upper Canada, the Commercial Bank, the Consolidated Bank, the Farmer's Bank and many others. Then my hon. friend says that paper money cannot be exported. To-day the American greenback is at a premium over gold in England because it is more easily transported to this country than gold. There is no trouble in exporting paper money. Supposing an English broker has a thousand dollars of Canadian money; he says: "That will buy so much wheat, so much butter, so many head of cattle, and these articles brought to this country, are worth so much, and therefore I will give that for it." As long as the country that issues the money is solvent, it has a value in every country with which that country trades, while gold might go to some country and never come back to us, our paper money would come back to pay for labor and to increase production in this country. The hon. member for North Norfolk says we have a system of money expansion now. Where is it? Bank notes are not money; they are promises to pay money; and all the money we have is the little quantity of gold, amounting to \$6,000,000, which the hon. member for North Perth has mentioned. It is impossible to get gold enough to do the business of the world, and this is one of the causes, as I have said before, of the panics and disasters that accrue to business periodically. The hon. gentleman said this money was hard upon the laboring classes. I would like to ask him if there ever was a period in the history of the United States when the laboring classes were so well employed or had better times than during the abundant circulation of paper money. There was greater prosperity in that country at that time than there ever was before or has been since, and the decrease of the circulation was what caused misery and ruin in the country, and caused it to be filled with tramps a few years ago. And what to-day is making things better? It is the large

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk),

amount of gold pouring into that country for the produce of the soil. The gold has given them an increased circulating medium to afford a stimulus to business. When England was in a state of ruin, with her trade paralyzed, what did her statesmen do? They suspended specie payments, and immediate relief was given to the depression. At another time they issued a large amount of Treasury notes which relieved the pressure of the people and increased their prosperity. You cannot show in the history of the world when money was abundant and labor not high, and the country prosperous; and, on the other hand, you cannot show you cannot give an instance of the scarcity of money unaccompanied by depression and ruin. My hon. friend opposite says the greenback party in the United States has past away. I think he is not a good observer of current events, because in 1876, when Peter Cooper ran for President, the greenback vote only amounted to 80,000. But last time, when General Weaver ran on that ticket he had nearly 500,000 votes—that does not show that the greenback vote has passed away; and the State of Maine elected a greenback Governor. But were it as stated, that would not alter the principle; because the Americans did not issue any money but promises to pay—a debased money that they would not take in payment of debts due them—but which they only made a legal tender as between individuals, and as to debts due by the Government to individuals. It could not be but expected that that money would depreciate under such circumstances. My hon. friend from South Perth has just given me a memorandum, which shows that in 1876 our national debt was \$93,046,051, and since that period we have paid almost an equal amount in interest, namely, \$92,791,690. The hon. the Finance Minister said he would not save anything in interest by my scheme. I believe, if a good paper currency was put in circulation, a large amount would be used by the people, and we should thus save the interest, which now goes to the banks as a profit on their circulation. Instead of having a bank circulation, we should have a Government circulation, thus saving that money to the people. In conclusion I must say that I spoke rather hastily to my hon. friend from Niagara, which I now regret; but I thought he was sneering at me. Perhaps I was over-sensitive and did him wrong, and therefore I apologize for it.

Mr. RYKERT. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. PLUMB. I accept the graceful apology of the member for South Norfolk. There could be no hostility or ill-feeling between two old friends like ourselves, who have stood side by side for years fighting the battles of the Conservative party. But I cannot agree with my hon. friend in those theories which he periodically puts before the House. I do not believe it is possible for any country to issue a paper currency, unless it is absolutely redeemable at par upon a gold standard and basis and to escape the disastrous consequences of its depreciation. I do not believe there is any power in any Government to stamp a piece of irredeemable paper and put it into circulation, and enable it to perform all the functions of gold, which is the recognized currency of the world, and to prevent its purchasing power from being reduced or lessened. That is the experience of the world everywhere. It is entirely beside the argument to talk about the product of labour or about the outlay of the Government upon public works which lead to the most dangerous temptations to spend easily created paper money. The truth is that every dollar expended by the Government, or by corporations or individuals, on public works, such as railways, canals, and the like, is so much money actually sunk, and the labor expended is absolutely, for the time being, unproductive, and unless these works pay returns upon the capital expended the money is absolutely lost. Labor, in the sense of producing that which will support

the community, that which produces the necessaries of life. has a certain value, that labor put into railways or canals or anything of that kind is absolutely so much capital buried until the time comes, if it comes at all, when they yield returns. My hon. friend has uttered a fallacy, because he has made a general statement which is only true in one or two particulars, and has built an argument thereupon, and because he has not taken into consideration the fact that the world in general long ago, by common consent and necessity, adopted a certain measure of value. That measure is not theoretically perfect, but is the best we can get because it represents, as a general rule, the very lowest reward of labor in its production. It is said that all the gold of California, put together, only represented in the aggregate one dollar a day for the people engaged in mining it. Gold is chosen at a measure of value for several reasons: first, because it is indestructible; next, because it is ductile and easily divisible; and next, because it is everywhere diffused; next, because it contains great weight in a small bulk; and next, because it represents as nearly as possible the lowest reward of labor and is the scarcest of the generally diffused metals. No country can afford to depart from it as a measure of value, no country can make a standard of its own, no Government or country can issue a paper currency which is not redeemable in gold on demand, dollar for dollar, and by any enactment prevent it from fluctuating and declining in value. It can have no settled value unless it has some sort of absolutely permanent purchasing power, which is ascertainable by exchanging it for an equal sum in gold. There is no doubt that no device is so eminently calculated to defraud labor of its just reward as an irredeemable currency. The man who has to sell his day's labor each day in the market must accept what he can get for it, and take the risk of loss if he is paid in a currency which is not measured and fixed by a gold standard. The effect of depreciated paper fluctuating in purchasing power is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Its evil effects fall upon those who by each day's labor gain each day's bread; and if at the end of the day they are compelled to take the paper dollar which will not bring more than 90 cents in gold they must bear the loss. I intend always to raise my voice against theories advocating an issue of practically irredeemable paper, which, though not nominally, must be really depreciated while it continues to be measured by the commonly accepted standard of the world. We have heard some very curious theories propounded about the difficulties we are under with respect to foreign debt. Why do we owe a foreign debt? Because we have not capital to loan at the same rate at which foreign capitalists are willing to lend. Our Finance Minister can borrow money at 4 per cent. in England; we in Canada cannot afford to lend it at that rate, we can make more profitable use of our money. To obtain money at that rate we must go to a country where there is a large amount of capital seeking investment. In a country like ours in prosperous times the demand for money for business purposes is too active to admit of low rates of interest. Such rates are an evidence of depression and stagnation. The late commercial disasters in England were accompanied and followed by a very low rate of interest. The first note of revival in trade was the increase in the rate of interest. I do not believe it is possible for the Government to issue paper money in any such way as my hon. friend earnestly proposes and keep it in circulation, at par with gold, even by the device urged by my hon. friend, of having it redeemable in 4 per cent. bonds. It would be absolutely a forced loan, if made a legal tender, and when he proposes to have the bonds paid in currency again he is simply reasoning in a vicious circle. I do not believe there is any possibility of that system being adopted in this country with the slightest degree of success. One can see the fallacy at once. If we want to lend money at 4 per cent. we can purchase the

Government bonds at par. Look at the position of the Bank of Montreal. The transactions of that bank, from day to day and from year to year, are more than ten times as great as the whole financial transactions of the Canadian Treasury. It is their interest to keep in circulation just as much of their own bank notes payable on demand and redeemable in gold as the public will take. How much have they got in circulation? Five million dollars. That is the extent which, in these flourishing times, with the machinery which the Bank of Montreal has, beginning at Halifax and ending at Winnipeg, it can keep afloat. That suggests what the Government might do. The Government have a nominal circulation to-day of legal tenders to the amount of \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000—at least three-fourths of that is in the vaults of the banks. If it is paid out to contractors and returned again, what machinery has the Government for re-issuing it and keeping it afloat? It must be redeemed, and if people do not want 4 per cent. bonds, what then? It is depreciated currency and the football of stock-jobbers, money-brokers and usury sharks, who fatten on the necessities of other men. I do not want to see any such system adopted here. There can be no objection to the Government making a moderate issue of paper based on a gold currency, redeemable absolutely in gold. The hon. member for North Perth seemed to think he was making a point when he said that the banks only held \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 in coin against their enormous liabilities. He did not take into account the fact that they had at least \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000 which they could draw from their agencies in London. They had of Dominion notes, \$9,800,000; specie, \$6,719,000; at agencies, \$22,234,000 more than enough in all to redeem their whole issues on demand, of which they had, on March 31, \$32,000,000, and making with other assets \$219,000,000, against total liabilities of \$141,000,000. The hon. gentleman ought to know that it is impossible for the whole liabilities of banks to come in upon them at once. It is well understood by all bankers who live upon credit, deal upon credit and issue upon credit, about how far and how fast they will have to redeem their liabilities. If they are called upon to pay, the public will be called upon to pay them, for the public are in their debt, and their profit is made very largely, not in circulation, but in deposits which they hold. It would be exceedingly inconvenient if anything were done to affect the banks holding large amounts in deposit. If the people should withdraw such deposits or close up their banking capital, commercial lenders instead of going to banking institutions to make loans, would be compelled to make personal negotiations with individual lenders—a thing which would not be tolerable to the business men of any country. Nothing could be more injurious to Canada as a young and growing country, than to make a tilt against vested capital in the shape of our banking interests. There have been some instances of failures in those institutions, but the loss has fallen upon the shareholders and not upon the general public. I am not aware of any instance in which any except the shareholders have ever lost a shilling in the currency of Canada. The Bank of Upper Canada redeemed its notes, dollar for dollar; no man lost anything who chose to keep them. There has been no instance that I know of here where the issues have not been paid in full, but if there were any the loss would be paltry compared to that which would accrue to the people generally through a depreciated currency. The Northern States borrowed, upon their interest-bearing bonds, as long as they could sell them to carry on the war, until they ran up a debt of \$2,200,000,000 or \$2,300,000,000; finding they could borrow money no longer they made a forced loan on the people by compelling them to take legal tender notes which were issued to the amount of nearly \$750,000,000. The public were compelled to receive them in payment of debts contracted upon a gold basis. The loss was almost incalculable in the payment of contracts previously made in a depreciated currency. There never

was such a case known since the Mississippi scheme of John Law a hundred and fifty years ago, which ruined France. A legal tender or greenback dollar lost its purchasing power so largely, that compared with the gold standard it was worth only from 40 to 50 cents. I, myself, bought on one occasion, two thousand eight hundred dollars of greenbacks for one thousand dollars of gold, and the money I bought was legal tender for the payment of debts. The bonds that were issued for the war debt were bought up in immense sums by speculators. I know one case where a syndicate of Hamburg bankers bought \$50,000,000 United States bonds bearing interest at the rate of seven and threethirds per cent. per year—the “seven-thirties,” as they were called, and they sold the gold with which they bought that enormous sum at a premium of 2-30, or, for each dollar in gold they paid for two dollars and thirty cents of bonds, so that in fact the United States received less than \$22,000,000 for \$50,000,000 of their bonds, which were redeemed at a premium afterwards in gold. But it is no argument at all, except against my hon. friend when he speaks of the United States. It is well known that no country has ever issued paper currency except under the greatest possible necessity, and I trust the time is far distant when we will be compelled to do the same thing. Russia, with all her power—a nation of 100,000,000 of people with vast resources, and, at that time, with unimpaired credit—issued only \$400,000,000 of paper currency during the Crimean war, and yet the depreciation was nearly 40 per cent. During the twenty years that England was under the necessity, at the beginning of this century, of suspending specie payments, with all her great wealth, with the Government fiat, her currency, the legal tender notes of the Bank of England, suffered depreciation. So it always has been, and so it always will be. There can be no inflation of paper currency without disastrous consequences. My hon. friend seems to think that the mint stamp makes the value of the English sovereign, that the stamp makes the value of the American gold dollar. Why, I can tell my good friend that when a quantity of American coins are sent to England the first thing they do is to obliterate the stamp and recoin them. I can tell him, too, that gold in coin and bullion are precisely the same thing in value. The mint charge is less than one-tenth of one per cent. All the gold that goes into the mint in bars comes out again in coinage, with a very small percentage charged just enough to pay the expenses of the mint. It does not add to the value of the metal a single penny. You can pay your debts with a bar of gold and send it off to any foreign country just the same as if it had received the Government coinage. Gold and silver in enormous bars are simply weighed by the ounce, assayed and stamped with their weight, and held in the United States Treasury or in banks as bullion. All we have to do is to send them to the mint and, at a charge of one mill on the dollar, or less, have them turned into money. It is simply a quibble to say one is money and one is not money. The stamp does not make the money. No paper currency, unless it is promptly redeemable in coin, can perform the functions of coin. I did not intend to make such extended remarks on the subject, but I believe that a fallacy, which my hon. friend from South Norfolk has not been able to see, underlies the propositions which he urges so ingeniously, and I believe it is of the greatest importance that our currency should remain upon a sound basis, upon a basis of gold. Though it may be painful to differ with friends of my own while defending what I consider to be a sound system. I am impelled by a strong sense of duty to take issue with several of my hon. friends who have preceded me. I speak from a large range of personal experience, and because I have had occasion during that experience to study and examine those abstruse questions connected with systems of banking which are not easily understood by those who take a simply empirical view of the subject.

Mr. PLUMS.

and which are less perfectly understood by those who have what is technically called the currency craze.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Before moving the adjournment I think it was understood that hon. members who were absent when the notices of motion were called before should have another opportunity of moving them now, provided no debate arises upon them.

Mr. KILLAM. Before six o'clock we were talking about moving a motion of which I had given notice and which was on the paper, and which we were talking about discussing at the time. The understanding was, I think, that at this stage of the proceedings I should have an opportunity of moving this motion and of discussing it at length.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member will have an opportunity, because on Monday next his motion will stand fourth on the list and there will be no doubt of its being reached.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of advertisements and tenders for reports on and correspondence with the contract for new lock gates for the Cornwall Canal, given last summer, and copy of such contract.—(Mr. Blake.)

Correspondence and reports on the subject of the possible effect on the level of Lake Ontario, of the works for improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence.—(Mr. Blake.)

Detailed statement in item of the particulars comprising the charges made against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for work performed on the first one hundred miles west of Red River, \$760,604.71; rails and fastenings, \$280,736.09; rolling stock, &c., \$281,914.58, total, \$1,323,255.38; with all reports, valuations and correspondence on the subject.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return of all import duties collected at or near the boundary line between the Province of Manitoba and the Rocky Mountains.—(Mr. Schultz.)

Correspondence between any of the municipalities of Manitoba and the Government on the subject of aid in the construction of roads and bridges.—(Mr. Schultz.)

Copies of all reports, petitions, papers and correspondence addressed to the Government, or any Department thereof, by the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company, or by other parties, on the subject of the construction of a ship canal to connect the waters of Georgian Bay with those of Lake Ontario.—(Mr. Hay.)

Copies of all correspondence, invoices, evidence and papers in connection with the valuation for duty of vault doors imported for the use of the Halifax Bank from Herring & Co., New York.—(Mr. Blake.)

Correspondence on the subject of the extent of the lands comprised by the words “adjacent to, or near the railway” in the charter of the Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing what rivers of the Dominion are leased for fishing, to whom leased, for what length of time, and on what terms.—(Mr. Haddow.)

List of all persons appointed as tobacco inspectors under the Act 42 Victoria, Chapter 19, together with a statement of the salary and expenses paid to each of them in the discharge of his duties.—(Mr. Béchard.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, evidence and papers relating to duties unpaid by the Pullman Car Company, and to any seizure made in respect thereof, and departmental action thereon.—(Mr. Béchard.)

Copies of all papers, letters, telegrams, reports, plans, specifications and other documents in connection with the improvement of the River and Harbor at Owen Sound. A

statement in detail of the expenditure from Municipal and Dominion resources, and of the present condition of the work; of the amount (if any) due to contractors for work done; of the amount of contract work still unfinished; of the amount of work remaining to be done in order to give the uniform depth of fourteen feet in the harbor.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement, in detail of all sums paid to Octave Laurin, an employee in the office of the Collector and Paymaster of Beauharnois Canal, from the 1st October, 1879, to 1st January, 1882.—(Mr. Holton.)

Statement, in detail of expenses of the enquiry under commission, into the conduct of Mr. Beique, as Superintendent of Beauharnois Canal.—(Mr. Holton.)

Copy of contingent accounts, in detail, of Antoine Dosithé Danis, as Collector and Paymaster of Beauharnois Canal, from 1st July, 1881, to present date.—(Mr. Holton.)

Copies of all correspondence, affidavits, or other papers in the Department of Customs, concerning charges against the Collector of Customs at Margaretsville, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Copies of all correspondence, evidence and departmental action in connection with the recent seizure of a boat and certain articles therein contained, the property of one Moir, on the Niagara River.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all departmental action and correspondence on the subject of any member of the Civil Service holding any municipal office.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all documents relating to the claim of Felix Caron and Henriette Chouinard, both of St. Jean Port Joli, against the Intercolonial Railway.—(Mr. Landry.)

Copy of any general Instructions or Circular issued to Telegraph Companies or Operators, referring to the transmission without pre-payment of any Telegrams connected with public business.—(Mr. Killam.)

Return of papers, communications and documents in possession of, or received by the Government, with reference to any scheme or company for laying a Cable from the western shores of Canada across the Pacific Ocean.—(Mr. Houde.)

Return showing, in detail, the number of square feet of lumber, of different kinds, shipped from the ports of Kingston, Brockville and Prescott, during the years 1879, 1880 and 1881, together with the total value of each description. Also, a return showing the number of thousands of shingles and laths shipped from the same ports during the same years, together with the total value thereof under each head.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Return showing, in detail, the number of square feet of lumber, of different kinds, shipped by cars only, from the port of Ottawa during the years 1879, 1880, and 1881, together with the total value of each description; also a return showing the number of thousands of shingles and laths shipped by cars only, from the same port during the same years, together with the total value thereof under each head.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Return showing the number of pieces of each kind of timber (logs included) passing the Chaudière and Gatineau Slides during the years 1879, 1880, and 1881, giving, if possible, the cubical contents of the same.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Return showing the number of feet, board measure, of all kinds of lumber, also of the number of thousands of shingles and laths which passed through the Grenville Canal during the years 1879, 1880, and 1881, and upon which tolls were paid, the said return to show whether the tolls were paid at Ottawa or Grenville.—(Mr. Rochester.)

Copies of all correspondence relating to the Cape Tormentine Railway since the 1st of May, 1881.—(Sir Albert J. Smith.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers, documents, petitions, reports, and Orders in Council in connection with any

arrangement for the purchase by the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, the Manitoba and South-Western Colonization Railway Company, the South Saskatchewan Railway Company, the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Railway Company, or any other railway companies, of any lands in the North-West. For copies of all correspondence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the subject of any such arrangement.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return of all bills, accounts, and other papers, showing the cost of a quantity of coal landed at Cape Traverse, in the year 1879, for the use, as was supposed, of the *Northern Light*, the charges for landing, wharfage or storage and care, the manner in which the coal was disposed of, and the amount realized for it and paid into the Treasury.—(Mr. Anglin.)

Copies of any correspondence, telegrams or other communications between Samuel Merner, Member for the South Riding of Waterloo, and the Government, or any Department thereof, touching the leasing, purchasing or settlement of Dominion Lands in Manitoba or the North-West Territory.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Copies of all reports, correspondence, plans and other papers in reference to wharves or blocks adrift in the Miramichi River since the fall of 1878; also all reports, correspondence, plans and other papers in reference to wharves or blocks built in that river; and also all reports, correspondence, plans and other papers in reference to all ballast wharves on that river, the whole to embrace from 1878 to present date.—(Mr. Snowball.)

Copy of the report of the commission appointed to investigate the working of the post office of Montreal.—(Mr. Houde.)

Copies of any correspondence which has passed between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and persons in Montreal in relation to the taxation and expenditure under the Port Warden Acts, and for copies of all documents sent by the same persons to the Department relating to the same matter.—(Mr. Gault.)

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, plans and surveys in connection with L'Ardoise Breakwater in the County of Richmond, N. S.—(Mr. Flynn.)

Copies of the report of the section-men and of all correspondence with the officials of the Intercolonial Railway in relation to damages caused by fire from the locomotives to the property of Mr. Ferdinand Bellavance.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Copies of petitions, correspondence and all other papers relating to the construction of a branch railway between Harmony Station on the Prince Edward Island Railway and East Point.—(Mr. Muttart.)

Correspondence in reference to leases applied for or granted by the Government, of the islands in the River St. Lawrence, at or near Brockville, since the first day of January, 1878; also the names of all persons to whom leases have been granted, and the rent payable therefor; also, a statement showing what rent has been paid and by whom.—(Mr. Fitzsimmons.)

Copies of all orders, instructions, letters and telegrams relating to the auction sale of public lands at Winnipeg, on the 15th instant; also, all orders, instructions, letters or telegrams relating to the sale of public lands in Manitoba or the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Mills.)

Statement of payments made on account of the contract of Williams, Anderson & Williams, for the erection of the Custom House at St John, N.B.; for copies of all powers of attorney and orders for payment given to or in favor of Henry C. Phillips, or to any other parties, by the contractors, or any of them, upon the Department of Public Works; also, copies of all correspondence and telegrams in reference to any order in favor of the said Henry C. Phillips had between the said Henry C. Phillips, the said

contractors, or either of them, with the Department of Public Works, or with any other person, received and handed to the Department; also the affidavit or declaration of Thomas Anderson, forwarded by the said Henry C. Phillips to the Department of Public Works in May last; also all papers in relation to the subject.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Copies of all letters, reports or other documents relative to complaints preferred against the keeper of the lighthouse on Brown Point, Wolfe Island, Ontario.—(Mr. Gunn.)

Copies of all Orders in Council and instructions to officers of the Department of the Interior, or others, relating to claims of the Hudson's Bay Company to lands in the Red River Settlement Belt; also, 1st. A statement of the lots, or parcels in the said Belt (if any) which have been granted to, or reserved for the Company, and the acreage thereof respectively; 2nd. A statement of the grounds or reasons for making the said grants or reservations respectively; 3rd. A list, with the names of the persons (if any) who have claimed the lots so granted or reserved as deriving title thereto under the Manitoba Act, or as settlers or squatters thereon, subsequent to the 15th July, 1870; 4th. A list, with the names of persons who have been dispossessed by, or compelled to become tenants of, or purchasers from the company, or otherwise prevented from acquiring title from the Government, together with a map, or maps, showing the lots granted to or reserved for the Company in the said Belt, and also showing the lots so claimed by settlers or squatters, but which have been granted to or reserved for the Company.—(Mr. McDougall.)

House adjourned at 11.40 o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 25th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 36) respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ROSS. Would the hon. gentleman give some information as to the qualification of the examiners? The Bill provides nothing as to their standing, though it is important that their standing should be sufficiently high to give general confidence in regard to the decision arrived at. We should have some guarantee as to the high standing of those examiners.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention of the Government is to appoint the best men we can find, and to make this measure a success. We wish the examination to be real and thorough, so that the certificates awarded may command the confidence both of the public and the Government.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman provide in his Bill that a certain number of the examiners should be graduates of some University? In the Bill of Senator Pendleton of the United States, a penalty is proposed for any act of favoritism or any wrong conduct on the part of the examiners. There should be a penalty for

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

any corrupt, partial or improper action on the part of Canadian examiners also. The Bill proposes no control over them, which I think a defect.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not believe in any penalty. The fact that the examiners will be men of good position and well qualified will be a guarantee of good conduct and efficient action in the discharge of their duties; and an additional guarantee will be the knowledge that the Governor in Council will have the right to remove them with a stigma attached to any misconduct. I do not think we should impose a penalty beyond a provision for their removal. Nor do I think that we should require graduates of a University; for though I have great faith in Universities and High Schools, I have known many who were not graduates, who were a credit to society, and learned men, every way able to compete with such graduates. I think the House should leave the matter in the hands of the Executive to select the best men.

Mr. BLAKE. I regret having been misled by the Ministerial statement as to what measure would be taken to-day. I have, therefore, not prepared myself by the study of certain papers and memoranda requisite to the satisfactory discussion of this measure. But the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill has made an observation which calls for some remark from my point of view. He stated the securities for the efficiency of those examiners and the high standing of the supposed nominees, and the circumstance that, at the pleasure of the Government, the examiners were susceptible of removal, would, he thought, afford a guarantee of the proper performance of the duty. Of course, the nominations should be in the hands of the Executive. The appointments to office is a responsibility which can be best discharged in that way; but as to the tenure of office, that is one of the difficulties of the measure. My opinion is, that the efficiency of this Bill and of those examiners, limited though their scope is to be, would be largely reduced by the circumstance that the persons are to hold office during the pleasure of the Government. I think, with the report of the Commissioners, that the officers ought to form an independent board. I think the tenure should be far superior to the pleasure of the Government. We know the difficulties by which they will be surrounded, and that their probable functions will be to examine persons who will be in fact, though not in form, designated for appointments, and to whom, through the influence of political supporters, the Government will be to a certain extent committed; and we know that if they did not accede to the wishes of those political supporters it would be a very great disappointment to those candidates who should be found unqualified. Under these circumstances, if you appoint examiners removable at the pleasure of the Government only, you run the risk of partial decisions in the passing of candidates known to be supported by friends of the Government, and in whose success the Government has an interest.

Mr. ROSS. I see that, in clause 3, we are to form regulations for the guidance of the Board of Examiners.

On clause 5,

Mr. BLAKE. This section appears to me to be out of order. It proposes a money payment, and it will be necessary that a resolution be introduced.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The clause can be allowed to stand and a resolution introduced later.

On clause 6,

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It would be of service to the public if an absolute time were fixed for the examinations once or twice a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would be determined by the regulations enacted in clause four;

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that the Board of Examiners shall not examine a' all, but that all examinations shall be conducted by others.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Board cannot make all the examinations. They will conduct them within a certain radius; beyond that sub-examiners will be selected for the purpose.

Mr. ROSS. I understood that those who were to be employed at the different points named, were merely to superintend the writing of the papers, prescribed by the examiners, but that the examiners themselves should read the papers, as is the system followed in the High Schools of Ontario and the University of London, England. The hon. Minister will weaken the value of the examinations if he allows the sub-examiners to do this important work. In the first place, you appoint a Board, and that Board appoints sub-examiners, charged with similar responsibility. It is a case of a delegate appointing a delegate.

Mr. BLAKE. In connection with my hon. friend's remarks, will the hon. Minister explain, because the Bill does not explain, whether it is intended that the examinations should be in writing.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That will be determined by the rules and regulations adopted afterwards. No doubt the best mode will be adopted. As I said, it is impossible for these examiners to be at all those places, therefore they must have the assistance of sub-examiners in the different localities. The papers in the written examination will necessarily have to be sent to the Board to be adjudged by them, but there may be certain oral examinations in which case the result must be communicated to the Board by the assistant examiners.

Mr. ROSS. We must ask the hon. Minister to allow us to amend the Bill, so that it will state distinctly that the examinations shall be in writing. We have no examination in connection with our Ontario High Schools that are oral.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some may require to be oral. The hon. gentleman must suppose that those entrusted with carrying into force this Bill, when it becomes law, will take care that the best mode will be selected in order that justice may be done to all. As a general rule these examinations will have to be made in writing, and in this case the Board will have to decide on the papers submitted.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended there shall be more than one assistant at each point?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not decided. In the beginning it will be a trial, and experience will tell whether we should have one or two; but I suppose two will be required. The number will be limited as much as possible, consistent with efficiency.

Mr. BLAKE. Speaking from the experience of the Province of Ontario, which is not based upon pecuniary considerations, but on those of older and more advanced countries in educational matters, it is utterly impossible to establish any uniform standard through the medium of different examiners at different points by an oral examination. Now, as to deciding with reference to the competitors themselves. Where you have more than one to be examined, and where you have an oral examination, you must, of course, unless you are going to ask different questions of each one, call them into a room one after another, you cannot have them in the room together while the oral examination is going on. If you decide that these questions may be asked by different persons who may ask different questions, you practically apply a different standard to the candidates. Then, as to the replies, it is obvious that so far as the examination is oral we must take as official the report of

the local examiners. You expect them to write down questions, but you cannot expect them to write down answers for report, that would be an utterly impossible thing, unless it was only one man that was going to be examined briefly. So it seems to me practically that the making of the measure, so far as it is designed to afford one test of competency for all persons who are candidates for admission to any particular branch of the Civil Service, will wholly fail unless it is based on this fundamental principle, that the examination is to be a written one, and that those who conduct these examinations, in the various localities are those who were recipients of papers sent to them by the Board of Examiners to be submitted with due precaution as to their previous divulgence to the parties to be examined, to be present while the answers are being recorded and to transmit them to the main Board. If you incorporate the element of oral examination, you will incorporate an element of complete uncertainty into the case. Though I admit that an oral examination is of some importance, yet I am satisfied that the basis of it must be in writing, or it will be one mass of uncertainty and dissatisfaction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right that the examination as a rule must be in writing, but he will see that in certain cases and for certain offices there must be an oral examination; for example, suppose a young man comes forward to be examined for the post of messenger. One of his qualifications should be an ability to speak both languages; of course, his examination on that point must be oral. Then he must be required to know a little arithmetic and other primary branches of that kind, as well as to write a fair hand, and in these particulars I admit that the examination must be in writing.

Mr. ROSS. I called the attention of the hon. Minister a little while ago to the necessity of securing a high standard on the part of the examiners, and I referred to the propriety of annexing a penalty to any malfeasance on their part. Now, these examiners may appoint assistants and these assistants may have the papers in their custody. They may dispose of them or allow them to be used by the candidates at an examination. But what precaution is he going to give to the next candidate that these assistants had not furnished other candidates surreptitiously with some of these papers? Is he going to provide that the assistant is to be of such high character as to be beyond any conduct of this kind, or is he going to annex some penalty to the misconduct of an assistant, so that we will have a reasonable guarantee of honesty in the conduct of these examinations?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would not attach a penalty, but would leave it as it is. The best guarantee will be the honor of the man himself. Confidence is reposed in clerks in commercial houses or in public offices, and a certain amount of confidence must necessarily be reposed in men in the position the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. ROSS. You take a guarantee bond from these clerks?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, not from public officers; and they deal with much more important matters. Nevertheless, you rely on their honesty, and as a rule they discharge their duty honorably. We must not suppose that these officers so selected, men of position who have to examine several young men as candidates, will tamper with the answers given by the candidates to the great injustice of some of these young men. I admit that it is possible, but I do not think we had better attach penalties yet. It will be time enough to deal with the evil when it manifests itself. While I am on the subject of dismissals I may say that this Board of Examiners will be in the same position as all other Boards that are appointed by the Government. For example, there is the Board of Dominion

Arbitrators, and they are appointed and are subject to dismissal for cause.

Mr. ROSS. Are they not sworn?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They may be sworn, but I rely more on a man's honor than upon his oath. If he is dishonorable he makes his oath as well. We must suppose that these men will be selected for their education and general high reputation and competency for their duties.

Mr. ROSS. I think the hon. gentleman's line of argument is hardly logical. I think he was Postmaster-General at one time, and took security from every postmaster in the Dominion for the faithful fulfilment of his duties. Why not in that case trust to the honor of the official? Why does not the Minister of Customs trust to the honor of his officials? Why do not the managers of banks trust to the honor of their clerks? I think for almost every responsible clerk there is either an official guarantee at the back of it, or else there is some obligation over and above the mere appointment to the office. I think the hon. gentleman is allowing this matter to be initiated in a very loose way. Unless better precautions are taken, the result of the first or second year's experience will be to vitiate the whole Bill, to disappoint the public, and we will have no security at all that the best man will get appointed. The whole system of competitive examinations will be of no value whatever, unless these precautions are carried out. I simply warn the hon. the Minister of Public Works that he is proceeding with all those dangers before him. We know in Ontario how many attempts have been made among the very honorable and respectable professions, to which I had the honor to belong myself, to obtain possession of examination papers in order that young men might receive certificates as Public School teachers. I think there is perhaps as much honor amongst that as any other profession. We know the attempt made in the Law Society to get possession of examination papers, and that at McGill College some of the young men got possession of the papers. If there is any collusion between the examiners and the candidates the whole examination is of no value, and there is no guarantee of the candidate's fitness. As we have an interest on this side of the House, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, in seeing the service filled with competent men, and young men who wish to obtain a certificate honestly, we have also an interest in seeing that those not qualified do not obtain certificates. In the experience of this, as of all other countries, the safest course is the best course, and the same security against misconduct on the part of appointees is desirable in the interests of the public service; and the Bill which the hon. gentleman seems so anxious should be adopted, is one, although defective in many respects, which may conduce to the improvement of the Civil Service of the country. In Ontario school examinations we have another protection. The persons appointed to conduct the examinations are always teachers whose standing as such would be sacrificed if they were found guilty of any misconduct, and the Minister of Education has already cashiered one or two persons. Although that is a more powerful lever than any financial obligation could be, some irregularities have occurred.

Mr. BOWELL. There will be the same protection under this law in regard to the dismissal of any of the appointees in cases of irregularity. No doubt the hon. gentleman's experience in school matters has taught him the truth of the remarks; indeed, in many cases school teachers will attempt to bribe examiners, and it was thought that by amending the mode of examination and by appointing special inspectors instead of county inspectors, the difficulty would be obviated. In various High Schools I am aware, as I was one of the Board for thirteen or fourteen years, that attempts were made to obtain possession of the papers; but I never found that any member of the Board whose duty it was to

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

defend the interests of the honest teacher, ever lent himself to an act of that kind. It seems to me, under this law, that if any examiners were guilty of any impropriety, the power resting in the hands of the Government would be a sufficient guarantee of the public interest, and no penalty, except a penal one, would be more effective.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. Minister add the words, "the examinations as far as practicable shall be in writing?"

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt it is the intention that the examination for the same class of appointment shall be uniform throughout the Dominion. If that is the case it should be stated in the clause.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The rules and regulations will be made by the Governor General in Council, and they will be framed with due regard to uniformity. There is no doubt these will be laid before Parliament at the proper time.

On clause 7,

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the intention that no promotion of any person at present in the service shall take place until after he passes the probationary examination prescribed by the Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill applies to appointments which are to be made hereafter, and the hon. gentleman will see, by the subsequent clause, that his objection cannot apply.

Mr. CASEY. I understood it was the intention to confine the first appointments to the lowest grade in each Department, except under special circumstances. The Bill provides, as it must provide, for special cases of appointment to any grade in the discretion of the Governor General in Council. No doubt, cases might arise where it would be absolutely necessary to place some outsider in a high place in the service. I think that where you are laying down a general rule as in this section, it should be provided that all appointments should be made to the lowest grade in the Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would not do. If a vacancy occurs in a first or second class office, and if the Head of the Department feels that there is no one in his Department that really can fill that office, you could not take one from a low office and put him in the vacant office just because he happens to be in the Department. You would have to look at the list of those who have passed the examinations, and ascertain if one of them is fit to fill the office, and then he could be appointed by the Governor General. It might be that the vacant office required a man of special qualifications, and in that case the Head of the Department would endeavor to find the man best qualified among those who have passed the examinations.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, there must be exceptions to every rule, but these exceptions are, as I understand, provided for in the body of the Bill further on. As the Bill stands the Governor in Council is in fact authorized to break all the general rules whenever it is considered that there may be special necessity for breaking them, and in this I quite agree. But this section is laying down a general rule as to first appointments, and I think the general rule should be here as it is in England and everywhere else, and as I conceive it was the intention of the Government to make it, that the first appointments should be made to the lowest grades of the service, and the upper grades filled afterwards by promotion. I hope I am not mistaken in supposing that that was the intention of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, you were not.

Mr. CASEY. It is a most important point, and one which will have a great deal to do with the efficiency of the officers who are in the service, that they know that they have a right *prima facie* to be promoted to the upper grades unless there are special circumstances which make it impossible to promote them. The hon. gentleman says that he would go back to the first list, but he would not be likely to get a better qualified man there, because in filling the lower offices in the first place he is supposed to have taken the very best men available.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. You take the best men on the list for a class for which you have a vacancy to fill; but if the vacancy to be filled, of the second or first-class, or if it requires special qualifications, then you would not go to the lowest grade, but you can take from that portion of the list which gives you the names of parties qualified specially for that particular office.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, of course, if special qualifications are required, as in the case, say of surveyors, but I am speaking of the ordinary run of officers in the Department. The rule, I think, should be and was, I believe, intended to be, that when a vacancy for a first-class clerk occurred the first choice should be amongst the second-class clerks, the second choice amongst the third, and last of all that you should have recourse to an outsider.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If there is a vacancy in the third class we look at the list and choose from amongst those who passed the examination for a third-class office. Nothing, of course, would prevent the Government from taking from the second list to fill a third-class office if they first thought the officer would be one that should pass through the third in order afterwards to be promoted, thereby preparing him for the higher grade, but the rule should be to take from the third-class list candidates to fill vacancies occurring in the third class in the Departments.

Mr. CASEY. That appears to be a new idea altogether, and it is not the one which we understood was the principle of the Bill. Does the hon. gentleman intend to have different examinations for the different grades?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is provided for further on as the hon. gentleman will see.

Mr. CASEY. I have not found it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is there.

Mr. CASEY. No, it only provides for one examination for men seeking to enter the service of this instance. There is no provision for first, second, or third-class primary examinations. The Bill provides that there shall be a preliminary examination for all men wishing to enter the service, that all applying for places shall be compelled to pass it, but out of that list there shall be chosen men to fill the office. If it is the intention of the Government to have a separate class of examinations, that is a totally new complication in the provisions of the Bill. There is no doubt that no system of reform is a reform at all unless it provides for a regular system of promotion from the lower grades upwards, except in any case where it is absolutely necessary to take an outsider, because there is no outsider competent for the office. What the service and the public have been complaining of all along is, that men were taken from outside and put over the heads of others who had acquired training and experience in the service. If the intention of the Bill is as the hon. gentleman has informed us, it is different from what the public have been led to expect, and it is a change which they will strongly and, I think, justly object to.

Mr. BLAKE. Though it is inconvenient to discuss the clauses of the Bill in anticipation, I certainly have understood the 29th clause to indicate that the examinations for admission were examinations for admission to the lowest grades. All that the clause says about anything more than

that, is: "And to such other offices in the lower grades as may be determined by Order in Council." But, it would be giving an entirely different cast to the whole measure if it were understood to be the principle, that qualifying examinations were to be held for admission to the other grades. In that point of view I was assuming that the new admissions would be almost without exception to the lowest grades, for which, as I understood, the examinations were prescribed. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing, if the Head of a Department were to say: "If I find no one in the Department competent to be promoted to any office which falls vacant, I will look outside." I would give the same right to such promotion to any one in any other Department of the service, who may have passed the qualifying examination for a clerkship of that particular grade—I mean the same sort of right as any clerk in a Department has to promotion. In a word, I would make the prizes of the service open to the whole of the inside service; I would say to every third-class clerk in the service: "You have a chance to be considered for promotion to any one of the Departments, though first of all, those in the Department shall be considered to have the primary chance, but you will be considered before outsiders." That is the only change I have to suggest, in view of the general application of this clause. I understand its general application to be to make appointments to the first grade, and that it will only be in quite exceptional cases that appointments will be made to a higher class from outside. With regard to the clause providing that from eighteen to thirty-five shall be the limit of age, it seems to me that while it may be proper to permit appointments to higher grades in those exceptional cases in which you appoint from the outside, to range even as high as thirty-five years, yet it would be a great mistake to permit that range to be established as the rule. The whole system is based on getting men into the service very young, and though I think eighteen years is perhaps the right minimum, I think the maximum should not exceed twenty-two or twenty-five years. Your system is one with low salaries at the start, with an assurance of increment, which is very well for a young man of eighteen to begin with, but is not applicable to one who is somewhat advanced in life when he begins; therefore, while I would not object to appointments in the higher classes of persons of the age of thirty or thirty-five years, there can be no case in which the public service would be promoted by the appointment of a man nearly as old as thirty-five years to a third-class clerkship or messengership. I would say that you should begin young in all cases.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and that is the intention. But if it is found necessary to appoint a person outside the service who is valuable for a certain position—it may be a second-class clerkship or a first-class clerkship—we must fix a limit, and therefore in that case we have said the candidate cannot be taken at a greater age than thirty-five years. But, as the hon. gentleman says, it is desirable that, in making appointments of messengers or first class clerks, we should take young men from eighteen to twenty-two to twenty-four years; they grow with the service, and we shall have the benefit of their experience for the higher offices. With regard to examinations, the hon. gentleman will see that the idea of the Bill is that they should be not only for third-class clerks. There could be no objection to a young man who had passed the third-class examination, also offering himself for the second-class, so that if at a future time a vacancy occurred for a second-class clerk, the Government might find one in the office fit to fill the position.

Mr. CASEY. I see the hon. gentleman has entirely abandoned the idea that I supposed he entertained of mak-

ing a real reform in the service, by compelling people to enter at the bottom and work their way up. One of the crying evils in the service at present is that this is not done, and the same system is to be continued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. The object is that if there is a man already in the Department fit to fill the office of first-class clerk, he should be promoted from the second-class, or if there is one in the third-class, he should be promoted. If there is none in the Department, the hon. gentleman says that one in another Department might be selected, and should have the same chance as if he were in the first Department. I take it that the Governor in Council will have that power to take one from another Department; but in many cases, the effect of taking a clerk from one Department and promoting him in another Department might be to demoralize the whole Department from which you take him, because you would create a vacancy, and have to put a raw man in to take the place of that man. But where there is a vacancy in the Department, it is better that it should be filled from that Department than from outside, unless you find one in another Department who might properly be promoted. We should give them faith and courage in their position. They should be able to say: "Well, if we enter that service, it is not necessary we should languish in it for years without any expectation of promotion; but if we do our duty well, and improve ourselves, learn more than is requisite for our own class, we shall be promoted when a vacancy occurs." That is a proper system.

Mr. BLAKE. The observations of my hon. friend are encouraging, but the practical application is the very reverse. He says that certain Civil Servants will have a large chance, but also, that their chance of promotion is limited to the chance of rising in their own office. But there may be a man of iron frame, of strong constitution, and great powers of vitality above them so that they may have to stick in the same office all their lives. You have enlarged the area of their expectations, and certainly that is one of the greatest stimuli that you can give to good civil servants. But what does the hon. gentleman in effect say? Well, I admit, that in general your ability and superior qualification deserve practical recognition, but in practice he says that if the man whom he is giving that stimulus is specially valuable to the public administration by his great zeal, ability and capacity, it will never do to say to him: "You shall be promoted—you are too valuable to rise—you have shown yourself so valuable where you are that you must stick in the position of the second or third class till a good Providence shall have removed the superior officer in your own Department, when you may get a rise."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I object to that method of dealing with such officers. I think the more valuable an officer shows himself in his Department the more valuable would he be elsewhere, and the more entitled to promotion. This superior ability should secure his promotion instead of being his passport to a continuance in the lower grade to which the hon. gentleman would consign him.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with what has been said by the member for West Durham, that the hon. gentleman's practical application of his principles does not carry them out. He further said, that it is the intention of the Bill to make regular promotions. What he objected absolutely to was providing in the Bill that promotions should go in regular course. He wants to leave the matter open, not for promotions at all, but for importations from outside the service. Of course, it is necessary to have it in as a last resort. But he advanced no argument against making, as a general rule, appointments to the lowest grades of the service, and regular promotions thereafter. As to the age limit, I find

Mr. CASEY.

that the Civil Service Commissioners agreed with the member for West Durham, and recommended that that limit should be from eighteen to twenty-five. No doubt it is a great mistake to leave the limit for the first appointments as high as thirty-five. It takes about twenty-five years to work up from the third up to the first class; and in ordinary cases that would bring a man appointed at thirty-five to the age of sixty before he obtained a first-class clerkship. It is in the first-class we should have men of the greatest vigor, mental and physical, men of great ability. Appointing men as old as thirty-five would fill the first-class clerkships with men in their decline instead of in their prime. A good many of those men are very efficient at an advanced age; but it is not to be expected that those men now filling the highest positions in the service, advanced in life, can devote as much energy to those duties as if they had come into the service young enough to reach first-class positions in the prime of life. You cannot expect as much from a man of sixty as from a man of forty-five. The hon. gentleman said that a candidate would be allowed to pass the first year his third class examination, and afterwards an examination for the second class. It is quite absurd to talk of letting any man who has never been in the Department before stand for an examination in the second class; because he could not have learned enough to qualify himself for the second class, or acquire information respecting it only to be learned by a considerable period of service in the Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman laughs at that, as if there was any difference between qualifications for such offices and ordinary office duties outside. Men can only learn Civil Service duties by service in the Department. It is a thing unheard of, qualifying a man for a second-class clerkship before he has learned the duties of the lower grades.

Mr. MILLS. Is it intended, when a vacancy occurs in the second-class, to promote a third-class clerk; and if so, will he have to undergo a second-class clerkship examination?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. MILLS. I think it would have been well to express that in the Bill. In many cases a man over thirty-five years might be taken to fill a second or first-class clerkship. It seems it would be proper to fix the different minimum for the different classes. While twenty-five or thirty might do for the second and first-class clerks, it seems that, to fix thirty-five for a third class is a high minimum, and which I do not think would contribute to the efficiency of the public service. It would be more satisfactory for the qualification of the different grades.

On clause 8,

Mr. BLAKE. What is the reason for giving the solemnity to the appointment and removal of the Deputy Heads, who are appointed by the Governor in Council, and hold office during pleasure, Parliament being informed of the reasons for that removal?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Deputy Heads are not to be appointed in the same way as other officers, but to rise upon the occurrence of vacancies, &c. The Deputy Head will, under this Bill, have very special powers, increased powers, so that he, in the absence of the Minister, will direct the Department, and when a change of Government takes place he is not to be removed without the reasons being made known at the beginning of the Session of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see any particular reason for it. It does not in the slightest degree affect the discussion of the Government. The removal is to be absolute, and all to be done is to state the reasons. It is to my mind one of the features of this Bill which is most objectionable, that an

apparent position of authority is being given to Deputy Heads, which is not substantial. They are to make certain recommendations, and if these are concurred in by the Head of the Department, certain results will follow. My opinion is that the Deputy Heads will make the suggestions in accordance with the views of the Head of the Department. The whole system is one which presents an illusory appearance of independent action on the part of an officer who, from his situation, must necessarily be in accord with the Minister who is his chief. It is utterly impossible that the business of a Department can be effectually carried on unless there is a hearty concurrence of sentiment between the Deputy Head and the hon. Minister himself. If there exists that concurrence of sentiment, this formality in this Bill had better be thrown out, and we had better come down to the reality of the case. What is that? It is the hon. Minister who will do these things.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are certain powers given to the Deputy Heads which it is necessary they should have. The hon gentleman seems to think that it might not be a very proper thing that the Deputy Heads should speak to the Heads of the Departments. In many cases the Deputy-Head will be a man of experience who has been fifteen or twenty years in the service, and a new Minister coming in will be glad to profit by his experience, and even have his attention to certain provisions of this law in order that they may be followed. It would not be extraordinary that the Deputy Head should try to fulfil his duty, and if he and the Head of the Department should not agree, that would not prevent him doing what he is authorized to do. In such a case the Head of the Department would take his own responsibility.

Mr. CASEY. While there is an appearance of independent action given to the Deputy Head it is not possible for him to exercise it. He must act in accordance with the views of the Minister, unless he is head of the service. Consequently all these things will be as directly under the control of the Minister as if there were no pretence of giving independent powers to the Deputy Head at all.

Mr. BOWELL. Would you suggest giving independent powers to a Deputy Head?

Mr. CASEY. That is not the question. The question is whether this Bill gives him independent powers or not? I say it does not. It provides to give him independent powers, but does not do so. If the hon. gentleman would read the Bill before he speaks, it would be better. It is admitted on all hands the Deputy Head would not exercise these powers except as he was told by the hon. Minister. My opinion is that a Deputy Head should have independent powers of action in certain matters of discipline. He would be a fairer arbitrator than the responsible Head, because he is supposed to have no political leanings. This particular clause should go a little further. Not only the dismissals of Deputy Heads, but all the proceedings of the Civil Service relative to appointments and dismissals should be laid before Parliament during the first fifteen days of the Session. That was provided in the Bill I had the honor to introduce. I think it is the practice in England to bring down the Civil Service report at an early day, which contains a full statement of what was done during the year. This would save a great many returns being asked for.

On clause 10,

Mr. CASEY. This clause is very vague. What are the other duties and powers referred to in it?

Mr. BLAKE. The only objection I see to that is that it might be interpreted to give a very high measure of authority by the Governor in Council to a Deputy Head. I would suggest that the word "powers" be struck out.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN agreed to the suggestion.

On clause 11,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I propose to amend this clause, by making it read thus: "In the absence of any Deputy Head, a chief clerk to be named by the Head of the Department shall perform the duties of such Deputy Head, unless the performance of such duties is otherwise provided for by Order in Council, and there shall be in the office of the Auditor General a chief clerk who shall at all times answer for the Auditor-General in his absence."

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the intention is to preserve the peculiar position of the Audit Office intact.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed by the other portion of the Bill to prescribe by whom this first assistant clerk of the Auditor-General is to be appointed? It is possible there may be two chief clerks in the office of the Auditor-General. Who is to nominate the chief clerk, and who is to act for the Auditor General in his absence?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The officers are appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Suppose there are two chief clerks in the office, is the Governor General in Council to promote the junior chief clerk, or have the power of doing so in the absence of the Auditor-General?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill provides there shall be one chief clerk in the office. If the Auditor-General found that a second one was required he would ask for another officer, and then, of course, the Government would ask Parliament for authority to create that new office. But the chief clerk, who was then in office, would be the one who should replace the Auditor-General in his absence.

On clause 12,

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman here says that the Deputy Head will be the Auditor-General. He calls the Auditor-General a Deputy Head, therefore the Auditor-General would report the propriety of the creation of a chief clerkship, then, secondly, ask the concurrence of the Head of the Department in such report. Now, who is the Head of the Department of the Auditor-General?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is that the Auditor-General shall communicate with the Council, report under the Audit Act to the Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Finance comes to Council and makes his report.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is a matter of indifference through what member of the Government the Auditor-General shall communicate with the Government, but it is not a matter of indifference, having regard to the peculiar office of Auditor-General, that you should prescribe that anybody is the Head of this Department except himself. The whole efficacy and utility of the arrangement will be dependant upon his occupying an entirely independent position, not subject to the headship of anybody. He stands between the Government and Parliament, and is responsible to both Houses of Parliament; therefore it is that I feel a difficulty in agreeing to the suggestion which seems to indicate that some one of the Ministers of the Crown is the Head of the Department of the Auditor-General.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the Audit Act the Auditor-General is to communicate with the Government, and he must communicate through one of the Ministers; therefore, we say that he shall communicate through the Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Finance presents his communication to the Council.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will see that the processes to be gone through would be these: That the Auditor-General, who is to be called the Head of the Department, is to report that he deems another office necessary, then

there is to be concurrence of the Head of the Department in such report. Now, who is the Head of the Department of the Audit Office? The difficulty is not that some one Minister of the Crown is to be the Minister through whom the Auditor-General is to communicate with Council, but it is that there is to be somebody's concurrence as the Head of this Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must understand that though the Auditor-General has certain powers under the Audit Act, yet when he requires a new officer he must apply to the Government, and it is for the Government to say whether they will grant it or not. Under these circumstances, we say that he shall communicate to the Council through the hon. Minister of Finance. The hon. Minister of Finance will see whether the office is required; he will then report to the Council, reporting the request of the Auditor-General, and his own enquiry into it, as to whether the request shall be granted or not. Some one of the Ministers must tell us whether the request should be assented to. That does not change the position of the Auditor. The Auditor-General has the power under the law; we cannot take it from him, and we do not wish to do so, but we desire to regulate the service, and in order to do so some Minister must communicate between the Auditor-General and the Council.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit there must be a vehicle between the Auditor-General and the Council, but I do not agree with the arguments of the hon. Minister of Public Works. The Auditor-General has to keep a watchful eye over the Minister of Finance more than any other Minister, and therefore he should be in no degree under his supervision.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot understand why the Minister of Finance has to be particularly guarded, because the Auditor-General has to exercise a check over the spending department. My experience as Finance Minister is that I am not able to put my hand on a dollar of public money, and I repudiate the statement that the Department of Finance requires to be more carefully looked after than the other Departments.

Mr. CASEY. It should be provided that the Auditor-General should report his recommendations direct to the Governor in Council, and, in case of their being concurred in, they should be carried.

On clause 21,

Mr. CASEY. There is no provision that a Minister shall make himself responsible for the number of third-class clerks in his Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first step in the service is to be made as third-class clerk. If a Minister requires such assistance he reports to the Council and obtains it, provided that the amount has been voted by Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. The object of making the restriction is to prevent a waste of public money, and to prevent the appointment of an unnecessarily large number of clerks; and whether an appointment involved a promotion or a first appointment the waste of public money would be equally great, if the clerk was unnecessary. No doubt, in usual cases when the Heads of Departments required additional clerks, they reported the case to the Privy Council and the appointment was made. In a great many cases, however, as the Commissioners stated, clerks were appointed by the Governor in Council although they were not required by the Head of the Department, but were simply placed in their position by the responsible Minister, or by him acting, at the request of his supporters. In this way a greater number of clerks than were needed were forced into the Department where they were not wanted. I think it is more necessary that there should be a limit to first

Mr. BLAKE.

appointments than to promotions, because promotions will at all events do some good to some one in the service, whereas in the other case outsiders would be benefitted at the cost of the public. Another difference is, that promotions are not nearly so likely to be made the subject of political pressure as appointments. It is much easier to induce the Government to put in a new man at, say \$400, than to increase the salary of an officer from \$600 to \$1,000.

Clause amended so as to include third-class clerks, packers, sorters, &c.

On sub-section 2, clause 20,

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The sub-section reads: "The said increase may be suspended," &c. Does that include only the last increase, or the suspended increases?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Simply the last.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Then I think you should so state them.

Clause amended by inserting "for the then current year."

Mr. GUTHRIE. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to this 20th section, which seems to me to conflict with the powers conferred upon the Auditor-General under the 15th section of the Audit Act. The latter gives the Auditor-General power to promote, suspend, or remove any officers or clerks employed in his Department, which power was considered at the time of the passing of that Act to be essential to that independence of action which it was thought that officer should possess. But this clause appears to deprive him of that power, and make his action subject to the concurrence of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated formerly that it was not intended to curtail the Audit Act.

On clause 22,

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is not intended to take any power to create any offices but those for which Parliament has provided.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it is provided that no officers shall be appointed unless salaries are voted for them.

On clause 23,

Mr. CASEY. This is a clause that will probably give rise to some discussion, and I intend to put my views with regard to it on record in a permanent form, unless the leader of the Opposition does so. I object to the principle of a qualifying examination, conducted by a board of Civil Service examiners, appointed during pleasure, which I cannot think could be a thoroughly impartial examination. Besides, if there is to be a qualifying examination, why have a preliminary one before that? Will not one examination sufficiently show a man's knowledge of arithmetic, orthography, handwriting, and everything else required in him. It is not necessary to have a preliminary examination to settle whether a man is to go up to a qualifying examination or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This preliminary examination is required in order that if a man does not know the elements of arithmetic or orthography, or is unable to write, he should not be allowed to waste the examiner's time in examining him. This provision is necessary to weed out the number of applicants. If they have not the elementary qualifications they should not be presented to the higher examinations.

Mr. BLAKE. I confess myself utterly unable to see the policy of this preliminary examination. We have agreed that the examination should be in writing, which would show the knowledge of writing and orthography in the applicant. Now, what are you doing? In the first place,

you require the attendance of all the candidates twice instead of once. Does the hon. gentleman intend the preliminary shall immediately precede the qualifying examination?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. If so, what is the sense of it, because it is quite obvious that a part of the examination will be in writing. If you decide that a candidate's knowledge of writing, orthography, or arithmetic, which are the elements, is defective, where is the use of proceeding any further? I am not aware of any case in which there is, for a qualifying examination, a preliminary examination to ascertain his knowledge of these elements. If he is deficient in those respects, that should at once dispose of his pretensions. This double examination would be a mere expense to the country. The ordinary course is, in these examinations, to test a man's knowledge by the state of his papers on such elementary subjects, and to notify him, if ignorant in regard to those cardinal requisites, that he need go no further. It seems necessary by this Bill to provide two separate sets of papers, one for the preliminary and the other for the qualifying examination. It is an entirely changed course as regards my experience. I would ask the hon. member for Middlesex, who has had a large experience in such matters, whether he knows of any precedent for it?

Mr. ROSS. I could not understand that provision in the Bill myself, and I intended making enquiries regarding it. I do not know what is meant by a qualifying examination, I see no necessity for it either. I know it is not required for Normal School work.

Mr. BLAKE. Nor in any University examinations.

Mr. ROSS. No. I hope the hon. Minister will eliminate that feature of the Bill, and allow candidates to go through for what they are worth. The examiners could soon see whether they were deficient in orthography, writing, &c., and govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. CASEY. I am sure the insertion of this clause has arisen from a confusion between this examination and the English system recommended by the Commissioners, who recommended a preliminary examination. I think, by an oversight, this preliminary examination clause has been copied into the Bill along with the qualifying examination. The qualifying examination is simply to see whether the man is fit for the office. There is no use in testing him twice. As to this clause saving time, the candidate will have to go through two examinations. With one they would save time, but not with two.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Our object is to save time and money. The examination will take place in Ottawa, when candidates will have to pass their preliminary examination, testing their orthography, writing and arithmetic, in regard to which, if they pass well, they will be subjected to a qualifying examination. Why, if those candidates are unfit, should you have them present to pass an examination with their papers and afterwards reject them? It is a great deal better to reject them at once if not able to pass a prior examination. I think the preliminary is required.

Mr. CASEY. The worst thing in the double examination would be the loss of time. The examiners would have to spend as much time over the preliminary as if there was no other examination. One paper showing ignorance of the elements, such as writing and arithmetic, should, with a single examination, decide the candidate's rejection. One examination would save the examiners trouble and the country great expense.

Mr. ROSS. How would the hon. Minister do in the case where preliminary examinations were to be held, say, in British Columbia or Prince Edward Island, to see who would be fit for the qualifying examination, which preliminary examinations would be held a month or two anterior to the qualifying, that the central Board might see how many

candidates could pass the preliminary? A report would have to be sent from British Columbia or Prince Edward Island to prevent the unsuccessful from coming here for the qualifying examination. Under another system the whole work could be done at once. It is not necessary to hold this preliminary examination to weed out the stupid and ignorant candidates. Every Board should have a crucial test on one or two subjects, upon which the fate of the candidate is decided; if hopelessly bad, they read their papers no further. It would be a work of supererogation to do so. By this Bill the examiners are having additional and unnecessary labors imposed upon them. I know that in my experience, I would far rather entail the expense of doing this with one than two. I am quite satisfied that the work would be better done, and there would be less expense.

On clause 34,

Mr. CASEY. Why should the limit of thirty-five years of age be applied to the inside service only?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the outside service special qualification might be required as in the case of an appraiser, who must be a man of experience in business. By putting a minimum and a maximum age the idea was that for the lower grades of the service we would not take men younger than eighteen or older than thirty-five, but in cases where men in the Department are not available, special men who have passed examination may be taken, though thirty or thirty-five years of age.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister's answer in regard to appraisers is very satisfactory, but I cannot call to mind any other cases to which the same reason would apply. I think that the limit might be put at thirty-five years of age in the outside service, excepting for appraisers and a few others requiring special qualifications.

Progress reported.

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

After Recess.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 148) to amend the Acts respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Caron.)

Bill (No. 149) to remove certain doubts as to the effect of "The North-West Territories Act, 1880," and to amend the same.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Royal Academy of Arts.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 102) further to amend "An Act to amend and consolidate the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force."

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Bill be amended by striking out clause 12.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that clause 13 be amended by inserting the following words:—

"Any member of the force other than a commissioned officer convicted of."

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not intend to divide the House on the Bill, but as I believe the increase of the force was not necessary, I must ask to have this Bill passed on a division.

Bill read the third time and passed on a division.

TRINITY HOUSE AND HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 126) to amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the second clause, which provides that the Harbor Commissioners shall have power to make by-laws respecting certain portions of the River St. Lawrence, and for the use of those portions of the river by craft of a different character. It seems to me very considerable hardship might arise under the operation of that Bill as it stands at present, and I would suggest that some amendment to that clause be made.

Mr. McLELAN. To meet the views of the hon. gentleman, I move, in amendment, to insert the following words in the second clause at the end of the sixteenth line: "Except in case of accident or stress of weather."

Mr. WHITE. I am afraid that the amendment will hardly cover the whole of the difficulties which would arise under the operation of this clause of the Bill. I am informed that at a certain point on the River at Cap à la Roche, which is on that portion of the river between Batiscan and Cape Charles, a tug steamer tugging rafts finds it impossible at certain stages of the tide, owing to the strength of the current, to keep those rafts out of the deep water channel, and the result of an accident occurring to any large vessel through coming in collision with any raft would be exceedingly disastrous to the owner of the craft, which was improperly using those channels, even though using them under circumstances beyond the control of the owner of those crafts. I would suggest that after the 36th line the hon. Minister insert these words:

"Provided always that no such restrictive by-laws shall apply to any craft, barge or other vessels of light draught which may be carried into the deep water channels at the points above named upon the river St. Lawrence, by accident, stress of weather, or force of current."

If that addition was made to the clause I think there would be no objection to it; without it I think it would be very objectionable.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Have the Harbor Commissioners been consulted in regard to the Bill?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, it has been referred to the Harbor Commissioners and carefully considered by them.

On clause 2,

Mr. WHITE. It is a great hardship to declare by this Bill that owners of rafts carried into the deep water channel by the force of the current or by accident shall be liable. In that portion of the river between Batiscan and Cap à la Roche, it is impossible to keep vessels from entering into the deep water channel. It seems to me it would not be straining the clause if the hon. the Minister would allow the words "force of the current" to be added. I think when extraordinary powers like these are proposed to be given to the Harbor Commissioners, a concession might be made to prevent the possibility of people being rendered liable for damage from an act over which they had no control.

Mr. McCUAIG. It is of the utmost importance that the channel should be kept clear, as they are always difficult to manage, especially in currents. If the principles mentioned

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

by the last speaker were applied, it would be found that small vessels would be getting in the way of larger ones, which would be towed up and down the river. I think the Bill is much preferable as it stands.

Mr. McLELAN. If it is found, when the regulations are submitted to Council, that exceptions of this kind should be made, they can be made by the regulations.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). If the hon. Minister refuses to add those words, I shall only have to give notice to add them on the third reading.

On clause 4,

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that this clause grants powers with reference to railways, of a very extended character, and we should certainly have some explanations from the hon. Minister as to whether the by-laws providing for the enforcement of these arrangements with the railway companies are to be compulsory upon the railways with which all arrangements may be made. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council can give certain facilities to railways with regard to connections, and so on, but certainly it is unusual to attempt to enforce such arrangements by by-law. Are those arrangements voluntary or not?

Mr. McLELAN. It is intended that the Commissioners shall have power to arrange with the Grand Trunk and other railways for increased facilities for conveying and carrying by such railways to and from vessels in the harbor and for making connection between such railways eastward and westward. It is intended that such powers shall, of course, be voluntary and the by-laws for the purpose of carrying them out.

Mr. BLAKE. If these arrangements are to be voluntary they could be made between the different railway companies themselves, and I would like to know what powers it is proposed to give to the Harbor Commissioners. Is it power to compel any company to agree to anything? No, the hon. gentleman says. Have they not power at this time to allow any railway company they like to go down to their wharves?

Mr. McLELAN. They say not, and they want to make a general regulation with all the railway companies.

Mr. BLAKE. It does seem to me that the provision that the Harbor Commissioners, instead of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, shall have power to arrange for connections between the railway companies, to define terms, &c., is wholly unsymmetrical. Why should not the Railway Committee of the Privy Council dispose of these connections when no voluntary agreement can be made? What power is to be given to the Harbor Commissioners to enforce arrangements? The ordinary laws of the land are the usual resort for their enforcement; and if these are inadequate in this instance, in what particular are they so; and in that respect is it intended to empower this Harbor Commission to enforce these arrangements?

Mr. McLELAN. The Harbor Commissioners have the power to enforce regulations for the transmission of freight on all the wharves under their control. Draymen and all transport companies doing business in Montreal are under the control of the Harbor Commissioners, and they have power to adopt rules in relation to them, and they ask the same power to be given to them in respect to any regulation they may make with railway companies for the transmission of freight.

Mr. BLAKE. I move to insert in the second line of the 4th clause, between the word "make" and the word "arrangements," the word "voluntary," so that it may be made clear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman had better consider the effect of that. The object of this

Bill is to empower the Harbor Commissioners to manage the business entrusted to them in an efficient way. They have no possible interest or object in view, except to make such arrangements with the persons doing business on the wharves, under their charge, as are essential to the public good, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman should wish to prevent them from making the necessary arrangements with railway companies who are permitted to lay tracks upon their wharves for the purpose of carrying on business in the harbor. It seems to me that the proposal is a perfectly reasonable one, and that the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is calculated entirely to defeat its object.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister who has charge of the Bill tells us that these are only to be voluntary arrangements. I propose that what the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill assures us is intended, shall be embodied in the Bill, and the hon. the Minister of Railways tells us that to embody his colleague's proposal in the Bill will be entirely to defeat it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It may be intentional to have voluntary arrangements, but the putting of the word "voluntary" in the Bill is an invitation to any person who does not wish to make the arrangements to refuse, to make them.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is said that the Grand Trunk Company have already extended their rails along several of these wharves. There was some dispute as to their right to run their rails where they did. If that is the case this House will empower the Harbor Commissioners to compel the Grand Trunk, who have their rails there already, to enter into such arrangements as they choose to dictate. If at present there are no rails on the streets adjoining those wharves, and we are simply enabling the Commissioners to induce the Companies by some means or other to extend their lines along the wharves, that is a very different thing. It is a question whether there are not private rights involved in this matter, which we ought most carefully to guard and respect.

On clause 4,

Mr. ANGLIN. Would it not be well before the clause is carried, to require that the by-laws for the regulation of these matters and the enforcement of the provisions of the Bill, should receive the approval of the Governor in Council? I think they should.

Mr. McLELAN. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for Renfrew, as to the portion of the river mentioned, there may be some force in his objection; so I have no objection to adding the words he suggested.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SICK AND DISTRESSED MARINERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 121) to exempt vessels employed in fishing from the payment of duties for the relief of sick and distressed mariners.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In Committee.)

Mr. KILLAM. I suppose the hon. Minister can now give us explanations regarding this Bill. I am scarcely yet satisfied that there is any necessity for its introduction at all. He ought to be able to inform the House how much is spent upon the sick mariners of foreign vessels, and whether the larger amount of the fund is paid by the fishermen of our own vessels or the steamers that call at our ports.

Mr. McLELAN. Very little of the Sick Mariners' Fund is paid by the fishermen of the Dominion. All the small coasting vessels coasting from one part of the Province to another, are exempt from the payment of these dues, or contribute very little; and in any case they do not participate in the benefits of it unless they go beyond the Province in which they pay the dues which entitle them to that advantage. Our own vessels which fish one part of the year, and the other portions make voyages beyond the limits of one Province, will therefore be called upon to pay those dues, and will be entitled to the benefits of the fund. But foreign fishing vessels seldom enter our ports and pay any dues unless they have a sick mariner on board, in which case they enter the port, pay a few cents or dollars, and leave a sick seaman on our hands, causing large expense. In one or two cases when that has not happened, but when they have entered our ports for this purpose, and been called upon to pay the sick mariners' dues, their Government has represented to this Government that it was an infringement of the spirit of the fishing treaty. It is thought, therefore, that it would be simpler and better to abolish the dues for vessels exclusively engaged in fishing, or when upon a fishing voyage.

Mr. KILLAM. My information is that fishermen, as a general rule, are willing to pay the dues and receive the benefits. I am afraid the Bill will have an injurious effect. What is a fishing vessel? Just now, as he says, fishing vessels coasting about one province do not pay hospital dues; but if they go from one province to another, they do pay them. During the early part of the season a fishing vessel may be carrying oats, for instance, from Prince Edward Island to Halifax, in which case they are liable to pay these dues. Is she then a fishing vessel, and are the crew entitled to the benefits of the marine hospital? I think the owners, as a general rule, prefer to pay the dues, and get the benefits of the system now in force.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will understand that if a vessel goes from one port to another, carrying produce other than fish, she is liable to pay the dues and participate in the benefits of the fund, and in almost all cases our own fishing vessels do not contribute to the fund. Our own fishing vessels do not contribute to the fund, because they are chiefly employed coasting within the province.

Mr. ANGLIN. A great many of our small vessels pass from the ports of one province to those of another, and many of them go to Montreal and Quebec with cargoes of oysters and fish.

Mr. McLELAN. That is not a fishing voyage, and would not exempt them from the dues.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). One of the leading firms in my constituency asked me to object to this measure, but if the explanation of the hon. member is correct, they will have no objection to it. Supposing a vessel is employed three or four months in fishing, and the remainder of the year in coasting trade, and paid during the latter portion hospital dues, would she have benefit of the fund during the whole year?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. You cannot draw any other conclusion from the Bill.

Mr. FLYNN. As the Bill now stands it exempts fishing vessels from those dues. Our vessels commence fishing early in the spring and continue until October. During that time they are exempt from paying the dues. Frequently, however, after that, they make trips with produce to Halifax, and are then liable to pay into this fund. While they would not participate in the benefit during the sum-

mer, they would be compelled to pay the dues toward the end of the season.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

FRENCH DOMINATION.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. TASSÉ. As we discussed the other day the Irish Question in a manner which I sincerely trust will be beneficial to the parties interested, I will take advantage of this motion to offer some remarks on a subject which concerns more directly a large portion of the Canadian community. I wish I could avoid bringing this subject under the notice of the House, but the responsibility of the action does not rest with me. This subject is pressed so unfairly and so persistently on the public mind; it has caused so much agitation and so many misrepresentations; it will become such a live issue during the approaching electoral campaign, that no alternative is left than to put the matter in its true light before this House and the country. The subject is undoubtedly a difficult and a delicate one, but having learned to respect those feelings in others, which are the dearest to a man—his national and religious feelings—and representing, as I do, one of the most mixed communities in the country, the Capital of Canada; having been returned by a French as well as by an English majority, by a Catholic as well as by a Protestant majority, I am confident that, while standing up in the cause of truth and justice, to defend the people of my race, I will say nothing that can hurt the feelings of, or that can be properly objected to by my hon. colleagues of other origins. For some time past you may have heard of the so-called French domination of this country. For some time past you may have read in the newspapers which exercise a great, a controlling influence sometimes on the other side of the House, that Frenchmen were the ruling power in this Dominion, that they were securing all the sweets of office, and had practically muzzled the British Lion. For some time past you may have read in the same paper that the hon. Prime Minister—although styled sometimes one man power—was but a pliant tool in their hands, and that this great Province of Ontario had to suffer once more the humiliating sway of her sister Province. Such is the temper of that press, that even the name of my hon. friend the Secretary of State has been cited lately by the *Globe* as a “conspicuous representative of the *bleu* interest”—these are the words of the paper—in order to scare the good people of Ontario—and why? Because my hon. friend had signed, in his capacity of Secretary of State, a document touching the much vexed boundary question of Ontario, which document emanated from His Excellency the Governor in Council. It is true this cry of French domination is not new in this country. During more than fifteen years it has been echoed and re-echoed on almost every stump, on almost every hustling from one end of this Province to the other, and in almost every Grit journal from the *Globe* down. It is questionable, if but for it the Grit party could have existed at all. In fact, that cry was put into its mouth as its war cry, as its watch-word on almost the very day of its birth. Hatred of the French Canadian seems to have been, I am very sorry to say, the first love of the Grits. No wonder that the French Canadian has been compelled sometimes most reluctantly to return the compliment. We all know that this cry of French domination has a most injurious effect in inflaming the passions of the people, in creating an ardent jealousy between the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and an intense rivalry between two races which have spent already too much of their vigor and

Mr. FLYNN.

energy in fruitless struggles. We all know that, owing to that agitation, the administration of public affairs became almost impossible in this country, and Confederation became a political necessity. We all know that, owing to that agitation, the Conservatives of Ontario had to suffer seriously, had to lose many an election, being branded as the enemies of their Province, as the enemies of their creed, as the enemies of their race. But, Sir, thanks to the sober second thought of the people the clouds of public prejudice have been dispelled, and we have seen the great Conservative leader recognized as the best champion, as the truest friend of the interests of Ontario. Although the hon. member for Lambton, when inebriated with power, predicted that the Conservatives of Ontario would never regain the confidence of this Province, we have seen the day when the hon. gentleman himself scarcely escaped defeat in the very county which he represents; we have seen the day when his party almost found a grave in that very Province in the great Liberal slaughter of 1878. When the Grits joined the Conservative party and established Confederation, and it is one of the very few acts in their history that commands my admiration, we heard no more of the cry of French domination. The French ghost vanished for a time in the pigeon-holes of the *Globe* office. When the Grits succeeded in capturing the Government in 1873, we did not hear of French domination, nor during the whole of their term of office. To speak of French domination in those days would have been indeed like a sneer and a farce. The French element was represented in the Cabinet by men who were not always creditable to their race, and whose sole ambition, in most instances, was to serve their country in the capacity of governors and judges, far, very far, from the verdict of their electors. Such men evidently could not possess that fair share of public influence which they should otherwise have exercised. Is it necessary to mention M. Antoine Aimé Dorion—a distinguished democrat fascinated by what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would call the “flummery of titles”—who was appointed Chief Justice of Quebec after having declared from his seat in this House that no such an appointment was contemplated; Mr. Letellier, who became Governor of Quebec, and who did, Sir, what Queen Victoria with all her might has never dared to do, thus inflicting what would have been a death blow on responsible government had such an act remained unpunished at our hands; Mr. Fournier, who became a member of the highest, if not the most popular, tribunal of the land; Mr. Cauchon, whose crime smelled to heaven, according to the Liberal organ, and who was then thought fit, in that capacity I suppose, by that very Government to represent Her Majesty in the Prairie Province, when my hon. friend from Quebec East, out of self-respect had refused to sit in the same Cabinet which made him Governor. It seems certain also that Mr. Laflamme would have been requested to adorn the Bench, but for the untimely transaction of the ballot box in Jacques Cartier, where our friends opposite showed to the people of this country how they could fabricate and manufacture votes in order to raise what they call the standard of public morality. Sir, as my opinion on the *personnel* of the late Cabinet might be supposed unfair or prejudiced, let me adduce some witnesses whose impartiality cannot be questioned. My hon. friends opposite will not deny that *La Patrie* is the recognized official organ of their party in the district of Montreal. Well let us see what *La Patrie* stated in an article of the 25th November, 1880:

“Mr. Dorion, although serving under the leadership of Mr. Mackenzie, was really the chief of the party. His withdrawal from office was soon after followed by that of Messrs. Fournier and Letellier. It is needless to recall the events which followed. Power was concentrated in the hands of Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright who had no one to checkmate them.”

I do not attach much importance to the *Ottawa Free Press*, but as it is the recognized organ in this city of my hon. friends opposite, I will quote the following opinion published on the 12th October, 1879:—

"Previous to the 17th of last month none were more obsequious than those who are now denouncing the late Premier as the marplot of the Liberal party, whose defeat they attributed to Mr. Mackenzie's tyranny, stubbornness and want of tact. Referring to the ingratitude thus expressed, the *Montreal Gazette* says:—'No baser kind of ingratitude can be imagined, than that of men willing to serve leaders when in power, and turning upon them when power passes from their hands. The Liberal party of Quebec added neither strength nor respectability to the Liberal party of the Dominion during the last five years.' Although we are far from including all the Quebec Liberals in the list of ingrates, yet there is much of truth, manfully spoken, in what our contemporary utters. That the Liberal party of Quebec added neither strength nor respectability to the Liberal party of the Dominion during the last five years, is too sweeping an assertion, as few will deny that the Hon. Mr. Dorion brought strength and respectability to the party. The *Gazette's* remark might apply to the situation during the last year or two, when the accessions to the Cabinet were not always accessions of strength or respectability."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there was no French domination in those days but there was French humiliation all around. Since the triumphant return of the Conservatives to power we have again heard the famous cry of French domination. The French ghost, which is more frightful than all the ghosts painted by Shakespeare, has re-appeared and is now haunting, agitating, disturbing, every Grit camp, every Grit meeting; that ghost even made its appearance the other day within the walls of the Chamber. Sir, I draw the attention of the House and country to the fact that this cry is always raised when it is thought proper by the Liberal party to excite and lead astray the public opinion of the country, especially in the Province of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, when the last campaign took place in Ontario during the year 1879 the same appeal was again made by the Liberal party, and a good many people caught the infection, and now that the day cannot be very far distant when both parties will have to give an account of their votes and conduct to our common judge, the people of this country, the same mean, disloyal and disreputable tactics are resorted to. So common is this practice that you can hardly open a Grit newspaper in the Province of Ontario, from the *Globe* downwards, without seeing articles against that so-threatening French domination. I will not worry the House by reading long extracts from these papers, but as that kind of evidence, I am sure, is familiar to many, if not most of hon. members, I will take the liberty to read a few lines which will give an idea, however imperfect it may be, of the work of misrepresentation and demagogism which is now so eagerly prosecuted by the Liberal party in the great Province of Ontario. The controlling organ of that party the *Globe* stated on 4th May, 1879:

"When Ontario joined the Confederation her supposition was by doing so she had escaped from Lower Canadian domination. The present subservience of the Government to Quebec Conservatives throws a doubt on this and our future position, and brings up the whole subject again. The Tories follow the lead of their precious chieftain, and would put Ontario, which Province they know they cannot either cheat or control, back again under the rule of the Frenchmen, whom Sir John can humbug and swindle if he cannot control."

In another article, 4th November, 1879, the *Globe* complained still more bitterly of the supposed French ascendancy:

"The old saying that Ontario is the milch cow for the remaining Provinces, was never more forcibly proven than it is by the action of the present Government in relation to the distribution of patronage. Ontario with nearly one-half of the population of the Dominion, and directly and indirectly contributing a larger proportion than that to the Dominion revenue only at the present time receives about one-fifth of the patronage. The Department of Finance, Justice, Railways and Canals, Marine and Fisheries, and of the Speaker of the Senate, are devoted to the three Maritime Provinces, while of the remaining Departments those of Public Works, Inland Revenue, Militia and Defence, and the House of Commons, are given to the Province of Que-

bec alone. In the Department of the Speaker of the Commons the French Canadians are receiving the lion's share of the patronage, and the English speaking employees are being plundered to satisfy them. Last Session of Parliament in this Department pages and messengers were employed who could not speak a word of English. These are specimens of the manner in which Speaker Blanchet is administering the affairs of his Department."

Let us see now what says another leading Grit paper which is understood to represent the hon. member for Bothwell, the *London Advertiser*, which fulminates almost every day against the French domination. The following article is very recent, being dated the 15th February last:—

"The French Tories envy the prosperity of Ontario, and they are determined to dismember her, if possible. Mr. Meredith and his followers are not representing Ontario, they are representing the Quebec Bleus—they have become their servile instruments—Ontario was for years subject to the annoyance of Quebec Toryism. They obtained local self-government to maintain their local independence, and they find a band of conspirators, who, for the sake of the support of the most narrow-minded and unprogressive party in all Christendom, are ready to betray them. Sir John Macdonald has upon this question surrendered himself to Sir Hector Langevin and his followers."

In an article still more fresh, on the 22nd February, the *Ottawa Free Press* used the following language:—

"The Dominion Ministry aim at nothing less than reducing this Province to a position subordinate to Quebec, in order to vest the Government of the country in the hands of a party which could not even exist without the aid of that most stupid, bigoted, retrogressive faction, the Quebec Bleus."

The French element ruled this Dominion to the detriment, prejudice and exclusion of our English fellow-citizens—at least such is the gist of these articles and of a great many other articles written in the same style and animated in the same spirit, but all calculated to stir up and revive the national feuds of former days. I know sufficient of the feelings of the people of the Province of Quebec to know that its members and its population do not wish to deprive or rob Ontario of a single inch of territory which properly, legally and constitutionally belongs to that Province. The unanimity with which the French members of this House voted the other day for the reference of the boundary question to the highest tribunal either in Canada or the Mother Country, is the best proof of the spirit of justice and fairness which animates them, and they were aided on that occasion by followers of the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. LAURIER. Your party could not show so much independence as that.

Mr. TASSÉ. No doubt I have a strong faith in the French Liberals of Quebec, although there are not many in this House. The hon. member, in speaking of the question of boundary the other day—

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member has no right to refer to a past debate.

Mr. TASSÉ. I am referring to a speech made by his hon. friend and supporter, as reported in the papers of the day, and I will make only a short quotation, which will be very agreeable to the hon. member for Quebec East. Here is what the hon. member said, when opposing the reference of that question to the Privy Council—

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is referring to a past debate.

Mr. TASSÉ. I quite understand why the leader of the Opposition is so anxious that the utterances of the hon. member for Quebec East should not be read in this House to-day. Have you, Mr. Speaker, decided that I have no right to read the extract.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to refer to a past debate.

Mr. TASSE. I am only reading from a report of the speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot read it.

Mr. TASSE. So the hon. leader of the Opposition does not wish to hear the reasons given by his colleague for opposing the reference of the boundary question to the Privy Council. We all know that the hon. member for Quebec East has been lauded by the Grit press for the exceptional broad-mindedness he displayed on this subject. Well, let me state that the great argument adduced by the hon. member for Quebec East was, that by allowing the question to be referred to the Privy Council it might add a great deal to the Province of Ontario, much more than was awarded.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TASSÉ. If you deny that such language has been used I will have to read the speech. Now, that the question of order is disposed of, and I hope satisfactorily to my hon. friends on the other side, I will say this: that the French Conservative members of this House are not responsible for the fact that the Ontario Government has refused, for electioneering purposes—for party purposes—to accept such a fair proposal as a reference of the question to the Privy Council or the Supreme Court, because that proposal, if I am well informed, was made by the present Premier as early as 1872, and for it the French members would have voted as they voted on a similar proposition the other day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will be kind enough not to refer to a past debate.

Mr. TASSÉ. I am speaking of now 1872.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rule is that no allusion shall be made to a previous debate in the same Session, but there is no rule preventing a reference to a debate in a previous Session.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has been referring to a debate of this Session.

Mr. TASSÉ. I was referring to 1872, and I said that the French Conservative members cannot be held responsible for the fact that the Ontario Government has refused for party purposes to accept the proposal which the present Premier made as early as 1872, and that we would have voted then for it as we voted for it the other day. Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as the public patronage mentioned in the *Globe* is concerned, a return for which I have given notice in the Orders of the Day will settle that point. I trust that it will be made as accurate and complete as possible. If such a grievance really exists, let us know it and let us remedy it. We ask no favors, and I think I am fairly echoing the sentiments of the mass of the French people of this country when I say that we only ask fair play, and equal rights with our fellow citizens of other creeds and origins. We ask nothing more but nothing less. A similar return was ordered last year by another Chamber but it has not been brought down. In the meantime, I have taken the trouble to collect a certain amount of statistics and other information, and while a portion of them may not be very complete or very fresh it will throw sufficient light on the matter to show that there is nothing like French domination in the shape of public patronage; that such domination exists, "figuratively speaking," only in the minds of the Grit press and their stump speakers. Nay, they fully demonstrate that not only have the French Canadians not been treated with favor or partiality, but that they do not receive even a fair share of the patronage if representation by origin is to be the determining basis. From the Public Accounts we may ascertain who are the French and English-speaking employees belonging to the inside service

Mr. TASSÉ.

with the amounts of their salaries. Let me give the following statement for the year 1881:

INSIDE SERVICE.

(From the Public Accounts of 1881.)

Department.	French.		Other origins.	
	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.
Governor Gen'l's Secretary's Office.....			7	12,875 00
Privy Council	3	3,750 00	13	10,349 60
Justice			17	19,030 05
Militia and Defence.	10	12,529 15	20	22,568 28
Secretary of State	7	8,566 67	32	28,234 98
Interior	6	6,150 00	50	55,881 48
Auditor General's Office.....	2	1,444 55	15	19,866 63
Finance			42	49,925 00
Treasury Board			2	2,133 38
Customs	2	4,050 00	24	26,511 97
Inland Revenue	5	4,984 63	21	24,249 23
Public Works	12	13,756 09	11	14,008 48
Railways and Canals	8	1,275 00	18	24,477 73
Post Office Department	13	8,860 17	101	92,383 46
Agriculture	22	212 30	8	11,775 00
Marine and Fisheries	5	5,100 00	20	24,347 50
Civil Service Board.....			2	600 00
	95	\$103,696 26	403	\$439,217 77

It is impossible to find a similar return as far as the officers of the Parliament and those of the outside service are concerned, their names, for some unaccountable reason, not being given in the Public Accounts. But a return like that which I ask for was produced in 1872, and from it I will draw the following statement which probably has not been materially altered since that year:

PARLIAMENT.

(From an official return published in 1872..)

	French.		Other Origins.	
	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.
Commons.....	19	17,910 00	33	38,919 50
Senate	9	10,400 00	11	8,900 00
Parliament Library	5	6,500 00	7	8,560 00
	33	34,810 00	51	56,369 50

OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Customs, Post Office, Inland Revenue, Marine and Fisheries, Public Works, &c.

	French.		Other Origins.	
	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.
Nova Scotia.....	14	3,299 00	891	293,393 25
New Brunswick.....	14	3,100 00	509	216,579 50
Quebec.....	321	135,728 50	431	220,474 50
Ontario.....	15	5,780 00	714	393,899 25
Manitoba.....	1	600 00	6	3,350 00
British Columbia.....			12	17,620 00
Generally.....	7	4,710 00	41	26,322 00
	372	153,217 50	2,604	1,171,538 50

As it may be interesting to know how we arrive at such figures touching the Province of Quebec, I will submit the following detailed statement:

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

	French.		Other Origins.	
	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.
Customs.....	75	34,634 50	156	78,225 50
Post Office.....	70	35,180 00	77	51,239 00
Inland Revenue.....	37	24,365 00	35	29,000 00
Public Works.....	35	13,199 00	39	18,636 00
Marine.....	104	28,350 00	123	42,576 00
	321	135,728 50	431	229,474 50

Now, if we include the foregoing figures touching the inside with the outside service, we obtain the following result:

ABSTRACT.

	No.	Salaries.	French.		Other Origins.	
			No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.
		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Inside Service.....	582	634,093 53	128	138,506 26	454	495,587 27
Outside Service...	2976	1,324,756 00	372	153,217 50	2604	1,171,538 50
	3558	1,958,849 53	500	291,623 76	3058	1,667,125 77

This would give a proportion of French employés in those branches of the public service of 7 per cent. As those figures are partly from 1872, the number of officers has undoubtedly much increased since, but I do not think, I repeat, that the proportion of their relative origins has been notably altered. In connection with this statement, it may be properly asked what is the relative strength of the French population in Canada. The last Census puts it at 1,298,803 souls, apportioned as follows: Quebec, 1,073,820; Ontario, 102,147; New Brunswick, 56,635; Nova Scotia, 41,219; Prince Edward Island, 10,751; Manitoba, 9,949; North-West Territories, 2,771, and British Columbia, 915. As the French element represented an aggregate of 1,082,940 in 1871, we have thus an increase of more than 200,000 souls during the last decade—a result which is wonderful if we take into account the emigration to the United States and the fact that such an increase is due entirely to their prolific qualities, qualities unsurpassed in the history of mankind. The population of Canada being calculated at 4,324,810 souls, the French element is thus a little more than one-fourth while it receives but one-seventh of the patronage. In the face of these facts, I may well ask where is the French domination? Where is the ghost, the horrid ghost which is evoked every day by the Grit press to terrify the people of Ontario? French domination! Do you see it in the fact that if the French element has more than its share in a few branches of the Dominion service, it is not fairly represented in some while it is almost ignored in others? Do you see it in the fact that if you except Quebec, there are very few officers of French origin employed by the Local Governments of the other Provinces? French domination! French domination! Do you see it in the fact that there is not a minority treated as justly and as generously as that of the Province of Quebec—a treatment which I would like to see imitated in all the other Provinces, in order to show to the world that there is not a spot on the

surface of the earth where the rights of every one are more carefully guarded than in the free and happy land of Canada. French domination! French domination! Do you see it in the most startling fact that in the very Province of Quebec—the very bulwark of our race—where the nine-twelfths of the people are of French origin, the minority has secured even the greatest number of the federal offices; that in 1872 there were in the Department of Customs, Post Office, Inland Revenue, Public Works, Marine and Fisheries, 431 English speaking officers receiving \$220,474 50, against 321 French employés receiving \$135,728 50—that is to say, there were 110 more English-speaking officers than French? French domination! Do you see it in the fact that French constituencies or constituencies with a French majority have elected, and are still electing men of another origin, of another creed, to represent them? At this very moment, the hon. member for the county of Ottawa—the King of the Gatineau,—the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, the hon. member for Gloucester, one of the lights of the Opposition, the hon. member for Chateauguay, the hon. member for Shefford, and the hon. member for Victoria, New Brunswick, all represent counties having a French majority. In the past, we have not been less generous, as it is fully exemplified by the following facts as related by the late lamented Sir Etienne Pascal Taché, the very man who predicted that the last gun for English supremacy on this continent would be fired by a French Canadian:

“That the people of Lower Canada always acted towards the English with liberality was best exemplified by facts. Before the Union, while the constituencies were almost exclusively French, English Protestant gentlemen were frequently returned to Parliament; and he had now opposite to him an hon. member who had for twenty years represented an entirely French and Roman Catholic county. He doubts that in the course of these twenty years, the hon. gentleman had ever been asked whether he were Scotch or Protestant. They took the man for his sterling worth. It was even a fact that the French had elected members with extraordinary names, and, as every body knows, there was sometimes a good deal in a name. Now, if there was one name which French Canadians disliked more than another, it was that of Luther. Yet they had elected a gentleman bearing that significant appellation. He was glad they had, and he had no doubt he had been elected because of his personal worth; but it unquestionably showed a great deal of liberal feeling on the part of the electors. But if an English Protestant was bad in the eyes of a French Canadian, a French Protestant was infinitely worse, and yet the county of Lotbinière had elected a French Canadian Protestant, without even questioning his religion. But again, quite lately in a division in Lower Canada, numbering only 50,000 souls, of which only 1,400 were English, an election of a member to this Chamber had taken place, the candidates being a French Roman Catholic gentleman, long and well known, and an English Protestant—and with what result? Why, that English Protestant had beaten the French Canadian Roman Catholic by 1,000 votes. Could any greater proof of a tolerant and liberal feeling be exhibited.”

French domination! Do you see it in the fact that the English minority, in the Province of Quebec, has five or six representatives in the other Chamber and in the Legislative Council of Quebec? Do you see it also in the fact that the last nominee to the Senate from the Province of Quebec is a gentleman, well and generally respected, but who has not a drop of French blood in his veins? French domination! Do you see it in the fact that while the English-speaking minority of Quebec is largely represented in the Upper Chamber—and I am glad to see a minority largely represented—the 102,743 Acadians, who differ from us French Canadians only in name, but who are the same as ourselves in language, religion, politics and historical associations—that they and the 108,605 French Canadians scattered throughout the Province of Ontario have not a single representative in the Senate—an injustice I sincerely trust the Government of the day will repair at an early opportunity. Those 211,345 Frenchmen scattered throughout Ontario and the Maritime Provinces will become, ere long, a very important factor in the Canadian community. And their claims are the more entitled to the consideration of the Government, that its hon. leader, at the time of the debates on Confederation,

stated that the Senate had been established especially to protect sectional rights. His very words were:

"To the Upper House is to be confided the protection of sectional interests."

French domination! Do you see it in the fact that hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions, have been spent to attract a foreign emigration to our shores, which, however desirable and useful it may be to the country at large, cannot certainly increase the influence of French Canadians. Now the Government should spare neither pains nor expense to facilitate the return of Canadians from the neighboring Republic. Thousands of them have been induced to return to their native land, which they were compelled to desert under adverse circumstances. Let us do for them what we have done for the Mennonites and the Scandinavians. The other day several hundreds of French Canadians left New England to become settlers in our great North-West. Let us encourage that movement by all possible means, and we shall see ere long not only hundreds but thousands of Canadians of all origins returning to their country, which they love, to give it the benefit of their intelligence, labor and industry. In the face of these facts, it is quite evident there can be no sincerity in the cry of French domination. The *Globe* and its satellites know perfectly well, unless more ignorant than fanatical, and that would be saying a great deal, that such a cry has not the slightest foundation, that if any ascendancy exists, or is to be dreaded in this country, it is not certainly that of the French. Minorities can have no power or influence in a country like this, such as has been ascribed to the French; they cannot rule except in exceptional cases with our well balanced system of Government. How could the French minority rule when this Government is not only supported by a majority from Quebec, but by one still larger from the great Province of Ontario, and by a majority from Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia? And this majority is not a "brute majority" as it was so styled by the courteous member for Centre Huron the other day, nor is it a majority of "slaves," as was described by the leader of the Opposition; but it is the majority of a House, which, according to old parliamentarians, constitutes one of the most intelligent and patriotic assemblies that ever sat in Canada. If ever the French minority had an occasional chance of ruling it would not abuse it. Its unsurpassed generosity towards other races, where it is the controlling power, constitutes an everlasting monument that no penny-a-liner can either deface or destroy. And were it disposed to be either unjust or intolerant, we know that no such temper would be tolerated by our English fellow-citizens, who, however divided by party lines and barriers, know of no division when the interests of John Bull are supposed to be imperilled. Why then is the Liberal party raising the cry of French domination? They raise it for mere electoral and political purposes? They raise it to wake up animosities that should have been buried for ever. They raise it to divert the public mind from the real issues of the day—to make the people forget, if possible, the great boon of the National Policy, and that they are now, instead of suffering from poverty and depression, enjoying unusual prosperity, and, instead of huge deficits, large surpluses—that they are ruled now by statesmen who are not mere muddlers of figures, nor mere flies on the wheel, but who are statesmen successfully working out the great and glorious destinies of Canada. Power is their sole object. Power is their magnetic pole. To reach power they will sacrifice everything. To reach power they deposed their former leader, and now they extol him to the skies. He may well exclaim: "Save me from such friends." To reach power they are prepared to sow the seeds of civil war, to set Province against Province, Creed against Creed, Eng-

Mr. TASSÉ.

lishmen against Frenchmen, to shake the very foundations of our political system, to break up the Union. The hon. leader of the Opposition will claim, perhaps, that he is not responsible for the utterances of the *Globe* and the Grit press. I know that before his promotion to that distinguished and responsible position—which I sincerely trust for the good of the country he will occupy for a great many years—he was accused by that very paper of delivering "disturbing speeches," one of which I presume was the Aurora speech; but I believe his views and those of that organ are now quite in accord. The hon. gentleman has been trumpeting his views over one-half the Dominion, the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and even the Atlantic coast have resounded with the echoes of his eloquence—but he never thought proper to state in his numberless harangues that he had no sympathy with that cry of French domination. The hon. gentleman visited Montreal before the last local elections of Quebec, to organize, or rather to reorganize a much disorganized and dispirited party, and I trust he is satisfied with the result of his labors. He then could exclaim at the end of a speech: *Moi aussi, je suis Canadien*, "I also am a Canadian;" but he did not dare to oppose the power behind the Throne and satisfy the legitimate anxiety of his French supporters in that Province, by stating that he had no sympathy with that anti-French policy. The hon. gentleman, who knows so well how to make prospective judges "speak now," could not find a word to say for the poor Frenchman. I will have to conclude that, though not willing to sow the wind he is desirous to reap the whirlwind, though he will not himself plant the bad tree of discord in our midst, he has not the slightest objection to gather the bad fruit. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has no sympathy with that cry of French domination, how is it that not only the Grit papers, but some of the most active members of his party have denounced from the hustings and in the Local Legislature, that so-called threatening French domination? How is it that the hon. the Secretary of State has been grossly insulted by a member of the Local Government on the sole account of his origin, that Mr. James Young, a former member of this House, and one of the most prominent supporters of the Government in the Local Legislature of Ontario, has used the following language in the debate on the Address on the 18th January last:—

"In the old Province of Canada Sir John kept office for fifteen years by denying the rights of Ontario to obtain a French Canadian majority, and his action on the boundary award was evidently dictated by the same motives. . . . The Government at Ottawa evidently hoped to ingratiate themselves into the confidence of other Provinces, and particularly Quebec, by dismembering Ontario and cutting it down to one-half its actual size."

If the hon. leader of the Opposition has no sympathy with that cry, how is it that the hon. member for Centre Huron has qualified the French Conservative party in this House as a small selfish clique. Here are the very words uttered by him in the last debate on the boundary question:

"I do not believe that the majority of the people of Quebec grudge us our rights, but I do fear, from past experience, that there is a small, selfish clique in Quebec who desire to deprive Ontario of her rights in this matter; and I fear they have too much influence in deciding this question in the councils of the Dominion."

If the hon. leader of the Opposition has no sympathy with that cry, how is it that another of his colleagues, the hon. member for North Norfolk, is reported to have uttered the following observation—not from his seat in the House; I do not believe he would dare to use such language from his seat in this House—but in a stump speech delivered a fortnight before the opening of this House at Aylmer, county of Elgin. He said:

"Why should Ontario submit to such injustice? It is the Province that pays three-fifths of the revenue of the Dominion; it is the heart of Canadian virtue, intelligence and enterprise, and it intends to assert its rights. It has long enough been made the catspaw of French lickspittles, and build the harbors and public works of Quebec."

I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman; but if he has really used that language, even in a stump speech, even in the backwoods, I can only say as a member of this House that it is to be regretted that a man of the ability and standing of that hon. gentleman, who pretends to possess liberal and broad views, should have so forgotten himself as to use such coarse and unjust language towards a race which deserves better treatment—a language which I am sure, if it has been really used by the hon. gentleman, will be resented by every Frenchman worthy of that name. If I am told that it is not incumbent on the hon. leader of the Opposition to stand by my countrymen when they are unfairly and unjustly assailed, when they are treated, for instance, as they were by the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk, as lick-spittles, such an excuse could not be urged in behalf of the member for Quebec East. Still that hon. gentleman, who is supposed to be entrusted with a peculiar mission in this House, has remained as silent on that most important point as his hon. leader—I will not say his master—although that would be a very fitting return for the epithet of slave addressed to us by the hon. leader of the Opposition. One would have thought, however, that the hon. gentleman had made sufficient sacrifices to please his leader. Was it not enough that he should have sacrificed the views of his party, or rather the remnant of his party—and even that remnant is not always true to the hon. gentleman—on a most important question, the question of protection to Canadian interests, without accepting silently the most humiliating role which has been assigned to him. No, my hon. friend and his friends are party to a comedy which is being played by the opponents of the Government at the expense of the people at large. Let me draw the attention of the House to the fact that while the Liberals of Ontario claim that Quebec reigns supreme, the Liberals of Quebec contend loudly that their Province is shamefully neglected by the Government, and that Ontario secures for herself the lion's share. In this way the Liberal party have pursued a wholesale policy of deception. They can exhibit at one time what the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) would call the two sides of the shield, in one Province the silver side and in the other Province the brazen side. To prove my assertion let me quote another article of the *Globe* of the 30th January last:

"Sir John A. Macdonald has thrown overboard every affectation of regard for Ontario, given up even the wish to conciliate this Province and now looks for his main force to Quebec. By bribery and political arts he trusts to keep ranged alongside his Bleus a sufficient number of members from Ontario and the other Provinces to give him a working majority. Sir George E. Cartier promised his followers that they should rule the Confederation, and by the aid of Sir John the pledge is at present being fulfilled with a vengeance."

As a matter of history, Sir George E. Cartier never promised, and never could have promised his followers in this country that they would rule under Confederation. That assertion is a deliberate falsehood, a deliberate perversion of facts. That great patriot promised his fellow-countrymen that under Confederation their rights as a distinct race in this country would be protected, and but for that solemn pledge which was given to them the French Canadians never would have consented to enter the Union. But, unfortunately, the French Canadians have to come to the conclusion that that pledge will not be respected by the Liberal party. Sir, at the time of Confederation one of their leaders, the late hon. George Brown, stated in a speech that the people of Lower Canada had consented to enter the Union, had consented to concede representation by population to the Province of Ontario on the express condition that Quebec would have an equality of representation in the Upper House. Here are the very words of Mr. Brown:

"Our friends from Lower Canada have agreed to give us representation by population to the Lower House on the express condition that they should have equality of representatives in the Upper House."

143

Well, do we not know that the Liberal party is striving to-day for the abolition of the Senate, which would be a violation of the Federal Act and a breach of faith fraught with the most alarming consequences, and tantamount to a dissolution of this Union. But even the maintenance of the Union does not much concern our friends opposite. At the present moment I see unfurled in the city of Montreal the flag of independence, and they mean to cheer with the hon. Mr. Jones, a former member of a Liberal Cabinet, when the British flag shall be hauled down from the citadel of Halifax. Now, Sir, that we have fully ascertained, according to the Grit papers and the Grit politicians, that the Premier of this Dominion is sold to the Province of Quebec, is sold to the "lick-spittles" of Quebec, to use the delicate expression of the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is an expression I have no recollection of having used. I disclaim the language attributed to me by the hon. gentleman. A report of my remarks on that occasion was made by a person who at the time was a stranger to me, I never revised them, and I disclaim the words which have been put into my mouth. I never used them with reference to the French Canadians or, to my recollection, with reference to anybody else. I should be sorry to use so vulgar an expression, and if I had done so I should feel it my duty to make an apology.

Mr. ARKELL. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that I have his speech here word for word, as published in his own organ, the *St. Thomas Journal*.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have just referred to that speech, and stated that the report of that speech had never been revised by me, and was not authorized.

Mr. TASSÉ. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that he never uttered that language, which would have been most abusive to my countrymen, and which would, I am sure, be resented by every one of them. If I have cited that language it is because in the debate on the boundary question, these very words were quoted by an hon. member from the speech of the hon. gentleman, and that I find those words in the report of the *Hansard*. I am sorry my hon. friend has not taken an earlier opportunity to say that the language attributed to him was not used by him on that occasion. Well, now, let us see the other side of the shield as it has been exhibited lately to the electors of the Province of Quebec by a French Liberal paper, *La Concorde*, of Three Rivers. The article which I will cite has been complacently reproduced in the organ of my hon. friend for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), *L'Electeur*, and also in *La Patrie*, of Montreal, which is the recognized Liberal organ of that district, and it will be quoted by the supporters of my hon. friend on all the hustings of that Province. Let us see the article in that paper which will be an antidote to the French domination cry:

"Never since the 17th September, 1878—the date of the last Conservative victory—has Lower Canada been so clumsily and so openly ill-treated as ever it was or probably ever it will be. Is it not a fact that the Macdonald-Langevin Cabinet has refused to our French Canadian members nine-tenths of the requests made them on behalf of their constituents? Is it not a fact that the present Government refused Mr. Vallee's application for a subsidy in favor of the Lake St. John Railway? Is it not a fact that the Government refused Mr. Lanary's request that it should build the St. Charles Branch? Did it not refuse Mr. Casgrain the building of a station at Elgin in the county of L'Islet? Did it not refuse Mr. Bourbeau the printing of pamphlets on the cultivation of tobacco, beet-root and agriculture generally? Did it not refuse Mr. Gigault the dredging of the Chambly River? Did it not refuse Mr. Bergeron the widening of the Beauharnois Canal? Did it not refuse Mr. Mongenais the building of the Cedars Canal? Did it not refuse Mr. Lanary the building of railway stations at St. Francis and at St. Peter in his county? Did it not refuse Mr. Hurteau the dredging of the Assomption River? Did it not refuse Mr. Bourbeau the printing and distributing of pamphlets which would make our mines known? Did it not refuse Mr. Bergeron the building of a line between Lachine and Caughnawaga to facilitate winter navigation? Did it not refuse Mr. Grandbois the erection of a lighthouse at Rivière du Loup? Did it not refuse (Mr. Vanasse, we believe) the abolition of duties on Canadian

tobacco? Did it not refuse Mr. Mousseau help for the people burnt out at Upton, St. Helene and St. Liboire in 1880? Is it not a fact that the Geological Museum, an institution belonging to Montreal, a Lower Canadian city, has been removed to Ottawa, an Upper Canadian city, by this same Conservative Government? Is it not true that several unjust refusals made by French Canadians are so flagrant that they have been loudly denounced by the *Courier de Montreal*, by Senator Bellerose and other authorized persons? Lastly, is it not true that the influence of the Province of Quebec at Ottawa, amounts to a cypher to-day, as is shown by the distribution of portfolios under the present régime and that under the Mackenzie Administration? Liberal régime: Hon. L. S. Huntington, Post Office; Hon. W. Laurier, Inland Revenue; Hon. R. Lafamme, Justice; Hon. C. A. Pelletier, Agriculture. Conservative régime: Hon. A. P. Caron, Militia; Sir H. Langevin, Public Works; Hon. J. H. Pope, Agriculture; Hon. J. A. Mousseau, Secretary of State; or two portfolios to-day against the four we had formerly. Can we ever be more crushed, more powerless and more neglected than we are in the year of our Lord, 1882, under the reign of these political pigmies whose names are Langevin and Mousseau? Let electors remember this."

I will not enter into the merit of these articles. They speak for themselves. They are nothing but shams, but frauds. I have cited them to expose the baseless tactics to which the Liberals are resorting to excite sectional jealousies against the Government. Such electoral dodges may succeed with some, but I trust that the vast majority of the electors are too intelligent to fall again into the trap laid for them. I see that a great fuss is made to-day by the Liberal party in relation to various matters touching the autonomy of the Provinces. Well, Sir, I am a Federalist in the fullest sense of the word. I am quite ready at any time to uphold the letter as well as the spirit of the Constitution. I regard the Act of Union as the true charter of our liberties. I regard our system as more perfect than the British or the American Constitution. I regard it as an improvement on both. But let me warn those who are raising this cry of French domination, that they are acting as the worst enemies of the Provinces, as the worst enemies of the Constitution. When the great scheme of Confederation was discussed, one of the main reasons urged by the late Hon. George Brown for its adoption was the following:

"I favor this plan because it will put an end to the warfare between Upper and Lower Canada. A most happy day will it be for Canada when this Bill goes into effect, and all the subjects of discord are swept from the discussion of our Legislature."

Well, it must be evident to every one that in prosecuting their mischievous work, in arousing Ontario against Quebec, the Liberal party is assuming a most dangerous responsibility and destroying one of the very objects for which Confederation was established, which was to put an end to the irreconcilable strifes of the old Provinces. There are some who hold that national distinctions should not be made or recognized, but I could not favor such a view. These distinctions alone have created Confederation. But for them a Legislative Union would have been established. They are essentially a part of our political system. But for them I could not speak here my own language when I choose to do so. But for them the practice of having three French members in the Cabinet would not prevail. But for them you would not perhaps, Mr. Speaker, occupy to-day the proud position of First Commoner—a position for which you are so eminently fitted otherwise. But for them it would not have been necessary to enact that the limits of twelve counties in Quebec—another safeguard against French domination—could not be altered without the assent of a majority of their members. I have no hesitation to state, Mr. Speaker, that if this Union is to be maintained, we must take into account these distinctions as much as possible. This Union rests on a diversity of interests, national, religious, educational and social, and these interests must be represented. Those conversant with history know that one of the main causes of the political commotion of 1837 was the fact that the French element was not fairly represented in the Legislative Council or in the Public Service. That grievance is set forth in very

Mr. TASSÉ,

strong terms in the celebrated ninety-five Resolutions adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Lower Canada in 1833. Those conversant with history know also that when that worthy Governor, Sir Charles Bagot, undertook with so much success to conciliate Lower Canada, one of his first acts was to confer some of the most important offices on those in whom the people had the greatest confidence. Let us not repeat that page of our history. Let us benefit by experience. It is true that these distinctions of race may complicate to a certain extent the problems of government, but their inconveniences are counterbalanced by still greater advantages. Lord Dufferin has, expressing an opinion on that subject well worth recalling, said:

"I do not think that ethnological homogeneity is an unmixed benefit to a country. Certainly the least attractive characteristic of a great portion of this continent is the monotony of many of its outward aspects, and I consider it fortunate for Canada that her prosperity should be founded on the co-operation of different races. The interaction of national idiosyncrasies introduces into our existence a freshness, a variety, a color, an eclectic impulse which otherwise would be wanting; and it would be most faulty statesmanship to seek their obliteration. My warmest aspiration for that Province has always been to see its French inhabitants executing for Canada the functions which France herself has so admirably performed for Europe."

Before concluding I will take this opportunity to refer to a statement made some time ago by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in the course of an answer to the congratulatory address presented to him by the Liberal Association of Ottawa:

"I thank you for the very kindly allusion to my father. I am old enough to remember, though I was but a young lad at the time, those days in which we took part in the great events to which your address has alluded. I was in Montreal a portion of the time, and saw and was much with some of the leaders of that day, Mr. Lafontaine and Mr. Baldwin. I remember the spirit which animated these men then and for some time afterwards. I remember the strong phalanx of Lower Canada Liberals who were then the backbone of Liberal Government."

Times have changed, as, no doubt, the hon. gentleman feels it severely when he contemplates the much mutilated band from Lower Canada—not even a corporal's guard—which surrounds him. But how can he expect that this small band will ever become the backbone of the Liberal party with the daily and violent onslaughts of his press and of his colleagues against the so-called "French domination." I only wonder that he can obtain support at all from that quarter. The hon. member for Quebec East, who was present on that occasion, in order to encourage the few French Liberals of the Ottawa district, not only endorsed the statement of his leader, but even expressed the conviction that "if the grand old leaders, Baldwin and Lafontaine, returned to earth they would not be found in the ranks of the so-called Liberal-Conservative party, but among the Liberals who believed not in legislating for personal aggrandizement, but for the greatest good of the greatest number." Truly, Mr. Speaker, Lafontaine and Baldwin were two great men. Their names cannot be too much honored, too much respected. Their names will be forever enshrined into the hearts of a grateful people. Both will occupy a high place in the Canadian Pantheon. But why should the hon. member for Quebec East insult their memory in stating that if they were living to-day they would be found in the ranks of the Grit party. Baldwin was a Liberal, but he was not a Grit. He was chased out of public life by a Grit. Lafontaine was a Liberal in the broadest sense of the word, but he was not a Rouge. Lafontaine was the embodiment of the political unity of his race, and that unity was broken by the friends of the hon. member for Quebec East. His bitterest enemies were the Radicals, headed by Mr. Papineau, whom the hon. member for Quebec East seems to discard, to repudiate now. Lafontaine has founded a political creed which is the creed of the French Conservatives of to-day; his associates and his disciples were the Morins, the Tachés, the Cartiers who have been, with this

great man, the real founders of the French Conservative party. If any one doubts that Lafontaine was opposed in the most violent manner by the party represented now by the hon. member for Quebec East, the following extracts from *Le Pays* and *L'Avenir*—the French Liberal organs at that time—will show to what extent the leaders of the Opposition misrepresent history in claiming Lafontaine as one of them. On the 5th December, 1852, we find the following language used by *Le Pays*:

"Decentralization and democracy are one, but he who says centralization says despotism. Now, Mr. Lafontaine did nothing but centralize during four years, thus ignoring democracy. His supporters ignored it also. Centralization has always been to this country the hydra-headed monster of the fable, the beast with seven heads of the Apocalypse."

Now, what will one think of the Liberals who claim as their own a man whom formerly they charged with being not only a despot, but with having introduced into the country the hydra of the fable and the beast with seven heads. That is indeed a strange fashion of eulogizing one's leader. But let us proceed. In another number *Le Pays*, speaking of Mr. Lafontaine's retirement, says:

"Messrs. Lafontaine and Baldwin, the two most backward men in the late Administration, have both gone back to private life. Mr. Lafontaine, the greater tactician of the two, feigns ill-health; as to Mr. Baldwin, he was simply shown the door."

If the Liberal party do not understand the interests of the country, no party understand better how "to show the door to their leaders."

"Now, we are of those who believe that Lafontaine retired from public life simply because he had abandoned all hope of being able to continue his system of restricting the rights of the people, of invading the privileges of the House, and of increasing the prerogatives of the Ministers..... The *Journal de Québec* acquired its Conservative ideas at the school of the Baldwins and the Lafontaines."

On the 24th August, 1853, we also find:

"It is notorious that Mr. Lafontaine, notwithstanding the silence of his retirement, stood as a perpetual skeleton in the cupboard of the present Ministry. For us, we had no cause to fear Mr. Lafontaine, for his return to public life was an impossibility, owing to the principles with which he had tried to inculcate the Legislature during the last Parliament. We do not wish to say that Mr. Lafontaine would not have found an electoral division to return him to Parliament, but he could never have found in the House the elements wherewith to reconstitute the despised party which governed us from 1847 to 1851. Mr. Cauchon is the only member of that party who has remained in the House; and this small individuality, embodying in itself the *debris* of that party, could not send forth the slightest ray of hope."

Now, let us see the opinion expressed by *L'Avenir*, of the 5th October, 1850:

"The cause of Democracy is nothing new. From the day when these reactionary men (Baldwin and Lafontaine) shall fall, swept away by the flood of light of public opinion shed upon their deeds or by one of those occurrences in appearance accidental, and which no one can foresee, but which are so justly called providential, from that day our programme (that of democracy) will again be that of the mass of the French Canadian population."

I may observe here, that it is not surprising that our opponents should try to steal our mighty dead, when we see prominent members of the Liberal party eulogizing now the late lamented Sir George Cartier, whom they disparaged, whom they maligned in his lifetime, and even represented as the assassin of his nationality. But there is another reason why the Grits of Ontario and the Rouges of Quebec cannot claim Baldwin and Lafontaine as the founders of their party. These two great men would never, to rise to power, have attempted to kindle civil discord in our midst. Their whole political life was devoted to unite two races which had been so divided in the past. Their whole political life was imbued with the same lofty sentiment which animated a British Governor when he elevated a common monument to the memory of two great soldiers, who nobly fought and died for their country, Wolfe and Montcalm. Their whole political life was devoted to teach the people that a spirit of compromise, of mutual forbearance, is indispensable to the Government of this country. Their whole political life was devoted to obtain,

to maintain and to extend the principle of responsible government, which Papineau and his party repudiated and which the Liberal party have endeavored to destroy by foul means. Baldwin would never have raised the sham cry of French domination. He who had been received with open arms by the county of Rimouski when rejected by his old supporters. Baldwin would never have aroused the prejudices of the people to reign thereby. No, he was too much the friend of truth, the friend of liberty, the friend of good government to assume the role of a demagogue. He had learned to appreciate the virtues of our race, and he knew that if they could be combined with the sterling qualities of the English-speaking race, we could stamp this half of a continent with the best features of the greatest peoples in the world. If the voice of the great Reformer could again resound in our Legislative Assemblies, it would be to denounce the Reform party as degenerated, as a party who has nothing to reform; to denounce the enemies of our country, those agitators, those demagogues who, regardless of consequences, under the false name of Liberals, are endeavoring to undermine, to destroy his noble work of the union of the various races which inhabit our young Dominion—a union which, I am proud to say, the Conservative party is still prosecuting with an undiminished vigor, under the safe guidance of its illustrious leader—a union which you will admit, Mr. Speaker, is necessary, is indispensable, if Canada is to become, what should be our common aim, our common ambition, a great, a glorious and a free country.

Mr. LAURIER. I have listened with a great deal of attention and a great deal of curiosity to the speech of the hon. gentleman, thinking that it would come to some conclusion, but I find that after a very laborious effort he has brought forth nothing, and that the only thing in his mind is a complaint that his countrymen and mine do not secure, at the hands of the Government, their legitimate share of the public patronage. I am aware that the question of patronage is always an absorbing question for the Conservative party, or at least for the Conservative party in my own Province. Whether my countrymen have or have not their legitimate share of patronage at the hands of this Government I do not care, and one would have thought by the lofty tone which the hon. gentleman has assumed that he would be above such matters. But it seems he attaches some importance to them, and let me tell him that he is committing an injustice to the Government of which he is a supporter. He has given us in detail the number of gentlemen of the French race employed in the several departments of the Government, but he has overlooked some of the most important of the employes of the House and the Government. He has forgotten to mention that all the correspondents of the French press of Lower Canada, who sit in this gallery, are employed as sessional clerks, and paid by this House. It is a fact, Sir, that ought to be known, and for which the Government which the hon. gentleman supports ought to have full credit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not take the trouble to answer the charges the hon. gentleman has made were it not for the fact that he has chosen to speak disparagingly of the party to which I belong. He has represented that we are merely a small band in this House. So we are, Mr. Speaker, but the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec have no reason to feel ashamed of their position. If we are but few in this House to-day it is because we have been decimated in the defence of a noble cause; because we have defended freedom and constitutional government against the attack of the party to which he belongs. The hon. gentleman says that the Grit press of Ontario makes appeals to the prejudices of their fellow-countrymen. If they do so—a matter which I do not know of, but which the hon. gentleman seems to have thoroughly investigated—he is right to denounce them, and I can only wish that he would only urge in the paper he edits

that the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec should profess the same principles which he professes here. If we are decimated, is it not due to the fact that the press and the party to which he belongs have always traded on the prejudices of our people? The hon. gentleman and his party would not have a standing in this House, were it not that for the last twenty-five years they never dared to meet us on political questions, but have always appealed to the prejudices of our countrymen. Who can deny the fact? The hon. gentleman objects to the remark I made somewhere that if Baldwin and Lafontaine came back to this country, they would not recognize the party to which they belonged as their party. Can the charge be denied? Is it not a fact that the press to which the hon. gentleman belongs has always represented it a heresy to belong to the Liberal party or to be called a Liberal? When we attack the Government, when we condemn their principles, when we try to engage them in a battle on political grounds in the Province of Quebec, we are always met with the same cry: "These gentlemen are enemies of your religion, they are Liberals, and it is not possible for a Catholic to be a Liberal." How often have we not found these words in the press of the hon. gentleman. How often could I not find them, if I had time, in the very paper of which he is the editor. It is because of such cries that we are so few here to-day. But, as I said before, few as we are, I would rather stand here a defender of the rights obtained for us by our fathers than to belong to the so-called Conservative party of the Province of Quebec. Any hon. member of this House can judge what that party are by a single utterance that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman. He has spoken with glee, with jubilation in his countenance as well as in his voice, of the fact that a large section of the French Liberals sitting on this side of the House voted against their party the other night on the boundary question. It is inconceivable to the average Conservative of the Province of Quebec that a man belonging to a party can be independent; he cannot realize that a man belonging to a party should vote according to his conscience. But we are Liberals, and it is our own pride that we will not submit our individual judgment to any man, living or dead, when we stand up and vote. We express what is in our consciences and our hearts. I voted on one side and some of my friends voted on the other side; but they never received a reproach from us, because we knew that they were voting according to their consciences. But not later than Friday last four hon. gentlemen opposite had the courage to do what our friends did, and the moment the whip was cracked over their heads, and the hon. gentleman who has just spoken knows it, they were driven into line again. If they were of the same metal as the hon. gentlemen on this side, I do not say that they would have voted otherwise, but they would not have submitted to have the whip cracked over their heads as it was done the other night. There is another remark in the hon. gentleman's speech to which I wish to take exception. I protest with all my heart and with all my might against his utterance regarding the Chief Justice of Quebec, Mr. Dorion, and I think the hon. gentleman himself ought to regret it. If there is a man in Lower Canada who has the esteem and respect of his fellow countrymen of all shades of opinion in politics and religion, it is the present Chief Justice—the hon. A. A. Dorion. What is the reproach attempted to be made on him by the hon. gentleman? The only reproach was that he said he had abandoned a political station to take a judicial station.

Mr. TASSÉ. After having stated in this House that no such appointment was contemplated.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, did he state an untruth? Will the hon. gentleman dare to make such an assertion?

Mr. LAURIER.

Will he question the word of the Chief Justice when he stated in this House that he did not contemplate taking such an appointment? Is it not a fact that a man can change his mind? I have been told several times that the Government which the hon. gentleman supported changed their minds between six and eight o'clock in the evening. If such a thing is possible, is it not too bad that the hon. gentleman should bring such a charge as that against the Chief Justice? Chief Justice Dorion said at one time that he did not contemplate taking office. I am sure he did not. At another time he accepted it, and how? I am sure I am not betraying any secret when I say that it was only at the earnest solicitation of his personal friends, and that he made a great sacrifice in doing so. He only transferred his usefulness from one sphere to another, and to-day I blush for my country, which possesses so few eminent men, to hear such charges brought against one of her worthy sons. The hon. gentleman has mentioned another name, that of Mr. Letellier. What has he to reproach him with? Is it accepting an office? What does he complain of in this case?

Mr. TASSÉ. With a very serious offence—with violating the grand principles of responsible government.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will not evade the question in that way. He did not make that charge, which now only comes in as an afterthought. Does he reproach him for accepting an office under the Crown? I am glad to see he has not the heart to repeat it again. It is a shame to make any such charge. Did the late Mr. Letellier commit any offence in this respect? Did he violate the laws of honor when he became the Lieutenant-Governor of his native Province? Not a charge circulated day after day in the press of the hon. gentleman against such men has a shred of foundation. This is a very serious charge, however; and the party opposite must be very much reduced indeed when it can stoop so low as to utter a name they should never mention in this House—the name of a man which their wicked persecution has driven into an early grave.

Mr. HOUDE. I must protest against the judgment passed by the hon. member for Quebec East, on the majority of his and my compatriots of Quebec. The smallness of the party of that hon. gentleman in this House, to which he alluded, is not due to the bigotry and intolerance of our party. I have been in many constituencies in Quebec, including those of my hon. friends from Iberville and St. John's, whom I see here present, but have never heard any French Conservative drag in religion on the hustings. But I have several times heard French Liberals introduce it and try to provoke and draw us on that ground. What is the cause of the present condition of that party? The member for Quebec East himself, in an eloquent lecture which he delivered five years ago before a Liberal Club in Quebec, the Club Canadien, acknowledged that the founders of the Liberal party of to-day were so extreme in 1848, 1850 and 1852, and so radical, that they not only frightened the Catholic clergy but the Protestant citizens of Canada, and especially of Lower Canada. Though he might be reproached for it, he had to acknowledge the fact, saying there was more honor in acknowledging a truth than trying to conceal it. He also explained why the Protestant Conservatives of Quebec were united with the French Conservatives—namely, because they liked liberty and also liked order; and it was because they were in favor of order and well understood liberty, that they were obliged to stand against the new Liberal or Radical party. I am glad to say that that party was modified as to its political aspirations and utterances as time passed. It is possible that in some instances members of that party may have suffered an injustice from illegitimate fears in regard to them. But whose fault was it? The fault of the founders them-

selves, whose extreme principles were so dangerous that my hon. friend himself, in spite of all the respect and esteem he always entertained for them and enjoyed at their hands, was obliged to repudiate. The reason the Quebec Liberals in Parliament are so few is, that they made promises to the people of their Province when they propounded what they called the National Policy in 1871 and 1872—this name was not invented by the Conservatives, but by my hon. friend and his supporters themselves; and when they came to power in 1873 and 1874, they failed to carry them out. When the day of trial and the day of judgment came, they were found wanting by the electors, and most of them were condemned to exclusion from Parliament. I know that in every party there are extreme men, including the Conservative party, although in far smaller number than amongst its opponents. But to-day, look at those extreme men who have been found occasionally in our ranks. They are in complete accord with the friends of my hon. friend the member for Quebec East. Take the *Canadien* of Quebec and its mighty editor Mr. Tarte. With whom is he and all his party acting to-day? They are entirely in accord with the chief of my hon. friend in the Province of Quebec, the hon. Mr. Joly. My hon. friend and his friends are not so scrupulous as to prevent them using these extreme men for their political ends. During the election—I should say defeat—of my hon. friend in Arthabaska, in 1877, I heard there a Liberal leader, and later on in 1879, another Liberal leader, both of my own origin, speaking of the leader of the Conservative party in terms of fanatical abuse which no Conservative speakers or organs in the Province of Quebec ever used towards their opponents. It is a well-known fact, both in and outside this House, that the hon. member for Lambton, when leader of his party, and the hon. member for West Durham as leader of that same party, have always been respected by French Conservatives. We believe it to be our duty to oppose their policy because we do not think it is in the interest of the country, but we have always respected those hon. gentlemen. I shall not make the hon. member for Quebec East responsible for the utterances of Mr. Langelier on the occasion I have just alluded to, but I wish to remind him that if there was a small number of our own compatriots who have forgotten themselves so far as to abuse political opponents, they are not on our side. I am glad to say, to the honor of my compatriots, that in spite of all the eloquence of the hon. member for Quebec East and his prestige personally and as a Minister of the Crown, he could not receive any benefit from such fanatical utterances as those made by the Hon. Mr. Langelier, and repeated two years after by the Hon. Mr. Mercier. What did they say? They represented the hon. leader of the Conservative party as a man who was trying to put the rope around the neck of the French Canadian nationality, and wishing to walk knee-deep in their blood. Was that worthy of men who call themselves the most liberal, in fact the only liberal class in the Province of Quebec? We are represented by the friends of the hon. member for Quebec East in Ontario, especially the Reform press, as enemies to progress, as retrograde and as bigoted. Well, can they cite a single instance, when we tried to deprive any of our compatriots of other creeds or origins of their legitimate rights or of rights which we wished to enjoy ourselves? Never. More than that, when the question was before the country of encouraging progress, building up this great Confederation, acquiring and opening up the great North-West, it was the French Conservatives and not the Liberals who favoured those measures. The Liberals opposed almost every enterprise of progress from the Grand Trunk to the Pacific Railway. I think the hon. member for Quebec East will regret of the judgment he has just passed in the heat of debate on the mass of his countrymen of French origin in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I have to solicit the hon. Minister of Finance for another nationality. We have had a field night for the Irish nationality, and I may say we occupied the time very well indeed. We have had a field night for the French nationality, and my hon. friend has done credit to his race. Would not the hon. Minister of Finance give us a field night for the Scotch, the despised Scotch, who are not represented in Parliament or anywhere else according to their capacity, and who are not represented in the Departments as they ought to be. But if I talk in the classic language of my native country and speak to any man in Scotch, there is not a single one who can answer me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You do not go to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ROSS. I know the hon. Minister of the Interior could do it. That accounts for his nationality. But I know there is scarcely an individual—only one to my certain knowledge in all the Departments, among the 585 quoted by the hon. member for Ottawa—who can use these classic terms, who can speak in that language in which a man can neither lie nor swear; and I think the hon. Minister should give us a night for that nationality. Why is it that we have had such a *séance*—I was almost going to call it a farce—as we have had here to-night in the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa? I must not be unkind, I must not be severe; he has been so kind and polished himself; but is it not, after all, a farce to keep the House of Commons in session nearly two hours to hear a grievance that no person complains of but the hon. gentleman himself. Surely his nationality are quite able to take care of themselves outside the House as well as in it without such a cry for political pap, without such a shriek for political patronage, without such an appeal to this House and to the people of Ontario, not to speak so unkindly of the French population. Sir, what we have heard spoken by the hon. member for Ottawa, from the political standpoint, was the strongest charge any hon. gentleman could make against the party the hon. gentleman supports. His leader and his party have been in power since Confederation, and for many years before; and if the French element, that I appreciate very highly, that I respect very highly, is not properly represented in the various Departments of the Dominion, to whom is it due? Is it owing to the Liberal party that the Senate does not contain more French Senators? Is it owing to the Liberal party that the various Departments are not better stocked with French officers, many of them very competent and capable? Surely not. Then it must follow from the argument of the hon. gentleman that if the French element is not properly represented in the various Departments his party is responsible for it, his leader is responsible for it, and he, notwithstanding that gross insult heaped upon that heroic race, in supporting the hon. leader and blaming the Liberal party. Every citation from statistics and from the Departments to which he referred is but another argument to show that, notwithstanding the fact that the French of Quebec have kept his leader in power since Confederation, and keep him there to-day, that leader and that party are committing that great wrong of which the hon. member for Ottawa is such a distinguished representative. I want the hon. gentleman to reflect upon that simple fact; although he spoke of the people of Ontario, of whom I am an humble representative, as bigoted, I think he will find, if he visits Ontario, as much toleration, both religious and political toleration, as there is in any Province under the sun.

Mr. TASSÉ. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I never said the people of Ontario were bigoted. I said that the Grit press was bigoted, that the Grit orators were bigoted, and I repeat it.

Mr. ROSS. The statement is true as respects the Conservative press and the Conservative orators; they are bigoted

as well as the Grit press and orators, as the hon. gentleman kindly calls them. But I took the words of the hon. gentleman down. He was referring to the people of Ontario and he spoke of them in this way "The bigotry of that race." Now, the race of the people of Ontario is Anglo-Saxon.

Mr. TASSÉ. No; I was mentioning the *Globe* and the *Free Press*, and I said such is the bigotry of that party that even the name of my hon. friend the Secretary of State has been cited by the *Globe* to scare the good people of Ontario. That is what I said.

Mr. ROSS. I would be very happy to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation, but that is not as I took his words at the time. The words struck me as out of tone with the general course of the hon. gentleman's remarks. It may have been a slip of the tongue, but if he denies the statement, I am very glad to stand corrected, as I would be sorry to charge the hon. gentleman with anything like intolerance. I have only formed the acquaintance of the French people since I came into this House, and I do not find any bigotry nor intolerance on their part, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that, I think, we have grown too large now as a people, we have tried too long as a part of this Confederation, of which the hon. gentleman spoke in such glowing terms, to waste our time in talking about these little national differences. Are we French? Are we Dutch, or Irish, or English here? I say no, I say we are Canadians here; and my idea in regard to political appointments is this, not is this man an Irish Catholic, is he a Protestant, or is he a Frenchman, but is he capable of discharging the duties of that office? That is my idea. I am sorry that at this stage of Confederation, when we are endeavoring to establish its prosperity, when we are, as it were, poising our wings to show the strength and vigor of our flight, that an hon. gentleman of the capacity and the talent and the culture of the hon. member for Ottawa, should raise such a cry as the French domination cry, the lack of French patronage and the lack of French sympathy. If there is any way by which the great work of national consolidation can be prevented, if there is any way by which national desires can be prevented, it is by taking a course such as the hon. gentleman has taken. Though I may not be old enough in years to lecture the hon. gentleman, he will allow me to express my sentiments, and to tell him, frankly and earnestly, that I do not believe this is the place to raise these sectional cries, nor is this the place to call attention to those little differences of race and nationality, which, after all, amount to little in the great problem of making out our national existence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no motion before the House. The hon. gentleman on his right had made certain observations, and as a general rule those observations are not replied to.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to proceed. As a general rule those observations are not replied to, but if the nature of those observations are such as obviously to call for a reply the reply is recorded, but it is always limited to two or three speeches before proceeding to the Orders of the Day. I think that is the constitution of the law.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know it is.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not at all understand it as the hon. gentleman has stated it. On the motion to go into Committee of Supply it is competent to any hon. gentleman to raise a debate upon any question of general public interest, and I could discuss the question which the hon. gentleman has started if the hon. gentleman had not started it. We can all discuss everything, and after this every hon. gentleman

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

man could discuss more than the measure before the House. It is not the first person who happens to catch your eye that has the exclusive right to discuss a question of grievance. But after a motion is put into your hands no further motion can be proposed in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. If that motion is withdrawn or carried then it is competent to make another motion to go into Committee of Supply. That one hon. member should occupy the attention of the House and state his views upon some subject, without an opportunity for criticism being allowed to the other side, is not in accordance with common sense, with fair play or the rules of the House as I understand them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman need not misrepresent me. I did not rise to a point of order. I simply said that the practice in the English House of Commons was, whenever such questions arose, as they did every Session, and there was not a motion, after two or three speeches, it is considered a matter of practice that the regular business of the House should go on. I am not mistaken about this question of practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman may be mistaken, for he has been mistaken before. On June 13th, 1845—to quote from English *Hansard*:

"On motion to go into Committee of Supply Sir H. W. Barron called the attention of the House to the state of the Irish fisheries. A debate took place, at the conclusion of which, Sir Charles Napier (who had already spoken) rose to bring forward the subject of the defences of the Natal forts and arsenals.

"The Speaker ruled that the hon. member, having spoken already, had lost his opportunity. It was not objected that he had no right to speak, but that he could not speak twice on the one motion to go into Committee of Supply."

A gentleman had lost the opportunity, having already spoken. Any hon. member, except that hon. gentleman, could speak. The First Minister will admit he was mistaken for once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then, how long are the speeches to be? Who are to measure the length? Who is to apply the test? Is the Speaker to be charged with that responsibility? I had no intention of speaking on this subject, and therefore I will not do so now. I simply make this remark. The hon. gentleman was so unjust as to attack the memory of the dead and to attack the living who are absent. With respect to the accusation that Sir A. Dorion is not quite honest in his declaration on the subject of his appointment, I explained, in reply to the leader of the Government who made a statement of that kind, that the subject of his appointment with the Chief Justiceship was never discussed between Sir A. A. Dorion and myself or any member of the Government until some days after prorogation. When I first mentioned it to him, with that generosity which always characterized him, he at first declined, and I asked him to reconsider it at the request of his friends. I regret that such a scandal, for it is a scandal, should be applied to Sir A. A. Dorion, for whom I have the greatest possible veneration—a man whose name is a household word through Upper and Lower Canada, who would at any time have been elected for an Ontario constituency, as a man whose patriotism was above suspicion, and whose character was beyond reproach. I regret exceedingly I should have occasion again to vindicate him.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. First Minister is mistaken in the rule laid down by him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I laid down no rule. I merely stated what the English practice was.

Mr. MILLS. If it is not intended that we should follow the English practice, I am mistaken as to the intentions of the hon. gentleman. The English practice is, on motions to go into Committee of Supply, that it is the right of mem-

bers to discuss any grievance whatever, and although, as the hon. member for Lambton has said, the party who has spoken once on the subject is not at liberty to speak a second time, yet upon it members of the House may continue the discussion as to the particular grievance which is under consideration; or the discussion may be continued on a new subject introduced.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I desire to offer a few remarks on the question before the House. I did not happen to be in my seat when the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) made his speech, but I was informed that he complained bitterly that the French people of the Province of Quebec, in the distribution of patronage, did not get their right share. We all know that for the last twenty-five or thirty years, with the exception of five years the Conservative party, the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, have been in power, if the French population of our Province do not get their legitimate share of the Government patronage the hon. member must throw the blame on those who lead the party to which he belongs. I am told also that the hon. member complained of the fact that some Liberals voted with the Government on the question of the boundaries of Ontario. Well, surely the hon. gentleman should praise us for having voted with him and his friends on that question. I will tell the hon. member for Ottawa, and the hon. leader of the House, that when I gave that vote I did it conscientiously and because I thought the proposition was a reasonable one under the circumstances. I belong to the Liberal party. As a general rule I will support my party; but while I belong to a party I do not consider I am the slave of any party or any man, and it has been my practice, whenever I thought I could not conscientiously vote with my friends, never to hesitate in recording my vote with my opponents. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), in the course of his remarks, seemed to deny the assertion made by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) that the general course pursued by the Conservative party had been to appeal to the prejudices of the people and to their religious feelings. He said that he went to several counties, even to the county of Iberville, and in the county of Iberville he had never heard a speech about religion on the hustings. Of course, the hon. gentleman never heard such a speech in Iberville. I met the hon. member there, and I am sure he told the truth when he said he never heard in that county a religious speech on the hustings. Such is not our practice in that county. An attempt to do so was once made, but the intelligent electors frowned it down, declaring they would not have an appeal made to their religious feelings on account of politics. I wish all the electors of Quebec were sufficiently well educated to know that they can be Liberals without jeopardizing their souls. In Iberville they know they can belong to the Liberal party and be good Catholics at the same time, but we know it is not so in all constituencies. In several constituencies in Quebec where the Conservative element is predominant it is not so. The newspapers tell us that in a large number of constituencies appeals have been made to religious feelings in favor of the Conservative party, and that party have received the benefit of that practice. If the hon. gentleman will read the history of an election investigation which took place a few years ago, he will find that appeals were constantly made to religious prejudices and to such an extent that the election has been annulled after being decided. Will the hon. gentleman deny that it is a fact that in many constituencies appeals were made to religious principles in favor of the Conservative party. I do not wish to be understood as drawing any blame upon our clergy, who, as a body, are entitled to our respect; but while we know that many of them were wise enough to shut their mouths and keep away from mixing in election strifes, others participated in

these contests and decided elections in favor of the Conservative party. So much was this the case, that last fall decrees came from the Court of Rome forbidding the clergy from taking part in the elections in the Province of Quebec. Why were these decrees published? Obviously because information had been received at Rome that great abuses had taken place with regard to that question. The hon. gentleman said that the founders of the Liberal party preached doctrines which frightened the priests and a large number of the Catholics of the Province, and that that was the principal cause of our small numbers in this House. I do not know whom the hon. gentleman means by founders of the Liberal party. I have always thought that formerly the greatest man of the Liberal party was Papineau, and after him, as the re-organizers of that party, after the rebellion of 1837, came Lafontaine, Morin and others in the Province of Quebec. Afterwards Mr. Dorion was the leader of the party; and I have yet to learn that any one of these illustrious men ever preached or expounded any doctrine which was of such a character as to frighten the conscience of any man in the Province of Quebec. My hon. friend said that another cause of our being small in numbers in this House was the fact that a few years ago—

Mr. HOUDE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain. I did not say that that was the principal cause of the small number of the Liberal party in this House. I said that the principal reason was that they had repudiated the National Policy, which had formerly been propounded by the same party.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but I do not believe that the Liberal party as a party ever propounded the National Policy. I have been informed, and I know that a few men in that party have expressed opinions in that sense. We know that very well, but these men were few. They were not the Liberal party, and I maintain that so long as a doctrine has not been propounded to the people as the doctrine of a party it cannot be considered as accepted by the party. The National Policy was never propounded to the people by the Liberal party. There were several men who expressed their individual opinions in that direction, some of them of high standing, I admit; but the National Policy was never accepted by the Liberal party.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid the speech of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) was not caused so much by the existence of a sectional feeling between Ontario and Quebec as because there is too little of that feeling, and my hon. friend is anxious to stir up a feeling which did not previously exist. I hope he has found by the response he has met with by the French Canadian members on this side that there is no possibility of the success of such tactics. There were times when English children used to be frightened by the bogie of Napoleon Bonaparte, or Boney, as they used to call him; but my hon. friend is trying to frighten the French Canadians by the spectre of Gritism. It may be on account of attacks made on himself by certain newspapers printed in the English language that his bill has been stirred up on this occasion. I do not say that those attacks were justifiable or that they were not, but it does not follow that because the hon. gentleman was attacked by an English newspaper that the French race generally was attacked by the English-speaking people or their press. The hon. gentleman's case is an exceptional one, and there are very few of the French members in this House who have drawn on themselves attacks by the English-speaking papers. It is easy, of course, to cull from the newspapers which the hon. gentleman sees in his capacity as editor, a lot of articles which appear to reflect on the French nationality; but if he will take the average editorials in the English-speaking papers in Ontario he will find that the

number of attacks on the English members of the Cabinet are much more numerous than those on the French members—in fact, it is an exception when a French member is attacked. Of course, we must draw the inference that the English-speaking members of the Cabinet commit the greatest number of atrocities—using that word, of course, in a jocular sense. It is an utterly artificial and forced effort on the part of the hon. member to make it appear that there is any such thing as a general attack on the French-speaking members or on the French nationality by the press of Ontario. It would have been easy at different times to cull quite as strong a list from the French newspapers pitching into the Grit party, or into the race which inhabits Ontario, but nobody would believe from that that there was any sectional feeling in Quebec against Ontario. Nobody in Ontario fancies that the people of Quebec have any special grudge against us on account of our nationality or religion, and it would be absurd to try to make the people of Ontario believe any such thing. My hon. friend from Lambton spoke truly, when he said that Mr. Dorion could have stood for any Liberal constituency in Ontario. The same is true of many French members on both sides of this House. The hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia, can boast of many personal friends they made on their trips last year. They were received as well as if they were English-speaking Ministers; and these hon. gentlemen would be gladly elected in a Conservative constituency of Ontario, if circumstances required them to go there. But if anything could stir up any of the feeling the hon. gentleman objects to, it would be the sort of attack he has made to-night. I am sure that feeling could not be stirred up against the French people as a whole, but only against the individual specimens with so few of those characteristics of the race, courtesy and politeness, as some hon. gentlemen opposite have shown to-night.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to make an observation or two, before the House goes into Committee of Supply. We were promised several measures in the speech of His Excellency, and a number of these measures have not yet been submitted to Parliament. The ancient rule of the House of Commons was to consider grievances, which legislation has recently taken the place of, before the House went into Committee of Supply. We have for several weeks been voting supplies; and these measures to redress inequalities in the representation of the country, to provide for the Government of the North-West, and others which the Government promised to submit to Parliament as necessary for the good government of the country, are not yet before the House. It was the old rule of the House of Commons in England that before Supplies were granted to the Crown, the Crown was asked to redress those grievances which were read by the Speaker from the Chair. At the present day, in England, it is the practice of the Government to submit their measures to Parliament in time to give the country an opportunity to become acquainted with the intentions of the Government before the supplies are granted. It has recently become the practice in this country—a most pernicious practice, I contend—to first deal with Supply, and at the last moment to submit important measures when there is no time for their consideration by the House. One measure last year—that relating to the boundaries of Manitoba and bringing Ontario into conflict with Manitoba—was submitted on the last day but one, and passed on the same day, when nine-tenths of the members had left.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They should not have left.

Mr. MILLS. I say the Supplies should not be granted before such important measures are considered. Now, let
Mr. CASEY.

me call attention to the practice in England by citing a few measures and showing how long they were before Parliament. In 1831, when the Reform Bill was passed, Parliament met on the 14th of June, the Bill was immediately introduced, and it was not till the 19th of September that it was read the third time. In 1866, when the Reform Bill of Lord John Russell's second Administration was discussed, Parliament met on the 1st of February, the measure was introduced on the 12th of March, and it did not receive its third reading until the 15th of June in 1867. A Reform Bill was introduced by Mr. Disraeli, in Lord Derby's Administration; the House met on the 5th of February, the Bill was introduced on the 25th of the same month, and it did not receive its third reading until the 15th of July, 1869. When Mr. Gladstone's Government was in power, Parliament met on the 16th of February, 1869, the Bill for disendowing and disestablishing the Irish Church was introduced on the 14th of March, and was before the House six weeks. In 1870, Parliament met on the 11th of February; the Irish Land Tenure Bill was introduced on the 15th of February, and on the 30th of May it received the third reading. In 1880, Parliament met on the 29th of April, and the Compensation for Disturbance Bill was introduced on the 18th of June, and was before Parliament for six weeks; and in 1881, the Irish Land Bill was introduced on the 17th of April, and was not carried through the Commons until the 29th of July.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because it was debated all the time.

Mr. MILLS. So it was; but the hon. gentleman takes precious good care that no opportunity shall be given for the discussion of important measures submitted to this House. Now, I am pointing out that the practice the hon. gentleman is introducing is wholly irregular and unconstitutional. The Government is supposed to be carried on here according to the well understood wishes of the people, and their wishes cannot be ascertained by the present practice. When the Bill for disendowing and disestablishing the Irish Church was introduced, Mr. Disraeli asked that the measure might be introduced at a sufficiently early period to give the members of the House of Commons an opportunity of consulting their constituents on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who did that?

Mr. MILLS. Disraeli. I read that very extract from his speech last year to show that we ought to have longer time to consider the Syndicate contract than the hon. gentleman was disposed to give in the first instance. I mention these facts to point out that we ought to return to a more healthy practice, and that as to Government measures it is only fair and courteous to introduce them at a period of the Session which will give ample time for their consideration by the House and the country. There is an intelligent public opinion outside this House, and which on some measures largely controls the opinion that largely directs the policy of this House. There is no opportunity of consulting that opinion, or of fully considering the measures submitted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that the Government is introducing a new practice, but I will venture to say that the present Government has brought down their measures earlier and pressed them more rapidly than the Government of which he was a distinguished member. I will not throw that statement across the floor singly, but shall take occasion to look into the Journals, which I think will prove my statement. The hon. gentleman says we should not grant supplies until grievances are dealt with, or legislation, as he says, which represents that action is effected. I cannot quite agree with that. The practice in England, as I understand it, is that in three or four days after the Speech is through the

Orders, the naval and military supplies are, as a general rule, brought down. They do not in England follow our practice of discussing the Estimates *de die in diem*; they sprinkle them through the whole of the Session, and the most important votes are generally carried before the question of grievances or legislation in view of grievances can be brought down. It is quite true the Reform Bill of 1831 was introduced at the beginning of the Session. The people elected the members for the purpose of carrying that Bill, and on the same ground when our Parliament was called, three months before the time, to settle the important question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we met in November; but I do not think we made much by our abnormal action on that occasion. I do not think we received much sympathy from hon. gentlemen opposite who deliberately set to work to oppose us. We said we called Parliament together with a view of getting its opinion so as to enable the work to proceed; and the opposition at all events, I will not say obstruction, we received with the unconcealed purpose of delaying the measure, cannot be forgotten. I think we brought down all our measures early except that for the readjustment of the representation.

Mr. MILLS. And the Bill for the division of the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already explained that the division was simply for postal purposes and nomenclature, or the names of those divisions, but the House approved of it. They might cover the areas of future Provinces; but there is no legislation required in regard to them. All the other Government measures are down. We took the very proper course of introducing several of the Bills in the Upper House. It is of great importance the work should proceed simultaneously in both Houses; so you see the Senate has worked industriously and sent us a number of Bills, and in this respect, I think we have made an improvement. That House now largely exercises the work of revision, which it is eminently qualified to perform.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When does the hon. gentleman intend to introduce the Re-distribution Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In a day or two.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You stated last Thursday or Friday the same thing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I only gave notice, on Thursday or Friday, of the introduction of the Bill.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

83. Lachine Canal..... \$790,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the position of the work, and what will be required to finish it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of this amount there is a revote of \$523,000, and a new vote of \$267,000. This amount is for the purpose of completing the work.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What depth does that give.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Fourteen feet at Lachine, and it completes the work with that depth of water. This will complete the work, including the two St. Gabriel Basins. Deepening the bed of the canal between the locks will cost \$500,000 more, and that will not be required until 14 feet navigation is acquired throughout.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What has become of the St. Gabriel Basin?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are constructing two additional basins for the purpose of providing additional facilities. That is included in the vote of \$790,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, this vote closes all the expenditure, piers inclusive.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only for a depth of 12 feet, of course it is more at the lower entrance.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is there any difficulty as to the supply of water to the mills?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The difficulty was about the current, and I myself partially determined to limit the granting of applications for water on that account. There was a current of from three to four miles an hour.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right, and the intention is to limit the supply of water for manufacturing purposes to such an amount that will not interfere with the navigation of the canal, which we look upon as the primary object.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At the other canals it was always a source of loss instead of profit to the Government. There were always claims for compensation, or demands for arbitration or valuation which swallowed up more than the entire amount received. When we get to the items for the expenses on the canals, I would like to know the state of the accounts between the Government and the lessees. Some of them are of long standing and large accounts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman that on concurrence. I may state, without being able to give the exact amounts, that the Government have made great efforts during the past season to collect arrears, bad debts have been written off and the most stringent measures adopted for the purpose of compelling payment of all arrears on the whole canal system.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Could the hon. Minister state to us roughly what he expects will be the effect of competition on the canals by the railways? To a considerable extent I am afraid our anticipations, from the enormous expenditures on these canals, hardly anything will be realized.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt that the discovery of steel rails, and their general use on railways, have had a very serious influence upon canal traffic. It has enabled large amounts of freight to be moved with so much greater facility and at so much less cost than could be done before, that I am afraid we cannot expect the great amount of traffic for the canals that they formerly secured.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The vote already taken will finish all the works at the Cornwall Canal. The works are not quite finished yet, but the amount remaining unexpended will be expended by the 1st of July, and will complete the works at Cornwall. There was one contract let at Cornwall which was to give the same depth of water, twelve feet on the mitre sills, as in the Welland and Lachine Canals, and that contract will be completed by the 1st of July, and that portion of the canal will be on the same scale both above and below.

84. St. Lawrence River and Canals..... \$154,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to complete the works under contract, which will cost about \$300,000, in addition to the \$154,000 now asked for. This will complete a channel of 300 feet in width adapted to a navigation of 14 feet through the Galops Rapids. The sum now asked for is as much as will probably be expended this year on that section of the canal.

85. Welland Canal..... \$600,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The vote which is now asked for is only about half what will be required to complete the

Welland Canal, including the aqueduct. There is a revote of \$492,000 as part of the \$600,000. It is expected that the entire sum will finish section 34, complete the aqueduct and enlarge the old lock No. 2, and settle the estimates still unpaid. It will complete all the work except increasing the Welland Canal from twelve to fourteen feet. Certain portions of it are now fourteen feet, and to deepen the rest to fourteen feet will require an additional amount.

87. Carillon Canal, Dam and Slide \$180,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will be glad to hear that the amount required entirely to complete that work will not exceed the original estimates, which were \$1,170,000. There is now expended and will be expended on the 30th June, 1882, including what will be required, \$939,348, and the total required from the 1st July is \$230,651, and the vote for the present year, with \$50,000 more, \$180,000, will complete the work within the original estimate. In addition to this amount of \$180,000, the sum of \$50,000 will be required to complete those works.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman stated in his report, I think, that the amount of quantities moved would be \$446,600. I would like to know how that estimate has been carried out by the actual facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The total expenditure up to 30th June, 1880, was \$571,023; to 30th June, 1881, \$191,326; and from 31st December, 1881, to 1st July, \$131,080; total, \$893,428. The estimated expenditure to the end of the present year, \$45,920, making a total of \$939,348 as the amount required to 1st July, 1882; that leaves on the original estimate of \$1,170,000, \$230,651; and there will be required \$50,651 to complete the work, so that it will be completed within the estimate.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When I left office, tenders had been received for this work. The lowest was about \$420,000. This contract was taken from the old contractors in consequence of their not proceeding with the work. The hon. gentleman gave them part of it, and gave the lowest tenderers, Messrs. McNamee & Co., another part. He estimated then that the amount, moneying out the quantities according to the contract schedule, would come to \$446,000, and McNamee & Co.'s tender was \$420,000. What I wanted to know is the expenditure since that time. The statement the hon. gentleman has made refers to another contract. If I recollect aright, \$334,000 were paid on the contract of Cook & Co. before the work was taken from them in June, 1878.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not in my power to give the hon. gentleman the precise figures to which he refers, but I may state briefly the result on these. Cook & Co. were the contractors; difficulties arose in carrying on the work, and the contract was cancelled; new tenders were asked for, and when the present Government came into office, they were waiting decision. Mr. McNamee's tender was the lowest, and he was notified that the contract would be awarded to him. Subsequently it became a very grave question as to whether we should go on, in the then financial condition of the country, with these works or not, and it was decided not. Mr. McNamee was informed of this decision, and his deposit returned. Subsequently, on the report of Mr. Page that the work was deteriorating and would sustain serious injury, it was determined to carry out the design of deepening the navigation of the Ottawa Canals and proceeding with this work. In the meantime the former contractors made a large claim on the Government for having been dispossessed of their contract, and after the vote was taken Mr. McNamee notified the Department that he would not proceed with the work under his former tender because they had in the meantime become seriously deteriorated by the action of the water. Cook & Co., who

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

had been dispossessed of their contract, said they would be willing to abandon all claims against the Government if reinstated at their original prices. That offer was accepted, because it was found that the cost would be less than the next lowest tender to Mr. McNamee. They were, however, called upon to strengthen themselves as this work was an extremely difficult one; and an agreement was come to between Mr. McNamee and the old contractors, to divide the work. The more difficult portion of it, the dock and slide, was taken by Mr. McNamee, and the remainder by the original contractors. The work has been vigorously carried on, and will be completed for the amount already stated. The new works consist of a dam across the River Ottawa, three-fourths of a mile above the village of Carillon, and of a canal three-fourths of a mile long. The construction of the dam has been completed, and the gates closed the 9th November. The work has been completed very satisfactorily, and there is every reason to believe the lock will be opened for navigation in the spring of 1882.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The gist of the whole thing is simply this, that by not accepting Mr. McNamee's tender the work has cost \$26,000 more than it would otherwise have cost. Mr. McNamee, whatever he may be, is a vigorous contractor who has always carried out his contracts very efficiently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I explained to the hon. gentleman the reason for our proceeding; we accepted Mr. McNamee's tender, but under the circumstances did not go on with the work. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that had the work been then proceeded with, it would have been completed for a smaller amount.

88. Grenville Canal \$575,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. At all these places the vote is very large in proportion to the amount asked. Only one-third of the amount voted is asked. What is the reason of that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They naturally over-estimate the rate of progress at which the work could be carried on. The amount now asked for, is for the completion of this section of canals.

89. Murray Canal \$200,000

Mr. CROUTER. May I be allowed to enquire if the Engineers have finished the surveys and made a report to the Department?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Rubridge has finally completed a survey. There was a survey also made by Mr. Perley, and Mr. Rubridge subsequently made a very careful examination and survey, and there is a question yet to be decided as to which of the two routes should be adopted; but Mr. Perley's estimate for this work is \$700,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Which will suit better for election purposes?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman does not mean to insinuate that the construction of an important section of navigation in connection with the great canal system of the St. Lawrence would be in the smallest degree influenced by considerations which at no very distant time seemed to have had so much influence on another portion of the line. I am quite certain the hon. gentleman recognises as fully as I do the great importance of extending the interior or barge navigation, as it will be extended, to Presqu' Isle or Witter's Bay. The hon. gentleman knows that perhaps the most dangerous portion of the navigation in connection with our canal system will be avoided by the construction of this work, and if an expenditure of \$700,000 will enable us to avoid the dangerous part of the canal system, the expenditure will be well expended.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Where are the \$700,000 to be expended? What route is that which Mr. Perley has estimated on?

Mr. McCUAIG. I desire to ask whether the estimate of the cost of the work is for the route by Weller's Bay. From Presqu'Isle to the waters of the Bay of Quinté it is five and a-half miles or six miles, and from my own knowledge of the locality the route through Weller's Bay will be much shorter and more advantageous to the country at large, as the length of the canal will not exceed two miles. I may state, without fear of contradiction, that in navigating Lake Ontario, you cannot with a south-west gale enter Presqu'Isle. I have before me the report of Mr. Page and Mr. Rowan, and it is very clear from that report Weller's Bay is a natural harbor of refuge and easy of entrance. If that be the case, a vessel navigating Lake Ontario, and forced by winds into Weller's Bay for safety, although within a mile of the entrance to the Bay of Quinté she would be obliged to remain in the harbor of refuge until the gale had subsided, whereas if the canal were cut from the Bay of Quinté direct through to Weller's Bay, she could proceed on her voyage down the Bay of Quinté to Kingston. The matter is of such consequence, aside from any question of mere local freights, that I trust the Minister will look carefully into the matter before coming to any decision.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to the question asked me by the hon. member for Centre Huron, I may say that we expect to obtain a depth of fourteen to fifteen feet. There are two routes—one by Presqu'Isle and the other by Weller's Bay. The latter is the shorter, but rock has to be encountered, whereas the other, though longer, is entirely free from rock cutting. Mr. Page, who is just now carefully considering the estimates on both routes, previous to an ultimate decision, has roughly estimated the cost to be the same by both routes. With regard to the point raised by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig), he would soon settle the matter in favor of Weller's Bay, but we are not certain that it is the best, and it is possible that Presqu'Isle may be found to be the most available point. I can only say that after having obtained the report and the judgment of the engineer on the whole subject, we shall consider it carefully, and that we expect a decision will be arrived at at an early day.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he knows, after entering the Bay of Quinté, what depth of water can be secured from the head down to Belleville and past it. I rather doubt whether there are any vessels now navigating the bay which draw more than 10 or 11 feet of water, so that the matter would be one of considerable importance. I am informed, though I do not pledge myself to the statement, that there will be considerable difficulty in obtaining a channel of the necessary depth after you get into the Bay of Quinté.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That matter has been fully looked into, and it is believed that there will be no difficulty in obtaining a navigation of fourteen or fifteen feet, otherwise, of course, it would be useless to get that depth in the canal.

Mr. McCUAIG. When I called at the office of the Minister of Railways I saw a petition which had been circulated in favor of Presqu'Isle. I may say, in the first place, that I disclaim being influenced by any local considerations in the matter. I am of opinion that our large canal system should be taken out of the channel of local prejudices and interests, and that it should be viewed entirely in the light of a national work. Believing that this should be our policy, I say that Weller's Bay is by far the better route for the canal. I am supported in this view by a petition presented by Mr. Pierson bearing the signatures of the

inhabitants of all the towns, villages and ports on both Lakes Ontario and Erie. It was signed by some of the most influential men of Upper Canada, including master mariners who are not likely to be influenced by local considerations. On the other hand, the petition in favor of the Presqu'Isle was signed only by bargemen, a master and a few seamen residing in the locality. I hope the Minister will give these petitions respectively the weight to which they are entitled—one being signed so numerously and influentially, and the other by a few men whose interests are purely local. Mr. Page stated that a vessel on Lake Ontario approaching Presqu'Isle Harbor, must, before getting in range of the inner light, with a view to entering the harbor, change its course fully 270 degrees, which in certain winds it is barely possible to do. When up with Salt Point (upon which there is a light, and behind it about 1,000 feet distant a range light) the course must again be changed to north-westerly, so as to clear Calf Pasture Shoal, and enter the wider portion of the harbor; in fact the direction of the entrance, crookedness and insufficient width of the channel are found by masters of vessels to prove serious obstacles to its being used either as a harbor of refuge or for commercial purposes. Again, he says that at the entrance to Presqu'Isle Harbor, there was in October, for a short distance, a depth of only ten feet which at extreme low water would be reduced to eight feet, therefore a very large quantity of dredging must be done in order to obtain the proposed depth; the channel being intricate, it would require a width of at least 250 to 300 feet, and at the outer end should have additional depth to allow for the plunging of vessels in a heavy sea. A comparison of distances from a point in the lake, which may be taken as common to the navigation into Presqu'Isle Harbor and Weller's Bay shows that the length from this point *via* Presqu'Isle Harbor to the Bay of Quinté would be fully twice that *via* Weller's Bay to the Bay of Quinté. Moreover, he declares that were the channel through Presqu'Isle Harbor, and other improvements made, the unavoidable difficulties to be encountered navigating it, would still present an insuperable objection to the adoption of the route to Presqu'Isle Harbor, and that in this view of the case the selection must lie between the two other routes, both leading to Weller's Bay.

Mr. BROWN. I find, from Mr. Page's report in 1867 or 1868, and also from that of Mr. Rowan, that it was almost impossible in a south-westerly gale to get into the Presqu'Isle Harbor. A vessel going east comes to Presqu'Isle Point, then a range of lights leads into the harbor; but it has to tow back and sail two and a-half or three miles to reach the point where the canal is contemplated to lead into Presqu'Isle at Weiss' Creek. They say that a vessel rounding in that sort of gale would be liable to the disasters that occurred there last year. Masters of vessels inform me that the anchor would not hold there owing to the presence of what they call eel grass, which fills the flukes of the anchors, so that the vessels drift down to the beach below. According to Mr. Page's report the route by Weller's Bay is a perfectly straight course all the way. The channel entering into Weller's Bay is fourteen feet deep, and the bay is thirty feet deep. As early as 1833, Mr. Beard recommended Weller's Bay, which route would only require a mile and three quarters or two miles of canal work, while the Presqu'Isle route would require eight miles. The entrance into Presqu'Isle Harbor is also condemned by that report. The channel is crooked, and there are only from eight to ten feet of water in the harbor, and vessels have great difficulty in approaching it in a westerly gale, which generally prevails there. This project, which is in the interest both of navigation and commerce, would obviate all the dangers of navigation along the southern coast of Prince Edward county, and prevent such great disasters as those which occurred last year. At present a vessel loading in the Bay

of Quinté and going westward has to travel 150 miles to get to a point on the lake within two or three miles from the place where she was loading, while, if this canal were built, she would reach the same point in two or three hours. I am speaking from practical knowledge, although my principal information is derived from the reports of Mr. Page, Mr. Munro and Mr. Beard. I believe Colonel Philpott, Royal Engineers, also reported in favor of Weller's Bay. That route is both the shortest and the cheapest, and I hope the Government will look carefully and seriously into the matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the subject will engage the most careful consideration of the Government before any decision will be arrived at, and I am quite sure the interesting speech the hon. gentleman has just delivered will have satisfied my hon. predecessor that this work is entitled to the support of the country, irrespective of any political considerations. I may say, after a good deal of examination of the question, there is very strong reason to believe that a lock may be dispensed with altogether. If that should prove to be the case, it will reduce the estimate by \$120,000.

Mr. McCUAIG. I wish to say that the matter of a harbor of refuge on the north shore of Lake Ontario is of great importance. Mr. Page states that vessels on Lake Ontario running for Presqu'Isle Harbor must, before getting to the inner side, change their course 270 degrees, which it is impossible for a vessel under canvas to do against a south-west gale.

Mr. CROUTER. The member for Prince Edward has, of course, entered into this argument with great zeal. He has stated that there are petitions from a large number of sea-going people in regard to the impracticability almost of getting into Presqu'Isle Harbor.

Mr. McCUAIG. They have been presented.

Mr. CROUTER. No, Sir; there is a petition in the office of the Minister of Railways and Canals, bearing the signatures of over 100 practical sea-going men from the vicinity, while people throw cold water on them. But why should they not be better acquainted with the real merits of the question than gentlemen from the farther portion of the lake. It is very well known that Presqu'Isle Harbor is the only real harbor of refuge on the north shore east of Toronto.

Mr. McCUAIG. Except Weller's Bay.

Mr. CROUTER. How long has that been a harbor of refuge?

Mr. McCUAIG. Twenty-five years.

Mr. CROUTER. I well remember the channel there being filled up with sand, and navigators having to dig out a channel. Then in a few years this sand was blown away, leaving an entrance into Weller's Bay. Where is the guarantee that this sand will not blow away again and leave the whole harbor open to the lake? Presqu'Isle, with a little more dredging, will always afford a safe haven for vessels. For perfect safety to the shipping at large Presqu'Isle is the real course and destination.

91. Dredging Basins No. 4, Lachine Canal \$2,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will this have to be dredged all the time? This is charged to income. Will the basins have to be dredged out every year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; this dredging is to put the basin in order. One of two small basins was deepened while the Lachine Canal was being enlarged. This is for the purpose of giving it the same depth as the others. At the basin deepened the improvement is supposed to be permanent.

Mr. BROWN.

92. Construction of a Swing-Bridge at Valleyfield... \$8,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is this a new bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; there were two plans for construction, one for above and the other for below. The site we have selected is approved of, and the Chief Engineer is of the opinion that while the upper works should be of wood, the basement should be of masonry. The population of the town has largely increased, and it is absolutely necessary to have a second bridge.

93. Chambly Canal—raising banks, lowering bottom of Canal, &c..... \$31,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is this to give greater depth?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is to greatly improve the canal, including the following works: to rebuild the east side, \$6,000; to build two cross dams, \$1,000; to build the upper walls at lock 4, \$1,000; to build a wharf at St. John and a long new revetment wall, \$3,110; operating the dredges, \$8,855; approaches and gravel, \$1,250.

94. St. Ours Lock and Dam—Construction of gates, piers, deepening and widening channel... \$21,350

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a similar class of work to that provided for by the last item; but here there are two pairs of gates to be made.

187. Repairs and working expenses of Canals..... \$402,190

Mr. McCUAIG. It may be pertinent to call the attention of the Government to the dry dock at Kingston. We are spending millions of money for the enlargement of the Welland Canal, for the purpose of attracting the western trade via the St. Lawrence, and a dry dock is absolutely necessary at Kingston of sufficient capacity to take out those large vessels that we hope to attract to her port.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Government has this question under consideration.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I observe that the working expenses are \$411,550 and the income \$369,597, leaving a loss on the whole canal system of \$41,953 as the result of last year's operations.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The expenditure last year was exceptional, the Welland Canal was found to be in a very bad state, and a great deal of work had to be done to put it in an efficient state of repair.

184. Intercolonial Railway..... \$1,906,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The details of this vote are as follows:—Locomotive power, \$628,000; car expenses, \$445,000; station and train expenses, \$254,000; general charges, \$143,000; maintenance, \$140,000. Total \$1,906,000. There is an increase of \$300,000. In former years we had to pay more than a dollar to get a dollar's worth of traffic, this year the accounts are nearly balanced and the additional traffic has involved this additional expense.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman make any statement as to the cost of working the Rivière du Loup Branch, and the receipts obtained from it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The accounts are not kept separate. I do not know of any mode by which we could ascertain exactly what accounts apply to any particular portion. The acquisition of this branch has been of great value to the Government; it has enabled us by putting down steel rails on that track, which was in very bad condition, to make more regular connections, and also to hold the traffic over the road by the rapidity with which we can put it through.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman stated that a very large portion of the increase was for rolling stock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not in this vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE. With regard to another vote, I say. Now, I find that in July, 1878, the total amount paid and chargeable to capital was \$2,006,047.26; average mileage at the time, 714. This gives \$2,809.59 as the amount per mile for rolling stock of all kinds. In July, 1882, there were 889 miles in operation; amount paid out of capital up to that time, \$2,753,001, or at a rate of \$3,099 per mile for rolling stock. I would like to know how much of the rolling stock got during the last ten years, has been chargeable to income. There is no statement in the report that gives it, and it is interesting to know. My conviction is that much too large a proportion is charged to capital.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in that impression. The rolling stock of the road was stated by Mr. Brydges to be working to its fullest capacity in 1878, and he reported that the rolling stock was barely sufficient to perform the traffic of the road. Now that there has been a great increase in the volume of traffic, the hon. gentleman will see that it will be impossible to do it with the existing rolling stock and additional rolling stock will be provided from capital account. What the road is obliged to do in order to make a fair exhibit, is to maintain in a state of thorough efficiency the road and the rolling stock provided from capital account to the traffic. If the volume of traffic has increased 40 per cent., as it has done, of course you must from capital account furnish the additional amount of rolling stock. That is the practice of all railways. All a railway undertakes to charge for working expenses is to maintain the thorough efficiency of the rolling stock. Capital account is closed until there is a great additional volume of traffic which requires to be provided for. On the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways, the moment there is a great additional volume of traffic, rolling stock sufficient to handle that traffic is provided and charged to capital account. I had a communication last summer from the managers of both those roads, and they both stated that was the practice with reference to both those roads.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to see those communications.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I asked specific questions and had specific answers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Great Western have new lines built, and that is a totally different thing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not refer to the extension of the lines at all. I refer to the rolling stock required for the increased volume of traffic, and both gentlemen stated to me that the practice on these roads is to provide for such an increase of expenses by charging them to capital account. The hon. gentleman will at once see that it would be quite impossible to furnish the amount of rolling-stock required to do \$500,000 worth of additional traffic a year. If the traffic amounts to a million dollars a year instead of half a million, you cannot handle it with that, nor is it possible to obtain it from working expenses, especially where you have a deficit to draw from instead of a surplus. It must be furnished chargeable to capital account. Now, I think the hon. member for St. John fell into some serious errors in dealing with the subject of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway. He endeavored to show that the comparison made by the hon. Minister of Finance between the results of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway under the late Government and under the present Government, is incorrect; and he has brought forward an array of figures in support of this position. But I shall show the hon. gentleman that he has not placed the facts correctly before the House. I have always admitted that the late Government were not responsible for the expenditure of 1873-74, as the obligations

for that year, incurred by their predecessors, had to be carried out. I therefore take the five years from the 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879, and I find the following facts:—

		Revenue.	Expenditure.
1874-5.....	381 miles in operation	\$ 861,593	\$1,143,157
1875-6.....	518 do	848,862	1,092,775
1876-7.....	714 do	1,154,445	1,661,673
1877-8.....	714 do	1,378,947	1,811,273
1878-9.....	714 do	1,294,100	2,010,183
Yearly average, 608		\$1,107,589	\$1,543,813

Having, for the reasons given, omitted the years 1873-74 in considering the working of the railway under the late Government, I begin its administration under the present Government for similar reasons, with the year 1879-80, and find the corresponding figures for the last two fiscal years to be:

Years.		Revenue.	Expenditure.
1879-80.....	825 miles in operation	\$1,506,298	\$1,603,430
1880-81.....	840 do do	1,760,394	1,759,851
Yearly average..... 832		\$1,633,346	\$1,681,640

These figures prove that the average yearly earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, during the Administration of our predecessors, were less by \$525,712 than under the present Government, while the average annual expenditure was less by only \$137,827, although the average length of line operated during the five years ended the 30th June, 1879, was only 608 miles, and in the following two years 832 miles. Had the expenses of the last two years borne the same proportion to the mileage under the operation as those of the preceding five years, the average annual expenditure would have been, not \$1,681,640, as I have shown it to have been, but \$2,112,448, showing an economy to have been effected, under the present Administration, of \$430,808 per annum, the cost of maintenance of way, renewals of bridges, fences, rails, &c., being charged in each year to revenue, as I continue to charge it from year to year. The cost of the change of gauge in 1875 and 1876 did not enter into this account, and in stating that this amount, about \$843,000, formed part of the expenditure embraced in the figures submitted by him, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) was in error, as he also was in stating that the cost of steel rail renewals, which form a charge against maintenance of way, are charged to capital under the existing Administration. The hon. gentleman states, moreover, that items which formed a charge against revenue under the late Government, are charged to capital by their successors. This is not correct. It is true that works of extension at the termini of the railway are still charged to capital as hitherto (the capital account for works along the line having been closed), as also old accounts in connection with the construction of the road under the Commissioners. But in this we only follow the practice laid down by our predecessors about a year before they surrendered the reins of Government, for several years previous to which extensive works were charged to capital, which if done at the present time would form a charge against revenue. The capital expenditure during the five years ended the 30th June, 1879, was:

1874-5	\$377,452
1875-6	316,641
1876-7	314,925
1877-8	408,817
1878-9	226,639
Average per annum	\$328,695

And for the two years ended the 30th June, 1881:

1879-80	\$161,439
1880-1	68,430
Average per annum	\$114,934

It will thus be seen at once that the statement that we charge to capital what our predecessors charged to revenue, is incorrect, the fact really being that we charge to revenue items which they, until a year or so before resigning office, systematically charged to capital. I have, of course, not taken into consideration the capital expenditure in connection with the purchase of the Rivière du Loup Branch, which would be out of place in the comparison I have given of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway during the two periods under consideration.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). The basis on which we started from for different years. I took from 1874 to 1878, as did the hon. Minister of Finance, who made a comparison of those years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. From July, 1874, to July, 1879.

Mr. BURPEE. I am speaking of the statement made in the Budget Speech in which the hon. Minister took from 1874 to 1879 to make a comparison.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman said in my hearing that he was not responsible for the years 1873-74.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I took from July, 1874, to July, 1879.

Mr. BURPEE. I took the receipts and expenditures from the Public Works Report. After taking out what was charged to capital account, the mileage in certain years is undoubtedly different from that of which the hon. Minister of Railways has spoken, as he has left over five or six miles of branch railways. Taking 1874 to 1878 and deducting the amounts of \$150,000 spent on steel rails and \$17,000 and \$200,000, the figures, according to the returns, are correct, taking the six miles difference mileage into account. The amount spent on capital account was in 1879, \$226,000; in 1880, \$548,000; 1881, \$608,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman includes the Rivière du Loup Branch. I left that entirely out of both calculations.

Mr. BURPEE. I took it from the report that the hon. Minister submitted to the House. In 1882, the amount was \$446,000, and a Supplementary vote asked this year reaches \$383,000 odd, making \$730,000. The Estimates for 1883 amount to \$609,000, on capital account. Nothing is said in the Public Works Report about any grant being for the Rivière du Loup Branch.

Mr. MACKENZIE. According to the figures the average is 615 miles a year, and not as the hon. gentleman stated. The hon. Minister has included what is not in the annual reports charged to working expenses; the hon. Minister gave \$1,661 instead of \$1,461, and \$1,811 instead of \$1,611.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will find the statement I have given perfectly accurate.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think it is not perfectly accurate. I am not counting anything at all for the original expenditure on the Rivière du Loup line. Then, Sir, let us look for a moment at the expenditure for the year 1878-79. In the year 1876-77 the expenditure for the maintenance, which is one of the heavy items, was \$384,280. The expenditure in 1877-78, our last full year, was \$451,114. Now, in the succeeding year, 1878-79, we were in office three months. We undertook no extraordinary works on the railway at all during those three months. We were engaged mainly preparing for the General Elections and were away from the Capital a part of the time, but the expenditure for maintenance of roadways increased suddenly that year from \$411,000 to \$567,000. I have never obtained a statement of the expenditures under that head, though I have frequently asked for it. I recollect picking out a few of them, but only a few, and no account of them is rendered in the return. In the first year there is no doubt that enormous ex-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

penditures were created in order to save the expenditures in the next year, and the result was that \$126,737 were spent that year in excess of the previous year, 1877-78, and in the following year the expenditures descended—as it well might after everything had been rushed into the previous year that was possible—to \$385,000. The increase in the expenditure for station expenses, which are a kind of expenses that may fairly be contrasted, because the same work has been in effect, was: 1878-79, \$4,987, and for general charges, \$5,527. Now, station expenses and general charges occurred almost entirely in the time when hon. gentlemen controlled the work. They had nine months and we had three. I admit that considerable savings were effected by hon. gentlemen in the matter of cutting down wages and salaries. I never approved of that, nor do I approve of it now. I believe in employing the best men and paying them the best wages, and I do not believe in cutting down the wages of workmen to an inordinate degree, as was done in this case. That saving was made at a vast expense to the country, because the force employed has not been sufficient to maintain the road efficiently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in arriving at any such conclusion as he has just stated. I have no hesitation in saying that there is no road on the continent with which the Intercolonial will not favorably compare. It has been visited by railroad men from various parts of the United States, who have been carried over it at a speed of eighty miles an hour, and the condition of the road has excited the admiration of every railroad man from the United States who has visited the country to such an extent that they have again and again spoken in the highest and most eulogistic terms of the condition of the road. All the savings which have been effected have been real and genuine, and it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to take up the statement which I laid on the Table of the House, at the request of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), without arriving at the conclusion that we have been enabled to obtain a very large amount of increased traffic and to handle that traffic at a greatly decreased expenditure. I find that one error has occurred in the table which I had requested to be prepared, making the average number of miles under the late Government 540 when it should have been 608. The rest will be found to be strictly accurate and to afford a just and fair comparative statement. All the stock furnished from capital account has been maintained, and, as Mr. Brydges stated in his report, it was barely sufficient to do the traffic then. It has been maintained in a thorough state of efficiency, without any charge to capital. All that has been expended from capital account for the purchase of rolling stock has been legitimately expended to meet the additional volume of traffic required to be handled. The reduction which took place in the wages and salaries of employees, and which, I must say, was cheerfully assented to by the parties concerned, was not such as at all to affect the efficient operation of the road. A few persons, it is true, did leave and went to the United States, but in almost every instance the parties have applied for permission to return to their old positions. The persons who have been engaged in operating the road have devoted the utmost time and attention to the duties they had to discharge, and they have worked with a success which, I think, should have excited the admiration of hon. gentlemen opposite rather than their criticism. An enormous public saving has been effected; the work has been carried on in the most vigorous and efficient manner, and never was the traffic handled with the same degree of success as has attended the handling of this large additional volume of traffic. I have furnished the House with data from which every person would be able to judge exactly how the matter stands. All the increases of the capital expenditure which have been

charged against the hon. gentleman for the five years have been correspondingly charged for the two years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has failed to notice this point: that he paid nothing for steel rails. Yet he charges us with the amount we expended. If you deduct \$200,000 from 1876-77, 1877-78 and 1878-79—taking the same view of the last year that the hon. gentleman does with regard to the responsibility for it—and we have a difference of \$168,000. The entire line was laid with steel rails before I left office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not the entire line.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, the entire line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The line between Moncton and Shediac has not been wholly laid with steel rails yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not count that as part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is perfectly amazing that the hon. gentleman should stand up and make the statements he makes here deliberately—statements which he says are facts, but which we say are contrary to the fact—repetitions of statements made by himself and the Finance Minister in the country, disputing the evidence which their own books could afford them if they choose to look into them. The hon. gentleman has gone through this country declaring that through his skilful management and his prudent economy he has succeeded in saving some \$750,000 a year in the working expenses, deliberately withholding from the public the facts which would explain what that economy meant. He knows that he charged against the hon. member for Lambton, as working expenses, \$146,000 for steel rails renewed, and some \$270,000 for raising the bridges, both of which were extraordinary expenditures on capital account. The hon. gentleman knows too that in the expenditures of the same year there was something like \$100,000 expended in fitting the old rolling stock to the narrower gauge, which ought also to be charged to capital, but he chose to charge it to working expenses. All these sums ought to be deducted in all honesty and fair play; if the hon. gentlemen had the slightest sense of justice or fair play to their opponents, they would deduct them. If statements of this kind are made, the public ought to be given the facts honestly and frankly; but they are not, they are deliberately misled; misstatements are put before them as facts. The hon. gentleman stands up and compares years when only a portion of the railway was open, and when the working expenses could not be so great, with years when the entire road was open. The true mode of comparison is to commence at the time the road was opened, in 1876, and balance the receipts against the actual working expenses of each year. The hon. Minister of Finance, in order to give value to his statement, said that he got it from Mr. Tims, the accountant. There is no doubt Mr. Tims made his statement from the books, but Mr. Tims was not directed to go into the question of how much was unfairly charged to working expenses for the purposes of comparison between the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. Minister of Railways. The report for the year 1877-78 says:

"In 1876-77 the expenditure for renewals amounted to \$543,595.68, and was entered in the Public Accounts, Part III, page 58, under the head of Renewals, Suspense Account. Of that sum \$200,000 was charged to working expenses for renewals in that year; \$200,000 is charged for the fiscal year 1877-78, and the balance, \$143,595.68, will be included in charges for renewals in the account of 1878-79. The cost of working the line, with maintenance, is \$1,811,273.56, including \$200,000 for renewals, chargeable to 1877-78, from the total expenditure \$543,591.88 made in 1876-77."

Deducting, therefore, \$200,000 for renewals from \$432,326, the nominal excess of expenditure over revenue, the real excess over expenditure would be reduced to \$232,326, and

that is the last year the hon. member for Lambton had charge of the Treasury. But even from that sum a large amount will have to be deducted for reconstructing the rolling stock, the construction of sidings, station buildings, tanks, &c. The Minister of Railways, in comparing the results of the management of the Intercolonial with those of the management of the hon. member for Lambton (M. Mackenzie) takes the year which was really the year of his own administration, for the road was really under his absolute control for nine months of that year. But the Minister of Railways states that the Opposition invariably insist that the present Minister is responsible for the expenses of 1873-74. They have never done anything of the kind, except in so far as saying that those gentlemen are responsible for so much of the expense of that year as they rendered inevitable. For that year, for the obligations they contracted, they must be held responsible; but the present Opposition claim credit for not having spent all the money estimated as necessary by hon. gentlemen opposite. We boast we succeeded in keeping the expenses several hundred thousand dollars within the estimates, and particularly with regard to railways. Unless it can be shown that hon. gentlemen opposite had incurred some obligation or entered into some contracts in 1873-74, which the succeeding Government would have been glad to escape from and would not have undertaken had they been free, it will be absurd to hold the late Government responsible for the railroad expenditure during that year. But it suits the hon. Minister just now to claim that year, for that gives him a pretext for charging the hon. member for Lambton with the expenditure on the road for nine or ten months after he had ceased to control it. There was no other obligation resting on the Minister of Railways but that of extending those bridges. He constructed thirteen new sidings which were not necessary. But if they were necessary, when you come to the point of the hon. gentleman's wonderful saving and working expenses, is it reasonable to set this among the working expenses? Would it not be fair and honest to take that out of the working expenses? The hon. gentleman defended himself two years ago by saying: "Oh, I continue the road under the management of the late Government." Mr. Brydges was continued in the same extravagant management. But he had the same power to dismiss Mr. Brydges, if necessary, the day after he took office as when he did dismiss him. He ought to have been quite prepared, when he took office, to undertake his wonderful task of economy. But, in his comparisons of the management of the late and the present Governments, he ought to state the whole facts frankly. Let him tell the public that the year he credits Mr. Mackenzie with was his own year, and that he might have curtailed or reduced that expenditure had it been absolutely necessary. If he will fairly compare the expenditure under each Government, let him take 1877-88, during which the member for Lambton had the entire control of the road, for which he is responsible. When he talks of obtaining new traffic for it one would really suppose that the increase of the traffic was due to something he had done. Everything done to procure additional traffic was done before he took charge. One of the sources of this new traffic was the calling of the Allan steamers at Halifax, and the landing of a large portion of the goods intended for Canada. Again, the calling of those steamers at Halifax has led to the development of the cattle trade which is rapidly expanding. It was not the Minister of Railways who compelled those steamers to stop at Halifax, but the member for Lambton. A trade, of course, does not spring into full existence at once; it is a matter of gradual development. These two great sources of revenue were supplied and developed without any action of hon. gentlemen opposite. One of the great freights of the railroad is the fish trade, which also was developed while the member for Lambton had control of the road. It has grown since he was in power. He did everything to foster that trade. No

new railroad through a new country of comparatively sparse population can be expected to have as large a trade the first, second or third year as afterwards; railways foster and create business. Depression may affect it for a year or two; because as we all know that depression began to be severely felt in 1877-78, the last year of the management of the member for Lambton. The increase of the receipts from freight that year, as compared with the year preceding, was 19.44 per cent., and the uniform growth and reduction of the deficit was \$74,901, showing a very rapid development of the trade of the country and of the road. But it so happened that the depression continued and became more severe in the year following, notwithstanding the advent of the present Minister to office,—notwithstanding the promises of the National Policy which were to restore and revive business the moment they got into power. Notwithstanding the declaration of the Minister of Railways that a new era had dawned on the Dominion, the depression not only continued but became intensified. That was one of the reasons why the deficit was so much larger that year than the previous one. When all these facts are taken into account, I really think the hon. gentleman ought to have more regard for the reputation of the Government—though it be a bad one—than to persist in repeating statements entirely contrary to the facts as demonstrated in the official archives. When the railway was handed over by the hon. member for Lambton it was probably the finest road in America. The road-bed, superstructure, and equipment were all that could be expected, and the road was all laid with steel rails except from Painsec Junction to Shediac. That is to-day in a very wretched condition. Only a day or two ago a train tumbled off—and the locomotive is still, I believe, in the ditch. The hon. gentleman pretends that the slight repairs necessary from time to time on a new road are to be compared to an entire renewal of superstructure, rails and all. He must see this is a perfectly unfair way of putting the case. The hon. gentleman says that in the present condition everybody abuses the road. No doubt, even in its present condition it is an admirable road; but it is not in the condition it was when handed over to him. The rolling stock is in a deplorable condition. The other day I referred to a letter of Mr. John Murray, who describes the locomotives as being almost useless. One especially, No. 73, has figured in a number of serious accidents through its being put to draw more cars than it is able to draw. The Rivière du Loup Branch did not entail any large addition to the rolling stock because the Government rolling stock was formerly used over it, and at greater wear and tear than at present, while the old rails have been replaced by steel rails. With regard to the hon. Minister's statement of the amount he has saved, there is room to doubt its accuracy. The Public Accounts are before us, and the hon. gentleman cannot pretend to say that the deficit, under the hon. member for Lambton, was more than \$232,000 on the working of the road.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. When an hon. member undertakes to speak against time he should select some other hour besides 2 a.m. I will give the hon. gentleman a reason why the expenses in 1878-79 were larger than in any other year. I believe the result of that was that the expenditures which were required were deferred until after the last Session previous to the General Elections, and then I have this evidence that the manager of the road and the chief superintendent engaged—immediately after the House rose for the last time, and when no returns could be again exhibited to the House—engaged in these expensive operations, and that he allowed the road to remain in abeyance until that period. The improvement can be made matter of proof by all the persons connected with the road, and by the works that were undertaken, and the result

Mr. ANGELL.

was that the expenditures made by the late Government were very much larger than they would have been. Then, again, between the 1st of July of that year and the 8th of October something like \$8,000 were paid out in increased salaries to officials. It was found very urgent to obtain political support by the appointment of a number of people here and there, and the result was that I see in that short period no less than \$8,000 increase was expended in salaries. I will ask the hon. gentleman now to take the year 1878, which he says is a fair year to test the comparative economy of the two Governments. They had then 714 miles of road in operation, and the expenses were \$1,811,273.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; \$200,000 is to come off that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Suppose I give the hon. gentleman the benefit of this \$200,000. I take them as I find them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They are not that way.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I maintain now, as I always maintained on that side of the House, that the renewals of the road of whatever character, required to be charged in the year in which they were made. They require to be spread over the five years. No one will pretend to state that renewals do not require to be charged to working expenses, and I charge that way all the renewals of the same character since then to the present Administration. Now, you will find that in the year 1877-78 they expended on 714 miles of road, \$1,811,273. Now, Sir, I only expended on 825 miles of road for the year 1879-80, leaving out altogether the intervening years, \$1,603,432, \$218,000 less for operating 111 miles more road. Now, even if you take away the amount for steel rails, you see the enormous economy effected. With regard to that table I presented I regret that the clerk made a mistake in stating the number of miles in operation during the five years averaged 540, instead of 608 as it should have been. That, of course, involves a change in the figures I subsequently gave, showing that the average annual expenditure, instead of being \$2,515,653, it should have been \$2,112,448, showing an economy under the present Administration of \$438,808. With the exception of that error I have no hesitation in saying that the strictest accuracy of every item submitted to the Committee can be maintained. I have gone into the figures on the table submitted and have worked out the whole question in such a way as to place it within the power of any hon. gentleman, with the Public Accounts in his hands and the reports of the various years, to verify accurately every statement. Now, I may say, with reference to the Pictou Branch, that a certain portion is not in so good condition, and that is the reason why I have been expecting, as the hon. gentleman knows, from month to month for the past year, to be called upon to hand it over. I did not wish to lay down a dozen miles of steel rails on a road that was to be soon out of the hands of the Government, and thus make a very valuable present to parties whom I thought had received quite enough before. The hon. gentleman did re-lay with steel a large portion after he had passed a Bill to transfer the Pictou Railway, upon which steel rails were laid, and I thought that was doing quite enough for a company which was to receive the road as a present. Had I supposed the road would remain in my hands I would have been compelled to do more to-day than I have done. For all the rest of the Intercolonial Railway, for all the rolling stock and everything connected with it, I challenge the strictest scrutiny to show that everything has not only been maintained in a thorough state of efficiency, but the road to-day is in the finest condition it has ever been. Now, I will add the testimony of Mr. Schreiber, Chief Engineer of Government Railways, and at present in charge of this work. They are prepared by the Chief Engineer of Railways, who is well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, who commands every respect and confidence, and who is known as an able and

painstaking officer; and if there is any inaccuracy in this statement, that gentleman is responsible. I have told him from the first hour I had anything to do with the railway and that he was put in charge, that he must not allow the road to run down or the rolling-stock to deteriorate, and that instead of such being deemed an economy it would be considered as the most blameworthy act of which he could be guilty. I told him that all the money required to maintain the road and the rolling-stock in the highest condition of efficiency was at his service, and I would recognize it as the greatest fault of which he could be guilty to allow either to run down. Hon. gentlemen opposite are aware that the chief mechanical superintendent, Mr. Whitney, has for twenty years filled the position—and I confess I place implicit confidence in his statement; and having myself visited every part of the road with the officers, and having taken the superintendent and mechanical superintendent to examine everything and obtain all possible information, I feel myself in the position to declare that all statements respecting deterioration either in the road or rolling-stock are distinctly unfounded. I have taken all the means that a gentleman, not being a professional man, could take to obtain accurate information, and that I have laid before the House fairly and impartially, and I challenge the closest scrutiny into those statements and the most careful examination by any person who wishes to look into them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Whoever is to blame, every statement that has come before the House is a false statement. The hon. gentleman can locate the blame where he pleases.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman cannot say that the statement is a false one. I stated that all the renewals for the five years he was in power have been charged against him, and that all the subsequent renewals have been charged against the present Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There have been no renewals since the hon. gentleman came to office. He cannot show there was a line laid down which was then beyond repairs. The renewals for 1874-75, was \$292,000; for 1875-76, \$215,289; for 1877, \$200,000; for 1878, \$200,000; for 1879, \$143,000. Not a dollar was spent by the hon. gentleman or this Government corresponding with his figures, and, therefore, no fair comparison can be made except by deducting those expenditures that were abnormal. In every instance in the Public Reports it is stated with that deduction made, yet the hon. member comes down with a statement which is a false statement and one calculated to deceive the public.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is perfectly true, every line of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am stating the facts, and I invite every member present to go and look at the reports and ascertain what is correct. The renewals in every year have been deducted in making a comparative statement. I wish a statement to be prepared and brought down before concurrence to show the precise condition of the road over the entire line, the amount of the rolling-stock in each year and the revenue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the information to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I want also a statement of the expense and maintenance of way in 1878-79, and I believe that expenditure was deliberately made by the Minister for the purpose of making it as large as possible, and reducing the expenditure for following years. Expenditure for 1877-78 for maintenance of way, was \$441,114; for 1878-79, only three months of which was under our control, there was expended on steel rails, \$567,851; the following year the amount was reduced to \$385,536. I hope if the hon. gentleman is going to present full information to the House he will withdraw the false statement he made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is impossible to withdraw false statements as such have not been made. The falsehood rests with the hon. gentleman in making such a statement. When I sat on that side of the House I stated that it was an untrue policy to bring down accounts in which the renewals were not charged, and I maintained they should be charged each year. The renewals are always charged to the year in which they are made. I might differ with the hon. gentleman as to the proper mode in which to charge the amounts, but if I bring down a statement in which the renewals in both cases are charged to the year in which they apply there would be no falsehood. The hon. gentleman may differ from me but he forgets what is due to himself when he characterizes a statement as false which is a perfectly true and frank statement. I defy the hon. gentleman to put his finger on any statement I ever made in this House or any document I ever submitted that could properly be characterized by any terms so insulting.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have just put my finger on such a case, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to deny it. I invite every hon. member to look at the Public Accounts or the Report on Railways and say if I am not right. The hon. gentleman will not get out of it in the way he thinks of it. I say that we laid the whole line with steel rails and that he did not lay any, and I say that nothing could be more false than the comparison he makes in that respect.

Mr. WELDON. I spoke the other night with regard to the number of casualties on the Intercolonial, and I find from statistics that that road occupies a very unfavorable position compared with others in this respect. In the whole of the railroads of Canada last year 99 lives were lost, while 147 persons were injured, making a total of 246. I find that on the Grand Trunk Railway 25 were killed and no others injured. On the Great Western Railway 9 were killed and 27 injured, making a total of 36. On the Intercolonial Railway 14 were killed and 67 injured, making a total of 81, or nearly one-third of the whole. We find also that many accidents occurred which are not reported, and I call attention to the following paragraph from the *St. John's Globe* of April 20th, entitled: "Another smash-up on the Intercolonial:"

"Rumors were current to-day that a collision had taken place on the Intercolonial yesterday, near Springhill, and that one of the new engines recently built by Messrs. Fleming & Sons had been badly wrecked. A reporter enquired at the railway station, but the officials there proclaimed ignorance of any accident. From other sources it was gleaned that at an early hour yesterday morning, somewhere between Springhill and Moncton, Conductor Brown's coal train was run into by a special and both engines seriously damaged. No one was injured. The last engine put out by Messrs. Fleming & Sons was one of the number. It was also stated that Engineer McNair, who was in the accident with the late Conductor Geldert, was driving the engine of the special train. The alleged cause of the accident is that the brake on the van would not work, but railway men assert that there are other and better reasons."

If it be true that these accidents are caused by the men being overworked it is false economy. It is noticeable, too, that in most of these accidents it is the employes of the road who generally suffer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see at once that if all the accidents occurred which are reported we would not be able, after repairing locomotives and so forth, to effect the enormous saving which we have effected. There is no truth in the statement that the officials are overworked. There are occasions, of course, when the officials perform more than their usual amount of labor, but it is voluntarily undertaken, and it would be impossible to carry on the work of this road by maintaining a sufficient staff to meet the traffic at particular times without increasing the labor of the regular staff. This would be utterly ruinous to any road, so that at particular times of pressure the road must be operated by calling upon the regular staff.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the Prince Edward Island Railway the hon. gentleman must be aware that the recent decision of the Court here, so far as the evidence has been given to the public, seem to show that it was not in good condition. Damages were awarded in one case, if I remember a right, to the amount of \$40,000 to one man, and upon the ground mainly that the road was not in a fit condition to be travelled upon, that there was both negligence in construction and negligence in keeping it in repair.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret the accident on the Prince Edward Island Railway; but I think we have sufficient margin, as compared with the late Government, to pay a good deal more than the amount mentioned by the hon. gentleman as having been awarded under the very extraordinary judgment of the judge, should that judgment be confirmed, of which we have no expectation. That judgment has been appealed against, and we shall be prepared to show that that finding of the judge was based upon testimony of the most undoubted perjury. I shall be able to show that the gentleman in charge of that railway at the time was one whom my predecessor advanced. He found him in the service at a salary of \$2,400 a year, and increased his salary to \$4,000 a year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But I required him to give up an appointment with the Nova Scotia Government from which he was receiving \$1,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But we were giving him only \$2,400 a year. He was chief engineer of the road and ought to have been able to see that the track was maintained, and that gentleman's testimony proved that where this accident occurred the road was in first-class condition. The track-master, who had been in the service during all the time of the hon. gentlemen opposite, a man of great ability and who is there now, swore in the most positive terms that the road was in the best possible condition. But a dismissed section foreman was brought there from the States who swore that the road was in very bad order. As the matter is still before the Courts, it is not necessary for me to say more than that I have no doubt whatever that the extraordinary damages given to a man who is at this moment performing the duties of cashier in a bank at Charlottetown, are much too great. The deficits on the Prince Edward Island Railway have been as follows:—For 1875-76, \$96,869; for 1876-77, \$97,930; for 1877-78, \$85,700; for 1878-79, \$97,457; for 1879-80, \$57,789; and for 1880-81, \$71,992.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As to the capacity of the engineer that is to be measured by instructions received from headquarters. I saw a statement in some of the papers that a very large number of new sleepers were put in immediately after this accident.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think a large number of sleepers were put in.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That would show that there were no arrangements to put the road in a good condition. The hon. gentleman seems to think it extraordinary that he has succeeded in reducing the amount of the deficit. Well, it ought to be reduced. During the last year I had charge of that road, a large party was engaged during the whole year in renewing portions of the road, extending some parts, straightening curves and so on, and the hon. gentleman found all these works done when he came in. The hon. gentleman says there has been undoubted perjury. Then, have the Government taken steps to have the parties arrested?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No steps have been taken that I am aware of. I make the statements on a report made to me yesterday by the officer who represented the Government at the trial, a highly respectable gentleman of the legal

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

profession, Mr. Hodgson, and his report leaves no doubt on my mind of the most glaring perjury by witnesses at that trial.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then I presume the Government will take immediate steps to have the perjurers arrested.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I hold in my hand the report of Mr. McNab. On the 24th August, 1880, a train left the track on the Prince Edward Island Railway, in consequence of which several persons were injured. It was alleged that the accident was caused by the bad condition of the track. Mr. McNab held an investigation and reported that:

"The accident is unaccountable, as the investigation which has been made shows that the road-bed has received a great deal of attention this summer, it having been levelled and gauged and provided with new sleepers where necessary, and no reduction has been made in the number of men employed."

Speaking of the place of the accident, Mr. McNab says:

"It had been examined by John McQuade, one of the section-men, on the morning of the 23rd instant, and it was then in good condition."

And further:

"As the investigation which has been made, combined with a personal examination of the ground, satisfies me that the road-bed had no connection whatever with causing the accident."

The road-master, Mr. H. Houle, is a man of great experience, having been connected with railways for thirty-two years, chiefly with the Calais and Baring Railway, the Grand Trunk, the European and North American, the Western Extension, the New Brunswick and Canada, and the Prince Edward Island Railway. His connection with the latter line dates from its commencement. So all those parties who were on the spot and responsible for the condition of the road, and who were trusted by the late Government, concurred in saying that the road was in first-class condition.

Mr. ANGLIN. Very respectable people in Charlottetown said that they went outside the place and were able to kick some of the sleepers off the track after the accident occurred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not require any other statement to prove that the man who asserted that gave false evidence. The hon. gentleman knows that over a sleeper that you could kick to pieces, a train could not be taken. Certain parties swore that they could pick the spikes out with their fingers and kick the sleepers off. Will that be believed in face of the statement of Mr. McNab, Mr. Houle and others, all able and accomplished men, who examined and declared the road in first-class condition.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Were those parties examined on the trial?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and the verdict was founded on the testimony of the parties who had been dismissed. The people in the neighborhood got excited on the subject.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The verdict seemed to me a very heavy one indeed. I enquired and was told by some people that the rails could not be kept together.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have the good authority I have mentioned for the falsity of that statement.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not prepared to say exactly; probably some Government Bills, and then Supply.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is the Redistribution Bill to be taken up first?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not at the next sitting of the House.

House adjourned at 3 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 26th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE IRISH RESOLUTIONS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Address adopted by this House on Thursday last, the 20th inst., to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, in relation to the affairs of Ireland, be engrossed.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman announced that he would take steps to prepare an Address, which would have the assent of their Honors in the Upper House—a joint Address.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the subject of my next motion.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that a Message be sent to their Honors, that this House has passed an Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen in relation to the affairs of Ireland, to which they desire the concurrence of their Honors.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS BILL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the Order for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 5) respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets, be transferred from the Public Bills and Orders to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

RE-ADJUSTMENT OF THE REPRESENTATION.

Mr. BLAKE. When is it the intention of the Government to ask leave to introduce a Bill for the re-adjustment of the representation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To-morrow or next day.

NEW BRUNSWICK MAILS.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that there are no mails to-day from New Brunswick. Every day we are without mails from that Province.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). There must be some defect in the post-office arrangements, for three times a week our mails do not connect. The Postmaster-General, or the Minister of Railways, should pay some attention to this matter; the present condition of things is too bad.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 36) respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 26,

Mr. CASEY. This clause appears to hold out to the young men of the country a prospect of entrance into the Civil Service by passing that examination. But we find further on, that although a young man may be successful, he has no chance of being taken on probation as a member of the service, unless he is selected by the Minister at the head of some particular Department. From the explanation which we have already received, I gather, that no matter how little examination any man may pass, he does not require any right even to be taken on probation by passing his examination, and, as a matter of fact, that he will not be taken on probation unless recommended by some supporter of the Government of the day. I have no doubt that the system of nominations by political patronage will remain exactly as it has been. Now, I think it would more correctly express the actual state of things which will exist under this Act to provide, as it was provided in one of the English Civil Service Acts, that only those who have been recommended for positions by members shall have an opportunity of going to these examinations. There will be no use of any one else going up, and it will involve a waste of time and money on the part of the applicants and the examiners, as only those who are on the right side of politics can obtain a recommendation to any influential position, and I think it will be much fairer to the applicants for such positions that the examinations shall be limited to those who are recommended by supporters of the Government, because that is what it really amounts to.

Mr. BLAKE. I perceive that the young men will have to pay a fee. There is an old proverb "what I keep, that I lose; what I gain, that I save." I want to know on what principle these fees are to be exacted, and what the probable amount will be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position now to say what fees will be required, but I suppose that if a candidate is selected to pass his examination, he will have to pay a small fee for his certificate. That, of course, is done everywhere.

Mr. BLAKE. The examination shall be open to all persons, upon the payment of a fee, therefore it is not a preliminary for taking advantage of the certificate, but it is a preliminary to going into an examination. I am not opposed to the payment of a nominal fee. In one of the institutions with which I have been connected, the Law Society, the fee required to be paid is one dollar. It is required upon the principle that there should be some check upon persons first giving notice and afterwards not coming up. But I think it would be extremely objectionable to put on a fee which would be an obstacle or barrier to coming up, who will say to the young man: "You have no certainty of getting into the service, there is no certainty of you getting a certificate, but there is a certainty of losing \$5."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no intention, but the contrary, to put any obstacles in the way of candidates coming up to pass their examinations; but, as the hon. gentleman says, there must be a certain check on parties giving the notice and putting the examiners to trouble and then failing to come up. There may be a fee exacted in that case, perhaps a fee from those who will receive their certificate. The thing is safe in the hands of the Government of the day, no matter of whom composed, because they are responsible to Parliament.

On clause 27,

Mr. CASEY. A notice of one month is scarcely sufficient for examination in British Columbia for instance, because

it would take the *Canada Gazette* a fortnight to go out there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a question of detail in the regulations. We may still give special notice in the local papers, but it is absolutely necessary to be published in the *Canada Gazette*.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is it intended that this clause shall apply to the preliminary as well as to the qualifying examinations?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It really seems to me to be quite unnecessary. I am sorry the Chairman has consented to strike out that preliminary examination.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is nothing to prevent the two examinations taking place at the same time. Notice may be given for the same time if the examiners find, on the preliminary examination, that, say, two young men out of ten are not able to pass the examination in arithmetic and orthography, they may tell them to withdraw, there is no chance of passing their examination.

Mr. CASEY. I see the notice is to state the time and place of examination and the subjects. Now, a notice of a month or even six weeks is too little to give on those subjects. The subjects should be settled by the Board of Examiners as early as possible after its organization, and they should then be published, so that all those who intend to come will have proper notice to prepare themselves on the different subjects. I think the House should have a general statement as to the character of the examination. We know the character of the qualifying examination in England, because we have the examination papers for some years back. The qualifying examination is pretty severe, but the competitive examination is excessively and unduly severe, and gives an improper advantage to those who "cram" as is the practice in England.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the Board is appointed it will have to go to work and prepare subjects for examination, and submit them for the examiner of the Executive, and the subjects will necessarily have to be published in the *Official Gazette*. That is the practice which obtains in regard to examinations for the Indian service. We could not, of course, ask a young man who proposed to have an entrance as a third-class clerk to have an examination in classics, Latin and Greek, but in the elementary subjects which he must know to make him a good clerk. If he wants to pass an examination for a higher degree the subjects must be more difficult.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think this matter rests entirely with the examiners. The members are not, under this Bill, an independent Board of Commissioners as they are in England, charged with the policy of the Civil Service; but this will simply be an Examining Board, the policy of the service remaining in the hands of the Governor in Council. Therefore, the service of the examination is a matter of policy not of detail, and the Government will decide it without the interference of the Examining Board.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government may consult with the Board.

Mr. CASEY. The examination should not include the higher branches of classics and scientific subjects. It is merely a qualifying examination intended to test the fitness of young men for ordinary clerical employment, and it should not exceed the capacity of an average well educated young man. Young men should not be admitted into the third class who could not be qualified to rise to the second and first. One of the complaints made against the service by several of the Deputy-Heads before the Committee of which I was Chairman, was that the service was filled with young men in the lower grades who were not fit for

Mr. CASEY.

promotion. The object of the qualifying examination is to secure the entrance of young men who are fit for promotion. I object to the principle of selecting second or first-class clerks by a higher examination than that for third class. I adhere to the only true system followed in every thoroughly organized system of Civil Service, that a man should work up, and that the higher grades should be attained by special qualifications and not on the ground of higher literary attainments. The principle of competition is that the man with the highest qualifications should be appointed. But in England, examinations are applied only to the lower grades; they are not considered a test for the higher grades, the test for those must be experience. In England, when a list of successful candidates is made out, they are given to understand that their claims will not extend beyond the period of the next examination, so as to prevent a number of men hanging on indefinitely in the expectation of getting Government employment. This section does not state whether the list will be made out so as to show the order in which the candidates have passed. This should be done, as there may be considerable difference between two successful candidates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to make the candidates pass a new examination each following term. Some of them may hang on, but they will soon find out what chance they have for appointment. Others will come up, and those who have passed, but have not been appointed, may not possess the other qualifications necessary. The regulations may provide for discrimination as to capacity, but that must of course be left to the regulations.

Mr. CASEY. It is really necessary to mark their standing, because it is quite possible for a highly educated man in passing this examination to show that he possesses other knowledge which might be useful to the Departments, and which the Minister should know.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A candidate who comes up for examination to be admitted into the third class may, if he chooses, pass an examination to qualify him for the first or second class; and if he should pass it successfully, that would be a strong recommendation to the Minister to select him in preference to another for the first or second class, should he be otherwise qualified.

On clause 29,

Mr. BLAKE. The examinations are, by this clause, provided only for appointments to third-class clerkships and messengerships. The hon. Minister has stated that a candidate may have the option for passing for first and second-class appointments. If that be the intention such examinations should be provided for in this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That may be provided later in another clause. We will let this clause stand, and if not will add to it a provision of this nature. But, in the meantime, I would ask that the clause be adopted as it stands, and I will take a note of the suggestion.

On clause 30,

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would like much if the Minister would insert an amendment which I propose in the fifth line, on the sixth page of the Bill, providing that in the selection no consideration shall be given to the political predilections of the candidates. I hold that the prizes of the service should be open to the young men of the country without regard to politics. In England, where there are competitive examinations, politics are ignored altogether; and I think, when we are creating provisions for a new Civil Service, we should, as far as possible, put a restraint upon the Government in the matter of making appointments out of political considerations. I would move that after the word "select" there shall be added "having no regard to political party considerations."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the clause should be adopted as it stands, without the amendment. The fact is, we do not speak of politics in this Bill at all. We are settling the Civil Service without reference to one party or the other. When I introduced the Bill, and also at the second reading, I said that I wished to have the countenance of hon. gentlemen in the measure, as I thought it was a matter in which both sides were equally interested. Hon. gentlemen may some day or other come back to this side, and they will, of course, have the law to work upon; but we, as a Government, having the countenance of Parliament, must be left to select these men, who having passed the examination are found to be qualified for office. We will select the men, who, in our opinion, are the best men to be appointed, and if, after six months, any man is found to be unfit for office, of course he will be replaced by another. If hon. gentlemen have not confidence enough in this or any other Government, to allow them to select the officers under the provisions of the Bill as they stand, they will not succeed better by inserting the few words proposed to be added. What guarantee will the hon. gentleman have with his amendment, that a selection would be made without reference to politics? Here is a list of twenty men, and out of them will be selected those who are considered the best. What effect will these words have? How can you prove that there was no reference to politics, or that there was a reference to politics in any particular appointment? It would be impossible to establish the one thing or the other, and, therefore, the words are useless, and the clause should be adopted as it stands.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. You should add the words since they would do no harm.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has frankly admitted that he would pay no attention if they were in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We pay no more attention than we would without them, because we would select the best men in any case, according to our opinion of their fitness.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman practically says that amongst the qualifications the best men are—

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, in his experience, will be able to give us all those qualifications.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We know that without the safeguard of competitive examinations this would be nothing but a political farce or dodge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows it by experience.

Mr. CASEY. It is true that nothing short of political examinations can prevent the introduction of a political and personal favoritism. I object to this clause, which simply leaves the choice of officers entirely in the hands of the Minister as before, with the exception that he must choose from a certain list of qualified men. I wish to call attention to the very strange words of the Commissioners in regard to this matter:

"Notwithstanding the reluctance of witnesses to commit themselves to any specific statements as to the inefficiency of their subordinates, there is sufficient in their general statements on that subject to justify the conclusion that the service is susceptible of very great improvement, and that there have been many appointments to it of persons whose habits, lack of educational requirements, or inaptitude for business could not fail to produce a state of affairs fully justifying most of the propositions stated in the reference to the Commission. But, apart from any specific statements made in the evidence, we find in its general tenor and in what we have ourselves observed, abundant reasons for the conclusions that the service requires reform, and that it has not been sufficiently guarded against the evil effects of political patronage. To this baneful influence, we believe, may be traced nearly all that demands change. It is responsible for admission to the service of those who are too old to be efficient; of those whose impaired health

and enfeebled constitutions forbids the hope that they can ever become useful public servants; of those whose personal habits are an equally fatal objection; of those whose lack of education should disqualify them; and of those whose mental qualities are of an order that has made it impossible for them to succeed in private business. It is responsible too for the appointment of those who desire to lead an easy and, what they deem, a genteel life."

What I wish to call attention to especially, is that to this baneful influence may be traced nearly all that demands change. It is not merely the admission of unfit men to the service, but the promotion and treatment of these men after being in the service, the general management of the service, its general tone, and its reputation before the public who are debased and degraded by the fact that the men are appointed by political influence. It is not merely an educational qualification that is required, but a radical change in the method of promotion. I heartily agree with the Commissioners that political influence is at the root of nearly all the evils of the service, and therefore I object to the clause as it now stands.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Perhaps the hon. Minister will accept the words "and the appointments shall be made from the three highest names on the list." This would be better than this mode of allowing the Government to select in this promiscuous way, from among the successful candidates, those who may be particularly recommended by political favoritism.

Mr. BLAKE. It is provided that they shall be selected in order, is it not?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). This is the pith of the whole Bill, and unless there is some safeguard here against political influences, which have depraved the Civil Service, the Bill will be utterly useless. We were looking forward to a Bill providing substantial reform, but there can be no reform unless the appointments are given to the men who stand at the head of the list, other qualifications being equal. The hon. gentleman knows that the system which has been so successful in the New York Post Office under ex-Postmaster-General James, was based upon competition; he knows that all the Bills at present before the United States Senate are based upon this system; he knows that all that has recommended the English system to all who have considered the question is this feature of competition; and he knows that these Commissioners, appointed by the hon. gentleman himself, base all their demands for a change in the service on a system of competition. Another clause of their report says:

"We claim that it is the most effectual, indeed the only, means of completely and permanently cutting away all opportunities for the exercise of political influence, which we believe to be so injurious to the public interests."

Now, the hon. gentleman appointed Commissioners to supply us with information with regard to certain evils in the Civil Service; they have supplied this information very fully, but the whole pith of it is discarded by the hon. gentleman. Yet we pay for this work; these Commissioners have been on duty for several years, and, I think, we have paid them \$3,000 or \$4,000. The hon. gentleman is using the time of this House with a Bill which is perfectly useless; my opinion is that it will be used as a protection to cover up some of the worst cases of political appointments in the service. Now, the hon. gentleman surely will not go back on the report of the Commission, or refuse to be guided by the experience of England and the United States, or ignore the kindly admonitions which he hears on this side of the House from gentlemen who know a good deal about competitive examinations, and as much as the hon. gentleman about reform in the Civil Service. If the hon. gentleman refuses all hints which we give him, he might as well adopt the course suggested, and do, by Order in Council, what he proposes to do by this Bill. I think the hon. gentleman is practically

insulting the intelligence of this House when he refuses to entertain the slightest amendment we offer, and I am almost prepared to say that he might as well put his Bill through Committee *pro forma*, have it signed by the Speaker, and just have the House prorogued. I never knew a Minister on the Treasury benches, when initiating such a great measure, to treat the intelligence of the House with so much contempt as he is doing.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed that this clause shall apply to the office of the Auditor-General? If it is, it seems to me to be subversive of the Audit Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The new clause which I propose to add provides that the powers and duties of the Auditor-General are saved.

On clause 31,

Mr. CASEY. This clause seems to be peculiar. If a man is rejected, another clerk is selected in his stead, and then the Head of the Department decides whether the man rejected is utterly rejected or taken on trial again. That would seem as if two men were to be put in the place of one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not at all. If a man is rejected, he, of course, goes out of the office and another man is selected in his place; and then the Head of the Department decides whether the name of the person rejected shall be struck off the list—not the list of the Department, but the list prepared by the examiners, as being unfit for the service generally.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand, however, that this rejection shall be definitive for that particular Department. Is he to be allowed another trial in that Department, or in the other Departments?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The trial he has had in that Department shows whether he is fit for the service or not. After having been tried for a year, and the Deputy-Head reports that he is not fit, he is rejected; and then it is for the Head of the Department to see whether the reason for his rejection is sufficient to render him unfit for the service generally; in that case he states so, and the officer's name disappears from the list.

Mr. CASEY. I think the provision should be limited so as to specify that he must not have a trial for the same Department; otherwise an unscrupulous Minister might state that he was unfit for the service altogether.

On clause 32,

Mr. BLAKE. On sub-section B of this clause arises a portion of the suggestion I made the other day. I maintain that the report of the Deputy-Head ought to be that the requisite qualifications are not possessed by any person then in the service of that or any other Department, and available for the office. If the qualifications are professional, the range is of course rarer; but there may be other qualifications for an office, such as that of an accountant, and there might be some person in the other Departments who would possess those qualifications, and who ought surely to have a chance for the office. The hon. gentleman suggested that this might demoralize the Department, and I have endeavored to phrase the amendment I propose in such a way as to meet that objection, my language being: "Not possessed by any person then in the service of that or any other Department and available for the office." So that if peculiar circumstances should render an officer not available, but wanted elsewhere, still we could go and find another person outside.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government or Head of the Department, by this clause, is not precluded from selecting another officer from another Department. The clause means that if the qualifications required are not possessed by persons in the other Departments, and the

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

Deputy-Head concurs in a report to that effect, then the Governor in Council may select any person deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy. We are thus not precluded from taking an officer from any other Department, whom we may select as well as an outsider; and therefore we cannot put in sub-section B the words: "That the requisite qualifications are not possessed by any person of that Department or any other," because the Deputy-Head could not report that. He is not supposed to know the qualifications of officers in other Departments. But, by stating what is proposed, he may say: "I concur in your report, so far as the Department is concerned; but if I find that in another Department there is another officer qualified for the position, who can be replaced without destroying the efficiency of that Department, I shall recommend him." And, therefore, it will fall under the second sub-section, which says that he may select that person from another Department, or from the outside.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not argue that the Governor in Council was precluded from selecting a person from some other Department, although I might have pointed out that sub-section A does seem to indicate such a difficulty. But I do not say that that is the effect of the whole clause; whereas, according to the hon. gentleman's limited interpretation of the Deputy-Head's report, it ought to be simply that no one in the Department itself possessed these qualifications—that he does not know any more as to the qualifications of individuals in other Departments than in an outsider; nor can he know any more of the working of other Departments than an outsider. So he is not qualified to say that such a person in another Department is or is not fit for the office. But what I wanted to emphasize was, not that the Governor in Council is precluded from selecting an officer of another Department, but that the scope of the clause indicates that the outside is to be looked to instead of the inside; and I want the clause to recognize the propriety of looking inside first, of widening the area of expectant promotion to deserving persons inside the service as far as possible. That was my object.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On principle, I would have no objection to meet the hon. gentleman in this way: in the second sub-section to provide: "If the Head of the Department concurs in such report, the Governor in Council may appoint such person if found in other Departments, or from outside, as shall be deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy."

Mr. BLAKE. It might read thus: "Such persons as shall be deemed best fitted to fill the vacancy from any other Department, if there be any other available, and if not, an outsider, could be taken." I have just one other suggestion with reference to sub-section 2. It will be observed that the clause in sub-section C provide that it would be for the public interest that the examination, herein provided for, should, as regards such vacancy, be wholly or partially dispensed with. I am strongly of opinion that the examination provided for by this Bill, which is only a qualifying examination, need never be dispensed with at all. It is quite different when it is a competitive examination. I should be disposed to say that any person, however advanced in years, or special his qualification, who cannot pass the qualifying examination would hardly be fit for any situation at all. But the clause provides that it shall be wholly or partially dispensed with; and then, if the Governor in Council shall select such person as he may deem best fitted to fill the vacancy, I suggest the introduction of these words: "The persons selected shall undergo such examination as may be suggested in the report." If there is to be only a partial examination, the persons should be selected finally after passing it.

Mr. CASEY. On the question of examination, before that alteration is finally made, I wish to say that the reason here given for deviating from the ordinary rules of appoint-

ment is chiefly that professional requirements exist which cannot be tested in the ordinary way. I think it should be made obligatory in cases where professional requirements are in question that a candidate should pass an examination for those requirements.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. Minister abandons the idea of test qualifications; he goes back on the spirit of his own Bill. A man to be admitted to the third class must pass an examination, but a man requiring professional knowledge or special requirements is not subjected to examination at all, so that there is no attempt to secure efficiency in this class. It has occurred again and again, as testified before the Committee by Mr. Sandford Fleming, that men utterly ignorant of professional duties were appointed as surveyors under him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have accepted the suggestions of the hon. member for West Durham, which I thought were carrying out the idea of this clause; but I am sorry to say that I cannot consent to the amendment of the hon. gentleman—it is not necessary. The examination is for admission into the Civil Service as ordinary clerks, but I do not think it should be extended to gentlemen who are selected on account of their professional qualifications. We should not ask a chief engineer, or a chief architect, or any person in that position, to pass an examination.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. Minister so far as regards the higher offices. It is by his professional knowledge, his own high reputation, his skill, certificate and approved record, that you appoint such an officer; but that does not apply to subordinate officers, who do not require skill and knowledge of that kind. I do not go quite so far as to say, that in the latter cases there should always be an examination. Even under the English Act a wise discretion is given, which was exercised not long ago by Sir William Harcourt in the case of an inspector of mines. The person appointed had no great educational advantages, but had special advantages of training, and the possession of the confidence of the people among whom he was to discharge his duties, and his appointment, without examination, was defended on those grounds. The Deputy-Head should be allowed a certain amount of latitude, in deciding whether, in cases of professional appointments, an examination should be undergone or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I differ with the hon. gentleman on this point. I do not think an engineer, or an architect, or any other officer of that kind, should be submitted to an examination. He has already passed his examination and received his certificate of admission into his profession. His certificates are well known to the men of his profession and to the clerks, by whom he is considered qualified to fulfil his duties, and he is selected by the Head of the Department, and confirmed by the Governor in Council for the position. Then he is not there permanently. Under this law he may be discharged after a certain time if he is not found to be competent. I think, under the circumstances, the clause should remain as we have amended it. I now propose to add the following as a new clause, to meet the suggestions of the hon. member for West Durham:—

"If a vacancy occurs in the office of the Auditor-General such report shall be made by that officer to the Minister of Finance, who shall lay it before the Governor in Council, and in any case in which the Auditor-General deems it necessary to report for the information of the Governor in Council, such report shall be made through the Minister of Finance."

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how that is going to work. As well as I remember the Audit Act, it provides that all appointments to that office shall be made by the Governor in Council. You deal here only with the case of a vacancy

occurring in the office. Supposing there is a new appointment, that an additional officer is required for the staff.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In any case in which the Auditor-General deems it necessary to report to the Governor in Council—that will cover the case.

Mr. BLAKE. I am discussing whether it is a workable provision. I now refer to the case where a fresh appointment may be required, not a vacancy at all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first portion of the clause provides for a vacancy, then "and in any case in which the Auditor-General deems it necessary to report for the information of the Governor in Council;" that will cover any new appointment.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that is a very awkward attempt to provide for the general run of the office of the Auditor-General, hitching it on to the 32nd clause, which deals only with exceptional cases. Clause 32 deals with a certain class of vacancies which require to be filled by persons having some special or professional knowledge. The report to be made by the Deputy-Head is only in exceptional cases.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It is very clear this amendment now applies only to these exceptional cases specified in clause 32. I think it would be better to make a separate clause for the general application.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The second portion of the clause reads: "in any case in which the Auditor-General deems it necessary to report." Perhaps it would be better to say: "in any case in which the Auditor-General has reported and deems it necessary to report." He may find it necessary to communicate with the Governor in Council; he may require some change to be made in his department, and I think the clause as amended would cover the case.

Mr. BLAKE. I think if the hon. gentleman will have the Bill looked over by some of the legal officers with reference to the whole case, he will find this is a very imperfect way of accomplishing the object we all have in view.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I instructed the Law Clerk what we required to be provided for in the Bill with reference to the medium of communication between the Auditor-General and the Council. However, before the Bill is finally passed I will again call his attention to the point raised by the hon. gentleman.

On clause 33,

Mr. BLAKE. In this clause it is of great consequence that we should also recognize the right on the part of clerks in other Departments to expect, if there be not clerks available for promotion in any Department where a vacancy occurs, to have a chance of promotion. I maintain that the practical business of the service, except for the highest grades, require in all the Departments somewhat similar qualifications.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I admit that in the event of the Head of a Department being unable to find a clerk qualified for promotion within the Department, he might select a clerk from some other Department.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman agrees to the application of the principle here, it will require other words, because the clause there deals with peculiar qualifications, and not with the ordinary promotions. If the hon. gentleman agrees to the principle, there will be no difficulty in settling the terms.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated that yesterday in regard to the other clause, and I think it follows here.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What do the words "unless the Governor in Council shall otherwise order" mean? Is

it not intended that every one in the Department shall have an opportunity of undergoing examination, or a chance for promotion ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This has reference to the previous clause, which suggests what shall be done in the case of a vacancy of office requiring peculiar qualifications.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think, as it appears here, it will apply to the 32nd clause, which is a general one.

Mr. CASEY. Though I do not think that it was intended by the Government, the effect of the words, as they are placed here, will be as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) suggests.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to strike out the words.

On clause 33,

Mr. CASEY. I think the wording should be changed to express more clearly what are the facts of the case. Promotion by examination means promotion made in consequence of having passed certain examinations; but that is not what is provided here. The clause provides only that selections for promotion shall be made from those passing qualifying examinations. I would suggest the words: "promotions shall only be made from amongst those who have passed the prescribed examinations as hereafter provided by the regulations," and so forth.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would alter the meaning altogether, and I think the clause must stand as it is.

On clause 35,

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask if this clause would interfere with the arrangements existing in the Excise Department, and perhaps others, for competitive examinations for higher positions in the service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; those examinations will stand as at present.

Mr. CASEY. I would here again urge that this list should be made in the order of merit, for the same reasons which I mentioned in the case of the entrance examinations.

On clause 36,

Mr. BLAKE. This clause proceeds on the theory that there are always persons available for promotion in the ranks of the Department, and while this may be the rule, especially in the larger Departments, but in my own experience, having charge of a Department with few employes, I found more than once that there was no person in the ranks of the Department whom I could fairly, having regard to the public interests, promote to a higher office. I would, in view of the recurrence of that difficulty, suggest some such amendment as the following:

"Provided that where no person employed in the Department is found available for promotion therein, then an examination shall be held of persons employed in the service of other Departments with a view to the promotion being made as far as practicable from the service."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I must again protest against the fact that this clause leaves political influence in regard to promotions exactly as it was before; that the recommendations of the Commission are totally disregarded, and that no reform whatever is made in the method of promotions. This clause is contradictory of clause 33, which says promotions shall be made by examination, and leaves the power of promotion entirely under the control of the Minister.

On clause 40,

Mr. BLAKE. The latter part of this clause in effect, gives to the Governor in Council the absolute power of

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH.

deciding how the whole sum voted for the Civil Service shall be allocated among the civil servants.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. After the passage of this measure, the Governor in Council will have to put it into execution, and the Governor in Council will have to do what was done once before, when there was a theoretical organization made in the different Departments. That is to say, the Governor in Council determines by an Order in Council that in such a Department there will be a sub-Head, a chief clerk, a first-class clerk, and so many others, and so many messengers; next, the salaries they shall receive. In this case, to put the Act into force, we shall have to retain the whole Civil Service and see what number of officers will be required in each Department to execute the work; and then the Governor in Council will determine the particular organization of the Departments, and follow the law as to the salaries. The salaries will be fixed by this Act. On the other hand, we do not interfere with the present incumbents who will retain their salaries. We will take those clerks able to fill the offices and say: "That chief clerk shall occupy this office, &c." But we wish also to say that in expenditure we shall not exceed the amount voted by Parliament. So, if we should require more officers than are provided by Parliament, we cannot appoint them; and shall have to ask Parliament for more as well as for the money to pay them. That is the object of the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. That may be its object, but it is not its effect, because it does not provide that the total amount voted for each Department shall not be exceeded, but only that the total amount voted for the whole Civil Service shall not be exceeded. So that out of the total amount, \$700,000 or \$800,000, they may appropriate enough to support extra officers, exceeding, in one Department, in this way, the whole amount of the saving effected in any other.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We cannot do that, because the money appropriated by Parliament is so much for each Department, and we cannot violate the Supply Act in regard to any.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Does this Bill require the reorganization of the Departments altogether? Will the officers require to be re-appointed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will enable the Governor in Council to remodel the Departments, and appoint first-class, second-class and third-class clerks. At present there are first-class, senior second-class, junior second-class and then third-class clerks, or fourth class; while, under this Bill, there will be but three classes, the time will be longer also. This Act will enable the Governor in Council to remodel each Department if found necessary.

Mr. CASEY. The second sub-section requires some explanation. A man's rank in the future reorganized Department will be decided altogether by the salary he happens to be in receipt of when the reorganization took place; so that any existing inequality will be perpetuated. This clause also provides that where there are too many clerks, the Governor in Council shall select those who are to be the acting clerks, and the balance are to be supernumeraries. Does that mean that they are to retain their rank with the salary, or the salary without the corresponding work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the reorganization, should the Governor in Council decide that there shall be two first-class clerks, while three are already in the Department, he will appoint two; but the other will retain his rank and salary, but will perform the duties of the next lower class. When a vacancy occurs in the first class, he will be appointed to it, receiving the rank and salary of that class. We do not want to degrade any officer; but the organization of the Departments will be different, securing a smaller number of clerks in certain classes. After a while the supernumeraries will be absorbed in the Civil Service

and disappear. The intention is that these clerks will fulfil their proper duties.

Mr. CASEY. While retaining the same salaries as at present, the new supernumerary first-class clerks will be doing inferior work. As I said, the clause must mean either that a man retains his rank without his salary, or the rank and salary without the appropriate work. He retains the rank and salary for doing an inferior class of work. It may be a little inconvenient for the moment for the officers, but he is remunerated at all events. How is the difficulty to be met? I suppose after the allocation in the different Departments regard will be had to the amount voted as salaries, and the number of clerks allotted to each Department will be only such as can be paid the salaries allotted to the different grades.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If after the reorganization of the Department the Governor in Council thought that one or two clerks of higher grade were required, and the money was not available in this year's vote, these clerks would be appointed, but would fulfil the duties of a lower grade until Parliament would decide whether to vote the money or not.

On clause 42,

Mr. CASEY. The principle of employing temporary clerks to do permanent work which has gone on for many years, will, I hope, be remedied by this Bill. I have known temporary clerks to have been kept in the service for eight or ten years, while many permanent clerks have been dismissed after shorter terms of service. Matters should be so arranged that a Department would know how many clerks it wants for ordinary transactions, and beyond that the employment of temporary clerks should be strictly temporary.

Mr. BLAKE. The present provision provides that the employment of temporary clerks should not continue longer than six months. What is the rule to be in future with reference to other employment of temporary clerks? Whatever that may be, it should equally apply to those at present doing temporary work. They are paid out of contingencies, and the public do not know what is paid at present, as my hon. friend has pointed out, for what is practically a permanent service. You are providing no limitation as to the length of time those now temporarily employed should be continued. Every person now temporarily employed ought to be discontinued contemporaneously with your new theoretical organization. Then, if there is a pressure of work you may employ temporary clerks, and will no doubt select those at present so engaged. I wish to object to the system of charging salaries of clerks employed on public works against the different works. They should come out of the vote for the salaries in the Department of Public Works. I think that the officers who are in the employment of the Public Works Department, temporarily or permanently, ought to be paid out of the public revenues, and so far as possible out of the moneys especially voted, and that only those who are regularly on the work itself can reasonably and properly be paid out of the vote for the work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman may be theoretically right, but practically he is wrong. Suppose that in the Public Works Department a number of civil engineers or architects are required for a special service, and that we have in the Department a number of men belonging to those professions, who have been for several years employed as clerks; is it right and proper that we should call upon these to perform this special work? The hon. gentleman made a distinction about clerks who are working on the spot, and a professional architect; but if the plans have not been prepared, the work has to be done in the office. We have more or less officers according as the Government has given the

Department more or less work to execute, and therefore these clerks, if they were to become permanent officers, would cost a great deal of money, and hence these officers must be temporary clerks or temporary officers. I have always found that it is better to divide their labor between the different works. For example, here is one who is specially employed for three or four months, preparing plans and specifications. Well, his salary is taken out of the appropriation for the special work on which he is engaged, in the same way as the clerk of works who is on the spot looking after the work. I think that the rule which has been followed from year to year should not be discontinued. I think it is a proper rule that each work should carry its own expenses with it, and these are legitimate expenses. However, these officers may be called extra clerks, they must still be paid, and if you put them on the permanent staff, or on the special staff of the Department, then they will be considered as belonging to the Civil Service, and will be considered as a source of increasing expense. Whenever a vacancy occurs in a higher grade amongst men of that class we know that we may promote one of their number who has performed his duties well and reward him for his long services. In this way I think the public service is as well accomplished, and at a cheaper rate than if we made the appointments in the other way.

Mr. BLAKE. I want to point out one great defect which arises from the continuation of the present system, and which ought to be remedied by some change of practice in the reports furnished to the public. There is no check whatever upon extravagance in the Department of Public Works. The only check which we have with reference to salaries is the annual vote, and the only check we have with reference to contingencies is the annual vote and the scrutiny of it; but we do not know at all what is the real staff, or what the real amount is, how much is covered by the salary account for persons employed in the different public works; therefore, we have not that scrutiny we ought to have, there being no publicity at all given to the real staff of the Department, or the real expenditure that occurs in the Department. Now, that is an objection far more than counterbalancing the suggested improvement of each work being charged theoretically in the Public Accounts with the precise expenditure which belongs to it. In order to carry that out you will have to charge each work to the account of the officer at the head of each Department. The hon. Minister did not direct his attention to the extended authorization which is given by this Act to the continuance of the temporary clerks, now under appointment by the hon. Minister. According to my memory of the Act no temporary clerk can now be continued for more than six months; but the hon. gentleman proposes to give an indefinite right to continue the service as temporary clerks of all persons yet so employed. That seems to me to be wholly indefensible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of this was that, after they had been there several years, we would deal with them in the same way as we have been doing with the permanent staff of the Department. While we are now adopting a new Civil Service Act, we ought to take into account the service rendered in the past by those who are now in the Department. I think those clerks who have been employed for a number of years should be dealt with liberally, and therefore we should make an exception in their favor. I think the clause should pass as it is.

Bill reported.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RETURN.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to lay before the House a return correcting the errors that were found in the return of the earnings, per train mile, on the Intercolonial Rail-

way, which I promised to procure for the hon. member for Centre Huron. The following are the corrected figures for the year 1876-77: earnings per train mile, 65.09 cents; working expenses, 93.69 cents; loss, 28.60 cents; train mileage, 1,773,671 miles; average tons of freight moved per engine purchased on capital account, 4,214. Then, for the year 1879-80, the capital expenditure, exclusive of expenditure in connection with the Rivière du Loup branch, was \$158,439; and the capital expenditure in connection with the Rivière du Loup branch was \$1,889,575. These are the correct returns.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Carling.)

THE DUTIES ON COTTONS AND WOOLLENS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ANGLIN moved in amendment:

"That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That the system and scale of duties on cotton and woollen goods have resulted in the imposition of a rate of taxation on those articles chiefly used by the masses inordinately high and greater than the rate imposed on those articles chiefly used by the rich, and that the said duties should be amended so as to reduce the rate of taxation on the masses, and to make it more nearly proportionate with that levied on the rich."

He said: We on this side of the House object to the present Tariff, mainly on two grounds: first, that it takes from the people of this country many millions of dollars more than are required for the proper maintenance, in the most efficient state, of the various public services of this country; and, next, Sir, that the burthens it imposes are unequally and unjustly imposed, because they bear more heavily upon the poorer people than upon the rich, because it burthens the masses more than those who are supposed to have large means, and who could afford to pay excessive taxation, were excessive taxation of any class necessary or desirable. It is probable that because we move this resolution the charge will be repeated against us that we are the enemies of the industries of this country, that we are the enemies in a special degree of the manufacturing interests of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, even the day after the election of 1878 took place, we, small as our numbers are in this House, represented nearly one-half of the whole of the people of this Dominion. To-day, small as our numbers are—and we have not increased much in numbers in this House—to-day I believe we represent considerably more than half of the people of this whole Dominion, and that we could be in thought or in fact the enemies of any great interest of this country, is an assertion that scarcely requires refutation. It is an assertion, however, which has been repeatedly made, and I have no doubt will be made again. I have no doubt that when hon. gentlemen on the other side go to the country, whether it be in the month of June next as some say, or next year as others still think, one of the cries on which they will seek re-election will be the cry that they are the friends of the manufacturing industries of this country, and that we are their inveterate enemies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ANGLIN. I see that hon. gentlemen intimate that that will be one line which they will take in the approaching contest; but I say that we are prepared to meet them on

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that line, that we are prepared to show that we are the friends of the working classes of whom they once talked so much, but of whom they say so little now. We will be prepared to show that we are the true friends of the manufacturers, and, indeed, of every industry of this country, because our policy is the policy of even-handed justice and fair play to all classes, because we refuse to create monopolies, because we refuse to impose unjust and undue burdens upon any industry of this country. The cotton industry, Mr. Speaker, is one of those to which we are said to be especially hostile, because we urge that, under the present Tariff, undue and unfair advantages are given to those interests, and that the working classes especially, on account of these advantages, have to pay enormously high prices for the goods they are compelled to purchase from those manufacturers. We, Sir, were glad to observe the progress of the cotton manufacturers of this country under the old system. We would be delighted to observe the progress of the cotton manufactures of this country to-day, and though we object to what we find to be unfair in the Tariff in respect to the duties on cottons, we would not inflict the slightest injury or do the slightest wrong to those interests. Under the old system cotton manufactures were fairly progressive. It was comparatively a new industry, and only a few years ago was comparatively a very small industry indeed. Probably the factory built in St. John some years ago was one of the first erected in the Dominion. One has existed at Cornwall a great many years. The Hudon cotton factory at Montreal was established in later years, but I find from some statistics taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns the following facts which show the growth in the manufacture of cotton in this country for a number of years. So late as 1872, after hon. gentlemen on the other side had been a great many years in power, after they had had ample opportunities of encouraging the industries of this country, and promoting their growth, the whole of the raw cotton imported into Canada was but 1,701,210 lbs. In the following year, 1873, when they were still in power, the quantity had increased by about 250,000 lbs., being 1,982,848 lbs. Then they went out of office, and immediately after they went out and the Liberal party obtained power, there was an extraordinary increase in the quantity of raw cotton imported. It increased from 1,982,848 lbs. in 1873, to 3,514,281 lbs. in 1874. Were I, Sir, to follow the system of logic, so called, of which hon. gentlemen opposite are so proud, I would assert, and produce these figures to prove, that the downfall of the hon. gentlemen, in 1873, gave a valuable impulse to the cotton industry of this country; the quantity manufactured certainly increasing nearly twice. In 1875, there was an increase to 3,778,109 lbs., and we find a still further remarkable increase from that quantity to 5,527,428 lbs., in 1876. There continued to be a steady and most satisfactory progress in the development of the manufacture of cotton in this country. Then, as we know, hard times came upon Canada; the business depression which prevailed for some time previous in other parts of the world began to affect us in Canada, notwithstanding the admirable administration of public affairs at the hands of the hon. member for Lambton and his colleagues. Consequently, the quantity of cotton fabrics imported, amongst other things, began to decline. In 1872, the value of cotton imported was \$10,182,000, in 1873 it was slightly less, but still over \$10,000,000, and, in 1876, it had fallen to \$7,160,013, a falling off of over 25 per cent. Notwithstanding that decline in those importations, the manufacture of cotton in this country steadily increased. If I chose to adopt the mode of argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, I might say that that increase in the manufacture of cotton under the more favorable administration of the hon. mem-

ber for Lambton, had led to this large reduction in the imports from Great Britain and the United States; but I do not choose to follow that mode of reasoning; I prefer to follow the plain, manifest ways of truth and fair dealing. As we know, the depression increased very greatly, yet the manufacture of cotton went on increasing. In 1877, the quantity of raw cotton manufactured was 5,578,222 lbs.; in 1878—that year of woe and mourning and suffering, according to hon. gentlemen opposite—the quantity of raw cotton imported rose to 7,243,431 lbs., or 1,700,000 lbs. more than in 1877; and, in 1879, only a part of which year was influenced directly by the National Policy, the quantity increased to 9,721,700 lbs. Thus we find a steady, natural and most satisfactory growth of this particular manufacture under the financial system then in existence—a growth that was scarcely affected by the extraordinary business depression then prevailing throughout the civilized world. We find, of course, a very considerable increase after that. The effect of the National Policy on this particular branch of manufacture has been what we on this side of the House always anticipated it would be. It stimulated the growth of that industry, so that we find it jumping up to 13,000,000 lbs. in 1880, and again to 16,000,000 lbs. during the financial year ending on the 30th June last. Now, I contend that there was a more healthy and satisfactory growth of this particular industry before it was stimulated by the extraordinary taxation imposed on cotton imports by the National Policy. If there had been no National Policy it is but fair and reasonable to suppose that after the business depression had passed away, the growth of this particular manufacture would have been far greater than it was previously. Taking the ratio of importations of cotton fabrics as the basis, our importations of raw cotton would probably have increased, in 1880 or 1881, to somewhere about 12,000,000 lbs. without any extraordinary impetus or stimulus. Under these circumstances, it is absurd to allege that we did any injustice to the cotton interest in our time. While the factory at Cornwall, for some reason never clearly explained, did not pay large dividends for some years, or paid no dividends at all, and it has been alleged that this was due to defects in the construction of the establishment in the first instance and to mismanagement afterwards—the factory at St John grew from a very small to a very large establishment, and the Hudon factory at Montreal, it was announced in the public press, declared a dividend, the year before the new policy went into operation, of 27 per cent. If other factories did not pay so well as that, it was not for the want of higher duties, but because the factories were not properly constructed, were not located in the proper place, or were not managed with the skill necessary to ensure success. But we are told that the necessities of the country required the imposition of higher duties. Duties could have been imposed so as to produce all the revenue which the hon. Finance Minister and his friends boast they possess, without being so regulated as to weigh unduly on the poorer classes in the country. An increase in the Tariff of the *ad valorem* duties would have given these gentlemen additional protection. That it would have been impossible to refuse them had we found it necessary to increase the Tariff. We, therefore, do not, by this amendment, object so much to the increase of the rate of taxation as to the manner in which the Tariff distributes the burden of taxation. It makes the burden of the rich only a little heavier, while it increases enormously the burdens of the poorer classes. The hon. Finance Minister has said that the general articles of merchandise on which high duties are now imposed have not been made dearer. That is simply begging the question; it is a subterfuge, a trick of which men who desire to stand high in the opinion of their fellow-countrymen should be ashamed. The question is this: does or does not the increase of the duties add to

the cost of the articles? Would we or would we not be able to procure those articles more cheaply, had the duties not been increased? We say the price to-day is as much more than the price otherwise would be, or very nearly as much more as is the duty to-day more than the duty of four or five years ago; that the manufacturers everywhere of all kinds of articles, charge just as much for them as it is possible to get and yet avoid competition with the imported article, unless in one or two instances, including boots and shoes, where the competition has always been so great as to prevent the manufacturers from keeping up the prices. The hon. Finance Minister admits that cottons are somewhat dearer than they were a few years ago, but only because of the increase in the cost of the raw material, and only inasmuch as the cost of that material has increased; that there has been since a very considerable average addition to the cost of raw cotton. I hold in my hand a statement prepared by a gentleman whose knowledge of such matters has been repeatedly proved correct beyond question, of the prices of cotton in the several years from 1877-78 up to the present time, and this gives the average for each month in the year. It commences with what is known in the trade as the beginning of the cotton year, 1st September; and if I take the average of the each year, I find the average of 1877-78 was $11\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb; 1878-79, in which the hon. Minister started the National Policy, average $11\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound; 1879-80, $12\frac{1}{4}$, or one cent and a fraction dearer than in the year preceding. But, from the beginning of September, 1880-81, up to August 11th, 1881, the price was $11\frac{1}{2}$, or nearly 1 cent a lb less than in 1879-80, and very nearly as low as in 1878-79, $\frac{3}{4}$ of a cent difference in the production of the whole year. A pound of cotton will make $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cloth, and if we divide this fraction of $\frac{1}{4}$ by $3\frac{1}{2}$, we will ascertain the almost infinitesimal extent to which the price of the raw material advanced, and to which it ought to have affected the price of the raw material. It is so small that I am sure that if the hon. Finance Minister had looked into it he would scarcely have dwelt on the fact that the price of the raw cotton had advanced, or have given that as a reason why cottons are considerably higher than when the National Policy went into operation. He also stated that to-day we could purchase in this country, cottons of all grades, at prices only exceeding by 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. the prices at which similar goods are sold at the mills in the New England States. If that were correct, it would only prove that there was no necessity whatever for any change in the Tariff in order to protect our cotton manufactures. Five and one-half per cent. deducted from the old Tariff rate of $17\frac{1}{2}$, would give 10 to 12 per cent. protection to Canadians over and above the price charged by the manufacturers, and in addition would be the cost of importation. The hon. gentleman, in making that statement proved too much, if the statement were to be accepted. I have no doubt he made it in good faith, but on information furnished him by persons interested in the trade. But why is it that we are always asked to compare our cotton prices with these in the United States, whose manufacturers require such extraordinary protection, 30 to 40 per cent.? We know that, in spite of that high protection, the British manufacturers force an immense quantity of cottons into the United States markets; and since the return of good times, the boom of which we have heard so much, the importation of British cotton into the United States has increased enormously. We should sometimes compare our prices rather with the prices in Great Britain. What good reason can be given why our manufacturers should not produce cotton of any grade or class at as low a price as the manufacturers in the United States? We get our raw cotton quite as cheap as they, and our fuel; and if they have water-power in some districts so have we, and labor must be at least quite as dear in the United States as in Canada, for we find thousands of our people flocking every week and month

to the United States to find employment and better pay than they can get in this country. Why should we be asked to pay 5 or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more for cottons than we could buy them from foreign manufacturers for? Under the old system the Tariff was $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and it might have been necessary to make it 20 per cent. or more, in order to raise more revenue to meet the increased expenditure of the country, and to that extend the cotton manufacturers must have been protected, but there is nothing to show that special protection of that manufacture is necessary, or to justify the peculiar mode in which those taxes have been imposed. The hon. the Minister of Finance laid on the Table, some time ago, a number of papers in which it was alleged that the prices in this country are quite as low, and in some cases, even lower, than the prices of goods of a similar character at the factories in the United States. I observe, that in some of those papers the price per lb. of cotton goods of a particular kind is stated to be lower in Montreal than in the United States. That is not a means of ascertaining conclusively whether the one class of goods is cheaper than the other or not. We all know that the coarser the article manufactured the more it is likely to weigh. There may be very material difference in the character of articles bearing the same name in Canada and the United States. I made it my business before I left St. John to consult on that very question, a gentleman, who is admittedly one of the very best buyers in the dry goods trade in that city. I asked him to show me goods of the same quality imported from Great Britain and the United States, and obtained from the factories in this country, and to tell me honestly how the goods could compare in cost and quality. He told me, what I found to be the fact on careful examination, that a comparison of any kind was exceedingly difficult, that the qualities were essentially so different, that only one thoroughly experienced in the trade could attempt to institute a comparison, and even to one of the largest experience a comparison was still difficult. The texture of the goods, their appearance, and what I may call their selling qualities, were very different. However, I said to him, select if you can two pieces of goods, the one American, the other Canadian, which you as a man of experience can say are intrinsically of the same value, no matter what may be their outside appearance. He did select two such pieces, and laid them side by side. I could not attempt myself to institute any comparison between the two, their texture and appearance were so different. He assured me that intrinsically they were exactly of the same value and that the imported goods cost him $\frac{1}{3}$ of a cent per yard more than the Canadian goods. He showed me, however, some goods which were more salable than the Canadian goods, and he said: "On these I can have a larger profit than I possibly can on the Canadian article, and these my customers will purchase much more readily at the same price." Let me now give you one or two cases taken from actual experience of calculations based upon intimate knowledge of this particular business. With regard to white cottons, I found an instance where an article which cost $3\frac{1}{2}$ pence in England, equal to 6.44 cents, on which the duty was $30\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. cost laid down in the market on this side 8.68 cents. That the gentleman who furnished us this information, and who is of unquestionably high standing in the trade, told us was equal to Valleyfield cotton that cost here $9\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Another case of imported cotton cost $2\frac{1}{2}$ d., on which the duty was $35\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and which cost laid down $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Large quantities of cottons of that class are imported and pay high duties and are sold at a profit. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite will say these goods cost no more than if the duties were very much lower, any advance in price being caused by the advance in the raw material. All these are actual transactions. Oxford shirtings, which cost 5.20 cents and duty 42 per cent., cost laid down in the store 8.47 cents, and those are sold against Dundas shirtings, which cost 9 cents at the

Mr. ANGLIN,

mill. Yet the hon. Finance Minister will say, on the authority of gentlemen engaged in the trade, that the Canadian article is sold at a lower rate in the store than the imported article of equal quality. There is another case in which cloths known as Congress American shirting costs abroad 11.87 cents, and the duty on this is 23 per cent. This is a high priced cloth. We dealt a moment ago with the Oxford shirting which cost only 5.20 cents and paid a duty of 42 per cent. When we come to this higher quality of goods, goods not worn, I presume, by the humbler classes, the duty is but 23 per cent. Then take American brown duck. Here we have in actual operation, a very simple exemplification of the working of the Tariff in this respect. The American brown duck of famous brand, of Woodbourne, Baldwin & Co., weighing ten ounces, sold, in 1880, at the mill, at $14\frac{1}{2}$ cents. The duty was 25 per cent, and the cost laid down in the store in Canada, $18\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard. Cornwall manufactures a somewhat similar article weighing also ten ounces, and also called brown duck; that was sold, in 1880, at 18 cents or a-half cent less per yard than it cost to import this famous American class of goods. In the following year we find the American goods lower in price selling at 14 cents instead of $14\frac{1}{2}$, and costing laid down in store, 18 cents a yard, and the Cornwall price reduced just in proportion, down to $17\frac{1}{2}$ cents from 18. The gentleman who furnished me with this information alleges that the Cornwall article is very much inferior in make. It must have been inferior in make, or else that difference in price would have been sufficient to exclude the American article altogether from our market. Now, Sir, if these statements are reliable, as I believe they are, if they cannot be controverted except by other statements from parties interested, they go far to contradict the statement of the Minister of Finance, that Canada cottons are sold to day in Canada at prices much lower than British or American cottons could have been imported under the old Tariff—in point of fact, at 5 to 7 per cent. higher than the price of the American articles at the American mills. Then, with regard to the manner in which the burden is distributed, with regard to the fact to which we take special objection, that the articles used by the masses of the people are the heaviest, taxed let me say that not only the cases I have just referred to prove it conclusively, but also the Trade and Navigation Returns which I have carefully examined. I find that during the year ending 30th June, 1881, we imported, of British grey and bleached cottons, 5,002,952 yards. Well, Sir, that is a large quantity, and the very fact that so large a quantity has been imported is itself not merely *prima facie* but conclusive proof that the articles sold in the country of the same class and quality must have been sold at as high a price as the imported article, otherwise so large a quantity as 5,000,000 yards would not have been imported and sold. These British goods cost only $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents a yard on the average, the duty paid on the whole of them was 30 per cent; and I have shown that in some classes of these cottons, the duties run as high as 42 per cent., that is on the very cheapest of the articles used by the people generally. But, taking the whole of that class, we find that the duty was as high as 30 per cent., nearly one-third of the original cost imposed as duty on the article; and, in addition to the 30 per cent., the cost of importation must be taken into consideration. From the United States, in that same year, notwithstanding their high Tariff and all the other difficulties in the way of their producing articles as cheaply as we ought to be able to produce them, we imported of that same class of goods, 3,892,779 yards, so that altogether, we imported nearly 9,000,000 yards of grey, bleached and unbleached cotton during that year, and no doubt the whole of it was sold in the country. The facts that it was imported and sold is conclusive evidence that the home-made article was sold at a price relatively quite

as high. But the article we imported from the United States is of a higher class than that which comes from Great Britain. The article from Great Britain cost $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard, and that from the United States a little over $9\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard, and just because it was a better article and therefore was used by the well-to-do classes of the country, not the poorer classes, it was taxed only 25·4 per cent. So again with British gingham. I find British gingham costs 10·8 cents, paying a duty of 33 per cent. I find that United States gingham costs 14 cents per yard, and paid 29·3 per cent. Then we come to another article that can hardly be compared with anything in former years, because of the great change in the classification. In former years I find the quantities of goods described as denims, drillings, and that sort, were something very small. Last year, they assumed very large proportions, and the importation was 5,352,537 yards from Great Britain. These goods cost a little over 11·2 cents per yard, and they paid an average of over 35 per cent. From the United States in that same year we imported 4,383,424 yards. These, again, like the other cotton goods, were of a higher quality, costing 14·3 cents per yard. We find that the rate per cent *ad valorem* duty is very much smaller, being 28·9 per cent., nearly 7 per cent. less than on the British goods. So through the whole of these articles, we find British goods the cheaper but paying a higher rate of duty, and they are the goods chiefly used by the working masses of the people, than American goods of greater intrinsic value. In all these various classes we find the same thing. We find an article of higher intrinsic value, costing more in its manufacture and requiring more labor for its production, yet paying a lesser rate of duty than the coarser and cheaper articles which are used by the masses of the people. Let me say *en passant* that the operation of this Tariff has been similarly to exclude more of certain classes of American goods from our markets than of British goods. The intrinsic cheapness of the British article has overcome the operation of the Tariff to such an extent as it overcomes the operation and effect of the American Tariff in the United States. But, Sir, a diminution had taken place in the quantity of American cotton imported before the National Policy went into operation at all. The six years which the Minister of Railways is so fond of describing as years of unexampled prosperity, were years of great depression in the United States in the cotton trade. The manufacturers of that country were compelled, not being able to sell their goods at home, to send large quantities abroad and to sell at very low prices, and just as trade improved and things began to mend, so was there a falling off in the importation of American cotton goods. We find a very marked diminution before the National Policy came into operation. Now, I think I have proved, if figures can prove anything, if authentic public returns can prove anything, that the advance in the price of raw cotton has not to any appreciable extent caused the advance in the price of cotton in Canada. I think I have proved, moreover, that the price of cotton manufactured in this country to-day is quite as high as the cost of the imported article of the same class, plus the duty and the cost of importation. Moreover, I have proved beyond all doubt that the rate of duty imposed on the articles consumed by the masses of the people is very much more onerous than the rate of duty imposed on the goods which are supposed to be used by the well-to-do classes. Well, we will look also at the question of woollens. The hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted a like policy as with cotton. Not only do they tax woollen goods at a very high rate, but they tax to an enormous extent the goods which are more especially used by the working people. The woollen industry is a much older industry in the country than the cotton industry. The woollen industry attained very remarkable proportions many years ago. We heard of woollen mills springing up all over the country long before the National Policy was ever heard of or thought

of. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in power in 1872-73, a very large number of woollen mills were in existence, and their number continued to increase. Looking at the importation of wool, I find that the 8,000,000 lbs. to which the hon. Finance Minister has referred, was not a very remarkable importation, not in fact, very much in excess of the quantity imported in other years; it was not more than the natural growth, of population and trade would lead us to expect. I do not believe there has been, as the result of this policy, any very great expansion of the woollen trade. There has been a revival in that business as in every other business. It may be that in 1878-79 those mills found difficulty in disposing of their products, and were compelled to sell at little or no profit; that is a fact of which we are all aware, and which no one will deny. But we do deny that such a state of things prevailed for want of Protection. The cause is obvious. The depression which prevailed throughout the world necessarily and inevitably affected this particular branch of business, and the producers found no customers for their goods. If there had been no change whatever in the fiscal policy we would have found a great revival in this industry, because it is one in which Canadian manufacturers have excelled. Some of the cloth they produce is of its kind equal to any manufactured in the world. I lately visited some mills at Almonte, and I admired beyond measure some of the products of the manufacturers in that district, which can favorably compare with any goods of a similar character to be found. The manufacturers learned to excel in that business years ago, and with a revival of trade their business revived. It has not revived because of the exclusion of foreign goods; notwithstanding the high rate of duty now imposed on foreign goods they have not been excluded. Foreign importations are now as large as in 1878; in that year the whole value of imported woollens was \$8,535,133; the year before it was a little more; in 1876, it was \$8,462,000; in 1881 it was \$8,742,000, so that it was not the exclusion of foreign goods that caused the revival of this branch of industry. The heavy duties on certain classes of foreign woollens gave to Canada manufacturers almost a monopoly of the home market, and enabled them probably to charge higher rates than those at which the goods would have been sold; but the effect on the general imports has not been remarkable. The hon. Minister of Finance is fond of saying that the people obtain their woollens at much lower prices than before the National Policy came into operation. That has been disputed; even if that were true it would be a mere begging of the question. The question for the people to consider is this, could we procure our woollen goods at lower prices than we are now compelled to pay, if the duties had not been increased? The answer to that is that they could have been purchased at much lower prices. This branch of industry flourished under the old system; the depression reached it long after other industries had begun to suffer. The recovery would have been as rapid as in any other branch of business, even had no change of policy taken place. Let me say, that if there had been a manifest necessity to increase the rate of taxation for revenue purposes the woollen manufacturers would have obtained an advantage from the increase of duties—that certainly would not have been refused to them. What we now complain of is the improper distribution of taxation which is unfair, unjust and bears heavily on the masses. We are no more hostile to them than to any other manufacturers; we are delighted to see them grow and prosper; we are much pleased to see new mills and manufactures springing up, and success achieved by the proper investment of capital and use of skilled knowledge. Let us see how the duties bear on this class of goods. The figures furnished in the Blue-Books are not such as enable you easily to judge of the progress of the trade; they are simply prepared for purposes of Customs duties, which

is quite proper. I looked for a long time to discover what grounds the hon. Finance Minister had for his statement, that the wealthy people of the country voluntarily paid an additional \$400,000 in duty on their fine cloths, during the last year, more than they had paid in former years. I am not aware that people pay voluntarily what they have to pay in duty on articles they are compelled to purchase. I find, in the Trade and Navigation Returns, that cassimeres, cloths, tweeds, and goods of that class, are all put down together at so many cents per lb. But I will give the result of my figuring to the hon. gentleman. I find that of that class of goods, we imported from Great Britain 5,469,519 lbs.: the average price per lb. of all those cloths, tweeds, broad cloths and so forth, was 61½ cents, and the rate of duty was 32·19 per cent. From the United States we brought a very small quantity of these goods, but they must have been of a superior character, 12,695 lbs., costing \$1.25 per lb., and instead of paying 32 per cent. duty on them, we paid 25·9, or more than 6 cents per lb. less than upon those imported from Great Britain. Take another class of goods—blankets. I find that is an article very highly taxed. We imported of blankets, from Great Britain, 589,477 lbs., and the fact that we imported this large quantity of these goods, and that they were sold in the country, is *prima facie*, I may say conclusive, proof that the domestic blanket-maker charges as much for his product as he can possibly get. That is the average, but there are instances in which the cheaper blankets are taxed enormously higher. From the United States we imported only 7,067 lbs., but instead of costing 29½ cents they cost 59·4, and the duty, instead of being 45·4, was 32·6 per cent. I have here a statement taken from one of some invoices of blankets, and it is very remarkable indeed as going to prove the policy of hon. gentleman opposite of charging the higher rate on the poorer article. In September 9th, 1881, these blankets were imported from Great Britain. In that importation were goods that cost 23½d. per lb. on which a duty of 35 per cent. was paid. There were others costing 17d. per lb., but upon those a duty of 43 per cent. was paid. Blankets of a much poorer quality, costing 13d., paid a duty of 49½ per cent. A still cheaper blanket costing 9d. paid a duty of 61 per cent. Then, again, on a much cheaper article—one of the poorest I suppose that could be imported, costing 7½d per lb., scarcely the price of the coarsest kinds of wool—a duty of 70 per cent. was actually paid. Let me go back a moment to cloths in order to show how the duty affects the price of those articles. I will take an actual invoice in this case also. On a quantity of woollen goods imported, English naps for children costing 1s. 4½d., a duty of 57 per cent. was paid. Then there was a heavy class of clothes for ulsters and jackets, which costs 7½d, and upon them the duty was 49 per cent. Then we have what are called heavy presidents for ladies jackets which cost 1s. 9d. per yard, and the duty on that class was 46 per cent. On another class of goods which cost 4s. the duty was 35 per cent. So it is throughout, the poorer the article and the cheaper the more heavily is it taxed. Then with regard to goods called black presidents, one article which cost 2s. 1d., paid a duty of 45 per cent. Now, in former times, under the old Tariff, this particular class of goods sold wholesale in Canada at 75 cents, but to-day, under the operation of this Tariff, the price is 92½ cents a yard, or 17½ cents more than it would be were the old Tariff in operation. Another class of goods costing 2s. 7d., paid a duty of 39 per cent., and these goods, which formerly sold at 95 cents a yard wholesale now sell at \$1.10 per yard. Another class of goods which cost 2s. 10d. in Great Britain paid a duty of 37 per cent. These goods formerly sold at \$1.05 here. They now sell at \$1.20. Hon. gentlemen opposite nevertheless assert that woollen goods are no dearer because of the duty. They say they are cheaper

Mr. ANGLIN.

than in former years, and while the hon. Finance Minister is ready to tell us that there has been an advance in the raw material of cotton goods, he forgets to tell us that there has been a serious decline in the raw material of woollen goods; that the cost of wool is very much lower, for which of course the farmers are very thankful. But owing to the National Policy our people are deprived of any advantage from that decline in price. Take again the article of carpets, and here you find another illustration of the fact that under the present Tariff the cheaper the article the higher the tax. Upon Brussels carpets, of which we import a very large quantity—1,333,000 yards—and which are used almost exclusively by the richer classes, a duty of 20 per cent. is paid. Of two-ply and three-ply carpets ingrained, all-wool, we imported from Great Britain 120,119 yards, costing 66·2 cents per yard, on which 36 per cent. was charged, while the Brussels carpet, the carpet of the rich man, paid only 20 per cent.; of Union carpets, which are especially those of the poor classes, we imported 150,000 yards from Great Britain, on which a duty of 31·6 per cent. was paid, and some from the United States, on which 33·3 per cent. was paid, while the rich man's carpet only paid 20 per cent. Now, I have endeavored to show that the statements made in the amendment in your hands, Mr. Speaker, are well-founded—that the duties charged on the cotton and woollen goods of the poorer classes are proportionately higher than those charged on the goods of the wealthier classes. I know it will be alleged that the reason for this is that in this country we manufacture the cheaper and coarser articles, and do not manufacture the finer articles—that there is some manufactory producing the union or other lower-class carpets, and therefore they are protected in order to give our own manufacturers command of our own market. But I have shown that our own manufacturers have not yet obtained our own market, and that our manufacturers do not sell their goods at the price at which they can produce them, but take care to obtain the highest price the duty enables them to get for the articles they sell. This is more particularly the case with regard to woollen goods. I am informed that heavy pilots and cloths of the class which pay a duty of 50, 60, 70, and in one case I know of as high as 80 per cent., are not manufactured in the country at all, and therefore there is not even that pretext for imposing the duty, while the people have to bear the burden. A St. John merchant told me that on a quantity of heavy cloth which he imported specially for the purpose of making up winter cloaks for girls, and which cost 1s. 2d. or 1s. 3d. per yard, he actually had to pay a duty of 80 per cent. at the St. John Custom house; and that class of goods, he said, is not manufactured in this country. Now, I may state exactly what we are paying for our cotton and woollen goods under the present Tariff. We paid into the Treasury on our cotton goods imported \$2,271,937 last year, or \$486,156 more than we would have paid under the old Tariff. On our woollen goods we paid \$2,345,627, or \$815,773 more than we would have paid under the old Tariff; on these textile fabrics, which are absolutely necessary for all the people of this country, rich and poor, we paid in all \$4,617,564, or \$1,301,729 more than would have been paid under the old Tariff. If it were necessary to raise this enormous amount on the clothing of the people of the country, I presume none of us would complain, however we might regret the necessity; but what we do complain of is that not only more is raised than is necessary for the country, but that this burden is unfairly and unequally distributed, and bears enormously on those who can least afford to bear it. In addition to that we have to pay, under this Tariff, a very large amount more to the manufacturers of the country—how much it is difficult to ascertain. Supposing

the 16,000,000 lbs. of raw cotton imported last year were manufactured into 60,000,000 yds. of cloth or the equivalent, we paid \$471,520 more to the manufacturers than we would have had to pay if the old duties had been maintained. For woollens, we paid \$700,000 more than we would have paid if the old Tariff had been in operation. Now, what we complain of is that under this Tariff more money is taken from the people than is required for the public service; we complain still more strongly that the amount is so unequally distributed that it bears harshly and cruelly in many cases on people who, even in these prosperous times, find it exceedingly difficult to buy clothing enough to protect them against the cold of winter. We complain and protest against this policy, particularly on that score—not because we entertain any hostility towards the manufacturers—not because we do not wish to see them flourishing, and exhibiting every satisfactory proof of prosperity—but because we feel and believe that a large number of the people are unduly burdened and cruelly oppressed by the taxation now imposed.

Mr. BLAKE. As there does not seem any disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to answer the remarks of the member for Gloucester, I am anxious of taking this opportunity of stating to the House some of the reasons which have led me to differ with the hon. Finance Minister, in the statements which he has made to this House as to the effects of these duties on certain classes of goods largely consumed by the people. And I am not sorry the hon. gentleman has omitted or delayed to answer statements made from this side, because I am anxious he should have the opportunity of responding to the observations which I shall now present. Before dealing with the effect of the duties on cottons, I wish to read to the House a letter sent to me very shortly after the hon. Finance Minister read, with reference to woollens, a letter from a manufacturer of Montreal, Mr. Greene. The hon. gentleman brought forward some precis of evidence to sustain the proposition which he advanced with great boldness and positiveness, and without any reserve or qualification, as to the practical effect of the Tariff on prices—as to the prices the people were paying relatively to the prices in former years. And as the hon. member for Gloucester observes, the hon. gentleman declared that we were paying lower prices for the various domestic manufacture of woollens than in former years, to prove which statement he read the letter from Mr. Greene. A friend of mine in Montreal applied to the senior partner of a large house, Maclean, Shaw & Co., upon that subject, and immediately afterwards I received from that gentleman the following letter addressed to him by Mr. Maclean:

"In answer to your enquiries as to the causes why goods in our line are sold cheaper now than in 1878, we find, on examining our English invoices, that we are buying the same grade of hats from the same houses 20 per cent. cheaper to-day than in 1878. So that, even with the increased duty, they cost us less laid down in Montreal now than in 1878. It is clear to any sensible merchant that if the duty was 17½ per cent., instead of 25 per cent., that these goods could be sold still cheaper. The sealteco and astrachan cloths imported for use in the manufacture of cloth caps, are also bought at a less figure than in 1878; and if these goods could be laid down as cheap now as under the old Tariff the cloth caps used by the poorer classes could be sold at a less figure than at present. It cost 50 per cent. under the old Tariff, and 85 per cent. under the present Tariff to lay these heavy goods down. The true reasons for the general reduction in the class of goods handled by us are, first, that competition is cutting prices every year, which competition was in existence before the National Policy came into force; and, second, that the goods used by us are bought at a much less figure in the English market now than in 1878. As you know, I am a supporter of the National Policy, but I do not believe in supporting it by a misrepresentation of causes and facts."

I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should have thought it consistent with his position as Finance Minister, to have brought forward letters to prove, and to have alleged himself, as a fact, that the cost of the domestic production of those articles to which he particularly referred, had been

reduced—by virtue of his policy, while in fact, the operation of those causes of greater competition, and particularly of lower prices abroad was to keep the domestic manufactures down. And while as this supporter of the hon. gentleman and his policy states, those goods to which he referred, and to which particularly Mr. Greene referred, being sold 20 per cent lower in the foreign market, they came into this country at about or a little below the prices of 1878, notwithstanding the increase of the duties. But it is plain that if the duties had remained where they were, we would have got our goods 20 per cent cheaper. That observation applies to the manufactured articles of woollens to which I referred, and the proofs are apparent. In almost all particulars of the consumption of the masses, there has been some abatement in prices abroad more or less. I wish, in reinforcement of the argument of the hon. member for Gloucester, to give a few statements of actual transactions in woollens, in connection with which there will be found some reference to the relative cost abroad, of woollens in 1878 and 1881, indicating the very low prices abroad in 1881 as compared with 1878, and furnishing a good reason why even the enormous increase of Canadian duties should have made prices relatively not very different—but indicating also that, in a word, the increase of the duties has absorbed the reduction in price, of which the people of the country otherwise have had the benefit. The particulars which I have to give are actual entries of transactions in the Custom house by merchants. Among these is an entry of 2nd February, 1882, as follows: Blue serge, cost 6d; duty 44½ per cent.; cloth for workingmen's suits, cost 1s 3d; duty, 39½ per cent.; fancy tweeds, gentlemen's suits, cost 2s 6d; duty, 29½ per cent. The enormous duties are on the material used by the poorer classes, while the duties are relatively light on the stuff worn by the people in better circumstances. The facts which my hon. friend for Gloucester presented are exemplified by those figures. Let me give a few other instances: Cloths, 1s 5d, cost laid down, 55½ cents, duty over 50 per cent; cost 9d., duty 50 per cent, used for boys' children's and men's suitings ready-made and ulsters by the better classes and used by mechanics and farmers, cost 1s. 8d., duty 50 per cent. Cloths cost 1s. 10d., duty 40 per cent. worn by wage-receiving people exclusively. Cost 1s. 6d., duty 35 per cent., very extensively used in town and country. Cost 2s. 2d., duty 40 per cent. Cost 1. 4d., duty 60 per cent., cloth used for men, women and boys clothing. Cost 4s., duty 27 per cent. Scotch tweeds used by first class tailors. Cost 10s., duty 25 per cent., used by high class trade. Cost 13s., duty 23½ per cent., used by high class trade. In black and blue broad superfines and higher qualities of French cloths the duty sometimes comes below 23 per cent., and as freight is all charged by measurement it is therefore the same on cheap and dear goods and adds to the inequality. The same merchant who gave me these prices from actual transactions in his trade, adds that woollen goods of all kinds, medium and low grades, are much cheaper in Great Britain than in 1877-78, but the Tariff has absorbed the reduction. Another merchant gives me these particulars: He paid in Great Britain, in 1881, 2s. 2d. for heavy woollen goods, which cost him, in 1878, 2s. 6d., or 4d. less in 1881 than in 1878; but his selling price for the 2s. 2d. in 1881, was 5 per cent. in excess of what he sold the 2s. 6d. goods for in 1878, though his percentage of profit is the same, thus showing that the duty not only absorbed the reduction, but actually increased the price of the goods. It is stated by this merchant that the letter on which the hon. member relies, although it may be true in one or two special lines, is not true on the whole, as to the general class of goods consumed by the people. As to an article costing 2s. 6d. in 1878, the selling price wholesale was 92½ cents, and, in 1881, the article costing the same price could not be sold under \$1.07½ at the same percentage of profit, showing an

advance of $16\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., entirely necessitated by the increase of duty. Flannels, of which the sterling cost, in 1878, was $9\frac{1}{4}$ d., cost at the wholesale price in Canada, 25 cents; in 1881, the sterling price was 9d., and the wholesale selling price was 30 cents. The advance in this case on the sterling price was, in 1878, $47\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and in 1881, $65\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the additional advance being required to pay the increase of duty; so that the cost went up instead of going down, although the sterling price was less than in the former year. As an example of the admirably graduated scale of duties, which the hon. gentleman's Tariff imposes on goods more expensive, as compared with less expensive goods, I will give a series of quotations in the articles of ladies' jackets and mantles, showing how the duty goes down as the price goes up:

Sterling cost		Duty	per cent.
3s. 11d.	54 $\frac{1}{2}$	per cent.
4s. 8l.	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	" "
5s. 11d.	42 $\frac{1}{2}$	" "
7s. 3d.	40 $\frac{63}{100}$	" "
9s. 11d.	37 \cdot 85	" "
12s. 11d.	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	" "
18s. 9d.	30 $\frac{7}{10}$	" "
29s. 9l.	28	" "

That is the general application of the hon. gentleman's Tariff. If you take the articles which are cheapest and dearest, the duty, speaking in a general sense, may be said to be twice as heavy on the cheapest as on the dearest class of goods. That is all I propose to say at present on the question of woollen goods. I wish particularly, as I said in my opening remarks, to deal with the hon. gentleman's statement as to the practical effect of this Tariff upon the subject of cotton manufactures. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's proposition that we should try his Tariff by its practical results, and if we find that it has operated beneficially—that looking at all the considerations—those on the surface as well as those which have to be ascertained and do not dwell so much on the surface,—it has operated beneficially, then the hon. gentleman will have proved himself in the right. The broad and general statement made by the hon. member requires a very considerable amount of detail and examination to ascertain whether it is founded on fact, whether in truth the results are such as the hon. gentleman declares they are. There are a number of considerations with reference to the cotton manufactures which are material, in order that we may reach a conclusion. We have heard of the great prosperity of that manufacture. The hon. Minister in his general statements, and other hon. gentlemen, have said repeatedly, that it is due to the circumstance that there is a very much larger production, and not to enhanced prices or enhanced profits per yard. It is due they say to the very large production which enables a large profit to be made by the manufacturer, even upon a reduced price per yard, so that the consumer gains while the manufacturer also gains. Let us first ascertain, so far as we are able, what the margin of profit is, and I agree with the hon. gentleman that a large margin of profit honestly obtained, not by law, but by the exercise of those virtues, talents and industries, which lead to success, in those walks of life in which a free competition exists is a thing not to be deplored, but rather to be regarded as a source of satisfaction. Let us first ascertain what the rate of profit is. On that subject I have some information, which I derived largely from shareholders in some of the mills, and which I believe to be authentic. Of course, in particular it is somewhat difficult to get authentic information. The shareholders' meetings of the cotton mills are not public, their statements, if they are laid on the Table, are not taken from the Table. The largest portion of their profits is not declared in form of a dividend. There are bonuses in the shape of watering stocks and of other kinds. There are large increments of capital in the way of improvements and enlargements and costs which are all to be taken into account.

Mr. BLAKE.

in order to ascertain what the actual profit of the enterprise is. Take, for instance, the Hochelaga or Hudon mill. The original stock of that enterprise was \$400,000, which, it is reported, was not all paid up in cash. That Company is said to have made, as the hon. gentleman for Gloucester points out, 27 per cent. on its capital in 1878, before the new Tariff Act, and after providing for depreciation in that year. The stock has since been watered in the proportion of one share in every three. Since that time a cash dividend has been paid of 10 per cent. on the watered stock equal to $13\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on the original stock. An enormous actual value has been put into the concern besides. The mill and machinery was first of all doubled, and after being doubled was trebled out of the earnings. So the mill and machinery now represent three times what they represented when this Tariff was imposed. The result of this, and the statement of their actual earnings and profit as given to me, is that their earnings have been, at least, 50 per cent. on the original stock of \$400,000, or at least \$200,000 a year for the last year or two, and their watered stock mark—not the original stock of \$400,000, but the watered stock has been quoted at 275, and is said not to be purchaseable under 300, but at 275 it would be equal to 365 per cent. on the original \$400,000 which is supposed to have been invested, thus bringing up its market value to over \$1,400,000. The stock is about to be again watered, I believe, to bring it up to about \$1,000,000, and when it reaches that figure upon the original \$400,000, it will be saleable at a very high premium. Now, these are startling results, and these results have been attained after very liberal allowances for depreciation, for keeping up the stock, and after an arrangement had been made which of itself indicates how large are the transactions which can be carried on on an original capital of \$400,000. I will only mention that the commission paid to the mill agent who sells the goods was \$27,000, or $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the original capital. You can imagine by this what the profit of the enterprise must be when the commission paid was $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the original capital. Now, I propose to refer to the Valleyfield mill as another example. The original stock was \$374,000, and that has been watered to \$500,000, or by $28\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. since this Tariff. The dividend declared last year was 20 per cent. on the watered stock, equal to over 27 per cent. on the original stock, besides which they laid up about \$23,000, and spent about \$15,000 for improvements and additions, and a commission was paid by the mill over and above all its profits of \$18,000. The commissions paid by the two mills therefore amounted to \$45,000 in that year. There stock was quoted lately at 187, equal to 215 on the original stock. Now, as I have said, if these enormous profits, if these enormous earnings of the last year or two, of 50 per cent. on the part of the Hochelaga mill, and of a sum about equal upon the original capital stock, upon all the stockholders put into the Valleyfield mill, were due to the circumstances I have referred, it is a subject of congratulation for us all; but if they be due to an excessive and inordinate protection which has obliged the people of this country to pay an inordinate price to these manufacturers of cottons, then they are not a subject for congratulation, but they are a subject for lamentation and regret. The hon. member said that owing to the large production the price of Canadian cotton had gone down, and he spoke as if it were a mere trifle to 5 or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. above United States mill prices. He declared he had a statement that cotton cost no more, both bleached and unbleached cotton, than from 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in excess of the mill price of similar United States goods. Now, in the first place the comparison of the hon. gentleman is not a reasonable one, because we know that the American goods are made under a system which greatly increases the cost of those goods to the people of that country. We are

well aware that they are made under a very high protective system, enhancing the cost of labor and of everything involved. I will not enter into this subject further than to say, that the circumstance that America exports to Great Britain an enormous value of raw cotton and does not export the manufactured article, while Great Britain exports enormously of it, proves that the cottons that are made in the United States are inordinately high priced. Great Britain is able to take the manufactured material across the water and to return some portion of it manufactured to the United States, and send it to all the neutral markets, while the United States is utterly unable to compete with her in those markets. That shows that the comparison of the hon. gentleman proposes to make is not very satisfactory, even if his statement were correct that we do pay only 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than the American mill prices. Nor is it very satisfactory even considering the figures. My hon. friend from Gloucester pointed out that our imports of raw cotton, last year, were 16,000,000 lbs. Now, I assume that 2,000,000 pounds would represent a liberal allowance for cotton used as waste and otherwise than in the mills. I assume that 14,000,000 pounds went into Canadian production. The product of 16,000,000 pounds in various forms was probably worth, at Canadian mill prices, \$5,000,000, and if there were $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. only in excess of United States mill prices, it is clear that there would be \$350,000 paid by the people of this country for the domestic cotton product on in excess of the cost in the United States. According to the hon. gentleman's own statement, this will prove the fallacy of that statement. But it is enormous. One proof my hon. friend from Gloucester has already referred to, that is the circumstance that enormous importations have been made of cotton goods at an enormous duty of from 26 to over 40 per cent. The Canadian supply was unequal to the demand, and it is impossible to suppose that the Canadian goods were kept so far below the duty here as the hon. gentlemen would suggest; when you find a range of duties from 26 to over 40 per cent., and the domestic supply unequal to the demand, you find the answer in these facts alone to the hon. gentleman's arguments, even if we were to have no more facts to deal with. The cotton imports to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, show these facts. I will not enter into the details of these various imports, but I will point out that the grand totals indicate that an average rate of duty such as proves the general fact to be that what we import costs us over 30 per cent. in duty. The grand totals of both articles denominated grey and bleached, &c., and denims, drills, &c., indicate an import from the United States and Britain combined, of 18,645,613 yards, at a cost of \$1,928,499; average cost per yard of all these goods was 9-15 cents, and the average duty was 30-36 per cent. On the smaller importation, gingham and plaids, the average duty was 32 per cent. over; wadding, &c., over 27 per cent.; knitting yarn, over 27 per cent.; wax, on beams, 34 per cent., so I am quite sure I am correct in stating that the rate of duty which we pay on all such cotton goods we import exceeds 30 per cent., irrespective of freight and charges.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. On all cotton goods?

Mr. BLAKE. No; not on all cotton goods, but on all cotton goods of those classes which are manufactured in the country. Of course, when the hon. gentleman proposes to include prints which we do not make, for the purpose of proving some illusory statement as to the advantages of his Tariff in this particular, he is welcome to repeat that calculation for the twenty-fifth time, and it will have as much weight as it did the twenty-fourth time. But I am dealing with the classes of goods manufactured here as compared with the importation of the same classes of goods, and I am averring as a general proposition, that these goods that we buy in Canada cost us approximately, including the duty

and the cost of transport, within a shade of the cost of analogous goods which are manufactured abroad. While the hon. gentleman dealt in generalities, it was of course difficult to grapple with him. He said cotton goods are sold within 5 or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of United States mill prices; but when we ask him to bring down the evidence on which he makes that highly important statement, he brings down a letter from Mr. A. F. Gault, and that is the only evidence on this particular subject on which the hon. gentlemen based his statement. The hon. gentleman is asked to bring down all the evidence, and that is all the evidence he can afford us. It is unfortunate that the hon. the Finance Minister ventured a statement of that kind upon that paper without having made further enquiry, without having obtained information from other quarters—however respectable, and I am the last to impugn the respectability of the quarter to which he applied—from opposite points of view, from those interested in other phases of the question than that in which Mr. Gault is chiefly interested, full information in order to enable him to reach the bottom of the question, and see how far Mr. Gault's views accorded with the actual views of the case. That letter is a very important contribution to the literature of this question. It deals broadly with a number of propositions which have formed the subject of discussion in various ways. Amongst other things it deals with the cost of the raw material. The prices of raw cotton says Mr. Gault, such as is generally used in Canadian Mills, run as follows: 1878, 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ c; 1879, 13 $\frac{1}{2}$; 1880, 14 $\frac{1}{2}$; 1881, 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb., thus indicating a range of prices which are important when we deal with the cost of the manufactured article. This statement indicates a rise of 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents between 1878 and 1881, but it admits a slight fall of one $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cent between 1879 and 1881; and I ask therefore the attention of the House to the fact that the raw material was rather cheaper in 1881 than in 1879. Dealing with the cotton manufacture, we may look at the public statements as they appear in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and see what was the valuation as to the actual cost of the cotton imports. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) gave us that statement the other day, but in this connection it is worth while repeating it. In 1878, according to Mr. Gault, it was 10-50 cents, while, according to the Trade and Navigation returns, it was 10-70 cents. In 1879, according to Mr. Gault, it was 13-50 cents, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, 10-12 cents. In 1880, according to Mr. Gault, it was 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, 11-30 cents. In 1881, according to Mr. Gault, it was 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, it was 10-65 cents; making for the fiscal year a slight fall between 1878 and 1881, and a slight rise between 1879 and 1881, and showing absolute values far below those Mr. Gault gives, except for the year 1878, with which it is desired to make a comparison with the year 1881, the Trade and Navigation Returns give 10-65 cents, as against 13-25 cents by Mr. Gault, or an excess of nearly 25 per cent. We take another test. The quality of cotton used in Canadian factories is probably on an average inferior to the general standard of quality of middling uplands in the New York and Liverpool markets. Some may be used, perhaps, superior to that description, but probably all round it is an article inferior to that; but taking the standard quality of middling uplands in New York either for the cotton year or the calendar year, for I do not know from which Mr. Gault gives his figures, this is the result: the cotton year begins on 1st September and the quotations, are generally taken from that period. The average price of New York middling uplands for the year ending 31st August, 1878, was 11-23 cents; 1879, 11-17 cents; 1880, 12-32; 1881, 11-40 cents. There is thus no very material difference between 1878 and 1879, but I think it probable that Mr.

Gault's statement may have been for the calendar year, though that is new conjecture. In view of the possibility that he took the average for the calendar year, I give the following quotation: For the calendar year 1878 middling uplands in New York were 10.81 cents; 1879, 11.37 cents; 1880, 12.62 cents; 1881, 11.50 cents, or a rise of 0.69 or $6\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. between 1878 and 1881, and $\frac{1}{4}$ of a cent. or 2.13 per cent. between 1879 and 1881. I have established that neither the absolute nor the relative prices of raw cotton as between 1879 1881 present appreciable distinctions. We all know that for a certain number of months in 1878 raw cotton was very low, but the price for the year is such as I have pointed out. The Trade and Navigation Returns, the New York prices, and Mr. Gault, all pretty much agree as to the price for that year, and as to the prices for the succeeding year they also fairly agree, but Mr. Gault has, to an extent that I can not understand, exaggerated the prices in 1879-80-81 beyond the price of New York middling uplands, whether you take it for the calendar or the cotton year, or whichever way you choose to take it. I deny, therefore, the accuracy of Mr. Gault's statement as to the cost of the raw material; but supposing his statement to be accurate, I call attention to the fact—which has an important bearing on other facts which I shall bring before the House, and that Mr. Gault acknowledges the average price for 1879 was a trifle higher than that for 1881. In instituting comparisons between the prices of cotton in 1879 and 1881, we may leave out of account the question of raw material. There is a practical agreement as to prices even by Mr. Gault himself. As to the cost of labor we have no statistics. The hon. member for Montreal West gave us a number of statistics, but he did not give us statistics of this particular manufacture which I believe is outside of the limits of the city, but to which he knows something of the rate of wages prices. Now, my belief is that some professional and skilled workmen in the cotton mills have better wages than in former years, but so far as I have been able to learn, if you go down to the large wage-receiving classes no material advance in prices has taken place up to the point to which I will now speak, namely, December, 1881, when Mr. Gault gave his statement of prices on which the hon. Finance Minister relied. I am of course unable to deal with the topic accurately in the absence of accurate information; but the statement I have received is, that irrespective of the raise of prices among a few of the more skilled and higher priced men, there has been no sensible advance in wages up to the date to which I have referred. There is, however, an element, no doubt, one to which the hon. Minister has referred, which ought to lead to greater economy of production, and if we allow on the one hand for the reduced cost due to a larger production and improved machinery, the Hochelaga mill has been trebled in that respect, and therefore those conditions more than counterbalance any slight advance if, there be any, in the price of labor. Let us deal for a moment, before passing to the consideration of prices, with the cost of some standard cottons in the free markets of the world. I have obtained a statement of the cost of standard goods of the world wide known firms of Horrocks, Miller & Co., and James Findlay & Co. The former list shows these variations in what is called A cloth, a well-known standard number from January, 1877, to January, 1882:

		Pence stg.
January 26, 1877	32 inch A	3½
June 1, 1877	"	3½
October 25, 1877	"	3½
January 12, 1878	"	3½
June 19, 1878	"	3½
December 4, 1878	"	3½
January 22, 1879	"	2½
March 31, 1879	"	3
April 7, 1879	"	3
May 22, 1879	"	2½
July 1, 1879	"	3½

MR. BLAKE.

January 16, 1880	32 inch A	3½
February 4, 1880	"	3½
February 17, 1880	"	3½
May 1, 1880	"	3½
July 12, 1880	"	3½
August 25, 1881	"	3½
January 4, 1882	"	3½

Giving you the range which has been obtained with the fluctuations such as they are largely dependent on the fluctuations in the raw material, showing no material change from 1877 to January, 1882. The prices from Findlay & Co., for J shirting another standard number, are as follows from August, 1876 to January, 1882:

		Pence stg.
August, 1876	32 inch "J"	4
January, 1878	"	3½
January, 1879	"	3½
February, 1880	"	3½
January, 1881	"	3½
January, 1882	"	3½

Thus indicating again that there has been no marked rise or any serious variation in price in these standard goods in the free market of the world. Now, to advert to Mr. Gault's letter in which he proposes to deal with the actual and relative cost of the two large classes of goods to which he refers as compared with their cost in former years. The points of comparison which I take are January, 1879, which is same as the end of 1878, May, 1879, a period at which changes were made in the price lists, and the average of the whole year of 1879, comparing each of these with December, 1881, the point of comparison which Mr. Gault gives. Now, Sir, let me once again state what his comparison of prices is. The prices realized for the average run of Canadian greys were, as he says, by the pound, in 1878, 26½ cents; in 1879, 28 cents; in 1880, 27 cents; in 1881, 28½ cents, giving an increase of but one-half cent on 28 cents between 1879 and 1881. As I have already pointed out the average cost of the raw material I will only add that in May, 1879, middling uplands cost 12½ cents in New York, while in December, 1879, they were 12 cents only. As the raw material is generally contracted for some time before, the monthly average is perhaps of less importance, except to point out that in the particular instance to which I referred the raw material was considerably higher in May, 1879, than in December, 1881. Now, to get at the advance in cost of grey cottons, which I aver to be considerable contrary to what hon. gentlemen has said, contrary to what I observe is being generally stated—I aver that there has been a very material and marked advantage in gray as well as in bleached cottons, and the mode I have adopted to get at the advance is this: I have taken three mills and five of the best known and most largely consumed brands at these mills, and these brands are also of a kind which will bear comparison one with another, being as nearly as possible the same in weight and texture. The mills I have taken are the Hochelaga, the Cornwall and the Dundas mills, and the brands are: Hochelaga, G, H, HHH, XX, and XXX. The Cornwall brands are: AW, AD, AC, AE, and AA. The Dundas brands are: D, C, B, A, AX. These brands corresponding as nearly as possible one with another in the order in which I have stated them. These represent very fairly the total product of these mills. I find that the average cost of these cottons was, in January, 1879, by the yard, 7.18 cents. The average for the year 1879, was 7.40 cents, and that average is obtained by taking the price lists for the months during which those price lists were in force, estimating a like average consumption per month, and thus reaching the average for the year. The average was, as I have said, 7.18 cents, in January, 1879; 7.40 cents, for the year 1879; 7.57 in the month of May, 1879; and 8.39 in December, 1881. Of those brands

Hochelaga HII, B, H, and the analogous brands of Cornwall AC and Dundas are most in consumption, and in them the average increase over January, 1879, was 21.51 per cent.; over May, 1879, 14.13 per cent.; and over the average of the whole year 1879, 17 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. The average increase in the price of all these brands, making allowance for the proportion consumed of each brand, in December, 1881, over the price in January, 1879, was 17.95 per cent., and over the price for the whole year 1879, 14.35 per cent. These results are derived from the mill lists. I do not interfere with the terms for cash, but I have taken the trade discounts, which, in the early portions of this period, were allowed on the mill prices, and I have reduced them to net terms, subject to the usual credit. The prices to which I have referred of the various classes of goods are perhaps material to be given in detail, at rate for the month of January, 1879, for the average of the year, and for December, 1881. The brands I have referred to are consumed in about these proportions: 15 per cent. of the first brand, 15 of the second, 40 of the third, 20 of the fourth and 10 per cent. of the fifth. There are some other brands of which, however the consumption is, relatively speaking, insignificant. The prices of Canadian greys at the Hochelaga mill are quoted as follows:—

	Jan. 1879	May, 1879	Year 1879	Dec. 1881
G.....	5,781	6,012	5,881	6,625
H.....	6,240	6,475	6,338	7,125
HH.....	7,170	7,630	7,408	8,625
XX.....	8,095	8,556	8,325	9,375
XXX.....	8,550	9,020	8,752	9,875

The prices of the Cornwall goods and the Dundas goods, with which I shall not trouble the House in detail, show the general results, with certain variations, producing the general averages I have given. Now, you will observe that Mr. Gault's letter, upon which the hon. Minister relied, gives the average price of Canadian goods in 1879, as 28 cents per lb., and for December, 1881, as 28 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb., being an increase of only 1.80 per cent. The increase, as ascertained by these figures, is no less than 14.35 per cent., and that is the real measure of the increase in the cost of grey cottons between 1879 and December, 1881. Now, the duty, as I have proved to the House, is a little over 30 per cent.; it was 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; the increase in duty is therefore 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the manufacturer has increased his price to the extent of the duty, and a little more; while the duty has increased 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the manufacturer's price has increased 14.35 per cent. To pause here and enquire what the effect on the Canadian people would have been, supposing a like increase had taken place in the cost of all Canadian cottons to that which has taken place in the cost of brown cottons, the increased cost on the cottons manufactured from last year's imports, assuming 1,000,000 lbs. or more of raw cotton to have been manufactured, would have amounted to about \$625,000 over the cost in 1879. The next question to be disposed of is, how near the makers do, in fact, go to the duty point. I have already shown that the manufacturers have increased the cost of cotton to an amount more than commensurate with the increase of the duty. Now, how near do they go to the duty point? I say they go as near as they dare; that is natural and reasonable. The duty was put up in order that they might raise their price—in order that they might have an advantage; I say they take all the advantage they dare take of it, and Mr. Gault admits that. Fortunately, we are not met here with the statement that there is any patriotic or philanthropic feeling on the part of the manufacturers

which induces them to take any less advantage than they can take; but, this gentleman says they do go as near the duty as they dare. I will give you his own words:

"You will see that the manufacturers are not really availing themselves of the extra cent per square yard, the principal reason being that they require to be this much below the regular market price of the United States trade to prevent enough odd lots coming in to disturb the market."

That is, they go as high as they can without allowing odd lots to come in to disturb the market. But there is no question of reasonableness of price or of consideration for the consumer. Nay, more; there is no question about the dealers' legitimate profit; there is no question about the wholesale merchants' or the retail merchants' legitimate profit. The arrangements are such that these profits are absorbed by the miller. There is an amusing statement in Mr. Gault's letter on this subject. He says:

"It is worthy of remark that nearly all the wholesale houses, as well as retail, sell Canada manufactured cotton to their customers at or about the mill price, certainly in few instances in which more than 5 per cent. profit, while imported goods of the same class usually pay 10 or 15 per cent. profit, customers getting the advantage of the close competition between the dealers."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman cheers it. Is it for philanthropic reasons that the dealer retails or sells it that way?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The consumer gets the benefit.

Mr. BLAKE. Not so. It is because the manufacturer takes the whole profit in his dealings. Goods must be sold at a living profit; but, as Mr. Gault says, the Canadian goods are sold at cost by the wholesale merchant and retailer. Now, even cotton manufacturers do not sell their goods for love. They sell them to make money; so the wholesaler, so the retailer, and this is certain that the wholesaler or retailer must get on his average sales a living profit, or advance, or else he will get into the Bankruptcy Court, if there is one, or into trouble if there is not. What he does not get in cottons, as what the grocer does not get sugar, he has got to make up from the consumer on other classes of goods. It is no advantage to the consumer, when a certain average rate of advance must be obtained by the middleman, in order that he may live, to be told that a particular article is sold at cost; he will have to pay more for some other article to make up the difference. What happens in this case is, that the cotton manufacturer, absorbs not merely his own share of the profits on cotton but also the share of those who intervene between him and the consumer; and, therefore, the consumer not paying to the middleman a profit on this article, has to pay to the middleman on other purchases his living profit in the prices of cotton and other articles as well. The consumer must pay in the end as much as will enable the middleman to live, on his average transactions. The manufacturer gets the whole profit, the mills have a perfect monopoly at present on many of these goods, securing their own prices and terms; and the question, being reduced to a purely business question, is—how near do the mills go to the duty point without permitting odd lots, as Mr. Gault says, to come in and disturb the market? That is the question which agitates and disturbs their minds. The duty is on the average over 30 per cent.; to that is to be added the advantage from freight, which, so far as the American goods are concerned, is of course a varying one, dependent on the market for consumption. It may take as much to carry goods from Boston to Toronto, as from Montreal to Toronto; and therefore there would be no advantage to the Canadian manufacturers of Montreal, over the American manufacturers of Boston, in the way of freight; but no doubt there would be some advantage, even

in the case of American goods, to the Canadian manufacturer, because there are cotton mills in various parts of the country. Still, for the purpose of eliminating a disputable point, put aside the question of freights, and the amount of additional advantage the Canadian manufacturer has in freights, and deal only with this advantage in the way of duties, the question is whether they dare take only 5 or $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—whether they are obliged to leave $22\frac{1}{2}$ to 25 per cent. of a margin in order, irrespective of the advantage in freights, to prevent the American goods coming in. That is perfectly absurd. The hon. the Finance Minister misread Mr. Gault's letter when he extracted any such statement from it. The statement which the hon. Minister applied to grey cottons is the statement which Mr. Gault made with reference to bleached cottons. The statement he made with reference to bleached cottons, did not give the whole facts of the case; because, what is applicable to grey cottons is not applicable to bleached. I shall show that the hon. gentleman misread Mr. Gault's letter when he assumed that that gentleman, in speaking of grey cottons, declared the manufacturer took only 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. over the American prices. He gave an account of United States grey or brown sheetings, and he says the average laid down price is 33.73, while the average for Canadian of a like kind is $28\frac{1}{2}$ to 29. "You will see," he says, "the manufacturers are not availing themselves of the extra 1 cent per square yard, the principal reason being, that they require to be very much below the market price." He says with regard to the grey cottons, that they are not availing themselves of the specific duties. He does not say that they demand only 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. over the mill prices. When he comes to white goods, he speaks of them as being sold at from 15 to 20 per cent. less than they can be laid down for, or from 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the American kinds. What Mr. Gault says as to the grey goods is that the manufacturers do not take advantage of the 1 cent, the specific duty, and that is all he states. What would that be? The specific duty would be as near as may be about 15 per cent., and the statement of Mr. Gault is that they take advantage of that amount. I have shown that the duty is about 30 per cent. specific and *ad valorem*; yet he says the specific is not availed of. That would be a very serious thing; it would make the cost of grey cottons at least 15 per cent. over the United States cost; but the statement is wholly fallacious. He gives a table of brown sheetings of American make, of which he asks you to draw the conclusion that he deduces. He gave the brands and qualities and widths, which are not at all comparable with the Canadian goods. He gave a number of light and narrow and fine goods of different qualities altogether, and they are unfair even if the comparison were made by the yard. They are still more unfair when the comparison is made by the lb. There are in this list of brown sheetings, of American make, only three or four brands which were at all extensively coming into consumption even under the old Tariff. The laid down prices he gives, also, are obviously incorrect. But I will assume the table to be correct in all particulars, and will give you its results. The average cost of United States greys, taking all the print cloths, the narrow and fine goods, and the high-priced goods which he goes on to compare with our average Canadian brown sheetings, is 25.89 cents per lb., and the laid down cost at Montreal, 33.73 cents, or an addition of 7.84, or 33.15 per cent., which constitutes the average advance in price on account of duty and cost of transport. The Canadian price is 29 cents. So, by his own table, without disputing a single one of his comparisons, without investigating a single one of his figures, and taking his own results, Canadian brown sheeting cost 12 per cent. in excess of the cost abroad, of the United States goods,

Mr. BLAKE.

which he gives as a measure of comparison. Consequently, by that mode of calculation the measure of advantage, instead of being 5 per cent. as the hon. member said, instead of being $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as the hon. Minister suggests, is really 12 per cent. Suppose that that were the general result in the case of Canadian cottons, it would mean an extra payment to the Canadian manufacturers of \$540,000 on the product of 14,000,000 lbs. of raw cotton used in the mill. But that is far from it. Mr. Gault acknowledges that the Canadian brown sheetings are chiefly from three to four yards in width. Let us say an average of $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards. He makes out the average price of these goods in December, 1881, was $28\frac{1}{2}$ to 29 cents. I make out that the average price was 29.46 cents, having taken the prices of the five brands produced by the three mills to which I have referred. Mr. Gault, in taking Hochelaga alone, is as nearly correct as possible; but taking the three mills to which I have referred the real result is, that the average price in December, 1881, was 29.46 instead of from $28\frac{1}{2}$ to 29. But I will assume the price to be 29 as Mr. Gault suggests. To what does he compare these average Canadian brown sheetings $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards in width which he says cost 29 cents? He compares them with finer, narrower and better goods altogether, made of finer yarn and in a different manner. I will give you proof of this by reading extracts of letters from numerous merchants in the highest standing in the country, with whom I have corresponded on this subject:

"Mr. Gault omits to state that the American grey cotton is intrinsically a better cloth, finer in make. For example, the Great Falls E is a well-known cloth in Canada. We know of no grey cloth made in Canada equal to it at the present date. It could be imported to sell at a profit if it recedes half a cent in price which, it may do. Or take the Atlantic H, the Canadian mills make no such cotton.

"The Canadian mills are not improving their cloth as they should. The tyrannical protection they get obviates the necessity of this. The Hochelaga greys approach nearer to the American goods than any other mill in Canada. If it had not been for protection granted to them that they did not require they would have done better. Since the new duty went on they have not improved. They have deteriorated. The Dundas mills made better goods years ago than they now do. Any housekeeper in the county of Wentworth could speak to that. The reason is the same with them all. They have no incentive to excel. Their goods are sure to sell owing to the enormous protection they have.

"Regarding white cottons, the English market is the check on the Valleyfield mills, who are the sole makers of bleached goods in Canada, the new mill at St. Henri, near Montreal, not having got started as yet. Many wholesale houses this spring have kept English bleached cottons solely in stock. The English goods are to-day better value than the Canadian.

"Regarding colored goods the Massachusetts mills send their goods here yet. They are superior in coloring and styles, and in spite of the 2 cents specific duty in addition to the 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, are largely imported.

"Regarding cotton yarn, the American yarn is finer than the Canadian and does not take so well in this country.

"The Canadian is a coarser thread and comparisons between the two are scarcely in order; indeed in making any comparison between American and Canadian goods the same remark applies. As before mentioned the American cloth is a finer fabric as a rule.

"More pains have been taken with it to make it good value.

"Nothing could illustrate the fallacy of excessive protection better than the fact that Free Trade England is to-day sending us more bleached cottons than either Canada or the United States, and they are improving fast, in fact beating us on our own ground irrespective of all the protection accorded to the Canadian mills.

"Mr. Gault's concluding remark that nearly all wholesale houses as well as the retail sell Canadian manufactured cottons to their customers at or about the mill price, certainly in few instances not much over 5 per cent. profit, while imported goods of the same class usually pay 10 to 15 per cent. profit, is a startling one. How could his clients live if they sold their goods for cost price? Are they philanthropists or do they find the English goods better value than they can get 10 to 15 per cent. more. Mr. Gault has impaled himself on the horns of a dilemma by such a statement."

Another gentleman says:

"With reference to print cloths and the other fine United States greys, they differ from our greys in being finer texture and I have no doubt are made of a higher priced raw material; at any rate, they are of a smaller, finer yarn, which yarn must be worth more per lb. than the coarser yarn that Canadian greys are made from. The Great Falls F and the Atlantic H and Atlantic V are made of similar yarn to Canadian cottons, at least as good yarn as any of the Canadian grey,

and better yarn than the Leybster greys; I think quite as good as the Dundas or the Hochelaga. With reference to the white, the Dwight Anchor and Wamsutta are a very fine, high grade of cotton and are still imported into this country by high-class retail trade such as some of the best stores who serve wealthy families."

Another gentleman states :

"I have merely to state that even Mr. Gault must admit that given the same weight for the same number of yards, of Canadian and American cottons, the make and quality of the latter are much superior. Prices of American manufactured cottons ruled high last season, in consequence of great demand, and there were more English than American cottons imported into Canada, as the prices were much lower of the English.

"I might also add that the knitting cotton sold, although bulky, is of very small value, and in comparison to other descriptions of cotton and woollen goods imported, on which the Tariff is excessive, the entire value of the whole consumption is a mere bagatelle; and it is not fair to single out an article of this kind, of trifling value, to prove the success of an exorbitant duty on other goods."

Another gentleman says :

"Mr. Gault has selected special brands from different mills which from their peculiar make and quality would hardly under any circumstances come into consumption in Canada. I have no means at hand of testing whether the prices he quotes are mill prices or jobber's prices. They should be mill prices to compare with Canadian mill prices. No business man could say that the quality of cotton put into Canadian cottons is as good or fine as that usually put in the United States cottons. As to the bleached shirtings, it is a difficult matter to sell them (Valleyfield) quality deteriorated, shirtmakers alone buy them to any extent. British white cottons preferred even though it cost more. His statement regarding cotton yarn is simply not correct, but that is one statement against another which could only be proven by having them tested.

"As I before stated it is a very unfair and unbusinesslike comparison for Mr. Gault to select lines of cotton that are not suitable for this trade (Canada), and with two exceptions so far as I can remember, that were never brought into the country under the old Tariff; these were the 30 inch "Atlantic V" and 36 inch "Atlantic H" and the 36 inch "Great Falls F"; but a very small quantity of any of the other brands could then be sold, as they are fine quality and more suitable for a city trade than for the mill, and I will ask you not to lose sight of the fact that Yankee cottons are made from better stock than Canadian; hence the impossibility to institute a fair and just comparison, having such a large market in the States, the makes are adapted to different localities and printing cloths are not used in Canada.

"The Valleyfield goods. It would be difficult to induce any house to buy a quantity of them; they are run down so in quality."

Another gentleman says :

"To my own mind, the whole matter lies in this simple question: Can grey and white cottons be imported into our market in the face of the existing tariff? The answer is, they can.

"Mr. Gault's method of reasoning as to the profits derived by the wholesale and retail merchant is singularly specious; he wisely makes no reference to the manufacturer. I may refer to the question which I proposed in my former letter? Out of whose pockets comes the increased price of the manufactured article? Out of the pockets of the consumers. Who receives the spoil? The manufacturer, and be alone.

"Our sales of English whites have been greatly in excess of Canadian, being better value in spite of the enormous duty.

Another gentleman says :

"The mills are so far behind in their delivery that we are sold quite out of their make, but the fact that English white cottons are imported largely and sold at a much larger profit, after paying the exorbitant Tariff, shows how much the mill is appropriating of the Tariff: in fact it shows that the mill is taking all the Tariff in addition to legitimate manufacturers' prices. The same can be said of colored goods, as the commission firms of Wright, Bliss and Falyan, lately Bliss, Falyan & Co. and Geo. O. Richardson & Co., of Boston, have been and are selling dark largely to the wholesale trade of Toronto and Montreal, and every live wholesale dry goods house in the Dominion is importing English shirting largely.

"You are quite right in pointing out the misrepresentation of Mr. Gault when he averages print cloths and such other fine cottons along with regular grey cotton to get a higher average price per lb. than greys like Canadians would show. The Great Falls F is a brand well known by Canadian merchants, as it came in here freely under the old Tariff; and you notice by his own statement the Great Falls E and the Adriatic Standard only show 1c. per lb. over the average he gives for Canadian cottons while the specific duty alone on these brands would be about 3c. per lb. in addition to the *ad valorem* duty.

"The list of grey goods given includes only three or four brands which went into consumption here even under the old Tariff.

"The others being light or narrow are not fairly comparable with Canadian made goods, more particularly when the comparison is sought to be made on the basis of an average price per lb. weight of manufactured cotton cloth.

"The same applies to a great extent to the white goods enumerated, although as has been stated it is more difficult to even institute a com-

parison in white goods. In the greys the Adriatic Standard, 36 inches, weighing 2.84 and the Great Falls E 2.90, are the only two that from experience I am in a position to compare with Canadian goods.

"The standard will weigh about the same, probably a shade more than the Hochelaga XXX.

"The Great Falls E about the same as the XX, but we are using a Black Hawk which weighs about 2.80 or between 2.80 and 2.90 which counts 44 x 48, costs us 9½ cents laid down and is preferred by many when placed side by side with the Hochelaga L, costing 9½ and freight from Hochelaga (which, in passing, is quite as high as the freight from Boston. The Great Falls E costs us 7½ cents in Boston and is laid down at 10-10 while the XXX costs 9½ and freight.

"There does not seem to me to be much use in comparing Canadian and American white cottons. The fact is the English white cottons have had the effect in this market of keeping the price of Valleyfields down. If we had not been able to draw supplies from Manchester our whites would have cost us a great deal more than they do. There are very few English greys imported excepting lower qualities, than are made in Canada, and wide thin goods for cheese bandages.

"In whites they are imported largely for two reasons. The value is much better and the supply of Canadian is not equal to the wants of the country."

Mr. PLUMB. Name these authorities.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to name these parties. The mill manufacturers of this country have at present the command of the trade, and to name them would be to expose them to be boycotted. I read these letters on my responsibility as a member of Parliament, stating they are given to me by the first houses in the trade in the various cities of the Dominion. I am not bound to name them. Another gentleman says :

"The large quantity of the better grade of English and American white goods that are imported do not come into competition with those made at Valleyfield which are a much lower class of goods and much used and are easily sold at a price just a little below what the same sort can be imported for. As the duty on low priced goods is much higher than on the finer, manufacturers will naturally make that which pays best.

"I might say that the best grey goods found in our large retail stores are American, and though not weighing any more per yard than our Canadian they are usually better made, have a nicer finish and consequently sell higher, so that retailers prefer to handle them. This will also apply to the white, which up to a short time were disgraceful in make and finish, yet they sold, and the company made last year not far from 40 per cent. on the paid-up capital."

The relative proportion of grey and white cloth made in Canada is about 5 to 1. Another gentleman says :

"Brown cottons are certainly kept out of the market, and the Canadian prices are a little under American 'laid down,' but the manufacturers cannot claim that they are not taking full advantage of the Tariff because if they do not give some margin the fluctuations of the American market would occasionally permit of the importation of certain lines. You will observe that according to Gault's figures the duties on brown goods range from 30 per cent. on the best line he quotes to 31½ per cent. on the lowest. With such a tariff they can well afford to sell a little under what the tariff would allow them to get. A comparison on between American and Canadian brown cottons, based entirely on weight and count is not fair because the American goods are much purer and cleaner. Canadian mills send out goods as perfect which no American maker of any repute would sell except as seconds.

"Note the point he makes about the small profit the jobber gets and the advantage to the consumer in the close competition between dealers; compare the profits he says the jobber gets with the dividends paid by the mills. The jobber takes nearly all the risk, and the 'profit' would not pay expenses, so that according to his own showing the jobbers are only servants of the mills and handle the goods for nothing. I think you are quite safe in stating that it costs more than 5 per cent. on the business to carry on jobbing.

"Respecting the white cottons, comparing these with American is out of the question, as the Americans make theirs so much better in every way. You can readily understand how easy it would be to make cottons weigh well by adding starch and other kinds of dressing, and this is done by the Canadian mills whilst the American goods are almost pure. In our business for the present season nearly one-half of the total sales in white cotton has been in English and American goods, and this is also the experience of others. There are no Canadian goods made like the last three, and especially the last two, on his list. If he had gone on and quoted still finer goods he could have made his average price per lb. higher. Regarding the yarns, this statement bears its own refutation as if the American yarn was inferior in quality it could not be sold, there being no scarcity in Canadian yarns, and jobbers can get all they require."

Another gentleman says :

"It is most unfair on the part of Mr. Gault (and he must have known that it would be misleading, too) for him to include in his comparison of grey or unbleached cottons, printed cloths and the finer makes of grey such as are not made in Canada.

"We are not able with any degree of success to import any unbleached cottons from the United States. Our Canadian cotton manufacturers regulate the price just so as to leave us no, or very little margin in importing from the States.

"From the enormous protection the Canadian manufacturers have (1 cent, say 1 cent per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*) we verily believe that they have from five to ten times greater profit per cent. in selling cottons by the hundred bale lots to responsible wholesale men than we have in selling from one to five pieces to merchants of different standing all over the country.

"We know less about the relative values in United States and Canadian bleached goods than we do in unbleached. We know, however, that we import largely from England in bleached goods, and sell them side by side with the Canadian bleached goods at a much better profit than we can get on Canadian goods, and of course the Canadian manufacturer gets the difference in profit."

Now, Sir, I have shown you by this statement how unfair in the general is the basis of comparison upon which Mr. Gault's statement rests. I have shown from the testimony of numerous persons that the average of the goods he refers to cannot be properly referred to as a basis of comparison with the average comparison from sheetings manufactured in Canada. His comparisons, while he admits the average Canadian goods are about 3½ yards to the lb. include printed cloths, weighing 7 yards to the pound; Monadnock greys, weighing 5·30 yards to the lb. Newberry BB's, weighing 4·20; Continental K's, 4; Nashua R's, weighing 3·45, out of a very high count increasing the cost. The brands which may be most fairly taken in comparison with our very best are such as Adriatic Standard and Great Falls E. I have prepared a table showing cost abroad, rate of duty, and the cost duty added of Gault's samples, divided into two parts. I have not added freight and charges, an additional protection varying in amount according to the point of distribution, and therefore disputable, through the charge at Montreal may be taken at about 2 per cent. The table is as follows:—

	Yards to lb.	U. States cost per lb.	Rate of duty.	Cost duty added.
		cents.	per cent.	cents.
Printing Cloths	7·00	28·00	33·75	37·45
Monadnock Greys	5·30	30·475	29·49	39·46
Newbury BB's	4·20	28·35	29·81	36·80
Continental K's	4·00	27·60	29·49	35·74
Nashua R (High Count).....	3·45	26·737	27·10	34·20
Average	4·79	28·23	30·09	36·73

I have taken as a second part the remainder of Mr. Gault's table:

	Yards to lb.	U. States cost per lb.	Rate of duty.	United States cost duty added.
		cents.	per cent.	cents.
Massachusetts I.....	4·00	25·60	28·02	32·71
Atlantic V.....	3·70	24·97	27·31	31·80
Laurel D.....	3·15	23·62	28·30	30·32
Atlantic H.....	3·05	23·64	27·90	30·23
Adriatic Standard.....	2·84	22·72	27·5	28·96
Great Falls E.....	2·90	23·20	27·5	29·58
Average.....	3·27	23·96	27·76	30·60

Now, I do not admit that second part of the table itself to be a fair comparison with the average Canadian brands at all, but even assuming that it is, these are the results. Now, I have taken, as I have said, the five staple brands of Hochelaga, Cornwall and Dundas, and their weight is, as Mr. Gault says, about 3½ yards to the lb., and taking, in the
Mr. BLAKE.

first place, Mr. Gault's own statement of the cost at 29 cents, the result is this: Canadian cotton costs 29 cents; United States cottons at mills costs 23·96 cents; excess of cost of Canadian cotton cost, 5·04 cents, or 21 per cent. in excess. Then add cost of duty to United States cotton and it will be 33·60 cents, or 1·60 cents in cost of Canadian cotton, or about 5½ per cent.

Mr. FARROW. Is the hon. gentleman reading a letter or is it his own speech he is reading now.

Mr. BLAKE. I am referring to certain figures which I do not propose to carry in my head, even to please the hon. member for North Huron. I say that the excess of United States duty added is by these figures only 5 or 6 per cent., and if you take the average cost of Canadian, as it is at 29·60, the result is that the excess of Canadian over United States at mill is 23 per cent; and the excess of United States duty added only about 3½ per cent., and the truth is if you were to take a fair comparison, which even the second branch of this table does not give you, of goods of equal value, you would find, instead of being, as I have pointed out, 21 or 23 per cent., the mill cost of Canadian goods would be between 25 and 30 per cent. over the mill cost of United States goods of equal value. I have shown that Mr. Gault acknowledged, in effect, that they took 15 per cent. on the brown, but that, in truth, they took nearly 30 per cent. These figures prove another thing: By reference to the relative cost which is given for these goods at the three Canadian mills, it appears there is a practical understanding as to the rate to be charged, and there is not, except under particular circumstances, any competition. So much with respect to brown sheetings and Mr. Gault's statement in respect to them, and I once again reiterate that the statement which the hon. Minister attributed to Mr. Gault respecting brown sheetings is a statement which Mr. Gault does not make, but he confines himself, in that regard, to bleached shirtings, to which I am now about to refer. Mr. Gault admits that in white goods the comparison with United States goods "can't be made so clear" on account of the variety of styles and makes. He gives a list of United States goods. Low fine shirtings cost abroad, 5 cents, duty 30 per cent; Manantic E cost abroad 6½ cents, duty 28·9 per cent.; Chapman X cost abroad 7½ cents, duty 28 per cent.; Elerton VS, cost abroad 8½ cents, duty 27·09 per cent.; Hill Semper Idem, cost abroad 9½ cents, duty 25·42 per cent.; Dwight Anchor cost abroad 10 cents, duty 25 per cent.; Langdon, G B, cost abroad 11½ cents, duty 23·22 per cent.; Wamsutta, cost abroad 11¾ cents, duty 23·10 per cent. The average cost per lb., in the United States is 37·38 cents; average duty 26·34 per cent; average cost per lb., duty added, is 47·12 cents. Now, Mr. Gault compares these with Valleyfield goods, of which he says the average price is about 38 cents a pound. I have taken the brands of Valleyfield white cottons—X, XXX, O, OO and OOO—being almost the whole consumption of Valleyfield, and find the average cost 38·89 cents. There is no comparison whatever between these goods. It is true that Langdon, GB, and Wamsutta may be looked at, but they compare, if at all, only with Valleyfield brand, LLL, of which the consumption is insignificant. These are goods made in the protected United States. It is the low price of English bleached goods that has kept Valleyfield down. It is with them the competition is; and a fair comparison would be with them. Valleyfield has, however, increased seriously in price. The price of October, 1878, and January, 1879, was of the brands mentioned. Average per yard for October, 1878, and January, 1879, 6·80 cents; for May, 1879, 7·24 cents; for year 1879, 7·32 cents; for December 14, 1881, 8·475, an increase over October, 1878, and January, 1879, of 24·72 per cent.; over May, 1879, of 17 per cent.; over average of 1879, of 15½ per cent. The brand X presents the following results: Increase over October, 1878, 31·94 per cent.; over May, 1879, 21·08

per cent.; over year 1879, 20-25 per cent. While the price has gone up the quality has deteriorated seriously, and it is only from necessity that the goods are bought. The competition is with England. Here the ocean and inland freight is a clear gain to home producer. have already given a statement showing the rates of of duty on cottons imported. To this must be added a considerable sum for freight and charges, making an enormous protection. Yet goods are coming in in great quantities. The mills keep just low enough to enable them to get the orders. Instead of getting the goods (as would be assumed by Gault's letter) at an advance of only 5 to 7½ per cent. over similar goods, or the goods in competition, we get the goods at nearly the highest point which duty and freight allow manufacturers to charge. Then, as to colored goods, Gault says it is impossible to arrive at any accurate estimate. But we have once more the best test: the demand is greater than the supply; the foreign supply is hampered with duties of 30 per cent. and over. Therefore, the home market can and does charge almost all that. The general result is that we are paying within a shade of duty point. That duty point may average (without freight) about 30 per cent.; and therefore we are paying that much, leaving out freight and charges for fluctuations. If the home product was at mill prices, \$5,000,000, and assuming only 25 per cent. advance over cost abroad, we would have paid for our home-made cottons \$1,000,000 more than the cost abroad. No wonder cotton men grow rich. But I will add some further proofs of the proposition I have advanced. I have some letters and a memorandum of actual transactions in addition to those already given. Now, these are the comparisons we are to take. What is the sense of the Minister bringing forward a lot of grades and styles of American white cottons which bear no comparison whatever with the Valleyfield cottons? Of the brands to which I referred only one or two may be compared with the Valleyfield LLL, the consumption of which is insignificant, and he omitted to consider what the goods were and what their cost was which did come in competition with Canadian goods, the British goods, and what the rate of duty is, and how the prices go with reference to them. The prices with reference to them go as above stated, that the Canadian manufacturer charges almost within a shade, the whole advantage, the cost abroad, duty and freight added. Now, the general result is, that the duty being over 30 per cent, we are paying between 25 and 30 per cent. for our various commodities of cotton beyond the cost abroad. As I have stated the mill prices would be about five millions out of a total product of from 14 to 16 millions pounds, and if we pay 25 per cent. more than the cost abroad, that means that if the price abroad were four millions while we were paying five, the duty enhances the price of Canadian cottons to the people of this country by one million dollars, which I believe is the lowest estimate which we can make of the cost to this country of the system which the hon. gentleman has introduced. I wish to give some further evidence of the proposition I have advanced and I will read some further letters on the subject:

"Of cotton goods mentioned, such as tweeds, ducks, bed ticks colored shirtings (Oxford), although made in Canada, the heavy duty charged on imported goods of some classes is not sufficient to keep them out of the country. In some or rather in nearly every instance the imported articles are much the best, and most desirable, and more than hold their own with the Canadian manufactured articles so that the actual cost to the consumer is not only increased by the amount of duty paid on each and every description of goods but also by the merchants, percentage of profit on that duty paid, as the profit is put on to the actual cost of goods delivered, including duty, &c.

"In the matter of bed ticks, ducks, bleached cottons, &c., the prices are so regulated by the Canadian manufacturer as to take the full benefit of the protective tariff by giving the wholesale buyer the very smallest margin of choice in favor of Canadian-made goods. They cut it so fine in many instances as to defeat the end they seek to obtain.

"I note your remark, the statement is boldly made, that in domestics, greys and whites, and indeed generally, the prices are but slightly above

United States mill prices, and are supplied as they would be if imported at a 10 per cent. duty.

"If, however, the duties were reduced to 10 per cent, these are the very parties who would most object. When the Tariff was 17½ per cent., manufacturers of domestic staples did not find it sufficient to keep out American goods, and if the duties were reduced to 10 per cent. there is not a mill in Canada that would be able to continue operations, as England and the United States both would supply all Canada at lower prices than the same qualities could be made in the Dominion.

"In many goods, called by the same names in Canada and the United States, the makes are so dissimilar as to be quite unsuitable to the same purposes of use. I more especially allude to grey or unbleached cottons, which in Canada are all of stout or thick threads, very rough in finish, and not so fine in texture as those of the United States.

"The first cost of these goods is so low in both countries, that the Canadian duty of 1c. per square yard and 15 cents *ad valorem*, is sufficient to compel the people to use the Canadian, though not as desirable. In the finer grades costing in the United States at present 7½ cents, and upwards, we still import.

"There are no such goods of fine thread and closely woven, made in Canada.

"The duty paid, as per copy of entry, you will see amounts to 28½ per cent., and as the goods are to be obtained at all times, on ordering, it is only necessary to purchase in small quantities.

"Copy of Entry.

"1 bale unbleached cotton, \$58.58, \$59 at 15 per cent.....\$8 85
 "808 Yards at 1 cent..... 8 08

"About 28½ per cent. duty. \$16 93

"In 29 inch unbleached drill, Peperell & Lyman Mills (twilled grey cotton), the duty amounts to 24½ per cent. as per entry following. The cost in the United States at present is 8½ cents per yard; in Canada, at Hochelaga Mills, 10½ cents.

"Copy of Entry, November 15, 1881.

"2 bales unbleached cotton, \$97.02, \$97 at 15 per cent...\$14 55
 "947 yards at 1 cent..... 9 47

\$24 02

"24½ per cent. duty.

"The above cost us landed at our door 10½ cents per yard; the Canadian exactly the same, including freight and cartage; and there is no choice whatever in quality or make between the United States Peperell Mills, Lyman Mills, and the Canadian Hochelaga. You will perceive, however, the duty 24½ per cent. is considerably in advance of 10 per cent.

"In bleached or white cottons the difference is more marked. In Canada there is only one mill making these goods, at Valleyfield. We have imported a few from the United States this season, but not many, as the demand for manufactures of this class in the United States, in consequence of the generally lively state of trade in that country, has forced up the prices.

"Copy of Entry, October 6, 1881.

"1 case white cotton, \$119, at 15 per cent.....\$17 85
 "2165 yards, at 1c..... 21 65

\$39 50

Percentage of duty, 33½.

"There is no Canadian bleached cotton of similar make or quality of the above, but the per centage of duty is a long way from 10 per cent. From England, however, we have had considerable bleached or white cottons since July, as they were cheaper there this season than in the United States. We give below a copy of Customs House entries to illustrate per centage of duty and comparison with Canadian; 30½ per cent. duty is, however, a long way from 10 per cent. Goods as under we have received several times this season, that is to say repetitions of the same goods:

"Copy of Invoice, October 7, 1871.

	£	s.	d.
"1 case 30 per cent. white cottons—			
34 inch, 20 per cent. medium cottons, 2¼d.,			
1,057 yds	12	2	3
31-inch, 10 per cent. diamond cottons, 3d.,			
843½ yds	10	10	10
Packing case	0	12	0
Total	23	5	1

"Extract from Customs Entry of above, ex SS. 'Toronto,'
 October 31, 1881.

"1 case bleached cottons, £22 13s. 1d., \$110 at 15 per cent., \$16.50; 1,724 yds. at 1c, \$17.24—\$33.74.

"Percentage duty, 30½ per cent.
 "Of the above, the cotton costing sterling 2¼d. cost us, landed at our door, 7½c., and is very much superior to Canadian, costing us 8½c. net, irrespective of freight. Although placed side by side with the Canadian at higher percentage of profit for price, the English invariably sold in

reference to the Canadian referred to. The white cotton at 3d. is a double warp, no such goods being made in Canada, but very essential for household use.

"Copy of Customs Entry, October 27, 1881, SS. 'Hibernian.'

" 2 cases white cottons, value £45 4s. 4d.—\$220	
at 15 per cent.	\$33 00
" 3,376 square yds. at 1c.	33 76

"Percentage of duty, 30 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.

"The above cost, sterling, 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. and cost ex-landed 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ c, being about $\frac{1}{2}$ c. more per yard than the Canadian, the net price of which is 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ c. The English cotton is, however, worth $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per yard more than the Canadian, and notwithstanding the duty of 30 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., which is a long way from 10 per cent, we sell the English more readily at $\frac{1}{2}$ c. higher price than the Canadian.

"In bed ticks, the lower grades we do not now import, as in consequence of opposition amongst Dundas, Cornwall and Stormont mills, the prices are very slightly in favor of the Canadian, about 5 to 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. average on those costing up to 15 cents. At this price, however, the 'Millbury Feather,' a Boston tick, surpassed all competitors in Canada.

"Copy of Customs entry, October 10th, 1881.

1 bale bed tick, value \$98.10, \$98, at 15 per cent.	\$14 70
581 square yards at 2 cents	11 62
	<u>\$26 32</u>

"Percentage of duty, 27 per cent. Cost landed per yard, 19 $\frac{7}{8}$ cents.

"In the matter of checked and striped shirtings, on which the duty is 2 cents per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, we herewith subjoin copies of Custom entries.

"August 24th, 1881. SS. 'Teutonia.'

" 1 bale shirting, £26 18s., \$131 at 15 cents	\$19 65
" 1,316 yards at 2 cents	26 32
	<u>\$45 97</u>

"Percentage of duty, 35 per cent.

"The sterling cost of above was 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.; cost landed respectively, 11 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents and 10 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents.

"The 10 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents are much better than any goods offered by Parks, here at 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ or even 13 $\frac{1}{2}$, and are also better than Cornwall or Dundas Manufacturing Companies. The 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. cloth is much better than what was recently offered by the Cornwall Cotton Manufacturing Co. at 13 cents and 14 cents, less 10 per cent.

"Copy of extract from Entry, September 17th, 1881, 'SS. Toronto.'

" 1 Case shirting £13 6s. 9d. ...\$65 at 15 per cent.	\$ 9 75
" 871 yards at 2 cents	17 42
	<u>\$27 17</u>

"Percentage of duty 40 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

"These goods cost 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. and 3d., and were bought merely as a sample lot to show customers with a view to spring trade, as they are altogether sold at that time of the year.

"The cloth at 3d. is heavy and more durable than the lowest made by Cornwall or Dundas Cotton Co. It cost us landed 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents at the above duty, and is better than the lowest made in Canada, which is by the Cornwall Co., and cost according to price list at present in our possession (not the latest) 10 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents net, exclusive of freight. On a few 'Cornwall' goods that we know, the present quotations of prices have advanced $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per yard, and the whole list is sure to be higher, as prices have advanced everywhere.

"In conversation with the Montreal agent at the Cornwall Cotton Co., when here (in October last I think), he stated he was formerly agent in Montreal for the Boston Duck Co., and that the Cornwall Co. now regulate their prices by the cost at which the Boston can be landed here, so as to be below.

"He quoted Cornwall checked duck at 15 cents net, irrespective of freight, that of the Boston being 11 cents, and equal in quality. The Boston Checked cost landed at our door 14 $\frac{3}{8}$ cents.

"In plain brown ducks the difference is more marked and we sell as good qualities as the Canadian at 2c. per yard less.

"The duty on checked duck, American costing 11c., at 2c. per square yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* is 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I give copy of one entry to illustrate :

"July 7th, 1881.

" One case Checked Duck \$161, at 15 per cent.	\$24 15
" 1,099 yards at 2c.	21 98

"Percentage of duty 27 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

\$46 13

"We have a great many entries for American ducks, mostly made in the early part of the year, when they are mostly used and the duty generally averages upwards of 30 per cent.,—long way from 10 per cent.

"In reply to question would give copy of our last entry of bed ticks :

"December 21st, 1881.

" 1 bale bed tick, \$145.84—\$146, at 15 per cent.	\$21 90
" 823 yards at 2 cents	16 46

"Percentage of duty, 26 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

\$38 36

Mr. BLAKE.

"The above cost 15 $\frac{1}{4}$ cents, and we sell it readily at 2 cents per yard higher than Canadian (Stormont, AAA), the net price of which is 18 cents. As stated in previous letter, the 2 cents per yard, and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* on the lower grades, makes such a heavy percentage that we do not now import them, and this is about the only illustration I can give, which I think a good one, as it shows we get 2 cents per yard more for an American tick than we can get for a Canadian costing 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents higher.

"A few days after writing you on December 8th, I received some prices quoting amongst others, plain brown duck marked 9 oz., at 14 cents. This is much inferior to that of Boston Duck Co., marked XX, the price of which at the time was 11 cents.

"The classes of cotton goods (imported) which enter into competition with Canadian goods are: 1st white cottons; 2nd demins; 3rd heavy colored shirtings; 4th grey cottons.

"There may be a few other lines but compared with these they are insignificant, and consequently not worth anything.

"As to the white cottons the consumption is large. The Valleyfield company have hitherto had the market exclusively. A new company will share the trade with them during the coming season, and may somewhat affect the price. We have a large standing order but from the enormous number of orders which the mill claims to have are unable to say when it will be reached.

"The duty, as you know on this class of goods is 15 per cent. and 10 per cent. per square yard specific. English cottons are imported from 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. up to 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., taking the lower price for example call 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. sterling, 5 cents, specific duty 20 per cent., *ad valorem* 15 per cent. Total 35 per cent.

"The consumption of Demins plain and striped is very large. The duty is 15 per cent., *ad valorem*, and 2 per cent. square yard. These goods are imported at prices from 4d. to 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Taking the lowest price then say 4d. or 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents currency, the duty would be say 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per yard specific, the width being 27 inches, the duty being 2 cents per square yard, and the *ad valorem* of 15 per cent. or nearly 35 per cent.

"Heavy colored shirtings are very largely used and largely imported, the prices varying from 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. to 4d.

"Taking the lowest at 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or 5 cents and the duty specific, say 2 cents per square yard, this for 27 inches would be

15 "

45 per cent.

"Grey cottons of which the consumption is enormous, are quite shut out. The English here never being able to compete, but the American grey cloth with the present Tariff would be subjected to a duty varying from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. All the goods referred to are used by the masses, by the working men of the country and in no instance save in very small quantities find their way to dwellings of the wealthy.

"The questions will arise if goods can be imported and sold after the payment of duties bearing from 30 per cent. to 45 per cent. what must the manufacturer make and from whom does he make it? Literally who pays these enormous duties.

"None are so benefitted as the manufacturers, who feeling the protection which they enjoy under the existing Tariff are simply arrogant, giving larger discounts for cash when they were earning but small dividends than they do to-day with their enormous earnings, pleading for orders before which they now regard it as a favour to execute and giving merchants to realize painfully that they are the masters of the situation.

"In no part of the world (and our own operations include China and Japan, in addition to the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland) save Canada do we know a single instance where manufacturers don't realize that business is something designed to be ultimately beneficial. That merchant and maker are alike to feel that their interest is a common one. In Canada the manufacturer virtually says to merchant and people, we have you under our heel and we propose that you should feel it."

There are numerous instances which I could give in detail of invoices, of statements of actual transactions, of comparative statements of different lines of Canadian with American and English goods, indicating that in almost all cases the Canadian goods are sold at a price approximating the cost of the foreign competitive article. I have here many instances at hand, but I will not add to those I have given. With reference to ball knitting cottons, to which the hon. gentleman referred, I hold in my hand two letters from the Montreal agents of Morse, Kaley & Co., one dated November 18, 1881, and the other April 12, 1882, which state that the discounts on Morse, Kaley & Co.'s knitting cottons are 25, 5, 5, and 5 per cent. off, irrespective of the cash discount. Thus, it appears that while Mr. Parks' charges are 39 \cdot 60 cents net cash those of Morse, Kaley & Co. are irrespective of duty 31 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents, making the cost of Morse, Kaley & Co.'s cottons, with the freight and duty added, 40 \cdot 03 cents against 39 \cdot 60f or Mr. Parks', or very nearly the whole advantage of the duty. So that in all instances in which I have made enquiry—and I have here

fifty or sixty additional statements in proof of the same fact, I come to the conclusion that it is not, as Mr. Gault contends, essential to the Canadian manufacturer, in the present condition of trade, that he should go as far below the duty point as he is said to go; but that, on the contrary, to retain his trade, he has only to keep a shade below the duty point; and the practical result of this Tariff, instead of being to supply us with domestic cottons at the old rate, has been to charge us an enormous tax, bearing disproportionately on the goods consumed by the poor. The effect has been to impose an enormously added tax to the goods which we buy from the British or United States market and to increase the price of the domestic article in favor of the domestic manufacturer to the extent of 25 per cent. or about one million of dollars.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I confess that I would have preferred that my hon. friend should have delivered this speech on Monday next, as he no doubt proposed doing, on a motion he intended to present to the House, because I understood that he had been provided with a brief, that would require two or three hours to speak from, prepared by the importers of cotton goods.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Will the hon. gentleman say no after having read these letters from different persons?

Mr. BLAKE. I will say no.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I do not object to it. When I was a very young man I used to attend the courts in the city of St. John, and nothing struck me so much as the wonderful ability displayed by members of the legal profession. I found that a gentleman of eminent ability, who had perhaps arrived in the city the previous night, and his brief would not be many hours in his hands, before he would appear in the court and make a most elaborate statement, which certainly did great credit to his ability and his skill in addressing a jury. I have heard that same gentleman a year after, having been retained with a brief on the other side, not in exactly the same case, but in a case involving the same principles, making as clear and forcible an argument on the opposite side of the case. It has often been said that there are too many lawyers in the Commons and Local Legislatures. But I do not know, considering the nature of the duties involved, whether all the members should not be members of the legal profession, in order that they might not, from time to time, present their views under different circumstances—both sides of the case—as has been ably done by a lay member on this occasion. The hon. member for West Durham has presented his views in a very lengthy and elaborate and complete form from his standpoint. He commenced by censuring me as Finance Minister for presenting letters written by gentlemen in the Dominion, upon which I formed my judgment with reference to the effect of the Tariff on the prices of certain goods manufactured in the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not censure the hon. gentleman for reading the letters, but I said he got more.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I gave the names of the letters I read, which came with the weight of their names throughout the country; and I know they did not mislead me in their answers to my questions. I told then I proposed using those letters in Parliament, and asked them for all the facts and nothing but the facts. But the hon. gentleman opposite declined to give the names of the writers he read, which is the difference between us. And what reason did he give for his refusal? That the writers were manufacturers of the Dominion, possessing a monopoly of their business, that they were under obligations to the Tariff, and he feared to give their names lest it should injure them.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In the same breath he also said that those men stated they could import into the Dominion and sell a better article of goods, and obtain better profits from them than from Canadian goods. If so, there was no reason why they should not give their names, if so independent of home manufactures. It is exceedingly difficult I admit, and the mover of the resolution says the same, and as says one of the writers of the letters communicated to me, which I read to the House, for persons even intimately acquainted with all the prices and business of these different branches, to give correctly comparative prices, so that there can be no question with regard to them. But if it is difficult for persons in the trade to do so, it must necessarily be more difficult to others when considering both sides of the question. But there are some points on which there can be no great question. I must refer to the question of woollen goods. Why, the mover of the resolution, and the gentleman who has just sat down, if necessary, could establish by certain evidence that the construction of railways had injured certain localities in the Dominion. I know localities where property is worth less than before railroads were built in their vicinity. But though you can find such cases, it would be an insult to our intelligence to say that railroads have not been a blessing to the country. So it may be with reference to some manufactures. Take the coarse shoddy blanket, and I admit the duty upon it is high. I know that that blanket has been shaken before the people of the Dominion everywhere to show the injustice of the Tariff, as the hon. gentleman says, like a red flag. But is it necessary in the interest of the country that that blanket should be imported? I believe it is not, because they can be replaced by blankets made in the Dominion, of Canadian wool, that will last in the lumber shanties for two or three years instead of only one, and by a cheaper and better blanket. Therefore there is no necessity for us to import such blankets. It is the same with reference to several other articles, some that we are not making may be imported with advantage. I think the mover of the resolution misstated what I said, that the finer woollen goods that were imported paid in duties last year \$400,000 more than the year previous.

Mr. ANGLIN. What was said was that our wealthy class voluntarily paid \$400,000 more on these goods.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I said, with reference to silks and satins, and spirits and wines and various other articles, that the users paid last year \$750,000 voluntarily, because they were not the necessaries of life. I went further and said that \$400,000 more was paid on the best class of woollen goods, which is a fact; and that cotton goods that paid 20 per cent. yielded \$300,000 more last year than the year before. While a great deal has been said throughout the country of the increased duties paid by the poor man for the cotton dress that his wife wears—and I ask the hon. member whether the average of duties on cotton goods is 30 per cent.—that cotton dress pays into the Treasury $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents more than in 1878. But that duty and the \$300,000 and \$400,000 additional that was just mentioned, goes only to make up the deficits that existed before the present Government was formed. The statements I made on woollen goods in my Budget Speech were not made on the authority of Mr. Greenshields, but on the authority of Mr. Catellier, or Catellier & Co., Montreal, naming distinctly the classes of woollen goods produced in this country. I read this letter to show that the prices were cheaper than before. The answer that the hon. gentleman gave, that woollen goods of this class are lower in England, does not amount to much. If they are lower in England it is just the same percentage. This proves that the increased duties have not increased the prices here, to say the least of it. The increase of duty has not increased the price. If

the statement that is made has not been controverted, if that description of goods sold 25 per cent. less than in 1873, and if it be true that the same article is worth 25 per cent. less in England than in 1873, it does not establish that the imposition of a higher duty has increased the cost to the people. I recollect that, in 1879, when hon. gentlemen opposite were explaining why they had a deficit, they spoke of the falling off in the value of goods as compared with 1873. I admitted that had a very great effect on the Tariff, and undertook to show that the increased Tariff we were imposing in 1879 on the value of goods at that time was per yard no greater than in 1873 when we applied the duty in 1873 to the 20 or 22 per cent., as the case might be in 1879. Now, we find, notwithstanding as has been said by the hon. gentlemen opposite, there has been a great depreciation in the value of cotton and woollen goods in the English market, our revenue has increased wonderfully. I reaffirm what I said in February last, that the woollen goods manufactured in the Dominion, including blankets and tweeds, consumed by the masses of the people, are sold to-day less than in 1873. I am prepared to prove further that, though the prices have decreased in England, a large portion are sold lower than they could have been if imported under the Tariff of 1878. It is quite true we have not yet reached, either in cotton or woollen manufactures, all the description of goods we hope and believe we will manufacture here ere long. Last year I had to admit, from the calculations and estimates placed in my hands, that we paid on refined sugar during the year 1879 and 1880, 25 cents per 100 lbs. more than we would have had to pay if imported under the Tariff of 1878. Then we had but two refineries in the Dominion. What is the result now? With five refineries in operation it is established beyond doubt that the description of sugar called yellow sugar is sold less than it could be imported at under the Tariff of 1878. Suppose all that has been said by the hon. member had been correct, with reference to the effect of this Tariff upon cotton goods, as far as their price is concerned, would that be a reason why this House should abandon the policy that induced us to increase the duty on cotton? Certainly not, because we know perfectly well that, though we have had additional cotton factories put into operation, there are not yet sufficient in Canada to supply the whole market, and until then, especially upon some articles not extensively manufactured in this country, we should have to pay into the Treasury a duty on imported goods, but the time is not far distant when there will be but little importation, and the prices will be less than they are at present, than they have been or than they would be under the Tariff of 1878. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made somewhat strong statements with reference to the operations of two cotton mills. I do not know if I took him down accurately, but I understood him to say that the Hochelaga mill had increased the value of its stock \$1,000,000 in two years, that \$400,000 was the original, which is now worth \$1,400,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I said that the stock, which was \$400,000, had been increased by one share on every three, and that watered stock of \$533,000 was quoted at 275 premium.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is about trebled in value. Then the hon. gentleman said with reference to another mill, that it had increased in stock value about \$450,000.

Mr. BLAKE. No. I said the stock of the Valleyfield mill was \$374,000 and had been watered, so that it was now \$500,000 and is quoted at 187 premium.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That would give an increase of \$450,000. There is, if the hon. gentleman's statement be correct, \$1,500,000 of increased value of property in those two mills alone, whereas the whole amount of labor expended in

the manufacture of cotton imported in the two years, the whole amount of interest on capital, the profits and everything else over and above the value of the raw cotton, is \$2,300,000. The inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's statement is that these capitalists have in the last year, in these two mills alone, made \$1,500,000. That cannot be; there is nothing to warrant it. There may be speculation in this matter. When I state that the whole value of labor expended, interest, capital and profits in the cotton manufactures of the last two years have increased the value of cotton imported from its raw value to about \$2,300,000, the facts of the case do not warrant any such high prices as those quoted. The hon. gentleman understands very well how to put a case. He said that the finer descriptions of woollen goods could be laid down at 60 per cent. and the coarser at 80 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very solicitous about the poor man with reference to the rates of duty on the articles he consumes. Would it not be outrageous to pay 20 per cent. on the tea he used, as he did when they were in power, while the more wealthy classes had only to pay from 10 to 16 per cent. on their tea. There was no escape in that case from unequal imposition, whereas, with reference to woollen goods, the articles that are made in Canada of the coarser class are those upon which the people pay no duty whatever. If I used to-day a garment the material of which is supplied to me at a price as low as it could be imported at, from England or elsewhere, no matter what the duty may be, it has not increased the cost. He states it is \$5,000,000, but there is no statement that can be presented by any importer that will show anything of the kind. On the contrary, it is quite clear—and this is confirmed by the evidence of a gentleman thoroughly understanding the cotton industry which was given before a Committee sitting last week—it is clear that in order to obtain a market the Canadian manufacturer must sell for less than the article could be imported for. The hon. mover of the resolution stated that the Canadian manufacturer in some mills here charged 9 cents while a similar article imported can be sold for 8 cents. I cannot understand how that is possible. We all know perfectly well, however, that there is a certain prejudice among the people against domestic manufacturers. We are all aware that there is a popular impression that the imported article is better than the article manufactured here, although there may be absolutely no difference between them. But after two or three years' trial, and when it is clearly established that we manufacture just as good an article as can be imported, that prejudice will be removed. More than that, it will be to the interest of the manufacturers to sell their productions for less than the article can be imported for. That being the case, it may vary from 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. A statement has been furnished to me that the average price of the Canadian article is 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ or 14 per cent. higher than the article imported. Then the consumer gets that under better terms than under the old Tariff, where they paid 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. When you import an article from the United States under a duty of 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., you will, of course, sell that at a higher price than a Canadian article that costs 12 or 14 per cent. It is only a question between the hon. member and myself, as to whether it is 5 or 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. That is the only point at issue. But as far as the consumer is concerned, he has the article at a cheaper rate than before. Now, in the inauguration of any great policy such as this, as I have stated over and over again, all its beneficial effects cannot be realized until it has been in operation a number of years, but a number of years will be required to create the competition that is now being created by the National Policy and the Tariff of 1869 which will give to the consumer prices as low as they possibly can be; and the marvel to me is that we are able at the present time, only three years after the introduction of the National Policy, to manufacture thirty

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

or forty of the leading articles here and sell them at a less price, or as low, as they were sold for before this duty was imposed. With reference to the cotton industry, we have at present 200,000 spindles, within twelve months there will be 400,000, and within a year probably 500,000, and then competition will be so sharp that we will find that the manufacturers themselves, though they may not be reduced to the point referred to by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance that their capital will be ruined by competition, certainly we will be in the position that whatever may be said to-day as to whether the true price is $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or as may be said here, $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in excess of what they were before, there is this important fact as shown by the public documents and the Trade Returns, that the whole imports of cotton goods in 1880, yielded a duty of $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the whole of them, or 5 per cent. above what was collected in 1878, or contributing to the Treasury of the Dominion of Canada \$450,000 a year more than was collected in 1878. As I said before, I here repeat, that we must necessarily expect a reduction in the revenue from this source as these establishments increase, though we may obtain in return a portion of the revenue that would be lost, or the goods consumed by the people engaged in these manufactures. Still we have a right to calculate that a considerable portion of the revenue now collected on these articles will no longer be collected, and that the day is not far distant when a larger portion of the goods consumed here will be made here and not imported, and at a price less than the average in 1873. I do not desire to go into this matter at greater length at present. There was something said about the prices of our cotton. I have had placed in my hand recently a statement, that since 1880 the cotton landed in Canada cost $12\frac{1}{2}$ c., in 1881, $11\frac{1}{2}$ c., in 1882, $12\frac{1}{2}$ c. I have this within the last two or three days. With reference to the value of cottons it is difficult to arrive at the true value. I understand that the value given in the Trade Returns is that of the article in the country to which it is imported, and that the price given by the hon. gentleman was the price of the cotton landed in Canada. Therefore, there has been nothing said by the hon. gentleman in the very elaborate statement furnished to him by the importers of cotton, that has shaken materially the statement that was made by me sometime since, of that description of cotton that is chiefly manufactured in Canada. Speaking of bleached cotton at the present moment, I think the hon. member stated there was one mill making bleached cotton. In six months another bleachery will be established in connection with one of the largest mills being erected in New Brunswick, where there will be sharp competition by the ablest Canadian manufacturers, with great capital at their disposal. I am satisfied the moment their establishment is completed for the bleaching of cotton, we will find that the competition will result in the reduction of prices, and that when we meet here next year it will be found that there will not be so great a discrepancy between the prices in Canada and the United States as there is to-day. But suppose the hon. member was correct, that we paid a little more for these articles that we consume, so far as the general policy is concerned, the very fact of the erection of these large establishments throughout the country, investing millions of dollars of capital and employing tens of thousands of people, the result will be that the indirect advantages we will derive from it will far outweigh any disadvantages we may have to undergo at present. But I hold that is not the case; and while there is a higher rate of duty paid on some articles and money is received by the people of this country for the payment of necessary expenditures for the redemption of the debt and for the future relief of the country from taxation, and while we are in our present prosperous position and going to prosper, as I feel satisfied we are, if the hon. gentleman could show that every statement which

he has read, which has been furnished to him by parties who have been his attorneys in preparing his case, the people of this country would say we throw aside any such statements as these and stand by the policy we inaugurated in 1879.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am no more desirous than the hon. gentleman to prolong the debate, but I would like to say a few words in reply to some remarks he has made. First of all let me say that the hon. gentleman has wholly failed to apprehend the argument submitted by my hon. friends. Their argument was not an argument in favor of Free Trade or against Protection. They confined themselves, and very properly, to these two things: first, to pointing out the excessive character of the profits and monopolies granted to half-a-dozen people of this community by the hon. gentleman, to the great detriment of the masses of the country; and secondly, to show how atrociously unjust to a large proportion of the people of this country is the scale of duties the hon. gentleman has adopted. Neither of these two points has the hon. gentleman attempted to meet in the slightest degree, and for excellent reasons, he could not meet them. He has no evidence which in the least disproved the statements of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) and my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Anglin). When he talks about my hon. friend presenting his case, arguing first on one side and then on the other, does the hon. gentleman forget how he and his colleagues in 1867 inaugurated their rule by enormously reducing the whole taxation of this country, and told us through the mouth of the Prime Minister that it was a step in the right direction. Has he forgotten how two years ago he himself declared it to be the aim and object of his policy to gradually reduce the imports of this country, whereas, as a matter of actual fact, he has largely increased them. Sir, the hon. gentleman talked to us just now about the shoddy blankets introduced into the country. The hon. gentleman has spent a great deal of time in visiting the various manufactories of this country, and had he made proper enquiries he would have found that in no one thing has the result of his policy been more marked than in the extent to which shoddy has been introduced into the woollen manufactures of this country in a great many cases. He told us that $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents was the amount added to the cost of the cotton dresses worn by the people of this country. If the hon. gentleman had told the exact fact he would have said that under his present policy every farmer's wife pays one-third more than she needed to pay for all those articles she uses for herself and children. The hon. gentleman has inflicted on the people of this country, and more particularly on the poorer classes, a tax ranging from 30 to 40, and even 50 per cent. on all the articles of raiment which they chiefly use. He says we pay no more than we used to on woollen goods. Let me take his own Trade Returns, and see from them the figures at which those goods could be laid down in every merchant's shop. Let me add the amount which on the inferior class of goods are charged by his Tariff—an amount making from 40 to 49 or 59, or even 69 per cent. Why, Sir, at this moment I could go into any shop in London and could obtain goods probably for two-thirds, and in many cases one-half the sum I am compelled to pay in Montreal, Toronto or any other city, and if that is true, as I know it to be true, in my own experience, it is ten or twenty times as true—if it is true of the high-priced goods, it is ten or twenty times as true of the low-priced goods, which pay a vast deal more. He talks about $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. being paid on our total imports. How is that made up? By paying a certain amount out on those goods which we did not manufacture in this country, and 30 or 40 per cent. on those goods imported in competition with our own manufacturers. Cannot the hon. gentleman understand the plain fact that it does not matter to the people a straw whether they pay

their taxes into the Treasury, or to the manufacturers of this country. The amount comes alike out of their pockets; and if, Sir, as the hon. gentleman knows, when we purchase goods from the manufacturer here, that manufacturer avails himself of this Tariff to raise the price to us to within 1 or 2 per cent. of the sum which we would have to pay after paying the duty, that is just as great a tax on us, and on the consuming people as if it was directly taken out of our pockets by the Custom house officers. Now, the hon. gentleman cannot deny the figures submitted by my hon. friend, as to the enormous profits made by these people. I have always admitted it was a matter which was perfectly plain and easy to be seen when these gentlemen came to me and demanded increased protection, that those who were on the ground, those who had the control of capital were likely to make enormous profits and how? Not fairly, not justly, not reasonably, but out of the power of taxing the rest of the community for their particular benefit; but I and my hon. friend and the party with which we were connected refused to allow ourselves to be made a catspaw or the instrument of a small class to the detriment of the whole. We desire by all reasonable and fair means to aid the manufacturers of this country. I have made enquiry, and more particularly with reference to the cotton manufacturers. I knew the facts stated by my hon. friend; I knew that where due skill and diligence were exercised and a proper amount of capital employed, the cotton manufacturers of Canada, before 1879, were making large and liberal profits—as high as 20 and 25 per cent.—and I was not disposed to add, as the hon. Minister has truly stated, one and a-half millions to their individual profits—in the case of two mills alone—at the expense of the rest of the community.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not state that.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman took my hon. friend's figures and he was not able to gain-say them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I said it was impossible that they could be correct, unless there was some speculation.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is possible. You give the proprietors of two mills the right to tax four millions of people; and it is just as easy for them to turn stocks of \$400,000 or \$500,000 into stocks of \$1,500,000, as it is for the proprietors of half a dozen sugar refineries to tax the people one million and a quarter per annum, as they have done for the last three or four years, through the instrumentality of the hon. gentleman's Tariff; and if the hon. gentleman has no better proof to give of the success of his policy than these sugar refineries, he stands self-condemned as false to his trust, as having abused his power, and the power the majority at his back gives him, to tax the many for the benefit of a very few. Now, Sir, I grant freely that there is no use of discussing this question on the basis of Free Trade; we are not in a position to adopt Free Trade here; we have to impose a heavy Tariff, as I have always pointed out, to obtain the revenue we require; but the difference between us and the hon. gentleman is, that we desire to have a tariff just to the poor as well as the rich; and it is plain to a demonstration that the Tariff the hon. gentleman has imposed is one of the most unjust that could possibly be devised as between these two classes of the community. When you have specific taxes as heavy as the hon. gentleman has imposed upon articles which form a very large part of the clothing of all classes, and which range in value from 3 or 4 cents to 17 or 18 cents, these specific duties must necessarily inflict a gross injustice; and I was astonished at hearing the hon. gentleman denounce us because we refused to repeal a specific duty on tea, a specific duty much less than the hon. gentleman himself had imposed when he was formerly Minister of Customs. Hon. gentlemen who heard his speeches

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

may remember that on no one point was that hon. gentleman louder than the inherent injustice of the specific duty on tea. It was idle for me to show that that duty worked a loss of about one-half a cent per head to the people of this Dominion, and was compensated for in other ways. Why, the hon. gentleman does not hesitate to inflict a loss of 6 or 7 cents on every individual yard of cloth which goes into the dresses of the children or the wives of the poorest men in this country, and at the same time talks of his disinclination to inflict an injustice on these people. Take the hon. gentleman's own remission of the tea duties. In the case of many poor families, we know that they cannot afford to use more than ten or twelve pounds of tea, and the hon. gentleman's total remission in these cases would not amount to more than 60 or 70 cents per family. I tell him that one single dress for a child costs at least 60 or 70 cents more than it need cost, under the operation of this specific duty.

Mr. BOWELL. That would be ten yards of stuff for a child.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. No, it would not. The hon. gentleman has an enormous specific duty and an enormous *ad valorem* duty besides. I am speaking of the duties on the articles which the workmen of this Dominion consume, and I say that on an enormous number of articles of heavy stuff you have put 17 or 20, and in some cases 25 cents a yard. Now, Sir, what is the result of this, even to the manufacturers themselves? Why, Sir, there are other manufacturers in Canada besides those who are manufacturing cotton or woollen goods, and by this unjust and oppressive system of taxation you injure all these other manufacturers very considerably. You add considerably to the cost of living of their employes, so that they must either raise their wages, or their standard of comfort must be seriously deteriorated; you interfere with their power to sell their goods to the community, and you interfere materially with their chance of carrying on an export trade. We notice by the returns that the export trade of corn is falling off, that our shipping trade is declining, and no wonder, when we have paralyzed the introduction of any foreign goods into this country, at the same time we add to the cost of production in this country. Now, apart from the article of food, the vast expenditure of every workingman in this country is necessarily for the clothing of himself and his family. I have always felt that our late Tariff was put up as high as it ought to be, having regard to the comfort of the great mass of the community. In some important respects I thought it was too high, and, apart from the requirements of the revenue, I regretted to have to impose it, because I hold the simple straightforward doctrine that it is a great injury to the community to increase the taxes on any account whatever. Now, Sir, the other day, when the hon. Minister of Agriculture was giving us an estimate of the cost of each child in this country, I think he put it as high as \$50 per annum.

Mr. POPE. No, I never did.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did so. No doubt he has forgotten it, but he entered into a calculation of what it would cost to rear a child in this country. But it is not a matter of much consequence whether the hon. gentleman was right or wrong in that contention. My point is that the large proportion of the expenditure of the people goes either for food or clothing, and the hon. gentleman has added enormously to the cost of clothing by these excessive taxes on cottons and woollens. As it involves some 40 or 50 per cent., taking the average of both cottons and woollens, on all the articles that go into the clothing of the poorer classes, it is easy to see how enormous a tax the hon. gentleman has inflicted on each family, and he cannot inflict that tax without at the same

time largely diminishing the whole standard of the people of Canada, and injuring to a large extent the self-respect, both of parents and children. There is no one thing more desirable for us to do than to provide that the children of the people of all classes shall be well and properly clothed. That is a matter of the greatest importance in a moral and social point of view as well as in a political point of view, and the hon. member, by this Tariff, renders it to a great extent impossible for a great number of people to clothe their children as they wish and ought to clothe them. That is the effect of the hon. gentleman's policy, an effect which is ever produced to a large extent in other countries where a similar unwise system of taxation has prevailed. The hon. gentleman had a great opportunity in his lands. By no skill of his, by no exercise of ability, but by fortunate chance or by fortunate decrees of Providence which gave us good harvests at a time when other nations in the world were afflicted by something like a famine, we obtained a very great advantage and the revenue very largely increased. We had at the same time thrown open a large extent of country in the North-West, which it is of great importance we should settle. What the hon. Minister has done is this: He has to the uttermost of his power thrown away that advantage. He has done all that in him lay to make it possible by this monstrous Tariff, which cannot ever be called a protective Tariff, but which is an unjust Tariff, especially to the poor, to deprive us, to a very great extent, of the advantage which we might otherwise have fairly expected, and which our agents might have held out to the people of the Old World.

Several hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman opposite does not appear to understand, and I am sure his followers do not, judging from what I have seen and known. I dare say they suppose the people of the Old World are as benighted and ignorant of the first principles of common sense as, I regret to say, are a great many people of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite had an opportunity to give a great impulse to immigration, and to be able to show that here they could obtain supplies of necessary goods more reasonably than in the United States, and place them as far as they could, on a par with the people of the United States, as regards the cost of living. What they have done is to throw away that advantage, to increase the cost of living and to add to the difficulties of settlers in the North-West. Apart from the tax on coal, the hon. gentleman has secured no addition to the revenue, because it is perfectly clear to a demonstration that the Tariff which we had in force, if applied to the scale of importation, would naturally have given as much. The increased exports we were able to send across the ocean, would have given us to-day quite as large a revenue as the hon. gentleman now boasts of. The present time of prosperity may receive a check, as has occurred several times previously, and what will then be our position? It will be simply this: we shall have thrown away our advantage. The savings which our people are able to make are being absorbed, not for the benefit of that people but for the benefit of a select few. We will find when the day comes, which the hon. Minister partly expects, that our imports are checked, and the temporary inflation has passed away, that the taxes will remain and the cost of living will remain, while the position of the people under this Tariff will be infinitely worse than ever before, even in the worst days of the depression.

Mr. PLUMB. We have heard very much the same line of argument addressed to the House by the hon. gentleman before, and we are quite accustomed to being told that we know nothing of the first principles of political economy, that we are utterly ignorant and are slavish followers of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Well, I think

there was a time when the blind, ignorant, servile followers of that hon. gentleman followed him over the precipice of 1878, and I think we will have wisdom enough to avoid the downfall to which that hon. gentleman led his followers by the insatiate policy which he and his associates pursued while in office. The hon. gentleman says the Finance Minister has been false to his trust, and has abused his power. That is the sort of language the hon. gentleman uses, who was rejected by his constituents and forced into another constituency, and who stands to-day in the estimation of the people of Canada as being entitled to the adjectives given him by the *Globe* in 1872 before he left the Conservative party and went over to the other side, when it declared he was a "mixer and muddler of figures." No man with his opportunities has mixed and muddled figures more than the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and who always poses as an authority on financial matters. The hon. gentleman says we have imposed a heavy tax on the poor man so as to prevent him from enjoying the comforts of life, and he asserted that the Tariff imposed a tax on a baby's dress of no less than 70 cents. It is well known that in no case could the tax exceed 1 cent or 1½ cents per yard, the baby's dress must therefore have had a skirt forty-six yards in length. The hon. gentleman's idea of baby clothes are quite equal to those of the leader of the Opposition, who stated in one of those arguments which he labors over, and gives to the House from a brief, that it requires seven yards of material to make a man's shirt. The garment must have, in such a case, been very large or the man very tall. The hon. member for Centre Huron further declared that the present Tariff actually prevented the poor man from clothing his children properly. I can remember well when the passages of this building were besieged by the starving men during the *régime* of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the late hon. First Minister was compelled to escape through the basement of this building in order to evade the masses who were pressing him for work. What difference did it make to them whether goods were cheap or not at that time? What a mockery to say there were no prices at that time when there was no labor for the workingman, while now every man is employed and is receiving full wages, when it is impossible in Toronto to find a laboring man not employed. I know that labor in Toronto is both scarce and dear at present. Parties who wanted laborers the other day had to send to the Emigration Office, not being able to get them in the city. They could not find a single man idle; and if the workingman now pays a cent or a cent and a half a yard more for the cotton in his baby's dress than formerly, he is perfectly happy to bring it home to his wife, because he buys her better food and provisions than under the *régime* of hon. gentlemen opposite, no matter how cheap cottons then were. But these hon. gentlemen are such friends of the poor man, that under their *régime* they kept him poor—the poor were always with them; and if they attained power again they would reduce him to the poverty he was plunged in while they held the reins of power during those five disastrous years. The hon. gentleman says that it was by no skill of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, but by the fortunate decree of Providence that we had a good harvest, but that we have failed to take advantage of our opportunities to open up the North-West. But after five years of struggle the hon. gentleman opposite completely failed to open up the North-West. They had a policy for settling up the North-West, by which the lands for 40 miles on each side of the railway were reserved so that no man could buy an acre, no settler could go there unless he paid \$1.25 an acre, and agree to pay such further sums as the Government might please to exact. We all know what kind of a pressure would be put on the settlers if in the hands of such an unscrupulous Government like that of hon. gentlemen op-

posite, if there were dues to collect during an election. Not only would they have to pay heavy prices for their lands, but they would have the screws put on them most heartlessly. I am glad that settlers never entered into that transaction. Does the hon. gentleman know that from January till the 10th April, 1832, 21,000 emigrants have gone to the North-West, and since the 10th April 10,000 more, a larger number than during the whole five years during which these hon. gentlemen attempted to carry out their singular policy in regard to the Pacific Railway, which culminated in their bringing in a Bill during their last year of office which promised any fifteen persons, no matter whom, that associated together a title and certificate from the Minister of the Interior, to become a railway corporation, to pay them 10 per cent. or \$6,000 a mile, and to give them 6,250 acres a mile bonus. There were no restrictions either as to the kind of rails they should lay, the kind of grade they should make, or as to the time in which they should build the road or the price for hauling the traffic. The member for North Norfolk, when advocating the passage of that Bill, said the scheme would only absorb half the lands of the North-West, thus favoring the granting of 125,000,000 acres to irresponsible parties who should girdle the whole country with railroads and tap the Canadian Pacific, and utterly destroy the chances of its bringing one ounce of traffic in Ontario or Quebec. And yet the hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that this Government has failed to take advantage of the opportunities in opening up the North-West. The scheme of hon. gentlemen opposite was to destroy the Pacific Railway, and give a bonus to every bogus railway company—to give the whole of that property to irresponsible parties, who could have built railroads without check or restriction. Yet we were told by the hon. the Minister of the Interior in the late Administration that it was only in this way the North-West could be opened up; and the hon. member for North Norfolk stated that it was useless to attempt to get capital into the North-West, unless you gave it every privilege; that the whole of the western States were settled by such a policy, and that it was silly for us to haggle upon a few hundred acres to the mile. I repeat there was no restriction in regard to the railways to be built in that region. These hon. gentlemen were not so critical then as when criticising the present contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Such was the feeling in regard to the scheme of the late Government, such was the disagreement among its supporters themselves, that the Premier dared not bring his Bill to a vote, and had to withdraw it ignominiously; and that was the result of five years' cogitation on the part of hon. gentlemen who now find fault with my hon. friend for his supposed neglect of his opportunity to open up the North-West. Hon. gentlemen ought never to open their mouths with respect to the railway policy of the Government, after the exhibition of that scheme exposed in the House, during a late debate. They should never presume to go before the people and talk about monopolies in the North-West when they intended to hand over one-half of the lands to parties over whom the late Government would have had no control—whom they would have permitted to build roads without fixing anything as to the freights, alignment, grades or curves. They took power to alter their whole homestead and land laws in order to satiate the sharks who were invited to come in and build those railroads. But I rise simply to show briefly the evidence of one of the most intelligent gentlemen of this country, an experienced merchant and manufacturer, a man well known for business ability and an authority on all subjects on which he speaks; a few extracts from the practical, plain, common-sense evidence of that gentleman, to dispose of the special pleading of the hon. gentleman who has treated us for the last two hours and a-half to the most tedious tirade which was ever made or read in this

Mr. PLUMB.

House, contrary to the rules of the House, and which he has imposed on the House to try our patience in a way in which I believe the House by-and-bye will learn to resent. He rose, and with a hundred or two hundred pages of manuscript he read page after page on subjects on which I am quite sure he could not have been examined ten minutes after he laid down the papers. We have had evidence striking enough, that he dare not show the name of the gentlemen who gave him what he considers proof of his views. He dared not produce the names of those who had furnished him with that information, and he expects that the country will be deluded by that kind of wire-woven argument which he brings here. He imagines that that sort of thing is going to fill the popular heart. Why, no man, unless he were an expert in the trade, could possibly follow him for five minutes, and I undertake to say there is not a man who sits behind him that understood one word of the argument he was endeavoring to make. I noticed that the hon. gentleman for Bothwell, his greatest admirer and most devoted follower, calmly resigned himself to slumber during the speech of his leader, and was probably dreaming about anything except the theories that the hon. gentleman discussed. I am going to read the evidence of a man who is not ashamed to put his name to what he says, and who knows what he is talking about, and I call the attention of the House to his statements:

"Woolen goods of Canadian manufacture are cheaper now than they were prior to 1878, but of course you will understand that the price of raw material must more or less affect the price of manufactured articles. The prices of wool were as follows from 1876 to 1878:—Rio averaged 17½ cents a pound, and since 20 cents a pound. Cape wool, 17½ and 20½ cents respectively, and Canadian fleece 26 and 25½ cents. I may say that Canadian fleece wool is not used now very largely by Canadian manufacturers, except in making blankets. It is too long. It is true it is utilized in the manufacture of the coarser classes of carpets, but our carpet industry is not yet extensive, although it is growing, and I am satisfied that it will continue prospering more and more under the present Tariff. Pulled wool averaged 26½ cents a pound prior to 1878, and 29½ cents since, and Monte Video 17½ and 19½ cents respectively, and generally speaking woolen goods, which were 72 cents a yard prior to 1878, have been since 71 cents a yard. I am connected with cotton and woollen mills in Cornwall and with the Londonderry iron works in Nova Scotia, where alone pig iron is produced in Canada. The effect of the Tariff has been to advance the price of Canadian pulled wool, which is being grown in steadily increasing quantities, as it is more suitable for Canadian coarse tweeds than fleece wool. Southdown and Oxford wools are largely used in the manufacturing of medium tweeds and flannels. The duty on woollen goods affects the price of wool by enlarging the home market and increasing the demand for wools in the country, by which farmers can be materially benefitted. At the Cornwall mill we make both blankets and tweeds, coarser medium tweeds, and white and grey blankets. We have now succeeded in turning out very beautiful blankets, which, in my opinion, are superior to the imported article. For these purposes I think Canadian wool is mostly employed. The blankets are now as low in price as they were at any time previous to the Tariff. We made them at Cornwall from 1859 to 1874, when we ceased owing to foreign competition, which prevented the enterprise yielding any return, but the prices during the last three years have been lower than they formerly were by fully 20 per cent. We are supplying a market which was previously occupied by imported articles, but now the importation does not compare in the proportion of one to ten to what it was previous to the introduction of the National Policy. That an increase in the market enables manufacturing to be carried on more cheaply is a great principle in the business. Anyone so engaged will understand that the great thing is to get a continued run upon one class of goods. The manufacturer is not like a merchant. The profit of the former is measured by the production of his machinery, and the larger the production the cheaper he can manufacture. This explains why we are now selling our blankets cheaper, and this applies to every class of goods. The wages we pay have increased in some instances as much as 30 per cent., and in all branches of manufacture they have been advanced. There is a most useful class of flannels which are used very largely by the people of this country, grey flannels. These were first made at Chambly, but the prices remain as low as ever they were, excepting one year, when the Chambly mill endeavored to drive competitors out of the market by cutting prices, but failed. Canadian etoffes are supplied at from 42½ to 45 cents per yard, weighing 14 or 15 ounces, and this proves that these goods have not been advanced in price by the Tariff. I will use a statement contained in a letter from the agents for such goods in Montreal. Seeing that there is no advance in prices, it may well be asked, where is the benefit of the Tariff to manufacturers? Our answer to this is simply that the mills are all kept fully employed, and are turning out more goods, and the Tariff is so evenly balanced that if the prices were increased the manufacturers, in our opinion, would lose

sales by importers turning their attention to foreign goods. You see the National Policy has enlarged our market; it has displaced foreign goods and we are supplying the consumers. That is the whole thing. No manufacturer can live, it does not matter what price you give him, unless he can sell his goods as fast as he can make them."

I rose more particularly to read this important extract, one ounce of which I think is worth a ton of such arguments as were given us by the hon. gentleman who detained us two or three hours reading from his brief. These hon. gentlemen are addressing themselves now in the interest of the importing merchants, and if the hon. gentleman ventured to give the names of his informants it would be found they are importing merchants, men who are in direct hostility to the manufacturing industries of the country. Sir, this is the hon. gentleman who addressed the House on a previous occasion at two or three o'clock in the morning, when his followers were wearied out, when he spoke an hour and a half on the manufacture of window glass, in which he said that we could not compete with Belgium, although we had cheaper taxes and cheaper material. I merely wanted to say that we have been told that Belgium would undersell us in our window-glass, no matter how much protection we put upon it, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that Belgium is a higher protected country than any other country in Europe, and has a higher protective tariff in many respects than even the United States. Under this tariff she has so far prospered that she can undersell England in window-glass in her own market. She takes heavy iron works and undersells England in the very markets where iron and coal are produced together. The evidence I read just now was given by the Hon. D. McInnes, President of a Manufacturing Association in Cornwall, a practical man whose word, I think, will be accepted by this House quite as ready as the anonymous statements given by the hon. gentleman whose authors were ashamed to give their names.

Amendment (Mr. Anglin) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Anglin, | Geoffrion, | Olivier, |
| Bain, | Gillies, | Paterson (Brant), |
| Béchar, d, | Gillmor, | Pickard, |
| Blake, | Gunn, | Rinfret, |
| Borden, | Guthrie, | Robertson (Shelburne), |
| Bourassa, | Haddow, | Rogers, |
| Browe, | Holton, | Ross (Middlesex), |
| Burpee (St. John), | Huntington, | Rymal, |
| Burpee (Sunbury), | Irvine, | Scrivier, |
| Cameron (Huron), | Killam, | Skinner, |
| Cartwright, | King, | Smith, |
| Casey, | Laurier, | Snowball, |
| Casgrain, | McDonald, (Vic., N.S.), | Sutherland, |
| Charlton, | MacDonnell, (Inv'ness), | Thompson, |
| Dumont, | Melsaac, | Trow, |
| Fiset, | Malouin, | Weldon, and |
| Fleming, | Mills, | Wheler.—52 |
| Flynn, | | |

NAYS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Abbott, | Fulton, | Méthot, |
| Allison, | Gault, | Mongenais, |
| Amyot, | Gigault, | Montplaisir, |
| Arkell, | Girouard (Jac. Cartier), | Mousseau, |
| Baker, | Girouard (Kent), | Muttart, |
| Bannerman, | Grandbois, | O'Connor, |
| Beaty, | Guillet, | Ogden, |
| Beauchesne, | Hackett, | Orton, |
| Benoit, | Haggart, | Quimet, |
| Bergeron, | Hay, | Patterson (Essex), |
| Bill, | Hesson, | Pinsonneault, |
| Bolduc, | Hilliard, | Plumb, |
| Boulbee, | Homer, | Pope (Compton), |
| Bourbeau, | Hooper, | Poupore, |
| Bowell, | Houde, | Reid, |
| Brecken, | Hurteau, | Richey, |
| Brooks, | Jackson, | Robertson (Hamilton), |
| Bauster, | Kilvert, | Rochester, |
| Bunting, | Kirkpatrick, | Rouleau, |
| Burham, | Kranz, | Routhier, |

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Carling, | Landry, | Royal, |
| Caron, | Lane, | Ryan (Marquette), |
| Cimon (Chicoutimi), | Langevin, | Ryan (Montreal), |
| Costigan, | Lantier, | Rykert, |
| Coughlin, | Longley, | Scott, |
| Coupal, | Macdonald (Kings), | Shaw, |
| Coursol, | Macdonald (Sir John), | Spronle, |
| Currier, | McDonald (Cape Breton), | Stephenson, |
| Cuthbert, | Macmillan, | Tassé, |
| Daly, | McCallum, | Tellier, |
| Daoust, | McQuaig, | Tilley, |
| Dawson, | McDougald, | Tyrwhitt, |
| Desaulniers, | McGreevy, | Valin, |
| Desjardins, | McLennan, | Valtée, |
| Domville, | McLeod, | Wade, |
| Drew, | McQuade, | Wallace (Norfolk), |
| Dugas, | McRory, | Wallace (York), |
| Elliott, | Massue, | White (Renfrew), and |
| Farrow, | Mermer, | Williams.—118. |
| Fortin, | | |

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

157. Expenses connected with the Geological Survey...\$80,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report of the Director of the Geological Survey shows how much has been expended, and the additional vote of \$10,000 is simply to do so much more field work on the survey.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I suggest that much might be done if some borings were caused to be made at points in the North-West. Some attempt, I think, was made two years ago, but to the best of my recollection only a small sum was available, and some members of the Geological Survey told me they were completely stopped for want of funds. Of course I am quite aware that anything like close boring would be inconvenient, but it would be a matter of great importance that a few borings at a distance of 100 or 150 miles from each other were made along the Manitoba frontier for the purpose of ascertaining the junctions a little better than we know them now, and also of locating one of the coal fields that we know to exist in that region.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Selwyn went himself to the Souris district at my request and examined the coal measures there. There have been no borings westward nor north towards the Saskatchewan, but the surveys have shown that there was a large coal measure there easily available, and of good quality. When we were discussing a resolution about coal, I mentioned that some English gentleman, who has dealt considerably in coal, has procured a portion of the coal region and is now sending out employes and machinery in order to commence work this summer.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. If I recollect aright from the account I read the explorations of Mr. Selwyn only extended over 200 miles of country. My proposition had reference to a series of borings to be made up to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. What Mr. Selwyn has done is available so far as it goes.

Mr. CASBY. I should be very glad to know that \$10,000 were intended to be expended on further explorations in the North-West. It is time we should protest against the course pursued during many years of expending the principal portion of the grant on mineral explorations in Nova Scotia. No doubt it is an interesting field, geologically and economically, but the lands belong either to the Provinces or to individuals. Increased attention should be given to the North-West, where the public lands belong to the Dominion. Borings have been carried on for some time. Mr. Selwyn conducted borings for coal at distances twenty miles apart, but did not make any fresh discoveries. It is absurd, however, to make borings at such distances apart, because if such were done even in the case of Spring Hill important deposits might not be touched. One boring made by Mr. Selwyn was on the banks of the Souris River where an outcrop of coal occurred. The next

boring in the same neighborhood, but instead of it being commenced from the bed of the stream which is 150 feet below the prairie level, it was commenced on the top and it did not reach the depth at which coal was found at the first boring. The borings were not carried on to the depth contracted for. I hope the hon. Minister will see, not only that a large amount is voted to geological explorations in the North-West, but that the money will be efficiently spent, as Mr. Selwyn did not efficiently spend it during the last summer.

Mr. MILLS. Are any steps being taken towards completing the collection of the Natural History Department?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amount is for field work only.

Mr. MILLS. With respect to the Geological Survey, it is of special consequence that a large expenditure should be made in the North-West for some years, in order that we may more thoroughly ascertain its natural resources. There are salt springs and petroleum beds as well as coal fields, and it is highly desirable that their location and value should be ascertained at a very early period. Salt was of very great consequence, and the salt springs were found capable of being worked.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This was a general vote for field work. Before Mr. Selwyn makes his arrangements the suggestions would be considered; and I agree that a large portion of the money should be expended in exploring the new territory.

Mr. ANGLIN. The value of the Geological Survey in the Lower Provinces is as great as anywhere else, for although the lands belong to private individuals their development contributes to the general prosperity of the Dominion. I have, however, no objection to the surveys being carried on more largely in the North-West, and they will probably prove of great value.

158. Indians, Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces, \$25,600

In reply to Mr. MILLS,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase of \$1,800 for the Indian schools in these Provinces. The usual annual grants for the Indians of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is \$4,500, and it is found that that vote is fully absorbed in taking care of the Indians, and though the Indians of those Provinces are worse taken care of than those of the other Provinces, \$900 has been annually taken out of the grant for each Province to support six schools. It is now proposed that a special vote shall be taken for these schools, and it is shown by the reports that five other schools are required, three in New Brunswick and two in Nova Scotia. These five schools make \$1,500, which with the \$1,800 for the others, make \$3,300, the increase to the vote.

Mr. MILLS. I think it would be well to consider the advisability of putting these schools under the charge of the school authorities of the respective Provinces, the Government here paying the salaries of the teachers, as thereby more careful examinations and better work would be secured.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter has not been brought to my attention, but I will consider the suggestion.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reduction of annuities under the Robinson Treaty is owing to there being an unexpended balance of cash on hand with interest.

162 {	For Indians of British Columbia generally....	23,300 00
	Surveys	7,600 00
	Reserve Commission.....	11,249 31

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In British Columbia Mr. Sproat has resigned, and Mr. O'Reilly, Government Mr. CASEY.

Inspector, is his successor. He is a very efficient man, and the salary is saved so long as he serves. He is now actively engaged in settling the matters of the Reserve Commission.

Mr. CASEY. A missionary from British Columbia, who came here to see the Department about Indian affairs in that Province, informed me that there was really a prospect of trouble with the Indians there unless something definite was done for them, as has been done for the Indians in other districts. It appears that to the present time nothing has been done in regard to their reserves or payments, and they seem to think they are ill-treated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have a Reserve Commission which has been laying out reserves for several years. The Indians take to these reserves very well, and I do not think the Indians are at all aggrieved unless they are told so by designing whites.

Mr. CASEY. I think a missionary living among the Indians should know their condition better than the hon. gentleman. If this Commission has been working for years at an expenditure of \$11,000 a year, it is very strange that it has not been able to locate the Indians on their reserves.

Mr. MILLS. I must say I think the Commission is being protracted very long. I think it has been in existence for upwards of seven years, and during that time it ought to have succeeded in locating 30,000 Indians. I think it is highly undesirable to suggest to the Indians that they are entitled to be pensioned out of the Public Treasury; but there is no doubt that they were dissatisfied and that the Government of British Columbia were not disposed to deal very generously with the Indian population. One of the difficulties of the Commission in its early days was to find reserves marked out, because in many instances territories that the Indians claimed had already been granted as pre-emptions to white settlers. I think the Government ought to be able to bring this Commission to a close very soon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true there has been some difficulty, from the disinclination of the Government of British Columbia, to enter early into the question of settling the reserves. But I do not think there is now any obstruction in the way, and I am quite sure that Mr. O'Reilly's report will be accepted by the British Columbia Government, and I believe Mr. O'Reilly to be an active, energetic officer, full of zeal for the service, even to the neglect of his own interests, and from what I have seen and known of him I am satisfied that he will not remain in the office any longer than there is need for him to do so.

163. Indians in Manitoba and the North-West..... * 830,499.39

Mr. MILLS. I called the attention of the hon. Minister last year to the largeness of the sum for annuities, and to the fact that when you collected the payments made of the annuities due for different years, it was pretty clear, from the Public Accounts, that we had not an accurate return of the number of Indians of the various bands, and that through Indian dishonesty a considerable number were paid twice or even a third time. The sums paid last year and this year are very much larger than four or five years ago. In 1879 the amount was \$164,000, or nearly \$40,000 less than at present. Of course there were some bands of Indians in treaty No. 6 who had not accepted the provisions of the treaty a few years ago, and were not paid, and this will make some difference. Still I think there are frauds practiced on the Government in the receipt of those annuities in the North-West. Another thing I will mention, before 1876 the Public Estimates were made up just as these are, when the hon. gentleman, now Minister of the Interior, strongly insisted upon receiving a detailed statement as to the number of the Indians in the different treaties who were to receive annuities, and the amount paid. Thus, in the Estimates for 1879 it was

stated the Indians in treaties Nos. 1 and 2 were to receive \$27,000; No. 3, \$15,640, &c. Now, the hon. gentleman, instead of adhering to that rule, has asked for a lump sum, and the same with regard to the purchase of agricultural implements, provisions, payments, &c. It is very much more difficult to follow the expense when only a lump sum is brought down than if a detailed statement were submitted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that there have been some frauds and some Indians paid twice. They are very clever fellows, and some of the agents cannot know one Indian from another, they look so much alike; but of course these frauds will become more difficult by degrees. True, these annuities were not so large in 1876; but the hon. gentleman gave the reason in stating that the Indians are coming in very largely and claiming their annuities, and now the American Government are driving British Indians who were in the United States into our North-West and insisting that they shall not be allowed to come back.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There were about 8,000 families receiving annuities; families of about five persons each to judge by the amount paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say; I do not know much about the prolific qualities of the Indians.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is clear from the vote that there is an average of about five Indians to each family and that we are paying about \$100 a family, which is an enormous sum *per se*.

163. Agricultural Implements.....\$23,616

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How is that enormous increase going to be distributed or arranged?

Mr. MACMILLAN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that it would be desirable, in asking for tenders, that the articles should be inspected in Ontario before being sent to the North-West. The inspection would be an easy matter. Thus would be created a greater competition than at present; because competitors object very seriously to taking such articles to the North-West and then having them refused. In the notices calling for tenders we are really advertising the American manufactures, particularly when they ask for a plough that is equal to the John Deer Plough, Chicago. I am quite sure we can manufacture as good articles as the United States, and we should not advertise their manufactures. Besides, in advertising for reapers, attention is called to another United States firm, the McCormick Manufacturing Co. We are thus holding out inducements to people to believe that they manufacture better farm implements in the United States than in Canada. By inspection in Ontario, and proper competition, I am positive we could get those implements 10 to 20 per cent. cheaper than when inspected in the North-West. The work would not take over one week or twelve days at the outside, and would prevent the rejection of articles on their arrival in that region after the payment of freight on them.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman is wrong as to the American plough, which has been made a specialty for a quarter of a century. It is better than ours; and the soil is so tenacious in the North-West that an ordinary plough does not clean. Scarcely a farm you pass in the North-West that you do not see one or two Canadian ploughs thrown aside. I think there is no harm in saying that Canadian ploughs are equal to that good American plough, because it is a particularly useful one; and if people here can make as good it is right to advertise it.

Mr. MACMILLAN. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his views on the subject, but I happen to have travelled as far in the North-West as he, and can speak with some little knowledge on the subject. In many

instances, they prefer the Ontario manufacture to the John Deer plough. All along Portage la Prairie and Brandon they consider our ploughs quite as good as the John Deer. Because the latter have had heretofore a reputation, I do not think we should desire to continue it as against our own manufactures.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) ought to know that in the very town in which he resides ploughs are made not at all inferior to those made in the United States. In the little town of Millbank Mr. Covony, a large manufacturer there, is manufacturing a similar description of ploughs, and selling them at the lowest prices. I do not see why the Government should apply for a Deer plough or any other plough made outside of Canada, when we can furnish them here of the highest quality. †

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is asking for \$12,000 more for agricultural implements than last year. No doubt the Indians in all the various bands have been supplied with agricultural implements, &c., which the Government were obliged to give them under previous stipulations. I suppose the Government are now proceeding to give the Indians implements and cattle gratuitously.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In Mr. Dewdney's report the hon. gentleman will find the matter fully gone into. As the Indians are now settling on the reserves, the desire is to furnish them with implements which will remain the property of the Government.

163. Provisions for Annuity Payments..... \$43,440 07

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is really not an increase over last year, when the expenditure was much greater than the vote. The hon. Minister of Finance and the Department of the Interior thought that was an excessive estimate, and it was cut down; but the result proved that the local authorities were right in their estimate. Then it was hoped that the Indians, as soon as they were settled upon their reserves, would relieve us from this expenditure. It is important to see whether any portion of this expenditure for provisions has been incurred in the payment being made to the Indians who are located upon the reservation.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How many does the hon. gentleman suppose will be added to the Indians already in our territory from that cause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From 4,000 to 6,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is he satisfied that these are Indians who properly belong to us, and who really had their domicile north of 49°?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no fear but that our own Indians will see that those who come across are really British Indians.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. Minister to say that a great many Indians had been rather arbitrarily forced across the line into our territory, but I did not understand him to mean Indians who had gone south.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are British Indians who may have been living south of the line for some time.

163. Supplies for destitute Indians..... \$294,525 20

Mr. MILLS. That is a large item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The original estimate for the current year was \$406,000, afterwards reduced to \$102,000. That was the estimate of last year, which latter sum has proved to be quite inadequate to the requirements of the service. Up to the 31st December, 1881, the ascertained expenditure was \$221,194, more than twice the amount of the reduced estimate of last year. Although half a year only has elapsed nearly as much more, it is estimated, will be required for the approximate half year.

Mr. MILLS. Then I must say it is pretty evident that the Indians have become pensioners upon the Public Treasury, that we are called upon to feed them, to clothe them, and that they are doing little or nothing for themselves. Now, I believe a barbarous population like the Indians may very easily be made wholly dependent upon the Government. I felt satisfied that that was the danger in dealing with the Indian population of the North-West, and I think that the extent to which they have been provided for during the past two or three years has produced such a condition of things that it will be very difficult to induce the Indians to devote themselves to industrial pursuits. I am of the opinion that the Government is largely responsible for this large sum. I have been told that in some instances the agents have told the Indians that if they did not hunt that they would be provided for at any rate, and the Indians have become discouraged. One party wrote me that a friend of his had been offered a very large sum if he would remain with an agent for the purpose of assisting him in feeding the Indians. He said the bands under him were not going out to hunt, and there would be a handsome thing in providing food for these Indians. Now, it is easy to see that unless there is some stringent check upon the appropriation that is being made for the Indians in this way, at a great distance from the seat of Government, and without any special supervision, there is great danger that the agents may be tempted to malappropriation of these funds.

Mr. HESSON. An agent can have nothing to do with furnishing supplies to these bands. We are driven into a large expenditure of this kind. We were told a year ago that this expenditure would go on increasing, by reason of the efforts made to induce the Indians to settle down under a system of farming. I desire to ascertain if the agents had control of the supplies under this item. If so, it is an unfortunate state of affairs; but I understand that the goods are furnished by contract.

Mr. CASEY. At whose discretion are supplies issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In case of apprehended famine the matter is to be dealt with on the spot; but the whole matter is dealt with by Mr. Dewdney, who has charge of the whole reserves. When the Indians are starving they have been helped, but they have been reduced to one-half and one-quarter rations; but when they fall into a state of destitution we cannot allow them to die for want of food. It is true that Indians so long as they are fed will not work. I have reason to believe that the agents as a whole, and I am sure it is the case with the Commissioner, are doing all they can, by refusing food until the Indians are on the verge of starvation, to reduce the expense. The buffalo has disappeared during the past few years. Some few came over this year, and although their arrival relieved the Indians, I was rather sorry, looking to the future, that such was the case, as the Blackfeet, Bloods, and Piegans who had settled on reserves at once returned to their nomadic habits and abandoned the settlements. It will occasionally happen that the agents will issue food too liberally, and the Government must depend on their agents—the agents advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite and who are doing the work well. I do not hear any complaints of dishonesty. One case occurred in which the agent would neither issue food or allow the Indians to take it, and the agent thought it was better he should issue it. We hope that the Indians will now settle down; but Indians are Indians, and we must submit to frequent disappointments in the way of civilizing them.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt the Indians will bear a great degree of starvation before they will work, and so long as they are certain the Government will come to their aid they will not do much for themselves. The maintenance of farms has

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

reached \$90,000, and although the experiment has been two years on trial there are no results therefrom, nothing adequate to warrant the expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indians eat the produce.

Mr. MILLS. Then that should be stated in order that we may arrive at a correct conclusion as to the cost of the Indians. No less than \$170,000 are expended for managing 30,000 Indians in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. More than that.

Mr. MILLS. Whatever the number may be it is not very large. No doubt if there was a white man on each reservation working with the Indians, showing them how to farm, and at the same time impressing upon them the fact that they must produce food for their sustenance, much greater results would have been accomplished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The farm is there on the reserve or just contiguous to it. We try to get a practical farmer with an assistant to work with the Indians. The expectation of the Commissioner is that the Indians will sow about 4,000 acres in the spring of 1882.

Mr. TROW. There is considerable force in the remark of the hon. gentleman for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in reference to indulging the Indians. It would be wrong, of course, to allow them to suffer, but they should be thrown on their own resources as far as possible. I have known bands of Indians to be lounging about when they might have been providing for themselves. Last fall we saw them in large numbers begging at points in Montana, when we counted in one day more than one hundred carcasses of buffalo on the prairie.

Mr. BANNERMAN. The hon. gentleman is speaking of the country south of the boundary line, and not of our own territory. There is nothing in which the Canadians compare more favorably with the people of the United States than in their treatment of the Indians.

161. North-West Mounted Police..... \$413,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This amount is estimated for 500 men instead of 300. The average cost of a Mounted Policeman and a horse, prior to 1879, was \$1,000 per annum. The cost during the current year will be \$875, while the estimate for 1882-83 is \$820. The average annual cost of an infantry soldier in the United States is \$1,000, and of a cavalry soldier, from \$1,600 to \$2,000. The cost per man and horse of the Mounted Police is \$875; the pay of the force, including the staff and gardeners, is \$160,000; the vote for 1881-82, was \$110,000. The present vote is for 500 men and 5 officers, an increase of 200 men; but no increase of officers.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 2:55 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 27th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to be embodied in Bill (No. 36) respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. CASEY. Is the hon. member satisfied with the propriety of making a per diem allowance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government will take care to limit the time as far as possible to save expense.

Mr. BLAKE. The possibility of travelling expenses ought not to be recognized in the case of persons named to assist the Board. Those persons should belong to the localities in which the examinations are held, and not require travelling expenses.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move that the words "exclusive of travelling expenses" be struck out in the case of sub-examiners.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose these local assistants are merely to see that the examination is fairly conducted, that they have nothing to do with the sending of papers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers will be sent to the local examiners and they will come back.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. I think this is objectionable. It is quite possible that the salaries of the Deputy-Heads ought not to be all at the same figure, but I cannot perceive any reason whatever for the proposed discretion which is to be given to the Governor in Council to determine what shall be the salary of a Deputy-Head. The Government knows, by this time, what are the duties and the responsibilities of the office of Deputy-Head of each Department. We ought to have a statement made of what the salaries are to be. I object, also, that there is no necessity for this discretion to the Governor in Council, because the Government knows to-day as well as it ever will know what the salaries ought to be. I object that it is contrary to sound principle to permit the Governor in Council to have this discretion without reason. I object, further, that so far as I can judge, it is intended to give a latitude to the Governor in Council subsequently to increase the salaries, and the salary of a Deputy-Head ought to be a fixed sum. I would ask the hon. Minister if it is intended that this salary shall be the sole emolument of all the Deputy-Heads. At present we have a system under which, in various forms, additional emoluments are paid to certain of the officers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman's objections are not well founded as to giving the Governor in Council power to fix these salaries. The hon. gentleman must see that by this Bill, the minimum and maximum salaries for these Deputy-Heads are fixed for this year. The Governor in Council will have no right to increase the salaries for this year, because we have no money voted to enable us to go beyond the maximum. But in the future, should the Governor in Council think that a salary is not sufficient, then they would have to ask Parliament for a vote of money to increase the salary; therefore the whole thing is in the hands of Parliament. The same rule will hold as to all other salaries. These provisions are not new, they are the provisions of the present law. Not a single dollar can be added to a salary without the previous sanction of Parliament. In answer to the hon. gentleman's question, I may say that no additional emolument of any kind will be given to these officers, whose maximum salaries shall not exceed \$4,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is to be done with those who are above \$4,000 now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a provision in the Bill by which the position of the present officers shall not be disturbed.

On resolution 5,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would move that the word "biennial" should be replaced by the word "annual."

Mr. CASEY. I think that is a step in the right direction, and that, indeed, the hon. Minister might go a little further. I think the annual increase in pay should be more rapid in the ranks of the service, because it is while a man is in the lower ranks that he is really improving.

Amendment agreed to.

On resolution 6,

Mr. CASEY. I think it is during the first two or three years of clerical service that a clerk improves in the knowledge of his duties. After that time no increase of salary should take place, unless he changes to more difficult work. I would prefer that such clerks should obtain an annual increase of \$100 for three or four years, and afterwards reduce it to a lower ratio, instead of the provision of \$50 a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it better to make the increase \$50 a year, for this reason: Third-class clerks are generally young men whose wants are less than those who have a number of persons dependent upon them. The increase is given in order that such clerks may improve during several years, in order that they may show themselves worthy of promotion.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister, in pursuing this course, is practically giving up perhaps the most important recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. In the English service it has been the practice for a considerable time to give fair salaries to the higher grades of officers, and to have a purely clerical staff at low salaries, quite distinct from the ordinary Civil Service. The practical result of the hon. gentleman's policy will be to give such clerks about \$1,000 a year, while the service will be filled with a large number of third or fourth rate men who are of no use except for purely clerical work. It would be much better to abolish the third class and have them placed on a similar footing with temporary clerks.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the prevailing salaries. The average salary in the Governor General's Secretary's Office is \$2,000; Privy Council, \$1,070; Department of Justice, \$1,300 in one Branch, and in the Penitentiaries Branch, \$1,362; Militia and Defence, \$1,344; Secretary of State, \$1,090; Department of the Interior, \$1,200; North-West Mounted Police, \$1,200; Department of Indian Affairs, \$1,010; Auditor-General, \$1,150; Department of Finance and Treasury Board, \$1,300; Inland Revenue, \$1,250; Customs, \$1,200; Savings Banks and Post Offices, \$951; Agriculture, \$1,084; Marine and Fisheries, \$1,240; Public Works, \$1,400; Railways and Canals, \$1,580. Many of those salaries are paid for purely clerical work, such as copying letters and documents. Take the Department of Militia and Defence, where there is no clerical work done, the average salary is \$1,334, the lowest salaries being \$600 to \$800. It is evident the country is paying some officers more than they are worth, while probably some of the higher officers are not paid enough. The worst feature of the Bill is that it proposes to continue this system instead of adopting that which prevails in England. I discussed the matter with the Chairman of the British Committee once or twice, and I learnt from him the great saving which had taken place in England, and I regret the same has not been adopted here. I regret exceedingly that it has not been introduced here. It is perfectly clear that it can be introduced, and that it ought to be introduced, and that it would serve an excellent purpose and enable us to do full justice to those classes I have referred to as being absolutely necessary in every Department—those possessing the higher grade of duties and the higher average of intelligence to perform them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think that by this measure we will obtain as good a class of officers as we would have had under the previous system; but I think the

average will not increase so fast as under the existing system, because now we have four classes instead of three, while the time a man may remain in a class is five years, by this measure the time fixed for the third class would be twelve years. Of course, an officer may be promoted from one class to another if there is a vacancy, and he is fit for it, and he has passed his examination. The increase from \$400 to \$1,000 will be slow; as it is by steps of \$50 a year, it will take twelve years to reach that maximum, so that if a young man enters the service at eighteen he will be thirty before he gets \$1,000, and if he enters at twenty-two he will be thirty-four. I think \$1,000 would not be an excessive salary for a man at that age, after spending that time in the public service.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman misapprehends our point. We say that it would be much better not to have any third class at all. If he likes he could admit a man into the second class, reducing the minimum salary and allowing them to work their way up. I am sure that that would add materially to the efficiency of the service within a few years. We do not want to bring into the service a class of men, respectable enough, but of very mediocre ability, who would regard \$1,000 as a very handsome salary. We want to secure men for the highest class of whom something can be made, and we would better the service considerably if we adopted the scale of salaries that the hon. gentleman proposes, because it would not allow him to give fair salaries to those who deserved them.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman's argument is sound with reference to those classes of officers who attain the maximum efficiency in two or three years, and who cannot rise any higher except by fitting themselves for what you may call the more intellectual classes of the service. I think the Commission demonstrated the fact that a large proportion of the whole work is of a routine, clerical, mechanical character, and they suggest that every man who is simply a good writer, and nothing more, ought to have eight or ten years in which to reach a salary of \$1,000. It is not our experience of that class of persons that they earn any more, and why should they in the Civil Service? I should be sorry to say that writers should not have the opportunity of promotion in common with others in their ranks; but I think it is a mistake to perpetuate an error by which, as the Commissioners all agree, there is a culmination in the higher classes of the highest salaries irrespective of the work performed by the great bulk of the service.

Mr. CASEY. I agree very strongly with the remarks of the hon. members who have just spoken. I think, if there is an increment at all it should be the most rapid in the lower grades. It is important too that there should be an opportunity afforded for the promotion of those who display a special aptitude for certain of the higher classes of work, as recommended by the Commissioners; a system which gives regular annual increases of salary to officers so long as they do not misconduct themselves is utterly ruinous to the system, and unfair to those who display special ability in the performance of their work. The Civil Service should be regarded as any other profession in which the highest salaries should go to those who display the highest merit. This may be done by employing a considerable number of non-promotable, temporary writers, such as are employed in England, and reserving the prizes of the service for those who display ability in the discharge of their duties. I notice from the returns that a number of clerks who were appointed several years ago, between 1873 and 1875, have not yet been promoted from the third class, and have not yet received any of the annual increase of \$50. I would like to know whether they will be placed as receiving the salary they ought to have received, and whether the arrears of increases will be paid to them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to answer that, but the policy of the Government is to preserve to the officers in the service the rights they have now. Besides, there will be some weeks before the law can be put into force, and during that time the Government may see what the rights of those officers are.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to observe, with reference to the marine mail clerk, that I do not see what there is in our situation to render it important that we should preserve a class of officers which is not preserved by any other country. Mails for Europe are leaving New York every day, and I believe none of them are accompanied by mail clerks. What reason can there be for our retaining permanently, for that fraction of the mails which goes by the Canadian lines, these marine clerks, when we know that the great bulk of the correspondence is carried by other lines without them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow the resolution to go, when we come to the third reading of the Bill, I shall be able to obtain from the Post Office Department the reason why this is done.

Mr. BLAKE. I have received, as I suppose every other hon. member has, a statement with reference to the railway mail clerks. May I ask whether the hon. gentleman has considered their position, or whether the original plan remains unaltered by the proposal now made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I myself received a statement from some of these officers, who are very deserving, but the Post Office Department, which I consulted, are of opinion that third-class clerks should remain. The proposal of the railway mail clerks, so far as I recollect, was that there should be only two classes, so that the salaries would be higher at the beginning, and they might advance sooner than at present. The Post Office Department, however, is of opinion that the present salaries are sufficient, because there are certain additions given for extra work such as night work.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 35) respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 44,

Mr. CASEY. I think the power to grant leave of absence for twelve months, for any other reason except sickness, is not well founded.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am of a different opinion.

Mr. CASEY. What other reason can you give?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An officer may have a very important case in England, France or Germany, and will require leave of absence. Of course, the Governor in Council will have to provide for a successor to be paid out of the salary of that officer.

On clause 45,

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this power of suspension, I am not in favor of putting too much power in the hands of the Deputy-Head, though the initiative should be taken by him, as he is more directly in contact with the clerks and knows best their conduct and deserts. I think this power should be primarily in the hands of the Deputy-Heads rather than with the responsible or political Heads who will know little about the clerks. This change would remove a great deal of trouble from the hon. Minister's shoulders, and relieve him of the suspicion of suspending any one through personal or political motives. The hon. Minister need not

shake his head and sneer at that remark, because we are told distinctly by the Commissioners that clerks have been continued in office, unpunished for misconduct, purely for political reasons. Some clerks enjoying the friendship of the Government can act as they please, regardless of the Deputy-Heads. The power of discipline should be in the hands of the men most interested in its maintenance and in the good working of the various offices.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The principle proposed by the clause is not a false one. Surely the Head of a Department should have the right to suspend an officer himself, without begging the co-operation or assistance of the Deputy-Head.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But the Deputy-Head cannot suspend except his principal be absent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Certainly not. If the Head is absent the Deputy has to administer the Department, and if he finds an officer misbehaves himself he may suspend him and report to the Head his action and the reasons therefor. It will be for the Head then to consider the proper final action.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, in such extreme cases as personal insolence on the part of a clerk, suspension should be exercised by the Head of the Department; but in ordinary cases the power should rest with the Deputy-Head. I suppose while he is present in the office, if insulted, the Deputy-Head must come and ask the Head if he can suspend the officer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Why not?

Mr. CASEY. Because in many cases where the Deputy-Head has asked the suspension of a clerk, the political Head has refused on political grounds. The power of enforcing discipline should be in the hands of the Deputy-Head, whether the political Head is present or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the first time I have heard of the Head of a Department acting in that way.

Mr. CASEY. Instances were given in evidences before my Committee. With regard to the fines mentioned in the sub-section, one day's pay is a very trifling penalty.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the burden of the punishment will consist in the shame cast upon the offender.

On clause 46,

Mr. BLAKE. There may be cases in which additional remuneration should be paid to a Deputy-Head, but it ought to be specially stated in the Estimates that a sum is voted for such remuneration, so that Parliament may know to what officer the money is given.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the intention, and to make it more clear I would suggest adding the words: "for that special purpose" to the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. The third sub-section may be construed to mean that an officer who has obtained leave of absence to attend to his private business during three months or more, may continue drawing his full salary, while a junior officer, who performs his work, will receive additional salary. The clause should be altered to prevent any such construction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is right. I would suggest that "through illness" should be substituted for "or by illness."

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 47,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved to insert the words "including the office of the Auditor-General" after the words "there shall be kept in each Department."

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 49,

Mr. COSTIGAN. It appears that, under this Act, second-class clerks will be entitled to only a biennial allowance, while first-class get an annual allowance of \$50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is changed now, and second-class clerks get an annual allowance.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I suppose it is the intention that the clerks in the Department may continue to receive the emoluments they now receive notwithstanding the passing of this Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated just now that the position of an officer is not changed, in so far as he receives emoluments.

On clause 51,

Mr. BLAKE. This, I observe, is a sort of amendment of the Superannuation Act, and perhaps the hon. Minister will explain the changes proposed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is an improvement on the Act. To-day, the Treasury Board makes an enquiry, but it is not bound to make it as fully as is here prescribed. For example, an officer in a Department becomes old or unfit for work by reason of paralysis or accident, and it is in the interest of the Department that he should be superannuated. The Head of the Department so reports to Council. The case is referred to the Treasury Board, and that Board reports that the officer has been so many years in the service, that he is in a certain position, and that his superannuation would amount to so much per annum. Then the first thing the Treasury Board would look into would be whether the person proposed to be superannuated was eligible and within the Act, and then whether his superannuation would result in benefit to the service and be in the public interest. There is a guarantee here. After the Minister has reported the Treasury Board may find that the Head of the Department was not cognizant of certain facts with which they were acquainted, and they were therefore in a position to say whether they would recommend his superannuation or not, because it might be found, by obtaining an additional medical certificate, it might appear that the officer would recover after a short period.

Mr. BLAKE. I know there have been great abuses in connection with the Superannuation Act, and anything that would tend to remove abuses would be desirable; but this proposal in its practical operation will not be very different from the existing law. Enquiry is made at present by the Treasury Board. There have been cases in which it has been difficult to understand upon what principle the superannuation has been directed. I wish to refer to another point in connection with this question. One of the greatest abuses that has resulted from the system of superannuation has been in the addition of years to the ten years' clause. The addition is not, as a rule, based on the services the officer has rendered. The law does not contemplate that. The law contemplates that the addition shall be made in the case of those who enter the service late by reason of special qualifications existing, which could not be acquired by those of younger years. Motives of compassion often decide these cases, as the hon. Minister will find, if he enquires, irrespective of special or particular qualifications. I would suggest that the Treasury Board should decide when such an officer is appointed, whether an additional number of years shall be added, and if so, how many; as I believe that would largely do away with the abuses which undoubtedly occur under the ten years' clause.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman will see that his remarks do not apply to the inside service, and with regard to other officers, I think it is a great deal better to leave the particular cases to be decided when they

come, especially as the number of such cases is exceedingly small. I know I attend the meetings of Council tolerably regular, and I am not aware they have granted an additional number of years in more than two or three cases. Not only must the officer show that he comes with special qualifications, but he must show by his actual services that he is entitled to the additional number of years. I think the hon. gentleman will see that the carrying out of his suggestion would involve more danger from political pressure, and so on, than exists under the present system.

On clause 53,

Mr. CASEY. If this report is to be made at all similar to the report of the English Civil Service Commission, it should include copies of the examination papers, so that Parliament and the public might be able to judge what sort of test the candidates were subjected to. The examination papers of the University of Toronto, the Normal Schools, and of every examining body, are published, and there is no reason why these papers should not be brought down, but strong reason why they should.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These papers, like all other papers in the Departments, will be always at the call of Parliament, on the motion of any hon. member.

Mr. CASEY. It is very important that they should be brought down as part of this report, because they are the most essential feature of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion by adding the words at the end of the 24th line, "copy of the examination papers."

On clause 54,

Mr. CASEY. I would like to suggest an addition to subsection 2. I think we should know what dismissals have taken place during the year, as well as what appointments and promotions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so. Why should you destroy the prospects of a man who may have misbehaved and been dismissed, by parading his name before Parliament and the country? I think we do well not to give the names of those dismissed, or the reasons for their dismissals, and, for my part, I will not consent to change that.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is absolutely necessary that the public should know why their servants are dismissed. The hon. gentleman takes refuge behind the cry of compassion for dismissed officers. I say it is just as often in justice to the man himself that we should have the reason of his dismissal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this case, if the hon. gentleman thinks it is an injustice to an officer, he will come with a motion to Parliament, on the subject. I remember some years ago a gentleman, not now in Parliament, put a motion on the paper, asking information for such a purpose. He was a friend of the officer, who was no friend of mine. I went to him next day, and said: "Here are the papers, if you wish them, but if made public they will destroy that man." He looked at the papers, thanked me, and withdrew his motion. If the hon. gentleman opposite will take the responsibility of asking for papers in any particular case, he may get them.

Mr. CASEY. Papers have been refused myself in certain cases, on the ground that they would injure the man, when it was my conviction that the production of the papers, instead of injuring, would have removed any unjust accusation under which he lay. The Government dismisses persons for improper reasons, and then takes advantage of this cry, that the production of the papers would injure the officials, when, in reality, they fear it would hurt themselves. It is absolutely necessary for Parliament, as men are liable to be

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

improperly dismissed, to know all the facts of the case. There has been too much working in the dark in respect to the Civil Service, which has been regarded as the concern of the Government, and not the concern of the public. You cannot create a stronger incentive to a man to be honest, supposing he has dishonest intentions, than establishing a rule that his dismissal, and the reasons for it, shall be published throughout the country. For instance, a man who has swindled the Government ought to have his character exposed to the country.

Bill reported.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to move the third reading to-morrow?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman prefers to wait until Monday, I should be satisfied.

Mr. BLAKE. I think I would. So far as I am concerned, there will be no debate on it of any length; but it is possible I may have an observation or two to make, and a motion to record on the principle of the Bill.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 151), to define the rights in certain cases to assault, wound or kill certain prisoners.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 152), respecting bridges over navigable waters, constructed under the authority of Provincial Acts.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

GENERAL PORT WARDENS' ACT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 120) to amend the General Port Wardens' Act, 1874.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the measure.

Mr. McLELAN. As I explained, when the subject was before the House before in the form of a resolution, the object of this Bill is to provide that when a consignee cannot be found, the Port Warden shall take charge of the property until the owner or consignee can be discovered. Also, that the Port Warden may have the power to appoint a deputy in case of absence.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill gives the Port Warden power, in the case when the consignee cannot be found, to initiate proceedings so as to avoid loss or damage to the parties interested in the vessel or cargo; but does not say how far he may go, whether he may carry those proceedings to their conclusion.

Mr. McLELAN. He is to perform all the acts that would have been performed by the consignee or owner.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I can scarcely conceive of a case where there will be no consignee. I asked the hon. Minister the other day if he knew of any such case. If such a case has occurred this provision of course might be made.

Mr. McLELAN. That same power is given to the Port Wardens of Quebec and Montreal, and this Bill will make it apply generally.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I suppose it is intended that the Port Warden shall be responsible for the action of his deputy. To make this clear, I think the words "shall be responsible for the conduct of his Deputy" should be inserted.

Mr. McLELAN. I think the Bill is clear as it is; but I have no objection to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to and Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MARINE TELEGRAPH.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 127) to make further provision regarding the incorporation of a company to establish a marine telegraph between the Pacific coast of Canada and Asia, and for repealing the provisions of any Act inconsistent therewith. He said: When I introduced this Bill the other day, I had the intention of asking the House to allow this Bill to go to a second reading, and to adopt, not only the first, but also the second clause, giving exclusive right for twenty years. The fact is, we incorporated this Company last Session to establish a cable across the Atlantic, and also one across the Pacific Ocean. That Company, up to very lately, seemed to have stirred very little about organizing and raising their capital. From time to time the rumor came that the Company was succeeding in obtaining their capital, and so on. I do not want to say anything in disparagement of the Company, because if they can raise the capital so much the better. As the Session proceeds, I intend asking the House to adopt this first clause, giving an extension of time to this Company of twelve months, and I will drop a few of the other clauses.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course that removes one of the great objections of this Bill. But the hon. Minister has not given us any information as to how it happens that the Company, which is under this peculiar favor, has not made any progress either. It has not even been incorporated, and the hon. Minister has had no opportunity yet of exercising that power which, under very exceptional circumstances, we gave to the Governor in Council to incorporate the Company, which was promoted by Mr. Fleming. Now, is it the case that that Company will not proceed unless its promoters obtain exclusive rights? Is it the case that they abstain from procuring their incorporation because they have not exclusive rights, and that they are waiting to see whether this other Company will succeed, and if it does succeed they will not go on, and if it does not succeed, they will come here next Session and ask for an exclusive right because the others have failed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. That would rather seem to be the case from the hon. Minister's statement. It would seem as if the promoters of the Act are not themselves advancing until they obtain an obnoxious privilege, which the hon. Minister was about to propose to give them this Session. I think we are entitled to know, since a public Bill has been proposed in the interest of certain promoters, what progress they have made, what expectation they have of proceeding during the recess to do those things which have not yet been done. We are the more entitled to know it, because when this Bill was introduced we enquired whether there had been any correspondence at all, and the answer was there had been none, and in consequence there is nothing to show that the present extension of time will be availed of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason why the incorporators have not proceeded are those I gave last Session when I proposed the Bill, namely, that there is no chance for two companies to succeed in that way. If one Company does not succeed in raising their capital the other Company will try and see if they can do better. The fact is, that when Mr. Fleming asked for his charter last year we had no idea this other Company would ask for rights in the Pacific Ocean. The rights that had been given in their Bill was only for the purpose of laying a cable across the Atlantic, therefore any other company could ask

for privileges on the Pacific Ocean, and Mr. Fleming asked that he might be incorporated for that purpose. From the energy Mr. Fleming has displayed already, I have no doubt he will prosecute his undertaking. When the other Company was incorporated and promised us such great results, of course Mr. Fleming was justified in hesitating about raising another Company while the first Company was supposed to be able to raise the capital and go on at once. He told me himself that had the other Company failed, he did not think that would prevent him from going on. At that time he had obtained certain powers for the landing of a cable in Japan, and other attempts were made by him to obtain privileges elsewhere, but this other Company being in the field and being known as desirous to raise capital, Mr. Fleming did not think that he should attempt the same thing, and deceive those that were trusting in him by trying to raise capital that might not be used afterwards. Under these circumstances, he was not able to go on, and we ask Parliament to give him another twelve months so that during that time things may shape themselves better, and if the other Company does not raise their capital he will try his hand at it, which, however, does not mean that he will ask any more privileges. From the attention that has been called to these schemes, he might then be able to raise capital and work the Asiatic cable without asking any privilege of Parliament; but if he requires the privilege, of course Parliament may grant it or refuse it. At all events, I do not think we should refuse him the twelve months extension.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The hon. gentleman says that the fact of this Company being incorporated has had the effect of deterring Mr. Fleming from going on. May it not also be the case that the Act passed last year in favor of Mr. Fleming was the reason this Company did not go on?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Fleming was the first in the field, and when the other Company came to Parliament they changed their scheme, and asked not only for privileges on the Atlantic, but for the privilege of laying an Asiatic cable. What they asked for, in the first place, was an Atlantic cable and nothing else.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I do not so understand it. It was contemplated to extend the lines beyond the Atlantic when the petition was presented, and it was so stated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier). Why did not Mr. Fleming make the application for a charter in the ordinary way? Why did the Government not take charge of the Bill and save him the fee of \$200. It seems to me that, both last year and this year, Mr. Fleming should have stood in the same position as any private person applying for an Act of incorporation. No reason has been given why the Government should have taken such an interest in Mr. Fleming's project. I understand that this is a *bona fide* Company, and they are taking measures to have the work prosecuted. I am not opposed to the extension of time for twelve months, but Mr. Fleming should, like an ordinary individual, have proceeded in the usual way to obtain a charter of incorporation.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

196. Post Office..... \$2,018,900

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire some information in regard to the increase in Ontario.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is due to increased mileage and the extra trains. Some of the extra mileage is on the Port Dover and Lake Huron Railway. Then on the Great Western

we have to provide for the probable increase of service on account of additional trains, and the same with regard to the Canada Southern, Northern and North Western, Credit Valley and the Grand Junction. There is an increase of \$10,000 in the ordinary land conveyance, to provide for additional routes and the cost of additional services. Then there is an increase of \$4,000 for mail bags, locks, principally owing to our having had to return the American bags, which were formerly in use. In Ontario, there is an increase of the salaries in clerks, and one additional clerk in Ontario, making in all \$4,000, the increase being necessary on account of additional work, owing to the constant increase of correspondence. There will probably be an increase of the clerks and letter carriers in the city post offices. Then we have to provide for the increase of the postal business, which will probably demand more supervision, and there are other increases of a miscellaneous character.

Mr. MILLS. I sent a petition to the hon. Minister asking for the establishment of a post office near the boundary between Kent and Bothwell, on the line of stage from Thamesville to Dresden. I have received no communication with regard to it, and I would like to know whether any action has been taken.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no recollection of the petition, but I dare say it is being dealt with by the deputy.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I observe that, under the head of Ontario—though I do not see why it should appear under that head—that there is apparently an increase of \$4,000 for ocean mail clerks. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do with respect to that branch of the service.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That charge has heretofore been made against the Province of Quebec, but now it will be divided between Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. The charge is one which would not appear to belong to either Ontario or Quebec alone, or to both of them.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It has to go somewhere.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but it belongs to the service generally. I would like to ask what is intended to be the permanent policy of the Government with reference to this branch of post office expenditure. I pointed out a while ago the fact that, so far as I know, ours is the only country which incurs these expenses for ocean mail clerks. The mails between England and the United States and between Europe and America generally, with the exception of those on the Canadian mail line, are not sorted at the expense of the country. Their sorting proceeds at either end of the journey, and we know that the necessary arrangements are made for very expeditious transport and sorting of the mails. At whatever period of the transportation this work is done, it is not, so far as I know, with reference to the vast bulk of the mail matter that passes from Europe to America, done on the journey, and I do not understand why it is proposed that we should be permanently saddled with this extra cost.

Mr. O'CONNOR. All I know is that this estimate has been taken for a long time, and that it is continued. I do not know of any change of policy on the subject. With regard to what is done on board the boats, I am told that the clerks are busily engaged during all the voyage in making up the mails.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I believe a considerable amount of work is done by clerks; but I say that, so far as I know, it is work that is done ashore with reference to the great bulk of the European and American mail matter. If the hon. gentleman has not been informed as to the advantages

Mr. O'CONNOR.

derived from continuing this item of expenditure, which is not incurred by England or the United States, he will perhaps be able to give us some information on concurrence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When this matter was under discussion in connection with the Civil Service Bill, I stated to the hon. gentleman that I would enquire of the Department, and be able to give him an answer at the next stage. I have had no time to confer with the Department since then, but he may rest assured that at the next stage of the Civil Service Bill, I shall be able to tell him why this system has been continued, and also whether he is correct with regard to other countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is an illustration of the advantages of occasional changes of Government. The hon. gentleman, who is so extremely anxious to save this expenditure and to obtain information on this point, was content for five years, without a murmur, to vote this same estimate to the Government which he supported, and I believe that this is the first time that this estimate has been attacked. Now, it appears to me that the fact that the mails are carried in a different way between Canada and Great Britain by the Canadian lines of steamers from what they are carried by the United States steamers may have a reason for it. The hon. gentleman knows that a subsidy is paid for the conveyance of the Canadian mails, while in the United States there is no subsidy. I shall be greatly surprised to find that the same method, which obviously facilitates the distribution of mail matter to such a great extent, is not followed in connection with the transmission of the mails from the United States to Great Britain. I know that the mail clerks are almost constantly engaged during the entire voyage in distributing the mail matter, and if that work were all required to be done after the arrival of the mails, it would entail a great deal of delay in the distribution, and defeat the increasing desire felt by the general public for the greatest possible dispatch in the transmission of mail matter. The reason for the adoption of the system, as practised in Canada under the late Government without a question, or a surmise that it was possible in the public interest to save anything in this regard, is, I think, based on such obvious advantages as to commend it to the judgment of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in thinking this to be the first time that this item has been referred to. I brought this matter to the attention of the Government when I was a supporter of it, though not in the House, and expressed the views I now express. The observation of the hon. gentleman does not meet the case. There is a difference, it is true, between the mode in which we remunerate our ships for the carriage of the mails, and the mode in which the great bulk of the ships are remunerated. We pay a great deal more than what is involved in this particular item.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Railways, as usual, is quite mistaken. I recollect that this question was brought before the House, and that the then Postmaster-General stated that the service would be gradually discontinued. Now, I find that, in 1878, only \$5,000 was asked for this service, but these two votes together are \$6,500, showing that the policy then intimated, to the best of my recollection, by my hon. friend the late Postmaster-General, appears not to have been persevered in, but to have been reversed. As the hon. gentleman is anxious to remind us of what happened on our side while in office, I may remind him and the House of the extraordinary attacks that used to be made on my hon. friend by the hon. gentlemen opposite for the enormous expenditure on this service. Now, in 1878, we required \$1,760,000 for it, but the present Postmaster-General \$2,018,000, besides, probably, Supplementary Estimates, being an increase of nearly \$260,000. This is a very clear

proof of the remarkable alteration in the views of the hon. Minister of Railways since he entered office. There may be some reason for part of this increase, and there may be this reason also, that hon. Ministers are not careful in their expenditures and not anxious to check items like those.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no service that Parliament is called upon to provide for, perhaps, which it provides for so cheerfully as this service, and there is none that it is so anxious to see increase. What I criticised with some sharpness, perhaps, when sitting on the opposite side of the House, was the great difference between the expenditure and the revenue. The more we expend on the Post Office the better, provided we get the money back; and, notwithstanding the great increase in the postal accommodation of the country, it is given at less cost than formerly. The deficit at present is less than that of the late Government, and the hon. gentleman will find that there was not that same reason for the close examination of the accounts that existed formerly.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The deficit the last year was \$555,000. I do not think in our last year of office it was any greater—probably it was not quite so great, although that does not affect the explanations of the Postmaster General on the subject.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The annual deficit was less from 1879 to 1881, than during the four years previous to 1878; and for the present year, judging from the receipts so far, I think there will be \$100,000 in excess of the estimates, showing that the deficit is likely to be much less than last year and the year before. The increased business will, of course, necessarily increase the expenditure, as most of the postmasters are paid a percentage on the revenue, as much as 40 per cent.

Mr. RINFRET. Before this item is passed, I would like to ask the Government whether it has decided upon giving the parish of St. Flavien a daily mail. Some time ago, I made this enquiry of the Government, and the hon. Minister of Public Works replied, that the matter was under consideration. Has the Government come to any decision?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention was to give the matter a favorable consideration, should it be found practicable. I do not yet know what additional amount will be required. If the thing is possible, and if it is within the limits of the attributes of the Department to alter the line ordinarily followed by the mails, I feel convinced that it will be granted. I cannot give the hon. member an answer to-day, but I will make a note of the matter, and will probably be able to do so Monday or Tuesday next.

Mr. RINFRET. The parish of St. Flavien is situated close to the Grand Trunk Railway, and the mails might easily be transported daily by that road. It is a very important parish, and I think that it is the only one in the county that receives mails twice a week only.

Mr. DAWSON. Before the item passes I would draw the attention of the Government to a part of the country where the mail service is not very efficient, not from any fault of the Post Office Department, but probably from circumstances over which it has no control, and that is in the carriage of the winter mails between Parry Sound and the Island of Manitoulin, and along the north shore of Lake Huron. The mails are often very much delayed, and petitions were sent to Parliament and to the Government this winter complaining that they had been over a month without mails. Of course, it arises from the circumstances of the case. There is no winter road along the Georgian Bay, and the mails have now to be carried, as they were half a century ago, on men's backs and with dog-sleds. I think this Government should

enter into communication with the Government of Ontario, to get a winter road along the Georgian Bay, from Parry Sound up to Killarney. It would not be a work of great expense, and it would greatly facilitate the carriage of the mails. We have now east of Sault Ste. Marie and in Algoma, a population of 12,000; and there is not another instance in the whole history of the colonies, of 12,000 people having their mails carried on dog sleds during winter. I hope that some better system will be devised for next winter. Of course, we know that when the railroads, including the Canadian Pacific, are completed up to Spanish River, all this difficulty will vanish; but something should be done in the meantime to remedy the evil.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have to notice and protest against the statement of the hon. Finance Minister, in comparing the expenditure previous to 1879 with the expenditures since that year. Under the late Administration a great many changes were made tending to reduce for a time the income even if the business had continued as large, if there had been no general business depression; but some of those changes were very important. There was the reduction in the charge on letters, and on the rate of postage between Canada and the United States, and other changes all calculated for the time to reduce the revenue, and all, after a time, to increase very much the business of the Post Office. These changes, including the reduction in postage, have led to an increase of the revenue. There was also, of course, an improvement in business generally, which led to a larger business being done through the Post Office. The position of the hon. Minister of Railways is untenable. He would have it that the accommodation given to the public must be limited, if the revenue from the Post Office itself is not nearly sufficient to cover expenditure. That is not the principle on which we proceeded, and it is not fair to say that at any particular period there was room for complaint, because the expenditure did bear the same proportion to income that it did at some other period. I presume there is nowhere too much accommodation given to any portion of the people. Once you create a post office it must necessarily be sustained, whether the times be good or bad, whether, owing to changes in business, there be an increase or decrease in the mail receipts. I think the late Government acted very properly on that principle, and very properly increased the accommodation to the public in various ways. To day, notwithstanding the increase in business, there has not been any increase in the post office accommodation in the North-West, yet the deficit last year was quite as large as the last year of the late Administration. The hon. Minister of Railways has no right to try and cover up the facts by a system of averages which does not apply in this particular case. The changes were made in the earlier years of the late Administration, and were only producing their beneficial effect in the latter year of that Administration and during the term of the present Administration.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman from Gloucester as to the benefit to be derived from increased accommodation. My attention was drawn to the large increase in the postal service; and in the Postmaster General's report for the past year, I found the following statement, which accounts for a large proportion of the increase referred to by the hon. member for Centre Huron. The country postmasters, who were left for quite a number of years during the late Administration without receiving any increase, have, during the present Administration, had their salaries readjusted in proportion to the work done. In 1877, the country postmasters of Ontario received \$180,493; in 1881 they received \$230,779. In 1877, the country postmasters of Quebec received \$59,201; in 1881 they received \$68,758. In 1877, the postmasters of Nova Scotia received \$41,329; in 1881 they received

\$46,061. In 1877, the postmasters of New Brunswick received \$25,614; in 1881 they received \$29,863. In 1877, the postmasters of Manitoba received \$1,339; in 1881, they received \$5,255. In 1877, the postmasters of British Columbia received \$4,205; in 1881 they received \$5,046. In 1877, the postmasters of Prince Edward Island received \$3,814; in 1881 they received \$5,449. This is for the country postmasters alone; the difference in these two years amounts to about \$75,000. No one will say they are not well entitled to the increase they have received, and which was based entirely on the amount of work done and the mail matter that went through each office.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What steps have been taken to remedy complaints as to insufficient postal accommodation at Winnipeg? I am aware that owing to the influx of population there, the present provision can hardly be expected to be sufficient, but the complaints which have reached me, both from private and public sources, are both numerous and loud.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The clerks in the offices there have been largely increased; seven or eight experienced clerks have been sent from Ontario and Quebec up there. Besides that letter boxes have been established in various parts of the city, and letter-carriers have also been increased in order to relieve the office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. the Finance Minister be good enough to give the figures which he said bore out the statement that the difference, though large, was less now comparatively than in former years before 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have made the statement in my Budget Speech, and am taking out the figures now.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The expenditure of 1874-75 was \$1,695,000, and the deficit, \$288,000, or about half last year's deficit.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. gentleman will take the four years following, and compare them with the two years, 1878-79 and 1880-81, he will find a different result. I recollect it was said that I did not, in my comparison for the post offices, extend the five years, as I did in other cases. That was quite true, because, in 1874-75, we had a higher rate of postage. We were then receiving a larger sum for performing the same work, therefore I took the four years when the rates for postage were the same as in 1879-80 and in 1880-81, for comparison. I cited the figures to show there was a reduction in the average of the four years.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The invariable result hitherto has been that reduction in rates have produced a larger revenue, in the course of a very few years. That has been the experience in England, and is corroborated, to a certain extent, by our own experience. This is what my hon. friend pointed out as entirely vitiating my hon. friend's comparisons.

Mr. MILLS. Has the hon. gentleman, in that calculation, included the expense in the first four years of changing way offices in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick into post offices. There was a very considerable expense incurred during those years in consequence of those changes, and the hon. gentleman's comparison is manifestly unfair if it has not included this expenditure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I admit there was some additional expense incurred in changing the way offices into post offices, but the same rate of salaries existed in 1878 and has not changed. The only difference I know is that the printing was very large during four or five years when these way offices were converted, and it was smaller afterwards.

Mr. CURRIER. I would like to enquire of the Postmaster General what advantage the public or the Depart-

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).

ment have reaped from the new system of doubling the price of the post office boxes. I know it has been a serious inconvenience to many citizens. Has it increased the revenue?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I cannot say whether it has or not. There has been no return yet made on that subject. The change was made during the incumbency of my predecessor.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that in the city of Quebec, since the post office boxes have been increased, the letters are now distributed very late. When we paid \$1.50 for a box we received our letters early in the day, now we are paying \$4 to \$6, and we get our letters very late.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think an opportunity should be given to the Postmaster General to say whether the rumor is well or ill-founded, which states that the uniforms for the letter-carriers in several cities and towns of the Dominion have been imported ready made from Great Britain.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There has been a great deal said about that matter, but the rumor is altogether unfounded. The uniforms are made in this country, though others have contended that it would be better to import them.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. the Postmaster General one or two matters that should claim his attention. In some country post offices, the postmaster gets only a salary of \$10 for attending to the mails twice a week. Now, is that the way to pay the servants of the Government. We pay city postmasters and their deputies large salaries, yet we ask country postmasters to attend to the post office, to enter into bonds, for a salary of \$10 and upwards. Then there is another point. In large and thriving villages, such as I have in my county, the postmasters have to devote their whole time to the office, and employ assistants, for only \$600 a year. They have to furnish the office, employ competent assistants, and to distribute to some fifteen or twenty corresponding offices, and for all these duties they only receive from \$600 to \$900 a year. It seems to me there should be some readjustment in the allowances to country postmasters. The postal service is becoming every day more important in this country, and people are every day appreciating and demanding better postal facilities; yet, in many neighborhoods, people have got to put their hands into their pockets and pay a certain sum yearly to keep the postmaster in office.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There must be very few offices where the postmasters receive no more than \$10 a year, and that is in places where there is but very little to do. Moreover, these offices are generally kept by persons who are carrying on some other business, and they are glad enough to get charge of the post office in order to attract people to their place of business. As to the large villages and towns, I think my hon. friend exaggerates a little the state of affairs there. The postmasters in all the towns are paid a percentage upon their collections. Besides the 40 per cent. which they receive on collections, they are allowed compensation for forwarding offices, lights and things of that kind. As a general rule, I think, they are pretty fairly dealt with.

Mr. McCUAIG. I am free to admit that the salaries paid to postmasters throughout the country are small, but we are applying for an increase to the number of post offices. Whenever we add to the number we increase by a large amount the expenditure which is already very large. If this House is prepared to vote double the present sum the Postmaster General will be quite willing to increase the salaries of the postmasters, but unless it is prepared to vote a large sum in addition to that already granted, the salaries cannot be increased. I consider it my duty to bear my testimony to the very faithful manner in which the Post Office

Department is conducted. We have few instances of irregularities taking place in that Department. A visit to the Department will reveal the fact that persons are constantly asking for increasing postal accommodation. It is wonderful to me that the Department, having so much to do with the inhabitants of the country, should be as successful as it is and be so free from blame. In my county they occasionally complain of the small accommodation they receive, nevertheless if a vacancy occurs there is no trouble in securing the services of good men.

Mr. SCOTT. At the last Session some hundreds of dollars were expended for lock-boxes in the Winnipeg post office. Although a year has elapsed they have not been placed in the post office. With the large immigration that is taking place into that country, and the number of people desiring to receive and send letters, the city lacks necessary post office accommodation. An attempt has been made to increase the postal facilities, but it is absolutely necessary that Government should provide a sum for the construction of a post office commensurate with the increased demands for postal facilities in the North-West. The Government have lately assisted a little in increasing the facilities by appointing letter-carriers, but without a building of sufficient size the officers cannot discharge their duties. I read a letter to-day stating that people were paying from \$1 to \$1.50 for the privilege of getting in ahead with their postal matter. That is not a fair way to treat the North-West, and I trust, in the Second Supplementary Estimates, the Minister of Public Works will insert a sum sufficient to construct a post office which will suffice for the requirements of the North-West.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter has not escaped the attention of the Government. The hon. gentleman has called the attention of the Government to the subject, and pointed out the requirements of the Winnipeg post office in order to afford accommodation in view of the large number of people who are going up to reside, to see the country, and to speculate, and the reports from Winnipeg were that the post office accommodation was not sufficient. On receiving those complaints directions were given to the Government architect to increase the accommodation, first, of the clerks inside, and, second, of the public. The space inside has been more than doubled. The outside of the post office, for the use of the public has also been more than doubled, and a second door is being provided, so that parties entering the post office will not have to return by the same door. This increased accommodation, with the extra clerks whom the Postmaster General has appointed, and the boxes placed through the city, as well as the letter-carriers appointed, must have relieved to a certain extent the pressure. We have to complain of the Winnipeg municipal authorities, that they have not numbered the houses. If that had been done at the proper time, we would have been able to place carriers on the route sooner, and relieved the post office. The municipal authorities have since given directions that the houses shall be numbered so that the population may be attended to by the carriers. I may add this information for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, that when the Estimates come down, he will find in those for 1883, an item for a new post office.

Mr. ROSS (Dundas). The hon. the Postmaster General thought I was exaggerating, but I have the figures here. I made no charge, because, as far as the hon. the Postmaster General is concerned, he has shown every disposition to meet the wants of the people in the most generous manner. I wish merely to substantiate what I stated by giving the figures. At Morrisburg, the postmaster, who has to employ an assistant, receives a salary of \$694, which with allowances has brought it up to \$874. At Iroquois, the salary of the postmaster is \$511. I know that the postmaster at Iroquois

has to rise to go to work at 6 a.m. and is employed to 9 p.m., with an assistant, and he receives \$911 for that work.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). The hon. the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech referred to the Post Office expenditure. He took the years 1875 to 1879, showing the average annual expenditure to be \$1,709,000, and the average annual receipts \$1,149,000, average deficits annually \$560,000, for the late Government; while for the years 1880-81, the average annual expenditure was \$1,847,000, and the average annual receipts \$1,302,000, average deficit \$545,000, or a deficit of \$15,000 a year less than the late Government. Now, the expenditures were as follows:—

1874	\$1,387,270
1875	1,520,861
1876	1,622,827
1877	1,705,311
1878	1,724,939
1879	1,781,424
1880	1,818,271
1881	1,876,688

Showing an increase of \$59,000 in 1879, and \$58,000 in 1881. The receipts were:

1874	\$1,139,973
1875	1,155,332
1876	1,102,540
1877	1,114,916
1878	1,207,790
1879	1,172,498
1880	1,252,498
1881	1,352,110

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is important, for the purposes of comparison, that such years may be taken as may afford a fair comparison. The hon. member takes 1873-74 and 1874-75 and places these years against 1878-79 and 1879-80 and 1880-81, but he should remember that in 1873-74 and 1874-75 the Government were receiving a larger rate of postage on letters and newspapers and had not at that time granted increased accommodation to cities, which involved increased taxation. If we take 1875, we find that the expenditure was \$1,622,827, and the receipts \$1,114,000, being a deficit of \$607,802. The deficit in 1876-77 was \$590,316; 1877-78, \$517,148; 1878-9, \$612,005; 1879-80, \$507,773; 1880-81, \$544,002. The average deficits for the two years 1878-79 and 1880-81, was \$545,000, against \$556,849; making a difference of some \$12,000 or \$13,000 as between the last two years and the years previous. In the last two or three years a new system was adopted. As the late Postmaster General will recollect, a commission on sums is retained by postmasters, but I think in his time the whole sum was sent to the Department and the commission sent back. Of course this does not effect the balance, but it does effect the aggregates.

Mr. BURPEE. The hon. Finance Minister selects those years of the late Government when there was a decline of revenue. The rates were reduced, and therefore the revenue naturally fell off.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The facts show that the revenue in 1875-76 was \$1,114,000, and in 1878-79 \$1,172,000.

Mr. BURPEE. The hon. gentleman will find that the receipts were, in 1875, \$1,155,000; in 1876, \$1,102,000; and in 1877, \$1,114,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The same rates are charged now.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. Does the hon. gentleman deny that the result of these ameliorations has been to increase the matter transmitted by mail?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is very likely, but I find in the four years to which I refer there was a slight increase of the revenue notwithstanding.

Mr. ANGLIN. The expansion is a slow process comparatively. It does not take place immediately after the reduction, especially if there is not material. The reduction is not very considerable, however, in our local rates or the rates on foreign letters—those to the United States and Great Britain. The reduction was a material reduction, no doubt calculated to increase very considerably the correspondence between these countries and the Dominion; but that increase would be gradual. Notwithstanding the general depression in business, which must have affected the amount of business done in the Post Office, we find that the income from the postal service increased gradually until it became as large as it was before the reduction was made. In 1874, the income was \$1,139,000; in 1875, \$1,155,000; in 1876, \$1,102,000; in 1877 it rose to \$1,114,000, and, in 1878, it increased still further to \$1,207,000, or considerably higher than it was in 1874 or 1875 notwithstanding the depression; proving conclusively that this decrease in the rates of postage led to an expansion in the revenue, and that expansion should have increased still further. But we find that, in 1879, when the country should have recovered rapidly and have attained a condition of unbounded prosperity under hon. gentlemen opposite, the revenue declined to \$1,172,000; and after the great depression of 1879 passed away, the revenue again expanded, until, in 1881, it reached \$1,352,110, that increase being the result of two causes—the reduction in the rate of postage and the increase in the general business of the country.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Public Accounts do not show that there was any great loss of revenue as the immediate result of the change, or that there was any very steady or gradual increase. There was some increase, but not so large as might have been expected under the circumstances. It is quite evident that any change made in the rates in this country does not affect the number of letters sent as a similar change does in the Old World.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). What I wished to point out was the ingenuity of the hon. gentleman in selecting 1875, 1876, and 1877, three of the smallest years of revenue collected by the late Government for comparison, which I think was very unfair.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I took the years in which the receipts were charged in the same way, and every hon. member will admit that that is the fair method.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not. When you determine to reduce the rates of postage, every man knows, and the experience of all countries teaches, that you must submit to a considerable loss of revenue for three or four years, and therefore until the system has had full time to get into operation, that basis of comparison is false and unfair.

Mr. BUNSTER. I regret to see that the item for British Columbia is reduced some \$200, when it is a well known fact that in all new countries the Government should always try to increase the postal facilities of the people. I merely want to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to this great injustice to British Columbia, hoping that it will not occur again. There is an outlying district known as Comox which has been greatly neglected, and I have drawn the attention of the Postmaster General to it year after year without much effect. The paltry sum of \$1,200 would give that settlement a weekly mail. At present they have a fortnightly mail while in the cities of Ontario, and the older Provinces, the mails are carried to the people's doors. But the residents of Comox are obliged to remain without a mail for a fortnight though they are as good British subjects and as well entitled to frequent mails as the people of any other Province. The postal service in British Columbia should

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

not be starved, while the service in other Provinces is increased. If we had a proper Post Office Inspector in British Columbia this injustice might not be prolonged. Albernia, and the west shore of Vancouver Island, which promises to be a city, has had no provision made for mail facilities, though there are over 250 settlers who might, with proper postal accommodation, be increased to 500. There is also the district of Sook—

An hon. MEMBER. Spell it.

Mr. BUNSTER. I don't know how—it is an Indian name, but letters are not sent to Sook as they should be. The settlers have to travel a distance for them different to the provincial system before we joined the Confederacy, and whoever made the recommendation for the change did so against the well understood wishes of the settlers, and the Department made the change without consulting me, and my constituents are displeased with me for the said change. There should be mail facilities to Sook, continued to the end of the islands from Otter Point to Cape Bear. In all new Provinces, Governments assist the establishment of mail communications though at a loss, for the convenience of the settlers who, on their part, contribute to the revenue in the payment of tea, sugar and other duties. But it is not fair to reduce the postal facilities of British Columbia which is increasing in population, even if they are Chinese. The rights of British Columbia in this respect has been shamefully neglected. I hope the Postmaster General will demand of his agent in British Columbia a description of its postal facilities. He has, in reply to my own enquiries, said: "We do not want to bother the Government with many reports about the requirements of the district." The people will sometimes say to me: "Bunster, where is your political influence—why do you not get us a mail to such a place or weekly communication to Comox?" I must admit the late Government did give us a weekly communication, but, through the operations of a bogus contractor, we are compelled now to take a fortnightly mail. I do not think that is very creditable to the present Government, since the population of the district is decreasing. I hope the Postmaster General will do us justice in this respect.

Mr. HOOPER. I wish to call attention to the arrangement doubtless entered into some years ago for carrying the mails from east of Toronto to Southern Manitoba, but which, under the present circumstances of the country, should be changed. It is this: All the mail matter sent to Southern Manitoba, to Emerson for instance, which is the distributing office for that point, goes to Winnipeg—that is, if carried by the Grand Trunk, which does not make up any mail bag for any other point. If carried by the Great Western, a mail bag is made up which goes direct to Emerson. The result is that you are paying the railway for taking a large amount of mail matter from Emerson to Winnipeg; it is there redistributed and mailed back to Emerson, which is the distributing point for all Southern Manitoba. Any business man will understand how great the inconvenience is of letters received two or three days later than they should be delivered. Again, take the country post offices. If it is an office for a weekly mail, and the mail from Winnipeg arrives one day late, parties in business and other people will get no mail for a fortnight. If a monthly mail should be a day or two late, the people will not get their letters for two months. I suggest some alterations, so that all mail matter intended for Emerson and west of it, should be sent direct to it and not to Winnipeg. There is another consideration. In consequence of the very large amount of mail matter which goes to Emerson—and few hon. gentlemen are aware how great is the quantity—it should go there direct; but at present it entails in the office at Winnipeg, a very large

amount of labor, which should be performed at Emerson, and the postmaster at Emerson should have, at least, two assistants and a proper post office building. I have not the least doubt that the post office is flooded and probably the postmaster has been obliged to take the whole of his mail matter out of the building. Again, you are paying in Winnipeg a very large amount in the shape of salary, whereas the postmaster at Emerson receives a very small compensation. I see by the last returns he simply receives \$645 as a salary, whereas if he had \$1,000 it would be little enough for the work; he is also paid \$100 for forwarding and \$80 for fuel, rent and light. A proper building should be erected in the town for a post office. The large increase in the population and the business done, require a proper building.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The matter will be looked into, and if found convenient and necessary, the changes will be made.

Mr. BUNSTER. I find, on a more careful examination of the Estimates, that the decrease is \$1,200, instead of \$200 in British Columbia. I hope the hon. Postmaster-General will explain why there is such a reduction against British Columbia. If he thinks the population is decreasing, he is mistaken. If he will give better postal facilities it would increase faster than it does. It is really an important matter that the settlers in British Columbia should have proper postal communication, but instead of being encouraged by the Government, by increased facilities, the opposite course is taken at present.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I desire to make a single observation in a sense which, I am sure, must recommend itself to the mind of every hon. gentleman who has been familiar for the past few years with the question under discussion. The hon. the Finance Minister has shown a gift in the way of comparisons, that does deserve a great deal of credit. I should like to see him compare his party, as it stood on this side of the House, with his party as it stands on the other, in relation to this single Department. When they sat here there were no words too long, no denunciation too deep in regard to the maladministration of that Department, its gross extravagances, its profligate waste of money. These hon. gentlemen went to the people, as it is said they are going before the people now; and I think before they go the hon. Finance Minister should explain why it was that when they came into power they did not check the extravagance of this wastefully conducted Department, get rid of some of the useless employes and change the administration they had so loudly condemned. I have heard the hon. gentleman complain of having words put in his mouth. Though something of a ventriloquist I will not put words in his mouth, but would like him to give utterance to explanations as to how it was that after pursuing this course toward the unfortunate Department, he did not when he came into office carry out the views which his friends and he when in Opposition thought had so much to recommend them. I would like to hear the hon. gentleman admit frankly that when his party got into office they found they had been previously talking about what they did not understand. The hon. Postmaster-General could explain, that when he got there he found it was not so easy to make any change, and that the evils he denounced were purely imaginary. I am not speaking as to whether the increased expenditure under this Administration is justifiable or not, but am simply drawing a comparison between criticism out of office and the conduct in office of hon. gentlemen opposite. If it be really true that they maligned the administration of this important Department, that their position in regard to it was untenable, they should either acknowledge their error, or be able to point to some change of policy which would justify their former attacks.

166. Miscellaneous Printing. \$10,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This item is made up of printing Budget Speech in English, \$344; in French, \$133, and Parliamentary reports \$8,721.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Halton). This item affords a favorable opportunity for me to make a remark which I make for the benefit of all parties concerned, as we are told that we are to go before the people very soon. I confess that there was some force in some remarks made by the hon. gentleman who spoke from the other side of the House with reference to claims which are put forth at elections by political parties and aspirants to the confidence of the people, because they promise if they get into power to effect great economy in the public expenditure. I confess that for myself at the last General Election I did arraign hon. gentlemen opposite for having, during the five years of their Administration, failed to carry out those pledges with respect to the public expenditure and reforms in the administration of the public service, which they had led the people to believe would be carried out; and, Sir, the gentlemen who opposed them, the party of the then Opposition, on their own behalf, and I, as a supporter of the policy which they then professed, on their behalf also, did arraign the Government of the day for their failure to carry out their promises to the people to make those reforms, which seemed to me necessary to the circumstances of the country. I must say that I have the same feeling of regret that hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches have not devoted themselves more earnestly towards effecting administrative reforms. They have carried through some very important measures, they have had matters of great public concern to deal with, and so far as these are concerned I have no fault to find. I feel that their pledges have been redeemed, that the promises made in behalf of that party have been, to a large extent, accomplished, but in the administrative department of the Government I do not see that activity, that zeal and that desire to remove admitted evils, and to effect promised reforms, which I had hoped and expected from them. Having said so much, I will call the attention of the members of the Administration to the state of the public printing, to the manner in which that printing is accomplished, to the enormous expense, and to the delays which occur in the execution of the public printing. Some years ago, before Confederation, it was proposed to remedy the difficulties we had experienced in that Department by establishing a Government printing office, and on the occasion of a visit to Washington in connection with the Post Office Department and some other matters, I was instructed by the Government to make enquiries into the system which prevailed there. I discovered that after trying the contract system for a number of years, and after trying various modifications of that system, Congress had discovered there was only one method by which the public printing could be satisfactorily performed, and they established a public printing office under the control of a public officer; and any hon. gentleman who chooses to go into the library and examine the public documents for a series of years prior to the establishment of a Government printing office, will see what a great reform was effected in the character of the printing, in the binding, and in all those branches which belong to that department, and they will see also, by an examination of the Public Accounts with respect to the public printing, that there was a great saving of expense. It struck me at the time that a great benefit was obtained in consequence of the efficiency and the promptitude with which the printing was done. The manager of the printing establishment called my attention to the delay that had occurred at the meeting of Congress, from the reports of the various Departments and the public documents that it was necessary for Congress to consider, not being in a position to

be put into the hands of members. The reports were behindhand, and, under the contract system, it took a long period to get them ready. He even asserted that Congress was continued in Session some weeks longer than was necessary because of their inability to proceed with the public business for want of the printed documents which they ought to have had earlier in the Session. He said that was now remedied, because he made a list of the various documents and reports required, and was accustomed to go to the Departments and call for the manuscripts, and the consequence was that those reports were printed and in a form to lay before Congress as soon as it meets, and the members could go to work immediately upon them. On the ground of expense, on the ground of facility and promptitude in obtaining information in a form in which a parliamentary body could deal with it, there is no question whatever, I think, that there is a great advantage in having a public printing office. Now, Sir, if you look at the nature of the work, you will see that all you require is the plant and the salary of a superintendent, a book-keeper and one or two others; because the printing business is of that kind that when there is a sudden demand for printers, they are of that circulating class, that you can, by offering them fair wages and certain employment, get as many as you require, and when Parliament is dissolved, you dismiss your extra printers, while there is always enough work required in the meantime to keep a certain force employed. On other grounds, it seems to me, great advantages could be secured, a saving effected, and a much more satisfactory result in the work itself. A report was made to the old Government of Canada with respect to that matter, but from one cause or another, it was not taken up; the fact that the gentleman who was in the office of Queen's Printer enjoyed a good deal of sympathy, which contributed to delay the matter a couple of years, and then Confederation took place, and from that time to the present we have been going on in the present fashion. At present I believe it is doubtful whether we have any legal existing contract between the Government and the gentlemen who perform the public printing; It does seem to me that this is one of those administrative reforms that ought to be taken in hand, and if accomplished I am satisfied we would reap beneficial results. I trust that having called the attention of the Government to the question it will be considered, and they will earn for themselves great credit if they succeed in making the change. At present there are charges of mis-management, charges of political intermeddling, and political objects being secured through contracts for public printing. I do not know how much truth there may be in these, but all that would be removed if we had a public printing office under the charge of a competent printer to superintend it, and the public printing done in a workmanlike manner, done promptly and efficiently, and I am sure, under these circumstances, done satisfactorily, and to the great advantage of the public Treasury.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be remembered that two or three years after Confederation this subject was brought prominently before the House and discussed, and it resulted not only in the printing that had formerly been performed for the public Departments without contracts being placed under contract, as well as the printing of Parliament, but also the distribution of the stationery of the public Departments was placed under the charge of the Government. I do not hesitate to say that the change made at that time has saved the country a very large amount annually and been a great relief to the Government; and it is a question whether this country has reached such a position as to warrant it in establishing a separate printing office under the direction of the Government as is the case in the United States. As regards the publication of public documents and records the United States possess advantages over those

Mr. McDougall (Halton).

we possessed here last Session, but the Government was then placed in an exceptional position that may not occur again. The inconvenience felt has been less this year, but it is a question for Parliament to consider whether we have arrived at that point in regard to the importance of the work that has to be performed to lead us to establish a Government printing office. If we have not done so no doubt we shall arrive at that position, because it is only a question whether the extent of the work will warrant the Government in establishing a printing office.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. How much is paid altogether for printing?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A very considerable sum, and it might include the printing of *Hansard*. It is a question whether the Government will be able to do the work as cheaply as under contract. There can be no doubt whatever that the work will be more satisfactorily performed.

Mr. McDougall. At all events, the Government will not be sued for damages for sending printing away to other offices.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The firm of Desbarats had the contract for the printing of the Statutes in 1860, and Mr. Thompson had the contract for Parliamentary and Departmental Printing. In 1862 or 1863, the Government of which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) was a member, entered into an arrangement for the purchase of stationery by the Clerk of the House, and it has continued ever since. One thing is quite apparent, that the printing and binding of our laws and papers, are far inferior to the work done for any other colony.

Mr. McDougall (Halton). Even British Columbia. The Statutes of that Province are printed like English books.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In New Zealand they are done at the Government printing office. It is, no doubt, desirable that we should avoid as much as possible, doing work by public contract. I am disposed to cast in my view with the hon. member for Halton, but our work is badly done, especially the binding of our Statutes and Sessional papers. It is very nearly impossible to read the earlier volumes of the Confederation Statutes. They are printed exceedingly cheaply, but I would prefer to pay a little more and have an article that would wear and give us more satisfaction. I have often felt ashamed at sending away some of our documents, that they were not better specimens of printing.

167. Unforeseen expenses; expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council and a detailed Statement to be laid before Parliament during the first fifteen days of the next Session..... \$50,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount paid under this head last year was \$24,128.

168. Commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles imported for the use of the Army and Navy..... \$4,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last year we paid \$1,749. So many difficulties occurred in the matter that a fixed sum is given in lieu of the allowance to the officers, no matter how much or how little they drink.

Mr. ANGLIN. While I have not the slightest objection that the officers should obtain their wines free of duty, I think we should be careful not to pay out of the people's pockets an amount under such conditions so as to be merely an addition to their pay.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Complaint is made on the part of the officers that a sufficient amount is not allowed, and a protest has been sent from the Imperial authorities calling our attention to the fact that we should increase the sum; but the Government has not increased it.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the allowance paid out of the public revenue.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. \$1,749.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it is about \$50 or \$60 per officer.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What has been done in the case of the officer at Halifax who was charged with fraudulent practices in connection with the importation of brandy? According to the newspapers he was suspended from his functions and a subordinate was released.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think any one has been released by order of the Government.

Mr. BUNSTER. Esquimalt is supposed to be the head naval station on the Pacific coast for Her Majesty's fleet. Many of the naval officers, instead of going through the circumlocution of going to the Custom house and paying for the goods at the bonded warehouse, and then going back to the Custom house with the officer's receipt, say: "No, you can keep the duty." This is a great injustice to the port. An officer going to sea and wanting to buy a small quantity of goods has to go from Esquimalt to Victoria, at considerable cost and great inconvenience. I hope the hon. Minister of Customs will take the matter into consideration and endeavor to give us a more simple form of collecting these duties. There should be a bonded warehouse at Esquimalt as well as Nanaimo.

169. For the expenses of Government in the North-West Territory, including roads, bridges, ferries, and aid to schools..... \$20,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Last year the sum voted was \$30,000, and the sum expended, \$18,279; therefore, we ask for only \$20,000 for next year.

170. For the expenses of Government in the District of Keewatin..... \$5,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The sum voted last year was \$7,500, but only \$1,265 was expended, principally for the care of insane persons, and therefore we reduce the vote to \$5,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was none of it expended for schools?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

171. To meet expenditure estimated to be required to put into force the Act respecting the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors..... \$5,000

Mr. BUNSTER. This item applies in a wholesale way to the North-West, and the Americans take advantage of it by warning emigrants that if they come here they will be deprived of their beer and other refreshments.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They get pain-killer.

Mr. BUNSTER. That may be very good for them to get from a drug shop, but it would not appease the appetite to which they have been used. Many Englishmen, and particularly Germans, who are in the habit of using ale as their natural beverage, do not care to be deprived of it, and I hope next year the Government will see to giving every man his natural beverage, as they do in Ontario, and strike this item out.

175. To compensate members of the North-West Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duty..... \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This, I observe, is a new item. On what basis does the hon. gentleman calculate the amount? I think such claims have hitherto been paid out of the vote for unforeseen expenses. I am not prepared to say, however, that it is not wise to have a special vote for the purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not suppose we have any special ground for including that sum, which is

moderate. There have been no large claims paid at any time; a few small sums have been paid. The settlement of these claims is a difficult question. A strong young man was seriously injured, and claimed large damages because he was an educated man, or almost a medical man. My answer was that he was a soldier, and his liberal education would not make any difference. So there has been no rule laid down on the subject. I propose a scale somewhat similar to that of the British service, though a little higher, as our men are of a superior class to the infantry soldier, and better educated, and are really to be considered as always in the field. Their work is so hard that a great many drop out for want of physical strength.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I know it is. In the case of present enlistments, has the hon. Minister discontinued the land bounty?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Long ago.

176. To reimburse D. H. Waterbury for loss sustained by his removal from the St. John post office.. \$4,500

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Why is this vote proposed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think there is equity in this proposal. Mr. Waterbury, a post office clerk in St. John, was dismissed from his office, in 1874-75, because the Inspector of Post Offices at the time thought him guilty of a very serious offence. The young man, in order to vindicate his character, brought an action against the Inspector, Mr. Dewe, which extended over two years. He felt he was innocent, and that was the only course left him to vindicate his character. The Courts of New Brunswick gave him a verdict for \$6,500, from which an appeal was taken by the Government to the Supreme Court, in order to test the point as to the liability of an officer in such a discharge of his duty; and it was decided that the Government was not responsible. But this young man, having established his innocence, the Government felt, about a year ago, that the least they could do was to give him employment, and pay him the salary before received; and considering his great anxiety of mind, for a long time, and the position he and his family were placed in, not having been able to find employment, owing to the suspicions against him, we reported in favor of giving him \$4,500 in compensation. I am not blaming any one, and I believe that Mr. Dewe acted honestly in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). There can be no doubt about the justice of this proposal. The Minister of Finance has placed the facts before the House correctly. The young man though innocent was a long time in compulsory idleness, and this vote would no more than compensate him for his loss of employment and mental suffering.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am very glad that the Minister of Finance has spoken so favorably of Mr. Waterbury. I have advocated his claims since 1874-75, but always failed. He was injured and dealt with in a most arbitrary way. We all thought so, and a jury of his countrymen gave him an award of \$6,500, his claims being sustained in every court. The people of the country knew him better than Mr. Dewe and stood by him. So, at the heel of the hunt he comes out, after several years of great anxiety and compulsory idleness, for nobody would employ him in the face of such a charge, with his character vindicated, and yet after eight years of suffering and much loss he does not get the amount the jury awarded him. Still I am glad that even this compensation is granted him, and he stands before his countrymen with his character fully vindicated.

Mr. WELDON. I was the counsel employed in the case and can confirm the statements of the hon. Finance Minister. The action brought against Mr. Dewe was one of slander for his statements in his report as Chief Inspector in the

Post Office. The young man brought the action to have an opportunity of proving his innocence, in which he succeeded in doing. Perhaps Mr. Dewe was over zealous, but I think he acted from a sense of duty and not from malicious motives; because, on a subsequent occasion, he expressed anxiety that he would be able to clear Waterbury entirely of the charges made against him. The question was tested and resulted in a point of law being decided in favor of the Government. Under the circumstances Mr. Waterbury was perhaps unfairly dealt with, although at the time Mr. Dewe thought he was doing what was right. Under the circumstances this grant is a very fair and equitable one.

Mr. McCUAIG. I would like to call the attention of the Government to two cases in my own county where injustice was done to two public officers connected with the Customs at Wellington and at South Bay. They were appointed years ago at a salary of \$450, and the officer at South Bay was transferred from Bath at \$450. During 1873-74 the salaries of these two officers were reduced down to \$250 without any explanation being given, although they had been about twenty years in the service. The officer at Wellington, who is of a very advanced age, has applied for superannuation. Instead of allowing him, upon the average received for many years, the Government propose to superannuate him on the lesser sum, giving him in his old age about ninety dollars per annum. I consider this is a very great injustice, and poor encouragement for officers in the service. I hope the hon. Minister will take my representation into consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. From statements made by hon. gentlemen on both sides, there may be exceptional circumstances in this case to justify this vote, but it ought not to be construed into a precedent. The officers in the service are held during pleasure, and while there is no power of Executive action, which ought to be exercised with a more scrupulous regard to fair consideration for the incumbance of the officer, still I have always held it might be quite within the duty of the Executive to remove an officer, although they could not prove him guilty of any malfeasance. We cannot lay down the rule that there must be absolute proof of his being guilty of some impropriety. I am glad to say, from the statements from both sides, that not only were the suspicions unfounded in this case, but this young man demonstrated his complete innocence. This vote, however, must not be construed as an admission of the principle that the Government must be fettered in its discharge of its duty in removing officers without absolute proof, or submit to a demand for compensation, as to admit this would be very seriously to cripple the efficiency of the service. Therefore, I have felt it right to make these observations on this question. The rule should be, that in the case of an officer discharged on an unjust suspicion, reparation should be afforded him by re-appointing him to the service, by restoring him, with honor, to that service from which he was removed. That would be a sounder mode than to propose that Parliament should give pecuniary considerations for loss of office, which office after all is held during pleasure, and from which the officer might be removed without cause assigned or suggestion of impropriety at all.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I quite concur with the remarks of the hon. gentleman. This case is a special one. I doubt whether for the next quarter of a century a similar one will arise. I agree that it would be a mistake to recognize the principle that the Government could not dispense with the services of an officer when they thought it desirable to do so. In this case the Government did restore the party to his position. He was not taken into Court by the Government but was dismissed.

Mr. WELDON.

There was only one means of establishing his innocence before the country. Therefore, he took the case into Court himself. A young man without any means of his own whatever, except his own character, and with a wife and four children dependent upon him, he felt it important he should establish his character. The evidence produced before the Court, as well as subsequent circumstances, established beyond doubt his innocence. He claimed damages and got them for \$6,500. I must say it is exceedingly gratifying to me to hear the remarks on both sides of the House, because the value of this vote will be increased beyond the pecuniary value by the way it has been accepted on both sides. I quite agree this case should not be taken as a precedent.

Mr. MacDONNELL (Inverness). I do not rise to oppose this vote, but I think it establishes an important precedent. I cannot draw any great distinction between this case and that of a person who is prosecuted at the suit of the Crown for a crime of which he is found to be innocent. Every day we find that innocent persons are arrested, kept in jail without trial, and when the trial comes off and they have expended large sums in establishing their innocence, they get their discharge from the criminal box without receiving compensation. The hardships suffered in such a case, is equal to that suffered in the case before the House. I had a case here a few years ago, when the Government prosecuted a man in my county on a charge of keeping an illicit still. This man was put to a great deal of expense at the suit of the Government, and was proved in a Court of Law to be innocent; still he could not tax his costs against the Government. The one case is of equal hardship with the other, and I think it is establishing a precedent which, if carried out to its logical conclusion, would involve the country in many large actions for damages.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would like to hear from the hon. leader of the Government a declaration of his views on this subject. I am afraid that the hon. the Minister of Finance will find that a vote of this kind will open the door to a considerable number of claims. It may be very desirable to compensate unfortunate parties who have been wrongfully deprived of their position, but it is a far worse thing to have been condemned to imprisonment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite concur in the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham, that this ought not to be taken as a precedent. I do not think there is much danger of that, from the fact that there will be very few dismissals where the party is cleared afterwards and has the good fortune to be able to establish his innocence. If it were proved beyond a doubt, it could be published, if it did not affect other parties. Mr. Dewe made his report in the exercise of his duty. He was not liable for anything in that report, but that report ought not to have been known, and the hon. Minister ought, if he was satisfied of the misconduct of the party, to dismiss him, as he did. He ought to have dismissed him and no reason given. It is well known that no reason could be given for the dismissal of an officer during pleasure. Of course, that is a correct statement of the principle. When the conduct of the Government is impugned in Parliament, of course Parliament is paramount, and can enquire into the circumstances, and see whether injustice has been done. As a general rule Parliament refuses to interfere except there is grave suspicion of improper conduct on the part of the officer responsible for the dismissal. In this case, Mr. Dewe unfortunately said to some person, or in some way, that the party was dismissed because he had committed a felony, and upon that unprivileged statement, which

could not be held as official or protected by law, there was an action for slander brought against Mr. Dewe. The Government undertook the defence of Mr. Dewe, and I did not at all complain of that, although Mr. Dewe was not acting officially in making that statement. The case was fought out and carried from Court to Court, the Government standing between Mr. Dewe and protecting him in this action. Although Mr. Waterbury satisfied the Court and the jury that he was innocent, he got a verdict of \$6,500—he remained for years under the suspicion of having committed a grave offence. Afterwards his innocence was established beyond a doubt by other circumstances arising quite independent of the evidence at the trial. For about six years this case was dragging, and during the whole of that time this young gentleman was under the imputation of being a felon, and it was thought allowing him \$750 a year would not be too much compensation under the exceptional circumstances of the case. I suppose in defending himself he spent fully that amount. It is an exceptional case, and I hope we will not see a similar vote appearing in the Estimates for another year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be better, instead of putting it down as compensation for loss of office, to put it down to pay expenses incurred by Mr. Dewe?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be better.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a little difficulty in reconciling the statement of the hon. gentleman with what I understand to be the law. He says it was because Mr. Dewe, in an unofficial manner, made a verbal statement of the circumstances of the dismissal, and the action was brought. Yet, if I rightly understand the case, the legal defence, upon which the verdict turned out to be inadmissible, was that the communication was a privileged one, that Mr. Dewe had communicated only to such persons as he was warranted in doing in the discharge of his duty. If Mr. Dewe did make such a communication as that, and the case was brought under those circumstances, Government ought not to have taken up his defence, and the Government could not have succeeded in saving him from the consequences of such an act. The hon. gentleman has said that the officer must be dismissed without cause being assigned, and so it is unless Government chooses to assign the reason. If a man be dismissed for immoral conduct I would not have any objection to let him know the reason if he asked it. If that is all that occurred, if there was no more said by Mr. Dewe, what has this young man suffered more than any man who after being charged with an offence, afterwards proved himself to be innocent. By the wording of this vote the House is laying down the principle that if a man is wrongfully removed from office he is entitled to compensation.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This is a dangerous principle to establish. I am not opposed to this vote, but it should be manifest to all future Parliaments that we did not commit ourselves to this principle. What right has this young man to compensation any more than a person who is indicted and acquitted. The young man instituted proceedings against the Government and was acquitted as being innocent of the charge. This is no doubt an exceptional case. I will not vote against the appropriation. The language should be changed so as to show Parliament has the right to remove officers. The difficulty was that Mr. Waterbury asked for an investigation and Mr. Dewe refused it, and he then had recourse to the Courts.

Mr. ANGLIN. It was after the dismissal of Mr. Waterbury that the statement appeared that he was dismissed, because he was suspected of having rifled letters. He suspected Mr. Dewe as being the author of the statement, which he denied, and Mr. Waterbury complained of the manner in which he was treated. It was because of some-

thing said by Mr. Dewe that the action was brought. Mr. Dewe had Mr. Waterbury brought into the presence of the postmaster and the clerk, and in his presence charged him with being guilty of the offence, and stated what led him to that conclusion. Much sympathy was felt for Waterbury in St. John, especially after it became known that the offence was committed by some other person in the establishment. I am satisfied the grant would meet with approval in St. John, at the same time there is room for serious doubt as to the policy of establishing such a precedent as is now proposed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It might be changed to read "to reimburse Mr. Waterbury his costs in the case of Waterbury vs. Dewe."

Mr. MACKENZIE. A case has come up in the English Parliament this year, where an innocent man was convicted of attempt to murder. The Home Secretary agreed to ask a vote to compensate him for the injury done by the unjust sentence.

Mr. ANGLIN. I trust that the hon. Minister will see that the money is paid into Mr. Waterbury's hands and no one else.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

197. Surveys of Dominion Lands..... \$450,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase in this vote is in consequence of the necessity of keeping pace with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Last year about 9,000,000 acres were surveyed into lots for settlers, costing \$350,000. The projected surveys for this year embrace 10,000,000 acres along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and 8,000 square miles of outlying townships in preparation for sub-division surveys next year. In addition to these, there are to be three outlying surveys—one at Edmonton, one at Battleford, and one at Prince Albert. Complete surveys are to be made at these points with the view of meeting probable settlement.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understand that this work will be completed at an average cost of 4 cents an acre. Will this vote of \$450,000 enable him to survey the full belt of twenty-four miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in addition to those side lines?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy so.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman expect to survey the whole of the remaining lands to the Rocky Mountains this season?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are going to try and keep pace with the construction of the railway. The Company hope to get the road built by the end of next season as far as Calgary, near the Rocky Mountains, and we are going to try to keep pace with them.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that at present the whole country is surveyed as far as those surveys have made progress. It will be a waste of money to survey inferior lands on which people will not settle. I think it would be well to block out the country in outline surveys, unless the land over any large area is utterly unfit for settlement. But we should be in no hurry pressing the sub-division townships, except at points to which immigration is being directed. A very large portion of the land so surveyed will not of course be occupied for many years; settlers will pick out the best lots, and the others will be neglected.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I have it stated that sufficient means have not been taken to render the surveys practically useful in years to come; that the wooden stakes and other marks made cannot be expected to be permanent, and that surveys will have to be made over again, if means be not taken to mark more permanently and distinctly the outline surveys.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The land marks of all surveys are liable to displacement, but means must be taken to prevent that as much as possible. People crossing the plains have often pulled up stakes and made fuel of them. In the block surveys it is intended to mark the points with iron piping which can be useful for no other purpose. Only wooden posts will be put down in the subdivisions, as the spots can be easily ascertained from the main points.

198	{	Dominion Lands (Outside Service), covering salaries and contingent expenses of Land and Timber Agencies, Inspections, &c.	61,095
		Extra Clerks at Head Office, Ottawa, publishing maps, advertising and other similar expenses.	20,960
		Outside Service, British Columbia, staff contingent expenses, &c.	10,645
		Land Guides in Manitoba and the North-West.	7,920

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This is nearly double the last rate; what is the cause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The rapid increase of the business in this branch in the public service. A Land Commissioner and an inspector of land agencies has been appointed with headquarters at Winnipeg. Mr. Walsh is the Commissioner, at a salary of \$5,000, and Mr. Percy is the Inspector at \$3,200—he is the Deputy-Head. They form a Land Board. Mr. Walsh will attend to the land business generally, instead of having it inconveniently and ineffectively transacted, a system which the North-West has outgrown. Settlers will go westward, as westward the star of empire holds its sway. There will be an increasing number of land agents, who will have responsible duties to perform. These men are liable to great temptations in that country just now, to which, I am happy to believe, only few of them have yielded. Still there must be an efficient supervision, and I believe that Mr. Percy, who possesses the highest testimonials, is physically and mentally well fitted for the office. The Commissioner will attend to land granting, while the inspector will examine those agencies, report upon them, and maintain the machinery in good working order. Land disputes will be settled by that Board, whose decisions, the members agreeing, of course, will be considered as final, subject to reference to the Courts and to Parliament. Should the Commissioners differ, there would be ground for an appeal to the Department and the Government. As fast as possible all the land granting business will be transferred to Winnipeg and the North-West. It is the policy of the Government and the Department that all general questions and regulations shall be attended to at Ottawa from which patents will ultimately issue. There are some new offices established: a land agency for Qu'Appelle district, and an agency at Edmonton, these are provided for in this estimate. The expense of the new agency at Qu'Appelle will be \$3,800. There are seven land offices, or eight, including the land office at Edmonton. The land office at Edmonton has been removed. There is no land office at Rat Portage as they have not reached there yet.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the \$10,645 expenditure in British Columbia for, we have no lands there except the railway belt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad to find that there is very good land there, in the opinion of the settlers in the Kamloops country. Complaints are made that the Government have not laid out that land, and people are anxious to come in and settle. It is really a large and valuable grazing country and there is a certain amount of land fit for agricultural purposes.

Mr. BUNSTER. I am very sorry to find the insignificant sum of \$10,640 put down for this service. The Dominion does not object to take \$700,000 out of British Columbia for Customs, but can only afford the paltry sum of \$10,000 for opening up a certain belt of land reserved at the request of the Government. For my part, so far as

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the paltry sum of \$10,000 is concerned in exploring British Columbia, I would sooner see it struck out than see the Province insulted by such a small item as that. He ought to have put down \$110,000 instead of \$10,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would mention to my hon. friend that we cannot commence surveying the lands that are to be granted in aid of building the railway, until we know where the railway is to be built. Whenever the railway line is finally located and confirmed by the Government, then we have twenty miles on each side of that line, and such portions of that line as are likely to be available for settlement, of course, will be surveyed. The Government will ask for a vote to survey those lands, and hope to be recouped afterwards by their sale. The first item included in this sum for British Columbia, is to cover the expenses of Mr. Trutch and his establishment. Mr. Trutch, as the House knows, was sent there as Government agent. He has general supervision of our interests in that portion of the Dominion, and he has general supervision over the railway matters there and over land matters, and is continually referred to on all subjects, Customs, Inland Revenue, and every question of public interest. It is arranged that the expenses of this establishment should be divided between the two Departments of Railways and Interior. The whole expense is \$9,840, for which \$4,900 is to be charged to the Department of the Interior and the rest to Railways and Canals. Then there is a branch of the Surveyor-General's Department, consisting of a surveyor in charge with a salary of \$1,000; a draughtsman, \$1,200; two clerks and a messenger, costing altogether \$5,700.

Mr. BUNSTER. It is very seldom that British Columbia is heard on the floor of the House here. It is not many years ago since I drew the attention of the Government to British Columbia. Now, the leader of the Government refers to Mr. Trutch, who once drew a map of British Columbia, and when I accused the hon. member for West Durham of having done injustice to British Columbia, he answered by holding Mr. Trutch's map so fashion on his head, which has ever since been a curse to British Columbia.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Which, his head?

Mr. BUNSTER. No, the map. I wish to call attention to the great injustice Mr. Trutch has done to British Columbia in drawing any such map, when it is well known British Columbia has never been surveyed. There has been no survey made of it, and the paltry sum of \$10,000 is offered in place of about \$110,000.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 12.05 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th April, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RE-ADJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 153) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons. The Bill, of course, as the House knows, is introduced under the British North America Act, and in consequence of the Census of 1881. By that Census it appears that the representation of all the Provinces will remain as it is, with the exception of the Province of Ontario, which obtains four additional representatives by the increase of population, under the scale established in the British North America Act. It is also proposed in this

Bill, in consequence of the increase of population in the Province of Manitoba, to give it one additional member; that will be five additional members added to the House, 211 instead of 206. The principle upon which the readjustment of the constituencies is arranged in this Act is to equalize as much as possible the population of Ontario. In consequence of four new members being added, there must be, of course, a *locus standi* for these additional members. Besides these four members it is proposed to unite the town of Niagara with the county of Lincoln, and also to unite the town of Cornwall to the county of Stormont, leaving six constituencies to be provided for in the Province of Ontario. The arrangement with respect to the additional members will be as follows: The county of Essex, which, as the Census shows, is a county of a large population, is to be divided into two; the county of Lambton, which also has a large population, is to be divided into two; Bruce, which has two ridings, will have an additional electoral district; Middlesex, which has three ridings, will have four; Simcoe, which has now two, will have three; and the county of Ontario, which has two, will also have three. These are the arrangements by which these six additional new constituencies will be provided. I do not propose to enter into minute details as to the different constituencies, because, until the Bill is in the hands of hon. members, and they have the Census before them, they will gather no information by reading the Bill; but I will point out how the principle of representation by population has been applied. Of course, there is not and cannot be a perfect adherence to the principle, pure and simple, of representation by population. In some cases it is impossible to follow strictly that principle, and to provide strictly that all electoral districts shall have the same body of population, but the alterations have been all in that direction. In consequence of the readjustment of so many of the counties there will be a considerable alteration in the arrangement of the different constituencies. I will point out most of them, as I have them in my memorandum. In Cornwall and Stormont the population is the same, and there is no alteration; it is merely joining the towns. Carleton (Ontario) is altered. The population, in 1871, 24,689, is reduced to 20,287, and the reduction will be applied to the adjoining county, the north riding of Lanark. I may mention that the average population in the different constituencies is about 21,000. The north riding of Lanark is too small according to the average. It had 13,943, and it will be increased to 18,345. So in Leeds and Grenville there is an alteration about the same.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the alteration?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is reduced from 12,929 to 12,423. I now state the fact generally, and I will give the particulars a little later. Brockville, which has a population of 12,514, by the addition of the township of Kitley, will be increased to 15,007. Victoria North, with a population of 13,799, will be increased by the readjustment to 16,540. The whole population of the county of Ontario is 60,809. By the readjustment and the addition of some townships from Muskoka, which has some 27,000, South Ontario will have 20,244; North Ontario, 20,823; and West Ontario, 19,730; the constituencies being thus very nearly equalized. Muskoka, which has 27,204, will have 17,640. East York will be reduced from 23,312 to 22,853. North York, from 24,501, will be reduced to 21,730. The three Simcoes, by the readjustment, will stand as follows: South Simcoe, 22,721; North Simcoe, 26,129; and East Simcoe, 27,185. Lincoln and Niagara, with 26,408, will be reduced to 20,901. Monck, from 17,145, will be increased to 17,380. South Wentworth, which had a population of 14,993 will be increased to 16,229. North Brant, which is now very small, 11,894, will be increased to 17,635. South Brant will be reduced from 21,975 to 20,482. North Oxford, from 25,361, will be

reduced to 24,389. South Oxford will be reduced from 24,732 to 23,133. South Perth will be increased from 20,773 to 21,889. North Perth will be reduced from 34,207 to 26,276. North Wellington will be reduced from 25,870 to 23,082. By some accident the figures have been left out for the three Greys.

Mr. BLAKE. Are the Greys to be changed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; slightly. East Bruce will have 22,355; North Bruce, 17,655; West Bruce, 25,618; East Elgin will be reduced from 28,147 to 26,301; West Elgin will be increased from 14,214 to 23,480. The four Middlesexes will stand thus: Centre, or South Middlesex, as I think they are going to call it, 18,889; East Middlesex, 24,552. However, a suggestion has been made to me to-day, that East London, which is really a portion of the city of London, should be taken away from East Middlesex and added to the city, of which it is merely a suburb. West Middlesex will have 19,491; North Middlesex, 19,540; South Huron, which had a population of 27,103 will have 23,042; Centre Huron will be reduced from 26,474 to 22,321; Bothwell, from 27,102 to 22,268; Kent, from 36,626 to 28,112. Essex is divided into two ridings. The population of South Essex will be 22,385, that of North Essex will be 25,659, the division being very nearly the same as for the Local House; and Lambton West will be 24,356, and Lambton East, 18,260. North Norfolk, which is now 17,219, will be increased to 20,869; South Norfolk will be increased from 16,374 to 19,019. Hon. gentlemen will see that alterations on the whole have been in the way of equalizing the population.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt of it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Equalizing the Tory population.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; you cannot equalize a majority.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no majority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we will see. Having made this general statement, if hon. gentlemen wish, I will read the names of the different municipalities composing the constituencies.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The following are the divisions:—

ONTARIO.

1. The county of Cornwall and Stormont shall consist of the town of Cornwall and the townships of Cornwall, Onabrock, Finch and Roxboro'.
2. The county of Carleton shall consist of the townships of Nepean, North Gower, Marlboro', March, Huntley and Goulbourn, and the village of Richmond.
3. The north riding of the county of Lanark shall consist of the townships of Ramsay, Pakenham, Darling, Dalhousie, North Sherbrooke, Lavant, Fitzroy, Torbolton, and Lanark, the town of Almonte, and the village of Lanark.
4. The south riding of the county of Lanark shall consist of the townships of Bathurst, North Elmsley, Beckwith, South Sherbrooke, North Burgess, Drummond and Montague, and the town of Perth, and the village of Carleton Place.
5. The north riding of Leeds and Grenville shall consist of the townships of South Elmsley, Wolford, Oxford and South Gower, and the villages of Smith's Falls, Kemptville and Merrickville.
6. The electoral district of Brockville shall consist of the town of Brockville, and the townships of Elizabethtown and Kitley.
7. The east riding of the county of Peterboro' shall consist of the townships of Asphodel, Belmont, Methuven, Burleigh, Anstruther, Chandos, Douro, Dummer, Dysart, Dudley, Harcourt, Guilford, Harburn, Bruton, Havelock, Eyre, Clyde, Nightingale, Livingstone, Lawrence, Cavendish, Glamorgan, Cardiff, Monmouth, Otonabee and Harvey, and the village of Ashburnham, Lakefield and Norwood.
8. The north riding of the county of Victoria shall consist of the townships of Eldon, Fenelon, Fenelon Falls, Somerville, Carden, Dalton, Bexley, Laxton, Digby, Longford, Lutterworth, Anson, Hindon, Galway, Snowdon, Minden, Stanhope, Shelburne, McClintock and Ridout. The county of Ontario shall be divided into three ridings, each of which shall return one member.

9. The south riding of the county of Ontario shall consist of the townships of West Whitby, East Whitby and Reach, the towns of Whitby and Oshawa, and the village of Port Perry.

10. The north riding of the county of Ontario shall consist of the townships of Scott, Brock, Thorah, Mara, Rama, Scugog, Morrison, Ryde, Draper, Oakley, Macaulay, Maclean, and the villages of Bracebridge and Cannington.

11. The west riding of the county of Ontario shall consist of the townships of Whitchurch, Uxbridge and Pickering, the villages of Newmarket and Uxbridge, and the whole of the village of Stouffville, which now extends partly into another electoral district.

12. The electoral district of Muskoka shall consist of the townships of Watt, Cardwell, Humphrey, Conger, Stephenson, Brunel, Franklin, Sinclair, Chaffey, Bethune, Perry, Proudfoot, Foley, Cowper, McDougall, Parry Sound village and island, Ferguson, Carling, Burpee, Shanaga and settlements on the lake shore to the mouth of French River, Christie, Monteith, McKellar, Bagerman, Spruce, Croft, McKenzie, Ferris, Wilson, Mills, McConkey, Hardy, Chapman, Strong, Magnetawan, Joly, Lount, Machar, Laurier, Ryerson, Armour, McMurrich, Stisted, Pringle, Gourd, Himsworth and Nipissing.

13. The east riding of the county of York shall consist of the townships of East York, Scarboro' and Markham and the villages of Yorkville and Markham.

14. The north riding of the county of York shall consist of the townships of King, East Gwillimbury, West Gwillimbury, North Gwillimbury, Georgina, and the villages of Holland Landing, Bradford and Aurora.

The county of Simcoe shall be divided into three ridings, each of which shall return one member.

15. The south riding of the county of Simcoe shall consist of the townships of Mulmur, Tossoronto, Essa, Innisfil, and Tecumseth, and the village of Alliston.

16. The north riding of the county of Simcoe shall consist of the townships of Nottawasaga, Sunnidale, Flos, Vespra, Barrie, Collingwood and Barrie, and the village of Stayner.

17. The east riding of the county of Simcoe shall consist of the townships of Tay, Medonte, Oro, Orillia, Matchedash, Muskoka, Wood, Medora, Monck, and Tiny, the villages of Gravenhurst, Penetanguishene and Midland, and the town of Orillia.

18. The county of Lincoln and Niagara shall consist of the town and township of Niagara, the city of St. Catharines, the townships of Grantam and Louth, and the villages of Merriton and Port Dalhousie.

19. The electoral district of Monck shall consist of the townships of Gainsboro, Moulton, Wainfleet, Canboro', Pelham, Dunn and Clinton, and the villages of Dunnville and Sherbrooke.

20. The south riding of Wentworth shall consist of the townships of Saltfleet, Binbrooke, Barton, Glandford, Grimsby and Caistor, and the villages of Grimsby and Beamsville.

21. The north riding of the county of Brant shall consist of the townships of Ancaster, Blenheim, East Brantford and South Dumfries.

22. The south riding of the county of Brant shall consist of the townships of West Brantford, Onondaga and Tuscarora, the city of Brantford and the town of Paris.

23. The north riding of the county of Oxford shall consist of the townships of East Nissouri, West Zorra, Woodstock, Elandford, South Easthope and North Easthope, and the village of Embro.

24. The south riding of the county of Oxford shall consist of the town of Ingersoll, the village of Norwich, and the townships of Oxford East, Norwich North, Norwich South, Burford and Oakland.

25. The north riding of the county of Norfolk shall consist of the townships of Townsend, Windham, Middleton, Dereham, the township of Tilsonburg, and the village of Waterford.

26. The south riding of the county of Norfolk shall consist of the townships of Houghton, Walsingham, Charlotteville, Woodhouse, the town of Simcoe and the village of Peterboro'.

27. The south riding of the county of Perth shall consist of the townships of Blanchard, Hibbert, Downie, Fullarton and Logan, and the town of St. Mary's and Mitchell.

28. The north riding of the county of Perth shall consist of the townships of Ellice, Elma, Mornington, Wallace and Listowel, and the town of Stratford.

29. The north riding of the county of Wellington shall consist of the townships of Marysboro', Minto, Arthur, Luther and Amaranth, the whole of the town of Palmerston, part of which is now in another electoral district, and the villages of Arthur, Shelburne, Harriston, Clifford and Mountain Forest.

30. The south riding of the county of Grey shall consist of the townships of Bentinck, Artemesia, Normanby, Glenelg, and Egremont, and the village of Durham.

31. The east riding of the county of Grey shall consist of the townships of Collingwood, Euphrasia, Osprey, Melancthon, Proton and St. Vincent, and the town of Mesford.

The county of Bruce shall be divided into three ridings, each of which shall return one member.

32. The east riding of the county of Bruce shall consist of the townships of Culross, Greenock, Brant and Carrick, the town of Walkerton and the village of Teeswater.

33. The west riding of the county of Bruce shall consist of the townships of Saugeen, Bruce, Kincardine, Huron, Kinloss, the town of Kincardine, the villages of Tiverton and Port Elgin, and the whole of the village of Lucknow, part of which is now in another electoral district.

34. The north riding of the county of Bruce shall consist of the townships of Arran, Elderslie, Amabel, Albemarle, Eastnor, Lindsay,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

and St. Edmunds, and the village of Southampton, Warton, Chesley, Tara and Paisley.

35. The east riding of the county of Elgin shall consist of the townships of Yarmouth, Malahide and Bayham, and the whole of the village of Port Stanley, part of which is now in another electoral district, and the villages of Aylmer and Vienna, and the town of St. Thomas.

36. The west riding of the county of Elgin shall consist of the townships of Southwold, Dunwich, Aldboro', Orford and Howard, and the village of Ridgetown.

37. The electoral district of Bothwell shall consist of the townships of Sombra, Dawn, Camden, Chatham and Zone, and the villages of Bothwell, Wallaceburg, Dresden and Thamesville.

38. The county of Kent shall consist of the townships of Dover East, Raleigh, Harwich and East Tilbury, and the town of Chatham and the village of Blenheim.

The county of Essex shall be divided into two ridings, each of which shall return one member.

39. The south riding of the county of Essex shall consist of the townships of Amherston, Malden, Colchester, Gosfield, Mersea, Romney, the town of Amherstburg, the villages of Leamington and Kingsville, and Pelée Island.

40. The north riding of the county of Essex shall consist of the townships of West Sandwich, East Sandwich, Maidstone, Rochester and West Tilbury, the towns of Sandwich and Windsor, and the village of Belle River.

The county of Lambton shall be divided into two ridings, each of which shall return one member.

41. The west riding of the county of Lambton shall consist of the townships of Sarnia, Moore and Plympton, the towns of Sarnia and Petrolia, and the villages of Wyoming, Forest and Point Edward.

42. The east riding of the county of Lambton shall consist of the townships of Enniskillen, Brooke, Warwick and Bosanquet, and the villages of Oil Springs, Alvinston, Watford, Arkona and Thedford.

43. The north riding of the county of Wentworth shall consist of the townships of Flamborough, West Flamborough, Beverly and Nelson, town of Dundas, and the village of Berlington.

The county of Middlesex shall be divided into four ridings, each of which shall return a member.

44. The centre riding of the county of Middlesex shall consist of the townships of Westminster, Delaware, Caradoc and Lobo.

45. The east riding of the county of Middlesex shall consist of the townships of London, West Nissouri, North Dorchester, South Dorchester, and the villages of East London, Petersville and Springfield.

46. The west riding of the county of Middlesex shall consist of the townships of Adelaide, Metcalfe, Mosa, Euphemia and Ekfrid, and the villages of Glencoe, Newbury and Wardsville, and the town of Strathroy.

47. The north riding of the county of Middlesex shall consist of the townships of East Williams, West Williams, McGillivray, Biddulph and Stephen, and the villages of Ailsa Craig, Lucan and Parkhill.

48. The south riding of the county of Huron shall consist of the townships of Hay, Stanley, Goderich and Colborne, the towns of Goderich and Clinton, and the villages of Exeter and Bayfield.

49. The centre riding of the county of Huron shall consist of the townships of Tuckersmith, Hullet, McKillop, Grey and Osborne, and the villages of Seaford and Brussels.

50. The north riding of the county of Huron shall consist of the townships of Ashfield, Wawanosh, Morris, Turaberry and Howick, and the villages of Blyth, Wingham, Wroxeter and Brussels.

MANITOBA.

51. The electoral district of Selkirk shall consist of the municipalities of Rhineland, North Dufferin, South Dufferin, Lorne, Louise, Argyle, Derby, Brandon, Turtle Mountain, Dennis and Souris.

52. The electoral district of Marquette shall consist of the municipalities of Portage, Norfolk, Westbourne, Cypress, Beautiful Plain, Minnedosa, Riding Mountain, Shoal Lake, and Russell.

53. The electoral district of Provencher shall consist of the municipalities of Cartier, Morris, Montcalm, Emerson, Youville, Hanover, La Broquerie, Hespeler, Sainte Anne, Taché, Saint Norbert and Saint Boniface.

54. The electoral district of Lisgar shall consist of the municipalities of Assiniboia, Belcourt, St. Francois Xavier, Macdonald, Kildonan, Saint Paul, Springfield, Saint Laurent, Woodlands, Rockwood, Fairfield, Gimli, Saint Andrews, Plessis and Varennes.

55. The electoral district of Winnipeg shall consist of the city of Winnipeg and the municipality of Fort Rouge: Provided that any tract of land annexed to and made part of the city of Winnipeg by Act of the Legislature of Manitoba, extending the limits of that city, shall, by such extension, become part of the electoral district of Winnipeg, and detached from the electoral district of Lisgar or Provencher as the case may be.

QUEBEC.

All that part of the parish of Ste. Monique, now in the county of Terrebonne, is hereby detached from the said county, and annexed to the county of Two Mountains.

These are the provisions of the readjustment. The Bill will be printed and distributed immediately, and plenty of time will be given for discussing it in all its details.

Mr. BLAKE. Before this Bill is read the first time, I wish to make a few remarks. Of course, it will not be

expected that I should enter, in any degree, into the details of the proposed readjustment; but I wish to make some general observations with regard to the measure, so far as I have been able to apprehend it. Sir, this measure has been brought down too late and too early. It has been brought down too late, because a measure of this description, which affects very deeply the political interests, feelings, wishes, and opinions of a large portion of the constituencies of Canada, ought to have been brought down at an early period of the Session, when there would have been ample opportunity for its details to be mastered, not merely by us here, but also by those for whom we are legislating. So far as the public basis of the Bill goes, it is based upon information which was in the possession of the Administration as long ago as before last midsummer. The Census returns were published about midsummer, and they were in the hands of the Administration and available to them for a considerable time before their publication; there was, therefore, so far as the public basis of a Bill to alter the representation is concerned, all that period for its preparation. But although its necessity was known, although it was announced in the Speech from the Throne, although it was repeatedly asked for, it is not brought down until the eleventh or twelfth week of the Session, when the hon. gentleman has upon the paper a notice to take Saturday; when we are wearied with our work and all anxious to go away; when, although the hon. gentleman says there will be time for discussion, he knows perfectly well there will not be time for discussion; when there will not be time for that communication with the people to which I have referred, and for their responses to come—I say it is not until this hour that this measure is brought down. It is brought down too soon, for the reason that such a measure as this ought never to be brought down at all. We know the name of a politician which has become historical in connection with the use—the profligate and outrageous use of political powers in the interests of a particular party in the neighboring Republic, to alter constituencies; and I venture to say that this Bill will associate the hon. gentleman's name for all time to come with a similar practice. Sir, what are the principles of the hon. gentleman in reference to readjustment? So far as I gather from his statement, there are over fifty changes proposed to be made in the Province of Ontario. Over fifty constituencies are to have their boundaries changed by this measure. The political map of the Province of Ontario is to be entirely reconstructed. What is the excuse? The excuse is that four seats had to be added to the Province of Ontario. What is the justification beyond that? That the hon. gentleman's nice notions of justice and equality to the different parts of the population are offended by certain discrepancies in the numerical proportions of the different constituencies, and he is obliged, by that strong sense of justice which animates him, to see that these are removed in consequence of the addition of those four members. What is he doing in order to accomplish this? Disregarding, so far as those statements we have can give us information at this moment, wholly the principle which he himself stated should govern us in making the changes ten years ago, when a similar duty devolved upon him—the principle, in respect of which his views were assented to on that occasion by this side of the House, of having regard to the municipal boundaries and divisions, a proper consideration of which should guide him in regulating the constituencies. He is wholly disregarding that principle now. He is detaching townships from their counties and adding them to other counties, and making his divisions under the pretence—and I repeat the word pretence—of equalizing the population, but with the real result of doing what he threatened he would do to an hon. friend of mine not now in the House, hiving the Grits. Hon. gentlemen may laugh at it, but if they had the

spirit and honor of men they would repudiate it. They laugh at it as a good joke that the majority in this House should legislate themselves into power. They laugh at it as a good joke that they should take advantage of their power and majority to do what I have stated is the ruling principle of the right hon. gentleman, so far as he can accomplish it—to collect together a number of townships where the Reformers happened to be in a strong majority, and detach them from the adjoining counties, and so to weaken the strength of the Liberal party in a large number of constituencies, giving them in return an occasional constituency. That is the main feature of this measure so far as redistribution is concerned. Let us consider how far this affects the natural municipal boundaries of the counties, and how far this business of equalization is really the honest intention of this measure, or ought to be adopted by this House. I will deal first of all with the question of detaching the townships from the counties, and making in effect electoral districts, which, although the hon. gentleman calls them ridings of counties, are not, in a great many cases, ridings at all. The name is nothing; it is the substance we look at. In many cases he takes a township from one county and adds it to another and calls it the north, east or west riding of this, that or the other; but it is no longer a portion of the original county, a segment of that organization—it is something added to another county for political purposes—for the purpose of strengthening the Government and weakening their opponents. I wish to read what the hon. gentleman thought on this subject ten years ago, when he had a similar duty to discharge:

“With respect to the rural constituencies, the desire of the Government has been to preserve the representations for counties, and subdivision of counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. (Hear, hear). It is desired as much as possible to keep the representation within the county, so that each county that is a municipality of Ontario should be represented, and if it becomes large enough, divide it into ridings—that principle is carried out in the suggestions I am about to make. That rule was broken in 1867 in three constituencies, viz.: Bothwell, Cardwell, Monck; and I do not think on the whole that the experiment has proved a successful one. I do not think it was unsuccessful as far as the representatives of those new constituencies themselves were concerned, as they are well and ably represented by the gentlemen who now hold seats for the constituencies; and I hope that if am returned again to the next Parliament I shall meet those hon. members. But it is obvious that there is a great advantage in having counties elect men whom they know. Our municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts. We all know the process which happily goes on in Western Ontario. A young man in a county commences his public life by being elected by the neighbors who know him to the Township Council. If he shows himself possessed of administrative ability, he is made a Reeve or Deputy Reeve of his county. He becomes a member of the County Council, and as his experience increases, and his character and abilities become known, he is selected by his people as their representative in Parliament. It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose abilities they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two separate counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest; they do not meet together, and they have no common feeling except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in the other. This tends towards the introduction and development to the American system of caucuses, by which wirepullers take adventurers for their political ability only and not for any personal respect for them. So that as much as possible, from any point of view, it is advisable that counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased it should be by subdividing the counties into ridings.”

Then he went on to point out that he had acted on that principle:

“I omitted to state that it is not intended to divide either Ottawa or Hamilton. Although we have adopted in Old Canada the principle of electoral divisions, it has not been considered in England a proper mode of representation, inasmuch as it totally excludes minorities, and in some constituencies in England they have introduced the system we now propose for the purpose of protecting minorities. It is therefore proposed that Hamilton shall return two members.”

Then replying to the hon. gentleman, I said:

“He did not intend to discuss the details, but agreed that the principle of the division of the counties adopted was judicious, making the elec-

toral divisions conterminous with the counties; and that it was not well to urge the doctrine of population too far, although it should be regarded as far as possible. The principle of representation by population had been properly disregarded, the charges having been made evidently for political reasons, and he was not surprised that the Bill had been brought down at this late stage of the Session when there was scarcely time to discuss it."

Then at a subsequent stage of the debate, the hon. gentleman said in reply that he believed the House generally agreed with him that the county organization should be preserved as much as possible. He had observed this principle, and no county in Ontario had been split up. That was the opinion of the hon. gentleman then. But now we find not merely electoral districts which have learned to act together, which have learned to consider themselves as an organization and as an entity, disturbed by the county divisions, disturbed with regard to one municipality, being taken from one county or a riding and added to another, merely in order to carry out an extensive scheme of the hon. gentleman—not to equalize the population, but to strengthen his hands politically in Ontario. Let us consider how wide his sense of justice extends with reference to the equalization of the population. Is there one law for Ontario and another for the rest of the Dominion—one sense of justice in dealing with Ontario and another in dealing with the rest of the Dominion? Is that what is so offensive that the majority of the House feels, with a stern virtue that they must remedy it so far as Ontario is concerned, at whatever cost to their political prospects, wholly inoffensive, wholly delightful, and to be continued, preserved and extended in all other places? Let us consider what those inequalities are, which the hon. gentleman is bound to redress, as compared with the inequalities which he thinks he should not, and which are favored by the majority in the other Provinces. Let us consider the condition of things which it does not disturb in the other Provinces—for he is not disturbing a single constituency, with the exception of a trifling allegation of both parts of a parish into one district in Quebec. What is the condition of things in Prince Edward Island? Each county there returns two members. Queen's returns two, with a population of 41,111, or 21,505 souls return one member. King's returns two members, with a population of 26,433, or 13,206 persons return a member in that constituency. But the hon. gentleman is not moved by this circumstance. He does not think we have anything to do with Prince Edward Island. Then he must leave Prince Edward Island just as it is, and give to thirteen men in King's the same power that twenty-four men have in Queen's, and say 17,000 men may return a member there, so that the proportion of political power in the different constituencies is twenty-four in one to thirteen in another, and to twelve in a third; and that is a condition of such great equality that the hon. gentleman's reforming tendencies did not lead him to propose any amendment to the representation to equalize the representation in Prince Edward Island. Take the Island of Cape Breton, N. S. Inverness returns a member with 25,651 votes; the adjoining county, Victoria, returns one with 12,470; thus Victoria has two votes to one in Inverness, because its population is not half that of the other. Take the county of Richmond, also in Cape Breton, and you find the aggregate population of Richmond and Victoria is 27,591, against a population of 25,651 in Inverness. Thus, practically, those two counties return two members, while Inverness, with an equal population, returns only one. You have one half the political power in the one case that you have in the other. Halifax, city and county, with a population of 67,917, returns two members; Lunenburg, with a population of 28,583, returns one; and Queen's, with a population of 10,577, returns one. Thus one man in Queen's has nearly three times as much political power as a man in Lunenburg, and more than three times as much as a man in Halifax. Shelburne, with a population of 14,913, returns

Mr. BLAKE.

one member. Shelburne and Queen's together make 25,490 and have two members, while Lunenburg, with 28,583, has only one. To Cumberland, which has 27,368 souls, the same observations would measureably apply. Take New Brunswick. The county of York, with 30,397 souls, returns one member; Westmoreland, with 37,719, one member; Charlotte, with 26,089, one member; Northumberland, with 25,909, one member; while Queen's, with 14,027, or less than half of York, less than half of Westmoreland, and a little more than half of Charlotte or Northumberland, has one member. Sunbury, with 6,651, has one member; and Restigouche, with 7,058, has one member. Thus two persons are returned by 13,709, as against one by 37,000 in Westmoreland, and one by 30,000 in York. Add Sunbury, Restigouche and Queen's, and you have 28,026, returning three members, as against one returned by 37,000 in Westmoreland; add Victoria, 15,686, and you have four members by 41,600 as against one by Westmoreland with 37,000. That is the state of things which the hon. gentleman does not propose to interfere with in the Province of New Brunswick. What are these principles of eternal justice of representation? Are they principles which are applicable to men in one part of this Dominion and not to those in others? Is it essential to disregard those considerations which have induced the hon. gentleman to leave these county and municipal divisions undisturbed, although the excrescences and deficiencies of the system, consequent on leaving them undisturbed, are even greater than those he proposes to remedy in Ontario. Look again at the Province of Quebec. I do not take for the purposes of this comparison the urban constituencies. I leave out Montreal and Quebec, because I always thought that peculiar considerations apply to capital cities; and am not going to discuss to-day how far these considerations should apply. Rimouski, with 33,791 souls, returns one member; Beauce, with 32,020, returns one; Drummond and Arthabaska, two counties, with 37,360, return one; Chicoutimi, 32,409, returns one; Hochelaga, with 40,079, returns one; Ottawa, with 49,452, returns one; making a total of six members returned by 225,091, or an average of 37,513 to a member, in those six constituencies. Take seven more. Gaspé, with 25,001, returns one member; Temiscouata, one with 25,484; Lévis, one with 27,980; Nicolet, one with 26,611; Richmond and Wolfe, one with 26,339; Portneuf, one with 25,175, and Champlain one with 26,818, or a total of 183,408 in the seven constituencies, making an average of 26,201 souls to each member. Add the whole together, and you find thirteen members returned by 408,499 souls, or an average of 31,422 to each. That is the state of things in thirteen rural constituencies in Quebec. Let us look at the other side of the picture, let us see if the hon. gentleman has considered the inequalities in Quebec. Montmorency, with 12,322 souls, returns one member; Three Rivers, one with 9,296; Saint Maurice, one with 12,986; Montcalm, one with 12,766; Jacques Cartier, one with 12,345; Laval, one with 9,462; Sherbrooke, one with 12,221; Brome, one with 15,827; Iberville, one with 14,459; Verchères, one with 12,449; Chambly, one with 10,858; Napierville, one with 10,511; Laprairie, one with 11,436; St. John, one with 12,265; Chateauguay, one with 14,393; Soulanges, one with 10,220; Vaudreuil, one with 11,485; L'Islet, one with 14,917; Montmagny, one with 15,268; Stanstead, one with 15,766; Huntingdon, one with 15,495; Beauharnois, one with 16,000; L'Assomption, one with 15,282; Two Mountains, one with 15,856; giving an average for twenty-five constituencies of 13,048 to each member, as against an average in thirteen of the larger constituencies of 31,500 souls to a member. Take a few of these smaller constituencies: Three Rivers, 9,296; Laval, 9,462; Napierville, 10,511; Chambly, 10,858; Laprairie, 11,436, and Soulanges, 10,220, and you have a total in

these six constituencies of 61,583, or an average of 10,297 souls to a member. Take seven others: Sherbrooke, St. John's, Vaudreuil, Montmorency, Verchères, St. Maurice and Montcalm, and you get thirteen constituencies with an average of 11,421, as against thirteen others with an average of 31,422 souls to a member. The hon. gentleman's opinions of political justice and the rights of the people extend just as far as the Province of Ontario, and he thinks it unnecessary to disturb the constituencies in the other Provinces, by any attempt at equalization at all. To use a vulgarity it is too thin. It is impossible to contend that the people of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island are to be treated in a different way from the people of Ontario, that they are entitled to have any greater regard paid to their rights, or any different measure applied to them from that which is to be applied to the people of Ontario. The hon. gentleman had a duty to discharge. That was to propose to Parliament a mode by which additional members should be assigned to Ontario and he takes advantage of the occasion to propose a complete reconstruction of the political map of Ontario, based upon a violation of the principle which I have read from his speech, of ten years ago, and that violation is obviously made to strengthen his political party, as the great bulk of these changes is intended to do, and to weaken the political party of those to whom he is opposed. Why, Sir, we know how this has been going on. We know there have been caucuses, gatherings, meetings of local politicians, interviews with the Tory candidate members, and discussions of this subject from one point of view only. We know that this discussion has been: "How shall we be strongest? What change shall there be, how shall we be strongest? What change is there which will alter the political map of Ontario in our favor? What change can be made which will weaken our opponents and strengthen ourselves?" Why, conventions have met, the Liberal Conservative Convention of North Bruce met in solemn assembly and have passed resolutions on the subject. They unanimously resolved, and the hon. gentleman has heeded them, that the north riding of Bruce, if both townships, Bruce and Saugeen were detached from it, would be a safe Conservative riding, but that if the township of Saugeen were left it would be dangerous at present and disastrous in the near future. And so the hon. gentleman abandons his boasted plans, he cuts the north riding of Bruce below its population and adds to the other riding, in order to do what the Liberal-Conservative Convention, through its delegate Mr. McNeil, or whatever you call him, told him was necessary in the political interests of his party, and a necessity to mould the riding so that it might return a Conservative instead of a Reformer, even without abstracting from each township a Reform majority of 300 or 400 voters. That was not enough, and after taking 300 or 400 from the Reformers, the hon. gentleman is told by his political supporters that he must go further, that he must dock Saugeen too, else it would be dangerous now and disastrous in the near future; and he takes Saugeen and adds it to the centre part of Bruce in which there is a Reform majority close upon a thousand in order to strengthen himself in the two other constituencies. This is one instance of the mode in which this plan has been arrived at. I say that having a great duty to discharge which demanded from the hon. gentleman that he should discharge it upon principles of general public justice, he has determined to use his majority to load the dice in the political game which is shortly to be played, and so far as he can to take care that the free sense of the people of Ontario, as spoken by the constituencies which he is never tired of boasting returned him so large a majority at the last election, and which he knows, such is the present sentiment, would return him in an equal minority at the next election, to alter these constituencies so as to produce by force of law,

if you can call such a thing a law, a result which he feels, without this interference, would never be produced at all. Why, Sir, we hear hon. gentlemen talking of their strength; they say they are strong as ever they were. Well, there are two omens that they do not feel as strong. First of all they talk of precipitating the elections because they know they would be weaker next year than they are this year; they talk of anticipating it by an appeal to the people, because they feel it is dangerous to wait, and they say that even now, in the Province of Ontario, it is dangerous to appeal to the people with the present bounds. They say: we must proceed legislatively to expound in advance what the vote shall be of the people of Ontario by cutting and carving up the constituencies, by arranging them so as to concentrate, so far as they can, the Liberal strength in a comparatively limited number of constituencies, to weaken as far as he can the Liberal strength in a great many of the constituencies, that is the general plan and scope of the hon. gentleman's measure. I hope, Sir, that the sense of spirit, of justice, of goodfeeling of the Province of Ontario will resent the hon. gentleman's course; that they will say it is a very unfair advantage in a party by their power in Parliament to carve out the constituencies in the way proposed, and that they will refuse their assent to a measure so highhanded, so arbitrary, so unjust, and that the hon. gentleman may not reap from it the full benefit which he expects. But at any rate it will not be our fault if the full iniquities of this measure be not disclosed. They must be disclosed, and we must ask and we demand an answer why this measure is of so different a character from that which the hon. gentleman proposed ten years ago as the county divisions; why a measure so different from that which he is applying to-day to all the other Provinces of the Dominion, should be extended to that Province for which and in whose name to-day and upon this occasion, though sitting here in a minority, I believe I speak.

Mr. MILLS. Before the motion is put I wish to make an observation or two. I had made an extract of the speech of the hon. gentleman, which he delivered here in introducing a measure in 1872. My friend who has spoken has read that extract, and I shall not trouble the House with it. But, it is quite obvious, the hon. gentleman has departed entirely from the principle he laid down then. I believe that was a just principle, which exercised the necessary restraint over the Administration of the day, that it secured to the minority of Parliament something like fair protection against the power which the majority in the House possesses for purposes like this. We do not say the hon. gentleman will reap all the advantages he expects from this measure, but what his friends anticipate there can be no doubt of whatever. The hon. gentleman has been boasting here for the last three years, and his friends have been boasting behind him the extent to which they enjoy the confidence of the country, have been telling us of their popularity, yet we see to what extent they distrust the people by the measure the hon. gentleman has submitted. The hon. gentleman professes that he is anxious to equalize the representation of the people in the Province of Ontario. I deny that the hon. gentleman has any such object in view. His object is to legislate himself and his friends into Parliament, that is the object disclosed in the face of this measure. Let us take the county of Essex. That county has a population of 46,962, more than sufficient to return two members to this House. Why then does the hon. gentleman take a township off the county of Kent and add it to Essex? Why the two constituencies of Essex, without that township, will have each 23,481, and yet the hon. gentleman detaches a township from the county of Kent and adds it to a riding of Essex, which will have after that addition more than an adequate population to entitle it to a member. The hon. gentleman has wholly ignored the fact that the county of Both-

well is not a municipality, that it is part of Kent and a part of Lambton. Kent has upwards of 54,000 population. Now, if the hon. gentleman wished to deal fairly, why did he not give two members to Kent and two to Lambton? Why not do away with the county of Bothwell altogether. The east riding of Kent would not have been more populous than the west riding is at this moment, and if he wishes to adopt the principle of representation by population, why not give to the two counties of Kent and Lambton five members in this House? They would have 21,000 of a population for each representative. If he had wished to adopt that principle, he could have formed a new county out of these two counties, which would have had upwards of 21,000 of a population. Then the hon. gentleman has taken off two townships and a town in which there is a large Reform vote, as I shall show when the Bill comes up for the second reading, and tacks them to the west riding of Elgin; but when we look at the county of Elgin we find it has a population of 42,161, and if the hon. gentleman wished to equalize the population, all that was necessary was to detach the city of St. Thomas from the east riding and add it to the west riding; then we should have had about the same population in the two ridings. But it is perfectly obvious that that would not have served the purpose of the right hon. gentleman; it would not have served the interests and objects of his friends; for it is obvious that the intention of the right hon. gentleman is to legislate himself and his party into Parliament, no matter what may be the views of the majority of the electors of the Province of Ontario. The Bill is a disgraceful measure; it is a disgrace to the right hon. gentleman who submits it, and it is a disgrace to hon. members who support it. It is neither just nor magnanimous, and I say no person who has proper respect for the principles of constitutional government, and of giving to the political sentiment of the country a proper influence, will support the measure which the right hon. gentleman has submitted. It is a violation of the principles laid down by him in 1872, and it does not carry out the object which the right hon. gentleman stated was his object to-day, but which we know is not his object, because his object is to secure to himself and his friends that power which he believes the country, if fairly represented, would not give him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not at all surprised at the great warmth displayed by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell. They do not like the Bill, and why do they not like it? Because they think by a fair and equal adjustment of the population of Ontario they may lose some seats which they have to-day. When Mr. Fox made the great mistake of declaring that the Prince of Wales had a right to assume the Regina without a vote of Parliament, Mr. Pitt said triumphantly:

"I will unwhig that hon. gentleman if he ever goes back on whig principles."

The sole objection of hon. gentlemen opposite to the Bill is because we are equalizing the population.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Their sole objection, I say, is that we are equalizing the population, which was the great Reform principle of representation by population. In former times William Lyon Mackenzie raised the cry of representation by population, and made it ring through the Provinces of Upper Canada, and Upper Canada demanded that measure almost at the point of the bayonet. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite do not like representation by population. They do not like that the population should be arranged in constituencies nearly equal in numbers, and which would express, at all events much more equally, what the deliberate opinion of Ontario is than can be done now with constituencies varying from 30,000 to 34,000. This Bill secures in a great

Mr. BLAKE.

measure equality, and the different constituencies represented, if this Bill passes, will come here with equal force, authority and voice, and will represent more clearly and fully the views of all sections of the Province than is now done with the present inequalities. The hon. gentleman has quoted my speech in 1872. I do not go back on a single word of that speech. Although the hon. gentleman has said we received the support of the Opposition at that time, we received no such support; we were attacked as we have been now for gerrymandering, and making changes with political designs. I remember very well a distinguished and illustrious friend of my own, who sat on the other side of the House producing the picture of one of the ridings of Huron, and said they might worship that, because there was nothing like it in heaven above, on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth.

An hon. MEMBER. That was true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same objections were taken to the Bill of 1872, as are taken to the Bill of 1882, and with just as little reason. The same changes were brought ten years ago as now; but notwithstanding that fact hon. gentlemen opposite are so convinced we acted justly in that re-adjustment, that they are anxious to adhere to it; and, in 1892, if the hon. member for Bothwell and myself are sitting in the same relative positions as we are now, no doubt he will argue, and the leader of the Opposition will contend for the settlement of 1892, just as he is fighting now for the re-adjustment we made ten years ago. I do not go back on a single word of what I said then. I said then, and I say now, it is of great importance to keep the arrangement of the electoral and municipal divisions which were the same; but if the hon. gentlemen will take up the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario they will see what the Liberal party headed by Mr. Mowat did.

Mr. RYMAL. What has that got to do with the question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I contended then that it was of great importance that the municipal counties should be the electoral districts, and I gave my reasons: that young men would become first councillors, then reeves and then wardens, and there would be municipal as well as political uniformity. But we see that the Ontario Government have disregarded that—as is their business—and they have changed the municipal and judicial divisions.

Mr. BLAKE. How did they do it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will produce, in future discussions, a calculated statement, showing exactly what they have done. I say that Ontario has disregarded this principle, and has made the municipal districts different from the electoral districts. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said it is very wrong to take a township from one electoral district and add it to another. Mr. Mowat split townships and villages into two; and when I find that Ontario had, by a Liberal government, acting on Liberal principles, born, cradled and raised in accordance with the principles of responsible government, disregarded that principle, drawing a distinction between electoral and municipal representation, the whole object of my argument is gone and the impropriety of the change, if there be an impropriety, rests on the Liberal Government of Ontario, which is regulated by the power behind the Throne—the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition here. I did not hear what the hon. gentleman exclaimed against the redistribution of seats for the Province of Ontario. I did not hear his indignant tones ringing either on the stump, the platform, or elsewhere, against the legislation in that Province, and if the principle which I laid down in 1872 is to be destroyed, the blame rests there and not with us. Great was the sin, according to the hon. gentleman's language, and great will be the retribution of justice under this Bill. I remember something which happened in

this House when the hon. gentlemen were sitting on this side. Do not we remember that there was a contest for the seat in North Wellington—there was a cross protest, one against Dr. Orton the other against Mr. Higinbotham. The latter held the seat, but while the matter was under trial before the Courts, Mr. Higinbotham introduced a Bill to so dispose of a township—to gerrymander it—so that if the protest went against him and he was unseated he would certainly be elected again. We did not hear the hon. gentlemen protest against that. They condoned it, they supported it and they acquiesced in it. There they sit, these purists. They countenanced that Bill and they countenanced the gerrymandering of the township of Tuckersmith to another riding, but we all remember that the whole country declared: "Thank God, we have a Senate to prevent such a course." This Bill which was introduced in the case of Mr. Higinbotham was only dropped at the last moment; first, because it was too late in the Session, and, second, because the Senate would not stand it, as they saw by the way they had acted in the Tuckersmith case—they would not stand the infamy, to use the language of hon. gentleman opposite. I declare that this Bill is an equalization, in a very large degree, of the population; that it cures many anomalies in the representation. The hon. gentleman says: "Why do you not include the Lower Provinces in the re-arrangement?" Why, Sir, Ontario was the only Province, I believe, that fought the battle of representation by population. Quebec, I think, went against that principle, and if they are satisfied with the mode of distribution I do not think it is at all necessary, when there is no alteration in the number of their representatives, that we should interfere and force that principle upon them; but we, the majority of the Ontario representatives in this House, are fighting the battle of representation by population against the indignant protests of hon. gentlemen opposite. We, Sir, stand on the great principle of representation, by population on the floor of this House. Then, again, they say it is done for political purposes. It is an unworthy, an unparliamentary and un-British idea, that political majorities go by geography and that opinions are cast iron. Look what a shifting sand are the political proclivities of any portion of the country. In 1874, the hon. gentleman opposite had a large majority in the counties, and in some of them, which hon. gentlemen call Tory counties, they had majorities. They would have had no objection then to representation by population carried out on the return of 1874. Then, Sir, in 1878 there was a complete change. There was a much larger majority returned against the hon. gentleman opposite than there was for him in 1874. It shows that the argument to be drawn from the supposed political proclivities of any locality is worthless—there is nothing in it. It is a proud thing for the Province of Ontario to be able to show by the manner in which they decided in 1874, and reversed their decision in 1878—the hon. gentleman says they are going to reverse their decision again in 1883—that they are not governed by hereditary or ancestral politics, that they are not governed by any tie of party, but that their decisions, whether they are right or wrong in individual cases, are given freely and independently; and as we are threatened that they will decide against us again if we do, so we will have to submit with Christian resignation. It is a proud thing for us to say, while we are carrying out the principle of equalization of representation by population, that there is no fear or dread that the people will be less independent, less inclined to use their votes when they are members of a large constituency, than when they are members of a small one. But there is a timidity across there. They would rather bear the ills they have than fly to others that they know not of. They are afraid of the change. They are afraid of having to go to a new element

—to trust a new element in any given constituency. They thought they had their little arrangements with the present constituencies, and they do not want any new elements which would alter or free the constituencies from the alliances, right or wrong, of party caucuses, party organization and party manipulation. I stand on the principle that this measure is a fair one; that it is a Bill which equalizes the population, which acknowledges the principle which was pressed to a successful completion by the Liberal party—the old Reform party of Canada—since that time adopted by all parties as being the true principle, the real basis of representative institutions. This, Mr. Speaker is, I think and hope, a sufficient answer to the fears and apprehensions and the declamatory denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. During the twenty-two years I have sat opposite the hon. gentleman, I never recollect any speech he made, less pregnant with argument of any sort than the one he delivered to-day. It is perfectly manifest that this is a scheme from end to end for the political aggrandizement of the hon. gentleman and his friends. There is no excuse whatever for the measure as he has brought it in. I was surprised to hear him say that his reason for doing so was that the principle of representation by population had never been asked for in the other Provinces, but that as Ontario had demanded it as a recognized principle, he used it in order to aggrandize his own followers. Sir, he ought to be ashamed, if shame can be brought to his countenance, to introduce such a measure as this. He has proved on all occasions during this Session that he is a traitor to his own Province in its feelings and interests. The hon. gentleman has not failed to try, by every effort in his power, to thwart his own Province; he has denied it political power in the aggregate, and now he brings in a sub-division of the constituencies in order to do it in detail. The migration of agents and candidates to the capital from all parts of the west for the last few weeks has proved that his sole object has been the aggrandizement of the political party of which he is the head. I can put my finger on gentlemen who were brought here for the purpose of being consulted with regard to the division of the constituencies.

Mr. BERGERON. Do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was not the Tory candidate for North York brought here?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; he was not.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I had the pleasure, if it is a pleasure, of travelling with him in one of the cars one night, and I heard my own name mentioned and my own constituency canvassed by one of two gentlemen, one of whom was a Tory candidate at the last election; and I heard the assurance given that York would be so arranged that neither Mackenzie nor Widdifield would have the slightest chance—that Mr. Anderson had just returned, and had secured such an arrangement, and the arrangement mentioned was precisely what is carried out in the Bill to-day. Why, Sir, there is a gentleman from Middlesex here at present, who has evidently come in at the last in order to be sure that West Middlesex, for which he is a candidate, will be properly attended to. The same thing is boasted of by Conservative candidates all over the country. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Lower Provinces no division that he could make would benefit him; that he calculates to be able to destroy largely a political party in his own Province by such infamous schemes as that which he has proposed to-day. The hon. gentleman endeavors to mitigate his iniquity by saying that Mr. Mowat and the Local Legislature interfered with municipal divisions. Will he tell one case in which that was done?

Mr. FARROW. In my own riding. The town of Wingham.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The town of Wingham was partly in two counties..

Mr. FARROW. The township of Turnberry.

Mr. BOWELL. For the county of Dufferin the township of Mono was taken from Cardwell, the township of Amaranth from South Wellington, the township of Mulmur from South Simcoe, and I could name others. This is disarranging municipalities.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The case the hon. gentleman has mentioned is not in point. I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite are impatient. If they have the feelings of men about them, they ought to feel impatient. They ought to feel scandalized by the measure which their hon. leader has brought forth. The case mentioned by the hon. Minister of Customs is the case of a municipal district created at the instance of the inhabitants—a municipal county created which was not in existence before.

Mr. HAGGART. What about Cardwell?

Mr. MACKENZIE. It became necessary to give additional members, and the county of Cardwell was made an electoral district for that purpose. What harm was there in that? Who ever complained of it?

Mr. HAGGART. The district of Cardwell was to consist of Caledon, Albion, Adgela and Tecumseth, all townships taken from South Simcoe, and the village of Bolton.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Exactly. The additional representation had to be given where the population lived. Here we find the county of Middlesex, with a population of 72,000, getting four members, while the counties of Kent and Lambton have a population for five members, and two or three thousand over, and yet they do not receive that representation. It is so arranged that part of Kent goes into Elgin, and part of Lambton goes to the old county of Bothwell, while the part now in Bothwell is included in Lambton. The hon. gentleman has so arranged Lambton that he has given the villages that are in the midst of one municipality to the other county, in order to secure, if possible, one member. I shall discuss the matter in detail, however, when we go into Committee. The hon. gentleman has given no reply to the statements presented to the House by the hon. member for West Durham in regard to the populations in the large counties in the Lower Provinces. The hon. gentleman says that he wishes to have the population evenly divided; but if he can show me a single instance in which his manipulation of the population has not been in the interest of his own political party, I shall be very much surprised.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I will mention one. The county of Essex is divided for the purpose of representation exactly as it is for the Local Legislature, with the exception that a Reform township is taken from Kent and added to Essex. For my own part, I would be glad if that was not the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, it is thought that the one county would be obtained, while the other was safe, and that was the hon. gentleman's own view, I have no doubt.

Mr. PATTERSON. No; it was against my wish that it was done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He protested strongly against it, I know.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the west riding of Middlesex has not been changed politically.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, I have not gone into it in detail, but I have no doubt it is changed politically, and I have no doubt my hon. friend from London (Mr. Carling) was a con-

Mr. MACKENZIE.

sulting party in these arrangements. If the hon. gentleman says he was not consulted I will accept his statement. He does not answer me. I recollect many years ago that I had to trot out the hon. gentleman, but he would not come.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Somebody had to be consulted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, and therefore all the sitting members and political aspirants were called together, from Dan to Beersheba, in order to make known to the head of the clan the precise measures necessary to secure success in each of their districts. And this is done by a gentleman at the head of the Government, who is supported to administer the affairs of the country with some regard to fair play, and to respect the interests of the country more than the interests of party. I believe that, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's trickery—I think his masterpiece of political trickery—it will do him a great deal of harm in some districts where the manly feelings of some will be partially aroused to the injustice he is trying to perpetrate. He told us he is the guardian of the sacred principle of representation by population—a sacred principle that he devoted a lifetime to oppose, but which he was willing to accept and act upon when it became absolutely necessary to secure himself in power, as he would to-morrow or next day accept any principle however violent and revolutionary that would keep himself and party in power. It is the duty of the Government, even if possessed of a large majority, to pay some regard to the principles of justice and equality to all classes in administering the affairs of the country. He has ever placed his party interests, however, before patriotism; he subjects everything that concerns the interests of the country, or that in any way affects his opponents, to the crucial test of party advantages to be reaped by himself and friends. I can only say that I trust the direct effect of the hon. gentleman's measure will not, to the extent he is calculating upon, increase his power, as it certainly will not increase his *prestige* in the country.

Mr. RYMAL. I will say a few words in reference to the change proposed in South Wentworth. It was not sufficient that Wentworth, as at present proposed, should be made out of two counties; in order to make it Tory, the Government have drawn from three electoral divisions. They have come within a mile of the county buildings, the county seat of Wentworth for seventy years, ever since Upper Canada was settled, and taken one of the most populous of her townships from her, and transferred it to Brant. They have gone some thirty-five miles to draw a portion of the population to the south riding of Wentworth. The hon. the First Minister says he did it to equalize the population. The south riding had 14,993, and as it is now it will have 15,539 residents. To effect this change he is transferring this populous township to Brant. I have heard a great many stories told by the right hon. gentleman, but did he ever tell one showing as little common sense and reason as that? No. I had some idea before I came here what was being devised by his Tory friends in Wentworth. He says he has not been waited upon by delegates from the different counties, to consult with him upon these matters; but there has been more than one delegation from Wentworth to advise the hon. gentleman, and he has followed their advice. To tell me that this change was not made with a political purpose! Why, I have read the Arabian Nights Entertainment, the Travels of Sinbad the Sailor, and of Gulliver, but any of those narratives would commend themselves to my judgment and faith, more than that statement of my hon. friend. From first to last those changes were all in the one direction. They are calculated to throw the Reform strength of a group of three or four constituencies into one and to make it absolutely Reform; and then we have taken from one, two, or

three surrounding districts, which have been depleted of their Reform strength, portions of counties, in order to make two or three Tory constituencies where possible. There is not a change that does not run in that direction. To talk about justice after a game like that is to insult the common sense of every man in the House. I do not wonder that some of the hon. gentleman's followers hang their heads with shame. Oh, they can howl as loud as they like; if they had the power, they would be demons. They may well hang their heads with shame, for, fearing to meet us before the people, of whom they boasted they had the confidence, they have used their strong legislative power to legislate us out of Parliament. But they meet us with loaded dice and gerrymandering the constituencies to beat us at the polls by trickery and not by the unrestrained voice of the people. I have not had an opportunity of looking at the map, which will show something, I dare say, that would recall a document exhibited by me a few years ago, and to which the hon. the First Minister referred by saying I described it as not the likeness of anything in the heaven above or in the earth beneath. The population of Huron in 1871 was so Grit that the county had to be gerrymandered—it did not answer his purpose. I understood him to say that a township was taken off it, which I believe was to insure the catching of a Tory gudgeon in that constituency. During my twenty-five years of political life, I have never witnessed so infamous a proposition as I believe this to be. Infamous as I believe it, infamous as I regard it, I believe it will be carried out. It is brought down in the interests of hon. gentlemen who will vote for it, because it will secure them seats that they know they would lose, if the unchanged constituencies were appealed to. If it had been done in the interests of equalizing constituencies, Ontario would not have been the only Province that would have been dealt with. The other Provinces has as large inequalities as that of Ontario, with the exception of the favored borough of Niagara, and nothing has been done with them. The principle acted on is that Ontario alone is to be dealt with in this matter. Knowing that defeat stared them in the face, the Government have so gerrymandered the constituencies in Ontario that no doubt many of them will have changed their political complexion under the manipulation, and hon. gentlemen opposite will succeed to a very great extent in the object they have had in view. To say that the supporters of the Government interested have not all been consulted in this matter is sheer folly. The hon. member for Essex just now said that changes were made of which he did not approve. Was he consulted, or did he voluntarily come forward just now for the first time to say he did not approve of that change? There is not one of the Tory party in Ontario from the lowest to the greatest, that has not been consulted in this matter, and there is not a constituency represented by a Liberal from Ontario that has not had Tory delegations down here consulting the Ministers in reference to this matter. I could see them two weeks after the beginning of the Session, coming in day after day, and they were received by certain members who had the matter in charge. The whole thing has been going on as regular as clock work and now we find the result. I do not believe it will have the effect they desire, for I think that the feelings of an outraged people will revolt against such scheming as this. I have not patience to express my feelings on this subject. I feel a little like the man who was addicted to a great deal of profanity and was driving a waggon load of pumpkins up a hill. Some of the boys thought they would hear some tall swearing and lifted the tail-board out of the wagon. He drove his oxen until he got to the top of the hill, when he looked back and saw the pumpkins rolling down and the

boys watching him to hear what he would say; but he said very little. One of the boys said: "Why don't you swear?" "Why," he said: "I could not do justice to the occasion." So I feel. The amenities of this House would be outraged were I to give expression to my feelings, and I do not want to outrage them. But if any hon. gentleman wishes to talk this matter over with me outside the House, there would be some strong denunciations used.

Mr. BOULTBEE. It is rather an unfortunate thing that this Bill should, on its initiation, produce a rather bad effect on the House, at least on some portion of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have lost their temper to a very unfortunate extent, except one of them who generally loses his temper quicker than any one else, the hon. gentleman for Centre Huron. He appeared smiling in a much more genial manner than I ever saw him in before, I conclude that he must feel secure and pretty comfortable about his seat. It is rather apparent that his colleagues do not feel very comfortable about theirs. It is an instructive example in this House, to find the sort of feeling that animates these gentlemen. We never knew before what a pure set of patriots they are. If they had to distribute the constituencies they would do it in such a way as patriotically to serve the Conservative party, to aid it by consulting those supposed to be best informed on the subject. In the way they did it in the Ontario House, we have an indication of the way they would make the distribution on this occasion. From what I know of what took place in the arrangement in the Ontario House, and from what I can bear in mind of what is proposed in this Bill, there is no such gerrymandering here as was proposed and actually carried out in Ontario. Oh, but they say then it was all right. Now the boot is on the other foot. That was done in the interest of Gritism, of the faithful. But with this Bill these hon. gentlemen have lost their temper and made use of language which properly ought not to be used on the floor of this House towards their opponents. However, the hon. member for South Wentworth made a different speech in this House from what he ever made before, for I never heard him make one unless to damage an opponent or hurt his feelings; but on this occasion he was so affected that he compared himself to a man who was driving a waggon load of pumpkins up a hill and lost them all before he got to the top. That is what I expected it would look as if some one had taken the tail boards out of the waggons of the hon. gentlemen opposite and their pumpkins had rolled down the hill, for I never saw a set of men looking so downhearted. They have attacked this Bill in an unfair manner. Not one of them said this was an arrangement to distribute the seats strictly according to population and geographical propriety. They cannot deny that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We do deny it.

Mr. BOULTBEE. Their abject demeanor shows that they think a re-arrangement of the constituencies in Ontario strictly according to population and with geographical propriety, wipes Gritism out of existence. Why should that be so? I am unable to follow the effect of the re-arrangement, and I know the political complexion of Ontario as well as any one. I say, as was said by the hon. leader of the Government, you cannot define that in that sort of way. You do not know from one election to another what the result is going to be, but we gather from these hon. gentlemen that re-arranging the seats so as to divide Ontario into ninety-two or ninety-four constituencies—I do not remember the number—so as to give them as nearly equal population as possible, and be as geographically correct as possible, means the utter defeat and extinction of Gritism, I am not surprised it should be so. These gentlemen are determined in carrying out their own ideas, and have set themselves against the will of the

people in every possible way. After having been four years here they continue to oppose that National Policy, which was passed by a larger majority than any other measure. The general feeling has not failed but it is intensified, and the people are more in favor of that policy than before. Yet we hear those hon. gentlemen, because there is a re-arrangement of the constituencies, arraigning that as a reason why they expect to be ignominiously defeated at the next elections. It would be impossible such a state of things could exist. If the people were not so strongly opposed to the policy of these hon. gentlemen it would be impossible to make any re-arrangement which would result in the entire destruction of a party. When we come to debate this measure clause by clause we shall be able to show that, as compared with the arrangement made by the friends of these hon. gentlemen in the Province of Ontario, this is a fair and statesmenlike measure, and one that will commend itself to the favor of the whole people.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before this Bill passes its first reading I wish to offer a few remarks, and I first refer to the assertion made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, as to the geographical propriety that has been observed in the construction of ridings under this Bill. I have a little diagram here which shows North Norfolk as it exists under the rearrangement. If that is a specimen of the geographical proprieties that have been observed by the right hon. gentleman, then I do not want to know much about such propriety. Here is a riding forty miles in length and four and seven-eighth miles in width in the centre. Now, geographical propriety would have been observed had the township of Norwich been taken in the riding would then have been symmetrical. But unfortunately the township of Norwich gives a Reform majority, while the township of Dereham gives a Conservative majority; consequently the geographical proprieties are observed as we find them in this diagram. Well, Sir, I apprehend that when we come to examine this Bill—a Bill which marks one of the scandalous epochs in the history of this Dominion—we shall find the geographical proprieties observed in much the same manner in many other cases. This is the Government who boast of their strength before the people, of the popularity of their policy, and that they have nothing to fear from an appeal to the people; this is the Government which is about to bring on the elections one year in advance of the proper time, in order to snatch a verdict. Not daring to wait for the fruits of their policy to ripen twelve months longer, it now resorts to this scandalous scheme of gerrymandering the constituencies in an entire Province for the purpose of obtaining a verdict by fraud from the people. Well, Sir, they may succeed. It is possible this scheme will add to the influence and to the number of votes of the party now in power at the next General Election; but I apprehend that the net result of this thing will not be as favorable as the hon. gentlemen imagine. I believe the better sense of the people of Ontario, that innate sense of justice which exist in the breasts of the people, will in thousands of instances lead them to repudiate this scandalous outrage upon the rights of the minority, although it seems, at present, that the result will be to the advantage of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are, if I may use the term, drunk with power. But, ultimately, when the record of history is made up, these men who are guilty of this outrage will be ashamed of the action of this day. I regret that a gentleman so long connected with the public affairs of this country, who has expended here so many years of his life, I refer to my right hon. friend, should allow his character to be sullied as it will be sullied by this measure. The hon. gentleman, however, seems to think it is a political necessity, but he must have very little regard as to what the verdict of the future may be, and I am sure

Mr. BOULTBEE.

the hon. gentlemen who sit about him will regret the step that has been taken to-day, this shameless gerrymandering of the constituencies of an entire Province, this outrage upon popular rights. I believe that the time will come, if they can feel a sense of shame—perhaps they cannot, some things can be done by men which would bring a blush of shame to the great Prince of Hades—but if they are capable of that feeling the day will come when they will regret this step, a step which I verily believe will be like a boomerang which will recoil upon them to their own discomfiture and loss.

Mr. BUNSTER. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. the First Minister to the desirability of having that part of British Columbia known as Vancouver Island, redistributed, giving all north of Nanaimo one representative, and all south of Nanaimo to Cape Beale one representative, except Victoria city which ought to have one in place of the two she now has. This would be only fair to that part of British Columbia known as Vancouver Island. I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister to a map which I have caused to be made, showing the geographical situation of Vancouver Island. Vancouver Island is not the inhospitable country that has been represented to him.

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

After Recess.

FIRST READING.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was introduced and read the first time.—

Bill (No. 154) to amend "The Extradition Act, 1877,"—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 5) respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Inspection of Steamboats, and the examination and licensing of engineers employed on them.

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

(In the Committee.)

On clause 7,

Mr. McCALLUM. I think any one appointed inspector of hulls should undergo an examination to prove his competency.

Mr. McLELAN. This clause is put in so that in cases of necessity, we may call in the surveyors for the English and the French Lloyds. They are the very best men who can be found in the country for the inspection of shipping.

Mr. McCALLUM. If they are such good men, they can have no objection to being examined.

Mr. McLELAN. The very fact of their being surveyors for Lloyds' is a proof that they must have been examined.

Mr. McCUAIG. I have no doubt that Lloyds' surveyors are well qualified to give an opinion as to the construction

of ocean-going vessels, but they have no experience of lake vessels, which are built on an entirely different principle.

Mr. McLELAN. It is provided that on the upper lakes, where there are no Lloyds' surveyors, competent ship-carpenters shall be provided by the Department.

On clause 9,

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not see that a man who is simply qualified to inspect the hull of the vessel can inspect the machinery also, or should be called upon to perform such work. At present there is a heavy penalty provided in the case of owners who have failed to obtain the inspection of engines and boilers.

Mr. McCUAIG. What is the object of appointing a hull inspector, unless he is qualified for his work? If qualified he does not require a Chairman of a Board of Inspectors to exercise jurisdiction over him. I contend the Chairman of the present Board is not qualified to inspect the hull; he is a mere engineer and unfit to pronounce on the hulls.

Mr. McLELAN. He is competent to discover and report any damage or defect in connection with the hull which will come to his knowledge when he is examining its boiler and machinery.

Mr. McCUAIG. What has he got to do with the hull?

Mr. McLELAN. He is to go aboard to examine the machinery and the boilers, and if he should discover or suspect anything wrong with the hull, it is proposed to give him power to call a meeting of the Board and procure an investigation; and, as a matter of course, the Board would send the hull inspector to report upon the vessel. It is an extra precaution for safety.

Mr. McCUAIG. The owners of steamboats have been called upon for the last sixteen or twenty years to pay the charges of inspection, and have not been after all relieved from the risk of unseaworthiness, because the inspectors of engines and boilers have not been able to satisfy the Courts they were qualified to pronounce on hulls. I object to the Chairman of the Board, who is nothing more than an engineer, having anything to do with the hull of a vessel.

Mr. McCALLUM. The 11th clause gives protection enough to the public, because if anything happens, if the vessel is injured in her machinery, hull or equipments, the owner is liable to a fine of \$200 for every day he neglects reporting the matter to the inspector. After all that, more protection is proposed.

Mr. McLELAN. The word "hull" is left in for the reason that the inspector of machinery is supposed to visit the vessels oftener than the inspector of hulls, and if he discovers anything wrong with the hull, he is to call a meeting of the Board to have the inspector of hulls sent to the vessel. It is not provided the inspector of hulls shall have power to give a certificate.

Mr. McCUAIG. The moment you do that you raise a conflict of opinion. I have a right as the owner of a vessel to know what my responsibility is, and if you appoint an inspector, to satisfy the Court that a boat is seaworthy, his certificate should suffice. I object to an engineer having anything to do with the hull. Do you give the same power to the inspector of hulls to examine the engines and boilers of which he knows nothing?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. If the inspector of hulls sees or suspects that anything is wrong with the boiler it will be his duty to inform the inspector of machinery.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. Minister says that this clause was in the former Bill. That is no argument, because we went wrong before. The object of this Bill should be to set us right. I object to the inspection of boilers being under

the control of the Chairman of the Board; the man appointed to inspect knows how to inspect. I, therefore, move that the word "hull" be struck out of the 2nd line of clause 9.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 10,

Mr. McCALLUM. I have something to say on this clause. The master should report to the owner and the owner to the inspector; the master should be made liable.

Mr. McLELAN. Suppose the ship was away from the owner, how could the master report then?

Mr. McCALLUM. Say the owner or agent.

Mr. McCUAIG. You first of all demand the right of appointing an inspector of the hull and engine, and after the engineer is placed on a boat with a certificate of your own inspector, and he neglects his duty, you subject the owner to a \$200 fine for any neglect. Why should you fine the owner? The man who is guilty of dereliction of duty is the man who ought to suffer.

On clause 14,

Mr. McCALLUM. I move that this clause be struck out, it is entirely unnecessary, and is putting power in the hands of the inspector which he should not have.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 16,

Mr. McCUAIG. I feel it my duty to say publicly on the floor of this House that this inspector has built several vessels for men in Upper Canada, and in every case they were ruined. After the calamity at London, which befel this country by the operation of this very law, the hon. Minister tries to give him more power than he had before. The power given to him in this Bill is more than any man should be entrusted with in the country. I say he is unfit to examine the hulls of boats, and his experience is not such as to justify the giving to him of these powers. I saw this Bill before it was printed, and it has been since altered very materially, I suppose at the instance of this inspector.

Mr. McCALLUM. I know the Chairman very well and I know him to be a good and efficient officer in the discharge of his duties as far as the inspection of steamboat boilers and engines are concerned. The very fact of there having been so few accidents in Ontario proves that he discharged his duty efficiently, but at the same time I object strongly to putting anything in this Act but what is in the interests of steamboat owners and the people, because anything you put in it Mr. Risley will carry out to the letter. As to the accident which took place last year at London on, what I may call a frog pond, I consider it was the fault altogether of the man in charge of that boat at the time and not the fault of the inspector. The captain took four passengers on board where he ought to have taken only one, and if he could not keep off the crowd he ought never to have left the wharf.

Mr. McLELAN. We are not giving the inspector any more power than he had before.

Mr. McCALLUM. I object to sub-section 2 of clause 11. It requires the boiler to be swept out in order that the inspector may not get his clothes dirty. It would be cheaper for the Government to provide him with a pair of overalls to keep his clothes clean.

Mr. BERGIN. It seems to me this is giving the inspector a great deal of power. He may make himself, not only very obnoxious to owners of vessels, but he may do much injury to them. It gives him the power to remove the bulk-heads at any time in order to facilitate his inspection.

Mr. McLELAN. It will be a very simple process, just unscrewing the nuts. No man can inspect a steam-boiler without requiring that to be done.

Mr. McCUAIG. Any inspector may come on board a boat and test a boiler with the cold water test which will stand as high as ninety, but he must lock her up at sixty. By this Bill the inspector may knock off twenty or thirty pounds from any boiler after being locked up at two-thirds the test pressure, at his own discretion; consequently I am precluded from using that boat to its full capacity, and am unable to connect with the railways. Are you going to give the engine and boiler inspectors power to go on board and reduce the propelling pressure so as to render the steamer valueless? It is simply preposterous. Before this Bill was printed I asked the Minister to amend sub-section 3 so as to refer any dispute between the owner and the inspector to skilled arbitrators; yet I do not find that in this Bill. Our property now is almost valueless and this will make it entirely so.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think this clause might be amended. As it stands now, any inspector may subject a boiler to a hydrostatic test whenever he takes it into his head, no matter whether the owner has a certificate or not. He may go every week and subject it again to this hydrostatic test, and may require all these bulk-heads to be taken away at the expense of the owner. It is evident that the best feeling does not exist between the inspectors and the steamboat owners. I think it would be well to amend the clause, so that inspection should only take place upon the application of the steamboat owner, and not whenever the inspector pleases to do so. I think that when a boiler is certified in the spring, that ought to be sufficient for the season.

Mr. McCUAIG. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) forgets that the engineer is an officer under the control of the Inspector of Steam-boilers, and it is his duty to notify the owner and inspector if he sees any defects in boilers. But for twenty-five years I have never heard of an instance where an inspector examined a boiler twice during a season.

Mr. McLELAN. Suppose an engineer calls attention to the fact that the boiler requires inspection, although it was inspected five or six months previous, it could not be done if the amendments were adopted. It would be better to adopt the clause in its present form as there would be no danger of an inspector making an inspection too often.

Mr. ROCHESTER. An inspection once a year is all that is required.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 18,

Mr. McCALLUM. I move that the word "and" be substituted for the word "on" in the first line.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 19,

Mr. McCALLUM. I move that in sub-section 2 the word "boiler-cocks" be struck out.

Mr. McLELAN. It is important that these words should remain in, as I am informed that accidents have occurred by the boiler-cocks being screwed loosely in the boiler, there being very little hold on them, so that when pressure is on they fly off.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. McCUAIG. The *City of London*, a vessel lost at London with 208 passengers, was inspected by Mr. McNeely, and yet my hon. friend says she was not. She had been inspected by him, however, before the accident. That is about the general result—the owners suffer, and these men get off scot free, and this Bill is put through the House without being properly considered and understood. Steamboat owners have paid some \$25,000 or \$30,000 over

Mr. McLELAN.

and above what has paid these men, who are extravagant in their general expenses.

Mr. McCALLUM. I wish to amend clause 33, which provides that these boats shall have a supply of fire-buckets of metal, leather or other similar material by striking out the words "metal, leather or other." I believe wooden buckets are the best, as one of them thrown to a man overboard would enable him to float and save his life while a metal or a leather bucket would carry him to the bottom.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 35,

Mr. McCUAIG. This clause provides that each steamboat of 200 tons and upwards, shall be provided with 200 life-preservers; and each steamboat of less than 200 tons shall be provided with not less than three life preservers for every five passengers. The figure ought to be 250 tons instead of 200, as the measurement of vessels have been materially altered of late, in consequence of the saloons and staterooms. As has been pointed out by one of my correspondents, under this clause a vessel of 195 tons would carry about 117 life-preservers, while one of 200 tons must carry 200 life-preservers. If 200 are necessary in one case, the other number is quite too small. This shows that the Bill has been put together without proper consideration.

Mr. McLELAN. That is the law that has worked well for years. I wish to amend the clause by inserting after the word "passengers," the word "crew," in order to provide water-floats for them also.

Mr. McCUAIG. These wooden floats are of no avail to save a man, as we know by experience; they have been thrown away, and by this Bill it is proposed to revive them. I do not see the use of having a number of them besides the cork life-preservers, except in cases of excursions, and then in such cases I would place a standard pine board, 18 feet long, 10 inches wide and 1 inch thick, for every passenger or excursionist on board the vessel.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. My hon. friend knows that these wooden life-preservers have been used for a long time. Experience has suggested no difficulty regarding them, and it is scarcely worth while to make a change.

Mr. McCUAIG. Since this Bill was framed originally, the late Government altered the measurement of vessels so as to make it about three times what it really is. I have been forty years connected with the transport trade, and have not very often imposed on the indulgence of this House, but I look on this clause as very important for the preservation of life. Our whole inspection system for years past has been a myth. These different clauses are pushed through the House without being properly considered. Our property is rendered almost valueless as an investment, and bankruptcy stares every vessel owner in the face.

On clause 40,

Mr. McCALLUM. I think that steamboat owners should be allowed to say they will place a pump on board their vessel without being dictated to by the inspectors. A steamboat owner knows his own requirements. I protest against the way this Bill has been carried. If the hon. Minister will not allow what is right and reasonable, I will divide the House on the third reading on every single amendment that I have proposed, if it takes a week to do it.

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman has woke up to the importance of observing the well-known parliamentary rule, that supplies should not be voted until legislation is brought down. He sees now the mischief arising out of the policy the Government has pursued.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not see what the supplies have to do with it, and as far as that goes the supplies are not passed yet. I do not want to say I am going to obstruct legislation, but I intend to exercise my right in the interests of the people, and I ask the hon. Minister for a reasonable concession to the steamboat interests. I move that subsection 5 of clause 40 be struck out.

Amendment negatived.

On clause 41,

Mr. McCALLUM moved that the word "passenger" be added before the words "main deck of the vessel."

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 43,

Mr. McCUAIG. When the Chairman of the Steamboat Inspection was here from Toronto I was asked to go over to the Marine Department. I suggested that each sailor should be provided with a kind of cork waistcoat, which he should wear in storms and which would preserve him in case of accident. As a rule, the more intelligent a sailor is, the more he appreciates danger, and if he has something about his person to preserve him when he jumps into the water he would not be the first to jump into the lifeboat in case of accident, but would be the last to leave the ship, while assisting the passengers to escape before him. This suggestion was entirely ignored. One would suppose that the Minister would readily have consented to a thing of that kind, but no heed is paid to it. I think the Minister ought not to be above advice coming from members of this House, who, having had experience, can give intelligent advice.

On clause 44,

Mr. McCALLUM. I disagree with the suggestion of my hon. friend from Prince Edward. The poor sailors have quite enough to carry now. Let the owners of vessels provide them with life-preservers if they wish. With regard to the number of fire-extinguishers which a vessel shall carry, I think it should be fixed by this Bill and not left to the whims of inspectors. We want no Orders in Council, changing the number from one year to another.

Mr. McCUAIG. As an owner of passenger steamers, I consider every possible requirement for the extinguishment of fire should be given, and I am quite willing to leave that in the hands of the inspectors. With reference to cork waistcoats, my hon. friend happens to be engaged in tug-boats and not in passenger steamers as I am, and I think I know quite as much as he does about the necessity of deck-hands being provided with life-preservers.

On clause 45,

Mr. McLELAN moved to amend it, so that applicants for the post of engineer, in case the Board is not sitting, may obtain a certificate until the next meeting of the Board.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 52,

Mr. LANE. I think something should be added to that clause. I believe accidents, which have occurred during the last few years, have been chiefly caused by overloading the vessels with freight. Last year, the *Jane Miller* went down in Georgian Bay with some thirty lives on board; two years previously the *Waubuno* was lost, and a year or so before the *Simcoe*, not one being left in either case to tell how the accident occurred. But it is well understood that two causes were mainly to blame: one, the overloading, and the other that the vessels were not properly constructed. There is generally an accumulation of freight at the last of the season, and there is a great anxiety on the part of steamboat owners to carry all they can the last trip or two. I think there should be a resident inspector at the chief ports on the great lakes to see that vessels are not overloaded. The

matter is a serious one, and should engage the attention of the Government.

Mr. McCALLUM. So long as we are engaged in navigating the waters in this country accidents will occur. The men who are in charge of the vessel, who risk their lives upon her, and who know how she will act in a heavy sea, are the best judges of how heavily she may be loaded. The hon. gentleman says that there were no survivors of the accidents he mentions, and he then goes on to say that the cause of their loss was overloading, but how does he know. I have heard that the *Jane Miller* was built with only a single frame, and was not strong enough for the lake service though she would do well enough for a river. How would an inspector be able to tell how a vessel would behave on the water? You cannot lay down a cast-iron rule and say that every vessel shall only be loaded so much, as a proper load depends altogether on the make of the vessel.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the loss of the *Simcoe* on Lake Huron. The reason that vessel was lost was because she was loaded with wheat in bulk, which shifted. Wheat is not allowed to be carried in bulk in ocean vessels, and I think a similar provision ought to be made with regard to vessels on the lakes.

Mr. McCUAIG. The best guarantee that a vessel will not be overloaded is that the master and mariners risk their lives on the vessels they sail.

On clause 55,

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). This clause, which is intended to prevent the master of a vessel from overloading it with passengers, is an important one, but I think the penalty is too small. We all know the great accident that took place at London, on which occasion it was proved the vessel was overloaded. I think the penalty of \$200 for such a crime is too little; and it ought to be at least \$1,000.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I quite agree with my hon. friend. When the captain of a vessel is so regardless of human life as to allow it to be overloaded, I think he ought to be held to be guilty of a misdemeanor, and be subject to imprisonment as well as a fine.

Mr. McCALLUM. If the penalty were made any larger, I do not think you would be able to enforce it.

Mr. McLELAN. I will agree to strike out \$200 and insert \$500, making the fine not less than \$50 and not more than \$500. If it were made too large, actions might not be brought, and the measure would therefore be inoperative.

Mr. ROCHESTER. This House cannot be too strict in providing that captains and engineers do their duty properly. I saw last summer, while on a steamboat on the St. Lawrence, an officer of another steamer lie down on the safety-valve, and increase the head of steam so much as to cause the vessel to rush ahead with much greater speed, and there were a great number of passengers on board.

Mr. McCUAIG. That was a very remarkable case, because there is always an iron case over the safety valve. I think it should be provided that any violation of the clause respecting the number of passengers a steamer should carry should be punished with the penalty of \$500; passengers lives are at stake, and the disobedient officer should be the victim.

Mr. McLELAN. This is a new regulation never tried before, and too high a penalty would make it inoperative.

Mr. McCALLUM'S motion, that clause 56 be struck out, was negatived.

On clause 57,

Mr. McCUAIG said that this provision for good and sufficient gang-boards was never carried out, and there is no use in retaining it in this Bill.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Why can it not be enforced ?

Mr. McCUAIG. Because these iron hand-rails on the gang-boards are never used.

On clause 62,

Mr. McCALLUM. I believe this clause violates the principles of British law, which says that a man is always considered innocent until found guilty. The clause reads:

"If any damage to any person or property is sustained in consequence of the non-observance of any of the provisions of this Act, imposing any duty on the owner or master of any steamboat, the same shall be deemed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, to have been caused by the wilful default of the master or other person having charge of the steamboat, in respect of which such non-observance has occurred, or such damage is done, and the owner of such steamboat, in all civil proceedings, and the master or other person having charge thereof, in all proceedings whether civil or criminal, shall be subject to the legal consequence of such default." (31 V., c. 65, s. 36)

This goes very far; if a man is brought up before a court for anything that has happened, he will have to prove his innocence. This should be amended.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This provision only applies in the case of wilful default.

Mr. McCUAIG. No man in the world will be able to observe all the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is time enough to punish a man when you find him guilty. A man should not be obliged to clear himself of such charges. I wish to amend that clause to provide that the owner of such a steamboat in all proceedings whether civil or criminal, shall be subject to the consequences of such default. I think that will meet the case sufficiently.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it is any improvement.

Mr. McCUAIG. If such laws are passed, with their restrictions and penalties we shall soon have no steamboats at all. Most of these clauses are ill-considered and useless.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This seems to me a most reasonable clause, which does not violate any principle of English law; because in the first place a complainant, before taking action, must have sustained some injury in consequence of the non-observance of some rule or regulation which ought to have been observed; and the clause simply provides that if a man sustains damage in this way that, *prima facie*, it shall be considered as done wilfully by the master or owner. It is open to the master to show that it is not done wilfully.

Mr. McCALLUM. You violate that principle of British law, if you hold a man guilty before he is proved to be guilty. It is a most monstrous provision.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If default is made he is presumed to be guilty.

Mr. SPROULE. If the accident occurs through any violation of rules of course there must be proof, and if the rules are violated of course the penalty is a fair one.

On clause 64,

Mr. McCUAIG. I move that "Justice of the Peace" be struck out. There are justices of the peace in Ontario unable to write.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported.

THE IRON INDUSTRY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BURPEE. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to place in your hands the following amendment:—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved that pig, bar and sheet iron, boiler plate and tubing are mater-

Mr. McCUAIG.

ials for a large number of important Canadian manufactures in extensive use.

That the increased burden of duties now imposed on such materials enhances the cost thereof to the damage of both the manufacturers and consumers, and that the duties on such materials for manufacturers should be reduced so as to enable the manufacturer to supply the consumer at a lower cost.

In placing this amendment in your hands I may say it is so much in the interests of manufacturers that I hope the hon. members of this House will support it unanimously. This was part of our policy from the introduction of the Tariff in 1879. We advocated it on the ground that while the revenue of the country was large and necessarily increasing yearly, it should be so adjusted as to give a fair and reasonable protection to the manufacturing interests and the interests of all classes of the community. We took the ground that some parts of that Tariff were very objectionable indeed, that the taxes of breadstuffs, fuel, sugar, and raw material were injurious to the best interests of the country, and this resolution is carrying out the policy we then advocated. The raw material of iron enters largely into many of our most important industries, and taxation on it affects mechanics as well as manufacturers. There seems to be no advantage whatever to any person in the tax placed upon iron. There is one industry in Nova Scotia, the Canada Steel Company, who were supposed to be benefitted some by this tax, but to little extent. They themselves have said, over their own signature, that the tax on other articles entering into their manufacture destroyed entirely all the benefits they got from the duty on iron. I will read you a letter written by the agents of that company on the 4th of April, 1879:

"To the Editor of the Montreal Gazette.

"SIR,—We notice in your letter of this morning a telegram from Londonderry, N. S., stating that the Steel Company of Canada 'intends branching out in very extensive and enlarged works.' This statement is incorrect—as the duty of \$2 per ton put on pig iron is barely adequate to counterpoise that put on coal, and will neither encourage the Steel Company to enlarge its operations, nor be likely to induce other companies to establish iron works in this country.

Your obedient servants,

"GILLESPIE, MOFFATT, & Co.,
Agents Steel Co. of Canada.

"Montreal, 4th April, 1879."

This testimony was given one year after the Tariff was passed. We find by the returns that the imports of iron for the present year are larger than they were last year, or the year previous. We find also, that whatever advantage that has been taken from the existence of the Tariff on iron, the Steel Company of Canada have taken that advantage, and just as the English iron advanced in price they advanced their price. I will read you the following table showing the imports of iron:—

Years.	Cwt's.	Value.	Average Duty.	Duty Collected.
1878	1,773,237 88,662 Ton	\$2,852,644	3½ p. c.	\$104,289
1880	1,587,817 79,391 Ton	2,815,984	13¼ p. c.	388,117
1881	2,704,859 135,243 Ton	3,299,188	13½ p. c.	441,631

also manufactures of iron imported :

	Value.	Average Duty.	Duty Collected.
1878	\$4,449,997	13½ p. c.	\$ 606,880
1880	3,882,297	24½ p. c.	934,626
1881	5,115,686	24 p. c.	1,226,859

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an enormous increase in imports which was due no doubt in a great measure to the increased volume of business done and to the great rise of railway stocks going on in the country, and to the cheapness of money; but there is no indication whatever that the Steel Company of Canada supplied any more than they did before the tariff was adopted. To show how near the Londonderry Iron Company keep pace with the iron market of Canada, I have prepared a table of the prices of bar iron for the years 1878, 1879, 1880 and 1881, imported, and the prices of Londonderry iron:

BAR IRON.

	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
In Liverpool		5 15 0	6 8 9	5 17 6
Freight		10 0	18 9	10 6
Duty	17½	1 0 2	17½	1 2 6
Other.....		2 0	2 6	2 6
	£7 7 2	£8 12 6	£7 11 1	
	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.	\$ c.
English per 100 lbs. in Montreal.....		1 63	1 89	1 70
Londonderry per 100 lbs. in Montreal.....		1 80	2 15	2 00
Londonderry per 100 lbs. in St. John	1 90	2 10	2 45	2 20

"Londonderry has the advantage in time, free from rust, delivered as made. Interest, &c., merchants' per cent. on duty as well."

The price for 100 lbs. of English iron in Montreal in 1879 was \$1.63; 1880, \$1.89; 1881, \$1.70. Londonderry iron in Montreal, 1879, \$1.80; 1880, \$2.15; 1881, \$2.00. Price of Londonderry iron at St. John: 1878, \$1.90; 1879, \$2.10; 1880, \$2.45; 1881, \$2.20. So the prices for iron landed in Montreal from Londonderry have kept pace year by year with the corresponding prices from Liverpool, keeping about 10c. per 100 lbs. higher than it could be imported from Great Britain. Sheet iron is worth more, and they could afford to have that additional price on Londonderry iron on account of the damages it may receive from rust, &c., on the voyage out from Liverpool. They have taken advantage not only of the insurance and the duty, but of the damage liable on iron imported from Great Britain. So, in the iron trade, the imports have not fallen off but have increased rapidly, and the Londonderry manufacturers have taken the full benefit of the duty on it as compared with the English iron. The interests that are large consumers of iron and manufactures of are farmers composing 500,000 of the population. Iron they use is increased 5½ to 17½ per cent.; nails, 17½ to 30 per cent.; horse-shoes and nails, 17½ to 30 per cent.; tools, saws, hammers, chisels, axes, adzes, augers, 17½ to 30 per cent. Agricultural implements—Mowing, threshing, reaping, fanning, &c., such as shovels, spades, forks, &c., 17½ to 25 per cent.; carriages and waggon, 17½ to 30 per cent.; harness, 17½ to 25 per cent.; chains, &c., 17½ to 20 per cent.; bolts, nuts, screws, 17½ to 35 per cent.; wire for hay, 5 to 15 per cent.; hardware, 17½ to 30 per cent.; scales, 17½ to 30 per cent. The average advance is 12½ per cent., and the Tariff is no advantage. Lumbermen employ 75,000 hands. His iron is increased from 5 to 17½ per cent.; saws, 17½ to 30 per cent.; files, 17½ to 30 per cent.; chains, 17½ to 20 per cent.; sled fixings, 17½ to 30 per cent.; axes, 17½ to 30 per cent.; tools, &c., 17½ to 30 per cent. The average advance 12½ per cent., and no advantage accrued from the National Policy. Blacksmiths employ 10,000 to 11,000 men. Iron is increased from 5 to 17½ per cent.; nails, 17½ to 30 per cent.; horse-shoes, 17½ to 30 per cent.; anvils, 30 per cent.; vices, 17½ to 30 per cent.; bellows, 17½ to 30 per cent.; bolts, &c., 17½ to 30 per cent.; tools of all kinds, 17½ to 30 per cent.; machinery, lathes, &c., 10 per cent. if not C, 17½ per cent. if C, 25 per cent. all; coal, free to 50 cents per ton; iron screws, 17½ to 35 per cent.

The additional tax on every \$100 is 12½ per cent., or \$12.50 per \$100, and there is no advantage from the National Policy. Carpenters employ 6,000 people, who have to provide their own tools. Nails are increased from 17½ to 30 per cent.; locks, 17½ to 30 per cent.; hinges, 17½ to 30 per cent.; screws, 17½ to 35 per cent.; bolts and nuts, 17½ to 30 per cent.; tacks and finishing nails, 17½ to 30 per cent. The materials used annually cause an additional tax of \$12.50 on every \$100, or 12½ per cent. Of coopers, there are 3,500 employed. Iron is increased from 5 to 17½ per cent.; tools, 17½ to 30 per cent.; screws and rivets, 17½ to 35 per cent.; nails, 17½ to 30 per cent. The increase in raw materials is equal to 12½ per cent., or \$12.50 on every \$100. Cabinet-makers employ 5,000 hands, and the home production is 97¼ per cent. of the whole consumption. Tools, a large item, as saws, axes, chisels, planes, vices, &c., are increased from 17½ to 30 per cent.; locks and hinges, 17½ to 30 per cent.; screws, 17½ to 35 per cent.; bolts and nuts, 17½ to 30 per cent.; tacks and brads, 17½ to 30 per cent. Carriage-makers employ 8,000 or 9,000 hands, and the home production equals 99 per cent.; iron is increased from 5 to 17½ per cent.; screw bolts and nuts, 17½ to 35 per cent.; screws, 17½ to 35 per cent.; malleable castings, 17½ to 25 per cent.; tools, a large item, 17½ to 30 per cent.; E.P. trimmings, 17½ to 30 per cent.; hardware, 17½ to 30 per cent.; axles and springs, anvils, 17½ to 30 per cent. Agriculture implements employ 3,000 hands, and the home production is 95¼ per cent.; pig iron is removed from free to \$2 per ton; iron, 5 to 17½ per cent.; iron bars, 5 to 17½ per cent.; iron rivets, 17½ to 30 per cent.; iron bolts, 17½ to 30 per cent.; iron castings, 17½ to 25 per cent.; nuts and bolts, 17½ to 30 per cent.; nails and tacks, 17½ to 25 per cent.; rivets and trees, 17½ to 30 per cent.; screws, &c., 17½ to 35 per cent.; sieve wire, 17½ to 25 per cent.; brass and copper castings 17½ to 30 per cent.; iron wire, 5 to 15 per cent.; tools (all kinds), 17½ to 30 per cent.; machinery, 10½ to 25 per cent.; coach screws, anchors, bars, &c., 17½ to 30 per cent. The average increase is 12½ per cent. On manufactured goods the increase is from 17½ to 25 per cent., or 7½ per cent.; raw materials, from 6½ to 16 per cent., or 9½ per cent. Nail and tack makers employ 1,000 hands, and the home production is 95 per cent. Nail iron increased from 5 to 17½ per cent.; machinery, 10 to 25 per cent.; nail rods, 5 to 17½ per cent.; tools, 17½ to 30 per cent., Swede iron, 5 to 17½ per cent. Now, the increased Tariff of 1879 over the one existing previously was, on the raw material, 13¾ per cent., the increased duty on coal was 7½ per cent., therefore the Tariff discriminated against the nail makers, as compared with the Tariff of 1878, to the extent of 6¼ per cent.; and they are that much worse off than they were before. Thus the nail-makers complain, especially as they get no drawback on the nails they export.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If they export they get a drawback on the iron.

Mr. BURPEE. On the Londonderry iron?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Mr. BURPEE. Next we take the case of foundrymen. In 1879 they produced 93 per cent. of the articles consumed in Canada made in their foundries. They employed 8,000 men. The following are the increases in the various articles they use:—

Pig Iron	free	to	\$2.00 per ton
Bar Iron	5½	"	17½ per cent.
Russian Sheet... ..	5	"	17½ per cent.
Sleepers	5	"	12½ per cent.
Iron Plate.....	5	"	13½ per cent.
Screws	17½	"	35 per cent.
Bolts and Nuts.. ..	"	"	30 per cent.
Copper, Tin, } ..	free	"	10 per cent.
Solder, Spelter } ..	5	"	15 per cent.
Wire	5	"	15 per cent.
Rivets and Screws..	17½	"	35 per cent.

The total result of the Tariff as it affects raw materials used by the foundrymen of the Dominion, as compared with 1878, is an increase from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to $14\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., including coal. Then on boiler plate there is an increase of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I do not intend to take up the time of the House more than to show first of all the effect of this duty on the raw material which enters so largely into the farming, lumbering and other industries of the country. A large number of our population have to pay the additional duty on the iron and the additional profit on the duty paid on the iron, for the merchants, I presume, in all cases charge not only the duty on the iron, but the profits on the outlay as well. Thus we find that the carpenters and the blacksmiths pay \$12.50 on every \$100 worth of materials used for building purposes, tools, &c. So with the cooper and all other laboring classes, while, on the other hand, we find that the manufacturers who are largely consumers of iron are no better off than they were before. I maintain that this amendment contains elements of large taxation to the several industries I have alluded to. I desire to place these things specifically before the House, in this amendment, because it is part of our policy to place on record the worst features of the hon. Finance Minister's policy.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am sorry this question has been sprung upon the House without notice, as we all know that the iron industry is a very large one. Iron enters into almost everything that is used in the avocations of life, from the spade with which we till the soil up to the highest form of machinery for the purpose of saving manual labor. Had my hon. friend taken up the question of putting more duty on iron, I would have supported him willingly. Pledged as I am to support the Government—and I gave no uncertain sound on that question in my constituency—pledged to support any Tariff which would benefit the producers of iron and tend to the employment of labor, I would have joined with the hon. gentleman in asking for this increase. We all know that for every ton of iron that is produced four tons of coal are required in the various stages of its manufacture. If we produced the iron which we now import we would burn the coal down in the Lower Provinces instead of shipping it to the Upper Provinces, so that not only would we have a greater amount of coal mined, but we would have to employ a vast number of people in the various ramifications of its manufacture. But the hon. gentleman argues that the duty should be taken off, and I will try to show him presently that some of his grievances are ill-founded. He does not try to find a remedy for the state of things in this country. While other industries have been largely protected iron has not been sufficiently protected, and the reason is simple. If the Government were to tax iron what would hon. gentlemen opposite say? They would say: "We cannot build ships, because you tax iron so heavily that it makes ships dearer, and we cannot compete with the rest of the world." Now, I do not agree with that. I believe that if a duty were placed on the iron coming into this country, which we manufacturers call a raw material, viz., pig iron, then, instead of the price of iron being increased the competition amongst ourselves would be so great that pig iron would be as cheap, or cheaper than the cheapest we now import. If all the pig iron we now import—the hon. gentleman said it was 45,000 tons last year—were made in this country, what would be the result? In Pictou, where exist the finest iron beds in the world, side by side with abundance of coal, pig iron would be produced in large quantities, whereas now it cannot be because iron dribbles into Canada from all parts of the world. That is the complaint of the iron manufacturers, and not that the duty is too high. I had the honor of being Chairman of the Ironmen's Association, at their meeting here last year, and they proved that the duty had not only not increased the price of iron but

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury).

diminished it; and that if the Government would put a higher duty on iron, the selling price would be far less than it is now, because the competition would keep down the price. Now, my hon. friend has referred to the increase of the duty on iron from 17 per cent. to 35 per cent.

Mr. BURPEE. I said from 5 to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I took down from 17 to 35.

Mr. BURPEE. That was on screws and bolts and nuts.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Well, that is a small matter, because I might remind my hon. friend that screws and bolts and nuts are cheaper to-day than they were in previous years. My hon. friend found fault with the price of nail, plate and bar iron. Notwithstanding the increase in the duty, bar iron, nails and nail plate, are cheaper.

Mr. BURPEE. The price of bar iron in Montreal, in 1878, was \$1.80 per cwt.; in 1879, \$1.80; in 1880, \$2.15; and in 1881, \$1.85. It was about 10 cents per cwt. higher in St. John.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend shows that it was 5 cents per cwt. or \$1 a ton dearer in 1881, than in 1878.

Mr. BURPEE. Besides the difference in the price in the English market, where it was 16s. 3d. less in 1881, than in 1878.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Never mind the English market. My hon. friend has shown that bar iron is only 5 cents per cwt. more than it was before. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman if he can refute the fact that nails were cheaper in 1881 than they were in 1878, notwithstanding the increase of 5 cents per cwt. in the price of bar iron.

Mr. BURPEE. The price of nails in Montreal, in 1878, was \$2.60 a keg; in 1879, \$2.65; in 1880, \$3.15; and in 1881, \$2.70; and the price in St. John in 1878 was \$2.45; in 1879, \$2.25; in 1880, \$3.10, and in 1881, \$2.70.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I entirely disagree with my hon. friend, because I know as a fact that nails were selling in St. John last year at \$2.40 and \$2.45 a keg. We can easily find out the prices of these grades of iron by telegraphing to the manufacturers. My hon. friend speaks of \$2.70 and \$2.75 being the price of those nails, but they were small. But if he takes the average between the ten and twelve penny nails, he will find the price is very much cheaper in 1881 than in 1878. The hon. gentleman did not take the average.

Mr. BURPEE. I took the large size.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Exactly; but I can produce figures from the merchants in St. John to show. What have the managers found fault with? That the Londonderry people were in a position to supply them with nail plate for nails, without competition, and could make the difference between the two markets, and were enabled to get in this country the full price of iron as against English iron—they could not import English iron to very much better advantage than they could purchase the Londonderry iron. The hon. gentleman says it was 5 cents per cwt. higher than the English iron; but everyone knows the Londonderry makes a superior nail plate, that the English makers roll out any scrap left and make an article of uncertain quality. But the quality of the Londonderry article is quite superior, for they only roll one description of iron; and any manufacturer would rather pay 5 cents more for that quality.

Mr. BURPEE. I said 10 cents higher was the average.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I took 5 cents down—he said \$1.80 to \$1.85.

Mr. BURPEE. I said 10 cents, but admitted the Londonderry was worth 10 cents more, being cleaner and free from rust, and that it was better to use it than the cheaper article from England.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend said that the Londonderry was slightly in advance to the English, and that the Londonderry people got the full benefit of the advance on duty.

Mr. BURPEE. That is all right.

Mr. DOMVILLE. He admits that the Londonderry iron is cleaner and better, and yet he complains it is 5 cents dearer.

Mr. BURPEE. My argument was that they kept pace with the English iron, and charged in addition 10 cents per cwt. more—that they took advantage of the duty.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I took down his words—that the cost of the Londonderry iron was 10 cents more than the English; but he stated in another place that the figures were \$1.80 against \$1.85, showing that his figures do not tally.

Mr. BURPEE. That was bar iron.

Mr. DOMVILLE. But my hon. friend said that he did not mean bar iron, but sheet iron. When I spoke of nuts, bolts and screws and said the manufacturer was getting his iron quite as cheap as before, the hon. gentleman said he did not mean nuts and bolts but nail plate; but I showed, according to his own figures, that the English cost \$1.80, and the Londonderry, \$1.85. Then he answered, the Canadian cost 10 cents more. What figures are we to take?

Mr. BURPEE. I will give you the exact figures. I said the English nail sheets, laid down in Montreal, cost in 1878 \$1.70, and the Londonderry, \$1.80; 1879, English, \$1.70, Londonderry, \$1.80; 1880, English, \$2.05, Londonderry, \$2.15; 1881, English, \$1.70, Londonderry, \$1.85. Bar iron, 1879, English, \$1.63 per cwt., laid down in Montreal; Londonderry, \$1.80; bar iron, 1880, English, \$1.89, Londonderry, \$2.15; 1881, English, \$1.70, and Londonderry, \$2 per 100 lbs.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend knows that the Londonderry is very different from the English and that those people roll horse-shoe iron.

Mr. BURPEE. I quoted our ordinary refined iron which was \$1.70 in 1881, and \$2 for the Londonderry article.

Mr. DOMVILLE. We know the ordinary refined iron is not equal to the Londonderry iron, and that if you roll a good quality of horse-shoe iron it costs 2½ cents per lb., while common barrow is as low as \$1.50 and \$1.45 in New Brunswick. At the time of the Fraser-Reynolds investigation, it was stated they had imported iron worth \$1.60 and sold it to the Government at 4½, 5 and 6 cents per lb., and Mr. Brydges and Mr. Cunliffe were put on the stand and showed invoices, when the Committee said: "Here is a gross piece of extravagance, charging those high prices for such cheap English iron." Those invoices showed the cost to be \$1.60 or \$1.55, and Fraser-Reynolds' invoice was produced showing their charge per lb. But we found that of the thousands of dollars worth imported, costing \$1.65 to \$1.70, they had supplied the Government with about \$50,000 worth, ovals, spread iron at 6 cents per lb. Here is the case—they tried to swear away the reputation of those men. That is very much a parallel case to the one I mentioned, as there is so much difference in the grades of iron, shaped and spread. If my hon. friend cannot show the House the exact grades, dimensions and qualities there is no debatable question before the House, because we do not know what we are dealing with.

Mr. BURPEE. There is one quotation for iron of a size. The iron I have quoted is for one of the largest iron merchants in Montreal, who takes the two qualities and for comparison compares the English iron equal with the Londonderry iron.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member's complaint is that it costs 10 cents higher from Great Britain. Is there any

compulsion to make the people pay 10 cents higher? Why does the manufacturer who is consuming that iron give 10 cents higher? If my hon. friend had said the iron was raised in price in England and consequently in this country, in consequence of this duty, there would have been something to find fault with. But my hon. friend says the iron in England changed in prices, and that while it could be imported from England for \$1.80, we were paying in this country \$1.90; but he does not attempt to show that the iron increased in price.

Mr. ANGLIN. That is precisely what he did say.

Mr. BURPEE. I also explained why the charge was 10 cents more.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member says that the iron from England was imported at a certain price. That the Montreal consumer was compelled to buy nail plate in Canada. If they were compelled, why did they pay 10 cents per 100 lbs. more than they could import it for? He follows it up with saying the quality is better; consequently the deduction must be that it is of better value. Then my hon. friend states that the prices in England had altered. He goes as far back as 1879, and contrasted the various prices of iron in the London market and in this country. He says that it cost the consumer in 1878, \$1.63 per 100 lbs., and continues his quotations until he brings it down to another when it cost \$1.80. He has failed to show that the Tariff has increased the cost of iron in a greater ratio than before, except as he states, 10 cents per 100 lbs. Then he follows it up and loses his case, because he says they are compelled to buy it in this country and pay 10 cents more per 100 lbs., which nobody can compel them to pay, and at the same time qualifies his statement by saying the quality of iron for many reasons is better. There is no argument in that. My hon. friend has talked about boiler plate. Can he say it is any dearer than it was, comparatively speaking, before the Tariff?

Mr. BURPEE. Each merchant charges the duty.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is not the point. I want to take up what is the selling price to-day. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the prices quoted in the past two years, and say that, taking into consideration the various rates in England, and comparing them with those in this country, boiler plate is any dearer.

Mr. BURPEE. It is dearer by the duty on the iron.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Will the hon. gentleman who has been so elaborate with his figures, say the difference in price in boiler plates between 1879 and 1881 shows an increase?

Mr. BURPEE. I have told the hon. gentleman twice the price was higher.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. gentleman told us what bar iron cost, and told us what nail plate cost, but I ask him to tell us how much dearer boiler plate is to-day than it was in 1879.

Mr. BURPEE. It is about 8 per cent. dearer.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I want the exact figures; I do not want any 8 per cent. My hon. friend has not perhaps looked into that, perhaps he is dealing with the question in the abstract from his point of view. We believe in giving the people employment, and in encouraging the manufacture of boiler plate in this country, and are proud to see our hon. friend support us by admitting that the iron we produce is so far ahead of the iron imported that we are prepared to pay 10 cents more per 100 lbs. for it. Had my hon. friend come forward and proposed a duty of about \$4 or \$5 per ton on pig iron; had he said, we are going to develop Nova Scotia,

we would understand his position. My hon. friend is interested in all the various interests of this country, and everybody knows he has never failed to work them up as far as he is concerned, and he should have said here: I am mistaken, I see these beautiful fields of iron and coal, contiguous to one another; I see a market at home, the great North-West, which wants steel rails, fish-plates, bolts, &c., and instead of bringing it from a foreign country, I am willing to pay 10-cents per 100 lbs. more, and will bring in a resolution saying I do not agree with the policy of the Government, but as the country has decided for this policy, I will gracefully come in and acknowledge my error by proposing a tariff that will set all the iron mines in Nova Scotia going. Let us sink party differences and do what we can to build up this country. We may be wrong and those hon. gentlemen may be right, but still we are endeavoring to do what we can to find employment for our people; and I hope my hon. friend will withdraw his motion, and join us in asking for an increase in the duty on pig iron of \$4 or \$5 a ton, and an increase in the duty on bar iron.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) has sufficient parliamentary knowledge to know that the hon. gentleman to whom he made his appeal for an increased duty on pig iron, is not in a position to comply with his request. He might have turned to the hon. gentleman at his left and made the appeal to him. It is not necessary to follow the hon. gentleman through the whole tone of his argument. He was unable to hear the figures that had been given by the hon. member for St. John, and consequently made some statements upon them which were entirely unwarranted. He has made one thing clear, however, and I have no doubt he has succeeded in convincing the Minister of Finance that, though he cannot concede the motion of the hon. member for St. John to be a proper one, he should be convinced surely by the argument of the hon. member for King's that in imposing a duty of \$2 a ton on pig iron he, instead of benefitting the country or any industry in the country, he has done an injury to many of the manufacturing industries of the country. My hon. friend has been consistent in his line of argument. Last year, I think it was, he presented, as Chairman of a Committee, a petition signed by some forty members of this House, stating to the Minister of Finance that the \$2 duty per ton on pig iron was inoperative in its nature, so far as the development of our iron mines were concerned. That, Sir, is a fact that must be apparent to everybody. I myself share in the desire of the hon. member for King's, to see our iron industries developed, if that were possible without too great a permanent injury upon our other industries. It has already imposed a serious burden upon those of our manufacturing industries that employ the greatest number of skilled workmen and mechanics, and has produced no beneficial results. It has been in operation three years or more, and has been fairly tried. The Minister of Finance, in responding to the memorial presented by the forty members of Parliament, promised that he would give it his serious consideration before the present Session. He has introduced certain Tariff changes, but we see nothing in the direction of either increasing the duty, which the hon. member for King's says would produce beneficial results, or of removing the duty which is injurious so far as the development of the iron industry is concerned and highly detrimental to many other industries, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from the city and county of St. John did not claim that it had been detrimental to any industries, but that it had increased the cost of the articles to the consumer.

Mr. PATERSON. So I understand by the increased cost my hon. friend means it has imposed burdens upon the

Mr. DOMVILLE.

people, taxes which they have had to pay. Now, I will consider the position of my hon. friend from King's with reference to the operation of the duty on pig iron. The hon. gentleman's utterances are recorded in *Hansard* when he brought this matter before the House last Session, when he said that a duty of \$2 a ton on pig iron had succeeded in doing only one thing. What was that one thing? It was to give the Londonderry Iron Company a complete monopoly so far as they were concerned. The operation of that duty upon pig iron serves no other purpose than putting \$2 per ton on Londonderry iron that the country uses. The hon. gentleman will not deny that, because he puts it in language as forcible as I can do, He says:

"The House will perhaps allow me a word or two in reply. I claim that on the adjustment of the Tariff there was not sufficient difference made in order to enable us to be on the same basis as before; and we ask to be placed upon that basis. We believe that while a duty of only \$2 a ton is put on pig iron, the Londonderry Iron Works have practically a monopoly, and they will not offer sufficient inducement to anybody else to put up blast furnaces, because they say that with a duty of \$2 a ton they have a market, and if you give us \$3.50 we have an assured market, we know that we have an assured consumption market, and we can afford to sell iron as cheap as it is sold to-day. We do not ask the difference in the duty as a bonus to ourselves; all we ask is an assured market. The Londonderry Iron Works have really no competition, because the duty has been placed that no one else would put up works on an uncertain market. They are unable to sell pig iron and they follow two trades, for they are not only pig iron producers, but they enter into competition as manufacturers of iron, for they have a rolling mill; and while they decline to sell pig iron to those who are engaged in the rolling mill trade, they use it themselves, and say they ought to be protected, because they are producers of pig iron. You find that in running these furnaces they produce from classes of iron, Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4; and they only produce No. 4 iron fit for puddling enough for their own use; they have none to sell, and consequently they enjoy a monopoly. When the Minister of Finance framed his Tariff it would have worked admirably on a high rate of duty, but when the market rules low, it rules very severely against us."

Now, that is the marked effect of that duty upon pig iron, put upon the Statute-book and maintained there in face of the fact being pointed out by the hon. member for King's, that the practical effect was to give the Londonderry Iron Works \$2 per ton on every ton of iron they made. Now, when this duty was imposed hon. gentlemen opposite prophesied the great benefits that would result from the imposition of the duty on pig iron. I am free to say that if these anticipated results had been in any degree realized I would not have objected to that item remaining on the Statute-book. We find the hon. Finance Minister saying this when he spoke of pig iron in the Tariff debate:

"If this be so, we may reasonably expect that in the western part of our Dominion, in Nova Scotia, in the valley of the Ottawa, in the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick we shall have some branches of this manufacture springing up and producing the most beneficial results."

Those were the predictions of the Finance Minister as the result of the duty on pig iron. Blast furnaces in western Ontario and in the valley of the Ottawa were to be established; the sun was to be almost darkened with clouds of smoke arising from those furnaces; the sound of iron industries was to be heard in New Brunswick, and away in Nova Scotia, where they have iron of good quality and coal lying side by side, there was to be a great development of the iron industry. That was the reason assigned by the Finance Minister for the imposition of the duty; and three years afterwards he finds that the industry has not developed in the slightest degree, that the foreign trade in pig iron has been increased, and that the duty has enhanced the cost of the article and taxed the people for the benefit of one firm. I ask the House if it is not reasonable that, in view of this state of things, the resolution now before the House should be allowed to pass; it has utterly failed in developing the iron mines of the country, and it has resulted in placing \$2 per ton in cash in the pockets of the Londonderry Iron Company for every ton produced.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member for St. John should not be placed in a false position, because he stated at the time that the quality and class of the Londonderry iron was superior to that of any other iron.

M. PATERSON. I should be very sorry to do any injustice to the hon. member for St. John, and it would only be with more regret that I would do any injustice to the hon. member for King's. But if I understand the question I do not understand that the \$2 per ton duty makes the Londonderry pig iron any better. That Company, no doubt, would produce as good iron without the \$2 per ton duty as with it. We now come to consider the effects of this duty on manufacturing industries. It has injured them by imposing a duty on raw material. It is perfectly useless for the hon. member for King's, who is an intelligent business man, to venture on the line of argument in Parliament, that because they had to impose a high rate of duty on certain articles and it was found the price, notwithstanding the imposition of the duty was even lower than before, the imposition of the duty did not compel the people to pay extra taxation. The hon. gentleman should know the fact that markets rise and fall. It has been already pointed out by the hon. member for St. John that the price in Canada has increased relatively with the price in Great Britain and other countries, and if iron ruled lower at one time in the foreign markets it would sell at a correspondingly low price in this market. The argument is fallacious. What we have to consider is this: Would the iron have been sold at \$2 per ton less if there had been no duty to pay. The hon. Minister of Finance, who is a candid and discerning man in business affairs, must answer in the affirmative, that if \$2 per ton duty were removed the price would fall by an equal amount. We had the prediction of the Finance Minister, that in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, there would be a sufficient number of iron furnaces, and that, as in the United States when their blast furnaces more than supply the home demand, the prices would fall, but with a large importation of foreign iron every business man must know that the imposition of the duty must be paid not partially but wholly by those who purchased the articles. I know from conversation with one of the manufacturers in my own town, that he made a bargain for a quantity of iron with a British merchant, the terms varying with or without duty. The difference in price was the amount of the duty levied by the Government. Take some of the manufacturing industries of the country and see what has been the effect of the duty.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Will the hon. gentleman state the price of pig iron previous to the imposition of the duty and the price at the present day.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not state that; I have not the figures with me and it is not necessary for me to do so.

Mr. DOMVILLE. How then can you say it is dearer?

Mr. PATERSON. My line of argument is before the House and it is sufficient to convince any man. Let me take the quantity of iron imported and what do we find? In 1878 there was \$2,152,644 worth imported, in 1881 it was \$3,299,188. That certainly proves that we had to be supplied from abroad, and as our home consumption is not sufficiently strong we must be paying the full amount in enhanced duty. I do not believe it is possible that the American producer of coal who knows that not one ounce of anthracite is mined in this Dominion, except possibly British Columbia, supposes that the manufacturer would pay the duty on the article, and so with reference to this article of pig iron. I will grant the position of my hon. friend if, as I said before, you had furnaces in sufficient number here to compete with the foreign market. It might be the position in a certain

state of the market; there might be some slaughtering going on. I will admit that for argument's sake, though I do not believe it to be correct; but forced as we are to buy iron in foreign countries, is it not the height of absurdity to suppose dealers in iron, who know that we must find our way to their market, who know our necessities to buy are greater than their necessities to sell, would share in paying in the duty. It cannot be. Take some of the large industries of this country. Take the articles of wag-gons and carriages—and I may say here that my figures are taken from the Census of 1871. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) and the Finance Minister were hardly fair in attempting to pooh-pooh the statements of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) because he took the figures from that census. Will the hon. the Finance Minister or anyone else tell me if, in speaking upon this matter in the House, where we may get figures upon which we may argue other than these? The hon. the Finance Minister himself endeavours to get some approximate figures by special Commissioners with regard to certain industries in this country, but he himself had to admit that they were not correct. There is only one place where we can get anything approaching correct information as to the home production of certain articles, and that is the Census of 1871; and I may say that we are a little at a disadvantage, especially those on this side of the House, in discussing the question, because, while we produced largely the goods manufactured in this country in 1871, the Census return of the quantity of those goods in that year will represent nothing in comparison with the products of those goods in 1881. I trust that when hon. gentlemen opposite find it necessary for them to send us to the country when this Parliament shall have reached its full time late in the fall of 1883, that they will be able to present us with the results of the Census of 1881, before that time, so that we may be able to address the electors, and base our statements on returns ten years later than those which are now at our command; and I know that these later figures will be much more favorable to the Opposition than those of 1871. In 1871 the carriage and waggon makers of this country produced \$3,580,920. That production has gone on increasing. These manufacturers have shared in the general prosperity, and have benefitted by the increased population of the country during the last ten years, and the extra demand for their goods caused by that increased population. Practically there is no more importation of foreign goods of that kind now than there was then, and at that date, I believe, something like 97 per cent. of these goods was home production. They had the practical control of the Canadian market and the imposition of a higher rate of duty was of no benefit to them. But how have they been affected by the duty on the raw material? The duty on their

Iron.....	increased from	5	per cent.	to	17½
Bolts and Nuts.....	do	17½	do	35	
Screws.....	do	17½	do	35	
Malleable Castings.....	do	17½	do	25	
Tools, a large item.....	do	17½	do	30	
Electro-plate Ironings.....	do	17½	do	30	
Hardware.....	do	17½	do	30	
Axles and Springs.....	do	17½	do	30	
Anvils.....	do	17½	do	30	

Take next, our foundries and machine shops; and I believe there is no industry in this country that gives employment to more mechanics than do these establishments, many of them being the longest in operation in this country. They were flourishing before the National Policy was introduced; and what has been its effect upon the large class which they are present? It is but a repetition of the others I have mentioned. There is an increase on their bar iron, their Russian sheet, their screws, their bolts, their nuts, their solder, their wire, their rivets and all the other articles they use, amounting to over 10 or 12½ per cent. Take next, agricultural implements, and what does the Census show?

The product of that branch of manufacture in 1871 was \$2,685,393; and who will say that it has not been trebled or quadrupled since that time? At that time 2,546 men were employed in manufacturing agricultural implements, and I say that the number of hands has been increased four times since that period. The effect of the National Policy upon this industry is but a repetition of its effects upon the others I have named, an enhancement of the duties upon all the articles they consume. I am now speaking only of the articles connected with iron, and have no reference to the paints, oils, cloths and so forth which also enter into the manufacture of their products. Taking the whole list we find an increase of from 17½ to about 25 or 30 per cent. They had 95 per cent. of the home market in 1871, and who will say that the home market was not as effectively theirs as it is now. I will not go through all the industries that are affected by these duties on iron, but take for example the sewing machine industry, and what a large one it is. It has been injured, as can be abundantly proved by the return of drawbacks on manufactured goods brought down a short time ago. Before doing that, let me prove from the hon. Finance Minister himself that the imposition of these duties on raw materials do operate injuriously upon the manufacturers. Speaking on the question of drawbacks in 1879, and referring to this very sewing machine industry, he stated:

"The drawback is for the purpose of encouraging those industries and enabling them to compete successfully with manufacturers in other countries. I am satisfied that this system can be carried out successfully, but some regulations may be necessary in regard to it. It will doubtless entail a great deal of trouble in the Departments, but still there can be no difficulty in practically working out a system."

If the duty did not increase the cost of that article to the manufacturer, why does he want a drawback to enable him to compete with foreign manufacturers in other countries? By their system of drawbacks, the Government gave their case entirely away, because it shows that the hon. Finance Minister knew that these duties were handicapping the manufacturer; and here we have him telling us plainly that the imposition of a duty on the raw material of sewing machine manufacturers and all other manufacturers of iron, places them at a marked disadvantage in competing with foreign manufacturers in other countries—and why? Because it enhanced the cost of the article we produced; and in order to get over that difficulty the Government proposed that drawback.

Mr. DOMVILLE. But the iron manufacturers are not finding fault.

Mr. PATERSON. How does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. DOMVILLE. We have no evidence of it.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, if I remember rightly, a little while ago I read in *Hansard* that a Mr. Domville, one of the most enterprising iron manufacturers of this country, had found a great deal of fault with the Tariff.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I did not complain that there was too much duty, but asked that more should be put on.

Mr. PATERSON. I rather think my hon. friend's argument was this: "You put \$2 a ton duty on pig iron; that is a practical monopoly for the Londonderry iron works, and they charge me more for my iron, so that it costs me more for the finished article that I use in my rolling mill; and I want you to take the duty off pig iron, so that I and other rolling mill proprietors can get our goods cheap."

Mr. DOMVILLE. No, not at all. I certainly stated that if we had active competition in this country in the production of iron rod, iron would rule as cheap as it could have been imported from England without any duty. I did not state that, in consequence of the duty, iron had become dearer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think I misinterpreted my hon. friend's remarks; but let me ask him, as a business man, if the duty on the products of pig iron has not enhanced the price.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I will state that bar iron and pig iron have not been increased in price in consequence of the duty; not only has pig iron been cheaper during the past year, but bar iron has been cheaper, and so have nail plate and nails. I state that without fear of contradiction.

Mr. PATERSON. Whatever his opinion may be, if he chooses to say that the price is not to be enhanced by the duty, then he must answer the question of who paid the duty, and if he says the foreign producer then he is wrong, and his testimony will be entirely hostile to that of the manufacturers on this point. I have stated that the only reason for the Finance Minister's instituting a system of drawbacks was that the manufacturers were hampered, and I can reinforce it by the statements of the Minister of Railways on the subject. Speaking in 1878, when the Cartwright Tariff was in operation, he said:

"Not only was that the case, but everything a Government could do to foster the manufacturing interests of this Company was done by the late Government. As the hon. gentleman knows right well we put the material the manufacturer used on the free list. We protected the manufacturers by relieving the raw material as far as possible from taxation. The hon. gentleman knows that we allowed machinery that could not be manufactured in this country to be brought in free of duty, thus assisting those who were engaged in such manufactures."

Then you find the Minister of Railways declaring that the policy of his Government, when in power before, was to afford protection to the manufacturers by placing their raw material on the free list; and he condemned the Cartwright Tariff because certain articles of raw materials had been taken out of that list. Again, we find him saying:

"I may tell the hon. gentleman further that what little protection was given to the manufacturing industry of Canada by the imposition of 2½ per cent. additional duty, raising the Tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent. was swept away by taking the raw material that our manufacturers used and taxing it so that the policy was as completely a reversal of that which had existed as was possible."

There was the testimony of the Finance Minister and the Minister of Railways to the fact that the imposition of duties on the raw material of manufacturers was a direct burden on them, and that their plan of protecting the manufacturers prior to 1874, was by having that raw material on the free list. And yet the members for King's and the Finance Minister will now be forced into the position of taking back their statements, and to assume the position the member for Kings does to-night, that you may put duties upon raw materials of manufacturers and not burden them. The statement of the Finance Minister and the Minister of Railways are against him, and the imposition of the drawback system is against him. What has been the effect of our drawbacks? They will show the amount of the burdens heaped on some of the industries. Last year two firms engaged in the manufacture of sewing machines were paid in drawbacks on the raw material \$2,931, which shows that they were burdened that amount—on their whole product? Nothing of the kind; but on their products exported to foreign countries. And if they were taxed in that way on their exports, they were equally taxed on each sewing machine that went into every Canadian family. Take the manufacture of fence wire. Four firms were paid \$6,998 in drawbacks, which proves, on the barbed wire for fences made and exported, they were burdened to that extent with the duty on raw material; and if so, they were burdened to a like extent on every yard or mile of wire fencing purchased by our farmers. On our machinery, we find claims from a large steam engine firm in Ontario, for \$750, which the Government has not allowed, but the owners claim that they are burdened to that extent on their limited exports to foreign countries. If burdened to

that extent on their exports, they have been burdened in a like manner and to a proportionate extent on their much larger sales in our own country. It is idle in the face of these facts, and still more idle in the face of the money paid back to these manufacturers on their raw material used, to say that they have not been damaged by the duties on it. How has our foreign trade been affected by it? The Finance Minister and the country know that our foreign trade which we boasted of with some feelings of pride in 1878, has, largely through the imposition of duties on materials, been prevented from competing successfully with that of foreign countries. There is a reduction of over 25 per cent. A few more years of like decrease, and our exports of manufacturers will be a thing of the past. I have in my pocket the statement of one of the largest manufacturing concerns in my own town, giving me a detailed list of the enhanced cost of raw materials directly through the operation of the Tariff, amounting to over \$6,000, for the amount they used. Is not that a burden on our manufacturing industries? I do not often notice on our newspaper paragraphs, but I have seen one in the *Mail*, saying:

"If we remember right, and are not mistaken, Mr. Paterson, of Brant, made statements in the House as from a certain letter, which was afterwards found he had not quoted correctly, and the member from West Durham seems to be taking a leaf out of his book."

It does not remember right. I presume the statement they refer to is the statement I made on the public platform that I had figures to prove that that firm paid, through the enhanced cost of their saw material, over \$6,000 more last year than previously; a Conservative paper in my town stated the sum was only \$700, but a member of that firm, in a letter, said that my statement was in every respect true, that the duties had cost them over \$6,000, and that they had never told the Minister of Public Works that the amount was only \$700; but that they had told him they had claims to the amount of over \$700 for drawbacks, which shows that while the Government was able to make fair promises, it was quite as able to break them. I challenge contradiction on that point. Testimony might be given by manufacturers in other lines in cases where thousands of dollars have been imposed on them, and yet the hon. member for King's says the manufacturers have not been injured. They might say in one sense they were not injured, perhaps, and that they take the price out of the purchasers. The member for North Norfolk stated that the enhanced cost of agricultural implements, owing to the duty on raw materials, was something like \$2 each. But, besides, hon. gentlemen opposite have lost sight of the fact that less material was put into those machines at present, and that while the price may not have been increased, had it not been for the enhanced duty, the competition and improvements in machinery would have enabled the manufacturers to sell those implements cheaper than before. It stands true that they have suffered meanwhile, or one other thing has happened, that is they have taken the enhanced price out of the consumer. The proposition of the hon. member for St. John is fully borne out. I believe the Tariff has been an injury to the manufacturer in part, the consumer in part, because the manufacturer has borne part of the loss himself, and has been forced to put part of the loss on the consumer. Let us see how this affects the consumer. I take the blacksmiths for instance. In the year 1871 there were, according to the Census, 10,213 men employed in the trade. They have been vastly increased since then through the increase of population. How are they affected by this Tariff—the extra tax on them averaging about 12½ per cent. over what it was under the late Tariff, or \$12.50 on every \$100 worth of material they use? Either they pay this tax or it comes out of their customers. Take carpenters and joiners. There were 5,408 in 1871, and no doubt there is double the number at present. What has been

the effect on them. We see that the carpenters are on a strike.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. That is exactly the sound I expected to receive from gentlemen who impose heavy burdens on those men, and refuse to remedy them; such derision is quite appropriate with the course they have pursued. Who will say they have not reason to strike; that, as far as the Tariff is concerned, the hon. Finance Minister has not given them reason to strike. As the hon. member for St. John has pointed out that as far as these men are concerned they have reason to demand increased wages; if they cannot get them any other way, they are not to be blamed for taking the steps they did. Each carpenter has to buy his own set of tools, and those in the trade know how large a thing this is to one of these mechanics. What has been the effect of this Tariff? Tools are raised from 17½ to 30 per cent.; hinges, from 17½ to 30 per cent.; screws, from 17½ to 35; bolts and nuts, from 17½ to 35; tacks and finished nails, 17½ to 35. I suppose if I were to say that \$100 is the average cost of a kit of carpenters' tools, I should not be out of the way. This gives an increased tax of \$12.50 to be paid by the carpenter. Let the hon. Minister show what has been the effect of the duty on these articles that are being imported into the country in larger quantities than ever before. Will he say their cost is not enhanced or take refuge in the subterfuge that things are no higher now than they were formerly. But admitting that, how can he say they would not be sold much cheaper if the duty were off. Take coopers, of whom 3,442 were employed in 1871. You find the same relative increase to tin and sheet iron workers, of whom there are three or four thousand, in the same catalogue. Mark you these taxes imposed on the artizan are not all they have to pay. I am not speaking of outside subjects, with reference to the clothes they wear or other goods they consume, but simply of the products of iron. Hon. gentlemen opposite feel disposed to say there has been no increase in reference to the Tariff. I have in my hand a circular issued by certain hardware, harness and saddlery dealers.

Mr. PLUMB. Name.

Mr. PATERSON. There is more than one name, there are the names of all the leading dealers in the Province of Ontario, and they say: "That in consequence of the great advance in the cost of all classes of goods, and the increase on custom goods prices are advanced from 15 to 30 per cent., with a prospect of a still further advance." This circular is dated 29th October, 1879, six months after the new Tariff came into operation. The articles consumed by the people, if produced in the country, must mean enhanced prices to the consumer. I have no desire to detain the House further. This amendment is one to develop the manufacturing industry. Under the present Tariff the Londonderry iron works remain solitary in their glory, unable to supply the trade. This proves conclusively that their tariff bears on the manufacturing interests of the country, and through them on the consumers. I share in the opinion expressed in the resolution that an increased burden has been placed upon the manufacturers who import under the operations of this Tariff. That being the case, the Tariff having proved utterly inoperative for good and powerful for evil, I would ask the House to allow the proposition of the hon. member for St. John to pass, that we may give the sewing machine manufacturers, the foundry and machine men, the agricultural implements and carriage makers—give to over one-half the manufacturing industries of this country—a fair share of protection which ought to be given to them by taking off the duties on their raw material, and placing this raw material on the free list.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is one advantage we possess on this side of the House when my hon. friend from

Brant speaks—we can always hear him distinctly and understand perfectly well what he says, and are consequently able to answer his remarks. But we are not so fortunate when the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Burpee) speaks. For myself I was unable to hear many of his statements, and, therefore, am not prepared to answer him until I will have read them in the *Hansard*. There is something very remarkable in the course taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite on this question of protection. Resolutions have been offered in the past declaring emphatically that this policy is taxing the people unnecessarily for the benefit of the manufacturers; but to-night we have the hon. member for the city and county of St. John strongly imbued with the principles of the National Policy, and therefore he was no doubt the proper person to move a resolution of this kind to show that the manufacturers are damaged by this policy instead of being benefited by it. That is the proposition submitted to this House, and the hon. member and those who think with him will stand up here and denounce the Government for not having given sufficient protection to the industries to which he refers. These are the Free Trade gentlemen who are now coming out and declaring that we are recreant in the interest of that industry in not imposing more duty upon it.

Mr. PATERSON. No; it is to take the duties off instead of putting them on.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, and for the purpose, he says, of giving protection to the manufacturers. One word with reference to the statements of the hon. member for Brant. We have often heard these statements before from him, and it may be well to say a word with reference to the absurdity of his position when he says that the diminution of the exports of manufactured articles indicate the failure of the National Policy. Nothing could be more absurd; and why? I will give you an illustration. After he had made his speech in the House last Session, calling attention to this fact and declaring it was an evidence of the failure of the National Policy, a gentleman in this Dominion who had been for many years engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes, said to me: "How absurd the statement of the hon. member on that subject. I recollect," he said, "crossing the Atlantic with you in a steamer two years since, when we were obliged to go to the British market for the coarser description of boots and shoes that we are manufacturing in the Dominion to-day. Now, my position is such that I have a grand market at home; I cannot supply even all the orders I have, and though I am under contract to send to England a certain quantity of goods, I am bound to supply them; but," he said, "I am in a position to-day to diminish that export because I have a profitable home market, and can give increased employment to the people, with better wages, and do a better business than before." This is one illustration of the effect of the National Policy. It has given employment in the home market for our people and makes it unnecessary for them to go abroad to sell without profit.

Mr. PATERSON. Did he tell you how many he had exported?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, we know it is a pretty large amount that they exported during this year, and he is going on with his contract to this day. A word with reference to the alleged failure of the National Policy with regard to the encouragement of the iron industry. He says I prophesied great things. I did prophesy great things; and let me tell him here that while the manufacture of iron has not sprung up with as great rapidity as other industries, there are reasons for it. In the first place you may start a manufactory for clothing, for instance, with a capital of \$40,000, and various other industries with a capital of from \$50,000 to \$100,000; but when you come to

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

the iron industry you require a large capital. In Londonderry, something over \$2,000,000 have been invested, though perhaps, some of it has not been judiciously expended. We know that men, when they invest their money in an industry of that kind, want to be assured of the permanency of the policy of the Government. Within a twelvemonth I have been visited by several gentlemen representing a large amount of capital in the United States—one of them representing \$2,000,000 capital, another \$5,000,000—who came to Ottawa to consult me with reference to the establishment of this industry here. Their statement was this: "If we were sure that this policy would be permanent we would invest our capital, but we are in doubt." I asked him why he was in doubt. "Well," he said, "the paper that is read most in Canada is the *Toronto Globe*, and that paper tells us when the people give their judgment on this question again they will reverse it, and, therefore, we are in doubt as to the permanency of this policy."

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. And the wisdom of it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have no doubt about the wisdom of it, neither had he; he wanted to know about the permanency. This was my answer: "Sir, in my judgment you may invest your capital without a doubt. In the election of 1878, the people spoke out emphatically on the subject, and since then out of thirty constituencies that were opened, we have carried all but two, and to-day our majority is eight more in Parliament, as a result of these declarations than it was in 1878; and I said such a thing is scarcely to be known in the history of our country, indicating as clearly as anything can what the verdict of the people will be when they again pronounce with reference to this policy. This very day, all over the Dominion, people are going on and establishing new industries. They are many American capitalists who are interested in the Dominion; and I will guarantee the time is not far distant when we shall see those iron industries established. Has nothing been done already? You would think that not one pound of iron more has been produced, and that no steps have been taken for producing it; but what is the fact? There are two furnaces instead of one being constructed at Londonderry, and from that date the construction will be doubled. Those furnaces would have been in operation before this had it not been for an unfortunate accident which happened in one of the mines from which the Company obtained coal with which to make coke. In New Brunswick, where we had industries in operation, it was thought that the whole trade would fall into decay. Some Americans came in, and owing to the National Policy they established the manufacturing of charcoal-iron. A company has been established in Montreal for the manufacture of charcoal-iron, and they have asked the Government either to allow to import crude petroleum at a low rate of duty from the United States, or to make some arrangement for petroleum produced in this country, because it is intended to manufacture iron with petroleum as well. Look at the movements that are taking place in Belleville and in the Ottawa Valley, and I do not doubt that it only requires the verdict of the people to introduce and bring into this country an immense amount of capital that is in abeyance, and is only so because hon. gentleman opposite have not in many cases declared their sentiments on the subject. I may quote a speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in order to show that hon. gentlemen opposite should be with us on this iron question. Referring to the iron industry in the United States the hon. gentleman said when the protective duty was imposed, iron manufactories were established, and in a short time the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton and is now sold cheaper than British manufacturers can do in this market. If the hon. gentleman would speak

out that new sentence we might have a sufficient declaration for the country and the capitalists outside to satisfy them that this policy was a permanent and successful one. The hon. member for Brant said the hon. member for King's might appeal to me, and declared he spoke as if he were making an appeal to the Government to do something more for the iron industry, and that when the memorial signed by forty members was presented last year to the Government asking for a readjustment of the Tariff with respect to iron, I said the Government would consider it. The Government have considered it, and I do not hesitate to say that if he err'd in any particular it was on the side of a low rate of duty. That is my judgment after three years' experience. It was a difficult matter to deal with, inasmuch as iron was the raw material for so many industries; and with respect to the duty on steel we have simply extended the time during which it will be admitted duty free until the close of the next Session, because we have already declared that so soon as it is manufactured in the Dominion the duty will be restored. Iron and sugar were two of the most difficult questions the Government had to deal with in order to provide that no particular industry should suffer, and at the same time give encouragement to those particular industries. The statement has been made by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) that the duty imposed was largely imposed by the consumer—that the manufacturer paid a part and the consumer another part. I frankly admit that to a certain extent manufacturers are additionally taxed upon some of those articles, but I assert that as far as the consumers are concerned they have paid only a slight increase in the cost. But what compensation have we given to the manufacturers, admitting that they pay $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty on iron? With respect to agricultural implement makers, the cost of malleable iron is about the same as it is being made in Canada. What compensation have we given to the agricultural implement makers?

Mr. PATERSON. Nothing.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have given them not only the market of Old Canada, but the market of New Canada. Were it not for the 25 per cent. duty the North-West would be flooded with American agricultural implements. As I said two years ago, on the evidence of a leading manufacturer, who had sold the year previous 1,800 reapers and mowers, and would sell that year 2,500, and was preparing to sell 4,000 the following year. Take the sewing machine manufacturer, for whom hon. gentlemen opposite have shown so much sympathy, and who had to pay something for castings. Those manufacturers, however, sold to-day four times as many machines as in 1878, and are in a much more prosperous condition. They are selling at a lower price owing to the fact that they have a larger market. As one of the manufacturers told me: they did not require to expend as much, in order to sell their goods, as they formerly did—because they sold four times as much as before—and could therefore sell them at a less price. The hon. gentleman says the fact of our allowing a drawback is an evidence that an additional duty is paid. Accept the hon. gentleman's proposition, and we give it back to them on their own industries, and therefore they are in as good a position as they were, while they are selling four times as many goods as they did in 1878.

Mr. PATERSON. One of them failed the other day.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Some men will fail in the management of any business. The position which one of the sugar refineries is in at Halifax to-day is entirely on account of bad management. Sometimes perhaps they may fail on account of the sharp competition, and, at all events, their failure would go to prove that they are not enjoying

the undue advantages which the hon. gentleman says they are enjoying.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the foreign manufacturers had three-fourths of the Canadian market?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say so.

Mr. MILLS. How are they selling four times as much as before?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The reduction in the price enables them to sell more, and so do the improved times which have been brought by the National Policy. Talk of strikes. Had we any strikes in 1878, except strikes for aid and assistance—striking the Minister of Public Works to give them bread and keep them from starvation. If it was a question to-day with the people between strikes and starvation, they would say: let us have the strikes. Let us have things in such a state that we may be able to employ a large number of people; let us have the better times. If it were not for the prosperous condition of the country; if the manufacturers were not able to make something out of their goods, they would resist the strikes rather than yield to them, and the inference is, that there is more wages for the men, and that the people desire the better times rather than the poverty for all as in 1878.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member for Westmoreland says hear, hear; but I say that in no part of the Dominion is the National Policy more appreciated than in his constituency—nowhere have they shown more zeal or more enterprise. He will find growing up in that county a manufacturing industry which promises to progress as well as any other in the Dominion, owing to the industry, enterprise, and the capital of the men who have engaged in it; and if it should be a question with me whether the men of Westmoreland or the men of the United States should make money, I would say the men of Westmoreland. There is a great sympathy exhibited for the mechanic because it is showed the duty on his tools has increased $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This is a terrible business, seeing that his whole kit is worth about \$100. Now, with reference to a large proportion of his tools, such as broad axes and narrow axes, I know they are not dearer to-day than they were in 1878. All the steel that goes into them is free. They have a larger market because they have a home market, and, as I said, you may go to Dundas, or any other place, and you will find that they are making them and selling them as cheaply as before. The sympathies of the poor mechanics are to be traded upon here by hon. gentlemen opposite, rather than support a policy which would give more work and better facilities to the workingman. Supposing it is correct that he pays $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value of his kit of tools, compared with the result of his year's labor, that is a mere bagatelle. The hon. gentleman says nails are high. I am prepared to prove, from one of the largest manufacturers in Canada, who went through his books, that the average prices are 5 per cent. less than they were in 1878. With reference to nuts, every man in the business knows that they are less than in 1878, owing to the large competition in that branch of manufacture. Then, in reference to carriages and waggons, I showed, by a reference to the prices, which no one has attempted to controvert, that they are cheaper to-day than in 1878 by about 10 per cent. The foundrymen say that they have added about 15 per cent. to their prices this last year, and that that just about covers what the increased wages amount to. Malleable iron is furnished as cheaply to-day as before, or at least that was the case when I saw the deputation who came to Ottawa on that subject. With regard to spikes they

were lower in 1881 than they were in 1878. Some of the manufacturers gave me the average prices of 1881 as compared with 1878.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What are spikes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They gave me \$2 per ton as being the amount of reduction since 1878.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What are the figures?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not believe it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. All I can say is that it was a reliable firm of manufacturers that gave me the information, and they say they took it from their books from 1878 to 1881. If these outside manufacturers could crush out our own industries, they would have the control of the market, and vote their own profits; but as long as we have competition at home and men struggling to keep the market, we shall get the articles at a less price than we could otherwise. I admit that some iron articles which are imported by the manufacturers cost them something more; but even these manufacturers are better off than they were before the policy was adopted. I remember visiting a small manufactory of horse-shoe nails in the city of St. John—and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) knows all about it—and what have they done since the adoption of the National Policy? They have erected a large building and widely extended their business, though we have charged 12½ per cent. more on their raw material.

Mr. BURPEE. You do not mean to say the Tariff has benefitted them any?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I do.

Mr. BURPEE. The proprietor of that nail factory told me over and over again that it was a great injury to him.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I should like to know, when we have increased the duty on the raw material but 12½ per cent., when we have increased the protection on their labor upwards of 25 per cent., when we have made the increase of protection to them even more than the difference in the raw material, why they should be worse. The hon. gentleman says, however, that they are not in as good a condition as they were before. There is something, perhaps, in the politics of a man. I believe there are many men to-day engaged in manufacturing who, if you asked them, would say that the Tariff had been no benefit to them at all; and yet, when the next election comes, the ballots of these men will invariably be cast for the National Policy. Therefore, I say that while we are not prepared at present to come down with a change in the duty of iron, yet—speaking for myself, though, I think, I speak also for my colleagues in this matter—if it became a question of the introduction of five or ten millions of capital into this country for the establishment of these industries in Ontario, in Quebec, in the Maritime Provinces, in Pictou, where we have beds of coal and iron within five miles of each other, the capital would remove the difficulty we are now in to give the manufacturers using iron their raw material as cheap as we do at this moment. While the number of these industries that have sprung up has exceeded our most sanguine expectations, still I am so hopeful of the iron industry to-day that I believe the day is not far distant when that industry will take as prominent a position as any industry brought into successful operation by this Tariff. And we know that the iron industry is no mean industry; on the contrary, it is one of the most important industries in the world; it is one of those that have made England what she is to-day. An American gentleman said to me that the iron ore from near Belleville is the finest and best on the continent of America. Under these

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

circumstances I hold that if there is any proposition submitted to this House that we should reject it is this proposition of the hon. gentleman, to reduce the duty on iron and withdraw the encouragement now given to the people of this country to establish a mammoth industry which will benefit every man, woman and child in the community, and to develop a policy which will make this country the great country that Providence has destined it to be, and that many gentlemen here will live to see.

Mr. ANGLIN. If we remained silent while statements such as those we have just heard made in the old emphatic manner, we might be open to the charge of not being able to controvert them. When the hon. member for West Durham, two or three evenings ago, made some statements of which he had been informed by others, he was called upon to furnish the names, and if I remember rightly, the hon. Finance Minister himself was one of those who chose to impugn the veracity of the statements made. The hon. Minister makes a statement in this House of a very remarkable character. He tells us that some gentleman representing \$2,000,000 of capital, and another representing \$5,000,000, have come to Ottawa to consult him as to the propriety of investing that money in iron works in this country, and he tells us that they were quite satisfied with this protection of \$2 a ton, although the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) says it is entirely insufficient. The hon. Finance Minister would have us believe that the iron industry is to be largely developed. I remember some time ago meeting a Church of England clergyman in St. John, who, speaking of the Finance Minister and some statements he had made a short time before, at a large meeting in St. John, said: "Well, I have always remarked with regard to Tilley, that, when he could not find facts to sustain his statements, he was ever ready to indulge in prophecy." And truly he has indulged in prophecy to-night. He admits, however, that the iron industry is not very largely developed. He claims, however, the second blast furnace at Londonderry, as every other new industry or development of an old one, as a result of the National Policy. Does he not know that some months after the Tariff went into operation the glass factory at Londonderry went out of operation altogether? Does he not know that, as regards the Londonderry iron industry, \$2 a ton was said to be not sufficient protection, and that other protection must be given? Does he not know that that led to a serious modification of the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway for the carriage of coal and other materials to that establishment; and that to-day it is protected in two ways: in the first place by \$2 a ton on all the iron consumed in Canada, and in addition by the carrying on the Intercolonial all the heavy freight used by that establishment at a price that does not pay the road. Some years ago the boot and shoe manufacturers were in such distress that they were forced to send their productions to Great Britain for sale; but the National Policy, we are told, has given them a market, with abundant employment for all their capital, at home. What is the simple fact with regard to this boot and shoe trade? Why, that at no period for years past have we imported, into all Canada, of all kinds of boots and shoes, from the French article, bought by those who can pay high prices, to the cheaper kinds imported for children, more than \$250,000 or \$260,000 worth; and the imposition of the additional duty did not increase Canadian production by more than \$120,000 a year. Will he pretend to say that the increase of \$120,000 a year effected by the National Policy as an addition to the quantity of boots and shoes manufactured here, has produced this wonderful revolution in the boot and shoe trade? Our boot and shoe manufacturers had already a monopoly of the trade of this country. That there was a diminution in that trade as in others during the years of depression, is doubtless true. Economy had to be practised everywhere. But

the National Policy could not possibly render any service to a trade that already had a monopoly of the whole business of Canada. With regard to agricultural implements, of which he has spoken, he has added burdens to the manufacturers in some cases by heavy additional taxation on their raw material. But then the Finance Minister asks, what have we done for them in return? We have given them the whole market of old Canada, and in addition new Canada. But they had the market of old Canada before the National Policy. The whole of the agricultural implements imported into old and new Canada in 1878 amounted to \$126,326. If that had been utterly wiped out, by reason of the National Policy, would that additional business have produced such a wonderful revolution in the trade of Canada, as the hon. gentleman boasts he has produced? What else is the fact? That after the imposition of the National Policy, the importation of those articles actually increased. In 1879 it rose to \$245,523, I think. The year after it fell again to \$169,714, but even that was \$43,000 more than in 1878; and this last year, 1881, they rose further to \$177,888, or \$51,500 more than before the National Policy went into operation. Where, then, is the wonderful revolution effected in our markets? As to his giving this industry the trade of new Canada, and asserting that without the present duties the United States would have furnished Manitoba and the North-West with their farm implements, how can it be argued that if those manufacturers were not able, under the old Tariff, to sell their implements at a profit, they could have competed in the North-West with our own manufacturers?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Because some of them are nearer our North-West.

Mr. ANGLIN. They have some factories nearer, it is true, but what advantage could that have given them with the old duty of 17½ per cent. against them. Have they not to pay a higher price for iron than our manufacturers? Had the Americans not to carry to the North-West the material of many of the articles they produced, and is that not as expensive as the carrying of the manufactured article? There was, therefore, no increase in the duty necessary in order to give our manufacturers a monopoly of the markets of the North-West. Take the difference between the cost in Toronto or any other city in Ontario and the cost landed in Winnipeg, and it will be seen there was no increase of duty necessary to give our own implement makers the absolute control of the North-West market also. I believe there were some causes in operation that prevented the agricultural implements of our own manufacture from being used in the North-West for some time. One was that our manufacturers did not for a time learn to produce the article specially required in the North-West, that the ploughs sent from Ontario were found not to be as useful breaking up the soil of the prairies as those manufactured in the prairie countries of the United States, that other agricultural implements were found also not to be so well adapted as the American article; but as our manufacturers found what was necessary they began to provide what suited the wants of the country, and even driving out the American article. It is an insult to the skill and enterprise of the agricultural implement makers of this Dominion to say that they could not, with a protection of 17½ per cent., compete successfully with the United States manufacturers in the great North-West. As they succeeded in excluding the American implements from the Provinces of old Canada, they would succeed in excluding them from the great North-West. If that be true, and it cannot be controverted, what becomes of the statement of the hon. gentleman, that his National Policy has conferred such wonderful benefits on the agricultural implement makers to revolutionize that trade, and though it has reduced

their profits has enabled them by selling a much larger number to realize larger profits on the whole every year. The implement makers are not at all satisfied with this Tariff. We have had statements from time to time during this Session to show that some of the very largest agricultural implement makers in Ontario are very much dissatisfied with the Tariff. With regard to carriages, the hon. Minister told us they are cheaper now than ever before, and would have us believe that his magnificent policy has given carriage makers an extended trade by giving them a monopoly of our own markets. He alleges that although he has taxed so heavily nearly every article that goes into the composition of a carriage, notwithstanding carriages are now at a much lower price than they were before, and higher wages paid, the carriage makers are making better profits. There is no system of arithmetic that would enable the hon. gentleman to figure out such a result. Higher taxes on the raw material, higher wages for the workman, lower prices for the article sold and better profit for the carriage maker. The hon. Minister alleges he has enlarged the market, that there is such an increase of wealth that people can afford to buy more carriages now than formerly. I would willingly believe this to be true, but I know it is not true. In St. John we do not see as many carriages as we did ten or fifteen years ago. In 1878 we imported altogether in all Canada but \$154,853 worth of carriages. Did the Tariff reduce very materially the number imported or the price? In 1879, during the depression, the quantity imported was smaller and the value lower, but the next year we imported to the value of \$137,378. In 1881, when we may suppose the National Policy was in full operation, we imported \$151,433 worth, or just \$3,400 less than in the year before the National Policy went into operation. Where did the National Policy, in this particular trade, confer any benefit on the manufacturers? With regard to sewing machines, the hon. Minister made another extraordinary statement. For once he forgot to credit the National Policy with all this increased trade, and said it is partly the effect of lower prices. Far more are sold but at cheaper rates. The people, he says, can afford better to buy them. It is a most gratuitous assertion to say that people buy sewing machines only when they are well off; nine-tenths of them are bought by persons to be used as a means of gaining a livelihood, though no doubt the general increase in their use is very large. When we look at the number imported we find that the Tariff could not have enlarged the market for the Canadian manufacturer. In 1878, the whole value imported was \$101,404. In 1881, was the quantity imported smaller? Had the National Policy the effect credited it? Not at all. The amount imported was nearly twice as large, \$193,337. There were double the number of machines, so that instead of having once and a half as many machines we had three times as many machines imported as in 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We manufactured and sold four times as many.

Mr. ANGLIN. I admit that to be unquestionable. Surely it does not prove that the National Policy was the cause of the increased production and sale of these articles, because if it had any effect it would be to increase the sales at home by the exclusion of the foreign article; but instead of excluding the foreign article, we find that under the operation of the National Policy the value of the sewing machines imported is nearly twice as large.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The reason is that they import the heads now and put them up here, and make and finish the frames here.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then the case of the manufacturer is worse.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is one reason why they are reduced in value.

Mr. ANGLIN. I do not deny the price has been reduced. We are progressing in all these things every day; we are discovering new and more expeditious modes of manufacturing sewing machines, and they are now manufactured much cheaper than they could be four years ago. Human ingenuity and enterprise are effecting improvements every day, but the hon. gentleman would not have them exercised in this country. I have run through several articles to which the hon. gentleman especially alluded in order to prove that the National Policy had effected so wonderful a revolution in the business of this country, and that it had given more employment and better wages. Where or when have the people obtained better wages than they did five or six years ago? Where are they put lower to day than they were then? Hon. gentlemen opposite have to compare the present state of things with 1878; they would like to compare the state of things to-day with the state of things when the business depression was at its very worst and people everywhere were suffering for want of employment; but if they are to claim credit for the National Policy, that it has elevated the working classes, or if they were to contend that the National Policy gives to the working classes better wages, they should compare the present state of things with that which existed in the country in former years of fair average prosperity—in 1874 or 1875; and if they do they must admit that the cases are very few indeed where the working people are earning as much in nominal wages to-day as they earned in those years, while a dollar earned to-day will purchase no more than 80 or 90 cents six years ago. Now, to come back to this other question, the hon. member for King's, usually so keen and sharp to comprehend a statement, seems to have misunderstood—perversely, I thought—the position taken by the hon. member for St. John. He would persist in arguing that the hon. gentleman endeavored to prove that the duty of \$2 per ton on pig iron and the other duties on iron, enabled the Londonderry mines to charge a higher price for their iron in the market than is charged for other iron of the same character. The hon. member for St. John, on the contrary, took the ground, and proved by the statements he produced, that this duty imposed on pig iron adds at least \$2 to the price of that iron in our own markets to-day. Then the hon. member for King's claimed that iron is cheaper now than it was two years ago, which is a begging of the question itself, an attempt to mislead the popular mind by saying they can get this article lower than formerly. We allege that there is room for doubting even the accuracy of those statements, but without questioning their accuracy, we assert that the addition of a duty adds so much to the cost of the article to the importer, and the importer has to charge his profit as well upon that duty as on the original price in the market in which he buys it. The hon. member for St. John showed that all through, before this increase of duty as well as afterwards, the Londonderry people not only charged 10 or 15 cents on the 100 lbs. more than the imported iron cost, but that their prices went up and down—kept pace, were the words he used—exactly with the cost of the imported iron, and that therefore the imposition of this duty, and the encouragement, so far as it has gone, of the manufacture of iron in Canada, has marked the effect which hon. gentlemen opposite promised with regard to all these protected manufactures, that competition would keep the prices down to a fair rate; but the manufacturer in this case, or in every other case, charges just as much for the article he produces as the imported article cost plus the price of duty; and in this particular case it cost more because the article to-day is of intrinsically greater value than it was four or five years ago. We allege that even if all kinds are made dearer by reason of the

Mr. ANGLIN.

duty, and that all kinds of iron would be just so much cheaper were these duties reduced to-day to the same low standard, that the farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, ship-builders and mechanics are all interested in obtaining cheap iron. Any addition to its price is a burden to every class and industry of the country, and, therefore, not merely on behalf of the manufacturers, but also on behalf of the people I claim that this burden should be taken from the industries of the country in order that the people may obtain from the domestic manufacturers and importers goods at more reasonable rates, and that the duty on iron should be reduced.

Amendment (Mr. Burpee, St. John) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Geoffrion,	Olivier,
Bain,	Gillies,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchar,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Blake,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Borden,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Holtou,	Rogers,
Brown,	Irvine,	Rymal,
Burpee (St. John),	Killam,	Scrifer,
Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Skinner,
Cameron (Huron),	Laurier,	Smith,
Cartwright,	McDonald, (Victoria NS),	Sutherland,
Casey,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Dumont,	Mclsaac,	Weldon, and
Fiset,	Malouin,	Wheler.—47.
Fleming,	Mills,	

NAVS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fulton,	Mongenais,
Allison,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Amyot,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier)	Mousseau,
Arkell,	Girouard (Kent),	Muttart,
Bannerman,	Grandbois,	Orton,
Beaty,	Guillet,	Ouimet,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Hay,	Plumb,
Bill,	Hesson,	Pope (Compton),
Bolduc,	Homer,	Poupore,
Boulbee,	Hooper,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Houde,	Richey,
Bowell,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Rocheater,
Brooks,	Kilvert,	Rouleau,
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Routhier,
Burnham,	Kranz,	Royal,
Carling,	Landry,	Ryan (Marquette),
Caron,	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Lantier,	Scott,
Costigan,	Longley,	Shaw,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Stephenson,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Strange,
Currier,	McCallum,	Tassé,
Guthbert,	McQuaig,	Tellier,
Daly,	McDougald,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McLelan,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McLennan,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McLeod,	Vallée,
Domville,	McQuade,	Wade,
Drew,	McRory,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Dugas,	Manson,	Wallace (York),
Elliott,	Massue,	White (Cardwell),
Farrow,	Merner,	White (Senfrew), and
Ferguson,	Méthot,	Williams.—114.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway.

218. To pay J. O. Nolan for rent of a building at St. Octave..... \$132

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is an amount found by Mr. Shanly, the Chief Engineer, due to Mr. Nolan for the rent of a building which was made use of by the Government after taking possession of the railway contract.

219. To pay J. B. McNutt, of Onslow, N.B., land damages..... \$500

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is an amount due to Mr. McNutt by the official arbitrator, Mr. Cowan, who was selected to examine and report and take testimony on the subject, and he reported that the flooding of the lands caused by the destruction of the road compelled the removal of the buildings belonging to that gentleman at an estimated cost of \$1,000, one-half of that amount to be paid by the Government.

222. To pay heirs of Geo. Moffat for transport of rails...\$4,777 25

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Government never employed Mr. Moffat to carry the rails. He himself declared on his honor to this House that he had no such contract.

Mr. MILLS. When the hon. gentleman was charged with the violation of the Parliament Act, Mr. Moffat denied he had any contract with the Government whatever.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The claim arises in connection with the transportation of rails for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway in 1875, between Dalhousie and Campbellton. Messrs. McDonald & Co. had the contract, but Mr. Moffat claimed to have performed the service for the Government. Messrs. McDonald & Co. however claimed they did the work, and payment was made to them. Mr. Buchan investigated the matter, and reported in favor of Mr. Moffat; but it was subsequently referred to Mr. Shanly, who reported in the same terms. The Order in Council was passed after the fullest investigation, authorizing the payment to the heirs, and providing that proceedings should be taken against Messrs. McDonald & Co., to recover the amount erroneously paid them. Mr. Shanly found that the money was improperly paid to McDonald & Co., and was due to the persons who performed the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But the persons who performed the work performed it for McDonald, who was the contractor, and Mr. Shanly does not controvert that in the least. The matter was examined into fully by the officers of the Department, and they all refused to recommend the payment to Moffat.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that the payment was authorized after the fullest and most elaborate examination. Mr. Shanly, in his report, shows that Mr. Moffat did not act on the authority of Mr. McDonald at all, but on the orders of Grant, who was an engineer of the Government.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I recollect speaking to Mr. Moffat several times and he told me more than once that he had no claim himself at all. He said that his son was the party entitled to make the claim if anyone was. I understand that Mr. McDonald was the party who made the contract.

Mr. DOMVILLE. But he said at the same time the steamers were then worked by his son, but when the estate came to be wound up it, of course, had to have the benefit of any valuation of the steamers.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It is quite clear that Mr. Moffat distinctly denied having any contract with the Government, and here we are called upon to pay over a sum of money which has been already paid. I must protest against this, no matter what Mr. Shanly or anyone else may say.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What steps have been taken to recover the money from McDonald.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the intention of the Government to collect the money from McDonald. The Minister of Justice advises that proceedings should be taken to recover the money or that it should be stopped out of any money that may be due to him by the Crown.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Can you collect the money?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. McDonald had the contract and he procured the carrying on of the work, and the engineers gave him the necessary certificate for the performance of the work. I do not believe that the Deputy Minister of Justice ever gave the opinion that it could be collected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman obtained any advice that there is a claim against McDonald? and on the statement made to-night I do not think there would be any.

Mr. HESSON. This work was not done by Mr. McDonald, and I think it is worth while to consider whether the party ordering that money to be paid should not be responsible. I think it is quite right and proper that the Government should pay the man who did the work, and it was the duty of the Government at that time to see that the contractor was not paid, not having performed the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He did perform the work. We had no business to interfere between the contractor and his men along the line, to see whether he paid them. If the Moffats chose to do this work for Mr. McDonald, it was none of our business. The work was paid for according to the regular usage of the Department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman thought, when he paid Mr. McDonald this money, that he performed the work; but it is proved that Mr. McDonald did not perform the work or obtain its performance, and that the work was done by the person for whom this payment is made, upon the direction of the officer of the Government in charge, viz., the resident engineer, Mr. Peter Grant.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Grant had no more business to give the order than the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the date of the arrangement with Mr. Moffat?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The date of the telegram from the Department is the 3rd of June, 1875.

Mr. BLAKE. Here is Mr. Moffat's statement made in the House on April 23rd, 1877:

"I never had a contract for the Intercolonial Railway in my life, to the best of my knowledge and belief. I know nothing about this, and I deny the whole of it. I have never obtained a cent of money from that railway, either for contracts or anything else. I have never sought a contract and never got one."

Mr. MILLS. Besides, Mr. Moffat, occupying a seat here, had no right to sit here; and it seems to me an extraordinary thing, in the face of that denial by Mr. Moffat, that the hon. Minister should pay his heirs or executors.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Moffat stated distinctly in this House that his sons did the work, though he admitted that he owned the steamers, but he did not know that it was done, as the arrangement had been made by telegram; but as they did the work, they ought to be paid for it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There are no facts, and it was not made improperly. The work was done according to contract and paid for in the regular course.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. My hon. friend supposes this was the only contract, but Mr. McDonald was a railroad contractor, and this work was an incident to the other work he had in hand.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears in this case that the Government assumed that McDonald had performed the work as he ought to have done, or had procured some other person who had the means. Moffat was the only person who had the means of removing the rails, and, under the circumstances, the resident

engineer employed another person, and the official arbitrator having obtained all the facts, reported that we owed that man so much money. I would like to ask the member for Westmoreland whether we were not bound to act upon the finding of our own officer?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Yes; if these are the facts. But Moffat testifies he never was the contractor. Did not McDonald acknowledge his indebtedness to Moffat for services performed, and is it not the fact that McDonald never repudiated his liability?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot say.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would like to know whether McDonald was interrogated on the point?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get the evidence before concurrence.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the report of Mr. Shanly, brought down on my motion, cover all the cases he has investigated.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; but all the papers the Government were able to bring down were those on which action had been taken, and that the Government had dealt with. They regard Mr. Shanly's reports as confidential until they act on them. Some of his reports have not been dealt with.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think we are entitled to those papers. Parliament made an order for them unreservedly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We do not consider the reports proper to bring down until the Government had dealt with them. It would be prejudicial to the public interest to publish some of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wished to get the opinion of Parliament before it rose on the Government's course of taking cases out of Court and submitting them to the arbitration of a single individual, and I am deprived of that opportunity by not having the papers whereby to know the claims submitted to this Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have taken no cases out of Court. The Order in Council was brought down under which Mr. Shanly was appointed, and it distinctly confines his duty to investigating and reporting upon cases that have not been adjudicated upon.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It may be true that cases are not taken out of Court, but the arbitrator is considering cases that might go into Court, which is the proper place for the decision of claims. Does the hon. Minister recollect, and will he enquire whether the claims of Frank Jones, in my county, for damages sustained by a fire have been settled?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; but I do not remember the amount. It was charged to the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway out of which it was paid.

225. Extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Halifax....\$5,000

Mr. ANGLIN. Is that work completed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will be a further sum in the Supplementary Estimates which will complete it.

227. Rolling Stock \$309,800

Mr. MACKENZIE. I asked for a statement of the entire amount of rolling stock paid and charged to capital account up to July, 1874, and from that date to the present time; also of the amount expended by the Government on repairs or new stock chargeable to revenue.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statements will be laid on the table.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Where was this rolling stock obtained?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Part in Canada and part outside. There were 100 cars from Quebec and 200 from St. John; 200 box cars at \$700; 200 cars at \$700; 2 mail cars at \$3,500 and 100 hopper coal cars at \$228.

295. Repairs and working expenses on the Intercolonial Railway.....\$300,00

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that this is in conformity with the vote I took last year. I took a vote of \$1,600,000 last year and was obliged to ask for this supplementary in order to cover the expenditure involved by the increased traffic. Every dollar of that is returned to the Treasury by the receipts of the road.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If we allow that item to pass at present we may have something to say about it on concurrence.

98. Repairs and working expenses, Windsor Branch Railway.....\$8,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. That also I desire to discuss.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman will not find any necessity for discussing that. It is a mere matter of account. The Government placed the Windsor and Annapolis Railway in the hands of the Company upon practically the same terms as the original lease. The Company receive two-thirds of the gross earnings, and the Government one-third to maintain the road. This is simply an expenditure in the maintenance of the road, all of which is returned to us by the money received from the road. It is regularly paid, and that is a mere matter of account so far as this vote is concerned.

Committee reported; and (at 3:25 o'clock a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 1st May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SURVEY OF THE HARBOR OF ST. ROCH DES AULNETS.

Mr. RINFRET, in the absence of Mr. CASGRAIN, enquired, Whether the Government have recently caused a survey to be made of the harbor of St. Roch des Aulnets; if so, what has been the result and the cost thereof, and is it the intention of the Government to make improvements in the said harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No survey has been made recently, but one was made two years ago, and from that survey the Government concluded that it could not make any improvements to the said harbor.

IMMIGRATION AGENCY AT NEW YORK.

Mr. COURSOL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish an Immigration and Repatriation Agency at New York, specially for the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen in that State?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government has not the intention of establishing an Immigration and Repatriation Agency at New York, but it has already one to that effect in the State of Massachusetts.

ASSISTANCE TO THE MUNICIPALITY OF ST. MICHEL.

Mr. AMYOT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant assistance this year to the municipality of St. Michel, in the county of Bellechasse, in relation to the repair and maintenance of the wharf on the River St. Lawrence in that municipality?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret to have to tell the hon. member that the Government is unable to come to the assistance of the municipality of St. Michel, in the county of Bellechasse, this year, in relation to the repair and the maintenance of the wharf on the River St. Lawrence, but a survey is to be made during recess in order to obtain a report which will give the Government more information than it is possessed of at present.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton) enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to make provisions for public buildings at Sydney and North Sydney, this year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government to make provision for public buildings at Sydney; but it is their intention to make provision for buildings at North Sydney.

INDEMNITY FOR DUTIES ON FISH AND FISH OIL.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) enquired, When an answer may be expected to the memorial of W. H. Pope addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, dated January, 1879, asking indemnity for duties paid on fish and fish oil exported from Prince Edward Island to the United States in 1871 and in 1872; and also the letter on the same subject from the members of the House of Commons and Senators representing Prince Edward Island, bearing date 20th April instant, and addressed to the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Premier of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This subject is now under the consideration of the Government, the attention of the Government having been called to it by a letter addressed to me about the 20th of April, and received about the 22nd.

DAMAGES TO THE SCHOONER *M. C. UPPER*.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Has any claim been preferred upon the present Government for damages to the schooner *M. C. Upper*, on the Welland Canal? Has the matter been settled? Has any sum been agreed to be paid? If so, what amount and when?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A claim has been made for damages to the schooner *M. C. Upper*. An amount will be submitted to the consideration of Parliament in the Supplementary Estimates of the coming year.

THE RE-DISTRIBUTION BILL.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to enquire what is the position of the public Bill which has been introduced by the hon. the First Minister, and read the first time? According to our practice, no Bill can be introduced in blank or in an imperfect form. I make the enquiry because many hon. members are unable to understand what the provisions of the Bill for the re-adjustment of the seats are; and the Bill was found not to be in the possession of the House, and access could not be obtained to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Bill was introduced by me after I had asked leave to introduce it. It was printed in galley shape, for the purpose of having it

printed and distributed to members; but, of course, we could not ask for the second reading until the Bill was printed, and members had an opportunity of reading it, and I am told it is being printed to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. The point was not that the Bill could not be read until it was printed. We knew that. The point was that the Bill introduced in print was retained by the hon. gentleman who introduced it, although it became the property of the House, according to the language of the Speaker of the English House of Commons, although, according to our reading, the first reading should be marked by the Clerk at the time. As I understand, it is the property of the House and not of a member. I do not think the hon. member who introduces it is expected to see to the printing, but it is put in the hands of the Clerk, who transmits it to the proper officer, who sees that the printing is attended to. Various efforts have been made to get access to the Bill. There are many representations as to what it says, and a conflict of opinion exists as to what its contents are. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that we should not have access to the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a matter of every day practice, and has been ever since I have been in Parliament, that the person immediately in charge of the Bill feels that it is his especial duty to see that it is got ready as soon as possible for the use of the House.

DOMINION LANDS ALONG RAILWAY LINES.

Mr. BLAKE moved that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That the present system of administering the Dominion lands situate along the lines of railway is likely to result, practically, in the acquisition by the railway companies of almost all the enhanced value, not merely of their own lands, but also of the Dominion lands in immediate proximity to stations on such railways; and that steps should be taken with a view to secure to the public, as far as practicable, such enhanced value in cases of stations hereafter to be established.

He said: This motion was placed on the paper on the 14th of March, but, owing to various circumstances, it has been postponed to so late a period that I do not propose at this time to engage in any lengthened argument on the subject; but I desire, briefly, to state the purport of the motion and the reasons I have for bringing it to the attention of the House. As the House knows, Dominion Lands Acts of various dates, including the one now in force, and the Bill which is now under the consideration of the House, contemplate the reservation of towns, cities or plots from ordinary occupation, and their sale by auction or otherwise as the Governor in Council may decide; and not long ago—I think in 1880—this principle was extended to the case of school lands in a manner which appeared to me to be somewhat arbitrary, but it was presumably in the general public interest. It was provided that if any section falling in the school lands list should happen to be suitable for a station, it should be withdrawn from the school lands list and sold by auction or otherwise for the public benefit, and the school lands list was to be credited with an amount equal to the highest value of other lands sold in the same township by either the Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I mention these facts to show that the general principle of obtaining such value as could properly be obtainable on account of eligibility of situation in reference to locations for towns or stations is contemplated in the various Public Lands Acts provisions as a proper thing. Now the general system under which land grants are made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and also to the other railways, is that alternate sections only are given to the Company, the others being reserved to the Government. The practical result has been, so far as my

information goes, that the Railway Company gets almost the whole enhanced value of these lands. The Company has, of course, the power to a considerable extent of controlling the location of these stations, and it is able by the exercise of that power, when a private individual has obtained possession of a lot cornering on its own lot on the lot on which the station may be—if the Railway Company is passing through a lot which is now the property of the Company—then it is able, I say, to point out to the individual, that unless he comes to terms with the Company, the station will be placed somewhere else, and is thus able to obtain cessions of the individual's interest in the property at moderate rates. I understand that various cessions have taken place under these circumstances. In some cases a bulk sum has been paid, and in others it has been agreed that the Company and the proprietors shall share in certain proportions in the enhanced value of the property which is to be sold by auction, and so on. Take the case of Brandon, which was fixed, I believe, by natural circumstances, for a station. A very large sum was paid by the Railway Company to what they called there a syndicate—a sum of \$100,000 or so, and it is said that many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been realized by the Company out of Brandon station. That is the way in which the matter is operated in reference to these parts of country which were more or less settled, or had been possessed by private individuals prior to the present time. We are now dealing with the state of things in which a large extent of country is to be tapped or reached by the Canadian Pacific Railway and its branches and by various other railways. Now, I am told that a system prevails of sending out homesteaders and preemptors—that of a fine morning you may sometimes see four or five individuals started off along the line of railway to homestead and preempt choice and eligible sites. They homestead and preempt, not for themselves, but in reality for those who employ them for that purpose; and thus possession is taken of the choice Government lands along the railway, not for settlement or for the advantage of the settler, but to obtain the advantage of the enhanced value of the lands by their selection as stations or town sites. Where, on the other hand, a *bona fide* homesteader or preemptor has gone into possession, he is dealt with in the way I refer to, and he gets but a small part of the advantage, while the great bulk goes to the Railway Company which controls the situation. This is a very serious question. The tract of country through which the line of railway goes cost but a trifle, and the whole value of stations and town sites, if the present impulse in Manitoba and North-West settlement goes on, is almost equivalent to the cost of constructing the railway through the prairie country. Now, it does seem to me that the state of things under which it is possible for the Railway Company to acquire almost the whole of this advantage—the public getting nothing, and the real settler getting nothing, or an insignificant fraction—is objectionable, and that steps should be taken and the control of the Government be used; that the Government should communicate to the Railway Company the importance of their being sharers in the enhanced value of the lands selected for station grounds or town sites, so that by their being sold on joint account or in some other way, the right of the public to get the benefit of the enhanced value of the stations and towns being established on the line of railway, should be recognized. At the present time, as I have stated, the practical result is that the Railway Company is gobbling up the enhanced value of the Dominion lands as well as of their own, and are thus, to a large extent, paying the cost of building the road from the public lands of which the public ought to receive the benefit. I, therefore, move that the House go into Committee on this resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I presume that the hon. gentleman has moved this resolution at this
Mr. BLAKE.

stage of the Session for the purpose of expressing the opinion he has now done. He does not point out in the resolution any mode by which the end he desires to attain can be attained. He says something or other must be done to enable the country to gain the advantage of the favorable sites. I explained some time ago, in answer to an objection that came from the other side—an objection to the Government's having reserved one range of townships along each side of the Pacific Railway—that the Government had been informed, as the hon. gentleman has been informed, that persons professing to be actual settlers had gone along the line of the railway with no intention of becoming *bona fide* settlers, but with the purpose of setting up a colorable claim as settlers, in order to speculate on the enhanced value of these lands from their peculiarly favorable positions. We were informed that scores of people had gone out and squatted, or professed to squat, on lands along the railway for the purpose of selling them at an enhanced value afterwards. Of course, we could not object to people taking that course; but when we heard of it we withdrew from homesteading all the lands along the line of railway, until the *bona fide* settler had an opportunity of having a fair start, and of getting possession of these lots. Of course, we know that the odd-numbered sections on each side of the railway belong to the Railway Company as fast as they earn them. The Government cannot dictate to them where they shall put their different stations. Like other railway companies, they will choose the most advantageous points in their opinion—points where roads from the country will converge, in the vicinity of streams, and so on; and, as a matter of course, they will, if possible, place them on their own lands. Whenever they do this, the Government has a section adjoining, and the Government can either allow the *bona fide* settler to get the advantage, or, under the reservation I have mentioned—which was rather objected to by hon. gentlemen opposite—lay it out as a portion of the station or town or village which has been laid out by the Pacific Railway Company on their own property. That land has been deliberately withdrawn from immediate settlement for the purpose of gaining the end which the hon. gentleman desires by his motion. I fancy it will answer no purpose for the hon. gentleman to press his motion; and I do not suppose he will, having called attention to the fact, and having been assured that the Government are quite willing to enable the country or the *bona fide* settler to gain any advantage from proximity to a station. I, for one, do not think the Government should be eagerly anxious to engage in speculation. If it should be the good fortune of any emigrant to get a better farm than another, either for fertility or any other cause, from being in the vicinity of the railway, I shall not grudge him that advantage. If we can get *bona fide* settlers to take up the lands in the first place, and if we can get out of those lands sufficient payments to recoup the people of Canada for their great expenditure of the Pacific Railway, valuable results would have been obtained. The Government are keeping steadily in view the objects mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I am aware that there is great danger of speculators homesteading the lands adjoining the railway, and that the Syndicate themselves have the greatest benefit from these speculations. I was told by a gentleman in Winnipeg that he was going out on the 1st of March to the Qu'Appelle country, to settle squatters in the interests of the Syndicate—the lands to be held ostensibly for actual settlement, under a bargain that the squatters will transfer them to the Syndicate as soon as the titles are obtained. I think that the reservation of the range of townships on each side of the route, which the Premier said was reserved to prevent such abuse, is excessive. If the Government reserved a range of sections, the sections adjoining the railway on each side, it would quite answer the purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I meant one range of townships—that is all right.

Mr. CASEY. I thought it was a slip of the tongue, and I think that provision is sufficient. Even that reservation is hardly just to the actual settler, as it is a reservation against the actual settler as well as against the speculator in lands, if means could be found for differentiating the actual settler from the speculator.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can that be done?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman in this resolution does not point out a remedy, which is for the Government and not the Opposition to do. I think the real remedy should have been the Government's reserving, in their grant to the Company, all the odd sections adjoining the railway. The Company had quite sufficient payment for their work, in the twenty-four mile belt on each side, without getting the town sites. The Government would thus have acted as they act in the case of all grants to other rings of speculators, and retained a great source of revenue. Every town site along the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, will be worth, on the average, over \$500,000. As these town sites are struck about every twenty miles, it is not hard to see what a source of revenue the Government would have acquired from the building of the road. Those sites would have realized about \$10,000,000. The hon. gentleman says that it is intended, after the stations have been located, to open the adjoining sections to homesteading, or sell those reserved sections. I think that would be very unfair, as the earliest comers or squatters, being certain of the places selected, could seize and get all the benefit of those favored localities. If the Government reserves those sections to get the benefit of the town sites, they ought to reserve them altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. The course which the hon. gentleman says he has pursued, in order to accomplish his object, I think will entirely fail of any beneficial result. The very object he has in view will be thwarted by it. He says: "I issued an order reserving those sections immediately adjoining the railway;" but he said also: "I will open them some day or other." This means that, of course, the persons on them will get them when they are opened, and also an invitation, not to the *bona fide* settler, who does not wish to run any risks, but to the speculator and Railway Company to sell, send bogus homesteaders and preemptors on these lands, to be held and disposed of afterwards, not for the benefit of the settler, but for the benefit of the Company and the speculators, that is the practical result of the order. I do not believe a single man of those speculators, going out in the early spring, will be thwarted by the circumstance that there has been a temporary withdrawal of those lands from homesteading. Most of them can get other persons to avoid for their benefit the restrictions thus imposed. It is one thing altogether to say to the new *bona fide* settler on the spot that he ought to have the benefit of any rising value of lands. I agree with that. It is an inducement to such a *bona fide* settler to go into the interior and open up unexplored portions of the country, in view of getting choice sites; but the practical result of this system, as it is carried out by the Railway Company, is not to give such actual settler anything more than a mere fractional interest, reserving almost the whole of the profit to the Company itself. I have been told that the Company's profits will be three-fourths of the value of those sites, leaving only one-fourth to the settler or homesteader. Those figures may be mistaken, but they would indicate that the large share of the profit is to be absorbed by the Company, which is the advantage of knowing the sites of the future towns. At the crossings of rivers and some other points there may be clear indications of town sites; but taking the railway as a whole, it is equally clear that far the larger portion of the stations may be located at one place or another, a mile here

or there making little difference, to suit the interests of the Company. The Company is able to say to any locality, unless you make such terms with us as we approve of we shall locate our station elsewhere. This policy has resulted, or is going to result, in depriving the Government from any profit from those lands, while the Railway Company will absorb the whole value of station sites as well as public Government lands. That is a state of things that ought not to exist. I regret that the hon. gentleman having taken the step he has, which seems to me is rather calculated to injure than to benefit the *bona fide* settler, is not now able to hold out any hope that any different result will take place.

Mr. MACMILLAN. I know perfectly well, as far as Brandon—which is one of the places where, according to the hon. member for West Elgin, injustice was done to the actual settler—is concerned, no injustice was done under any circumstances whatever, for actual settlers were the persons who have received the benefit on all sides, except the north side, where I understand Mr. Ross owned a section on which a squatter had placed himself, and the Government were bound to replace by selecting one immediately north of that locality. He was the only person who received any benefit from the selection in that way. I am also aware that the hon. member for West Elgin discovered cunningly that there was to be a site in a certain locality, and he with some of his friends set to work to buy up, and actually did buy up, a very important locality on the southern extension of the road. They had the authority of the locating engineer at the time, who managed the road, that this was a point at which there was to be a town, and purchased, to a considerable extent, land on this site. Subsequently they discovered that their information was unfounded, and begged the parties from whom they had bought the land, to let them off the bargain. The hon. member is one of those who accuse the Government of being parties to anything of this kind. To my mind railway companies have a perfect right to select the localities where cities are to be built, and I do not think that the hon. member for West Elgin ought to complain, after having been treated so generously, when he and his friends had placed themselves in an unfortunate position.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. gentleman sees fit to attack me personally for having done something which he considers improper—

Mr. McLELAN. Not improper—speculative.

Mr. CASEY. I admit that I, with certain others, did suppose that we had bought a certain place which was publicly declared, by the Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to be the located terminus of a certain branch line. That gentleman had written a letter, stating that was the location and which was allowed to be shown to the public. I bought from second hands—from a party who had bought from the original settler. After investigation, and after having sold a number of lots in this new town site, we found that the man from whom we had bought had no title, so that instead of having to beseech him, we were in a position to compel him to return the money. He did not require compulsion, he was an honest man, and on representation of the case returned the money, and we were in a position to do the same by those who had bought lots from us. I do not see what this has to do with the question before the House at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has a right to speculate in property and make the most out of it, and I am glad that he and others are investing their money in the North-West. I think the hon. member has rather misunderstood me, or I failed in making myself understood. I quite agree with the hon. member that it is very difficult to find out who is the *bona fide* and who is the

pretended settler; and we withdrew the first section on each side of the road, all along the line of the railway, for further consideration, until spring opened and a full tide of emigration set in, when everybody would have the same chance—on the plan, first come, first served. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says, that there is no greater security now, that *bona fide* settlers will get these lands, than there was three months ago. As I understand, his views which I take to be those of the Opposition, are, that these lots on each side should be reserved for the purpose of selling to the best advantage, and that speculators or pretended settlers should not be allowed to get possession of them. These views are worthy of all consideration, but the difficulty was that the Government had announced their policy, that a number of sections all over the country should be reserved for actual settlers, and this would be an apparent infringement of that rule. No precaution can prevent a person settling on a lot of land and improving it for speculative purposes, without really having settled himself, and the land being settled and improved, that is all the Government and the country can want. The difficulty was, we did wish to be supposed, as withdrawing from the plan laid down, that the even-numbered lots should be held for pre-emptions and homesteads. Still, under the circumstances, I think the Government will be slow to act in putting a range of sections on each side of the railway into market for homestead and pre-emption, without taking every possible precaution against speculators getting hold of the land.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not suggest the policy the hon. gentleman proposes. I suggested to him that it would be reasonable that the Government should confer with the Railway Company as to those lands on which stations are to be erected. The Company knows where the stations are going to be, and the Government and the Company ought to share the profits. If a railway company chooses to put a station on a lot of land it owns altogether, it has a right to do so, but then there is a profit on the surrounding lots, and the Government's adjoining lots may be very close. The Government ought to have early information where the stations are going to be, and that land should be reserved. Under the present system, neither the Government nor the settler gets any profit, but the Company gets it all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. These sections on each side of the railway will not be sold until all the conditions are completed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have come to no conclusion; but the tendency of the advice from the other side, and from my own mind, to accept that advice—

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that the hon. gentleman misunderstands me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was answering my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish to understand what the hon. gentleman meant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is the tendency, still I cannot speak exactly. We have only suspended the sale of the sections on each side, and we should think well of it before we open that suspension.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to ask him a question, though it has no particular reference to this subject? Where there are warrants granted for 160 acres, are there warrants still for the 160 acres, or only for a certain amount of money?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For a certain amount of money, and it can apply on the purchase of the land.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have been applied to by parties in this position. They supposed they could get a quarter section with a warrant, but were told by the Government officials it was only payable as security for the \$160. Now,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

suppose the land is \$2 an acre, have they to pay \$160 in cash besides giving money for the warrant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is the case.

Mr. BOULTBEE. It is quite evident the hon. member for Lambton wants the Government to exercise the same supervision as he did in the case of the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Kaministiquia, where the whole town plot got into the hands of a ring of speculators before the station was fixed there.

Motion withdrawn.

CHARGES AGAINST CHIEF JUSTICE WOOD.

Mr. SCHULTZ moved for the reading of the Journals of the House of Monday, March 7th, 1881, so far as they relate to the petition of Henry J. Clarke, Q.C., and others, setting forth certain charges against the Hon. Edmund Burke Wood, Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the understanding in the House, agreed to by the hon. gentleman at my own suggestion, that the papers in this case should be printed and distributed for the use of members, before we should be called upon to give a vote. They have not yet been distributed. They were ordered some time ago, but we have not yet got a copy of the petition, nor a copy of the reply.

Mr. STEPHENSON. They were ordered several days ago, and I requested Mr. Hartney to expedite the printing as rapidly as possible. I cannot say why it has not been printed and circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman withdraw his motion?

Mr. SCHULTZ. It is evidently quite impossible to reach any result with this motion were it to pass the House at this time, therefore, as ample time has been given for the production of these papers, and as I have reason to believe the papers themselves are not important as bearing upon the decision of the House as to whether a Committee shall be granted or not, I object to withdraw the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know the right hon. gentleman's views on the subject. Of course, it has been the practice heretofore in dealing with these cases—that of Judge Loranger for instance—to have the papers printed and brought down and made accessible to members. The hon. gentleman himself said that was reasonable. I stated that I would take the very earliest opportunity of calling his attention to the printing, and he agreed to that. If he, as leader of the House, thinks a different course ought to be adopted—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I do not. It was understood that the practice should be carried out, and that whenever a complaint was made against a Judge, the printed copy of the complaint and the evidence in immediate relation thereto should be put into the hands of the members in order that we might judge of the matter with *connaissance de cause*. The difficulty that I see in this matter is that if the Journals were read now, I presume we could not follow it up by appointing a Committee at this late period of the Session, as there would be no time for a Committee to do anything. I do not know what my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Schultz) proposes with respect to moving for a Committee, or what progress he hopes to make in Committee. Therefore it would be no object to read the Journals, unless there can be effectual action taken upon the charges that are brought against this judicial dignitary.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I would ask that the Journals of the House be read, and then that the motion should be put for a Committee. Of course, I am aware it is impossible to do anything with that Committee this Session, but there

may be an alternative suggestion made which will reach the object we have in view.

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

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that the House objects to reading the Journals.

Mr. BLAKE. A discussion took place on that very question. I ventured the suggestion that we ought not to read the Journals except for a purpose, and that that purpose must be the papers of which notice had been given. My hon. friend opposite agreed in that view, and the motion to read the Journals was postponed until the hon. gentleman should put on the notice paper a subsequent motion. At the same time, I suggested it would be necessary that the papers referring to both sides should be printed, and the hon. gentleman also acceded to that. Therefore, I say that if the motion is not to be followed up effectively by a motion for a Committee, it seems to me contrary to practice, and cannot occasion any good result to read the Journals, unless we are going on with the discussion of the subject as to the appointment of the Committee.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. member himself has admitted that there is no possibility of carrying out his object by the appointment of a Committee, there can be no use in reading the Journals.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks of an alternative mode. What does he mean by that?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Some of my friends, and I believe all the hon. members from the Province of Manitoba are as one in this matter, have proposed an alternative suggestion by way of an amendment to the motion. If I am not allowed to put the motion, of course, an amendment can be made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You can put the motion, of course.

Motion agreed to; and the Journals of the House read.

Mr. SCHULTZ moved:

That a Special Committee be appointed, composed of Messrs. Ryan (Marquette), Royal, Scott, Schultz, Robertson (Hamilton), Rykert, Grouard (Jacques-Cartier), Weldon, Daly, McCarthy, Kirkpatrick, Colby, Ives and Sir Albert Smith, to enquire into the Administration of Justice in the Province of Manitoba; and that the Petition of Henry J. Clark, Q.C., and others, and all other Petitions complaining of the conduct of the Hon. Edmund Burk Wood, Chief Justice of Manitoba, be referred to the said Committee, and that the said Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time.

Mr. RYKERT moved in amendment:

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"it is inexpedient and highly detrimental to the administration of justice that such serious charges as appear in the Petition of Henry J. Clark, should be made against the Hon. Edmund Burk Wood, without an opportunity being offered to him of answering the same; therefore, in the opinion of this House, the Government should cause to be issued a Commission to investigate the charges contained in the Petition, and report thereon to this House."

Mr. BLAKE. I object to the principle involved in any such disposal of the case as is now proposed. If those charges have not been investigated by this House, it is because the petition was presented very late last Session, and because no hon. member took any effective step this Session to place on the paper a notice for the appointment of a Committee until as late as the 15th of March. If, even under those circumstances, a Committee has not been appointed, it is owing to circumstances which I do not know; and the House at the present time is not in possession of facts which would enable it to form a judgment on the case. Which of us know what the charges are? I certainly do not. Which of us knows that they are of such a nature as to require investigation, either by a Committee or in any other way? Which of us knows what the answer of the Judge is? Why,

therefore, should we depart from the custom which has prevailed since Confederation of appointing a Committee to deal with charges against Judges and enquire into the case? A charge against an exalted functionary like a Judge of a Superior Court or against a Chief Justice of a Province should certainly be dealt with; but if it is not dealt with, and it hangs over for a considerable time because no person proposes that it should be dealt with, and subsequent delay should be due to circumstances connected with the printing, those facts afforded no reason for a departure from the rule which the House has hitherto followed in dealing with such questions. I look with jealousy for the proposal that the Government should have power to appoint a Commission to try a Judge. There is no reason, under the circumstances, why we should depart from the rule established, and the precedent followed, and why the House should not deal with care as with other cases by appointing a Committee to conduct an investigation, to sit during the Session with open doors, when every member has a right to attend and watch the proceedings taken on the evidence adduced. The Judges of this country hold their offices during good behavior, and can only be removed on a joint address by the Senate and House of Commons. In my opinion, any such address should have for its basis evidence taken before the Committee, and probably repeated at the Bar. Fortunately in the number of cases which have occurred we have never been obliged to proceed further than the preliminary investigation, and we have not settled the practice whether evidence in such cases should be taken at the Bar, as has been done in two or three cases in England, in addition to the evidence taken before the Committee. I speak without much consideration, as this motion has been taken up contrary to the understanding arrived at. I believe the question was raised and settled in England in one case, but evidence with respect to a Judge should be taken at the Bar of the House. However that may be as regards the preliminary proceedings, we have settled the practice that a Committee should be appointed to sit here during the Session with open doors, so that every member of the House could watch its proceedings. There is nothing to justify the proposal in asking the Government to undertake the task of naming a Commission under the Crown, to sit and take evidence during the recess. We should adhere to the precedent adopted and the course hitherto followed, and if the question has to be disposed of, it should be disposed of by our decision as to whether there is full ground for investigation; and, second, if there is ground for investigation it should take place before a Committee. I feel myself unable to say whether there are grounds for an investigation, or not. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has put in your hands a resolution which declares that there are grave charges against the Chief Justice contained in the petition; but I do not know what the petition contains, and I am unable therefore to say whether the charges are grave or whether they are frivolous—or whether the petition is so framed that it should receive our attention. I agree that if there are grave charges in this petition, they should be made the subject of enquiry; but I do not agree with the proposal to decide the question without our having an opportunity of perusing the petition and the Judge's answer, nor to the proposal of the hon. gentleman that we should decide affirmatively that there is a case for enquiry, nor do I agree with the means—supposing there be a case—by which the hon. gentleman proposes to conduct the enquiry.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am fully impressed with the difficulties of the case, and I am glad that the matter has been brought up now, so that we may decide something like the practice that should be followed considering the peculiar position of the Dominion. Our judicial system, owing to the extent of our limits, is altogether different from that contained in England. There, whether it be an English,

Scotch or Irish Judge whose conduct is accused, the petition can be received by the House of Commons, and can be disposed of easily during the course of a parliamentary Session. There, of course, the Sessions last from six to seven months in the year, and sometimes more, and from the proximity of the Courts and the Judges, and all the evidence that would be adduced in the case, there is no difficulty in disposing of the matter in the same sitting in which the charge is made. Here, from the great distance at which some of the parties may be from the seat of Government, it is almost impossible, no matter how grave the charge may be. A charge may be made against a Judge in British Columbia, or Manitoba, but it is almost impossible to have the petition presented, the Committee appointed, and the evidence brought before the Committee in one Session. So that from Session to Session the gravest imputations may be hanging over a Judge—his conduct may be impugned to the utmost extent, in a matter, which, if true, or at all true, would altogether incapacitate him from acting as a Judge, and yet the circumstances cannot be enquired into. I have not read the petition myself, but it is a matter of public notoriety that the learned Chief Justice made the charges the subject of a charge to the Grand Jury in Manitoba in which he went elaborately into the charges against him and answered them; and he distributed his answer to the charges all over the country. I received a copy of the charge and read it at his request. I did not read the accusations, but I gathered from the charge to the Grand Jury that the petition involved his capacity to administer justice fairly and impartially. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says about the issue of Commissions by a Government, because the Government takes the responsibility of selecting the Commission. I think such a Commission ought not to go further than a Commission to take evidence. It should certainly not in any way be a Commission to try a Judge, as that would be exceeding the powers given us under the Constitution as a legislative body. But it is quite clear that a Judge will practically escape the consequences of his impropriety, or will run a great chance of escaping altogether, if a Committee is to sit here in Ottawa, if all witnesses are to be brought here, the evidence considered and the Committee to come to a conclusion, and then that that conclusion or report should be submitted to the House of Commons, and perhaps the evidence examined over again at the Bar. This might go on from year to year, and the Government be freed from all responsibility. That is the fact.

Mr. BLAKE. Manitoba is only three days from us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman would find it difficult to go there in three days just now. On the whole, I think, it would be better to carry the original resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. I would prefer the original resolution, but I do not know whether there is a case to enquire into.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We can have the original resolution, and the Committee can meet at any rate.

Mr. BLAKE. Let us observe the constitutional forms of the House at all events. None of us have had an opportunity of knowing what the charges are, and we should, at any rate, let the petition be read and the learned Judge's response. I think decency would require that we should have an opportunity of studying both. The petition is there in manuscript, if not in print, and it can be read.

Mr. BUNSTER. I understood the leader of the Government to refer to the Judges of British Columbia; but I hope there is no aspersion on their character, because they enjoy the respect of the inhabitants of that Province. We all feel

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

proud of our Judges, and I think the Government ought to feel proud of them too, particularly when they learn that all their decisions have been accepted by the people. They are men of superior ability, well able to carry out the law of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe the Bench of British Columbia is a very good one, and stands deservedly high, not only in the estimation of the people of British Columbia, but of those who are the best able to judge of their efficiency, and that is the Bar. I believe they are highly respected both by the Bar and people.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would like to ask if there is any probability of the answer to the charges being brought before the House within a day or two, because if there is it would be better to let the matter stand over and allow it to come up again by consent of the hon. First Minister. It is quite clear that we are not now in a position to discuss, intelligently, the question of whether or not it is a proper question for an investigation of any kind. We have before us a petition presented some time ago by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz), and though I suppose most of us have read the charges, for my part I have not seen the answer which has been made by the learned Chief Justice. I do not think it is fair, under these circumstances, to ask the House to adopt either the original resolution or the amendment. The rule is clear that an investigation of this kind should not be entered upon unless the Government are satisfied that there are reasonable grounds. Lord John Russell said in a similar case: "Nothing but the most imperious necessity should induce the House to adopt such a course as enquiring into the conduct of a Judge." Now, we cannot say whether there is any imperious necessity for enquiry in this case or not until we have become acquainted with the charges and the answers to them. Mr. Todd says: "Before consenting to a parliamentary enquiry Ministers should investigate the cause of complaint to see whether there should be any enquiry." Now, I understand the hon. First Minister has not had an opportunity of considering the petition, and, under those circumstances, it is impossible to say whether or not this case is one that should necessitate an enquiry either by a special Committee or by a Royal Commission. Of course, the charges, if there is anything in them, might be proper enough for an investigation; but before we can pronounce on that point, we ought clearly to see the charges themselves as well as the answers made by the Chief Justice. If there is a reasonable probability of our having the answers in print this week, would it not be better to allow the matter to stand, and then we can give an intelligent decision on the subject. I have read over the charges, and, so far as I can see, with one solitary exception, none of them come within the rule laid down by the Imperial Parliament on this subject. I, therefore, suggest that the matter might be allowed to stand over.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has started a point of some importance. It may be that some of these charges are such as the House might think not fit to be entertained; it may be, that others are fit grounds for an investigation. On this ground it is well to be guarded; it might be very damaging to refer to a Committee a charge against a Judge in the dark. As I understand the rule, you do not refer matters of enquiry unless you are able to lay down this proposition; if these things are true they will form a proper ground for the removal of a Judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I think that is the rule.

Mr. BLAKE. And surely the charges ought to be so substantially alleged and of such a character that if you can say these charges are proven, we could follow up the investigation with an address to remove the Judge; but can we say that now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a very grave matter, and we should look at it on both sides of the House in such a way that no difficulty can arise. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Huron is a good one—that this matter should be allowed to stand over for a time; but at this period of the Session, I think the hon. gentleman who has taken the responsibility of bringing it forward should have an opportunity of bringing it up again; and if it be understood that it may come up on a Government day, it might stand till this day week, and then the papers may be in the hands of hon. members.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I, of course, assent to what is suggested, but I wish to point out the difficulty of the Printing Committee. The answer is voluminous, embracing nineteen quires of foolscap, and it will take a long time to print this. Whether that answer contains any evidence on these charges or not, this has been stated, and must be stated again, that this is not the first charge made against the hon. gentleman. The Legislature of Manitoba passed a resolution, which was transmitted to this Government, making serious complaint of the administration of justice by that Judge; and the action which was taken unanimously last Session has been repeated this Session; and if the Printing Committee find it impossible to have this answer printed, it will lead to the conviction in the mind of Chief Justice Wood, and of other culprits like him, that all that is necessary to prolong his case indefinitely or to save him from investigation is to fill an extra quire of foolscap.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a large amount of money voted for printing outside of the parliamentary printers. I think this is a case for applying the rule which has been applied by hon. gentlemen opposite in cases in which it was not so much required. I understand that the parliamentary printers printed the report of the Pacific Railway Commission for the Messrs. Stephenson, of Chatham, the Messrs. Stephenson taking the profits. That might be done in the present case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is fertile in expedients.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

FISH TRAPS AND BRUSH WEIRS, N. S.

Mr. KILLAM moved for copies of all Orders in Council passed since 1st May, 1879, in reference to fishing for salmon in the Dominion; also copies of all departmental instructions issued in pursuance of any such orders to fishery officers in Nova Scotia, together with a statement showing the scale of fees chargeable to licensees; also a statement giving the names and address of all persons in the said Province who paid such fees, together with the amount of fees paid by each, and the names of the fishery officers to whom such fees had been paid; also a statement showing the number of licenses granted for fish-traps and brush-weirs for catching any description of fish in each of the Maritime Provinces, with the price paid for such licenses. He said: My object in moving this resolution is merely to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the irregular system which prevails of charging for licenses for fish traps and brush weirs in the Province of Nova Scotia. In that Province there are, in all, 1,081 of these machines for catching fish. Of these very few pay license. The only fish traps that pay licenses are in the counties of Yarmouth and Shelburne, with the exception of one in Lunenburg and one in Queens; they pay a license of \$40 each. Of the rest, only four brush weirs pay licenses of \$10 each, and they are in the county of Yarmouth. So that nearly the whole revenue derived from fish catching is derived from the counties of Shelburne and Yarmouth, and

these counties have never been assisted by the placing of spawn in the rivers therein. No application that I made to the hon. Minister or his predecessor had the least effect, although I placed the case strongly before them. I hope this motion will have the effect of relieving the people of the county I represent from this charge of \$10 each for weirs, and that the hon. Minister will see that the rivers of these two counties will receive the consideration they are entitled to in connection with the distribution of spawn from the different hatcheries. I think it was suggested, the other day, that this motion and that of the hon. member for Antigonish, should be combined, as they are on the same subjects, and I think labor will be saved to the officers of the Department by preparing the information in one return.

Mr. McISAAC. My object in giving notice of this motion, which is added by way of amendment to the motion of the member for Yarmouth, was to elicit information which I failed to obtain in any other way. It will be remembered that in June, 1879, an Order in Council was passed prohibiting salmon fishing in all the Provinces of the Dominion, except under the authority of a license or lease. The order was to be universal in its application, but its operation has been but partial—a matter that I could not explain to several parties in my own Province engaged in this fishery, who knew that the order was to be universal, but that some persons in Nova Scotia were exempt from its operation, while other parties were subjected to heavy fees. Besides, it was impossible for them or me, since I came to Ottawa, to find out the scale of fees chargeable for license for salmon fishing. I applied to the proper authorities here for the information, and the only satisfaction I received was that instructions were sent to the different fisheries officers to charge in fact such fees as they thought proper. I could hardly believe then, and I can hardly believe yet, that such unrestrained authority would be left to any such body of men as the fishery overseers of the Dominion. I have nothing to say against any of them, but still there is a temptation to an abuse of their power, and to partiality to which such officials should not be exposed. Until 1879 no person in Nova Scotia had to pay one cent for the privilege of salmon fishing. The fishermen now consider this charge a very great injustice. The uncertainty, the elasticity of the tax is also a subject of complaint. Nobody can tell what amount may be charged, unless there are Orders in Council which I failed to obtain. I have also been written to since I came here, and asked whether this year licenses should be taken out. I have found they are to be taken out. What is the object? It has been alleged that the object was to establish fishing stations or berths. If that is the only object, can it not be constitutionally and legally attained without extracting money from every poor fisherman? I think it can. This is evidently nothing else but a device to extort money from those poor men; who are already too much taxed. I would ask the President of the Council, himself a Nova Scotian, and acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to consider this matter. It is not fair that the Province of Nova Scotia should be obliged to pay this tax, while the Province of Prince Edward Island is exempt, or that salmon fishing should be prohibited in one Province, unless licenses be taken out, while permitted in another. The regulation of the amount to be paid is at the discretion of the fishery officers. We may infer from the amount of the penalties attached to the violation of this regulation, the maximum figure that the fishery officers can charge. Invested with magisterial authority. They can fine a man \$20 for every offence; and for every day a fisherman has his net out he is liable to a penalty of \$20, unless licensed. Another clause states that all material and appliances used in fishing shall be seized and confiscated. Now, the outfit of a net-salmon fisherman amounts to something between \$200 and \$400, which may be all forfeited, in addition to

the other penalty, if he does not take out his license. This is the only mode by which we can arrive at the maximum figure which the fisherman can be charged if he does not take out his license. There is another evil which, with all due respect to these overseers, should be mentioned. Their opportunities of favoritism which are sometimes turned to account. A fisherman may select a particular spot for his net, and the fishery overseer may have a friend whom he prefers to serve; the first party may then be told by the overseer: "Unless you pay me so much, you shall not have that place," and as his authority is discretionary, he may give the place to his friend for a merely nominal amount. I am sorry that complaints of this kind have been made. I feel confident that the acting Minister of Marine and the Government, when they consider this matter, will put an end to this injustice at once. It is said the charge is only nominal, and some fishermen in my own county pay from \$2 to \$3 for their license. But any money taken from the fishermen is by some considered only nominal, while anything given them is considered substantial. The penalty may be \$40, \$50, \$60, or \$400. I hope there are checks which can be applied to the action of those officers. I have only to bring the subject before the hon. Minister of Marine, I feel certain, in order that such an injury to his own Province will be removed, because he understands as well as any one that such a thing was never known in Nova Scotia as taxing the sea, for this is nothing else. I hope that this Order in Council will be cancelled, and the fishermen allowed to enjoy the sea and its products, as their forefathers have from the first settlement of the country.

Mr. McLELAN. I shall endeavor to have all the information asked for brought down as speedily as possible. So far as I have been able to enquire in this matter, it arose from the fact that the fishermen were disagreeing amongst themselves, and breaches of the peace occurred. It was necessary to make some regulation in order to maintain peace. Of course the value of the different locations vary, and must be judged in a large measure by local officers.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am aware that much difficulty and inconvenience arose among fishermen owing to disputes as to the rights to fish in certain localities. I have, on various occasions, made application to this and the late Government for the appointment, within certain jurisdiction, of officers to settle such disputes or prevent their occurrence; but I was quite unprepared to find any such applications would result in a tax being imposed upon fishermen for the privilege of fishing in the salt water. I could not believe that such an Act was on the Statute-book, and when informed that it was, when I saw the Statutes and ascertained that it was, I felt it must have been due to an inadvertency or a mistake. It was something new for our fishermen to be told that they could not fish in the high seas without having to pay a tax. I hope that this tax, which is unprecedented, and should never have been proposed, will be removed from the Statute-book.

Mr. BLAKE. It does seem to me that the procedure is of a most extraordinary and objectionable character. I could hardly believe, when told by an hon. gentleman of this House, that the practice is as has just been explained by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I agree with my hon. friend behind me. I am entirely opposed to this motion of imposing a tax upon fishermen, for the privilege of fishing in the high seas. If, in order to prevent disputes, it is necessary that an overseer should give out permits to fish, they should be free; or if you are to charge anything the charge ought to be a mere nominal charge, fixed at the lowest possible rate, to cover the extra expense occasioned by the issuance of permits—a dollar or so, as a sort of registration fee. But what is the case? The local overseer is allowed to fix a varying license fee according to

Mr. McISAAC.

his discretion, according to what he thinks is the value of the holding. How many are there that have this right?

Mr. McISAAC. Two hundred and forty in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAKE. Two hundred and forty in Nova Scotia alone, and each one within his own locality has a discretion to decide how much each fisherman to whom he gives a license shall pay for his license. To one he may charge \$2, another \$5, another \$10 and another \$20, as the case may be, and he has the right to enforce the taking out of licenses, and to punish the act of fishing without a license by as high a penalty as \$20 for each breach, so that the punishment which the law describes as most effectual, is wholly out of its reach. I call earnestly for the immediate revision of this practice.

Mr. McLELAN. There are about 240 overseers, but very few grant licenses.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not care if there were but ten or twelve. I should equally object.

Mr. McLELAN. Their instructions are just to charge a nominal fee, sufficient to make the man holding the license feel he has a right in it, and sufficient to keep order. Most of these cases are in trap-nets, there is a distinction between trap-nets and those that are located. In most cases where they are fixed, a scale was charged. The charge for a trap-net is \$40, in some other cases discretionary powers are given to the overseer, and in most of these cases reports are made as to the location. They have to report to the local inspector in Nova Scotia as to the value. The general instruction is that a nominal fee only is to be charged when licenses or permits are to be granted.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say the charge was according to the value of the holding.

Mr. McLELAN. That is where the nets are located, except the trap-nets. These are fixed by the Department at \$40 per head. In some cases when nets of other description are to be set they are varied according to the locality.

Mr. CASGRAIN. To what extent do these licenses extend? I understand they govern the right of going within three miles from shore. I am afraid that if we took the right over ocean fisheries our neighbors might object.

Mr. McLELAN. It does not extend to ocean fisheries.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then I am incorrectly informed by my hon. friend's colleague.

Mr. McISAAC. It is the Atlantic coast, the Straits of Northumberland.

Mr. McLELAN. It is the coast fishing lying upon the Atlantic.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then it is within three miles from shore. It is important to know the exact jurisdiction of these overseers.

Mr. ANGLIN. In the first Session after Confederation the right hon. gentleman at three o'clock in the morning, moved the second reading of a Bill for the fishing matters in the Dominion. I protested against it being introduced, because I was then the only person present representing a constituency interested in fisheries, and I stated it was the intention of several members in the House to move an amendment which would secure in permanence the rights claimed by persons holding property along the coast of our bays and creeks to the fishing in front of their property. They claimed it as a right, and had sometimes by force excluded others from what they considered as an encroachment on their own fishing districts. It came to be regarded on all sides as the right of persons holding a farm that ran down to the sea to set nets for the salmon fishery. The right hon. gentleman then requested that I should not move any such amendment

or delay the passage of the Bill in any way, as we were all anxious to rise; and he told me it was the intention of the Government that these riparian rights should be thoroughly respected for all time, and that if I wished it the Minister of Marine would write me an official letter to that effect. I replied that as the right hon. gentleman, in his position as leader of the Government, had made me a promise of that kind, I would accept it as quite equal to any written promise that could be made, and I have ever since regarded it as almost in the light of law as bearing upon this particular subject. Now these riparian rights are not respected. These owners are compelled to pay licenses for the right of setting their nets in contiguity to their own lands. I am aware that disputes have arisen from time to time as to the extent of these so-called rights, equitable rights, that required the intervention of the fishery officers. In my own county fishermen were induced to take out licenses in order finally to settle disputes of that kind. I did not care to interfere in the case for they seemed to be satisfied with the arrangement. If an amount at all equivalent to a rent is to be charged in any of these places to persons who are proprietors of land on the banks, then that, I think, would be a very distinct violation of the pledge made to me, and through me to the fishermen of the Dominion, on that occasion by the right hon. gentleman. My recollection of that pledge is strengthened by the continued irritation existing for some years, and I trust that the right hon. gentleman has also a distinct recollection of the promise he then made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry to say that I have forgotten it altogether, it is so long ago, though I have no doubt what the hon. gentleman says is correct. This is a matter of considerable importance, and I can promise that the subject will engage the immediate attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The question of the rights of riparian proprietors on the bank of a river, or on the fore-shore of the sea, are two different questions altogether. However, I fancy the fishermen have a right to fish in the deep sea without licenses from anybody. As regards the fore-shore, I will engage that this matter shall be looked into, and that if there are any improper practices they shall be removed.

Mr. GILLMOR. That practice is observed already in the county I represent. I think every man has the preference to set one of these traps opposite his own land. The catching of fish in these traps or weirs is a very large industry in my county. It will not do to allow every person to build weirs indiscriminately. They must apply to some officer and have the location fixed, because the great difficulty is that one weir would necessarily destroy another unless they are a certain distance apart. Every man who wants a weir in front of his own land should have the preference, but if he does not occupy it the officer may grant it to another. The price is fixed: formerly it was \$15, now I think it is \$10. With regard to fishing in the deep sea with nets or seines, I do not know that an objection is urged to that. A large part of the fishing in the Bay of Fundy and along the coast in the inner bay, is done now by nets. There is no objection to any person catching fish by nets, and there is no license or tax imposed upon them for that purpose. With regard to these weirs, it is a very large industry indeed. I do not believe that the practice can be improved upon. It must be regulated by these officers, and the fishermen themselves would rather pay a tax of \$5 or \$10 than to have it left without regulation. The county of Charlotte is one of the largest fishing centres in the Province of New Brunswick, and I do not think any improvement can be made upon the practice that now exists. There has been a great deal of trouble, because no man can build a weir for less than \$1,000, and no one will build a weir and take the run of the

fish unless he is certain that he will not be interfered with. Therefore it must be regulated by a Government officer, and that is now attended to as well as it can be.

Mr. FLYNN. I was not aware, from the notice, that this regulation of Council applied. It says in the 19th section, "if the regulation shall be found necessary or deemed expedient for the regulation of the sea coast and inland fisheries." I would ask the President of the Council if the words "sea coast" applies to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. McLELAN. It is only on the shore, the fore-shore.

Mr. FLYNN. I am glad to hear that any injustice done to the fishermen will be remedied. It may be necessary to have an officer to superintend the weirs, but fishermen who set their nets in the deep sea will be subjected to a great injustice if they are compelled to pay a tax. I take the guarantee of the Government that any such injustice will be remedied.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This can only apply to fisheries within the three-mile limit, because Canada has not jurisdiction beyond that limit.

Mr. McDUGALL. It has not exclusive jurisdiction within the three miles.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Yes, for fishing. While I would object to heavy taxation being imposed on fishermen, it is necessary to have some regulation, and to have a registration fee which should be small. While the late Government compelled parties to take out licenses, they gave the proprietors of the land bordering on the shore preference over strangers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How far from the shore?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Canada has exclusive jurisdiction within three miles from the shore.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would we prohibit a man fishing one mile from the shore without a license?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The regulation applies to all waters within three miles of the shore, and all the fishermen were amenable to those regulations.

Mr. DALY. When the regulation referred to was first issued by the Government, no doubt it was considered in many quarters an oppressive tax on the fishermen of Nova Scotia. The license to be taken out for salmon fishing was considered burdensome, and it was thought that it would injure the fishermen very materially; but, as far as I have been able to ascertain, the feeling which was at first instilled into their minds by interested parties, has since worn out, as it appears that the fee is simply to enable the overseers to know who wished to set salmon nets and what were the berths they wanted, in order that proper order might be maintained. I believe at present there are no complaints—at all events none have reached me from my county—of the regulations which prevail, though, as several hon. members have urged, the fee should be one merely for the purposes of registration and issuing licenses, so that overseers may superintend with regularity and see that fishermen do not interfere one with the other as respects their stations.

Mr. KAULBACH. I feel deeply interested in the present discussion respecting the regulation for charging of licenses for inshore fishing, as the county I have the honor to represent is more largely interested in that industry than any other county in the Dominion. When it was first intimated that a charge for a license was to be imposed in order to avoid dispute for berths, the fishermen asked to have Lunenburg county exempted from the payment of a tax, which request was acceded to by the Department upon my application; they (the fishermen) preferring through the overseer to draw for berths rather than be subjected to a tax. Finding that the draw system is practically better, I, on their behalf, feel constrained to oppose the license system.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Sheburne). The amount of license charged for fish traps, \$40, is a very heavy charge, and one that should be reduced at least one-half. I am glad the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is aware of the fact that the fishermen are very heavily taxed, because all his votes and speeches and the legislation of the present Government have been directed with a view to more heavily taxing the fishermen; but I am gratified, even at this late date, on the eve of a General Election, that he seeks to reduce the burthens on this class of the people in which he now feels so deep an interest.

Mr. McLELAN. The Government does not desire to tax the fishermen, but to maintain order. The traps mentioned by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) are very large seines and catch a large number of fish.

Mr. KILLAM. I do not know that very great objection is made on account of the traps, which cost \$2,000 or \$3,000, or even more. If the compulsory inspection fee were removed, it would give more satisfaction than the removal of the license. I see no reason why a few brush weirs in Yarmouth should have to pay, when a thousand over the Province do not pay a cent.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT LANDS WITHIN THE RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. HESSON moved for copies of all Orders in Council withdrawing from homestead and preemption all Government lands within the Canadian Pacific Railway belt. He said: When this notice was placed on the paper five weeks ago the Order in Council having been passed, an impression got abroad that the Government had withdrawn from settlement all that portion of their lands within the twenty-four mile belt on both sides of the Canadian Pacific Railway. When this motion was placed on the notice paper, now nearly six weeks ago, it was to obtain correct information from the Government as to the meaning of the Order in Council withdrawing homesteads from settlement along the line of railway. I have received several communications from parties in the West, who feel aggrieved over what they supposed to be the meaning of the Order in Council, and I was induced to put this notice on the paper in order to obtain the information sought for. It has been a very slow process reaching that information, and having learned meanwhile, that it was the intention of the Government simply to withdraw the first belt of one mile on every side, throughout the length of the railway, as it is being located, and not as the people supposed, so large a portion as twenty-four miles on each side of the railway—I say, having obtained that information, I beg now to ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

ROBBERY OF ALMA, N. B., POST OFFICE.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for copies of all papers, correspondence and affidavits in connection with the robbery of the post office kept by Nathan Cleveland, at Alma, Albert County, New Brunswick. He said: This man, Nathan Cleveland, suffered a loss by the robbery of Alma post office, the robbers having carried off stamps and other things for which he was accountable. There being a difference of opinion between Mr. Cleveland and the inspector as to what took place, and as his bondsmen were being pressed to recoup the loss, I wish to have the proceedings stopped so that we may be in possession of the facts. I understand he was held responsible for some things for which, as he says, and as I believe, he was not responsible.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. KAULBACH.

DEATH OF — BUCHANAN.

Mr. DOMVILLE moved for copies of all petitions, correspondence and recommendations relative to indemnity to the friends of — Buchanan, who was killed at Sussex last summer by the explosion of a shell. He said: I brought this matter before the House when the militia estimates were under discussion, and at that time the hon. Minister of Militia and I did not agree as to the facts. I tried to show that the Government were responsible for the death of this man by the explosion of a shell at Sussex, or, if they were not responsible, that this rich and powerful Government should contribute something towards the support of his family. I may have been wrong in supposing that the Government were responsible for his death, but I cannot say as to that until I am in possession of the facts sought by the motion. I understand that when the matter was brought before the Department it was recommended by the Major General Commanding the Forces, and I do not think he would recommend it if it was not a proper thing to be paid. It may be that the Government could not be compelled to pay the amount by course of law, and that the parties are too poor to proceed by petition of right, but that should not prevent the Government from doing justice in the premises, and contribute a small sum to the support of this man's family.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was the young man's age?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I think about eighteen.

Mr. MACKENZIE. To whom would the money go?

Mr. DOMVILLE. To his aged father.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

SECTION 27, WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved:

That by the Public Works Act of 1867 Section 20, it is provided as follows:—

"It shall be the duty of the Minister to invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergencies where delay would be injurious to the public interests, or where, from the nature of the work, it could be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the Department."

That the contract with H. J. Beemer, laid on the Table, for the construction of the works on Section 27, of the Welland Canal, for the sum of \$759,170, was made without inviting tenders for such works, by public advertisement.

That the said contract was made after six tenders only had been received in response to private circulars, issued to ten persons only, namely:—

Robert Wilson, of Granby, Ontario,
Alexander Manning, of Toronto, Ontario,
Alexander S. Brown, of Belleville, Ontario,
Merrit A. Cleveland, of Port Colborne, Ontario,
James Worthington, of Brockville, Ontario,
H. J. Beemer, of Montreal, Quebec,
Messrs. Smith & McGaw, of Port Hope, Ontario,
Messrs. Beldon & Co., of Syracuse, United States,
Charles Raynor & Co., of Syracuse, United States,
G. Peterson, of Lockport, United States.

That no opportunity was afforded to other contractors to tender for said work.

That the said contract was ordered to be made subject to the approval of Parliament.

That subsequently the said contract was ordered to be made, and the same now is binding, unless disapproved of by a resolution of the House of Commons

That this House will thus share the responsibility of Ministers unless it disapproves of the said contract.

That the said contract so let, without inviting tenders by public advertisement, and on circulars addressed only to ten persons, was a violation of the law and the policy of Parliament, and deprived the country of the securities and advantages to be derived from adherence to the law and policy which prescribes a free and open competition for such works.

That this House cannot approve of the contract so let in violation of the law.

He said: The Public Works Act sets forth very particularly the necessity of advertising publicly for tenders. This was, however, disregarded in this case, and circulars were issued by the Government addressed to several parties. This action was done, no doubt, on the advice of the Chief Engineer, Mr. Page, but no claim of that kind can be put forth by hon. gentlemen opposite as a justification for their action. It is very evident that a practice which may do in the case of small contracts, and which has been followed on the Intercolonial Railway, for instance, to a certain extent under both Governments with regard to supplies, is a very different thing when applied to a large contract like this, involving \$750,000. There are also some circumstances connected with the transaction to which I would refer for a moment. The contractors were contractors of some standing on the Welland Canal and elsewhere, and were financially strong men, who ought to have been, in my opinion, compelled to finish their contract. The hon. gentlemen opposite, however, chose to relieve these contractors of their contract without sufficient reason, so far as I can ascertain from the papers presented to the House. The circulars were sent round on the 20th of September, if I recollect rightly, and tenders were received on the 4th of October. There was no necessity, on the part of the parties tendering, to make out lists, as an estimate of the quantities accompanied the circular in every case, and the estimate of the quantities could have been sent as well by those who tendered on a public advertisement, if it had been issued. I am quite at a loss, therefore, to understand what could have been gained by issuing a private circular. There are occasions, which the Public Works Act anticipates, on which the Government should take work into their own hands; but in this case I cannot see anything that hon. gentlemen could possibly gain by this method of making contracts. Invitations or circulars were sent, I think, in all, to ten parties, and of those ten parties only six responded by sending in a tender, thus limiting the competition unduly, and far more than there was any necessity for. There was one inexplicable circumstance connected with the invitation, and that is that the parties who had so recently failed in their contract, and whom the Government had released in order to let the contract to stronger men, were invited to tender afresh. I cannot understand why that should have been done. I recollect one or two cases under the late Government, notably the case of the Ottawa post office, in 1874, when the Government had to take a contract out of the hands of the contractors, Messrs. Hatch, and they tendered again, but the Government declined to receive any tender from them because they had failed previously. The same practice, I hold, ought to have been pursued in this case; after the parties had failed to finish their contract, they should not have been allowed to tender again for the works which they had a short time before given over. When I gave notice of this motion, it was my intention to go into the question of quantities and the prices of the materials furnished; but after the remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite concerning Mr. Page, who was the sole valuator, I have confidence enough in that gentleman to decline asking the prices and the quantities of the materials, especially as the hon. gentleman opposite promised to bring them down if they were required. My whole intention was to refer to the question of letting public contracts by private circulars. No doubt Mr. Page strongly urged this course, but I believe he is in favor of that as a general principle, which I infer from his letters. But we have not yet adopted that principle, and while his argument may be a reason for changing the law, it can be no reason for violating the terms of the Statute as it now exists.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely in his right in making this motion, and I can certainly

take no exception to the terms in which he has made it. I do think that the hon. gentleman is serious in proposing that that contract should be annulled, or that if the matter were left to his decision, he would assume the responsibility of annulling it. He treats it as a question of law. The law is as the hon. gentleman has stated it. I do not intend, at this late period of the Session, to take up the time of the House with this subject at any length. The subject was referred to before, in connection with a motion for papers, which are now all laid on the Table, or in course of being submitted. Though I have urged their production, the pressure of work has thus far prevented it. The papers will, however, disclose the cause of this contract being let without public tender in the manner to remove any necessity of lengthy observation on my part. As the hon. gentleman stated, the law required that contracts let in the Public Works and in my own Department, should be by public tender, and there is no doubt, it is the duty of the hon. Minister in all cases, consistent with the public interests, to carry out the law. I contend it was carried out in this case. The hon. gentleman will probably say that I am not in a position to set up my authority against that of the Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, as to what constitutes a pressing emergency. He stated that this was a case of most pressing emergency. It was a very large contract, originally for some \$750,000, and Mr. Page, having encountered great difficulty in getting the contract executed. The difficulty was so great that when those works came to a stand-still, the very able engineer on the spot, Mr. Thompson, directed the water to be let into the coffer dam, and he says if that had not been properly done, the whole side of the Welland Canal, involving a most terrible destruction as well as an enormous expense, would have gone out. Mr. Page came to the conclusion that this was not a case of an ordinary contract, but a case in which the contractors had been unable to carry it out in a manner to secure the object in view. The Chief Engineer considered that the prices were not half large enough for a very large and important portion of those works. The hon. gentleman says that the contractors should have been compelled to carry out this contract notwithstanding. I am not aware of any instance in which his or any preceding Government compelled contractors or their sureties—in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, contractors were obliged to be joined with sureties, responsible men, for the carrying out of the works—to finish their works in such circumstances. Nor were the sureties either obliged to execute those contracts. Again and again works were taken out of the hands of contractors and were finished at great expense on the part of the Government. Nor am I aware of a single case in regard to the canals, where, when the contractors broke down, the sureties, however wealthy, were called on to finish the work at their own expense. When it was represented that it was of the greatest possible moment that this work should be properly proceeded with, the Chief Engineer reporting there was a pressing emergency, and when I honestly concurred in that opinion, I think the hon. gentleman will see that I had no course but to submit to the Council the report of the Chief Engineer and my own views as to the necessity of the case in the public interest. That was done. It would not have been wise to neglect the counsel of so high and experienced an authority as Mr. Page. Mr. Page's proposal to send out private circulars showing the character of the work to be performed, and recommending the selection only of contractors whom he believed had the knowledge, experience and resources that would enable them to carry it out to a successful completion, while possessing great weight and authority, and commending itself to my judgment, was most unpalatable so far as the position of the Govern-

ment was concerned. The Canadian contractors embrace a numerous and important section of the community. They possess great influence in their localities, and no step the Government could take was so likely to involve them in unpopularity with this large class, as to shut them out from public competition by adopting the views of Mr. Page. It was with very great reluctance I adopted that advice, simply because I believed the public interest demanded it. And as the papers disclose, when those private estimates were sent out to the parties selected by Mr. Page, who was authorized to give any counsel he thought proper, and to select the parties himself, I had no more idea to whom he sent those tenders than the hon. gentleman opposite himself. Mr. Page had asked to have that responsibility placed upon him, and I believed he could be safely entrusted with it, always regarding public interests. The hon. gentleman has criticized one of the parties, Mr. Cleveland, whom I was as much surprised as the hon. gentleman to find associated with those contractors.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Cleveland & Murray.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it was Cleveland alone.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Murray, in reply to my question, said he was with Cleveland.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Murray may have said so, but the question is: did Mr. Page send a circular to Cleveland & Murray? He sent one to Cleveland. The contract was let upon the assurance, on the part of Mr. Page, that he believed that Beemer & Co. were the lowest tenderers, but yet that he believed the work could be done by them successfully and thoroughly. There were a number of similar cases during the time of the late Government. I will only refer the hon. member for Lambton to his own return, laid on the Table, in which he will find a dozen cases—I am not saying he did wrong—but in which, without his being able to plead any special emergency, he entered into contracts without public tender or advertisement. I think I have showed a precedent for my action, though, perhaps, not in matters of so great a magnitude as this. Yet, I believe there is one case in which I believe a work had been re-let, in which he stated it was re-let for something like \$1,000,000 without a call for tenders.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What case was that?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A case on the Lachine Canal, I think; at all events it is mentioned in the return. Difficulties had occurred with the contractors, and the hon. gentleman found abler contractors to take up the work, when, with some slight modifications of the contract, and without asking for tenders, he gave them the work as the best arrangement.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What contract was it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was a contract for the Montreal section No. 1, two locks and a basin, and section No. 2 of the Wellington basin. The contract was originally given to A. D. McDonald & Co., and was cancelled on account of the unsatisfactory progress of the work. I am now reading from the hon. gentleman's own return. He says: "Consequently, no tenders were called for, and that contract was let to James Worthington & Co., at \$1,089,012." I merely mentioned this to show that there are cases in which contracts were entered into by the late Government in the public interest without calling for tenders, establishing precedents if any were required. I do not think in this case any precedent was required, because the work was a very important one, and with the strong declaration of a gentleman of Mr. Page's experience, we thought we would not be justified in interposing our imperfect judgment in opposition to the plan which he proposed, and which I believe will be effectual in obtaining the construc-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tion of this work at the very lowest possible cost. The voluminous papers laid on the Table of the House, contains full particulars connected with this matter, and, from the terms in which the hon. gentleman has made his motion, I do not feel disposed to go more fully into this subject. At the same time, when making this contract it was provided not that the usual course should be taken in connection with the contract, that it should become ratified when laid on the Table of the House for a month, but it provided that, made under these peculiar circumstances, this House could at any moment, so long as the contract lasted, interpose and cancel it, and the contractors would have no right to make any claim for compensation. Mr. Lash suggested that as the best mode of dealing with this case. I trust these explanations will be satisfactory to the House, and I am sure that I might safely leave to the hon. gentleman himself to say whether that contract should be cancelled or not.

Mr. BLAKE. Unfortunately we have not been able to examine into the papers, as they are now in the hands of the printers and the manuscripts are not available.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have done my best.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not implying any blame to the hon. gentleman; but we are not qualified to deal with the case. If I had derived, from the perusal of the Chief Engineer's report, the impression the hon. Minister has derived from it and conveyed to the House, I should have thought his answer to the motion perfectly satisfactory, and, in fact, thought the motion should not have been made. But I derived, and maintain the opinion, that a wholly different impression is to be derived from the report, not that it does not strongly recommend the adoption of the course adopted, but as to the grounds on which that course is recommended. As the hon. member for Lambton has stated, and as is stated in his motion, the law provides:

"It shall be the duty of the Minister to invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergencies where delay would be injurious to the public interests, or where, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the Department."

The impression which I derived from a careful perusal of Mr. Page's report is this: I think that the House will see, when the papers are printed and laid before them, that Mr. Page made a direct attack, supported by very strong language and argument, against the principle of that clause of the Act of Parliament, against the principle of letting contracts for public works by public competition. It is upon that principle he tells us that what has happened in the past, when contracts have been let by public competition, will happen in this instance if the contract is let in the same way. He says that when you let contracts by public competition, a number of contractors come forward to tender; amongst them, a great number are incapable of properly executing the work, and a certain number who come in with still more unworthy motives, obviously referring to that class of tenderers who come in with a view of selling their contracts. He says that the parties responsible for letting the contract are embarrassed by the existence of these low tenders, that the best tenderers will not tender at these low rates, that the low tenderers are in the way, and that the consequence of the letting of this description of work by public advertisement is that the work is not let to the best men, who are best fitted to carry it out, and that difficulties will ensue. That is his *résumé* of the practical effect of carrying out clause 20 of the Public Works Act, and he advises the Government, in consequence of this, his experience, not to apply that clause. It is not because the case is one of pressing emergency, where delay would be injurious to the public interests, but because to let by public advertisement will induce the presence of a number of low tenderers, unable to perform the work, who will embarrass the letting of the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is not that a pressing emergency?

Mr. BLAKE. That is the law, and if it is a pressing emergency the proper way to meet it is to repeal the clause. It is not an emergency connected with the work.

Mr. McCALLUM. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say it was not a pressing necessity to have that work completed at once?

Mr. BLAKE. I say it was; but I say that the engineer did not tell us that to advertise would take a longer time than to send a private circular. I say that he did not tell us that that was the cause of the delay in letting the contract by public advertisement. What he tells us is, not that it was a pressing emergency where delay would be requisite to the public interest, but that if he advertised for tenders as the law required, there would come in a lot of inadequate and improper contractors, the existence of whose lower tenders would embarrass the Government in allocating the contract to the proper person. Now, I venture to assert that Mr. Page's report is an attack upon the general principle of the law, and it is an affirmation that the true way of letting important and difficult contracts for public works is not by public advertisement, and by competition, but by issuing circulars to selected contractors. Where I feel the Government erred was in yielding to that advice, and that if they were determined to yield to that advice they could only do it upon the theory that they were prepared to propose to Parliament a modification of the Act of Parliament itself; because if you do not modify an Act of Parliament itself, which I do not recommend—because I find from the report that you do not propose to modify an Act of Parliament—then you destroy the basis of Mr. Page's report. It is, I repeat, not a piece of argument directed to the special circumstances of this work, but a piece of argument to the view that difficulties supervened in the letting of great public contracts by adopting the principle which the law prescribes of letting them by public advertising. That is the difference between the hon. Minister and myself as to what the meaning of Mr. Page's report was. If Mr. Page reported, giving reasonable ground, as I have no doubt he would, if he did so report, that this was a case of pressing emergency, and that delay would be caused by advertising which could be avoided by letting the contract by circular, that would be another thing. But I say he does not bring the case within the law. His report declares the law is a vicious law which will get you into trouble, and that it ought to be repealed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Page, as I understand, took the ground: if I send circulars to a limited number of contractors and tell them that I am only calling for men of great experience and ability to ask for tenders for this work, I have a better chance to get such men to come forward than I would have if they knew this was to be thrown open to general public competition; and that they would have to compete with the very class of contractors to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, Sir, that is the very thing; that is an attack upon the system of letting by public tender. It is not because this was a peculiar work that he says so. It is a contract of a quarter of a million for a special piece of work, but no more special than many other pieces of public work that have been let, and not requiring peculiar qualifications more than any other. It is not the most difficult piece of canal work that has been let; and I maintain that the fact of Mr. Page sending out to select contractors, whom he thought it expedient would result in procuring tenders from better contractors and a more selected contract for the public, suggests what I have said. It is an attack on the law; that is the position. It is a position that the law produces the general result.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think he leans in that direction.

Mr. BLAKE. The report is decisive upon it, and there it is that I think the question is a serious one. However Parliament—because Parliament was invited to express an opinion on this contract, and if this contract passed without an expression of that opinion, Parliament would be taken to acquiesce in letting a contract upon tenders received under private circular, upon general grounds, largely applicable to all tenders for large public works, not specially to this work but to all. The engineer, in a word, declares: "You can produce better results for the public by repealing this law, and by substituting a provision that tenders are to be asked for from selected contractors." Arguing from that gentleman's standpoint, every case that he proposes to the Minister it should apply it to that particular case. Now, I say that that applied to that particular case on that basis, it means that we are asked to agree to the repeal of that clause or to its being ignored; and you will find, if you have public works of an important character to let during recess, the same report made, unless Mr. Page happened to change his mind after the changed experience he has had in the letting of contracts in this way. That is the true, and I have no doubt that it is his sincere conclusion; but where I differ with the hon. gentleman is this: the hon. gentleman says: "I would have taken a grave responsibility if I had differed from Mr. Page." True, if he had differed as to the delay being injurious to the public interest, but not true if it is directed to the general proposition that the law is a bad law, that it produces ill results, and that that law should be departed from. That, it seems to me, was a question of policy which the hon. gentleman was perfectly correct in submitting to his colleagues, and having it decided as a governmental question; but where it appears to me the Government erred was in considering the law itself as impracticable instead of not being applicable in this case. We have seen to-night one instance of the exceptional results which follow; because in this very case one of the three persons to whom the contract had been let, about whom we have a volume of correspondence, showing how the difficulty came through him, and from whom the work was taken. The engineer himself says: "I can procure for you a high-class tenderer by adopting the system of private tenders," and he chooses from contractors in the United States and Canada ten men, amongst whom is the very man who had failed in the contract and created all the trouble. Now, I really find it impossible to justify that, and the hon. Minister has not attempted to justify it. He says he was much surprised.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. His explanation is that their price was utterly inadequate, that there was an impossibility of doing the work at their price.

Mr. BLAKE. I forgot that statement, because it did not appear to be very material. This man was the one Government acted for, having cancelled the contract of Murray & Co. My hon. friend beside me will be able to make an observation, by-the-way, on that subject. But it is clear that it gave great dissatisfaction to the engineer in charge, Mr. Thompson, and also to Mr. Page. It is extraordinary that the hon. gentleman did not apply to his Chief Engineer for an explanation; and he does not tender us an explanation of how it happened that having determined to take this and refining process for selecting his tenderers, he puts among them a person who was the cause of the trouble. There is another curious thing in the correspondence. We find a gentleman who is a contractor, combining the occupations of a lawyer, either telegraphing or writing to the Prime Minister to say that some one, and I think named Bannerman, was much surprised at not having an opportunity to tender, that there was some suggestion that there was only a favored lot to whom circulars were addressed.

You find the Prime Minister either writing or telegraphing, or directing a letter or telegraph to be sent, that he thought Mr. Bannerman ought to have been allowed an opportunity of tendering, and you find Mr. Page announcing that the time had already passed in which tenders were to be received. So the Prime Minister declared that the charmed circle of ten contractors should include, at all events, this gentleman who was a few hours too late. Tenders were received, and it was impossible to deal with other would-be contractors. The Prime Minister felt disposed to conciliate the body of contractors and recommended Mr. Bannerman, but the Minister of Railways was above all such considerations and would not say anything in favor of that gentleman. In regard to the McDonald and Worthington matter, I happen to know something of the facts of that transaction, and unless I am incorrect the McDonalds proposed the introduction of Mr. Worthington as an associate, and he was so introduced. But a new contract was made. The question in this case is this: The Chief Engineer in effect reports that section 20 of the Public Works Act is wrong in principle; that it embarrasses the Government of the country by introducing tenderers of inadequate standing and discouraging higher class tenderers; and he advised that this clause be abandoned in this particular instance.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will look at page 85 he will find the first letting of these two contracts there set out. The figures appear to be as follows: Lemay & Bowie, \$462,284; A. P. McDonald & Co., \$626,728. If the hon. gentleman will add those two figures together, he will find they make a total of \$1,088,012. A. P. McDonald & Co. took the work from Lemay & Bowie, as well as the other. I paid several visits myself to the work and found it dragging very much; and the McDonalds proposed to take in Mr. Worthington, and as I knew Mr. Worthington had been very successful in contract work, I, as Minister, expressed my gratification at the prospect of taking him in. Mr. Worthington, however, declined to come in as a partner unless his name was in the contract, so a new contract was made out, including his name, for the two contracts, but there was no tendering at all. This was done in order that Mr. Worthington should obtain security for his payment of the money.

Mr. McCALLUM. I know something of this very important work, and that all the expenditure that has been made on the Welland Canal is of no benefit until this work is completed. I have gone through the papers, and know that the Minister of Railways ought to be censured by this country if he had taken any other course in this matter. I found fault with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) when he was in office for leaving the most important contracts on the Welland Canal to the last, and for withholding the letting of works that should be first completed until the last. With respect to the hon. gentleman's remarks as to Mr. Cleveland, I consider Mr. Cleveland is as good a contractor as we have in America; he has done a large quantity of work for the Government, satisfactorily, on the Welland Canal, and it should not be said that he should be cut out, because Mr. Page said it would take double the money to put in the coffer-dam than that for which he offered to do it. If a man took work at half price and afterwards found himself unable to do it, the Government should not ruin him; no doubt, he went on as far as possible. But hon. gentlemen opposite have found fault with Mr. Page and declared he wants to destroy the system of letting contracts. Mr. Page, in recommending the Government to let the work by circular, did so in order to secure an energetic and responsible contractor who would go on with the work at once, otherwise they might have obtained a contractor who would have taken the work at lower prices; but this was an important work and should be proceeded with immediately. The country has not lost any money

Mr. BLAKE.

by it. Only six tenders were received, and I have here a statement of the prices. The Government were slow in relieving Messrs. Hunter, Murray & Co. of the work. The late hon. Minister of Public Works let the work on September 26th, 1877. The hon. gentleman stated that the Welland Canal should be finished in 1876; but he did not let the contract for the aqueduct until 1877. The hon. gentleman had so much to do in regard to public works and canals that he had not time to consider how the work was progressing on the Welland Canal. The Government, as I have said, were very slow in taking the work out of the contractors' hands, and it was only after several letters had been received from Messrs. Hunter, Murray & Cleveland, asking to be relieved of some portion of the work, that this was done, and the Government engineer was appointed to settle with the contractors. The Government have done so, and the work ought to be carried on. It was Mr. Page who suggested that the work should be let by circular, and the Government gave the necessary authority for this to be done. Let me read the prices of the tenders: No. 1, H. J. Beemer & Co., \$759,140; No. 2, F. A. Manning, \$787,414; Beemer's tender being less by \$28,274. No. 3, was Gibson & Co., \$853,093, or \$93,953 more than that of Beemer. No. 4 was Mr. A. Cleveland, this much abused man who knew all about the work and the difficulties he had to contend with, his tender being \$890,427, or \$131,287 more than Mr. Beemer. No. 5 was R. Raynor & Co., \$956,99, or \$197,852 more than Beemer's contract. No. 6 was Peterson & Co., \$966,591, or \$207,451 more than that of Beemer. I hope this firm has sufficient money to finish their work. Mr. Page would deserve censure if, under such circumstances, he did not recommend the contract to be let as in the present case. The hon. gentleman opposite did not always take the lowest tender, and I am surprised to find him making this motion. I believe the present leader of the Opposition was acting for the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) when the latter was in England, and I would like to know what were the facts about contract No. 1 on the Welland Canal. The contract was taken from Denison, Belden & Co., who were good contractors, and given to the highest tenderer. Why did not the hon. gentleman carry out the law of the land in that case? I do not say that the hon. gentleman did wrong in not always accepting the lowest tender. In fact, I think he did perfectly right. I can refer to this return and show several instances where he did not accept the lowest tender, but, as I said, I believe there are circumstances in which this should be done. He let a contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway, section 25, for building a tunnel, additional work, without any tender and without any security, for \$70,830.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, no.

Mr. McCALLUM. Yes, yes. I take my information from this return, and if the information is wrong the return is not correct. I find another for fortifications, Lévis, platform for guns, \$1,005, in which there was no security and no tenders. Another contract was a subsidy for running a steamer between Gaspé and Campbellton, \$5,000 a year, in which no tenders were asked for. Another contract was the transport of spikes from Duluth to St. Boniface, in which no tenders were asked. Then there is the Whitehead contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which no tenders were received and no security given. The hon. gentleman should not find fault with Mr. Page, for he was glad enough to shelter himself behind that officer when he was in power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I made no attack on Mr. Page.

Mr. McCALLUM. Why this motion then, if there is no attack on Mr. Page? And we remember the Goderich Harbor job, where the people of this country lost \$30,000 by

certain shady transactions; and the hon. gentleman got a letter from this able officer and sheltered himself behind his back, though he attacks him to-night. I have known Mr. Page for a long time, and there is one thing that is to be said about him: he always finishes his own work—he clears it up as he goes. The contractors in the present case I consider to be the best in America, either the United States or Canada, and I consider that the Government is getting the work done very cheaply if it can be done for this amount of money, and I hope the work will be completed in good time, inasmuch as we cannot get the benefit of the expenditures upon the canal until this work is done.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. I should be sorry to protract the discussion, and would have taken no part in it, but for the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. These remarks he made in good spirit, except that he was entirely mistaken in reference to contract No. 1, on the Welland Canal, with which I was connected in the absence of the Minister of Public Works in 1875. Denison, Belden & Co., no doubt, are good contractors. I do not know, in fact, whether they are now or not, because I have not followed their career, but I know that at the time of this contract, when they presented the lowest tender, there were serious charges made against them in the State of New York, and they were of such a nature that but for the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I would have made no reference to them. I will, however, as briefly as possible, read some extracts from official documents in that case.

Mr. McCALLUM. That matter passed through the Courts, and we do not want exploded slanders in this House. The whole thing has been repudiated.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. If the hon. gentleman feels an anxiety to protect these gentlemen he should not hold them out in the position in which he held them to-night, as men who were badly treated by the late Government, and though the hon. gentleman did not impute motives, the worst possible motives have been imputed. I do not know what the result of the investigation may have been, but I propose to throw some light upon the subject. When the contract was made and when they were understood to be the lowest tenderers, the *New York Journal of Commerce* came under my eyes, in which appeared a report submitted by the Canal Investigating Committee to the Governor on the Denison contract. The whole story is too long to be repeated here, but its framework was fraud from beginning to end, according to the reports of the Commissioners. They wind up a report of considerable length by stating:

"That the parties interested in this contract, to whom it was unlawfully awarded, for whose behoof its conditions were unlawfully changed, and the work on it, and materials furnished under it falsely measured and estimated, were H. D. Denison, James J. Belden, A. Caldwell Belden, and Thomas Gale."

That is Denison, Belden & Co.

"That the false and fraudulent measurements, estimates and allowances under this contract were only possible through the culpable neglect or connivance of the canal commissioners, engineers and inspectors in charge with the contractors."

Well, Sir, that was enough to make one open one's eyes to the character of the men who had already two large contracts on the Welland Canal. In the *New York Journal of*

Commerce we find the subject again referred to, as follows:—

"The Canal Fraud Prosecution.—Judge Westbrook to-day granted an order of attachment, directed to the sheriff of Onondaga County, against the property of Denison, Belden & Co., canal contractors, at the suite of the State, for \$417,000; and also an order of arrest requiring bail from each in \$200,000. The complaint of the Attorney General states that \$150,337.02 has been paid the defendants for work never done."

The article then goes on to give a long list of works charged for, which were never done. There were a great many reports of this kind circulating throughout the United

States, and the hon. gentleman will admit that a stranger, not knowing Denison, Belden & Co., would say that this was a *prima facie* case against them. I take up the *London Times*, and I find its Philadelphia correspondent expressing astonishment that the Canadian Government should have such men engaged on its public works. All this made it necessary for the Department to look into the conditions of the tender of Denison, Belden & Co., to whom the contract was about to be awarded. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman's friends were not entirely silent on that occasion. I find the *Mail* quoting the paragraph from the correspondence in the *London Times* to which I have referred, as follows:—

"In New York the campaign of the State Government against the 'Canal Ring' has assumed practical shape in the form of an action at law against some of the contractors. At the last session of the Legislature the Civil Remedies Amendment Act was passed for the better punishment of this kind of speculation, and under it the suit is brought. The Investigating Committee appointed by the Legislature exposed a number of fraudulent contracts, and their report being sent to the Attorney-General, he has filed a bill of complaint in the New York Supreme Court founded upon one contract for about \$76,000, upon which there has already been paid out over \$417,000. Suit for the recovery of the sum is brought in the name of the State against the contractors, Henry D. Denison, James J. Belden, A. Caldwell Belden and Thomas Gale. An attachment for that amount has been issued against their property and an order for their arrest accompanies it, bail being fixed at \$200,000 each. This suit will probably open vigorous action against the ring. It is stated that owing to speculations the New York canal deficiency this year will exceed \$1,000,000."

This subject also attracted the attention of the newspapers of this country. The *Mail* had an article about that time, headed, "More Denison-Beldenism," in which it states:

"More developments are coming to light respecting the very peculiar manner in which Mr. Huntington's friends, Denison, Belden & Co., 'fix' their contract schedules to their own vast profit and the people's grievous loss. A despatch of Saturday last, from Saratoga, where Governor Tilden is at present staying, says:

"The Canal Commission appointed by Governor Tilden made to-day their second report. It comprises another contract of Belden, Denison & Co. for work done near the city of Utica, which was to cost about \$10,000, but on which the State has paid about \$50,000. The case is even more flagrant than the one which is the subject of the present suit. The Governor immediately transmitted the report to the Attorney-General to-day, with a request under the law of last winter, that the suit be commenced in behalf of the State to recover moneys wrongfully paid. This is a case in which Horace Seymour, jr., nephew of Horatio Seymour, was appointed engineer to superintend the execution of the work. He insisted upon its being performed on the terms of the contract, and the conflict arose. The contractors endeavored to have him instructed to measure work that had never been done and to acquiesce in their fraud against the State. When they found they could not succeed in this purpose, and could not get it removed, they recklessly abandoned the work, leaving a stop wall, which they had pulled down in the canal, from which it had to be removed to render navigation possible. This suit will also be pressed forward with the utmost vigor. Other cases are partially investigated."

The *Mail* goes on:

"An Albany despatch of the same date announces that the Attorney General has been instructed to take action upon the Utica contracts, and that suits will be forthwith pressed against Henry D. Denison, James J. Belden, A. Caldwell Belden, and Mead Belden. Governor Tilden tells the *New York Herald* of Sunday that the canal men can march well with muffled drums; they can fight well in ambush, but when we get them in the open field they are beaten at once.' Unless Mr. Huntington cancels the contract awarded them, Denison, Belden & Co. will carefully establish themselves behind the *torres veritas* of the parallel, and bid defiance to Governor Tilden and proceed to assault our Treasury with all the audacity they have displayed and the experience they have gained in their great campaign on the Erie."

Again the *Mail* gives the following despatch from Ottawa:—

"The Dominion Government has awarded the contract for the enlargement of the Welland Canal, section No. 1, to Denison, Belden & Co. of Syracuse."

The *Mail* also published the following despatch from Albany:—

"The *Argus* to-morrow will contain the first report of the Governor's Canal Investigation Commission in full. It relates mainly to the Denison contract between Port Schuyler and the Lower Mohawk Aqueduct, on which more than \$400,000 has been paid for work contracted to be done for less than \$80,000. In this report the Commission have developed the profligate system upon which extraordinary repairs have been made for the last eight or ten years throughout the eastern division of the

canals. It is understood that the report will be followed by a succession of reports on other contracts, as fast as they can be put into form, and the suit to be brought by the Attorney General against Denison, Belden & Co. is based upon the facts set forth in this report."

I could go on quoting from Ministerial journals of that time, but it appears unnecessary. Of course the hon. Minister of Railways, finding this to be the state of things as to a matter which I am sure he has not much investigated, will be glad to know that in imputing improper motives he is mistaken, and that the course urged by all parties to be taken in this matter was pursued by the Government. It does not, therefore, lie with the hon. gentleman, nor with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, to blame us, unless they declare that allegations of fraud made in the warrant of the Governor of New York, and the general voice of the State, given expression to in all the newspapers on both sides of politics, were to be utterly disregarded as to the placing of great contracts in the hands of these people. I am mindful of the hon. gentleman's remark that he did not wish to protract this discussion, and I am willing to follow his example. I had intended to say more on this matter, but I satisfy myself with this statement, that it is not my fault if Denison, Belden & Co. are spoken of in these terms in this House. I never reproached them, but acting with my colleagues, and with a sense of the delicate position of responsibility I occupied, and acting on the advice of those in whom I had confidence, I simply felt that it would be an act of impropriety to give a contract to parties whose characters were impugned as theirs were. As to the other statement that I gave the contract to a higher tenderer, I do not want to apply the adjective which the hon. gentleman applied to Mr. Patrick Larkin the other day; but his tender was only \$300,000 more than that of these people, and he took the contract at their price; and I conclude my observations by simply asking the hon. gentleman whether Mr. Patrick Larkin has concluded his contract on the Welland Canal to the satisfaction of the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may, perhaps, be allowed a single remark with reference to an expression made by the leader of the Opposition, that there was scarcely sufficient foundation for the position taken in Mr. Page's report. It is right that I should give a brief extract from Mr. Page's report in order to point out that Messrs. Hunter, Murray & Cleveland could not carry on their contract. He says:

"The construction of the coffer-dams, and the unwatering of the foundations for the new structure, could not be done by the most experienced contractor under the best management for less than double the amount stated in the contract for that purpose."

And the hon. gentleman knows that there is nothing so fatal to a contract as the price being utterly inadequate to do the work.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is only a part of the work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; but it is a very important and a very expensive portion of the work. Mr. Page goes on:

"It appears to me that the only certain way of getting the aqueduct built now is to place the work in the hands of experienced, energetic contractors, at rates that will enable them to form proper dams, and otherwise conduct the undertaking advantageously, and in the manner contemplated."

So that Mr. Cleveland might have been a very good contractor, and able to do a good deal more at double the price than with half of it. Mr. Page says:

"I therefore advise that the offer of Messrs. Hunter, Murray & Cleveland to relinquish their contract, be accepted."

He says, in addition, on this subject:

"In regard to the question of proceeding with the works immediately under the Department, I venture to say that this is a case in which an experiment of that kind is the least likely, of any course that could be tried, to result satisfactorily; whilst no one could possibly form any idea of the time it would take, or what would be the probable cost of completing the undertaking under such an arrangement. The best—

Mr. HUNTINGTON.

if not the only way, in my opinion, at all likely to be successful—would be to invite tenders for the execution and completion of the works by 'circular' letters addressed to such experienced, competent contractors possessing means and of such standing that they could be relied upon to carry out what they undertake."

Then he goes on to give his reasons for that opinion. Mr. Page's report goes very strongly in the direction of showing that public competition is not always the most successful mode of procedure. There was a time when hon. gentlemen opposite gave a great deal of weight to Mr. Page's views. My predecessor, after tenders were in for half-a-dozen of those last contracts, on precisely similar views of Mr. Page, gave them as a reason for setting aside all those contracts, and re-inviting tenderers, to obtain better tenders. As the hon. gentleman who has just sat down asked me a question on this subject, I will say I believe that Patrick Larkin executed his work very satisfactorily, and in a way to prevent fault being found with it. I do not remember having used any adjectives calculated to reflect on his ability; but if I did so it was unintentional. I think the hon. gentleman did wrong in referring to Denison, Belden & Co., who were attacked, as he says, violently by newspapers and political parties in the United States. A heated election had taken place, when Tilden ran for President, and they took a very active and influential part in defeating him. The result was, as I am informed, a violent political conspiracy was entered into to crush them. I am informed that when their case was tried by the highest Courts, that they were acquitted in the most honorable manner. But this I know, and my predecessor knows, that we never had contractors in Canada who performed their duties more faithfully, efficiently and successfully than Denison, Belden & Co.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman must admit also that when my hon. friend was attacked a few evenings ago by the hon. Minister of Railways, it became absolutely necessary to refer to the circumstances as they existed. He also knows, from observing the papers at the time, on his own side of the House, that a very strong case was made out; and also, although it turned out afterwards that it was very different from what we supposed, every one at the time believed that this was the case. The hon. member for Monck seemed to think that I was not consulted about the matter. I was; the matter was not fully settled till my arrival here.

Mr. McCALLUM. That was my understanding of it—that the matter was closed before the hon. gentleman got here. But if wrong I am glad to be set right.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister of Railways today, and on former occasions, referred to the six contracts which were not let upon tenders received by them before they went out of office, and I was blamed by him for asking for tenders afresh, and was reminded that the fresh tenders cost somewhat more than the old. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will remember that they had the contractors before the Privy Council before we succeeded to office, and that they themselves decided not to act on those tenders. That is a little secret before not known.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I come from a constituency deeply interested in the works on the Welland Canal; and we know from the way in which that work dragged its weary length along, that the country was deprived of the use and profit of money voted by Parliament, and expended on that work. For years, as the hon. member for Monck has stated, I remember two or three in succession, when sitting on the opposite side of the House, asking the hon. member for Lambton, then Minister of Public Works, when this work would be completed, especially the aqueduct; and I remember him stating it would be finished in 1876; afterwards it was to be finished in 1877, and then in 1878. But we found that it was not till 1882 that this work could be made ready for vessels to pass through, and that it is not

finished yet in its entirety. Why, if the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had not exercised the right given him by the Public Works Act, of considering this work as a work of necessity, of emergency, of letting it in this manner, so that the trade of the country should have the benefit of this canal at the present day, he would have fallen short of his duty. We know the contract was not let by any favoritism. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not desire to charge that, nor was it let on account of any private letters to Ministers, from their friends, unlike some other works in this country, but it was let upon the report of Mr. Page, the trusted officer of the Public Works Department, whose praise the hon. member for Lambton has often sounded.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will do it yet.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It was upon his report that the work was let; the hon. the Minister of Railways did not let it by public contract, but he invited ten men to tender for it, the most skilful contractors in the country, and out of those ten tenders the best was selected. Can hon. gentlemen opposite say that anything wrong was done in letting this contract? Not a word. They simply say that it is the policy of the country to adhere to the Public Works Act. Well, we agree with them in that respect. We have often impressed upon them when they were in office that that was the proper way to let public works. They will remember very well that we called their attention to a great public work, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, for which no contract was made and no tender invited by them. Did hon. gentlemen opposite then say this Act should be adhered to? Did they say that was a work of emergency? No, it took years to finish it; and though finished two or three years it has never been used to this day.

Mr. ANGLIN. Why?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Because there is no trade to go there.

Mr. ANGLIN. There are no gates.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There are gates there to be put on, but there is no possibility of using it; there is no trade to go through, and if vessels did go through they could not get back, because the Rainy River has never been deepened.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, it has.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It would take this country thousands of dollars to build vessels to navigate that lock, which has simply been left there as a monument to the late Administration. I have heard it remarked that some 2,000 years hence, when some explorer will pass through that country to visit the ruins of the great empire which is to be erected there, he will find this great cavern filled up with debris of all sorts, and wonder what commotion of the earth caused this great curiosity. We ought to have put in large letters on the side of the lock something to say under whose Administration it was made: "*Mackenzie fecit A.D. 1877.*" That was a work which was not of public emergency, and which was built in violation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, or the Public Works Act, yet hon. gentlemen opposite now simulate indignation because a work of emergency, for which the whole trade of the country was waiting, was let without calling publicly for tenders. Hon. gentlemen opposite should be the last to complain of any apparent violation of the Public Works Act. The hon. Minister has shown conclusively that the action of the Government was fair and proper, considering this work as one of public emergency, and was not done in violation of the Public Works Act, but in accordance with the report of their eminent engineer.

Mr. ANGLIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of this trick of carrying war into Africa. When they find

themselves hard pressed they retort by saying: "You did something quite as bad or very much worse." We have heard a great deal about the Fort Frances Lock, and we know the mode in which the work was carried on. The hon. Minister of Public Works of that day believed he was carrying on the work in full conformity with the Act, and the mode he adopted was the best calculated in the public interest to carry out that work, which was remote from the ordinary means of conveying supplies or material into that part of the country. At that time it would have been impossible for contractors to ascertain what the work would cost. Therefore, if any reliable contractors tendered at all they must, necessarily, in order to protect themselves, have tendered at so high a price, that having the alternative of selecting reliable contractors at those high rates or letting to less reliable contractors at low rates, on the one hand, and doing the work as a public work on the other, my hon. friend felt that his duty to the country required him to carry on the work as he did. His interpretation of the Public Works Act has been challenged. It was said that the provision as to what may be done by the officers of a Department, only justified him to employ such persons as were ordinarily in the employ of the Department, on departmental work, but did not authorize him to employ them on a work of that kind. The hon. gentleman says the lock was placed out of the way; that there is not, nor ever will be, use for it. I have been told by persons in that part of the country, that if this lock was used and the improvements made, which would not cost a great deal, it would be of great utility and open up a vast extent of valuable water communication. I am further told that there are in that neighborhood two steamers contracted for by the present Government, when formerly in power, at an enormous expense, which are now lying rotting away and might have been very properly employed to very great advantage to the people resident in that country, for the purpose of opening up a country where, although the lands on a whole are not of much agricultural value, there are valuable resources of various kinds. I have heard it stated and reiterated that if the lock is allowed to remain in its present state, it is simply as a reproach to the late Government and a standing proof of the charges made against them. However, whether the Fort Frances Lock was well advised, has nothing to do with the present case. This case must stand entirely on its own merits; nor is it any use to the present discussion to say that the work on the Welland Canal was not pushed forward during the existence of the late Administration as rapidly as it might have been. No doubt on that, as on many other works of similar magnitude, there were some mistakes as to the amount of work to be done, and the time in which it should be done. I do not think the hon. member for Lambton, while Minister of Public Works, could justly be charged with want of zeal in the prosecution of that work. I think he was too desirous of seeing the work completed, to omit anything that he could reasonably do. It is not for hon. gentlemen opposite to blame the hon. member for Lambton for not having completed that work within his five years, though he brought it near completion, when they themselves have been four years in office without completing it. With regard to this being a work of emergency, the hon. member for Monck, especially, speaking of the manner in which the work was carried on, seemed to indicate that there was a great deal of delay, that though the loss of time was not connived at by the Department, it was half tolerated, and that no active measures were taken to compel those contractors to proceed rapidly with their work. No doubt representations were made to them, perhaps remonstrances were made to them; nevertheless, they were allowed to go on dallying with the work. Time might have been saved if the work had been taken off their hands sooner, and the emergency would not have been so

great. In reality it appears that no time was saved by the hon. gentleman; he does not pretend to argue that an emergency existed from the necessity of saving time, but that course was adopted in order to avoid trouble and worry of having to deal with contractors by whom Mr. Page thought the work could not be perfectly done. There was another mode in which the hon. gentleman might have proceeded. He might have invited tenders from all parties who chose to tender. Not only those selected, but all parties might have had an opportunity of tendering, and when the tenders came in the hon. Minister might have put aside those parties whom Mr. Page did not consider trustworthy, and he might have selected from those that were really eligible, and then take the lowest of them and so arrive at a result quite satisfactory to the country. Now, let me say to that hon. Minister, that I have myself heard some of the most respectable contractors in Canada complain very bitterly that they received no intimation whatever that tenders would be received with regard to that matter, that the gentlemen who obtained the contract are Americans, while respectable Canadian contractors of known character and standing were never invited to tender at all; and this fact has given rise, in many parts of the country, to very serious complaint, and, let me say, complaints that really are not unreasonable.

Motion negatived on a division.

QUARTERLY STATISTICS OF TRADE.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Department of Agriculture should publish quarterly statistics of the trade of Canada, the condition of its finances, shipping, railway and canal traffic, and such other information in regard to trade and commerce as might be considered valuable from an industrial or economic point of view.

He said: Many members of this House must have felt a difficulty in getting current statistics of the trade and commerce of Canada or of the different Provinces, or any of those matters in which we are deeply interested in this House, and which so frequently occur in discussion. I am anxious that a Department of Agricultural Statistics should be created as a sort of sub-department in which statistics of this kind might be compiled and published quarterly or annually. It is exceedingly difficult to Canadians, or to strangers coming here, to ascertain our standing, either financially or commercially, in order to know the progress we are making in exports or the extent of our imports. It is very often necessary to turn over several volumes of Trade and Navigation Returns, and if we wish to see our financial condition we might have to refer to various volumes of Public Accounts. In the same way, if we want to ascertain our standing among commercial nations, we must look over various reports of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Now, not only is this inconvenient, but it often prevents us being sufficiently informed in regard to those matters. I am strongly impressed with the idea that the Minister of Agriculture could establish, in connection with his Department, a sub-bureau, where these statistics could be compiled. I believe it would effect an important saving in the publication of the Departmental reports. Our reports are exceedingly voluminous and very expensive, and often nearly all that is valuable in them is the statistical part. I think if the Minister would issue annually, just before the meeting of the House, statistical information of all the reports of the Departments, it would save the members a great deal of trouble and expense. Besides, we are getting to be a somewhat important people. If we are not putting on airs of independence, at least we are feeling a little like it—we are assuming, at least, the importance of a new nationality. I notice that in almost all the colonies of the Empire there is such a Department as

Mr. ANGLIN.

this in connection with the Government. The colonies of Australia and Van Dieman's Land, and the larger Australian colonies, have such statistical reports as I referred to, from which I think the Minister could get valuable hints. For these reasons, as well as for economical reasons, I think it is desirable the Minister should undertake this work; and we will be delighted to see, lying upon our tables when the House meets, a careful compilation of all the statistics of Canada—statistics of its commercial progress, of our commercial standing and of our financial standing, and of the number of immigrants arriving here. If the Minister should think it within his sphere to extend the scheme a little further, I think he might very conveniently, with the library at his elbow, make some comparisons such as are made in the statistical reports at Washington, in the Statesman's Year Book, and in that valuable compilation of Mr. Gosford, the librarian at Washington, which would enable us here to see at a glance how we stand relatively with other countries. I need only say that the hon. Minister was kind enough to ascertain from me privately my undivided view on this question, and I think he is favorably impressed with the suggestion, and I commend it to his consideration individually as well as to the careful consideration of the House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not quite understand why the hon. member has formed the opinion that the Department of Agriculture would be the proper Department to furnish returns with respect to the country. It strikes me this duty would fall more properly within the Department of Customs. That Department issues every month a statement—it is true, not as complete as is desirable—of the exports and imports, and of the character of the exports, for each month. Without incurring a large expense this statement might be enlarged and perfected; but while I have seen the importance of obtaining not only these statistics but also agricultural statistics, it is just possible that in the Supplementary Estimates a vote will be asked for the purpose of obtaining fuller agricultural statistics, especially in a certain portion of the Dominion which is creating a great deal of interest. Nevertheless, it would be unwise to take the matter of trade returns out of the hands of the Minister of Customs, whose Department is particularly employed in obtaining and collating that information. It is very desirable to have a Statistical Department where all information may be obtained, but I am not quite sure that if the Government were to ask the House to spend \$50,000 or \$75,000 in procuring that information the hon. member for West Middlesex, on the stump in 1883, would not point out to the country that this was an extravagant expenditure by the Administration.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). When I suggested that the House should impose the responsibility on the Department of Agriculture, it was because I noticed it is designated the Department of Agriculture and Statistics, and I thought such work would be germane to that Department. That was my only reason. I am not particular as to what Department undertakes it, but, as the House will see, I had good reason for naming the Department of Agriculture. Besides, that Department publishes criminal statistics. In my opinion, the cost need not amount to \$50,000 or \$75,000, and if the Finance Minister suggested such a large sum I would charge him with extravagance. If a cost could be kept within reasonable limit by the employment of one or two efficient clerks, making the expense \$4,000 or \$5,000, then I promise the hon. gentleman in advance that I will not charge him with extravagance.

Mr. SPROULE. If the information desired could be obtained for a reasonable sum it should be procured. It would be of great advantage during the debates on the trade of the country, its industrial prosperity and agricultural advancement, if correct data could

be obtained on which to base arguments. It is only by means of such information that we are able to ascertain whether the country is prospering or not. The House should have information, not only in respect to our trade, but as to our agricultural resources, the quantity of grains and the kinds grown, the increase in railway business, and other particulars. If we had some such statistics produced once a year, if not oftener, it would be of great benefit to the House in determining what the country requires. It would also be a means of ascertaining what the pursuits of the people should be, for we would be able to learn how many are engaged in agriculture, the number engaged in manufacturing, in professional life and in other occupations, and we would thereby be enabled to determine whether it was in the interests of the country that the people should continue in the same lines of business, or that they should develop new industries and give employment to the people. I am of the opinion that if such information can be furnished for a reasonable outlay, it is very important that the Government should, at as early a day as possible, adopt measures to procure it.

Mr. BOWELL. The object of the hon. gentleman, no doubt, is a very praiseworthy one if there was any possibility, without incurring a much larger expenditure than he anticipates, of procuring those statistics referred to; but the motion involves more than the hon. member has any idea of. It asks for the publication, quarterly, of the financial state of the Dominion. That applies exclusively to the Finance Department, and although the debit and credit account of the Dominion is not published quarterly, still every month the amount of receipts from all sources, together with the expenditure for that month, is published in the *Official Gazette*; and comparing that with the annual return made by the hon. Finance Minister, together with that of the Auditor, any person desirous of obtaining the financial state of the country can do so every month. The motion also asks for a statement respecting shipping. On referring to the Trade and Navigation Returns a full statement of all the shipping of the Dominion by Provinces is to be found. There would be some difficulty in publishing that quarterly, and I cannot see that any particular advantage would be obtained. The motion further asks for statistical returns quarterly of the railway and canal traffic. By referring to the return laid on the Table by the Minister of Railways and Canals, statistical returns in regard to the traffic will be found. True, it is annual and not quarterly. The balance of the motion in reference to the trade and commerce of the country is given very fully in the Trade and Navigation Returns. If these returns are to be given quarterly, and are to be extended as they are in the Trade and Navigation Returns, they would require, so far as the Department of Customs is concerned, at least double or treble the present staff. So far as I could understand the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), he desired to have the motion extended to agricultural returns, but I am not aware whether my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture would have the statistics in his Department which would enable him to supply these returns in the manner in which they are asked. There is but one way in which the objects sought by the motion could be accomplished, and that would be by quadrupling our present staff; but a synopsis could be given of them as nearly as possible by some one officer, with probably one or two clerks under him. He would have to obtain his information from the different Departments, and keep constantly at the work in order to have the returns published quarterly. But as the hon. gentleman must know it would be almost impossible to place them before the country until a month or two after the quarter had expired, as they could not possibly be prepared earlier. I readily admit that it would be a great convenience to the members of this House to have a com-

pilation of these returns before them at the beginning of each Session. The only information asked for in the resolution which is not laid before the House, in the annual returns of the different Departments, is a comparative statement of our trade and commerce and railway and canal traffic with that of other countries. There are now in these returns comparative statements of the trade of one year with that of other years, and I am sure, so far as my own Department is concerned, if any suggestion could be made which would enable us to make these returns clearer and more concise and more easily comprehended by the House, it would be accepted and adopted. But I do not think that the benefit which would be derived from the adoption of the principle involved in this motion would be commensurate with the expense which would devolve upon the Government in preparing these returns.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, after what my hon. friend has stated, the House will rather hesitate before undertaking this vast work, for it is a vast work. If this resolution is carried out it would require for each quarter a revenue as large as the annual Trade Returns. The hon. gentleman does not ask for a mere summary.

Mr. ROSS. Yes, a summary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, he asks that we should publish quarterly statistics, and we know what statistics mean. To be of any value they must be full. He asks for statistics of the condition of our shipping. A return, stating that there are so many ships sailing from so many ports, is not what he wants. So with regard to our railway and canal traffic, he does not want a return stating that there have been so many trains running, or such an amount of traffic carried over the Government or other railways for the past three months. That would be of no value. Statistical returns must be full to be of any value, for otherwise they would be misleading. The hon. gentleman says he does not desire that any great expense should be incurred; and as I wish always to meet the views of hon. gentlemen, I would suggest a change in the wording of the motion. It will not do to have it read "the Department of Agriculture," because although that is the Department of Agriculture and Statistics, it does not of necessity apply to the trade returns, nor to the railway and canal returns which come from other Departments. Supposing it should read this way:

"In the opinion of this House it is desirable that quarterly statistics of the trade of Canada, the condition of its finances, its shipping and railway and canal traffic, and such other information regarding its trade and commerce as may be considered valuable from an industrial or economical point of view, be published if it can be had at a moderate expense."

Mr. ROSS. I do not object.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RECIPROCITY WITH THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. BUNSTER moved that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, to beseech Her Majesty to obtain for the Dominion of Canada, commercial reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands; embracing corresponding advantages to those embodied in the existing treaty between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands, which was entered into in the year 1875. He said: The Hawaiian Islands will probably have a great commercial future which will have an important bearing on the interests of this Dominion and in the way of furnishing work for the Canadian Pacific Railway. As we are all aware the Hawaiian Islands lie in the tropics, and we want tropical fruits in Canada and particularly in British Columbia. I know that we have not

the power of making treaties without the assistance of the Mother Country, but I hope the Premier will urge this matter on the Home Government. I notice that the Government did not see fit to press on King Kalakua the importance of a commercial treaty between the Dominion and the Sandwich Islands; but the Americans saw fit to negotiate a treaty with the Hawaiian Islands, from which they reaped a considerable advantage, and to-day it is a question before the Congress of the United States which had the best of the bargain. It is generally conceded that the Hawaiians had the best of the bargain, and the United States people are trying to break off the treaty. While they are doing that, if the people of the Hawaiian Islands see that they can make a treaty with Canada, they will probably give us more favorable terms than they otherwise would. If trade relations can be opened up between that country and British Columbia, the receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be greatly added to. We are within some twenty days' sail of the Hawaiian Islands; we claim to be able to offer the best rural scenery in the world to tourists; we claim that if this treaty is carried out we will be able to offer inducements to tourists from Europe and elsewhere to visit our shores. I think, therefore, the importance of my remarks will sufficiently commend itself to the Government to justify them in granting the request. Although it is late in the Session, still the gentlemen whose names I have taken the liberty of placing on the Committee will, I dare say, give their attention to the matter, and probably present such a report to the Government that if they do not pass it this Session, they will pass it next year, when they return to power.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite appreciate the motives of my hon. friend in moving this resolution, and I agree with him that it would be well if commercial relations could be established between the Hawaiian Islands and the Dominion of Canada. At this late period of the Session, I presume my hon. friend does not mean to press his motion, but he has moved it for the purpose of explaining his views and calling the attention of the Government and Parliament to the importance of this question. That trade is not to be undervalued at all. The United States took great pains to obtain a commercial treaty with Hawaii, and I think we ought to do something whenever we are independent enough to open direct negotiations with these Islands. I think if my hon. friend would be satisfied with the remarks he has made, I can assure him on the part of the Government that they will endeavor during this summer to see what can be done in the way of opening these negotiations. Her Majesty, I believe, has no representative at Hawaii just now; but there is a Consul, who in the absence of an Ambassador, I suppose, has certain diplomatic duties and functions, and I think without much difficulty some quasi-official communication could be had with the Government of the Islands on this very important subject. I may say to my hon. friend that last summer I had the honor of being presented to His Majesty when I was in England, and he entered with me into a very long and interesting conversation as to the productions of his kingdom, and spoke very strongly about his desire to open negotiations with British America on the Pacific, and made serious enquiries as to what our probable products would be; and I, as representing one of the constituencies there, was able to give him the most full and explicit information with respect to all the productions of British Columbia. So that the initiative has been taken in this way for the establishment of commercial relations between the Islands and Canada. I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied with this explanation and assurance, and will not press his motion.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a painful instance, Sir, of the shortsightedness which beset hon. gentlemen opposite the other

Mr. BUNSTER.

day—my hon. friend (Mr. Bunster) I am sorry to say assisting them—and induced them to take a step which would have facilitated our taking these proceedings. I am very glad to hear of the interesting conversation which the hon. gentleman had with His Majesty, and I am sure it would have been interesting to all of us if he had given us some of the details of it. But if my hon. friend had placed himself in that position by which we could have succeeded his motion with an address to appoint the hon. gentleman from Vancouver as an envoy to make these negotiations, I am satisfied the matter would have reached a conclusion by a much shorter way than the roundabout way which my hon. friend's vote has inflicted upon us.

Mr. HOMER. Before the existence of this treaty between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands, there was a comparatively large and growing trade between that country and British Columbia; but since this treaty has come into operation, that trade has dwindled down to almost nothing. If reciprocity can be established between the Dominion of Canada and the Hawaiian Islands, we might not only recover that trade, but increase it very materially. British Columbia can supply them with fish, lumber, coal and other products; and you, in the present state of your manufactures in the Eastern Provinces, will be able to supply them with all the machinery and all the descriptions of manufactures they may require. In return, you will be able to take their sugar, fruit and other products for which there is now a large and growing market in British Columbia, and which will be increased by the opening up of the North-West when the railway is finished. Taking this view of the matter, it is very desirable that some action should be taken for the purpose of establishing reciprocity between the Dominion and the Hawaiian Islands, more particularly as the present treaty between the United States and those Islands is likely to come to a sudden end, if we are to judge of the feeling between them and the United States. Should that treaty cease and a reciprocity treaty be established between the Dominion and those Islands, I believe the result would be highly beneficial to both contracting parties. I hope that during the recess the Dominion Government will devote a portion of its time to the consideration of this matter, and that it will be able to report a good result at the next meeting of this Parliament.

Mr. BUNSTER. I wish to thank the Prime Minister for his graceful assurance that he will give this matter his serious consideration. Notwithstanding the threat of the member for West Durham with regard to my vote, I must say that I hold myself not so much responsible to the House, as to my constituents, for the manner of casting it. I think my independent manner of voting will materially conduce to their sending me back to Parliament. The Premier's influence in London may have a considerable effect in bringing about such a treaty.

Motion withdrawn.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for a copy of the memorandum of Senator Macpherson on the subject of the Pacific Railway, and Mr. Sandford Fleming's position, referred to in the evidence taken before the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, at page 1685. He said: On this page of the evidence will be found a memorandum quoted by Mr. Fleming himself, explaining his position relative to certain matters in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the House is entitled to the correspondence or memoranda on that subject.

Motion agreed to.

DAM AT LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE.

Mr. ROCHESTER, in moving for a copy of all surveys, &c., in relation to the building of a dam at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue, said: My object is to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the River Ottawa requires some more improvements in order that the lumber trade on the Ottawa may have more than the present convenience. A great change has taken place with regard to the Ottawa. I should like to see the Government build a dam across the Ottawa at the foot of this lake, in order that a reservoir might be made to hold back the spring freshets and utilize the water later in the season when it is actually required for navigation. Now that the country opposite on the Ottawa is becoming greatly cleared, and the sun has a chance of getting at the snow in the woods, we find, as in other parts of the country that have been cleared, that the snow goes away so much faster as to make tremendous freshets in the spring, so that it is almost impossible to build works strong enough to withstand it. While this water comes down almost all at once in the spring—high water, of course, can last but a very short time—its highest stage lasts about ten days. Then it begins to go down, and early in July it is so low in the Ottawa that it is very hard to get our timber and logs down the river; and it is equally difficult for vessels on the Ottawa carrying lumber, and doing the trade of the Ottawa, to find water enough for navigation, from the simple fact that this water goes off so very fast in the early spring, much more than it used to do some years ago when the country west was covered with wood. My object in bringing this before the Government is simply to explain that it is a plan adopted by the lumber trade on a smaller scale. In all parts of the Ottawa west we have to dam up the smaller lakes every spring to hold the water back, in order that we may bring our logs and timber down. If a dam were put across the Ottawa River in order to hold back a certain amount of the spring freshet, there would be navigation on the Ottawa during the months of low water. I believe I am correct in saying that of the logs and timber got out on the Ottawa last year not more than one-half was got to the mills. This is a very serious loss, because by sawing this lumber and sending it to foreign countries a larger amount of capital is brought into this country. Instead of sawing, as we usually do, about 3,000,000 feet of lumber, we only sawed about 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 at the outside. There are no Government works in any part of the Dominion that pay the same rate of interest into the Dominion Treasury as the works on the Ottawa. I think I am therefore justified in asking the Government to make a survey and examination of this place. Temiscamingue Lake is about 90 miles in length, and varying from one to five miles in width, with very bluff hills on both sides nearly the whole length. That part of the country is not an agricultural country. The land is inferior with the exception of some at the head of the lake. Raising the dam there to the extent I propose would not drown these lands and do little or no harm to any one in that direction, while it would be of great convenience to the staple trade of the country. Besides the loss at present incurred through the sticking of logs from May to the middle of July, our water mills run at full speed, and from that time until the fall they run at not over half speed. If we had water at the average height it would not only aid navigation, but also enable the mills to run at full speed during the whole sawing season. I believe that the Kipewewa Lake, which empties into the Temiscamague, could also be dammed, and those two immense reservoirs would hold sufficient spring water back to enable the mills to run full time during the whole sawing season, and there would be a good depth of water for sailing craft the whole season through. I may mention that the trade between here and Montreal is very large, and between here and the United

States. I was not in the House when the Estimates came up in regard to the Carillon Dam, from the completion of which the country has received such great benefit. I am sure there is no dam to compare with it in this country or in the United States. It is some 1,800 feet long and 18 feet high and dams the whole of the Ottawa tributaries for two or three hundred miles above here, down to Carillon. It has been built and completed on the plan of an old and tried Superintendent of Public Works on the Ottawa River, Mr. Merrill, who was superannuated some years ago. A large amount had been spent on that dam, and no benefit derived; in fact, it was carried away every spring. I was the means of bringing the old gentleman back to the Minister, to whom he submitted a plan, which was approved, and since that the dam has been built and completed. That dam was to raise the water between the foot of Grenville and Carillon and drown out what was called the Chute à Blondeau. Now, I would say, for the information of the House, that all the lumber on the Ottawa River has to pass through this small channel of the Chute à Blondeau, only wide enough to admit of two barges passing side by side. Last summer one of these barges swung round and blocked up the whole channel, not a boat could pass for two or three days, and finally the barge had to be sawn in two and turned off. Now, this dam being built, a steamer can go anywhere over the Ottawa River between the foot of the Grenville Canal and Carillon, eighteen miles. That is one of the benefits Ottawa has derived from the improvements on the river below here. As soon as Ste. Anne's Locks are completed, with one or two more improvements that require to be made between here and Montreal, we will have excellent navigation for the transport of our lumber to Montreal. I think we need to have a survey and examination of this dam at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier), who is also acquainted with this scheme, may raise some objection to a dam at the foot of the lake, and may want it further down in order to aid navigation; but I would say that the present dam the timber trade is asking for now would be no detriment, but would aid the navigation of the river, because some years before the canal could be built, such as I know he is in favor of, we would have the benefit of holding back that water and getting the use of it during the summer months. The House will understand this question when I show them the difference between loading a barge at this season of the year and loading it in the month of July. The average load of a barge in the month of July would be 275,000 feet, board measure, while the average load of the same barge, from the middle of July to the middle of September, would only be 107,000 feet, or a difference of 168,000 feet. The expense of taking that barge from Ottawa to Montreal, with the 275,000 feet, would be just as much as the expense of taking it with 107,000 feet. This will show the House the benefit that can be derived by the trade if we could retain a portion of this spring freshet and hold it back until the first of July, and let that water gradually come down and keep up the Ottawa River to a fair depth during the summer months, so that navigation would be benefited by logs and timber being brought down the river. I am satisfied that when the water gets low in the month of July it costs \$2 to drive logs more than it costs in June. This will give you some idea of the difference it will make if we can retain a portion of this water and be able to use it when it comes from the lake. I hope the hon. Minister will, in the Supplementary Estimates, bring down something to pay for a survey and an examination, such as will prove satisfactory and adequate to existing circumstances.

Mr. CURRIER. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Carleton, especially as to the necessity of something being

done by the Government towards regulating the flow of water in the Ottawa River. It is well known to many people in this country that as the country becomes cleared up and the land exposed to the sun in large tracts up the Ottawa, we have from year to year an increase of high water at the spring flood, and in the same proportion low water in the fall. This will go on increasing so long as the extent of cleared land increases, whether from the operations of the lumberman or the farmer. This ought to be provided against, and only the Government can afford a remedy. While I quite agree with my hon. friend from Carleton in this point, I cannot agree with him as to the scheme of building a dam at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue. I know that country pretty well, and I am certain that scheme cannot be carried out. That lake is about seventy-five or eighty miles long, and on the north side of it there are large tracts of splendid farming land, as good as can be found in any part of Canada, and even on the prairies. At the head of the lake is a large tract of country which I believe is an Indian reserve, and which cannot be surpassed as to quality. If a dam be built at the foot of the lake it would completely overflow these lands, and it would submerge the Hudson Bay station. It would also submerge the village on the Ontario side of the lake where the Roman Catholic mission is established. Then there are many farmers on both sides of the lake who would be flooded out. I believe, however, that if a dam were constructed at the foot of Seven League Lake, which is about 30 miles below the place indicated by the hon. member for Carleton, a dam here with a slide to overcome the rapids for running timber, would be of very great advantage, not only to the lumber trade, but to extend the navigation upon that lake down to a point within thirty miles of the Mattawa on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This would be of immense advantage, not only to the lumber trade, but to the settlement of that part of the country. I agree with my hon. friend in what he has said with regard to the improvements on the Ottawa Canals, and especially to that at Carillon. They have enabled our lumber boats to carry three times the quantity they carried before the improvements were made. Before the enlargement they were only able to carry from 80,000 to 100,000 feet, whereas they were now built to carry 300,000 feet, which was an immense advantage to the lumbermen of this district. If my hon. friend will extend his motion so as to invite the Government, not only to examine that place, but also Kippewa and other lakes, whose waters could be reserved to advantage, it would be desirable.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I do not ask the Government to do the work without making a thorough survey. With respect to the assertion that this work would interfere with the Hudson's Bay fort at the head of Lake Temiscamingue, I think the fort is at least thirty feet above the level of the lake, and would not be affected by the improvement; but if the fort had to be removed higher up, such a difficulty should not stand in the way of the trade of the district. I hope the Government will place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum large enough to make a thorough investigation in respect to the works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With the data we have before us we could not ask Parliament to give us a grant of money for this purpose. The information is not sufficiently full, and we shall have to make a new survey. I intend to send there the Chief Engineer; but with the data in his possession he did not feel safe in making a recommendation in this matter. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier) has suggested that we should make an examination of two or three other lakes in that neighborhood. Perhaps the hon. member will communicate officially with the Department in regard to the matter, and if the lakes are not far apart the engineer might also examine them.

Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I would suggest the old Superintendent of the Ottawa Works and the Superintendent of all the improvements on the Ottawa should be sent to make this examination.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FLEMING'S CABLE SCHEME.

Mr. BUNSTER moved for all documents, cablegrams and correspondence having reference to the cable scheme of Mr. Fleming, and also in connection with the European, Canadian, American and Asiatic Cable Company. He said: During these days of the march of progress this question is of too much importance to be allowed to drop. I am sorry to say that Mr. Fleming (the promotor) has joined himself to the Hudson Bay Company and is not paying that attention to this scheme that the country should demand from him. It is of more importance to the Dominion and the Eastern Provinces than many people are aware of. It is of great importance to British Columbia, inasmuch as she furnishes the key for the commencement of the cable work, and the Government should see that the scheme is properly carried out. No doubt, the Minister of Public Works will see that the papers are brought down. If Mr. Fleming does not care to carry it on we can form many other companies for the purpose.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BUNSTER moved for all communications concerning immigration to British Columbia; also the report of the Dominion Agent in Victoria, on the same subject. He said: I am sorry to say the close of the Session precludes my doing justice to this motion and scolding the Government for the way they have neglected British Columbia as far as immigration is concerned. While many tons of documents respecting Manitoba have been sent from this city, nothing has been done regarding British Columbia. We all know the Government must feel proud of the bargain made with that Province, securing it on the promise to build the Pacific Railway; but the people of British Columbia have a grievance with the Government because they have not dealt with them as they have with Manitoba. I am sorry indeed that the Government has neglected us to such an extent, and I particularly draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the matter, because he was out in our Province, and I believe enjoyed his visit as well as the salubrity of our climate. If any other maps of the Dominion are published, I hope he will see that British Columbia is included as well as Manitoba.

Motion withdrawn.

JUDICIAL CHARGES IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH moved for copy of all correspondence between the Government of New Brunswick or any of its members, and the Dominion Government or any of its members, in relation to the creation of a new County Court in that Province, and the appointment of a Judge thereto. He said: I have some remarks to make on this subject, but I shall reserve them until the appropriation for the purpose referred to in the motion is brought down.

Motion agreed to.

CONQUERALL BANK, NOVA SCOTIA, POST OFFICE.

Mr. WADE moved for a copy of a petition addressed to the Honorable the Postmaster General in February, 1881, praying for the re-opening of the post office at Conquerall Bank, Lunenburg County, Nova Scotia.

Mr. KAULBACH. This request is made by my hon. friend for the purpose of satisfying the idle curiosity of

another party. A similar request was made to me, but having a knowledge of the circumstances I treated it with silence. The prayer of the petition is simply this: that the post office, as at present placed, is most inconvenient for the public, and it asks that it may be removed to a place which would be more satisfactory. It does not ask for the removal of the postmaster, but simply for a change in the location of the post office.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman has made observations which are not respected in this House, and which, I think, he should not have indulged in. I have simply been doing my duty to his county, and he should rather have aided me than have spoken in the way he did.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURN.

The following motions for returns were severally agreed to:—

Statement showing the names of the persons in the second Registration District of the County of Rimouski, who have paid the tax on tobacco of their own growth sold by them; also, the amount paid by each of them to the several postmasters or other officials authorized to collect the revenue.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Copies of the last regulations of the Montreal Harbor Commissioners, and of the petition of the boatmen of St. Francis, St. Thomas and St. Michel de Yamaska, complaining of the said regulations.—(Mr. Vanasse.)

House adjourned at 11:10.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 2nd May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 155) to amend the Patent Act of 1872.—(Mr. Pope, Compton.)

WINDSOR AND PICTOU BRANCHES OF THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in the absence of Sir CHARLES TUPPER, moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 156) respecting the Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation of the Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had hoped that my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Railways would have been present to introduce this Bill, but he is obliged to be absent on account of illness in his family. I need not go over the circumstances connected with the papers and the legislation in reference to the Windsor Branch of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, as they are in the recollection of those hon. members who were here at the last Parliament, and will be fully gone into on the second reading. An agreement was entered into in 1871 between the Government of the day and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway with regard to running powers on that road. The Nova Scotia Government, in the exercise of certain statutory powers, are about to assume the ownership of the

Windsor and Annapolis Railway, and this Act declares that upon such ownership being transferred to the Government, the running powers granted under the agreement should belong to the Government of Nova Scotia. It is in fact legislation to correct the imperfect legislation of 1875. That Act intended to transfer absolutely the ownership of the Windsor Branch from the Windsor and Annapolis Railway to the Western Counties Railway. The Government of Nova Scotia will, under the arrangement I have referred to, acquire all the rights of the several railways, and the running powers will be transferred to the Government under this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to hear if there is any correspondence between the Government, or any member of the Government, and the Government of Nova Scotia, or any other party, touching this proposed legislation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is very likely there is correspondence. I know that the different parties have been heard before the Privy Council, where they were represented by counsel on both sides.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, as I understand, the arrangement has not received the assent of all the railways of Nova Scotia. There are opposing parties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Windsor and Annapolis are, with regard to certain terms.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to provide for payment of the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario, constituted by the Judicature Act, 1881, passed in the 44th year of Her Majesty's reign, by the Legislature of that Province, and that the said salaries shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of Ontario.....	\$6,000 per annum
Three Justices of Appeal, each.....	5,000 "
The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench...	6,000 "
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division, each.....	5,000 "
The Chancellor of Ontario.....	6,000 "
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, each.....	5,000 "
The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas..	6,000 "
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Common Pleas Division, each.....	5,000 "

2. That it is expedient to provide for the payment of the salaries and travelling allowances of two County Court Judges in the Province of Manitoba, the salary of each Judge being \$2,000 per annum for the first three years of service, and \$2,400 per annum after such three years; and the said travelling allowances being such as the Governor in Council may from time to time determine.

3. That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the Judge of the County Court of the city and county of St. John, N.B., shall be increased to \$3,000 per annum.

4. That it is expedient to provide for the payment of the salary of the Judge of the County Court for the counties of King's and Albert, lately established by the Legislature of New Brunswick, and that such salary shall be \$2,000 per annum.

5. That it is expedient that the said salaries and travelling allowances shall be paid out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

He said: The salaries referred to in the first clause are just the same as those paid at present, but it becomes necessary to make the proposed change so that the salaries may be properly paid and audited in consequence of the change in the Judicature Act of the Province of Ontario. The second clause is necessary from the fact that the Local Legislature have provided for two County Court Judges in the Province of Manitoba. With reference to the third clause the salary at present paid the Judge is \$2,400, and he has to attend to duties both in King's county and in the city and county of St. John and, at the last meeting of the Legislature the powers of County Court Judges were largely increased. I think, under

the powers given, it is nearly double, and therefore it will increase the duties of the Judge. In the city and county of St. John it will perhaps double the duties he will have to perform, and it will relieve parties who have suits before the Courts. During the last three or four years the remanents have been frequently fifty or sixty, and persons have had to wait more than two years before their cases were tried. This will enable them to have their cases tried by the County Court Judge, and it will relieve the other Courts, while it will increase his duties. That Judge has very onerous duties to perform, not only in connection with his chamber practice in his own Court, but in connection with other Courts—duties that would otherwise devolve on other Judges were they resident in the city of St. John; but many of them are resident in Fredericton. I move the House into Committee of the Whole on these resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. Not to-day; these are money resolutions.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will object.

Mr. BLAKE. We supposed that he was going to take the preliminary motion. I am very anxious to read some correspondence in the papers in relation to this question, and in relation to the creation of a Judgeship in the counties of King's and Albert, which, so far as my information goes, is an entirely indefensible proceeding.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government are, of course, acting under the provisions of the Local Act, which they consider warrants them in asking the House to consider these resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS FOR COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

Resolved,—That incase of a Judge of a County Court, after having continued in office as such Judge for a period of at least ten years, becomes afflicted with some permanent infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, or in case a Judge of a County Court, after having continued in office as such Judge for a period of at least twenty-five years, resigns his office, Her Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada, grant to him a pension equal to two-thirds of the annual salary of which he was in receipt at the time of his resignation, to continue thenceforth during his natural life, and be payable *pro rata* for any period less than a year during such continuance.

Resolved,—That if a Judge of the County Court be removed by the Governor in Council for inability or incapacity, and the inability or incapacity has arisen from the old age or ill-health of the Judge, Her Majesty may grant to him the same pension which might have been granted to him had he resigned his office at the time of his removal.

Resolved,—That all such pensions shall be payable out of any unappropriated moneys, forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolved,—That if any person receiving a pension becomes entitled to any salary in respect of any public office under the Government of Canada, such salary shall be reduced by the amount of such pension.

Mr. BLAKE. I object to going on to-day. These are money resolutions also.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would request that the hon. Finance Minister, before this matter in regard to the County Court Judgeships for New Brunswick—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to order. There is no question before the Chair.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I move that the House adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I was simply going to ask the hon. Finance Minister—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to order. If we are going to have order, we must have strict order.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. ANGLIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What I was going to say is this: I did not wish to take up time, as we are all anxious to get away, and I am surprised that the hon. First Minister should interpose. I wish to ask the hon. Finance Minister if he will furnish the correspondence I moved for in the resolution which was adopted last night relating to this question. That is all I rise for, and I presume he will do that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh yes.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn and main motion agreed to

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That for the remainder of the Session this House do sit on Saturdays, and that when it adjourns on any Friday it shall stand adjourned until Saturday at Three o'clock, and that on every Saturday for the remainder of the Session Government business have precedence.

He said: With leave of the House, I will add to the motion that for the remainder of this Session Government business shall have precedence every Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not object to the motion for sitting on Saturday, but I object to the amendment to give Government business precedence on Monday. No notice has been given of this.

Mr. BOWELL. I move that the motion be amended by adding the following words:—

“That for the remainder of the Session Government business have precedence every Monday.”

Mr. BLAKE. This motion will deprive us of the opportunity of proceeding with any motions that remain on the paper between now and Monday, and of asking questions. It devotes the whole of the remainder of the Session to Government business. It seems to me premature to take away Monday from private members. I am of opinion that the amendment is not free from objection either.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe that the amendment is in order, and that we can move that one, two or three days the Government business shall have precedence.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

NAVIGATION ON INLAND WATERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend Chapter 29 of 38 Victoria, intituled: An Act to extend certain provisions of the Seamans' Act, 1873, to vessels employed in navigating the inland waters of Canada, be transferred from the Public Bills and Orders to Government Orders.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the motion?

Mr. McLELAN. This subject has engaged the attention of the Government for some time, and we desire to make some amendments in the Act 38 Victoria, in the interest of seamen navigating our inland waters, to which we desire the application of amelioration, contained in the Admiralty report. We desire, in the meantime to meet actual hardships arising in the case of seamen on our inland waters, with reference to an operation of an Act passed in 1879.

Motion agreed to.

DRY DOCKS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that if any incorporated or other Company approved by the Governor in Council as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with Her Majesty to construct a dry-dock, for the reception and repairing of vessels, at a place, and according to a plan and specification approved by the Governor in

Council on a report of the Minister of Public Works, as sufficient for the requirements of the public at such place, and to be completed within a convenient time to be limited by such agreement; then provided the Company performs the work according to such agreement, and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose Department the work shall be done, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of any unappropriated monies forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, of a subsidy not exceeding two per cent. per annum on the cost of the work, during twenty years from the time of its completion and acceptance by the said Minister; provided that such subsidy shall not exceed \$100,000 per annum, and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said Minister, and the subsidy shall not be payable for any portion of the said twenty years during which the dock shall not be in complete repair and working order.

He said: At present there are applications from several of the seaports of the Dominion, and from some of the lake ports, including Kingston, asking aid towards the construction of dry docks, and it was considered the safest and best plan to adopt, in order to insure some merit in the applications that the parties should receive a certain percentage on their outlay on such work. It was thought advisable to submit to the House this proposition, in order to deal with all applications that may have merit—that the Governor in Council might think entitled to this consideration. The value of the work is not to be settled by the persons themselves, but by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, after which the percentage will be paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Governor General has given notice that he assents to this proposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to recall the hon. gentleman's attention to the possible inconveniences which may arise from dealing with other than with incorporated companies in the manner which is proposed. He will see, on reflection, that while he proposes to pay a subsidy for so long a period as twenty years, unless there is some corporation actually in existence, there is very considerable difficulty in making any engagement, for we do not know with whom we may be dealing. The present owners may assign their interests to any party and they may assign it to others. This provision also is worthy of consideration—that the dock shall be in complete repair and working order. There is no provision for its actually being kept open for use during twenty years. It may be in complete repair and working order, and may have been kept open for years falling short of the twenty. The hon. gentleman has stated that this general proposition is brought down in consequence of his having received applications from several places. I should be glad he would state from what points he received them, and if he would bring down the papers with those applications at an early stage of the measure.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That I will do. Speaking from memory, I think we have applications from Halifax, St. John, Kingston, Rimouski, and Moncton, and shall have another application later. A report of the action of the Council and the papers shall be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to repeal certain provisions of the General Inspection Act, 1874, and to make other regulations with respect to herrings packed and inspected in Newfoundland.

He said: Under an Act passed some years ago, it was provided that herrings imported from Newfoundland, after inspection in that Island, should be free from inspection in the Dominion on payment of 2 cents per barrel. It has been found by experience that the fishermen themselves are appointed inspectors, and inspect their own fish, and the fish come in here and are sold without any inspection whatever. The Government propose to place the fish, imported

from Newfoundland, on the same footing, as far as inspection is concerned, as our own fish.

Motion agreed to; and resolution reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 157) to repeal certain provisions of "The General Inspection Act, 1874."

Bill read the first time.

DRAWBACKS, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 141) to provide for the allowance of drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada, for use in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. I fully explained this Bill when the resolution was passed in Committee. It is simply to change the wording so as to enable the Government to pay the drawback to manufacturers who may furnish spikes and other articles, provided to be admitted free under the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. Under the present Act, a drawback can only be paid to a manufacturer after proof is given of their actual use in the construction of the main line. I propose to place the manufacturers of these articles in precisely the same position as the merchants who import any article for a special purpose free, or at a lower rate of duty than other articles.

Mr. BLAKE. We have already a paper brought down showing the estimated amount payable out of the Treasury in respect to certain classes of these goods. It does not include the iron bridges, of which the hon. gentleman stated it was impossible for him to make an estimate. But could the hon. gentleman state what the amount is of the duty on the raw material, so to speak, as compared with the amount he estimates he will have to pay in the shape of bounty on the manufactured goods?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount paid back to the manufacturers is a sum equal to the specific duty, as nearly as we can calculate, the duty which would be paid upon the value of the article in England at the time it was imported.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman proposes to pay a bounty equivalent to the duty on the value of the manufactured article in England. What I wish to have is, what is his estimate of the amount of duty which would be payable but for this provision, and which, in point of fact, is payable by the manufacturer here upon his raw material used in the manufacture of these articles, if that raw material were imported into the country—the iron, for instance, from which bolts and nuts are made?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not made any calculation of that kind, the calculation has been based upon the value of the manufactured article, not upon the raw material. A large quantity of the spikes and bolts manufactured in this country are made from Canadian iron.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The duty, for instance, on bolts and spikes is specific and *ad valorem*, and the drawback under the Order in Council is not for both, it is simply a specific duty, so that they do not obtain the full amount of duty. It is in the form of a specific duty.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not in the form of a duty, nor in the form of a drawback, but is in the form of a bounty, and of a specific bounty, and it is a larger sum specifically than the specific duty.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). As I understand it, it is the duty, that it is payable on those articles imported into the country, both specific and *ad valorem*. There is one

thing the hon. Minister might easily give us, that is the amount that would be payable on spikes alone, or bolts and nuts for putting the rails together. He might easily find out the number of tons from the number of tons per mile and the number of miles. If the mileage is something like it was when the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill was passed through the House, the amount would reach nearly \$150,000, if the whole length of the line were taken into consideration. As I understand it, it is a drawback, not on the raw material, but on those goods as if imported into the country, which is, of course, greater than on the raw material.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no change in the principle of the Bill as adopted last Session. It is only changing the mode and the time at which this drawback, or an equivalent sum, can be paid to the manufacturer. Under the present law the Department is prevented from paying drawback on any article used in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, until evidence has been produced that it has actually been so used. Now, all I ask by the Bill is to enable the Government to treat the manufacturer in the same way as we treat a merchant who imports an article free for a specific use, upon his making a declaration that it is for the particular purpose, as provided by law, and he is then permitted to pass the article free. Under this Bill, upon evidence being given to the Department that a certain quantity of spikes or bolts have been furnished to the Canadian Pacific Railway to be used in the construction of the main line—not the branches—then the Department will be enabled to pay the manufacturer a sum equal to the drawback of the duty under this Bill. I explained to the House, when I introduced the resolution, that in order to prevent the payment of a larger sum through mistake or design, I proposed to have regulations adopted by which the manufacturer will have to make an affidavit that the articles furnished to the Company are for a special purpose, and another declaration from the Company that they are purchased for that purpose and will be used for no other. Then I propose to have a debit and credit account open with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so that when the road is completed we shall be able to come to a direct decision as to whether a larger amount has been paid than they are entitled to. Hon. gentlemen can understand the difficulties in the construction of a road of that extent with its numerous branches, and if these articles were put into a warehouse, in Winnipeg or Brandon, or any other depot in the West, some of their men might take out these spikes and use them in the construction of a branch line, which would be in direct violation of the law and of their contract. In order to protect the revenue we shall be enabled to tell whether we have paid more than the Company is entitled to receive, by reference to this debit and credit account. We have calculations made and obtained from the Railway Department by competent experts in the construction of railways, Mr. Schreiber, for instance, as to the quantity of spikes, bolts and other materials that will enter into the construction of every mile of road; and when the road is completed and measured, we will be able to arrive at a correct conclusion as to whether a larger quantity has been imported from a foreign country and admitted free, or whether we have paid too large an amount for drawbacks. In case it should be shown that an error had been made in that way, then the bond which the Canadian Pacific Railway has agreed to give will be sufficient to hold them and to enable the Government to deduct from the subsidies which will be paid to them, a sum equal to that which had been overpaid. Every precaution has been taken that could possibly be taken, in order to protect the revenue.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not appear unreasonable, the principle of the provision having been settled by the
Mr. BURPEE (St. John).

Canadian Pacific Railway contract, that some relaxation should take place in the manner proposed. The hon. gentleman says he proposes to keep an account with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to rest until the completion of their line and then to clear up the accounts. Now, it is quite clear, from the course which he has taken, that there will be a very large amount of mileage of branch lines built before the construction of the main line will be completed, and therefore, it may be quite possible to anticipate this arrangement with reference to spikes, bolts and nuts to be used upon the branch lines, when the application, or purchase, or withdrawal is in advance of what the Company requires for its main line at all. It seems to me that a periodical reference to the question of how many miles of main line they had, and how that compared with their account in order to prevent an over draught in earlier years, perhaps to be remedied in later years. That would obviously have a great advantage; so that the hon. gentleman's precautions are not fully adequate to the occasion, unless he provides that from time to time the figures of the Railway Department may be compared with the amount of mileage of track that has been laid. Then he will know from time to time how many miles of main line are built, and whether the amount of drawback paid bears a proper proportion to the amount of the line built.

Mr. BOWELL. The proposition of the hon. leader of the Opposition is quite correct; that provision has been already adopted. The accountant has already called my attention to the fact that the demands are in excess of the millage already constructed, and instructions have been given to compare the account frequently—I would like the House to understand this—and the account will not be finally balanced until the road itself is completed. That will be a continuous check. Every demand that is made by the manufacturer for a payment under this law will be checked; and, in order that we may know exactly what amount of material has been used or brought into the country, instructions have been given to collectors that every entry which is made by or on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway of articles which are free under their contract, shall be at once sent to the Department and there entered, so that there will be the continuous check to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, I apologize to the hon. gentleman, but he did not mention that precaution.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. During the previous stages of this Bill we have frequently protested against the total disregard of the opinions and recommendations of the Civil Service Commission, shown in this Bill. I need only briefly recapitulate that in consequence of the agitation which this subject has received at different times, the Government appear to have felt it their duty to enquire thoroughly into the actual state of the service, and they did so by means of a Royal Commission. That Commission sat for several months in different places, and made an exhaustive examination and report. In appointing that Commission the Government intended it to enquire into the truth of a list of grievances which was laid before them. The Sub-Committee of Council stated in their report to Council, on which the appointment of the Commission was ordered—after recapitulation—that legislation had already taken place in regard to the Civil Service:

“Since the period above referred to, a series of years have elapsed and many changes in the character as well as in the extent of the service required in each Department have developed themselves, the duties of some Departments and some branches of each Department and of certain officers in each Department have been varied, diminished or increased,

and many men have, by old age, incapacity, bad habits or continued idleness, become unavailable for useful purpose—the number of men in each Department has increased, it is thought out of proportion to the needs of the service. Young men have been appointed who, from want of education or strength of constitution or general unfitness, have not made, and will never become, efficient public servants. The general expense has been increased by the tendency of the existing rules to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes.

“A careful reconsideration of the duties of each Department, including both inside and outside service, is eminently desirable, with a view to seeking greater economy in all the Departments, by the weeding out of men who, from any of the causes named, are no longer efficient public servants, by the creation of a new theoretical organization for each Department, which should regulate the number of each class of officers required for its work, the promotions from class to class, and the steps by which salaries should be increased.

“Your Sub-Committee are of opinion that it is expedient, in the public interests, that a full, intelligent and painstaking enquiry, by the best men who can be selected for the purpose, should be made during the present summer into the whole subject, with the main objects above referred to, but with instructions, as on the previous occasion, to ‘make such other suggestions and recommendations for promoting the efficient and economical administration of public affairs as they deem proper.’”

The report goes on to suggest who shall be the Commissioners. The House will observe that this point of giving them authority to make other suggestions as they might deem to be for the advantage of the service was held to be a very important part of the reference. The Commissioners so considered it, because they take great care in making recommendations. They first examined into the present state of the system, and reported the evils that existed; they also examined into the systems of other countries, including France, Belgium, England and the United States, and they state briefly what is the system in operation in each of those countries. They especially devote themselves to the Civil Service of Great Britain, which—as being the outcome of the common sense and practical ability with which we always credit John Bull in governmental operations, and as having also had a trial for about twenty years in a more or less complete form—is the system to the results of which they attached the greatest importance. That system is based entirely on admission into the service by competitive examination, tempered by six months probation. This system they found, according to the reports made year after year by the Civil Service Commission, to have succeeded admirably well in the Mother Country, to have removed entirely all the evils that at one time deformed the service there, evils which were exactly similar to those which now deform our service, and they believe the same remedy here will produce the same results as in England. This the Commissioners make the vital part of their recommendations—that that system or some modification of it should be adopted in Canada, and this, the principal point in their recommendations, is the very one which the Government have chosen to disregard and overlook. I consider this is no slight neglect, it is no neglect of matters of detail, it is an intentional rejection of a great principle, the principle on which I believe the Civil Service of every country should be based. We have hitherto here adopted, in a modified form, the creed that prevails so strongly on the other side of the boundary—that to the victors in political contests belong the spoils; that employment should only be given to the friends of the party in power; that no money should be allowed to be drawn from the public Treasury except by a Grit or a Tory, according to the complexion of the Government then in power. I believe we do not see the defects of the system, because it has been for a long period existing here; but I believe it involves the most corrupt, unjust and oppressive principle ever adopted in any Government. It tends directly to degrade the tone of the public service, because that service becomes necessarily composed of strong partizans, of men who have no other object than that of getting into office when their party should come into power. I do not say this is the invariable rule, because some nominees are too young to have taken an active

part, but their friends worked for the party with that special object. They obtain office because they are partizans, and they remain partizans when they are in office, and they continue to be an integral part of the party to which they owe political allegiance, though, perhaps, not in all cases so openly. We know how this party system prevails in the United States, that the employes in the public Departments are taxed to assist the election fund and to support the party which placed them in office. We have not got quite so far yet. We take it out of the officials in another way, we expect them to use influence with their friends, or to slip down quietly to a county and work for the Government—we do not expect them to contribute money, because we do not give them sufficient money to enable them to do so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was never done before we came into office.

Mr. CASEY. I do not say that; I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am speaking in no partizan sense. I do not make these charges especially against this Government. Every Government, so long as this system continues, will be compelled more or less to do partizan acts in connection with the service. I say the officers remain partizans in the service. That is an evil. When a change of Government occurs, the incoming Government finds all the confidential places in the service filled with political opponents; especially if one party has been long in power. The Government cannot feel comfortable, and its intentions cannot be properly carried out under such conditions. We know how leaky the Civil Service is in such circumstances, and that the secrets of the Government are divulged, it cannot be supposed in any other way except by the action of some partizan. I do not mean to say that such a thing is general, but it frequently occurs. The character of the Civil Service is also degraded and made less attractive to energetic men. A young man who feels he is able to make his way in the world is not attracted to the service when he knows that his promotion depends entirely on political favor, even if he gets a large salary on entrance; and it is for that reason that we find that the Deputy Postmaster General testifies that the Civil Service cannot obtain as good servants at an entrance salary of \$100 as banks can at an entrance salary of \$200. The difference is that in the one case a man is promoted according to efficiency, and in the other according to political favor. It was stated by several members of the Commission that the average of young men who entered the lower grades of the Civil Service are not fit for promotion, because men who are fit for promotion have too much ambition to enter a service of that kind. Now, I think the Civil Service should be as honorable and respectable individually and on account of the duties it performs, as either law, medicine, the army or the navy. It should require and should obtain as good a class of recruits. The inducement to obtain them is not higher salaries, because the salaries at present given on entrance are higher than those given in the initial stages of most professions. It is the fear that promotion will not follow according to merit, and we shall never obtain as good a class of recruits for the Civil Service as the banks, insurance companies and learned professions obtain, so long as the blot of political patronage remains on the service, either as to admission or as to promotion. There is another consideration in connection with this matter—a general principle which we should observe. I believe that all citizens of Canada have an equal right to obtain a share of the public money paid for the service of the public. Take such a state of things as prevailed some time before Confederation, and for some years after it, when one party was in power almost continuously for twenty years, and the other party was practically excluded from any share in the public service,

That is simply an injustice—an oppression of those who did not belong to the ruling party. I say that both parties have an equal right, as citizens of the country contributing equally to the revenue, to earn the money of the public in this way if they show equal ability. If we pretend to reform we should strike at the root of the evil and abolish the system of political patronage. For the purpose of putting my views on record I move the following amendment:—

That it be resolved,—That by the report of the Sub-Committee of Council of the 14th June, 1880, on the subject of the Civil Service, it was declared that “many men have, by old age, incapacity, bad habits or continued idleness, become unavailable for useful purpose—the number of men in each Department has increased, it is thought out of proportion to the needs of the Service. Young men have been appointed who, from want of education or strength of constitution or general unfitness, have not made, and will never become, efficient public servants. The general expense has been increased by the tendency of the existing rules to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes,” and that a reconsideration of the question is desirable with a view to seeking greater economy in all the Departments by the weeding out of men who, from any of the causes named, are no longer efficient public servants, and a Commission was recommended.

That by the report of the Civil Service Commission appointed accordingly objection is taken to appointment by political influence and patronage; and the Commissioners say:

“To this baneful influence, we believe, may be traced nearly all that demands change. It is responsible for admission to the Service of those who are too old to be efficient; of those whose impaired health and enfeebled constitutions forbid the hope that they can ever become useful public servants; of those whose personal habits are an equally fatal objection; of those whose lack of education should disqualify them; and of those whose mental qualities are of an order that has made it impossible for them to succeed in private business. It is responsible, too, for the appointment of those who desire to lead an easy and, what they deem, a genteel life.

“To the same influence may be ascribed most of the appointment of men taken from beyond the Service to the best places over the heads of tried and efficient servants.

“Political patronage is responsible for other evils, and we do not hesitate to express the conviction that many unnecessary Civil offices have been retained, and that new places have been created for no better purpose than to provide for the followers of influential politicians.”

That the Commission declares that the only remedy for the evils it discloses can be found in completely eliminating all traces of political patronage, and proposes probationary appointment by open competitive examination under an independent Civil Service Commission.

That the said Bill does not adopt this principle.

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend it so as to provide for probationary admission to the Civil Service by open competitive examination under an independent Civil Service Commission.

That the report of the Sub-Committee of Council of the 14th June, 1880, on the subject of the Civil Service states, that the general expense has been increased by the tendency of the existing rules to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes.

That the report of the Civil Service Commission finds that, “while by far the greater portion of the work of the Departments is of a purely routine character, and such as in private business would be performed by men receiving comparatively low salaries, it has heretofore been largely done by clerks who, by mere force of survival, have been advanced to the highest grades of the Service. This, we believe, is a fruitful source of unnecessary cost,” and declares that “the routine work of the Departments, such as checking, comparing, copying, compiling and transcribing accounts and documents, so far as we can ascertain, comprises four-fifths of the whole work to be done, and requires for its performance no special attainments beyond what can be acquired in the common schools. The clerks in this class should be promoted only on having passed a competitive examination, and thereby attained such a position as the lists herein referred to of clerks eligible for promotion as will establish their fitness to fill the vacancies that may occur in the higher grades. The salary at first entrance, we propose, shall be \$500, advancing by biennial increment of \$100 to \$900.”

That the said Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing for the creation of a class of writers to discharge such routine work with salaries proportionate to the nature of their duties with a view to greater economy.

Amendment negatived; and Bill read the third time and passed on a division.

FUGITIVE OFFENDERS BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 108) respecting fugitive offenders in Canada from other parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, said: The papers sent down to the House show all the corres-

Mr. CASEY.

pondence which has taken place between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government relating to the old Fugitive Offenders Bill. Her Majesty's Government passed a Bill some time ago, to enable the transfer of offenders from one part of the Empire, especially the colonial part, to another part. After full consideration, the Government here came to the conclusion that certain objections which had been taken to the legislation in England should not be pressed. In order, however, that the position of the Dominion and the jurisdiction of this Parliament should be affirmed, Her Majesty's Government was informed that an Act would be introduced here for the purpose of legislating in the same sense as the Imperial legislation. This Bill is introduced for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. The mode in which the Government has chosen to assert or maintain the authority and powers of the Legislature of Canada seems to me to be not a very effectual one, and liable to lead to considerable confusion. While agreeing to withdraw the objections which have been taken to Imperial legislation upon a subject professedly within our own powers of legislation—practically within our exclusive power, unless our charter is revocable at the will of the Imperial Parliament—the hon. gentleman proposes to maintain the authority and autonomy of Canada by passing, *verbatim et literatim*, the same measure. Is the Imperial Act to be in force in Canada or not? It is intended to embrace Canada. Under which of the laws will fugitive offenders be arrested under the Imperial law, the Canadian law, or both? Are warrants to be issued under both Acts? You are practically asserting your power to legislate exclusively by a slavish imitation of Imperial legislation, by passing the Imperial Act, and thus making both laws applicable to the country. It is quite clear that one of them is enough. It is quite clear that if you admit the power of the Imperial Parliament to legislate in this direction, this law is effectual, and would answer the purpose. No doubt our legislation would be subject to those questions which arise with regard to the transfer of offenders beyond seas—into which I do not propose to enter to-day, although I think much is to be said on that subject—and even assuming that that difficulty would be surmounted by Imperial legislation, it would be limited to that portion of territory where the agreement of the parties would be obtained, and might be beyond our jurisdiction, if any would. That is no excuse for such a wholesale measure of legislation as that which is about to take place by the consent of the Legislature of Canada with regard to offenders in our own country. I cannot, therefore, myself congratulate the Government on this mode of asserting and maintaining the autonomy of Canada, and the rights which by the Act of 1867 were granted to the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is not certainly free from the difficulties the hon. gentleman has pointed out. But, in the first place, this Bill was passed by the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of aiding the colonies to send criminals from one colony to the other. We cannot legislate, of course, beyond our own bounds; we have no power, under any legislation of ours, to arrest a criminal and send him across the seas, either to New Zealand, Australia, or to any of the other colonies. Her Majesty's Government, for the convenience and the good of the colonies, passed a general Act applicable to all the colonies, by which criminals escaping from any one colony to another can be arrested by a certain process and tried in the country to which he has escaped. All the colonies, with the single exception of Canada, have assented to the legislation on the request of Her Majesty's Government, and we think that we should not be the only recalcitrant colony, or that we should not give our consent to this Act, which was passed for the benefit of our colonies, and for their sake

alone. But in order to vindicate the autonomy of Canada, we informed Her Majesty's Government that we would pass a law here for the purpose of authorizing the arrest of parties and holding them subject to be transmitted across the seas. I do not suppose that any particular difficulties will arise from a conflict of the jurisdiction. I take it that the Ontario Statutes will be upheld by the Courts, and that the moment a party is put on board a ship to be transported to another colony the Imperial Act will then take effect; so that really we can preserve our autonomy and gain the benefit of Imperial legislation.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. This is a transcript as far as possible of the Imperial Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN THE DISPUTED TERRITORY BETWEEN ONTARIO AND MANITOBA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 109) to amend and further continue in force for a limited time, the Act respecting the administration of criminal justice in the territory in dispute between the Governments of the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba. He said: This Bill in effect continues for another year the temporary Act 43rd Victoria. In consequence of the legislation of last Session, the words "or in Manitoba" are introduced in the Bill after the word "Ontario."

Mr. BLAKE. The title of the Bill is objectionable. While it is called an Act to amend and further continue in force, for a limited time, the Act in question, as the Act itself shows, it is an Act respecting the administration of criminal justice. So the title incorrectly describes the Act which it proposes to continue in force. For the word "Manitoba," we should have the words "the Dominion of Canada."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am willing to correct the title.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

FIRE-ARMS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 111) to amend the Act 40th Victoria, Chapter 30, intituled: An Act to make provision against the improper use of fire-arms, said: This is to provide that pistols seized under the Act should not be destroyed, but handed over to the municipality, to be used by constables and other peace officers.

Mr. ANGLIN. Can the hon. gentleman inform us whether the number of weapons seized under the Act would, if used, instead of being destroyed, be of sufficient value to pay the cost of this legislation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot tell.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 112) respecting County Court Judges, said: This Bill owes its introduction to certain circumstances connected with the county judiciary in western Canada, that it is not necessary to specify just now. This

is a law under which a County Court Judge can be dismissed after trial before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario preferred not to act under it. Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 are money clauses, providing for superannuation, &c.

Mr. BLAKE. I regret that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the return for which I moved at an early period of the Session, and which would have a bearing on this Bill, has not been brought down. I moved for the judgment of the Chief Justice, for the writ of prohibition against an officer appointed by this Government to enquire into the conduct of County Court Judges, and for all correspondence on the subject. If I rightly understood the case, from reports of the Local Legislature debates, the Ontario Government did not act on the power contained in their Statutes, after a declaration from the Government here that the Statute was *ultra vires*. The history of that old legislation is familiar at any rate to two persons in this House. The hon. gentleman caused to be disallowed the legislation making the tenure of office during pleasure, and left that in operation providing for the possible removal of a County Court Judge for inability or misbehavior after enquiry by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That mode of prosecuting the enquiry was an objectionable one. I have a great aversion to the executive political power being in anyway directly or indirectly connected with the question of a removal of a Judge. It is important, no doubt, that the door to assaults on a Judge who has committed improprieties should be an open, obvious and plain door, and, at the same time, I think the more we free the Judge from the possibility of executive interference the more likely we are to secure a really independent judiciary. Therefore, I do not myself approve of the principle of the Act, though it may be an improvement upon the preceding Act. I am glad to notice that in this Bill, apart from the delicate and doubtful question of jurisdiction as to with whom the power of removal rests, I am glad to notice that the mode proposed here for the trial of the question of the collation of the evidence is a satisfactory mode. It is well to leave it in the hands of the Government to select from one of the Superior Court Judges, and to give to a functionary of that kind this power. But there is still the power and the discretion resting with the Government itself of dealing with the report. I should personally have preferred two Judges to one for the investigation, and a larger share of power. Our old Court is a very solemn one, but it is too cumbersome. Our full Court of Appeal, which was at one time composed of nine Judges, was the Court of Impeachment of a Judge, but it was too cumbersome, because it was difficult to get all the Judges together, and detain them for the period of time necessary. I think more than one might properly be allotted to the discharge of a responsible and particularly invidious duty such as this. There is another point to which I will refer. In a measure which has passed its third reading to-day, we have provided that if you remove the Deputy-Head of a Department you shall lay the causes of the removal before Parliament at its next Session. I really think the judicial office is entitled to as much respect and consideration, and Parliament is entitled to as much and more representation on that subject than it is to the removal of a Deputy-Head. I think the whole proceedings—the proceedings upon which the Commission was founded, the Commission itself, the evidence taken, the report of the Commissioners, and the action of the Governor in Council in every case ought to be laid before Parliament, at any rate in the very next Session after the removal of a Judge has been made. In other cases it might be proper to leave these papers unproduced, except on demand of a member who might move for them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with much the hon. gentleman has said. I would like as much as he

does that there should be no interference by the Government of the day with the trial of Judges. Only the other day we had a discussion in the House about a Supreme Court Judge, and my hon. friend mentioned that the Government must take the responsibility of looking after the papers.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it was the hon. member for Huron, who mentioned it. I took a different view of the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, it is a subject worthy of every consideration. I think that the whole matter as to the best way of disposing of charges against Judges, should be taken up and settled upon a satisfactory basis. We cannot well do that now. The Ontario Government felt themselves unable to do as they desired in a particular case, on account of the doubt as to their jurisdiction. I can say, however, that I shall call the attention of my hon. friend the Chief Justice to the subject, with the view of establishing some satisfactory tribunal for the trial of such cases, entirely removed from all political pressure in the matter. Meanwhile, I hope the Bill will be passed. I do not propose to go into Committee of the Whole to-day, because the many resolutions are not yet passed.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the Session is too far advanced to legislate on the matter now. At the same time I retain my opinion that this is not a satisfactory provision, and I would venture to suggest that the clause be continued in force only till the next Session of Parliament, and if the hon. gentleman makes an improvement upon it, he can continue it next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will think of it, and I would like to consult my hon. friend the Chief Justice in the matter.

Bill read the second time.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Pilotage Act, 1873, and the other Acts therein mentioned. He said: It is proposed to amend the Act so that the pilotage authorities may examine witnesses on oath, and that the Pilotage Commissioner of Halifax or St. John, absent twelve months without leave, shall forfeit his office. It also proposed to limit the time in which complaints may be made against pilots, and it defines the power to limit or cancel a pilot's license.

Mr. ANGLIN. When the resolutions were before the Committee, objection was taken by several hon. members. Further enquiry has given increased force to those objections. I speak more particularly with respect to the pilots of the city of St. John, who have presented a petition to the House in which they state their case. Long before New Brunswick came into Confederation, indeed almost from the foundation of the city of St. John, the pilot laws have been strict there. Persons desiring to become pilots are compelled to pass an examination in order to obtain permission to become an apprentice. The apprentices were compelled to serve in a pilot boat for five years in order to obtain a knowledge of the business. After serving five years, the apprentice had to make two voyages across the Atlantic in a square-rigged vessel, performing duty as a seaman, in order to become thoroughly acquainted with the working of the rigging and for other reasons. After that time the apprentice had to pass a rigid examination before he obtained a license. That is substantially the law still with respect to the qualifications of St. John pilots. I consider it hard that a man who has thus become qualified should be liable to be deprived of this license by a majority of the members of the Pilot Board. If this Bill should become law it would give this Commissioner the arbitrary power of withholding a license

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

for two years without any cause assigned or complaint made or trial had; in respect to men of this class—and they are generally very respectable men indeed—who might have given offence to some members of the Board, they would thus be placed at their mercy. That, I think, is such a strong objection to the Bill as to lead the hon. Minister not to press that portion of the Bill to which I have referred. It is a matter of justice and right towards these pilots who have everything at stake. Deprive them of their licenses, and they are at once reduced to the position of common sailors; they would have no other means of livelihood, and they would be obliged to go to sea as common sailors. That they should be held to strict account and compelled to conduct themselves with the greatest possible propriety, and always be sober, steady and careful in discharging their duties, I quite admit; but they should not be deprived of their licenses until specific charges have been brought against them, and they have had a fair opportunity of proving their innocence. This arbitrary power of withholding licenses from pilots is a power that should not be given to any body of Commissioners.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). I should be glad if the hon. Minister would explain the reasons why this proposal has been made. The hon. gentleman stated that he had received applications from St. John and Halifax to have the Act amended, and the House would be glad to know what reasons were given. I know the people of St. John are much opposed to the present Bill, and especially in regard to the proposed power given to the Pilotage Board with respect to licenses. I understand there has been no application made during the last two or three years for any change to be made in the law. If no such application has been made, on what ground has the present proposal been made?

Mr. McLELAN. One of the reasons given for the change was, that in many of the smaller districts of the Maritime Provinces, pilots who obtained a license performed their duties for a year or two and then absented themselves. After they had absented themselves without the knowledge of the Commissioners there was a want of pilots; and when they returned and resumed their occupations there were more pilots than were necessary. This evil had been brought to the notice of the Department, and it was represented that the Pilotage Board should have power to cancel certificates. This question had been raised in St. John, among the pilotage authorities there, and after the opinion of the Department of Justice had been taken, it was found that the pilotage authorities did not possess the power to limit the period for which licenses were granted. Considering the number of cases that had arisen in the smaller ports, where persons holding pilot licenses absented themselves after performing the duties, it was thought desirable to give the Pilotage Commissioners power to limit the period during which licenses should be granted.

Mr. WELDON. I think that some of the provisions in this Bill will prove a serious injustice to the pilots who are a very numerous and important body of men in the city of St. John. A certain sum is taken from these pilots every year which forms a fund out of which they are entitled to receive pensions. They are obliged to undergo a long apprenticeship, and a course of training which includes two voyages to Europe, and they are also obliged to hold a share in a pilot schooner. I think that, under the provisions of this Bill, they will feel a disinclination to enter the service, as they will consider themselves to be at the mercy of the Board. I object to the provision which enables the pilot authorities at their discretion to limit a period during which a license shall be in force to any term not less than two years. As suggested by the hon. Minister, if a man absents himself for two years, or is guilty of any dereliction of duty, his license might be taken from him. I agree that

if a man neglects his duty, he shall be severely punished, because a great deal of property and many lives often depend upon their faithfulness and efficiency. I think, if a man has passed his examination, so long as he conducts himself properly, he should retain his license. That would be the only way in which we could secure and retain an efficient body of pilots. I believe, too, that a different provision might be applied to the smaller ports from that applying to larger places like St. John, where the number of vessels is very large.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I quite agree that the pilotage authorities should have extensive powers, but I do not think the reasons given by the hon. Minister, for the enactment of the fifth clause, are satisfactory. The Act of 1873, says :

"Every branch pilot or licensed pilot who shall pass two full and consecutive years without acting as a pilot (unless in case of sickness, unavoidable absence, or special permission from the pilotage authority of his district) shall forfeit his license."

The hon. gentleman says that if a man goes away for two years and comes back, he may resume his occupation, but meantime others are appointed and he is not required.

Mr. McLELAN. I said any time less than two years. If he is away six months, say during the season of navigation.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. But *ipso facto*, if he does not observe any of these conditions he forfeits his license. I believe in giving the authorities every reasonable power, but I do not see the necessity of this clause. It does not make it imperative on the pilotage authorities to make a license permanent for two years, and they may give it for a less period than two years if they choose. I have heard of no demand for such a provision, and though I approve generally of the Bill I do not think this clause is necessary.

Mr. McLELAN. I have been informed by the Pilotage Commissioner of St. John, that ever since 1875 their by-laws have required pilots to renew their licenses annually, and the question came up in the Courts of Justice as to whether this was legal or not.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. That is for the purpose of fees, but the renewal comes as a matter of right, unless there is a formal exception.

Mr. McLELAN. As I have said, they have been acting upon it since 1875, and they want to have power to do so hereafter. They want to have power to fill vacancies in the outlying sections for a limited period as they occur.

Mr. ANGLIN. This taking of the licenses annually is an old practice in St. John, which prevailed before Confederation, but it is merely for the purpose of taking the fees. There was not any power of dismissal created, or any power of withholding licenses, and we object to the arbitrary power now established of withholding licenses for two years without assigning any cause, and without perhaps any cause existing. Surely the hon. gentleman would not have such a state of things existing with regard to a class of men who require to undergo such training as the pilots undergo, and who devote their whole time to this pursuit. With regard to smaller ports the case is entirely different, and it is absurd to apply the same rule, and at those outports some skillful fisherman or sailor acts as pilot without having proved his competence in a general way, and without having to undergo a special apprenticeship or to acquire a special training. These men are selected by the authorities and the licenses are granted. Sometimes, because there is not a great deal to do, he devotes a great deal of his time to other pursuits. He does not require, like the pilot in a large harbor like St. John, to be on the ground every day. There is nothing of that kind in a small harbor; the conditions are entirely different, and therefore it is absurd to attempt to enforce regulations

which in one case may be quite proper, but in another case would be entirely wrong and oppressive.

Mr. McLELAN. No; this measure is less oppressive, because it makes the licenses of pilots extend over two years.

Mr. WELDON. In St. John all the officers of the Corporation, including the pilots, were required to renew their licenses every year and pay their fee. Under the present law, they could not refuse to give a pilot his license if he paid his fee; but under this law, at the end of two years, they may for some reason or other refuse to give a pilot his license, and thus it makes him dependent on the pleasure of the Board. As has been pointed out, the pilots in St. John and other large harbors are not allowed to assume any other business, but in the smaller ports the pilots only follow piloting incidentally to their principal business. What we want is this: that as long as these men are qualified to act and conduct themselves properly, they shall be entitled to their license as a matter of course. The third section, I think, is a salutary provision, because the captains do not complain of the pilots. The Pilotage Board should have complete control over the pilot, but so long as he conducts himself properly, it seems to be only fair that he should be allowed to continue to pilot, and if he becomes disabled or aged, that he should be entitled to a portion of the fund to which he has contributed a portion of his earnings.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 3,

Mr. AMYOT. I must thank the Government for the kindness which they have shown to the pilots of the Quebec harbor and below, for the amendment to their tariff which they have promised to sanction, but I regret very much that the third and fourth clauses of this Bill are brought before the House. The law at present in existence has always worked satisfactorily to everybody—to the proprietors of the ships, to commerce, and to the pilots. Nobody is asking for this change; the law is known all over the world. The proprietor of a ship knows when he comes into the river that he has four days to complain of any accident due to a pilot, and no more. Now, it is proposed to change that, I ask why? I understand that a few years ago such a measure was attempted to be carried through this House, and it was afterwards withdrawn. What is the power behind the throne which brings in this measure which nobody wants, but which everybody protests against? It is not in favor of the ship owner, the pilot, nor commerce. I think at this late period of the Session these clauses should be withdrawn. It is nothing but absurd to give this period of one year. A captain of a ship comes to Quebec; an accident occurs; he does not lodge his complaint, but sails off to another port near or distant, and, after other accidents, perhaps goes to England. He leaves his log-book there and one year after comes back to Quebec, when he lodges his complaint. But where is the log-book, where are the seamen, and the whole of the crew to give evidence? The pilot may be thus at the mercy of one man, who may be part owner of the ship; at how is the Harbor Commission to find out the facts about the accident? There may have been five or six since. Then these clauses give an immense authority, which is not asked for, to the Harbor Commissioners. What kind of a tribunal is this that we erect? You go before them and need not give your name or security, and lodge a complaint which is not even written, and upon that complaint, not written or sworn to, if the Harbor Commissioners happen to be unfriendly to the pilots, they grant an *enquête*. The judgment is given then, not by lawyers nor

sworn Judges, but by parties who know nothing of the law, and it may take away from the pilot his license and certificate; and this judgment is final. The Harbor Commissioners are given every possible power over the property of that pilot without his being entitled to the assistance of a friend or attorney. You would thus leave the pilots at the mercy of an irresponsible tribunal, after giving the shipowner a delay of a year to prepare his plans of persecution; and if the Commissioners happen to be the enemies of the pilots, they will have no remedy whatever. There is no reason for this Bill, which will injure trade as well as the pilots, who are invaluable in the promotion and protection of our St. Lawrence navigation and commerce generally. I trust, therefore, the Government will kindly withdraw these clauses, and refuse to the Harbor Commissioners the powers now proposed.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. I was speaking before recess of the injuries which this clause would inflict on the pilots. Is it the intention of the Government to amend these clauses.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. AMYOT. I expect that these clauses will give great arbitrary powers to the Harbor Commissioners without any guarantee of protection or justice to the pilots. The Commissioners will sit as an unsworn tribunal, before whom complaints need not be made in writing, and the defendant may not know by whom they are made. There is also no guarantee as to the truth of the accusation; and there will be no appeal from their judgment. Nor does the law state what will be the offences tried; they may be imaginary. There is nothing specified neither as to the punishments. The Pilot Act of 1873 was passed as a compromise between the trading classes and the pilots, and the interests of every person were carefully weighed and examined, the Act specifying all the offences which a pilot may commit with the punishments that may be inflicted therefor. The law proposed leaves that to the arbitrary fancy of the Harbor Commissioners, and the amount of the penalty is not fixed. By the law as passed in 1873, all the offences are described and the penalty is described. Everything is provided. By the law as proposed, we create any amount of imaginary offences which it may please an arbitrary power to create at a given moment. I think there is no reason why we should give that power to the Harbor Commissioners; it is not asked for. We are not here simply to pass laws, but to pass laws when they are asked for and when they are necessary in the public interests. In the present case, that arbitrary power is not asked for, nor is the delay for complaints against pilots asked for. Since 1849, the four days after arrival have always been found sufficient. I do not see why we should extend that delay to a year, or thirty or even fifteen days. The proposed law speaks of a delay after the occurrence of the accident. Now the delay begins to be computed after the arrival of the ship in the harbor. If you give the delay provided in this Bill, a wrecked ship may arrive in harbor after the time specified, so that it will be too late. In any way we look at this Bill, it seems dangerous and tyrannical, and appears to treat the Corporation of Pilots as if they were mere school boys, or toys, not, I am happy to say, in the hands of the hon. Minister of Marine, who has always been willing to do them justice, but of somebody who deceives him. Two years ago something of the same kind was tried, but was refused. Circumstances have not changed since then, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Marine will be the first to remove these clauses.

Mr. VALLÉE (in French). Mr. Speaker, I have been entrusted by the pilots of the district of Montreal, who ply

Mr. AMYOT.

between Montreal and Quebec, with the care of looking after their interests in the matter of this Bill. It is necessary to well understand the position of these pilots, in order to comprehend how odious is the legislation now proposed. For thirty-three years has the old law existed; no one has ever complained of its working or of the manner in which it has been carried out, and yet it is now proposed to amend it. It is a fact generally admitted that respect should be shown to what is old and antique. The law passed in 1849 regulates the pilotage between the ports of Montreal and Quebec. It has been in operation from that date to the satisfaction of both pilots and merchants, as also of owners of vessels sailing between these two ports. Why should we now seek to amend the law in a fashion odious to the pilots, who have always fulfilled their duties to the satisfaction of shipowners? Now, who are really those whom we should consider when legislating on this occasion? Why, the ship owners and masters of vessels sailing between the ports of Montreal and Quebec. If they are satisfied with the conduct of their pilots, who is there who has the right to complain? No one. The only other people who might complain besides those I have already named, are the marine insurance companies. Now, in the present case, not a single company has had any occasion, or has felt capriciously inclined to lodge any complaint against the pilots of the district of Montreal. Mr. Speaker, I am, moreover, authorized to protest against this Bill by the whole body of pilots, the majority of whom, I may almost say the whole, reside in my county, for of the forty-nine pilots who ply their trade between the ports of Montreal and Quebec there are, I think, thirty-five who reside in my county. These pilots belong to both political parties. I do not, therefore, come here to take up a cause in the interests more of one party than of the other; I am merely defending certain rights in the interests of justice. These men, by their social position, by the knowledge of their profession, have acquired public confidence, and their public character and responsibility should not be made the subject of attack without a serious cause. Now, according to the amendment suggested by clause 3, this is what can take place: A pilot starts from Montreal in charge of a vessel which he takes to Quebec; at the latter port, he must, on leaving the ship, receive a certificate from the master to the effect that he has faithfully performed his duty. If no accident has occurred during the trip, he obtains a clean sheet; if, on the contrary, an accident has happened, the captain becomes the pilot's judge, and if he is of opinion that he has exercised all the care that can be demanded of any ordinary man, and that the accident was beyond his control, he will not lodge any complaint against him, but he will state that it took place owing to the current, or to darkness, or again he will lay the blame of it to some other ship which was coming from an opposite direction. Therefore the captain takes upon himself to exonerate the pilot and delivers a clean sheet to him. Now, what will be the result of the present law if it is adopted? Here is a pilot who is discharged on arriving at Quebec; at that port the captain takes another and proceeds on his journey. The ship owner who did not feel inclined to complain of the pilot to the Harbor Commission of Montreal when he discharged him, might do so in a year's time. We all know that a ship's crew is engaged from one port to that of destination. If the ship left Montreal for Sydney or Liverpool, the crew which brought her from Montreal to Quebec, will be discharged at Sydney or Liverpool; yet a year later the Harbor Commission, on any information whatsoever, with or without any one complaining, will be allowed to try that pilot before its Board. But why should he be thus tried? If he has been in fault, it should have been taken cognizance of immediately, and a report would have been made against him when he arrived at the port of Quebec. But why allow a ship's master

or a ship owner to come a year later and say that his ship has sustained damage? If such damage has been sustained during the trip between Montreal and Quebec, it was known to him, and he should have immediately reported to the authorities, who have to judge the conduct of pilots, the damage sustained by his vessel. If he is given a year in which to lodge his complaint, a serious injury may be done the pilot, for the ship may sustain damage in some other port, and through some caprice the captains, aware of the fact that the pilot cannot disprove the charge, may then lodge a complaint against him. It is easy to be seen how odious this law would become were that clause adopted. According to the old law, the ship owner or the master of a vessel is compelled to report to the authorities within four days of the occurrence of the accident. It is now sought to extend this delay to a whole year or at least to the thirty days following such accident; but during these thirty days the ship will have been under the control of another pilot, viz., from Quebec to Bic. Now, let us suppose that an accident takes place after the ship leaves Quebec; if a feeling of friendship exists between the captain and the Quebec pilot, the ship owner or the master of the ship will be able to lodge a complaint against the Montreal pilot, and in what position will he then find himself? A year, six, or even three months after the accident, the master will alone remain of the ship's crew, which will have been discharged, and how is the pilot to establish his defence? The answer to that question suffices to show that that clause is entirely useless. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are here to legislate either in the public or in the private interest. In the interest of the public it must be established that the pilot has acted wrongly, and that he has been the cause of injury to the public; but if no report is made to the authorities there is no principle on which the Government can base itself to put in force such a measure. Now, besides the public interest, there may be a private one. In the present case have any private interests been affected? No, Mr. Speaker, they have not, for the Government has not, and cannot, have received a single complaint from either the merchants, the Board of Trade or the pilots themselves. Now, there are but these three parties which can lodge a complaint from the point of view of private interests. I am authorized by the President of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal, Mr. Robertson, to state that there are no complaints against the pilots plying between Montreal and Quebec; and I am moreover authorized to state that Mr. Robertson has declared that it was not the Harbor Commission of Montreal that was asking for this change in the law. The Government is therefore not guided in its opinion by the body which has authority over the pilots; thus, neither the public nor the private interest demands that the law should be changed. Are the merchants or the insurance companies complaining? No, there are no complaints on their part. Well, then, who remains then but the pilots? Now, the pilots are on this occasion represented by me; they entrusted me with the care of defending their rights in this House, which will, I know, listen to me, and which is desirous of doing justice to so important a body. Now, the pilots say that this legislation is useless. How is it then that a law is placed in the hands of the President of the Council, who is acting simultaneously for the Minister of Marine? How is it that such a law comes before the House? Two years ago a similar law was introduced, but it was withdrawn at the request of members interested in the question. Why is it again agitated in our midst? How is it that every time a new Minister takes the place of the Minister of Marine that one should introduce in this House measures which no one asks for? Who are those who are entrusted here with the mission of persecuting that public body, which is an honorable body, against which there is no complaint, either on the part of the authorities who have the control of it, or on the

part of the merchants? Why not respect a law which exists now for thirty years, and against which no one has a word to say? Let things therefore remain as they are, and it will be but doing justice to the pilots of the district of Montreal. Such are the few remarks that I had to make against the third clause of the present Bill. (The hon. gentleman continued his remarks in English.) This clause is to amend the old Act which has been in force for thirty-three years, and against which no complaint whatever has been made either before this House or the public. Who are the parties interested in the conduct of the pilots? They are surely the owners or the masters of the vessels, or, perhaps, the insurance companies, and it is on those we must call to judge the conduct of the pilots. Under the present law, the captain and the owner have a right to make a complaint before the legal authority, within four days after the vessel has suffered damages. This Bill proposes to amend that law as follows:—

Or of any other Act or law, as requires complaint or information of the master or owner of any ship, steamer or other vessel sustaining damage through the fault of any branch pilot for and above the Harbor of Quebec, before the pilotage authority of Montreal can declare that such pilot has forfeited his branch, is hereby repealed."

Thus, neither the owner or the captain will have the right to put the complaint before the legal authority. This claim will be replaced by the following:—

And the said pilotage authority may, in their discretion, investigate the matter and declare the branch of such pilot forfeited, at any time within one year after such loss or damages sustained through his fault, and upon such information as they may deem sufficient, and with or without complaint by any person whomsoever."

This clause is creating a tribunal. The pilotage authority may investigate the conduct of a pilot when no complaint has been made. Have we any such tribunals in this country? Have we ever seen such tribunals in the world? Never! This Bill provides that information may be laid by any one. I admit that the proprietor has a right to complain when he has suffered through the misconduct of the pilot. The Bill provides that the pilotage authority may institute proceedings upon such information as they may deem sufficient; that means that they may enquire into the conduct of the pilot without any complaint being made against him. The amendment is nonsense, and I cannot believe that the Government or the hon. Minister have originated it; neither can I believe that it has come from the President of the Harbor Commissioners, and certainly it has not come from the pilots, for they are opposed to the Bill. They have told me themselves that they did not ask for this legislation. This provision relating to the Montreal pilots is very unfair. When a pilot takes charge of a ship from Montreal to Quebec, when he lands at Quebec he has his discharge from the captain or the owner of the ship, and the ship is put under the control of another pilot from Quebec to Bic. Is it fair that the Montreal pilot should be under the control of the owner or the captain of a ship during one year after he has left the ship at Quebec under the control of another pilot? I think it is very unfair. When a pilot takes charge of a ship from Montreal to Quebec there is crew who were witnesses of his conduct, but after he has left the ship where will be the witnesses to sustain the charge of the captain? I hope the Minister who has charge of this Bill will withdraw that clause.

Mr. McLELAN. I think my hon. friends are unnecessarily alarmed on behalf of the pilots. We are not proposing to try them by any new tribunal, but by the same tribunal that has tried all officers for the last thirty-three years, and against which I believe there has been no complaint by the pilots. In the old law the same provision existed for trying charges and imposing penalties as is now proposed. All the change that is proposed relates to the time within which a complaint may be made against a pilot, and for that my hon. friend says that I am not res-

possible. I tell him I am responsible for it. A case came under my own observation in which I went to the authorities to demand an investigation into the conduct of the pilot, and found I was a few hours too late, that it should have been made within four days after the accident. Consequently, I came to the conclusion that a longer time should be given for the captain, or any person interested, to bring the charge. After an accident has occurred, through the misconduct of a pilot, the captain and those in charge of the ship have enough to do to attend to the ship, to keep her floating or to provide for her safety, and are frequently unable to formulate a charge against an offending pilot within four days from the accident. The hon. gentleman complains that the pilotage authorities may investigate a charge without a complaint being made. Well, the Pilotage Commissioners are the authorities that licenses the pilots, and they are responsible for their action. They have an interest in their well-doing. The captain may be lost in an accident, and there may be no other person legally qualified to prefer a charge against the pilot, in which case the Commissioners should have power to take the matter up. Other cases often occur where there is collusion between the pilot and the owner or captain, purposely to wreck a ship, in which case neither the captain nor the owner will prefer a charge against the pilot, who escapes scot free, though he may be guilty of a serious crime. The Harbor Commissioners are most anxious to have the power, upon sufficient evidence being placed before them, to order an investigation, even where the owner or the captain do not come forward to lodge a complaint, and they, being responsible for the conduct of the pilot, desire authority to hold an investigation and impose penalties when misconduct is proved. It has been considered desirable, in the interest of commerce and in the interest of the pilots themselves, that the time should be extended within which a complaint may be made. I inserted one year, in order that discussion might arise and the opinions of those interested in the subject might be gathered. I ask that clauses three and four may be allowed to stand until further consideration.

On clause 5,

Mr. VALLÉE moved that the words "except the districts of Quebec and Montreal respectively" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to; and Bill reported.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE.

Mr. CARON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 148) to amend the Acts respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada, said: Under the law as it now stands re-enrollment of the sedentary militia takes place every five years. Under the proposed Act, power will be given to the Governor in Council to make this enrollment when in his discretion it may appear necessary to make it. An expenditure of \$55,000 is required for the enlistment, and it is thought better that it should only take place when it may be deemed necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. When did the last enlistment take place?

Mr. CARON. The last enlistment took place about six years ago.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SCRIVER. I would like to enquire of the hon. Minister of Militia if the Government, in making this change, intends practically to do away with this examination altogether, unless in a case of some great emergency as threatened now, or something of that kind.

Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. CARON. As the hon. gentleman will see by looking at the Bill, the Government wish merely to save this expenditure of \$55,000 for re-enrollment whenever it can be saved.

Mr. SCRIVER. What I would like to know is, under what circumstances the Governor in Council might think it necessary to have such enrollment?

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman is asking a question which I am not prepared to answer. The Governor in Council will have power, if an emergency occurs, to decide whether or not it will be proper to incur this expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, under the law at present the enrollment takes place at certain specified periods, but under the proposed law the Governor in Council can order an enrollment as often as he likes.

Mr. CARON. True; but the purpose of the Bill is to prevent it being made unnecessarily. Last year, as the hon. gentleman will remember, a Bill was brought before the House and passed for the purpose of preventing this enrollment; but we wish to place the matter within the discretion of the Governor in Council.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 152) respecting bridges over navigable waters, constructed under the authority of the Provincial Acts, said: It has been found in practice that, in regard to bridges constructed only in one Province, there was a difference of opinion about the mode of passing them. Formerly the Local Legislature granted charters for the construction of these bridges, and then it was found that it could not deal with questions of navigation, and it was thought that the parties wishing to build the bridges should apply to the Federal Parliament. When they applied to the Federal Parliament, the difficulty found was that though we had the power to deal with navigation, the question of tolls, the character of the bridge, the kind of vehicles allowed to pass over it, and so on, were within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. By this Bill it is proposed to deal with those bridges by a general plan. The Local Legislatures, under this law, will grant charters for the construction of the bridges, and the plans will be submitted to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and the Minister of Railways for their approval. If they find them satisfactory, and that the navigation will not be interfered with, then they will declare that the bridge is a lawful one. If they find otherwise, they will declare that the bridge is an unlawful one. That is the substance of the Bill.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 9,

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that there is a provision here that "No approval shall be given under this Act of the site or plans of a bridge over the River St. Lawrence or the River St. John." I suppose this is because of the importance of those rivers as boundaries.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me there are other streams to which the same observation will apply, as the River St. Clair, the Niagara River and the Ste. Marie River.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will include these rivers in the Bill.

Bill amended and reported.

PORT WARDEN OF MONTREAL.

Mr. McLELAN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 122) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to

the office of Port Warden for the Harbor of Montreal, said : This Bill is mainly intended to consolidate the various Acts under which the Port Warden of Montreal has been acting for a number of years, and to make some provision for the better examination and survey of ships both on arriving at and departing from that port, especially on clearing. The old Act provided for a survey of vessels laden with grain wholly or in part; but it has been found necessary, for the protection of life and property, that this survey should be extended to vessels laden with other products. It is therefore proposed to give power to the Port Warden to make such survey and examination as may be necessary for the safety of life.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

238. Grounds at Ottawa.—To pay amount of award and judgment in favor of Marshal Wood\$13,900.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount this gentleman has received in all, for his services.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$13,050, and the balance was to provide for the future possible costs, making \$13,900. The amount he claimed was \$29,050, we contested that and he offered to compromise for \$15,000, we contested that again, and the Dominion Arbitrators allowed him \$13,050, and they confirmed the judgment of the arbitrators. There was a Commission, I think, to take evidence in England, because Mr. Marshal Wood contended he should have more, but the Court held he should have brought that evidence before, and the cost of that evidence taken in England was given against him.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.. I do not know that the hon. Minister or any one was to blame, but I am sure we got very little for our money. All that resulted was simply what was done in front, and the hon. gentleman could have laid that out without consulting any one.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would not have taken that risk. What shows that Ministers of Public Works are not disposed to take risks is this: that after my successor, the hon. member for Lambton, came into office, he sent the Chief Engineer of the Department to New York to see the Commissioner of Central Park there, who gave him some plans, and who has now a claim against the Department. That claim was only lately brought to my notice and is not yet decided.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. From what I know of this work, my impression is that Mr. Marshall Wood had not a claim for a dollar. It seems all that is necessary for a man to do is to make a claim, and if he cannot get it this year, he will get it next, or the year after. It will be referred to the Official Arbitrators, who seem certainly to take very loose views, and are disposed to give parties much more than they are entitled to. This man, I believe, had no claim whatever, the only success he had was in persevering with his claim. It was referred to the Official Arbitrators, who awarded a certain sum and the Court confirmed that award. The evidence seems to be all *ex parte*, and the Government had scarcely a hearing.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend is mistaken. This case was defended on both sides before the Arbitrators, and it was only after a long trial and much deliberation that they gave the award. Then the Government decided to take the case to the Exchequer Court, and Hon. Justice Fournier went through the evidence with great care, and, as I said before, when Mr. Marshall Wood's counsel asked for the evidence in England

Mr. Justice Fournier gave a Commission, and when it came back and he saw the evidence, he said :

" This proves your case in my opinion, more than was proved before the Arbitrators, but you should have brought that in the first instance and not put the Government to this expense ; therefore I will not allow you the cost of this Commission, and the Government will pay only the regular cost of the case before the Arbitrators."

So the case was well investigated and judged on its merits.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Who defended the case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think Mr. Lash on the part of the Government, and on the other side the Hon. Mr. Cockburn.

239. Contract of Jas. Goodwin, grounds at Ottawa \$5,359.46

Mr. CURRIER. I would call the attention of the House to the necessity of an enlargement of this building. We have a Railway Committee composed of some 140 members who assemble in a room which is none too large for fifty men. I would suggest that some alteration be made. I believe an extension might be made on one of the wings so as not to change the appearance of the buildings in the front while it would improve the looks on the western side. The members of the Ottawa Valley have never been able to get a room in the building for their own private use, where they could write and converse, as we have always felt it was our duty to give the unoccupied rooms to those who came from a distance. I think an extension could be added which would give a room 100 feet in length for the accommodation of the Railway Committee, besides affording rooms for other purposes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think it would be wise to increase this building by adding wings. I think it should remain as it is. It has been so planned by the architects, and it would be a pity to damage its appearance. If we have not space enough in this building we might get it by completing the western block which, as the hon. gentleman knows, is not yet completed on the square.

243. Balance of contract for quarantine station,
Grosse Isle \$5,144

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Has this quarantine station been put to any use of late? There seems to have been for many years an annual expenditure on this institution.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So long as there is no war an army seems to be useless; and so it is with respect to a quarantine station. There have been only a few patients each year, and the annual expenditure has declined.

246. Expenses in connection with His Excellency
the Governor General's quarters at Quebec
Citadel \$5,700

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to provide a reception room which is required in the building.

247. Expenses in connection with the Supreme Court
of Canada, new furniture and repairs to old.... \$1,600

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I do not rise to oppose the item, but to express my regret that the Supreme Court has been removed. In my opinion, it occupies an entirely unsuitable site, it is very inconvenient of approach, and very few people are found attending the Court. The Court should be more convenient and accessible to the members of the House and the public generally.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret to say that I differ with the hon. member. I think the Supreme Court when in this building was in the way of communication between the different sections. It is much better that the Court should occupy its own building. It is a substantial building, it has a nice court-room, well ventilated and lighted. The legal profession complain of the accommodation

in this parliamentary building. It is a change for the better for the Court as well as Parliament.

Mr. WELDON. I think the new quarters are not half so convenient as the old. The smell in the building to-day was dreadful. The building is away from the Parliamentary Library, and that fact tends to injure the efficiency of the Court.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think the hon. Minister is entirely in error as to the views and wishes of the lawyers who practice at the Court. The opinion of the profession was almost unanimous against the building.

Mr. MacDONNELL (Inverness). I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I have been in other Courts that have been distant from other buildings, and I think it was most desirable that this Court should be removed from this building, particularly when the House was in Session. The library was constantly occupied by those in attendance on the Court, and the Court interfered with members of both Houses.

248. Ottawa Geological Museum, Heating apparatus \$5,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. How much is this building, which I have always held to be most unsuitable and most expensive, already cost.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount spent in 1880 was \$38,000, in 1881, \$9,000 more, and now \$5,000 are asked for heating apparatus. I think the building serves its purpose very well, though of course, a great many repairs had to be made. We had to build the front of the building in order to put it on a level with the main building. The museum is in the very best order, and if the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) has visited it lately he would find it well arranged, though some improvements may yet be required; but I do not think they will cost much. The amount asked for was, however, absolutely necessary, as I could not go on with the work until the appropriation was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This means that we have expended \$53,000 on this old building, and there is no doubt in my mind, that the Government could have had a better new building for \$30,000. I have not visited the building lately for the simple reason, that had I done so, I would have had so much to say against it that the hon. gentleman would not have been pleased.

Mr. GAULT. I have visited the building, and must say that it is most admirably situated. I find that there are more people come here to see the museum at Ottawa than there were in Montreal, and I think Professor Selwyn deserves great credit for the manner in which he has arranged it.

Mr. ANGLIN. The number of visitors does not prove that the place is a proper one, and it does seem an extraordinary thing to spend \$5,000 for heating up a museum in which there are nothing but mummies and fossils. The building looks out on what? On a cart stand, a pile of filth, with a stench pervading the atmosphere all the time; with dust in summer and mud at other seasons.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Still it must be admitted that it is not bad for a fossil Government.

Mr. ROSS. In connection with this item, I think the cost of printing the report of the geological survey might be reduced. It is now printed in Montreal, by Mr. Dawson, at special rates, and costs some \$5,000 or \$6,000. It is printed there for the reason that Mr. Selwyn could more easily revise the report and have it printed under his eye, but now that he is here, it might be printed by the Government contractors at the regular rates, and thereby save, perhaps, \$2,000. I had the pleasure of going through the Museum, and though I need not say anything particularly

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

about the building, it is due to Professor Selwyn to say that his arrangement is most admirable, under the circumstances, and that a visit would well repay any hon. member of this House or any other gentleman of a scientific turn of mind.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). With regard to the geological reports, I have letters in my desk urging that a larger number should be printed to encourage a taste for studying our mineral and geological resources. By printing a larger number, the cost would not be very much enhanced when the matter is in type, and everything in readiness for printing it.

252. Winnipeg Post Office, additions and alterations \$11,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I believe this amount is needed, but I should be glad to hear what the hon. gentleman proposes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, we had to go on with these repairs, for the fact is that there was very nearly a rebellion in the Winnipeg post office every time a mail was about to be delivered. People would stand about in hundreds outside, and I was told that certain places were bought from the parties occupying them on the street for \$2 a head, so one can imagine what the crowd must have been. Then the accommodation inside was so small that the people could not get in, and had a struggle every time they tried to get their letters. We have doubled the accommodation for the officers inside, and more than doubled the space for the public. We have also made a new exit from the building, so that parties coming to the post office may come in one door and go out another. These will not be permanent if there is to be only one office. Hon. gentlemen will most likely find in the Second Supplementary Estimates, when they come down, an item for a new post office in Winnipeg. The question is whether we should abolish the present post office and build a large one, or whether we should have two post offices. That point has not yet been settled; but we are quite alive to the necessity of having additional post office accommodation in Winnipeg. Of course, the city council there have something to do themselves. As the houses were not numbered, it was difficult to have letters delivered at domiciles; but I understand that the houses are now being numbered, and the Post Office Department are in a position to have letter carriers employed, and we have also ordered some boxes to be placed at different points throughout the city to receive letters. In these ways the post office will be relieved, and when the money is voted for the new post office, we will try to build it as fast as possible.

258. To cover expenditure for alterations, &c., in Parliament Building, owing to removal of Supreme Court Offices..... \$10,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is this large expenditure for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the Court was removed, the Court room, which was converted into a reading room, and the other rooms around this Chamber had to be changed in order to be made suitable for the purposes for which they were intended. The old reading room was fitted up for the press, and the ceilings of three rooms upstairs over that room were lowered to afford accommodation for the translators. The accommodation provided everywhere is much better than it was before.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In the course of the discussion about these buildings last year, or the year before, the hon. Minister, I think, stated that he had under consideration the adoption of the electric light instead of gas. That would be a great improvement in two ways, the gas adds very much to the heat of the buildings, and destroys the air very much more than the electric light would do. I

would be glad to know whether, among other improvements, he is disposed to give us the electric light in the future.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was my intention at the time to try the electric light in this Chamber and in the Senate Chamber, but when this intention became known I was besieged with offers from electric light companies; but I thought, as improvements were still going on in regard to the electric light, that I might allow these companies to cool down a little, and we might probably be able to obtain the latest improvements in the electric light. The matter has not been lost sight of, and I hope that next Session we may be in a position to have the electric light put in this room, and also, perhaps, on the square.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Will the hon. gentleman tell us what use he intends to make of the shelving in the reading room? If it would suit the arrangements in the library, a certain portion of the shelving might be very well used to stow away our Sessional Papers and Journals. The Sessional Papers are the most inaccessible papers in the library. If they were in the reading room, close at hand, it would be a great convenience to members.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The shelving in the reading room has been erected for the accommodation of books of reference, such as the Journals of the House, the Appendices, and the Statutes of the Dominion and the Provinces. I called the attention of several of the members of the Library Committee to this matter, and was told at the beginning of last week that the Committee had decided to call upon the Librarian to put those books of reference on the shelves.

Mr. HESSON. I desire to express my own gratitude and I think that of most of the members, to the Minister of Public Works for the admirable arrangements he has had carried out for the proper ventilation of this House, from which, as well as the passages, foul air has been expelled, with great benefit to our health.

259. Mabou Harbor—To pay Dr. Cameron for services rendered by him in connection with dredging... \$126

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is the first time we have been called upon to pay a medical man for services in connection with public works. Is it for the administration of pills or ointment for the improvement of the harbor? I would like to know the precise services he rendered that harbor? What sort of therapeutic remedies or dredging instruments did he apply for the purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt he is a very good medical man, and that his patients had no reason to complain of his absence while superintending the works at that harbor.

Mr. HADDOW. I would like to remind the Minister of Public Works of a petition which was sent to him last year by the inhabitants of Campbellton, asking him to send a dredge to deepen the channel a short distance below that place. The lumber trade there is rapidly increasing, and it would be very much promoted by having this improvement made in the navigation of the river. At present vessels of large size requiring great depth of water cannot conveniently load there, whereas, if the improvement asked for was made, vessels of almost any size might be employed. The lumber merchants in that vicinity are placed at a disadvantage because of the increased rate of freight required to be paid owing to these hindrances in the navigation of the river. I cannot suppose that the necessary expenditure would be very great as the portion requiring to be dredged is not very extensive, and the outlay will prove a great advantage not only to Campbellton but to the whole country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My hon. friend no doubt wants the doctor sent to his afflicted harbor; but the Minister of Public Works has not stated what kind of services the doctor has rendered, or whether there was a gentleman of that name a Conservative candidate at the last election, and who is the prospective candidate for the coming election? Is it possible that the Government has, in consequence of his position politically, engaged him to do work on a harbor? What professional knowledge of a harbor can he have? It is simply outrageous to ask a vote to pay a Conservative candidate who is simply a medical man, for attending to that harbor, which I suppose is now as well as can be expected.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I see the hon. gentleman knows exactly the party who has been employed; and though he may find fault with that gentleman for being a Conservative, I can assure him it did not disqualify the doctor in our eyes for such employment. I am pretty sure that if the hon. gentleman had found him at work, he would have considered him a very good medical man, and quite competent to improve the harbor. Mr. Cameron was employed and has to be paid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What did he do?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He was inspector of works for forty-two days.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think that medical men in the country charge only \$1 a visit.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He may have made three visits a day.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is there any charge for medicine.

262. Owen Sound Harbor—To complete works..... \$7,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a work that was begun a year ago. The contract was \$58,985. The locality furnished \$13,000 in money. This was for the moving of the bar outside the harbor. There was also piling to be done, and a good deal of obstacles in the shape of sand and boulders which had to be removed.

263. New hull, &c., for dredge vessel, Maritime Provinces..... \$9,000

Mr. HADDOW. Will the hon. gentleman give me an answer now to my question?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These applications have been put together and will be dealt with immediately after the Session. When the votes of money have been obtained no doubt I will be able to meet the requirements.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Will the hon. gentleman also deal with the petition?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say what I shall do in the matter now, but shall give the subject my attention.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What is this new hull for, for the Lower Provinces?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the dredge *New Dominion*. Tenders were advertised for in eight or ten papers, but only one man tendered; he asked \$11,200, which was above the estimate of the engineer, but he has since stated that he will do the work at the engineer's estimate.

Mr. ANGLIN. Who is the party?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Olive.

264. Union Suspension Bridge, Ottawa, additional amount required..... \$1,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What was the total amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We expended last year \$4,000, this will make \$5,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is a work which should not be on our hands, but be handed over to the municipalities.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Complaint was made several times that tolls were collected on that bridge. We have not yet made up our minds to ask Parliament to make this a free bridge. If the municipalities had made an offer of some kind by which they might have paid a reasonable sum, we might have brought down a measure to make it a free bridge.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The bridge is not a source of revenue. \$3,000 were collected last year and \$4,000 spent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This was for repairs that will last several years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I merely point out the inconvenience of keeping the work on our hands. The intention was originally to have it pass as soon as possible into the hands of the municipality, so that it would be a source of no expense to the Government.

265. Compensation to Patrick McHale, for damages to his land by the erection of a dam near the head of the Chats Slides, Ottawa River..... \$435

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. When was the damage done?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the month of April, 1872, Patrick McHale, of the township of Fitzroy, purchased, from William Kehoe, a piece of land without being aware that the dam, which the Government had commenced to build in the fall of 1871, would have the effect of submerging the most valuable portion of the farm, otherwise he would not have purchased Kehoe's property. The Superintendent says that the claimant is a poor man and bears a very good character, and that his assertions are fully corroborated by Mr. Kehoe and by Mr. McFarland, Deputy Master of the station. He did not make his claim sooner, because some of his neighbors told him it was useless going to law with the Government, as such a proceeding might cost him more than the whole land was worth.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was anyone sent to value this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, the station master and the Superintendent of the Ottawa Works, Mr. Brophy.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This only verifies what I said before, that all the party has got to do, who has a claim against the Government, is to pursue it, and he will receive compensation for it. Now, that claim has been allowed to rest ten years, which is conclusive evidence that he had no claim at all. If there is anything necessary to establish the fact that this man can have no claim in equity, it is the fact that he allowed it to sleep so long.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The man delayed his claim because the neighbors told him that it would be refused. He came forward himself and made his claim to the Government, and it has been investigated and found to be correct. It is not because he is a poor man and an uneducated man that we should refuse him; on the contrary, it was exactly because he was helpless and uneducated that I thought he should get justice. He had none to look after his case, and I thought, under those circumstances, I would look after it for him, and I sent the Superintendent up to investigate it and he reported the claim well founded.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I should like to know who his representative is. It is strange that a poor man should have allowed ten years to elapse before presenting his claim. What county does he live in?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is in the county of Carleton, Ontario.

267. To complete telegraph lines to Mille Vaches and those in the Maritime Provinces..... \$4,510

Mr. BUNSTER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the injustice done to **Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.**

British Columbia by his neglect. The Dominion of Canada agreed to build a telegraph line through British Columbia, and inasmuch as British Columbia is attracting more attention than could be expected, I would like to enquire why the hon. Minister has so grossly neglected the line from Nanaimo to Comox, and also the telegraph line from Nanaimo to Alberni. British Columbia has been totally neglected, and I hope the hon. Minister will give it his serious consideration. The company is now building a railway in that much-abused country, but the Dominion Government declines to do justice to the Province, by building the telegraph line. I want the Government to build the line between Nanaimo and Alberni, and I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will take the subject into his favorable consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This money is to pay the Great North-West Telegraph Company for the line from Murray Bay to Mille Vaches and a small land and cable lines on the islands of the Lower St. Lawrence and the Gulf and the Maritime Provinces. We pay \$1,600 a year to the Telegraph Company for working the line.

Mr. GAULT. I hope after some time the system of telegraph lines will be owned by the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In regard to the telegraph line from Nanaimo to Comox, and the other line to Alberni, we, the Government, are not in a position this year to entertain the project. It is a scheme that will require some attention, and I shall be very glad if we are in a position another year to meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

270. To provide for expenses in connection with the training-ship *Charybdis*..... \$12,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think the House will be glad to hear something about this wonderful engine of war. We want to know what has been done, what is being done, and what is intended to be done with respect to this addition to the Canadian fleet.

Mr. McLELAN. As to what has been done, the ship has been brought to St. John. This vote will cover the expense of the repairs in the dock-yard and of bringing her out and mooring her at St. John. As to what is to be done to her, that is yet under the consideration of the Government.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We have had a vote before for this vessel, and I think the gross amount must reach \$22,000 at least, or perhaps \$30,000. I would like to know what is the total expense.

Mr. McLELAN. The total amount expended up to the present time is \$13,000, a portion of which is provided by Governor General's warrant during the last fiscal year.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It therefore appears that the Government are not able to tell us what they intend to do with the vessel. It had been understood that it was to be used as a training ship. What use would it be put to?

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). It is time the Government should know what they are to do with the vessel. In St. John harbor the vessel was a nuisance last year. The vessel should be taken out of the harbor as she has done damage there and two lives have been lost. The sooner the vessel is taken out of St. John harbor the better the people will be pleased.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This vessel seems to be an extraordinary one, as she is unguidable, like a vessel without a rudder. This estimate of \$12,000 is to cover expenses already incurred.

Mr. McLELAN. And to be incurred up to 30th June.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. How much does she cost per day, for what purpose is the money expended, and to what use is the vessel to be applied? The bringing out of this

vessel was a most consummate piece of folly, and was a fraud on the country; it would be in accordance with the general sentiment of the people that this vessel which runs on her own account and does damage should be set on fire and burned.

Mr. McLELAN. She is securely moored and is not doing any damage. The Government will carefully consider what should be done with her.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I always objected to the *Charybdis* being sent to St. John, as I thought we in the Lower Provinces should not be charged with a public work from which we would receive no advantage. She is anchored in the harbor, but breaks away now and then, and I presume this item of \$12,000 is to pay for damages. I do not blame the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am merely dealing with facts as I find them, and I am not prepared to say that the Government is responsible. Nobody is responsible. This vessel was sent out from England, probably in pursuance of some high-flown notions in England at that time. We know that Mr. Brassey and others had the idea of raising a mercantile navy all over the world, and this vessel may have been sent out as part of that scheme. I want it to be sent to Halifax; I think Nova Scotia should have it. The other night I was severely commented upon because I made some remarks thinking that something was not going right, but I hope I shall not get the same—

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Castigation.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Yes, castigation, I believe that is the word—I hope I shall not receive the same castigation to-night. I think the *Charybdis* should be towed out of the harbor of St. John, so as to protect the shipping, and that this money will be paid for the damages she may commit when she breaks down vessels. We want a training ship; we want all we can get, and I trust that we may have vessels that may train our mercantile navy, but I am sure this vessel is no good for us or anybody else, and the sooner she is got rid of the better. I find no fault with the hon. Minister of Marine nor the Government, because I am sure the Government did not bring her out. I have reason to believe she was forced on them. My suggestion is that she be towed to Halifax and handed over to the Imperial authorities, and let them do what they like with her.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to punishing Halifax in that way, and if there is no hon. member to speak up for Halifax, I am ready to put in a word for her.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) deems either that the harbor of St. John is too small for the *Charybdis* or that the *Charybdis* is too large for the harbor, but if that place advises us to take the vessel to Halifax there will be abundance of accommodation for her there.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I cannot allow a remark of that kind to be passed on the harbor of St. John. St. John harbor has certainly never been frozen over in my time, but I have walked on the ice from Halifax to Dartmouth.

Mr. OGDEN. I am surprised to hear the member for King's (Mr. Domville) assert that the harbor of St. John is not sufficiently large.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I did not assert it.

Mr. OGDEN. The hon. gentleman said something in that direction. He said that \$12,000 was probably in the Estimates to pay for the expense caused by this vessel having broken adrift and damaged other persons' property in the harbor. I am sorry to hear that the harbor of St. John is so small and its anchorage so poor that a vessel like the *Charybdis* cannot remain safely at anchor. Last year the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) said he was anxious that St. John should be made the

winter port. I did not think at that time he was sincere in making that claim, and I thought he was only jesting. Now I know he was not sincere, because if the harbor of St. John is not able, as he says, to accommodate a vessel like the *Charybdis* and allow her safely to ride at anchor it certainly is not a proper place for a winter port. I would say that the people of Halifax would gladly receive that vessel. They have a harbor which is safe and commodious enough to accommodate the whole British navy, and where the anchorage is good enough to prevent them going adrift. I therefore suggest that she be sent to Nova Scotia, but I think there is another and a better port than Halifax—a port which will eventually be the winter port of this Dominion. We would be glad to receive the *Charybdis* in the harbor of Whitehaven—the best port on the Atlantic coast—and I am glad to know that the members for New Brunswick have come out boldly and acknowledged that St. John is not a suitable port to accommodate the British navy. I therefore suggest in all seriousness that the Government should seriously consider this matter, and in making this suggestion I am only doing my duty to myself, to this House and to my constituency in asserting that the harbor of Whitehaven is one sufficiently large to receive all the ships that may be sent there and accommodate the combined navies of the world.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I cannot allow such a slur to be cast on the Province of New Brunswick and the harbor of St. John without resenting it. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, is very clever in trying to make political capital in favor of the harbor of Whitehaven and his own constituency. When the hon. gentleman asserts that the harbor of St. John is not large enough to contain that vessel and has not a good anchorage, I think somebody should correct him. Hon. gentlemen talk about my asking for a winter port. Yes, I have asked for a winter port, and I shall continue to ask for a winter port. I may not have the honor to represent my constituency here next year—many of us may be defeated—but while I have a seat, I shall endeavor to see that New Brunswick has the winter port of the Dominion. If there is any harm in that, and if the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Ogden) is to be offended because I ask that New Brunswick shall have her share, and that we shall have a winter port terminus at St. John, in spite of his slur of that harbor, I still hope my people will support me because I support them, and I trust that other hon. members of this House may stand up and defend the harbor of St. John as a harbor fit to hold a navy, and that we may not sit here to have a slur cast on that harbor as fit for nothing compared with the harbor of Halifax.

Mr. OGDEN. I wish to say that I did not cast a slur on the harbor of St. John or insinuate that it was not a good harbor. I know St. John harbor very well, and I know it to be a very good harbor; but I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this sum was placed in the Estimates to defray the cost of the damage done by this vessel breaking adrift and floating down the harbor, and I am sorry that any hon. gentleman should so forget his allegiance as to condemn this ship, which is a free gift from Her Majesty. Another hon. gentleman says she should be burned. If the gifts of Her Majesty are not sufficiently appreciated in New Brunswick, we shall gladly receive them in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KILLAM. There has been a rumor afloat that the bridge across the St. John River at Navy Island was to be removed, because there was not room enough in the harbor for the bridge and the *Charybdis* at the same time.

Mr. DALY. I do not think it was at all necessary for the hon. member for Lambton to rise to defend the interests of Halifax. I can merely say that those acquainted with the harbor of Halifax—and I know the hon. member for Lambton is one of that number—will bear testimony to the fact

that the harbor of Halifax has ample room for not only the *Charybdis*, but for more than half the navy of Great Britain; that the *Charybdis* can ride in safety there, will not be injured, and will not be likely to break adrift and do damage to property there. I have been surprised at the number of hon. gentlemen, not from Nova Scotia, but from New Brunswick, who, if I judge rightly the meaning of their words, came to the conclusion that the harbor of St. John was not capable of affording anchorage room for the *Charybdis*. I think better of the harbor of St. John than the opinion implied in the representations made by the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Burpee), the hon. member for Westmoreland, and others who have spoken on the subject. Now, I believe St. John is a fine harbor, and it would be far from my desire to cast the slightest slur upon it. I would like to see Halifax a winter port, and I would be glad to see St. John a winter port also. I believe the interests of both ports can be advanced by the present Government, and I believe they are taking steps every Session to promote them, and we may expect to see the day when both Halifax and St. John will be shipping grain to the ports of Europe. I believe there is no jealousy existing between either port. I disclaim any feeling of jealousy towards St. John; they are both good ports in their way; but so far as the harbor of Halifax is concerned, if the Government send the *Charybdis* there, she will have plenty of room, and I believe the Government will find some useful object to which she can be applied.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When *Havard* was first established; I had some doubts about the propriety of it, and the advantage it would be to the country; but I am satisfied it will be a matter of great interest to the people of New Brunswick to read the discussion which has taken place on this vote to-night. They will ascertain how highly the harbor of St. John is appreciated by some of their representatives in this House; but, happily, they cannot injure that harbor, because its advantages and its central position are such that they are well understood. But I must say I thought a more favorable view would have been taken of the position and the facilities of that harbor by those hon. members who have spoken. With reference to the *Charybdis* breaking loose, she has been anchored there safely all winter, and has not interfered with any vessel, so far as I know. She is in one of the best positions that could be found for her in the Dominion of Canada. It is central, and in every way a desirable point; but you would judge, by the remarks made to-night by some hon. gentlemen, that that harbor has no capacity, and that if a ship should drift from her moorings, she would come in contact with some other vessel. That is quite true, because it being the principal port of the Dominion, it has vessels for it to come in contact with, while other ports have not. But all that the hon. gentlemen have said to disparage that port will have no effect, because it is impossible that anything any hon. gentleman can say can damage the position of that harbor.

Mr. ANGLIN. In the country I came from, a man who was very angry and yet did not want to be profane, instead of sending a man to a certain warm place, was accustomed to say: "Go to Halifax." Well, we in St. John are quite willing to say, "Go to Halifax." If we had taken or sent her further in that direction than Halifax, we should say—go to Whitehaven. The hon. Finance Minister very properly, in reply to the hon. member for Guysborough, who boasts of the capacity of Whitehaven, and says it possesses ample room for the *Charybdis*, made the statement we have heard. No doubt in Whitehaven there would be no danger of coming in contact with anything except ice.

Mr. DALY.

Mr. OGDEN. That is a mistake. I have seen in that harbor three hundred vessels.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Fishing boats?

Mr. OGDEN. Vessels from 50 to 1,000 tons every year for the twelve years I have resided in the county.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Three hundred at one time?

Mr. OGDEN. Yes; and ice is never known in the harbor of Whitehaven.

Mr. ANGLIN. If what the hon. gentleman says is correct, and if at any time from stress of weather or other adverse circumstances, 300 sail are compelled to take refuge at Whitehaven, they had better not station the *Charybdis* there, because she is a most formidable vessel, and gentlemen on the opposite side are censurable for not knowing it. The hon. member for King's, in his speech, shows that the *Charybdis* is the very representation and incarnation of the National Policy, so to say. It is the National Policy put into wood and iron. There she stands; with her they can defy the whole world, particularly our neighbors of the United States. We can shake our National Policy in their faces, and say: "We will impose duties on your products, and we defy you to find fault with them." We can say to our enemies: "We are safe, the *Charybdis* stands, not behind us, but in front of us;" and if there is any excuse for having her at St. John, it is that she stands in front to defend us against our neighbors and all others. Even if she has no cannon or guns, no vessel in the American navy dare approach our frontier, for the *Charybdis* will run into her and sink her at once.

Mr. McCUAIG. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Marine that he should first have the *Charybdis* measured and inspected under the new Steamboat Inspection Act, and after that she should be exposed for sale. This should be done under a Bill before the House with fourteen new clauses and thirteen Orders in Council in regard to it—a Bill with forty clauses and six amendments—inspection under such a Bill would produce wonders.

Mr. BUNSTER. Since Canada has refused such a gracious compliment as the *Charybdis*, I can tell the Government how to utilize her.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Send her to British Columbia by railroad.

Mr. BUNSTER. The least you say about the Canadian Pacific Railroad the better. Your ideas are too amphibious to build the Pacific Railway. I have a grievance so far as your Government is concerned in that respect. You did not do much for the railroad. In order to facilitate commerce between the eastern and western Provinces of the Dominion, the best thing the Government could do would be to place this vessel on the route between here and British Columbia. She has been there before and we looked upon her with pride and pleasure when the British tars and officers were in our ports. Any such magnificent gift from old England should be hailed as an heirloom, and if the people of old Canada are not willing to receive her the people of British Columbia are. The merchants and manufacturers of Canada, under the National Policy, will be able to send out in her a ship load of goods to British Columbia, when we will be able to send back a cargo to the eastern Provinces. We want eastern goods, for which we can easily make a return in the production of our Province.

Mr. ANGLIN. Of what?

Mr. BUNSTER. Wheat, coal and other things.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I contend with the hon. Minister of Finance that hon. gentlemen have no right to find fault with the harbor of St. John. I endeavored, in the few

remarks I made, to show that the *Charybdis* is totally unfit for the work she was intended for, and it would be better to hand her back to the Imperial Government, to Mr. Brassey or anyone else who wants to carry out some Quixotic idea of their own. At the same time I stated I did not think the Government were responsible or to be blamed for the inefficiency of the vessel. The hon. member for Halifax undertook by faint praise to damn the harbor of St. John and make out that the harbor of Halifax is the finest in the world. The harbor of St. John can speak for itself, and it is out of place for the hon. member for Nova Scotia to find fault with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister says the entire money expended was \$13,000. I felt certain he was mistaken. I know that a certain amount was expended in England to make her fit for the voyage, and a certain sum was expended to bring her out, the two amounting to \$20,000; \$9,040 were expended on her last year where she lies, and the whole expenditure cannot be less than \$30,000. The vessel is not worth keeping: she is a source of expense and of no public utility. If nothing else can be done with her she might be sold to Barnum. The Government has no policy in relation to her. Why should we vote money every year to keep a vessel which is utterly worthless.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Marine appears to be in a somewhat singular position between this *Charybdis* and the Scylla of the Opposition. It appears to me that this vessel which is denounced by both sides of the House might, perhaps, provide a solution of a great problem. Every one must be satisfied that under existing conditions almost all representative institutions in the great constitutional countries of the world have belied their character. Mr. Gladstone appears disposed to put a stop to free discussion, by introducing the "cloture" in England, thereby interfering with those institutions which, Mr. Green tells us, came from the green pastures and the pleasant farm-houses of Schleswig. In our country we have the introduction of the power behind the Throne, which appears practically to control the business of the country, and all representative institutions in the United States, as well as here and in Great Britain, are somewhat anomalous in their character. Perhaps the members of this House who are going out of public life, might embark in the *Charybdis*, and as the hon. member for Vancouver suggests, "go round the Horn," taking several horns on the way, and in that way we might leave the country practically in the control of abler and stronger men than we have proved ourselves to be.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). Leaving all joking aside, the hon. Minister of Marine should inform us what the policy of the Government is regarding her. With regard to the port of St. John, the hon. Minister of Finance, with his usual ingenuity, has tried to make out we ran it down. We did nothing of the kind. I said that she was a nuisance to the port, and so she is.

Mr. ANGLIN. What is the Government going to do with this vessel? If there is any possible purpose to which she can be applied, they should let us know. My own opinion is that the Imperial Government should be asked to take her back: If they will not, she should be run up on the beach and left there till she falls to pieces. There is no reason why we should spend \$10,000 or \$12,000 for the care of a vessel which is of no use to us.

Mr. McCALLUM. Hon. gentlemen opposite are making a great mistake in finding fault with the small amount of money spent on this ship. These hon. gentlemen who are now trying to get the power to make our own treaties, will want this ship to commence with.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am glad the hon. member for Monck has found out a use for the unfortunate vessel. It

seems when the Government appoint ambassadors they are to embark on board the *Charybdis*, and all nations will capitulate at once rather than have this formidable vessel enter their ports. In the meantime we must proceed like business men and ascertain from the Government how much money has been spent on this vessel.

Mr. McLELAN. The vote last year was \$15,000; we are asking now for \$12,000 more. The amount that has been actually paid is about \$13,000, which has been made under the Governor General's warrant. This covers all the bills that have been made.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is a mistake.

Mr. McLELAN. I am speaking from a memorandum given me from the office—cheques that are sent out and the authority under which they have been given as to the cost of the vessel now. It has been inoored and is comparatively free from expense. She has one caretaker on board who is paid \$25 a month. What other disposition we may make of her is not determined.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is to be done with the money?

Mr. McLELAN. Whatever disposition we make of her will cost some money; if you send her back to England or send her up to Halifax the moving of a large ship like that will cost several thousand dollars. The whole of that \$13,000 has already been paid, \$12,000 are now asked for, and the \$5,000 for last year, makes \$17,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the amount this vessel has cost. He will find, on reference to the correspondence, that a thousand pounds sterling was placed to the credit of Captain Scott in the agency of the Bank of Montreal in London. Two or three months afterwards Sir A. T. Galt communicated with the Canadian Government stating that a further sum of a thousand pounds was required, so that \$10,000 were spent on the vessel before she left England. He will find, I think, in the Public Accounts a sum of \$9,000 in addition to that, and now the hon. gentleman wants \$12,000, which makes altogether \$31,000.

Mr. McLELAN. I stated that there might be outstanding accounts.

Mr. CAMERON. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he has accounted for the \$10,000 that was placed by the Government of Canada to the credit of Captain Scott in England before the vessel left England at all? The hon. gentleman will find that a sum of over \$30,000 has been spent on this vessel.

Mr. McLELAN. The expenditures the hon. gentleman has referred to are some charges by the British Government that may not have been paid yet. That was all done by the British Government.

Mr. CAMERON. Not a farthing of it. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that that was done by the British Government? They did not spend \$1 on it.

Mr. McLELAN. Repairs on the ship were done by the Government in England and paid by the British Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, they were not.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is wrong. The ship was put into the dockyard on the other side and repaired as to her copper and tanking, and the bill probably will come before the Dominion Parliament. But there has been no bill paid yet.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Yes, there is; it is all paid.

Mr. McLELAN. I beg your pardon. I find the amount last year was \$10,000, and the \$12,000 now asked for is expected to cover all expenses.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister is entirely mistaken. The British Government simply gave us the hull of the vessel, the spars and the rigging. They took out of her the guns, the coal, the stores, the small arms, and gave us nothing but the hull. The hon. Minister will find, if he looks into the account, that \$10,000 were paid on the other side in repairs which even then made her barely fit to cross the Atlantic in summer. Now he says she is of no value whatever to us. What is the policy of the Government with regard to her? When the British Parliament is asked to vote money the Government is always expected to tell what the money is for—how it is to be used. Why is this large sum asked for now? The ship, as she lays in the St. John Harbor to-day, is utterly unfit to go to sea. If the hon. member for Monck and the forty or fifty gentlemen around him could be induced to make a sea voyage in their political entity—I would be sorry to have them embark in her in their personal entity—I think we, on this side, would be willing to vote any amount of money to promote their voyage. But we ought really to know what the Government intend to do with this very expensive and ugly toy of ours. Are we to go on year after year voting money for the *Charybdis*, simply because she is there and must be taken care of? The Imperial Government probably meant well by presenting her to us, but the Government should, in this case, have adopted a policy in regard to her and announce it to the House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was stated in the House last Session that Her Majesty's Government had placed at the disposal of the Dominion Government this steamer for the purpose of establishing a naval school in the Dominion of Canada. It was placed at our disposal by the Imperial Government, and it was considered a valuable property. It was found after we had obtained possession of this ship, which had returned from two or three years' service in the Chinese sea, that considerable repairs were necessary before she could be brought to this country. The amount of £1,000 sterling was placed at Mr. Scott's credit to bring her here. Then it was found the construction of the vessel, on account of her being built so as to be propelled both by steam and sail and with heavy yards, was such as to require a very heavy crew. When she arrived we found she was not so desirable a vessel for the purposes required as we hoped for. It was stated last Session that the Government had not decided what course it would pursue, that enquiries would be made during recess and a vote taken sufficient to bring her out. It was found on examination, that the vessel required very considerable repairs in order to place her in a perfectly seaworthy condition. The position is this: With the best intention on the part of the Imperial Government the vessel was placed at our disposal, and we are not desirous to throw the vessel back again on the Imperial authorities if we can make any use of her. If it is found practicable or desirable—because there is now a question whether a smaller vessel would not answer that purpose better—when further Supplementary Estimates come down, the leader of the House will either ask a sum of money to maintain the vessel as a naval vessel or he will be asked that she shall be returned to the Imperial Government. All we ask at the present time is a vote for the payment of expenditures down to 1st July.

Mr. ANGLIN. The explanations made by the Finance Minister are so far satisfactory, except for the "if" introduced. As we understand the leader of the Government will explain his policy before the close of the Session, I think the vote may pass without further discussion.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have discovered a solution of the difficulty. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) last night declared himself in favor of the treaty with the Hawaiian Islands, and those members on both sides of the House who intend to leave Parliament can proceed thither.

Mr. McLELAN.

In this way the good intentions of the British Government in offering us this vessel would not be ignored.

271. To provide for repairs to and maintenance of the steamer *La Canadienne* \$12,000

Mr. McLELAN. This vessel was wrecked last November on White Island, and it was with great difficulty she was got off and taken to Quebec, the cost involved being \$7,000 or \$8,000. An estimate was made of the cost of repairing the vessel and tenders invited, and an additional expenditure of \$5,000 was incurred.

272. To provide for expenses incurred by the Water Police in connection with the Montreal laborers' strike, and the employment of extra men \$7,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How was this expenditure incurred?

Mr. McLELAN. During the laborers' strike last summer an additional force had to be employed, and this is the continuation of the vote of last year.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have always objected to the principle of the Dominion Government meddling with the affairs of the harbors of Montreal and Quebec, or any other ports of this Dominion. It is not a part of our duty, of the Federal Government, and I think as soon as possible these matters should be relegated to the local authorities. The troubles to which this particular vote refers was one with which the Federal Government had nothing to do, and now they are asked to pay this expenditure.

274. To provide for the maintenance by the Harbor Commissioners of buoys and beacons in the port of Montreal, for the year ending 30th June, 1880... \$3,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Explain?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The buoying of the river has been performed in the past by the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal. It was said by them, and I think with a good deal of force, that whatever might be their duties as Harbor Commissioners, there was no reason whatever why the expense of buoying the river, which was not within the limits of the harbor, should be borne by them. When I introduced the Bill last Session, reducing the rate of interest on advances to the Commissioners, I stated that we purposed at the same time to relieve them of this expense. The work has been done by the Commissioners for the year; and this sum is to reimburse them for the amount. Hereafter the duty will be performed by the Government, and no special vote will be asked.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I can see no reason why they should perform the duty one year more than another, though I admit that I can see no reason why this expense should be borne by the Harbor Commissioners.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman admits that the system is wrong, and yet he objects to our changing the system.

275. To provide for the payment of salary and disbursements to S. A. McVicar, Fishery Overseer. \$541 65

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances of this claim?

Mr. McLELAN. It is for two years and eight months' salary as fishery overseer. He did not draw his salary during the time he performed his duties.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Was the matter simply an oversight?

Mr. McLELAN. Not wholly an oversight. The Department withheld his salary, asking for further returns than he had sent in. The matter went on for some time, until he was relieved or left the office, and he made a claim for his salary. On enquiry, it was ascertained that he had discharged his duties, and that the money collected was faith-

fully paid over, and all that was wanting was that he did not send in a complete return for his term.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Was he dismissed?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not sure whether he resigned or was dismissed, but he is out of the office now. On the enquiry being made it was found that either from negligence or attention to other duties he had not sent in full returns.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My recollection of the matter is very faint at present, but my impression is that he deliberately refused to attend to his duties. But he is a good Tory editor, and the Government have no hesitation in going back several years and paying a claim which should not be paid. I hope the papers will be brought down so that we may see what the claim amounts to before we are asked to pay it. I have not the slightest doubt that the claim is a bogus one, and it is at least five or six years since it was rendered.

Mr. McLELAN. The claim has never been presented until within a year—at all events it never was passed upon by my predecessors.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. When was the service performed?

Mr. McLELAN. I think from 1875 to 1877.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. And he never presented a claim before?

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was no claim to present.

Mr. BOWELL. He was in the service of the Government. He was relieved, I think, by hon. gentlemen opposite of any duties he had to perform, and they refused positively to pay him for the time he was in their employment.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I do not think that was the case.

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking from knowledge that came to me from himself when he made the claim. He said he had asked the Government to settle with him, but that they had refused to settle because he had failed to make a certain return. I then told him distinctly that it was his duty to make a return for all the time he was in the employ of the Government, and that whatever salary was due him would be paid. A thorough examination was made by the officers of the Department, and it was ascertained that all moneys he had collected during his tenure of office had been correctly and honestly accounted for, and the Government considered that he was entitled to the salary for the time he was in office. It may have been because he was a good Tory editor that hon. gentlemen opposite thought it necessary to relieve him of the \$200 a year that he was getting, and I have no doubt that the fact of his being an editor of a Tory paper in the town and county the hon. gentleman represents brought down on him the odium of the Government. I think it is the duty of the incoming Government, having due regard to the proper treatment of their officers, whether they belong to one party or another, to see that they are properly remunerated for the services they rendered.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. There is a discrepancy between the statements of the two Ministers. One says that a claim was made, and the other says that no claim was made; I would like to know which speaks the truth. I suppose the hon. gentleman means to insinuate that I refused to pay this man because he was an editor of a Tory paper. I entirely repudiate that charge; it is utterly untrue; and I think, before we are asked to concur in this vote, the papers should be brought down.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's rebuke ought to be applied to the hon. gentleman beside him (Mr. Mackenzie).

It appears to him to be quite correct for his friends to impute improper motives to the present Government. I would not have referred to the fact of his being the editor of a Tory newspaper, had not the hon. gentleman's late leader declared that to be the reason the Government were paying his claim. There is no discrepancy between the statement made by my hon. colleague and that made by myself.

Mr. McLELAN. Year by year he claimed his salary, but he never made the claim as a whole.

276. Fish Breeding—to provide an additional sum..... \$2,000

Mr. ANGLIN. The other day the hon. Minister stated that somewhere on the Restigouche or the Metapedia, a new hatchery was likely to be erected, but he was asked who owned the ground, and he evaded answering it.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not evade it, and my attention was called to a report in the *Hansard* which was incorrect. I stated the site had been selected and a contract made for some materials and some work, but that I had suspended operations until a title could be purchased. Under the old arrangement it was proposed to take a lease of the property; but I did not consider it proper to make a large expenditure on properties for which we had to pay a rent. I stated this and did not evade the question.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. gentleman evaded one part of the question, viz.: who was the owner, or who claimed to be the owner of that property, upon which that hatchery is to be erected.

Mr. McLELAN. Judge Clarke claims to be the owner, and the proposal is to lease it from him.

Mr. ANGLIN. Surely it was a strange way of proceeding, to erect a hatchery upon a property to which the Government had not obtained a title. Rumor says the owner is Mr. Wilmot, and that he wants the building on it that he may obtain for land for which he paid some 50 cents an acre, a large sum from the Government. The hon. gentleman did evade the main point of the question, which was to the ownership of that ground—as to the person from whom the Government had leased or purchased it. They have contracted to erect a hatchery, and have carried materials on to the ground without obtaining a title.

Mr. McLELAN. The terms of the lease had been arranged, but the title had not been completed.

Mr. ANGLIN. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say that Mr. Wilmot does not directly or indirectly own the property.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Wilmot does not; it belongs to Judge Clarke.

Mr. ANGLIN. Why did you not say that before?

Mr. BOWELL. You gave us no chance. You did all the talking yourself.

Mr. ANGLIN. The question was put some days ago: who was the owner, or who claimed to be the owner?—to which the hon. Minister made no answer. But he has repeated what he said that evening as to his giving orders for the suspension of the work. He ought to be able to say on his own authority, after investigating the matter, that Mr. Wilmot is not the owner.

Mr. McLELAN. I told you that Judge Clarke was the owner.

Mr. ANGLIN. Mr. Wilmot's management of this whole business is very much impugned, and there is grave doubt as to whether we receive value for our money. I had no idea how the impression went abroad that Wilmot had an interest in it, but that impression was current, and the statement that Judge Clark is the owner will scarcely remove the impression unless it is proved that Mr. Wilmot

is not directly or indirectly interested in selling this ground for the hatchery in question.

Mr. BUNSTER. In the whole of the Estimates there is not a dollar down for our fishermen, although they send out \$1,000,000 worth of fish yearly and pay a large amount of duty into the revenue. \$700,000 go from British Columbia into the general Treasury of the Dominion, yet we are completely ignored. I trust the hon. Minister will remedy this injustice.

277. To provide the expenses of inspecting the rivers and mill-dams in Nova Scotia..... \$1,000

Mr. McLELAN. This is for the salary of a special inspector, Mr. Meath, who was sent out on complaints as to the condition of the rivers on the southern coast of Nova Scotia and the eastern coast.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. How is it that Mr. Rogers was not employed? He is an official of the Department, a very competent man, who has made some invention for fishways.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Rogers has all he can do in the supervision of all matters connected with the Province of Nova Scotia.

279. To provide for arrears of rent in connection with building occupied by the St. John Observatory \$449 81

Mr. ANGLIN. What observatory is that?

Mr. McLELAN. It was in a public building pending the construction of new buildings.

Mr. ANGLIN. What building?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot point that out now.

290. Expenses connected with the charges against Fishery Inspector Mowat..... \$675 80

Mr. McLELAN. Charges were made against the overseer on the Restigouche which I found lying in the office when I came there. I felt that they were of a serious nature and sent Commissioners down to examine and report upon them. The Commissioners were Mr. Brydges, one of the fishery inspectors, and Mr. E. M. Roberts, of Truro. Circumstances detained them and the investigation occupied nearly a month, the expenses for which are asked for by this vote. Sufficient was heard of Mr. Mowat to warrant the Government in dismissing him.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Is there any objection to submitting these papers without a motion?

Mr. McLELAN. Certainly not.

292. To provide for a grant to fishermen on the coast of Nova Scotia who suffered losses by storms in April, 1881..... \$1,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This is an unusual vote and requires some explanation, I think. What were the circumstances which induced the Government to ask for this vote?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A very heavy gale took place in April, 1881, which destroyed the buildings of a great many fishermen, and destroyed their boats and nets, and left them without any means of obtaining a livelihood. This money was not given to them, but was placed in the hands of an agent there to purchase boats and nets as a loan to them, so as to enable them to earn a living. I do not recollect what part of Nova Scotia it was, but there came up a report showing great distress on the part of the people, giving the number of boats, nets and buildings that were destroyed.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I suppose it was done by Order in Council?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.
Mr. ANGLIN.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then the hon. Minister no doubt will produce that Order in Council?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am very loath to oppose a thing of that kind, where the distress may have been very great, but at the same time it is a precedent which might become a very awkward one. Does the hon. Minister propose, in the event of any serious injury occurring to the fishermen along the coast, to introduce the system of loaning money from the public Treasury.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; it was because the Government appreciated the peculiar hardships of this case that they advanced the money. They did not give it, but they loaned it. We saw the difficulty, and therefore put it in the position of a loan.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The practice has been to grant aid to sufferers where there has been an overpowering calamity, such as the St. John fire; in other cases a loan of money has been made on security taken for it. It will not do to take absolute ground that under no circumstances shall money be loaned or given. At the same time, it is quite clear that if we are not very careful demands will be made upon the Government for minor calamities, and the greatest care should be observed in making loans. In this case there will be no means of paying back the loan, so it is practically a gift.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It is stated in the vote as a positive grant.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will bring down the Order in Council, which states that this is a loan.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Of course, while having very great sympathy for these distressed fishermen, it does seem to me to be a dangerous practice to adopt to afford relief from the Treasury to unfortunate people in different parts of the Dominion. Almost every year, in Prince Edward Island and some parts of Nova Scotia, fishermen suffer very severely from storms or other calamities, and it would be a dangerous thing if it is understood that the Government are to come forward and loan these people money to indemnify them for their losses.

Mr. RICHEY. I think this case comes under the denomination of those serious calamities which are for the time overwhelming. The principle that is generally acted on is, that when the case can be made a local charity the Dominion Government does not interfere; and I do not think in this case there was any expectation this principle would be transgressed. If this harbor had been properly protected by a breakwater from the effects of the storm, it would not have been felt to the same extent; but the calamity occurred at the season of the year when the population were about to prosecute the fisheries, and it rendered them unable to prosecute their business that year. Under those circumstances an appeal was made to the Government for a loan of money, and an investigation was made by the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and the loan was granted. The disaster occurred at Prospect Harbor and extended to Dover, in the county of Halifax.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is a matter which should have received the attention of the Local Government. A storm occurred on the Labrador coast a few years ago; and although an application was made to the Dominion Government for relief, such was not granted.

Mr. RICHEY. The expense might fall on the municipality, but it would be inconvenient that it should fall on the Local Government, which had really nothing to devote to a case of that kind, unless from the grants for roads and bridges.

Mr. DALY. I desire to know whether hon. gentlemen opposite intend to oppose this motion, for I think I can

give reasons why it should pass. The circumstances under which the money was loaned were such as render it necessary. At that season of the year the fishermen were prepared to go to sea to prosecute their calling, but they were deprived, by a storm, of their nets, boats and fishing tackle in a single day. They swarmed into Halifax in a destitute condition, and subscriptions were taken up but did not prove sufficient; a loan from the Dominion Government to those fishermen was just, in view of the calamity which had befallen them; and if any vote could be justified it was such a vote as this which went to alleviate the destitution. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to oppose such a vote as this.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. We are able to protect ourselves, and while no hon. member has opposed the vote hon. gentlemen on this side of the House desire to make themselves acquainted with the principle which underlies it.

Mr. McCUAIG. I have many fishermen in my own county, and in view of the very precarious nature of this occupation, I am quite willing to support the vote; and if the House were as careful in all expenditures as in this it would be more to the credit of its members.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) evidently knows more about this calamity than any hon. gentleman on this side or the hon. Minister of Finance, who did not know where the calamity occurred. There are circumstances which justify the lending of money, but we desire some statement of the particulars so that we may be able to judge, not merely whether the case is one deserving relief, but as to what is to be the principle adopted. It is rather singular that a calamity so widespread was not better known. A year ago a Government steamer was chartered to go to relieve the people at Guysborough at I do not know what cost to the Dominion. Now other fishermen—a portion of Halifax—wanted to be relieved.

Mr. OGDEN. I desire to state the circumstances of the case referred to by the hon. member. Three years ago, owing to a scarcity of fish, many people in my constituency came short of food. An appeal was made to me from different parts of the county to try and obtain assistance from the Dominion Government. At that time there was some money placed in the Estimates for a public work. The Minister of Public Works allowed a certain sum to be drawn in advance, which was paid back in labor and material by the fishermen in one part of the county which I represent. In another part of the county an appeal was made for relief. There were no public works to be constructed in that part of the county, and knowing that many of the people were destitute and were suffering, and that perhaps some might die for want of assistance, I did not hesitate to put my hands in my pocket and purchase \$300 worth of meal, which I sent to the people of my county, telling them that if they could pay for it I would gladly receive it; and I asked the Government if they would permit me to send this meal in the same steamer which carried the meal to the other part of the county where the Government work was going on. The Minister kindly consented on condition that I was to receive no profit from the freight. I did this, as I thought it was my duty, to assist the people in my county when they needed assistance, and I think the Government did right in granting my request, as it cost them nothing. The steamer had to pass the port—in fact she had to enter within a hundred yards of the wharf where the meal was landed. It cost the Government nothing extra. The only cost was to myself, and I believe that many hearts were made glad by this assistance and that some lives were saved. I feel very thankful to a kind Providence which enabled me at that time to be in a position to grant this aid to the people, and thankful to the Government for having acceded to my

request. I am also thankful to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), for giving me this opportunity for making the matter plain. I am surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite taking up the time of the House for one moment in discussing this question, Hon. gentlemen on the other side single out the poor fishermen as groaning under the heavy taxes imposed upon them by the National Policy, but when \$1,000 is asked for to alleviate their sufferings, they say it is a bad principle to establish. They fight on principles in questions of this kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. members on this side of the House did not hesitate to give \$100,000 to the starving people of Ireland, and it would not be fair for the members of this House to ignore the wants or requirements of their own countrymen. The fact that these hon. gentlemen have brought up this question shows that after all their pretended sympathy for the suffering fishermen, when it comes to a question of dollars and cents, they are always anxious to fight for the almighty dollar, and they are always ready to impose upon the poor fishermen as severely as any other class. I will always stand up for the fishermen, and I congratulate the Government for making provision to pay the fishermen a bounty so as to assist them in adding to the wealth of this country, because there is no class more deserving of assistance than the noble fisherman. I wish the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) to understand that the present Government in all their dealings with the fishermen have endeavored to do what was right and just, and they have acted most favorable to them in every respect.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman evidently does not belong to that charitable class of individuals who desire to hide their light under a bushel. We are glad, of course, to receive information from him showing how extremely liberal he dealt with his constituents, but when he talks about teaching us our duty, let him understand that whether it pleases him or his constituents, when we find a vote here which imparts a bad precedent, we will not fail to record our opinion about it whether we deem it expedient to expose it or not. I do not intend to oppose the vote, but I know that such grants as these are constantly made the means of very gross jobs throughout this country.

Mr. KILLAM. I would like to ask the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Ogden) whether he regards the duty of 40 cents a barrel upon this same corn meal as one of the blessings which the Government have conferred on the fishermen?

Mr. OGDEN. I paid every cent of duty myself.

Mr. ANGLIN. The Government must have had an extraordinary idea of the hon. gentleman when they were so particular as to stipulate that he should not make any profit out of the meal or the freight upon it. The hon. gentleman's statement reflects not much credit on the Government or himself—some on the Government because they were exceedingly careful, but not much on the hon. gentleman because of the stipulations which the Government thought it necessary to impose on him. The hon. gentleman is not correct in saying we oppose relief to the fishermen, but we are anxious to know why, where and how the grant was made.

Mr. OGDEN. I wish to inform the hon. member for Gloucester that I did not make as great a profit on this meal transaction as he did upon his printing contracts with the former Government.

303. Telegraph Lines, British Columbia..... \$20,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This vote is caused by the superintendent of the telegraph lines in British Columbia having counted the revenue from the telegraph lines as a

receipt against the expenditure, and these earnings were employed without being put into the Receiver-General's hands. We corrected that and said that all that money should be placed to the credit of the Receiver-General. The receipts, which were \$5,000 or \$6,000 previous to the change of Government, will this year be about \$25,000.

305. Additional amount required to pay for the engraving of plates and printing of Tobacco Stamps for the stamping of Tobacco under the provision of 43 Vic., c. 19 \$30,000

Mr. BOWELL. It is a very large item, but it was necessary to procure the stamps, to carry out the provisions of 43 Vic., cap. 19. When the law was passed it provided that all packages, no matter how large or small, should be stamped, it was necessary to procure a very large number of stamps. I noticed, in many cases, the Customs Department had applied through the head office for 500,000 stamps at a time, in order to meet the requirements of the law and prevent the illicit sale of tobacco, which might either be brought into the country, or be replaced by the native grown tobacco which probably would, in the market, take the place of the excised tobacco.

306. Additional amount required to pay to Customs Officers commissions on Excise duties collected by them \$1,000

Mr. BOWELL. This sum has been paid by the Department to the Customs officers at ports where they have no Excise officers, and where the labor is not sufficient to justify the appointment of Inland Revenue officers. The clerks of the Customs are paid 5 per cent. on the amount of their collections.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is a good arrangement.

Mr. BOWELL. A very large amount would be saved if the principle could be extended.

203. Civil Government \$1,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is this to make additional payment to the Departmental officers?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This amount was paid them until the last year or two ago. It is to pay officials of the post office savings banks in the Maritime Provinces for extra work, keeping them late at night, in reference to despatching notices to depositors who have balances to their credit, in order to the correct keeping of the accounts. They received payment for this work previously.

204. Administration of Justice—Payment of expenses in the case of Russell vs. Woodward, now before the Privy Council on appeal from the Supreme Court of New Brunswick \$5,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is this the case of the Scott Act?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. ANGLIN. Does the hon. gentleman think the Government is justified in paying the costs in this matter?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; it was very important that the question should be settled, and as the Government has paid for the argument of the case before the Supreme Court they thought they would be justified in asking Parliament for enough money to have the case settled definitely.

Mr. ANGLIN. It would have been supplied anyhow. The parties themselves were taking the case before the Courts and were prepared to fight the matter out. They wanted no assistance, but the Government chose to interpose, as I understand, because the parties who wanted to prohibit the sale of liquor did not want to contribute to the contest.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think this was a subject that ought to have been determined in this way. I think Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

the expenditure ought to have been advanced by the Government for the purpose of having a decision from the highest Court in the Empire in settlement of this great constitutional question. I believe the whole people should bear the cost of such decision.

Mr. WELDON. The appellants never asked for it, but took proceedings at their own expense.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is not a question as to whether this question ought to be settled at the public expense. The Government supplied funds to enable one party, the prohibitionists, to test this question, while the other parties were willing to pay their own expenses in the Superior Courts. This interposition on the part of the Government was not a fair one, but was intended to enforce the Scott Act and establish its validity at the public expense.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When the argument took place before the Exchequer Court on both sides, the Government paid for it, and they believed they should pay for the present argument on both sides, when it is to test the constitutionality of such an Act of Parliament. I agree with the hon. member for Westmoreland that whatever may be the difference of opinion as to the character and wisdom of the Scott Act, it is of the utmost importance this should be definitely settled.

Mr. WELDON. It is to be regretted the Government did not arrive at that decision earlier.

Mr. KILLAM. It is absurd for the Government to spend money in carrying out elections under the Scott Act in counties where no license previously existed, when there is no force to carry out the Act.

213. For payment of the transport of immigrants from Quebec to Toronto \$28,000

Mr. BOWELL. This is to meet the expense of forwarding immigrants from Quebec westward, that was agreed to be paid under the arrangement made with the Dominion Government by the Ontario Government, that that Government should pay two-thirds the expense of transporting immigrants from Quebec westward. That arrangement continued until 1881, when the Ontario Government gave notice to the Dominion Government that they would no longer be party to that agreement. The Estimates had been laid before the House by the Dominion Government before the withdrawal of the Ontario Government from the bargain, and consequently a deficiency arose which this sum is intended to meet.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 1.40 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 3rd May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PENSIONS TO COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting County Court Judges. Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only change which the first resolution makes in the law is to substitute ten years for fifteen years. It is thought reasonable, if a

County Court Judge becomes disabled after serving ten years, that he should be entitled to the pension.

Mr. MILLS. Is that irrespective of his age when appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me there ought to be some further provision, as the hon. gentleman might appoint a man sixty-five years of age, who would be unfit for service in ten years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, the same principle will apply to Judges of Superior Courts.

Mr. BLAKE. That is true, but the hon. gentleman himself explained, on a former occasion, the difference that exists practically between the appointment of Judges of the Superior Court—when he first introduced the provision for the retirement of the County Court Judges. Then he gave the term of service, of twenty-five years, as the minimum, explaining that the decision to apply the provision as regards the Superior Court Judges would be a very considerable check on the Executive in making appointments, including persons of advanced years and imperfect health. That the same check does not exist in relation to the more numerous County Court Judges, and that it would be dangerous to give an uncontrolled power to the Executive, because it might be exercised in the appointments of persons of advanced years, who might be soon in a position to apply for pensions. Now, we found it expedient to reduce the term from twenty-five to fifteen years, which was made with some doubt. The hon. gentleman has now gone further, and reduced the term to ten years. I think that is very objectionable, unless we provide the maximum age for the appointment of the County Court Judges, as it might lead to a large number of such applications, the number of those Judges now exceeding fifty; and it might lead to the appointment of persons of advanced age and infirm health, who would not otherwise be appointed, as the hon. gentleman himself said when he first proposed the clause. I am not disposed, unless the hon. gentleman advances strong reasons, to agree to any further limitation of the period beyond which pensions on account of age or incapacity should be granted. I think the period we have already fixed is narrowly consistent with the retention of those securities which the hon. gentleman himself proposed for the prevention of abuses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite time I called the attention of Parliament to the difference between the case of the County Court Judges and the Judges of the Superior Court. Still, experience has shown the reasons for the proposed change, which is proposed upon the strong remonstrances of the whole body of the County Court Judges. I understand there are some cases of these Judges not being fit to perform their duties; and really after all, after a service of ten years, when a Judge is broken down or is afflicted with some disease or infirmity, it is not too much to ask for the continuance of his salary. I admit there is much in what the hon. gentleman says about the duty of fixing a maximum age for County Court Judges. Of course, the Government must take the responsibility of making proper appointments, avoiding the selection of parties old or unfit. I am not at all aware that during our time, or that of any preceding Government, that appointments to the Superior Court or County Court Bench were governed by the principle of providing for persons advanced in years.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the charge of making such unfit appointments can be brought against the hon. gentleman's Government—I do not make it. But it is to be observed that during his Administration there was no provision for pensions, and therefore there was no possibility of getting rid of a Judge, and that was a check on Govern-

ments formerly. He knows the difficulty of the situation, and the pressure to which he will be exposed, and also his weakness, and it was himself, as leader of the Government and Minister of Justice, who pointed out these difficulties if he possessed the power intimated of granting pensions to those County Judges. That no abuse of the power has occurred, when there was no opportunity to abuse it, with reference to prospective pensions, is but a poor argument against the proposition that such abuses may occur when the opportunity arises, and the creation of such opportunities is what the hon. gentleman is proposing to effect to a larger extent than the law now permits.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What would be done in the case of a County Court Judge who served a number of years, and resigned his position, and served a further period of years on the Bench: would the first years count in his claim for a pension?

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. He would get the benefit of the former years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think he ought.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the aggregate of the two periods of service ought to be counted, within the spirit of the law. In questions of precedence, &c., the Imperial Government have decided that former terms of service in an inferior Court, under somewhat similar circumstances, counted in the matter of giving precedence as between the different classes of Judges.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. There is some question as to the right of a Judge, after serving twenty-five years, to resign and be entitled to a pension.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Some Judges believe they have that right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that any question can arise.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause is the same as that with reference to the Superior Court Judges, except that we have fifteen years of a term prescribed. That clause has always been interpreted as leaving the Judges at perfect liberty to resign, with a discretionary power in the hands of the Government to decide whether they should be pensioned. It would not be proper to grant a pension to a Judge able to execute the duties of his office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Statute has always been so construed.

Mr. BLAKE. The 7th clause seems open to some exception. One of the great difficulties the hon. gentleman will have to deal with—and I speak from a little experience on that subject—is to persuade a Judge that he is too old and incapable of continuing the duties of his office. Not that the Judge does not feel, in one sense, that it is fit for him to retire, but he feels that it is not fit for him to retire on two-thirds of his salary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is very true.

Mr. BLAKE. I repeat it is a very great difficulty. I think this clause will have the effect of causing Judges, who may be unable to fulfil their duties, to hold on to their position as long as possible, confident that they will run no risk by such a course, as they will be entitled to a pension after the Commission has been issued and proceedings taken against them. I was in correspondence with the friends of no less than two learned Judges, both of whom were declared by common consent unfit for the discharge of their duties. They had served the twenty-five years period, but neither would retire because they wanted the whole of their salaries. One of them had a junior Judge who did all the work, and another wanted a junior Judge to be appointed

so that he might practically be made a pensioner at a full salary. Under this clause you would never get a Judge to retire after the twenty-five years period.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What this means is that it authorizes the Government to remove a Judge for inability or incapacity arising from old age or ill health, and should this removal take place two years after the appointment he would be entitled to a pension as if he had served ten years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what the hon. member for West Durham says. This clause was introduced to meet the case of a Judge in the county of Wellington, Judge McDonald, who had performed his duties very satisfactorily, but who is now unable to perform them and incapable of resigning, and if he was removed for incapacity under the law he could not receive any salary.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no provision for power to deal with this case in the resolutions, nor do I think the clause bears the interpretation put upon it by my hon. friend from Westmoreland.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Any doubt as to the construction of the second resolution would be cured by putting in the word "so" before "removed."

Mr. BLAKE. I should object strongly to a provision which in fact got rid of the ten years clause. Does the hon. gentleman propose to introduce a clause providing for the filling up of vacancies on the judicial bench in any reasonable time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the second resolution be struck out.

Motion agreed to and resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committees on Bill (No. 112) respecting County Court Judges.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 3,

Mr. BLAKE. It would be well to specify the manner in which the enquiry is to be made, since clause 4 following is merely permissive. This clause obviously gives power to the Governor in Council to make an enquiry in any way they please, notwithstanding that the Judge may oppose it and may prefer a Commission. Therefore, it is practically investing the Governor in Council with power to remove a Judge, not with the security which the Statute provides, but only with the security of an enquiry which may be made in an unsatisfactory manner by the Executive Department of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A Judge might prefer to be heard by the Governor in Council rather than by a Commission. In any case I think any Government would be exceedingly anxious to avoid the exercise of that power. This is precisely the same provision as before, only it gives power to the Executive Council of the Dominion.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

AN ACT CONCERNING THE INLAND REVENUE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Mousseau's proposed motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1880, 43 Victoria, Chapter 19.

1. By prescribing the license fee to be paid for a bonding warehouse when in the same building with a Customs warehouse.

2. By repealing the duty of 4 cents per lb. on common Canada twist, imposed by section 35, sub-section 10, and providing that it shall pay the same duty as other Tobacco manufactured exclusively from leaf

Mr. BLAKE.

grown in Canada, under sub-section 8, such duty to be reduced from 14 cents to 8 cents per lb., for the two years next after the passing of the Act, and to 10 cents per lb. for the two years then next.

3. By reducing the duty, under sub-section 9 of the said section 35, on cigars made solely from Tobacco grown in Canada, from 30 cents to 20 cents per lb.

4. By providing for a monthly payment, equal to the cost of properly surveying the establishment, by any party licensed to use a chemical still.

5. By making certain amendments to facilitate the working of the said Act, but not affecting the rates of duty imposed by it.

He said (in French): I now move that to clause 2 of the foregoing resolution, the following be substituted:—

"2. By providing that the duty on tobacco manufactured by licensed manufacturers exclusively from leaf grown in Canada shall be reduced from 14 cents to 8 cents per lb., for the two years next after the passing of the Act, and to 10 cents per lb. thereafter."

This change has been made in conformity with the promise made by the Government when the hon. Minister of Finance made his financial statement. I think that I have already had occasion to explain the reasons that have caused the Government to make these changes, but it may not be out of the way to refer once more to the matter to-day. This policy with regard to Canadian tobacco is far more important than it appears at first sight. I have already submitted some statistics in this respect. We wish to try and cultivate in the country the immense quantity of tobacco which we import from abroad. Preliminary experiments have been made, and it has been established in the Inland Revenue Department, that the tobacco produced, both by the growers of Lower Canada and those of the Province of Ontario, is of such quality that we can manufacture as good cigars and as good smoking tobacco as those we manufacture from foreign tobacco. I have already given statistics showing the number of pounds of tobacco which we import from abroad. One well-known manufacturer alone, who yearly imports foreign tobacco to the extent of \$100,000, has said to us: "With the changes which the Government is about to introduce, I am convinced that within two or three years I will take at least half my tobacco in the country; in other words, instead of sending \$50,000 per annum abroad that sum will remain at home." Of course there are great obstacles to be encountered. It is an experimental policy, and many difficulties will always arise during the transitory period, i.e., between the time when we are importing largely and that when we are changing the fiscal policy in order to import less, we shall manufacture in large quantities. Several means have been proposed, and I think this one will work perfectly. Since it has been known that we are about to extend the margin heretofore existing on manufactured tobacco, manufactories are being started that will be in working order this fall or next year. Formerly the margin on cigars was from 30 to 40 per cent.; we are reducing it to 20 per cent., or a difference of exactly one-half. On manufactured tobacco the duty was 20 per cent. on imported tobacco, and 14 per cent. on Canadian tobacco; we are reducing that to 8 cents for two years, and after that to 10 cents per pound. Those figures have been declared to be sufficiently low by the manufacturers in the country to enable them to compete with foreign tobacco. With regard to the tobacco manufactured by the grower, in the shape of twist or roll, the duty will continue to be 4 cents per pound as heretofore. I shall have occasion to speak of this more fully hereafter; if these resolutions are reported, I will have a Bill to introduce, and I will give explanations later on.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand the hon. Minister, the duty of 4 cents now in force on Canada twist is to remain unchanged?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. And the change now proposed will simply affect manufactured Canadian tobacco?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. The first resolution reduced the tax from 14 cents per pound on Canadian twist, to 8 cents per pound. We now remove it altogether. It is the only change made in the resolution. Other changes are announced in the Bill which is to be brought down later. Thus, for instance, there is no longer to be any license necessary for the cultivation and sale of tobacco in the leaf, which is to be entirely free of duty for some years to come.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, if I understand aright, the first resolution is simply modified by removing the duty from rolled tobacco?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Yes.

Mr. HOUDE. Will the manufacturers of tobacco be allowed to manufacture in the same building, imported and foreign tobacco?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, there is no change in this respect.

Mr. BÉCHARD (in French). Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure that I heard my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, declare that we could cultivate in Canada as good tobacco as that imported from abroad; and if I understand my hon. friend aright, the policy of the Government will henceforth be to encourage the development of that branch of agricultural industry. I regret, however, that my hon. friend was not able to inform the House that the Government was disposed not to impose any Excise duty whatever on the production of Canadian tobacco, and to allow it to be sold free and exempt from all Excise duty. It seems to me that such would have been the best means of encouraging the cultivation of Canadian tobacco. I recollect that my hon. friends opposite, or at least several among them, have on several occasions blamed the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) for having expressed some doubts as to the success of the cultivation of Canadian tobacco, and for having, last year, changed his opinion and accepted that of the majority of the members from the Province of Quebec, viz.: that Canadian tobacco can be cultivated to advantage in Canada. Now, I will add that as long as the Government does not encourage the cultivation of tobacco by the total exemption of Excise duty, I shall have the right to tell my hon. friends opposite that they are doing precisely what they formerly blamed my hon. friend the member for Quebec East for. From my point of view—I do not speak here in a political sense, I am speaking as a French Canadian member, not in a hostile sense to the Government, but as favoring the cultivation of Canadian tobacco—from my point of view, I say, it seems to me that the surest way of favoring the development of that branch of agricultural industry, which is apparently a most profitable one wherever it is carried on, would be to allow Canadian growers to cultivate and sell their tobacco without paying any Excise duty. If you impose any duties, you discourage the grower, you place obstacles to the cultivation of tobacco, and the slightest obstacle in this respect will cause a large number of growers to abandon its cultivation. I repeat, therefore, that I regret that the hon. Secretary of State has not been able to state on this occasion that the Government has decided to encourage, in a more decided fashion, that branch of agricultural industry. The agricultural class forms an important part of the population, and I think that this Legislature should favor it as much as possible. On referring to an official document laid on the Table of the House during the present Session, I see that the total amount of revenue collected on Canadian tobacco amounted during the present year to \$22,946.89, and that the expenses incurred by the various officials entrusted with the collection of that duty were \$12,832.39, which would leave the Department of Inland Revenue a balance of \$10,114.50. Really it is not worth while discouraging a large number of those who would be inclined to develop that important agricultural industry for the meagre pittance of \$10,114.50

per annum. This revenue is not sufficient to compensate the obstacles thrown in the way of farmers who wish to grow Canadian tobacco.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (in French). Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the hon. member speak as he has just done, because the Government measure is exactly what he asks for; for it has looked into the amount of revenue collected from that source, and seeing that it amounts to very little, it has sought to encourage the cultivation of Canadian tobacco. Consequently, as just stated a moment ago by my colleague when he was introducing the measure, the cultivation of tobacco is henceforth to be free. What more does the hon. member require for the encouragement of the cultivation of tobacco in Canada? Henceforth the farmer will be able to cultivate tobacco as he cultivates wheat and oats, and he will be enabled to sell his tobacco as he sells his potatoes and his oats. If the farmer wishes to manufacture Canada twist he may do so for his own use without paying any duty, but if he wishes to sell twist he will pay a duty of 4 cents per pound the same as every other manufacturer. Now, as to the large manufacturers, those who convert tobacco into cigars, &c., they will have to pay the duty mentioned by my colleague—20 cents on cigars, I think, and 8 cents for all other kinds of manufactured tobacco. An hon. member asked me just now if the manufacturer of foreign tobacco might manufacture Canadian tobacco in the same building, and I answered that he might not; two buildings will be necessary, but I presume that the manufacturer will work both buildings with the same machinery. At all events, the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) must be content that the Government has done exactly what he wished.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I am glad of the concessions made by the Government since the beginning of the Session, but I would have been more content had these concessions been complete. There still remains an important tax that will naturally be a considerable obstacle to the cultivation of tobacco.

Mr. HOUDE (in French). Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised to see the position taken by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard). When he rose, I expected to hear him congratulate the Government on the measure that it has just introduced in favor of a number of the agricultural class. But perhaps it is because he sits on the other side of the House that he sees fit to look upon measures coming from this side in a different manner than if they emanated from his friends. The hon. member was not so hard upon his friends when they were in power as he is to-day upon the present Government, and yet his friends were far from introducing a measure as favorable as the present one towards the reduction of the duty on tobacco in the interest of the Canadian grower. Mr. Speaker, as shown by the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. Minister of Public Works, the production of Canadian tobacco is perfectly free of duty, and my hon. friend from Iberville is mistaken when he says that obstacles are placed in the way of the cultivation of tobacco. On the contrary, the obstacles are removed by the measure now submitted to our consideration. Moreover, the sale of unmanufactured tobacco is equally free. Some of my friends asked this boon of the Government, together with myself, and we are glad to see that the Government has granted our request. As for myself, I cordially congratulate the Government in the name of that large portion of the agricultural class which is to be benefitted by the present measure. I notice that the great objection of the hon. member for Iberville is that there still remains a duty on tobacco in roll. Well, all those who have practical ideas on the subject, and who have studied it under its various aspects, have come to the conclusion—at least the majority has, and I regret that my hon. friend from Iberville has not come to the same con-

clusion—that it is in the interest of the farmer that a tax should be placed on tobacco in roll, in order to improve its cultivation. Our object is to cause the native product to be consumed in lieu of foreign tobacco. Now, that is the only way to cause Canadian tobacco to be consumed and to improve its cultivation. Although, generally speaking, Canadian tobacco is of a passable quality, yet the greater part of it is not so. I am aware that a few persons have incurred the expense of going to study its cultivation in the United States, but the quantity which is of excellent quality, and almost equal to the best imported tobacco, is relatively small. Now, as long as the unscrupulous farmer manufactures roll tobacco, he will have the means of defrauding, to the detriment of other farmers; he will be inclined to introduce tobacco of an inferior quality, and by placing bad tobacco within the outer leaf he will take away all its value. Now, if the farmer prepares his tobacco merely to sell it to this one or the other, and at any price that he can obtain, he will never improve the cultivation of that plant; but if he cultivates it with the intention of selling it to manufacturers, he will produce an improved plant of superior quality, for which he will obtain more remunerative prices. On the other hand, should rolled tobacco not be taxed, it will delay the establishment of special manufactures of Canadian tobacco. I feel certain that in future only bad tobacco will be made into rolls, because, in the first place, it always gives some trouble, and next because tobacco, offered for sale on the market in that shape, is not in itself to be commended. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the Government has taken the necessary precautions to protect the grower and to remove obstacles from the production and the sale of tobacco; whilst at the same time it aids its improvement, the result being that in future Canadian tobacco will realize more remunerative prices.

Mr. PLUMB. As I was a member of the delegation which waited upon the Minister of Inland Revenue in the early part of the Session, with reference to this question, I feel that it would not be improper for me to say a few words, especially as the constituency I represent is one in which tobacco has been grown to a considerable extent, and it is a crop which has also been cultivated successfully in Kent and Essex, and doubtless extended to many other parts of Ontario. It could not, however, be expected that the cultivator of the soil would experiment upon a new crop which requires much special skill and minute labor, when he was followed at every step by a revenue officer who was ready to seize whatever he should produce beyond 10 lbs. weight if the Excise entries were not made and the duty paid thereon. Under such embarrassments it is not surprising that the tobacco crop has been fluctuating and uncertain and the quality unsatisfactory. It is however certain that with moderate encouragement the farmers of Quebec will be stimulated largely to increase the acreage devoted to its culture, and I venture to say that the importance of the measure now under consideration to the agricultural community of that Province can scarcely be over estimated, and, further, that they will easily see to what party they are indebted for a valuable concession worth a whole deluge of theoretical talk, which furnishes us fuel to boil the pot and no food to put in it. I trust that the Government having taken this important step in the right direction, will find it advisable to procure and to disseminate throughout the country the very best tobacco seed of varieties adapted to the Canadian climate, and that the best information that can be procured will be obtained in respect to the culture of the plant, and the proper methods of curing it. It is known, perhaps, to most of the hon. members of the House that, after the war broke out between the Northern and Southern States the growth and culture of tobacco, which was largely restricted to the Southern States, it became necessary to supplement the supply by the cultivation of the plant in the

Mr. HOUDÉ.

North. Up to that time it was regarded mainly as a fancy or experimental crop in the Northern States, but since that time it has become one of its great staples. Tobacco is now grown in Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana and other Northern States, and, of course, in the great tobacco growing states of Kentucky and Virginia where it was cultivated largely before. The crop in the North is grown to such an extent that it is now very much larger than in the South, a fact which shows what can be done by assiduous culture and proper and well directed encouragement. Tobacco is one of the most profitable rotation crops, two or three acres of tobacco realizing as much as eight or ten acres of any of our cereal crops, and therefore it may allow a large proportion of the land to lie in fallow. I have at hand a few statistics of the growth of tobacco in the United States, and I think it will be of interest to the House to hear, as showing the enormous strides the growth of tobacco has made in the Northern States since 1861, owing largely to the encouragement it received from a Government which has adopted as its cardinal principle the encouragement and protection of its own people. The tobacco production of all the Northern States for 1862, did not amount to more than probably about one-eighth of the crop altogether. The products of the State of Kentucky very nearly maintains its former relations to the whole crop, as it produced in 1880, 171,120,784 lbs. Virginia, which was in its best days one of the great tobacco growing States, producing about half as much as Kentucky, or 79,988,868 lbs. Of the Northern States, Pennsylvania produced 36,943,272 lbs., valued at \$4,612,894; Ohio, 34,635,235 lbs., valued at \$2,633,234; Connecticut, 14,044,652 lbs., valued at \$1,929,982; Wisconsin, 10,608,423 lbs., valued at \$899,118; Indiana, 8,872,842 lbs., valued at \$443,642; New York, 6,481,431 lbs., valued at \$72,868; Massachusetts, 5,369,436 lbs., valued at \$683,575; Illinois, 3,935,825 lbs., valued at \$202,745; and West Virginia, 2,296,146 lbs., valued at \$170,374. While the whole production of tobacco in the United States amounted to 470,000,000 lbs. valued at \$36,624,357, of which nearly 123,000,000 lbs. are raised in the Northern States. Pennsylvania stands next to Kentucky and Virginia in the quantity produced. It must be remembered, as I pointed out before, that it is comparatively a new crop in the North. A new industry, owing its rapid growth to the manner in which the United States Government have fostered it. The United States Customs duty upon cigars, cigarettes, cheroots of all kinds, including wrappers, is \$2.50 per lb. and 25 per cent. The internal revenue tax upon cigars of all descriptions is \$5 per thousand; upon cigarettes of not over 3 lbs. per thousand, \$1.50, and upon those over 3 lbs. per thousand, \$5. The Customs duties upon manufactured tobacco not otherwise provided for, is 50 cents per lb.; and the internal revenue tax, 16 cents; in leaf unmanufactured, not stemmed, 35 cents; and stems unmanufactured, 15 cents. The arrangement proposed to be made by the Government is quite in accordance with the general policy which has characterized the Liberal-Conservative party since it came into power—a policy which shows that we believe the Government should, at any rate, endeavor to foster this industry, contrary to the statements of an hon. member representing one of the leading city constituencies of Quebec, who averred, four years ago, that the climate of Lower Canada was unsuitable to the growth of tobacco. It is an industry which has never been fairly fostered and cherished, and our policy is one which promises to bring about great results for Quebec, as did a similar policy in the neighboring Republic for the cold, sterile and worn lands of Massachusetts and Connecticut. I remember well when that hon. gentleman, then a Minister of the Crown, derided those who desired to encourage the tobacco growers of Quebec, and

he said that the climate of that Province was such that it was impossible to grow tobacco there advantageously. I remember, too, that not long afterwards when the tables were turned, and the hon. gentleman took a seat on the Speaker's left, the same hon. gentleman supported, and I think seconded, a resolution of an entirely opposite character. In a later Session, with the patriotic consistency usual to hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, who seem to take delight in decrying the ability of the country to do any good thing—the hon. gentleman again stated that it would be impossible for the tobacco growing industry to flourish in the Province of Quebec. But I believe the policy now adopted will prove the inauguration of a great and important movement in the agricultural interests of that Province, and I believe that if the Department of Agriculture takes proper care, we shall soon see results commensurate with the importance of the great industry which we are now discussing. I congratulate the Government upon having solved a great difficulty, which I believe will tend to the great prosperity of the Province of Quebec, and of those parts of Ontario which are favorable to the culture of a plant which, though somewhat exhausting to the soil when constantly cropped and and re-cropped for a series of years, will yet be found to be a most profitable one for the farmers of Quebec and Ontario, and a great factor in our agricultural prosperity.

Mr. DUGAS (in French). Mr. Speaker, when a few days ago the Government submitted to the consideration of the hon. members of this House certain resolutions, and that the hon. Secretary of State was called upon to explain those resolutions, the object of which was to amend the Inland Revenue Act of 1880, I did not hesitate to state that I was opposed to the duty imposed on Canada twist. That declaration seems to have surprised certain members of this House. The object of this resolution is to hasten the progress of the cultivation of tobacco in this country, and to develop that industry by encouraging those who are engaged in it. Now, how can we attain this object? By granting to farmers the right of cultivating tobacco without a license, to sell it in the leaf, and to give manufacturers alone the right of manufacturing it, so that they should manufacture it of such quality as to make it acceptable, not only to the market of the Province of Quebec, but also to those of other Provinces and of foreign countries. I now rise, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Government, for it certainly deserves our congratulations, for the measure that it has introduced; that measure is entirely in favor of the producer. I will tell the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) that what the producer finds a want of to-day is a market for the sale of his tobacco, and it is by decreasing the duties on the manufacture of Canadian tobacco that we shall succeed in getting this market. I have every reason to believe that the producer will be satisfied with the resolutions submitted for our consideration, and I hereby declare myself in favor of them.

Mr. LAURIER (in French). Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the Ministerial members are grateful to the Government for what one calls in English a favor. They have in turn declared their gratitude to the Government for its line of conduct in encouraging the cultivation of tobacco. There are two kinds of duty on Canadian tobacco; in the first place, a duty of four cents on rolled tobacco; that duty remains as it was; on that point the law is unchanged, and that duty will henceforth continue to be levied as in the past. Now the duty on manufactured is 14 cents. In this direction the Government grants a temporary advantage to producers; it reduces the duty to 8 cents for the next two years; then the duty will be increased to 10 cents and remain so for years to come, until it pleases the Government to alter the law, when the duty will again be 14 cents.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The law does not say that.

Mr. LAURIER. The proposed amendment says that for the two years following the passing of the Act the duty will be 8 cents per pound and for the two following years 10 cents.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The duty is 8 cents for the two first years, and then 10 cents *in deternum*.

Mr. LAURIER. The resolution does not say that, but the Government is advancing in the way of concessions, and if its partizans will but exercise a little pressure they may perhaps obtain that result. If such be the policy of the Government, it will be sufficient to alter the resolution in that sense by excising the last words of it.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Such is the policy of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to learn this, but it is not the policy expressed in the resolution. I am very glad that the Government commits venial sins only instead of mortal sins. As for me, I cannot do otherwise than give the Government credit for the good that it does, but I cannot help admitting also the harm that it does. The following is the state of affairs such as it appears to me: The duty for next year and the following one is to be 8 cents per pound, and for the following years, 10 cents per pound. My hon. friend who introduced this Bill, has been congratulated by his colleague, "because," said he, "the cultivation of tobacco is now as free as that of oats and wheat." Again am I glad to notice—and if it is true that we must give the devil his due, there is no reason why the Government should not get it—that if the Government now permits the farmer to grow tobacco without taking out a license, it will protect those who produce tobacco. But my hon. friends, the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State, are they really logical in their views? I remember that a few years ago I expressed some doubts as to the cultivation of tobacco in our Province. I thought at the time that our climate was so variable that tobacco could not be profitably cultivated. Everyone told me at the time that I was mistaken, not only then, but during one of the debates that recently took place in this House. The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) stated that the cultivation of tobacco was one of the most profitable of cultivations in the Province of Quebec; that the cultivation of tobacco was more profitable than that of wheat, and he thinks that all hon. members opposite share his views. I do not ask for anything better than to be convinced that I am mistaken. I admit that I was, and I am disposed to think that the cultivation of tobacco is among the most profitable that we have; but is the Government logical in levying an Excise duty on a cultivation which is more profitable than that of grain, which merely pays Customs' dues. I respectfully submit this action of the Government to the consideration of the Ministerial members. As they hold the opinion that cultivation of tobacco is more profitable than that of grain, is it reasonable to impose on it an Excise duty, whilst they content themselves with levying Customs on the latter? It seems to me that the conclusion is a logical one, and that if the cultivation of tobacco is as profitable as it is represented to be, more freedom should be granted to it so that it should become general throughout the country. But what is your position to-day? You say: "We have no more profitable cultivation than that of tobacco." Yet, you place in the Statute-Book a law which imposes on this cultivation a duty of 8 cents for the two first years and of 10 cents for the following ones. You have not imposed an Excise duty on grain, but merely Customs' dues. Now, if you wish to protect Canadian tobacco, you should do for tobacco what you have done for grain, viz., merely impose Customs' dues on it and leave its cultivation as free as possible.

Mr. AMYOT (in French). I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) express the opinion that the Government of this country could altogether dispense with an Excise duty on Canadian tobacco. It seems to me to be the position which the Liberal party intends to take when meeting its opponents before the electors. We know that the Liberal party when in power never afforded any protection to the cultivation of tobacco. On the other hand, we know that the Conservative party when it came to power in 1878 inaugurated a system of protection which brought money into the public Treasury, and we know that it is owing to that policy that the Government is to-day enabled to bring forward a measure which will give a real protection to the cultivation of tobacco, and that the Government can diminish its revenues by several hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Speaker, there is a fact admitted by all, and that is that in every country the first things to be taxed are the articles of luxury, such as tobacco and spirituous liquors. Why should not my hon. friend put forth as a principle before this House that since the Government is desirous of protecting breadstuffs in Canada, it should remove the duties on spirituous liquors manufactured in the country? He does not dare to go thus far, but with regard to tobacco he goes so far as to say that no duty whatever should be imposed on that product. Mr. Speaker, I lay down as a principle that tobacco and spirituous liquors are the two articles of luxury that should be the first to be taxed in any country. But there is an intelligent way of levying that tax, and the Government has followed it. It begins by saying to the growers: "I will give you every possible freedom to sell your tobacco in the leaf. I am going to rid you of that host of officers, tax-collectors and appraisers, who pursued you even into your dwellings;" and it adds: "If you wish to sell your tobacco in roll you shall pay a duty of 4 cents per lb., as you frequently conceal in it an inferior quality of tobacco. Secondly, if you wish to manufacture it you will have to pay a duty of 8 cents per lb." Now the difference between that duty of 8 cents and that of 20 cents levied on foreign tobacco establishes a sufficient protection in favor of the Canadian grower. Let us suppose that Canadian tobacco is worth 2 cents less per lb. than foreign tobacco, there will still remain a considerable margin for the protection of Canadian tobacco. I am convinced that Canadian tobacco will now be grown and be sold in large quantities in our country districts, and in a short time those who cultivate that tobacco will be able to sell it not only in the different Provinces of the Confederation, but export it to other countries. Canadian tobacco being less heavily taxed than foreign tobacco, the former is going to take the place of the latter, and instead of bringing in \$10,000 per annum to the Treasury, it will bring in ere long several hundred thousand dollars, and much of the money that was sent to the States to buy tobacco will remain at home. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we would have liked the Government to have allowed the manufacturers of foreign tobacco to manufacture Canadian tobacco in the same establishment, I must nevertheless state that several manufacturers have told me that they preferred that the two establishments should be separate, and there are consequently two opinions on the subject. The Government must necessarily adopt the safest, that by means of which the public revenue will not be defrauded. On the whole, I think the measure now proposed is most acceptable. I am of opinion that the Government has committed a bold act in depriving the Treasury of its present large revenue; but it feels itself strong because all the other departments yield considerable revenue; it does not fear the future, and it is making a supreme effort to make our opponents understand the extent of the principle of protection, and how far it is possible to go in the direction of benefitting the people, all the while holding

Mr. LAURIER:

the public Treasury intact. We are told that it is but a small boon that the Government has granted the people. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think any one will dare repeat such an utterance in presence of an audience personally interested in the present law. The grower who will no longer have to purchase a license to grow and sell tobacco will tell us that a great boon has been conferred on him; the grower who will have the manufacturer call upon him and buy all his tobacco, without his having a cent to pay before selling it, will tell us that that is another great boon. But if the boon is a small one, I will ask why did not the Liberal party grant it before to-day? The Liberals were in power for five years, and they never dreamt of granting this small boon. If it was a small one they are doubly guilty for not having granted it. The resolutions now submitted to our consideration foreshadow a Bill that will prove that the country is prosperous, and that the Government is animated with the best of intentions, and that it has a claim on the gratitude of growers, traders and manufacturers.

Mr. FISET (in French). The hon. member forgets that in 1878 we voted in an entirely opposite direction. At that time the majority of Liberal members from the Province of Quebec voted in favor of a motion asking for the total repeal of the duty on Canadian tobacco.

Mr. AMYOT. The country was not rich enough then; it was so considerably in debt that we had to wait until the state of our finances was better.

Mr. FISET. Nevertheless, several of the hon. member's friends voted with us. The motion proposed by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc) was conceived in the following terms:—

"Mr. BOLDUC, seconded by Mr. BLANCHET, proposed in amendment, that all the words after 'that' to the end of the resolution be struck out, and that the following be substituted: 'That whereas one million dollars' worth of tobacco is imported every year, and whereas that plant might be cultivated to advantage in this country, this House is of the opinion that the cultivation thereof should be encouraged by the abolition of duties on tobacco grown in Canada.'"

The following voted for that motion: Hon. Mr. Blanchet, Messrs. Bolduc, Coupal, Desjardins, Cuthbert, Langevin, Lantier and Pinsonneault; the following also voted for the same amendment: Messrs. Bourassa, Casgrain and Fiset. Thus you see, Mr. Speaker, that several of us did not hesitate to separate ourselves from the Government on that question, to vote in favor of the motion of the hon. member for Beauce. Now, it has been said that in future tobacco is to be as free of duty as grain. If it is true, there is no duty on wheat, but the farmer in the Province of Quebec, as well as in the other Provinces, pays not only no tax on his wheat, but he does not pay any tax to have it ground, and we would like to see not only that the tax on tobacco should be removed, but that the grower shall be free to sell in twist or in roll without having to pay any Excise duty. We are charged with not having abolished that tax when we were in power, but we can hurl the same argument at our opponents. In 1872, when the Conservative party was in power, that tax was in existence, and why did it not abolish it? I think we should be grateful to the Government for having assented to abolish the duty on tobacco in the leaf; but we would be still more so, had it removed it on rolled and twist tobacco.

Mr. BÉCHARD (in French). I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I merely wish to take up the words spoken about me by the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde). The hon. member stated that if our friends were in power, and that they proposed a measure similar to this one, it is probable that my attitude on the question would be a different one from that I assume to-day. I will tell my hon. friend that if he wishes to take the trouble of ascertaining what has been my conduct on that question in the past, he will see

that it was the same as to-day, even when my friends were in power. I was absent when the motion to which the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) has referred was made, but it will be seen that I myself in 1867 presented a motion for the total removal of the duty on Canadian tobacco. It will also be seen that later on I voted in favor of a similar motion brought forward by the member for Joliette (Mr. Godin); and at the last Parliament I voted for a motion of the same kind introduced by Dr. St. George, member for Portneuf.

Mr. HOUDE. The friends of the hon. member were not in power in 1867.

Mr. BÉCHARD. No; but they were in 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878, and I voted for a similar motion introduced in this Parliament when my friends were in power. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, to show that our conduct has always been in unison with the position I now take. The hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde) and the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas), as also several others who have taken a part in this debate, contend that the duty of 4 cents per lb. on the sale of tobacco in roll and in twist is advantageous to the producer, because they say that the producers who sell their tobacco in that shape introduce bad tobacco in it. In the first place, I say that this does not concern the Government. We know that the man who is known to sell a bad article will see that the price of his goods fall, and consequently it is not in the producer's interest to sell bad tobacco within a good outer leaf. On the contrary, it is his interest to sell a good article if he wishes to preserve his good name. Again, I do not see that this is in favor of the producer, for a number of them prefer making up their tobacco in rolls because they obtain a better price for it in that shape than if they sell it in the leaf; the tax on tobacco manufactured in this fashion is an obstacle to the free cultivation of tobacco. Now, we have seen by the motion read just now by the hon. member for Rimouski, and which was made in 1878 by the hon. member for Beauce, that the policy of my hon. friends representing the Province of Quebec, and who sit on the opposite side of the House, was then in accord with the opinion which I have always held on the subject, viz., they were in favor of the removal of all duties on Canadian tobacco. I regret very much that they should have changed their attitude on that question since they came to power.

Mr. BOURBEAU (in French). Mr. Speaker, when the present Government came into power, it was difficult to sell tobacco in the leaf on our market, because our growers were compelled to make up their tobacco into rolls or into twist. Now, I know by experience that growers prefer to sell their tobacco in the leaf rather than in twist or in rolls. We know that all growers are not able to prepare tobacco in that fashion, and consequently they will be glad to offer their tobacco for sale in the leaf both on the markets and in the stores. Now, the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), has said that the growers who sell good tobacco is well known as doing so. This may be true when he sells it in his parish, but when he goes to dispose of it in a parish or in a town where he is not known, how can the buyer be aware of the fact that this man is in the habit of offering a good article for sale. The buyer may be allowed to be suspicious of the honest man who will have prepared his tobacco, and thus, the man who will have acted honestly, will come to lose on the value of his tobacco, because the one who will have placed bad tobacco within a good outer leaf will destroy the buyer's confidence in tobacco thus prepared. I must consequently congratulate the Government for having introduced a measure that will tend to make roll tobacco disappear from the market. I think that we may consider that it has already disappeared. Where is to-day the grower that will roll tobacco and pay a duty of 4 cents per lb. when he can sell it in the state he grows it without

paying any tax? We know that the rolling of tobacco comes to 2 cents per lb., if we take the wages of the roller at 50 cents a day. And if we consider that the wages of the roller are \$1 a day, the rolling of tobacco will come to 4 cents per lb. Now, if we add to that a duty of 4 cents per lb. we obtain a difference of 8 cents per lb. between tobacco in the leaf and in roll. Moreover, it is easier to preserve tobacco in the leaf than in roll, as by pressing it, it is kept in better condition. Consequently—I repeat it—I congratulate the Government for having been so good as to grant us the right of selling our tobacco in the leaf without paying any duty. The difference between the duties to be paid now-a-days by the manufacturer of Canadian tobacco and those which were in force when our hon. friends opposite were in power, is a considerable one. The difference amounts to this: instead of having to pay 20 cents per lb. on tobacco in the leaf, the manufacturer will merely have 8 cents to pay, or a difference of 12 cents per lb. We have gradually diminished the duty, and we cannot doubt of the good intention of the Government for the future when the time will come to make further changes. I heard the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) state that instead of 10 cents the duty would be 14 cents in two years. It is not so, I say, for since the present Government has been in power it has always reduced the duty on tobacco, and perhaps it may reduce it to 6 cents per lb. Consequently I have full confidence in the Government—in the present Government—which is working in the interests of the farmer, and I cannot but support the present measure. I will assuredly take great pleasure in proclaiming this measure in the country districts, and I intend doing so as soon as possible, so that the farmer may prepare his hot-beds and take steps to have a good crop of Canadian tobacco this year.

Mr. RINFRET (in French). The hon. member who has just sat down has stated that the grower would be free to sell his tobacco in the leaf without paying any duty. I do not know if I understood the hon. Minister of Public Works aright, but I think that he said that the cultivation of tobacco, as far as the leaf was concerned, would be free. Will the hon. Secretary of State say if the grower will have the right to sell the leaf in open market?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. The sale of the leaf will be entirely free, and the grower may sell it in open market or wherever he pleases.

Mr. TELLIER (in French). Mr. Speaker, the policy which Government has just declared, with regard to Canadian tobacco, will be received with pleasure not only in this House, but throughout the country. The grower of tobacco will now be allowed to plant it without let or hindrance, without being compelled to take out a license, and he will be able to sell it to whomsoever he pleases without paying a cent duty. Through the proposed reduction of the duty, the manufacturer will be enabled to manufacture native tobacco, on a large scale, a thing he could not do before. The new measure which is brought before us will have the result of encouraging the culture and the manufacture of Canadian tobacco, and of doing away with the obstacles which are the feature of the law now in force. Both producer and consumer will have cause to be satisfied with the changes wrought, for the former will have a market, and will obtain a better price for his tobacco, whilst the latter will get an article of good quality on more advantageous terms. That policy will establish a protection, in the true sense of the word. It may not be out of the way to recall the policy followed in that respect by the two political parties in the country. The placing of a duty on Canadian tobacco dates from 1864. It was the Liberals who first had the idea of levying that tax; that idea was subsequently accepted and

put into execution by the Conservative party. This first tax has been increased at various times. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that by the Statute of 1870, it amounted to 15 cents per lb. on manufactured tobacco, to 7 cents per lb. on rolled tobacco, or tobacco in coils, and to 30 cents per lb. on cigars. The Canadian product was on the same footing as the foreign product. Our growers did not enjoy any protection, and the manufacturer found it more to his advantage to use foreign tobacco. The grower could not, owing to the law, sell his tobacco to any one but the manufacturers, and as they would not use it in their manufactures, there was neither market nor demand for this important agricultural product. The grower had but the resource of making his tobacco into rolls, of paying the duty, and of then selling it at a low figure. Discontent reigned among the agricultural classes, and advantage was taken thereof to stir up prejudices which tended to render any tax on Canadian tobacco odious. Who are those who stirred up these prejudices? It is the Liberals. They spread in all directions that our grower was not free to cultivate tobacco, and that that plant should be exempt of all duty. We had to struggle against these prejudices. Whilst declaring ourselves favorable to the encouragement of the cultivation of tobacco, we sought to inculcate the principle that taxes must be imposed rather on articles of luxury than on articles of necessity. The Liberals came to power in 1873, and we had a right to expect that their policy would be totally different from that of the Conservatives, and that they would remove the duties imposed on Canadian tobacco. We were mistaken, Mr. Speaker. They took up the question as early as 1874, and modified the law, but not by removing the duties, but by increasing them. We have seen these gentlemen increase the duty on manufactured tobacco from 15 to 20 cents; the duty on rolled tobacco, or on tobacco in coils, was raised from 7 to 10 cents, and on cigars to 40 cents per lb. Thus, far from encouraging the cultivation of tobacco in the country, the Liberal party checked it by considerably increasing the duties and by keeping them in force as long as they were in power. According to that law, the grower could not sell his tobacco in the leaf, and to be allowed to sell it in rolls, he was compelled to pay a tax of 10 cents per lb. That tax weighed, therefore, heavily on the cultivation of tobacco, and could but have the effect of injuring it. I have just heard the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) and the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) pride themselves on not having followed their political leaders on that question, and of having voted with the Conservatives. Those hon. gentlemen must have had very little influence with their party since they could not cause it to adopt their views; and yet they continued to support leaders, who, far from encouraging the cultivation of tobacco, placed serious obstacles in its way. The Conservative party came into power in 1878, and what did it do, Mr. Speaker? It went to work and, during the Session of 1879, reduced the duty on tobacco, in roll, to 6 cents per lb., in order to encourage its sale. The change was an advantageous one, especially to the consumer, who did not assuredly complain of it. The discontent which I spoke of a while ago, existed among the growers. He might grow tobacco on his land, but he was not allowed to dispose of his crop except to the manufacturer, and as the latter preferred using foreign tobacco, there was neither market nor demand for Canadian tobacco. Now, in 1880, the law was so altered as to give protection to the grower, and the duty, which amounted to 20 cents on each lb. of manufactured Canadian tobacco, was reduced to 14 cents, whilst the duty on foreign tobacco was left at 20 cents, thus giving the Canadian product the benefit of a 6 cents protection. The duty on rolled tobacco and tobacco in coils, which the Liberal Administration had increased to 10 cents, was

Mr. TELLIER.

reduced to 4 cents. Moreover, the duty levied on foreign tobacco used in manufacturing cigars, was raised to 40 cents per lb., whilst the duty on cigars manufactured from Canadian tobacco was reduced to 30 cents per lb.; this gave the Canadian product 10 cents per lb. protection. That protection did not bear any fruit as it was insufficient. The present Government, which is ever making progressive strides, seeks to-day to give the Canadian producer a still greater protection, and proposes to remove the obligation for the grower of taking out a license to cultivate tobacco. It wishes also to allow the sale of tobacco in the leaf, without subjecting that sale to any duty. In order to encourage the manufacture of tobacco, it announces that on manufactured Canadian tobacco the duty is to be 8 cents per lb. during the next two years, and 10 cents per lb. for the following ones, and that the duty on foreign tobacco will remain what it was before, *i.e.* 20 cents per lb., or a protection of 12 cents per lb. in favor of Canadian tobacco. There is no change on tobacco in coils. With regard to cigars, the duty on cigars manufactured from foreign tobacco is to remain at 40 cents per lb., whilst on those manufactured from Canadian tobacco, it is to be reduced to 20 cents per lb. The consequence of this change in the law will encourage the cultivation and manufacture of native tobacco. The grower will be enabled to cultivate his tobacco, and to sell it in the leaf without paying a cent of taxation and without taking out a license, and he will have a market wherein to dispose of his product. We have, therefore, every reason to be satisfied with the resolution which is now submitted to our consideration. The Government is now granting a protection which will create a demand for Canadian tobacco, which will establish a real market for our growers of tobacco, and which will cause the substitution of Canadian to foreign tobacco in our manufactures. That protection will have the result of creating in all directions manufactures of Canadian tobacco. The manufacturer will find it more to his advantage to employ Canadian than foreign tobacco. The consumers do not complain of the tax levied on tobacco, and as has been said by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot); they understand that taxes must be levied on articles of luxury rather than on the necessities of life. Now, if there is an article which does not belong to the latter category, and which can be called an article of luxury, it is assuredly tobacco. Tobacco should therefore be taxed, but in such a manner as to weigh on the consumer and not on the producer. The Government has just solved this problem; it is an improvement on the old system of taxation, and has my approval.

Mr. LANDRY (in French). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate, but I think that on this occasion where one has seen fit to refer to past documents in this House, it will not be out of the way to quote likewise some of the utterances of hon. members now in Opposition, who, when they were in power, held views diametrically opposed to those they hold to-day. The hon. member who has just sat down fully agrees with the remarks made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), and both are of opinion that if there is an article of luxury it is tobacco; that if there is an article that should be taxed, it is tobacco, and those two gentlemen are not alone of that opinion. If we look at the debates of the House of Commons, for the year 1878, we find the following words spoken by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier):

"And more than this, as the hon. member for Beauce had stated, if there was an article which ought to be taxed, it was tobacco."

And in those days the hon. member occupied a prominent position on the Treasury benches. And he adds:

"No one could to-day, in a civilized country, pretend that tobacco ought to be exempt from taxation; and it was above all an article on which, by every Government, revenue ought to be raised. At the present time * * * * *"

He fondly returns to that expression :

"There was no civilized country which would venture to remove this Excise duty and make tobacco free from duty. Spirits and tobacco were always articles on which all civilized Governments raised a part of their ordinary revenue."

Thus you see, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the name of civilization; it is in the name of the brightest light that shines upon the nineteenth century that the hon. member for Quebec East, *ex officio*, speaking as a Minister, comes and says that there is not a civilized country in the world which would take upon itself to remove the duty on tobacco. Such is one of the reasons he gave at the time, and later on he added :

"In the second place, it is impossible to levy a duty on foreign tobacco, without levying the same on Canadian tobacco. If the duty were removed from native tobacco, the effect would be to destroy entirely the revenue obtained from this source. I am of opinion that tobacco is one of these articles on which a duty should be levied, and consequently it would be an erroneous and ruinous policy with regard to the revenue to remove that duty."

Such were, Mr. Speaker, the ideas given utterance to by the hon. member for Quebec East when he was in power. It was in those days that the hon. member for Beauce introduced the motion spoken of by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset). The highest praise than can be awarded to that motion, the best testimony in its favor, are contained in the speech which the hon. gentleman made just now. He stated that he had himself voted in favor of that motion. If the measure was a good one at that time, the vote of the hon. member for Rimouski was a good one, but to-day, he does not dare say whether that vote was a good or a bad one. He commenced by reading the various names at the foot of the motion, but when he reached his own name, he stopped. We merely heard, as a feeble echo, the name of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain). The hon. member proves that at the time the hon. member was in power, we asked without being able to obtain anything. The past is thus clearly defined, and we can now see the difference between the two parties. In those days, hon. members opposite could not obtain anything from their hon. leaders; to-day, we make ourselves the echo of the popular wish, at a time when prosperity has returned to the country, at a time when the Treasury is overflowing, so to speak, and we ask in our turn, and what is the result? We succeed. Mr. Speaker, since we are now exposing the hidden relics of the past, it is also well that we should know what is the sentiment on that question, I do not say of the chief of the French section of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, but of the would-be leader, the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain). This is what he said then :

"Nevertheless, the people complain of the tax which is imposed on native tobacco. I think it would be a very difficult matter to remove this tax, though it contributes very little to the revenue; perhaps, the duty paid on home-grown tobacco does not even pay the cost of collection, but this does not imply that it ought to be entirely removed. I believe that the time will arrive"

As early as those days, the hon. member expressed his prophetic views. As early as that he lifted a corner of the veil which hid out the future, and he saw the new Government take the place of the one he was supporting, and acceding to the popular wish, grant what it asked for in those days :

" I think that the time will come when it will be possible to somewhat reduce the duty on Canadian tobacco and slightly increase it on foreign tobacco."

In those days, the hon. member declared himself in favor of protection because we had not got it. I think that to-day his sentiments must be the same. I think that his silence, when so important a question is being discussed in the House, when it is his interest to let the country know his views on the subject, is a golden, an approving silence; it is the approval of the measure introduced by the Government. What else have we seen since that question was submitted

to our consideration? We have seen hon. members of the Opposition rise in turn and say that the measure satisfied them. It is a measure which they are glad to see pass into law. They are glad to see that the Conservative party is able to carry out its ideas. Mr. Speaker, I can understand their joy. I can understand their gladness. As was shown to us by the hon. member for Iberville, the only grief which he feels, is that from a political point of view, we may derive some advantage from this measure; but I know that hon. gentlemen love their country too much, they are too fond of their Province, to allow such a consideration to prevail and to prevent them from uniting with us to congratulate the Government and to approve the policy which it submits to-day to the country.

Mr. BÉCHARD. And to render the measure more complete.

Mr. LANDRY. I do not know if that expression means that there is something supplementary or complimentary needed; but such as the measure stands, if it is not complete, at least I consider it entire. At that time, in 1878, the hon. gentleman for L'Islet added :

"The present duties on Canadian tobacco are not too high."

Such was his utterance, and yet every one knows that the duty on Canadian tobacco was 10 cents higher than the duty of 11 cents now proposed. Well, if that duty was not too high then, I understand that the hon. member cannot find it too high now; this quite explains to me his joy, and I can understand that it chokes him and prevents him from speaking. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that at this phase of the discussion, this measure produces on the two hon. members of the Opposition, who have ever sought to throw obstacles in the way of measures introduced by the Government, the effect produced on the body by a balm which is not the good Samaritan, and which goes by the name of St. Jacob's Oil. I will close with these few remarks, as I see that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) is burning with desire to speak on this subject; I see that he has the intention of supporting the Government, and as this measure is meeting with the approval of all the hon. members of the Opposition, I wish to give him the opportunity of telling the country and the House the views he holds on the subject.

Mr. RINFRET. I have but a word to say to the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry). The hon. member has quoted a speech delivered on Canadian tobacco, in 1878, by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). That quotation had already been made by hon. members on the opposite side of the House who have spoken on the subject. I regret that they should not have taken the trouble to look a few pages further and to read the speech delivered at that time by their leader, the hon. Minister of Public Works, by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and by others. They would have seen that in those days these gentlemen spoke in favor of the motion of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc), and that they asked for the total removal of all duties on Canadian tobacco. But those hon. gentlemen asked for the repeal of that tax when it was well known that the Liberal party, then in power, was suffering from a deficit in the Treasury, and that consequently it was impossible to grant their request as the revenue was insufficient, and that the repeal of that tax would have deprived the Treasury of a revenue of \$500,000 or \$600,000 per annum, according to the calculations of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot); but now that the Treasury is full to overflowing, I think that it is the proper time to repeal that duty. The demand made in those days was not a reasonable one, as hon. members must have understood that the Mackenzie Administration could not grant. But they were sincere when they preferred it, and when, during the last elections, they promised

on the hustings to repeal the duty on Canadian tobacco, they will never have a better opportunity than the one they have to-day of demonstrating their sincerity, as to have a surplus of several millions in the public Treasury. The hon. member for Montmagny has remarked that we are pleased with the concessions made by the Government. It is true, as I have said already, that the Government has made a step in the right direction, but I think that it has not sufficiently protected Canadian tobacco to permit of its being manufactured with advantage in the country. In order that tobacco should be really protected, the duty should be reduced another few cents; if the duty is left at 8 cents on manufactured tobacco, it will certainly not be sufficient protection, and I think that, to give real protection, the duty on manufactured tobacco should be 4 or 5 cents only.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MOUSSEAU (in French). The policy of the Government, on the question now under consideration, has been to give the farmer all the possible protection on the cultivation of tobacco. Our efforts in that direction have been crowned with success, and it is with pleasure that I have seen our friends, and even our opponents, recognize the wisdom of the legislation inaugurated by the Government. Recently, in a debate that has remained memorable, the hon. leader of the Government had occasion to say that we were not like the Bourbons; that we Conservatives could learn something, and also forget something. It is for that reason that we have listened with so much pleasure to the requests of our friends, and that we have acceded to them. There is also, Mr. Speaker, a better and higher reason, that has induced us to adopt that legislation. It is because we understand exactly our mission as Ministers. We are not in office to govern the Dominion in the interests of the Ministers, but to govern it in the interests of the people, in the interests of the Dominion represented in this House by its members. We Ministers are but a large Joint Committee of the House and of the Senate; a Parliamentary Committee, wherein the two branches of the Legislature are represented by Ministers from the Senate, and Ministers of the House of Commons. We deem it an honor to give an ear to the just demands of our friends, because our friends who sit in this House represent the interests of the Dominion, and when we submit to their demands, we are not showing weakness, but we are following a wise policy. Mr. Speaker, when the sitting was suspended at six o'clock, I was desirous of continuing the debate, not to enjoy the childish satisfaction of making a speech, I have no speech to make, but I wished to lay before the House a few facts that will show that the people approve of the proposed changes with the same gratitude as do hon. members of this House. I have also to note a curious fact in the shape of private letters, which I desire to make public, because they bear on public interests. One day, a friend of mine, a Conservative elector of the Province of Quebec, wrote me a letter precisely on the subject of that light duty of 4 cents per lb. levied on manufactured tobacco. Impelled rather by party interests than by those of the cause, he thought he was giving me wise advice. This is what he wrote:

"SIR.—A number of Conservatives of St. Hugues called upon me yesterday, Sunday, to ask me to write to you with regard to the tax on tobacco grown and sold by farmers in the country districts, and to beg you to use your influence to cause this wretched tax to be repealed. The public returns show a revenue of \$7,000 derived from that tax on tobacco, and it costs some thousands to collect it. It is absurd: and, moreover, the repeal of that tax would be most popular. The Government would show an act of cleverness and would show a great deal of tact, under the present circumstances, if it removed that duty from the shoulders of the *habitant* who grows tobacco, whilst maintaining the tax on tobacco imported and manufactured in the country. You have a few millions of a surplus, now is the time for the Conservative Government to take

Mr. RINFRET.

advantage of its splendid position to prepare the impending elections. The repeal of that tax would have a magical effect on the mind of the country population, and would prepare public opinion for a glorious triumph for the Government, at the inauguration of the coming campaign * * *."

Several hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Such is exactly the object of that letter. It is a frank one and expresses exactly the thoughts of my friend. When the House will have heard the reply I sent to that letter, I hope that my hon. friends opposite will continue to say: hear, hear.

" * * * The farmers detest that tax, all the more so that it does not yield any profit. It is a nuisance to everybody, and it is not wise of the Government to keep it in force. Had the administration of the Government not been more fortunate in other directions in its collection of taxes, we should not have the pleasure of seeing a surplus this year. If you wish to receive formal petitions let me know, I can procure them."

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. Thus did an elector of the Province of Quebec write to me. And this is how, rising above party considerations to consult public interests alone, I answered his letter:

"I received last night your letter of the 27th February. You are entirely mistaken on the question of Canadian tobacco, and let me tell you so frankly; should I convince you of the fact, I hope that you will take the necessary steps among my friends to correct the error into which they have fallen. Let us take as a point of departure two well established facts:

"1. We import from abroad several millions of dollars worth of tobacco.

"2. The result of investigation shows that Canada can produce excellent tobacco which can compete with foreign tobacco, and which consequently will keep in the country the millions which we send abroad.

"You will admit a third and equally important fact: tobacco is essentially an article of luxury, real smoke in fact. At all events, it is an article of utility to the grower, since the law exempts his own provision of it from duty. A fourth and well established fact can also be admitted. Generally speaking, our Canadians manufacture bad tobacco, and thus its fame is so much damaged by bad cultivation that many manufacturers will not handle it. With these premises, my dear Doctor, you have all the policy of the Government, which follows therefrom as a matter of course. We do not at present require the tax on Canadian tobacco to keep the Government in existence; you are perfectly right in that respect, but we require to watch tobacco, to be cognizant of its quantity and quality, and especially to direct the fiscal policy of the country so that producers accustom themselves to take their tobacco to manufacturers and have it manufactured into smoking and chewing tobacco and into cigars. By that means will Canadian tobacco take the place of foreign tobacco; hence the necessity of our inspection laws, and of the insignificant tax which we have imposed, and which will, I feel sure, be looked upon favorably by the whole people and especially by the growers of tobacco if the intention of the Government is made known and explained to them."

"Mr. Aikins, the Minister of Inland Revenue, said to me last week: 'Mr. Mousseau, I can assure you that the experiment has now been made, and that the growers of Lower Canada produce tobacco that is equal to the best that is imported.' Now, why should we take abroad, every year, millions of dollars, which we might keep here, when it is an established fact, as has been shown, especially in the counties of Montcalm and Joliette, that fine and good tobacco can be grown, and that its cultivation is extremely profitable, more so than any kind of culture in the country. It is with the object of inducing growers to sell their tobacco in the leaf to manufacturers or to their licensed agents that we have this year reduced the duty on manufactured tobacco from 14 cents to 8 cents for two years, and to 10 cents afterwards, and that we have likewise reduced the tax on cigars made from Canadian tobacco from 80 to 18 cents. This reduction creates between foreign and native tobacco so wide a margin that several manufacturers have thanked the Government for it, and are preparing to manufacture Canadian tobacco on a large scale, thus establishing a real market for our producers, and which will gradually bring about the substitution of Canadian for foreign tobacco. Thus we can overlook the small inconvenience of this insignificant tax when one obtains so grand a result. Ten years ago the county of Montcalm was overburdened with mortgages; the farmers took to growing tobacco (it is common enough to find among them some who produce from 15,000 to 20,000 lbs. per year; others 40,000 lbs. and some even 50,000 lbs.), and to-day that county is one of the richest in Lower Canada. I hold this information from Mr. Dugas himself, the intelligent member for Montcalm, who approves in every respect the fiscal policy of the Government in this direction; but yesterday he was telling us that the farmers would be furious to see that duty on tobacco repealed, because it affords protection to those who cultivate carefully. With regard to the duty of 4 cents on roll, twist, &c., manufactured by the *habitants* themselves, it will disappear as soon as there will be sufficient manufactures to establish a competition on the market, and a more profitable sale for leaf tobacco, which will take one or two years, perhaps three. The tax will then be completely repealed and the law

will prevent the producer from selling roll, twist, &c. You know as well as I do, that this roll, twist, &c., are the real cause of the disfavor which Canadian tobacco meets with, because many of our growers sell cabbage leaf or musty tobacco enveloped in a fine yellow leaf, as good quality tobacco; thus do they lower the price and harm the production of the good Canadian tobacco. I hope that you will be satisfied with all these explanations, and that, as I feel sure you will, you will share my opinion."

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the whole policy of the Government, viz., to obtain the object of causing our tobacco to be better prepared and to take the place of the tobacco which we imported in large quantities from abroad. After having received my explanations, my friend became of the opinion of this House, and thanked me in the following terms for what the Government has done. I skip the first part, which flatters me too much. My hon. friend the member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) will see that my friend, that that elector, is as wise as he is, and that he has come over to the policy of the Government, which Government, according to the confession of one of his own leaders, has, during the whole of its existence, committed several sins, which is saying a good deal:—

"SIR,—You are the right kind of Minister, you, who as a Judge would say, have taken the trouble of sending me almost a factum, in order to give information to your constituents, and that during the time the House is in Session. Were I in the House, I would not fail to tell your colleagues that you are a model politician. If ever, as I still hope you will, although you are now far away from us, you come back to St. Hugues, I trust that all my friends who grow tobacco will present you with a fine roll of Canadian tobacco, as a proof that with you we appreciate the duty which the Government has imposed on the production of that article in the country. You have made us understand, that on looking at the question from a different point of view, that the tax is not an absurdity, as I stated in my first letter to you, but that it will, on the contrary, bring about the good results which you anticipate for the future. The only thing that I would ask you to do; would be to get some friend to make a motion in the House in favor of the removal of the tax, so as to enable you or some one else to make the explanations which you have done me the honor of transmitting to me in your letter of the 1st March inst. These explanations would be reported by the papers and every one would at once see the object of the tax. I do not pretend to give you any advice, I merely wish to tell you that it would be the best way of thoroughly enlightening our population on the subject, without being compelled to repeat these explanations to all those who approach you on the subject. However, do as you see fit. Sugaring has begun in our woods since yesterday, a month earlier than customary. Were it not that the House is sitting, I would ask you to come and see us and eat some maple sugar, and smoke some good tobacco that has not paid any duty yet."

I am glad to be able to read this letter. I do not do so to glorify myself, nor for an electoral purpose. I do not know when the elections are coming off, although our opponents know it better than we do, but I do so to establish the fact that the best friends of the party and the country are in perfect unison with the House, as we have seen this evening from the speeches delivered by the hon. members for Quebec East, Iberville, Rimouski, St. Hyacinthe, Bellechasse, Montmagny and others.

Mr. CASGRAIN (in French). The hon. Secretary of State has been good enough to read us the letter we have just heard. I asked him to be good enough to give me its date.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I feel too much friendship and esteem towards my hon. friend not to gratify his legitimate curiosity. The first letter is dated the 27th February, last; the date of my answer is the 1st March, and the date of his approval, March 4th.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to have those dates. They show to what extent my hon. friend the Secretary of State is consistent with himself. He goes as far as to take the trouble of writing a factum to one of his electors to prove that this tax on tobacco is useful, necessary, indispensable, and he so succeeds in convincing him that he receives a letter approving of his factum. But now he shifts round and changes entirely the policy of the Government which is considered to-day to be an important question. If that is the approval which that complacent elector grants to the policy of my hon. friend, I cannot pay him the same compliment. Mr. Speaker, the position

which I have taken on that tobacco question is the same to-day as that which I have ever held. I have always held that that tax, from the time that it was established by the Conservative Government in 1868, was a wretched tax, as was said by the elector of the hon. Minister, rather noxious than useful, and the collection of which has cost more than it was worth. I still hold the same views to-day, and I am ready to support a motion in the terms of the one introduced in 1878, by my hon. friend the member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc). Now, it may be said that tobacco should be looked upon as an article of luxury, but the habitant does not look upon it as a luxury, but rather as a necessary. Smokers in the country who are deprived of a number of things enjoyed by town folks, really enjoy smoking their tobacco whatever its quality, so that one cannot really say it is a luxury. I can understand that it should be considered a luxury for the well-to-do class which wishes to get finer tobaccos, and I am not opposed to the increasing the duty on imported tobacco; but since the Government goes back on the attitude it assumed in 1878, why not make the tobacco trade as free as that of groceries and breadstuffs? If it is, as certain members contend, an agricultural resource equal to the cultivation of the best grains in the country, why not make it entirely free for purposes of trade and manufacture? If hon. Ministers wish to be consistent in their system of protection, they should prevent the importing into this country of foreign tobacco, and content themselves with seeing native tobacco grown here. That would be the natural consequence of their so called policy of Protection. Now, I consider that Canadian tobaccos can and should be cultivated to advantage in the country. I will not go so far as to say that one might succeed in producing a tobacco equal to or of superior quality to that produced in more temperate climes; it would be asking for more than nature will ever grant us; but we can produce a quality of tobacco that will meet the requirements of the agricultural community. As to producing a tobacco that can be sent abroad, I do not think that we can do so for some time to come, because the climate does not permit it, and moreover the preparation of tobacco is almost unknown in this country. Under those circumstances, I am prepared to support a measure tending towards the complete repeal of all restriction on the cultivation and sale of Canadian tobacco. Now, I will leave the hon. Secretary of State to his change of policy, and I am very glad to hear him say that he serves his country rather than his private interests, and I hope he will continue to follow that line of conduct.

Mr. BOLDUC (in French). Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Government upon the policy which it has adopted with regard to Canadian tobacco. In 1878, I took up that question. I introduced a motion asking that the sale of leaf tobacco should be free. The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) has made comments on that motion, and has stated that the Government did not grant all that I asked for. I think the hon. member did not read the whole of the motion I made at that time, or he would have seen that I was merely asking for the free sale of leaf tobacco, and not that manufactured tobacco should be free of duty. Mr. Speaker, the Government is granting us, to-day, all that we asked for in those days. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) has just reminded us that he was always in favor of the complete abolition of duties on Canadian tobacco. If I remember aright, the hon. member voted for my motion in 1878, but before recording his vote, he spoke for an hour or an hour and a half to prove that he was called upon to give a vote contrary to his personal opinion and merely to please his electors. Such was the position assumed by the hon. member in 1878, but instead of congratulating the Government this evening for having adopted the principle he supported then, he can do no better than blame it.

The Government has done well, and has gained public approval in allowing the grower to cultivate his tobacco freely, without being compelled to take out a license, and to be able to sell it to whomsoever he pleases without paying a cent of duty. But if the grower wishes to do as the manufacturer does, then he must submit to the duty of 4 cents imposed on the preparation of tobacco. Once more do I congratulate the Government, and I am convinced that the measure now submitted to us will meet with the approval of all the electors of the Dominion.

Mr. LANDRY (in French). Previous to the Committee rising, I think it important to take up a remark that has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain). He is evidently under a misapprehension. He says that the Canadian grower would like to see his tobacco completely free of duty. But the hon. member ought to know that the Canadian grower does not pay a cent of duty on the tobacco which he grows; the Treasury does not derive a cent from the cultivation of that tobacco. Consequently when the hon. member comes and makes a display of his superabundant love for the Canadian grower, I think that he is speaking without cause, and the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Bolduc) was quite right in saying just now, that when he made his motion in 1878 the hon. member for L'Islet had made a speech in favor of the Government of the day, and that he ended in voting against his own speech. I should not be surprised to see him do the same thing this evening. I should not be surprised to see him support in his speech the motion introduced by the hon. the Secretary of State and to vote against it when we go into concurrence. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that we may dispel these fears, for the hon. member, who is in awe of his electors, will set aside what he believes to be the interest of the country to save his own. I hope that in this case his own interest will compel him to vote for him in the general interest, if he does not think the two incompatible: he may fall into that error, and he will be perfectly justified in doing so.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MOUSSEAU, in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 123) to amend "The Inland Revenue Act, 1880, and for other purposes," said: In the few remarks which I have made on the resolutions which have received the sanction of the House, I dealt with the objects of this Bill. It provides for the removal of some of the duties on Canadian tobacco, and the modification of others. The Bill also provides distinctly that the producer of this tobacco may raise and sell it without paying any tax or inspection dues in the market or elsewhere. A great many of the provisions apply to matters of minor importance which I can explain on the second reading.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to call the attention of the Government to this matter: I have on the paper a Bill, which I consider in the public interest, and I think also in the interests of the Government and all their employes—the Bill for the prevention of frauds in contracts involving the expenditure of public money. So far as I can see this Bill cannot be reached at this stage of the Session. The hon. Minister of Public Works, when I proposed the second reading, gave as a reason for delay the fact that the English Parliament

Mr. BOLDUC.

were considering a measure to the same effect, and that he was awaiting the result in order to judge what should be done with my Bill. I will give him credit for being sincere, but it is with the greatest effort that I make that admission. I would like to ask the Government if it is possible this Bill can be passed this Session? If not I will adopt some means of ascertaining the opinion of the House on the subject, in order to see whether the Government has decided that the end of the Session is to prevent the passing of this measure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I told the hon. gentleman I would give him the opportunity he seeks, and I will. House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

9. Indian Affairs..... \$23,315

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The difference between the estimates for 1881-82 and for 1882-83, is \$4,215, which is made up thus: A statutory increase to the amount of \$500 The Indian Office, which has been so long in Toronto, is to be removed to Ottawa, there being no necessity for keeping up a separate staff at Toronto. Mr. Plummer, who is at the head of the office, and whose salary is \$1,800, and Mr. Dalton, whose salary is \$1,100, will therefore be brought to Ottawa. Those amounts, with Mr. Cuttler's salary of \$750, make a total of \$3,650 which, with another small item, gives the aggregate of \$4,215.

173. To meet expenses connected with the consolidation of the Dominion Statutes..... \$ 6,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Commissioner is to get \$4,000, the secretary \$1,000, and the balance will cover printing, stationery, &c. The hon. gentleman asked for some statement as regards the progress made in the collation of statutes. The following letter is from the Commissioner:

"OTTAWA, 1st May, 1882.

"To the Honorable
The Minister of Justice of Canada.

"Sir,—In compliance with your request, I have the honor, as Commissioner appointed under a Commission, dated 15th November last, in connection with the proposed revision and consolidation of the Statutes of Canada, to report as follows:

"1. I have, in pursuance of the said Commission, continued and completed, to the present time, the Schedules (referred to in the Commission) of Acts requiring examination for the purposes of the said revision and consolidation.

"2. I have examined the Statutes, passed by the Parliament of Canada, since the first day of July, 1867, and have collected therefrom such of them as are still in force, and incidentally thereto, have noted the enactments of the old Provincial Statutes, which have been repealed or amended by the Statutes of Canada.

"3. I have also, pursuant to instructions received from you, in that behalf, proceeded with the examination, collection and classification of all unrepealed enactments of the Parliament of Canada and of the several Provinces coming under the general subject of Criminal Law, and I have made considerable progress with this branch of the work.

"Before receiving the instructions last referred to, I had made some progress with the collection and classification of the unrepealed Statutes of Canada and of the several Provinces with reference to other subjects of legislation, but upon receiving said instructions, I confined my attention to the subject of Criminal Law only, and am still engaged thereupon.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"JAMES COCKBURN,
"Commissioner.

"ALEXANDER FERGUSON,
"Secretary."

Mr. BLAKE. Was it not the intention to enlarge the Commission and employ other persons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman proposes to enlarge the Commission, does he intend asking for another vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is proposed to have another Commissioner act with the present Commissioner during the preliminary work before the work of consolida-

tion commences. Then another Commissioner from Quebec will be added. We do not ask for another vote, because we will ask next Session for that vote if the present scheme is carried.

Mr. BLAKE. A great deal of the preliminary work to which the hon. gentleman refers was done some years ago, and it is a great pity it should be done over again. It seems to me we ought not to ignore the work done by Mr. Langton in the consolidation of the Ontario Statutes, which necessarily involved a consideration of the whole question. The consolidation was not merely a consolidation of the Statutes of Ontario but of the Statutes of old Canada so far as they fell within the limits of the legislative system of that Province. Will the hon. gentleman state about how long the Commission is to sit, and when we may expect some fruit of its labors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to answer that. I have no doubt the Commissioners are making all possible progress. I should think it might take another season to do the work. I can perhaps speak more confidently on Concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is the secretary to whom the money is to be paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Ferguson, barrister-at-law, Ottawa.

202. In connection with Penitentiaries, John Cooper, late Chief Keeper of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary \$366.20

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At the time Mr. Cooper was transferred from Kingston to St. Vincent de Paul, the Board of Directors agreed that he should have a dwelling-house rent free. Notwithstanding this agreement, he was compelled to pay rent for a certain time, and this is to reimburse him.

209. To cover the amount awarded by the arbitrators appointed pursuant to the Order in Council of 24th May, 1881, to adjudicate on the claim of S. T. Drennan for loss sustained by him for the non-fulfilment of a contract made with the Warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, together with the expense of the defence and the fees of the arbitrators... \$10,668

Mr. BLAKE. I think some information is required with reference to this item. I have an indistinct recollection of a very ancient claim of Mr. Drennan's, which had been for a long time in the pigeon holes of the Department of Justice when I was there. If I rightly remember, some disposition was made of it, and I hope the hon. gentleman will have the papers looked up and brought down before Concurrence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know something of the claim. The arbitrators were Judge Clarke, Mr. Wm. Hartney, of Kingston, and Mr. McInnis. They were a special board of arbitrators. There were two claims pending in connection with the fire in the Penitentiary many years ago. One was by a Mr. Evans, who had a contract for iron ware of some kind. That was left to the arbitration of the late Justice Burroughs, County Judge, who awarded a certain sum of money in favor of Mr. Evans. Mr. Drennan had the furniture contract which was swept away by the fire. His claim was so excessive that I would not look at it until it was reduced to reasonable dimensions. I suppose the same thing occurred in the hon. gentleman's time. Latterly Mr. Drennan thought it prudent to reduce his claim to reasonable terms, and thereupon a special arbitration was allowed as in the Evans case, and this award is the consequence.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman bring down a memorandum, before Concurrence, of the case, showing the

dates and the decisions of previous Ministers upon the subject, and how it came to be investigated so late as the 10th of May, 1881?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring it down.

211. For difference of salary payable to H. B. Mackay, acting Warden of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, from 21st June, 1880, to 24th January, 1881, at \$98 per month, and for salary for November and December, 1881, as acting Warden, at \$212.33 per month \$1,121.20

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the 21st of June, 1880, the then warden of St. Vincent de Paul was given leave of absence pending the investigation of the charges made against him, and Mr. Mackay, the deputy warden, was appointed acting warden, and continued to act in both capacities until the 24th June, 1881, when, upon the warden's dismissal, he was appointed acting warden, at a warden's salary. It was thought only fair that he should be paid the regular warden's salary, inasmuch as during that time he had the whole responsibility of the management of the Penitentiary, in fact did double work. M. Lavolette, the present warden, was appointed in November last, from which time his salary dated. Mr. Mackay was sent by the hon. Minister of Justice to Manitoba Penitentiary where he served two months, the warden being sent to St. Vincent de Paul. \$264 is the balance due for travelling expenses on that occasion.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not know anything of the gentleman, and I dare say he is an efficient officer, but I observe in several newspapers reports as to state of discipline in that penitentiary, and in particular I saw a statement made the other day that when Mr. Bedson, the warden of the Manitoba Penitentiary, took charge there he caused an examination to be made of the prisoners, and quite a large number of deadly weapons were found upon them. I should like to know from the Minister whether such was the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is some truth in the statement, but it is greatly exaggerated. No doubt a bad state of discipline prevailed. Mr. Bedson was sent down as an officer free from influences of any kind, to introduce a better system. He made a search and found some concealed weapons among the convicts. That, however, cannot always be avoided. In times past the warden of Kingston Penitentiary has occasionally, owing to cunning and secrecy of the convicts, been unable to prevent them from secreting weapons or iron that can be made into weapons, and that cannot be altogether prevented. I am afraid there was laxity in the general management at that time. Mr. Bedson introduced a new system, and I believe Mr. Lavolette is carrying out that system successfully, and complaints which have existed for some years will no longer be heard.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether the buildings are thoroughly completed, all the cells in proper order, and the stone wall which was intended to surround the building is properly built, and the convicts in a state of proper discipline?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The buildings and walls are not completed. Lately we built a large wing which will give 110 or 120 new cells. That has been completed and is, no doubt by this time, occupied. We are going on with other buildings. There is now a large dining-room being built. The walls are not completed; they are going up by degrees and the work is being executed by convicts. It is well known that convicts will not work with the same energy as men who are paid so much per day. We give them proper material, and indeed the

stone is of the best quality quarried in the neighborhood, and the work is of the most substantial character. The visit of Mr. Bedson had a good effect in re-establishing discipline, and the new warden who went to Kingston for several months and made himself acquainted with the discipline there, and the benefit of Mr. Benson's experience, has taken the matter in hand and has succeeded very well. The Government ask a small sum of money to put iron gratings or wires on the lower openings of the jail, because it was thought some of the weapons must have been handed in to the convicts through those apertures. No doubt when this work has been done and the walls completed we shall be able to do without so many jailors.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is there any truth in the reports that three or four convicts have lately escaped?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position now to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It appears that two or three more convicts have managed to escape, and that one or two have been captured.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know; but escapes will occur occasionally. At Kingston, where the discipline is very good and the arrangements very complete, a couple of men happened to escape some time ago, but they were captured and brought back.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Under the former warden the establishment was better managed than it has been ever since. I do not think the change has been at all for the better. On the contrary, it appears from public reports and from other information, that since Mr. Desaulniers has left, the establishment has not been equal to the wants of the public.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would not like to enter into any comparison between Mr. Desaulniers and his successor. I have no doubt he did his best as well as the gentleman who is now in charge as warden, but I think mistakes were made in his *regime* as well as in others. The hon. gentleman must see that the enclosure is not a proper one, and that there is always a temptation to convicts to escape. When, however, it is completed there will be less trouble of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I notice that there appears to be two items in the Estimates for the same service, one of \$1,200, which we are now considering, and the other of \$264.95, for the same purpose in another item. There must be some mistake. I objected last night to this sum of \$1,200, thinking it a very large one, but the total amount seems to be \$1,464.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When we come to Concurrence I will be able to say whether there has been any mistake.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not forget.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will not be forgotten.

280. To cover expenditure incurred in providing supplies to destitute Indians, Manitoba, and North West Territories... \$327,139 47

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This sum includes two Governor General's warrants and important expenditures which were absolutely necessary to prevent the Indians from starving. The first was altogether for destitute Indians, \$147,789; the next was \$197,350. Some of this was caused by a short estimate, and the other amounts are as follows: Dues unpaid, \$20,072; cattle under treaty, \$8,440; seed grain under treaty, \$16,000; provisions during payment, \$24,000; provisions for destitute Indians, \$70,000; clothing, \$156; farm instructors, wages and expenses, \$12,000; for ordinary general expenses, \$25,000; grist mill, \$2,000. With respect to the grist mill, I may say that it

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

has been sold for \$10,000, half of which has been paid and the other half has been secured by mortgage. The sums make up the balance.

Mr. MILLS. In order to vote intelligently on this subject, the hon. gentleman should have brought down a statement of the products of these farms, and the manner in which they have been consumed. I mentioned the other evening when the Estimates were under consideration, that our Indian expenditure, if those farms were at all moderately productive, was much larger than the Estimates indicated, because we have no report of the products of those farms, their value, or the manner in which they are used. The sum which the hon. gentleman now asks is a large one, and unless the country has been wholly misrepresented, unless it is not productive, unless the crops are subject to be destroyed by frosts, we should have, now that we have tried the experiment four years, some report showing what the productions are and how they have been used. It would have been well to have had a statement showing where these expenditures have taken place. There are bands of Indians scattered over the whole of the North-West Territories; which of the bands is so destitute that this large sum is now asked, or does the destitution extend to all the bands? If the voting of supplies of this sort is not to be a farce, it is necessary that the hon. gentleman should give to the House the information we are seeking. In addition to the large sums already voted, we have an estimate here for the purchase of agricultural implements for the Indians. Before I retired from office, I think, all our obligations in this respect were met, except in Treaty No. 6. I do not say that it is improper, if the Indians show a disposition to turn to farming, that we should supply them with additional agricultural implements, and if we are sure that they will make use of them for the purpose for which they are given; but, so far as I can learn, in a great many instances that is not done. The oxen we give them are sometimes consumed for beef, and the agricultural implements are sometimes sold to the white population for a mere trifle, and, I think, in some instances they have never reached their destination. It is perfectly obvious, from the various estimates brought down, that the Indians of the North-West are costing us to-day, in the matter of food, upwards of \$100 per family. These Indians are being pensioned on the public Treasury; instead of being taught habits of self reliance, they are being taught habits of dependence, and, at this hour, they are more dependent on the Government for their means of subsistence than they have been at any former period. Before the hon. gentleman asks for the concurrence of the House in this appropriation, I think he should be prepared to give us the fullest information on all these points.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I observe an item here of \$24,000 for provisions during the payment of the Indians. That is surely a perfectly monstrous expenditure, and I should like to know what necessity there is for it. I am quite aware that for years this expenditure has been going on more or less, but it is a practice that the Government should put a stop to. Surely it can be arranged that the payment shall be made promptly, without keeping tribes of Indians in one place for days.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For some years back the Indians have been allowed to collect together in large bands when being paid, and it became a time-honored custom to feed them while they were waiting, and I suppose they gorged themselves when they had the chance. The only way to correct that is to pay them on their reserves. The Indians are settling fast on their reserves—much faster than I anticipated they would. The agents are now instructed to allow no band of Indians who have settled on a reserve to go to any other place for payment. Some nomadic Indians still assemble at some central point, but I

hope that in a year or two this charge will disappear altogether. I am happy to inform the Committee that the Indians are now away from the frontier altogether, except an Indian called Big Bear, and his people, who are still on the American side, but they are expected to cross the border shortly eight or nine hundred strong. With the exception of that band, we hope to have all the Indians moved away north, so that they will no longer be able to assemble in the neighborhood of Fort Walsh, Wood Mountains, Cypress Hills, or Qu'Appelle, and they will all be paid on their reserves. Those Indians come back always in a very destitute condition, half the horses are sold or traded away, and they are often short of clothing, so that there will be some expense in moving them away towards their reserves. But I hope we shall get them all on the reserves. As soon as they will be, every band will be paid on its own reserve, when this charge I hope will fade away or, nearly disappear. Of course, there is some disappointment in managing the Indians. We cannot be sure of success with the best and most anxious exertions. The report of the Indian Commissioner states generally the products of the farms. Some of the crops were hurt by the early frosts last year, and bands of Indians went away to hunt on the first information of the buffalo crossing the line. Still we hope to have them settled, and the Indian Commissioners speak very hopefully indeed of the progress that will be made, and of the number of acres that will be cultivated next year. The hon. member for Bothwell said that the Indians are being rendered more dependent than self-supporting. There is no use in putting Indians on a reserve to teach each other agriculture. There must be Government instructors, and all but two or three of them have proved successful. I think the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the agricultural implements not reaching the Indians. There may have been some cases of failure for want of transport, which is sometimes difficult to obtain in that country. We hope, however, in another year there will be a railway and other facilities to overcome the difficulties and enormous expense of transport. The whole matter is an anxious one. We are quite in a transition state, and only by patience and perseverance, and considerable expenditure, can we hope in a few years to bring about a better condition of affairs.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How many farm instructors are there now at present?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Twenty-six.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In what way are those men looked after?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By Mr. Wadsworth, the Inspector of Agencies, a very efficient man. He has to visit all the agencies and see that their work is done. Then we have the Commissioner, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, and also the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Elliott, who are constantly moving about.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Do the Government intend to put farm instructors on every reserve on which a band of Indians are settled, or is there any limit as to the number?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have twenty-six instructors now, but the country is being settled fast, and largely from Ontario, and we must have a farm instructor for any considerable band on a reserve. But instead of sending a Government officer to each settlement we shall be able to get the assistance of some good practical farmer settled near the reserve, who, by precepts and example in working his own farm, can teach the Indians for a small sum in comparison to the salary given a man whose whole time is spent as a farm instructor. We shall thus save a good deal of money with as much advantage to the Indians as would be secured by the other system.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think the item is wrongly entered here. So far as I can judge from the explanations of the Minister this is not an item to cover supplies for destitute Indians in the proper sense of the term, but one which contains quite a number of supplementary votes for almost all the purposes named in the Estimates under this heading. I think this estimate ought to have been divided into as many parts as there are separate services.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first amount issued was altogether for destitute Indians, the chief sum being \$147,728; then there is a second sum of \$71,000, after which comes the other charges which the hon. gentleman truly says are not for destitute Indians. But as they are for subsidiary purposes and of small amount they were included in this one warrant and brought down in this general way.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Some \$219,471 went to destitute Indians, the remainder going to the other services.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does that destitution still continue?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That destitution still continues to some extent. When the Indians come around the forts for food it is impossible to refuse them. They are now moving away from the forts where they used to hang about and are going to the reserves. They will have to get supplies until the crops are in. There is no large game in the North-West, only fish and small game and very little of that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How are these supplies provided.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By contract.

310. Head Office, Ottawa---Printing maps, advertising payments of extra clerks \$10,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What number of maps have been already issued or will be issued this year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 15,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I dare say every hon. member of this House who represents a western constituency can corroborate my statements, that we are deluged with applications for these maps, more particularly the large maps showing the lands located. I should like to know whether any steps have been taken to allow persons to buy them. Of course, the Government would supply them at first cost.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are now on sale. The large maps of which the hon. gentleman speaks of, are being sold in Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, and here at Durie's for 25 cents, and other maps at 10 cents and 12 cents. The demand was so enormous, especially from this House, that it ran out, some hon. members asking for 200 sets at a time.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I did not get them anyway, though I could have easily disposed of them. I am bound to say the officers of the Department were very courteous in supplying me so far as they could. In the country districts, I am probably within the mark in saying, that every second family has a relative going to the North-West, consequently they are very desirous of getting a map.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the Government are taking steps to advertise this country largely on the continent? I am aware it is being well advertised in the United Kingdom, but rather from the reports the emigrants send home than from the efforts of the Government. We are given to understand there will be a large emigration from Germany and Switzerland this year, I would like to know whether any special effort has been made to secure a portion of this emigration for Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, maps and pamphlets have been printed in German and disseminated in Germany, Switzerland and Holland. As far as possible, the agencies of the different steam lines have been employed for the purpose of disseminating such information on the Continent.

Mr. CASEY. It was understood that the Canadian Pacific Railway would take a great deal of this business off the hands of the Government. Are the Government aware whether they have been actually advertising this country in Europe, or is the whole weight of advertising still borne by the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So far as I understand, they have special agents in Europe with maps and plans and all the usual inducements, which they have learned from the United States companies, both from the Continent and from the United Kingdom.

Mr. BLAKE. When the immigration estimates were before the Committee I could get no information whatever from the Minister of what the Canadian Pacific Railway was doing in this direction. The Speech from the Throne, in announcing the railway contract, held out, as an inducement to its ratification, that the Company would effectually promote the work of immigration, relieving the Government largely of this duty and expense. We were also promised that there would be concerted action between the Government and the Company in promoting emigration, and I think it is desirable that the House should be put in possession of information as to what action has been taken and with what result.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. If I understood the hon. Minister correctly, these maps are only on sale at the large centres. I think it would be a great convenience if arrangements could be made by which these maps could be attainable at the leading post offices, one or more in each county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad to say that in Western Canada there is perhaps no town, and very few incorporated villages, that have not a book store of some kind, and these maps are not only sent to these points, but every bookseller or person dealing in stationery can procure these maps, and a commission of nearly one-half is allowed them. That regulation has been in force about a month.

Mr. BLAKE. I think if we allowed even more liberal commissions to booksellers it would result in a rush of orders to the Department, and that would be a more sensible and business-like way of disseminating the maps.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right. The demand for the first issue of the maps was unexampled. The supply is, however, being renewed, and will be kept up. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman will be adopted, and booksellers and stationers will be able to get supplied, and the amount of commission will be stated in advertisements.

311. Unprovided items of 1880-81, by the Auditor General's report, page 446 \$392,358

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I observe that \$10,356 were required for Departmental contingencies. What is the cause of that expenditure?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was an excess of the estimate by the employment of additional clerks and additional telegraphy and other expenses stated in the Public Accounts.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That brings the expenditure for contingencies up to \$150,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. \$137,000 or \$139,000 were voted.

Mr. CASEY.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I notice that under the head of Intercolonial Railway, there is an unprovided item of \$137,000 for rolling-stock. Was the amount required for engines?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was for locomotives and rolling-stock owing to increased business on the road. The increased receipts for the last year amounted to \$300,000 and the expenditure bore a like proportion, and it became necessary in order to perform the increased business that additional rolling-stock should be obtained.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There was a vote taken last year, and another vote for \$300,000 for this year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For next year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The total is \$1,900,000 or \$2,000,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I see that this general item includes \$4,040 for the vessel *Charybdis*, and it was stated last night that the hon. the First Minister would make a statement to the House with respect to the intentions of the Government. The hon. the First Minister stated, a year or two ago, that it was intended to make this a training ship, but that idea appears to be entirely abandoned and there now remains the alternatives suggested by the hon. members, of towing the vessel out to sea and sinking her, or of sending her to Halifax where it was estimated the vessel would do less harm, and other alternatives were named; but the House would like to hear what the Government proposes to do with respect to the *Charybdis*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand the hon. Finance Minister stated last night that I would give a true and particular account of the *Charybdis*, her future prospects, and our future prospects with respect to her. I will do so before Concurrence.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. An amount of \$10,000 appears for aid to sufferers by the Quebec fire. By whom was that money distributed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This and subscriptions of private individuals were placed in the hands of a Committee of which the mayor was chairman, and the funds were expended in affording relief to people requiring food and clothing.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I observe there is an item of \$36,000 for working expenses on the Pacific Railway.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was owing to increased business which necessitated increased expenditure.

312. Militia Drill Pay and other expenses connected with the drill and pay of the Militia..... \$37,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. Before this vote is adopted I wish to call the attention of the Committee to an extraordinary order which appeared in the *Official Gazette*. It reads as follows:—

"The Major-General Commanding regrets to be called on to censure publicly an officer of long service and good character.

"By evidence produced before a Court of Enquiry which investigated the case, it appears that Lieutenant-Colonel Walter Ross, 16th Battalion, when in temporary command of the camp at Picton, Ont., on the 6th September, 1881, gave orders, without instituting sufficient enquiries, for an armed party from the battalion under his command to pull down a certain building which was being erected as a canteen under authority of the Minister of Militia and Defence, and which, when pulled down, was by this armed force thrown over the fence upon the highway.

"The Major-General considers that Lieutenant-Colonel Ross acted precipitately in calling for an armed force. He is therefore hereby seriously censured for this grave military indiscretion, and the Major-General hopes it will be a warning to this officer, and to all future officers commanding in camp or quarters, to be very careful before proceeding to such strong measures."

In the first place, so far as I am informed, it is an unprecedented thing to censure for such an offence as this by a general order in the *Gazette*, and I am not able to find from

the papers which were brought down in response to a motion I made, that the Major-General ever recommended such a course to be taken. The Minister of Militia has, therefore, taken on himself to order this censure contrary to the intention and the disposition of the officer in command of the forces. I am surprised that such a course should have been taken, because we have no officer in our militia force more competent to discharge his duty than Colonel Ross. At a critical time in the history of the country he turned out a battalion nearly 500 strong, and he would have done good service if required. He kept this battalion up for many years in a state of rather more efficiency than almost any other battalion, and it was quite equal to the test as the evidence in these papers show. Yet the Minister of Militia in this manner undertakes to censure Colonel Ross in defiance of the intention of the Major-General Commanding the Forces. This is one of the most extraordinary instances of petty tyranny that has ever occurred in the history of the militia affairs, and I warn the hon. gentleman that if he continues to act like this, he and his Department will have very little to do, so far as the active militia force is concerned. The hon. gentleman appears from the papers to have assumed that Colonel Ross had been guilty of disobeying orders. He says in the papers submitted to the Major-General in command:

"According to the evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel Ross that officer has been guilty of disobeying the orders of Lieutenant-Colonel Villiers, commanding the district, who acted under directions from headquarters in respect to the canteen building.

"(2) Was Lieutenant-Colonel Ross justified, in your opinion, in using an armed force to pull down the building erected by Heffernan?

"(3.) If Lieutenant-Colonel Ross disobeyed the order of Lieutenant-Colonel Villiers and was wrong in using an armed force for the purpose of pulling down the canteen building, what punishment do you consider should be awarded?"

Major-General Luard says in his reports on these points:

"As regards No. 1, I cannot see that 'the action of Lieutenant-Colonel Ross' establishes that 'he was guilty of disobeying Lieutenant-Colonel Villiers' orders.' So far from this he states as follows:—'I was not in any way notified by Lieutenant-Colonel Villiers, Major McGill, Heffernan, or his legal adviser and prompter.'

I believe that the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) is mentioned, and he had a great deal of difficulty in connection with this affair:

"That Heffernan was the man authorized, that had the promise or authority, to come into the camp-ground and build a canteen.

"I kept every intruder from interfering with the camp-ground, and when Colonel Villiers came into camp, about 6.30 p.m., I at once waited upon him and gave up the command and obeyed all orders from the Commandant—and the evidence taken as regards his conversation with Heffernan, goes to show that Heffernan did not produce any authority from Lieutenant-Colonel Villiers or headquarters, and that Lieutenant-Colonel Ross acted in ignorance of such authority.

"As regards Lieutenant-Colonel Ross having determined to stop the further building of what he supposed an unauthorized building, he had a perfect right, as the senior officer in camp, in my opinion, to make use of armed force, and that, I think, was wise, so that the display of overpowering force might prevent any disturbance or fighting.

"Having answered Nos. 1 and 2 as I have, it appears to me unnecessary to reply to No. 3."

Here we have the evidence of the Major-General in command of the Forces, that Colonel Ross acted properly and promptly in regard to this matter. The trouble appears to have arisen from the fact that the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) had great difficulty in distributing the patronage in connection with this small business. He made some journeys to Ottawa, and no end of letters and telegrams were sent, in order to have this Heffernan, who is supposed to have some local influence on some section of voters in that county, appointed to take charge of the canteen. The Minister was telegraphed to all over the Lower Provinces to find out where he was, in order that he might stop the granting of canteen provisions to anyone in connection with the camp; and an order was obtained from the Minister, dated at Campbellton, I think, that no appointment was to be made until he came, and afterwards an order

was made that the nominee of Mr. McCuaig should get the appointment. Major McGill was notified that Heffernan should be allowed to go on the camp ground to build a canteen, but Colonel Ross being in command, pending the arrival of the superior officer, objected to his building it on the camp ground, and on his declining to go off he brought a number of men and forced him to desist and put all the materials over the fence on the roadway—what seemed, indeed, a very proper proceeding—the only proceeding that apparently could be taken. Yet the hon. Minister deliberately assumes, in the face of the evidence that is presented, that Colonel Ross was made aware of this distribution of patronage, and Mr. Heffernan himself was not able to show any authority whatever for his appearing on the camp ground. Nay, more; it appears from the evidence that the ground on which the camp was, was the property of the trustees of Colonel Ross's estate, and that the ground was obtained on the express condition that if any canteen provisions should be given they should be given to some one in connection with the camp for the benefit of the band, if I recollect aright.

Mr. CARON. The papers do not show that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have seen nothing but the papers, and I think they show that.

Mr. CARON. You will not find it in the papers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am sure I will. The statement is here.

Mr. CARON. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will find it when I sit down. This was the arrangement made, and this undeserved and unparalleled censure upon an excellent officer in defiance of the opinion and recommendation of the officer in command of the Militia, was because this Mr. Heffernan, the nominee and *protege* of Mr. McCuaig, was not allowed to erect a canteen and sell liquors on the camp ground.

Mr. CARON. It will show that no liquors could be sold.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No ardent spirits were to be sold, but there was no provision against beer and porter and liquors of that kind.

Mr. CARON. Yes, there was.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What was to be sold?

Mr. CARON. If you had read the papers you would know.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman ought to know without the papers. Whatever there was to be sold, there was no authority shown to Colonel Ross. There was no reason why the Minister should interfere at all; and for the sake of distributing this little bit of political patronage, all this trouble has been incurred and all this censure bestowed on Colonel Ross. It was solely at the instance of Mr. McCuaig and Mr. Heffernan that a military court of enquiry was authorized to make an inquisition into the conduct of Colonel Ross; there was no complaint from any officer, or on the part of the Minister himself; but Mr. Heffernan, on the ground that he had obtained Mr. McCuaig's permission, and through him the assent of the Minister, to the erection of a canteen, puts in a claim that a commission of enquiry should be issued, and it is issued at once without any interview with or recommendation from any officer whatever; and the General in command has been apparently directed to issue this order which I have read, and the language of which is very remarkable—"The Major-General commanding regrets to be called upon to censure." Who called upon him?

Mr. CARON. His duty.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, Sir, but the hon. Minister called upon him. I am sure the hon. gentleman cannot find in the annals of the Department any other case in which such proceedings were resorted to. Although he expected to

show that Colonel Ross had disobeyed orders, the evidence showed that he disobeyed no orders; but the hon. Minister shows his animus against the officer by assuming that he has disobeyed orders, and he asks the Major-General, in his grandiloquent way, what punishment he should inflict on Colonel Ross. I am only surprised that Colonel Ross should submit to any such censure. No one could occupy his position better than he did, and for this act which he was fully justified in doing, he is thus to be brought into the contempt of the whole militia force and insulted. There can be no remedy applied in the case now; the mischief, whatever it is, is done; but I think that an officer of Colonel Ross' standing in the militia and his standing everywhere in the country, deserved better treatment at the hands of the Government; and I determined, therefore, to bring the matter before the House, with the view of expressing my own opinion of the gross harshness and injustice with which he was treated, and also of calling the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Militia has usurped the functions of the General Officer in command. It is for him to make a recommendation in a matter of this kind, and not the Minister, and the General recommends simply that he should be censured for his indiscretion; but this censure is communicated through the Minister to the public, by means of this order published in the *Gazette*. Anything more blameable I think I have never known in connection with the military force of the country.

Mr. CARON. I regret exceedingly that the hon. gentleman, who used to be a distinguished officer in the Militia Force of Canada, should have so completely forgotten the rules and regulations of the service in a matter of this kind. I can understand very well that the hon. gentleman should be true to the few friends who remain to him, and that he should show the feeling he has shown in the discussion of the question before the House. But the hon. gentleman forgets completely or ignores the fact that matters of canteen are left absolutely under the control of the Minister of Militia. If there is one thing that can be urged in favor of the action of the Department of Militia in the present case, it is that we have shown that we did not want to deal as harshly with Colonel Ross as we should have done; and I say that, after making myself acquainted with the facts, and not interpreting the record without having read it, as the hon. gentleman evidently has done, the matter was brought up, and a court of enquiry was appointed to investigate it. Mr. Heffernan, who had charge of this canteen, had been authorized to take charge of it by the Department of Militia, and the authorization had been sent to him through the official channel. The Deputy-Adjutant General, commanding that very camp, sent orders through his Brigade Major that this man was appointed to take charge of the canteen; and I ask, under these circumstances, whether it was right for Colonel Ross, who came into the temporary command of that camp for a few hours, to give an order to twelve men under the command of Capt. Johnson to go down to that canteen; and, would you believe it—this Colonel, in command of a regiment, a man supposed to have the responsibility of his acts, when they came within the presence of Heffernan and the canteen ordered these men to fix bayonets and charge Heffernan. Supposing Heffernan had resisted, what would have been the result? There would have been bloodshed, and Colonel Ross, instead of being censured, might have been tried for murder or manslaughter. I ask whether the Department of Militia did not act towards Colonel Ross in the most lenient possible manner. I extended the hon. gentleman opposite the courtesy of sending him the papers before I laid them on the Table; but I fancy he did not take the trouble of reading them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did.

Mr. CARON. I am afraid the hon. gentleman did not carefully read that record. Instead, he has taken up the

Mr. MACKENZIE,

case as made out for him by his old political friend, Colonel Ross. The order was transferred to Colonel Ross by Brigade Major McGill, who said to him that he had received instructions, not from the Minister of Militia, but from the commanding officer of his camp, from the Deputy Adjutant-General, to take control of the canteen. Did Colonel Ross attempt to ascertain his duty in the matter? If he had done so, he would have gone and enquired who that man was. But he did not want to know who the man was who would "take control of my canteen." What has been the result? As Capt. Johnson says: "When we came within twenty paces of the canteen I ordered my men to fix bayonets and there was a small war in a camp that had not yet been properly formed, because the Deputy Adjutant-General had only arrived that evening." Considering all the facts, I ask whether the whole of that investigation does not show that Colonel Ross acted in such a manner as commanding officer as to deserve not only censure, but to be forever deprived of a position in which he could command men and run risks in a camp like that held at Picton, where men were exposed to be brought into a conflict that might have produced lasting effects upon the militia of Canada. The hon. gentleman talks of its being a very grave offence, and being looked upon as affecting the future of the Force in Canada; but if the Militia Department had not taken the position it assumed, it would have been impossible at any time to have allowed a camp to be formed in any district in Canada, because men like Col. Ross might have been put in command and risked not only the future Militia Force, but brought it into discredit. So far as I am personally concerned, I have known Colonel Ross for many years and knew him when he sat in this Parliament, and I have no personal feeling against him. The action of the Department could not possibly have been avoided, unless it had done what it should have done—discharge him from the Force. The post of the General commanding Militia Force shows there was no pressure brought to bear by me as Minister of Militia upon him; in that respect the report speaks for itself. What the General advised was done, but nothing further.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister says that Colonel Ross was informed by Major McGill. I have already read Major-General Luard's statement that he was not; that is borne out by Colonel Ross' own evidence. He says: "I was not in any way notified by Captain Villiers, Major McGill, Mr. Burlind or his legal adviser and prompter, that Captain Heffernan was the man who had the authority to come to the camp ground to build the canteen." The Minister said that he carried the order of the Major-General. If the hon. gentleman will show me where the Major-General recommended that this should be set over the general order, I will admit that I am wrong. I have read the papers from beginning to end, and there is no such statement. The General in command never recommended the issue of this general order. I ask the hon. gentleman to find the authority for his statement.

Mr. CARON. I recommend him to read the evidence of the General.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no such report, but there is simply this statement, that he should be censured for his indiscretion.

Mr. CARON. I admit that.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Major McGill is censured for not informing Colonel Ross of the telegram he had. If the Colonel was fully informed by Major McGill, why was he censured by the hon. gentleman himself for not informing him? The statement reads: "I beg, therefore, to add from the evidence adduced that Major McGill gave no information to Colonel Ross, and that Colonel Ross acted without due discretion, unintentionally causing the trouble which followed, and which will be a lesson to him in the future."

Then the Brigade Major is censured for not informing him. How can the hon. gentleman possibly hold both positions? As to the hon. gentleman's alleged courtesy to me, in giving me the papers, I presented the case without showing any feeling, or using harsh words, and I have taken no advantage of him. I have made no complaint as to his not acting courteously, and I am sure he has no complaint to make as to anything I have said to day. I think and say that he acted in an unauthorized and unusual manner, and contrary to the directions of the General in command, when he censured an officer for what is not a military fault at all. If a military fault at all, it must be one of a most trivial kind. If the hon. Minister was driven to such straits by his political supporters as to appoint Mr. Heffernan canteen-keeper, the officer in command, no matter how temporarily, should have been informed. Then, if he should have refused to accept the appointment, he would have been censurable. He was censured simply for clearing the ground of obstructions. I am quite sure our gallant officer, a member of the Cabinet, the hon. Minister of Customs, would have been the first man to take such a course. More than that. A precisely similar affair occurred in Ottawa at the very ears of the hon. Minister of Militia, and no action was taken.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This statement of General Luard most decidedly does not agree with that of the hon. Minister of Militia. General Luard declares expressly that the evidence taken, as regards Colonel Ross' conversation with Heffernan, shows that Heffernan did not produce any authority from Colonel Villiers; that consequently Colonel Ross acted in ignorance of that authority. If that is the case, a most harsh construction has been put on Colonel Ross' conduct. The hon. Minister may count himself exceedingly fortunate he did not carry out his threat, now expressed, of dismissing Colonel Ross. If he had, I doubt whether he himself would not be obliged to send in his resignation, at the instance of the volunteers of Ontario. No officer has done more for the service than Colonel Ross, or shown himself more ready to act in an emergency. In 1865 his regiment was one of the first and the best equipped to respond to the demand of the Government.

Mr. CARON. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the General in command does not say in his report that Colonel Ross is deserving of the most severe military censure for the indiscretion which he committed in that camp. I leave it to the hon. gentleman to say, after reading the whole report, not a portion of it, that General Luard advised me, as head of the Department, that the officer was liable to the greatest possible military censure. What was the result of that advice? Did I act up to it? I simply censured Colonel Ross in the general way, though I might have cashiered him from the service.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister might do anything, but the law supposes that Ministers will always exercise due discretion. What I complain of is that there is not a single case in the Department where an officer was punished for indiscretion by having the punishment published in the *Gazette*. This is the first case of the kind, and I do not believe that Col. Ross deserved any such offensive mode of censure. Major McGill was also censured, but it was not published in the *Gazette*. Why should one be censured when the other was not? Major McGill never gave Colonel Ross a copy of the order he had, and Colonel Ross was surely less deserving of censure than he.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he differs from the views of the hon. member for Lambton? I understand there is no instance of a censure of this kind having been published before this one.

Mr. CARON. That is because such a case never came before the Department before, consequently I cannot fall

back upon precedent; and it was in consequence of a matter of that kind coming before the Department for the first time that I acted so leniently, and if the matter had occurred before certainly I would have insisted upon his being cashiered.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not read all the proceedings, but the hon. gentleman says he will leave it to those who read the record, while the trouble is that he does not bring down the papers in time to give us facilities for reading the record.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman is completely wrong. The hon. member for Lambton will say that I sent the papers to him as soon as I could get them copied.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Last Monday week.

Mr. BLAKE. That observation does not meet my point at all—a communication of that kind from the Minister to the hon. member for Lambton, when the papers were moved for early in the Session.

Mr. CARON. They were not moved for early in the Session.

Mr. BLAKE. They were moved for a long while ago. They were asked for many times, and the Minister told us many times that they would be down the next day or two.

Mr. CARON. That is another set of papers.

Mr. BLAKE. Both sets of papers were asked for and the same answer was given. The hon. gentleman says that he sent them to the hon. member for Lambton, but I complain that he has not given the members of this House facilities for perusing this correspondence, even if they had been laid upon the Table in manuscript a good while ago. We consequently cannot enter upon this discussion. The hon. Member for Lambton read a document, a categorical demand by the Minister of Militia upon the General Commanding with reference to the proceedings of the court of enquiry, and it appears that the Minister called upon the General Commanding to state his opinion on three points. The General differs obviously from the view of the Minister as to the conduct of Colonel Ross.

Mr. CARON. No, Sir.

Mr. BLAKE. I speak of that portion which has been read, and I say it is obvious that the General commanding made a different reply from that of the Minister. It is true that on one point the Minister makes a statement—he does not ask for advice or an expression of opinion—but on that point the General differs as to the three questions, and they are not such as would justify this censure. Now, what other portions of the record justify the hon. Minister's view I know not, because I have no opportunity of reading these papers. The Minister is called upon to defend himself. That portion of the record which seems to show the impropriety of his action is read; but instead of referring the House to the other portions of the record, and pointing out that my hon. friend has drawn an incorrect opinion from the record, he reads nothing; and he says: "I refer you to a stack of papers that are scattered about the desk, and if you read them all you will find I am right." The hon. Minister has the question at his finger ends; and he ought to have established that the position taken by the hon. member for Lambton was wrong by the papers. I dare say there is no case precisely like this in the records of the Department. I hope there is not; and I think it would be an indication that the Department needed very seriously to be reformed if there were two cases like this. But if there be no precedent in a public censure upon an officer for what is called a military indiscretion, then I say the course pursued was not merely unprecedented, but was unjust. We have had statements made in former years with reference to the conduct of the officers of the volunteer force, who presented reports saying such a one was present

at drill, when in point of fact he was not, and making other mis-statements of facts of a character infinitely graver than this one, but I had never seen any censure published in the *Gazette*.

Mr. BOWELL. Those charges were dismissed.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps so, but I never saw any censure published in the *Gazette* upon officers before.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman does not take much interest in military affairs.

Mr. BLAKE. No, but I take some interest. What I maintain is, that if there has been no instance heretofore of publishing in the *Gazette* a censure upon an officer thus making a military indiscretion the subject of a public degradation such as this, this certainly was not a case in which that precedent should be established. I am not now discussing whether upon the whole of this record Colonel Ross was censurable at all or not, because the hon. member for Lambton shows some evidence that he was not, and the Minister says that if the whole record were read it would prove that he was censurable; but admitting that the whole result established a case of military indiscretion—it was not a case of fraud or dishonesty, but of mistaken judgment—I do say that it was an extreme punishment of a distinguished officer of long standing in the volunteer force to publish in the official *Gazette* a censure upon him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to read this portion of General Luard's letter in full:

"By this it would appear that Heffernan was not named to Lieut.-Col. Ross as Mr. McCuaig's nominee. Col. Ross appears to have read telegram D, received that morning, 6th September, but was not shown the letter E, received the previous day, nor fully informed of its contents by Major McGill. The link of evidence required to prove that Lieut.-Col. Ross knew that Heffernan, as nominee of Mr. McCuaig, represented the orders from Lieut.-Col. Villiers, and therefore from headquarters, appears to me to be wanting. I must therefore reply to question 1, that, in my opinion, evidence is lacking to prove the grave military offence of disobedience of orders from headquarters against Lieut.-Col. Ross. At my interview with the Minister of Militia to-day, however, it appeared to me that he wished to know my opinion more generally than the questions in writing already asked of me would elicit. (*Vide memo.* 3306 and Col. Powell's memo.)

"I beg, therefore, to add that, on the evidence already adduced, I consider that Major McGill, in not fully informing Lieut.-Col. Ross of the contents of letter E, acted unwisely and without due discretion, and unintentionally caused the trouble which followed—it will be a lesson to him in the future—and that Lieut.-Col. Ross displayed great indiscretion and want of military judgment, when he saw Heffernan, in not asking him *at once* whether he was the nominee of Mr. McCuaig."

I do not think it was his business at all to ask a stranger if he was the nominee of McCuaig. Suppose he said he was the nominee of McCuaig, was he to accept that as a statement?

"Had he done so all must have gone right; but inflated, it would seem, by the sense of the importance of this brief and temporary command, and acting precipitately in calling for armed force, Lieut.-Col. Ross was guilty of a very grave military indiscretion, an act deserving very serious censure. On his previous history and conduct should depend whether he may be considered competent to retain command of a battalion. The case impresses on me how unfortunate it was that Lieut.-Col. Villiers was detained at Kingston, and how important it is to discover why the transport for the troops was so long delayed, so as to prevent recurrence of such an error."

That is the entire letter on which the censure is based. I have pointed out to the Committee that immediately before this was written General Luard reported formally that Colonel Ross had acted with perfect propriety in taking an armed force to dispossess this party who held the ground. Another reason why I think the hon. gentleman acted partially for some reason is the fact that Major McGill, who was also an offender against military discretion—that is the phrase—was censured privately and was told not to commit the offence again; but Colonel Ross, being in a different position in the hon. gentleman's eyes, must be, reprimanded in the *Gazette*. I say it is an unusual act. Anything Colonel Ross did, as far as I can see at present, any officer in command of a battalion would have done in clearing the ground

Mr. BLAKE.

of intruders who, according to the information of the Government, had no business there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I differ a good deal from the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for West Durham in regard to this case. Colonel Ross, I believe, is a gallant and a good officer, and deserved well of his country for his long services; but he committed, as the best of men are liable to commit, a grave military offence for which there was no excuse. There was to be a camp, and it was to have a canteen. The camp was held, but particular care was taken in this instance that the canteen should supply food and tea, but that no intoxicating liquor should be sold within the camp. The command devolved on Deputy Adjutant General Villiers and Major McGill was there as a Brigade Major. The commanding officer was Colonel Ross, who was his superior officer on the ground, but he had not command of the camp. The officer having command of the camp was the Deputy Adjutant-General, Colonel Ross having no right to interfere, and he was informed verbally by the Brigade Major that Heffernan was to have the canteen; but he disregarded it, and the censure is because he did not conform to the instructions of Adjutant-General Villiers, and every one knows that according to military practice, if a staff officer conveys a verbal communication to a superior officer, that information is to be taken as correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In action.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In all cases. There was a letter written the day before, but which was not delivered to Colonel Ross. A telegram was offered to him, but Colonel Ross said he did not want to read it. He was told by the staff officer, what the commanding officer desired; he was told, by authority of the commanding officer, that Mr. Heffernan was to have the canteen, and the hon. gentleman says it was a miserable little bit of patronage that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. McCuaig) desired to exercise; but it was the desire of Colonel Ross to put a political friend in that position instead of Mr. Heffernan, and he sought to frighten Heffernan to surrendering his claim. Such was the conduct of this officer, and when those facts were explained to the General he said it was a most grave military offence. The soldiers were ordered to fix bayonets in order to drive the duly appointed caterer off the ground. No doubt Colonel Ross thought Heffernan would charge him, and so he anticipated him by charging first. But instead of charging with a bill, as the canteen-keeper would have done, he wanted to charge him at the point of the bayonet. Sir, it is a disgraceful thing, it is a mean piece of spite, and because he did not get his man appointed canteen-keeper he took advantage of the temporary and unavoidable absence of the officer really in command, and it was an act for which he richly deserved censure. The hon. gentleman does not deny that he objects to the publication in the *Gazette*.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do deny it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sir, it is a thing which the public ought to know. The offence was a public one—it was a grave breach of military discipline, the General says.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He does not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman read the language.

Mr. CARON. A grave breach of military discipline.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says the censure should be administered privately.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not say that. What I do say is that McGill was censured privately, and Colonel Ross publicly through the *Gazette*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only offence against McGill was that he did not read the letter; he thought Colonel

Ross would take his word first, but Colonel Ross' offence was a public one, and I say that if anything like discipline is to be observed, if a person is liable to be censured at all for a grave military offence, that censure should be public. If Colonel Ross had received a private letter calling it a grave military censure, he would simply have put it in his pocket or torn it up, and there would really have been no censure at all. The hon. gentleman says there has been no precedent for anything of the kind. I have seen again and again, in my experience of the Militia Department, statements that officers were removed or cashiered, some allowed to retire as a gentle punishment, some allowed to retire retaining rank, showing that they retired with honor. If there is to be any censure it should be known, or there is no censure at all. Private censure from the commanding officer is no censure—at all events, it does not convey the weight which should follow a grave breach of discipline. Colonel Ross knew that this man was appointed, and when he knew that he was to be canteen-keeper he marched a body of men with fixed bayonets and ordered the man off the ground, which he had no right to do.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It appears that when the matter was first presented to the General, the General not only believed that Colonel Ross had been guilty of no offence at all, but he explicitly stated that he appeared on the evidence to have acted in ignorance of any authority given to Heffernan. There is General Luard's statement on that point. Now, as to the statement of the hon. gentleman that Colonel Ross had been guilty of a mean piece of spite, if any one has been guilty of a mean piece of spite in this matter, it is the Minister of Militia and the Government which sustains him, and not Colonel Ross. Colonel Ross had acted perfectly right and exactly as other military men under similar circumstances have repeatedly acted, and it is a matter of great misfortune that this outside gentleman, whoever he may be, should have been permitted to nominate the canteen-keeper of the camp held under these circumstances. The evidence does not go to show, according to the statement of General Luard, that McGill did inform Colonel Ross that Heffernan was the person authorized, and so Major McGill was censured for not doing so. I have here a memorandum regarding the Court of Enquiry at Picton camp, signed by General Luard. He says, regarding the action to be taken regarding the court of enquiry:

"1. Lieut.-Col. Villiers to be informed that he is acquitted of blame, in not having been at the camp on the morning the troops were expected. In future, however, he will be so good as to be at the camp before the arrival of any troop, leaving the transport question to be settled by the department which is responsible for it.

"Major McGill to be informed that the Major-General commanding considers that he acted unwisely and without due discretion, in not fully informing Lieut.-Col. Ross of the contents of the letter marked B, and that the Major-General hopes it will be a lesson to him in the future."

Now, it is quite evident from that that the Major-General still continues of the opinion that Colonel Ross was not informed that Heffernan was appointed. He deliberately censures Major McGill for not informing him properly; and here comes the gist of the whole matter, showing that in spite of all the skill and all the lessons given in a period of two months, that there was a difference between him and the Minister of Militia:

"The Adjutant-General of Militia to have a meeting with Lieut.-Col. Villiers, D. A. G. of No 3, Lieut.-Col. Ross and his next senior officer, at which the opinion of the Major-General regarding his conduct shall be read to Lieut.-Col. Ross and he shall be informed that he is now 'seriously censured for his very grave military indiscretion,' and warned to be more prudent in future."

What the General recommended was that his opinion be communicated to these two or three witnesses and Colonel Ross; but, Sir, there is a paragraph attached to this effect: "That Colonel Ross be censured in General Orders—signed,

A. P. C., Minister of Militia." The General knows more about these matters and the custom in Her Majesty's Service a good deal than does the hon. Minister of Militia, although he has been supreme arbiter of the defence of this country for eighteen months. The Major-General thought that the proper way was to communicate privately his opinion before one or two proper persons to Lieutenant-Colonel Ross, but the Minister of Militia overrides the General's opinion and declares he is to be published in the General Orders; and that is precisely what we complain of and what the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) justly says is an unprecedented thing; and bearing in mind the relations which existed for many years between Colonel Ross and the Minister of Militia and his friends, these facts justly expose them to the charge of abusing their powers for the purpose of injuring the character and reputation of a valuable and excellent officer.

Mr. ORTON. The question is one which strikes very forcibly the whole question of our volunteer system, and the question whether volunteering should be brought into party politics or not. It seems to me that the opinion of Colonel Ross is perfectly in accord with that of the leader of the Opposition, for if there is any portion of our people who more than another are determined to sacrifice themselves in the interests of their country and in the interests of the connection with Great Britain, it is the volunteers of Canada; but when we find the leader of the Opposition openly advocating a policy that means independence and separation from the Mother Country, and the taking away of the *esprit de corps* of our volunteers, his conduct is perfectly consistent with that of Colonel Ross. I think it is very desirable that we should preserve the connection with Great Britain. This is an instance in which the colonel of a battalion attempted to interfere in order to benefit his political friends at the expense of the volunteer force. I have had the honor of being a volunteer for several years, first as the captain of a company, and then as the surgeon of one of the best battalions in the country, and I am glad to say that the colonel of our battalion is a Reformer—the Speaker of the Local House—a gentleman with whom I and every officer in that battalion have worked in accord; and I regret exceedingly that a Colonel of a battalion in Ontario should so far forget himself as to use his position to create division in his battalion. The hon. leader of the Opposition has yet to face the spirit of the volunteers of Canada on his independence question, and as to whether they will endorse his views, or the views of the present Government as to the importance of keeping up our volunteer force; and I wish to suggest to the Government whether it would not be wise to vote a certain portion of the lands in the North-West Territory to those who have tried to keep up the volunteer force of Canada. I maintain that the military spirit of Canada has had a great deal to do with creating respect for Canada among foreigners, and confidence among the people of Canada in our position as a portion of the British Empire. I maintain that Colonel Ross has not acted in the interest of the volunteer force. The volunteers of Canada have, so far as my experience goes, desired to unite together and eschew all political feeling, and I regret exceedingly that any officer in the force should have been the means of exciting any such feeling.

Mr. BLAKE. For some time I was at a loss to perceive the relevance of the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton); but when I reflected that it is now after dinner, and that the subject was a canteen, I perceived at once the relevance of the hon. gentleman's remarks to the subject under discussion, and at the same time that it would be utterly absurd for me to reply to him.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I do not think the leader of the Opposition has any occasion to bring in the question of after dinner. What does it mean? Has not he dined him-

self? What has that to do with the militia question? The question relates to Colonel Ross, and to whether he was properly censured or not. As belonging to the militia, I am willing to accord to Colonel Ross every sympathy that I think he is entitled to, and I am sorry to see such warmth of feeling displayed on both sides, and especially by the leader of the Opposition, who would be glad to have any support he can get from the militia of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. And will have it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I only hope he will live long enough to come back with all the support he expects. We know that there is a motto among the Turks:

"May you live till you die, and may your shadow never grow less."

Mr. BLAKE. The Turks of Ireland.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. gentleman says he wants justice to Ireland, and I have no doubt that every Irishman will have it written on his heart that the hon. member for West Durham is the champion of the Irish people in this country. He says: "It is true, I cannot alleviate any difficulties for you, but I am with you;" and that is his position to-night—although he leads the Opposition, he is not able to do anything for the country. I have sat in the House with Colonel Ross, and I think he is a good man; he may have made a mistake, but I do not think he should have all this punishment turned on his head. Now, for the future, it would be well to understand that as the militia of Canada serve the country voluntarily—for the pay can be no temptation to them, they believe they are doing their duty to Canada and promoting its welfare—as much should not be expected from them as from regular soldiers; and they should not be censured for any little dereliction of duty. What militia officer can be expected to know the whole of the regulations and orders. He does the best he can, coming forward for six, ten or fourteen days, and says: I will endeavor to marshall and drill the men to fit them for any duty required by the country. If Colonel Ross made the mistake, let us have straightforward orders, and let the commanding officer of any camp be placed beyond the risk of misunderstanding any orders. I know Colonel Ross, who was formerly a member of this House, and I should not like to expose him to censure. Though he may differ with us in politics and may have made a mistake, still he endeavored to serve his country as a militia officer, and I have failed to discover there is any charge against him that he did not know his duty and was not a good officer.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to make a personal explanation. I regret exceedingly that the leader of the Opposition should have found it necessary to utter the unworthy remarks heard to-night. His insinuations were utterly unworthy of the leader of a great party and of a man of ability. The point to be noticed is this: Whether we are going to be retained as a portion of the British Empire or not, because the retention of the volunteer force is involved in this point.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. I yielded the floor to the hon. gentleman only to enable him to make a personal explanation. He has no right to enter into a discussion at this time.

Mr. ORTON. I have a right to finish my remarks in reference to the allusions peculiarly personal made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the member for West Elgin has the right to the floor. You can finish your speech afterwards.

Mr. CASEY. I was glad to hear the manly, soldierly and proper sentiments to which the member for King's has given expression on this occasion, to the effect that Colonel

Mr. DOMVILLE.

Ross should not have been censured in the first instance; and that even if he should have been censured, the punishment should not have been out of proportion to his demerits. What we complain, 1st, is that Colonel Ross was censured contrary to the opinion of the chief military authority in the Dominion; and, 2nd, that his censure was most unduly severe; and not only so, but that we have an additional cause of complaint in the fact that, in addition to the public censure, justice has been violated, and a strong spirit of political partizanship has been introduced on the subject on the floor of this House. I am sorry the leader of the House is not present, for I wish to notice his expression with regard to Colonel Ross, respecting the petty party spite which he said was shown by that officer. He thus attacked a man whom he had often to face on the floor of this House, but who is not here to defend himself, for having shown party spite. He also accused him of a great breach of military discipline, and of disobedience to orders, and all this in the teeth of the authority of the Major-General commanding, who says he was not guilty of this offence.

Mr. CARON. He does not say so.

Mr. CASEY. He does. His words are:

"I cannot see that the evidence of Lieut.-Col. Ross establishes that he was guilty of disobeying the orders of Lieut.-Col. Villiers."

And he goes on to give evidence showing that Colonel Ross did not disobey those orders, that he was not in any way notified by Lieut.-Col. Villiers, Capt. Heffernan or anybody else of what has been alleged.

Mr. CARON. That is not the opinion of the Major-General.

Mr. CASEY. I am reading from the report signed by General Luard.

Mr. CARON. You are reading the evidence, but not the report.

Mr. CASEY. I must call the Minister of Militia to order. He insists that I do not know what is in my hand. I repeat I am reading the report of General Luard, and I must resist the interruption. It appears, then, that Captain McGill had authority to come into the camp and build the canteen. Colonel Ross says, as soon as Lieutenant-Colonel Villiers came into the camp, I obeyed him from that time out. This statement is included in General Luard's report. He goes on to say:

"As regards number two, Lieut.-Col. Ross having determined to stop the further supplying, what he supposed to be an unauthorized supplying, had a perfect right as the senior officer in camp, in my opinion, to make use of an armed force, and I hold that was wise, because a display of force might prevent any disturbance. The same reason appears to me to apply to number two."

General Luard, when the case was first presented to him, said Colonel Ross had not disobeyed orders or committed a breach of discipline, but acted very properly. But, according to the right hon. gentleman, he was made to understand, and was induced to give, a somewhat different opinion. He said Colonel Ross was guilty of grave indiscretion, not a breach of discipline or disobedience of orders. I believe the whole thing was planned by the member for Prince Edward county to damage a political opponent, but that hon. gentleman will find his course will only succeed in hurting himself.

Mr. ORTON. I rise to protest against the unworthy remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I still recollect his coming into my riding and making similar unworthy remarks. He said at a public meeting that he had been my lawyer in carrying a case through Court, and that I was the last man that ought to find fault with his political course. After making that statement he left amidst groans and hisses.

Mr. SPROULE. I think Colonel Ross might well exclaim: "Save me from my friends." Were it not for their efforts

his case would only have been referred to in the official *Gazette*, which only very few people see, whereas now it will be read all over the Dominion. It is said a great deal of allowance ought to be made because he belonged to the volunteer force, and volunteers were not supposed to be posted in military discipline. I think Colonel Ross is above a mere volunteer, he is an officer; but there is the strongest evidence that he did not want to be exposed in this thing, because he refused to read the telegram. The whole thing is in keeping with the conduct of the Opposition here to-night. There appears to be no discipline amongst them. Colonel Ross desired to use his position for his own aggrandizement, and his friends here desire to turn this question to account—the very men who are endeavoring to estrange this country from the Empire. But Ross' friends here have done him an infinitely greater injury by dragging this question into Parliament and calling the attention of the whole country to it, than if they had allowed it to rest with the official *Gazette* where only one man in five hundred would ever have known anything about it.

Mr. BROWN. There appears to be a doubt as to who commands the volunteer forces, whether the hon. Minister of Militia or the Major-General. I recollect a short time ago, when Lieut.-Colonel Ross was Adjutant-General, and came before the Public Accounts Committee in connection with some question which it is not necessary to refer to now, he said he had nothing to do with the hon. Minister of Militia, but he was an Imperial officer and only responsible to the Governor-General.

Mr. BOWELL. What was the decision of the Committee and of the Government of the day upon that declaration of Colonel Ross?

Mr. BROWN. I believe he resigned without being asked to do so.

Mr. BOWELL. He went on and tried to shirk the responsibility from himself onto the Deputy Adjutant-General, Colonel Powell, and when he was called to account for it he retired from the service.

Mr. BROWN. He was an Imperial officer.

Mr. BOWELL. Paid by us.

Mr. BROWN. There is the Governor-General.

Mr. BOWELL. The only difference is the Governor-General is appointed by the Imperial Government, while we appointed the other.

Mr. BROWN. You do not appoint the Major-General.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, we do; and it is provided for in the Militia Act.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The Government selects him.

Mr. BOWELL. No, they do not.

Mr. BROWN. Well this is a serious matter, and it has engaged the attention of the Militia Department for some time. In 1880 the Minister of Militia, at that time Mr. Masson, brought down an amendment to the Militia Act, that canteens should be allowed. However, that clause in the Bill was struck out, and canteens have not since been allowed in camps. Now, neither the Major-General of the Militia Department nor anyone else has a right to establish a canteen in any camp, according to the Militia Act. It may be said that this canteen was not for the purpose of selling liquor; at all events the man who desired to establish a canteen there was not actuated by patriotism, but by a motive of making money out of it. It is to be regretted that a man outside the volunteer force should have been allowed to put up a canteen there. The limits of the camp have been laid down, and the officer in command has a right to keep out all persons who do not belong to the militia, so that they may not interfere with the drill and discipline of the camp. As to the orders that

were given, Colonel Ross was acting upon his own judgment at the time as being in command of the camp, and he was authorized to prevent this man from going in there and putting up his canteen. He was an officer of long standing, and it is poor encouragement for a man after twenty years' experience, to be treated as he has been. However, this is too important a question to engage so much of the attention of the House; it ought to have been left with the Militia Department. I know several occasions where a canteen has been ordered to be removed. Colonel Ross gave orders to go down and remove the canteen; I suppose the troops were out with muskets and side-arms, and whether the Colonel gave an order to fix bayonets or not, I know in removing the canteen the men would be more useless with muskets in their hands than without them. Without them the men would have two hands to remove the canteen and put it over the fence, and how they managed to do so I do not perceive, for those in charge could not have made much resistance. It was put out of the ground in the first instance, and when Colonel Villiers came and took over the command the canteen-keeper came to him, and the canteen was stopped until communication could be had with headquarters. After it was put up the second time it was thrown over the fence, and no efforts were subsequently made to establish it there. I think it is a matter of deep regret that a subject of such small consideration as the profits that would be made out of keeping a canteen should engage the attention of this House, when no canteen, according to the Militia Act, should have been established. If such were permitted the Act should be amended.

Mr. WRIGHT. I cannot allow this debate to close without saying a few words on the subject before the House. I, too, have the honor of being an officer in Her Majesty's militia, and, therefore, I think I have a right to participate in this debate. Gentlemen of the legal profession are in the habit of telling us that we outside of the profession are laymen; this is, perhaps, specially the case in regard to military matters. I know that those who have studied the action of the Minister of Militia must be satisfied that during the brief period of his occupancy of the office, he has done very much to bring about a state of things that would promote the improvement of the militia of Canada. For my part, I read with much pleasure the hon. gentleman's progress through the Dominion, and the speeches he delivered, which gave evidence of a desire to infuse a true military spirit into the great body of our people. I know in these respects the hon. gentleman has been eminently successful, but every old member who shares in that *esprit de corps* of the service on both sides of this House, must have read with feelings of great pain and humiliation the censure passed on an officer so well qualified as Colonel Ross. I, for one, shared in that feeling, which I believe was entertained by everybody. I have known this officer since 1863, and I have found him foremost in every militia movement. Many will remember when he was at Quebec, at a time when it was expected that the Fenians would come over, and he has occupied a foremost position among the volunteers of Canada. Those who knew that officer best, and the attempts he made to keep up our militia organization, will sympathize with him under the circumstances, and consider that what perhaps might be a lack of discipline, committed by a gallant and generous officer, who might be somewhat impetuous, was not of such a character as to justify a public censure. I read with pain the order in the *Gazette* censuring that officer. When the hon. Minister said he would do the same thing again, I did not believe it, as he must have regretted adopting that course. I think it is a poor compliment to pay to volunteer officers who have done so much and exerted themselves to make the militia a great success, to censure them for what I cannot conceive to be anything more than a trifling breach of discipline. In my county there are

four or five companies, and we have very great difficulty in maintaining them. But although far up in the interior we send men to Wimbledon, where they acquit themselves as Canadians always do, in an able manner. It is, perhaps, well that this discussion has taken place, because I am quite satisfied that so far as the Canadian militia is concerned, many of the measures adopted by the Minister of Militia will conduce to their efficiency, but I do not think a censure of this kind is likely to bring about the result. Knowing his generous nature, I am satisfied that the hon. Minister must regret, as much as I do, that this order was issued.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I moved for papers in the case of Colonel Campbell, an officer who served in my battalion with myself for years, and who is a credit to the battalion. I know he is a patriotic man; and when I conceived that he had been somewhat ill-used, I moved for papers in order to obtain information in regard to the true particulars of the case. I knew that although Colonel Campbell was a very strong political opponent of my own, he was a zealous volunteer, and was prepared to do his duty, as he did for some time, and I found that the usage he received was not such as was proper towards an officer occupying his position. I am glad to be able to say, after looking at the papers, that the hon. Minister is justified in that case. The substance of the decision is satisfactory to Colonel Campbell, to his officers and myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) to pass unnoticed. His remarks would imply a censure on the Minister of Militia. I always find the hon. gentleman casts his vote on the right side and that he is actuated by a generous spirit, but his remarks on the subject were very wide of the mark. Knowing the particulars of the case, and being connected with the militia force and having been in the camp where this little unpleasantness occurred, I must say that as a militia officer and one who desires to act fairly with all parties, I am prepared to affirm that the action of the Minister should be sustained by this House. The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Brown) endeavored to lead the House to believe that the Minister of Militia was stepping beyond his powers when he appointed a canteen master or tenant for the camp. In order to set the mind of the hon. gentleman at rest, I will read from the Queen's Regulations, which, under the circumstances, constitute the only authority on the question. Our Militia Law or our Militia Regulations do not deal with the question, so we must fall back on the Queen's Regulations, and under them we find that the canteen-keeper is appointed by the Secretary of War—which I suppose is virtually the Minister of Militia—and is removable only by him. I am sorry that the papers in this case have not been printed and put in the hands of hon. members, as I have not seen the comments of the Major-General on the affair. I know myself, however, more of the circumstances perhaps than he did, and if he pursued a wrong course it does not follow that we should endorse it. The facts are that there seemed to be a very hospitable effort on the part of the officer commanding the local corps to have one local canteen, and a grasping or grabbing desire that the local corps only should realize the profits. As an officer of a regiment and one always desiring to control his canteen and to keep it under strict care, I strongly objected to this course. I suppose the hon. Minister of Militia may have heard the circumstances, and knowing that it was a matter entirely under his control, he would refer to a gentleman in whom he had every confidence, to recommend some one who would give satisfaction and he would naturally apply to the member for that particular constituency. Under these circumstances I think it most unfair to make

Mr. WRIGHT.

a personal attack on the Minister of Militia. From what I know of the case Colonel Ross certainly was instructed by Colonel Villiers, through the Brigade Major, of the action of the Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No, he was not so informed.

Mr. CARON. Yes, he was. The papers show it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Looking at them and forming my opinion from what I know myself—

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that he must see that the case must be judged on the evidence before us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am willing to take the evidence before the House. I understand that the Brigade Major was instructed by Colonel Villiers, and that he notified Colonel Ross, who was in temporary command, that a certain canteen was to be constructed, and that the place was pointed out where it was to be erected, and I think the name of the keeper was also mentioned. I do not desire to prolong the debate, for it seems to me to have already reached a greater length than was necessary considering the trifling character of the affair. I have not heard the whole debate, having just dropped in, but I understand that the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Brown) made a violent attack on the hon. Minister of Militia.

Mr. BROWN. In reply to the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Williams) I desire to say that I made no attack on the hon. Minister of Militia. I simply wanted to arrive at the fact of whether the hon. Minister of Militia or the Major-General had the right to authorize the establishment of the canteen under the Militia Act of the present time. When a Bill was brought in to settle this question, I would like to know why that particular clause was struck out? So far as the Queen's Regulations are concerned they refer altogether to the regular service. We have rules and regulations governing ourselves, but there is nothing in them at all which refers to the canteen, and if we are to have canteens we must amend the Act authorizing them to be established.

Mr. WRIGHT. I beg to assure the hon. gentleman who has referred to me that the Minister of Militia has no more faithful supporter or greater admirer than I, but as a member of this House I will never hesitate to tell him when I think he is wrong. I think he was decidedly wrong in the present case. I think it was not fair to an old officer like Colonel Ross to censure him in that way, and I have no hesitation in saying so. So long as I have a seat in this House, I shall never hesitate to tell the hon. gentleman or any other Minister what I may think of any act of theirs.

Mr. BLAKE. But you will only censure them privately.

Mr. RYMAL. Early in my parliamentary history I became acquainted with Colonel Ross, and I have long known him as an energetic and enthusiastic officer of our volunteer force. At the time of the Fenian invasion in 1866, when the other members of this House were attending to their duties, Colonel Ross went to the front in command of a body of volunteers and did his duty as an officer, jeopardizing his life in defence of his country. I have always understood from that time to this that he has been one of the most effective and enthusiastic of our officers, and that he has been at considerable expense in devoting himself to his military duties. I think it was dealing out an extra measure of justice, when for a trifling indiscretion such as that reported by the Major-General he received a public censure at the instance of the Head of the Department. It would tend to disgrace him in the eyes of the volunteers and would seem as if merited reproach was heaped upon his name. I perfectly agree with the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) that, considering the services that Colonel Ross has

rendered, an indiscretion of that kind has been punished severely; for what can a patriotic and enthusiastic Colonel of our volunteers think who is censured through the official medium by the Head of the Department? It appears to me, speaking for myself and giving expression to my own opinion for what it is worth, that we have growing up in this Canada of ours a lot of young men who do not seem to recognize or properly appreciate the services of the men who were men when they were children, men who proffered their services in the hour of danger. These young men think that when placed in an official position it becomes them to censure unnecessarily older men who have jeopardized their lives on behalf of the country. I am sorry to have to say this of my hon. friend, for he is a genial and a good fellow, but I agree with my hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) that the hon. gentleman deserves some reprimand from this House for the extra severity of the sentence which, without the recommendation of the Major-General, he inflicted on a worthy and gallant officer.

Mr. LONGLEY. I do not propose to offer any remarks on the general question, but I desire information on one point. Two or three years ago, when the Militia Bill was brought before this House by the predecessor of the present Minister of Militia, I understood that the clause relating to the establishment of canteens for the benefit of volunteers was struck out of the Militia Law.

Mr. BOWELL. It never was in.

Mr. LONGLEY. It was proposed to put in such a clause. The hon. Minister of Militia, if my memory serves me, at the instance of a few members of this House, kindly agreed to strike out that clause, and I think it was struck out. It does seem to me to be a matter of regret that our volunteers cannot meet for drill without being under the necessity of establishing a canteen. The fact is, this canteen seems to have been at the bottom of all the trouble that has arisen in connection with this matter. Had there been none, Colonel Ross would not have been subjected to censure, and we would not have been called on to spend hours over a matter that might have been settled in fifteen minutes. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia will kindly explain to us why, in the state of the law, it was proposed to establish the canteen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the hon. gentleman kindly let us know what a canteen is, and what it is established for?

Mr. LONGLEY. A canteen is supposed to be something for furnishing provision or eating; but these canteens are like taverns, which profess to be established in order that people may get something to eat, whereas the primary object is to get something to drink.

Mr. AMYOT. Having belonged to the Canadian militia for about twenty years, I will be allowed to say a few words. This is a most important matter, because the whole militia system is interested in it; every battalion in the country will read what is said here to-night, with the view of understanding exactly the responsibility of every officer, and the responsibility of the Minister of Militia to this House. For my part, I think it is wrong to say that the Minister of Militia is to be blamed because he has gone beyond the report of the Major-General; I think the reports of the Major-General, of the Adjutant-General, or of the Brigade Major, are to be submitted to the Minister of Militia, who is responsible to this Parliament. If we were to be bound by the reports of the Major-General, there would be no necessity for having the Minister of Militia here. The Major-General comes from England; we do not suppose that England sends us her best officer, but if she did, he would not understand our habits or the spirit of our system, and if we were to be bound by his reports, there would be no responsibility at all; we would be under the despotism of

one man. All our militia officers hold their commissions by the good pleasure of the Queen, and that good pleasure exists so long as the Minister of Militia advises Her Majesty to continue it, and the Minister of Militia is responsible to the Parliament of the country for the advice he gives. As to this particular case, I am sorry that the papers have not been asked for before, and have not been given to us in time to enable us to peruse them and form a just opinion on the matter. For my part, I think the past services of volunteer officers should be respected; but because an officer has been long in the service it is no reason why he should be at greater liberty than another to commit a gross injustice or a gross blunder, for political or other purposes. In the present case I am not able to express an opinion, or to give a vote against the Minister of Militia, in whom I place the fullest confidence, because I do not know the facts sufficiently, and I cannot either praise or blame one or the other.

Mr. CARON. I wish to answer two questions which have been put. Several hon. gentlemen have expressed their dissatisfaction at the papers not having been brought down and placed upon the Table of Parliament. It may be my fault, although I do not believe it is. When the papers were asked for in this House, I had them copied, and as the hon. member for Lambton asked for these papers, thinking that possibly I might save him some little trouble, I sent the papers to him, expecting that he would return them to me, so that I might place them on the Table of the House before the question should be discussed, so that every hon. member might have the fullest information; but I little expected that the discussion would have taken place before the papers were laid upon the Table of Parliament. However, the discussion took place, statements were made, and I can readily understand at what a disadvantage members who discussed this question to-night were placed through not having seen the record. Upon that record I am ready to put my case before Parliament and the country; I believe I did my duty in taking the course I pursued in the light of the facts shown to me, and I would do the same again. The member for West Hastings has asked whether the Minister of Militia had a right to appoint canteens, tenants or not. The existing Act shows that he has. And let me tell the member for Annapolis, whose views on canteens I know, I foresaw the difficulty that would occur in renting canteens where spirituous liquors would be dispensed, and anxious as I always am to obtain his approval, I gave strict orders against the serving of such liquors. But a canteen is almost indispensable, where men can obtain articles of the best quality not included in the regulation allowance. Nothing could have been more painful to me, knowing Colonel Ross as I did, and having often met him as a member of this House, than to carry out the recommendations of the General in command, in censuring him as was ordered.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman says: hear, hear; but he admits himself that he has not read the papers containing the whole of that evidence, and the case as I have tried to submit it to the House. Taking up that record, and reading the report of the General commanding, it was impossible for me not to carry out the General's order, censuring Colonel Ross. The hon. gentleman in dealing with the case, read the report of the General, but not the last report sent me, on which I was bound to act, a Minister being always obliged to act on the last opinions of the officer who advises him. In carrying out that report I thought I had shown a leniency to Colonel Ross which, possibly, his former association with me in this Parliament and my knowledge of his services as a militia officer, might excuse. In fact I thought that I had been prevented, to a

great extent, by these considerations, from carrying out fully the recommendation of the report.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman persists in saying that he carried out the General's order and recommendation.

Mr. CARON. I do.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is not the case. The final report read recommends that Lieutenant-Colonel Ross be censured in presence of two officers, and that Major McGill be censured for his indiscretion in not communicating the information to Colonel Ross. That is implied in the initials on the margin, W. P., for Walter Powell. There are also other words upon the margin in the hand of the hon. Minister, directing that Colonel Ross be censured in General Orders. That is not in the General's recommendation, and the hon. gentleman should know it.

Mr. CARON. The report of the General was submitted to me, and upon it I had to act. I had to give the order which nobody else could give that Colonel Ross should be, as he was, censured.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman did not act on the General's report in the sense of obeying it. That report recommended that the censure of Colonel Ross should be administered by one officer in the presence of the Colonel and another officer; and the hon. gentleman did not say, "Let that be done," but he said, "Let censure issue in General Orders," which was not what General Luard had recommended, but something so different that the First Minister, in speaking on the subject, said the private censure was nothing—the public censure was everything—so different was the conduct of the hon. member from that recommended by the General. The hon. gentleman had the power to determine whether the report of the General should be agreed to, reversed or modified. The report suggested one thing which the hon. leader of the House said was nothing. The last report recommends that this censure be administered by the Brigade Major in the presence of the next senior officer. But the hon. Minister says he felt great pain in being obliged to follow out the report of the General. His pain was so great that he went entirely beyond the report, by making public the censure which the General had intimated should be made before only one or two individuals.

Resolution ordered to be reported; and (at 1 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 4th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. MÉTHOT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, may I be permitted to ask a favor of the House. I have on the papers a question to the Government, and as the Session is approaching its end, I would desire, by permission of the House, an answer to it to-day. It is as follows:—

1. Whether the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway is in existence?
2. If it exists, how it happens that its name does not appear in the Statistical Return of Canadian railways?
3. Whether the Government have hitherto taken steps to cause that Company to comply with the law which requires the making of an annual return.

Mr. CARON.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a point of order. When the Government took every day, the other day, I pointed out, among the inconveniences of that course, that hon. members would be deprived of the opportunity of asking questions. But no exception was made to that resolution; they did not leave us that opportunity, and, consequently, though I have been asked myself to put questions on the paper, I have not, feeling it would be but a mockery, since the Government has taken every day for the remainder of the Session. Now, but one measure of justice can be meted out to all members, and as I did not receive the support of the hon. gentleman, on asking for the privilege of putting questions for some time longer, I object to his asking the present question, because other hon. members have not the same opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question can be put only by the unanimous consent of the House. You cannot prevent the Government from answering it otherwise.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. member for West Durham objects to the question, of course we cannot answer it. Nevertheless, I am afraid I shall have to find some opportunity of answering the question in the House before the end of the Session.

INSPECTION OF STEAMBOATS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that Bill (No. 117) to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examining and licensing of engineers employed on them, be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for amendment.

Motion agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLELAN moved that "May" be struck out of clause 69 and "September" substituted.

Amendment agreed to and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I renew the application I made to insert a provision in place of clause 55, to punish the master who allows his steamer to carry more passengers than allowed by his certificate. We know that on certain occasions, especially on excursions, captains of steamers often allow their vessels to be overloaded. I have only to mention the great disaster which took place last Queen's Birthday, at London, Ont., which indeed was not the first occurrence of that kind which has occurred in this and other countries. I think the punishment provided by the Bill in section 55, is quite inadequate to the crime—for it is a crime, and it should be made so by the Bill. I, therefore, move that the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to substitute for the 55th clause the following:—

The master of any steamboat who, knowingly, shall at any time allow to be carried on board said steamer a greater number of passengers than that provided by her certificate, shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and who, on conviction thereof, shall be imprisoned for two years in the penitentiary, or for a less term or place of confinement, or shall be subjected to a fine not exceeding \$500, or shall suffer both fine and imprisonment within the above defined limits as the Court may order.

The clause will provide for cases like that which happened last year near London. If the violation of the law is not aggravated, then the Judge may impose a small fine; if it is a gross violation of the law, if life be lost, then the Judge may impose both fine and imprisonment. I may also mention now that I intend to move a clause to prevent steamboat racing, which is becoming quite alarming in this country. The Richelieu Navigation Company is opposed by another line running on the St. Lawrence and the Upper Lakes, and steamboat racing between these two lines has

taken place even in the rapids. There are also other opposition lines running on the St. Lawrence, and these races are becoming alarmingly frequent. I shall, therefore, propose that the Bill be recommitted to make provision to insure the safety of steamers and the lives of passengers, by making steamboat racing a misdemeanor. Clause 55 provides for the same offence, but only punishes it by a fine of \$500.

Mr. COCKBURN (Muskoka). I think the present clause is more forcible than that proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Under the former clause a captain is bound to ascertain and know whether he has too many passengers on board or not, but under the latter clause he is not compelled to know and would not be liable to punishment, because he might claim he did not know he had too many on board.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. It is the captain's duty to see how many passengers are on board, and if he carried too many passengers he would be held guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, and two years in the penitentiary would not be too severe.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). In the event of the captain not being in command of the vessel, the mate, or whoever is in charge, should be held responsible.

Mr. GIROUARD. The clause is proposed with the view of meeting a case like that which occurred at London, Ontario, on the Queen's Birthday, when every one on board knew that the vessel was over-crowded.

Mr. MACKENZIE. From the newspaper reports I gathered that the cause of the accident was because the boiler was set loosely on the deck, the vessel being without a hold and flat-bottomed. When the vessel tilted the boiler got loose and carried away the supports of the other deck, and the passengers were swept overboard. Whether the Bill provides for such a case I do not know. If vessels on the Thames are still constructed after this manner, that circumstance is more dangerous than mere over-loading.

Mr. McCUAIG. It was proved at the coroner's inquest that the boilers were not fastened, and when the boat lurched it slipped to one side and carried everything before it. That was the real cause of the accident. It is very important that the House, before dealing with this question, should understand in what way it is to be determined how many passengers the steamer can carry. For instance, the hull of a boat will be 200 or 300 tons measurement, but by the more recent system of measurement the state-rooms are all measured and the total would reach 900 or 1,000 tons, and a vessel with an upper deck would carry more passengers.

Mr. McLENNAN. There was a further cause of the London accident which must be corrected by the more strict system of inspection now established. I seconded the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because I think an evil of this magnitude affecting the risking of the lives of the people must be prevented by something more deterrent than a mere money fine, and this can only be effected by making such an error a misdemeanor and subjecting the party to punishment. I hope the promoter of the Bill will see the propriety of adopting the amended clause.

Mr. McLELAN. The desire of the Government is to provide for the protection of the lives of passengers on steamboats. The clause was so drafted that masters and owners should become interested, and watch the passengers as they come aboard and see there was not an excessive number. I think we have made a great step in advance of the old regulations. I admit it is a grave crime for the master of a vessel to knowingly go to sea with a large excess of passengers, and I would

suggest that there be inserted at the end of the clause such words as these :

"The master or person in charge of a vessel who shall proceed to sea knowingly having an excess of passengers on board, should be held to be guilty of a misdemeanor."

Motion agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. GIROUARD. I propose to add a new clause after clause 55, to the effect that the master of any steamboat, or the officer in charge of such steamboat for the time being, who knowingly shall at any time allow to be carried on board such steamboat a greater number of passengers than that permitted by the certificate, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be imprisoned for two years in the penitentiary, and so on.

Amendment agreed to and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. GIROUARD moved :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted with instructions to add another clause immediately after clause 56, to the effect that the master or officer in charge for the time being, of any steamboat carrying passengers, who shall allow his steamboat to race with any steamer so as to endanger the lives of his passengers, shall be punished as provided for in the preceding clause.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think the amendment as it stands, will have the effect which the hon. gentleman wishes it to have. How can you say racing will endanger the lives of passengers or not?

Mr. GIROUARD. That would be a matter for the jury to decide.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is already provided in the Bill that a steamer shall only carry a certain amount of steam, and if it is allowed to carry more, the owner or master is liable to the punishment provided. How can a man race his boat if he is not allowed to raise his steam to a racing point. It seems to me, therefore, that the amendment is unnecessary, as it is amply provided for by the preceding clause. It is very desirable that there should be every protection to life and property, but we need not go too far; we need not go so far as to drive off our waters all the steamboats of this country.

Mr. McCUAIG. It is provided in the Bill that the pressure shall only be so much and the safety-valve is locked up, so I agree with the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) that it is unnecessary to add this new provision.

Mr. COCKBURN. The only question that can come in after the provision with regard to the maximum pressure, is the question of crowding and the right of way, and there can be no difficulty in regard to that, because they are provided for by the general navigation law of the country. I think, therefore, that the new clause will only encumber the Bill.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. As it would be a violation of the law to put on more than a certain amount of steam, it seems that this clause is unnecessary. I do not see any objection to our steamers racing a little on our rivers, if they do not put on more steam than is allowed by the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. This matter was considered in preparing the Bill, and we thought that the provision in regard to locking up the safety-valve would be sufficient, because the question of crowding and the right of way in narrow passages is dealt with by the navigation laws of the country.

Mr. BUNSTER. I hope the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) will withdraw that clause with regard to racing. In British Columbia we have

a strong company that owns a considerable number of boats, and we have other enterprising men building boats, and they are vieing vigorously with the large monopoly in steamboats that has existed for years. I hope the hon. gentleman will see fit to withdraw that part of his motion relating to racing.

Mr. GIROUARD. I believe the clause as framed will meet every objection. It says that when a captain of a steamer shall allow his steamer to race so as to endanger the life of his passengers or the safety of his steamer, he will be guilty of a crime. That will be left to a jury.

Mr. McCUAIG. What is the meaning of the word race? It means an increase of motive power to produce greater speed, and the moment a man increases the power of the engine, he violates the law.

Mr. McDUGALL. It appears to me the question is a simple one. It is quite true that you may not be able to put on steam enough to make a race; but we know that when people want a race, there is a way of getting at this locked-up safety-valve, I apprehend, and what proof can you give whether the safety-valve has been maintained at the proper pressure or not? A race is a thing which a hundred people may be spectators of and may be able to give proof of; but as to whether the safety-valve was kept in its proper position, or whether too much steam was put on, cannot be ascertained except from the officers of the boat.

Mr. McCALLUM. I think the hon. member for Halton cannot have read the Bill, because it provides that under a certain penalty the certificate granted by the Inspector is to be hung up, so that every passenger can see it; and that tells the number of pounds of steam which the steamer ought to carry, and the steam-gauge tells what amount it is carrying. Does the hon. gentleman want more than that? In this Bill ample punishment is provided for any man who violates the law. The amendment cannot hurt the Bill very much. With regard to racing, suppose two steamboats leave a wharf together, both carrying all the steam that the law will allow, and both running at about the same speed; you might call that racing, but it is not, because they are running according to the law.

Mr. McLENNAN. The explanation that is made of the safety that arises from locking up the safety-valves does not cover the case. The test of a boiler is made with reference to its strength, and not its ability to propel craft. That will depend upon the size of the vessel for lading, and many other circumstances, and if the boiler happens to have strength enough to stand the test of a high pressure of steam, the vessel may be able to race without violating the law. Thus speed might be produced, measured only by the capacity of the boiler, not by the danger of racing, and everybody knows that racing is very dangerous.

Amendment negatived on a division.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. McCALLUM. Sub-section 6 of section 19 of this Bill provides that:

Every boiler, safety-valve, steam-gauge or other appendage to a boiler, or machine placed on board a steamboat after the coming into force of this Act, shall for the purposes thereof be considered as having been made after this Act is in force, and subject to the requirements thereof accordingly.

I consider this a very severe provision, because it will have the effect of condemning all the boilers made up to the time this Act comes in force, which are not made in accordance with this clause. I do not think that is the intention. I cannot understand it, and I have not seen a man who can explain it to me. It is not right that we should have this provision applied to all the boilers already made which are good enough, that Mr. Ristley should try his hand at such experiments. I, therefore, move:

Mr. BUNSTER.

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same, by striking out the word "boiler-cocks," in sub-section 2 of section 19, and by striking out sub-section 6 of section 19.

Mr. McLELAN. The effect of this amendment would be to permit boiler-cocks to be screwed into the thin shell of the which proves a very slight hold. The Bill now requires boiler, there should be a flange to connect the boiler-cock to the boiler, or connection by a nut, to give it a better connection between the boiler and itself. In some cases the boiler-cock has been simply screwed into the thin shell of the boiler by a very slight thread of a screw, and has afterwards been blown out, lives being lost in consequence.

Mr. McCALLUM. Never.

Mr. McLELAN. I know of some cases. The Bill provides for additional security by setting in a flange, and by allowing the boiler-cock to pass through the shell with a nut inside, and attaching it more securely to the boiler. Under the amendment a difficulty would occur in leaving the time unlimited. Every boiler made after the passing of this Act, whether in one, two, or ten years, and set in a steamer, under this proposition, would be free from the requirements of this Act. This motion would destroy the effect of the whole Act. Again, you could take an old boiler out of an old steamer and put it in a new steamer, under the operation of this amendment, and would be free from the provision of this Act. This Bill has been known for two or three months, and it will not operate till the 1st of September next, and all boilers in course of construction will be placed on board of steamers before that time.

Mr. BROWN. With reference to placing the flange inside, and the boiler-cock, as proposed in the Bill, if a boiler is likely to burst with a pressure of steam, it would be better to let the cock go altogether. If we could place a plug there on the pressure of steam, it could not do any harm. It is difficult sometimes to get the washer inside the boiler. The guide-cocks sometimes become unscrewed and frequently have to be taken out, and it is difficult to place them inside. Boiler explosions occur very seldom. The principle point is to see that the plates are of good quality and well riveted down. I never knew of a boiler exploding when the engine was in motion. It will generally work off the steam faster than it can be raised. If the steam is likely to get very high, the engineer will be able to let go altogether, which would be a better protection to the boiler.

Mr. McCUAIG. Although I am over forty years in the steamboat business, I have never known of a cock of a boiler being blown out. Previous to a steamer leaving the wharf she tests the cock at 90 lbs. pressure and 65 lbs. locked up. A good many boilers are so constructed as to render it impossible to put this flange in. This is a new clause altogether. None of my engineers either, have known of such accidents as the hon. Minister has mentioned. Steamboat owners ought not to be put to unnecessary expense simply because the Chairman of the Inspection Board wishes to test some new-fangled experiment which he learned of in England. With the present precautions and protection I do not see how any accidents can occur.

Mr. COCKBURN. I believe there was an accident in Montreal from the blowing out of a steam-pipe, but I do not think any danger exists when the proper screws are in the boilers as at present. It would impose a very great hardship on the trade were they compelled to take out all their present connections and put in bolts. I have consulted practical men on this matter, because I know the inspectors have been in favor of connections on those flanges. In some cases they have had to break the pipes all to pieces. When screwed into the boiler they were more secure than they could have been made by any flange, therefore they

are perfectly safe. The accident that took place is no reason why we should adopt this change. A clause might be introduced applying to future boilers, but none should be made retroactive. If it is the desire of the Committee to make it apply in new cases only, I do not object. When people are putting in new machinery they will not object to putting on flanges, but if the inspectors wish to put those on in old boilers it would be a great hardship.

Mr. CURRIER. The heads of boilers, I presume, are generally considered the weakest part, and I think the obligation to rivet on flanges will do harm. Boring holes to rivet on flanges and putting on try-cocks, will serve to weaken the head of the boiler. The try-cock of a boiler is small, not more than half an inch in diameter. That would only be one-third of a square inch on which the pressure would come. Boiler bolts are scarcely less than three-eighths of an inch in diameter. That would take about nine threads of a screw in the thickness of a boiler bolt. I do not see how it is possible a try-cock put on with nine threads, taking hold of the thickness of the boiler, could possibly be forced out, because the pressure on it is so small, not being more than one-third of a square inch. It would be a great hardship to steamboat owners to be compelled to change their boiler heads by putting on all these flanges.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is very important there should be plenty of water in the boiler all the time, and a glass tube is attached that shows you the quantity of water in the boiler; but in case this tube should by accident be broken, there are three of those gauge-cocks in every boiler to show the amount of water. They are not any larger than my finger, and the holes are not more than one-eighth of an inch in diameter. In a boiler that will carry 100 lbs. of steam, there is not more than a pressure of 30 lbs. on the size of my finger. But as far as valves are concerned, it is greater. A man at Montreal when screwing one of these valves did not make it sufficiently fast, it was blown out and killed him. On that an Order in Council was passed, on the 26th March, 1880, providing that all valves and all boiler cocks and everything of that kind should be put on with a flange. In the pipes of any size as high as an inch and an inch and a-half, that has been carried out in the past even on board my own boats; we had to destroy pipes to get them out and they were afterwards put on with a flange. I do not object at all that in case of valves when there is any pressure of steam against them and there is the slightest danger of their being blown out, flanges should be put on; but I know the House does not want to impose this useless expenditure on steamboat owners of putting flanges on gauge cocks and making a boiler weak by boring these holes in its weakest part. The hon. Minister says if we strike out sub-section 6 of section 19 you can put any old boiler on board a vessel. But he has got the same law as we had before, and the whole Act itself, even should this sub-section be struck out. I do not want this Bill to be made retroactive so that steamboat owners will be obliged to destroy the boilers already made up to the present time, which they would have to do under this clause which provides that all the boilers made before the passing of this Act must come up to the standard of this Act although they may be safe and good boilers. By one stroke of the pen you are going to destroy people's property. If a boiler does not come up to this standard the inspector will have to condemn it. I hope the hon. Minister will strike out this clause because it is retroactive.

Mr. McLELAN. It is not.

Mr. McCALLUM. The clause reads:

Every boiler, safety valve, steam-gauge or other appendage to a boiler, or machine placed on board a steamboat after the coming into force of this Act, shall for the purposes thereof be considered as having

been made after this Act is in force and subject to the requirements thereof accordingly.

If that is not retroactive I do not know what is.

Mr. McLELAN. No; it only refers to boilers placed on board after the passing of the Act. With regard to sub-section 2, the boiler-cock may stand, as the hon. gentleman has said, 90 lbs. pressure when the screws are new, but after they are worn a while and corrosion sets in—

Mr. McCUAIG. That makes them stronger.

Mr. McLELAN. After continual handling the thread weakens, and the pressure becomes too heavy. The hon. gentleman has referred to one case of loss of life, in consequence of that, and there have been many others. I believe now it is a custom to provide safety-plugs of lead, which melt and allow the steam to escape, and no damage is done.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The steamboat owners throughout the country are very much excited over this Bill. Their business is now reduced to almost a non-paying basis through the great competition they have to meet with railroads, and the out-look is that their business will be still further reduced in the future. They naturally feel aggrieved that any unnecessary, if they are unnecessary, or irksome charges should be put on them. The amendment which the hon. member for Monck proposes will not weaken this Bill at all, because it refers to boilers that may be made between now and the time of the coming into force of this Act. He only asks to have this clause amended by adding: "Any boiler, safety-valve, steam-gauge, or other appendage to a boiler or machine, and placed on board after the Act comes into force."

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. What will be the standard of the old boiler?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The same standard as at present. It will have to go through the same inspection, to be subject to the hydrostatic test and every other test now required.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. Would that test be abolished by this clause?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not at all, it is kept in force still. This amendment will not state that these boilers will not be subject to this Act, but that they will not be required to have these new contrivances that the steamboat owners are complaining of. I think, then, that these two words "made and" might be inserted there without injuring the Act at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The proposition of the hon. member for Monck seems to me a most reasonable one, and I think the hon. Minister ought to give way to it. There can be no dangerous result from it in making it prospective altogether in its operation.

Mr. McLELAN. "Made and placed on board," made when? Made in ten years? If I understand the hon. gentleman he wants to be allowed to place on board boilers that are made or may be made.

Mr. McCALLUM. No. My amendment strikes out that altogether because it is useless.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I would ask whether a boiler made now will be subject as it is now under the law after this Act passes?

Mr. McLELAN. It will be subject to the same tests of inspection, but it may be excepted from some of the particulars of construction.

Mr. McCALLUM. I have no objection to striking out the clause altogether; it will suit me better.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am afraid this Bill may be used in such a manner by the inspectors as to make great hardship to steamboat owners, not required by a fair con-

sideration of the public good. I have received several communications as strongly opposing some of the provisions. While it is absolutely necessary to provide for the public safety, we all know that Government officers are sometimes apt to perform their duties in a rather austere manner, without due consideration to the interests of private parties. Of course, it is undoubtedly our duty to see that every reasonable prevention is taken to secure the safety of the public, but I do not think it is desirable that we should confiscate the property of steamboat owners by making rigid regulations which, when administered by a very severe inspector, would virtually render valueless property that can be used for the convenience of the public, and without any injury to the public by the present owners. Now, a boiler may be perfectly safe and adequate to pass the existing scale of examination, and the boat in which it is used is burned or wrecked, but under this clause that boiler could not be put into a new hull without violating this new Act, and would be practically useless, and the owner would be compelled to purchase a new boiler or else abandon the boat altogether. In my county there are some fifteen or eighteen small or large steamers navigating inland waters, and if a very rigid system of inspection is applied to every one of these boilers, and the owners were all required to build new boilers, the result would be that the public will be deprived of that accommodation which is so useful to them. I do not think the safety of life will be improved in consequence, but an almost irreparable injury will be done to the owners of these vessels. If the Minister intends to strike out that clause, I certainly think the public would suffer no harm, while the property of a good many steamboat owners who are largely interested would be secured.

Mr. McLELAN. I have no objection to strike out the clause altogether rather than amend it. As to clause 2, that has been in operation two years by an Order in Council. I understand from some steamboat owners on both sides that all the boilers are brought up to the requirements of the Order in Council passed two years ago, therefore it cannot be hard in its operation.

Mr. McCALLUM. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the inland waters of this country not a single gauge-cock is ever put on, and the present inspector does not insist on it. But another inspector might adopt a new policy and cause a good deal of trouble. I shall agree if the hon. gentleman strikes out gauge-cocks altogether. That is a useless provision. As to the valves, I know the inspector insists on their being put in, and they are being put in in many cases at great expense to the steamboat owners.

Mr. McLELAN. It has been in force two years and no harm has resulted from it. I move, in amendment, that the Bill be re-committed for the purpose of striking out sub-section 6.

Mr. McCALLUM. Then I will withdraw my motion. But I am determined to insist on getting these words: "boiler-cocks" struck out.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McCALLUM moved to strike out sub-section 6 of section 19.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McCUAIG. The object contemplated by the amendments to this Bill is to secure greater safety to the public. It has been found, in cases tried before Ontario Courts, that the present inspectors are deficient in knowledge in regard to the hulls of vessels. The members of the Board

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

of Inspectors are wholly uninformed as to the manner of constructing hulls, and, in recent cases, they failed, when brought before the Courts, to satisfy either the Court or the jury that they had sufficient knowledge to qualify them to examine inspectors. In consequence of that fact, steamboat owners generally have asked the Government to appoint a hull inspector, one practically familiar with the building of vessels. I observe that clause 7 of the Bill runs as follows:—

7. No person shall be appointed Inspector of boilers and machinery of steamboats, unless nor until he has passed a satisfactory examination before the Board of Steamboat Inspection, as to his knowledge on the subject of boilers and machinery of steamboats, and the working of the same; or an Inspector of the hulls and equipment of such vessel, unless he has passed a satisfactory examination as to his competency for the office, before a Board of three practical shipbuilders, to be appointed by the Governor in Council, or is a certified surveyor of a recognized society for the classification of shipping.

The Courts and juries have declared, time and time again, that the Chairman of this Board of Inspectors and the Board itself are not competent to examine these men.

Mr. McLELAN. Read on a little further.

Mr. McCUAIG. The clause continues:

Nor shall he be appointed an Inspector for either purpose unless he has received from the Chairman of the Board, or from the said practical shipbuilders (as the case may be) a certificate in writing that he has satisfactorily passed such examination, or is a certified surveyor as aforesaid.

I do not wish to leave it in the power of the Government to say that these men shall be examined by the Board of Inspectors. What I desire is, to separate the hull inspecting staff from the inspectors of boilers.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. They are separated.

Mr. McCUAIG. I beg to move:

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same as that in clause 7 after the word "his," in line 32, page 3, the words "skill and experience in the construction, fastening and strength of a steamer's hull and of his" shall be inserted,—and after the word "Council," in line 34, page 3, the words "from amongst the residents of the Province within which the inspection is required to be made" shall be inserted,—and after the word "from," in line 38, page 3, the words "a majority of" shall be inserted. After the word "Council," in lines 34 and 35, of the same clause, the words "or is a certified surveyor of a recognized society for the classification of shipping,"—and after the word "from," in lines 37 and 38, the words "the Chairman of the Board or from,"—and after the word "shipbuilders," in lines 38 and 39, as the case may be,—and after the word "examination," in lines 40 and 41 of the same clause, the words "or is a certified surveyor as aforesaid," shall be struck out.

What I really aim to secure by the amendment is this: I wish the hull inspectors to go before practical ship-builders and undergo an examination, and that their certificate shall be satisfactory. I object decidedly to this clause, "or a certified surveyor of a recognized society for the classification of shipping." Because we know that political pressure is brought to bear on the Government, and the men appointed are not qualified to discharge their duties properly and to the satisfaction of the public. I, therefore, want them to be brought down to a practical test.

Mr. McCALLUM. I agree with my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. McCuaig) that it is desirable that life and property should be protected as far as possible, and I believe that we are going a long way in that direction in passing this Bill. I objected in Committee to some parts of clause 7. The Bill provides that the inspector of hulls shall go before a board of qualified shipbuilders and undergo a certain examination before receiving his appointment, and I think that is sufficient. I objected to the words "or is a certified surveyor of a recognized society for the classification of shipping," for this reason, that the Bill provides that they shall go before a qualified body of men who understand their business.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. That applies entirely to the inspection of hulls.

Mr. McCALLUM. Well, who is better qualified to inspect boilers or machinery than the Board of Steamboat Inspection. I object to the inspector of hulls being under the control of the Chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection, because the Chairman of the Board of Inspection can go on board a vessel and supersede the inspection made by the hull inspector. If these gentlemen hold certificates now from the society spoken of, it certainly would do no harm, if they understand their business, to go before the Board, and show to the world that they are qualified. We have societies in the Province of Ontario for the inspection and classification of shipping, and they may be as well qualified as those the hon. gentleman speaks of. If the hon. gentleman will not withdraw the motion I will have to vote against it.

Mr. McLELAN. I think everything the hon. gentleman really asks for is provided in the Bill. The inspector of hulls has to be examined by a Board of three practical ship-builders, to be appointed by the Governor in Council, and must receive a certificate from them, and I think this provision meets every requirement.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. I think the clause provides for all my hon. friend wishes. He seems to think that the Chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection has something to do with the examination of hulls.

Mr. McCUAIG. Unquestionably he is, under this Bill.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The Chairman of the Board of Inspection has nothing to do with the examination of the person proposed to be appointed inspector of hulls. They are entirely distinct. I think the provision with regard to the inspector being a certified surveyor of a recognized society for the classification of shipping, is a very wise one. It is the strongest possible evidence of confidence in every respect.

Mr. McCUAIG. What I object to is this provision with regard to the inspector being a certified surveyor of a recognized society for the classification of shipping. If you are going to adopt that provision why not adopt at once classification of insurance companies. The Board of Underwriters examine vessels every year, and I should be perfectly willing to accept the classification of the insurance companies. It would be a much more independent classification than the one provided for.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The Government could authorize the person who is agent of these companies to examine and certify vessels. The Government may appoint the same men.

Mr. McCUAIG. They may not appoint these men though.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 152) respecting bridges over navigable waters constructed under the authority of Provincial Acts.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend Chapter 29, 38 Victoria, intituled: "An Act to extend certain provisions of 'The Seamen's Act, 1873,' to vessels employed in navigating the Inland Waters of Canada, and to provide for the collection of the wages of seamen and other persons employed on board vessels trading on the inland waters of Canada, in a summary manner." He said: This Bill is intended to remedy a

hardship of which seamen in Ontario complain. In most countries where seamen are employed, their wages are regarded as the first payment to be made by the owners or captains of vessels. In 1879, an Act was passed in this House allowing mortgages on vessels on our inland waters, to have precedence of sailors' wages, and several cases of great hardship have arisen in consequence. Seamen have found at the end of a season's work on board these vessels, that some mortgagee could come before them and deprive them of their wages. It is proposed to remedy this evil and to give the men who sail the vessel and make her profitable to the owners and mortgagees the right to claim their wages first. I propose to amend the Bill very considerably in Committee.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. How is this Bill originated, is it applied for by parties interested in shipping in Ontario? It makes great changes, and unless it has been asked for by a very considerable number of parties engaged in the shipping business, it does not seem necessary to change the law as proposed, because the sailors have the securities of the owners of the vessels for their wages, which is ample. It would be a serious matter to interfere with mortgagees rights, and allow sailors at any time to take steps which would have the effect of destroying the priority of a mortgage. I would like to hear the opinion of the member for Prince Edward on this measure.

Mr. McCUAIG. Under the Maritime Court Law of Ontario, the sailor has at present a prior claim for his wages.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. No.

Mr. McCUAIG. Yes; the sailor has a prior claim on the vessel over a mortgage and everything else, except where a mortgage was created prior to the establishment of the Maritime Court. Perhaps there are not more than half-a-dozen vessels in Ontario that have such old mortgages resting upon them. I wish to impress on my hon. friend for Monck this one point: most of those steamboats cost from \$50,000 to \$60,000, one-half of which perhaps is furnished by the builder, who receives a mortgage on the vessel for that amount. Is not that mortgage then created to pay the laborers, the carpenters and others engaged in building the vessel, as well as for the materials, and through these means does not the sailor get employment? What right, then, has Parliament to destroy that security created for the building and working of the vessel? So far as I am concerned this provision will make no difference to me, but the matter should be carefully considered by Parliament with such laws destroying the securities of property and railways aided by Government, competing against steamboats, we shall soon find them driven out of existence altogether. At present the stock of the mail line, which boasts of some of the finest steamers afloat, running from Hamilton to Montreal, can be bought at from 25 to 30 cents on the \$1. It is the constant passing of such Bills—for every year we have an Inspection Bill—which destroys the public confidence in those boats. This frequent legislation should be terminated.

Mr. GUILLET. The hon. member for Prince Edward has made a very extravagant statement; it is not a new thing to grant a first lien on vessels to the wages of seamen, and the argument of increased employment is not worthy of much consideration if wages are insecure. If there are but half a dozen mortgages, there is the less reason for refusing the protection which is granted by universal Maritime Law.

Mr. McCUAIG. You have it now.

Mr. GUILLET. On the upper lakes the Maritime Law of the United States recognizes seamen's claims as the prior lien on shipping to everything but, perhaps, salvage; and as that law has not existed with us, our seamen

have been placed at a great disadvantage to those of the United States, and consequently many of them prefer sailing under the American flag which gives them security for their wages. I know many instances of seamen finding themselves at the end of the season deprived of their hard earnings on which they had depended upon for support of themselves and families through the winter, in consequence of the existence of mortgages ahead of them. Several cases of hardship have occurred to my own knowledge. I know there is a strong feeling throughout the Province among the seamen with reference to this matter. It is well known that our seamen are men who are not very fond of money for its own sake. They are generous, hearty fellows, anything but mercenary in their characters, reckless of life and limb in the performance of duty, but keenly alive to their rights. They feel very keenly the wrong imposed on them by their being placed in an exceptional position different to that of seamen in any other part of the world. I am extremely glad the Government are giving the Bill their support, and protecting the interests of our seamen, as they have done in regard to every other class of our citizens.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). When the Act was passed in Upper Canada it was received with great satisfaction by all parties interested in shipping matters. The sailors, up to that time, had no remedy for obtaining their wages in cases where they had difficulties with the masters of vessels. This Act was passed in 1877, but in 1879 an Act was passed changing its spirit by excluding from its operation vessels on which there were mortgages prior to the passing of the Act.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Not the vessels but the mortgages.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is the same thing. I think it was a retrograde step, and I am glad that the hon. the Minister of Marine has decided to wipe out that law from the Statute-Book. I have personal experience, as Proctor of the Maritime Court, of the great hardship inflicted on common sailors by the operation of that law passed in 1879, and have already, in former Sessions, protested against its continuance. I have known cases in which sailors at the end of a season did not receive one dollar of their wages. The sooner that law is repealed the better. I understand that this Bill provides to extend to Ontario the provisions already existing in the Maritime Provinces in relation to the summary obtaining of wages within a certain amount. As we have established a Maritime Court in Ontario, it is only reasonable we should have the benefit of the Seamen's Act in Ontario to the same extent as in the Maritime Provinces. I suppose this Act is only intended to be a temporary Act, if we are to judge from the resolutions passed in the other House in relation to the uniform maritime jurisdiction in the Dominion. In the meantime, I think, it is a matter of the merest justice that this Act should become law.

Mr. McLENNAN. A most prominent feature in this Act is, not the question of the lien that is held by the sailor for his wages, but an unfortunate provision in clause 7, that on a seaman or other person on board such vessel making an affidavit or affirmation before a Police Magistrate, or any Justice of the Peace, where the vessel is lying, that the master of such vessel is indebted to him for wages or refuses to pay them, the vessel may be detained.

Mr. McLELAN. Pending the result of the resolution moved elsewhere, and the carrying out of the intention of the Government to make some general Bill applicable to the whole maritime cases of the Dominion, I simply propose to make their wages a lien on the vessel and give them the right to recover that they had in the Act of 1873.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

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

Mr. GUILLET,

After Recess.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 1,

Charges of Management..... \$169,834 10

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is the item on which the hon. member for Centre Huron asked if we had any communication to show if the engagement made by the hon. Finance Minister in 1860, in respect to the English loan, was 1 per cent. I have a letter here which I will read:

"LONDON, 17th January, 1860.

"GENTLEMEN,—I think it desirable before my return to Canada to place in writing the arrangement agreed upon between us in relation to the new Canada loan. The financial agents are to charge the commission of 1 per cent. stipulated in former cases of loans negotiated by them for Canada, to be taken into account as the loan is realized. Brokerage of one-fourth of 1 per cent. to be charged where it has been claimed by and charged to the brokers.

"The small incidental expenses of printing, postage, &c., to be charged to Canada.

"No commission is to be charged on the exchange or future purchaser of the currency or Consolidated Municipal Loan Fund Bonds, made on account of, or out of the proceeds of loan, but where bonds are bought in the market the brokerage actually paid is to be charged.

"No commission is to be charged on the conversion of the sterling 6 per cent. and 5 per cent. bonds, but brokerage of one-eighth of 1 per cent. may be paid to brokers through whom such conversion takes place.

"In lieu of the commission to which the general agents would be entitled, on the redemption of the outstanding sterling bonds, a commission of 1 per cent. is to be charged upon the amount annually invested in the sinking fund, including the accumulated interest thereon.

"In case any of the outstanding bonds shall not be converted before maturity, the agents will, in such case, be entitled to commission on their redemption (1 per cent.)"

That is the letter of the agents acknowledging this communication and accepting it.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not, however, notice any express stipulation of 1 per cent. of final payment.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It says at the end if they are not redeemed in purchases for the sinking fund, then they are to pay 1 per cent. for their purchase.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. "In case any outstanding bonds shall not be converted before maturity," does that refer to this mode?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It refers to the 1 per cent. charged as in former loans, under former engagements which we know were entered into by Old Canada.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I would not, without careful consideration, choose to contradict the construction which the hon. Finance Minister puts upon it, but it seemed to me to bear some doubt as I heard it read. There were a lot of other securities, according to my recollection, at the time. Part of the arrangement made by Sir A. T. Galt had reference to a conversion into 5 per cents. of certain outstanding 6 per cents. I should think that with these outstanding bonds, which matured at different dates, ranging over several years after 1860, were what we referred to in this, and not the whole sum of £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 sterling which constituted this 5 per cent. loan.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think if the hon. gentleman reads the second letter he will see it refers to the \$2,800,000 floated in 1860.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Those outstanding bonds to which I called the attention of the hon. Minister, which were collected, as the letter shows, with our old Municipal Loan Fund indebtedness, came due, I think, at odd periods ranging from 1860 onwards, and this agreement for 1 per cent. refers to that apparently, not to the amount paid by the loan, as I read these two communications. I should judge, with only these two before me, that the point was

left undecided except as regards the several outstanding debts of Canada, which came in in 1864 or 1865.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Does the hon. member recollect when the last 5 per cent. loan was issued by Old Canada?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That was the last one. None was issued after 1860.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. And that may be redeemed in 1885.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Exactly. Then that refers to that loan.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. As the bargain seems to have been concluded now, I do not know that it will affect our position materially one way or the other, but it would affect, to some extent, the terms which the agents had got. I would not venture, without further examination, to pronounce a positive opinion one way or the other upon it, but I think you had better put this on the Table.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I will do that. If I find to-morrow there are any other papers I will bring them down.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am inclined to think that our legal friends will say that the matter was left in abeyance, that they had neither conceded nor waived the point. As regards that particular £50,000 or £60,000, I remember having had considerable discussion with Sir John Rose about it in 1874 or 1875, though whether he produced that letter, or whether the agents produced it, I cannot say from memory, but I know we both came to the conclusion that the matter had been left open.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The correspondence that has been placed before me has not been with reference to their right to claim 1 per cent. if they redeemed it. One point was whether it was a contract we were bound to carry out with them as a firm or a banking house.

On Resolution 44,

To meet expenses in procuring and taking care of Archives..... \$5,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. POPE. I have directed Mr. Brymner to make further enquiries regarding the documents in Boston, but the appropriation is so small that it has not so far been possible to obtain copies of them.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think that at Albany also, valuable documents having reference to the early struggles between the French and British colonists, and the settlement of Upper Canada can be found. Our own archives are singularly deficient in these respects.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that there should be a very full and ample index of the archives prepared and carried on from year to year, and printed in some journal. I think some sort of index or catalogue is now issued, but it does not appear to me to be at all as full as it ought to be. What I propose would not be expensive, while it would be extremely useful; so far as anything is known except to those in the Department, these archives might as well be sealed books altogether.

Mr. POPE. A full and complete catalogue is now in course of preparation.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have been informed that the Government of the Province of Quebec is getting copies of all plans and maps of Old Canada which are in the library in Boston. I have been informed that application has been made to the Government here to obtain a duplicate of these maps and plans, for the library or the archives of the Dominion. Perhaps the hon. Minister could give some information on this subject.

Mr. POPE. My attention has been called to this matter, but the appropriation is so small that I am not yet able to devote any money to that purpose. I hope this year, however, to be able to make enquiry into this matter.

On Resolution 47,

Expenses in connection with the Census..... \$60,000

Mr. ANGLIN. Does the Minister intend to make any change in the Census returns to correspond with the gerrymandering of the constituencies in the Bill before the House?

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex). Will the Minister not find it convenient to publish a few volumes of the Census on better paper and with better binding than the Census of 1871? If it is the same paper, it looks very bad.

Mr. POPE (Compton). It is better.

Mr. ROSS. I would suggest a better paper and better binding, to make the volumes appear respectable. The United States work is far in advance of ours.

Mr. POPE. We have obtained the best paper we could find in the country, which I think very good. The answer to the question of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) must depend on this House. We have distributed one copy to each hon. member, and it is intended to give each hon. member four as hitherto. It will take some time to get the other copies ready. One volume has been prepared much earlier than that of England or the United States, though the Census in those countries were taken a year earlier.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Gloucester enquired whether it was proposed to gerrymander the Census in the same way as the constituencies. If you have to go to three, four or five political constituencies to get the facts in relation to the numbers of former political units, great difficulties will occur. Had the Administration always continued the course of dealing with the municipal organization as the units for electoral purposes, that difficulty would, perhaps, not have been so marked. But we have now neither political nor, in the units proposed to be used in any sense, municipal units, so that we have really no means whatever, without very considerable time and trouble, of applying any unit of any size larger than a township or town, and learning what the statistical facts of the Census are.

Mr. POPE. It must be understood that the Census was taken in April of last year, which will account for the non-appearance of certain names and facts which would be included in any Census taken at present.

Mr. BLAKE. I pointed out that the redistribution was not arranged on the principle of counties, but on the principle of ridings, and as the ridings have to be all changed we have neither counties nor ridings.

Mr. POPE. The Census having been taken in April of last year could not refer to any divisions of constituencies that have been made since.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will find that every village or municipality has been enumerated and dealt with in proper form.

Mr. BLAKE. My suggestion was that they should be aggregated with reference to one or other of two sets of aggregations in force in the Province—one set is the county aggregation, and the other set is the Federal political aggregation. We have had them here before in the Federal political aggregation of ridings or political districts. We have now not one of them in that form, or in the county form either; and unless something is done to remedy the difficulty, much trouble and expense will be the result in working the new scheme.

On Resolution 39,

To meet expenses connected with health statistics.. \$10,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this, however excellent the object may be, there seems to be a very considerable divergence of opinion among the members of the medical profession in this House in regard to the utility of this vote. If I am not mistaken, many asserted no good results will flow from it. The hon. Minister himself had no very clear idea as to what value he could get for the money. He spoke of the vote as being experimental, and said he was going to confer with the Medical Council and ascertain what they would do. Has the hon. gentleman any further information on the subject?

Mr. POPE. I have no further information than what I gave when the item was first brought down. The Medical Board said that if a certain amount were placed at their disposal they could collect health statistics much cheaper than we. They will submit a plan for approval.

On Resolution 51,

Quarantine..... \$68,266

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. With respect to cattle quarantines in the West, have the sites been fully determined?

Mr. POPE. One will be at Sarnia. It is possible there may be another one, but I am very loth to have another if we can avoid it. If we do it will be in a place where it can be run very cheaply, and will be for a short time in the year.

On Resolution 128,

To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, to line of steamers to trade between Canada and West Indies and Brazil, provided a like amount be paid by the Brazilian Government..... \$50,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A steamer belonging to this line left Halifax in February, I think. The Brazilian Government have formally agreed to pay the subsidy on their part.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman aware, at this moment, whether any formal communication on the subject has been addressed by the Brazilian Government to Her Majesty's Government?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say positively. If the hon. member wishes I will allow that to stand.

On Resolution 131,

Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton and Gaspé, and intermediate ports..... \$8,000

Mr. ANGLIN. Has anything been done towards providing for this accommodation?

Mr. McLELAN. Arrangements are being completed for placing a fortnightly steamer upon that service.

Mr. ANGLIN. This is a matter of much interest to a large population. I endeavored, two or three years ago, to induce the Government to have these boats run also on the other side of the Baie des Chaleurs occasionally, where there is a large population far removed from a line of railway, and to whom the regular running of a steamboat during the season would be a very great advantage. Some attempts were made to create a trade, which were not very successful. I think, at the time, parties tendering asked a higher sum for this additional service than the Government were willing to give. As it is a matter of great interest to a large population in that part of the country, I would ask the Minister, whenever he does open negotiations on this matter, to turn his attention to that part of the subject, and make provision for supplying a pressing want to 15,000 or 20,000 people. If

Mr. BLAKE.

they were afforded facilities they could do a much larger trade than they do at present.

Mr. McLELAN. Complaints have been made that the steamers put on the route last year were not sufficient for the work, and negotiations are about closed with a view to get a better boat to run in summer, to be succeeded in autumn by a screw boat.

Mr. ANGLIN. I speak mainly for the purpose of directing the Minister's attention to the claims of this particular portion of the population on the main shore, who were really neglected in the old arrangement, the object seeming to be merely to accommodate Gaspé and Bonaventure. It is of great importance a boat should run there as late in the season as possible, because there is there a large quantity of fish and other produce waiting to be taken to market. I trust the hon. Minister will look at both sides of the Bay with an impartial eye, desirous, as I hope he is, of promoting the public service and affording facilities to all classes and parties and sections of the country. I find the necessity for this service is quite as great on one side of the Baie des Chaleurs as it is on the other.

On Resolution 132,

For steam communication from Port Mulgrave, at the terminus of the Eastern Extension Railway, to East Bay, Cape Breton..... \$6,000

Mr. BORDEN. I desire some information from the Government with respect to this item. An offer was made to perform this service for \$4,000 by Capt. Beaty, a man who has run a steamboat in that locality for a long time. This offer was made to the Government last year and refused. The Government employed a steamboat from Quebec, and brought her to this locality to perform the service, for \$6,000. The vessel went there late in June and left in October, and complaints have been made that the service was not efficiently performed. I understand this year the same offer was made to perform the service for \$4,000 by the same party. I would like to know from the Government why that offer was refused. The service should have been offered to tender. It is said there are some political reasons why the members of the county of Cape Breton did not care to give the contract to Capt. Beaty; but certainly the public interests should not suffer to such an extent for this reason. The service should be offered to public competition, as I have said, as is done in other cases. I believe, for example, the service at Gaspé is offered to public competition; and the mail service to which I have referred should be placed in a like position. I should like to know from the hon. Minister whether an offer was made last year to perform the service for \$4,000, and why it was refused; and whether the same offer was repeated this year and refused; and whether any arrangement has been made for the service during the present season, and if so, to whom has it been given?

Mr. McLELAN. This matter is under the management of the Postmaster-General. I know of no such offer.

Resolution ordered to stand.

On Resolution 134,

For steam communication between Halifax and St. Pierre..... \$2,000

In reply to Mr. ANGLIN,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There can be no doubt the position of St. Pierre is a very embarrassing one to the Dominion, and especially to the hon. Minister of Customs, whose duty it is to see that goods are not brought in without paying duty. This is one of the points from which it is difficult to prevent the introduction of smuggled goods, but arrangements have been made which have decreased the quantity largely. When the vote was first given it was for \$4,000, but it has since been reduced to

\$2,000. There is a larger trade between Nova Scotia and this Island than is supposed. During the summer a large quantity of cattle and agricultural produce were sent over from Cape Breton and different parts of Nova Scotia, and business has considerably increased. The trouble has arisen with sailing vessels over which the Government has no control; and although the Minister of Customs has had secret agents on the Island to report the vessels which left with a cargo on board, it is quite evident that the existence of the steamboat line has nothing to do with the prevalence of smuggling.

On Resolution 135,

To provide for a subsidy of \$1,500 a voyage for voyages of steamers from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain or Continental Ports.. \$7,500

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask the Government how long is the arrangement with the Montreal Steamship Company, and what is their intention in regard to renewing it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The arrangements made by the owners of that line with regard to the landing of freight were not very satisfactory last year, but they are in a more satisfactory condition at the present moment; and the agreement is terminable at one year's notice.

Mr. ANGLIN. Last year, in making enquiry as to the growth and progress of the cattle trade in the Lower Provinces, of one who is largely interested, I was surprised to learn that shippers found great difficulty in getting accommodation on the Allan line, and had to engage room a long time in advance. He told me that he had to pay a rate, I think, of 10s. sterling higher at Halifax than could be obtained at Boston. If these steamers were doing an ordinary business in their own way we would not perhaps have a right to complain. It might be said that competition would regulate it, but when we subsidize this line so largely, I think we have some right to interpose in the matter and ask that the rates imposed on our own people for the shorter voyage may be at least no higher than the American charge on the longer voyage.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know nothing about the charges on cattle. The charges I referred to were those for freight on goods delivered in Halifax and the freight on goods delivered in Boston. There was a great distinction and great dissatisfaction resulted, but I believe this has been remedied. I did hear, last year, that the difficulty experienced by shippers of cattle from the lower ports was that space was engaged ahead at a high figure by certain parties, and that if other parties wished to ship they made them pay high prices, but before the season was half over the prices fell completely, so that the Allans and other steamers reduced their rates $33\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the cattle shipped in their boats. My impression was that the difficulties which arose in this connection had been removed, and I am a little surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that they charge more at Halifax than at Boston. It may be so, but the circumstances as they were presented to me, led me to suppose that they would have been glad to take cattle at almost any price at the close of the season.

Mr. ANGLIN. I am speaking of the early part of the season.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think that arrangements have been made now by which a large portion of the freight passes over the Intercolonial instead of going to Boston over the American lines.

Mr. McLELAN. The facilities for shipping cattle at Halifax during the past year have been largely increased, and the improvements will now compare favorably with those of any other port in the Dominion.

Mr. MILLS. If cattle can be shipped at Boston at 10s. a head cheaper than at Halifax, that is a good reason for going there, and the superior accommodation at Halifax will not secure the traffic over the Intercolonial as long as the subsidized steamers prefer the traffic at American ports.

Mr. ANGLIN. The shipper whom I mentioned complained loudly of the difficulty he experienced in getting space, and said that this hardship was calculated to prevent the growth of the cattle trade in the Lower Provinces.

On Resolution 137,

For the providing of a steamer to replace the *Glendon* \$30,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is the vessel named the *Fox Hound* which I see mentioned as the one which is to take the place of the *Glendon*?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What sort of a steamer is it, and what did the hon. gentleman do with the *Glendon*?

Mr. McLELAN. The *Glendon* was offered at tender, and the tender was accepted at between \$4,000 and \$5,000. She was condemned by the inspector. The *Fox Hound* is an iron vessel employed in the fishery service. She was purchased in England and is now at Quebec for repairs.

On Resolution 141,

Expenses in connection with Canadian registration of shipping \$500

Mr. ANGLIN. Has this item any meaning at all? There was an old idea at one time about establishing a strictly Canadian system of classification, but that was abandoned.

Mr. McLELAN. This is in connection with the measurement and registration of shipping.

On Resolution 152,

Grant for Meteorological observations, including instruments and cost of telegraphing weather warnings \$40,000

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. Minister has arranged for a more thorough system of weather warnings for agricultural purposes than has heretofore been in force. The warnings have been issued at too late an hour in the morning and have not arrived at their destination until all good farmers are at work; and they have not been issued to a sufficient number of telegraph offices. They should be issued to all the telegraph offices in the country. If these warnings are worth anything, they are worth millions of money to the farmers, and I think the least that could be done would be to give them the benefit of the warnings during the months of harvest.

Mr. McLELAN. It is the hope of the Department to increase the service, and to give fuller, earlier and more frequent reports than hitherto. I am afraid we have not asked quite enough money to perform all that the hon. gentleman asks, but additional information will be given, and this valuable service will be gradually extended.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The evidence submitted by the weather observers in the United States tends to show that the great storms, lasting for several days, are usually indicated for a considerable time before their approach, and I have no doubt those in charge of this Department could similarly furnish information which would be of incalculable value to the farmers. Who is supposed to supervise the distribution of this money?

Mr. McLELAN. The distribution is submitted by Mr. Carpmal and his officers to the Department and sanctioned here.

Mr. CASEY. The weather is not reported in sufficient detail to be of any use in some parts of the country. The lake region is the smallest division covered by the reports, and in the summer, during harvest, the weather may be very different at different points in this region. Severe thunder storms sometimes rage in one part of Ontario, while places not far distant are free from them. I think it would be well to ask the weather office to define when possible with greater particularity the districts likely to be visited by storms, say, for instance, eastern, central, western, or northern Ontario, and to ask those officers, when they can, to predict the general weather for a week in advance. That would be very useful to the farmers. It is often within the knowledge of the weather officers what the character of the weather for the next few days may be. They should try to give a longer forecast than for the next twenty-four hours only.

On Resolution 114,

Manitoba \$13,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I wanted to know whether any steps had been taken to ascertain whether Lake Winnipeg, which lies north of the country adjacent to Winnipeg, cannot be permanently lowered. A very large portion of the country immediately surrounding it has been for a year or two flooded, and was formerly supposed to be of very considerable value. An examination was made, I believe, and reports were handed into the Government. It would be of some interest to know what the opinion of the Government is as to the possibility of draining those lands.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right with reference to some enquiry having been made, and I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works reported that he thought it desirable to make some further enquiry before asking for a sum of money to carry on the improvements that might be found necessary after full investigation.

On Resolution 158,

Indian schools in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick..... \$9,800

Mr. ANGLIN. Where are those new schools in New Brunswick to be?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. One of them is at Indian village, above Fredericton, one in the neighborhood of Burnt Church, and the other is in the northern part of the Province—I do not recollect the locality.

On Resolution 176,

To reimburse D. H. Waterbury for loss sustained by his removal from the St. John post office..... \$4,500

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I thought that item was to be altered in shape.

Mr. McLELAN. The change was made back again. It was thought the alteration would give it all to the lawyers.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The objection was this: that it is proposed to reimburse this gentleman for losses sustained by his removal from the post office. A good deal of objection was taken to placing in the Supply Bill a statement that we recognized the principle of reimbursing any man, appointed during pleasure, for the loss of his office.

Mr. ANGLIN. Would it not be better to say it was a gratuity—put it in some shape that would not commit us to a dangerous principle?

Item amended by striking out the words "for loss sustained by his removal from the St. John post office."

On Resolution 182,

To meet expenses under the Act respecting the adulteration of food..... \$10,000

Mr. McLELAN,

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Are there no other points at which analyses are made than Montreal, Toronto and Halifax?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are made at these places and at Quebec and St. John.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the analyses are purely voluntary?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think they are.

Mr. ANGLIN. I suppose there is no policy of restraining dealers from selling impure articles?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It would be very expensive to have persons visiting every part of the Dominion for that purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It seems to me that this is a matter which is entirely within the province of the Local Legislatures, and I think the Government should consider the advisability of expunging this item altogether from the Estimates.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have never heard the right of the Government to deal with it questioned before.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We discussed the question years ago. We might as well undertake to examine the quality of leather to see if it is fit to make shoes.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have inspectors of flour, leather, and fish and other articles of that kind, and I suppose this would come in the same category.

Mr. MILLS. It used to be the custom to have reports of the analyses of sugar sent to the Inland Revenue Department. I would like to know if any such report has been made lately, and if it has, whether it will be brought down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not aware of any such report.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have observed that the Inspector in Toronto has occasionally advertised the results of his inspection, in some of the local papers, showing the quantities of adulteration found in the various articles of food he inspected.

On Resolution 180,

Weights and Measures, and Gas..... \$76,000

Mr. ANGLIN. What is the explanation of the decrease of \$6,350 in this item?

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Inland Revenue has found that there were more officers than were required to do the work, and he has been steadily decreasing the expenditure in that particular by not filling vacancies when they occurred, and by promoting members of the Weights and Measures branch to that of the Excise.

Mr. MILLS. At an early period of the Session, I called attention to the manner in which the duties on imported articles are collected, and I mentioned two or three cases which had come under my notice. Mr. James Dougall bought some nursery trees in the United States for the purpose of increasing his assortment, and reported to the Department that he had purchased them at the same price at which they were sold to the wholesale dealers at the nursery, and the answer he said he received from the Department was that there were other nurseries in the United States where a higher price was asked for trees of the same sort. I also referred to the importation of mills for grinding sorghum and of vacuum pans which were purchased at Cincinnati. Upon enquiry, I ascertained that the Canadian purchasers of these articles, Mr. Patterson and other farmers in the West, who wished to make experiments as to the profitableness of engaging in this sort of agriculture, and the statement they made to me was that the Customs officer at Amherstburg had charged

them duties on an increased value on the articles, that they objected to his valuation, that an appraiser was sent for who valued them at a higher price than was actually paid for them, and that they were not only charged the duty on this additional price, but were fined for not having agreed to the arbitrary valuation fixed by the Customs officer. Since then, the parties have forwarded to me the affidavits of the manufacturer and the shipper, which I sent to the Department, and I have not yet been informed what action has been taken on the matter. It appears to me that this is not the way to encourage higher agriculture. The hon. Minister of Customs may be able to tell us now what course he intends to adopt with reference to importations of this kind.

Mr. BOWELL. The points brought before the House by the hon. gentleman involve the whole question of the Customs laws as they exist, the duty of the officers, and the principles involved in that law. The hon. member for Bothwell complains that Mr. Dougall of Windsor, who had bought trees in the United States, imported them into Canada; that he paid the ordinary market price in the United States, but that the Customs officer or appraiser in Canada had decided they were undervalued, and set a new value upon them and charged duty accordingly. Then it appears the same course was pursued in reference to the question of vacuum pans and cane mills, and that the importer demurred to the valuation put on the article by the collector. In that case the law provides that in case of a dispute of that kind, appraisers shall be appointed who are acquainted with the value of the article to be appraised, and also that such appraisement shall be final, and if it be 20 per cent. higher than the price at which the article was entered, the importer shall be subject to a return of the extra amount of duty imposed on the article. If those appraisers were appointed, and the value of the article 20 per cent. higher than the price at which it was entered, the law itself imposes the fine; nor does the law give the power to the collector or Head of the Department to remit that fine unless there be extenuating circumstances. From the facts that were stated by the hon. member for Bothwell, which, I have no doubt, he related as he heard them, the collector has not gone beyond his duty. The Department in Ottawa has nothing to do with this question, unless it be brought before it on appeal from the collector's decision. In such case the Department will take all the necessary steps to ascertain the actual value of the article as far as possible. Frequently, however, people will go to the United States and purchase articles which come into competition with the manufactures of Canada at much lower rates than they are sold for in that market for home consumption; that is not the fair value on which to levy the Canadian duties, but the value at which the articles are sold to the home consumer. That is the principle on which all Customs duties are levied. Mr. Dougall may have purchased at lower prices than was charged American purchasers; but whether the vacuum pans can be classed under that head or not, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman has scarcely apprehended my observations with reference to the trees. I stated that the price Mr. Dougall paid was the price universally paid in the United States, and that whether those nurserymen were charging a higher price in the United States seemed beside the question; that the law was complied with; that the cane mills and vacuum pans manufactured by this Company were sold to their American customers at the same price charged Mr. Patterson, and that it did not seem to me that the Minister of Customs or his officer were at liberty to go beyond that price, assume they were entered below their value, and charge what he considered was the proper amount of duty upon the value which he chose to consider the correct one.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see the difficulties that presented themselves to the collectors in the cases to which he has just referred. There are, it is true, some manufacturers of a particular article who will sell at less than others. There was, for instance, the case of the importation by the Canadian Pacific Railway of a large number of locomotives which were entered at a certain price. All the evidence that could be produced was to the effect that those engines cost the Canadian Pacific Railway \$9,500, only. At the time they were imported we had entries for the same sized engines precisely, same sized fire-boxes and cylinder, and, as far as an invoice could indicate, of the same character, from another manufactory, however, at \$14,000. The collector stopped the engines in transmission, and although every evidence possible was produced to show the actual value to the importer was \$9,500, they were increased to \$11,000 each for duty for the reason that that was the fair market value at the time of the exportation from the United States. It matters not what the article cost, its value for duty is that at the time it was exported.

Mr. MILLS. Supposing the price had diminished, would the Government have made a corresponding reduction?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly. I am surprised that a gentleman who pays so much attention to the business of this House, does not remember that during last Session I introduced an amendment to the Customs Act, which provided for this very case. Under the Act introduced by the late Government no allowance could be made for reduction of price even should an article have gone down 50 per cent. before it was exported, while if the price went up the duty was charged on the increased value. I believed this was not fair to the importer, and introduced an amendment to remedy this injustice. As to the case in question, we arrived at as correct a calculation of the actual value as possible. We have catalogues and price lists of all the nurserymen in the United States, who sell to this country, extending as far west as Delaware in the Southern States. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be surprised to learn that many manufacturers have an export price list and a price list for home consumption. In this case we have to make a comparison always finding the export list much lower than the price for selling to their own people. They have a very perfect system of paying drawbacks in the United States, and the manufacturers can afford to sell to foreign markets less the amount of the drawback, and make as much money as by selling in their own country. With regard to trees we have tried to establish a uniform price for certain qualities and standards. If Mr. Dougall has suffered in this case, and if any evidence be produced that he has been improperly treated, justice will be done to him.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I have no doubt Mr. Dougall's statements are correct. Mr. Dougall was annoyed at the manner in which his communication to the Department was answered, and he did not press the matter because he did not consider the amount involved was of sufficient importance to carry on the correspondence. I have no doubt, if it had been brought under the notice of the hon. Minister of Customs himself, the amount would have been refunded. Mr. Dougall felt rather annoyed, and very naturally so, that a man so well known as he is, whose respectability and credibility are beyond question, should have received the uncourteous answer he received when he first made his complaint.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented two Messages from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Messages as follows:—

LORNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, the additional Supplementary Estimates of the amounts required for the Service

of Canada, for the year ending 30th June, 1882; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 4th May, 1882.

LORNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1883; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 4th May, 1882.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Messages, with the accompanying Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to; and (at 11:50 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 5th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES AND TRADING CORPORATIONS.

Mr. MOUSSEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 145) respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies and Trading Corporations. He said: There are two salient features in this Bill, by explaining which I explain the whole Bill. In the Act of 1875, there are provisions for the discharge of debtors but none for the discharge of insolvent banks, insurance and trading companies. A year ago Mr. Chamberlain, in a speech in the House of Commons, England, on presenting a Bill relating to Insolvency, pointed out abuses flowing from the Insolvency Laws which are similar to those that exist here; that is, that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and by leaving to the creditors the entire control of insolvents estates, they, trusting to one another, did nothing, and the whole business went from bad to worse. He suggested that Parliament should take some control from the creditors and give it to a Court. There are important differences between the law of insolvency which we adopted in 1875 and this Bill. This Bill applies to insolvent banks, insurance companies and trading corporations, and the proceedings in it are those set forth in the English Act of 1879, and in our old Insolvent Law of 1875, with this difference, that there is no discharge to be granted to insolvent corporations as there is under the Insolvent Law, and the control of the assets is placed more in the hands of a council of Judges than in those of creditors.

Mr. BLAKE. The distinction the hon. gentleman makes is only a formal one, because under the old Insolvent Law, when dealing with an insolvent corporation of any description, the assignee gets everything that can be got, including the liabilities of shareholders to pay up the stock in full. There is, therefore, nothing to discharge the company from because there is nothing more to be got. The corporation being left without any assets, has nothing whatever left which would enable it to subsist any longer, therefore the discharge is immaterial. I did not exactly catch the measure of control which the hon. gentleman proposes to give to the Judges over the assignee or the assets of corporations; but I quite agree that one of the difficulties in Insolvent Laws in all countries, is the apathy and neglect of the creditors. If the hon. gentleman has succeeded in finding a method by which that great difficulty, inherent in

Mr. SPEAKER.

human nature, may be removed, he will prove himself a benefactor to his country, in giving us a sample legislation which, I am sure, will be extensively copied in all parts of the world.

Mr. OUIMET. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if in these insurance companies, mutual insurance companies are comprised. We have in Quebec, as in Ontario, a lot of these mutual insurance companies, and in some cases where they have been put into liquidation in conformity with some Local Act, it has been decided that the Local Acts are unconstitutional. In the third clause, I would suggest that mutual insurance companies be included, and in the commercial joint stock companies I would suggest that building societies, incorporated in conformity with the Dominion or Local Act, be included. It will be easily seen that when these companies, although incorporated by a Provincial Legislature, are insolvent, it remains with us to deal with them. I would suggest that building societies be included in the operation of the Act. That would be a great relief to the business community in Montreal and the whole Dominion, I think, because at present we have no power to deal with these insolvent companies. All that is required is simply to mention these companies in the Act.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I think my hon. friend is correct as to mutual insurance companies, but I do not think it would be well to include building societies. I always looked upon building societies as essentially civil corporations, since their business consists in civil contracts and loaning moneys.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I am glad the hon. Minister is willing to amend the Act, so as to apply it to mutual companies; but I believe the reason he has given for not including building societies, is not a sound one. I admit that they are civil corporations, but when this Act provides for the winding up of insolvent corporations, it ought to include building societies as well, over whom we have undoubted jurisdiction. Within the last few years a great number of building societies have become insolvent, and considering the great advantages which this Bill affords for winding up insolvent corporations, civil or commercial, I think it is very desirable, indeed, in the interest of the community, that this Act should also apply to building societies.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I cannot agree with the hon. member that because building societies are civil corporations they must fall under our jurisdiction when they become insolvent. That question has been decided otherwise by the Courts. In 1867, the Quebec Parliament passed an Act relating exclusively to commercial insolvencies, the proper word for which, in French, is *de confiture*. It was for the winding up of civil corporations. Actions were taken under the Act, and the Superior Court maintained that it was constitutional. Appeal was taken to the Court of Queen's Bench, which declared the Act unconstitutional. It was then taken to England, and the Privy Council declared that the Quebec Parliament had a right to legislate on these matters precisely because these corporations were of an exclusively civil nature.

Mr. GIROUARD. The Dominion Act was not an Act to provide for the insolvency of building societies, it was only to provide for the winding up of building societies, a very different case. We have jurisdiction over civil or legal corporations, the moment our action has reference to the insolvency of these civil corporations, and the case cited by the hon. Minister has no application whatever to a Bill like this, which provides for the winding up of insolvent corporations, and should, I believe, also apply to building societies.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I think the distinction is obvious. With

reference to any corporation over which the Local Legislature has jurisdiction at all, it has jurisdiction for the voluntary winding up of such corporation; because the voluntary winding up may take place even when the corporation is solvent. It makes no matter what is the character of the corporation, if it is a corporation you can provide for its insolvency just as we could provide for winding up the insolvency of any company engaged in trade. We have absolute jurisdiction over insolvency, not only trade insolvency, but insolvency generally, and if we choose to extend our Insolvency Law to persons who are not traders it would be quite right. If we extend it to any class of the community which incur debts at all, it would be within our jurisdiction, because if these corporations, no matter what their character, incur debts, we can provide for their winding up.

Mr. ABBOTT. It seems to me there are important points to be provided for in this Act, in the general winding up of corporations. I see it is called in this Act "to liquidate," and, so far as I understand the Bill, this liquidator is appointed by the Judge, without any consultation with any one, without any consideration for the wishes of the creditors or the shareholders. Now, if am right in that respect, I think it would be a mistake to give to the Judge unlimited jurisdiction to appoint whom he likes to so important an office. As for the liquidation of these large companies, I would call the attention of the hon. Minister to that point, and ask him to consider how far he can arrange so that the wishes and the interests of the shareholders and the creditors, or of either of them, can be consulted in the appointment of the liquidator. That, I think, is one of the most important features of the Bill. Its efficiency will depend greatly upon the impartiality and the good judgment of the person appointed to wind up the affairs of a company in liquidation. It does not appear to me, as the Bill now stands, that there is sufficient provision for acquainting the Judge as to who is the person or company that can most efficiently perform the functions of liquidator. I quite agree with the hon. member for West Durham with reference to the jurisdiction of this Parliament; I think we have a perfect right to make provision for the winding up of any person or company who may become insolvent.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

MEMBERS' INDEMNITY.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved:

That inasmuch as certain members were delayed on their way to attend the present Session of Parliament, by reason of travel being unusually obstructed by snowstorms, such members be not deprived of their indemnity allowance for the time so lost, and that they specify such time, in their declaration of attendance.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 69,

Canadian Pacific Railway, Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River	\$1,067,000
---	-------------

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think, with respect to this item, some information was to have been given on the amount of trestle work and other matters of that kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. the Minister stated that, as nearly as he could remember from conversation with the engineer, there was about a mile of this trestle work, but he said he would give more accurate information on Concurrence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I have looked into the matter, and find that instead of having at all increased, the amount of trestle work which was originally estimated between Kaminstiquia and Selkir' has been greatly reduced, and the amount of square timber has been reduced by a very large amount. The amount of trestle work has been reduced on section 15, and it has been increased on sections A and B.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The exact increase you are not prepared to state.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had a table prepared, which I cannot now place my hand upon, giving the quantities of the different kinds of work as estimated in the first instance, and as they stand at present, and I will lay that upon the Table for the information of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister state whether this trestle work is now concentrated in a small number of places?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is applied to a number of places to a much larger extent than was originally intended, but the character of the road as a whole is greatly improved. I may say that the Chief Engineer will be only too happy to show any hon. gentleman who will call at the office the plans and specifications for the whole of this work as originally devised, and the plans and specifications showing how the whole work is now being constructed, and the hon. member for Lambton will see that they bear out the statement I have made as to the character of the road being greatly improved.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The net result, however, is simply this, that the trestle work on section 15 is reduced \$250,000, while it is increased on sections A and B \$650,000, that is, there is \$400,000 more of trestle work than the original contracts provided for.

On Resolution 78,

Subsidy—Canadian Pacific Railway.....	\$8,500,000
---------------------------------------	-------------

Mr. RYKERT. Before this item is concurred in, I desire to make a few observations in reference to the Pacific Railway. During the last Session of Parliament, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House found a great deal of fault with the contract which was brought down to this House in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. A large number of resolutions, in the shape of amendments, were formulated by hon. gentlemen opposite, in which they attempted to show, among other things, that the effect of that contract would be to create a great monopoly in the country. They referred particularly to the fact that the Government were exempting that road from a very large amount of taxation, and certain hon. gentlemen placed those exemptions at a very fabulous amount. The reason I bring up this question now is, that the House and the country may ascertain the exact position hon. gentlemen opposite occupy in reference to this matter. I do so particularly because I find these hon. gentlemen circulating throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion a quantity of campaign literature, which, in my judgment, conveys to the people of this country a very large amount of trash. There are statements made in these documents which are not borne out by the facts, and I desire to show the country what kind of gentlemen there are on that side of the House who are attempting to educate the people. It was said that the result of this contract, if ratified by the House, would be to create a great monopoly. That cry, I think, has now about ceased. Hon. gentlemen are shifting their sails, and endeavoring to find out some other cry on which to found their case. Instead of being a monopoly, instead of holding the land at a fabulous price, instead of retarding settlement and preventing the settler from enjoying that prosperity which he ought to enjoy, we find that the Pacific Railway Company, as a matter of their own salvation, are compelled to sell their land at a very

moderate price, and are endeavoring to bring settlers into the country. We find that certain prophecies made by hon. gentlemen opposite have not been fulfilled. On the contrary, the result shows that the Government, in adopting that contract, were legislating in the right direction. Now, it seems very singular that these hon. gentlemen, who themselves, in the early part of their Administration, were committed to the exemption of the land of that railway from taxation, should now make such a cry against this Government for taking the same course. I think I will be able satisfactorily to show the House, and the country through the House, that these hon. gentlemen are playing the part of political hypocrites when they are professing to show such great alarm because this Government are exempting the lands of that road from taxation. In one of these celebrated sheets, one of which I find issued by the second lieutenant on that side of the House, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I find the extraordinary statement that the country is going to lose \$5,000,000 by the exemption from duty of rails, cars, engines, lumber, wire, and all other material. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen know that that statement is not correct; because they cannot be ignorant of the plain words of the contract. They know that there is no exemption on cars or engines. So far as the cars and engines are concerned, a very material portion of the stock of the Company, they are not exempt from taxation. However, in order to blindfold the electors, they place on record the fact that the exemptions would amount to \$5,000,000 for rails, cars, engines and lumber. I propose now to call into the witness box, the leader of the Opposition, to show that that statement is wrong from the very commencement. In the debate last year, in enumerating those different exemptions that hon. gentleman carefully analyzed the whole question, and wound up by saying that the total of those exemptions would amount to \$1,000,000—and he was very particular in his enumeration. The first item is the exemption on account of rails, which everybody knows are exempt to every railway for a certain time, I believe for another year from this date. But he assumed the time would expire on the 1st of January, 1882, and the amount of duty the Company would be compelled to pay at that time would be \$576,000, assuming the railway will require 150,000 tons; also that the duty on fish-plates would be \$42,000; the duty on engines, \$60,000; on spikes, \$108,000—making a total of \$786,000, and then there were exemptions for telegraph and other material, making a total of \$1,000,000. Now, instead of telling the House and country that that was the amount, the hon. gentleman who had the engineering of this little campaign sheet has set it at \$5,000,000. If you will turn to page 507 of the *Hansard* of last year, you will find that the right hon. leader of the Opposition then stated that the whole amount would be \$1,000,000; but you must deduct from them the rails, because they came in free. But including the rails, the total would be but \$1,000,000. We find, from the reports, that the total amounts of exemptions the Company will gain by the purchase of spikes, bolts, nuts and fish plates, will be \$160,950, instead of \$210,000, as stated by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Then, again, the amount of exemptions for telegraphing material, I place at \$50,000, which every one will say is a large estimate. The hon. leader of the Opposition gives the total exemptions as at \$1,000,000, while the campaign sheet makes it \$5,000,000. But an error of a few millions makes very little difference with these hon. gentlemen. Instead of \$5,000,000, however, I estimate the total at \$510,950, including the exemption for spikes, bolts, nuts and fish-plates at \$160,950. I calculate there might be ten bridges costing \$100,000 each, a very large estimate indeed. A duty of 30 per cent. on \$1,000,000 would be \$300,000; telegraph material, \$50,000, and \$160,950 as before stated for spikes, bolts, &c., making a total of \$510,950, instead

Mr. RYKERT.

of \$5,000,000, or a difference of \$4,498,050. Then, again, those gentlemen state that the amount they save by the exemption of the road and the capital stock, forever, was \$7,250,000. On the occasion of my addressing the House last year, I pointed out that they were stating what they knew perfectly well were not the facts. However, in my absence, having been obliged to leave the House, when the vote came up the hon. member for North Norfolk estimated the exemptions would amount to between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000. I had previously shown they would not amount to over \$160,000 if the annual payment was capitalized at 6 per cent, and the land valued at \$12.14 per acre. I am going to show that the hon. gentlemen were mistaken. I will assume there are 1,000 miles of road built by this Company, which is perhaps excessive, and that it is 200 feet wide, which would give a total amount of land of 32,000 acres, I will estimate that land at \$2 an acre. The hon. member for North Norfolk last year stated that—I am sorry I was not present to contradict—that the property of a railway company should be assessed at its cost price. Why, any person familiar with the municipal law of this country knows that you have to assess the railway land at the price of the land adjoining. That is the law of Ontario, which it may be assumed is the strongest possible law, against the Company; and it may also be assumed that in the North-West Territory there will be Provinces established which will have the power of taxation, and whose municipal law will be largely based on the law of Ontario. According to this law, every railway company must annually deliver to the Government a memorandum showing the quantity of land taken, and fixing the price by the average quantity of the land in the neighborhood; so the only property taxed is the land itself. The rails and capital stock are not taxed, although the campaign sheet states the capital stock will be taxed. I challenge the writers to prove that statement, which they know is not true. They say, also, that they have a right to tax the cars and other things. Now, section 29 of the Assessment Law of Ontario provides that the personal property of any incorporated company shall not be assessed, but each shareholder shall be assessed for the value of his shares, unless such stock is so exempt by this Act. By sub-section 18 of section 3, the whole of that stock is exempt by law. I estimate the value of the land at \$20 an acre, which is very high and higher than it will ever be in our lifetime. Now, I showed last year that the average price of land in the richest counties of Ontario was \$12.14 an acre. I am going to take that land at \$20 an acre throughout the line of the railway, 32,000 acres, which would amount to \$640,000. I am going to take 100 station houses at \$1,500 a piece, which is an extravagant estimate, as very few station houses cost over \$1,000 a piece. That will amount to \$150,000. The workshops, which are now exempted in every place where there are workshops, I place at \$250,000, making altogether \$1,040,000. Now, take the assessment at the highest rate in any municipality in Ontario, 1½ cents on the dollar, which will make \$15,600 a year on that land; capitalize that and it amounts to \$260,000, so that the total taxation for the roadway itself and station houses, which these gentlemen estimated at \$7,050,000, at the very outside would amount to only \$260,000, or a difference of only \$6,990,000. I defy contradiction on that point. These gentlemen, last year, were asked by me to show that my figures were incorrect, and they could not do it; but after I left the House the hon. member for North Norfolk, Mr. Charlton, who always so wise in his own generation, went on to say:

“It is proper to assess a road for what it costs to construct it?”

Did you ever hear anything so insane as that?

“And, in addition, to assess the locomotives, cars, station houses, and all appurtenances for the future transaction of business.”

Could you imagine a more insane statement than that? And yet these hon. gentlemen go about the country making this statement in the school-houses and other places where it cannot be refuted. I have already pointed out that only the roadway is liable to be assessed by law. Now, Sir, the hon. member for West Durham, the hon. leader of the Opposition, had repeatedly declared that the exemption was a very great privilege, and in order to stir up the country against the Government he pointed out the enormity of exempting these people from taxation on land to the amount of \$5,000,000. Now, let me make an estimate. I think we can safely assume, looking at what we have seen during the past year, that this Company will not hold over half the land for the next ten years; but supposing they do, we will put that at \$2.50 an acre in the wilds of the North-West. Place that assessment at 1 cent on the dollar, amounting to \$250,000 a year, and in ten years to \$2,500,000, instead of \$5,000,000 as stated by these hon. gentlemen, and as stated last year by the organ of the party at \$16,700,460. I find that statement in the *Globe* of December, last year—they might just as well say \$20,000,000 as \$16,000,000. I want to show the country what absurd statements are made by these hon. gentlemen outside Parliament where there is no one to contradict them. I do not wish to use a strong adjective, but I say a greater amount of hypocrisy never was exhibited than on this question. These hon. gentlemen themselves were always in favor of exempting the land for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Do they deny that? The ex-leader of the Opposition, when he controlled the Government, and when the present leader of the Opposition was hon. Minister of Justice—both these gentlemen were in favor of exempting the land for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Yet the country is now told that the Government is committing an enormous crime in exempting the land from taxation. Let us come to the proof. Let us have a few facts in order that these gentlemen may have an opportunity of saying whether they were in favor of taxation or not. It will be within the recollection of this House that in the year 1872, an Act was passed by the British Columbia Legislature taxing this very land 4 cents an acre. That Bill was placed before the present leader of the Opposition, then Minister of Justice, in order that he might pronounce upon its constitutionality, and he recommended the disallowance of that Act, unless the Legislature revoked what they had done. That Act was not allowed. In 1873 the Legislature of British Columbia amended the Act in accordance with the wishes of the Dominion Government. In 1876 another Act was passed affecting these same lands, which on reference to their Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake), that gentleman refused to allow, as he was of the opinion that it was not the intention of the British Columbia Legislature to tax railway lands, and over his own signature endorsed the action of the present leader of the Government, and fully set forth in his report the reason why it was inexpedient to tax the said lands, repeating the present leader's report thereon. That report showed that the taxation of that land would be a great detriment to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and that the taxation of that land would render it perfectly valueless, and he instructed the Lieutenant-Governor to have the legislation so altered that that land would not be taxed. Those were the views of that hon. gentleman then. He has forgotten them now no doubt, he forgot them last year, because, in the speech he delivered in Parliament, he spoke about the enormous privileges conferred upon that Company by exemptions from taxation. I will now read a few lines from that speech which will show what he thought about this exemption then:

By the contract all that property, station houses, their harbors, their elevators, telegraph lines, road-bed, rails, rolling stock, the equipment, and all their property and capital stock are wholly free for-

ever from Dominion taxation, from taxation in new Provinces, and from taxation by municipalities in new Provinces. Hon. gentleman will observe that here is an important departure from the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, a departure of great consequence, upon which it will be my duty, and the duty of others, further to enlarge at a later stage, while under the Act the land grant of the Company would remain subject to taxation, under the contract that grant is exempt from taxation of all kinds, until used or occupied for twenty years from the date of the grant. That also is an exemption of great value to the Company, of enormous value to the Company; an exemption which added to the right of selection, makes the land grant a wholly different thing from a land grant subject to taxation. A land grant subject to taxation, in a country like that, is as different from a land grant not subject to taxation, as a fertile field is different from a rugged hill. There is an annual burden increasing as the country grows and prospers, of the most serious character, upon all the lands which are subject to the common burden, and this makes the contract altogether different, and makes the value of the company's possession enormously greater.

That was his opinion then. Now, let me read the report made by the present leader of the Opposition in October, 1876 on the Bill of the British Columbia Legislature, which he thought taxed these lands, being referred to him. I hope he will listen to that report, because it was so different from the tune he played last year. At page 288 of Sessional papers for 1877, No. 88—it is as well to be exact on this subject—I find the following:—

"The British Columbia Assembly passed in its Session of 1872, an Act to impose a wild land tax, which was reserved. Upon that Act the following observations were made by the then hon. Minister of Justice, viz:

"35th Victoria, 1872. This Act imposes a tax of four cents per acre upon all lands, with certain exceptions."

"By sub-section A, of the first clause of this Bill, lands vested in, or held in trust for Her Majesty, or for the public uses of the Province, are exempted from the tax, although under this exemption, the lands to be conveyed in trust by the Government of British Columbia to that of the Dominion, under the eleventh section of the Terms of Union between British Columbia and the Dominion, will be free from the tax, it is clear that whenever these lands are conveyed to any company incorporated for the purpose of the construction of the Pacific Railway the exemption will cease.

"Now, the imposition of so heavy a tax as four cents an acre upon this large tract of wild lands, will render it particularly useless.

"The Government of Canada are taking active steps to endeavor to induce capitalists to engage in the great undertaking of constructing a railway to connect the two oceans. The chief inducement to such capitalists is the promise of a large grant of land in aid of the enterprise, and the imposition of such a tax upon these railway lands would greatly diminish the prospect of a company being formed.

"He also begs to suggest that the Lieut.-Governor of British Columbia be instructed to press upon the Government the expediency of exempting these railroad lands in any Act that may hereafter be passed imposing a land tax.

"The Act was not assented to. In 1873 the British Columbia Legislature passed an Act exempting land now or at any time hereafter to be vested in Her Majesty.

"It is by the Act now under consideration (passed, 1876) repealed and the following enacted:—

"Section 8.—All land in British Columbia shall be liable to taxation except all property vested in Her Majesty, and all lands to be conveyed to the Dominion Government under 11th section of the terms of Union (for Pacific Railway).

"Section 10.—In addition to the tax hereby imposed on real estate, an annual tax of five cents per acre shall be levied upon all unoccupied land in the Province (with certain exceptions)."

"It will be observed," says Mr. Blake, "that the exemption from the fixed tax of five cents on unoccupied land is not as extensive as the exemption from the tax on the assessed value; and it might be argued to include lands 'held as Dominion railway lands,' which are exempted from the operation of the 8th section.

"The undersigned (Mr. Blake) presumes that this cannot have been intended, and he suggests that the attention of the Lieut.-Governor be called to the difficulty, with a view to the amendment of the section before the period arrives for disallowing the Act.

"Signed,

"EDWARD BLAKE,
"Minister of Justice."

What better evidence can we have of the fact that the leader of the Opposition and his friends were in favor of exempting these railway lands? I think I have satisfactorily shown that the leader of the Opposition while a Minister of the Crown, expressed the opinion of the Government that it would be impolitic to tax Pacific Railway lands because it would render them valueless; yet the hon. gentleman seeks to condemn the present Government for doing the same thing. Why do they not tell the House and the country that such was the course they proposed, but they

do not follow that course because they desire to play a political trick in order to deceive the electors. Their policy, as expressed in the document of October, 1876, shows that they themselves were in favor of exempting from taxation this very land. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House, because I had no opportunity of discussing this question during the Pacific Railway debate. I think the country should know what hon. gentlemen opposite are doing, and, if they are deceiving the public, the public should know it; and as campaign literature is being sent out at the expense of the Legislature (they complain of our friends, but they themselves are sending it out by the ton), I hope they will issue a supplementary sheet showing that the present Government have simply adopted the course they themselves pursued. I am not in favor of *tu quoque* argument, still, when we find hon. gentlemen acting the part of political hypocrites, the public should know it. I feel that I should fail in my duty to my constituents and this House, did I not, at the earliest opportunity, expose the actions of hon. gentlemen in Opposition, which are calculated to mislead and deceive the public.

On Resolution 79.

Intercolonial Railway—rolling stock..... \$305,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. Minister was to bring down a full statement of the expenditure for rolling stock on capital account and revenue account for some years back.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I laid on the Table of the House to-day, a full statement respecting rolling stock from the commencement of operations on the road, from which the hon. member for Lambton will find that the quantity of rolling stock, including all that I am asking for this Session, for the Intercolonial, was much less in proportion to the present length of the road and the amount of traffic than it was in 1878, when Mr. Brydges declared that the rolling stock was taxed to its fullest capacity. The hon. gentleman also stated that rolling stock purchased for other roads, owing to increased business, was not charged to capital. I think I spoke of the Grand Trunk and Great Western; it should have been the Grand Trunk and the Northern. I requested of Mr. Schreiber to send a telegram to these three leading roads to ascertain what their practice was, and I will read to the House the telegrams and the answers:

"J. HICKSON, Montreal.

"Will you please inform me, for the information of the hon. Minister, if it is customary for railway companies to add to their rolling stock at the expense of capital, or is it made a charge against working expenses?"

"G. SCHREIBER."

The answer to that was:

"MONTREAL, 28th October, 1881.

"COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER, Ottawa.

"The stock of railway companies is constantly increased at the cost of their capital. Stock once supplied should, however, be maintained at the cost of revenue, the charges forming a portion of working expenses.

"J. HICKSON."

That is exactly what has been done. The following message was sent to Mr. Greig, the Manager of the Northern and North-Western Railway:—

"OTTAWA, 28th October, 1881.

"TO MANAGER NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY, TORONTO:

"Will you please inform me, for the information of the hon. Minister of Railways, if it is customary for railway companies to add to their rolling stock at the expenses of capital, or is it made a charge against working expenses.

"G. SCHREIBER."

The following answer was received:—

"TORONTO, 31st October, 1881.

"COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER, Ottawa.

"Our understanding is that the original equipment of rolling stock is chargeable to capital, also any necessary additions to rolling stock
Mr. RYKERT.

other than making good damages which are clearly chargeable to working expenses.

"(Signed) G. GREIG,
"Northern and North-Western Railway."

The hon. gentleman will see that the practice is to furnish and equip the railway in the first instance, at the cost of capital, as was done by the hon. gentleman. As I have said, Mr. Brydges, who was their Chief Superintendent of the road, said that the business then on the road required all the rolling stock. It was worked to its fullest capacity, and in charging to capital account the additional stock required for increased business, the course has been pursued on the Intercolonial that has been pursued by all other companies. I hold in my hand a table showing the quantity of rolling stock on the road, and the quantity of freight moved, showing the amount of freight moved per engine is much larger at present than it was in 1877-78. In 1877-78, 100 engines moved 522,710 tons of freight equal to 5,227 tons each, and 121 engines moved equal to 5,996 tons each. In 1882-83, 130 engines are expected to move 900,000 tons of freight, equal to 6,923 tons each, instead of 5,227 tons each, which was the case in 1877-78. The cars being of different capacity I have reduced to ten ton cars for comparison. In order to make the comparison we could not take the number of cars, because, as the smaller cars were worn out, they were replaced by cars of double capacity and not so many in number, and that was done at the cost of working expenses. In 1877-78, 2,640 cars moved 522,720 tons of freight, or 198 tons each. In 1880-81, 2,780 cars moved 725,377 tons freight, equal to 261 tons each, and in 1882-83, 3,639 cars are estimated to move 900,000 tons of freight, or 247 tons each, being forty-nine tons each more than in 1877-78. So that the hon. gentleman will see that in asking for the rolling stock I am asking for, I am still providing a much smaller amount in proportion to the freight to be moved than was the case when the hon. gentleman was in charge.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is one thing to be remembered about the tonnage of freight cars, and that is the road was only opened in 1876 for freight and a very large number of the trains were running constantly with less than the full freight. We had to create the traffic, and the same amount of rolling stock would have done a great deal more than the business they were required to do. Then the hon. gentleman took credit for having 120 miles more to work, but it should be remembered that we furnished all the rolling stock for the traffic on the Rivière du Loup Branch. We carried all the passengers to and from Quebec in our own cars.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That practice had been discontinued long before the change of Government, the whole traffic was being done by the Grand Trunk Railway and Rivière du Loup, with the exception of some passengers' stock.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no recollection of that change. Was there no agreement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The agreement was abandoned for the work was being done by the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no recollection of its abandonment, but I recollect the agreement being made, and we were running these two years previously the same mileage that the hon. gentleman has been running since with increased force. The agreement shows that we supplied the rolling stock for the traffic except the engines, and to my knowledge, some of the engines used were also ours. I observe there is an item in the Supplementary Estimates of \$65,000 for additional rolling stock at the expense of capital. I wish to examine the statement which has been laid on the Table, and which it is impossible for me to do so

now; but before we come to this item, I will have an opportunity of discussing it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the Prince Edward Island Railway. That does not stand on the same footing as the statement I make in reference to the Intercolonial. The rolling stock of the Prince Edward Island Railway has been adequate to the traffic, because there has been no great increase of traffic there; but while the rolling stock has been adequate for the traffic of eight months of the year, it has always been utterly insufficient to do the business of the other four months, when almost all the freight that moved on the Island requires to be moved. I have asked for an addition to the rolling stock that will cost \$65,000 for Prince Edward Island, simply on this ground. I have laid a full statement with regard to the supply of rolling stock on the Intercolonial, as well as the Island Railway on the Table, and when it is printed the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of informing himself of the details.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If the Clerk would send it to the printer's at once we might have it printed for to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope it will be put in type at once.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am not prepared to dispute the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways that capital accounts on Government railways and other roads are kept open forever, but I am prepared to say that both in Government roads and other roads I believe that system is fruitful of abuses. There is an excuse for it, no doubt, and in the English roads, and the American roads more particularly, this practice of constantly keeping open a capital account has been used and is constantly being used to cover up a great many expenditures which ought properly to go on income instead of capital account. Now, without the full details and a very careful examination, it is not possible for us to decide how far that has been the practice in the present case. I know that many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been charged for rolling stock, both in connection with the Intercolonial, and in connection with the expenditures incurred for the purchase of the Rivière du Loup Branch—in all about one million dollars, though I speak from recollection. The point to which I wish to call the attention of the House is this: It is an unquestionable point whether, in the case of the Government railway, the capital account should be allowed to be kept open, whether it would not be better to spread the items over a reasonable number of years, say three or four or even, in certain exceptional cases, as many as five years perhaps. I would also say this: that a comparison between the management of my hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) and that of the hon. Minister of Railways, is entirely vitiated by reason of this practice. Mr. hon. friend practically, in fact, I think, altogether, closed the capital account of the Intercolonial, and he charged a very large amount for several years to income, which certainly had a better claim to be charged to capital account than rolling stock. I refer more particularly to the charges caused by the change of gauge, and also to the charges caused by substituting steel for iron rails. It is also clear that a very large sum ought in fairness to be deducted from the charges for the past three or four years of my hon. friend's administration, during which he systematically placed to account of income sums which under the present arrangement he certainly would have been justified in charging to capital account. I regret that the hon. Minister holds out no hope of closing capital account. According to his view of the case capital account can remain open to an indefinite extent and for an indefinite period. In fact it will never be closed as long as it is convenient for the Administration to call upon us from time to time for large sums for rolling stock on capital account. There

is another objection to this plan, and that is that it appears a considerable inducement on many occasions to throw sums improperly into capital account in order that the Administration may appear more economical than it really is, and also that it quite vitiates all comparison on these points.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no doubt some force in one of the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and that is that during the four or five years of my hon. friend's administration of the Intercolonial, a very large amount of money was expended on renewals for steel rails which did not require to be made since. These renewals were, of course, made a charge against revenue, as all renewals must be. Every road must be renewed as a charge against revenue, and the hon. gentleman adopted the mode of spreading over a number of years an amount of work which was done in a single year. I feel that it is due to the hon. gentleman that he should have the advantage of that expenditure, against which there is no equivalent expenditure since the change of administration, and I have laid on the Table a statement showing the exact amount charged to steel rails renewals in each year he was administering the road. But I do not agree with the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) that it is desirable to close the capital account. I hope it will be a long time before it is closed, because the capital account, according to the proper mode of carrying on the accounts of the Intercolonial as well as other railways, will only be properly and legitimately closed when the increase of business ceases, and therefore I hope it will be a long time. The hon. gentleman surely would not consider it right, if my hon. friend equipped the road to carry 500,000 tons of freight and charged the cost to capital account, that I should not be allowed to charge to capital account the extra equipment required to carry 1,000,000 tons of freight. Where would it come from? The hon. gentleman must see that if there is only rolling stock sufficient to handle 500,000 tons of traffic, you must, in the nature of things, if that traffic doubles, increase the rolling stock, and that is a legitimate charge to capital. We have had a great additional volume of traffic. I have a letter under my hand from the Chief Superintendent, stating that, in a single month, the increased traffic handled was \$34,000; and it is quite impossible to have an increase of traffic or 40 or 50 per cent. without providing for it from capital account. I have endeavored to bring down the fullest possible information, so as to place every fact in relation to the road within the reach of every member, so that he may give the question the most sifting examination that is possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course, I want to give it that examination before I reply to the hon. gentleman's observations, because the last return brought down was so grossly inaccurate and so wrongly compiled as to be intended deliberately to place my position in an unfavorable light, and to place the hon. gentleman's position in a more favorable light. It was a comparative statement of the expenditures which he and I incurred, and I was charged in it over \$500,000 more than I should have been. The hon. gentleman has refused to reduce that, and how do I know that this statement is not cooked also?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has no right to apply such terms to that return. If I am bringing down a statement of the charges on revenue for the different years, I ask the hon. gentleman if I am not right in taking his own figures; and they embrace a charge for steel rail renewals, which was a proper charge on revenue. The only inaccuracy in the return was in favor of the hon. gentleman, because in his statement of renewals he had included a large amount for fences and other things which we have habitually charged to working expenses. There was no misstatement or attempt to mislead, but a desire to place the facts in the fullest light before the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I can only say that if there was no desire to mislead the House, it was very singularly misled. The hon. gentleman did not use my figures. My figures give in one instance \$1,461,000, while he makes them \$1,640,000, and in another instance my figures give \$1,611,000, while the hon. gentleman makes them \$1,811,000. The annual reports stated the actual amounts, less renewals for steel rails, and the actual amounts including the renewals, and this the hon. gentleman took. He had the two statements there, and yet he took the one that showed in his own favor, and not in my favor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no return that could be brought down that would be in the hon. gentleman's favor, and that is the reason of these strong and unwarranted statements. A fair and honest statement is not in favor of the hon. gentleman, and he knows it right well. Since the Intercolonial has been a railway, this House has never been furnished with the full and accurate detail of figures that I have laid on the Table of the House, and it is because these figures place the hon. gentleman in the position they do, that he makes these unwarranted and unwarrantable statements. I tell the hon. gentleman that there is no possibility of bringing down a comparative statement that would be favorable to him. If he wants to refer to a question of inaccurate statements, I ask him why it was that when he was responsible for the statements that were brought down, that he had \$545,000 voted by this House for capital expenditure, expended by himself as capital, declared by himself to be capital expenditure, declared by Mr. Brydges to be capital expenditure, and yet that amount stands in the Public Accounts to-day, brought down by his own Finance Minister, as chargeable to revenue. I ask was that a false statement or a true statement? The statement I have made is a strictly accurate one; it was found that there were a few unimportant clerical errors in it, which were immediately corrected; but every statement I have made to the House is as thoroughly well founded as any statement can be, and was a fair honest exhibit of the true condition of things in every particular.

Mr. ANGLIN. In the early part of the evening the hon. gentleman seemed disposed to recede from the position which he took with regard to railway expenses and management, and to admit that charges for management should properly be deducted from the gross charges for working expenses in any comparative statement intended to show the relative merits of his management and the management of his predecessor; but he seems to have courage enough to assume his old position, and to assert that no statement could possibly be made that would place the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton in a favorable light. What we complain of is that the statement which he has placed before this House—no doubt, in order that it may be used throughout the country before the next election to prove that the hon. Minister of Railways has managed the railway efficiently and economically, while his predecessor has bungled it—is intended to create a most mistaken and erroneous impression. There is no misstatements so gross as a misstatement conveyed in words or figures which, taken merely by themselves, appear to be absolutely correct. Judging from the Public Accounts or reports of the Railway Department, the working expenses seem to be what they are represented in this paper. On the 20th of February last I made a motion for the return of the number of locomotives, cars, and other rolling stock, purchased during the past year or contracted for by the Minister of Railways, which could surely be made up in an hour or two; but though I have asked for it again and again, to this day I have been unable to get it. But this document, which required ten times the amount of labor, was scarcely spoken of by the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

member for Centre Huron when, presto, it appeared on the Table ready for distribution. Why? Because the return I moved for would damage the Government, but the other return produced was considered profitable and advantageous. In this document it is stated that the working expenses of 1877-78 were \$1,811,273; that, no doubt, is a strictly correct transcription from the Public Accounts, but it conveys a most erroneous idea of the actual expenses of that year. In the report for that year we find that, in 1876-77, the expenditure for renewals was \$544,543, entered in the Public Accounts. Now, \$200,000 was charged to working expenses in that year, and \$200,000 for the year 1877-78, the balance being charged in the accounts of the next year. The cost of working the line was \$1,811,273; but this report goes on to say, including \$200,000 for renewals. Subtracting that \$200,000 for those extraordinary, unprecedented renewals, including all the steel rails on the road in the Lower Provinces, the working expenses are reduced to \$1,611,000. We have had it stated over and over again that of that sum for the working expenses, the cost of converting the rolling stock of the old road into a condition to suit the new road, and of the narrowing of the gauge formed a large portion. We have had before the House the statement of Mr. Brydges, that the expenditure on that account came to another \$100,000; and if a comparative statement of the expenses of the road under each Administration is to be made, this sum also should be taken from the amount charged for working expenses. If it was deducted, the expenses would reach but \$1,511,500. There might be some excuse for overlooking an item of that kind, of which no special mention is made; but there is no excuse for overlooking the other item, of which mention is expressly made in the official report. In that same year we have the statement that the deficit, as compared with the year previous, was reduced by \$74,901. The earnings of the road increased very rapidly indeed that year. In 1876-77, the first year that the whole road was open, the earnings were but \$1,154,245, and in the year following, \$1,378,947. The next year, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the earnings declined to a very extraordinary extent. The official report plainly states that of this \$1,811,000, which the hon. Minister of Railways is so fond of bringing before the House and country as the amount of the working expenses under the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, \$200,000 was fairly and properly chargeable to extraordinary renewals. Therefore, in a comparative statement, that sum should have been deducted. If you come to the following year, for which the hon. Minister of Railways has often, before the House and public meetings, held the hon. member for Lambton responsible, although for nearly nine months of that year he had the management of the road himself, you find a very remarkable state of things. The hon. Finance Minister has united with the hon. Minister of Railways in boasting of his consummate skill, and great energy and wonderful ability, by which he has succeeded in converting a deficit of over \$700,000 into a small surplus; and for that deficit he holds the hon. member for Lambton responsible—but he is not responsible. The railway year commenced on the 1st July, 1878, and the hon. member for Lambton retired from office in the following October. In that first portion of the year, the expenses could not have been very large. The great bulk of the expenditure which swelled up the deficit was incurred under the Administration of the present hon. Minister of Railways, and for which he is directly responsible. By the reports of his own officials, we can see the character of that expenditure. Mr. Schreiber says on that point:

"In 1876-77, the expenditure for renewals amounted to \$543,591.68, and was entered in the Public Accounts, Part III., page 58, under the head of renewals, surplus account. Of that sum, \$200,000 was charged to working expenses for renewals in that year; \$200,000 is charged for

he fiscal year 1877-73, and the balance, \$143,591.63, will be included in charges for renewals in the account of 1878-79. The gross earnings of the year have been \$1,378,946.78, being an increase of 19.44 per cent., as compared with last year. The cost of working the line, with maintenance, is \$1,811,273.56, including \$200,000 for renewals, chargeable to 1877-78, for the total expenditure. \$543,561.88 made in 1876-77. The renewals of the year previous were nearly double. In the former year they required 354,000 rails, and in the latter 167,742, showing an increase of the expenditure in the former year of 143,943. I think, if there is anything that the hon. member for Lambton can fairly boast, it was the condition he left the rolling stock of the Intercolonial Railway."

We find that this year, under the administration of the hon. Minister opposite, an extraordinary expenditure was incurred for improvements and repairs, which produced this strange result of a deficit of \$700,000. The rolling stock was, to a considerable extent, reconstructed, a great number of railway cars being rebuilt, a number of others repaired and considerable alterations made in passenger cars, and extraordinary efforts were made to put the track in a very much better condition than it was before. A great number of additional sidings were put down, water tanks, and other necessary appliances were provided, and every expenditure possible was crowded into that year in order to put the road in the highest possible state of efficiency to do all the business likely to be done for some years. By this extraordinary expenditure incurred in that year the hon. Minister was enabled to effect a very large reduction in the expenditure of the years following. The hon. gentleman's object which was not then apparent has since become apparent. His object was to hold the hon. member for Lambton responsible for this expenditure and deficit, and therefore he has gone through the country proclaiming every where that the deficit under the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton amounted to \$700,000, although in reality that deficit occurred under the hon. gentleman's own Administration. Under the management of the hon. member for Lambton the deficit never exceeded \$200,000, and that was when the road was new and the traffic had to be created, and many things were necessary to render perfect the equipment of the road. Immediately after July 1st, 1876, the hon. member for Lambton, determined in the public interest that construction account must be closed once for all. Had he chosen to charge to construction account a great many of the items which he charged to expense account the balance would never have seemed so large as it was, even though we admit those extraordinary renewals must properly be charged to construction account. Thus we found the hon. Minister declaring, with a great flourish of trumpets and display of economy, after having wasted a whole year before making a single move in that direction, that we had discharged officials, clerks and employees of all kinds along the line of the railway. I have before me a return of the number of officials discharged, and I find that the total was 15 out of 119 employes, and on further analyzing the return I found that this change was accompanied by another. A very considerable portion of the work formerly done at Moncton was transferred to the Department here in Ottawa, and the money which it cost to do that work in Ottawa is not charged to the Intercolonial, but to the Civil Service Account. The hon. Minister may perhaps claim credit for having reduced the expenditure by some trifling amount, on account of dismissals and reductions of that kind, but there his whole claim must really end. We find next that station-masters, telegraph operators, freight clerks, checkers and baggage-masters were discharged to the number of fifty-five. Now, Sir, comes the question, as to whether there was any unnecessary number of men of that class employed on the road. Surely, the station-masters could not very well have been reduced in number. I am not aware that any stations were closed, and telegraph operators being generally connected with station-masters, some amalgamations might have been effected. Then we come to

engine-drivers, conductors, brakemen and baggagemen, and here we find the numbers were reduced from 539 to 451, in all eighty-eight. Now, here is a point where, I think, the hon. gentleman made a most egregious mistake. He told us when first announcing his changes to the House, that a very large number of persons were employed in cleaning locomotives—an absurdly large number he seemed to think. Well, I am not prepared to say, there was not more of that class of men employed than were required, but we all know that there could be no improper motive for the Ministry of the day or the Superintendent of the railway in employing more men of that class than were absolutely necessary, because it is well known that persons who are willing to accept employment in that capacity, are rarely possessed of much political influence. We found soon after what that meant, to some extent. The country was surprised to find that this economical Minister was proceeding to paint over the brass work of nearly all the locomotives employed on the railways—a most ridiculous piece of economy which has distinguished the hon. gentleman during his action of the railway. Since then we have heard various complaints with regard to the condition of the locomotives. The hon. gentleman asserts that they are maintained in the highest possible state of efficiency; but, as I have had occasion to tell him before, the public have had a very different opinion of the condition of the railway and rolling stock. Within a few days we have had letters published over the signature of Mr. John Murray, who for years acted as fireman, and afterwards as engine driver on the road, in which he gives a most deplorable account of the condition of the locomotives. He attributes three unhappy deaths on the railway to the fact of the inefficiency of the locomotives, particularly locomotive No. 73, which was absolutely incapable of shunting a train. We find, moreover, according to the hon. gentleman himself, that conductors, engine drivers and firemen are at least permitted on that railway to work many more hours in the week than is compatible with the efficient discharge of their duties. He tells us that they do this work voluntarily, that they were never compelled to do it; but he did not tell us that in consequence of these men being overworked most deplorable results have occurred on that railway. Mr. Murray asserts that he was requested to work more hours than he was willing to work, that he was threatened with dismissal if he did not work over-time, and that after having been forty-eight hours without sleep he refused to take charge of a train. The coroner's jury, sitting in inquest on the body of Conductor Geldert, corroborated, to a great extent, the statements of Mr. Murray, because they recommended that thereafter persons in charge of trains should not be required or permitted to work more than a reasonable number of hours. Why, Sir, the story of the case of poor Geldert was one of the saddest that we have ever heard of on any railway. This man started with a heavy train and found himself in what is technically called a hole—I presume a place graded on both sides—with this heavy train and this incapable engine. So weary was he that he fell asleep on that train, and other hands on that train being apparently also wearied out and asleep, they were incapable of discharging their duties properly, and consequently this deplorable accident took place. All this was in consequence of the admirable management of the hon. gentleman, who boasts here, as he boasted elsewhere, of having dismissed fifty-five conductors and engine drivers. Under such admirable management a train stands still on the road, another train dashes into it, and poor Geldert is killed. A short time before that, I am credibly informed that a train started from Moncton towards the north, in charge of men who were all exhausted for want of sleep; that soon after starting these men all fell asleep, a portion of the train somehow became detached and remained behind and they never missed it. When about

thirteen miles from Moncton this train, conducted by men who were asleep from over fatigue, dashed into another train on the siding and great damage was done to property, though no life was lost. The hon. gentleman boasts that he has effected great economy in the dismissal of these conductors and engine men, but it appears these men were paid by the number of hours they were employed, paid for each trip, and, therefore, no more money would have been paid for these fifty-five additional railway men than would have been paid if they had not been dismissed. That is a kind of economy that will not procure the hon. gentleman much credit before the country. Now, let me come to the item of repairs made upon the track. We saw that, according to the statement of Mr. Schreiber, so many hundred thousand sleepers were laid down, so many sidings were constructed in that year, and then we find him coming in when this extraordinary work was all done and dismissing a number of men, and then boasting that he had reduced the staff. He does not attempt to say that the number of men regularly employed on the track was reduced. We know that the number was reduced, and that very serious consequences resulted from that reduction. We find also that a large number of roadmasters, section men, and laborers were dismissed, reducing the number from 624 to 449. Now, how many of these did the hon. gentleman discharge, because so large an extra number must have been employed during the year previous to do this large amount of extra work described by Mr. Schreiber? We cannot say, but I think we may reasonably conclude that the proportion was very large. Then, again, we come to machinists, carpenters, painters, etc. Now, Sir, to ascertain the meaning of the dismissals here we must also look at what Mr. Schreiber tells us. He states that during the previous year a great number of cars were being built, that extensive changes were made in many other cars, and extensive repairs were made requiring a large additional number of hands for that particular period, a larger number than would be required thereafter, even if the hon. gentleman had continued to build the locomotives required from year to year at Moncton, and had continued to make all necessary repairs. But we find the number 720 reduced to 593, a reduction which was a matter of great boasting on the part of the hon. gentleman. Those were all reductions of a mixed character. Some of them were proper reductions, quite justifiable and even necessary, because the extraordinary work in which the various departments have been engaged was then completed, and there was no longer need for their services. Those who remember what transpired at Moncton before the hon. member became Minister of Railways must remember that the hon. member for Lambton found it necessary from time to time to discharge large numbers of men, not discharging them all at once, not throwing them on the labor market of the Lower Provinces, but selecting men who would be likely to obtain employment elsewhere, and so reducing the staff. That reduction went on, and the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially about Moncton, raised a loud outcry when men were dismissed; they said the hon. Minister was throwing whole families out of employment and on the cold charity of the world. When the hon. member for Cumberland came into power he found it desirable to stop for a time that system of dismissals, and found it desirable to make employment for the men then retained. At all events there is the fact that a great deal of extraordinary employment was found for the men for that particular year, but at the end of the year the hon. gentleman found it necessary to discharge a large number. There was no economy, no claim for credit to statesmanship to be based on such an operation; but that is exactly one of the points on which the hon. Minister founds his claim to administrative ability and efficient railway management. I have shown that the hon. Minister is not justified in charging the hon. member for Lambton with any degree of

Mr. ANGLIN.

responsibility for the expenditure of 1878-79, that he himself is responsible for the expenditure of that year, and that the expenditure of that year was a reason why many men were employed in the various departments, and why it was felt desirable, at the end of a year, to discharge a large number of hands. I say, therefore, the hon. Minister has no right to claim credit in this regard. But the hon. gentleman says, the traffic is growing from day to day. Traffic grew rapidly under the hon. member for Lambton. The road was opened only on the 1st July, 1876; it was under the hon. gentleman's control a little over two years, during which period trade expanded most satisfactorily. A number of new businesses were developed—the fish business was developed, the cattle trade was created, the Allan Line was compelled to call at Halifax, and English goods were brought back in return. The hon. Minister has told the House the increase of traffic between Halifax and the West was a justification for obtaining a large quantity of new rolling stock. One of the difficulties of the railway was to find return freight for the cars which went down to Halifax from the Upper Provinces. Cars went down full and returned empty, but instead of their returning empty, they now carry European goods and West India sugar—a change for which hon. gentlemen opposite is entitled to credit. That fact should add to the net profits of the railway, the cost of moving trains from Halifax to Lévis being very nearly as large for an empty as for a full train. The number of passenger trains is no larger than those of four years ago, the number of cars attached being slightly larger, the cost of moving goods being just as great; but the increase returns and profits should be much larger. So it is with respect to freight. When the road was opened it was necessary to move trains which had only a few car loads; but since the development of the traffic such is no longer a necessity, and therefore there should be less expenditure to move one ton of freight per mile than in olden times. The earnings of the road were as follows: During the last year of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, \$1,103,708; the year before last \$1,506,000; last year, \$1,760,000. Last year the amount was \$1,760,000, an increase of \$254,000, and in comparing the gross earnings as well as the expenditures we must not forget that we have added 120 miles to our railway from Rivière du Loup to Point Lévis. On the other hand we find that the number of employees has been greatly increased. The number, in 1880, was 1,910, and this number has been increased to 2,154. We find also that the rate of wages has increased by \$86,813. I am aware that many persons employed on the railway, steady, skilful and capable men, complain very bitterly that the wages they receive are very much less than they could receive elsewhere. We find that the working expenses have increased \$156,422, while the earnings have increased only \$254,000. Now, I do not think that that is a very extraordinary or creditable showing, taking into account the fact that this is comparatively a new road, and that therefore, the expenses should be cut down by the annual increase of the earnings. I would now point to one or two particular instances as specially exemplifying the peculiar character and quality of the hon. gentleman's administration of this railway. We find in the mere monetary arrangements of the road some very peculiar transactions. In the Supplementary Estimates there appears an item for coal-hoppers purchased from Mr. Burland. I moved for the papers in that transaction, and the papers which came down are quite as remarkable for what does not appear as they are for what they contain. The first paper is a report from the mechanical superintendent, dated at Towanda, Pa., 2nd November, 1881. The hon. Minister told us that he was urged very earnestly by the proprietors of coal mines and others to put on additional rolling stock, that he resisted their solicitations for a time, but finally yielded. It appears

that he ascertained by some means, that coal hoppers were for sale by Mr. Burland, but he does not say how he came into communication with that gentleman. He does not say that any tenders were asked or anything of that kind, but at all events communications began which resulted in the purchase of a number of coal hoppers. One would have thought that in a transaction of this kind, in which the hon. gentleman's conduct was impugned, in which there existed a suspicion of impropriety, that he would have made a clean breast of the whole matter and proved that his conduct was beyond question; but we have among the papers no copy of applications made by the owners of coal mines or others, nor of any proposal received from Mr. Burland, nor of any letter addressed by the Minister to Mr. Burland, nor by Mr. Burland to the Minister. We have no copy of any instructions to the mechanical superintendent, but on the contrary the hon. gentleman appears to have rushed *in medias res*, so to speak. We begin with the report of the superintendent, who, at somebody's instructions, found himself in the State of New York inspecting certain coal hoppers. What does he tell us about them:

"I reached this place yesterday A.M. and found that nearly all the coal cars that I came to see had within the last few days been put in service, after having been idle, it is said, since last spring. I saw about 120 yesterday, part of them here and part of them at Waverley, 20 miles away; last night 118 came in and I looked at them this forenoon. Some of these cars are about nine years old and not in very good condition, while others vary from less than one year to five, and all in very good order, most of them quite serviceable, a few, about fifty, as good as new, having been used but little.

"The wheels and axles, of which there are three sizes, are altogether different from anything we have in use, and if they should be purchased would involve the procuring of new patterns and castings to be used in repairs.

"As I wired you to-day, I think about two hundred could be selected from the whole lot that would be really serviceable, the principal objection being that they are different from our cars.

Mr. Lyon, the superintendent here, says that if they are purchased they will be put in condition to run should any require it.

"If we take them some person should be here to select unless you are willing to trust Mr. Lyon not to send any bad cars. I understand he has a market for forty or fifty of the poorer ones.

"I do not think it worth while to stay any longer."

This is the first report. So it appears that these cars which he supposed were five-ton cars, but which I believe were only four-ton cars, were being abandoned by this road. That report is dated the 2nd November, and whether the Minister saw that report from the 2nd to the 12th of November there is nothing to show, but on the 12th he wrote a remarkable letter to Sir Hugh Allan in these words:

"MY DEAR SIR HUGH,—Just before leaving Montreal you gave me verbal notice that you intended on my return to demand possession of the Pictou Branch.

"I have agreed to go over the Eastern extension next Friday with the officers of my Department, and, at the request of Captain Melbourne, to inspect the condition of the road.

"You are, no doubt, aware that the greatly increased coal traffic has created an imperative demand for a large number of coal cars, and I am now asking tenders for the immediate construction of 400 cars, a large proportion of which will be fifteen-ton cars. It would be impossible for you to take over the road without something like 400 cars, in addition to the supply that would be furnished you by the Intercolonial.

"Mr. Burland, of Messrs. Burland, Watson & Co., has proposed to sell 300 good second-hand coal cars, now in New York. Of course if the road is to be taken over by you, the Intercolonial will not require these cars in addition to the number I am contracting for.

"Having received notice that you intend to demand possession of the branch immediately, it would be impossible for me to assume the purchase of these cars while their acquisition presents a favorable opportunity of equipping your road with coal cars that are absolutely necessary to your assuming its management, and at small cost, and meeting the present necessities of the traffic under these circumstances, I have decided to propose to you to purchase these 300 cars, at a price to be fixed by our inspector, who will be sent from the Department for that purpose.

"In case you do not obtain possession of the road, I will take the cars at cost price.

"Hoping that this proposal will be satisfactory to you,

"I remain,

"Yours faithfully,

"CHARLES TUPPER.

"Sir HUGH ALLAN, Montreal."

Sir Hugh Allan allows seven days to elapse, and then he telegraphs on the 19th of November, from Montreal, to Sir Charles Tupper:

"If assured of permanent possession of Pictou Branch, I would buy Burland's rolling stock at once, but under the circumstances you should buy it, and if I get the road I would take over from you. Reply before four o'clock, as Burland leaves for New York to-night."

We find Sir Hugh Allan's interest excited in this Mr. Burland; but as to whether anything passed between these gentlemen during that week, we are left in the dark. We find Sir Charles Tupper, however, responding at once to Sir Hugh Allan's telegram, all the way from Stewiacke, N. S.:

"If found good, I will take 200 on terms proposed by you.

What are those terms? There are no terms mentioned in Sir Hugh Allan's telegram.

"Provided they are delivered at Chaudière Junction within ten days after I receive report of inspector, and notify Mr. Burland of their acceptance, and that the price does not exceed \$210 each, delivered at that point"

Up to this moment, so far as these papers show, the hon. Minister had no means of determining the value of these cars, and yet he offers this large sum of \$210 each for them. That telegram was on the 19th of November; on the 21st of November, Mr. Whitney telegraphs from Philadelphia to Mr. Pottinger:

"I leave this morning. There has been trouble with some of the cars jumping the track, and for this reason were refused by another railway. Better not close trade at present. Am making further enquiry."

So Mr. Whitney reports two days after Sir Charles Tupper has promised to purchase this large number of cars. On the 22nd of November Mr. Whitney writes from Young's Hotel, Boston:

"I wired you to-day from New York that Barrows & Company had made a written offer to supply 100 twenty-ton gondola cars for \$555 each, delivered at York, S. W. I think this a much better offer than that of the five-ton cars, provided the time of delivery will suit, viz., 15th January. You did not let me know the price asked for the small cars and I did not think to ask for it, and I may say here that fifty of them would be worth about \$250, 100 about \$190 to \$200, and fifty not more than \$150, though the latter are in such condition as to be serviceable for some time yet. Still they are old cars and would not last long; this is supposing they run well and do not jump the track, as I was informed they did by a person on the train to Philadelphia, and there is the other objection of their different sizes and description of axles and bearings, spoken of in my former letter."

On the 23rd of November we find Sir Hugh Allan telegraphing to Sir Charles Tupper:

"The following is a copy of a telegram received this afternoon from Mr. J. B. Burland, dated New York this day. About fifty of the cars have only been used two or three times; balance of 200 in good condition. Will you kindly address any instructions to me at Morton House, Union Square, here; if you have any instructions to give Mr. Burland on this subject, you can either address him direct, or if you will send them to me, I will forward same."

So Sir Hugh Allan still declares his deep interest in the welfare of Mr. Burland. Sir Charles Tupper telegraphs from Moncton on the 26th of November to Sir Hugh Allan:

"From inspector's report, I don't think it advisable to take any of the cars offered by Mr. Burland."

There is his conclusion, which seems to be a fair and proper conclusion. We find next in these papers a great gap. Evidently some papers are not furnished, so as to enable us to see the whole of this transaction clearly. The next we find is a telegram from Mr. Burland at New Glasgow to Sir Charles Tupper in Montreal:

"Have received answer. You can select fifty, and will deliver at Chaudière Junction at \$238 cash, or 100 at \$228, delivered same place. Kindly advise me here at your earliest convenience, as I have been requested to reply to-morrow."

Here Mr. Burland says: "Have received your answer." Where is that answer? The last document from Sir Charles Tupper says: "I don't think it advisable to take any of the cars." We next have a peculiar document, dated the 10th

December, 1881, by telegraph from Montreal to Mr. Pottinger :

" We will take delivery at the Chaudière Junction, of 100 boiler and hopper cars, which Whitney may select, price \$220."

Surely there must have been some telegrams passing between these gentlemen before that extraordinary conclusion was arrived at. The last statement by Sir Charles Tupper was: " We will not have the cars;" and the next thing we find is this order for the delivery of the cars at a certain price. I have only to remark that here is an account in regard to the Intercolonial Railway dated 3rd January, 1882, and there is a receipt as follows: " Received from the Intercolonial payment in full, \$22,850," dated 25th February, 1882. The cars were taken possession of about the 3rd of January. I find also that on the 22nd December, Pottinger telegraphs to Schrieber: " Shall I enter the cars free?" Schrieber telegraphs back: " Yes, enter them free." We also find that there is a pretence of obtaining the authority of the Governor in Council to this transaction. On 3rd January, Schrieber telegraphs: " 100 coal cars having been offered at the Chaudière Junction at \$228 each, I recommend the offer be accepted." Already the cars had been delivered. After Schrieber recommended the offer be accepted, Sir Charles Tupper makes his report recommending that that recommendation be carried out, when an Order in Council of the 23rd February is made, ordering the purchase of the coal hoppers which had been purchased by telegraph weeks before. This is one of the most extraordinary transactions that could be discovered even in the most secret history of the management of any railway on this continent. The fact that those papers are brought down in this condition, and that many documents have been deliberately suppressed, although the House ordered them to be brought down, is in itself evidence of a transaction of a very extraordinary and reprehensible character. The cars were purchased in spite of the recommendation of the mechanical engineer and of the decision of the Minister himself, who decided they would not suit and that a much higher price than the value set upon by the mechanical engineer. The delivery was appointed, and they were put into use on the Intercolonial, though entirely unfit for the railway. The experience of the Intercolonial Railway has shown that the small hoppers were not the best kind for use. With regard to those hoppers what do we find? They were scarcely put in use when they excited a strong feeling of indignation among the employees of the road. They cannot even bring the coal in safety from the Spring Hill mines to the market place. I got a letter telling me that, of five of those hoppers, two came in absolutely empty and the other three nearly empty. I have been told also, that it was necessary to fasten the hoppers at the bottom and remove the coal by shovelling. I find from a return, that six of those hoppers were undergoing repairs, and no less than 114 were awaiting repairs; and rumor says, that a very large number of these were practically condemned as entirely unfit for the purpose—that the evil repute they possessed, of jumping the track, is well founded, and that they are exceedingly dangerous. I am told, whether truly or not, that a young man, Brown, killed at Amherst, owed his death to those hoppers. But this is one of the transactions which exemplifies in a remarkable light the political economy of the hon. gentleman opposite, his great ability, great prudence, great public opinion and entire disregard of all personal and private motives in the management of the Intercolonial. I think the hon. gentleman hereafter should put his case before the House and public, in such a way as to do justice at once to his opponents and himself. We are not at all disposed to deny to the hon. gentleman any credit to which he is fairly entitled for the management of this railway. But when he challenged the management of the hon. member for Lambton, and used

Mr. ANGLIN.

figures in order to prove *prima facie* that his own administration was so much more economical and able than that of his predecessor—when he claims credit for having converted a deficit of \$710,000 into a surplus of some \$500 or \$600, and when he charges that his predecessor, either by waste or extravagance, want of ability, skill, or due attention to the public interest in the management of the road, created that unfavorable condition of things, he must expect his statements will not go unchallenged. While he charges his predecessor with extravagance, want of ability and skill, he cannot expect this statement will pass unchallenged. All the official figures and facts disprove his statements and throw light on his own mode of managing the road. The hon. gentleman now ventures on another course, and says that whatever may be the comparison of results, he, at all events, has managed the 840 miles of road for no greater amount than the hon. member for Lambton expended in the management of the shorter distance.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For much less.

Mr. ANGLIN. According to his own statement, the working expenses in 1877-78 amounted to \$1,811,173. Deducting \$200,000 off that would bring the amount down to \$1,611,173, and I maintain that off that should be taken \$100,000 more for the rebuilding and reconstruction of rolling stock. But leaving that aside, we have \$1,611,000 in 1877-78 against his \$1,603,000 in 1879 and \$1,753,000 in 1881. The hon. gentleman will perhaps say that we did a larger trade in 1880-1. No doubt we did, but it would require a very elaborate calculation, which probably only a railway accountant could make, to ascertain exactly how much more or less the hon. member for Lambton's expenditure was than that of 1880-1, taking into account the difference in quantity of freight and passengers carried. If we look at the earnings we have not grown per mile so much as the hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose. In the first year the road earned \$1,600 per mile; the next year \$1,931 per mile; the year following, under the administration of the hon. gentleman opposite, it fell to \$1,812; the year following it rose to \$1,825, and the year after to \$2,095 per mile.

Mr. PLUMB. What objection is there to that?

Mr. ANGLIN. I am not objecting. I merely point out the fact that the increase of earnings has not been so very rapid or wonderful as the hon. gentleman would have us suppose it has been under his administration. For the two years under his administration the earnings were less than the last year of the hon. member for Lambton's administration. Then when we come to talk of the acquisition of the Rivière du Loup Branch we must remember that that was not a road running through a wilderness at a loss of money, but a road which had netted even under the miserable management of the Grand Trunk Railway an actual profit of \$38,000 the year before we got possession of it, so that our earnings should have increase in a greater ratio after receiving this additional mileage. The increase, however, was not so great as the hon. gentleman would have us believe. I have said the working expenses could not be calculated fairly according to the additional mileage. We ran our own trains over that road during the time it was run by the Grand Trunk Railway. Under our arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, it was specially provided that no charge should be made by the Intercolonial for the use of our cars. We gave them all our trains. Every passenger and freight car employed on the Intercolonial, to and from Quebec, belonged to us, that went over this 120 miles of road which caused more wear and tear to rolling stock than two or three times the length of road elsewhere would. The maintenance of way for the last year or two, since the hon. gentleman has taken possession of that road, is very trifling, because during that period the

road underwent extensive repairs chargeable to capital account. The whole road-bed was renewed, and the superstructure was also renewed during that time and charged to capital account, so that the maintenance of the road during this time could have cost but a trifling sum. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but I felt it was necessary to answer the hon. gentleman's statements. Let me add one word more. I charge the hon. gentleman with having unnecessarily gone out of the country to obtain a very large quantity of rolling stock that with proper precautions, prudence and oversight, we might have obtained within the Dominion. I do not know how much of the rolling stock purchased last year has been purchased outside the Dominion. It is said a large portion has been made in the workshops of Quebec. There is no reason why it should not have been manufactured in the workshops at Moncton by the Dominion Government itself. But there is less fault to be found with them for that than in going outside the country to purchase rolling stock that could have been provided just as well in this country, though I admit not quite so rapidly. But we could furnish all the rolling stock we want, and it is the duty of the Government to afford every possible facility to our own manufacturers. I go for fair play to our manufacturers. For whatever is fair and right they will find no more earnest advocate than myself. The hon. gentleman last year went out of the country to purchase in the United States \$164,000 worth of rolling stock, and last year he probably purchased twice as much outside the Dominion. This is one of the charges I make against his administration of the railway, that he has not taken the pains and care which should have been incumbent upon him as a member of the Government to afford an opportunity to our own mechanics and artisans of supplying the railway stock required on the railway. I have hurried over these statements in order to occupy as little time as possible, and I thank the House for the kind attention with which they have listened to me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I shall not reply at length to the remarks of the hon. member for Gloucester for the reason that almost all the statements he has made to-night have been made again and again before, and have been again and again refuted, and I have learned by painful experience that there is one thing the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot forgive, and that is any effort at saving money. I have learned by painful experience that you can bring down any amount of expenditure you like, and these gentlemen will cheerfully vote it, but if a member of the Administration is able to show that by care and attention he is effecting a considerable economy and saving hundreds of thousands of dollars to the country, it is a crime that these hon. gentlemen cannot forgive, and there is more trouble in getting an item through this House in connection with what a great saving has been effected, than any other vote that can be asked for. The hon. gentleman has referred to the question of obtaining rolling stock outside of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman has had his answer two or three times before; he knows right well that it was done in consequence of the great and unexpected volume of traffic which demanded measures to be taken in order to handle it that were beyond the capacity of the country to furnish. The hon. gentleman has been told before and knows right well that not a single dollar has been expended outside the country for rolling stock that could have been procured in the country at the time it was required. Yet again and again we have the same old story repeated, which has been again and again refuted. Now, the hon. gentleman sees something very suspicious in the purchase from Burland of 100 hopper cars. Why, Sir, the explanation was not only made to the House, but it was apparently satisfactory to the hon. gentleman, who voted the money for these cars without a single comment until to-night he found it was necessary, in order to talk against time, at this late hour to go elaborately into

the question. I met the story at every point by stating to the House that I first saw Mr. Burland when I was at Shediac on my way to Prince Edward Island. At that time it was expected the Eastern extension, which belongs to the Company of which Sir Hugh Allan was President, would shortly take over the road. They had given us notice that they intended to take the road off our hands, and under these circumstances, I referred Mr. Burland to Sir Hugh Allan, as a party who would likely avail himself of the opportunity of making a purchase of these cars; that he could not take over the road until he had necessary rolling stock to operate it, and that would naturally belong to that section of the road from Truro to the Strait of Canso, which would then pass into Sir Hugh Allan's hands under the contract made with the late Government. That I should suppose would be a perfectly natural step for me to take, and when I found on my arrival at Pictou, after having visited Prince Edward Island, and was waited upon by the coal owners there who urged the necessity of having a large additional supply of coal cars, in order to fill the orders and engagements they had made, I was obliged to take up this subject on short notice, and being on that tour of inspection, having the Chief Engineer of Government Railways and the Chief Superintendent with me, and being in communication from time to time with the Mechanical Superintendent, who was also with me on that occasion, it is quite evident that a part of this transaction would naturally be conversational and a part would be reduced to writing. All the papers and all the correspondence I am aware of that was not embraced in personal communications were brought down to the House, and the hon. gentleman ought to know from the various places at which these communications were dated that I was on the road, that the officers connected with the Department were with me, and he ought to be able, with the exercise of a very little intelligence, to see why everything is not expanded in correspondence in relation to this transaction. Now, finding that Sir Hugh Allan was not willing to make the purchase, but was prepared to take them over at the price at which they were purchased, I could not very well meet his objection from that standpoint, and it was necessary to get additional supplies; and being assured that the statement that these cars would jump the track was an error, having learnt from Mr. Whitney that the person who had told him so had no personal knowledge of it, I decided to take a certain portion of these hopper cars, provided we were allowed to select the best quality. The hon. gentleman can understand why we could not select one hundred out of the whole lot, most of which were comparatively new, without obtaining them at the same price for which they were offered to us for the whole lot. I now lay upon the Table of the House a supplementary return containing a letter received from Mr. Whitney that, I think, will set the hon. gentleman's mind entirely at rest on the subject. In a letter addressed to the Chief Superintendent, under date of April 8th, 1882, he says:

"INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY,
"MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE,
"MONCTON, N.B., 8th April, 1882.

"D. POTTINGER, Esq.,
"Chief Superintendent, Moncton.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to the enclosed letter from Mr. Schreiber, in reference to the Burland Hopper Cars, I have to say that these cars will hold five net tons.

"They are not very inferior stock; most of them, of course, are second-hand cars; some of them, the first time I saw them, had not a pound of coal in them.

"About fifty of them were from ten months to a year old, and had been used but very little. The others had been considerably used, but were all sound cars. They are not dangerous to couple any more than any ordinary car, and they keep the road as well as any Hoppers do.

"The drawbars being somewhat lower than our standard height for box and platform cars, a crooked coupling is required, when they are coupled with other cars, otherwise they are no more trouble or dangerous to use than the cars we have.

"I had a report the first time that I went to see them, that they would not keep the road, but I found that that report was incorrect.

"You are aware that I objected to these cars on the ground that they were of different construction from ours and necessitated our getting new patterns made to correspond to castings.

"Yours truly,

"H. A. WHITNEY,
"Mechanical Superintendent."

An Order in Council, authorizing the purchase of rolling stock, having been made long before, and the purchase having been made in this particular mode, authority was subsequently taken for it when we returned to Ottawa. So the hon. gentleman will find that the story which has interested him so greatly is one that only requires a word of explanation in order to place it in a perfectly clear and satisfactory light to the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman says, with respect to 1879, that the expenditure during that year should be charged to the present Administration, because we were in power for a long period of years. But the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Brydges was the General Superintendent, that he had the entire control of the Intercolonial Railway, and from 1st July, 1878, until the last of February, 1879. Mr. Brydges was in sole control of the road, and his administration was not interfered with, nor any arrangements made for introducing economy, and these were not brought into operation until after the close of that year. The hon. gentleman has referred to the large number of sleepers put in that year. Those expenditures were made by Mr. Brydges when the road was under his control. They were entered upon to a very large extent—the bulk of the expenditure was made—before the change of Administration, and were carried out by Mr. Brydges until the end of February, and after that the works in which he had been engaged were completed. The hon. gentleman referred to a graver question, and the only one to which I intend to call the attention of the House at this late hour—the danger to which employees are exposed arising from those economies and the accidents which have occurred in consequence of it. Why, the hon. gentleman knows there is no foundation for that statement; he is perfectly well aware that the present winter has been an exceedingly severe one. Since 1872, no such difficulty has arisen on the Intercolonial as during the present year. The hon. gentleman knows that we have increased the car mileage on that road since we undertook the management by 10,000,000 miles, and notwithstanding we have had a number of accidents, I regret to say during the present season, our position in that respect, on 840 miles of road with this increase of car mileage, in regard to those casualties, will compare most favorably with 1877-78 under the management of Mr. Brydges. The year ending 30th June, 1878, shows the following:

"Ballast train ran into freight train; engine and nine cars damaged. Conductor, driver and brakeman all injured. Coal train collided with No. 17 freight; two engines badly damaged and one coal car wrecked. Train collided with engine, breaking pilot off. Train parted; parts collided, damaging three cars. Pullman and first-class car left track; both damaged. Engine ran into train; four cars damaged and employee's leg broken. Pullman and postal car damaged by train jumping track. Employee killed by overhead bridge. Thirteen cars left track; one damaged. Engine and four hoppers left track. Engine thrown from track. Van left track and upset. Van left track; engine thrown down embankment, baggage, second-class and postal cars damaged. Employee had hip dislocated. Train divided; another train ran into one division; van damaged and two cars thrown from track. Engine thrown from track: tender smashed, engine and two cars damaged. Thirteen hoppers left track; four broken up."

Yet the hon. gentleman, knowing that was the record, that on that comparatively short road and on that comparatively short length of car mileage, six men were killed and all this damage was done to rolling stock under the management of their political friends, he never gave the matter an hour's consideration or said it arose from bad management. Every person knows that no man in Canada has had greater experience than Mr. Brydges, and I do not refer to these accidents as showing in the least degree any want of care

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

on his part, or lack of attention in maintaining the condition of the road or the rolling stock, but only to show how hard pressed are hon. gentlemen opposite who have brought up one or two accidents to throw discredit on our management of the road. The hon. gentleman has also occupied much of the time of the House in regard to Murray's statement. He has sprung into unwonted notoriety; he has been induced even to leave the road, where his services did not receive that amount of consideration to which he thought they were entitled, for the purpose of devoting his services to a political party whose great exigencies required his assistance; but if the hon. gentleman would read Murray's own statement, he will find that he gives three different, distinct and contradictory reasons why he left the road. He has said he left the road because life and property were unsafe—because his life was unsafe; yet Murray wrote this letter:

"BEDFORD STATION, 2nd April, 1882.

"To D. POTTINGER,
"Chief Superintendent, Moncton.

"I hereby tender you my resignation as driver on Intercolonial Railway. I wish to comply with the book of rules and regulations. If you can relieve me from duty at once, you will oblige, as I cannot stand the humbug there is at Richmond and other stations.

"Yours truly,
"J. MURRAY."

On April 4th, Murray wrote:

"SHUBENACADIE STATION, 4th April, 1882.

"To H. A. WHITNEY, Moncton.

"I tendered my resignation last night to the Chief Superintendent. I would like to be relieved from duty to-day on arrival at Richmond. I am not feeling well."

"J. MURRAY,
"Driver."

We have three distinct statements for Murray's leaving the service of the road. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) asked me if my attention had been called to Murray's statement as to the manner in which the employes of the road were overworked, and whether I had received any report on that statement. I told the hon. gentleman that I had called on the Superintendent to report on Mr. Murray's statement, and also applied to Mr. Schreiber, the Chief Engineer of Railways in operation, for a statement in reference to the important point as to whether the hands were overworked? Mr. Schreiber reports:—

"In reply to your enquiry as to the train hands on the Intercolonial making extra trips and working overtime, I may say that their doing so is by no means compulsory. On the contrary, I am informed, that they are so desirous of making extra time that each presses his claims for permission to do so. They, of course, receive compensation."

I have already explained to the House the utter impossibility of maintaining a staff which will be sufficient for discharging all the duties that occasionally make an extra demand on the services of the employees, without having a large body of men idle, their wages being paid at the same time by the public. These parties are paid for the work they do, and they complain bitterly if a large number of persons are employed, because it diminishes their remuneration. I have now a letter written by the Superintendent on Mr. Murray's letter, which I will read, as a great deal has been made out of this matter, and as the letter is not very long:

"INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY,
"Office of the Chief Superintendent,
"Moncton, N. B., 24th April, 1882.

"C. SCHREIBER, Esq.,
"Chief Engineer, Government Railways,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—In answer to your telegram with reference to John Murray, whose letter appeared in the "Morning Chronicle" of a recent date, I find on enquiry that he entered the Railway service, as a fireman, at Pictou Landing, in October, 1874. He appears to have been promoted rapidly and was made a driver in 1876. On the 3rd of the present month, he telegraphed from Bedford his resignation.

"I am informed by those who know him that he is a confirmed grumbler and that it is almost impossible to satisfy him.

"His statements are quite untrue and carry no weight with those who know him.

"During February and the first part of March, the weather was very stormy and trains were in consequence delayed. The Enginemen were, therefore, sometimes delayed an unusual length of time upon the road, but were, of course, paid accordingly, and the detention was unavoidable.

"This was the case upon the Sunday morning he refers to, when he was ordered to assist a Freight train from Londonderry to Folly Lake, as there had been a heavy snow storm.

"I find on examining the time sheets, that he was not on duty 126 hours, as stated, and 48 hours without rest. In January I find that he did not work on the 1st, 8th, 13th, 15th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th and 29th.

"In February he did not work on the 5th, 11th, 12th, 19th, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th.

"In March he did not work on the 5th after 9.30 A. M., he did not work on the 12th, 19th, 24th, nor 26th. So that he seems to have been able to refrain from work whenever he wished.

"Engine No. 73, which he calls an old trap and fit only for the scrap-heap, was purchased in 1874 from the Portland Company. She is a Passenger engine with four driving wheels coupled. The diameter of the drivers is 66 in. and the size of the cylinder 16 x 24.

"This engine came out of the shop in December last, after having received a thorough repair.

"The life of a locomotive is not less than fifteen years, so that this engine has only been in use half the time that she is capable of serving. The engine was perfectly capable of hauling 36 empty cars and has frequently, since that time, hauled as heavy a train.

"His statement that engine driver Hunt was fined for setting off cars in false. Hunt is one of the oldest and most careful drivers on the line, and he is a good man in every respect and a good driver. Why Murray should refer to him so prominently in connection with the collision of trains at Grand Lake, I cannot understand, for Hunt was entirely blameless in the matter.

"Murray's letter is somewhat rambling and inconsistent. In one part of it he blames us for overworking the men; in another part he blames us for employing new men; and talks about Hunt's fireman being a green hand, who had only fired for four weeks.

"Our enginemen are as good a lot of men as can be found on any railway in the country, but there are a few among them—very few I am glad to say,—who, if they were allowed, would shirk their work and haul fewer cars than their engines are capable of hauling. The consequence is that such men have to be looked after and made to do the work that other men are able and willing to do under similar circumstances. There is no road in the country where the enginemen are allowed to manage the traffic and say what number of cars they shall take in a train.

"With us, the Mechanical Superintendent and the skilled men under him state what each engine's capacity of hauling is, and this information is acted upon by the Traffic Department.

"I wish it understood that we have very little trouble with our engine-drivers with regard to hauling train, it is only with a few of them—Murray being among the number.

"This winter there has been a large and unexpected increase in the traffic, both in Passengers and in Freight, and we have therefore had considerable difficulty in moving it.

"This increase of traffic should be a source of great satisfaction to every well-wisher of the country, and it should be especially so to the persons living along the line of railway and to the railway employes as it is the strongest possible evidence of the general prosperity of the country.

"The great majority of employes in all departments have been glad to see the increased traffic and have done their utmost to facilitate the work. And I am sure that they do not thank Murray for his misdirected efforts in their behalf.

"You are aware that there are a large number of people leaving the Lower Provinces for Manitoba and the North-West and of course some of the railway employes, thinking to better their condition, have gone to the North West also, but the number of our men who have left is really very small.

"The statements that rails and materials are not furnished for the repair of the track; that the rolling stock is not in good order; that the snow is not shovelled from the sidings; that men are run for 380 miles without rest and without food, &c., are untrue.

"In his letter in the "Chronicle" of April 22nd, Murray refers to Samuel Cameron, mechanical foreman, at Pictou Landing, and states that he has left the service in consequence of his pay having been cut down \$10 a month.

"Cameron's pay was reduced \$10 per month at the time that the reduction in salaries was made, but his pay was again raised to the original amount and for a long time he has been receiving as much pay as he ever did. Cameron has gone to the North West, taking his two grown up sons with him, because he thinks he can give them a better start in life in that new country. He is a good man and he parted with the railway in a friendly way and is deserving of success wherever he goes.

"There has been a good deal said in Murray's letter with reference to overworking the men. I have already explained to you, in previous letters, that men when running special trains are paid by the trip, the line being divided into sections and a certain value counted in days or parts of a day assigned to a trip over each particular section. For instance, from St. John to Moncton is 89 miles and this is counted one day, although it may only occupy four or five hours. From Moncton to Campbellton, 185 miles, is counted one day and a half, and it may only

occupy six or eight hours. From Truro to Halifax and return, which is 120 miles the round trip, is counted one and a quarter day.

"The enginemen are paid at a certain rate per day. Murray's pay being \$2.31 per day.

"From this explanation you will see that the men are paid according to the work they perform, and if they work overtime, it results in no economy whatever to the railway. The question will naturally occur to a person unacquainted with railway work, if this is the case, why not employ more men. In answer to this I may explain that the business of almost every railway, fluctuates very much, there being sometimes a rush of freight, as we have for a short time in the winter and at other times very little.

"It has been found by experience that when men are once promoted and afterwards have to be reduced to an inferior position,—such a case for instance as a fireman being made an engine-driver and afterwards being set back to be a fireman—that, in general, the promotion has had the effect of spoiling a good fireman—the man being afterwards dissatisfied in any position inferior to that of engine-driver.

"The same is the case with brakemen and conductors. Again, if many new conductors and engine-drivers are made during a busy season, the chances of accident are necessarily increased, because these men, who have not had long experience in their new duties, are employed at the very time when the greatest degree of skill and care is necessary. It is usual therefore to use, as far as possible, the regular staff.

"I think I have referred to all the matters in Murray's letters that are deserving of notice.

"It seems to me that the more letters of this kind that Murray writes, the better it will be for the railway management. When the first letter came out, I suppose that a number of people, outside of the railway and unacquainted with its working, thought that his statements were facts, but by the time he writes a few more letters, the public will be able to estimate him at his true worth, and his own letters will be the best vindication of the railway.

"Your obedient servant,
"Signed, D. POTTINGER."

That letter from the Chief Superintendent gives the most effective refutation to any statement of Mr. Murray's that required the slightest attention at his hands. Now, Sir, I think I have said everything that requires to be said. As I stated before, all the other statements of the hon. gentleman have been again and again refuted, and if they are of any interest to him, I think they have ceased to be so to anybody else.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that it is due to the faults of the hon. gentleman's officers, or of his administration, but I do know that the last railway statistics laid on the Table show a most unusual percentage of accidents as having occurred on the Intercolonial Railway during the year ending the 30th June, 1881. All the persons killed and wounded in Canada during that year numbered 246, on nearly 7,000 miles of railroad in actual operation. On the Intercolonial Railroad, of which 840 miles are in actual operation, eighty-one persons were killed and wounded during that year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How many were killed?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Fourteen were killed and sixty-seven injured. I do not know that the railway authorities are specially to be thanked that the injuries did not result in actual death; and this is a very high percentage, bearing in mind the fact that many of these railroads, such as the Grand Trunk and Great Western, carry a very much larger number of passengers than the Intercolonial, and show a smaller number.

Mr. McLELAN. Under the management of the hon. Minister of Railways, there has not been a single passenger killed or seriously injured. With respect to this matter of Mr. Murray, it seems strange that hon. gentlemen opposite should desire to attach so much importance to that letter. I can understand Mr. Murray or any other employee of that road, who did not get a promotion he sought, endeavoring, if possible, to injure the road; but I cannot understand hon. gentlemen opposite, who ought to be above such an action, giving that letter so much importance as to create the impression in the country that the road is not in a safe condition to travel upon. A considerable portion of this road runs through the county I have the honor to represent. A

number of my constituents feel anxious to obtain employment on the road, and the complaint I have received from them—and I have a number of letters in my possession at present from some who are usually employed as conductors or firemen or drivers—is that being paid by the piece or by the day, they do not get sufficient employment. Therefore, having this fact in my possession, I do not attach any importance to the statements made in Mr. Murray's letter that the employees are so overworked that it is unsafe to travel on the road.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The letter of Murray was published in the newspapers, and as it had every appearance of being authentic, I was entitled to bring the matter before the House and have it explained. I said nothing either for or against him; I knew nothing about him or his statements, but they were there and had to be met. Whether they are sufficiently met by Mr. Pottinger's letter is a matter of opinion; I think to some extent they are. With regard to the accidents in my time we invariably put down the number of accidents not only to individuals, but the rolling stock. According to this last report, it would appear that not a single engine or car was injured during the whole of last year. Is that the case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Certainly not; the hon. gentleman knows that is not the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose it is not correct; but what is very remarkable is this. We have an entry of two Grand Trunk engines having got off the track and got on their sides. As they did not belong to the Government, the accident is mentioned, but we have no means of knowing the number of engines or cars belonging to the Government that were injured during the year. Then the hon. gentleman made another statement, which I presume was a mistake; he stated that there was an increase of 10,000,000 of train mileage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I intended to say car mileage.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The train mileage of 1881 was 2,813,723, and of 1877-78, 2,160,080. The increase in business does not at all correspond to the increase in the mileage. For instance, in 1872-73 and 1873-74 the number of trains per mile was 1,147; in 1874-75, 945; in 1875-76, 695; in 1876-77, 590; in 1877-78, 732; in 1878-79, 715; in 1879-80, 681, and in 1880-81, 863. Taking five years, including 1873-74, the average would be 822; five years, commencing 1874-75, average 735; the three years of the hon. gentleman opposite, from 1878-79 to 1881, average 752; and for the two last years, 772. So that the difference in the tonnage as per mile is practically nothing; and if we include the year 1873-74, it is more in the years of the late Administration than in any other period. The hon. gentleman declared, a few evenings ago, his firm conviction that all steel rails, after the road was once built, should properly and could only be properly charged to a revenue account. How does it come that he charged to capital account the sum of \$40,000 for nut locks two years ago, upon his own showing of what a proper revenue or capital charge is. The fact is, the only difference between the hon. gentleman's expenditure and that which he has been criticising is this: that he made use of the capital account in order to cover all deficiencies, to an extent more than sufficient to wipe out the entire difference.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reference to the remark of the hon. member for Centre Huron as to the accidents, they are numbered in this way in the railway statistics: the smallest possible mishap or damage is put down as an accident and is included among the serious accidents, whereas the practice on most of the other railways is only to take notice of very serious accidents. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken as to the number killed, the largest number of employees for any one year being only seven.

Mr. McLellan,

Mr. MACKENZIE. The report of the hon. gentleman's own Department gives the names of fourteen killed in one year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The damages on account of accidents to men, animals and property on the Intercolonial for the years 1878 and 1879 were \$6,000 and \$7,000. They have not been as high as \$4,000 any year since.

Mr. WELDON. I asked on the 9th of March for a return of the accidents on this road, where there were neither lives lost nor injuries to persons, and also a return of damages to goods; but it has not yet been furnished, although the information has appeared in the papers of the Lower Provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The largest number of employees killed was seven, killed beyond the track.

Mr. PLUMB. We have heard from the member for Gloucester his annual attack on the Intercolonial Railway, and the usual discussion in the usual temper on the other side of the House. We have been treated by the hon. gentleman to a speech lasting an hour or two, in which he exemplified, as he usually does, the Italian proverb—that the tongue is like a race-horse, which runs faster the less weight it carries. The hon. gentleman has exhibited his utter ignorance of railway matters in the most striking degree in everything he has said respecting the Intercolonial. But it was reserved for the member for Centre Huron to make a direct attack on the road with a view to alarming people and frightening them from travelling upon it.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB. If the hon. gentleman had been a railway touter for other roads, he could not have more effectually served the interests of his employers. There were no passengers on the Intercolonial Railway killed during the last three years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And none the last three years.

Mr. PLUMB. I was speaking of the report from which the hon. gentleman read. There were four employees and another person killed by falling from the engines and cars. That is a kind of accident which certainly the Company could not be responsible for. Five others were injured in the same way, and in jumping off or six persons were injured. I am not aware that the Superintendent or the Manager, or the Minister of Railways is responsible for accidents to people who choose to jump off the cars or engines while in motion. Twenty-three were killed at work on or near the track making up trains. It is impossible for the most careful superintendent of a railway to prevent men employed on a railway from becoming reckless or to prevent accidents of that kind. Another kind of accident occurs to men coupling cars; twenty-six men were injured in this way. That had nothing to do with the running of trains or the management of the road—nothing to do with the condition of the track. Thus we have got fifty-nine out of eighty-one accidents the hon. gentleman brought before the House with such earnestness. Two persons were killed by collisions and by trains thrown from the track, and one person was injured. That is the only class of accidents which can in any way, even remotely, be attributed to the management or running of the road or to its condition. The report further says, under this heading, walking, or standing, or lying, or being on the track, one person killed and no other person injured. We cannot tell whether the man was an employee of the road or not. Probably he was not. He may have been a person staggering across the track. That is the whole sum of the accidents on the Intercolonial Railway which the hon. gentlemen have made gravely the basis of a charge against the management of the Intercolonial Railway. It

is only necessary to read that statement to show what is the character of the whole attack that has been made on the road by these hon. gentlemen to-night. From that one can see the animus of the whole. The House and the country will judge these gentlemen according to their merits as shown by the disingenuous statements they have to resort to in order to make out their case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Can the hon. Minister of Railways tell the House for what reason Hamilton, the train despatcher at Truro, was dismissed?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was dismissed in consequence of having given a wrong order, and probably in connection with it the habit of falsifying the books.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was there any trial of the case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The matter was thoroughly investigated by the Department, and in the Court where the testimony was produced. A charge of manslaughter was brought against one of the station masters. In the first instance there was an investigation under oath on the coroner's inquest; and in the second instance one of the relatives brought a charge of manslaughter against the station master at Windsor Junction. Upon sworn testimony the station master was honorably acquitted, as the evidence proved that the order had been wrongly sent by Hamilton, and that the figures had been afterwards changed from 15 to 13.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course I only saw an *ex parte* statement of the case, but it did seem to me Hamilton was harshly treated. The evidence did not seem to me to be at all against him. Of course the hon. gentleman is better informed than I. It seemed to me from the evidence I saw that Harris was more to blame than Hamilton.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Harris was, after a most thorough investigation before the Court, when he was brought up on a charge of manslaughter, honorably acquitted and discharged, and I have not the slightest doubt properly so, because I investigated the matter very closely myself.

RATES OF PILOTAGE.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 119) further to amend "The Pilotage Act, 1873," and the other Acts therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. VALLÉE. I have already explained to the Committee why clause 3 should not apply to the pilots between Montreal and Quebec. According to the old law, when a pilot, having charge of a ship between Montreal and Quebec arrives in Quebec, he is discharged and the ship is put under the control of another pilot, from Quebec to Bic. The clause provides that complaint against the pilot may be lodged within thirty days after an accident has happened. How can that be done? If an accident has happened between Montreal and Quebec the captain can make his complaint to the pilotage authority on arrival at Quebec, and a delay of thirty days is altogether unnecessary. Pilots between Montreal and Quebec ought not to be put on the same footing as those from Quebec downward, because, in the former case, the captain or the owner have far better facilities. The hon. Minister has supposed a case where the pilot, the captain and the owner have agreed together to wreck a ship, and where, consequently, there would be no one to make a complaint before the pilotage authority. That is a very unlikely supposition. According to the old law, if a ship has been wrecked between

Montreal and Quebec, the pilotage authority may be informed of it by telegraph communication, when it can at once take the necessary steps to have an investigation. The case is quite different when a ship goes out to sea, and, therefore, the same provision should not apply to both cases. The present law has been in force for twenty-two years and ought not to be changed upon a mere supposition like this. The pilots are a responsible body who have well performed their duties in the past to the satisfaction of all parties. Then why change the law. The President of the Council quoted the other day the case of *La Canadienne*, which was wrecked last year, and he said that he could not secure an investigation because the prescribed delay had elapsed. That is only one case and is not sufficient to justify this change. I ask, therefore, that this third clause be struck out.

Mr. VALIN moved that the 3rd clause be struck out.

Amendment negative.

Mr. McLELAN. I beg to move an additional clause to this Bill—one limiting the number of pilots in the district of Quebec. Under the present law, the number of pilots is fixed at a minimum of 150 and a maximum of 200, and as there are more pilots there than are necessary, it is proposed to give authority to reduce the number to 125.

Mr. AMYOT. If I understand this clause, it will exclude apprentices who have not served more than three years.

Mr. McLELAN. They will have to wait till the number gets under 125.

Mr. AMYOT. How many are on that list?

Mr. McLELAN. I think the whole number of pilots are 184; thirty-five are over sixty-five years of age, and there are about thirty-five apprentices, who have to serve seven years for their license. The apprentices who have served over three years may be made pilots under the regulations until the number falls below the number of 125. Those who have served less than three years will have to await an opportunity of filling out their term, or adopt some other profession.

Mr. AMYOT. The official list showed on the 14th of September last that there were thirty-four apprentices, of whom fourteen have not yet served three years. So the Bill proposes that these fourteen apprentices, who have paid from \$200 to \$300 to be admitted, and have spent one, two or three years studying this business, will be deprived of the benefits of the existing law and of their acquired rights. This is nothing but stealing under pretext of law. Pilots do not ask this Bill, but would be pleased to grant licenses to their apprentices when their apprenticeships were served. Why pass this retroactive Bill and steal away the rights of these young men under the protection of a law? I believe this Parliament should not degrade itself by passing this law.

Mr. VALIN. I am of the opinion of the hon. member for Bellechasse that it is not right to deprive these apprentices of the right of completing their apprenticeship. We want to reduce the number of pilots, but it should be done regularly even though it takes some time. I therefore move an amendment:

"That the apprentices now admitted should be exempt from the application of this Bill."

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for Bellechasse says that the pilots did not ask for this Bill; but the pilots have asked that the scale of fees should be increased upon the whole commerce of the St. Lawrence, in order to give them an additional allowance per annum. The 184 pilots on the list demand that the fees should be increased to give them, after setting apart a sum for the maintenance of widows and orphans and decayed pilots, an allowance of at least \$600 a year. Now, the wants of commerce can be

supplied very well by 100 pilots at the outside. Useful as are the services of these men, it would be unjust to the commerce of the St. Lawrence to compel it to maintain double the number of pilots that are required. If you do not restrict the number of apprentices, so as to allow all the thirty-four to finish their apprenticeship, it will be a generation before you can reduce the number of pilots to 125. The Bill will allow all apprentices over seventeen to serve out their term and take licenses. It will only strike out apprentices from seventeen to fourteen years of age. I think there would be no great hardship in sending them to learn another trade. Unless the Government increases the taxation on the shipping, the present number of pilots are so large that they cannot obtain \$600 each with the number of vessels likely to visit the St. Lawrence this season.

Mr. VALIN. Navigation to-day is more by steam than by sail. In 1873 a compromise was made amongst the pilots, the Government and the trades, that small vessels under 250 tons would be free of pilotage. It was also understood that if, during these years, the pilots did not make an average of \$600 a year, the tariff should be revised so as to enable the pilots to make that average. The first year they did, and also the three following years; but the past three years they did not make that average. While the number of sea-going vessels arriving in our ports was less, their tonnage was greater. A ship of 1,000 tons draws as much water as a steamer of 5,000 tons that carries three times as much cargo as the smaller vessels. We should impose a tax on the tonnage and not on the draught of water. We are bound to give our pilots a means of living. It would not be fair to deprive those young men who have completed their third year of apprenticeship of practising their calling.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that in these days when every effort is made to carry on commerce as cheaply as possible it would be no injustice to attempt to curtail expenses. These young men are at an age when it will be no hardship to them to adopt another career, and what they have learned in their apprenticeship may be useful to them in many ways. There is no reason why pilotage should be charged on tonnage, because it is as easy to pilot a large vessel as a small one. When we are trying to do away with tolls on canals we should also reduce charges on sea-going vessels.

Mr. AMYOT. I move that the words "now under indenture" be added to the clause. The pilotage in Quebec costs less than in any part of the world. It has been agreed by the hon. Minister that the actual tariff, instead of being increased 15 per cent. as recommended by the Quebec Harbor Commission, will be increased to 7½ per cent. and if the pilots do not then receive \$700 per year it cannot be helped. It has been also agreed that the number of pilots will be diminished gradually until it is reduced to 125, and also that the number of apprentices should be gradually reduced from fifteen to twenty. It would not be right to deprive those young men who have served their two or three years apprenticeship of the right to follow out their calling and compel them to adopt another. They have selected this mode of existence, they have passed their examination, yet this Bill proposes to drive them from their occupation. Let us give them time and they will themselves reduce their number to proper numbers.

Mr. KILLAM. The hon. gentleman from Bellechasse says that this is the cheapest pilotage in the world. That may be the case, but when I ask him what the price of the pilotage is between Bic and Montreal he said he did not know.

Mr. AMYOT. It is about \$3 on the average.

Mr. KILLAM. One would suppose from the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse, that the pilots of his

Mr. McLELAN.

district were an inferior class of men if they cannot be tried after four days have elapsed from the time of an accident.

Mr. VALIN. Pilots have about \$3.50 a foot in the spring of the year, during the summer time it is a little less, and in November it is nearly \$4. The hon. member for Yarmouth ought to know from experience the prices of pilotage to Quebec, Liverpool, the English Channel and the United States.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill reported; and (at 2:10 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

SATURDAY, 6th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that, on and after the first day of June, in the present year 1882, newspapers published in Canada, mailed by the publisher at the place of publication, and addressed to regular subscribers or news agents, in Canada, shall be transmitted to their address free of postage.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

The Order being read for the second reading of Bill (No. 153) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons and for other purposes,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the introduction of this Bill I explained at length the mode of readjustment and the changes proposed to be made in the representation in consequence of the Census. I now move the second reading of the Bill, and no doubt, in a full discussion of the changes proposed, the Government will be quite prepared to listen to all the arguments that may be adduced on either side with respect to the redistribution of the representation.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a question of order. The Bill which is just now placed in your hands is not the Bill which was introduced and read a first time. I object to the reading of the Bill at the present time. By the Bill which was presented the other day, and read the first time, certain provisions were made as to the component parts of the various electoral districts of the Province of Ontario, and in point of fact that was the object of the Bill. By that Bill, the township of Logan was taken from the existing north riding of Perth and placed in the south riding of Perth; by the Bill now introduced, the township of Logan is not taken from the north riding of Perth, and does not form part of the south riding of Perth. By the Bill as read the first time, the township of Clinton was taken from the county of Lincoln and added to the electoral district of Monck; by the Bill now proposed to be read, the township of Clinton remains part of the county of Lincoln and is not part of the electoral district of Monck. By the Bill which was read the first time, the village of Beamsville was taken from the county of Lincoln and put into one of the ridings of Wentworth; by the Bill now proposed to be read Beamsville remains in the county of Lincoln. By the Bill read a first time, the township of South Cayuga remained part of the county of Haldimand; by the Bill now on the Table, it remains part of the electoral district of Monck. By the Bill read the first time, the village of Petrolia was made

a part of the new electoral district of Lambton; by the present Bill it is made part of East Lambton. By the Bill which was read a first time, the township of Usborne was left part of the electoral district of South Huron; by the Bill now in your hands, it is made a part of South Perth. By the Bill read the first time, the township of Wallace was left part of the electoral district of North Perth; by the Bill on the Table, it is made part of North Wellington. By the Bill read the first time, the township of Colborne was left part of the district of Centre Huron; by the Bill on the Table, it is taken from Centre Huron and made part of the district of South Welland. There are other changes in the Bill which is on the Table as compared with the Bill which is read; but I have specified these to you as adequate to the purpose of pointing out that very material alterations have taken place in the Bill read the first time, as it is now proposed to be read the second time. The law upon the subject is contained in May's book, the oldest edition, at page 500:

"After a Bill has been presented, and read the first time, it is not regular to make other than clerical alterations in it. On the 28th March, 1873, notice being taken that the University Tests (Dublin) Bill had been materially altered since the first reading, in order to meet objections raised in a debate upon another Bill. The Speaker ruled that after the first reading, a Bill was no longer the property of the member himself, but passed into the possession of the House. The order for the second reading was accordingly discharged, and the Bill withdrawn; and leave being given to present another Bill instead thereof, another Bill was at once presented. The same course was adopted in the case of Hypothec (Scotland) Bill, in 1878. It frequently happens that before the second reading of a Bill it becomes necessary to make considerable changes in its provisions, which can only be accomplished, at this stage, by discharging the order for the second reading, and withdrawing the Bill. The ordinary practice has been to order a Bill to be withdrawn and to give leave to bring in another Bill. And this course is always necessary if there be any change of title; but when the Bill is withdrawn for the purpose of making numerous amendments, without any change of title, a simpler form of proceeding has occasionally been adopted. So soon as the first Bill has been withdrawn, the order of leave for bringing in the Bill is read and leave is given to present another Bill instead thereof upon the same order of leave. This was done in 1814, and the practice has since been revived, with much convenience."

Some of the authorities on which these propositions are founded very clearly state as to what was the opinion in the House from which we draw our practice. With reference to the University Tests and Discipline Bill, a debate arose on the question of the second reading. Mr. Callan pointed out that it was not the same Bill which had been read the first time, and, referring to the case of the Marriage of Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, the Speaker of the day, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, ruled that it was not competent for an hon. member to make any other than clerical errors in a Bill which had been introduced and read the first time. The Speaker said:

"I am bound to say that the hon. member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) has exercised a sound discretion in taking the course which he proposes to adopt."

The course pursued was to discharge the order.

"There is no principle more clearly laid down in this House than this: when a member has introduced a Bill to the House, it ceases to be in that member's hands and passes into the possession of the House. No essential of that Bill, at any stage may then be made without the distinct order of the House.

Likewise on the Hypothec (Scotland) Bill in 1868:

"Mr. J. Lowther said that in connection with the measure he desired to direct the Speaker's attention to a point of order. Leave had been given by the House to an hon. and gallant member (Sir George Balfour) to introduce a Bill on the subject of hypothec, for which Bill another had since been substituted, and had only been delivered to hon. members that morning."

To this the Speaker replied that—

"He had noticed that some material alterations had been made in the Bill. Hon. members might make clerical or verbal alterations in Bills, but it would not be in order for an hon. member to move the second reading of a Bill which, although having the same title, differs materially and substantially from the measure which he had obtained leave to introduce. The Bill which the hon. and gallant member now asked the House to read a second time was not the one which he was allowed to introduce, and, therefore, the only course open to him was to withdraw or ask for

the second reading of the Bill, and to ask leave to introduce a Bill in substitution for it."

The same view was taken in the case of the Marriages Bill, the report of *Hansard* on which says:

"Mr. Speaker said it was not competent for an hon. member to make any other than a clerical alteration in a Bill which had once been introduced and read a first time.

The evidence, I may say, on which I stated to the House, that the Bill contained the statements I referred to, is the speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior as reported in the Official Debates, which show the absence of these various changes to which I have referred, and verify the statement that it differs in the particulars I have stated from the Bill now proposed to be read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In answer to the hon. gentleman's technical objection which was taken only for the purpose of delay—I have to state this—that the practice proposed which was objected to at the time by the hon. gentleman on the first reading, has been the uniform practice in Canada. As regards the particular case he cites, of alterations in some of the clauses of the Bill, for which he refers to my speech, if there are such alterations it is open to him to take his objection in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAKE. But my objection is to the principle of the second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do not interrupt me, Sir, if you please. The whole principle of the Bill is the readjustment of the representation. There may be a township misplaced here, or a town there; it is open for the hon. gentleman to take objection in Committee of the Whole. I shall hold to my speech, and if it be found that in any of the clauses there is an alteration or misplacement of town, township, or village, I will agree that it was not in the original Bill. I press upon you, Mr. Speaker, to hold to our uniform practice.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not apprehended my objection. This is not the objection I took a while ago, that he ought not to have retained possession of the Bill after it was introduced. You, Mr. Speaker, disposed of that objection, and I have not renewed the controversy. I take this objection to the second reading of the Bill on the distinct ground that it was not the Bill which was read the first time. That is the ground I take, and it is consistent with the evidence I offer, which is clear and conclusive, which the hon. gentleman does not deny, cannot deny, and which is confirmed by the English practices and precedents to which I have referred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is speaking a good deal from the sheet that was stolen by the *Globe* people.

Mr. BLAKE. No; from the speech.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so. The reason why I did not place it in the Clerk's hands, is that it was in galley form merely, and inaccurate in some respects. That I stated at the time. I think that our practice should be held to establish the rule in this case. The hon. gentleman is quite at liberty to move in Committee, or to show that the name of any township has been misplaced.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The question is simply whether that is the Bill that was read a first time or not. I called upon the hon. gentleman for a copy of the Bill. He said he would send it to me, but had to see the Law Clerk first. The Bill never came. There is one simple way of ascertaining whether this is the Bill or not—let the Law Clerk be called and examined.

Mr. BLAKE. The report in *Hansard* shows it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. the leader of the Government asked me to get a copy of the Bill, if I could and send

it to the member for Lambton. I went to the Law Clerk and tried to obtain one, but could not. I say this merely to show, that if the Bill was not given to him, it was because it was impossible to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I mentioned that merely as an incident, showing that the Law Clerk had the Bill at the time, and he can show whether or not it has been altered since it left his hands.

Mr. BOWELL. I spoke merely to show that the effort was made to keep the promise made to the hon. gentleman. He seemed to convey the impression that there had been neglect.

Mr. BLAKE. With regard to the statements made by the hon. First Minister, which I think he had no right to make, as to the source from which I drew my information, I may say that it was from the official report of the speech.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That the Bill was altered after it was introduced is beyond controversy. I paid the greatest attention to the statement made by the hon. First Minister, as I supposed he would make some alterations in my riding. He stated that the township of Osborne would form a part of the riding of South Huron, while the Bill now before us says that it does not form part of that riding, and that the Bill must have been altered after the time the hon. gentleman introduced it, and is not the Bill first presented to the House. I find also, in the organ of the hon. gentleman in this city, the *Citizen*, which I suppose would not misrepresent him, it is stated that the township of Osborne is to form part of the riding of South Huron. There is not a member of the House, who listened to the speech, who does not think that the hon. gentleman made that statement.

Mr. BOWELL. Whatever may have been reported, I know this: that it never was intended that the township of Osborne should form part of the riding of South Huron.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is an easy matter to have the point decided by having *Hansard* read.

Mr. MILLS. The terms of the Bill, as introduced, are pretty well known to the members of the House, because there is hardly a thing contained in it which the hon. gentleman did not read. He had the galleys in his hands, and from them he read the description of the limits of the various counties and electoral divisions being changed, and nearly every member of the House noted the observations he made, and they are in perfect accord with the right hon. gentleman's speech as it appeared in *Hansard*. Now, Sir, we have before us a Bill which is not that Bill, which does not contain the same description of the electoral divisions, but another different description. The right hon. gentleman is asking to have this Bill read a second time, as the Bill he submitted some days ago. There is no room for two opinions on this subject. It is perfectly clear that this is another Bill, and not the Bill read the first time, and it is not treating the House with proper respect to make alterations in this surreptitious way. I say surreptitious, because we seem to be governed by a conspiracy rather than by a Government, and the proposition now made is an illustration of the fact.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The report in *Hansard* confirms what the hon. member for West Durham has said. It will be confirmed not only in regard to the population in the various districts, but in regard to the details. For instance, in *Hansard*, Sir John A. Macdonald says that the south riding of the county of Perth shall include the township of Logan, which is not now in the Bill; also that the north riding of Perth shall contain the township of Wallace, which, in the Bill as it appears for the second reading, is transferred to the north riding of Wellington. The north riding of Wellington, it was stated, would include the township of Mary-

Mr. BOWELL.

borough, which is now transferred to Centre Wellington. I think that it will be found that in every case cited by the hon. member for West Durham, *Hansard* bears out his recollection and my own.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no doubt that the point of order is very important, and should be carefully decided, with a view to settle such questions in the future. It is true that a loose practice has prevailed in this House, and that Bills have been even allowed to be introduced in blank, without objection being taken. But the rule is absolute, and such a practice should not be permitted. It is also equally established that when a Bill is once before the House it becomes its property, and cannot be materially altered, except by the House itself. I think, since this point has been raised, it is best to follow the settled practice of the English House of Commons, and not to permit hereafter any change, except mere clerical alterations, in a Bill, when it has been once regularly introduced. I therefore decide that the point of order is well taken, and that the proper course, under the circumstances, is to discharge the order, and re-introduce the Bill on the previous motion for leave.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 158) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Bill introduced and read the first time.

THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply, I desire to call attention to the very remarkable inflation of the Estimates which has taken place within the last year or two. Had the present Supplementary Estimates been of a moderate character I would have gladly dispensed with the task, but in view of the large addition which is proposed to be made to the extraordinary large amount already demanded, I think it is our duty again to call attention to the enormous and unprecedented sums with which not merely the general expenditure, but the fixed charges are being increased. Sir, it appears to me that in this matter we are going from bad to worse. I thought, last year, that in view of the declarations of the hon. Minister of Finance himself, in view of the repeated attacks which have been made upon us when we sat on that side of the House, on account of our unparalleled extravagance in increasing the expenditure, that hon. gentlemen would have paused before they demanded from the people of Canada an amount in excess of \$28,000,000 for the services for the years 1882 and 1883. But it appears we were mistaken. It appears that those hon. gentlemen, having been possessed of a surplus due to the exorbitant system of taxation, have very little idea of anything else than how to raise the expenditure so that the surplus will disappear. Last year the case was bad enough. On the occasion of the bringing down of the Supplementary Estimates in 1881, I called attention to the fact that our expenditure for 1878 was, in round figures, \$23,500,000, that our expenditure for 1880 was \$24,850,000, and that the Estimates for the year 1882 amounted to no less than \$26,475,000. Sir, I repeat that these Estimates reveal a large proposed expenditure. I repeat that, in consideration of the statements made, not merely by the hon. the Minister of Finance, but by almost all his followers, they show a great difference between the sums which that hon. gentleman and his followers had deemed necessary when in Opposition, and the sums they thought proper to expend when in power. But I regret to say that, on the present occasion, those

Estimates have been greatly increased. Sir, the actual Estimates, the bare Estimates, without counting future Supplementary Estimates, which, no doubt, will come in due time for the year 1883, amount to no less than \$27,999,483, which, apart from certain large sums, to which I will presently call attention, are dangerous—I cannot say reprehensible, because some are not so unreasonable—because they involve additions to our fixed expenditure, which is already larger than that of almost any other country in proportion to our means. On this occasion we are asked to expend about \$4,000 in the shape of sums to be granted to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, in the shape of additional subsidy to Manitoba, in the shape of a proposed resolution which the Government has for granting a subsidy of \$150,000 a year to a ship railway. So that apparently about \$28,409,000, very nearly \$28,500,000, will be required for the service of the future year, being an excess of the sum found requisite for carrying on the business of the Government of Canada in 1878, of no less than \$4,906,000, or an excess over the ascertained expenditure for 1880 of \$2,906,000 in round numbers. In dealing with that, I have entirely left out of sight the fact that over and against both charges which are made to the ordinary expenditure there are large sums charged to capital account of a dubious character. Large sums are charged on account of rolling stock for the various railways under the control of the Government, and large sums are charged on account of Dominion Lands expenditure. Waving the question of the propriety of those charges, as to both of which I express considerable doubt, there is this objection to them: that in our time those charges formed a part of the expenditure chargeable to income, and for the purpose of instituting a fair comparison between the expenditure of hon. gentlemen opposite and their predecessors, it is quite clear that such amounts as we charged to income and to which they charge to capital must be taken into account. Were I to include those sums, \$365,000 or more for rolling stock and \$450,000 for Dominion lands, which, as I say for purposes of comparison, at all events should be included, the total amount would be \$29,224,000. I have often called the attention of members of the House to the fact that a great proportion of our annual charges are now fixed, and that a very large proportion of the expenditure on account of Indians, which now amounts to nearly \$1,000,000 annually, must be regarded as a fixed charge. We have besides charges amounting to \$3,500,000—rather more with the addition of the sum to be granted to Manitoba—for subsidies, and we have charges of a similarly fixed character which, in 1881, amounted to \$12,500,000 in round numbers. So that, putting all these things together, it is perfectly plain that of our annual expenditure something like \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000—I will not weary the House by going into minute details—are fixed charges over which, to all intents and purposes, the people of Canada have very little control; and when you remember that of the other charges a very considerable amount is a charge for maintenance of railroads, post offices and similar services, it will appear that we are trenching again in spite of our surplus, perilously on the margin that we might have available for the future necessities of this country. The answer that is made by these hon. gentlemen is two-fold. First of all, we are told that is no matter whether they take three, four, five or six millions of money out of the pockets of the people of Canada, because, they say, it goes back into their pockets or into the Treasury. I say that answer is faulty in more respects than one. I deny that a great proportion of this money taken from the whole of the people goes back into their pockets when it finds its way into the Treasury, or if it goes back into their pockets at all, it goes into the

wrong pocket—it goes to the pocket of a small select set of favorites of the hon. gentleman, and cannot be said to be employed for the general benefit of the whole people. I say that it is bad economy, bad statesmanship, to take more money than you require out of the pockets of the people under any system, no matter how just the taxation may be, no matter how well distributed it may be, and it is doubly unwise and unjust under a system like ours, under which, in addition to the sum actually paid into the Treasury, an enormous though uncertain amount is paid into the pockets of certain private individuals of this country. Then, Sir, the other answer is that it is no matter because money is abundant and plentiful now. To that I reply that had that money been obtained without enormously increasing the burthens or taxes of the people there should now be some little sense in that answer; but when that reply is made by a Government, who have enormously increased the burthens of the people, and have so distributed them that they press most heavily and unduly upon those classes of the people less able to bear them, I say the answer is a mockery, and it is a disgrace to us that we should, under the circumstances, continue to exact many millions of money from the people more than the real necessities of the Government require, even at the very extravagant estimates which are now submitted to us. Sir, the hon. gentleman hardly appears to be aware of the enormous positive charge which is inflicted on the people of this country by this taxation. What the total amount of the taxation this year will be, it is hard to say, but I find that, in 1881, our total receipts were \$23,635,000, and that of those there were raised by taxes, as nearly as possible, \$23,942,000. We find, Sir, it is probable that, in 1882, judging from the returns to April, which are all we have got, that the taxation exacted from the people will be \$3,500,000 or \$4,000,000 in excess of the large sum I have already named. Now, Sir, as our population, without including Indians—who are certainly non-productive in a high degree, and who are rather a charge upon us—I find that the result of these enormous taxes is that, in round numbers, we are obliged to pay in the gross \$7 a head, and, remembering that every family in this country has an average of five members, we would have \$35 per family; or even if we take the net sum which is exacted from the people of this country, I find that the total amount per family equals \$30 at least. Sir, unhappily that is very far from representing the true amount of the burthen on the people of Canada. Unhappily, over and above these taxes which go into the Treasury, a very large, although, as I said, an uncertain amount is paid under our present system to certain private parties throughout Canada, putting further and more heavy burthens on the people of this country. And, what is more, Sir, our system of taxation is so arranged, our system of distribution of these taxes is so unfair and unjust, that a very much larger percentage is levied on the poorer classes of the community than upon those who are better off; so that I am within the mark in saying, that this amount of taxation, huge as it is, probably falls short by one-fourth or one-third of the true burthen inflicted by these hon. gentlemen upon the people of Canada. As it is raised by a most unjust system of taxes—as this surplus includes taxes on fuel, taxes on light, taxes on knowledge, taxes on clothing and taxes in fact on everything, the hon. Minister should endeavor to avoid taxing, or he should be compelled to tax as lightly as possible, and should endeavor so to distribute his taxation that the poorer classes of the community should be taxed less according to their means instead of more, as under the present system, and I say, Sir, that as he has not done so these results are trebly mischievous. Now, it is quite true, that so long as we continue having this prosperity the mischief of this may not be so apparent; but even the hon. Minister of Finance will hardly venture to say in

view of our own experience, and the experience of the United States—in view of the experience in England and every country which raises money at all in the same way as we do ourselves—that he has any patent which will enable him to secure a continuance of this prosperity forever, and the moment the check occurs, the moment the times become in the slightest degree hard, then, Sir, this result follows: Our surplus will disappear, and, unhappily, our taxes will remain, and the scale of expenditure, which the hon gentleman is now fixing, will remain too. I speak with knowledge—I think the hon. gentleman will not contradict me—that there is no more difficult task than to cut down or materially reduce the expenditure of any country consisting in a large degree in permanent charges, when it has been allowed to attain a certain figure. Now, I regret this exceedingly on many accounts. Canada is becoming rapidly an exceedingly dear country to live in. I am not prepared to say it is so extravagant and expensive as the country beside us, but in many most important respects the scale of living in Canada—the price of articles in common use has become enormously enhanced, and compare disadvantageously with the prices on the other side of the Atlantic. Now, Sir, a great opportunity has been given to us. We have become possessed of an enormous tract of country well calculated to attract immigration from the other side of the Atlantic. One of the first things which will necessarily attract the attention of these persons is the prices at which they can obtain the articles of every-day use, and which are absolutely necessary here. I am sorry to say that by no fault of Canada or by our own position, but simply by the foolish and unnecessary system of taxation, we are deprived to a great extent of the advantages we might naturally have possessed, and instead of this surplus having been used to any practical extent to reduce the heavy expenditure of living here, we find the hon. gentleman, although he has perforce, perhaps, for the purpose of promoting the chances of his friends with the elections, been compelled to make some concessions and reductions, has been careful not to reduce any of those articles which most require reduction at his hands. The taxes he has reduced, as they now exist, do certainly take as little from the people as any taxes that can well be devised. These he has reduced, but he has left untouched the great mass of the taxes to which I have referred, under which the burthen on the people is far greater than the actual amount placed in the Treasury. Moreover, Sir, he has, beyond all question, added very seriously to the difficulties, which always encompass persons of very small means, to make both ends meet. I do not know that these persons have placed their complaints before the hon. gentleman, although I have been informed that some of the employés in the Government service have remonstrated in vain with that hon. gentleman, and have pointed out that the salaries they get to-day are far from possessing the purchasing power of the salaries they enjoyed a few years ago. I know that all that class of persons, such as clergymen, school teachers, and clerks, who are as valuable a class as any in the community, do find the hon. gentleman's Tariff more and more oppressive every day. But, Sir, I also notice that in the case of that large portion of the community who depend on their daily wages, the increasing cost of living is making itself more and more apparent from day to day. It cannot have escaped the notice of the House that not merely in Canada, but in the United States, there is a great and growing tendency to strikes on the part of these laborers; and I say there is nothing more calculated to produce dissatisfaction in the minds of these persons than to see that the whole system of taxation contains, not in one particular, but in all particulars, more unjust preferences in favor of the wealthier portion of the community, and against those who have to earn their livelihood by their daily toil. Now, hon. gentleman,

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

men may think this is a small matter. All I can say is that when this Tariff was introduced, and before its full effect had time to make itself felt, I was at the pains to ascertain from various quarters how, and in what way, the working community were in the habit of employing their wages. I obtained some returns within the course of the past few months, and, in looking over these, no one thing was more apparent than the fact that a great number of those persons were compelled to stint themselves to an extraordinary degree, as compared with their scale of living in former years. I found that in the amount they devoted to food, to clothing, to educational purposes, in almost all points these men were materially worse off than they were three or four years ago. This is coming home to them now; and our manufacturing friends will do well to remember that if they have a Tariff that increases the cost of the necessaries of life all over the country, they may rely upon it that in the present state of civilization, they may be speedily compelled to increase the wages of their employés all round, and it is very proper that they should do so. But that is putting manufacturers at a great disadvantage in carrying on many of the manufactures in which they are engaged, and at a special and serious disadvantage when they meet, in export trade, with persons engaged in the same trade in foreign countries. At this late stage of the Session, I do not care to delay the House, particularly as these subjects have been pretty well exhausted before, and therefore, I shall content myself on the present occasion with moving:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That the expenditure for the year 1878 was \$23,503,158;

That the expenditure for 1881 was \$25,502,554;

That the Estimates for the year ending, 30th June, 1883, amount to \$27,999,483.86 independent of large amounts, proposed to be added to the annual expenditure, involving a further addition of \$410,000 more;

That many of the items charged to Capital Account, are of a character which might more properly be charged to Income;

That a very large proportion of this expenditure consists of paid charges, or of charges of a permanent character, which when once created are either incapable, or very difficult of reduction;

That recent legislation and the completion of existing engagements will result in a steady increase of the fixed charges within a few years;

That experience has shown that the consequence of rapidly increasing the fixed charges, is to produce great embarrassment in the Public Finances;

That this House views with regret the proposal of the Government to expend for the year 1883, \$2,906,627, more than the expenditure for 1881, and \$4,906,325, more than the expenditure for all purposes in 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution has been brief in his remarks, and I shall be equally brief in my reply. I must call, however, the attention of the House to the fact that, notwithstanding it has been intimated to the country, on what grounds I do not know, that whenever our friends opposite go to the country, they do not intend to make the National Policy or Pacific Railway two of the questions they are to divide the country upon, I should judge, from the speech of my hon. friend, that whatever may be the policy of his party he intends to make the National Policy and the question of protection to our industries leading planks in his platform, at all events. In calling attention to the sums expended in 1873, 1878 and 1881, he has compared them with the Estimates now on the Table. Well, it has often been stated that a comparison between the Estimates and the expenditure for a year is not a fair mode of comparing expenditure; for instance, it will be remembered that in the Estimates of last year the actual expenditure was a little under \$500,000 less than the estimated expenditure, and, therefore, though the hon. gentleman may state the figures carefully and correctly—I have not examined them—that the Estimates for all purposes, laid on the Table, reach \$29,000,000, still it does not follow that those Estimates will exactly show the amount of expenditure during the next year. As a rule the expenditure keeps below the Estimates. Now, this resolution is misleading, though the figures may be correct, inasmuch as it indicates that the

absolute expenditure for which the people are to be taxed, has increased \$2,900,000 between 1881 and 1883, and \$1,000,000 or \$4,000,000 over the expenditure of 1878. Now, I think it would have been fairer had the hon. gentleman, when giving his figures, conveyed to the House some idea of the items of this increased outlay, and confessed that a considerable portion of it is not taxation upon the people at all. For instance, I may state as to the public works, that the expenditure for our railways is considerably increased in the Estimates for 1882 and 1883 as compared with the expenditure of 1880 and 1881, and as compared with the mileage of railways in operation in 1878. It is well known to him that, since 1878, we have purchased, and taken possession of and are now working 127 miles of the Grand Trunk Railroad, formerly not worked by the Government. In the discussion of the Estimates, last evening, it was stated that \$300,000 additional had to be asked to pay the increase, chargeable to the working expenses of that railway, because its business has increased, giving us a corresponding revenue. Still, from the language of the resolution, it might be supposed that this has put an increased tax upon the people. We are now not only working these 127 miles of road, not worked in 1878, but are doing 40 to 45 per cent. more business on it than in that year. Is it fair then, to say that, because we may expend \$2,200,000 more, in 1882, in the working of railways than in previous years, and receive the \$2,200,000 back, supposing the receipts meet the expenditures, that we are in a worse position than we occupied when the average deficit was \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year, so far as the taxation upon the people is concerned? Then, with reference to the post office, its expenditure is considerably increased within the last two or three years—not because the geographical dimensions of our country have increased—but on account of the large increase in our population in the North-West and elsewhere. Besides, we are constructing railways in British Columbia, where the contractors are now employing from 6,000 to 10,000 hands, who must have additional postal accommodation. We are giving such increased accommodation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and while we have increased the expenditure considerably in the last two or three years, if the House does not relieve the people from the burden of taxation on the country newspapers, we shall have a smaller deficit than in 1878. Therefore, any increased expenditure in that direction is not an increased tax on the people. We obtain a return from it just as much as from additional cars on our railways, which carry an additional number of passengers and a larger quantity of freight. The men carried over those roads pay for the service, and this outlay does not represent additional taxation. If we give additional postal accommodation to the people, and obtain an equivalent in revenue, the people or the House should not be misled by the idea that that increased outlay means additional taxation, though it nominally represents increased expenditure. There is another point worth noticing: during the next year, we will pay into the sinking fund \$500,000 more than we paid in 1877. Now, what does this mean? It is the redemption of our debt to that extent since 1878. Therefore, though we have to provide for this charge, under the terms on which those bonds were floated, the increase of this fund by \$500,000, within the last four years, is not necessarily increased taxation; it is a laying aside of that amount over and above what we paid in 1877 for the redemption of the debt. In this respect, then, the Government are not chargeable for any dereliction of duty or increase of the taxation on that account. Then, with reference to the expenditure on the Indians, the hon. gentleman takes a less hopeful view than ours. True, that expenditure during the last few years has increased very considerably. It is very heavy the present year and may be heavy next year. But if hon. gentlemen opposite were on the Government side of the

House, and had been during the last and all that is expired of the present year, and if they were providing for the future, I believe they would have arrived at the conclusions we have reached, that this money is well spent if it prevents Indian wars—if it prevents not only Indian difficulties that would require an increase of our police force—but outrages upon the lives and properties of the settlers. And, therefore, apart from the humane considerations, as a matter of policy, I am satisfied the country will sustain the action of the Government in providing for those Indians and saving them from starvation. But we are more hopeful than the mover of this resolution with regard to this expenditure, because the time is not far distant when the Pacific Railroad will extend into the Indian territories, and we shall be able to say to the aborigines: "Here is work for you as for the Indians in British Columbia at present, and so long as it lasts; if you will not undertake it you must abide the consequences." And we will be relieved from the necessity of providing for the prevention of starvation. That state of things is rapidly approaching, and we are more sanguine on this side of the House with reference to our future expenditure in relation to the Indians, than we were in the past. As that country becomes filled up, as the population takes possession of it, it is of still greater importance that we should increase our police force so that order may be maintained and the Indians placed in such a position that there may be no justification on their part for taking possession of the property of settlers to keep themselves from starving. The hon. gentleman says that if we increase expenditure it will be exceedingly difficult to reduce it. That is the case with reference to certain classes of expenditure. In the Estimates, now before the House, it will be seen that there is at least \$1,000,000 voted for Public Works more than there was in 1878. It may be said that involves additional taxation. Well, the Government have asked Parliament this Session to vote more money than they did last Session or the previous year, because our revenue is increasing to such an extent, that though I estimated there would be no increase of Customs during February, March, April, May and June on account of the reduction made in taxes, the increase in the last six months has been something like \$600,000 in the item of Customs alone, showing that Parliament can increase the expenditure on Public Works necessary to be built or completed in the public interest. The Government have asked Parliament therefore to appropriate, as I have no doubt Parliament will appropriate, something like \$1,000,000 for the next year over and above the expenditure of 1878. Let us take up a few of the items contained in these Supplementary Estimates which are larger, I admit, than I expected they would be when I made my financial statement, and see on what grounds the increase is based. We know that a gale took place since I made my financial statement that swept away part of the island which protects the harbor of Toronto, and in order that the damage should not be increased by delay, we have had to ask for \$87,000 to remedy it. Then we come to the question of expenditure in the North-West. So strong has been the pressure of business, so universal has been the demand for greater facilities in the delivery of postal matter in Winnipeg, that the Government felt called upon to ask an appropriation of \$50,000, in addition to the sum asked for before, in order to provide sufficient postal accommodation in that city. We have also provided in the Supplementary Estimates for additional accommodation for emigrants in the North-West. The flow of immigration into that country is so great that the Government felt they could not hesitate a moment in providing, no matter what it might cost, for the accommodation of immigrants, not only in the vicinity of Winnipeg, but in the far West. A very considerable sum is also asked for the erection of gaols and buildings for the police in the far West. The whole of these additional estimates, including the harbor of Toronto, amount to over

\$200,000. The interest on the public debt is also increasing, though not so rapidly as it was supposed it would, because the expenditure on our canals and the Pacific Railway has been made, to a certain extent, out of our surplus. Therefore, the interest on our public debt has not increased as rapidly as was expected. But it cannot be expected that the interest on our public debt will be no greater in 1882 or 1883, than the average interest from 1874 to 1879, when but little had been expended in the enlargements of canals and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. From the fact that the construction of this railway is being so energetically pushed forward that it is expected 500 or 600 miles will be completed by July 1st, 1883, a very large sum will be required for subsidy; the completion of the canals and other various expenditures of that kind will also require a sum, so that the interest on our debt cannot remain at the average of from 1874 to 1878, or as it stood in 1881. To this expenditure I have named, must also be added the item of \$365,000, for rolling stock. As the hon. the Minister of Railways explained, both last night and on a former occasion, it cannot be expected, that as we increase our mileage and as the work increases on our mileage, it will not be necessary to add to the rolling stock, to provide additional engines and facilities for the moving of freight, and that that should be taken out of the receipts. I have prepared a statement, which will be increased by the increase of the Estimates yet to be brought down, showing what the taxation upon the people will be, as compared with previous years. That is a fair way of putting it. You cannot consider as increased taxation, the increased expenditure on railways or postal service, which give an increased revenue owing to increased business. The true way to test the matter is, to look at the expenditure of the country and the taxation per head of the population, necessary to pay that expenditure, as imposed in Customs and Excise duties. The question is, what sum of money would have been necessary, under the statement I submitted some time ago, in the shape of taxation during next year, and what would that amount to per head of the population? When making my financial statement in February last, I took the expenditure from 1874 to 1879, and I took the taxation that would be necessary to be collected during those years to pay that expenditure. I stated that the expenditure was not paid out of taxation during that period, but I added to the taxation collected from Customs and Excise the sums that would be necessary to pay that expenditure. I took the average of population for five years, and showed—and my statement has not been controverted, nor can it be successfully controverted—that the taxation during the five years from 1874 to 1879, was \$1.88 per head, which from 1879 to 1881 was 23 cents per head less. In the Estimates that were before the House, and that varied from the Estimates since submitted, we find that though the estimated sum to be received from Customs and Excise for the next year was \$25,000,000, it was estimated that there would be \$3,000,000 of a surplus, which would make the taxation necessary to pay the expenditure, \$22,000,000. Now then, Sir, the population of 1882-83, allowing simply the increase of the last decade, which is $1\frac{1}{8}$ per cent. will be \$4,502,000, and if you divide \$22,000,000 of the taxation by that figure we have exactly \$4.88 per head, notwithstanding we are asking for a large sum to be expended for public works more than last year, more for Indians, more in the payment of the Sinking Fund, and more interest than in the past; notwithstanding all that, the taxation per head would have been, had the expenditure been for what I stated when I made my estimate with an addition of \$300,000 for Supplementary Estimates, \$1.88 per head, and adding the additional Estimates brought down for public works it would be \$4.98 against \$4.88, which was the expenditure

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

from 1874 to 1878 with a much smaller sum required as interest, and not more than \$500,000 paid in the Sinking Fund, with a much smaller sum expended for public works and on the Indians than we are asking for the next year. Even with other expenditures that cannot be avoided, the result will still be that all the expenditures made during the year will amount to only 10 cents a head over and above the average, with a much larger rate of progress in our public works and canals and in the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman says that we are in a state of prosperity just now, but that by-and-bye there will be a diminution of imports, and therefore we are embarrassing ourselves by asking for a large expenditure that cannot be curtailed. Sir, if at any period within the next four or five years it should be found that a reduction was taking place, we shall simply have to reduce the expenditure for public works, harbors and improvements of that kind, from \$2,000,000 to \$1,000,000. I admit that so far as the remaining expenditure is concerned, it is not easy to do that, that if you have an increase in the general expenditure of a fixed character it is difficult to do it; but with reference to the expenditure of public works, which forms a large item in the present increase, it is susceptible of being controlled by Parliament without any difficulty whatever. The hon. member speaks of increased expenditure as the result of the increased taxation. He may say: "Very well, but you are taking more than \$22,000,000, you are taking \$3,000,000 more." Well, Sir, I admit that. We are expecting to raise, during the next year, at least \$3,000,000 more than necessary to pay the expenditure. But the hon. member says that it is unwise to take this additional sum of money out of the pockets of the people, but I answer him with his own statement, that this state of things cannot continue. We are in a very prosperous condition to-day, and it is possible that a change may take place; but I asked him, would it be prudent, when we are in a period of what I hope will be one of long prosperity, to reduce our revenue to the present expenditure? No, Sir, the hon. member himself would be the first to declaim against anything of that kind. He would say that though we are now enjoying great prosperity the imports might fall off in a year or two, and therefore we would not be justified in reducing the revenue. That is what he would say were he on this side of the House. I would answer by saying: "Very well, as long as we are prosperous our people can pay this \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 and it will go for the reduction of our debt, or the construction of public works, which will save the payment of interest and thus reduce for all time to come the taxation of the country." Then the hon. member refers to the strikes in the United States and to the strikes in Canada as being the result of this policy; he says that men are asking for increased salaries here in the Civil Service on account of the increased cost of living, and that it is desirable that this should be made a cheap country to live in. Well, Sir, we might discuss how far a cheap country to live in has reference to the question of prices, because it is altogether a relative question. If you can only earn \$1 a day, and it costs you 95 cents a day to live, and if you can earn \$1.50 a day, and it costs you \$1.25 to live, relatively the last state of things is the best for those who are placed in that position in any country. The question of strikes was referred to the other night. It is regretted that strikes do take place; but I can say, from my communications with manufacturers throughout Canada, that I know of many cases in which an advance of wages has been made by the employers without any demand from the employés at all. I believe that in many cases the strikes could be prevented if the same course had been taken a little earlier. It is a struggle to a certain extent between capital and labor, and the very moment it is in demand then of course it has a right legally to ask to get the benefit of

it. When capital is in the ascendent then you will find that capital, as a rule, if it is not remunerative, will necessarily press upon labor and demand that the latter shall make some concession. If the same liberal course that has been pursued in many cases, had been generally pursued in Canada we would have had much fewer strikes. The hon. Minister has given us a list of increased prices. Let me say that the increase of the price of living—and I speak from my own experience—is but slightly affected by the National Policy, but the increase is chiefly in the higher price of food. Fuel to-day is higher than formerly. Why? Because men were without employment, and had to go into the woods in winter to get their fuel because they had nothing to buy it with, and consequently the price went down; but now when labor is more remunerative and men have more money the price of fuel has gone up. Of course, there is some increase of expenditure in the Dominion, and there must necessarily be an increase when we are constantly extending our public works. Well, Sir, the taxation of the people during the last year was 23 cents less than the average from 1874 to 1879, and should all this money appropriated now be expended, it will only be 10 cents per head of the population more than was collected, or ought to have been collected, by our friends opposite. Therefore, there can be no great alarm on the part of the people in this matter. If we collect more it goes to the reduction of the debt and towards preventing the necessity of floating loans that would be subject to interest, and in this way we effect a direct saving to the people. It is out of one pocket into the other. It is not increasing the taxation without obtaining an equivalent; and therefore the amount for which the people would be taxed in Customs and Excise, even with the reductions we have made in that Department, with the proposed reductions from the revenue of \$50,000 now received from the postage on newspapers, the Dominion will still be in a position to have a handsome surplus that can be appropriated in the reduction of our debt.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to challenge the figures of the hon. Minister, and to show by his own figures that his statements are incorrect, in so far as regards his assertion that \$4.23 is the average of the taxes paid by the people for some years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say \$4.23; I never used those figures.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I understood the amount stated was \$4.23. What were the figures?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. To what figures does the hon. gentleman refer? I said the average expenditure for which taxation was necessary for the period preceding 1874, was \$4.88, and for 1878-79 and 1880-81, it was 23 cents less.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is a matter of a few cents, the amount being \$4.88. I take the returns of the hon. gentleman himself, and apply them to the Province of Quebec. I have them here, they being taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1880-81, and they show that the taxes paid by the people of Quebec for Customs duties, amounted to \$6.94 per head; and I desire these figures to go to the public in order that they may not be deceived by the declarations of hon. gentlemen opposite. When I made this assertion previously, I did so because I was sure that I was making a correct statement, and I then complained that the taxes were not imposed in an equitable manner, as regards the Province of Quebec.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What proportion of that sum does the hon. member suppose was paid by the people of Quebec, and what by the people of Ontario?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I can tell the hon. member exactly, according to his own returns. In order not to make a mistake I am in a position to give him the amount of Customs duties paid per head by the population in each Province, from

1868 to 1881. I will not occupy the time of the House by giving the statistics from 1867, but I will confine myself to 1880-81. In 1880, Ontario paid \$3.14; Quebec, \$5.03; Nova Scotia, \$3.14; New Brunswick, \$4.05. In 1881, Ontario paid \$3.22; Quebec, \$6.94; Nova Scotia, \$3.40; New Brunswick, \$3.31. I have compared these figures myself with the Trade and Navigation Returns and they are correct. I repeat that the Province of Quebec bears an undue share of the burdens of the taxation of the Dominion, and we have not a return for it. That is what I complained of before, and I do so now. I do not impute to the hon. Finance Minister any intention to mislead the public more than Ontario, but I say his figures are totally incorrect as to averages. You can make an average over the whole population, and that might give \$4.88, but by the hon. gentleman's own figures it appears that the Province of Quebec pays an undue taxation. We paid \$3.62 per head. It is my desire that these figures from the official documents, prepared by the Department of Customs, should be laid before the public so that there may be no mistake about them, and in order that the people may ascertain, and especially the people of the Province of Quebec, as to whether the figures I have given are true or not, and judge between the hon. gentleman and myself on this point.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the hon. gentleman understands the matter better than the House would suppose he did from the statements he made. It is quite true that the amount collected at the ports in Quebec is larger per head of the population than any of the far older Provinces; but it is well known that a large portion of the goods imported into Montreal pay duty there, and are consumed in Ontario. I merely wish to put the hon. gentleman right on this point, because the impression might prevail among people outside the House who have not looked into the matter that Quebec paid a much larger sum per head than any other Province in the Dominion. In 1878-79 the sugar refined in the Dominion was refined in Quebec. It was brought to Montreal, the duty paid there, and it was then distributed through the country, and the Province of Quebec had credit for that in the revenue raised. It will be found that the statements made by the hon. gentleman are accurate so far as regards the Trade and Navigation Returns, but you must take into account the goods consumed in Ontario, and in some cases in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and that Ontario obtains very large supplies from Montreal. There can be no doubt that the consumers in Ontario pay the duty rather than our friends in Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There can be no doubt the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) is entirely wrong in the use he made of the figures in regard to Quebec contributing a much larger sum than Ontario, but it shows the necessity of having statistics correct in future Sessions. I remember we took some pains to obtain the proportion from Montreal and Quebec, and my recollection is that either 53 or 63 per cent. of the amount was actually paid in Quebec, but the balance was paid on goods consumed chiefly in Ontario, and partly in Ontario, for a considerable quantity of goods has passed over the railway to the Lower Provinces during the last few years. I desire, however, to say a few words upon the remarks of the hon. Minister. He has endeavored to demonstrate a very difficult problem, namely, that the people were heavily taxed and yet paid no taxation. It is one of the most curious illustrations of, what I was going to say, mental imbecility—it is a strong phrase—that I ever heard of.

Mr. MILLS. Hallucination.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, anything you like so long as it affects the mind. The simple fact is, and it is an appalling fact, that within the last three years the taxation of the people has been increased by \$4,500,000. The hon. gentle-

man endeavored to soften the impression that might be derived from this one point, by stating that a great deal of it was paid for public works, Indians, and so on. No doubt. We are not accusing the hon. gentleman of appropriating the money to his own use, but we do accuse him of unnecessarily and extravagantly increasing the taxation of the people. He proposes next year to levy from the people the sum of \$27,000,000 from Customs, Excise and minor revenues, an increase of \$4,500,000 in the course of three years. The hon. gentleman endeavors to show that circumstances existed which compelled him to increase the taxation of the people to a considerable extent. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, alleged that the expenditure upon the canals was not necessary, because hon. gentlemen opposite—meaning the present Opposition—commenced them. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what canals we commenced? Will he mention a single one that we commenced?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman took tenders for the enlargement of the canals. He did not accept the tenders invited by us, but asked for new ones.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And were none let before that?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Some were. There was paid during the time the hon. gentleman was in office \$3,000,000 and odd on contracts which were in existence when the hon. gentleman came into office.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We expended altogether something like \$25,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite commenced the canal system and we carried it on. I am not blaming them for doing it; I am only blaming them for giving us the credit or discredit—if there was any—of beginning them when the hon. gentleman knows that the Government of which he was a member commenced all these works. We, of course, carried them on, doing so tentatively. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) and the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) blamed me very severely the other evening, because we proceeded leisurely—we did not go fast enough. I believed then that these canals would be a greater success than I fear now they will be; but, nevertheless, I considered that for works of that character requiring strength and solidity, and therefore requiring time to settle, it was not well to proceed too hastily. Now, instead of being blamed for not hurrying the works, the hon. gentleman blames us apparently for commencing them, forgetting that we never commenced them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I never blamed you. I think you were right in going on with them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The only work we commenced and carried on was the small canal at St. Peters; the others were prosecuted in consequence of obligations assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. Finance Minister of the late Government (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) in his first Budget Speech, gave a recapitulation of the various sums we were necessarily compelled to spend to carry out the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman has accomplished this feat: in the course of three years incumbency of office he proposes to increase the taxation of the people by \$4,500,000, which is only paralleled by the last year of his former incumbency of office when he raised the expenditure from \$19,000,000 to \$23,000,000. I admit, Sir, the plea of the hon. gentleman with respect to the increase of interest and the increase on account of Sinking Fund. There is no doubt that whatever sum the interest was increased by, it is not one which the Ministry of the day should be charged with having produced; nor is it fair to charge contributions to Sinking Fund as an increase against the Ministry of the day. It is true, at the same time, that hon. gentlemen opposite, when arguing about the expenditure of the late Government, invariably refused to make this admission, and have charged us with the

Mr. MACKENZIE.

increase of Sinking Fund and interest precisely as if it were a matter for which we were wholly responsible. In the debate on the Budget I contrasted their expenditures with ours, but I gave them credit for all those increases relating to the interest on debt, Sinking Fund, Indians, North-West Police, Weights and Measures and items of an abnormal character, and yet I was able to show that their expenditure had increased more than ours by a sum considerably in excess of \$1,500,000.

Mr. BOWELL. Weights and Measures, did you say?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, that was included as an abnormal expenditure. Hon. gentlemen opposite decline to accept the existence of strikes as an evidence of the derangement of the labor market. There is no doubt, as many professional men have told me who have kept an exact account of their personal expenses, that the increase of their expenses, owing to the taxes laid upon them by the new Tariff, amounts to 10 per cent. of their income, and if that is the case with them how much more will be the increase in that of the laboring classes who have not the same facilities for obtaining immediate credit and cheap goods as the general run of our professional men. During the late strikes in Toronto a statement was made by the workingmen claiming an increase, because their taxation was 20 per cent. instead of 10 per cent. There is no doubt that the increased cost of living caused men in Toronto, Hamilton and other cities to strike for higher wages. It is true, there has been no strike in Ottawa, because all the workingmen have been driven out of Ottawa. This city, so far as workingmen are concerned, is a desert. As long as the late Government were in office, efforts were made by hon. gentlemen opposite to inflame them against the Government, and I remember well when a mob was encouraged to come up to the Buildings and raise a row at the door.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes; although the members of Parliament who were encouraging that demonstration knew perfectly well that the Government had nothing to do with the labor market.

Mr. ROCHESTER. Will the hon. gentleman name the members of Parliament?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I could name them very well.

Mr. ROCHESTER. Well, name them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman knows them as well as I do, and perhaps better—just the same as other members of Parliament stimulated riots in Montreal on the 12th of July, in order to bring odium upon the Government. In fact, there is no sort of lawless or revolutionary proceedings that hon. gentlemen opposite have not been ready to resort to, in order to bring discredit on their opponents. It will always be a matter of difficulty to restrain Tories, out of office, from such demonstrations; they become insatiable, their rapacity is inexhaustible, and nothing can restrain them while they are out of office. We can remain in Opposition philosophically; in fact, it is much more comfortable to be out of office than in it. The hon. gentleman says he understands, from certain symptoms, that nothing is to be said about the National Policy in the coming contest. Well, I can tell him, for myself, that nothing will restrain me from expressing my views freely on the National Policy, which I consider to be a national folly and a national crime. Nothing will restrain me from putting forward those views which I have always held as to the fixity of taxation where it is possible to have it. I have said—and the hon. gentleman may make of it what he pleases—that when a particular policy becomes the law of the land, no incoming Government would be justified in violently interfering with existing interests.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman may say hear, hear, but if he will look at my speech at Hamilton, in 1874, or at Brampton, in 1877, when I was in office, and without the slightest thought of the present condition of affairs turning up, he will find that I propounded those views at that time, precisely as I do now. But, Sir, whatever may be our policy in future years, it is perfectly clear that every one who has a love for his country must protest against a policy which is already beginning to produce such disastrous effects within three years of its inception; a policy which has destroyed our national trade abroad; a policy which is bringing us into discredit with the British Empire, where a different policy prevails; a policy which is levying all its extortions on the industrial classes of the country and making a few people rich at the expense of the many; a policy which refuses to give the slightest protection to labor, but imposes all kinds of restriction upon labor and increases the taxes on those who till the soil, and those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. Sir, it is easy for the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, it is easy for those who possess large incomes, it is easy for those who have large and prosperous manufactories, to laud a policy which imposes severe taxation upon the poorer classes of the country; but the time will come when these working classes will resent this interference with their just rights, and will call hon. gentlemen opposite to account for the manner in which they have abused the power which they obtained accidentally three or four years ago.

Mr. BOWELL. I was surprised to hear the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, particularly those with regard to the Trade Returns. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman himself, that these calculations and tables were made upon the same principle that prevailed when he was in office; and if it be necessary now to change this principle, and to present these figures which will show the exact consumption of goods in the several Provinces, it will be equally necessary to apply the same rule to the period of the hon. gentleman's Administration of affairs. He knows that when goods are imported into Montreal and then purchased by any merchant in the Maritime Provinces or in the North-West, it is almost impossible to keep an exact account of these sales in order to learn the actual amount of goods consumed in the Province of Quebec or any of the other Provinces. Goods may be purchased and sold out of bond. If the articles that paid duty in Montreal were confined to the Province of Quebec alone, then there might be a comparative statement made, such as that desired by the hon. member for Lambton; but he knows, and every merchant knows, that when goods on which the duty is paid, are sold to merchants in other Provinces, it is impossible to prepare such a statement as he says this Government ought to prepare, unless he is disposed to enact a law to compel every merchant who sells an article in another Province than that into which it is imported, to keep a debit and credit account of the transaction. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) was out only \$1 in the figures he gave in reference to the Province of Quebec—by the substitution of a six for a five; but the error, I have no doubt, was unintentional, because he did not prepare the table himself, but cut it from a newspaper.

Mr. CASGRAIN. From your paper?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not expect the Government to give an exact statement; what I proposed was that an estimated statement should be made up.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is fertile in explanations. What the hon. gentleman said was that the result

was not correct in the mode in which the hon. Finance Minister applied his figures; and that, it only proved that the Government should take steps to furnish a statement by which it could be ascertained what amount had been consumed in the different Provinces, and I have pointed out that it is almost impossible to prepare a table of that kind. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the hon. Finance Minister's mental imbecility, and it was suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell that he should not use that word, but speak of an hallucination of the mind. It is possible that, as we grow old, we may grow imbecile, but I fancy that remark may be hurled back to some hon. gentlemen opposite, to whom it is more appropriate than to the hon. Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman is not slow in using epithets towards hon. members on this side of the House that may be considered improper; it may not be improper in him to hurl epithets of that kind towards the hon. Finance Minister—I leave that to himself and his supporters. The hon. gentleman also declared that the Finance Minister had declared that strikes were not an evidence of the derangement of the labor market. My hon. friend said nothing of the kind; he made no reference whatever to that point. What he wished to impress on the House, was the fact that strikes occur in all countries, and at almost all times, and under different circumstances. If he argues that the late strikes are attributable to the present trade policy, how does he account for the strike that occurred and extended from Portland to Sarnia, upon the Grand Trunk Railway, at the time the late Premier was in office? How does he account for the strikes in the United States, with the immense destruction of property, during the same period? There was a combination of labor at that time, and a derangement of the labor market, resulting from the belief and declarations of trades unions that the men were not properly remunerated for their labor; the result was the strikes. Strikes occur in England more than in any other country in the world, the most Free Trade country in the world.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only Free Trade country in the world.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, the only one. I shall not refer at length to the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton, in reference to the difficulties that arose in Ottawa when he held office, when he accused members of Parliament of having incited those troubles and difficulties. I think he should in response to the hon. member for Carleton, have named them, if he knew of anything of the kind. I know that hon. members who were not in accord with him or his Government, used every endeavor possible to allay that excitement; and no man was more active than the hon. members for Ottawa, Carleton and Northumberland, in New Brunswick, in striving to quiet and wisely direct the men. Those members, with others, did all they possibly could—not at the risk of their lives, perhaps—but at the risk of personal injury—to prevent those men even calling on the hon. gentleman, who has complained so bitterly to-day of the exciting of the workmen at that time. As to his insinuations respecting the riots in Montreal, I do not know whom he referred to. I hesitate not to say that he is quite as incorrect in this instance as when he attributed unworthy motives to members of Parliament, in reference to the labor difficulties in Ottawa. I know of no member who incited those troubles, or who did anything other than try to allay the difficulties that occurred at that time. I also know that members on this side of the House at that time used those troubles on every stump in Ontario, in denouncing prominent members of the Orange Society, because they would not lend themselves to the aggravation of the difficulties that occurred at that time, and if there

was political capital made out of them, it was by the gentlemen who followed the member for Lambton.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I know this charge was applied to myself and the hon. member for East Hastings, who also did all he could to allay the troubles. I repeat, it comes with a very bad grace from the late Premier to bring such charges against members of Parliament unless he is prepared to designate them. The hon. gentleman in his remarks referring to the trade policy of the country, and to the Trade Returns, misstated the facts, as the returns show clearly and distinctly that the National Policy has increased our trade with Great Britain, that it turned to the advantage of the manufactures of England and to the disadvantage of the United States; that while our imports from the United States had decreased, the imports from England have increased, and that our exports, on the contrary, to the United States have increased as compared with 1878, showing that we have bought more from English merchants, that, too, with money obtained from the larger exports of our products to our American neighbors. I have another point to notice. In making a comparative statement in reference to the weights and measures, as well as in reference to the other Department under the present, as compared with the late Government, I believe it will be found the result will not be to the disadvantage of the present Administration. The hon. member for Lambton knows well that when he brought the Weights and Measures Act into force, he expended over \$52,000 in paying officers in the different sections of the Dominion, before they had done a single hour's work. And yet, in face of these facts, we have had from every stump almost in Ontario—I do not know as to the other Provinces—whenever a speech was made by hon. gentlemen

opposite, this question of the weights and measures was hurled in the faces of the electors, and the statement made that the present Government not only increased the expenditure of the weights and measures branch, but on almost every thing else connected with them. I may just as well inform the House how this Department was administered, because we may expect, during the next campaign, the same stories told over and over again.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says: hear, hear. I know no hon. member who is so apt in using these figures for party purposes as that hon. member. Perhaps the House will be surprised when I point out how the Weights and Measures Act was brought into operation, how many officers were appointed, how much money was expended, and the amount of work performed for the pay. We remember well that the hon. member for Gloucester, for one or two Sessions, made a particular point of claiming the refund of that proportion of an officer's salary which was retained for superannuation purposes—an officer of the Weights and Measures Department, residing, I think, in his own county or neighborhood. The hon. gentleman argued, and perhaps fairly, that though that officer had nothing to do, and did nothing, it was not his fault, but the fault of the Government who never furnished him with any materials with which he could perform any work. I find, on examining the matter, that the amounts spent by the late Government on this Department, without one hour's or one minute's work ever being performed, reached the nice little sum of \$52,282. In case there should be any doubt on this point, I will give the localities in which those officers lived, and their names, from which it can be seen whether my statement is correct or not.

STATEMENT showing Divisions and Names of Officers appointed under the provisions of the Act 36 Victoria, Chap. 47, with date of appointment, when salaries began, when supplied with Standards, when operations commenced, how long unemployed, and amount of salary drawn during period unemployed.

ONTARIO.

Divisions.	Officers' Names.	Date of Order in Council.	Date when Salaries commenced.	Date when Standards were supplied.	Date on which Operations began.	Number of days Unemployed.	Amount of Salary drawn during the period officers were unemployed.
Algoma	Wm. Carney.....	Sept. 30, 1875...	Nov. 29, 1875...	June 26, 1876...	Oct. 7, 1876...	313	\$ 427 44
Brant.....	John Allan.....	do	Oct. 26, 1875...	July 3, 1876...	Oct. 3, 1876...	313	463 94
Brockville.....	S. Carruthers	do	Nov. 4, 1875...	Nov. 14, 1876...	Dec. 9, 1876...	401	657 90
Bruce.....	C. B. Stevens	do	Nov. 2, 1875...	Oct. 24, 1876...	Dec. 10, 1876...	404	551 98
Dundas.....	E. F. Loucks.....	do	Nov. 1, 1875...	March 6, 1877...	Mar. 15, 1877...	500	684 90
Durham.....	P. R. Randall.....	do	Oct. 26, 1875...	May 17, 1876...	June 26, 1876...	244	334 18
Elgin.....	John Campbell	do	Oct. 30, 1875...	Aug. 12, 1876...	Oct. 10, 1876...	346	472 73
Essex.....	Geo. Rankin.....	do	Nov. 3, 1875...	May 15, 1876...	Oct. 4, 1876...	336	459 42
Glengarry.....	F. McRae.....	do	Oct. 29, 1875...	Sept. 15, 1876...	Dec. 11, 1876...	409	558 71
Grey.....	D. Campbell.....	do	Oct. 25, 1875...	July 4, 1876...	Aug. 19, 1876...	299	407 93
Halton.....	Thos. Smith.....	do	Dec. 28, 1875...	May 12, 1876...	June 14, 1876...	169	231 61
Hamilton.....	H. Sheppard.....	do	Oct. 25, 1875...	July 7, 1876...	Aug. 12, 1876...	292	558 83
do	M. Murphy.....	do	Oct. 25, 1875...	July 7, 1876...	Aug. 12, 1876...	292	558 83
Wentworth.....	J. Rymal.....	do	Nov. 5, 1875...	July 31, 1876...	Aug. 12, 1876...	281	342 50
Hastings.....	J. P. Macdonnell.....	do	Oct. 30, 1875...	April 12, 1876...	June 2, 1876...	216	354 83
Huron.....	Chas. Morrow.....	do	Nov. 5, 1875...	Aug. 12, 1876...	Sept. 25, 1876...	324	533 33
Kent.....	John Watts.....	do	Nov. 6, 1875...	Sept. 16, 1876...	Dec. 4, 1876...	394	538 56
Kingston.....	W. L. Baxter.....	do	Nov. 1, 1875...	May 17, 1876...	Aug. 1, 1876...	273	524 97
Lambton.....	Wm. McLean.....	do	Nov. 2, 1875...	Sept. 28, 1876...	Dec. 4, 1876...	398	544 12
Lanark.....	J. W. Manning.....	do	Nov. 27, 1875...	Mar. 17, 1877...	Mar. 25, 1877...	485	661 89
Lennox.....	Geo. W. B. Sills.....	do	Nov. 15, 1875...	April 12, 1876...	Nov. 18, 1876...	369	503 94
London.....	J. J. Spettigue.....	do	Dec. 6, 1875...	July 13, 1876...	Aug. 28, 1876...	265	725 77
Middlesex.....	James Campbell.....	do	Oct. 29, 1875...	May 19, 1876...	Aug. 2, 1876...	277	380 28
Muskoka.....	James Sharpe.....	do	Oct. 26, 1875...	Oct. 24, 1876...	Jan. 31, 1877...	464	632 96
Niagara.....	L. D. Winchester.....	do	Nov. 2, 1875...	July 4, 1876...	Sept. 2, 1876...	304	499 99
Norfolk.....	T. R. Slaght.....	do	Nov. 2, 1875...	June 2, 1876...	Nov. 14, 1876...	378	516 47
Northumberland.....	J. H. Willoughby.....	do	March 8, 1876...	April 12, 1876...	May 20, 1876...	73	98 80
Ontario.....	J. O. Forman.....	do	Oct. 20, 1875...	April 15, 1876...	Aug. 6, 1876...	291	477 41

Mr. BOWELL.

STATEMENT showing Divisions and Names of Officers appointed under the provisions of the Act 36 Victoria, Chap. 47, with Date of Appointment, when Salaries began, &c.—Continued.

ONTARIO—Concluded.

Divisions.	Officers' Names.	Date of Order in Council.	Date when Salaries commenced.	Date when Standards were supplied.	Date on which Operations began.	Number of Days Unemployed.	Amount of Salary drawn during the period the officers were unemployed.
Ottawa	E. A. Lapierre	Sept. 30, 1875	Oct. 25, 1875	March 4, 1876	May 3, 1876	191	\$ 524 16
Oxford	G. H. Hotson	do	Nov. 11, 1875	Aug. 25, 1876	Oct. 3, 1876	327	536 66
Peterborough	F. W. Hall	do	Oct. 27, 1875	April 12, 1876	June 30, 1876	247	340 00
Prince Edward	R. Boyle	do	Oct. 26, 1875	June 26, 1876	Aug. 1, 1876	280	383 00
Renfrew	James Stewart	do	Oct. 28, 1875	do 14, 1876	do 2, 1876	279	381 63
Simcoe	H. W. Laird	do	Oct. 25, 1875	July 4, 1876	Sept. 5, 1876	316	517 95
Stratford	J. W. Pierson	do	Oct. 29, 1875	Sept. 16, 1876	Oct. 31, 1876	368	503 95
Toronto	J. Wingfield	do	Oct. 23, 1875	May 26, 1876	May 31, 1876	221	546 77
do	Thos. Berkinshaw	do	Nov. 6, 1875			207	398 58
Victoria	W. A. Silverwood	do	Nov. 8, 1875	April 11, 1876	April 11, 1876	155	212 45
Waterloo	J. McDougall	do	Nov. 13, 1875	Aug. 21, 1876	Aug. 21, 1876	282	462 25
Welland	A. A. Davis	do	Oct. 27, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Sept. 4, 1876	313	427 46
Wellington	H. H. Swinford	do	Nov. 20, 1875	May 26, 1876	July 21, 1876	244	400 58
York	H. McCutcheon	do	Nov. 29, 1875	Oct. 11, 1876	Oct. 11, 1876	317	552 78
Total							19,897 44

QUEBEC.

Beauce	J. B. Mercier	Sept. 30, 1875	Dec. 27, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Dec. 31, 1876	370	506 64
Beauharnois	C. B. Dewitt	do	Oct. 25, 1875	May 2, 1876	Oct. 3, 1876	344	470 29
Bellechasse	F. Lamontagne	do	Oct. 20, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Jan. 31, 1877	470	627 59
Berthier	A. Coutu	do	Oct. 28, 1875	do 4, 1876	Nov. 28, 1876	397	542 55
Chambly	E. Lamoureux	do	Oct. 27, 1875	do 4, 1876	Nov. 2, 1876	372	508 02
Champlain	H. A. Cinq-Mars	do	Nov. 12, 1875	do 4, 1876	Dec. 4, 1876	388	530 23
Drummond	P. N. Pacaud	do	Nov. 8, 1875	do 4, 1876	Nov. 6, 1876	364	497 09
Gaspé	G. M. Michaud	do	Nov. 2, 1875	do 4, 1876	Sept. —, 1877	675	922 11
Hull	A. Quesnel	do	Nov. 1, 1875	June 1, 1876	June 17, 1876	229	313 83
do	P. Lynch	do	Nov. 3, 1875	July 18, 1876	Nov. 4, 1876	367	501 28
Iberville	J. M. Lansier	do	Oct. 27, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Jan. 31, 1877	463	631 62
Joliette	J. L. B. Derochers	do	Oct. 25, 1875	do 4, 1876	do 31, 1877	465	634 30
Kamouraska	J. O. Chamberland	do	Dec. 17, 1875	April 18, 1877	May 31, 1877	166	228 46
Labrador	N. Grenier	do	Nov. 20, 1875	Never acted.		1,319	1,806 89
Laval	H. Lalonde	do	Nov. 11, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	June 30, 1877	446	609 66
Lévis	A. Leveque	do	Oct. 25, 1875	Aug. 22, 1876	Nov. 6, 1876	378	516 23
Lotbinière	H. Q. de St. George	do	Nov. 1, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Dec. 19, 1876	414	565 16
Mississquoi	B. A. Haskell	do	Oct. 26, 1875	May 26, 1876	Nov. 3, 1876	374	510 74
Montmagny	N. Nadeau	do	do 20, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Jan. 31, 1877	469	627 59
Montmorency	T. Larue	do	Nov. 1, 1875	do 4, 1876	Dec 4, 1876	399	545 51
Montreal	L. N. Roy	do	Jan. 13, 1876			233	509 62
do	S. Quinn	do	Oct. 23, 1875	July 5, 1876	Sept. 2, 1876	315	602 73
do	D. Lyons	do	do 22, 1875			316	604 67
do	O. Fautaux	do	do 27, 1875			311	594 97
Quebec	Jos. Gregoire	do	do 25, 1875	July 5, 1876	Dec. 4, 1876	406	985 31
do	E. Dubord	do	do 25, 1875			406	766 34
Richelieu	Chas. Blais	do	Nov. 20, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Oct. 31, 1876	346	473 53
Rimouski	D. Ouillet	do	do 20, 1875		May 31, 1877	559	765 15
Saguenay	H. Simard	do	do 20, 1875	July 4, 1876	Aug. 7, 1876	261	356 41
Sherbrooke	H. J. Pennoyer	do	Oct. 20, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Jan. 31, 1877	470	753 22
St. Hyacinthe	F. L. Desrivieres	do	Nov. 6, 1875	Aug. 22, 1876	Feb. 28, 1877	481	659 61
Terrebonne	Thos. Lamb	do	Oct. 22, 1875	May 12, 1876	Aug. 3, 1876	286	391 00
Three Rivers	L. A. Lord	do	Nov. 8, 1875	Sept. 4, 1876	Feb. 28, 1877	479	490 19
Total							20,048 54

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Fredericton	E. C. Freeze	Sept. 30, 1875	Nov. 6, 1875	June 26, 1876	Oct. 16, 1876	345	470 96
King's	W. O. Slipp	do	do 20, 1875	Dec. 16, 1876	May 31, 1877	559	805 15
Moncton	J. T. Carter	do	do 4, 1875	May 25, 1877	Aug. 31, 1877	667	912 41
Northumberland	R. B. Cutler	do	do 1, 1875	Oct. 11, 1877	Res gd May 31, '78		1,291 54
Restigouche	T. Blanchard	do	do 11, 1875	Never acted			1,819 39
St. John	J. Macfarlane	do	do 7, 1875	April 13, 1877	June 1, 1877	207	566 64
Woodstock	Wm. Dibblee	do	do 9, 1875	do 13, 1877	do 14, 1877	218	298 56
Total							6,164 65

STATEMENT showing Divisions and Names of Officers appointed under the provisions of the Act 36 Victoria, Chap. 47, with Date of Appointment, when Salaries began, &c.—*Concluded.*

NOVA SCOTIA.

Divisions.	Officers' Names.	Date of Order in Council.	Date when Salaries commenced.	Date when Standards were supplied.	Date on which Operations began.	Number of Days Unemployed.	Amount of Salary drawn during the period the officers were unemployed.
Annapolis.....	E. E. Tupper.....	Sept. 30, 1875....	Nov. 13, 1875....	Aug. 22, 1876....	Nov. 9, 1876....	362	\$ 494 30
Cape Breton.....	L. Tremaine.....	do	Oct. 28, 1875....	May 21, 1876....	Aug. 14, 1876....	291	399 13
Colchester.....	A. McKay.....	do	Nov. 1, 1875....	Nov. 9, 1876....	Dec. 18, 1876....	413	564 42
Guysborough.....	A. J. O'Maguire.....	do	Jan. 18, 1876....	June 26, 1876....	Aug. 7, 1876....	202	276 63
Halifax.....	James Prior.....	do	do 15, 1876....	April 15, 1876....	June 17, 1876....	154	423 47
Hants.....	S. G. Kerr.....	do	Nov. 15, 1875....	Aug. 8, 1877....	April 30, 1875....	897	1,230 44
Inverness.....	Peter Grant.....	do	Oct. 28, 1875....	June 7, 1876....	Aug. 8, 1876....	285	389 49
Lunenburg.....	J. Hendry.....	do	Nov. 16, 1875....	do 17, 1876....	July 31, 1876....	258	354 11
Pictou.....	R. McConnell.....	do	do 4, 1875....	April 15, 1876....	Sept. 5, 1876....	306	417 93
Yarmouth.....	J. M. Lecain.....	do	Oct. 29, 1875....	June 17, 1876....	do 15, 1876....	322	431 46
	Total.....						4,981 38

MANITOBA.

Manitoba.....	L. Hayward.....	Sept. 30, 1875....	Nov. 19, 1875....	May 19, 1876....	Feb. 28, 1877....	468	770 00
---------------	-----------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------	-----	--------

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Queen's.....	A. Ferguson.....	Sept. 9, 1877....	Oct. 23, 1877....	Sept. 15, 1877....	Dec. 31, 1877....	70	95 41
King's.....	A. J. McDonald.....	do	Sept. 20, 1877....	do 15, 1877....	do 31, 1877....	102	140 25
Prince.....	Peter Gunn.....	April 3, 1878....	April 12, 1878....	April 3, 1878....	June 30, 1878....	80	109 68
	Total.....						345 34

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Victoria.....	H. B. Good.....	July 12, 1877....	Sept. 16, 1878....	May 13, 1878....	Jan. 31, 1879....	137	74 97
---------------	-----------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------------	-------------------	-----	-------

SUMMARY.

Ontario.....	\$19,897 44
Quebec.....	20,048 54
New Brunswick.....	6,164 65
Nova Scotia.....	4,981 38
Manitoba.....	770 00
Prince Edward Island.....	345 34
British Columbia.....	74 97
Total.....	\$52,282 32

N. B.—The salaries of these 97 Officers began on the date of their approved surety bonds.

I call the attention of hon. members from Ontario to the fact that while in Ontario there were forty-two officers receiving only \$19,800.79 for doing nothing, in Quebec there were thirty-three friends of the Government receiving \$20,048 for doing the same labor. If my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) knew these facts he would admit there was French domination in this country. These facts and figures are taken from the official record of the Department, and they show that hon. gentlemen opposite squandered the public money, payed their political supporters out of the public chests to the extent of over \$52,000 in this branch of the service alone, before they furnished officers whom they had appointed by Order in Council with any instruments or tools with which they could commence the duties to which they were appointed; yet those hon. gentlemen constantly

Mr. BOWELL.

declare across the floor of the House that the present Government have been the most extravagant that ever existed in this Country.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BOWELL. I closed my remarks before recess by saying that the late Government had paid in salaries of the officers of the Weights and Measures branch of the service, \$52,282.32 before they had performed any work. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith) asked the question, who paid this money? I scarcely knew that it was necessary for the hon. gentleman to ask that question, when I gave the dates of the Orders in Council

appointing these different men, and fixing the dates at which they commenced operations. Had he reflected for a moment he would have known that from the 30th day of September, 1875 to some of the last dates mentioned, such as 30th June, 1877, which were the periods during which these gentlemen did nothing. That being the case, he must have known, when asking that question, who paid the salaries during the time they were unemployed. I have a record of one case here which is pertinent to the present discussion as showing the manner in which some of these officers were appointed and the method by which they were paid. I refer to the appointment of a man named Sands, in Port Hope. I find that as early as the 23rd February, 1875, he was recommended for appointment by the then member for the riding, Mr. Ross. However, not until 4th April 1876, was Mr. Sands appointed, and thereupon Mr. Ross was notified of the fact. Mr. Sands, on the 11th April, forwarded his bonds and sureties. The next entry I found was that he was paid the sum of \$350 on account of salary, which, by-the-bye, had never been fixed by Order in Council or in any other way. Again, in 1877 he had another cheque sent him for \$252. In February, 1878, he was forwarded \$636, being his salary from the 10th April, 1876, to the 31st January, 1878, at the rate of \$700 per annum. This salary was paid out of Contingencies, the Order in Council never having fixed the amount, and the late Government never did a better thing than place on the Statute-book a law appointing an auditor, for since his appointment and under the law, transactions of this kind cannot again occur even if hon. gentlemen opposite returned to power. Having been wearied doing nothing for two years Mr. Sands tendered his resignation on the 24th of September, and the economical Government accepted that resignation. On the 4th of October, they appointed his successor, a nephew of Mr. Sands, two days before they went out of power. Mr. Perks continued in office for some time after, never having performed any labor other than having taken charge of the office, and in 1878 the gentleman very coolly proposed to the Government that if we would give him a year's salary he would retire, but the Government did not deem it in the interests of the country or of the revenue to do as he proposed, but, on the contrary, they dispensed with his services. In this transaction we have a very fair sample of the manner in which the office of Inland Revenue was conducted by the late Government, and the manner in which they rewarded their political friends, whether for services rendered or for anticipated services in future. Having disposed of that branch of the subject, I turn to another interesting fact, and that is while these gentlemen were doing nothing, the Government were employing their officers in stocking the cellars and lower flats of the Eastern Block with a large quantity of material that never was used and, as it is useless, will never be used. Without wearying the House by reading the quantity of each particular article, I shall content myself by saying that there is now in the lower parts of the building, weights, measures, scales and other articles which are comparatively useless to-day, amounting to \$37,399.49, and if you add to this the \$52,282.32 which was squandered on the officers for doing nothing you have a nice little sum thrown away on one branch of the service alone. I propose now for a moment to give a comparative statement of the receipts and estimates in that branch for a few years past. I find, on looking into this question, that a statement showing the annual receipts and expenditures in connection with the Weights and Measures equipment and inspection branch, is as follows: From 1876 to 1877, equipment cost \$22,000.73; contingencies, \$23,382.93; salaries, \$55,025.48; total, \$100,409.14. The receipts were \$51,657.85. An Order in Council was passed in July, 1877, by which the tariff

of fees was reduced, but not uniformly, the reduction varying from 11 to 66 per cent., and by 40th Victoria, chapter 15, when the weights and measures were found, on a second and subsequent inspection, to be correct, only 25 per cent. of the full fee was charged. This will account for the reduction in the amount of the receipts for the work performed after that date, and it is a sufficient answer to the charges which have been made that in the management of this branch of the service under the present Administration, the receipts have largely fallen off, while the expenditure in the performance of the work has been increased in the same ratio. In 1877-78 the equipment amounted to \$4,484.37, contingencies, \$25,788.21, salaries, \$51,720.27, while the receipts amounted to \$29,683.81, as against \$51,657.85 in 1876-77. I do not bring that forward as a charge against the late Government, because they had relieved parties for whom the work was performed of a certain portion of the fee, and consequently they had less to pay.

STATEMENT showing annual expenditure and receipts in connection with Weights and Measures equipment and inspection from 30th June, 1876, till 30th June, 1881.

Year.	EXPENDITURE.				Receipts.
	Equipment.	Con-tingencies.	Salaries.	Total.	
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
*1876-77	22,000 73	23,382 93	55,025 48	100,409 14	51,657 85
1877-78	4,484 37	25,788 21	51,720 27	81,992 85	29,683 81
†1878-79	3,474 38	17,384 69	51,195 17	72,054 24	13,222 59
1879-80	1,750 37	13,426 31	32,371 34	47,548 02	17,080 11
†1880-81	240 22	15,554 31	44,201 28	59,995 81	34,584 55

* By Order in Council of 10th July, 1877, the tariff of fees was reduced but not uniformly; the reduction varied from 11 to 66 per cent., and by 40 Vic., cap. 15, when Weights and Measures were found on second or subsequent inspections to be correct, only twenty-five per cent. of the full fee was to be charged.

† The Weights and Measures Act of 15th May, 1879, only required a biennial instead of an annual inspection, which necessarily greatly reduced the gross amount of fees collected.

‡ The amount charged for equipment in 1876-77 contains some expenditure for Gas Standards. As there was at that time a vote generally applicable for equipment of Weights and Measures and Gas Standards, it was necessary to show all such expenditure together, but since that date there has been no special vote, and therefore whatever amount has been spent for that service has appeared in the statement for the service interested, whether Weights and Measures or Gas.

I have given this statement, Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be placed in possession of the full details of the amount expended for all purposes in connection with that branch from 1878 to 1881. It has been alleged that there are a much larger number of officers in that branch now than there were under the late Administration, and on the surface, without investigation, there would appear to be an increase; but when the matter is investigated it will be found that the increase is only apparent and not in fact, for the reason that a number who are entered as being in the Excise Branch are also engaged in the Weights and Measures Branch, and as Inspectors of Gas. Thus one officer sometimes represents three, and this circumstance is made the basis of the statement which is circulated broadcast over the country, that three men are doing the work that was previously done by one. As regards gas inspection, the number of places at which gas was inspected in 1877-78, was eleven; in 1880-81, it was seventeen. The number of gas inspectors in 1877-78, was eleven; in 1880-81, it was thirteen. Of the thirteen inspectors in 1880-81, two received only \$150 each per annum; one received only \$250 per annum, for this service, as these three were also inspectors of weights and measures, instead of new officers being appointed for this service. The amount of salaries paid for gas inspection, in 1877-78,

was \$9,153; in 1880-81 it was \$9,038. The inspection of gas meters is compulsory only once in five years. After the first inspection was completed only meters newly taken into use, or those found in new inspection districts, would be inspected. But the testing of gas for illuminating power and for purity goes on continuously, and is of infinitely greater importance and requires much more work than the inspection of meters, though it yields no revenue. I find that the Excise revenue and the Excise salaries in the different years are as follows:—

Year.	Excise Revenue.	Excise Salaries.	Cost of Salaries per cent on Collections.	Number of Excise Officers.	Increase of Revenue per cent.	Increase of Salaries per cent.
1872-73	\$4,513,194	\$135,305	3	180	—	—
1877-78	4,883,069	174,272	3½	206	8½	28
1880-81	5,400,903	189,528	3½	246	10½	8½

The increased number of officers in 1880-81 is accounted for as follows:—

Specially appointed for the survey of tobacco cultivated in Canada.....	15
Counted also as Inspectors of Weights and Measures.	3
“ “ “ Gas.....	1
Employed as Inspectors of Petroleum imported into Canada (for the Customs Department at the principal places), and for the more effectual inspection of Canadian Petroleum under the Act of 1880.....	6
Additional Excisemen required for the survey of distilleries, it having been found necessary to provide additional security for the collection of the revenue.....	6
Making a total of.....	31

The employment of the nine unaccounted for above became necessary in consequence of the additional work imposed on the Department in stamping Canadian tobacco and in providing and distributing stamps to the Customs Department for imported tobacco. There was a total number of forty appointed, as necessary on account of extra and additional work imposed on the Department by stamping for the different Custom Houses. I could show just as favorable a statement for the Department over which I have the honor to preside, for both the inside and outside service during the period of the present Administration, but as that has not been attacked by any hon. gentlemen on the other side, nor in the country either, I do not deem it necessary to refer to it. But there is just one other point to which I will call the attention of the House in order to show how the money of the country was spent by the late Government, and then I shall leave it to hon. gentlemen who may speak after us to explain how the \$52,000 was thrown away on men who did nothing, and why they had \$30,000 or \$40,000 worth of material in the vaults of the Buildings useless. In October, 1878, when the present Government took office, we found about the Buildings, for such purposes as keeping them clean, fourteen men and sixty-one charwomen, making a total force of seventy-five, as against thirty or forty in 1873, when the late Government assumed office. Why it was necessary to increase the number to that extent I leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite to explain. One case, however, may illustrate the whole; one woman was appointed, who never made her appearance at all but sent her servant; the reason for her appointment may be found in the fact that her husband had a good vote, and the inference is that this rapid increase of those employees during the last days of the reign of the hon. member for Lambton was connected with political objects. We have

Mr. BOWELL.

the work now as well done as in 1878-79, when we came into power, by twelve men and thirty-seven women, or a total of forty-nine against seventy-five. I have no doubt, if the pruning-hook was still further applied the number could be reduced still further. This fact may be considered one of minor importance, but it is on a par with the whole administration of the affairs of the country during the five years that hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. You may investigate every branch of the Service, and you will find the same extravagance prevailed and unnecessary employees on the staff. Not only were there too many charwomen, but too many inspectors of weights and measures, as well as superfluous officers in other branches. I think I have said enough to show the country and the House that when hon. gentlemen opposite declaim in the future as they have in the past against the extravagance of the present Government, under this particular branch, they should compare its present management with that of the late Government, and notice the smallness of the return in work formerly received for the money paid. In fact under the late Government there was no work performed. Then let them ask themselves who have governed the country properly so far, at least, as the Excise Department of this country is concerned.

Mr. WRIGHT. I wish to make a few remarks in connection with a statement which was made before six o'clock, by the hon. member for Lambton. He stated, if I understood him correctly, that the riots which occurred during his term of office were caused by the intrigues of hon. members of Parliament, and, as I thought, by inference, the members from this Ottawa region.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I did not mean that.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman said: "The troubles were caused by hon. members of Parliament," and I naturally supposed that we were the men pointed at.

Mr. MACKENZIE. On the contrary, every one knows that the hon. gentleman, as well as the hon. member for Carleton, did everything they could in the opposite direction. I never dreamt of imparting anything of the kind to these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. WRIGHT. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation; but I understood him to have spoken in a different sense. But, with regard to some other statements he made, I may venture a few remarks. He stated that the workingmen were driven out of Ottawa. I can tell him where they are: they are driving our rafts, running our saw-mills and engaged on our farms and in all our industries and operations. I think, indeed, the change has been a marvellous one so far as these men are concerned. So far as I am concerned, and without entering into the economic discussion which at times occupies the House, that the hard times which appeared to follow my hon. friends now in Opposition so inevitably, appear to have passed away under the present Administration. In my own section, where I used to get men under the old régime at 50 cents a day, I am now obliged to pay \$1.50. That is rather hard on me; but as the object of all Governments is to secure the greatest good to the greatest number, it is a great deal better for the masses. I am quite satisfied with the explanation of the hon. member for Lambton, because I was certain that whatever good was done with regard to the men concerned in the troubles in the time of the late Government, was due to my hon. friend the hon. member for Carleton.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Especially to yourself.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank my hon. friend for the compliment.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I propose to say a few words on this motion, and first to address my attention to the chivalrous hon. member for Hastings, the hon. Minister of Customs. He undertook to make a defence of his Govern-

ment, because of their large economies, and particularly in the Department of Weights and Measures. It must have been apparent to every hon. member of the House, that he was giving us in advance the campaign literature with which we expect the country to be strewn during the forthcoming elections.

Mr. PLUMB. You have been scattering yours.

Mr. ROSS. If the dying swan will restrain his music a little longer, perhaps I will address a few remarks to him. We know that in such speeches we have the advance sheets of the campaign literature of 1882, and that evidently the hon. gentleman spoke from a prepared brief, although he did not speak briefly. His remarks were tedious in the extreme, and were not very pertinent; they were not a completely accurate statement of the facts. They did not prove half as much as he wished to prove. Let me address myself at first to almost the last remarks he made. He challenges the confidence of the country, for this good Government of his, because when they came into power they inspected the lobbies. They came down here early in the morning and found there were some thirty, forty, seventy or eighty charwomen engaged; and this gallant, chivalrous, Minister of Customs, true to the interests of the Conservative party, with a heroism worthy of the great work which he undertook, dismissed a number of these poor charwomen, cut down the number of employees in that Department, in order that this country might not be driven into financial ruin. If this is all the hon. gentleman can boast of, as an evidence of his economy, I commend him to the tender mercies of the charwomen; I know how they will deal with this matter when their husbands come to vote. If I were a member of the Government I would not, in the face of an expenditure of \$5,000,000 over and above the expenditure of 1878, point to a reduction in the number of charwomen as one of the most significant features of my economy. The hon. gentleman dealt with the Weights and Measures in detail. Let us begin at the beginning. In the first place, who is responsible for the Weights and Measures Act? Evidently not hon. gentlemen on this side. The hon. Minister of Railways is responsible for that Act, and boasts of it as one of the beneficial Acts of his legislation. In 1875 the hon. Minister of Railways, when the expenditure under this head was challenged, said:

"He held himself entirely responsible as a member of the late Government for this legislation. No measure had ever been passed by this House upon so clear testimony of the strongest character as to its necessity. So strong was the testimony in its favor that it passed the House unanimously and he was glad that the present Government in the discharge of the duty that devolved on them had incurred all the responsibility of putting it into operation."

So here we have a complete exoneration of the expenditure incurred to put that Act into operation. I have only cited that because I know it is an authority which the hon. gentleman will acknowledge, to satisfy him that that expenditure was justifiable; for although the hon. Minister of Railways may waste hundreds of thousands on public contracts, we hear not a word of condemnation. How, then, will the hon. Minister of Customs condemn the hon. Minister of Railways for having expended, as he says, \$52,000, perhaps unnecessarily, under the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman said that \$52,000 had been expended unnecessarily.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, but I did not say by the hon. Minister of Railways.

Mr. ROSS. Well, it was expended under the Act of which the hon. Minister of Railways approved, for which he held himself entirely responsible, and was expended, as I will show pre-

sently, necessarily in connection with that Act. The point now settled is that the hon. Minister of Railways, as the colleague of the hon. gentleman, is responsible for the Weights and Measures Act, passed when the present Government was in power before their present term. Then he is responsible for the expenditure incurred in connection with the purchase of weights and measures. The hon. gentleman referred to the large quantity stored in the Eastern Block. I will tell the hon. gentleman how they came there. Here is a report of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue on that question laid on the Table of the House in the Session of 1873.

"Arrangements have been made in England for the construction of their standards and for their verification with the standard of the United Kingdom. * * * In consequence of an unexpected delay in the delivery of the apparatus and standards ordered in 1872, only \$559.90 out of the \$4,000 was disbursed prior to the 30th June, 1873."

Then we have the building stocked with standards and weights that were ordered in 1872, and the hon. gentleman, with a candor which is almost appalling in these later days, tells us: "We are responsible for the purchase of these weights and measures." The hon. gentleman says that a number of men were employed under the late Administration who rendered no services for their wages. "\$52,000," he says, "were expended in salaries before these men entered on their duties." That may be true. No doubt it is; but under what circumstances? Why, we have it in the report of the Commissioner that it was expected the Act would be enforced in 1874; the weights and measures had been sent to England, and were unnecessarily delayed in their return. The proclamation was issued for putting the Act into force, and these men had to be appointed to take charge of their offices as soon as the weights and measures arrived out. They had besides to be instructed in the discharge of their duties, and it was necessary a certain delay should occur before their entering on the discharge of their duties to give them time to be instructed. These \$52,000 were expended preliminary to their entering on the discharge of their duties in order that they might be instructed. Does the hon. gentleman say that was wrong? In any similar change in any Department men would have to be instructed until appointed to office, hence this expenditure; but admitting, for the sake of argument, that we spent \$52,000 on salaries in 1872, for which no value was received in service, did that state of affairs exist only under the late Administration? Let the hon. gentleman turn to the first year of his own administration in the Department of Weights and Measures, and he will find similar cases of gross management, if we choose to to call it gross mismanagement. Take the town of Brockville: There was paid in salaries at Brockville, in 1878 and 1879, \$801.58, and the revenue collected was \$92.54. That does not show admirable management in the Department. In Halton County there was expended in salaries, \$611.00, and the revenue was only \$3.25. Does the hon. gentleman call that good management? In Kent there was expended in salaries, \$695.00, and the revenue was \$7.50. In Niagara, represented for the time being by my hon. friend shortly to be represented no more by him or by anybody else, I am happy to say, the expenditure in 1878 and 1879 was \$764.26, and the revenue, \$98.80. In the County of Ontario the expenditure was \$728.00, the revenue was \$5.75. If I went over, as my hon. friend did, the various counties and Provinces of Ontario and Quebec the same result would follow. Take Missisquoi, the expenditure there was \$191.14, and the revenue, *nil*. Take Northumberland and Restigouche in New Brunswick. The expenditure in the one was \$116.00, and in the other \$535.00, and the revenue, *nil*. Take the County of Guysborough, the expenditure was \$580.00, and the revenue, the enormous sum of \$2.52. Take British Columbia, to which my hon. friend referred. The expenditure was \$410.69 and the revenue was \$39.

That was in 1878-79, when the Department was in charge of the hon. gentlemen opposite. There is evidence from their own report which was officially laid on the Table, that these men were discharging duties of revenue officers without contributing to the revenue in some cases not one dollar, and in others a mere trifle. The whole expenditure for that year was \$66,487.67, and the revenue was only \$13,085, over \$5 of expenditure to collect \$1 of revenue.

Mr. BOWELL. Were they not all your own officers?

Mr. ROSS. They were appointed by us, but they were under the control of the hon. gentlemen opposite. When they were appointed they were discharging their duties. I will take the year 1877-78, when our revenue was \$30,084. How is it that in 1878-79, with the same officers, the hon. gentlemen opposite only collected \$13,000? Does that not prove that there was some mismanagement? Evidently these men's labors were suspended, but their salaries went on precisely the same as the salaries of the officers in 1874-75. But if the hon. gentleman does not like that I will take the next year, which was entirely under the control of the hon. gentlemen opposite. If it would not weary the House I could show that officer after officer appointed by the hon. gentlemen opposite were discharging duties and receiving very high salaries, but collecting a very small amount of revenue in proportion to their salary. I take the management of that Department for the last five or six years, and it simply shows that in 1877-78 under the Reform Administration, it took \$3 of expenditure to collect \$1 of revenue. In 1878-79 the first year of hon. gentlemen opposite, it took \$6 of expenditure to collect \$1 of revenue; while in 1879-80 it took \$4 of expenditure to collect \$1 of revenue. Last year I admit they did a little better, they did it because they were driven to it by the Opposition, because they knew the iniquity which they were perpetrating was being exposed. In order to save themselves late in the day they sought to urge these men to a better discharge of their duties, and now they claim that they are managing this matter economically. I have shown their responsibility for the expenditure incurred in the purchase of weights and measures, and I have shown that during the first two years of their Administration the revenue was much less in comparison with the expenditure than it was under the Liberal Administration. But he says, these men were our political friends, that they were drawing their salaries simply because they were our political friends. Sir, I did think the hon. gentlemen would have been sufficiently careful not to trench upon such precarious ground. Does he not know that the very spirit of the Administration of the Government by hon. gentlemen opposite is, not the interests of the country, but the interests of their political friends? Does he not know that the Departments are filled from garret to basement with the appointees of hon. gentlemen opposite, not so much that the public service may be advanced, but that political friends may have clerical and material advantages? Does he not know that a large contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia was awarded to political friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and a lower contract set aside? And yet the hon. gentleman charges us with the waste of \$52,000 in the inspection of weights and measures, when we have it on the records of this House that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues sacrificed the interests of the public to the extent of over \$200,000 on one contract alone, for no other purpose than that I can see, but to benefit political friends. But there is something more in connection with the inspection of weights and measures that I must refer to. In 1878-79, the hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, and they found a set of ninety-seven men for that Department who were discharging their duties well, and against whom no fault could be found. The hon. gentleman has not to this day dared to say that these officers failed to discharge their duties;

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

and what was done? In the face of the most satisfactory discharge of their duties that could be required, ninety-five of these men were sacrificed by the political guillotine erected by the hon. gentleman opposite and his political friends appointed in their place. On the plea of economy ninety-five men were discharged, and on the plea of economy sixty-four men, political allies of the hon. gentlemen opposite, were appointed in their place. More than that, they were not appointed simply because they were political allies, but they were appointed to do the political work of the hon. gentlemen opposite, as I know. I have a vivid recollection of a contest that took place in West Northumberland in December last at which the hon. Minister of Finance was present. I also went into that county, and the first gentleman I met on the public platform the first night was a paid servant of the Minister of Finance. The next afternoon I met the same gentleman again, and also on the following night I met him in the town of Cobourg cheek by jowl with the Minister of Finance at a public meeting. I have not heard that he was discharged. Was he appointed because he was a political friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite? Why, Sir, if the hon. gentlemen had any sense of political decency, they would have discharged that man. I heard further that the same gentleman was appointed Inspector of Weights and Measures for the Province of Manitoba, but his instructions were not to go to Manitoba till after the general elections. Is that the doctrine of the hon. gentlemen opposite? I have a statement of the hon. First Minister on that subject taken from the *Hansard* of 1878, and of several of the hon. gentlemen on the same question. Perhaps I might refresh their memories a little on the point. Sir John A. Macdonald, in the debates of 1878, said:

"Every Government selected for the Civil Service their own friends, and no one could object to it. He now contended, and had always contended, that civil servants should not be political agents. They should have the right to vote, and the Government of the day should give them a fair opportunity to do so; but the Government should sternly put their foot down against the civil servants becoming political agents."

Sir Charles Tupper said:

"If, in a political struggle, members of the public service were allowed to go out and take an active, energetic part in such a struggle, a state of things as would be a great misfortune to the country would be brought about."

Sir Hector Langevin said:

"To allow officers to go away electioneering in that manner and for that purpose was at once unfair and unjust. They were the paid officials of the country, and it was their duty to devote their time to the service of the country and not in the interests of a party. Public officials should not be deprived of their votes, but they should not mix up in politics or canvass."

That is a good doctrine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On what occasion was it said?

Mr. ROSS. It was said, no doubt, in 1878.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On what occasion?

Mr. ROSS. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the particulars. Does the hon. gentleman repudiate the statement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Just look at the paper and say what the occasion was.

Mr. ROSS. That does not alter the fact. The hon. gentleman cannot get out of it that way. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that his enunciation of political principles depends on the occasion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What was the occasion?

Mr. ROSS. Does the hon. gentleman want the House to understand that he has one set of political opinions for one state of things and another set for another state of things? I was stating to the hon. gentleman a sound political

doctrine, and was asking him to apply it to the case in which an officer of his violated that principle; and if the hon. gentleman repudiates it let him say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On what occasion was it said? Is the hon. gentleman afraid to state on what occasion it was said?

Mr. ROSS. I have said I do not know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That cannot be the case.

Mr. ROSS. If the hon. gentleman will allow me an opportunity, I will quote those statements from the debates in the course of the evening and give him the occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Give it now.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman cannot get out of it that way. I ask him whether that is a sound political opinion or not. If he says it is a sound principle, then it has been violated by an employee of the hon. gentleman, by a paid servant of the hon. gentleman, and unless he repudiates that principle I call upon him to dismiss that officer and not let the country be insulted by having a public officer traveling up and down it to advance the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think I may dismiss the hon. Minister of Customs for the time being; I may say something more about him by-and-bye, as we are likely to remain here a week and perhaps longer, and I may refer more fully to his sayings and doings. I think I have established conclusively that the late Government was not responsible for the Weights and Measures Act or the expenditure incurred under it, and I have shown by statements from the Public Accounts that our administration was more satisfactory. For my county I know this, that whereas the expenditure was nearly \$26,000 in 1880-81 only \$580 were paid into the revenue, and I know under the Administration of the late Government the weights and measures were inspected thoroughly, and I could name places in Middlesex where weights and measures have not been inspected since hon. gentlemen opposite came into office. So as far as the administration of the Act is concerned there has been woeful negligence of the public interests, and at the same time the officers are to-day drawing liberal salaries. I have a word or two to say in reply to the statements of the hon. Minister of Finance on the motion of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright). I was struck with the apologetic tone the Minister assumed in answering the charge of gross extravagance. I could fancy the Minister from a platform in New Brunswick in 1878 denouncing the extravagance of the late Government. I fancy hearing now the melodious tones of his voice ringing through some great hall, and declaring that the average expenditure of the country need not exceed \$22,500,000; and I can fancy a few weeks hence that same Minister going to the same Province and telling the people that a different state of affairs now exists: "True, I said that in 1878, but I was not then invested with the responsibilities of office, but a change came o'er the spirit of my dream: I have found a lot of needy political friends at Ottawa whose interests had to be attended to, and I found it was necessary to construct public works, custom houses and post offices, and make improvements in order that our political friends may have a fair chance at the elections." It was not enough that the leader of the Government gerrymandered constituencies in order to make things pretty safe; that to make them doubly sure he built custom houses and other public offices and incurred a large expenditure on account of public works; and so the hon. gentleman might say I have no doubt the expenditure on public works has been increased since 1878, but look at all the advantages derived; look at the buildings erected through the Provinces; go where you like in Ontario and you will find similar buildings; this accounts for a large portion of the expenditure. Supposing positions were

changed and the late Government were in power in 1882, and we had an increased expenditure from \$23,500,000 in 1877-78 to an estimated expenditure of \$23,500,000 in 1882-83, what would the hon. gentleman then have said? He would have pointed to those expenditures and public works in the Departments, and he would have told the electors of this Province and of the country that he held those men responsible for every dollar, and it was proof of most intolerable extravagance on the part of the Government. I intend to take that line with the hon. Minister himself, and I hold him and his Government responsible for that enormous increase. Does he attempt to justify himself? There is not one word of justification said. He did not show this House that the expenditure was justified; he did not show that the increases in the various Departments were necessary; but in an apologetic tone he tried to break the force of the charges made by the hon. member for Centre Huron. That apology will not do, the electors know right well that the burdens of taxation are pressing heavily upon them, that the Government are exacting from them millions of money unnecessarily, and if the hon. gentleman expects under cover of such an apology to escape condemnation, I can say, that I know the electors of Ontario will not condone such extravagance as I find visible on every page of the Public Accounts. Look at the controllable expenditure alone. If the hon. Minister will allow his recollection to go back for a moment, he will know that the late Administration increased that expenditure by only \$186,000. What do I find? That hon. gentlemen opposite found the controllable expenditure to be \$6,065,420 in 1877-78, and by the Estimates now before the House, it is proposed to be increased to \$8,560,000. While we increased that item \$186,000 in four years, hon. gentlemen opposite in four years increased it by over \$2,000,000. What is the explanation of that increase? None is offered. The hon. Minister says the people do not feel the burdens of taxation. I have made a careful investigation as to the burdens imposed on the people by the hon. gentlemen, and I find the expenditure per head is not exactly as the hon. gentleman stated it. The taxation for Customs and Excise for 1873 amounted to \$4.35 per head; in 1881, \$5.54 per head, and according to the Estimates brought down by the hon. Minister when he made his Budget Speech, the charge for the current year will be \$5.83, or an increase of \$1.48 per head. Can the hon. gentleman justify that increase? His only reply is that the people do not feel this burden. Look all over the land and you will find disturbances; what for? Because the people feel that the expense of living is pressing upon them, there is not the slightest remedial measure proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to alleviate that distress. There is no proposal to alleviate it, but the expenditure of the country has been day by day increasing, not at the rate of thousands or hundreds of thousands, but by millions per annum, and the burdened taxpayers will have to recoup the Treasury for every dollar. It is appalling that during four years the expenditure of this young country should have been increased by \$5,000,000. It is something we cannot understand. It did not prevail under the late Administration, and yet we were charged with extravagance. We have already charged the hon. Minister of Public Works with locating some custom houses and post offices with a view to secure political advantages to his own party. I repeat that charge. I am prepared to say here or anywhere, and I believe it to be true, that my hon. friend, in making those expenditures, had more in view the political interests of his party than the public exigencies. Look at the case of the custom house which is to be erected in Amherstburg which has a population of only 2,876, while towns nearly as large as cities have no provision made for the public requirements. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to make an expenditure on my town for political purposes, but we

have more than a thousand more population than Amherstburg. If these matters are to be guided by any principle let the public expenditure be made according to that principle, and let not these smaller places, or the member representing them go to the Minister and importune him for these expenditures, in order that his political chances of success may be rendered better thereby. The whole system is wrong so long as it is not based on some principle, and I say that the large expenditure on public works is not based on any principle, and is consequently wrong. I referred in the Budget debate to the large expenditure in the Post Office Department, and the whole substance of that expenditure can be thoroughly grasped. I find that the expenditure in 1881 increased over that of the previous year by \$110,000; and that out of that expenditure only \$24,000 was owing to increased mail accommodation for the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Has the hon. gentleman justified that expenditure? Not at all. That expenditure was incurred through increased salaries and other unnecessary increases. We on this side of the House are willing to support the Minister in all necessary expenditures for affording mail facilities to the people of this country, but not on any such extravagances as appear on the face of the public records. If it were not too late in the night, and too late in the Session, I would take up the challenge of the hon. Minister of Customs, and go through the expenditure in every Department of the Public Service—go through the items in the Public Accounts, and challenge the hon. gentleman to justify the increases, for there is scarcely a single exception to the fact that in every Department of the Public Service there have been enormous increases in 1881 over 1877-8, and a still greater increase in the Estimates which are now being pushed through the House. I hardly expect that the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) will justify that expenditure. I do not think it can be justified. I do not think the hon. Minister of Customs, if he would reflect for a moment, would attempt to justify it. The hon. gentleman may say that in calling attention to this increased expenditure we are diverting attention from the National Policy, but I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we are not afraid to meet them either on the National Policy or any other issue for which they hold themselves responsible. Whether it be the National Policy, the increased expenditure, or the re-distribution of seats, we have no hesitation in saying here or elsewhere that when the day of reckoning comes, the number of men from the other side of the House who will return here to give an account of the battle will be small indeed. Defeat is written on the faces of these hon. gentlemen. Why all these attempts to bolster up a failing cause? Why the resort to all these expedients, so well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, in order to strengthen their candidates in the various constituencies, were it not for the fact that hon. gentlemen know right well that the country will repudiate them and their policy they have advocated for the last four years. They say they are going to snatch an early verdict from the people, and is not that an evidence that they are afraid to abide by the well-considered verdict which the people would pronounce upon them at the proper time. Is it not an evidence that they are alarmed, and that before the situation becomes more chaotic than it is, before the people will more fully understand the political infamy—shall I call it—which they have committed during the last four years—before the people are more fully convinced in regard to the various acts which they have committed, they expect to snatch a verdict which would entitle them to occupy their present seats for five years longer. The apologetic tone of the hon. Finance Minister assures me that he fears the verdict which will be rendered. Rumour has it, indeed, that my hon. friend the Finance Minister is not going to face the music. It tells us that a distinguished gentleman

Mr. Ross (Middlesex):

from England will come and occupy the seat which he now occupies with so much complaisancy; that he will desert the Treasury Benches and become a Commissioner at Her Majesty's Court in England—a very comfortable position, in which, no doubt, he would look after the interests of Canada with honor and integrity; but it is another evidence that rats desert the sinking ship; another evidence that hon. gentlemen themselves are afraid of the results of their policy, and are not anxious to allow the people of this country to decide these issues on their merits. I am satisfied that the motion of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) will command the sympathy of the people of this country—but the electors will not justify this extraordinary expenditure—that while hon. gentlemen here may seek to condone their extravagance the electors will conclude that those who run up the expenditure \$5,000,000 in four years are not such men as should be entrusted with the affairs of this country.

Mr. ROCHESTER. My hon. friend appears to have worked himself into a fit of excitement about a civil servant who appeared on a platform with him in a western constituency. Everyone who heard that hon. gentleman talk would think that the Government of which he was a supporter were perfectly pinks of perfection in this respect; but what did they do in the city of Ottawa when they were in power? What did a member of the late Government do? He ordered out every civil servant in this building to vote for their party in the county of Carleton, and they even sent out buggies to help in the election, and a detective was put at each polling booth in the five villages around Ottawa. One was placed there with a book and pencil in his hand to record every man who came to vote; and although they could not tell how they voted under the ballot, this man was able to show the Hon. R. W. Scott the name of every man who voted and the name of every man who did not come forward to vote. To hear my hon. friend from Middlesex talk, you would think that hon. gentlemen opposite were such paragons of perfection that they would never think of doing anything of this kind. This gentleman who belonged to the Civil Service who met my hon. friend on a political platform in some constituency up west—I do not know who the gentleman was—must have been a match for the hon. gentleman, or else he would not have been so irritable to-night. But what I rose for, Sir, was to refer to a remark of the hon. member for Lambton with regard to the visit of the Ottawa workmen to the Parliament Buildings while his Government were in power. When he spoke of some members of Parliament encouraging these men, I took it for granted that he referred to some of the members living in the vicinity of Ottawa, either to the hon. member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Currier), the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), or myself. The hon. member for Lambton has assured us that such was not the case, for which I am very much obliged to him, and I do not think any one of the three deserve any remark of that kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I know that the hon. member for the city of Ottawa, the hon. member for the county of Ottawa and myself did everything we could to prevent any disturbance or any annoyance to the Government.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. Speaker, this discussion has been carried so far beyond the precise scope of the resolution of the hon. member for Centre Huron, that the real question has been nearly lost sight of. The debate began on an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, which was offered by the hon. member for Centre Huron, after a violent speech in which he ventured to censure the expenditure of the present Government. That hon. gentleman has special advantages in bringing before this House any financial question; he was the Minister of Finance until

our indignant people having for five years endured the mixing and muddling and something far worse of which he was guilty, rose up in their highest indignation and hurled him and his evil associates from their seats. That hon. gentleman's habit of mind, his course in debate, his manner of addressing the House, is so well known to us all, that whenever he rises we fully expect such a personal and offensive attack as he made to-day. The hon. gentleman when abusively criticising the public expenditure has an inveterate habit of dealing only with possibilities and probabilities. He is fond of discussing the Estimates as if they were actual expenditure, although he knows, or ought to know, that the ascertained and fixed expenditure of the country only can be accurately discussed as it appears in the Public Accounts themselves; and I venture to say that I can show from the Public Accounts that the hon. gentleman has no ground of complaint against the Government. I would say, in the first instance, that he departs entirely from the rule which was insisted upon by himself and his friends in discussing questions of expenditure when they were in power. In November, 1873, these hon. gentlemen came into power, and took possession of the Treasury Benches. The expenditures of the year 1873-74 should have been made on the Estimates adopted by the Conservative Parliament in April, 1873. We contend that the succeeding Ministry added to the expenditure of that year by Supplementary Estimates and Votes, a very considerable sum during their first Session in 1874. They hold us responsible for the whole expenditure of 1873-74, amounting to \$23,316,316, on the basis of the Estimates passed in April, 1873. But what did the hon. gentleman, then Finance Minister, do when he came into power? Why, Sir, he took \$540,000 that belonged to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, and charged it against us as current expenditure against revenue in those Supplementary Estimates; he charged nearly \$200,000 for the cost of a general election which he and his associates sprung upon the country as a midnight surprise; he charged us with about \$222,000 for other expenditures for which we were in no way responsible. Of the expenditure of that year, we were responsible for about \$22,400,000. On the same principle which they urged in our case, we charged these hon. gentlemen with the expenditure of 1878-9, which amounted to \$24,455,000, and that is why they do not want this principle applied. Why, Sir, the expenditure of 1878-9 was made upon their estimates, not upon ours. In 1875-6 their expenditure was \$24,488,000. Why, Sir, in the face of the greatest depression that ever befel the commercial world, what did these hon. gentlemen do? After they came into power they increased the expenditure in every direction. They were not bound, although the hon. member for Lambton insists, when it suits his purpose, that they were by any agreement of ours to build the Canadian Pacific Railway; they were not bound to carry out our undertakings to construct other public works. Our undertakings were only theoretical; we expected to carry them through if we continued to have, as we had during the time we were in power, such a surplus rolling into the Treasury as had always, prior to 1874, enabled us to make all the yearly charges against revenue and expend \$11,000,000 in useful public works, as the late Finance Minister himself acknowledged and adopted as a motto for the silver shield which he exhibited to English bankers. If the times had continued prosperous those projects would probably have been carried out, if we had held the purse strings. But we had no idea of rolling up the public expenditure upon a series of increasing deficits such as were piled up under the financial rule of the hon. member for Centre Huron. The hon. member for Lambton came into office untrammelled. He knows that one of his first acts was to take the Pacific Railway into his own hands as a Government work, under his Act of 1874,

and that he repudiated every contract and every agreement made by the previous Government. He knows that he refused to be bound by the policy of his predecessors. The present member for Centre Huron, in his Budget speech of 1874, said in substance: "Although there is a prospect of a diminished revenue, although I am compelled to impose \$3,000,000 of additional taxation, you will not expect me to decrease the expenditure of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works." No, there were too many hungry jobbers to be appeased. What did the subservient Finance Minister do in order to conceal his reckless expenditure? He reduced the militia vote from \$900,000 to \$500,000, and his expenditure on Public Works chargeable to income was cut down \$500,000 in 1876-77, and in 1874-75 the expenditure, adding what had been improperly put into the expenditure of 1873-74, would have been \$24,762,000. In 1875-76, it was \$24,488,000, except for the starving of the Public Works chargeable to income, and the reduction of the militia expenditure, the outlay for 1876-77 would have been \$24,400,000, and in 1876-77 it would have been an equal amount. In 1877-78 also, it would have reached nearly \$24,500,000. They could then no longer keep it down, but were compelled to acknowledge \$24,500,000 as the expenditure of 1878-79, and that is why they disingenuously seek to evade responsibility for that year. Now, Sir, I beg to enquire what was the late Government doing all those five disastrous years? Were they carrying on great public works, opening up the North-West, or endeavoring to do something towards constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway? No, they were busily engaged in decrying the advantages of the country, in warning immigrants from our shores, in exaggerating the amount of our liabilities, and understating our ability to fulfil them. They had delivered themselves over to an army of contractors, and they were compelled to go on with public works in order to give those men their wages. I can show by irrefutable testimony that the hon. gentleman who was so savage in his denunciations of his successors to-night—that I almost fancied he had recovered his old vigor—made a contract with the late Mr. Foster, for constructing the Georgian Bay Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, before an engineer had made even the most superficial examination of the route. I can show that Mr. Hazlewood, the engineer who made a general exploration of the Nipissing country, did not go within twenty-five miles of the line upon which it was hurriedly decided to build the Georgian Bay Branch, and that upon an unknown route. In mysterious haste tenders were asked for, and the contract was awarded upon specifications that bound the Government to particulars as to which they had no information whatever. The gradients were required to be twenty-six feet to the mile on the eastern slope and fifty-two on the western slope of the divide. It was found utterly impracticable to obtain such gradients, owing to the broken character of the route, and having virtually undertaken that such gradients were possible the Government were compelled to relieve Mr. Foster and to pay him \$104,000 for their blunder. The contract, I repeat, was based upon a line which had never been surveyed, ran through a wilderness which the foot of no man but the Indian or the trapper had ever trod. The hon. member for Centre Huron in his Budget Speech of 1875 endorsed the stupid scheme. I can show that the hon. gentleman began to make his contracts between the Red River and the Kaministiquia before his engineers had made even a thorough preliminary exploration of the route selected, and that tenders were based upon a bill of works which called for specific quantities of the different kinds of work: grubbing, clearing, rock and earth excavation, filling, grading, bridging, ballasting and track-laying, which were tendered for item by item thus moneyed out, and the aggregate of the whole was the amount of the competitive tender. Nothing could be more delusive, as the hon. gentleman

found, to the contingent cost. Mr. Carre, the resident engineer of sections 14 and 15, testified before a Committee, of which the hon. gentleman from Lambton was a member, that while he was running a rough preliminary line with eye and compass, on section 14, having traversed but fourteen miles, he was ordered to Winnipeg to prepare plans and profiles of the whole section and make up quantities for tender for that section, a route of which he had scarcely even seen a sixth, and of which he absolutely knew nothing. The contract on that route extended from Red River to Cross Lake; 77 miles was let upon such imaginary data as he was compelled, under peremptory orders, to furnish which he never pretended were anything but the wildest guesswork, not even approximating a semblance of accuracy. Mr. Carre never pretended that they were otherwise than imaginary. The bill of works at the prices bid by Sifton, Ward & Co., of Petrolia, ardent supporters of the hon. member for Lambton, who got the contract, amounted to \$402,950. Mr. Carre's surveys, such as they were, had been begun at Cross Lake, from whence he was working westward, and consequently there was no line established at Red River—in fact the contractors and the engineers arrived at Selkirk at the same time, and in one case the contractors claimed and got some \$3,303 from the Government for pay of men while they were waiting for the engineers to find and establish a point at which they could begin work on the contract. The cost up to 1879 had reached \$722,000, about 60 per cent. increase. In regard to section 15, from Cross Lake to Keewatin, a worse condition of things was discovered. No attempt at accurate survey had been made; the lines were run by Mr. Carre by eye and compass; a common bush profile was taken and heights were scaled by it at Ottawa. Mr. Carre warned Mr. Rowan, the resident engineer, that the estimate quantities were mere guesswork. The bid upon which the contract was finally awarded was \$1,594,000. When the Committee investigated the matter in the Session of 1879, it was estimated that an additional sum of \$336,000 would be required to complete the work, and I think its actual cost has been nearly double the sum for which the original contract was made. An attempt was made to build section 13, westward from the Kaministiquia, by way of Lake Shebandowan. Tenders were asked for. Sifton, Ward & Co. also obtained that contract. The distance was 45 miles. Mr. Fleming himself says that no accurate survey had been made; to use his own words: "they did not know where they were going." At Sunshine Creek, 32½ miles from Fort William, the attempt to reach Shebandowan was given up and the contract was cancelled, not without considerable loss to the Government. The line from Sunshine Creek to English River, section 25, was undertaken by Purcell, Ryan & Co., upon the same hasty and incomplete surveys—if the mere preliminary exploration can be called surveys. The amount of their tender, moneyed out on the misleading principle I have mentioned, was \$1,032,000. The bill of works called for 1,000,000 cubic yards of earth excavation at the liberal price of 33 cents a yard. The amount paid for was 1,970,000 yards; the price per yard was 10 cents higher than on No. 13, of which No. 25 was partly a substitute and partly an extension. 10,000 yards of loose rock at 90 cents a yard was increased to 100,000 yards; on No. 13 the price was but 50 cents a yard. The solid rock excavation, which was taken at the low price of \$1.50, was reduced from 240,000 yards called for in the bill of works to about 77,000 yards. It is very easy to see that it is absurd to argue that contracts such as these were given to the lowest bidder. Any inconsistency in prices might give the contractor far more than would have been received by a higher bidder; it all depends on the final adjustment of quantities of work performed. If items taken at very high prices are largely increased in quantity, and quantities of those taken at low prices are largely reduced, the consequences are too obvious

Mr. PLUMB.

to be disputed. This was shamefully the case in the contracts which I am now considering. The most suspicious circumstances attended the letting of section 15, 38½ miles, and I think a brief statement of the revelations in respect to that work will prove a sufficient answer to the hon. member for Middlesex; for, as he started the discussion, he must be held responsible for it, and we may as well have it out. In October, 1876, the hon. member for Lambton, then Minister of Public Works, called for tenders for section 15. The lowest sent in was that of A. P. Macdonald & Co. for \$1,443,175, and the next lowest was that of Martin, Charlton & Co. at \$1,562,050, the next lowest was that of Sutton & Thompson for \$1,594,085. Tenders had been twice previously advertised for—once for a line with heavy rock-work and again upon a meagre bill of works, which we were told was intended to be supplemented at a future letting. Tenders were made in each case, but none were accepted. The construction upon which those tenders were asked for did not contemplate the adoption of trestle work. After a delay of several months, an advertisement for tenders was published in September, 1876, to be sent in in suspiciously short time, and it seems to have been then decided to substitute for earth and rock as a road-bed an enormous quantity of trestle-work, estimated at nearly 15 solid miles of timber, in a country in which it was notorious that there was no suitable timber to be found. In fact it was not obtainable at a nearer point, according to evidence, than the head waters of the Mississippi. When the twenty-one tenders were opened in October, 1876, the lowest was found to be that of A. P. Macdonald & Co. The tenders included ballasting and track-laying on section 14, of which section 15 was an extension eastward. Sifton, Ward & Co.'s contract required section 14 to be completed and ready for ballasting by July, 1877; but after the bids were opened A. P. Macdonald & Co. heard that the time for completing Sifton, Ward & Co.'s contract had been extended two years. They had based their tender upon the completion of that section over which they expected to take in their supplies. They saw that the change would materially alter the conditions upon which they had made their calculations; and on the 13th October, 1878, they wrote to the Minister to enquire if such was the case, because they said, as I have just now mentioned, their contract was based on the idea that Sifton, Ward & Co. would have fulfilled their contract at the time fixed, so as to enable them to get in their supplies for section 15 by railway over section 14; and that they could not get them round by way of the now notorious water stretches by the amphibious route from Fort William by way of Rainy Lake and River and Lake of the Woods, without incurring great additional expense. The secretary of the hon. member for Lambton answered in effect thus: "No explanation whatever will be given—no modification will be made of any conditions—sign the contract immediately." Messrs. A. P. Macdonald & Co. then wrote to the Government, that unless they could be assured that the conditions of the contract with Sifton, Ward & Co. would be enforced they could not safely undertake to sign the contract, and they gave good reasons as sound business men for their decision. Martin & Charlton were the next lowest tenders, the latter had a somewhat doubtful reputation as a contract jobber, if we may believe Mr. Joseph Whitehead, who denounced him as such, in a letter written during his negotiations with Mr. Mackenzie. Ostensibly Martin was a partner in the bid, but he seems to have had a secret understanding with Baird, Arnold & Co., a firm in New York, and to both of these parties he seems to have committed himself. Mr. Charlton only appears in the correspondence at first, and he is notified on the 17th October, after Macdonald & Co. had withdrawn, to put up his security, he does not offer anything satisfactory, and the correspondence continues till the end of December, when he writes that

he fears he cannot give the security required. Meantime Mr. Marcus Smith telegraphed the Government from Winnipeg to defer letting the contract till he returned to Ottawa. His request was disregarded. At last, on the 27th December, after nearly three months delay, the Minister received a telegram from Mr. Charlton, saying that he was compelled, by dissension from within and extraordinary pressure from without to give up the contract. On the 29th, Mr. Martin, the partner, came and offered to put up the security which was five per cent. of the tender, and to perform the work. He stated that Charlton had never let him know that he could not make up the security, and earnestly protested against any act depriving himself of the contract. The New York firm, Baird & Co., telegraphed on 28th December that Mr. Charlton had been dodging them for three weeks, had used them shamefully, and they had not been able to find him, but they were prepared to put up the balance of security required and to fulfil the contract. To Baird & Co. the Minister replied that the parties who signed the tender having retired, the Department cannot deal with proposed partners who have not signed it, but to Martin who had signed it no reply at all seems to have been given. The very next day after Martin's offer was made, the Minister sent in a minute to the Council stating that Macdonald & Co., and Martin & Charlton were unable to furnish the necessary security—note that, Mr. Speaker—and recommending that the contract should be awarded to Messrs. Sutton & Thompson for \$1,594,085, or \$150,000 more than the offer of A. P. Macdonald & Co. Disregarding the offer of Mr. Martin to furnish security and fulfil his contract, who earnestly protested against having the contract taken out of his hands, the hon. gentleman proposed that Mr. Joseph Whitehead, who had written a letter urging him to give the contract to Sutton & Thompson should be associated with them, which was done accordingly, and in a short time it was found that the work had passed into Mr. Whitehead's hands exclusively. The specification or bill of works on which the tender and subsequent contracts were based, required 80,000 yards of earth excavation only, mere stripping of the rock. The small lakes and deep cuttings were to be passed by trestle-work involving for that work and for wooden bridges and culverts, 2,250,000 lineal feet of large-sized and round timber, which at the prices named in Sutton & Thompson's tender, amounted to about \$335,000. Another tender put the timber at \$975,000. In fact, the line was to be built in a country that had a splendid growth of rock, but no timber. The hon. member for Lambton showed his practical wisdom by rejecting the use of rock and earth for his road-bed, where a superabundance of both could be found, and adopting a perishable and inflammable trestle-work where there was no suitable timber nearer than the head waters of the Mississippi. It would have been absolute ruin to have delivered the timber if it had been possible to procure it at all. The loose rock excavation called for on the specification was 30,000 yards; it was taken at the high price of \$1.75 a cubic yard; solid rock, 300,000 yards, at \$2.75; earth excavation, 80,000 yards, at 37 cents a yard. It will be seen that price of the timber was very low. Mr. Whitehead had not long entered upon the work before he proposed to change the whole character of it by dispensing with the trestle-work and substituting earth and rock for the road-bed and filling. Mr. Rowan, the resident Engineer, recommended the change very strongly, and it seems to have been then suggested to the Department that enough trestle-work timber was not to be found in the country, and that such work was inflammable and perishable—considerations that ought possibly to have occurred beforehand to the eminently practical mind of the hon. member for Lambton. In some mysterious way which has never been explained Mr. Whitehead seems to have succeeded in having his plans adopted, with the following

startling results: the greater portion of the timber, amounting to \$299,000, was dispensed with, leaving but \$36,000 worth to deliver; the earth excavation at 37 cents a yard was increased from 80,000 to 1,657,000 yards, increasing the cost by a trifle of \$583,645, and I think about 1,000,000 yards more have been added since my investigation was made, making the increase in that item alone \$953,645—a sum which would absorb all the alleged iniquities of sections A and B, the Carillon Canal and the Onderdonk contract put together, and leave a handsome balance still to be accounted for. But, Sir, we have not done with this model contract which seems to contain a combination of every possible form of jobbery and blundering from its inception to its completion. The specifications called for 300,000 yards of solid rock excavation at \$2.75 a yard, the quantity was increased to 525,646 yards at that respectable price, making an increase of cost on that item of \$620,526. Loose rock at \$1.75 a yard, increased 30,000 yards in quantity and \$52,500 in cost. To sum up the whole, the increases up to 1879 on that economical contract, that model of the ex-Premier's care and skill, were \$1,256,800, or about 83 per cent., of which perhaps the *Globe* will make a note, and I venture to say that \$500,000 more has been added to the cost since the investigation was made. That is a specimen of the contracting of the Reform Government, and the eminently practical gentleman, who formerly mismanaged the public works, and who now sits on the opposite side of the House, and presumes to criticise the railway administration of the Government. There is more than that. The hon. gentleman went before the public in the campaign of 1877-78, and claimed that he was entitled to a renewal of the confidence of the people of the Dominion on the ground that, by his superior management of the Pacific Railway construction between Fort William and Red River, he should be able to complete the sections then under contract, making 228 miles of road for \$24,500 a mile, making ample allowances for rolling stock; that it would be equal to the Intercolonial, except that the bridges would be wooden instead of iron, and would be finished at half the cost of that work, which he put at \$48,000 a mile. He made a statement in the House in 1877, showing how he arrived at that conclusion. He there took the amount of the contract, which I have mentioned at \$3,302,568, and added, for engineering, rails, rolling stock and station grounds and buildings, \$2,300,425; in all, \$5,603,093, or \$24,521 a mile. But what were the actual facts? Every one of those contracts had already shown an enormous increase of cost, and the hon. gentleman now knows, and ought to have known then, that the 228 miles to which he referred would cost nearly, if not quite, \$40,000 a mile. The increase on every contract he had made was enormous. On section 14 it was 80 per cent.; on section 25 it was 32 per cent.; on section 15 it was estimated at 60 per cent., and will doubtless be 100 per cent., and with the facts before him that all these contracts were rashly entered upon without surveys even of the most preliminary character, Georgian Bay Branch and all, for sublime audacity commend me to the assertion made by the hon. gentleman at Kingston in June, 1877, when he asserts that:

"By his wise policy, his elaborate surveys and examinations of the country, and his proper system of letting contracts, he has succeeded in building and letting contracts for the road west of Lake Superior, for less than half the cost of the Intercolonial, and hopes to be able to establish that as far as the administration of the great public works of the country are concerned: he has succeeded beyond his expectation in realizing that economy which every Government proposes and desires to secure, but which very few can reach except by devoting their whole energies to the task and introducing essential reforms in the management of the Public Works."

Even in 1875, when probably not an axe or a compass had been used on the line, he asserted in regard to section 15:

"It so happened that a most elaborate survey had been made. It would be impossible to have a more careful survey, a closer examination

or a more careful calculation than were made on those thirty-seven miles. There had been no such survey on the Intercolonial."

I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the last sentence is quite true. In regard to the other assertion, I can only say Mr. Carre stated in Mr. Mackenzie's presence, and was uncontradicted, that there had been no survey at all worth the name where the contract was let. More than that. The hon. gentleman, in order to show the startling ingenuity with which he could waste the public money, built 110 miles of road at one end of a route and 112½ miles at the other—to do what? To connect his water-stretches and portages, a detour of 400 miles which led from Port Savanne by a descent of 400 feet to Rainy Lake, and thence, by Rainy River, through Lake of the Woods, to Rat Portage. The hon. gentleman would have expended on these 112 miles of road nearly \$8,000,000, and the capacity of the water-stretches which he said he intended to use for years, with their eight or nine portages, was stated at 1,560 bushels of wheat per day. From the time of the harvest in the North-West to the freezing up of the shallow waters he could only get two fair vessel cargoes from one bit of railway to the other by means of the water-stretches. The capacity of 1,560 bushels of wheat a day would make a total for the season, say of sixty days after harvest, before the setting in of the October frosts, which close the shallow waters of that district, of 93,000 bushels. He would have done better to have bought that wheat at \$1. per bushel, distributed amongst the Mennonites gratis, and allowed his railway and water stretches to lie idle. That, Sir, was another specimen of the intelligent, economical, practical policy of the hon. gentleman in the administration of the Public Works Department. The history of the contract for section 15 is one of the most damning records that there is in the archives of Canada, and I do not intend that the hon. gentleman shall forget it; but there are many other very unsavory transactions with which the hon. gentleman is connected indissolubly. The \$52,000 expended uselessly by the hon. gentleman under the Weights and Measures Act, so graphically placed before the House by the hon. Minister of Customs, this afternoon, reminded me of the transaction in which the hon. gentleman from Lambton deflected his railway line ten miles above the terminus upon the Kaminstiquia, brought it down by a curve in front of a paper town, and paid \$600 an acre for the terminal grounds, when he could have got land nearer the mouth of the river, avoiding a bad bend in the stream, for fifty dollars an acre at most, if he had not disclosed his purpose of establishing the terminus there. The hon. gentleman complains of delay in bringing down returns. I applied for returns in regard to the Fort William town plot two years in succession, and was insulted by the hon. gentleman from his seat in the House the last time I asked for them, and they were never brought down. It was amusing to hear the hon. gentleman complain of a slight delay in bringing down returns on our side. One might suppose he never had withheld a return in his life. I was surprised when I saw the hon. gentleman get up to-night, and with such violence and virulence support the resolution of the hon. member for Centre Huron. He reminded me of something in a fascinating child's book, written by a grave Oxford professor a year or two ago, called "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland." One of the principal curiosities that Alice saw in that land of strange creatures was the proverbial Cheshire cat, which, after displaying its wonderful arched back and its claws and whiskers, vanished slowly until nothing was seen of it but the malicious grin. Alice remarked that she had seen a cat without a grin before but had never seen a grin without a cat. I certainly could not but think when I listened to the hon. gentleman that scarcely anything remained of his old fighting self but the malice, which was like the grin without the cat, and I think the application will be evident enough. The hon. member for Centre

Mr. PLUMB.

Huron complains that the expenditure is increasing from year to year. Sir, that is the greatest evidence of our prosperity. A country fenced in, a country stagnant, a country of cheap expenditure is a country that I for one would wish to get out of. It is a country that is finished, completed, (like Venetia, for instance, as it was twenty years ago) with its capital containing mouldering palaces and stagnant canals, so long the refuge of those who had declined in fortune and went from the more busy capitals of Europe in order to economize there. It was so with many other Italian towns. They were cheap places to live in, but the people were in the condition of the wretched inhabitants of Paris in the days of the splendor of the court and the misery of the masses, of whom Marie Antoinette said: "Why should they starve when they could get such nice cakes for a penny?" Ah! they had not the penny. The hon. gentleman has often said that he wished Canada to be a cheap country to live in. When it is a cheap country to live in its prosperity will be gone. When we talk of limiting the legitimate expenditure of the country and stopping its increase, we might as well talk of keeping a boy always in a short jacket after he became a man and far outgrown his boyish garb. The best evidence of revived prosperity is the fact that it has become necessary for these hon. gentlemen to oppose an increase of public expenditure. They have done it because they have been driven to it by the fact that the Great West was advancing with such giant strides that it became necessary to provide for the needs of that country, the prosperity of which is due to our policy. The hon. gentleman knows that every mile constructed of the Canadian Pacific Railway is a signal that they will remain in Opposition; they know that every settler that goes into that country bears living evidence to the successful policy of my friends on the Government Benches. They will be forced to abandon their insensate attacks on our Pacific Railway expenditure and our land policy and its wonderfully successful results, as an issue in the coming campaign, because, having tried to fire the popular heart by those attacks, they found it did not enthuse, as my hon. friend the Premier, who is now listening to me, would say, worth a cent. Then there is the National Policy, and I was very much surprised to hear my hon. friend from Lambton denounce it in such venomous terms after his ingenious attempt to dodge the question in Lambton not long ago, in his farewell address to the little band of mourners in Sarnia, but I was highly gratified to hear him do so. Nothing could be more acceptable to this side of the House than such utterances as that hon. gentleman ventured to indulge in this afternoon. What did he say? Why, Sir, he said that the National Policy was national folly and national crime. He said that what we had done to make the country prosperous was a national crime, and that the people who supported that policy were guilty of national folly; and loud applause greeted him from his quondam followers. I want those words emphasized to go before the people of Canada. I desire every man in Canada to know that the party opposite is the party of reaction, the party of obstruction, the party which decries and disparages the resources and ability and advantages of this country, which has no other capital except an attempt to provoke jealousy and dissension between the sister Provinces, an attempt to create discontent in the chief Province of the Confederation; an attempt to despoil one man who does not vote for them for the benefit of another who does; an attempt to revive the cry of independence or of annexation, which means the same thing. Those will be the substantial issues of the next campaign, and we are ready to meet them and any others the ingenious Opposition leader may invent in the meanwhile. Sir, whenever there is a hard task in the way of meeting hard facts by perverted, disingenuous statesmen, which require special boldness of assertion, when the Opposition have a desperate thing to do in this House, the

man who has to do that work, who is put up to do it—to use the courteous expression of the hon. member for Lambton in regard to myself—is the hon. member for West Middlesex. There is no man in the House who rises with more alacrity to do that sort of job than the hon. member for West Middlesex. Though I do not say that that hon. gentleman ever strains his figures and perverts his facts to suit the exigency of the occasion, yet I always look at the record after the hon. gentleman has made a statement, and always with satisfactory results—results that do not increase my confidence in him. He reminds me of a story I heard in the South, where a gentleman of the negro persuasion was speaking about a companion of whom he said:—“Well, I think that nigger is a very prayerful nigger, and I have great confidence in him. He is a very good pious nigger in every possible way, but I tell you what it is, I always advise the chickens to roost high when he comes round our neighborhood at night.” The hon. gentleman made the same assertion in the speech with which he treated the House at the beginning of the Session that he has made this evening. He took the record of 1877-78, as the termination of the fiscal responsibility of the party which he supports. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that they are responsible for every item of the expenditure upon their Estimates of 1878-79, voted by him and his friends in the Session of 1878. But the hon. gentleman went out of the record in every possible direction. He alluded to everything, to every issue that is before this House and to many issues that are not. I will not attempt to follow him on these points, because there will be an opportunity of discussing them before the people when the proper time arrives. But the hon. gentleman talked about the charge that had been made by my hon. friend from North Hastings (Mr. Bowell). I have never seen since I have been in this House, so damaging an effect produced upon an opposition party as was produced by my hon. friend in respect to the reckless expenditures of the late Government in connection with the Weights and Measures Act, and by those figures which he laid before us, I knew that the hon. member for West Middlesex would attempt to cover up and throw dust over the issue by a cloud of words which he, more than any other man upon that side of the House, is an adept in using. The hon. gentleman dared not meet the issue, he dared not face it, he did not face it, he knows he did not face it, he knows that he attempted every other device to break the force of the attack, except to attempt a defence against the damaging statements that were made by my hon. friend. He said that we put this Act into operation; we did no such thing.

Mr. ROSS. I did not say so.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman knows that the leader of the late Government is responsible for the Weights and Measures Act. It was on the Statute-Book when he came into power, it is true; but to put it in force a proclamation was necessary which he was in no possible way compelled to issue. It was on the Statute-Book, to be sure, but it could not go into operation until it was proclaimed; and the hon. gentleman, if he knows anything of the law, knows perfectly well that that was the case, and he dare not and cannot deny it. There is where the whole responsibility rests. The truth is the faithful wanted easy employment, plenty of pay and leisure for spending it. There was a splendid opportunity to illustrate the beauties of reform and retrenchment. Before the instruments were bought, long before the Act was or could possibly be put into operation, this hon. gentleman attempted to persuade us that that horde who were fattening upon the public Treasury were being instructed in their duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How could they be instructed without instruments?

Mr. PLUMB. Certainly. Although some instruments and machinery were purchased, which the hon. gentleman says are now rusting in the cellars of the Public Buildings, he knows perfectly well that a second order was given by his friends far larger than the first by ours, thus largely and as it resulted needlessly and prematurely adding to the expenditure; and he knows perfectly well that the hon. gentlemen opposite used that law for the purpose of rewarding political friends. Why, Sir, on the coast of Labrador where there is nothing to be done except to weigh and measure the seals—put them under seal, I suppose, according to law—a man was paid over \$1,800 for some 1,400 days services in doing nothing. In fact he had nothing to weigh, and was willing to wait. I must say that if he was under instruction all that time he must have been a dull scholar. I would say, as some gentlemen in the United States said, it was a great mistake to attempt to give a \$5,000 education to a \$5 boy; and I rather think we were giving an \$1,800 education to a two-penny officer. Sir, he was never instructed, they never gave him instruments, and he never did anything for his money except to sign his orders on the disbursing officer and his receipts when they were cashed. The hon. gentleman attempted to show that because after the Act was put in operation the returns at certain points were not large, and that he considered an answer to the argument made by the hon. Minister of Customs. We will leave him just where he floundered and allow him to make all he can out of that kind of argument. When we came into power we found in 1878-79, men appointed by the hon. member for Lambton occupying positions under the Weights and Measures Act. The very men of whom that hon. gentleman complained that they did not collect money enough to pay their salaries, were of his own political stripe, and everything he said recoiled upon the late Government; and the hon. gentleman must have been sorely in need of an argument and must have become desperate indeed when he found it necessary to attack his own friends in order to attempt to make a point against the damning charges which were brought to-day against his party from this side of the House. As usual we have turned the tables and put the hon. gentlemen on the defensive. I would not want any better campaign document for our side than the trenchant statement of the Minister of Customs. The hon. member for West Middlesex says, it is to be part of that document, but I do not think so, we have material enough and to spare without it, but it will make a very pretty, neat, attractive little postscript. It will be far more easily understood than the prolix theories of the hon. gentleman's hair-splitting leader. With the material that we draw from the five years, during which the hon. gentlemen exhibited the consistency and sincerity of their professions and their performances, I am quite ready to meet the hon. gentleman from West Middlesex, or his leaders on any platform he may select, and I can show beyond dispute that the figures adduced by our side of the House from the Public Accounts are such as the hon. gentleman, with all his sophistry, can never controvert. I have only in conclusion to offer a remark with respect to the hon. gentleman's statement, that a Government official took part in the late contest in West Northumberland. The *tu quoque* argument will answer there. I say that the whole of the riding was flooded with employes of the Province of Ontario. I tell the hon. gentleman, and I can prove it, if necessary, that there were men among them who, beyond all question, ought not to have been there, and I may remind the hon. gentleman himself that he is not entirely free from the imputation of being an employe of the Ontario Government. I can tell the hon. member that it is credibly stated that he is, and that he has been for a long time the recipient of honorariums at least, I might say of a regular yearly stipend from the Ontario Government, and it ill-becomes

him to speak of officials meddling in election affairs. I can tell the hon. gentleman and his friends opposite that we are perfectly willing that they may gather any consolation they can from the present aspect of affairs, but they are like the nervous boy who whistled aloud to keep his courage up as he passed the churchyard. They fear that there is a spectre behind them, and it is the spectre of their own misdeeds. These hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that within the last week the leader of the party gave up everything as lost. They know they are a forlorn hope, desperate indeed, and their position frightful, and it is hourly proving worse. Every move thus far that they have made against us has proved disastrous to themselves. We are ready and able at any time and place to justify the acts of the Government we support, and we believe that the people at any time and place will refuse to accept again the mixers and muddlers, the blunderers and plunderers, the helpless incapables, utterly blind and deaf to the most apparent omens and the loudest warnings, who showed their utter incapacity to read the signs of the times, their utter lack of political foresight and capacity, their want of sympathy with the people, and their contempt of the distress and suffering by which they were surrounded; deaf to all appeals they went their way, and we know that the history of 1878 will repeat itself as the Nemesis of their infatuated career since they were repudiated by the people, whose confidence they betrayed. Upon what tenable ground can they claim to be taken back, for, since their great disaster, like the French Bourbons, whose hopes for restoration are almost as well founded, they have learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

Amendment (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Dumont,	Mills,
Bain,	Fiset,	Olivier,
Béchar,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Flynn,	Pickard,
Borden,	Geoffrion,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Brown,	Gunn,	Rogers,
Burpee (St. John),	Guthrie,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Haddow,	Rymal,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Smith,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Sutherland,
Casey,	King,	Trow,
Casgrain,	McDonald (Victoria, NS),	Weldon,
Charlton,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Wheler and
Cockburn,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—47.
Coupal,	Malouin,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Amyot,	Fulton,	Merner,
Arkell,	Gigault,	Méhot,
Baker,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mongenais,
Barnard,	Girouard (Kent),	Montplaisir,
Beauchesne,	Grandbois,	Mousseau,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Muttart,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	O'Connor,
Bill,	Hay,	Ogden,
Bolduc,	Hesson,	Patterson (Essex),
Bowell,	Homer,	Pinsonneault,
Brecken,	Hooper,	Plumb,
Brooks,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bunster,	Jones,	Richey,
Burnham,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Rochester,
Carling,	Kirkpatrick,	Ross (Dundas),
Caron,	Kranz,	Rouleau,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Landry,	Ryan (Montreal),
Colby,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Coughlin,	Lantier,	Sproule,
Coursol,	Longley,	Stephenson,
Currier,	Macdonald (Kings),	Tassé,
Guthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tellier,
Daly,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tilley,
Daoust,	Macmillan,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Valin,

Mr. PLUMB.

DeCosmos,	McCaig,	Vallée,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Vanasse,
Dumville,	McLelan,	Wade,
Dugas,	McLeod,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Elliott,	McQuade,	Wallace (York), and
Farrow,	McKory,	Wright.—99.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I desire to inform the First Minister that he will find the speech to which I referred on page 2218 of the *Hansard* of 1878, and I do so merely lest it might appear that I was not quoting the hon. gentleman correctly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

338. Public buildings in Manitoba..... \$19,550

Mr. BLAKE. What would be the extent of the accommodation at any time at Winnipeg and Brandon respectively in the immigration buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot state the number of people. The amount is for frame buildings 51 x 27 feet, and well put up and connected. It would appear to be rather a small room, considering the number of immigrants that may arrive at one time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In addition to the permanent building, in consequence of the great and unexpected rush of immigrants, the hon. Minister of Agriculture has given instructions that a temporary shed shall be put up, the timber and boards of which may be used afterwards. In addition to this, the barracks which were occupied by the Militia will be used for the same purpose, except the portion occupied by stores.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I see it stated that communication had been made by Mr. Brydges with the hon. gentlemen opposite to stop the arrival of immigrants at the present time, in consequence of the flooded state of the country. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if such a communication has been received and if any steps have been taken in consequence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was learned from various sources that there was a temporary cessation of communication at Winnipeg and a shortness of supplies, and it was recommended that immigrants had better move slowly—that they had better stop at Quebec, Montreal or Toronto at least for ten days rather than go on to Emerson, and it was hoped that after that time communication would be restored.

339. To cover expenditure for salaries of engineers, firemen and contractors of Dominion Buildings (hitherto paid by the respective Departments for which the services were performed)..... \$13,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In what items were these charged in the Public Accounts? Were they charged in the contingencies?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Then in that case it is clear that our contingencies are in reality increased by a large sum, though that does not appear on the face of the accounts.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These salaries were not paid out of the contingencies of the head office here, but out of the moneys voted for the outside service, but it was thought by the Government that those officers should be paid under one Department. By this means we can more readily ascertain what their duties are, and equalize their salaries according to the kind of work they perform. There are twenty-eight of these officers at various places throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. There seems to be one difficulty connected with this change, and that is that we can no longer charge to each building the expenses in connection with it. There will be an apparent economy when in reality the amount is only finding its way into another part of the Public Accounts, and we will have difficulty in comparing one year with another.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These figures will appear in the reports of the various Departments.

340. Telegraph and signal service generally..... \$2,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount voted for the year was not sufficient. We require this for instruments for the different stations, for preparing maps and for contingencies.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What sort of agreement is made with the telegraph companies for the transmission of weather bulletins?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In many cases they allow the despatches to go free, in other cases there is a very low rate charged; and of course they are free over our own lines, unless they are for private individuals.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I suppose there is a system of exchange with the American weather service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

QUEBEC.

384.	Grosse Isle Quarantine Station	\$3,000 00
	St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.....	750 00
	Montreal Drill Shed—New roof, etc.....	20,000 00
	Montreal Post Office	5,500 00
	Bury Drill Shed—Repairs	600 00
	Cartridge Factory, Quebec.....	2,700 00
	Hull Post Office and Inland Revenue Offices— Additional amount required for grading site,	1,200 00

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the Cartridge Factory? There has been five separate items for it, I think.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$40,000 to \$43,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What arrangement respecting this Drill Shed has been made with the Montreal Corporation? The vote proposed is large. I understand the City was to pay half.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The repairing of this roof has been left in abeyance for years, it has practically left Montreal without a drill shed; \$20,000 is required to roof the building. At a meeting of the Aldermen in February last, a resolution was passed in favor of properly repairing the building, the Corporation to pay half the cost, 6 per cent. on the corporation outlay, and an annual rental of \$1,200 for the use of the building by militia; or that the Government give the drill shed to the city for the use of the volunteers without rent. Of course, before the money is spent upon the building, an arrangement will be made between the Government and Montreal Corporation as to the duties of each.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The arrangement will be that we shall have to pay 6 per cent. and the \$1,200 besides.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first alternative of the corporation is that they should pay one-half and the Government pay the other and \$1,200 besides; and that the city should give up the drill shed to the Government for the use of the militia, without rent, the Government to have the option of deciding what method would be adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would not adopt the plan of paying \$20,000 and rent for the remaining \$20,000.

Mr. CARON. Nothing is decided so far.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Something should be decided, and we should know how the money is to be spent. We do not

vote money at the discretion of the Government. The corporation should pay so much and the Government pay so much and control the drill shed. Than to pay \$20,000 and give 6 per cent. on the other \$20,000, it would be better to pay the whole \$40,000 as we can get the money at less than 6 per cent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$20,000 is half the cost of the roof; and the corporation will pay the other half.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal). The Corporation of Montreal do not know whether the Government or they themselves are to blame with regard to the state of this drillshed, but they feel that the volunteers have been ill-treated. For years they have had no place, even in the depth of winter, to drill in, although there is not a more efficient body of men in the country, or a body that has made more sacrifices for the public interest. The Montreal Corporation have expended on this building \$150,000. The roof fell in some years ago. During the time that the drill shed was complete the Government paid an annual rent to the Corporation of \$1,200; since the roof fell in that has ceased. When the drill shed was originally constructed the Government contributed \$10,000 or \$12,000 to its construction and agreed to pay a rent of \$1,200 per year. The Corporation has made a proposition to the hon. Minister of Public Works to concede this property, which cost the city \$150,000, to the Government, provided the Government will put a roof on it, whether that roof will cost \$20,000 or \$40,000, and the Government will have no rental to pay. On the other hand, the Corporation say that if they are called on to contribute half the cost of the roof they should receive the annual rental of \$1,200 a year as formerly. I would have preferred that the hon. Minister had asked for a vote of \$40,000 to put the building in proper repair in every respect, and that would be a saving to the Government because they would be thereby exempt from the rental of \$1,200 per year. As the Government can borrow money at 4 per cent. the saving by this course would be \$400 per year, leaving out of question the probability that it would not cost \$40,000 to put a roof on the shed and properly repair it. I hope that before these arrangements are completed between the Government and the Corporation the Government will see their way clear to accept the proposition of the Corporation and assume the entire control of the property.

Resolutions ordered to be reported; and (at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 8th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INDEXES TO STATUTES.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There has been for some time in the office of the Chief Law Clerk of the House, a very useful index to the Statutes since 1867, also a table of the Statutes showing the various amendments made, also an index to the Orders in Council, authorized to be made under pursuance of those Statutes. These indexes are lying in manuscript form in the Law Clerk's office, and if they were printed and distributed among hon. members, they would prove most useful. The cost of printing, as estimated by the parliamentary printers, is as follows: Index to Statutes, \$150; Orders in Council, \$80; Table of Statutes, \$150. This estimate is for 600 copies, and if printed in French

there will be an additional charge of 50 per cent. I beg leave to move:

"That the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be instructed, to cause to be printed six hundred copies of the Index to the Statutes, Index to Orders in Council, and Tables of Statutes, now prepared in the Office of the Chief Law Clerk, 300 copies to be distributed to the members of both Houses, and the remaining 300 copies to be kept in reserve."

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say a few words in order to place myself right with my constituents and the people of New Brunswick. In the debate the other night in regard to the *Charybdis* I took the ground, and was very careful to state, that no one had a right to run down the harbor of St. John, and I spoke in favor of that harbor. I find in the Government organ at St. John, the following:—

"As a good many things appeared to have been said—by New Brunswickers too—which reflect credit neither upon themselves nor the people they are supposed to represent, it is not yet too late to give our citizens the benefit of these deliverance."

The journal gives from the *Hansard* all the remarks I made, except the last remark. It makes a statement that I ran down the harbor, and it winds up by saying:

"The whole of the statements of Messrs. Burpee and Domville are injurious to the port and calculated to do it great injustice."

And it further says:

"Take the discussion as a whole it was most discreditable to certain New Brunswick representatives."

As I am assured that the omission could only have been made by mistake, as the journal says:

"Want of space and the late hour at which it was received compelled us to hold over yesterday our parliamentary correspondent's summary of the discussion anent the *Charybdis* and the St. John harbor."

I can only say I presume it could not have been intentional, and that it could not have intentionally given certain parts of what I said and left out the last part. I wish to get this in the *Hansard*, in order that I may be able to point it out to my friends and the public. According to *Hansard*, I said:

"I contend with the hon. Minister of Finance that hon. gentlemen had no right to find fault with St. John harbor, &c."

I wish to have it appear that in my remarks I said nothing detrimental to the harbor of St. John, but spoke in a contrary spirit, and that these remarks in no way reflected discredit on those people that I am supposed to represent.

FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. VALIN (in French). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of this House on the French translation of the debates. I see that the publishing of the French *Hansard* is behind time. Here we are at the end of the Session, and we have not received, so far, one-half of the debates in French. The consequence is that if we wish to refer to the *Hansard* for information, we have only the English copy; and if we have something to explain to anyone not understanding English, we are compelled to make a translation, which may not always be satisfactory. We were told the other day that we did not understand English. Well, if we had the French translation of the debates, we could understand the speeches of hon. members. It seems to me that it would be but justice to the French members that the French translation of the debates should be expedited.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 158) to re-adjust the representation of the House of Commons and for other purposes.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. PLUMB. As the constituency which I represent is interested very largely in the contents of the Bill, the second reading of which has now been moved, I venture to ask the indulgence of my hon. friends on this side of the House, as well as of hon. gentlemen opposite, in trespassing for a short time on their attention while I state the position in which I stand, and the position in which the old historical constituency which I represent on the floor of this House also stands, with regard to the changes which are made by this Bill. The clause of the Bill which specially interests my constituency first and myself afterwards, is as follows:—

"The county of Lincoln and Niagara shall consist of the town and townships of Niagara, the city of St. Catharines, the townships of Grantham, Clinton and Louth, and the villages of Beausville, Merriton and Port Dalhousie."

The old constituency which has just been merged in and connected with the county of Lincoln, was originally the seat of the capital of Ontario, in which the first Parliament of Upper Canada met. After the Treaty of Paris, in 1763, when the Canadas were ceded to the British Crown, there was no division of the Provinces until the Act of 1791. In 1791, Upper Canada was separated from Lower Canada, and by that Act each was entitled to representative institutions. The Lieutenant-Governor was directed to call Parliament together by proclamation, and the qualifications of the members of that Parliament were defined, and the electoral divisions of the Provinces were established. The 20th section states:

"And be it hereby further enacted by the authority aforesaid: That the members for the several districts, or counties or circles, of the said Provinces respectively, shall be chosen by the majority of votes of such persons as shall severally for their own use and benefit of lands or tenements within such district or county or circle as the case shall be, such lands being by them held in freehold, or in fief or in roture or by certificate derived under the authority of the Governor in Council of the Province of Quebec, and being of the yearly value of forty shillings sterling or upwards, over and above all rents and charges payable out of or in respect to the same; and, that the members for the several towns or townships within the said Provinces respectively shall be chosen by the majority of votes of such persons as either shall be severally possessed for their own use and benefit of a dwelling-house and lot of ground in such town or township, such dwelling-house and lot of ground being by them held in like manner as aforesaid, and being of the yearly value of five pounds sterling or upwards, or as having been resident within the said town or township for the space of twelve calendar months next before the date of the writ of summons for the election shall, *bona fide*, have paid one year's rent for the dwelling-house in which they shall have so resided, at the rate of ten pounds sterling or upwards."

Under the authority of that Act, in the year 1792, Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe ordered an election of members of Parliament. His letters patent ordering the election were dated 9th July, 1792. He divided the Province of Upper Canada into the following counties: Glengarry, with two members; Stormont, with one member; Dundas, with one member; Grenville, with one member; Leeds and Frontenac, with one member; Ontario and Addington, with one member; Prince Edward, with one member; Lennox, Hastings and Northumberland, with one member; Durham and York, with one member; Lincoln, with one member; Norfolk, with one member; Suffolk and Essex, with one member; Kent, with two members; making in all nineteen counties and fifteen members. The first members who were elected to represent the country were as follows: John McDonnell, Speaker; Joshua Booth, James Baby, Alexander Campbell, who being a Quaker would not be sworn and was replaced by Philip Dorland, Peter Van Alstine, Jeremiah French, Ephraim Jones, William Mocomb, Hugh McDonnell, Benjamin Pawling, Nathaniel Pettit, David William Smith, Hazleton Spencer, Isaac Swazy, — Young, John White. The Lieutenant Governor and his Legislative Council convened Parliament on the 17th day of September, 1792, and the first Parliament of Canada was held in a small building at Fort George in Niagara, the town in which I

reside. William Osgoode was Speaker of the Legislative Council, and the members of the Council were William Osgoode, James Baby, Robert Hamilton, Richard Cartwright, jun., John Munro, Alexander Grant, and Peter Russell, who was afterwards Lieutenant-Governor. An elegant writer who has made important contributions to colonial history, and whose writings have more than a colonial celebrity, writes as follows in regard to this first historic meeting of the Parliament in the Province of Canada. He first speaks of the meeting of the Parliament of Canada in the Bishop's Palace, Quebec, and then he contrasts the meeting of that Parliament with the meeting of the first Parliament that convened in the great Province, which I have the honor to represent in part in this House:

"Now let us leave the Bishop's Palace, among the rocks of Old Quebec, and visit another scene, much humbler in its surroundings, but equally characteristic of the country as it was, and equally eloquent in the lesson that it teaches. In Quebec, the descendants of the Normans and Bretons of old France, had opened the first act of a political drama, which, in its later stages, would illustrate the struggles of an impulsive and generous people for free institutions as well as their ability to understand parliamentary government. While the French Canadians were thus engaged in the initiatory stage of their political history, we pass on to the wilderness Province of Upper Canada, where their fellow colonists were also called to show their ability for managing their internal affairs in a Legislature composed of two Houses.

"The theatre in which the Upper Canadian had to act had none of the attributes of historic interest which surrounded the first Legislature of Lower Canada. The little village of Newark was but a humble settlement on the confines of civilization; and it was here that Governor Simcoe decided to open his first Legislature under the new constitution. Across the rapid river was the territory of the new Republic, which was entering on a grand experiment of government, in contrast with that just set in operation in Canada. Newark was the most convenient place in which to assemble the small and scattered population of the western Province. But if the village was unpretentious in its architectural appearance, its natural surroundings had much to attract the eye. The roar of the mighty cataract was heard in calm summer days; below the bridge rushed the dark river, seeking rest in the bosom of the great lake not far beyond. Within sight of this unrivalled river the little Parliament of Upper Canada assembled for the first time, in a small framed building, a short distance from the village. It was but a mean Parliament House compared with a massive pile which was chosen for a similar purpose in Quebec; and yet each was appropriate in its way. The Bishop's Palace illustrated an old community which had aimed at the conquest of the largest part of America, and had actually laid the foundations of an empire. The little Legislative cabin of Newark was a fit type of the ruggedness and newness of western colonial life. The axe was whirring amid the forest, and only here and there, through a vast wilderness, could be seen the humble clearings of the pioneer. But, nevertheless:

"The rudiments of empire here
Were plastic, still and warm,
The chaos of a mighty world
Was rounding into form.

We hear the tread of pioneers
Of nations yet to be,
The first low wash of waves where soon
Shall roll a human sea."

In this unpretentious building Governor Simcoe met his Legislature on a day in the early autumn of 1792."

At the opening of that Parliament, Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe delivered an address—one of the most eloquent which I think can be found upon the pages of colonial records, one which deserves to be embalmed in the history of the country and in the memories of the people of Canada. A few brief extracts from that speech will, I think, be pertinent to the present occasion. Governor Simcoe said:

"The wisdom and beneficence of our Most Gracious Sovereign and the British Parliament have been eminently proved, not only in imparting to us the same form of Government, but also in securing the benefits by the many provisions that guard this memorable Act so that the blessings of our invaluable constitution, thus protected and amplified, we may hope will be extended to the remotest posterity.

"The great and momentous trusts and duties which have been committed to the representatives of this Province, in a degree infinitely beyond whatever, till this period, have distinguished any other colony, have originated from the British nation upon a just consideration of the energy and hazard with which its inhabitants have so conspicuously supported the British constitution.

"It is from the same patriotism now called upon to exercise, with due deliberation and foresight the various offices of civil administration that your fellow subjects of the British Empire expect the foundation of

union, of industry and wealth, of commerce and power, which may last through all succeeding ages.

"The natural advantages of the Province of Upper Canada are inferior to none on this side of the Atlantic; there can be no separate interest through its whole extent; the British form of Government has prepared the way for its steady colonization, and I trust that your fostering care will improve the favorable situation, and that a numerous and agricultural people will speedily take possession of a soil and climate, which, under the British laws and the munificence with which His Majesty has granted the lands of the Crown, offer such manifest and peculiar encouragements."

It may be mentioned that one-seventh of the Crown lands were at that time given to the Province. The Legislature met, and its first act was to establish British law in the new Province; its next act was to establish trial by jury; its next Act was to prepare for the speedy manumission of persons held in slavery or bondage; and in the succeeding Parliament it provided a liberal fund for the purpose of having translated into French the laws of the country, the proceedings of Parliament, and such public information as should be necessary for the information of the French population of Upper Canada, in the eastern and the western districts. When Governor Simcoe dismissed his Parliament which sat for a month in the town of Newark, better known as Niagara, he uttered these memorable words:

"His Majesty in his benevolence having directed a seventh from such lands as shall be granted to be reserved to the Crown for the public benefit, it will become my duty to take those measures which shall appear to be necessary to fulfil His gracious intentions, and I make no doubt but that as citizens and magistrates you will give every assistance in your power to carry into full effect a system from which the public and posterity must derive such peculiar advantages.

"I cannot dismiss you without earnestly desiring to promote by precept and example among your respective counties, the regular habit of piety and morality, the surest foundations of all public and private felicity; and at this juncture, I particularly desire to explain that this Province is singularly blessed, not with a mutilated constitution, but with a constitution which has stood the test of experience, and is the very image and transcript of that at Great Britain by which she has long established and secured to her subject as much freedom and happiness as it is possible to be enjoyed under the subordination necessary to civilized society."

With expressions like these, who can wonder that the foundations of liberty and freedom—freedom, not license—were laid broad and deep in this Province of Ontario? The Legislature was then discussed. Six years afterwards there was a change in the representation. It was not very material; the Parliament, however, ceased to meet in the town of Niagara, and was removed to Toronto. In 1823, an Act was passed, by which it was provided that whenever the town of Niagara could show that it had 1,000 inhabitants it should be entitled to a representative in the Legislative Assembly. In 1825, the population having reached the limit which was provided, Niagara became entitled to a representative, and from that time it has been represented in the Councils of the country. The Act fixing the conditions under which the town should become entitled to return a member to Parliament, was passed in 1821; but the Census was taken in 1824, when its population exceeded the specified number. Accordingly, in 1825, it first sent a member to the Parliament of Upper Canada. It was the ninth Parliament of Upper Canada which met in Toronto. Niagara was represented by Edward McBride; in the tenth Parliament by Robert Dickson, the brother of the present Senator for that district, who was subsequently a member of the Legislative Council. Its representative was Henry John Boulton in 1831, and Chas. Richardson, in 1835 and 1836-37. After the Union it was represented by Edward Clark Campbell in 1840 and 1841; the hon. Walter Hamilton Dickson, now a Senator, represented it from 1844-45 till 1848, and then until 1852, when the hon. Francis Hincks was elected and represented it in 1852 and 1853. Joseph C. Morrison sat for the constituency in 1854-55, and John Simpson represented it in 1858, and again in 1862 and 1863. Mr. Simpson was succeeded by Angus Morrison, who sat for it the Session after Confederation. He was again elected

in 1872, but at the dissolution of Parliament in 1873, Mr. Morrison, against my strong urgency, declined to be a candidate. I was then nominated and returned for the town and township of Niagara, the township being then attached to the town, thus enlarging the constituency, and I have sat as its humble representative from that time till this. It was, perhaps, my misfortune that I came into public life at all. It certainly now turns out to have been my misfortune that I was elected to the loyal borough which I have represented so long; and I claim that the greatest misfortune that falls upon any hon. gentleman in this House, under the Bill now introduced by my hon. friend, with perhaps a single exception, falls upon me. I live in the midst of the district with which I had been identified for more than twenty years. All the constituents of that district, with perhaps a very few exceptions, are, I believe, my personal friends. They are not all my political friends; and I have had some severe contests in retaining my seat in this House, verifying the old adage: the smaller the area the more savage the fight. There is quite as much politics to the acre in the borough of Niagara as in any place represented in this House.

“But the tree of deepest root is found,
Unwilling still to quit the ground.”

—and if I took any other position in this House, which is exceedingly doubtful, as an old tree is not to be easily turned up by the roots and transplanted to take root in some other place, at least every association of my political life is severed by this Bill. If there should be any complaint about gerrymandering, for I believe that is the word applied to the Bill by hon. gentlemen opposite—if anybody is affected specially and absolutely by it—I am more affected, and have more reason to complain, than any one else. If I have been wounded in the house of my friends, by the Bill of the hon. gentleman, whom I have endeavored in my feeble way to support ever since I have been in public life, I must believe that such changes as are proposed by it must arise from some overwhelming necessity, and I have reason to believe that the same disregard of personal considerations which has marked the policy of this Government in other cases, has dictated its course in the Bill now before us. Very strong arguments indeed may be urged in favor of small boroughs. I do not believe myself in cutting the Province of Ontario, or any other Province, into mathematical squares on a question of changing the representation. I believe that some variety in that is necessary to the free and harmonious play of our institutions. I believe it has been acknowledged in all cases, by all parties in England, that the system of small boroughs was one which did not work evil, but, on the contrary, there are almost unanswerable opinions given in its favor. The small borough of Arundel, disfranchised by the Reform Act of 1867, having 174 registered electors, actually represented the largest constituency in England; because for many years it was the sole English constituency which returned a Roman Catholic to the House of Commons. After its disfranchisement the Isle of Wight for a time returned the only English Roman Catholic. Since the disfranchisement of the small boroughs, the remaining larger ones either chose very rich or local men, thus excluding men capable of legislating for the interests of the whole Empire, and as little as possible hampered by local ties and prejudices. Again, there used to be a direct connection between young men of talent, fresh from universities and public life, so long as nomination boroughs made it possible for young men of ability and ambition to achieve political distinction at a comparatively early age, without long purses, or a surrender of their intellectual individuality. The eminent Liberal leader, Henry Fawcett (now Postmaster-General), wrote his opinion in 1871, that since the extension of the suffrage and the extinction of nomina-

Mr. PLUMB.

tion boroughs, “important opinions are unrepresented and considerable sections of the community are virtually disfranchised.” And, in 1877, Mr. Gladstone deplored “the rapid and constant advance of the money power” in the constituencies, and “the reduction, almost to zero, of the chances of entrance into Parliament for men, who have nothing to rely upon but their talent and their character.” Well, in 1874, it was my good or ill-fortune, after what was called the midnight attack, to accept the nomination for the borough of Niagara. I was at that time opposed by Mr. John Currie, the brother of the then Speaker of the Local House. I had no political ambition. I had no desire to take any part in public life further than that I had pretty decided opinions upon political matters, which I had never hesitated to express whenever the opportunity offered; but I never expressed them before the public, for I never had made a speech in public anywhere in my life, and I was not “a wedding breakfast spouter,” as I was at that time styled by the *Globe*, but I felt that a great wrong was being done, that an attempt was being made to hoodwink the people of Canada, to steal a verdict which I thought was an unfair one, and after much hesitation on my part and great urgency on the part of my constituents, after endeavoring in vain to get Mr. Morrison to accept the nomination, I accepted it. I had ten days in which to canvass, and during that time was compelled to leave my constituents for three days. I made no personal canvass whatever, but I was elected by a majority of thirty. There had been, contrary to my express instructions and without my knowledge, a small expenditure of money on the part of my over-zealous friends. On the other side there had been, as I ascertained by means which I shall not now state, an enormous expenditure in proportion to the size of the riding. The expenditure on the other side, I believe, amounted to at least \$3,500. I knew the disbursing agent, I knew where the money came from, how it came, and how it was distributed, for I had the whole evidence ready, in case the gentleman who opposed me and through whose direction my election was protested, should claim his seat. However, he did not venture to do so. I was unseated, and when the trial in which there were more than 100 witnesses subpoenaed, and which was conducted on the part of my opponent by Mr. Thomas Hodgins assisted by Mr. J. G. Currie, was about half through, it was disclosed that a small amount of money had been expended in my behalf. I was then asked by the opposing counsel if I would throw up the sponge, for there had been a device at that time invented to cover up the shameful expenditure of the party of purity, by which device a member whose seat was protested, could, during the trial, the very instant a single act of bribery was proved, acknowledge it, and he was unseated and any further developments prevented. I do not know exactly to whose ingenuity that device was due. It has been credited to an hon. gentleman whom I see before me, but I may be mistaken in supposing that he was the author of a system which certainly was calculated to screen and did largely screen the gentlemen who were elected upon the elevation of the standard of purity and the disclosure of whose election cases do not form a very savory page in the history of the Reform party. We refused. My counsel demanded that the investigation should proceed to its extremest limit, and said that if I were not called into the witness-box by the opposing counsel he would put me into the witness-box himself. They did call me. We defied them. We told them to proceed as far as they liked. The consequence was that an expenditure of \$125 was proved and I was unseated; but the Judge, in his charge, specially and explicitly exonerated me from any participation in bribery by any improper act. I then ran again, after purging the voters list in the Township of 41 votes. At that time, the party then in power in Ontario had disfranchised or wiped out Niagara as a borough for local

representation although there was a good deal of indignation felt at that, for it seemed to be an entirely uncalled-for procedure, I did not perceive that the loudest of those on the other side who denounced it in the borough, left their party on that account and voted for me. But I had a large majority; I was elected by a majority of 105. Since then I have had another very notable contest. For some reason or other it was deemed desirable that the borough of Niagara, which had for many years elected a Conservative, should change its allegiance. It was said by a prominent gentleman, the leader of the opposite party, just before the election, that means had been found by which I was to be forever excluded from this House. He said that I never would come back again. I also am told that the late leader of the party in this House was also influencing a gentleman to oppose me. That gentleman's case has been commented upon in this House, and I am always reluctant to speak of it, but I have been forced, very often by statements made, particularly by innuendoes from my hon. friend from West Middlesex, to drag before the House and the public matters which are not or which ought not to be very pleasant to hon. gentlemen opposite, or to those who have acted as their agents or allies. I told the gentleman who was put up to oppose me that I knew he could not be elected if the election was a fair one, and I gave him notice that if he expended money corruptly I would follow him to the last extremity and punish him if I could possibly do so. The election came on and I was defeated by two votes. Some of the money which was lavishly thrown about the constituency was brought to my friend on the very night after the election. The gentleman who came there claimed that he came in the interests and at the suggestion of the late leader of the party, and of his great supporter, whose name I will not mention here. He claimed he was acting for them. That gentleman made the most lavish expenditure that has ever been made, I presume, in any constituency in Canada, not excepting South Huron or North Simcoe, or London, or Chambly or any other of those illustrations of the remarkable elevation of the standard of purity by hon. gentlemen opposite. The gentleman himself confessed that he expended in that election \$17,500. He got a majority of two votes. I protested the election in my own name—the first man that ever dared to do it. I claimed the seat—the first man that ever claimed a seat under the Election Law. My opponent was disqualified, and I gained the seat without an election. It was only necessary to strike off three, or four of the corrupt votes to give me the majority. The case disclosed that my opponent by himself and by his relatives and other agents had been guilty of the most flagrant bribery, and after my counsel had succeeded in establishing enough to secure the seat for me and his disqualification, it was not deemed desirable to proceed further. It was agreed that no more witnesses should be called, and that votes enough should be stricken off my opponent's list to give me a majority. If I had proceeded further I could have secured a larger majority. My opponent not only lost his lavish outlay, most of which went into the pockets of agents and never was paid to voters at all, but he had an enormous bill of costs to pay swollen by his counsel by many motions not directly affecting the main issue, and also notably by the contention that the Parliament of Canada had not the power to enact the Election Law of 1874. I came back to my seat in the middle of the session of 1879, at the time that the Conservative party, having succeeded by an enormous majority, was carrying out their National Policy, one of the great pledges they had made during the election campaign. I came here at that time, and I have remained to do whatever duty might devolve upon me in my humble capacity. I believe the constituency I represent is still faithful to Conservative interests; I believe that constituency, if I were to

go back for election to-morrow, would return me by a majority ranging from 50 to 100 out of the few votes which that small constituency polls. I can only say that by wiping out that county, or in attaching it to the county of Lincoln—for which, of course, I cannot think of competing with my hon. friend who sits behind me—I think in doing so, I have been deprived of a sure seat in this House, that my constituents have been deprived of a representation which, to them, was of inestimable value. One can imagine that an old county having been in existence for more than sixty years—it is sixty-one years since they were first made by law, entitled to the privilege of electing a representative—must feel with great chagrin, with bitterness, with humiliation, the deprivation of a privilege which they have so long enjoyed. It is no fault of their own if the old borough has been so unfortunate as to be declining in population. The Welland Canal and the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railway system diverted from our noble harbor and magnificent river, the great part of the carrying trade from the limited point upon which the beautiful town in which I live is situated, that growth, activity and prosperity which have signalized most other places in Canada, and yet it is beautiful for situation; it is the garden of western Canada; it is a place where the finest productions of nature are grown with lavish profusion; it has a climate of unequalled salubrity, where the severe winters and bleak springs are unknown, it is inhabited by the descendants of the United Empire Loyalists, who settled there after having dared the great and terrible wilderness, the dense forests, the deep and rapid rivers and the dangerous swamps and morasses that barred the way from the Mohawk to Lake Ontario, an undertaking full of hardships and dangers which it is now scarcely possible to imagine,—fleeing from the revolution of 1776 to remain under the British Crown, and leaving their farms on the Mohawk and in New Jersey, leaving their crops ungathered, leaving everything that could contribute to their material prosperity, to be true and loyal to the Crown. In that district first settled the pioneers of a great part of western Ontario. Lands are still held by the descendants of those families, and that explains why there is so large a Conservative element in my county and the adjoining counties. They will see with the most intense regret that they have been deprived of their ancient privileges. They cannot see it with greater regret, with greater pain, than I do. While I feared that some necessity of the kind was pressing itself upon my right hon. friend, I received resolutions adopted at a meeting held in Niagara in respect to the redistribution of seats which I sent to my right hon. friend, accompanied by a letter which I shall venture to read to the House:

"23rd March, 1882.

"DEAR SIR JOHN,—An influential meeting of the electors of Niagara was held on the 19th inst. at which the resolutions enclosed herewith were unanimously adopted, and I beg to commend them to you in support of the strong efforts that I have already made to prevent the disfranchisement of the old constituency in the impending readjustment.

"Its historical position as the former seat of Government where the first Parliament of Upper Canada was held under Governor Simcoe, and as one of the earliest points of settlement of the brave and devoted United Empire Loyalists, who gave up every advantage they possessed in the revolted colonies for the sake of the Crown, would seem to give it peculiar claim upon the consideration of the Government, and its unswerving attachment to the Conservative party, evidenced by many a closely and bitterly contested election, seems to entitle its prayer to a favorable hearing from the chief of the party.

"I venture therefore to express the hope that some means may be found of avoiding the sacrifice which is feared, and of either continuing the district as at present constituted, or of enlarging it in such a way as to preserve the name and to give it additional weight in public councils.

"I am, dear Sir John,

"Yours faithfully,

"J. B. PLUMB.

"To the Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, K.C.B., M.P."

I wish to put that letter on record as an evidence that I made every possible effort to save the constituency from the

doom which I feared was impending. I could not suggest an enlargement which contained an approximate equalization,—without which an enlargement would have been only a temporary expedient,—without making it liable to interference in the future, and without seriously injuring Lincoln or Welland or both. The feeling of my constituents with regard to absorption, led me to fear that even an apparently satisfactory solution of the difficulty would be threatened by the resentment of the electors who would be taken from old associations and forced into new ones. I felt strongly impelled to meet the situation by placing, when I now sit down, my resignation in the hands of the Speaker. If I had taken my own counsel, I certainly would have done so; but, Sir, I have talked with those who, perhaps, are better able to decide my course of action, in such a trying position than I am myself, and now that the excitement is over, I think I have best done my duty to my constituents, and have best done my duty to the party I represent, and through the party my duty to the country, not to take any such step, for certainly I would not do anything, even at a grave and solemn juncture like this, which would in the slightest degree embarrass my right hon. friend, or in the slightest degree weaken his hands in carrying out a plan which involves the greatest difficulty, involves the greatest possible complications, involves embarrassments it may be much easier to accept upon the other side of the House than upon this side; for I venture to say, that there is more dissatisfaction really felt among friends than among foes, at the inevitable necessities which have compelled my right hon. friend and his colleagues to make the apportionment under which the Bill is now before the House. When I found that I personally had so large a stake in the Bill, and that my constituents were personally so largely concerned, I abstained from any interference, after making my own remonstrance and using all the arguments I could use for my constituents more than for myself, and I can say that I did not know one single item of the contents of the Bill which is now before the House, until the day on which it was laid on the Table. I can say, also, that I decided it was best for myself and for my constituents that I should so abstain; but I now wish to appeal to my right hon. friend to say whether I have not, so far as in me lay, fulfilled the duty which I felt devolved on me, with respect to the sacred trust placed in my hands to protect the constituency which has honored me with its confidence, and through it to protect those generous friends, the ardent supporters who have always been ready at my call to stand firmly shoulder to shoulder with me and to fight the three severe battles which I have been compelled to fight in order to be returned to this House. Sir, those friends will be deeply grieved to find that all their labors are henceforth no longer to be extended in that direction, but I will say to them that I bow to the inevitable. I believe that nothing but the absolute necessity which compelled my right hon. friend and his colleagues to take away a seat from the borough of Cornwall, having three times the number of inhabitants of that which I represent, would for a moment have induced him to do what he has done in my case. I say I will submit, but I submit with sorrow, I submit with a feeling which seems to me to indicate that I will not long anywhere stand in the public councils of the country. As to myself I may say—"The shadows lengthen as the day declines," and it is not important that I, or any other individual, should be in the councils of the country. Ontario has men enough to represent her, talent enough coming forward in the young men of the country to enable us to say that taking the whole Dominion together one man more or less will never be missed, when the general election comes. I believe, we having established—as we have established—the policy which has brought this country into a state of prosperity, although it may be disputed by hon. gentle-

Mr. PLUMB.

men opposite, is not denied by the practical-thinking people of the country who are not warped and biased by party prejudice—I believe that having adopted that policy we, the majority, which is now represented on the floor of this House, and which I believe, will be largely augmented whenever an appeal is made to the people, notwithstanding the bitterness of the press on the other side, and of some hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches—I believe that having established that policy, whether one man more or less is here to represent that party is comparatively of little consequence. I only wish, in the statement which I am making, to have my friends remember and believe that I have, so far as in me lay, discharged what I believe to be my duty to the country through the party which I have sustained. I trust that in doing so I have not gone far out of the way of strict parliamentary propriety. When hon. gentlemen opposite sat on this side, a persistent effort was made to prevent me from addressing the House and to frighten me out of my position; and if I had some little revenge to gratify—and we are all human—I think by this time we on both sides, myself and those on the other side who took a prominent part in the endeavor to crush me, are pretty nearly even—at all events what ever may happen, I will cherish no unkindly feelings. I carry anger as the flint bears fire, which being struck gives out a heated spark and straight is cool again, and if I have in the heat of debate unconsciously and unwittingly, for I would not do it otherwise, done injustice to hon. gentlemen opposite, I humbly beg their pardon. With this statement I intend to close my remarks. I will take no general part in the debate which is now to proceed in its present stage, but I deemed it necessary, before excitement had arisen in this House respecting such an exciting subject as the present, that the statement I have now made should be made at the earliest possible moment, and I thank the House for the great attention, and the great kindness which it has shown me while making these explanations, for I have made them not so much for myself as for the faithful, the true, the honest, and the unpurchasable friends who first urged me to enter public life, and who have so energetically and so truly sustained and supported me since I entered it; and I close by appealing to my right hon. friend, whenever it may be possible in the course of this debate, to exonerate me from any lack of duty which I owe to those kind and true friends, from whom as a public man I must henceforth be separated. I will say this, that it falls with peculiar hardship upon me because I am a resident in the midst of that community, I must live among them, I will stay among them, I expect to spend my life among them, and it is peculiarly bitter to me that I am to live among them while they feel in some degree perhaps I might be held responsible for the position in which they are placed. But I tell them that they are to be represented, I trust heretofore, by one who is entitled to their fullest confidence, by one of the most ardent supporters of this Government, by an indefatigable and resolute fighter for the right; and I say this, that if I can endure the change, who am at present most affected, I think my friends who were my former supporters can also take the same position, and I believe, when the time comes, they will rally with me as one man to the support of my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. The second reading of this most important measure, a measure which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has described as even in his view possessing most complicated and difficult considerations, a measure which he says has created disappointment and dissatisfaction even greater on his side of the House than on this side of the House, a measure, which therefore, if the secret hearts of hon. gentlemen were to be revealed—for according to the hon. gentleman, it pleases hardly any body, and would be rejected by the vast majority of this Assembly—

the second reading is moved in silence. And although its justice, its propriety, its principle, the fairness with which it dealt with the subject under consideration were all challenged, no attempt is made in this debate, by the hon. Minister who introduced it, by the Government who are responsible for it, to answer that challenge or to vindicate the justice of their measure. So much with reference to the portion of the Bill which deals with the redistribution of seats in the Province of Ontario. But there is another provision of the Bill upon which not even a word has been said, not even on the introduction of the measure—that clause which at a blow sweeps away one of the securities for fair dealing between Governments and Oppositions, long fought for, but unsuccessfully, by the Liberal party, but which they placed on the Statute-Book when they had the opportunity of obtaining the reins of power,—the clause which prescribes that men of local station, men of local rank, having a certain stake and interest in the local community, and living amongst the people whom they are to serve on this occasion, and who ought to act, from their general position, in a judicial manner and in manner commanding respect—the choice or the limiting of the returning officers who may be selected is wiped out and left to the absolute and uncontrolled discretion of the Government of the day, and that added change to the Electoral Law is made without a word on the introduction, without a word on the first reading, without a word on the second reading of the Bill, and the House is asked to assent to the change. Now, Sir, first of all, dealing with the subject of redistribution, the avowed object of this Bill as stated by the hon. Minister on a former occasion, and as set forth in the preamble, is to deal with certain necessities arising out of the British North America Act, and arising out of the determination of the Administration to consolidate the old county of Lincoln and the old county of Cornwall by uniting the borough of Niagara to Lincoln, and uniting the borough of Cornwall with the county of Stormont. I say the preamble of this Bill states as the measure of necessity, as the ground work of these changes which are to be made by it in the Province of Ontario, these two things and these two alone. You find in the preamble of this Bill no statement that it is necessary or expedient to provide a greater equality among the various constituencies of Ontario than now exists as a reason for readjustment, but you find this and this only:

Whereas by the Census of the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, and in accordance with the 'British North America Act, 1867,' the Province of Ontario is entitled to four additional members in the House of Commons.

Then, omitting the reference to Manitoba: "By reason thereof," that is to say by reason of the right of Ontario to four additional members:

By reason thereof and of the intended union of the electoral district of the town of Niagara with the township of Niagara thereto, attached with the electoral district of the county of Lincoln, and the union of the electoral district of the town of Cornwall with the township of Cornwall thereto attached, to the county of Stormont it is expedient to readjust the boundaries of certain of the electoral districts in the said Province of Ontario.

There, Sir, you have the groundwork. By reason of the necessity of giving four new members to Ontario, by reason of the determination to unite the old county of Lincoln, all the parts of it into one, and the uniting of all the parts of Stormont into one, which is necessary to readjust the representation of Ontario, and it is on that narrow foundation—that narrow basis—that the hon. gentleman proposes to justify the revolutionary measure and the readjustment of the whole political map of the Province of Ontario, which is contained in the clauses of this Bill. Now, Sir, we stated on the occasion to which I have referred, ten years ago, the general principle which, according to our mind, ought to be adopted in giving new seats to a Province entitled to them by reason of increase of its population; and that general

principle—not bounded, however, by any hard and fast laws—as we stated it was, that the new seats would, as a rule, be given to the population to which new seats were due. If you found a very large and rapid increase of the population of a county thus giving to the whole Province, it is fit and proper that some regard should be paid to this increase, and to the use of the power given to Parliament of having additional seats to bestow, to remedy, so far as practicable, the most gross and glaring inequalities at that time existing in the representation. Adopting that principle which I advocated ten years ago, I agreed then, as I agree to-day, it is from that principle the hon. gentleman has wholly departed, that electoral representation was not a mere geographical term, and that it was of the last importance for various and most cogent reasons, that the municipal county boundaries should be respected, and that electoral districts should not be carved out of various portions of different municipal counties for the purpose, and in search of a fancied equality not attainable accurately, not attained even approximately, either by the Act of 1872 or by the measure now before us. Now, Sir, the duty which devolved upon the hon. gentleman assuming the consolidation of Lincoln and Stormont, and thus that forty-six seats had to be disposed of, might very easily, in my opinion, have been discharged, and in very considerable measure discharged in the direction toward which the indications were so plain, that they have moved even himself. If you look at the county of Essex, it is plain and clear that it ought to have been, as it is proposed to be, divided into two electoral districts. But there was no necessity for the addition to either of these ridings of townships from other counties, or for taking any township from them to add to other ridings. Taking the municipal counties of Kent and Lambton, divided at present into the electoral districts of Kent, Lambton and Bothwell, it is clear these three would be entitled to five members, and that by dividing the electoral district of Lambton into two, by resuming and reattaching to a portion of the county of the electoral district of Kent, those townships of the municipal county of Kent which belong to the electoral district of Bothwell, two ridings might be made, reattaching a portion of Bothwell, and the remainder of Bothwell would form one separately, and you would find a reasonable result as to equality of population and the distribution of political strength. By giving to Bruce an additional member, and by giving one member to the municipal county of Dufferin, created some years ago in accordance with the petition of the people, and by dividing what would remain of Simcoe (after Dufferin had been dealt with, and after Cardwell had been readjusted as would be necessary in order to deal with Dufferin) into three instead two, the whole six seats would have been established, while at the same time reasonable regard would have been had to those principles which ought to apply—the recognition of municipal county bounds, and the assigning of new seats, so far as that principle would permit, to those places where there was the greatest discrepancy of population, and where there was the largest number of persons represented by only one member at the time of making the arrangement. Now, Sir, such an operation as that, or an operation anything like it, or proposals made by the hon. gentleman in any other reasonable way to deal with the seats remaining after he had dealt with those he has disposed of, after the fashion to which I have referred, demanded hardly a touch upon the map of Ontario. They demanded no such wholesale reconstruction, no such wholesale change, no such adding of townships to other ridings than those to which they at present belong, no such cutting and carving of the constituencies as the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill. I say it is plain and clear, both from what the hon. gentle-

man has himself proposed, from his own mode of dealing with the six new seats, from the considerations I have briefly stated as to the true mode of dealing with those seats, from an inspection of the Census returns and the map of Ontario, that the basis which the hon. gentleman provided these wide-spread changes is a basis too narrow altogether, and that these changes are not required by the discharge of the duty he was called upon to discharge, but are the outcome of a decision on his part to alter the political map of Ontario in a manner which he thinks will be advantageous to himself. What did the hon. member for Niagara say? He said that he would not insist that the boundary of Niagara should be enlarged so as to render it reasonable that that borough should be retained, because it would endanger the counties of Lincoln and Welland. Those are the considerations which the hon. gentleman's loyalty to his party led him to believe of such weight that he withdraws his proposal that the boundaries of the borough should be enlarged. He feels that no changes should be made which would endanger the party's prospects in those two counties.

Mr. RYKERT. He did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. I think he did. I hope my hearing is as good and my memory as reliable as the hon. member's. He may differ from me, I differ from him. The operation in which we are engaged, which, as I have said, is nothing less than a wholesale change of the electoral bounds of the Province of Ontario, is, in its character, a most difficult one. There can be no doubt of that. It is one which, if you abandon the principle we have been hitherto agreed upon, the principle of county representation, we are wholly at sea. It is one which, under any circumstances, even retaining that safeguard, requires the exhibition on our part of some of the great tests which exist for the capacity of a people for self-government under our system. It requires, in the minds of those who are to exercise this power, a sense of moderation, of justice, of fair play, an exhibition of the spirit which ought to animate legislation and which was so well referred to by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, of doing unto others as you would that they should do unto you; that without which our institutions would become wholly different from what representative institutions properly analysed ought to be. There is no right on the part of the majority in Parliament, or out of Parliament, to pass laws designed to oppress a minority. There is no right on the part of the majority, outside or inside of Parliament, to pass laws designed to do injustice. The only moral sanction for all laws is justice and fair play to all sections of the community; and when you depart from those principles in the aims and objects you have in legislation, you depart, I say, from the only moral sanction for real legislation, and you deprive the legislation propounded and brought forward with those aims and objects of those sanctions upon which legislation ought to depend for its being respected and enforced, and you deprive it of the right to the respect of the people which ought to rest upon the conviction that the aim and object has been—however far we may have fallen short of it—to do justice, and that justice has been attained. I say you will find in this measure an attempt professedly to apply to the Province of Ontario a principle not heretofore applied to that Province in this sense, except very slightly, and this slight application was formerly condemned by the hon. gentleman himself ten years ago, thus repudiating his own handiwork. He pointed out at that time that this principle was so false that it was not to be repeated again, and those observations were echoed from the other side of the House, and so it then became the unanimous sense of Parliament that a departure from that principle was not to be commended, and that from that time out Ontario in this particular was to be legislated for as the other Provinces were

Mr. BLAKE.

legislated for. I say you find to-day, asserted by the hon. gentleman—though before I sit down, I think I shall be able to prove that the pretence of the application of that principle is hollow and unfounded—that the prominent and predominating feature as applied to Ontario only, mark you, is equality of members in the persons who are to send a member from each county or district, and that the equality of members which he says he is desiring to give to the Province of Ontario, but which he does not give—desirable in itself, so far as you can attain it consistently with other and more important objects—is to be attained at the sacrifice of those other and more important objects, at the sacrifice of that county autonomy, at the sacrifice of those arrangements sanctioned by old usage, by common interest, by the circumstances and working of our municipal institutions—is to be sacrificed, I say, for the Province of Ontario, in which the municipal system has been more highly developed, and exists in its greatest strength and vigor, while for the other Provinces the contrary principle is to be justly maintained. Now Sir, a measure like this, dealing with such a subject as this, on such a principle as this, and on such an extended scale as this, ought of all measures to have been brought down earlier in the Session, so as to have given the amplest opportunity for full consideration in all its bearings, not merely by us who are now pronouncing upon it, but also by our constituents, who are so deeply, directly, and diversely affected by it. The hon. member for Niagara told us in touching terms, when he departed from that most important subject to which he devoted the greater part of his attention and touched upon his constituents—he told us of the feelings which they entertained at the wrench to their old associations by the change which had just come upon them. Does the hon. gentleman not suppose that other constituencies, other residents of municipalities, other holders of the franchise in combination with their own county or their own riding, will also entertain feelings like these? Does he not suppose that they also would have a desire to be consulted and considered, and have time and opportunity to reflect upon this subject; and surely that time and opportunity ought to have been allowed to them. But that time and that opportunity were not allowed to them, because this measure is brought in towards the end of the Session, and is being pressed to a second reading within a very brief period from the time at which its true merit was communicated to the House. It was more needed than in the case of most great measures, because in this case the Government does not pretend, cannot pretend, that it stands indifferent to the legislation which it is proposing to Parliament. It cannot pretend that as to the details of this measure it stands indifferent as to what townships shall be aggregated to create constituencies. It is at once judge and party. It cannot pretend but that a measure of this description may have a very great effect upon the contest which is shortly to take place. It cannot pretend but that in forming these constituencies it has had regard to its effect upon that contest, and therefore it stands in a position altogether different from that which a Government may ordinarily assume towards measures of public legislation which they propound. On a measure of public legislation, not affecting constituencies or the franchise, you may say: "Well, what object can we have, except to promote the general good, except to increase our strength and popularity, by proposing some measures such as will secure the sympathy and support of a larger portion of the public than we even now gather around us." But, with reference to this measure, it deals with considerations directly touching the mind of the Government itself, in its party interests. I do not suppose that one of those hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the concoction of this measure will say—if they did say it we would all laugh at them, some of us aloud and others not

aloud—but none of them would say: “We never considered anything in framing this measure, except equalizing the representation. It never occurred to us to look at the electoral returns. We never considered what the balance of power would be in the various constituencies. Oh no, we declined to advise with our political party friends, we would not consult with the members or the county wire-pullers, or the political committee men. We would not do such a thing; we felt that it would be wrong. We knew we were the party and the judges, and therefore we blinded ourselves, and blotted out from our memories all those things and dealt with the question merely as one of representation.” No, they will not say that, but perhaps they will say: “But while we considered the interests of ourselves and our friends, we have allowed to you what we think is your just due.” That is a proposition which will indicate the exceptional delicacy of this measure in which, in point of fact, the Government is judge as well as party. Therefore, I say once again that the measure was one which, beyond all other measures, we should have had early in the Session, and which there should have been ample time to discuss in the municipalities and in the different sections of the country, and to analyze its effects here and there. Full deliberation is needed for another cause—because this measure is exceptional in its character in this: All other measures of legislation which you bring before Parliament, you submit, when the time of trial comes, to the constituencies which sent you to do their business; you submit to the same men and the same set of tribunals throughout the community; you go before them, and you say: “Five years ago you entrusted me with power to act as your representative, such-and-such things have I done, I bring them before you as the fruits of my labors in that capacity, and I ask you who sent me to judge whether I am deserving of your continued confidence or no.” But this is a measure, Sir, which proposes to alter the jury, to alter the tribunal, to provide for a different set of jurors to try those who are to come before them very shortly for trial upon the events of the last four or five years. No longer are we to appeal to the same set of men before whom we fought the battle four years ago; no longer are we to say to them: “You returned me by such-and-such a majority, or you defeated me by such-and-such a majority, and I appeal to you, on the one hand, to continue your confidence, on the other hand to reverse your vote of want of confidence on the issues which have been raised during those four or five years.” No, it is proposed to provide for a different set of jurors, to whom hon. gentlemen, afraid to appeal to those who sent them here, propose to appeal to vindicate their conduct. Now, Sir, the operation is most delicate of all in this: that the Province of Ontario, perhaps beyond any Province—I do not know whether I might not say beyond any country possessing representative institutions, in a very marked and extraordinary degree—is composed of constituencies very closely balanced, constituencies in which the range within which you may mark the strength or the weakness of either party is a narrow and limited one, and in which, therefore, a strong popular impulse or a good cause may change very markedly the representation in this House, although with a comparatively slight change in the gross numbers of those who poll on the two occasions which are being contrasted. The hon. gentleman in the course of the debate on the first stage—not of this measure, but of the measure which he introduced—declared that it was idle to speak of the constituencies as being of fixed opinions, that they changed their opinions according to the times, the circumstances, and the issues which were before them. We know that there are certain changes in opinion, but we know also—and it is unnecessary to do more than analyze a few election returns to prove it to you—that these changes in opinion are slow and slight, and that it requires, in the

Province of Ontario but a very slight change in opinion, under the impulse of a popular cause, or with the strength of a very good cause, to create a very great change in results. What follows? It follows, of course, that a change in the electoral districts of Ontario, constituted as they are very largely of closely balanced constituencies, is a very delicate operation, capable, unless it be very justly performed, of producing very great results. Under these circumstances it is that we are called upon to decide this great question, involving the general principle to which I have referred, involving so many complicated details to which it will be my duty to allude—this great question, in which, as I have pointed out, the Government is acting not merely as the promoter of public legislation, but also the judge in a case in which it is a party—this great question, in which the majority is dealing with the matter in a sense in which it is bound to consider what its effect will be upon its own chances at the next elections;—we are called upon, I say, to enter upon and complete the discussion of this question within a very few days, and before the country has had a proper time for its consideration, before it has been possible for the members of this House even to apprehend, by that communication with constituencies, with friends, and with persons in all parts of the country, what the wishes, the wants, and the feelings of the people are, and what results by the measure may be. This, Sir, is the position of the Liberal party and of the Parliament of the country on the one hand, while, on the other hand, we know that for months the Government of the day has been concocting in secret this scheme, with the assistance of Tory members, with the assistance of Tory candidates, with the assistance of Tory manipulators, with the assistance of Tory political agents—

Mr. PLUMB. That is no-Tory-ous.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, it is too notorious—with the assistance of all those whom they could gather round them, to discover what sort of measure they might make, which would do most good to them, and do most hurt to those who are opposed to them. You have had private caucuses, you have had private gatherings, you have had your little arrangements with one another. Why, look at the Bill; compare it with the Bill the hon. gentleman brought in; look at the changes that were made in it. We can imagine the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) saying: “I won't stand this—I won't stand losing the good township of Clinton; I must insist on the county of Lincoln—

Mr. RYKERT. I will resign to-morrow, and try you in the county of Lincoln, if you dare.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, the hon. gentleman is making the county of Lincoln to suit himself, and then he asks an antagonist to meet him in it.

Mr. RYKERT. I beat the strongest man you ever had, with all your money,

Mr. BLAKE. We all know, Sir, because we have had the hon. gentleman's assurances for it, repeatedly this Session—and who so well qualified to speak of himself as himself?—we all know what an invincible opponent he is. We hear from himself that he has been on every platform; we hear from himself that he has conquered everybody and that he is quite invincible; but, notwithstanding that, we can imagine the hon. member for Lincoln saying: “I won't do it; these gentlemen from Niagara will be annoyed at the old borough of Niagara being wiped out, and I will have to conciliate them; it is true, you are making some other arrangements which may lighten my load a little, but I cannot do without the township of Clinton; although you put it in your Bill, although you brought it up in your caucus, I insist on getting back my own township of Clinton;”—and he got it. And the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), who, we all know, is a sturdy man, deter-

mined to do his best, was obliged to content himself with the loss of the Reform majority of Caistor and without the addition of the Conservative majority of Clinton. I can imagine my hon. friend from North Perth saying: "Well now it is quite true that your Bill gratifies me very largely—that it puts North Perth in a very different position from what it was a while ago—it is quite true it gives me, on the return of 1878, instead of 40, 200 or 300 of a majority—but for all that, I do not like losing my good old township of Logan with its Tory majority of 208, and I insist on getting it back again. Take Wallace or some place else, but do not deprive me of that good old township of Logan—I will have it;" and he got it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He says he will give it back.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say I thought the party cowardly putting in North Perth and insisting on Logan.

Mr. HESSON. Wallace gave 175 Tory majority last time.

Mr. BLAKE. The arrangements were such, according to the returns, that at any rate North Perth did not want to lose Logan, and has got it back again.

Mr. HESSON. I wanted to preserve the shape of my county.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, he did, and to preserve the Tory complexion of his county; and he himself felt that the county, after carrying out the Governments proposals, after six months of deliberation, would be a shapeless county; but there are other shapeless counties which are simply monstrosities.

Mr. HESSON. Come up and try our county.

Mr. BLAKE. It is remarkable to see those bold, gallant men who proposed to carve up the constituencies to suit themselves challenge us to come up and try conclusions with them. "Come on," he says, "I have prepared the battle field, and am ready for the encounter." Then it was considered expedient to strengthen the hon. member for Centre Wellington, and to give him the township of Maryboro; but the hon. member for North Wellington said, with great propriety—I can imagine the conversation, though I was not present: "I have no objection to a fair exchange, to swap a township, but to lose Maryboro without getting something for it, is more than I can bear; and, therefore, if you take Maryboro to strengthen yourselves in the centre, I must have Wallace or some other place." And my hon. friend will probably say, also: "I challenge you to come and meet me," after the constituency is prepared to suit himself. So that we had to get a new Bill to remedy those difficulties and alterations—to remedy the alterations hon. gentlemen opposite had made to suit themselves in various particulars. I have already announced the considerations which led to the arrangement respecting the north riding of Bruce. I have stated to the House, what I repeat, that the leading Conservative Association in North Bruce met in solemn conclave and passed a resolution to the effect that it would be a safe Conservative constituency if you took out the townships of Bruce and Saugeen, which includes Port Elgin—that to retain Saugeen and Port Elgin would make it dangerous and disastrous in the near future.

Mr. BOWELL. How does the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. BLAKE. I know it to be a fact.

Mr. BOWELL. I will tell you how you know it?

Mr. BLAKE. I will say to you that what has been done in the north riding of Bruce, at the instigation of the Conservative Association, is another proof of the equalization spoken of, which cuts that riding down to a little over 17,000 inhabitants, while the west riding of Bruce is made up to 25,000, a difference of over 7,000. If the

Mr. BLAKE.

equalizers had left the township of Saugeen in the north riding, Bruce would have produced two constituencies very nearly equal in point of number. These are some of the events which took place almost on the surface, which appeared to us after the first reading of the Bill, which we know from the changes in the Bill, and as to which we can conjecture the moving causes of several of them. But we do not know, of course, all the precedent discussions—all the arrangements which were in process of execution for so long before the measure assumed the form in which it was first presented in this House. I say the Bill is not a just Bill for the redistribution of the representation of Ontario; it is a personal, a party, a political measure, framed with regard to party ends and aims, with a design to use power, so far as those who are in power can, unjustly to promote their own objects. I am amused at this commentary upon the boasts of these hon. gentleman for the last four years, and this testimony to the sincerity of these boasts. Why, all the time they have been telling us how proud they were to consider that the day was approaching on which they would go back to their constituents and invite them to endorse their action. All the time they have been telling us they were growing in strength, growing in popularity, particularly in Ontario. All the time they have been telling us about their superior strength in Ontario, under the returns. I do not know the exact figures; it has not been worth my while to count them up. I suppose they give about three to one in favor of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they say they are stronger to-day, and are more than three to one. I do not know in what way they lead themselves to this belief; but I know it to be an unfounded belief. I know this Bill proves, and they have a shrewd suspicion of it, that they cannot carry their present seats and retain their present majority: and this Bill is designed, so far as they can make up by legislation, for the strength they have lost by their misdeeds for the last four years and by the results to which they have led. Now, they confess that they expect to be strengthened by it. They confess that and say: "Oh, yes; but that is because any measure which enabled the principle of the equalization of the population to be carried out would strengthen us." On a minor scale that thing was done in 1872, in the case of Monk and Haldimand, and in the division of Huron and Wellington. The hon. gentleman was assisted on that occasion as he believed by that measure. The changes were, on the face of them, looking at the returns and at the apparent strength of parties in the divisions, obviously and palpably designed to give him political strength at the elections. That did not succeed any more than this measure will succeed. The hon. gentleman had on that occasion this legislative string to his bow, the Redistribution Act of 1872; and he had that other string to his bow, which came of the arrangement made in Montreal with Sir Hugh Allan, and by bribing the constituencies of Ontario, as had been agreed upon, he hoped and expected to obtain a majority. Of course, we do not know what are the arrangements which the hon. gentleman has made for the supply of money on this occasion—whether they are of the same character, or from what source they are to come. But his political arrangements which are upon the surface, which are before us, which are to be made by Act of Parliament, are plain, and they are very extensive indeed. They are contained largely in this measure, though they are contained also in other measures which, if I had time, I would be glad for a moment to allude to. Now, I have said that I believe this measure will fail of its obvious and intended effects; and I say so because, in the first place, a measure so treacherous, unjust and indefensible as this will arouse, as it has aroused, to the uttermost the zeal, the enthusiasm, the indignation of those whom the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to oppress; because, in the second place, there are a considerable number in

every constituency of fair-minded persons who do not take a very active part in politics, who are not very much enamoured of party, but who will resent, as upon a former well-known occasion they did resent, what they believe to be an abuse of a high trust, an attempt to trample those who are supposed to be in the power of the oppressors; and will give their voices in favor of those who are sought to be oppressed, and against the shameless oppressors; and lastly, because I believe that even in the ranks of the Conservative party there are to be found, if not in this House, at any rate in the constituencies, cut and carve them as you will, many men who will repudiate the claims of party, if the cost of allegiance to party be the support of a measure of this description, who will prefer the recognition of the just and sounder principles to which I refer, which the hon. gentleman himself propounded in 1872, of adherence to the county and municipal boundaries, who will not be compelled by the disguised suggestion that that principle is no longer in force, and that some new principle is triumphant, and is to blot out all former considerations; but they will recognize the fact, that without cause, without reason, without any just pretence for the action, the hon. gentleman has departed from his own views publicly expressed as the leader of the Government and endorsed by Parliament in 1874, and departing from it to tear asunder men who are solemnly associated together as one community for electoral purposes, to break cherished associations, to break the associations of business and of local and municipal interests—and all for the purpose which he does not even accomplish in fact, which he barely professes to have in view, of equalization, and for that purpose to disregard those close ties, those higher and more important considerations. I am glad to say that these views are being largely adopted, that there is a very great deal of dissatisfaction with this measure, not confined to the hon. gentleman's opponents, but existing also among the hon. gentleman's friends. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst those who believe that no sufficient cause has been urged for that departure from former plans of representation which obtain everywhere except in Ontario. The hon. gentleman will find that though he may by the force of his majority transfer territory and men's bodies, he will not transfer their minds or their opinions. He will find that though he may transfer the voters, he will not transfer the votes. They will vote in another locality and also in another way; and they will vote another way just because they condemn the action of the hon. gentleman in proposing this measure. It is my duty to lay before the House the objections in detail to this measure. I have already stated the conclusion, viz.: that it is a measure breaking down altogether the hon. gentleman's principle of action as heretofore stated, not accomplishing at all his new principle of action, the equalization of population at all hazards, but dealing with the constituencies in a low, party spirit, with the design, if he can, of strengthening himself and hurting those who are opposed to him. It is my duty even, within these walls, to appeal, not to the supporters who have concocted this measure, but to those who come from other Provinces and have a cherished system of county representation which has not been interfered with, to look at what is being done to-day in Ontario by this Bill, to consider how they would like such a measure applied to themselves; and if their answer be as, if honestly given, I know it will be, that they would not endure such a measure as applied to themselves, that they would resent the proposal, that they would consider it a thing to be rejected with scorn and indignation, I ask them to apply those principles to the Province of Ontario which they would desire to see applied to themselves, and as they would not like to be so dealt with, not to so deal with us. It is unfortunate that the details have to be entered into; but, of course,

a general statement on the one hand, that the Bill is just; and a general statement on the other that the Bill is unjust; a general statement on the one hand, that it interferes slightly with county boundaries, and, on the other hand, that it interferes greatly with those boundaries; a general statement on the one hand, that it is an equalizing bill, and on the other, that it leaves inequality so gross as not to deserve that name, or to be defended under that title—these general statements balance and neutralize one another. Therefore, it is that I feel bound to go through this measure and show wherein it sins against the principles to which I have referred, and against every view which ought to commend a measure to the acceptance of a Legislature. In the first place, I say that county boundaries are violated most flagrantly, and I refer once again, upon this subject, to the hon. gentleman's statement and his mode of observing it. In introducing his Bill of 1872, he said:

"With respect to the rural constituencies, the desire of the Government has been to preserve the representations for counties, and subdivision of counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. (Hear, hear). It is desired as much as possible to keep the representation within the county, so that each county that is a municipality of Ontario should be represented, and if it becomes large enough, divide it into ridings—that principle is carried out in the suggestions I am about to make. That rule was broken in 1867 in three constituencies, viz.: Bothwell, Cardwell, Monck; and I do not think on the whole that the experiment has proved a successful one. I do not think it was unsuccessful as far as the representatives of those new constituencies themselves were concerned, as they are well and ably represented by the gentlemen who now hold seats for the constituencies; and I hope that if am returned again to the next Parliament I shall meet those hon. members. But it is obvious that there is a great advantage in having counties elect men whom they know. Our municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts. We all know the process which happily goes on in western Ontario. A young man in a county commences his public life by being elected by the neighbors who know him to the Township Council. If he shows himself possessed of administrative ability, he is made a Reeve or Deputy Reeve of his county. He becomes a member of the County Council, and as experience increases, and his character and abilities become known, he is selected by his people as their representative in Parliament. It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose abilities they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two separate counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest; they do not meet together, and have no common feeling except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in the other. This tends towards the introduction and development to the American system of caucuses, by which wire-pullers take adventurers for their political ability only and not for any personal respect for them. So that as much as possible, from any point of view, it is advisable that counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased it should be by subdividing the counties into ridings."

The hon. gentleman's speech was commented on from this side of the House, and at a subsequent period of the debate, referring to this commentary, he read these words:

"I believe the House generally agrees with me that the county organizations should preserve as much as possible their municipality limits." So that I think I have proved clearly, not merely what was the principle that the hon. gentleman enunciated in 1872, but also the fact that it was generally accepted by the House, and that the hon. gentleman himself, in closing, so far as he was concerned, the debate, once again reiterated the principle. Now, Sir, what is the hon. gentleman's answer to all that? He says: "I think so still; I would not withdraw a word of it; those words express my opinion of to-day; but the whole state of things is altered because Mr. Mowat passed a Bill in the Ontario Legislature to readjust representation, and that was quite wrong; the Bill was a very bad one, it violated my principles and views; it was contrary to my opinions, which I still hold. He has not converted me to those opinions, and I hold them yet, but I am going to follow him; as he did wrong I shall do wrong too; as he violated the principle of county representation I shall violate it as well; as he inflicted upon this Province, so far as he could, these great evils, I will do all in my power to

complete the infliction, and as he has done in the Province I will also do in the Dominion, what I can to deprive the county organizations, in Ontario, of the advantage they now possess of affording a sufficient mode of elevating their young men by degrees from the municipal and township councils to the county councils, from the town councils to the county wardenship, and from the wardenship to a seat in Parliament, and say that Mr. Mowat has broken that system down so far as the Provincial Legislature is concerned, he has done a great wrong to Ontario, and I will complete it: I will destroy the last chance there is for keeping the representation of the country upon a sound principle, and I will violate a good principle because he has done it." Well, Sir, I will show you in the way I put it, how absurd this answer would be if it were true, how utterly preposterous it would be to assign as a reason for doing this thing that a wrong had been done by another legislator in another Legislature. There still remains, supposing it to be true, the principle of carrying out, with reference to this great Legislature, with reference to this more desired object, with reference to this higher object of aspiration than is stated in the Local Legislature, the full opportunity of carrying out the first principle. It is all with us. We have it here, it cannot be taken away from us. Are we to give it up? Are we to abandon it? Are we to go in a wrong path because in the Local Legislature it is said Mr. Mowat has so gone? The proposition is absurd; but the argument has another weakness, and that is that it is founded upon an utterly and entire misapprehension of the Bill to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. Well, an hon. gentleman suggests misrepresentation, and I will believe that the hon. gentleman had that argument put in his hands while he was speaking by somebody whom he had told that Mr. Mowat's Bill had done this, and that he used the argument in the heat of debate, not having read the Bill, for I cannot believe, if this were not the case, that he would have said what he did. Now, what were the changes made by the Act to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and which I read, I must confess, for the first time after the hon. gentleman's speech? In the first place, the representation of Ontario was settled by the hon. gentleman himself in the first instance, it was settled by the coalition government which passed Confederation, and it stood, if I rightly understand the question, wholly unchanged until the close of the year 1874—when the Act was passed, after the Census, to give additional members to the Province of Ontario. Now, the first change that took place, taking them by the order of the sections of the Bill, was that the municipal county of Huron was divided into three ridings instead of two. There was surely no departure from the principle of county municipal representation, there was simply a division of a riding, one of the largest in the Province, and most entitled by its increased population, as recognized by the hon. gentleman himself, to three representatives. The second change which took place was the abolition of the electoral district of Bothwell. The east division of Bothwell had been established by the hon. gentleman, it was one of the three electoral districts to which he referred in 1872 as having been unsuccessful experiments—not successful in the character of the men whom they had sent to represent them here, but unsuccessful experiments on the whole, and not to be repeated. So far from going on lines different from those of the hon. gentleman, it appears the Ontario Legislature proceeded on his lines, only they brought into action in this instance that about which he simply spoke. He declaimed against Bothwell, Cardwell and Monck as mistakes. He said: "Yes, they are such great mistakes that we will abolish Bothwell." For what purpose? For the purpose of applying in a new direction the principle of county representation. What was done? Bothwell is abolished; one of the three electoral districts, not identified particularly with counties, is abolished, and the municipal county of Lambton

Mr. BLAKE.

is divided into two ridings. So you find here by Mr. Mowat's Bill, in advance of the hon. gentleman's action, but in accordance with the hon. gentleman's professed principles, a restoration of the principle of the county municipal boundary as the true limit, and of the plan of dividing the largest counties into two or three ridings as the mode in which the representation should be applied. What followed? The county of Kent was divided into two ridings. Thus you find the second marked application of the same principle—Bothwell blotted out of the map, Kent and Lambton, the two municipal counties of which Bothwell was composed, actually divided into two ridings. You find that not merely in those changes which were necessary in order to add seats for the simple purpose of adding seats, but in the other modifications which were made. The Bill goes upon the lines of recognizing the importance of municipal county representation, and upon no other lines. The county of Essex was divided into two ridings. Once again, you find a municipal county having the largest population divided into two ridings, and the same principle of not making merely the electoral districts but of keeping the county united, and where it was too large, or was entitled to more representation, dividing it into ridings, exemplified by this Bill. The municipal county of Dufferin was provisionally established after many efforts had been made by the people in that neighborhood to attain what they thought was a boon to them. The counties from which it was cut off are counties of enormous size, and their county towns Mr. Mowat formed from the localities out of which Dufferin was formed, and upon the petitions of the localities interested the provisional municipal county of Dufferin was formed, and it was erected into a county upon proclamation after a vote of the people had been taken in each locality, if I rightly remember, affirming the view that those townships and municipalities which constituted Dufferin should be constituted into one municipal county. That municipal county so created, was given one of the additional seats. Once again, you find an emphatic and expressed recognition of the principle of municipal county representation. Dufferin was formed into municipal county and is given a member in the Local Legislature. Then, Sir, Dufferin municipal county was formed in part of Grey, Wellington and Simcoe, it comprised a part of the electoral district of Cardwell. Obviously the formation of that county of Dufferin, taking away a part of the electoral district of Cardwell, not very large in its population, rendered it necessary to add a township to Cardwell in order to make it proper that Cardwell should be continued as one electoral district; and if I recollect aright, a village was taken from South Simcoe, adjoining the townships in Cardwell and added to Cardwell, not altering the political complexion of the south riding of Simcoe, which was Conservative, as far as I remember a convenient mode of effecting what was a necessary readjustment. There was in this action no disregard of the principle of county representation; the only alternative that could have taken place would have been to abolish Cardwell. Supposing you were to continue Cardwell, it was essential to add one township, and that was what was done. Then the county of Grey was divided into three ridings. There was no alteration there of county bounds. The municipal county of Wellington as it existed after the creation of the municipal county of Dufferin was readjusted because its bounds were changed, its extent and area were changed by the formation of Dufferin. There, again, there was no departure from the principle of recognizing municipal county representation. The districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound, which I think had been formed into provisional judicial districts, but which had not received separate representation, received that representation, and some townships that had therefore been added to North Victoria,

but which were not part of the county of Victoria, which were a municipal part of Simcoe, but not an electoral part of Simcoe at that time, were transferred from North Victoria to the new provisional district and electoral district of Muskoka and Parry Sound. There was, again, no disruption of municipal ties. There was the recognition of the provisional judicial district as entitled to more than a township, not a township from the electoral district of Simcoe, but from the electoral district of North Victoria.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Those townships are still a municipal part of Victoria.

Mr. BLAKE. No; not as I understand it.

Mr. CAMERON. The warden of the county of Victoria is reeve of one of those townships at this moment.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not so understand it.

Mr. COCKBURN. The hon. member for North Victoria is correct; a portion of Muskoka is connected with the county of Victoria for municipal purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. However that may be, those were arrangements which were connected with northern and north-eastern townships, and if it be the case (which I have not been able to ascertain myself from a hurried perusal of the Bill) that certain townships were abstracted from Victoria and put in the new district, it is an exceptional case, and is by no means a justification of the proposition that the principle of the Bill is to abolish and abrogate municipal and county divisions, as the hon. member has said. East and West Peterboro' were readjusted, but as far as I can ascertain no change was made in the principle to which I have referred. Certain townships were taken from Lanark and added to South Renfrew; the same abstraction applies to Brockville, a township was added, but there is no change in the county and municipal bounds. Niagara is abolished, and Lincoln, of which Niagara is municipally a part, is constituted one electoral district as if one county. A general provision of the Bill says:

"Every village, township or place lying within the territorial limits of any electoral district, and not specifically included in other districts, by the Acts hereby amended or by this Act, shall be taken to be and be part of the electoral district in which it is so locally situated."

Thus you find that whether you regard the general provisions or the details of the Statute, the principle elucidated is the recognition of the municipal county divisions and the application of that principle by giving a member to every county and more than one to such counties as by their population are entitled to more members than one, in which case the division would be into ridings. No fair minded man can reflect on the Statute without deducing from it as its principle and underlying basis that view of representation to which I have referred; and therefore it is I maintain that the excuse of the leader of the Government, if it were true, that Ontario was cut up by that Act, is no excuse because it is accurate to say that the principle of this measure is non-recognition of the municipal and county bounds.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. The question to which my hon. friend from North Victoria referred, so far as it concerns the connection of certain townships of North Victoria with Muskoka, is occasioned by these townships being also conjoined to Muskoka in the Act of 1872. The same townships which, being to Victoria municipally, form a part of it electorally also formed part of that county electorally in the Province of Ontario. He says also that another change was made in that direction by the formation of the provisional and judicial county of Haliburton, including some portions of a

township formerly belonging to Peterboro', and the conjunction of these with the North Victoria. These are the only instances in regard to which the observation might be made that we have simply the fact that following the legislation here they attached the townships forming the provisional county with the north riding of Victoria with which they naturally belong. I repeat that on the whole it is utterly impossible to demonstrate by any fair process of reasoning that the Bill furnishes any ground—if its being analogous or based on the same principle would form a ground—for the present legislation. But I proceed to discuss the mode in which the county municipalities have been dealt with. I wish to analyse for a little what the results are of this great measure of equalization, because, mark you, this enormous disturbance of the political map of Ontario is founded on one proposition, that it is proper to equalize the voting population, that it is proper to arrange that there shall be the same number of persons entitled to return a member in one part of the country as shall be entitled to return a member in another part of the country. I wish to enquire how far the Bill as it is before us reaches that object, how far this can be said honestly to be a Bill having that in view, how far it can be justified disturbing as it is as a Bill accomplishing an approximate equalization of the population. Take the eastern district—the eastern third of the Province considered by the number of seats—take the eastern thirty-two seats, extending as far west as Durham and Victoria inclusive. It will be observed that, so far as representation goes, the eastern district comprises little more than one-third of the total number of seats to be allowed to Ontario by this Bill, the centre and west comprising sixty. Now, there are for that allotment of thirty-two, 519,674 souls, or an average of 18,550 to a member. The quota under the Act which gives an increase is 20,908, and, therefore, the eastern district, with its thirty-two seats, averages 2,358 per seat under the quota. The centre and west, with their 60 seats, have a population of 1,329,654, averaging 22,161 souls to a member, or 1,253 per seat over the quota. The difference between the eastern and centre and the west is no less than 3,611 per seat on the average. This is the condition of things with reference to the division *en bloc* between the east and the centre and west. To give the same power to the centre and west which is given to the east by this Bill, the centre and west should have more than 71 members instead of having only 60 as they have at present, and if you allowed to each member in the west and centre the 18,550, which is the average in the east, you would have 11 more in the centre and west, than you have by this Bill. I say that that brief statement of facts demonstrates that this measure is not defensible on the ground that it is a measure for equalizing the people, because it is a measure which does not give even an approximate political strength in proportion to the number of persons in each constituency. But while that is the general result in a large sense, I can exemplify it more strikingly by referring to some details which will show how utterly absurd is the ground taken that this is a measure of equalization. Take eight of the smaller constituencies: South Grenville with a population of 13,526, North Leeds 12,423—the latter having been actually reduced by about 500 souls from its previous population—Brockville 15,207, Frontenac 14,993, Kingston 14,091, West Peterboro' 13,310, Ottawa—with two seats—27,412; making a total of 110,962 souls, with eight seats, or an average of 13,870. In the same district is to be found Russell, with 25,000 souls or nearly double the population, Lennox with 16,314 souls, Addington 23,470, Frontenac 14,993; and consider if you please that a large portion of the territory and population of Addington belongs municipally to Frontenac. Take seven other small seats so as to get a larger

average: South Wentworth 15,599, as readjusted, Monck 15,940, which has been readjusted by being reduced, Peel 16,387, Cardwell 16,770, Lennox 16,314, East Hastings 17,315, West Hastings 17,400—total 115,665; to which add the population for the eight smallest seats and you will have a total of 226,627 for fifteen seats, or an average of 15,108 under this equalization Bill. Now, take eight of the largest constituencies: Kent 28,112, East Simcoe 27,185, South Wellington 26,618, East Elgin 26,303, North Perth 26,538, North Simcoe 26,120, North Huron 26,098, North Wellington 26,024, a total for the eight of 212,998, an average for the eight largest of 26,624 against an average in the eight smallest of 13,870. Proceeding, as I have already done, and taking the seven next highest constituencies, we find the following: West Bruce, 23,618; South Grey, 25,703; East Grey, 25,909; Russell, 25,802; South Oxford, 24,798; North Oxford, 24,390; East Middlesex, 24,552, or a total of 176,053, to which add the eight already quoted and you have an aggregate for the fifteen ridings of 389,050 as against 226,627 of the other fifteen, or an average of 25,936 each—almost 26,000 souls—against an average of 15,108 souls in the smallest townships. No less than 162,423 persons are left unrepresented in the fifteen large districts as compared with the fifteen smaller ones, and to give the same proportionate representation to the larger that you do to the smaller you will have to give them twenty-six members, and to give the same proportionate representation to the eight largest that you would to the eight smallest you would have to give them sixteen members. In fact, Sir, if you want to equalize, if you want a reality instead of a sham, you must proceed from one end of the Province to the other, taking off the smallest municipalities from the more populous ridings and adding them to the less populous ones without regard to anything else than this one consideration. If you did that you might accomplish one thing, though I believe it would be at a cost in excess of any value to be derived from it—the equalization of the population. But this measure does not accomplish that, it does not approach even an approximate equalization of the population in the constituencies. You adopt that plan by which in effect you can say and do say that whenever you can strengthen yourself or weaken your adversary, we must do a little equalization here; but it is elastic and where you find you can strengthen your own cause, or weaken that of the other side, there is not much difficulty found in even reducing already inadequate populations. Where it would reduce the strength of counties on the other side there is not much difficulty even in increasing superabundant populations. A very slight variation for the average is quite sufficient to present a cause of over-ruling necessity which obliges these hon. gentlemen to absorb county corporations and to make a new arrangement entirely regardless of them. There is a gross violation of county limits having as a result, upon the basis of the figures of the contest of 1878, the weakening of one party and the strengthening of the other. It is done in such a way, with such persistency, and with such a general result that it is impossible that any but the most prejudiced can come to any other conclusion than that it is the design, end and object of this measure. Now, Sir, in order to establish that proposition, I shall deal with a large number of the constituencies dealt with by the hon. gentleman in groups, as nearly as possible dealing with those that are interfered with in the same connection. It is not possible to do so always, because the interlacing is so varied and extensive. Not much change is made in the eastern district. It did not suit him to make it, and as I say, he has left great disparity as between East, Centre and West Ontario, as the figures I gave a moment ago established. But let us take a group in the east he does deal with, made up of North Lanark, South Lanark, Carleton, North Leeds, Grenville

Mr. BLAKE.

and Brockville. The population of North Lanark is 13,943, of South Lanark, 20,032—a total of 33,975; an average of 16,987 souls. As I have shown you, the average of the whole of the thirty-two eastern ridings, in the middle of which the Lanarks are, is 18,552. The average of the Lanarks is therefore only 1,565 below the general average. But there are eight seats in this eastern district, the average of which, as I have shown, is 13,870, or 2,608 below the average of the Lanarks. There is therefore no especial reason why the Lanarks should be changed in respect to county boundaries. An easy arrangement is capable of being made to avoid the disparity of population between the ridings. There is a tier of municipalities to the southward of North Lanark, by adding one or more of which to the south riding, you could equalize the populations of the two ridings without adding anything to Lanark or taking anything from it. Any hon. gentleman who will look at the map will see how that could be done. But Sir, look at North Leeds and Grenville and Brockville. These comprise 40,886 souls with three seats, or 13,828 on an average, which is to be reduced to 12,423. North Lanark was too small, but it was not so small as North Leeds is to be. It had to be made larger, but it could not be made larger by taking a township from my hon. friend who sits smiling at me there, but by cutting a piece from Carleton, and South Lanark is to be readjusted by taking a piece from some other place, so a portion is taken from South Leeds to add to it, thus reducing the population of that riding down to 12,423. Yet South Grenville is left at 13,256. Brockville will be 13,000. But his feelings overcame him when he thought of Lanark, and he felt that a crying wrong had to be remedied. And how did he remedy it? He takes two townships out of the county of Carleton in North Lanark. Carleton, as we all know, is a strong Tory county, though my hon. friend had another hard time of it to secure his election there on the last occasion.

Mr. ROCHESTER. No, no.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I think it was close enough. The hon. gentleman says he does not mind losing a township or two, he is quite indifferent, and that is one of the cases in which the Tories have weakened themselves, but it does not do them any harm.

Mr. ROCHESTER. We wanted to equalize the number.

Mr. BLAKE. We all know just where the hon. gentleman is desirous of equalising the number. He is quite ready to make a change where the Reformers can be hurt, but elsewhere the numbers are to be left where they are. Now Lanark was too small. It did not have enough of population to adjust it within its own bounds, and so two townships had to be added from Carleton. But that made Lanark too large, and so having added on something to the north riding, something has got to be off the south riding. By a piece of ill-luck or misfortune, which I am sure my hon. friend for the south riding (Mr. Haggart) deeply deploras, it became absolutely necessary, in pursuing this policy of absolute justice which is the leading idea of this Bill, to take from it the village of Smith's Falls, which polled a majority of ninety-seven votes against the hon. gentleman. I am sorry for my hon. friend that such cutting and carving up of the south riding of Lanark was necessary, and that his political strength should have been impaired by the loss of a municipality which, in 1878, polled against him a majority of ninety-seven Reform votes. The village of Smith's Falls is added to the little riding of North Leeds. I do not think North Leeds would have been very much too large if Smith's Falls had been left on, but that would not do. That little addition of a couple of thousand souls would not answer, and so the township of Kittley is taken off North Leeds and added to Brockville. We all see what

this little game is designed for. It is not equalization, but it is a disturbing of the county boundaries in order, as the hon. gentleman hopes, to weaken the Reformers in North Lanark, to strengthen himself in South Lanark, to have North Leeds and Grenville safe, and to weaken Brockville. And this, while Lennox is left with a population of but 16,314, and Addington with a population of 23,470, which is taken in a large measure from the municipal county of Frontenac, comprising only 14,993, while West Peterboro' is left with 13,310. In the whole eastern district there is an average of 18,523, or between three and four thousand souls less than the average for the centre and western districts. But there was not much change made in the eastern district. The hon. gentleman thought that changes in that district would not bear much political fruit, and so he leaves this collection of the smallest constituencies in the province untouched, except to reduce one of them and increase another a little. He passes by these smaller constituencies and goes on to Centre and Western Ontario, where he makes his great changes. Take the map, and look at North and South Ontario, Muskoka, North, East and West York, North and South Simcoe. What is the state of things there as it stands? The county of Ontario, south riding, has a population of 20,708; the north riding has a population of 28,434,—a total of 49,142; or an average for the two of 24,521. I have shown to you already that the average for the whole sixty constituencies in Centre and Western Ontario is 22,161, so that the average for the two Ontarios would be but 2,411 above that average. The population of those two counties is perfectly capable of adjustment within their own municipal bounds, with the result of giving to each riding a population of 24,500 souls. As to the Yorks, there are at present three ridings,—the east riding with a population of 23,312, North York with a population of 24,502, and West York with 18,804 souls, an aggregate of 66,618, or an average of 22,206 for each riding. The quota is but 20,904, so that these three counties are but 1,296 each above the average quota. The average for the central and western districts is 22,161, so that the average for the Yorks is but 40 above the average of those groups of constituencies, and they can be easily adjusted within their bounds, adjoining as they do, a large number of municipalities which want readjustment most. The west riding of York, with a population of only 18,804, is left untouched, because the hon. gentleman thinks he has a strong cause there, and he wants some change in the other riding to effect his purpose. Take the Simcoes, the south riding, with a population of 26,891, and the north riding with 49,238, or a total of 79,129, and an average for three seats of 25,376. This number is above the general average for the sixty constituencies by 3,215, but the county is easily capable of readjustment within its own bounds. That municipal population to which I have referred, would of course be diminished, if, as is right, a member were given to the municipal county of Dufferin, part of whose municipal bounds are within the bounds of the district of South Simcoe, and if an additional portion were taken, as would necessarily follow upon giving a member to Dufferin in the readjustment of Cardwell. So that, now while that is the state of things as it is, what are the actual results of the proposed change? There is the new riding of West Ontario, with a population of 19,730, and the riding of South Ontario, which would have 20,241 as against 20,348. The riding of South Ontario has 20,241, against 20,348, or 107 less in population than it is now; North Ontario has 20,828, instead of 28,434; Muskoka is cut down to 17,646 from 27,204; East York is 22,853, against the present population of 23,312; West York, the most defective in point of population of all, is left where it was; North York is 21,730, against 24,502 at present; South Simcoe is 22,721, against 26,981; North Simcoe is 26,120, and East Simcoe,

27,185; and such revolutionary changes have been made in order to accomplish the equalization at the very spot where the equalizing process should go on most freely. You find one of the Yorks left where it is, a new riding made up of 19,730, another reduced to 17,646, and you find two new ridings, one with 26,120 and another with 27,185, all in the same batch. Now, to accomplish these admirable results in the process of equalizing the population, what has been done? The municipal bounds have been violated and the electoral bounds changed thus: West Ontario is made up of Whitechurch, taken from North York, Newmarket from North York, Stouffville partly from North York and partly from East York, Pickering from South Ontario, Uxbridge from North Ontario, and Uxbridge Village from North Ontario, being made up of parts of two counties and parts of four ridings—that is the mongrel constituency of West Ontario. The south riding of Ontario is changed by adding the township of Pickering to West Ontario, by taking Reach from North Ontario and by taking Port Perry from North Ontario; and North Ontario is changed by adding Port Perry and Reach to South Ontario, by adding Uxbridge and Uxbridge Village to West Ontario, and by taking Oakley, Macaulay, Morrison, Ryde, Maclean and Bracebridge from Muskoka, and leaving Seugog Island, whose electors will have to travel seven miles through South Ontario to reach their own division. East Simcoe is made up of seven municipalities, from North Simcoe, which would give it a wholly adequate population, as I shall show presently; but that would not do for the hon. gentleman in his equalizing process, and so he takes five Reform municipalities from Muskoka, including Wood, Monck, Gravenhurst and Medora, with the result of producing a very great inequality in the populations. The south riding of Simcoe has transferred Bradford and West Gwillimbury to North York, and the old north riding of Simcoe has transferred seven municipalities to East Simcoe; the north riding of York has transferred Newmarket, Stouffville and Whitechurch to West Ontario, and has added West Gwillimbury and Bradford from South Simcoe; and East York has transferred Stouffville to West Ontario. Thus you find changes in the municipal bounds and in the electoral bounds, the whole face of that country changed to accomplish these results. Now, as I said, the east riding of Simcoe which has had an adequate population without having added to it from Muskoka the five townships I have mentioned; without this addition, the population of East Simcoe would have been 23,118, or in excess of equity, and in excess of the average of those constituencies in which it is placed; but in order to give the Grits, the 180 majority in these townships had to go, and so they are transferred to East Simcoe, which is raised from 23,118 to 27,185, the county bounds are broken, and Muskoka is lowered to 17,646. Seven townships are also taken from Muskoka and added to North Ontario. Now, what is the political effect of this transaction, taking for convenience sake, the figures of 1878? In South Ontario the hon. gentleman hopes to weaken the Reform interest by 198 votes; in North Ontario by 260 votes; in Muskoka by 163 votes; in East York by 42 votes; in North York by 184 votes; in North Simcoe he hopes to get a Tory majority of 287, and so weaken the Reform interest by 237 votes. In East Simcoe he puts together twelve municipalities from North Simcoe and Muskoka, of which eleven had a Reform majority and one a tie, giving a Reform majority of 558; and in West Ontario, he puts together six Reform municipalities, giving a majority of 583; the general result being to give to the Reformers great majorities in two ridings, and to weaken them, according to the hon. gentleman's expectation, in six ridings. The third group of counties to which I shall refer is composed of Lincoln, Niagara, Monck, South Wentworth, North Wentworth, South Brant, North Brant and Haldimand. The present population of Lincoln is 22,963,

and the population of Niagara is 3,445, making an aggregate of 26,408 in the old municipal county of Lincoln, apart from certain parts of Lincoln which had previously been taken away, or 4,247 above the average of the sixty constituencies, equal to a very large number that are left and smaller in population than several that are left. But it was necessary to add another township to Monck, which had a population of 17,145 before the equalizers put their hands upon it. North Wentworth has a population of 15,998, and South Wentworth 14,993, or a total of 30,991, being an average of 15,495, being higher by 1,631 than the average of eight of the smallest ridings to which I have referred as left by this scheme, within 435 of the population of readjusted Monck, and over 300 beyond the average of fifteen of the smallest ridings which are left by the equalizers. The south riding of Brant comprises 21,975 and the north riding 11,894, or a total of 33,869, giving an average of 16,934, or higher than some eighteen or twenty constituencies which are left untouched. Haldimand has a population of 18,619 as it stands. Now, what are the results of the change? Lincoln and Niagara are made 23,400, instead of 22,963, Monck is reduced from 17,145 to 15,940, the north riding of Wentworth is changed from 15,998, to 20,406, the south riding of Wentworth is increased from 14,993 to—what? Why, to 15,539, and there is where the equalizers have left it. The south riding of Brant is changed from 21,975 to 20,482; the north riding of Brant is changed from 11,894 to 17,645; and Haldimand, which is below the average, numbering 18,619, is still further reduced to 17,660. So that those who were so anxious to equalize Haldimand and Monck and to get them upon the standard of 1872, have now found it their duty in the pursuit of the same phantom, to reduce Monck below what it was in 1872, and to reduce Haldimand as well. They must be equalized even at the expense of a general equalization. Now, to accomplish that result, municipally and electorally, they proceeded thus: Grimsby town and village have been withdrawn from Lincoln and added to the south riding of Wentworth; Barton township, belonging to the county of Lincoln, municipally and electorally, to the district of Monck, has been added to South Wentworth and withdrawn from Monck. The hon. gentleman who represents Monck I am sure will have regretted the abstraction of the Reform township of Caistor from that riding. He contended very earnestly, when it was proposed to add the Tory township of Dunn in 1872, that he thought he was quite as competent to represent those extra thousands as any other man, and he wanted them added and it was all right. But he does not seem to feel himself as competent to represent those thousands of souls in Caistor which has been taken from Monck, while Cayuga was taken from Haldimand and added to Monck. The figures for Monck are 15,240; so you have two changes in Monck—the abstraction of Caistor and the addition of Cayuga. From South Wentworth the township of Ancaster is withdrawn and added to North Brant; the township of Caistor, municipally belonging to Lincoln and electorally to Monck, is handed over to South Wentworth; Gainsborough township and village are taken from Lincoln and added to Monck. From South Brant the townships of Burford and Oakland are taken away and added to South Oxford; Paris and Onondaga are transferred from North to South Brant. First of all, they add to the weaker riding of North Brant, to the South, the stronger riding, two portions of the weaker; then they take away from the stronger two of its townships and add them to another county. The north riding of Brant is too small, and so Paris and Onondaga are taken away from it. But to make up for that abstraction Blenheim is taken from the north riding of Oxford and added to North Brant, and Ancaster is taken from Wentworth and added to North Brant; and the constituencies formed from two townships,

Mr. BLAKE.

one from North Brant and one from South Oxford, are forty to forty-eight miles long and forty-four to forty-five miles broad. Haldimand, as I have said already, which is considerably below the quota, is equalized by being reduced nearly one thousand. What is the purpose effected by this business of equalization? Lincoln and Niagara are consolidated; but then Grimsby village, with six of a Tory majority, is withdrawn; and Grimsby township, with sixty-four of a Reform majority, is withdrawn; and Niagara, with two of a Tory majority, is added, making a net result of weakening the Reformers by 62 votes. From Monck they have taken Caistor, which had a Reform majority of 34 and Cayuga is added to it, making a net Reform majority of 32. From South Wentworth a township has been withdrawn and added to North Brant. From South Wentworth, Ancaster has been withdrawn and Grimsby and Caistor added, weakening the Reform majority by 177. To North Wentworth, the Tory township of Nelson has been added, which gave a Tory majority of 73, and also Burlington village, with 13 of a Tory majority, thus weakening the Reformers by 86 votes. As regards South Brant, Onondaga, which has been added, gave a Tory majority of 40, and these with the votes from the other new additions weaken the Reformers by 241 votes. All those results cannot be accomplished without hiving the Grits somewhere, and one place where they have hived them largely, is North Brant, a riding in which, on a poll of 700, we had a majority of 191 and which was perfectly safe for us. But by the additions made where they did not do any good to us, the Reform majority is increased to the handsome figure of 723. The result is that our majority is increased in a constituency which was perfectly safe, while we are attempted to be weakened in five ridings in this group. The next group to which I will refer is that of North and South Norfolk, North and South Oxford, and North and South Perth. The population of North Norfolk comprises 17,219 souls, and South Norfolk, 16,734, and an average of 16,846. There are then 18 or 20 ridings which are left by this scheme very nearly equally divided as the constituencies now stand. South Oxford comprises 24,732 and North Oxford 25,361, giving an average of 25,046. South Perth has 20,778 souls and North Perth 34,207, or an average of 27,492, a very fair average, but not so large as some of the constituencies created and some altered by this scheme. It was easy, if desired, to take 13,000 from South Perth and make a new constituency without disturbing anything. It would have been better to divide the county equally. What are the actual results of the changes in the population? Old North Norfolk had 17,219 of a population as against the new population of 20,293. Old South Norfolk had a population of 16,294 against the new of 19,039. South Oxford was too large before, having a population of 24,732, so it is equalized by being increased to 24,778. North Oxford had 25,361, which is reduced to 24,390. South Perth, old population, 20,778; increased to 21,608. North Perth had 34,207, and has now less than 26,538. So the equalizers did not get perfectly equalized in this division, when you find the south riding with 21,608 and the north riding with 26,538, under this process of equalization. To accomplish this result, what changes have taken place in the municipal and electoral bounds? South Easthope has been withdrawn from Perth and added to North Oxford, and Osborne is taken from South Huron and added to South Perth. From the north riding, Easthope is withdrawn and Wallace is added to North Wellington and Palmerston is withdrawn and added to North Wellington, so North Perth contributes to two different constituencies. As to North Oxford, North Easthope is taken from North Perth and added to North Oxford, and South Easthope is taken from South Perth and added to North Oxford. Blenheim is

withdrawn and added to North Brant; so the Oxfords bled in the north riding in those ways. From South Oxford, Durham is withdrawn and added to North Oxford, and Tilsonburg is withdrawn and added to North Norfolk. Burford has to be taken from South Brant and also Oakland and added to South Oxford. What is the political effect of these transactions? To the north riding of Norfolk a Tory majority of 46 is added by the attachment of Tilsonburg, 56 being added by the township of Durham, giving a total Tory majority of 94, and weakening the total Reform vote by 8. The real object to be attained was to do my hon. friend from North Norfolk little hurt, but to make South Norfolk safe to the Government. So it was necessary to take a Tory municipality from the north riding and add it to the south riding, to make him feel a little more comfortable, and Simcoe was taken from the north riding with a Tory majority of 94, and added to the south riding, thus rendering necessary serious additions to the north riding of Norfolk. The sole reason why any change was made in the north, is that my hon. friend from the south riding may be strengthened. The hon. gentleman having taken something from the north had to add something to it from some other constituency to make things square. From the south riding of Perth, South Osborne is withdrawn and Logan was added. But Logan was afterwards taken away, and the net result is that the Reformers are weakened by 195, according to the return of 1878 in that south riding, and in the north riding of Perth the Reformers are weakened 205. But I admit we are strengthened in two constituencies of this group. In the south riding of Oxford, where in 1878 we had a majority of 361, the hon. gentleman has been thoughtful enough to strengthen the Reform majority by 327 votes by taking away some of the Tory municipalities which he wanted, making a total majority in our interest of 680 votes. He is generous to us when we are perfectly safe. He adds strength, but he adds it by some portion of his own supporters and putting them where they will do most good. So with reference to the north riding of Oxford. It is well known that there is a small Reform majority in that riding. In the last contest that majority summed up 903, but the hon. gentleman must add to it by the changes he has made, 262, making a Reform majority of 1,165 in the north riding of Oxford. The result of the hon. gentleman's various efforts in search of justice and equality in these six ridings is that he weakens the Reform interests in four and strengthens it in two, where this strength is wholly useless, because it was utterly impossible, as things stood, for any of his friends to have the slightest chance. I will now deal with the Wellingtons and Halton. The present condition of the Wellingtons is that South Wellington has a population of 25,400; Centre Wellington, 22,265; North Wellington, 25,780, making a total of 73,445, or an average of 24,461, not seriously above the average of the 60 constituencies I have mentioned. Halton has a present population of 21,919, while the quota is 20,908, and the average of the 60 counties, 20,161. What has been accomplished in South Wellington? The old population was 25,400, the new riding is 20,270. Centre Wellington has now a population of 26,818, as against the old figure, 22,265; and North Wellington, whose population was 25,780, is now reduced to 26,024, or a total of 73,019, being a total change of only 326 souls in the three ridings, but with the result, in their distribution, of producing slightly greater inequalities among the three than exists at present. Halton, which had a population of 21,119, or 200 over the quota, has been moved up to 22,632 by the change, and to do that the municipal boundaries have been changed.

Mr. POPE. It is not true.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, it is according to the figures as I read them. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity

of making any correction. I know that the hon. gentleman has these figures at his fingers' ends, for he had a great deal to do with them, being sort of sub-counsel to one or two other persons in manipulating the constituencies of Ontario. What has been done to accomplish these results? The township of Erin is withdrawn from South Wellington and annexed to Halton in order to make South Wellington below the quota and unequal to the other constituencies of Wellington. It is not added to the constituency which it adjoins, and which it would raise up to something near the quota, but it is added where it will do no harm by swelling the Reform majority already arranged for in Halton. Maryborough is transferred from the north to the centre riding of Wellington, part of Shelburne village to East Grey, and Wallace is transferred from North Perth to the north riding of Wellington; also a part of Palmerston. Halton, which comprised a population as near the average as one can hope to get, is mutilated by the abstraction from one corner of the township of Nelson and the village of Burlington, in order to weaken the Reformers in Wentworth, and by the addition to another corner of the township of Erin taken from the south riding of Wellington. What are the political results? In the south riding of Wentworth the Reformers are weakened by 220 votes, in the centre riding by 36, and in the north riding by 48. Halton, already a Reform riding, is made more so by the withdrawal of Nelson and Burlington to gerrymander North Wentworth, and Erin is now added to Halton from South Wellington, in order to make the gerrymandering complete, so that the Reform majority is made 300 in the county of Halton. The general result is that the Reformers are weakened in the three ridings, and strengthened in the county of Halton. Let me deal with the case of the Middlesexes and London. Their present population is:

North Middlesex	21,239
East do	30,600
West do	21,496
London	19,746
Total	93,081

This comprises the whole municipal county of Middlesex with its city. East Middlesex comprises the town of London East and the village of South London as suburbs of Middlesex, and East Middlesex is the constituency in which there is the greatest equality. The average for these four districts would be 23,270, a sum hardly in excess of the average to which I have referred. The average of Centre and West Wellington could be easily adjusted by the addition which was suggested on the first reading of the Bill by the First Minister himself, by the addition of one of the suburbs of London to London, and its withdrawal from East Middlesex; and the three ridings of Middlesex would be represented in accordance with their population, and with a full, fair and unusual degree of equality of numbers as between themselves. But what has been done? North Middlesex of which the old population was 21,239, has a new population of 19,540. East Middlesex has its old population of 30,600 reduced to 24,552. West Middlesex whose former population was 21,496, has now but 19,491, and South Middlesex is given 18,889. London is left as it is. This gives an average of 20,423 to the five ridings as against an average of 23,270 to the four ridings according to the present numbers and distribution, and all this although West Middlesex and North Middlesex are made a little further from the quota than they were before the readjustment. Still South Middlesex, the new riding, is furthest removed from the quota. Now, to accomplish these changes in North Middlesex, Lobo is transferred to South Middlesex and Adelaide to West Middlesex. Stephen is transferred from the county of Huron

and added to North Middlesex; Westminster is taken from East Middlesex and transferred to South Middlesex; South Dorchester is taken from Elgin and added to East Middlesex; Delaware is transferred from West Middlesex to South Middlesex, and Caradoc is transferred to South Middlesex; Euphrasia is taken from Bothwell and added to West Middlesex; Westminster is transferred from East Middlesex, Lobo is taken from North Middlesex, Caradoc from West Middlesex and Delaware from West Middlesex, and all are added to South Middlesex. I need not tell you that South Middlesex is the new county, and you will have already learned from the experience you have derived in the history of this Bill that these four townships are four Reform townships. The political results of these results are that the hon. member for North Middlesex, who got in by eight votes—

Mr. McCALLUM. You did not get in by that many.

Mr. BLAKE. I got in by acclamation this time, but I do not think the member for Monck, of all hon. members in this House, is a man to twit persons about small majorities. I congratulate the hon. member that there is one advantage in a small majority. His majority last time was twenty-eight. Not very serious changes have been made, but they have been big enough to more than double the majority. He has taken care of it; he dislikes a small majority; he knows the trouble, and he takes care of the mammon of unrighteousness. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Middlesex did not feel happy, and the leader of the Government did not feel happy about the north riding, and so he equalizes things by turning 8 into 271, or thereabouts, to weaken the Reform party. East Middlesex was a fighting riding. I think the hon. member got in by eighty-six votes, and the riding was a condition which the hon. gentleman knew was precarious. Well, it is adjusted. It is well known what the strength of the Reformers was in East Middlesex; there the township of Westminster was their main strength, but it is taken away, and they have added a little township from Elgin and they have made a Reform weakening in East Middlesex, according to the vote of 1878, of 232. The west riding of Middlesex,—of course it is impossible to make a tremendous weakening everywhere, and where they could not hit a man very hard they hit him as hard as they could—my hon. friend who had a majority of forty-eight is weakened by eight votes. The south riding of Middlesex, as was the natural outcome of these magnificent changes, is composed of the Reform municipality of Westminster with a majority of 258; of Lobo, with a majority of 251; of Caradoc, with a majority of 61; and Delaware, with a majority of 12, giving an aggregate majority of 581. In fact the Grits are hived in order to strengthen the hon. gentleman in the three other ridings. That is the result of the change. Take next Kent and Essex, Lambton, Bothwell and the Elgins. The present condition of these is as follows: the electoral district of Kent has a population of 36,626, that of Lambton, 42,616, and Bothwell, 27,102, making an aggregate of the municipalities of Kent and Lambton of 106,344. Essex has a population of 46,962; the electoral district of Lambton has a population of 42,616, giving an average of 21,308, or almost literally the quota. Electoral Kent has a population of 36,626, which, if you take from electoral Bothwell part of the old county of Kent, about 5,500 souls, and add them to Kent, you get 42,000, giving an average of 21,000 odd, and leaving electoral Bothwell about 21,000, thus making, by dividing electoral Lambton, and by restoring to Kent a portion of the townships in excess in Bothwell, a division natural, convenient, disturbing hardly at all the existing state of things there. Essex has, as I said, a population of 46,692, which would give an average of 23,346, in excess of the quota, it is true—considerably in excess, but not so much in excess of the quota that an equalizer ought to hesitate about leaving Essex as it is;

Mr. BLAKE.

and the equalizer did not hesitate because it was a little too large, but he hesitated on the other side. He was like the Irishman whose wall was more than plumb, because, although Essex is in excess, the hon. gentleman equalizes it by taking a township from Kent and adding it to Essex. Then, Elgin is comprised of 28,147 souls in the east riding and 14,214 in the west riding, a total of 42,391, with an average of 21,195, as near as possible correct, requiring only the subtraction of St. Thomas from the east riding, and its addition to the west riding to make the numbers, as between these, as nearly accurate as you could hope for, which would leave East Elgin 19,780 and West Elgin 22,581. Was it possible to adjust these two ridings within the municipal bounds to give to the old county of Elgin the two representatives within its own municipal bounds, to which it is entitled by all considerations which can possibly be brought to bear upon that question of population? Well, now, what is done? Electoral Lambton is divided into two, as I suggested would be right, West Lambton having 20,917 and East Lambton 21,975. Instead of subtracting a portion of old Kent from Bothwell and adding it to Kent, thus creating the equal constituencies, Kent has taken from it only a small portion of its 36,000 souls, and has left no less than 28,112 by the equalizers, and Bothwell is reduced from 37,102 to 22,497. East Elgin, too large already, having a surplus probably to be applied to an increase of West Elgin and to readjusting the county within its bounds, is made from 28,147 to 26,303. It is not brought down to the proper point as it would have been brought down by a transfer. West Elgin has 14,214, and the Essexes about equally divided, with the addition of a township from Kent, making them 23,176 for the north riding, and 23,786 for the south riding, by virtue of the addition of the township of Romney, in the county of Kent. Now, to accomplish this result, what has been done? Romney has been taken off from Kent and added to South Essex. The hon. member who now represents the whole county of Essex said the other day that he objected very much to that, but I understand that the hon. member is going to stand for North Essex, which he does not affect particularly; but what he objected to was the addition to the south riding of a township which gives a small Reform majority, which would no doubt add to our strength in the south riding of Essex where we have a majority, but which would do a good turn to the hon. member under the new arrangement. So it was hardly brotherly on the part of the hon. member for Essex to object to a transaction which would relieve the hon. member for Kent a little without doing anybody any great harm, since the Reformers could carry South Essex any way. Then Bothwell, Chatham, Wallaceburg, are added to Kent; instead of restoring some of the surplus Kent townships to Bothwell, thus making two divisions, they take from Kent, Chatham and Wallaceburg, and add them on to Bothwell. Having taken some from one side they have to take off from the other side. They took off Orford, Howard and Ridgetown are taken off Bothwell and added to West Elgin and Euphemia is taken off and added to West Middlesex. In South Essex, Romney is added from Kent, Port Stanley is transferred to the east riding. In East Elgin, part of Port Stanley is transferred from West Elgin and South Dorchester is taken away and added to South Middlesex. How would it stand according to the vote of 1878? In Kent, according to that vote, there remains after all that has been done, 375 majority; and the hon. gentleman, I suppose, thought the county was quite safe with that majority, and he would spread the overplus among other places where it would do the most good and still leave the hon. gentleman safe—not so safe but that the hon. gentleman is anxious to get Romney transferred to his county; but the result is that there is a Tory accession of 154 where there was a majority of 375; but in Bothwell there has been a net Reform weakening of 473, and in West Elgin, a constituency of

small proportions, where the majority in 1878 was 108, and which by consequence was perfectly safe, the Reform strength is increased by 355, making its strength now 463. It is made safe for the hon. gentleman, but it was safe before. Objection was made not so much with respect to the charge as it affected West Elgin but as to its effect on other constituencies. In East Elgin the Reformers are deprived of 41 votes, and the Reform strength in other constituencies are also reduced. Next we come to the counties of Huron, Bruce and Grey. Huron it will be remembered was the scene of the attempt at gerrymandering in 1872.

Mr. PLUMB. In 1874.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman had pronounced his final oration and was not about to take part in the business of the House for some time to come, but he is a lively corpse. Why, we must have an Irish wake over him, and after the appeal he made to the hon. leader of the House he will expect an answer with usury and that he will not only obtain a certificate of good character for which he has humbly implored, but that will use his influence with his supporters in the various ridings which he thinks he has made safe by this Bill to give the hon. gentleman a safe county, so that he may come back and interrupt us once again. It appears that this was not, after all, a final oration, but as an hon. gentleman behind me says it was an apotheosis, it was not an absolute political death, but a transition to a serener upper air to be heard still in the politics of the country, in a Chamber where, perhaps, his speeches will be as much appreciated as they have been here. Huron, I say, was the scene of the gerrymandering in 1872. The hon. leader of the Government has found that the hon. member for the south riding of Huron is a hard man to beat, and so he has to gerrymander the Hurons again in order to do the business. The county which was cut and carved ten years ago is to be cut and carved again, and not content with that, portions have to be abstracted and put outside the bounds. The present population of South Huron is 23,393; Centre Huron, 26,474; North Huron, 27,103; or an aggregate of 76,970, giving an average of 25,656. In Bruce there are but two members for the county. The south riding has a population of 39,803, and the west riding, 24,971, giving an aggregate of 64,774, or an average for three members of 21,591, or slightly over the quota. South Grey has a population of 21,127; East Grey, 29,688; West Grey, 23,334; or an aggregate of 74,149, giving an average of 24,716. The readjustment boundaries of Bruce and Grey are not touched, but Huron must suffer though there is no appreciable difference in population. What is the proposed population? The old population of South Huron was 23,393, of the new, 23,042. The old population of Centre Huron was 26,474, of the new riding, 19,808. The population of old North Huron was 27,013, and of the new, 26,098. There is a greater proposed inequality than exists to-day. North Bruce has now a population of 24,871, and it is reduced to 17,335. The west riding will have 25,618, and the south riding, 21,502. Here is one of the most gross and flagrant departures from the professed principle of equalization that exists in the whole Bill. By leaving in the north riding the township of Saugeen and including Port Elgin, 13,490 will be added to its population, making it 20,825; North Bruce would be 22,128, South Bruce 21,502, or as nearly equal as they may be. You could make them more nearly equal than is done by the Bill by dividing the present south riding into two, and allowing the north riding to remain as it is. They however take Saugeen and Port Elgin from the north riding, not to equalize the population, but to make the north riding safe for the Conservatives. The population of South Grey, under the old arrangement, was 21,127—new, 25,703; North Grey, old, 23,314—new,

23,334; East Grey, old, 29,668—new, 25,909, the change being that Artemesia is taken from the east and added to the south riding. There is no change, as I have stated before, in the bounds of Bruce and Grey, but in Huron—the scene of a former exhibition of carving and cutting—changes are made. Goderich town and Colborne are added to South Huron. From the centre, Stephen is removed to North Middlesex; Osborne is removed to South Perth. The townships in which Exeter is situate are not taken away, but Exeter is taken from the centre and added to the south. My hon. friend from the south riding (Mr. Cameron) is made a present of Exeter because it gives a Tory majority of 116; they go away, but the township in which Exeter is situate could not be spared. The centre riding of Huron has part of Brussels transferred from the north, Colborne and Goderich transferred from the south; and the north riding has part of Brussels from the centre, and part of Lucknow is added to the new riding of West Bruce. Now, what are the political results? The hon. gentleman had “hived the Grits” pretty well in 1872 so far as South Huron was concerned—he had made it as strong as he could, I do not say as strong as he decently could—but he has found that these Grits have swarmed and the hon. gentleman has to make fresh arrangements for hiving. The majority of 362 in 1878 is to be increased by thirty-six of a majority in Centre Huron, giving a Reform majority of 446. I need hardly tell you that the abstraction of these Reform townships from the county was not in order to increase the Reform strength in one place, but to weaken the Reform strength in another place. I do not suppose the most audacious or the coolest of the individuals who discuss this subject will venture to deny that. Then as to the south, there is a net Reform weakening of 163. My hon. friend's majority at the last election in a constituency already gerrymandered was 163, and the hon. gentleman has framed his Bill so judiciously that he has just taken away his majority.

Mr. CAMERON. They cannot do it very well.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, they took away the old majority, but my hon. friend has made a new one since. They say it is so far right as it stands in the south and north that even that is not enough, and that mayhap if the delegations from these ridings, of which I have received advice to-day, succeed in their persuasive efforts he may make further changes. They say: “You have not done your work well enough. You have done enough to create all the odium, to excite all the indignation, to do all the mischief you can to yourself, but you have not done enough to produce the political results which you want to produce,” and he may be told: “If you rob take possession, if you kill take the plunder of the man you kill. Do something more; you may as well be hung for a sheep as for a lamb, particularly when you will not get the lamb; and you may, perhaps, have a chance of getting the sheep.” So in South Huron, my hon. friend's majority of 78 is cleaned out, and the member for North Huron is trying to take a little better care of himself and that portion of Lucknow which belonged to his riding, but of which he is not very fond and which gives a Reform majority of 39, is put to another riding, and a portion of Brussels which gives a Reform majority of 3 is also removed, so that the Reformers are weakened in that riding to the tune of 42. But they are going to carry that riding notwithstanding their loss of 42 votes. So that so far as the Hurons are concerned, judicious arrangements have been made to put as many Reformers as possible where they will not be available for electoral purposes, and to weaken them as far as possible in other ridings. In North Bruce it was not enough to detach the township of Bruce with 319 Reform majority from the north riding. Although this would have left an apparent Tory majority of 163, yet they were afraid to face my hon. friend with even that majority on the

figures for 1878. This would have left the riding with the proper population. It would have left a population nearly equal, it would have done that part of the business correctly and would have given them a majority of 163. But no, say these valiant and chivalrous gentlemen, we will cut down the population of Bruce to 17,300 and we will raise up the population of the adjoining riding to 25,000. Was this done in order to equalize? No, of course not. That is not equalizing; that is creating inequalities of the most shameless character and in the most wanton manner. No, not wanton for a purpose—for the purpose of taking away another large Reform town and township which gave a Reform majority in North Bruce; and this is done by creating inequality absolute and relative, an inequality by cutting North Bruce down, by putting the other riding away up; by making about 7,000 difference in the populations; and in their endeavors to destroy the Reform interests in North Bruce they have weakened the Reformers by 493 votes. Then the difference between these two ridings, Sir, the product of the hon. gentleman's equalizing business, is about 8,000 souls. In West Bruce are concentrated eleven municipalities with nearly 26,000 souls, Reform majorities of 1,086, less Tory majorities of 130, leaving a net majority of 956; taking almost the whole Reform strength out of two ridings; taking a portion of the Reform strength out of North Huron and creating a Reform riding with a majority of 1,000, with an unnecessarily and unduly large population in the centre of these two ridings—equalizing again to give the Grits and get Tory constituencies around them. In South Bruce four townships are taken off to form a new riding, giving 461 of a Reform majority in the last contest; and the Reform interest in South Bruce as it stood before is weakened to that extent and by that amount. In Grey Reformers are weakened by adding from East and South Grey the township of Artemesia with a Tory majority of 153. And they may say: "We have helped you in East Grey." Well, Sir, it is just the way they like to help us. The majority was 531 in that constituency, and, of course, they could afford to take off 153, the majority in Artemesia, leaving them 378, so my hon. friend need not be so much alarmed, although Artemesia does go over to cook the goose of his brother practitioner, as he stands for the south riding.

Mr. SPROULE. All right.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope he is all right, notwithstanding the machinations of this Bill. Now, Sir, the general result is this: In these last groups, whereas there were before eight seats, there are now nine, and the Reformers are weakened in five of those seats, and strengthened in the centre riding of Huron, where they were strong enough before. Now, I have shown by these statements of details and which follow irresistibly the conclusions which I state to you, the result as designed by hon. gentlemen opposite of this measure. I have shown, with reference to the municipal counties, enormous interference. I have shown you that two townships are removed from Carleton, two are added to North Lanark, one township removed from Lanark to Leeds and Grenville, townships removed from North York to West Ontario, townships taken from Muskoka, to North Ontario, from Muskoka to West Simcoe, from South Simcoe to North York, from Monck to Wentworth, from Wentworth to Brant, from Halton to Wentworth, from Brant to Oxford, from Oxford to Brant, from Haldimand to Monck, from Perth to Oxford, from Huron to Perth, from Perth to Wellington, from Oxford to Norfolk, from Wellington to Halton, from Elgin to Middlesex, from Kent to Essex, from Oxford to Middlesex, from Kent to Bothwell, from Bothwell to Elgin, from Huron to Middlesex, making in all five-and-twenty changes of municipal county boundaries. I have shown too that the electoral divisions are changed, carved and cut up in more than 50 cases, of

Mr. BLAKE.

nine instances only are in this eastern division which the hon. gentleman thinks it better not to interfere with largely, and in Centre and Western Ontario, where his greatest struggle is to take place, no less than 41 changes are made in electoral divisions. The result as the hon. gentleman hopes and expects it to be is, that the Reformers are weakened and the Tories strengthened in a great number of what I may call fighting ridings—those in which contests may be expected to take place: North Lanark, South Lanark, Lincoln, Brockville, Monck, South Wentworth, North Wentworth, North Ontario, South Ontario, Muskoka, North York, East York, North Simcoe, North Norfolk, South Norfolk, North Perth, South Perth, North Middlesex, South Middlesex, West Middlesex, South Wellington, Centre Wellington, North Wellington, South Huron, North Huron, North Bruce, East Bruce, South Grey, Bothwell, East Elgin, Haldimand. I have shown you that the Tories are weakened, where they think it will do them no harm because they are so strong—in Carleton, South Simcoe, East Grey, North Simcoe and Kent, and in the fighting riding which they give up, knowing it to be lost. The Reformers are given for the purpose of living West Bruce, South Middlesex, West Ontario, East Simcoe, and their strength is closely concentrated in North Brant, South Oxford, North Oxford, West Ontario, East Simcoe, South Middlesex, West Bruce, Centre Huron and West Elgin. The Reform majorities, applying the figures of 1878 to those new constituencies, are as follows:—North Brant, 723; South Oxford, 688; North Oxford, 1,165; West Ontario, 583; East Simcoe, 558; South Middlesex, 581; West Bruce, 956; Centre Huron, 446; West Elgin, 463; Halton, 290; a total of 6,445, or on the average of 645, for ten ridings; while in the same districts which are the subject of these manipulations the Tory majorities by the same figures, are North Simcoe, North Perth, West Middlesex, East Middlesex, Kent, North Essex, North Bruce, East Grey, South Simcoe, a total of 3,506, or an average of 350 as against an average of 625 in the ten Reform constituencies I have just referred to—being a concentration with Reform counties, with the design of weakening us in the fighting ridings. Now, Sir, will any man outside of this House, will any man inside of this House, pretend that this is all accident, that this is the result of an honest and fair effort to discharge the duty of giving four, or almost six, new seats to the Province of Ontario? Will any man pretend inside or outside that such a concatenation of circumstances as I have pointed out here does not indicate, does not make plain and conclusive, that the intent and object of this Bill is something utterly different? Not to equalize the constituencies in point of population, not to equalize them in point of voting strength, but to use as a miserable pretence some attempted equalization in order that the hon. gentleman can convert a minority of Tories amongst the people to a majority of Tories in the House. That is what he is aiming to do by this Bill, as I have proved. I say, Sir, honest men cannot afford to vote for such legislation. I say this legislation is dishonest and fraudulent, a disgrace to those who propose it and a disgrace to those who support it. I say it is an insult to the people of Ontario, whether Conservative or Reform; to the people of Ontario whose legislation you wantonly disallow, to the people of Ontario whose bounds you wantonly and improperly refuse to concede to them; to the people of Ontario, whose municipal arrangements, most cherished amongst them, whose legitimate aspirations in connection with those arrangements, whose cherished associations in connection with Federal representation you are about wantonly to interfere with and to violate. I say you dare not to do this with the other Provinces. You dare not propose that with reference to the members from the other Provinces. I tell the members from the other Provinces, who would resent this Bill if administered to themselves, that they are not behaving as men ought to behave, as

upright and honest men should behave, if they support an Administration enforcing upon one Province what they would resent and resist if attempted to be imposed upon another. I ask them to judge as they want us to judge them. I ask them to consider what their feelings would be if such a measure as this were proposed with reference to them. I ask them to realize how they would denounce such a measure, with what vehemence they would declaim against it, with what obstinacy they would declare it was an outrage and that they would not submit to it. And if these be the feelings with which the Province of Quebec, the Province of Nova Scotia, the Province of Prince Edward Island, the Province of New Brunswick would view a measure of this kind applied to them, I ask them in all fairness, candour and decency, to deal with us as they would be dealt with, to look at us as they would look at themselves in a like case, to reject a Bill based upon principles which they must know in their hearts are principles which they would not permit to be applied to themselves, based upon professions which I have proved are dishonest, based upon pretences which I have proved are false, and which aim at results—and they tell us this themselves—which are iniquitous and fraudulent. You hope to have the unanimous support of your friends from the other Provinces in forcing on Ontario a measure which you know you dare not ask them to support in the case of their own Provinces. And you hope for more. You hope the Ontario Tory may exhibit signs of being a patient animal; you hope that he may not resent this measure; you hope to get his acceptance of it by telling him: "It is quite true, it is a bad business to cut up the counties, to carve up the municipal organizations, to destroy all your old associations and arrangements; we know it is a cowardly thing; it looks cowardly to us, because we have been telling you that we are strong enough to carry the country as it stands; but—mark you!—come closer and let me whisper in your ear!—it was necessary in order to win at all; pardon it and forgive it; forgive it for the good of the cause; smother your emotions, conceal your disgust, and go to the polls like a man in the new constituency of what's-its-name, made up of I-don't-know-what municipalities; go to the polls in your new associations, in your new arrangements, and vote for the man who did all these things in order that he might convert a minority of Tories in the country into a majority of Tories in the House." Why, Sir, this proposal—which, as I have told you before, you are mistaken in supposing will accomplish its ends, which I have told you before, I believe, the people will revolt against, which I believe the honest sense of the people in all the Provinces will revolt against, whatever the members from the other Provinces may do or say, or whatever restraints they may wish to impose, or whatever fetters and shackles they may wish to place upon Ontario—this is a proposal, I say, which I believe their constituents, the people of their counties, will look upon as one they ought to be very jealous of. I believe they will say: "This comes close to our doors; we know not, if this rule is adopted, on what principle it can be confined to one Province; if the representation in the largest Province is to be disposed of in this way, how soon may it not be that the same rule will be applied wholesale to the country, and with what force can we reject it after we have sustained you in imposing it upon our neighbors." I believe they will say: "We decline to be responsible for this." Up to this moment the Government is responsible for it; if it passes in this shape the House will be responsible for it; and if the people endorse it at the polls, they become responsible for it; and those who endorse it must do so on the principle that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and if all municipal bounds are to be swept aside on the flimsy pretence of an attempt at redistribution of the representation, that cannot be confined to the Province of Ontario, but must be extended over

the whole Dominion. But one would have thought only this Bill was enough. One would have thought that the boasters and braggarts who talk of going to the polls to increase their strength, who said that the constituents who sent them there would send them again with an enhanced majority, would have been satisfied with cutting and carving these constituencies up; one would have supposed that their attempt, by this audacious, this outrageous measure, to smother the popular sentiment which is against them to-day as they boast it was for them in 1878, would have been enough. But it is not enough. The hon. gentleman does not trust in that alone. He knows that it is necessary, in taking a step of this kind, to go still further; and so, as I said in my opening, that great reform, which after many efforts, having been contended for in two Parliaments unsuccessfully, the Reform party was able to achieve in 1874, of providing that the returning officers with their large, important and delicate duties, their judicial and administrative duties, their duty of choosing the deputies, their duty of seeing to the count, their duty of seeing fair play, should be chosen from and selected from among persons who had a stake and a position in the community, whose duty it was, obviously from their station, so to demean and comport themselves as to win the respect and confidence of all classes of the community in which they lived. I say that great reform which took away the power which the hon. gentleman had used in former years, of selecting returning officers as he pleased, and made well-known officials of character and standing in the community those from amongst whom the choice should be made, is now to be repealed, and, without one word of explanation or defence, upon the first reading or the second reading, the hon. gentleman has asked us to assent to a Bill which contains a clause repealing that clause in the Act of 1874, and providing once more that the returning officer should be chosen at the sole discretion of the Government; once more that the hon. gentleman may do what he did in 1872; once more that he may appoint his creatures to return the minority candidates as they were returned in 1872 in Muskoka and West Peterboro'; to re-enact the outrages which were enacted under the hon. gentleman's direction and responsibility when he had the power of appointing such persons as he pleased to be returning officers for the constituencies. Sir, these are the two cardinal principles of this measure: first, to mar the face of the constituencies and alter the municipal bounds, and if, by any means, in the Liberal Province of Ontario, it can be done, to destroy or weaken the Liberal strength and give strength by force of law to the Tories; and secondly, what the law cannot do, by executive authority, administered as the hon. gentleman formerly administered that authority, with the result which he formerly produced, to use his discretion to appoint returning officers, in order that he may no longer have men restrained by the considerations to which I have referred to act as such ought to act in such a position, but to appoint his creatures to do his dirty work. Sir, we saw an account the other day in the newspapers of a great banquet at which there were flowers and sumptuous meats and costly wines and great enthusiasm—the banquet of the Old Guard. It is not a very numerous body as represented in this House. I do not think anything can more strikingly tell us what the precarious tenure of a Canadian politician's life is than these figures. The hon. gentleman was, I suppose, 125 strong in this House in 1873, and he is about 150 strong here to-day; but of his 125 of 1873 I see here to-day in his majority of 150, about 38 souls; while of us who were in a minority of about 80 then, and are in a minority of about 60 now, there remains so large a percentage that we appear about 30 strong. These are the mutations of a Canadian political life, and I do

not doubt, when the hon. gentleman looked at these figures and saw in the midst of his triumph that among his majority to-day, those who supported him in 1873 were under forty, he must have felt that there are chances in the future as there were chances in the past. I wonder if at that great feast, brilliant as it was, whether the Belshazzar of the feast did not at the same period see a mysterious handwriting in unknown characters on the wall. I wonder was there any Daniel there to decipher those unknown characters and to tell him that the "mene, mene, tekel, Upharsin," being interpreted was—"God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it. Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting. Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians." Whether it was at the banquet or before it, the hon. gentleman saw that handwriting on some wall, and what did he say?—"I know that according to the feeling of the constituencies that elected me, my kingdom is gone. I know that according to the views of those who sent my supporters here, and who are to return them again, if there be a change, 'I am weighed in the balance and found wanting.' But, like the unjust steward, he said: 'I will readjust the numbers; I will falsify the weights; I will arrange for trusty enumerators and carvers of the work who shall give a proper account of the result; and so, by adjusted divisions and falsified balances, and by counties of my own making and my own legislation I will do what in me lies to defeat the characters which are written on the wall, so will I continue my kingdom and remain still again in power.'" But the handwriting on the wall is not reversible by any such fraudulent, impotent pretences as those. The shadows have deepened, the handwriting is darker and more marked, the words are plainer to be seen. They are to be read in our honest English tongue to-day; and they tell us that an indignant and honest people of whatever political complexion, is about to resent at the polls the fraud which is attempted to be perpetrated upon it, and to tell the hon. gentleman that the handwriting is true and his kingdom is indeed finished. I believe this measure deserves our attention at this stage, and that it is at this stage we ought to be called upon to record our opinions. This Bill may or may not be rejected. The hon. gentleman thinks it will pass. He knows the views of his friends better than I do. But if it pass, it shall pass over such amendments as shall enable those who vote for it to give a sound reason for their votes if they can, and shall enable those who vote against it, to vindicate the vote we are prepared to give. I move in amendment:

That in dealing with the representation of the people in Parliament, the municipal County organization has been observed in all the Provinces, save Ontario, and that in Ontario the said organization modified by a division of Municipal Counties into Ridings, has been generally observed;

That on the occasion of the re-adjustment of 1872, the soundness of the said plan of observing the Municipal County organization, and the evil consequences of a departure therefrom, were recognized by Parliament, and on that occasion the First Minister of the day, Sir John A. Macdonald, announced with approval from all sides the policy of the Government to the following effect, viz:—"with respect to the rural constituencies, the desire of the Government has been to preserve the representations for Counties, and sub-divisions of Counties as much as possible. It is considered objectionable to make representation a mere geographical term. It is desired as much as possible to keep the representation within the County, so that each County that is a Municipality of Ontario should be represented, and if it becomes large enough, that it should be divided into Ridings—that principle is carried out in the suggestions I am about to make.—That rule was broken in 1867, in the three constituencies, viz.:—Bothwell, Cardwell and Monck; and I do not think on the whole that the experiment has proved a successful one. I do not think it was unsuccessful as far as the representations of those new constituencies themselves were concerned, as they are well and ably represented by the gentlemen who now hold seats for the constituencies; and I hope that if I am returned again to the next Parliament, I shall meet those honorable Members. But it is obvious that there is a great advantage in having Counties elect men whom they know. Our Municipal system gives an admirable opportunity to constituencies to select men for their deserts. We all know the process which happily goes on in Western Canada. A young man in a County commences his public life by being elected by the neighbors who know him, to the Township Council. If he shows himself

Mr. BLAKE.

possessed of administrative ability, he is made a Reeve or Deputy-Reeve of his County; he becomes a Member of the County Council, and as his experience increases, and his character and abilities become known, he is selected by his people as their representative in Parliament. It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose ability they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two separate Counties, and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest; they do not meet together and they have no common feeling, except that once in five years they go to the polls in their own township to vote for a man, who may be known in one section, and not in another. This tends towards the introduction and development of the American system of caucuses, by which wirepullers take adventurers for their political ability only, and not for any personal respect for them. So that as much as possible, from any point of view it is advisable that Counties should refuse men whom they do not know, and when the representation is increased, it should be by sub-dividing the Counties into Ridings * * *

I believe the House generally agrees with me that the County organization should be preserved as much as possible. I have observed this principle and no county in Ontario has been split up.

That the said principle of observing, as far as possible, the limits of the Municipal Counties in adjusting the Parliamentary representation is sound and should be followed in the said Bill for the reason so given by Sir John A. Macdonald, and approved by Parliament; and also because it affords some safeguard against the abuse of power by the party in office to adjust the representation unfairly towards their opponents.

That the said Bill is framed in utter violation and total disregard of the said principle, since it takes away territory from the Municipal Counties for electoral purposes, and conjoins for electoral purposes territories, having no Municipal County relations with each other in a very large proportion of the constituencies of Ontario; while, at the same time, it does not effect the proposed object of equalising the population of the Electoral Districts.

Mr. BOWELL. If, as the member for West Durham says, we have had a dying speech from the hon. member for Niagara, we have had a funeral dirge from the hon. leader of the Opposition. He has occupied the time of the House for the last four or five hours, dividing his discourse into four parts: First, general abuse of the Government; second, a defence of the Ontario Government in the division of counties into electoral districts; third, a criticism of the Bill before the House; and, fourthly, the hon. gentleman wound up with a characteristic flood of general abuse. I have noted a few of his choice epithets, such as "dishonest," "Tory conspirators," "Tory schemers," "fraudulent, dishonest boasters, braggarts and raniplulators of electoral districts." We are told we presented to this House an odious and outrageous Bill, and have framed clauses in order to appoint returning officers determined to do the Tories' dirty work. Also that they were determined to commit iniquitous and cowardly acts, and, among other things, to take from Ontario those rights and privileges which she had obtained in the past, and which is her particular mission, judging from his remarks, to retain in the future. I do not know that the word coward comes with a very good grace from the hon. gentleman, particularly when he attempts to discuss the question of the boundaries of this Province, and the alleged desire of the Dominion to deprive her of the land which legitimately and properly belongs to her. If the hon. gentleman had had the courage of his convictions, we should have heard the sound of his sweet voice when that question was under discussion in this House. He found it convenient either not to risk the utterance of his opinions, or he had none to utter on the question, or if he had an opinion it must have been in accord with the policy of the Dominion Government or we should have heard from him upon the subject. When he spoke of conspirators, I was forcibly reminded of his political conduct during the last ten or twelve years. Conspirators, forsooth! Who, I should like to know, conspired to seize the reins of Government from the late John Sandfield Macdonald? Did he not succeed by a majority of one in ousting that gentleman from power, when there were no less than eight seats in Ontario unrepresented. Who entered into a conspiracy with the Speaker of the Ontario House and brought him down from the Chair and made him a Cabinet

Minister, but the hon. gentleman who now hurls these epithets across the House at others. Who tampered with and brought the Treasurer of that Government but he? Yet he stands up here with a coolness—I will not say audacity as he does—and apparent honesty that one would think, who had never heard him before, that he was a paragon of perfection. He also poses himself as a leader of a great party, possessed of all the honesty, integrity, and political morality in the world. We know how he and his party got in power in 1873. We know that the same schemes, the same devices, the same conspiracies and the same eaves-dropping are taking place to-day. Why did the hon. gentleman not answer my question when I asked him how he obtained certain information? He did not answer it, because he knew that he obtained it improperly; that he knew that information was obtained by one of his late colleagues who broke the seal of a telegram. Had he been a gentleman he would never have used that information, but retained it within his own breast. In the past those gentlemen did not hesitate to subsidize people in order to obtain information that was afterwards made public, and we know now that they do not hesitate to open telegrams and letters in order to obtain information which, if they had one particle of honesty, they would retain within their own breasts and not publish it forth to the world.

Mr. MILLS. Who did that?

Mr. BOWELL. You know very well.

Mr. MILLS. No, I do not.

Mr. BOWELL. Ask the hon. gentleman to whom I am addressing myself. He will tell you. Admitting for a moment, as may be said, that these telegrams were opened by mistake, I say that the hon. member for West Durham, had he the instincts of a gentleman—I use the word advisedly—he would not have used that information. I am not surprised to hear the hon. member for Shefford say “hear, hear,” remembering his record.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. Will the hon. gentleman explain the record which justifies him in singling me out.

Mr. BOWELL. When an hon. gentleman assumes the right to sneer at what another hon. gentleman is saying, I have a right to retort in the manner I did. I do not propose to enter into the hon. gentleman's record just now.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. You had better not.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman need not be at all alarmed. I have heard his sonorous tones before, and am not at all afraid of him now.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. Then go on.

Mr. BOWELL. The world knows who the hon. gentleman is; his record is known. I am not going to deal with it now.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. You dare not deal with it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is very boastful, I know. In the meantime we will attend to him on some other occasion.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. Go on, and tell us what about my course.

Mr. BOWELL. I am very glad that I have awakened the ire of the hon. gentleman. He has been very quiet during the last few Sessions, and it is charming to see him lose his temper. I have nothing to do with him just now; I am treating another question, and shall let the hon. gentleman alone most decidedly.

Mr. HUNTINGTON. That is the best thing you can do.

Mr. BOWELL. When interrupted by the hon. gentleman I was remarking that even private telegrams had been opened perhaps by mistake, and that those who had opened

them ought at least to have kept the contents to themselves, no matter what might have been their character. In that brag-gadocio speech which we have just heard—if I may copy the expression of the hon. leader of the Opposition—we have but a re-enacting of the scene that took place in this House in 1872. When the hon. the First Minister then introduced his Bill giving an additional representation to the Province of Ontario, the same language was used towards him as is used to-day, and the proposition met with equal abuse. At that time, so much in love with the principle of representation by population were the hon. gentlemen opposite that they denounced the Government for not demolishing the small boroughs of Brockville and of Niagara. They supported it to such an extent that the hon. member for Lambton moved the following resolution affirming that principle:—

“That the six additional members to be allotted to Ontario are due to the increased population of that Province, and should be allotted with reasonable regard to the population. That the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the House with instructions to amend the same by allotting members for Ontario in such a manner as to give as far as practicable representation to those parts of the population which, by the present division, would be excluded from their fair share of political power.”

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is all right.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the principle which the hon. gentleman then advocated, and I expected that the remark he has just uttered would fall from his lips at the present moment. Now, that the hon. First Minister and the Government have adopted that principle, so far as practicable, in the readjustment of the constituencies which I shall show before I sit down, the same parties denounce him for it. The *Globe*, at that time the organ of the hon. gentleman opposite, used language of this kind, and one would suppose that they still remembered their language in 1872, or had been studying the debates of that time and committed them to memory. This is what the *Globe* said:

“Our own convictions are that the intense feeling of indignation at the recent proceedings of Sir John Macdonald's Government, the disgust that this last endeavor to defraud the country of a fair representation will excite, will give enormous strength to our cause, defeat this gerrymandering and cause the arts and craft of the too-cunning schemer to recoil upon himself. As the Bill openly violates the constitutional theory, there remains only the conviction that the whole thing is the meanest and merest shuffle—an electioneering dodge, in fact, to gain a vote or two, no matter who is wronged or who is cheated.”

This was the language of the leading organ in 1872, it is the language of the hon. gentleman opposite to-night. The leader of the Opposition says that the right hon. leader of the Government is not adhering to the opinions he then expressed, that he has even violated the principle he then enumerated. Well, the hon. gentleman is not charitable. In a speech lately made by himself in the West he declared that he was not to be held responsible to-day for what he said a few days ago. I think it is quite right and proper that he should have used that expression, because he changes so often it is difficult where to find him. I am glad he approves of it now.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say it.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say he did not use that language at a dinner in Toronto?

Mr. BLAKE. No, I did not.

Mr. BOWELL. All I can say is that I shall, with the permission of the House, read from the report of the hon. gentleman's speech as published in the *Globe* and supposed to be correct, but which I have not by me just now, to prove that he did use that very expression.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether it is correct or not. I never read it.

Mr. BOWELL. I know that whenever it is convenient for the hon. gentleman he is quite willing to repudiate *Hansard*, repudiate his own organ, and any other newspaper report when it suits his purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I repudiate it when it is wrong.

Mr. BOWELL. I know that when he made a speech at Dundas a few years ago he deprecated the fact of being followed by reporters, because he said he had not an opportunity to repeat his speeches. I take for granted, judging from the past, that he has a good memory, but I know it is convenient for him to disavow any expression he may be reported to have uttered as incorrect when it suits his purpose. Now, Sir, he has argued for nearly an hour that the principles of the Bill of the Ontario Government were correct, that in no case were the boundary lines of municipalities interfered with—

Mr. BLAKE No.

Mr. BOWELL. Wait until I have finished my sentence—with the exception of cases where new counties in the new electoral divisions were established. He ought to know, because I take it for granted that he has read the law, for he pronounced it almost perfect, that in some cases they actually divided the townships.

Mr. BLAKE. I said the county municipalities.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not a township a municipality as well as a county? Is not the subtracting of one portion of a township and adding it, for electoral purposes, to another township, just as bad, if it be wrong, as to take a township from a county municipality and attach it to another? The hon. gentleman may not be capable of comprehending the distinction, but if he will look into the matter he will find that in this very county of Huron, which he talks of as being gerrymandered that townships have been divided for electoral purposes. They have taken a portion of one township, lying on the other side of another township, where that township belonged to another division. The principle is precisely the same. I find no fault with that, particularly when the principle is applied to the Dominion Parliament. Now, there may be some argument in favor of retaining municipal divisions for the Local House, but it does not apply in any sense to the Dominion Parliament. The Provincial Legislatures have exclusively to deal with municipal corporations, and with all local matters pertaining to the Provinces. They have nothing whatever to do in their legislative capacity with the general politics of trade and commerce of the Dominion, and hence there is no analogy between the two cases. I admit, and I say it frankly, that if it were a readjustment for provincial purposes, there would be much force in the argument advanced by the hon. member for West Durham, but as applicable to this Parliament where the trade policy of the whole Dominion is to be discussed, as well as the commercial policy and monetary institutions, and all that is of a general character, a division of even municipalities, whether they be county or township, could have nothing whatever to do with it. I would like to know what difference it makes to a voter who lives in one township, in what electoral division he votes upon a question affecting the trade policy of the country? He records his vote in accordance with the opinion he entertains, and the effect is the same wherever he votes. But the hon. gentleman says, oh, no, he is disfranchised unless he can vote in the municipality in which his township or county is situated. I leave it to any intelligent man, and leave it to any man who will take the trouble to think for a moment, whether municipal institutions, or the municipal divisions of a county or township, have ought to do with the questions to which I have alluded. I desire to show that whatever has been done in the way of readjusting the representation it has been done without cutting townships in two, and has been in the direction of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Lambton in 1872, when the former Redistribution Bill was before the House. When the First Minister introduced that measure he did not declare that the sole object was representation by population; what he said was

Mr. BOWELL.

that in the readjustment they had followed that principle as closely as it was practicable and convenient to do so. There are many counties that were overpowered numerically by those adjacent to it, and in order to secure anything like a fair redistribution it was necessary to take from one and add to another. The hon. member for West Durham justified the abolition of Cornwall and Niagara. Why did he justify that and at the same time argue for hours in favor of retaining other electoral districts with very few more inhabitants than Cornwall and Niagara? In regard to Cornwall, the hon. gentleman says the Government were justified in abolishing that constituency because it was a step in the right direction. Why was it in the right direction? Was it because it returned a Conservative to this Parliament, because it was sure, if left with its present boundaries, to return another Conservative, or because it has a small population. If there is one feature in the Bill of which I have any doubt as to its not being strictly correct, it is as to abolishing the town of Cornwall, because it has a growing population. But the hon. gentlemen says you may abolish Cornwall with 9,904 people, but you must retain North Brant with 11,894. Why is North Brant to be retained and Cornwall abolished? Is it because one is Conservative and the other is represented by what he terms a Reformer or a Grit. The hon. gentleman is desirous of retaining North Brant, and would like South Wentworth with 14,993 and West Elgin with 14,214 to be retained as they are, but he objects to any diminution in the electoral districts of East Elgin with 28,147, East Middlesex with 30,600, North Perth with 34,207, North Huron with 27,104, Bothwell with 27,102, North Ontario with 28,434, Muskoka with 27,204, and would retain of course according to the same argument North Victoria with only 13,799. It is a crime in his eyes to have electoral districts equalized territorially and numerically, but if the hon. gentlemen can only retain half a dozen or a dozen constituencies in the West averaging from 11,000 to 14,000, composed of gentlemen who will follow him (I will not use such language in regard to them as the hon. gentleman used to members on this side of the House), it would be quite right and proper. Abolish the Tory constituencies as much as you please; it is all right and proper; but Reform constituencies should be preserved, even though the members represent, proportionately, but one as compared to every three or four electors represented by Conservative members. If that is not the hon. gentleman's argument, it is nothing. The hon. gentleman never uttered a word against that, but, lawyer-like, and very few members are equal to the hon. gentleman when speaking from a brief, he would have condemned the Government just as strongly if they had abolished Grenville. North Leeds, with a population of 12,929, hon. gentlemen opposite would like to remain, while they sustain the retention of Grenville with about the same population. The hon. gentleman had not the common honesty to tell the House, when he spoke of North Leeds being reduced that the readjustment occurred from the fact of the increased population at Brockville, nor did he tell the House when speaking that his own party dismembered another municipality alongside of Brockville, by adding two or three Grit townships by which they could secure the seat for a member of the Ontario Cabinet. There is no excuse on the ground of the hon. gentleman's lack of intelligence, because he knew it, and was no doubt a party to it at the time. If his party had not attached the township of Young to Brockville they would have lost their Minister of Public Works in the Ontario Government. Let me go through the changes and see what has been done. The hon. gentleman's figures were comparatively accurate as far as population is concerned, but in one or two particulars they were not correct. The town of Cornwall was found with a population at present of 3,904. The hon. gentleman is quite willing that that should be

abolished. Stormont, which adjoins it and which forms a part of the same county has a population of 13,294, and by adding Stormont and Cornwall together they obtain a population of 23,198, that is about as fair and equitable a division as under these circumstances you could obtain except you divide some municipality. Carleton had a population of 24,689, while North Lanark, which was represented by a follower of his own and a Liberal, the hon. gentleman did wish disturbed, seeing no reason why a Grit should not represent 13,000 while a Tory alongside should have 20,000 or 24,000 to represent; or, in other words, one Grit, according to the hon. gentleman, was as good as two Conservatives. However, that being a matter of opinion, we will not discuss it. Carleton has 18,777 instead of 24,689; North Lanark, 19,855 instead of 13,943; South Lanark, 19,949 instead of 20,032 or 18,19 and 19 as compared with 13,24 and 20. Could you by any possibility, without dividing different municipalities and villages conceive any greater equality than that contained in the Bill. It is true we have Brockville with 15,107 and North Leeds with 12,443, but the hon. gentleman objected that Brockville should have been increased from 12,000 to 15,000, while Smith's Falls has been taken from South Lanark and added to North Leeds, thereby making the constituencies as nearly equal as possible. Peterborough East had 23,956 and it has been reduced to 20,058. The hon. gentleman was horrified at the idea of West Brant being forty miles in length, and one would suppose that no such case prevailed in our representation. East Peterborough is 100 miles in length; North Hastings, which I represent, is 100 miles long by thirty-five miles wide. It may be the hon. leader of the Opposition is desirous to have pocket-boroughs which would return men to support him and the party which he leads. In order to equalize East Peterborough, territorially as well as otherwise, we deducted three or four townships from that very large riding, and attached them to North Victoria, an addition which the hon. member for North Victoria will not like, because it will give him a great deal more difficulty to canvas the constituency. And by that division we increased its population from 13,799 to 16,540, and we not only increased its population but we increased its territory, by which, I repeat, it would have more territory and a greater probability in the future of the population increasing in that neighborhood, and reducing the east riding of Peterborough so as to bring it within the reach of reason. Well, Sir, we went to the Ontarios. True, the hon. gentleman objects to the division in the Ontarios, and he points out how one municipality is interfered with—how one municipality is detached from another, in order, he says, to accomplish political objects. The House knows and the country will know, from reading the Bill, that in giving additional members to this House, the Government have selected those portions of the Provinces which are most densely populated, and in increasing the representation of these particular localities, it was absolutely necessary to detach one municipality from another. South Ontario had 20,378 of a population, it now has 20,244; North Ontario had 28,434, and that has been reduced to 20,825. And this new riding to which the hon. gentleman has alluded has a population of 19,732, making these three ridings as readjusted as nearly as possible the same in population without interfering with separate municipalities, either villages or townships. But the hon. gentleman objects because a village, one portion of which lies in one municipality and another in another, is placed wholly in one electoral division. The village to which he referred, lies territorially in two of the Yorks, and is a separate and distinct municipality of itself. Part of it for electoral purposes lies in one municipality and part in another. The hon. gentleman, if he takes the Bill from one end to the other, will find that in every instance where we have found a village, part of which lies in one

county and part in another, we have invariably in cases where it was a municipality in itself, allotted to some one riding or the other. Some difficulty occurred in my own riding some years ago, when, if I remember aright, by a special Act the village of Stirling was attached to North Hastings. It was attached as Stouffville is, and as Palmerston and others which have been alluded to, to an electoral division, and I ask the House and the country if the plan we have followed is not correct in theory and in principle. Then the hon. gentleman complains of the division of Muskoka and the Simcoes. At the last census Muskoka had 27,204, and it is now reduced to 17,640. Those who were in the House when Muskoka was erected into an electoral division in 1872 will remember that it had between 8,000 and 9,000 inhabitants, and hon. gentlemen denounced the erection of that territory into a separate and distinct electoral division. It was declared that the Government were creating another rotten borough. It was declared that while there were large counties, numerically speaking, in Ontario, that had only one representative, the new riding of Muskoka was given an equal voice and power in this House, while it had only 8,000 or 9,000 of a population. During the last ten years that territory has increased to nearly 28,000 inhabitants, and if it has been reduced to 17,000 now, it is on the same principle upon which it was given a representative in 1872. It is in the new and unsettled portions of Ontario, where we must expect the great increases to take place, and I venture to say, that in 1892, whoever may live to see it, Muskoka will have increased much greater in population than any of the older settled parts of Ontario, and Muskoka by that time will have her full quota and more comparatively than she has to-day as compared with 1872. The Yorks contain at present 23,312, 24,502, 18,884, while under the redistribution they will have 22,853, 21,730 and 18,884, or as nearly equal as it is possible to make them. It is true that in order to form a new riding—to give that thickly settled and wealthy portion of Ontario another representative in the Councils of the Country, it was necessary to take from one and give to the other, but I repeat that so far as the duties of a member of this House are concerned, he has nothing to do with territorial limits or the county, or township, or village in which he lives, from the fact that local questions which crop up constantly in the Local Legislature, cannot arise in the Dominion Parliament. Then, Sir, we come to the south-western peninsula of Niagara. The hon. gentleman denounced Niagara as a rotten borough in 1872. He denounced its retention as a parliamentary riding as a gross violation of the principles upon which the Confederation was based so far as the representation of the country was concerned, and now he approves of it.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that he does not.

Mr. BLAKE. I disapproved of it then, and I disapprove of it now.

Mr. BOWELL. You denounced the Government then for retaining it, and now you approve of its being wiped out, probably because it is represented by a Conservative, while the hon. gentleman sustains another division which has scarcely more than one-half more electors than Niagara.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. I do not sustain it.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly you did, for you denounced the whole scheme. With regard to Niagara and Lincoln the hon. gentleman finds fault with the detaching of one township from a county.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt he would like to have Niagara abolished and tacked on to Lincoln, and let the

population remain as it would be with that addition, but he would like to have Wentworth, which returns gentlemen who support him, kept at a population of about one-half. That is the argument the hon. gentleman has indulged in to-night. Lincoln, without Niagara had a population of 22,903. By attaching Niagara to Lincoln with which it is geographically connected, renders it necessary to interfere with the county, for this change increases its population to 26,408; by the re-adjustment it is made 20,901. Haldimand was 18,000; now it is 17,660. These were the only divisions that could be properly made to fairly distribute the population; had they not been made, South Wentworth would have remained precisely as it was, with 14,993 at which figure the hon. gentleman would have liked to retain it, because it would return a supporter of his own to this House. But he forgot to tell the House that the whole of the three municipalities which with the remaining portion of South Wentworth constitute the riding, are Reform. There was no Tory municipality, as he terms it, added to South Wentworth, to swallow up the Reform majority.

Mr. BLAKE. No, but there was a Reform constituency taken away.

Mr. BOWELL. The population of North Brant was increased by the addition of adjacent townships, the only way by which it could be given anything like a correct population. North Brant, as the hon. gentleman would like to retain it, had a population of 11,894; we have increased it to 17,705, and if there had been a possibility of giving it more without cutting a municipality in two as the Ontario Government did, we would have equalized it a little better. South Brant, which had 21,975, is now 19,281, so that the Brants, instead of being 11,000 and 21,000, are now 17,000 and 19,000. The hon. gentleman objected to the reduction of the Oxfords; but the Oxfords had more than their quota. North Oxford which had 25,361, is now reduced to 24,389, and South Oxford, which was 24,732 is reduced to 23,923. North Norfolk, which had 17,219, has now 20,133; and South Norfolk, which had but 16,374, to which the hon. gentleman objects to add the Town of Simcoe, although it lies in the south riding, and naturally and geographically belongs there, is given 19,279, which is certainly a more equitable division than existed before. Now, we will take the Perth, which formed a large part of the hon. gentleman's complaint. We find by the census that the south riding had but 20,778, while the north riding has 34,207; but as the south riding was comparatively a pocket borough for the hon. gentleman he did not want it touched. We, however, carrying out the principle on which this measure is based, made one 21,508 and the other 25,538. The arrangement of the Bruce, the hon. gentleman says, is the most iniquitous scheme ever propounded. If the hon. gentleman carried his mind back over the past ten years, he would know that the population of the county of Bruce has increased very rapidly, and if it increases in the same ratio within the next ten years, that increase must be in the north riding, so that, although North Bruce is now the smallest in the county, the same principle prevailed with regard to its arrangement that prevailed elsewhere. It was but fair and proper that those sections of country in which a great increase of population is expected should have their population so established as to give them the same representation as the counties around them. The county of Bruce contained a population of 64,774, with two representatives; upon the principle of equal representation as near as possible. We established three ridings, consisting of 22,618, 25,618 and 17,655 respectively, and I have no doubt that before many years roll round North Bruce will be as strong numerically as either of the other ridings when the disparity which exists now will exist no longer. We now come to the Elgins. The hon. gentleman thought

Mr. BOWELL.

that East Elgin, having a population of 28,147, and West Elgin, having but 14,215, should not be interfered with except by taking the town of St. Thomas from the East and adding it to the west riding. Perhaps if there had been no other readjustment necessary in order to equalize the population, the suggestion by the hon. gentleman might have been accepted. But as Bothwell, and Kent, and Lambton, and Essex, lie in the same group, it was necessary in the readjusting of West Elgin to readjust the others, and regard was to be had to population. Well, the result of the readjustment is that East Elgin, instead of having 28,147, has 26,304; and West Elgin having before 14,214, has now 23,480. So the two Elgins have a population of 23,000 and 26,000 each, instead of 28,000 and 14,000 respectively. East Elgin is represented by a Conservative and West Elgin by a follower of the hon. gentleman opposite. Two to one must be retained in this place as well as others. One Grit of course, is just as good as two Conservatives, and ought to have double the voice in the representation of the people, that possessed by two Conservatives, taking the hon. gentleman's argument, this is his theory. The question of representation by population has very little to do with his argument or principles when it suits his political purposes. We have Bothwell next, with a population of 27,102, which is now reduced to 24,115. Kent had 36,626, now reduced to 28,112. It ought to have been reduced still further if possible, if it could have been done without dividing townships or villages, to a small number, in order to come down to what the hon. gentleman calls the correct quota for each division in the country.

Mr. MILLS. It is quite possible.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman thinks he is quite capable of accomplishing this object, if he had the matter in hand, and two or three more constituencies to add to the Province of Ontario. If the population would have justified it I have no doubt we could have carved it out as the member for West Durham has suggested. But having but four new constituencies to add, and two to abolish, we divided them as equitably as we could, at the same time reducing the larger constituencies to a minimum, without dividing the different townships and adding to those which had but a few. Well, Kent has been reduced to a population of 28,112. Essex, the hon. gentleman thinks, with the same disregard to the population of the country, should have been divided north and south without any townships being attached to it. He was quite willing that Kent should have retained its 3,000 or 4,000, and I have no doubt my hon. friend from Essex would have been very glad, if the suggestion could be adopted and Romney taken from that County. Oh, said the hon. gentleman, South Essex is a Reform Constituency and they gave to it no strength. Has he forgotten that it is represented in the Ontario Legislature by a Conservative.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. BOWELL. You either forgot the fact or attempted to deceive the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I stated that I took the figures of 1878.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman, if he had analyzed those figures, knows that the vote given in 1878 against my hon. friend from Essex, for certain reasons which did not exist at the local election, and that when the east riding was contested at the local election it was carried by Mr. Wright by two or three hundred majority. Then he tells us that it is a Reform constituency. It is one of those constituencies in which the electors have an opinion of their own, and which expresses its opinion on principles. It is well, as the Premier said a few years ago, that the opinions of the intelligent electors are not bound by territorial

limits. It is one of the boasts of a free country, not only on this but on the other side of the line, that the people mark their ballots in accordance with principles and not for the men who are running at the particular time. And if they thought that the Government of 1873 did wrong, they marked their disapprobation by returning the late Ministry to power; but after five years' experience of the hon. gentlemen opposite, those same electors, having changed their opinion as to their administrative abilities, as to their honesty of political profession, reversed that judgment. In the neighboring Republic we find that scarcely at any two Presidential elections is the same vote cast. As new principles crop up the necessities of the country require a change or the adoption of another policy, in order either to mar or assist its progress, the people, as intelligent, educated men, cast their ballots accordingly. And so it was in Ontario and South Essex, the hon. gentleman had therefore no right to claim it as a pet Reform constituency. Essex is now altered by the addition of Romney, the north riding having a population of 25,609, leaving the south with 21,303. We have increased the population of South Essex by making it nearly 22,000, while North Essex will have exactly the same territorial division as the Ontario Government leaves it, with 25,659 of a population. But if it had not been for this condition of things—a county with a population of over 36,000, represented by but one conservative, or nearly three times as many inhabitants as the member for Brant represents, the change that is now effected would not have been made. The hon. gentlemen complain of the division of Lambton because it has not been divided up between Lambton and Bothwell counties leaving Essex as before. I think if you will look at the figures and at the territorial divisions you will find that the division is equitable certainly in point of numbers. One division, the West, contains 20,891; the East division contains 21,725. I suppose they would like to have it a little closer. I supposed we could have cut one of the small villages in two and made perhaps the division a little more equal, but it was impossible, taking the county as it was to divide it more equally and fairly. It is true that in the first draft of the Bill, Petrolia was in the wrong place, but that was a printer's blunder which was discovered and corrected. The village of Beamsville was also misplaced and because these were taken out of the ridings in which they had been improperly placed, and placed in the correct ones, the hon. member for West Durham objected to proceeding with the Bill last Saturday. Now we come to Middlesex and to Huron which the hon. gentleman says are gerrymandered. Middlesex and the Ontarios are two of the most wealthy and populous portions of Western Ontario, and because the Government has given an additional representative to each of these two sections of the country, they are denounced for gerrymandering and doing an iniquitous act. It will rest with these constituencies to say whether they will approve of the position that has been taken by the hon. gentleman or whether they will approve of the act of this Government in giving an additional representative to each of these sections of country. The carving out of a new constituency in that particular locality of Middlesex and Huron it was necessary to detach the townships as they have been in order to equalize them. Not a single word fell from the leader of the Opposition during that five or six hours' speech denouncing the formation of any of those constituencies, except that of North Brant which he said was 48 miles long. South Middlesex, the new constituency that is created, contains a population of 18,884, and East Middlesex that formerly contained 30,600 is now reduced to 24,552; West Middlesex that had 21,496 has now 19,491; North Middlesex that had 25,000 has now 21,496, and South Middlesex that had 21,239 has now 19,540. As I have already pointed out, the necessity of changing the county of Huron in order to

equalize the counties as much as possible, the township of Stephens was added to North Middlesex in order to increase its population, while South Huron had attached to it the town of Goderich, and the township of Colborne, Centre Huron had a population of 26,474. Now how do they stand? The north riding of Huron had 27,104. The hon. member for West Durham found a great deal of fault because that municipality had been reduced by adding a portion to the county in Bruce. Centre Huron instead of having 26,474 has now a population of 22,321.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken by 3,000.

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman explain how.

Mr. CAMERON. I detach Goderich and Colborne from Centre Huron and add 444 for Brussels.

Mr. BOWELL. You should also detach Usborne from South Huron?

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman said that Centre Huron contains now 22,000. I say it only contains 19,443. His figures are all wrong.

Mr. BOWELL. And South Huron which formerly contained 23,393 now contains 23,916. It may be possible the hon. gentleman is right, I am not prepared to say distinctly he is not, but I am inclined to think my figures are correct. I have gone over them very carefully, and am satisfied they are correct. You can take the whole divisions from beginning to end and you will find that they are based on the principle that hon. gentlemen opposite advocated and on account of which they condemned the Government in the past in the most uncompromising terms. Taking the bill as a whole I defy the hon. gentleman to make a more equitable readjustment in regard to population and locality. The peroration of the hon. gentleman was similar to those which he generally makes on all questions. It was a rhetorical display which certainly does him great credit, but if he would adhere a little closer to arguments and facts and less to splitting of hairs, which characterizes Chancery lawyers and more particularly one of his standing at the bar, people would have more confidence in him than they have to-day. This is a question which we might discuss without using those strong adjectives he has so often used towards those who do not agree him. I have no doubt that if he goes to the country he will find that the people will not be misled by declamation such as he has uttered here to-day. It is marvellous that all the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are afraid of going to the people. He tells us that the Government is doomed. They say the Government is afraid to retain office until the expiry of the parliamentary term, and that the whole country is rising in denunciation of its policy. Now if the country holds the opinion that it is represented on the other side of the House as holding, surely the Opposition ought to court an appeal to the country at once. If the Government are willing to relinquish the eighteen months remaining of the parliamentary term, and appeal to the people now, it shows that they have perfect confidence that the country will again endorse their policy. If the Government retained office until the end of the term they would do precisely as their predecessors did—holding on to power with such tenacity as characterizes them in holding on to every office ever they had an opportunity of putting their clutches upon. If the people of this country are opposed to the policy adopted by this Government, the sooner they make their opposition known the better it will be for all parties, and particularly for capitalists who are specially desirous of being assured that the policy of the Government is a stable one. If the policy of the Government of the last three or four years is to be set aside, and we are to go back to the days of deficits and depression, when men were seeking employment in great numbers without finding it, and

we are to have, instead, the principle of free trade inaugurated, then let the country know it. Then the people will know that it is not safe for them to invest their money in this country. Many of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been trimming on this question, but, I am glad to know, there are a few who have nailed their free trade colors to the mast and will accept no compromise. Let them go to the country purely and squarely on that issue, and then we shall know whether the country is going to pursue a policy that has made the neighboring Republic great and prosperous, or whether it is to be reduced to the straits in which it was a few years ago, when we shall be dependent, not only upon our neighbors, but upon every other country. If we are to accept the speeches of the hon. member for Lambton, I should say that he intends to pursue the same policy that he pursued after his accession to power. The same language he used then he has used lately in his speeches in the West and in this House. The people should learn that, notwithstanding their promises when they attained to power, they violated every one of them, and I shall be very much mistaken if, on appeal to the people, they do not tell them that they have as little confidence in them now as they had in 1878.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no intention of speaking at the present moment upon the merits of the question, but I desire to ask if the hon. gentleman who has just sat down alluded to me as making known the contents of a telegram addressed to him.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I did.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then, Sir, I can only say that the longest and best part of the hon. gentleman's name is the same as mine, and a telegram was delivered at my desk which I tore open naturally the moment I got it, and when I saw the address inside, I immediately carried it over to him and told him that I had not seen a word of the message. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have thought me capable of doing such a thing.

Mr. BOWELL. There is an adage of a man telling just half the truth. I am not referring to the telegram the hon. gentleman opened in this House addressed to me, but to a telegram he opened in the Railway Committee Room. As to the first telegram, it is quite true that the hon. gentleman did cross the floor of the House with an open telegram and handed it over to me saying: "Here is a telegram I opened through mistake, but I have not read it." The other telegram, that was opened in the Railway Committee Room, I saw him holding in his hand and reading it. I did not know it was mine until he handed it over to me saying, "I have made another mistake." I know that immediately afterwards in the railway train and everywhere else the contents of that telegram were talked of by a late colleague of the hon. gentleman who said—what was a falsehood—that I at once took up my hat and rushed away to the telegraph office and gave the telegraph operators a blowing up for sending my telegram to the hon. gentleman. I do not say the hon. gentleman opened it knowingly, but that it was he who opened it—and I think if he had common decency, the decency of one gentleman to another—he certainly would not have read its contents. One thing is quite certain, I never told the contents to the hon. gentleman's colleague.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I can only say that I did not see a single word of the message in question. I hope I am incapable of doing such a thing, and I hope I have not sat for twenty-five years in Parliament to hear a single gentleman think I could be capable of doing such an act.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's denial; I have only to add that I did not tell the contents to the hon. gentleman's friends.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think my hon. friend who sits beside me need believe that a single human

Mr. BOWELL.

being whose opinion in Canada is worth respect will attach the slightest importance to any charge of the sort that may be brought against him by any man in this House, let him be whom he may. Now, Sir, as regards the measure before us, I, for one, can say that I am not in the slightest degree surprised by this Bill. It is true, as the hon. gentleman for West Durham has said, that the measure now in your hands is a cowardly measure, a dishonest measure and a treacherous measure. It is most true that the measure in your hands is one which it is not possible to conceive that any man of honor could introduce, or that any man of honor could vote for under any conceivable circumstances. Sir, it is most true that the measure violates every principle—I do not say that the introducer ever held—but that the introducer ever professed or ever put on record in this House. It is most true that this measure openly applies one distinct rule of action to the Province of Ontario and another distinct rule of action to every other Province in this Dominion. It is most true that he applies one rule and one measure to constituencies of equal strength lying side by side, and that at every point and every passage of this Bill, every shadow of a principle which the hon. gentleman proposes to base it upon is openly and flagrantly violated. I say now, I say it is a measure which will, if it becomes law, pave the way to a great and radical change in the constitution of this country, and the hon. gentleman who does not like intelligence and foresight, and who is aware as to what is involved in such a measure, must be satisfied that although he is the nominal leader of the party which professes to uphold the constitution he is by this measure laying the axe to all principles on which the constitution rests. I am not surprised. I knew the man, knew what he is capable of, and I was not the least surprised that he should have brought down the measure. If hon. members will look at past history they will find the hon. gentleman's record. Is not this the man who, after denouncing his colleague as being steeped to the lips in corruption, held office for many years at the good will and pleasure of his friends? Is not this the man who was driven into a corner by some of the intrigues in 1868, particularly by a piece of treachery—the most outrageous in the history of any country—the man who would not, on any account, consent to the introduction of the Federal principle in legislation, and yet when the choice came between losing office and accepting the Federal principle, he accepted the latter.

Mr. BOWELL. You supported them in everything at that time.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In 1868 I sought another and better leader, but could not find him. I will not allude to the circumstances under which the hon. gentleman lost power in 1873. But if the hon. Minister of Customs talks of conspiracies and dares to say that the hon. First Minister was turned out of office by unworthy means I ask what honest man can look back without a blush rising to his cheek at the manner in which Canada was disgraced by the hon. gentleman who occupied the Treasury benches in 1872; but of all his dishonorable acts none are more dishonest and more treacherous to the interests of Canada than this measure. The measure shows what the hon. member is ready to do when he thinks he has power. It shows, too, the point of degradation to which his followers and the country have been reduced. One question alone remains to be answered. Has that hon. gentleman judged correctly of the debasement of his followers here and outside of this House? Have four years of the hon. gentleman's rule so debased and degraded what was once a good and honest party that they are prepared to throw aside every sense of fair play and every instinct of pride and enable the hon. gentleman to consummate his efforts. For the sake of Canada, for the sake of all of us, I hope the hon. gentleman will not follow up his conclusions in this

case. What is the aim of the hon. gentleman? His object is clear. The measure is framed so that it will prove injurious to his own Province, where he has lost the good will of the people and it is desired to give a minority of the voters in Ontario control of the majority of seats. What is his pretext for doing so? What has the hon. Minister of Customs told us is the pretext? The Minister of the Interior, of all men in Canada, in his old age comes forward as an advocate of equality, and in order to adjust four seats in Ontario finds he must change the boundaries of fifty-four constituencies. So fond of equality and representation is the gentleman that he has prepared a scheme by which, if carried out as he hopes and expects it will be, will enable one-third of Ontario to control two-thirds of the seats, and that is what he calls equality of representation. All through the other Provinces there is to-day the greatest possible inequality of representation, even not excepting Manitoba. The hon. gentleman's supports is as crooked as his politics. I do not deem it necessary to go at length over the arguments which have been put forward by my hon. friend, but in answer to the reply, if reply it can be called, of the Minister of Customs, I will take four or five groups of constituencies in various parts of Ontario, and I will show with what zeal the principle of representation by population has been applied. No one objected to the grouping of Cornwall and Stormont, but we find that the hon. gentleman who desired to apply the principle of equality of representation calls attention to the fact that at this moment there are upwards of thirty constituencies in eastern Ontario, with an average population of 15,000 as against sixty in western Ontario, which average 22,000 or 23,000, that the hon. gentleman does not deny and for good reasons, but when he comes to North Leeds and Grenville he has an earnest desire to amend the representation. There is a reason, North Leeds and Grenville contains 12,900 people, or a little more than half the population which was necessary to carry into practice the principles of the hon. gentlemen. Why, Sir, after you deduct the township of Chitley with 2,593, and after you add Smith's Falls with a population of 2,087 you get this result, that North Leeds and Grenville, which was nearly 10,000 too small is 500 souls smaller than before. In virtue of the principle of equality of representation the hon. gentleman asks this House to decree that North Leeds and Grenville instead of having 9,929 shall have 12,423, and that is the first step in his pathway to equality of representation. But Sir, he redresses all that. Brockville is too small. It has only a population of 12,500. To Brockville shall be added Chitley, with a population of 2,593, making a total population of 15,000 souls. Now let us mark how well this hon. gentleman acts up to his professions. Close to Brockville, in direct municipal connection with Brockville is the county of South Leeds. South Leeds contains a population of 22,206, something like 1,300 souls more than the proportion it should have—something like 4,000 more than the proportion it should have as compared with the groups of 30 constituencies at the end of Ontario. Now, had the hon. gentleman desired to apply this principle, had he been actuated by any honest impulse in this matter would he have travelled far enough to select Chitley, would he have taken from South Leeds, which had a population considerably in excess of what it should have on any fair ground of proportion of division and added it to Brockville? Let the House judge what are the grounds upon which he passed South Leeds with 22,000 of a population and fixed upon North Leeds and Grenville with 12,900 as the county from which the extra number should be drawn. But the hon. Minister of Customs tells us that in all these cases we should have regard to the probable growth of the constituencies. He said with some degree of force, if you find that certain constituencies from year to year are growing larger you

may fairly assign those in some cases a smaller number, trusting that the growth of population will soon rectify the apparent inequalities. Now it happens that in a constituency well known to the hon. Minister of the Interior and myself, and well known to many member of this House that that the hon. gentleman had a most excellent opportunity of putting in practice the doctrine laid down by his own Minister, and how does the hon. gentleman do it? On the occasion of the last Census the county of Frontenac contained 16,300 souls. On the occasion of the last Census Addington contained 2,132, and now let the House mark the just and wise application of the principle respecting growing counties. Addington has increased in ten years something like 2,158; Frontenac has decreased by 1,317 souls, but not one hair's breadth, not one township, not one of the smallest municipal sub-divisions is to be taken from the sacred soil of Addington and put to Frontenac, and most of us who have studied the electoral references can guess the reason why. And this is the most unreasonable because not merely is Addington enormously in excess of Frontenac but it was largely taken away from the original county of Frontenac. Many of the townships deal with the municipal centre of Frontenac and have no natural connection with Addington at all. I come next to South Wentworth. The hon. Minister of Customs spent some time to show what a righteous and excellent thing it was that South Wentworth, with a population of 14,933, should be raised no matter at what expense or inconvenience to 15,539. Sir, allow me to call the attention of the House to one of those remarkable combinations of numbers which sometimes occur. You saw that it went to the heart of the hon. Minister of Customs that South Wentworth, with a miserable population of 14,933 should have been left unaltered and unadded to. But let us look back. We find that Frontenac has 15,933 too. Frontenac and South Wentworth contain to a single unit identically the same population. I believe one difference is that Frontenac is unhappily losing, while South Wentworth is growing a little; but nothing could induce him to touch Frontenac, though he found great urgency for meddling with South Wentworth. From South Wentworth he takes Ancaster, with a population of 4,726—a township which represents, I believe, the utterances of my hon. friend the member for South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal), and in order to make up for it he adds Grimsby and Caistor and the village of Grimsby, with a population of 5,722, for the purpose of making up for the disproportion which exists in South Wentworth, giving a total population in that riding of 15,929, or only about 6,000 less than the amount to which it should be raised were they going in for the principle of equality of representation. To the case with reference to the Middlesexes, I desire to call the attention of the House particularly. We find that in the case of Middlesex that we have three ridings with a total population of 73,335. Now, Sir, if you will turn to the adjoining county of Huron you will find that there is a population of 76,968. What would be the natural course which the hon. gentleman would have taken had he been desirous of promoting the principle of equality of representation? Would he instinctively come to the county which had nearly 3,500 less, and say I must give that county four members and leave the larger county with three? Is that the case which necessarily and naturally and instinctively suggests itself to the mind of the hon. gentleman. But here also comes in another principle which the hon. Minister of Customs dwelt upon greatly.

An hon. MEMBER. There is not a Minister in the House.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not wonder at it. I have not the highest opinion of these hon. gentlemen, but I may say that it is to their credit that they are ashamed of this measure, But we are not speaking to the

Ministers. We do not expect to influence the Ministers. We expect to find an Abigail among the 120 supporters. We expect to find a good many more among the good men and true whom they have deceived for the last six years.

Mr. HESSON. No traitors here.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I wish I could say that even in the absence of the Ministry, but I am sorry to say that I fear that the men who vote for this Bill, whether they know it or not, are in the highest degree traitors, not merely to their own Province but to the Constitution and good government of Canada. My position is this: We were told that a growing population should be considered and respected. Well, we find that in the course of the last ten years the County of Middlesex has increased 5,566; we find that the County of Huron has increased 10,802; therefore, on every rule of right, on every reasonable ground that can be urged, if you were going to give four members anywhere you ought to have given them to Huron and not to Middlesex. But why was the representation given to Middlesex and not to Huron? Because the people of Huron were too troublesome to be trusted with four constituencies, while in Middlesex two might have been saved out of the fire. But when the people of Ontario come to understand the principle of this measure, I can assure hon. gentlemen that they will resent the idea that the whole territories and constituencies of that Province should be made a matter of bargain and traffic by hon. gentlemen opposite. What is the argument of these hon. gentlemen? They tell us, forsooth, that they are justified in cutting and carving many of these constituencies, because they allege that Mr. Mowat, in the local divisions of Ontario, chose to make certain alterations. My hon. friend has shown that Mr. Mowat, in every case in which he did not strictly respect the proper municipal divisions, adopted the division made in 1872 by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves; and yet the talk of the division of townships made by Mr. Mowat as being irregular. But the hon. gentleman told us it was of no consequence to the Dominion Parliament, whether municipal divisions were respected or not. Is he a subordinate minister prepared to disavow all the utterances of the hon. First Minister on this subject no longer ago than the 28th of April, when on introducing this Bill, he said with regard to his speech of 1872:

"I do not go back on a single word of what I said then. I said then, and I say now, it is of great importance to keep the arrangement of the electoral and municipal divisions which were the same, and I contended then that it was of great importance that the municipal counties should be the electoral districts and I gave my reasons, that young men would first become Councillors, then Reeves and then Wardens, and there would be municipal as political uniformity."

Is the Minister of Customs the true exponent of the doctrines of the Government, or does the Minister of the Interior, as of right, expound the sentiments upon which the majority of this House are to base their legislation? The Minister of Customs went further; he asserted that my hon. friend objected to the division of the Peterboroughs and the Victorias. Now, I took careful note of what my hon. friend said, and I did not hear him say one word against that division. The hon. member went on to explain that the reason Haldimand, already below the proper quota was reduced, was because it was necessary to add to South Wentworth; and he said that there was no Tory addition made to South Wentworth. Well, Sir, if there was no Tory addition made there was a very large reform subtraction. And what did the hon. gentleman say about Bruce? He represented that it was necessary to make provision for a growth in population, where it was limited, but nothing could induce him to disturb the *statu quo* of my hon. friend for Frontenac. As in the case of Essex, my hon. friend showed in the clearest and most distinct manner, that by observing the municipal boundaries by taking away from Bothwell, which is slightly overgrown, and

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

adding to Kent, without the slightest difficulty, without disturbing any municipal boundary from one end or the two counties to the other, my hon. friend showed in great detail that it was perfectly possible to equalize the representation, and at the same time to keep the municipal boundaries; and he showed an utter disregard of all such boundaries in the proposed division. Was there an attempt made on that side of the House, to shake my hon. friend's proof that there were fifteen constituencies at one end of Ontario which have double the representation of fifteen at the other end. Was there the slightest reference made to it? No; it was one of those clear distinct facts which the people can understand, which they shall please Providence, have an opportunity of understanding, and on the understanding by which they will condemn the hon. gentleman's scheme as an impudent fraud and an impudent attempt to deceive and mislead the people of Canada. The hon. the First Minister is an expert tactician. He has not studied in vain the constitution under which we live. He knew that under our existing system of representation there is a plot; he knew that there is a danger here, like many dangers that are known to exist in the British Constitution from which ours is in part derived if that plot is taken advantage of by an unscrupulous administration for their own vile purposes. Every man who has paid the slightest attention to our system of representation, especially when it is carried out under the very perfect municipal system we possess, knows that where the constituencies are, as in Ontario, closely divided, the difference not exceeding 100 or 200 voters between the two sides in politics, it is always possible for an unscrupulous man so to gerrymander the constituencies that one-third of the voters may be able to return, under cover of the law, two-thirds of the representatives. The case is clear. We may have in thirty constituencies an average majority of 500, and in sixty others an average majority of 100. We should then, on the whole representation, have a total majority of 9,000 votes, or far more than the present Ministers received; and yet we may be left with but one-third the representation in this House. That is the blot on the measure known to exist, and pointed out as hostile to the British Constitution; and, up to the present, not only in Great Britain, but in every British Colony, the trust of the people has been that their representatives will be too honorable and high-minded to avail themselves of that blot, or to attempt, by such unjust and unfair means, to prevent the will of the people from being exposed on the floor of Parliament. Now, I think that the English people and their descendants heretofore have relied on these two things—on a sense of justice among the legislators and on the weight of public opinion—to correct them if they went astray. Have we to ask ourselves now whether these things exist and can be trusted in Canada? If they do exist, then I feel that those hon. gentlemen never made a greater mistake in their own interest than if they vote for a measure like the present. But if it does not succeed—if, by any misfortune, the people should consent to allow this nefarious scheme to go into effect, then I warn the House that they are preparing for themselves very great constitutional changes. It is not to be expected or desired that the Reform party, a party so powerful at present that it controls by an overwhelming majority the Local Legislature, will sit down patiently under a wrong like this. Hon. gentlemen may depend upon that they will be punished soon, if not immediately, for supporting such a measure. I believe the hon. Premier has gone far to make changes of our whole constitutional system inevitable by that proceeding. I do not think this scheme will succeed, but it is possible; and I ask if the result of the next general elections shows that the Reform party have a clear majority of the votes polled in Ontario, and yet have failed to get a majority of the seats in this House, is that a state of things conducive to good govern-

ment, or likely to make the people of Ontario respect and obey the decisions of the Dominion Parliament? I felt surprised the Minister of Customs would rise in his place, and, in face of the facts cited from this side of the House, could pretend that Ministers were actuated by a desire to promote equality of representation. Why could he not take the more honest and straightforward, if more unscrupulous line, and tell us at once that they had the power, and would use it, to deprive the people of Canada and our party of their just rights. That admission at any rate would have a respect for the truth. A Bill to give Ontario four new seats has caused an alteration of the boundaries of 54 constituencies. Let me contrast this course with that of the hon. member for Lambton, when, in 1874, he had the opportunity of using the power he legally possessed to secure the discomfiture of his opponents. The House knows that my hon. friend and his supporters had long contended that it was right, proper and desirable that the general elections should all be held on the one day. Yet in 1874 the law gave him power to hold those elections as he pleased. What did he do? Did he take any mean advantage of it? Did he bring on all the elections in Ontario on the same day? Every man knows the effect on the public mind, and the overwhelming victory we secured, and that small as the Conservative minority was in 1874, it would have been vastly smaller had my hon. friend used the power he then possessed. Hon. gentlemen opposite think they have effectually provided for the retention at any rate, of a certain number of seats. In those calculations they depend on the vote that was cast in 1878. Now, the natural changes which have taken place since have been large, the exodus from Canada has been large, and what is more to the purpose there was in 1878 a very considerable vote which held back and was in many cases large enough to have turned the day in many constituencies; and Ministers may find now that all this trickery and deceit may have the effect of driving the more respectable number of their party from them in sheer disgust and despair. I repeat the Government have shown by this act that they have no regard for the interests of Ontario; that Ontario is looked upon, as the late Geo. Brown said, "rather as the milk cow from which they might draw to support their extravagance, than as the great Province whose rights and interests should be respected in this House." I will say that if the people of Ontario, after what they have seen and experienced at the hands of these hon. gentlemen opposite, should sustain them by their generous vote, which I do not in the slightest degree believe, they will show that they desire to be trampled upon, their rights disregarded and their liberties made a football of by the present Administration.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The only attempt made on behalf of the Government to answer the arguments of the hon. member for West Durham was a singularly feeble and ineffective one. What the hon. member for West Durham contended was that the principle of county representation had been violated in almost every instance. The answer which the hon. Minister attempted to make was, that the Government had endeavored to follow the principle of representation by population. He admitted, in fact, what he could not deny, that they paid no regard whatever to municipal and county boundaries. The hon. member for West Durham showed that there was a way by which the principle of representation by population could be in a large measure followed by observing municipal and county boundaries. For instance, as he showed in the case of Brant, if you take North and South Brant, and add the populations together, you would have about 34,000; and by dividing them as nearly as possible you would leave each riding a population of 17,000, which is a larger number than that of many of the constituencies which this Bill leaves untouched. Again, with regard to Elgin, the hon. member for West Durham showed that, without changing the county of

Elgin within its own municipal boundaries, there was an opportunity to equalize the populations between the east and west ridings. So with regard to Peterboro, the west riding has a population of about 14,000 and the east riding nearly 24,000, why should not that be equalized? Why should West Peterboro be left with a population under the quota and East Peterboro with a population over the quota, when the latter could have been reduced so as to equalize the numbers? It will be found that, in every case mentioned by the hon. member for West Durham, the equalization of population could have been obtained without the extraordinary disregard for municipal boundaries which this Bill exhibits. There is one remarkable feature about this scheme which I do not think has been referred to. There are as many as twenty-eight rural constituencies which have not been interfered with. Of those twenty-eight, twenty-four are represented in this House by Conservatives and only four by Liberals, and the total number of rural constituencies interfered with is forty-seven, of which twenty-six are represented by Conservatives and twenty-one by Liberals. Nearly half the constituencies interfered with are represented in this House by members of the Opposition, a proportion out of all keeping with the number of Opposition members from Ontario. What does this mean? It means that where the Conservatives in this House felt they were safe their constituencies were not interfered with, and that where they did not feel safe, they have either increased their strength, by relieving themselves of Liberal townships or by arranging so that they would get Conservative townships from adjoining constituencies. In what instances has that been done? This is altogether independent of that scheme of hiving which the hon. member for West Durham has well illustrated. We find Conservative members being relieved in the manner I have indicated in the following constituencies: South Lanark, East York, North York, Lincoln, Monck, North Perth, East Elgin, East Middlesex, North Middlesex and North Huron. We find that Conservative townships have been added to constituencies that were considered too weak, where they could be spared from other constituencies. They have been spared from Carleton to weaken the Reform party in North Lanark; they have been taken from Halton to weaken North Wentworth; North Wellington has been made more Conservative by drawing from North Perth; South Grey has been strengthened by drawing from East Grey; and Centre Wellington, by drawing from North Wellington which was previously strengthened by receiving Wallace. In all these instances it will be found on examination that the sole motive for making the change has been to strengthen the Conservative cause and weaken the Liberal. The hon. Minister of Customs has not attempted to impugn the figures of the hon. member for West Durham, showing the political effect of these changes, showing that in some eight or ten cases Reform townships have been thrown together, giving enormous Reform strength in particular counties and weakening the Liberals in a number of adjoining counties. There are some thirty constituencies affected by these "hiving" processes, eight or ten of which will return Liberal members by majorities ranging from 500 to 1,500, and the other twenty, according to the calculation of the framers of this Bill, will return Conservatives. Thus, if this Bill accomplishes its purpose, our number from these groups on this side of the House, now seventeen, will be cut down to ten, whereas before this iniquitous Bill was brought forward, we had every prospect of carrying some twenty-eight out of these thirty. No better illustration can be found of the Government's motive in framing this measure than the fact that out of the thirty seats, of which we now occupy seventeen, they intend to leave us only ten, whereas we had a reasonable expectation of carrying twenty-eight. The hon. Minister of Customs undertook to answer some of the arguments about the inequality of population in respect

of only a few of the counties. What did he say in regard to the district about Niagara? We find that the constituencies of Niagara, Lincoln and Monck combined have a population of something like 43,000. If that population were divided equally so as to give a member to Monck and a member to Lincoln each would have a population of something over 21,000. That cannot be considered out of the way, in view of the disparities existing in counties that are not affected by this Bill. If there was a real intention to equalize the population, how do these hon. gentlemen account for the fact that Welland is left with a population of 26,000, and that county adjoins the county of Monck which is reduced to 16,000? Yet those gentlemen say it was an absolute necessity to interfere with the Wentworths, one of which had about 15,000 and the other 16,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, ask yourself if that single instance does not illustrate the plan and plot and scheme upon which this measure has been based? Why was Welland not interfered with? Because the member for Welland could not spare any Conservatives and the hon. member for Monck did not want any Liberals. That is the real secret of it. The hon. member for Welland would gladly have given Liberals to the hon. member for Monck, but the hon. member for Monck did not want them, and so we have this result that that large county is left untouched and the adjoining county of Monck is reduced to 16,000. Then, again, what is the operation in Wellington? We are told that a growing county should be considered. Now, if any riding in Canada is growing it is North Wellington, which has increased its population from 18,000 in 1872, to 26,000 in 1882. It has growing towns and villages and plenty of unoccupied land. It is pretended that regard was had to the prospective increase in North Bruce and Muskoka; but was regard had to that in North Wellington? Why, instead of diminishing it this Bill actually increases its population to a little over 26,000. The population of the whole county is at least as large as the county of Middlesex, which is to have an additional member. The three ridings of Wellington as they now stand are about as nearly equal in population as could be desired. One has 25,400, the other 22,000 odd, and the other 25,000 odd, and the changes that are made by this Bill leave the total population of the county just about what it is now; but they violate the county by taking out of it a Reform township at the south end and adding at the north end, from another county, a Conservative township. Could anything better illustrate the sham and hollow pretence of this equalizing population argument which we have heard advanced? In this county the whole shuffle of the cards results, not in changing the population of the county, but in so distributing it as to weaken the Reform cause in the whole three ridings and to strengthen the Conservative cause in each at the expense of violating in two of the constituencies the boundaries of the county. Then we have the case of the adjoining county of Halton. We have that county mutilated to help the Conservative cause in North Wentworth and weaken the Liberal cause in South Wellington, while the riding of Cardwell, which adjoins South Wellington, has a smaller population than Halton would have even after the township of Nelson was taken out of it. We have that left untouched; why? because the township of Erin, if added to Cardwell, would render Cardwell a doubtful constituency for the Conservatives. The hon. member for Cardwell would not allow Erin to be added to his county, and the result is we have the township of Erin added to a county that is larger in population than the adjoining county of Cardwell. We have a large number of constituencies throughout Ontario left untouched that have populations under 20,000. They are: South Grenville, South Renfrew, Frontenac, Lennox, having only 16,000, while the adjoining county of Addington has 23,000; East Hastings, West Hastings, West Northum-

Mr. GUTHRIE.

berland, Peterborough, with only 13,300—no necessity felt on the part of the Government to interfere with it; Durham East and West, West York, Peel, 16,000 only; and the county of Cardwell, which I have already mentioned. All these counties are left untouched, thus showing that the pretence of equalizing population is a sham. When this Bill was first introduced it was pretended that it was following a precedent set by Mr. Mowat in the Local House, but after the very lucid explanations we have heard of that measure by the hon. member for West Durham, no attempt was made on the part of the Government by their mouthpiece the hon. Minister of Customs, to show that that measure was based on any other principle than that of observing, as far as possible, existing county lines and not transgressing municipal boundaries. There has been no attempt on the part of the Government to answer that. There has been not one solitary reason adduced why the proposition that was laid before us to-night by the hon. member for West Durham, showing where additional members could be given to Ontario in counties having the necessary population, without doing violence to the principle of respecting municipal county boundaries should not be adopted. We have the county of Essex entitled to two members, Lambton entitled to two members, Bruce and Simcoe to three members each, and Dufferin to one member. You can accomplish all the purposes that the hon. leader of the Government said in 1872 were desirable, and still give Ontario the additional representative she is entitled to without doing injustice to either of the political parties. The names given in this Bill to electoral districts are misnomers. We hear read a statement of populations; we are told that the population of North Brant, for instance, is about 12,000, and that it is to be increased to 17,000 or 18,000. Any one listening to these statements would suppose that North Brant was really what the name implies; but what is it? North Brant is to consist of part of two other counties and only a very small part of North Brant. North Brant, in other words, is not North Brant. It might, with as much propriety, be called West Wentworth or East Oxford, for it is made up of townships from both those counties, as well as from North Brant. So with respect to North Oxford, we were gravely told by the hon. Minister of Customs that the old population was so much and that the proposed population would be so much, leaving in the minds of those who have not examined the details to suppose that townships composing new districts were really part of the county of Oxford. The fact is North Oxford is made up of part of Oxford and a part of the south riding of Perth and the north riding of Perth. So with respect to West Ontario, that county should properly be understood as comprising parts of Ontario, parts of East York and parts of West York. So with respect to North Middlesex, part of which is in Middlesex and part of which is composed of townships taken from South Huron. So it is with respect to South Perth. Its boundaries have been altered not only by depriving it of a Reform township to be added to North Oxford, but by having a township from Huron added on the west side. Those names are misnomers, and if the Government really intended to do right in the matter they would insert different names so that the people would not be misled. We have it, as the result of this discussion so far, that the only pretence for this measure is the desire to produce equality of population. That, however, has been shown to be utterly unfounded; not only have greater inequalities been left untouched, but the attempts made to re-adjust have left the constituencies tampered with in a worse position. For instance, in the cases of Leeds, Muskoka and Haldimand, the Government have reduced them very much below the number allowed, while North Wellington, Centre Wellington and Halton have been increased beyond the correct number; so that you find, when you come to disregard the general

assertions and examine the details, the true reason must be found in something else, and it has been demonstrated beyond cavil that the motive is a political one, because every one of the changes has been made with a political purpose and with the intention of unfairly retaining Conservatives in office and weakening the Liberal party. Under those circumstances can you wonder that the measure has been received by many of the independent Conservative electors and newspapers with disapprobation. Conservative townships refuse to be made tools of. Hon. gentlemen opposite are ashamed to defend the measure. It has no merits, and no wonder hon. gentlemen opposite desire to vote upon it in silence. The leader of the Government, in proposing the second reading of the Bill, did so in silence, and a desire has been manifested to make no attempt to answer the masterly speech of the hon. member for West Durham. It has been said that we on this side of the House have been desiring a dissolution. Not a word has been said by us indicating a fear of a dissolution if we are to have fair play with respect to the constituencies; but we protest that hon. gentlemen opposite who have been pointing to an alleged growth of public opinion in their favor should seek to take advantage of their large majority here and legislate us out of our seats, conspiring to prevent that full and fair expression of public opinion which they so much profess to court. Why, we cannot fail to come to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite are really afraid to appeal to the people under the same constituencies as in 1878. I feel satisfied, from the expression of opinion we have had by correspondence and through the public press showing a strong sense of the unjust nature of the measure itself, that although the Government may meet some advantages from it, they will not reap the full advantages they expect to reap. I believe we can with confidence appeal to the fair-minded electors and ask them to say whether we are to be treated as this Bill seeks to treat us; over fifty constituencies have been arranged with such disregard of right and justice that not a majority will give a potential voice, but a minority shall return most members, and the larger portion of Ontario will be in the position of being represented in this House, not by members possessing its confidence, but by men who have not its confidence.

Mr. COCKBURN. I desire to offer a few remarks on this Bill, seeing that the county which I have represented is now cut into about five pieces. But before discussing the features of the measure I wish to point to one particular which comes home to myself as representing a new section of the county. The House will observe that no step has been made in giving more representation to the northern portion of Ontario. It is quite true that my constituency has a population of over 27,000, but while it is true that some portions of it should be added elsewhere the Government have gone in the wrong direction. I hold that Algoma and Muskoka should have been put into one constituency, and a new constituency formed in the centre and called by some name and description of the localities—taking the northern portion of Muskoka and the southern portion of Algoma. I hope the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) will assist me in trying to get justice for that portion of the county. As I stated before, the new settlements are entirely ignored. The district of Nipissing, for instance, is entirely unrepresented, and one village of 700 inhabitants in the northern part is totally unrepresented. The Government, in fact, do not appear to have had in view the better representation of the northern part of the Province, but to have confined their efforts to the more southern parts. They take off from my county 5,000 souls and add them to North Ontario, leaving us a little less than 22,000. They go further and take 4,000 more and add them to East Simcoe—in other words, they take from the smaller counties and add to the larger. Among the anomalies, inequalities and oversights

in the Bill with regard to Muskoka, I notice that in one case where two townships form one municipality, one goes to one municipality and the other to another; and in another case three townships are omitted altogether—they are not even mentioned—I refer to the townships of Baxter, Gibson and Freeman. These townships, geographically, could most conveniently be added to East Simcoe, and as East Simcoe has a household franchise, the Government could either confer the household franchise upon them, or what would be better, add them to Muskoka. The figures which have been given go to show that my case is not a singular one—that I have not had the antipathy of the Government specially, except as belonging to my party. I humbly submit that the people of this country, of all shades of politics, will look upon this Act with disapproval; that the outrage which has been perpetrated in this portion of the nineteenth century will be denounced by the sensible, independent men of all parties. There are, of course, blind partizans who would support any act of their friends, but I have good reason to believe that the atrocious character of this Bill will defeat its own object. When the House is in Committee I shall have some amendments to suggest, in the direction of removing the anomalies I have indicated. As they do not involve any questions of principle I hope they will be agreed to. For example, I think it is time that the elections of Muskoka were held on the same day as elsewhere. Under the Act the returning officer is obliged to have two weeks intervene between nomination and polling day. I found that a disadvantage in 1878, and though I believe it will operate in my favor at the next election, I am quite willing to forego the advantage if the district is treated the same as other parts of the Province. The local elections are held upon the same day, and considering that the size of the constituency has been diminished and that the roads have been greatly improved, I do not see why it should be treated exceptionally in the Dominion elections. I think also that the name of the district should be changed and that it should be called Muskoka and Parry Sound, as the latter, which is a large and important district should not be ignored. In conclusion, I may say that I think hon. gentlemen should freely own up the corn, as the plea that their plan was to equalize the population is too thinly disguised not to be quite apparent to all. The people will see very plainly that the Government have got themselves into a trap, they have themselves to blame, and I have no doubt they will be visited by condign punishment.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not wonder at the plaintive tone of the last speaker, as I have heard him adopt the same tone in a different place and under different circumstances. I recollect his appealing very strongly on one occasion for Conservative support for which he was abused by the organ of the party to which he now belongs. I believe he was one of the nine martyrs, and I have no doubt, if the Government would only consent to gerrymander two or three townships in his favor, he would be quite willing to be a martyr at the present time. As regards the member for Centre Huron, I think I can dismiss him with a few words. It is necessary for the Reform party always to have dirt slingers; and I know of no man so fitted for the position as that hon. gentleman. I think I should retract those two last words, "hon. gentleman;" and I do retract them—or, rather, I use them in a strictly parliamentary sense. I have known that gentleman for forty years; I knew him at school and he was despised and disliked then as he is now. He was always viewed with suspicion, and the boys were always glad to lock up their lunches when he was about. No man can throw dirt better than the hon. member for Centre Huron, a man despised by almost every one in the community, a man who is the Jonah of the Grit party, and if there is any one person to whom the hon. member for

Lambton is indebted for his overthrow, it is to that member and to his contemptible conduct. He treated every person with whom he came in contact as his inferior; the big "I" and the little "u" was his leading principle. The hon. member for West Durham must have been highly flattered by the way in which the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) tried to bolster up his case. One would suppose that, if there is anything at all in the speech of the leader of the Opposition, he required very little assistance from his friends. It must have been clear to the mind of every man who heard him (Mr. Guthrie) that that hon. gentleman feels he was about to receive his quietus at the hands of the electors, provided this Bill goes through the House. I think that future is in store for that hon. gentleman, and I think he sees the handwriting on the wall. The hon. member for West Durham has gone into this matter in the most elaborate manner; and has collected an extraordinary category of adjectives which he has thrown across to this side of the House, but I think they will have very little effect either in this House or in the country. The hon. gentleman has spoken about a conspiracy. Well, he had better not say much about a conspiracy, or he may hear something about one that he was interested in. We can stand being called brutes by the hon. member for Centre Huron, because he does not know better, but when a man of intelligence like the hon. member for West Durham talks about a conspiracy, I tell him that it is just as well to let sleeping dogs lie. But it is necessary for these gentlemen to have a cry. They have failed in their cry about the Pacific Railway upon which they were so anxious to go to the country last year, but the very moment the electors were aroused, and the moment they saw the great benefit that the contract was conferring upon the country and how rapidly the North-West was being developed, that moment these hon. gentlemen, instead of insisting on an appeal to the electors, wanted the elections staved off for a long time. The National Policy cry is no longer used by these hon. gentlemen, but they want some cry to go to the country with, and they seem to have hit upon the gerrymandering cry. They are going to make the electors believe that we are legislating all the Grits out of the House, and going to elect Conservatives; however, I do not believe that the cry will amount to a great deal. The hon. member for West Durham appealed to the sympathy of his friends from the Lower Provinces to rise in indignation and vote down this measure. He contrasted the representation in Ontario with that in the Province of Quebec, but he forgot to tell this House that when Confederation was finally adopted, the principle of representation by population was to be paramount with regard to Ontario, but with regard to the Province of Quebec there was nothing said about representation by population or readjustment; and I venture to say that those who have thoroughly examined the Confederation Act will come to the conclusion that neither the Province of Ontario or the Province of Quebec has any power whatever to increase its representation. That ground was taken on the floor of the Legislature of Ontario, and was never successfully refuted. It was never contemplated to increase the representation of these Provinces for local purposes, but for Dominion purposes. But that Christian politician in Ontario, the Hon. Oliver Mowat, thought he would satisfy Ontario better if he added to that representation. The question of representation by population, however, was not to be considered in the future adjustment of the representation of Ontario, so far as this Dominion is concerned, except as regards the number of members coming from that Province; there is nothing in the British North America Act to indicate that constituencies should be set apart through that Province according to population, but it was intended simply that the Province should have eighty-two members at that time, and increased as

Mr. RYKERT.

the population showed it was necessary, but it does not follow that these members shall represent constituencies of equal population. In this Legislature we have only to consider what interests and benefits the whole Dominion. We have nothing to do with questions affecting counties or municipalities, which are matters for the Local Legislatures, and yet hon. gentlemen want to make capital out of the fact that one man represents 20,000 and another only 12,000 or 13,000. The hon. member for South Wellington seemed delighted that the hon. member for West Durham had answered the charge with regard to the policy pursued by Mr. Mowat in the Local Legislature. Well, Sir, according to my idea, the Hon. Oliver Mowat gerrymandered the Province of Ontario to a greater extent than is done by this Bill. The hon. member for West Durham saw that it was necessary to defend the Mowat Government, and that there was something wrong in his legislation of 1874. Mr. Mowat had only one object in view, viz., to strengthen himself in the Ontario Legislature. What other reason was there for altering the boundaries of Brockville and adding the two Grit townships from the adjoining county unless to strengthen his hands. We all know that county was represented by a large Conservative majority, and the two Grit townships were added to it for the purpose I have mentioned. The town of Brockville and Elizabethtown had townships with a Grit majority of 228 added to overcome the large Conservative majority of the previous election, and in order to have a sure seat for the present Ontario Minister of Public Works who had received a warning in South Grenville. With regard to South Huron, and in the division of other counties, it is said that Mr. Mowat followed the plan adopted by the Dominion Government in 1872. He did no such thing. In Huron he turned about fourteen townships, placing them differently from their positions under the previous Acts. If he desired to act in the interest of the country, and no complaint was made as to the population, what necessity was there for altering that constituency? To meet his own views, and to satisfy the demands of his party, he divided the townships in a way that only the hon. gentlemen opposite would justify. The result of that gerrymandering was, as I have said, which gave the east riding 21,976, the west riding 24,474, and the south riding 22,025, whereas; under the Act of 1872, the south riding had 21,512; Centre Huron 22,791, and the north riding 21,862, almost equal numbers in the three constituencies formed by the Dominion Legislature. But mark the ingenuity of Mr. Mowat. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the one thing he kept in view was to hold the municipalities together. A few days ago it was said the townships were not divided, that the municipalities were kept intact; yet when we challenge this statement, showing that four were divided by Mr. Mowat, they back water and say that they kept them intact so far as the counties were concerned. The end always justifies the means with Liberals when in power. The hon. member for West Durham stated that there were certain associations connected with those municipalities; that the people were in the habit of acting together, and ought to be represented together in this House. Now, what connection is there between municipalities, so far as politics are concerned, and what necessity is there for one township adjoining another, so far as the representation is concerned? Mr. Mowat solved that matter, in endeavoring to justify his little trickery—and he was equal to such tricks so far as Huron is concerned—in order to satisfy his own friends, who represented the three ridings. He justified the dividing up of the townships by geographical lines. He said he had endeavored to find a division that would be correct geographically, looking to the Census, and which would put together those portions most nearly associated in their business relations, and that he found it impossible to do this without dividing the townships. If he wanted to have those social relations kept intact, why did he divide

the townships? His object was to get a Grit majority here and a Grit majority there; and he violated the principles which he laid down in the very opening of his speech. He gerrymandered South Wellington in order to secure that constituency. The hon. member for West Durham states that the county of Dufferin was set apart provisionally at that time. He is mistaken. It was not established as a county, nor was the Bill read the second time till after Mr. Mowat made his speech on redistribution. I have got the documents here to show it. The hon. member for West Durham said it was set provisionally apart, but I say it was not, because the provisional setting apart of counties only takes place when the junior county withdraws from the senior county, or when a new county is established and provision is made for officers to be elected for a certain time. The Bill was introduced by Mr. Mowat on the 7th of December. His speech in regard to Dufferin was made that same day, and the second reading of the Dufferin Bill took place on the 9th. After screaming about, as he knows how, to find some excuse for the gerrymandering and for the political slaughter of his opponents, he says:

"The Government had come to the conclusion that the evils of such a change would exceed the advantages, but whenever a new county was to be formed they thought it desirable that it should be represented by a member of this House. There might sometimes be considerations that would make it impossible to carry that out, but now that they had some seats to dispose of it was desirable that if a new county were to be formed during this Session it should receive representation. He believed it was only likely that one such proposal should be made this Session, that referring to the county of Dufferin. One Bill of that kind was brought down in 1873, another in the first Session of the year and now the question was before the House again. It had been urged upon the Government that although they might not be disposed to deal with all the applications for the formation of new counties in which they clashed with one another, there was not sufficient reason to resist the demand from the county of Dufferin which did not clash with any other scheme, and the reasons for which were such as to commend themselves to everybody."

Two days after that, the Bill was read a second time, so that the hon. member for West Durham is a little astray in his historical narration of the case.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman will contradict anything and everything on every occasion and everywhere, regardless of the truth. As regards South Wellington, Mr. Mowat said that he had selected Eramosa on account of its commercial relations with Guelph. Eramosa was a very convenient township to put on, on that account. What on earth had its commercial relations to do with the Local Legislature? The little Premier showed a great deal of ingenuity in endeavoring to find out a reason. In Centre Wellington we found out how much he knew about geography. Talk about gerrymandering. What could be worse than that. [Here Mr. Rykert held up a plan of the county]. See how ingenious the little fellow was. The township of Garafraxa, of which half gave 260 or 270 of a Tory majority, and half gave a Grit majority, the Tory half he adds to Dufferin and the Grit half he places in Centre Wellington; and in order to make it certain Grit he adds Erin township, with 200 Grit majority. I do not think we will hear much more about gerrymandering, as far as North Brant is concerned. Take another county. As I said before, the county of Huron had no less than fourteen townships gerrymandered. Take the county of Grey. Unfortunately the political complexion was not alike all over that county, and in order to make it as beneficial, politically, as he could, he found it convenient to make a change, and wanting to give some reason for it, he said:

"The only change they proposed in making the arrangement which had been adopted by the Dominion, was that they learned that St. Vincent was not connected by railway or travelled road with the township of Artemesia, in which the nominations had been held lately. They learned that if St. Vincent people wished to reach Artemesia it was necessary, if they took the most convenient road, to go first to Owen Sound. They propose therefore, to place St. Vincent where Welland was, and Portland where St. Vincent was."

By doing that they turned the majority in that constituency. The people protested in the strongest terms against the change, but their protestations were unheeded. When, however, it came to the counties of Cornwall and Glengarry the Premier said: "I understand they do not wish to join the town of Cornwall, and consider that the objection should not be disregarded." In this instance he gave effect to the appeal of his friends, though the appeal in the other case was unheeded. Then we come to East Grey, which was changed about by the addition of the township of Langton, and then we come to the celebrated county of Dufferin, which was not a county at all until Mr. Mowat made it. A Bill was introduced in 1873, with different boundaries, which did not become law. He did not ask for the same division as in 1874, because there were five Conservative constituencies which could be made into four Grit and one Conservatives by judicious carving. Not satisfied with that, they gerrymandered Cardwell, which was a county quite square with four townships, but was not of the proper political complexion, and by so doing they succeeded in destroying the Conservative majority. Of the whole counties in Ontario Mowat redistributed not less than twenty-six. Mr. Mowat, seeing that power was slipping from him, felt it necessary to sell some of the assets of the Province in order to make the surplus appear large, although this Government had given him \$340,000 a year by assuming the debt, and in order to preserve his hold he proceeded to gerrymander the Province and altered no less than twenty-six constituencies. He paid me the compliment of adding Niagara to my constituency. He hoped to wipe me out. He knew there was a feeling of hostility against me in Niagara on account of my views on the question of the county seat. But for all this at the next general election they gave me a majority of sixty-five, and ever since they have given me a handsome majority. I am ready to test my constituency at any time with the strongest man my opponents can bring forward. We all know that that was done for the purpose of killing me in the county of Lincoln, and the attempt signally failed. The hon. member from West Durham said to-night that I appealed to the Premier to have Clinton and some other township taken back. All I can say is that the county of Lincoln intact gave me a large majority last election, though my opponent was the strongest man they ever had in the county. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of this Bill as a gerrymandering Bill, but they forget their own attempts to gerrymander. I have heard of a Bill called the Tuckersmith Bill, and I have heard of another Bill to which Col. Higginbotham's name is attached, but I have no doubt the hon. member for Centre Wellington will deal with that matter. Mr. Mowat, in order to retain power altered the counties of Huron, Bothwell, Kent, Lambton, Essex, Cardwell, the Greys, South Simcoe, Wellington and Victoria. Speaking about Wellington, when the Redistribution Bill was introduced in 1872; the hon. member for South Huron pronounced the division in Wellington as a proper division, and I have on record his approval of it. Yet Mr. Mowat, in the face of that, alters that county and changes eight or ten townships in order that these three counties might return a Grit majority. On page 1060 of the Debates, the hon. member for Centre Huron said: "The proposed readjustment of Wellington was right and proper." Changes were made in North Victoria, the Simcoes, East and West Peterborough, North and South Renfrew, Brockville, Niagara, East Northumberland, West York, North Lanark, South Bruce and the three Greys. Now, what was all that done for? In the outset of his remarks he states that it is necessary to increase the number of members for the Province; that the large counties ought to be divided, he gerrymanders over the whole Province. For what purpose? There was no necessity for it. No one ever complained there was any

rivalry or jealousy between the eastern and western sections of Ontario. During the time I was a member of the Local Legislature there was no appearance of sectional strife at all. Well, setting out with the proposition that representation by population should be the guiding principle instead of dividing the constituencies, Mr. Mowat left no less than twenty constituencies, having a population of under 15,000 and some as low as 8,000. Now this Bill alters fourteen of those twenty constituencies and raises them up to an average population of 21,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain that this Bill does not fairly readjust the representation between the eastern and western parts of the Province. They can look at the Bill introduced by themselves which left some twenty constituencies containing under 15,000 of a population and which this Bill now properly rectifies. Any one who looks at the question for a moment must come to the conclusion that this Bill is in the interest of the general public. According to their organ there are now forty-five constituencies properly readjusted with an average population of 21,000. I think that is an evidence that the Government followed that principle precisely in framing this Bill. True there may be some discrepancies in it, as you may find in any other Bill, but taking the Bill as a whole no person can find fault with it unless it be the hon. member for Niagara whose constituency is to be wiped out, but that hon. gentleman is sufficiently patriotic to perceive that the interests of the whole country ought to dominate over the interests of any small portion of the people, and I feel satisfied that his constituents will take the same view. Now, the hon. member for West Durham spoke about minority representation in that celebrated speech of his at Aurora. But there in this Bill we find that very principle is being carried out to a large extent, and that minorities are obtaining better representation than they have yet had. I know the hon. gentleman feels much grieved that some of his friends are likely to lose their seats in this Legislature. We may regret some of them; no doubt this House will regret the departure of the hon. member for South Wentworth, who has so long furnished amusement to this House. No doubt the House regrets the hon. member's departure; but under any circumstances the handwriting was on the wall. The last local election was significant; the hon. member and his party failed to win the last local election with all their power.

Mr. RYMAL. It did not go against me.

Mr. RYKERT. When the Reform party's candidate had all the power of the Government at his back he failed, and it was a significant warning that Mr. Joseph Rymal should not try a contest again. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman has made a virtue of a necessity. The right thinking people of every province will come to the conclusion that the Government has desired to do justice to Ontario, and although they may use strong language and vote against the Government, opponents have not asked that any change be made in the Bill. The hon. member for West Durham in his plaintive way has asked that justice be done to Ontario. The Maritime Provinces to which he has appealed would not make such a demand, but the hon. gentleman is trying to raise a sectional cry. When the second thought of the people comes to pass judgment on the Bill it will be given in favor of the Government by an overwhelming majority, and when the case has been thoroughly examined, and when the arguments have been sifted to their foundation, when the people of Ontario come to examine into the motives which have actuated hon. gentlemen opposite, that second thought will pronounce that the Government Bill is a step in the right direction, and that it embodies a principle which has been a guiding principle with political parties and that the measure is in the best interests of the whole Dominion.

Mr. RYMAL. I wish to put my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) right in regard to a statement he has made

Mr. RYKERT.

respecting what he calls my forced retirement, and the fact, as he says, that my constituency was lost to the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The election that I won in 1878 was no warning to me that my political days were numbered. My majority in 1878 was three times what it was in 1867, and twice what it was in 1861 and 1863; and with the falsehood and deception practised in 1878, the wonder was not that I was returned by seventy-five majority, but that I was returned at all. The following year, at the local election, the reform candidate won his seat. Tory villainy endeavored to wrest the riding out of our hands, and we were obliged to appeal to the Courts, and then my Reform friend obtained his seat. It is forty-six years since the Tory party obtained a triumph in the constituency which so long has done me the honor of returning me, and I fear not now, gerrymandered as we are (for there will be a pretty hot time before a Tory is returned for South Wentworth), although I am not going to be a candidate, I will not be a disinterested spectator, and I hope that we will not appeal to the electors in vain. If the hon. member for Lincoln could boast of such uninterrupted confidence of his constituents as I have enjoyed, he might have something to boast of. But he has gone and come again and again; and although he has endeavored to secure himself more firmly in Lincoln than formerly by getting rid of sixty Reform votes, he is not going to sleep on a bed of roses when the next contest comes on. He had better put his house in order in time and see that his guns are loaded. The hon. gentleman was always referring to the hon. Premier of Ontario as the little man. I will compare the two men. They are both legal gentlemen and politicians. Let us look at the positions they hold as professional men. Mr. Mowat held one of the most lucrative practices in Ontario and was afterwards entrusted with an important position in the courts of that Province, in which position he did great credit to himself. Every one was satisfied he was an able judge. Let us see where the hon. member for Lincoln stands as a member of the Bar. He stands somewhere between a fifth and a fifteenth rate lawyer, he is a briefless barrister practicing in Police and Division Courts, and even there only with a limited degree of success. Let us compare them as politicians. Mr. Mowat is the first commoner in his native Province, a position which he has held for many years and he is strong in the affections of the people. My hon. friend is, I was going to say, a fifth rate politician, but I will value him at his own estimate and will call him a second rate politician. It was said by Pope, the poet "That the soul was the measure of the man." I never heard any man say that Mr. Mowat, was not a whole souled noble hearted specimen of humanity that bore the stamp of nobility on his countenance, while ten thousand souls like that which actuates the hon. gentleman opposite could lodge in a flea's skull and then have as much room to play in as two frogs could have on the broad bosom of Lake Ontario.

Mr. MILLS. As it is now 2 o'clock in the morning, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to my hon. friend that I gave the hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity on Saturday to discuss this measure. They chose to take a technical objection and they may make the most of it.

Motion negatived.

Mr. MILLS. We see now how much sincerity there was in the assurances given to the House by the hon. gentleman. We see that this measure was introduced at the last hours of the Session, and was introduced purposely late in order that there might be no opportunity for a full and open discussion. The hon. gentleman tells us he gave us an opportunity on Saturday and, Sir, you ruled that the Bill which the hon. gentleman proposed to be read a second time was

not the Bill which he before read the first time. The hon. gentleman introduced some days ago a measure to this House relating to the subject of the re-distribution of seats and that measure is not the one now under consideration. It is a wholly different measure and it proposed a wholly different distribution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it did not.

Mr. MILLS. I say yes it did, and you said so, Mr. Speaker. It was because it was a different measure that the hon. gentleman was compelled to ask that the order be discharged and to introduce a new measure which was read the first time on Saturday and now the hon. gentleman at the first sitting and the first day after that, and the first opportunity for a fair discussion of the subject, insists that after we have been sitting eleven hours that this discussion shall be proceeded with and that a measure, the most important that has ever been before this Parliament shall be forced to a second reading without any fair chance for its being considered by the country. I know, Sir, that it is a matter of form in a great measure to proceed with this discussion. I know that a number of supporters of this Government did not intend that there should be a fair opportunity for the consideration or discussion of this subject, but I owe a certain duty to my constituents and if I do not succeed in discharging it as efficiently as I could desire it is because I have been listening for more than ten hours to the discussion which has taken place, and I do not think it is fair to me or my supporters that I should be compelled to discuss this subject at two o'clock in the morning. But the hon. gentleman professes to be guided in this measure by English practice. I made some evenings ago a statement showing the practice in England and a series of statements showing the time that important measures since 1831 were introduced in the English Parliament and how long they were before the House of Commons. In almost every instance there was not a measure which reached its third reading that had not been before the House for nearly three months. I alluded to the opinion expressed by Mr. Disraeli in reference to the Irish Church Bill, and the hon. gentleman seemed to doubt whether the views expressed, and which I attributed to the late leader of the Conservative party in England, were the views which that distinguished nobleman entertained. Well, Sir, I have turned up the speech of Disraeli on that occasion and I will read an extract to the House. Mr. Disraeli, when Mr. Gladstone first proposed the resolutions relating to the disestablishment of the Irish Church, declared that the measure was important and should not be disposed of by Parliament without the country having an opportunity of considering it—that the House should be dissolved and the question made an issue and that if the people in the country sustained Mr. Gladstone in that view, then, and not before it would be time to deal with the subject. Well, Sir, Mr. Gladstone acted on the principle laid down by his antagonist. An appeal was had to the country and a majority were returned favorable to the disestablishment of the Irish church. After the new Parliament met, after Mr. Gladstone spoke on the subject, Mr. Disraeli made the following observations:

"I take the fair interpretation of the decision of the country at the general elections to be this: That it was the opinion of the country that the right hon. gentleman should have the opportunity of dealing with the question of the church in Ireland. I do not understand that the country pledged itself to support any particular measure. No particular measure was then before it; but it declared and decided in a manner which could not be mistaken that the right hon. gentleman should have a fair and full opportunity of dealing with the church in Ireland."

On the same subject he goes on to say:

"I trust the right hon. gentleman will give ample time to the House and the country for the consideration of his measure before he asks for a decision."

The House will mark the observation "ample time to the House and the country for the consideration of his measure." He goes on to say:—

"I trust, therefore, as we are not opposing the motion, the right hon. gentleman will accede to my proposition, and allow the House and the country an opportunity for considering this important subject, which involves details all of which must be investigated; and if he pursues that course, he will find that he will have to encounter no unnecessary or vexatious delay."

Mr. Gladstone in reply said the measure would be in the hands of members next day, that being a Monday, and two weeks from the following Thursday would be allowed before the Bill was read a second time. That was seventeen days between the first reading and the second. The Right hon. gentleman, who led the Conservative party, asked not merely that the House should have ample time for consideration, but that time should be given for consideration of the subject by the country. Now, I would like to know what time the hon. gentleman has given for the consideration of this Bill by the country. Why, Sir, four-fifths of the country—a great majority of the constituent body have had no opportunity at all. In many parts of Ontario it has scarcely reached them yet, and yet the hon. gentleman insists at the last moment of the Session that the present measure shall be put through, not only without giving the country a fair opportunity for its consideration, but the House an opportunity for considering the effect of this measure in all its details. The right hon. gentleman says why you took a technical objection to the Bill. I say we took a proper objection to a wholly different Bill. The hon. gentleman brought down here one Bill; he submitted to a third Chamber that same Bill. It was surreptitiously taken from this House; it was submitted to that third Chamber unknown to our law and our constitution. It was altered and amended there. Why, Sir, we have heard rumours of the discussion which took place there. We have heard of stormy meetings there, of high words that passed between men who were fighting for this township or that, to have it transferred to this constituency or that, and one hon. gentleman it is said averred that he had not heard such swearing, such profanity since the meeting was held for the execution of Mr. Letellier, and when similar profanity was indulged in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who told the hon. gentleman that?

Mr. MILLS. I said it was a rumour.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman is the propagator of a false rumour. He is stating what is distinctly untrue.

Mr. MILLS. Is it true, I ask? Were there no disputes? Is it true the Bill he introduced on the 28th of April was altered in that caucus?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not true.

Mr. MILLS. How is it then that we had brought down on Saturday a wholly different Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not true.

Mr. MILLS. How is it that we have a Bill which is wholly different in its provisions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not wholly true.

Mr. MILLS. I say it is, and the Journals and Debates of the House will prove it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is false, altogether false.

Mr. MILLS. That statement on the Journals will show whether the falsehood rests with me or in the denial of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman leads not a Government but a conspiracy—a conspiracy against the constitution of this country—against the

liberties of the people of this country, against the rights and honour of Parliament.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman should retract these words. They are a disgrace to him and I say his words should be taken down.

Mr. MILLS. Are they true? The hon. gentleman to-day said himself that his constituency was not the proper shape and that he insisted on these changes.

Mr. HESSON. There is another falsehood.

Mr. MILLS. This Bill is the result of a contract between conspirators. This Bill confirms what these hon. gentlemen did in that secret caucus, and the people will decide whether these hon. gentlemen will profit by the conspiracy which was then formed to deprive the majority of the people of the controlling influence in the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to deal with a subject which is a great public trust committed to his hands, a subject which does not relate to the administration of public affairs, which does not concern the Crown, but which concerns this House and belongs to the constitution of this House; and he should deal with this question as the leader of this House and not as the chief adviser of the Crown. How has he undertaken to protect the rights of the minority of this House and to deal with the electorate of this country, who are represented by that minority? Has he undertaken to exercise that protecting care which, as the leader of this House and the guardian of rights of the electoral body represented here, are entitled to look for at his hands?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every new constituency is a Grit constituency.

Mr. MILLS. We know how anxious the hon. gentleman is to accommodate the Grits. This is the most important question that ever came before Parliament, because it makes it quite possible that the great majority of the votes of the electors may be cast for one party and the great majority of the representatives who sit in this House may belong to another party. A measure that makes such a thing possible is not a proper measure; and the measure now before us was intended to produce this result and might produce it but for its atrocious character and the indignation that it will arouse. Sir, we can have some regard for the revolutionist, even though his acts may be wholly unjustifiable, who will run some personal risk to obtain success, but what can be said for a leader of a Government who feels that the majority of the country are against him, and in order to secure success without any risk to himself, avails himself of the power of legislation to secure office and its emoluments for himself in the succeeding Parliament? The hon. gentleman has spoken in favor of the great principle of representation by population. That principle is not recognised in this Bill, and if it were, it would not remove the objections against it as it appears before us. What is the aim of Parliamentary Government? Is it not to carry on the Government according to the well understood wishes of the people and to give to the prevailing sentiment of the country a controlling influence in Parliament, while the Bill of the hon. gentleman aims to carry out the design of keeping a political party in office irrespective of the sentiments and feelings of the majority of the electors. I am in favor of representation by population, but I deny that it is the only point to be considered. There are many other considerations such as those of municipal boundaries, which the hon. gentleman recognized in 1872, which he again affirmed a few days ago, but which the hon. Minister of Customs to-night repudiated. He told us that these considerations were of no value in this House because we did not deal with municipal or local affairs, but with matters of trade and commerce. The hon. gentleman knows that in choosing a candidate for election, the bringing together of people who have been

Mr. MILLS.

associated in municipal affairs and in various other matters, is a wholly different thing from calling a people together who never meet for any other purpose. There is no justification for it—it being proposed wholly in the interest of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman has proposed to govern us by the sacred rule of three, and yet the hon. member for West Durham has shown that that rule is wholly illusory as applied to this measure, and that representation by population is not recognized. If the hon. First Minister was sincere in his professions, why did he not equalize the constituencies in the other Provinces also? We know there was no sincerity in this argument, and that his object was wholly different. Equalization could have been secured without violating the municipal boundaries of the various constituencies of Ontario. The hon. gentleman is a very recent convert to representation by population which he formerly struggled against and denounced in the strongest language. In the readjustments of 1867 and 1871 he did not propose any such policy as the present, or only to a very limited degree, as in Grey, the Hurons and Wellingtons, and in Haldimand and Monck. We pointed out the injustice involved, and he was limited in his operations by the principle he himself laid down. He has now disregarded that principle and proposed a scheme which would reduce the Government of Canada to the condition of those of Mexico and Peru. He is exercising no such restraint and forbearance as are absolutely necessary to fairly carrying out the English system of parliamentary government. He knows well that if we accede to power we could not permit those proposed boundaries to remain. They are a crying injustice; an injustice so great that they would require to be immediately remedied; and if we were to act on the principle of the hon. gentleman, we should have no settled institutions in this country, or no enduring bases of government. It has been well said by Sir James MacIntosh, that institutions grow and Governments grow, and are not made. The hon. gentleman is acting on a wholly different theory that institutions may be made, without growth. Some respect should be paid to the habits and Conservative tendencies of the people of this country: When you have a county which requires but a small reduction to give it the number required for representation, why interfere with its boundaries? Its people are used to act together in all their municipal affairs, ecclesiastical organizations and other arrangements of life; and you propose to interfere with them to bring the fractions of several counties together, men who never met before, which may produce half-a-dozen rival candidates at an election, none willing to yield to the other. If you act on his principle of dissociating wholly the political life of this Parliament from the political life of the people in every other respect. Parliament should rather be the outcome of our municipal and provincial institutions than an arbitrary creation standing wholly alone. When you propose arbitrarily every ten years to break up the whole constituent body of the Dominion, what is the result? Why that every ten years you will have society cut up by the roots, and new constituencies formed to suit the party in power. The principle of the hon. gentleman's Bill is most dangerous and wholly inconsistent with parliamentary government. I am willing to recognize the principle of equality, so far as you can consistently, with a due regard to other interests equally important.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what this Bill does.

Mr. MILLS. It does not. The hon. gentleman has paid no regard to county boundaries. Take, for instance, the county of Essex, which has more than population enough for two members, why then add on the township of Romney? The county of Kent has nearly enough for three, and under this Bill has not its due representation. Why

then give to the county of Lambton nearly three members, when it has 2,000 of a population less than Kent? Why take part of the county of Kent and add it to the county of Essex, which has already more than sufficient population? You add to the county of Elgin where there is a sufficient population for two within the county. The county of Lambton has two and a-half representatives, and the county of Kent less than two, yet the hon. gentleman professes to recognize the principle of representation according to population in the division which has been made. The propositions made in this Bill have completely thrown off the restraints which I have mentioned. You take away all certainty as to the stability of political associations, and you put, as the hon. gentleman said some years ago, the constituent body of the country, not in the hands of the people who may be said to fairly represent the electors, but in the hands of professional politicians. It may be laid down as a correct principle under our system of parliamentary government that the leader of a party owes something to the country as well as to his party, that there are other interests than those of the mere success of a party to be considered, and that there are interests to which the future well-being of a party may require that the party interests for the time should be subordinated. This is one of those occasions. The hon. gentleman, in dealing with a measure of this sort, had two courses open to him. One was to adopt the principle of equalizing the constituencies throughout the Dominion, beginning at some point in each Province, and making them uniform so far as the township, town and village municipalities would permit, or recognize the municipal boundaries of counties and act within the restraints which those municipal boundaries impose. He has done neither. He did not apply the principle of representation by population pure and simple; neither did he recognize the principle of respecting the political and municipal boundaries of counties. Had he done so the fifty odd changes that have been made would not have taken place. I have taken the trouble to prepare a map based on the Bill, as it was introduced on Saturday, and the extent to which the hon. gentleman has disregarded the boundaries of counties is most extraordinary. There is hardly a county lying west of Kingston, the boundaries of which are intact. It is preposterous, in view of these facts, for the hon. gentleman to pretend that he has paid the slightest regard to the county municipal boundaries. As the hon. member for West Durham has shown, the right hon. gentleman has taken a number of constituencies in groups and hived, to use his expression, the Reform party within those constituencies, so as to give that party a minority in representation. There is another very important consideration, and that is the degrading effect a measure of this sort must have on the minds of all those who are disposed to follow the hon. gentleman in the course he has marked out. No greater misfortune can befall a country than for their representatives to undertake to degrade the political and public sentiment of the country. There is not a particle of generosity or open, manly warfare remaining in those who once enter on the course of defending the Bill which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House. The hon. First Minister, in proposing the measure which is now before us, has paid no regard to the principle of fair representation of the various political parties in the country in proportion to their numbers. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to confine the Reform party within a few constituencies—in South Essex, the two Oxfords, West Elgin and South Middlesex, and a few other constituencies, and it is impossible to look at the results of the last elections without seeing the care with which this object was kept in view. I have said already that a system of parliamentary government cannot be carried on based solely on mere personal loyalty or party consideration. There are certain traditional influences which grow up in a country,

emanating from institutions established by the people, and which time will ultimately crystalize into law, it has been observed by Bagehot in his work on the Constitution, that very few men think out many of the political problems with which they have to deal. The great majority of our political opinions are second-hand. We profit by the experience of others and we add our own small stock to the accumulated knowledge of our predecessors, and it is only by doing so that the system of parliamentary government becomes possible. What the hon. gentleman proposes to do by this Bill will render it impossible to profit by the experience and labor of those who have gone before us. Now I object to the Bill on this ground. It is a matter to me of small consequence which party may succeed at the elections; it is a matter of small consequence whether I am elected here or not. Those who know me know that I care very little whether I come back here or not, but I do know that if I wish to come back here for Bothwell as it is now constituted I can come, and the hon. gentleman cannot form a constituency in Kent that I cannot be elected in, whether in West, East, or North Kent. But it is a matter of great consequence to the stability of the Government in the country and the maintenance of our English system that a measure of this kind should not receive the sanction of Parliament. If the hon. gentleman chooses to act upon the principle of a Mexican chief and to use the power of the law for the purpose of establishing himself in office, then I say that parliamentary government is at an end, because the means employed to secure that object will render further and radical changes necessary, and will render it impossible that the system as it now exists can be continued, and it is because this is the case that I enter my earnest protest against the measure the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House. This country is new, its institutions are new, and many of them have taken but a slight hold of the country. The permanency of the Government will largely depend upon the stability of those institutions, but we know that those institutions cannot be made available in the Government of the country if a measure like this becomes law. The hon. member for Lincoln says that Mr. Mowat proposed a measure exactly of the same sort, and he told us that the county of Dufferin was formed after the Distribution Bill was passed. If the hon. gentleman had looked at the Statutes of Ontario he would have found that a municipal and electoral district were formed which should return a member, and in fact the two measures were before the Legislature at the same time, they were introduced by the same Government to provide for the municipal county of Dufferin, and they designated it in the Bill which I hold in my hand. The hon. gentleman's statement was wholly misleading when he informed the House that the county was formed for electoral purposes and was subsequently organized for municipal purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. They were organized at the same time. I selected a member first who sat in Parliament for a length of time and then the municipal county was formed.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The two Bills were introduced the same Session, and were under control of the same Administration, but supposing the statement were true that the measure of Mr. Mowat was as objectionable as it is represented to be, and any statement made here to-night shows that he confined himself within the municipal boundaries of the counties except in those districts that had been previously established under the British North America Act; but suppose his measure was as objectionable as this one, then I say what the people should do would be to hold the Government of Mr. Mowat to strict account for it, and it would be no justification for us to pursue a course equally open to objection, equally

injurious if it should become law. Sir, many will remember in the history of England the story of Richard III; how he accused the Earl of Hastings of withering his arm in consequence of the witchcraft of Jane Shore. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman in pleading the act of Mr. Mowat as a justification for his act, seems to be putting forth an argument very much like the accusation of Richard. The spirit is the same. The act is in intent the same. We have not the axe of the executioner, but the hon. gentleman undertakes to execute us by the votes of his followers in pressing this measure. If we are not executed, the hon. gentleman and his friends will be disappointed because they are seeking to prevent the Reform electors from being represented in this House. The hon. gentleman is like King Richard in more respects than one. He has been ambitious, and in the gratification of his ambition he has not always been particular in the means employed. We all know something of the double shuffle, we all know something about the sale of the Pacific Railway charter to Sir Hugh Allan, and we know something of the design of the measure which is before us. I say the hon. gentleman has not always been particular as to the means he employs to accomplish his ends. King Richard on one occasion said:

"If Edward be as true, as just,
As I am subtle, false and treacherous,
Then by this act shall those I fear be mew'd up."

And the hon. gentleman is saying something very much like that at this time. But I do not believe the hon. gentleman will succeed in his object. I am glad to know that there is in this country a considerable section who have not tied themselves to any party, men who love fair play, men whose sense of fair play is stronger than their attachment to any particular party, and who will be the first to resent the policy upon which the hon. gentleman has entered. There is a large section of the people who will always array themselves on the side of that which they believe to be in the public interest. They may be mistaken; they may sometimes err in their notion, as to what is best for the public interest; but in a matter of this kind there is no possibility of mistake. This is a moral question, and all their sense of manliness, of fair play, all their dislike of cowardice and treachery, will be arrayed against those who support the proposition which is now before the House. Those who are real Conservatives, who wish to see something like stability in our institutions, who look to preserving what they believe to be best in our institutions, no matter whether they approve of the National Policy or disapprove of it, will know right well that they have before them a higher question than the mere question of dollars and cents. The Constitution has been attacked in the Streams' Bill and in its most vital parts by this measure now before Parliament; and without abandoning the view I entertain as to the mischievous character of the fiscal policy of the Government, I say this question is one of greater magnitude because it involves the subject of the government of the country. Looking at what has happened in Ontario—at the interference in questions of local policy, with the restraint exercised in the interests of the minority upon the policy of the majority in the attempt to rob the Province of its right to a fair representation in this House, I have no doubt whatever that the majority of the people of Ontario will disregard every consideration and stand up for the rights and liberties of that Province. Hon. gentlemen opposite may succeed in carrying this Bill through this House and the House of their friends at the other end of this building. No doubt those hon. gentlemen will feel that this is no concern of theirs, and it may be that they will be pleased to have an opportunity of serving their friends; but here is another tribunal to which this Richard will have to appeal. The disaster which will befall the hon. gentleman will equal that of the other Richard at Bosworth field.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not see that there is anything very new in the policy of representation by population. It was at one time strongly insisted on by the Reform party, and, if the Government now adopt it, I do not see that the Opposition have any great cause of complaint. For my own part, it is a policy in which I could not fully acquiesce if it were to be generally applied. Representation by population may work well enough in the more densely settled parts of the country, but, even in these, it cannot be carried out without modification. If closely adhered to, in all cases, the cities would have undue representation as compared to the rural districts; and, if applied to new settlements, the consequence would be that in most cases they would be without adequate representation, and in others without any representation at all, or the next thing to it. In a new country, such as this, there must always be extensive districts but sparsely settled, and how could the people, when spread over a wide region in small numbers or in isolated settlements, be adequately represented on the basis of representation by population. The district which I have the honor to represent covers half the territorial area of Ontario; or, to make the matter more clear, I should say that Algoma proper, that is Algoma as it has heretofore existed, without going beyond the old boundary of the height of land, embraces about half the Province of Ontario, and this being the case, it does seem rather odd that one-half of Ontario should have ninety-one representatives in this House, and the other half but one. The singularity of this arrangement shows that there should be territorial representation as well as representation by population; and in fact we are acting now and must always act on the system of territorial representation, at least to a certain extent. British Columbia, with a white population less than that of Algoma, is represented by five members in this House and three in the Senate; and Manitoba when it had a population of only ten thousand white people, was represented by four members in the Commons and by two Senators in the other House. But, in fact, territorial representation has always been acted on in this country. In 1791, when Upper Canada was first cut out of the Province of Quebec and became a separate Province with a constitutional government, the population was only about 15,000, and yet it was provided that there should be two Houses—a Lower House, with at least sixteen members, and an Upper House with at least seven members. By the year 1800 the population had increased to about 50,000—chiefly from the influx of people from the United States who did not desire to live under republican institutions—but, even then, the average to each constituency was only a little over 3,000. Kent and Essex, which at that time covered the entire western part of the Province, had only a few straggling white settlers, but they nevertheless sent their member to the Parliament of Upper Canada. During those days and for a long time afterwards the new and thinly-settled districts were always fairly represented, as well as the older and more populous sections, and that, in my humble opinion, is the policy which should obtain in every well-governed country. Adequate representation must, moreover, be a favorable element in bringing about the development of new districts, inasmuch as, for one thing, it is, at least, a means of making the Legislature and the country at large familiar with their resources. The district of Algoma, taking the height of land as of old for its northern boundary, extends from the 81st to the 91st meridian, making ten degrees of longitude, and it covers something more than four and a-half degrees of latitude. In a region so vast, it will be readily understood that there must be differences of soil, climate and natural productions, and although the population is scattered and amounts in all to only 21,000 souls, that is no reason why a district of such extent should have only one member in this House, unless

we are to depart from the system under which the country has grown and flourished. True, we have as yet only a population of 21,000 or so in Algoma, but with the development sure to arise from the construction of the Pacific Railway, it would be safe to reckon on at least 60,000 before the end of the next decade, and in apportioning the representation of a new district the prospective increase in the population should certainly be taken into account. In 1871 the population of Algoma was but 7,018, in 1881 it was 21,000, so that it has trebled in ten years, and that too without there being anything unusual to stimulate it. In view of this fact, I do not think I am in any way too sanguine in predicting that it will again have trebled before the time for the next Census comes round; so that if we cannot have more than one representative now on the basis of population, we will be entitled to three in less than ten years, and this should, I think, have been considered in arranging the representation. In British Columbia and Manitoba the representation seems to be based more on the assumed population of the future than on the present numbers. In new districts this is unquestionably the true policy to follow, and I cannot see why it should not be applied to Algoma—in other words, to the western half of Ontario. I am quite aware that Ontario, with full and untrammelled power in this matter in her hands, has, ever since Confederation, refused to increase the representation of Algoma in the Local Legislature. But if the Government of Ontario deems it right to treat the finest and largest constituency in the Province, and the one from which the chief provincial revenue is derived with injustice, that is no reason why the Dominion Government should follow in its footsteps. The district, as it now stands, might at least have been cut in two, with one representative for Eastern and another for Western Algoma. But if we cannot have this, the people would prefer to remain as they are. The inhabitants of Manitoulin would rather stand where they are in the front of Algoma than to be tacked to the tail of Bruce. Neither have the people any desire to see Muskoka extended along the north coast of Lake Huron. What they want is a fair sub-division of their district as it now stands, and there is room enough in it for three large electoral divisions which might be known as Eastern Algoma, Central Algoma and Western Algoma, and all within the old and recognized boundary of the height of land. Our friends on the Opposition benches seem to entertain gloomy apprehensions as to the effect of this Bill, but I venture to think that the country will survive and flourish under it. The district which I have the honor to represent has at least as much cause to complain as any other district. A territory running 600 miles from east to west, should in all reason have more than one representative, but the want of adequate representation in our case will soon cure itself. A district in which the population trebles in ten years need have no fears for the future.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to draw a comparison between the position of the hon. leader of the Opposition to-day and the position he occupied some years ago. In the year 1874 an attempt was made by the then Government, led by the hon. member for Lambton, backed up, I believe, by the hon. member for West Durham, to do what would justly have called down upon this House the indignant remarks which that hon. member has used to-night. But I well recollect that when that atrocious attempt was made by the Government of that time to shield their friends and injure their opponents by gerrymandering, the hon. member for West Durham sat silent and allowed the Bill to pass this House and the Senate and become law. As many hon. members of this House will recollect, there was a process pending against the hon. member for South Huron, and that Bill was introduced because the Government knew that that hon. gentleman had bought his way into this House, and had little chance of being elected again. After being unseated he did not come back again, because the

charges against him were of such a grave nature that he dare not face the people of South Huron, and he fled the country in order to avoid an election. But the high standard of political morality which the hon. member for West Durham has appealed to to-night, he did not appeal to when that Bill was introduced. Following that was another Bill, introduced by another supporter of that Government, who also had a protest hanging over him. And what did that Bill do? Among the protests that were pending was one against myself as the representative of the Centre Riding of Wellington. There was also a protest hanging over Mr. Higginbotham, the member for North Wellington, who had secured his election by a very small majority, and this Bill proposed to take from Centre Wellington 5,000 inhabitants and add them to North Wellington, which was then larger in population than any other riding of Wellington, numbering over 30,000 inhabitants. It proposed also to add to the constituency I represented two Government townships, one of which gives a majority of from 200 to 300 Reform votes, making the population of Centre Wellington something over 26,000 and reducing that of South Wellington to over 14,000. And that gerrymandering Bill was introduced and passed its first reading without a protest from the hon. member for West Durham, and it was not the excuse which the Government has to-day of rearranging the electoral divisions of Ontario, but it was for the bare-faced purpose of shielding the Government's friends and injuring their opponents, when they had a large majority in the House. I might quote the evidence which was given at the trial of the petition against the hon. member for South Huron, to show the justice of the cause which was so advocated and so consented to by the hon. member for West Durham in connection with the Tuckersmith Bill:

"He told me to go to his office the next Saturday (says Millar) when he would give it me. I went, and he gave me the note. I gave him the note originally on account of his conducting the case for me, and when I got the note from him I gave him nothing in return. I would not have voted for him, nor do I think that I would have even promised him if he had not given me up the note."

The Judge on that occasion said that the expenditure was so great in the election that he would order the respondent to pay all the costs, showing that he believed there was an unusual amount of bribery and corruption; and yet to shield this iniquity the Tuckersmith Bill was introduced. Now, Sir, I want to draw attention to some reasons why it is important that the present rearrangement should be made. It is well known that the reason for the readjustment is that four additional members were required from Ontario according to the Confederation Act. In the Lower Provinces, especially in Quebec, the population is in different circumstances, and the constituencies there are arranged in order to carry out certain principles that were agreed upon in the Act of Confederation, one of which was that the Protestant minority in Quebec should be secured their rights. We recollect, also, that in the Province of Ontario the cry of representation by population carried the people of that Province, and was eventually accepted by both political parties, and it was agreed upon that that should be an essential principle in Ontario representation. Therefore, it became the duty of any Government that might be in power to arrange the constituencies according to representation by population, which principle seems so repugnant to the feelings of the Reform party to-day. With regard to the conduct of the Local Government, we know that they have increased their patronage for no other purpose than to compel the electors of Ontario to support them and to keep them in power. We know that their highest gifts are given to the most bitter partisans in the country. Only the other day, in my county, the clerk of the County Court resigned, and notwithstanding the fact that a petition signed by the most respectable of the electors asked to have a

Reformer appointed, a gentleman of known integrity and fairness, the Government of Ontario appointed a bitter partizan, who no doubt was in accord with the leader of that Government. This was a gentleman who took the highest interest from the poor people in that section, 40 to 60 per cent. Then the Mowat Government took the issue of tavern licenses away from the county and municipal councils, and entrusted it to the Local Legislature, thus securing further power over the people. Only the other day in my county one of the commissioners appointed to ascertain the number of tavern licenses in the village of Fergus refused a license to one of the most respectable men in the town, in which a good business is done and in which he kept a good house; he was refused because a Conservative, and, in order to coerce his vote at the coming election, however, they were obliged to give him his license again, owing to the indignant protest and demands of the people, Conservatives and Liberals alike. This is one of the methods taken by the Mowat Government to keep itself in power. When you contrast the conduct of the Opposition and their supporters in Ontario with that of their opponents you cannot otherwise conclude than that the present Government have acted in the best, the only way possible—that is, to rearrange the representation according to population, and carry out the feeling of the people of Ontario; and that, on the other hand, every effort had been made by the Liberals to use their power to promote their party interests, without regard to justice or the public welfare.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The arguments used by the hon. member for Centre Wellington are just the kind of arguments used by the supporters of the Government in defence of this Bill. That because the Mowat Government did not distribute the representation in the Province of Ontario to suit the views of the hon. gentlemen opposite, this Bill should pass; that because some man in a country village did not get a license, therefore the Bill should pass; that because some friends or clients of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down was not granted a tavern license, therefore, this Bill should pass. This is the kind of argument used in support of this Bill. We had, first, the hon. member for Niagara whose whole speech did not contain one argument in favor of the Bill; a Bill of the most unjustifiable ever submitted to Parliament. I rose more particularly to answer some statements made by the First Minister and others with reference to Bills introduced by the late hon. member for North Wellington and myself in 1874, to adjust the representation of our respective counties, and to answer some charges personal to myself. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down stated that the late member for North Wellington (Mr. Higinbotham), introduced a Bill into the House to gerrymander the north riding of Wellington, when there was a petition against it, and that it had the support of the hon. member for West Durham. He knows perfectly well, or should know, that the Bill never reached a second reading—was never more than introduced. Mr. Higinbotham had a right to introduce a Bill as well as the hon. member for Centre Wellington, and any fair-minded man would say he was justified in introducing that Bill. He did it to correct an outrageous wrong perpetrated on him by the Government in gerrymandering the constituency in 1872. I introduced a Bill in 1874 to rectify an equally glaring wrong. Prior to 1872 Tuckersmith was attached to South Huron for electoral purposes. In that year the Government detached it from South Huron for political purposes. I, in 1874, introduced a Bill to attach it again to South Huron. Why did I do so? Because regardless of rights—and relying on their majority in Parliament the Government attempted by detaching this township from my riding—a township that gave me 200 of a majority to legislate me out of Parliament they knew my total majority was only 165, and it was thought that the detaching of that township from South Huron would secure my defeat. I

Mr. ORTON.

warned the Government that they would fail in securing their object, and they did fail; a Liberal member was returned by a majority of eighty-four. I introduced my Bill to rectify the wrong perpetrated in 1872. When I introduced that Bill—the present First Minister—the hon. Minister of Customs and many of their followers were in Parliament, and yet not one of them ventured to divide the House against my Bill. They were ashamed of their work of 1872 (as now they are ashamed of the Bill,) and one of the colleagues of the hon. First Minister said that the Bill was one that should be sanctioned by Parliament.

Mr. PLUMB. Who was it?

Mr. CAMERON. Peter Mitchell—a man who stands higher in the estimation of the public than the hon. member for Niagara.

Mr. PLUMB. I would like to know where you will find that?

Mr. CAMERON. If the hon. gentleman will look up the records of that day, he will find that Peter Mitchell said the Bill had his entire approval. Why, the hon. gentleman ought to know that; or is he really so ignorant of the proceedings of former Parliaments that he does not know this fact.

Mr. PLUMB. I know when the hon. gentleman's case was tried, and I can get the record for him.

Mr. CAMERON. I know when yours was tried, and if you got your deserts you would not be here. The hon. member for North Wellington has seen fit to refer to my election trial, and to make some unfavorable comments on it, but he had not the candor to refer to any other than the one witness who gave testimony against me, a man named Millar. He has not the honesty to point out that this man's evidence was contradicted by that of two other men. He had not the candor to point to the judgment of Mr. Justice Galt, who said that he placed no weight whatever in Millar's testimony, that he did not believe a word that Millar uttered, and that I was in no sense personally implicated in the charges made against me. Sir, I never disputed the fact that there was money spent in South Huron; but why, Sir, you must meet the devil with the devil's weapons, and so some money was spent.

Mr. PLUMB. \$6,000.

Mr. CAMERON. Perhaps so, but the hon. member for Niagara was never able satisfactorily to account for \$1,700 found in the manger of a stable on the eve of the election, conveniently left there to be had by his friends, and to be used for corrupt purposes.

Mr. PLUMB. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has ventured to say that \$1,700 were found in my stable which I could not satisfactorily account for. The hon. gentleman has said, probably not wittingly—for I will not charge him with that—a positive untruth. No such sum or any sum of money was ever found on my premises or near my premises. No such statement appeared in the evidence at the election trial; no such charge was ever made against me; I was never called upon to account for any such sum; no such sum was expended in my election. The whole sum proved to have been expended was \$125, while the hon. gentleman expended \$6,000, as he acknowledged himself.

Mr. CAMERON. I say that in one of the trials against the hon. gentleman for corrupt practices the evidence pointed to the fact that a certain sum of money was found in the manger of the hon. gentleman's stable which was never accounted for. I never disputed the fact that there was money expended in South Huron in 1872. Anybody who will turn to my evidence will find a candid statement of the amount of money so expended. But I have explained why it became necessary to expend any money in South

Huron in 1872. Will the hon. First Minister deny, if he is within the range of my voice, that he sent his law partner to South Huron in 1872 with \$3,000 of Sir Hugh Allan's money in order to defeat me, and that it was spent to corrupt the electors of that constituency? If he does deny this charge, then I challenge him to give me a Committee of this House and I will prove it. The less hon. gentlemen say on a question of this kind the better for themselves. Let them turn to the records of the election trial in Kingston before the late Chief Justice Richards. Do they not know that their leader escaped disqualification by the skin of his teeth; and he would not have escaped it at all had not his colleagues happened to be conveniently absent at the time. The less hon. gentlemen opposite say on this subject the better. A word or two as to this Bill. No one, who will honestly examine this Bill, can doubt that it is a Bill solely in the interest of the Tories. Every county is gerrymandered in their interest. Equalizing the population, contiguity of municipalities, maintaining county boundaries, were all of minor consideration. The one object aimed at was to keep the Government in power, and this is notably so with regard to the Hurons. Let us see how the population stood, and now stands, in that county: The population of the north riding, according to the first proposition, was 26,098. The population of Centre Huron, was 22,321, and of South Huron, 23,453. These three ridings were, therefore, as equally balanced as probably any three ridings in any county in the whole of Ontario. As between the centre and the south there was a difference only of 1,132 souls, and between the centre and the north, by that readjustment, there was a difference of 3,777 only. What was the object then of making any further change, which the hon. gentleman did make, detaching the township of Osborne from and annexing the township of Colborne to the south riding? Was that for the purpose of equalization? As the hon. Minister of Customs has gone over these figures with great care, as I understand, he was the manipulator of the whole transaction, perhaps he will explain what was gained by this shuffling of municipalities in the way of approximating the populations to the quota. By detaching one and annexing another municipality he succeeded by the enormous number of sixty souls. For the purpose of this approximation, in the judgment of hon. gentlemen it is necessary to detach from my riding a township that gave me, in 1878, a majority of seventy-five, and would give me, to-morrow, 100, and annex to my riding a corporation that gave against my hon. friend who sits before me a majority of seventy-three. Now, does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that there is a man in this House or out of it fool enough to believe that the hon. First Minister gerrymandered Huron for the purpose of approximating the population, when only sixty souls were concerned in the matter? Sir, there is no justification for this intermeddling with the constituencies, and none was offered. What then is the cause of it? The cause is not very far to seek. My hon. friend from Centre Huron could not be defeated in Centre Huron, though all the power of the Government were arrayed against him. They tried it in 1874, and made an ignominious failure; they tried it in 1878 and failed again. They knew there was no chance of defeating him, and therefore they withdrew from the centre riding of Huron a municipality that gave a majority against him of seventy-three and attached it to South Huron, and by detaching a township that gave me a majority of seventy-five, they have taken from my majority 140 votes. They knew perfectly well that my majority in 1878 was 163; they knew that by reducing that majority by 148 my majority of 1878 would be reduced to fifteen, and that therefore there would be a chance of defeating whoever the Liberal candidate might be for South Huron. But hon. gentlemen were not satisfied with that. Intimation reached Ottawa

to-day from the Conservative Associations of the Hurons that they could not defeat the Liberal candidate for South Huron by this gerrymandering, and so they set their wits to work to devise another scheme by which they could more successfully accomplish their purpose. Now they propose withdrawing from South Huron another township, evenly balanced politically, and attaching to it one from Centre Huron that at the last election gave a Conservative majority of fifteen; and thus by completely wiping out my majority of 1878 they hope to defeat me in 1882. Now, that is the cause, that can be the only cause, for the outrageous gerrymandering of the Hurons. But they will fail. All the power of the Tories from here to Jericho cannot defeat me in South Huron, and hon. gentlemen will discover that in due time. Sir, that is the motive—that is the cause for this scandalous and outrageous proceeding, and yet these men talk about fairness, about honesty; they talk about dividing these counties to equalize the population. They talk about the compactness of the ridings and their geographical position. Why then did they detach from South Huron the township of Stephen and annex it to North Middlesex? Why did they detach from South Huron the township of Osborne and annex it to South Perth; and why did they leave the village of Exeter, carved out of the townships of Stephen and Osborne, in South Huron? To be honest and fair the village of Exeter should have been attached to one of the ridings to which Stephen or Osborne was attached. No; Stephen and Osborne, that gave me a majority of seventy-three, were detached; but Exeter, that gave 115 against me, still forms part of South Huron. That is the fair play and honesty of the Government. Why, Sir, as well might a thief talk of his honesty as hon. gentlemen talk about their fair play; as well might a prostitute talk about her virtue as hon. gentlemen opposite talk about their fair play in dealing with gentlemen on this side of the House. Whenever they can attach a municipality to a riding and thus secure the triumph of the Conservatives, that will be done. Whenever they can detach a municipality from a riding so as to defeat the Liberal candidate, that will be done. But I tell hon. gentlemen that they will fail in their machinations as they failed in 1872. Sir, when the hon. First Minister was forcing this Bill through Parliament in 1872, by which the Hurons were gerrymandered so as to be unlike anything in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, I warned him what the result would be. He left me in a minority of 187. I told him then he would fail; I told him such dishonest tactics never succeeded with an intelligent people. I told him I had unbounded faith in the honesty and spirit of fair play of the intelligent electors, and that if he gerrymandered the county in the way he proposed the result would be that the Liberal candidate would be returned to Parliament, and I was right. My predictions were verified and the Liberal candidate was returned to Parliament by a majority of eighty-four, and that majority has increased in every election since that day. I say the same thing to hon. gentlemen now. They may gerrymander the Hurons, they may think they will succeed in getting two out of the three representatives that county sends to Parliament; but they will fail. It is said the Conservative party in Huron is still unsatisfied. It does not feel quite secure notwithstanding the gerrymandering. It is said a deputation is now on its way to Ottawa to induce hon. gentlemen to make another shuffle of the cards, and to so shuffle them this time as to make the election of two Tories perfectly secure. Sir, they cannot do it. I have an abiding faith in the spirit of fair play of the people of the West, and I know that whatever the Government may do the people will rise in their might and teach the hon. gentleman a lesson that he ought to have learned in 1872. A word or two as to the Bruces. No more unfair or outrageous division of the Bruces could possibly be made than has been made by this

Bill. Why in South Bruce, of the twelve municipalities composing it every one that gave a Reform majority is detached but two—and these two only gave in 1878 a Reform majority of thirty-four—leaving South Bruce Tory by 586. In North Bruce my hon. friend who represents that riding had a majority of 156; two municipalities that gave him an aggregate majority of 487 are detached, and he is now in a minority of 331. Not only is this the case, but the population is scandalously unequal—that in West Bruce is 25,618, while that of North Bruce is only 17,655. Now, Sir, was all this done in the interest of the country; was all this the conduct of honest and fair men; was all this for the purpose of equalizing the population? No, Sir; the object was to defeat my hon. friend—that was the sole object. I trust it may fail. In fact, Sir, the whole Bill is a fraud on the electors; it is an outrage on common decency. It is a Bill “conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity.” But it will fail as all other infamous schemes have failed in the past and as all outrageous schemes will fail in the future.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Lanark). I desire to express my opinion and the opinion of my constituents, why this motion should not pass. I regret that no hon. member on the other side has given any reason why North Lanark has been changed in the manner proposed. It is true that after the last election in that riding, threats were then made that that election would be the last one in which North Lanark would return a Grit. That threat was made by the hon. member for South Lanark, and has been reiterated by every Tory in that riding. And I regret that the hon. gentleman has not seen fit to give his reasons why the boundaries of North Lanark have been changed as they are changed now. I regret, moreover, that such a change is proposed, because it will alter the relations existing between Lanark and Carleton. During my course in this House I have endeavored to deal with political questions on their merits. I have given no opposition to the hon. gentlemen except so far as to differ from them respecting their legislative measures. If North Lanark had been allowed to retain its boundaries it was my full intention to have retired from political life; but when I found that they wished to crush out the riding I resolved to again contest it. The hon. Minister of Customs has said that the reason why the boundaries of North Lanark are changed is in order to equalize Carleton and North Lanark. That is true so far as it goes, but the hon. gentleman did not give the full reason why the change was made. We find that the riding of North Lanark has a population of 13,943. If it had been desired to equalize the two ridings, it could have been done. Mr. Mowat did it when he altered the constituencies. We took Carleton Place from the south and gave it to the north riding, thus nearly equalizing the two ridings. He did not take from Carleton a township or cut off the village of Smith's Falls, but he left Lanark intact, so that the two ridings now represent 33,000. If it had been intended to equalize the Lanarks it could have been done as I have just stated. They added Torbolton and Fitzroy; perhaps the hon. member for South Lanark will explain why Huntley was not added also?

Mr. BOWELL. Would the hon. gentleman prefer Huntley to Torbolton, for we might accommodate him.

Mr. MACDONNELL. No; but I would not be surprised at you adding anything now. In fact the people of Huntley came down here and insisted that Huntley should be kept out. If there was no reason to add Huntley there was no reason to add Torbolton and Fitzroy. Hon. gentlemen opposite said they desired to equalize the Lanarks. Why did they not go down to Russell, with a population of 25,082, and equalize that? The people of that county declared that if two townships were taken from Russell and annexed

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

to Stormont they would go against the Government. Such a statement was made even to the hon. Minister of Customs or the hon. leader of the Government; and that is the reason why Russell was not changed. In Ottawa there are two representatives to a population of 27,412; had Nepean been added, the average would have been 17,703, and Carleton would then have had 16,645, or 418 more than the average of thirteen eastern Ontario constituencies. The hon. member for South Lanark had boasted of strength, but he was compelled, in order to strengthen himself, to cut off Smith's Falls. He found his opponent, Mr. Frost, with 100 majority, and had him moved into another riding. It was supposed at one time that part of my riding would be taken to South Lanark, at another time to Frontenac, but it turns out that part of South Lanark is taken away. The man with 300 majority at the last election is afraid to meet his opponent. The hon. leader of the Government in introducing this Bill, said that his whole aim would be not to interfere with the territorial boundaries of the counties. But this is the very thing they have done. If Fitzroy and Torbolton are to be parts of North Lanark for municipal purposes, I have nothing to say if the people of those townships consent; but if they are simply placed there for election purposes, then I say the Government should take into consideration the resolution of Torbolton Council and the petition of Fitzroy Council:

“At a special meeting of the Council of the Corporation of the township of Torbolton—Present all the members.

“Moved by Mr. P. O. Kelly, and seconded by Mr. James Shaw, and resolved, That this Council sees with surprise and regret that the Dominion Government has in contemplation a move to separate part of the county of Carleton and join the same to the county of Lanark.

“We would therefore take this opportunity of expressing our view on the subject. We therefore are unanimous in our opinion, that any change would be against the wishes and injurious to the interests of all ratepayers of this township.”

This is signed by the reeve and the clerk. The hon. leader of the Government says he has received no petitions on this subject, but I say my late opponent and the prospective candidates of the Conservative party, and the president, secretary and several members of the Conservative Association were here weeks ago and had communications with the Government in reference to this Bill. If they desired to equalize the population why did they not call upon the people of Fitzroy and Torbolton? No; but my late opponent and the Conservative manipulators in North Lanark did not wish to do so. The people would have been up in arms. And the Tory manipulators ask that this Bill should go through without their consent, and I say that if they do not pay attention to the wishes of the people of these townships, they will be glad to do so before the elections are over. They may compel them to vote in a certain place, but they cannot compel them to vote for a certain candidate. Nothing more convinces me that the Government will be opposed by the Liberal young men of this country than this Bill. Why did not they gerrymander North Lanark in 1872? Because the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) represented it at that time, and if there was no necessity for a change in 1872, why make a change in 1882? The reason is that they have ascertained that any person professing to support the acts or the policy of the Government need not apply to Lanark now. They cannot make the people of these townships believe that this Act is passed for anything else than political purposes, and if they pass it they will find that not only the people of these townships, but the electors all over the country will rise up against them. We have the hon. Minister of Customs occupying an important place and receiving a large salary, as do many of his friends, and the same is true of the hon. Minister of Finance, and whatever influence or power I may possess I shall exert to the utmost to remove them from the positions they now further wish to hold by this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. Although it is an outrageous, and an unfair, and an absurd thing to debate a question of this importance after four o'clock in the morning we feel that a debate must be had, that we have that to say which must be said, and we shall say it at whatever hour in the morning or the afternoon it may have to be said. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of a midnight attack having been made upon the electorate in 1874, when a change of Government was brought about by unforeseen and unlooked for scandalous disclosures in regard to the personal conduct of the men who formed the Conservative Government. But the fact was that new Government, although it possessed a small majority in the House, had not a working majority, and as the public sentiment in favor of the new Government was stronger in the country than in the House, the gentleman who led that Government dissolved the House, and took the only constitutional means of ascertaining what the will of the country was. Now, Sir, we are on the verge of another midnight attack, if that were a midnight attack.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. CASEY. The Bill before the House shows it; the stump speeches made in the House by the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways, and the other members of the Government, are sufficient proof of it. The statements of the Conservative papers and of Conservative candidates show that we are on the verge of an election. They hope that in spite of all these signs they may catch us napping; but I think the country is sufficiently aroused now to the fact that there is going to be a dissolution, a sudden and uncalled-for dissolution. We find a Government with a majority of eighty or ninety who declare that they are stronger in the country than ever, that the National Policy has more friends than it ever had, that the Pacific Railway bargain is more popular than it ever was, about to dissolve the House and appeal to the people. Their excuse is that the people should pronounce on their railway and financial policy. We asked this House and the Government to let the country pronounce on the Pacific Railway contract when there was some chance of the opinion of the country having some effect upon it, and they absolutely refused to do so. But now they demand an appeal to the people when it is too late, and the introduction of the present Bill is the most convincing proof that the Government know that the public sentiment of Ontario at all events is against them. Why, Sir, they have not the courage to fight out the battle on the old battle-field, or to play out the game according to the old rules, but in the last days of the Session, when they know they are going to dissolve the House in a few days, they are changing the whole map of the battle-field and making new rules for the game; and yet they dare to tell us that they are going back to the country to consult the people and obtain their true opinion. Why, Sir, I venture to say that it is quite possible, under the provisions of this Bill that a minority of the total vote of Ontario may elect a majority of its members in this House, and it is with that object that the Bill is introduced. The great Napoleon used to say that Providence was on the side of the strongest battalions. Our Canadian Napoleon seems to be of the same opinion. He thinks Providence is on the side of his strong majority, and he thinks it well to make sure that that majority shall be permanent. He is going to obtain his future majority by the votes of the majority he now has. If this Bill succeeds in its object, this House will virtually become a close corporation. Talk about consulting public opinion? Under a Bill of this kind, the Government will not be consulting the public opinion of Ontario, but the opinion of those who sit behind them. I think that on this occasion the hon. gentleman is counting

too much on his strong battalions and on the miraculous effects of the providence which sits behind him, which however powerful in carving the constituencies, will fail in enlisting the sympathies of the people. I think the Government are far mistaken in supposing that with the transfer of townships they can transfer the votes of their inhabitants. Their action has disgusted many of their own friends as well as all the Liberals, a proof of which I can advance in an extract from the *Ridgetown Standard*, published in Ridgetown, one of the places transferred from Bothwell to West Elgin. This Conservative editor denounces the Bill, saying that the Opposition is right in condemning it as an infamous one; and this for the reason that the purpose of the Bill was so unconstitutional that even the grossest partyism could not decently excuse it.

"With all the Reform and many of the Conservative journals, we must confess our surprise at the scope and range of this Redistribution Bill. We looked for the creation of new ridings in counties where the Census showed the population to have increased to the proper extent, or the rearranging of electoral divisions where this could not be conveniently done, but we find instead a complete transformation of the political map of Ontario. That to give this Province the four members to which it was entitled the Government found it necessary to change the complexion of and tamper with fifty-two constituencies without any apparent regard to their municipal boundaries, and this in direct defiance of the principle laid down by its leader in introducing the Bill of 1872, when he declared that so far as possible the municipal boundaries should not be interfered with. A pretence is made that it is attempted to equalize the representation, and with this we could find no fault if it had been done in anything like a fair spirit, but in every case the exigencies of party are considered paramount to the convenience of the electors. Constituencies are run in all directions and at every angle, and the new map will resemble about the worst possible specimen of a patchwork quilt. To show that the excuse for mangling the constituencies in this manner is false is the easiest matter possible, and numerous instances could be cited. Townships are taken off here and added there, in opposition to the principle of representation by population, and none but the blindest partizan can deny it. Take, for instance, the case of the Elgins, the east riding of which had a population of 28,147, and the West Riding 14,214. All that was needed was to take St. Thomas from the east and add it to the west to equalize the representation a great deal better than the Bill provides for, and without interfering with county lines. But in this, as in the others, party would suffer, so cutting and haggling had to be resorted to. A reply is made that Mowat did as bad. Yes; and for doing so was condemned by the whole Conservative party, which now attempts to justify its deeds by those of a man it found guilty although powerless to punish. The *Standard* is in accord with and supports the general policy of the Government; but it cannot endorse such a measure as the one under discussion, and which was rightly pronounced by the Opposition an 'infamous Bill.'"

It is quite clear that we must give up all pretence of considering this Bill one to equalize the representation of the people. How has the representation been equalized in Elgin? The total population was over 42,000 and returned two members. To be exact there was one member for every 21,195 souls. But the two ridings were unequal in size, one containing 28,000 and the other 14,000. Was it possible to equalize those two ridings without giving outside county boundaries? It was extremely easy. On the boundary line between the two ridings stands St. Thomas with a population of over 8,000, and if it was transferred from the east to the west riding and the village of Port Stanley transferred to the east as by the Bill, the two ridings would stand thus: East, 19,780; West, 22,581 as near an approach to equality as you could expect. Why was that not done? Because St. Thomas gave a Conservative majority of 117 in 1878, and this change would have made the east riding Reform, though it would have afforded a fair chance to a Conservative to carry the west riding, because the Conservative majority in St. Thomas was about the same as that by which I carried the west riding in 1878. The probability is, however, that both would have gone Grit at the next election and hence this change was not made. The population of the new riding of East Elgin is over 26,000, and the west riding over 23,000. In other words, as the two ridings are arranged they return one for every 14,500, instead of one for every 21,195 as formerly. And this the hon. gentleman has the audacity to tell the House is equalizing the population

of those two ridings. He has placed them 3,400 each further away from the average quota than before his redistribution, and has made their inequality greater, and for the purpose of securing the election of a political friend for the east riding, for he gives him a piece of a Conservative village which gave a Conservative majority of 40 in 1878. The right hon. gentleman also wishes to get rid of the hon. member for Bothwell by taking away two townships and a town which gave a Reform majority of 320 at the last election, and by whose votes the present member for that riding was elected. It is not at all wonderful, therefore, that it is such a glaring case of injustice and impartiality that even the Conservative newspapers of Ridgeway should denounce this as an infamous Bill. So much for the equalizing of the county of Elgin. I shall not go into the equalizations that have taken place in other neighborhoods. Many glaring cases have been brought up, and there are a great many more to bring up. Although we are weak in the flesh at this hour in the morning, we are not weak in spirit, and as long as we have voice left to express our indignation, we shall make ourselves heard. This Bill and the dissolution of Parliament, which is to immediately follow, are parts of a concerted scheme to bulldoze the premier Province of the Dominion, and to make this House a close corporation, to extort from the people a verdict favorable to the Government by the means of the noisy majority at their back. I do not believe this midnight attack, this *coup d'état*, will have the success expected. I do believe it will have a very considerable effect. It is impossible to suppose that such a cleverly-concocted scheme, such a cunningly devised trick, such a cleverly contrived fraud, should not have some effect on the next elections. It is impossible to suppose that it will not reduce, to a considerable extent, the number of Reformers who would otherwise have been returned to the House of Commons. But it will be successful to a smaller extent than its authors imagine. I shall not detain the hon. gentlemen who are about to follow me on this side by making any further remarks, but will simply express a confident hope that in spite of this midnight attack, in spite of the *coup d'état* effected by this Bill, we shall come back to the next House, if not in a majority of the whole House, at least in such force as will prevent the perpetration of any such outrage as this during the next five years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for Niagara insists on calling in the members because I am not speaking, and I cannot speak simply because of the noise he is making. The hon. gentleman who is dying so gracefully, who is being so nearly guillotined, should not be so hard on others on whom the same thing is attempted. It is perhaps consistent with the whole course of the Government's action in this matter, and is consistent with the text of the Bill, that the hon. gentlemen who support this unworthy act should supplement it by an attempt to prevent those who have been directly aimed at from saying a few words in reference to it. I can understand that hon. gentlemen are tired, and that speaking must be very repugnant to them at this late, or, rather, early hour in the morning, but if they will force on a division, I must first give expression to my opinions on this matter. There is in the Bill a confession of weakness on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. For a long time they have been proclaiming that if an appeal was made to the constituencies again they would be returned by an overwhelming majority; and yet judging from my information and from the details of this Bill, some of the hon. gentlemen that have been loudest in their boasts, have had fear and trembling in their hearts, and therefore it is we find townships containing intelligent electors have been kicked from county to county and member to member as boys might kick a football. And thus it is that after the Bill was first introduced to the House changes were

Mr. CASEY.

made at the solicitation of members, and actually after quarrelling on the part of different members, with reference to the different townships. What means a Bill of this kind? The hon. First Minister was charged with the duty of finding seats for four new members, and he could find these four new seats in the counties of Essex, Lambton, Bruce and Simcoe, each one of them requiring an extra member. How is it then that after finding these four seats fifty-two different constituencies in Ontario have been cut and carved as we find them in this Bill? The hon. gentleman himself years ago laid down a just principle which should guide him in legislation of this kind. The crime, for it closely approaches to that in taking the course he has done, is only exceeded in its wickedness by the attempt made in its justification to show that the great principle upon which these changes have been made has been the equalization of representation by population. Why, Sir, Leeds and Grenville, with its 12,000 population, Monck with its 16,000, and dozens of other constituencies give emphatic denial to this preposterous assertion. All these constituencies cry out in thunder tones that no such principle has been guiding the hon. gentleman who framed this Bill. One of the first faults of this Bill is that it is calculated to bring into the contest an element of bitterness perhaps greater than has ever before entered into any previous election contest. It is calculated to engender a bitterness between hon. members of this House who sit opposite each other in friendly relations. Hon. gentlemen opposite think that the epithets applied to their Bill from this side of the House have been strong and denunciatory, but I would ask hon. gentlemen who object to the words "cowardly," "infamous," what words I shall apply to it? Give me the words that will fitly describe the Act that a majority of the members sitting in this House, with the power in their hands, are directing against me personally, against the hon. member for West Durham personally, against the hon. member for Bothwell personally, against the hon. member for South Wentworth personally, against the hon. member for South Perth personally, against the hon. member for North Wentworth personally, against almost every member on this side of the House. A small band we are, and this Bill is deliberately levelled at us for the purpose of causing our political decapitation over which their organs gloat at the present time. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, I trust, a little spark of manliness left yet. Let me ask them to put themselves in the places of the gentlemen aimed at by this Bill, when they were powerless to resist, how would they feel to have their hands tied, and these men to stand there and scoff at them and say: "Ah, you cannot withstand us now." Noble, manly warfare this! What a party of gentlemen they are who tie a man's hands and then defy him and mock him, because they know he is no longer able to go into the fight. Our hands are, in a measure, tied, but our spirits are as resolute as ever. To-day we see the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite gloating over the victory to be accomplished by tying their opponent's hands and feet. I am one of the victims so intended, and I find, in the Tory organ of my town, that the sounds of the voices of Mackenzie, Mills and Paterson will soon be heard in the legislative halls no more. We are marked out to fall, not as honorable men fall, but with our hands bound, manacled, and we are to be jeered and scoffed at as they are endeavoring to slay us. But all is not lost yet. Speaking of South Brant, and only speaking for myself, I know that an attempt will be made to take advantage of my supposed helplessness, and suppose easier seats might be found, but it is not my intention to seek them, and it is not my intention, in my old constituency, to allow any gentleman supporting the present Administration to go in there and be returned by acclamation. The question has been often asked, "Who struck Billy Patterson?" And I suppose the question has been

now answered. The man has been found who struck the blow, in the noble and chivalrous gentleman whom Her Majesty thought it right to appoint a member of Her Privy Council. It was always supposed that the first hon. gentleman, as the head of the Conservative party, possessed chivalrous feelings, but their treatment of a political opponent had awakened in the minds of men a feeling that it was dishonorable on the part of the hon. gentleman to have struck a blow below the belt. I believe a change of sentiment will take place among the people. Why should a little band of representatives be legislated out of existence and not given a chance to defend themselves in a fair and open contest? Have we deserved it? True, we have opposed the hon. gentleman. I challenge the hon. gentleman to say that I have not discussed questions in a manly and non-partizan spirit, and if I have overstepped the bounds in the heat of debate I have been ready to apologize. If I opposed them on the National Policy it was because I held contrary opinions which I fearlessly expressed. Are there, however, no duties to be discharged by an Opposition, and is it because we have discharged them that hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to leave us to fight it out in the country before the same constituents? I regret that the hon. First Minister should have placed his name to a Bill that cannot bring to him credit and renown. The hon. gentleman must now see he has made a mistake. No defence of it is made, in the Bill, to the arguments of the leader of the Opposition; no attempt to answer them was made. It was absurd to talk about the Bill equalizing constituencies. They had to travel almost from Niagara up to the county of Brant in order to strike a blow at myself; but the contest which is coming on has yet to decide whether it will be fatal. I regret, however, that the townships taken away should include men who have stood by me during my political life, and with whom I have had pleasant associations. Here was the riding of North Norfolk, with 17,000 people, needing equalization; but Oakland is dismembered from South Brant, and not put there, but tacked on to a riding with which it had no connection, a riding which has already a population of 24,000. I ask the hon. Minister, who I see has resumed his wonted good nature, why this was done? The right hon. gentleman will find that in this matter, as in many others, he has committed a mistake in fighting against principles which in days gone by he opposed, but which he was always ready to take up and adopt in order to retain himself in office. But he will find, as he has found before, that when he takes up principles which he does not believe in, which he never did believe in, and attempts to put them in practice, he is sure to bungle. The county of Bruce was entitled to another member, and the hon. gentleman gave it another member. But how? Three divisions could easily have been made, approximately equal in population and geographically correct. In that case, they would have taken from my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. Gillies) nearly 200 of his supporters; but that was not enough. Even that did not satisfy them, and they took away from him another township with 150 of a Reform majority, and the result of all this is that one riding has 25,000 population and the other 17,000, and so it goes throughout the whole Bill. I find it is impossible, in view of the details of this Bill, to speak of the hon. gentleman in the terms in which I would like to speak of him—to speak even of an opponent. The hon. gentleman professes to be guided by the principle of representation by population, and I appeal to him before it is too late—for it is within his power and within his province, while the Bill is within the Committee, so to alter it as to give a measure of recognition to that principle which, as the Bill now stands, is violated in every clause. Every honorable and fair-minded man must see, in the measure, a

shameful and deliberate attempt to stab political opponents, to bind their hands. In Committee of the Whole there will be an opportunity for the hon. gentleman to retrace his steps. If the hon. gentleman will yet amend his Bill so as to accord with the principle to which he professes his adherence, I, for one, will not raise my voice against the Bill, no matter what may be its political effects in individual cases. But if this Bill is allowed to go through Committee as it is, with all its iniquities, with all its violations in almost every clause of the true principle of equalizing the population, then, Sir, I will be sorry for it, and deep down in my heart will rest the conviction—and it will be a lasting and abiding one—that a gentleman who has passed a high and successful career in the cause of Canada, has, in his last days, been a party to putting a measure on the Statute-Book which the unbiassed people of the country and of the world will repudiate as an act unworthy of his position. The right hon. gentlemen said with some pride, in our hearing the other day: "A Briton I was born and a Briton I hope to die." Sir, it is a grand thing to be a Briton, because associated with that name is all that is noble and brave and chivalrous; but if the hon. gentleman puts that Bill through, a Bill intended to level a fatal blow at his opponents, and intended to strengthen him in this House by sheer force of the majority which he has, I put the question to the hon. gentlemen, having been born a Briton, how can he hope to die a Briton with that blot on a name which I would fain hope might yet go down unsullied by it to posterity.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fiset,	McIsaac,
Bain,	Fleming,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillies,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Pickard,
Brown,	Guthrie,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Haddow,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Rogers,
Cameron (Huron),	Huntington,	Ross (Middlesex),
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Rymal,
Casey,	Killam,	Scriven,
Casgrain,	King,	Skinner,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Cockburn,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Thompson,
Crouter,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Trow,
Dumont,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Wheeler.—51.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fitzsimmons,	Merner,
Amyot,	Fortin,	Méthot,
Arnell,	Fulton,	Montgenais,
Baker,	Gault,	Montplaisir,
Bannerman,	Gigault,	Mousseau,
Barnard,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mutart,
Beauchesne,	Girouard (Kent),	Ogden,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Gillet,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Hackett,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Haggart,	Poupore,
Bolduc,	Hesson,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hay,	Richey,
Brecken,	Homer,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Hooper,	Rochester,
Bunting,	Kaufbach,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Kilvert,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kirkpatrick,	Royal,
Carling,	Kranz,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Landry,	Rykert,
Cimon (Ochicoutimi),	Langevin,	Shaw,
Colby,	Lantier,	Sproule,
Costigan,	Longley,	Stephenson,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coupal,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Currier,	McCallum,	Tyrwhitt,
Outhbert,	McQuaig,	Valin,

Daly,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Drew,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Ferguson,

McDougald,
McGreevy,
McLelan,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McQuade,
McRory,
Manson,
Massue,

Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—111.

Mr. MILLS. The discussion which has taken place shows that the right hon. gentleman and those who support him are not disposed to disturb the representation in such a way as fairly to represent the different political parties in the country. Further than that, the Bill now before us interferes with existing arrangements unnecessarily, and it does so in a manner wholly unfair to the Liberal party. The observations which the hon. the First Minister himself has made, indicate that it was his deliberate intention, to use his own expression, to "hive" the Liberal party in the constituencies in the Province of Ontario. But, Sir, we will have an opportunity of appealing to hon. gentlemen, to their masters, the constituent body of the Province of Ontario. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved, that in readjusting the representation of the people in Parliament, there should be no needless interference with existing arrangements, and the principle of justice and fair play towards both political parties should be observed.

That the said Bill contains numerous needless changes, and is framed with a view to concentrate large bodies of the Liberal voters in a few electoral districts, and to add Conservative voters to, or remove Liberal voters from, many electoral districts, and thus to weaken the effective strength of the Liberal party, and to pack the constituencies of Ontario in favor of the Conservatives.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,
Bain,
Béchar, d,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cameron (Huron),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Cockburn,
Crouter,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Geoffrion,
Gillies,
Gillmore,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haddow,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),
Macdonell (Lanark),
MacDonnell (Inverness),

McIsaac,
Malouin,
Mills,
Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Shelburne),
Rogers,
Ross (Middlesex),
Rymal,
Scrivier,
Skinner,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—52.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,
Amyot,
Arkell,
Baker,
Bannerman,
Barnard,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bolduc,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cimon (Ochicoutimi),
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coupal,
Coursol,

Fortin,
Fulton,
Gault,
Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hesson,
Homer,
Hooper,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Kranz,
Landry,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,

Méthot,
Mongenais,
Montplaisir,
Mousseau,
Muttart,
O'Connor,
Orton,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Rochester,
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Royal,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Stephenson,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Currier,
Outhbert,
Daly,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Drew,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Ferguson,
Fitzsimmons,

McQuaig,
McDougald,
McGreevy,
McLelan,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McQuade,
McRory,
Manson,
Massue,
Merner,

Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—112.

The main motion was then agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,
Amyot,
Arkell,
Baker,
Bannerman,
Barnard,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bolduc,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cimon (Ochicoutimi),
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Currier,
Outhbert,
Daly,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Drew,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Ferguson,
Fitzsimmons,

Fortin,
Fulton,
Gault,
Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hesson,
Homer,
Hooper,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Kranz,
Landry,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McQuaig,
McDougald,
McGreevy,
McLelan,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McQuade,
McRory,
Manson,
Massue,
Merner,

Méthot,
Mongenais,
Montplaisir,
Mousseau,
Muttart,
O'Connor,
Ogden,
Orton,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Rochester,
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Royal,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Stephenson,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—112.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Anglin,
Bain,
Béchar, d,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cameron (Huron),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Cockburn,
Crouter,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Geoffrion,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haddow,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),
Macdonell (Lanark),
MacDonnell (Inverness),

McIsaac,
Malouin,
Mills,
Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Shelburne),
Rogers,
Ross (Middlesex),
Rymal,
Scrivier,
Skinner,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—52.

Bill read the second time.

PROVISIONAL DISTRICTS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:

LOBBE.

The Governor General transmits, for the information of the House of Commons, the copy of a Minute of the Privy Council of Canada, dated the 8th May, instant, on the subject of the establishment of the Provi-

sional Districts in the North-West Territories, as shown on the accompanying Map, which he recommends to the favorable consideration of the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 8th May, 1882.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I give notice that I will, on Wednesday, invite the consideration of the House to His Excellency's Message.

House adjourned at 5:45 a. m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 9th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That in view of the great advantages which would accrue to the Maritime Provinces, and the Intercolonial trade of Canada generally, from the construction of a ship railway across the Isthmus of Chignecto from Tignish, on La Baie Verte, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, to a point at the mouth of the River La Planche, on the Bay of Fundy, and of the proposal made by Mr. H. E. C. Ketchum, on behalf of a Company formed and to be incorporated as "The Chignecto Ship Railway Company," and approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, after consultation with the Chief Engineers of the Department, it is expedient to entertain the said proposal and to provide:

That if the said Company do within ^{years} ~~day~~ ^{now next} construct such Ship Railway, according to the terms of their said proposal, and of an agreement and contract in that behalf which the Government of Canada may, if they see fit, make with the said Company, in a substantial manner and fully equipped for the services therein to be stipulated, to the satisfaction of and subject to the approval of the said Government; then, during a term of twenty-five years from the date of said approval, provided the said Ship Railway is kept in thorough repair and satisfactorily performs the services aforesaid, a subsidy at the rate of \$150,000 a year shall be paid to the said Company out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, such subsidy not being payable for any period during the said twenty-five years during which the conditions above mentioned shall not be complied with.

He said: I have received the assent of the Crown to this resolution.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOR OF ST. JOHN, N.B.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the following resolution:—

1. That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of certain Commissioners for the improvement and management of the harbor of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.

2. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise, by the issue of debentures bearing interest payable half yearly at the rate of four per cent. per annum, and redeemable in forty years, the sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and out of this sum to advance and pay to "The Harbor Commissioners of St. John," in the first place five hundred thousand dollars, to enable them to complete the acquisition of the harbor property, rights, rents and privileges, from the Mayor, aldermen and commonalty of the city of St. John, in the manner provided in the Act to be passed in that behalf, and to advance the remainder of the sum, so raised from time to time, to the said Commissioners to enable them to meet payments to be made for the improvement and extension of the harbor; the said Commissioners depositing with the Receiver General, on the advance of any such sum, their own bonds in favor of Her Majesty for the Government of Canada, for a like amount in such form as the Receiver-General may approve, and bearing interest at the rate of four per cent. per annum, from the time of such advance, payable out of the income of the said Commissioners, from tolls and other sources of income under the said Act, and to be the first charge thereon, after the expenses of collecting the same.

He said: The assent of the Crown has been given to this resolution.

Motion agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill (from the Senate) was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 160) to amend the Act respecting the Harbor of North Sydney in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. McLellan.)

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Government Orders are called, I desire to direct the attention of the hon. First Minister to a Bill which I have charge of, and which he was kind enough to promise me, on a previous occasion, should be acted on this Session. A week ago Monday we completed the Notices of Motion, and the House adjourned when the Orders were reached, the Bill standing first on the Order Paper, and I had the hon. Minister's promise that the Bill would be taken up yesterday, the next private day. Since then, however, that private day has been taken by the Government, and unless the courtesy of the Government is extended to me, I cannot reach the Bill this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say that I think the hon. gentleman's friends on the other side are responsible a good deal for my not having hitherto given him the opportunity to take up the Bill. I shall, however, give him an opportunity before the close of the Session.

NORTH-WEST PROVISIONAL DISTRICTS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I brought down this morning a Message from His Excellency the Governor General about the territorial subdivisions of the North-West which I intend to move to-morrow, and I have a plan of it attached to the Message, and I think I had better have it put up in the reading room that hon. gentlemen may see at once what the proposed divisions are.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 158) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I desire to offer a few remarks upon this Bill, and I shall detain the House but a very few minutes in doing so. I intended to have spoken on the subject last night, but the lateness of the hour prevented me. I shall endeavor, in discussing this matter, to do so in a temperate spirit, a spirit which, I must confess, it is very difficult for one to possess himself of on an occasion of this kind. The course of the Government, aside from the character of the Bill itself, is one calculated to provoke resentment and indignation, because this Bill, a Bill of a character more important than any that has been introduced into this House for many Sessions, has been brought down at the very last stage of the Session, and with an evident desire of curtailing and stifling that full and free discussion which should have been had upon a measure of such importance. Enquiries for this Bill have been made repeatedly by the leader of the Opposition. On each occasion that hon. gentleman asked the hon. First Minister when it was his intention to bring this Bill down; on each occasion the importance of having it brought down at an early day was plainly placed before the House. On each occasion it was asserted that a measure of the importance of this measure should be brought down at such a stage of the Session as would admit of a full and free discussion of the Bill. Sir, that has not been done;

the Bill has been brought down at a late hour, and the evident tactics of the Government, now that it is brought down, are to rush that Bill through with all possible haste. They are unwilling to permit any greater degree of discussion of that measure than the majority choose to permit; and it must be admitted that the Government in this respect will succeed, because the members have already been kept here beyond the ordinary period of parliamentary Sessions, all are anxious to reach their homes, and this Bill will evidently fail to have that discussion which it should receive. The Bill throughout its course has been marked by irregular proceedings. The hon. gentleman, when he introduced the Bill, did not leave it with the Clerk of the House, but withdrew it after its introduction. That Bill was materially altered after it was introduced into the House. The whole course of the Government with respect to this measure shows that they have determined to do as they please, to be a law to themselves. I think it is due to your honest and judicious ruling on this matter that they should not be enabled on this occasion to carry out their intentions by disregarding parliamentary rules. This Bill, and I say it without any desire to use harsh language, desiring only to characterize the Bill fairly and dispassionately, as it deserves, is an outrage upon popular rights, and particularly upon the rights of the people of Ontario. It is a Bill calculated to secure for the minority a majority of the representatives in the House of Commons, and to suppress the free expression of popular sentiment. It is a Bill calculated to give to a small portion of the people of Ontario undue strength and undue weight in the political affairs of this Province. This Bill is subversive of free institutions; and the party capable of framing it, and attempting to pass it, would be restrained by no considerations, would stop at no outrage upon popular rights that might be perpetrated with impunity in carrying forward their policy. The party that can thus trample upon the majority of a great Province, may be naturally expected to disregard popular rights; and this Act is the entering wedge subversive of popular liberties of that Province and this Dominion. The Bill, in addition of being subversive of popular liberties—and I am sorry to use so harsh an expression—partakes of the character of a swindle; because it is founded upon false pretences, including the pretence of equalizing the representation, and of sweeping away small boroughs with a population smaller than the basis of representation, and equalizing the representation of various ridings; and yet no attempt is made to obtain that result. Five of the new ridings that are formed under the Bill have a population of but a trifle over 15,000 each; seven of the old ridings that had a population of about 16,000 each are left untouched. In all, there are twenty-five ridings either now being formed or old ridings not interfered with having a population a trifle over 17,000, and many with a population of a trifle over 14,000 each; and yet this Bill was introduced ostensibly to equalize the representation. I am, therefore, justified in characterizing the Bill as a swindle, because it is founded on false pretences. One thing that strikes me in this matter with alarm is the fact that it is impossible to elicit a single expression of shame from hon. gentlemen opposite over a crime like this, a crime perpetrated for the first time in Massachusetts, and there recognized as subversive of the popular liberties. The design of this Bill is to enable a powerful majority, to deprive the minority of their rights in the government of the country. That offence at present does not elicit, in this House, a single blush, and the protests of the Opposition against this scandalous operation are received with jeers and gibes. I am sorry it is so. I think it augers ill for the future of this country that a monstrous Bill of this kind should be introduced as this has been, and forced through in the manner witnessed. I noticed a

Mr. CHARLTON.

caricature in one of our cartoon journals—a model of a Christian statesman on his knees praying the Lord to forgive this fraud and make it a great success. That seems to illustrate the feeling that actuates hon. gentlemen opposite, who profess Christian feeling. They may, like the Pharisee, thank God that they are not like other men; and I think there are many thousands in the country, who will thank God that there are a great many men not like them. Well, this scheme, immoral as it is, is pre-ordained to failure. Already we are beginning to see the first fruits of the ingathering that will come. I noticed in the daily journals last night that the president of a Conservative association in East Durham has resigned his seat. He had a little sense of shame left. He could not condone so great a crime, and, as an honest man, he washed his hands of the whole matter. I now wish to give an historical account of the class of measures called gerrymandering schemes, and I wish to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to the first transaction of this kind, that resulted in giving schemes of this nature the name they now bear. The first scheme of this kind, the first atrocity of this kind, was perpetrated in Massachusetts in 1811, at the time that the Hon. Elbridge Gerry was Governor of that State. We are told, in the historical account of this matter, which is very brief and which I will read, that the contest for power between the Federalists and Democrats of Massachusetts had been long and bitter. In 1811 the latter succeeded in electing their candidate as Governor. The following is the account of the origin of the gerrymandering process: "The contest for power between the Federalists and Democrats of Massachusetts had been long and bitter. In 1811 the latter succeeded in electing their candidate for Governor (Elbridge Gerry), and a majority of both Houses of the Legislature. In order to secure the election of the United States senators in the future, it was important to perpetuate this possession of power, and measures were taken to retain a Democratic majority in the State Senate in all future years. The senatorial district had been formed without any division of counties. This arrangement, for the purpose alluded to, was now disturbed. The Legislature proceeded to re-arrange the senatorial districts of the State. They divided counties in opposition to the protests and strong constitutional arguments of the Federalists; and those of Essex and Worcester were so divided as to form a Democratic district in each of those Federal counties, without an apparent regard to convenience or propriety. The work was sanctioned, and became law by the signature of Governor Gerry. He probably had no other hand in the matter, yet he received most severe castigation from the Opposition. In Essex county the arrangement of the district in its relation to the towns was singular and absurd. Russell, the veteran editor of the *Boston Sentinel*, who had fought against the scheme valiantly, took a map of that country and designated by particular colors the towns thus selected, and hung it on the wall of his editorial room. One day Gilbert Stuart, the eminent painter, looked on the map, and said the towns which Russell had thus distinguished resembled some monstrous animal. He took a pencil, and with a few touches, added what might represent a head, wings, claws, and tail. 'There,' Stuart said, 'that will do for Salamander.' Russell, who was busy with his pen, looked up at the hideous figure, and exclaimed: 'Salamander! Call it *Gerrymander*!!' The word was immediately adopted into the political vocabulary as a term of reproach to the Democratic Legislature. Stuart's monstrous figure of the *Gerrymander* was presented upon a broadside containing a natural and political history of the animal, and hawked about the country. From one of these before me, kindly placed in my possession by the late Edward Everett, I copied the picture given in this note, which is about one half the size of the original. After giving some ludicrous guesses

as to its character and origin—whether it was the genuine *Basilisk*, the *Serpens Monocephalus* of Pliny, the *Griffin* of romance, the *Great Red Dragon* or *Apollyon* of Bunyan, or the *Monstrum horrendum* of Virgil—the writer of the natural history of Gerrymander, says the learned Dr. Watergruel proved it to be a species of Salamander, engendered partly by the devil in the fervid heat of party strife. ‘But,’ he says, ‘as this creature has been engendered and brought forth under the sublimest auspices, the doctor purposes that a name should be given to it expressive of its genus, at the same time conveying an elegant and very appropriate compliment of His Excellency the Governor, who is known to be a jealous patron of whatever is new, astonishing, and erratic, especially of domestic growth and manufacture. For these reasons, and other valuable considerations, the doctor has decreed this monster shall be denominated a *gerrymander*.’ What was the result of that scheme, which, like the present one, disregarded county lines, and placed districts without regard to geographical outlines and county lines, and was calculated to secure for the party ascendancy in the State Government, but which resulted in disappointment to its authors. In the history of Massachusetts is the following reference to the result of this scheme :

“In the midst of this excitement, a new election took place which resulted in favor of Caleb Strong. The contest was ‘uncommonly animated’ and both parties were active; but the friends of Mr. Gerry, with all their exertions, could not overcome the prejudices against him. Yet the vote was close and the majority for Mr. Strong was but 1,370. It is possible that the conduct of Mr. Gerry, in districting the State for the election of Senators, had some influence on the popular vote; and it was alleged that the division thus made, which the Federalists christened with the name of ‘Gerrymandering’ was new and arbitrary, and was ‘designed to secure the triumph of the Republican party.’ And, so far as the Senate was concerned, it had that effect; but a majority of the House was of the Federal party. It happened then, as it has often since, that the movements of politicians, however sagacious in their own estimation, failed of effecting all they desired. There were elements not taken into the account, which operated against them; and the fluctuations of public opinion were wholly overlooked.”

Sir, there are fluctuations of that nature at work now. There are fluctuations of public opinion in consequence of this felonious measure that will produce results unexpected by the hon. gentlemen who have concocted this scheme. Many subsequent atrocities in the United States in this line have been perpetrated. We have the account of the shoe-string districts of the State of Mississippi, where the colored population of that State were hived in counties along the river. The hiving process, no doubt, my hon. friend has copied from the example of the Democrats of Mississippi. In addition to the gerrymandering process of the State of Mississippi, the gentlemen from whom hon. gentlemen opposite have copied went a step further. They adopted the policy of the shot gun association and intimidation, the natural outcome of a state of things such as is now introduced in this country. To-day, the Republican party in the United States, after twenty years rule, after having saddled that country with a policy under which the people are becoming restive, and seeing indications that they will be driven from power, are seeking to fortify themselves by gerrymandering the congressional districts from one end of the Union to the other. They have gerrymandered the State of Ohio in such a way that they expect to carry nineteen out of the twenty-one districts in that State, when, with a fair division of districts, it is doubtful if they would carry a bare majority. They are gerrymandering every State in the Union that they may override the wishes of the people and set the popular will at defiance. That is what my hon. friend is doing to-day. He is simply a servile imitator of those men. The press of the United States are making some comments on the gerrymandering. They must be interesting reading to Sir John and his followers. To an American, of course, there is nothing particularly new or startling in the process.

The public of the United States have become habituated to it, and it is looked upon almost as a matter of course that the party in power should use this means of perpetuating its rule. The United States press treat it as an evidence of the rapid Americanization of our politics. The *Boston Post* thinks that as imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Republican party can point with pride to the fact that its example in the matter of re-districting the States is being followed so closely by Sir John in Ontario. It says :

“There is no patent on political knavery. It is easy to smuggle it across any boundary, and it looks to us as though Sir John Macdonald had been a close student of the methods of manipulation employed by the Republican party in the United States to keep itself in control of the Government.”

As a matter of fact, neither party can claim any monopoly of the practice, both having fully availed themselves of it when the opportunity presented itself. American experience, however, is not calculated to encourage the naturalization of the system in Canada. Operations of this kind have frequently had a boomerang effect on the projectors, as may not improbably be the case with the extensive job which the Republican party now have on hand. The *Chicago Times* says :

“The gerrymanders of Massachusetts are finding Boston a difficult problem, and are proposing to put the city into five different congressional districts, but the longer heads are counselling against a course which some day will be certain to bring retaliation. Canadian Tories would do well to restrain their exultations until the elections are well over, for on this side of the line the public conscience has not been deadened to the enormity of the crime by its frequent repetition, and the recoil will be much swifter and surer than they imagine.”

I hope the right hon. gentleman will take into consideration the fact that the course he is taking is one that some day may bring retaliation, that he is opening the flood-gates for evils the extent of which no man can foresee. When we have the misfortune to lose talented, efficient men from our midst, when death calls such men away from us, it is customary for us to indulge in expressions of grief, to mourn their loss. The right hon. gentleman, on this occasion, proceeds to usurp the functions of death in attempting to remove, as effectually as death could, from this Chamber, men whose services here can ill be spared. He has aimed a blow at the hon. member for Lambton, whose experience and ability are invaluable in the solution of public questions. He seeks to deprive this House of the presence of the hon. member for Bothwell, whose painstaking industry and close attention to his duties will make his loss, should the hon. gentleman succeed in his aim, severely felt in the councils of this country. My hon. friend from South Brant has been singled out as a victim, as well as many other of the brightest intellects in this House. For what purpose? Certainly not for the good of the country, and I hold that the right hon. gentleman should be condemned for this Act, if for nothing else in connection with this gerrymandering scheme. But, Sir, there is another feature in this scheme the most deplorable of all, and that is the demoralizing influence that it will exert upon public sentiment and upon the public morals in this country. The Bill is calculated to produce a state of feeling like that which exists among people destitute of political virtue. It is calculated to say to the people: “Behold the rewards of fraud, behold the rewards of political dishonesty, behold the rewards of a disregard of popular rights, behold the rewards that attend the sweeping away of the safeguard of popular liberty.” If this Bill be a success, if, in consequence of it, the right hon. gentleman and his party are continued in power, the lesson that Bill will teach to the people is a demoralizing, a debasing, a disastrous lesson, and the right hon. gentleman in this matter, standing as the conservator of the peace of this country, standing as he does with reference to this people and with reference to that Maker who rules over us all, ought to pause before he perpetrates an atrocity and wrong of this kind, fraught with consequences so monstrous,

consequences so deplorable to the Dominion of Canada. Sir, we are hastening on to the day when we shall have the rule of American politics adopted in this country. We are adopting the most scandalous, the most debasing, the most demoralizing of all the things that pertain to American politics in this gerrymandering Bill, and following this we shall have rogues in office and good men avoiding office as they do in every State in the American Union; we shall have in this country politics a by-word and stinking in the nostrils of all honest people, we shall have lobbies, we shall have rings, we shall have bribes, we shall have corruption, we shall have speculation, we shall have the whole nameless brood, the whole swarm of evils, that will follow like vultures flocking to the carcass when you open the floodgates, as the consequence of adopting this Bill. The right hon. gentleman, like every man placed at the head of affairs in this country, is a public educator, and his influence will be exerted either for good or for evils, and no consideration should have greater weight with any public man than the consideration that his influence is more potent than any other influence that can be named in the education of the people, over whom God has called upon him to preside. What has been the influence that my right hon. friend has exerted upon the morals of this country? Why Sir, it is time for that hon. gentleman to seek repentance with tears, instead of adding to the long list of his—I will not say crimes—to the long list of his failures to perform his whole duty to this people, by this most scandalous of all his public acts. Sir, that right hon. gentleman, in the matter of the Pacific Scandal, struck a blow at political morality in this country that is most disastrous in its results. I say that, without any desire to open that old matter, I only refer to it as a historical matter, and I say that the right hon. gentleman, with the record he has behind him, ought to have sought, on this—perhaps the great closing scene of his political career, to have secured the blessings of man and the favor of his God rather than to introduce this measure, which will be pronounced by posterity as the most scandalous of all the measures that the right hon. gentleman is responsible for. Well, Sir, we have to trust that his design will fail. We have more than a trust of this, we feel an assurance, we have not a doubt, Sir, that this act will fail. We do not believe that the public of Canada are debauched to such an extent as to give their sanction to a measure like this. We believe that an indignant people will rise in their might, and will repudiate this measure and those who have sought to enact it; and we believe the result of this will be to verify the words of the greatest poet of all time who said:

"I have seen the wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree; yet he passed away, and lo! he was not. Yea, I sought him, yet he could not be found."

Sir, the party who are attempting to perpetrate this outrage upon the people of Ontario, the party who are so insensible to the demands of justice, the party who are so insensible to the common claims of honesty, will inevitably be repudiated by the people of this country. That party will be swept away and they will leave nothing to remember them by but the evil odor of their acts from which we implore them to-day to withhold their hand, not to insist upon passing the Bill and making it the law of this land. But, Sir, great an injustice as it is, this matter is worse than an injustice; it is a crime that promises disaster to Canada, it is a crime that is aimed at one Province alone. Of all the Provinces of this great Dominion Ontario is the only one brought under the operation of this gerrymandering Bill. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the state of feeling in the Province of Ontario is sensitive, that it is excited, that a resentful feeling exists there. Various things have conspired to create the feeling that now exists in Ontario. We have had a dispute about the boundary of that Province; the right

Mr. CHARLTON.

hon. gentleman has refused to accord to that Province its territorial rights. He seeks to despoil it of a large part of its domain in the face of an award which the Government of the Dominion solemnly bound itself to stand by. He seeks to do that in violation of his own past record, and the manner in which he seeks to do it, and the circumstances attending this case, are such as to create resentment among the people of Ontario. I can tell him that the feeling is deep seated; it is one that it will not do for the right hon. gentleman to trifle with. Then, Sir, with a degree of fatuity almost beyond belief, the right hon. gentleman proceeds to provoke that feeling still further by the disallowance of legislation clearly within the jurisdiction of the Province of Ontario. Then, Sir, the right hon. gentleman, in place of having the wisdom to adopt a policy of conciliation, and striving to undo the mischief he has done already, proceeds to crown his acts by an Act which he proposes to-day that will arouse a greater feeling of indignation in that Province than both other Acts put together. Sir, the right hon. gentleman and his followers in this matter are invoking disasters upon themselves and upon this country that no hon. member in this House may be able to measure. I can tell the right hon. gentleman that the people of Ontario are not represented fairly by the class of men who are here as their representatives, and obeying the behests of the right hon. gentleman. I can tell him that the people of that Province will repudiate the acts of these men. I do not utter this as a threat, but I call his attention to it, and maintain that he is now taking a course that imperils the existence of Confederation. I can tell him that there is a limit to the forbearance of freemen, and when that limit is reached Ontario will resent these attempts to trample upon her rights, these attempts to drag her through the mire, and to make her the victim of malignant party hate. I can tell him that there is danger if he persists in his course of driving the people of that Province to start out upon a career for themselves, with justice for their motto and liberty for their guiding star, freeing themselves from all the complications that exist in this Dominion in consequence of the policy of the right hon. gentleman. I give him plainly to understand that the outrages he is perpetrating upon them are outrages that they will submit to no longer. I may have spoken warmly on this subject. I feel that a grave crisis threatens this Dominion. I feel that the right hon. gentleman in his desire to secure the perpetuation of his power is trifling with the dearest and most sacred interests of this country. I feel that the right hon. gentleman is allowing his regard for and allegiance to party to override and overwhelm his allegiance to country, and I implore that right hon. gentleman and his followers to consider the step they are about to take, and, if possible, to be governed by reason, by principles of common fairness, by a desire to promote the interests of the country rather than of the great Conservative party, to act as patriots, to look above mere party interests to the interests of the whole Dominion. I implore them to regard the rights of the minority, to do justice, to refrain from perpetrating a great wrong, and if they do not do this, I warn them that the day will come when they will regret the course they have taken to-day.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not think I can keep silent when I hear such language uttered on the floor of the House, as I have heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk. That hon. gentleman has treated us to a tirade unsurpassed in violence in any of the debates we have heard for years. The hon. gentleman has not touched the case, he has not discussed the Bill before us, he has not mentioned a single instance in which he complains; his whole language has been that of violent denunciation. The hon. gentleman, contrary to his usual habit, has absolutely lost his temper. What does he say? He says this

Bill was brought down at a late hour. Ample opportunity has been given by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, ample opportunity will be given to hon. members to say what is to be said on this subject, to discuss this matter fully and freely, and we showed, by the patience with which the discussion was listened to last night, there was no intention to do as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House did from 1874 to 1878, choke down the minority by the most unseemly conduct ever witnessed on the floor of a deliberative assembly. The hon. gentleman says that we are attempting to deprive Ontario of her liberties. We saw in a very clever newspaper a caricature which the hon. gentleman has referred to, and I am glad he has put me in mind of it. We saw Ontario represented as a helpless Gulliver thrown ashore upon the island of Lilliput, who in the morning found himself tied to the earth by lines which proved to be the largest cables that small people could find, and they were not larger than a hair. If the hon. gentleman had read his Gulliver lately, and I have not certainly since I was a boy, he would remember that Quibus Flestrin—the Man Mountain, as he was called by the Lilliputians in their little language—when he awoke in the morning and brushed the dew from his locks and rose like a giant refreshed, went into the service of the Government, and remained there, not at all disturbed by what had been done. On the contrary, with the greatest alacrity he commenced and carried on for a long time a warfare on his own account against the big Endians who were contending with the little Endians. He waded into the sea, seized the cables of the hostile fleet with one hand, and towed them into the harbor, as we intend to seize the cables of the minority, and bring them captured into our port. That is the final conclusion of the caricature which the hon. member for North Norfolk has quoted. But there is something more serious than this, to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. He has ventured to say that the dominant party has attempted to use their power for the purpose of crushing out the miserable remnant of life left on the Opposition side. They failed to be in sympathy with the people of Canada; it is not a scheme for redistribution seats that has killed these hon. gentlemen, their doom was pronounced in 1878, and it has never been reversed; and whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may have said, I say that their lack of political instinct has killed them, their lack of sympathy with the whole of Canada has killed them; the fact that they failed to recognize what were the absolute necessities and requirements of a country like this has killed them. The reactionists and obstructionists are the men who will be hereafter held responsible for the ruin of a party which was once powerful and respected, and which it was desirable in the interests of this House to keep in opposition, for I believe nothing can be more unsafe than to have a weak and feeble minority, a threatening and desperate minority, such as the hon. gentlemen who has just spoken represents on the Opposition side of the House. I could imagine, if I desired to do so, a conversation among hon. gentlemen opposite, similar to that which was quoted by the leader of the Opposition last night during his long speech. I could imagine those hon. gentlemen in power in 1882, and could see them get together to construct a scheme for the redistribution of seats in Ontario. I could see them guided by the inspiration of the Mowat Government in 1873-74, and we very well know from the indications we had then what would have been the result of their cogitations. The hon. gentleman spoke as if a scheme of this kind was an anomalous one. Does he not know that the voters of Ontario remain the same? With one breath he says we have annihilated his party, and in the next breath he says an indignant people will rise and repudiate the attempt made to destroy them, and will repudiate the attempt to do what we had a perfect right to do; but no man can complain of what is

perfectly legitimate, what we have done in the exercise of an authority which was delegated to the right hon. gentleman who I follow and his colleagues, what we could not refrain from doing, and hon. gentlemen opposite knew it full well. The wounds smart no doubt, and the hon. gentleman shows his wounds, and like a whipped school-boy he whines over them. Sir, the hon. gentleman and his friends will get no sympathy in Ontario. The Province of Ontario will say: "In 1874, we entrusted those hon. gentlemen with power. In 1874, misled by the promises of the hon. gentleman and his friends, we said, if you can govern better than the party who have been in power from 1868 to 1874, we give the country into your hands. You have promised that you will govern the country on certain principles which you have announced, you have promised retrenchment and reform, you have promised a reversal of the extravagant policy which you renounced; we will let you try your hand, we will send away our old and trusted servants, we will listen to your charges against them, you shall have the keys of the Treasury, and we will see how the new men will manage." With an enormous majority, with a majority at his back which gave no excuse for shortcoming, what did the hon. leader of the Government do during all those five years. I will venture to say there is not a more shameful record of jobbery, of plundering, of abuse of powers than can be found in the records of the Government for five years between 1874 and 1878. There is the secret of the hon. gentleman's grief; there is the reason why he and his party suffer the humiliation of which a daily spectacle is presented to us in the minority which now sits in this House. The people took these hon. gentlemen at their word. They trusted them. They were deceived, and upon the flimsiest issue that ever went before a people they hurled them indignantly out of office. Hon. gentlemen say we stole a verdict. Sir, let the words of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) never be forgotten when he rose, after my right hon. friend moved his resolution for the protection of the struggling industries of Canada. He said: We are thankful now we are face to face with the Liberal Conservative party upon an issue which can be discussed, an issue which cannot be avoided, an issue which we had sought; we have nailed our flag to the mast, we will keep them to that issue, and the people of Canada well understood it. The people of Canada accepted that issue; they pronounced upon it, and the hon. gentlemen on the other side are, to-day, reaping the fruits of their policy, and they have discovered what was the drift of public sentiment, what was the desire of the people; and I can tell you, Sir, that they are responsible for the condition in which they find themselves to-day. But, Sir, the voters remain the same, the people are the same. The hon. gentlemen now direct their attention to Ontario. They have deserted all their former battle grounds; their whole appeal is to Ontario, and it is a revolutionary appeal. The hon. gentleman says, the people of Ontario ought to rise in their might against this nefarious scheme. Well, Sir, the voters are all there. If they have a majority in Ontario they can easily obtain it. There is no difficulty about it. The Government cannot smother the views of the voters. The votes would be taken away from them; but if the hon. gentleman is fully satisfied that the voters of Ontario will denounce this scheme, why does he expend his fury on the denunciations in which he has just indulged? Why does he not let us rush on to our fate? Why attempt to check us, and appeal to us in a language which is first a menace and then a whine? The hon. gentleman knows that he and his friends have lost the confidence of Ontario; that they cannot regain that confidence. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not the habit of our side to bring American politics into our discussions. That role is notoriously reserved for the hon.

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), for I believe every speech of any consequence made by that hon. gentleman since he entered Parliament has contained something with regard to the great Republic beside us—a country which we greatly respect, which we always desire to treat with consideration, but we want them to have their politics in their own way. We do not intend to meddle with them, or that they should meddle with us, and we do not intend to import any of their opinions. When the hon. gentleman was on this side of the House he opposed the Democratic party, and now he is denouncing the Republican party. I do not intend to make any insinuations against the hon. gentleman, but I would like to ask him if he voted in or near Bay City, Michigan, at the last presidential election, and whether he voted for the Democratic or Republican party.

Mr. CHARLTON. In reply to hon. gentleman, I may say that I am a British subject by birth, that I never voted in the United States, that I left that country when I was a minor, and since that time I have been a resident of Canada, and the only votes that I ever cast in my life were cast in Canada. If it were worth while to pay any attention to the rudeness of the hon. gentleman, I might refer at some length to the insinuations of the hon. gentleman, but I merely repeat that I am a British subject by birth, although born in the United States.

Mr. PLUMB. A British subject by birth although born in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. In Queen Anne's reign a Statute was passed for the purpose of relieving those who were born outside of Great Britain of the hardship of being aliens, and under that Statute any person born a British subject in a country at peace with Great Britain is a British subject by birth. I might say further to the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) that I can trace my ancestry back to the ninth century, that I am proud of my ancestry, proud of the fact that I am a British subject, and proud of the fact that, in comparison with me, the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) is a plebeian.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not intend to question the hon. gentleman's genealogy or his family tree, nor did I assert that he had voted in the United States. I merely asked that question which I might have asked in another way, by enquiring if he had voted would he have voted for the Democratic candidate or the Republican candidate. The hon. gentleman says that the Province of Ontario, if it is driven to the extremity of being compelled to accept this Act, will rise in its might. He says already there is great dissatisfaction in that Province. The truth is that these gentlemen, reduced to the desperation of their condition, have abandoned their attacks on the National Policy, except the snarl uttered by one hon. gentleman the other day. They have been silenced on that question since their Bill on Colonization Railways was, unfortunately for them, produced in the House not long ago. They have abandoned all the previous issues, and now they intend to stand upon the seizure of private property without compensation—upon confiscation. They intend to stand upon secession; they intend to stand upon disunion; and they are welcome to that position, for I believe the loyal heart of Ontario the instant a movement of that kind arises, will repudiate them altogether. Sir, the leader of the hon. gentleman's party ate up all the cake last night and left not a crumb to the hon. gentleman, or to his associates on the back benches, so that he was obliged to resort to declamation alone. The hon. gentlemen both quoted Scripture. Well, we have heard that a certain person more celebrated for his talents than his virtues, can

quote Scripture on certain occasions. But I can say with Hood, that in my speeches:

"I do not waste the Scripture in my speech,
And thus upon the public mind obtrude it;
I thought, like Otaheitan cooks,
No meat was fit to eat till I had chewed it."

And all the declamation hon. gentlemen opposite can pour down upon our heads will not alter the intention of the Conservative party in this House, or in the country, or the intention of the men of this country, who will not go back to the days of deficits, those dark days when these hon. gentlemen sat upon the Treasury benches, and were only intent on how they could reward their friends and squander the public money. We know very well what would have happened if they had in their day had the opportunity which we have not taken advantage of. What has happened? My hon. friend has wiped out two constituencies which were represented by men whose seats in this House were secure. There is not an instance cited by hon. gentlemen opposite in which the injury to them is more than hypothetical. They contend that no disasters will happen to them, but that the people of Ontario will protect them against this monstrous attempt to deprive them of their seats. The world would actually come to an end, as one hon. gentleman put it, if we aimed a blow at the hon. member for Lambton. Why, that hon. gentleman committed *hari-kari* himself, when he left Lambton and went to East York. That hon. gentleman had little sympathy from hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly from the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he was *in extremis*, and when they deprived him of the leadership of the party. That hon. gentleman feared to face the electors of Lambton where he was elected by acclamation a few years ago. He dare not face them; he withdrew from them voluntarily, and was not crowded out in any way; he voluntarily took his chance of appealing to the electors elsewhere, in order to let himself down more easily, for he could not face the idea of defeat in the constituency which he had misrepresented so long. Then we are told that we may possibly be deprived of the services of the hon. member for Bothwell. Well, I have said that if it were in the power of the Conservative party by any policy to shut up the mills of Bothwell the world might be the gainer. We are told also that there is a blow aimed at South Brant. I believe my hon. friend from South Brant has no fear of himself, whose manly utterances are always received on this side of the House with a measure of approbation, and a certain amount of admiration—for he strikes from the shoulder squarely, and it is not necessary, when he makes a speech in the House, for us to go back to the records to see whether he has garbled the facts or the public accounts. The griefs of the hon. member for North Norfolk lie in another direction. He sees that by the equalization of the population of the district he represented, which had 6,000 or 7,000 less than the average population, something may happen which will not make it quite so easy for the township of Townsend to override the whole population of North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman has a majority in one township of North Norfolk that absolutely overrides the whole vote of that district, and yet the hon. gentleman talks about the importance of free municipal representation. The hon. gentleman knows that his majority in the township of Townsend and the little village connected with it far exceeds his general majority in the district by nearly 300 votes, and he is a little afraid that Tilsenburg and Dereham, and the other municipality which is added, will make it a little more difficult for him to carry his constituency; but he is sure of carrying it of course. The hon. gentleman's eloquence has given him a position which would make it impossible for the people of Ontario ever to

Mr. PLUMB.

refuse to send him to the councils of the country. The hon. gentleman only fears that he may be obliged to stay at home and attend to his constituents, that is his trouble. I hope, Sir, when the next Parliament assembles, whenever that may be, that we may see a goodly representation of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and that hon. gentlemen opposite will continue to be Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and no one who has noted the signs of the times can have any doubt that they will continue to be so; in fact, the whole case was given up at the very introduction of this Bill by the leader of the hon. gentleman himself. He said there was no hope for them.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I did not.

Mr. PLUMB. He said a diabolical arrangement was made by which there was no chance for him and his party getting back to power.

Mr. BLAKE. No I did not.

Mr. PLUMB. I noted the hon. gentleman's words, and I can produce the *ipsissima verba*, but I do not think it is worth while. The hon. gentleman knows that he begged the question, that he gave up the whole case; and I was surprised at his want of tact; I was surprised that the leader of a party should absolutely deliver himself and them over to defeat as that hon. gentleman did. He will lead them to defeat at the next election, though I trust that we shall have against us in the next Parliament an Opposition of respectable weight and numbers, it is desirable in every way, and especially for this way: no party should be too strong; and I am only afraid that the course which is adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, playing into our hands on every occasion, throwing themselves utterly at our mercy, and in every resolution they have offered, turning the tables upon themselves, and enabling us always to put them on the defensive—I am afraid that the course they have pursued,—not on account of this Bill, or any arrangement of the constituencies, but throughout the whole Dominion, everywhere—will result in sending back to this House so small a baker's dozen of them that they will not act as they should act, as a check upon a dominant majority. And I, for one, have no desire to see their numbers any less than at present; because I do not think, in the interest of the country, it is desirable they should be much weaker.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I do not propose to follow the hon. member for Niagara, except merely as a matter of form, as an hon. gentleman beside me suggests. I should remark, however, that I am delighted to see him in such a happy mood. Yesterday he was a despairing Hamlet, exclaiming:

"Of comforts let no man speak,
But talk to me of graves and worms and epitaphs."

But to-day he is a Romeo, who exclaims:

"Night's candles are burnt out,
And jocund day stands tip-toe on the misty mountain tops."

I am delighted with his resurrection. I hope he will stay resurrected a good while. Of course, by the provisions of the Bill which the hon. gentleman has so vigorously defended, we shall not again in this House hear his eloquent voice; but, perhaps, elsewhere he will be a burning and a shining light, as he has been in this Chamber. I object to this Bill. I have an alternative Bill to propose, which is not so extensive in its provisions, but which, I think, more fully discloses the true inwardness of the policy on which the attention of the House is fixed. My alternative Bill differs in title and in every other respect from the Bill now in your hands. The title of the alternative Bill reads as follows: "An Act to bull-doze the Liberal party of Canada, and for other purposes." I will read its provisions:

"Whereas by the Census of the year of Our Lord 1881, and in accordance with the British North America Act of 1867, the Province of

Ontario is entitled to four additional members in the House of Commons;

"And whereas it is desirable to secure, if possible, the defeat of the Liberal party of Canada, and the return to power for the next five years of the present Government; and

"Whereas public opinion has been seriously affected by the large increase of the public expenditure, the railway and commercial monopolies created through the policy of the Conservative party, the exodus from Canada of thousands of her best sons, and the interference with Provincial rights, particularly with the rights of the Province of Ontario;

"And whereas, it is desirable that the Conservative party should not be bound by the declarations of its leader in 1872, that municipal county lines should be respected in the re-adjustment of electoral districts:

"Therefore, Sir John Macdonald, by and with the advice of party whip-pullers and Tory deputations from the Province of Ontario, and with the connivance of Tories from the other Provinces, enacts as follows:—

"1. The House of Commons shall consist of 211 members, of whom a majority shall belong to the Conservative party.

"2. That several members of Parliament, during the last four years, have loyally supported the present Government at a great sacrifice to their own conscious conviction of duty, and at the peril of their political lives, that it is alleged by the members aforesaid, to wit: the members representing the electoral districts of South Lanark, Cornwall, South Grey, North Huron, North Middlesex, East Middlesex, Monck, Lincoln, South Norfolk, Centre Wellington, North Wellington, East York, North York, North Simcoe, South Bruce, East Elgin, and Kent, that their constituents are very much dissatisfied with many of the votes given by the members aforesaid during the said period of time that the various gifts bestowed on the said constituencies, to wit, the post office in St. Thomas \$28,000, the post office in Stratford \$28,500, the post office in Oshawa \$28,000, the post office in St. Catharines \$31,500, the post office in Cornwall \$28,000, have not fully appeased the clamor against the members aforesaid,

"Therefore it is expedient so to readjust the constituencies of the said members as to prevent their being driven from public life and their vote and influence lost to the Conservative party.

"6. That the appointment of returning officers is a political gift, that all such appointments should be made in the interests of the party, that there is great danger lest the well known social standing of Sheriffs and Registrars should interfere with that liberty of action which political exigencies sometimes require, it is expedient, therefore, to repeal section one of the 'Dominion Election Act of 1874,' thus leaving the Government free to select such returning officers as in their opinion would best serve party interests.

"7. The various schedules to this Act amended, marked respectively from one to fifty-four, contain the true boundaries of the electoral districts of Ontario under the provision of this Act."

I have also to submit before we go into Committee on this Bill, a few of the electoral districts as defined under this alternative Bill, as follows:—

"That several members of the Liberal party represent constituencies that cannot be readjusted, that in divers cases, by aggregating the Liberals, if two or three constituencies together after the process recently patented, known as 'hiving' certain adjacent electoral districts, can be rendered more secure for the Conservative party, that in several electoral districts, to wit: the electoral districts of North Lanark, Muskoka, North Ontario, South Ontario, South Wentworth, East York, North York, South Perth, North Bruce, South Brant, West Middlesex, Bothwell, South Norfolk, there can be made such a readjustment of the Liberal vote as to weaken the Liberal candidates in said constituencies, that no loss would accrue to the Conservative party from the absence of the members representing said constituencies from the House of Commons, it is expedient, therefore, to readjust the electoral districts aforesaid in such a way as to prevent the election of the Liberal members in such and all of the said electoral districts."

I do intend to follow these provisions through. Of course, they will be discussed in Committee, when the various amendments and sub-amendments to the Bill will be treated. I have done this in order that the House may not be misled, in order that the Conservative party might not appear before the country in false colors, and the hon. leader of the Government ridiculed for bringing in this Bill under false pretences. It is quite clear this Bill is an attempt to bull-doze the Liberal party in Canada, originated in the cowardly hearts of several members of Parliament, who knew that under the old condition of affairs their seats were seriously in danger. The pretension that its object is to equalize the constituencies is not borne out by its own provisions. I have, therefore, carefully and deliberately drafted a Bill that shall indicate the true purpose for which the various clauses are designed, and thus, while achieving the same result as the one under discussion, will leave no room for misconception. Take for instance the clause affecting the hon. member for Niagara. We all know that his leader

could continue that constituency if he wished, that the hon. member for that borough implored him to continue it; we all know that the leader who could pass through this House various measures this and the preceding Session, could easily continue the existence of that little borough of Niagara. Then why was it blotted out? The hon. the First Minister could not have had any grudge against that borough, which has always been right loyal to him; but, as I have said, its distinguished representative, having gained considerable in this House, being well trained in parliamentary usages, will be quite an acquisition to the Senate. This will be the crowning point in his career. It would be an apotheosis to the hon. gentleman, and his resurrection in the Senate will cause that body to rise as it were from the dead, or from the lethargy which is akin to death, and from which it only requires the lively corpse that we propose to send it to arouse it into life. Look at the case of the hon. member for Lincoln, who is very courageous when there is no danger. He has challenged not only a humble member like myself, who would dread to meet a man of his stamp on the platform or anywhere else, but he is prepared to challenge the leader of the Opposition. We know the hon. gentleman is very valiant in this House, but in his own county, which has rejected him already several times, he does not feel very safe, so he has had it strengthened to make his return secured. He is one of the cowardly members who had their constituencies fixed to suit their own purposes, and he calls that statesmanship. I do not propose to discuss the Bill at great length now, but I hope the House will favorably entertain it. I have promise of the support of the hon. member for Lincoln, at least to one clause of the Bill. I trust, when it is fully understood, it will be considered an honest Bill, for I would scorn to bring down a Bill that I did not believe to be honest. I know the right hon. gentleman knows that every clause of my Bill more truly represents the purposes for which all these deputations met here day after day. I know that its title is more applicable than his, and I believe that when this Bill is put upon record it will relieve the hon. gentleman of the odium which I fear will attach to him from the Bill he has placed in your hands. Therefore, incited by the motion to get honest legislation from this Parliament, and to protect the character of the right hon. leader of the Government from the odium of dishonesty, and to protect the reputation of hon. gentlemen opposite from the charge of cowardice, I have brought down this Bill in the humble expectation that it will receive the cordial approval of this House, and be carried by a very large majority.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 2, section 2,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the word "Huntley" be struck out and the word "Torbolton" be added to meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Amendment agreed to on division.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the word "Torbolton" be struck out and the word "Huntley" be substituted to meet the views the hon. gentleman expressed last night.

Mr. BLAKE. No, not at all.

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark). Last night I said that though the addition to North Lanark of the township of Fitzroy might be justifiable, so far as equali-

Mr. Ross (Middlesex).

zation is concerned, there was no reason why the township of Torbolton should be added. I protested vehemently against adding the township of Huntley, or adding any township outside of North Lanark, and then told the Government they should divide the two ridings of Lanark more equitably and more honestly by giving me the village of Carleton Place to the north riding. I told them that the reason they did not add Huntley was because the people of Huntley protested against being added, and, at the last moment, the Government put in the township of Torbolton instead of the township of Huntley. But when my present opponent and late opponent, and the President of the Conservative Association, found out the addition of Torbolton would make a majority against their party, they came down here and said that North Lanark would still be lost unless the township of Huntley were added. I saw them on Monday evening when this Bill was introduced, down in the lobbies of this House. I heard that they were in the company of the hon. First Minister, and I ask the hon. First Minister if they were not a deputation asking to get the township of Huntley added, and I ask him honestly if they did not tell him that unless Huntley was added North Lanark would still be lost to them? And that it was only at their solicitation and upon the representation that it was the only way they could carry North Lanark, that Huntley was added and Torbolton thrown out. Why did they not listen to the people of Huntley in this respect? Because they knew that the people of Huntley would never consent. And I say it is a midnight attack, it is cowardly, low and mean, and everything that is dishonest to add the township of Huntley to North Lanark. If Parliament desires to annihilate North Lanark, and affirm that it shall at least not return any member who is not favorable to the dishonest dealing of the present Government, let the declaration be made. I am surprised that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) should glory in the Bill, because he has boasted of his strength in his constituency. Nothing could be more dishonorable than to support a party which initiated such a Bill as that before the House. The people well know that if such a measure was necessary, the acts of the Government could not bear the light of day. Although Torbolton has been taken away and Huntley added, I am not dead yet.

Mr. BLAKE. The House is now aware of the true inwardness of the change proposed. The change was made, not for the purpose of equalizing the populations, but in order that the political complexions of the constituency may be made to suit the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman last night asked why not add Huntley, so that the riding might be symmetrical. He declares he has found that Torbolton would give him a majority, there was no objection offered to that change made; but the reason why Huntley has been changed for Torbolton is simply this: Strong representations have been made to me that Torbolton is on the Ottawa, and that Carleton is an Ottawa county stretching along the Ottawa. Torbolton is on the Ottawa and Huntley is more inland, and in order to carry out the principle of making one an Ottawa constituency and the other an inland constituency, Huntley, in order to meet the views of hon. gentleman opposite, has been substituted for Torbolton.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman now says that the changes were made for a geographical reason, and because strong representations were made that Torbolton lies on the Ottawa. We, however, know that long ago we did not require representation to inform us of that fact. It is as to the political lay of Torbolton that the hon. gentleman has been informed.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only last night that the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Macdonell) was complain-

ing very much about Torbolton being added to the north riding because of its geographical position. Huntley lies beside it geographically, and it is difficult to see why he complains of the addition. I did not hear the hon. leader of the Opposition make any special reference regarding the constituencies in Central Ontario. According to calculation it would appear, when these changes are made, a majority will be left for the hon. member for South Lanark, and the constituencies have been arranged so as to be nearly equal. The Grit majority which the hon. gentleman complained of as being taken from South Lanark and added to North Leeds, would leave a majority of Reformers in the latter constituency. The last two elections that I remember were between Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Jones. It may be contended that Mr. Jones, although supported by the Opposition, was not a true Opposition candidate. The last fair and square political fight that occurred in that riding was between Mr. Jones and Mr. Smith, the majority obtained by the former being forty-seven. Another complaint was made respecting the addition of the township of Kitley to Brockville. Not a word is said about the addition of 250 Reformers to Brockville. I do not think the changes will have the slightest effect in altering the political complexion of these constituencies. There was not a word in the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition, in which he dealt with the western constituency, as to the changes in Central Ontario.

Mr. BLAKE. I made a special reference to the south riding of Lanark.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman simply stated the fact that there was a Reform majority of eighty-seven in Smith's Falls, and that it was added to North Leeds. He did not pursue the argument farther.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I did.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman did not say what would be the effect of the change on the other constituencies concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I did. I said the county of Carleton was so Conservative that the abstraction of two townships from it would not affect the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester), and that hon. gentleman cheered me when I said so. I said these two townships were added to North Lanark with a view of weakening my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) there. I said that the abstraction of Smith's Falls, with its Reform majority of eighty-seven, from South Lanark was designed to strengthen another hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart). I said that North Leeds and Grenville was supposed to be so Conservative that it was of no consequence to it to gain Smith's Falls and lose the Township of Kitley, and that the hon. gentleman supposed that North Leeds and Grenville would be safe for him still, while Kitley was added to Brockville to weaken our strength there.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but the hon. gentleman went over the various constituencies and elaborated the figures, comparing the Reform and the Conservative majority in each of them, but he did not try that in the case of North and South Lanark. If he applied that principle in the constituencies in Central Canada, it would show him that there would be no such result as he states. The changes and interchanges which are made in the votes given at the different elections will not affect the general political complexion of the constituencies, and they will have left them as nearly as possible equal in population, and geographically correct in every way. The scheme is one which is perfectly defensible, and much more defensible than any other that could be made in that section of country.

Mr. BLAKE. For reasons which I told the House, I confined myself to the figures of the last General Election, for I felt that if I entered into the figures of previous elections the result would be to lengthen a speech already too

long. Now, in the county of Lanark, there has not been for many years a strictly party election.

Mr. ROCHESTER. Mr. May ran in the interests of the Liberal party.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman consider that the majority he got last election was his regular party majority.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I am dealing with what happened. Rev. Mr. May ran in the interests of the late Administration. I can prove that by letters from one of the late Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. BLAKE. My information is derived from the newspapers, and from them I understood that he was running as an Independent candidate.

Mr. ROCHESTER. Not at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I was not in the country at the time, and the hon. gentleman was on the spot, so he probably knows, but I fear that the news that a Liberal candidate could run the hon. gentleman so closely in the county of Carleton is too good news to be true. I fear, however, that the hon. gentleman will not repeat that statement when he goes before the electors; that he will not tell them that the contest was one between a true blue Conservative candidate and a Reformer. My view was that it was impossible to elicit from the votes in Torbolton and Fitzroy according to that contest, any result; therefore I stated what I believe, that they were of a Tory complexion. I could speak of South Lanark with assurance, because there was a party vote there, and I could speak of the majority in Smith's Falls, though I notice that the hon. gentleman, with characteristic modesty, does not discuss South Lanark as freely as he does the adjoining constituencies. The contest in North Leeds and Grenville was not a party one, as all who are familiar with the political complexion of the constituencies know perfectly well that the contest there is decided largely upon personal questions and considerations, and the future complexion of that constituency is as decidedly Conservative as Carleton. It is one therefore which hon. gentlemen opposite treat as they have treated others of the same kind. First of all, they add some Reform strength upon it where it would be thrown away. They abstract some Tory population from it where it could do most good, and they reduce the population still further. I gave as accurate figures as could be attained from the records of that election to which alone I was confining myself.

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark). I have here a statement of the figures showing the political complexion of these townships. There were three candidates running at the last election. Reverend Mr. May, an Independent; Mr. Rochester, an out-and-out supporter of the Government, and Mr. J. A. Grant, an Opposition candidate. In Fitzroy, Mr. Grant got 63 votes; Mr. Rochester 185, and Mr. May 85, giving a Conservative majority of 135 in Fitzroy. In Huntley, Mr. Grant got four votes; Mr. May 186, and Mr. Rochester 120, or a Conservative majority of 302 over the Liberal candidate. Those are the facts and those the reasons why Huntley was added to North Lanark. In Torbolton, the Liberal candidate polled six votes and the two Conservatives 54, giving a majority of 48 in that township.

Mr. HAGGART. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the fact that Mr. Grant was a Reform candidate when he only polled a few votes in the whole of Carleton county; why does the hon. gentleman regard Mr. May as a Liberal Conservative candidate, when the letter was written by Mr. Scott, a member of the Reform Ministry, advising the supporters of his Government in that constituency to support him?

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) or the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester) say that these changes do not strengthen the Conservative interests in North Lanark?

Mr. ROCHESTER. I am prepared to prove that the late Ministry took up Mr. May and ran him in the interests of their Government, and one of the Cabinet Ministers—I think the President of the Council—sent several letters to the township of Fitzroy to the Reformers there asking them to support Mr. May as the Reform candidate. Mr. Grant, whom my hon. friend from South Lanark has mentioned as running in the Reform interest, was a local man belonging to the township of Fitzroy. Mr. Grant came down and saw Mr. Scott, and wanted him to withdraw Mr. May from the field and let him run alone, but after consultation here with ten or fifteen of the principal Reformers in Ottawa, it was finally decided that Mr. May should not be withdrawn from the contest. Mr. Grant then said he would run at all hazards, and I know him to be a true and consistent Reformer. Then the split came between the Rev. Mr. May and Mr. Grant. Mr. May ran in the interest of the late Administration, and Mr. Grant ran in the interest of the Reformers of Ontario, and he received those votes which the hon. member for South Lanark said he received from Fitzroy.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman answer the question whether the addition is intended to give a Conservative majority?

Mr. ROCHESTER. I did not say that I would answer that question. I said that when I first learned that the townships of Fitzroy and Torbolton were to be added to North Lanark, I was opposed to the change, because I thought it would be better to take in the township of Huntley, because Fitzroy and Torbolton border on the Ottawa River and naturally belong to Carleton.

Mr. McCALLUM. How can you tell the political effect of these changes? I have represented a constituency for fifteen years in this House, and I can say that the candidate has a great deal to do with the carrying of a constituency. What right have hon. gentlemen to ask our opinion of the political effect of these changes?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has been telling us for the last four years what the political sentiment of the whole country is, and now he says he is unable to tell what the political sentiment of a single portion of his own constituency is. In fact, he says it has got no political complexion—that everything depends on the candidate. But that is not the principle on which the Government have acted; that is not the principle on which the third chamber acted when they sat in deliberation on this Bill; that is not the principle which the hon. gentleman himself recognized when he advised the Government with regard to the alteration of the constituencies in his own neighborhood. He took into consideration the votes of the last election, and advised the Government accordingly. We know that we cannot obtain an honest, candid, and fair expression of opinion from hon. gentlemen supporting this measure; nevertheless, we shall have this measure discussed. The public know their reasons, and the public will judge between the sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen here and the acts of hon. gentlemen as revealed by this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the effect on population of this change?

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman's question is absurd. Does he think that he can judge the political feeling of this country by a single township? I cannot give an opinion of what the next election will do, but I should judge, by the feeling in the country, and by the fact that this Government has carried out every pledge that it made to the people, that it will be sustained.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. BLAKE. I find that the result of this change is to reduce the population of Carleton to 18,777, and, under pretence of equalization, to increase the population of North Lanark to 19,855; so that the population of North Lanark is increased beyond that of the old electoral district of Carleton. The hon. gentlemen who were blind, during the whole period of the concoction of this Bill, to the obvious circumstance that Torbolton naturally belonged to Carleton, have, since the first reading of the Bill, discovered that the circumstance of its being on the Ottawa River should make it part of Carleton. Something occurred since the publication of the Bill, since it got into the regions of Torbolton and Fitzroy, which suddenly made the Government alive to the obvious geographical considerations to which they had before been blind, to which the remonstrances of the hon. member for Carleton made them alive, and which something induced them to make this change. Can any one doubt what that something was? We know that their plans will not meet with the complete success that they had hoped for, and that they are at present altering their Bill in order to further those plans.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman objects very much to deputations coming here, and to communications having been received from various quarters with reference to this Bill. Yet he and several other members have complained that the Bill was not brought down early enough to enable the people to make representations; and now he complains that it has gone to the country, and that we have received representations.

Mr. BLAKE. We did complain that the Bill was not brought down early enough to enable the general people to make representations regarding it. We knew that that portion of the people which consists of Tory wire-pullers and agents had private opportunities of ascertaining its provisions, and that they could boast of it, and that the representations being now made are from others in the localities affected, and that the Tory wire-pullers have a little bungled, and the hon. gentleman is proposing such changes as will rectify those bumbles, those who advised him formerly. The time that we wished was to enable the honest yeomanry of the country, not simply the election agents on the other side to analyze the measure and ascertain its bearings and aspects fairly and openly. He perfectly well understood that a week, or ten days, or three weeks is not adequate for that purpose, as regards this class. It may be adequate to those who take an overwhelming interest in political questions, and those who are the local chiefs of the party, and who would act at once in the hon. gentleman's interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In other words, the hon. gentleman objects to any representation being made by the Tories; but the honest yeomanry—not the Tory yeomanry, of course—should be attended to. Let me tell you that I have received representations from other parties, from two honest men not Tories, from the members for Muskoka and North Norfolk.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has received a representation from the hon. member for Muskoka on two points which show the defects of the Bill. Upon one point he communicated with the Premier a long time ago, and upon another point, which indicated that the Bill was not adequate to give the franchise to all the people in that district, and that this was a defect that required to be remedied. I am quite aware that he received communications on these subjects from the hon. member for Muskoka, who had just communicated with me, and whom I told that it was the best thing he could do to make the measure perfect, so that no part of the district should be disfranchised. But I repeat that I objected strongly to the Government not giving the whole people ample time to consider and analyze the measure, make their views known in regard to it, while

Tory wire-pullers and agents had early information on the subject, and every opportunity afforded for selfish partizan operations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman complains that in regard to this Bill there was a want of sufficient notice. Now, there has been eight times the notice given to the country in respect to this Bill, that was given to the hon. gentleman in regard to the measure for the disposal of the whole of the surplus of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. CASEY. Our objections is not that the Tory agents are heard, but that they were heard secretly, privately, before anybody else had an opportunity to be heard once. It was on the representations of Tory agents that the Bill was prepared. As in the case of the Tariff Bill, the Government have acted simply as the mouthpiece of other interested parties, who have urged their views secretly, and for the most selfish objects and political purposes. The Government have framed this Bill on the suggestions of the little Committee which sat to cook up this measure on the representations made by persons and the localities interested. It is scarcely a secret even to us on this side, who composed the Committee. We know several members of the Committee, who were more run after than the Premier himself, while the Bill was in process of production. We know they were run after by people who wished changes to be made in their county. The only possible reasons for those changes that we can discover, are drawn from the figures that appeared in the records of 1878; but even these figures fail to afford any proper justification for this iniquitous measure.

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

After Recess.

On section three,

Mr. CAMERON. Nothing could more clearly exhibit the object and scope of this Bill than the item now under discussion. The hon. Minister who has charge of the Bill, in moving this change, attempted to justify it on the ground that this township of Torbolton should remain in Carleton, because it is one of the municipalities that border on the Ottawa. The hon. Minister knew that as well when he introduced the Bill as he does now. The hon. member for South Lanark wanted us to believe that this change and the whole Bill had no political significance, that this change left the north and south ridings of Lanark and the north riding of Leeds as they were before, in so far as the political strength of parties is concerned. If that is so what reason was there for the change. If there is no political object to be gained, clearly no other reason has been given, for there is no attempt at equalization. The hon. member was quite wrong in trying to make us believe that there is no political significance in this movement. He knows that the Liberal majority in North Lanark, though always certain, is by no means large, and that by the annexation of either Torbolton or Fitzroy or Huntley to North Lanark—all Conservative municipalities—its political complexion will necessarily be changed. He knows that by detaching Smith's Falls, that gave a Liberal majority against him, he must be more or less affected, and the change is not to his injury, otherwise he would have protested against it. By it he gets rid of a disagreeable majority against him of some eighty-seven, and legislates his political opponent out of the riding. The hon. gentlemen knows that in North Leeds there has been for years no contest except between Conservatives as in Carleton. He knows also that Brockville has been an uncertain constituency, and that the strong Conservative township of Chitley being annexed to Brockville, that district is secured, as hon. gentlemen opposite hope, in their interest beyond peradventure. How are the populations affected by these changes? Old Carleton had a population of 24,689, or 3,781 above the

quota; by the present change it is reduced 18,777, or 2,131 below the quota. South Lanark had a population of 20,032 or 872 below the quota; by this proposed change it is reduced to 17,945, or 2,963 below the quota. Yet the hon. gentleman wants us to believe that the sole object of this change is to approximate, as nearly as possible, the populations of the various ridings to the quota. If that is so why did he meddle with the electoral divisions at all. He has in no sense effected his professed purpose. Whatever necessity there might be to deal with North Lanark, there was none to touch South Lanark. But when the hon. gentleman detached from Carleton, the two townships and annexed them to North Lanark, he thought it was necessary to make some alteration in South Lanark. Let us see how this change affects Leeds. North Leeds had 12,929, 7,929 under the quota. Under the new arrangement it has a population of 12,422, or 8,486 under the quota, or 506 farther from the quota than under the old arrangement. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot deny that there was some object besides the mere object of approximating the population in this extraordinary and unjustifiable change. Now, the hon. member for Brockville represents a constituency which gave a Conservative majority of 127. It was necessary to make that secure, and hon. gentlemen think they have made it secure by detaching Kitley from North Leeds and annexing it to Brockville. Anybody can see that the sole aim of these changes was not in the direction of equalizing the population, but in the direction of an attempt to make three out of the five constituencies more Conservative than they now are. In order to accomplish that the hon. gentleman has transgressed his own rule with respect to three different counties, and he has to encroach upon the municipal and judicial boundaries of three counties, and entrench upon the boundaries of five electoral divisions, and that solely with the object of strengthening the Conservative party where it is weak, and weakening the Liberal party where it has now a majority. There can be no clearer evidence that hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid to go to the country with the constituencies as they have heretofore existed. Suppose for instance that the electors of North Lanark as now proposed to be constituted should defeat my hon. friend—I believe, however, they will not—can it be said that it is an endorsement of the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite? No, Sir, that cannot be said, because the county to which my hon. friend now appeals is not the county to which he appealed in 1878, and so a verdict adverse to my hon. friend would be no argument in favor of the view presented by the hon. gentleman opposite that they were prepared to appeal to the country and expected to be sustained by the country. They are prepared to appeal to the country, but, before doing so, they take precious good care that they will not be tried by the same jury that tried them in 1878. I say there is no possible justification, and no excuse has been attempted, for annexing either Torbolton or Fitzroy or Huntley to North Lanark except the one I have just indicated, and the hon. First Minister might just as well admit at once that the Bill we are now discussing is a Bill in the interests of the Conservative party and not in the interests of the people of this country.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment to add the village of Smith's Falls.

Amendment lost on division, and section agreed to.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved in amendment:

"The east riding of the county of Northumberland shall consist of the townships of Cramahe, Brighton, Murray, Perry and Seymour, and the villages of Colborne, Brighton, Campbellford, and the whole of the village of Hastings, which now extends jointly into another electoral district."

On section 14,

Mr. STRANGE. The hon. leader of the Government finding that he was compelled by the Statute to secure more new seats in Ontario, has, in my opinion, very wisely readjusted the distribution of seats in that Province. He has done so for the purpose of equalizing the population. Hitherto the various ridings in Ontario have averaged from 9,000 up to 36,000, and the 36,000 in the one riding have only had the same representation as the 9,000 in the others. Now, what ought to be taken as the unit for the representation of this House in Ontario? Should it be the county, the township, or the incorporated municipalities? This House has nothing whatever to do with parish politics or with the deliberations of the county councils or the municipalities. We are here on broader ground to discuss matters pertaining to the Dominion, irrespective altogether of the various influences which exist in the various counties of the Province. Well, the township being taken as the unit, what does the hon. leader of the Government do in this case? He has taken the various townships, and looking at the large and largely increasing population of the metropolitan county of York, of the county lying alongside, the county of Ontario, has found it necessary to give a new member to that section of the country. In order to do that it would have been impossible to divide any one of the counties up so as to provide for a new representative; so it has been found absolutely necessary to divide up Ontario and York to create a new constituency. Now, in order to get the amount of representation there it has not been found possible for the sake of securing the proper population, and of adopting the principle laid down by the Premier of representation by population, to avoid touching the township of Simcoe. Therefore the new north riding of York is composed of a portion of the old riding and a portion of the county of South Simcoe. I feel there is nothing to fear in thus invading the county of Simcoe. Simcoe has a population already far too great for its present representation, and is well able to give to York the necessary population to make up the new county of West Ontario. Moreover, it has been alleged by the hon. leader of the Opposition that this Bill interferes to a great extent with the municipal boundaries at present existing. The old riding of North York consists of various townships and certain municipalities—among others, half of the municipality of Stouffville, the other half being in the east riding of York. My hon. friend from East York and myself, in attending to the wants of that district, used to meet in that village; he represented the one half and I the other. We felt it was an anomalous position for any two gentlemen with seats in this House to occupy. The hon. Premier has decided to put the whole of that village into one electoral district. I think this a thoroughly sound principle. An incorporated village ought never to have been divided, and I am glad that Stouffville is now embraced in the constituency of West Ontario. The hon. leader of the Opposition also, in objecting to this Bill, dwelt with great strength on the fact that the Government were taking the power of appointing their own returning officers. I think this is one of the wisest provisions of the Bill, as any impartial man must admit who knows that the sheriffs and registrars at present entrusted with these duties have been the mere creatures of the Ontario Government and have often displayed the grossest partizanship in the interest of the Reform party. I know a certain registrar, not a hundred miles from North York, who has used his office for the promotion of Reform schemes and interests upon all occasions. Every Reform cabal, intrigue and scheme in the riding which I represent, has been hatched and brought forth in that registrar's office. If, therefore, there is one wise provision in this Bill, which meets with my most unbounded satisfaction and approval, it is that the Governor in Council may appoint the returning officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

On clause 20,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the words "Electoral District" be put before the words "County of Simcoe."

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman is determined to disregard municipal boundaries, why insert the expression electoral district, and why speak of ridings at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the county of Simcoe in the main; it is therefore convenient to divide it into ridings.

Mr. McCARTHY. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for West Middlesex, with regard to the north riding, I would point out to the Committee that the north riding has exactly the same bounds as the west in the Local House. I do not know how it is possible to divide it in any other way than that proposed. There were nearly 50,000 inhabitants in the north riding and the west riding, which is called the north in this Bill. I do not know what was meant by the hon. gentleman in saying that this redistribution had been made on any suggestion of mine, or from any desire to create a riding more favorable than the one that now exists. The only possible division is the one that has been made. I would be very glad if any other arrangement were made which would reduce the riding to some extent. It has now 26,000, and might well be less.

Mr. BLAKE. If my hon. friend is so anxious it should be reduced a little, why should East Simcoe be made as large as North Simcoe by changing townships from Muskoka to it, thus bringing Muskoka down to 17,000?

Mr. McCARTHY. I was answering the objection made from the other side of the House. It was suggested that I had the district arranged so as to get a larger majority. All I have to say is, that some scheme had to be adopted in order to relieve Muskoka, which had a population of 27,000. I do not know that any other course was open, but at all events the one taken is a fair one.

Mr. BLAKE. We have already relieved Muskoka by taking six townships from it and adding them to North Ontario, with the result of reducing Muskoka with the townships transferred from it to East Simcoe, the population of which is thus raised to 26,000. Thus the population of East Simcoe is raised to 26,000, and that of Muskoka diminished to 17,000.

On section 20,

Mr. BLAKE. Why, since it was necessary, ten years ago, to increase the population of Monck, is it expedient now to diminish the population considerably below what it was then?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the abolition of Niagara it was necessary to readjust the whole of the townships of the surrounding constituencies.

Mr. RYMAL. If the desire was to equalize the population several thousands might have been drawn from the populous county of Welland.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The electoral county of Monck is now made up in some part by the municipal county of Welland, so that with great propriety a little more of the municipal county of Welland might have been taken, it being now too large, and added to Monck, which is too small.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it necessary because Welland, although having a population larger than that of any of the other electoral districts as they stand before or stand now, has not been touched, Welland with its 26,000, though Monck is partly municipally composed of Welland? But the county of Monck, which the hon. gentleman found it necessary to

raise awhile ago, is reduced, because Lincoln is increased. Because Niagara is added to Lincoln, therefore it is necessary to readjust it, but as the readjustment does not extend to equalization, but extends to diminution of Haldimand, already below the quota, to the diminution of Monck, already below the quota, and leaving Welland largely in excess of the quota where it stood. That is what he calls equalization and readjustment.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am quite willing that Monck should have a larger population, and would be perfectly willing to get a portion of the county of Welland, and I believe it would increase my majority in the next election. South Cayuga was not added to Monck for any political reason, because it only gave a majority of two in favor of the Conservative candidate.

Mr. BLAKE. The necessity of adding Cayuga was because Lincoln had been taken away, which was put in the first Bill, and by the abstraction which would also take place of Caistor. Clinton he gave back again to Lincoln, and having given it back of course he had to take something from the neighboring counties in order to get the population up to 15,445. The hon. gentleman made two gains; he lost a township with a Reform majority, which was a gain, and he found a township with a Conservative majority, which was another gain.

Mr. McCALLUM. I never asked for the township of Clinton, I never asked for anything; but whatever is necessary to do in order to readjust the county of course I am satisfied. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Of course Caistor is in the county of Wentworth, and it gave thirty-four majority against me at the last election. But I think it is desirable in the interest of the county that I should be in this House, and it can tell my hon. friend that if I am a candidate at the next election, I am coming back to this House, and I can tell him further that if he left Caistor in my county I would come back to this House. I know they looked upon Monck as a Grit preserve, but I took it from them and I have managed to hold it, except on one occasion when I was defeated by a fluke. I am not at all alarmed about Monck, as it was because I defeated them in 1874, although I had the power of both Governments to withstand, and some of my opponents were guilty of bribery too; they bought a man and turned me out in 1875. I had another election and came back to this House in spite of them. Of course I would like to get another township in order to equalize the population if it is agreeable all round.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman boasts of his having always won, but we know that he carried the county of Monck in virtue of the gerrymandering vote of ten years ago, which gave the township of Dunn to Monck. That township gave him about eighty of a majority, and by virtue of it only has he been able to retain his seat.

Mr. McCALLUM. I never asked for the township of Dunn to be added to Monck, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that he has got a supporter in this House who asked for it in order to make himself strong. It is true that I did not object to it, and I never spoke of it at the time. Even after he asked for it he was not man enough to stick by it, because afterwards he moved that it should be put back where it was before. I am ready to-morrow to run for either Monck or Haldimand.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman boasts he will be able to carry Haldimand, but he did not object ten years ago to have had the township of Dunn added, and another change made ten years afterwards.

Mr. McCALLUM. I never asked for it.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). The facts of the case with respect to the township of Dunn being taken from

Haldimand and added to Monck, are these: During 1872 a petition was placed in my hand signed by the electors of the township of Dunn, and asking that this change should take place. I presented that petition, and no sooner was it presented than a counter petition was sent to me against that annexation, and the facts set forth in that petition went to show that the first petition was not signed entirely by ratepayers or freeholders of that township. Of the 162 names signed on the petition, ninety-nine only were parliamentary voters, and some of the signatures were represented as having been obtained in a not very honorable way. The petition against annexation was signed by over seventy-one names. I have here copies of the petitions certified by Mr. Lindsay, who was then Clerk of the House. I will leave it for the House to say how far I asked for this change.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman asked me to put it in and I did so.

Mr. THOMPSON. After the presentation of this petition, if the petition is right there can be no objection to it; subsequently, a counter petition came in, and I took the action that has been stated.

Mr. McCALLUM. I was aware the hon. member for Haldimand was going to ask for this.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The political complexion of the township of Dunn appears to be this: The hon. member for Monck had a majority in the township of Dunn of eighty-four, and his total majority in Monck was only twenty-eight.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Monck has discovered since six o'clock that there are Tory and Reform townships. He knows well how the people of the township of Dunn are disposed to vote, and he was glad to support a measure by which Dunn would be received into his constituency.

Mr. McCALLUM. What I said before six o'clock was to the effect that the Bill would have very little effect on the electors. The people would remember how Government affairs have been conducted by the late Administration. Did hon. gentlemen suppose the people forgot the acts of the late Government.

Mr. MILLS. What about the Pacific scandal?

Mr. McCALLUM. It is a slander which you try to keep alive, but you did not honestly come by it. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot expect to come back to power on the sins of the Conservative party. Those sins were washed out in September, 1878. That crew of pirates who were destroying every interest in the country were soon removed by the votes of the people. When hon. gentlemen opposite are defeated at the approaching elections they wish to make it appear that it was due to gerrymandering the constituencies.

Mr. RYMAL. If equally divided, the average population of Welland, Lincoln and Wentworth would be about 22,000. There was no reason why Caistor should be taken from Monck. There was some reason why Grimsby on the Lake shore might be added to Wentworth. But I can see no reason why Caistor, belonging to Monck, and Monck being below the average population, should have been transferred to Wentworth. Wentworth, if left as it is, with Grimsby added, would have been nearly 19,000, or 2,000 below the average. Monck might have got a township from Welland, retaining Caistor, and would have been a fair-sized constituency, leaving Welland above the average still. Now, to tell any person who knows about the position of affairs in the Niagara Peninsula, that there was no motive in this other than the equalization of the constituencies there is enough to cause every one to laugh at you. The veriest Tory, if told that that was the sole and only aim of the Government, would reply at once that you lied. I am sure that even as poor a mathe-

matician as I could have sat down and made these compact in form and could have equalized them in population within a limit of 1,000 or 2,000, which is all that we could expect.

On clause 21,

Mr. RYMAL moved in amendment that after the word "Townships" Ancaster be inserted. He said: If you carry out this idea the south riding of Wentworth would have 20,265 of a population, or 643 below the average. As it is now proposed to be constituted it has only 15,539, or 5,369 below the average, and as it was before this Bill was introduced it was only 546 less than proposed. But in the change they have made they have turned a Reform majority of seventy-five to a Tory majority of 102, and they have taken the principal township of the county of Wentworth—a township which reaches within a mile of the county buildings, and a township which has been the central figure in that section of country since the settlement of Upper Canada. When the old Gore district existed, Ancaster was the centre figure of that group, and the village of Ancaster, in that township, at the time the seat of Government was to be chosen for Upper Canada, was the rival of York for that honor. In the united counties of Wentworth, Halton and Brant, Ancaster was still considered the key-stone of that organization, and it has remained the key-stone of Wentworth ever since. But it happens to be strongly Reform, and to it I owe my election on every occasion on which I presented myself; and in order to decapitate me or my successor, Tory violence had to be resorted to and fraud consummated. It is a constituency that for forty-five years at least has never returned a Tory, and when it did return a Tory, it was by the interference of the Executive in the time of Sir Francis Bond Head, when an irresponsible Government, in order to override the wishes of the people, issued some 500 patent deeds on territory that the Indians had surrendered, and by this means swamped the Reformers of Wentworth. Now, an irresponsible, wicked and tyrannical Executive, backed by a cowardly and wicked following, are ready to deprive Wentworth of its central figure and transfer it to the county of Brant, uniting it with townships forty-five miles distant and making a constituency some forty-five miles long by eight or ten in width. A greater outrage on the rights of a free and independent constituency was never perpetrated, and that for the sole and only purpose of converting one of the veteran Reform ridings of Upper Canada into one which they consider hopelessly Tory. But I have my opinion about that yet. It will be all they will be able to do to convert that ancient stronghold of the Reform party into a Tory riding, and I promise them a stern fight for it. I would like to know from the hon. First Minister his reasons, if he has any good reasons, for taking Ancaster from Wentworth other than to decapitate the Reform candidate in South Wentworth.

Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 35; nays, 71.

Mr. RYMAL. How true the old saying is—

"Injustice leagued with strength and power,
Nor truth nor innocence can stay;
In vain they plead when tyrants lower,
And seek to make the weak their prey.
No equal rights obtain regard
When passions fire and spoils reward."

On section 22,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sections 22 and 23 postponed.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what his intentions are with reference to sections 22 and 23.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object in postponing them is to give them further consideration.

Mr. RYMAL. It seems to me that in an old municipality like this, where the bounds and population are so

Mr. RYMAL.

well known, it is impossible that we can understand why these should be left.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is it that requires consideration in connection with these two counties? We ought all to know, because we are to consider them as well as the hon. gentleman. He is not the House. If there is something wrong in these two constituencies as laid down in the Bill, let us know what it is. We may be able to help him in the consideration. Perhaps the hon. member for Halton may be able to help him also.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that a good deal of dissatisfaction exists amongst the Conservatives of a portion of the county of Halton as to the proposed change there, and I believe they have sent down a deputation to interview the hon. gentleman in regard to that aspect of the Bill, which he has so carefully kept out of consideration in concocting these different municipalities. The hon. member for Lambton does not seem to reflect that when the hon. gentleman drew up this Bill, with a sole regard to maintaining geographical and municipal grounds, occasional mistakes were made as to their political aspect, and it is with the view of considering these political matters, which the hon. gentleman was very properly blind to until after he introduced the Bill, that it is now proposed to postpone these clauses.

Mr. MILLS. No answer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have told the hon. gentleman I may submit the same clauses, or I may submit an alteration of these two for the consideration of the House.

On section 29,

Mr. PATERSON. I will explain the arrangement with reference to the north riding of Brant. This was one of the ridings that I supposed, the county lines having been thrown over and equalization having been resorted to, would need to have some population added. If I remember right, it was something like 12,000. Its sister riding, South Brant, which I represent, had something like 21,000, if we count in the Indian population. But a very strange way of equalizing North Brant was by taking from that 12,000, between 3,000 and 4,000 in the town of Paris, and between 2,000 and 3,000 in the township of Unandago and adding them to South Brant; that, of course, gave South Brant more population than was required, and therefore the townships of Burford and Oakland were taken from the south riding and added to South Oxford, that, with their addition, has more of a population than the south riding from which they were taken. Of course, the north riding would remain with about 6,000 or 7,000, and in order to make that up, and equalize the township of Ancaster, which was required in South Wentworth, was abstracted from it and added on to what is now called North Brant, and Blenheim was taken from North Oxford and attached to North Brant; the total result being that North Brant had still but 17,000 population. Why were all those changes made? There was only one object to be gained, and that political. I had thought of an amendment, but from the fate of the amendment of my hon. friend from South Wentworth, I have no hope from this Committee. I see that some clauses are laid over for consideration, and of what the objects are I have a shrewd suspicion; and if the Government restore to South Brant the townships they stole from it, it will be only because they have awakened to a sense of the truth of my prediction last night, that though they desire the dismembership of that riding in the first place, to secure for themselves and supporters a representative in South Brant—if they restore those townships, which, I think, they ought to do, in order to maintain for the people the associations in which they have been connected so long, but which I despair of their doing—I can only attribute it to the fact that it will be because they have awakened to the conscious-

ness that South Brant, mangled as it has been by them, dismembered and torn up, without any excuse as far as the equalization of the population goes, is, after all, not to be found a Tory preserve, not one in which a supporter of the Premier can be returned. I repeat, if I can secure a nomination for South Brant, and I think I can, there will be found a candidate in opposition to the Government who will bend his ever lawful means to retain that county, as it has been for the last ten years, on the side of the Opposition. I may move an amendment on the third reading, but I thought it right to expose to the House the means taken to get rid of Liberal members and convert their counties into Tory preserves. I believe there will be a reaction in reference to this matter and that the Government and their supporters, if they endorse this transaction, will find a spirit of resentment has been awakened in the country, of which they will feel the tyro effects, as happily there is still a sense of fair play in the breasts of our people. I am sorry that the Government should have introduced such a Bill. I feel the sorrow that every true Canadian must feel when the Government of his country does that which should produce an honest blush of shame, and introduces a measure that will produce a reaction in the minds of honest and fair-minded men, of whatever party. I believe it will be found that its effect in reference to the House and the majority of the members will be, that they will be opposed to a Government that could resort to such a device, to secure themselves in power, as the cutting and carving of 52 constituencies out of 92--if, peradventure, the Government may seek to obtain, by legislative force, what they failed to obtain by fair and honest appeals to the judgment of their countrymen.

Mr. FLEMING. I wish to exhibit a diagram showing the present form of North Brant as altered by the Bill before the House. A moment's inspection will enable hon. members to judge of its convenient, graceful and symmetrical propositions. (The hon. gentleman held up a diagram.)

On section 29,

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has, in other cases, applied the term "electoral districts." In this case the township of Lancaster is a part of the county of Wentworth, not a part of the county of Brant. Blenheim is a part of the county of Oxford. Here are parts of three counties, and it is a misnomer to constitute them part of the north riding of Brant. There is a definition given of the county of Brant, which does not correspond with any county of Brant that we know.

On section 31,

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I notice that the hon. gentleman has postponed some of the clauses in the Bill. He should postpone this one also and reconsider it. If the changes were made on the principle submitted by the hon. leader of the Government, I would feel bound to support them, but the facts prove the contrary. The population of North Oxford is at present 25,361; as readjusted it is 24,732. The north riding, in its old form, is a well-formed riding; the people act together municipally and have intimate commercial relations with one another, and I am sure it is the wish of the population of both sides of politics that the county should be left as at present constituted. Even if the Government required to take off the townships they have taken off, they should still leave that riding with the other townships that constitute it, when it would have a population of 21,000. The electors of North Easthope and South Easthope are so situated geographically that they have very little connection, either municipal or otherwise, with the county of Oxford. Personally I have no objection to the change, because I believe the people of North Easthope and South Easthope will vote as they ought to. But I would ask the Government to postpone this section for reconsideration.

Mr. TROW. I coincide with the views expressed by the hon. member for North Oxford, so far as North Easthope and South Easthope are concerned, which have been taken from the south riding of Perth, the population of which, prior to readjustment, was 20,708. If the Government could not see their way to returning South Easthope to the south riding of the county of Perth, at all events, they could withdraw from North Oxford, North Easthope, connecting it with South Easthope, which is in the south riding of Perth. This would make about equal the number of inhabitants in Oxford, North Perth and South Perth, and would not interfere with North Perth. By taking Usborne from South Perth, the four ridings would be nearly equal in population. I felt somewhat astonished that the old townships, North Easthope and South Easthope, that have been united together for one quarter of a century, should have been disturbed. I have resided with these people for one quarter of a century, and now see the township of South Easthope severed from me, of which I have been reeve for twenty one years. The people of South Easthope have held a meeting to protest against the policy of the Government in attaching them to another county entirely. I have had in the riding a majority of over 200 Reform votes. This township is now taken away, and the result is that they have taken that majority from me by this Bill, and I am now in a minority of 118 votes, so that when I go back for election I shall have to work myself through that 118 votes in order to get an even start. It strikes me forcibly that it is doing an injustice to the riding to place it as it is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would ask one question with regard to the other clause. South Oxford has a population of 24,732 at the present time, and it is increased to 24,778, and I think that the hon. member might easily reconsider this, or, at any rate, lay it over with the other clauses. It has 4,000 of a population over the average. Besides, it destroys the municipal boundaries and the municipal and social relations of the people in that riding.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, it is increased because they take 6,000 off my riding to increase it. It is evident, from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Customs, that he has been placed at a great disadvantage by consulting a few men who by chance happened to be of one political opinion; if he had chosen to obtain information from this side of the House how much nicer a map he could have made.

Section agreed to.

On section 32,

Mr. MILLS. This clause and the three or four that precede it show very distinctly that the object of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues was not the equalization of the constituencies, but to give the Grits. Hon. gentlemen on this side have asked that a certain clause should be reconsidered. Why, it has been considered and reconsidered, and they would not accomplish their object if any other arrangement were made than that which has been made by the provisions of this Bill. The hon. gentleman could not have succeeded in putting a great majority of the Reformers in a large district of country like the county of Oxford if any other arrangement were made. The hon. gentleman is quite right in not reconsidering these clauses, because so long as he is determined to carry the elections if possible by a minority of votes he must, of course, persist in the line he has adopted.

Section agreed to.

On section 35,

Mr. TROW. I think that section, at all events, should be remodelled and the township of Usborne, which is now proposed to be added to South Perth, should be left in connection with South Huron.

Section agreed to.

On clause 40,

Mr. MILLS. This is another case in which, if the hon. gentleman really desired to equalize the constituencies, he could easily accomplish that result without any interference with the municipal boundaries. All that would be necessary would be to transfer the city of St. Thomas from East Elgin to West Elgin, and the two constituencies would be as nearly equal as may be.

Mr. CASEY. I scarcely know, with the exception of Brant and one or two other counties, a more glaring case of re-adjustment for political purposes than the case of the two Elgins. The ostensible basis of this Bill is the equalization of population. These two ridings as they stand give as nearly as possible an average of 21,000 souls to each member. The total population is 42,361, making an average of 21,180 in the two ridings. The two ridings, however, are considerably different in population, the one being about 28,000 and the other 14,000; but here the geographical position of the county steps in to relieve the Government of the difficulty of equalizing them. It happens that a large body of population, municipally separated from the rest of the county, lies in St. Thomas, having a population of 8,000 odd. The population of East Elgin being 28,000, this 8,000 might have been transferred and yet leave over 19,000, while it would make the population of West Elgin about 22,000. This would have been a close approximation to equalization. But, instead of following this obvious and reasonable course, the Government have seen fit to do otherwise. Finding East Elgin too large, they subtract 1,800 and add 300, leaving it with a population of 26,300. West Elgin being too small, 9,000 are added from the adjoining county of Kent, in townships which form a part of the electoral district of Bothwell. The two ridings at present stand at 26,302 and 23,480, the difference of 3,000 being as great as before the change was made, and greater than that which in several other instances has caused an attempt to be made at equalization. The average population per member under this arrangement is 24,800, so that, by redistributing the two ridings, the average is made about 3,000 further from the average quota of the Dominion than it was before. That fact is sufficient to show that no regard was had to the equalization of population. But if further proof were required it is furnished in the nature of the subtractions and additions. East Elgin gave a very small majority to the sitting member, forty only; South Dorchester, which gave a Reform majority of six, has been added to East Middlesex. There was great risk that Dorchester would give a much larger vote in the coming than in the last election, and therefore South Dorchester was taken away and the small Reform majority was smothered in East Middlesex. A part of Port Stanley, which belonged to West Elgin, which gave a Conservative majority of thirty-five, was also added, so that by the addition and subtraction proposed the Conservative strength in the east riding was increased by forty-one votes. No greater change could be effected without cutting the county into two parts. It happens that East Elgin consists of a row of townships along the lake shore, with South Dorchester at the top, and that the latter is the only township that could be taken away without cutting the county in two, unless Bayham had been added to South Norfolk—and the member for that riding might have objected to this. Take West Elgin. It is a strong Reform constituency, and it gave a majority of 112 in the face of all the difficulties which a Reform candidate had to contend against at the last election. They have added a population of 9,000 from Bothwell to West Elgin, making it 2,000 beyond the quota. These municipalities were added because they were so strongly Reform that they turned the scale in favor of the present representative of Bothwell, who, by the logic of his speeches in this House and elsewhere, is one of the worst

Mr. Trow.

thorns in the side of the Government. In both these cases there has been a virtual disfranchisement of certain townships. In England disfranchisement is reserved for such localities as are proved to be hopelessly corrupt in the case of an election, but by this Bill it is meted out to townships which show themselves independent of the Government. South Dorchester gave a small Reform majority at the last election. On former occasions it was more strongly Liberal, and it was expected that it would be more so in future, but by adding it to the strongly Conservative riding of East Middlesex, where it is smothered by Conservative votes, it is virtually disfranchised, and the same is true of the townships and town taken from Bothwell. It is quite possible that the vote of South Dorchester might have turned the scale against the member for the east riding. It is certain that the vote of Orford, Howard and Ridgetown was sufficient to turn the scale in Bothwell. Yet all four are now placed where their vote will not make the result different from what it would have been in any case. This is virtual disfranchisement. On the proper occasion I shall put on record my protest against what has been done and my view of what would have been a proper arrangement and one in consonance with the principles on which the hon. gentleman professes to have based the Bill. I omitted to state the reason why the change I have spoken of as being a proper arrangement of Elgin was not made. The reason was that the city of St. Thomas, which should have been transferred to the west riding gave a Conservative majority at the last election, about three times as great as the total majority of the Conservative candidate in East Elgin, and if it had been added to West Elgin this time he would have had no chance of re-election.

Mr. ARKELL. I repudiate the idea that the Government had any political motives in the arrangement of the Elgins. South Dorchester, which is taken off East Elgin, used to give a Reform majority of fifty. At the last election it only gave a majority of six against me, and I am satisfied from what I know of the township that it would have given at least a majority of fifty for me, if I had run again. Port Stanley was included in East Elgin in the Census, making it something over 28,000. South Dorchester and Springfield, which are taken away from East Elgin, have a population of something like 2,400. In arranging the new ridings of Essex and Kent the Government had to commence at some certain point, and I suppose that was their object in making this arrangement. So far as West Elgin is concerned the Conservatives of that riding are much annoyed at the change, and they say they could have carried it under the old arrangement, and were making ready for the election. My hon. friend's majorities in that riding have been decreasing of late, and the Conservatives felt satisfied they could have carried it this time. The Government have gained nothing at all so far as I can see, and for my part I would as soon have had East Elgin as it existed before than as it is proposed to be arranged by the Bill. With regard to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), whom my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) is so anxious to see in the House, the best thing he (Mr. Casey) could do would be to resign in West Elgin, and allow the hon. member for Bothwell to run for his constituency.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member rose to explain and repudiate, and he is very severe upon the Government. He repudiates the idea of political effect being intended by this Bill. By so doing he casts the strongest possible reflection upon the common sense and the ordinary intelligence of the hon. leader of the Government. If this Bill is not intended to have political effect, if it is meant to equalize the population, it is a clumsy, absurd and ridiculous Bill, because it has put these two ridings very much further from the quota than before. It is an ineffective Bill, because

it does the very opposite of what it was intended to do. As to the township of South Dorchester, the hon. gentleman says it formerly gave a larger Reform majority than it did in the last election; but he hopes it will give a Conservative majority next time. I do not know that; but I know that in 1878 a whirlwind passed over our western townships which induced a great many townships which ordinarily gave large Reform majorities, to give smaller Reform majorities or to give Conservative majorities. But that, I believe, has largely passed away, and the National Policy is not likely to have the same power as it had in 1878, when it was new and untried; and the probability is that these townships will give a larger Reform vote than they did in 1878. But the fact remains that the population of East Elgin had to be reduced to some extent in order to bring it nearer the quota.

Mr. ARKELL. It is in good shape now.

Mr. CASEY. South Dorchester is the only township that could be touched without cutting in two the northern boundary of the riding; it is also the only one that could be cut off with any regard to the convenience of the member for East Elgin, and it is taken off; and it happens that that excision leaves East Elgin in a comparatively decent shape. The riding is not unshapely or objectionable on the ground of form; it is objectionable simply on the ground that a township has been taken from the county and added to a neighboring one, when the equalization of the population could have been better attained by taking from East Elgin and adding to West Elgin without disturbing the county bounds at all. But the hon. gentleman has another excuse; he said the Government had to commence somewhere in order to equalize the population of Essex and Kent. I do not know that they had to commence there for that purpose. Both Essex and Kent had about the right population to cut into two ridings; and if the Government wanted to equalize them they might as well just cut each of those counties in two as the Local Government did, instead of taking some of the Kent townships belonging to Bothwell and attaching them to Elgin. The hon. gentleman suggests a way out of the difficulty. He made a very suggestive remark, one which perhaps his leader would have been just as well satisfied he had not made. He said that if I wanted to see the hon. member for Bothwell have a seat in this House, I could resign and give him West Elgin. I do not know whether the hon. member for Bothwell needs another seat than the one he now represents. Besides, the suggestion shows one of the objects of the change, which is to create a rivalry between the hon. member for Bothwell and myself, by making us both residents of the same riding. As to the candidature of West Elgin, that is not a matter which either the hon. member or I can settle by our own motion; it is a matter to be settled by the electors themselves, and a matter which the electors and the hon. member for Bothwell and myself can settle to our own satisfaction, although perhaps not to the satisfaction of hon. gentlemen opposite. By this change they hope to insure the exclusion of both the hon. member for Bothwell and myself from the House; but I am sure that in that expectation they will be utterly disappointed.

On section 51,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). With reference to North Middlesex, under the old division, as it stood before the readjustment proposed by this Bill, the population was 21,239, or only about 331 above the quota; but by withdrawing from old North Middlesex the townships of Adelaide and Lobo, and adding to it the township of Stephen, from Huron, the population is reduced to 19,543, or 1,365 under the quota. In connection with this I may mention that the population of South Huron, under this Bill is 23,453, 1,728 over the quota, while the

population of North Middlesex is only 19,543. The township of Stephen is detached from South Huron and annexed to North Middlesex; but the village of Exeter, carved out of the township of Stephen, attached to North Middlesex, and the township of Usborne, attached to South Perth, is attached to South Huron, although not one foot of it is in any of the municipalities, that make up South Huron—it is detached from North Middlesex, to which it properly belongs as part of the township of Stephen. That is manifestly wrong, and contrary to the principles laid down by the hon. gentleman, that when a village is made up out of a municipality, or carved out of a township, it should belong to the riding to which the township has been attached. The object the hon. gentleman professes to have in view in these changes is not served by these arrangements. And in addition to this the populations are further from the quota than the adjustment I have suggested. If Exeter is attached to North Middlesex the population would then be 21,268, or only 260 over the quota, and if it were detached from South Huron the population of that riding would be 21,728, or only 820 over the quota.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps my hon. friend would state what the political complexion of Exeter is.

Mr. CAMERON. Surely it is useless to talk about the political complexion. No one imagines for a moment that a man in the position of the hon. gentleman would be actuated in a matter of this kind by political considerations. I may say, however, for the information of my hon. friend, that Exeter gave 115 of a majority against me, and that may account for this gerrymandering.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will postpone the consideration of the three ridings of Huron.

Mr. CAMERON. But not with a view of correcting it in the light I have indicated.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite clear the hon. gentleman has news that the nefarious objects of this Bill are not likely to be accomplished in Huron by this means, and he wants time to devise some other.

Mr. MILLS. We are obliged to go back to the Statutes of thirty years ago to find out the political boundaries of many of the electoral divisions of Ontario. A very few minutes' work would embrace them all in this Statute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be done in the consolidation of the Statute.

Mr. MILLS. That may be ten years hence.

Committee rose and reported progress; and (at 11:25 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 10th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ABOLITION OF POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that on and after the first day of June, in the present year 1882, newspapers published in Canada, mailed by the publisher at the place of publication, and addressed to regular subscribers or news agents, in Canada, shall be transmitted to their address free of postage.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. RYKERT. I have been informed that papers of an agricultural nature, published monthly, do not come under this provision. It is just as important that agricultural papers should have this exemption as well as other papers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is intended to cover all newspapers, but not magazines. When the Bill based on this resolution is introduced, we may make it include monthly papers.

Mr. ANGLIN. The qualification of newspapers will prevent the Bill applying to that class of periodicals to which the hon. member for Lincoln has referred. Agricultural papers will not be regarded as newspapers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The intention is to include newspapers published specially in the interests of agriculture.

Mr. BAIN. Most of our newspapers devote more or less of their space to agriculture, but there are other periodicals, not very numerous, which are not in newspaper form, and which will be excluded from the benefit of this exemption. I think it is desirable that these periodicals should be included if for no other reason than that they are more likely to be used and kept when they are published in the periodical form than in the newspaper form. I presume the objection is not only to encourage newspapers, but also to encourage a beneficial class of literature.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I would suggest that the postage should be removed from all purely Canadian periodicals—not American or English.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 161) to provide for the free transmission of Canadian newspapers by mail within the Dominion. He said: I do not propose taking the subject up to-day, and I will probably make some amendment in the draft submitted, if there is no objection.

Bill read the first time.

INCREASED SUBSIDY TO MANITOBA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider a certain proposed resolution on the subject of increased subsidy to Manitoba.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As the papers in connection with the application made by Manitoba were laid on the Table of the House some time ago, and the Order in Council in connection with it, it is perhaps scarcely necessary for me to enter very fully into explanations relative to the proposed change. It is well known that, owing to the extensions of the boundaries of Manitoba, the expenses of that Province will be necessarily very considerably increased. On the change being made, the Government of that Province applied to the Dominion for a change of the financial basis upon which that Province is placed at present; and it will be found by the papers on the Table that the Government of that Province asked that they be allowed 5 per cent. upon a debt of \$3,243,000, that is at the rate of \$32.43 per head of an estimated population of 100,000. They ask also that they be allowed 80 cents per head on an estimated population of 80,000, and ask various other concessions that were taken into consideration by the Government, who decided to ask Parliament, not to grant all Manitoba asked, but to grant what, under the circumstances, they felt it was reasonable to expect Parliament should

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

concede. The Government considered that, inasmuch as under the terms of Union, there is no arrangement made for a change in the population, that is as respects any one of the Provinces after they enter the Union—no provision for an increase of the *per capita* grant to the Provinces, in proportion to its population, until it reaches 400,000—that they could not concede the full claims of Manitoba. When Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Union, from the fact of its having no Crown Lands, such as is owned by the other Provinces, \$45,000 a year was granted in lieu of Crown Lands, or \$500,000, that the money might be used in the purchase of lands belonging to absentee proprietors. It was thought advisable, as in the case of Prince Edward Island, to ask Parliament to appropriate to Manitoba \$45,000 a year; and as we could not increase the debt for an increase in the population, it was thought proper to pay Manitoba for the next ten years, a subsidy of 80 cents per head on a population of 150,000. It was estimated, two months ago, before the recent immigration to that Province commenced, that its population was 90,000. The Census returns show simply the actual inhabitants at the time of the immigration, and not the new arrivals since. Therefore, 90,000 was taken as the number, in March last, but in all probability it will reach, before the year closes, 115,000 or 120,000. As this arrangement is intended to extend over a period of ten years, until the Census of 1891, it was considered desirable, inasmuch as it was impossible for that Province to transact its business without some consideration beyond what the population of to-day entitles it to, to ask Parliament to consider the population during the next ten years as 150,000. It is also proposed to increase the sum voted for the expenses of the Government from \$30,000 to \$50,000. Those changes will make altogether an increase of \$120,000 over the present grant. It receives now, 80 cents per head on an estimated population of 70,000, under the Act of last Session; \$30,000 for the Government and 5 per cent. upon the balance of the money undrawn, which amounts to about \$12,000 a year. Though this increase is considerably below what was asked by Manitoba, still after the most careful consideration, and examining the lowest figures which would enable them to manage their affairs for the next ten years, the Dominion Government believed they were warranted in asking the House for this readjustment for the present terms and arrangements. This will give Manitoba something like \$220,000 or \$230,000 income for the expenses of the Government and the management of the affairs of that Province.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state exactly what the Manitobans demanded?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The delegates proposed that they be allowed for Government and legislation, \$60,000 instead of \$30,000, also 5 per cent. interest on \$3,243,000, being at the rate of \$32.43 per head on a population of 100,000; also the amount already received by the Province, 80 cents a head on 100,000, or a total of \$286,730. The Census returns showed the population of Manitoba to be 64,814, which does not, of course, include the immigrants of last year, estimated at 25,000, making a total population of 89,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does it include the Indians?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; they claim that the Province should have the management of the sale of the public lands, and of the wood and timber thereon, and quote the course pursued with British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. There were other claims made with reference to half-breed grants and the appointment of Judges, and various subjects, but these are the financial portions of the claim; and instead of increasing the debt, as was proposed, the Government do not ask Parliament for any increase, because that is stipulated under the Constitution, and cannot be set

aside without interfering with the whole basis on which the different Provinces in the Union rest. The Government propose to give them \$50,000, and instead of granting them land it is proposed to give them \$45,000 per year.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said this proposal was made after very careful consideration, and reducing the service to the lowest possible cost. I should like to know what are the broad details of the general estimated cost of carrying on the Manitoba Government from which the Government arrived at the conclusion that the sum proposed would be adequate to the needs of the Province with its enlarged boundaries and expanding population.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We took up the different items of expenditure and estimated that the sum of \$225,000 would, with the greatest economy on the part of the Manitoba Government and Legislature, enable them to pay the expenditure for the next ten years. Besides their subsidy, they received last year something like \$18,000 for licenses, and we estimated that with the increase of population they would, in future, receive \$50,000 a year from that source. Adding the various items together, it is found that the sum proposed would, with the strictest economy, cover their expenditure for the next ten years.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not able to furnish the House with a statement of the mode by which this calculation is arrived at, because it is impossible for us, without that statement, to form any independent judgment, as to the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's result. The expenditure of Manitoba, up to this time, would furnish an extremely inadequate basis on which it would be possible to arrive at a conclusion as to what would be the proper sum for the next ten years. In two important respects the condition of the Province is wholly changing. The boundaries are enormously enlarged, and while they are enlarged, the timber lands included in them do not go to the Province, so that increased expenditure is involved without compensation in the way of territory. The population is increasing rapidly, and increasing over a very large area, and this will also involve a considerably increased expenditure. I expected the hon. gentleman would have given us the details on which he has based his calculations. His proposal is less than what the Government has demanded as a minimum, and they ask for the lands besides. The lands have not been granted, and the money grant is considerably less. What we are entitled to know is what is the basis of taxation upon which this settlement is proposed to us? We have a right to know the process of reasoning by which the hon. gentleman arrived at this conclusion. We ought to know what the hon. gentleman thought Manitoba was, what he thought was the eastern boundary, because, obviously, upon the extent of its territory depends to a considerable extent the costs of its administration.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is certain information asked for by my hon. friend that would be exceedingly difficult for the Government to furnish. As to the calculation where the eastern boundary of Manitoba is to be, that question did not enter into the consideration, because no matter where that may be it probably will not affect that question very materially for ten years to come—although it will, of course, affect it to some extent. With reference to the detailed information the hon. member desires, I can only say that certainly before the third reading of the Bill, if he wishes it, I will bring down a statement showing the exact expenditure under the heads of education and judiciary at the present time, and the mode at which we arrive at that. Of course, there is no record made of that, but from the discussion I can give the expenditure under these different heads, and what the Government thought probably would be sufficient to cover them collectively. If it is any advantage to him I may also state the

sum under each head that will probably be required. With reference to the question of the boundary, it will be very difficult for me to give him such definite information. We can give him no definite information, because whatever may be the decision, it may affect the expenses of the judiciary, and it may, to some extent, affect the expenses of education; but, as a rule, that subject was not definitely considered when we arrived at the calculation as to the amount that would be necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. Whether the Province contains 60,000 or 70,000 more square miles, the hon. gentleman thought it was not at all necessary to consider whether that would affect the statement of its public revenue for a period of ten years to come. I am afraid, if the same judicious vagueness pervades the other elements of the hon. gentleman's calculation it will not be found as available means of reaching a conclusion as we might have hoped it would be. But vague as it is, and indefinite as it necessarily must be, it certainly would be some help to us if we had it at some period before the third reading. Of course, we have access to the public documents in that connection, but it would be to the convenience of the House if we had also a statement of the expenditure under each head of the public service in Manitoba for each of the last three or four years. That would show us the expenses of the nearer past. Then the hon. gentleman's calculation as to what the expenses ought to be under each of these different heads for the next ten years would enable us to form some sort of judgment of the correctness of the calculation which he has reached. For my own part, under these circumstances, I shall not, at this stage of the Bill, give utterance to some further views which I have entertained, but will hold them in reserve until I receive that information which we ought to have had to-day.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be doubly desirable, if the hon. Minister of Finance should furnish this information in considerable detail. I recollect very well when the Province of Manitoba—and I think you yourself, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Royal) was at that time a member of the Government of Manitoba—appealed to the Government of which my hon. friend from Lambton was the chief, for an increase, and we found, on examining the details of the administration, that there were very large, and as it appeared to us, very unnecessary expenditures incurred. I speak from memory, but I think that almost all the sum devoted to the service in Manitoba was unfortunately at that time absorbed in what may be called legislative expenses, almost to the exclusion of any of the more valuable services, with the solitary exception, perhaps, of some parts of the administration of justice. Now, I am bound to say that the then Government of Manitoba did, so far as I can see, apply themselves with considerable earnestness to the task of reducing this expenditure, and although we were not able to give them quite as much as we could have desired in the then state of the public finances, still considerable additions were made to their income. It is therefore all the more desirable that we should know how this sum, that we are about to give, is intended to be expended. But there is another reason: it is very undesirable in the public interest, and in the interest of the other Provinces, that those settlements should be perpetually disturbed; it is very undesirable that, from year to year, fresh demands should be made, fresh questions should be raised, as to what this or that particular Province is entitled to; and it is therefore to be regretted that this question was not brought up at an earlier period of the Session, because there are very important questions underlying and involved. It is exceedingly expedient on many grounds that the demands of Manitoba should be fully and fairly considered, that we may not see Manitoba next year, or the year after that, or perhaps each year in succession,

appearing here and demanding further increase, shouting for further subsidies. Such a state of things is very undesirable both between Manitoba and the Dominion and between Manitoba and the sister Provinces, and I therefore think that we should have, in this case, even fuller information than would otherwise be necessary to form an opinion on the subject.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is greatly to be regretted that the Government did not bring down this proposition at a reasonable time. It is perfectly obvious that at the close of the Session it is impossible to give this subject the consideration to which it is entitled. It is one that ought to be very carefully considered by the House. We should act upon some intelligent principle, and we should know with the greatest minuteness the reason for the course the Government has adopted, and for the particular sum upon which they have decided. There can be no doubt that Manitoba stands in a different position from any of the older Provinces. The Government still controls the public lands in that Province, which is an important source of public revenue, and the Government have undertaken, and at the expense of this country, to make certain improvements in Manitoba that are considered in other Provinces local improvements, and it is very desirable that we should know how far the Government have taken this into consideration in determining the amount to which Manitoba is entitled. Now, the hon. gentleman has told us that he proposes to give \$5,000 a year as an offset to any claim Manitoba may have for public lands, while that may be more or very much less than Manitoba might be fairly entitled to. We ought to know, in connection with this, how far the Government proposes to appropriate lands within that Province to aid in the construction of railways that would in other Provinces be considered local works, undertaken if at all, by the Government, or if subsidized by the Government would be at the expense of the other Provinces. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that so far as the lands are concerned in the limits of Manitoba, subject to the amount it has cost the Dominion to survey them, they should be administered wholly in the interest of the Parliament; they should be regarded as Provincial lands, and it always seemed to me that as soon as the Province was able to take charge of them, that is, so soon as the Government became a settled Government, these lands might be very fairly placed under the control and at the disposal of the Province. It is true we have undertaken the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and propose to aid the construction of that road through the Province out of these lands. I do not object to that. That work, however, may be considered as standing in precisely the same condition as other works of the old Provinces, such as canals and railways, which may not be aided by the Government at the expense of the country as a whole. It is important how far the Government have considered the improvements which they have made within the limits of Manitoba, as improvements which might be charged against the Province, as a debt with which they would come into the Union. Those are important considerations, because they enable us to arrive at the principle which forms the basis upon which we may fairly deal with the Province, and place it in a position to control its own affairs without being embarrassed and compelled to come here as a dependent upon this Government. That is a very undesirable condition. Manitoba ought to stand as an independent Province, having its own autonomy, controlling its own affairs; but in a great measure the Premier of the Province has been dependent upon the Government here, and has not acted in accordance with the wishes of the people of that country. In a large degree, the policy of that Province has been controlled by the Federal Government, and the affairs of that Province have been largely administered in the interest of the Administration here. Why has the Premier of

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

Manitoba so acted? Simply because the Dominion Government have kept that Province dependent upon their Administration. Practically they have controlled the finances of the Province, and in doing so interfered with the action of the Manitoba Government. It is greatly to be regretted that the hon. gentleman did not bring down the proposition earlier. He has acted upon the assumption that as a Minister of the Crown he is not subject to this House. In dealing with matters of finance, and in submitting a proposition of this kind, which may be approved or not by the House, the members of the Government are acting as agents of Parliament. The advisers of the Crown are nothing more, yet they have ignored Parliament, disregarded its authority, and have simply come down at the last moment and asked its approval of a certain proposal, allowing no time within which an opinion can be formed. What is the position the hon. gentleman occupies before the House? It is this: he comes down and tells the House that as Minister of the Public Treasury, and as controller of its finances, he makes a certain proposal. He informs the House that a conclusion has been arrived at, but he does not go out of his way to furnish information which would enable hon. members to form an opinion for themselves; he asks the House not to excuse an independent judgment, but to accept the resolution at which the Government have arrived. That is in perfect accord with the policy of the Government during the past four years. The Ministers have looked on Parliament as a body appointed to register the decrees of the Government, and we find how the Government has treated Parliament. The Government have come down at the end of the Session and submitted a proposition which is to remain a contract between the Dominion Government and the Province of Manitoba for the next ten years. The hon. gentleman knew right well that he thereby ties the hands of his successors in office, and although that fact is obvious, yet Parliament is called upon to support that proposition without any information having been given. I enter my protest against such a policy. I assumed when I was elected that I was to exercise an independent judgment as to what the public interests required, and I declined to abdicate my functions, and hand over the trust which the electors have committed to me to the Administration. The hon. gentleman must have considered the details of this proposal which he has submitted, and it is necessary that all information should be furnished to the House to enable it to arrive at a proper conclusion; but the hon. gentleman has not done so, and he and his colleagues, who expect the Session to close within a few days, know it is impossible to give a proposition of this kind the consideration to which it is entitled. It is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman did not submit the proposition relating to the proposed increased subsidy to Manitoba at an earlier period, and did not accompany it with such a statement respecting the finances of Manitoba as would have enabled hon. members to reach an intelligent conclusion on the subject.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A stranger would suppose that the Government had prevented by some process the hon. member for Bothwell and other hon. gentlemen opposite from discussing to the fullest extent every subject that has been under consideration. During my experience, extending over a number of years, I have never known Government measures, whether affecting the Tariff or other matters, to have been so fully discussed, and have never known so little an attempt made to shut out the fullest debate. The Government has not intimated to the House that it will close the Session at a certain date, for that depends on the state of public business and the feelings of hon. members as to the time which will be required for discussion as to this proposition, which the hon. gentlemen seems to think is a most intricate and difficult one. The

whole correspondence between the Dominion and the Manitoba Government, and the Order in Council were brought down a month ago in order that hon. gentlemen might make themselves acquainted with the desire of the Manitoba Government and the action of the Dominion Government in that regard. There is no desire to withhold the fullest information, but the Government thought, with the correspondence and Order in Council before the House, those documents would prove sufficient to enable hon. members to form an opinion on the subject. I will have the information which he desires before the third reading, with the income and expenditure for the third and fourth years. The hon. gentleman states that the Government are simply the agents of this House. Sir, we know that perfectly well, and as the agents of this House the Government of Manitoba approached us, because it was necessary to do so in order that we might decide what we should submit for the consideration of Parliament. After having given the subject careful and deliberate consideration, we felt that it was desirable to come to the conclusion which we have presented to the House. The hon. gentleman says that this action we propose will prevent future Governments from interfering in the matter for the period of ten years. The very object of this Bill is to close the question, so far as we can, and we gave the Government of Manitoba to understand, as stated in the resolution, that this agreement was to stand as a contract until 1891. Of course, the present population does not amount to 150,000, but we all feel that it will largely increase and even exceed that number, and the present action is taken in order to prevent them coming year after year. The hon. gentleman says that this is an important question with reference to other Provinces, but there is no other Province situated like Manitoba which has enlarged its borders and is increasing its population rapidly. The hon. gentleman asks how far the Government consider that the expenditure they make on railways should be taken into account with reference to the public debt. We have not conceded that Government any increase of the public debt. In the case of Prince Edward Island, a consideration for its public debt according to its population, and amounting to \$32 per head or so, was allowed. That debt was largely created for the construction of their railways, and in this case the Dominion Government are, either by subsidies granted or by the sale of lands at a fixed rate, encouraging the construction of railways in Manitoba, and that Province is therefore relieved from that expenditure. That was one of the reasons given to the representatives of that Government, that they were not in the position of other Provinces, and therefore had not the same ground for claim apart from the constitutional difficulty. The hon. gentleman says that it is an intricate calculation that \$30,000 we paid when that Province came into the Union, with a small population, a much smaller population than at present. Any one can understand, judging by the amount at present expended approximately for legislative and governmental purposes what their expenses will be for the next ten years, and say whether a certain sum is an exceptional or a reasonable one. It is a point upon which hon. gentlemen opposite are as able to form a calculation as the Government can. With reference to the proposition of placing the lands at the disposal of the Government, the trouble is that a large portion of the lands of Manitoba have been secured for the construction of railways; a large portion of the territory of that Province has been taken up or pledged, mortgaged as it were, in various ways; and it was considered desirable that the lands should remain largely as they are. It was considered, under those circumstances, that we should deal with them as with the Island of Prince Edward. That Island has a less population to-day than it is probable Manitoba will have in a year

or two, and therefore the Government considered that the proposition they made with regard to the next ten years was a moderate one as regards the expected population of the Province. Another question is, whether in placing the average population for the next ten years at 150,000, we have made a number too high or too low, and if there is any ground of complaint on that score. The people of that country will say it is too low, and that the average will be beyond that. Since the correspondence between the two Governments has been on the Table for two months, I did not expect to be asked these details, though the hon. gentleman is within his rights in asking them. But I may say that the statement of the income and expenditure will be laid on the Table in ample time.

Mr. BLAKE. And your calculation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I can give you the general calculations, though I do not know that we have a record of the minute details.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the complaint made by the hon. member for Bothwell was not merely that there was a lack of information on this subject, but that the information was brought in at so late a period in the Session. It really looks as if important measures had been delayed until a number of members left the House, and hon. gentlemen would have but a small audience to which to discuss their measures at the last moment. We have the resolutions regarding the Baie Verte Ship Railway, \$150,000; the fisheries boundaries, \$150,000; the Manitoba resolutions, \$110,000; and the representation Bill, all brought down within the last week. If ever a House had reason to complain of those who are charged with the administration of the affairs of the country, this House has. I have never since I recollect found so many important measures crowded into the last few days of the Session, when, as hon. gentlemen know, discussion is impossible. Even when discussion is possible hon. members behind the Ministers get up and insult the Opposition, by taunting them with the smallness of their numbers—taunt them in every possible way—and no decent regard is paid to anything that is said on this side of the House. No attempt whatever is made to fulfil the functions of parliamentary government, by those who are now charged with the administration of affairs.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). I join in the regret that these resolutions have been delayed so long. I think they involve matters far more important than the mere grant of \$227,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Did I not delay them at your request?

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman was kind enough, two weeks ago, to say that he would not bring them down on a particular day, when I expected to be absent at Kingston; but I certainly expected them the following Tuesday, which was two weeks ago yesterday, and, besides, they might have been brought down long before that. They involve far more important considerations than the mere money grant, which is, of course, important to Manitoba; they involve the careful consideration of the relations to which the various Provinces of the Dominion stand to the Confederation. If we are going to have the Province in the dependent position it has been in since it came into the Confederation, we practically destroy its independence. We all know that, owing to the financial necessities of the Province of Manitoba, the Premier and deputation after deputation from that Province visited the Government at Ottawa, and had frequent interviews with the Government, with the view of obtaining better terms; and we all know the danger involved in placing a Province in that humiliating position. I think this condition of things was not intended when the Federal system was established in 1867. I think it was intended that each Province should be so provided for, that it might stand in a position entirely

independent of the Dominion Government for its revenues. We know the excitement that prevailed in this House and the country and the political complications that arose, because of the better terms that were sought for and extended to the Province of Nova Scotia a few years ago. Now, here we have a Province larger in area than the Province of Ontario, a Province containing probably 70,000,000 or 90,000,000 acres of land, placed in the humiliating position of being obliged to send its Premier to Ottawa, year after year, to ask for further concessions, to ask that its depleted exchequer should be replenished, to ask from the Government of the day such financial aid as would enable it to provide for the ordinary expenditure for Government housekeeping. We all know that financial independence under such circumstances is practically impossible; we all know that involved in this there is a tacit understanding, that for any financial advance to that Province, a political *quid pro quo* will be returned. Let us look at the advances already made to Manitoba. We gave her at first \$71,072 a year; in 1876, this was increased to \$105,653 a year; and, in 1879, a further advance was made of \$112,000 a year. Now, it is proposed to double that sum, and to make it \$227,000. It is quite possible that this sum is not equal to the wants of the Province of Manitoba. I fear very much, from the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that he has not considered what the wants of the Province may be; I fear very much that with the growing settlement in the North-West, and the large influx of settlers there, her population will soon be much larger than he has estimated it to be, and that as a consequence her expenses will be much larger than we are making provision for. Take the Province of British Columbia. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) informs me that the Estimates for that Province for 1882-83, amounted to \$629,000; we know that Prince Edward Island with a population of 100,000, spends nearly \$500,000 a year; Ontario last year expended \$2,838,000, and Quebec expended \$1,956,766. It is necessary, then, in laying the financial foundations of a Province, that such provisions should be made as would place it in a position of financial independence, and that no Provincial Government should be obliged to come here and petition the Dominion Government for such advances as would prevent absolute provincial bankruptcy. The question of finance, I believe, has not been properly considered; but more than all, I think the Government have failed carefully to consider the land question. I cannot understand why—after due allowance is made for the first expenses incurred by the Dominion Government with respect to the land being paid—the Province of Manitoba should not be afforded, like the other Provinces, full control of its own land. That Province has 73,600,000 acres of land, equal to about four times the amount of land settled and cultivated in the Dominion of Canada. These lands are very productive, and would soon be placed in the market. Now, who is so well qualified to manage these lands as the people of Manitoba? We are so far removed from that country that it is impossible for any Minister, I care not what his capacity, to consider the various exigencies that will arise in the settlement of the country—how drainage would add to the value of the land, how certain lands might be placed in the market at one season and realize more than they would at another season; we cannot tell, at this great distance, in what direction the tide of immigration flows, and I am exceedingly anxious, as we are adding Province after Province to this Dominion, that each Province should be placed in such a financial position as to be entirely independent of the Government, and I am exceedingly anxious too that we should now consider carefully the policy we intend to pursue in regard to these Provinces. The whole system should be carefully considered, and I will be prepared, under reason-

Mr. Ross (Middlesex):

able circumstances, to give my hearty support to any scheme that would give the Province of Manitoba control of its own lands, subject to such diminutions as might be necessary to make up for the expenditure already increased by the Dominion in the purchase of the North West Territory and the settlement of the country. The Province of Ontario last year had a revenue of \$838,000 from woods and forests. How much revenue the Province of Manitoba could derive from the same source we do not know, but if she had that source of revenue, she might not be obliged to petition us for assistance for her depleted Treasury. I would suggest that the matter should be delayed in order that it might be more carefully considered; but I suppose delay is impossible under the present circumstances; and as the Minister promises to give us more information on the third reading of the Bill, I will withhold further criticism until I am able to judge what line should be taken, not only in the interests of the Dominion, but in the interests of Manitoba herself.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not intend to discuss this Bill, but I desire to notice a point made by the hon. member for Lambton. Those who were in the House during the period when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, will remember what course was pursued in regard to one of the most important measures ever brought before this House. The hon. gentleman who then led the House, brought before Parliament a Bill relating to the Pacific Railway, on the 8th of May, 1874. He stifled discussion upon those resolutions by his overbearing majority. The Bill was introduced on the 12th of May, and the second reading took place on the 19th of May; and everybody then in the House knows how discussion on that Bill, on the Opposition side, was choked down, and how the Bill was passed under whip and spur, long after midnight by the use of the mechanical majority of the hon. member for Lambton. The House prorogued on the 25th of May. For three days prior to prorogation it was merely kept together to receive Bills from the Senate. It does not then lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth to talk about the late introduction of Bills this Session. Everybody knows, who has watched the proceedings of this Session, that we have not attempted to make reprisals for the treatment we received from hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. Everybody knows that the largest latitude and liberty has been given them. We might well have retorted upon those hon. gentlemen what was said by the hon. member for Lambton on one occasion, when a hon. member, then in the minority, in his perfect right, rose to discuss a question in respect to a resolution he had offered; when he had made an address in the first instance—not a long one—and when he attempted to speak again on his amendment, and when the hon. gentleman with his mechanical majority tried to silence him, the hon. leader of the then Opposition remonstrated, and told the hon. member for Lambton that it was unfair to use his majority for such a disgraceful purpose. The hon. gentleman said: "Oh, yes, I acknowledge the hon. gentleman is in his right—he has made an amendment—he had a right to speak, but he has already spoken on the main question, and our people have not the patience to listen to the repetition of speeches day after day." What have we been listening to? There never was anything so monotonous as the speeches from the opposite side. This Session we have had the same statements that we have heard repeated every Session since 1879, a re-hash of stale speeches over and over again, the same discussions, the rolling of the stone up the hill like that of Sisyphus rolling down again, and the same rolling up again with precisely the same results; and yet we have sat here day after day and listened to those tiresome harangues without losing patience which has been sadly tried. We have seen hon. gentlemen with speeches prepared come to the front and read them with the most unblushing effrontery, and the hon. leader of the Opposition afraid to rise unless he spoke from a brief, which he would read

page after page, ready to take anybody's brief for his purpose who persuaded him to accept it. I did not intend to speak on the merits of this question, but to say that the Opposition have wearied the House with the grossest, most insulting and tedious harangues, day after day, and that if ever an Opposition tired the patience of a majority it is the present. Who is responsible for the House sitting to this time, and for all the delays? Who have made interminable speeches on all occasions, and kept up the discussions week after week? The excitement and interruption of hon. gentlemen opposite show that they are hard hit now. I will appeal to the pages of the *Hansard*. Though they number but fifty-five representatives of the once triumphant party—that is the number to which they are reduced—the party of great promises, by their own mismanagement, and not by any stealing of a verdict on our part, but simply because they did not know how to conduct themselves when in power—if you take *Hansard* you will see that these hon. gentleman occupy as much of its space, or more than the whole 144 members who represent the triumphant majority on this side. We have let them have full swing, as a rule. Now and then, of course, when a bumptious speaker gets up on the opposite side late at night there may have been some expressions of dissatisfaction; that is usual and quite parliamentary. But we can remember that during the rule of the late Premier the contemptuous and insulting playing of the jewsharp by one of his colleagues, and the blowing of penny whistles, indulged in during the whole time we were engaged in discharging our duty as members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. We have never adopted the shrieking system of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are now wincing under our hard knocks. Night after night the then leader of the Government would say, I cannot control my men, while hounding them on. I remember once in the middle of a most important debate, one of that gentleman's followers danced a jig to the amusement of the members on the back benches and danced himself out of the House. I repeat the Opposition is responsible for all the delays and loss of time this Session. Everybody knows that many Government measures could not be introduced while the supplies were being voted, and that it is the first duty of the Government to secure the voting of the supplies. It was the duty of the Government to act as they have done. It does not become the member for Lambton, who introduced his Pacific Railway resolutions within five or six days of the regular demise of the House, and forced us to accept them whether we would or not, to utter the reproaches we have heard. I have heard him boast on public platforms that that Bill never was amended, that there never was a comma even changed. Why? Because his mechanical majority refused to hear any member on the opposite side. I merely rose to recall some reminiscences of the old days which many of my hon. friends know nothing of, and others are apt to forget. But I am determined that no such statements shall be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, unless they are brought face to face with their old record.

Mr. MacDONNELL (Inverness). The remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down remind me of a certain personage reproving sin, when he lectures any hon. gentleman on this side for taking up the time of this House. If there is any hon. gentleman in this House who has made himself obnoxious to it, and an obstruction to business, by long and frequent speeches since the day he entered the House, it is that hon. gentleman. It is not only in this House that we are annoyed by his meaningless platitudes. In the Committee as well, not many days ago, that hon. gentleman had the presumption and the ill-breeding to tell every hon. gentleman on that Committee that he would stand there and speak, despite the efforts of both his friends and opponents to make him sit down and allow the business to go on.

It is well known that the hon. gentleman is to be translated from this honorable House, and that the main object of his friends is to rid this House of his presence. In the time of this Legislature, which he has uselessly taken up, he has cost the country ten times more than his little services are worth. It is well known that the Government has crowded the business of the Session at its close. From day to day, at the beginning of the Session, for weeks together, we were here without anything to do. The hon. leader of the Opposition time and again complained that the Government measures were not before the House. The hon. Minister of Finance says there is no intimation to be given by the Government as to when the House is to close. It is well known to the Government that at this season hon. members must go home to attend to their various businesses, and it is evident that the Government have kept back their most obnoxious measures until such time as these measures could not meet with the vigorous opposition that they would otherwise meet with. We have heard a great deal this Session about organized hypocrisy. It has been a favorite cry of the Government to charge the Opposition with organized hypocrisy. If ever hypocrisy was organized, it is organized by hon. gentlemen opposite. Notwithstanding their cry that the National Policy is a great success, they are driven to bring down resolutions which show they have no faith in their own professions. They come down with a change in the Tariff by taking the duty off tea and coffee as a bribe to the people on the eve of the elections; they have thrown out a paltry bait to the fishermen, and in order to gain Halifax they have given a large vote for an elevator in that city; and we find after all this their gerrymandering Bill. If ever there was hypocrisy, it is the hypocrisy which hon. gentlemen opposite exhibit in every move.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 162) for increasing, during a certain period, the yearly subsidy to the Province of Manitoba.

Bill read the first time.

SEAMEN'S ACT OF 1873.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 135) to amend Chapter 29, 38th Victoria, intitled: An Act to extend certain provisions of "The Seamen's Act, 1873," to vessels employed in navigating the Inland Waters of Canada, and to provide for the collection of the Wages of Seamen and other persons employed on board Vessels trading on the Inland Waters of Canada, in a summary manner.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLELAN. When we went into Committee a few days ago, I proposed an amendment that seamen's wages should be the first claim on mortgaged ships. The Bill as originally introduced made provision for the collection of wages and for the attaching of vessels. It is proposed in the first clause of the Bill as altered to restore the state of things which existed under the general Act, and I propose to add the words "wages accruing after the passage of the Act," so that the Bill will not affect cases now in litigation.

Mr. BLAKE. The remedy given should apply to wages now due, but the hon. gentleman could provide that it shall not apply to cases now pending before the Courts. This would meet the object he has in view.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand from those who suggested this amendment that action has been brought against owners of vessels, and since commencement they have been transferred into other hands. It might enable them to

follow the vessel although she had been sold two or three times.

Mr. McCALLUM. At this time, the spring of the year, you will not find many wages remaining unpaid since last year.

On clause 2,

Mr. BLAKE. "Recover their wages." That is recovering their wages otherwise than *in rem*.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended, then, that the seamen shall have a remedy to recover their wages in a Maritime Court and also in another Court?

Mr. McLELAN. It is intended they shall have the same remedies as provided in the Seamen's Act of 1873, and they shall have the remedy *in rem*, as well.

On clause 4,

Mr. McCALLUM. This was not in the first Act. It is giving the preference to mortgagees in case of accidents or collision. I think it would be much better if this clause were struck out. Supposing a vessel is shipwrecked on the lake shore, and a man goes to her assistance and saves her, if the vessel is mortgaged that man will not get his pay.

Mr. McLELAN. This alteration I found in the other Bill, and it was agreed to by the shipowners of Ontario. I would have preferred to drop the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. The shipowners of Ontario may have an interest different from that of the mortgagees. It is well we should consider what the real foundation of the clause is.

Mr. McLELAN. I was about to say that, looking at the clause as it stands, I should think it was but just, in the interest of the shipping itself, that the clause should be thrown out. As the shipowners and those interested in Ontario have suggested that it be dropped now, I move that it be struck out.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would say that no honest man can have anything against the interests of the shipowners. If a vessel gets into trouble, and the master calls for assistance, of course the men who render that assistance know that they can collect their pay.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that there can be no justification in putting any claims above those of the nature of salvage claims. Of course, it is in the interest of the mortgagee that the vessel should be saved, and therefore I would have no reluctance in saying that the salvage claims should stand uppermost. What saves the ship must be to the advantage of all interests.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

HARBOR AND RIVER POLICE.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 107) respecting the Harbor and River Police of Canada. He said: The object of the Bill is to establish harbor and river police at Montreal and Quebec. This force has existed for a number of years, but doubts have existed as to the authority for establishing that force. It was originally appointed by the Governor General in Council, and legislation that has been had in respect to it has proceeded on the supposition that authority had been given; but as the force became more important it was necessary to define clearly the authority to appoint it, and to place that authority in the hands of the Governor in Council. It is also proposed that the authority under which the force was acting should be increased, and that a Judge of the Superior Court should have power to try cases brought before them by the police, either at Montreal or Quebec. At present the Police Magistrate and Judge of Sessions and Stipendiary Magistrate are all

Mr. McLELAN.

represented by one person at the port of Quebec, so that in case he is absent there is no person to try cases, and in order to avoid this difficulty it is proposed to add a Superior Court Judge.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLELAN. With regard to the first clause, I may say that it is intended that the operations of the Bill may be extended to other ports in Canada, and that it is done in order that the force may be sent down the Lower St. Lawrence in case disturbances should occur. That power has been rendered necessary by the fact that mutinies have occurred on vessels outside of the port of Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the Bill was merely designed to place in more regular form the votes which have been passed for the support of this force ever since Confederation. The hon. gentleman uses the words in the Bill "Harbor and River Police of Canada." Now, Sir, we have consented time after time under protest, to the establishment of a harbor and river police force at Montreal and Quebec, but it seems to me that if we are to have such a force they should be confined to these places, and possibly to the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence. We are now proposing, however unnecessarily, to establish a harbor and river police force, which shall have an indefinite jurisdiction over the whole of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that he asks for that power, but he does not intend to use it; but I think it is a power objectionable to be asked for. It is beyond the scope of the hon. gentleman's necessities as he explained them. If the hon. gentleman wants to give this force jurisdiction over the Gulf of St. Lawrence let him say "such parts of the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence as may be defined by the Governor in Council."

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman complains that the ground covered by the Bill is too much, but the intention is to confine the exercise of that power to the St. Lawrence and the navigable rivers flowing into it. It might be desirable to send the force a long distance below Quebec, and it is well, therefore, that we should have the power to send them there, or to some of the navigable rivers flowing into the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, that might be defined in so many words without giving the general power.

Mr. McLELAN. I have no objection to making the amendment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I fear that the words suggested by the hon. gentleman will not be sufficient, because these sailors may go upon the shore, into villages, or into country ports, or upon the wharves of cities. It is necessary, too, that they should be able to arrest persons and take them to port.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps those words will not cover the ground, but I took the words suggested by the Minister. The difficulty might be obviated by saying "at towns and cities and the shores thereof."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think that we should limit the power when the intention is expressed in the Bill, and the exact power must be defined by the Governor in Council. An Order in Council may be brought down next Session to hon. members and laid on the Table, so that they may see how far the power has been used. I think it would be better to leave the Bill as it is.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's suggestion comports with his general view of leaving everything to the Governor in Council. He says the Governor in Council will define it. Cannot we define it? Is there any greater difficulty in this

Parliament defining it, than the Governor in Council defining it? Is not the Council here? What I object to is that the Governor in Council shall be given an unnecessary power, a power infinitely larger than the necessities of the case could possibly require, and that we should place on the Statute-book a law creating a force with authority and jurisdiction from one end of the Dominion to the other. That should not be possible under the law. It is not required by the necessities of the case. Whatever way in which you define the territories in a day or two, it is as easy to define them now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So far as the powers of the Governor in Council are concerned, I agree, and I have always agreed with the hon. gentleman, that we should do here as much of the legislation of the country as we can; but the hon. gentleman knows that we cannot attend to all the details of our legislation—that a great many of these details have to be afterwards defined by Order in Council, because cases will sometimes arise requiring an immediate change.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that you should say "such territories adjacent thereto as may be defined by the Governor in Council."

Mr. McLELAN. I think it is better, as the Bill says, to let the Governor in Council define the jurisdiction of the police after full enquiry. These men are sometimes obliged to pursue criminals in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence and elsewhere, and if the hon. gentleman's proposition were adopted, they would be prevented from doing that.

Mr. CARON. It has become necessary on more than one occasion for the river and water police to follow and arrest prisoners entirely outside of the territory adjacent to Montreal or Quebec. I have known cases in which they had to go to Toronto or Hamilton to arrest prisoners. I can readily understand how inconvenient it would be to give them jurisdiction beyond a reasonable limit. They are specially appointed for the harbor of Montreal and the harbor of Quebec; but to carry out their duty they are sometimes required to go elsewhere, and I think it is necessary to leave the Bill as it stands. I cannot see how the expression, "territories adjacent thereto," could meet the case I have mentioned.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite admit that the words do not meet the case of an arrest in Toronto or Hamilton. I do not want that they should. I object emphatically to such an extension of the functions of this Government as that they should be able to send these harbor police to arrest criminals at such a distance. This whole provision for harbor police for Montreal and Quebec is an excrescence; it is exceptional legislation which has been objected to from time to time; but, as I have said, I do not intend to object to putting on the Statute-book a provision which has been carried out since Confederation. But to give the Government power to send their police to arrest criminals in the Province of Ontario would be largely to subvert our Constitution, which gives the administration of criminal law to the Provinces. If a sailor is to be arrested in Toronto or Hamilton, or at any other port so remote from the scene of the labors of this police force, let it be done by the ordinary machinery of the Province just as a murderer or a thief is arrested.

Mr. McLELAN. If you insert the phrase, "and territories adjacent thereto," the question would arise: Where is the territory adjacent thereto? The River St. Lawrence extends into the Province of Ontario. I think it is better to leave the clause as it stands. I think that under this Bill, which provides that the territory in which the police shall have jurisdiction will be defined by Order in Council, the force will work more satisfactorily than at present.

Mr. KILLAM. No doubt it would be more satisfactory to have everything done by Order in Council than by Act of Parliament. When this law was introduced it was owing to the exceptional circumstances of the harbors of Montreal and Quebec, and I hold very strongly that the jurisdiction of the force should be limited strictly to what was intended when the provision was first passed for establishing this force.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I join entirely with the view expressed by the hon. member for West Durham, that this is an encroachment, an assertion of power, for the first time under my notice, and I think it might be well to insert the words: "such parts of the Province of Quebec," which would confine the jurisdiction to that Province. The harbors of Montreal and Quebec are great national harbors, and ever since Confederation they have been dealt with exceptionally, and I see no objection to regulating the jurisdiction of this police force by the authority of an Act; but I have very strong objections to our asserting in an Act of Parliament that we are extending it all over Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. I think the hon. gentleman's proposed amendment will meet all the objections—jurisdiction over such parts of the Province of Quebec as may be defined by the Governor in Council.

Mr. OUMET. This proposal is as objectionable to Quebec as it would be to Ontario. If you limit the jurisdiction of the superintendent of police, it might be all right. We in Quebec have no more love for the interference of Dominion authorities than has Ontario, and as we have our own means of carrying out the Criminal Law, it would be unfair to leave the House to think that we want some extra jurisdiction, which is resisted by the other Provinces. We wish to be treated as well as the other Provinces. I object to Quebec being placed under the jurisdiction of the Privy Council, and to its being enabled to send its police everywhere through the Province to arrest criminals, whom our own police can capture as well.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think my hon. friend has lost sight of the fact that those Boards of Police are in the Province of Quebec, in the harbors of Montreal and Quebec; and it is not proposed, nor will the Act empower the authorities at Ottawa to order the police to go over the whole Province, but only to such parts as the Governor in Council may decide as necessary for the purposes of the law. There is a reason for applying this Bill to the Province of Quebec, which does not exist as regards Ontario. The harbors of Montreal and Quebec are within that Province; and a force has been required and provided to sustain the law at those ports.

Mr. OUMET. The Governor in Council will be empowered to use their police to arrest a man in any part of our Province if they think proper to do so. We do not want such a power; but only that the power be limited to those ports for the maintenance of the peace and the arrest of criminals within their limits. If a criminal flee from those ports and the jurisdiction of their police, our local police officer may be empowered to arrest them. I protest against singling out the Province of Quebec for this legislation.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no other Province in the Dominion visited by so much shipping, and the Bill is for the regulation, not of the inhabitants of Quebec, but of the foreigners visiting those ports—for the preservation of peace and order among the large body of sailors. As the force is specially for Montreal and Quebec, it should have jurisdiction over such adjacent territories as may be defined by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to know whether it is intended to make the harbor and river police of Montreal and Quebec one force, or to have the force at each port a distinct organ-

ization; whether it is intended to have a separate superintendent for each, or one superintendent with jurisdiction at one port, with an assistant at the other port, and how many officers it has proposed to appoint?

Mr. McLELAN. At present there is a superintendent at each port, though the police are considered one force. It a difficulty occurs at Montreal or Quebec, the whole of the men may be concentrated at either port to preserve order.

Mr. BLAKE. How many men are there?

Mr. McLELAN. About seventy; forty at Quebec, and thirty at Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. Is not that number increased?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. CARON. There is a reduction.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a superintendent at Montreal and another at Quebec, which arrangement is to be continued.

Mr. BLAKE. Is each to have independent authority?

Mr. McLELAN. Each superintendent has authority over the men with him.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Were there no temporary additions made to the force last year, in consequence of the labor troubles?

Mr. McLELAN. I think eight or ten men were added to the Montreal force; eight or ten of the Quebec men have been ordered up to Montreal during the last few days. The same number are engaged at Montreal as in former years.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have often contended that we should wash our hands clear of this business; that it is entirely out of our province to take charge of the domestic affairs of the Montreal or Quebec harbors. We should relegate this duty either to the municipal or provincial authorities.

Mr. AMYOT. Why does not the member for Gloucester ask the ports of Montreal and Quebec to pay the Custom house officers and all the expenses necessary for the commerce of those cities? It is a strange statement that the payment for the public services at those harbors is a domestic affair. If we do the country any immense service by those harbors, I think it is the first duty of the country to pay such expenses.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken; they are paid now differently from what he supposes.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause was to be amended.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; I move it be amended so as to include those words—"jurisdiction over such part or parts of the Province of Quebec as may be defined."

On clause 2,

Mr. BLAKE. This gives unlimited power to the Governor in Council to appoint harbor and river police. Such a thing was never done before. When the Mounted Police were appointed the number was limited, and when an increase was proposed the maximum was made 500.

Mr. McLELAN. We do not know what the emergency may be. We may at any time find it necessary to increase the force temporarily for a few days.

Mr. BLAKE. A maximum number should then be fixed in case of an emergency. I do not see why we should depart from the rule adopted with regard to the Civil Service and the Mounted Police. Why should unlimited powers be given to the Government on water any more than on land?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's premises are entirely unsound. The hon. gentleman fails to see a distinction between this force and the ordinary Civil Service.

Mr. BLAKE. I spoke of the Mounted Police.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said he did not see why this was different from the Civil Service. There is a great difference between the two as there is also between the Mounted Police force and this force. The course the hon. gentleman proposes would be a mischievous one. What you want is the smallest police force with which to perform the ordinary service. If provision is made that only so many men may be appointed to the harbor police force, you will enable persons to organize strikes in sufficient force so as to overwhelm this maximum of police force, which cannot be exceeded; while, on the other hand, if the number is left unlimited it may be at any time made sufficiently strong to quell any disturbance they may be able to make.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I was observing, when the House rose, that the force in question, has been in existence since a date before Confederation, and that, therefore, the nominal strength of the force necessary for the attainment of its ordinary objects, has been well ascertained by the experience of the years that have elapsed since 1867. It is now well known what the existing state of the commerce in Quebec and Montreal requires should be the number of this force. I do not propose that the Minister should be authorized to arbitrarily state the exact number of the force, but that a certain amount of elasticity should be allowed. I suggested even as many as ten, in excess of what the hon. gentleman knows from the experience of the last few years, as the amount of the force required at this time—not that that would mean that ten should be appointed in excess to what are required, but that the increase might be made when the necessity arose. As to the extraordinary purposes of the force, the hon. Minister of Railways suggested that a limitation of temporary appointments would lead probably to the disturbers of the peace gathering together in force enough to overcome the maximum. That is easily got rid of by not establishing the maximum, but by leaving it to the discretion of the magistrates. I am of the opinion, and I think the Committee agree with the opinion, that if we are called upon to organize this force, its normal condition, its standing as an ordinary and permanent police force, its officers and the salaries, ought to be fixed by the Bill, as in the case of the Mounted Police—I do not mean the exact salaries, but the maximum salaries. The present clauses leave everything, in all these particulars of organization, as vague as they are left to-day, although the hon. gentleman justifies the introduction of the Bill upon the ground that it is expedient to put formally in the shape of a Statute the opinion of Parliament as to the constitutional force.

Mr. McLELAN. The force has been in existence for forty years, and I think no person will contend that the power to appoint has been abused. The strength has always been required according to the requirements of the time, and I think we should leave it where it is, in the discretion of the Minister. The extent of territory over which they have to operate is increasing, and perhaps the number may require to be slightly increased.

Mr. DESJARDINS (in French). Mr. Speaker, if any complaint has come from Montreal, it is to the effect that Montreal has not, in comparison with its extent, a sufficient police force to protect its wharves. I do not think that the water police's position can be compared to that of the mounted police. It is well known that at a given time an organized body of laborers can put to flight the small body of police now existing, and if the Government has not the power to increase it at once in a reasonable proportion, it

might as well be abolished at once, for in many instances it will be really inefficient. I think that the latitude asked for by the Government is reasonable and that it should be granted.

Mr. McLENNAN. I think it is a mistake to suppose that this police force bears any resemblance to the Mounted Police or any other system of preserving the peace that we ordinarily use. This is a special service for the protection of a special interest, and that object can only be attained by placing the fullest powers in the hands of the Government to apply this force in any measure and at any time when it happens to be required, to determine on some fixed body that we would be able to incite into an active and efficient force. Parliament would destroy that efficiency and it would fail to meet the very pressing necessities for which this force is brought into use, that is to preserve the peace in the harbor of Montreal at a time when a Ship-laborers' Union is creating a disturbance and requires to be dealt with promptly. It is not a charge upon the public; the special object of the Act is to legalize and bring within the operation of the law this necessary provision for the protection of this interest, and unless it is applied as it is proposed, and in which it has been proposed by the hon. Minister after advising with the parties concerned, it will simply fail of its effect.

Mr. McLELAN moved that clause 4 be struck out.

Mr. McLENNAN. Before this is done, I would expostulate with the Minister. Every word I have said applies generally to the character of the force and is an argument that the superintendent of this force should have some power of acting. I am told that when there are thirty men in the force on duty in the harbor of Montreal, taking from that number the men who are on duty at the station, and those required in other ways, there is about one man per mile left on active duty. The only way to increase the efficiency of this force and to overawe those who organize for evil is to give some magisterial authority to the superintendent of the force. I do not know that it is an extraordinary provision. I presume the arguments used when this clause was inserted in the Bill were sufficient to convince the Minister of its necessity; I think they exist still, although perhaps the power proposed to be given is perhaps too great, but some power should be given to the superintendent to act judicially.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 8,

Mr. BLAKE. The Act 31 Victoria, respecting the Harbor Police, which is repealed by this Act, provides for further levying of a tonnage tax; but it provided further for the application of that tax towards the maintenance of the Harbor River Police. Now the hon. gentlemen proposes simply that these tonnage dues shall simply form part of the general revenue.

Mr. McLELAN. It is the same for the old Act.

Mr. BLAKE. That part of the old Act which provides that the tax shall be applied specifically for the keeping up of the Harbor and River Police is entirely struck out. My opinion is that the tax should be adequate to the maintenance of the force, and should apply to the maintenance of the force, and that a return should be brought down to Parliament every year, as at present, showing the amount of the tax, what the expenses of the force have been, and how the balance stands.

Mr. McLELAN. The old practice of allowing the money to be drawn from the Receiver-General by the proper officer no longer obtains, but money is voted in the usual way in the Estimates. The return made every year will show the amount of money received, and other transactions.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not advocate a return to the old custom of drawing the money from the Receiver-General's

hands; but what I object to is that the old plan of specifically applying that tax to the keeping up of the force is done away with by this Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. I have no objection to adding to the 10th clause, words to the effect that a return should be made to Parliament.

Amendment agreed to.

On clause 8,

Mr. McCUAIG. It often happens that the Upper Canada mail steamers arrive at Montreal about the time that the steamer for Quebec is leaving, and passengers and so forth are simply transferred from one boat to the other. I wish to know if the Upper Canadian boat has to pay the harbor dues in such a case.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no change affecting that point in the present Bill.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

HARBOR OF ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK:

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions to provide for the appointment of certain Commissioners for the improvement and management of the harbor of St. John, New Brunswick.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These resolutions, except the name, are similar to the resolutions submitted to the House the other day respecting the Harbor Commission of Three Rivers, and the Bill which will follow the adoption of these resolutions is based on the Bill which was then passed. There will be five Commissioners, as in the other case: one will be appointed by the City Council of St. John, another by the Board of Trade of St. John, and the three others, including the chairman, by the Government.

Mr. ANGLIN. I, myself, have for a long time been opposed to the proposal to place the harbor of St. John under a Commission, because I do not believe such a change in the management of that harbor is either necessary or desirable. Our harbor is now very fairly managed. We have ample accommodation at present for all the trade of the port. There is no necessity for the erection of new wharves or for any very extensive improvements in order to enable us to do all the business we at present have or are likely to have for several years. This proposal, in different aspects, has been talked of in the city of St. John from time to time, but the talk has been confined usually to small circles. The Board of Trade is a very small body indeed, having on its list of members comparatively few of the merchants and business men of the city, and a yet smaller number attend its meetings. The largest number that ever attended its meetings could easily be accommodated in a very small room. The members of the Common Council, on the other hand, have had their own peculiar views on this subject. They have been desirous of disposing of a quantity of corporation property lying contiguous to the harbor, and of getting control of the money to be raised by selling this property to the Commissioners. Should this project be realized, it would be necessary to state that the moneys advanced by the Government shall really be appropriated to benefitting St. John—that the money shall not be left at the absolute disposal of the Common Council—that it shall not have discretionary power as to the manner in which the money so raised shall be invested. What the present project is, strange to say, the people of St. John do not know, never having been consulted. Only the few promoters of this scheme know anything of

its provisions. The members for the county and I, myself, have not been able to answer the questions put us by parties interested in St. John with reference to this project; and gentlemen here representing the wharf owners, until a day or two ago, had no idea of its character. They were never consulted as to the project which the Government have carried out and which must materially affect their interests. The people in St. John interested in this measure—which is of the character of a private Bill—should have had an opportunity of forming and expressing an opinion upon it. They regard the clandestine project with alarm. Fully two-thirds of the whole harbor of St. John, on the east side, on which nearly all our deep-watered wharves are settled, is the property of private individuals. In the lower part of the harbor the Government have erected large wharves, and further up the Corporation have some deep-water wharves. Then we come to the Custom House wharf, from which, up to Rodden's wharf and Rankin's wharf, at the head of the harbor, the whole property is private, except one or two properties owned by the Corporation. The value of this private property will be very seriously affected by our proposed legislation. Harbor Commissioners, as might be expected, would regulate the business of the harbor from the private wharves to those under their control. I believe that representatives of those private owners are here at present to ask either that this matter be postponed, so that the wishes of the people may be fairly expressed upon it, or that at all events due regard be had to their private interests. They urge that if this measure is to be passed against their strongest remonstrances and despite their serious apprehensions, that the Commissioners be required to take over this private property again at a fair and reasonable value, to be determined by any proper mode the House may choose to adopt. I think that is but a reasonable demand, but it is more reasonable to ask that the whole matter should stand over till the people of St. John have had an opportunity of pronouncing upon it, when, next year, Parliament, if so disposed might carry out the well-understood wishes of the people, and not the wishes of some parties working for purposes not understood by those whom they pretend to represent.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the present position of the harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The second resolution is the money clause. The harbor of St. John belongs to the city by the charter given to it years ago. Some of the wharves belong to private individuals who own them, or the land on which they have been built, and for which they pay to the city a yearly rent. The proposal is that the property belonging to the city shall be transferred to the Harbor Commissioners. That property has a revenue of between \$30,000 and \$33,000 a year.

Mr. ANGLIN. Do you include in that what are known as harbor dues?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; and the revenue from the fisheries belonging to the city. The proposition is that the Government should advance to that trust, as they have done in Montreal for the deepening of the channel, and in Quebec for the graving dock, say \$500,000 to the Harbor Commissioners, at 4 per cent. to pay for that property, and they will raise besides \$20,000 at the same rate to go on with the improvements of the harbor. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat seems to think this is a new scheme of which the citizens of St. John know nothing; that it has been decided by a corner meeting. This, on the contrary, is a project that has been before the city of St. John since 1874. The hon. gentleman says that there have been no complaints there, and that no improvements are required. I do not know where the hon. gentleman has been during that time, but I know that when

Mr. ANGLIN.

I went to St. John, the citizens of both parties were unanimous in declaring that large improvements were required. He knows perfectly well that the Dominion Government have made large expenditures for the breakwater at Negro Point. The people of St. John held that it was a Dominion work, being for the protection of an important harbor; but, on the other hand, as spirited men who know they should help themselves, as well as call upon the Government to help them, that other improvements were required which they should aid in making, therefore, they said: "Let us have a property on which we can obtain money, and we will administer this property." I am astonished that an hon. gentleman hailing from St. John should have objected to that scheme. The hon. gentleman says we must not trust the Council of St. John. I am surprised that he will not trust the people of St. John who have elected that Council, which we must suppose, having been elected by the people, has their confidence, and will not use their money in any other way than that provided by law. The hon. gentleman, who understands constitutional principles, must know that if we purchase that property from the city, we have no conditions to make as to the disposal of the money, which is theirs once we have paid it to the city. I think the scheme is a good one. It will enable the Harbor Commission to make the necessary improvements to the harbor, and, on the other hand, the Government will be safe, because, by the provisions of the Bill, the Government will take care that the revenues of the harbor, after the expenditure connected with its collection, are forthcoming to pay the interest. The hon. gentleman says we must be careful not to interfere with private property. We are not taking private property. The revenues coming into the city from it, and due to the city, are to be transferred to the Commission, as well as the property of the harbor; but without reference at all to the complete acceptance of the property belonging to private individuals, the question whether we should provide for the purchase of that property *volens volens* from the proprietors of those lots is a different question. We have provided in the Bill in the first instance, that the Commission may purchase these private properties after coming to an arrangement with the proprietors. The question now is whether we should go a step further, and give the Commission the right to purchase the property, as the hon. gentleman suggests, whether the owners are willing to sell or not. That question will be decided when we come to the second reading of the Bill. I am informed that the local Act of the New Brunswick Legislature provides that the money shall be applied to pay the debt of the city, therefore the hon. gentleman's fears must entirely disappear. On the one hand, the money will be paid to the city, and the law of New Brunswick says what the City Council shall do with that money.

Mr. ANGLIN. Will the hon. Minister tell us what improvements are to be made that will cost \$250,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Harbor Commission, after being incorporated, will decide what the improvements shall be. It is not for us to prescribe what improvements the Commission shall make. The hon. gentleman will see that if the Commission desires to purchase property they will have to secure the sanction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Bill [regulating the Harbor Commission at Quebec provides that no works can be undertaken without the approval of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is correct as to the large docks at the mouth of the River St. Charles, and the graving dock on the side of the harbor.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the same provision ought to be here. The hon. gentleman should have given the House some statement of what was to be done with the money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so. The money must be put at their disposal for the construction of the necessary works; of course, the Government will have to see that the money is expended for the purpose for which it is voted. As to the suggestion that the sanction of the Governor in Council should be obtained for the construction of the works, that will receive my attention before the second reading.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister laid some stress upon the fact that this money was to be expended, or at least obtained, on the request of the Municipal Council of St. John. Now, as a matter of course, a requisition from the Municipal Council of St. John is entitled to all reasonable respect; but I would like to know whether it was understood, when these gentlemen were elected, that this project was under contemplation? Unless it was understood at the time that they were going to make a requisition on the Government to have the money so expended, it can hardly be fair to say that in any shape or way the concurrence of the citizens of St. John can be had to this measure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know that this matter has been before the citizens of St. John for seven or eight years, and this grant has been in contemplation by them for the last month at least. It has been under discussion in the City Council and the Board of Trade, and has also been thoroughly discussed in the newspapers. Since the City Council and the Board of Trade have come to a thorough understanding in the matter, there has been no petition and no letters against the project. On the contrary, all the information I have is that the scheme is looked upon with great favor by the citizens.

Mr. ANGLIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. There are petitions before the House signed by hundreds of the most respectable people of St. John, asking for postponement.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That may be, but there is no petition against the scheme.

Mr. ANGLIN. Yes, there is.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The thing has been thoroughly discussed, and the press are unanimous about it. They do not oppose it, they do not say it is a bad scheme, but there have been a few, no doubt, who wish the matter postponed. I have no doubt that if the scheme were submitted to-morrow to the people, they would sanction it at once. This scheme will furnish money at a very low rate of interest for the improvement of the harbor. The city of St. John loses nothing by it, and they will have, besides, the \$500,000 to pay the debt, and \$250,000 to dredge their harbor and make other improvements required by the trade of St. John. The hon. gentleman says that we should purchase private properties. Well, in the second reading, I will be ready to say whether we shall put in a clause to that effect.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister does not seem to be aware of the fact that petitions signed by several hundreds of the business men of St. John, asking for delay in this case, have been presented to this House. The principle reason they assign is that they do not know what this scheme is. The hon. Minister seems to think the matter has been fully discussed. I can assure him that until I heard his statement here to-night, I had but a very vague idea myself of what the scheme was to be. It is not known. There has been a great deal of discussion as to the propriety of putting the harbor under a Commission, and one of the strongest arguments in favor of any scheme ever proposed has always been that a large amount of money could be got in that way at a less rate of interest to apply to other purposes; in other words, that the Dominion Government could in some way be used for the purpose of enabling the city to convert a 6 per cent. debt into a 4 per cent debt

But there is this difficulty about that: that only a small portion of that debt is likely to become due within the next year or two, that a great many of the bonds have ten years to run, and in some cases as long as thirty years. If this money is paid over to the Corporation now they will have to invest it somewhere at a lower rate than 4 per cent., in order to derive any profit from it. The only profit arising out of it for some years to come will be the difference between the rate of interest at 4 per cent. charged by the Government, and the rate at which the city could borrow money to-day to pay off the indebtedness as it accrued. That certainly will not be over 5 per cent., or there will be saving of 1 per cent. and that only upon such amount as the Corporation will in the meantime be able to pay off, and that 1 per cent. will be swallowed three times over by the expenses of the Commission. Some of us do not like it, because we apprehend a great deal of extravagance. The hon. Minister boasts of the improvements to be made. I know something of the harbor of St. John. Down the harbor large wharves are erected, which may be considered outside the harbor; away to the head of the harbor on the east side, where vessels requiring deep water can lie at the wharves, the whole grounds are covered by wharves, and there is as much accommodation as can be provided. On the western side of the harbor, the Western Railway erected a wharf at Sand Point, which I regret is not much used. On the Carleton side, there are places where such wharves can be built. But the propriety of building them is a matter of doubt, inasmuch as the harbor, which is already narrow, would be rendered incommodious. Such extensions, for they would not be improvements, would rather injure the harbor than serve it; and I do not know that anybody contemplates the work of dredging the great mud banks so as to provide deep-water wharves. What the improvements are, I venture to say, the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill cannot himself state. A large number of wharves have been erected during the past few years. The Corporation has managed this business fairly well, let it be said to their credit. They have erected large wharves and have purchased large properties, and have, in fact, covered all their own ground with wharves of the best character. I am sorry there is not enough business to make them paying properties. Last year, the hon. the Minister of Public Works was urged to undertake various improvements in the harbor. I suppose they pointed out some improvements which it was thought should have been undertaken, and which would not cost a large sum. They asked for the use of a dredge in the harbor. There was no necessity to create a Commission to carry out that work. If the work was a necessary the Common Council could carry it out, and there is no necessity to effect a change in the management of the harbor. The hon. Minister should be able to tell us what would be effected by the Commission, what improvements are to be made, and how they are to be made. The hon. Minister has spoken of the breakwater at Negro Point, but it was undertaken as a Dominion work, and should be completed as such. A great storm damaged the work, but the Government have undertaken the repairs. I do not know any other work, unless it is the wild idea of making deep-water wharves on the Carleton side. With regard to private property, no doubt private individuals pay a small rent to the Corporation, but these wharves are not the less the property of individuals. It was long ago decided that while persons owning property on the banks had not the right to build wharves, no other person had the right to build in front of them; and, therefore, it came to this: that all the owners of property running down to deep water obtained from the Corporation, perpetual leases at very low rates. The property just as much belongs to the wharf owners as if they held it in fee. The hon. Minister has said that it is not proposed to diminish the value of the property. If the hon.

gentleman fully understood the state of things he would not have made that assertion. No doubt he intends to promote the interests of St. John, but he does not understand the case when he speaks in that way. The Commission would have control of the harbor and business. They would have directly or through their agent the right to say where vessels would lie.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The harbor master, who is now appointed by the City Council because the property belongs to the city, would be appointed by the Government as are all harbor masters, when this Bill has passed.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then he will work in the interests of the Government. The owners of private property feel they have been placed in a strange position. The hon. Minister is entirely mistaken if he supposes that this project has been discussed in St. John, that it has ever appeared in any newspaper, or been heard of by more than a dozen citizens outside of those small bodies who have moved in the matter. When property owners came here they found it difficult to obtain information as to what the effect of the Bill would be. They will be placed in an entirely different position, and if the Bill passes in its present form, those private properties will fall 25 per cent. The House has always shown its care in protecting private properties, and I ask the hon. Minister if he will consent that this measure be referred to a Committee so that representatives of those properties may be heard before it. Some years ago a different proposition was brought forward, under which all private property had to be purchased and all the harbor property placed in the hands of a Commission. That should be the scheme if any scheme had to be adopted. The Provincial Legislature, in authorizing the Common Council to dispose of this money, took steps to see that provision was made for its proper application, and their example should be followed by the Dominion Government. All this money cannot be applied at once to the payment of the debt, because the bonds are not due and the money must in the meantime be paid over to the Corporation and invested until the bonds mature; and therefore the hon. gentleman should see that the money is appropriated in the way in which the Corporation professes their intention that it should be appropriated.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend will allow me to say that he is mistaken in saying that this scheme is unknown in the city of St. John, for it has been agitated there for years. I was in the Common Council, and I waited on the late Government in 1877, and had interviews with them with regard to it, and though the details of this measure may be different, the principle of the scheme is the same. The principle was that the harbor of St. John should be placed under a Commission. Was it necessary that the harbor should be taken out of the hands of the Common Council in order that it might be made more efficient for the public? It must be borne in mind that St. John harbor is not private. It affords the means of access to the back country in several directions, being the mouth of a river which drains a large area. The mud which comes down that river and the difficult tides which we have, together, rendered it necessary that the harbor should be administered under a better system. A great deal of private property is yearly losing in value for the want of dredging, which, of course, private individuals cannot afford to carry on, and the result is that not only the owners suffer but the public of St. John and the country at large. At one end of the harbor there is so much property belonging to the Common Council, and in the centre and at the other end there are small portions in the same position, but between these there are important and valuable private rights. The private owners of wharves may fairly say to those in authority: it is true we own private rights, but the interests of the city, the interests of its trade and of the trade of the whole

Mr. ANGLIN.

Dominion stand above those rights and they are injured because the harbor is not properly looked after. I think it is in the interests of the public that the harbor—should be placed in the same position as other harbors, such as Montreal and Quebec; that it should be made a public harbor, maintained at the public expense. There should be some body who is entirely responsible for dredging it and keeping up the wharves, for St. John is to become, as I believe it will become, one of the ends of the great Canadian Pacific Railway. I for one shall try to have the eastern end of that railway in New Brunswick, and I hope I will have the hon. gentleman's support. We may not get this boon all at once, but if not we must get it in pieces. That is a part of our National Policy; that is what we were pledged to, and my hon. friend is mistaken in saying that putting this harbor under a Commission is not going to help us. I care little where the money goes, because I am sure that the ratepayers and the Government will look out for themselves. To-day the wharves are mortgaged by these outstanding bonds, and before they hand the money over they will see that the liabilities are liquidated. What does it matter what is done with the money if they get the property into their hands at a certain and proper valuation. With regard to the Board of Trade, I have very little commiseration for them. I declined years ago to meet the Board of Trade before the late Minister of Customs and the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries—why? Not because I thought they were not a good body; but I say here is a bargain between the city of St. John and the Government, and the Government having decided that this harbor is to be placed under a Commission, and the city having property to sell, it is for the city fathers, those elected by the people, to deal with the Government, and the Government having completed their arrangements with the Council may turn round to private property holders and carry out the final details. But while the Government were making a bargain with the Corporation of St. John, no one had any right to step in and say anything regarding the city's own property. Of course the Board of Trade, in the interest of trade, have a right to be heard; they may be right or they may be wrong, but while they exist, and while they confine their functions to their proper limits, we should consider what they have to say. The hon. gentleman must not try to make the House believe that this is a new scheme. It has been long thought of, and though I see many difficulties surrounding it, I think it is for the best interests of St. John and the Province generally. But we must have private rights looked after. I am satisfied that we cannot put the harbor into the hands of a Commission without looking after the rights of the private wharf owners. If we were to place a small portion of the harbor under a Commission, the result would be that a portion of the wharves would be free while the rest would not. Would the ships go to the wharves where they would have to pay? No, they would go to the wharves which were free. The whole matter must result in this: that the taxes on the whole port must be applied to meet the expenses of the port; you may put them on tonnage dues, on export duties, or on import duties, but the long and the short of it is that the traffic of the harbor has to pay these dues; and if you improve the harbor so much more has to be paid. We must bear in view that we must not trammel that port with expenses, and make it too dear for the importers and exporters; but I believe that by placing the management of these wharves into one or two hands, instead of having a dozen to make a living out of them, as they do to-day, the expenses of the port will be greatly reduced. With regard to the wharves wearing out, they must be repaired at all hazards, and we must keep the harbor properly dredged. If a certain portion of the wharves are made free, vessels will not go to the private wharves, and the result will be that the private owners will find themselves without a

revenue, and will consequently be unable to keep their wharves in repair. Consequently, the question comes down to this: are you going to make this a free harbor under a Commission? If such is the case, then you must deal with it from end to end as one harbor, and not have any sectional divisions. I think we are all agreed on that; and having decided that this harbor is to be placed under a Commission we must respect private rights. My hon. friend says that private rights will be respected. I have not been able to go into the details of this Bill; but I have faith in the Government, that they will do what is right, but I think there should be something put in the Bill to define their rights, and place the private wharf owners on a fair basis. They have no right to ask that their wharves should be taken over at any greater value than could be arrived at by finding out what rental they yield in a certain number of years. Although you say this is a permissive Bill which does not interfere with private rights, yet I say, if you do not make any provision for them, you do a great injustice to the private wharf interest of the city of St. John; and as that interest is a very large one, I know such cannot be the intention of the Government, and I am satisfied that when we come to the second reading of this Bill, our friends will do justice to all parties. I believe all parties are agreed to make St. John a public harbor, and if we admit that, the question of details, I am satisfied, can be settled on the second reading of the Bill.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for Gloucester say that the people of St. John knew nothing about this question. Were I asked to point to one proposition, which more than any other has been under consideration in the city and county of St. John for the last eight years, which has been more prominently before the public, and engaged more of the time and attention of the Common Council and the public men of the city than any other, I should point to this question of placing the harbor of St. John in charge of a Commission. I have two pamphlets, containing the report of the proceedings of the Common Council's delegation to Ottawa, in communication with the then Government, in 1878, on this subject, and of its action from 1874 to 1878, showing the various discussions they had on the subject, the reports after they returned, and the reasons why the propositions made at that time were accepted. The fact is, in 1875 the Corporation obtained legislative authority from the Legislature of New Brunswick to sell to the Harbor Commissioners certain property they owned for \$515,000, or some specific sum. That question had been under the consideration of the Council. The chief difficulty was as to the sum the Commissioners were to pay to the city of St. John for that property when transferred. In 1878 the deputation stated that the Government refused to receive the proposition of \$515,000, preferring that the value of that property should be decided by a Commission to be appointed. The deputation that waited on the Government offered certain portions of the property for \$515,000. The Government's refusal caused the deputation to return greatly disappointed, whereupon they made their report and withdrew their offer of the property to the Commissioners for \$515,000. That matter has remained in abeyance down to a very recent date. A month or two ago the subject was brought before the Common Council and the Board of Trade. Why was it brought under their consideration? Some five or six months ago a meeting was called in the county of St. John, to consider the best means of making St. John the winter port for the trade of the great North-West; and after various resolutions passed it was decided that a Committee should be appointed to put itself in communication with the Finance Minister, in order to ascertain what could best be done for the accomplishment of

this object. The City Council then renewed the consideration of this subject and passed resolutions. They also sent a memorial to the Government, which was transferred to the Minister of Public Works. The Board of Trade then took up the subject of placing the harbor under a Commission, but objected to certain reservations made with reference to certain properties the city wished to hold, while asking \$500,000 for the rest. The Board of Trade thought that this reserved property might be very valuable at a future day and would be used probably, if held by the city and county of St. John, in competition with the Harbor Commissioners. Both memorials, one being from the Board of Trade, taking that exception alone, were handed to the Minister of Public Works, and were brought before the Council. We understood perfectly well, though hon. gentlemen may say in the House and elsewhere that the Board of Trade is not a representative body, that it is; and I, as a representative of St. John, regard it as speaking for the commercial interests of that city. But if we expect to make that port a successful competitor for the North-West trade, we must have it not only put in Commission, but the harbor improved and obstacles removed, while materially increasing the dues. The Board of Trade, having in view the payment of a large sum that might interfere with the value of property, remonstrated against this condition in the proposal of the Common Council. They came to the Government, who said to them: "Unless you can more nearly agree than at present, we shall decline to ask Parliament to take any action in the matter whatever." This resolution was passed by the Council before the elections, and the order for the delegates for the people to come here was made after the elections. Well, those two parties, having agreed upon this subject, both feeling the importance of having this harbor put in Commission, certain results followed; and why? I recollect when vessels could find at certain wharves in St. John twenty-four feet of water where now there is only sixteen. The River St. John carries down earth and mud which tend to choke up the harbor, thus depreciating the value of the property. As a representative of St. John I am prepared to urge upon the House the deepening and improving of the harbor in the interests of its trade. It is said that the representatives of the wharf owners have not had an opportunity of seeing this measure in good time. It was placed in the hands of one of them on Monday, and the Bill is most carefully worded, with reference to their protection. As the hon. member for King's said, the only question now practically in dispute, and it is receiving the attention of the Government, is the meeting of the views, if we can do so, consistently with the interests of the public, of those wharf owners, and as to the mode in which we shall deal with that property. The Government decided they would not force any man to sell his property or take it at a Government valuation; and, therefore, a clause provides that nothing in this Bill shall interfere with the rights of private owners. But while we are anxiously guarding against forcing those parties to sell their property, a proposition has been made by them, saying, we wish you to take it at a valuation. That changes the aspect of the matter. Of course there is some difficulty with reference to the value of the property, and as to the use of the money advanced for that purpose. The Bill contemplates and provides for the acquiring, step by step, any wharf property suitable, if the owners agree to the price offered. Then the Commissioners are forced to buy; but, of course, no sale of that kind requiring money to be advanced by the Government shall be finally settled without reference to the Government here. When the hon. Minister of Public Works was down last summer he was shown the difficulties we had to contend with. He was shown where the harbor was filling so that vessels could not be at certain points, where ten years ago they could come to anchor without difficulty. It is true,

the principle laid down with reference to management of harbors is that, as a rule, the keeping of the harbor in repair and making improvement is considered a local charge, except in the cases of the breakwater at St. John and the island opposite Toronto; but when the Government is also interested it may assume a portion of this work. There is great difficulty with reference to deepening the harbor of St. John, in the fact that any expenditure the Government might make, would increase the value of wharves which are private property, and the Government did not feel they could consistently ask an appropriation for the improvement of private property. The only alternative left was to put a Commission in possession and provide it with \$250,000 for improvements, without increasing the taxes of the harbor. That could only be done by furnishing the Commission, as this Bill provides, with \$750,000 at 4 per cent., which interest could be met by the gross revenue. The Commission will thus be able to pay \$500,000 to the Corporation for the property transferred, and have \$250,000 to expend in improvements. The hon. Minister of Public Works was pressed very strongly to undertake this as a Government work, but it could not be done by any of the Government dredges. The Commission will have to construct a dredge with longer arms to work where the water is deepest. In addition to deepening the harbor and removing this accumulation of silt that has been going on for years, the Commission will have, under the operation of the Bill, a certain sum of money with which to acquire other properties. The improvements are necessary to be made in order to make St. John the harbor it ought to be, if we are to get a share of the winter trade of the North-West. While these two bodies, the Board of Trade and the City Council, did not agree, we felt a delicacy in asking the House for an appropriation, but when they both came to an agreement, we felt authorized to introduce this Bill which must meet the approval of all who wish to see our harbors throughout the Dominion made available for public purposes. Therefore I believe this proposition is not only in the interest of St. John, but in that of the whole Dominion. If there is one question more than another in which the citizens of St. John are interested, it is this one; and I was surprised that the hon. member for Gloucester should intimate that it was sprung on the House without any consideration having been given it by the citizens of St. John.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). It would be very much better if we had the Bill before us, before entering into a full discussion of the question. This question came before the late Government in 1875 and 1878, but as the Board of Trade and the Common Council of St. John could not come to any agreement together, we were unable to deal with it. I think the harbor of St. John requires to be carefully looked after, and I think that a body specially provided to look after the matter would look after it better than the Common Council. There is no doubt that the trade of St. John has been in a depressed condition for some time. The harbor and shipping are now in a sensitive condition, and it requires great care on the part of the Government and on the part of the Commission that may be appointed under this Bill, that no increased tax is put upon the imports and exports of St. John for years to come. I hope the Government will see that some provision is made to prevent any increase of taxation in that direction. In 1878 we discussed the matter from three points of view: first, with regard to the Common Council of St. John, next with regard to the Board of Trade and the commercial interests, and then with regard to private rights. We had at that time a statement given us of the value of the private property in St. John, which, if I remember rightly, was nearly \$400,000. It was our intention to provide for the Harbor Commission, to provide for the paying off of the debt, and also to enable the Commissioners to buy private property when needed and when it could be obtained at a reasonable price.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

I think it is in the interest of St. John that all the property of the harbor should be under one control. The Minister has said that he has preserved private rights. If this be not done no doubt the placing of the harbor under Commission will depreciate private rights very much. In 1878, it was proposed to levy a percentage of so much on the imports for the use of the Commission; that was to be the source of the Harbor Commission's revenue. If you collect the revenue in this way under this Commission, which I think the Harbor Board will adopt, you will find that the wharfage will decrease a good deal, and you will have the revenue collected on the imports and less from the wharves. Therefore the wharves of private owners will contribute not only to the revenue of the Harbor Commission by a percentage on imports, but they will also be compelled to charge a wharfage, which is the only revenue they can get for the private property thereby being under this disadvantage. You will at once see the disadvantage private wharf owners will have, not only in the collection of revenue, but also in the improvement of the harbor. In the discussion in 1878, it was thought desirable that the Harbor Commission should own all the wharves belonging to private owners, and I think that system should be incorporated in this scheme. I think the Commission should own and control all the wharf property in the harbor of St. John. I think that to place the harbor and the Harbor Board in a proper condition it will be necessary, in the interest of both the Government, the Harbor Commissioners and the city of St. John, that the private property should be purchased by the Corporation, and that the Harbor Board should own the whole harbor of St. John.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend has spoken about preparing the wharves, about putting a taxation upon trade in order to put the wharves in a proper condition, and at the same time he says that the Government must control this Commission so that they shall not put a tax on trade. If money is to be spent on the port of St. John it has got to be raised from two sources—one is local, the other is out of the Dominion revenues. This Bill proposes to place that harbor in the position that the hon. gentleman undertook to place it in himself in days gone by when I waited on him here as a delegate—that is, place it under a Commission to have control of the port. I do not think my hon. friend is placing the matter properly before the country, when on the one hand he advocates that the harbor of St. John should be placed under Commission, and on the other hand he says it must be done without taxing anybody to pay expenses. Somebody has got to pay that tax. I think my hon. friend is not right in putting it in that way, because we know that if the expenditure is made the interest has got to be met out of what this Commission can collect from the port. Now, if the Common Council on their own account wish to take this harbor and put it into thorough repair and carry out all my hon. friend thinks right, the Common Council would have to pay that tax, the city of St. John would have to pay it; but if, on the other hand, the harbor is put in Commission the city of St. John will not have to contribute the whole taxation, but the port that drains the St. John River and all the trade of the country at that port, will have to contribute a certain portion of the rates required to pay for the improvements. The consequence is that the city of John, being responsible for keeping up the harbor, contributes nothing to the harbor. But my hon. friend places the matter in an unfair position by saying that the trade of that port is going to be unfairly taxed. The city should never have been asked to maintain the wharves for the benefit of the whole country. It is a Dominion port just as much as Halifax, Montreal or Quebec, and when repairs are wanted neither hon. gentlemen opposite nor any New Brunswick member would be justified in saying, you should defray the expenses when we have asked

the trade of the port to pay its fair share of the expenditure which is made for their benefit.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). In explanation I desire to say that the Government have the assurance that the revenue raised by the population will be sufficient to pay the interest on the money that is going to be advanced, not only on the \$500,000, but also on the \$250,000 to improve the harbor. But the progress of St. John harbor will depend as much on private interests as on Government measures. No doubt improvements will be made by the Commission, but it is, after all, on the mercantile interest and on the energy of private citizens it depends for its success.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. Minister of Finance must have misunderstood my remarks, or he would not have argued that the question of placing the harbor in Commission had not been discussed for years. I said it had, but I declared that the present scheme, although I do not yet understand it, is not known to the citizens. One reason given for that action was the desirability of securing the western trade. I am anxious to secure that trade, but to place the harbor in Commission will not assist it in the slightest degree, unless some improvement is necessary which can only be carried out by a Commission. I have already stated that some dredging is necessary, but the harbor is just as deep and in as good a condition as it was many years ago, and is capable of receiving the largest vessel afloat. The reason why a dredge had not been applied was because there was not sufficient work to keep it constantly employed. The importations of the port are not more than what they were fifteen years ago, and that is the reason why the value of property has declined. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) talked of the necessity of making St. John a public harbor. I hardly know what he means. It is now a public harbor, open to all the vessels of the world.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that the harbor of St. John is a public harbor in the face of our charter, in which we assert that we own the bed of the river, the fisheries and everything else? That is why I made the assertion that it should be a public harbor.

Mr. ANGLIN. Provision is made to levy dues to keep the port in proper order, and that is one of the sources of revenue to be handed to the Commission. It does not make any distinction between a ship from one part of the world and a ship from another. It is simply entrusted with the management of the harbor, because St. John was supposed to have a special interest in its proper management. I believe that on the whole the Common Council of the city of St. John have managed the harbor fairly well. I am entirely opposed myself to putting the harbor in charge of a Commission, and I believe a great many of the people of St. John agree with me on that point; but though I differ from other hon. members on this subject, we are all agreed that if it is to be put in the hands of a Commission then the whole of this property should be under their control. I do not think we will save any money by this transaction, but we will find that we have added enormously to the expenditure by the change, that works will be undertaken which are not necessary, that others will be undertaken which are of a speculative character which will not prove to be useful. If we get the money at a little lower rate of interest so much the better, but as the trade of St. John must pay the cost, whatever money is advanced, we should not be betrayed into expenditures not absolutely necessary, because we are paying less for the money. We are all desirous of seeing the trade of St. John revive and increase, and we are all prepared to make some sacrifices and ask our fellow-citizens to make some sacrifices in order to accomplish these ends.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN introduced Bill (No. 163) relating to the harbor of St. John in the Province of New Brunswick.

Bill read the first time.

FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLIC CONTRACTS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire again to bring to the attention of this House a measure which I consider of some importance. We are about to entrust the Government with large sums of money, and I think this is the time to bring before the House the principle of the Bill which I had the honor of introducing during the first days of the Session. At this stage of the Session, I do not believe this Bill can reach its second reading and be passed by the House; therefore, I take the only opportunity I have of placing before the House and the country my views upon this subject. Last Session I brought before the House a measure to prevent fraud in connection with the expenditure of money on public contracts. That measure was referred to a Special Committee, which reported it unanimously to the House. The Government have not chosen to take that measure under their own patronage; on the contrary, both last Session and this Session they have prevented it from coming before the public. In order to avoid giving you the trouble, Mr. Speaker, of looking for precedents in connection with this matter, I will state that my desire is not to bring the Bill before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman refers to a Bill that is on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is only incidental.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman refers to a Bill that was thrown out last year, and he refers to the same Bill which was introduced this year, and the proceedings that have taken place upon it. I think the hon. gentleman cannot refer to that Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My reference to the Bill is only incidental to the motion I have to make. It is only explanatory of the motion, and is not with the view of bringing the Bill before the House at all; so that my hon. friend may make his mind easy on that point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have a right to speak to the question of order. My object, as I say, is not to bring this Bill before the House. That has been refused to me, and I understand the Government continues to refuse it, and although I was told a few days ago by the Prime Minister that he would give me a day, he has not done so; but I suppose he would do as he did last year, give me a day after prorogation. Apart from this Bill there is the other question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must rise again to a question of order. Whilst the Speaker is looking over his authorities, I think the hon. gentleman should not proceed. Until the question of order is decided, he should not proceed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You do not know what my motion is. When it comes you will see whether it is in order or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the motion to go into Committee of Supply grievances may be placed before the House and the Government. Of course the hon. member cannot make any motion relating to an Order of the Day or a notice of motion, and he may not speak upon questions referred to in them; all he can do is to bring forward grievances.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He may speak on a subject that a Bill relates to.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a grievance, of course he can do so.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I will show the difference between the Bill and my motion, and I acknowledge the correctness of your decision. At the present moment, when we are about to vote money for public contracts and other purposes, I think we should declare it expedient that a measure of some kind should have been brought by the Government to prevent the expenditure of that money wrongfully, that is to say, to prevent brokerage in connection with public contracts, and to provide that if Ministers, employes of the Government, or contractors, were guilty of any fraud, they ought to be punished. My motion is as follows:—

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved, That it is not expedient, nor in the interest of the public service, to vote any money for expenditure on public contracts without some adequate measure of legislation to prevent and punish frauds in contracts involving expenditure of public moneys, and that this House regrets that the Ministry did not bring and carry such measure before this Parliament.

Amendment (Mr. Casgrain) negatived on the following division:—

YEA:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Dumont,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Fiset,	Malouin,
Béchar,	Fleming,	Mills,
Blake,	Geoffrion,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gillies,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Brown,	Gunn,	Rogers,
Burpee (St. John),	Guthrie,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Rymal,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Skinner,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Sutherland,
Casry,	King,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Trow, and
Charlton,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Wheler.—43.
Crouter,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Méhot,
Amyot,	Girouard (Kent),	Mongenais,
Arkell,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Baker,	Guillet,	Mousseau,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	O'Connor,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Ogden,
Benoit,	Hay,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Hesson,	Ouimet,
Bergin,	Hilliard,	Patterson (Essex),
Bolduc,	Homer,	Pinsonneault,
Bourbeau,	Hooper,	Pope (Compton),
Bowell,	Houde,	Richey,
Brecken,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kaulbach,	Rochester,
Burnham,	Kilvert,	Rouleau,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kranz,	Routhier,
Carling,	Landry,	Royal,
Caron,	Langevin,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Lautier,	Ryan (Montreal),
Colby,	Longley,	Rykert,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Kings),	Scott,
Coughlin,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macmillan,	Stephenson,
Coursol,	McCallum,	Strange,
Currier,	McCarthy,	Tellier,
Cuthbert,	McGaughey,	Tilley,
Daly,	McDougald,	Tupper,
Daoust,	McDougall,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McLellan,	Vallée,
Desjardins,	McLennan,	Vanasse,
Donville,	McLeod,	Wade,
Elliott,	McQuade,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	McRory,	Wallace (York),
Fitzsimmons,	Manson,	White (Cardwell),
Fulton,	Massue,	White (Hastings), and
Gault,	Merner,	Williams.—109.
Gigault,		

Mr. SPEAKER.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself in Committee of Supply.

371. St. Charles Branch and Ferry between Lévis and Quebec \$536,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. Have the Government determined on building that branch?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. This sum is intended to cover half the cost of a steam ferry between Quebec and Lévis, for carrying the cars of the Quebec, Montreal & Occidental Railway from one shore to the other, and for the construction of a branch from Lévis up to the Grand Trunk station, and a direct line from Point St. Charles to the Intercolonial, 12 miles distant. The Government of Quebec will pay half the cost of maintenance of this ferry.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What will the ferry cost?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. About \$200,000, not including the wharf. There will be two steamers to ship and unship the cars, which work is to be done by cranes lifting the whole car. The Quebec Central Railway is to bear a portion of this expense. They are now engaged in bringing that railway from where it crosses the Intercolonial at St. Henri to the same point; and five miles of the line, from the ferry at Point Lévis to St. Charles, will be common to both roads. They propose for the station accommodation which they are to receive from the Intercolonial at that point, and for the use of those five miles of the road, to pay \$12,000 a year, which will cover a considerable portion of the expense outside of what is borne by the Province of Quebec for the establishment of this ferry.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Surely it is not a good plan to build the boats so that the cars have to be hoisted off. Why not have them built like the Great Western Railway boats, from which the cars can be run off?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject has been very carefully considered, and it is believed that owing to the rise and fall of the tide at Quebec it would be more convenient to have cranes for lifting the cars into and out of those boats. The whole of the arrangements for the ferry and everything connected with it are to be a matter of a joint arrangement between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At the Grand Trunk crossing at Sarnia they have an adjustable landing to suit the difference in the water level there, which is between three and four feet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a good deal of difference in the localities, however.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think it would be much easier to cross the trains at certain times and land them by other means than by hoisting.

Mr. ANGLIN. How will the trains run when this new branch is built, so as to suit passengers from the Lower Provinces on their way to Montreal, or passengers from the West to the Lower Provinces—will people not going to Quebec be taken down to Lévis and then back to the Chaudière?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The intention is to make close connection at the Chaudière Junction, as formerly, with the Grand Trunk, and, therefore, the line between St. Charles and the Chaudière will be operated as usual. All the freight and passengers going to Quebec will be carried directly to that city, and all going to Montreal will proceed direct to it also, without loss of time.

Mr. ANGLIN. Will that not be very expensive?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt it would involve some additional expense and locomotive power, but that is

inevitable without sacrificing time in the communications between the two.

372. Extension to Halifax..... \$37,500

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is for the purpose of providing increased accommodation at Halifax. The volume of traffic has been so greatly increased that additional yard room was absolutely required. I thought this expenditure might have been postponed, but in consequence of the very urgent representation of the superintendent it was found absolutely necessary to incur it. The letter is as follows:—

“From what I can learn, the amount for the new main line at Halifax has been struck out of the Estimates. I regret this very much, because it is an improvement absolutely necessary, and unless something is done in that way during the coming season we shall certainly be very much hampered in moving the traffic at Richmond and Halifax next winter. We have had a great deal of trouble this winter, and extra expense has been incurred in order to work the traffic. A considerable portion of the delay and extra expense would have been avoided if the facilities were better.

“The earnings for the month of March were the largest of any month since the opening of the road, amounting to over \$199,000, or an increase of \$34,000 over the month of March last year.

“There is reasonable ground to expect that next winter here will be a corresponding increase in traffic, and if so we will be but ill-provided for if the improvements spoken of are not made this summer.

“I would, therefore, strongly urge upon you to again submit the amount for consideration.

“Your obedient servant,

“D. POTTINGER.”

So that the hon. gentleman will see that the increased traffic for the single month of March is nearly sufficient to cover the expenditure, and there is reasonable ground to expect that next winter there will be a corresponding increase of traffic.

373. Rolling Stock..... \$65,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is to provide for the means of removing the traffic in the four months in the year, during which we never had the means either in locomotive power or cars.

374. Cape Traverse Railway \$189,200

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One of the conditions of union with Prince Edward Island was an engagement on the part of the Dominion Government to provide continuous steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railway. To carry out that engagement the Dominion Government had the steamer *Northern Light* constructed; but that steamer, though effecting considerable improvement in the existing communications, entirely failed in maintaining continual communication. The late Government directed a survey to be made between the Intercolonial Railway and Cape Tormentine, on the one side, and Cape Traverse and the Island Railway on the other. This survey was completed, and a report made by the able engineer appointed by the late Government, recommending the best points for railway connection. And we are now carrying out the policy contemplated by the late Government in ordering this survey to be made. This vote is for the purpose of constructing eleven miles of railway, or thereabouts, from the Prince Edward Island Railway to Cape Traverse. It is not settled whether it shall be the county line or another point, the name of which escapes me, as the best means of connecting the Island Railway with Cape Traverse and the construction of such docks as are necessary at Cape Traverse for the purpose of making the communication as perfect and as effectual as possible. I may be asked why provision is made for carrying out this design in Prince Edward Island and not on the mainland. I may say that it would have become the duty of the Government, and we would have been prepared to bring down an estimate for the construction of the connection between the Intercolonial Railway and Cape Tormentine, but for the fact, that in the

meantime that service has been provided for by the Government of New Brunswick, who have renewed the charter of a private company who propose to construct that work with the aid of a subsidy. Under these circumstances we felt that we could not ask Parliament to provide for a service which was apparently provided for by the Local Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Under what Bill is this to be constructed? There is no Bill for building a railway in this place that I know of. Surely the hon. gentleman does not intend to build a new railway by virtue of a vote in the Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that we have power, without even going to Parliament, to build six miles of a branch.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not aware of that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the hon. gentleman knows that there is a provision to extend railways for six miles. I think the authority of Parliament to extend a branch over a Government railway of eleven miles would be quite as sufficient on Prince Edward Island as it is from St. Charles to Point Levis.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman must be aware that he cannot expropriate land or do anything else merely because he happens to represent the Government. He has no power to touch property.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will look into that point.

Mr. ANGLIN. Will the hon. gentleman state what provision he will make at the terminus of this road to enable the steamer to ply during winter? During winter the solid ice extends out one and one-half miles, and it is necessary to make some provision to enable the steamer to approach some wharf or place connected with a railway, unless he expects the steamer will be strong enough to work her way through the ice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a very important point. It will have to be, to a certain extent, experimental as to the best means of establishing water communication during the severe portion of the winter. A considerable expenditure is involved in the design, both in Prince Edward Island and at Cape Tormentine, to attain such wharf communication as will give the necessary facilities when we are not obstructed by the ice. When the ice forms measures will have to be taken to make the communication which is now regularly maintained by ice boats. It will be to some extent experimental as to how far the board ice will have to be made available on the two sides. It would not be possible to run up wharf communication so as to make a contact with the water without using the ice which forms on the two sides for a portion of the winter.

Mr. ANGLIN. There is great reason to doubt whether the action of the Local Legislature grants a sufficient subsidy—I think it is only \$3,000 a mile. My impression is that they had some idea of getting assistance from the Dominion Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I differ wholly from my hon. friend beside me. I think the Government should build no branches if they can get other people to build them. It was the policy of the late Government to get rid of all the branches as soon as possible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is a good deal to be said in favor of having this road in the hands of the Government.

Mr. ANGLIN. There is a small piece of line forming a portion of a through line which we are bound by our treaty with the Island to finish if possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think we have done very well by the Island, and we have carried out the terms of Union to the utmost possible extent.

375. Construction of a race-way between the Welland Canal feeder and Chippewa River.....\$26,000

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will remember that when the enlargement of the Welland Canal was proceeded with a deputation waited upon him from the town of Welland, pointing out that the measures required to be taken on that occasion involved the destruction of the water power which they had at Welland. That water power having been destroyed it is proposed now that the supply be obtained from Lake Erie, and we can utilize the water power from the feeder without at all interfering with the supply to the canal, as that will no longer be required. Then it is proposed to restore the water power by bringing that supply from the feeder. This item is carrying out the proposal or application which was made to the hon. gentleman, and is in accordance with what he stated to a deputation who came from the town of Welland, that the subject would receive consideration when the supply from Lake Erie was obtained. It is for the purpose of obtaining that supply that this vote is asked for.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I expressed my opinion some evenings ago about the propriety of giving a supply of water from our canals for manufacturing purposes. I said I thought it was a great mistake, and if I were in office I would not allow it. We have suffered heavy losses on all our canals from this course, and we are sure to suffer more losses. I am surprised to find that this will be done by a wanton act, for it is not connected with the canal, it is a mere scheme to furnish water power to some people there. It may have something to do with the coming election in Welland, but it has nothing to do with the canal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to my predecessor that this is an entirely different question. I quite agreed with the statement he made on an entirely different subject, that it was improper to draw upon the supplies of the canals for water power in such a way as to obstruct and interfere with navigation. The hon. gentleman pointed out that currents were established which interfered with navigation, and I quite agreed that the primary object of the canals is for the purposes of navigation, and that no question of water power should be allowed to interfere with that primary object. This, however, is not drawing water from the Welland Canal at all; it is drawing water from the feeder which was required until the Lake Erie level was obtained, but it is not now required to supply the canal and does not in the slightest degree touch the use of the canal for navigation purposes, but it restores the water power destroyed by the construction of the aqueduct. It is an entirely different question, but, as the hon. gentleman stated, it could not be taken up until the Welland Canal had obtained the Lake Erie level and enabled that water to be drawn from the feeder without in the least degree interfering with navigation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why the Government should undertake to provide, from the Welland Canal, water power for manufacturers, is a matter I cannot understand. We require all the water for canal purposes. We were never under any obligation to furnish water power; we are entering into a transaction to furnish water power to manufacturers. It is no part of the Government's business to do that work, and if it is done on the Welland we must do it elsewhere.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is the only case.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I protest against Welland obtaining this concession unless it is made general. I object to the Mr. ANGLIN.

vote as one irreconcilable with the management of our public works.

Mr. McCALLUM. The Government is interested in the welfare of every town and village of the Dominion. The town of Welland enjoyed good water power, but the Government took that privilege from them. With respect to this vote, I believe \$26,000 will accomplish all the work required. As regards speculation, it will pay even when viewed from that standpoint, because it does not take any water from the canal, as since we have adopted the Lake Erie level we have the whole of the Grand River for water power, and the Government is acting wisely in assisting the people to take advantage of that power for manufacturing purposes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The deputation that waited on the hon. member for Lambton, when he was destroying the water power of Welland and precipitating the community in grief at what was going to affect them so vitally, went away with the impression that when the hon. gentleman obtained the Lake Erie level he would be prepared to restore the water power from the feeder.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is quite a mistake. I was desirous of complying, as far as the public interest would permit, with any reasonable request, and I could not do anything else but say that the subject would be considered at the proper time; but I never committed myself to furnishing water power from the canal, for such a project would be opposed to the views I adopted from my observations. This is to furnish water power for a particular locality. Why should not some commercial company undertake that duty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We charge for all the power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why does not a commercial company take it up?

376. Williamsburg Canal, construction of new weirs.....\$4,000

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is this amount for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that while the Welland Canal has been deepened and measures have been taken to provide for ultimately attaining a depth of fourteen feet, by which vessels will come from Lake Erie to Kingston, and while measures have been taken to enlarge and deepen to the same extent the Lachine Canals, with the exception of the work at Cornwall, it has been proposed to defer the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canals and to depend at present upon the navigation which we have between these points, Kingston and Lachine. But it is found at this point there is not the same depth of water. This is the shallow point, and this expenditure of \$40,000 is to give us the same depth of water at that point that we have at all the other locks between Kingston and the Lachine Canal; and it is to overcome the shallowest point there, which is found to be an obstruction to navigation, that the expenditure will take place, in order to provide the same navigation at that point that there is above and below, and the work will all be useful should the programme of carrying out the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canals as contemplated by my predecessor at any time be proceeded with. It is a comparatively small expenditure for a very large and important object.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What is the depth of water at the mitre sills.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As near as I can remember it varies from six to fifteen inches shallower than the balance of the canal either above or below.

377. St. Ann's Lock and Canal—Towards deepening the canal above the lock.....\$75,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This work requires \$75,000 more, making \$150,000, to complete it. It is for aqueous rock excavation.

378. Trent River navigation—For the construction of locks and the improvement of navigation b tween Lakefield and Balsam Lake..... \$290,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the plan under which the hon. gentleman proposes to improve that navigation, and what is the length of navigation he hopes to get.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware that the subject of the Trent navigation has been engaging the attention of the Government for the past year. A very careful survey was entered upon for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of getting a depth of five feet of water throughout the whole system on the Trent navigation. That survey has been vigorously prosecuted during the past season, but it was, owing to its difficult and extended character, impossible to make such an exact and accurate location survey as to give with anything like accuracy what the cost would be. We shall presently come to an additional item of \$8,000 to prosecute that survey to its completion during the present season. It was found, however, that by the expenditure of the amount proposed in the Estimates we could accomplish a great object in opening up internal water communications in that section of the country. The hon. gentleman knows that at present there is railway communication from Port Hope to Peterborough, and from Lakefield, near Peterborough, by the expenditure proposed at Buckhorn, Burley Rapids and Fenelon Falls, communication can be obtained from the railway at Lakefield to the railway at Cobocok, from which there is railway communication to Toronto. About sixty-five miles of navigation will be opened in this way, and a large section of country will also be opened up by connection with the lateral waters. These works will open up a navigation altogether of some 150 miles.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. To what point does the hon. Minister hope to extend this system finally.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is a question which I would not like to answer, because it will require a survey in order to be in a position to look the question fairly in the face and say what expenditure would be involved in building the line of communication which has been known as the Trent navigation.

Mr. ANGLIN. Nowadays, no one, as a matter of choice, would transfer freight from railways to steamers if railway communication throughout can be had.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. gentleman is committing a great mistake in beginning a new canal in the present state of transportation eastward. We have expended about \$12,000,000 on the new Welland Canal, and so far as I know there is only one vessel, and that one on the stocks, at all suitable for the navigation of that canal, showing that progress by rail is reaching a point that sets our canal navigation at defiance. I asked some of the principal shippers how it was that after the Government expended so much money on that work that they did not use it more, and I was told by them that they had great doubts whether it would pay to carry grain by vessels at all or not. At any rate the hon. gentleman should have a completed scheme before Parliament instead of building a canal in the middle of the country, without beginning or end. No man can vote for that intelligently; nobody knows where it is; there is no map before us, no plan, no report of an engineer, nothing on which we can base any argument.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before Concurrence, I will lay upon the Table of the House the report of the engineer and a map showing what is to be done.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not agree with the hon. member for Lambton that the day of canals is past; but I

do not intend to discuss that question to-night. The hon. gentleman says that nobody knows where this proposed canal is to be. It seems very strange that such a remark should come from him, considering that for so many years he held the position of Minister of Public Works, and that a large number of these Trent works were done under his charge, and I suppose that with that devotion to the duties of his office that he always showed, he made himself thoroughly familiar with the position and character of these works. The subject has been discussed in this House on more than one occasion, and I think the members know pretty well where the canal is. I look upon it as a most important work in the general interests of the Dominion, and not only to the locality. This canal, when completed, will afford the shortest route for the transmission of grain from the Georgian Bay by way of the Trent River and the St. Lawrence River to Montreal. Grain can be carried from the whole of the North-West and the Western States, through Lake Michigan, Lake Superior and Lake Huron to the Georgian Bay, where there are excellent harbors, and then transhipped to barges, which will be able to pass through this canal without any change of barge till they reach the ships at Montreal. A great portion of the grain trade now carried to American ports would in that way be carried to Montreal. Therefore I say this is a matter in which the people of the Dominion at large are very much concerned. It would afford a saving of some 400 miles of navigation which is necessitated by the present route through Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and would constitute a far shorter and more valuable route than that now existing by the Welland Canal. With regard to the general policy of building canals, it is to be regretted that the hon. member for Lambton did not long ago come to the conclusion which he has apparently come to now, that all the money that has been expended on the Welland Canal and other canals is thrown away, because if he had acted on that view when he had a large majority at his back in this House he would, if his views are right, have saved to the country the expenditure of a large amount of money. I am glad for one reason that he has expressed himself satisfactorily, because in the newspapers supporting the party to which he belongs in the neighborhood where this canal is proposed to be built, it has been put forward that if the people want that canal built they have to return Mr. Blake and his party to power. For instance, the Peterborough *Examiner*, which is the organ of the party in the county of Peterborough, and which is edited by a man who stands very high in the confidence of the party in that neighborhood, in an article on the subject, after referring to the fact that the Session has nearly closed, winds up by saying:

"If the Government do not build the work at once, Mr. Blake and his party will. We await the issue."

In an article published on the 31st March, 1881, in the same paper, there is this passage:

"We believe we are justified in saying that nothing would more effectually secure the construction of this important work than the placing of Mr. Edward Blake in power."

I am sure the hon. member for Lambton speaks the opinions of the Opposition generally upon this subject, and if he does it is quite evident that this newspaper does not. If the Opposition take the position that the canal is a useless work, that all the money spent upon it will be thrown away, as a matter of course in the event of Mr. Blake and his friends coming into power we cannot hope that a dollar will be spent upon it or that the work will be continued. I am quite prepared, if necessary, to show the great usefulness which this work will be to the country at large as well as to the neighborhood, if completed. The construction of locks at Fenelon Falls was not much, as a lock exists now at Balsam Rapids, and one at Bobcaygeon will open navi-

gation to the extent of upwards of 100 miles, and by the removal of obstructions at Buckhorn and at Burleigh Rapids, navigation will be opened to Lakefield, and an immense advantage will be conferred on all the inhabitants of that section of country. They feel, and I think with some right, that when the Government is in a position, which fortunately it is, to expend a large amount of money on public works, that district should not be neglected, especially when the work in question is one of great public benefit, not only to the neighborhood, but to the whole Dominion.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am willing to admit that if we were commencing the work of enlarging the canals to-day, we should consider it very seriously. The Welland Canal had a great capacity before; and when my hon. friend from Lambton says that there is only one vessel suitable to the enlarged canal, I am sure he is responsible to some extent, because he gave out that this canal was to be ready in 1876. To-day we have not twelve feet of water in the Welland Canal. We know that ship-building in this country and in the United States is overdone; but people have got their vessels, and they are going to use them till they are worn out. We have only twelve feet of water in the Welland against fifteen feet going into Buffalo. Until we get at least fourteen feet in the Welland we cannot expect to attract this trade. Besides, a change is being made in ship-building. Hereafter vessels will be built of iron, or of iron and wood. If the North-West will turn out anything like we expect, the Welland Canal, if sufficiently deep, will be very beneficial to this country, in carrying a great deal of grain. I find fault with the late Government, that they did not at once, from Thorold down, secure a depth of fourteen feet. It is to be regretted the canal was opened at all until that depth was obtained. The people in the United States who feared that this canal was going to take away the trade of the Erie, when they see we have only reached twelve feet, are no longer apprehensive. We may have a reaction, and the trade going in the opposite direction, and we know how hard it is to divert trade from its accustomed channels. I do not blame the hon. member for Lambton for this policy more than anybody else, but I blame him for not, when Premier, paying more attention to the Welland, and letting first the contracts for the works that required to be first completed, instead of keeping them to the last. I hope that the present Government will carry out this improvement, which is one of the terms of Confederation, and which I believe would be in the interests of the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am glad the hon. member for Victoria has spoken, for I have got more information from him than from the Minister. I knew nothing about a barge navigation of four or five feet, but the hon. gentleman has the facts at his fingers' ends.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The report was laid on the Table of the House last Session.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We are not in last Session, but in this Session.

Mr. CAMERON. Another report was laid on the Table this Session.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I never saw it, and I rather think the hon. gentleman's information is private.

Mr. CAMERON. I read the report of last Session. Though I have not read a report for this Session, I am sure there was one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As regards the hon. member for Monck, he never speaks on public works, but he charges me with having promised to have the Welland Canal opened in 1876. Whatever promises a Minister gives in reference to public works, is based upon the opinions of his chief engineer. I never was in too great a hurry with the canals.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

All public works require a great deal of time, but none more than canals, and I never looked upon such time as lost. But as for the time of beginning and ending of contracts, I acted, as I have no doubt the present Minister acts, on the opinion of the Chief Engineer. What I have found fault with was, that in such a large contract, the Minister of Public Works invited tenders by private circular instead of by public advertisement, as is done in other cases.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would not have said anything respecting the hon. member for Lambton if he had not brought up the Welland Canal. He wanted to show it would be a total loss to the country. I disagree with him in that respect, and I have a right to say so.

Mr. BROWN. This is a work which has engaged the attention of the people in its vicinity for a great many years, and it is one of great importance. I believe the Government of old Canada expended \$800,000 on it, and when the rebellion broke out the work was suspended; nothing has been done on it since. It has always been looked upon as a work that would be accomplished some day. It would prove a great advantage to our carrying trade. I do not know of any work of equal importance in Canada that would shorten the distance between Chicago and Montreal 500 miles. It is to be hoped this work will be proceeded with and advanced with reasonable speed. The opening up of the Trent with its train of tributary lakes and streams from the Bay of Quinté to the Georgian Bay, is not only feasible, but a work of great importance to the trade of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I must express my surprise at the confession of the hon. member for Lambton of ignorance as to this work. A gentleman of his industry, who has given so much attention to public works, should not have forgotten that the first report on this work was made by Mr. Baird, as long ago as 1833. The route has been surveyed a number of times since and several reports have been made as to its utility. The hon. gentleman's ignorance is also strange when we reflect that one of the last acts of his Government was to transfer all those works to the Ontario Government; and when we remember that arrangements had been made with some gentlemen owning lands lying along the line of that proposed work—drowned lands which they had purchased—the dams were to be cut which assisted the navigation along that route, and that they were to make a pretty good speculation out of the transaction. However, when the present Government came into power, always recognizing the importance of opening up that inland navigation, they set aside the Order in Council transferring those works for nothing to the Ontario Government, who, as I have already said, were about having the dams blown out, and the lands which had been paid for by old Canada transferred to private parties. In addition to that there has been portions of that navigation which have been improved by the Ontario Government since Confederation by the construction of some small dams and small canals connecting one or two of the lakes. When this question was before the House a few years ago it met with the determined opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite; I am glad that many of them have been converted to this scheme, either by their silence or by the conviction of its necessity in the interests of the country. When the question was discussed two or three years ago there was opposition to it. I think we know what quelled that opposition, when we reflect that certain influential politicians living along that line intimated to the leader of the present Opposition that it was not in their interest to oppose it. Consequently we had no opposition until to-night from the hon. member for Lambton. I was in hopes that every man on the Opposition side who has given the slightest attention to this matter had been converted to the belief that it was absolutely necessary in the interest of the country.

I am not surprised at the remark of the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Brown), because when this canal is completed, it will terminate at the Bay of Quinté in his constituency. It must be very gratifying to him to know that the Government since its formation have taken a very great interest in this work. If the Government have had no other support from the hon. gentleman, I am glad to know he is willing to support them in this work, which will be of such paramount importance to the constituency he represents.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The proper course, as I have always held, is, that if works of this kind are to be kept up at all they should be kept up by the Local Government. The Rideau Canal is another case similar to that. We expend \$50,000 per year on it, and only receive \$6,000 or \$7,000 revenue from it. What is the use of that canal to the trade of the country, surrounded as it is by railways. With regard to the transshipment navigation, I was not the first Minister of Public Works that proposed this course; the present Minister of Public Works took the initiative in that matter.

Mr. BOWELL. That is true, but the hon. gentleman should have been candid enough to state that when the late Minister of Public Works offered to transfer them to the Local Government, it was with the distinct understanding that they should be kept up. The hon. gentleman transferred them without any such condition.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). He transferred them, although he had the distinct statement of the Ontario Government that they would not keep them up, and the only Statute authorizing the transfer stipulates that such works can only be transferred for the purpose of maintaining them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not intend to discuss that matter to-night further than to say that the works were practically mixed up then. They cost \$6,000 per year and their revenue last year was \$290.57.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman has complained of my not giving him sufficient information in reference to this I will read my report to Council. It is as follows:—

"COPY OF REPORT TO COUNCIL, No. 17,495, APRIL 8, 1882.

"(Order in Council, No. 94,566, April 17, 1882.)

"The undersigned has the honor to represent that from time to time during many years past, as shown in successive annual and other reports, the establishment of a line of water communication between Lake Ontario, at the mouth of the River Trent, and Lake Huron, through the utilizing of existing river and lake waters, has been under consideration.

"That in 1833 a survey of the section of country extending from the mouth of the Trent to Rice Lake, was made by Mr. N. H. Baird, and in 1835, a further survey was made by him, dealing with the remaining section between Rice Lake and Lake Simcoe. The contemplated course being as follows:—"Through the River Trent, Rice Lake, the River Otonabee and Lakes Clear, Buckhorn, Chemong, Pigeon, Sturgeon and Cameron to Lake Balsam, the summit water, about 166 miles from Trenton. From Lake Balsam by a canal and the River Talbot to Lake Simcoe; thence by the River Severn to Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, the total distance being about 235 miles."

"That operations were thereupon commenced, but were subsequently in 1839, suspended, owing to lack of funds, and that in 1841 at the time of the Union, the scheme of forming a line of through communication was laid aside. The works were, however, utilized and others were executed to aid in the passage of timber, for which purpose and for what use they have, in part at least, been maintained ever since. The dimensions of the Dominion Locks are 133 feet 6 inches in length, by 33 feet in width, with 5 feet of water on the sills.

"That in consequence of representations made and the reception of various petitions from parties interested, an appropriation was voted during the last Session of Parliament to cover the cost of a further survey and examination of the rivers and lakes lying between the Bay of Quinté and Georgian Bay, and that under date the 20th instant a report has been received from Mr. Thomas Rubidge, the engineer appointed to conduct such survey.

"That under instructions, Mr. Rubidge has directed his attention more specially to the determination of points where the construction of works would afford the greatest immediate advantage to local navigation, such works being at the same time, an integral part of any greater scheme of through communication which may hereafter be carried out. His report accordingly deals exclusively with that chain of lakes desig-

nated by him the 'Back Lakes,' which form the head waters of the River Otonabee and extends from Lake Kitchiwanoo to Balsam Lake, the summit waters of the projected canal, this chain forming part of the main line of communication recommended by Mr. Baird.

"That Mr. Rubidge's report favors the construction of the following works, the estimated cost of which is given:

"1. Fenelon Falls, two locks and swing bridge, opening out the route from Balsam Lake to Mud and Scugog Lakes	\$100,000
"2. Buckhorn Rapids, one lock connecting Pigeon and Buckhorn Lakes with Deer Bay.....	50,000
"3. Burleigh Chute and Falls, three locks and dam, to connect Deer Bay with Stoney and Clear Lakes.....	140,000
	\$290,000

"That by the works named communication would be opened between Lakefield at the head of the Otonabee Rapids, about six miles from the town of Peterborough, and Lake Sturgeon, a distance of 45 miles; thence to Cobocook on Gull River, flowing into Balsam Lake, a distance of 15 miles, a southern route being opened from Lake Sturgeon to Port Perry on Lake Scugog, a distance of 35 miles, by means of an existing lock at Lindsay, built by the Ontario Government in 1879.

"That in addition to the above the construction of these works would open up some 55 miles of lateral navigation, making a total of 150 miles, bringing a very considerable extent of country into direct communication with the western and southern railway systems of Ontario.

"That a report made by the Chief Engineer on the 29th ultimo, shows that the upward route to be followed by a vessel upon the completion of the works suggested, would be as follows:—

"Starting from Lakefield, a lock at Young's Point, built by the Government of the Province of Ontario, gives access to Clear Lake and Stoney Lake, at the head of which the two proposed new locks at Burleigh Falls and the one new lock at Burleigh Chute, would open communication with Deer Bay, a further new lock at Buckhorn Rapids giving a passage to Pigeon Lake; at Bobcaygeon a lock was built in 1857 by the Canadian Government, connecting Pigeon Lake with Sturgeon Lake, while the construction of the two new locks at Fenelon Falls, would afford access from Sturgeon into Cameron's Lake; whence by means of a lock built by the Ontario Government, a vessel could pass up to Cobocook, and so through to Balsam Lake, the summit waters; of the several works specified, the Chief Engineer considers those at Fenelon Falls to be the most important.

"The Minister recognizing the fact that the interests of a very large section of country would be served by the opening up of navigation in this district, and that the works as above set forth are the best calculated to meet immediate requirements, while being at the same time of use in any further development in this direction, recommends that the sum of \$290,000 be placed in the Supplementary Estimates for the years 1882 and 1883, to be laid before Parliament during its present Session."

Mr. BROWN. There was a Committee of this House appointed and evidence was brought to show that there was nothing like the amount of land affected that was generally supposed—between 20,000 and 30,000 acres; there was nothing like that quantity of land. I recollect the late Mr. Keeler was anxious to have this land reclaimed.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Keeler was never in favor of the renewal of the dams.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, he was decidedly, as he showed by his report. As to the transfer of the works to the Ontario Government, I recollect the time when the late Sandfield Macdonald was urged to assume those works, and he would have nothing to do with them; the Dominion Government had them and they must keep them.

Mr. HILLIARD. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman speak so disparagingly of our waterways; I think they are able to maintain themselves. The fact that we find such a great difference in railway rates between summer and winter should cause us to maintain our waterways. I contend that this waterway is worthy the attention of the Government. If the hon. member for Lambton should visit those water stretches I am sure he would call them magnificent. Between the Bay of Quinté and Georgian Bay we have 160 miles of navigable waters. I maintain that freight can be carried cheaper through this route than by any other route. Here we have complete land-locked navigation perfectly safe and free from storms. It is desirable that the Dominion Government should adopt some plan to avoid the numerous accidents that occur on the larger lakes. Take as an instance the accident that occurred last fall on Lake Ontario, when the *Zimmerman* was lost. When we consider that the great North-West is opening up, and

requires some mode of transporting its products to the east, it certainly behoves us to look to our waterways. The system of farming in the West is different from that in Ontario. In the West they thresh the wheat in the field, while in Ontario they put their wheat in the barn before threshing it, and it there goes through a certain sweating process that prepares it for a long transportation. The wheat of the West, on the other hand, is not in a condition to go into the hold of a vessel to be carried through to Montreal, though it might very well go to the terminus of this canal and pass through the elevator at that point. I contend that by the advantages that this route has to offer, we need fear no competition on the question of transit from the great West. We read in a report of the State Engineer, at New York, that that "miserable ditch," the Erie Canal, is able to compete with their first railways, and I think, therefore, we need not have any doubt as to the success of this route.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just wish to correct one error that I think the hon. member for West Hastings has fallen into. I do so out of respect to the memory of the late Mr. Keeler, a friend of mine and a member of this House. I am sure every one knows that if any action has been taken in this matter by the Government, it is chiefly owing to the energy and ability with which he brought the matter before the House. His object was not to take down the dam, but to keep it up. I think the gentleman who represented that constituency in another Legislature, was anxious to take that dam down, but Mr. Keeler's object was to keep it up and to keep these works along with it. He brought the matter not only to the attention of this House, but also before the Boards of Trade of Montreal and elsewhere. The object he chiefly had in view was to prevent these inland waters being placed under the control of the Legislature of Ontario. It was almost complete, I think, and the hon. member for Lambton, long after the 17th September, 1878, passed an Order in Council, transferring these works to the Legislature of Ontario, but unfortunately they had not been formally handed over. From the remarks of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Hilliard), one would suppose that the only outlet of the magnificent canal was by the Trent and the waters of the Bay of Quinté. He seems to forget that, many years ago, a careful survey was made which showed that a proper outlet, one that would give the greatest accommodation to the trade, would be from the head of Rice Lake to Port Hope. I trust the hon. Minister of Railways will turn his attention to that important route.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. member for East Durham is mistaken regarding the opinions of the late Mr. Keeler. Mr. Keeler was a particular friend of mine, and I know he claimed that there was a large quantity of land there which could be reclaimed if that dam was taken away. People had already been paid for the land by the old Government of Canada when the dam was put up, and who thought they could get the land back again. The hon. member for Victoria, if he was here, could confirm all I say.

Mr. BURNHAM. I think the hon. member for West Hastings is correct to some extent in what he says in regard to the late Mr. Keeler. Mr. Keeler did favor the removal of the lower dam at Chisholm, but only in the event of the canal system not being taken up by the Dominion Government. But he was not in favor of the abolition of those dams, nor was he opposed to the Trent Valley navigation. The hon. Minister of Customs spoke of the ignorance that prevailed respecting the proposed work. If he had taken the same interest in the internal navigation of the country as the present Minister of Railways and Canals, and had visited the country and gone over the route and ascertained for himself whether such a system could not be carried out, he would have been in a better position to have spoken on the

Mr. HILLIARD.

matter. After this report was brought in by Mr. Keeler the Government sent Mr. Stark, a competent engineer, and he made a report, which was laid on the Table of the House, in which was given an approximate cost of the canal. A perusal of that report establishes the fact that that canal is a practicable one, and that the system proposed by Mr. Baird was one which should be carried out. I hope the Government will this year carry on the survey, and will be able to show next Session that Mr. Stark's survey on the estimate can be carried out.

Mr. CROUTER. I think it is not correct that Mr. Keeler wanted to get the dams taken away, because I know he was active in furthering the work. For a number of years I was a member of the County Council of my county, and a large portion of the drowned lands were in my municipality. That gentleman came before our Council, and I did all I could to obtain funds to furnish information in regard to the work. I know that his support of that work would have secured him his seat in the county so long as he was disposed to keep it. I believe this canal is of great importance, not only to the local, but to the general interest of the country, and I would be disposed to oppose any Government that would look lightly on those improvements. If carried through it will be one of the great routes for commerce between the West and East, and the canal will be of the cheap kind—a barge canal. It is very well known that a tug can tow a very large number of barges, which will transport a larger quantity of freight than a single sailing vessel. I look upon the project as one of great advantage to the Government, and it will receive my earnest support.

379. Construction of Works in connection with the Tay Canal..... \$50,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a work intended to restore the navigation which formerly existed between the Rideau Canal and the Tay Canal. This canal is to connect the Rideau navigation with the town of Perth. The original canal, built in 1831 and opened for traffic in 1834, has long since been abandoned and hardly any vestige of the original works remains. The length of the proposed canal, by way of Beveridge's Bay, and recommended by Mr. Wise, is $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles, which may be reduced to $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles by making cuts across the bonds of the rivers. The locks to be 130 x 30, with a depth of 5 feet of water on sills—it is proposed to build two locks of 13 feet lift each, the width of the canal prism to be in earth 60 feet and in rock 30 feet. The probable cost, as estimated by Mr. Wise, is \$132,660, but this amount does not include the cost of land damages which may arise from the construction of the proposed dams, the extent of which will be known when a contour survey is made.

327. Intercolonial Railway construction..... \$10,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is in connection with Mr. Shanly's office, his salary and the salaries of the staff, and to provide for any legal expenses that may be required to be made in question with the investigation. The expenditure we expect will be within this amount.

329. Intercolonial Railway—Completing and fitting up passenger station at Halifax..... \$4,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The upper part of the building has not been finished, and an application has been made by the Nova Scotia Railway Company for accommodation there, and the expenditure will be much more than covered by the rent.

333. To pay damages to the steamer *M. C. Upper* in the Welland Canal..... \$8,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The *M. C. Upper* was in the canal, having paid her dues, and she was properly moored. The schooner *Louise* came in contact with the gates, broke them away and led to the damage which was inflicted on the *Upper*. The official arbitrators reported that the *Upper* was in no degree to blame, and that while there might not be a strictly legal claim there certainly was an equitable one. The schooner *Louise* which led to the disaster, owing to mismanagement, carried away part of the gates, and bonds were taken for the damage inflicted. Subsequently the amount claimed on the bonds was considerably reduced, evidence having been given that the gates were considerably decayed. Under these circumstances, and considering that the *Upper* had paid her canal dues and that there was no negligence contributory or otherwise on her part the Government felt that there was a substantial and fair ground for the favorable consideration of the claim.

Mr. MILLS. Who was the owner?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum).

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the legal claim should have been against the other vessel and not against the Government, who were not to blame in the matter. As it is the Dominion loses this money because the *Louise* broke the gates and placed the *Upper* in this position. With regard to damages of this kind the principle I laid down was, that they should be paid for according to the age of the gates and their condition of decay.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not agree with the hon. Minister that there was no legal claim. Mr. McCallum paid all the dues and conformed with all the regulations; and he was fairly entitled to go through without interference; and if this damage was caused by another person's carelessness, surely Mr. McCallum should not be the sufferer. The Government were in the position of common carriers, and the claim was legal as well as equitable or moral. It was stated in the report sent to the Department by the superintendent that Mr. McCallum had not complied with the regulations. It was upon that chiefly that the claim of Mr. McCallum was refused. That report was contradicted by Mr. Bodwell under oath. In his report Mr. Bodwell says:

"In the first place the damage sustained was occasioned by no defects in the Government works, nor by any neglect of duty on the part of the officials in charge of the works. * * * It is stated by the lock-tenders that the *M. C. Upper's* lines with which she was snubbed at the time were not taut, giving the vessel room to get under headway before the strain upon the lines commenced, and it is their belief that if the lines had been taut they would not have parted. Of this I have no personal knowledge as I was not on the spot at the time of the accident. Upon the above considerations I fail to see any grounds for Mr. McCallum's claim. * * * The vessel lay moored within 110 feet of the lock, whereas (see No. 19 of Canal Regulations) it is provided that when several boats or vessels are lying by or in waiting to enter any canal, they shall lie in single tier at a distance of not less than 300 feet from such lock or entrance. Had the *M. C. Upper* been moored 300 feet above Lock 21, the chances are that if she had parted her lines, loaded as she was, the rapidity with which the water lowered would have caused her to rest on the bottom of the canal before she reached the breast wall, and no damage would have been sustained."

When Mr. Bodwell was on oath he did not make the same statement. Mr. Bodwell says that the *M. C. Upper* was further from the lock at the time of the break than his officers reported her to be, and that the gate had been two years longer in use. He further says that if the toe-post was in such condition—and as much worn as Bernard Clarke in his evidence represents it—it should certainly have been reported to him by the division overseer; and his omission to do so would be a serious neglect of duty. He says that it is necessary to have the gates strong in all other parts, and to see that a sufficient strength is kept up in all other parts subjected to a pressure of the water. Some of the gates had given way, although they had been in the lock but for a short time only, as in the case of the gates of Lock

22. He had removed nearly half of the old gates and replaced them by new ones; he found it necessary for the safety of navigation to remove the old gates. It turns out that these gates which he reported as being only in use a short time had been long in use, and some of the gates had been carried away before and were replaced in the lock without being thoroughly repaired. The facts are that the vessel was moored in a particular position, and strictly in accordance with the rules and regulations of the canal. The valves of the upper gates were left open nearly a foot by the lock-tender, and the lower gates struck by the *Louise* were old gates so far decayed that it was utterly impossible to use them with any safety to the navigation of the canal. The arbitrators make this report:

"In coming to the conclusion that the damage to the *M. C. Upper* was directly caused by the mismanagement of those on board the schooner *Louise*, and not by the generally defective condition of the gates of Lock 21 on the Welland Canal; still considering the very contradictory evidence, and the fact that the Government virtually admitted the unsound condition of the gates by reducing the amount of Battle's bond in settlement with them—the fact that there is no corroborative evidence in support of either McAvoy's or Ferris's different statements as to the cause of the accident, in consequence of the death of McTaggart, the lock-tender, the only other party present—the fact that the *M. C. Upper* was moored in the proper place, and the absence of any proof that her lines were not taut—the fact that Mr. McCallum had paid his canal dues, and that there was no negligence contributory or otherwise on his part or on the part of those acting for or under him at the time of the accident; we have also come to the conclusion that there are substantial and fair grounds for the favorable consideration of the claim."

It will be in the recollection of this House that a return was moved for some time ago, and when that was brought down it showed that when the accident took place the late Minister of Public Works ordered a bond to be given by Mr. Battle for \$2,000, and when the matter was referred to the Superintendent he fixed the amount to be paid by Mr. Battle at \$1,100; but by some strange manoeuvring on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and through the negotiations of Mr. Thomson, then member for Welland, the amount was reduced to \$600. The Superintendent did not know the reason of that change. He reported that the amount should be \$1,100, but Mr. Thomson, then high in the favor of the Government, came to Ottawa, and by some strange manipulation induced them to reduce the amount to \$600, and that amount was paid unknown to the superintendent. I say, I believe Mr. McCallum had a legal claim; he had paid his dues, and did everything he was called upon to do to entitle him to the free use of that canal, and if anything is damaged by the carelessness of the officials the Government are bound to make it good. The evidence shows that the Government were wrong in their action; they were trying to economize, and the result was that the whole canal ran down, and it became in such a bad state that it was almost unsafe for a vessel to enter the locks. Lock-gate after lock-gate was knocked over simply by the touch of a vessel. Had the canal been properly looked after by Mr. Bodwell the result would have been quite different. It was shown by the arbitrators that the lock gates could hardly stand by themselves, the posts were so rotten. If there was negligence on the part of the Government, they are to blame and ought to pay all the damage. Why was not Mr. Battle held responsible for this faulty condition of the work? It was because he was a strong supporter of the late Government. He came down here and got the amount reduced \$500 or \$600. The less the hon. member for Lambton says about the matter the better, because everybody who knows all the facts will conclude that Mr. McCallum did everything he could, and that the accident was wholly caused by the carelessness of the canal officials.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I utterly deny that the canal was not in a proper state of repairs.

Mr. RYKERT. You deny everything.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will not deny that the hon. gentleman is very insolent. I would admit that at once. The Chief Engineer invariably obtained all the money he demanded for the repair of all of those works. The hon. gentleman's assumption is wholly untrue, that the works were in that bad state; and the other insinuation that some one obtained a favor for some particular reason is quite unworthy of my consideration. I stated that he was required to pay the value of the locks at the time, but not the price of new locks. I do not think the posts were rotten. There might be some decay in the wood and the gates remained tolerably good. Assuming that to be the case, the charge for new gates would be very unjust. The price we charged was thought proper after consulting the officers of the Department.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In any case the principles attempted to be laid down by the hon. member for Monck is entirely untenable. There is not the slightest ground for holding the Government of Canada liable as common carriers. They are only liable if injury results from the action of their own agents. But the position of the hon. Minister of Canals was that this injury was caused by the mismanagement of another vessel, the schooner *Louise*—that that was the cause of the injury to the vessel of the hon. member for Monck; if so, I fail to see how the Government can be liable for injury to the steamer. The remedy will be clearly against the *Louise*. It is not the business of the Government, though asserted by the hon. member for Lincoln, when injury has been done by one private individual to another, to attempt to secure damages in favor of one man against another. The decision must be left to the Courts.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure it will strike every one as a singular doctrine that the Government, as the proprietor of a canal, is a common carrier. You might as well argue that a turnpike road company was a common carrier and liable for the damage of one vehicle to another. The position of the Government is wholly different from that of a railway company. A railway company not only owns the road, but the coaches which makes them common carriers. That the Government does not own the vessels that sail on the canals, and therefore are not common carriers. If a collision occurs on a canal, an injury is done to one vessel by the carelessness and negligence of the master of another, it is only the party who caused the injury that can be held liable.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for Lambton has told me that I was very insolent. I would like to return the compliment by telling him on this occasion that he often addresses the House, although his age screens him, in the most insolent manner. I wish him to understand that he is not going to cast those slurs and insults at hon. members on this side without being taken to task for it. Though a little older than myself I have been as long in public life as he, and I will not allow him to charge myself and friends with being insolent without resenting it. When making some allowance for the state of his health, he must recollect that we are his equals in this House, and I will not submit to his impertinence in telling me that I have been insolent towards him. Besides, it was not parliamentary to tell me that my statement was untrue, a statement based on evidence. Mr. Bodwell admitted he had stated what was not correct in his first report. He admitted that the canal was in a bad state of repair, and I say, as a matter of fact, the canal was completely run down. All his whole time was taken up in covering up its defects. I said they were in the position of common carriers, but I did not say they were common carriers. They undertook that Mr. McCallum's vessel should be protected in going through the canal, and if injured by their negligence they were liable.

Mr. RYKERT.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When the hon. gentleman says I would deny anything, he must expect to be answered in a very short manner. Nothing could be more improper than to use such an expression, but every time the hon. gentleman speaks he insults hon. members on this side. Such expressions will not be allowed to pass. As for the hon. gentleman's consideration, I do not desire it or need it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In reply to what fell from the hon. member for South Huron, I want to draw his attention to the position of the question, and I think he will see that there is very great force in the point to which I wish to allude. The accident occurred, from whatever cause. The hon. member for Monck's vessel was wrecked, and he made a claim for damages. The Department of Justice, to which it was referred to know whether the claim was a proper one to be referred to official arbitrators, reported that it was, and the official arbitrators, after careful investigation, reported that the accident was entirely due to causes over which Mr. McCallum had no control. The following is in their report:

"Messrs. Compton, Buchanan and Simard report:—

"In coming to the conclusion that the damage to the *M. C. Upper* was directly caused by the mismanagement of those on board the schooner *Louise*, and not by the generally defective condition of the gates on Lock 21 of the Welland Canal; still considering the very contradictory evidence—the fact that the Government virtually admitted the unsound condition of the gates by reducing the amount of Battle's bond in settlement with them—the fact that there is no corroborative evidence in support of either McAvoys' or Ferris's different statements as to the cause of the accident, in consequence of the death of Mr. Taggart the lock-tender, the only other party present—the fact that the *M. C. Upper* was moored in the proper place and the absence of any proof that her lines were not taut—the fact that Mr. McCallum had paid his canal dues, and that there was no negligence contributory or otherwise on his part, or on the part of those acting for or under him at the time of the accident; we have also come to the conclusion that there are substantial and fair grounds for the favorable consideration of the claim."

Mr. MILLS. Has the hon. gentleman the opinion of the Minister of Justice then?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will produce it later, but the hon. Minister gave an opinion also that it was a proper case to be referred to the official arbitrators.

353. Prince Edward Island Railway..... \$12,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This expenditure I was obliged to make owing to the unwonted severity of the winter. The storms on the Intercolonial Railway have been very severe, but nothing as compared with those on Prince Edward Island Railway. A succession of snow-storms of the most unusual character have taken place, and for miles the road was buried up to a great depth, and this expenditure is largely caused by the increased cost for removing the snow.

386. To defray expenses in connection with Public Buildings in Manitoba..... \$60,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Winnipeg post office is now too small. We have enlarged it, but the more we enlarge it the less is it capable of accommodating the enormous and increasing crowds of people who visit it. The intention is to have a new post office. The lot on which the old post office stands, being on the main street, is of great value; that will be sold and a new lot purchased.

392. Expenses in connection with Harbors and Rivers in New Brunswick..... \$12,500

In reply to Mr. ANGLIN,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With reference to the harbor of Shippegan, the Chief Engineer's estimate of \$4,000 is for the completion of the first 1,400 feet of the breakwater at Alexander's Point, which was commenced in 1875. The total length originally recommended was 1,750 feet. The first 900 feet of the breakwater, owing to the

lateness of the season, could only be secured in a rough manner, and being left in an imperfect state it has nearly disappeared. We cannot do the whole of this with \$4,000, but we will secure the work in such a way as to make it serviceable and prevent it being carried away by the waves.

Mr. ANGLIN. The way in which this work has been managed does not reflect much credit on the Government as a whole. When hon. gentlemen came into office the work was discontinued, because the contractor had broke down. I made an application to the Minister of Public Works to expend the balance of the appropriation, but he refused to do more than expend sufficient money to make the works secure. The work is an important one, in view of the large number of fishing vessels in the locality. I hope the works as proposed will be carried out, and that the breakwater will be run out into the deep water.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry I was unable to visit this place last summer, otherwise I would have been more *au fait* with the situation there. I may be able to judge of the work. This sum, however, will be sufficient to keep the works from being injured.

393. Harbors and Piers in the Province of Quebec\$29,500

Mr. ROGERS. I presume the amount of \$2,000 for breakwater in Rusher Bay is for the enlargement of the breakwater at Anderson Hollow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for an addition to the wharf.

Mr. ROGERS. I understand that a petition has been forwarded to the Government asking for money to build a breakwater to protect a wharf at another place a short distance from the one already in course of construction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There has been such a petition. This grant is for an addition to the one already begun.

394. Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... \$138,450

Mr. MILLS. Is it intended to begin the work at Morpeth for which an appropriation was taken some time ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention to begin the work.

In reply to Mr. MILLS,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work on the Sydenham River will be the removal of obstructions between Wallaceburg, Dresden and Wilkesport.

Mr. GILLIES. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that some parties in my section of the country expected that an appropriation would have appeared in the Estimates for the improvement of Inverhuron Harbor. The Minister of Public Works promised on a certain occasion that he would keep this harbor in mind, but nothing has been done in relation to it. It requires improvement, and it has been recognized as one which they should take up.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a grant for Warton Harbor, but unfortunately Inverhuron was one of the harbors on the list which was not adopted in Council.

398 Hydrographic Survey, River St. Lawrence, Quebec to Cap à la Roche \$7,500

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I thought that had all been done by the British Navy engineer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in consequence of one of the steamers of the Allan Line having been totally wrecked there. A demand was made on the Government to have a careful survey made of that portion of the coast in order that he might see what obstacles should be removed, and whether any buoys or lighthouses should be erected.

403. For erection of Mounted Police Barracks..... \$30,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These barracks will all be erected at the capital of the North-West; and as we intend having the capital selected in a short time, we shall be able soon to give out the contracts.

Mr. ANGLIN. You intend to abandon Battleford?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For that purpose.

Resolutions ordered to be reported, and (at 2:20 a.m.,) House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 11th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 158) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, and for other purposes.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the 12th section of the 2nd clause, respecting the electoral district of Muskoka and Parry Sound, I should prefer any discussion on some proposed changes postponed for the present. It is thought more convenient that the township of Ridout, which is now in North Victoria, ought to be, for convenience sake, placed in the north riding of Ontario. It is now united for municipal purposes with Maclean. I move that the 12th section be adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not hear anything about an intention to change the connection of the township of Ridout; but an amendment was proposed adding also the townships to the northward of the said electoral district to it. The statement was that that was an undefined enlargement of the electoral district; and it was suggested that an effort should be made to ascertain the municipal limits of Muskoka and Parry Sound. Obviously, when you mention certain districts like this, and in a way which we notice, you are dealing with a wholly undefined area.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can be provided that certain townships shall form the constituency and such other townships as may hereafter be here laid down to the north of the said electoral district; that must mean, if they lie to the north of any other electoral district. It cannot mean townships lying to the north of Muskoka.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not mean that the extension was indefinite in its latitude, but in its longitude. It does not matter that they are laid out consecutively to the north. If there is a considerable portion of Ontario to the north of this electoral district here defined, then it is quite clear that township will be left out, one does not know where.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find a good deal of difficulty about that, but if this clause is allowed to pass, by the time of the third reading I will try to define the district. In relation to section 17, some changes are proposed: in the east riding of Muskoka the township of Gibson is left out, and it is proposed to insert these words: "and all that part of the territorial district of Muskoka lying to the south of the township of Hagerman, and east of Medora and Watt." Part of that county is unsurveyed.

Mr. BLAKE. This is including more territory.

Mr. BOWELL. It includes that territory portions of which are un-surveyed, lying westward of Magog and running to Georgian Bay.

Mr. BLAKE. The practical effect of that proposal will be to disfranchise the inhabitants of that territory. Being unorganized, there is no provision for municipal assessments, which is the basis of the voters' list. There is a special franchise for Muskoka and Algoma in consequence of their possessing so much unorganized territory, and if the hon. gentleman withdraws that district which contains that special provision, and inserts another which does not contain it, he disfranchises the population so transferred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, we will add that back to Muskoka.

Mr. BLAKE. Where does Gibson lie?

Mr. BOWELL. It lies in that portion of the territory to which the Oka Indians have removed, west of Medora and south of Grey.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should it be abstracted from Muskoka then?

Mr. BOWELL. We are putting Gibson in Muskoka.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, proposals of this kind, made without previous notice, cannot be discussed with advantage as we have not at our finger's ends the precise location of every township in Ontario, particularly in those new and unorganized districts. The hon. gentleman should give us an opportunity, before the final disposition of this measure, of looking into what is the final effect of the changes, and give us a statement of the reasons why they are made.

On section 22,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I leave the north riding of Wentworth unaltered.

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate the Conservatives of Halton, particularly of the township of Nelson, on the success with which they have impertuned the hon. gentleman to make these alterations.

On section 23,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that section 23 be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. I renew my congratulations to the Conservatives of Halton.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 26,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that after the word "Puslinch" the word "Erin" be inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate my hon. friend, the present and future member for South Wellington, on the change.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I might suggest that the clause be struck out altogether. I may say that while the township of Erin will be faithful to the Reform party wherever it is, I have no doubt it is better satisfied to remain as it has always been, part of the county of Wellington.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that the clause be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 38,

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman reserved this clause for consideration, and strong solicitations were made to him to take the Elgins out of this enormous riding and place them where they ought to be, in the north riding.

Mr. SHAW. It must be observed that though the west riding is large, the north riding comprises a great number of townships; there are the townships of Arran, Elderslie, Amabel, Albermarle and Lindsay, and there are five incorpor-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ated villages. Now this part of the country is being rapidly settled, there is the rising village of Warton in the north riding, which is rapidly growing, and in a short time the population of the north riding will be equal to that of the east or west ridings. Looking at the number of townships and the number of villages, there is reasonable ground for believing that there will be a large increase in population. There are three of these townships now connected under one municipal corporation, and very soon, no doubt, these townships will be separate municipalities. It is only a short time since the townships of Amabel and Albermarle were connected with the township of Arran. Then Innisfil was separated from Arran, and subsequently Albermarle has been separated from Amabel. Now, with regard to the west riding, I am glad to observe the hon. leader of the Opposition does not seem to consider it incorrect.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. SHAW. Well, he has not mentioned it at all events, and I presume that his silence gives consent as to the propriety of the course taken. The hon. leader of the Opposition, however, must bear in mind, and I believe that the people of the south riding will agree with me, that the proper method of dividing these ridings was to divide them into the east and west. There has been considerable discussion in that county as to the mode of dividing these ridings, and the Reformers have maintained that an outside party should be selected as the candidate, because the interests of the east and west were opposed. They have now been separated, and probably it may be said that the Reformers are hived in the west. Well, if that be the case, the Conservatives are hived in the east. You cannot hive Reformers without hiving the Conservatives, and so no great mischief was done. The question then is simply, is the county territorially growing in population? I think it is. I observe that matter has been discussed in the south riding, and only one objection has been taken to it, namely, by the incorporated village of Lucknow. Now, that village is at the very south of that riding. It was comprised of a portion of three townships, two in the north riding of the county of Huron, one in the south riding of Bruce. As that village now stands, a portion of it votes in the north riding of Huron and a portion in the south riding of Bruce for Dominion elections. The present arrangement will do away with that. It will leave the municipal organization of that village within the west riding of the county of Bruce, and a very proper arrangement it is. The same course was adopted with that village when it was incorporated; it was placed in the south riding of the county of Bruce for electoral purposes to the Local Legislature, and as regards that, I might just refer to the question of population. It is said the arrangement with regard to that village will benefit the present hon. member for the north riding of Huron, that it will take some Reformers from his riding and add them to the west riding of the county of Bruce. That is so, but the same course was adopted by Mr. Mowat's Government when that village was incorporated and put into the west riding, notwithstanding that the vote of South Bruce was much larger than the vote of North Huron and larger than the vote of North Bruce. I might also remark that the village of Tiverton, which lies on the border between North and South Bruce, was also brought into South Bruce for the reason that South Bruce was a little doubtful in its vote, while there was no doubt as to the vote of North Bruce. South Bruce was always doubtful, and although its population was nearly double the population of North Bruce, still these villages were both added to South Bruce in order to increase the Reform majority there. That was done by Mr. Mowat's Government, and although that is no argument for adopting the same course in Federal elections, still the Reformers of that riding have no ground to complain if Mr. Mowat's course be followed by the House of

Commons. The leader of the Opposition has deprecated interference with municipal organizations, and he has contended that electoral divisions should coincide with county and township divisions. My opinion is that it does not make much difference as regards counties, but certainly it makes a difference when townships are divided, because they would then be required to have two sets of voters' lists. My hon. friend from West Durham referred approvingly to the speech of the leader of the Government in 1872 in favor of maintaining the county organizations the same as the electoral divisions. One would consider, however, that his position, as former representative of South Bruce, was a little different from the position he takes to-day on that question. In that speech the leader of the Government said that a young man first enters the Township Council, and if he there displays some ability he is selected as a reeve, then he graduates into the County Council, probably becomes warden, and finally represents his county in Parliament. Now, it is worthy of remark that the first entrance of my hon. friend into political life was by successfully opposing the warden of that county. That warden was a farmer in the county, he became a councillor, then a warden, then a reeve, and finally warden of the county, and then the hon. leader of the Opposition defeated him.

Mr. BLAKE. And then another of them.

Mr. SHAW. It did not end there, we put forward another gentleman in that riding. He was first a councillor, then a reeve, and afterwards warden, and the hon. gentleman defeated him. The fact was that no municipal officer in that county would be returned by the Conservative party, and it had finally to get a lawyer to try issues with the hon. gentleman. Such were the acts of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but perhaps he is not here to give his own opinions on the matter, but simply to advocate the opinions of the party he represents. It appears to me from the hon. gentleman's acts in connection with South Bruce, that he was simply carrying out the opinions of the party, and whatever the Reform party desired that he sought to carry out irrespective of county or municipal organization. It may be said it was all right that the hon. gentleman should oppose those wardens, and if it had ended with simple opposition it would have been well enough, but when all the influence of a party is brought to bear against the municipal officers who are running for Parliamentary honors, the position is a great deal worse. Those elections, although I do not charge any corruption or impropriety against the leader of the Opposition—

Mr. BLAKE. You had better not.

Mr. SHAW. By no means, I do not mean to do so, and I do not do so; but I do say that a large amount of money was expended in those ridings to carry the elections, and that the hon. gentleman did carry the election by these means, and that he would not have carried it by any other means. I say, further, that managers of money-lending institutions were sent, not gerrymandering through the country, but meandering through it, where they had mortgages—two or three of them—during these elections, and that they did produce an effect in the county, and the result which was intended, the election of the hon. gentleman. I have heard it said, and I believe there is truth in it, that the leader of the Opposition felt some delicacy in accepting the position after he was elected, having ascertained that so much money had been spent there; but party exigencies again overcame the objection and the hon. gentleman accepted the situation. Those things usually have to be done for the purpose of party, it is said, and I suppose the Reformers are not much better than the Conservatives in that respect, although they profess a great deal more. I would not have extended my remarks to such a length upon those clauses, were it not that I heard the right hon. leader of the Opposition say that the division of

the Bruces was one of the grossest cases. I am glad he has said that, that he has expressed that opinion, because, when it is committed to the electors of that county, I have no fear of their opinion on that subject if that is the grossest case.

Mr. BLAKE. I never said that was the grossest case. I said it was one of the grossest cases.

Mr. SHAW. If it is one of the grossest cases, I think it will be accepted by the county as about fair and just.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman heard my speech, and he has produced his own speech.

Mr. SHAW. Not from notes at all events.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to show that my course is inconsistent, because I defeated two candidates who happened to be wardens. I have always said, and made the statement publicly on the platform, that a local man had many points of advantage over a stranger in a political contest. I stated that I only asked to be judged and voted for, for or against, after a fair and just allowance had been made. I have always admitted that candidates, such as wardens, possessed a great advantage, but the hon. leader of the Government proposes to deprive local residents of those advantages, by abolishing the system of county organization. That did not occur in the case of Bruce, because it was divided into electoral districts, but it applied to the bulk of the changes as brought down. Of course, some clauses have since been altered; within a few minutes three clauses proposing great disruption have been altered for reasons which we all understand. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Shaw) says that the public opinion of the Bruces will approve of this proposed division, and that he is glad to hear that I said it is one of the grossest cases in the Bill, immediately afterwards stating that I had said it was the grossest case, thus contradicting himself. I said it was one of the grossest cases—I think so; it is not the grossest case, but one of the grossest cases. Here is a county which, even under the circumstances of the elections of 1878, under the difficulties in which the elections were run, particularly in Bruce as affecting the south riding, which the hon. gentleman well knows returned a majority of Reform votes. There was a majority in the combined votes of the two divisions recorded for the Reformers as against the Conservatives, and so it has been in preceding elections for a considerable time; and the hon. gentleman says that the honest men of Bruce will approve of the division, the inequality of population, and the design to stultify the voice of the majority, and give the Conservatives two votes out of three in a county, the people's voice from which, even as judged by the elections of 1878, was Reform rather than Conservative. That is the hon. gentleman's opinion of the majority and fair spirit of the electors of Bruce. I do not share it. There may be men there blind to everything but a sense of party advantage, who think politics is a game in which it is proper to strive with the opinions of the majority, and while the majority of the electors under the most unfavorable circumstances goes Reform, they so readjust the representation that two-thirds shall be Conservative and one-third minority. I do not doubt there are such, but many of the hon. gentleman's supporters will say it is not just, fair and reasonable, and since it does not equalize the population it is obvious that the purpose is that which I have stated. Of course, the hon. gentleman considers he has a convenient majority in that portion of the riding for which it is possible he can stand. It was impossible to provide otherwise without taking a portion of a strong Reform county; but the result of the division is to make a middle and two ends, so that according to the returns of 1878, the two ends will be strongly Conservative, and the middle an unfortunately stronger Reform constituency. It

would have been more fair and just to have divided the south riding and have left the west riding untouched.

Mr. SHAW. Suppose it were done.

Mr. BLAKE. I will not suppose so, because it is not going to be; but nothing the hon. gentleman has said has furnished any argument for diminishing the population of the north riding to 17,300 as against 25,000. We know the reasons, Sir. The reason is, that because an equalization of the population would have given the north riding to the Reformers, or made the result doubtful, the hope to avoid that result, and a Bill professedly based on equalization, having its justification in the argument that equalization was necessary, contains on the face of it this glaring inequality: that these two townships are taken from the north riding and put to the west riding, making a difference of about 7,000 in population for the sole and only purpose of accomplishing this nefarious result, and stifling the voice of the electorate, and providing that a county, which has a majority of Reformers and a minority of Conservatives, shall give its voice in Parliament for two Conservatives and one Reformer. If the north riding of Bruce increases in population in future years make your readjustment then. Deal with the necessities of the case as they arise. The hon. gentleman talks about the villages and the number of townships, but we know the conditions of the north riding of Bruce and the Indian Peninsula as compared with other parts of the county. We all know that the expectations of the hon. gentleman are not likely to be so extensively realized as he seems to imagine. I say the profession is a hollow one, an unjustifiable one.

Mr. SHAW. The hon. gentleman contradicts himself. He has stated before, that even with the township of Saugeen and the village of Port Elgin, and if the south riding were then divided into east and west, there would still be a deficiency of 163 in the Reform vote, and that simply increases it, so that if divided into east and west the Reformers will still be behind in the north, and the north riding would have a majority of 163 Conservative votes over the Reform votes. So it cannot be placed in the north riding, except for the purpose of increasing the majority. That can be the only argument he can use. The majority is there without the addition of that township. It is, therefore, done for the purpose of giving it proportion in territory as well as in population. He does not deny that the territory is large; that it is unsettled; that these townships will be filled up in the future and that shortly. The hon. leader of the Government has not said that he intended altogether to divide the constituencies according to population, but both by population and territory, and that principle has been kept in view in the north riding as well as in the east. In that respect I deny that there is anything wrong in this Bill, and the hon. gentleman must be aware of it. According to the last returns there were, without Bruce, 163 Conservative majority already. It was unnecessary to divide it the way proposed by this Bill in order to make the north riding Conservative. It would have been a Conservative riding with the township of Bruce annexed to the south riding. In any view of the situation, the hon. gentleman will not deny that the township should have gone to the north riding.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that the leader of the Government considered territory as well as population. This is the first time we have heard that. We did not hear that from the hon. Minister before, but let me give him an instance of the manner in which territory is considered in this Bill. The county of Frontenac for electoral purposes contains 320 square miles and a population of 14,983, and a very large portion of the municipal territory of the county of Frontenac has been cut off and added to Addington. For electoral purposes the county of Addington contains 2,057 square miles and a population of 23,470.

Mr. BLAKE.

If you wanted to consider territory as well as population, of course, provision ought to be made for subtracting from Addington in territory and population, municipally belonging to Frontenac. But the grossest inequality of territory is preserved in this scheme. Over 2,000 miles is taken from the small and given to the large by the old Bill and unaltered by this. As the hon. gentleman says, look at the returns of 1878, and you will see that there is a majority of Conservatives in North Bruce even with the subtraction of the township of Saugeen and the village of Port Elgin. It is true that is the case by the returns of 1878. As I said before, the voice of the county of Bruce spoke with only something like 100 of a majority on that occasion; but I said it spoke under great difficulties, and the hon. gentleman knows that that is not the present voice of North Bruce. He knows that it would be dangerous to the Conservative cause in the north riding to leave Saugeen and Port Elgin in, and it is because it would be dangerous to leave them there that they are taken from the north riding and put in the other. That is the case I say, and I believe that nine men out of every ten in this country will believe it to be the case.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman found fault with the Bill, because it made too many changes, but now we find he wants more changes made. He has alluded to one illustration with which I am somewhat familiar. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the division of the counties of Addington, Frontenac and Lennox, was made some years ago, at the suggestion and with the approval of the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Sir Richard J. Cartwright). I am certain that hon. gentleman was consulted as to the division of those counties, and why does he find fault now? I have no doubt that a great many more changes might be made, but the Government knew that every additional change would be found fault with by hon. gentlemen opposite, and when we listened to the agonizing shrieks which they sent up, when the Bill was brought down, that the Government had legislated themselves into power for another ten years—

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say so.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The *Globe* newspaper said so.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You cannot do it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. They say so now; they did not say so last week. The *Globe* said that Sir John A. Macdonald had legislated himself into power for another ten years. These gentlemen say that the people of Ontario are discontented, dissatisfied, impoverished by the policy of the Government; discontented with the Canadian Pacific Railway policy of the Government, dissatisfied with all the scandals connected with them—*anxious to turn them out*—and yet this wave of discontent has not swept over the country equally. We are told that the rain falls from Heaven upon the just and the unjust alike; but it appears that this wave of discontent has not swept over the country in the same equal manner, but that it has jumped from township to township, and only lighted on a few townships, which the hon. gentleman, with that prescience which distinguished him, finds grouped together in this Bill. I would ask any hon. gentleman in this House, does he think it possible that if the majority of the people of Ontario are dissatisfied with the present Government and their policy, can they be hived together? Can the minority hive the majority? No, Sir, it is impossible. Hon. gentlemen opposite know, and the terror which they display at this Bill shows, that they feel it in the supreme hour of their political existence; just as the last hour before dissolution, when they and we alike are going to meet our judge, the people, that they have to give an account of the policy they have pursued in this House, they have to show whether their opposition to this Government and its policy has been just

and fair and proper. They know that all their declarations, all their oppositions, will be regarded by the people as *vox et præterea nihil*.

Mr. RYMAL. Say it over again.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, I shall say it over again that the people will tell them it is all wind, all gas, all nonsense, what they have been uttering. I do not know whether it would be parliamentary for me to use an expression with reference to the minority here which has been used with reference to a minority elsewhere. We know that lately an Irish member of Parliament was called to account by his constituents for having voted in favor of the cloture resolutions in the Imperial House of Commons, and he wrote to tell his constituents that they did not understand the subject, and that the cloture was necessary as a guardian of free debate, and as a protection of the majority against a "blatherskite" minority. Now, I hope it will not be found that all the opposition to the Government for the last four years has been "blatherskite," and that all the dissatisfied people can be hived together in a few townships, so that their influence will not be felt. I say, again, that it is impossible for the minority to hive the majority, and if the supporters of the present Government are, as hon. gentlemen say, in a minority in the Province of Ontario, then I say it is impossible to so group the constituencies that hon. gentlemen opposite will not have a majority from that Province. But by their language in this House, by the terror they have shown, by the agonizing shrieks they have given, we see that they believe they are lost as a political party. I accept this Bill as the best one which I believe could be produced under the present state of things, although, for my own part, I believe another principle might have been very properly introduced, and that is the principle of grouping together some of the constituencies into districts, so as to give representation to the minority in those districts. I believe that the Parliament of this country should be the mirror of the nation, that it should represent faithfully, all shades of thought in the country, and that the minority in every district should be represented here. I would like to see the city of Toronto, for instance, with its three representatives, made a district in which every man would have two votes, so that the minority would have one representative from that city; and I would like to see the same principle applied to some of the other large districts. That is my view, but it does not receive the weight which I think it is entitled to, and it is useless for me to press it. But under the present system, when we come to divide up the country so that each constituency will have one member, then I say the right hon. gentleman has striven to his utmost in this Bill, to give a fair representation according to population. For the last quarter of a century, hon. gentlemen opposite have been dinging into his ears, and badgering him with resolution after resolution, to adopt the principle of representation by population; and he has striven in this Bill to do so as far as possible. But whatever he does meets with the same opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite. They never admit that anything he introduces can have a principle of right about it at all. When we consider that the Province of Ontario has a right to have four additional members, and consider that the representation of Cornwall and Niagara have been taken away, we must see that the Government has made as few changes in the representation as possible by this Bill, and that they have been guided solely, apparently by a desire to equalize the population. When hon. gentlemen opposite declare that the Bill has done them an injury, they do not think what it has done to hon. gentlemen on our side of the House. There are two hon. gentlemen on this side legislated out of their seats altogether, but we do not hear a word of condolence for them. Because the Bill has not been framed to meet their views, they declare that it is

wrong. I do not think the House or the country will regard it in the same light, but every fair-minded man who looks at it dispassionately will say that it is designed to give Ontario a far representation according to population.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I think it is very fit that the hon. member for Frontenac should appear as the champion of this Bill. There were three principles laid down by the hon. First Minister and the hon. Minister of Customs, which they said had regulated their ideas in framing it: one was the principle of equalizing the population, another the principle of having regard to territory, and the third the principle of having regard to growth. Each one of these three principles, in the case of the hon. member for Frontenac, has been grossly violated. His constituency contains 300 square miles as against 120 square miles in the neighboring constituency; it has a population of 14,900, while the constituency alongside has 23,870; his county during the last ten years has lost nearly 10 per cent. of its population, while the county alongside grew nearly 10 per cent. The hon. gentleman is, therefore, the right man in the right place in upholding as gross a piece of trickery as ever was inflicted on any people. There is not one single solitary principle that those hon. gentlemen ever professed, including the principles professed by the hon. First Minister in 1872, which this Bill does not grossly and daringly violate. And naturally the hon. gentleman whose constituency is an example of distinct violation of the three rules which this hon. gentleman laid down, is the first to applaud it. The hon. gentleman spoke of some remarks made on this side of the House, as being *vox et præterea nihil*. He could not have hit on a better description, not only in his own speech on this occasion, but of his usual speeches in this House. In the present speech there was not one original idea; the only idea uttered was one stolen from the Aurora speech of the hon. member for West Durham—that Parliament should be a mirror of the feelings of the people.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That idea was expressed long before.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. As regards Lennox, I had something to do with arranging that county in 1867; as regards Frontenac and Addington, I do not remember having taken any particular action. But, in 1876, Lennox, which then contained a population of 16,500, was within the nearest fraction of the fair quotient which the several constituencies ought to have contained. But I merely rose to call attention to the extreme propriety and fitness of the hon. member for Frontenac, who in his own person unites all the objections that can well be taken to the measure, being its advocate.

Mr. GILLIES. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for South Bruce bring forward the point he has urged. As to the facts of the case, they are so plain as to require little argument. This county has got 64,000 population, giving 21,000 for each riding. The only point he endeavored to make was that the territory to the north was larger than the territory to the west and south. Now, the Indian Peninsula was offered for sale in the fall of 1855 at Owen Sound, and a very large portion sold. At the same time other portions of Bruce were also offered for sale, and were sold and settled. How was it that the Indian Peninsula in that section, if it was a country capable of settlement, was not settled? The simple reason is that the country is so rocky and difficult of settlement that no people would settle in it. In the days when it was offered for sale, shortly after the Russian war, there was a land fever, and any actual purchasers did not know the quality of the land. Finding it was so inferior in quality people would not settle on it. Of late years some settlers have gone in to take off the timber. The more people know of this region, the more they are inclined to view it as inferior

for agricultural purposes. Not more than one farmer in fifteen would settle upon the part yet unsettled; and instead of that country increasing in population, it is more likely to decrease during the next decade. So, if that was the only ground for the argument of the hon. member for South Bruce, it would have been better if he had not presented it. I am somewhat surprised that they desired to push through this measure. It was shown, by the last election, that the Conservatives would certainly have as good a chance as they could have desired or can wish for to defeat any candidate in the Liberal cause for North Bruce, so there are no grounds for saying there should be an increase of the population in the west riding unless it be to make doubly sure of defeating a Liberal in the north riding. The Conservatives will certainly have something in the neighborhood of 150 or 200 of a majority, with which they surely should be satisfied. For their own sake, the Conservatives should show some liberality in this matter; it would certainly be more in their own favor than dividing that county in the way proposed. It will be found, when the redistribution is made, that instead of increasing that section of the country, it will diminish it as compared with the other ridings in that county. The arguments offered by the hon. first Minister, and especially by the hon. member for South Bruce, are simply technical and flimsy, and therefore discreditable to them. If the Government desire to carry this measure through, in its crude iniquity, as seems apparent, there is one thing that will be satisfactory: that it will, to a certain extent, carry its own destruction to this side of the House with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for the west riding of Durham made a suggestion a little while ago, similar to the proposal of this motion—that Saugeen and Port Elgin should be taken away from the west riding and added to the north. Now, I will meet the hon. gentleman half way; we will take Port Elgin from the west riding and add it to the north riding of Bruce.

Mr. BLAKE. I am delighted to hear the hon. gentleman make that proposal. The return for Port Elgin shows that Port Elgin is about equally divided in political opinion, and that it would not hurt his Tory candidate to put it in the north riding. Why does he not propose that Port Elgin shall be taken into the riding. Everybody knows why. He proposes to leave with us the smaller of the two in point of population, so as to make the discrepancy as much as he can, Port Elgin having 1,100 and the other over 2,200 of a population. He proposes to leave with the north riding that which has a very slight Reform majority, and to take into the riding in which he is living the Grits that have a substantial majority. I am glad the hon. gentleman makes the proposal, because it indicates that in every line of the Bill, and every amendment proposed, he has but one idea, that of strengthening his own friends and weakening his adversaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was the hon. gentleman, and not I, who made the proposition. To be sure he wanted the two. I made no suggestion, because I was quite satisfied with his division. The hon. gentleman asked for the whole, and we give him the half, and half a loaf is better than no bread. The hon. gentleman would like us to do as Mr. Mowat did in Huron—take Goderich and a slice running along the shore in order to connect it by an artificial connection. Suppose we take a strip of Saugeen and Port Elgin, would that satisfy the hon. gentleman? We have a precedent for it in the Local Legislature.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says he did not propose to add Port Elgin to the north riding. No; he proposed to take it from the north riding, and his counter proposal to my hon. friend now is that he will remit so much population in the north riding as is comprised in the village of Port Elgin, and I say we know the reason. We

Mr. GILLIES.

see from that what the hon. gentleman considers is the political complexion of these two municipalities, and while dealing with it in a way in which he pretends to remedy the evil, he substantially makes no particular change. The majority in Port Elgin was nine, so that the leader of the Government, having looked at the electoral returns, or heard from the hon. Minister of Customs or somebody else, that Port Elgin is about equally divided and that Saugeen is a strong Grit town, takes this process ostensibly to meet the views of hon. gentlemen on this side, while in reality making no material concession to their wishes. By replacing Port Elgin, which is about equally divided, no material change is made, while by not replacing Saugeen, which has a strong Liberal majority, the Liberals are hived as originally intended.

Mr. SHAW. There is one remark I would like to make in reply to the hon. member for North Bruce. He has forgotten to mention in regard to the Indian Peninsula, that no railway has been constructed to run into that district until lately. One is now under construction, and that portion of the county is now being opened up. That accounts largely for the increase of population in late years, and that increase is going on. No doubt Port Elgin is very equally divided. Surely, therefore, there could be no objection to its going into the north riding. If it is considered better, I might make another suggestion, that is, to divide the township of Saugeen and let half go to the north and half to the south riding.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should we divide it?

Mr. SHAW. To come nearer your opinion, that the populations should be more nearly equalized and less regard paid to territory. We believe the present arrangement is fair. It is a matter that has been discussed in that county by my hon. friend and myself. I recollect we discussed representation by population, and I recollect the very last time I met my hon. friend at Port Elgin at a public meeting. I stated I was aware that at this Session the county of Bruce would ask for another representative, and he would be here to assist me. I am sure he does not object to that, but only to the division.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, in the first instance, was represented by the hon. First Minister as his agent. Now, he makes a proposition in his own name. He tells us he is willing to divide Saugeen. A few moments ago he said that the township and village municipality was a very convenient unit, but very great inconvenience would arise from any attempt to divide township and village municipalities as two voters' lists would be required, and many other inconveniences would result. It is perfectly obvious, from the offer the hon. gentleman makes, that he feels this matter is entirely in his own hands, that he is here as the proprietor of the county of Bruce, and that the hon. First Minister is simply his agent; and the reports we heard of townships being traded off and of the disputes that took place are verified by the proposition of the hon. member for South Bruce. The hon. gentleman stated that there is a prospect of population coming into North Bruce, and that therefore the division of that county into ridings ought not to be equal, and that South Bruce and West Bruce ought to have a larger population than North Bruce. I supposed that, in making a division under this Census, we were acting on the Census taken, and not on some imaginary Census that might exist at some future period. The elections that will take place in the course of a few weeks will be elections by the electors that are in the constituencies at present, and the members returned will be the representatives of those electors and not the representatives of a population likely to be there at some future time. There is a provision of the Constitution requiring us to readjust the population every ten years on the basis of the Census, but

that does not prevent readjustment within the limits of each Province at any intervening Session. What we have to do now is to provide a fair representation for the population that now exists. If the population in one section of a county is largely increased because it is rapidly settled, there will be no difficulty in altering the boundaries and redistributing the seats in a manner that will be fair to the population at some future Session. When the inequality arises we will have no difficulty in dealing with it. But at this moment we have to look at things as they are, to the Census that has just been taken; and we find that the hon. gentleman, under pretence of equalizing the constituencies, proposes to create in one riding of Bruce a constituency with a population of nearly 25,000, and in another riding a constituency with a population of 17,000, a difference of nearly 8,000. Now, what justification is there for this? None, except that the hon. gentleman sought to place a great majority of the Reformers of the three ridings in one riding. I say that the proposition under consideration is a monstrous one. It is unjust. It seeks to give to a minority of the electorate in the county of Bruce, two out of the three representatives, and the tenacity with which the leader of the Government and the hon. gentleman who represents South Bruce, adhere to the division that has been made, the care with which they seek to protect the Conservative majority in the north from being turned into a minority, show what the real object is that arrived at by this measure. I do not believe this measure will succeed in accomplishing the object the hon. gentleman has in view, because I have a better opinion of human nature than the hon. gentleman. I do not believe that men are as base as he assumes they are. I do not believe that every member of the Conservative party, because he approves of the general policy of the Administration, is so base, so cowardly, as to seek to secure the control of the Government when he believes the majority of the people do not favor it. There are men opposed to us, who are ready to engage in manly warfare; they are not corrupt followers ready to butcher the wounded and plunder the dead. When the hon. gentleman makes this proposition and undertakes to defend it by such arguments as have been advanced by the hon. member for South Bruce, who knows right well what his object was, and that so far as an Act of Parliament can secure their election, they have undertaken to pass an Act of Parliament with that object. But I believe there is a sufficient number of honest men in the Conservative party to defeat the hon. gentleman's scheme, and I am glad to think so, because it would be a most disastrous thing if a measure of this kind should be approved by the majority of the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this measure is not going to succeed, and is going to have all the effect the hon. gentleman predicts, why does he object? Why do they make such a row about it? But there is no satisfying the hon. gentleman. We tried to meet his proposition half way, to the extent of Port Elgin, then my hon. friend from South Bruce makes a further suggestion, and the hon. gentleman had the unparliamentary weakness of attacking him for stating his opinion, and the hon. gentleman stated that I was acting as his agent.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong there. The hon. gentleman has no right to talk that way. It is not right to use the language he did a little while ago. Using that kind of language is not the way to get on in Parliament or out of Parliament, or to increase the respect of the members in Parliament for each other, or of the people outside for their representatives. It is only the violence of a weak nature, of a womanish nature, a disposition to scratch and bite; nothing can be more unmanly, nothing can be more weak, and it is rather a libel on the ladies to say it is feminine, but it leans that way.

Now the hon. gentleman says we want representation by population. But they do not really want it. They want, instead of giving the Grits, that the Tories should be hived, that is all. Then my hon. friend behind me says: "Let us go half way, there is an inequality of population and we will give you Port Elgin." That is his proposition, and he is quite at liberty to move it. We will give you half Saugeen, and you won't accept it. You won't have anything but just your own way. You are not seriously in favor of representation by population, nor will you accept it, nor even an approximation to equality, but you want simply to give the Tories. The hon. gentleman says that it is a mistake to look into the future in readjusting the representation of Canada, that we must take the present population. The hon. gentleman did not say so when Algoma got a representative, or when Muskoka got a representative. That was accepted on the ground that there was a rush of immigration to those two sections—accepted by the whole House, and the result showed it was right. Muskoka, which had 8,000 inhabitants in 1872, has nearly 30,000 in 1882. And so it will be in the north riding of Bruce. My hon. friend has truly said that there has been a large influx of population. The Census shows that the increase of North Bruce has been much larger than in any other part of Bruce. When the railway which is rapidly approaching completion, reaches Warton that county will be pretty well settled, for it is now settling rapidly. The hon. member for North Bruce, who was present at a deputation which came down to see me during the present Session, said that the people were going in there so rapidly that the licenses to cut timber which had been given to Cook & Co., must be stopped in order to prevent the deterioration of their farms. That was this very Session—not for the purpose of re-arranging the representation, but in the interest of the settlers. He stated there was a great influx of population there, and that the railway was going to increase it; but as North Bruce was very large in territory, and was a broken land, not continuously fertile, that the most valuable part would be the timber, and if the timber were cut by the lumbermen, the company that had got the licenses, the land would be so deteriorated that further influx would be arrested. The proposition that has been made is not acceptable to the hon. gentleman, but we cannot help it; therefore we will take it as it is, for the present anyway.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As I understand hon. gentlemen opposite, they object to this particular clause because it gives the political minority in the county of Bruce a majority of the seats. Well, Sir, the answer of the hon. First Minister is sufficient to that. But if that were not so, we have a capital precedent to justify even a proceeding of that kind, a precedent which hon. gentlemen opposite, at any rate, did not complain of. It is drawn from the legislation of that body where Reform principles find their most perfect illustration, I mean the Legislature of Ontario presided over by Mr. Mowat. I find that, according to their Readjustment Bill, but of the territory of fifteen constituencies which returned Conservatives in the Session of the Legislature of 1871 to 1875, twelve of those thirteen were so readjusted as to return supporters of the Government. That is not all. I find in those particular constituencies the Conservative votes polled at the preceding election, were 13,677 and the Reform votes 13,611, some sixty-six less, and yet they readjusted those constituencies so that they gave from that lesser number of Reform votes, nine out of thirteen representatives. The hon. gentleman comes here and tells us that in the readjustment of the representation of the constituency, where there is in one portion of it a large unoccupied territory, which with railways running into that territory and the improvements going on in that country, is certain to become largely populated in the early future, the result of this measure, so far as it relates to that

constituency, may be to give the minority, as they call it, a majority of the representatives. Then, as I understand it, they also object to this measure because some constituencies have been left as they were instead of being changed. They refer to the constituency of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and they say it was not touched, because if it had been touched it would probably either injure him or some surrounding constituency politically, and therefore nothing was done. If that were true—I do not say it is true—we have again a precedent for that to be drawn from the legislation of that body where, as I have said, Reform principles find their most perfect illustration. What do we find? We find that Brockville, in the preceding Legislature, was represented by a Conservative, the hon. member who now represents it in this House. It had a population, at that time, of 10,475. It was necessary to readjust the representation there, and therefore they added some of the surrounding municipalities so as to give it a population of 13,937—of course, entirely with a view of equalizing the representation as compared with the population. But, when we come to Cornwall, what do we find? We find a smaller population, only 7,114. Yet, what was the fact? They left that as it was, and for the reason given in the comments of the press at the time. And in regard to Cornwall, we can find no better justification than that given in the columns of the *Globe*. On the 15th of September, 1874, that journal stated:

“Cornwall alone is left untouched, in obedience certainly not to any political exigencies, but to the very strongly expressed desire of the surrounding constituencies to remain for the present without alteration. A desire it was the more easy to gratify because there was no reason to suppose a change would be made in the political character of the representation of the district by any reasonable scheme of readjustment that could be devised.”

So that in the case of Cornwall, where nothing could be done to improve things, because nothing could be done to improve things this small borough was left untouched; but in the case of Brockville, where something could be done to improve things, according to the view of hon. gentlemen opposite, a large addition was made from the surrounding district to that constituency.

Mr. BOWELL. What was the result?

Mr. WHITE. A gentleman who is not likely to get a seat in South Grenville, who had worn his welcome out, found a very comfortable seat at Brockville. I do not say this object was to give him a seat, but the object was to give some one who is favorable to the Government a seat. So we have this fact, that in the legislation of the Reform party, when they had absolute control of it, they gave to a minority of votes, nine out of thirteen seats; and in those two boroughs to which I have referred, in one case they readjusted it in order to secure a change, and, in the other case, according to their own statements, they left it as it was, because they could not improve its political complexion. If ever there was hypocrisy exemplified it was in the attempt of hon. gentlemen opposite to raise the cry that political exigencies alone dictated the changes made in this particular Bill.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The last speaker has attempted to prove that political exigencies demanded the measure now before this House for the hon. gentleman quoted as a precedent, and as the authority and warrant for its submission, that the Mowat Government had enacted a measure something of the same kind and for the purpose of securing seats for the supporters of his Government. The hon. gentleman appears to have been cognizant of the fact that this measure had been proposed for political effect, and the defence is that the leader of a Government in another House had committed a similar act. I deem that it is not true, for the leader of the Ontario Government endeavored to preserve county boundaries, a principle which is violated under the present measure. In regard to the equalization

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

of population, it will be remembered there was very little excitement and expression in regard to the Ontario Government. As far as I am aware, little exception was taken to the affair, but the hon. gentleman is aware that there is indignation deep, loud and widespread over this measure, and that it is not confined to the Reform party. Why, to-day, the hon. gentleman has restored South Wellington and North Wentworth, and hon. members on this side of the House think it is in obedience to the demand from political supporters in Halton. The hon. gentleman, exercising a spirit of fairness, should meet the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Gillies) half way. If the hon. the leader of the Government has any sense of fair play left he will accept the proposition of that hon. member. Granting there may be greater increase of population, and, compared with the other riding, the change proposed by that hon. member would still leave his riding with 2,000 more than the other riding. The hon. the leader of the Government having shown his willingness to go so far in amending the Bill, will be guilty of showing the white feather if he does not entertain the proposition. If Saugeen and Port Elgin are added to North Bruce—and it is known that the present member has been already nominated as the candidate for the riding—the change would only give him about one hundred and seventy votes more towards a chance of political existence in the next contest. Let there be some sense of manliness, some sense of fair play. Let hon. gentlemen go into the contest prepared to vindicate their principles of equalization of population as near as possible; accept the hon. gentleman's amendment, for in doing so you will still leave his riding 2,000 less than the other ridings of Bruce.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I make the numbers 20,735 as against West Bruce, 22,355, but an hon. member informs me I am out 1,000.

Mr. SHAW. Nearer 2,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that that would equalize the population? Would North Bruce be still less?

Mr. SHAW. A little, I think.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman makes the admission and the point is gained. If they yield to the proposition of my hon. friend, North Bruce will still be in a minority, but hon. gentlemen cannot go on to lay down their high and holy principle of equalizing the population while they perpetrate this inequality. I am glad to notice that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Shaw) displays at last a little sense of shame—or shall I call it, a spirit of manliness. We heard him rise and defend the Bill as it stood, he defended the monstrous iniquity of allowing a population of 17,000 in North Bruce and 25,000 in West Bruce. But when the hon. Premier was prepared to give a little in a direction which would not hurt him, the hon. gentleman, for the purpose of having his character stand a little better in the minds of the honorable men of Bruce, before whom he is shortly to go, remarked that he was willing to give up half of Saugeen. The hon. gentleman, for the purpose of strengthening himself, though he had a majority of seventy-five, took steps—for he was a party to it—did not we hear him say, “we,” as he spoke of this arrangement? What did this hon. gentleman of the “we” party arrange to do with reference to himself? He was afraid to meet the electors without having 461 votes added to the seventy-five which he had before, and yet he thinks it consistent with the position of an honorable, a fair-minded and a manly man to refuse to give up the township of Saugeen. I say it is lowering the dignity of the House, and one of the worst features of the Bill is that hon. gentlemen, who should regard one another with fair-play and decency, lead themselves to tactics so unfair

and dishonorable. I am willing to give hon. gentlemen opposite all the legitimate political advantage to which they are entitled in arranging for four new constituencies, but this running up and down the whole Province, and striking at men whose hands are tied is unfair, unmanly and unworthy of any political party. If, as we have just heard, and for the first time, territory is to be regarded as well as population, I can suggest some interesting problems for hon. gentlemen opposite. For example, if territory is an element in the redistribution, why should the township of Oakland be taken from my riding which comprises about fifteen miles, and added to another which is fifty miles long? If territory is to be taken into account, what shall we say in reference to taking Ancaster out of the county of Wentworth right against the city limits of Hamilton, and taking Blenheim, almost adjoining the corporation limits of Woodstock—points about fifty miles apart—and throwing them into one riding about five or six miles wide? Hon. gentlemen had better, for the sake of their own credit, give up the pretence of paying regard to territory because there are too many instances which show that that consideration had no weight with them. So far as we can judge, if they refuse the motion before the Committee they will show that they have paid no regard to equalization, no regard to territorial arrangement, and that their only desire has been to strengthen their own men in the various constituencies, to use their legislative power to stab their political opponents when their hands are tied. I am sure you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Colby) as a fair-minded man, will agree with me, as others on that side will, that hon. gentlemen cannot pretend to indicate the principle of equalizing the population unless they accept the amendment. If they refuse, they will simply put in the hands of their opponents another and a stronger weapon which will give additional strength to men whose hands they seek to bind by an Act of this Legislature.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite evident that if, as the hon. gentleman says, his hands and those of his friends have been tied by this measure, their tongues have not been tied, for they have used them to considerable advantage during this debate. One would imagine to hear them talk that they belonged to a party that could not be accused of any such transaction, and I would like to ask them what was done in the case of the redistribution of seats in the Province of Ontario. The hon. member for Huron East contradicted me when I said that the Government of Ontario had formed provisional counties for the purpose of increasing their political power, though the people did not want them formed. The truth of my statement is proved by the fact that the people of the county of Dufferin refused to pass a vote making it a provisional county. They changed no less than five constituencies for the purpose of redistributing the seats, and, in order to form this county of Dufferin, they rearranged three other counties, and they took one township entirely across the line and put it with North Grey, thinking to get a little increased political strength in that constituency. The people of Dufferin refused to erect themselves into a county until they were served with a mandate, and I would like to know what stronger evidence could be given that political exigencies compelled the Ontario Government to make the rearrangement. If the Government wish to satisfy the people, there is only one way in which they can do it, that is to give their side the political majority in the constituencies. Then they will acknowledge it is right and not till then. I was rather amused at the argument of the hon. member for West Durham. The other day he complained that, in order to give four additional members to the Province of Ontario, the Government found it necessary to change no less than forty constituencies; to-day he grumbles because they have not changed more constituencies. The whole question has been, what is the political complexion of this constituency?

If it only gave a majority to the Opposition it was all right but if it gave a majority to the Government it was all wrong. There is the strongest evidence for their arguments that they are guided by no rule except what would increase their political strength. Their whole objection is to find fault. A great man once said that to criticise successfully, you must find fault. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted that rule. The question is not whether anything is right or wrong, but whether it adds to their political strength. I think no one can look fairly over the Bill without seeing that it is fairly based on the principle of representation by population. To show the growth of population, I may refer to my own county. In 1871, when the Census was taken, it was found that the three ridings of Grey had about an equal population; but we find to-day that East Grey has over 29,000, while South Grey has 21,000, showing that the former has been settled very rapidly. My own feeling is that the Government have rearranged the constituencies in that county fairly according to the principle of representation by population; and both the Bruces and Simcoes are arranged much more fairly than they were before. I am satisfied that within a few years the population of North Bruce will be equal to that of any of the other ridings. But I think it would be unfair to attempt to satisfy the Opposition in the House, because nothing can satisfy them. Their conduct is only a pretext to waste the time of this House from day to day and from week to week; they are only trying to advance argument which they may use again in the country. I think the Government would be derelict in their duty if they attempted to meet them even half way; but they have only to go on in their course and the country will sustain them.

Amendment negatived.

On section 43,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that the township of Romney be added to Kent from the south riding of Essex.

Mr. MILLS. I think it proper that Romney should be retained in the county of Kent. I do not propose to make any motion while the Bill is in Committee, but I think the county of Kent is wholly inadequately represented and most unfairly divided, and I shall, at a later stage, propose an amendment to this provision of the Bill. The county of Kent, with a population of 54,000, has not been given more than two representatives, while the county of Lambton is represented almost by three. I think the provision is most unfair.

On section 52,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have been looking at the division of the county of Huron for local purposes, and I see that, instead of being divided into North, South and Centre Huron, it is divided into East, South and West Huron. I propose to introduce very much the same division, so that the south shall be called the west, the centre shall be called the south, and the north shall be called the east riding. I propose that the west riding shall consist of the townships of Wawanosh East, Wawanosh West, Ashfield, Colborne and Goderich, and the towns of Goderich and Clinton. I propose that the east riding shall consist of the townships of Howick, Morris, Turnberry, and Grey, the town of Wingham, and the villages of Brussels, Blythe and Wroxeter. And I propose that the south riding shall consist of the townships of McKillop, Tuckersmith, Stanley, Hullett and Hay, the town of Seaforth, and the village of Bayfield. In looking at the map it will be seen that the hon. gentleman has been holding out a series of pictures in regard to these constituencies. It will be perceived that the changes will make them more compact than at present, and that they will be very nearly equal. East Huron will have a population of 21,720; West Huron, 23,512, and South Huron, 21,991.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What about the village of Exeter, which, of course, belongs to South Huron, and makes the population 23,716?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to put the village of Exeter into the north riding of Middlesex.

Mr. BLAKE. That was not reserved.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It may be as well to supply some facts in regard to these changes which the hon. Minister has omitted, no doubt, inadvertently. This same division seems to have cost him a great deal of mental labor. When the Bill was first introduced, we found the division proposed was not the division now before us; the township of Osborne was attached to South Huron, and several other differences were apparent. Then, at the second reading we had the new divisions, as shown by the Bill, and now at this, the third stage, a total alteration is proposed. The constituency that I represent is lost, so far as its name goes, to the roll of Canadian constituencies, and the other constituency is altered in a manner in which the House will probably better understand from some of the facts from our electoral returns. I find in the division of West Huron, as at present proposed, by the voting at the last General Election, the hon. gentleman opposite would have had a majority of 108 or thereabouts, and in East Huron a majority of about 174, and in South Huron, as at now proposed, the Reform party had a majority of close upon 800. Now, doubtless none of those facts were known to the hon. gentleman or his advisers. This is a pure result of the desire of the hon. gentleman exemplified in so many other places to secure as nearly as possible an equality. But he has succeeded in producing an equality in a curious fashion. He has taken away about 1,000 souls from the county of Huron, as municipally constituted—I think the population of Stephen Village, of Exeter and the township of Osborne amounts to about 10,000. Having taken these people away, he made the division before us. The result has the peculiarity of making the Reform majority not far short of 1,000 in the south riding, about 100 in the west and about seventy-five in the east. Well, it is tolerably clear what the object of the hon. gentleman's advisers was, to whom he, in his ignorance and innocence, has yielded. I am sorry to see Centre Huron thus blotted out of the map. As the fidelity of this riding has been so great to the Reform cause, and particularly in electing myself at a time when this cause was in a very despairing condition, I have no objection to propose, if the hon. gentleman will leave that constituency alone, not to stand for it again. In this riding, for many years, the Reform party have had a majority of 500 or 600; and its local electorate in the local elections of 1879, elected the three Reform candidates by a total majority of 630. There cannot be the smallest possible doubt as to the object of these changes; they are exactly a repetition of the policy attempted to be carried into effect in the county of Bruce. It is a riding which for a great many years had given a decided, though not by any means so large, a Reform majority. But they so manipulated it that there should be nearly 1,000 Reform votes placed in one constituency, so that the hon. gentleman may try to obtain a more moderate majority for his friends in the other. Here we have an exact duplication for the same proceeding, something like 800 Reform voters placed together, and the ridings so divided that the hon. gentleman thinks his friends may secure a considerable majority on the other side. All those plans and purposes are likely now, as in the past, to be frustrated. The hon. gentleman, in former times, found it necessary to create a party constituency so far as the shape was concerned in Centre Huron; but he found that his decision, although no doubt the object was scarcely concealed at the time, failed to give him control of the county of Huron. So he now attempts to reproduce in a different

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

fashion, and by entirely destroying one of the constituencies, the same feat and to obtain the same result. I do not know that is to be altogether regretted. It is desirable that there should be gross and crying cases of inequalities which every man can understand without the slightest difficulty. I will venture to say that in all the Western Peninsula their will not be a single voter on either side of politics who will not thoroughly and fully understand precisely why the Hurons were gerrymandered in this fashion. I am quite aware that there is no great use in remonstrating with the hon. gentleman. I, like my hon. friend, beside me, have considerable faith that when these propositions are fully explained and fairly submitted to the people of Ontario, the hon. gentleman will find that even his own honest supporters will vote against the disgraceful trick he attempts to practice here, and to them I must leave it, not having much hope in an appeal to the justice or generosity, or sense of fair play, of the hon. gentleman and his supporters.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I wish to say a word or two on this extraordinary change which the hon. gentleman has seen fit to make at the eleventh hour. In 1872, the hon. gentleman tried to do precisely the same thing in South Huron. He undertook to elect the Liberal member out by gerrymandering to such an extent that he was left in a minority of 187. The Government at that time detached the same township they are to-day annexing; and their object was the same as it is now, to improve their political prospects. This is the third change the hon. gentleman has made. Is it to be the last? Is the hon. gentleman satisfied that by this third change he has accomplished his purpose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do you want it altered?

Mr. CAMERON. When the hon. gentleman introduced this Bill first the only change he proposed was to detach from South Huron the townships of Osborne and Stephen, and annex to it the town of Goderich. That left me in a minority of 107 according to the last returns. The hon. gentleman thought he had accomplished his purpose, but on looking over the figures he found that there was an absolute certainty that whoever the Liberal candidate for South Huron might be, he would occupy a seat in Parliament. He set his wits to work and tried his game again. Calling on a council of the Conservative party in the House, he made another attempt, he detached a township that gave me a majority, and annexed another municipality that gave a majority against the Liberal candidate. The hon. gentleman thought he had accomplished everything then, but found he was mistaken. He saw the Conservative organ from the Hurons, which declared that if the Government expected to accomplish what they had in view, by the gerrymandering they had perpetrated in the Hurons, they were mistaken, because instead of weakening the Liberal member for South Huron by attaching Goderich to it, they strengthened his hands. It became therefore necessary to make another shuffle of the cards, and the hon. gentleman was equal to the occasion. On Friday last, a delegation from the Conservatives of the Hurons waited on the Government, and intimated to it that, with the present formation of the Hurons, the whole three ridings were uncertain, and that in two of them the Conservative prospects were so slight as to be hopeless. What did the hon. gentleman then do? He attached to South Huron every single township he could that gave a Reform majority. Thus he hived all the Grits of the three Hurons in the south riding where their majority, by this gerrymandering, ought, according to the last returns, to be 684. By this means, he thinks he has made East and West Huron perfectly safe. According to the last vote, South Huron would now give a Conservative majority of 107, and East Huron, a Conservative majority of 108. I ask you if

it is not a gross outrage that a county like Huron which, at the last elections, gave a clear Liberal majority over the whole county of 450 votes, should now be so gerrymandered as to secure, as far as any outrageous attempt of the kind can secure, the return of two Conservative members out of the three. We heard something from the hon. member for Frontenac about Parliament immuring public opinion. Here is a county with a clear liberal majority of 452, which the hon. gentleman has so carved up as to return two Conservative members under the last voting. No clearer evidence could be given that this measure is solely in the interests of party and an attempt to override the opinion of the country. Intimations came from the hon. member for North Middlesex, that his hands required to be strengthened, and, in order to make his return perfectly safe, the village of Exeter, which is the only municipality in the whole of South Huron that gave a Conservative majority at the last elections, a majority of 115, is annexed to North Middlesex. The whole of the hon. gentleman's gerrymanderings in the Hurons is only on a par with that practiced in the other counties of Ontario. My own humble opinion is that the hon. gentleman will signally fail in attaining his object, but it will not be by his fault. He has done all he possibly could to hive the Grits in South Huron. By that process he makes the Reform majority 300 votes over, the Conservative having majorities in the other ridings. Yet the hon. gentleman says this is a fair Bill. I believe the hon. gentleman, despite his gerrymandering, will fail in the Hurons, and that the three members returned from there will be returned to support a Liberal Administration.

Mr. BLAKE, The proposal now before us is to improve for the third time upon the constitution of the three ridings of Huron. In 1872, as we all know, the hon. gentleman for the first time proposed to give that constituency three representatives instead of two. We all recollect the exciting debate which took place on that occasion, in which it was shown that the hon. gentleman's effort was to concentrate as far as he could, the Reform majority in one riding, and to obtain two instead of the three ridings in the county which had a preponderating majority of Reformers. We know the measure was changed with that intent; we know that the figures established that intent on his part; we know that he made one clear Reform riding and two apparently Conservative ridings, and he has since that time succeeded in retaining, by a narrow majority, the north riding of Huron, while my hon. friend's power and capacity of attracting and obtaining popular support, has enabled him to overcome the unfair conduct of the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and to retain the south riding of Huron to the Liberal cause. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman on this occasion had the condition of the Hurons before him for several months, he had before him the geographical position of the Hurons, their position with regard to population, their local divisions, and the election returns as to their political complexion, and with all deliberation he made a proposal to Parliament to destroy the municipal autonomy of the county of Huron, to take away certain townships, to retain a village which was in one of these townships, in the county, while he took away the township to which it belonged, in order, once again, to hive the Grits who had swarmed in Huron, and by that means to increase, taking the figures of 1878, the Reform majority of the centre riding, which was 362, according to that election, to 446. That was the hon. gentleman's proposal. While, of course, you could not increase the Reform majority in the strong Reform ridings in the constituency without weakening in one or other of the two ridings the Reform interest, that was the inevitable result, and at the second reading of this measure we pointed out that the hon. gentleman was repeating his operation of 1872, having found it necessary, in order to

have any chance of success, once again to gerrymander Huron by taking a Reform strength from the weaker riding, in a Reform point of view, and adding them to the centre where their effective strength would be useless.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills, (from the Senate), were severally introduced and read a first time:—

Bill (No. 164) to correct certain errors in the French version of "The Dominion Lands Act," and "The Dominion Lands Act, 1879."—(Sir Hector Langvin.)

Bill (No. 165) further to continue in force for a limited time "The better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878."—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 166) declaratory of the meaning of the word "Telegraph" in certain cases.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I was observing, when the House rose, that the geographical situation of the different divisions of the county of Huron, the numerical relations of those divisions, the mode in which the county had been divided by the Federal Parliament, and also by the Local Legislature of Ontario, for electoral purposes, were all within the knowledge of the Administration when they selected this particular mode of division which was brought down to us in this Bill; that that had been done after mature deliberation and consideration with various interests, and that the result of this constituency, which had been gerrymandered in 1872, was to produce a very large majority in the then centre riding, was to increase the majority from 362 to 446, thus, of course, taking proportionately from the strength in one or other or both of the remaining divisions of the other. Well, Sir, the hon. Minister who reversed these clauses when the Bill was in Committee before, has come down to-day and proposed a further change in the divisions of the county of Huron, and he asks the country to understand that the reason for the changes he makes is, that he has looked since that time at the divisions made in the Local Legislature, and that he pretty nearly, as he says, adopts them, and he thinks under the present plan the population will be equal. These are the reasons the hon. gentleman gave in Committee. The political results of these changes, to which the hon. gentleman never alludes, are that whereas he had a hive of 446 of a Reform majority in the centre riding, in the south riding, which is, according to the new plan, to be the hive, he increases the Reform majority, according to the same set of figures—those of the election of 1878—to no less than 684, thus effecting a further weakening of the Reform strength in the other two ridings. Coincidentally with this, the hon. gentleman, who, when he was desirous of weakening my hon. friend in the south riding of Huron, thought nothing whatever of leaving the village of Exeter in that riding. Now that he has changed the complexion of the south riding of Huron, and made it a sea in which the Reform strength is to be hived, he takes Exeter out of it and puts it where he thinks it will do more good, in the north riding of Middlesex, thus showing that no principle animated the hon. gentleman, but that he disposes of the different municipalities in accordance with that which is the ruling idea which animates the Bill—the political complexion which he may give to the different constituencies. I say that the changes which are here proposed, are not an act of geographical convenience, not an act of the equalization of the population, not an act of the considerations which were obvious to the hon. gentleman and to the Government long before and at the time when they matured this measure, but the changes are proposed because it has been found, upon examination since the

measure became public, that representations are made that it will not be sufficiently injurious to the Reform party. There have been gatherings in the two ridings of Huron which are to be affected by this Bill; there has been a consideration of this question; deputations have been sent down here, and communications have been forwarded with a statement that the results are not what the hon. gentleman anticipates, and what his friends in the localities would desire, and that for this purpose other changes in Huron were required, and the hon. gentleman is now proposing to carry those other changes. He is carrying out the changes which were proposed by the local wire-pullers, and by those who were interested in securing, if they can, the representation of the two ridings of Huron which have, on the whole, a very large Reform majority over the whole county. He has altered this measure, I say, in this way, adding still further to the strength of the Reform majority, in the riding which he must leave to the Reformers, and weakening their strength in the other two ridings—not on account of the geographical considerations which were obvious the whole time, and which the hon. gentlemen knew as well as they do to-day, which could not have been overlooked, which were before those which prepared this Bill, but on account of the political view of the situation which the local persons have taken since the Bill was brought down, and on account of representations made to the effect that the object will not be accomplished; but while the hon. gentleman weakens himself by proposing the measure in the shape in which it is brought down, he does not sufficiently strengthen himself in the county of Huron to accomplish what he hoped to accomplish, and that therefore some further gerrymandering is required; and these alterations to this clause are the product of these representations, and are designed to carry out that object; they are not designed to carry out these obvious considerations which the hon. gentleman referred to, and which were always before him, but they are designed to carry out the political objects which this Bill has in view.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved an amendment that East Huron consist of Howick, Turnberry, Grey and Monas, the town of Wingham and the Villages of Brussels, Blythe and Wroxeter.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) has any observations to make on the substitution of East for North.

Mr. FARROW. I came to the conclusion, when the hon. member for West Durham was addressing the House, that nothing would suit him. If you go on the principle of representation by population, that does not suit him. If you go on the principle of making a riding compact, that does not suit him. If you go to the right he says you should go to the left, and if you go to the left he says you should go to the right; if you go forward he says turn backward. Since I have had the honor of representing North Huron I have found that such has been the hon. gentleman's course in Parliament—no hon. member in this House has greater respect for the hon. gentleman than I have; but I must say that I am speaking consistently when I tell him that he is entirely wrong in his remarks about the division of the Hurons. The hon. gentleman has spoken as if the north riding was in favor of a change, just as if they thought their case was a bad one unless something was done. The contrary is the fact. I can inform the hon. gentleman that there was a convention held at Wingham on the 4th, and from what I could learn they are quite content to leave the riding as it is. No doubt there was some talk about changes as to the compactness of the riding and as to the population. The hon. member for West Durham must know that my riding has geographically increased very largely since the change took place in 1872. He must know that in North Huron there are several

Mr. BLAKE.

villages and one large town that did not exist ten years ago, such as Wingham, which now has a population of nearly 2,500, and the growing villages of Blythe and Russell; and when you take it into consideration it is evident a consideration must be made. I must say, and I say it candidly, and above board, that I have had no hand in this thing. I am placed in a worse position I think. They have given me the township of Grey, one of the strongest strongholds of the hon. member for Centre Huron, a township they say will give 250 Grit votes. If it gives that number I do not want to go into the riding. The hon. member for West Durham will find that the east riding is very compact, geographically speaking, and the west and south ridings are in the same position. The hon. gentleman will not deny that they are compact.

Mr. BLAKE. I am told so.

Mr. FARROW. You will not deny that the populations are nearly equal.

Mr. BLAKE. From what the hon. gentleman says, I cannot deny that.

Mr. FARROW. Then you cannot complain.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; I can.

Mr. FARROW. I say that you cannot please the hon. gentleman, for you cannot divide Huron into three more compact ridings. As regards the effect of this Bill on myself, it will not benefit me at all. Now, I do not know anything about this rearrangement or what hon. gentlemen call gerrymandering. I probably am too humble an individual, but at any rate I have had nothing to do with it, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not blame me, though I think the Government has divided Huron up into three ridings, the most compact and satisfactory that could be obtained.

Mr. BLAKE. The mode in which the hon. gentleman divided Huron into three ridings was, by first of all taking off 10,000 population, putting so much to one county and so much to another county, and dividing the remainder into three ridings, so that now the county of Huron forms part of five ridings. I admit that the hon. gentleman has lost as well as gained. I will be as frank as he. He gains in political strength all the political strength in a new riding, but he loses in his individual strength, because he has less chance for nomination than before. While the hon. gentleman says—and I accept his statement not merely in a parliamentary, but in every sense—that he had nothing to do with the proposed change, he will not deny that the local Conservatives, leading Conservatives in the ridings, have had to do with it; he will not deny that it was discussed at that convention of which he speaks, and which was held a week ago; he will not deny that there were communications with Mr. Gregg, Dr. Holmes, and perhaps some others on that subject by letter or otherwise, and that the change has taken place in accordance with the views of the local leaders of the Conservative party in Huron. If he denies these things he denies statements which I have, on very respectable authority, that is now on the Table before me.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. gentleman ignores the great growth of Huron as a whole. The county of Huron was too large for three members.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the Greys?

Mr. FARROW. I have nothing to do with the Greys. I have plenty of work to look after my own county. My riding had a population of something like 27,500, and therefore, I think the Government was quite right when they saw this great surplus population, in taking some off. They might have taken some off in the north, but there was no chance there, and the only way of equalizing the population was by taking off these two townships in

the south. So far as communications may have gone on with the Government from the riding, I am not in communication with the Government. I do not know their secrets; I do not listen at their key-holes or their lobbies, or go into their bedrooms, so I cannot say whether the hon. gentleman is right or wrong. The county of Huron has a population of over 70,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman justifies the division of Huron on the ground that it had a population of something like 76,000, but how does he account for the fact that the county of Grey, with a population of 74,000, is only given two members. It appears that that which has been found to be a justification in the case of Huron has not been found to require similar action in the case of Grey, and the hon. gentleman's suggestion, as to population has not the force, when we consider the whole county, which the hon. gentleman is disposed to ascribe to it when he deals with an isolated case.

Mr. McLENNAN. I think an humble member who has no more relation with the county of Huron than that he happens to be in the same Province, may have a word to say about this matter. This is a question of ridings but it has been made also a question of representatives, and we have had many pathetic appeals from this gentleman and that gentleman who is on the floor of the House, that he must be treated with the courtesy of an appeal, and we have had appeals on behalf of some who expect to be treated as superiors. Now, the chief point in the whole Bill is to give its proper representation to Ontario. Ontario, I think, is admitted to be the heart of this Dominion. It is very important that it should have its proper and full representation. Ontario has, in its time, contributed a great deal to the political history of this Dominion, and it has lately produced, through its representatives, many new and important theories. From this fact, and from the fact that the development of the Dominion must be sustained in a great measure by Ontario, it is important that that Province should be properly represented. It is very uncertain what the future may bring upon us, when that happy millennium comes, when the Reform party will be in power—and I believe it counts on being in power very largely by the influence of Ontario—and it becomes more important what it represents. We are told that when that good time comes we shall have a great many good things; we are to have commercial independence and a representative at Washington; and if we are to have a representative at Washington, it is quite obvious that the present representative for Centre Huron must occupy that position, for the reason that they are very fond of lions at Washington, and the hon. gentleman can roar like Bottom in the play. It is true there are some objections to this; my right hon. friend was not willing to concede, the other night, that we are able to carry out the idea, because we have no army and are not an independent power. Well, we have heard a good deal since then about a little army and its warfare; we had a history the other evening of a war that was fought by our little army, but it was only with beer bottles and jugs, and things of that sort; and I have no doubt that the Premier of Ontario would lend us a legion or two if we required them for our representative at Washington. But when we go back to those whose ancestors a century ago came and took up their homes in Ontario, he will find that they are not identified with independence or with this legendary army of Mr. Mowat's, and our hearts warm to the United Empire; and when we think of 1812, and how our fathers held this country against that theory of independence, again we do not think so much of independence; and if we are to have a representative at Washington, and the question comes up who is to represent Ontario in this House, and who is to be the leader of the Reform party, when that time comes it is very important that we should know now how all

these good things are to be brought about. I believe Ontario will be true to its history, its character and its patriotism; I believe there is something beyond the magnificent intelligence of the hon. the leader of the Opposition that will govern the Province of Ontario; I believe Ontario has a heart as well as a head, and every pulsation of it beats in unison with the Empire, and, in order to preserve our proper relations to the Empire, we want now to guard our representation, we want to see that in the future Ontario shall be represented, as it has been, with a proper regard for the feelings of its people, of the people who have made it what it is, and who, I believe, by their loyalty to the Empire, are prepared to continue it as it is.

Mr. TROW. In connection with the extraordinary changes that have taken place in Huron in the last two hours, I think it would be advisable for the Government to make a still further change, and take in the township they have attached to South Perth. It would be more complete geographically. The county of Perth could have been divided properly without interfering with any other county. The population of South Perth prior to the redistribution was 20,778, and that of North Perth, 34,000. North Perth is now over 26,000, while South Perth is only 21,256. Hon. gentlemen during the Session have boasted of their popularity and strength in the country; yet it is surprising, with their extraordinary majority in this House, and with the feeling which they declare is favorable to them in the country, that they would not face the electors, without all this gerrymandering and disarranging of the complexion of the whole country for political purposes. The operation of hiving has been extensively carried on in North Oxford, in which the Reform majority was about 1,500; in Bruce there would be 1,000 Reform majority; in West Elgin, 500; in North Brant, 700; South Oxford, 800; South Middlesex, 500; one of the Hurons, 600; South Simcoe, 600; West Ontario, 500; making a grand total of 6,500 Reform majority hived in those nine constituencies, and absolutely thrown away from the Reform cause. This total would give a handsome majority of 100 in 65 different ridings if it had been distributed properly. I have not looked over the majority given to strengthen the Conservative interest, but I have no doubt it has been distributed so as to benefit a large number of Government supporters. The Government have, in the second reading of the Bill, changed the complexion of some ridings, and as the Premier offered to go half way to meet the views of one Liberal member, I would have no objection to his meeting me half way also. The Government have taken off my majority in the removal of a township that gave a Reform majority of 200. I understand that the opinion was expressed in Stratford by farmers residing in North and South Easthope a few days ago—and I received my information from an influential person, Conservative resident of Stratford—that the people of those respective townships would resent those changes, and that many farmers would carry their produce to Woodstock instead of to Stratford, to punish the member for North Perth and the Conservatives in Stratford for their action in this matter. I have no doubt they will carry that threat into execution. The hon. gentleman has taken great credit to himself for the extraordinary development of the North-West. I have had some little experience of the North-West, and without desiring to boast I take a little credit to myself for having spent, in exploring that country and proclaiming its advantages, \$6,000 of my own money. I have been writing it up for the last seven years through the press; and now the hon. gentleman is to a certain extent reaping the benefits of my exertions and sacrifices. I think it is not becoming on the part of the Government to make a dead set at me, making my riding almost an exceptional case in this House as to the extent of the alteration. However, under any circumstance I will face my opponent in my riding, and I have no doubt, notwithstanding that I have 118 votes to

make up, that I shall secure my election. If I were only placed on a par with my opponent I would not care who opposed me. I am not discouraged at the loss of this 118 votes. I have every confidence that the people will frown down this gerrymandering scheme, and return me by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BERGIN. Among the many complaints against this measure, I do not find any as to the wiping out of the counties of Stormont, Cornwall, Niagara and Lincoln. I find, on the contrary, that the hon. leader of the Opposition thinks that Eastern Ontario has too many representatives still, and that the Government have been more than just to it. He seems to think, as has been always the case with his party, that Western Ontario should have everything. Now, we desire to be just to Western Ontario, but it is impossible that we can have a strictly accurate distribution of members according to population. The Bill does not pretend to such a distribution. The hon. leader of the Government has done the best he could under the circumstances. I know he desired to preserve those old constituencies of Cornwall and Niagara with their old historic surroundings, but it was impossible. Cornwall and Stormont were too small, and being adjacent constituencies, they could not be very well annexed to any other; and, therefore, although we lose a representative in Eastern Ontario, to which we were honestly entitled, we submitted with good grace, not complaining like gentlemen opposite. We feel, after all, that the question is not whether this or that constituency has a representation, but whether Ontario has the full quota to which she is entitled under the British North America Act, which provided for an increase of the representation of Ontario proportionate to the increase of her population at the end of each decade. The hon. Premier was obliged to submit this Bill, which I believe entitled it to the confidence of this country. Some of its opponents say the constituencies are too large, others that they are too small; that some are too Conservative; that others are too Grit—that the Grits are hived in some constituencies and entirely driven out of some others. I can hardly imagine what would satisfy them. If we give them a good Grit riding they growl, and if we do not give them one they howl, and when they are heard they do not cease to complain. We have been hived in the county of Stormont, and I am proud of it. We have not only a great county, but a good old loyal Conservative constituency in Stormont, settled by old United Empire Loyalists, like my grandfather, who came from the valley of the Mohawk to live under the British rather than under the American flag. And if the hon. Premier has so arranged the constituencies in Ontario, that they shall be loyal—that they shall return loyal members—men not disposed to vote for Independence, or look to Washington—then, I say, he deserves the thanks of the country and will long live on its merits. Not content with finding fault with the distribution of seats in Ontario, the hon. leader of the Opposition, as he always does, endeavored to provoke sectional strife. He, like many others, who, when they get into difficulty, are anxious to get others into similar difficulties, would tear up by the roots the old Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Although there is no color of law in it, no reason whatever, except that misery loves company, he would do all the injury he could, when he could not get power himself, to those who would not assist him to get power. He would disturb the constituencies in those different Provinces without rhyme or reason. Because we refuse to re-adjust constituencies in New Brunswick, Quebec and Nova Scotia, where nothing of the kind is asked for, and where they are not compelled under the law, to have any redistribution, he calls, with a coolness, that even in him is remarkable, upon the representatives in those Provinces, if they are honest men, to assist him in voting down

Mr. TROW.

what he calls an infamous measure. I shall not go over the list of adjectives with which that hon. gentleman favored us in the discussion of this Bill, as he always does in discussing every measure. If I were to go over the history of that hon. gentleman, I could show that he has been guilty, to use his own words, of as mean, low and dishonest political acts, as any man who ever sat in this Parliament. I said a while ago, that it is hard to satisfy those hon. gentlemen. Under the law, they have four new seats, and by the wiping out of Cornwall and Niagara, two other seats, making six in all. If I read this Bill aright, these six new seats have been given to them. I would like to know if they had the power, would they hand over generously the six new seats to us. Far from it. Those who read the history of hon. gentlemen opposite and know how they gerrymandered this country through the instrumentality of the Premier of the Local Government, Mr. Mowat, know that they cannot be honest in their professions when charging us with gerrymandering. We know that the Premier of Ontario always consulted the leaders of the Liberal party in the Federal Government, and that everything he did was done, as it is now, after consulting with them; and we never heard they complained, because he arranged the constituencies so as to give them a majority. If I remember aright, they took thirteen Conservative constituencies in 1874, and gerrymandered them into nine Grit and four Conservative constituencies in the Lower House, yet we did not hear a word from hon. gentlemen opposite about the wrong that was then done. Everything is right when it is done in the interests of the Liberal party; but if not, everything is wrong. With their usual modesty they did not speak so much for the Liberal party as for Ontario. One would suppose that those forty or fifty gentlemen represented Ontario. They are not Ontario; they are only the Liberal party from Ontario. Yet when they are required they presume to say that Ontario is required. If, as has sometimes been the case during the consideration of this Bill, hon. gentlemen opposite had their complaints listened to by the right hon. Premier, and their requests granted in every instance, they would still turn around and whine. We had an instance of an hon. gentleman complaining that Torbolton was added; he would have preferred Huntley. The next day the hon. Premier acceded to his request by taking away Torbolton and giving him Huntley. What a row there then was. It was the most unjust act that ever was perpetrated. They complained about the village of Exeter and about the village of Saugeen—again the Premier was willing to accede to their request; but no, they were not satisfied. Had they supposed he would not have granted them there would have been no end to their complaints. There is another question I would like to put to the hon. leader of the Opposition. Suppose—and I admit it is the most improbable thing under the sun—that, through any misfortune, so dire a calamity should befall this country as that the hon. gentleman should be returned to power at the next election, would he pass an Act repealing this Bill and placing the constituencies in the same position in which they were before? Not at all. He would say: Ontario is all right; Sir John made a terrible mistake, and I made a mistake; the country was sound after all. This Bill up to 1892 would be kept in full force; not a change would be made in the constituencies. He finds it convenient to forget that, in 1872, the Liberal party denounced what they called then the gerrymandering Bill, just as fiercely as they denounce the present Bill, yet we had the spectacle the other night of that hon. gentleman moving an amendment which actually provided that the measure of 1872 was a just and honest measure, and his complaint is that we are not leaving the constituencies in the position in which they were in 1872. If anything could show want of political honesty more strongly than that I would like to hear it. I do not intend at any length to follow the statements—I

shall not say arguments—made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, but I must take this occasion to protest against his violence of language. On this side of the House we are neither cheats, nor swindlers, nor political rascals, nor assassins, nor do we believe that any honest man in this country, knowing the measure has been fully and freely discussed, will object to obey the law made by this Parliament and sanctioned by the Governor General. When a man gets up in his place and threatens this country with consequences so dire that assassination will follow, because, forsooth, a few hon. gentlemen know this change may cause them to lose their seats, he is not fulfilling his duty as a member of Parliament, he is not a good subject; and I think that if the Bill could have been altered so as to make it certain that such a man as that could not come back to the House, the hon. Premier would have been justified in making such alterations. I think if the Bill could have been altered so as to make it more certain that such a man as that could not come back to this House, the Premier, after that speech, would be justified in doing it. We want men in this House who will teach the people that their first duty is to obey the law, that their duty is to be good citizens always and not to stir up strife and ill-will, and threaten all sorts of evil for this country, and even to promote assassination. Allusions have been made to myself and to my constituency which I think I can afford to treat with the contempt such allusions merit. But, Sir, before I sit down I may be permitted to say a word in connection with my constituency, because I had hoped that the great growth of Cornwall during the past four or five years might have been of some assistance to me in the effort I was making to preserve its autonomy as a constituency. The House will pardon me if I allude to the growth of that town since 1878. Perhaps nothing can show more forcibly the prosperity of that town than the amounts deposited in the savings bank branch of the Post Office Department at different periods. In 1878 the amount deposited by the operatives in Cornwall, principally boys and girls working in the mills, was \$10,183. In 1879 it had increased to \$14,559, and last year the amount was \$53,980, or an increase of more than five-fold in three years. In the first quarter of this year the deposits amounted to the large sum of \$21,181, or an amount more than double the whole year of 1878. The duty on goods imported into Cornwall during the years the hon. member for Lambton was at the head of the Government, was \$22,492.93; the gross amount of goods, free and dutiable, imported in any one year, being \$297,963. Well, Sir, during the last nine months there have been collected on duties \$34,348, or \$12,000 more than were collected during the whole five years of the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton. The duties collected during the last three months amounted to \$16,783, or more than in any four years of the previous Administration. In regard to exports I have a report here from the United States consular agent; they comprise butter, eggs, cattle, grain, horses, lumber, poultry, sheep, lambs, railway ties, potatoes and wool. Now, the amount of exports during the previous Administration for the five years was \$40,014.32, while last year the exports amounted to \$143,374.80, or over four times as much as during the whole time of his Administration. During this year, since the first of January the exports have been over \$300,000 already. There have been paid in wages this year in Cornwall over \$600,000, and during the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite the wages did not amount to more than \$140,000. So it is with everything else. Why, even in the Division Court, we have only had one suit within the last three months, and during the Administration of the hon. gentleman opposite the Courts were always full.

Mr. RYMAL. There is a falling off in business.

Mr. BERGIN. Yes, because the people have got more money to pay their debts with.

Mr. RYMAL. Do you discard sheriffs and bailiffs?

Mr. BERGIN. I believe the sheriffs and bailiffs are appointed by the Local Government, and I say the pound-keepers will be shortly, in accordance with the hon. leader of the Opposition, whose cry, up to 1878, was that the Executive had too much power, and therefore, he found it necessary to lessen that power, I suppose, by appointing license inspectors, sheriffs, bailiffs, and everything of that kind by the Local Government of Toronto. This is the way those hon. gentlemen have lessened the power of the Executive and added to the power of the people. Well, Sir, though I regret the constituency I represent is to be annexed to the county of Stormont, I am delighted that the county of Stormont is to be rejoined to the town of Cornwall as it was many years ago. I believe the people of the county will be satisfied, because it was a necessity; it was impossible that these two small constituencies, one of them containing only 13,000 and the other 6,000, could continue separate constituencies. Although Cornwall's population is now 7,000, still the Census is the rule by which we are to be judged. Therefore, I think the county as well as the town will see the necessity which imposed upon the right hon. gentleman the duty of joining these two constituencies, and of depriving eastern Ontario of one constituency. I think the people of eastern Ontario have reason to rejoice that the right hon. gentleman is at the head of the Government, because from the expressions that have fallen from the hon. leader of the Opposition, if it had been in his power there would have been a terrible wrenching in eastern Ontario, and instead of having thirty-two representatives we would perhaps have not more than twenty-two.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved to reconsider the 51st section so as to insert the word "Exeter" after the word "Lucan."

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sections 55 to 59, inclusive, contain a description of the electoral districts in Manitoba. The hon. member for West Durham desired that there should be placed on the Table a map showing the divisions of the different electoral districts, and that has been done.

Mr. BLAKE. To a certain extent only. The eastern boundaries of Manitoba are not given in the map. I do not know how far they extend.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot tell where the eastern boundary of Manitoba is, and therefore we provide for a boundary which, without doubt, is within the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the only provision proposed to be made for the representation of Manitoba?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. There is the township of Varennes in Lisgar which is not indicated on the map. What we desired was some idea as to what were the electoral districts of Manitoba, and they are described, so far as Provencher is concerned, as constituting the municipalities of Ste. Anne, which I presume is wholly contained on the map, La Broquerie, Emerson, &c. Their eastern limits and boundaries should be known and the House should be informed as to how far they go. Many of those townships have been created under Orders in Council passed by the Local Government. So with respect to Springfield and so with Varennes, the Government should state how far they extend eastward.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government cannot be expected to be well informed with respect to municipal arrangements in Manitoba. None of the municipalities extend into the disputed territory.

Mr. BLAKE. On what information is their territorial area placed in the Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government of Manitoba laid out the whole of their territory into municipalities and registration districts. We have had communication with representatives of Manitoba in this House and in the Senate, and also with the Premier of Manitoba when he was here, and the opinion expressed was that it would be well if they could sanction a mode of arrangement. Provencher is a somewhat peculiar shape. That county was originally largely French Canadian and it still contains a large French population, and we thought it well that they should have a county in which the majority would be French Canadians. If they do not emigrate to the North-West in larger numbers in a few years, that district in a few years will become English; but we thought it fair that Provencher should not be swamped by another race. It thus occurs that Provencher is a peculiarly elongated territory, situated along the Red River. The hon. member for West Durham is well aware that when the first counties were laid out we had to make a rough and ready division at the time when the Manitoba Bill was passed.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not at this moment analyzing the particular shape of Provencher or speaking of the nationalities which predominate in that or any other constituency. I want to know the shape of the constituencies.

Mr. MILLS. There must be some Statute of Manitoba fixing the boundaries of those municipalities, and the Government should be able to give the House information on that point. There certainly must be in the Library or in the possession of the Government some indication of the limits of these constituencies, and if so we should have it laid before us.

Mr. BLAKE. If I recollect aright the Consolidated Statutes of Manitoba passed in 1880 with some amendment in 1881, prescribed the number of municipal districts, and I think there are some additional municipal districts established by Order in Council, under the authority of the Statute in connection with the arrangement and extension of the Territory. Of course it is satisfactory to know that the four hon. gentlemen representing Manitoba think that this is a proper division, and if they are attending to their parliamentary duties during the discussion of the question of the boundaries of their Province, perhaps they could supply some of that information with which they supplied the Government, but which the Government seem indisposed to supply to us. I think surely, before the Bill goes through the Committee, we should be informed on the subject, especially as it is a question on which information should not be difficult to procure. What is the territorial size of the various districts, Marquette, Selkirk, Provencher and Lisgar?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the information at hand, and I cannot see that it would do the hon. gentleman or the House any good if we had it. We consider that Manitoba has a right to five members—the whole Province of Manitoba. I do not think that it was ever expected in the world, that in any such measure as this the admeasurement or the territorial extent of the municipality should be furnished. I think the hon. gentleman should be satisfied that the townships are laid out of the usual size adopted in that part of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not ask the size of each municipality of Manitoba. We had information as to the area of every electoral district in this Dominion excepting those for the Province of Manitoba, and it seems to me material that we

Mr. BLAKE.

should have the same information with regard to that Province. I would like to ask how many miles to the eastward of the line laid down on the map these townships come—how close to the disputed territory?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot tell.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman cannot say whether they go to the disputed territory or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure they do not extend into the disputed territory.

Mr. BLAKE. What is embraced in that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They do not go farther eastward than the boundary line.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say what provision has been made for the representation of that portion of Canada eastward of the line and running down to Algoma?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no provision.

On clause 3,

Mr. ABBOTT. I would suggest that a change be made in the boundaries of the county of Terrebonne. There are three new townships in the rear of Argenteuil recently settled entirely from the county of Terrebonne. They have been settled through the efforts of the Rev. Mr. Labelle, well known for his success in colonization. The population is almost entirely French Canadians, and all its relations, commercial and otherwise, are with the county of Terrebonne. The mails come through that county, and it is impossible to pass from these townships to Argenteuil without going to Terrebonne. It has accordingly been considered expedient by all the public men interested in the matter that these three townships of Rattsbon, Sallaberry and Wolfe should be included in Terrebonne, not only electorally but municipally, and Mr. Chapleau has given notice of a Bill for the change in the Quebec Legislature. The territorial areas of the two counties would be about equalized by the change. They are, therefore, entire strangers to the county of Argenteuil proper, and should be added to the county of Terrebonne. I, therefore, move that these townships be added to that county. I may say there is no political significance attached to this change, as these townships have given a majority to the Conservative member for Argenteuil, and will make no difference, I fancy.

Mr. MILLS. I observe by the Census that Argenteuil has a population of 16,000 and Terrebonne nearly 22,000. How will this change affect the population?

Mr. ABBOTT. It is quite true that Terrebonne has a greater population than Argenteuil, but Argenteuil is rapidly settling up, and will shortly be equal to Terrebonne in population. The population of these three townships is now in the neighborhood of 1,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The shape which the hon. gentleman proposes to give to Terrebonne is not a very compact one; it makes the county very long and very narrow. However, I think if the hon. gentleman's statement, as to the commercial and business relations of these parishes be accurate, as I have no doubt it is, and particularly if it is proposed to attach these townships to Terrebonne for municipal purposes, the proposition ought to receive consideration. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to make a provision that in case these townships become municipally attached to Terrebonne, they should become attached to Terrebonne for electoral purposes. It will be observed that that is the plan adopted in the immediately preceding clause of the Bill with regard to the electoral district of Winnipeg.

Mr. DUGAS. I would suggest that part of the townships of Wexford and Kilkenny should be made part of the county of Terrebonne. By an Act of the Local Legislature passed in 1872, they were annexed to the county of Terrebonne for

electoral, municipal, judicial, and registration purposes, and I think they should also form part of the county of Terrebonne for the representation of the House of Commons.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure we must all regret the absence of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) on this interesting occasion when everybody seems disposed to add to his county. It encourages me to hope that in the future I may have the support of the hon. gentleman who last spoke in reference to the general principles that should influence us in dealing with parliamentary representation. My hon. friend has given as a reason for adding these townships, the expediency of making the electoral limits coterminous with the municipal limits. I do not remember to have received the support of my hon. friend to that principle, which I embodied in a motion an evening or two ago, but on the renewal of that motion in the future I may hope to receive his support on the general principle.

Mr. DUGAS. I was influenced by the statement made by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), that if any steps were taken in the Local Legislature to annex these two townships to Terrebonne for all purposes, it was but right that they should form part of that county for electoral purposes.

Mr. ABBOTT. As I have been very careful in making this motion to have the entire assent of those who represent Terrebonne, I cannot make any addition to it with regard to the suggestion that the addition of these townships should be made conditional on their being made portions of the municipal county. I have in my hand telegrams from Mr. Chapleau, stating that he has given notice of a Bill to carry this out. I do not know why I should apply this principle to this clause, since those portions of the Bill referring to Ontario do not depend on that principle.

Mr. MILLS. With regard to the Ontario portion of the Bill the hon. First Minister declared that he was adhering to the principle of representation by population. If the hon. member for Argenteuil followed the provisions of the Ontario section of this Bill as interpreted by the First Minister, he would abandon his proposition altogether, because he proposes to take from a county with a population of 16,000, and add to one with a population of nearly 22,000. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will hardly be able to defend the amendment by appealing to the Ontario portion of this Bill.

Mr. ABBOTT. I do not propose to defend it by reference to the Ontario portion of the measure; I merely propose not to make the addition conditional on its being made municipally, by referring to Ontario in that respect. As to the question of representation by population, I do not know that I can go quite so far as to say that this principle is of so sacred a character that nothing else should affect it. Now, in this particular case the question is not a question of political representation at all; it is a question of the convenience of these people who are proposed to be added to their neighbors and friends and fellow-citizens, and people speaking the same language, having the same faith and being of the same race, instead of being added to any new county where they are in a minority, where their ideas are practically of no value, and where the votes will probably be given on principles different from those that regulate the remaining portions of Canada. It is upon those grounds that I think, if the principle of representation by population were a solemn principle, I might claim to have some exemption from its effect. But I can scarcely admit it is of so solemn a character that no exception is to be allowed, and I think that the reasons I have stated for making an exception in this case are sufficiently strong to induce the House to make it.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to make a suggestion which I think of some practical consequence before we proceed to the 5th

clause. It seems to me it would be much more logical to put the township of Ashbury, which is in Ontario, in the Ontario section of the Bill, or in the section relative to the county of Addington, and to put the Magdalen Islands, Gaspé and the other Quebec districts in the section relative to the Province of Quebec. There is no general provision, but there is a specific provision with reference to certain electoral districts, and these localities should be incorporated with the other provisions respecting related or adjacent electoral districts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It might be convenient to consider that suggestion.

Mr. FORTIN. I wish to propose a new clause to the Bill relating to voting in the winter season on the Magdalen Islands and the Island of Anticosti, when communication between the mainland and those islands is impossible. Hon. members will remember that I introduced a Bill at the beginning of the Session to carry that into effect, but my hon. friend said I had better introduce it as an amendment to this Bill. The clause is as follows:—

Whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, at the time when an election of a member to represent either of the electoral districts of Gaspé or Saguenay in the House of Commons of Canada, is about to be held, that communication by water between the Island of Anticosti or the Magdalen Islands (as the case may be) and the mainland, may probably be interrupted during such election by the severity of the season, he may direct that all necessary instructions and intelligence relating to such election may be transmitted by telegraph to and by the proper deputy returning officer or officers, by and to the returning officer, so that he may be informed of the number of votes given for each candidate, and of other matters relating to the election, and be enabled to return the candidate having the majority, or to make such other return as the case may require; and the Governor in Council may make such order as to the details of the proceedings at such election, depending on such telegraphic communication, as to him may seem proper for best attaining the purposes of this Act.

We do not propose to vote by telegraph, but to carry on the proceedings of the election by telegraph. Instead of sending the proclamations, writs and appointments by letter, they will be sent by telegraph, and the reports will be made by returning officers by telegraph. The most important communications are now made by telegraph and are as sure as if made by letter, because they are repeated, and when a telegram is repeated we have the strongest assurance that it has been sent correctly. The ballot boxes will be made at the Magdalen Islands, bulletins printed there, and the elections carried on in winter as in summer, the only difference being that instead of sending the information by letter it will be sent by telegraph. The telegraph system in those islands is owned by and under the control of the Government. Some people will say that might give rise to fraud, but the candidates will also be able to telegraph for information, so that there cannot be any fraud.

Mr. BLAKE. It appears to me this clause stands on the Orders of the Day, in a Bill which is ordered to be read a second time. Is it in order to propose the clause on this occasion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There cannot be any exception to this motion, because it is not a Bill but a resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. I find a Bill on the Orders of the Day proposing to carry out the object proposed in this clause. The House has ordered that the Bill be read a second time, and it now stands on the Orders of the Day. The point of order is whether we can anticipate the decision of the House on that question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a Bill on the Orders of the Day, but this is not a Bill. This is a resolution, and, therefore, it does not prevent the Bill on the Orders of the Day being taken up as ordered.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am not aware that if a private member thinks fit to introduce a Bill and put it on

the Orders of the Day, there is any reason why the Government should not adopt a similar clause, and introduce it into a Bill introduced by the Government for a general purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not aware that the hon. member for Gaspé was a member of the Government.

Mr. CAMERON. I did not say he was a member of the Government, but I said: 'That if a private member introduced a Bill, that was no reason why the Government should not incorporate a clause similar to the Bill in a Government measure.'

Mr. BLAKE. The Government is not proposing this amendment, it is the hon. member for Gaspé who is moving it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He introduced it as a member of the House and not as a member of the Government, and the members of the Government have no greater privileges in that regard than any other member.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty that strikes me in reference to the merits of the hon. gentleman's clause is one upon which I would like a little further information before giving it my adhesion. Of course we must all be desirous that the difficulties attending the communication with a portion of the county of Gaspé should be remedied if practicable, and the only question is whether we can remedy them and give adequate securities for the results of the election being properly declared. The difficulty that occurs to me is that of identifying in some way the written communication of a returning officer. The hon. gentleman says there will be no difficulty because candidates can send despatches too, but the candidates' despatches will not be authentic records of what has occurred in the Magdalen Islands. You have further to be assured that the despatch which is written on the other side by the returning officer was really signed by him. There is not that evidence. There is no provision which insures its being the act of the returning officer of the other side which reaches the chief returning officer on this side.

Mr. FORTIN. I think that difficulty is very slight, because the hon. gentleman knows that all the telegraph operators are sworn, and if the proclamation, for instance, is sent by telegraph from Percé round to Meat Cove, and then by cable to the Magdalen Islands, it passes through the hands of people who are sworn. One of the returning officers receives that, and some time afterwards he receives a second copy, and if that copy is a *fac-simile*, then he has got the material proof that it is the proclamation that has been posted at Percé. It is not possible that an election can take place in the county of Gaspé without its being telegraphed by many persons from the Islands to the mainland. Supposing frauds were attempted, the friends of the candidates would have already telegraphed that an election was going to take place, that the proclamation was going to be issued on such a day, and that such a person was to be returning officer. There is no possibility of fraud being practised.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would see the possibility if he were to consider the effects of proposing that all the instructions and all the returns by the different returning officers throughout the Dominion might be transmitted by telegraph. It may be true that the telegraph operators are sworn, but the telegraph operator, when he receives a despatch, never enquires if the signature is the genuine signature of the party who transmits it. There is no security that anything which is despatched as the return of the returning officer is really his return.

Mr. FORTIN. The hon. gentleman has forgotten what I said about all the telegrams being repeated, and that where a second copy is found to be the *fac-simile* of the

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

first despatch, then it is material proof that it is the genuine despatch. When an election takes place numerous telegrams will be sent from the Magdalen Islands to the mainland, and there will be no chance of fraud being necessarily practised. Moreover, nothing can be gained by fraud. I bring in this Bill in order to give those people a chance to exercise their rights as Canadian voters. I have a special reason for that because the elections in the Magdalen Islands take place after the others on account of the difficulty in reaching them in winter. There is a maximum time and a minimum time, and the Government would consult their own interests in choosing either one or the other. In 1878 I would have come forward for the Local House to defeat for the third time the candidate who opposed me in the Local House, but how could I do it? The Government at Quebec, instead of choosing the maximum time so as to give a chance to these people to vote, they chose the minimum time to exclude these voters, and therefore I did not come forward. In the fall I came forward for the Federal House, and the Government chose the maximum time so as to have the election in the winter in order to disqualify the Magdalen Islands people again. But they could not do it because the maximum time was not long enough. But the voting took place during a storm and I lost about 400 votes, though I still had 900 of a majority.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not answered the difficulty at all, but he has supplied a very important reason why another portion of his clause should not pass in its present shape. The hon. gentleman has told the House that when discretionary power was in the hands of the Government, it was improperly used, and his late opponent, Mr. Flynn, secured election in Gaspé. The proposal, however, was to place the whole details in the hands of the Government. If it is intended to announce the result of the polls by telegraph it should be surrounded by many precautions. The repetition of the telegram is no security of the correctness of the measure, and among the other safeguards there should be one for identifying the returning officer who sends the telegram.

Mr. FORTIN. The Government will have no discretion. The voting at Magdalen Islands will take place at the same time as on the mainland. The arrangements for voting will be so closely watched that fraud will be impossible. If fraud should take place, nothing would be gained because the ballot boxes would be forwarded as soon as navigation opened.

Mr. BLAKE. If we are going to accept returns by telegraph, the arrangements should be surrounded with every precaution, and these should be determined by Parliament and not by the Governor in Council.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we had better accept for the present an amendment providing that a return shall also be made in the same way as other returns, and that in the case where the telegraphic return varies from the written one the latter shall be accepted. Before the Bill comes to the third reading I shall have the amendment drafted in proper form, providing that the return shall be forwarded to the Clerk to be dealt with by the House in case there is a variation.

On clause 6,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is this change made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason the change is made is that in the first place the returning officers provided for by the present law are not in any way the servants or officers of the Dominion, but the servants and officers of the Provinces. They are in no way under the control of the Dominion Parliament, except that they may be brought to the Bar of the House and punished for misdemeanors. They are not obliged to perform this duty; they can refuse

to do it, and more than that, I mean to say I have no confidence in a certain number of these officers. They are the creatures of the Local Government, and if the Local Government chooses to put pressure on them there is great danger of their being governed by those who appointed them. It is for those reasons that I think the returning officers should be considered in every respect as Dominion officers, that this amendment has been proposed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. How can the hon. gentleman obtain more control over one set of officers than he has over another? What does it matter if they are local officers, he will have the same control over them precisely.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no counteracting influence.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No; the hon. gentleman simply wants to try another dodge in order to appoint men who will make returns such as used to scandalize the whole country. We know what sort of returns were made by his appointees in the past. The system in operation has, undoubtedly, worked well, and I am not aware that any difficulty has arisen.

Mr. BOULTBEE. There is no doubt that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) is fighting for something of great interest to his party. It is of great importance for them to retain returning officers appointed by the Local Government, because in more than one instance, in more than twenty instances in Ontario, the grossest favoritism has been shown by them, and they have thrown serious obstructions in the way of the Conservative party. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Strange) mentioned a case of which I am cognizant in which a registry office was made the Grit headquarters, and the business of the office could scarcely be carried on. In South Wellington, where certificates were being asked from Sheriff Gow for the purpose of enabling certain parties who were agents to vote, he stated, on more than a dozen occasions, in order to prevent them from voting, that he would have to consult his solicitor, who is the present member for South Wellington. I hold that as it is notorious that the influence of these men has been directed to prevent freedom in the elections, in almost in every instance the Conservative party and the Dominion Government should have the power of appointing officers who would do their duty fairly and honorably.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There are certainly as many Conservative registrars and sheriffs, and a great many more in some of the Provinces, I am sure. There was no object whatever in making the present law except to avoid the scandal that had existed of appointing officers who were brought directly under political influences, while these men were not.

Mr. BOULTBEE. It may be that there are more Conservatives than Reformers, but no case is alleged against those appointed by the Conservatives. The case is alleged only in the case of those appointed by the Grit Government, and that is where the trouble is.

Mr. GUTHRIE. This is the first time I have heard any charge of partizanship against Sheriff Gow. I do not believe it, but I believe that the hon. gentleman has been misinformed. Anyone who knows Sheriff Gow knows that he is incapable of doing injustice to any political party. My recollection of his proceedings is that he appointed the same deputy returning officers as his predecessor, the late Sheriff Grange did, unless they were dead or removed. I do not think the hon. gentleman has been correctly informed at all. That is not the sort of man Sheriff Gow is.

Mr. BOULTBEE. I did not say that complaints were made by the hon. member for South Wellington, but I have heard Conservatives complain that he delayed the certificates.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Of course I do not say that he did not, but what I do say is that it is entirely different from the character he holds. I never heard him charged with any misconduct in the performance of his duty as returning officer.

Mr. MILLS. The point to be kept in mind in the consideration of this clause is that the Government are a party in the matter. They will not stand indifferently between those engaged in the electoral contest. The Crown dissolves Parliament on their advice; they go to the country; the Crown makes appointments on their advice, and in every instance they are the parties who appoint returning officers, and there is very much greater danger of abuse, of improper conduct on the part of returning officers who are subject to the influence of one of the parties in the contest, than there is when the returning officers are appointed by some outside party. If the Government cannot trust men in high official positions, who have social and political positions to lose by improper conduct, how much less can those be trusted who will be appointed by the Administration for the time being. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied to take the sheriffs for returning officers, why does he not designate a class in the Bill? Why does he not give Parliament power to appoint returning officers, who being once appointed by Parliament, would not be under the immediate control of the Administration. We all know how the returning officers acted when the Government appointed them. We know what took place in the representation of North Renfrew. A candidate who was defeated by nearly 200 votes was returned to this House, and the hon. gentleman defended his return. There were Mr. Sheepskinski, Mr. Calfskinski, and many others reported as voting for the candidate; and we know that the gentleman so returned succeeded in retaining his seat until that Parliament was dissolved. I refer to the return of Mr. O'Reilly. In West Peterboro' also we had the returning officer sitting in judgment on the qualification of one of the candidates and deciding that his qualification was not sufficient; and although he received a majority of votes, he was kept out of his seat by the returning officer who sent another gentleman here who occupied the seat during two Sessions. An improper return was made in the same way from Muskoka; and all these cases arose from the partizan character of the returning officers appointed under the law as it existed before 1874. When the hon. member for Lambton went to the country in 1874, he acted upon the principle set forth in the law now upon the Statute-book and which the hon. gentleman proposes to repeal. Was there a single complaint of anyone being improperly returned, of anyone being kept out of his seat in consequence of improper conduct on the part of a returning officer on that occasion?

Mr. BANNERMAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman name one case. I do not know of one. We know that in many cases in which partizans were appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, they were disqualified by their partizanship from discharging the duties of their office. In my own constituency the hon. gentleman appointed as returning officer one of the most violent political partizans in that constituency. He went outside of the constituency for deputies, so that the Tory party might not lose a vote in the election, and he appointed Reformers as poll clerks, and in this way prevented twenty or thirty persons from voting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They could vote.

Mr. MILLS. No; under the law they were not at liberty to vote; and I know that these poll clerks were not paid, although, I believe, the returning officer received the money to cover the expenses of the election. It is perfectly obvious that the proposition of the hon. gentleman is utterly inconsistent with everything like fair dealing in an election contest. He knows right well that no one who is not an active

and ardent supporter of his own will be appointed. The first qualification that a returning officer will have to possess is that he is a friend of the Administration, and I say the Government is as much disqualified for advising the Crown in this matter as a member is in a question in which he has a personal interest. The hon. gentleman has made out no case. He has not shown that any abuse exists under the law as it stands; he has not shown a single case in which a returning officer has made an improper return in which he has returned the candidate in a minority, or kept out the candidate entitled to the seat. Yet the hon. gentleman, without showing a single abuse, and without any facts to warrant it, proposes this change in the law. What should be the rule to guide the Legislature? That it should make such changes, as experience shows necessary for the removal of real abuses and grievances, is patent to everybody. The hon. member for Lambton has stated truly that the majority of the returning officers belong to the side of the Government, to which a large majority of officials in Quebec, Ontario and the other Provinces belong. But, not satisfied with that, he insists that the returning officers shall be his creatures and appointees. The present law is just and satisfactory to both parties; like the other propositions of this Bill, the present is intended to load the dice in favor of the hon. Premier and his supporters.

Mr. BOULTBEE. The hon. member for Bothwell argues that the returning officers should not be appointed for Dominion elections by the Dominion Government, because they would be subject to its influence, whereas the appointees of the Ontario Government would not be subject to its influence. If the Ontario Government was taking a proper position on this matter, his argument would be good; but they are notoriously not taking the proper position, and the chief opponents of the Conservative party in Ontario at present is the Ontario Local Government. We find its hostility everywhere. It is an open secret that as regards the questions to be brought before the country at the next elections, including the boundary question and the Streams Bill, that the Government of Ontario and the leader of the Opposition have been in consultation for hours, days and weeks, getting up a case—not trying to effect a proper settlement of these questions, but to bring them into a shape by which trouble may be caused for their political advantage. The hon. leader of the Opposition and Mr. Mowat do not want the boundary question settled, preferring it should be a leading question at the next elections. Instead of, as the hon. member for Bothwell says, returning officers who hold offices under the Ontario Government being free and unbiassed, they are the worst biassed men we have to meet, and they are acting in every shape and in every place against us. Why within the last two days, I have learned how the whole pressure of the Ontario Government is being used in East York against myself. The tavern-keepers are being told, that they shall not have their licenses if they do not pledge themselves to vote for the hon. member for Lambton instead of me; and the Division Court clerk is canvassing against me. When we find the tactics so apparent and general—when those men tell you: I cannot vote for you, although I am a Conservative, for I shall lose my license and my bread, it is seen that their action is dictated by the principles of business. And yet we have the hon. member for Bothwell declaring: We want those returning officers appointed by the Ontario Government, and under their immediate control—we want those unbiassed men left in charge of the Dominion elections. If there ever was anything necessary to preserve the liberty of election, it is that the Dominion Government should have the right to appoint men who will conduct them free from party bias, fairly and properly. It has not and cannot be alleged, at least within my memory, that any returning officer appointed by the Conservative Gov-

Mr. MILLS.

ernment has acted unfairly. Such officers appointed by the Ontario Government, would, like the license inspectors at present, try to coerce the people and prevent freedom and fairness in the elections. The Commons of Canada should not be governed by the Ontario Legislature, or be subjected to its Ministerial cabals. The Dominion Government should appoint their own officers for this as for other duties.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement the hon. gentleman has just made with reference to myself and Mr. Mowat, is utterly and entirely and absolutely without foundation in fact. Mr. Mowat never consulted me on any one step of this controversy as to what he should do; he never communicated to me his intended course. I never gave him any expression of opinion as to what he should do, and was never aware of any one step he proposed to take through the whole of this controversy until the public became aware of it.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Bothwell stated he had not heard of any case in which a sheriff interfered in the elections. Now, we have in Stratford, I presume, as respectable a sheriff as the Reform party are in the habit of appointing, and without finding fault with him I may give an instance of such intermeddling. We have a police magistrate in Stratford appointed by the Mowat Administration, contrary to the will of the people. We are compelled to pay him \$1,200 a year to deal out even-handed justice to all, irrespective of their politics. But the partizan sheriff selected the partizan appointee of a partizan Government, one who went no less than twenty miles to act as deputy returning officer in a division of my county where it was notorious his co-religionists were found to a large extent. It was not for the benefit of the public that he was selected, but to influence voters connected with his own church. In another case, a bailiff was selected for a scrutineer for another division, and who carried into a poor settlement a large number of judgments and executions to influence voters. We know what influence they had on the electors. With such influences as these against us, my friends and myself feel we are unfairly handicapped in the elections. When such cases as that occur, it is high time the Government should take into their hands the selecting of the returning officers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the selection by the Government of a returning officer prevent a police magistrate voting if he pleases? He has as good a right to vote as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the appointment of a police magistrate as a scrutineer for a returning officer? I gave you a clear case of partizanship, and by a respectable gentleman too.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has not made out any case. He has not shown any improper conduct on the part of any officer appointed. With reference to the observation of the hon. member for East York that the sheriff and the registrars are appointed by the Local Government, they are not appointed for this purpose. They are Dominion officers—officers of this Government, and the mere fact that they are discharging the duties of returning officers depends on the Statute which the hon. gentleman proposes to repeal. Sheriffs and registrars being permanent officers of the Local Government are no more under its control as returning officers than would be the judges in any of our courts under the control of the Government. What the hon. gentleman wants is not justice or neutrality on the part of returning officers. He wants them to be violent partizans on his own side, and is, therefore, very anxious that this Government should appoint them. We know how these men act. I have given instances of their returning candidates who were in a minority, and those candidates were enabled, through the influence of the Government, to sit here for two or three Sessions. The hon. gentleman who proposed to

change the law has not cited one case where a returning officer acted improperly.

Mr. BOULTBEE. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken says that I have not shown a single case. We have asserted, and I do not think it can be denied, that the North York registrar's office was used as a room for committee meetings, and that the sheriff in Guelph delayed people who wanted certificates for voting under the pretence that he had to get counsel's opinion first. Hon. gentlemen opposite say the Ontario Government does not interfere. The Premier of Ontario, in talking on the question during last Session, said he would meet this Government on that question at the polls. What did he mean by that but that we would have the whole force of the Ontario Government against us. Every possible means, every sheriff and division court bailiff and license inspector, and every creature they have, is used against us.

Mr. BANNERMAN. The hon. member for Bothwell said he knew of no case where a returning officer had acted unfairly since 1874. I can show where a returning officer, the registrar of the county of Renfrew, declared on a nomination day that the present Auditor-General was elected through a flaw in our nomination paper; and when appeal was made to Judge Wilson, he in his judgment condemned that returning officer for the action he took. That returning officer, moreover, never appointed a deputy, or a clerk, or anything else, without first consulting the head-centre of the Liberal Association in Renfrew.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We have had under the present system the elections of 1874 and 1878, or, I suppose, about 450 individual elections. In my judgment and experience of twenty-five years I maintain the grievances have been very exceptional and slight, and the present system is the best one. There is no necessity for the change. Because there is some antagonism between Ontario and the Federal Government, why should the other Provinces be interfered with? If we go back to the old system we will have returning officers like the one brought before this House who asked for twenty-four hours consideration to reply to the question as to what was his name.

Mr. LANDRY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that this law has been in operation since 1874. It was framed after the elections of 1874. The principle was voted upon in the county of Montmagny, where they did not choose either the sheriff or the registrar, but they selected men of their own party to act as returning officers. If the hon. member for L'Islet does not want any changes in his constituency it is because he has a registrar named by the late Joly Government, who is ready to do what he has done already.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I deny that, Sir.

Mr. LANDRY. He did place the polls at the end of parishes, though I do not know that it was at the solicitation of my hon. friend. It was done and he profited by it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire entirely to contradict what has been said. There was no complaint at the last local or Federal election.

Mr. FARROW. In my own riding a partizan returning officer was appointed by the Mackenzie Government—one of the worst partizans that could be found. The village of Brussels belonged half to me and the other half to Centre Huron, and this officer ordered all the votes to be polled in North Huron and they did so, and that same half again polled its vote in Centre Huron. I have often wondered how the late Premier can wear such a long, serious, and sanctimonious face when he knows that such facts took place under his Administration.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I can only say that this is the first time I have heard of any impropriety of the returning

officer. In large counties where there is only one registrar and one sheriff, of course some one else has to be appointed. I know nothing about the appointment, and have no recollection of the circumstance at all. The fact that we took that function deliberately out of the hands of the Government showed that we had no other object to serve than to have the public work done properly.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If what the hon. member for North Huron told us is correct, it is a very strong argument why we should not adopt this clause. We are told that in his riding neither the sheriff nor the registrar was appointed the returning officer, the reason, no doubt, was that they were acting as returning officers in the other riding. As they had to get somebody else, he tells us they selected a violent partizan, of whose conduct he complains. Now, that is precisely what we wish to prevent by passing this amendment. We want to prevent the selection of strong partizans, and to leave that duty in the hands of men of established character.

Mr. BOWELL. The remarks of the last speaker afford rather an argument that the law should not remain as it is now. If in a county where there are three ridings there are only two officers provided for, under the law, it would follow that the appointment of a third officer would be necessary.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Sometimes there are two registration officers.

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking of cases where there are not two, of which my own county is one. There are three ridings, and in every case the Government has had to appoint an additional returning officer. In my own riding I am glad to say that the registrar, though appointed by the Reform Government, is a gentleman in whom I have the most implicit confidence. But there is a sheriff in the adjoining county who, in the last Dominion election, gave certificates to doubtful voters and sent them into rural sections of the county to act as agents of the candidates and there depositing their vote. It is men of that kind who should not occupy the position of returning officer. I know it is not the intention of the present Government to overlook the sheriffs and registrars, who are believed to be impartial men, and these will receive appointments. But where cases of the kind to which I refer have occurred, it is the duty of the Government to see that such men do not get a similar appointment again. The hon. member for Bothwell told us he knew of a Tory returning officer who took the trouble to go out of the division to select returning officers who had no votes, and he afterwards told us that, under the law as it then existed, the returning officers had they had votes could have not recorded their votes; and in the next sentence he told us, that by going into an adjoining county and bringing young men who had no votes, he disfranchised thirty or forty returning officers. If that is logic I do not understand it.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say so.

Mr. BOWELL. By what means then did he disfranchise the returning officers, unless he appointed those who had votes? When this question was under discussion in the House I remember calling attention to the fact that in constituencies where the contest was likely to be close, a partizan returning officer, or a returning officer who intentionally appointed friends of one particular party, might by that means carry an election, and the law was then repealed. Now the hon. member for East York referred to a threat on the part of the Ontario Premier. Hon. gentlemen know very well that in discussing the question of the boundary, on which we have not yet had the very valuable opinion of the leader of the Opposition, they stated distinctly and boldly and in a threatening tone that it was at the elections, that they hoped would take place in 1883,

that they would test this question. Judging from the character of some of the men whom Mr. Mowat has appointed to the position of returning officers, any honest man would shrink from going through an election if such men were to be returning officers. We know that men who have been appointed sheriffs have been disrobed for improper conduct by the Judges of the Court. They may be perfectly honest, but if they were dishonest in the administration of funds placed in their hands, it is not likely they would be honest if they could serve their masters who gave them a living. I know that in the town where I live the license commissioner, to whom an hon. member has already referred, is known and has been proved to have accepted bribes from different tavern-keepers before he would grant a license; yet when this fact was published, and the Ontario Government knew it as well as the people of Belleville, he was reappointed to the position he had disgraced. The friends of the Ontario Government were so disgusted with this reappointment that they induced his colleagues not to meet at the board with him; and the Mowat Government was again compelled to relieve him of the responsibility, and to prevent him blackmailing persons who desired to obtain licenses. We know that the fact is patent in every constituency, that unless the keepers of licensed houses voted in a certain manner they would not obtain licenses; that men who had been keeping respectable houses, against which no complaint had been made, from ten years to a quarter of a century, were deprived of their licenses because they were Conservatives and could not be convinced into taking political action against their party. If no difficulty has arisen of appointing returning officers in counties in which there were not sufficient sheriffs or registrars, we have as good a right to believe that the men appointed shall be responsible to the Government, will be just as honest in the administration of their office of returning officer, and more so than men who are not responsible to the Government practically, if opposed to them, but rather would be inclined to serve the cause of a Local Government by placing difficulties in the way of any candidate he desired to defeat. I have no fear of any of the results to which hon. gentlemen have referred arising from the appointment of returning officers, nor do I believe the Government will pass over the heads of appointees of the Ontario Government. But where returning officers have been known to act partially it is well that the Government of the day, whether Conservative or Reform, should have power to teach those men that they should not commit acts of that kind in future.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Customs seems to have more to do with the elections than the hon. First Minister, and is in antagonism with the hon. First Minister with respect to this matter. The former hon. gentleman declares that appointees will not be passed over, while the latter thinks that such persons holding office under a Local Government should not be appointed returning officers. It is difficult to know what is the principle which is about to regulate Executive action. We have heard a good deal of the misdeeds of returning officers, but such as have been stated on this side of the House are cases which have been before Parliament or a judicial body, while the cases brought forward by hon. gentlemen opposite have not received any sifting or investigation. The Reform party, for a long time, advocated this proposition. They advocated it a long time ago, when the great bulk of the officers was under the control of the Government of Ontario, holding views different from our own. They were unsuccessful in securing its adoption, because the Government insisted on keeping the power in their own hands. When they came into power it was the rule that registrars or sheriffs should be returning officers, but such officers were equal to the occasion. It was with reference to such a Government, animated by such a sentiment, having appointed these officers and having

Mr. BOWELL.

control of them, that my hon. friend, in furtherance of the general principle to which I have referred, deliberately proposed to Parliament to tie his hands and the hands of any future Government by providing that these officers should be appointed from amongst those ranks. Hon. gentlemen did not oppose it then; they did not object to it then; they thought it was all right, they thought it would help them; but no sooner than they get into power they change their minds. It was a good thing to tie our hands, but a bad thing to tie theirs, and they want to free themselves from the tie the House imposed. My hon. friend tied his own hands, because it was well that all Governments should have their hands tied in this regard, and that we should accept the proposition that the general standing of these officers, the responsibility they were under to the community in which they lived, was a better guarantee, on the whole, for our having good, honest and impartial returning officers, than to place the appointment in the uncontrolled hands and at the uncontrolled disposal of the Government of the day, who would thus be allowed full license to name whom they pleased for the purpose of discharging the duty of deciding whether they or their adversaries were the elected representatives of the people. I admit that there may be cases where the sheriff or the registrar is not the best man. I admit that there are bad sheriffs and bad registrars; but the question is, whether it would not be vastly better, even with these few exceptional cases, to entrust these particular duties to such men than to place their appointment at the uncontrolled discretion of the Government of the day to appoint its own creatures. I think that on the whole you are sure to get as a general rule respectable men for returning officers under the present plan, but you are proposing to substitute the control to the Government of the day in a matter of which the Government of the day is not indifferent, in which it has an interest, in which it is one of the parties and in which their wish will be that a returning officer may be favorable to their own side. The Minister of Customs says he could not understand my hon. friend's argument; but it was perfectly plain. The returning officer in that county wanted to have partizan returning officers, but he did not want to lose any votes in Bothwell, so he took men from another county who had not votes there and put them in as returning officers. He had his creatures there to do his bidding and yet he lost no votes, and he appointed poll clerks, supporters of my hon. friend who were under the control of the deputy returning officers sworn to do their duty, and they did it and they were deprived of their votes.

Mr. BOWELL. They need not have taken the office unless they liked.

Mr. BLAKE. No, of course, they need not, had they cared to forfeit £10 each as that is the fine for refusal. I know a case in which a most active supporter of mine in one of the townships I was contesting was chosen the day before polling. He was the gentleman upon whom I mainly depended for organization in that particular township, and the £10 had to be paid in order to release him. In other words, he was fined £10 because he was an active supporter of mine.

Mr. BOWELL. I had a case in which they served the papers after 12 o'clock in order to compel him to serve the next morning.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly; abuses have occurred and they do occur. I do not suppose that abuses will be altogether avoided under the law as it now stands. I do not say that the sheriffs and registrars are in every case the pick and lead of the community, but on the whole you have better securities by this plan than by a plan by which you make a party to the contest judge of who shall decide between the parties as returning officer. One word with regard to

a particular feature of this debate. We have, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in this discussion, a dead set against the Ontario Government, against the appointment of their officers and the conduct of their officers. I do not know about these transactions, and I shall not discuss them, but I say it is most extraordinary conduct to impugn a Provincial Government as their conduct has been impugned in this House. It is a course which has never been taken before with reference to any Provincial Government; and whether the Ontario Government be right or wrong, hon. gentlemen should remember that it commands the esteem, the respect and the confidence of a large majority of the people of Ontario, and I believe Ontario will resent such conduct on the part of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I am surprised that the hon. gentleman looks at this provision of the Bill as a new one, and when I say it is not I will not speak on my own authority, but I will give an authority which I believe is worthy of the respect of hon. gentlemen opposite. I look upon the old law—the one passed by the late Administration—as not being imperative. It was not imperative on the part of the Government to address the writs of election to the sheriff or registrar. In 1878, in a contest which then took place in my own county, the writ was addressed, not to the sheriff or the registrar, but to a notary of the county. The sheriff, it is true, had sent a letter to the Government saying he would not act, but the registrar did not do so and he was willing to act. This was done under the authority of the then Minister of Justice, who is an able lawyer; so that I do not regard the principle of the Bill as a new one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish to make another amendment, providing that the elections in Muskoka shall take place on the same day, as in other parts of Canada. This change is made at the request of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Cockburn), and I think it is a proper one, as there is no necessity for having the elections on a different day than in the case of the Province.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree that this change is quite correct, and I believe that Mr. O'Brien, the opponent of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Cockburn), agreed in that view. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether, in the present state of things, Manitoba might not also be brought within the same provision, as we are now within three and a-half days of that Province, and it is quite as accessible as many points of the Dominion. It is nearer in fact, than Cape Breton or the Island is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how it would affect the outlying districts, but I will consider it before the third reading.

Mr. BLAKE. Even if exceptional time were given for the return of the writs, there would be no reason why the elections should not be held on the same day.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I wish to allude to an anomaly which exists in the Dominion Election Law, and which has been complained of almost every Session since the law has been enacted. The law imposes a tax of \$50 upon each candidate, the object being to prevent bogus candidates from interfering in an election contest. But this amount was not deemed a penalty to a man who would put a constituency to the trouble of an election uselessly; and there was a Bill proposed this Session by my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who is unfortunately absent, and I think the present occasion is favorable for introducing the provision of his Bill as a new section in this Bill.

I will therefore move that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

Section 19 of the Act last cited is hereby amended by striking out all the words after "nomination paper," on the fifth line of the said section, and by substituting the following:

Nor unless a sum of \$200 be deposited into the hands of the returning officer at the time the nomination paper shall be filed with him. And the receipt of the returning officer shall in every case be sufficient evidence of the production of the nomination paper, consent of candidate and of the payment herein mentioned:—The sum so deposited by any candidate shall be returned to him in the event of his being elected or of his obtaining at least one-half of the votes polled in favor of the candidate elected, otherwise it shall belong to Her Majesty for the public uses of Canada; and the sum so paid and not returned, as herein provided, shall be applied by the returning officer towards the payment of the election expenses, and an account thereof shall be rendered by him to the Auditor-General of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. This amendment has taken us very much by surprise, and I regret that the hon. gentleman has not seen fit to have given some notice of it; and I invite the attention of the Government to the fact that this very important question was postponed at their own suggestion at an early period of the Session, in order to give us an opportunity of considering it. It does not seem to me that there is now an opportunity of debating it. I myself stated my views at that time, and they are not at all changed. I have never very much favored a deposit at all. I have never very much favored the view that if a deposit is put in, it should be irrevocably lost to the candidate, and I so far agreed with the views of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe as to assist him to secure a change in the law by which the deposits should be returned. But to increase that deposit may place a very serious practical check upon the freedom of the people in the nomination of the candidates. I object to increasing it to a substantial sum like \$200. I believe we never had any deposit at all until it was proposed to substitute a written nomination for an open nomination. In the open nomination there was nothing to prevent a bogus candidature and that sort of public opinion which gathers around the hustings; and when it was proposed, on the adoption of the election by ballot, to substitute written nominations for oral nominations, it was said: "You have not got the check of that public opinion which surrounds a public nomination on the hustings, and, therefore, it may be, if the nominations are to be made privately by a written paper, that bogus nominations will be put in." Then it was said that the number of voters required might be increased, and it was increased, I think, to twenty-five. It now requires twenty-five electors to sign and file a written nomination paper, and the consent of the candidate, if in the country, shall also be filed. I am also inclined to think that an ample security, quite as good without any deposit, speaking for the feelings and social action of the people of our Province with whose political modes of thought I am more acquainted, without anything more. But it was proposed to do something more to prevent a few persons eager for a contest from embarking in it—to put a legal check upon them, this deposit of \$50 came into the Bill as a further security. As I said already, I do not admire very much that principle, and now to increase the amount to \$200, I think, would be a great mistake. But to provide the \$50 deposit shall be returned in the event in which the hon. gentleman proposes the \$200 should be returned, seems to me not unreasonable. It seems to make the law less absurd than otherwise it would be and to place less of a restriction to people who nominate candidates. I therefore propose to amend this clause by substituting \$50 for the amount of \$200.

Mr. BUNSTER. Early in the Session I announced my wish to amend the clause by proposing that the sum of \$250 be deposited by each candidate, the successful candidate to receive the money. I would like now to make the deposit

\$500 for the benefit of the successful candidate. I will move an amendment later.

Mr. OUIMET. It seems to be admitted by the hon. leader of the Opposition that there must be some check on bogus candidates, since we have no longer open nominations. During the last contest I had an opponent in my county, who vanished before he could get twenty-five electors to sign his paper. But there were bogus candidates in the counties of Terrebonne, Two Mountains and Beauharnois, one in each who did not poll ten votes each. This abuse should be terminated. I think the deposit of \$200 not too high, as any *bond fide* candidate can raise it, either himself or by his friends. It would not prevent any good man from coming forward, but would prove a bar to bogus candidates.

Mr. MILLS. It would be rather extraordinary if the hon. First Minister supports this proposal to discourage the nomination of candidates, after expressing the hope at Toronto that his friends would permit no Opposition candidate to be elected by acclamation. We have two great parties in the country; but there may be a number of electors in various constituencies who do not agree with either when they wish to put a candidate in the field, not with the expectation that he will succeed, but in order to have their views proclaimed on the hustings and propagated throughout the country, and they ought not to be hindered from doing so. Now, this proposition is a proposal to fine men, who, though they should be in a large minority, undertake to express their views on the hustings, and before the candidates in the field. That would be a restriction upon freedom of election, and wholly at variance with the spirit and principles of representative Government. How is a candidate to know what the chances may be at an election, and why should he, if he does not poll a certain number of votes, be subjected to a fine of \$200. It is the right of a minority to nominate and elect a candidate if they can; and if there is any class that ought to enjoy the special protection of the law it is the minority. What was the object in requiring twenty-five electors to sign a nomination paper? To settle the *bond fides* of the candidate who seeks election. If twenty-five are not enough increase it to fifty or 100; but there is no reason shown for requiring a deposit to be forfeited if a certain number of votes are not polled. I believe the choice of the electors should be as free and unrestricted as possible. I am opposed to the proposition and will support the amendment of my hon. friend in preference. I am in favor of removing the provision of the law relating to money deposits, either absolutely or conditionally, from the Statutes.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. member forgets that the law was enacted by the late Government.

Mr. MILLS. I know that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. According to this amendment the unsuccessful candidate must have one-half the number of the successful candidate. Suppose there are 1,000 votes and four candidates, and the successful candidate gets 501. These then will have 163 each, or together half the votes polled, yet each one would have to forfeit his deposit.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At this late hour of the night I do not intend to occupy much time in placing this resolution before the House. The whole question is so thoroughly familiar to the members of the House, and is so fully set forth in the papers which have been distributed, and the subject, in one form or another, has so long engaged the attention of Parliament, that I do not think it will be necessary to detain the House very long in explaining the pro-

Mr. BUNSTER.

posal of these resolutions. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in 1871, a Commission, composed of gentlemen well qualified to deal with the question of trade communication, was appointed to consider the enlargement and extension of the canal system of Canada. That Commission, after very careful consideration, embodied their views in a report which was adopted by the Government and received the unanimous approval of Parliament. I do not now remember that any gentleman on either side of this Parliament took any exception to the conclusion to which that Commission arrived. I will remind the House that in proposing to enlarge the Welland, St. Lawrence and Lachine Canals their attention was directed to the question of the Baie Verte Canal. They divided the different canals upon which they reported into three classes—those that were considered most important in the interest of the whole Dominion were placed in the first class, those which were next in importance in the second class, and the others in the third; they placed the construction of the Baie Verte Canal in the first, as they regarded it of the greatest importance to the interests of the Dominion. I will read a brief extract from this report which will show the importance they attached to the construction of that canal:

“Inseparately connected with the growth of intercolonial trade is the construction of the Baie Verte Canal across the isthmus connecting the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

“The advantages that must occur, not only to the Dominion as a whole, but to the commerce of the Maritime Provinces, are so clearly pointed out by the Boards of Trade of all the leading cities of Canada, and by men largely interested in the development of our growing commercial interests, not simply the merchants of St. John and other places in the locality of the proposed canal, but merchants of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec, that it is superfluous for the Commissioners to do more than briefly to refer to a few features of the scheme.”

Now, Sir, I may say that this question also engaged the attention of the Boards of Trade in the various cities referred to. Those of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and others took the question up, and having examined in the light of the commercial interests of Canada, resolved with great unanimity that it was of great importance to the trade and commerce of Canada that that canal should be constructed. The Government adopted the policy suggested by the Commission and brought it down to this House, and I believe it received the unanimous sanction of the House. In connection with other appropriations for the enlargement of the canals to which I have referred, \$1,000,000 was appropriated by Parliament for the commencement of the Baie Verte Canal. The Government had surveys previously made for the purpose of ascertaining the cost. Messrs. Keefer and Gzowski reported, after a very careful survey had been made, that it would cost between five and six million dollars to construct the canal on the line they proposed, a line that is absolutely the same as that which is now proposed for this ship railway. The Government, under the belief that the canal could be constructed for \$5,000,000, were planning to place that work under contract when a change of Government took place in 1873. The hon. member for Lambton, then at the head of the Government, embodied the views of his Government in the most formal and authoritative manner in the speech with which Parliament was opened in the Session of 1874, and a clause of that speech reads as follows:—

“Canal and harbor improvements are being regularly prosecuted with a view to ensure adequate accommodation for the rapidly growing trade of the country. The report of the Chief Engineers of the Department of Public Works on the proposed canal between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy will be submitted for your consideration.”

Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer of the Canals, as here stated, had been called upon to take up the estimates and survey that had been previously made. In the Estimates of that year \$1,000,000 had been voted, and that was repeated in

the Session of 1875, although the hon. member for Lambton is aware that at the time Mr. Page had made his report that this canal would involve an expenditure of eight or nine million dollars on the route that he considered best. The large increase over the appropriation which it was found necessary to ask for caused some further examination, and the hon. member leading the Government, having given this subject consideration, stated in very emphatic terms that if the canal could be constructed for the estimate of Messrs. Gzowski and Keefer, he should consider himself bound to proceed with the work, and he proposed to test that question by asking for tenders for the work in order to ascertain whether it could be constructed for that amount, and if the result showed that it could be, he was prepared to go on with it. Subsequently, however, Government sought to institute by a Commission to ascertain whether the commercial features of the work would warrant so large an expenditure as eight or nine million dollars. Under these circumstances a Commissioner was appointed. They reported adversely to that. The same Commissioner would have been prepared, if the work could have been accomplished for the sum, a little over \$5,000,000, to have concurred in the proposition to go on with it; but under the impression that it would cost a larger sum, a halt was called and the work was abandoned by the hon. member for Lambton, because, as I have said, he had given the strongest evidence, after carefully examining the subject, of his desire to proceed with it. The work remained from that time to this in abeyance, until a proposal was made by Mr. Ketchum, an engineer of ability who had turned his attention to the question of substituting a ship railway for a canal, and he placed himself in communication with the Government in order to ascertain whether they would be disposed, if a ship railway, performing this service equally efficiently, or more so, than a canal, could perform it and at a smaller expense to the country, to consider a proposal. Having received assurances that the Government were alive to the importance of securing the object to which Parliament had pledged itself in connection with the work, surveys were instituted and road plans prepared, and ultimately Mr. Ketchum made a proposal to the Government which has been concurred in and embodied in a Minute of Council and laid on the Table for consideration, the substance of which is embodied in this resolution. I may say that I am now reading from the Order in Council. The proposal is to accept an offer for the construction of this work at the risk of private capitalists. It is proposed by Mr. Ketchum and his associates in this country and the Mother Country, and who he believes, from communications he has had with them, will be prepared to give their support and who, besides furnishing the capital, will assume the risk of placing the work in a position to discharge all the service to the country that the canal which, under Mr. Page's estimates was to cost \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000, would accomplish, and to ask nothing whatever from the country until the work was in position to discharge all the service required. It is proposed to carry ships of 2,000 tons weight from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Bay of Fundy or *vice versa*, and as it is believed that as this work can be constructed at a much smaller cost than would be involved by the canal, while the transit would be cheaper and occupy less time, it would be more valuable than a canal which would be blocked by ice, and it could therefore be operated earlier and later in the season. Under these circumstances the Government believed that assuming it to be practicable to accomplish the work in this way, to obtain all the advantages that would be obtained by constructing the canal, it could be executed at a less cost than the smallest sum to which the Government, after full and careful consideration, could commit the country. The proposal to pay \$150,000 a year after the work is placed in an efficient and

thorough operation and only continue the payment so long as the transit is efficiently operated, is one that the Government believed would commend itself not only to the hearty and cordial approval of all members of the House, but to the people of this country who take such great interest in promoting its trade and commerce. I do not intend to go into an elaborate statement as to the practicability of the work for the reason stated that Parliament is not asked to incur any liability or risk in the construction of the work. Were we to ask that this should be proceeded with as a Government work it would become a most vital and important question as to whether it was possible to accomplish it; but when the parties are assured of its practicability that they are prepared to accept all risk, it becomes unnecessary to detain the House with any elaborate argument in regard to its practicability. I have no doubt as to its practicability. The principle of hydraulic lifts by which ships are to be raised at one end or the other to the railway and placed on the track has been applied at the London docks for a number of years, and ships of greater burden than those that will require to move across the Isthmus and raised to as great a height as in this instance. The question has been settled. There is scarcely an important harbor here we do not see ships hauled up a steep incline by means of stationary locomotive engines, and if that be the case we can see that in regard to this marine railway, which will be about 18 miles in length, no difficulty can arise in carrying vessels across after landed on the rails. I have the most ample evidence and testimony of the most eminent engineers in the world of the entire practicability of the scheme; and were I submitting this as a Government work, I would feel justified in detaining the House while I read from these authorities. The Congress of the United States have examined the question thoroughly and express their entire confidence in the possibility of carrying ships up greater inclines and for longer distances than is proposed here, and Congress are prepared to expend a large sum of public money to accomplish a similar work in another place. I may first refer to the importance of this undertaking. I will quote from a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton, then leader of the Government, delivered in 1878, when he was reluctantly compelled by the large cost estimated as necessarily involved to change the policy which up to that time he had pursued with respect to the construction of the Baie Verte Canal. He said:

"The Government had acted in perfect good faith. They considered, if it was possible to execute the work at prices corresponding somewhat with Mr. Keefer's estimate, which originally was three and a-half millions, and subsequently five millions, it might be a very considerable advantage to do so. . . . In the meantime, they proposed as soon as the plans were ready to call for tenders, and if these tenders bore any reasonable relation to the estimates that were formed by the gentleman whom the hon. member for Cumberland had characterized as a hydraulic engineer of very high character, they might be able to act on the authority which the House would give them."

In 1874, when the subject was discussed, in a very able speech, by the hon. member for Sunbury, he quoted a number of authorities in relation to the work, and he placed these authorities in very convenient form for me to refer to. He said:

"The advantages to be derived from the Baie Verte Canal were unquestioned at the time of Confederation. Scarcely anybody raised a voice against it, and Mr. Young, at the meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade in 1871, spoke as follows:—

"But there can be no doubt that the inland propeller can descend the St. Lawrence and go direct to Halifax, in Nova Scotia; and this fact brings up other important considerations. Among projected canals there is the Baie Verte Canal, to connect the Bay of Fundy, on the Atlantic, with the Straits of Northumberland in the Gulf, and the Murray Canal, to connect the Bay of Quinte with Weller's Bay on Lake Ontario. If the Baie Verte Canal is possible of construction, the work will be highly important, and, in its results, of a truly national character in all its respects. The City of St. John, in New Brunswick, as well as all other places on the Bay of Fundy, would be brought 430 miles nearer Montreal, Quebec or Toronto for the water-borne vessels, than at present; and if such a canal were constructed, the propeller of 900 tons sailing from Lakes Superior, Michigan, or Ontario, could proceed

direct to Halifax or St. John with Western States or Canadian products.

"It would be difficult to point out all the advantages which would result to Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by the construction of the Baie Verte Canal. If the 900-ton propeller could deliver western or Canadian products at Halifax or St. John, these places would thus become cheap depots for such products. Assorted cargoes of fish, hoops, shooks, lumber, &c., could be made up at these ports of the West India Islands and South America, and could bring back return cargoes from these countries of sugar, coffee, hides, tallow, etc., to be again re-shipped as return cargo to Canada and the Western States by the inland propeller, and thus be delivered at less cost by such means than by any other possible route."

"He also quoted from the report of Mr. Patterson, in his report of the commerce of Montreal, for 1869, as follows:—

"The value of the proposed canal, in more intimately connecting all the Provinces, must be evident to all who have examined the geographical situation. At present there is little or no community of interest between the portions of the Provinces on the Bay of Fundy and those on the Gulf,—although separated by but a narrow strip of land. For want of a few miles of canal navigation, a profitable development of the fisheries by the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia is seriously hindered; the fishermen of Cape Ann, in Massachusetts, being nearer the valuable mackerel fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence than the Canadian fishermen who live on the Bay of Fundy. By means of the proposed canal the waters of the Bay and Gulf would be united, and the fisheries brought within the reach of the fishermen of all the Provinces;—passing easily, so to speak, from one sea to another as the fishing season might render necessary."

"In 1870, Messrs. Allan, Gzowski, Calvin, Laidlaw, Garneau, Stairs and Jardine, were named, by the Dominion Government, Commissioners to institute and make a thorough enquiry on a comprehensive improvement of the canal system of the Dominion, and were instructed to report "On the construction of a canal through the Isthmus dividing the Bay of Fundy from the Gulf St. Lawrence and Baie Verte."

"Those gentlemen in their report stated:—

"Inseparably connected with the growth of intercolonial trade is the construction of the Baie Verte Canal. The advantages that must accrue, not merely to the Dominion as a whole, but to the commerce of the Maritime Provinces, are so clearly pointed out by the Boards of Trade of all the leading cities of Canada, and by men interested in the development of our commercial cities—not simply the merchants of St. John and other places in the locality of the proposed canal, but merchants of Hamilton, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec—that it is superfluous for the Commissioners more than briefly to refer to a few salient features of the scheme.

"A steamer laden with flour for St. John, N. B., now goes down the Gulf as far as Shediac, where the cargo is transported by rail to its destination. The total distance by water from Shediac through the Gut of Canso and round the coast of Nova Scotia to the Bay of Fundy, as far as the commercial capital of New Brunswick, is about 600 miles, and the consequence is that there is little or no direct communication between the Bay of Fundy ports and those of the River St. Lawrence.

"By a canal through the Isthmus, from Shediac, the distance to St. John will not be more than 100 miles. This fact will show the insuperable obstacle that now exists to anything like extensive commerce between Montreal and the Bay of Fundy ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the great impulse that must necessarily be given to the trade by the opening out of a route which will shorten distance so considerably, furnish an inland navigation from the lakes to Boston, and consequently lessen freights between those points at least twenty-five per cent."

The Boards of Trade to which I have referred spoke in the warmest terms of the great advantage to the whole business of the country of the construction of that work. I may say it is also believed that so far from there being any difficulty in the carriage of the ships across the canal, there will really be infinitely less strain upon the ships than that to which they are subjected in stormy weather on the ocean. The proposal is, as I said, to give in all a subsidy of \$150,000 per annum for a period of 25 years. At 4 per cent. that amount capitalized would be \$2,343,312, or about one-third of the estimated cost of the canal, which was at least between five and six millions, or according to Mr. Page, between eight or nine millions, besides the cost of maintenance afterwards. As the hon. member for Lambton remarked the other evening, the operation of our canals is not at present a source of profit to the Dominion, and if, as I said, this work can be accomplished by the expenditure of so small an amount comparatively, and the service can be performed better than it otherwise could, I think the House which again and again, with entire unanimity, voted to sustain this project when it was to cost so much larger a sum, will not hesitate in providing the smaller sum by which it is believed such important commercial results will

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

be secured for the country. I do not propose to detain the House at any length, as the pamphlet which has been distributed to hon. gentlemen supplies any further information that may be necessary. It has been shown that there is a tonnage on the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf ports of something like 2,687,550 tons entering and leaving those ports per annum, which would receive the advantage of this work. Then there is the fishing fleet of not less, I believe, than 600 vessels, and who can estimate the value to the country at large of having the means of crossing from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Bay of Fundy by means of this ship railway, enabling vessels to carry two cargoes and make two voyages from Boston to the Gulf for every one by the existing mode of communication. It would not only afford access to the large American fleet of fishing vessels that would be passing across the Isthmus to the fishing grounds, but our own fishermen would be able, by obtaining access to the American ports, to carry on their business with a vigor and success which are impossible at present. It is estimated that there would be traffic over this canal of something like 600,000 tons per annum; the distance saved is detailed in the pamphlets which have been placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen; the length of the canal is between 17 and 18 miles, it is practically a dead level, the highest incline being something like 10 feet per mile, which is an inappreciable incline and only sufficient to afford drainage for the canal. When the House is told that all these resolutions asked is that authority may be given to the Government to make a contract with responsible parties, who will be prepared, at their own risk, to furnish all the money required to put the work into efficient operation, and at the end of the first year's efficient operation, to pay them a subsidy of \$150,000, and to pay them that amount only so long as the work is efficiently operated, and in that case for twenty-five years only, I think the House may safely pass these resolutions and place it in the power of the Government to secure objects of such great importance at such a comparatively small cost to the country. I do not intend to occupy the House longer, because I have no reason to believe that this will become a subject of controversy, but, on the contrary, that every hon. gentleman who has been committed to this policy, whether under the previous Government of my right hon. friend or under the Government of my hon. friend from Lambton, will be only too glad to adopt the means of securing such great results in the interests of the trade and commerce of the whole country at a cost so comparatively small.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have no intention of opposing the resolutions for the reasons the hon. gentleman has given. I have not had time, since the subject was submitted, to give much attention to the reports and the evidences of success that the projector mentioned briefly before the Railway Committee. I have already complained that we were not aware, when the matter was before that Committee, of the intentions of the Government relating to it, and gave it the less attention on that account. Had the hon. gentleman at that time informed the Committee of the full proposal of the Government it would have received much more searching criticism than it was proposed by anyone to give it. It was looked on, in short, by the members of the Committee as a thing that might possibly succeed, but of which there was no great likelihood. A similar proposal has been before the people of Ontario for several years in connection with Mr. Capreol's scheme of building a ship canal to connect Toronto with the Georgian Bay; but whether it is that the project does not commend itself to engineers, or whether there is no faith in the canal system, Mr. Capreol has been unable to obtain any real support for his scheme. Now, while it is said that a canal at this point would be of great public service, I am bound to say that our experience for

two or three years leads to the conclusion that the traffic which would pass through it would be very small. The hon. gentleman says that it would be used by some five or six hundred fishing vessels. I recollect, when the subject was discussed in this House in 1875, getting the opinions of many of the Nova Scotia members, and the universal opinion was that it would be of no service to the fishing fleet. The navigation of the Bay of Fundy is not suitable to fishing vessels; they have to accommodate themselves to the tide, and when it fails them they must wait until they can get it again. As the tide is very high in the Bay of Fundy, difficulties in this respect are more serious there than in perhaps any other part of the world.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regard the tide in the Bay of Fundy of the greatest possible advantage, because it does not leave a vessel dependent upon the wind to the same extent as elsewhere. The vessels go up with one tide and down with another.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They go a certain distance with one tide, no doubt. The tide would, no doubt, be of service if used judiciously. I do not say that the scheme is impracticable, but I doubt very much its utility from the reports made from time to time by maritime men on the subject. My recollection is that several New Brunswick members, and those from the neighborhood of St. John especially, were warm in favor of the construction of the canal, while those from Nova Scotia were entirely hostile to it, believing that the trade which would pass through it would be very much less than was anticipated by its friends. I think it was rather conclusively proved that vessels passing to the West Indies would never seek that route, but that it would be much cheaper and better for them to take a straight line eastward until they reached the open sea and got into a direct line to the West India Islands. The trade from Prince Edward Island and any trade from the Lower St. Lawrence to Boston would undoubtedly be benefitted by a short course there; but that trade is comparatively light. With regard to the cost, I think the projector estimated it at from three and a-half to four millions, and he will be able no doubt to obtain the money in the English market with the guarantee of the Canadian Government to pay 4 per cent. interest upon it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Page places it at over \$4,000,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course I have no means of ascertaining the probable cost of the work, which is perhaps speculative to a great extent. It is the first work of the kind to any great extent. Although the principle is applied in dry-docks, that is a very different thing from hauling vessels over a distance of 20 miles; and the grade must be greatly against the possibility of taking heavy vessels over it. No doubt it can be done; because railways of this kind have been constructed in other places, including one at Ste. Marie, to take vessels into Lake Superior. But will it pay for vessels to go into Baie Verte, a somewhat difficult navigation, and pass over the railway to the waters of the Bay of Fundy? It is very doubtful. I am not inclined to oppose the resolution, mainly on account of the scantiness of substantial information in regard to the scheme. But I doubt very much if it can be made a success. The money, no doubt, will be raised by the projector, but there is every danger that you may have a repetition of the Grand Trunk experience—a declaration that the work will stop, after the expenditure of the first subsidy, till more assistance be given. I fear much of Mr. Page's opinion is what the Minister states, that when the work proceeds a certain distance we shall find difficulties interposed, which we shall be called upon to make good. At the same time I would prefer doing the work this way to having it undertaken by the Government, which would be much worse.

Mr. KILLAM. Upon an engineering question of this magnitude I do not pretend to express an opinion to which any particular weight would attach. Anything I say must be regarded purely from a commercial or political standpoint. We have had the subject of the Baie Verte Canal before us for a number of years, and we understand that the Minister of Railways has made it a subject of great consideration as one not only concerning his county but the whole Province of Nova Scotia. But it was supposed by all of us that when the National Policy came into force, and the public Treasury was reinforced by the immense sums raised by the Finance Minister, that some decided step would have been taken before this either to ascertain what was practicable in reference to transmission across the Chignecto Isthmus, or taken in pursuance of the votes given by the House previously for the construction of the Baie Verte Canal. \$500,000 were placed in the Estimates once for its construction.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. \$100,000 three years in succession.

Mr. KILLAM. No portion, however, was expended. I suppose full consideration had not been given the scheme, and the money was merely placed in the Estimates for the purpose of going on with the work if found practicable, or for other purposes. I am not prepared to say that I believe the expenditure of \$12,000,000, or \$8,000,000 or \$3,000,000 by the Dominion is a legitimate expenditure. I speak of those different sums because about \$12,000,000 was the estimate for a canal available at any time of the tide, while \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 was thought enough for a canal available at half tide, according to the estimate of Mr. Keefer. The Minister now proposes to spend \$3,000,000 for a substitute scheme, a ship railway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A little over \$2,000,000.

Mr. KILLAM. I consider the capitalized value of this sum, supposing the scheme really practicable, and that men with capital, energy and skill are prepared to proceed with it, cannot be far from \$3,000,000. But these \$3,000,000 would be spent merely for an experiment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman loses sight of the fact that we pay nothing if it is an unsuccessful experiment.

Mr. KILLAM. As to the commercial merits of the scheme I claim, speaking with all modesty, to be as fair a judge as any hon. gentleman on either side of the House. I leave all the statements of the Minister of Railways as to the number of fishing vessels which may use this railroad, the tonnage of the vessels entering the Bay of Fundy and likely to use this railway, with his conjectures as to whether a vessel could be carried up by the tide, to the public who are better qualified to judge than the hon. gentleman. But I do not believe his statement to-night that the railway has the commercial value he attaches to it. I believe any sort of transmission would have a certain amount of local commercial value, but not that general commercial value in which he believes. I do not believe it would have that general commercial value which he believes. It might be possible to have some mode of crossing the Isthmus, which would save time and thus induce owners of vessels to pay some toll for crossing it. The commercial value of the work must be estimated by what those vessels would be willing to pay. Not one of the 600 fishing vessels spoken of bound for the United States ports could be expected to pass through the canal and be transported over the ship railway. With a fair wind they would square away to get out of the Gut of Canso, preferring to take their chances upon the open sea outside the Bay of Fundy than to go into the Bay of Fundy where fogs and difficult navigation render the course more dangerous and necessitate their paying a higher rate of insurance. Nothing has been done since I have had the honor of representing a

constituency in this House, to show any serious intention of going on with the Baie Verte Canal. This canal will not be of very general commercial—but may be of considerable local—value. This proposal to vote \$150,000 a year for twenty years may be regarded as simply a means of attracting offers from capitalists, in order to get their idea as to what might be done. I do not see why, if the Government have deliberately adopted the intention of substituting the scheme of a ship railway, they should not have informed the House that they assumed the responsibility, because the distinguished engineer who had this subject under consideration will be in a difficult position when he attempts to borrow money to proceed with its construction. It may be said to him, that the Canadian Government do not in any way endorse the scheme, that they did not think it was of sufficient commercial value to make it worth while to construct it, but are willing to say: If you will take the whole risk, you may do so, and if you succeed we will give you this annual subsidy. This indicates that the hon. Minister of Railways has abandoned the scheme which for years he pretended to regard with so much favor. He gives it up and says that if Mr. Ketchum or somebody else will find the money to build it, and make it a complete success, the Government will then pay the money. I look therefore, upon this as an abandonment of the project which the hon. Minister pretended he had at heart.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I must congratulate the Government upon the manner in which they have taken up this question. They have shown their very great wisdom in the precaution they have taken with respect to the carrying out of this scheme. They have taken the precaution of saying that this work shall be fully carried out before they guarantee to pay the money, and the gentleman who has undertaken to carry out this scheme guarantees to carry it to a successful issue before requiring any money. I think this undertaking will be of very great benefit, to the Maritime Provinces especially. It will give them very easy access to the United States *via* the Bay of Fundy, and more especially will that be the case in respect to the people of Prince Edward Island and the northern portion of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Consequently cargoes of potatoes, being a perishable article, suffer very materially. If this railway was constructed they would be able to avail themselves of this much shorter route, and also to take advantage, when they got into the Bay of Fundy, of the prevailing westerly winds with which they have to contend in the Gut of Canso. In that way it would be of great advantage to the people of Prince Edward Island; not only that, but I believe that the general shipments from all the principal ports in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, bound for southern ports, could take advantage of this route. I must say that I think we have rather gained than lost by the delay in this matter. Had the work been begun at a previous time we would have been expending a very large amount of money, whereas the amount we are called upon to expend is comparatively small, and we are not called upon to expend that until we have an assurance of success. I think the Government is to be congratulated in taking up this matter the way it has.

Mr. DOMVILLE. At this late hour of the night I shall not make any remarks on the resolution, but reserve what I have to say on some other stage of the Bill.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 167) to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.

Bill read the first time.

Mr. KILLAM.

PILOTAGE ACT, 1873.

The Order for the third reading of Bill (No. 142) to amend the Pilotage Act of 1873, being read,

Mr. McLELAN. When this Bill was last under consideration it was brought to my notice that apprentices to pilots had certain rights by the payment of fees. I had not been able to discover from the regulations of the pilotage authorities that such was the case, but I have ascertained since that, although there are no regulations compelling the payment of dues, it has been the practice that each pilot in his turn shall have the right to name an apprentice, and for that right the apprentice pays a sum ranging from two to four hundred dollars. Consequently, all these young men who are apprentices have paid this in, not to the authorities, but to the individual pilots who have nominated them, and therefore they have acquired a right to a sum of money which it may be difficult for them to obtain. In consideration of this circumstance, I thought it but justice to those young lads to amend the clause so as to allow all apprentices who are on the list now to come in and receive licenses whenever they have completed their seven years' term. I therefore move that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending clause eight in the sense I have indicated.

Bill again considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 106) repealing certain provisions of the General Inspection Act of 1874.

Mr. KILLAM. I desire to ask if it is the intention of the Government to change the law in respect to the inspection of fish in districts where inspectors are appointed?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not proposed to introduce any other Bill this Session with respect to the inspection. In Committee I intend to propose a clause making a change, owing to the imperfect inspection in Newfoundland. Fish inspected in Newfoundland can be sold in Canada without being re-inspected. It is found that fishermen have been appointed, and a good deal of dissatisfaction has taken place. Since the passage of the resolution, telegraphic communication has passed between the Government of Newfoundland and the Dominion, and I shall propose, as a result of that provision, that this Bill shall be brought into force by proclamation of the Governor in Council. The members of the Newfoundland Government state that they will make satisfactory arrangements.

Mr. KILLAM. The hon. gentleman misapprehended my remarks. On a former occasion I called the attention of the Secretary of State to the subject as to whether the Government proposed to remove the fee for the inspection of fish. If the Government does not care enough for the interests of the fishermen to take the subject into consideration, and if they are not ready to give an answer I will leave the matter with the fishermen to decide.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KILLAM. I give notice that I will move on the third reading an amendment to provide that the inspection of fish shall not be compulsory in any part of this Dominion. We have arrived at a late period in the Session, and we were to have had something important from the Finance Minister upon his proposal to grant a bounty to the fishermen. When he makes his explanations I shall take further occa-

sion to say something on this subject. I give them fair warning that if they are not disposed to consider this question I will give them ample time to consider it before prorogation. I hope they will accept the motion in such a way as to do justice to the people whose rights I consider myself bound to advocate here.

Bill reported.

INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, &c.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 145) respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies and Trading Companies.—(Mr. Mousseau.)

On clause 122,

Mr. MOUSSEAU. When this Bill was first under consideration I asked that a section be struck out and another inserted in lieu thereof. I now beg to withdraw that amendment, and restore the original clause.

Bill reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. I ask leave to withdraw Bill (No. 123) concerning the Inland Revenue and to introduce a new Bill (No. 168) to amend the Act concerning the Inland Revenue, 1880.

Bill read the first time; and (at 2.20 o'clock, a. m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 12th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved that the second report of the Official Debates Committee be adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing, as far as I am concerned, the recommendations made in this report. I place confidence in the Committee, and am quite disposed to support those particular recommendations; but I take this occasion to say that I believe the arrangements which have been made by the Committee, and which it is proposed to continue, are inadequate for the proper reporting of the debates—not that the reporters employed are not competent to discharge their duties, but, as far as I can judge from results, there are not enough reporters on the staff to render an efficient discharge of their duty possible. I have more than once pointed out how grossly inaccurate are the papers submitted to us, and I believe the inaccuracies are due, not to the want of ability and skill on the part of the reporters, but to the circumstance that more work is given them than they can get through. I have had no communication with the gentlemen on the staff on this subject, but such is my conclusion from the character of the errors. The errors, from their character, are evidently attributable, as a general rule, to too great haste and absence of proper revision. There are repeated instances of words which are alike in sound but not in sense, and repeated errors occur in figures and punctuation which often entirely destroy the sense of that which was said. I observe evidence also of the absence of an intelligent reading over of copy by those who have written it; and I believe that both in the extension of the notes, in the punctuation, in the printing, and in the proof reading, there is a want of accuracy which renders the

result not creditable, and not by any means a substantial representation of what the speakers have said. My own idea is that the pressure is too great. It looks to me as if the reporters were obliged to transcribe their notes as rapidly as possible, and have no opportunity to make proper connections between the different parts taken by different reporters, or seeing that their own work is correctly transcribed. With reference to the editing, it seems to me that if the editor is responsible, as I understood from members of the Committee when *Hansard* was last spoken of here, for seeing that the general substance of speeches is set down, he ought to be here. It is extremely difficult for one who has not been present during a debate, and has, therefore, no idea what was said, to properly discharge the duty of supervising the reports. That is, perhaps, only a minor point, but I do say that we should have, not a verbatim report, but a report which, at any rate, would give us the substance with reasonable accuracy, of what is said by the speaker. With the present scanty staff, that result is not attained.

Mr. STEPHENSON. I consider the reports are a marvel and the printing almost a miracle. Considering that the reporting costs but \$7,000, as originally estimated, its being done so successfully as it is, is a wonder to every pressman and reporter throughout the country. I think the hon. gentleman is about the only gentleman in this House, or at least one of the exceptions, who has not given a great deal of trouble to the reporters. He speaks very correctly, and is one of the easiest hon. members of this House to report; but I think when he complains about the punctuation, the figures, and that sort of thing, the fault is his own. Every hon. member has a right to revise his speeches, and if the hon. gentleman opposite has not taken the trouble to revise his speeches, then I must say that he is scarcely in a position to blame the reporters for the clerical errors of which he complains. I think we have an efficient staff of reporters, who have done their duty with thorough impartiality; no matter on what side of politics these gentlemen may be outside of this House, in the performance of their duties there is not the slightest trace of a party bias. I think the reports we have had have been fair and equitable towards all parties who have spoken, no matter from which side of the House. So far as the number is concerned, I do not think that, starting under the circumstances in which *Hansard* was started, it would not be at all prudent for us to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. We have secured, I believe, the best reporters, for an equal number, that can be found in America, and we are paying them the smallest possible salaries for the amount of work they perform. We have taken occasion in this report to increase their salary, and it is the smallest increase we could give them and retain their services. Everybody is proud of the *Hansard*, the House is proud of it, because in many cases the reporters give to members better speeches than they have delivered themselves. So far as the salaries are concerned, that is a matter deserving of consideration, and if it is thought proper to increase them, I, for one, would be willing to vote for it.

Mr. AMYOT. I would call attention to the fact that there is only one French reporter, and it is altogether impossible for him to report in proper time all that is said in French. It would be better to dispense with the services of the French secretary and employ two French reporters.

Mr. STEPHENSON. In reference to that, I may say that one member of the present staff has sent in his resignation, and another gentleman has been appointed in his place who is able to report both in English and French, and hereafter we shall have two gentlemen on the staff who will be able to report in both languages.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Kent has entirely mistaken the observations of the hon. leader of the Opposi-

tion. My hon. friend did not complain that the reporters were not efficient, and were not doing their work properly under the circumstances, but merely that the *Hansard* that was laid on our tables was not so accurate as it might be. We know that the reporters have been compelled to sit and report these debates some times for fifteen or sixteen hours in succession. The number of men who are employed is altogether inadequate for such a Session. Now, it is quite impossible when men are so much hurried that they can extend their notes with perfect accuracy. I know myself, in reading over the reports of the debates, that I have seen occasionally, one word put for another which it resembled in the stenographer's notes, a mistake which would not have occurred had the reporter had more time to do his work. The observations of my hon. friend pointed to this: that the staff is too few in numbers. If we had reasonable Sessions, if we adjourned here at ten o'clock in the evening, so as to give those gentlemen an opportunity of extending their notes with more care, I have no doubt the reports would be more accurate. But such an opportunity is not given them when we are sitting here until four o'clock in the morning, in which case it is quite obvious that the present staff is not at all adequate to the work they are called upon to perform; and unless we are prepared to shorten the sittings so as to give the reporters a reasonable opportunity of extending their notes, we must increase the staff.

Mr. STEPHENSON. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell, I may say that probably he takes more care in revising his speeches than the hon. member for West Durham. I believe it is a fact known to most of us that the hon. member for West Durham hardly ever looks over his speeches, and therefore he has probably occasion for complaint, but those who have plenty of time upon their hands are accustomed to revise their speeches with care, and they have the least reason to complain. As to an increase in the staff, it would involve some additional expense, but if it is the wish of the House that the staff should be increased, nothing will afford the Debates' Committee more pleasure than to take steps to increase its efficiency by that means. I think the House will agree that, so far as the present staff is concerned, the work they have been doing is a marvel, and the printing of the debates is also a marvel for our small country, and in a small city like this. I think the members of the staff are entitled to every credit, and, perhaps, we ought to give them more consideration than they have had yet, for I know that many members of this House have had their speeches reported in a manner superior in every way to the speeches as they were actually delivered, the members getting the credit of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak with any authority on this matter as I never read the *Hansard*, so I cannot say whether I am reported or misreported. But I have heard from many members that the accuracy of the reports of this Session has been marvellous. I have heard so from hon. gentlemen who have gone over their own speeches, and who are therefore apt to be critical, whilst we are all aware that a person speaking on the *nonce*, without previous consideration or preparation, very frequently says things that he forgets afterwards. There is one great disadvantage in our present system, and that is the practice of allowing members to amend their speeches, which destroys the value of the *Hansard*. Hon. gentlemen who have made mistakes, or who repent of having made certain statements, and who are replied to at the moment, when they correct their speeches they leave out that part or modify it, and the consequence is that the person who replies to him actually appears to make a fool's speech, because he is firing against nothing; and for that reason I think that members should not be allowed to correct their speeches.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I thought they had not that right. I thought they were only allowed to make verbal corrections.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have known it to occur—at least I have had representations made to me—that speeches have been altered completely, that the written speech is not a reflex, even in substance, of the spoken speech, which is unfair to the House, unfair to the country, and especially unfair to the gentleman who has made the reply. I have no doubt the hon. leader of the Opposition has found that.

Mr. BLAKE. I have found it, and have myself made observations in response to statements which I did not afterwards perceive in the *Hansard*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That must be the case so long as individual members have the power to correct their speeches, and hence the great value of the remark made by the leader of the Opposition, that in addition to accurate reporting—the stenographer being guided by the ear and not by the sense—there ought to be some person of literary attainments, who, for instance, can understand the value of a quotation, and who has some considerable acquaintance with the general run of political affairs in the country. This gentleman should sit in the gallery and listen to the speeches, as I am told the hon. member for Gloucester used to do, who with his marvelous memory, was able to report *verbatim* every word that was said, and as others with the same happy faculty have been known to do in England—Mr. Black, for instance, of the old *Morning Chronicle* and others, who were able to report verbally almost from recollection. There ought to be some such person, a superior person who should be well paid—you cannot get such a person without his being very well paid—who should undergo the wearisome task of sitting in the gallery and listening to the general current of the debate, and thus be able to read it over with intelligence. If there was such an officer, then there should be a most strict rule, that no hon. gentleman should be allowed to correct his speech, for the corrected speech is nothing more nor less than a garbled speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not like to differ with my hon. friend with whom ordinarily I see eye to eye, but I do not agree with him in saying that no alteration should be permitted in the report of the speeches that hon. members deliver. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in the statement that as a rule the reporting, in my judgment, of some very long speeches, has been exceedingly well performed and reflects the very highest credit on the reporters; but I can take the *Hansard* of the present Session, and show where it was absolutely necessary to make slight corrections, or otherwise, on the most important questions, hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would be made to say the very reverse of what they said; and while I think it is impossible to prevent such corrections being made, I think such should be done under great limitations. Under the present system we are furnished with a report of the speeches, as first taken down and put in print by the reporters and by the editor of the debates, and before it has been seen by any person, and, by referring to the corrected *Hansard*, it is very easy to compare and see whether an hon. gentleman has been permitted to change his speech, which I quite agree is utterly opposed to the system. No hon. gentleman should be permitted to make any change in his speech, but he should be permitted to correct any obvious inaccuracies in the report; or otherwise, as I have said, instead of its being a record of what took place, it would be in some instances, and those most important instances, a record of what did not take place. You must permit corrections of obvious inaccuracies to be made before the record goes into the permanent *Hansard*, but you must not permit any change in the construction of the speeches, or in the

speeches themselves; but you must permit those corrections, for otherwise a slip of the tongue might not be corrected. In speaking the other night I used the term train mileage, instead of car mileage. I was speaking hastily and dealing with a mass of figures; the hon. member for Lambton corrected me, but I thought I had said car mileage. In such a case, hon. members must be permitted to make an obvious correction of that kind, as it is necessary. But these instances in which, notwithstanding the great accuracy with which very long speeches have been reported, even when dealing with a mass of figures; certain corrections must be permitted, or we would have *Hansard* a record of what did not take place, instead of what did take place.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Unfortunately, it is not possible to accept *Hansard* as a perfectly reliable report of what passes here. I think myself that the *Hansard* reporters have done as well as they could possibly be expected to do; but I have observed on many occasions that words somewhat similar in sound but wholly different in sense, making in fact absolute nonsense, are introduced by the stenographic process. You may read for a long distance in the report what is evidently a very accurate *verbatim* report, and then you come on half-a-dozen sentences which are absolutely nonsense, which has been caused by the fact that there was a great deal of disturbance in the House, and the reporters could not hear. I do not know whether it is possible to adopt the suggestion of the hon. First Minister and have a supervisor or censor of the speeches, so that *Hansard* should be accepted as an accurate record of what passed; but I do say this: that I should object very much to be held bound by everything put down in *Hansard* in my own name, as would hon. gentlemen opposite, unless they took the trouble to revise their speeches. That is not possible in a great many cases. It is possible in the early portion of the Session when hon. members are not very fully occupied, and the House is not sitting very late; but no one who knows the trouble and labor of revising, can pretend to say that a long speech can be revised when delivered at three or four o'clock in the morning.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that the hon. gentleman, from the tone of his reply, somewhat misunderstood my observations. I did not intend to say anything in the slightest degree derogatory to the manner in which the reporters discharged their duty; on the contrary, what I said was, that they were placed in the painful position, from my point of view, of it being impossible for them to discharge the duty they are asked to do, for it was more than it was possible for the staff to do. They are over-worked, because there is not enough of them; that is the difficulty of which I complain. My view is, in accordance with the hon. First Minister, that it would be better if the speeches were taken entirely out of the hands of hon. members; but I do not believe—I suppose, at present, from the consequence of not being able to look at my speeches—that anything like a correct report of what has been spoken would result with a staff so scanty in point of numbers though adequate in point of ability. But having an official report, it should be a respectable and adequate report, and one free from errors, in which the utterances of the hon. members are correctly represented; and in order to secure this all the House has to do is to add, perhaps, two more reporters to the staff.

Mr. STEPHENSON. If that is the view of the House, the *Hansard* Committee will be very happy to present another report, in accord with the suggestions of the leaders of both sides of the House. The Committee felt the responsibility placed upon them; they felt the necessity of having an enlarged staff, but at the same time they felt that, under the circumstances, they would not be justified, and they did not feel themselves strong enough to make those recommendations, because they thought the House might not

sustain them. Therefore the Committee went as far as they could reasonably go; but if the House is of opinion that the staff should be increased, the *Hansard* Committee will be very happy to act on the suggestions made.

Mr. SCRIVER. In all the deliberations of the Debates Committee, the idea of the inadequacy of the staff has hardly ever been brought into consideration. I think the general impression among the members of the Debates Committee was that the work this season and last season was much harder than it had usually been, and harder, perhaps, than it is likely to be again. I do not understand, myself, that any complaint was made on the part of the staff, that the number was inadequate for the work, except in a few instances where there were all-night sittings. As the Chairman of the Committee has stated, the members of the Committee felt that they were placed in a somewhat difficult position. They were obliged by the great stress in the state of affairs to recommend considerable increases in the disbursements connected with the Committee, and they felt fearful that if they recommended some other changes that did seem judicious to them, they would not be sustained by the action of the House, and, therefore, they came to the conclusion that matters had better remain as they were, with the exception of such changes as they have recommended in the way of increased compensation to the reporters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I used to be very much surprised at the wonderful accuracy with which the speeches to which I listened in the English House of Commons were reported in the *Times* newspaper the next morning. I wondered how it was possible to attain such accuracy and precision in reporting those speeches, but I was somewhat undeceived when, after a very important debate in which it was necessary for me to furnish a leading member of the House of Commons with information in reference to the subject under discussion, before he had resumed his seat half an hour I was sent for to an ante-room of the House of Commons and his speech was submitted to me in type for my correction. I learned on that occasion the mode in which they attained such remarkable precision and accuracy in reporting the debates of the House of Commons; that measures were taken before the House rose by which the member, or some other person, equally familiar with the subject of the speech, would have an opportunity of correcting it. So far as my observation goes, from speeches submitted to my notice, the reporting in this House will compare favorably with that in the English House of Commons.

Mr. KILLAM. I should be the last one to complain of the *Hansard* reporters. I believe, as a rule, they have done their duties efficiently, especially when we consider that during the last part of the Session they have had to work as long as twelve or fifteen, or even eighteen hours at a stretch. Of course they are human.

Mr. MILLS. And the House was inhuman.

Mr. KILLAM. Yes, and the Government too, though I will not say anything on that point at present. These gentlemen have done as well as they could, but it is impossible for them, under such circumstances, to report every speech fully. My own opinion has always been at variance with that of the hon. Minister of Railways, as I do not believe in an official report of the Debates. I think the reports had better be left to newspaper enterprise. The hon. Minister of Railways, in his official position, of course speaks with advantage. He is able, in making official explanations, to say what he has to say from the book deliberately, and he is well reported. I consider the hon. gentleman a master of amplification, and that pages of his speeches as they appear in the *Hansard* might be well condensed, so that his ideas might be apprehended much more readily in an ordinary newspaper report. Measures are brought

down at a late period of the Session when late sittings are necessary, and when the official reporters are tired out, so that it is impossible to discuss them, and impossible for the *Hansard* reporters to report fully the speeches of hon. gentlemen on both sides, on subjects which they consider as very important. It is impossible to report them in such a way as to have the views of hon. members conveyed to the country through the medium of the official reports. The other evening, as an instance, I had the honor to make some remarks on a subject of immense importance to my own county. I spoke, perhaps, for half an hour, and spoke purely to the question before the House, as the leader of the Government knows. I referred to the comparative necessity of providing public buildings of a certain kind in my own county. I spoke on the subject with considerable earnestness, and I thought with considerable force, but in the *Hansard* report there was not a single word of what I said on that occasion. That may have been all right. I know, at the same time, that remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the criticisms of members of the Government who did not agree with me entirely, were not reported. I only refer to the matter to show that speeches made in the early part of the day may be thoroughly reported, while, owing to the Government's delay in bringing down important measures, and the consequent lateness of the sittings, there are many speeches that cannot be reproduced in the pages of *Hansard*.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENSON moved that the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the debates of the House be adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the report with reference to the contracts.

Mr. STEPHENSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman should give us some idea of the comparative cost of the service as involved in these changes.

Mr. STEPHENSON. The same contractor has the contract for the composition as this year, but the composition will be 60 cents instead of 40 cents a thousand; the press work per token is 30 cents; folding per sheet one-tenth of a cent; alterations per hour, 25 cents; extra copies of speeches per thousand, 75 cents; the binding is less than it was before, being 90 cents per volume; the translation costs \$1.75 per page, compared with \$2.50 under the present contract.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The composition seems high.

Mr. STEPHENSON. The hon. member must bear in mind that the work is all night work, and if we are to have the daily issue of the *Hansard* laid on the Table of the House at three o'clock every day, we need not expect to get the composition done for the ordinary day rate. The regular trade rates in the city are, I believe, 33½ cents a thousand, and when you take into consideration—to use a printers' phrase—that there is no "fat" in this matter, that it is all "solid" matter, I think the price cannot be regarded as excessive, considering the rate paid to printers for ordinary day work. Moreover, there was only one tender put in, which we did not accept on its first presentation; but we had a conference with them and arranged prices and terms, so that they are made the most satisfactory we could possibly make them, and I think they will be satisfactory to the House and the country.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman say that the general result is that the cost of the service remains the same.

Mr. STEPHENSON. About the same.

Mr. KILLAM.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. DECOSMOS. Chinese immigration appears likely to become a very serious matter. From time to time, the question of Chinese immigration into the Province of British Columbia has been brought before the House; from time to time, the Legislative Assembly of that Province passed resolutions and sent Addresses to the Governor General, asking the Government here to take some measures to stop the flow of Chinese laborers into that Province; but, up to the present moment, no action has been taken by the Government whatever. A recent telegram, however, brings the matter more forcibly under our notice, and it is a matter of pretty general comment by the press throughout the Dominion, that the Chinese are flowing into British Columbia in such numbers as to prove destructive, in all probability, to white labor. A telegram, dated Victoria, May 9th, states:

"24,000 Chinese in all are expected before August. The Chinese in the Province will number 32,000, and will outnumber the whites."

Now, Sir, when we recollect that the United States Government recently enacted a law to prohibit the immigration of Chinese laborers for ten years; that along the coast of Mexico there is little or no employment for Chinese; that when we come to the Central American States, there is none, or very little; that when we go to New Grenada, Peru, and Chili, we find that there is little or nothing for them to do; that when we cross the ocean to the Hawaiian Kingdom, we find that they are driving out the native population, and the other population too; that when we go to the Australian colonies, we find that the colony of Queensland has for some years had two Acts on its Statute-book, sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government, in order to keep out the Chinese—one of which imposes a poll-tax of £10 sterling on every Chinaman who enters the country, and the other a tax of £3 sterling on every Chinaman who enters the mines—we can easily understand that these countries are vigorously protecting themselves against Chinese immigration. Last December, I wrote to the Agent-General of New South Wales in London, and I received the following reply:—

"WESTMINSTER CHAMBERS,
"VICTORIA STREET, 9th January, 1882.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your note of the 16th ultimo, asking for a copy of New South Wales Act respecting Chinese immigration, I regret my inability to comply with your request. There has not been time for copies to reach me from the colony. Immediately I receive them I shall have great pleasure in sending a copy for your acceptance. I know by a newspaper telegram that a poll-tax of £10 has been determined upon, and that ships arriving in the colony are not allowed to carry more in proportion to tonnage than, I believe, one for every one hundred tons.

"I am, dear Sir,

"Yours very truly,

"SAUL SAMUELS,

"Agent-General for New South Wales."

The great object of the Chinese in coming to British Columbia will be, failing to get employment there, to make their way across the border to the United States. The United States, however, by the recent Act has prohibited them. The *New York Times* of May 9th, states:

"The President has signed the new Bill to suspend the immigration of Chinese laborers for a period of ten years. It is to be hoped that this will settle the much-vexed Chinese question for a time at least. The Bill was drawn with special reference to the objections raised by the President in his message disapproving the first Bill passed by Congress. As it now stands, the law suspends the immigration of Chinese laborers, whether skilled or unskilled, or employed in mining. It provides for a system of certificates, to be issued on the identification of Chinese persons now living in this country, or who may hereafter arrive here under provisions of the law authorizing them to come. The naturalization of all Chinese is expressly forbidden. Various fines and penalties are imposed upon the masters of vessels who shall bring unauthorized Chinese persons in this country, and upon any who shall forge, alter or make fraudulent use of the certificates to be issued to Chinese who are allowed residence in the United States. The Bill, as it has become a law, does not infringe upon any of the rights of China as defined in existing treaties. The people of California will probably be satisfied with all its features, unless they may object to the shortness of the term during which immigration is to be suspended."

Now, I would ask the Government whether they are prepared to introduce any measure this Session, no matter how brief, with a view to repress the immigration of Chinese into British Columbia? There has been a general feeling abroad that in the absence of white labor in that country a certain number of Chinese would be admitted into the country to work on the railway; but even that the people have objected to. But, under the circumstances, I believe the general feeling would be to allow a certain number in for this purpose. If, however, they are to come into the country, by the middle of August, to the number of 24,000, the country will be overrun by Chinese, as it will then have 32,000, who will, as stated in the telegram, outnumber the entire white population. It strikes me that in view of the action of the United States Government, some action ought to be taken by the Canadian Government to repress that immigration; and I put it to the hon. gentleman opposite, in the common interest, as well as in the interest of the country, whether or not something cannot be done to relieve British Columbia from the Chinese difficulty?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is rather inconvenient that this subject should be brought up without notice of any kind; and the hon. gentleman must be satisfied with a very brief and perhaps unsatisfactory answer. No complaints have reached the Government of serious interference with white labor in British Columbia, from the influx of Chinese labor. In fact, there is such a want of white labor in British Columbia, that if you wish to have the railway finished within any reasonable time, there must be no such step against Chinese labor. It is certain that British Columbia suffers very much from the want of a steady flow into it of white immigration; and until the Pacific Railway is finished, I fancy that difficulty will always continue. It is of very great importance, in order to enable British Columbia to get the advantage of the flow of emigration from Europe, that the railway should be finished as early as possible. When Mr. Onderdonk was here in the beginning of the Session, he told me he employed every white man he could get, and that he tried to get every white laborer from Canada that he needed. He asked me, for instance, if I could recommend to him a reliable, a respectable man, a master builder or carpenter, who might get him the carpenters he wanted. I found him such a man, and he took over from Canada fifty or sixty carpenters to help him. Mr. Onderdonk said also that he expected at one time to be able to get sufficient white labor from the United States; but such was the extent to which the construction of new railroads were proceeding in the United States this year, that he could really get no satisfactory labor, but only the culls and refuse, persons who could get no employment at San Francisco, to work on the British Columbia Railway. I presume that this influx of Chinese is greatly caused by the demand for labor for the construction of the railway. Whether the hon. gentleman is correctly informed as to 24,000, or 10,000, or 5,000 Chinese coming into British Columbia, I have no means of knowing. But if they are coming, it is merely to work on the railway, to finish it as soon as possible, and we may well put up with the temporary inconvenience, as I understand it, of the presence of these Chinese. A good many people in Vancouver Island, who keep house, tell me that if they had not Chinese servants, they would have none at all; and I have no doubt things are still worse on the mainland. The Chinese bring no women to British Columbia with them, and are not likely, therefore, to be permanent settlers. Nor do I hear that there is any danger of miscegenation or a mingling of the races. So that after they have finished this particular work they can go back to China again. Whenever a practical difficulty arises, it is quite in the hands of the Legislature to deal with it, in the manner in which it has been dealt with, after a great many years experience, in the United States, and as it has

been dealt with in the Australian Provinces. At present every white man can be employed in British Columbia at good wages. The Government have had no information of an alarming influx of Chinese. This is the first I heard of these 24,000 Chinese immigrants, and I think the report must be mythical. I have seen in the newspapers, however, a statement that several vessels had been chartered to bring over Chinese laborers to work on this railway, to which I think there can be no objection. I share very much the feeling of the people of the United States, and the Australian colonies, against a Mongolian or Chinese population in our country as permanent settlers. I believe they would not be a wholesome element for this country. I believe that it is an alien race in every sense, that would not and could not be expected to assimilate with our Arian population; and, therefore, if the temporary necessity had been overcome, and the railway constructed across the continent, with the means of sending the European settlers and laborers into British Columbia, then it would be quite right to join to a reasonable extent in preventing the permanent settlement in this country of Mongolian, Chinese or Japanese immigrants. At present it is simply a question of alternatives—either you must have this labor or you cannot have the railway. The Government have not had their attention called to this subject of late; but it is a matter of so great importance that it will engage our attention, and that of every public man in this House, to discover how far we can admit Chinese labor without introducing a permanent evil to the country by allowing to come into it, in some respects, an inferior race, and, at all events, a foreign and alien race. Of course, British Columbia, from its geographical position and proximity to the ocean, is that portion of the Dominion that will chiefly suffer from an influx of this description of settlers.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I am glad to hear the hon. leader of the Government express an opinion favorable to repressing Chinese immigration at some time in the future; but I believe it will be found, by the experience of the present year, that that future will not be very distant. The point, however, to which I wish to draw your attention is this: The hon. gentleman has intimated that the Government has had no information bearing on the question of Chinese immigration. I have only to draw his attention to this fact: that at almost every Session of the Legislature of British Columbia since 1871 resolutions or addresses have been passed by the Legislative Assembly and forwarded to the Secretary of State of Canada dealing with this question. The hon. gentleman remarked that Chinese were useful as servants in Victoria. No doubt they are used as servants there, and are appreciated, but the number of servants in Victoria altogether would not probably amount to over 200, which is a very small number in comparison with the 4,000 or 5,000 Chinese in British Columbia, as shown by the Census report, and since that Census 4,000 or 5,000 more have been added to enter into competition with white labor. With regard to the point raised that Chinese labor on railways would be very acceptable in the absence of white labor, I believe that as a choice between evils the Province would accept Chinese labor for the purpose of constructing the railway; but, at the same time, the Legislature and the people are looking anxiously to this Government to take some action to put down Chinese immigration, and such action would be the more easy now since there is a ten years limit put on such immigration in the United States.

Mr. ROCHESTER. I do not know what the difficulty is with regard to Chinese labor in British Columbia, but I do know the people of Canada would be glad if they had Chinese or other labor. Agriculturists in Ontario, find it utterly impossible to procure labor. During the last few days, a few batches of immigrants arrived in Ottawa, and they were only a few hours here when they were carried off to

different parts of the country, and ten times as many more would have been employed had they arrived. We are in the same position with regard to our mill work. Mill hands are very scarce, and it is almost impossible to get a supply of laborers to do the work required to be done. British Columbia has so much work to do in building railways, that she ought to be thankful to get in Chinese labor, or the labor of any other country, to do it. The people of Ontario would be very glad if they could have an opportunity of employing Chinese labor.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the third reading of Bill (No. 158) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons and for other purposes, said: The point reserved was whether we could not make the elections in Manitoba the same day as in the other Provinces. On making enquiry I came to the conclusion it would not be safe to alter the law as it is now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be remembered by the House that in discussing this Bill in Committee yesterday, when the electoral division of the north riding of Bruce was under consideration, the hon. the leader of the Government stated, in response to the motion made by the hon. member for that riding, that he was willing to adopt some change with reference to that division so far as regarded its population. Though not entirely satisfactory to my own views as opposed to those of hon. members opposite, yet there is no doubt it would tend to equalize the population in a greater degree than they are equalized in the Bill as it now stands. It would be without any great political consequence it is true, but it would, notwithstanding, in a degree, remedy the great inequality of population that exists between the west and north riding of Bruce in this Bill. I therefore beg to move the following amendment, which I am sure the hon. the leader of the Government will accept:—

That the Bill be not now read a third time but be re-committed to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by providing that the village of Port Elgin shall form part of the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Bruce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the hon. gentleman said, last night, that Saugeen and Port Elgin should be added to North Bruce, I said the Government was prepared to go half way and give Port Elgin. Is the hon. gentleman serious in proposing to take away Port Elgin from Saugeen and put it in North Bruce, or does he propose that the strip of land lying between Port Elgin and the present southern boundary of North Bruce shall be added to North Bruce?

Mr. PATERSON, With the view of meeting the hon. gentleman, and taking what I could in the way of carrying out the principle of the Bill, I move this amendment first, and then, having given the hon. gentleman an opportunity to yield gracefully on this point, in favor of which he has expressed himself, I will give him an opportunity to go the proper length by attaching the township of Saugeen to North Bruce as well.

Amendment (Mr. Paterson) agreed to, on the following division:—

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Amyot,	Flynn,	Mongenais,
Anglin,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Arkell,	Gillies,	Mousseau,
Bain,	Gillmor,	O'Connor,
Bannerman,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Olivier,
Barnard,	Girouard (Kent),	Orton,
Beauchesne,	Grandbois,	Quimet,
Béchar,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Benoit,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Platt,
Blake,	Hay,	Pope (Compton),

Mr. ROCHESTER.

Borden,	Hilliard,	Poupore,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Homer,	Richey,
Bowell,	Hooper,	Rinfret,
Brecken,	Huntington,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Brown,	Irvine,	Rochester,
Bunting,	Jones,	Rogers,
Burnham,	Kaulbach,	Rouleau,
Burpee (St. John),	Killam,	Routhier,
Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Ryan (Montreal),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kirkpatrick,	Rymal,
Carling,	Kranz,	Scott,
Caron,	Langevin,	Scrifer,
Cartwright,	Lantier,	Shaw,
Casey,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tellier,
Cimon (Ochicoutimi)	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Thompson,
Colby,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Trow,
Coupal,	Mackenzie,	Tupper,
Coursol,	Macmillan,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	McCarthy,	Valin,
Daoust,	McDougall,	Wade,
Dawson,	McLellan,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Desaulniers,	Malouin,	Wallace (York),
Domville,	Merner,	Wheler,
Dumont,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Farrow,	Fiset,	White (Hastings),
Fleming,	Mills,	White (Renfrew).—124.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Bill,	Landry,	Ross (Dundas),
Bolduc,	Lane,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	McCallum,	Sprule,
Costigan,	McRory,	Vallée,
Gigault,	Ogden,	Vanasse.—15.

Amendment considered in Committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. PATERSON. I desire to follow up this amendment with another motion I had prepared with reference to the matter, and which the First Minister will agree with me is a necessary motion to be made. I could not think, of course, of detaching Port Elgin from the township of Saugeen, and therefore, the hon. gentleman agreeing with me in that view, as he did, I am happy to say—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONAD. Not by a long chalk; that will not do.

Mr. PATERSON. I am now about to follow it up with a motion that the township of Saugeen in which is the town of Port Elgin, shall also be added to the north riding of Bruce. I am sure it will commend itself to the favorable consideration of the House. Consequently, I beg to move:

That the Bill be re-committed with instructions to provide that the township of Saugeen shall form part of the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Bruce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think this amendment shows to what extent hon. gentlemen are willing to go—I was going to say they are factious. Last night it was proposed that Saugeen and Port Elgin should be put into the north riding. Well, I suggested that we would go half way and put in Port Elgin. That was scouted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, but to-day we have just voted for it. The hon. gentleman's proposition is factious. The hon. gentleman said: "Let Saugeen go, we will go half-way;" and therefore the Bill passed as it was originally introduced. The hon. gentlemen changed their minds, and they now want the full loaf. We offered half a loaf by adding Port Elgin to North Bruce, and they voted for it. Now they want me to give them the whole loaf and allow Saugeen to go into North Bruce. I shall vote against that.

Amendment (Mr. Paterson, Brant) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar,	Gillie,	Mills,

Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Gillmore,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),
Macdonell (Lanark),

Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Rymal,
Scriver,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Arkell,
Bannerman,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bolduc,
Bourbean,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Costigan,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Fortin,

Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),
Grandbois,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hilliard,
Homer,
Hooper,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kirkpatrick,
Kranz,
Landry,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
McCallum,
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McDougall,
MeLellan,
McRory,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongenaix,
Montplaisir,
Mousseau,
O'Connor,

Ogden,
Orton,
Oimet,
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Rochester,
Routhier,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Shaw,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—98.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. While this Bill was under consideration in Committee, I made some observations with regard to changes that were made in the county of Oxford. I now consider it my duty, as representing one of the divisions of that county, to protest against and point out the objections I have to these changes. The north riding of Oxford, as it is at present formed, has a population of 25,361. This Bill proposes to change that riding by withdrawing the township of Blenheim from North Oxford, which has a population of 5,937, and adding from the county of Perth the townships of North and South Easthope, having a total population of 4,966. The total difference in the population of the riding, as is proposed by this Bill, is only 925. The changes in South Oxford are made by withdrawing the township of Dereham and the village of Tilsonburg, with a total population of 6,359, and adding from the county of Brant the townships of Burford and Oakland, with a population of 6,405, thereby increasing the population by 46. The principal objection I have to these changes is this: The county of Oxford, ever since Confederation, and in fact for some time before, has been divided into two divisions for electoral purposes, and each division has been represented in this House by one member. As the county is at present constituted, each riding is well formed. By withdrawing the township of Blenheim from the north riding of Oxford, you place the electors in another riding with which they have no municipal or commercial relations. The farmers of that township at the present time sell all their produce and buy what they require in the town of Woodstock, which is situated about the centre of the riding. The people in the townships of North Easthope and South Easthope, which are added to the riding, have no connection in that way whatever with the county of Oxford. The people are connected municipally with the county of

Perth and do most of their business and trading in the town of Stratford, which is situated in quite a different direction from any town in the county of Oxford. It is just the same with the south riding. The people in the township of Dereham do their trading and sell their produce in the town of Ingersoll. They are now cut off and added to the county of Norfolk. The two townships added, Burford and Oakland, are in the same position as regards South Oxford. The people in those townships are connected municipally with the county of Brant, the farmers go to Brantford to do their trading and sell their produce, and I think it is an injustice to the people of those townships to sever their old electoral associations for no better reasons than have been adduced in this House. I do not see any reason or necessity, in order to create four or five new constituencies, that a large number of the old counties should be broken up as is contemplated by this Bill. It is a bad precedent. If it is adopted we may expect future Governments to readjust matters; it is a precedent that should not be set in this House and should not be sustained if no better reason than that which has been adduced before the House can be given. The townships of North Easthope and South Easthope to which I have referred might easily have been added, if it was the desire to equalize the population, to South Perth, which would then only have a population of 23,500, and it would have left the people in connection with the county with which they already have municipal relations. Just so is it with respect to the townships of Burford and Oakland, which have been added to the south riding. It would have been far better, if it is necessary to make a change, to have placed the townships in the county of Brant, it would have equalized the population much better than the present plan. As I believe it is the wish of the electors of the county which I represent that they should be left for electoral purposes as at present constituted, I beg to move the following amendment:—

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Oxford, with a population of 50,093, is divided into two ridings each returning one member; that by the proposed Bill, the two ridings of Oxford will have a population of 49,168, but to effect this change the townships of North Easthope and South Easthope are taken from Perth and added to North Oxford; the townships of Burford and Oakland are taken from Brant and added to South Oxford; the township of Blenheim is taken from North Oxford and added to North Brant; Dereham and Tilsonburg are taken from South Oxford and added to North Norfolk.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the municipal county of Oxford shall be divided into two ridings, each returning one member to Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I propose that the plan adopted the other morning should be followed, and that in the record the votes shall appear as in the last division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the proposition. I presume there will be some more amendments, and I think we had better have all the members summoned in, and this first vote will be taken as guiding all subsequent amendments.

Amendment (Mr. Sutherland) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin,
Bain,
Bécharde,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),
Macdonell (Lanark),

Mackenzie,
Malouin,
Mills,
Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Rymal,
Scriver,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—42.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McGuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Montgenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At this stage of the Session I do not propose to waste one moment's time in discussing the amendment which I propose to offer for the purpose of indicating what I believe to be a correct principal, that is, to maintain the ordinary municipal boundaries where that is practicable, and as a protest against the needless and, in my opinion, reckless interference with county boundaries I move :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of York is divided into three ridings, each returning one member, with an aggregate population of 66,618, or an average of 22,304 for each member, divided into

East York	23,312
North York	24,502
West York	18,504,

that any inequality which it may be desirable to correct in the population of the three ridings can be adjusted by a transference from one to the other, without interfering with the present county boundaries; that the proposed re-adjustment leaves the west riding of York, having the smallest population, untouched, and transfers part of the village of Stouffville in East York to the west riding of Ontario, the township of Whitechurch, the town of Newmarket and part of the village of Stouffville in North York, to the west riding of Ontario, and the township of Gwillimbury and the town of Bradford from the south riding of Simcoe, to the north riding of York.

That the proposed re-adjustment is objectionable; that the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that three ridings, to be formed out of the county of York, shall each return one member.

Amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :
Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McGuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongensis,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I wish to submit a motion with regard to the county of Wellington. Two complaints existed with regard to the original arrangement of this county. One of these—the transference of Erin to the county of Halton—has been rectified, while the other—the taking of Wallace from North Perth and adding it to North Wellington, remains. The result is to give to the county of Wellington, which has already a much larger population than the quota, viz., 73,445, an additional population of 4,795, making the total population of this county, 78,240, or 15,240 in excess of the quota. The motion is to restore Wallace to North Perth, and it should commend itself to every one who favors the principle of equalizing the population. I move :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Wellington at present comprises a population of 73,445, divided into three ridings, each returning one member, with an average population of 24,461; that by the said Bill it is proposed to add to the north riding of Wellington the township of Wallace, part of the county of Perth, and to transfer the township of Maryborough from North to Centre Wellington, and to make other changes, thus increasing the population of the electoral county of Wellington, now beyond the quota by 4,795 souls; that the proposed addition of Wallace to North Wellington is objectionable.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by withdrawing Wallace from North Wellington and re-transferring Maryborough from Centre to North Wellington.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :
Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, NS),	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton)

Bill,
Bourbeau,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Fortin,
Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),

Hooper,
Hurteau,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McLelan,
McRory,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongenais,
Mousseau,
O'Connor,

Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Ross (Dundas),
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—99.

Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Fortin,
Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),

Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Laundry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (C. Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McLelan,
McRory,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongenais,
Mousseau,
O'Connor,

Ross (Dundas),
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—99.

Mr. FLEMING. The principle upon which this Bill is supposed to be based is the equalization of population; but it is somewhat singular that the county of Welland, which has a population of 5,142 above the quota, is left undisturbed, while the neighboring electoral district of Monck, by the provisions of the Bill, is re-adjusted so as to give it a population of 4,968 below the quota, or a difference in population in the two constituencies lying side by side of 10,120. From what the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) said the other evening, this discrepancy cannot be justified even on political grounds. He said that he would be quite willing to take a portion of Welland, for he believed that it would increase his majority, and I am very sure that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Bunting) cannot very well offer any objection to sharing with his neighbor a portion of his county. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the electoral district of Monck comprises a population of 17,145 or 3,763 below the quota; the proposed re-adjustment withdraws from Monck with a view to attaching it to South Wentworth the township of Caistor, belonging municipally to the county of Lincoln, and withdraws from Haldimand the township of South Cayuga, belonging municipally to that county, in order to add it to Monck; that by the change the population of Monck is reduced to 15,910, or 4,968 below the quota.

That the said Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the proposed changes in the electoral district of Monck.

Amendment (Mr. Fleming) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,
Bain,
Béchar, d,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),
Macdonell (Lanark),

Mackenzie,
Malouin,
Mills,
Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Rymal,
Scriver,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Arkell,
Bannerman,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bourbeau,
Bowell,
Brecken,

Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hilliard,
Homer,
Hooper,
Hurteau,
Jones,
Kaulbach,

Ogden,
Orton,
Quimet,
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),

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

After Recess.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to move an amendment respecting the county of Ontario. The north riding of Ontario, as proposed by this Bill, is, I think, the most unshapely riding in the Province of Ontario. It is about 90 miles long. I think the Government, before the Bill is passed, should detach the township of Seugog from North Ontario, and add it to South Ontario; it is about 9 miles from the nearest point of the north riding, and it is connected with the township of Reach by a floating bridge about one-third of a mile long on Lake Seugog. In the north riding, I find the townships of Morrison, Ryde, Draper, Oakley, Maclean, and Macaulay, and the village of Gravenhurst, have been taken from Muskoka, and which make the constituency a very unwieldy one. I think it would be much better if the townships of Maclean and Macaulay were added to Muskoka, and the township of Muskoka and the village of Gravenhurst added to North Ontario. This would make the constituency much more shapely than it is at present. The objection to that is, I suppose, that they give a Reform majority. The population of the township of Muskoka is 1,135, and that of Gravenhurst village 1,015, making a total of 2,150. If these were added to North Ontario and the townships of Macaulay and Maclean taken away, the population of the riding would be increased by only 500. But I find by the returns of the last election that the township of Muskoka gave a Reform majority of 59, and the village of Gravenhurst a Reform majority of 62, making a total of 121; the township of Maclean gave a Reform majority of eight, and the township of Macaulay a Conservative majority of 13; so that the change adds 115 or 120 Conservative votes to North Ontario. The resolution I propose to move is to leave the county as it was before, and to take the township of Reach from North Ontario and add it to South Ontario; this would leave the constituencies much more shapely than they are now, and would give them 23,000 or 24,000 each. To show the inconvenience of the present division of the county, I may refer to a bill which I have received, calling a meeting of the electors to organize this new constituency of North Ontario, which states that the distance the electors will have to travel to attend the meeting will probably not exceed fifty or sixty miles. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Ontario is divided into two ridings, with a total population of 49,142, giving an average of 24,571 for each riding and the inequalities between the two ridings can easily be adjusted by a transfer from the north to the south riding of a portion of the county territory; that the proposed Bill leaves the south riding of Ontario with a population of 20,241, as against a present population of 20,348, and the north riding 20,828, as against a present population of 28,434, and creates a new riding of West Ontario with a population of 19,730. That for these purposes the south riding of Ontario is changed by transferring the township of Pickering to West Ontario, and by transferring

the township of Reach and the village of Port Perry from North Ontario; the north riding of Ontario is further changed by taking Oakley, Macaulay, Morrison, Ryde, McLean and Bracebridge from Muskoka and transferring Uxbridge to West Ontario and the new riding of West Ontario is created by taking Whitechurch and Newmarket from North York, Stouffville from North York and East York, Uxbridge from North Ontario and Pickering from South Ontario, being thus composed of parts of two municipal counties and four ridings; that the said plan is objectionable.

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the county of Ontario be divided into two electoral districts each returning one member.

Amendment (Mr. Wheeler) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills.
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheeler—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arnell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McCuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. MILLS. Before the question is put I wish to make an amendment which will state all the facts with sufficient explicitness to render any explanation on my part unnecessary. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the settlements lying eastward of the limit settled by the award, as the westerly boundary of Ontario, and not provided for under the Bill, be embraced for electoral purposes within the electoral district of Algoma.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no objection to that amendment. I do not wish to vote against it.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,

Mr. WHEELER.

Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheeler—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arnell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McCuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. TROW. I wish to move an amendment as regards the county I have the honor to represent, more for the sake of the people than for myself, because it is a matter of indifference to me whether I shall continue to represent it or not. I think it is generally known that it was to oblige the people and not myself that ever I came to Parliament. However, the Government have seen fit to disarrange that riding in such a manner as to disfigure it. This is probably as bad a case as there is in the whole Province of Ontario. There is no necessity of changing the population, because the two ridings of Perth would have made two very nice constituencies with similar population and about the number requisite to return a member. There was no need of disarranging the whole county for the purpose of forming four or five new constituencies, and these two ridings more particularly. Had there been a change either north or west there would not have been such a difference. But to place those two old townships that have been side by side so long in the positions proposed, and which have rolled up majorities time and again for the Liberals, is rather unfair. They have not now any power when thrown into a riding with 1,000 of a majority of opposite opinions. If the township of South Easthope was not taken back from Oxford, why not return the township of North Easthope to the south riding of Perth? It would not disarrange the smaller county by letting North Easthope return to the county from which it was taken, and it would not disturb Oxford or Huron. I noticed in one of the most ultra-Tory papers in a western county that they have predicted my defeat. They have arranged for that result, I presume. The editor goes on to state that his friend in North Perth is now secure. I know there was no possibility of his securing his election had those changes not been made. I have no particular objection to the Government securing the election of their friends;

but I do not see why they should go out of their way to defeat an opponent like myself. I should like very much to have a vote on my amendment, as I have heard at least a dozen Conservative members express sympathy with me, and express the opinion that my seat should not be put in danger. I have no fear of not securing my election, but at the same time these changes cut up the riding in a very improper manner. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by attaching North Easthope to the electoral district of South Perth.

Amendment (Mr. Trow) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Ouimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McGuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Montgenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to propose a motion in relation to other changes made by this Bill. The right hon. gentleman, in moving the second reading of this Bill, declared his object was to establish the principle of representation by population, and make the electoral districts nearly equal in population. I undertook to show that he could not make a very much more equal division than existed in the constituencies included in my motion, without a violation of the principle he laid down in 1872, in reference to maintaining the boundaries of the municipal counties intact. In taking off the township of Romney from the county of Essex and putting it back again in the municipal county of Kent, to which it belongs, the motive may not have been a very excellent one, but the fact itself was capable of defence. I mentioned before, and I state now, that the county of Kent is very inadequately represented by the provisions of this Bill, that while the county of Lambton has two distinct

electoral divisions within its limits, and forms a large proportion of a third and a fraction of a fourth electoral division, Kent has the election of but one representative within its limits, the remaining portions of it being tacked on to adjoining constituencies. If the hon. gentleman were to take the township of Harwich and the village of Blenheim from Kent, as it now stands, there would still remain 20,572 of a population within the limits of that county. The eastern division of Kent might be formed, with a population of nearly 20,000, and within the limits of Kent and Bothwell an electoral division might be formed containing a population of 22,000, which would be a very much more equal division than that which the hon. gentleman has made and which would not interfere with the existing divisions. I beg leave to move:

The the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the municipal counties of Kent and Lambton comprise the electoral districts of Kent, Lambton and Bothwell, with a population of 106 344, making for five members an average of 21,268 per member.

That the electoral district of Lambton comprises 42,619, and may properly be divided into two ridings.

That the electoral district of Kent comprises 36,626, and may by the restoration from Bothwell of some of the municipalities of Kent, be divided into two ridings of about 21,000 each, leaving Bothwell with about 21,000.

That the proposed Bill needlessly disarranges the existing organization for Kent and Bothwell; takes from Kent and adds to Bothwell, Chatham and Wallaceburg; takes from Bothwell to add to West Elgin, Oxford, Howard and Ridgetown, and takes from Bothwell to add to West Middlesex, Euphemia.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the provisions for the representation of Kent, Lambton and Bothwell in Parliament.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Ouimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McGuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Montgenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. CASEY. I have to make, with regard to my county, objections of a similar character to those made by many other hon. members in regard to their counties. The general objections made to the scope of the Bill itself have been justified and strengthened in the course of this debate. As one change has followed another in this Bill, it has become more and more apparent that the Bill is the production of continued caucusing, and that the caucusing has not stopped yet. Local districts have sent down their representatives and those representatives have been heard, and while the country at large is refused an opportunity of properly understanding this Bill and of expressing their opinions upon it, the supporters of the Government have been heard on every point, and at their dictation and representation alterations have been made to meet exigencies not at first provided for. A still further proof that the Bill is indefensible is the fact that hon. members opposite do not, as a rule, attempt to defend it. The occasional speeches that have been made in favor of the Bill have not been made by the members of the Government or their leading supporters, but by junior members of the party, who have perhaps escaped the party reins and talked when they were not wanted to talk. The rule seems to have been promulgated by the leaders of the opposite side that the Bill shall not be discussed on that side, because the more it is discussed the more indefensible it must appear. This very afternoon one portion at least was made to appear so indefensible that the Government had to give their influence and votes to the removal of that provision. With regard to Elgin, the population of that municipal county is almost the exact quota for two members, viz., a little over 21,000 each. The difference between the two ridings is very considerable as they are now arranged. That difference, of course, it was part of the declared policy of the Government to remove as far as possible; but it was also part of their declared policy not only to remove the difference, but to reduce the average of these ridings to as nearly the quota as possible. I have pointed out that in the case of the two Elgins they could not reduce the average to a point nearer the average quota of the Dominion than as it stands, but they could have removed the inequality of the two ridings by making the changes within the boundaries of the county itself. But instead of doing so they have seen fit to begin a series of changes affecting several of the neighboring counties, by adding to the county of Elgin at one end and cutting it off on the other, something on the principle of the Irishman who found his blanket was too short, and he cut off a piece at one end and added it to the other end in order to make it longer. The Government have done so with the county of Elgin; they have cut off one township at one end and put two new townships on to the other end, and they have succeeded in making it a little longer than it was before. They have given the county a total population of 49,000, which is considerably more than the required quota for two members. They have disarranged the representation of those two ridings in such a way as to give the individual electors of Elgin a much smaller share of representation than they had before. They had already, on the average, just the share they should have had, compared with the rest of the Dominion—one member for every 24,000; they have now only one for every 24,500. The hon. Minister has disfranchised the two townships added by putting them in a riding where their vote will have no effect on the result. They have not succeeded yet in reducing the population of East Elgin to nearly the point of the required quota. When East Elgin is reduced it contains nearly 26,000 people, and is larger than Carleton, East Peterborough, Muskoka, South Simcoe, South Huron, South Wellington, or North Bruce, all of which were found to be so large that the Government declared it necessary in the interest of fair representation to reduce these ridings; and yet by the changes they have made, they have left East Elgin much

Mr. MULLS.

larger than any of those constituencies. It is therefore quite clear that equalization was not the object in the arrangement of that riding, at all events. I might further point out that the two ridings of Elgin as now arranged contain a somewhat larger population than the two ridings of Ontario before they were re-arranged, and yet the Government declared that, in the interest of fair representation, they were compelled to reduce the representation of the Ontarios, notwithstanding which they have increased the two Elgins from having exactly the proper quota up to a point above that at which the Ontarios stood before they reduced them. I therefore move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Elgin contains a population of 42,361 souls, and is divided into two ridings, each returning one member to the House of Commons, with an average population of 21,180 per member, which is very near the average quota for the Dominion.

That by the proposed Bill the township of South Dorchester and the village of Springfield are transferred from East Elgin to East Middlesex, and the town of Ridgetown and the townships of Oxford and Howard are transferred from Bothwell to West Elgin for electoral purposes.

That by these changes the population of East Elgin becomes 25,806 and that of West Elgin 23,477, being a total of 49,277 for the two ridings, or an average of 24,638 per member, which is much further from the quota for the Dominion than the present average.

That by the transfer of the city of St. Thomas from the east riding to the west riding, the population of each riding would be as follows: East Elgin, 19,780; West Elgin, 22,581.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the municipal county of Elgin be divided into two ridings, each returning one member.

Amendment (Mr. Casey) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scrifer,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Baunerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Saw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McCaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLellan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—22.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will not be necessary for me to detain the House with any remarks with reference to the iniquity in the Bill which I propose to remedy by this amendment, as it is fully set forth in the document which I will read and place in your hands. I beg to move:

That the county of Brant with a population of 33,869 is at present divided into two ridings, each returning one member, with an average population of 16,934, or a population greater than the population assigned to many ridings by the said Bill.

That any inequality between the two ridings of North and South Brant could be easily adjusted by transferring some part of the south to the north riding.

That the proposed re-adjustment transfers from the smaller riding North Brant, to the larger riding South Brant, the town of Paris and the township of Onondaga, and takes away from the south riding of Brant and adds to another municipal county, that of Oxford, the township of Burford and Oakland, and takes away from Oxford, and adds to the proposed new riding of North Brant, the township of Blenheim, and takes away from Wentworth and adds to the proposed north riding of Brant the township of Ancaster, thus making a north riding of Brant, so-called, composed of parts of Brant, Oxford and Wentworth.

That the proposed changes are objectionable.
That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by dividing the municipal county of Brant into two ridings, each returning one member.

Amendment (Mr. Paterson, Brant) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar, d,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmore,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury)	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton)
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tepper,
Dawson,	McCuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongenis,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. MACDONELL (North Lanark). The hon. First Minister the other evening, judging from his remarks, thought I was in favor of changing Torbolton for Huntley. Had the hon. gentleman been in his place when I made my remarks in respect to the Bill he would not have been under that impression. At that time I asked

the hon. Minister of Customs, in the absence of the hon. First Minister, why the Government did not add Huntley, and I said the reason why they did not do so was because the people of Huntley objected to its being added to Lanark. I, moreover, say that objection might be taken to Huntley on the same grounds on which objection was made to Torbolton. I regret the hon. member for Carleton has not raised his voice in regard to attaching the township from his riding to Lanark. It was at his suggestion that Huntley was added to Lanark. I hope the hon. First Minister will accept the suggestion of dividing Carleton into two ridings by the addition of Gloucester and another township. I protest in every way against the townships added to North Lanark, and I hope those ridings will be allowed to remain as at present. I beg to move in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the municipal county of Lanark at present returning one member for each of two ridings, contains a population of 33,975, equal to 16,937 for each member, or within 1,615 of 18,552 being the average number of souls to a member for the thirty-two seats in the eastern portion of the Province, and largely in excess of the proposed population for eight of the seats in that district, namely:

South Grenville.....	13,256
North Leeds.....	12,423
Brockville.....	15,207
Frontenac.....	14,993
Kingston.....	14,091
West Peterboro'.....	13,310
Ottawa (2 seats).....	27,412

giving an average per seat of 13,946.

That the disproportion between the north and south riding of Lanark can be easily adjusted by transferring from South Lanark one of the municipalities adjoining the north riding. That the proposed re-adjustment separates from the municipal county of Lanark, Smith's Falls, in the south riding of Lanark, and attaches it to North Leeds and Grenville, part of another municipal county, and separates from the municipal county of Carleton the townships of Fitzroy and Huntley, and attaches them for electoral purposes to the north riding of Lanark.

That the proposed re-adjustment is objectionable.
That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by creating out of the municipal county of Lanark, two ridings for electoral purposes.

Amendment (Macdonell, Lanark) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar, d,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Browa,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,

Coursol, McDonald (Cape Breton) Tellier,
 Daly, Macmillan, Tilley,
 Daoust, McCallum, Tupper,
 Dawson, McQuig, Tyrwhitt,
 Desaulniers, McDougald, Valin,
 Desjardins, McLelan, Vanasse,
 Domville, McRory, Wade,
 Elliott, Massue, Wallace (Norfolk),
 Farrow, Merner, Wallace (York),
 Fortin, Méthot, White (Cardwell),
 Gigault, Mongenais, White (Hastings),
 Girouard (Jac. Cartier), Mousseau, White (Renfrew),
 Girouard (Kent), O'Connor, Williams.—99.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the following amendment :—

That the County of Haldimand has at present a population of 18,619 or more than 2,000 under the quota.

That the proposed Bill reduces the population of Haldimand to 17,667, by withdrawing the township of South Cayuga and adding it to Monck; that there is no ground for such reduction.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the County of Haldimand, as at present constituted for electoral purposes, shall return one member.

Amendment (Mr. Thompson) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin, Fleming, Mackenzie,
 Bain, Flynn, Malouin,
 Béchard, Gillies, Mills,
 Blake, Gillmor, Olivier,
 Borden, Gunn, Paterson (Brant),
 Bourassa, Guthrie, Pickard,
 Brown, Holton, Rinfret,
 Burpee (St. John), Huntington, Rogers,
 Burpee (Sunbury), Irvine, Rymal,
 Cartwright, Killam, Sriver,
 Casey, King, Sutherland,
 Casgrain, Laurier, Thompson,
 Dumont, McDonald (Victoria, N.S.) Trow,
 Fiset, Macdonell (Lanark), Wheeler.—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot, Grandbois, Ogden,
 Arkell, Guillet, Orton,
 Bannerman, Hackett, Onimet,
 Beauchesne, Haggart, Pinsonneault,
 Benoit, Hay, Platt,
 Bergeron, Hilliard, Plumb,
 Bergin, Homer, Pope (Compton),
 Bill, Hooper, Poupore,
 Bourbeau, Hurteau, Reid,
 Bowell, Jones, Richey,
 Brecken, Kaulbach, Robertson (Hamilton),
 Bunster, Kilvert, Ross (Dundas),
 Bunting, Kirkpatrick, Rouleau,
 Burnham, Landry, Routhier,
 Cameron (Victoria), Lane, Ryan (Montreal),
 Caron, Langevin, Rykert,
 Cimon (Charlevoix), Lantier, Scott,
 Cimon (Chicoutimi), Longley, Shaw,
 Colby, Macdonald (Kings), Sproule,
 Coupal, Macdonald (Sir John), Strange,
 Coursol, McDonald (Cape Breton) Tellier,
 Daly, Macmillan, Tilley,
 Daoust, McCallum, Tupper,
 Dawson, McQuig, Tyrwhitt,
 Desaulniers, McDougald, Valin,
 Desjardins, McLelan, Vanasse,
 Domville, McRory, Wade,
 Elliott, Massue, Wallace (Norfolk),
 Farrow, Merner, Wallace (York),
 Fortin, Méthot, White (Cardwell),
 Gigault, Mongenais, White (Hastings),
 Girouard (Jac. Cartier), Mousseau, White (Renfrew),
 Girouard (Kent), O'Connor, Williams.—99.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. In the absence of the hon. member for North Norfolk, I beg to move the following amendment :—

The county of Norfolk, with a population of 33,593, is divided into two ridings, each returning one member, with an average population of 16,846, a population greater than assigned to many ridings by the Bill.

That it is proposed by the Bill to take away from Oxford the township of Dereham and the town of Tilsonburg, and to add them to North Norfolk.

Mr. MACDONELL (Lanark).

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the county of Norfolk be divided into two ridings, each returning one member of Parliament.

Amendment (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin, Fleming, Mackenzie,
 Bain, Flynn, Malouin,
 Béchard, Gillies, Mills,
 Blake, Gillmor, Olivier,
 Borden, Gunn, Paterson (Brant),
 Bourassa, Guthrie, Pickard,
 Brown, Holton, Rinfret,
 Burpee (St. John), Huntington, Rogers,
 Burpee (Sunbury), Irvine, Rymal,
 Cartwright, Killam, Sriver,
 Casey, King, Sutherland,
 Casgrain, Laurier, Thompson,
 Dumont, McDonald (Victoria, N.S.) Trow,
 Fiset, Macdonell (Lanark), Wheeler.—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot, Grandbois, Ogden,
 Arkell, Guillet, Orton,
 Bannerman, Hackett, Onimet,
 Beauchesne, Haggart, Pinsonneault,
 Benoit, Hay, Platt,
 Bergeron, Hilliard, Plumb,
 Bergin, Homer, Pope (Compton),
 Bill, Hooper, Poupore,
 Bourbeau, Hurteau, Reid,
 Bowell, Jones, Richey,
 Brecken, Kaulbach, Robertson (Hamilton),
 Bunster, Kilvert, Ross (Dundas),
 Bunting, Kirkpatrick, Rouleau,
 Burnham, Landry, Routhier,
 Cameron (Victoria), Lane, Ryan (Montreal),
 Caron, Langevin, Rykert,
 Cimon (Charlevoix), Lantier, Scott,
 Cimon (Chicoutimi), Longley, Shaw,
 Colby, Macdonald (Kings), Sproule,
 Coupal, Macdonald (Sir John), Strange,
 Coursol, McDonald (Cape Breton) Tellier,
 Daly, Macmillan, Tilley,
 Daoust, McCallum, Tupper,
 Dawson, McQuig, Tyrwhitt,
 Desaulniers, McDougald, Valin,
 Desjardins, McLelan, Vanasse,
 Domville, McRory, Wade,
 Elliott, Massue, Wallace (Norfolk),
 Farrow, Merner, Wallace (York),
 Fortin, Méthot, White (Cardwell),
 Gigault, Mongenais, White (Hastings),
 Girouard (Jac. Cartier), Mousseau, White (Renfrew),
 Girouard (Kent), O'Connor, Williams.—99.

Mr. TROW. I beg to move an amendment :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Middlesex and the city of London contain a population of 93,081 souls; that any substantial inequality in the division of this population can be easily adjusted within municipal bounds; that by the proposed Bill the township of Stephen is taken from the municipal county of Huron and added to North Middlesex, the township of South Dorchester is taken from the county of Elgin and added to East Middlesex, the township of Euphemia is taken from Bothwell and added to West Middlesex, and numerous other changes are made.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the provisions for the representation of the county of Middlesex in Parliament.

Amendment (Mr. Trow) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin, Fleming, Mackenzie,
 Bain, Flynn, Malouin,
 Béchard, Gillies, Mills,
 Blake, Gillmor, Olivier,
 Borden, Gunn, Paterson (Brant),
 Bourassa, Guthrie, Pickard,
 Brown, Holton, Rinfret,
 Burpee (St. John), Huntington, Rogers,
 Burpee (Sunbury), Irvine, Rymal,
 Cartwright, Killam, Sriver,
 Casey, King, Sutherland,

Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)
Macdonell (Lanark),

Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—42.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,
Arkell,
Bannerman,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bourbeau,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Fortin,
Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),

Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hilliard,
Homer,
Hooper,
Hurteau,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
MacDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McLelan,
McRory,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongenais,
Mousseau,
O'Connor,

Ogden,
Orton,
Oumet,
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Ross (Dundas),
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—99.

Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Gillmor,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)
Macdonell (Lanark),

Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Rymal,
Scriber,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—42.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,
Arkell,
Bannerman,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Bourbeau,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Burnham,
Cameron (Victoria),
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Colby,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Fortin,
Gigault,
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),

Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Hilliard,
Homer,
Hooper,
Hurteau,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdonald (Sir John),
MacDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McLelan,
McRory,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongenais,
Mousseau,
O'Connor,

Ogden,
Orton,
Oumet,
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Reid,
Richey,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Ross (Dundas),
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Ryan (Montreal),
Rykert,
Scott,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—98.

Mr. BAIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up the portion of time to which I am entitled to discuss this question to-night, but at the same time I feel disposed to say that I think the old municipal and county boundaries have a strong claim for consideration in any re-adjustment measure, and I think that the right hon. leader of the House, when he made the arrangement after the former Census certainly he had much more respect for that principle than he has at the present time. I have simply to say in connection with the motion I propose to make, that while the present adjustment of Simcoe disturbs, not only the municipal boundaries of the county, but also of the two adjoining counties, the division is still very far from a fair average. The average I find to be 25,342, varying in population from 22,000 in the south to 27,000 in the east. Under the arrangement which I propose, these ridings would have an average population of 22,607, which is much nearer to the average representation of the Province as a whole, besides preserving to a greater degree the municipal boundaries. I move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, That the North and South Ridings of Simcoe comprise a population of 76,129, giving an average population if divided into three Ridings of 25,376, and that a portion of the population is comprised in the municipal county of Dufferin to which the said Bill does not assign a Member.

That it is proposed by the said Bill to create the East Riding of Simcoe partly by withdrawing from Muskoka the municipalities of Wood, Medora, Monck, Muskoka and the Town of Gravenhurst, and by transferring from South Simcoe to the North Riding of York the Township of West Gwilliambury and the Town of Bradford.

That the said re-adjustment is objectionable.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the Municipal County of Dufferin shall return one Member and by dividing the remainder of the south riding of Simcoe and the north riding of Simcoe into three ridings, each returning one Member, and by making other consequential changes.

Amendment (Mr. Bain) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin,
Bain,
Bécharde,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Gillies,

Mackenzie,
Malouin,
Mills,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to get the attention of the Chairman of the Committee which was charged with the preparation of this Bill, and I shall be obliged to him if he will indicate his consciousness by looking at me. I see he keeps his head down, however, but I wish to say to the hon. Minister of Customs that I do not want the resolution which I am about to move voted down in silence. I think we have a right, if we cannot have any attention, at least to have an explanation of the arrangement made in South Brant and South Oxford. I desire to ask, whoever is in charge of the Government at this moment, if it was the principle of equalization of the population, that was the basis of this change, and if that was not the principle, I think I have a right to know, and the House has a right to know under what principle it was made? They took from South Brant two townships, and they annexed them to the riding of South Oxford. Now, I do not lay much stress with regard to the case of Burford, from a geographical point of view, though there was no necessity of disturbing that riding at all, as it had the proper number of inhabitants; but let me point out to you that in taking the township of Oakland from South Brant and adding it to South Oxford, you are taking a population of 930 from a riding which has only a little over 20,000 and attaching it to a riding which has a population of nearly 25,000. The township of Oakland does not belong geographically to the south riding of Oxford at all, for if it had not been attached to Burford on one side, which you are now attaching to South Oxford, Oakland would be twelve miles away at its nearest point from the county of Oxford, and as the township is three-quartered—is three-correred—the result of the change is to leave that county anything but symmetrical. This township

comes within eight miles of the city of Brantford, the county town, where its inhabitants do all their business, and the town of Ingersoll, which is the main town in South Oxford to which it is now attached, will be something like 40 or 50 miles distant. I move :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the township of Oakland shall form part of the Electoral District of the south riding of the county of Brant.

I want an answer to my question.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Surely, after so pointed and repeated a request, an answer should be given.

Mr. PATERSON. Is there no hon. gentleman on the other side with sufficient spirit to answer ?

Amendment (Mr. Paterson, Brant) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkel,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Onimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (King's),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McQuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongeneis,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. BLAKE. I move :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by striking out the sixth clause which gives to the Government the absolute power of naming the Returning Officers at elections, and repeals the existing law whereunder the Returning Officers are to be selected when practicable from the Sheriffs and Registrars of the Districts.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Bécharde,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Gillies,
Gillmor,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Holton,
Huntington,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)
Macdonell (Lanark),

Mills,
Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Pickard,
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Rymal,
Scriver,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheler.—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkel,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Onimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald (Cape Breton)	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McQuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méhot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Mongeneis,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to move :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by reducing the money deposit required on the nomination of a candidate from \$200 to \$50.

Amendment (Mr. Blake) negatived on the following division :—

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scriver,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkel,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Onimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,

Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Ochicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald(CapeBreton),	Tallier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McCuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Montgenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard, Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams—99.

Mr. TROW. I move:

By the proposed arrangements for the representation of the county of Perth, South Easthope is withdrawn from South Perth and added to North Oxford, Osborne is withdrawn from South Huron and added to South Perth, North Easthope is withdrawn from North Perth and added to North Oxford, Wallace is withdrawn from North Perth and added to North Wellington. That these extensive severances of municipal county organizations for electoral purposes are objectionable.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the provisions for the representation of the county of Perth in Parliament.

Amendment (Mr. Trow) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Béchar, d,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guthrie,	Pickard,
Brown,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Huntington,	Rogers,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Irvine,	Rymal,
Cartwright,	Killam,	Scrifer,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Dumont,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)	Trow,
Fiset,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Wheler.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Grandbois,	Ogden,
Arkell,	Guillet,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Beauchesne,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hay,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Plumb,
Bergin,	Homer,	Pope (Compton),
Bill,	Hooper,	Poupore,
Bourbeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bowell,	Jones,	Richey,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kilvert,	Ross (Dundas),
Bunting,	Kirkpatrick,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Landry,	Routhier,
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Ryan (Montreal),
Caron,	Langevin,	Rykert,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Lantier,	Scott,
Cimon (Ochicoutimi),	Longley,	Shaw,
Colby,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sproule,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Strange,
Coursol,	McDonald(Cape Breton),	Tallier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Tupper,
Dawson,	McCuaig,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers,	McDougald,	Valin,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Massue,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Merner,	Wallace (York),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Cardwell),
Gigault,	Montgenais,	White (Hastings),
Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mousseau,	White (Renfrew),
Girouard (Kent),	O'Connor,	Williams.—99.

Mr. RYMAL. The appeal I made on a former occasion when the House was in Committee, to replace

the township of Ancaster where it properly belongs, where it has been for the last 70 years, proving ineffectual, as the Government are exhibiting a determination that no amendment shall be made to the Bill as it at present stands, I have only to renew my former protest against the action of the Government. It is clear to me that the object which they say they have in view is not the true one. The equalization of the constituencies has been, not entirely, but to a very great extent, disregarded, and the political complexion of the constituencies has been the sole, the guiding motive of their action in changing the bounds. Now, when we come to realize the fact that in some fifteen constituencies—no, in ten—yes, in nine—there are 6,500 Reform electors who are virtually disfranchised—who have no influence whatever in this country—who might just as well be politically decapitated—we have some idea of the nature of this Bill. Now, these 6,500 Reform electors, who have been thrown into these nine or ten constituencies, from perhaps eighteen or twenty others, would have been sufficient in many cases to have turned the tide of the political battle, and it was for this reason only that this wicked, this tyrannical change has been brought about. Why, Mr. Speaker, every Tory wire-puller or prospective candidate, who fancied that his chances of election would be improved by having his constituency or those adjoining it changed, has been consulted day after day and week after week, and, although I am not a very observant person, I have seen these delegations here enquiring for certain gentlemen, who I do not hesitate to say were agents in the gerrymandering business. So the Government were well posted; but when the Bill came down, it was found that those who first acted did not complete the job to the satisfaction of some who did not appear here, and the business had to be gone into again. One change after another was made, and I do not believe they were all made with the approval of the Chairman of the gerrymandering Committee; I believe there is too much honor and fair play in him to stoop to some of the mean tricks which have been resorted to in order to defraud the Reform electors of their representatives. When we consider that in the Tory constituencies of Lincoln, Monck, South Norfolk, East Elgin, East Middlesex, North Middlesex, North Huron, North Perth, South Bruce, North Wellington, Centre Wellington, North York, East York, South Lanark, Brockville, and Stormont and Cornwall, the prospects of the Tory candidates have been materially improved, and that in South Wentworth, South Brant, North Norfolk, North Perth, West Middlesex, Bothwell, North Ontario, South Ontario, North Lanark and North Bruce, the Reformers have been decimated and weakened, the result is that the Tory party has been strengthened in everyone of these twenty-six constituencies. But the equalization of the population has not been secured. In my own constituency, where we were 6,000 below the quota, we are now 5,400 below the quota; and, in the case of my own riding, I feel as sure as that I am a living man that there was no other reason for removing the keystone of that old municipal organization of Wentworth than the fact that for forty-five years at least it has had much to do with returning a Reform representative for that riding. I quite understand the animus which inspired the hon. First Minister when he said to me privately on the floor of the House, a night or two ago, with a pretty hard expression at the commencement of his sentence: "We meant to make you howl." Well, he has made us howl; but we have not begun to howl yet, and some of us will do some howling before the next election; and I venture to predict that although the hon. gentleman has done such an infamous act, although he has attempted to strangle the voice of the people, although he has changed the constituencies for the express purpose of bringing his creatures into Parliament, it will be as on a former occasion when he attempted something of this kind—that he has overshot the

mark, that an outraged people will resent this act; and I am glad to know that some of his Tory friends in the township of Ancaster, who have been added to a county 45 miles away, are telling their comrades and the Reformers that they are not slaves or serfs, to be placed here and there at the whim of a Minister, although they have, in times gone by, supported his general policy; and I venture to predict that there will be some disappointments in the returns when the next general election is over. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not made of such material that I can beg for justice. I can ask you plainly and in a manly way to do what is right, but I cannot beg, I cannot fawn and be a sycophant. I can play a fair, honorable part. If the tyrant tramples upon me, if he binds my people's hands so that I or some one else holding the same views may not be their representative, my indignation rises and I feel a great deal like the chained gladiator:

"I loathe you petty tyrants,
I scorn you with mine eye,
I'll curse you with my latest breath,
And fight you till I die;
I will not beg for quarter,
I scorn to be your slave—
No, I'll swim the sea of slaughter,
Or sink beneath the wave."

This diabolical act of the Government is a fitting climax to the many corrupt and wicked acts perpetrated under the Government of the present Prime Minister. I wish he were here that I might the more fully express my thoughts; but there are some instances of his political career that in his absence I shall not refer to. I do not wish to appear to make a cowardly attack on an absent member. I have never yet been branded as a coward, and I do not wish to speak behind a man's back what should only be said to his face. I have no doubt the hon. First Minister desires to go down to his grave honored and respected; and gladly would I see any man who has devoted so many years of his life to the public service, depart in that way. But there are some acts of the right hon. gentleman's career to which I must refer. His leadership of the Tory party was obtained, as I was told, by the man he supplanted, by intrigue and deception. The man he supplanted told me that he had warmed a viper in his breast that turned round and stung him. Having obtained power in that way, by a cunning and deceptive heart and mind, he signalized his public career by acts that are not unworthy of notice. The double-shuffle of 1878 signalized the cunning of the man; for he led the Liberal party into a trap most completely. He allowed them to take office, and in two days afterwards he and his friends voted them out without even allowing them an appeal to the people. When resuming office he swore he would perform his duties, never intending to do so, for the day after he swore to perform the duties of another office, an act characterized by the late D'Arcy McGee as gross and deliberate perjury. The Pacific Scandal also marked his administration of public affairs as that of a man ready to corrupt the electorate, to buy the constituencies, and to sell a great public contract to obtain the funds for the purpose. The organs of public opinion in this and the adjoining country, and at home, almost without exception, stigmatized that act as unworthy of the character of a Canadian statesman; and the apologetic and whining manner in which he attempted to justify that transaction—the pity-the-sorrows-of-a-poor-old-man style in which he addressed the House in his defence, showed he felt the humiliating position in which his wicked conduct had placed him. The Pacific Railway contract and his subsequent conduct marked his subserviency to that great corporation; for I do not believe that any demand the Syndicate might make on the Government dare be refused. They have handed over to the tender mercies of a grasping monopoly the heritage of the people of Canada; and to-day the men who are going into the great North-West to develop

Mr. RYMAL.

its rich soil, meet with a great many obstructions which, under a paternal Government, they would never have been subjected to. I always believed there was a spirit of manly pride in the Premier, and something like moral and political courage—that he was not afraid to meet his opponents in a fair field and on equal terms—that he was willing to be tried by an unpacked jury. But, able as I acknowledge him to be, he seems to have shrunk from the discussion of the public questions, and the verdict which an impartial jury would render, and for that purpose he has placed the issue before a jury of his own packing. Can anyone expect justice at the hands of such a tribunal as this? And is it not cowardly, after all the boasts from hon. gentlemen opposite that the country had become so prosperous under their Administration that, day by day, the public heart was being drawn towards them and that they only wanted an opportunity to convince the world that that Administration for the last three or four years had won for them the unbounded confidence of the people, to bring forward such a measure as this. There never was a more vainglorious boast; and the Bill now before the House is the most conclusive evidence that there was a coward's heart in the breast of every one of them, for no fair-minded honorable men would have attempted to so gerrymander the constituencies, had they at all been sure of their seats. No fair-minded honorable man would have attempted to gerrymander the constituencies as to make the seats sure. I suppose the die is cast, and we shall have to appeal to these gerrymandered constituencies, to plead our cause before a tribunal formed in such a way as to render it a biased one. In many cases, no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite will succeed in their efforts, but in many others I am sure they will not. We shall go into the fight terribly handicapped, and if they win a verdict under such circumstances, they will have nothing to boast of. They should rather blush for shame, to think that they are retained in place and power by means so base, by appealing to a jury so partizan in its character. I may ask whether there is any redress for this. From this House I expect nothing. The die is cast. The partizan character of the majority will cause them to support the measure irrespective of its merits, and the character of the other branch, the Senate, precludes any hope that they will not affirm what has been passed in this House. The only appeal left is that to the representative of the Sovereign. For what else can a Governor General be here if not to stand in the breach when a gross outrage is being perpetrated, when a corrupt Executive, backed by a subservient following, use their legislative power to prevent the free expression of popular opinion. I have thought, in my simplicity and ignorance, perhaps, that this is a function which the representative of the Sovereign might properly exercise. I wonder whether he will take the task of asking some very pertinent questions of his tyrant Minister as to the reason why he did this thing. I think that he might properly do it, and I think that the son of the noble house of Argyle, unless he has forgotten the traditions of his family, will ask some such pertinent questions.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. RYMAL. May I not speculate as to what is to occur? I bow to the Speaker's decision. Speaking for myself, perhaps this is the last time my voice shall be heard here. I have a personal regard for every man in this House, and I have been assured by a number of my Conservative friends of their regret that I should disappear from the public stage. They assured me of the value they set upon me, and hoped I would forego the determination I have made and still continue to be an ornament, I suppose, to this House. Well, in my simplicity I believed that these men were speaking truly what they felt, and not until they, as it were, took me by the throat and assassinated a goodly number of

my electors had I any doubt of the truth of what they said. I cannot, in fitting language, describe what I believed them to be, or you, Mr. Speaker, would call me to account again, but I think I can give you a pretty clear idea. I will suppose that the hon. First Minister was about to organize his followers into a great band of musicians, and he were to ask me what instruments they should play, I would say to him: Let everyone play the lyre because the bandmaster would not have much trouble in making experts of them. The moment they had the instruments in their hands they would be accomplished musicians. I trust that good will come out of this. I hope that the people will arise to the necessity of the occasion, and teach an unjust, unfair, corrupt Minister that he may not trifle with the dearest rights of Britons, that he may not ruthlessly disfranchise 7,500 of the loyal subjects of Canada just because they happen to be Liberals in principle. Fair play and justice hides its head at such a scene as this, and the Goddess of Liberty, clad in mourning, weeps over the wrongs he has done to his countrymen; but we shall see what we shall see. On looking over this Bill I do not consider it complete, and have drafted an additional clause which I will read to the House and send over to the First Minister, in order that he may judge for himself whether it is not a fitting clause to add:

Should any county or electoral division in Ontario except North Brant, West Elgin, South Middlesex, North and South Oxford, South Huron, West Bruce, South Huron, East Simcoe and West Ontario, contrary to the interest and meaning of this Act, nominate and elect any person known by the name of Grit, Reformer, or Liberal, to be a member of the House of Commons, the election of such member so elected may by Order in Council be declared null and void by disallowing the same, and in like manner such member so elected may be declared ineligible to sit and vote in the House of Commons of Canada; and the county or electoral division so disregarding the intention and purposes of this Act shall be disfranchised and not entitled to elect a member of Parliament, and the seat so forfeited may by Order in Council be conferred on some defeated candidate in the Tory interest at the coming election, preference being given to those who have longest been subservient followers of the Tory Government and supporters of Pacific Scandals and known as the "Old Guard," the present members for Niagara and Cornwall, whose seats have been abolished, being first of all provided for.

I beg to move the following amendment:—

The County of Wentworth comprises a population of 30,991, divided into two ridings, with an average population of 15,495, which is higher than the average population for eight of the seats proposed under the said Bill.

That by the said Bill it is proposed to withdraw from the south riding of Wentworth the township of Ancaster and attach it to the north riding of Brant, another municipal county; to withdraw from the electoral district of Monck the township of Caistor and attach it to the south riding of Wentworth, another municipal county; to withdraw from the county of Lincoln the township and village of Grimsby and add them to the south riding of Wentworth, another municipal county, with the result of increasing the population of the electoral division of the south riding of Wentworth by only 546 souls, making it 15,539 souls, as against 14,993, its present population.

That the said re-adjustment is objectionable, and the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the municipal county of Wentworth shall be divided into two ridings, each returning one member.

I call for the yeas and nays. I have a particular desire that the yeas and nays shall be taken on this occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the last time I shall trust to an arrangement made with the leader of the Opposition. He has broken his word.

Mr. BLAKE. Did the hon. gentleman say I had broken my word?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I did say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Why, Mr. Speaker, I am amazed the hon. gentleman has made such a statement.

Mr. RYMAL. I understood the right hon. gentleman to suggest that if any member particularly desired it it should be done.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, that is what the hon. Minister himself said.

Mr. RYMAL. There is no contract between the hon. Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition that I know of, and I heard him say it might be done if any one desired it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind, not a word.

Mr. RYMAL. I heard him say so.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I deny it distinctly. Any body who says I did, says what is not true.

Mr. BLAKE. I say I heard him say so.

Mr. MILLS. I say so, too.

Amendment (Mr. Rymal) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin,
Bain,
Béchar, d,
Blake,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brown,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Dumont,
Fiset,

Fleming,
Flynn,
Geoffrion,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Holton,
Irvine,
Killam,
King,
Laurier,
McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)
Macdonell (Lanark),

Mackenzie,
Maloun,
Mills,
Olivier,
Paterson (Brant),
Rinfret,
Rogers,
Rymal,
Skinner,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trow,
Wheeler.—41.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,
Arkell,
Bannerman,
Beauchesne,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bill,
Boldue,
Bourbeau,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Bunster,
Bunting,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Ochicoutimi),
Coughlin,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Carrier,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson.
DeCosmos,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Domville,
Elliott,
Farrow,
Ferguson,
Fortin,
Fulton,
Gigault,

Girouard (Jacq. Cartier),
Girouard (Kent),
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hay,
Homer,
Hooper,
Hurteau,
Jones,
Kaulbach,
Kirkpatrick,
Kranz,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Lantier,
Longley,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Sir John),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
Macmillan,
McCallum,
McCarthy,
McQuaig,
McDougald,
McLellan,
McLeod,
McRory,
Manson,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,
Mongensis,

Montplaisir,
Mousseau,
O'Connor,
Ogden,
Orton,
Quimet,
Patterson (Essex),
Pinsonneault,
Plumb,
Pope (Compton),
Poupore,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Rochester,
Ross (Dundas),
Rouleau,
Routhier,
Ryan (Marquette),
Ryan (Montreal),
Scott,
Shaw,
Sproule,
Strange,
Teller,
Tilley,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vallée,
Vanasse,
Wade,
Wallace (Norfolk),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Renfrew),
Williams.—106.

Mr. BUNSTER. I consider the Government in this gerrymandering business has not gone far enough. The hon. Premier, as well as the junior member for Victoria, will probably have to endorse the remarks I am going to make. The electoral districts of Vancouver, according to the returns of the British Columbia Government, contains 1,384 votes; that is more than Victoria has to-day. While the hon. Premier does not, as a matter of course, like to relinquish any part of the seat he now occupies so worthily; I have a right, in justice to British Columbia, to demand from the Government that the constituency of Vancouver Island shall be divided. I am not asking for any additional

seat, I am merely asking for what is fair to the Island, which is, that all north of Nanaimo, including Comox and Queen Charlotte Island, shall be entitled to one representative, the constituency to be known as the Nanaimo electoral district; and that all south of Nanaimo shall have one representative, save and except the city of Victoria. The city of Victoria shall have one representative, leaving three representatives the same as we have now. I do not see why the Government should not grant this request; inasmuch as it is just and reasonable. But it is very hard to get anything from the Government; they know their great strength, their great majority, and they generally answer, no. I am now alluding to the hon. Minister of Customs, who, as the hon. leader of the Government justly stated in the last campaign, knew how to say no, and he has not forgotten to say no yet. I am speaking now for only a part of British Columbia. I laid the matter privately before the Government, but could get no satisfaction from them. As to the Chinese, I understood that the junior member for Victoria brought up the Chinese question without giving any notice of it, and the leader of the Government snubbed him for it. I have spoken of the Chinese question, year in and year out, and I can safely say that no Government in Canada can stand unless they make the Chinese question a plank in their platform. The present Government has carried out the wishes of the people, I believe, in regard to the National Policy as well as with respect to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but they will have also to assist the people of the Pacific Province in preventing the Chinese from landing on our shores. They have a good precedent in the action of the people of the United States, as exhibited in California, in respect to this question. We have present the senior and junior members for Victoria, and when they come to consider the representation of Vancouver Island they will no doubt approve of the proposal which I now submit to the House.

Mr. DECOSMOS. How many voters have you?

Mr. BUNSTER. 1,134. How many have you in Victoria city? I will read from the most energetic paper we have in that Province, the *Nanaimo Free Press*, which, speaking upon the question of representation, urges me to ask justice for the Province in the following terms:—

"That it is urgently required on this Island cannot be safely disputed. Look at the present anomaly of Vancouver District extending from one end to the other of Vancouver Island and from one side to the other thereof and only return one member, while Victoria District, a radius of two or three miles from the centre of the city, sends two members. We hope to see Mr. Bunster moving energetically and intelligently in this matter, for he is sure to meet the opposition of the Victoria element. In political matters, Victoria has ever claimed to be the entire Island, oftentimes the whole Province. It is high time this anomaly was wiped out, and the country more fairly redistricted and represented. We have frequently urged that Vancouver Island should be divided into three electoral districts, each returning a member to the House of Commons, and we have heard no arguments to the contrary (except selfish ones from Victoria). The suggestion made by us was that Victoria city and district return one member; the farming settlements between Victoria and Nanaimo, another; and the coal mining districts of Nanaimo and Comox the third. This would give a fair and equitable representation, not only as to population and importance, but of the different industries of the Island. The Provincial Legislature have partly acknowledged our importance by giving a second member to this district, to take effect at the coming general election. It is a matter of paramount importance that the interests of each district should be properly represented, but that is impossible while the entire influence is centered in and around Victoria; for in nearly all cases the interests of Victoria are considered first and the others last. The same principle permeates almost every Department of the Government. Why, for instance, should Victoria get all the credit for the exports and imports of Nanaimo, for in all the reports Victoria is the only place mentioned. We are pleased to see that the Government have taken the general question of representation in hand, and it is to be hoped that at least justice will be done to the Western Island of the Dominion."

I do not expect to meet with the opposition of the hon. leader of the Government; though I may meet with the opposition of his colleagues. Nevertheless, I think they are disposed to agree to my request; but if we have the support of the

Mr. BUNSTER.

hon. leader of the Government we are secure. I beg to move in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the Island of Vancouver, in British Columbia, having three seats in Parliament, be divided as follows: Nanaimo city and all north, including Denman Island, Hornby Island, Queen Charlotte Island and Taxada Island form one electoral district known as the Nanaimo district, and shall be entitled to one member; and all south of said district, excepting the city of Victoria, shall be entitled to one member and shall be known as the electoral district of Vancouver; and the city of Victoria shall be entitled to one member for the House of Commons of Canada.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I must crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I reply to the hon. member. I have no doubt the hon. member is perfectly correct in stating that a portion of the population of Vancouver Island district desired to have that section of the Province redistricted; but I am not aware that it extends beyond Nanaimo. I am not aware that the district of Comox, the far northern district, desires such a change. I am not aware that the district of Cowichan desires such a change, or any other portion of Vancouver. It is practically confined to Nanaimo alone. Nanaimo is in favor of Free Trade and wants a member to represent that view of public policy. The hon. gentleman has stated that in his district there are 1,134 electors. I am not aware that that is correct. I find the number of voters in his district is 1,043. In the city of Victoria there are 1,134 voters. If the district should be divided as proposed, Victoria would have one member for 1,134 voters, the district he would call Vancouver one member for 558 voters, and the district of Nanaimo one member for 635 voters. Now, Sir, that would give to Victoria nearly double the number of voters of any of the other districts. Speaking, Sir, for the people of Victoria, so far as I know their views, they have no desire that the country shall be redistricted, but that it shall remain as it is. The arrangement has worked very well during the last twelve Sessions it has been represented in Parliament, and I believe it would work well in the future. I do not think it desirable that an antagonistic element should be introduced in our country. I do not wish to see the people of Victoria taught Free Trade doctrines, nor that the people of Nanaimo should be induced to cultivate Free Trade candidates. I am one of those who believe in Protection as the sound fiscal policy for this country, and I believe that by uniting the towns of Nanaimo and Victoria with the farming districts, that fiscal policy which has attained such success in this country in the last four years has a better chance of contributing to the advancement of the western Province. I trust my hon. friend will withdraw his motion, as I presume it is rather presented to meet the views of some of his constituents than really to carrying out his own opinion as to the necessity of redistricting the Province.

Mr. BUNSTER. Victoria has a vote of 1,095, according to the Sessional Papers of British Columbia as recorded for 1880.

Mr. DECOSMOS. I will show the hon. gentleman the last Sessional Papers, 1881.

Mr. BUNSTER. The hon. gentleman being agent of the Government, probably has access to later information than I have, but these were the latest I could procure in the Library.

Mr. DECOSMOS. These papers are from the Library.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is one of the representatives of Vancouver, while the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and myself also hail from that Island. Now, there are two to one against him, for I agree with my hon. friend and colleague representing Victoria; so I hope my hon. friend will graciously yield to the majority and withdraw his motion.

Mr. BUNSTER. If it is a question of two to one, of course I might as well subside, but I would ask the hon

gentleman if this is fair. I suppose the hon. gentleman, if he gave the order to hang a person, would be able to do it.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have a motion to make with regard to one more county. It relates to a matter which forms a striking example of what we have been complaining of as a defect in the Bill before the House. One hon. member—I think the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick)—told us that it was impossible to arrange the constituencies so as to enable the minority to return a majority of the members. Now, the county of Huron is arranged to accomplish precisely that result. At the last election for this House in the ridings of Huron, the total majority for the Liberal candidate was 452, and in the elections for the Ontario Assembly the Liberal candidates had a majority in that county of 630. But the arrangement proposed for dividing the county of Huron, if hon. gentlemen get the result which they anticipate, according to the last vote, will enable the Conservative party to secure two of the seats for Huron, and only leave one for the Liberals. They have fixed the whole of the Liberal strength in one riding, so that a county which is Liberal by from 400 to 700 would only have one representative, and a minority of consultation will have two from that county, if their calculations turn out to be well founded. I therefore move:

The population of the county of Huron is 76,970 or an average of 25,656 for each of the electoral divisions into which the said county is divided.

That the township of Stephen and the village of Exeter are detached from Huron and annexed to Middlesex, and the Township of Osborne is detached from Huron and annexed to Perth. That the population of the municipalities so detached is 9,303.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the provisions as to the Parliamentary representations of the county of Huron.

Hon. MEMBERS. Lost on division.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Of course if the names are received there is no objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was an arrangement made, and that arrangement was broken. The arrangement was that after a certain vote was taken there should be the same division for all the resolutions which should be moved against the third reading. It arose in this manner: The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), who happened to be on the other side of the House, came over to me and said he had a proposition to make from the other side of the House—that at a certain time one vote be taken, and that vote should govern the subsequent motions on the third reading of the Bill. He said that proposition came from the hon. leader of the Opposition through the hon. member for Laval. There had been a vote taken before the communication was made, but it was proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition that the divisions on the subsequent motions should be the divisions on the motion next to be taken. I said, "No; let us take a vote on this one motion, and let that govern all the subsequent resolutions," and it was so finally agreed across the floor.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that there was a consultation with the hon. member for Laval, the result of which was the communication made by the hon. member for Laval, in the terms he mentions. The arrangement, however, that was made was one made openly across the floor. I made the suggestion, and the hon. gentleman made the modification, according to the recollection of myself and several other hon. members; that, of course, if any hon. member objected on any occasion, a division would have to be taken. Of course it is quite obvious that any hon. member who desired to vote against a particular motion and vote for another could not have his name recorded against his will. Any suggestion I made was made in my place

here for the information of those who agree with me and those who are opposed to me; and any statement the hon. gentleman made, was made in the same way; and as far as each of us could, we expressed our desire that such an arrangement should be made. I take this opportunity to refer to a phrase the hon. gentleman used intimating that I had broken my word in this connection. I say no word more than that I did all I could do to carry out the arrangement in the sense of the modification, and I have nothing whatever to do with the action of my hon. friend from South Wentworth in suggesting a division; I did not know that it was his intention to propose a division, and I did not propose, any more than the hon. gentleman himself, to bind all the members of this House. All I said was what I said openly, and I think the observation of the hon. gentleman was uncalled for and contrary to the facts of the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can quite understand, as the hon. gentleman states, that neither he nor I can govern any particular vote, and if any hon. member wishes to vote contrary to his previous vote, he has a right to do so. But there is no pretence that on the motion made by the hon. member for South Wentworth any one person desired to change his vote. The supposition is that it was known that a good many of our friends went away, and that that was the motive and the reason this motion was made. It was thought there would be a catch vote, which would reduce the majority. That was the obvious intention. There could be no sense in making the motion except for that object, and the hon. gentlemen got a just reward for what I say was a piece of parliamentary treachery by having a larger majority recorded against them than on any previous division to-day.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We would much prefer seeing every hon. member on the hon. gentleman's side recording his vote on these motions.

Mr. RYMAL. I understood, when the conversation took place between the hon. First Minister and the hon. member for West Durham, that as far as they could influence it the arrangement they made would be observed. But I also understood the hon. First Minister to say that if any one desired a vote on a specific motion, they could not prevent him from having it. When the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) asked for a division the hon. First Minister did not say it was contrary to the arrangement, but he informed him that no five members had asked for the vote.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. member for South Wentworth to say whether I had the slightest intimation that he was about to propose the motion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No one says the hon. gentleman had any previous intimation; but the hon. gentleman cannot say what he did with regard to the motion of the hon. member for South Perth. He asked the hon. member for South Perth not to press for a division, to which the hon. member agreed. The hon. gentleman did not even turn round to ask the hon. member for South Wentworth to do the same.

Mr. BLAKE. I believed that any motions that hon. gentlemen might desire to have divisions upon had better be taken at the end of the proceedings, and the hon. member for South Perth having made his motion at a very early stage, I thought that if we began the system of dividing the practical result of saving time by this arrangement would be altogether gone. There is the whole of it. But to impute to us the unworthy suggestion that we desired to catch a vote, is beneath the hon. gentleman's position. I agree with the hon. member for Centre Huron that we would infinitely have preferred that every supporter of the hon. gentleman had been here to record his vote against these motions.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The very object in asking for the votes to be recorded was to show the electors of the country who supported the Bill; and I understood the motive and object of the hon. member for South Wentworth simply to be this: that he thought the case he presented was such a glaring one that he would have an exception made with regard to it, and would, as he said, test the feelings of the members who had professed personal friendship for him, and see whether they would vote him out of Parliament.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Wentworth if he was in the House when the arrangement was made?

Mr. RYMAL. I was.

Mr. McCALLUM. Then I say that was the time for him to state that he would not be bound by the arrangement.

Mr. RYMAL. Not at all. Because I understood the First Minister to say that any one specially desiring a division should have it.

Mr. McCALLUM. I remember, on a former occasion of a similar kind, I rose in the House and said I would not be bound by the arrangement, and the hon. member for South Wentworth should have done the same thing.

Amendment negated on a division.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Bill is finally passed I desire to say a few words. Perhaps there is not, within the range of this Bill, a case that is more grievous than that of the county I represent. That the Government in power should be inclined to fortify itself is reasonable to suppose, if it should do it consistently with the interests of the country; but a re-adjustment, such as that contained in this Bill, done with the intention of disfranchising many of the electors, is of itself unfair, and is discreditable to the party in power. There is no less discrepancy between the populations of the west riding of Bruce and the north riding of Bruce than 5,573. There is no reason, then, for taking 487 votes of the Liberal party from the north riding and putting them into the west riding. By allowing the township of Saugeen to remain in the north riding, the Conservative party would still have a chance beginning with a majority of 160 in its favor, which surely ought to be satisfactory. If they cannot win on that ground, they certainly belie their own boasts; for we hear from them constantly that they are perfectly satisfied with their position in the country, and sure of winning in the next elections. If so, why seek so unfair advantage of members in a position like myself? This is not my case, but the case of the people of Bruce. I would scorn to ask favor in my own or their behalf, but I am here to ask their rights before the measure passes. Perhaps there never was a Government in this country that had a better opportunity of acting an honorable part than the present. In a House of 206 members, they have had a majority of from 60 to 85 during the whole Parliament; and they predict now their great success in the future. They surely, then, can afford to allow the division of Bruce to be made on reasonable terms. We have a population of 64,000 in that county. There is nothing simpler or easier than to divide it and give 21,000 to each riding. But what is the object of the Government? It is to put the Conservative party in such a position that it will be impossible for the people to have an opportunity of expressing their views by means of their franchises. The hiving of the Liberals in the west riding affects no less than 1,000. The leader of the Government yesterday said that our object was to hive the Conservatives; but if we were to be hived in that county as the Conservatives are we would be perfectly satisfied. Surely then the leader of the Government should have sufficient liberality to suggest to his friends behind him to allow this division to be made in a way to reflect some

Mr. BLAKE.

credit on himself. He can surely afford to allow the people of this county an opportunity of expressing their wishes adequately. In Huron and Wellington there is a Liberal majority, but such is the redistribution that it is impossible to return more than one Liberal from each county. It is most unfair to gag the majority in that way, and prevent its fair representation. I move in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved, that the county of Bruce comprises a population of 64,774 souls, or an average for three ridings of 21,591.

That the said Bill detaches from the north riding of Bruce so large a population as to reduce North Bruce to 18,645, giving West Bruce, 24,218, and South Bruce, 22,355.

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the boundaries of the proposed three ridings of Bruce.

Amendment (Mr. Gillies) negated on the following division:—

YEAS :
Messieurs

Anglin,	Fleming,	Mackenzie,
Bain,	Flynn,	Malouin,
Bécharde,	Gillies,	Mills,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Olivier,
Borden,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Brown,	Guthrie,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Rogers,
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Rymal,
Casey,	Killam,	Sutherland,
Casgrain,	King,	Thompson,
Croutier,	Laurier,	Trow,
Dumont,	McDonald (Vic., N.S.),	Wheler.—37.
Fiset,		

YEAS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Montplaisir,
Arnell,	Girouard (Kent),	Mousseau,
Bannerman,	Grandbois,	O'Connor,
Benoit,	Gillet,	Ogden,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Orton,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Quimet,
Bill,	Hay,	Patterson (Essex),
Bolduc,	Homer,	Pinsonneault,
Bourbeau,	Hooper,	Plumb,
Bowell,	Hurteau,	Pope (Compton),
Brecken,	Kirkpatrick,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunster,	Kranz,	Rochester,
Bunting,	Landry,	Ross (Dundas),
Cameron (Victoria),	Lane,	Rouleau,
Carling,	Langevin,	Routhier,
Caron,	Lantier,	Royal,
Cimon (Charlevoix),	Longley,	Ryan (Marquette)
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Macdonald (Kings),	Ryan (Montreal),
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Scott,
Coughlin,	McDonald (Oape Breton),	Shaw,
Coupal,	Macmillan,	Strange,
Coursol,	McCallum,	Tellier,
Currier,	McCarthy,	Tilley,
Daly,	McQuaig,	Tupper,
Daoust,	McDougald,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McDougall,	Valin,
Desaulniers,	McLellan,	Vallée,
Desjardins,	McLeod,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McRory,	Wade,
Elliott,	Manson,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Farrow,	Massue,	Wallace (York),
Ferguson,	Merner,	White (Cardwell),
Fortin,	Méthot,	White (Benfrew),
Fulton,	Mongenais,	Williams.—103.
Gigault,		

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the House, before the third reading, to the provision with reference to the communication of the result of the voting in the Magdalen Islands. Objections were taken to the adequacy of the provision against fraud, and the Government declared that they were inadequate, and the First Minister attempted to prepare a clause which would render it more perfect; but he said he was not quite satisfied with this amendment, and, therefore, the clause prepared by the hon. member for Gaspé was laid over, the promise being given that a proper clause would be brought up on the third reading—a clause to perfect the precautions against fraud. A portion of this provision that the hon. Minister proposed was that the telegraphic returns should be subject to correction

by the written return, and if the written return reached the returning officer before he needed it the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery might make up his report from that return; and if it came afterwards he should send it to the Clerk of the House, or some other officer, who should have power to deal with it. On that understanding it was that the clause passed. I invite the attention of the Government to the necessity of carrying out the arrangement and remedying those defects as soon as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I certainly thought, last night, on the motion of the hon. member for Gaspé, and after his statement, that some means should be used against possible fraud; and I attempted on the spot to prepare a resolution with that object. I found it very difficult to do so and was not satisfied with my work. I then said I would endeavor to prepare another clause to prevent such fraud as a stranger sending a false telegram to the returning officer. But in consequence of our late sitting last night, when I went home I had not time to prepare an amendment. I do not now feel inclined to delay the passing of this Bill, which has been so much obstructed yesterday and to-day, in order to introduce such a clause.

Bill read the third time and passed.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT, 1874.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the third reading of Bill (No. 157) to repeal certain provisions of the General Inspection Act, of 1874.

Mr. KILLAM. I beg to move that this Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of providing that mackerel be not subject to inspection if exported within two months before the 1st of August in the year in which they are caught. I was inclined to move that the whole system of fish inspection should be done away with; but I explained my views on this subject at length in the early part of the Session, and, at this period, I would not like to press them too strongly on the consideration of the Government. I beg leave to move this amendment:

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same, by adding a clause to provide that spring mackerel exported, or intended for export before the 1st of August in the calendar year, in which such mackerel were caught, shall not be liable to compulsory inspection.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, &c., BILL.

Mr. MOUSSEAU moved the third reading of Bill (No. 145) respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies and Trading Corporations.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I beg to move the following amendment:—

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend Sections 25 and 36, by providing that the powers therein given to the Court shall be exercised only upon such notice to the creditors, contributories, shareholders and members, as the Court may order.

Amendment agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. The clause as to set-off or compensation having been struck out, the Bill is defective as it now stands, in that it contains no provision in lieu of the law of set-off in the various Provinces.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. My hon. friend will recollect that we excluded in that Bill all societies which are entirely of a civil nature. We might perhaps insert a clause relating to the mode of compensation in all the Provinces, as regards insurance companies and trading corporations, but I think we cannot deal with loan companies and building societies.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). I entirely object to a set-off, whether applied to banks or building societies. I believe the law of set-off and compensation is exclusively a civil right which belongs altogether to Local Legislatures, and I do not think we can, under pretence of making our insolvent law, change the civil laws of the Province.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. If we have a right to legislate with regard to these companies, we have a right to select the way in which the claims of the creditors shall be settled. A clause of this kind ought to be inserted, otherwise it will leave the administrator of the company uncertain as to how he ought to act.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). This is not a question of formal claim at all, it is a question of right between two creditors. If, under pretence of making an insolvent law, you change the law of set-off, why not change the other civil laws of the Province?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It is an incident.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). We have no power to deal with the question.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—CONCURRENCE.

On item 35 of resolution 2,

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury.) The effect of the change in the second paragraph of this resolution will be to impose a duty on all fine salt. Of course the amount collected will not be very large, but the amount of duty imposed as compared with the cost of the article will be quite large, reaching 50 per cent. This is another step in the direction of taxing a great many, and farmers in particular, in the interests of a few salt manufacturers—in the interests, in fact, of one county in this Dominion, and of a very few manufacturers. It is a branch of manufacture so limited that they can at any time combine to put their prices up, and the plea that competition will regulate the market does not apply in this case. In fact, if I am correctly informed, the salt manufacturers at Goderich have already put up the price of their salt 20 to 25 cents per barrel; and if the farmers have the same facilities for combining which the manufacturers of that article have, I firmly believe that no such imposition would be made. The duty proposed to be levied is 12 cents per cwt., and in the following section a duty is imposed on the packages or bags in which fine salt is imported, which will amount to about 2 cents per cwt., making in all, 14 cents per cwt. The object is to give a larger market to the manufacturers of salt, but while it would be a tax upon the farmers who use this fine salt largely in the making of butter and cheese, I do not think that they will be able to send this salt to the Maritime Provinces and consequently will be of no benefit to the manufacturer. The duty is 14 cents per cwt., and at the lowest freight rate on the Grand Trunk Railway and Intercolonial it will cost about 25 cents per cwt. to take it to the Maritime Provinces. They may extend their market further east than at present, but I do not think they will extend it as far as the Maritime Provinces by imposing a duty of 14 cents per cwt. The salt generally used in the Maritime Provinces is the imported Liverpool fine salt, and the price of that salt at the ports of St. John and Halifax will not average over 20 or 25 cents per cwt., and that is just about the price of the same quality of fine salt at the Goderich mines. This tax, as I say, will have to be paid entirely by the consumers. There is no competition to regulate the price, and the farmers will have to pay this tax. Let us just contrast the duties imposed upon articles which the farmers have to consume and the duties imposed upon articles which they produce. Upon agricultural implements they pay 30 per cent., upon waggons and carriages 25 per cent., upon sugars between 50

and 60 per cent., upon cottons and woollens from 30 to 70 per cent.

Mr. RYAN (Montreal). They are cheaper.

Mr. BURPEE. That does not prove anything in favor of protection; and it cannot be proved that the articles would not be cheaper if there was no duty imposed. On paraffine oil the farmers have to pay between 80 and 100 per cent., and this may be placed in the same category with salt, because there is no competition and the consumer has to pay the whole of the duty; we can purchase paraffine oil on the other side of the line for about half the price we pay on this side. On rubber boots and on boots and shoes the farmers have to pay 25 per cent. The fact is the farmers have to pay dearly for all they use and all they wear. Now, let us consider what protection is afforded to the farmers. I do not admit that upon the whole it is possible to frame a tariff that can protect the farmers; they are so situated that they can be protected in very few articles and some of those few articles are not protected. How to protect farmers, lumbermen and fishermen is a difficult problem. The farmers have about 30 per cent. on bacon and ham, and on some fruits and early vegetables; and on these two articles the farmers have been benefitted to some extent I admit, but they are about all. We import a large amount of pork, but there is no increase of the duty on that article, except on the packages, and we only pay about 10 per cent. as the price rules now. Last year we imported \$1,000,000 worth of pork. Now, I contend that if the farmers are to be protected, a duty should be placed on pork. I do not admit that it is a proper principle, but I say that if we are to have protection the farmers should have their share, and there should be an increase in the duty on pork in the interest of the farmers. It may be said that this would interfere with lumbering operations. I admit that it would, but if we are to have a protective system, we should not protect one industry at the expense of another, but give all the protection we can to all the industries alike. There has been no increase in the duty on butter and cheese, and I do not think any increase of duty would increase the price of butter and cheese, because we export butter and cheese. There are two other articles which should be protected if we are to have protection, viz.: hides and fine wools. We do not import coarse wool on which a duty is imposed, but of fine wool we import largely, and on it there is no duty. I contend that the farmers are not fairly dealt with by this Tariff; while you are endeavoring to protect all other classes you neglect them. To the fishermen you are proposing to distribute \$150,000 as a bounty, but there is no bounty for the farmers. Shipbuilders have a drawback farmers have none; they are harshly and hardly dealt with in every way. It may be said that the duties have been increased on cattle, horses, sheep, coarse wool, oats and potatoes; but all these articles we export and do not import as a rule, and therefore the duty can be of no service; it is entirely delusive. I am surprised that it should be contended that a duty put on articles which we do not import but export largely, should be of any benefit to the producer. I know it is said that it is for the purpose of giving to the farmers the home market which will be opened from the establishment of manufactures in the country, and that this is their compensation for the duties they have to pay upon manufactured articles. This Tariff has not increased the home markets in New Brunswick. We export now more than we did before it came into operation. I had hoped for an increase of this home market, but it has diminished. St. John, which is our principal market has decreased for several reasons. The fire hurt it somewhat; but a portion of the wholesale trade has left the city through various causes, including the departure to Montreal of our manufacturers that we had in St. John a few years ago. The boot and shoe manufacturer has to a certain

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury.)

extent removed to Montreal. We do not manufacture as much now in St. John or New Brunswick as before the Tariff went into operation; and we also import clothing from Montreal. The decrease of our wholesale trade is one reason why the population has not increased. But there are many other elements that have contributed to this decrease. The Tariff has not increased the population in New Brunswick, nor the home market for the farmers. It is said the Tariff is in the interests of inter-provincial trade. Before Confederation I did expect a great deal for this trade, which it is desirable to encourage; but from one cause or another it has not been encouraged, or encouraged all on one side. We buy largely from Ontario and Quebec, but do not barter our products in exchange. We have to sell our farm produce and lumber in England, and the United States for coin with which to pay for the goods of the western Provinces. The Tariff has effectually crippled our trade with the United States, or prevented a mutual exchange of goods, and therefore has reduced our exports to that country than which, for some of them, we have no other market. I know the purpose of the Government is to prevent a foreign trade or our getting a market in the United States. What, then, are we to do with our surplus? We have to buy our flour, as a rule, and other products in Quebec and Ontario; but we have nothing to exchange for them except our gold. I maintain, therefore, that this Tariff is injurious to our farmers, and in their interests I object to this tax on salt. The hon. member for North Huron is very anxious that this new impost should be placed on this trade in the interest of his constituents. That is very natural. But I think he was not polite when he said in his own emphatic way that if we did not choose to buy the Goderich salt we might take a rolling-pin and crush our own salt. I think that was hardly a kindly remark, or gallant to the daughters of our farmers. That is not the spirit that should animate the people of one Province as regards another, and it is not in the interest of the Dominion that such sentiments should go abroad. I would not advise him to visit our Province and repeat that remark, for he might find such an application of the rolling-pin as might make his head considerably flatter than at present. The Government might spare us this imposition on the salt used in the Maritime Provinces. The duty of 14 cents a cwt. cannot bring down the Goderich salt to the Maritime Provinces. We can import foreign salt as cheaply as they can manufacture it at Goderich. The cost of freight on the salt from Liverpool to the Maritime ports is almost nominal, the vessels that come out to these ports for lumber often bring out salt for ballast, for which they get very little or no freight; and the price of salt at the Maritime ports is as cheap as in Goderich. In most cases, the freight, at its cheapest, to bring salt from Goderich down to the Maritime Provinces, is 25 cents per 100 lbs. The duty is an imposition, pure and simple, on the former.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member said he would be brief, but his brief was not as brief as he led us to expect. I must congratulate the hon. member upon his becoming an advocate of the National Policy. He complained in the first place that we had not increased the duty on pork. Now, practically, we have increased the duty on pork, because, previous to the passage of the Tariff, it was 1 cent a pound on 185 lbs., and now \$2 per barrel is collected instead of the \$1.85. The rate of duty during last year collected on pork was about 20 per cent., and during 1880 it was 20 per cent. On hams, shoulders and bacon, we added 50 per cent. to the duty collected before. Still the hon. member stands up here an advocate of the farmers, and complains that we did not impose a higher duty on these articles. I think, therefore, I have a right to claim him as an advocate of the National Policy. He also discussed paraffine oil. It is well known that the

reduction of duty on paraffine oil was made under pressure from hon. members now in the majority, but there is a minority. Therefore, there is no increase of duty in the matter. With reference to the salt duty, the hon. gentleman says it is an imposition on the Maritime Provinces. A short time ago, a party in the city of St. John started the business of grinding coarse salt, and manufacturing it into butter salt; therefore, there is a competition between salt coming into the country under the Tariff and the salt from the west. Everywhere the grinding may not be done with the rolling-pin, but it could be done everywhere. It is done in Yarmouth.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was done in Yarmouth, but it is not done there to-day.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a greater inducement to-day to do it. The hon. member says the importation on oats has not increased the prices. In this we differ with the hon. member on his right who says that oats being taxed has increased the price of taking out lumber.

Mr. IRVINE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how a duty of 1 cent. per lb. on pork is equal to 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Take the returns of 1880, and the hon. gentleman will find that the duty was equal to 20 per cent.

Mr. IRVINE. I have no recollection of any time during the past year when pork was sold for \$10 per barrel. The price to-day is \$22 per barrel, and at that rate the duty would be less than 10 per cent. Again, he says that people roll coarse salt into fine salt. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the salt ground for dairy purposes is pure rock salt. It is imported in 10 or 20-lb. boxes, and if the Ontario salt were given to me for nothing I would not use it in the dairy. I have read essays from men who have analyzed the article, and they pronounce the article unfit for dairy purposes at all; rock salt ground is far better for dairy purposes. Again, the hon. gentleman says that he has not put an additional duty upon dry ham and bacon. I ask the hon. gentleman if any sensible man in this country would dry meat for the purpose of sending it across the border and pay an additional duty on it, when he can send hams green for 1 cent. a lb., and thus save the trouble of drying.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hams are no better whether they are green or not.

Mr. IRVINE. It is not green hams, it is only the dried hams, that are mentioned. That is a great protection to the farmers. The hon. gentleman must have a vast amount of intelligence to say that you can take dried hams across the line by paying 1 cent per lb., when you can take green hams across for nothing, that you dry them for the sake of paying 2 cents per lb. on them. That argument is of a piece with all the rest. They insult the farmer and then they try to humbug him. It is bad enough to go out into the streets and talk such nonsense to an ordinary beggar, but it is worse for the hon. Minister of Finance, who understands figures as well as he does, to try to stuff this House with it. When he says that 1 cent per lb. duty, or \$2 on the barrel, is equal to 20 per cent., you ought to laugh at him. There has not been a day for ten years in any market in Canada, when our pork has sold for \$2 a barrel. Those are reckless statements which I thought ought to be named at the very time. If the hon. gentleman opposite cannot make truthful statements, he had better make no statements at all.

Mr. FARROW. Coming from a salt-producing county I cannot allow these arguments to go unchallenged. We ought to be proud of the natural resources of this country, proud of our coal in the East and of our salt beds in the West, and I look forward to the time when we shall have a

large inter-provincial trade in the articles of coal and salt. I wish particularly to insist upon one characteristic of our salt, and that is its purity. I am astonished at the assertions made here to-night by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine). He ought to know that our salt is the purest in the world. He can laugh, but he laughs at the best intelligence in his country, at the best chemists and analysts. The matter has been proved by experiment. In one of our cheese factories, they salted three different cheeses with Liverpool salt, with some of the best salt manufactured in Syracuse, and with salt from Mr. Colman's well in Seaforth. The curd for all these cheeses was taken from the same vat. Then three of the best experts in Canada were brought on to test these cheeses, and they gave the first prize to the cheese salted by the Huron salt. Next it is contended that this duty increases the price of salt. The duty on salt is 8 cents per 100 lbs. in bulk, and 12 cents when it is barrelled up. Now, if a farmer had to buy 100 lbs. of fine salt he would only pay 12 cents duty, but that salt would salt all the butter made on a large farm in one season. The hon. Minister of Finance shows there is competition; they are grinding it up in the Lower Provinces and thus avoiding the duty. What benefits have we derived from the discovery of salt in this country? I hold in my hand a letter from a gentleman who says that before our salt was discovered the Americans charged us \$1.65 a barrel, but since we manufacture our own salt they have diminished their price to \$1.32. During the last ten years we have saved \$300,000 a year, or \$3,000,000 altogether, but the hon. gentleman, following the gospel proclaimed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, does not believe in trading with his own people. He says to the people of the Maritime Provinces: "Your trade does not lie in the direction of Ontario, it lies in the United States, send your money over there." That is the very doctrine which drove these gentlemen from power in 1875, and as long as they cling to that doctrine they cannot come back to power. The hon. gentleman talks about the duties increasing the price, and he mentioned agricultural implements. Just consider the testimony given by the farmers of Ontario to Dr. Orton's Committee, farmers who knew well what they were talking about. Agricultural implements were cheaper. Such were the opinions of practical farmers who knew what they were talking about. What is the use of hon. gentlemen talking about this small duty; it is not going to do us much good. I would rejoice if by levying a coal duty the Lower Provinces could be benefited. I do not think they have much to complain of.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I took down the statement made by the hon. member for Carleton. I will not say the hon. member, in which he said I made an untruthful statement.

Mr. IRVINE. I said so in regard to 20 per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is difficult to make the hon. member understand anything. I have here the value of pork imported in 1879: it was \$375,923, on which a duty was collected of \$30,468; in 1880, \$663,166, duty collected, \$124,764; the average of these two years being 20 per cent. Here the hon. gentleman said I made an untruthful statement and did not know what I said. The hon. gentleman said the only duty on shoulders was on dried shoulders. Why, here is the Tariff in which it says shoulders, fresh, salted or dried, are subject to a duty of 2 cents per lb.

Mr. ANGLIN. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1881, the quantity of pork imported was 13,322,639 lbs., of the value of \$898,947, on which a duty was paid of \$133,226, or about 15 per cent. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) is correct in saying that pork has not been purchased for \$10 per barrel for some years past.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I took the two years previous.

Mr. ANGLIN. Pork has ruled exceptionally cheap for the last year or two, but when we speak of this duty we do not refer to a year or two, but to its general effect. The hon. member said the farmers were not protected as are other classes, that they do not enjoy a full share of such benefits. With respect to oil: it is true the duty on oil has not been changed in one sense, but a material change has been made as to test of quality, and American oil has been almost excluded from our market by the operation of that test. The price has been increased very materially because it was necessary that a high rate must be paid to the Americans. The oil that enters into consumption in the United States is not of an explosive character or dangerous in the household, but under this protective system it has been shut out. With respect to salt the Ministerial proposal would afford no protection to Huron salt, it will not force Huron salt in the Lower Provinces markets, but it will make the article dearer there. It is not necessary to discuss the Huron salt. It may be the purest in the world, but there is an opinion—a prejudice, if you wish—against the use of Ontario salt for dairy purposes, and the people do not care to be forced against these prejudices by Act of Parliament. In the Old Country salt for dairy purposes is obtained from the salt rock. It will cost 25 cts. per 100 lbs. for the carriage of Huron salt to King's or Queen's County in New Brunswick. With respect to the remark of the hon. member for Carleton, the hon. gentleman's remark that the hon. Minister made an untruthful statement was rather an unparliamentary expression, or an offensive expression.

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to direct the attention of hon. members to the report made by the Ontario Government in relation to an investigation on the question of salt in the Goderich and Kincardine districts. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) considers it impossible to get two kinds of salt out of the same well.

Mr. ANGLIN. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. He did not exhibit a proper knowledge of the question, because in Goderich there are five different strata, and out of each of these strata different kinds of salt may be obtained. I have here the report of the celebrated analyst, Sherry Hunt, and he rates its purity at 97.30, which we know, from the reports of the United States and Europe, is a very high percentage of chloride of sodium. If you compare the proportion of the chloride of calcium and of other salts, you will find that the Canadian salt is especially good as compared with that of other countries. The hon. gentleman has only to go to the Geological Museum and look at the specimens of salt there, to convince himself that Canadian salt, from the coarsest rock salt up to the finest dairy, is of the very best quality. Before the development of the Canadian salt industry we used to have to pay \$3 a barrel, whereas now we can get it at 16 cents per barrel by the carload, or at retail for \$1 a barrel. When the gentlemen engaged in this manufacture were becoming successful, the Americans came here and tried to buy them off, and failing in that forced their salt on the Canadian markets at prices which made competition impossible, being sometimes 25 to 50 cents less than the prices for which it was sold in their own country. The result was to break down the men engaged in the business and the loss of a large amount of capital; and then they applied to the Government to do something for them, to give them a chance to develop the resources of the country, and they would engage to supply a better quality of salt at a cheaper price. That promise has been kept, so far as western Ontario is concerned, and if this protection is continued, with the assistance of inter-provincial trade, we can supply the

Mr. ANGLIN.

Maritime Provinces with every quality of salt at the lowest price, taking in return the products of these Provinces. The hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) made some remarks with regard to farm produce, which, if he had made them in western Ontario, would have exposed him to a charge of being more ignorant than farmers usually are. He ought to know that in the West we had rattlesnake pork, as it was called—the worst kind of pork—brought in and sold at \$10 per barrel. I know that hundreds of barrels were bought by the lumbermen at that price, and that their extensive use of it had a very bad effect on the Canadian market. The same was the case with regard to American oats bought by lumbermen, whose operations are generally along the frontier, the result being that the price of Canadian oats went rapidly down. To-day, however, the very reverse is the case. Our lumbermen are buying Canadian products and spending their money among the farmers, who are receiving full return for their labor. If these hon. gentlemen should travel through western Ontario and use the arguments which they have employed to-night, they would be open to either of two charges—either that they were absolutely ignorant of the subject, or that they were so dishonest, so blinded, that in the interests of their party they would deny what they know to be true. They can take which horn of the dilemma they please, but I am quite certain that when the time comes for the people to sit in judgment upon them, they will return the same verdict that they returned in 1878; they will say that they have no confidence in these gentlemen, because either they do not know what the country wanted, or, knowing it, failed to give it.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I wish to make an explanation. I gave the percentage on pork at 10 per cent. and I wish to say that I took the prices in St. John at \$22.50 and deducting \$2.50 for freight and charges. I took the prices at the present time and did not speak of any past period.

Resolution carried on a division.

On Resolution 2,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When this proposition was introduced, it was proposed, with the view of meeting the requirements of several of the leading educational institutions in the country, that they should be permitted to import books, maps and charts, not exceeding two in number, free of duty. It was thought that this would be a considerable advantage to these institutions, and would not injure the book trade. But upon enquiry, we find that the practical advantages to these institutions would be small, because when they import in small numbers they have to pay the retail price, and we found that we would interfere materially with the book trade, because these articles form a large item in their importations. These views having been presented to the Government, we have decided to ask that that portion of the resolution be struck out. I move that it be so amended.

Amendment agreed to; and remaining resolution concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) to amend the several Acts imposing the duties of Customs now in force.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 28,

Dorchester Penitentiary \$42,245 30

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not see our way to making special provision for the one female prisoner in this penitentiary, but during the recess we shall consider

some way of providing for the female convicts, perhaps at Kingston or somewhere else.

On Resolution 35,

Publishing Debates..... \$20,000

Mr. BLAKE. We will require some information on that subject also.

Mr. BOWELL. After this item was reserved, and the hon. leader of the Opposition asked for information in regard to it, I applied to Mr. Hartney, who supplied me with a statement. Of course the House understands that certain amounts were paid after the sums voted by Parliament lapsed. The Clerk tells me that they have been in the habit of using the money, or obtaining the money, either by grant or from whatever funds they had at their disposal for the year, for the printing, afterwards paying it back again after the appropriation was made for the following year. The total amounts expended for reporting, printing, for paper and miscellaneous services for the years from 1875 to 1881, were as follows:—

TOTAL COST.						
1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1880-81.
\$12,329	\$12,280	\$15,356	\$19,007	\$16,130	\$16,286	\$24,099
APPROPRIATION.						
\$8,000	\$15,000	\$25,000	\$20,364	\$19,425	\$25,000	

These sums vary from \$10,000 to \$30,000, and in the Public Accounts appears as if the printing, &c., for 1881 cost \$30,725, while the expenditure for that year's work was only \$24,099. A delay sometimes took place in completing the work of the year until after the financial year had ceased. Consequently the money has to be paid after that, and gives an apparently larger amount of expenditure that year than the work really done entailed; while in other years the amount stood as low as \$8,000 or much less.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the figures shown as the expenditure for the next two or three years will be very considerably under the expenditure, and that this expenditure was settled on the figures of the first year upon which there was a large vote, \$20,000.

Mr. BOWELL. That was in 1878. The first year the cost was but \$12,000, while the vote was not taken until afterwards. The Government took the responsibility for the expenditure for that year, with the consent of the House, ordering the printing of the debates without any appropriation, but to be paid for afterwards.

Mr. BLAKE. It would appear as if the votes for the earlier years had been inadequate or the expenditure excessive—in one year there was an outlay of \$25,000; one should understand how those accounts have been balanced. I suppose that this last year, in which \$30,000 apparently was expended, it would have covered some arrears. It would be important to prevent the recurrence of those irregularities in the payments, so that the work of one fiscal year might be comprised within that year.

Mr. BOWELL. That is almost impossible unless we insist on all the work being completed, including the printing and binding, before 30th June. In many cases it runs over into July before the binding is done; and as the binding is part of the expenditure, it would really appear to be an expenditure ascribed to the year in which the money was paid, while it is not. As I have already stated, for the year ending 30th June last, it would appear as if the debates, &c., cost \$30,725, while the expenditure was \$24,099, and it is just so with the other years.

On Resolution 37,

Grant to the Parliamentary Library..... \$7,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. As to this item also we should have some information.

Mr. BLAKE. Since this item was reserved, a report of the Library Committee has been presented, from which it appears we are once again in a position of difficulty as to the Library grant. There was an expenditure by the librarian, under the expectation of a large grant, which expectation was not afterwards realized; so that the allowance for the year is once again to be starved. The views of the Committee cannot be carried out, if the vote be as limited as this amount. The report contains the report of the librarian, the substance of which is that he applied for a grant of \$3,000, and an increased grant of \$10,000; that he had reasons to believe that those proposals would be complied with, and bought a large number of books in consequence; that the first grant of Estimates was sent to them with the proposed estimate of \$10,000, which amount was subsequently struck out, when he found himself without those resources, and after spending one-half of the grant for the year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry to see this statement is made by the Library Committee. Of course, it is true, but it shows that the librarian continues to do, year after year, what we have been complaining of year after year, exceeding the sum placed at his disposal. The Government have remonstrated several times, but that officer is especially under the control of both Houses. The Committee should adopt some rule by which the librarian will be prevented spending more money than he is authorized to spend. A great many of the books purchased for the library are books that ought not to be there. There seems to be on the other side booksellers who take a pleasure in sending us a great deal of trash with which to fill our shelves.

Mr. BRECKEN. The proportion of light literature in the library was enquired into by the Committee, and the librarian said there was a smaller percentage than in any other library of the same size. The pecuniary difficulties have been caused by the very large outlay in the purchase of law books.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a special vote for that. I understood from the discussions in Committee that a portion of the funds for general literature had to be expended on law books.

Mr. MILLS. The difficulty is due to some extent to the fact that the appropriation is made by the Government, instead of being recommended directly by the Library Committee. I know that the librarian stated that the estimate of the hon. Finance Minister had been submitted to him, and that he concurred in it, but that afterwards a wholly different estimate was brought down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The librarian wrote to the Hon. W. H. Odell. In his communication he states that in November, 1881, he applied for an immediate advance of \$3,000 over and above the vote of Parliament to cover existing deficiencies in the library. Of course no such amount could be given, as it would be a violation of the standing order. Shortly after that he says a clerk from the Finance Department brought him a proof-sheet of the Estimates, by order, which included this amount, but that afterwards the Government revised the Estimates and only gave the ordinary grant. No man in the Department had the right or authority to submit this estimate to the Librarian. Well, Sir, I must say this is an extraordinary letter, and I feel it my duty to ascertain if any official in my Department gave to Mr. Todd a statement that that was the revised addition of \$10,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume he did not suppose the clerk brought it without an order.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I see there are no proof-sheets with \$10,000 on them.

Mr. BLAKE. My object was to call the attention of the House to the condition in which we stand with reference to the library. The Minister of Public Works has perhaps suggested the condition of things that formerly existed. About two years ago a difficulty arose from its being ascertained that there had been a system of purchasing on credit which had gone on for some years—not that the grant itself had been overdrawn in the sense that Parliament had been asked to give more money, but that there had been some purchases on credit, the ultimate result being that the library was about \$7,000 short. We proposed to settle this \$7,000 by reducing our grant to \$3,500 a year for current purposes for two years. That being paid off we now recur to our ordinary \$7,000 grant. In the meantime the librarian appears to have found that the \$3,500 a year was inadequate, and he appears to have made this proposal to the Government upon which the purchases have been made. The result is that for the year for which we are now voting these estimates we are to have but \$3,500. That is the condition of things in which we are when we know that for law books, publications, binding, &c., something like \$1,000 a year is required, so that we shall only have \$2,500 for the next year for the purchase of books. It seems to me that the library will fall into a disreputable and improper state of arrears as to current literature.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not if they anticipate the expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. For the last two years we have only had \$3,500 a year, of which only \$2,500 have been available for making additions to the library.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have anticipated the next year. We have the books ordered and they are here. The hon. gentleman will observe that if the librarian expects there will be \$10,000 available he would obviously order a class of books to an extent which would not be ordered if he had only \$1,000 instead of \$13,000. The difficulty is that on the first of July next we shall only have available \$2,500.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it is the fault of the librarian, who, instead of doing his duty by confining himself to the vote of the current year, expends half of the grant of the following year. He continues that from year to year. We condoned the offence once by giving \$3,500 for two consecutive years, and he still goes on in the same way. I say he should be called to account and be made to limit himself to the vote of Parliament. Now we are voting \$7,000, and we find that half of the money is gone already, because the librarian took upon himself to expend the money before Parliament gave the vote.

Mr. BLAKE. The librarian says that he made application, that a proof-sheet of the Estimates was brought to him containing these two items, and he made these purchases. My proposition is that we ought to consider whether only \$2,500 should be expended in additions to the library.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think we can ask Parliament to increase the appropriation this year. But suppose the librarian had not spent a dollar beyond what Parliament had voted, we would still have \$7,000 to expend next year. Practically he has expended \$3,500; the books are there, the money has not been thrown away. The library will receive the benefit within the twelve months of the \$7,000.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think we will ever be able to make a satisfactory selection of books, with the amount of money we appropriate from year to year. If the members of the Library Committee were furnished during the interval with a catalogue of the publications as they appear it would be quite possible to assist the librarian in making a

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

selection. But as it is now the purchase of publications takes place during recess, and necessarily so, as often the additions would otherwise be exhausted. When the Library Committee meets, they find purchases have already been made. This cannot be avoided unless different steps are taken.

On Resolution 23,

Contingent expenses of the High Commissioner of
Canada at London \$4,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understand when the High Commissioner, Sir Alexander Galt, sailed on the 4th instant, for this country, and when this item was under discussion before, the Finance Minister informed the House that the First Minister would state what the policy of the Government was, whether Sir Alexander Galt had resigned, and if it was intended to obtain a successor, or any other information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sir Alexander for private reasons has offered his resignation, but it has not yet been accepted, and the subject will be a matter of discussion between him, myself and the Government when he arrives here. He sailed on the 4th instant, as the hon. gentleman has said. The Government have no intention to do away with the position. In case Sir Alexander's resignation is accepted and a vacancy takes place, the Government will endeavor to fill it.

On Resolution 128,

To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted
at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, to a line of
steamers to trade between Canada and the
West Indies and Brazil, provided a like
amount be paid by the Brazilian Government \$50,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item, we were to be informed as to the position of the subsidy to be granted by the Brazilian Government, and as to whether it had been so granted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grant of the Brazilian Government has not been made to this Government, but to the steamship line. The Brazilian Government give the same bonus as we do, and the line is now in operation, and we hope it will be successful.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The point is whether the grant was made by the Brazilian Government, as our grant is made dependent on the sum granted by Brazil.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So we understood. There has been no official communication from the Brazilian Government in respect to the matter, but the contractors have established a line of good steamers, and we are informed by the proprietors that they have succeeded in obtaining the same subsidy from the Brazilian Government. I have no doubt that is true, but we have no official communication from the Brazilian Government to that effect.

Mr. BLAKE. Did the contractors not offer the Government any proof that they had obtained a subsidy from the Brazilian Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They started the line.

Mr. BLAKE. Parliament was asked to grant, and did grant, \$50,000 on condition that a line was started, and the Brazilian Government supplied an equal amount. The Government should have obtained evidence that the conditions on which Parliament made the grant had been fulfilled. The statement of the contractors is not a sufficient guarantee. Some documents establishing the fact of the grant having been made by the Brazilian Government should have been obtained and laid before the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is hard to satisfy. The contractors were informed by the Government in writing that they had received a grant from Brazil, and that the line had been established, and that we

had given over \$50,000. If they return the \$50,000 to the Brazilian Government we still have the line. I have no doubt that this amount has been paid by the Brazilian Government. We have the ships and trade.

Mr. MILLS. The vote passed on the condition that Brazil should contribute a like amount. Not only should the Government have had evidence conclusive to that effect, but it should have been brought before Parliament in order that Parliament might know the conditions on which the money was being granted, and whether these conditions were actually complied with.

On Resolution 132,

For steam communication from Port Mulgrave, at the terminus of the Eastern Extension Railway, to East Bay, Cape Breton..... \$6,000

Mr. ANGLIN. I think an hon. gentleman stated that another party had offered to do this service for a much smaller sum, but for some reason the offer was not accepted. It was understood, I believe, that some papers were to be brought down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Enquiry was made at the Department, but no such application has yet been received. If these parties should yet write to the Department, their applications will be considered. I think one of the hon. members from that district said that a letter had been received by a member—now deceased—saying that they would do the work, but it was not sent to the Department.

On Resolution 115,

River Saskatchewan, examination and improvement of..... \$20,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This amount is for the purpose of building a wing dam and removing boulders at Cove's Falls and Tobin's Rapids, \$10,000 each. The Hudson's Bay Company, who are interested in the work, have offered on their part to build a pier at each of two other places at \$6,000 each.

On Resolution 118,

Dredging..... \$128,000

Mr. ANGLIN. In Committee I asked the hon. gentleman whether he did not intend to do some dredging at Bathurst, and he said he thought he would have a special item for that work. I notice that there is no such item.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say whether I shall be able to do anything more or not as we have only a certain amount of time and a certain amount of money to do the season's work. We try to use the dredges along the coast in such a way that we may reach a certain point at the end of the season without returning to do any work. If I can do anything for the place in question I will endeavour to do it.

Mr. KILLAM. I call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that while the House was in Committee I asked about the work of the dredges. He gave me a fair explanation, which I thought would have been taken down by the *Hansard* reporters. The fact that it was not reported only bears out what I said to-day, that the staff have been overworked.

On Resolution 179,

Culling timber..... \$67,000

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. From 1872 to 1878 the total receipts from this source were \$525,647, and the expenditure, \$559,828. Last year the receipts were \$36,000, and the expenditure, \$51,000.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There appears to be a heavy falling off in this item. It appears to me objec-

tionable that we should have to pay \$20,000 or \$30,000 to maintain a Cullers' establishment, and on the measuring of timber, which timber pays dues to one or other of the two Provincial Governments, especially when there is such a discrepancy between the receipts and expenditure. We are simply paying out Dominion money for the convenience of the Provincial Governments, and for a service which specially belonged to them.

Mr. ANGLIN. Formerly there was usually a small surplus in this service every year. Years ago I took objection to our acting in a matter which should be left to the local authorities, but it was said then that it would be difficult to have it managed by the local authorities, because a large quantity of this timber went from Ontario to Quebec, and there would be difficulty in entrusting the culling to either the one Government or the other. Afterwards some members of the House, interested in the timber trade, clamored for a re-adjustment of the rates, alleging that the amount levied on the timber for the amount of these cullers was exorbitant. We find out how these men have been satisfied. Instead of paying the cost of the culling, the revenue does not pay more than half of it. That should not occur any longer. The Government should increase the tolls, so as to raise money enough to cover the expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true that the expenditure exceeds the receipts, and an attempt should be made to make the receipts and expenditures balance. But this is a matter which must of necessity be under the charge of the Dominion Government, as it is like the inspection of flour, a matter connected with trade and commerce. At the same time it is quite true that the timber comes from one Province or another, and if the timber is cut from Government land, the revenue therefore goes to the Local Treasury. If there should be a casual falling off in the receipts in any one year, it cannot be helped.

Mr. CARON. The arrangement under which the sum of money is now paid to the cullers was arrived at when Mr. Lafamme was Minister of Inland Revenue, and after most of the gentlemen engaged in the lumber business, who were sitting in this House as members, had met the Minister of Inland Revenue and had arrived at the conclusion that the amount the cullers are now receiving was the smallest amount that should be paid to them. To-day at Quebec, where most of the culling takes place, the cullers are complaining that this \$700 which they receive is not sufficient, because out of that they have to pay about \$250 for attendants. This is the smallest amount that can be paid to these cullers, who have to give particular care to the study of their profession, and I think every gentleman engaged in the lumber trade will say that it is fairly earned by the cullers.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John). I do not see how it is that the revenue which was collected in 1875-76 was larger than it is to-day. The revenue and expenditure for the several years past have been as follows:—

	Revenue.	Expenditure.
In 1874.....	\$92,000	\$82,000
1875.....	89,000	81,000
1876.....	81,000	76,000
1877.....	74,000	68,000
1878.....	53,000	49,000
1879.....	24,000	44,000
1880.....	27,000	44,650
1881.....	36,000	51,000

Up to 1878 there was a surplus to the credit of this fund, and the expenditure has almost doubled in the last three years. While the receipts and expenditure balanced each other, of course there was no complaint; but now it is a question whether the charges have not been largely increased during the last two or three years.

On Resolution 270,

To provide for expenses in connection with the training ship *Charybdis*..... \$12,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. We were promised, after a long and protracted discussion on this item, that the Government would endeavor to make up their minds as to what was to be done with this remarkable vessel, and would give us some information on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government do not intend asking any sum of money for the establishment of a naval training school. The Government are considering what they will do with this vessel, and when they have reached a decision they will make it known.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to incur any further expense for this vessel?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no expense to be incurred except for caretaking until she is finally disposed of.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Various items have been asked for expenses in connection with the training ship *Charybdis*. She is designated a training ship, and the money seems to be wanted for training ship purposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. She is called a training ship, and was loaned or practically presented by Her Majesty's Government to Canada for the purpose of making her a training ship; but she has not yet been made that, and I am inclined to think never will be.

Mr. BLAKE. What is her total cost to us including the proposed vote?

Mr. McLELAN. About \$13,000 has been spent up to the present; and it is estimated that \$12,000, and the \$10,000 granted last year, will cover all the expenses until a decision is arrived at as to her final disposal.

Mr. BLAKE. Will \$22,000 cover all expenses up to the 30th June next?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. What is on the other side of the account?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The ship.

On Resolution 333,

To pay damages to the steamer *M. C. Upper*, in the Welland Canal..... \$8,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The letter of the hon. Minister of Justice, under date of October 10th, 1881, distinctly does not recognize it. The letter of the hon. Minister of Justice, under date 10th October, 1881, and addressed to Mr. Braun, Secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, is as follows:—

"Re claim L. McCallum.—As regards the question in your communication of the 29th September, I have considered this case with respect to the liability of the Crown for the claim. In my opinion, the Crown is not liable, viewing the case as one between subject and subject, giving the claimant the same justice against the Crown as he would have against the subject; and it is clear that unless the accident was caused by the imperfect state of the lock gates or by the officers of the canal there would be no liability to indemnify Mr. McCallum for the loss sustained. The services of the arbitrators seemed to be unanimous that the accident was caused by the negligence of those in charge of the steamer *Louise* and not by the defective condition of the gates. The Crown cannot be made liable for the management of the *Louise*.—Z. LASH. 'I concur in this opinion.—ALEX. CAMPBELL.'"

This is a different state of affairs than that which was stated in the Committee when the hon. Minister of Railways informed it that the official arbitrators had been of the opinion that something was due on the score of defective management. The House will observe that the finding of the official arbitrators seems to be unanimous, namely, that the accident was caused by the parties in charge of the steamer *Louise*, and not from the condition of the lock gates.

Mr. BURTON (St. John).

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. What is the date of that opinion?

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. 10th October, 1881. There is also a letter of 29th May, in which the opinion is expressed that the case might go to the arbitrators as regards certain questions of fact. They went to the arbitrators and reported as stated by the Deputy Minister of Justice. I know that this claim was brought before the hon. member for Lambton and was not adopted by him in view of the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice as set forth in the letter read.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Is there not some subsequent report and evidence? The case was heard before the official arbitrators, and the evidence proved that the accident arose in consequence of defective gates, and when that evidence was given the liability of the Crown was established.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. These are the papers brought down in answer to a motion for papers. It appears that those papers were placed in the hands of the hon. gentleman. The first is a letter from Mr. Lash to the Department, dated May 29th, 1879. The letter which my hon. friend has read and incorporated in his motion is dated 10th October, 1881, two years and a-half after mention is made of a reference to the arbitrator. It will be observed that he gives Mr. McCallum the benefit of any question which might arise as to the Crown being free from liability to the subject, and assumes that the Crown would be liable if the subject were liable. These are the two papers brought down by Government in order to prove that the Crown was liable to pay this demand; but they prove that the Crown was not liable. The Minister of Justice reports that the arbitrators were unanimous in the conclusion that the damages were not caused by the defective condition of the lock gates, but that they were caused by the mismanagement of the *Louise*, and therefore that the remedy of the owner of the *Upper* is against the proprietors of that boat, and not against the Crown.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. According to the best of my recollection, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways went into this case very fully in Committee, but as I am not sufficiently well informed in the circumstances to reopen them, I move that the item stand for the present.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have taken the trouble to read over the whole of the evidence submitted to the official arbitrators, and now I come to the conclusion that that evidence before any Judge or jury is overwhelmingly in the direction of showing that the cause of the accident was the defective state of the lock gates. I have no doubt that the negligent management of the *Louise* contributed to the result; but if the lock gates had been in proper condition the accident would not have happened. I have all respect for the Deputy Minister of Justice, but so far as I myself am concerned, as a member of Parliament, I prefer my own conclusion after reading the whole of the evidence.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman must remember that the House has not got before it those materials which the hon. gentleman was fortunate enough to get, and which he was assiduous enough to peruse. We have not been generally fortunate, but I observe that the report of the arbitrators is unanimous in the conclusion that the damage was not caused by the defective condition of the gates.

On Resolution 394,

Harbors and Rivers of Ontario..... \$138,450

Mr. GILLIES. The other evening when these items were before the Committee, I remarked that the hon. Minister of Public Works, during this Session, promised myself and others who attended his Department, that he would submit to Council a recommendation for an expenditure on the harbor of Inverhuron. This harbor is on the coast of Bruce,

and it is under the control of the Government. It pays dues to the Government, and it requires a number of improvements from time to time. The Government is in receipt of the moneys collected at that harbor. The hon. gentleman gave us to understand that he would bring the matter before the Council, and the other evening he stated that this was one of the items that was not brought before Council. The hon. gentleman is the representative of the Government as the Minister of Public Works, and if he slights matters of this kind, I think the people to whom he made the promise should know it, as it is not very satisfactory. That part of the coast of Bruce is exposed to a great many storms, and the harbor urgently requires a breakwater or something of that sort.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman has asked this question, as I answered it the other evening. I said positively, I had fulfilled my promise by submitting the matter to Council, but that of the items which went before Council, those now submitted to the House are the ones which passed.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the fact, as appears by the daily papers, that there has been a very serious breach in Toronto harbor, and that it is said to be now in a rather precarious condition. The account I noticed in two of the daily papers is really alarming, and I would ask the hon. Minister's very earliest attention to the matter, because it does seem to me that if it is possible to do anything to arrest the deterioration of the harbor which has gone on through the recent storm, it should be done at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My attention has been called to the damage done to the harbor of Toronto quite lately, and it is my intention to ask my colleagues to allow me to anticipate the vote of Parliament for the next year, and go on with the work immediately. Of course, we will do what is absolutely necessary at first to save the island, and then we shall go on with the works. I think it is absolutely necessary to go to work at once.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad indeed to hear the announcement of the hon. Minister.

Mr. GILLIES. There is another matter I wish to bring before the hon. Minister of Public Works. There is a harbor on the coast of Bruce called Sable River. A deputation came to Ottawa during the Session to see the Minister about the harbor, and it was shown that there were large exports and imports of timber at that place. The gentlemen interested in that harbor are lumbermen, who carry on a very large amount of work, and they agreed to contribute \$15,000 in the event of the Government undertaking the work. The hon. Minister agreed to bring the matter before the Governor in Council. I would like to know whether he has done so or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I fulfilled my promise also in that case, but as the Government could not recommend the construction of all the numerous works that were asked for from all quarters, this item does not appear to have remained on the list accepted by the Council.

House adjourned at 3.10 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 13th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAWSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to draw the attention of the House to the anomalous position in which members might be placed by such a system of recording votes as was followed yesterday. It was arranged, as the House is aware, that the division on the motion of the hon. member for South Brant should be taken as the division on the subsequent motions to be made by hon. members on the Opposition side, in amendment to the motion for the third reading of the Bill for the readjustment of the representation. The hon. member for Bothwell made a motion which, in as far as it affirmed that certain settlements east of Manitoba should have a voice in the elections, I would have supported, but the division on the motion of the hon. member for South Brant was taken in this case, without the yeas and nays being called. I mention this, lest it should be supposed that I was opposed to votes being taken in the settlements in question, whereas I am strongly in favor of it, and see no reason why they should not be represented, and, indeed, there is nothing in the Act to prevent them from having a voice in the elections, for they are, of course, in some electoral district.

BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in moving the second reading of the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole on the 24th March instant, to increase the sum placed at the disposal of the Governor in Council for the purpose of paying off any claims on the Bank of Upper Canada, from two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to two hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars, said: I now lay upon the Table of the House a statement which has been prepared for me, being a memorandum on the estate of the late Bank of Upper Canada:—

"On the 30th June last the balance at the credit of the liquidation account stood at \$332,437.28, since that date there are receipts for \$18,809.25, total \$348,746.63; and the mortgages not matured and other securities will, by the latest estimate, fetch probably \$60,000 more; this would make a total realization of about \$408,000 or thereabouts.

"On the 1st of August, 1870, the estate was taken hold of by the Government, previously thereto an advance was made by the Government to the trustees of \$150,000.

"Up to the 30th June last the amount advanced by the Government, in addition to the above \$150,000, was \$102,370.78, making in all \$252,370.78, or \$2,370.78 in excess of the amount authorized by Parliament."

"I find that on the 1st August, 1870, in addition to a debt to Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co. of \$74,416.20, there were other liabilities of the Bank amounting to \$117,988.73, it was estimated that the demands against these liabilities would aggregate \$88,110, as under:

	Liabilities.	Estimated demands.
1. Bank notes in circulation	\$43,301 50	\$10,000 00
2. Due as suspense account	250 10	250 00
3. Current Accounts	4,511 56	4,000 00
4. Deposit receipts	7,243 21	7,500 00
5. Bank drafts	6,869 93	21,750 00
6. Trustees' certificates	56,961 43	65,500 00
	\$117,987 73	\$88,110 00

"This estimate with a possible payment to Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co., would if it was anticipated absorb \$100,000, and hence authority was procured to advance in all \$250,000.

"In November, 1872, the securities held by Messrs. Glyn, Mills & Co. were transferred to the Government and a settlement was made in full of all demands by a payment of \$30,000, this only left \$70,000 for the other liabilities, and whilst the estimate was not so far out in the other items, that for redemption of the note circulation was greatly under

estimated, as since that date notes to the extent of \$390,000 have been redeemed, and but \$4,000 apparently remain in circulation.

"Judging from the past two years I do not anticipate that any demands will arise from the liabilities above cited beyond that for redemption of notes, as in 1879-80 and 1880-81 nothing was paid except for that purpose, and then only in small amounts.

"The claim referred to by Mr. Hesson arises out of another matter entirely; the claimant states, that in 1861, he had assigned to him a judgment obtained by the Bank and that upon endeavoring to realize the same he found that the Bank had released the parties. The case is extremely complicated, and will probably have to be transferred to the Department of Justice.

"In asking for \$5,000 I have made up the figures as follows: \$2,000 already advanced, \$1,000 for note redemption, and \$2,000 for a margin.

"Respectfully submitted.

"(Signed) J. M. COURTNEY,
Deputy Minister of Finance.

"FINANCE DEPARTMENT,
"OTTAWA, 28th March, 1882."

Then I asked the Deputy Minister of Finance to give me a further memorandum, which contains some of the particulars which the hon. member for West Durham was desirous of having. The following is the memorandum:—

OTTAWA, May 12, 1881.

Bank of Upper Canada—Liquidation Account.

1879.

June 30. The amount received at this date, from all sources, on account of liquidation, since August 1, 1870, was..... \$317,577 11

1882.

May 12. Since the above there have been received from the sale of the Lyn property.....\$15,000 00
From the Christian Brothers of Toronto..... 8,000 00
From instalments on mortgages, &c..... 8,169 52
31,169 52
Making a total to date of..... \$348,746 63

Advance.

1879.

June 30. Amount of advance made prior to 1st August, 1870..... \$150,000 00
From 1st August, 1870, to 30th June, 1879..... 101,528 53
\$251,528 53

1882.

May 12. Notes redeemed from June, 1879, to date, \$1,123 at 75 cts. on the dollar.. 842 25
Making a total to date of..... \$252,370 78

This memorandum has been handed to me, which will perhaps cover part of the ground to which the hon. member referred:

"Canada Central Railway stock, \$9,000; mortgages, estimated at \$35,000; judgments, &c., \$16,000; making \$60,000 as the estimate of the sums yet to be collected from those sources."

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that these three small items are the only assets still in possession of the trustees of the Bank of Upper Canada?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the other items may not all be bad, but are there no unsatisfied claims of any kind beyond the three which the hon. member has read?

Resolution agreed to and reported.

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Mr. BUNSTER. I rise to a question of privilege personal to myself. A paper in this city known as the *Free Press*, has made a personal attack on me. It alludes to the fact that 32,000 Chinese are on their way to British Columbia, and it holds me responsible in not having done my duty in drawing the attention of the Government to it. That journal has persistently tried to traduce me, but this is an attack that I cannot stand. You, Mr. Speaker, are well aware, from the many occasions on which I have addressed you on the subject, that I have drawn the attention of the Government repeatedly to the infliction to which the people of our country are subjected from the Chinese. Still nothing has been done any further than to encourage them. The hon. Finance Minister even took the duty off rice, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, I have protested against; while he has not taken the duty off powder so as to allow the miners to develop the mines. I draw the attention of the House to the matter. I now repudiate the idea that I encouraged Chinese immigration to this country. I have directed the attention of the Government to this question, and it is well known that the people of the United States have suffered a great infliction from the landing of Chinese on the Pacific shores, and I am satisfied the leader of the Government should have taken into consideration the Chinese question as well as the Pacific Railway and the National Policy. If the right hon. gentleman adopts a National Policy, he has also, in my opinion, to protect white labor.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

316. To cover additional expenditure for the High Commission, including disbursements at Paris, in connection with the Trade negotiations..... \$ 1,250

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Has any further information been obtained as to these negotiations with the French Government?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The proposition made by the High Commissioner to the French Government was not accepted. The proposal was not considered sufficient to induce them to grant what we ask, and the result was that the correspondence was communicated to the Government here, and so it stands at the present moment. Nothing final has been done, and the matter stands open for the consideration of the Government.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. Minister able to make any statement as to the nature of those matters, or are the negotiations in such a shape that it is impossible to communicate them?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The proposition was that upon the removal of the *ad valorem* duty of 30 per cent. on French wines, certain articles, if my memory serves me, including agricultural implements, leather manufactures, paraffine oil and one or two others should be admitted in France on favorable terms. The question of tonnage duties on vessels, of course, did not arise because that was disposed of in another way, and the French Government stated they did not consider that proposition was satisfactory but asked for a reduction of the duty on silks and one or two other articles. That is the position in which the matter stands at present. It was also proposed that the French Government should contribute \$50,000 a year for a line of steamers running direct from Canada to France. That proposition was favorably received, but it was left open in connection with the other proposal.

Mr. ANGLIN. Then no idea is entertained at present that we shall be able to obtain the admission of our vessels to the markets of France on reasonable terms.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Our vessels are admitted on the same terms as English vessels, namely at the two franc

duty, and, as stated by the hon. member, the effect of that was largely interfered with by the subsidy given to French vessels. Practically they are in the same position with regard to our ships built in Canada as those built in England and sold in that market, but the value of both is materially affected by the bounty given.

Mr. ANGLIN. Of course, it could not be expected that the French merchants would purchase our vessels, take them to France, and run under what are practically disabilities, but I would like to know if there is any hope of our inducing the French Government to readjust that matter so as to permit the possibility of our selling ships there.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The odds are certainly against us, and there is not much hope unless the subsidy now given to their steamers is so much that they will have to curtail it. With regard to wines there is now a specific and *ad valorem* duty, but in our negotiations, for which we have the authority of Parliament, it is proposed that the *ad valorem* duty shall be dropped on Spanish and French wines.

321. Manitoba Penitentiary—To provide for difference in exchange..... \$1,000

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It appears that a certain person owns some land adjoining the penitentiary, and adjoining this property is that owned by the Dominion Government. It is proposed to exchange the lot owned by the Government for the other, as it will make the property more compact, and this sum is for the purpose of paying whatever difference may be necessary to pay in the exchange.

325. Immigration expenses..... \$28,000

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Mr. POPE. The new sheds at Winnipeg erected by the Government, are expected to accommodate above 400 immigrants. There is also an old shed, which is not convenient, but which could be used in case of necessity.

343. To provide for the payment of claims for improvements made by squatters in the Indian Reserve, in the township of Gibson \$5,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is known that in order to settle the dispute, which seemed to be interminable between the Seminary and the Indians of Oka, an arrangement was made by which the Seminary purchased a large tract of land in the township of Gibson, for the purpose of placing the Indians there. The purchase was made through the Ontario Government; but there were some French Canadian squatters on the land, whose rights the Ontario Government held should be respected. When the Indians went there, the religious difficulties broke out as they did at Oka, the French Canadians, who were Catholics, coming into collision with the Indians who were Protestants. In order to put an end to the trouble, the Government desire this \$5,000 to remove the settlers. This sum will be a charge upon the lands which have been purchased by the Seminary, and will eventually be recovered.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What information has the hon. gentleman as to the position of the Indians, and as to how far they are satisfied with the land assigned to them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that on the whole the Indians are very well satisfied. They suffered some inconvenience in going up too late in the autumn, but they are now well satisfied, and I believe the remainder of the Indians will be removed this spring. The land is well situated on the lake, there is plenty of fishing and shooting, and the soil is fit for agricultural purposes. The gentlemen of the Seminary behaved with the most wonderful liberality, and expended a very large sum, infinitely more than they

were obliged to expend, in buying out their houses and helping them to migrate.

Mr. SCRIVER. Are the Indians to hold their now lands in severalty or as a tribe?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are to hold the land as other Indians do, as an Indian reserve. The tribal system will still be continued. We think it would be rather a dangerous act to treat the Indians as whites and vest in them the land. It would be found in a very few years that they would have no land left. As they became educated, they can at any time become enfranchised and get their freeholds.

Mr. SCRIVER. Is the land secured in the Muskoka district sufficient to provide for the wants of the Indians who have not gone there, but who may yet decide to go?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is much more than sufficient for all the Indians who have gone, and who may yet proceed to the new district. If every Indian family moved from Oka to Gibson, there would still be a large surplus of land.

405. To cover expenses in connection with the International Fishery Exhibition..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. How is this money to be expended?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was a fishery exhibition in Berlin two years ago. It was successful excepting in one regard: France could not exhibit in Germany, and there was a very poor exhibition from the Mediterranean. Another international fishery exhibition is announced to be held in England. Holland, Germany, France, Italy, and the United States have agreed to exhibit there and to contribute to making the exhibition a great success, not only showing the various modes of preserving fish, but all the articles of fish food, and the various fish implements, and models of boats, with all the specimens of fish fit for food. It promises to be a most interesting exhibition. When I was in England last summer, there was a great meeting called under the auspices of the Fishmongers' Guild, to help on the negotiations. We were asked whether Canada would contribute, and we said we would aid the enterprise, subject, of course, to the approval of Parliament, to the extent of the fishmongers' subscription, namely, £500 sterling, and we agreed to subscribe the additional amount as well. That is only in order to initiate the exhibition. We propose to appropriate a sum for the purpose of preparing specimens and getting them ready for this exhibition in 1883.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is this to be an annual vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is asked only for this exhibition.

Mr. ANGLIN. Has the hon. First Minister made up his mind as to the person he will entrust Canada's share of this work? We shall want an expert acquainted with everything connected with fisheries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not yet decided on the parties; we are still considering the subject. There will be more than one man's work. Canada has large fishing interests yet in their infancy, and I think that no pains nor expense should be spared to enable Canada to make a creditable exhibition, as regards her Atlantic, Pacific and fresh water fisheries. That will involve the employment of a good many experts. Mr. Wilmot, who is well known in connection with our fisheries, was obliged to go to New York the other day, and I advised him to go to Washington and see Professor Baird on the subject. We have engaged several men who fully understand the subject. They will be distributed in such a way that every portion of Canada

will be creditably represented in regard to its wealth in fish.

354. Salary of Inspector of Indian Agencies in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces..... \$1,600

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is proposed to appoint an Inspector of Indian Agencies over the older Provinces, and as the Government are breaking up the establishment at Toronto, which is rather an impediment than an advantage, Mr. Plummer will come down here and be the Inspector.

Mr. MILLS. This proposition shows that the hon. gentleman's views have been considerably modified since he divided the House on the appointment of the first Indian Agent appointed in the North-West. The late Administration proposed to appoint an Inspector as an experimental appointment, and the hon. gentleman divided the House upon the appropriation for that purpose. Now he thinks Inspectors are highly desirable. I concur in his opinion, but very much more is required. I called the hon. gentleman's attention last year to the fact that the Indians who have not been emancipated have no power to dispose of the profits of their industry, and have, therefore, when they find a purchaser, to sell generally at much less than the actual value of their property. The hon. gentleman does not undertake to relieve the Indians. There are serious impediments in the way of Indian industrial problems. How is an Indian to succeed in his farm operations when he cannot get a buyer for his produce, because laboring under the disability of a minor, his property, if he sells it is liable to be claimed back at any time.

360. To provide for the salary of one Chief Clerk to 30th June, 1883, Post Office Department..... \$1,800

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. There is an item of \$1,800 for Chief Clerk in the Post Office Department. Where is he to act?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That has become necessary owing to a combination of the functions of the inspector of Post Offices with those of the manager of the Savings Bank. One of these officers died, and it is proposed that one person perform the functions of both, and this is for an additional chief clerk necessary under the readjustment.

362. To meet the amount required to make payment to those officers in the Savings Bank Branch of Post Office and Finance Departments engaged in balancing accounts and computing interest in Depositors' Accounts..... \$ 1,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister intend to make this an annual charge, because if so why not put it in the ordinary place with the salaries instead of in the contingencies?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is very difficult to do that. Down to 1880 these officers were paid extra for the extra work necessary in order to conduct the business of the Department. A good deal of extra work was required to be done, and instead of appointing additional clerks, for which there was no authority, they have been paid extra for doing extra work.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. This looks like interfering with the statutory provisions that we should not pay for extra work. I am aware it has been done, but the matter has been commented upon two or three times in the public Acts and elsewhere, and I think it is against statutory declarations in such case.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know it is against the principle of the Statute, and I quite agree with my hon. friend in that respect. But unless you double or treble the staff it is necessary to employ the present staff extra time. When the quarterly, and sometimes the monthly, returns

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

come in the work is much heavier, and at certain periods circulars have to be sent out to every depositor showing the state of his account, like a bank examiner who examines the accounts of the bank, and all this requires much extra labor. We either have to double the staff or require extra labor of the present staff.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, no one can object that a public officer should be paid higher, whose services are specially arduous, but the difficulty is as to what shall be called extra labor. The hon. gentleman has on his staff certain officers who periodically perform extra work, and he says the most economical way for the public service is to arrange that the existing staff shall work over hours. Now what is contemplated by the Civil Service Act is not that we should pay them extra for extra work, but on the contrary, it expressly provides that their salaries shall be graduated to the arduous character of their labors. That is, that an officer who has to discharge more arduous labors is rated higher than another. But here we find a sum which is allocated to be disposed of at the discretion of the Ministers, paid to whom we know not, for services which we do not measure. We have here all the evils which were sought to be got rid of by abolishing the system of extra pay. I do not propose that this item should be struck out, but I ask the Minister to consider whether it is not possible to comply with the letter as well as the spirit of the Civil Service Act, while doing full justice to the officers.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I admit it is very desirable to avoid it if possible.

363. Increase of salaries of three Trade Instructors at the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... \$480

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. If I recollect aright these men are already paid \$700 each, which is the highest amount paid in the Kingston Penitentiary to the trade instructors of the first class, while a considerably smaller sum is paid to those of the second class. It seems the hon. gentleman proposes to pay these trade instructors of St. Vincent de Paul \$860 each, as against \$700 paid at Kingston. That seems rather a serious inequality, and will doubtless lead to demands for further increase from the trade instructors of every other penitentiary.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In the Estimates for 1881-82, two of them are paid \$700 each and two \$560. The hon. Minister of Justice reported that they demanded an increase of salary, and could not be retained in the service without that increase was granted.

Mr. BLAKE. This is in fact a proposal to increase the salaries of second class trade instructors at St. Vincent de Paul by a sum in excess of that which is paid to first-class instructors at Kingston—\$180 to be added to \$560. There can be no more difficulty in getting trade instructors for St. Vincent de Paul than in getting them at Kingston. We know that the expenses of St. Vincent de Paul are disproportionately large to-day, every allowance being made, as compared with those at Kingston. The salaries are disproportionately large, and in excess of the second-class paid at Kingston.

368. For collecting and compiling agricultural, industrial and other statistics, in Manitoba and the North-West Territory, and also for acquiring and compiling such statistics elsewhere..... \$20,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. POPE. I intend to appoint officers to collect these statistics. It is admitted that it is of great importance that the Government should collect statistics in regard to Manitoba and the North-West. Ontario has already provided means of collecting their statistics, and we have made an arrangement to obtain these statistics in relation to that

Province. As far as the other Provinces are concerned, I am not able to say what we shall be able to do.

Mr. BLAKE. What proportion of the vote will be expended in Manitoba and the North-West?

Mr. POPE. The larger proportion will be expended there. The obtaining of Ontario statistics will cost nothing more than the expense of collating them.

Mr. BLAKE. It is highly desirable to provide some means of ascertaining the statistics in the North-West. I am pleased to know that the Government proposes to take this step but the House should be made acquainted with the Minister's plans. At the same time the number of the population should be obtained. It depends on the mode in which the Minister disposes of this vote as to whether we should advance in this direction. I think it would be of great consequence, particularly with reference to immigration and settlement and a good many problems which will be constantly coming up in regard to the North-West, that we should have some indication not merely of the gross progress of settlement, but also distribution of settlement oftener than is to be obtained by the decennial Census. These statistics might not be thoroughly accurate, but any information that could be obtained would be of high consequence.

Mr. POPE. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it would be desirable to have as much information as possible of this kind oftener than once in ten years, but I did not expect to provide for that in this vote. This vote, as the hon. gentleman knows, is experimental. I cannot say how far I may be able to utilize the municipal institutions of Manitoba and the North-West, but I will utilize them as far as possible and get the information as correctly as possible, because incorrect statistics are worse than none at all, as they are liable to mislead.

370. To provide for the purchase of four guns with 400 rounds of ammunition from the British Government..... \$2,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. CARON. These are siege guns purchased from the British Government, and I consider we are getting them almost for nothing. The ordinary net cost of these guns with a hundred rounds of ammunition, wrought iron cartridge, and one hundred shot of solid iron, is \$1,027.37. We got the four guns complete in England at £100 each. They are siege guns, and looked upon as very perfect. It is not yet decided where they will be placed, but probably one will be put in Montreal, one in Quebec, one in Kingston and one in Halifax, or probably two in Quebec and the others divided.

Mr. BLAKE. What place does the hon. gentleman propose to besiege with these guns?

Mr. CARON. I do not intend to do any besieging, but if any body besieges me I intend to be ready for them.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought that perhaps the hon. gentleman might place them at a convenient point near St. John, and fire at the *Charybdis*.

Mr. ANGLIN. What weight of ball do these guns carry?

Mr. CARON. They are 40-pounders, Armstrong guns, and are 3,200 lbs.

Mr. ANGLIN. Have you masonry sufficiently strong for such guns?

Mr. CARON. I think the Citadel of Quebec would be sufficient to carry one at least, and that there would not be any danger even with two.

Mr. BLAKE. How about those guns which we are manufacturing ourselves?

Mr. CARON. The completion of the contract was delayed in consequence of experiments going on in England before Sir William Palliser died. It was found that the breach which he applied to the converted gun was not as perfect as it was first supposed to be and the work was delayed on his part, and in consequence on our part so as to be able to get the most perfect improvement possible.

Mr. BLAKE. They are not yet converted?

Mr. CARON. They are all converted, but they are not perfected.

Mr. BLAKE. So that in case of war they would not be used.

Mr. CARON. In case of war I will take care that other guns will protect us until they are completed.

406. To assist in promoting the purposes of the International Circumpolar Observations, by contributing towards the expenses of transporting the British Party from Halifax to the Hudson's Bay Station, on Great Slave Lake, and return..... \$4,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Mr. McLELAN. We have been asked by the British Government if we would contribute anything for transporting this party from Halifax to Slave Lake; and as it is through our own territory, and these observations are to be made in the Dominion and will be of great value to us, we ask for this amount. The Royal Society pay the salaries and the maintenance of the party and their expenses to Halifax.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not the British Government.

Mr. McLELAN. But we were asked through the British Government.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the scientific object of the expedition?

Mr. McLELAN. The object is to obtain a better knowledge of the atmospheric laws and magnetic forces which are supposed to affect the state of the weather. It is supposed that this will enable the observers at Toronto and elsewhere to better prognosticate the weather, and that we shall gain largely in that respect.

342 To defray the expenses in connection with the Geological Survey..... \$14,409

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That item was allowed to stand for some explanations.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The following letter from Dr. Selwyn will give all the information required:

"GEOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY,
"OTTAWA, 12th January, 1882.

"Sir,—I have the honor to call your attention to the present state of the appropriation for the Geological Survey, and to point out that the available balance is not sufficient to meet the current monthly expenditure and pay-list salaries to the close of the fiscal year, and pay outstanding liabilities.

"This has been occasioned by the unavoidable heavy expenses in connection with the removal from Montreal. In consequence the whole of these expenses have been paid during the past six months from the ordinary Survey appropriation.

"Under these circumstances, and in order that I may not render myself liable to the charges of incurring on unauthorized expenditure, I would respectfully request that such authority, as may be required, should be issued, to enable me to pay outstanding liabilities and current expenditure to 30th June next. This, as per statement annexed, cannot be estimated at less than \$13,520.71, required to be provided for by supplementary estimate, would be provided on the civil list. This was not carried out, and hence the deficiency which has arisen.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"ALFRED R. C. SELWYN.

"The Deputy of the Minister of the Interior, Ottawa"

APPROXIMATE EXPENSES OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CANADA, FROM
1ST FEBRUARY TO 30TH JUNE, 1882:—

Outstanding liabilities:			
Estate Sir W. E. Logan—Claims for books, instruments, &c.....	\$4,500 00		
Burland Co., lithographing maps, &c.	2,265 75		
Gazette Printing Co., printing report.	500 00		
Canada do do	400 00		
E. Chanteloup, show cases.....	280 00		
Dawson Bros., books, periodicals, &c.	261 07		
H. Cochrane, balance exploration expense	189 31		
T. Birkett, hardware.....	43 69		
J. Erratt, furniture.....	30 00		
R. Forsyth, specimen of granite.....	15 00		
R. Campbell, chemicals.....	13 51		
		8,498 33	
Advances required by field explorers previous to 30th June, 1882, on account of exploration expenses, 1882 83.....	5,000 00		
Wages of carpenters, hall porters, laborers and charwomen, from 1st February to 30th June	850 00		
Wages, Acting Librarian, to 30th June	300 00		
Wages, Museum Assistant.....	187 50		
Translation of report.....	600 00		
Queen's Printer, printing, &c.....	500 00		
Stationery, &c.....	250 00		
Coal and wood	500 00		
M. O'Farrell, current expenses, five months, at \$40.....	200 00		
Water taxes.....	57 00		
Removing snow from Museum premises.....	40 00		
		8,484 50	
Binding sundry valuable books, &c., now unbound in library.....	1,000 00		
Furniture for office, Museum, including one fire-proof safe.....	800 00		
Fitting up Museum and cases.....	500 00		
		2,300 00	
Jan. 30, 1882—Balance at credit of Survey in Bank of Montreal this date	3,461 35		
Balance at credit of Survey—approximation.....	12,939 37		
Less—Pay list, salaries per Order in Council, to 30th June, 1882, five months.....	10,638 60		
		2,300 77	
Balance required by supplementary vote to make up the above deficit.	13,520 71		
Total.....	19,282 83	19,282 83	

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I took occasion, when the item for the Geological Survey was under consideration, to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to the desirability, if the funds permitted, of causing more systematic borings to be made in the North West, and which he promised to consider. Incidentally the matter was brought to my attention in this way: Parties who were desirous of making explorations for minerals in this country applied, I believe, to the Minister of Customs for permission to import diamond drills free of duty. No doubt the Government are aware that they are not manufactured in Canada, and are not likely to be, and that it would be very largely for the benefit of the country that they should be more largely used in borings. I would therefore suggest that if, as I think is the case, it is in the power of the Government under the Statute that enables them to limit duties on such instruments as may be greatly wanted in this country, and which are not made in it, they should allow explorers to import those drills untaxed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is quite likely we will not make diamond drills in Canada very soon, and considering their usefulness, I think the hon. Minister of Customs will do all the law enables him to exempt them from duty.

Mr. ANGLIN. Some days ago a gentleman in Ottawa asked me to obtain information for him as to the regulations regarding explorations for minerals in the North-West,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

especially coal. I obtained a copy of the regular report before the House, and by it I observed that no protection is afforded the explorer; that if he employs some person to assist him, that employe may get the start of him by a prior application for the district in which the coal was discovered. The gentleman suggested it would be much better if the Nova Scotia system was adopted, under which applications are made in the first instance for a license to explore. That gives a person a special right for a short period to explore in a district; and if he discovers a vein of coal he has the prior right to apply for a lease of the district. The Dominion regulations do not afford the explorers such protection, and, therefore, an explorer may be discouraged by the prospect of being deprived of the fruits of his labor and expenditure by an employe making an application.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought there was an objection on the part of the gentlemen opposite to our having any provision of that kind; that they argued we should put it up to tender. There can be no difficulty about providing against the evil mentioned. If he goes to the Department—he can do that at Winnipeg—and states the fact that he is going to take out his party, he would be accepted as the explorer and no application from any member of his party will be entertained. All he has to do is to give a list of those who are to go with him.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the negotiations will bear any such construction. There is nothing whatever to show that the explorer will have a prior right at all. The statement is that applications will be granted in order of their priority. No statement exists that the person who comes in first, if he be not the discoverer himself, or his agent, will have his title voided in any way.

Mr. ANGLIN. The explorer may obtain remedy by application to the hon. Minister, but that may be a tedious process. He might be out in the far West long before he had a suspicion of any application being made, and the titles might be perfected before he could apply for redress. He would have to produce also, proofs to show he was the original explorer. That is a discouraging prospect and may discourage explorations being made. An explorer, on giving notice of his intention to explore a particular district, might have the right to a lease, provided his exploration be successful.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The remedy would be worse than the disease. There would be a rush to any district supposed to contain coal or minerals, and notice would be given of intended explorations, and if those claims had priority, other people would be kept out.

Mr. ANGLIN. The claim might be confined to a limited area.

351. To provide compensation to Jean Louis Legaré. \$2,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Legaré incurred a great deal of trouble and expense, and no little danger, in his successful attempts to get Sitting Bull to surrender himself to the American authorities. I will read Mr. Dewdney's statement which is based on the report of Col. Irvine, the Commissioner of Mounted Police, who knows all about it. He says:

"I cannot vouch for the statement made by Mr. Legaré as to the expense, labor and time incurred in the matter, but I have from time to time heard of Mr. Legaré and the efforts he was making to advance the surrender of the Sioux.

"Mr. Legaré's reputation for rectitude and honesty is well known in the Territories, and I have no doubt his statements are correct. Under these circumstances I think he is entitled to remuneration. The good effects of the surrender were felt very shortly after Sitting Bull left our Territory, as buffalo came in and our Indians have been getting a few ever since.

"I also think that should the Government remunerate Mr. Legaré, who is an Indian trader and has great influence with the Indians, it would have a good effect, and be the means of obtaining like assistance from others in his position, should it be required at any time."

Col. Irvine says :

" I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter. I concur most fully with your recommendation in which you suggest that \$2,000 be paid Mr. Legarée."

Mr. ANGLIN. Would the Minister say whether Mr. Legarée acted voluntarily or under the authority of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At their special request. Resolutions ordered to be reported.

BUILDING SOCIETIES AND LOAN AND SAVINGS COMPANIES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 131) to further amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The object of this Bill is to allow building societies to issue preferential stock, subject to such conditions with regard to specifying a limited rate of dividend as may be agreed upon by the stockholders. An amendment will be proposed that the issue of this new stock shall be offered in accordance with the law, as it is at the present time among existing shareholders, *pro rata* as nearly as possible without fractions; and in case such new shares be not taken up within thirty days, the said shares, or preferential shares, shall be disposed of as the directors may from time to time determine. While I do not deny that under certain circumstances, the company should have power to increase the capital stock as proposed, I yet entertain some apprehension less the creation of different classes of stock of different denominations should not swamp wholly the different classes of stock paid up. The building societies of Toronto have cognizance of this Bill, and with the amendment which I intend to propose, it will be acceptable.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think the difficulty in the case is, that it is proposed to give to newly issued preferred stock the same voting powers as are possessed by paid-up stock. It seems to me it would be quite practicable to put in a clause securing them the voting power *pro tanto*, according to the paid-up stock. Otherwise a nice little game might be played by some of the interested shareholders, by taking up the stock and overbalancing and controlling the affairs of the company for themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. I recollect that a case of that kind was very widely referred to in the newspapers in which a majority, which did not at all represent the paid-up capital, controlled the affairs of the company.

Mr. PLUMB. The shareholders have the matter in their own hands, and there is no reason why they should swamp their own holdings; if there is there should be an issue of stock, under such regulations as they choose to make.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The trouble is that the existing shareholders may not find it convenient to take up the new preferred stock; that a few of them may do so, and if there is to be the same voting power for unpaid or partially paid-up stock, as for that which is paid, it will probably open the door to such a state of things as I have indicated.

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

After Recess.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. In accordance with the remarks made before the Hon. rose, I propose an amendment providing that the new shares to be issued in pursuance of this

Act shall only have voting power according to the proportion the amount paid thereon bears to the stock issued irrespective of this Act.

Bill amended and reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE SEAMEN'S ACT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 110) to further amend the Seamen's Act, 1873.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On clause 1,

Mr. McLELAN. Under the Act at present the offence is punished by five years imprisonment in the penitentiary; but this Bill proposes to give the judge discretionary power to impose a penalty of not less than two or more than five years imprisonment.

Mr. ANGLIN. The Act of which this Bill is an amendment was passed at a period of very great excitement, after a seaman had been murdered on a vessel in the harbor of Quebec, and it was thought that very severe repressive measures were necessary to put an end to the carrying of dangerous weapons. But I think we went entirely too far on that occasion, and I think we ought to go further in the opposite direction than this Bill does go. It is the policy of our whole criminal law to place discretionary power in the hands of the Judge. We all know that there will be very great differences in the nature and character of these cases, and the mere fact that when a man is arrested some weapon happens to be found upon him, should not be held as conclusive evidence that he intended to use it for some unlawful purpose. Some persons carry weapons as a habit, and not with any evil purpose or intent, and it should be left to the Judge to determine whether the evidence showed that there was any unlawful intent in carrying the weapon. If the Judge finds that it was intended to use the weapon he might impose a heavy penalty; but if no such intention was apparent he should be at liberty to inflict only a small penalty. While fully protecting the officers and owners of vessels from parties who want to carry off their sailors, let us not run to the extreme of inflicting unnecessarily severe punishment in cases where no good reason exists for it.

Mr. McLELAN. This Act was passed under extraordinary circumstances, but it has effected an extraordinary cure. I shall add the words suggested by the leader of the Opposition, to amend the clause.

Mr. BLAKE. I certainly feel that the penalty proposed in the case on which my hon. friend has commented is extremely severe. It is provided a penalty shall be inflicted in the case of parties boarding a vessel without the permission and against the orders of its officers. Such a proceeding may subject a party to confinement in the penitentiary for three years, and to five years if an offensive weapon is found on him. This seems a tremendous penalty.

Mr. McLELAN. The law was excessively severe before.

Mr. ANGLIN. It was Draconian before.

Mr. McLELAN. It has not worked any great evil.

Mr. ANGLIN. I have heard of cases where it did. I would not except from severe punishment any party endeavoring to bring off sailors from a vessel, or interfering with the master's control, or a party in whose case there was anything to indicate an intention to draw a weapon to intimidate the officers. I only advocate a discretionary power with the Judge when the offence was of a much milder character, the offender being found with the weapon which he had not attempted to use; the Judge should be able

to inflict less than two years imprisonment in the penitentiary.

Mr. CARON. I must admit that this is a very stringent law. But crimping had become the curse of the harbor of Quebec; sailors had often been carried away from vessels, to their great loss and the injury of the trade, and much personal violence and sometimes murder resulted from crimping. The Act has abolished this evil, and I think the clause as it now stands is not at all too stringent.

On clause 2,

Mr. BLAKE. I have the strongest objection to the second clause. Under the Act which is sought to be amended there was a recent case in which the Stipendiary Magistrate or Judge of the Sessions tried a man and inflicted upon him a very severe penalty. The case was brought before the Court of Queen's Bench of Quebec, and there was a difference of opinion between the Judges as to whether the true interpretation of this Act did permit the trial, without a jury, by an inferior magistrate, of a subject, for an offence of this description and the imposition of a penalty like this. The majority in the court were of the opinion that the law authorized that, but the minority, consisting of the Chief Justice, Sir A. A. Dorion, and Mr. Justice Ramsay, were of the opinion that the law did not authorize it. My opinion is, and in this I agree with Mr. Justice Ramsay, that if the law did authorize it, it ought not to have authorized it. The second clause proposes to authorize this. If you are going to impose so severe a penalty as you have provided by the first clause, a penalty of five years imprisonment, in respect of which the maximum penalty in England is, I believe, three months, the subject ought at least to have the benefit of a trial by jury; and to provide that an inferior magistrate such as a Judge of the Sessions, a Police Magistrate, a Stipendiary Magistrate or a Judge of a County Court, shall have authority to try and determine in a summary way an offence which you have made so serious as to be punishable by five years imprisonment in the penitentiary, is nothing less than monstrous. I maintain that our criminal law has not gone beyond the trial by jury. There are certain cases of a very minor character which are to be tried by Police Magistrates summarily, but our law, so far as we have interfered with graver offences, provides a summary mode of trial, at any rate in the Province of Ontario and some of the other Provinces, with the consent of the accused; but here it is proposed to try cases summarily without his consent, without giving him any option. This is contrary to the spirit of our criminal law and all sound views. The following is the language of Judge Ramsay:—

"Now, we are invited to declare that these words oust trial by jury, and place the liberty of any person accidentally going on board the wrong ship, at the mercy of two justices of the peace or of a stipendiary magistrate. It is not contended that these words are those ordinarily used for conveying jurisdiction; but, if I understand the respondent's pretension, it is assumed, that some of the dispositions of the Act are of a character so contrary to the general spirit of criminal legislation and to the institutions of this country, that we must be more readily disposed to admit it to be the intention of the Legislature to create a new jurisdiction than if the law were of a usual character. Such a doctrine appears to me to be intolerable—a monstrous law, which, in its eagerness to reach the guilty, confounds innocence and guilt, has no spirit, and its operation must be confined to the narrowest interpretation of its words."

The Hon. Chief Justice Dorion said:

"In a matter like this, where the punishment cannot be less than five years, I am not disposed, even if I felt that I was permitted by law to do so, to extend, by way of interpretation and by doubtful inferences, the jurisdiction of the Judges of the Sessions of the Peace, so as to deprive any accused from the invaluable privilege of being tried by his peers, especially when I find that in England, where these laws are administered by men well versed in the practice and with the principles of the criminal law—an advantage which we do not always possess here—the penalty for similar offences under the Act already cited, is three months' imprisonment, and the extreme punishment which a stipendiary magistrate can in any case inflict is a penalty not exceeding \$100 or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months." (17 and 18 Vic., Cap. 104, ss. 237, 518 and 519.)

Mr. ANGLIN.

"If the Legislature wishes to abolish the trial by jury in any particular case and to leave the citizens to be tried by an exceptional tribunal, especially when their liberty for such a period as five years may be in jeopardy, it must say so in clear and unmistakable terms; and I shall not deem it my duty to assist in such a work by any decision which is not clearly justified by the very letter of the law."

Mr. McLELAN. The cases here dealt with are altogether exceptional. The man must persist in remaining on board the ship against the orders of the captain or other person in authority. Unless you make the trial summary, you are liable to detain the ship, which would entail very great expense. No cases of hardship have arisen under the present Act, which is much more stringent than it is proposed to make it now. We have provided that a Judge of the Superior Court may try such cases, in addition to a Police Magistrate or a Judge of the Sessions. I think that Judge Ramsay's objections arose from having a doubt whether, under that Act, we had authority to inflict punishment when it was limited to the infliction of necessary penalties. Therefore he was of opinion that Mr. Justice Chauveau should try cases when pecuniary penalties only were provided.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that no cases of hardship arose under the law. I should think it is a case of hardship that a man should be tried summarily before a magistrate and condemned to five years imprisonment for going on board a ship without the permission of the master.

Mr. McLELAN. Remaining on board.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. That was not the law. The hon. gentleman proposes to alter the law. He confounds the whole law with the Bill now before us. The charge against this man was that he unlawfully did go on board the ship *Cavalier* without the consent of the master, Mr. Jackson. This man was tried and convicted in his absence by a single judge, Mr. Chauveau, and condemned to five years imprisonment because he went on board the ship without permission. If he is not convinced that it is a case of hardship I would feel it useless to attempt the task of convincing him that it is.

Mr. McLELAN. If a man violates the law.

Mr. BLAKE. Under these circumstances, there could be no hardship under any law. You have before you the case in which a man was tried and convicted in his absence, under the law as it stands, and sentenced to five years imprisonment for going on board a ship without the master's consent. In the Court of Appeals, a doubt existed as to the interpretation of the law. You propose now to make it clear, that a trial, in the case mentioned, can take place without a jury. The hon. gentleman is not cognizant of the principles of jurisprudence when he says it must be a clear case because there must be permission of the master. He forgets that one of the questions to be determined is, whether it was against the orders of the master. It is a trial as to whether the law has been violated or not by going on board without the consent of the master, and we require the assistance of a jury before coming to a conclusion which may temporarily subject the accused to the loss of his liberty for five years in the provincial penitentiary. Having before us now plainly and clearly what the consequences of this legislation would be, we are face to face with this question: Is it necessary to establish so severe a penalty? If it be necessary you preclude yourselves from the proposition that the subject that you expose to so severe a penalty shall be exposed to it without the advantage of a trial by jury. If the penalty were lighter, three or six months, such as the English penalty, there would be less objection to a summary trial, though it would be in its measure foreign to the spirit of criminal law. But when you determine that the ends of justice require a penalty so severe as this, you determine also that the ends of justice exact that the sentence should be upon the verdict of a jury and not upon the verdict of a single judge.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman says that this offence is visited in England by three months imprisonment, but I must tell him that there is no similarity at all between the English offence and the Canadian offence. In England the crew are discharged in the port as a rule. In Canada seamen arrive here with three or four pounds, and when they return to England, their wages amount to six or seven pounds. There is a strong inducement for the seaman to desert his ship, a strong inducement for the crimps to take possession of the seaman and sell him to another ship returning home to England, while their increased wages, as a rule, go into the pockets of the crimps. Speaking of the principles of law, is not a captain the master on board his own ship? and is he not in his castle? Has he not the same right to be protected as any other man in his own residence from trespassers going on board that ship, and even, as it has happened at Quebec, shooting down men who would desert their vessel? I consider that this law is not at all too stringent. In the case to which the hon. gentlemen has referred, Judge Chauveau had no discretion, because the law fixed the penalty three years for some offences and five years for others, and the case being proved he had no power to exercise a discretion. It would be impossible to prove a case against a prisoner by the witnesses on the ship, who alone could give the necessary testimony, if the case was postponed until the Quarter Sessions, and the only way to deal with such cases is to deal with them summarily. It is true the punishment may appear excessive, but considering all the circumstances, the difficulty of preventing this crime will justify it. That crime has now altogether disappeared from our harbor in consequence of the stringent laws which were passed and which protected private property and protected the ship-owner and captain. It was only in consequence of such laws that the captain was able to control his crew and protect his ship.

Mr. BLAKE. If the crime has already disappeared what was it for which Michael Clarke was sent to the penitentiary last September for five years?

Mr. CARON. That is only one case.

Mr. BLAKE. It is only one man. I admit that the difficulties are serious and that they may require exceptional provisions, but I maintain that that exceptional provision is to be obtained not at the sacrifice of the sacred rights of the subject to trial by jury, but by providing for an expeditious trial. Let the hon. gentleman, if it requires an immediate trial, make a special provision under which a jury may be secured at once and the trial take place immediately. There is no impossibility in that; there are judges of sufficient rank always in the city of Quebec to try those cases. The hon. gentleman tells us, first of all, that the crime is more grave than many others, and that the consequences are so much more serious that we must stamp it with the degradation and the severity of a five years' imprisonment as a maximum punishment; and then to tell us that we can find no means whereby the usual safeguards of trial by jury can be secured, is something that cannot be listened to. If the hon. gentleman wants to make the penalty so severe and to have an immediate trial, let him combine these things by providing special jurisdiction for the trial of this offence with the immediate summoning of a jury, and so get over both difficulties; but do not tell us in the first place it is a very grave crime, and in the next instance that we must deprive persons charged with it of the right of the trial by jury.

Mr. ANGLIN. The mistake both Ministers make is in imagining that only the rights of property are to be guarded, and that the rights of an individual man are of small importance, that because a man happens to be called a criminal he is to be deprived of all the rights which we profess to hold so sacred everywhere—the right of trial by

jury. That is a right of which we should not rightly deprive any one of Her Majesty's subjects. The hon. Minister of Marine talked as if the very moment a man is arrested on a charge of this kind he should be treated as a criminal. The principle of English law is that every man is to be treated as innocent till he is convicted of a crime. Police Magistrates, though they may be respectable men, are usually men of small experience and capacity, and from a habit of dealing with criminals of the lowest class, they usually have small regard for individual rights. We are treating this matter too lightly. We are interfering with the most sacred rights—rights which ought to be held the most sacred in those who are meekest and most humble. It is not because you choose to call a man a criminal that he is therefore to be held as having no such rights as the rest of the community are supposed to be in the full possession and enjoyment of. A prisoner must be held to be an innocent man until after he has been convicted by a jury of his peers, and a Stipendary Magistrate should not have the power to commit a man for five years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. After listening for some time to the very strong terms in which the hon. leader of the Opposition denounces this measure, I was startled lest some great innovation was being made; but I was surprised to learn that all the hon. Minister was doing was to propose an amelioration of the law as it was in operation during the time the leader of the Opposition was Minister of Justice. I feared the proposition was to impose a most stringent penalty, but I find it to make it less stringent and to give a discretion to reduce the penalty from five to two years.

Mr. ANGLIN. What does the hon. gentleman say in regard to summary procedure?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is not proposed to make any change in that particular. Have such offenders had trial by jury during the last five years?

Mr. ANGLIN. This Bill will remove doubts and establish the power of the magistrate to try and convict and impose such penalty.

Mr. McLELAN. The doubt expressed by the Judges was as to whether they had the power to impose punishment. I have a letter from Mr. Chauveau.

Mr. BLAKE. I have the opinions of the Judges. I did not consider it within my business as Minister of Justice to have enquired into all the enactments passed while the gentlemen opposite were in power; and that because my attention was not called to this fact when I was Minister, that therefore my mouth should be shut now. The Judges of the Superior Court of Quebec had the statement before them during the last two or three months. They were divided on the question whether the Act had the interpretation that was generally placed upon it; but they decided the question—the Chief Justice, a man of great ability, and Judge Ramsay composing the minority. That is the present state of the law; and this Bill proposes to settle the question.

Bill reported.

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN.

Sir Leonard Tilley moved, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution to provide for an annual grant of \$150,000 to aid in the development of the sea fisheries, &c.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In submitting for the consideration of the Committee the resolution upon the subject

of the bounty to the fishermen, I desire to say that it is exceedingly difficult, with the information we have before us at present, to state specially the nature of the bounty to be given to the vessels or boats employed in the fisheries. All that we propose to do at the present time is to state, upon the information, on data, we have at command, what we think will be the probable amount to be appropriated in the distribution of this \$150,000, per ton, per vessel, and per boat engaged in the sea fisheries. It will be found by reference to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department for 1830-81, as well as other data that we have been able to command, that the average number of men employed in the fisheries during the last two years was 60,589. The average number of vessels engaged in the fisheries was 1,150, the average tonnage 46,856, and the average number of boats 26,106. It is intended for the first year to administer the distribution of the money by arrangements made by Order in Council, after the fullest information has been obtained, and it is proposed to give \$2 a ton for the vessels engaged in the fisheries. Of the tonnage of 46,856 some are vessels engaged for a short period in each year, and they would not be entitled to any bounty on that account. On the best information we have before us there will be about 42,000 out of the 46,000 entitled to the bounty. It is proposed, for example, that a vessel shall require to be at least three months engaged in the fisheries each season, or probably four months, and it is proposed also to divide the bounty between owners of the vessels and crew. That is the proposition at present. With reference to the boats we find some little difficulty at the present moment in stating the nature of the boat, because they vary so much in size and value, and the number of men employed. For instance, there are many boats employed in our fisheries manned by two men; others engaged with the seine or net, and others with only one man. Then there are a number entered in the returns who are owned by men who are not fishermen, farmers and others on the coast of Nova Scotia frequently going out at certain seasons of the year to catch fish for their own use. It is not intended that they shall partake of the bounty. Out of the 22,000 boats employed, we take 10,000 of the larger size and allow them \$4, and 12,000 of the smaller size, \$2 each. This is the approximate estimate, but, of course, the arrangement is only of a tentative character. After enquiring, we have decided that boats less than fourteen feet long should not receive anything. By giving \$2 a ton for an aggregate of 42,000 tons, part to the owner of the vessel and part to the crew, \$4 each to 10,000 smaller boats, and \$2 each to 12,000 of the smallest size, we make up \$148,000. The subject having been discussed by Government before my visit to the Maritime Provinces last summer, I took occasion to enquire into the condition of the fishermen, especially in Nova Scotia, and I learnt that a large portion of the fishermen, previous to the Washington Treaty, were in the habit of going to Massachusetts in ships belonging to Massachusetts. They have there a very superior class of vessels, which are built especially for that trade. From the habit of their going there previous to the treaty, I was told that they still go there; and I was told, especially in Yarmouth, that if the bounty was given in such a way that the owner of a vessel would receive a certain portion, it would be an encouragement to persons who had capital to construct the class of vessels used by these people in Nova Scotia, so that they would not be compelled to go to the United States. That was one object we had in view. It was also considered that the interest on the \$1,500,000 awarded by the Fishery Commission should be distributed among the fishermen who, under its operation, had been compelled to give up the advantage of having access to the American market for their fish. We hope, within the next month or so, to be able to pass the Order in Council based upon this resolution,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

to an extent that will very likely be about the \$150,000 asked for.

Mr. KILLAM. I do not think the hon. member could have more thoroughly convinced the House than he has done by his eloquent speech, that the distribution of this bounty cannot be intended for anything else than a political bribe. This is one of the most crude propositions ever submitted to a Legislature. It has been submitted without any consideration or any knowledge of the facts; and it has been laid before us at half-past nine on the second evening preceding the prorogation, of what we are led to suppose, is the last Session of this Parliament, when it is entirely out of our power to consult with our friends in the different parts of the country as to whether this proposition is a sound one or not, and when we have not time to consider the provisions of the measure. The hon. gentleman tells us that the matter is to be settled by Order in Council. No doubt, as in many other cases; he would like to have the matter settled by Order in Council and not by such an Act of Parliament as would make it clear to those interested. The fishermen know how they have been taxed by the hon. gentleman, and how he voted against giving them a fair share of the Fishery Award; and they do not thank the hon. gentleman for bringing down, at the last stage of the Session, a half measure of this kind, for returning to them a portion of the money which he knows has been withheld from them for so many years. The fishermen will not give the hon. gentleman the credit he expects to obtain by this measure. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has investigated this matter, or if he is at all conversant with it; or is he bringing down this measure because he thinks it is a popular thing to give a bounty to the fishermen? After having taxed every article which the fishermen use for the last three or four years, he goes to them and says: "Although we have been taxing you, we have been looking after your interests, and we propose to return to you part of the taxes we have taken from you. As soon as the turmoil of the elections is over we will settle with you by Order in Council." Sir, I profess to be conversant with this subject; I know something about the tonnage of vessels and about fishing boats; I have taken the trouble to post myself with regard to the catch of fish, and I believe there will be no trouble for the hon. gentleman to distribute \$150,000; but it will be very difficult for him, with the knowledge he has acquired so far, to discuss this subject properly. It would have been in order for the hon. gentleman, when he proposed to levy a duty upon the necessaries of life used by these people, four years ago, to have taken that matter into consideration. But he never thought of it then. Now, when the unpopularity of that policy makes it necessary to him to try to redeem his character in some way, he comes down with this proposition. But he knows nothing about the subject. If he took into consideration the question of the fish caught, the risks incurred in taking different kinds, and the revenue the Dominion derives from the catch of the different sorts, he might with some degree of knowledge distribute this bounty in a way to acknowledge the most deserving. But that is not within the scope of his knowledge. He does not understand how to deal with that part of the subject. He submits this proposition, I unhesitatingly assert, solely as an election kite, because he has not considered the interests of those people the last three years. He is pretending now to make some amends to them without a proper knowledge of the subject, and without a consideration of the proper method of dealing with it. And what we shall find out when the elections are over is, that it will be perhaps one or two years before he will be able to distribute his first year's award, and afterwards that the distribution has been an improper one, occasioning the utmost dissatisfaction; and that the proper way, as everybody contends, to deal with the fishermen is to release them from unnecessary taxation, and not by

taking \$2 from them and giving \$1 back, and so try to make himself especially popular with these people.

Mr. ANGLIN. How small a vessel will be entitled to this \$2 bounty—will vessels of five or six tons be? Will those five or six ton vessels be entitled to \$2 a ton or only to the \$4.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say at this moment; because all the vessels are registered, and their register will be the guide as to the payment on the tonnage. The law, I think, speaks of registering all vessels of ten tons; any smaller tonnage is not registered, and that is where one of the difficulties arise in reaching a decision. The hon. member for Gloucester says no time was given. We gave notice a long time ago. Many hon. members have furnished the Government with information—members of practical experience; and many have been in communication with their constituents, and have placed in the hands of the Government the returns made. The statements I have made are based on recommendations to a large extent of members, either the results of their own personal experience or of information from their constituents. One of the matters that will have to be investigated concerns that class of vessels between the size required to be registered, of ten tons, and an ordinary boat. Some scale will have to be fixed, based on either length, breadth or capacity; therefore I cannot state any general rule for vessels under the regular tonnage.

Mr. FLYNN. I am not disposed to question the motives that have animated the Government in giving these \$150,000 as a bounty to the fishermen. I have said, and still think, that if the taxes were lightened, it would be to greater advantage to them than any bounty. It was quite within the power of the hon. Finance Minister to obtain that information, which I regretted to hear him say he did not possess, to enable him to make the best distribution of this money to the fishermen in the Maritime Provinces. This information could as well be obtained between the day of his Budget Speech and to-day, as it can be procured hereafter. I presume the most competent authorities will be the officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I am not satisfied with the proposed \$2 a ton. I only hope, however, that the fishermen themselves will get the benefit of the grant and not the owners of the vessels to a large extent. The hon. Minister proposes to give a certain class of boats \$2 and another \$4. In every part of the Maritime Provinces there is a different class of boats varying in size from 12 and 14 feet, flat-bottomed boats up to 35 or 40 feet in length. Some of those boats of a very fair size would have only two men. Therefore, if a boat of thirteen feet keel got \$2 with two men and one with 30 feet keel only got \$2, that would certainly not be a fair proportion. I think it should be so arranged that the bounty would be distributed according to the number of men in each boat and not according to the size of the boat.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The difficulty is to know how many men are engaged.

Mr. FLYNN. You will have to get official information. You could have a register of the boats and a return to the Department of the size of each boat and the number of men employed in it. No doubt many difficulties surround this question, and a good deal more care and time will be required to settle it satisfactorily than the hon. Minister has been able to bestow on it. The fishery overseers would be the proper persons to visit the districts and obtain the information required in order to distribute this sum in an equitable manner.

Mr. BRECKEN. I agree with the hon. member, that it is a matter of very great difficulty to distribute this bounty in an equitable way. I should like to see it distributed according to the number of men employed in the boats irre-

spective of size. In some cases the boats are owned by the fishermen themselves, but, in others, by the proprietors of fishing stations, and they vary a good deal in size. I know it was impossible for the hon. Finance Minister, in the pressure of time and business, to have propounded a very clear and distinct plan, but I look at it in this light—that the poorer the men, the greater the necessity they should receive assistance out of this bounty. I do not see why it should be distributed according to the size of the boats, because, after all, the men who are in a position to purchase and own larger-sized boats with more efficient gear are the men who stand less in need of the bounty than those who are struggling to make a livelihood in the smaller boats. Men should be appointed in the neighborhood of these fishing stations to issue licenses to those engaged in the trade, and see that that they are *bona fide* engaged in it so as to prevent men pretending to be fishermen for the purpose of getting a share of the bounty. In this view a minimum catch would have to be established. Some scheme of that kind would be more acceptable to the fishermen than that proposed by the hon. Finance Minister.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is much to be regretted that the hon. Finance Minister should not give earlier some outline of his plan for the distribution of this bounty, and so enable us to consult in our constituencies the leading men in that industry so as to obtain information which would probably have enabled the hon. Finance Minister to arrive at a more definite and fair conclusion than he has been able to reach. I agree with the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken that it would be better to apportion this bounty according to the men employed rather than to the size of the boat, because the smaller the boat and the poorer the outfit the greater the need of this assistance. If you divide the money according to the length of the keel there will be great jealousy aroused among the men, who will not understand why one should get more than another. I endeavored to ascertain from my constituents their views exactly, but I had so little information as to the views of the hon. Minister that I had but little to work on. Some wanted to know if the money was to be voted altogether for the encouragement of deep sea fishers or whether the inshore fishers would also be aided, or whether the ordinary boat was to be distinguished from the vessel thoroughly equipped for fishing; but I could not give any information on those points. There are difficulties in the way, and I am sure we would all have been delighted to assist the hon. Minister in arriving at a proper conclusion. If we are determined to divide \$150,000 amongst the fishermen it should be done upon some fair and equitable basis. This is not a case where party interests or political considerations should have any weight. I am only sorry that I cannot now afford more information on the matter.

Mr. DECOSMOS. This discussion has so far apparently been confined to the eastern Maritime Provinces. The hon. Minister of Finance, in introducing his resolutions made no distinction, however, between the eastern and western Maritime Provinces. Now, Sir, allow me to draw your attention to one or two facts with respect to the fisheries. The total exports of fish for the last fiscal year was about \$6,867,715. The total take of fish in British Columbia during the last calendar year, according to the report of the Inspector of Fisheries for the Province of British Columbia, was \$1,454,321.

Mr. ANGLIN. Does that include salmon?

Mr. DECOSMOS. It is quite immaterial whether they are salmon or codfish. If we have a salmon aristocracy you have a codfish aristocracy. The produce of British Columbia amounted to nearly one-fifth of the total exports of fish. Now, I would remind the House of the fact that under the fifth article of the terms of Union between Canada and British Columbia, Canada agreed to protect

and encourage the fisheries of British Columbia, and I take it that in any distribution of this \$150,000 among the fishermen, and for the encouragement of the fisheries; the Province of British Columbia should receive its due share.

Mr. OGDEN. Not much.

Mr. DECOSMOS. Now, Sir, let me draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to this fact; that when the treaty of Washington was made it was stated by the present hon. Minister of Railways, and by the hon. Premier to myself personally before that treaty was adopted by this House, that Columbia was included. It turned out afterwards that Columbia was not included in the treaty, although Prince Edward Island, which was not in the Union, was included. As a consequence our fishermen have not been able to send their fish into the United States free of duty; we have not been able to send our oil or anything else that is produced from the sea, into the United States under that treaty. I think that in distributing this bounty the Province of Columbia should share man for man with the other Provinces. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), as well as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Brecken) is inclined to the view that the distribution of this award should be given as a poll bonus. Now, let us see how the Province of Columbia stands in regard to the fishing industry. Last year she had eight steamers of from five to fifty tons, ten schooners of from fifteen to eighty tons, 335 fishing boats, thirty-five flat boats, 146 canoes, with a sealing fleet, sixty-two sailors and 2,831 fishermen and shoremen. An hon. gentleman remarked that this was a salmon fishery, but I submit there is no difference between taking salmon in Columbia and taking fish off the coast of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island in boats. Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia have no large rivers, though there is the Avon, the St. Croix, the Shubenacadie and others; but they are comparatively small. In framing this scheme we should take into consideration the character of the country. What may satisfy the small Provinces east may not satisfy the great Province west, and if the salmon fishery is at this moment the chief industry the salmon fishermen should be just as much entitled to a bonus as the cod fishermen in the Gulf of St. Lawrence or on the coast of Nova Scotia. We have also the seal fishery, which has grown up during the last few years. Last year there were ten schooners engaged in it and 146 canoes, which took 13,541 seals worth \$170,242. Now, here is a deep sea enterprise that deserves encouragement. It is the same class of seals for which the United States Government receives over \$250,000 of royalty from the Alaska Fur Company. My intention, in making these remarks, was to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to this point, that as Columbia contributes her share for the protection of the fisheries east, I take it she is entitled to her share of the money given for the encouragement of the fisheries; and I would like to hear the hon. minister state whether it is the intention of the Government, in the distribution of this bonus, to include Columbia. From the utterances we have already heard, it seems to be the opinion that this money is simply going back to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces as a portion of that which was paid over to the Dominion by the United States. Now, that question was discussed here before, and the majority of the House expressed the opinion that that money was the property of the Dominion, and not the property of the Maritime Provinces alone, consequently we are entitled to our share of the money from the fact of our being a partner in the Dominion. I would now formally request the hon. Minister of Finance to state whether he intends to include the Province of Columbia in this matter.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The proposition is to reimburse the fishermen of that portion of the Dominion who have had taken from them by the treaty exclusive privi-

Mr. DECOSMOS.

leges which they formerly enjoyed. It is to compensate them for the competition which they are now meeting with from American fishermen. British Columbia does not come within the terms of the treaty, and American fishermen are not competing with them. The hon. gentleman says the people of British Columbia have contributed to the maintenance of the fisheries in the east and have a right to their share of consideration. That is quite true. Officers have been appointed there by the Dominion Government, and before the Session closes an appropriation will be asked for fish-breeding establishments and the encouragement of fish-breeding in British Columbia, recognizing the right they will have to the protection of their fisheries, the amount to be paid out of the general revenues of the Dominion. A number of communications have been received through members of the House representing fishing districts. There have been propositions to pay on the fish exports. It was felt that the amount would not reach the parties engaged in the business. Another proposition offered was that every man engaged in the fishing business should receive a certain sum per head. That, however, would be a difficult undertaking, although from a political point of view it would be advantageous. But there are two objects in view in the propositions submitted: first, to encourage the construction of a class of vessels that is much needed; second, to compensate the fishermen. It is the intention of the Government to use the fishery officers for the purpose of granting licenses and looking after this matter, but it would be a difficult matter to distribute the amount according to the number of men in a boat. The point with respect to which there is at present some difficulty is as to the size of the boat, but we may arrive at that by the length of the keel and the dimensions of the boat. The proposition now submitted to the House in its brief form has been the result of the recommendation of members connected with the fishing counties, and correspondents to whom they have written.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to found a Bill on the resolution?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, we propose to place a vote in the appropriation.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to define the mode of distributing the money?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not for the present year—not until we have had a year's experience.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has adduced, as a reason why Parliament is asked to pass upon this measure at this late period of the Session, that hon. members wish to give him the result of enquiries made during the Session. I feel it is to be regretted that the Government, who took up the subject so long ago, did not take it up in a manner to enable them to make a more equal distribution in connection with the grant. It is obvious that Parliament is being asked to vote this money into the hands of the Government. What the Government was bound to do was this—to have acquired information to have enabled them to go before Parliament, which would pass upon it. It might be said that it will not be necessary to retain the plan for more than the first year, and that therefore, the plan should be tried. The plan is to be tried after the Session, and the money will be distributed for the first year according to the views of the Government and not with the sanction of Parliament. This proposal is contrary to the two principles which should regulate a Government holding office under our Constitution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman loses sight of the fact that my hon. friend stated that the mode of making this distribution is to a certain extent experimental. What Parliament is asked

to do is to appropriate \$150,000 per annum for the benefit of the fishermen of this country. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has taken Parliament in the fullest degree into his confidence by giving it all the evidence he has been able to gather on the subject. He has explained in the fullest possible manner to Parliament the mode in which it is proposed to deal with that which is obviously at present an experiment, and when we come to devise the means of making that \$150,000 per annum useful for the fishermen for whom it is intended, when we crystalize that appropriation into an Act, the Government will have the advantage of possessing a year's experience and will be able to judge by a year's experience and the information which will be acquired on the subject, as to how they can best permanently provide for the administration of that money — what scheme they can submit to Parliament for the permanent appropriation of that money. I think the hon. gentleman is unreasonable in asking that more shall be done than to bring forward our determination to appropriate a specific sum, and outline the mode by which it is proposed to expend it. The hon. gentleman has left no vagueness as to the mode in which it will be expended, or as to how it will be appropriated, so far as we are able to form a judgment at the present time. The hon. leader of the Opposition does not go so far as the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), who did nothing but fling taunt and insult and obloquy across the floor to my hon. friend the Finance Minister, because he comes down with his proposal to appropriate \$150,000 for the benefit of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman represents a Province which has thousands and tens of thousands of hardy fishermen to whom this money will be a great and well-deserved boon, and has nothing for the Government and for my hon. friend who brings down this proposal, but the strongest imputations of the most dishonorable motives. He denies that the fishermen will accept this as a boon; and I say, Sir, that if he were accepted as the mouth-piece of the fishermen of the country the Government would at once withdraw the grant and the hon. gentleman would be in a similar position to that which he occupied when upon an appropriation for his own county appearing in the Estimates, he asked that the item be struck out. I repeat that if the hon. gentleman was the accepted mouth-piece of the fishermen, the Government would not retain this item on the Estimates for five minutes. Does not the hon. gentleman know that a large deserving body of the population of this country will gratefully receive this evidence of the fact that the Government are prepared now, as they always have been prepared, to give that consideration to them which is due to men engaged in an arduous, toilsome and dangerous profession, and a consideration which they have never received from hon. gentlemen opposite. How is it, I would ask, that we have \$150,000 to appropriate to this object? Where does it come from? Who was it that opened the markets of the United States to the fishermen of our country? Who took away the prohibitive tariff which prevented the fishermen from getting access to the large markets of the United States? I say this boon was obtained by gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, despite the efforts of the leader and of the body of the Opposition to prevent it. A measure was brought down by which the markets of the United States were to be opened. The hon. gentleman sustained that proposition, but in sustaining it he condemned the attitude of the party with whom he is acting to-day, and in overwhelming numbers did what they could to prevent that market from being opened for the fishermen of our own country. Not only so, but in the first efforts of the Conservative party to protect the fisheries of this country they were met with nothing but taunt and insult and obloquy from the friends of the hon. gentleman, just as they have met with here to-night. When we sub-

mitted to Parliament large appropriations for the protection of the fisheries, we were ridiculed, and, had the policy of the hon. gentleman opposite been adopted, the whole fisheries of our country would have been left open as a prey to the United States fishermen, who would have gone upon them and absorbed those fisheries to the exclusion of our own people, while, on the other hand, our fishermen were shut out of the markets of the United States. But the Conservative party went on in their policy of protecting those fisheries, and the result was the accomplishment of the Washington Treaty, and the result was that we attained access to the markets of the United States as a *quid pro quo* from the use of our waters to which the hon. gentleman would have given them access without a policy of compensation. When my right hon. friend came back with this treaty in his hand and submitted it to Parliament, what did hon. gentlemen tell us in regard to that provision of the treaty providing for the appointment of arbitrators, of ascertaining how much money should be paid by the United States? That provision was treated with ridicule. They said that not a farthing would be obtained from the United States; that the treaty was a piece of waste-paper; but, under that treaty, the markets of the United States were opened to our fishermen, and under it we have received \$4,500,000, or \$5,500,000 if Newfoundland be included, as compensation to this country for rights which the American fishermen enjoy, and which, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, they would have enjoyed to the same degree without compensation to the amount of a single dollar, and without giving our fishermen access to the markets of the United States. But in spite of the hostility, in spite of the efforts of these hon. gentlemen to prevent the fishermen of our country from having access to the markets of the United States, the proper compensation was got for the use and enjoyment of our fishing grounds by the fishermen of the United States. The hon. gentlemen opposite were in power when this award was made and this \$4,500,000 received, and had they been able to prevent the adoption of that treaty the markets of the United States would have been closed to Canada and we would not have had in our coffers the \$4,500,000 we received under that treaty. While they were in power this award was made, and it was known that \$4,500,000 were to be paid out of the exchequer of the United States to the coffers of Canada. What did hon. gentlemen do with that money? Did they propose to give any consideration to the fishermen of this country? No, not a dollar. The hon. gentleman says we voted down a proposition that that money should go to the Maritime Provinces. Who voted it down? Why, Sir, only thirty were in favor of that proposition, and fifteen out of the thirty were from this side of the House. The hon. gentleman knows that all the leaders of his party, with perhaps the single exception of the hon. member for Gloucester, voted against that resolution; and yet, Sir, he taunts my hon. friend the Minister of Finance with having voted it down. What has the hon. Finance Minister done? The moment the financial condition of this country has improved, the moment we are in a position with this great and important interest, he comes down here and says that the proceeds of the \$4,500,000 which has been obtained under the Washington Treaty, under that system of protection to the fisheries which the Conservative party adopted, shall inure to the fishermen of this country and are annually to be expended in their maintenance and support; and yet the hon. gentleman, associated with the party which has never raised a finger, which has never attempted to do anything to raise this country, when the hon. Minister of Finance comes down with a proposition to give to the fishermen of Canada all the benefit of that award, the hon. gentleman has no word of gratitude. He does not say, as

the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) said, that he would not question my hon. friend's motives. How could he question the motives for an action which is so obviously a matter of justice and propriety? But the hon. gentleman not only does that, but he treats my hon. friend's proposition with obloquy and insult. If the hon. gentleman were trusted as the mouthpiece of the fishermen of the country, there would be a short story to this effect to give to that great and influential class of our countrymen that consideration to which they are entitled. I believe the hon. gentleman has greatly mistaken the intelligence of the fishermen of this country and the county he misrepresents, if he thinks he will not be held to a strict account for the manner in which he has endeavored to obstruct the final effort of my hon. friend to do justice to a body of deserving men. I would ask him to put alongside of his language the language of a man elected to represent that county in the Legislature of Nova Scotia—a man who has turned his back upon the party whom the hon. gentleman is associated with because of their utter indifference and neglect to the great interests of that constituency—and a man who has himself declared that there was no measure that would so entitle the Government of this country to the support and confidence of the county of Yarmouth as the very measure brought down by my hon. friend.

Mr. KILLAM. The hon. gentleman is a good hand at the use of adjectives. I care very little for his abuse. My own position on this subject is perfectly clear, and between my action and his I leave the people to judge at the proper time. The hon. gentleman says that an annual grant of \$150,000 is provided. This is not the first time that I have had to contrast the opinion of the Minister of Railways with that of the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance said that he did not intend to provide in the Bill for an annual grant, but to put it in the Supply Bill for this year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I said no such thing. The question was asked by the late leader of the Government, if we intended to embody this vote in a Bill; and I said not until we had the experience of a year and knew what to embody in the Bill.

Mr. KILLAM. When the hon. gentleman made his proposition the hon. member for Richmond asked if he was going to make an annual grant, and he could not get a straightforward answer.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That statement is as incorrect as the other. There never was a statement from me to the effect that it was not the intention of the Government to continue it more than a year.

Mr. FLYNN. It was Sir Albert J. Smith who asked the question.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Sir Albert J. Smith asked some particulars of the details, and I said they would be given when the resolution was moved.

Mr. KILLAM. I am glad that we have been able to get the statement from the Government that it is to be an annual grant.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The resolution states so.

Mr. KILLAM. It does not alter what I was saying, such a Bill introduced which will provide in a clear and distinct manner, that this will be an annual contribution of what is due to the fishermen. The hon. Minister of Railways says this was fully explained by the hon. Minister of Finance. My opinion is different; no full explanation was made at all. He made a general explanation, which conveyed the idea that after he thought the subject over, he would fix the mode in which the money was to be paid by Order in Council; and we are now no more sure of the way this is to be done, and no fisherman is any surer of the amount he will receive than before the hon. gentleman made his ex-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

planation. The ground I take is perfectly clear. I say that by their financial policy hon. gentlemen opposite have taken unnecessarily out of the pockets of the fishermen of my Province during the last three years at least \$500,000 to form part of his boasted surplus; and now he comes down, owing all this money and trying to compromise with his creditors by asking the fishermen if they will take back so much in full payment of all their demands. I do not profess to be an organ of the fisherman, but I feel bound to stand up here and proclaim the cause of truth and justice, and support those things which I believe to be morally right. I believe the course of the hon. gentleman in this matter to be morally wrong in not proposing to grant the whole of this award in such a comprehensive way that the fishermen will know it is granted.

Mr. BRECKEN. I believe with the hon. Minister of Finance that this resolution has settled great difficulties, and I believe the plan proposed is perhaps suitable to the greater number of the fishermen. The reason I offered the remarks I did was not to catch a vote, but was owing to the peculiar position in which our fishermen are placed. They fish upon what is called half-line; the owner of a station or one of the neighbors owns a boat, and the crew fish on half-lines. This bounty must necessarily be small, and it is not likely to warrant them in altering their mode of business. I listened with great pleasure to the hon. Minister of Railways. We have recently had an election in Prince Edward Island, at which, to a certain extent, Dominion questions came up, and this Committee will hardly credit the fact that one of the cries of the Reformers against the supporters of the Government was that we had not obtained for them a share in the fishery award, had turned our backs on the fishermen in this important matter, and that the only men who, had they the power, would secure us a share of that award were our political opponents. The Finance Minister has placed that matter honestly before the Committee, and I wish his speech had been set before the electors of Prince Edward Island, where our opponents had the unbounded coolness and audacity to stand up as the champions of the revision of this award. When I contended some time ago in this House that we were, if not on legal, on equitable grounds, entitled to a division of this award among us, it was contended that the award was made on other grounds than the theory of territorial property. But when the question was put to the vote, did my opponents say that this property was particularly territorial property? But when you gave \$1,000,000 to Newfoundland, you acknowledged that principle. On that occasion were the leaders of the Liberal party in this House found the friends of the Maritime Provinces? No; although it is true that the hon. member for Gloucester and other Reform members in the Lower Provinces voted for us. The Reform leaders, however, voted with the Government. And yet I repeat, the Liberals of the Island had the assurance to declare that if the Reform party had been in power at Ottawa the \$4,500,000 would have been divided among the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. If my memory serves me the hon. member for Lambton was First Minister when the award was made, and his Government had the power, had they had the will, to divide it.

Mr. ANGLIN. It was not paid over then.

Mr. BRECKEN. No; but you had the credit of the American Government that it would be paid, and you should have been thorough in your distribution, carefully considering whether the other Provinces were not as well entitled to a share as Newfoundland. I held the opinion three years ago that this fishery privilege was territorial property, and whatever injury was inflicted on British fishermen by the Americans coming within three miles of our coasts, was suffered by the people who lived on the shores of the Mari-

time Provinces. I accept this grant of \$150,000 as a great boon to the fishermen, and I believe under all the circumstances that it was as much perhaps as the Finance Minister could accomplish. As he properly said, it is not a party question. I hope that this grant will be distributed mainly among the poorer fishermen, whose business needs a fostering care not necessary in the case of the classes in better circumstances. It is the poorer fishermen who ought to be helped by this timely grant, for which the Government deserves great credit.

Mr. RICHEY. Having been associated with a number of my friends on the opposite side of the House, as well as with many on this side, in the vote to which reference has been made more than once this evening, I feel called upon to disavow all participation with the sentiments expressed by many of them on this occasion. I am so far from holding with the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), that the fishermen of Nova Scotia and other Maritime Provinces will disregard this vote, or consider it as one which is not given to them frankly by the Government, that I believe it would be received with that gratitude that ought to be evinced. Had I at the time when the resolutions were brought down, and which I felt it my duty to support, had an assurance that a solution of the question so much more favorable to the fishermen of my Province as this proves to be, would have been submitted by the Government. I should not have been found among the number who made the claim set forth with regard to the Provinces of the Dominion. Whatever may be my views as regards the territorial rights of the several Provinces, I believe that as regards the fishermen themselves, they must derive vastly more benefit from having this fund administered by the Government of the Dominion. My hon. friend has referred to the question of taxation. I would remind him that there is not a class of persons in the whole Dominion for whom specific exemptions have been made to such an extent as the fishermen, and when he speaks of this measure being brought as an electioneering trick to overcome difficulties arising from the unpopularity of the National Policy, I tell him that just because of the popularity of the National Policy, which is daily increasing, the Government might have taken their stand on that in safety and refused us the justice which I am glad to see they have concluded to render us. I believe I speak not only for Nova Scotia, but for all the Maritime Provinces, when I say that they will recognize in this act of the Government, not only the desire, but the most astute endeavor to provide in the very best way for the compensation of those engaged in the fisheries.

Mr. ANGLIN. It is to be regretted that at this late hour on Saturday night the National Policy and the Washington Treaty should be dragged into the debates. The hon. member for (Queen's, P.E.I.) knows best what promises and assurances he and his friends gave to the people of Prince Edward Island with regard to the disposition of what they consider their share of the award. He knows best whether or not he led them to expect that they would obtain that portion of the money to which they believe they are entitled. I am not aware that on this side anything was said to justify any unreasonable expectations on that score. As to the question whether this was or not to be an annual appropriation, let me quote from *Hansard* what the hon. Minister of Finance said:

"Mr. MACKENZIE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the \$150,000 proposed to be given as bounties to fishermen is simply a grant for a year, or whether it is proposed to ask a similar grant every year?"

"Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not proposed by Act of Parliament to take an appropriation year by year."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Exactly, by Act of Parliament.

Mr. ANGLIN. That justified the conclusion on this side that the Government did not wish it to be understood, at all events, that they pledged themselves to make this a regular annual appropriation, but that it was merely a tentative proceeding. I do not think the hon. Finance Minister had a right to become so angry a while ago when it was said he had denied it was to be an annual appropriation. With regard to the Washington Treaty the hon. Minister of Railways went out of his way to make a violent attack on this side of the House, as to the position we have taken toward the fishermen from time to time. He alleges that we never did anything for them. We never taxed them. As to the National Policy there is no class of people on whom that policy presses more heavily. They buy large quantities of the heaviest woollen cloths and cottons, and have to purchase nearly all their provisions, so that there is no class who pay so much under the National Policy as the fishermen. I quite agree with the hon. member for Yarmouth that the \$150,000 will go a very short way towards counterbalancing the taxes imposed on the fishermen under the National Policy. With regard to the treatment of the fishermen, the hon. Minister of Railways says that when hon. gentlemen on that side undertook to protect the fisheries their efforts were scorned and scoffed at by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. After their old treaty expired, the Provinces not being then united, we in the Lower Provinces endeavored to protect our fisheries. We undertook to enforce a system of licenses, but each year the demand considerably diminished. We found great difficulty existed in preventing Americans fishing on our territory without paying even a nominal compensation. Hon. gentlemen opposite did make an extraordinary effort to protect the fisheries; they employed small boats and crews at certain points along the Gulf to prevent the Americans from fishing within our limits, but they never succeeded in driving off one American vessel. The display was not one of strength, but one of pitiable weakness. When the hon. Minister of Railways pretends that one result of that action by the Government was to bring about the Washington Treaty, he goes a little too far even for him. That matter was discussed years before, and was used merely as a pretext by the British Government to bring about a treaty with the United States, which they desired very much at that time. I read a speech of a member of the British Government in the House of Lords, in which he stated how negotiations were opened in regard to this matter, and one of the means was the fishery question, which was used as a pretext for opening negotiations that led to the Washington Treaty. It is something new for the hon. Minister of Railways to defend before this country that treaty in which we gave a great deal more than we received compensation for, either directly or indirectly, even taking into account the \$1,000,000 or \$5,000,000 received for our fisheries. We accepted it under compulsion, because we were told that it was necessary for the welfare and security of the Empire that it should be ratified. I for one protested against it, chiefly because this reason was not stated as plainly as it ought to have been, and because some faint attempt was made to persuade us that on the whole the treaty was a pretty good thing. The hon. gentleman claims credit for the amount received, but when the treaty was of such a character that we would not willingly have ratified it, nobody is entitled to credit for having received this money since we have given more than we received. But who really is entitled to any compensation we have received? Is it hon. gentlemen opposite, whose speeches were quoted by the American Commissioner in his case as supporting his contention, or is it the hon. gentlemen on this side, then forming the Government, who insisted that despite the declaration made by hon. gentlemen opposite there was real value in our fisheries for which we were entitled to compensation, and succeeded in establishing our claim.

I find here a speech of the leader of the Government, a large portion of which was actually incorporated in the case prepared by Mr. Foster. Let me read a few pages from it where the hon. gentleman stated :

"I may be liable to the charge of injuring our own cause in discussing the advantages of the arrangement, because every word used by me may be quoted and used as evidence against us hereafter."

Even then he felt that he was saying what might be used against him, but he felt by a high sense of duty, by a regard for truth and justice, he proceeded to speak of the great advantages we would derive from having the markets of the United States open to our fishermen. There is no doubt that some advantage would be derived by our fishermen from opening the markets of the United States, and from the removal of the duty on mackerel. The whole of his remarks are well worth the attention of the House, but I will only read the following :—

"Those opposed to the treaty seemed to set great value upon it, and we were asked by it to surrender. 'Oh,' said they, 'why should we give up our valuable fisheries, such important privileges, and for so small a consideration?' Had those who talked in this way studied the case, I believe they would not, else they would form a different opinion. That our fisheries are valuable, I am well aware. Their value under favorable conditions could not be overestimated; but that value would be great or small just in proportion to the markets we possessed. By this treaty we surrendered very little, and gained in many ways; for, in addition to our own fishing grounds, which we still retained, we had the privilege, if we chose to avail ourselves of it, of going into the United States waters to fish, and would gain a free market, which would have the effect of increasing the value of our own fisheries to a most important extent."

There was a declaration immediately after the treaty was made that by that treaty we granted very much and gave away very little. I find the hon. Minister of Railways himself is credited with having made a similar declaration that went to destroy the value of the fisheries altogether. He is reported to have said also:

"Was there any one who could doubt that the practical result would be to leave the Canadians, in a very short time, almost without any competition at all? The Opposition, for a long time, had held out the idea that Parliament and the Government must protect the poor struggling and industrious fishermen of Nova Scotia and the other Provinces against the operation of this treaty, which, it was held, would be ruinous to them in every way."

Why, years ago, he charges us on this side with being most solicitous for the welfare of the poor struggling fishermen, sneered at us then because we were so solicitous for them, and now he says we never did anything for them:

"Gradually, however, light began to break upon them, until, at last they discovered this extraordinary fact, that while the clauses of the treaty which related to Canada, were held by every intelligent fisherman to be a great boon, as something which would take the taxes off them, and relieve them from hundreds of thousands of dollars tribute that they were now compelled to pay to a foreign nation, the fishermen of the United States were, on the other hand, just as much averse to the treaty as our own people were anxious that it should be carried into effect."

Well, Sir, Mr. Foster believed, and reasonably believed, that if these declarations were to be taken as evidence before the Commission, the Commission were forced to the conclusion that our fisheries were of very little value, and if the Government had not taken other means to establish that these statements were ill founded, that our fisheries were of real value, we should never have received a single dollar of that money. Now, Sir, it is said the fishermen ought to be very grateful for this bounty—a bounty in a double sense, if we are to take the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey). Grateful for what? Does not this money belong really and equitably to the fishermen? Why, we have declared that it did; the hon. Minister of Finance himself has said so. If money is being paid to them which has been taken from them, why should they be grateful for receiving their own? Why should they not rather resent the fact that they have been kept out of their own for so many years? Three or four years have passed since this money was paid over to the Dominion Government. Once or twice in this House the

Mr. ANGLIN.

demands have been made by hon. gentlemen representing the Maritime Provinces for a distribution in some way of this money. Some hon. gentlemen insist that it ought to be divided among the Provinces territorially. I agree that that claim was not well founded in law, and I went further and contended that such a distribution would not be best for the fishermen, that it would be better for them if the money were held by this Government and administered on behalf of the fishermen, and I suggested several modes by which the interest annually might be expended for their benefit. I am glad to find now that the Government are acting to a great extent on my views, that they now acknowledge that this money belongs equitably to the fishermen. But the fishermen will owe no gratitude to the Government for it or to anyone else, they are but getting what is now due them. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Brecken) asks why the late Government did not apportion this money in some way between the Provinces, or appropriate it for the benefit of the fishermen. The reason is that they had not obtained the money when they went out of office. They had succeeded in obtaining the award, but for some time there were grave doubts as to whether the United States would recognize the validity of that award, and the money was not paid over until some time after the present Government came into office. The first Session of Parliament after that money was paid over was under the control of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and if the distribution should have been made then, as I believe it should, the fault rests upon the hon. gentlemen opposite. From first to last we have defended and asserted the full rights of the fishermen, and I am sorry the Government have so long delayed the justice which it owed to them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he agreed with the hon. leader of the Government that this money ought not to be distributed to the Provinces?

Mr. ANGLIN. No, I did not say that. I agreed with the hon. Minister to this extent, that the Provinces had not a right to a division of this money territorially. If it did not belong to the Imperial Government in strict law, then it certainly belonged in strict law to the Dominion. In that view I fully concurred with the hon. leader of the Government.

Mr. OGDEN. I cannot allow these resolutions to pass without offering a few remarks. I was not in my place when the resolutions were introduced, but I am glad to know that the Government have taken this matter into consideration, and that they have resolved to place \$150,000 per annum in the Estimates to be distributed among the fishermen as a bounty, which I suppose is about the interest of the \$1,000,000 of the fishery award. If I remember correctly, in 1879, when the late Minister of Finance delivered his speech on the Budget, he said he left in the Treasury \$1,500,000 of the fishery award to pay off the national debt. It was evident that it was not the intention of that hon. gentleman to distribute that amount of money among the fishermen. I do not pretend to say that I am a prophet, but in this House I have been fortunate in my predictions. I said on the 7th April, 1880, that I would oppose the giving of this money to the Local Governments, that I believed it should be in some way distributed among the fishermen, and as it came from the sea the fishermen should receive the benefit of that money. I thank Parliament for having carried out the suggestion which I made on that occasion. I take to myself a certain amount of credit, but the minds of honest and great men always move in the same channels, and no doubt the hon. gentlemen were acting on the idea I put forward then. The hon. gentlemen opposite did not intend to give the fishermen \$1. While the late Finance

Minister said the amount should be used to pay the national debt, the present Government are resolved that the interest on the fishery award shall be given as a bounty to the fishermen. When the hon. leader of the Government moved a resolution that this should not be set apart as a fund for the Maritime Provinces but should go into a general fund, how many hon. gentlemen opposite voted on that question? I believe the only ex-Minister who did not shirk the vote was the hon. member for Lambton; and to the hon. member for Gloucester, the late Speaker, I give him credit for having stood up and voted that the money should be distributed to the fishermen or to the Provinces. It was certainly not the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to give \$1 of that money to the fishermen, but the hon. gentlemen now occupying seats on the Treasury benches have looked fairly on the claims of the fishermen, and whenever I have spoken in their behalf I have said I had implicit confidence in the Government, that they would deal justly and generously with the fishermen, and I am happy to say that to a very great extent my expectations have been realized. I would not bind the Government to say how much they will give to each boat, but let Parliament leave it to their own good judgment to distribute the money in the way they think best; and I know they will call to their assistance men competent to assist them in carrying out their scheme. I would not like to bring the Government down to any particular method of distributing the money, because it may be advisable, and I believe it will be, to pay the fishermen a certain amount upon each barrel of fish caught, and the matter should be left in the hands of the Government at least until we have had a little experience. Some hon. member said the fishermen are very heavily taxed under the present Administration. They, however, obtain tea much cheaper than they did under the late Government. Coffee is also cheaper; molasses, which is largely used by them, is also obtainable at a very much lower price than formerly. Rope is free; fishermen's salt is free. My reason for making this statement with respect to salt is because it has been asserted by certain gentlemen who are opposed to me and by a gentleman who is travelling through the county which I represent, that fishermen's salt is taxed. I say before this House that it is free, and I challenge any hon. member to deny that statement. I thank the Government for submitting a policy which is going to be so warmly supported. I thank the Government for not forgetting my constituency, and I represent a very large fishing constituency. Certain hon. gentlemen have sought to make the House believe that fishermen are a poor and miserable race; I am a fair representative of the fishermen. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) on one occasion described the fishermen of my county as pale, wan, starving men. He said: "The hon. member for Guysboro', whose eyes stand out with fullness, does not properly represent his starving constituents." The policy of the late Administration did not put much fat on his ribs, and I would not exchange policies with the hon. member for Charlotte. I sincerely hope hon. gentlemen opposite will offer no obstruction and will say nothing against these resolutions, but allow them to pass and leave the matter in the hands of the Government, and next year when they come down fully acquainted with all the details, they will be prepared to take into consideration any suggestion which may emanate from either side of the House, and I have unbounded confidence in them. I believe they will deal fairly and generously with the fishermen, as they do with all other classes of the community, and I feel confident that they are coming back in 1883, after the general elections, with a stronger support than they have now—"of whom"—as Mark Twain said—"I expect to be one of which."

Mr. ANGLIN. I see by the Votes and Proceedings that Mr. Richey, of Halifax, moved a resolution affirming that the Provinces should receive the full benefit of the award. To this Sir John A. Macdonald moved an amendment, setting forth that, among other things, "such expenditure and the public advantage to be derived therefrom are correlative, and that the portion of the fishery award paid over to Canada constitutionally and of right belongs to the Dominion of Canada." It was against that proposition that I voted, and I said that I always maintained that the money should go to the fishermen.

Mr. GILLMOR. I may say that any reference to the fishermen of Guysboro' was because the hon. member for that county (Mr. Ogden) said they were so poor that they had to get from the public chest an item of \$1,000.

Mr. OGDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that they got \$1,000 from the public chest?

Mr. GILLMOR. Well, provisions to that amount were left there.

Mr. OGDEN. The hon. gentleman is in error, \$1,000 was advanced on a public work, and repaid every cent of it in labor and material, by the fishermen. They are not indebted to this country a single dollar.

Mr. GILLMOR. I presumed that they were in poor circumstances, or they would not have asked for help. I remember the discussions with regard to this award. I remember that the advocacy of the views of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey) was very able and convincing, and I also remember the speech by the right hon. leader of the Government, and I was troubled to know who had the best of the argument. I think that, legally speaking, perhaps the hon. leader of the Government was in the right of it, but I also believe that, in equity, the fishermen were entitled to the money. It was, however, the decision of the majority of this House that this money should go into the Treasury, and I never expected that it would go to the fishermen. I am now rejoiced to learn that the Government have come to the conclusion, whether from the reconsideration of the arguments or not I cannot say, that the fishermen are to get this money, for I believe they deserve it. I think that this is a question upon which there need not be a party fight. I do not wish to criticise any hon. member, but I rather think my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) was to a limited extent the aggressor in his encounter with the hon. Minister of Railways, though I must say that the latter is always only too willing to accept a challenge, and I also notice that he is always more eloquent when he begins to fight than when he reasons a question. I think the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister was such as I could accept under the circumstances. I confess, however, that I think, in fairness to myself and to the question, he should have intimated to me that he desired to obtain such information as might be of assistance to him in distributing the money. All the information we had from him was what he said in the Budget Speech, that he intended to appropriate \$150,000 as a bounty to the fishermen. I believe that the subject is a very difficult one to deal with, and that even when they go on the ground, the division will be attended with great difficulties. I am satisfied that even if the members from the different constituencies representing the fishing population were to sit down themselves and deliberate upon the matter, they could not agree, and, therefore, I maintain that unless the question had been taken up last season, it would be impossible to give any better idea of the division of the money than that given us by the hon. Finance Minister. I think he has a general idea of how the money should be expended, and that on the whole he is not very far astray. As he has stated, there is such a variety of fishing craft,

from the smallest boat, managed by only two men, up to schooners of 100 tons or more, that it is almost impossible to know how to distribute the money. I think, on the whole, the most equitable plan is to divide it among the fishermen, though even then it is difficult to decide who are fishermen and who are not, or to say how many months they should be engaged each year in fishing in order to constitute them fishermen for the purposes of the bounty. Then, again, the habits of fishermen and the construction of their boats, and so on, in one part of the Dominion are quite different from those in another part. I think any evils or mistakes that may arise can be remedied, but that the details cannot be embodied in a law at the present time. The question must be investigated to a greater extent than is possible at the present time. A great deal of nonsense is talked on this subject by those who do not know anything about it. For example, I am satisfied that those who will get most money under the proposed system will be those who suffer least. Those vessels which are able to engage in deep-sea fishing, such as schooners of 50 or 100 tons, are not those which suffer most or are most ground down by the American fishermen. It is those who do the in-shore fishing—those who, in rough weather, cannot go far from shore, that suffer the greatest inconvenience. The fishermen suffer the greatest inconvenience from the American fishermen, who come with their large vessels and stretch miles of net across the channels where the fish play, greatly to the injury of those who are obliged to fish nearer shore. But with the disadvantages there are certain advantages in the American fishermen coming to fish off our coasts. There is the winter fishing. We can remember when the fishermen in the winter season could not get more than \$8 or \$10 a month and when they had just to take their pay when they could get it; but now it is difficult to get a man for less than \$30 or \$40 a month. Just as soon as winter sets in the American fishermen come there and hire our fishermen at good wages, and they derive considerable advantage also from the Americans coming to buy our fish. I believe I am not exaggerating when I say that they leave in my county in one season \$150,000, \$200,000, and sometimes as much as \$300,000, on the whole. I think the Government have come to a wise and just conclusion in deciding to distribute among the fishermen the interest on this money, and I believe they are adopting the best mode they can in distributing it. I only hope they will see that it is distributed in such a way as to give satisfaction, and so far as I can aid them I will do so. I think I know perhaps as much about the matter as the hon. gentleman who spoke about his poor fishermen. No one ever heard me say my fishermen were poor fishermen. I represent a county in which lumbermen, farmers and fishermen reside, and there is as much money, intelligence, comfort and every luxury enjoyed by the fishermen as by any other class of the people. This money fairly belongs to them, and I congratulate the Government on having done one thing I can approve of—I think the very best thing they have done since I have had a seat in this House.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks which have been made by the various speakers on this subject, and I quite agree with them that it is very difficult to formulate a scale for the equitable distribution of this fishery award, with the limited knowledge we have at present on the subject. Whilst listening to the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, it struck me very forcibly that in all their murmurings and complaints (not in the interests of the fishermen certainly) with regard to this grant of \$150,000 to the fishermen, they have not advanced one practical view, or suggested one idea, with regard to this distribution. Hon. gentlemen opposite having failed to show how it ought to be distributed, and with a knowledge of its being a difficult problem, I quite agree

Mr. GILLMOR.

with the hon. the Minister of Finance, and it shows the wisdom of the Government, that delay should occur in order that he may be able to obtain all possible details, and be better advised, before deciding how this grant should be distributed. The complaints made by the Opposition, and their statements as to how the fishermen are taxed, is hardly worthy of comment, as it is well known they are intended to deceive and mislead the honest electors, more particularly the fishermen of the country, without there being a shadow of truth in them. The fishermen, and in fact every elector is aware that if the fishermen were taxed it was under the late, not under the present, Government, as was shown by the hon. member for Guysborough, who referred to tea and coffee, now on the free list, whereas under the late Government they were taxed; molasses lower than under the Mackenzie Government for domestic purposes, but free to the fishermen; and salt free; but he omitted to include in the free list nets, lines and twines. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what other articles the fishermen are taxed upon? With regard to the principle of the distribution, I will ask the hon. the Minister of Finance to be careful to see that the poorer class of fishermen receive their just quota. It is that class who would more highly prize the portion of the bounty they receive than those who are better able to do without it. I feel, however, every confidence that when the hon. the Minister of Finance has enquired fully into this matter, he will make such a distribution as will leave no cause for complaint or dissatisfaction on either side.

Mr. GILLIES. Before this measure is passed I desire to bring to the recollection of the hon. Minister of Finance that at the time this item was brought down I had a question on the paper, asking whether the fishermen of the lakes in the interior of the country should participate in the grant. The hon. Minister stated that when the matter should be brought forward for discussion at the present time, an answer would be given. There are a great number of fishermen on the coast of Lake Huron, in the riding I have the honor to represent as well as in neighboring ridings. There are no less than about 100 fishing boats engaged on that lake, distributed as follows: Kincardine, 10; Inverhuron, 3; Port Elgin, 5; Southhampton, 15; Cove Island and the Indian Peninsula, 20; Owen Sound, 10; Meaford, 15; and Collingwood, 20, approximately speaking. That would bring up the number of boats to about 100. Now, these fishermen on the lakes depend upon the proceeds of their labor as much as the fishermen on the Atlantic and Pacific coast. I think it would only be reasonable then that the circumstances and claims of the fishermen in question should be considered as well as those of the fishermen on the Atlantic Coast. [Great noise and interruption from the explosion of fire-crackers.]

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am very nearly 40 years in Parliament, and I have never known anything so disgraceful as the noises this evening.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear the First Minister make that statement. I do hope the gentlemen indulging in this practice of exploding fire-crackers will cease at once. It is discreditable to this assembly.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Some members say it is the pages. It is not the pages, it is members of the House who are misbehaving.

Mr. GILLIES. The fisheries along the coast I have referred to, employ about 294 fishermen. Estimating the tonnage at ten tons per boat, there will be a total of 980 tons; and I should imagine that the proceeds of the industry of the fleet would be at least \$124,000 in the aggregate per season. This matter deserves the attention of the Government in order to come to a decision as to whether these men are not

entitled to a share of this bonus equally with the fishermen operating on the coast of the Maritime Provinces.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

THE ONTARIO BANK.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would ask the indulgence of the House for leave to introduce a Bill necessitated by the length of the Session. In the earlier part of the Session, a Bill intituled: "An Act to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and change the nominal value of the shares thereof, and for other purposes," was introduced and passed through this House and the Senate; and in it it is provided that the shares therein remaining unconverted on the 15th of May shall be disposed of by the directors. Well, as the Bill cannot become law until after the 15th of May, the action of this Bill is postponed until the 15th May next year; and as this delay would tie up the affairs of this financial institution, unduly. I move for leave to introduce Bill (No. 170), intituled: "An Act to amend the Act of the present session, intituled: 'An Act to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value of the shares thereof, and for other purposes.'"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order to prevent a failure of legislation, I should be very glad to see this Bill passed at once.

Bill read the first, second and third times, and passed; and (at 11:45 o'clock, p.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 15th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 171) to increase the amount placed at the disposal of the Governor in Council by the Act 34 Victoria, Chapter 8, for claims on the Bank of Upper Canada.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill (No. 172) further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act, 1880.—(Mr. Bowell.)

TENDERS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I beg to be permitted to lay on the Table, instead of a return made to the motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth, an abstract of the papers which, I think, will substantially convey all the information that the hon. member for Yarmouth required. It has been impossible to obtain that return in a form more complete than this in time to lay it before the House. The hon. gentleman seemed to insinuate on one or two occasions that I was not using due diligence in bringing down this return. The hon. gentleman shakes his head—I am glad he does not insinuate that, but he seems to think that it was desirable to have them laid on the Table more promptly than has been done. I will, therefore, ask permission to read a letter addressed to me by the Chief Engineer, Mr. Schreiber, dated 12th May, 1882:

"SIR,—On the 27th February there was an Order of the House of Commons passed for copies of all advertisements or circulars asking for tenders for the supply of iron and other stores during the period from the 30th June, 1880, to the 31st December, 1881—and also for the year ending 30th June, 1878. I beg to inform you that copies of the abstract

of the tenders received during this period are being made, and also a list of the persons who were asked in each case to tender. Even these will take a long time to prepare, and will not likely be ready for this Session. I therefore send herewith the lists of persons asked to tender, and abstract of tenders received for the period from the 1st July to 31st December, 1880. The accepted tenders have been marked in the abstracts thus, †. I would recommend that these portions of the return be laid before the House in order that it may be seen that the list is being done under the circumstances to furnish the information, and some idea may be formed of the voluminous character of the returns asked for and the labor there must necessarily be in presenting such a return.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,

"Chief Engineer of Government Railways."

Now, when I state that this abstract, simply giving the names of the persons who were invited to tender for these stores, and an abstract of the amount of tenders that were sent in, are as voluminous as this, the hon. gentleman will see that it will still require months of time to complete the return in the form in which the motion was made to the House. The hon. member for Yarmouth will have an opportunity of perusing it, and if he finds in it all the information he desires, I shall be extremely glad to be relieved from the labor and the expense of preparing so voluminous a return as would be required to cover the motion as set forth. This return will give the hon. gentleman information of the number of persons who in each case, for each class of supplies, were invited to tender, and I think he will find from them the evidence that a sufficient number of parties were invited to tender to insure the Government obtaining the supplies at the lowest possible rates, and he will also find that these tenders came from Halifax, Moncton, St. John, Montreal, and some from Toronto. The hon. gentleman will also find the prices at which parties, in response to those tenders, sent in application, and he will find marked with a cross the tenders that were accepted. He will also find evidence that, having regard to the quality of material, the Government have in every case taken the lowest tender, and having regard to cheapness they have actually taken the lowest tender in every case. If the hon. gentleman finds that this return contains all the information he desires, I would be glad if he would let me know it, because it would save the necessity of carrying on the preparation of the return.

Mr. KILLAM. I appreciate the diligence of the minority, but when so many returns are asked for, some of them may, perhaps, be forgotten even by so diligent gentlemen as those occupying the Treasury benches at the present time. If the hon. Minister thinks that, in anything I have said, I was mentioning anything improper, personally, I now withdraw it. I merely stated that I was asked by different individuals to apply for this information, and I told the hon. gentleman that the public might judge in the way I suggested the other day. I am very glad we are going to get even the partial information the hon. gentleman has offered us, and I hope it will cover the ground. If there is anything in the motion I made which required a more voluminous return than was necessary, I told the hon. gentleman the other day he could condense it to suit himself, but to give us the information as soon as possible.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned toward the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned; that is to say:

For a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, both in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding \$6,000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....\$ 660,000

For a railway from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, both in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	384,000
For a railway from River du Loup, in the Province of Quebec, to Edmunston, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	240,000
For a railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, both in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole.....	224,000
Total.....	\$1,508,000

The said subsidies to be granted to such Companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to complete the said railway respectively, within a reasonable time, to be fixed by Order in Council, and according to descriptions and specifications to be approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made by the Company with the Government, and which the Government shall be empowered to make, and to be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments on the completion of each ten miles of railway, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with the whole work undertaken, such proportion to be established by the report of the said Minister.

He said: It will be found upon reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874, that it was therein contemplated that aid should be given to the lines of railway connecting railways in Ontario and those in Quebec with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The 14th clause of that Act provides:

"The Governor in Council may also grant such bonus or bonuses, subsidy or subsidies to any company or companies already incorporated or to be hereafter incorporated, not exceeding \$12,000 per mile, as will secure the construction of the branch lines extending from the eastern terminus of the said Canadian Pacific Railway to connect with existing or proposed lines of railway; the granting of such bonuses or subsidies to be subject to such conditions for securing the running powers and other rights over and with respect to the whole or any portion of the said branch railway, to the owners or lessees of the main line of the said railway, or of any section thereof, or to the owners or lessees of any other railway connecting with the said branch railway, as the Governor in Council may determine; but every Order in Council granting such subsidy shall be laid before the House of Commons for its ratification by resolution of the House."

Under that authority, and in accordance with the proposal to subsidize lines of railway to connect the railways of Quebec and Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway, a subsidy was proposed of \$12,000 a mile for 120 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway extending from Pembroke to Nipissing or the point now called Callander Station. The object of this portion of the resolution is to provide the same facilities for connection with the lines of railway connecting the great commercial centres of Ontario, and the existing lines of railway permeating the Province of Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be at once apparent that no steps could be taken more calculated to promote the industries of that Province, or to subserve the railways of that Province, or develop the North-West itself by furnishing the most direct, cheap, and easy means of communication between the North-West and these great commercial and manufacturing centres. The provision itself is entirely within the scope of the provision of the law, and there is no doubt it was in contemplation at the time that policy was adopted, that aid should be given to the trunk lines of railway connecting with the Ontario railway system, in the same manner as was done in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, connecting in a direct line with the railways in the Province of Quebec. It will be seen, by reference to the discussion, that when my hon. predecessor was introducing this Act and submitting his policy to the House, I took the liberty of asking the question as to whether it was intended to subsidize one or both lines, and the answer showed the hon. gentleman then had in view the subsidizing of both lines of railway. It is possible that the then financial condition of the country induced the hon. gentleman to pause and hesitate about carrying out the original proposal

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of giving the lines of railway in Ontario the same facilities for connection with our great national line of railway to the Pacific as has already been provided by Parliament for connection with the East. I may say that the Government have been solicited by the Company, the Northern and North-Western, for a subsidy of \$12,000 a mile, for these 110 miles, or thereabouts, between Callander Station and Gravenhurst, but the Pacific Junction Company having also sent a large deputation to the Government with the proposal to secure the construction of that portion of the line from Gravenhurst to Callander for a subsidy of \$6,000 per mile, the Government, in submitting their proposals, have taken the lowest amount which we have any reason to believe would secure the construction from Gravenhurst to Callander. Very great interest is taken in this measure throughout Ontario, and a very great desire is felt to have the railway system of that Province placed in the most direct, cheap and rapid connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is also almost impossible to overrate the importance to the North-West itself, to have the competition in furnishing supplies to that country that will be thus given, between the industries of Ontario and Quebec. I do not imagine that any difference of opinion can exist in reference to the proposal contained in that resolution. The next proposal is for a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile for a railway from St. Raymond to Lake St. John, both in the Province of Quebec. At first sight this may appear to assume somewhat the character of a local Provincial railway, but there are features connected with that work that take it out of that category and place it on a broader and more substantial basis that will commend it to the approval of this House and the country. The undertaking to connect the harbor of Quebec, the ocean outlet of the Province of Quebec, with Lake St. John, is an undertaking of considerable magnitude. The Province of Quebec has contributed very largely to that railway; private capitalists have come forward and placed a large amount of private means in this important work. Having given to this subject for a long time the most careful and thorough consideration, having gone over that portion of the line which is built from Quebec to St. Raymond, about thirty-five miles, and having studied carefully the statistics in reference to this section of the country around Lake St. John, the Government have come to the conclusion that almost Dominion objects will be obtained by the construction of that work. The country around Lake St. John is said to be the most fertile of any section of country, certainly of any undeveloped section of country in Quebec. I am aware that the Eastern Townships are admitted to be a very attractive and fertile section of the country, but they are already well supplied with railway accommodation; but this section of country remaining in the Crown and possessing such a degree of fertility, if access could be obtained to it, would prove a most effective means of repatriating the Province of Quebec, that in no other way can we so effectually secure the bringing back that portion of the population of Quebec that has gone across the frontier than by giving access to a very large fertile section of the country. We believe, therefore, the object of the Government will be regarded with favor by both sides of the House and by the people of the country, as a means of bringing in a large part of the most industrial population of Quebec, and no method can be more effective than to grant the aid now found to be absolutely necessary in order to supplement the efforts of the Province and capitalists who have undertaken the work. In addition it is contemplated to extend this line of railway, when it is found practicable to do so, to James' Bay, for there is a large section of undeveloped country there, and when this is accomplished it will give another ocean outlet to the Old Country. But irrespective of that larger view of the subject, the claims of the proposal are ample to justify

the Government in asking this small subsidy to this important work. I may state the principle on which the subsidy has been arrived at and the amount placed at \$3,200 per mile. All we propose to do in regard to this and the railways to which I shall subsequently call attention, is to furnish the means for providing the superstructure. It takes about 100 tons of rails and fastenings to finish a mile of railway, and those can be purchased at Montreal for about \$32 per ton; this sum will provide the superstructure, leaving it to private enterprise and the Province of Quebec to implement that sum by the additional means required in order to secure that object which we believe to be a very important one, of opening up that fine and extensive wheat growing country. In fact, if reliance is to be placed—and I have studied the matter with the greatest care and attention, and I believe reliance can be placed on the representations made—on the statistics furnished, the wheat growing power of all the country around Lake St. John is scarcely to be surpassed by the fertility of the North-West itself, and under those circumstances we feel we are justified in asking money aid to the extent of furnishing the material to lay the track. So it will be seen it is proposed to furnish that subsidy as the work advances. The next resolution is to aid the construction of a railway from a point between Rivière du Loup and Rivière Ouelle to Edmunston, in New Brunswick, which also takes it out of the character of being a section of provincial railway. In the first place it is inter-provincial. It connects Quebec and New Brunswick; but it is not on this ground I give it the character of a Dominion work. It is known that Canada is most anxious to find the means of furnishing an open winter port for Dominion trade without having recourse to neighboring territory in the United States. It is known that the laudable efforts made to have Canadian trade pass through Dominion channels and to Canadian ports at all seasons of the year, has been hindered by the short distance to Portland, and we believe that we will furnish an additional means of competition against the United States ports if by this means we provide a connection between our own country by the shortest Canadian route to an Ocean port; and when I mention that St. John and St. Andrews, both open ports at all seasons of the year, will be brought 158 miles nearer Quebec, than by the Intercolonial Railway, the importance of furnishing a small amount to aid in attaining that object will at once become apparent. We may now practically take Quebec as the starting point for our traffic, because, as I have stated to the House, the Canadian Pacific Railway having purchased the line from here to Montreal, and thus having a through line to Montreal, and having made traffic arrangements over the line from Montreal to Quebec, Quebec now practically becomes the ocean terminus of the Pacific Railway, because they not only have traffic arrangements but are entitled to make a rate to Montreal and also to Quebec itself. When you have reached, therefore, the port of Quebec, which, under existing arrangements, is the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is a matter of no small moment to know that by this short route we will be able to make the distance from Quebec to Liverpool almost equidistant, whether you pass through Portland or St. John or St. Andrews. I know there will be no difference of opinion in this House as to the importance of increasing by every means in our power, our ability to compete with the ocean ports of the United States, to which otherwise a good deal of our traffic must be expected to flow. Not only so, but the distance from Montreal to Liverpool will be only about three hours longer *via* St. Andrews, or St. John than *via* Portland, and I am sure it is the wish of the House that such an object should be gained if it can be accomplished for \$240,000. That amount has been arrived at in the same manner as in the former case, it being the sum required for the superstructure, for the steel rails and fastenings, leaving it to the Company to provide everything else in connection

with it, and limiting the liability of the Government to that comparatively small sum. With reference to the next resolution for the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, both in the Province of Nova Scotia, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole \$224,000, I may say that the House is aware that a charter was granted during the present Session to Mr. Blackman, who is engaged in the project of reducing the ocean voyage to some 1,600 miles from the west coast of Ireland to Newfoundland by constructing a railway across the island of Newfoundland for 300 miles to Cape Ray, establishing a ferry for fifty-two miles to Cape North, building some hundred miles to the strait of Canso, running from the eastern extension, now in operation, to New Glasgow; and we have authorized the construction of seventy miles between New Glasgow and the Intercolonial at Oxford, as a means of furnishing the shortest and most direct line of communication that can be found between our great commercial centre, Montreal, and consequently our whole western country, and Liverpool and London. I may say that the Government of Newfoundland have given him all the aid he has asked in reference to the construction of 300 miles of road, on that island, and I have been assured by him, that if this Government would furnish the steel rails and fastenings for seventy miles, from New Glasgow to the Intercolonial, he would, at once, proceed with the construction of the work. But, supposing this scheme were to fail, that it should prove to be chimerical—if it should turn out that there was any difficulty in crossing the strait between Cape Ray and Cape North, we shall still, by the continuation of this line, obtain the most direct line of communication between our great commercial centres and Europe that it is possible to obtain. The Nova Scotia Railway Company have bound themselves to construct a line from the Strait of Canso to the harbor of Louisburg, which is an open harbor at all seasons of the year, and the nearest open harbor, before Cape North was mentioned, to be found in Canada. The construction of this short line of seventy miles by this limited amount of aid will have the effect of shortening the distance between Montreal and the harbor of Louisburg by some thirty-eight miles, which is at present involved in going to Truro in the first instance, and New Glasgow in the second instance. You have at present two sides of a triangle, of which the proposed railway will be the hypotenuse. Not only so, but the great coal fields of Pictou and the rising industries of that country are brought thirty-eight miles nearer the west than they are at present, which is a most important element in connection with this branch of the subject. I may remark that Mr. Blackman believes that by carrying out the scheme he is engaged in he will bring Montreal forty-eight hours nearer to London, than it can be brought by any other means. He believes he is going to be able to bring all the mail and a large portion of the passenger communication of a larger part of the United States, by Cape North and the Strait of Canso, and then by this short line across to St. John, and so, by the nearest means possible, the city of Montreal. He believes the mails of Chicago and the north-western States, if not those of New York, will be almost entirely brought by this line, and there is every reason, I think—and I have looked very carefully into his figures and calculations—to believe that this scheme can be carried out in its entirety, so that Montreal will become the thoroughfare of communication between Europe and Chicago, and I am sure if that can be done, anything this House can do to promote that object, will be giving a great impetus to the travel and commerce of the world, and especially to that mail communication to which rapid transit is now considered of such importance. I think, therefore, no difficulty will be felt by any gentleman in this House, on these grounds to furnishing the means—as the subsidy practically

will do—of providing the superstructure, as the remaining portion is provided for by other means. I may say, Sir, that I am afraid we are not entitled to claim any credit for the novelty of this proposal; I am afraid I must give it to my hon. friends on the other side, for the policy which has led up to this proposal. It is well known that the late Government adopted the policy which had then my heartiest sanction and co-operation, and I have since had no reason to doubt that the policy they adopted in that respect was a wise and judicious one—I say they adopted the policy of furnishing lines of railway connecting or communicating with the Intercolonial, with the means of providing the superstructure with the iron for the road. Under that policy some seventy-five miles, which I have reason to believe would never have been constructed otherwise, has been constructed, most of it in the Province of New Brunswick, furnishing communication to a number of important districts of the Intercolonial Railway; and the policy we now propose is simply a slight extension of the policy of the late Government. While all those results are based on Dominion rather than sectional questions, it is a very slight advance on the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, of aiding in the development of the country by furnishing the superstructure of these roads. I believe it is a wise policy to aid in the construction of these lines. Although these are private enterprises it is impossible to build these railways in Canada judiciously in any section of the country by means of either subsidies from the Local Government or private enterprises without enriching the Treasury of Canada. Who receives the benefit from all the increased trade which flows from the increased development of the country by the construction of these roads? Certainly the Dominion Treasury. Every mile of road constructed puts a certain sum into the Treasury. In Nova Scotia when we were an isolated Province we involved ourselves in a heavy indebtedness for the purpose of constructing railways which gave no direct return to the Treasury, but after careful consideration it was found that the entire money expended in this way by the Province was returned year by year from the increased revenue arising from the increased development of the country. I think, therefore, that in that respect this policy is based on a sound and legitimate foundation. I wish to mention one word with reference to what is not contained in the resolution. My hon. friend for the county of Ottawa (Mr. Wright) has placed before me a pressing application for aid to a work which I have no doubt is of great importance in developing an important section of country. I refer to the Gatineau Railway. His colleague, the member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Currier) and some other gentlemen have placed an application in my hands for an extension of the line from Gravenhurst to Callander, opening up a valuable timber section to the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and there is a scheme proposed of a stronger character in connection with an application for a road from the Intercolonial from Edmunston, with regard to which I have had some urgent communications with my hon. friend the member for Queens, New Brunswick (Mr. King.) I may say, in addition to that, that there has been an application made by parties interested in the construction of a line of railway from the Intercolonial Railway to Paspébiac, about 100 miles in length, which it was stated would not only furnish a means of communication with a very large and important section of country, but would also become a very valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. The line, however, to which I particularly refer now, is one with which I regret I have not been able to deal at present, is a line from St. Marys, just opposite the city of Fredericton to Apohaqui on the Intercolonial Railway, or that portion that runs between Moncton and St. John. It is claimed that this road about seventy miles in length, would open up a very

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

valuable section of country which at present is in want of railway communication; and it is further stated—and it is a very important statement, if it proves to be well founded—that a line of railway between St. Marys and Apohaqui would intersect a coal section where valuable bituminous coal could be obtained, which would greatly facilitate the operation of railways in that section of country, because it would be nearer than the Springhill coal mines, which are the nearest point of supply at present. I may say, with reference to these applications, that the Government have not felt able to go further than the resolutions which are submitted to the House; but during recess careful investigation and examination will be made by the Department into all these applications, and we shall be very glad if any of them can be placed on such a footing that we can ask the House to aid them as we have those which are embraced in these resolutions.

The question having been put,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman opposite will allow me, I will take the resolutions to-day, and introduce a Bill to-morrow, on which any discussion could be taken. This would save time.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt it would save time; that is to say, it would shorten the interval of time during which hon. members of Parliament might consider the hon. gentleman's measure. At this stage of the Session, when many hon. members have left, and many others are about to leave, so that the hon. gentleman's suggestion is practically one which would enable more hon. members to be present than otherwise, would be possible during the consideration of the measure; but that is an indication of the extreme inexpediency of having to deal at this period with the hon. gentleman's proposal. It is not my intention, at this time, to enter into any very lengthened discussion of the observations he has made. We received the first intimation of this Bill on Saturday, and we are called upon to take the first step upon it—and the hon. gentleman proposes several steps—to-day. The hon. gentleman has informed us that he has received communications from various persons in reference to this and other applications. He has not brought down a single one of these papers; he has not given a single item of information which would enable us to judge how far he has reached right conclusions on these things. With reference to the proposed railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, we know from the newspapers that there had been applications from two corporations, that deputations had been here, and that the hon. gentleman had been interviewed. We learn now that he received considerable information and written proposals from these companies as to what they would do; but the hon. gentleman has not laid them on the Table so as to enable us to judge whether his proposals are expedient or not; it is impossible, if he had, that they could be accessible to hon. members, because it is impossible that they can be printed. The hon. gentleman has informed us that one Company has made application for \$12,000 per mile, and another for \$6,000, but I think that hon. gentleman, before disposing of this question, should know what these proposals are, and what the various considerations suggested by the rival applicants are, on the obvious questions which arise on these applications. There are questions of policy, questions of route, questions of running power, questions of the efficiency of connection, all of which it is obviously intended Parliament shall not deal with at all, but shall leave absolutely to the discretion of the hon. Minister, without having seen any of the papers. So with reference to the St. Raymond and Lake St. John Railway, the hon. gentleman says he has carefully studied the statistics and enquired into the matter, and has reached certain conclusions; but I ask whether Parliament should not be

supplied with this information in order to enable us to form an intelligent view. So, again, with reference to the railway from Oxford to New Glasgow, the hon. gentleman tells us that this is, in fact, part of a great line which some Mr. Blackman is likely to construct in order to shorten the route to Europe by twenty-four hours, and to secure that portion of the American passenger trade which passes by Chicago. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that he has received a good deal of information from Mr. Blackman, that Mr. Blackman's figures are very important and very interesting, and that they lead to certain conclusions; but where are Mr. Blackman's figures? Why have we not got the papers so as to enable us to judge whether Mr. Blackman's views are sound, and if sound whether they support the conclusions which the hon. gentleman has arrived at. Then the hon. gentleman says he has received applications from other companies, one of which he mentions as being very important—that of the Grand Central Railway Company—but he is not able to deal with that application this Session. Why do we not see that application, which, I understand, is one conjoined with that which the hon. gentleman proposes Parliament shall deal with this Session, namely, the application for aid to a railway from Edmunston to Rivière du Loup. I say the hon. gentleman ought to have been prepared, in bringing down these propositions, to give Parliament a full opportunity of dealing intelligently with the facts as they have been presented to him, or of ascertaining what the information is on which he bases his conclusions, both as to the absolute and the relative importance of the various lines. I will only say just now, that the subject the hon. gentleman proposes is one of the very greatest importance, as being, however he may disguise it, very largely a proposal that the Dominion Parliament shall grant aid to local or provincial enterprises. It is of the greatest importance, both as regards the enterprises which it is supposed to assist, and the principle of the rate of aid which it is proposed to apply, and the money assistance which it proposes to extend, and above and beyond all, in the precedent which it proposes to create. Under these circumstances, looking at the fact of the novelty of the proposition, and the advanced hour of the Session, I think it is deeply to be regretted that the hon. gentleman should not have brought it down at an earlier period.

Mr. CIMON (Chicoutimi), (in French.) Mr. Speaker, as I am about to leave to-morrow, the House will allow me to say a few words, to thank the Government for the grant just made to the Lake St. John Railway. I must tell you that I am perfectly astonished to see the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) oppose it on the futile grounds that this road is a provincial one. Still, in opposing this grant, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) is merely acting as did his party when it was in power. You will recollect that during the five years that the Liberal Reform party was in power, I annually asked for a grant for the railway from Quebec to Lake St. John, and that, every year, the Liberal Government met my demand with an unqualified refusal. Yet I did not lose courage; I continued to speak in favor of that road. The first time that I broached the subject, Lake St. John was derided as an unprofitable and frozen up district; but I persevered, and by dint of speaking about it, the question became a popular one in this House, and it is a satisfaction for me to-day to see the members from Ontario and from the Maritime Provinces as well as from Montreal, display an interest in Lake St. John, and speak in its favor. My voice is no longer the only one to make itself heard in this House in favor of Lake St. John. This is a great triumph for me. But the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) surprises me from another point of view; he is opposed to the grant to Lake St. John because, says he, there is no information before the House to show what that railway is. How can that be?

Does the leader of the Opposition not know that the Government instructed an engineer to gather information on the Lake St. John Railway, and to submit it to the Minister of Railways? At the last Session the report of that engineer was laid on the Table of the House; it was a detailed report giving all the required information, and it was printed among the documents of the Session. I am quite surprised that the hon. leader of the Opposition should come and tell us to-day that he is unable to form an opinion on the question, as he has not read the documents. I see that he makes little of the Province of Quebec. He who works so hard, who shuts himself up in his room every day, surrounded with documents to facilitate the study and discussion of public affairs, I am surprised that notwithstanding all this love of work, he has not found time to cast his eyes over the documents concerning the Lake St. John Railway, on the very documents that would give him most important information. Assuredly, Mr. Speaker, had the hon. leader of the Opposition taken the trouble of reading this important report, he would have seen that the construction of a railway from Quebec to Lake St. John was not of a local, but of a general interest, that it will open to settlement an immense and fertile territory, capable of feeding a population of from 200,000 to 250,000 people, who will contribute to the national wealth and help to fill the public coffers. I thank the Government, Mr. Speaker, for what it has done for the Province of Quebec; I thank it for its grant to the St. John Railway, for having given that road to the Province of Quebec, and assuring us that it is to be built ere long. I have always had faith in my leaders. I said last year I felt confident that if the Government found an opportunity of aiding that important enterprise, it would hasten to give it a grant. I continued to agitate the question, and my faith has not been disappointed. I am glad I had such faith in them. Last year the leader of Lower Canada (Sir Hector Langevin) told us to be hopeful, that for the time being he could not give us a grant, but that next year we might have a chance. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) did not put faith in that promise, and said: "I have no faith in the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works; next year again you will get but promises. I do not think that the Government will come to the aid of that enterprise." And yet he, too, was of opinion that the Government should grant a subsidy to the road. We have more faith in our leaders than the Opposition have in theirs. We know that they have at heart the interests of the country. Our faith has not been deceived. I knew that the leader of Lower Canada would not break his word. I renewed my efforts this year, and it took some time to gain the point, but at last we have this grant. Once more I thank the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways for the aid they have given the Province of Quebec by granting a subsidy to the railway from Quebec to Lake St. John.

Mr. WRIGHT. The resolution introduced by the hon. Minister of Railways is one of great importance, and will receive my support. The policy inaugurated by the Government is one calculated to advance the best interests of the Canadian people. It is admitted on all hands that a good system of railways is calculated to promote the prosperity and develop the resources of the country. I am satisfied, that in aiding the enterprises mentioned in those resolutions, the Administration is advancing in the right direction. While they have secured the construction of the main trunk lines, it is of importance that aid should be given to feeders of those main lines. Therefore, while I am in favor of granting the aid asked for in those resolutions, I would hope the Government would see its way clear of aiding another enterprise of an equal, if not more important character. I allude to the Gatineau Valley Railway, and its mineral branch. The reasons for asking for this aid may be briefly stated. A charter has been granted to a company

for the purpose of constructing a railway from Hull to the Desert, through the Valley of the Gatineau. It is also proposed to build a subsidiary branch through the mineral region. An application has been made to the Quebec Government for aid, which I have every reason to believe will be granted. I have received a telegram from the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, from Quebec, in which he assures me that his Government takes a great interest in the project, and suggests that we should apply to the Dominion Government for aid as well. The reason for asking for this grant may be briefly stated. The construction of this Gatineau road will create a most valuable feeder for the Occidental and Intercolonial systems of railways. It will also prove of the greatest importance from a colonization point of view. One hundred miles due north from the city of Hull, I am assured, are millions of acres of good agricultural and timber lands, on which millions of Canadian people could find happy homes. I was informed by the Rev. Father Deleage, who for many years was missionary for the Indians of that region, that so fertile was the soil that from one bushel of fall wheat he had repeatedly reaped sixty bushels in return. I was so much impressed with his statements that I induced him to form them into a memoir which I presented to the hon. Minister of Public Works, and they now form part of the Archives of the Dominion. He also assured me that the lands of that region would also afford homes for millions of people. The construction of that railway would also add another Province to the Dominion. The Gatineau River extends 400 miles into the interior of the country, taking its rise in the vicinity of that great affluent of the Saguenay River the St. Maurice. It drains an immense tract of country richly endowed with agricultural and mineral wealth. The lacustrine system of this region is one of the finest in the world, the whole of it teeming with trout and all the other fishes found in our Canadian waters, which alone would prove a great attraction to intending settlers. The Gatineau River is composed of a series of water powers which would literally drive the spindles of the whole world. The mineral resources of the county of Ottawa are of incalculable value. Immense deposits of the richest iron ore can be found in many places. There are also immense deposits of galena, asbestos, and all the other minerals to be found in Canada. The phosphates alone are of the greatest value, and, to my mind, will prove of more importance to Canada than are the silver mines and guano deposits of Peru. One cannot but hope that at no distant period, those fertilizers will be manufactured in our own country. The Gatineau Valley Railway will pass, for 150 miles, through a country which is settled by a most active and intelligent population. The way traffic alone would justify the construction of this road. The Gatineau region has contributed more than any other section to the revenues of the country, by the payment of timber duties, and has received nothing in return. I trust that at least some measure of justice may be meted out to this section of the country, and that this railway will receive some aid from the Government in its endeavor to develop its resources. The argument in favor of granting aid to this railway may be briefly stated. It will form a most important feeder for the Occidental and Intercolonial system of railways; it will open up a vast tract of country for settlement and colonization; it will develop the mineral, lumbering, and agricultural resources of the Gatineau section; it will practically add another Province to the Dominion; and it will afford railway facilities to a most active, intelligent and enterprising people. Under these circumstances, I submit that the Government should grant a subsidy in aid of the construction of this railway through the Valley of the Gatineau.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will only say a single word with reference to the objection of the leader of the Opposition, that information on this subject has not been

Mr. WRIGHT.

submitted to the House. The hon. gentleman knows that the usual course is that in matters of general interest papers are asked for and brought down. And as has been already remarked by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Cimon), so far as Lake St. John is concerned, the papers were moved for on a former occasion, by parties taking an interest in this scheme, and everything respecting this road was laid on the Table of the House. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Railway Committee the subject was discussed very fully, when a charter was applied for by Mr. Blackman, and that charter was granted. I may read a very short despatch from the *Globe* which embodies a description of this project as follows:—

“St. John’s, N. F., May 8.—On Saturday night the Assembly passed an Act incorporating the Great American European Short Line Railway. Large and important concessions were made to the Company. They receive from the Newfoundland Government 5,000 acres of select Crown lands for every mile of railroad they construct. They are conceded the exclusive monopoly of the country for railroad purposes for forty-five years, and are to enjoy during that term immunity from taxation on all material required for railway construction. The question of an annual subsidy to the Company or endorsement of their road-bed bonds to the extent of \$3,000,000 has been left to the constituencies, as the current term is the last of the existing Legislature, and the General Election takes place in the autumn. The new railway syndicate is composed of New York and London capitalists. The object of the Company is to establish more rapid, safe, and certain communication between America and Europe across Newfoundland. The outline of the scheme is the construction of a railroad from the most eastern point of the Newfoundland coast across the island to Cape Ray. The western terminus will connect by steam ferry with the railway from Cape North over the island of Cape Breton to the Straits of Canso, the straits to be crossed by ferry. The line will traverse the north shore of Nova Scotia, and form a junction with the Intercolonial Railway, from which connections will be effected with railways communicating with Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Montreal, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco. From the east shore of Newfoundland the Company will establish a line of ten powerful, swift despatch steamships to connect with the west coast of Ireland, and thence by fast express trains with London and all continental cities. The minimum saving of time between London and New York is estimated at forty-eight hours. The whole sea voyage is reduced to 1,700 miles between these great commercial centres, and the dangerous coast, a thousand miles in extent, between Cape Race and New York is completely avoided. The Company anticipate carrying annually across the Atlantic 200,000 passengers. They are sanguine they will completely absorb the transportation of mails for the Government of America, Europe and Asia. Construction will be proceeded with immediately.”

That gives, in a condensed form, the information on this subject which has been before us for some time in the *Globe*. I want, before sitting down, to say that in reference to the application for a line of communication from St. Mary’s to Apohaqui, it was simply a case in which the member for Queen’s has taken a warm interest, using every effort in its behalf. Both the hon. member for Queen’s and the member for King’s have used very powerful arguments to show why this line should be taken up, an investigation will be made with a view to ascertain what it was the duty of the Government to do at the ensuing Session.

Mr. MILLS. I think the House has reason to complain that an important measure such as this is should be announced for the first time at the close of the Session. It involves the very important question of public policy, and should have been disclosed to Parliament at an earlier period of the Session, so that the representatives of the people might have had ample opportunity to consider it in all its bearings. It is practically a proposition to aid railways generally throughout the Dominion. I am not, at this period of the Session, going to enter into a discussion as to whether this is an improper course to pursue or not, but it is highly improper in these last days of the Session, when more than half of the members on each side have left for their homes, to bring forward a proposal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Those members did not leave before these resolutions were on the paper.

Mr. MILLS. Before they had an opportunity of considering them, and when they had made up their minds that the Government were about to close Parliament and ask for a dissolution.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Every hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who has left has endorsed the resolutions.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think the hon. gentlemen has the right to make an assumption of that kind. I do not think Parliament has before it the information to enable them to come to an intelligent conclusion. This is another instance of the improper policy which the administration has pursued this Session. They have withheld every question of public policy and legislation until the last hours of the Session; they have ceased in a great measure to be a representative body, or to discharge the duties of such a body, and we simply register the decrees of the Government and hand over legislation and everything connected with government to the hon. Ministers for the time being. I protested when the hon. gentleman brought down a resolution similar to this one reserving 100,000,000 of acres at the close of the Session, two or three years ago, and I do not think hon. gentlemen are called upon to enter into a discussion of the policy involved in these resolutions. In my opinion the Government have treated the House in a most improper manner in submitting a question of such importance as that involved in these resolutions at the last moment of the Session.

Mr. KING. The subject now before the House is one in which I feel deep interest, and I take this opportunity to enter my protest against the scheme adopted by the Government. I protest against the unfair manner in which New Brunswick and the county I represent has been treated in this measure. During the early part of the Session the hon. member for Sunbury and myself asked for an interview with the hon. Minister of Railways, and pressed that the road, which had been recognized by the late Government as an important feeder of the Intercolonial, should be aided if aid were granted. The hon. Minister informed us that it was out of his power to comply with our request, and that he was not in a position to furnish rails; and that the most he could do, as there was no precedent under which he could grant a cash subsidy such as is now proposed, was to give a subsidy for carrying mails. On the strength of that declaration, we thought it was useless to press our claims, but later on in the Session we understood a new departure had been taken. The Government were to adopt a new policy, and intended to introduce a measure such as that now before the House. The members from Quebec and New Brunswick met and appointed a Committee, and decided to ask for an extension from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, and also an extension to the Intercolonial between Salisbury and Norton some seventy miles in New Brunswick. In order to save the time of the House, I will read the memorial that was presented to the hon. the Minister of Railways as this points out the merits of the road:

"To Sir CHARLES TUPPER,
"Minister of Railways and Canals.

"We, the undersigned members of the House of Commons would most respectfully call your attention to the fact that at the time union of the Provinces was consummated, provision was made for the construction of a line of railway between Halifax and Rivière du Loup.

"That in the selection of a route for said line of road in order to avoid the great military objection to any line in close proximity to the American boundary, it was deemed advisable to locate it *via* north shore of New Brunswick, adding very materially to its length.

"That so urgent have the demands since been for a shorter commercial line that the Local Government of New Brunswick have been forced to give aid to the extent of 2,000 acres of land per mile, to a line running from St. Mary's in the county of York *via* the Valley of St. John, to Edmunton near the Quebec boundary. That said road covers a distance of 160 miles, and is at present in good condition, and being operated by the New Brunswick Railway Company. The requirements of inter-provincial trade demands an extension of said road north-westwardly a distance of seventy-five miles to form a junction with the Intercolonial Railway, between Rivière du Loup and River Ouelle as provided in a charter granted to said New Brunswick Railway Company. And also an extension south-eastwardly from St. Mary's, county of York *via* the head of Grand Lake, an equal distance to a point on the Intercolonial Railway between Salisbury and Norton, as provided in a local charter granted to a Company known as the Central Railway Company.

"The westerly extension of said line will enable the inhabitants of the upper St. John to reach the markets of Quebec and Ontario by a direct route. The southerly extension will pass through the coal mines of New Brunswick, which are the nearest known coal areas to Quebec, and which are capable of furnishing an inexhaustible supply of coal suitable for railway, and superior to any yet discovered for ordinary forge purposes. It will also afford a direct line between the capitals of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The extensions referred to will aid materially in developing the sections of country through which they may pass and give to their inhabitants much needed railway facilities.

"Their completion will, at the same time, afford to the people of this Dominion the shortest possible all-rail line to the seaboard on Canadian territory. Will do much to promote reciprocal inter-provincial trade, and help to cement the bonds of union between the different Provinces. Asking your consideration of the views here presented, and hoping that you may be disposed to look upon the work referred to as one, the promotion of which would be to the general advantage of the Dominion of Canada, we would earnestly request that you may be pleased to use your influence to obtain a subsidy from the Dominion Treasury, which, added to the aid it is confidently believed will be given by the Local Governments of Quebec and New Brunswick, will ensure the early completion of a through line of road between the points named.

"(Signed) 80 TORY,
40 LIBERAL."

That memorial was signed by 120 members of the House of Commons, eighty of whom were Government and forty Opposition supporters. I took some trouble to obtain signatures from hon. members on this side of the House, as did the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) those of hon. gentlemen opposite. I listened with interest to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways, in which he attempted to point out to this House that the extension from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston was in the interest of St. John. I am not prepared to differ from the hon. gentleman in his views with regard to this matter. I agree that the extension of this road would be in the interests of the Province of New Brunswick, but I wish to read what the *St. John Sun*, the organ of the hon. the Finance Minister in that city, said of this matter on the 28th of January, 1882:

"The extension of the railway from Edmunston to the St. Lawrence would mean for St. John the loss of all the up-river trade above Woodstock. Business men in St. John have in many instances come to believe that the railways built in New Brunswick have each and all been the means of drawing trade from St. John. Whatever foundation there may be for the statement as regards existing railways, there need be no doubt as to what will follow the building of the road from Edmunston through. The cities of the Upper Provinces will supply all the upper St. John. Why should flour come from Ontario to St. John by the Intercolonial or *via* Boston, to be sent up the St. John river, after this road is through? What St. John merchant will sell a barrel of flour on the upper St. John? Take beef, pork, iron, heavy hardware—why should these go to the Upper Provinces from this city after the opening of this road? Why should lumbering supplies be sent from here? Will anybody explain how St. John can hope to retain this trade? Having suffered this loss, what is St. John to gain? Some one may suggest: 'Why, we shall get through freight and we can load steamers for Europe!' But not a barrel of ordinary freight from any point west of Quebec will come by this route that will not come more cheaply by the Megantic 'short cut' from Montreal. In fact, there is no advantage whatever, promised or hoped for by means of this route, which will not come to us in greater fulness and more speedily by the Megantic, while by the latter we are in little danger of losing the trade we have already. Whatever advantages may accrue to Quebec or Montreal from the building of this extension from Edmunston, in the light of past experience St. John merchants and people will see few that are likely to come to them. The business of the Upper St. John is something to this city; divided among the cities of the Upper Provinces it would amount to very little for any of them. The additional trade to be thus divided above is not a sufficient incentive to induce them to promote the building of the extension, but the loss of this trade to St. John is a strong reason why this city need not help it. In this position St. John will have the sympathy of the bulk of the population along the St. John River, whose market for their agricultural produce is largely in St. John. Whatever helps to build up St. John helps the farmers along the river; whatever tends to injure St. John goes to destroy the farmers' market here."

I confess that, in my humble judgment, this is a sectional view; but I think the manner in which the Government have dealt with the extension of the Rivière du Loup line, both north and south, is on the whole most unfair to New Brunswick. I find, on looking at the proposition before the House, that it is proposed to aid a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, in Ontario—a line which, I understand, is controlled by a company, and will act simply as a feeder to a line already subsidized by the Dominion Government.

Then there is the road from St. Raymond to St. John's, Quebec, to which a subsidy of \$384,000 is to be given. We have heard that this is to be a part of the great line to St. James' Bay, but I find that no such claim is made for that road. In an article which appears, to-day, in the *Gazette*, the organ of the Government in Montreal, it simply said that this road will open up for settlement one of the finest districts in the Province, and, as a colonization work, is second, in importance and the benefit it will confer, to none in contemplation, in progress or in operation in the country. Then we have the road from Oxford to New Glasgow, to which it is proposed to give a subsidy of \$324,000. The hon. Minister of Railways has informed us that this is to be part of the Great European and North American Short Line Railway; but if so, this is the first we have heard of it, and there is no argument which will apply in favor of this road which will not apply with equal force in favor of the other. The hon. gentleman says it will shorten the distance between Montreal and certain points in Nova Scotia by some thirty-eight miles; but the line I advocate will shorten the route that distance if the shortest possible line in Canadian territory is to be adhered to between these points and Montreal. I could wish that at this moment the hon. the Finance Minister was free from the responsibilities of office, that he was free from the trammels of party, so that he might stand up and advocate in more eloquent terms than I can command, the claims of the Province of New Brunswick and his native county. I am certain that he would point out to the Government that the line I am now advocating is one which is entitled to the recognition of the Government, especially as it is a line which, when he was endeavoring to enlist the sympathy of his province for Confederation, he assured them it would be one of the results of the Union. I think he would point out that while it was highly desirable to aid in the development of the coal mines of Nova Scotia, yet that New Brunswick had coal mines which though not very extensively mined, produced coal equal and in some cases superior to any discovered, and that it might be mined sufficiently for the purposes of our local railways. It might be said that New Brunswick had received compensation elsewhere, but some advantages that St. John, for example, is it receive, are more for the benefit of Halifax than of St. John itself; while, as to other supposed advantages, she is paying fully what they are worth. I would like to ask, though I scarcely expect an answer, if the speeches made by the hon. Finance Minister in this House and out of it, have influenced the Government in dealing so harshly with us. He has been in the habit of saying that we get more than our share of aid from this Government, but I think it can easily be seen that, in comparison with Nova Scotia, we are not getting our share. The hon. gentleman could point to the fact that the hon. the Minister of Railways had provided liberally for his own Province. We have first, the Chignecto Railway; then we have the road from Oxford to New Glasgow, \$224,000; then the Intercolonial extension to Halifax, the increased passenger accommodation at Halifax. Then when we come to Quebec: we have the St. Charles embranchment, which rendered a portion of the Intercolonial comparatively useless, \$536,000; St. Raymond to Lake St. John, \$384,000; and Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, \$240,000. Then we go to Prince Edward Island: we find a new road there, which is being subsidized by the Government, so that, on the whole, when we compare the treatment of New Brunswick with that of the other Provinces, we have a right to complain. We are told that the matter will receive the attention of the Government during the recess, and that, perhaps, some time or other, we may get our share. I heard a report, that one gentleman was stating throughout my county that he had had letters from the hon. Minister of Finance to the effect that

Mr. KING.

this proposition was to be considered along with others when he next visited Queen's. I scarcely believe that report, but if it is not true the hon. Finance Minister will have the opportunity of contradicting it. If, however, he did make such a statement to influence the electors in his native county, I beg to assure him that he much mistakes the temper and spirit of the people if he supposes he can influence them by such considerations.

Mr. IVES. I had not the pleasure of hearing the hon. Minister of Railways when he introduced these resolutions. I am therefore unable to say whether he has announced as his policy in the future the aiding of railways of provincial importance by the general Government. I have been somewhat surprised, however, at the disinclination of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to discuss the merits of this policy as a matter of principle. It looks to me as if the question embodied in these resolutions is one of as great importance as any railway question which has been brought before this House during the present Parliament. I had understood that the policy of this Parliament was to build and assist railways of the Dominion, and that it was not the policy of this House to aid railways of local or provincial importance, no matter how great that local or provincial importance might be. However important may be the roads mentioned in these resolutions, it seems to me that their adoption practically amounts to a new departure in policy—practically to the adoption of a policy of building or assisting to build, by Federal subsidies, any railway in any Province which is of local importance in its neighborhood or locality. If this is the policy, I think it would be well for the hon. leader of the Opposition and the right hon. leader of the Government to discuss this matter before the House, and that the House should, before adopting these resolutions, decide whether so important a departure should be made in the policy of the country. One thing appears to me to be certain, and that is, that if we aid these railways this year, we should have no reason for refusing to assist railways of equal importance which may hereafter apply for similar aid—and we have already heard two applications in the course of the last fifteen minutes, one very ably presented by the hon. member for Ottawa, who has certainly given as good reasons as any I have heard for aiding the other schemes, and another by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Other railways could be mentioned, which are important to their localities, which it is difficult to construct, which it is important should be constructed, and which it is impossible can be constructed without provincial or Dominion aid; and if we are prepared to assume the construction of the whole railway system of the country, provincial and Dominion, we should not do so without understanding what will be the natural consequences that will flow from that step. I have nothing to say against the construction of the Lake St. John Railway or the other railways that have been mentioned; they are important; but other railways have been constructed already by capitalists in the different Provinces, and I would ask the hon. gentlemen who are pressing for assistance for the Lake St. John Railway, or the Edmunston Railway, what reason is there for the construction of these railways that does not apply to the North Shore Railway, which is certainly a very important road. This measure is going to have a retroactive effect; we are not merely providing for the construction of railways in the future, but we must go back and assist in defraying the cost of those railways which had already been built but which are in debt; we must help, both directly and indirectly, to relieve the Provinces of these debts. If we start we cannot stop; it may be well enough; I do not know that it is proper to stop; I believe in aid to railways, although I would hesitate to adopt this principle; but, if we have any ambition to reduce our

national debt, though I am not a prophet, I can say that if we adopt this policy of building Provincial railways with Dominion subsidies, it will be a long time before we shall be able to talk about applying any surpluses to reduce the debt. I am surprised at this proposal, and it seems to me that the hon. leader of the Opposition is abrogating his functions, is deserting his post in not challenging in some way or other, either approving or disapproving, so important a principle as that involved in the proposition to construct railways in the several Provinces with Dominion money. For my own part, I have so much doubt that before I vote on the question I would like to hear it discussed as a matter of principle.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I purpose approaching the matter with delicacy and moderation—delicacy, because I may offend some hon. gentlemen on this side, and moderation, because I feel so bitterly disappointed at the result of all the negotiations we have had, that I hardly know how to take this matter up. I cannot help feeling that, though supported by the Government, there is a higher duty imposed upon me, even than supporting a party, namely, that of looking after the interests of the Province and the county that sent me here and the country generally, in connection with the construction of any works of public improvement, such as I consider the extension we ask for, which would benefit not only the locality interested, but the country generally. Not upon any personal ground do I urge this matter; not with any view of helping the Opposition in any complaints they make; but simply because I feel it hard, in voting for this resolution—which I certainly shall vote for, because I think it is a step in the right direction—that we, in New Brunswick, have not had the aid granted to us which we desired. While the hon. the Minister of Railways was giving his reasons for subsidizing these lines, I felt that every mile shortened between Montreal and Liverpool was something to the advantage of Canada; I saw that by the construction of a railway in Newfoundland, and the establishing, so to speak, of a bridge of steamboats, we were going to shorten the distance to Liverpool by forty-eight hours, and that in order to do that we should endorse this scheme of building a line from Oxford to New Glasgow. My hon. friend also pointed out that by aiding the road between Megantic and Rivière du Loup, we would again shorten the distance to such an extent as to be justified in making the expenditure of public money which is proposed. I approved of that, and I agreed with the hon. the Minister; but I hold in my hand a map, taken from the Sessional Papers of 1867, showing all the routes of the Intercolonial Railway laid down. I find that if we follow the line from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, coming down on the west side of the River St. John, we have to follow two sides of a triangle; but if we come down by the route which I and others ask to be subsidized, we would cut off forty-four miles of the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and whatever point the proposed line intersects the Intercolonial Railway. Then, taking up the argument which I find in this pamphlet, the central line No. 5, will require three enormously expensive bridges. The passage thus reads:

"The Central Line, No. 5, will require two enormously expensive bridges over the St. John, and as it will neither open up a new country, nor give railway facilities to population now destitute of them, its claims are too small to merit much consideration. The means of communication with St. John by the river and western extension with the town of St. Andrews by western extension and the St. Andrew's line is quite sufficient to meet all the wants of the inner counties. As this divergence from the Central Line proper has no particular merits to recommend it over that line, but has several strong objections, besides that of running too near the American frontier, it may safely be put aside with the frontier line."

I wish to show that if we are to accept this as the shortest line, and even through every part, it will give forty-four miles. Then we have got to understand the difficulty of

the bridging of the St. John at Fredericton. It will take \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000 to do it properly; and it is doubtful if a bridge would stand, owing to the great body of ice that comes down in spring. If connection can be made at that point, the Local Government cannot bear the expense, and will have to be aided by the Dominion Government. The two bridges, including the suspension bridge from Carleton to St. John, would require an expenditure of \$1,000,000—I believe will be nearer \$2,000,000—which will have to be expended before this through short line can be achieved. Now, on the other hand, if my hon. friend had followed out my views and his views in regard to shortening the distance, and he had subsidized these seventy miles south to St. Mary's, opposite Fredericton, south and east of the Intercolonial, with an expenditure of about \$3,000 a mile, we should have had an outlay of \$210,000, seventy-five miles more railway, and should have saved the expenditure of \$2,000,000, while obtaining the shortest route to Europe. Taking my hon. friend's estimate of \$210,000, it would necessitate a further expenditure by the Company, because a railway cannot be built for \$3,000 a mile. We are told, on good authority, that every mile constructed put into the Treasury interest on the entire expenditure which is returned by the increased revenue. Now, supposing that it had not shortened the route much, still there would have been a great expense in that country, from the public and private purse; but it would have opened up all central New Brunswick, and it would have furnished the northern section of the Province with means of getting at its coal, and would have assisted it to develop and open up that beautiful valley through King's County, known as Mills Stream Valley. The road would have come out at some of the little villages, either Apohaqui or Sussex. We find we are not to have this work. We cannot get it on the argument of its being shorter—because it is shorter; nor on the argument that it is a necessity. My hon. friend read something from the *Sun* newspaper, I presume—but I do not know whether it is correct or not—and argued that it is against the trade of the Province and St. John to construct that road. Then we should not have that railroad at all. We should go back to the old times, when there was a wall around that city, and let nothing in or out. I cannot agree with them; because I see, taking up the very elaborate report of the Intercolonial Railway, when it was built, it carries conviction to my mind that the central route was the correct route and the only one in the interest of New Brunswick. The writer already referred to goes on to say:

"The Northern Central Line combines all the advantages of Major Robinson's line, with several others, not secured by the latter. It is about the same length to build, gives King's, Queen's, and Sunbury the advantage of the railway without depriving Kent of the privilege, and opens up the coal regions of Grand Lake, Salmon River, and Coal Creek. This being the case, we shall consider it as essential. Major Robinson's line, though, preferable to it in all respects."

We have also this further statement:

"In this connection it must not be forgotten that the Northern Central line, which we are now examining, starts from Apohaqui, and passes through the populous counties of King's and Queen's, and touches both Sunbury and Kent. If the populations of these be taken into account, it would give our northern line as many inhabitants per mile, as Mr. Fleming's figures show for the frontier line."

I shall read this further extract:

"But we think we have shown beyond a doubt, that St. John, in this matter of the route, will be fairly dealt with by adopting the northern central, striking Apohaqui. And if more is done in her favor, it must be done not only at a greater cost and to the total destruction of the military character of the road, but also at the expense and sacrifice of the interest of the whole northern part of New Brunswick, and of the eastern part of Lower Canada."

Now this pamphleteer, who has gone thoroughly into the subject, says that St. John will not be benefited by the opening of this branch line. I entirely agree with him; but it would bring more business to St. John by opening a route to the back counties in winter and enabling the cen-

tral counties to send out in winter, boards, shingles, hay and oats, which is not now practicable, and to buy and bring back goods from St. John. In summer there is traffic up that line at places where the steamboats does not touch. This road would better develop those back counties and increase the trade of St. John. If the argument of the *Sun* is correct, this line is going to cut off the trade of St. John. A good road should be built to compensate St. John for that loss. It is clearly a question of national importance that we should have a shortened line through all Canada to the sea-board. I was pleased to hear the hon. the Minister of Railways say that that was the tendency of their policy. It will enable me to say, when I go home, that we may look for a winter port at St. John, without which the National Policy would be incomplete. I cannot but think that works of such great necessity as this should be proceeded with, and I am sorry they have not been taken up earlier this Session. My hon. friend has told us the matter should be investigated, that he had not sufficient particulars before him to conclude to give this grant. I gave a silent vote when the Chignecto Railway grant went through. Though I knew very little about it, I had faith enough in the representations of the hon. Minister to believe it was a step in the right direction, and submitted my judgment to his. But when I see a grant given for a speculative work of this kind, I say we should have our portion of the line through the centre of New Brunswick, which we know is not a speculative line and will build up that section of the country. I cannot see what further investigation is required. We have all the information required; we have got the population and trade from the Census, and have the thorough and complete surveys of Mr. Fleming and others. The plea of want of information for not giving this grant, cannot be sustained in this case. I do not wish to attack the Government, but simply to stand out in an independent position, and say: "I am much grieved at the course adopted." If the Government give us the road in the future I shall be pleased. I know we cannot look to any pledge, because Governments are influenced by many considerations. As a man said who was going to be hanged: "If you put it off one year, I will accept the sentence." If the Government are in earnest, the hon. Minister of Railways should tell us, that not only are they going to investigate the matter, but if there is a just and proper claim the Government will grant the subsidy on its own merits, and not take this up in connection with other railways, because if that principle is established every claim will be as good as ours and every railway will make a claim. Unless we have some expressions to show that our appeals will not be thrown aside, because of the claims of St. Andrews or St. John, but that our claim will be judged on its own merits and we will be given what we are entitled to, I shall not be satisfied. I shall not submit to any course now or in the future that will cut off from us what we are entitled to, whether it pleases my hon. friends or not, but will take an independent position and fall under it or survive.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I only wish to emphasize what has been so well said by the hon. members for Queen's and King's. I am equally disappointed with them at the resolutions brought in by the hon. Minister of Railways. The fact is, this line of railway has been well investigated. It is the old proposed route of the Intercolonial Railway, which the new counties thought would have been adopted, or they would never have voted to come into Confederation. They think they were deceived on this subject, and they feel the deception deeply. This is the only inter-provincial route, and the action of the Government in taking a portion of it and leaving the other destroys the inter-provincial character of the road. The road as it stood before, as it was memorialized for, was the old Intercolonial road, and was of a national character. It was

Mr. DOMVILLE.

memorialized for by 120 hon. members of both sides of the House, and the Government is without excuse, because the resources of that section have been proved to be abundant enough to justify a subsidy, even giving it a local character. Last Session the local Government gave a subsidy of \$3,000 per mile to aid this branch road, so that it is considered of very great importance. The iron ore in that locality and the abundance of coal of a superior character are awaiting development, and our National Policy is founded on the fact that we had coal in Nova Scotia and flour in Ontario. Here the deposits are lying comparatively idle for want of development, yet the Government shows no consideration in the matter, though, to develop the coal of Nova Scotia, the rates on the Intercolonial Railway have been reduced one-half. The coal in Nova Scotia has been subsidized in more than one way, not only has a duty been imposed to force it on the west, but the rates of carriage from the coal pits of Nova Scotia to St. John have been reduced almost one-half, from \$1.50 to 82 cents. In that respect they are subsidized for the same coal for which we are now refused a small subsidy to build a railway to develop it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to complain of the reduction of the coal rates to St. John?

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). I only wish to emphasize what has been so well said by the hon. members for Queen's and King's. I am equally disappointed with the resolutions brought in by the hon. Minister of Railways. New Brunswick has been ignored. The fact is that the line of railway in which we feel a deep interest, and for which over 120 members of this House memorialized the Government for aid, is in one of the routes of the old Intercolonial Railway promised New Brunswick before Confederation, and if the river counties in New Brunswick had suspected that that road would not have been built, they would never have voted to go into the Union. They were deceived by our leader, and they feel the deception keenly. This Central New Brunswick road is inter-provincial in its character when connected with the New Brunswick road, and the proposed road from Edmunston to Rivière du Loup as asked for by us. But the Government have provided for the western portion only in the resolutions, and the action of the Government in taking a portion of it and leasing the other destroys its inter-provincial character. Let the hon. Minister of Railways veil the resolutions as he may, they now partake of a local character. The line we applied for was, as I said, on one of the proposed routes which had been surveyed for the Intercolonial and thoroughly investigated, and its resources had been fully put before the Government by the hon. member for Queen's and myself. The Government have no excuse on that score, because we had proved that the resources of the eastern section which has been left out are abundant to justify a subsidy in order to develop the coal fields and other industries, even were it entirely of a local character. There is iron ore in the vicinity of the eastern portion of the said road, as well as an abundance of coal of a superior character for some purposes awaiting development. Of such importance is this road that the New Brunswick Local Government offer a subsidy of \$3,000 per mile for its construction, and it only required a moderate subsidy from this Government to secure its completion, and yet this Government have refused that small consideration, which would develop those important interests. The National Policy was said to be founded upon the development of, and encouragement to, the coal interest in the east, and the wheat-growing interest in the west. Nova Scotia coal interests have been aided by railway accommodation as well as reduced rates on the Intercolonial Railroad to St. John, and comes into competition with the coal I am now speaking of, and which has been deemed fair consideration. The rates on Spring Hill coal to some ports on St. John have been reduced from \$1.50 to 82c., or almost

one-half, and this coal competes with New Brunswick coal. I ask why has New Brunswick been denied consideration in developing her coal mines?

Mr. ANGLIN. There is no doubt this is one of the most important questions that has come before the present Session of Parliament, since it forms an entirely new departure in regard to the railway policy of this country. It is the beginning of a policy of the construction of railways of a purely provincial character on the Dominion credit. It may be all right or it may be very wrong, but there is not time now for a reasonable consideration of the policy in all its scope and effect. Looking at the proposition before us, the people of New Brunswick see reason to complain of its unfairness. What has been said of the railway from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston and St. John, and of the probable commercial effects, is unquestionably true. No one who has studied the history of our Province and has observed the effect of railway construction upon its business, can have the slightest doubt that the business of St. John will be very materially lessened by the construction of the road, and that it will be all the more injured had the railway not been completed, had the track not been permitted to go in that direction to the city of St. John. The opening up of the country at the head of Grand Lake and along that district up to St. Maurice near Fredericton, would in itself very materially tend to bring much of the trade to St. John, much more than comes at present. The coal fields there are very extensive, and the country is said to be fertile and inexhaustible. These facts furnish an additional reason why, if we undertake the development of the country at all, this portion of the railway should be built. The hon. Minister of Railways stated correctly that building the portion from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston does not by any means effect the object the hon. Minister expects. They must cross the River St. John at Fredericton by an expensive bridge to connect with the system of railway now in existence on the other side of the river; then, having come down on that side of the river by a devious route you find yourself at the city and harbor of St. John, while coming down by the other direction you come on to the Dominion line of railway. But I rise specially to speak on behalf of that portion of the country which I represent. Baie des Chaleurs has been shamefully neglected in this scheme. For many years past the representative of the county of Bonaventure in this House has labored to obtain railway communication for the people of that county. The present Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec, while in this House, did all in his power to obtain railway communication for that part of the country, and was always met there, I presume, with the reply that it was contrary to the policy of the Government to subsidize lines of railway running in that direction. Well, Sir, to-day we find that the several lesser lines which are essentially of a local character, lines which all the eloquence of the hon. Minister of Railways cannot deprive of their essentially local character—though they may be very important in themselves—yet we find them subsidized, railroads which will not feed the Intercolonial Railway in any way whatever. We find these railways assisted, but we are refused assistance to lines of railways along the Baie de Chaleurs. Down through the county of Bonaventure to the county of Gaspé there is a large tract of fertile country and a considerable population. The whole Baie de Chaleurs is well known as one of the finest fishing grounds in the world, but its almost untold wealth is scarcely as available as it might be for want of sufficient railway facilities. For a great part of the year they are quite out of the world. In my county there is a district in which a line of railway is projected of such importance that the Local Government last Session granted it \$3,000 a mile. When that is built it will lead directly to the Intercolonial Railway and put a population of 15,000 in connection with that road with all

their considerable trade. That line also we find entirely neglected. There is no doubt that if we enter upon this policy the Government, whether the present one or their successors, will find it to be absolutely incumbent upon them that if money can be raised by any process of taxation not much more onerous even than that which now burdens the business of this country—they will find it absolutely necessary to extend the system inaugurated by these resolutions, and to assist lines of railway up the Gatineau, to open up the country on both sides of the Baie de Chaleurs, and to develop many other portions of the country. I believe a railway through King's and Queen's has a special claim on the Government and on its individual members. Something has been said in respect to promises made, not quite directly, but by implication by the hon. the Finance Minister, as to the route of the Intercolonial, and if the hon. members for Sunbury and other New Brunswick constituencies, believe, if that hon. Minister were free from the shackles of office, he would use his eloquence and power to advocate the immediate opening of that part of the country and the construction of that line. The enterprise halts and is inconclusive, unless this other portion of the road is built.

Mr. SCRIVER. I listened with close attention to the remarks that fell from the hon. the Minister of Railways upon the resolutions which have been introduced to the House. We heard the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), in whose remarks, upon the whole, I cordially agree, and I feel that these resolutions are of the greatest importance, as indicating, on the part of the Government, a departure from the established rule which has prevailed up to this time in the Government of this country that Government aid should not be extended to provincial undertakings or even to inter-provincial works. The discussion which has been continued with such earnestness since the introduction of these resolutions, show how great is the principle involved in these resolutions, and they show that the view taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition that it is very unfortunate indeed that these resolutions have been introduced at so late a period of the Session, is of great force and great truth. For myself, I am free to say that I regard the departure which these resolutions indicate on the part of the Government, from the established rule which has hitherto existed, of extending aid to works solely of a Dominion character, as of great danger. I regard the departure from that principle with the greatest apprehension, and I am well satisfied that, however, with regard to the importance of the enterprises referred to in these resolutions, no good reason has been given by the hon. Minister of Railways for regarding those enterprises as any other than private. The hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Cimon) seemed disposed to cast great blame on the Administration from the fact that they had not been led to give aid to the Lake St. John Railway. I remember very well the argument that hon. gentleman made several Sessions ago in favor of that enterprise, and I remember distinctly the reply the hon. Minister of Railways made to that argument on that occasion. The hon. Minister admitted the importance of the enterprise, but said that it was purely local only, and that the Government of the Dominion are not prepared to extend any aid to it. It is rather a suspicious circumstance, that just on the eve of a general election this departure from the established policy of the Government has been enunciated. Judging by the discussion that has occurred we have reason to suppose that the applications for aid, if this grant for this aid should be granted, as I suppose it will, will be legion in their number, and I do not see how this or any future Government can draw such a line, if they once depart from the rule to which I have referred, between enterprises of a private and those of a Dominion character. With the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe I would have been glad to have heard this question

thoroughly discussed. It is one of sufficient importance to warrant such a thorough discussion, and I would have been glad to have heard the hon. Minister of Railways, in introducing the resolutions, not confine himself, as he did confine himself, to remarks to show the importance of the enterprise it was supposed to aid, but to have gone further and given some good reasons why he now advocated a departure from the policy hitherto followed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hon. members referred to this as being a new departure. It is an extension of an old policy. During the late and the present Administration assistance was given to branch railways connected with the Intercolonial to the extent of the iron for those branches. The extension in this case is not confined to branches of the Intercolonial, but the policy has been recommended by both Governments and aid given. The branches thus referred to may be feeders of the Government Railways, but I admit the branches that were constructed and to which aid was given were direct feeders of those railways.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the rails were only lent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A supporter of the Government, who obtained some of them, expected they are more than lent. They have been retained until now, and I doubt if they shall be returned very soon. There has been a recognition of certain principles. I am not surprised that the hon. members for King's, Queen's and Sunbury should have expressed their views so emphatically, because they are interested in this question; but I was surprised that hon. gentlemen who have never failed, since the line of the Intercolonial was established, to denounce me for having assented to remaining in the Government, to the construction of the line of railway on the north shore. A proposition is now made to this House for the purpose of giving the shorter line to St. John within Canadian territory, giving practically the central lines of railway, and the shortest route to St. John for the western trade, it being one string to the bow, and we hope soon to add a second string to the bow—the hon. member shakes his head—and we have been pointed to the fact, that a portion of the trade of the Upper St. John will be carried free to Quebec. We recognize that fact. No man who has been in that section of the country, even before railways were constructed, and has seen the way in which business was conducted in the neighborhood of Little Falls, but must feel that a considerable portion of that business must go to Quebec, but at the same time its value to New Brunswick, and especially to the port and harbor of St. John, is that it gives on Canadian territory the shortest line of railway to the nearest open port in the Dominion of Canada. I have balanced the account and have found that its advantages are so much greater than the loss which will be sustained in that particular section of the country that I think, on the whole, it will be of the greatest possible value to St. John. I am free to admit that I am in sympathy to a considerable extent with the proposition to construct the other line which has been proposed by hon. gentlemen, because it will bring an additional portion of the Province of New Brunswick in contact and communication with St. John, but so far as the direct trade from the west is concerned the city of St. John does not depend upon that line. It has been said that it will cost \$1,000,000 to construct certain bridges, and I know that there are physical difficulties in the way of ice at Fredericton; but we know that a line has been subsidized from Woodstock to Harvey by the Local Legislature, and that would make the most direct line possible between Woodstock and St. John or between Rivière du Loup and St. John. Still, as I have said, I am in sympathy with this proposition and endorse the statement of my colleague that it is entitled to receive and should receive, as it undoubtedly will, the most favorable consideration of the Government. I would

Mr. SCRIVER.

remark, however, that when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they did not give any iron to that particular road.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). On the contrary, it was the only road to which they did give iron.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Was there any legislation on record to settle that question? I think, though I was not here at that time, that a Board representing the county of Queen's, notified the Government in very strong terms what they would do if they did not take a certain course.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). There was a resolution passed in the House giving aid by loaning old rails to certain feeders of the Intercolonial, and a Minute of Council, which the hon. gentleman may find, specified that road and that line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But they were taken back and appropriated to other roads.

Mr. BURPEE. Not the ones for that road.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My impression is that the rails at the disposal of the Government at that time were appropriated to other roads. However, I do not desire by any word or action of mine to detract from the merits of the application which has been referred to. Then there are the local advantages to be derived from the construction of a railway through a section of country where there is a deposit of coal, which it is very important to develop, and which, though not valuable for household purposes, is a very excellent coal for steam and smith purposes. An hon. member referred to a gentleman in the county of Queen's having some letter of mine. If my memory serves me, that gentleman wrote to me. I had hoped to have an opportunity of addressing the people of Queen's last summer. That opportunity was not afforded to me, however, and I promised, if spared to the spring of this year, to make that visit; and this gentleman wrote to me to say that when I did make that visit, a strong demand would be made upon me to state whether that should be done. I stated to him in reply that when I made my appearance I should be able to state the policy of the Government in reference to it; but the Minister of Railways has already stated it, and therefore that statement shall have to be mine when the question is put to me. There are other reasons which it is not necessary for me to enumerate, why I feel this proposal has its merits; but there are other questions of a Dominion character in reference to that road, which necessarily require a little more consideration than the Government have been able to give at present. I may say here, that with reference to the statements of the very limited advantages which we would derive from the road from Rivière du Loup to Edmunston, I say that, as we will have by its construction the shortest route to the sea, where we have open water during the whole year, that proposition is, in my judgment, surrounded with vast importance, not only to the Dominion generally, but especially to the constituency I have the honor to represent.

Mr. OUIMET. I have been rather surprised to hear some hon. members of the House say that these resolutions make a new departure in the policy of the Dominion. As I understand it, the policy of the Conservative party is the development of the trade, the increase of the population, and the increase of the prosperity of the whole country and every part of it. That is the policy upon which we have been establishing our popularity in the country, and it is to the interest of the Dominion that this policy should never be lost sight of. By spending millions of money in developing the North-West, we have felt that we were promoting the prosperity of the older Provinces; and shall we say now that we have not the means to provide for the wants of these Provinces, which are not provincial wants, but Dominion wants. Shall we say that the old Provinces do not form part of the Dominion, when it is proposed to spend a few thousand dollars to increase the prosperity of some of these

Provinces? It is said that the great valley of the St. John, for instance, can support millions of prosperous people. When we are spending millions in the North-West, are we going to grudge a few thousand dollars for the valley of the St. John, or the Gatineau Valley or any of the valleys of New Brunswick? This is not national policy; it is anti-national policy; and I congratulate the Government on having confirmed their policy by taking this step to develop the resources of the Dominion, instead of striving to pay the whole debt, because it is too soon to do that until the North-West is more fully developed. I concur very heartily in the policy which has been promulgated in these resolutions, and I think this provincial cry is not the cry that ought to be raised to-day. I agree also with what has been said by the hon. member for the county of Ottawa (Mr. Wright). He says very properly that we are now adopting a policy which will warrant him in coming next year and claiming a subsidy for a railway which will open up the great Ottawa Valley; and next year, if I have then the honor of a seat in this House, I shall be very happy to endorse that proposition. If the people of New Brunswick wish to develop the resources of their Province, whether their fisheries or any other of their resources, we in the Province of Quebec shall be glad to help them. Only a few days ago we voted \$150,000 to enable the fishermen of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Gaspé—not to prosper, because it is too late to hope for them to prosper, but only to live. Did anyone raise the cry then that that grant was for the purpose of assisting individuals? No, Sir, they were interested in concealing their feelings, because they had fishermen among their constituents. We have been almost every day voting much larger sums of money than these resolutions and for the purpose of helping anybody in the country who appears to be suffering. Well, we have suffering people in the Province of Quebec; we have in the valley of the St. John thousands of settlers who have been suffering for years; we have men there who have gone into the unbroken forest, and have not yet been able, for want of railway communication, to establish prosperous homes. It is right for this Dominion to tell these men that we are willing to help them on their own account, although I believe the development of the St. John Valley will promote the general trade and prosperity of the Dominion. The proposed railway will be an important feeder to the Intercolonial Railway; and every man who will be induced to go there and settle, instead of going to the United States, will add to the wealth of this country, and more than repay the interest on the paltry sum of \$384,000, which we are proposing to give. I did not intend, Sir, to make a speech; but I desired to express, as strongly as I could, my disapproval of the provincial cry which has been raised, and the attempt to distinguish provincial interests from Dominion interests. I say they are one and the same thing; if the Provinces prosper—and I hold that the older Provinces more than the newer Provinces have a right to ask us to aid them to prosper—the whole Dominion prospers; and I believe the new provinces will not be those to grudge the paltry assistance which it is now proposed to give to our own citizens.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. I have much pleasure in supporting these resolutions. I cannot coincide with the views of several hon. members opposite that it is not legitimately within the province of this Parliament to subsidize those railways. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said he looked upon it as a baneful principle to establish a precedent of this kind at this particular time. But this is not the establishment of a precedent, it is the carrying out of a principle established some time ago. The hon. member for West Durham said, in reference to the

loan of rails to a provincial railway, that it was not establishing a principle. He must have forgotten that those rails represented a considerable value, were of use to the railway, and if returned would necessarily be greatly deteriorated in value, else there would be no reason for loaning them, consequently this loan was equivalent to a grant. I hold it is within our province to deal with this question. Those railways are under Dominion charter, and it is within the duty of this Government to deal with it. Why do we charter those railways, while provincial railways are chartered by the Provinces within which they lie? Because those Dominion chartered railways extend outside a Province or run to another country, and are recognized as of Dominion importance. This railway connecting the Ontario system with the Canadian Pacific is specially important. It represents the outlet of some fifteen or sixteen Ontario railways, including the Great Western, Grand Trunk, Whitby and Port Perry, Wellington, Grey and Bruce, and a number of others embracing the minor railways. It is the outlet also of the richest part of Ontario and the Dominion. But it is important to the whole Dominion for another reason—it is an advantage to the new country into which it leads. Ontario must, in the future, be more of a manufacturing centre for the supply of Manitoba and the North-West, and it is of the greater importance, therefore, that we should have an outlet by the shortest possible route, so as to keep down the cost of freight and give the North-West people our products at the smallest prices. The railroad would be of importance, again, by opening up a new market, and the older the country becomes the more important it will be. Ontario will manufacture the more for the North-West. Hamilton sent lately to Manitoba and the North-West \$500,000 worth of manufactured goods; but this railway would be an outlet, not for one town only, but for London, Hamilton, Guelph, Toronto, Meaford and many other important towns. It will prove the outlet to that section of the country that supplies agricultural implements, cattle and horses to the North-West. I think then it comes with very bad grace from the hon. leader of the Opposition to throw cold water on this scheme. I do not agree with him that there is not sufficient time to consider this question, which is neither intricate nor difficult. A gentleman of his clear and comprehensive mind would not need more than five minutes to understand it thoroughly. But his depreciation of it is based on the fear that it will make more popular a Government that has done so much for the country. He wishes to make a point against the Government in view of the approaching elections. So far as the western members are concerned, this opposition, instead of doing the Liberal party good, will do it harm, because we all recognized the merits of a Government, and especially of a Minister of Railways who has shown such a strong and commendable desire to do even this much in the interest of a Province that is contributing so much towards the opening up of this great new country. Supposing, as has been objected, that other railways should apply for a subsidy, there would be nothing wrong in that. I think the hon. member for Ottawa can, with equal reason, apply for Dominion aid for his railway. I believe that if members consider it in the interest of the country, they would not go wrong in supporting it. If members opposite recognize the importance of assisting a provincial railway by lending it rails, as already mentioned, how much more reasonable is it to assist railways which will work in the interest of the whole country.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

THE WORD TELEGRAPH.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 166) declaratory of the meaning

of the word Telegraph in certain cases be transferred from Public Bills and Orders to Government Orders. He said: The only object is to declare that telephones are not telegraphs.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. OGDEN. The *Free Press* this evening has the following item:—

"On Saturday night there occurred in the House of Commons one of the most disgraceful scenes ever witnessed there. A number of that class of members who find the work of attending to public business for which they were elected too irksome, amused themselves by setting off 'torpedoes' or sand-crackers in the House. For several hours a perfect fusillade was kept up to the great annoyance of the speakers and all the sensible members of the House. Sir John Macdonald said that during the forty years he had been in Parliament he had never known anything so disgraceful. This remark was greeted with another volley of crackers. Mr. Blake also protested, and the chairman repeatedly called order, but the schoolboy M.P.'s kept up their 'fun' until adjournment. Principal among the offenders were Messrs. Ogden, McLeod, Manson and Landry. These gentlemen, beyond their ability to register their votes with their party, are about as much good in Parliament as chips in porridge. Not content with neglecting their parliamentary duties, they feel it incumbent on them to act the baboon and prevent other members from attending to theirs."

All I have to say in regard to this matter is, that I entered the Chamber at about ten o'clock on Saturday night, and the first remark I heard was from the hon. leader of the Opposition, to the effect that the action was disgraceful, and that the torpedo shooting should be put a stop to as one hon. member had been struck by one of them. There was at the time a question before the House in which I was very much interested, and I took my seat behind the hon. Minister of Railways, and remained in that seat until I left the Chamber. Several hon. gentlemen who sat near me can corroborate the truth of what I say. There is not a word of truth in the charge against me contained in this article. I had not in my possession one solitary torpedo, nor did I throw anything across the floor of the House. The statement is a falsehood. I was as innocent as either the hon. leader of the Opposition or the hon. Premier. Why this man—I will not say gentleman—should publish this falsehood, I cannot understand, unless it is that this Opposition press, being unable to bring anything against my public character that will injure me in my constituency, resort to lying and slander. I defy any hon. member to say that I have ever, since I have been in this House, acted discourteously or ungentlemanly in any manner. As regards my attending to my parliamentary duties, every hon. member knows that I am always to be found in my place, or, if not in my own particular seat, perhaps, sometimes on the other side or at other times close to the Treasury Benches when I have information to get from the hon. Ministers. If I were to mention some scenes that occurred in this House in which some members of the staff of this paper were prominent, you, Mr. Speaker, might feel it to be your duty to summon them before the bar of this House or have them ejected from the gallery. I trust the editor of this paper, with whom I am acquainted, is not responsible for this and will not allow this matter to go uncontradicted in his columns.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I sat by the side of the hon. member for Guysboro' from the time those torpedos were used in this House until the House adjourned. Neither directly nor indirectly was he connected with anything of the kind. He was anxious to make a few remarks on the fisheries question, which affected his constituents, and appeared very much interested in the debate. One remark of the hon. gentleman should be looked to. The editor of the paper in question, a few evenings ago, in the Senate Chamber, or in the saloon of this Chamber, choked an hon. member of this House and not a word was said about it. Neither the *Mail* nor the

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Globe nor the *Witness* said anything about it, because, forsooth, he is a member of the staff. Because he is the editor of a newspaper, he can do just as he pleases, but an hon. gentleman is published as a blackguard on the slightest provocation. Why should a newspaper man be allowed to enter the Senate and choke an hon. member for this House? These members of the press who are so very anxious to show up hon. gentlemen who do wrong, why do they not expose one of their own associates? No; we have to put up with what those men see fit to do. I am sorry I had not the pleasure of being in the saloon: I would have had my hand in and helped my hon. friend who was used so roughly by this great and good man, the editor of the *Free Press*.

Mr. McLEOD. I wish to make a few remarks in reference to the proceedings on Saturday night and to disclaim all connection with them. I may say that when these explosions were going on within this Chamber I was not within its precincts. I had not in my possession a single torpedo and I did not throw any. It is not necessary for me to enlarge upon this subject, because the hon. member for Guysboro' who has just taken his seat has referred to it in the terms it deserves.

Mr. LANDRY. The *Toronto Globe* contains an indictment against me, beginning with the words: "Mr. Landry is a Tory," which are the only true words in the article. I will read the article:

"Mr. Landry is a Tory from the Province of Quebec, who gives about the same attention to most of the questions which come before the House as do the majority of those with whom he acts. Last night, while the fishery bonus was being considered, he amused himself by getting up a 24th of May celebration, and throwing schoolboy torpedoes about the House. Such an exhibition was very derogatory to the dignity of the House, but yet it was allowed to go on unchecked by those whose duty it was to interfere, until Mr. Blake insisted on its being stopped. Even the temporary restraint thus given did not last long. Mr. Landry's example was followed by other members, and for the rest of the evening miniature explosions were to be heard in all parts of the Chamber, much to the annoyance of those members who were desirous of taking part in the important discussion then in progress. At the close of the sitting, just as Sir John and Mr. Plumb were leaving the Chamber together, one of the pages threw a torpedo at their feet. Sir John turned angrily around, and Mr. Plumb valiantly caught a youth whom he thought to be the offender, with a 'Here is the boy, Sir John!' The chieftain did not say much, and turned and walked away; but Mr. Plumb gave the boy, who pleaded that he had got the torpedoes from a member, a very severe lecture, winding up very emphatically with 'I will have you turned out of the House.' Had half as much attention been paid to the Tory M.P.'s, who were the real offenders, instead of permitting the indecency to go unrebuked, the dignity of Parliament would have been better preserved."

Well, Sir, I have only one word to say. While that noise was going on I was very quiet, as usual, standing at the bar of the House, and every hon. member may have seen me there. I was very much annoyed myself. Torpedoes were thrown at me, and I found the position so dangerous that I was compelled to go out. It was only because that I was taking care of my own life that the *Globe* has seen fit to insult me in this manner. I stand in just the same position as the hon. member for Guysboro', and it is because the *Globe* has nothing to say against me in my public life that it tries to injure me in my constituency. But if I really have torpedoes I will keep them for the next election, and we will see in my constituency what use I will make of them.

Mr. MANSON. I have only to say, in reference to the charge made in the *Globe*, that I had none in my possession nor anything of the kind, nor did I take any part in the disturbance complained of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that next Session if any gentleman pleases to use crackers he may add cheese with them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LORNE,

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of the amounts required for the service of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1883, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 15th May, 1882.

SEAMEN'S ACT, 1873.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Seamen's Act, 1873.

Mr. BLAKE moved:

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same so as to provide for a trial by jury of any person liable to be sentenced under the said Bill to from two to five years imprisonment in the Penitentiary.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Blake,	Fiset,	Langley,
Borden,	Fleming,	Mills,
Bourassa,	Geoffrion,	Olivier,
Brown,	Gillies,	Rymal,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Gillmor,	Scrifer,
Casey,	Gunn,	Skinner,
Coupal,	Guthrie,	Sutherland,
Crouter,	Holton,	Thompson,
Domville,	King,	Trow.—28.
Dumont,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Gigault,	Mongenais,
Anyot,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Montplaisir,
Bannerman,	Girouard (Kent),	Mousseau,
Beauchesne,	Grandbois,	O'Connor,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Ogden,
Bergeron,	Hackett,	Quimet,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Plumb,
Bowell,	Homer,	Poupore,
Brecken,	Hooper,	Richey,
Bunster,	Houde,	Rochester,
Bunting,	Hurteau,	Ross (Dundas),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Rouleau,
Caron,	Kilvert,	Routhier,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Kranz,	Ryan (Montreal),
Costigan,	Landry,	Shultz,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Sproule,
Currier,	Lantier,	Stephenson,
Outhbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tellier,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tilley,
Daoust,	McCallum,	Vallee,
Dawson,	McQuaig,	Vanasse,
DeCosmos,	McDougald,	Wade,
Desaulniers,	McDougall,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Elliott,	McLeod,	Wallace (York),
Farrow,	McRory,	White (Caldwell),
Ferguson,	Manson,	White (Hastings),
Fitzsimmons,	Massue,	Williams,
Fortin,	Merner,	Wright.—87.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House resumed the consideration of Resolution 333,

Damages to the *M. C. Upper*..... \$8,000

Mr. MILLS. The hon. Minister, when he proposed this item, said it constituted a moral claim against the Government. I understood him to indicate that the arbitrators had recommended the payment of this sum, and the hon. Minister of Justice said there was no legal claim. In reading over the papers I do not find any statements to bear out the observations made by the hon. Minister. Such is not done either by the letter of the Deputy Minister of Justice on the 29th May, 1879, or by his communication of 10th October last. Those statements

having been made to the House, it is obvious that the Minister has no grounds on which he asks the House for an appropriation. It will be a gross abuse of the power of the Government, especially when the proprietor of this vessel is a member of this House, to pay him a sum of money to which he has no legal claim and respecting which the arbitrators concurred in the decision arrived at by the hon. Minister of Justice and his Deputy; except it be that Mr. McCallum is a supporter of the Administration, and because he is a supporter of the Administration he is to be dealt with in a way different from other claimants. I therefore move:

That the said Resolution be not concurred in, but that it be resolved, that the question of the liability of the Crown for injury done to the *M. C. Upper* was reported upon by the Minister of Justice as follows:—

OTTAWA, 10th October, 1881.

Re claim *L. McCallum*.

SIR,—As requested in your communication of the 20th September, I have considered this case with reference to the liability of the Crown re this claim. In my opinion the Crown is not liable. Treating the case as one between subject and subject, and giving to the claimant the same rights against the Crown that he would have were his claim against a subject, it is clear that unless the accident were caused by the defective state of the lock gates or by the negligence of the officers of the Canal, there would be no liability to indemnify Mr. McCallum for the losses sustained. The finding of the official arbitrators seems to be unanimous that the accident was caused by the negligence of those in charge of the steamer *Louise* and not by the defective condition of the gates. The Crown cannot be made answerable for the mismanagement of the *Louise*. Papers returned.

(Signed) Z. A. LASH,
"D. M. J.

"I concur in this opinion.

(Signed) A. CAMPBELL,
"M. of J.

"To F. BRAUN,

"Sec. R. & C. Dept.;"

And that the proposals under these circumstances to pay the sum of \$8,000 to L. McCallum, the owner of the said steamer *M. C. Upper*, is wrong and would establish a dangerous precedent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am much surprised that the hon. member who has put this resolution should have made a statement which I think was unworthy of him, and that is that the claimant in this case being a member of this House had influenced the appropriation which has now been submitted to Parliament. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he would consider me unwarranted in the statement that Mr. Thompson, a late member of this House, had influence enough with my predecessor to reduce a charge for damage done by the schooner *Louise*, about which there was no question, from \$1,100 to \$600. That is on record. It is to be found in the papers laid on the Table of the House, that Mr. Bodwell, superintendent of the Welland Canal, estimated the damage to Mr. Battle, owner of the schooner *Louise*, at \$1,100, and that after a long, deliberate and careful examination of the question the Minister of Public Works, my predecessor, directed the Inland Revenue to collect that sum. Was the Minister of Justice so instructed to collect it? It was not collected.

"In the matter of the Queen vs. Battle for Lock Damages.

SIR,—I herewith enclose you, certified, a check for \$600, being the sum agreed upon between you and Mr. Thompson, M.P. I regret not having sent it sooner, but things have been very hard on shipping and money very scarce.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN BATTLE,
"per Son.

Hon. ALRX. MACKENZIE,
"Minister of Public Works, Ottawa."

If I should say there is clear and positive evidence from the hon. gentleman's own Department that a man who legitimately owed the Government of the country \$1,100, upon whose claim the Minister of Justice, after careful consideration, reported estimating that he had inflicted \$1,100 of damage, was able, through the influence of a supporter of this House, to take off \$500 that was due to the public, while

the Minister of Justice had been instructed to recover the whole amount; yet, Sir, I would have a great deal more reason to make that statement than the hon. gentleman to make the statement which he has made. I do not make it; I do not assume for a moment that the hon. gentleman who was then Minister of Public Works was influenced to act unfairly and unjustly to the Treasury by a supporter in this House. I believe he was convinced by the evidence submitted to him that the charge against Mr. Battle had been overestimated, because, on careful consideration, he found from the testimony that there was reason to believe that the defective condition of the lock gates was such as to compel the Government to assume part of the damage; that if the lock gates had been in a sound and perfect condition, they would have withstood the contact of the schooner and the damage would not have occurred, and in consequence of that belief he reduced that amount, and that had great weight in the subsequent consideration of this question. Under these circumstances the gentleman who had suffered a loss, which is not disputed in consequence of this action, of \$8,000—for there is no dispute about that—all the parties are agreed that the damage sustained by the *M. C. Upper* was \$7,997 or about \$8,000. That is admitted.

Mr. BLAKE. Who admits it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Every person who has examined it. I read the arbitrators' report, and on that point there is no doubt. It is claimed in this case that the Government themselves had admitted the defective condition of the lock gates by reducing the claim which the Minister of Justice of that day had him instructed to collect. The claim was put in and it was sent to the Minister of Justice. Here is his report, which is to the effect that the question is an appropriate one to refer to one or all of the arbitrators. The hon. gentleman has read the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice who, instead of saying that there is no ground for the claim, says this is a proper case to refer to arbitrators. We took the proper course of getting the testimony, and the most convenient mode; we referred the case to one of the arbitrators, Mr. Buchanan, who made an elaborate report. He gave the whole of the testimony and the report of Mr. Bodwell, and he reported against the claim. The matter would have rested there, but for the fact that I sent Mr. Buchanan's report to the Deputy Minister of Justice? And what did he say? Did he say that he quite agreed upon the soundness of Mr. Buchanan's report? Nothing of the kind. There is his report declaring that Mr. Buchanan had come to his conclusion in the face of the testimony, that if it was a case before one of the arbitrators he had a right to appeal to the whole Board. He says:

"If it was a case before the courts, between subject and subject, the finding of Mr. Buchanan is so obviously in antagonism with the facts that the Court would at once set aside the decision and give Mr. McCallum the right to have it tried over again. I have the declaration of Mr. Lash, in the first place, that this is a fit case for arbitration; and I have the express declaration from him, in the second place, that the finding of one arbitrator is wrong, and consequently I am bound under that declaration to send it to the full Board."

And what was the result? The majority of the arbitrators came to the conclusion that as the claimant had sustained a loss without any negligence on his part, amounting to \$8,000, and that he is not in the slightest degree to blame, that he had paid his dues, and that he was entitled to expect that his vessel would go through in safety. The hon. gentleman says they did not find in favor of the payment of the claim. They say they are unprepared to deal with the question of loss, but they declare that Mr. McCallum has suffered a loss of \$8,000, and they recommend that loss, under all the circumstances, to the favorable consideration of the Government. The hon. gentleman will see that by the statement of the Deputy Minister of Justice, it was a proper case for

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

arbitration, and according to his opinion the finding against Mr. McCallum was contrary to the testimony, and he ought to have an appeal to the full Board. We gave him an appeal to the full Board, and we now submit the question for the consideration of Parliament. I am a good deal surprised, after looking carefully over the testimony, that the Board did not distinctly find that the rotten and defective condition of the gates caused the accident, and that Mr. McCallum had a strictly legal claim. Mr. Bodwell, on further examination, very largely modified his testimony in the matter. I shall lay upon the Table of the House Mr. Buchanan's report against the claim, the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice that Mr. Buchanan's finding was contrary to the evidence and that it was a case to refer to arbitration, the testimony taken, and the opinion of the full Board. Mr. Lash said:

"I may mention, however, that Mr. McCallum, the owner of the *M. C. Upper*, had an interview with me on the subject. He states that the accident was caused, not by the carelessness of those in charge of the other vessel, but because the gates of the canal were rotten, and not fit for their purpose. He further states that he can show that those in charge of his vessel were in no way to blame for the accident.

"These are matters of fact upon which I can offer no opinion; but I think the case is one which it would be proper for the Minister, should he think fit to do so, to refer to one or more of the official arbitrators for examination and report under the 3rd section of the Act, 41st Vic., ch. 8.

"It is evident that the true facts of the case can never be known by the Government unless they are enquired into by some tribunal having power to summon witnesses and examine them upon oath."

Well, witnesses were called, Mr. Buchanan reported his finding against the claim, and with reference to that Mr. Lash says:

"I have carefully considered the evidence taken by Mr. Buchanan, one of the official arbitrators in the above matter, and his report thereon.

"The reference which you have made of the case does not specify any particular question upon which my opinion is asked.

"I presume, therefore, that an opinion is desired upon the whole matter.

"Treating the Government as if they were a private company owning the Welland Canal, with authority to collect tolls from vessels using the same, and treating this claim as if it were an action brought by Mr. McCallum in Court against the owners of the canal for the damages sustained by his vessel, and treating Mr. Buchanan's report as if it were the verdict of a jury, I have come to the conclusion that under the evidence in this case, the Court would set aside the verdict and order a new trial before another jury.

"Mr. McCallum's claim is based upon the contention that the lock gates which gave way after being struck by the boat *Louise*, were not reasonably fit for the purpose of the canal, and that had they been in proper repair, they would not have given way under the blow from the *Louise*, and that consequently the injury to his boat would not have been caused, and that the blow from the *Louise* was not greater than the gates, if in a proper state, should have withstood.

"The Government base their defence upon two grounds:—1st. That Mr. McCallum's boat was moored in an improper place in the canal, and contrary to one of the canal regulations. 2nd. That the gates were in good order and reasonably fit for the purpose of the canal, and for the safety of vessels therein.

"Upon the evidence taken before Mr. Buchanan there seems to be little doubt that the first contention of the Government was not sustained.

"Had the reference to Mr. Buchanan been made to him for an award instead of merely for an enquiry and report, Mr. McCallum would, under the statute in that behalf, have been entitled, without the consent of the Government, to appeal to the full board of arbitrators.

"Were I quite satisfied with Mr. Buchanan's finding upon the evidence, I would not recommend the reopening of the case. I think, however, that the Department would hardly be justified without first obtaining the report of the full Board of Arbitrators upon the question of fact involved in absolutely repudiating Mr. McCallum's claim on the strength of Mr. Buchanan's report alone, because as abovementioned. I think, had it been the verdict of a jury, the Court would have set it aside and ordered a new trial. In making a new reference to the full Board of Arbitrators for enquiry and report, the Department will be doing no more than Mr. McCallum would have had a right to do, had the case come before Mr. Buchanan in a different shape. I think, therefore, that if the claimant desires it, a reference to the full Board should be made."

After the statement of the Deputy Minister of Justice, I think every hon. gentleman will see that the Government had no other alternative but to refer the question to the full Board; and I would ask what position would we occupy if,

having made this reference under the strong statement of the Deputy Minister of Justice, that the finding of Mr. Buchanan was contrary to the evidence the full Board had found, that Mr. McCallum had sustained damage, had not contributed to it himself and was fairly entitled to be paid. I do not intend, at this late period of the Session, to occupy much time; but I will read that portion of the testimony upon which I expressed my surprise that the Board could have found otherwise than that the defective condition of the gates had largely contributed to this accident. Having gone carefully into the evidence, I have not the shadow of a doubt that the gates were not in a proper and efficient condition to resist such contact with the schooner *Louise* which, if sound, they would have resisted; and if that is the case it is unquestionable that Mr. McCallum's claim is not only just and equitable, but a legal claim as well. The arbitrators say:

"As to the first grounds taken by Mr. Bodwell we respectfully refer you to the evidence itself, and to that particularly of Bernard Clark with respect to the condition of the gates. With regard to there being no neglect of duty on the part of the officials we are not in a position to form any entirely satisfactory opinion."

The official report says further:

"In this connection we desire to call your attention to the evidence of McAvoy and Ferris as to the direct cause of the accident, each assigning a different cause and one contradictory of the other. It is unfortunate that the only person who could corroborate either McAvoy or Ferris is the lock-tender, McTaggart, who was in charge of the lock at the time of the accident, and who has died since it occurred, and sometime before the investigation was held. Coming now to the second and third grounds taken by Mr. Bodwell, it will be found that they are not borne out by the evidence. All the witnesses testify that the *M. C. Upper* was in her proper place, and where vessels are regularly moored, and there is no evidence to show that the men in charge of the *M. C. Upper* were in any way contributory to the damage she sustained. Mr. McCallum, moreover, contends that by the Government's redeeming Battle's bond, and by the giving it up, and the payment of the small sum of \$600, they virtually admitted the unsound condition of the gates of lock 21. There is no doubt whatever upon the minds of the arbitrators but that Mr. McCallum has sustained a loss of nearly \$8,000 by the damage caused to the *M. C. Upper*. We have, however, thought it desirable to group together in this report those portions of the evidence bearing upon the cause of the accident, and of the condition of the gates prior to its occurrence."

Mr. John D. Smith, a man thoroughly competent and able to speak on the subject, says:

"He remembers the break in the Welland Canal in 1874. He noticed the condition of the gates. Took notice of one gate which was jammed between the *M. C. Upper* and the lock and noticed a portion of the gate decayed and rotten. He saw that portion of another gate on the heel-path side was decayed, and he could pull out rotten timber of the heel-posts with his hands. Formerly, the practice was to let the gate go until knocked out, and some vessel pay for them. Within the last two or three years, they take them out and replace them with new ones. Has known gates to be in such a decayed condition as to fall out of their own accord. Has known the upper gates of a lock to be forced open by a vessel striking them and then close again without doing any damage. If the gates were rotten and a vessel was to strike them they would be liable to go out."

"John Battle says he noticed the condition of the gates at the time the *Louise* struck them or broke through. Saw the balance beam and heel posts of two of them, which were decayed. This is where the collar or anchor comes around the heel-post, and it is a very important part of the gate, from the strain coming upon it. He noticed the head gate of the heel path side particularly decayed. He says that he contended before the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie that the gates were rotten; that Mr. Mackenzie reduced the amount of the bond to \$500, and he made this reduction on the representation that two or three of the gates were carried away by the schooner *Louise* in 1874. The gate could be very much decayed and still stand up. He discovered that the heel-post of the lower gate was shattered by reversing and considerably decayed. In answer to the question, 'Is it not at all likely that the gates spoken of would have remained useful for years had it not been for the collision?' he replies: 'I think one of the foot gates should have been removed before. With this exception, the gates might serve the purpose for some time.' He speaks also of a portion of the lock gates that were as rotten as punk and dozey."

"Mathew Battle swears that the accident would not have occurred had the gates been sound. From the general appearance of the gates it would not take much force of a vessel to break them."

Now, I need not trouble the House any longer with the evidence for the claim. I will now briefly refer to the testimony of some parties who were examined for the defence.

Jas. Dill, called by the Government to resist the claim, says:

"Has been employed on the canal since 1850. Both upper and lower gates were all broken in two and held together by the irons. They were broken between the second and fourth girths and one of the heel-posts was broken off short at the collar—twisted off or shivered about two feet from the top. This heel-post was a little affected, but sound at heart. It was affected about two or three inches deep from the outside—it was kind of dead like and spongy pretty much all the way around the post from the collar up. This would materially weaken the gate above the water. The collar is right at the water's edge or surface. There is stress or strain upon the heel-post above the collar on a vessel entering the lock, or in settling down in the lock. If the gates had not been struck, thinks they would have lasted. Does not think the gates were broken by reason of their own defects. The late Robert Collier was superintendent at the time of the break, and witness was in no way responsible, he thinks, for any defects that might exist in the gates of the lock. On being examined, this witness says there is a constant strain on the gates in the ordinary locking of vessels; that every vessel coming into the lock strikes the gate more or less—they could not come in without doing so. Gates have to be built very strong to stand the wear and tear and be safe. The size of the heel-post is sixteen inches. If a sixteen-inch heel-post was rotten all round for two or three inches on the outside, it would weaken it to the extent of two-thirds. It is important that every part of the gate should be in good condition for the safety of navigation. The principal cause of the gate being taken out of lock No. 21 was on account of something being wrong with the valve, and it was somewhat defective otherwise. Did not consider it fit for anything after being taken out except for the old iron. This is not worth a great deal when in the lock, but could work the lock with it. It was taken out for the safety and despatch of navigation. If the lower gates were chained to the coping so as to keep them in the recess until a vessel was snubbed, think it would prevent their being carried away in the event of the upper gates being carried away. He understands there is an invention of this kind, but has not seen it. If this arrangement had been in use at the time of the break, there would not have been more than one pair of gates carried away. The expense of such an arrangement to each gate would be \$5.00. A gate in use for ten years would be worth nothing but the old iron; gates last from ten to fifteen years; some not so long. The gate first taken out of lock 12 in 1878, was only a little rotten above water; the second gate was perfectly sound where it was broken. These gates could not have been broken if properly mitred. Considers these gates were fit for navigation if properly handled. The foot gates put in at the same time are there yet. No record has been kept of the age of gates prior to 1873, and of his own knowledge could not tell the age of any gates on the canal previous to that year. The gates in lock 12 broke without, to his knowledge, being struck by a vessel. Examined the gates in spring of 1874 and reported them all right. Mr. Collier told him that it would not pay to put a new valve in the gate broken out of lock 21 in 1873, and put it in again, as it had been in use seven or eight years."

The reason why he did not put back a gate seven or eight years old was because it was Mr. Collier's orders. Mr. Collier was a good judge whether the gate was fit to go back in the lock again for use. John McAuley, lock-tender on lock 21, was sworn. In reply to the question:

"Did you have a great deal of trouble during the ten years that the head gates were in lock 21 up to the time of the second break in July, 1874?" he said: "It was hard on account of the leakage of the lower gates, which would not mitre close at the bottom, which accounts for their defective condition."

Bernard Clarke, of Merriton, lock-tender, said:

"Has been lock-tender and working in yard for twenty-three years. Remember the break in the gates in July, 1874. Was there soon after and helped to take the gates out. He found them in a half-worn state. In his opinion three of them would have stood for some years with ordinary care, but the fourth was pretty much worn. The one spoken of was an upper gate. Did not particularly notice what portion of that gate was broken, but gates generally break in girths above the valves or bottom girths. The tow-post and the gates generally were in a bad condition when he helped to repair them. Had to put on repair bands to hold the gate together. In his opinion the gate spoken of should have been taken out for the safety of navigation. If the canal had been his own he would have taken them out."

And that is one of the witnesses brought by the Crown to resist the claim, and I think the hon. gentleman will be satisfied with that evidence. I am sorry that it was not before the House sooner. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw the motion he has made, on reading this evidence, and on the fact that the Board concluded the accident was entirely caused by the rotten condition of the gates. Mr. Bodwell says:

"Saw some decay in the heel post of the head gate on the heel-path side and in the balance beams or fillings. The decay was mainly above

the collar and the heel-posts were split or broken. As far as the decay in the balance beams and fillings are concerned it was in both gates. If the gates were mitred, the posts would not have likely given way with the pressure of the water; but if the gates were not mitred they would have given way under any circumstances."

It appears the gates were not mitred. Further on he says:

"Believes three of the gates would have been in two or three years and not eight years as stated in his report of October, 1874, that is to say, the two upper gates and the lower one. Says that the evidence indicates to him that the *M. C. Upper* was farther from the lock at the time of the break than his officers reported her to be, and that the gates had been two years longer in use."

He corrects his first impression as to the contributory negligence on the part of the *M. C. Upper* and corrects his first impression as to the sound condition of the gates. What was the result of all this? The hon. gentleman said that the Board had not found in favor of the justice of this claim. I ask him again, what other construction can possibly be given to this statement? They say:

"In coming to the conclusion that the damage to the *M. C. Upper* was directly caused by the mismanagement of those on board the schooner *Louise* and not by the generally defective condition of the gates of lock 21 on the Welland Canal; still considering the very contradictory evidence—the fact that the Government virtually admitted the unsound condition of the gates by reducing the amount of Battle's bond in settlement with him—the fact that there is no corroborative evidence in support of either McAvoy's or Ferris's different statements as to the cause of the accident in consequence of the death of McTaggart, the lock-tender, the only party present—the fact that the *M. C. Upper* was moored in the proper place and the absence of any proof that her lines were not taut—the fact that Mr. McCallum had paid his canal dues and that there was no negligence contributory or otherwise on his part or on the part of those acting for or under him at the time of the accident; we have also come to the conclusion that there are substantial and fair grounds for the favorable consideration of the claim."

This is signed by those present, Messrs. Compton, Buchanan and Simard. After every means was taken by the Government to resist the claim, after hearing the full evidence on the whole question, I ask the hon. gentleman whether, with the declaration of the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Lash, assuming that a purely legal claim was not made out that could be sustained, the Government could do otherwise, as an honest Government, than come here and present the claim. The arbitrators had found that fair and substantial grounds existed for the payment of the loss sustained. Had the loss been incurred by a gentleman on the other side, the Government would have no alternative than to do what they have done, to do that fair and substantial justice, that their own officers—not an ordinary arbitration in which the claimant names one arbitrator and the Crown another, but an arbitration conducted before the officers of the Government, men entirely independent of any influence that could be brought to bear on them by the parties—declared should be done. Our own officers declared it was a question of arbitration, and the arbitrators unanimously came to the conclusion that there were fair and substantial grounds for the payment of the loss sustained, which loss occurred without the slightest contributory negligence on the part of the plaintiff.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has placed before the House partially, by reading, some of the papers which he did not submit to its consideration at an earlier period. I need hardly say it is utterly impossible to analyze those papers, from the hon. gentleman's perusal of such parts as seem to him to be material to the question. The report of the Department of Justice—the last papers so far as we know on this subject—is dated as long ago as the 29th October last. The hon. gentleman did not bring down this amount in the original estimates. It came down about the same time as the Redistribution Bill, very late in the Session, and when it was brought forward in Committee, where we had the only opportunity for discussion, the hon. gentleman was not prepared with any papers, so far as I am aware. I was not in my place at the time, but the information I received was that there was a discussion, and the hon. gentle-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

man promised to place some papers at the disposition of the hon. member for Centre Huron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was asked for certain papers, and the papers I was asked for were given.

Mr. BLAKE. This side of the House did not know what papers were material. The hon. gentleman knew, and he sent across the House and placed at our disposal two papers and no more. When the item came on for discussion the hon. gentleman was not in his place, and an amendment was asked on these papers that were here. It was pointed out distinctly that all the information furnished to this House did not justify, but on the contrary rendered wholly improper this item in the Estimates. Then the hon. First Minister proposed that the item should stand, inasmuch as the hon. member was not in his place. To-day, without laying the other papers on the Table, the hon. Minister of Railways causes concurrence to be moved on that item. He takes advantage to read part of the arbitrators' report and argues from that he justifies his position. I say that is a wholly improper mode of dealing with this House. If the material on which the hon. gentleman relies is not to be submitted to us, except by his reading such parts of it as he deems fit to read, it is obvious we are asked to concur in an item of the particulars of which we are not fully cognizant. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has agreed that the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice suggesting a reference justifies his action. I deny it. The Deputy Minister of Justice says that upon the papers before him there is no claim, but he says: "Mr. McCallum had an interview with him, and represented to him that the accident was caused, not by the carelessness of those in charge of the *Louise*, but because the lock gates were bad and not fit for that purpose, and he can show that those in charge of his vessel were in no way to blame." There was the issue. What appeared to the Deputy Minister was that this accident was caused by the accident of the *Louise*; what Mr. McCallum said to him was: "That is not the case, this accident was caused by the defective condition of the lock gates, not by the mismanagement of those in charge of the *Louise*." Well, says the Deputy Minister, "It is a question of fact upon which I can offer no opinion, and I suggest a reference to one or more of the official arbitrators in order that the evidence can be taken, and that they may have the facts properly brought before them upon which a conclusion may be reached." The hon. Minister was perfectly right in referring the case, in order that the suggestion of the Deputy Minister might be carried out. I agree with that. Then the Minister says that he referred it to the Board of Arbitrators, who found in a manner that was not satisfactory to the Deputy Minister. We have not that evidence before us, we have not got that report, but we have the hon. gentleman's perusal. Well, I assume for the purposes of the case that the report warranted a reference back to the full Board on the question. Then we have not got the evidence which was taken before the full Board; but the hon. gentleman reads only a portion of the report of the full Board, extracts from evidence tending to show that the condition of the lock gates was bad. Well, now, suppose they were bad, that is a matter wholly immaterial if this accident was not due to that but to the mismanagement of the *Louise*. The question is whether the accident was due to the mismanagement of the *Louise* or to the defective condition of the lock gates; if it was due to the mismanagement of the *Louise*, then the question ends. Although the hon. gentleman read the evidence, and extracts from the reports bearing on the defective condition of the lock gates, he does not read any portion of the evidence, and but a scrap of that part of the report which deals with the mismanagement of the *Louise*. We did not hear that. It is not told us what the arbitrators found. What do they say? Once again I will read over the conclusion, but before doing so I will ask why these papers were referred to the Department of Jus-

tice? What was the object of sending this whole budget of papers to them? The hon. Minister holds that he was absolutely bound in the earlier stages of this matter to do just what the Department of Justice said he should do. But he does what the Department says he should not do, and he has not uttered a single syllable with reference to that which forms this motion. He has not said one word upon that report of the hon. Minister of Justice which is embodied in the motion in your hands. He has ignored it as completely as if there was no such report, as completely as he has ignored those portions of the report of the arbitrators which speak of the conduct of the *Louise* as I assume. I have not had the opportunity of reading them, and have not had these advantages which the hon. member for North Victoria has had of reading the evidence and the reports. To certain favored members of this House that information is communicated, but not to the *hoi polloi*, not to the rank and file, not to the general mass of us; but from the information which is vouchsafed to the bulk of us, we hear nothing in particular about the mismanagement of the *Louise*. Now, once again, let us read that document which, though read and re-read by hon. friends in their argument, read by you, Sir, when you read the motion, seems to have escaped attention to-night, as it seems to have escaped the attention of the Minister of Railways. Let us read it once again, so that it may be impressed upon his mind, so that it may be answered by somebody as requested in your communication:

"*Re claim L. McCallum.*—As regards the question in your communication of the 29th September, I have considered this case with respect to the liability of the Crown for the claim. In my opinion the Crown is not liable, viewing the case as one between subject and subject, giving the claimant the same justice against the Crown as he would have against the subject; and it is clear that unless the accident was caused by the imperfect state of the lock gates or by the officers of the canal, there would be no liability to indemnify Mr. McCallum for the loss sustained."

Now, there Mr. McCallum is put in as favorable a position as it is possible for the Department to put him. A grave question immediately arises as to his being put in so favorable a position, because the Crown not infrequently occupies a position more favorable than the subject in such cases. But to avoid all questions on that subject, to avoid all doubt, the Department of Justice, for the purposes of the case, waives any consideration of the point whether the Crown occupied a higher position in resisting the demand of Mr. McCallum than a private individual would under like circumstances, and he says: "We put aside all considerations of that kind, and we supposed it was Mr. McCallum or Mr. Jones or Mr. Smith that were here contesting." And the question is whether if it had been Mr. Jones or Mr. Smith instead of Her Majesty, Mr. McCallum would have had a legal demand against him. Well, what do they answer:

"The finding of the official arbitrators seems to be unanimous that the accident was caused by the negligence of those in charge of the steamer *Louise* and not by the defective condition of the gates. The Crown cannot be made answerable for the mismanagement of the *Louise*.—Z. LASH. 'I concur in this opinion.—ALEX CAMPBELL.'"

Now, Sir, I claim that the hon. gentleman, even in his early exposition of the case, has not read that portion of the report which tends to establish this statement of the Deputy Minister, concurred in by the Minister of Justice, which states that the unanimous finding was because of the mismanagement of those in charge of the *Louise* and not of the defective condition of the gates. "The Crown," he says, "cannot be made answerable for the mismanagement of the *Louise*; papers returned;" and the Deputy Minister and the Minister concur in that view. Now, Sir, I maintain that that opinion, based upon the assumption upon which it is based, but which we have nothing to contradict, is obviously correct, and the steamer *Louise* was so mismanaged as to cause this accident to the schooner. Then Mr. McCallum has a remedy against the owners of the *Louise*, but he has no remedy against the

Crown, no matter how defective may have been the condition of the gates. I care not how defective the condition of the gates may be; if this accident was not due to that but to the mismanagement of the *Louise*, then he has his remedy against her and not against the Crown. I have before me a statement of the Minister of Justice, of a Minister of this same Government, who brings down this vote, to the effect that it is the unanimous finding of the arbitrators that this accident was caused by the mismanagement of the *Louise* and not to the defective condition of the lock gates. Now, Sir, that finding is entirely consistent with the gates being defective. What is material is to ascertain what caused the accident. Now, that was the issue at the start. Mr. McCallum tendered that issue to the Deputy Minister. When he first saw him he said it was the defective condition of the gates, and not the mismanagement of the *Louise*, that caused the accident. Then he goes to the arbitrators, and they find unanimously it was the defective condition of the gates and also another cause, namely, the mismanagement of the *Louise*, to which the accident was due; and it being the mismanagement of the *Louise* the Crown is not liable, as of course it is not. Well, the hon. gentleman has said that the circumstance that there was a reduction in the assessed liability of the *Louise* to the Government is an indication that the gates were defective.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The arbitrators say that unanimously.

Mr. BLAKE. I said the hon. gentleman made that statement. It may be so, but the hon. gentleman confounded the two questions. I dare say that the hon. Minister of Public Works of that day was of opinion that old debts were not equal to new ones, that old gates were not equal to new ones, and that the ordinary assessment of damages was not sufficiently taken into account. That has nothing, however, to do with the case. It is a question how much damage was done by the *Louise* to the lock gates. What took place forms an important element in determining the amount of damages; and if it was found that much damage was done by that vessel the damages to be paid by the Government should be so much less. It will be remembered there was a reduction in that assessment, and that fact was attributed to the political relations existing between the hon. member for Welland and the Government. I recollect that letter being read, and that hon. gentleman being charged with being guilty of prostituting his office. What is really before this House is whether on the papers upon which we have to form a judgment—as we have not had the advantage the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) had of perusing all the papers—we are able to arrive at a conclusion in accord with the Board of Arbitrators, that they found that the accident was due to the *Louise* and not to the circumstances that the lock gates were defective. That being so, it is immaterial whether the lock gates were defective or not. I say that the Minister of Justice found—the hon. gentleman has not given me an opportunity of contrasting the reports as he has not read the parts which bear on the case, but he has read those parts which do not bear on the case and which he wants to bear on the case, and he finds he cannot tell about a question of negligence, but the arbitrators have found the cause of the accident. They found unanimously it was due not to the mismanagement of officers of the Government, but to those in charge of the *Louise*, and that the accident was not due to the defective condition of the lock gates. I presume the hon. gentleman agreed with his colleagues. If the Government had disagreed they would have referred the report back for a reason, as was done by the Minister of Militia towards General Luard in the Ross case. The report of the arbitrators in this case, however, stands as a final document. The Deputy Minister of Justice had the claim early before

him. The answer is given that there is no claim in the evidence before him, but Mr. McCallum says that circumstances exist, including the defective condition of the lock gates, which demanded investigation, and the Deputy Minister recommended the investigation. The Government proceeded to investigate. The report was not satisfactory and it was sent to the full Board. After all the facts had been investigated the arbitrators decided that the loss was due not to the circumstance that the lock gates were defective, but that it was due to the mismanagement of the *Louise*. Upon that report this item is indefensible, and I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Reference has been made by the hon. leader of the Opposition that I possessed the advantage of having read through the evidence of the three arbitrators. I have read that evidence very carefully and also the evidence taken before the single arbitrator, and also the reports made by the hon. Minister and Deputy Minister on the subject, and I have no hesitation in expressing the conclusion to which I have arrived in my own mind, that a clear and valid claim was established by the evidence of Mr. McCallum. The hon. leader of the Opposition no doubt evidently has laid down perfectly correctly the rule, that if the accident was caused by negligence on the part of the officers of the *Louise*, Mr. McCallum's claim would be against the proprietors of that vessel. But the evidence shows not only that there was carelessness on the part of the *Louise*, but also that the lock gates were so defective that except for that negligence on the part of the officers of the *Louise* no injury would have occurred to the *Upper*. That is the real point in the case. Here is a matter in which two cases of neglect were shown, first, on the part of the officers of the *Louise*, and second, on the part of the Government in allowing the lock gates to be in such a condition that they could not resist any great pressure. If the lock gates had been in a proper condition they would have been able to resist the pressure and no injury would have occurred. It was the negligence of the Government officers in having defective lock gates that really caused the accident. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to the finding of the arbitrators, and has charged the hon. Minister with garbling it, and reading only those parts that suited his purpose. The whole of the finding of the arbitrators, except what is a mere recital of evidence, was read by the hon. Minister.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but he did not read any evidence as to the mismanagement of the *Louise*.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That is beside the question. Nobody denies that there was negligence on the part of the officers of the *Louise*, but the point is whether the mismanagement of the *Louise* was such that if the lock gates had been in good condition the *Upper* would have been damaged, and the evidence shows that it was the defective condition of the lock gates which caused the damage, though it originated in the first place by the mismanagement of the *Louise*. I will again read the whole finding of the arbitrators:

"In coming to the conclusion that the damage to the *M. C. Upper* was directly caused by the mismanagement of those on board the schooner *Louise*, and not by the generally defective condition of the gates of lock 21 on the Welland Canal; still considering the very contradictory evidence, and the fact that the Government virtually admitted the unsound condition of the gates by reducing the amount of *Battle's* bond in settlement with them—the fact that there is no corroborative evidence in support of either *McAvoy's* or *Ferris's* different statements as to the cause of the accident, in consequence of the death of *McTaggart*, the lock-tender, the only other party present—the fact that the *M. C. Upper* was moored in the proper place, and the absence of any proof that her lines were not taut—the fact that Mr. McCallum had paid his canal dues, and that there was no negligence contributory or otherwise on his part or on the part of those acting for or under him at the time of the accident; we have also come to the conclusion that there are substantial and fair grounds for the favorable consideration of the claim."

Mr. BLAKE.

Now, I should like to ask the House if that report by the arbitrators, that there was substantial and fair ground for the favorable consideration of the claim, was not sufficient to justify the Government in arriving at the conclusion at which they arrived. The witnesses examined in both cases were the same, and there were no material variations in the evidence they gave. Now, what was the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice on the evidence taken before Mr. Buchanan? It was as follows:—

"Treating the Government as if they were a private company owning the Welland Canal, with authority to collect tolls from vessels using the same, and treating this claim as if it were an action brought by Mr. McCallum, in Court, against the owners of the canal, for the damages sustained by the vessel, and treating Mr. Buchanan's report as if it were the verdict of a jury, I have come to the conclusion that under the evidence in this case, the Court would set aside the verdict, and order a new trial before another jury."

My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Court never sets aside a verdict and orders a new trial, unless they come to the conclusion that the evidence does not support the verdict that the jury has arrived at. Mr. Lash reports that the evidence does not satisfy him that Mr. Buchanan's finding was correct, and that if it was before a court they would unhesitatingly order a new trial. That trial was held and the arbitrators made the report which I have read. On these reports, on the evidence which was read by the Minister of Railways, on the recommendation of the three arbitrators that it was a proper case for the favorable consideration of the Government, it seems to me that they were fully justified in making this reparation to Mr. McCallum for the undoubted injury he had sustained and the amount of what was clearly proved to be within a few dollars of \$8,000 and for which damage he was entirely innocent.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Blake,	Fiset,	Mills,
Borden,	Geoffrion,	Olivier,
Bourassa,	Gillies,	Rymal,
Carpe (Sunbury),	Gillmor,	Scriver,
Cartwright,	Holton,	Thompson,
Dumout,	King,	Trow.—18.
NAYS:		
Messieurs		
Allison,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mongenais,
Amyot,	Girouard (Kent),	Montplaisir,
Brker,	Grandbois,	Mousseau,
Bannerman,	Guillet,	O'Connor,
Beauchesne,	Hackett,	Ogden,
Benoit,	Haggart,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Hay,	Quimet,
Bergin,	Homer,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourbeau,	Hooper,	Plumb,
Bowell,	Houde,	Pope (Compton),
Brecken,	Hurteau,	Poupore,
Bunster,	Kaulbach,	Richey,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kirkpatrick,	Rochester,
Caron,	Landry,	Ross (Dundas),
Oimon (Chicoutimi),	Lane,	Rouleau,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Routhier,
Coupal,	Lantier,	Ryaa (Montreal),
Coursol,	Lougley,	Schultz,
Currier,	Macdonald (Kings),	Shaw,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Stephenson,
Daly,	Macmillan,	Tellier,
Daoust,	McOnaig,	Tilley,
Dawson,	McDougald,	Vallee,
Desaulniers,	McDougall,	Vanasse,
Domville,	McLelan,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Elliott,	McLeod,	Wallace (York),
Ferguson,	McRory,	White (Cardwell),
Fitzsimmons,	Manson,	White (Hastings),
Fortin,	Massue,	Williams,
Fulton,	Merner,	Wright.—91.
Gigault,		

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the Resolution to provide for an annual grant of \$150,000, to aid in the de-

velopment of the Sea Fisheries, be read the second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

MARITIME COURT FOR CANADA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in asking the House to consider the message from the Senate on the subject of the establishment of a Maritime Court for Canada, said: I do not know that I can do better than read the Address which the Senate have adopted to Her Majesty on the subject. The address explains its object. The Vice-Admiralty Courts are branches of the High Court of Admiralty in England; the Judges are appointed from England, and we pay them; the process of these Courts is the same obtained in the Court of Admiralty. But their numbers, their form of procedure and their expenses are not at all adequate to our system. The address mentions the fact that there is already a Maritime Court for our inland waters, and states truly enough that we have the power to establish a Vice-Admiralty Court within our own limits, but that we have not the power to try cases on the high seas without special authority from the British Parliament. For these reasons, this Address has been carried in the Senate, and I move:

That this House do concur in the Address of the Senate to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen on the subject of the establishment of a Maritime Court in Canada, by filling up the blank with the words 'and Commons.'

Mr. BLAKE. To the general proposition, Sir, that it is expedient to move in the direction indicated, I have not merely no opposition to offer, but I give my hearty assent. In point of fact, when I was charged with the duty of securing the assent of the Imperial authorities to the establishment of a Maritime Court for our inland waters, I took occasion, as will appear from the printed documents now on our records, to represent that the circumstances of this country called for early attention to the subject, by our own authority, of our maritime jurisdiction by the establishment of courts in substitution for the Vice-Admiralty Courts. I agree with the hon. gentleman in the statement that these courts are anomalies; they are anomalous in that while we pay the Judges, they are nominally, at any rate, appointed upon the advice of the Imperial advisers of Her Majesty, though I believe the course taken is always to accept the suggestion of the authorities in Canada as to the person named for the office. They are anomalous in their existence here at all; and they are even worse than the hon. gentleman has said in practice, because there exists in them the older, more cumbrous, more antiquated, and more expensive system, which has been for a long time got rid of in the Vice-Admiralty Courts of the United Kingdom. Under these circumstances these courts have been practically a blot on our administration of justice. I am told that the business done is very trifling, except in the one at Quebec, which is naturally the seat for a Vice-Admiralty Court—that the business is much smaller than it would be if the process were more modern and the expenses lighter. Because there is a practical grievance, and because we ought to exercise our own powers, I agree in the step; but whether the manner in which that step is to be accomplished is the best manner I may be permitted to express a doubt. My own opinion is, that it would have been better for us to have passed a law—if we were going to address Her Majesty otherwise than by means of the intermediate executive power—to go into force by proclamation, which would have intimated what we believed our degree of jurisdiction was, and then to address Her Majesty to withdraw the Vice-Admiralty Courts. Of course I do not at all mean to say that we should put into force our law while the courts exist, which would be attended with obvious inconvenience. I apprehend, however, that

the course now proposed to be adopted is one that will not be attended with very speedy result. The second point to which I take some exception is this: My belief is that we have, for practical purposes, all the necessary jurisdiction. I am now referring to civil jurisdiction, not to maritime jurisdiction, because that I think we should not ask for; it would be exercised only in time of war, and should belong to an Imperial Court. But if our power be defective, as this Address admits, my opinion is that we should specify in the Address what powers they are which we do not possess, but which we think we ought to possess. The invitation to Her Majesty to grant us such further powers as Her Majesty thinks expedient is not likely to have any very abundant fruits. We leave to the Colonial authorities and the Admiralty authorities to decide what in their opinion they ought to grant us. Now, that is a very difficult investigation, and an uncertain manner of disposing of the question. I think it will be found, when we come to deal with the answer to our action upon this Address, that the circumstance that we have not fully considered what the extent of our own jurisdiction is, that we have not decided wherein, if at all, it is defective, and that we have not asked plainly and definitely for instructions, if any, as we require, in order to make a Vice-Admiralty system for civil jurisdiction, will lead to delay and still more unsatisfactory results.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and it might be subject of consideration whether the two steps could not be taken together; whether, when the Address goes to England, the hon. Minister of Justice could not address himself to a specification of the jurisdiction which such a court, if established, ought to possess in Canada. The great advantage of, it seems to me, the necessity for an Address to Her Majesty is this: that supposing we have all sufficient jurisdiction with reference to the Maritime Courts, that does not do away with the Vice-Admiralty Court, or with the right of the Admiralty to establish those courts; and if we should have two jurisdictions vicious parties might go into the old court for the sake of delay.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly. I do not object to that.

Mr. MILLS. We ought to distinguish between asking Her Majesty to withdraw this jurisdiction, exercised by the Court of Admiralty, and asking for permission to establish such a court ourselves. In my opinion we have that power already. The British North America Act contains a provision that we should provide for military and naval defence. It is perfectly obvious that the power of legislating as to what any Canadian colonist may do, beyond the marine league, is vested in this Parliament. While I, therefore, concur in the object of the Premier, to get rid of the Imperial Courts and their jurisdiction here, and that jurisdiction should be exercised on all those subjects by courts established by the Parliament of Canada, I do not feel disposed to ask for powers that we already possess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Suppose the English Attorney-General should disagree with you?

Mr. MILLS. That is a fair subject for discussion; but it would be inconvenient to give up your own case and admit that you have no right. It would be very much easier to give up the English jurisdiction than to acquire jurisdiction from England, if we were to admit we do not possess it. We should say to the Imperial Government: "We have power given us by you, but we cannot exercise that power conveniently so long as your Imperial Courts remain with us. We ask you, therefore, to withdraw your authority that we may exercise the authority already given to us."

Motion agreed to.

NORTH WEST TERRITORIES ACT, 1880.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 149) to remove certain doubts as to the effect of the North West Territories Act, 1880, said: This Bill is to amend the Act in connection with the establishment of the Government, including the 38th and 39th Victoria, and the North-West Territories Act of 1880. They are all the same Act, in fact, and may be considered as consolidated. But, rightly or wrongly, some of the Stipendiary Magistrates have come to the conclusion the last Act only has effect, from the time it was passed—that there is no consolidation. The 3rd section is to correct the 9th sub-section of the 9th clause of the last Act, by striking out the words “having jurisdiction in the North-West Territories.” These words “having jurisdiction in the North-West” are not necessary. It should run: “before any Stipendiary Magistrate or Justice of the Peace,” otherwise a Justice of the Peace of the District of Keewatin would be excluded.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say what would be the practical effect of this?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was held that the previous Acts were repealed by this Act, that the Act did not apply to any transaction that occurred between the passing of the first Act and the last.

Mr. BLAKE. What the hon. gentleman wants, I suppose, is not to apply the provisions of the North-West Act of 1880 to those old transactions, but to keep the old law for the old transactions and the new one for the new.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the object.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

PATENT ACT OF 1872.

Mr. POPE, in moving second reading of Bill (No. 155) to amend the Patent Act of 1872, said: This amendment is simply to place a patentee, in respect to importing into Canada the thing patented, in the same position as that in which he was placed by the amendment of 1875, in respect to the manufacture of his patent, by extending the time.

Mr. BLAKE. The same reason does not, to my mind, apply to the question of importation as to the question of manufacture. Considerable time and expenditure of capital are required to establish a manufactory, and it was, perhaps, not unreasonable that when the condition was that a manufactory should be established in the country, there should be discretionary power given to the Commissioner to extend the time, but I do not see that the same reasons can apply to a simple case of importation.

Mr. POPE. If it is reasonable to give an extension for two years to enable a patentee to manufacture his patent, it is just as reasonable to give him an extension of time to import it. I am trying to avoid the very things the hon. gentleman speaks of. Under the amendment I propose he cannot start for three years. Then is it not right, and is it not in the interest of the country, that until he can get that started we should also extend the time?

Mr. BLAKE. My opinion is that the practical result of the hon. gentleman's proposal, as he now explains it, will be that he will have a great many more applications for extension of time to manufacture than he would have had otherwise, because he will find men saying: “Now I find it extremely difficult to create a manufactory in Canada, and I know if I find it difficult I will get the consent of the Minister of Agriculture to allow me to go on and import a few years.”

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. POPE. I have confined it to this fact, that the man must show a good cause before he can get an extension.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Have there occurred any cases of inconvenience or difficulty?

Mr. POPE. There have been applications. There are certain things patented in this country that it is almost impossible to manufacture in sufficient quantity, from the fact that there is only one manufactory, and consequently the article has to be imported. There have been three or four cases of that kind brought to my attention.

Mr. BLAKE. I recollect to have heard that there was one machine in connection with woollens, and that there was a difficulty that the goods could not be imported and manufactured so that it would be profitable for the patentee to make them here. Now, that is just the class of cases in which it does not seem to me that it is important to take a patent out at all.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). I may mention to the Committee that my attention has been called to another class of patented articles that it was desirable to have this Act passed with a view to apply to—that is some parts of the machinery used in the production of electric lights. I believe Mr. Osler has been acting for the Edison Electric Light Company, and he informed me that this Bill is very desirable. It seems to me questionable whether the Bill goes far enough. There may be some cases in which the year allowed for importation has expired, and this Act would not apply to these cases. Now, if the law is to be altered, it seems to me that these parties who have made application within a year, should be allowed a certain time within which they may make application after this Act is passed. I, therefore, propose, in amendment, to add after the 12th line: “who may also grant a like extension not exceeding two years from the date thereof, in cases where the patent was granted two years prior to the last day of May, 1882.” Of course, it is only a discretion that is given to the Commissioner of Patents, it is not an arbitrary extension. I may say that I have been requested to introduce this amendment by Mr. Osler, who informs me that in reference to one of the patents connected with the Edison Electric Light, some fifteen months have elapsed, and the amendment would meet this case.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's argument for the Bill is that it is applied to a class of inventions for which the demand is so limited in this country that it would not pay to manufacture them here. Well, this would be a good reason for allowing a man to import during the whole period of the patent, unless he supposes that while it would not pay at the end of two or three years it might begin to pay after that to build a manufactory. But a class of machines of a very rare description, of which the quantity for this country would be so small that it would not pay to establish a manufactory for them, is not likely to be so much required within three years that it will pay at the end of that time. There is a natural protection because if it does not pay the monopolist, who is protected against all the world, to put up a factory, it will pay nobody else to take out a patent, therefore he does not want a patent in this country. I believe eventually that patentees will make representations to the Minister, and that what are known as patent affidavits will be put in to support them, and we will be told in scores of cases in which, but for this, there would be no factories built, that it would not pay to build a factory for the small demand in this country, and therefore the extension should be asked for.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I think I can make it clear that the logic of the hon. gentleman is not very good. In 1875 the hon. gentleman came down to the House and asked it to pass a Bill by which two years more would be given to inventors to establish the industries in this country. The hon. gentleman says to-night we must not allow them to bring in a machine after twelve months. It is evident the hon. gentleman has gone back on his opinion of 1875.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is incorrect in supposing that I brought down the Bill in 1875. I had no more to do with it than had the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not quite agree with the hon. Minister as to there being no distinction between the foreign inventor who desires to patent an article in this country and the Canadian inventor who manufactures nowhere else than here. In the case of the Canadian inventor, in cases of difficult inventions involving the building of a factory, it may be said that a longer time should be allowed to them than to the foreigners who have no claim on us. We give that advantage to inventors who manufacture in this country; but if they do not do so, I do not see why any one who desires an implement or patented article may not go into the United States and bring it here according to the usual practice. This is a radical deviation from the practice, and while I do not oppose the Bill I regret giving those privileges unless we adopt the other principle that foreigners shall have the same rights as Canadians. That is done in England.

Mr. POPE. It is also done in the United States.

Mr. WHITE. The policy of this country is different, and it is an unnecessary infringement of the policy which we have always followed.

Mr. POPE. It is no infringement, but simply an extension of the policy. All patents are open in England and the United States, but we felt in 1872, when we tried to meet the wishes of the United States as far as possible, and when they were allowed to come in here and take out patents, that we inserted a clause which forced them to come in here. We must not draw a line, under this Patent Act, between Canadians and inventors who come from the United States and take out patents.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

WINDSOR BRANCH, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 156) an Act respecting the Windsor Branch of the Intercolonial Railway. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I may briefly state that in 1867 an Act was passed incorporating the Windsor and Annapolis Company for the purpose of constructing a railway from Windsor to Annapolis. The Government had already constructed a railway to Truro, and a branch about thirty-five miles from that branch from the Truro line to the town of Windsor. This was an Act for the purpose of incorporating a company for the construction of the intervening portion between the terminus of the Government Railway at Windsor and the town of Annapolis. That road was largely subsidized by the Government, and it was provided for the purpose of enabling the line to be effectively operated, that mutual running powers should be enjoyed by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company and the Government of Nova Scotia, who were then operating the line from Halifax to Windsor. The Bill also contained a provision that whenever the Government of Nova Scotia wished to acquire the road they should have power to do so by paying the value to the Company, and it was provided that the value should be ascertained by the appointment of an arbitrator by the Company, another by the Government

of Nova Scotia, and a third by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. In order to provide for that part of the charter which gives mutual running powers to the Government of Nova Scotia and the Railway Company, an agreement was come to under which the Company were allowed to operate what is called the Windsor Branch with running powers into Halifax, the Government maintaining the road and receiving one-third of the gross proceeds and the Company operating it and taking the other two-thirds. That arrangement was entered into in 1871. In 1873, the policy was adopted of utilizing the Windsor Branch for the purpose of extending the railway from Annapolis to the town of Yarmouth, and an Order in Council was passed, and in 1874 an Act also passed for the purpose of conveying the fee simple of the Windsor Branch to the Company, provided they would extend the road from Annapolis to Yarmouth, a certain reasonable and limited time being fixed. Under that arrangement and under the Act, the late Government took the road from the hands of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company and transferred it to the Western Counties Railway Company as a consideration for their extending the road from Annapolis to Yarmouth. The Western Counties Railway Company failed. They operated the Windsor Branch under the power given them by the late Government until after the present Government came into power. When the period elapsed, about October, 1879, during which they were required to extend the railway to Yarmouth as a condition of the agreement which declared that they should give up the peaceable possession of the road, it was taken from the Western Counties Railway Company and held by the Government pending certain litigation which had been entered into between the Western Counties Railway Company and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. Since that period, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, under the agreement to operate it by the month—an agreement that was terminable at thirty days' notice on the part of the Government—have operated it practically under the same arrangement as the original agreement, they retaining two-thirds of the proceeds, and the Government one-third. The Government of Nova Scotia have passed legislation, providing for the consolidation of the railways in that Province that are not the property of the Dominion Government, and providing for the carrying out of the design which this Parliament had when they passed the legislation of 1874 giving this road to the Western Counties Railway Company, in consideration of their extending it to Yarmouth on the one side by the completion of the link between Annapolis and Digby, and completing the communication with the Strait of Canso on the other. Under the clause in the charter of this Company, which enables the Government of Nova Scotia at any time to become the owners of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, on payment of the amount found by the arbitrators to be the value of the road, this Government has been notified of the determination of the Government of Nova Scotia to become the owners of the railway, and it consequently becomes necessary to have legislation here which will accomplish that which the Act of 1874 was intended to accomplish, but which was not accomplished by it. The Western Counties Railway Company brought this matter into Court, and it has ultimately been decided by the Privy Council of England that the Act of 1874 does not contain the power necessary to do that which Parliament intended to do, viz.: to vest the Western Counties Railway Company with the absolute ownership of the Windsor Branch of the Railway. It is therefore proposed to pass this Act, which will enable the Government of Nova Scotia, upon assuming the ownership of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, to take possession of the Windsor Branch; and this Act provides that that may be done if they carry out, what Parliament intended in the Act of 1874, the construc-

tion within a reasonable time of the railway from Annapolis to Digby. The Bill and the schedules, which have been some time in the hands of hon. members, contain a full statement of these various agreements, and also what is proposed to be accomplished by this Act. I may say that a petition has been placed in the hands of hon. members by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, objecting to the passage of this Act, on the ground that it interferes with certain rights they possess. I do not see how any rights they possess can be interfered with by this Bill, because the Government of Nova Scotia has power under the original charter to become owners of this road whenever they please, and the tribunal is provided for to fix the value; and although they refer to their "undertaking," whatever that may mean, I suppose they would hardly claim that as the Windsor Branch was conveyed to them by an agreement for a specific purpose, that that which was given to them, and which was incident to the operation of this line of railway under their charter, should be continued. Whatever rights they have will be submitted to the arbitrators provided for by the charter, and they will only be called upon to part with their property on receiving full value for it. That, briefly, is the object of this Bill, and the necessity which has arisen for submitting it to this House.

Mr. BORDEN. Before entering into a discussion of the question involved in this Bill, I desire to call your attention to a point of order. This Bill is one which the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company claim interferes with their rights, in fact, takes away certain private rights which they hold; and they claim that they have had no opportunity of stating their case before the Government, and if this Bill is passed, will have no opportunity of appearing by counsel in defence of their rights. It seems to me, therefore, that this Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee of this House, and to show the practice in the British House of Commons, I will read from May's Parliamentary Practice, edition of 1879, page 693:

"And in 1862-63, Bills for the embankment of the Thames were brought in as public Bills; but, as private property and interests were affected, the standing orders were complied with, and other proceedings taken, as in the case of private Bills. The same course was adopted in 1867 and 1876 with the Metropolis Gas Bills; in 1874 with the Metropolis Water Supply and Fire Prevention Bill; and in 1877, with the Metropolitan Toll Bridges Bill. Such Bills, however, appear among the public orders of the day, and are treated in the House as public Bills; and petitions against them are presented to the House and not deposited in the Private Bill Office. In 1857, the Thames Conservancy Bill was introduced as a private Bill; and in 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877 for giving further powers to the Metropolitan Board of Works (chiefly in respect of local improvements) were introduced and passed as private Bills."

I take the opportunity now of calling attention to this, in order that you may consider it before the time that you move its reference to Committee of the Whole. The petitioners state:

"Your petitioners have seen a Bill introduced in your House this day intituled: 'An Act respecting the Windsor Branch of the Intercolonial Railway,' but have no opportunity of seeing the same, or of becoming aware of its contents until after it had been introduced; and the said Act, if it should be passed, would seriously prejudice the rights and property of your petitioners, and the interests of their shareholders and bondholders in respect to the said railway. And your petitioners would be justly aggrieved by the provisions, and, therefore, strongly object to and protest against the passing of the said Act."

Now, with regard to the Bill itself the hon. Minister of Railways has stated the facts correctly, I think. The agreement with this Windsor and Annapolis Company, I believe, was made in 1871 between the Company and the Government of the Dominion, and it was based upon a right which the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company claimed to have under their original charter. The Company was incorporated by an Act of the Nova Scotia Legislature in 1867, before Confederation. That Act involved an agreement made in 1866 and the previous Act of Nova Scotia of 1865. Those three measures went to make up the Act of 1867. Now, Confederation intervened between the time of the grant of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that charter and the completion of the road, which was completed in 1869. After Confederation the Company found they were called upon to treat with the Government here, in order to get the use of their chartered rights. I think I cannot do better than read one or two extracts from the decision of the Privy Council referred to in this petition, which is also referred to in the Act to which the hon. Minister has referred. This decision was the result of litigation arising out of an Act of this Parliament passed in 1874, upon which the Government of that day dispossessed the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company of the Windsor Branch. The judgment reads thus:

"THE WINDSOR BRANCH RAILWAY.

"The Windsor Branch Railway became the property of the Dominion upon the 1st July, 1867, being the day appointed by Her Majesty, in terms of section 4, of the British North America Act, for the provisions of that Act coming into operation. And, on the 22nd September, 1871, the Government of Canada, as the owners of the railway, and an implement of the obligation to make a 'traffic arrangement' which is contained in the agreement with the respondents, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company.

"The 108th section of the 'British North America Act, 1867,' which must be read in connection with the third schedule of the Act, had the effect of transferring on the first day of July, 1867, to the Dominion of Canada all railways which were the property of the Province of Nova Scotia. Their Lordships are of opinion that it had the effect of vesting in Canada any other or larger interest in these railways than that which belonged to the Province at the time of the statutory transfer. Accordingly the Dominion took the property of the Windsor Railway, subject to the same obligation by which the right of the Provincial Government was effected, viz.: To enter into a traffic arrangement with the Respondent's company in terms of the agreement confirmed by the Provincial statute of the seventh day of May, 1867, and it was in pursuance of that obligation that the Dominion Government entered into the agreement of 22nd September, 1871. The agreement thus made was valid, and must continue to receive effect until it has been terminated by the default of the Respondent company, by the mutual consent of parties, or by the action of a competent Legislature."

Now, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company contend that the agreement is as much a part of their property as any portion of their road, and that in having their property taken from them the Company claim that their rights in the Windsor Branch should be considered as well as the road itself which they constructed. The result of the passing of this Bill would seem to deprive them of that right. The Minister of Railways has not seen fit to enter at length into a discussion of that particular point, and I think I cannot do better than to remind him of his own remarks, upon this question made in this House in 1878. At that time the Windsor Branch Railway had been taken away from the Company, and the Minister of Railways, referring to that subject, made the following remarks:—

"Let them take, for instance, the position in which the western portion of Nova Scotia stood to-day. Nova Scotia obtained the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, 85 miles in length, by granting a large subsidy out of the public money, and by providing by law that that railway company should have running powers over the Windsor Branch and main line of the Intercolonial into Halifax, some 45 miles. The late Government gave the Windsor and Annapolis Railway a 21 years' lease of the Windsor Branch, on the condition that they paid one-third of the earnings to the Government. They failed, however, to pay that third of the earnings and the late Government having given them notice that they would cancel the lease if they did not comply with the terms, passed an Order in Council just before going out of power, cancelling the lease to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, and agreeing to transfer the line to the Western Counties Railway upon evidence being furnished that they could complete the railway from Annapolis to Yarmouth. The late Government had never contemplated giving to the Western Counties Railway what they did not possess. They had no power to take away the running powers of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway over the Government Railways in Halifax. This right was guaranteed by an Act of Parliament, without which the money could not have been obtained to build the road. If the hon. the First Minister desired to hand over the fee simple of the road, he must do it subject to the law of the land, as by an Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia the right to run had been previously transferred. In 1875, the Minister of Public Works renewed the lease with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. He had passed an Act giving him power to transfer it to the Western Counties Railway Company; but with that on the Statute-Book he renewed the lease, making an engagement with them to change their gauge, involving an expenditure of \$50,000 or \$60,000, and making a binding contract with them renewing their lease. Notwithstanding this, Mr. Brydges was authorized to go by force of arms and

wrest that line out of the hands of the Company which had it under lease from the present Government, and on the faith of which they were induced to change their gauge, and hand it over to the Western Counties Railway. In England the Government of Canada had been held up to public obloquy, for having induced men to come into this country and spend money on the faith of an Act of Parliament which had been disregarded. The best English advice had been obtained, and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway had taken this case into the Court of Chancery, in Nova Scotia, and the Judge in Equity had given judgment that the Government had violated their lease and exceeded their powers, and that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company had, at present, the right to running powers over the road, which was given to it by Act of Parliament. He had, in his possession, extracts from the London *Times* in reference to the bad faith shown to capitalists by the Government of Canada—a most damaging thing to be going about in the journals of Great Britain."

This speech was made at a time when the matter was in litigation. Then the hon. Minister took the ground that this Company had the right under their original charter, and that the Government had never intended to take their rights away from them. Now that the case is finally decided by the Privy Council, he proposes an Act which will have the direct effect of taking away those charter rights. I think this House is entitled to have a clear statement from the hon. Minister as to what the effect of the Act will be, and I think if there is any doubt as to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company having the right of compensation for the loss of any rights they may possess, the Bill should be so amended as to secure them that right of compensation. I suppose there can be very little doubt but that Parliament has power to appropriate, in the public interests, if they think necessary, private property; but surely there can be no doubt that compensation should be given when private rights are forcibly appropriated. We had, during this Session, a question of private rights brought up in the disallowance of the Streams Bill. Not one hon. member opposite denied the power of the Legislature of Ontario to pass that Act, but it was claimed that it interfered, in a single instance, with private rights, and it was disallowed on that ground, although it provided for compensation. I did not believe, after the position the hon. member then took, that he would introduce a measure of this nature without guaranteeing, to the fullest extent, the rights of this Company, which are interfered with. I know that during the early part of this Session, the parties immediately interested in this legislation, the Government of Nova Scotia, a certain Railway Company, that was formed there recently, and the manager of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway and his counsel, met here on several occasions and tried to arrange some basis of agreement. The difficulty which stood in the way of their coming to an agreement was this: This Company insisted as a basis of arbitration that their rights in the Windsor Branch which they now hold, under the agreement of 1871, should be considered in the arbitration, and the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia and the representatives of the Nova Scotia Railway Company refused to accept that as a basis of arbitration. In this Bill it is very clear an injustice will be done to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. I shall not detain the House longer, but will commend your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the point of order that I have raised.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. Minister will make some explanation in reply to the statement of the hon. member for King's. The hon. Minister, when he introduced this Bill, said that it did affect private rights, that the various parties interested had been heard before the Privy Council and that there were conflicting interests, and that the Government had thought that the position assumed by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company was an extreme one. I would like to understand more clearly than I have been able to gather from the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways, to what extent private rights are interfered with, and what was that attitude of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company to which the hon. Minister referred as

being that to which the Government could not accede. The circumstance was admitted, on the introduction of the Bill, that there are private rights to be dealt with, and this renders it peculiarly important that we should have an accurate understanding of the situation as to that. From a cursory perusal of this Bill, and without that fuller knowledge which the hon. gentleman's statement ought to impart to us, it appears to me that the Bill has affected a declaration and enactment of fact. It declares and enacts that certain rights, privileges and powers are acquired by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway as owners of the line from Windsor to Annapolis, &c. Now that either is or is not the case; if it be the case it is necessary for us to declare and enact that it is the case, and therefore the enactment is useless; if it be not the case, or if it be open to contention on the part of the Railway Company that it is not the case, then we are, so far as we can make that law, stating that to be the case which is not the fact. So much of the law therefore as declares and enacts that these rights were acquired by this Act in a particular capacity, is either useless or improper, useless if it simply states that to be fact and law which is a fact and law, and improper if it proposes to make that fact and law which is not fact and law. Then, Sir, it seems to me subject to correction, but I do not believe that is a question that we ought to settle one way or other, that whatever rights the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company were entitled to under their original charter in the other railway, whatever the rights they were entitled to or may have acquired by virtue of, or not by virtue of, that original charter, are part of their undertaking, and form part of that which ought to be measured and estimated as the value of their undertaking when they come to be settled for. It is one proposition to say that these running rights are a graft upon their original enterprise, and are not to continue to be enjoyed by them when the Nova Scotia Government has assumed, if it has power to assume, the enterprise; but it is altogether another proposition to say that that circumstance alters the right of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company to claim that their undertaking is in fact in part composed of these running rights. I say that these running rights add value to their enterprise, I say it is proper that if the share capital and the loan capital, if there be any, which was raised on this charter of incorporation, was raised by virtue of the circumstance that the railway company was to have certain running rights or powers over another railway, that that circumstance rendered the enterprise worth more money and would actually enter into the consideration of those who would subscribe for shares or take bonds in the enterprise, and that the power, although contained in some instrument, of taking possession at a price of the property of the Government of Nova Scotia, must include the value of all the elements of the property, of which this was one. That is the view I take of the position of the Company. But it is not enough for the purpose of this legislation to say that that is open to argument, because it is obviously clear that if we have power—and we are assuming to have power—to deal with this subject, we ought to be careful in the last degree not to do or say anything which may impair the right of that Company to set up a claim. I do not propose that we should adjudge that they have such a claim, but I propose that we should, in the clearest manner, enunciate that we are not attempting to interfere with the assertion by them of that claim in the reference; and I maintain that the language of this clause is ambiguous and doubtful. It has created a doubt in my own mind as to the real object of this, and as to how far it may complicate the position of this Company in claiming compensation for the whole of this undertaking, including these running rights of this lease which is said to be a graft on, or a substitute *pro tanto* for these running rights. Now, I say we have no authority to adjudicate one way or the other be-

tween the Government of Nova Scotia and the Railway Company on this subject, and our duty is to leave it just exactly where it is. But before we say that the Railway Company shall not have as full right as it would have but for our legislation, unaffected and unobstructed by our legislation, to aver before the Board of Arbitration which is to be constituted, that in the elements of compensation are to be included those running rights, and the arrangement which is said to be an arrangement *pro tanto* in substitution for them, we should not aver that this position exists as against the Government of Nova Scotia, we should not put any obstacle against its operations as against the Railway Company. These are two points on which I desire further information than has yet been given to the House, the first one as to the necessity and propriety of the clause which declares the mode in which and the circumstances under which the grant for twenty-one years is held; and the second one as to the intention of the Government with reference to the claim of compensation; and in the course of these explanations I should desire to learn what those points of contention were before the Privy Council, between the parties, which the Government heard, and upon which they disposed of, as the hon. gentleman says, in part or altogether, adversely to the Railway Company. The circumstance that the Government heard counsel on the subject is a strong support to the position of my hon. friend that there are private rights involved which we ought not to lose sight of, because it indicates that the Privy Council thought there were interests which were proper to be represented by the very exceptional course of hearing counsel before themselves. But this Bill, which does not become law by the will of the Executive—at any rate in theory, it becomes law by the will of Parliament—and if it was essential that the Privy Council should hear counsel argue in support of private rights which were alleged to be affected by the proposed legislation, it would seem, as my hon. friend has observed, to be at least equally essential that we, who are, theoretically speaking, the moving power in this thing, without whose consent the legislation cannot become law, we should put that matter in a similar train of discussion, and give to these parties some opportunity of presenting to our mind the argument upon which counsel reached one conclusion, but not on which it is just possible that Parliament might reach another.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume the point of order the hon. gentleman has taken is not pressed with the idea—

Mr. BLAKE. That point of order could not rise till after the second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But as the hon. gentleman has raised the point on the second reading—

Mr. BLAKE. He mentioned it at the opening of his statement, because he said it would rise after the second reading and the reference to the Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's statement, and I do not know whether he raised the point of order or not.

Mr. BORDEN. I asked the hon. Speaker to consider that when the reference was made, I mentioned this in the meantime, so that he would have an opportunity to consider it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is whether this is a Bill that ought to pass. It is a measure affecting Government property and affects the Windsor Branch, and on that account only it is dealt with as a Government measure. The hon. leader of the Opposition said it is, in fact, a private measure affecting private rights, and that is shown by the fact that the Privy Council have heard arguments upon it. He says it is an exceptional case; it may have been when the hon. gentleman was a member of the Cabinet,

Mr. BLAKE.

but it is a common course with the present Government. We have heard discussions of both public and private interests. Sometimes we hear parties by deputation or Committee of Council, but when the question is one involving considerable interest, it is frequently heard before the whole Council. In this case there was a question in which the Government of Nova Scotia, with a public measure passed by their Legislature, and other parties assumed to have rights as to engage to press their claims. This is a measure to ask Parliament to supplement the legislation of May, 1874—a measure passed when the hon. gentleman opposite was a Minister of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was a public Bill dealing with a public matter on public grounds, and was for the transfer of the Windsor Branch to the Western Counties Railway. The necessity of this measure arose from the fact that what was intended by Parliament in 1874 failed to be carried out. The intention was obvious, but the mode of expression was defective, and this measure is nothing more or less than a declaratory Act to supplement and cure the defects of the original legislation. The hon. gentleman opposite urges quite correctly that whether this is a public or private Bill it affects certain private rights. There are few public Bills that do not do so, and the question is whether this Bill is just in itself and does not deprive any persons of their rights. The hon. gentleman says that the original running powers conferred by the Canadian Government belong to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, that these powers were to enable the railway to make certain connections, and the moment they cease the Windsor and Annapolis Company cease to be owners of it. In fact, the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company cannot give any power of running powers if it ceases to be owned by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. The hon. gentleman says the language is ambiguous, and that it is not clear that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company are not deprived of some of their rights which they now possess, or claim to possess, under the running powers which continue for twenty-one years with power of renewal. The ownership of a line of railway in Nova Scotia cannot be taken away from the railway without receiving compensation for their rights, whatever those rights might be, at the time they surrendered them. The law there is this: the Government of Nova Scotia can, with respect to certain railways, of which this is one, by giving notice and submitting to arbitration the question of the value of the railway—of course such arbitration must include any rights and property of this kind—arrive at the value of all the property direct and contingent and ascertain what the value of the property to be surrendered is. I do not think this clause has any effect or restrains in any way instructions given to arbitrators; but I see considerable objection to any claim by which it would be held that this legislation affirms what the rights are either in its original charter or as a railway company.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not suggested that. All I am anxious for is that we should make it perfectly clear that we do not make a statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is quite clear. There is nothing in this Act that in anyway restrains the arbitrators or restricts them from finding the value of the property with its attendant easements as they existed at the time of the surrender.

Mr. LONGLEY. Were it not that I doubt whether I should have another opportunity of making any observations on the Bill before the House, I would not ask the House to listen to any remarks, but under the circumstances I feel myself called upon to make a few observations. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company came before this House

by petition, in connection with which demands have been made to represent that undue advantage has been attempted to be taken of them. There would have seemed to have been no further remarks called for after the detailed statement made by the hon. the Minister of Railways. I venture to say, as far as I have been able to apprehend the claims of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, and the condition of things generally in reference to this Bill, that not only has there been no unjust attempt to do injustice to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, but I hold if an attempt were made it would not succeed, because, under the circumstances, no injustice could be done to that Company simply because the charter itself in the Bill provides for the adjudication of their claims by arbitration. But, of whatever value their present franchises are, the value of those franchises must, as a matter of necessity, be taken into account. Now, I will endeavor to explain what I mean. The Windsor and Annapolis Railway, as I understand the terms of the Bill of 1867, were entitled to running powers over the Windsor Branch under certain conditions. In other words, arrangements were made in the Bill for mutual running powers. I am not aware that the Government ever had any privileges in that way from the Windsor and Annapolis Railway. Had they enjoyed these privileges then the matter would have stood about this way: The Government would have enjoyed any advantages under that arrangement derivable from eighty-five miles of railway. The Government would have conceded the road over forty-five miles. In that condition of things the balance of advantage would have been with the Government, and inasmuch as the Government never exercised any right of running powers over the railway, it seems to me that any privileges conceded in that way would be all on one side and to the advantage rather than to the disadvantage of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. Now, on the 1st of January, 1872, an arrangement was made with that Company by the then Government under which they were allowed to operate on terms which have been already stated, namely: they were to pay to the Dominion Government one-third of the gross earnings of the road, the Government being obliged to maintain it. The Windsor and Annapolis Company enjoyed that privilege for five years and seven months or thereabouts, and according to statements which have been made, the accuracy of which I am not prepared to vouch for, that was considered a considerable privilege, an advantage that transcended any advantage which could possibly accrue under mere mutual running powers. Now, I assume from the references which have been made recently by the Western Counties Railway respecting the value of that privilege to them, that the value of the privileges accorded to them under the terms of the agreement of 1872 were less than \$20,000 per annum. If that is an extravagant estimate then I have to make whatever reduction might be considered fair, and if that privilege was worth \$20,000 a year, then during the five years and seven months the advantage to the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company amounted to \$111,000; and assuming the net advantage to have been about half that sum, then the advantage of that privilege was worth \$55,000 during the five years and seven months. In August, 1877, the road was forcibly taken out of the hands of the Company, and it was thought that on the part of the Government of the day this seemed harsh, not justified by the circumstances, but the Government thought otherwise. At any rate that condition of things obtained until the last of October or the 1st of November, 1879. From that time to the present the Windsor and Annapolis Company enjoy the privilege for nearly three years, at the low estimate of \$10,000 a year—though I believe it has been worth a good deal more—that would be in the neighborhood of \$25,000, in addition to something like \$80,000 advantage which that Company has

enjoyed under the favorable conditions or means which they have obtained from two successive Governments. Now, suppose that my calculation be correct. When the arbitrators come to take this matter up they will ascertain—I apprehend as almost the first duty they will have to discharge—what the Windsor and Annapolis Railway with all its franchises is worth; and as a rule we do not expect any higher value put on any property than the net income which that property yields, so that as I look upon it it would be impossible to deprive that railway of any franchise which they possess at the present time, or which they possessed during the period of which I am speaking. I think any company which brings its capital into a country, with the view of promoting the public works of that country, and necessarily developing its resources and affording conveniences to the people, is entitled to liberal treatment; and I think the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company has had every liberal treatment—first at the hands of the Nova Scotia Government, which gave it a subsidy of \$1,089,000, or \$12,000 a mile; and everybody knows that it would be hard to find a section of country where a road could be built more cheaply than down the Annapolis Valley, and many think that the \$12,000 per mile went a large way in meeting the cost of that line. That Company obtained other concessions; it first asked and obtained from the Nova Scotia Government legislation, which had for its object the promotion of its interest at that particular time, and the Government afterwards, on two separate occasions, guaranteed the Company's bonds for considerable amounts. It will not be pretended that the privileges of mutual running powers enjoyed under the Bill were at all commensurate with the privilege of operating the Windsor Branch and paying to the Dominion Government only one third of the gross earnings of that line. I think about the year 1875, I heard something, also, about new trucks being given that Company for old ones, and about other important concessions having been made to it to off set the change of gauge. In these several instances my impression is that the Dominion Government dealt very liberally with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. But I waive all these circumstances, and I say that as the matter presents itself to my mind there is no possible injustice being done to that Company. Whatever may be the value of the agreement or the lease, and whatever may be the value of the promised extension of that lease, it must, as a matter of course, be taken into account; and if the Company is entitled to any consideration for the increased value which that lease might have acquired had it gone on for twenty years longer, the arbitrators will take that into account also. I should like my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) to show in what respect any advantage has been taken of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, or how it is possible any advantage can be taken of them in the future. If I felt otherwise I would not on any account give utterance to the views I have just expressed. If I have any sympathies they are in favor rather than against that Company, and to-day I would very much sooner do it a good turn than a bad turn. But after all, I think the Company itself has almost forced us to speak out the sentiments we entertain, and show just what the facts of the case are. I would have been glad if this matter had been settled amicably among the Nova Scotia Government, the Western Counties Railway Company, and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company; but I hold that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company was a little exorbitant in its demands, and the fault must rest with it if a settlement is not reached in accordance with its demands. I suppose no hon. member need be told of the scope and bearing of this Bill, or its value to Nova Scotia. Its effect is to make sure the proposed consolidation of all the railways in Nova Scotia, which gives us

promise, not only of having the roads more efficiently operated, but also of having about 131 miles of new road built. And if so large advantages can be secured to the country without doing injustice to any interest, Company or individual, I see no reason why a scheme so full of promise should not be consummated.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The fact that the Bill is read the second time is an admission that it is recognized as a public Bill. As for its reference, the House has power to refer it to any Committee it likes.

Mr. ANGLIN. May I be permitted to say that the authorities distinctly lay down that certain Bills are public in their character, and yet partake so largely of a private character that they should be treated as private Bills in this respect: that the individuals interested should have power to appear before a Committee of the House to maintain their rights. When private rights are affected, individuals may appear before a Committee, in person or by counsel, to maintain what they believe their rights as affected by the measure, and to satisfy Parliament, if they be able, that the measure should not be passed, or should be first amended.

Mr. SPEAKER. The cases quoted by the hon. member were of a local character, and legislation upon such cases has always been considered as public legislation. As for the want of notice, if some private rights were interfered with, of course I have nothing to do with that matter. Committees are appointed by the House to look into such matters. As the Bill is considered as of a public character, and has passed its second reading, the House has power to refer it to any power it likes, but the rule is to refer public Bills to a Committee of the whole House.

Mr. ANGLIN. I think we ought, as a matter of justice and fair play, to refer this Bill to a Committee, and allow the Windsor and Annapolis Company to be heard before it. The First Minister is of opinion that this Bill will not impair in the slightest degree any of the Railways' Acts, or in any way obstruct or prevent a fair estimate of those rights by the arbitrators as a portion of the property of the Company. There can be no doubt this lease is as much a portion of the Company's incorporate property, as the railroad itself is a part of its corporeal property, and that their interests ought to be held as sacred in the one case as in the other. The Company differ from the First Minister, believing that their rights and interests are being impaired. I think they have reason to claim that this Act has been deferred so long as to leave little time for its discussion. The Company came to the conclusion that their property would be materially affected by the passing of this Bill. Under these circumstances, I think they have a right to further consideration, and of being heard before a Committee of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. The right hon. gentleman has informed us that counsel has been heard before the Privy Council. It would be of very great consequence to us, under these circumstances, if the hon. gentleman would inform us what were the views put forward, what were the contentions of the parties before the Privy Council who believed their interests were about to be prejudicially affected by the legislation proposed.

Mr. DALY. It would be as well to remind hon. gentlemen opposite that the Bill of 1874, which was passed during the late Administration, went very much farther than this Bill proposes, with regard to affecting the rights of the Windsor and Annapolis Company. That Act which was proposed and carried during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite and was supported by, I believe, the hon. member for King's, went so far as to take away the right of the Windsor and Annapolis Company and convey to the Western Counties Railway the right of running over

Mr. LONGLEY.

the Windsor Branch hitherto enjoyed by that Company. It appears to me the hon. member for King's is going back on his record in proposing now to throw obstacles in the way of this Bill which does not interfere with the rights of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway as the other one did. The subject of this Bill has been already so fully stated that I do not intend to detain the House at great length, but wish to observe that in the Acts of Nova Scotia of 1865 will be found an Act to provide for the construction of two other sections of the Provincial Railway. Sec. 7 of that Act provides:

"The Governor in Council may at any time before or after the said sections, or either of them are or is completed, by Order in Council, assume on behalf of the Province the ownership of the said sections, or either of them, by paying to the owners thereof the value of the same—to be ascertained as hereafter provided."

Section 8 provides:

"The amount to be paid under the next preceding section shall be ascertained by the decision of the arbitrators, one of whom to be appointed by the Governor in Council, one by the owner or owners of the section, and one by the principal Secretary of State for the Colonies."

After that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company was incorporated by an Act which includes among its provisions the following clause:—

"The several conditions, agreements, provisos and terms contained and mentioned in the said contract or agreement entered into by the Commissioner of Railways and the said W. H. Princhard, J. Barry and Ed. Clark, dated 22nd November, 1866, and the Act 28 Vic., cap. 13, so far as the same is not altered or modified by this Act, and each and every of them, shall be incorporated into and made part and parcel of this Act."

I assume, therefore, that the charter of the Windsor and Annapolis Company incorporates in its provisions the provision of the Act of 1875, which gave to the Nova Scotia Government the right to assume this road. It will be noticed in this agreement between the Dominion Government and the Windsor and Annapolis Company there is no mention made of the assigns of that Company. It conveys to that Company alone, and not to its assigns, any right of transfer of that agreement. I take it that this agreement was entered into between the two contracting parties with the distinct understanding that the charter incorporating the Windsor and Annapolis Company, and the previous Act left in the hands of the Nova Scotia Government the power to assume that railway. Therefore I contend this agreement was subject to be cancelled on the assumption by the Nova Scotia Government of that railway; and I believe that this Act, in terminating that agreement, is merely giving effect to carrying out the law as it was intended it should be carried out. I believe the whole value of the road now held by the Windsor and Annapolis Company should be considered as a matter for arbitration; and I do not think the Windsor and Annapolis Company should throw any obstacles in the way of referring it to an arbitration which would take into consideration the whole value of their undertaking. It has been said that this Parliament has no right to deal with civil rights. In this Bill we are dealing, not only with civil rights, but Dominion property, and this Government has power and jurisdiction over Dominion property, and it cannot be maintained that because civil rights are relegated to the jurisdiction of Provincial Governments this Bill should come before the Provincial Legislature and not before this House. We are dealing with the larger subject of Dominion property and if in dealing with it we also deal with civil rights we are entirely within our jurisdiction. This Bill is eminently in the public interests of Nova Scotia. Every facility should be given to the Government of that Province to carry out the scheme of the consolidation and amalgamation of all the railways of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN. The last speaker has charged me with having gone back upon my previous record. The hon. member for Halifax says that the Act of 1874 is more stringent

than this one; he differs from the hon. First Minister, who said, in introducing it, that it was to supply certain defects in the Act of 1874. With regard to my going back on my own record, I may say that when the Act of 1874 was passed, although a member of this House, I was not here. But I never was in favor of that Act, I was always opposed to the transfer to the Windsor Branch, and did my utmost to prevent the late Administration from transferring that branch from the Windsor and Annapolis Company to the Western Counties.

Mr. DALY. I did not say the hon. gentleman was not in the House. I simply observed that he was supporting the Government which had carried out that legislation.

Mr. BORDEN. He said I had gone back on my own record, and I make this statement with regard to that. The hon. gentleman refers to my putting obstacles in the way of this legislation. I do not think he has any right to make such a charge. I do not desire to put obstacles in the way, but I do desire that private rights shall be respected. I have as much interest as the hon. gentleman can possibly have in the scheme for improving the railway system of my own Province and of seeing railway amalgamation successfully carried out, and the unfinished lines in that Province completed; but I do not think it is fair to take away private rights from one company for the advantage of another, because that is what the Bill amounts to.

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. member for Halifax throws new light on the whole question. If his contention is correct, the arbitrators have nothing to do with the value which these running powers give to the property of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, because they would be really no part of that property. If that is so, then this Bill assumes a more objectionable character than it had before. We are assuming in this Bill that that is the actual condition of things, that the running powers would not press the railway with the Province, and that it is absolutely necessary that we legislate here to give the running powers, that we become owners of the railway. I am told that the Act of 1865 was materially altered as to its effect by the agreement made between the Province and the Railway Company in 1866, and that in 1867 legislation passed which virtually surrendered the right previously held by the Government to assume the ownership of this road whenever they chose. If that is so then this act of assumption of ownership does not place the Company just in the position they would be in if they sold the railway to other parties.

Mr. BLAKE moved the addition of the following proviso:—

Provided nothing in this Act contained shall have the effect of interfering with or altering any legal rights of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, or affecting the elements of the valuation of their property in the preamble mentioned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I consider the proviso decidedly objectionable, as it conveys a sort of assumption that the Bill affects the rights of the Railway Company. The Bill has been carefully drawn in this respect. It asserts nothing, it assumes nothing, it simply states that if by the law of Nova Scotia the Government become the owner of the railway then the legal consequence ought to follow that the running agreement should go to the owners.

Mr. BLAKE. I fail to see, if the Bill is not intended to affect the rights of the Company, that any objection can be taken to stating that fact.

Amendment negatived, and bill reported.

HARBOR OF ST. JOHN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 163) relating to the Harbor of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 164) to correct certain errors from the French versions of "The Dominion Lands Act," and "The Dominion Lands Act, 1879."

Mr. BLAKE. I am informed that the passing of this Bill, which is retroactive, would affect some cases pending in the Supreme Court, which cases are supported by the French versions of those Acts affected by the Bill. Now, while I have no objection to errors being corrected, I think that existing rights and pending litigations ought not to be affected by those corrections.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I admit the principle that we should not prejudice cases pending in Court; but I do not see how any would be affected by this Bill, because the sense of the law is certainly changed altogether—the clauses in the French translation not having at all the meaning of the English clauses, and not the meaning intended by Parliament. The English version is right, but the translator for the French version has given the very opposite rendering of the words in French, and which are wholly wrong and misleading.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have a number of corrections to make in different clauses, so as to make the French readings correspond with the English version. From beginning to end the translator has taken opposite meanings from those intended by Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no objection to the correction of errors; but of course the English and French versions are of equal values in elucidating the law. And if cases are being maintained in Court with the assistance of the French version, we should be interfering with the rights of certain parties by changing the phraseology of the Act, unless we provided that those amendments should not affect pending cases. The member for St. John said that he was in Court and heard of cases depending on certain French constructions of the Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not hear of any such cases, though the Bill has been on the notice paper for a long time.

Mr. BLAKE. For four days.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill has gone through the Upper House and has been for some days on the Order paper of this House, but no representations as to its prejudicially affecting any pending cases have been made to us.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 167) to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is proposed to make a contract on the terms of the proposal, taking every guarantee that the work shall be done in a proper manner and binding the Government, should the work be done to their entire satisfaction and the work satisfactorily performed, to pay the subsidy and to continue paying so long as the service is efficiently performed.

Mr. ANGLIN. Why is such a contract necessary? Does not the Act on the one side and the charter on the other constitute a contract?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All that this Act does is to authorize the Government, if they are satisfied with the resources of the Company, and the Company will accept the terms, to make the contract according to those terms.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the contract will enable the Company to raise capital more easily. But the terms of the agreement may be such as may entangle us, inasmuch as capital is to be raised on the strength of them. Hence may arise some such kind of obligation as is sometimes recognized by Governments to pay the subsidy, inasmuch as capital was raised on it, although the conditions might not have been fulfilled.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The terms of the contract are limited to the bills and resolutions. Any capital subscribed will be subscribed with the fact distinctly stated that obligation of the Government depends on the contingency of this work being successful.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 169) to further amend the several Acts imposing Duties of Customs now in force.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and reported.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were considered in Committee, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 159) to make further provisions respecting Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons.—(Mr. McLelan.)

Bill (No. 160) to amend the Act respecting the Harbor of North Sydney, N.S.—(Mr. McLelan.)

DRY DOCKS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a resolution respecting the construction of Dry Docks by incorporated or other Companies. He said: I will read for the information of the House the following memorandum in regard to this subject:—

"Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 17th April, 1882.

"On a memorandum, dated 12th April, 1882, from the Minister of Public Works, submitting that applications have been received from certain of the residents of Halifax, Pictou, St. John, Rimouski and Kingston, for assistance from the Government towards the construction of Dry Docks at the several localities named.

"That the construction of Dry Docks would be of great importance to the shipping interest of the Dominion. That an Order in Council was passed, dated 11th June, 1881, recommending that a Bill should be submitted to Parliament at its next Session for the granting of a subsidy to a Graving Dock Company at Halifax, such subsidy not to exceed \$10,000 a year, nor to continue for a period exceeding 20 years.

"The Minister recommends that the Order in Council, dated 11th June, 1881, be cancelled, and that a resolution be submitted to Parliament during its present Session for the granting of a subsidy to any Dry Dock Company, to be *bonâ fide* established with the sanction of the Governor in Council, of two per centum per annum on the cost of the dock, so

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that the said cost does not exceed the value of the work as estimated by the Department of Public Works, or if it should exceed such value, then such two per centum shall be calculated on the value only—such subsidy to last for twenty years, that the amount of the subsidy to be paid annually for any such dock do not exceed \$10,000 (ten thousand dollars) and be paid semi-annually on the 2nd days of January and July in each year during the term herein mentioned, or so long as any such dock is kept in order and duly worked, and that the first payment be made so soon as the said dock has been completed and is in working order.

"The Minister furthermore recommends that all plans, specifications and estimates be submitted for the approval of the Governor in Council, and that the works during construction be subject to examination and inspection by an officer of the Department of Public Works, and at any time during the twenty years or so long as the payment of subsidy may take place, and further, that these docks shall be free for the use of all vessels and dr-dges owned by or in the service of the Dominion Government.

"The Committee submit the foregoing recommendations for Your Excellency's approval.

"Certified.

"JOHN J. MCGEE,
"Acting Clerk, P. C.

"The Honorable
"The Minister of Finance."

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In regard to the Halifax Dry Dock the difficulty exists at the present moment between the corporation and the parties who made the proposition. The conditions were that there should be a deposit of \$20,000 within fifty or sixty days after the grant of \$10,000 a year for twenty years had been passed. The party who had made the proposition had not complied with the conditions. A new proposition had been made by another party, but the second party had not complied with the conditions.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 173) to encourage the construction of Dry-Docks, by granting assistance, on certain conditions, to Companies constructing them.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS BY MAIL.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY, in the absence of Mr. O'CONNOR, moved the second reading of Bill (No. 161) to provide for the free transmission of Canadian newspapers by mail within the Dominion.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed and (at 2:30 a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, 16th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LANDRY (in French). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Government if it has the intention of introducing in this House the Bill promised in the Speech from the Throne, with regard to the amendments to be made to the Act establishing the Supreme Court, so as to make that Court acceptable to the Province of Quebec and to the other Provinces? If I am well informed, a draft of such a law was introduced in the Senate, but no more has

been heard about it. On the 8th March last, I had myself the honor of asking the permission of this House to introduce a Bill, the object of which was to repeal the Act establishing the Supreme Court. The Government requested me at the time—and it put the request in the light of a matter of courtesy—not to press my measure, as it had the intention of bringing forward its own in a few days, and that I should have every opportunity of introducing my own were I not satisfied with theirs. The Session is now drawing to a close, and I have not been afforded the opportunity to introduce that measure in amendment to the one which the Government had the intention of introducing. I think that since I have been courteous enough of acceding to the wishes of the Government, as well as to those of the hon. leader of the Opposition, not to press my measure, the Government might act likewise towards me, and if it does not determine upon introducing its measure it should at least allow me to introduce mine in order that we may ascertain the opinion of the House on the subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (in French). Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. member should not have waited till the Prime Minister should be in his seat before making these remarks, and I will ask him to reserve his question till his arrival. I can tell him, nevertheless, that a Bill has been introduced by the Government in the other House, but that it has not yet reached us.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 156) respecting the Windsor Branch of the Intercolonial Railway.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Bill (No. 169) further to amend the several Acts imposing duties of Customs, now in force. (Sir John A. Macdonald.)

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. MOUSSEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 168) to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1880.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On sub-section c, of section 2,

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I wish to have that sub-section amended, in order to enable manufacturers to put up fine cut chewing tobacco in packages of 5 or 10 lbs., instead of only 2 lbs., as the Bill provides. When the tobacco is put up in such small quantities it is liable to mould, and the consequence is that large quantities are returned to the manufacturers as unsaleable. Manufacturers in the town of Windsor have told me that they have lost thousands of dollars in consequence of this restriction, and if the concession I ask is not granted, some of these manufacturers will be driven out of the country. A manufacturer who was induced by the National Policy to come from Detroit and establish a factory at Windsor, informs me that if the Government refuse this concession he will have to close his factory and go back to Detroit. In the United States the manufacturers of fine cut chewing tobacco are allowed to put it up in packages of 5, 10, 20, 40 and 60 lbs. I accompanied a deputation of tobacco manufacturers from Montreal to the hon. Minister on the same subject, and they are unanimous in asking for this concession. The Windsor manufacturers manufacture not only for the Dominion, but for the European market, and they afford employment for a large number of people not only directly in their factories, but indirectly in the manufacture of paper and wooden boxes. The only ground the Department have for not granting this concession is that they are afraid that retail dealers, after the boxes are emptied, will fill them

with Canadian leaf tobacco; but it is very unlikely that any person who has been in the habit of using fine cut chewing tobacco, which requires very expensive machinery in its manufacture, will be imposed upon by the Canadian article. I have the authority of experts in the Inland Revenue Department, who are inspectors of tobacco, for the statement that it is impossible to imitate the fine cut tobacco with Canadian leaf, as the Canadian leaf is coarser

Amendment agreed to, allowing 5 lb. packages.

On clause 84,

Mr. MILLS. The word "occupy" has a particular meaning in law. What of the tobacco grown on the farms he does not occupy? This clause states further that he may sell to any person licensed as a dealer in leaf tobacco, or as a manufacturer of tobacco, or to anybody else. Why not simply say he may sell to everybody?

Mr. MOUSSEAU. The word "occupy" means to occupy either as owner or tenant or farmer, in any capacity whatever. He may reside in a village and grow the tobacco at a distance from his residence.

Mr. MILLS. That is not the meaning of occupation in English law.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. And he may sell to any licensed dealer in tobacco in the market or elsewhere.

On section 18,

Mr. BUNSTER. I would ask the Government to take into consideration the question of the repeal of this section. They have already done the people of the Dominion considerable justice by reducing the Tariff in different respects, but the great injustice under which we suffer to-day in respect to malting is the extra labor imposed in weighing the grain, also in the extra labor involved in taking the different measurements imposed upon them. I propose to substitute in lieu of a maltster's license, a duty on beer, of 2 cents a gallon, which, as any one can see, will yield more money to the Government than they receive under the present system.

Mr. MOUSSEAU. It is not the policy of the Government to accept such a change.

Mr. BUNSTER. Unfortunately we have not got what I consider a practical maltster in the Cabinet, but we may have one later on, and then the request may be complied with.

Mr. TELLIER (in French). I would ask to be allowed to amend the first section of the Bill by adding the following words:—

"This exception to be likewise applicable to each and every person who shall have bought from the grower, leaf tobacco grown in Canada, merely for his private use and for that of his family, and not for the purpose of selling it."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BOURASSA (in French), on motion that the Bill be read a third time, moved that it should not be read a third time, but be referred to the House as a Committee of the Whole to be amended, and that for paragraphs one and six the following be substituted:—

"The grower of Canadian tobacco may take to market and freely sell, there or elsewhere, to all and every one and free of duty, leaf, twist and rolled tobacco, grown by him on his farm or on land occupied by him."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I must first express my satisfaction with the concessions made by the Government in this direction. Yet I think it is still but half a measure. If all the hon. members of this House knew the fatigue and the enormous amount of labor demanded by the cultivation of Canadian tobacco, I think we would give the growers more liberty. Canadian tobacco does not keep if it is left in leaf; as soon as it is dry enough to be rolled, if it is left in leaf,

be it only for a fortnight or three weeks, it decreases considerably in value. On the other hand, the growers of tobacco are generally not rich men; the majority are young men who have been to the States to learn that cultivation, and after having earned a few hundred dollars, they have come back here and have taken up the cultivation of tobacco rather than that of grain, in order to make a little money out of it. It seems, therefore, to me that we should allow growers to make up their tobacco in twist and roll, so as to preserve it and sell it more easily.

Mr. AMYOT (in French). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just moved this amendment forgets that the present law already allows the free sale of leaf tobacco on the market and elsewhere, and it is utterly useless to try and amend the law in that direction. It is employing an unjust mode of fighting the Government. Secondly, with regard to the duty on Canada twist, it has been understood in this House that this restriction should exist for the very protection of the grower, because the making up of tobacco into rolls allows growers to introduce a bad quality of tobacco, and as a result when tobacco is offered in that shape on the market, the good pays for the bad. The object of the present law is to do away with the fraud existing formerly. I can conceive the satisfaction felt by the hon. member, but he should see that in making that motion, he is moving a vote of censure against his friends when they were in power, and he tells us that by this amendment that the policy of his leaders with regard to Canadian tobacco has ever been contrary to the good of the country, as well as to the welfare and wishes of the grower. The amendment which he proposes is a slap in the face to his hon. leaders; and he gives us the right of saying to the growers, when we shall go to render an account of our parliamentary stewardship, that the present law is so good that all the hon. members of the Opposition gave it their approval, and that the Government has settled that question to the general satisfaction owing to the splendid condition of the finances and owing to its policy of protection.

Mr. BOURASSA (in French). I must say that all the hon. members of this House know that I look to measures first, whether they come from one side of the House or the other. I take their worth into account, and if they are good I approve of them. I repeat that the Government has taken a step in favor of the grower, but it is only half a measure, and it should have gone a step further.

Mr. HOUDE (in French). I would ask the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Bourassa) whether he thinks that if we were to allow growers and all those who buy from them, to manufacture tobacco under the different forms suggested by him, it would have the effect of encouraging capitalists to invest their capital in establishing new manufactories for the manufacturing of Canadian tobacco. Were that amendment agreed to, it would have the effect of preventing the establishment of these manufactories. The hon. member has told us that tobacco was cultivated by young men who have returned from the States after learning its cultivation there. I must tell him that if there are in his county any young men who have learnt the cultivation of tobacco in the States, they have learnt it badly. The tobacco which comes to us from the United States, is leaf tobacco put into *boucault*; all the tobacco that we manufacture here as coming from the United States is leaf tobacco, and it is the best way to prepare it and keep it in good condition.

Mr. TELLIER (in French). I have some difficulty in understanding the amendment just proposed by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Bourassa). We have often heard this question of Canadian tobacco discussed, but it has always been handled from the grower's point of view. The hon. member forgets that the grower has just received considerable protection. The cultivation of Canadian tobacco is now

Mr. BOURASSA.

entirely free. The grower is no longer compelled to take out a license to cultivate tobacco, and he has the right to sell it in the leaf without paying any duty. The hon. member seems also to have forgotten that by the amendment which I moved just a moment ago and which was agreed to by the Government, the right which the grower possessed, to manufacture tobacco for his own and that of his family, is extended to the consumer. Thus, according to the law, such as exists to-day, the grower has the right to sell his tobacco in leaf without paying any duty, and the consumer who buys that tobacco on the market may make it up into rolls if he sees fit. The hon. member did not speak on a point which, in my mind, is an important one, and that is that Canadian tobacco enjoys considerable protection to-day. According to the law such as it was formerly, the duty on Canadian and foreign tobacco being the same, the manufacturer had no interest in manufacturing Canadian tobacco, but under the present law, he will find it more to his advantage to employ Canadian tobacco, and, on the other hand, the grower will have a market to dispose of his tobacco. Consequently, I say that the hon. member's motion has merely for its object to curry popular favor, and no one will argue at public meetings in favor of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. The slight duty of 4 cents per pound placed on roll tobacco falls on the consumer and not on the grower.

Mr. BÉCHARD (in French). I do not understand how a tax on Canadian tobacco can be construed into protection for the consumer any more than a tax on flour is a protection for the consumer of flour. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Tellier) and a few others contend that a duty placed on roll and twist tobacco will have the effect of protecting the grower against certain producers who introduce a bad quality of tobacco into their rolls. Well, I repeat what I have already said, that he who sells bad tobacco soon becomes known, and like he who sells bad hay or bad grain, he soon loses public confidence. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Bourassa) asks that not only should the grower be allowed to sell his leaf tobacco without paying any duty, but that he may be allowed to do so in the case of twist or rolled tobacco, and I am of opinion that, were that right granted to him, it would be greatly to his advantage. For, if the grower has the right of selling twist or roll tobacco without paying any duty, he can obtain a higher price for it than if he sells it in leaf only. There are growers who sell excellent tobacco in that shape, and that protects them against the manufacturer, for having the advantage of selling it dearer, if it is made up into rolls or twist, he can obtain a higher price for his leaf tobacco. Consequently, I think that the repeal of the present duty such as proposed by the motion of my hon. friend, would be a protection for the grower instead of for the manufacturer. And I maintain that by preventing him from selling his tobacco freely, whether in twist or in roll, one is giving protection to the manufacturers, because one is preventing the grower from obtaining as high a price as he otherwise might obtain for his tobacco.

Amendment (Mr. Bourassa) negatived on a division.

Mr. LANDRY (in French). Before this Bill is read a third time, I would ask the Government if it will be subjected to any amendment in the other House, I mean with the consent or at the suggestion of the Government?

Mr. HOUDE (in French). I think that that question is unfair. We cannot ask this House to control the doings of the other House.

Mr. SPEAKER. We cannot speak here of what may or may not be done in the other House.

Mr. LANDRY (in French). May I ask the Government whether it will or not sanction the changes which might be made to the Bill in the other House?

Mr. MOUSSEAU (in French). The Government has defined its policy in the Bill such as it has just been agreed to.

Mr. VANASSE (in French). Before this Bill is read a third time, I wish to propose that section 84 be amended by adding the following words :

"All persons thus buying leaf tobacco from the grower may retail it without paying any duty to the Inland Revenue."

Mr. MOUSSEAU (in French). Were the Government to consent to such an amendment, it would be establishing a new meaning with regard to the different classes of people who might buy or sell tobacco.

Mr. VANASSE (in French). The law, such as it stands, seems to me to be a general one and can cause such difficulties to arise, that I think it would be good to adopt a clear and precise meaning, so that there should not be any ambiguity.

Amendment negatived on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. AMYOT. In the *Free Press* of this afternoon, under the title of "Sessional Jottings," appears the following:—

"Mr. Ogden assures us he had no share in the fire-cracker business. We accept his word. Mr. Amyot and Mr. Bergeron were the principal offenders."

When the Session commenced, I was most disgracefully attacked in that infamous and low paper, in which there is never a word of truth, and which abuses the hospitality it receives in this House by its constant, disgraceful attacks upon hon. members on this side. I treat the accusation with the most profound contempt. I was in one of the rooms outside with an hon. Minister discussing the tobacco question when these torpedoes were being thrown. I tell the *Free Press* and all newspapers of that description, that though they may be circulated in my county, they will meet with that contempt which such disreputable rags deserve, and find that their words are judged exactly for what they are worth, and that is nothing at all.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on a certain proposed resolution to provide for the granting of subsidies for the construction of certain lines of railways.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to say a few words with reference to the first proposed grant, and to the form in which it is proposed to be made. Not long ago, it was the opinion of Parliament and of the public that the connection, for the purposes of Ontario, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, was necessary to be made at or near Callander station, but that opinion was changed by the utterances of the hon. the Prime Minister last fall. When the proposal was that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be constructed through Ontario, far from the seaboard of Lakes Huron and Superior, it was one thing; but when the proposal came that the Canadian Pacific Railway should rapidly reach the shore of the Lake, the hon. Minister announced that plan in words which verify the statement I have made. In the *Mail's* report of the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman, at Toronto, on the 24th of November last, these words occur:

"I may add that the proposed alterations in the line will be of great and special advantage to Ontario, and the cities and commerce of Ontario, and to no place will this advantage be greater than to the great city of Toronto. (Cheers.) The road will run from Callander to near

the Sault Ste. Marie. It will not touch that place, however, but strike near there, and run along the coast, and the effect of that is, by the construction of the road to Lake Nipissing, the supplies of the great North-West will in a great measure come from Toronto and London; and Ontario, which was in a considerable degree to have had the go-by, if the road had run to the north of Nepigon, and gone straight through the wilderness to Montreal, will have its fair chance and full opportunity in trade and commerce, and manufactures, to supply all that great North-West country."

Now, Sir, if the connection for Ontario purposes, with the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be made at Callander, it is clear that this glowing anticipation of the hon. Minister as to the useful results of the change of line will not be realized, because it is of little consequence by what mode or route, whether along the shore or through Ontario, Callander is reached, if it be at Callander that Ontario is to tap the traffic of the North-West. The hon. gentleman's statement, therefore, obviously pointed to an improvement to be given to the condition of the Province of Ontario, and particularly of the city of Toronto by the change, because the go-by, which, as he says, would otherwise have largely been given to that Province had the route remained in the interior, to the north of Nepigon, would now not result, and it would be able to get the trade which it would not, to a large extent, have been able otherwise to secure. How is that to be secured if we are to tap the railway only at the old tapping point at Callander? Obviously the advantage the Province is to derive from this new departure mentioned by the hon. gentleman, that a shorter distance is to be found by this means from the chief centres of Ontario to the North-West, and that is to be found only if we strike the Canadian Pacific Railway, not at Callander—although I do not object to that—but at some other point on its way towards the shore of Lake Huron from Callander. By that means, by crossing the French River at another point and striking the Canadian Pacific Railway either on the shores of Lake Huron or before it reaches the shores of Lake Huron, a considerable distance would be saved, and the chances of Ontario to reach that traffic would certainly be increased. It would take less mileage to go from Toronto, Hamilton, London or Port Hope, from the various points we have to deal with, to Thunder Bay and so further westward, than the route by Callander. But I would like to ask how the benefits are to be realized to Ontario if, after all, we are still to tap the Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander only? What is the gain? The mileage by the proposed route will be a little longer from Callander to Winnipeg, than it would have been by the old route, so that we gain nothing in shortened mileage; and if we are to tap the longer main line at some point, as was before calculated upon, where is the gain? There is none at all. Now, Sir, it seems to me that the Administration ought to have considered this fully, and have come down with a definite policy upon it. The hon. gentleman may answer me, we have that definite policy, and it is that the only tapping point shall be Callander. If so, I regret it. I would prefer that the question should be left open as to where the point shall be, whether Callander or some other point, which would give a still shorter line for the trade of Ontario, and strike the Canadian Pacific Railway higher up, or whether arrangements should be made to tap both points. As far as I am able to understand the proposal, it has been made to cover both points, or either of them. It is announced that the definite determination of the Government is that Callander is necessarily to be the point of junction, and therefore I would ask an explanation of the reason why any of the gains stated by the Minister to accrue to Ontario from the change of route—what that gain is, wherein it exists? And I would also ask the reason why the proposed plan of uniting with the Canadian Pacific Railway at a point higher up, which would shorten the mileage considerably for all Ontario, has been unfavorably considered and disposed of by the Government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The resolutions state the policy of the Government, and that is the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callander. I stated, in submitting these resolutions, that the Government had considered the representation of both companies, the Company proposing to go from Gravenhurst to Sault Ste. Marie, or rather to cross the French River and extend thence to the Sault; and also the same Company has a charter by which they can go to Callander. That Company, which proposes to make what is called the shortest communication to Sault Ste. Marie, or the Canadian Pacific Railway to the westward of Lake Nipissing, made a distinct proposal to the Government to construct this line, for which a subsidy was asked to authorize the Company, now called the North-Western Company, which had proposed to construct it for a subsidy of \$12,000 a mile; the proposal made by the other Company for a line from Gravenhurst to Callander for a subsidy of \$6,000 a mile, when, as I suppose, nearly half the line from Gravenhurst to Callander is common to both lines. You do not pass from the branch crossing French River and running to Sault Ste. Marie until you have gone half way from Gravenhurst to Callander. The hon. leader of the Opposition asks why we struck for Callander. It was regarded as the distributing point for the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Ontario system of railways in the Bill of last Session, providing for communication at Callander. The distance will be fifty-five miles shorter, but at the same time the country is a much more difficult one for railway construction than the direct line to Callander, both lines being, however, somewhat difficult. The present proposal is simply to take power to secure the construction of the connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander, without conveying it to any one company, as the matter was left entirely open, and we have proposals from both companies.

Mr. BLAKE. How, under these circumstances, will Ontario be benefitted by a change of route shortening the distance from Callander, as was stated by the hon. First Minister on 24th November?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The distance is much shortened. It is practically the same, because the distance from Callander to Thunder Bay is assumed to be as nearly as can be ascertained, the same by either line; but two objects are attained by a change of route, and both are very important to Ontario and its commerce. Toronto, Hamilton and the railway system generally of Ontario will be brought by this change of route into more direct communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also into communication with the connection at Sault Ste. Marie with the Northern Pacific Railway and the north-western States. In this case you accomplish, by the construction of one line, what might be expected to be furnished by two lines, and, at the same time, secure much more rapid connection and at a much earlier period. Toronto by the change of line will be brought thirty miles nearer the Sault, and will secure, at a much earlier period, connection with the American lines at the Sault, as well as with the North-West, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, than would otherwise be secured.

Mr. BLAKE. What I want to know is, in what way Toronto and Ontario will be benefitted by the proposed change of route.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot answer that.

Mr. BLAKE. That point is now settled. I observe no provision is made in the resolutions indicating that running powers will be imposed on the favored Company. It is quite clear that the favored Company will occupy a very important position, and it seems to be absolutely essential, in order that fair play may be extended to other companies, that there should be some arrangement for exchange of traffic

Mr. BLAKE.

and running powers over that portion of the line which is to be subsidized.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All parties have agreed that the line should be available to all railways; I quite agree with the hon. gentleman on this point.

Mr. BLAKE. In the measure there should be a general declaration that the favored Company should submit to such running powers as might be decided by the Governor in Council. The hon. gentleman referred to the railway to Oxford, and made a very long and glowing statement with regard to Mr. Blackman's project, but he did not say whether this particular railway was part of Mr. Blackman's scheme.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, it is.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any particular object to be gained in adopting Mr. Blackman's offer in preference to others?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, not necessarily.

Mr. BLAKE. Because I understand there is embraced in the traffic, powers of another railway, the Nova Scotian railway, the operations of a line from some point on their railway to Oxford.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not aware if it covers that. There is a branch to Pictou from the Intercolonial, and I hope there is one to Oxford, because that would give us another chartered company with whom to secure the construction.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed to invite tenders or proposals or plans from the various companies, or to deal with a particular one?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Whoever the Government can make the best terms with.

Mr. BLAKE. The amount per mile is fixed, so how do you expect to improve the matter?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There will be the question of facilities, for the proper and efficient discharge of the work.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any proposals been made up to this time?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. None, but with Mr. Blackman, who said that, with a subsidy to this extent, he would be prepared to construct the work properly.

Mr. BLAKE. The construction of this road has been agitated a good deal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I think not.

Mr. BLAKE. Part of it I think has.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Only in general terms for some time.

Mr. BLAKE. It was discussed in general terms last summer I believe?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I believe it was.

Mr. BLAKE. Whence this measure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say it for him.

Resolution agreed to and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER introduced Bill (No. 176) to provide for the granting of subsidies for the construction of certain lines of railway therein mentioned.

Bill read the first and second times.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BERGERON. I notice that the Ottawa *Free Press* of to-day has a paragraph in which my name is mentioned. It says:

"Mr. Ogden assures us that he had no share in the fire-cracker business, and we accept his word. Mr. Amyot and Mr. Bergeron were the principal offenders."

The editor of this paper seems to be trying to learn who the offenders were, because he first mentioned a number of names, and four gentlemen yesterday denied the accuracy of his statement. He now takes back every word, and throws the blame on Mr. Amyot and myself. I was sitting in the House while this firing of crackers was going on, and they were flying all around my head as well as others. I could not ascertain where they were coming from, and they might have come from the gallery, from the editor of the *Free Press*, as likely as from any other place. While I was here I was in respectable company, namely, that of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Secretary of State, and I had nothing to do with the firing of these crackers. This is the second time I have been mentioned in abusive terms by this newspaper: In the first Session I was here I was referred to by it in slanderous terms; but I would not have mentioned it on this occasion had not its previous statements about me been repeated in a low, contemptible way by a paper of about the same calibre as itself, and that is the reason that I rise to make these remarks.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE FISHERIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 177) to authorize an annual grant for the development of sea fisheries, and the encouragement of the building of fishing vessels.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood that while the hon. Minister of Finance said he could not at this Session arrive at a definite plan for the distribution of this money for the want of sufficient information, it was his intention not to make any proposition for the permanent disposition of the fund. Would it not be advisable that an Order in Council for the allocation of the fund in subsequent years should be laid before Parliament, or that some provision of that kind should be made? I think that would be better than placing it at the absolute disposal of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right, and we may be able to introduce a clause to some such effect.

Bill read the first and second times.

THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented the fourth report of the Select Committee on the Official Debates of the House, and moved that it be concurred in.

Mr. AMYOT, (in French.) I take the opportunity afforded me by this motion in which I concur, to add a few remarks to what has already been said in this House with regard to the *Hansard* got up by Mr. Desjardins for the Parliament of the Province of Quebec. I think that we have far from done justice towards so important a publication which is approved of and praised by the two political parties of the Province. I shall read an extract from a letter of Mr. Desjardins, which will give an idea of the extent of the work:

"My work is in no wise the reproduction of newspaper reports. On the contrary, the speeches published *in extenso* in the newspapers are prepared by me ninety-nine times out of one hundred and given to members in order that they may have the advantage of handing them over to friendly sheets for publication. What was said by Mr. White is consequently not exact, and the same applies to what was said by Mr. Plumb, who considerably improved in inaccuracy on the speaker preceding him. As to the particular instance referred to by Mr. White with regard to the debate on the disallowance of the Mining Bill, here are the facts of the case: That debate lasted but a few minutes, and I took down the speeches *verbatim*. In conformity with my system, which is so good a one that it is in force in Ottawa to-day, I submitted the result of my labors to those who had spoken on the subject, and they themselves reduced my manuscript to the proportions complained of by Mr. White, so I am clearly not to blame for this. It is also untrue that members hand me their speeches ready written out, and that those who do not give them to me are omitted in my work. As an instance,

I did not receive more than a total of 160 pages of manuscript out of 1,000; this is an infinitely smaller proportion than in Ottawa. Believe me, I have positive information on the subject. Now, my system is a good one, and I have the proof of it by referring you to what has been done in England during the past eighty years. There, the *Hansard* is left to private enterprise and has always been so as it is in France, where it remained so from the revolution of 1789 to 1843, when an opportunity was sought of making it a matter of patronage, and no other system has ever been used in England (you know how fond Englishmen are of precedents). There too they abridge more than I do; consult any volume and you will see this. Questions of the highest importance are cut down, a thing I do not do. But what I do, is to cut out repetitions, and the Lord knows how numerous they are. Mr. Plumb stated that from what Mr. White had said, that my report was not worth that given by the newspapers. This is quite untrue, for I make it a point of submitting my work to every member; and one of the greatest merits of my publication in the eyes of Mr. Joly, is its clearness, accuracy and absolute impartiality. So much is this the case that during the important debate which has just taken place in the Legislative Assembly on the railway question, that both sides have vied in giving their testimony to the impartiality of the 'Debates.' As a matter of fact, it is greatly through my volumes that both sides argued the question. Mr. Chapleau himself has on every opportunity since the beginning of the Session praised the work, and so have Messrs. Marchand, Shehyc and Gagnon. I am mentioning these names from memory, but I may say that no member has ever cast any doubt on the accuracy of my work. I am afraid of tiring you with these details, but I beg you to excuse me."

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall soon find copies of that publication in the Library of Parliament.

Report concurred in.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills (from the Senate) were introduced and read the first, second and third times, and passed:—

Bill (No. 174) to further amend the Indian Act, 1880.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 175) to provide for building certain branch lines of railway from points on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway, respectively.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

The following Bill was considered in Committee, and read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 177) to authorize an annual grant for the development of the Sea Fisheries.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

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

After Recess.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER, in moving that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 176) to provide for the granting of subsidies for the construction of certain lines of railway therein mentioned, said: I wish to draw the attention of the leader of the Opposition to an amendment I propose to make to the general provision, which is as follows:—

The said subsidies to be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to complete the said railways respectively, within a reasonable time, to be fixed by Order in Council, and according to descriptions and specifications to be approved by the Governor in Council on the Report of the Minister of railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made by the Company with the Government, and which the Government shall be empowered to make, and to be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments on the completion of each ten miles of railway, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with the whole work undertaken, such proportion to be established by the Report of the said Minister.

I propose to add to that provision an amendment, to meet the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, which is as follows:—

Provided always that the granting of such bonuses or subsidies shall be subject to such conditions for securing such traffic arrangements to other roads as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connecting therewith.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have left out purposely the words "running powers." Perhaps you might have it optional to say running powers or traffic arrangements such as the Governor in Council may require. There is great difficulty in giving them to a large number of railways. I am providing that all the railways connecting with these roads should have equal facilities.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman believe those words are wide enough in case the Governor in Council should deem it proper to include running powers?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think they are. I therefore suggest the provisions shall be amended as to include running powers or such traffic arrangements as may be deemed proper.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better to include those words.

Amendment agreed to and reported.

On motion for third reading.

Mr. BLAKE. I move in amendment

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to insert after the word "Callander," the words "or to some other point on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

410. To defray balance of travelling expenses and indemnity of the late L. A. McConville, Esq., M. P., to be paid to Mrs. McConville\$761 80

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing on my part, and on that of my colleagues our deep felt regret at the death of our colleague, Mr. McConville. That gentleman had only been a very short time with us, but he had shown, once or twice, when he spoke in this House, that he had great aptitude and ability, and would certainly have made his mark in this House. We all regret his untimely death, and his memory will be cherished by us, as it is by his family, who cannot fail to profit by the good example he has always shown. I am sure the Committee will agree to this proposal.

412. { Barrie Post Office, &c..... \$8,000
{ Por Hope do 8,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This will not cover the whole expense.

413. Jordan Bay..... \$5,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to provide for repairs at the breakwater required for the safety of that harbor.

414. Newcastle harbor improvements..... \$5,500

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is in the county of West Durham. It is about half the amount that will be required. The locality will furnish the balance.

415. To aid corporation of Emerson in building a bridge over the Red River. The plans, &c., to be approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council..... \$30,000

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is about half the expected cost; the town furnishing the other half.

416. Fish Hatchery in British Columbia..... \$4,000

Mr. HOMER. During my short visit in Ottawa, I find that it is the general opinion in the eastern Provinces that
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the resources of British Columbia are confined principally to the salmon fisheries. Our fisheries are very extensive but that is not our only source of natural wealth. We have no difficulty in finding a market for our fish, and we could dispose of five times as many if we had them. Therefore it seems highly proper that the Government should do something towards developing the fisheries. Among the other products of our country, we have gold, silver, copper and iron mines. We have extensive coal products and also cattle which are being shipped to the north-western States. The country is also belted with timber on the northern and southern boundary, our markets for which are in France, Mexico, South America, the Australian Colonies and China, to which ports cargoes are leaving every week in the year. The coal beds are very extensive, and the quality is such that it commands a higher price in San Francisco markets than any other coal. That market consumes 700,000 tons of coal annually contributed by the different coal beds of the world, and when I say that British Columbia coal brings a higher price than any other, that is sufficient evidence of its superior quality. Our country is penetrated with streams and rivers, and the coast is indented with the finest harbors, which, with the protection which this Government is now proposing to extend, will become among the finest in the world. This is the general character of the natural resources of our country. We have a comparatively small population of 50,000 inhabitants, yet we exported last year products of the value of \$3,100,000, of which \$1,400,000, according to the fishery reports, were for products of the fisheries, being nearly one-sixth of the whole amount of fish exported by the Dominion. Last year, the Customs Department alone contributed \$61,000 of revenue, over one-third of the amount contributed, and about one-half of the amount contributed by New Brunswick, the former containing a population of 450,000 and the latter a population of 350,000. This House has already appropriated this Session the sum of \$150,000 for the fishermen, and \$30,000 for hatcheries in the eastern Provinces. We ask now for \$4,000 which, in addition to a previous appropriation, amounts to \$6,000 or thereabouts, which sum, I think you will all agree, is reasonable, when we consider the amount it contributes towards the exports of the Dominion. Some complaint has been made that the Government are appropriating too large a sum for the fisheries, in view of the large appropriation for railway purposes in our Province, but I think it would be a very unwise policy on the part of the Government to refuse to assist these young and growing industries in any of the Provinces. I may, however, say that the Government have taken a course which will be satisfactory, not only to British Columbia but to all the eastern Provinces, in assisting these industries. We admit we are deriving great benefit from the Canadian Pacific Railway, but at the same time we cannot admit that British Columbia is the only Province that derives a benefit from the construction of that road, or its extension from the east base of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific coast. We believe the eastern Provinces are equally benefitted, if not more, than British Columbia. The people of the eastern Provinces do not seem to realize the important fact that upon the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Port Moody the markets of the whole Pacific coast as well as those of the Australian Colonies, China, Japan and the whole Asiatic coast, will be open to their markets, and that a very efficient and intelligent staff of commercial travellers in the Lower Provinces will soon put them in commercial communication with 700,000,000 souls. But to recur to the fisheries. There are three distinct runs in British Columbia. The first makes its appearance about the first of April, and continues to run in limited numbers until the 30th of June; these are called spring fish or large salmon. They again make their appearance about the middle of August and run six weeks

in limited numbers. These two runs of fish are of a very superior quality, and if they could be appropriated for canning purposes the Government would realize a large amount of revenue from that branch of business. The third run, or the middle run, which makes its appearance in the river about the 10th of July, runs in great numbers for thirty days, and every fourth year this fish runs in immense numbers. The second year the run is increased about one-third, while the two next years they run in such limited numbers that they are barely profitable. It is in this run that seven-eighths of the fish are obtained for packing purposes. This large run of fish which we wish to develop is the same kind which is caught in the Colombia River and the Sacramento River of California. Last year the Colombia River packed 550,000 cases, the Sacramento River 200,000 cases, and the Fraser River 160,000 cases. We are third in the order of fish producing countries. Six years ago the fishing on the Sacramento was greatly reduced, but with the establishing of hatcheries they brought the supply up last year to 200,000 cases. If the hatcheries were so successful there it is easy to see that they would be still more successful in the Colombia River. By establishing hatcheries we would extend the fishing season over a period of five or six months, while now it only lasts about thirty days. It gives employment at the present time to a population of 3,500 for a period of thirty days, 3,000 for forty days, 2,500 for fifty days, and 500 for the balance of the year. If fish hatcheries were established and the canneries could extend the fishing season over six months, we could have such a population as I have mentioned for six months, half of it for the balance of the year. We experience great difficulty yearly in obtaining men to work the fisheries. One of the difficulties arising from the fishing season being so short, is to obtain a sufficient number of hands to do the work. If those hatcheries were established, large numbers of Indians would obtain employment who otherwise might become a burden on the country. The position of the whites would also be improved, and all classes of the community would derive more or less benefit.

Mr. PLUMB. As this is one of the last requests I shall ever make, I desire to call the Government's attention to the need of providing a small fish hatchery in the town of Niagara. I had intended to refer to the subject when the Estimates were being discussed, but I did not happen to be in the House at the time; and I wish to enquire from the acting Minister of Marine, whether he will not find it possible, out of the moneys for fisheries in the hands of the Department, to devote a few hundred dollars for the purpose of establishing a hatchery there. Niagara River is a *habitat* of the white fish. The white fish there are of fine quality and are found in large numbers, and the fishing is greatly benefitted by stock supplied from the hatchery at Newcastle, but in order to bring fry from there, great expense has to be incurred. It has to be brought down in cases either from Windsor, where there is a hatchery, or from Newcastle, and in either case the expense is great, and an economy would be effected in having a small hatchery at Niagara to supply the river and the lake. An arrangement has been made there—and if the hon. Minister is not aware of it, the Commissioner of Fisheries is, at all events, aware of it—by which a small sum appropriated would be acceptable to my former constituents, who will be my constituents no longer after Parliament has prorogued.

Mr. McLELAN. Since the matter was strongly pressed on me a short time ago, I have given it a good deal of consideration, but I have not reached a decision. The Government will be unable to accomplish the object this year, but I think it is desirable from the recommendations that have been made to me, and I will endeavor to give it attention, and I hope another year a sum will be placed in the Estimates.

Mr. PLUMB. I think the hon. gentleman has had time to consider it, and it is a small favor to have asked.

Mr. McLELAN. It is only recently it was brought to my notice. The hon. gentleman asked me for fry from the hatchery in-operation, and I believe he obtained it.

Mr. BANNERMAN. In looking over the appropriation brought down by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I observe only \$1,000 in the Estimates for protecting fisheries in the North-West. Before the next five or six years will have elapsed members from that territory will be asking for grants for the protection of fisheries in Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba. The fisheries of those lakes are destroyed by thousands, and hundreds of thousands of fish being taken out of season. To my knowledge last year in Lake Winnipeg alone there were between 700,000 or 800,000 white fish caught out of season; and I was told by factors and traders of the Hudson's Bay Company that where they were accustomed to catch an unlimited quantity of fish fifteen or twenty years ago they were unable to catch one, and for fishing purposes they had to go forty or fifty miles further up the lake. I would suggest to the Government that it would be in the interest of the country, especially as the supply of fish is limited to the four large lakes, to have a proper staff of officials appointed to protect the fisheries, so that no applications will be needed for hatcheries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised that the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) has made a strong appeal in respect to the propagation of white fish in the Niagara River, and I think I can suggest a mode to the hon. gentleman that will be effective in convincing the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he will be doing no more important service to the country than in taking measures to propagate and increase the white fish found at the mouth of the river. I once had the good fortune of having breakfast at the residence of the hon. member for Niagara, and I shall never forget the delicate white fish that I enjoyed at his table. I have eaten white fish in other places, but I had no idea, until that morning, what a delicate fish it was; and I am quite sure that, in addition to the admirable manner in which the fish was prepared, there must have been special excellency in the fish itself; and I am quite certain the hon. the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries would do no more acceptable service to the country than to endeavor to make provision for the increase of the fish to be found in that locality. I may say, however, in reference to the statement of my hon. friend from Niagara, that this will probably be the last occasion on which he expects to present the claims of Niagara, that I differ from the opinion he has expressed on that point. I believe that for many long years to come the hon. member for Niagara will be found here the representative of a larger if not a more interesting constituency than Niagara. I am certain that for years to come he will continue to adorn this Chamber, and that his friends in Niagara will find him as zealous and steadfast in advocating their interests as he has been in the past.

417. To provide for the purchase of a collection of coins and medals illustrating remarkable events in the history of Canada, from its discovery by the French, with a full descriptive catalogue of the same.....\$2,500

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. From whom was this purchase made? And are the coins to be placed in the library?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From Mr. Hart, of Montreal, a gentleman who is well known as a numismatologist. It has been a labor of love with him to collect a series of coins and medals altogether connected with the Province of Canada. I have not seen the collection myself, and I would not be a very good judge if I should see them,

but I am told and know from the various reports that it is really a valuable and almost unique collection. It has been valued several times, and the present sum is much less than Mr. Hart thinks it is worth. The Library Committee this Session, and for several Sessions, strongly urged the acquisition of this collection at this very moderate price, and it will be placed in a position of the library or such other place as Parliament may wish. We have an opportunity of getting this very fine collection which we may never have again. There are Indian and Canadian medals, all early ones, I believe, connected with the history of Canada, besides coins of every description that have been made in Canada.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of the number?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not. I am sorry that my time has been so occupied that I have not looked through the catalogue, which, since last Session, has been made very complete.

Mr. DAWSON. I saw the collection some time ago. It has been made by the Hart family, one of the oldest in Lower Canada, who have been collecting for many years. It is really a most valuable and interesting collection, and I do not know where any such other collection could be found.

418. Unexpended balance of vote of 1880-81 for travelling expenses, Niagara Falls Commissioners (revote) \$699 15

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact position in which this Commission stands? I suppose the Dominion has not much to do with the project which was initiated by the State of New York. I think it had rather been taken up by Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By both.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is there any idea of carrying out the idea suggested by Lord Dufferin, of making an International Park?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was at one time a good prospect, but upon an economical turn in the Legislature of New York, the vote for the appropriation was defeated. The Province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada acted very promptly, and desired to act liberally for what I think is a very laudable purpose. The Dominion of Canada is directly interested in securing the land, the whole bank or a great portion of it, having been reserved for military purposes, and this strip of land the Dominion will be very glad to have planted and otherwise fitted up for a park. The Government of Ontario have, I believe, no land there, but Mr. Mowat took a very active interest in the matter. As the hon. gentleman will remember, there was a deputation came here some years ago, and there was at that time a good prospect of the project being successful, but a difference of opinion arose in the New York Legislature, and the vote was defeated by a small majority. We have good hopes, however, that some day or other the appropriation will be carried in that Legislature.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to see something of the kind carried out, if it could be carried out on fair and reasonable terms, because, I regret to say, the last time I was there I was disgusted to see the extent to which the banks of the stream had been disfigured by buildings and excrescences of other kinds, and I think it is a shame and a scandal to both countries that it should be so. The difficulty will be that the sum involved on the American side will be very large. I believe they intended to take in a considerable extent of land, and the proprietors have been making so much money out of it that if you capitalized all their incomes the sum would be a formidable one. I am glad to hear, however, that there is some prospect of the project being successful.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to say that the people and the Legislature of New York were exceedingly willing and desirous to preserve that land as a park, but when the Bill was in the Legislature it was vetoed by the Governor. The member for the county of Niagara, which is along the river towards the lake, informed me that he thought there would be a large vote in favor of it, and that when the new Governor was elected, he had no doubt that almost the first thing done would be to make an appropriation for that purpose. He said further, that they would be willing to expend a large sum of money for the purpose, and that it would be expended solely by the State of New York, as they were so jealous of their rights that they would not accept any aid from the United States Government. On this side a plan was made, and an engineer drew the necessary profile of the property which it was proposed to take. It extends from the upper Suspension Bridge to the smooth water at the head of the rapids, including part of the property which formerly belonged to my late brother-in-law, the islands below, and the property upon which the Clifton House, the museum and other buildings now stand. That would cost a sum which was not considered excessive. I think all the Commissioners were convinced that the project was a feasible one. Several attempts have been made by private companies to carry out this project; but I think it would be very unfortunate if it fell into the hands of private speculators. I think there will be a feeling on the part of the Government, and that it will be responded to by Parliament, that if anything could be done within reasonable limits to preserve the Canadian side, it should be done; and I think it could be arranged that the sum required for the purpose would be recouped; at any rate the interest would be paid, so that there would be no charge to the general public. I am glad, however, to see this sum continued, and I hope the project will receive further attention in the future.

419. To settle claim of Reuben Lunt for damage to steamer *St. John*..... \$15,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What are the particulars of this claim?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The following memorandum from the Department of Justice has been placed in my hands:—

“DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
“OTTAWA, 16th May, 1882.

“*Lunt & Burpee vs. Lloyd*.”

“This action was brought to recover damages for loss of steamer *City of St. John*, sunk in Bathurst harbor. It was alleged that the accident happened by reason of the *St. John* striking on the anchor of the dredge *Canada*. This case was tried before Mr. Justice Weldon, at the November Circuit in St. John, 1878, when the jury disagreed. It was tried again at the York sitting in January, 1879, before Mr. Justice Fisher, when a verdict was given for the plaintiff for \$45,720. A new trial was granted by the Court, and the case now stands in that position. The reason of the Judges who granted the new trial were not given.”

The solicitor for the plaintiffs, Mr. Thompson, had to leave to argue a case before the Privy Council in England, and died there. From 1880 to the present time Mr. Lunt has been in communication with the Government, urging for a settlement without carrying the case into Court; and the Government decided to ask Parliament to appropriate \$15,000 in full payment of the claims for the loss of the steamer, alleged to have been caused by the neglect of the captain of the dredge. This amount covers everything, and Mr. Lunt has agreed to accept it.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

On Resolution 319.

To pay balance due to S. L. Bedson, on account of travelling expenses to and from St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary from and to Manitoba..... \$400

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister promised to let us know exactly what Mr. Bedson's expenses were.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have a memorandum as follows:—Salaries—Acting Warden McKay, \$1,432.61; Wm. B. McDougall, \$165; total \$1,597.61. Travelling expenses—Warden Bedson, \$675; Acting Warden McKay, \$539.95; total \$1,214.95. Expenses—Private quarters for Mr. Bedson, the Warden's house having been handed over to the Department of Public Works for repairs, \$173.59. These items make a total of \$2,986 15. All that is asked for in the different estimates.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Were Mr. Bedson's travelling expenses to and from Manitoba \$675, because that appears a rather large sum. I imagine one third of the sum would very fairly cover all the expenses of such a journey.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume the \$600 covers all his expenses from the time he left the penitentiary in Winnipeg until he returned to his home. You can hardly expect to take an officer from his home, and send him travelling, without paying some additional expenses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose I must ascertain the nature of his expenses, and see that they are not excessive.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. That is scarcely the way to put an item through Committee except on the last night of the Session. I think the hon. Minister ought to look into it and see that it is all right. I call attention to the fact that it is expressly set down on the score of expenses to and from—it is entered wrong.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will make a note of it and see that it is entered right.

On Resolution 321,

Manitoba Penitentiary—to provide for difference
in exchange of land \$1,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. What is the quantity of land?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The lot on which the penitentiary stands is 160 acres; immediately in rear of it is the lot owned by Mr. Bedson, 160 acres, upon which they are laying out town lots. He owns the lot that is proposed to extend from the Government lot lying alongside, but not exactly connecting, touching the corner and the lot leading to the penitentiary. It is proposed to exchange Bedson's lot for the lot owned by the Government, and the correspondence shows that \$1,000 is asked besides for the exchange. The owner himself proposes to leave the matter to arbitration, and \$1,000 is the sum mentioned as necessary to be paid in the meantime. The final payment will be the sum named by the arbitrators.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The property is twelve miles out of Winnipeg, and the railway runs within a quarter of a mile of the building.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There are two tracks—one running across one portion of the Bedson lot, and another running across another.

On Resolution 345,

To reimburse to Mrs. Diana Fox the sum of
\$390 22, fraudulently obtained at the Post
Office, Ottawa, in October, 1881, by a
person representing herself to be Diana
Fox..... \$390 22

Mr. BLAKE. There ought to be some further explanation of this item. I do not understand how it was that this sum was obtained in the way described. The provisions respecting the Post Office orders are extremely stringent.

They provide against any liability being incurred by the Post Office in the case of money being paid to a wrong party; and inasmuch as a very large and continually extending business is being done in these offices, care should be taken not to establish evil precedents.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think I stated that some person stole the book of Diana Fox and personated her, producing what was considered evidence to lead the authorities to suppose she was Diana Fox. It was not until some time after, that Diana Fox found she had lost her book, and on enquiry that her money had been paid to another. Efforts have been and are being made to find out the offender, but so far without success.

On Resolution 370,

To provide for the purchase of four guns with
400 rounds of ammunition from the British
Government.....\$2,000

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that unless for the purpose of training, these guns are of very little use. In the present days of heavy artillery they would be but a very small defence.

Mr. CARON. All the military authorities I have been able to consult, look upon them as very valuable guns. The latest calibre of artillery would cost an enormous amount of money. For placing upon a citadel or any fortified place in Canada, these guns would be very valuable, and are obtained at a very cheap rate. We could not have obtained them so cheaply, except through the interference of persons who have considerable influence with the Home Government, and who take great interest in our militia.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved.—That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1882, the sum of \$2,185,799.78 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.
2. Resolved.—That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1883, the sum of \$3,365,754.69 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions agreed to, reported and concurred in.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 178) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public Service for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1882, and 30th June, 1883, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Bill introduced, read the first, second and third times and passed.

THE EXTRADITION ACT, 1877.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 154) to amend the Extradition Act, 1877, said: The Parliament of Canada passed an Extradition Act in 1877, and yet Her Majesty's Government have not yet suspended the operation of the Imperial Extradition Act. In consequence of our adopting the Dominion Act, a lengthy correspondence has taken place and it has arrived at this stage: the reason why Her Majesty's Government has not advised the suspension of the Imperial Act and brought the Dominion Act into force, was in consequence of one or two reasons given by the Minister of Justice. It is important to bring our own Act into power, as it is better suited to our circumstances than the Imperial Act. This Bill enacts that the words "that for any other reason

he ought not to be surrendered" shall be struck out of the Act of 1877. In other respects the Act was to remain without changes.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not rise to object to the second reading of the Bill, because I think, under the circumstances in which the Government are placed, it is desirable to yield to the wishes of Her Majesty's Government, and that the Extradition Act shall be amended in that particular. But it has not been observed that the design and scope of the Act was to place the Minister of Justice in a position as nearly as possible the same as Her Majesty's Secretary of State in regard to the English Act. Important steps may be taken with or without the warrant of the Secretary of State. Under our system they are to be taken without any warrant of the Minister of Justice.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions on the subject of the salaries of Judges.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood some papers were to be brought down to the House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A communication signed by all the members of the Bar, except Mr. Wedderburn, the present Secretary, was addressed to the leader of the Government, asking that Mr. Wedderburn be appointed County Court Judge. It was placed in an envelope addressed to the hon. First Minister, but it cannot be found.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of occupying the valuable time of this House with any lengthened remarks upon this question, but I think, in my humble opinion, it is due from every member of this House that he should, in the interest of this Dominion—comparatively as yet in its infancy, and with a limited exchequer—give a frank, free, and unbiassed expression of opinion with regard to this branch of the public service. I have no hesitation in stating that this branch of the administration of justice is a most extravagant piece of machinery, some parts of it utterly useless, and the outlay or cost very largely in excess of the exigencies of the country. The Supreme Court of Appeal, and the County Courts, a sort of luxury to some, is unquestionably what we can very well dispense with and save so much to the country. I can arrive at this conclusion, more particularly, when I consider that previous to the creation of these Courts, under the practical working of the Court of Queen's Bench—better known in the Province to which I belong, as the Supreme Court, no discontent nor dissatisfaction was expressed by the people—the ends of justice were fully met, and suitors well satisfied. Establishing the County Courts literally means relieving the Supreme Court of the major portion of its work, giving the Judges of the latter heavy salaries with comparatively little or nothing to do; worse still, taking the petty or minor cases from the Magistrates' Courts where they could be disposed of at a trifling expense, and running poor suitors into said County Courts to be subject to the costs, in some cases of hundreds of dollars, and often in fact to the sacrifice of all they are worth, is a state of things greatly to be deplored. We are expending a large amount of money, as I conceive unnecessarily every year, in this service, and I certainly do think that it should be the desire—nay, it is the duty of every member of this House—to promote a spirit of economy in this branch, and curtail an outlay exhibiting such immense proportions and such a degree of extravagance. The Supreme Court of Appeal, I don't scruple to state, is most unpopular, and was established by the Mackenzie Government without ask-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ing the people—by your leave, and without any public opinion having been given in its favor. The lay portion of this Dominion are opposed to a multiplicity of tribunals when they consider that the administration of justice can be so well rendered within a narrower compass, the machinery lessened, the cost reduced, and thus necessarily become less complicated, at least it is manifestly the case in the Province to which I belong. There was no necessity for the creation of the Supreme Court of Appeal, as the Federal Act of 1867 does not require it—it simply says: "Canada might," mark you it says "might, notwithstanding this Act, from time to time provide for the constitution, maintenance, and organization of a General Court of Appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada." I contend that it would have been quite time enough for the late Government to have created this costly and useless appendage when the country expressed themselves in favor of it. Nothing would afford me greater pleasure now than to see both the Supreme Court of Appeal and the County Courts abolished, and the work performed by the Supreme Court, or Court of Queen's Bench, of the respective Provinces, and the Chief Justices of the respective Provinces to meet as often as required, as a body, and substitute the present Court of Appeal, clothed with the same functions as the present Court of Appeal, for the purpose of hearing and determining all important questions, whether constitutional or otherwise, that may be brought before them, from which appeal can be had, if suitors are not satisfied, on reference to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, which costs this country nothing. All petty and minor cases could be disposed of in the Magistrates or Stipendiary Court, by giving it extended jurisdiction. The amount the Judiciary system cost Canada, for the year ending the 30th of June last, was \$583,957.46, and for Nova Scotia, \$52,694.55 which I feel satisfied could have been applied better to other purposes. I certainly do hope that this House will look favorably upon the views I have just expressed, and arrange to abolish both these Courts, more particularly the latter, which I have no hesitation in stating is a snare and a deception to the country, and a means in the hands of many unscrupulous and merciless attorneys to bring a poor man to ruin. Now, Mr. Speaker, a word as to salaries. I have been curious to know, for some time past, why it is that the salaries of Government officials in the various branches of the public service throughout this Dominion, have been, and still are, so unfairly distributed among employees; and if I am not out of place at present, in making the enquiry of this House, I would desire an answer. It would appear from the public reports that from the Judges down to the lowest employee, those of Nova Scotia are more poorly paid than their brethren of the same class in Ontario and Quebec. That a difference of this kind should exist and without any cause, so far as I am aware of, being assigned, is what I cannot understand. It cannot be that the labor is less arduous in Nova Scotia than in Ontario; on the contrary, it can be shown that in Nova Scotia it is considerably greater. I will instance the Customs Branch, where it will be generally admitted, and which can be shown by the reports, that whilst the officials of Ontario and Quebec are only employed in summer, and can, in consequence of their navigable waters being closed for at least five months of the year, enjoy ease and repose beside their comfortable firesides with their families, with comparatively nothing to do; the officials in the Maritime Provinces have to endure the rigour and exposure of the bleak searching winds of the Atlantic without any respite whatever. A still stronger reasoning can be offered as respects light keepers who are subjected to greater exposure during the inclement season of winter, being placed in the most exposed positions of the coast, and yet

the officials of Ontario receive larger salaries per annum, than those of the Maritime Provinces. I can multiply instances and show that the principle is wrong. I repeat again that the highest salaries are paid in Ontario and they decrease as they approach Nova Scotia. As it is not the over-excess of work in Ontario, as I have clearly shown; and it certainly is not from incapacity or lack of ability, intellectually or physically on the part of Nova Scotians, to perform the work; nor that the officials in Ontario are so much superior; for if the latter were set up as a reason I would have no difficult task to prove to the contrary, as we see Nova Scotians taking the foremost rank in nearly every position in the Dominion, and in many instances outside of it,—then, I ask, why not have the employees in the Maritime Provinces placed on a par with their neighbors in the Upper Provinces, and thus avoid the unjust discrimination that has hitherto offered? I observed by one of the city papers some few days ago the unequal distribution of salaries to the messengers of this House compared with those on the Senate side, and from what I can gather am of opinion that it is not without just cause. The messengers of this House are on duty every day from 8.30 a.m., till very late at night, and at times till day dawn in the morning, whereas their neighbors are often free at an early hour in the evening, and notwithstanding this difference, the messengers on the Senate side receive \$50 more per Session than on this side. These grievances have not only existed since the present Government came into power, but long previous, and have been suffered to exist ever since. I am a friend of the employee, and ask for tribute to whom tribute is due, believing it to be but just and right, and hope that the Government will take such steps as to extend a fair distribution to all.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On Resolution 4,

Mr. BLAKE. So far as I can judge, the proposed Judgeship of the new County Court for the counties of King's and Albert I do not think it is required for the administration of justice. I remember to have read the statement of Judge Watters, made after this proposal was introduced into the Legislature of New Brunswick, that it was not required at all, but that the business could be easily disposed of by the existing staff. The hon. gentleman has stated that the jurisdiction of the County Court Judges has been increased; but my opinion is, that it will be found to be much less on the whole than the jurisdiction of the County Court Judges of Ontario, where, in many instances, one Judge does the work of a much larger population than the aggregate population of these two counties. The information I have received from various quarters is that this new Judgeship is not required; that it is, in fact, what has occurred on more than one occasion since we have been called upon to deal with the subject under the existing state of things, which gives one Legislature the right to create a Judgeship and imposes upon another the duty of paying the officer. If the Legislature which created the office had the responsibility of paying the salary of the Judge, there would be a check; but there is not at present any check, because the Local Legislature says: "We appoint the officer, but he is paid by the Dominion Government out of Dominion funds." I say it is utterly wrong for us to assume that we are under the obligation, because a Local Legislature creates an additional Judgeship, to pay the salary of the officer; and when there is published in a New Brunswick newspaper a statement of Judge Watters, and when there is, as I believe, a concurrence of opinion, that the existing County Court staff of the Province of New Brunswick is adequate to discharge the whole of the judicial functions likely to devolve upon the County Court Judges.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. gentleman will compare the number of Judges according to the population in New Brunswick with the number in Ontario, I think he will find that there are as many in Ontario as in New Brunswick. But there are some districts possessing the Judge and the County Court, which have more population and are larger than united counties in Ontario. But in addition I have in my hand a report of the changes made in our legislation during the last Session increasing largely the powers given to those Judges. In the first place it seems they are not to deal with cases where the title to land is brought in question; nor, in the second place, in cases where the validity of any deeds, requests or limitations is disputed, and certain exceptions are done away with. Besides, where they dealt previously with this Act with cases of debt to the amount of \$200, they can now deal with cases of \$100; and in actions of Courts where damages are claimed, their jurisdiction is extended from \$100 to \$200, thus increasing very largely the extent and nature of the duties. It has been urged that the Local Legislature provides for the appointment of the Judges, and that in the Provinces people want Judges, but are not called upon to pay for them. But they are called upon to pay for them in increased taxation. There is that check upon improper appointments. So long as certain rights and duties are thrown upon the Local Legislature, as in this case, it is exceedingly difficult for the Dominion Government or Parliament, the responsibility of the administration of justice resting with them, to say how many Judges should be appointed. Of course the case of an excessive number of Judges would be another matter.

Mr. ANGLIN. We have been called upon every Session the last four years to increase the judicial staff somewhere, and we increased it some time ago in New Brunswick by adding an additional Judge to the Supreme Court Bench. It is only in St. John that the judicial business is large and likely to fall into arrears; but I can see no necessity whatever for the creation of this additional Judgeship. Mr. Wedderburn is an estimable man, but his appointment is unnecessary and it imposes an additional burden on the people. He is appointed, not because another Judge is required to do the work, but because a Judgeship is required for him.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I desire to have the provision as to salary read thus: \$2,000 per annum for the first three years, and \$2,400 per annum afterwards.

Resolutions agreed to and reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY introduced Bill (No. 179) to fix and provide for the payment of salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario; and of certain Judges and County Court Judges in Manitoba and New Brunswick.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment

That the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to strike out the provision for the salary of \$2,000 a year, increasing to \$2,400 a year, for a new County Court Judge for the Counties of King's and Albert, since the Public Service does not require any such Judge.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 158) to re-adjust the representation of the House of Commons and for other purposes, be read the first time.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the amendments?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The seventh section is amended by striking out the words "Muskoka and" and that involves the necessity of making the same correction in the twelfth, second and third sections. The amendment is simply to allow the election to be held the same day in Muskoka as in the other Provinces. The ninth clause is amended by striking out Ridout from North Victoria and adding it to Muskoka in the thirteenth clause. This is evidently a mistake of the Senate. It should be added to North Ontario, but we can amend the Senate's amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. That comes of the Senate meddling with what concerns the representation of the people in this House.

Mr. MILLS. Better drop the Bill and *ride out* without it. Amendment struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then there is an amendment to the third section relating to Manitoba. It is apparently describing the boundary of Provencher.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman moves that amendment, it will be a very serious departure from the policy of the hon. gentleman announced to the House on the second reading, and during all the progress of the measure. He stated it was not intended to interfere with the disputed territory at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is an amendment which relates to the Province of Quebec. About twelve or fifteen electors residing in the county of Bellechasse, were in the habit of voting in Montmagny, but by law they had no right to vote there. In order to avoid possible future electoral contestations on account of this state of things, it has been thought proper to transfer the territory where these men reside to the county of Montmagny.

On amendment No. 5, to extend the territory eastward,

Mr. BLAKE. It is a most extraordinary procedure that the Senate should interfere in a most important matter and deal with the disposition of a considerable territory and number of votes on which this House had determined. The conclusion reached was not satisfactory to myself, but this is still more unsatisfactory, and I take the objection that it is not the province of the Senate to deal with the deliberate judgment of the House of Commons on matters affecting the representation of the people; and if they do so they should do it to settle something and not unsettle everything. The Government felt the difficulty of the question. They dealt with it in a way by which the inhabitants of the disputed territory were omitted, inserting in Manitoba those territories which were recognized by both parties to be within the Province. The Senate proposals, however, bring several new territories within the Act, which would lead to inextricable confusion. As there is no opportunity for full and fair discussion now, the Government should allow the Bill to remain as it left the House, and if they are adverse to such a policy, they should define definite bounds showing what should comprise the limits of the different districts, so that the inhabitants, the returning officers and the county may know what the electoral districts may be at the next election.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) himself proposed that those settlements eastward of Manitoba should be included in the district of Algoma.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. DAWSON. But this is practically the same thing, only we do not refer to the word at all in the Bill as it comes from the Senate.

Mr. BLAKE. What my hon. friend proposed was a definite boundary. He proposed that for electoral purposes

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

there should be attached to Algoma all the territory to the eastward of the limit fixed by the award of that Government, a fixed and definite boundary. It gave for electoral purposes that territory and those voters in the Province of Ontario to the district of Algoma. What the Senate proposes is that everything should be set at confusion and that we should have no notion where the limit should be.

Mr. DAWSON. I think it might be arranged that the electoral divisions shall not come east of the Lake of the Woods, and that the electoral division of Algoma shall not come west of that. That would not touch the lines fixed by the award.

Mr. MILLS. Under the Bill it is declared that the boundaries of these particular districts shall extend eastward to the boundaries of Ontario. Now, the Government must act on their own contention as to the boundaries of Ontario, and what would make a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi at the boundary of the District of Provencher and the district north of it. Now, it is obvious that a large section of territory in the District of Algoma, as hitherto recognized, will vote in one or the other of those two districts of Manitoba. It seems to me a monstrous proposition. You are undertaking to take from Ontario a portion of her population and assigning it to Manitoba. In addition to that there is another amendment proposed particularly inconsistent, for it proposes to extend the district of Algoma westward until it reaches these two particular districts in Manitoba. The Government must either act on their own contention or on the award of the arbitrators. We proposed, when the matter was before the House, that the award of the arbitrators should be acted upon, but the hon. gentleman refused to recognize the proposition, and he has allowed Manitoba to extend eastward to this undisputed limit, and now the Senate proposes this amendment. It seems to me that the Senate has completely transcended its functions, and that it might as well undertake to amend the Supply Bill or interfere with any of those matters which particularly belong to this Chamber, as to interfere with the representation of the people in the people's House. Who made the Senate? Who made the hon. members of the Senate judges of how the people should be represented in this House, or how a particular district should be divided, or how far the limits of Manitoba should extend? These are the propositions which we have before us, and that have been brought before us by the improper interference of the Senate.

Mr. McDougall. It seems to me that we are unnecessarily getting into a position of considerable difficulty. I quite agree with the opinion just expressed, though perhaps the word is not the most proper that could be used with reference to the other branch of the Legislature, but I cannot see any just grounds on which the Senate should amend a Bill like this, dealing with the representation of this Chamber, except, of course, in a matter of mistake or grammatical error, or something of that kind; but to undertake to change the boundaries of the constituencies, or amend the Bill in that respect, without having that information and that right discussion that members in this House have in dealing with a question peculiarly their own, it seems to me as a matter of principle an interference with our rights, and that we should vindicate our rights to control matters of this kind. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that they might as well undertake to amend the Supply Bill, for I believe it stands on the same footing. I hope the hon. leader of the Government will not complicate the boundary question by undertaking to decide or fix the limits of the Province, by agreeing to an amendment of this kind, after the matter was brought up in another House and in another form. I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be disagreed to. I think we have made the Bill workable and that the Act leaves

Manitoba as it was before the Bill was introduced. The people of that Province will, therefore, vote in their respective districts as they would have done if there had been no dispute about the boundary. It seems to me that those who occupy this unsettled country and whose right to vote depends on a freehold title, would have no vote because their titles are uncertain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am obliged to differ wholly with the two hon. gentlemen who have last spoken on the constitutional question. There is no doubt in the world that the House of Lords has a right, and has exercised the right to deal with the question of the representation of the House of Commons. The House of Commons admitted that right by the manner in which the Reform Bill of 1832 was dealt with. That right was never disputed until it was disputed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-night. This matter stands upon a different footing entirely from the Supply Bill. The hon. gentleman's memory and reading will tell him that the House of Lords did deal most independently with all matters of representation, that they have a right to protect the people in those matters, and I defy either of the hon. gentlemen to say that the House of Commons of England have ever denied to that branch of the Legislature the right to intervene and express their opinion legislatively on the question of representation. There can be no doubt about that question, though of course it may be a matter of expediency as to the extent.

Mr. McDougall. They may have the power, but not the right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Legal power is right, but the expediency of exercising that power is a different affair. The only matter in which the House of Lords cannot interfere is the Supply Bill. We know that when the Senate threw out the Tuckersmith Bill, the hon. gentleman did not deny the constitutional right of that House to interfere in the matter; and they interfered rightly and well on that occasion, because they prevented a breach of the British North America Act, by so doing. However, I have no desire—far from it—to complicate this Bill with the Boundary question. At the same time, it is quite clear that the Senate desired no portion of the people of this country should be disfranchised.

Mr. Blake. So did we.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the action of this House was to deprive of the franchise all Her Majesty's subjects residing in the disputed territory.

Mr. Blake. Contrary to our view.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to amend the amendment in such a way as to give the people of that territory the right to vote either in Ontario or in Manitoba.

Mr. Blake. With the exception of a very small area, the hon. gentleman's proposal is practically that proposed by my hon. friend from Bothwell the other day, and I for my part will not object to it, as the hon. gentleman is practically acceding to our view.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With reference to the amendment touching the franchise of the employes on the Intercolonial Railway, I am quite certain the hon. member for West Durham will at once see the propriety of it when the facts are stated. The hon. gentleman is a strong advocate of a measure by which the Local Legislatures shall establish the franchise for members of this House of Commons, and he is also a strong believer in a Local Legislature being composed of one Chamber. The hon. gentleman is aware that the Government of Nova Scotia, following the practice of Ontario, has propounded the policy of abolishing the Legislative Council; and when I tell him that the

amendment which is proposed here was carried in the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia by a majority of 23 to 7, and that it was defeated by a Legislative Council which is in a moribund condition—because it is only awaiting the change of two votes in order to be abolished altogether—I think the hon. gentleman will be satisfied that what is now proposed is quite right, and quite in accordance with the views he himself holds. This amendment does not go so far as that Bill. That Bill applied to all officials who were disfranchised by the Act of 1871. What I propose to do in this amendment is to provide that the Intercolonial Railway officials in the Province of Nova Scotia shall enjoy the same rights and privileges as are enjoyed in the Provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, and on all other railways in the Dominion, who are entitled to vote if they have the property qualification under the law. All this amendment does is to enable those who pay the amount of taxation the law requires, and whose names have been left off the electoral list in consequence of the local Act of 1871, to exercise the franchise upon being prepared to take an oath that they have been omitted from the list in consequence of the Disqualifying Act of 1871. I am quite certain that every hon. gentleman will see the propriety of having the officials on the Intercolonial Railway in all the Provinces, enjoy the same privilege, especially when it is demanded for them by an overwhelming majority in the Assembly of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Blake. It certainly is a most extraordinary course on the part of the other Chamber to propose to us at this time this amendment. We now know whence it comes. "I propose," says the Minister of Railways "such a change;" but he might have added: "I did not propose it in the Chamber to which I belong and where on every ground it should be discussed. But I have it introduced into the Senate and brought down here within a few hours of the close of the Session." And this a Bill affecting the question of the franchise, affecting the principle as to the distribution of the franchise, and proposing to affect it in the most harsh and unsatisfactory manner. I think that if there is anything of which the House ought to be jealous, it is the consideration of the question of the franchise. If there is anything we ought to discuss, and to have the usual opportunities of dealing with, and the usual stages of deliberation with regard to it, it is the question of the franchise. The question of who should vote in the election of members is certainly and peculiarly and specially within our own province, and ought to be dealt with by us deliberately. I am not concerned to consider whether the Upper Chamber might not properly interfere with a franchise Bill. This is not a franchise Bill. The Bill sent to the Senate dealt with the redistribution of the seats and not with the question as who is to vote within the different constituencies. But there is interpolated into this Bill, by the other branch, a proposal to alter the law as to the franchise. We are asked then on the last night of the Session, when we are but a handful, and without any opportunity of discussing this amendment, to make an important alteration in the measure. I hold that it is uncalled for, and that the hon. gentleman should have proposed this amendment in this House, as part of the Government Bill, when we should have an opportunity of discussing whether we should infringe upon the rights of one of the Provinces with regard to the settlement of the franchise, and whether, if we chose to infringe upon it, we should do so in the manner proposed. What principle is there in the proposal that Intercolonial officials should have the right to vote in Nova Scotia, and not other Dominion civil servants? The hon. gentleman knows there are many other civil servants.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Many of them have the right.

Mr. Blake. And many of them have not. And the hon. gentleman knows that because they are civil servants

of the Dominion that those railway officials have not the right to vote. The hon. Minister of Railways says that the Intercolonial Railway officials ought to have the same right in Nova Scotia that they have in New Brunswick and Quebec. But so ought the other Dominion officials who are disqualified in Nova Scotia, but who have the right to vote in New Brunswick and Quebec. There is no distinction there. But the hon. gentleman is Minister of Railways, and supposes himself to be master of the employes, and he extends his patronage just so far as he is. He proposes that we should adopt, at the instigation of the other House, not conversant with the election matter nor with the facts that might arise on such a subject, that we should accept the expedient of an oath taken by the voter, swearing he believes he was left off the roll because he was a Government official, and this oath is to be taken as a qualification, notwithstanding the law in Nova Scotia and the Dominion against a Government employee voting. He is not legally qualified under the law of Nova Scotia or under the general law, but this oath is to qualify. He is not to swear that he has a proper qualification; and there is to be none of those precautions of care applied in the case of all other voters on all the other lists of all the other Provinces of the Dominion. He has to come to the polls and swear that he is legally qualified, without giving more particulars, and to say: "I truly believe that my name was omitted from the voters' list by reason of my being an employe of the Government, on the Intercolonial, and for no other reason." I hold then that we ought not, being so few in numbers, and at this stage of the Session, to interfere with the franchise, a question not involved up to this time in this Bill. In the second place, we ought not to interfere with the question as to the franchise at the instance of the other branch at all, and on a form of procedure which gives us but this one stage in which to deal with it. I say, in the third place, we ought not to interfere with the question of the franchise in a partial or perfunctory manner, conferring the franchise on one class of Government officials in Nova Scotia and leaving disfranchised the other classes to whom just the same reasoning will apply, except that the hon. Minister of Railways has not got them under his particular control. I say, in the last place, we ought not to interfere by an operation which proposes simply, by an oath at the polls, to prove the qualification of an elector—a general oath that he is legally qualified—instead of providing some means of putting him on the lists in some way or other, so that there may be the same classes of security which are given to other votes. For these several reasons we shall act a just, dignified and proper part in disagreeing to this amendment, in declining to accept the suggestion of the Senate that we should engraft on this Bill such a proposal with reference to the franchise; and I move that the amendment be not agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad that at the outset the hon. gentleman has abandoned the ground taken by two former speakers as to the right of the Senate to deal with the franchise.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not abandoned it at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is compelled to admit in the fullest sense that the upper branch of the Legislature has a perfect right to deal with the question of the franchise.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not admit it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. ANGLIN. He said nothing about it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He did say something about it. He made the distinct admission that he was not going to question the right—

Mr. BLAKE. I said I was not going to discuss it.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. For a sufficient reason. He knew this was not the first time that the Senate had earned the gratitude of the country for interfering with the franchise. He did not forget that he and the Government of which he was an associate—

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Undertook to disfranchise a large body of the people of Prince Edward Island. They thought to strangle at the polls a large body of persons who enjoyed the franchise. The hon. gentleman did not forget that in that hour the Senate came to the rescue and prevented the Statute-book of this country from being blotted, as the hon. gentleman and his associates attempted to blot it.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Senate earned the gratitude of the independent electors of this country, for the manner in which they came to the rescue and prevented the interference, just previous to the elections, by a partizan majority with the rights of a great body of the free and independent electors of this country. What objection has the hon. gentleman to urge against allowing these people to exercise their franchise? The Government own the railways on Prince Edward Island, and every railway official who has the other qualifications required can exercise the right of a free citizen, and the same right exists in Quebec and Ontario. The Senate only asks that this class of people in Nova Scotia should be put upon the same footing as they are on in other parts of the country. The hon. gentleman says this is a branch of the Civil Service and these parties are civil servants. They are not under the Civil Service Act, and there are not a dozen employes on the Intercolonial Railway who are civil servants in the sense in which Customs and Excise officers are. That Act, which was passed by a partizan majority, for a partizan purpose, deprived the franchise of those people to the extent of preventing any man employed by the day—after thirty days consecutive labor on the Intercolonial Railway—from exercising the franchise that under the law he previously enjoyed. There is a sufficient reason for confining this Bill to these officials. In regard to the way housekeepers, lighthouse keepers, and post-masters who were disfranchised by that same Act, they have all been relieved and the franchise restored to them, excepting, I think, the Inland Revenue and Customs officers in Ontario and Quebec. These officials are not allowed to vote. All that is asked here is that the same class of officials in Nova Scotia should enjoy the rights and privileges that are enjoyed by them in New Brunswick, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. There is not a fair-minded man on either side who will not say they are entitled to have restored to them their franchise, especially when in the very Province in which they are disfranchised an overwhelming majority of the people's representatives have endeavored to remove that disability from them and to place them in the position in which this Bill places them.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman discussed this question as if the Government had no responsibility whatever with reference to this measure. This is a Government measure, and the hon. gentleman knew of the disqualification of those parties in Nova Scotia. He has had ample opportunity for considering the question, and should have, at an earlier period, introduced a measure to give those people their franchise. They preferred to wait, however, until this measure had passed through the various stages in this House, and after the large majority of the members had left, this extraordinary provision is inserted by the Senate and the hon. gentleman defends it in this House. He overlooks the fact that the franchise is not uniform in the various Provinces. Because those parties are entitled to vote in

other Provinces, they should, he said, be allowed to vote in Nova Scotia. On the same principle he ought to make the franchise uniform throughout the Dominion. In British Columbia and Prince Edward Island they have manhood suffrage. Why should not the hon. gentleman extend that suffrage to the other Provinces? Why should he take so special an interest in those railway men in Nova Scotia? We have, rightly or wrongly, adopted, for the election of members of this House, the qualification adopted in the various Provinces for the election to the Local Houses. Now, the hon. gentleman wishes to make a special exception to that, and waits to make it until all opportunity for fair discussion has gone by. He had not the courage to propose this amendment in this House, but had it proposed in the Senate. He has not the courage of his convictions, or he would have introduced this provision in the measure itself. The hon. gentleman has referred to a provision or departure from the rule made some time ago in the case of Prince Edward Island. We know why the late Administration proposed to adopt the qualification of the voters for the second Chamber instead of the first in that Island, because in one case they had a voters' list and in the other they had not. But if I remember rightly the Bill provided that as soon as provision was made for the preparation of the voters' list the qualification in the popular branch should be adopted. Why was it not adopted in the first instance? It was because we were informed by the various representatives from the Island that a large number of our fishermen came forward at every election and voted for the election of members for the Legislature because they had no voters' list. But we know why the hon. gentleman desires to have this provision inserted; we know why so loose, so extraordinary a provision as this is placed in this Bill; we know that this provision is intimately connected with the sixth section of this Act. The Government have provided that they shall appoint whom they please as returning officer, and we know whom they would recommend to have appointed in Nova Scotia, and we know who will be permitted to vote under the provision of this Bill. The hon. gentleman has had it suggested in the Senate that any person who would come forward and declare on oath that he is qualified, shall be entitled to vote. How is his vote to be questioned? Why, the vote is recorded, and any number of men may vote in this way; a member may be improperly elected to this House. We know the difficulties we have had under the law as it stood, and the hon. gentleman now proposes a return to the condition that existed many years ago, so far as it is possible for him to do so. It is a highly improper provision, and I say again that the Senate had no right to insert it. I repeat, notwithstanding the observation made by the right hon. gentleman, that the Senate Chamber has no right whatever to determine the limits of electoral districts and the qualifications of voters. This measure was properly introduced and considered in this House, and it was open for the other Chamber to accept the Bill or reject it; but what have they to do with the limits of electoral districts and the qualifications of voters, and beyond everything else what right have they to import into a Bill, redistributing the seats of the House, a clause which is not an amendment to this Bill, but is an amendment to the qualification of voters in a wholly different Act?

Mr. BRECKEN. The hon. member for Bothwell, in speaking about the case of Prince Edward Island, has made the same mistake that every gentleman makes who attempts to speak of a thing he does not understand. The facts are these: The franchise for an election of a member to the General Assembly approaches very closely to manhood suffrage. The qualifications are, British subjects, twenty one years of age, a residence of twelve months in the district and a liability to pay a poll tax. The qualification for an elector to vote for

a member of the Legislative Council requires that he shall have £100 worth of real estate in freehold. But here was a mischievous Act that was attempted to be perpetrated in Prince Edward Island by a party who called themselves Liberal. Prince Edward Island was represented here by four or five gentlemen, and there was an attempt made by the Liberal Government of this Dominion to confine the franchise only to those possessing £100 of real estate to enable them to vote for members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. ANGLIN. Oh, no.

Mr. BRECKEN. Yes, that was the case, and there was an electoral list. I was the man who introduced the Bill for vote by ballot in Prince Edward Island, in the year 1876. Previous to that we never had a list, and it was a dark design on the people of Prince Edward Island, in 1878, when an opportunity occurred to disfranchise more than one-half of the electors of the Island and send them to their homes; and when we go to the hustings, as I suppose we shall in a few weeks, they will be reminded of that Liberal enactment. In standing up here and making this statement I know what responsibility rests upon me, not to misrepresent anything but to state the facts as they exist, and I do not hesitate to say that it is one of the most infamous, one of the most tyrannical, one of the most diabolical Acts that ever was perpetrated by a so-called Liberal party, because they were under the delusion that the people were at their backs. The young men of the country who are now growing up to take upon their shoulders the duties of citizenship were tempted to be disfranchised unless they had £100 of real estate. The hon. member for Bothwell may say that his Government did not understand the thing, but the man who was sent to the North-West knew it well enough, and if he withheld the facts from them it was a disgrace to the name of Liberal. I remember the time when he was a Conservative, and I know he sold himself for the purpose of power, of pelf, when he stood up here and attempted to disfranchise so many of his fellow-countrymen. There was a new electoral list on the basis of manhood suffrage, and we have had it for many years. I am not an Ultra-Radical, but I will say that the men who voted upon what we call the franchise as distinguished from property qualification, have ever intelligently discharged their duties, and they have always been Conservative—the young men, the rising men who take an interest in the country, have always supported the Conservative candidates, and that in the estimation of the Liberals was a reason why they should be disfranchised, why they should occupy the same position as the negroes in the Southern States did before Abraham Lincoln enfranchised them. Where was the Hon. David Laird when this thing was attempted, where was Donald McIntyre, where were those men who came from Prince Edward Island as representatives of the people whom they attempted to disfranchise? The hon. member for Bothwell gets up here and talks about some little irregularity in the electoral districts. There was nothing of the kind, there was no electoral districts in Prince Edward Island till the year 1876. And yet, nearly one-half of the people, the intelligence, the industry and the education of the Island were to go for nothing unless they had £100 worth of property. I do not hesitate to say that if the Government were deceived, they were deceived by the representatives of that Island, and we would like to see these men come back here if they can. It was a dark, it was a disgraceful, it was a dishonest scheme, and the people of Prince Edward Island have determined that the men who sold them once shall not have an opportunity of selling them a second time.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I did not observe that the hon. Minister of Railways said one word as to whether those men's names were really on the list or not. That undoubtedly is an important matter. If the

names are not on the list it is quite possible that confusion and very great room for irregularity must of necessity arise. I do not see how names are to be added to the list under the circumstances narrated by the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will explain. The list of electors is established from the Assessment Roll. Those are public property; and a man who is placed on the Assessment Roll for a certain amount of property, whether real or personal, or both, is entitled under the law to be placed on the list of electors. This amendment will allow parties whose names are on the Assessment Roll, and have the amount of property required by the law, to be placed on the list of electors, but who were left off on account of the Act of 1875, declaring that employes on the Intercolonial should not be placed on the electoral list, who are left to take the oath. If any person doubts the right of an individual to vote, they have to swear that they possess the property qualification; and if they are not on the Assessment Roll for property qualification, they have got to commit perjury, and that can be established against them by most clear and decisive means, because, in order to have the right to vote they must have a property qualification under the amended rule.

Mr. ANGLIN. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Brecken) has made an extraordinary statement in regard to the measure passed by Parliament some years ago, which provided for a property franchise of £100. I do not remember the precise wording of the measure, but it is not supposed to convey any such meaning as the hon. gentleman has attached to it. The reason assigned for its submission was that it was necessary in order to prevent fraudulent voting. It was thought necessary, on extending the ballot system to Prince Edward Island, to have some such proposal as that adopted. It was a strong statement for the hon. gentleman to make that the effect of such a measure had been to reduce the people to a condition similar to that of the negro slaves in the Southern States before emancipation. There are thousands of respectable people in New Brunswick who have not the franchise to-day, because they do not possess the necessary property qualifications, which is \$100 in real estate or \$400 income. With regard to the measure now before the House, it is true the other House has the power to meddle with a measure of this kind, but circumstances must be very grave before the Upper House should interfere as to the mode by which hon. members are to be returned to this House. * * * An hon. member. That may be the case in Nova Scotia, but it is not the law in our Province. They are required to post up the name, and the law requires that others may apply to have the list corrected. A great many months must pass from the time the assessment is made until the list is completed, and it is not to be expected that these employes will examine whether they are on the list or not.

Mr. BOWELL. Are they not served with a notice of the amount they are assessed with?

Mr. ANGLIN. No.

Mr. BOWELL. Then how do they appeal?

Mr. ANGLIN. It then becomes their duty to go and enquire about it.

Mr. BOWELL. How is it remedied?

Mr. ANGLIN. There is a Board of Appeal before which they appear. They have a right to make a statement on oath, and the Board is required to accept that statement and to alter the assessment accordingly. It is not to be supposed that these men who are employed everywhere examine the rolls and are aware whether they are assessed for the amount named or not. If it were provided that these persons should go to some proper officer to get their right to vote and have their names placed on a list,

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

these voters could go to the poll like others. I do not think it is right to provide for any such disfranchisement as this unless it is applied to everywhere. Some public officers are deprived of their votes in Ontario, and why not make this provision apply equally all over?

Mr. BRECKEN. We have two franchises in the Island, one requiring \$100 worth of property, either household or real, and the other manhood suffrage. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made a remark about the American fishermen coming in, but I wish to say that I represented Charlottetown for thirteen years, and will the hon. gentleman take my word for it when I say that I never heard, from one end of the Island to the other, either party complain of the interference of American fishermen; and I must say that the man who wanted to stuff the hon. gentleman was one he apparently wanted to betray, the man who put him in the Legislature. I am the oldest politician in the Island with the exception of my colleague who is on a bed of sickness, but I say that no such case has occurred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish that hon. gentlemen opposite would come to some common agreement on this subject. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) approves of a diversity of franchises. In British Columbia there is universal suffrage. There is one degree of property qualification in one Province, and another in another. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) say they object to this provision because it does not apply to everybody, but only to the Intercolonial service. There is no agreement between these hon. gentlemen. It is quite clear that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) assumes the responsibility which primarily falls upon the shoulders of his former colleague, Mr. Laird, for wilfully depriving the fishermen the right to vote in Prince Edward Island, because some American fishermen had voted. We did not hear any excuse of that kind urged when the Bill was before this House. The Bill was run through at the point of the bayonet for the purpose of depriving the working people and the fishermen of their votes, and confining the franchise as much as possible to the property holders, who were supposed to be more favorable to Mr. Laird than the mass of the population. The hon. gentleman complains that these electoral clauses are forced into this Bill, which is merely a Bill for defining the bounds of constituencies and adding one or two members; but we must remember that this House itself altered the original character of the Bill, in providing for votes to be taken by telegraph in the Magdalen Islands, and in increasing the amount of the deposit to be made by candidates from \$50 to \$200. This House dealt with a variety of subjects cognate to the division of the country into electoral districts; and the object of defining the electoral districts is to show where the franchise shall be exercised. But it is very remarkable that these hon. gentlemen who call themselves Liberals and Reformers, who say that they inherit the traditions of the Reform party, whenever they have a chance of showing that they are Liberals and Reformers they do it by restricting the franchise instead of enlarging it. Well, they are Liberals after a fashion, but not after the fashion of the old Whigs, the old Liberals, or the present Whigs or Liberals of England; they are of the Canadian type, the *genus Americanum*. It is quite true there is a varying qualification in the different Provinces; and the inconveniences which have arisen from these variances, and which will increase every year, show me that this Parliament must, sooner or later, assume the control of its own franchise, declare what people have a right to vote, and not leave it to every Provincial Legislature to settle whether men, women or children shall vote. We might have, in some Provinces, women voting, and in other Provinces, aliens voting; we might have all kinds of diversities of the

franchise—and we have seen sundry alterations in the franchise by the different Provinces since the Confederation—showing that no member elected in any Province by a given body of electors, has any assurance that he will go back to the same body of electors—to people having the same qualifications. Just see the peculiar hardship of the men on the Intercolonial Railway. That railway runs through three provinces. If a man happens to be a French Canadian having his house in Quebec, or if he lives in New Brunswick, he has a vote; but if he happens to live in Nova Scotia, although he goes over the same ground, associates with the same people, has the same rights, official and social, yet, because he happens to belong to Nova Scotia he is to be placed in a position of political inferiority to those from the neighboring Provinces. That is a humiliation to the men from Nova Scotia; and hon. gentlemen opposite must admit that if these men are deprived of the franchise, it is a hardship for them. Why, then, should the hardship continue to exist? You may find the conductor of a train, if he happens to be a Nova Scotian, without a vote, while every brakeman, every baggageman, every man who carries the oil to grease the wheels, may have a vote, and therefore be politically superior to the head of the whole train. This is a practical hardship, and it ought to be cured; and why not have it cured? It is quite clear that these men ought to have a vote; and why not give it to them? The hon. gentleman says there may be a difficulty in establishing their title. I hold in my hand the official printed voters' list, a copy of the Sheriff's roll, in which a number of names are marked as those of Dominion officials, and therefore they cannot vote. These men can go up and swear that they are entitled to vote; and why should they not? Why should the hon. gentleman get up in such a storm and object to these men, who have the electoral qualification, from exercising the franchise? Why, the reason is clear—because, forsooth, these men are Government employes—because, forsooth, this tyrannical Minister of Railways is going to whip in these men to vote whether they will or not, and watch their ballots and see whether they vote right—simply because these men are Government officials, and hon. gentlemen opposite are not in the Government. There can be no other reason for taking this objection. The amendment is a wise and liberal extension of the franchise, and which morally and legally ought to have been made, and there can be no difficulty, no embarrassment, no confusion by giving those men the vote proposed.

Mr. RICHEY. The burden of the grievance on the part of the Opposition seems that the Senate has interfered in this case to pronounce on a matter which seems to come peculiarly within the province of the representative body. What will hon. gentlemen opposite say to the second Chamber in Nova Scotia giving a veto to a Bill passed almost unanimously by the Assembly of Nova Scotia? To me there seems to be something peculiarly appropriate and opportune in the fact that the Second Chamber of Parliament should step forward to remedy a grievance that has been perpetrated by the Second Chamber of Nova Scotia, and I am very thankful that this amendment has been made for the reason that I have a recollection of the course pursued in the elections of 1878, when numbers of railway employes were discharged, and contracts were provided for them in order that they might be employed, though not immediately under the direction of the Government—they were set to work to operate in those elections, and immediately after the elections of 1878, they were restored. As to the alleged inconvenience that will result from the new provision, it is quite as great under the present law. The First Minister has produced one of the voters' lists, on which men are marked as Dominion officials. Under the law by which these men are prohibited from voting, all employes within thirty days before the elections are restricted from casting their votes. The

lists are made up every year by the middle of May. Take an election occurring in January of the following year, or in September, as it did in 1878—the whole body of Dominion officials might have been changed; and those then marked as Dominion officials and eligible for voting, might not be entitled to vote, and a large number of those on the list marked as entitled to vote might, by virtue of their having been since in the employ of the Government, be disqualified. The objection is taken that we are to rest simply on the affidavit of the man. Under the Statute of Nova Scotia, that is precisely the provision made in the case of an employe being discharged from the service of the Government after the electoral lists are made up. I think that on all the points raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, the very facts of the case fully meet their objections.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say I was in favor of varying the franchise, but that I was in favor of accepting the franchise of the Local Legislatures. I would be very glad if all the Provinces adopted manhood suffrage.

Senate amendments amended and agreed to.

PROVISIONAL DISTRICTS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the consideration of a Message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting for the information of the House, the copy of Minute of the Privy Council of Canada, dated 8th May instant, on the subject of the establishment of the Provisional Districts in the North-West Territories, as shown on the map accompanying said Message. He said: As the report laid before the House in the Message states, this arrangement is required for the convenience of the settlers in the North-West—that the region should be divided into four districts having their boundaries settled. A copy of the map has been hung up in the House for the last nine or ten days. Great inconvenience has been found in the want of geographical or topographical sub-divisions of that country, especially as regards settlers or intending settlers. Therefore it has been thought well to provide, provisionally, that the portions of the country which most likely will be supplied ere long, to which there will be a considerable emigration, should be thus divided. Of course it is not proposed to establish an organized Government among them. There will still be portions of the North-West governed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the North-West. These are simply topographical divisions. But as it might result in those divisions becoming hereafter Provinces, if it was thought right and respectful to the Parliament to proceed in the present manner, no important step in regard to them to be hereafter taken without first submitting it to Parliament. The first division is called Assiniboia, containing about 95,000 square miles. It is bounded on the south by the international line, on the east by the western boundary of Manitoba, and it runs north in the manner described in the measure, and contains 95,000 square miles. To the north of that lies the provisional district of the Saskatchewan, which contains about 114,000 square miles. They are pretty nearly of the same area. But it does not bind Parliament in any way. They can sub-divide them into Provinces or do as they please. It does not affect the North-West Council in any way, and it will be found to be a great practical convenience.

Mr. MILLS. I am not speaking of the convenience, but I am questioning this being the proper mode to take, because a Department regulation would have just as much force as an Order in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. If I rightly recollect the North-West Territories Act it contains power to make advances for the sub-division of the territory into districts, and it is possible therefore, we are here conflicting with that power. Having

given that power one could, of course, trench upon it by passing another Act, as we did when we subtracted from the North-West Territories the district of Keewatin by Act of Parliament, which it was held convenient to place under a different arrangement for a provisional Government. I dare say it was hardly worth while to bring down an Act of Parliament to name this country, and I have no doubt, that an expression of opinion by the House of Commons that these names are very proper and mellifluous names, would be quite as decisive as an Act of Parliament. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the choice of the names, and I hope his wisdom in the geographical division of the district will be verified by events. As I said in discussing the Address, nobody can forecast where the principal settlements will be, or what ultimately may be the most convenient divisions.

Motion agreed to; and it was resolved:

"That this House concurs in the memorandum contained in the minute of the Privy Council, transmitted by His Excellency the Governor General, in his gracious Message dated the 8th of May, viz.: that for the convenience of settlers and for postal purposes, a portion of the North-West Territories should be divided into four Provisional Districts—to be named respectively Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Athabaska;—and this House further approves of the boundaries of the said several Districts, as described in the said minute of Council."

SUBSIDY TO THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 162) for increasing during a certain time the yearly subsidy for the Province of Manitoba.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. BLAKE. I have not heard from the hon. gentleman, as I wished to have heard, some further statement with reference to the basis of this measure. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to place in my hands, in partial fulfilment of the promise he made, some statement of the estimated expenditures in the Province of Manitoba for a few years back, but the hon. gentleman agreed to accompany that with some general calculations upon which they base this measure for the proposed subsidy.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know that I can give anything more than the hon. member has in his possession, except to point out to him some calculation that was made upon the basis of 1880. For instance, the legislative expenses for 1880 were \$15,600, and we added 50 per cent. to that as the probable increase for the next five years, owing to the increase of population and the extension of the boundaries. Expenses for Civil Government for 1880, were \$17,150, and it was thought the expense would be increased by about one-third. Then the estimate for that year for the Administration of Justice, was \$15,000, and it was thought proper to add one-third for the next five years. Education was placed at \$18,000, and in view of a probable large increase in population during the next five years, reaching perhaps 200,000, and taking into account the cost for other parts of the Dominion, we increased that amount 50 per cent., or to \$27,000. Then the estimate for Roads and Bridges was \$30,000, which we have doubled. The municipalities then received \$25,000; one-third has been added to that. In 1880, there was a vote for Drainage of \$50,000. There was a considerable sum of money spent in that year and the year following, but that was not taken into account as a permanent expenditure to that extent. We thought that might be reduced, and probably removed altogether, and therefore that was omitted. The estimate for Printing was \$4,000; probable increase, one-half. Government Buildings were \$5,000, and in the memorandum I prepared I thought might be only \$3,000 for the future. The estimate for Emigration

Mr. BLAKE.

was \$5,000, which has been continued. Expenses of Government House, \$4,000, continued the same. There was an estimate for Miscellaneous, in 1880, of \$19,600, which we have increased by \$10,000. Basing these items on the estimate of 1880, the expenditure would amount to \$251,183, not allowing anything for drainage for some years. Then it was found that while calculations were made of an expenditure of the sum just mentioned, the estimated income would be about \$242,000, against which they claim would be their necessary expenditure of \$286,000. I find that the expenditure of 1880 was \$201,000, and in 1881 it went up to \$221,000, Education, \$23,892; Government and Legislation, \$48,461; Public Works, &c., \$85,167; Administration of Justice, Agriculture, &c., \$64,000; so that, taking the basis of 1880, the amount reached \$251,000; but the sum provided by the proposition now before the House will be \$240,000 or \$250,000, Manitoba asking that it shall be provided with means to meet an expenditure of \$286,000. In view of the rapid increase of expenditure on education, we felt that some such basis should be arrived at; and probably it will require great economy before 1890 is reached, and an increased subsidy is allowed on the larger population.

Mr. BLAKE. Not having had these figures before me, it is impossible for me to give them an analysis or consideration worthy the attention of the House. I admit the subject is largely a speculative one. I believe the condition of Manitoba, the time it was organized, and by which it was somewhat prematurely made a Province without having much regard to the population, was such that the system applicable to the older Provinces was utterly inapplicable to it. The question of a subsidy based on population is not unreasonable in dealing with Provinces that have attained a considerable extent in the national development. It is entirely different with a very large area, and with a small and increasing population. Then again with respect to lands, I consider each condition was exceptional. I agree it was impossible to propose to hand over lands and at the same time carry out for the territory great public works; but I contend that no satisfactory conclusion will be arrived at until those subjects shall all be taken into consideration and we deal with the questions of public advances and of the lands. With respect to the hon. gentleman's suggestion as to the finality of these arrangements, I am sorry there seems to be a grave misunderstanding between the Government and those with whom they have negotiated. The hon. Minister of Finance said the other day:

"As this arrangement is intended to extend over a period of ten years, until the Census of 1891, &c. &c." (Page 1.) "We took up the different items of the expenditure and estimated that the sum of \$225,000 would, with the greatest economy on the part of the Manitoba Government and Legislature, enable them to pay the expenditure for the next ten years." (Page 2.)

And again on page 4 he says:

"The hon. gentleman says that this action we propose will prevent future Governments from interfering in the matter for the next ten years. The very object of this Bill is to close the question so far as we can, and we gave the Government of Manitoba to understand, as stated in this resolution, that this agreement was to stand as a contract until 1891."

I find in the Manitoba Legislature debates on this question that the Premier made this statement:

"It will be found that the arrangement effected is not of the permanent character to which members allude, that it is only to meet a temporary emergency, and that it is perfectly understood by the Government below that they will meet the exigencies of the Province as circumstances warrant."

Referring to the \$45,000 in lieu of lands, he said:

"And were that amount granted by the Dominion Government and accepted by the Local Government, in lieu of all our land claims, I would myself feel constrained to concur in some of the remarks of the hon. member for Mountain, but the grant has not been given or accepted in that way."

The arrangements are defective and unjust. The hon. gentleman has stated that 150,000 people is a fair average of

the population of Manitoba for ten years; they assume that 90,000 is the present population, including the immigration for the year. Taking that increase at 12,000 a year, the immigration pouring into Manitoba for five years will bring the population up to 150,000. In regard to the suggestion of 12,000 a year for Manitoba, is one that hon. gentlemen should not regard as extravagant. I think to apply the system of a decennial census to a country like this which has grown from nothing in 1877, to its present dimensions, which the hon. gentleman expects to more than double in ten years, and which from present appearance will more than double, as far as we may judge, in five years, would be inadequate. I think the circumstances of the Province would require a shorter period than ten years, and I think that the interests of the country, of the whole Dominion, demand that we should revise the settlement at quinquennial periods at any rate. I therefore move in amendment the following:—

That the Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same, by striking out the words "during the ten years next after 1881," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "during the five years next after 1881."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the parties themselves asked that the calculation should be made on 100,000. That is their application. Our experience was this, that they asked that they should be allowed to increase the debt at the present population of 90,000. The hon. gentleman knows right well that by the Constitution it is provided that they shall enter the Dominion at a certain rate of debt per head of population. In my opinion, there is just one defect in the arrangement we made in reference to that, and one which affects the smaller Provinces of the Dominion coming into the Union. I have no doubt that it will have the same effect on the districts which are now provided for, viz., that they will not be in a hurry to come into the Union as separate Provinces, but rather remain as districts until the population increases, so that they are enabled to come in at a larger rate of debt. However, this would be breaking away from the principle of the Constitution. In order to meet the requirements of the delegates on that occasion, although they asked for 80 cents per head on 100,000, it was well known that the population would increase during the next ten years, and the Government felt that they could meet their requirements by increasing the population upon which the debt was to be calculated. The population was calculated at 90,000. They made it 100,000, which gave them within 30,000 of what they asked.

Mr. BLAKE. But they asked for the lands besides.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They asked for the lands what the additional lands for the next ten years would not make, \$45,000 a year, on account of interest, because they have been losing on the lands. The Government thought it would be the most liberal policy to give them the \$45,000, than to give them the lands, and tell them to make up that amount from the lands if they could. It is time the population is estimated in the Provinces on the Census of 1881. The Census of 1881 gives a population to Manitoba of about 65,000, and if we include persons who cannot be taken into account and who came in since, the number will probably be 90,000, and the proposition was that it should be taken at 150,000, in order, if possible, to meet the expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this amendment it appears to me that the hon. gentleman is rather misusing Manitoba. The Bill provides that the Province is to receive a certain yearly sum for ten years, but the hon. gentleman will not allow them to have the money for but five years, or half the time. The hon. gentleman thinks to make a bid for Manitoba, but he does not do it artistically. He says:

"They give it every ten years, and we will go on better;" but the people of Manitoba are practical people, and they would rather have a bird in the hand than two in the bush. They would rather have this money secured by law for ten years than have it for five years in the hope that they would get better offers from my hon. friend or some one else. In the interests of Manitoba, I call upon my friends to stand by that Province. This amendment will not do. It is a glaring injustice that at the last moment of the Session an amendment of this kind should be presented—presented to a moribund Parliament trying to ruin one Province for five long years. It is a monstrous proposition, and I call on this House to adhere to this offer and to give this benefit to the people of Manitoba for ten years; and if we are in power at the end of five years, as we shall be, we will be able, perhaps, to deal more liberally with them than circumstances allow us to do now. It has also to be remembered that these sums are such that the people of Manitoba accepted them gratefully, and that the hon. gentleman seeks to deprive them of that benefit by offering this amendment.

Amendment negatived on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed.

BETTER PREVENTION OF CRIME ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the reading of Bill (No. 165) further to continue in force for a limited time the better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878. He said: The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) knows that this Bill was proposed in 1878, and has since continued in force. We think it should be continued, because there are a great many works going on in the unprotected parts of the North-West to which the Act should be made to apply.

Bill read the second and third times, and passed.

THE WORD TELEGRAPH.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 166) declaratory of the meaning of the word Telegraph in certain cases.

Bill read the second time; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I think we require some explanation of this Bill. It appears to me that it may affect very important private interests.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of the Bill is simply to declare that the telephone is not a telegraph. The Anglo-American Telegraph Company, which has a telegraph line in Prince Edward Island, will not allow any telephone to be erected on the Island without receiving tribute therefor; and as the telegraph company, under its charter, has exclusive power to build telegraph lines on the Island, and as the telephone was not known then or discovered, they will not allow any telephones to be established there without paying tribute to them. This seems to be an extension of their powers, and this Bill is brought forward for the purpose of allowing telephone companies to establish telephones there as well as elsewhere by simply stating that telephones are not telegraphs.

Mr. BLAKE. But for this Bill telephones would be telegraphs—and I believe it has been so decided in the English Courts of Justice in cases in which it was contended that the creating of telephonic arrangements was an infringement upon the exclusive right of the Crown to the telegraphs. It may be that by this wide measure of legislation we are giving rights to the assumed patentees of telephonic rights, which do not exist under the law; it may be that we are creating monopolies even more extensive than that which the hon. gentleman says exists on the Island by the

telephone and telegraph being held to be identical. I should prefer very much at this late stage of the Session, unless there is some necessity for it, that some more limited measure of legislation might be devised which would not be so likely to produce such far-reaching consequences as might arise from this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter was investigated by the Senate before they passed this Bill. The Bell Telephone Company have tried to introduce their telephones on the Island, but the Anglo-American Telegraph Company prevented them from doing so unless they paid them tribute. Some time ago, when we had to lay cables in the Gulf from the Magdalen Islands, we intended to go to the Island of Prince Edward to connect with the telegraph system of the country, but we could not do so because this Company wanted to impose on the Government conditions which we could not respect, and I directed that the telegraph, instead of going to the Island, should go to Cape North, in Cape Breton. Under these circumstances this Bill was introduced in the Senate and passed. Their Honors thought it was not an infringement of the charter of that Company to declare that telephones were not telegraphs.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how that was done. It is not from that aspect of the question that I am discussing the Bill; I was much more interested in the other aspect and which deserves our most serious consideration. If it be the case that under the English decision telephone is included in telegraph, and if it does follow from that—because these telephonic arrangements were all patented in England—that there is an exclusive right to the patentees, it may be to the greatest possible advantage to the telephonic proprietors; and if the proposition to create a legislative distinction which does not now exist between the telegraph and the telephone, and if it be useful to create that distinction for the purpose of permitting telephones to be erected in Prince Edward Island, can not some declaration be made in the Bill that this definition is not to confer on the patentee of the telephone any other or greater rights than they might possess but for that, so as to preserve the interests of the public in not creating a right which would be created by the opposition of this law, so as to give an interpretation to the word telegraph different from that which according to right and justice does not belong to it. It is very important we should not step hastily in this matter.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The decision of the Court in England turned to a very great extent upon the construction that applied to the Statute applicable to telegraphs.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). From a perusal of the decision lately, I repeat my assertion. I admit there was a large amount of scientific evidence from eminent electricians and others, including Sir William Thompson, to the effect that inasmuch as electricity was used to a limited extent in the telephone system, telephones came within the particular definition of the English Statutes relating to telegraphs. Of course, the position of Prince Edward Island is very peculiar. The people are strongly under what may be termed, I think, without exaggeration, a monstrous monopoly, which, no doubt, they were foolish enough to enter into. They are, no doubt, suffering under a grievance; and, if it is legitimate and proper legislation, as to which I say nothing now, to interpret any Statute already passed in reference to the matter—if it is within the function of this Parliament, I would think we were not exceeding proper functions by doing anything we can in reason to relieve Prince Edward Island of the incubus under which it is undoubtedly suffering. We should thus be doing a public good by putting the people of that Island in a position to obtain modification of the hard terms which the monopoly are now administering to them.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. MILLS. When I dissented from the hon. member for Victoria I did so from the recollection of the decision of the English Judge. I think it was Justice Stephens who was the presiding Judge, and who gave an elaborate judgment after men of high scientific attainments were examined, and after learned counsel were heard, to the effect that not merely upon the provisions of the Statute, but also from the nature of the two inventions that a telephone was a telegraph, and the control of the telephones in England was upon their scientific identity.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I omitted that the telephone company had given notice of an appeal, and when about appealing an arrangement was made between the telephone company and the Government, whereby further litigation was avoided.

Mr. MILLS. The Government may have felt some hardship in the case of the telephone company, and may have agreed to a compromise based on moral and not legal considerations. Assuming that the English decision was correct, was law—what does the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill propose? By an Act of Parliament to divest parties in this country of property without any consideration. I may call the hon. gentleman's attention to the communication made by the hon. Minister of Justice to his colleagues, on the Streams Bill, in which the hon. gentleman complained that the Local Government were depriving certain parties of property without any consideration. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do in this case? The Courts have decided that a telegraph and a telephone are the same, and the hon. gentleman proposes to say they are not the same. With what purpose? To deprive certain parties of rights which he says they have got.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Our legislation has always recognized the distinction between telephones and telegraphs. In the Bills incorporating telegraph companies we have given them limited powers for telephone purposes, and in those incorporating telephone companies limited powers for telegraphy. The policy of this Parliament has always been to recognize those two systems as distinct. This Bill proposes simply to carry out that same idea; to declare, as a general proposition, what we have already declared in nearly every Act relating to telegraphs or telephones that has passed this House since the invention of telephones. The object to be obtained by this Bill is one of very great importance, and since we have recognized the distinction all through our legislation we ought to declare that distinction now so that there can be no doubt that telephones and telegraphs are separate and distinct things; and if by a cable from Prince Edward Island to the mainland telephonic communication may be had between the two, and the messages transmitted from the mainland over the telegraph wires, the people shall have the right to establish that telephonic communication. I will not venture for a single moment to dispute the argument of the hon. member for West Durham, but as I understand the hon. gentleman he does not object to our taking this course so far as the avowed object is concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. I rather said I would not discuss it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). But the hon. gentleman suggests another difficulty, that by declaring these two things to be distinct in the way proposed, we, in that way, give to certain telephonic inventions a value they would not possess if what is generally accepted to be the decision of the Courts in England obtained. I venture this opinion with great deference, that there is nothing in that, for this reason: Assuming they are the same, the telephone is simply a distinct invention for transmitting messages by sound and is an improvement upon the telegraph. So far it may have a distinct patent and distinct value which will not be increased or diminished by the fact that you separ-

ate it from the telegraph altogether. The interests involved in this are so great I sincerely trust the Bill will pass and thus enable the people of Prince Edward Island to have a cheap mode of transmitting messages to the mainland and thus get rid of the monopoly under which they labor at present.

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. MILLS. I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee with instructions to amend it by adding to the end of the second clause the following words: "or any right now existing."

Amendment negatived on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION.

Mr. BOWELL, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 172) further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act, 1880, said: This Bill is to prevent the importation into the country of an article which is called high test petroleum, or in other words sperm petroleum. It has been imported under two or three different names. It is put up as having a very high fire test, but its gravity is much greater than that which is prescribed by the Act, therefore, it could not be admitted under the Act as it stands. Under the existing law petroleum having a greater specific gravity than .845 cannot be lawfully sold or used for illuminating purposes in Canada, but an oil has been imported under the name of mineral sperm which has a specific gravity of from .825 to .830, and a fire test of about .280. This product is used almost exclusively now on board ocean steamers and outward vessels in inland waters. It is also used by railways from the fact of its being much safer than ordinary petroleum. The law provides that this must stand a fire test of .180, while the fire test provided for the other is only .150. That is the only change.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the annual Petroleum Bill, without which, I suppose, every Session would be incomplete. I believe there has been one every Session of this Parliament, and it has always come down about this period of the Session when it was impossible that it should be examined by those who are interested in the trade. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press the measure, because I am expecting to receive an intimation on the subject in the course of the morning from a person interested in the trade. The Bill, in several respects, indicates the imperfection of preceding legislation. In the first place you have got here a condemnation of your specific gravity test, because you are proposing a different test from that heretofore used. In the next place you are proposing a mode of applying the flash test which has been condemned by the Minister and officers who have introduced the new test. We have a new, extensive and complicated test; I think it takes two or three pages of the Statute-book to describe the mode in which the test shall be applied. We are coming back again in this Bill to an old test about which we can read statements of Ministers and experts that it was so very imperfect that they could not tell, after a long examination, whether the oil would stand the test or not. You are applying here a different range of fire or flash test, and you are restoring this particular application of the fire test and the old open cup, displaced by the more extensive machinery. I have been unable to find out, as on former occasions, from whom this Bill really comes; I do not know whether it comes from importers or manufacturers of the article, whether it is intended to make the article here or whether it has been found that under the law as it at present exists, it is imported under some other name. So far as I know there is no such name known in the trade now as high test

petroleum. I am aware oil has been imported and sold under the name of mineral sperm. I rather suspect that if the hon. gentleman searched to the bottom he is really proposing that this article shall in future be designated a high test petroleum.

Mr. BOWELL. I have the best authority for saying that this does not interfere with the ordinary petroleum trade in the least. When the Bill was introduced last year and the year before, this class of oil was not known in the trade. It came first under my notice in Prince Edward Island, where the steamers running between Boston and Halifax, and touching at Charlottetown, applied for permission to import this oil, its specific gravity being so much greater than that provided for by the Petroleum Act that they could not import it under the law. It has been found that the Grand Trunk Railway has been purchasing it in the United States and using it on the through lines, and also the steamers on the lakes import it. I have had a long telegram from oil men in Petrolia and the West in reference to this matter, and so has the Minister of Inland Revenue, pointing out that it did not interfere in the least with their trade, and there has been no protest entered against the passage of the measure. The suggestion did not emanate either from the manufacturers or importers, but simply from the fact that we found that under the law the article was safer to use by railways and steamboats; although imported it proves to be a much safer article than that which was produced in the country. I will also inform the hon. gentleman that this kind of petroleum has not hitherto been made in Canada, but they have discovered a mode by which it can be manufactured from the Canadian crude petroleum, and they are commencing to manufacture it in this country. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman desires that this article, which is safe in its character and certainly not explosive, should be kept out of the country, because if it were we would have to prevent under the law its use in this country, though it might be manufactured. There is no objection to allow the third reading to stand till to-morrow.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

LEGISLATION RESPECTING INDIANS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have to crave the indulgence of the House while I introduce a Bill (No. 174) from the Senate to amend the Indian Act. It has been represented to me as requisite in consequence of some decisions and doubts that have recently taken place in the North-West. I will not go over the clauses, as I have shown the Bill to my predecessor (Mr. Mills) and he concurs in all the clauses, with the exception of one, which will be omitted.

Bill read the first, second and third times and passed.

BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

Bill (No. 171) to increase the amount placed at the disposal of the Governor in Council by the Act 34 Vic., Cap. 8, for paying off claims on the Bank of Upper Canada.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, and read the third time and passed.

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH AND CABLE COMPANY.

On the order to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 17) to grant certain powers to the American Telegraph and Cable Company being read,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). With respect to one of the amendments the Company are unwilling to agree to it, and at this late period of the Session I shall not ask the House to dissent from the amendment. I prefer to adopt the

alternative of moving the withdrawal of the Bill. The reason why the Bill is withdrawn, I may briefly say, is that the amendment made by the Senate will place the Company at a disadvantage as compared with other cable companies. I move therefore:

That the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill No. 17, to grant certain powers to the American Telegraph and Cable Company, be deferred for three months.

Mr. BLAKE. I think my hon. friend cannot move the discharge of the Order after it has come down from the Senate. To accomplish his object he had better move that the amendment be considered this day three months, and he can make a separate motion as to the return of the fees.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that would be better.

Mr. CAMERON, moved:

That the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill No. 17, to grant certain powers to the American Telegraph and Cable Company, be deferred for three months, and that the fee and charges paid thereon, be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2:25 a.m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, 17th May, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REMUNERATION OF THE MESSENGERS.

Mr. ROYAL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to lay before the Government a class of claims to their favorable consideration, which appears to me, as well as to others, as being overlooked. I mean the humblest class of officers of this House, the messengers. During this Session we have thought of remunerating very largely, but not too much, the highest class of our civil servants. We have not neglected to take care of the Deputy-Heads of the Departments. We have provided fully for every class in the various Departments of the Civil Service; but I believe we have to a great extent, if not neglected, overlooked at least the rightful claims of a most interesting class of our employees. This is, perhaps, owing to the fact that they are the humblest in the scale of officers; but I believe that we must not close the labors of this Session without attempting at least to call the attention of the Government to the claims of these officers. They are poorly paid, as they only get \$200. This Session has lasted about a hundred days, so that their pay amounts only to the small pittance of about \$2 a day, out of which they have to pay their expenses and provide themselves with decent clothing. The same class of employees in the Senate, whose duties are much less onerous, are paid \$250. When we consider, also, that the pages receive \$1.50 a day, the claims of our messengers should not be overlooked, especially when we have an overflowing Treasury, and when the Government, with judicious generosity, are providing for all the requirements of the public service. I can speak disinterestedly on this subject, because Manitoba is too far away from Ottawa to have any people from that Province appointed on the staff of messengers of this House; and I am sure that our hon. friends on the Opposition side will join me in urging upon the Government the claims of our messengers on their favorable consideration.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I think the House of Commons should pay the same salaries to its messengers as the Senate pays. It is well known that they do three times the amount of work. They are here about a hundred days, and when they pay their board and expenses and return to their homes they have very little left. There is another class of our officials who are hardly worked, and that is the sessional clerks. There is no class employed about the buildings who put in more hours of work, and, I think, in addition to the three dollars a day, they ought to get a bonus of \$50. I do not think anybody in the House or the country would object to that being done. These men have to work sometimes from eight or nine o'clock in the morning until two or three the next morning. I hope the Government will see their way to granting this bonus; I do not think any hon. member will oppose it, and, as the hon. member for Niagara says, a year from now, whoever rules this country may make the increase permanent, and put it in the Estimates.

Mr. BERGERON. I entirely concur in what has been said. I do not see why our messengers, who have ten times the amount of work to do, should not be paid as much as the messengers in the Senate.

Mr. GUILLET. I desire to say a word on behalf of another class—of those in the paste-room. We know that a large number of documents have been sent away this Session, and that these employees have had a great deal to do. All hon. members will sympathize with them I believe, because all have availed themselves of their services.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt you, Sir, and the Commission of Internal Economy who assist you, will take all these matters into consideration.

Mr. ORTON. I thoroughly endorse the views expressed by other hon. gentlemen, especially with regard to the sessional clerks. I know of one sessional clerk who gave very valuable services to the Committee of which I was Chairman, working night and day, sometimes until two or three o'clock in the morning. I certainly think that the House would do well to reward those who have labored so well in the public service; and I think the suggestion, that a bonus should be granted for this Session, and the matter of a permanent increase left for future consideration, is a very good one.

Mr. TASSÉ (in French). I hope that it will be found possible to grant the increase asked for by the sessional messengers, and that during the recess the Government will take into consideration the increasing of the salaries of those messengers from \$500 to \$600 per annum. These employees render valuable assistance to the Government, and I think that their services should be rewarded as fully and as generously as possible. I am glad to see that hon. members who spoke before me on this question have all declared themselves in favor of increasing the salaries of sessional messengers.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 168,) to amend the Inland Revenue Act of 1880.

Mr. BLAKE. The amendment that seems to be material, as far as I can judge, is that on page 4, line 32, providing that when manufactured into common Canada twist the Canadian tobacco may be sold by the grower, when grown on premises occupied by him, to any person for his own use, to the extent of 30 lbs. for each male member of the purchaser's family, and limiting the time of selling to two years after the passing of the Act. That provision conflicts with the third clause of the Bill, which gives absolute power to sell to anybody at any time, whether leaf or twist. These are very important modifications of the right of the

cultivator to sell tobacco. You have two inconsistent clauses inserted in the Act. The second clause obviously modifies the other clause which gives practically unlimited right. It modifies it in point of time—it gives the right to sell the leaf only for two years; it modifies it in point of character—it gives the right to sell only to any person who requires it for his own use; it modifies it in point of extent, entitles you to sell the leaf only to the extent of 30 lbs. for each adult member of the purchaser's family; so that the change which is proposed is a very important one. Well, then, you have repealed the clause as to the manufacture and sale of the twist. It leaves that in this way: "The cultivator may also, during the set period of two years, manufacture into twist, the surplus tobacco grown," so that as to the sale of Canada twist, and the manufacture of the leaf into Canada twist by the cultivator, instead of being an unlimited and permanent privilege, is restricted to two years, so that if the hon. gentleman adopts the amendment it will be observed that, both with reference to the sale and disposal of the leaf and also with reference to the disposal of the common Canada twist, very important restrictions are laid upon the privileges accorded to the cultivation of tobacco by the Bill as it passed this House.

Mr. HOUDE. I would ask whether there is not a change affecting the cultivator for two years to come?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, there is. The effect of that is, first of all, that the privileges are by the Bill, as it passed this House, general and unlimited, while they are now limited to two years. The effect, secondly, is, that whereas there is a general power to sell the leaf now, it is only for two years, and the power to sell the leaf is only to any person who wants it for his own use, and the power to sell is limited to the quantity of 30 lbs. for each adult male in the purchaser's family. This is a most serious departure, and I hope the hon. Minister will change his view and disagree with the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the amendments be not concurred in, and the reason for such non-concurrence is, that the said amendments are contrary to the general policy of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 172) further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Mr. Bowell.)

THE WINNIPEG POST OFFICE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether there has been any enquiry by Post Office Inspector Dewe on the subject of the Winnipeg post office; whether any report has been made; whether the report recommends the removal of any, and which officers of that post office, and on what grounds; whether the report will be laid on the Table?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow this question to stand for a few minutes until the arrival of the hon. the Postmaster-General, who will shortly be here.

BOROUGH OF NIAGARA.

Mr. PLUMB. I had hoped that upon the consideration of the Redistribution Bill, I might have again appealed to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, in respect to the constituency of Niagara; but I now desire, in regard to the changes made in that constituency, to appeal to the right hon. gentleman to say that I had endeavored as far as I could to discharge my duty to my constituents and endeavored to preserve the constituency

intact. I trust, on some other occasion, I may be exonerated from any neglect of duty in respect to my constituents at Niagara, and I hope that the right hon. gentleman will say that I did endeavor, as far as in me lay, to prevent the sacrifice, as it will appear to them, by annexing that old constituency to the county of Lincoln. I think my right hon. friend scarcely understands the deep feeling that exists among the inhabitants of that loyal borough, on finding themselves deprived of a representative, but I trust they will follow my example in still remaining loyal to the Conservative cause, which they have often done on hard fought fields in the past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hoped to have had an opportunity of saying something on this matter; what I say in these few words I shall perhaps have an opportunity of repeating at greater length on some future occasion. The hon. gentleman waited on me not only in season but out of season, day and night, sometimes when I was particularly engaged, in order to preserve the right of representation to the borough of Niagara, which he has represented so well, ably and fearlessly on the floor of this House. I hope to have an opportunity of speaking of this matter by-and-bye. In the meantime I would say on behalf of my colleagues and friends in this House, that we will view with great regret any accident which will prevent my hon. friend from any longer assisting in the Government of the country as a member of the Legislature. I do not believe such a fall will happen to him or any such misfortune will happen to the party, which would lose a valuable friend and adviser, and I have full confidence—perfect confidence, that the hon. gentleman, if his life be spared, will come back to the next Parliament as the representative of an Ontario constituency.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Having heard what was said by the hon. First Minister in regard to the probable retirement from this House of the hon. member for Niagara, I trust I shall have time enough to express my sympathy for the hon. gentleman; and my admiration for the eloquent valedictory speech on which he the other day closed his address in bidding good-bye to the old loyal borough of Niagara. I regret very much that the hon. gentlemen opposite in their speeches on that occasion did not meet my hon. friend in the kindly spirit which his admirable and feeling speech deserved. I am sure we all admire his chivalrous spirit in which he placed his seat in the hands of his chief. But I for one am glad to hear that political retirement is not to be the fate of my hon. friend, for I have the pleasure of knowing that his political career will not be ended with the present Parliament. I think the leader of the Government, when he was giving my hon. friend a bill of health, might have said a word to a few other of his supporters; and I would be glad if he would say something for his opponents too, for I would be sorry to see their number lessened, I would rather see it increased. I do not think it would be in the interests of the country that their number should be reduced; and I am quite satisfied, notwithstanding their professed alarm, that every leading member of the Opposition will be found back on that side after the elections. No doubt oppositions are very useful to the country.

Mr. PLUMB. Therefore we always want to keep them there. I think, Mr. Speaker, I may also add what might have been more appropriately said by a member of greater experience, that this House ought to express its great appreciation of the able manner in which you have discharged your duty as Speaker this Session. Having the peculiar advantage common to all your race of that courtesy and politeness characteristic of French Canadians, and the ripe experience gained as Speaker of a Provincial Assembly, you have discharged your duties with an amount of tact and success highly creditable to yourself as well as useful to this Chamber. I desire, on behalf of what I may call

the inexperienced parliamentarians, to express our grateful appreciation of the great encouragement you have always given us, and of the experience you have placed at our disposal when questions involving parliamentary practice have arisen from time to time. I am sure that all of us who have had the privilege of sitting in this Chamber, over which you have so happily presided, will look back with pleasure to your career as its presiding officer, and will always remember cordially and kindly the personal hospitalities which you so lavishly dispensed, and the character which you kept up, not only as a French Canadian gentleman, but as a Canadian and as the Speaker of the Commons of Canada.

Mr. ROYAL (in French). Mr. Speaker, I think it my duty, as one of the Junior members of this House, to unite with the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) in his expression of praise and regret with regard to the leave-taking of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). It is always an advantage for a young member to listen to speeches as instructive and as full of new ideas as those made by the hon. member for Niagara during the three years that I have occupied a seat in this Parliament, with the greatest profit to himself and, I am sure, to those who will, in the future, read the debates of this House to seek in them the necessary elements for writing the parliamentary history of the country. As for me, I have ever admired the varied eloquence, the extensive knowledge and the rapidity of conception of the hon. member for Niagara. Although advanced in years, his mind has remained young and fresh. More than once have we enjoyed the vivacity of his answers, whilst at the same time we may sometimes have regretted that he should have abused the too great popularity he had acquired in this House. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, no one more than myself has admired the hon. member for Niagara, and it will certainly be a loss for this House and for the country that a man should disappear from the parliamentary precincts who has been such an ornament to them by his extensive knowledge and his talents of a high order. Now, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba was formerly in the habit of electing the principal men of the country, whom the older Provinces, in a moment of spite, had refused to elect. In 1873, Manitoba had the honor of electing Sir George E. Cartier, after his defeat in the Province of Quebec. In 1878, it had the honor of electing Sir John A. Macdonald, the Prime Minister of the Dominion, who had been beaten in a city of the Province of Ontario. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that Manitoba, which has only young men to send to this Parliament, has given a proof of its wisdom by electing eminent men unjustly rejected by the older Provinces, and if the hon. member for Niagara is cast out of the political arena because the county of Niagara has disappeared, I think he will be welcomed and will triumph in one of the districts of Manitoba or of the North-West. I also join the hon. member for Essex in what concerns you personally, Mr. Speaker. I might be taxed with being too favorably inclined towards a fellow-countryman, but I cannot refrain from praising the cordiality of your receptions as well as the lively interest you have shown in making agreeable the long sittings we have had to spend in this House. I am sure that if the young ones are those who must praise their elders, I could not select a fitter subject to allow me to express on this occasion my sympathy with the hon. member for Niagara, and my admiration for the hospitality and impartiality with which you have presided over the deliberations of this assembly during the three Sessions I have had the honor of being in this House.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. SPEAKER stated that the Master in Chancery had come from the Senate to say that the Senate doth not insist
Mr. PLUMB.

on the amendments made by them to the Bill (No. 168) to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1880, except the 7th of the said amendments, upon which the Senate doth insist.

Mr. MOUSSEAU moved that this House do not insist on disagreement with the 7th amendment, but agree to the same.

Mr. BLAKE. I really do not think this will do. It is proposed to strike out the clause which is substituted for clause 146, in order to provide for the new state of things supposed to be created by this Bill. It therefore leaves alive clause 146, which provides that every person who offers for sale, or has in his possession, except on the premises where tobacco is grown, or in a licensed manufactory, any unstamped tobacco, shall pay a penalty. This clashes with the permission to sell uninspected tobacco, which you intend to give to the cultivator.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suppose the last provision made by Parliament in this matter would be considered, by the interpreters of the law, as nullifying this clause 146 in the old Act. We are satisfied the law will work well without that amendment, and would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the motion to go as it is.

Motion agreed to.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General, by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

MR. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

- An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Manitoba Bank.
- An Act to incorporate The St. Lawrence Marine Insurance Company of Canada.
- An Act to incorporate the North-Western Bank.
- An Act respecting The Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Lake Superior and James' Bay Railway Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Railway Company.
- An Act respecting the Sun Mutual Life Insurance Company of Montreal.
- An Act to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan and Peace River Railway Company.
- An Act to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Dominion Fire and Marine Insurance Company.
- An Act to further amend the Act incorporating the Mutual Life Association of Canada and to change the name thereof to "The Life Association of Canada."
- An Act to revive and amend the charter of the Chartered Bank of London and North America, and to change the name thereof to "The Chartered Bank of London and Winnipeg."
- An Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steamship Company (Limited).
- An Act to amend and consolidate as amended the several Acts relating to the British America Assurance Company.
- An Act to incorporate the Planters Bank of Canada.
- An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan and for other purposes connected therewith.
- An Act respecting the New York and Ontario Furnace Company.
- An Act respecting the Portage, Westbourne and North Western Railway Company.
- An Act concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.
- An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western Railway Company.
- An Act to empower the Ottawa Agricultural Insurance Company to wind up their affairs, and to relinquish their charter and to provide for the dissolution of the said Company.
- An Act to amend and extend the Act to empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the winding up of their affairs.

An Act to incorporate the Tecumseh Insurance Company of Canada.
 An Act respecting the Exchange Bank of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.
 An Act to amend the Act incorporating the North American Mutual Life Insurance Company, and to change the name thereof to the "North American Life Association Company."
 An Act to amend the Act incorporating "The Canadian Steam Users' Insurance Association" and to change the name of the said Company to "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada."
 An Act to reduce the stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value of the shares thereof, and for other purposes.
 An Act to incorporate the Western Bank of Canada.
 An Act relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.
 An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.
 An Act further to amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountains Railway Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Ocean Mutual Marine Insurance Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Edison Electric Light Company of Canada.
 An Act to incorporate The Quebec Timber Company (Limited).
 An Act to incorporate The Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Railway Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Canada Mutual Telegraph Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Thomson and Houston's Electric Light Company of Canada.
 An Act to make further provision for the improvement of the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec.
 An Act to authorize the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited) to issue preference stock.
 An Act to grant certain powers to the "C. W. Williams Manufacturing Company" and to change the name thereof to the "Williams Manufacturing Company."
 An Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.
 An Act to amend the charter of the Fellows Medical Manufacturing Company.
 An Act further to amend the Acts to provide for the improvement and management of the Harbour of Quebec.
 An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, and to authorize the said Company to erect a bridge over the River Ottawa.
 An Act respecting the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.
 An Act to incorporate the Montreal and Central Canada Railway Company.
 An Act to exempt vessels employed in fishing from the payment of duties for the relief of sick and distressed mariners.
 An Act to incorporate the St. John's Bridge Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Richelieu Bridge Company.
 An Act to provide for the improvement and management of the Harbour of Three Rivers.
 An Act to amend the Act Thirty-Fifth Victoria, Chapter Forty-Two, respecting the appointment of a Harbour Master for the Port of Halifax.
 An Act to authorize the construction, on certain conditions, of the Canadian Pacific Railway through some Pass other than the Yellow Head Pass.
 An Act for amending the Acts relating to The Trust and Loan Company of Canada and for enlarging the powers of the said Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.
 An Act respecting a certain agreement between the Canadian Securities Company and the Liquidators of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.
 An Act to incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Bridge Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.
 An Act to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Acts amending the same."
 An Act to amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intituled: "An Act to incorporate the Managers of the Ministers, Widows and Orphans Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland," and amendments thereto.
 An Act to extend and amend the Acts relating to the Canada Landed Credit Company.
 An Act to amend The General Port Wardens' Act, 1874.
 An Act to make further provision respecting the incorporation of a Company to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific Coast of Canada and Asia.
 An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.
 An Act to amend the Act Fortieth Victoria, Chapter Thirty, intituled: "An Act to make provision against the improper use of fire-arms."
 An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.
 An Act respecting fugitive offenders in Canada from other parts of Her Majesty's Dominions.
 An Act to amend and further to continue in force for a limited time, the Act Forty-third Victoria, Chapter Thirty-six.
 An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.
 An Act respecting Bridges over navigable waters, constructed under the authority of Provincial Acts.

An Act to amend an Act to amend and consolidate as amended the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.
 An Act respecting County Court Judges.
 An Act to incorporate the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Rapid City Central Railway Company.
 An Act respecting Queen's College at Kingston.
 An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Company.
 An Act to incorporate the International Construction Company (Limited).
 An Act to incorporate the Great Eastern Railway Company.
 An Act to provide for the allowance of drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada, for use in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.
 An Act respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.
 An Act respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.
 An Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the Province of Quebec.
 An Act to incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).
 An Act to incorporate the Great American and European and Short Line Railway Company.
 An Act to incorporate the Qu'Appelle Land Company (Limited).
 An Act to amend an Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.
 An Act to amend the Act Forty-second Victoria, Chapter Forty, intituled "An Act to amend The Maritime Jurisdiction Act, 1877," and to make further provision for the recovery of the wages of seamen employed on vessels navigating the inland waters of Canada.
 An Act to incorporate the "Canada Provident Association."
 An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the office of Port Warden for the Harbour of Montreal.
 An Act to amend the Acts of the present Session, intituled: "An Act to reduce the capital stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value of the shares thereof, and for other purposes."
 An Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.
 An Act to incorporate The McClary Manufacturing Company.
 An Act to further amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.
 An Act to repeal certain provisions of the General Inspection Act, 1874.
 An Act further to amend "The Pilotage Act, 1873," and the other Acts therein mentioned.
 An Act to provide for the free transmission of the Canadian newspapers by mail within the Dominion.
 An Act to remove certain doubts as to the effect of "The North-West Territories Act, 1880," and to amend the same.
 An Act to further amend "The Seamen's Act, 1873."
 An Act to make further provisions respecting Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons.
 An Act to correct certain errors in the French versions of "The Dominion Lands Act" and "The Dominion Lands Act, 1879."
 An Act to amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.
 An Act to provide for building certain Branch Lines of Railway from points on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway respectively.
 An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the inspection of Steamboats and the examination and licensing of Engineers employed on them.
 An Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons, and for other purposes.
 An Act for increasing during a certain time, the yearly subsidy to the Province of Manitoba.
 An Act relating to the Harbor of Saint John, in the Province of New Brunswick.
 An Act to encourage the construction of Dry Docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to Companies constructing them.
 An Act further to continue in force for a limited time "The better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878."
 An Act to amend "The Extradition Act, 1877."
 An Act declaratory of the meaning of the word Telegraph in certain cases.
 An Act further to amend the several Acts imposing Duties of Customs now in force.
 An Act further to amend "The Indian Act, 1880."
 An Act to fix and provide for the payment of the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario, and of certain Judges and County Judges in Manitoba and New Brunswick.
 An Act to provide for the granting of subsidies for the construction of certain lines of railway therein mentioned.
 An Act to increase the amount placed at the disposal of the Governor in Council by the Act Thirty-four Victoria, Chapter Eight, for paying off claims on the Bank of Upper Canada.
 An Act respecting the Windsor Branch of the Intercolonial Railway.
 An Act to authorize an annual grant for the development of the Sea Fisheries and the encouragement of the building of fishing vessels.
 An Act to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company Limited.
 An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1880.

An Act further to amend "The Petroleum Inspection Act, 1880."
 An Act to further amend "The Patent Act of 1872."
 An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, and Trading Corporations.

Then the Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,

"The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required by the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

"In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a Bill intitled: 'An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1882, and the 30th June, 1883, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service,' to which I humbly request Your Excellency's assent."

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

"In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill."

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Fourth Session of the Fourth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I desire to convey to you my best thanks for the earnestness and assiduity which you have shown in the performance of your parliamentary duties, and I am glad to believe that on returning to your homes you will find the country everywhere enjoying a large measure of prosperity.

The Civil Service Act will, I trust, be productive of the best results. It will improve the organization and add to the usefulness of that service, already so efficient.

The measures relating to the extradition of fugitive offenders, to the winding up of Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies and Trading Corporations, and for amending the Criminal Law, are all of an important nature.

The appropriation in aid of Railway enterprise will tend greatly to open up vast tracts of fertile country hitherto almost inaccessible to the settler.

The annual grant for the encouragement of the Sea Fisheries and the improvement of the condition of the fishermen will be of great value to that important branch of the national industries.

The removal of the duties on tea and coffee will lessen the cost of these important articles of food to the people, and the repeal of the Stamp Tax on Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes will be appreciated by the commercial community as a relief from an irksome burden,

while the transmission of newspapers and periodicals free from postage will be accepted as a boon by the whole country.

Our manufacturers already in a prosperous condition will be further aided by the abolition of the duties on metals and other raw materials used in their several productions.

It is satisfactory to know that the buoyant state of the revenue will permit these reductions, amounting to about a million and a quarter of dollars, to be made without inconvenience.

During the recess my Ministers will continue their efforts to secure favorable commercial arrangements with France and Spain. In these endeavors the High Commissioner will receive the same hearty support from Her Majesty's Government and the Imperial diplomacy as has already been given to him.

Such support must greatly strengthen Canada in any negotiations entered into for the improvement of her trade with foreign countries.

It has been the more readily accorded that Her Majesty's Government rely on no preference being given by Canada against the trade or products of the Mother Country.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you in Her Majesty's name for the Supplies you have granted, which will be expended with all due attention to economy.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I heartily congratulate you on the rapid and successful development of our manufacturing, agricultural and other industries.

I am, however, advised that their progress would have been still greater were it not that capitalists hesitate to embark their means in undertakings which would be injured, if not destroyed, by a change in the trade and fiscal policy adopted by you in 1879. In order, therefore, to give the people, without further delay, an opportunity of expressing their deliberate opinion on this policy, and at the same time to bring into operation the measure for the readjustment of the representation in the House of Commons, it is my intention to cause this Parliament to be dissolved at an early day.

The Speaker of the Senate then said:

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is His Excellency the Governor General's will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Monday, the 26th day of June next to be here held, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until Monday, the 26th day of June next.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to the 26th day of June next.

INDEX.

FOURTH SESSION — FOURTH PARLIAMENT, 1882.

ABBREVIATIONS of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used, as the following:—Adjn., Adjourn; Amt., Amendment; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; Civ. Serv., Civil Service; Clk., Clerk; Com., Committee; Conc., Concurrence; Cont., Contract; Cor., Correspondence; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; H., House; H. E., His Excellency; H. M., Her Majesty; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; M., Motion, Moved; Mess., Message; Neg., Negatived; O. C., Order in Council; Pap., Papers; Pet., Petition; Prop., Proposed; Q., Ques., Question; Rep., Report; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Sel. Com., Select Committee; Com. of W., Committee of Whole House; Withdn., Withdrawn; W. & M., Ways and Means; Y., Yeas; N., Nays; 1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; *, Without discussion.

ABBOTT, Hon. J. J. C., *Argenteuil*

Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co's. and Trading Corporations B. 145 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1315.
Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa Ry. (B. 114, 1°*) 376.
Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1460.

AMYOT, Mr. G., *Bellechasse*

Canadian Tobacco, Duty on (M. for Statement) 20.
Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Report of Com., 692; Second Rep., 1473; Fourth Rep., 1555.
Fisheries and Fishing Licenses (M. for Ret.) 229.
Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1428.
Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1282; on B. 168, in Com., 1552.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on M. for 3° (Amts.) 485, 490.
Military College at Kingston, Abolition of (Ques.) 73.
Military Schools for the Infantry Service (Ques.) 73.
Militia Employés, Aged (Ques.) 72.
Pilotage Act (1873) Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1261, 1329.
Quebec Customs Boatmen, Uniform for (M. for copies of Petitions), 316.
Question of Privilege (on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 1553.
Red River Expedition (1870-71), Names of Officers, &c. (M. for Ret.) 328; (Ques.) 478.
Ross, Lieut. Col., censure of in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1301.
St. Michel Wharf Improvements (M. for Reps.) 128; (Ques.) 568, 1231.

AMYOT, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Supply—Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1301.
Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 698.

ANGLIN, Hon. T. W., *Gloucester*

Accidents on Government Rys., on M. for Ret., 285.
Amount expended for "Completion of the Intercolonial, \$24,372.54" (M. for Ret. in detail) 191.
Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 875; in Com., 1513, 1517.
Canadian-built Vessels in France, on M. for Cor., 285.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1015.
Charybdis Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1270.
Chignecto Ship Ry. Subsidy B. 167 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1550.
Coal landed at Cape Traverse in 1879 (M. for Ret.) 1121.
Concurrence—Census, 1309; Mail Subsidies (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1310; (P.E.I. and Great Britain) 1311; (Port Mulgrave to East Bay, C.B.) 1501; Registration of Shipping, 1311; Indian Schools, 1312; Miscellaneous (compensation to D. H. Waterbury) 1312; Weights and Measures and Gas, 1312; Intercolonial (rolling stock) 1320; Culling Timber, 1501.
Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to (M. for Ret.) 50.
Cottons and Woollens, Duties on (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 1162.
Delay in the reception of Mails (remarks) 493.
Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co. Act Amt. B. 105 (*Mr. Gault*) in Com., 922.
Fire-Arms, improper use of, Act Amt. B. 111 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1259.

ANGLIN, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*

- Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1131.
- General Port Warden's Act (1874) Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res. 788.
- Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. 1429.
- Hudson Bay Ry. (Ques.) in Com. of Supply, 1099.
- Income and Deficits in Post-Office Service: in Com. of Supply, 1196.
- Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c., on M. for copies of Circulars, 286.
- Intercolonial Ry. Branches (M. for Ret.) 285.
- Intercolonial Ry. Coal Hoppers (M. for Ret.) 478.
- Intercolonial Ry. Employés (M. for Ret.) 189.
- Intercolonial Rolling Stock (Ms. for Ret.) 56, 120; (Ques.) 866; in Com. of Supply, 1151; on Conc., 1320.
- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 876; on Res. 1060.
- Iron Industry, on Res. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1226.
- Letter-carriers' Uniforms (Ques.) in Com. of Supply, 1194.
- Ministerial Explanations, 27.
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 534.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 945; on Amt. to 3^o (*Mr. Blake*) 947; in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 948; on Amt. to 3^o (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 949.
- North-West Mounted Police B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 545.
- Persons charged with indictable offences B. 50 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1^o, 110.
- Pilotage Act Amt. (1873) B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res. 659; on 2^o, 1260.
- Postage on Newspapers, Abolition of, B. 161 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1429.
- Potts, Thomas, Letters addressed to (M. for Cor.) 374.
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. 129 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 534.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Senate Amts., 1566.
- Rivière du Loup Branch of the Intercolonial Ry., Total Cost of (M. for Ret.) 191.
- Salaries of Judges B. 179 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1561.
- Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1238.
- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. 110 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1509.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 548.
- St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1429.

ANGLIN, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*

- Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1531.
- Supply—Charges of Management*, 593—598; *Civil Government*; (Secretary of State) 602—605; (Public Works) 657; (High Commissioner: contingent expenses) 659; (additional expenditure) 1504; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 780; (St. Vincent de Paul) 782; (Dorchester) 783; *Legislation* (Senate Chaplain) 784; *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) 848; *Immigration*, 849; *Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 851; (Intercolonial) 1151; *Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 857; *Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life Boats, &c.) 866; (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1270; (Water Police, Montreal) 1272; *Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens); 870 *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.B.) 1023; (Ottawa Geological Museum) 1266; Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1027; (N.B.) 1445; *Railways and Canals—Capital*: Railways (C.P.R.) 1096; (Intercolonial) 1436; (Cape Traverse Ry.) 1437; *Geological Survey*, 1184, 1508; *Post Office*, 1193; *Miscellaneous* (Army and Navy, Articles imported for) 1198; (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1275; International Fishery Exhibition) 1505; *Fisheries* (Fish Breeding) 1273; *Administration of Justice* (Russell vs. Woodward) 1273.
- Tariff, The, and Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 257.
- Thunder Bay to Red River, Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1096.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) on Res. 660; in Com. on B., 1131.
- Upper Canada Bank, claims against, B. 171 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 531.
- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 147; Comments on Sir Leonard Tilley's reply, 521, 522; on Res. in Com. (salt) 526; on Conc. (salt) 1497.
- Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27, on M. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) of Want of Confidence, 1247.
- Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. 156 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on Ques. of Order (*Mr. Borden*) on 2^o, 1548; in Com., 1549.

ARKELL, Mr. T., *East Elgin*

- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 759.
- Canada Southern and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. (B. 14, 1^o*) 46.
- Maps of Manitoba and the North-West, on M. for Copies, 227.
- Minister of Public Works' visit to St. Thomas: in Com. of Supply, 927.
- Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co. (B. 48, 1^o*) 109.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1418.
- St. Clair River Bridge and Tunnel Co. (B. 80, 1^o*) 229.

ARKELL, Mr. T.—*Con.*

- Supply—Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (Ont.) 1024.
 Tariff, The, and Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 257.
 Welland Canal, Damage to Lock No. 1 (Ques.) 1108.

BAIN, Mr. T., *North Wentworth*

- Hamilton Custom House and Offices (M. for copy of Petition, &c.) 172.
 Postage on Newspapers, abolition of, B. 161 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1420.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1487.

BAKER, Mr. G. B., *Missisquoi*

- Richelieu Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 42, 1°*) 78; on 2°, 110.

BANNERMAN, Mr. W., *South Renfrew*

- Customs Revenues on Hudson's Bay (M. for Ret.) 43.
 Customs Seizures at Hudson's Bay Ports (M. for Ret.) 47.
 Hudson Bay Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1099.
 Rapid City Central Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 139, 1°*) 659.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1465.
 Revenue Cutter on Hudson's Bay (Ques.) 45.
Supply—Civil Government (Interior) 605; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (C.P.R.) 1099; *Indians* (N.W.T.) 1186; *Fisheries*, 1557.
 Tramway at Grand Rapids of the Saskatchewan (M. for Paps.) 172.

BEATY, Mr. J., jun., *West Toronto*

- Anchor Marine Ins. Co. Act Amt. (B. 56, 1°*) 162.
 Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co. (Ont.) Act Amt. (B. 131, 1°*) 541.
 Canada Landed Credit Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 47, 1°*) 109; in Com., 1104.
 Canadian Steam Users' Ins. Association Act Amt. (B. 113, 1°*) 376.
 Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada (B. 8, 1°*) 42.
 Insolvent Debtors, Discharge of (B. 137, 1°) 614.
 Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of (B. 136, 1°) 606.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 462.

BEAUCHESNE, Mr. P. C., *Bonaventure*

- Paspebiac Harbor Survey (M. for Rep.) 37.
 Port Daniel Harbor Survey (M. for Rep.) 40.
 Restigouche River, Traverse in Channel of (M. for Reps.) 40.
 Steamers on Bay Chaleurs (Ques.) 48.

BÉCHARD, Mr. F., *Iberville*

- Credit Foncier Franco-Canadian B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques-Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 442.

BÉCHARD, Mr. F.—*Con.*

- Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2°, 265.
 French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply, 1143.
 Inland Rev. Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 546, 1279, 1281; on B. 168, in Com., 1552.
 Official Report of the Debates (M. to concur in First Rep. of Com.) 690.
 Pullman Car Co., unpaid Duties and Seizures (M. for Cor.) 1120.
 Tobacco Inspectors, Appointment of (M. for List) 1120.
 Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) to 3°, 1079; on M. for 3° (Amt.) declared out of order, 1080.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 425, 444.

BENOIT, Mr. P. B., *Chambly*

- Employment of Telephone on Chambly Canal (Ques.) 221.

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois*

- Address, The (moved) 3.
 Little River St. Louis Works (Ques.) 163.
 Manufactories in Beauharnois County (M. for Ret.) 328.
 Personal Explanation (paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 1555.
 Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.

BERGIN, Mr. D., *Cornwall*

- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 937; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 938, 944.
 Niagara Peninsula Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 67, 1°*) 172.
 Ontario Pacific Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 61, 1°*) 162.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 159 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1458.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1213.
Supply—Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 858.

BLAKE, Hon. E., *West Durham*

- Acts of Provincial Legislatures (M. for Cor.) 39.
 Address, on the, 9.
 Administration of Criminal Justice in Disputed Territories B. 109 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1259.
 Administration of Justice in Manitoba (M. for Cor.) 54.
 American Telegraph and Cable Co. B. 17 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 3°, 429.
 Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 875; in Com., 1514; on M. for 1°, 1555.
 Bridges over Navigable Waters B. 152 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1264.
 Brown Sheetting and Bleached Shirtings (Ques.) 320.
 Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co. (Ont.) Act Amt. B. 131 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 1509.
 Canada and Brazil, Steam Communication between (M. for Cor.) 328; on Conc., 1500.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Canadian-built Vessels in France, on M. for Cor., 284.
 Canadian Extradition Act (M. for Cor.) 37.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Commission (M. for Statement of Expenses) 57; defective Return (remarks) 876; Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 48; Rep. of Evidence (remarks) 773.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., Charges against, for Work performed on first 100 miles west of Winnipeg (M. for Statement) 1120.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., Deposits of Money by (M. for Statement) 166.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. (M. for Cor. and O.C.) 57.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., Payments of Money to (M. for Cor., &c.) 40.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., Sale of Lands by (M. for Statement) 371.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s Charter, Extent of Lands under (M. for Cor.) 1120.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Branch Lines (M. for Maps or Plans) 55.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. and Senator Macpherson's Memorandum (M. for Ret.) 1250.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Contract Rights (M. for Cor.) 35.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Land Grant Bonds (M. for Cor.) 35.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Lands granted, selected, or reserved for (M. for Reps., &c.) 47.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Passenger and Freight Rates on Rys. owned by (M. for Cor.) 40.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Port Moody and Yale Section of, on M. for approximate quantities, 168.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rep. (M.) 54.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountain Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 1^o, 852; on M. for 2^o (reply to General Statement) 969.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Route through the Rocky Mountains (Ques.) 558.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Route of, and Expenditure west of Winnipeg (M. for Cor.) 40.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Savona's Ferry and Port Moody (M. for copies of advertisements, &c.) 56.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Sub-contracts (M. for Copies) 451.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Tariff, Classification of Articles under (Ques.) 1108.
 Census District No. 192 (M. for description of locality and Map) 69.
 Census, Information as to the (Ques.) 36; (M. for Statement) 165.
 Charges against Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, on Ms. for reading the Journals, 372, 481, 1234; on Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) to M. for Special Com., 1235.
 Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 57 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 1103.
 Chignecto Ship Ry. Subsidy B. 167 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1550.
 Circulars (Three) directed to Banks (M. for Copies) 41.
 Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2^o, 790; in Com., 1122, 1155, 1187.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Civil Servants and Municipal Offices (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Coal Lands in the North-West (Res.) 558, 564.
 Commercial Relations between Canada and other Countries (M. for Cor.) 38.
 Commercial Reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands, on M. for Sel. Com., 1250.
 Commercial Treaties (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 1068.
 Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1200.
 Concurrence—Care of Archives, 1309; Census, 1309; Publishing Debates, 1499; Parliamentary Library, 1499; Mail Subsidies (Canada and Brazil) 1500; *Charybdis*, 1502; *M. C. Upper*, 1502; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1538; Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1503; Militia (Purchase of four guns) 1559.
 Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure Chargeable to, on M. for Ret., 50.
 Cornwall Canal, Contract for Lock Gates (M. for Ret.) 1120.
 Cottons and Woollens, Duties on, on Res. (*Mr. Anglin*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1167.
 Cottons, Cost of Canadian and Foreign (M. for Ret.) 313.
 County Court Judges B. 112 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1254; on 2^o 1259; in Com. on Res., 1277.
 County Court Judges (M. for Cor.) 53.
 Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on M. for 2^o, 439.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2^o, 280.
 Disallowance of Railway Charters (Ques.) 558.
 Disallowance of Streams B., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 908.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2^o, 620.
 Dominion Lands along Railway lines (Res.) 1231.
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 101 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 2^o, 803; in Com., 804.
 Dominion Lands Act Correction B. 164 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2^o and in Com., 1549.
 Dorchester Penitentiary, Female Convicts at (Res.) 51.
 Drawbacks on Articles used in Construction of C.P.R. B. 141, on M. to introduce B. (*Mr. Bowell*) 614; in Com. on Res., 790; in Com. on B., 1255.
 Drawbacks on Sheet Iron (M. for Cor.) 42.
 Drawbacks to Manufacturers of Goods required by Canadian Pacific Ry. (M. for Cor., &c.) 40.
 Drawback Regulations (M. for Cor.) 313.
 Dry Docks Construction Aid B. 173 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 1255.
 Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 431; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 486.
 Emigrants booked for Canada (M. for Statement) 46.
 Emigration to Manitoba and N.W.T. (M. for Statement) 57.

INDEX.

*

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Extradition Act (1877) Amt. B. 154 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1560.
- Factory Commission (M. for Ret.) 283.
- Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co. Act. Amt. B. 105 (*Mr. Gault*) on M. for 2°, 488; in Com., 928.
- Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 787.
- Fuel Supplies in the North-West (Res.) 282.
- Fugitive Offenders in Canada B. 108 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1258; in Com., 1259.
- Galt, Sir A. T., on Emigration (remarks) 849.
- General Business, on delay in bringing down Returns (remarks) 721.
- General Port Wardens Act (1874) Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. McLelan*) on 2° and in Com., 1190.
- Georgian Bay, Boat Licensing on (M. for Cor.) 283.
- Government Business, Precedence of, on Ms. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 621, 1254.
- Government Land Policy in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 823.
- Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 94 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on 2°, 312.
- Grinding in Bond (M. for Cor.) 52.
- Halifax Bank, Importation of Vault Doors for (M. for Cor.) 1120.
- Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1426.
- Interior, Report of the Minister of the (Ques.) 36.
- Intercolonial and P.E.I. Rys. (M. for Tariffs of Rates) 40.
- Immigration, Arrangements for Promotion of (M. for Ret.) 258.
- Interest on Money secured by Mortgage B. 49 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2°, 267.
- Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c., on M. for copies of Circulars, 285.
- International Construction Co. Incorp. B. 75 (*Mr. Boulton*) in Com., 887, 927.
- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1034; remarks on Vote, 1067; on M. to engross Address, 1155.
- Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations B. 145 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1314; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1495.
- Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1425.
- Inland Rev. Act (1880) Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) on Senate Amts., 1572, 1574.
- John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 488.
- Land purchases by Railway Companies in the North-West (Ques.) 1107; M. for Ret., 1121.
- Library of Parliament, on M. for Sel. Com., 41.
- London Post Office Clerks (M. for Cor.) 166.
- London Post Office Irregularities (M. for Ret.) 39.
- Manitoba, Extension of Boundaries (M. for Ret.) 376.
- Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1421; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1568.
- Maps of Canada (M. for Copies) 40.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Marine Telegraph (Pacific Coast and Asia) B. 127 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1°, 531; on 2°, 1191.
- Maritime Court, Cases Disposed of in the, on M. for Ret., 51.
- Maritime Court for Canada, Establishment of, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Address to Her Majesty, 1541.
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on 1°, 42; in Com., 320; on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 491.
- M. C. Upper, Schooner, Claim for Damages to (Ques.) 1231; on Conc. 1502; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1538.
- Military Defence of Canada (M. for Cor.) 38.
- Mills, Mill-Dams, Wharves, &c., Erection of, Legalization B. 84 (*Mr. Domville*) on 1°, 269.
- Mining Rights (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 480.
- Ministerial Explanations (remarks) 19, 21, 31.
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 533.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on 2°, 312; in Com., 928, 931, 933, 936; (Amts.) 938, 939; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 947.
- New York and Ontario Furnace Co. B. 65 (*Mr. White, East Hastings*) on M. for 3°, 429.
- Niagara River, Seizure of a Boat, &c., on (M. for Cor.) 1121.
- North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 544, 798.
- North-West Territories Act (1880) Amt. B. 149 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1542.
- Ocean Mail Clerks: in Com. of Supply, 1192.
- Official Report of the Debates, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 691; Second Rep., 1473; Third Rep., 1476; in Com. of Supply, 784, 1499.
- On permission of a Member to ask a question (Ques. of Order) 1302.
- Owen Sound River and Harbor Improvements (M. for Ret.) 1120.
- Patent Act (1872) Amt. B. 155 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1542.
- Pawnbrokers Act Amt. B. 24 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2°, 189.
- Petroleum Inspection Act (1880) Amt. B. 172 (*Mr. Howell*) on M. for 2°, 1571.
- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res. 659.
- Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 582.
- Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts B. 7 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1 m. h., 188.
- Printing for Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. or Dominion Lands (Ques.) 1107.
- Provincial Railways (M. for copy of Res.) 371.

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.*

- Provisional Districts in the North-West, on consideration of H. E. Message, 1657.
- Public Accounts, 1880 (M. to refer Items to Com.) 483.
- Public Business, State of (remarks) 287, 428.
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. 129 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 534.
- Railways, Accidents on, on M. for Ret., 285.
- Railway Consolidated Act Amt. B. 143 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 852.
- Readjustment of the Representation (remarks) 1068; (Ques.) 1155; on B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1204; (Ques.) 1231½; on M. for 2° (Ques. of Order) 1330; on B. 158, on M. for 2°, 1360, Amt., 1376; in Com., 1410—1419, 1445—1467; on M. for 3° (Amts.) 1488; on Amt. (*Mr. Rymal*), 1491; on Amt. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 1493; on 3°, 1494; on Senate Amts., 1562.
- Returns of Railway Contracts (remarks) 493.
- Revision of Canadian Statutes, Appointment of Commissioner (M. for Ret.) 492.
- River St. Francis Floating of Cordwood Regulation B. 118 (*Mr. Vanasse*) on 1°, 428.
- Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1295.
- Salaries of Judges B. 179 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 1254; in Com., 1561; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1561.
- Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 279; on M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 851.
- Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees Charged, on M. for Ret., 1238.
- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. 110 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1509; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1535.
- Settlers in Manitoba and North-West during 1881 (Ques.) 36.
- Shelburne Harbor, Fog-Whistle at, on M. for Ret., 319.
- Sittings of the House, on M. (*Mr. Bowell*) to sit on Saturdays, 1254.
- Stamp Acts Repeal B. 63 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 162.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on objection (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to M. to go into Com. on Res., 546; in Com., 546.
- St. Lawrence Navigation and Level of Lake Ontario (M. for Cor.) 1120.
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1524; in Com., 1553; in Com. on B. 1556; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1556.
- Sun Mutual Life Assurance Co. B. 4 (*Mr. Gault*) on M. for 3°, 312.
- Supply—Civil Government* (Justice) 601; (Penitentiaries Branch) 601; (Interior) 605; (Indian Affairs) 606; (Post Office) 656; (Agriculture) 656; (Marine and Fisheries) 657; (Departmental Contingencies) 658; (Stationery Office) 658; (High Commissioner: contingent expenses) 659; (Post Office and Finance Depts.: contingencies) 1506; *Penitentiaries*

BLAKE, Hon. E.—*Con.**Supply—Con.*

- (Kingston) 779, 1289; (St. Vincent de Paul) 782, 1506; (Dorchester) 783; (Man.) 784; (B.C.) 784; *Legislation* (Publishing Debates) 784, 1499; (Grant to Library) 785, 1499; (Printing, paper and book-binding) 786; *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Criminal Statistics) 847; (Census) 847, 1309; (Health Statistics) 847; *Immigration*, 849, 1507; *Immigration and Quarantine*, 850; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.S.) 926; (Man.) 1354; (Repairs, &c.) 1354; *Post Office*, 1192; *Miscellaneous* (compensation to D. H. Waterbury) 1200; (Consolidation of Dom. Statutes) 1288; *Dom. Lands—Income* (Maps, &c.) 1292; *Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 1295; (Purchase of four guns) 1507, 1559.
- Supreme Court, Appeals to the (Res.) 164.
- Supreme Court Repeal B., on M. to introduce, 254.
- Telegraph Lines in the North-West, Cost of Operating (M. for Ret.) 172.
- Telegraph (Word) Declaratory B. 66 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1569.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) in Com., Ques. of Order, 550; in Com. 551, 552; on Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) 719.
- Timber Licenses, System of Granting (Res.) 566, 569.
- Tonnage Dues at Quebec and Montreal, in Com. on Res., 535.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) on Res., 660.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1130.
- Trust and Land Improvement Fund, on M. for Cor., 40.
- Upper Canada Bank, Claims against B. 171 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 533.
- Validity of Marriage in Quebec (M. for Paps.) 55.
- Vancouver Island Ry. (M. for Cor.) 41.
- Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. (sulphate of quinine) 524; (blasting powder) 525; (glass, &c.) 525; (sand and emery paper) 526; (silver plate glass) 526; books, &c., 526; (salt) 526; (paraffine wax, &c.) 528; (fruit trees) 528; (table glass, &c.) 529.
- Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27 (remarks on papers brought down) 320; on M. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) of Want of Confidence, 1242.
- Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. 156 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1253; on M. for 2°, 1545.
- Winnipeg Post Office, Removal of Officers from (Ques.) 1573.
- BOLDUC, Mr. J., *Beauce*
Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1287.
- BORDEN, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
Accidents on the Intercolonial Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1100.

BORDEN, Mr. F. W.—Con.

Concurrence—Mail Subsidies (Port Mulgrave and East Bay) 1310.

Duties on Carboys (Ques.) 477.

Intercolonial Ry. Employés, remuneration of: in Com. of Supply, 1100.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 946.

Postmaster at Greenwood (N.S.) Removal of (M. for Cor.) 485.

Supply—Fisheries (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 873; *Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers* (N.S.) 1026; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Intercolonial) 1100.

White Rock Mills Post Office (Ques.) 478.

Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. 156 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2° (Ques. of Order) 1544; on 2°, 1548.

BOULTBEE, Mr. A., East York

Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 736.

Dominion Lands along railway lines, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 1234.

Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*) on 1°, 608.

International Construction Co. Incorp. (B. 75, 1°*) 229; in Com., 887—927.

Lake Superior and James' Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 22, 1°*) 47.

Ministerial Explanations, 24.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 938; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 946; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 949.

Personal Explanation (paragraph in *Globe*) 889.

Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Ry. Co. (B. 20, 1°*) 47.

Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. (B. 103, 1°*) 367.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1211; on B. 158, in Com., 1463.

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 278.

Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co. Act Amt. (B. 68, 1°*) 192.

Thunder Bay and Minnesota Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 21, 1°*) 47.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 192.

BOURASSA, Mr. F., St. Johns, Q.

Census Enumerators in the County of St. John (M. for Statement) 226.

Credit Foncier Franco Canadian B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 439.

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) in Com., 1551.

Isle aux Noix, Completion of Works at (Ques.) 615.

BOURBEAU, Mr. D. O., Drummond and Arthabaska

Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 629.

Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1233.

BOWELL, Hon. M., North Hastings

Adulteration of Food Rep. (presented) 18.

British Columbia, Amount of Duties collected in (Ans.) 35.

Canada Landed Credit Co. Act Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 1104.

Chesley as a Port of Entry (Ans.) 614.

Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1124.

Collector of Customs at Sackville, on M. for Cor., 282.

Concurrence—Weights, Measures and Gas, 1313; Publishing Debates, 1499.

Cottons, Cost of Canadian and Foreign, on M. for Ret., 313.

Debates, Official Report of (M. for Sel. Com.) 18; in Com. of Supply, 784, 1499.

Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M. for Ret., 65.

Drawback Regulations, on M. for Cor., 313.

Drawbacks on Articles used in Construction of Canadian Pacific Ry. (B. 141) M. to introduce B. 614; Res. in Com. and 1° 790; in Com., 1255.

Export of Quebec manufactures to B. C., on M. for Statement, 284.

Grinding in Bond, on M. for Cor., 53.

Hardware, Standard Prices for (Ans.) 1108.

Importation of Goods for Consumption, on M. for Statement, 46.

Imports, Classification of, on M. for Ret., 118.

Imports of Canton Flannels, on M. for Ret., 190.

Inland Revenue Departmental Rep. (presented) 18.

Ministerial Explanations, 29.

Petroleum Inspection Act (1880) Amt. (B. 172, 1°*) 1521; 2°, 1571.

Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1339.

Quarterly Statistics of Trade, on Res. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1249.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1210; on M. for 2°, 1331; on B. 158, on M. for 2°, 1376; in Com., 1465.

Revenue Cutter on Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 45.

Sittings of the House, (M. to sit on Saturdays) 1254.

Statement of Appointments under Weights and Measures Act, 1340.

Supply—Civil Government (Secretary of State) 603; (Customs) 606; (Departmental Contingencies) 658; Legislation (Publishing Debates) 784, 1499; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 851; Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 867; *Public Works—Income: Public Buildings* (N.S.) 926; *Fisheries* (Salary of Fishery Overseer *McVicar*) 1273; *Inland Revenue* (Tobacco Stamps) 1276;

BOWELL, Hon. M.—Con.*Supply—Con.*

(Commissions to Customs Officers) 1276; *Immigration* (Transport) 1276; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1442.

Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 18.

Trent River Navigation: in Com. of Supply, 1440.

Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. (books, &c.) 526; (salt) 527; (paraffine wax, &c.) 528; (fruit trees) 528; (cotton manufactures) 529; (table-glass, &c.) 530.

Weights and Measures Rep. (presented) 18.

BRECKEN, Mr. F. DE ST.-CROIX, Queen's, P.E.I.

Belle Creek (P.E.I.) Harbor Improvements (M. for Ret.) 2-2.

Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1513, 1516.

Concurrence—Grant to Library, 1499.

Disallowance of Streams B., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 903.

Elections in the Magdalen Islands, &c., B. 74 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 1°, 221.

Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1056.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 943.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Senate Amts., 1565.

Supply—Mail Subsidies (P.E.I. and Great Britain) 866.

Winter Communication between P.E.I. and Mainland (M. for Cor.) 224.

BROOKS, Mr. E. T., Sherbrooke

Canadian Securities Co. and Liquidators of Consolidated Bank (B. 87, 1°*) 288.

Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland (B. 71, 1°*) 192.

Mutual Benefit Association of Sherbrooke Incorp. (B. 33, 1°*) 57.

Quebec Timber Co. Incorp. (B. 32, 1°*) 57.

BROWN, Mr. J., West Hastings

Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1299.

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1304.

Supply—Militia (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 856; (Drill Pay) 861, 1299; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (Ont.) 1024; Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1028; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Murray Canal) 1147; (Trent River Nav.) 1440.

Trent River Navigation: in Com. of Supply, 1440.

BUNSTER, Mr. A., Vancouver Island

Bonded Warehouse at Esquimalt and Nanaimo: in Com. of Supply, 1199.

British Columbia Judiciary (remarks) 1236.

BUNSTER, Mr. A.—Con.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountain Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2° (remarks on M. to adjn. Deb.) 987; comments, 974, 979, 980.

Charybdis Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1270.

Coal Lands in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 566.

Commercial Reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands (M. for Sel. Com. to draft Address to Her Majesty) 1249; withdn., 1250.

Courtney River, Tender for Clearing (M. for Agent's Rep.) 372.

Cowichan River Expenditure (M. for Statements) 372.

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2°, 621.

Immigration to British Columbia (M. for Ret.) 1252.

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 163 (*Mr. Mousseau*) in Com., 1551.

Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1059.

Maps of Manitoba and the North-West, on M. for Copies, 228.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 491.

Meteorological Service of Canada, on M. for Stmtnt 169.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. (remarks on commercial agencies) 936; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 937; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 939.

North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 801.

Pacific Ocean Cable Schemes (M. for Ret.) 1252.

Personal Explanations (paragraph in *Montreal Herald*) 1067; on Mr. Anglin's speech on Irish Resolutions, 1102.

Questions of Privilege: (injustice to B. C. ports) 853; (Chinese labor) 1504.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1212; on B. 158, in Com., 1467; (Amt.) 1491.

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1303.

Supply—Immigration, 850; *Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 861; *Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life Boats, &c.) 863; (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1270; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keeper-) 867; *Post Office*, 1196; *Miscellaneous* (Army and Navy, articles imported for) 1199; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1098; *Dom. Lands—Income*, 1202; *Public Works—Income* (Telegraphs) 1268; *Fisheries* (Fish Breeding) 1274.

Telegraph Extension in Vancouver Island (M. for Papers) 228.

Vancouver Island Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.

Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. (blasting powder) 525.

BUNTING, Mr. C. W., Welland

- Appointment of Captain of Cadets at Military College (M. for Cor.) 191.
- Changes in Organization of Military College (M. for Ret.) 191.
- Charges against Major Ridout (M. for Ret.) 190.
- Imports of Canton Flannels (M. for Ret.) 190.
- Major Ridout's removal from Military College Staff (M. for Cor.) 190.
- Salary paid Prof. Ferguson, &c., at Military College (M. for Ret.) 191.
- Staff of Employés connected with Military College (M. for Ret.) 191.

BURNHAM, Mr. J., East Peterborough

- Supply—Railways and Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1442.

BURPEE, Hon. I., St. John

- Charybdis* Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1268.
- Classification of Imports (M. for Ret.) 118.
- Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- Concurrence—Culling Timber*, 1501.
- Drawbacks on Articles used in construction of Canadian Pacific Ry. B. 141 (*Mr. Bowell*) on Res., 790; in Com. on B., 1255.
- Expenditures for Post Office Service: in Com. of Supply, 1195.
- Importation of Goods for Consumption (M. for Statement) 46.
- Importation of Coal (M. for Ret.) 128.
- Immigrants settled in the Dominion (M. for Ret.) 129.
- Intercolonial Ry. through Freight (M. for Ret.) 129.
- Iron Industry (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 1216.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. (Amt.) 945.
- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1260.
- St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1435.
- Supply—Collection of Revenue* (Customs) 851; (Intercolonial) 1150; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.B.) 1023; *Post Office*, 1195; *Miscellaneous* (Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to) 1199; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1268.
- Ways and Means—on the Budget*, 446.

BURPEE, Mr. C., Sunbury

- Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 128.
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1004.
- Charybdis* Training Ship (Ques.) 73.
- Dominion Officials and Municipal and Local Taxes (Ques.) 73.
- New Brunswick Mails, Delay of (remarks) 1155.
- St. John River Shoal: in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1530.

BURPEE, Mr. C.—Con.

- Supply—Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 874; *Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1028.
- Ways and Means—on Conc. (salt)* 1495.

CAMERON, Mr. H., North Victoria

- American Telegraph and Cable Co. (B. 17, 1°*) 47; on 3°, 429; on Senate Amts. (B. withdn.) 1571.
- Appeals to the Supreme Court, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 164.
- Bell Telephone Co. of Canada Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°*) 289; on 2°, 312; in Com., 928—948.
- Canada Landed Credit Co. Acts Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beatty*) in Com., 1105.
- Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 57, 1°*) 162; 2° and in Com., 1102.
- Concurrence—M. C. Upper*, damages to, 1502; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1540.
- County Court Judges B. 112 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1278.
- County Court Judges' Salaries (M. for Cor.) 169.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 178.
- Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 924.
- Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com. 432.
- Grand Central Station Co. Incorp. (B. 93, 1°*) 289.
- Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 94, 1°*) 289; on 2°, 312.
- Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 62, 1°*) 162.
- New York and Ontario Furnace Co. B. 65 (*Mr. White, East Hastings*) on M. for 5°, 430.
- Patent Act (1872) Amt. (B. 106, 1°) 367.
- Patent Act (1880) Amt. B. 155 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) in Com., 1542.
- Questions of Privilege (paragraph in *Montreal Gazette*) 328; on *Mr. White's* explanation, 368; (article in *Globe*) 988.
- St. John's Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 19, 1°*) 47.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1305.
- Supply—Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 869; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1439.
- Telegraph (Word) Declaratory B. 66 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1570.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on M. for Com. (Amt.) 549; on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) in Com., 551—555; on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to 3°, 704; on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) to 3°, 709; (Amts.) 716, 718; on Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) in Com., 719.
- Trent River Navigation: in Com. of Supply, 1439.
- Trent Valley Canal Location Survey, &c. (Ques.) 36.

CAMERON, Mr. M. C., South Huron

- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 728.

CAMERON, MR. M. C.—*Con.*

- Charges against Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, on Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) to M. for Special Com., 1236.
- Chartered Railway Companies in the North West (M. for Cor.) 129.
- Charybdis* Training Ship (M. for Cor.) 123; in Com. of Supply, 1271.
- Claims of Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. for Stone, Timber, &c. (M. for Cor.) 40.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 180.
- Court of Maritime Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 72.
- Criminal Law Amt., Offences against the Person (B. 11, 1°*) 42; on M. for 2°, 279; in Com., 615.
- Disallowance of Streams Bill (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 876.
- Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M. to adjn. Debate, 78.
- Fuel and Broadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 636.
- Grazing Lands in the N.W.T. and Squatters' Claims (M. for Ret.) 19.
- Land sold and Prices obtained in Manitoba and N.W.T. up to 1882 (M. for Ret.) 40.
- Maritime Court, Cases disposed of in (M. for Ret.) 51.
- McLaren vs. Caldwell (M. for copies of Judgments) 129.
- Mineral and Timber Lands located, &c., in N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 20.
- Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses (B. 10, 1°*) 42; on M. for 2°, 616.
- Official Arbitrators, Claims referred to (M. for Ret.) 56.
- Official Visits to England (M. for Ret.) 37.
- Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 580.
- Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts B. 7 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1 m. h., 188.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1332; on B. 158, on M. for 2°, 1396; in Com., 1413, 1418, 1454.
- Rivers, Streams and Creeks Act (Ont.) disallowed (M. for Cor., &c.) 40.
- Sale of Lands in Manitoba, Arrears on (M. for Ret.) 19.
- Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 272.
- Supply—*Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1271.
- Surrogate Judges of the Maritime Court of Ont. (M. for Cor.) 45.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) to 3°, 713.
- Timber Licenses granted in N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 19.
- Winnipeg South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s Act, disallowed (M. for Cor., &c.) 40.

CARLING, Hon. J., *London*

- Ontario Investment Association Incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 129.
- McClary Manufacturing Co. Incorp. (B. 100, 1°*) 311.

CARLING, Hon. J.—*Con.*

- Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1210.

CARON, Hon. A. P. R. E., *Quebec County*

- Brigade Camps (Ans.) 163.
- Cadets in Military College, on M. for Ret., 191.
- Concurrence—Culling Timber, 1501; Militia (Purchase of four guns) 1559.
- Discipline observed in the 27th Battalion of Volunteers, on M. for Reprs., 56.
- Fletcher, Lieut.-Col., Retirement of, on M. for Cor., 170.
- Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 167 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1427.
- Military Clothing and Accoutrements (Ans.) 1106.
- Military College at Kingston, Abolition of (Ans.) 73.
- Military Defence of Canada, on M. for Cor., 38.
- Military Schools for the Infantry Service (Ans.) 73.
- Militia Acts Amt. (B. 148, 1°*) 1129; 2° and in Com., 1264.
- Militia Departmental Rep. (presented) 18.
- Militia Employés, Aged (Ans.) 73.
- Red River Expedition, Officers who took part in (Ans.) 478.
- Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1294, 1301.
- Salaries of Deputy Adjutants-General, &c. (Ans.) 222.
- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. 110 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1510.
- Superannuation Allowances in the Civ. Serv. (Ans.) 222.
- Supply—*Civil Government* (Militia) 601; *Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 851; *Militia* (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 853; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 854; (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 855; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1294; (Purchase of four guns) 1507.

CARTWRIGHT, Hon. Sir RICHARD J., *Centre Huron*

- Accidents on the P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1154.
- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 739.
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 997.
- Census, The (Ques.) 72.
- Charybdis* Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1268, 1292.
- Concurrence—Charges of Management, 1308; Care of Archives, 1309; Health Statistics; 1310; Quarantine, 1310; Mail Subsidies (Canada and Brazil) 1310, 1500; (P.E.I. and Great Britain) 1311; Ocean and River Service (*Glendon*) 1311; Meteorological Observations, 1311; Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 1312; Miscellaneous (Waterbury, D. II., Compensation to) 1312; Adulteration of Food, 1312; Canadian Pacific Ry., 1315; Intercolonial (Rolling Stock) 1319; Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner, 1500; Culling Timber, 1501; *Charybdis*, 1502; *M. C. Upper*, 1502; Penitentiaries (Balance due S. L. Bedson) 1559; (Man.) 1559; Militia (Purchase of four guns) 1559.

CARTWRIGHT, Hon. Sir RICHARD J.—*Con.*

- Circulars to Dominion Banks (M. for copies) 39.
 Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1157, 1188.
 Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1200.
 Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to, 1874—1882 (M. for Ret.) 20.
 Cottons and Woollens, Duties on, on Res. (*Mr. Anglin*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1179.
 Deposits in Banks, 1st Feb. 1882 (M. for Statement) 20.
 Deposits in Banks, each Month, 1880-81 (M. for Statement) 41.
 Dominion Lands, Moneys received on account of (M. for Statement) 41.
 Exports and Imports, 1877—1882 (Ms. for Rets.) 20.
 Factory Commissioners' Report (Ques.) 46.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res., 541.
 Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock: on Conc., 1319.
 Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1046.
 Kingston and Pembroke Ry., Complaints against the Location, &c., on M. for Cor., 482.
 Manitoba and Hudson's Bay Ry. (M. for Cor.) 46.
 Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1421.
 Ministerial Explanations, 22.
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 533.
 M. C. Upper, damages to, in Welland Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1444.
 North-West Mounted Police B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 542.
 Ocean Mail Clerks: in Com. of Supply, 1192.
 Official Report of the Debates, on M. to concur in Second Rep. of Com., 1475.
 Pawnbrokers Act Amt. B. 24 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2°, 189.
 Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 590.
 Post Office Savings Banks, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (M. for Ret.) 20.
 Prince Edward Island Bank Relief B. 38 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 72.
 Public Debt, Arrangements for the Payment of Interest on (M. for Cor.) 20.
 Public Expenditure (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 1332.
 Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. 129 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 534.
 Readjustment of the Representation (Ques.) 72; on B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1382; in Com., 1449; (Amt) 1456; on Senate Amts., 15 5.
 Reports, Presentation of (remarks) 18.
 Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1295.
 Shipping Disasters on Inland Waters (M. for Cor.) 46.

CARTWRIGHT, Hon. Sir RICHARD J.—*Con.*

- St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1431.
 Sugar Duties, Amendment of, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 776.
 Supply—Charges of Management, 592—600; *Civil Government* (Justice) 601; (Militia) 602; (Secretary of State) 602—604; (Interior) 605; (Indian Affairs) 606; (Customs) 606; (Post Office) 655, 1506; (Agriculture) 656; (Railways and Canal-) 657; (Departmental Contingencies) 658; (Stationery Office) 658; (High Commissioner: contingent expenses) 659; (additional expenditure) 1504; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 781; (Dorchester) 783; (Man.) 784; (B.C.) 784; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1289, 1506; *Legislation* (Grant to Library) 725; *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (care of Archives) 786; (Patent Record) 847; (Census) 847; (Health Statistics) 847; *Immigration*, 849; *Militia* (Branch and District Staff) 853; (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 855; ("A" and "B" Batteries) 865; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1295; *Mail Subsidies* (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 865; (Canada and Brazil) 865; (France and Quebec) 865; (Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Halifax) 865; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.S.) 926; (P.E.I.) 1023; (N.B.) 1023; (Que.) 1024, 1265, 1355; (Ont.) 1024; (Man.) 1025, 1266, 1354; *Repairs, &c.* (Parliament Buildings) 1266, 1354; (Telegraphs) 1355; Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1028; *Capital* (Ottawa) 1205; *Railways and Canals—Capital*: Railways (Canadian Pacific) 1095; (Intercolonial: Claim of Heirs of Geo. Moffatt) 1229; Canals (Lachine) 1145; (Grenville) 1146; (Murray) 1147; (Trent River Nav.) 1439; *Income*: Canals (Lachine: Dredging Basin No. 4) 1148; (Swing Bridge at Valleyfield) 1143; (Chambly) 1148; (Welland: M. C. Upper) 1444; *Geological Survey*, 1183, 1508; *Indians*, 1185, 1291, 1505; *Post Office*, 1192; *Miscellaneous* (North-West Mounted Police) 1198; (Compensation to D. H. Waterbury) 1200; (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1274; (International Fishery Exhibition) 1505; (Purchase of Coins, &c.) 1557; (Niagara Falls Commission) 1558; *Dom. Lands—Capital*, 120-; *Income* (Maps, &c.) 1291; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1268; (Water Police, Montreal) 1272; *Fisheries* (Fishery Overseer McVicar) 1272; *Unprovided Items*, 1292.
 Tea and Coffee Duties, Remission of (M. for Cor.) 41.
 Timber Licenses, System of granting, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 569.
 Upper Canada Bank, Claims against B. 171 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 532; on 2° of Res., 1504.
 Ways and Means—Budget Speech (reply to) 96; remarks in reply to Sir Charles Tupper, on M. to adjn. House, 146.
 Winnipeg Post Office, insufficient accommodation (Ques.) in Com. of Supply, 1194.

CASEY, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin*

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1021.
- Charges against Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, on M. for reading the Journals, 1235.
- Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1°, 71; on M. for 2°, 795; in Com., 1124, 1155, 1187; on M. for 3°, 1256 (Amt.) 1258.
- Concurrence—Meteorological Observations, 1311.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 178.
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 101 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 805.
- Dominion Lands along Railway lines, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 1232.
- French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply, 1143.
- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1051.
- Minister of Public Works' Visit to Ontario: in Com. of Supply, 927.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 93 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 933.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1399; in Com., 1413, 1418; (Amt.) 1484.
- Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1298.
- Supply—*Civil Government* (Civil Service Board) 653; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 781; (Dorchester) 783; *Legislation* (Grant to Library) 785; Additional Officers and Contingencies of Library) 785; *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives) 786; *Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 855; (Drill Pay &c.) 1298; *Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Lifeboats, &c.) 865; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.B.) 1023; (Que.) 1024; (Ont.) 1024; (Man.) 1025; (B.C.) 1026; *Geological Survey*, 1183; *Indians*, 1184; *Dom. Lands—Income* (Maps, &c.) 1291.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com., 557; on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) to 3°, 718.

CASGRAIN, Mr. P. B., *L'Islet*

- Claim of Lucien Morin (Ques.) 615.
- Compensation to Jos. Chas. Lislois (Ques.) 615.
- Concurrence—Care of Archives, 1309.
- Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 441.
- Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 632.
- Imports and Exports at St. Hyacinthe, on M. for Statement, 257.
- Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1 87.
- Intercolonial Ry. Accommodation in L'Islet: in Com. of Supply, 1099.
- Military College Graduates Provision (B. 124, 1°) 493.

CASGRAIN, Mr. P. B.—*Con.*

- Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts (B. 7, 1°*) 35; on M. for 2°, 187; (remarks) 876; 1288; (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 1436.
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1337.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1465.
- Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees Charged, on M. for Ret., 1238.
- Stadacona Insurance Co. Winding-up (B. 6, 1°*) 35; on M. for 2°, 47.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1303.
- Supply—*Civil Government* (Post Office) 655; (Agriculture) 656; *Immigration*, 849; *Immigration and Quarantine*, 850; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.S.) 926; (Man.) 1025; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Intercolonial) 1099; *Post Office*, 1194; *Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 1290.

CHARLTON, Mr. J., *North Norfolk*

- Answer of Hon. F. B. Wood to Petition of H. J. Clark and others (M. for Ret.) 20.
- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 758.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person), Adultery, Seduction, &c. (B. 25, 1°) 47; on 2°, 326; remarks, 1403.
- Crown Timber Agent at Winnipeg, Letters and Instructions (M. for copies) 228.
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 101 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 809.
- Dominion Lands, Applications for, for Colonization, Pasturage, &c. (Ms. for Rets.) 45.
- Drawbacks on Goods Manufactured for Export, on M. for Ret. (M. to adjn. Deb.) 68; adjd. Deb., 74; remarks reserved, 189.
- Exports and Imports of the Dominion for six months ending 1881 (M. for Ret.) 57.
- Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 643.
- Government Land Policy in the North-West (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 810.
- Legal Tender Notes, on Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1114.
- Manitoba Indian Agency (M. for Rep.) 20.
- Minister of Public Works' Visit to Western Ontario: in Com. of Supply, 927.
- Number of Acres entered and pre-empted in North-West during 1881 and prior to 1881, and amount paid thereon (M. for Ret.) 41.
- Number of Acres Sold in North-West and amounts realized, &c. (M. for Ret.) 41.
- Number of Acres surveyed in North-West, &c. (M. for Rets) 41.
- Number of Acres taken up in North-West under Homestead Act prior to 1881 (M. for Ret.) 41.
- Order of Business (remarks on B. No. 25) 1068.

- CHARLTON, Mr. J.—*Con.***
 Public Debt, The (Ques.) 254.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1212; on B. 158, on M. for Com., 1403.
 Regulations as to Sale, &c., of Public Lands, and Mineral, Coal and Timber Lands in North-West (M. for Ret.) 41.
 Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) to 3°, 715.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 289.
- CIMON, Mr. E., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay***
 Postal Communication with the County of Saguenay (M. for Ret.) 125.
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1525.
- COCKBURN, Mr. A. P., *Muskoka***
 Dominion Lands in Manitoba and North-West, leasing or purchase of (M. for Cor. between S. Merner, M.P., and Government) 1121.
 Georgian Bay Branch of Canadian Pacific Ry. (M. for Cor.) 36.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1387.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1303.
Supply—Militia (Drill Instruction and Drill Pay) 860.
- COLBY, Mr. C. C., *Stanstead***
 American Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. (B. 79, 1°*) 229.
 Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. (B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 431.
- COSTIGAN, Mr. J., *Victoria, N. B.***
 Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1189.
 Extension of the Parliamentary Franchise (Ques.) 45.
 Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy (prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 762; (remarks) 875; (Res.) 1030; reply, 1066.
 Staked Claims under Manitoba Act (M. for Rep. of Commission) 128.
 Tenders for Dominion Canals (M. for Copies) 117.
- COUGHLIN, Mr. T., *North Middlesex***
 Complaints against Indian Superintendent at Sarnia, &c. (M. for Copy) 172.
 Registered Letters lost during 1881 (M. for Stmt.) 57.
- COURSOL, Mr. C. J., *East Montreal***
 Clock in Montreal Post Office (Ques.) 72.
 Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1085.
 Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 442.
 Immigration and Repatriation Agency at New York (Ques.) 1230.
- COURSOL, Mr. C. J.—*Con.***
 Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1050.
 Napierville Junction Ry. and Quarry Co. Act. Amt. (B. 44, 1°*) 78.
 Ryan, Thomas, appointment of (M. for Cor.) 316.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 251.
- CBOUTER, Mr. D., *East Northumberland***
 Grants of Land for Military Services in 1837 (Ques.) 221.
Supply—Railways and Canals—Capital (Murray Canal) 1146; (Trent River Nav.) 1442.
- CURRIER, Mr. J. M., *Ottawa City***
 Canada Provident Association Incorp. (B. 98, 1°*) 289.
 Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 184.
 Dam at Lake Temiscamingue, on M. for Ret., 1251.
 Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 60, 1°*) 162.
 Question of Privilege (paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 990.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 594; on Amt. (*Mr. McCallum*) M. for 3°, 1305.
Supply—Public Works—Capital (Ottawa) 1265.
- DALY, Mr. M. B., *Halifax***
 Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c., on M. for Copies of Circulars, 286.
 Ocean Mutual Marine Ins. Co. Incorp. (B. 90, 1°*) 289.
 Salmon Fishery Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1239.
Supply—Miscellaneous (Fishermens' losses through storms) 1274.
 Telegraphic Communication with Sable Island (Ques.) 45; on M. for Ret., 50.
 Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. 156 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1548.
- DAWSON, Mr. S. J., *Algoma***
 Boundaries of Ontario (Ques.) 110; on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 722.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountain Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 996.
 Indians of Lakes Huron and Superior (M. for Cor.) 39.
 Instructions to Governors General of Quebec, &c., on M. for Ret., 1108.
 Parry Sound and Manitoulin Island Mail Service: in Com. of Supply, 1193.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) Ques. of Privilege on Mode of Recording Votes on Amts., 1503; on Senate Amts., 1562.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1215.
Supply—Militia (Drill Instruction and Drill Pay) 860; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 868; *Post Office*, 1193.
 Volunteer Companies in Algoma (M. for Ret.) 319.

- DECosmos, Mr. A. Victoria, B.C.**
 Amount of Duties Collected in B.C. (Ques.) 35.
 Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1513.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountain Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1005.
 Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1084.
 Emory-Savona Contracts of Canadian Pacific Ry. and Steel Rails for same (Ques.) 19.
 English Bay as permanent terminus of Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1097.
 Importations into British Columbia (Ques.) 19.
 Inspector of Fisheries for B.C. (M. for Rep.) 116.
 Population of B. C. by last Census (Ques.) 35.
 Port Moody and Emory Section, Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1097.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bunster*) to 3°, 1492.
 Supply—*Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1097; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1269.
- DESJARDINS, Mr. A., Hochelaga**
 Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 735.
 Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 59 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques-Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 441.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) that Com. do rise, 616.
 Dominion Elections Act. Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2°, 265.
 Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1429.
 Official Debates, Translation of (remarks) 376; on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 690.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1467.
- DOMVILLE, Mr. Jas., Kings, N.B.**
 Abolition of Postage on Newspapers B. 161 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1420.
 Alma Post Office, Robbery of (M. for Ret.) 1240.
 Buchanan, Death of, through the Explosion of a Shell (M. for Ret.) 1240.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Thunder Bay to Red River: in Com. of Supply, 1095.
 Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1199.
 Intercolonial Ry. Employés, Remuneration of: in Com. of Supply, 1099.
 Iron Industry, on Res. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1218.
 Mills, Mill Dams, Wharves, &c., Erection of, Legalization (B. 84, 1°) 269.
 Moffat, Geo., Claim of Heirs for transport of rails: in Com. of Supply, 1229.
- DOMVILLE, Mr. Jas.—Con.**
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 946.
 New Brunswick Mails, Delay of (remarks) 1155.
 Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 18, 1°*) 47.
 Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1297.
 St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1432.
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1529.
 Supply—*Militia* (Branch and District Staff) 853; *Contingencies and Grants to Associations* 862; (*Drill Pay, &c.*) 1297; *Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 874; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1095; (*Intercolonial*) 1099; (*Claim of Heirs of Geo. Moffat*) 1229; *Miscellaneous* (D. H. Waterbury, Compensation to) 1199; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1269.
 Winter Terminus of the Canadian Pacific Ry. (M. for Ret.) 166.
- DOULT, Mr. R., Pictou**
 Dry Dock at Pictou (M. for Ret.) 314.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 438.
- DREW, Mr. G. A., North Wellington**
 Private Bills Petitions (Ms. to extend time) 46, 58, 129, 288, 367.
- DUGAS, Mr. F. Montcalm**
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 536, 1281.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1450.
- ELLIOTT, Mr. W., Peel**
 Brampton Post Office (Ques.) 110.
- FARROW, Mr. T., North Huron**
 Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 738.
 Mail Service (Ques.) 48.
 Money Orders to Foreign Countries (M. for Ret.) 43.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1210; on B. 158, in Com., 1456.
 Registered Letters, Charges on (Ques.) 42.
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. (salt) 526; on Conc. (salt) 1497.
- FISSET, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski**
 Bellavance, Ferdinand, Damage to Property by Fire (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Bic Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 478.
 Census Enumerators in the County of Rimouski (M. for Statement) 229.

FISER, Mr. J. B. R.—Con.

- Complaint of Joseph St. Laurent (M. for copies of Statement, &c.) 493.
 Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 440.
 Her Majesty's Escape, on the Joint Address, 201.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1282.
 Mataue Wharf and Harbor Improvements (M. for copy of Engineer's Rep.) 288; (Ques.) 312.
 Official Debates, Translation of (remarks) 376.
 Rimouski, Wharf at (Ques.) 478.
 Rivière Blanche Breakwater (Ques.) 558.
 Sale of Steamer *Rimouski* (Ques.) 1108.
 St. Anaclet, Parish of, Station at (M. for Cor.) 313.
 Supply—Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1028.
 Tobacco Tax paid in Rimouski (M. for names of persons) 1:53.

FITZSIMMONS, Mr. W., Brockville

- Islands in the St. Lawrence above Brockville (Ques.) 269; (M. for Cor.) 1121.

FLEMING, Mr. G., North Brant

- Fuel and Broadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 653.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1481.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 458.

FLYNN, Mr. E. P., Richmond, N.S.

- Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 875; in Com., 1513.
 Delay in the reception of Mails (remarks) 493.
 Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. 1131.
 L'Ardoise Breakwater, N.S. (M. for Cor.) 1121.
 Salmon-Fishing Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1239.
 Supply—Mail Subsidies (Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Halifax) 866.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 341.

FORTIN, Mr. P., Gaspé

- Elections in the Magdalen Islands, &c. (B. 74, 1°) 220.
 Importation and Inspection of Pickled Herring (M. for Ret.) 369.
 Roadjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1451.
 Resident Judge at Gaspé (M. for Ret.) 110.

FULTON, Mr. O., Stormont

- Montreal and Central Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 132, 1°) 541.

GAULT, Mr. M. H., West Montreal

- Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 128.
 Canada Agricultural Ins. Co. Relief Act Explanation (B. 88, 1°) 288.

GAULT, Mr. M. H.—Con.

- Canada Co-Operative Supply Association (B. 138, 1°) 659.
 Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 443.
 C. W. Williams, Manufacturing Co. (B. 69, 1°) 192.
 Deposits of Benefit Societies (Ques.) 172.
 Dominion Telegraph System (Ques.) 73.
 Dundee Land and Investment Co. (B. 40, 1°) 78.
 Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co. Amt. (B. 105, 1°) 367; on 2°, 489.
 Foreign Life Ins. Cos., deposits of (M. for List) 191.
 Government circulation of Four Dollar Bills (Ques.) 222.
 Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of B. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*) on 18, 609.
 Instruction to Health Officers at Halifax, &c., on M. for copies of Circulars, 286.
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res. in Com., 533.
 Planters' Bank of Canada Incorp. (B. 52, 1°) 129.
 Port Warden Acts, Expenditure under (M. for Cor.) 1121.
 St. Lawrence Marine Ins. Co. of Canada (B. 3, 1°) 35.
 Sun Mutual Ins. Co. of Montreal Incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 35; on M. for 3°, 311.
 Supply—Public Works—Income: (Ottawa Geological Museum) 1266.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 475.

GIGAULT, Mr. G. A., Rowville

- Canadian Tobacco, Inland Revenue Seizures (M. for Ret.) 47.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. (*Mr. Mousseau*) on M. to go into Com. on Res., 540.
 Intercolonial Ry. Working Expenses and Revenue (M. for Statement) 288.
 Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1080.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 310.

GILLIES, Mr. J., North Bruce

- Bounties to Fishermen (Ques.) 369; on B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1520.
 Chesley as a Port of Entry (Ques.) 614.
 Concurrence—Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1502.
 Mail Services in Bruce County (Ques.) 369.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1449; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1494.
 Stratford and Chesley Mail Service (Ques.) 73.
 Supply—Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont) 1445.

GILLMOR, Mr. A. H., Charlotte

- Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1519.
 Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1239.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 352.

GIROUARD, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier*

- Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien Act Amt. (B. 99, 1°*) 311; on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 439.
 Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations B. 145 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1314; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1495.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization (B. 9, 1°) 42; on 2°, 74; in Com., 320; on Amts. (*Mr. Amyot*) 486, 491.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 942.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1467.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1215; on M. for 3° (Amts.) 1302, 1303.
 Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) to 3°, 711.

GRANDBOIS, Mr. P. E., *Temiscouata*

- Bridge crossing Rivière du Loup (Ques.) 110.
 Light on the Rivière du Loup Wharf (Ques.) 222.

GUILLET, Mr. G., *West Northumberland*

- Address, The (seconded) 6.
 Inland Waters Navigation (B. 135, 1°*) 549; (remarks) 876; on M. for 2°, 1307.
 Intercolonial Ry. Mileage, Cost of Working (M. for Ret.) 320.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 938.
 Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.
 Supply—*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.,) 869.

GUNN, Mr. A., *Kingston*

- Sugar Duties, Amendment of, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 773.
 Wolfe Island Lighthouse Keeper, Complaints against (M. for Copies) 1122.

GUTHRIE, Mr. D., *South Wellington*

- Bills of Lading, Unjust Conditions Annulment (B. 147, 1°*) 1067.
 Cheque deposited by Andrew Onderdonk with Tender (M. for Copy) 229.
 Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1128.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 280.
 Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 894.
 Elgin Station, L'Islet County (Ques.) 1107.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 936.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1332; on B. 158 on M. for 2°, 1385; in Com., 1414, 1446; (Amts.) 1480, 1493.

HACKETT, Mr. E., *Prince, P. E. I.*

- Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 277.
 Cascumpec Harbor Improvements (M. for Cor.) 315.
 Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 634.
 P. E. I. Ry. Rates, on M. for Statement, 114.
 Supply—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wards) 873.
 Winter Communication between P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 225.

HADDOW, Mr. G., *Restigouche*

- Dredging the Restigouche River (Ques.) 254.
 Ferry Service at Cross Point and Campbellton (Ques.) 254.
 Fish-breeding Establishments in the Dom. (M. for Ret.) 493.
 Licensed Druggists under Canada Temperance Act (M. for copies of Annual Rets.) 288.
 Rivers of Dom. leased for Fishing (M. for Ret.) 1120.
 Supply—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wards) 873; *Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1027, 1267.

HAGGART, Mr. J. G., *South Lanark*

- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 746.
 Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 175.
 Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 893.
 London and North America Chartered Bank Act Amt. (B. 28, 1°*) 57.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1210; on B. 158 in Com., 1410.
 Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com., 555; on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to 3°, 702.

HAY, Mr. R., *Centre Toronto*

- Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Co. (M. for Ret.) 1120.

HESSON, Mr. S. R., *North Perth*

- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 760.
 Canada Landed Credit Co. Acts Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beatty*) in Com., 1104.
 Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 441.
 Dom. Lands Acts Consolidation B. 101 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 806.
 Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for export, on M. for Ret., 64, 77.
 Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 633.
 Government Lands within the Railway Belt, withdrawal of (M. for copies of O. C.) 1240.

HESON, Mr. S. R.—Con.

- Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*) on 1^o, 613.
 Legal Tender Notes, on Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1116.
 Maps of Manitoba and the North-West (M. for Copies) 227.
 Moffat, Geo., Claim of Heirs of for transport of Rails: in Com. of Supply, 1229.
 Money Orders to Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret., 43.
 Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. 103 (*Mr. Boulton*) in Com., 1106.
 Question of Privilege (paragraph in *London Advertiser*) 990.
 Railway Employés: in Com. of Supply, 1101.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1464.
 Supply—Charges of Management, 600; *Civil Government* (Interior) 606; *Militia* (Drill Pay) 861; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1096; (Intercolonial) 1101; (Claims of Heirs of Geo. Moffat) 1229; *Indians* (North-West Territory) 1185; *Public Works—Income*: Repairs, &c. (Parliament Buildings) 1267.
 Thunder Bay to Red River, Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1096.
 Trust and Land Improvement Fund (M. for Cor.) 39.
 Upper Canada Bank, Claims against, B. 171 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 533.
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. (salt) 527; (table glass, &c.) 531.

HILLIARD, Mr. G., West Peterborough
Supply—Trent River Nav., 1441.**HOLTON, Mr. E., Chateauguay**

- Beique, Mr., Enquiry into Conduct of (M. for Statement of Expenses) 1121.
 Danis, Antoine Dosithé, Contingent Accounts of (M. for copy) 1121.
 Laurin, Octave, Sums paid to (M. for Statement) 1121.

HOMER, Mr. J. A. R., New Westminster

- Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 987.
 Commercial Reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands, on M. for Sel. Com., 1250.
 Supply—*Fisheries* (Fish Hatchery, B.C.) 1556.

HOOPER, Mr. E., Lennox

- Information respecting the North-West (Ques.) 1107.
 Ontario and Manitoba Mail Service: in Com. of Supply, 1196.
 Supply—*Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (Man.) 1025; *Post Office*, 1196.
 Ways and Means—in Com. on Res. (glass, &c.) 526.

HOUE, Mr. F., Maskinongé

- Civil Service Commission Rept. (Ques.) 19.
 Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1088.

HOUE, Mr. F.—Con.

- Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2^o, 621.
 Dredging the Mouth of the River Maskinongé (Ques.) 269.
 Fletcher, Lieut.-Col., Retirement of (M. for Cor.) 170.
 French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply, 1140.
 Independence of Parliament (B. 125, 1^o) 493
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mosseau*) 1279; on B. 168, in Com., 1552; on Senate Amts., 1579.
 Insolvent Debtors' Estates, Distribution of (Ques.) 19.
 Irregularities in Montreal Post Office (Ques.) 36.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 323.
 Montreal Post Office, Working of (M. for Rep. of Commission) 1121.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to 3^o, 949.
 Pacific Ocean Cable (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Rivière du Loup (*en haut*) Mouth of (M. for Rep. of Engineer) 229.
 Salaries of Deputy Adjutants-General, &c. (Ques.) 222.
 Sir George Cartier, Monument to the Memory of (Ques.) 615.
 Superannuation Allowances in the Civ. Serv. (Ques.) 222.
 Supply—*Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 861; (Contingencies and Grants to Associations, &c.) 862.

HUNTINGTON, Hon. L. S., Shefford

- Fletcher, Lieut.-Col., Retirement of, on M. for Statement, 171.
 Ministerial Explanations, 26.
 Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 589.
 Resident Judge at Gaspé, on M. for Ret., 113.
 Supply—*Civil Government* (Secretary of State) 604; *Post Office*, 1197.
 Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27, on M. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) of Want of Confidence, 1245.

IRVINE, Mr. D., Carleton, N.B.

- Supply—*Immigration*, 849; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.B.) 1023.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 304; on Conc. (salt) 1497.
 Woodstock (N.B.) Post Office (Ques.) 48.

IVES, Mr. W. B., Richmond and Wolfe

- Boundaries of Ontario, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 667.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 616.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 12, 1^o) 42; on M. for 2^o, 264; adjd. Deb., 619; (remarks) 876.
 Judicial Appointments in Quebec (M. for Ret.) 48.

IVES, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 277.

Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1528.

JACKSON, Mr. G., *South Grey*

Dismissal of Postmaster at Neustadt (M. for Reprs. &c.) 44.

JONES, Mr. D. F., *South Leeds*

Importation of Cattle for Breeding purposes, on M. for Ret., 252.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 943.

KAULBACH, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg*

Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1520.

Conquerall Bank Post Office, on M. for Ret., 1252.

Salaries of Judges B. 179 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res. 1560.

Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1239.

Superannuation in the Public Service (M. for Ret.) 373.
Supply—Fisheries (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 874.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 501.

KILLAM, Mr. F., *Yarmouth*

Administrator of the Government (M. for Cor.) 115.

Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 875; in Com., 1512, 1516.

Charbydis Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1269.

Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 57 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 1102.

Chignecto Ship Railway Subsidy B. 167 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1471.

Customs Seizures and Fines exacted (M. for Ret.) 57.

Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in Second Rep. of Com., 1475.

Elections in the Magdalen Islands, &c., B. 74 (*Mr. Fortin*) on 1°, 221.

Exchange Bank of Nova Scotia (B. 23, 1°*) 47.

Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) on Res., 787; in Com., 1131.

Fish Traps and Brush Weirs (M. for Ret.) 1237, 1240.

Free Postage on Newspapers, on M. to introduce B., 109.

Halifax Harbor Master Appointment Act Amt. B. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 788.

Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1427.

Importation and Inspection of Pickled Herring, on M. for Ret., 370.

Inspection Act (1874) Amt. B. 157 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1472; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1495.

Inspection of Fish and Fees charged (M. for Statement) 485.

KILLAM, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Metaghan River Breakwater (M. for Statement of Expenditure) 327.

Newfield and wrecked *Moravian* (M. for Cor.) 482.

Pier at Annapolis (M. for Cor.) 55.

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) on Res. in Com., 660, 1330.

Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees charged (M. for Ret.) 1237.

Shipping Disasters in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret. (Ques.) 117.

Supplies, &c., for the Intercolonial (M. for Ret.) 129; (Ques.) 876, 1102; on presentation of Ret., 1521.

Supply—Civil Government (Departmental Contingencies) 658; *Immigration*, 850; *Immigration and Quarantine*, 850; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 867; *Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 870, 875; *Public Works—Income: Public Buildings* (N.S.) 926; (Ont.) 1025; *Harbors and Rivers* (N.S.) 1027; *Railways and Canals—Capital: (Intercolonial)* 1101; *Ocean and River Service (Charybdis Training Ship)* 1269; *Miscellaneous* (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1275; *Administration of Justice* (Russell vs. Woodward) 1276.

Telegraphic Communication with Sable Island, on M. for Ret., 51.

Telegraph Messages and Public Business (M. for Instructions) 1121.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 454; on Res. in Com. (fruit trees) 529.

Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Earnings (M. for Statement) 171.

Yarmouth and Pubnico Harbors, Dredging at: in Com. of Supply, 1029.

KILVERT, Mr. F. E., *Hamilton*

Dominion Fire and Marine Ins. Co. Winding-up (B. 13, 1°*) 46.

Great Western Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 134, 1°*) 541.

Mutual Life Association of Canada Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°*) 57.

Rainy River Improvement Co. Incorp. (B. 33, 1°*) 78.

Saskatchewan and Peace River Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 57.

KING, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.*

Dredging Grand Lake, N.B. (Ques.) 255, 558.

Grand Lake and McMahon's Cove (Ques.) in Com. of Supply, 1029.

Springhill Coal Deliveries (M. for Ret.) 172.

Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1527.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 465.

KIRKPATRICK, Mr. G. A., *Frontenac*

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (Ont.)

Act Amt. B. 131 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 1509.

Canada Mutual Telegraph Co. Incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 162.

KIRKPATRICK, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*

- Customs' Seizures and Amount of Fines (M. for Ret.) 44.
 Dry Dock at Pictou, on M. for Ret., 315.
 Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations
 B. 145 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1495.
 Kingston and Pembroke Railway, Complaints against
 the Location, &c., on M. for Cor., 482.
 Mills, Mill Dams, Wharves, &c., Erection of, Legaliza-
 tion B. 84 (*Mr. Domville*) on 1^o, 269.
 Ontario Bank Capital Stock Reduction (B. 45, 1^{o*}) 78;
 (B. 170, 1^o, 2^{o*} and 3^{o*}) 1521.
 Personal Explanation (paragraph in *Globe*) 839.
 Queen's College, Kingston (B. 64, 1^{o*}) 172.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John
 A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1448.
 Royal Academy of Arts Incorp. (B. 150, 1^{o*}) 1129.
 Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 5, 1^o) 35; on
 2^o, 263; M. to transfer to Government Orders
 withdn., 851.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*)
 in Com., 1214, 1305.
 Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr.
 Shaw*) in Com., 552.
 Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Act Amt. (B. 35, 1^{o*}) 57.
 Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27, on M. (*Mr.
 Mackenzie*) of Want of Confidence, 1246.

KRANTZ, Mr. H., *North Waterloo*

- Malt and Malt Liquor Duties, on M. for Ret., 125.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 351.

LANE, Mr. S. J., *North Grey*

- Shipping Disasters in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 117.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*)
 in Com., 1215.

LANDRY, Mr. A. C. P. R., *Montmagny*

- Claim of Jos. Chas. Lislois (Ques.) 73.
 Claims of Felix Caron and Henriette Chouinard (M. for
 Ret.) 1121.
 Crane Island, Pier at (Ques.) 1107.
 Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First
 Rep. of Com., 691.
 Dominion Laws, Codification of (Ques.) 1108.
 Grosse Isle and Montmagny, Semaphore between
 (Ques.) 1107.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*)
 1284, 1288.
 Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Cos-
 tigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1066.
 Library of Parliament, on M. for Sel. Com., 41.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization
 B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr.
 Amyot*) 492.
 Oromocto Shoals: in Com. of Supply, 1029.
 Question of Privilege (paragraph in *Ottawa Free
 Press*) 1534.
 Railway Ferry at Quebec (Ques.) 36.

LANDRY, Mr. A. C. P. R.—*Con.*

- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A.
 Macdonald*) in Com., 1465.
 Royal Assent, Form of (Ques.) 43.
 Supreme Court Bill (Ques.) 48, 1550.
 Supreme Court Repeal B. (M. to introduce, withdn.)
 254; (B. 146, 1^{o*}) 950.
 Survey of the Basin of Montmagny (Ques.) 1107.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 416.

LANGEVIN, Sir HECTOR L., *Three Rivers*

- Accidents on Government Rys., on M. for Ret., 285.
 Admission of Live Stock into Canada, on M. for Ret., 41.
 Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 127.
 Annapolis, Pier at, on M. for Cor., 55.
 Belle Creek, P. E. I., Harbor Improvements, on M. for
 Ret., 223.
 Bic Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 478.
 Brampton Post Office (Ans.) 110.
 Bridges over Navigable Waters (B. 152, 1^{o*}) 1190; on
 2^o, 1264.
 Canadian and Brazilian Line of Steamers (Ans.) 313.
 Canadian Tobacco, Duty on, on M. for Ret., 21.
 Canadian Tobacco, Treatise on (Ans.) 46.
 Cascumpee Harbor Improvements, on M. for Cor., 316.
 Census Enumerators in the County of St. John, on M.
 for Statement, 226.
 Civil Service (B. 36, 1^o) 69; on M. for 2^o, 790, 793;
 on 2^o and in Com., 1122, 1155, 1186; 3^o m., 1256.
 Clock in Montreal Post Office (Ans.) 72.
 Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to
 Com. of Supply, 1084, 1086.
 Concurrence—Grant to Library, 1499; Harbors and
 Rivers (N.W.T.) 1501; (Ont.) 1503; Dredging,
 1501.
 Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*)
 on Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 6 m. h., 185.
 Courtney River, B.C., Tenders for Clearing, on M. for
 Agents' Rep., 372.
 Crane Island, Pier at (Ans.) 1107.
 Cross Point and Campbellton Ferry Service (Ans.) 254.
 Dam at Lake Temiscamingue, on M. for Ret., 1252.
 Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First
 Rep. of Com., 690.
 Deposits of Benefit Societies (Ans.) 172.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M.
 for 2^o, 265, 620.
 Dominion Lands Act Correction (B. 164, 1^{o*}) 1455;
 on 2^o and in Com., 1549.
 Dominion Telegraph System (Ans.) 73.
 Drawbacks on Sheet Iron, on M. for Cor., 42.
 Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr.
 McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 487.
 Elgin Station, L'Islet County (Ans.) 1107.
 Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr.
 Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 623.
 Grand Lake, N.B., Dredging (Ans.) 255, 558.
 Grosse Isle and Montmagny, Semaphore between (Ans.)
 1107.

LANGEVIN, Sir HECTOR L.—*Con.*

- Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1426.
- Harbor Works in Nova Scotia, on M. for Reps. of Engineers, 261.
- Her Majesty's Escape, on Joint Address, 201.
- Immigration and Repatriation Agency at New York (Ans.) 1230.
- Imports and Exports at St. Hyacinthe, on M. for Statement, 257.
- Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1279; on B. 168, on Senate Amts., 1574.
- Interest on Money secured by Mortgage B. 49 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2^o, 268.
- Isle aux Noix, Completion of Works at (Ans.) 615.
- Library of Parliament (M. for Sel. Com.) 41.
- Lighthouse on Isle Perrot (Ans.) 222.
- Lighthouse on West Head Cape, Sable Island (Ans.) 222.
- Little River St. Louis Works (Ans.) 163.
- Lockeport, Government Savings Bank at (Ans.) 478.
- London Post Office Clerks, on M. for Cor., 166.
- Marine Telegraph, Pacific Coast and Asia (B. 127, 1^o) 531; on 2^o, 1191.
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 491.
- Matane Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 312.
- Militia Returns (Ans.) 614.
- Mining Rights, on M. for Copies of O.C., &c., 481.
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 533.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 940.
- Mouth of Rivière du Loup, Dredging the (Ans.) 255.
- Navigation of Water Hen River (Ans.) 163.
- Ocean Mail Clerks: in Com. of Supply, 1192.
- Paspebiac Harbor Survey, on M. for Rep., 37.
- Pawnbrokers Act Amt. B. 24 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2^o, 189.
- Petite Nation River Works (Ans.) 172.
- Pilotage Act (1873) Amt. B. 142 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 789.
- Postmaster at Greenwood, N.S., removal of, on M. for Cor., 485.
- Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts B. 7 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on M. for 2^o (Amt.) 1 m. h., 188; on Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply (Ques. of Order) 1435.
- Public Works Rep. (presented) 18.
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 534.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Senate Amts., 1562.
- Red Point (P.E.I.) Breakwater (Ans.) 164.
- Red River, Improvement of Rapids in (Ans.) 163.
- Restigouche River, Dredging the (Ans.) 254.
- Rivière Blanche Breakwater (Ans.) 558.
- Rivière du Loup Wharf, Light on the (Ans.) 222.

LANGEVIN, Sir HECTOR L.—*Con.*

- Ryan, Thos., Appointment of, on M. for Cor., 317.
- Shelburne Harbor, Fog Whistle at (Ans.) 222; on M. for Ret., 319.
- Sir George Cartier, Monument of (Ans.) 615.
- Sorel, Public Buildings at (Ans.) 164.
- St. Anaclet, Station at, on M. for Cor., 314.
- St. Flavien Mail Service (Ans.) 222; in Com. of Supply, 1193.
- St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission (B. 163, Res. prop.) 1403; in Com., 1429.
- St. Michel Wharf Improvements (Ans.) 368, 1231.
- St. Roch des Aulnets Harbor, Survey of (Ans.) 1230.
- Supply—*Civil Government* (Post Office) 655; (Public Works) 657; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.S.) 926; (P.E.I.) 1023; (N.B.) 1023; (Que.) 1023, 1265, 1355; (Ont.) 1024, 1265, 1556; (Man.) 1025, 1266, 1354, 1444; (N.W.T.) 1025; (B.C.) 1025; Repairs, &c., 1026, 1266, 1354; Telegraphs, 1355; Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1026, 1267, 1556; (N.B.) 1027, 1444; (Que.) 1028, 1445; (Ont.) 1028, 1267, 1444, 1556; (Man.) 1028; (N.W.T.) 1029; (Dredging) 1267; Roads and Bridges (Union Suspension) 1267; Slides and Booms (Compensation to McHale) 1268; Telegraphs (Mille Vaches and Murray Bay) 1268; Capital (Ottawa) 1265; Post Office, 1192; Collection of Revenues (Telegraph Lines, B.C.) 1275; Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1289; Unprovided Items, 1292; Miscellaneous (Mounted Police Barracks) 1445; (Hydrographic Survey) 1445; Legislation (Mr. McConville's Indemnity) 1556.
- Supreme Court Bill (Ans.) 48, 1551.
- Supreme Court Repeal B., on M. (*Mr. Landry*) to introduce, 254.
- Survey of the Basin of Montmagny (Ans.) 1107.
- Sydney and North Sydney Public Buildings (Ans.) 1231.
- Telegraphic Communication with Sable Island (Ans.) 45; on M. for Ret., 51.
- Telegraph (Word) Declaratory B. 66 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) M. to transfer to Government Orders, 1533; on 2^o and in Com., 1569.
- Three Rivers Harbor Improvement (B. 128, Res. in Com. and 1^o) 532.
- Ways and Means—on the Budget (remarks) 250.
- Whitby Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 313.
- Winnipeg Drill Shed (Ans.) 163.
- Winnipeg Post Office Accommodation: in Com. of Supply, 1195.
- Woodstock (N.B.) Post Office (Ans.) 48.

LANTIER, Mr. J. P., *Soulanges*

- Improvement of the St. Lawrence below Prescott (Ques.) 36.

LAURIER, Hon. W., *East Quebec*

- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 744.

LAURIER, Hon. W.—*Con.*

- Canadian and Brazilian Line of Steamers (Ques.) 312.
 Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 907.
 French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply, 1139.
 Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 622.
 Gaspé, Resident Judge at, on M. for Ret., 113.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 536, 1281.
 Laval University, Act respecting, disallowed (M. for Copies, &c.) 40.
 Mines, Act respecting, disallowed (M. for Copy) 40.
 Welland Canal Locks, Lighting of, by Electric Light (M. for copy of Tenders) 328.

LONGLEY, Mr. A., *Annapolis*

- North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 800.
 Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1301.
 Supply—*Immigration*, 850; *Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers* (N.S.) 1025, *Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 1301.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 359; in Com. on Res. (fruit trees) 529.
 Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. 156 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1547.

MACDONALD, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*

- Chignecto Ship Ry. Subsidy B. 167 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1472.
 Indemnity for Duties on Fish Oil (Ques.) 1231.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 452.

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A., *Victoria, B.C.*

- Address, on the, 14.
 Administration of Criminal Justice in Disputed Territory (B. 109, 1°*) 376; on 2°, 1259.
 Administration of Justice in Man., on M. for Cor., 54.
 Administrator of the Government, on M. for Cor., 116.
 Allan, Capt., Dismissal of (Amt. to M. for Paps.) 319.
 Attempt on the Queen's Life: Telegraph Message, 183; Address to Her Majesty on Her Escape, 200; Res., 201; from Senate, 224; Acknowledgment of Receipt of Address, 228.
 Better Prevention of Crime Act (1878) Continuation (B. 165, 1°*) 1455; on 2°, 1569.
 Boundaries of Ontario (Ans.) 110.
 Bounties to Fishermen (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on prop. Res., 875; (B. 177, 1° and 2°) 1555.
 Canadian-built Vessels in France, on M. for Cor., 285.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 48.
 Charges against Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, on Ms. (*Mr. Schultz*) for reading the Journals, 372, 1234; on Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) to M. for Special Com., 1235.
Charybdis Training Ship (Ans.) 73.
 Chinese Immigration (remarks) 1477.
 Civil Service Appointments (Amt. to M. for Ret.) 50.

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—*Con.*

- Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 19.
 Coal Exports from N. S., on M. for Statement, 226.
 Coal Lands in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 563.
 Codification of Dominion Laws (Ans.) 1108.
 Colonization Societies and Land Regulations (Ans.) 163.
 Commercial Reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands, on M. for Sel. Com., 1250.
 Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1075.
 Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1200.
 Concurrence—Dorchester Penitentiary, 1498; Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner, 1500; Mail Subsidies (Canada and Brazil) 1500; Culling Timber, 1501; *Charybdis*, 1502.
 Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure chargeable to, on M. for Ret., 50.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Adultery, Seduction, &c.) B. 25 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 327; (remarks) 1403.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 280.
 County Court Judges (B. 112, 1°*) 376; Res. prop., 1254; on 2°, 1259; in Com. on Res., 1276; in Com. on B., 1278.
 County Court Judges' Salaries, on M. for Cor., 170.
 Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in Second Rep. of Com., 1474.
 Definition of Right to Assault or Kill Prisoners (B. 151, 1°*) 1190.
 Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 919.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2°, 620.
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation (B. 101, 1°) 328; on 2°, 803; in Com., 804.
 Dominion Lands Act, working of, in North-West, on M. for Reps., 319.
 Dominion Lands along Railway Lines, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 1232.
 Dominion Officials and Municipal and Local Taxes (Ans.) 73.
 Dorchester Penitentiary, Female Convicts at, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 52.
 Dredging the Mouth of the Maskinongé (Ans.) 269.
 Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 433.
 Evidence in Criminal Cases Law Amt. B. (Ans.) 313.
 Extension of the Parliamentary Franchise (Ans.) 45.
 Extradition Act (1877) Amt. (B. 154, 1°*) 1212; on 2°, 1559.
 Fire Arms, Improper Use of, Act Amt. (B. 111, 1°*) 376; on 2°, 1259.
 Fraudulent Trustees, on M. for Ret., 319.
 Free Postage on Newspapers, on M. to introduce B., 109.
 French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply (remarks as to relevancy of Debate) 1142; (on bringing down Government measures) 1144.
 Fuel Supplies in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 283.

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—*Con.*

- Fugitive Offenders in Canada (B. 108, 1^{*}) 376; on 2^o, 1258.
- Gaspé, Resident Judge at, on M. for Ret., 112.
- General Port Wardens' Act (1874) Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 788.
- Government Business, Precedence of (Ms.) 369, 621, 1254.
- Government Land Policy in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 819.
- Grants of Land for Military Services in 1837 (Ans.) 222.
- Indemnity for Duties on Fish Oil (Ans.) 1231.
- Indian Act (1880) Amt. (B. 174, 1^{o*}) 1571.
- Information respecting the North-West (Ans.) 1107.
- Inland Revenue Act (1880) Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) on Senate Amts., 1573.
- Insolvent Debtors' Estates, Distribution of (Ans.) 19.
- Inspection of Factories B. (Ans.) 222.
- Instructions to Governors General of Quebec, &c., on M. for Ret., 1108.
- Interior, Department of, Report (remarks) 222; (presented) 311.
- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 876; on Amt., 1044; remarks, 1066; M. to engross Address, 1155.
- Islands in the St. Lawrence above Brockville (Ans.) 269
- Land Purchases by Railway Companies in the North-West (Ans.) 1107.
- Land Regulations, Translation and Printing of (Ans.) 558.
- Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to 3^o, 1569.
- Maps of Man. and the North-West, on M. for Copies, 1227.
- Maritime Court Cases disposed of, on M. for Ret., 51.
- Maritime Court of Canada, Establishment of (M. for Address to Her Majesty) 1541.
- Maritime Jurisdiction Act (Ans.) 110.
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 320—324.
- Mennonite Reserves, unoccupied sections of (Ans.) 269.
- Messages from His Excellency, 192, 1102, 1402.
- Mills, Mill Dams, Wharves, &c., Erection of, Legalization B. 84 (*Mr. Domville*) on M. for 1^o, 269.
- Ministerial Explanations, 21.
- Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, Competent as Witnesses B. 10 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2^o, 619.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 929; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to 3^o, 947; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 948.
- Niagara, Borough of (remarks) 1573.
- North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation (B. 102, 1^o) 328; in Com. on Res., 541; on 2^o and in Com., 798, 1129.
- North-West Territories Act (1880) Amt. (B. 149, 1^{o*}) 1129.
- Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1^{o*}) 1.

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—*Con.*

- Personal Explanation (remarks on article in *Globe*) 570.
- Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 587; remarks after vote, 592.
- Prince Edward Island Bank Relief (B. 38, 1^o) 72.
- Printing for Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. or Dominion Lands Office (Ans.) 1107.
- Promissory Notes and other Negotiable Securities B. 73 (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) on M. for 2^o, 621.
- Provincial Constitutions, on M. for Ret., 167.
- Provisional Districts in the North-West: Message (presented) 1402; considered, 1567; Res., 1568.
- Public Business, State of (remarks on adjnmt. of House) 287.
- Quarterly Statistics of Trade, on Res. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1249.
- Readjustment of the Representation (B. 153, 1^o) 1203, 1208; (remarks in Ans. to *Mr. Blako*) 1231; 2^o m., 1330; B. withdn., 1332; (B. 158, 1^{o*}) 1332; M. for Com., 1403; in Com., 1410—1419, 1445—1468; 3^o m., on Amts. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1478; on Amt. (*Mr. Rymal*) 1491; on Amt. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 1492; on 3^o, 1494; on Senate Amts., 1561—1566.
- Redistribution of Seats B. (Ans.) 72, 228, 1155.
- Repeal of the Stamp Act (Announcement) 109.
- Richelieu Bridge Co. Incorp. B. 42 (*Mr. Baker*) on M. for 2^o, 110.
- Rights of the Hudson's Bay Co. (Ans.) 313.
- Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1296.
- Royal Assent, Form of (Ans.) 48.
- Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 53 (*Mr. Thompson*) on M. for 2^o, 281.
- Sale of Government Property in Ottawa (Ans.) 129.
- Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 279.
- Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1239.
- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. 110 (*Mr. McLelan*) 3^o m., 1535.
- Select Standing Committees (m.) 3; Com. to prepare Lists, 19; Lists rep. and concurred in, 20.
- Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.
- South Simcoe Election, introduction of Member (Res.) 172.
- Speech from the Throne, Consideration of (m.) 2.
- Stamp Acts Repeal (B. 63, 1^o) 162.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on objection (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to M. for Com. on Res., 546.
- Supply—Civil Government (Civil Service Board) 658; (Indian Affairs) 1288, 1506; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 779, 1289; (St. Vincent de Paul) 782, 1289; (Dorchester) 783, 1498; (Man.) 784; (B.C.) 784; *Legislation* (Grant to Library) 785; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.S.) 926; (Man.) 1354;

MACDONALD, Sir JOHN A.—*Con.**Supply*—*Con.*

Geological Survey, 1183, 1507; *Indians*, 1184, 1290, 1505; *North-West Mounted Police*, 1185; *Miscellaneous* (North-West Mounted Police: Compensation to Members) 1199; (Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to) 1200; (Consolidation of Dom. Statutes) 1288; (International Fishery Exhibition) 1505; (Compensation to Jean Louis Légaré) 1508; (Purchase of Coins) 1557; (Niagara Falls Commission) 1558; *Dominion Lands: Capital*, 1201; *Income*, 1202, 1291; *Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 1296.

Supreme and Exchequer Court Acts B. (Ans.) 493.

Supreme Court, Appeals to the, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 165.

Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com. (Amts.) 551, 552, 553, 555.

Timber Licenses, System of Granting, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 567.

Validity of Marriage in Quebec, on M. for Paps., 55.

Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. (B. 156, 1°) 1253; on M. for 2°, 1546; in Com., 1549.

MACDONELL, Mr. D. G., *North Lanark*

Brigade Camps (Ques.) 163.

Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com of Supply, 900.

Promissory Notes and other Negotiable Securities (B. 73, 1°) 220; on M. for 2°, 621.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1398; in Com., 1410; (Amt.) 1485.

Wool Importations and Duties collected (M. for Ret.) 288.

MACDONNELL, Mr. S., *Inverness*

Delay in the reception of Mails (remarks) 493.

Harbor Works, N.S., on M. for Reprs. of Engineers, 261.

Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1425.

Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees charged, on M. for Ret., 1238.

Supply—Miscellaneous (Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to) 1200; *Public Works—Income: Repairs, &c.* (Supreme Court) 1266.

MACKENZIE, Hon. A., *Lambton*

Accidents on the Intercolonial: in Com. of Supply, 1099.

Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 128.

Boundaries of Ontario, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 666.

Canada Landed Credit Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 1105.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 141 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2° (Statement) 990; on M. for 3°, 1029.

Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 57 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 1102.

Chignecto Ship Ry. Subsidy B. 167 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1470.

MACKENZIE, Hon. A.—*Con.*

Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langvin*) in Com., 1124, 1187.

Claim of Jos. Chas. Lislois (objection to Ques.) 73.

Classification of Imports, on M. for Ret., 119.

Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1089.

Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1201.

Concurrence—Adulteration of Food, 1312; *Canadian Pacific Ry.*, 1315; *Intercolonial (Rolling Stock)* 1318.

County Court Judges B. 112 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1277.

Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 694.

Deficits in Post Office Service: in Com. of Supply, 1194.

Discipline observed in the 27th Battalion of Volunteers (M. for Reprs.) 56.

Dominion Telegraph System (objection to Ques.) 73.

Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M. for Ret., 64.

English Bay as Permanent Terminus of Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1097.

French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply (remarks as to relevancy of Debate) 1142.

Government Business, Precedence of, on M. to take Wednesdays, 622.

Her Majesty's Escape, on Joint Address, 201.

Intercolonial Ry., Claims against, submitted to Frank Shanly (M. for Reprs., &c.) 57.

Intercolonial Railway Mileage, Cost of Working, on M. for Ret., 320.

Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock, on M. for Ret., 121; in Com. of Supply, 1230; on conc., 1318.

John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 6 m. h., 488.

Kingston and Pembroke Ry., Complaints against the Location, &c. (M. for Cor.) 481.

Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1423.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 325; on Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 489.

M. C. Upper, Damages to, in Welland Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1443.

Military Schools for the Infantry Service (objection to Ques.) 73.

Militia Returns (Ques.) 614.

Ministerial Explanations, 33.

Moffat, Geo., Claims of Heirs for transport of Rails: in Com. of Supply, 1229.

Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 533.

North American Mutual Life Ins. Co. Act. Amt. (B. 53, 1°*) 129.

North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 545, 801; on M. for 3°, 1130.

MACKENZIE, Hon. A.—*Con.*

- Parliamentary and Departmental Printing and Binding: in Com. of Supply, 1198.
- Pilotage Act (1873) Amt. B. 142 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 789.
- Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply), 571; remarks after vote, 592.
- Port Moody and Yale Section of Canadian Pacific Ry. (M. for approximate quantities) 167.
- Postmaster at Greenwood, removal of, on M. for Cor., 485.
- Provincial Constitutions (M. for Ret.) 167.
- Public Business, State of (remarks) 428.
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard J. Curtwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1337.
- Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. 103 (*Mr. Boulton*) in Com., 1105.
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. 129 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 534.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1209; on M. for 2°, 1331; on B. 158, in Com., 1412, 1463; (Amt.) 1480.
- Resident Judge at Gaspé, on M. for Ret., 113.
- Ross, Lieut.-Col., Charges against (M. for Copies) 327; in Com. of Supply, 1292.
- Sale of Government Property in Ottawa (Ques.) 129.
- Sovereign Fire Ins. Co. of Canada Act Amt. (B. 78, 1°*) 229.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res. (Ques. of Order) 546; in Com., 546., 1303, 1305.
- St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1430.
- Supply—*Charges of Management*, 597; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 781; (Dorchester) 783; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1290; *Legislation* (Grant to Library) 784; (Printing, Paper and Bookbinding) 786; *Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 858; (Care of Military Property, &c.) 863; (Royal Military College) 863; (Drill Pay) 1292; *Mail Subsidies* (France and Quebec) 865; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 867; *Railways and Canals—Capital*: Railways (Canadian Pacific) 1095; (Intercolonial) 1100, 1436; (Claim of Heirs of Geo. Moffatt) 1229; (Cape Traverse Ry.) 1437; Canals (Lachine) 1145; (Carillon Canal, Dam and Slide) 1146; (Welland) 1438; (Trent River Nav.) 1439; *Income* (Welland Canal: *M. C. Upper*) 1443; *Collection of Revenues* (Repairs, &c., Canals) 1148; (Intercolonial) 1149; (Rolling Stock) 1230; *Post Office*, 1191; *Miscellaneous* (Printing) 1198; (Army and Navy, Articles for use of) 1199; (Compensation to D. H. Waterbury) 1201; (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1274; *Public Works—Income* (Ottawa Geological Museum) 1266; (Montreal Drill Shed) 1355; (Mabou Harbor) 1267; (Union Suspension Bridge) 1268; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charydis* Training Ship) 1271; *Fisheries* (Fishery Overseer McVicar) 1273; *Indians*, 1290.

MACKENZIE, Hon. A.—*Con.*

- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to 3°, 705.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 660.
- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 243.
- Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27 (M. of Want of Confidence) 1240, 1246.
- Welland Canal Contracts (remarks) 34; (M. for O. C., &c.) 57; (remarks on Paps. brought down) 320.

MACMILLAN, Mr. D., *East Middlesex*

- Dominion Lands along Railway Lines, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 1233.
- Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland Incorp. (B. 70, 1°*) 192.
- Saskatchewan, Qu'Appelle and Assiniboine Navigation Co. Incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 269.
- Supply—*Indians* (N. W. T.) 1185.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com., 552, 555; on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) to 3°, 716; (Amt.) 720.

MANSON, Mr. D. A., *Brome*

- Question of Privilege (paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 1534.

MASSUE, Mr. L. H., *Richelieu*.

- Dredging the Mouth of Rivière du Loup (Ques.) 255.
- Great Eastern Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 89, 1°*) 289.
- Imperial Measure (Ques.) 614.
- Public Buildings at Sorel (Ques.) 164.
- Sale of Government Property in Sorel (M. for Statement) 228.
- St. Lawrence and Pacific Ry. Ferry Co. Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 91, 1°*) 289.

MCCALLUM, Mr. L., *Monck*

- Canadian Waters Navigation Act Amt. (B. 82, 1°*) 254; on M. for 2°, 376.
- Damages along the Grand River (M. for Reps. of Dominion Arbitrators) 372.
- Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1426.
- Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beatty*) on 1°, 612.
- Legal Tender Notes, on Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1115.
- Ministerial Explanations, 33.
- Pawnbrokers' Act Amt. B. 24 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. Deb.) 189.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1412; on Amt. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 1494.
- Shipping Disasters in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 117.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 547; B. in Com., 1212, 1303; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1304.

McCALLUM, Mr. L.—*Con.*

Supply—*Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1096; *Canals* (Welland) 1438; (*Trent River Nav.*) 1440; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis Training Ship*) 1271.

Trent River Navigation: in Com. of Supply, 1440.

Ways and Means—on the Budget (remarks in reply to Mr. Anglin) 161.

Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27, on M. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) of Want of Confidence, 1244.

McCARTHY, Mr. D., *North Simcoe*

Court of Ry. Commissioners for Canada (B. 2, 1°*) 18; on 2°, 173; referred to Sel. Com., 186.

Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 885, 889.

Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. (B. 46, 1°*) 78.

Importations of Farm Products, Value and Duty of (M. for Ret.) 327.

Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. 10 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 617.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 941.

Personal Explanation (paragraph in *Globe*) 889.

Persons charged with Indictable Offences, Evidence in own behalf (B. 50, 1°) 109.

Railway Inspection Fund (Ques.) 368.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1414.

McCUAIG, Mr. J. S., *Prince Edward*

Amalgamation of Rys. under control of Parliament Prevention (B. 116, 1°*) 416.

Cadets in Military College, on M. for Ret., 191.

Charybdis Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1270.

Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 184; withdn., 186.

Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 440.

Fraudulent Trustees (M. for Ret.) 319.

Free Postage on Newspapers (M. to introduce B., withdn.) 109.

Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1429.

Injustice to Public Officers: in Com. of Supply, 1200.

Inland Revenue Act Amt., on M. for Com. on Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 535.

Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1307.

Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*) on 1°, 613.

John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 6 m. h., 488.

Maps of Manitoba and the North-West, on M. for Copies, 227.

McCUAIG, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 322; (Amt.) 490; on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 492.

Salaries of Country Postmasters: in Com. of Supply, 1194.

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 278.

Shipping Disasters in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret., 117.

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 546; B. in Com., 1212, 1303.

Supply—*Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 851; *Ocean and River Service* (Purchase of Life-Boats, &c.) 866; (*Charybdis Training Ship*) 1270; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 867; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Murray Canal) 1147; *Collection of Revenues* (Repairs, &c., Canals) 1148; *Post Office*, 1194; *Miscellaneous* (Compensation to D. H. Waterbury) 1200; (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1271.

Tonnage dues at Quebec and Montreal, in Com. on Res., 535.

Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1130.

McDONALD, Mr. W., *Cape Breton*

Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 690.

Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c., on M. for Copies of Circulars, 286.

Sydney and North Sydney Public Buildings (Ques.) 1231.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 349.

McDOUGALD, Mr. J., *Pictou*

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 511.

McDOUGALL, Hon. W., *Halton*

Appeals to the Supreme Court, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 165.

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (Ont.) Act Amt. B. 131 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 1509.

Canadian Electric Light Co. (B. 77, 1°*) 229.

Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1092.

Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 183.

Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 101 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 804.

Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 905.

Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 436.

Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1427.

Hudson Bay Co.'s Claims to Land in Red River Settlement Belt (M. for O. C., &c.) 1122.

Hudson's Bay Co.'s Rights (Ques.) 313.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 325.

McDOUGALL, Hon. W.—*Con.*

- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 929, 932; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 937; on Amts. (*Mr. Blake*) 938, 940; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 947.
- Public Printing and Establishment of a Government Printing Office: in Com. of Supply, 1197.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Senate Amts., 1562.
- Steamboat Inspection Act. Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1304.
- Supply—*Miscellaneous* (Printing) 1197.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act. Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com., 552; on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to 3°, 706; (Amt.) 718.

McISAAC, Mr. A., *Antigonish*

- Harbor Works in N.S. (M. for Reps. of Engineers) 258.
- Salmon Fishing Licences and Fees Charged, on M. for Ret., 1237.

McLELAN, Hon. A. W., *Colchester*

- Canadian Waters Navigation Act Amt. B. 82 (*Mr. McCallum*) on M. for 2°, 376.
- Charybdis* Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1268.
- Concurrence*—Intercolonial (Rolling Stock) 1327.
- Fishery Warden Mowatt, Charges against (Ans.) 1108.
- Fish Hatcheries in N. B. (Ans.) 1108.
- Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues (B. 121, Res. in Com. and 1°) 787; on 2° and in Com., 1131.
- General Port Wardens Act (1874) Amt. (B. 120, Res. in Com. and 1°) 787; on 2° and in Com., 1190.
- Halifax Harbor Master Appointment Act Amt. (B. 140, Res. in Com. and 1°) 788.
- Harbor and River Police of Canada (B. 107, 1°*) 375; in Com. on Res., 535; on 2° and in Com., 1426.
- Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. Guillet*) M. to transfer to Government Orders, 1254; on 2°, 1307; in Com. and 3°*, 1425.
- Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock: on Conc., 1327.
- Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons Provision (B. 159, 1°*.)
- Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 47.
- Meteorological Service of Canada, on M. for Stmt., 169.
- Ministerial Explanations, 26.
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners, Powers of (Ans.) 477.
- Montreal Port Warden, Office of, Acts Consolidation (B. 122, Res. in Com. and 1°) 786; on 2°, 1264.
- Newfield* and wrecked *Moravian*, on M. for Cor., 482.
- North Sydney Harbor (N.S.) Act Amt. (B. 160, 1°*) 1403.
- Pilotage Act (1873) Amt. (B. 119, Res. in Com. and 1°) 659; on 2°, 1260; in Com. 1263, 1329.
- Pilotage Act (1873) Amt. (B. 142, Res. in Com. and 1°) 789; on 3°, 1472.
- Regulation of the Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 171.
- Salmon Fishing Licences and Fees Charged, on M. for Ret., 1238.
- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. (B. 110, 1°*) 376; on 2° and in Com., 1509.

McLELAN, Hon. A. W.—*Con.*

- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 117, Res. in Com. and 1°) 546; on 2° and in Com., 1212, 1302.
- St. Emilie Lighthouse (Ans.) 615.
- Supply—*Civil Government* (Marine and Fisheries) 657; *Ocean and River Service* (Steamer *Glendon*) 866; (Purchase of Life-Boats, &c.) 866; (Quebec and Montreal River Police) 866; (Removal of Obstructions) 867; (Training Ship *Charybdis*) 1268; (*La Canadienne*) 1272; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 867; (Completion of Sands Head, B.C., Lighthouse) 870; *Fisheries* (Salaries of Overseers and Wardens) 870, 873; (Fishery Warden McVicar) 1272; (Fish Breeding) 1273; (Inspecting Mill Dams, &c.) 1274; (Fish Hatchery, B.C.) 1557; *Scientific Institutions* (St. John Observatory) 1274; *Miscellaneous* (Expenses *in re* Fishery Inspector Mowat) 1274; (International Circumpolar Observations) 1507.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. (B. 126, Res. in Com. and 1°) 660; on 2° and in Com., 1130.
- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 329.

McLENNAN, Mr. J., *Glengarry*

- British North America Ins. Co. Consolidation (B. 24, 1°*) 57.
- Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1429.
- Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. McLealn*) on M. for 2°, 1308.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to 3°, 949.
- Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 583.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1457.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1303.
- Sugar Duties, Amendment of, on Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 775.
- Tecumseth Ins. Co. of Canada Incorp. (B. 41, 1°*) 78.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com. (Amt.) 550; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 708.
- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 211.

McLEOD, Mr. W. M., *Cape Breton*

- Question of Privilege (on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 1534.

MERNER, Mr. S., *South Waterloo*

- German Delegates, Report of (Ques.) 254.
- Mennonite Reserves, Unoccupied Lands in (Ques.) 269.

MÉTHOT, Mr. F. X. O., *Nicolet*

- Montreal and Champlain Junction Ry. (permission to ask Ques.) 1302.

MILLS, Hon. D. *Bothwell*

- Allan, Capt., Dismissal of (M. for Paps.) 319.
 Auction Sale of Lands at Winnipeg (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Boundaries of Ontario, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 674.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Rocky Mountains Construction B. 141 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1001.
 Charges against Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, on M. for reading the Journals, 372.
 Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 57 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 1104.
 Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1°, 70; in Com., 1126.
 Classification of Imports, on M. for Ret., 118.
 Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1080.
 Concurrence—Mail Subsidies (P. E. I. and Great Britain) 1311; (Canada and Brazil) 1501; Adulteration of Food, 1312; Weights, Measures and Gas, 1312; Grant to Library, 1499; *M. C. Upper*, damages to (Amt.) 1535.
 Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure Chargeable to, on M. for Ret., 50.
 County Court Judges B. 112 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1277.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 280; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) 616.
 Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in Second Rep. of Com., 1473.
 Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 925.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2°, 620.
 Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. 101 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 803; in Com., 804.
 Dominion Lands Act, working of in the North-West (M. for Ret.) 319.
 Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 420.
 French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply (remarks as to relevancy of Deb.) 1142; (on the discussion of Government measures) 1141.
 Government Business, Precedence of, on M. to take Wednesdays, 622.
 Government Land Policy in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 836.
 Indians of Lakes Huron and Superior, on M. for Cor., 39.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) in Com., 1551.
 Instructions to Governors General of Quebec, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1108.
 Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1057.
 Kent and Bothwell, Post Office near Boundary (Ques.) in Com. of Supply, 1192.
 Land Regulations of 1878 (M. for Copies) 172.
 Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1422.

MILLS, Hon. D.—*Con.*

- Maritime Court for Canada, Establishment of, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Address to Her Majesty, 1541.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 322; (Amt.) 485.
M. C. Upper, damages to: on Conc. (Amt.) 1532.
 Mining Licenses issued within Disputed Territory (M. for Copies) 172.
 Moffat, Geo., Claim of Heirs of, for transport of Rails: in Com. of Supply, 1229.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 949.
 North-West Mounted Police Acts Consolidation B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 799.
 Ontario Boundary Award, Correspondence with Lieut.-Gov. of Ontario (M. for Copies) 229.
 Personal Explanation (paragraph in *Morning Herald*, Halifax) 888.
 Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts B. 7 (*Mr. Casgrain*) on Amt. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1 m. h., 188.
 Provisional Districts in the North-West, on consideration of Message, 1567.
 Readjustment of Seats B. (Ques.) 228.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1207; on M. for 2°, 1332; on B. 158; on M. for 2°, 1390; (Amt.) 1402; in Com., 1412, 1450; on M. for 3° (Amts.) 1482, 1483; on Senate Amts., 1562.
 Richelieu Bridge Co. Incorp B. 42 (*Mr. Baker*) on M. for 2°, 110.
 Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 58 (*Mr. Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 281.
 Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 276.
 Stamp Acts Repeal B. 63 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 163.
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1526.
 Supply—Civil Government (Post Office) 656; (Agriculture) 656; (Public Works) 657; (Indian Affairs) 1506; (Departmental Contingencies) 658; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 781; (Dorchester) 783; (B.C.) 784; *Legislation* (Grant to Library) 784; (Salaries of Officers, additional, and Contingencies) 785; (Printing, Paper, and Book-binding) 785; *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Care of Archives) 786; (Health Statistics) 848; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.S.) 926; Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1445; *Geological Survey*, 1184; *Indians*, 1184, 1290; *Post Office*, 192; *Dom. Lands—Capital*, 1201; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Intercolonial: Claim of Heirs of Geo. Moffat for transport of Rails) 1229.
 Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan Incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 109.

MILLS, Hon. D.—*Con.*

- Telegraph (Word) Declaratory B. 66 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1570; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1571.
 Timber Licenses issued within Disputed Territory (M. for Copies) 172.
 Timber Licenses, System of Granting, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 568.
 Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts. Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1079.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 504; in Com. on Res. (sulphate of quinine) 525; (sand and emery paper) 526.
 Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. 156 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1518.

MONGENAIS, Mr. J. B., *Vaudreuil*

- Lighthouse on Isle Perrot (Ques.) 222.

MOUSSEAU, Hon. J. A., *Bagot*

- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 752.
 Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 907.
 Imperial Measure (Ans.) 614.
 Importation and Inspection of Pickled Herring, on M. for Ret., 371.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 123) Res. prop. 533, 1278, 1286; in Com. and 1°, 1288; B. withdn., 1473; (B. 163, 1°) 1473; on 2° and in Com., 1551; on Senate Amts, 1574.
 Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations B. 145 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1314; in Com., 1473; on Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) 1495.
 Inspection of Fish and Fees Charged, on M. for Statement, 485.
 Resident Judge at Gaspé, on M. for Ret., 113.
 Secretary of State's Report (presented) 162.
Supply—Civil Government (Secretary of State) 602, 693.

MUTTART, Mr. E. B., *King's P.E.I.*

- Harmony Station and East Point (P.E.I. Railway) Station between (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Prince Edward Island Railway Rates (M. for Statement) 114.
 Red Point (P. E. I.) Breakwater (Ques.) 163.
 Souris West Harbor Improvements (M. for Cor.) 478.
 Winter Communication between P. E. I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 225.

O'CONNOR, Hon. JOHN, *Russell*

- Bruce County Mail Service (Ans.) 369.
 Delay in the reception of Mails (remarks) 493.
 Kent and Bothwell, Post Office on Boundary of (Ans.) in Com. of Supply 1192.
 Letter Carriers' Uniforms: in Com. of Supply, 1194.
 London Post Office, Irregularities in, on M. for Ret., 39.
 Mail Service (Ans.) 48.
 Money Orders to Foreign Countries, on M. for Ret. 44.

O'CONNOR, Hon. JOHN—*Con.*

- Montreal Post Office, Irregularities in (Ans.) 36.
 P. O. Savings Banks at La Baie, Yamaska (Ans.) 558.
 Postal Savings Bank System (Ans.) 1108.
 Postmaster-General's Rep. (presented) 41.
 Registered Letters, Charges on (Ans.) 42.
 Salaries of Country Postmasters: in Com. of Supply, 1194.
 Salaries of Rural Postmasters (Ques.) 46.
 Stratford and Chesley Mail Service (Ans.) 74.
 St. Raymond and St. Casimir, Savings Banks at (Ans.) 478.
Supply—Mail Subsidies (San Francisco and Victoria, B. C.) 865; (Grand Manan, N. B., and Mainland) 865; (Canada and Brazil) 865; (France and Quebec) 865; *Post Office*, 1191.
 White Rock Mills Post Office (Ans.) 478.
 Winnipeg Post Office accommodation: in Com. of Supply, 1194.

OGDEN, Mr. A., *Guysborough*

- Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res. 1518.
 Question of Privilege (paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 1534.
Supply—Fisheries (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 871, 873; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1269; *Miscellaneous* (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1275.

ORTON, Mr. G. T., *Centre Wellington*

- Agricultural Interests (Ms. for Sel. Com.) 126, 257.
 Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 183.
 Drawbacks on Goods Manufactured for Export, on M. for Ret., 64.
 Interest on Moneys Secured by Mortgage Act Amt. (B. 49, 1°*) 109; on M. for 2°, 266.
 Malt and Malt Liquor Duties (M. for Ret.) 124.
 Pawnbrokers Act Amt. (B. 24, 1°*) 47; on M. for 2°, 189; B. withdn., 266.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1395.
 Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1297.
 Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.
Supply—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Health Statistics) 848; *Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 1297.
Ways and Means—on the Budget.

OUIMET, Mr. J. A., *Laval*

- Commercial Treaties, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1084.
 Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com. (Amt.) 615.
 Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1427.
 Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations B. 145 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1314.

OUMET, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

- Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1468.
Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1532.

PATERSON, Mr. W., *South Brant*

- Brant Loan and Savings Co. Incorp. (B. 59, 1°*) 162.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1009.
Drawbacks on Goods Manufactured for Export (M. for Ret.) 58.
Grinding in Bond, on M. for Cor., 53.
Iron Industry, on Res. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1220.
Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1400; in Com., 1416, 1452; on M. for 3° (Amts.) 1478, 1485, 1487.
Sugar Duties, Amendment of (Res. in Amt. to Com of Supply) 762.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 390; in Com. on Res. (iron boilers and iron tubing) 527.

PATTERSON, Mr. J. C., *Essex*

- Admission of Live Stock into Canada (M. for Cor.) 44.
Canada Southern Bridge Co. (B. 81; 1°*) 229.
Concurrence—Weights, Measures and Gas, 1313.
Disallowance of Provincial Acts (M. for Ret.) 19.
Ferries between Canada and the United States (M. for Ret.) 113.
Importation of Cattle for Breeding Purposes (M. for Ret.) 258.
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) in Com., 1551.
Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1308.
Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1053.
Kingsville Harbor (M. for Reps. of Engineer) 45.
Meteorological Service of Canada (M. for Detailed Statement) 168.
Minister of Public Works' Visit to Ontario: in Com. of Supply, 927.
Niagara, Borough of (remarks) 1573.
Personal explanation of remarks in Com. of Supply, 927.
Quarantine Stations on the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers (M. for Ret.) 327.
Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1210.
Repeal of the Stamp Act (Ques.) 18.
Supply—*Post Office*, 1193.
Ways and Means—on Res. in Com. (fruit trees) 528.

PLUMB, Mr. J. B., *Niagara*

- Boundaries of Ontario (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply) 661.
Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (Ont.) Act Amt. B. 131 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 1509.
Concurrence—Intercolonial (Rolling Stock) 1328.

PLUMB, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

- Cottons and Woollens, Duties on, on Res. (*Mr. Anglin*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1181.
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 176.
Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 693.
Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M. for Ret.) 52, 65.
Government Land Policy in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 840.
Hardware, Standard Prices for (Ques.) 1108.
Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 537, 1280.
Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beatty*) on 1°, 609.
Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock, on M. for Ret., 121; on Conc., 1328.
Legal Tender Notes, on Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1118.
Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1424.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 486.
Meteorological Service of Canada, on M. for Stmt, 163.
Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 941, 944.
Niagara, Borough of (remarks) 1573.
Ontario Boundary, North and West (M. for Paps. and Cor.) 19.
Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1348.
Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. 103 (*Mr. Boulton*) in Com., 1105.
Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1356; on M. for Com., 1406.
Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 276.
Supply—*Charges of Management*, 598, 600; *Civil Government* (Justice) 601; *Fisheries*, 1557; *Miscellaneous* (Niagara Falls Commission) 1558.
Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com., 554.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 229; in Com. on Res. (glass, &c.) 526; (fruit trees) 529; (table-glass, &c.) 531.

POPE, Hon. J. H., *Compton*

- Accommodation for Immigrants at Winnipeg (Ans.) 255.
Census, The, Message, 42; Report of Minister of Agriculture respecting the taking of (presented) 58; on further information (Ans.) 72; on M. for Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 165.
Charges against Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, on M. for reading the Journals, 481.

POPE, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*

- Concurrence—Care of Archives, 1309; Census, 1309; Health Statistics, 1310; Quarantine, 1310.
 Emigrants booked for Canada, on M. for Statement, 46.
 Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co. Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Gault) on M. for 2°, 489.
 German Delegates, Report of (Ans.) 254.
 Immigrant Sheds in the North-West (Ans.) 478.
 Immigration, arrangements for Promotion of, on M. for Ret., 258.
 Importation of Cattle for Breeding Purposes, on M. for Ret., 258.
 Information as to Census (Ans.) 36.
 Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c., on M. for Copies of Circulars, 286.
 John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (Mr. Ryan, Montreal) on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 6 m. h., 488.
 Ministerial Explanations, 26.
 Number of Settlers in the North-West in 1881 (Ans.) 36.
 Patent Act (1872) Amt. (B. 155, 1°*) 1253; on 2° and in Com., 1542.
 Population of British Columbia by last Census (Ans.) 35.
 Potts, Thomas, Letters addressed to, on M. for Cor., 375.
 Statistical Bureau at Winnipeg (Ans.) 255.
 Supply—Civil Government (Agriculture) 656; Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Care of Archives) 786; (Patent Record) 847; (Criminal Statistics) 847; (Census) 847; (Health Statistics) 847; Immigration, 848, 1505, 1506; Immigration and Quarantine, 850.

RICHEY, Mr. M. H., *Halifax*

- Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (Sir Leonard Tilley) in Com. on Res., 1517.
 Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (Mr. Beaty) on 1°, 613.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) in Com., 326.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Senate Amts., 1567.
 Supply—Miscellaneous (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1274.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 514.

RINFRET, Mr. C. J., *Lotbinière*

- Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Mousseau) 1285.
 St. Emilie Lighthouse (Ques.) 615.
 St. Flavien Mail Service (Ques.) 222; in Com. of Supply, 1193.
 St. Roch des Aulnets Harbor, Survey of (Ques.) 1230.
 Supply—Post Office, 1193.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 214.

ROBERTSON, Mr. T., *Hamilton*

- Evidence in Criminal Cases Law Amt. B. (Ques.) 313.
 Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (Mr. Beaty) on 1°, 608.

ROBERTSON, Mr. T.—*Con.*

- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Act Amt. (B. 115, 1°) 376.
 South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co. Act Amt. (B. 76, 1°*) 229.
 Supply—Public Works—Income (Ottawa Geological Museum) 1266.
 Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Shaw) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. McLennan) 551.

ROBERTSON, Mr. T., *Shelburne*

- Annie Stewart, Tug Boat, Services performed for Government (M. for Statement) 228.
 Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. 121 (Mr. McLelan) in Com., 1131.
 Fog Whistle at Shelburne Harbor (Ques.) 222; (M. for Ret.) 318.
 Importation and Inspection of Pickled Herring, on M. for Ret., 371.
 Importations of Flour, Meal, &c., into Nova Scotia (M. for detailed Statement) 228.
 Lighthouse at West Head Cape, Sable Island (Ques.) 222.
 Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees Charged, on M. for Ret., 1240.
 Supply—Ocean and River Service (Removal of Obstructions) 866; Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 867; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 869; Fisheries (Salaries, &c., of Overseers and Wardens) 872, 875.
 Telegraphic Communication with Sable Island (M. for Cor.) 50.
 Whitby Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 313.

ROCHESTER, Mr. J., *Carleton, Ont.*

- Chaudiere and Gatineau Slides, Timber passed through (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Chinese Immigration (remarks) 1477.
 Dam at Lake Temiscamingue (M. for Ret.) 1251.
 Grenville Canal, Lumber, Laths and Shingles passed through (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Lumber, Shingles and Laths Shipped from Kingston, Brockville and Prescott (M. for Ret.) 1121.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (Mr. Cameron, Victoria) in Com. (remarks on Commercial Agencies) 934; on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 936.
 North-Western Bank Incorp. (B. 29, 1°*) 57.
 Ottawa Agricultural Ins. Co. winding-up (B. 30, 1°*) 57.
 Ottawa, Lumber, Shingles and Laths Shipped from (M. for Ret., 1121
 Public Expenditure, on Res. (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1348.
 Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. 103 (Mr. Boulton) in Com., 1106.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1411.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. McLelan) in Com., 1215.

ROGERS, Mr. A., *Albert*

Government Life Insurance Scheme (Ques.) 1107.
Hopewell Corner Post Office (M. for Ret.) 129.
Importation of Sugar, Syrup and Molasses (M. for Ret.) 129.
Supply—Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1028; (Que.) 1445.

Ross, Mr. G. W., *West Middlesex*

Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (Mr. Plumb) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 754.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1005.
Civil Service Appointments (M. for Ret.) 50.
Civil Service B. 36 (Sir Hector Langevin) in Com., 1122, 1157.
Concurrence—Census, 1309.
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (Mr. McCarthy) on Amt. (Mr. McCuaig) 6 m. h., 185.
Customs Receipts for last six months of 1879, '80, '81 (M. for Ret.) 57.
Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 695.
French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply, 1141.
Government Advertising (M. for Ret.) 20.
Government Land Agencies Opened in the North-West Territories (M. for Ret.) 20.
Government Land Policy in the North-West, on Res. (Mr. Charlton) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 844.
Government Printing (M. for Ret.) 19.
High Commission in London, Sums paid, &c. (M. for Ret.) 128.
Indian Agent on River Thames, Complaints against (M. for Ret.) 47.
Indian Commissioner and Secretary's Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for Ret.) 128.
Manitoba Subsidy B. 162 (Sir Leonard Tilley) in Com. on Res., 1423.
Public Expenditure, on Res. (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1344.
Quarterly Statistics of Trade (Res.) 1248.
Report of the Interior (remarks) 222.
Squatters in the North-West Territories (M. for copies of O. C.) 20.
Supply—Charges of Management, 593; *Civil Government* (Militia) 601; (Interior) 605; (Agriculture) 657; (Marine and Fisheries) 657; (Departmental Contingencies) 658; *Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Patent Record) 847; (Health Statistics) 848; *Militia* (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 854; (Drill Pay) 860; (Royal Military College) 864; *Public Works—Income*: (Ottawa Geological Museum) 1266; (Repairs, &c., Parliament Buildings) 1267.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 198; comment on Sir Leonard Tilley's reply, 521.

Ross, Mr. J. S., *Dundas*

Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 6 m. h., 443.

Ross, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*

Legal Tender Notes, on Res. (Mr. Wallace, Norfolk) 1117.
Salaries of Country Postmasters: in Com. of Supply, 1194, 1195.
Supply—Post Office, 1194.
Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Shaw) on Amt. (Mr. McLennan) to 3°, 712.

ROUTHIER, Mr. F., *Prescott*

Petite Nation River Works (Ques.) 172.

ROYAL, Mr. J., *Provencher*

Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (Mr. Plumb) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 741.
Commercial Treaties, on Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1085.
Immigrant Sheds in the North-West (Ques.) 478.
Niagara, Borough of (remarks) 1574.
Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.
Translation and Printing of Land Regulations (Ques.) 558.

RYAN, Mr. J., *Marquette*

Lake Manitoba Water Level (M. for Reps. of Engineers) 57.

RYAN, Mr. M. P., *Montreal Centre*

John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief (B. 104, 1°) 367; on M. for 2°, 487.
Ryan, Thomas, Appointment of, on M. for Cor., 317.
Supply—Montreal Drill Shed, 1355.
Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal B. 122 (Mr. McLellan) in Com. on Res., 660.

RYKERT, Mr. J. C., *Lincoln*

Abolition of Postage on Newspapers B. 161 (Sir Leonard Tilley) in Com. on Res., 1420.
Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (Mr. Plumb) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 756.
Canadian Pacific Ry.: on Conc., 1315.
Charges against Chief Justice Wood, of Manitoba (Amt.) to M. for Special Com., 1235.
Concurrence—Canadian Pacific Ry. Subsidy, 1315.
M. C. Upper, Damages to, in Welland Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1443.
Ministerial Explanations, 34.
Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1387.
Supply—Railways and Canals—Income (Welland Canal, M. C. Upper) 1443.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 376.

RYMAL, Mr. J., *South Wentworth*

Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (Mr. Plumb) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 761.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1014.

RYMAL, Mr. J.—Con.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 1210; on B. 158, in Com., 1414; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1489; on Amt. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 1493.

Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1300.

Supply—*Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 1300.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 471.

SCHULTZ, Mr. J. C., Lisgar

Chief Justice Wood of Manitoba, Charges against (M. for reading the Journals) 372, 481, 1234; M. for Special Com., 1235; on Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) 1237.

Claims of Half-Breeds and Minors under Manitoba Act (M. for Copies) 328.

Import Duties collected between Manitoba and the Rocky Mountains (M. for Ret.) 1120.

Occupation of School Lands in Man. (M. for Cor.) 328.

Roads and Bridges, Aid in construction of (M. for Cor.) 1120.

SCOTT, Mr. T., Selkirk

Accommodation for Immigrants at Winnipeg (Ques.) 255.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Rates (Ques.) 163.

Colonization Societies under Land Regulations (Ques.) 163.

Drill Shed at Winnipeg (Ques.) 163.

Extension of the Boundaries of Manitoba (M. for Copy of Proclamation, &c.) 223.

Improvement of Rapids in Red River (Ques.) 163.

Lock Boxes in Winnipeg Post Office and increased accommodation: in Com. of Supply, 1195.

Manitoba Bank Incorp. (B. 16, 1°*) 47.

Navigation on Water Hen River (Ques.) 163.

School Lands and Squatters in Man. (M. for Cor.) 263.

Statistical Bureau at Winnipeg (Ques.) 255.

Supply—*Post Office*, 1195.

Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 15, 1°*) 47.

SCRIVER, Mr. J., Huntingdon

Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 443.

Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in Second Rep. of Com., 1475.

Fletcher, Lieut.-Col., Retirement of, on M. for Cor., 171.

John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal Centre*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 6 m. h., 488.

Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1531.

Supply—*Indians*, 1505.

Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) to 3°, 717; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) 718.

SHAW, Mr. A., South Bruce

Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beatty*) on 1°, 609.

Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1446.

Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. (B. 66, 1°*) 172; in Com., 552, 555; on M. for 3°, 696; on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) 709, 715; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) 720.

SMITH, Sir ALBERT J., Westmoreland

Bounties to Fishermen (Ques.) 255.

Canadian Pacific Ry. constructed by Government (M. for Ret. showing net and gross earnings) 492.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1012.

Canada Landed Credit Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beatty*) in Com., 1104.

Cape Tormentine Railway (M. for Cor.) 1121, (Ques.) 222.

Charybdis Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1269.

Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 57 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. (Amt.) 1104.

Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1128, 1156, 1189.

Coal Exports from Nova Scotia (M. for Statement) 226.

Collector of Customs at Sackville (M. for Cor.) 282.

Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1201.

County Court Judges B. 112 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1254; in Com. on Res., 1277.

Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 46 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 438.

Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. 121 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 787.

General Port Warden's Act (1874) Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 787; B. in Com., 1190.

Halifax Harbor Master Appointment Act Amt. B. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 788.

Inland Revenue Act Amt., on M. for Com. on Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 540.

Inland Waters Navigation B. 135 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1307.

Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beatty*) on 1°, 612.

Inspection of Factories B. (Ques.) 222.

Judicial Changes in N.B. (M. for Cor.) 1252.

Marine Telegraph (Pacific Coast and Asia) B. 127 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1191.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 323; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 489.

Moffat, Geo., Claim of Heirs for transport of Rails: in Com. of Supply, 1229.

Montreal Harbor Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 130 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 533.

SMITH, Sir ALBERT J.—*Con.*

- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 933; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 946; in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 949.
- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) on 2°, 1261; on B. 142 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 789.
- Protest against lengthy sittings: in Com. of Supply, 926.
- Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. 103 (*Mr. Boulbee*) in Com., 1106.
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. 129 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 535.
- Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 276.
- Salmon Fishing Licenses and Fees Charged, on M. for Ret., 1239.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 546; in Com., 546; in Com. on B., 1214, 1303.
- Supply—*Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 783; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keepers) 867; *Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., of Overseers and Wardens) 870; (Salary of Fishery Overseer McVicar) 1273; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.B.) 1023; Repairs, &c. (Supreme Court) 1265; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1096; (Intercolonial: Claim of Heirs of Geo. Moffatt) 1229; *Miscellaneous* (Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to) 1201; Fishermen's losses through storms) 1274; *Public Works—Capital* (Ottawa) 1265; *Income* (Compensation to McHale for damages to land) 1268; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1269; (Buoys and Beacons, Montreal) 1272; *Administration of Justice* (*Russell vs. Woodward*) 1276.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) in Com., 555; on Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) 719.
- Tonnage Dues at Quebec and Montreal, in Com. on Res., 535.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 660.
- Upper Canada Bank, Claims against, B. 171 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on Res., 533.

SNOWBALL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, N.B.*

- Miramichi River, Wharves, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1121.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 943; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 946.
- Supply—*Fisheries* (Salaries, &c., Overseers and Wardens) 872; *Public Works—Income*: Public Buildings (N.B.) 1023.
- Ways and Means*—on the Budget, 493.

SPOULE Mr. T. S., *East Grey*

- Agricultural Interests, on M. for Sel. Com., 127.
- Cadets in Military College, on M. for Ret., 191.

SPOULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

- Fuel and Broadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 640.
- Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*) on 1°, 612.
- Interest on Money Secured by Mortgage B. 49 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2°, 268.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 936.
- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1330.
- Quarterly Statistics of Trade, on Res. (*Mr. Foss, Middlesex*) 1248.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1453.
- Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1298.
- Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 275.
- Shipping Disasters in Inland Waters (M. for Ret.) 116.
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 547.
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1533.
- Supply—*Civil Government* (Secretary of State) 602, 604; *Militia* (Drill Pay, &c.) 1298.
- Temporalities Fund Management Act Amt. B. 66 (*Mr. Shaw*) on Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) to 3°, 709.
- Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1080.
- Ways and Means*—in Com. on Res. (fruit trees) 528; on Conc. (salt) 1498.

SPEAKER, The (Hon. J. G. BLANCHET) *Lévis*

- Address to Her Majesty on Her Escape, rep. from Senate, 200, 224.
- Agricultural Interests, M. for Sel. Com.: on objection (*Mr. Trow*) 128.
- Boundaries of Ontario, Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply: on objection (*Mr. Mousseau*) to Member speaking twice, 754.
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*): on objection (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Member having spoken, 1004.
- Charges against Chief Justice Wood, on M. (*Mr. Schultz*) for reading the Journals, 1235.
- Claim of Jos. Chas. Lislois: on objection (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to Ques., 73.
- Controverted Elections (Argenteuil and Bellechasse) Judges' Reprs., 1.
- French Domination (*Mr. Tassé*) reference to a past Deb., 1133.
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) on Ques. as to Amts. likely to be made by Senate, 1552.
- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy: on objections to mode of recording vote, 1068.

SPEAKER, The—*Con.*

- Language, unparliamentary (Budget Deb.) 242.
 Latitude in Budget Deb.: on objection (*Mr. Domville*)
 to quoting from copious notes, 355.
 Librarian's Rep. (presented) 3.
 Messages from His Excellency, 1, 42, 58, 69, 192, 1102,
 1313, 1402, 1525.
 Military Schools for the Infantry Service: on objection
 (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to Ques., 73.
 New Members, 1, 172, 696.
 On permission of a member to ask a question, 1303.
 Personal Explanation in Budget Deb. (*Mr. Plumb*) 452.
 Prevention of Fraud in Public Contracts: on Ques. of
 Order (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Res. (*Mr. Cas-*
grain) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1435.
 Question of Privilege (*Mr. Bunster*) on injustice done
 to B. C. Ports, 853.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir*
John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of
 Order (*Mr. Blake*) 1332.
 Receipts and Disbursements of H. of C. (presented) 18.
 Speech from the Throne (rep.) 1.
 Stadacona Insurance Co. Winding-up B. 6 (*Mr. Cas-*
grain): on constitutionality of B., 48.
 Stamp Acts Repeal B. 63 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) re-
 ported from Senate, 183.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*)
 on objection (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to M. for Com.
 on Res., 546.
 Supply—*Legislation* (Grant to Library) 784, 785.
 Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr.*
Kirkpatrick) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (*Mr. Bechard*)
 1080.
 Vacancies, (Announcement) 1.
 Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry.
 B. 156 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, on Ques.
 of Order (*Mr. Borden*) 1548.
 [See also *Order, Privilege and Procedure.*]

STEPHENSON, Mr. R., *Chatham*

- Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First
 Rep. of Com., 691; Second Rep., 1473; Third
 Rep., 1476; Fourth Rep., 1555.
 Indemnity to certain Members (Res.) 1315.
 Mail accommodation between Belleville and Toronto
 (M. for Copies of Petitions, &c.) 41.
 Rond Eau Harbor of Refuge, Vessels entered and de-
 parted (M. for Rets.) 45.

STRANGE, Mr. F. W., *North York*.

- Cadets, number of, in Military College (M. for Ret.) 190.
 Fletcher, Lieut.-Col., Retirement of, on M. for Cor., 171.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization
 B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com. (Amts.)
 489, 492.
 Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. (B.
 72, 1°*) 220.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A.*
Macdonald) in Com., 1414.

SUTHERLAND, Mr. J., *North Oxford*

- Act respecting Grand Juries (M. for Cor. withdn.) 223.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John*
A. Macdonald) in Com., 1417; on M. for 3° (Amt.)
 1479.

TASSÉ, Mr. J., *Ottawa City*

- French Domination, on M. for Com. of Supply, 1132.
 Question of Privilege (paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*)
 990.
 Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.
 Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories Incorp.
 (B. 92, 1°*) 289.

TELLIER, Mr. L., *St. Hyacinthe*

- Fletcher, Thomas, Sentence of and Petition to be set at
 Liberty (M. for Ret.) 328.
 Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of, on Res. (*Mr.*
Laurier) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 649.
 Imports and Exports at St. Hyacinthe (M. for State-
 ment) 256.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on prop. Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*)
 1283; on B. 168, in Com. (Amt.) 1551, 1552.

THOMPSON, Mr. D., *Haldimand*

- Militia Clothing and Accoutrements (Ques.) 1106.
 North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation
 B. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 328; in
 Com. on Res., 545.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John*
A. Macdonald) in Com., 1415; (Amt.) 1486.
 Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 58, 1°) 162; on M. for 2°, 281.
 Supply—*Militia* (Ammunition, Clothing, &c.) 860.

TILLEY, Sir S. L., *St. John, N.B.*

- Abolition of Postage on Newspapers (Ans.) 36.
 Adjournment for Ash Wednesday (m.) 57; Easter, 762.
 Auditor-General's Rep. (presented) 18.
 Bounties to Fishermen (Ans.) 255, 369; (B. 177, Res.
 prop.) 875; in Com., 1511, 1514.
 Brown Sheetings and Bleached Shirtings (Ans.) 320.
 Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (Ont.)
 Act Amt. (B. 131, 2° and in Com.) 1509.
 Canada Landed Credit Co. Act Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beaty*)
 in Com., 1104.
 Canadian Extradition Act, on M. for Cor., 38.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Royal Commission, Rep. of Evi-
 dence (presented) 773.
 Canadian Tobacco, Sale and Manufacture of (Ans.) 19.
Charbydis Training Ship: in Com. of Supply, 1270.
 Civil Service B. 36 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1128.
 Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply,
 1199.
 Concurrence—Charges of Management, 1208; Mail Sub-
 sidies (Canada and Brazil) 1312; (Halifax
 and St. Pierre) 1312; (Prince Edward Island and
 Great Britain) 1311; (Port Mulgrave and East Bay,
 C.B.) 1501; Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 1312;
 Indians, 1312; Adulteration of Food, 1312;
 Grant to Library, 1499; Culling Timber,

TILLEY, Sir S. L.—*Con.**Concurrence—Con.*

- 1501; Penitentiaries (Balance due S. L. Bedson) 1559; (*Man.*) 1559; Reimbursement to Diana Fox, 1559.
- Cottons and Woollens, Duties on, on Res. (*Mr. Anclin*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1177.
- Cottons, Cost of Canadian and Foreign, on M. for Ret., 313.
- Customs Acts Amt. (B. 169, 1^o*) 1498.
- Deficits in Post Office Service: in Com. of Supply, 1193, —1195.
- Drawbacks on Articles used in construction of Canadian Pacific Ry. B. 141 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 1255.
- Dry Docks Construction Aid (B. 173, Res. prop.) 1254; in Com. and 1^o, 1550.
- Duties on Carboys (Ans.) 477.
- Duty on Land Plaster (Ans.) 255.
- Estimates, The (notification) 45; Message, 58; referred to Com. of Supply, 58; Suppl. Est., 1881-82, Message, 69; further Suppl. for 1881-82, Message, 1313; Suppl. for 1882-83, Message, 1314; further Suppl. for 1882-83, Message, 1535.
- Factory Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 46; (presented) 58.
- Franchise for the Dominion (M. to adjn. Deb.) 256.
- General Business, bringing down Returns (remarks) 721.
- Government circulation of Four Dollar Bills (Ans.) 222.
- Government Commissioner at Paris (Ans.) 45.
- Government Life Insurance Scheme (Ans.) 1107.
- Inland Revenue Act Amt., on Res. (M. to adjn. Deb.) 541.
- Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations (B. 145, 1^o*) 853.
- Inspection Act (1874) Amt. (B. 157, Res. in Com. and 1^o) 1255; 2^o and in Com., 1472.
- Iron Industry, on Res. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1223.
- John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 6 m. h., 488.
- Legal Tender Notes, on Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1113.
- Manitoba Subsidy (B. 162, Res. prop.) 721; in Com., 1420; M. for 3^o 1568; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1569.
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 130, Res. in Com. and 1^o) 533.
- New Westminster Election, introduction of Member (Res.) 696.
- Official Visits to England, on M. for Ret., 37.
- Parliamentary Printing and Establishment of a Government Printing Office: in Com. of Supply, 1198.
- Postage on Newspapers, Free (B. 161, Res. in Com. and 1^o*) 1419.
- Public Debt (Ans.) 254.
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1334.
- Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. 103 (*Mr. Boulton*) in Com., 1106.
- Quarterly Statistics of Trade, on Res. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1248.

TILLEY, Sir S. L.—*Con.*

- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. (B. 129, Res. in Com., and 1^o) 534.
- Redistribution of Seats B. (remarks) 1068.
- Repeal of the Stamp Act (Ans.) 18.
- Salaries of Judges (B. 179, Res. prop.) 1253; M. for Com., 1560; in Com. on B., 1561.
- Statement of Unforeseen Expenses (presented) 18.
- St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1433.
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res. 1532.
- Supply—Res. for Com., 18; on formal vote, 58; *Charges of Management*, 593; *Civil Government* (Justice) 601; (Penitentiaries Branch) 601; (Interior) 605; (Indian Affairs) 606; (Auditor-General's Office) 606; (Railways and Canals) 657; (Departmental Contingencies) 658; (Stationery Office) 658; (Post Office) 1506; (Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner) 659; (additional expenditure) 1504; (Post Office and Finance Depts., Contingencies) 1276, 1506; *Penitentiaries* (Kingston) 781; (*Man.*) 1505; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1506; *Legislation* (Salaries of Officers, additional, and Contingencies of Library) 785; *Post Office*, 1193; *Miscellaneous* (Printing) 1197; (Unforeseen Expenses) 1198; (Army and Navy, Articles imported for) 1198; (North-West Territory, Government in) 1199; (Keewatin, Government in) 1199; (Fishermen's losses through storms) 1274; (Claim of Reuben Lunt) 1558; (*Waterbury, D. H.*, Compensation to) 1199; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1270; (Buoys and Beacons, Montreal) 1272; *Administration of Justice* (*Russell vs. Woodward*) 1276; *Unprovided Items*, 1292.
- Supply (B. 178, 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*) 1559.
- Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Act Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1079.
- Trust and Land Improvement Fund, on M. for Cor., 40.
- Upper Canada Bank, Claims against (B. 171, Res. in Com.) 532; on 2^o of Res., 1503; 1^o*, 1521.
- Ways and Means*—Res. for Com., 18; Budget Speech, 78; reply, 517 [for Debate see *WAYS AND MEANS*]; Ans. on Res., 524; in Com. on Res. (sulphate of quinine) 524; (blasting powder) 525; (glass, &c.) 525; (white lead) 526; (sand and emery paper) 526; (silver plate glass) 526; (spirits) 526; (salt) 526; (boilers and iron tubing) 528; (mustard and mustard cake) 528; (paraffine, wax, &c.) 528; (fruit trees) 528; (table-glass) 529; (stoves, &c.) 531; Res. agreed to, 531; on Conc. (salt) 1496; Res. rep. from Com., 1559. See *Supply Bill*.

TROW, Mr. J., *South Perth*

- Abolition of Postage on Newspapers (Ques.) 36.
- Agricultural Interests, M. for Sel. Com. objected to, no notice having been given of names, 128.
- Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 760.

TROW, Mr. J.—*Con.*

- Government Savings Bank at Lockport (Ques.) 477.
 North-West Mounted Police, in Com. on Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*), 543.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1417, 1457; on M. for 3° (Amts.) 1482, 1486, 1489.
Supply—Public Works—Income: Public Buildings (Man.) 1025; Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1028; (Man.) 1028; (N.W.T.) 1028; *Indians* (N.W.T.) 1185.
 Timber Licenses, System of Granting, on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 569.

TUPPER, Sir CHARLES, *Cumberland*

- Accidents on the Intercolonial Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1100.
 Accidents on the Prince Edward Island Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1154.
 Bounties to Fishermen B. 177 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. on Res., 1514.
 Bridge Crossing Rivière du Loup (Ans.) 110.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Branch Lines, on M. for Maps or Plans, 55.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rates (Ans.) 163.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rep., on M. (*Mr. Blake*) 55.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction (B. 144, 1°) 852; on 2° (General Statement with respect to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Ry. and progress of Contract by the Syndicate) 950; (Explanations) 1014; on 3°, 1029.
 Canadian Pacific Ry., Route through the Rocky Mountains (Ans.) 558.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Savona's Ferry and Port Moody, on M. for Copies of Advertisements, &c., 56.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Sub-Contracts, on M. for Copies, 481.
 Canadian Pacific Ry. Tariff, Classification of Articles under (Ans.) 1108.
 Cape Tormentine Ry. (Ans.) 222.
 Cape Traverse Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1437.
 Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 57 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com., 1103.
 Chignecto Ship Ry. Subsidy (B. 167, prop. Res.) 1403; in Com. on Res., 1468; 1°, 1472; 2° and in Com., 1549.
 Claim of Jos. Chas. Lislois (Ans.) 73, 615.
 Claim of Lucien Morin (Ans.) 615.
 Concurrence—Canadian Pacific Ry., 1315; Intercolonial (Rolling Stock) 1318; *M. C. Upper*, Damages to, on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1535.
 Consolidated Ry. Act Amt. (B. 143, 1°) 851.
 Contracts for British Columbia Section of Canadian Pacific Ry. (laid on Table) 220.
 Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 174.
 Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 690; Second Rep., 1474.
 Deposits by Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., on M. for Statement, 166.

TUPPER, Sir CHARLES—*Con.*

- Disallowance of Railway Charters (Ans.) 558.
 Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 12 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2°, 264.
 Emory-Savona Contracts of Canadian Pacific Ry., and Steel Rails for same (Ans.) 19.
 Employment of Telephone on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 221.
 English Bay as permanent terminus of Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1097.
 Extension of Intercolonial Ry. to Halifax: in Com. of Supply, 1437.
 Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co. Act. Amt. B. 105 (*Mr. Gault*) in Com., 928.
 General Business, bringing down Returns (remarks) 721.
 Government Land Policy in the North-West, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 828.
 Haggas' Water Elevators (Ans.) 73.
 Harbor and River Police of Canada B. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1427.
 Harbor Works in Nova Scotia, on M. for Reps. of Engineers, 263.
 Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Rys. Branch Lines (B. 175, 1°*) 1555.
 Intercolonial Ry. Coal Hoppers, on M. for Ret., 479.
 Intercolonial Ry. Earnings per train mile (corrected Ret. presented) 1161.
 Intercolonial Ry. Employés, on M. for Ret., 189.
 Intercolonial Ry. Employés Remuneration: in Com. of Supply, 1099.
 Intercolonial Ry., Free Importation of Goods for (Ans.) 73.
 Intercolonial Ry. Mileage, Cost of Working, on M. for Ret., 320.
 Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock and Purchase of Stores Rets. (Ans.) 876; in Com. of Supply, 1148; on Conc., 1318, 1325; (Ret. presented) 1521.
 International Construction Co. Incorp. B. 75 (*Mr. Boutbee*) in Com., 888, 928.
 Kingston and Pembroke Ry., Complaints against the Location, &c., on M. for Cor., 481.
M. C. Upper, Schooner, Claim for Damages to (Ans.) 1231; in Com. of Supply, 1443; on Conc. on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1535.
 Ministerial Explanations, 24.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 935; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 941; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to 3°, 947.
 Murray Canal Survey (Ans.) 18.
 Ocean Mail Clerks: in Com. of Supply, 1192.
 Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for, on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 574; remarks after vote, 582; in Com. of Supply, 1097.
 Port Moody and Yale Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., on M. for approximate quantities, 167.
 Prince Edward Island Ry. Rates, on M. for Statement, 115.

TUPPER, Sir CHARLES—*Con.*

- Printing for Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. or Dominion Lands Office (Ans.) 1107.
 Public Accounts, 1880, on M. to refer items to Com., 483.
 Public Business, State of (remarks) 428.
 Raceway and Feeder, Welland Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1438.
 Railway Ferry at Quebec (Ans.) 36.
 Railway Inspection Fund (Ans.) 363.
 Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (M. to transfer to Government Orders) 1155.
 Railways and Canals Rep. (presented) 18.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Senate Amts., 1563.
 Report of the Minister of Interior (Ans.) 36.
 Returns of Railway Contracts (remarks) 493.
 Rimouski, Wharf at (Ans.) 478.
 Rolling Stock, on Ms. for Ret., 56, 121.
 Sale of Lands by Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., on M. for Statement, 372.
 Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 274; on M. to transfer to Government Orders, 851.
 Sale of Steamer *Rimouski* (Ans.) 1108.
 Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. 110 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1511.
 Shipping Disasters in Inland Waters, on M. for Ret. (Ans.) 117.
 St. Anne's Lock and Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1438.
 St. Charles Branch Ry. and Ferry: in Com. of Supply, 1436.
 Steamers on Bay Chaleurs (Ans.) 48.
 St. John, increased accommodation at: in Com. of Supply, 1099.
 St. Lawrence below Prescott, Improvement of the (Ans.) 36.
 Subsidies to Rys. (B. 176, Res. prop.) 1521, 1526; in Com., 1553; in Com. on B., 1555.
 Subsidy to Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
 Supply—Charges of Management, 596, 599, 600; *Mail Subsidies* (France and Quebec) 865; (Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S.) 865; (P.E.I. and Great Britain) 866; *Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 868; (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms) 870; *Railways and Canals—Capital: Railways* (Canadian Pacific Ry.) 1095; (Intercolonial) 1099; (Rolling Stock) 1230; St. Charles Branch and Ferry) 1463; (P. E. I. and Cape Traverse Ry.) 1437; (General) 1102; Canals (Lachine) 1145; (St. Lawrence River and Canal, 1145; (Welland) 1145, 1438; (Carillon Canal, Dam and Slide) 1146; (Grenville) 1146; (Murray) 1146; (Williamsburg) 1438; (St. Anne's Lock and Canal) 1438; (Trent River Nav.) 1439; (River Tay Canal) 1442; *Income: Canals* (Lachine: Dredging Basin No. 4) 1148; (Welland: *M. C. Upper*) 1443; *Collection of Revenues* (Intercolonial) 1148, 1230; (Repairs, &c.) 1230; (Windsor Branch)

TUPPER, Sir CHARLES—*Con.*

- 1230; *Post Office*, 1192; *Charges on Revenue* (P. E. I. Ry.) 1444; *Fisheries*, 1557.
 Tay Canal Works: in Com. of Supply, 1442.
 Telegraphic Communication with Sable Island, on M. for Ret., 50.
 Telegraph Lines, Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
 Tenders for Dominion Canals, on M. for Copies, 117.
 Thunder Bay to Red River, Canadian Pacific Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1095.
 Trent River Navigation: in Com. of Supply, 1439.
 Trent Valley Canal Location Survey, &c. (Ans.) 36.
 Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1130.
 Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) to 3°, 1079.
 Vancouver Island Ry.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
 Ways and Means—on the Budget, 129.
 Welland Canal Aqueduct, Contract for (presented) 18.
 Welland Canal, Contract for Section 27 (remarks on papers brought down) 320; on M. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) of Want of Confidence, 1241, 1246.
 Welland Canal, Damage to Lock No. 1 (Ans.) 1108.
 Welland Canal Tenders (remarks), 34.
 Wharf and Elevator at Halifax: in Com. of Supply, 1101, 1153.
 Williamsburg Canal, new Weirs: in Com. of Supply, 1438.
 Windsor and Annapolis Ry. Earnings, on M. for Statement, 171.
 Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. (B. 156, 1°) 1253; M. for 2° 1543; in Com. (Amt.) 1549.

TYRWHITT, Mr. R., *South Simcoe*

- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy (remarks on vote) 1067.

VALIN, Mr. P. V., *Montmorency*

- Accidents on Government Rys. (M. for Ret.) 285.
 Canadian-built Vessels in France (M. for Cor.) 284.
 Export of Quebec Manufactures to B.C. (M. for Statement) 284.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1329.
 Vessels Registered in Quebec (M. for Statement) 288.

VALLÉE, Mr. R. P., *Portneuf*

- Canadian Tobacco, Sale and Manufacture of (Ques.) 18.
 General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 85, 1°*) 269.
 Government Commissioner at Paris (Ques.) 45.
 Inland Revenue Act Amt., on M. for Com. on Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 538.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1262, 1329.
 Point aux Trembles, Wharf at (M. for Rep. of Eng.) 44.
 Stadacona Insurance Co. Winding up B. 6 (*Mr. Chasgrain*) on M. for 2°, 47.

- VALLÉE, Mr. R. P.—*Con.***
St. Raymond and St. Casimir, Savings Banks at (Ques.) 478.
- VANASSE, Mr. F., *Yamaska***
Canadian Tobacco, Amount of Duties Collected on (M. for Statement) 47.
Canadian Tobacco, Treatise on (Ques.) 46.
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 168 (*Mr. Mousseau*) in Com. (Amt.) 1553.
Militia Expenditure in Canada (M. for Statement) 327.
Montreal Harbor Commissioners, Powers of (Ques.) 477.
Montreal Harbor Commissioners Regulations and Complaints of Boatmen (M. for Copy) 1252.
P. O. Savings Banks at La Baie or St. Thomas de Pierreville (Ques.) 558.
River St. Francis Floating of Cordwood Regulation (B. 118, 1°) 428.
- WADE, Mr. J. C., *Digby***
Clements Steamship Co. Incorp. (B. 31, 1°*) 57.
Conquerall Bank Post Office (M. for Ret.) 1253.
- WALLACE, Mr. N. C., *West York***
Customs Circulars, Memoranda, &c., relating to Importations under Tariff from 1874 to 1879 (M. for Ret.) 228.
Glen, Capt., Case of (M. for Cor.) 493.
Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1066.
Railway Crossings in Toronto (M. for Ret.) 227.
Rainy River, Water Power at Rat Portage (M. for Ret.) 228.
- WALLACE, Mr. W., *South Norfolk***
Canada Landed Credit Co's. Acts Amt. B. 47 (*Mr. Beaty*) in Com., 1104.
Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 442.
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 177.
Franchise for the Domiuion (Res.) 255.
Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*) on 1°, 607.
Legal Tender Notes (Res.) 1109, 1117.
Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 938.
Postal Savings Bank System (Ques.) 1108.
Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. Co. B. 103 (*Mr. Boulton*) 1105.
Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 276.
Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1078.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 300.
- WELDON, Mr. C. W., *St. John, N.B.***
Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western, on Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 749.
- WELDON, Mr. C. W.—*Con.***
Calais and St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. (B. 97, 1°*) 289.
Charges against Fishery Warden Mowatt (Ques.) 1108.
Compensation to D. H. Waterbury: in Com. of Supply, 1199.
Concurrence—Intercolonial (Rolling Stock) 1328.
Delay in Lower Provinces Mails (remarks) 990.
Disallowance of Streams Bill, on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 904.
Fish Hatcheries in N.B. (Ques.) 1108.
Fishing Leases and Licenses (M. for Ret.) 172.
Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c. (M. for Copies of Circulars) 285.
Intercolonial Ry. Train Casualties (M. for Ret.) 288; in Com. of Supply, 1153; on Conc., 1328.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 324.
Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 946.
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. McLelan*) on 2°, 1260.
Regulation of the Fisheries (M. for Ret.) 171.
St. John Custom House, Contract for (M. for Statement of Payments, &c.) 1121.
Supply—*Mail Subsidies* (Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S.) 865; *Collection of Revenues* (Intercolonial) 1153; *Miscellaneous* (Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to) 1199; *Public Works—Income*: Repairs, &c. (Supreme Court) 1266; *Administration of Justice* (*Russell vs. Woodward*) 1276.
- WHELEB, Mr. G., *North Ontario***
Duty on Land Plaster (Ques.) 255.
Haggas' Water Elevators (Ques.) 73.
Salaries of Country Postmasters (Ques.) 46.
Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1481.
- WHITE, Mr. J., *East Hastings***
Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 6 m. h., 441.
Drawbacks on Goods manufactured for Export, on M. for Ret., 76.
Interest on Money secured by Mortgage B. 49 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2°, 267.
Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1065; remarks on vote, 1067.
Murray Canal, Completion of (Ques.) 18.
New York and Ontario Furnace Co. (B. 65, 1°*) 172.
Question of Privilege (paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*) 1534.
Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 5 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 278.
Sessional Messengers, Remuneration of (remarks) 1572.
Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) on Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) to 3°, 1079.

WHITE, Mr. P., North Renfrew

- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 6 m. h., 185.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 934.
 Pembroke and the Canada Central Ry. Bonus (M. for Ret.) 483.
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co. Incorpor. Act Amt. (B. 86, 1^o*) 288.
 Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. 122 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1130.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 457.

WHITE, Mr. T., Cardwell

- Debates, Official Report of, on M. to concur in First Rep. of Com., 691.
 International Construction Co. Incorpor. B. 75 (*Mr. Boulbee*) in Com., 888.
 John Dickenson Brunton Patent Relief B. 104 (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 6 m. h., 488.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) in Com., 326.
 Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) in Com. (Amts.) 934, 937; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 942; on M. for 3^o (Amts.) 948, 949.
 Patent Act (1880) Amt. B. 155 (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) in Com., 1543.
 Personal Explanation (remarks respecting newspaper paragraph) 368.
 Readjustment of the Representation B. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1451.

WHITE, Mr. T.—Con.

- Sugar Duties, Amendment of, on Res. (*Mr Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 768.
 Sun Mutual Life Assurance Co. B. 4 (*Mr. Gault*) on M. for 3^o, 311, 429.
 Telegraph (Word) Declaratory (B. 166, 1^o*) 1455; in Com., 1570.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 404.

WILLIAMS, Mr. A. T. H., East Durham

- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy (remarks on vote) 1017.
 Maritime Jurisdiction Act (Ques.) 110.
 Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1300.
 Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co. Incorpor. (B. 43, 1^o*) 78.
Supply—Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1300; *Railways and Canals—Capital* (Trent River Nav.) 1442.
 Western Bank of Canada Incorpor. (B. 133, 1^o*) 541.

WRIGHT, Mr. A., Ottawa County

- Ireland, Resolutions of Sympathy, on Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1049.
 Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1344.
 Ross, Lieut.-Col., Censure of, in *Gazette*: in Com. of Supply, 1300.
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 117 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 548.
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 176 (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on prop. Res., 1525.
Supply—Militia (Contingencies and Grants to Associations) 863; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1300; *Ocean and River Service* (*Charybdis* Training Ship) 1271.

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- ABBOTT, J. J. C., *Argenteuil*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction of, 3.
- ABOLITION OF POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 36; Res. prop. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1330.
- Abolition of Postage on Newspapers B. No. 161** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 1419; 1°*, 1420; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1550. (45 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- ACCIDENTS ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS: M. for Documents (*Mr. Valin*) 285.
- ACCOMMODATION FOR IMMIGRANTS AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 255.
- ACT RESPECTING LAVAL UNIVERSITY, disallowed: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 40.
- ACT RESPECTING MINES, QUEBEC, disallowed: M. for Copies (*Mr. Laurier*) 40.
- ACTS OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 39.
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH: *moved* (*Mr. Bergeron*) 3; *sec.* (*Mr. Guillet*) 6; agreed to, 18.
- ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY ON HER ESCAPE, 200; Res. 201; from Senate, 224; acknowledgment of receipt, 228; Message from H. E. expressing thanks from the Queen, 1102.
- ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER: M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 762.
- Administration of Criminal Justice in disputed Territories of Ont. and Man. Act Amt. B. No. 109** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 376; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1259. (45 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN MANITOBA: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 54.
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. See SUPPLY.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1.
- ADMINISTRATOR OF THE GOVERNMENT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Killam*) 115.
- ADMISSION OF LIVE STOCK INTO CANADA: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 44.
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD: Conc., 1312.
- Adultery, Seduction, &c. (Criminal Law Amt.) B. No. 25** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°, 47; M. for 2° carried (Y. 107, N. 16) 327; ref. to Special Com., 327.
- ADVERTISING, GOVERNMENT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- AGED EMPLOYEES IN THE MILITIA: Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 72.
- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR INDIANS: in Com. of Supply, 1185.
- AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 126; declared out of order (*Mr. Speaker*) 128; M. for Sel. Com. carried, 257.
- AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Supply, 656.
- Agricultural (Ottawa) Insurance Co.'s Winding-up B. No. 30** (*Mr. Rochester*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- ALGOMA, FORMATION OF VOLUNTEER COMPANIES IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 319; in Com. of Supply, 860.
- ALLEN, CAPT., DISMISSAL OF: M. for Papers (*Mr. Mills*) 319.
- ALMA (N.B.) POST OFFICE, ROBBERY AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Donville*) 1240.
- Amalgamation of Franchises, Rights, Privileges, &c., of Railway Co.'s Regulation B. No. 116** (*Mr. McCuaig*). 1°*, 416.
- AMENDMENT OF THE SUGAR DUTIES. See *Sugar Duties*.
- American Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 79** (*Mr. Colby*). 1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com., 444; 3°, 486. (45 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- American Telegraph and Cable Co. B. No. 17** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 221; 3°, 429; B. withdn., 1571.
- AMMUNITION, MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF: in Com. of Supply, 855.
- AMYOT, G., *Bellechasse*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction of, 1.
- Anchor Marine Ins. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 58** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 201.
- ANDREW ONDERDONK'S CHEQUE Deposited with Tender: M. for Copy (*Mr. Guthrie*) 229.
- ANNAPOLIS, PIER AT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Killam*) 55.
- "ANNIE STEWART" TUG BOAT, Services performed for Government: M. for Statement (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 223.
- ANNUITY PAYMENTS TO INDIANS: in Com. of Supply, 1185.
- APPEALS TO THE SUPREME COURT: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 164.
- APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION TO REVISE CANADIAN STATUTES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 492.
- APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS RYAN: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Coursol*) 316.
- APPOINTMENTS TO CIVIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 50.
- APPRAISERS, CUSTOMS' BOARD OF: in Com. of Supply, £51.
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Supply, 786; Conc. 1309.
- ARGENTEUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep. declaring Election null and void, 1.

ABISAIG PIER, N.S.: M. for copies of Reps. of Engineers (*Mr. McIsaac*) 258.

ARMAMENT OF THE VOLUNTEERS: in Com. of Supply, 855.

ARMY AND NAVY, ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR USE OF: in Com. of Supply, 1198.

Arnprior and Ottawa Junction Ry. Co. Incorp.

B. No. 18 (*Mr. Domville*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68; in Com., 221; 3^o*, 263. (45 *Vic.*, c. 74.)

ARREARS DUE GOVERNMENT ON SALE OF LANDS IN MANITOBA, N.W.T., &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 19.

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS. See *Supply*.

Athabaska (Lake) Hudson Bay Ry. Co. Incorp.

B. No. 62 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 162; 2^o*, 201; in Com. and 3^o*, 615. (45 *Vic.*, c. 83.)

ATTEMPT ON THE QUEEN'S LIFE: Telegraphic Despatch read (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 183; Message from H. E. expressing thanks from the Queen, 1102.

AUCTION SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS AT WINNIPEG: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mills*) 1121.

AUDITOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF: in Com. of Supply, 606.

Bank of Manitoba Incorp. B. No. 16 (*Mr. Scott*).

1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

Bank of Prince Edward Island Relief B. No. 38

(*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*, 72. (45 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

BARRINGTON HARBOR (N.S.) Lighthouse on West Head Cape, Sable Island: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 222; in Com. of Supply, 870.

BAY CHALEURS, STEAMERS on: Ques. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 48.

BAYFIELD BREAKWATER, N.S.: M. for Copies of Reps. of Engineers (*Mr. McIsaac*) 258.

BAY OF FUNDY, COAST OF: Ques. (*Mr. Killam*) in Com. of Supply, 867.

Bay of Fundy (N.B.) Erection of Mills, Milldams, Wharves, &c., Legalization B. No. 84 (*Mr. Domville*). 1^o, 269.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL EMPLOYEES: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Holton*) 1120.

BEAUHARNOIS, COUNTY OF, MANUFACTORIES IN: Ms. for Ret. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 328.

BEIQUE, MR., ENQUIRY INTO CONDUCT OF: M. for Statement of Expenses (*Mr. Holton*) 1121.

BELLAVANCE, FERDINAND, Damage to property by fire: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1121.

BELLECHASSE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep. sustaining Sitting Member, 1.

BELLE CREEK, (P.E.I.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Brecken*) 223.

Bell Telephone Co. of Canada Incorp. Act Amt.

B. No. 95 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312; in Com. and 3^o*, 1078. (45 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

BENEFIT OR CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES DEPOSITS with Government: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 172.

Better Prevention of Crime Act (1878) continuation B. No. 165 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 1455; 2^o* and 3^o*, 1569. (45 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

Better Prevention of Fraud in Public Contracts

B. No. 7 (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1^o*, 35; M. for 2^o, 187; Amt., 1 m. h. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) carried (Y. 78, N. 51) 188; remarks (*Mr. Casgrain*) 876.

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 1.

BILL (No. 2) For constituting a Court of Ry. Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Ry. Act, 1879.—(*Mr. McCarthy*).

1^o*, 18; M. for 2^o, 173; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 185; withdn., 186; 2^o, 186; M. for Special Com. carried, 186.

BILL (No. 3) To incorporate the St. Lawrence Marine Ins. Co. of Canada.—(*Mr. Gault*).

1^o*, 35; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

BILL (No. 4) To amend the Act incorporating the Sun Mutual Ins. Co. of Montreal.—(*Mr. Gault*).

1^o*, 35; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 296; M. for 3^o, 311; 3^o, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 100.)

BILL (No. 5) Respecting the Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).

1^o, 25; M. for 2^o, 269; M. to refer to Sel. Com. withdn., 279; 2^o, 279; prop. M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 851; carried, 1155; 3^o*, 1212.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 6) To amend and extend the Act to empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Ins. Co. to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding-up of their affairs.—(*Mr. Casgrain*).

1^o, 35; 2^o, 47; in Com. and 3^o*, 669.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 101.)

BILL (No. 7) For the better prevention of fraud in relation to contracts involving the expenditure of Public Moneys.—(*Mr. Casgrain*).

1^o*, 35; M. for 2^o, 187; Amt., 1 m. h. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) carried (Y. 78, N. 51) 188.

BILL (No. 8) Respecting the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.—(*Mr. Beaty*).

1^o*, 42; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 444, 541; 3^o*, 541.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 120.)

BILL (No. 9) Concerning Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.—(*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1^o, 42; M. for 2^o carried (Y. 137, N. 34) 74; in Com., 320; rep., 326; on M. to concur in Amts. from Com., Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 104) 485; Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 485, neg. on a div., 489; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) neg. (Y. 36, N. 113) 489; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. on a div., 489; Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) neg. on a div., 490; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) neg. on a div., 492; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 87) 492; 3^o on a div., 492.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

BILL (No. 10) To provide that persons charged with Misdemeanors shall be competent as Witnesses.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*).

1^o*, 42; M. for 2^o, 616; 2^o*, 619; ref. to Special Com., 619.

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provisions of the Act respecting Offences against the Person.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*).

1^o*, 42; 2^o, 279; in Com., 615.

- BILL (No. 12) Further to amend The Dominion Elections Act, 1874.—(*Mr. Ives.*)
1° , 42; M. for 2° , 264; Deb. adjd., 266; adjd. Deb. resumed, 619; 2°*, 621.
- BILL (No. 13) To authorize and provide for the winding-up of the Dominion Fire and Marine Ins.Co.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 45; 2°*, 47; in Com. and 3°*, 541.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 14) Respecting the Canada Southern Ry. Co., and the Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Arkell.*)
1°*, 45; 2°*, 47; in Com., 221; 3°*, 263.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 15) To incorporate the Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Scott.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 888; 3°*, 888.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 16) To incorporate the Manitoba Bank.—(*Mr. Scott.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 17) To grant certain powers to the American Telegraph and Cable Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°* 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 221; 3° , 429; B. withdn., 1571.
- BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Domville.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 221; 3°*, 263.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 19) To incorporate the St. John's Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com. and 3°*, 888. (45 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 20) Respecting the Portage, Westbourne and North-Western Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Boulton.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 558; 3°*, 615.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 21) To incorporate the Thunder Bay and Minnesota Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Boulton.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 68.
- BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Lake Superior and James' Bay Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Boulton.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 69; in Com., 264; 3°*, 296.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 23) Respecting the Exchange Bank of Nova Scotia.—(*Mr. Killam.*)
1°*, 47; 2°*, 69; in Com. and 3°*, 669.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 24) To amend the Act respecting Pawnbrokers.—(*Mr. Orton.*)
1°*, 47; M. for 2° , 189; Deb. adjd. 189; Deb. resumed and B. withdn., 266.
- BILL (No. 25) To amend the Criminal Law, and to extend the provision of the Act respecting Offences against the Person, by providing for the punishment of Adultery, Seduction, &c.—(*Mr. Charlton.*)
1° , 47; M. for 2° carried (Y. 107, N. 16) 327; ref. to Special Com., 327.
- BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Saskatchewan and Peace River Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 312; 3°*, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 27) Further to amend the Act incorporating the Mutual Life Association of Canada, and to change the name thereof to "The Life Association of Canada."—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 28) To amend the Charter of the Chartered Bank of London and North America, and to change the name thereof to "The Chartered Bank of London and Winnipeg."—(*Mr. Haggart.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the North-Western Bank.—(*Mr. Rochester.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 30) To empower the Ottawa Agricultural Ins. Co. to wind up their affairs, and to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the dissolution of the said Co.—(*Mr. Rochester.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 773; 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Clements Steamship Co., limited.—(*Mr. Wade.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 115.)
- BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Quebec Timber Co., limited.—(*Mr. Brooks.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 119.)
- BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Mutual Benefit Association of Sherbrooke.—(*Mr. Brooks.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89.
- BILL (No. 34) To amend and consolidate the Act of incorporation of the British North America Ins. Co., and all Acts affecting the same.—(*Mr. McLennan.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 35) For amending the Acts relating to the Trust and Loan Co. of Canada, and for enlarging the powers of the said Co.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 1078; on M. for 3° , Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 'carried (Y. 70, N. 55) 1079; 3° , 1080.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
1° , 69; M. for 2° , 790; 2° , 798; in Com., 1122, 1155; Res. in Com., 1186; Res. incorp. in B. and in Com., 1188; M. for 3° , 1256; Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) neg., 1258; 3°*, 1258.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 37) To amend the Act to Establish a Court of Maritime Jurisdiction in the Province of Ontario.—(*Mr. Cameron, Huron.*)
1°*, 72.
- BILL (No. 38) For the Relief of the Bank of Prince Edward Island.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1° , 2°* and 3°*, 72.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Rainy River Improvement Co.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110.
- BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Dundee Land and Investment Co., limited.—(*Mr. Gault*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110.
- BILL (No. 41) To incorporate the Tecumseth Ins. Co. of Canada.—(*Mr. McLennan.*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110; in Com. and 3°*, 669.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 42) To incorporate the Richelieu Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Baker.*)
1°*, 78; 2° , 110; in Com. and 3°*, 888.—(45 *Vic.* c. 91.)

- BILL (No. 43)** To incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Williams.*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110; in Com., 264; 3°*, 296.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 44)** To amend the Act incorporating the Napier-ville Junction Ry. and Quarry Co.—(*Mr. Coursol.*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110.
- BILL (No. 45)** To reduce the Capital Stock of the Ontario Bank and to change the nominal value thereof, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110; in Com. and 3°*, 541.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 46)** To incorporate the Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°*, 78; 2°*, 110; in Com., 430, 486; 3°*, 487.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 47)** To extend and amend the Acts relating to the Canada Landed Credit Co.—(*Mr. Beatty.*)
1°*, 109; 2°*, 172; in Com., 1104; 3° on a div., 1105.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 48)** Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Arkell.*)
1°*, 109; 2°*, 172; in Com., 312; 3°*, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 49)** To amend the Act intituled: An Act relating to Interest on Moneys secured by Mortgage of Real Estate.—(*Mr. Orton.*)
1°*, 109; 2°, 266.
- BILL (No. 50)** To enable any person charged with an indictable offence, to be admitted to give evidence on his behalf.—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)
1°, 109; 2°*, 621.
- BILL (No. 51)** To incorporate the Syned of the Diocese of Saskatchewan, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(*Mr. Mills.*)
1°, 109; 2°*, 172; in Com., 444; 3°*, 486.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 126.)
- BILL (No. 52)** To incorporate the Planters' Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Gault.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 172; in Com. and 3°*, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 53)** To amend the Act incorporating the North American Mutual Life Ins. Co.—(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 172; in Com. and 3°*, 541.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 54)** To incorporate the Ontario Investment Association.—(*Mr. Carling.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 172.
- BILL (No. 55)** To incorporate the Canada Mutual Telegraph Co.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 615.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 56)** To amend the Act 43 Victoria, chapter 69, respecting the Anchor Marine Ins. Co.—(*Mr. Beatty.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201.
- BILL (No. 57)** To incorporate the Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201; in Com., 1102; 3°*, 1104.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 58)** To provide that Ry. Passenger Tickets shall be available to the holder thereof until used.—(*Mr. Thompson.*)
1°, 162; 2°, 281.
- BILL (No. 59)** To incorporate the Brant Loan and Savings Co.—(*Mr. Paterson, Brant*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201.
- BILL (No. 60)** To incorporate the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Currier.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 615.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 61)** To incorporate the Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 1001.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 62)** To incorporate the Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 162; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 615.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 63)** To repeal the Duty on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 2°* and 3°*, 162.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 64)** Respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 172; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 123.)
- BILL (No. 65)** Respecting the New York and Ontario Furnace Co.—(*Mr. White, Hastings.*)
1°*, 172; 2°*, 201; in Com. 312; 3°, 429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 113.)
- BILL (No. 66)** To amend the Act of the late Province of Canada, intituled: An Act to Incorporate the Board for the Management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Acts amending the same.—(*Mr. Shaw.*)
1°*, 172; 2°*, 201; M. for Com., 549; Amt., delay of one week (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) neg., 550; in Com. 550; rep. 558; M. for 3°, 696; Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) neg. on a div., 698; Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) neg. (Y 35, N. 130) 715; Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) neg. on a div., 716; Amt. (*Mr. McDougall*) carried, 718; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Macmillan*) neg. on a div., 720; 3°*, 720.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 124.)
- BILL (No. 67)** To incorporate the Niagara Peninsula Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Bergin.*)
1°*, 172; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 68)** To amend the Act incorporating the Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co. and Act amending the same.—(*Mr. Boulton.*)
1°*, 192; 2°*, 221; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 69)** To grant certain powers to the C. W. Williams Manufacturing Co., and to change the name thereof to "The Williams Manufacturing Co."—(*Mr. Gault.*)
1°*, 192; 2°*, 221; in Com. and 3°*, 823.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- BILL (No. 70)** To incorporate the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(*Mr. Macmillan.*)
1°*, 192; 2°*, 221.

- BILL (No. 71)** To amend the Act of the late Province of Canada intituled: An Act to incorporate the Managers of the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the amendments thereto.—(*Mr. Brooks.*)
1°*, 192; 2°*, 221; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 125.)
- BILL (No. 72)** To amend the Act incorporating the Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Strange.*)
1°*, 220; 2°*, 264.
- BILL (No. 73)** Relating to Promissory Notes and other negotiable instruments.—(*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark.*)
1°, 220; 2°, 621.
- BILL (No. 74)** Respecting the Voting at Elections of Members of the House of Commons of Canada, in the Magdalen Islands in the Electoral District of Gaspé, and the Island of Anticosti in the Electoral District of Sagouay, under certain circumstances.—(*Mr. Fortin.*)
1°, 220.
- BILL (No. 75)** To incorporate the International Construction Co.—(*Mr. Boutbee.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com., 887, 927; 3°*, 928.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 114.)
- BILL (No. 76)** To amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 77)** Relating to the Canadian Electric Light Co., and to confer certain powers upon the said Co.—(*Mr. McDougall.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com., 950; B. withdn., 1001.
- BILL (No. 78)** To amend the Acts incorporating and relating to the Sovereign Fire Ins. Co. of Canada.—(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264.
- BILL (No. 79)** To incorporate the American Electric Light Co. of Canada.—(*Mr. Colby.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com., 444; 3°, 486.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 80)** Respecting the River St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.—(*Mr. Arkell.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com. and 3°*, 1078.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 81)** Relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Patterson, Essex.*)
1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 82)** To amend the Act 43 Victoria, respecting the Navigation of Canadian Waters.—(*Mr. McCallum.*)
1°*, 254; M. for 2°, 376.
- BILL (No. 83)** To incorporate the Saskatchewan, Qu'Appelle and Assiniboine Navigation Co.—(*Mr. Macmillan.*)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 296.
- BILL (No. 84)** To make lawful the erection and maintaining of certain mills, mill dams, wharves, ways, sluices, fishways and works, between high and low water mark, upon and near to certain streams that flow into the Bay of Fundy, in the Province of New Brunswick.—(*Mr. Downville.*)
1°, 269.
- BILL (No. 85)** To amend the General Inspection Act, 1874.—(*Mr. Vallée.*)
1°*, 269.
- BILL (No. 86)** To amend the Act incorporating the Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co., and to authorize the said Co. to erect a bridge over the Ottawa River.—(*Mr. White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 288; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 87)** Respecting a certain agreement between the Canadian Securities Co. and the liquidators of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Brooks.*)
1°*, 288; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 88)** To explain the Act to grant relief to the Canada Agricultural Ins. Co., and to define the powers of the Assignees therein mentioned.—(*Mr. Gault.*)
1°*, 288; 2°*, 312.
- BILL (No. 89)** To incorporate the Great Eastern Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Massue.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 1001.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 90)** To incorporate the Ocean Mutual Marine Ins. Co.—(*Mr. Daly.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 669.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 91)** To amend the Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Pacific Ry. Ferry Co.—(*Mr. Massue.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312.
- BILL (No. 92)** To incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(*Mr. Tassé.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 950.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
- BILL (No. 93)** To incorporate the Grand Central Station Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312.
- BILL (No. 94)** To incorporate the Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 289; 2°, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 1106.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 95)** To amend the Act incorporating the Bell Telephone Co. of Canada.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 1078.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 96)** To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Montreal Telegraph Co.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°*, 289; 2°, 312; in Com., 928; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 947; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) carried (Y. 108, N. 40) 948; Amt. (*Mr. White*) neg. on a div., 949; Amt. (*Mr. White*) neg. (Y. 48, N. 99) 950; 3°*, 950.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 97)** To incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co.—(*Mr. Weldon.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 1078.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 98)** To incorporate the Canada Provident Association.—(*Mr. Currier.*)
1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 1106.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 107.)

- BILL (No. 99) To amend an Act to enlarge and extend the powers of the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien.—(*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.*)
1°*, 311; M. for 2°, 439; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 439; carried (Y. 105; N. 35) 444.
- BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the McClary Manufacturing Co.—(*Mr. Carling.*)
1°*, 311; 2°*, 541; in Com. and 3°*, 1162.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 116.)
- BILL (No. 101) To amend and consolidate the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion of Canada.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 328; 2°, 803; in Com., 804.
- BILL (No. 102) Further to amend and consolidate the several enactments respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 328; Res. in Com., 541; 2°*, 798; in Com., 798, 1129; 3° on a div., 1130.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 103) To incorporate the Qu'Appelle Land Co.—(*Mr. Boulton.*)
1°*, 367; 2°*, 492; in Com., 1105; 3°*, 1106.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 121.)
- BILL (No. 104) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Dickenson Brunton.—(*Mr. Ryan, Montreal.*)
1°*, 367; M. for 2°, 487; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) carried, 488.
- BILL (No. 105) To amend the Charter of the Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co.—(*Mr. Gault.*)
1°*, 367; 2°, 488; in Com. and 3°*, 928.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- BILL (No. 106) To further amend the Patent Act of 1872.—(*Mr. Cameron, Victoria.*)
1°, 367; 2° and in Com., 1472.
- BILL (No. 107) Respecting Harbor and River Police of Canada (from the Senate).—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
1°*, 375; 2° and in Com., 1426; 3°*, 1429.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 108) Respecting Fugitive Offenders in Canada from other parts of Her Majesty's Dominion (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 376; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1258.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 109) To amend and further to continue in force, for a limited time, the Act respecting the Administration of Criminal Justice in the Territory in dispute between the Governments of the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 376; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1259.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 110) To further amend the Seamen's Act, 1873 (from the Senate).—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
1°*, 376; 2°* and in Com., 1509; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 28, N. 87) 1535; 3°*, 1535.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 111) To amend the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 30, intituled: An Act to make provision against the improper use of Fire Arms (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 376; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1259.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 112) Respecting County Court Judges (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 376; 2°, 1259; Res. prop., 1254; in Com., 1276; embodied in B., in Com. and 3°*, 1278.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 113) To amend the Act incorporating The Canadian Steam Users' Ins. Association, and to change the name of the Co. to "The Boiler Inspection Co. of Canada" (from the Senate).—(*Mr. Beatty.*)
1°*, 376; 2°*, 492; in Com. and 3°*, 950.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa Ry.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)
1°*, 376; 2°*, 492; in Com. and 3°*, 1078.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 115) To amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 376.
- BILL (No. 116) To regulate the amalgamation of the franchises, rights, privileges, assets and property of Ry. Co.'s.—(*Mr. McCuaig.*)
1°*, 416.
- BILL (No. 117) To amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the Inspection of Steamboats, and the examination and licensing of Engineers employed on them.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 546; 1°*, 549; 2°* and in Com., 1212, 1302; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) carried, 1303; Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*), neg. on a div., 1304; Amt. (*Mr. McCallum*) carried, 1306; Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) neg. on a div., 1307; 3°*, 1307.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 118) To regulate the Floating of Cordwood on the navigable portions of the River St. Francis.—(*Mr. Vanasse.*)
1°, 428.
- BILL (No. 119) Further to amend the Pilotage Act, 1873, and the other Acts therein mentioned.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 659; 1°*, 660; 2°, 1260; in Com., 1261, 1329, 1472; 3°*, 1472.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 120) To amend the General Port Wardens' Act, 1874.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 787; 1°*, 788; 2° and in Com., 1190; 3°*, 1191.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 121) To exempt Vessels employed in Fishing from the Payment of Dues for the Relief of Sick and Distressed Mariners.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 787; 1°*, 787; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1131.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 122) To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Office of Port Warden of the Harbor of Montreal.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 786; 1°*, 786; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1264.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 123) To amend the Inland Rev. Act of 1880.—(*Mr. Mousseau.*)
Res. in Com., 535; Deb. adjd., 541; Deb. resumed, 1278; 1°*, 1288; B. withdn., 1473.
- BILL (No. 124) To provide for the admission to the profession of Dominion Land Surveyor, of the Graduates of the Royal Military College.—(*Mr. Casgrain.*)
1°, 493.

- BILL (No. 125) Further to secure the Independence of Parliament.—(*Mr. Houde.*)
1°, 493.
- BILL (No. 126) Further to amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 660; 1°*, 661; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1030.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 127) To make further provisions regarding the incorporation of a Co. to establish a Marine Telegraph between the Pacific Coast of Canada and Asia, and for repealing the provisions of any Act inconsistent therewith.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 531; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1191.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 128) To provide for the Improvement and Management of the Harbor of Three Rivers.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
Res. in Com., 532; 1°*, 532; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 988.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 129) Further to amend the Acts to provide for the Improvement and Management of the Harbor of Quebec.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. in Com., 534; 1°*, 535; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 988.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Act 36 Victoria, chapter 60, relating to the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. in Com., 533; 1°*, 534; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 988.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 131) Further to amend the Law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 541; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1509.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 132) To incorporate the Montreal and Central Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Fulton.*)
1°*, 541; 2°*, 558; in Com. and 3°*, 1106.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 133) To incorporate the Western Bank of Canada.—(*Mr. Williams.*)
1°*, 541; 2°*, 558; in Com. and 3°*, 950.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 134) To amend the Acts relating to the Great Western Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)
1°*, 541; 2°*, 558; in Com. and 3°*, 773.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 135) To amend chapter 29, 38 *Victoria*, intituled: An Act to extend certain provisions of The Seamen's Act, 1873, to vessels employed in navigating the Inland Waters of Canada, and to provide for the collection of the wages of Seamen and other persons employed on board vessels trading on the Inland Waters of Canada, in a summary manner.—(*Mr. Guillet.*)
1°*, 549; M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Mr. McLelan*) carried, 1254; 2°, 1307; in Com., 1307, 1425; 3°*, 1426.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 136) For the Equitable Distribution of Insolvent Estates.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
M. to introduce, 606; 1°*, 614.
- BILL (No. 137) For the Discharge of past Insolvent Estates.—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°, 614.
- BILL (No. 138) To authorize the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (limited) to issue preferential shares.—(*Mr. Gault.*)
1°*, 659; 2°*, 773; in Com. and 3°*, 950.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 112.)
- BILL (No. 139) To incorporate the Rapid City Central Ry. Co.—(*Mr. Bannerman.*)
1°*, 659; 2°*, 773; in Com. and 3°*, 1106.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 140) To amend the Act 35 *Victoria*, chapter 42, providing for the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 788; 1°*, 789; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 988.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 141) To provide for the allowance of Drawback on certain articles manufactured in Canada for use in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Ry.—(*Mr. Bowell.*)
1° prop., 614; Res. in Com. and 1°*, 790; 2°* and in Com., 1255; 3°*, 1256.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 142) To amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
Res. in Com., 789; 1°*, 789; B. withdn.
- BILL (No. 143) Further to amend the Ry. Consolidated Act, 1879.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
1°, 851.
- BILL (No. 144) To authorize the construction, on certain conditions, of the Canadian Pacific Ry. through some Pass other than the Yellow Head Pass.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
1°, 852; M. for 2°, 950; Deb. adjd., 988; Deb. resumed, 990; 2°* and in Com., 1022; 3°, 1029.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 145) Respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s. and Trading Corporations (from the Senate).—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
1°*, 853; 2° and in Com., 1314, 1473; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) carried, 1435; 3°*, 1495.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 146) To repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts and the Acts amending it.—(*Mr. Landry.*)
1°*, 950.
- BILL (No. 147) To annul Unjust Conditions in Bills of Lading.—(*Mr. Guthrie.*)
1°, 1067.
- BILL (No. 148) To amend the Acts respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.—(*Mr. Caron.*)
1°*, 1129; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1264.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 149) To remove certain doubts as to the effect of The North-West Territories Act, 1880, and to amend the same.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1129; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1542.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Royal Academy of Arts.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick.*)
1°* and 2°*, 1129; in Com. and 3°*, 1212.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 122.)
- BILL (No. 151) To define the rights in certain cases to assault, wound or kill certain prisoners (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1190.

- BILL (No. 152) Respecting Bridges over navigable waters, constructed under the authority of Provincial Acts.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
1°*, 1190; 2° and in Com., 1264; 3°*, 1307.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 153) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 1202; M. for 2°, 1330; B. withdn., 1332.
- BILL (No. 154) To amend The Extradition Act, 1877 (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1212; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1559.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 155) To amend the Patent Act of 1872.—(*Mr. Pope, Compton.*)
1°*, 1253; 2° and in Com., 1542; 3°*, 1543.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 156) Respecting the Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
1°, 1253; 2°, 1543; in Com., 1549; 3°*, 1551.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 157) To repeal certain provisions of The General Inspection Act, 1874.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. in Com. and 1°*, 1255; 2° and in Com., 1472; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Killam*) neg. on a div., 1495; 3°*, 1495.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 158) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1332; M. for 2°, 1356; 2°*, 1402; M. for Com., 1403; in Com., 1410, 1445; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) agreed to (Y. 124, N. 15) 1478; Amt. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 98) 1479; Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1479; Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1480; Amt. (*Mr. Guthrie*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1480; Amt. (*Mr. Fleming*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1481; Amt. (*Mr. Wheler*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1482; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1482; Amt. (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1483; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1483; Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1484; Amt. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1485; Amt. (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1485; Amt. (*Mr. Thompson*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; Amt. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; Amt. (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; Amt. (*Mr. Bain*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1487; Amt. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; Amt. (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1489; Amt. (*Mr. Rymal*) neg. (Y. 41, N. 106) 1491; Amt. (*Mr. Bunster*) withdn., 1493; Amt. (*Mr. Guthrie*) neg. on a div., 1499; Amt. (*Mr. Gillies*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 103) 1494; 3°*, 1495; Senate Amts. considered, 1561.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 159) To make further provisions respecting Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons (from the Senate).—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
1°*, — (45 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 160) To amend the Act respecting the Harbor of North Sydney in Nova Scotia (from the Senate).—(*Mr. McLelan.*)
1°*, 1403; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 161) To provide for the Free transmission of Canadian Newspapers by Mail within the Dominion.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. in Com., 1419; 1°*, 1420; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1550.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 162) For increasing, during a certain period, the yearly Subsidy to the Province of Manitoba.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. prop. 721; in Com., 1420; 1°*, 1425; 2°* and in Com., 1563; M. for 3°, 1568; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1569; 3°*, 1569.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 163) Relating to the Harbor of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
Res. prop., 1403; in Com., 1429; 1°*, 1435; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1549.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 164) To correct certain errors in the French Version of "The Dominion Lands Act," and "The Dominion Lands Act, 1879" (from the Senate).—(*Sir Hector Langevin.*)
1°*, 1455; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1549.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 165) Further to continue in force for a limited time "The Better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878" (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1455; 2°* and 3°*, 1509.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 166) Declaratory of the meaning of the word "Telegraph" in certain cases (from the Senate).—(*Mr. White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 1455; M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1533; 2°* and in Com., 1569; M. for 3°, 1571; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. on a div., 1571; 3°*, 1571.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 167) To provide for the granting of a Subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.—(*Sir Charles Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 1403; in Com., 1468; 1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1549; in Com. and 3°*, 1550.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 168) To amend the Inland Revenue Act, 1880.—(*Mr. Mousseau.*)
1°*, 1473; 2°* and in Com., 1551; 3°*, 1553; Senate Amts. considered, 1572, 1574.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 169) To amend the several Acts imposing the Duties of Customs now in force.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
1°*, 1498; 2°* and in Com., 1550; 3°*, 1551.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 170) To amend an Act of the present Session intituled: "An Act to reduce the Capital Stock of the Ontario Bank, and to change the nominal value of the shares thereof, and for other purposes.—(*Mr. Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 1521.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 58)
- BILL (No. 171) To increase the amount placed at the disposal of the Governor in Council by the Act 34 Victoria, chapter 8, for claims on the Bank of Upper Canada.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley.*)
Res. in Com., 532, 1503; 1°*, 1521; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1571.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 172) Further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act, 1880.—(*Mr. Bowell.*)
1°*, 1521; 2° and in Com., 1571; 3°*, 1573.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 26.)

- BILL (No. 173)** To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks, by granting assistance, on certain conditions, to Companies constructing them.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)
Res. in Com., 1550; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1550.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 174)** To further amend the Indian Act, 1880 (from the Senate).—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*.)
1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1571.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 175)** To provide for building certain Branch Lines of Railway from points on the Intercolonial Ry. and Prince Edward Island Ry. respectively (from the Senate).—(*Sir Charles Tupper*.)
1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1555.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 176)** To provide for the granting of Subsidies for the construction of certain Lines of Ry. therein mentioned.—(*Sir Charles Tupper*.)
Res. prop., 1521; in Com. 1553; 1°* and 2°*, 1554; in Com., 1556; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1556; 3°*, 1556.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 177)** To authorize an Annual Grant for the development of the Sea Fisheries.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)
Res. prop., 875; in Com., 1511; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1555.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 178)** For granting to Her Majesty certain Sums of Money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively 30th June, 1882, and 30th June, 1883, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)
Res. rep. from Com. of Ways and Means, 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1559.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 179)** To fix and provide for the payment of Salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario, and of certain Judges and County Court Judges in Manitoba and New Brunswick.—(*Sir Leonard Tilley*.)
Res. prop., 1253; in Com., 1561; 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1561; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1561; 3°*, 1561.—(45 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 192, 1574.
- Bills of Lading, Unjust Conditions Amendment B. No. 147** (*Mr. Guthrie*). 1°, 1967.
- BOAT LICENSING ON GEORGIAN BAY**: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 283.
- Boiler Inspection Co. of Canada B. No. 113** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°*, 376; 2°*, 492; in Com. and 3°*, 950. (45 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO** and Sir F. Hincks Lecture: Ques. (*Mr. Dawson*) 110.
- BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO, NORTHERN AND WESTERN**: Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 661; Deb. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 666; (*Mr. Ives*) 667; (*Mr. Mills*) 674; (*Mr. Dawson*) 723; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 728; (*Mr. Boulbee*) 736; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 739; (*Mr. Royal*) 741; (*Mr. Laurier*) 744; (*Mr. Haggart*) 746; (*Mr. Weldon*) 749; (*Mr. Moussau*) 752; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 754; (*Mr. Desjardins*) 755; (*Mr. Rykert*) 756; (*Mr. Charlton*) 753; (*Mr. Farrow*) 758; (*Mr. Arkell*) 759; (*Mr. Trow*) 760; (*Mr. Hesson*) 760; (*Mr. Rymal*) 761; Amt. carried (Y. 116, N. 44) 761.
- BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA, EXTENSION OF**: M. for Copy of Proclamation (*Mr. Scott*) 223; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 376.
- BOUNDARY AWARD OF ONTARIO**: M. for Copies of Cor. with Lieut. Governor (*Mr. Mills*) 229.
- BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN**: Ques. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 255; Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 369; Res. prop. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 875.
- Bounties to Fishermen B. No. 177** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 875; in Com., 1511; 1°, 2°*—; in Com. and 3°*, 1555. (45 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BRAMPTON POST OFFICE**: Ques. (*Mr. Elliott*) 110.
- BRANCHES AND SIDINGS OF INTERCOLONIAL RY.**: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 285.
- Brant Loan and Savings Co. Incorp B. No. 59** (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 201.
- BRAZIL ROCK, BELL BUOY AT**: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) in Com. of Supply, 867.
- BREAKWATER AT RED POINT, P.E.I.**: Ques. (*Mr. Muttart*) 163.
- BRIDGE CROSSING RIVIÈRE DU LOUP**: Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 110.
- Bridges over Navigable Waters B. No. 152** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°*, 1190; 2° and in Com., 1264; 3°*, 1307. (45 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BRIGADE CAMPS**: Ques. (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) 163.
- BRIGADE MAJORS**: in Com. of Supply, 854.
- BRITISH COLUMBIA**:
Amount of Duties collected for 1881: Ques. (*Mr. De Cosmos*) 35.
Bonded Warehouse at Esquimalt and Nanaimo (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 1199.
Canadian Pacific Ry. Sections: in Com. of Supply, 1077.
Courtney River, Clearing of: M. for Agent's Rep. (*Mr. Bunster*) 372.
Cowichan River, Expenditure on: M. for Copy of Statement (*Mr. Bunster*) 372.
Drill and Training of the Militia (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 861.
Emory-Savona Contracts of Canadian Pacific Ry. and Steel Rails for same: Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 19.
Immigration and Dom. Agent at Victoria: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunster*) 125.
Importations into: Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 19.
Indians: in Com. of Supply, 1184.
Inspector of Fisheries: M. for Rep. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 116.
Life-Boats, &c., Purchase of (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 866.
Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries of (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 867.
Pacific Terminus of Canadian Pacific Ry. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) in Com. of Supply, 1097.
Penitentiary: in Com. of Supply, 784.
Population by last Census: Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 35.
Port Moody and Emory Bar, Contract between, Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 592.
Post Office Service (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 1196.
Public Buildings: in Com. of Supply, 1025.
Telegraph Extension in Vancouver Island: M. for Paps. (*Mr. Bunster*) 223.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- Sands Head Lighthouse: Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Com. of Supply, 870.
- Vancouver Island Ry.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 41.
- Vancouver Island Ry. (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 1098.
- Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Supply, 1276.
- British North American Ins. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 34** (*Mr. McLennan*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89; in Com. and 3^o*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 99)
- BROWN SHEETING AND BLEACHED SHIRTINGS: Remarks before calling the Orders (*Mr. Blake*) 320.
- BRUCE COUNTY, MAIL SERVICE IN: Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 369.
- Brunton, John Dickenson, Relief (Patent) B. No. 104** (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*). 1^o*, 367; M. for 2^o, 487; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) carried, 488.
- BUCHANAN, FRANCIS, Provision for family of: Remarks (*Mr. Domville*) in Com. of Supply, 862; M. for Copies of Petitions, 1240.
- BUDGET, THE: Speech of Finance Minister (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 78. [For Deb. see WAYS AND MEANS.]
- Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (Ont.) Act Amt. B. No. 131** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1^o*, 541; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1509. (45 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- BUOYS AND BEACONS, Montreal Harbor: in Com. of Supply, 1272.
- CADETS IN MILITARY COLLEGE: M. for Ret. of number since opening (*Mr. Strange*) 190.
- Calais and St. Stephen Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 97** (*Mr. Weldon*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312; in Com. and 3^o*, 1078. (45 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ STEAM COMMUNICATION: Conc., 1310.
- Canada Agricultural Ins. Co. B. No. 88** (*Mr. Gault*). 1^o*, 288; 2^o*, 312.
- CANADA CENTRAL RY., BONUS TO, by Town of Pembroke: M. for Copy of Petition (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 483.
- CANADA CENTRAL RY., SUBSIDY TO: in Com. of Supply, 1095.
- Canada Co-Operative Supply Association B. No. 138** (*Mr. Gault*). 1^o*, 659; 2^o*, 773; in Com. and 3^o*, 950. (45 *Vic.*, c. 112.)
- Canada Landed Credit Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 47** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1^o*, 109; 2^o*, 172; in Com., 1104; 3^o on a div., 1105. (45 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- Canada Mutual Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. No. 55** (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1^o*, 162; 2^o*, 201; in Com. and 3^o*, 615. (45 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- Canada Provident Association Incorp. B. No. 98** (*Mr. Currier*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312; in Com. and 3^o*, 1106. (45 *Vic.*, c. 107.)
- Canada Southern and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. B. No. 14** (*Mr. Arkell*). 1^o*, 45; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 221; 3^o*, 263. (45 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- Canada Southern Bridge Co. B. No. 81** (*Mr. Paterson, Essex*). 1^o*, 229; 2^o*, 264; in Com. and 3^o*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

- Canada Trust and Loan Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 35** (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89; in Com., 1078; M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) carried (Y. 79, N. 55) 1079; 3^o, 1080. (45 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- CANADIAN AND BRAZILIAN LINE OF STEAMERS: Ques. (*Mr. Laurier*) 312; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 323; in Com. of Supply, 865; Conc., 1310, 1500.
- CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES FERRIES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 113.
- CANADIAN BUILT VESSELS IN FRANCE, ENTRY OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Valin*) 284.
- Canadian Electric Light Co. B. No. 77** (*Mr. McDougall*). 1^o*, 229; 2^o*, 264; in Com., 950; B. withdn., 1001.
- CANADIAN EXTRADITION ACT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 37.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 43; Rep. of Evidence presented (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 773; Rep. of Commissioners presented (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 789; M. for Statement of Expenditure (*Mr. Blake*) 57; defective Ret. (remarks) 876.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:
- Allowances paid Canadian manufacturers of goods required by Co.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- Amalgamation with other Ry. Co.'s: M. for Papers, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 55.
- Annual Statement (*Sir Charles Tupper*) on B. 144, 2^o, 950; Reply (*Mr. Blake*) 969; Deb. (*Mr. Homer*) 987; on adjmnt. of Deb. (*Mr. Bunster*) 987; Deb. resumed (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 990; (*Mr. Dawson*) 996; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 997; (*Mr. Mills*) 1001; (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 1004; (*Mr. De Cosmos*) 1005; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1005; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1009; (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 1012; (*Mr. Rymal*) 1014; (*Mr. Anglin*) 1015; (*Mr. Casey*) 1021; Explanations and Comments (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 969—1020; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 951—957; Correction (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 969; Comments (*Mr. Bunster*) 974, 979, 980.
- British Columbia Sections: in Com. of Supply, 1097.
- Contract Rights: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 37.
- Claims by Company for Stone, Timber, &c.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40.
- Canada Central (Subsidy): in Com. of Supply, 1095; Conc., 1315.
- Charter of Co., extent of lands under: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.
- Deposits by Co.: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 166.
- Emory-Savona Contracts and Steel Rails for same: Ques. (*Mr. De Cosmos*) 19.
- First 100 miles west of Red River, charges made against the Co. for work performed: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.
- Georgian Bay Branch: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 36.
- Grants, Selection or Reservation of Lands: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- Land Grant Bonds: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 37.
- Land Grant Bonds, Sale of: M. for Copies of Advertisement (*Mr. Blake*) 55.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*

- Lands sold by Co.: M. for Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 371.
 Maps and Plans of Branch Lines: M. for Copies (*Mr. Blake*) 55.
 Net and Gross Earnings of Sections constructed by Government: M. for Ret. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 492.
 Passenger and Freight Rates on any Ry. owned by Co.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
 Payments of Money to Co.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
 Port Moody and Yale Section, approximate quantities: M. for Copies (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 167.
 Port Moody and Emory Bar Section, Contract for: Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 571; neg. (Y. 55, N. 128) 592.
 Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River: in Com. of Supply, 1095; Conc., 1315.
 Pacific Terminus: Remarks (*Mr. De Cosmos*) in Com. of Supply, 1097.
 Progress Reports, M. for (*Mr. Blake*) 54.
 Route and Expenditure west of Winnipeg: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
 Route through the Rocky Mountains: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 558.
 Rates between Emerson and Winnipeg: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
 Savona's Ferry and Port Moody: M. for Copies of Advertisements, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.
 Sub-Contracts: M. for Copies (*Mr. Blake*) 481.
 Station Accommodation: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
 Subsidy to Co.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
 Senator Macpherson's Memorandum and Sandford Fleming's position, 1250.
 Telegraph or Telephone Lines, Acquisition of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 55.
 Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
 Tariff, Classification Sheet of Articles under: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1108.
 Winter Terminus: M. for Copies of Petitions, &c. (*Mr. Domville*) 166.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Rocky Mountains Construction B. No. 144 (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 852; M. for 2°, 950; Deb. adjd. 988; Deb. resumed, 990; 2°* and in Com. 1022; 3°, 1029. (45 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

Canadian Securities Co. and Consolidated Bank of Canada B. No. 87 (*Mr. Brooks*). 1°*, 288; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

CANADIAN STATUTES, REVISION OF, Appointment of Commissioner: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 492.

Canadian Steam Users Ins. Association Act Amt. B. No. 113 (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°*, 376; 2°*, 492; in Com. and 3°*, 950. (45 *Vic.*, c. 102.)

CANADIAN TOBACCO, Amount of Duties Collected on: M. for Statement (*Mr. Vanasse*) 47.

CANADIAN TOBACCO, DUTY ON: M. for Statement (*Mr. Amyot*) 20.

CANADIAN TOBACCO, Inland Revenue Seizures: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Gigault*) 47.

CANADIAN TOBACCO, Sale and Manufacture of: Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 18.

CANADIAN TOBACCO TAX, Res. (*Mr. Mousseau*) to amend the Inland Revenue Act, 535; Deb. (*Mr. Dugas*) 536; (*Mr. Laurier*) 536; (*Mr. Plumb*) 537; (*Mr. Vallée*) 538; (*Mr. Gigault*) 540; (*Mr. Béchard*) 540; (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 540; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 540; Debate resumed (*Mr. Mousseau*) 1278, 1286; (*Mr. Béchard*) 1279, 1283; (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1279; (*Mr. Houde*) 1279; (*Mr. Plumb*) 1280; (*Mr. Dugas*) 1281; (*Mr. Laurier*) 1281; (*Mr. Amyot*) 1282; (*Mr. Fiset*) 1282; (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 1283; (*Mr. Tellier*) 1283; (*Mr. Landry*) 1284, 1288; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1285; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1237; (*Mr. Bolduc*) 1287.

CANADIAN TOBACCO, TREATISE ON: Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 46.

CANALS:

- Carillon*: in Com. of Supply, 1146.
Chambly: in Com. of Supply, 1148.
Cornwall, Contract for new Lock Gates: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.
Grenville: in Com. of Supply, 1146.
Lachine: in Com. of Supply, 1145, 1148.
Murray: Ques. (*Mr. White, East Hastings*) 18; in Com. of Supply, 1146.
St. Anne's Lock and Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1438.
St. Lawrence River and Canals: in Com. of Supply, 1145.
St. Ours Lock and Dam: in Com. of Supply, 1148.
Tay Canal: in Com. of Supply, 1442.
Trent River Navigation: in Com. of Supply, 1439.
Trent Valley Location Survey: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 36.
Welland: Copies of Tenders for (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 34; Hunter, Murray & Co.'s Contract, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 57; Contract for Section 27, remarks on Papers brought down (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 320; M. of Want of Confidence, 1240; Lighting Locks by Electric Light, M. for copies of Tenders (*Mr. Laurier*) 328; Damage done to Lock No. 1 in 1881, Ques. (*Mr. Arkell*) 1108; in Com. of Supply, 1145, 1438.
Williamsburg: in Com. of Supply, 1438.

CANTON FLANNEL, IMPORTATIONS OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 190.

CAPE GEORGE PIER, N.S.: M. for Copies of Reps. of Engineers (*Mr. McIsaac*) 258.

CAPE TORMENTINE RY.: Ques. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 222; M. for Cor., 1121.

CAPE TRAVERSE (P.E.I.) RY.: in Com. of Supply, 1437.
 CARILLON CANAL, DAM AND SLIDE: in Com. of Supply, 1146.

CARON, FELIX, AND CHOUINARD, HENRIETTE, CLAIMS OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 1121.

CARTIER, SIR GEORGE, Monument to Memory of: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 615.

CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hackett*) 315.

CASES DISPOSED OF IN THE MARITIME COURT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 51.

CASUALTIES TO TRAINS ON INTERCOLONIAL RY.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 288.

- CATTLE, IMPORTATION of, for Breeding Purposes:** M. for list of Quarantine Stations (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 258.
- CENSUS DISTRICT 192:** M. for description of Locality and Maps (*Mr. Blake*) 69.
- CENSUS ENUMERATORS in the County of St. John:** M. for Statement (*Mr. Bourassa*) 226; County of Rimouski (*Mr. Fiset*) 229.
- CENSUS, The, Information as to result of:** Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 36; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 72; Mess. from H. E. transmitting copy, 42; Expenses in connection with: in Com. of Supply, 847; Conc., 1309.
- CENSUS, The, Persons counted though absent:** M. for Statement of number (*Mr. Blake*) 165.
- CHAMBLY CANAL, Telephone on the:** Ques. (*Mr. Benoit*) 221; Raising banks, &c.: in Com. of Supply, 1148.
- CHARGES AGAINST LIEUT.-COL. ROSS:** M. for Copies (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 327; Deb. in Com. of Supply, on Censure in *Gazette*, 1292.
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT.** See *Supply*.
- Chartered Bank of London and North America Act Amt. B. No. 28** (*Mr. Haggart*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- CHARTERED RYS. IN MANITOBA and N.W.T.:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 129.
- "CHARYBDIS," STEAM CORVETTE:** Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 73; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 122; in Com. of Supply, 1268; Conc., 1502.
- CHAUDIERE AND GATINEAU SLIDES, Timber and Logs passed through:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1121.
- CHESLEY as a PORT of ENTRY:** Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 614.
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION** (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 850; (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 1476; Ques. of Privilege. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1504.
- CHIEF JUSTICE WOOD of MANITOBA, Charges against:** M. for reading the Journals (*Mr. Schultz*) 372; 481, 1234; M. for Special Com., 1235; Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) 1235; Deb. adjd., 1237.
- Chignecto Marine Transport and Cape Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 57** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 162; 2°*, 201; in Com., 1102; 3°*, 1104. (45 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- Chignecto Ship Ry. Subsidy B. No. 167** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1403; in Com., 1468; 1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1549; in Com. and 3°*, 1550. (45 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- CIMON Mr., X. C. (Charlevoix):** Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 1.
- CIRCULARS TO DOMINION BANKS, &c.:** M. for Copies (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 39; (*Mr. Blake*) 41.
- "CITY OF LONDON," Loss of:** in Com. on B. 117, 1214.
- CIVIL GOVERNMENT.** See *Supply*.
- CIVIL SERVANTS AND MUNICIPAL OFFICES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 1121.
- CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 50.
- CIVIL SERVICE BOARD:** in Com. of Supply, 658.
- CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT:** Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 19.
- Civil Service of Canada B. No. 36** (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1°, 69; M. for 2°, 790; 2°, 798; in Com., 1122, 1155; in Com. on Res., 1186; Res. incorp. in B. and in Com., 1188; M. for 3°, 1256; Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) neg., 1258; 3°*, 1258. (45 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES:** Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 222.
- CLAIM of JOS. CHAS. LISLOIS:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 73.
- CLAIM of MARSHALL WOOD:** in Com. of Supply, 1265.
- CLAIMS OF CONTRACTORS ON INTERCOLONIAL RY.** submitted to Frank Shanly: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 57.
- CLAIMS OF HALF-BREEDS AND MINORS under Manitoba Act:** M. for Copies (*Mr. Schultz*) 328.
- CLAIMS REFERRED TO OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 56.
- CLASSIFICATION OF IMPORTS, Circulars respecting:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 118.
- Clements' Steamship Co. Incorp. B. No. 31** (*Mr. Wade*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com. and 3°*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 115.)
- CLOCK in MONTREAL POST OFFICE BUILDING:** Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 72.
- CLOTHING FOR THE MILITIA:** in Com. of Supply, 857.
- COAL EXPORTS FROM NOVA SCOTIA:** M. for Statement (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 226.
- COAL HOPPERS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RY.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 478.
- COAL, IMPORTATIONS OF, BY PORTS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 128.
- COAL LANDED AT CAPE TRAVERSE IN 1879:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 1121.
- COAL LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST:** Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 558.
- COAL, MINERAL AND TIMBER LANDS, Locations in N.W.T.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 20.
- COBourg HARBOR of REFUGE, LIGHT AT:** (*Mr. Guillet*) in Com. of Supply, 867.
- COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT SACKVILLE:** M. for Cor. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 282.
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES.** See *Supply*.
- COLONIZATION SOCIETIES AND LAND REGULATIONS:** Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- COMMERCIAL AGENT AT PARIS, FRANCE:** Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 45.
- COMMERCIAL RECIPROCITY WITH THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS:** M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1249.
- COMMERCIAL RELATIONS between Canada and other countries:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 38.
- Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada B. No. 8** (*Mr. Beatty*). 1°*, 42; 2°*, 47; in Com., 444, 541; 3°* 541. (45 *Vic.*, c. 120.)
- COMMERCIAL TREATIES:** Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1068; Deb. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1075; (*Mr. Mills*) 1080; (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1084, 1086; (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 1084; (*Mr. Ouimet*) 1084; (*Mr. Coursol*) 1085; (*Mr. Royal*) 1085; (*Mr. Houde*) 1088; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1089; (*Mr. McDougall*) 1092; Amt. neg. (Y. 58, N. 101) 1095.
- COMMISSIONS TO CUSTOMS OFFICERS on Excise duties collected by them:** in Com. of Supply, 1276.

COMMITTEES:

- Charges against Chief Justice Wood* of Manitoba: M. for Special Com. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1235.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 2* (*Mr. McCarthy*): M. for Sel. Com. carried, 186.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 11* (*Mr. Cameron Huron*) ref. to Special Com., 619.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. 14* (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*): ref. to Special Com., 281.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person, Adultery, Seduction, &c.) B. 25* (*Mr. Charlton*): ref. to Special Com., 327.
- Library*: Sel. Com. to assist *Mr. Speaker* appointed, 41.
- Official Report of Debates*: Select Com. to Supervise appointed, 18.
- Select Standing*: M. for, 3; Com. to prepare Lists, 19; Lists rep., 20.
- Tariff, The, and Agricultural Interests*: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 257.
- COMMUNICATION BETWEEN P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: M. for Copies of Cor. (*Mr. Brecken*) 226.
- COMPENSATION TO D. H. WATERBURY: in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- CONCURRENCE. See *Supply*.
- CONQUERALL BANK (N.S.) POST OFFICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wade*) 1252.
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE chargeable to: Ms. for Ret. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 20; (*Mr. Anglin*) 50.
- Consolidated Ry. Act. Amt. B. No. 143** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 851.
- CONSTITUTIONS OR CHARTERS OF THE PROVINCES: M. for Copies (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 167.
- CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ON BOARD INCOMING VESSELS: M. for Copies of Instructions to Health Officers at Halifax, &c. (*Mr. Weldon*) 285.
- CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS, laid on Table (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 220.
- Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. No. 7** (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1°, 35; M. for 2°, 187; Amt., 1 m. h. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) carried (Y. 78, N. 51) 188.
- CONTRACTS ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: M. for Copies (*Mr. Blake*) 481.
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS. Special cases, see the respective *Districts*; also see HOUSE OF COMMONS.
- COOPER, JOHN, Sum paid for Rent by: in Com. of Supply, 1289.
- CORNWALL CANAL, Contract for new Lock Gates: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.
- COTTONS AND WOOLLENS, DUTIES on: Res. (*Mr. Anglin*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1162; Deb. (*Mr. Blake*) 1167; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1177; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 1179; (*Mr. Plumb*) 1181; Amt. neg. (Y. 52, N. 118) 1183.
- COTTONS, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, COST OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 313.
- County Court Judges B. No. 112 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 376; 2°, 1259; Res. prop., 1254; in Com., 1276; embodied in B., in Com. and 3°, 1278. (45 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ms. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 53; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 169.
- COURTNEY RIVER (B.C.) Clearing of: M. for Agent's Rep. (*Mr. Bunster*) 372.
- Court of Maritime Jurisdiction (Ont.) Act Amt. B. No. 37** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 72.
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. No. 2** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°, 18; M. for 2°, 173; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. McQuaig*) 185; withdn., 186; 2°, 186; M. for Sel. Com. carried, 186.
- COWICHAN RIVER (B.C.) Expenditure on: M. for Copy of Statement (*Mr. Bunster*) 372.
- CRANE ISLAND, PIER AT: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 1107.
- Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien Act Amt. B. No. 99** (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*). 1°, 311; M. for 2°, 439; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 437; carried (Y. 105, N. 35) 444.
- CRESSEY LIGHTHOUSE, WHARF AT (*Mr. McQuaig*) in Com. of Supply, 867.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person, Adultery, Seduction, &c.) B. No. 25** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°, 47; M. for 2° carried (Y. 107, N. 16) 327; ref. to Special Com., 327.
- Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person) B. No. 11** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 42; 2°, 279; in Com., 615.
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Supply, 847.
- CROSS POINT AND CAMPBELLTON (N.B.) Ferry Service: Ques. (*Mr. Haddow*) 254.
- CROUTER, Mr. D., *East Northumberland*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 1.
- CROWN TIMBER AGENT AT WINNIPEG: M. for copies of Letters of Instruction (*Mr. Charlton*) 228.
- CUSTOM HOUSE AND PUBLIC OFFICES AT HAMILTON: M. for Copy of Petition (*Mr. Bain*) 172.
- Customs Acts Amt. B. No. 169** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°, 1498; 2° and in Com., 1550; 3°, 1551. (45 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
- CUSTOMS BOARD OF APPRAISERS: in Com. of Supply, 851.
- CUSTOMS BOATMEN AT QUEBEC, Uniforms for: M. for Copies of Petitions (*Mr. Amyot*) 316.
- CUSTOMS CIRCULARS, MEMORANDA, &c., relating to the Importation of Goods under the Tariff from 1874 to 1879: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 228.
- CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Supply, 606.
- CUSTOMS RECEIPTS for last six months of 1879-80-81: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 57.
- CUSTOMS REVENUES ON HUDSON'S BAY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 43.
- CUSTOMS SEIZURES AND AMOUNT OF FINES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 44.
- CUSTOMS SEIZURES AND FINES Exacted for last six months of 1881: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Killam*) 57.
- CUSTOMS SEIZURES IN HUDSON'S BAY PORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 47.

CULLING TIMBER: Conc., 1501.

C. W. Williams Manufacturing Co. B. No. 69 (*Mr. Gault*). 1°*, 192; 2°*, 221; in Com. and 3°*, 823. (45 *Vic.*, c. 118.)

DAMAGES ALONG THE GRAND RIVER: M. for Reprs. of Dominion Arbitrator (*Mr. McCallum*) 373.

DAM AT LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1251.

DANIS, ANTOINE DOSITHÉ, Contingent Accounts of: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Holton*) 1121.

DEBATES. See *Official Report*.

Deceased Wife's Sister, Marriage with, Legalization B. No. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*). 1°, 42; M. for 2° carried (Y. 137, N. 34) 74; in Com., 320; rep., 326; on M. to concur in Amts. from Com., Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 104) 485; Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 485; neg. on a div., 489; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) neg. (Y. 36, N. 113) 489; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. on a div., 489; Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) neg. on a div., 490; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) neg. on a div., 492; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 87) 492; 3° on a div., 492. (45 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

DEFICITS IN POST OFFICE SERVICE: in Com. of Supply, 1193.

Definition of right to assault or kill Prisoners B. No. 151 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1190.

DEPARTMENTAL CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Supply, 658.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR REPORT: Attention of Minister called to article in *Mail* newspaper (*Mr. Ross Middlesex*) 222.

DEPOSITS IN BANKS WITH THE RATES OF INTEREST: M. for Statement (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 20.

DEPOSITS IN CANADIAN BANKS: M. for statement (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 41.

DEPOSITS MADE BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 166.

DEPOSITS OF BENEFIT OR CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES WITH GOVERNMENT: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 172.

DESTITUTE INDIANS, SUPPLIES FOR: in Com. of Supply, 1185.

DEWDNEY, MR. E., INDIAN COMMISSIONER, amounts paid to, and Secretary, for travelling expenses, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 128.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Essex*) 19.

DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT RESPECTING MINES: M. for Copies of Act (*Mr. Laurier*) 40.

DISALLOWANCE OF RY. CHARTERS: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 558.

DISALLOWANCE OF STREAMS BILL: Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 876; Deb. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 885; (*Mr. Guthrie*) 894; (*Mr. Haggart*) 898; (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) 900; (*Mr. Brecken*) 903; (*Mr. Weldon*) 904; (*Mr. McDougall*) 905; (*Mr. Laurier*) 907; (*Mr. Mousseau*) 907; (*Mr. Blake*) 908; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 919; (*Mr. Cameron Victoria*) 924; (*Mr. Mills*) 925; Amt. neg. (Y. 50, N. 110) 926.

Discharge of Past Insolvent Debtors' B. No. 137 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°, 614.

DISCIPLINE observed in the 27th Batt. of Volunteers: M. for Reprs. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 56.

DISMISSAL OF CAPT. ALLEN: M. for Paps. (*Mr. Mills*) 319.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT NEUSTADT: M. for Reprs. (*Mr. Jackson*) 44.

DISPUTED TERRITORY, Timber and Mining Licenses issued in: M. for Copies (*Mr. Mills*) 172, 1108.

Distribution of Insolvent Estates B. No. 136 (*Mr. Beaty*). M. to introduce, 606; 1°*, 614.

DIVISIONS:

Boundaries of Ontario, Northern and Western: Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, carried (Y. 116, N. 44) 761.

Commercial Treaties: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 58, N. 101) 1095.

Cottons and Woollens: Res. (*Mr. Anglin*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 52, N. 118) 1183.

Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien Act Amt. B. 99 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*): on M. for 2°, Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. Bourassa*) carried (Y. 105, N. 35) 444.

Criminal Law Amt. (Offences against the Person: Adultery, Seduction, &c.) B. 25 (*Mr. Charlton*): M. for 2° carried (Y. 107, N. 16) 327.

Disallowance of Streams Bill: Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 50, N. 110) 926.

Fuel and Breadstuffs Duties, Repeal of: Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 47, N. 120) 655.

Government Land Policy in the North-West: Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 47, N. 112) 846.

Iron Industry: Res. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) in Amt. to Com. Supply, neg. (Y. 47, N. 114) 1228.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalization B. 9 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*): M. for 2° carried (Y. 137, N. 34) 74; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 104) 485; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) neg. (Y. 36, N. 113) 489; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 87) 492.

M. C. Upper, Damages to: on M. to concur in Res. from Com. of Supply, Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 18, N. 91) 1540.

Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidated B. 96 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) carried (Y. 108, N. 40) 948; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) neg. (Y. 48, N. 99) 950.

Port Moody and Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Contract for: Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 55, N. 128) 592.

Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts B. 7 (*Mr. Casgrain*): on M. for 2°, Amt., 1 m. h. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) carried (Y. 78, N. 51) 188.

Prevention of Fraud in Public Contracts: Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 43, N. 109) 1436.

Public Expenditure: Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 47, N. 99) 1354.

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

- Readjustment of the Representation of the House of Commons B. 158 (Sir John A. Macdonald):* on M. for 2°^o, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 111) 1401; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 52, N. 112) 1402; 2°^o carried (Y. 52, N. 112) 1402; on M. for 3°^o, Amts. to recom. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) carried (Y. 124, N. 15) 1478; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 98) 1479; (*Mr. Sutherland*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1479; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1480; (*Mr. Guthrie*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1483; (*Mr. Fleming*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1481; (*Mr. Wheeler*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1482; (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1482; (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1483; (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1484; (*Mr. Casey*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1484; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1485; (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1485; (*Mr. Thompson*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; (*Mr. Bain*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1487; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1489; (*Mr. Rymal*) neg. (Y. 41, N. 106) 1491; (*Mr. Gillies*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 103) 1494.
- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. 110 (Mr. McLelan):* on M. for 3°^o, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 28, N. 87) 1535.
- Sugar Duties, Amendment of:* Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, neg. (Y. 36, N. 85) 779.
- Temporalities Fund Management B. 66 (Mr. Shaw):* on M. for 3°^o, Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 130) 715.
- Timber Licenses, System of Granting:* Res. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 106) 570.
- Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. 35 (Mr. Kirkpatrick):* on M. for 3°^o, Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) carried (Y. 79, N. 55) 1079.
- DOMINION CANALS, TENDERS FOR: M. for Copies (*Mr. Costigan*) 117.
- Dominion Elections Act (1874) Amt. B. No. 12** (*Mr. Ives*). 1°^o, 42; M. for 2°^o, 264; Deb. adjd. 266; Deb. resumed, 619; 2°^o*, 621.
- Dominion Fire and Marine Ins. Co.'s Winding-up B. No. 13** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°^o*, 45; 2°^o*, 47; in Com., and 3°^o*, 541. (45 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- DOMINION FRANCHISE, The: Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 256.
- DOMINION LANDS, Account of Moneys received: M. for Statement (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 40.
- Dominion Lands Acts Consolidation B. No. 101** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°^o, 328; 2°^o, 803; in Com., 804.
- Dominion Lands Acts Correction B. No. 164** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1°^o*, 1455; 2°^o, in Com. and 3°^o*, 1549. (45 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- DOMINION LANDS, APPLICATIONS FOR, for Colonization, Pasturage, &c.: M. for Rets. (*Mr. Charlton*) 45.
- DOMINION LANDS chargeable to Capital and Income. See *Supply*.
- DOMINION LANDS IN MANITOBA and the North-West: M. for Cor. between S. Merner, M.P. and Government (*Mr. Cockburn*) 1121.
- DOMINION LANDS in the North-West, Government Policy: Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 810; Deb. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 819; (*Mr. Blake*) 823; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 828; (*Mr. Mills*) 836; (*Mr. Plumb*) 840; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 844; Amt. neg. (Y. 47, N. 112) 846.
- DOMINION LAWS, CODIFICATION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 1108.
- DOMINION MEDICAL BOARD and Health Statistics: in Com. of Supply, 847.
- DOMINION OFFICIALS and Local and Municipal Taxes: Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 73.
- DOMINION POLICE. See *Supply*.
- DOMINION STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION OF: in Com. of Supply, 1288.
- DOMINION TELEGRAPH System: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 73.
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, FEMALE CONVICTS AT: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 52.
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Supply, 783, 1023; Conc., 1498.
- DRAPER, CHIEF JUSTICE, MISSION OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mills*) 1108.
- DRAWBACK REGULATIONS, EVASION OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 313.
- Drawbacks on Articles used in construction of C. P. Ry. B. No. 141** (*Mr. Bowell*). 1°^o prop. 614; Res. in Com., and 1°^o*, 790; 2°^o*, —; in Com., 1255; 3°^o*, 1256. (45 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
- DRAWBACKS ON GOODS manufactured for Export: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 58; Deb. adjd. (*Mr. Charlton*) 68; Deb. resumed, 74; further remarks reserved, 189.
- DRAWBACKS ON SHEET IRON: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 42.
- DRAWBACKS TO MANUFACTURERS OF GOODS required by C. P. Ry.: M. for Cor. &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- DREDGE AT THE MOUTH OF RIVIÈRE DU LOUP (*en haut*) Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 255.
- DREDGING GRAND LAKE, N.B.: Ques. (*Mr. King*) 255, 558.
- DREDGING THE RESTIGOUCHE RIVER: Ques. (*Mr. Haddow*) 254.
- DRENNAN, S. T., Claim for loss sustained through non-fulfilment of Contract by Warden of Kingston Penitentiary: in Com. of Supply, 1289.
- DRILL SHED AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- DRILL PAY OF THE VOLUNTEERS: Deb. in Com. of Supply, 860, 1292.
- Dry Docks Construction Aid B. No. 173** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 1550; 1°^o*, 2°^o*, in Com. and 3°^o*, 1550. (45 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- DRUGGISTS, LICENSED, under Canada Temperance Act: M. for Copies of Annual Returns (*Mr. Haddow*) 288.
- Dundee Land and Investment Co. B. No. 40** (*Mr. Gault*). 1°^o*, 78; 2°^o*, 110.
- DUTIES COLLECTED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA FOR 1881: Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 35.

- DUTIES ON CARBOYS** containing Sulphuric Acid: Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 477.
- DUTIES ON COTTONS AND WOOLLENS.** See *Cottons and Woolleens*.
- DUTIES ON FUEL AND BREADSTUFFS, REPEAL OF:** See *Fuel and Breadstuffs*.
- DUTIES ON MALT AND MALT LIQUORS:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Orton*) 124.
- DUTIES ON SUGAR, AMENDMENT OF THE.** See *Sugar Duties*.
- DUTY ON LAND PLASTER:** Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 255.
- EASTER ADJOURNMENT:** M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 762.
- Edison Electric Light Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 46** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1^o*, 78; 2^o*, 110; in Com., 430, 486; 3^o, 487. (45 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- Elections (Dominion) Act (1874 Amt. B. No. 12** (*Mr. Ives*). 1^o, 42; M. for 2^o, 264; Deb. adjd., 266; Deb. resumed, 619; 2^o*, 621; remarks, 876.
- ELECTRIC LIGHT, WELLAND CANAL LOCKS:** M. for Copies of Tenders (*Mr. Laurier*) 328.
- ELGIN STATION (L'ISLET) ACCOMMODATION:** Ques. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 1107.
- EMERSON AND RAT PORTAGE, RATES BETWEEN:** Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- EMIGRANTS BOOKED FOR CANADA BY AGENTS:** M. for Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 46.
- EMIGRATION TO MANITOBA AND N. W. T.:** M. for Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 57.
- EMORY BAR AND PORT MOODY SECTION OF C. P. R., CONTRACT FOR:** Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 571; Deb. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 574; (*Mr. Cameron, South Huron*) 580; (*Mr. McLennan*) 583; (*Mr. Blake*) 583; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 587; (*Mr. Huntington*) 589; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 590; Amt. neg. (Y. 55, N. 128) 592.
- EMORY-SAVONA CONTRACTS of Canadian Pacific Ry. and Steel Rails for same:** Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 19.
- EMPLOYÉS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RY.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 189.
- Erection of Mills, Mill Dams, Wharves, &c., Legalization B. No. 84** (*Mr. Domville*). 1^o*, 269.
- Erie and Niagara and Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 14** (*Mr. Arkell*). 1^o*, 45; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 221; 3^o*, 263. (45 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO, Bonded Warehouses at:** in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- ESTIMATES, THE:** Notification (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 45; Message from H.E. transmitting same for 1882-83, 58; referred to Com. of Supply, 58. See *Supply*.
- EUROPEAN, CANADIAN, AMERICAN AND ASIATIC Cable Co.'s Scheme:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1252.
- Evidence in Criminal Cases Law Amt. B. No. 115** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). Ques. 315; 1^o, 376.
- Exchange Bank of Nova Scotia B. No. 23** (*Mr. Killam*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 69; in Com. and 3^o*, 669. (45 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- EXCISE.** See *Supply*.
- EXODUS FROM THE LOWER PROVINCES:** in Com. of Supply (*Mr. Anglin*) 849.
- EXPEDITION TO RED RIVER (1870-71) Names of Officers:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 328.
- EXPENDITURE FOR MILITIA PURPOSES IN CANADA:** M. for Statement (*Mr. Vanasse*) 327.
- EXPORT OF COAL FROM NOVA SCOTIA:** M. for Statement (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 226.
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS from 1877 to 1882:** Ms. for Ret. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 20.
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS of the Mine, Fisheries, Forest and Animals:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 57.
- EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 376.
- EXTENSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE:** Ques. (*Mr. Costigan*) 45.
- Extension of Seamens' Act (1873) to Vessels navigating Inland Waters B. No. 135** (*Mr. Guillet*). 1^o*, 519; M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Mr. McLelan*) carried, 1254; 2^o and in Com., 1307, 1425; 3^o*, 1426. (45 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- Extradition Act (1877) Amt. B. No. 154** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 1212; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1559. (45 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- FACTORIES COMMISSION:** Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 46; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 283.
- FARM PRODUCTS, IMPORTATION OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 327.
- Fellow's Medical Manufacturing Co. Act Amt. B. 105** (*Mr. Gault*). 1^o*, 367; 2^o, 488; in Com. and 3^o*, 928. (45 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- FERRIES BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 113.
- FERRY SERVICE AT CROSS POINT AND CAMPBELLTON:** Ques. (*Mr. Haddow*) 254.
- Fire and Marine (Dominion) Ins. Co.'s winding-up B. No. 13** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1^o*, 45; 2^o*, 47; in Com. and 3^o*, 541. (45 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- Fire Arms, Improper use of, Act Amt. B. No. 111** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 376; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1259. (45 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- FISH AND FISH OIL, Indemnity for Duties paid:** Ques. (*Mr. McDonald, King's, P.E.I.*) 1231.
- FISH BREEDING ESTABLISHMENTS OF THE DOMINION:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Haddow*) 493.
- FISH-BREEDING, FISH-WAYS AND OYSTER-BEDS:** Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Com. of Supply, 870.
- FISH-BREEDING:** in Com. of Supply, 1273.
- FISHERIES AND FISHING LICENSES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 229.
- FISHERIES, LEASES AND LICENSES issued under Act of 1868:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 172.
- FISHERIES, REGULATIONS OF THE:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 171.
- FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF.** See *Supply*.
- FISHERMEN, BOUNTIES TO:** Ques. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 255.
- FISHERMENS' LOSSES BY STORMS:** in Com. of Supply, 1274.
- FISHERY WARDEN MOWATT, CHARGES AGAINST:** Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1108.
- FISH HATCHERIES IN N. B.:** Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1108.

- FISHING LICENSES, FISH TRAPS AND BRUSH WEIRS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Killam*) 1237.
- Fishing Vessels Exemption from Dues B. No. 121** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com. and 1^o*, 787; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1131. (45 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- FISH, INSPECTION OF, AND FEES CHARGED: M. for Statement (*Mr. Killam*) 485.
- FLEMING'S, MR., CABLE SCHEME: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1252.
- FLETCHER, LIET.-COL., RETIREMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Houde*) 170.
- FLETCHER, THOMAS, Petition to be set at Liberty: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Tellier*) 328.
- FRANCE AND QUEBEC STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Supply, 865.
- FRANCE, CORRESPONDENCE WITH, in relation to Canadian-built Vessels: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Valin*) 284.
- FRANCHISE FOR THE DOMINION: Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 255.
- Fraud in Relation to Contracts B. No. 7** (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1^o*, 35; M. for 2^o, 187; Amt., 1 m. h. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) carried (Y. 78, N. 51) 188.
- FRAUDULENT DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY BY TRUSTEES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 319.
- FREE POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS: M. to introduce B. (*Mr. McCuaig*) withdn., 109; Res. prop. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1330.
- FRENCH-CANADIAN IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Supply (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) 849.
- FRENCH DOMINATION: on M. for Com. of Supply (*Mr. Tassé*) 1132; (*Mr. Laurier*) 1139; (*Mr. Houde*) 1140; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1141; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1142; (*Mr. Béchard*) 1143; (*Mr. Casey*) 1143; remarks on relevancy of Deb. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1142, 1144; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1142; (*Mr. Mills*) 1142.
- FOG-WHISTLE AT SHELBURNE HARBOR, N.S.: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 222; M. for Ret., 318.
- FOG-WHISTLES, &c., MAINTENANCE OF: in Com. of Supply, 867.
- FOREIGN LIFE INSURANCE Co.'s Deposits with Government M. for List (*Mr. Gault*) 191.
- FORT WILLIAM, LIGHT AT: Deb. in Com. of Supply, 867.
- FUEL AND BREADSTUFFS, Repeal of Duties on: Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 622; Deb. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 629; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 632; (*Mr. Hackett*) 634; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 636; (*Mr. Sproute*) 640; (*Mr. Charlton*) 643; (*Mr. Tellier*) 649; (*Mr. Hesson*) 653; (*Mr. Fleming*) 653; Amt. neg. (Y. 47, N. 121) 655.
- FUEL SUPPLY OF THE NORTH-WEST: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 282.
- Fugitive Offenders in Canada B. No. 108** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 376; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1258. (45 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- GALT, SIR A. T., HIGH COMMISSIONER, Sums paid to: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 128.
- GALT, SIR A. T., ON EMIGRATION: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) in Com. of Supply, 849.
- GARRISON ARTILLERY, "A" and "B" BATTERIES: in Com. of Supply, 865.
- GASPÉ, RESIDENT JUDGE AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 110.
- GENERAL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 721.
- General Port Wardens' Act (1874) Amt. B No. 120** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 787; 1^o*, 788; 2^o and in Com., 1190; 3^o*, 1191. (45 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM HEATING APPARATUS: in Com. of Supply, 1266.
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY. See *Supply*.
- GEORGIAN BAY, BOAT LICENSING ON: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 283.
- GEORGIAN BAY BRANCH OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cockburn*) 36.
- GERMAN DELEGATES, REPORT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Merner*) 254.
- GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND, DELEGATES FROM: Remarks (*Mr. Pope, Compton*) in Com. of Supply, 849.
- 'GLENDON,' STEAMER, CONDEMNATION OF: in Com. of Supply, 866; Conc., 1311.
- GLENN, CAPT., 37TH BATTALION, CASE OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 493.
- GOODWIN'S, JAS., CONTRACT FOR GROUNDS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Supply, 1265.
- GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATOR: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Killam*) 115.
- GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- GOVERNMENT AGENT AT PARIS: Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 45.
- GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE OF: Ms. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 369, 621; (*Mr. Bowell*) 1254.
- GOVERNMENT ISSUE OF FOUR DOLLAR BILLS: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 222.
- GOVERNMENT LAND AGENCIES OPENED IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- GOVERNMENT LAND POLICY IN THE NORTH-WEST: Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 810; Deb. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 819; (*Mr. Blake*) 823; (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 828; (*Mr. Mills*) 836; (*Mr. Plumb*) 840; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 844; Amt. neg. (Y. 47, N. 112) 846.
- GOVERNMENT LANDS WITHIN THE RAILWAY BELT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1240.
- GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE SCHEME: Ques. (*Mr. Rogers*) 1107.
- GOVERNMENT PRINTING executed outside of contractor: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 19.
- Grand Central Station Co. Incorp. B. No. 93** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312.
- GRAND JURIES, ACT RESPECTING: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Sutherland*) withdn., 223.
- GRAND LAKE (N.B.) DREDGING: Ques. (*Mr. King*) 255, 558; in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Supply, 865.
- GRAND RAPIDS OF THE SASKATCHEWAN, TRAMWAY AT THE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 172.
- GRAND RIVER, DAMAGES ALONG THE: M. for Reps. of Dominion Arbitrator (*Mr. McCallum*) 372.
- GRAND TRUNK RY. MAIL ACCOMMODATION between Belleville and Toronto: M. for Copies of Petitions, &c. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 41.
- GRAZING AND PASTURE LANDS IN N.W.T.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 19.

Great American and European Short Line Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 94 (*Mr. Cameron Victoria*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312; in Com. and 3^o*, 1106. (45 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

Great Eastern Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 89 (*Mr. Massue*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312; in Com. and 3^o*, 1001. (45 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

Great Western Ry. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 134 (*Mr. Kilbert*). 1^o*, 541; 2^o*, 558; in Com. and 3^o*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

GREENWOOD (N. S.) POSTMASTER AT, Removal of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Borden*) 485.

GRENVILLE CANAL, Lumber, Shingles and Laths passed through: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1121.

GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Supply, 1146.

GRINDING IN BOND: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 52.

GROSSE ISLE AND MONTMAGNY Semaphore Communication: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 1107.

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Supply, 1265.

GUILLET, MR. G., *West Northumberland*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 1.

GUNS, CONVERSION OF: in Com. of Supply, 855.

HAGGAS' WATER ELEVATORS: Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 73.

HALF-BREEDS AND MINORS CLAIMS under Manitoba Act: M. for Copies (*Mr. Schultz*) 328.

HALIFAX AND ST. PIERRE STEAM COMMUNICATION: Conc., 1310.

HALIFAX BANK, Importation of Vault Doors for: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.

Halifax Harbor Master's Appointment Act Amt. B. No. 140 (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 788; 1^o*, 789; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 988. (45 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

HALIFAX QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Supply, 926.

HALIFAX TERMINUS (INTERCOLONIAL) Wharf and Elevator: in Com. of Supply, 1101.

HAMILTON CUSTOM HOUSE AND PUBLIC OFFICES: M. for Copy of Petition (*Mr. Bain*) 172.

Harbor and River Police of Canada B. No. 107 (*Mr. McLelan*). 1^o*, 375; Res. in Com., 535; 2^o and in Com., 1426; 3^o*, 1429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

HARDWARE, STANDARD PRICES OF: Ques. (*Mr. Plumb*) 1108.

HARMONY STATION AND EAST POINT ON P.E.I. Ry., Station between: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Muttart*) 1121.

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, Commercial Reciprocity with: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1249.

HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Supply, 847; Conc., 1310.

HIGH COMMISSIONER, Contingent Expenses of: in Com. of Supply, 659; Conc., 1500; Additional Expenditure, 1504.

HOMER, MR. J. A. R., *New Westminster*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 696; Introduction, 696.

HOPEWELL CORNER POST OFFICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rogers*) 129.

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

[For Ques. of "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE" or "PROCEDURE," see those subjects.]

Argenteuil Controverted Election, Judges' Rep., 1.

Bellechasse Controverted Election, Judges' Rep., 1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Bills Assented to, 192, 1574.

General Business: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 721.

Indemnity to certain Members: Res. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1315.

Introduction of New Members, 1, 3, 172, 696.

Library of Parliament: Rep. of, presented, 3; Sel. Com. to assist *Mr. Speaker* appointed, 41; Grant to, in Com. of Supply, 784; Conc., 1499.

M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to sit on Saturdays, 1254. Meeting, 1.

New Members returned, 1, 172, 696.

Official Report of the Debates. See *Committees*.

Prorogation, 1576.

Publishing Debates: in Com. of Supply, 784.

Public Business, State of: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 287, 428.

Receipts and Disbursements, presented, 18.

Speech from the Throne, rep., 1.

Summoned to the Senate, 1, 192, 1574.

Vacancies in the Representation announced, 1.

HUDSON'S BAY AND MANITOBA RY.: M. for Cor. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 46.

HUDSON'S BAY Co. and their North American Territories: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mills*) 1108.

HUDSON'S BAY Co. CLAIMS TO LAND in Red River Settlement Belt, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) 1122.

HUDSON'S BAY Co.'s RIGHTS: Ques. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) 313.

HUDSON'S BAY CUSTOMS REVENUES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 43.

HUDSON'S BAY RY.: Remarks (*Mr. Bannerman*) in Com. of Supply, 1099.

HUDSON'S BAY, REVENUE CUTTER ON: Ques. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 45.

HURON AND ONTARIO SHIP CANAL Co.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hay*) 1120.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY, River St. Lawrence: in Com. of Supply, 1445.

IMMIGRANTS ACCOMMODATION AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 255.

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN THE DOMINION, BY PROVINCES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 129.

IMMIGRANT SHEDS IN THE NORTH-WEST: Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 478.

IMMIGRANTS, TRANSPORT OF: in Com. of Supply, 1276.

IMMIGRATION AND QUARANTINE. See *Supply*.

IMMIGRATION AND REPATRIATION AGENCY AT NEW YORK: Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 1230.

IMMIGRATION, ARRANGEMENTS FOR PROMOTION OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 258.

IMMIGRATION TO BRITISH COLUMBIA: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1252.

IMPERIAL MEASURE: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 614.

IMPORTATION AND INSPECTION OF PICKLED HERRING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 369.

IMPORTATION OF CATTLE FOR BREEDING PURPOSES: M. for List of Quarantine Stations (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 258.

- IMPORTATION OF COAL BY PORTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 128.
- IMPORTATION OF FLOUR, MEAL, &c., into Nova Scotia: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 228.
- IMPORTATION OF GOODS FOR CONSUMPTION: M. for summary Statement (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 43.
- IMPORT DUTIES COLLECTED BETWEEN MANITOBA AND ROCKY MOUNTAINS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1120.
- IMPORTATIONS INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA: Ques. (*Mr. De Cosmos*) 19.
- IMPORTATIONS OF THE PRODUCTS OF THE FARM: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 327.
- IMPORTATIONS OF WOOL AND DUTIES COLLECTED: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) 288.
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS AT ST. HYACINTHE: M. for Statement (*Mr. Tellier*) 256.
- IMPORTS, CLASSIFICATION OF, Circulars respecting: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 118.
- IMPORTS OF CANTON FLANNELS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 190.
- IMPROVEMENT OF RAPIDS IN RED RIVER: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- IMPROVEMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE EAST OF PRESCOTT: Ques. (*Mr. Lantier*) 36.
- INDEMNITY TO CERTAIN MEMBERS: Res. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1315.
- Independence of Parliament B. No. 125** (*Mr. Houde*). 1°, 493.
- INDEXES TO STATUTES: M. to print (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 1355.
- Indian Act (1880) Amt. B. No. 174** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 2°* and 3°*, 1571. (45 *Vic., c. 30*.)
- INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Supply, 606, 1283.
- INDIAN AGENCY IN MANITOBA, MANAGEMENT OF: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Charlton*) 20.
- INDIAN AGENT ON RIVER THAMES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 47.
- INDIAN COMMISSIONERS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 128.
- INDIAN SCHOOLS in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick: Conc., 1312.
- INDIANS, DESTITUTE, in Manitoba and N.W.T.: in Com. of Supply, 1290.
- INDIANS OF LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Dawson*) 39.
- INDIANS. See *Supply*.
- INDIAN SUPERINTENDENT AT SARNIA, &c., Complaints against: M. for Copy (*Mr. Coughlin*) 172.
- Indictable Offences, Persons charged with, to give Evidence on own behalf B. No. 50** (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°, 103; 2°*, 621.
- INFORMATION RESPECTING THE NORTH-WEST: Ques. (*Mr. Hooper*) 1107.
- Inland Revenue Act (1880) Amt. B. No. 123** (*Mr. Mousseau*). Res. prop., 535; Deb. adjd., 541; Deb. resumed, 1278; 1°, 1288; B. withdn., 1473.
- Inland Revenue Act (1880) Amt. B. No. 168** (*Mr. Mousseau*). 1°*, 1473; 2°* and in Com., 1551; 3°*, 1553; Senate Amts. considered, 1572, 1574. (45 *Vic., c. 8*.)
- Inland Waters Navigation B. 135** (*Mr. Guillet*). 1°*, 549; M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Mr. McLelan*) carried, 1254; 2° and in Com., 1397, 1405; 3°*, 1406. (45 *Vic., c. 34*.)
- INLAND WATERS SHIPPING DISASTERS: M. for Cor. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 46.
- Insolvent Banks Ins. Co.'s and Trading Corporations B. No. 145** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). 1°*, 853; 2° and in Com., 1314, 1473; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) carried, 1495; 3°*, 1495. (45 *Vic., c. 23*.)
- Insolvent Debtors, Discharge of Past, B. No. 137** (*Mr. Beaty*). 1°, 614.
- INSOLVENT DEBTORS' ESTATES, Distribution of: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 19.
- Insolvent Estates, Equitable Distribution of, B. No. 136** (*Mr. Beaty*). M. to introduce, 606; 1°*, 614.
- Inspection Act (1874) Amt. B. No. 85** (*Mr. Vallée*). 1°*, 269.
- Inspection Act (1874) Amt. B. No. 157** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com. and 1°*, 1255; 2° and in Com., 1472; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Killam*) neg. on a div., 1495; 3°*, 1495. (45 *Vic., c. 25*.)
- INSPECTION OF FACTORIES B.: Ques. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 222.
- INSPECTION OF FISH AND FEES CHARGED: M. for Statement (*Mr. Killam*) 485.
- INSPECTION OF RIVERS AND MILL DAMS IN N.S.: in Com. of Supply, 1274.
- INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, British Columbia: M. for Rep. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 116.
- INSPECTOR OF INDIAN AGENCIES: in Com. of Supply, 1506.
- INSPECTORS OF TOBACCO, Persons appointed as: M. for List (*Mr. Béchard*) 1120.
- INSTRUCTIONS TO GOVERNORS GENERAL OF QUEBEC: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mills*) 1108.
- INSTRUCTIONS TO HEALTH OFFICERS AT HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN: M. for Copies of Circulars (*Mr. Weldon*) 285.
- INSTRUCTIONS TO TELEGRAPH CO.'S OR OPERATORS: M. for Copy (*Mr. Killam*) 1121.
- INTERCOLONIAL AND P.E.I. RYS.: M. for Copies of Tariffs of Rates, &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- Intercolonial and P.E.I. Rys. Branch Lines B. No. 175** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1555. (45 *Vic., c. 15*.)
- INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
- Accidents: Remarks (*Mr. Borden*) in Com. of Supply, 1100.
- Amount expended for Completion, \$24,372.54: M. for Ret. in detail (*Mr. Anglin*) 191.
- Branches and Sidings: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 285.
- Claims of Contractors submitted to Frank Shanly: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Muckenzie*) 57.
- Coal Hoppers: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 478.
- Elgin Station (L'Islet) Accommodation: Ques. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 1107.
- Employés, Remuneration of: Remarks (*Mr. Domville*) in Com. of Supply, 1099.
- Employés: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 189.
- Extension into Halifax: in Com. of Supply, 1230, 1437.

- INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Con.**
 Halifax Terminus, Wharf and Elevator at : in Com. of Supply, 1101.
 Increased Accommodation at St. John : in Com. of Supply, 1099.
 Mileage, Cost of Working : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guillet*) 320; corrected Ret. presented (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1161.
 Rivière du Loup Branch, Total Cost of : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 191.
 Rolling Stock : Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Anglin*) 56, 120; Remarks, 876; in Com. of Supply (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1102, 1149, 1230; Conc., 1318.
 Superannuation Refunds : in Com. of Supply, 1102.
 Tenders for Supplies : Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Killam*) 129; Remarks, 876; Ques., 1102; presented (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 1521.
 Through Freight : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpce, St. John*) 129.
 Train Casualties : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 288.
 Working Expenses and Revenue : M. for Statement (*Mr. Gigault*) 288.
- Intercolonial Ry. (Windsor and Pictou Branches) B. No. 156** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°, 1253; 2°, 1542; in Com., 1549; 3°, 1551. (45 *Vic., c. 16.*)
- Interest on Moneys Secured by Mortgage Act Amt. B. No. 49** (*Mr. Orton*). 1°, 109; 2°, 266.
- INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT**, Arrangements for the Payment of : M. for Statement (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 20.
- INTERIOR, DEPARTMENT OF** : in Com. of Supply, 605.
- INTERIOR, DEPARTMENT OF, Minister's Report**: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 36.
- INTERNATIONAL CIRCUMPOLAR OBSERVATIONS** : in Com. of Supply, 1507.
- International Construction Co. Incorp. B. No. 75** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°, 229; 2°, 264; in Com., 887, 927; 3°, 928. (45 *Vic., c. 114.*)
- INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EXHIBITION AT LONDON** : in Com. of Supply, 1505.
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ACT RESPECTING** : in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS**. See *House of Commons*, —also, Subjects.
- IRELAND, Resolutions of Sympathy** : Prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Supply (*Mr. Costigan*) 762; Remarks, 876; Res., 1030; Deb. (*Mr. Blake*) 1034; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1044; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 1046; (*Mr. Wright*) 1049; (*Mr. Coursol*) 1050; (*Mr. Casey*) 1051; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1053; (*Mr. Brecken*) 1056; (*Mr. Mills*) 1057; (*Mr. Bunster*) 1059; (*Mr. Anglin*) 1060; (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 1065; (*Mr. Landry*) 1066; (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 1066; Reply (*Mr. Costigan*) 1066; Remarks (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1066; Personal Explanations on Vote (*Messrs. Williams, Tyrwhitt, and White, Hastings*) 1067; Remarks on M. to engross Address, 1155.
- IRON INDUSTRY** : Res. (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1216; Deb. (*Mr. Donville*) 1218; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 1220; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1223; (*Mr. Anglin*) 1226; Amt. neg. (Y. 47, N. 114) 1228.
- IRVINE, Mr. D., Carleton, N.B.** : Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 3.
- ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE NEAR BROCKVILLE** : Ques. (*Mr. Fitzsimmons*) 269; M. for Cor. respecting Leases, &c., 1121.
- ISLE AUX NOIX, WORKS AT** : Ques. (*Mr. Bourassa*) 615.
- ISLE PERROT, LIGHTHOUSE ON** : Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 222.
- James' Bay and Lake Superior Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 22** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°, 47; 2°, 69; in Com., 264; 3°, 296. (45 *Vic., c. 84.*)
- "JANE MILLER," Loss of : in Com. on B. 117, 1215.
- John Dickenson Brunton Relief (Patent) B. No. 104** (*Mr. Ryan, Montreal*). 1°, 367; M. for 2°, 487; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) carried, 488.
- JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS IN QUEBEC** : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ives*) 48.
- JUDICIAL CHANGES IN N.B.** : M. for Cor. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 1252.
- JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF** : in Com. of Supply, 601.
- KENT AND BOTHWELL, Post office near Boundary** : Ques. (*Mr. Mills*) in Com. of Supply, 1192.
- KEEWATIN, EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT IN** : in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY.**, Complaints against Location, &c. : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 481.
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, Management of** : in Com. of Supply, 779.
- KINGSVILLE HARBOR, ONT.** : M. for Reps. of Engineer (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 45.
- LA BAIE AND ST. THOMAS DE PIERREVILLE, SAVINGS BANK AT** : Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 558.
- "LA CANADIENNE," Repairs and Maintenance : in Com. of Supply, 1272.
- LACHINE CANAL** : in Com. of Supply, 1145, 1148.
- Lake Athabaska and Hudson Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 62** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 162; 2°, 201; in Com. and 3°, 615. (45 *Vic., c. 83.*)
- LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR INDIANS** : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 39.
- Lake Superior and James' Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 22** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°, 47; 2°, 69; in Com., 264; 3°, 296. (45 *Vic., c. 84.*)
- LAND AGENCIES OPENED IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES** : M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- LAND GRANT BONDS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.** : M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 37.
- LAND GRANTS FOR MILITARY SERVICE IN 1837** : Ques. (*Mr. Crouter*) 221.
- LAND PLASTER, DUTY ON** : Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 255.
- LAND POLICY IN THE NORTH-WEST**. See *Government Land Policy*.
- LAND REGULATIONS AND COLONIZATION SOCIETIES** : Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- LAND REGULATIONS IN FORCE IN OCT., 1878** : M. for Copies (*Mr. Mills*) 172.
- LAND REGULATIONS, TRANSLATION AND PRINTING OF** : Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 558.

- LAND TAKEN UP UNDER HOMESTEAD ACT IN MANITOBA
KEEWATIN AND NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: M. for Ret.
(*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- LANDS GRANTED, SELECTED OR RESERVED FOR CANADIAN
PACIFIC RY.: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- LANDS SOLD IN MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES,
prices obtained, &c.: M. for Rets. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*)
40.
- L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, N.S.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Flynn*)
1121.
- LAURENT, JOSEPH ST., COMPLAINT OF: M. for Statement (*Mr.*
Fiset) 493.
- LAURIN, OCTAVE, SUMS PAID TO: M. for Statement (*Mr.*
Holton) 1121.
- LAVAL UNIVERSITY, ACT RESPECTING: M. for Cor. (*Mr.*
Laurier) 40.
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Act Amt.**
B. No. 115 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1^o, 376.
- LEGAL TENDER NOTES: Res. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1109,
1117; Deb. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1113; (*Mr. Charlton*)
1114; (*Mr. McCallum*) 1115; (*Mr. Hesson*) 1116; (*Mr.*
Ross, Dundas) 1117; (*Mr. Plumb*) 1118.
- LÉGARÉ, JEAN LOUIS, Compensation to: in Com. of Supply,
1509.
- LEGISLATION. See *Supply*.
- LETTER CARRIERS UNIFORMS: in Com. of Supply, 1194.
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT. See *House of Commons*.
- LICENSED DRUGGISTS UNDER CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT: M.
for Copies of Annual Rets. (*Mr. Haddow*) 288.
- LIFE-BOATS, &c., PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Supply, 866.
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE. See *Supply*.
- LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS, SALARIES OF: in Com. of Supply, 867.
- LIGHTHOUSE ON ISLE PERROT: Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 222.
- LIGHTHOUSE ON WEST HEAD CAPE, SABLE ISLAND: Ques.
(*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 222.
- Lighthouses, Buoys and Beacons B. No. 159**
(*Mr. McLelan*) 1^o* —
- LIGHT ON RIVIÈRE DU LOUP WHARF: Ques. (*Mr. Grand-*
bois) 222.
- LISLOIS, JOS. CHAS., CLAIM OF: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 73;
(*Mr. Casgrain*) 615.
- LITTLE RIVER ST. LOUIS WORKS: Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 163.
- LIVERPOOL AND ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX STEAM COMMUNICA-
TION: in Com. of Supply, 865.
- LIVE STOCK, ADMISSION OF, INTO CANADA: M. for Cor. (*Mr.*
Patterson, Essex) 44.
- Loan and Savings Co.'s and Building Societies**
(Ont.) Act Amt B. No. 131 (*Mr. Beaty*). 1^o*,
541; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1509. (45 *Vic., c. 24.*)
- LOBSTER FISHERIES REGULATIONS: in Com. of Supply, 870.
- LOCKPORT, GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK AT: Ques. (*Mr.*
Trow) 477.
- LOCKPORT HARBOR: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) in
Com. of Supply, 867.
- London and North American Chartered Bank**
Act Amt. B. No 28 (*Mr. Haggart*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*,
89; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311. (45 *Vic., c. 59.*)
- LONDON POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES AND SUPERANNUATION
OF CLERKS: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Blake*) 39, 166.
- LOTBINIÈRE, LIGHTHOUSES IN: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 615.
- LUMBER SHIPPED AT KINGSTON, BROCKVILLE AND PRESCOTT:
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1121.
- LUARD, MAJOR GENERAL, and Censure of Lieut.-Col. Ross
in *Official Gazette*: Deb. in Com. of Supply, 1292.
- MABOU HARBOR, DREDGING AT: in Com. of Supply, 1267.
- MACKAY, H. B., DIFFERENCE OF SALARY: in Com. of Supply,
1289.
- MACPHERSON, SENATOR, ON THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. and
Sandford Fleming's Position: M. for Copy of Memorandum
(*Mr. Blake*) 1250.
- Magdalen Islands, &c., Voting at Elections for**
Members of H. of C. B. No. 74 (*Mr. Fortin*).
1^o, 220.
- MAIL ACCOMMODATION BETWEEN BELLEVILLE AND TORONTO:
M. for Copies of Petitions, &c. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 41.
- MAIL SERVICE AND SMALL PARCELS: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 48.
- MAIL SERVICE IN BRUCE COUNTY: Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 363.
- MAIL SERVICE, ST. FLAVIEN: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 222.
- MAIL SUBSIDIES. See *Supply*.
- MAILS, DELAY IN RECEPTION OF: Attention of Minister
called to (*Mr. Flynn*) 493.
- MALT AND MALT LIQUOR DUTIES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Orton*) 124.
- MANITOBA:
Accommodation for Immigrants at Winnipeg: Ques.
(*Mr. Scott*) 255.
Administration of Justice: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 54.
Answer of Hon. E. B. Wood to Petition of H. J. Clark
and others: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 20.
Auction Sales of Public Lands at Winnipeg: M. for Ret.
(*Mr. Mills*) 1121.
Charges against Chief Justice Wood: M. for read-
ing the Journals (*Mr. Schultz*) 372, 431, 1234.
Chartered Railways: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*)
129.
Extension of Boundaries: M. for Copy of Proclamation
(*Mr. Scott*) 223.
Extension of the Boundaries: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*)
376.
Half Breeds' and Minors' Claims under Manitoba Act:
M. for Copies (*Mr. Schuttz*) 328.
Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Supply, 1028.
Improvement of Rapids in Red River: Ques. (*Mr.*
Scott) 163.
Increased Subsidy: prop. Res. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 71.
Indians: in Com. of Supply, 1184.
Lake Manitoba Water Level: M. for Engineer's Reps.
(*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 57.
Management of Indian Agency: M. for Rep. (*Mr.*
Charlton) 20.
Mennonite Reserves, Unoccupied Sections: Ques. (*Mr.*
Merner) 269.
Penitentiary: in Com. of Supply, 784.
Public Buildings: in Com. of Supply, 1025.
Rainy River, Water Power on: M. for Ret. (*Mr.*
Wallace, York) 228.
Rates between Winnipeg and Brandon, and Emerson
and Rat Portage: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.

MANITOBA—*Con.*

- Roads and Bridges, Aid to: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1120.
- School Lands, Occupation of: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Schultz*) 328.
- School Lands, Squatters on: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Scott*) 263.
- Statistical Bureau at Winnipeg: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 255.
- Water Hen River Navigation: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- MANITOBA AND HUDSON'S BAY RY.: M. for Cor. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 46.
- Manitoba Bank Incorp. B No. 16** (*Mr. Scott*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- Manitoba, Increased Subsidy to, B. No. 162** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop. 721; in Com., 1420; 1^o*, 1425; 2^o* and in Com., 1568; M. for 3^o, 1568; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1569; 3^o*, 1569. (45 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- MANITOBA PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Supply, 784, 1505.
- MANUFACTORIES ESTABLISHED IN THE COUNTY OF BEAUPRENOIS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 328.
- MAPS OF CANADA: M. for Copies (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- MAPS OF MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST: M. for Copies (*Mr. Hesson*) 227.
- MARBLE COVE, DREDGE AT: Remarks (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- MARGARETSVILLE, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT, Charges against: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1121.
- MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Supply, 657.
- Marine Insurance (St. Lawrence) Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 3** (*Mr. Gault*). 1^o*, 35; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- Marine Telegraph (Pacific Coast and Asia) Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 127** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). 1^o, 531; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1191. (45 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- MARITIME COURT, CASES DISPOSED OF IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 51.
- MARITIME COURT FOR CANADA, ESTABLISHMENT OF: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Address to Her Majesty, 1541.
- MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO, SUBROGATE JUDGES: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 45.
- MARITIME JURISDICTION ACT: Ques. (*Mr. Williams*) 110.
- Maritime Jurisdiction (Ont.) Act Amt. B. No. 37** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1^o*, 72.
- Maritime Jurisdiction Act (1877) Amt. B. No. 135** (*Mr. Guillet*). 1^o*, 549; M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Mr. McLelan*) carried, 1254; 2^o and in Com., 1307, 1425; 3^o*, 1426. (45 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legislation B No. 9** (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*). 1^o, 42; M. for 2^o carried (Y. 137, N. 34) 74; in Com., 320; rep., 326; on M. to concur in Amts. from Com., Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 104) 485; Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) 485; neg. on a div., 489; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) neg. (Y. 36, N. 113) 489; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. on a div., 489; Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) neg. on a div., 490; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) neg. on a div., 492; Amt. (*Mr. Strange*) neg. (Y. 49, N. 87) 492; 3^o on a div., 492. (45 *Vic.*, c. 102.)

- MARSHALL WOOD, CLAIM OF: in Com. of Supply, 1265.
- MASKINONGÉ RIVER, DREDGING AT MOUTH OF: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 269.
- MATANE WHARF, REPAIRS TO: M. for Engineer's Rep. (*Mr. Fiset*) 288; Ques., 312.
- MARTINI-HENRY RIFLES: in Com. of Supply, 856.
- McClary Manufacturing Co. Incorp. B. No. 100** (*Mr. Carling*). 1^o*, 311; 2^o*, 541; 3^o*, 1162. (45 *Vic.*, c. 116.)
- McDOUGALL, Mr. J., *Pictou, N.S.*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 1.
- McHALE, PATRICK, COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES TO LAND: in Com. of Supply, 1268.
- McLAREN vs. CALDWELL: M. for Copies of Judgments (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 129.
- McLELAN, Hon. A. W., *Colchester, N.S.*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 1.
- McMAHON'S COVE, DREDGE AT: Remarks (*Mr. King*) in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- McNUTT, J. B., LAND DAMAGES AT ONSLOW, N.B.: in Com. of Supply, 1229.
- McVICAR, S. A., FISHERY OVERSEER: in Com. of Supply, 1272.
- "M. C. UPPER," SCHOONER, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1231; in Com. of Supply, 1443; Conc., 1502; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1535.
- MEMBERS INDEMNITY: Res. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1315.
- MEMBERS INTRODUCED. See *House of Commons*, also *Names*.
- MENNONITE RESERVES, UNOCCUPIED SECTIONS ON. Ques. (*Mr. Merner*) 269.
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:
- Commanding attendance of Commons in Senate Chamber, 1, 192, 1574.
- Transmitting copy of Numerical Census of Dom. of Canada, 42.
- Transmitting Estimates for 1882-83, 58; further Supplementary, 1335.
- Transmitting Supplementary Estimates for 1881-82, 69; additional Supplementary, 1313.
- Transmitting Despatch from Secretary of State for the Colonies acknowledging receipt of Address congratulating the Queen on Her Escape and tendering Thanks, 1102.
- Transmitting Minute of Privy Council on the Establishment of Provisional Districts in the North-West, 1402.
- MESSENGERS (SESSIONAL) REMUNERATION: Remarks before Prorogation, 1572.
- METAGHAN RIVER BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Statement (*Mr. Killam*) 327.
- METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS, &c.: Conc. 1311.
- METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE OF CANADA: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 168.
- MILITARY COLLEGE, ROYAL:
- Appointment of a Captain of Cadets: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Bunting*) 191.
- Cadets in: M. for Ret. of number since opening (*Mr. Strange*) 190.
- Debate in Com. of Supply, 863.

- MILITARY COLLEGE, ROYAL—Con.**
 Changes in Organization: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 191.
 Salary paid Prof. Ferguson, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 191.
 Staff and Employés of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bunting*) 191.
- MILITARY DEFENCE OF CANADA:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 38.
- MILITARY INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES:** in Com. of Supply, 865.
- MILITARY SCHOOLS FOR THE INFANTRY SERVICE:** Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 73.
- Militia Acts Amt. B. No. 148** (*Mr. Caron*). 1^o*, 1129; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1264. (45 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- MILITIA, AGED EMPLOYÉS IN THE:** Ques. (*Mr. Amyot*) 72.
- MILITIA CLOTHING AND ACCOUTREMENTS:** Ques. (*Mr. Thompson*) 1106.
- MILITIA, CLOTHING FOR:** Debate on the Tariff in Com. of Supply, 857.
- MILITIA, DEPARTMENT OF:** in Com. of Supply, 601.
- MILITIA EXPENDITURE IN CANADA:** M. for Statement (*Mr. Vanasse*) 327.
- MILITIA RETURNS:** Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 614.
- MILLE VACHES AND MURRAY BAY TELEGRAPH SERVICE:** in Com. of Supply, 1268.
- MINERAL, COAL AND TIMBER LOCATIONS IN MANITOBA, &c.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 20.
- MINES ACT (QUEBEC) DISALLOWED:** M. for Copies, &c. (*Mr. Laurier*) 40.
- MINING AND TIMBER LICENSES issued in disputed Territory:** M. for Copies (*Mr. Mills*) 172.
- MINING RIGHTS:** M. for Copies of O.C. (*Mr. Blake*) 48.
- Minnesota and Thunder Bay Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 21** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68.
- MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS:** Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 19, 21; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 21.
- MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS' VISIT TO ONTARIO:** in Com. of Supply, 927.
- Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund (Presbyterian) Management Incorp. Acts Amt. B. No. 71** (*Mr. Brooks*). 1^o*, 192; 2^o*, 221; in Com. and 3^o*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 125.)
- MIRAMICHI RIVER, WHARVES, &c.:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Snowball*) 1121.
- MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.** See *Supply*.
- Misdemeanors, Persons charged with, competent as Witnesses B. No. 10** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1^o*, 42; M. for 2^o, 616; 2^o*, 619; ref. to Special Com., 619.
- MOFFAT, GEO. HEIRS OF, CLAIM FOR TRANSPORT OF RAILS:** in Com. of Supply, 1229.
- MONCTON POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE:** in Com. of Supply, 1023.
- MONEY ORDERS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Farrow*) 43.
- MONTMAGNY, SURVEY OF THE BASIN OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 1107.
- Montreal and Central Ry Co. Incorp. B. No. 132** (*Mr. Fulton*). 1^o*, 541; 2^o*, 558; in Com. and 3^o*, 1106. (45 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY.:** Permission to ask Ques. (*Mr. Méthot*) 1302.
- MONTREAL DRILL SHED:** in Com. of Supply, 1355.
- MONTREAL HARBOR BUOYS AND BEACONS:** in Com. of Supply, 1272.
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Act Amt. B. No. 130** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 533; 1^o*, 534; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 988. (45 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS, POWERS OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 477.
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS REGULATIONS:** M. for Copy (*Mr. Vanasse*) 1253.
- Montreal Port Warden, Office of, Acts Consolidation B. No. 122** (*Mr. McLellan*). Res. in Com. and 1^o*, 786; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1264. (45 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- MONTREAL POST OFFICE CLOCK:** Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 72.
- MONTREAL POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES:** Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 36; M. for Rep. of Commission, 1121.
- Montreal Telegraph Co.'s Acts Consolidation B. No. 96** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o, 312; in Com., 928; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 947; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) carried (Y. 108, N. 40) 948; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) neg. on a div., 949; Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) neg. (Y. 48, N. 99) 950; 3^o*, 950. (45 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- MONTREAL WATER POLICE AND LABORER'S STRIKE:** in Com. of Supply, 1272.
- MONUMENT TO THE MEMORY OF SIR GEORGE CARTIER:** Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 615.
- MORIN, LUCIEN, CLAIM OF:** Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 615.
- Mortgage Regulation Act Amt. B. No. 49** (*Mr. Orton*). 1^o*, 109; 2^o, 266.
- MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, ERECTION OF:** in Com. of Supply, 1445.
- MOWAT, FISHERY WARDEN, CHARGES AGAINST:** Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1108; in Com. of Supply, 1274.
- MUNICIPAL AID TO ROADS AND BRIDGES IN MANITOBA:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1120.
- MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL TAXES and Dominion Officials:** Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 73.
- MURRAY CANAL:** Ques. (*Mr. White, Hastings*) 18; in Com. of Supply, 1146.
- MUSKOKA, FORMATION OF VOLUNTEER COMPANIES IN:** Remarks (*Mr. Cockburn*) in Com. of Supply, 860.
- Mutual Benefit Association of Sherbrooke Incorp. B. No. 33** (*Mr. Brooks*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89.
- Mutual Life Association of Canada Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 27** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- Mutual (Sun) Insurance Co. of Montreal Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 4** (*Mr. Gault*). 1^o*, 35; 2^o*, 47; in Com., 296; M. for 3^o, 311; 3^o, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- Napierville Junction Ry. and Quarry Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 44** (*Mr. Coursol*). 1^o*, 78; 2^o*, 110.
- Navigation of Canadian Waters Act Amt. B. No. 82** (*Mr. McCallum*). 1^o*, 254; M. for 2^o, 376.

- NAVIGATION OF WATER HEN RIVER: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- NEUSTADT POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Reps. (*Mr. Jackson*) 44.
- NEW BRUNSWICK:
- Fish Hatcheries: Ques. (*Mr. Weldon*) 1108.
- Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Supply, 1027.
- Judicial Changes: M. for Cor. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 1252.
- Mails, Delay of: Remarks, 1155.
- Public Buildings: in Com. of Supply, 1023.
- "NEW DOMINION," Dredge, Hull for: in Com. of Supply, 1267.
- "NEWFIELD" AND THE WRECKED "MORAVIAN": M. for Cor. (*Mr. Killam*) 482.
- NEW GLASGOW, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Supply, 926.
- NEW MEMBERS. See *House of Commons*.
- Newspapers, Free Transmission of, through Mail B. No. 161 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 1419; 1^o*, 1420; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1550. (45 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- New York and Ont. Furnace Co. B. No. 65 (*Mr. White, Hastings*). 1^o*, 172; 2^o*, 201; in Com., 312; 3^o, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 113.)
- NIAGARA, BOROUGH OF: Remarks (*Mr. Plumb*) before Pro-rogation, 1573.
- Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co. B. No. 48 (*Mr. Arkell*). 1^o*, 109; 2^o*, 172; in Com., 312; 3^o*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- Niagara Peninsula Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 67 (*Mr. Bergin*). 1^o*, 172; 2^o*, 201; in Com. and 3^o*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- NIAGARA RIVER, SEIZURE OF A BOAT, &c., ON: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 1121.
- NOLAN, J. C., RENT OF BUILDING AT ST. OCTAVE: in Com. of Supply, 1228.
- North America (British) Ins. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 34 (*Mr. McLennan*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89; in Com. and 3^o*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- North American Mutual Life Ins. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 53 (*Mr. Mackenzie*). 1^o*, 129; 2^o*, 172; in Com. and 3^o*, 541. (45 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- NORTHERN AND WESTERN BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO: Res. (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 661; Deb. adjd., 690; Deb. resumed (*Mr. Dawson*) 723; carried, (Y. 116, N. 44) 761. [For Deb. see *Boundaries of Ontario*.]
- "NORTHERN LIGHT," Coal purchased for use of: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 1121.
- North Sydney Harbor Act Amt. B. No. 160 (*Mr. McLelan*). 1^o*, 1403; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, (45 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- North-Western and Portage and Westbourne Ry. Co. B. No. 20 (*Mr. Boulbee*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68; in Com., 558; 3^o*, 615. (45 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- North-Western Bank Incorp. B. No. 29 (*Mr. Rochester*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89; in Com., 296; 3^o*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE, Compensation to Members: in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- North-West Mounted Police Force Acts Consolidation B. No. 102 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 328; Res. in Com., 541; 2^o*, 798; in Com., 798, 1129; 3^o on a div., 1130. (45 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE SERVICE. See *Supply*.
- North-West Territories Act (1880) Amt. B. No. 149 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 1129; 2^o, in Com. and 3^o*, 1542. (45 *Vic.*, c. 28.)
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
- Arrears due Government on Sale of Lands in Manitoba, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 19.
- Applications and Leases of Grazing and Pasture Lands: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 19.
- Coal, Mineral and Timber Lands, Locations, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 20.
- Chartered Rys.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 129.
- Coal Lands: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 558.
- Expenses of Government in: in Com. of Supply, 1199.
- Government Land Agencies opened: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- Government Land Policy: Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 810.
- Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- Immigrant Sheds: Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 478.
- Information respecting: Ques. (*Mr. Hooper*) 1107.
- Indians: in Com. of Supply, 1184.
- Land Sold up to Feb., 1882, and Prices obtained, &c.: M. for Rets. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40.
- Land taken up under Homestead Act and Number of Settlers: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- Number of Acres of Land surveyed, &c.: M. for Rets. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- Number of Acres of Land sold and amounts realized, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- Pre-emptions and Amount Paid thereon: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- Public Buildings: in Com. of Supply, 1025.
- Purchase of Lands by Ry. Co.'s: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 1121.
- Provisional Districts: Mess. presented (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1402: Considered, 1567; Res. 1568.
- Regulations as to Sale, &c., of Public Lands and Minerals, Coal and Timber Lands: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- Squatters on Lands: M. for O.C. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- Supply of Fuel: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 282.
- Timber Licenses Granted in Manitoba, Keewatin, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 20.
- Nova Scotia, Exchange Bank of, B. No. 23 (*Mr. Killam*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 69; in Com., 264; 3^o*, 296. (45 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- NOVA SCOTIA HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Supply, 1026.
- NOVA SCOTIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Supply, 926.
- Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1^o*, 1.
- OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS, Removal of: in Com. of Supply, 866.
- OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE. See *Supply*.

- OCEAN MAIL CLERKS: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) in Com. of Supply, 1192.
- Ocean Mutual Marine Ins. Co. Incorp. B. No. 90 (*Mr. Daly*). 1^o*, 289; 2^o*, 312; in Com. and 3^o*, 669. (45 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- OCCUPATION OF SCHOOL LANDS IN MANITOBA: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Schultz*) 328.
- Offences against the Person (Criminal Law Amt.) B. No. 11 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1^o*, 42; 2^o, 279; in Com., 615.
- OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS, CLAIMS REFERRED TO: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 57.
- "OFFICIAL GAZETTE," Censure of Lieut.-Col. Ross in: Deb. in Com. of Supply, 1292.
- OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES:
- Com. to supervise appointed (*Mr. Bowell*) 183.
 - M. to concur in First Rep. of Com. (*Mr. Béchard*) 690; Second Rep. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1473; Third Rep., 1476; Fourth Rep., 1553.
 - Supply—in Com., 784; Conc., 1499.
 - Translation of: Remarks on the (*Mr. Fiset*) 376; (*Mr. Valin*) 1356.
- OFFICIAL VISITS TO ENGLAND: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 37.
- OLIVER DAVIDSON, & Co., MAINTENANCE OF TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
- ONDERDONK, ANDREW, CHEQUE DEPOSITED WITH TENDER: M. for Copy (*Mr. Guthrie*) 229.
- ONTARIO:
- Boundaries, Northern and Western (*Mr. Plumb*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 661; Deb. adjd., 690; Deb. resumed (*Mr. Dawson*) 723; Amt. carried (Y. 116, N. 44) 761. [For Deb. see *Boundaries of Ontario*.]
 - Boundary Award: M. for Copies of Cor. with Lieut.-Governor (*Mr. Mills*) 229.
 - Bureau of Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Supply, 843.
 - Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Supply, 1028.
 - Indians: in Com. of Supply, 1184.
 - Level of Lake: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.
 - Northern and Western Boundary: M. for Reprs. and Cor. (*Mr. Plumb*) 19.
 - Public Buildings: in Com. of Supply, 1024.
 - Streams and Creeks Act, Disallowed: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40.
 - Visit of Minister of Public Works: in Com. of Supply, 927.
- ONTARIO AND MANITOBA MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (*Mr. Hooper*) in Com. of Supply, 1196.
- Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 72 (*Mr. Strange*). 1^o*, 220; 2^o*, 264.
- Ontario Bank Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 45 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1^o*, 78; 2^o*, 110; in Com. and 3^o*, 541. (45 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- Ontario Bank Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 170 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*, 1521. (45 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- Ontario Court of Maritime Jurisdiction Act Amt. B. No. 37 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1^o*, 72.
- Ontario Investment Association Incorp. B. No. 54 (*Mr. Carling*). 1^o*, 129; 2^o*, 172.
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 61 (*Mr. Bergin*). 1^o*, 162; 2^o*, 201; in Com. and 3^o*, 1001. (45 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- ORDER OF BUSINESS: Remarks (*Mr. Charlton*) on B. No. 25, 1068; Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 1154.
- ORDER, QUESTIONS OF:
- Allusion to a past Deb. objected to and checked by *Mr. Speaker*, 1133.
 - Boundaries of Ontario: Res. (*Mr. Plumb*). Objection (*Mr. Mousseau*) Member having already spoken, sustained by *Mr. Speaker*, 753.
 - Canadian Pacific Ry. B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Objection (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to Member speaking twice. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Member did not make a speech, 1235.
 - Claim of Jos. Chas. Lislois. Objection (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to construction of Ques. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that same be amended, 73.
 - Explanation in Deb. after Member has spoken only allowed by permission of the House, 452.
 - Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (*Mr. Mousseau*). Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) as to Amts. likely to be made by the Senate. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) cannot speak in House of Commons of what may or may not be done in the Senate, 1552.
 - Military Schools for the Infantry Service. Objection (*Mr. Mackenzie*) to construction of Ques. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that first part of Ques. not objectionable, but last part must be withdrawn, 73.
 - Permission of a Member to ask a Ques. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that Ques. can only be put by unanimous consent of the House, 1303.
- OROMOCTO SHOALS: Remarks (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- Ottawa Agricultural Ins. Co's winding-up B. No. 30 (*Mr. Rochester*). 1^o*, 57; 2^o*, 89; in Com. and 3^o*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- Ottawa and Arnprior Junction Railway Co. Incorp. B. No. 18 (*Mr. Domville*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68; in Com., 221; 3^o*, 263. (45 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- OTTAWA, LUMBER, SHINGLES AND LATHS SHIPPED FROM: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1121.
- Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 60 (*Mr. Currier*). 1^o*, 162; 2^o*, 201; in Com. and 3^o*, 615. (45 *Vic.*, c. 47.)
- OWEN SOUND, RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120; in Com. of Supply, 1267.
- OYSTERS, CULTIVATION OF: Remarks (*Mr. Killam*) in Com. of Supply, 870.
- PACIFIC OCEAN CABLE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Houde*) 1121.
- PACIFIC RAILWAY. See *Canadian Pacific Ry.*
- PARLIAMENT, 4TH, FOURTH SESSION, 1882, 45 VICTORIA: Opening, 1; Speech from the Throne, 1; Bills Assented to, 192, 1574; Prorogation, 1576.
- PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE, EXTENSION OF THE: Ques. (*Mr. Costigan*) 45.
- PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY. See *House of Commons* and *Supply*

- PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING CONTRACT in Com. of Supply, 1198.
- PASPEBIAC HARBOR SURVEY: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 37.
- PASSENGER AND FREIGHT RATES ON RYS. OWNED BY CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- Passenger (Ry.) Tickets B. No. 5** (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 85; 2° prop., 269; M. to refer to Sel. Com., withdn., 279; 2°, 279; prop. M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 851; carried, 1155; 3°*, 1212. (45 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- Patent Act (1872) Amt. B. No. 106** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°, 367; 2° and in Com., 1472.
- Patent Act (1872) Amt. B. No. 155** (*Mr. Pope, Compton*). 1°*, 1253; 2° and in Com., 1542; 3°*, 1543. (45 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- "PATENT RECORD:" in Com. of Supply, 847.
- Pawnbrokers' Act Amt. B. No. 24** (*Mr. Orton*). 1°*, 47; M. for 2°, 189; Deb. adjd., 189; Deb. resumed and B. withdn., 266.
- PAYMENTS OF MONEY TO CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: M. for Reprs. and O. C. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- Peace River and Saskatchewan Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 26** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 312; 3°*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- P. E. I. and Intercolonial Ry Branch Lines B. No. 175** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 1555. (45 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- PEMBROKE AND THE CANADA CENTRAL RY. BONUS: M. for Copy of Petition, &c. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 483.
- PENITENTIARIES. See *Supply*.
- PENSIONS. See *Supply*.
- Persons charged with Misdemeanor, competent as Witnesses B. No. 10** (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 42; M. for 2°, 616; 2°*, 619; ref. to Special Com., 619.
- PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 328, 368; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 368; (*Mr. Plumb*) 452; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 570; (*Mr. Mills*) 888; *Messrs. Kirkpatrick, McCarthy and Boulton* 889; (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 927; (*Mr. Bunster*) 1067, 1102; (*Messrs. Tasse and Currier*) 990; (*Mr. Hesson*) 990; (*Mr. Domville*) 1356.
- PETITE NATION RIVER WORKS: Ques. (*Mr. Routhier*) 172.
- Petroleum Inspection Act (1880) Amt. B. No. 172** (*Mr. Bowell*). 1°*, 1521; 2° and in Com., 1571; 3°*, 1573. (45 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- Planters' Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 52** (*Mr. Gault*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 172; in Com. and 3°*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- PICKLED HERRING, IMPORTATION AND INSPECTION OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 369.
- PICTOU DRY DOCK: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Doull*) 314.
- PIER AT ANNAPOLIS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Killam*) 55.
- PIER AT CRANE ISLAND: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 1107.
- Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 119** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 659; 1°*, 660; 2°, 1260; in Com. 1261, 1329, 1472; 3°*, 1472. (45 *Vic.*, c. 32.)
- Pilotage Act (1873) Amt. B. No. 142** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 789; 1°*, 789; B. withdn.
- POINT AUX TREMBLES, WHARF AT: M. for Reprs. of Engineers (*Mr. Vallée*) 44.
- Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 86** (*Mr. White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 288; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- POPULATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA BY LAST CENSUS: Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 35.
- Portage, Westbourne, and North-Western Ry. Co. B. No. 20** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 558; 3°*, 615. (45 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- PORT DANIEL HARBOR SURVEY: M. for Rep. of Engineer (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 40.
- PORT MOODY AND EMORY BAR SECTION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RY., CONTRACT FOR: Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 571; Deb. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 574; (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 580; (*Mr. McLennan*) 583; (*Mr. Blake*) 583; (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 587; (*Mr. Huntington*) 589; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 590; Amt. neg. (Y. 55, N. 125) 592.
- PORT MOODY AND YALE SECTION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RY., APPROXIMATE QUANTITIES: M. for Copies, 167.
- PORT MULGRAVE TO EAST BAY (C.B.) STEAM COMMUNICATION: Conc., 1310, 1501.
- PORT WARDEN ACTS, EXPENDITURE UNDER: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gault*) 1121.
- Port Warden's Act (1874) Amt. B. No. 120** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 787; 1°*, 788; 2° and in Com., 1190; 3°*, 1191. (45 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- Port Warden of Montreal Harbor Acts Consolidation B. No. 122** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com. and 1°*, 786; in Com and 3°*, 1264. (45 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS, ABOLITION OF: Ques. (*Mr. Trow*) 36; prop. Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1330.
- POSTAL COMMUNICATION WITH THE COUNTY OF SAGUENAY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cimon, Chicoutimi*) 125.
- POSTAL SAVINGS' BANKS SYSTEM: Ques. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 1103.
- POSTMASTER AT GREENWOOD (N.S.) REMOVAL OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Borden*) 485.
- POST OFFICE AT BRAMPTON: Ques. (*Mr. Elliott*) 110.
- POST OFFICE AT WHITE ROCK MILLS: Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 478.
- POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Supply, 656.
- POST OFFICE ORDERS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Farrow*) 43.
- POST OFFICE SERVICE: in Com. of Supply, 1191.
- POTS, THOMAS, LETTERS ADDRESSED TO: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Anglin*) 374.
- PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING, HARBOR AT: Remarks (*Mr. Dawson*) in Com. of Supply, 869.
- PRINCE ARTHUR'S LANDING TO RED RIVER (CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.): in Com. of Supply, 1095; Conc., 1315.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND GREAT BRITAIN STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Supply, 866; Conc., 1311.
- Prince Edward Island Bank Relief B. No. 38** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 72. (45 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Supply, 1023.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY., CONDITION OF: in Com. of Supply, 1154.
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY. RATES: M. for Statement (*Mr. Muttart*) 114.
- PRECEDENCE OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS: Ms. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 369, 621; (*Mr. Bowell*) 1254.
- PRE-EMPTIONS IN MANITOBA, &c., AND AMOUNT PAID THEREON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.
- Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland Incorp. B. No. 70** (*Mr. Macmillan*). 1^o*, 192; 2^o*, 221.
- Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund Management Incorp. Acts Amt. B. No. 71** (*Mr. Brooks*). 1^o*, 192; 2^o*, 221; in Com. and 3^o*, 773. (45 *Vic., c. 125.*)
- Presbyterian Temporalities Fund Management Incorp. Acts Amt. B. No. 66** (*Mr. Shaw*). 1^o*, 172; 2^o*, 201; M. for Com., 549; Amt., delay of one week (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) neg., 550; in Com., 550; rep., 558; M. for 3^o, 696; Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) neg. on a div., 698; Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 130) 715; Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) neg. on a div., 716; Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) carried, 718; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Macmillan*) neg. on a div., 720; 3^o*, 720. (45 *Vic., c. 124*)
- PRINTING, CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. AND DOMINION LANDS: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1107.
- PRINTING, GOVERNMENT, EXECUTED OUTSIDE OF CONTRACTOR: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 19.
- PRINTING MAPS OF SURVEYED LANDS IN NORTH-WEST: in Com. of Supply, 1291.
- PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Supply, 1197.
- PRINTING, PAPER AND BOOKBINDING (LEGISLATION): in Com. of Supply, 785.
- PRIVATE BILLS PETITIONS: Ms. to extend time (*Mr. Drew*) 45, 58, 129, 288, 367.
- PRIVILEGE, QUESTIONS OF:
- Better Prevention of Fraud in Contracts B.: Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) respecting day for discussion, 876.
 - Elections Act Amt. B.: Ques. (*Mr. Ives*) of precedence, 876.
 - Explanation (*Mr. Hesson*) respecting article in London *Advertiser* and charge of making disturbing noises, 990.
 - Explanation (*Mr. Bunster*) respecting Official Rep. of Debates attributing speech made by Mr. Anglin on the Res. of Sympathy with Ireland, 1102.
 - Explanation of Rep. of proceedings in House in St. John *Sun* respecting Deb. on the *Charybdis* and St. John Harbor (*Mr. Domville*) 1353.
 - Explanation *in re* Montreal Telegraph Co.'s B. respecting paragraph in Montreal *Gazette* (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 228, 368; paragraph in Toronto *Globe*, 988.
 - Explanation respecting Mr. Cameron's personal remarks on newspaper paragraph (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 368.
- PRIVILEGE, QUESTIONS OF—*Con.*
- Explanation (*Mr. Mills*) respecting paragraph in Halifax *Morning Herald* charging him with having accepted a fee (or bribe) of \$4,000 from Ont. Government *in re* Boundary Dispute, 888.
 - Explanations respecting paragraph in Toronto *Globe* charging certain Members with supplementing their Indemnity by fees for promoting Bills, &c. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 889; (*Mr. McCarthy*) 889; (*Mr. Boulton*) 889.
 - Explanation of Remarks in Com. of Supply reflecting on an hon. Member (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 927.
 - Explanation (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) respecting article in *Globe* newspaper charging him with having sold himself to a contractor for \$2,500, 570.
 - Explanations respecting paragraph in Ottawa *Free Press* on dispensing patronage (*Mr. Tassé*) 990; (*Mr. Currier*) 990.
 - Explanations respecting items in Ottawa *Free Press* charging certain hon. Members with setting off torpedoes, &c. (*Messrs. Ogden, McLeod and Manson*) 1534; (*Mr. Amyot*) 1553; (*Mr. Bergeron*) 1555.
 - Explanation respecting paragraph in Toronto *Globe* charging the throwing of torpedoes (*Mr. Landry*) 1534.
 - Explanation respecting paragraph in Montreal *Herald* on retiring from parliamentary life (*Mr. Bunster*) 1067.
 - Inland Waters Navigation Bill: Ques. (*Mr. Guillet*) of precedence, 876.
 - Intercolonial Ry. Rolling Stock: Ques. on bringing down Rets. (*Mr. Anglin*) 876.
 - Intercolonial Ry. Tenders for Supplies: Ques. (*Mr. Killam*) as to when Rets. will be laid before the House, 876.
 - Ireland, Res. of Sympathy: Ques. (*Mr. Costigan*) as to day for discussion, 875.
 - Pacific Ry. Com. Expenditure Return: Remarks as to defective character (*Mr. Blake*) 876.
 - Readjustment of the Representation B.: Remarks on system of recording votes (*Mr. Dawson*) 1503.
- PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF:
- Agricultural Interests: M. (*Mr. Orton*) for Sel. Com. objected to by *Mr. Trow*, proper notice not having been given of names comprising same. Objection sustained (*Mr. Speaker*) 128.
 - Irish Res. of Sympathy (*Mr. Costigan*). Objections made by Messrs. *Williams, Tyrwhitt* and *White (Hastings)*, to record of vote as published in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the House, maintaining that Res. were carried on a div., *Mr. Blake* contending that they were carried unanimously, calling upon the *Premier* to sustain him. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that record in *Votes and Proceedings* cannot be altered, 1068.
 - Prevention of Fraud in relation to Public Contracts. Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) in Amf. to Com. of Supply. Objected to by *Sir Hector Langevin*, the Res. referring to a B. on the Orders of the Day. *Mr.*

PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF— *Con.*

- Prevention of Fraud in Public Contracts—*Con.*
Speaker decided that only grievances could be placed before the H. and Government on M. for Com. of Supply, and that a M. cannot be made relating to an Order of the Day, 1435.
- Readjustment of the Representation B. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). M. for 2° objected to by *Mr. Blake*, the B. which was prop. for 2° not being the same that was submitted to the H. for 1°, quoting English authorities to sustain his objection. The *Premier* submitted that the objection taken by the leader of the Opposition could be taken in Com. of W.; but the *Speaker* sustained the objections and discharged the Order. B. withdn., 1330—1332.
- Stadacona Ins. Co. B. (*Mr. Casgrain*). Constitutionality of B. questioned (*Mr. Vallée*) as the legalizing of such a measure would interfere with the Civil Law of Lower Canada. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that the constitutionality of a B. is not decided by the Chair but by Com. to which B. might be referred 48.
- Steamboat Inspection Act: M. (*Mr. McLelan*) for Com. of W. to consider Res. Objected to by *Mr. Mackenzie*, the proposition not having first been submitted to Com. of W. as laid down by the Rules of the H. *Mr. Speaker* decided that the prop. M. came sufficiently within the meaning of the Rule as generally understood and interpreted by late English practice, 1546.
- Trust and Loan Co. of Canada B. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). Amt. (*Mr. Béchard*) to M. for 3° objected to by *Mr. McCarthy* under the 67th Rule of the H., one day's notice not having been given; objection sustained (*Mr. Speaker*) 1080.
- Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. (*Sir Charles Tupper*). On M. for 2°, Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) as to B. affecting private rights. Ruled (*Mr. Speaker*) that the B. having passed the 2° it was recognized as a public B., the H. having power to refer it to any tribunal it likes, but generally to Com. of W., 1544—1549.
- PRODUCTS OF THE FARM, IMPORTATIONS OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 327.
- Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Act Repeal B. No. 63** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1°, 2°* and 3°*, 162. (45 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- Promissory Notes and other negotiable Instruments B. No. 73** (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*). 1°, 2°, 220; 2°, 621.
- PROVINCIAL ACTS DISALLOWED: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 19.
- PROVINCIAL CONSTITUTIONS OR CHARTERS: M. for Copies (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 167.
- PROVINCIAL RYS.: M. for Copy of Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 371.
- PROVINCIAL DISTRICTS IN THE NORTH WEST: Message presented (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1492; considered, 1567; Res., 1568.
- PROBATION OF PARLIAMENT. See *Parliament*.

- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, 1880: M. to refer Items to Com. (*Mr. Blake*) 483.
- PUBLIC BUSINESS AND TELEGRAPH MESSAGES: M. for Copy of Instructions (*Mr. Killam*) 1121.
- PUBLIC BUSINESS, STATE OF: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 287, 428.
- PUBLIC BUILDING AT SOREL: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 164.
- Public Contracts, Fraud in relation to, B. No. 7** (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1°*, 35; M. for 2°, 187; Amt., 1 m. h. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) carried (Y. 78, N. 51) 188.
- PUBLIC DEBT, ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON: M. for Cor. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 20.
- PUBLIC DEBT, The: Ques. (*Mr. Charlton*) 254.
- PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 1332; Deb. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 1334; (*Mr. Casgrain*) 1337; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1337; (*Mr. Bowell*) 1339; (*Mr. Wright*) 1344; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1344; (*Mr. Rochester*) 1348; (*Mr. Plumb*) 1348; Amt. neg. (Y. 47, N. 99) 1354.
- PUBLIC PRINTING AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: Remarks (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) in Com. of Supply, 1197.
- PUBLIC SERVICE, SUPERANNUATIONS IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 373.
- PUBLIC WORKS CHARGEABLE TO INCOME AND CAPITAL. See *Supply*.
- PUBLIC WORKS, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Supply, 657.
- PUBLIC AND YARMOUTH, DREDGES AT: Remarks (*Mr. Killam*) in Com. of Supply, 1029.
- PULLMAN CAR CO., DUTIES UNPAID AND SEIZURES MADE: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Béchard*) 1120.
- Qu'Appelle Land Co. Incorp. B. No. 103** (*Mr. Boulbee*). 1°*, 367; 2°*, 492; in Com. 1105; 3°*, 1106. (45 *Vic.*, c. 121.)
- QUARANTINE. See *Supply*.
- QUARANTINE STATIONS, CATTLE, OF CANADA: in Com. of Supply, 850.
- QUARANTINE STATIONS ON DETROIT AND ST. CLAIR RIVERS: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 327.
- QUARTERLY STATISTICS OF TRADE: Res. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 1248.
- QUEBEC:
- Act respecting Mines: M. (*Mr. Laurier*) 40.
- Harbors and Rivers: in Com. of Supply, 1028.
- Indians: in Com. of Supply, 1184.
- Instructions to Governors-General, &c.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mills*) 1108.
- Judicial Appointments: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ives*) 48.
- Manufactures exported to B. C.: M. for Statement (*Mr. Valin*) 284.
- Public Buildings: in Com. of Supply, 1023.
- Validity of Marriages: M. (*Mr. Blake*) 55.
- Vessels Registered in: M. for Statement (*Mr. Valin*) 2-8.
- QUEBEC CITADEL, GOV. GEN.'S QUARTERS: in Com. of Supply, 1265.
- Quebec Harbor Improvement Act Amt. B. No. 129** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 534; 1°*, 535; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 988. (45 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa Ry. B. No. 114 (*Mr. Abbott*). 1°*, 376; 2°*, 492; in Com. and 3°*, 1078. (45 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

QUEBEC RY. FERRY: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 36.

Quebec Timber Co. Incorp. B. No. 32 (*Mr. Brooks*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 119)

Queen's College, Kingston B. No. 64 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 172; 2°*, 201; in Com. and 3°*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 123.)

QUESTIONS OF ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE. See those subjects.

Railway Commissioners, Court of, B. No. 2 (*Mr. McCarthy*). 1°*, 18; M. for 2°, 173; Amt., 6 m. h. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 185; withdn., 186; 2°, 186; M. for Special Com. carried, 186.

RAILWAY CO.'S IN THE NORTH-WEST, PURCHASE OF LAND BY: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 1121.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS IN TORONTO: M. for Cop. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 227.

RAILWAY INSPECTION FUND: Ques. (*Mr. McCarthy*) 368.

Railway Passenger Tickets B. No. 5. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 35; 2° prop., 269; M. to refer to Sel. Com. withdn., 279; 2°, 279; prop. M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 851; carried, 1155; 3°* 1212. (45 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

Railway Passenger Tickets, good until used B. No. 58 (*Mr. Thompson*). 1°, 162; 2°, 281.

RAILWAYS, ACCIDENTS ON GOVERNMENT: M. for Documents (*Mr. Valin*) 285.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS CHARGEABLE TO INCOME AND CAPITAL. See *Supply*.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of *Supply*, 657.

Rainy River Improvement Co. Incorp. B. No. 39 (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°*, 78; 2°*, 110.

RAINY RIVER WATER POWER ON: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Wallace, York*) 228.

Rapid City Central Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 139 (*Mr. Bannerman*). 1°*, 659; 2°*, 773; in Com. and 3°*, 1106. (45 *Vic.*, c. 85.)

READJUSTMENT OF SEATS B.: Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 72; (*Mr. Mills*) 228; remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 1068; Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1145; (*Mr. Blake*) 1155, 1231.

Readjustment of the Representation of the H. of C. B. No. 153 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 1202; M. for 2°, 1330; B. withdn., 1332.

Readjustment of the Representation of the H. of C. B. No. 158 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1332; M. for 2°, 1356; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1376; neg. (Y. 51, N. 111) 1401; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 52, N. 112) 1402; 2° carried (Y. 112, N. 52) 1402; M. for Com., 1403; in Com., 1410, 1445; on M. for 3°, Amts. to recom. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) carried (Y. 124, N. 15) 1478; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1479; (*Mr. Sutherland*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1479; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1480; (*Mr. Guthrie*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1480; (*Mr.*

Readjustment of Representation—Con.

Fleming) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1481; (*Mr. Wheler*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1482; (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 42, Y. 99) 1482; (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1483; (*Mr. Mills*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1483; (*Mr. Casey*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1484; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1485; (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1485; (*Mr. Thompson*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1486; (*Mr. Bain*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1487; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1488; (*Mr. Trow*) neg. (Y. 42, N. 99) 1489; (*Mr. Rymal*) neg. (Y. 41, N. 106) 1491; Amt. (*Mr. Bunster*) withdn., 1493; Amt. to recom. (*Mr. Guthrie*) neg. on a div., 1494; (*Mr. Gillies*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 103) 1494; 3°*, 1495; Senate Amts. considered, 1561. (45 *Vic.*, c. 3.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1249.

RED POINT (P. E. I.) BREAKWATER: Ques. (*Mr. Muttart*) 163.

RED RIVER EXPEDITION (1870-71) NAMES OF OFFICERS. M. for Ret. (*Mr. Amyot*) 328; Ques., 478.

RED RIVER, RAPIDS IN, IMPROVEMENT OF: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.

REGISTERED LETTERS, CHARGES ON: Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 42.

REGISTERED LETTERS LOST DURING 1881: M. for Statement (*Mr. Coughlin*) 57.

REGISTRATION OF SHIPPING: CONC., 1311.

REGISTRATION OF VESSELS IN QUEBEC: M. for Statement (*Mr. Valin*) 288.

REGULATION OF THE FISHERIES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 171.

REID J., *Cariboo, B.C.*: Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 1; Introduction, 1.

REPAIRS, FURNITURE &c., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of *Supply*, 1026.

REPEAL OF DUTIES ON FUEL AND BREADSTUFFS. See *Fuel and Breadstuffs*.

REPORT OF GERMAN DELEGATES: Ques. (*Mr. Merner*) 254.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR: Attention of Minister called to an article in *Mail* newspaper (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 222.

REPORTS PRESENTED:

Adulteration of Food (*Mr. Bowell*) 18.

Auditor General's (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 18.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Royal Commission, Evidence before (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 773; Commissioners' Rep. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 789.

Interior (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 311.

Inland Revenue (*Mr. Bowell*) 18.

Militia and Defence (*Mr. Caron*) 18.

Postmaster General's (*Mr. O'Connor*) 41.

Public Works (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 18.

Public Accounts (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 18.

Railways and Canals (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 18.

Secretary of State's (*Mr. Mousseau*) 162.

Trade and Navigation Returns (*Mr. Bowell*) 18.

Weights and Measures (*Mr. Bowell*) 18.

- RESIDENT JUDGE AT GASPÉ: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fortin*) 110.
- RESTIGOUCHE RIVER, DREDGING THE: Ques. (*Mr. Haddow*) 254.
- RESTIGOUCHE RIVER, TRAVERSE IN THE CHANNEL OF: M. for Reps. of Engineers (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 40.
- RETURNS OF RAILWAY CONTRACTS: Remarks (*Mr. Blake*) 493.
- REVENUE CUTTER ON HUDSON'S BAY: Ques. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 45.
- REVISION OF CANADIAN STATUTES, APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 49.
- Richelieu Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 42** (*Mr. Baker*). 1°*, 78; 2°, 110; in Com. and 3°*, 888. (45 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- RIDOUT, MAJOR, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Copy, &c. (*Mr. Bunting*) 190.
- RIDOUT, MAJOR, REMOVAL FROM MILITARY COLLEGE STAFF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Bunting*) 190.
- RIMOUSKI, CENSUS ENUMERATION IN: M. for Statement (*Mr. Fiset*) 229.
- "RIMOUSKI," STEAMER, SALE OF: Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 1108.
- RIMOUSKI, TOBACCO TAX PAID IN: M. for Names of Persons (*Mr. Fiset*) 1253.
- RIMOUSKI, WHARF AT: Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 478.
- RIVER FISHERIES: in Com. of Supply, 875.
- River St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co. B. No. 80** (*Mr. Arkell*). 1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com. and 3°*, 1078. (45 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- RIVERS IN DOMINION LEASED FOR FISHING: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Haddow*) 1120.
- RIVIÈRE BLANCHE BREAKWATER: Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 558.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRIDGE CROSSING: Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 110.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH OF THE INTERCOLONIAL, TOTAL COST OF: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 191.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, DREDGE AT MOUTH OF: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 255.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP (*en haut*) MOUTH OF: M. for Rep. of Engineer (*Mr. Houde*) 229.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP WHARF, LIGHT ON: Ques. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 222.
- ROADS AND BRIDGES IN MANITOBA, AID TO: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1120.
- ROBBERY OF ALMA (N.B.) POST OFFICE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Domville*) 1240.
- ROLLING STOCK, INTERCOLONIAL RY.: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Anglin*) 56, 120.
- RONDEAU HARBOR OF REFUGE, Arrival and Departure of Vessels: M. for Rets. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 45.
- ROSS, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Copies (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 327; Deb. in Com. of Supply on censure in *Gazette*, 1292.
- ROUTE AND EXPENDITURE ON CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. WEST OF WINNIPEG: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 40.
- Royal Academy of Arts Incorp. B. No. 150** (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1°* and 2°*, 1129; in Com. and 3°*, 1212. (45 *Vic.*, c. 122.)
- ROYAL ASSENT, FORM OF: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 48.
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 192, 1574.
- Royal Military College Graduates, to be admitted to profession of D.L.S. B. No. 124** (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1°, 493.
- RUSSELL vs. WOODWARD: in Com. of Supply, 1276.
- RYAN, THOMAS, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Coursol*) 316.
- SABLE ISLAND, TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (*Mr. Daly*) 45; M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 50.
- SACKVILLE, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT: M. for Cor. (*Sir Albert J. Smith*) 282.
- SAGUENAY, POSTAL COMMUNICATION IN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cimon, Chicoutimi*) 125.
- SALARIES OF DEPUTY ADJUTANTS-GENERAL AND BRIGADE MAJORS: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 222.
- SALARIES OF COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: Ques. (*Mr. Wheeler*) 46; in Com. of Supply, 1194.
- SALARIES OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 169.
- Salaries of Judges B. No. 179** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 1253; in Com., 1561; 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1561; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1561; 3°*, 1561. (45 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- SALE OF PROPERTY ON RIDEAU STREET, OTTAWA: Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 129.
- SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS AT WINNIPEG: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mills*) 1121.
- SALES OF LAND BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.: M. for Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 371.
- Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets B. No. 5** (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 35; 2° prop., 269; M. to refer to Sel. Com. withdn., 279; 2°, 279; prop. M. to transfer to Government Orders (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 851; carried, 1155; 3°*, 1212. (45 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- SALMON FISHING LICENSES AND FEES CHARGED: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Killam*) 1237.
- SANDS HEAD LIGHTHOUSE, B.C.: Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Com. of Supply, 870.
- SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA (B.C.) STEAM COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Supply, 865.
- Saskatchewan and Peace River Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 26** (*Mr. Kilvert*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 312; 3°*, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- SASKATCHEWAN GRAND RAPIDS, TRAMWAY AT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 172.
- Saskatchewan, Qu'Appelle and Assiniboine Navigation Co. Incorp. B. No. 83** (*Mr. Macmillan*). 1°*, 269; 2°*, 296.
- SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Conc., 1501.
- Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 43** (*Mr. Williams*). 1°*, 78; 2°*, 110; in Com., 264; 3°*, 296. (45 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- SCHOOL LANDS IN MANITOBA, SQUATTERS ON: Ms. for Rets. (*Mr. Scott*) 263; Occupation of (*Mr. Schultz*) 328.
- SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS. See *Supply*.
- Sea Fisheries Development B. No. 177** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 875; in Com., 1511; 1°, 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 1555. (45 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

- Seamen's Act (1873) Amt. B. No. 110** (*Mr. McLelan*). 1°*, 376; 2°* and in Com., 1509; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. (Y. 28, N. 87) 1535; 3°*, 1535. (45 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPARTMENT OF: in Com. of Supply, 602.
- Seduction, Adultery, &c. (Criminal Law Amt.) B. No. 25** (*Mr. Charlton*). 1°, 47; M. for 2° carried (Y. 107, N. 16.) 327; Ref. to Special Com., 327.
- SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. See *Committees*.
- SESSIONAL MESSENGERS, REMUNERATION OF: Remarks before Prorogation, 1572.
- SETTLERS IN THE NORTH-WEST: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 36.
- SHEETINGS AND SHIRTINGS: Remarks before the Orders of the Day (*Mr. Blake*) 320.
- SHELburne HARBOR (N.S.) FOG WHISTLE AT: Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 222; (M. for Ret.) 318; in Com. of Supply, 869.
- Sherbrooke Mutual Benefit Association Incorp. B. No. 33** (*Mr. Brooks*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89.
- SHINGLES AND LATHS SHIPPED FROM KINGSTON, BROOKVILLE AND PRESCOTT: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1121.
- SHIPPING DISASTERS IN INLAND WATERS: M. for Cor. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 46.
- "SIMCOE," LOSS OF THE: in Com. on B. 117, 1215.
- Sisters of Charity of N.W.T. Incorp. B. No. 92** (*Mr. Tasse*). 1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 950. (45 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
- SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to sit on Saturdays, 1254.
- SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION, COST OF: in Com. of Supply, 855.
- SMUGGLING ALONG THE FRONTIER: in Com. of Supply, 851.
- SOREL, PUBLIC BUILDING AT: Ques. (*Mr. Massue*) 164.
- SOREL, SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN: M. for Statement (*Mr. Massue*) 228.
- Souris and Rocky Mountain Ry. Co. Incorp. Acts Amt. B. No. 68** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°*, 192; 2°*, 221; in Com. and 3°*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO. LAND PURCHASES: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1107.
- SOURIS WEST HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Muttart*) 478.
- South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 76** (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 229; 2°*, 264; in Com. and 3°*, 773. (45 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- Sovereign Fire Ins. Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. No. 78** (*Mr. Mackenzie*). 1°*, 229; 2°*, 264.
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep., 1; for the Address, &c., see *Address*.
- Springfield and Winnipeg Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 15** (*Mr. Scott*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com. and 3°*, 888. (45 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- SPRINGHILL COAL DELIVERIES: M. for Ret. (*Mr. King*) 172.
- SQUATTERS IN THE N.W.T.: M. for O. C. (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 20.
- Stadacona Fire and Life Ins. Co. Act Amt. B. No. 6** (*Mr. Casgrain*). 1°, 35; 2°, 47; in Com. and 3°, 669. (45 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- STAKED CLAIMS UNDER MANITOBA ACT: M. for Rep. of Commission (*Mr. Costigan*) 128.
- STAMP ACT REPEAL: Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 18; Announcement (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 109.
- Stamp Act Repeal B. No. 63** (*Sir John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 2°* and 3°*, 162. (45 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- STATION ACCOMMODATION (CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.): in Com. of Supply, 1098.
- STATIONERY OFFICE, FOR STATIONERY: in Com. of Supply, 658.
- STATISTICAL BUREAU AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 255.
- STATISTICS, HEALTH AND CRIMINAL: in Com. of Supply, 847.
- STATUTES, INDEX TO: M. to print (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 1355.
- Steamboat Inspection Acts Consolidation B. 117** (*Mr. McLelan*). Res. in Com., 546; 1°*, 549; 2°* and in Com., 1212, 1302; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) carried, 1303; in Com., 1303; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) neg. on a div., 1304; Amt. (*Mr. McCallum*) carried, 1306; in Com., 1306; on M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. McCuaig*) neg. on a div., 1307; 3°*, 1307. (45 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- STEAM COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CANADA AND BRAZIL: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 328.
- STEAMERS ON BAY CHALEURS: Ques. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 48.
- STREAMS AND CREEKS ACT, DISALLOWED: M. for Cor. &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*), 40.
- STREAMS BILL (ONT). See *Disallowance*.
- STRATFORD AND CHESLEY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 73.
- STURGEON FISHERY IN N.B.: Remarks (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) in Com. of Supply, 874.
- SUB-CONTRACTS ON CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: M. for Copies (*Mr. Blake*) 481.
- SUBSIDY TO CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
- Subsidy to Manitoba B. No. 162** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. prop., 721; in Com. 1420; 1°*, 1425; 2°* and in Com., 1568; M. for 3°, 1568; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div. 1569; 3°*, 1569. (45 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
- Subsidies to Rys. B. No. 176** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1521; Res. in Com., 1553; 1°* and 2°*, 1554; in Com., 1556; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) neg. on a div., 1556; 3°*, 1556. (45 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- SUGAR DUTIES, AMENDMENT OF THE: Res. (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Supply, 762; Deb. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 768; (*Mr. Gunn*) 773; (*Mr. McLennan*) 775; (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 776; Amt. neg. (Y. 36, N. 85) 779.
- Sun Mutual Insurance Co. of Montreal Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 4** (*Mr. Gault*). 1°*, 35; 2°*, 47; in Com., 296; M. for 3°, 311; 3°, 429. (45 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 222.
- SUPERANNUATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS AT LONDON: M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Blake*) 166.
- SUPERANNUATION REFUNDS (INTERCOLONIAL): in Com. of Supply, 1102.

SUPERANNUATION IN THE PUBLIC SERVICES: M. for Ret.
(*Mr. Kaulbach*) 373.

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts Repeal
B. No. 146 (*Mr. Landry*). 1^o*, 950.

SUPREME COURT, APPEALS TO THE: Res. (*Mr. Blake*)
164.

SUPREME COURT BILL: Ques. (*Mr. Landry*) 48; (*Mr. Costigan*) 493.

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA, FURNITURE AND REPAIRS: in
Com. of Supply, 1265.

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion are
noted under this head.]

Formal Vote before Budget, 58.

Message from H. E. transmitting Estimates for 1882-83,
58; referred to Com., 58; Message from H. E.
transmitting Supplementary Estimates for 1881-82,
69; referred to Com., 69; further Suppl. for
1881-82, Message, 1313; Suppl. for 1882-83, Mes-
sage, 1314; further Suppl. for 1882-83, Message,
1535.

Res. for Com., 18; Res. in Amt.: Port Moody and
Emory Bar Section of Canadian Pacific Ry., Con-
tract for (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 592; Fuel and Bread-
stuffs, Repeal of Duties on (*Mr. Laurier*) 622;
Boundaries of Ontario (*Mr. Plumb*) 661; Sugar
Duties, Amendment of (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*)
762; Government Land Policy in the North West
(*Mr. Charlton*) 810; Disallowance of Streams B.
(*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 876; Commercial Treaties
(*Mr. Blake*) 1068; Ireland, Resolutions of
Sympathy (*Mr. Costigan*) 1034; Cottons and
Woollens, Duties on (*Mr. Anglin*) 1162; Iron In-
dustry (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 1216; Public
Expenditure (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 1332.

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice:

Russell vs. Woodward, Expenses in case of, 1276.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Agricultural and Industrial and other Statistics of
Man. and N.W.T., 1506.

Care of Archives, 786; Conc., 1309.

Criminal Statistics, 847.

Census, 847; Conc., 1309.

Health Statistics, 847; Conc., 1310.

Patent Record, 847.

Charges of Management, 592; Conc., 1308.

Civil Government:

Civil Service Board, 658.

Contingent Expenses, High Commissioner, 659;
Conc., 1500; additional expenditure, 1504.

Dept. of Justice, 601.

" " (Penitentiaries Branch) 601.

" Militia, 601.

" Secretary of State, 602.

" Interior, 605.

" " (Indian Affairs) 606, 1288, 1506.

" Customs, 606.

" Agriculture, 656.

SUPPLY—Con.

COMMITTEE—Con.

Civil Government—Con.

Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, 657.

" Public Works, 657.

" Railways and Canals, 657.

Departmental Contingencies, 658.

Office of Auditor General, 606.

Post Office Dept., 655, 1506.

Post Office and Finance Depts.: Contingencies,
1276, 1506.

Stationery Office, for Stationery, 658.

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food, Conc., 1312.

Customs, 851.

Culling Timber, Conc., 1501.

Excise, 1067.

Inland Revenue: Tobacco Stamp, 1276.

" " Commissions to Customs officers,
1276.

Public Works: Telegraph Lines, B.C., 1275.

Railways and Canals: Intercolonial, 1148, 1230.

" " " Windsor Branch Ry., 1230.

" " " P. E. I. Ry., 1444.

Weights and Measures and Gas, Conc., 1312.

Dominion Police, 659.

Dominion Lands—Capital, 1201.

Dominion Lands—Income, 1202, 1291.

Fisheries:

Fish Breeding, 1273.

Fish Hatchery, B. C., 1556.

Inspection of Rivers and Mill-dams, 1274.

Salaries and disbursements of Overseers and War-
dens, 870.

Salary, &c., Fishery Overseer McVicar, 1272.

Geological Survey, 1183, 1507.

Immigration, 848, 1276, 1505, 1506.

Immigration and Quarantine, 850; Conc., 1310.

Indians:

British Columbia, 1184.

Manitoba and the North-West, 1184—1186, 1290.

Ontario, Quebec and Maritime Provinces, 1184;
Conc., 1312.

Squatters on Reserve in Gibson, Ont., 1505.

Legislation:

Grant to Library, 784; Conc., 1499.

Indemnity of the late L. A. McConville, M.P.,
1556.

Publishing Debates, 784; Conc., 1499.

Printing, Paper and Bookbinding, 785.

Salaries of Officers (additional) and Contingencies
of Library, 785.

Lighthouse and Coast Service:

Buoys and Beacons in Montreal Harbor, 1272.

Completion and construction of Lighthouses, &c.,
869.

Maintenance, &c., Lights, Fog-whistles, &c., 867.

Salaries, &c., Lighthouse Keepers, 867.

Sands Head Lighthouse, B. C., 870.

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Mail Subsidies:*

- Steam Com.: San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 865.
 " " Grand Manan, N. B., and Mainland, 865.
 " " Canada and West Indies and Brazil, 865; Conc., 1310, 1500.
 " " France and Quebec, 865.
 " " Liverpool and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., 865.
 " " Prince Edward Island and Great Britain, 866; Conc., 1311.
 " " Campbellton and Gaspé, Conc., 1310.
 " " Port Mulgrave to East Bay, C.B., on Conc., 1310, 1501.
 " " Halifax and St. Pierre, Conc., 1310.

Militia:

- Ammunition, Clothing and Military Stores, 855.
 " A " and " B " Batteries, 865, 1292.
 Brigade Majors Salaries, transport expenses, &c., 854.
 Contingencies, Grants to Associations, &c., 862.
 Care of Military Properties, 863.
 Cartridge Factory at Quebec, 1292.
 Drill Instruction and Drill Pay, 860, 1292.
 Military Schools and Drill Instruction in Colleges, 865, 1292.
 Purchase of four guns, &c., 1507; Conc., 1559.
 Royal Military College, 863.
 Salaries: Military Branch and District Staff, 853.

Miscellaneous:

- Army and Navy, Articles imported for use of, 1198.
 Claim of Reuben Lunt, 1558.
 Coins, Medals, &c., purchase of, 1557.
 Compensation to Jean Louis Légaré, 1508.
 Consolidation of Dominion Statutes, 1288.
 Erection of Mounted Police Barracks, 1445.
 Fishery Warden Mowat, 1274.
 Fishermen's Losses through Storms, 1274.
 Fox, Mrs. Diana, Reimbursement to, Conc., 1559.
 International Fishery Exhibition, 1505.
 International Circumpolar Observations, 1507.
 Intoxicating Liquors, Act respecting, 1199.
 Keewatin, Expenses of Government in, 1199.
 Miscellaneous Printing, 1197.
 Niagara Falls Commissioners, 1558.
 North-West Territories, Expenses of Government in, 1199.
 North-West Mounted Police, Compensation to Members, 1199.
 Unforeseen Expenses, 1198.
 Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to, 1199; Conc., 1312.

*North-West Mounted Police, 1186.**Ocean and River Service:*

- Canadian Registration of Shipping, on Conc., 1311.
 Investigations into Wrecks, &c., 866.
 La Canadienne, Repairs, &c., 1272.

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Ocean and River Service—Con.*

- Life Boats, &c., and Rewards for Saving Life, 866.
 Montreal and Quebec Water and River Police, 866.
 Provision for replacing the Steamer *Glencorn*, 866; Conc., 1311.
 Removable of obstructions in navigable rivers, 866.
 Training Ship *Charybdis*, 1268; Conc., 1502.
 Water Police, Montreal, 1272.

Penitentiaries:

- British Columbia, 784.
 Dorchester, 783; Conc., 1498.
 Kingston, 779, 1289.
 Manitoba, 784, 1505; Conc., 1559.
 St. Vincent de Paul, 782, 1289, 1506.

Pensions:

- Veterans of War of 1812, 851.

*Post Office, 1191.**Public Works—Capital:*

- Grounds at Ottawa: Marshall Wood's claim, 1265.
 " " Goodwin's contract, 1265.

Public Works—Income:

- Harbors and Rivers: Nova Scotia, 1026, 1267, 1556.
 " " New Brunswick, 1027, 1444.
 " " Quebec, 1028.
 " " Ontario, 1028, 1267, 1445, 1556; Conc., 1502.
 " " Manitoba, 1028; Conc., 1312.
 " " North-West Territories, 1029; on Conc., 1501.
 " " Dredging, 1267; Conc., 1501.

*Miscellaneous: Hydrographic Survey, 1445.**Public Buildings: Nova Scotia, 926.*

- " " Prince Edward Island, 1023.
 " " New Brunswick, 1023.
 " " Quebec, 1023, 1265, 1355.
 " " Ontario, 1024, 1265, 1266, 1556.
 " " Manitoba, 1025, 1266, 1354, 1444.
 " " North-West Territories, 1025.
 " " British Columbia, 1025.
 " " Repairs, Furniture, &c, 1026, 1266, 1354.

*Roads and Bridges: Union Suspension, 1267.**" " Manitoba, 1556.**Slides and Booms: Compensation to McHale, 1268.**Telegraphs: Mille Vaches and Murray Bay, 1268, 1355.**Railways and Canals—Capital:**Canals: Lachine, 1145.*

- " St. Anne's Lock and Canal, 1438.
 " St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1145.
 " Williamsburg, 1438.
 " Welland, 1145, 1438.
 " Trent River Navigation, 1439.
 " Carillon Canal, Dam and Slide, 1146.
 " Tay Canal, 1442.
 " Grenville, 1146.
 " Murray Canal, 1146.

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Railways and Canals—Capital—Con.*

General: Surveys and inspection, 1102.

Intercolonial Ry.: Increased accommodation at St. John, 1099.

" St. Charles Branch and Ferry, 1436.

" Wharf and Elevator, Halifax Terminus, 1101.

" Extension into Halifax, 1230, 1437.

" Rolling Stock, 1102, 1230; Conc., 1318.

" Heirs of George Moffat for transport of rails, 1229.

" Superannuation refunds, 1102.

" J. C. Nolan, for rent of a building at St. Octave, 1228.

" J. B. McNutt, of Onslow, N.B., laud damages, 1229.

Pacific Ry.: Canada Central (subsidy) 1095; Conc. 1315.

" Prince Arthur's Landing to Red River, 1095; Conc., 1315.

" British Columbia, 1097.

" Telegraph lines, 1098.

" Station accommodation, 1098.

" Subsidy to Company, 1098.

P. E. I. Ry.: Rolling Stock, 1437.

" " Cape Traverse Ry., 1437.

Railways and Canals—Income :

Canals: Lachine, Dredging in Basin No. 4, 1148.

" Chambly, Raising banks, &c., 1148.

" Swing Bridge at Valleyfield, 1148.

" St. Ours Lock and Dam, 1148.

" Welland, Damages to *M. C. Upper*, 1443; Conc., 1502, 1535.*Scientific Institutions :*

Meteorological Observations &c., Conc., 1311.

St. John Observatory, 1274.

*Unprovided Items, 1880-81 :**Vide* Auditor-General's Report, p. 46, 1292.

CONCURRENCE :

Adulteration of Food, 1312.

Bedson, S. L., Balance due, 1558.

Canada and Brazil Mail Service, 1500.

Canadian Pacific Ry., 1315.

Care of Archives, 1309.

Census, 1309.

Charges of Management, 1303.

Charybdis Training Ship, 1502.

Culling Timber, 1501.

Damages to the *M. C. Upper*, 1502, 1535.

Dorchester Penitentiary, 1498.

Dredging, 1501.

Fox, Mrs. Diana, Reimbursement to, 1559.

Grant to Parliamentary Library, 1499.

Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 1312; (Ont.) 1502.

SUPPLY—*Con.*CONCURRENCE—*Con.*

High Commissioner's Contingent Expenses, 1500.

Indians, 1312.

Intercolonial Ry. (Rolling Stock) 1318.

Mail Subsidies, 1310.

Manitoba Penitentiary, Exchange of land, 1559.

Meteorological Observations, 1311.

Militia, purchase of four Guns, 1559.

Ocean and River Service, 1310.

Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B., Steam Service, 1501.

Publishing Debates, 1499.

Quarantine, 1310.

Saskatchewan River Improvements, 1501.

Waterbury, D. H., Compensation to, 1312.

Weights, Measures and Gas, 1312.

ST. ANACLET, PARISH OF, STATION AT: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 313.

ST. ANNE'S LOCK AND CANAL: in Com. of Supply, 1438.

ST. CHARLES BRANCH (INTERCOLONIAL) AND FERRY: in Com. of Supply, 1436.

St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co. B. No. 80 (*Mr. Arkell*). 1^o*, 229; 2^o*, 264; in Com. and 3^o*, 1078. (45 *Vic.*, c. 70.)ST. EMILIE, LIGHTHOUSE AT: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 615.ST. FLAVIEN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 222.**St. Francis River Floating of Cordwood Regulation B. No. 118** (*Mr. Vanasse*). 1^o, 428.**Supply B. No. 178** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. rep. from Com. of W. and M., 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*, 1559. (45 *Vic.*, c. 2.)SURROGATE JUDGES OF MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 45.

SURVEYS AND INSPECTION OF RYS.: in Com. of Supply, 1102.

SURVEYS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN MANITOBA, KEEWATIN AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 41.

SWING BRIDGE AT VALLEYFIELD: in Com. of Supply, 1148.

SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (*Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton*) 1231.**Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan Incorp. B. No. 51** (*Mr. Mills*). 1^o*, 129; 2^o*, 172; in Com., 444; 3^o*, 486. (45 *Vic.*, c. 126.)ST. HYACINTHE, IMPORTS AND EXPORTS AT: M. for Statement (*Mr. Tellier*) 256.ST. JOHN, COUNTY OF, CENSUS ENUMERATORS IN: M. for Statement (*Mr. Bourassa*) 226.

ST. JOHN, INCREASED WHARF ACCOMMODATION AT: in Com. of Supply, 1099.

St. John (N.B.) Harbor Commission B. No. 163 (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. prop. 1403; in Com., 1429; 1^o*, 1435; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1549. (45 *Vic.*, c. 51.)ST. JOHN (N.B.) CUSTOM HOUSE, CONTRACT FOR: M. for Statement of Payments (*Mr. Weldon*) 1121.

ST. JOHN OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Supply, 1274.

St. John's Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 19 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 47; 2^o*, 68; in Com. and 3^o*, 888. (45 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

- St. Lawrence and Pacific Ry. Ferry Co. Act Amt. B. No. 91** (*Mr. Massue*). 1°*, 289; 2°*, 312.
- ST. LAWRENCE IMPROVEMENT OF, EAST OF PRESCOTT: Ques. (*Mr. Lantier*) 36.
- ST. LAWRENCE, ISLANDS IN, AT OR NEAR BROCKVILLE: M. for Cor. respecting Leases, &c. (*Mr. Fitzsimmons*) 1121.
- St. Lawrence Marine Ins. Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 3** (*Mr. Gault*). 1°*, 35; 2°*, 47; in Com., 296; 3°*, 311. (45 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 1120.
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Supply, 1145
- ST. LOUIS RIVER, LITTLE, WORKS ON: Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 163.
- ST. MICHEL WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Rep. (*Mr. Amyot*) 128; Ques., 368, 1231.
- ST. OURS LOCK AND DAM: in Com. of Supply, 1148.
- ST. RAYMOND AND ST. CASIMIR, SAVINGS BANKS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 478.
- ST. ROCH DES AULNETS HARBOR, SURVEY OF: Ques. (*Mr. Rinfret*) 1230.
- St. Stephen and Calais Ry. Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 97** (*Mr. Weldon*). 1°*, 289; 2°*, 312; in Com. and 3°*, 1078. (45 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- ST. THOMAS DE PIERREVILLE AND LA BAIE, SAVINGS BANKS AT: Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 558.
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, DISSENSIONS IN: in Com. of Supply, 782.
- TARIFF (CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.) CLASSIFICATION SHEET OF ARTICLES UNDER: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1108.
- TARIFF, THE, AND AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS: M. for Sel. Com. (*Mr. Orton*) 126; declared out of Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 128; M. for Sel. Com. carried, 257.
- TAX ON CANADIAN TOBACCO. [For Deb. see *Canadian Tobacco*.]
- TAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION OF WORKS: in Com. of Supply, 1442.
- TEA AND COFFEE DUTIES, REMISSION OF: M. for Cor. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 41.
- Tecumseth Ins. Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 41** (*Mr. McLennan*). 1°*, 78; 2°*, 110; in Com. and 3°*, 669. (45 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- Telegraph and Cable (American) Co. B. No. 17** (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 221; 3°, 429; B. withdn., 1571.
- TELEGRAPH LINES, B.C.: in Com. of Supply, 1276.
- TELEGRAPH LINES, CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: in Com. of Supply, 1098.
- TELEGRAPH LINES IN THE NORTH-WEST, COST OF MAINTENANCE, &c.: M. for detailed Statement (*Mr. Blake*) 172.
- TELEGRAPH MESSAGES AND PUBLIC BUSINESS: M. for Copy of Instructions (*Mr. Killam*) 1121.
- TELEGRAPH SYSTEM OF THE DOMINION: Ques. (*Mr. Gault*) 73.
- Telegraph (word) Declaratory B. No. 166** (*Mr. White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 1455; M. to transfer to Govt. Orders (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 1533; 2°* and in Com., 1569; M. for 3°, 1571; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) neg. on a div., 1571; 3°*, 1571. (45 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH SABLE ISLAND: Ques. (*Mr. Daly*) 45; M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 50.
- TELEGRAPHIC EXTENSION IN VANCOUVER ISLAND: M. for Paps. (*Mr. Bunster*) 228.
- TELEPHONE ON THE CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (*Mr. Benoit*) 221.
- TEMISCAMINGUE, DAM AT LAKE: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1251.
- Temporalities Fund (Presbyterian) Board of Management Incorp. Acts Amt. B. No. 66** (*Mr. Shaw*). 1°*, 172; 2°*, 201; M. for Com., 549; Amt., delay of one week (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) neg., 550; in Com., 550; rep., 558; M. for 3°, 696; Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) neg. on a div., 698; Amt. (*Mr. McLennan*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 130) 715; Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) neg. on a div., 716; Amt. (*Mr. McDougall, Halton*) carried, 718; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Macmillan*) neg. on a div., 720; 3°*, 720. (45 *Vic.*, c. 124.)
- TENDERS FOR DOMINION CANALS: M. for Copies (*Mr. Costigan*) 117.
- TENANT FARMER IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Supply, 849.
- THOUSAND ISLANDS: Ques. (*Mr. Fitzsimmons*) 269.
- Three Rivers Harbor Improvement B. No. 128** (*Sir Hector Langevin*). Res. in Com. and 1°*, 532; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 988. (45 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- Thunder Bay and Minnesota Ry. Incorp. B. No. 21** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68.
- TIMBER AND MINING LICENSES ISSUED WITHIN DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Copies (*Mr. Mills*) 172.
- TIMBER, COAL AND MINERAL LOCATIONS IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 20.
- TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED IN MANITOBA, KEEWATIN AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 20.
- TIMBER LICENSES, SYSTEM OF GRANTING: Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 566.
- TOBACCO INSPECTORS, APPOINTMENT OF: M. for List (*Mr. Bechard*) 1120.
- TOBACCO STAMPS, ENGRAVING AND PRINTING: in Com. of Supply, 1276.
- TOBACCO TAX PAID IN RIMOUSKI: M. for names of persons (*Mr. Fiset*) 1253.
- TONNAGE DUES AT QUEBEC AND MONTREAL: Res. in Com. (*Mr. McLellan*) 535.
- TRAIN CASUALTIES ON INTERCOLONIAL RY.: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 288.
- TRAMWAY AT THE GRAND RAPIDS OF THE SASKATCHEWAN: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bannerman*) 172.
- TRANSLATION AND PRINTING OF LAND REGULATIONS: Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 558.
- TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES, REMARKS ON THE: (*Mr. Fiset*) 376; (*Mr. Valin*) 1353.
- TRANSPORT OF IMMIGRANTS FROM QUEBEC TO TORONTO: in Com. of Supply, 1276.
- TRENT RIVER NAVIGATION: in Com. of Supply, 1439.
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL LOCATION SURVEY: Ques. (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) 36.
- Trinity House and Harbor Commissioners of Montreal Act Amt. B. No. 126** (*Mr. McLellan*). Res. in Com., 660; 1°*, 661; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1030. (45 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

- TRURO CUSTOM HOUSE, &c.:** in Com. of Supply, 927.
- TRUST AND LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Hesson*) 39.
- Trust and Loan Co. of Canada Acts Amt. B. No. 35** (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 57; 2°*, 89; in Com., 1078; M. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) carried (Y. 79, N. 55) 1079; 3°, 1080. (45 *Vic., c. 111.*)
- TRUSTEES, FRAUDULENT DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY BY:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. McCuaig*) 319.
- TUG BOAT "ANNIE STEWART," SERVICES PERFORMED FOR GOVERNMENT:** M. for Statement (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 228.
- TYRWHITT, Mr. R., South Simcoe:** Announcement of Return by The Speaker, 172; Introduction, 172.
- UNFORESEEN EXPENSES:** Statement presented, 18; in Com. of Supply, 1197.
- UNIFORMS FOR CUSTOMS BOATMEN AT QUEBEC:** M. for Copies of Petitions (*Mr. Amyot*) 316.
- UNIFORMS OF LETTER CARRIERS:** in Com. of Supply, 1194.
- UNION SUSPENSION BRIDGE, OTTAWA;** in Com of Supply, 1267.
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS IN AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP:** in Com. of Supply, 1292.
- Upper Canada Bank, Claims against, B. No. 171** (*Sir Leonard Tilley*). Res. in Com., 532, 1503; 1°*, 1521; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1571. (45 *Vic., c. 13.*)
- "UPPER, M. C.," SCHOONER, CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO:** Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1231; in Com. of Supply, 1443; Conc., 1502; Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 1535.
- VACANCIES IN THE REPRESENTATION.** Speaker's Announcement, 1; See HOUSE OF COMMONS.
- VALIDITY OF MARRIAGE IN QUEBEC:** M. (*Mr. Blake*) 55.
- VALLEYFIELD, SWING BRIDGE AT:** in Com. of Supply, 1148.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND RY., CONSTRUCTION OF:** M. for Cor. (*Mr. Blake*) 41.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND RAILWAY:** Remarks (*Mr. Bunster*) in Com. of Supply, 1099.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND, TELEGRAPHIC EXTENSION IN:** M. for Paps. (*Mr. Bunster*) 228.
- VESSELS IMPORTING SUGAR, SYRUP, MOLASSES:** M. for Ret. showing number (*Mr. Rogers*) 129.
- VETERANS OF THE WAR OF 1812:** in Com. of Supply, 851.
- VOLUNTEERS, ARMAMENT OF:** in Com. of Supply, 855.
- VOLUNTEER COMPANIES IN ALGOMA, FORMATION OF:** M. for Ret. (*Mr. Dawson*) 319; in Com. of Supply, 860.
- VOLUNTEER DISCIPLINE IN THE 27TH BATTALION:** M. for Repts. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 56.
- VOLUNTEERS, DRILL PAY AND BRIGADE CAMPS:** Deb. in Com. of Supply, 860, 1292.
- Voting at Elections of Members for the H. of C. in the Magdalen Islands, &c. B. No. 74** (*Mr. Fortin*). 1°, 220.
- WATER AND RIVER POLICE, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC:** in Com. of Supply, 866.
- WATERBURY, D. H., COMPENSATION TO:** in Com. of Supply, 1199; Conc., 1312.
- WATER HEN RIVER NAVIGATION:** Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- WATER POLICE AND SHIP LABORERS STRIKE:** in Com. of Supply, 1272.
- "WAUBUNO," LOSS OF THE:** in Com. on B. 117, 1215.
- WAYS AND MEANS:** Res. for Com., 18; *The Budget Speech*, 78; reply (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) 96, 140; Deb. (*Sir Charles Tupper*) 129; (*Mr. Anglin*) 147; (*Mr. McCallum*) 161; (*Mr. Boulton*) 192; (*Mr. Ross, Middlesex*) 198; (*Mr. McLennan*) 211; (*Mr. Rinfret*) 214; (*Mr. Plumb*) 229; (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 243; (*Mr. Coursol*) 251; (*Mr. Charlton*) 289; (*Mr. Wallace, Norfolk*) 300; (*Mr. Irvine*) 304; (*Mr. Gigault*) 309; (*Mr. McLelan*) 329; (*Mr. Flynn*) 341; (*Mr. McDonald, C B.*) 349; (*Mr. Kranz*) 351; (*Mr. Gillmor*) 352; (*Mr. Longley*) 359; (*Mr. Rykert*) 376; (*Mr. Paterson, Brant*) 390; (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 404; (*Mr. Landry*) 416; (*Mr. Béchard*) 425, 444; (*Mr. Burpee, St. John*) 446; (*Mr. Macdonald, Kings, P.E.I.*) 452; (*Mr. Killam*) 454; (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 457; (*Mr. Fleming*) 458; (*Mr. Beaty*) 462; (*Mr. King*) 465; (*Mr. Doull*) 468; (*Mr. Rymal*) 471; (*Mr. Gault*) 474; (*Mr. Snowball*) 493; (*Mr. Kaubach*) 501; (*Mr. Mills*) 504; (*Mr. McDougall, Pictou*) 511; (*Mr. Richey*) 514; (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 517; Res. in Com. 524.
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS:** Conc. 1312.
- WELLAND CANAL:**
- Copies of Tenders asked for (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 34.
- Hunter, Murray & Co's Contract, M. for Cor. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 57.
- Contract for Section 27: Remarks on Paps. brought down (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 320; M. of Want of Confidence, 1240.
- Lighting Locks by Electric Light. M. for Copies of Tenders (*Mr. Laurier*) 328.
- Damage done to Lock No. 1 in 1881: Ques. (*Mr. Arkell*) 1108; in Com of Supply, 1145, 1438.
- Westbourne, Portage and North-Western Ry. Co. B. No. 20** (*Mr. Boulton*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com., 588; 3°*, 615. (45 *Vic., c. 80.*)
- Western Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 133** (*Mr. Williams*). 1°*, 541; 2°*, 553; in Com. and 3°*, 950. (45 *Vic., c. 64.*)
- WHITE ROCK MILLS POST OFFICE:** Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 478.
- WHITEY HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS:** Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 313.
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL:** in Com. of Supply, 1438.
- Williams Manufacturing Co. B. No. 69** (*Mr. Gault*). 1°*, 192; 2°*, 221; in Com. and 3°*, 823. (45 *Vic., c. 118.*)
- WINNIPEG, ACCOMMODATION FOR IMMIGRANTS:** Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 255.
- WINNIPEG AND BRANDON, RATES BETWEEN:** Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.
- Winnipeg and Springfield Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 15** (*Mr. Scott*). 1°*, 47; 2°*, 68; in Com. and 3°*, 888. (45 *Vic., c. 92.*)
- WINNIPEG AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.'S ACT, DISALLOWED:** M. for Cor., &c. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 40.
- WINNIPEG DRILL SHED:** Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 163.

- WINNIPEG POST OFFICE, INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (*Sir Richard J. Cartwright*) in Com. of Supply, 1194; Vote, 1266; Removal of Officers: Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 1573.
- WINNIPEG, STATISTICAL BUREAU AT: Ques. (*Mr. Scott*) 255.
- WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RY., EARNINGS OF THE: M. for Statement (*Mr. Killam*) 171.
- Windsor and Pictou Branches of the Intercolonial Ry. B. No. 156** (*Sir Charles Tupper*). 1^o, 1253; 2^o, 1543; in Com., 1549; 3^o*, 1551. (45 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- WINDSOR BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Supply, 1230.
- WINTER COMMUNICATION BETWEEN P.E.I. AND THE MAINLAND: M. for Copies of Cor. (*Mr. Brecken*) 224.
- WINTER TERMINUS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: M. for Copies of Petitions, &c. (*Mr. Domville*) 166.
- WOOD, HON. E. B. CHARGES AGAINST: Answer to Petition of H. J. Clarke and others: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 20; M. for reading the Journals (*Mr. Schultz*) 372, 481, 1234; M. for Special Com., 1235; Amt. (*Mr. Rykert*) 1235; Deb. adjd. 1237.
- WOOD, MARSHALL, CLAIM OF: in Com. of Supply, 1265.
- WOODSTOCK (N.B.) POST OFFICE: Ques. (*Mr. Irvine*) 48.
- WOLFE ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for Letters, &c. (*Mr. Gunn*) 1122.
- WOOL IMPORTATIONS AND DUTIES COLLECTED: M. for Ret. (*Mr. Macdonell, Lanark*) 288.
- WORKING EXPENSES AND REVENUE OF INTERCOLONIAL RY.: M. for Statement (*Mr. Gigault*) 288.
- YARMOUTH AND PUBNICO, DREDGES AT: Remarks (*Mr. Killam*) in Com. of Supply, 1029.